

THE ARCHPOET & MEDIEVAL CULTURE

Peter Godman



THE ARCHPOET AND MEDIEVAL CULTURE

The Archpoet and Medieval Culture

PETER GODMAN

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Peter Godman 2014

The moral rights of the author have been asserted

First Edition published in 2014

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2014932822

ISBN 978-0-19-871922-9

Printed and bound by
CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CR0 4YY

*alle diese geständnisse sind in solcher fülle und behendigkeit der sprache
abgelegt, dasz sie jeden zweifel an dem wahrhaftigen beruf ihres verfassers
für die poesie niederschlagen: sie scheinen mir das vollendetste was [das]
mittellateinische mit ihren mitteln überhaupt hervorbringen konnte; flusz und
wollaut der rede, die gewalt des reims sind unvergleichlich.*

(JACOB GRIMM, *Kleinere Schriften*, iii (1866) 27)

Monumentis Germaniae Historicis

*ducentessimum annum mox acturis
semperque florentibus,
sine quibus hic libellus
scribi vix potuisset.*

Preface

This is a study of one of the most famous and least understood poets of the Latin Middle Ages. His works and his world are its subjects. Neither of them has been treated at book-length, nor are they easy to appreciate. A writer whose style sparkles with brilliance, the Archpoet hides himself in the dark of obliquity. Wit is his lure for the initiate, irony his barrier to the profane. Those unprepared for the rigours of erudite art are discouraged from trespassing on his domain. It is shared with the other member of a partnership that he forms against rivals and detractors, bigots and bores: his patron, Rainald of Dassel, who languishes in an obscurity that the pages below attempt to dispel. Their focus is trained on the intellectual history of the twelfth century, in which this pair played a significant but unrecognized role. They ask what it meant for a cleric to work for the bugbear of the orthodox in an alternative culture constructed by Germans who were being decried as barbarians elsewhere in Europe. They probe the dual identity that our author developed as a poet and a notary. And, because that development revolved around the fascinating figure of Rainald, attention is paid to the terms of his togetherness with the Archpoet.

The work was begun in Rome, where it could have been neither continued nor completed. Progress in research and writing was made thanks to the Monumenta Germaniae Historica, to whose excellent library I have had the privilege of access, assisted by the generosity of the Alexander von Humboldt- and the Gerda Henkel-Foundations. Gratitude is owed to the former President and Vice-President of the MGH, my friends Rudolf Schieffer and Gerhard Schmitz. When, two decades ago, Rudolf Schieffer published a study identifying the Archpoet with a notary in Rainald of Dassel's service, I hesitated. It took me time to see that he is right. Now that historical insight forms a basis of this book. Earlier versions of it were delivered as lectures at the University of Cambridge, during the academic year 2009/10, when I had the honour of being Leverhulme professor among old friends and new. All of them flattered me by their presence, and none will mind if I single out three: Philip Ford, a dear companion in this field of study; E. J. Kenney, my much-admired teacher of classics; and Mark Warner, an eminent physicist, who gave me heart by his interest in the Archpoet. For help with redaction of my work I am indebted to Ingetraud Brehm, Venetia Bridges, and Rodney Lokaj. Valuable advice on single or successive chapters was provided by Nora Behrend, Frank Bezner, David d'Avray, Roman Deutinger, Knut Görich, Patrick Zutshi, and an anonymous reader of Oxford University Press. My thanks to each of them do not imply co-responsibility for my errors.

The translations are my own. As the commented edition of the Archpoet that I am preparing for the MGH has yielded to the priority of the *Carmina Burana*, which Frank Bezner and I are editing for OUP, I have cited the vulgate

by Watenphul–Krefeld, indicating where I differ from its text and interpretations in footnotes. The studies preliminary to this book listed under my name in the bibliography have been altered, corrected, and expanded in the pages that follow. Aiming to re-think categories in which medieval literature is now considered and to suggest a less literal mode of reading the sources to historians of the Middle Ages, they are an effort to come to terms with the love of a lifetime. I first stumbled on the Archpoet in New Zealand when I was 17, and noted in my diary: “This is the most wonderful thing in the world.” Although I hope that, forty years on, my views have become a little more sophisticated, they have not changed.

P.G.

*Munich,
Spring 2012*

Contents

<i>Abbreviations</i>	xiii
I. Prelude in the Pub	1
II. The Ruin of the World	5
III. Culture and Conflict in the Chancery	31
IV. Transmontane Identity	54
V. 'A Depraved Man Sowing Tares'	78
VI. The Anti-Actor	102
VII. The Reluctant Encomiast	129
VIII. The Penitent at Pavia	157
IX. The Preacher of Sin	185
X. The Roving Prophet	209
XI. The Culture of the Barbarians	234
<i>Bibliography</i>	251
<i>General Index</i>	275

Abbreviations

Blaise, <i>Vocabulaire</i>	A. Blaise, <i>Le Vocabulaire latin des principaux thèmes liturgiques</i> (Turnhout, 1966)
CCCM	Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum Series Latina
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
DA	<i>Deutsches Archiv</i>
DFI	<i>Die Urkunden Friedrichs I</i> , ed. H. Appelt, <i>Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Diplomata regum et imperatorum Germaniae 10 i-v</i> (Hanover, 1975–90)
FmSt	<i>Frühmittelalterliche Studien</i>
<i>Gesta Frederici</i> , ed. Schmale	<i>Bischof Otto von Freising und Rahewin, Die Taten Friedrichs oder richtiger Chronica</i> , ed. F.-J. Schmale, <i>Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters 18</i> (repr. Darmstadt, 2007)
HZ	<i>Historische Zeitschrift</i>
LMA	<i>Lexikon des Mittelalters</i>
MGH	<i>Monumenta Germaniae Historica</i>
- SrG	- <i>Scriptores rerum Germanicarum</i>
- SS	- <i>Scriptores</i>
MIÖG	<i>Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung</i>
MJb	<i>Mittelateinisches Jahrbuch</i>
NA	<i>Neues Archiv</i>
PL	<i>Patrologia Latina</i>
RS	<i>Rolls Series</i>
QF	<i>Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken</i>
SC	<i>Sources chrétiennes</i>
Schmale, <i>Quellen</i>	F.-J. Schmale (ed.), <i>Italische Quellen über die Taten Friedrichs I. in Italien und der Brief über den Kreuzzug Kaiser Friedrichs I</i> , <i>Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters 18a</i> (Darmstadt, 1986)
VuF	<i>Vorträge und Forschungen</i>
Watenphul–Krefeld	<i>Die Gedichte des Archipoeta</i> , ed. H. Watenphul and H. Krefeld (Heidelberg, 1958)

I

Prelude in the Pub

- 12 *Meum est propositum in taberna mori,
ut sint vina proxima morientis ori;
tunc cantabunt letius angelorum chori:
'Sit Deus propitius huic potatori!'*¹
- 12 It is my intention to die in the pub,
with wines in reach of my expiring throat;
then the angelic choirs will sing merrily:
'May God be merciful to this carouser!'

The Archpoet recited this strophe at Pavia in November 1163. His audience was composed of clerics skilled in the learned language and proficient in Holy Scripture. None of them will have failed to experience a frisson on hearing, in the last verse above, an echo of the Bible: 'God be merciful to me, a sinner' (Luke 18:13). All of them knew that St Luke's prayer was quoted by confessors to penitents.² And each man of the Church will have realized that its sacrament of atonement is being stood on its head.

The apostle's *peccator* has become the Archpoet's *potator*. A sinner transformed into a carouser, the stage is set for a comedy of conscience. Nothing is so exalted as to be above the mirth. Angels join in jubilation as our author, poking fun at the religious obligation of remorse, takes light-hearted leave of this world. Bibulous on his imagined deathbed, he celebrates the Christian vice of over-indulgence (*crapula*)³ when he ought to be heaving a last gasp of contrition. If we revel in the merriment, we may ponder its point, which will have bemused even the original audience. Did the Archpoet intend to provoke a shiver of complicity at his humour or a shudder of horror at his blasphemy? In the high culture of twelfth-century Europe, what was the difference between irony and sacrilege? No one can, no one could answer such questions with certainty. Elusive in his eloquence, the dying drinker does not state his purpose, except in jest; nor is it sufficient to listen to what he says. We must also attend to his silences and read between his lines. But if we remain unsure about where

¹ *Carm.* X, 12, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 75.

² *Oratio sacerdotis dicenda ad paenitentiam venientibus*: 'Domine Deus omnipotens, propitius esto mihi peccatori' (Burchard of Worms, *Decretum* xix, 3, PL 140, 950A).

³ *Regula S. Benedicti* 39, ed. A. de Vogüé, *La Règle de Saint Benoît*, ii. SC 182 (Paris, 1971), 578.

he stands, at least we grasp that we have entered a world of inversion. For it is a cleric, perhaps a priest, who recites these bold and beguiling verses.

His name is unknown. The literary pseudonym, however, provides a clue of dual identity. Styling himself Archpoet, our author imitated the high-sounding titles of his patron, Rainald of Dassel, archbishop-elect of Cologne and archchancellor of Italy (1159–67), who employed him as a notary.⁴ Not the wandering scholar of legend,⁵ he practised the mundane métier of an itinerant bureaucrat. Sighs of disappointment should be suppressed. The official prose in which he plodded when not soaring in verse enables us to clear the clutter of myth and follow the Archpoet's track. Rather than imagine him meandering down medieval roads (generally impassable during the winter) in search of wine, women, and song, we can trace his travels throughout Germany, Italy, and Burgundy. Evidence of these journeys is offered by charters that he composed and copied in his professional role as 'Rainald H', the eighth of the nameless notaries so classified after their order of appearance in the imperial chancery headed by Rainald of Dassel.⁶ Among this small group of functionaries—no more than two or three of whom worked together at a time—'Rainald H' sustained a proximity to his master matched by none other. Documents that he wrote, dated, and located during peregrinations over the empire were verified and authorized by the archchancellor. These are the historical testimonies to their togetherness.

A different dimension of their relationship is revealed by this strophe, which vaunts the alternative identity of 'Rainald H'. He played the part of a wit and a wag for the benefit less of his colleagues than of their chief. All the Archpoet's extant verse was composed at Rainald of Dassel's instigation or inspiration, and most of it was addressed to him. Analogies to their closeness are not uncommon in medieval literature, and there are fine studies of the familiarity between patrons and clients.⁷ But next to nothing has been written about the character of the complicity that distinguished this partnership in provocation from its contemporaries. Unparalleled and unprecedented, the sense of humour that they shared was aimed against conventions of clerical decorum. No one before our author had mocked the Bible in the presence of a twelfth-century archbishop-elect with the same confidence that, from his throne of authority, he would not frown but laugh.

Laughter too can be a sign of community,⁸ an expression of 'us' against 'them'. Gravity, solemnity, austerity were qualities urged on princes of the high

⁴ See R. Schieffer, 'Bleibt der Archipoeta anonym?', *MIÖG* 98 (1990), 59–79.

⁵ H. Waddell, *The Wandering Scholars* (London, 1932).

⁶ DFI, v, 59–60.

⁷ e.g. J. Bumke, *Mäzene im Mittelalter: Die Gönner und Auftraggeber der höfischen Literatur in Deutschland 1150–1300* (Munich, 1979), who hardly treats the Archpoet.

⁸ Cf. W. Röcke and H. Velten (eds), *Lachgemeinschaften: Kulturelle Inszenierungen und soziale Wirkungen von Gelächter im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit*, *Trends in Medieval Philology* 4 (Berlin, 2005).

medieval Church by moralists,⁹ for whom Rainald of Dassel had no sympathy. With the nonchalance natural to this ecclesiastical man of the world, he shrugged aside contrasts between the sacred and the profane dear to reformers more rigorous and less sophisticated than himself. Small wonder that, appalled by his personality and aghast at his policy, they decried him as ‘the ruin of the world’.¹⁰ Tailored to the outrageous esprit and the wry refinement of this controversial figure, the Archpoet’s works are a cut above the productions of his peers. They were capable of scriptural spoofs, ranging from parody and satire to revelry at the feast of fools.¹¹ But within the ample spectrum of their virtuosity there was no place for a mockery of moralism that so subtly inverted religious standards.

Whose religious standards were being stood on their heads by this duo of defiance? At the time we encounter them, in the early 1160s, Rome—less the city than the symbol of orthodoxy—was wracked by civil war. Schism had erupted in 1159, rending the unity of Christendom and pitting the adherents of Alexander III (1159–81) against the supporters of the imperial antipope, Victor IV (1159–64).¹² In what was to be a long and bitter struggle for mastery of the Church, his many detractors considered Rainald of Dassel to be the chief troublemaker. More imperialist than even Frederick I Barbarossa (1152–90), he was identified not only as an archchancellor, but also as an antichrist of empire. Few would now guess, from the Archpoet’s works, that this was the background of turmoil against which they were written. Obliquity is their nature, and their targets are types: the prim and the pious, the boneheads and the bores. Yet behind this mask of anonymity it is possible to discern the unflattering features ascribed to the Roman arbiters of orthodoxy by Rainald of Dassel’s client. He had not forgotten, in November 1163, that they had excommunicated his patron the previous May.¹³

Religious conflict deepened intellectual disdain. Those loyal to Rome and to Pope Alexander III deplored the ‘Teutons’ as brutish barbarians.¹⁴ Aware that synonyms for ‘German’ were becoming dirty words, the Archpoet, indirect as ever, did not resort to polemic. Writing for a circle turned in on itself by the hauteur of hostility elsewhere in Latin Europe, he sought a neutral name to evoke the cultural identity of his side in the strife. He found it in the term ‘Transmontane’. It was not the mountains that mattered, but the perspective. In the Transmontane perspective of the Archpoet, all is upside down. Inversion,

⁹ See Gerhoh of Reichersberg, *De edificio Dei*, ed. E. Sackur, MGH Libelli de lite imperatorum et pontificum iii (repr. Hanover, 1995), 131–201. Cf. S. Haarländer, *Vitae episcoporum: Eine Quellengattung zwischen Hagiographie und Historiographie untersucht an Lebensbeschreibungen von Bischöfen des Regnum Teutonicum im Zeitalter der Ottonen und Salier*, Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters 47 (Stuttgart, 2000), and H. Zielenski, *Der Reichsepiskopat in spätottonischer und salischer Zeit (1002–1125)*, i (Stuttgart, 1984).

¹⁰ See Chapter II.

¹¹ Cf. P.-G. Schmidt, ‘The Quotation in Goliardic Poetry: The Feast of Fools and the Goliardic Strophe *cum auctoritate*’, in P. Godman and O. Murray (eds), *Latin Poetry and the Classical Tradition: Essays in Medieval and Renaissance Literature* (Oxford, 1990), 39–56.

¹² See Chapter IV.

¹³ See Chapters VII and VIII.

¹⁴ See Chapters III and XI.

however, may be manipulated by an insider in the know. Anathema can be countered with an ironical act of faith. So it is that, in a tour de force of fantasy, our author makes a comic confession to the excommunicate archbishop-elect. The deathbed scene in the pub is staged by, and for, schismatics.

Rainald of Dassel was skilled in the symmetries of inversion. He had an antipope in his pocket. Yet he failed to impose him on the Church, and, as the imperial cause waxed and waned during the early 1160s, in his less fraught moments he withdrew from the cares of state that beset them both in the chancery to the wit of another world conjured up by his client, companion, and doppelgänger. Not confined by time or place, the Archpoet's world is devoid of the details about politics and property with which charters by 'Rainald H' are replete. Reticence about realia makes him into the exact opposite of an occasional writer. None of the obvious occasions to commemorate Rainald of Dassel, such as his consecration as archbishop of Cologne and the canonization of Charlemagne in 1165, is mentioned in the extant *œuvre*; nor is it probable that large-scale works by the Archpoet have been lost.¹⁵ He resists pressure to compose an epic, and, when he writes political encomium, it is under duress and against the grain.¹⁶ Extolling his sins as the sources of his art, he disdains the bucolic boors who were more diligent labourers in the literary vineyard. The Archpoet's stance, chosen to match that of his master, is effortless urbanity. And yet he crafts the slender and scintillating corpus of his verse with the care of a miniaturist.

That care is reflected in the dialectical principles of its construction. Presented to a patron trained in dialectic,¹⁷ our author's works counter each of their affirmations with a denial. *Sic et non* also motivates his metamorphoses. Casting himself as a penitent and a preacher, a mendicant and a mega-seer, he doubles such parts as the critic of courtiers, the enemy of entertainers, the scourge of buffoons. None of these roles is to be confused with his protean persona. It is defined by antithesis to the foolish jesters and fawning retainers whose antics bore too close a resemblance to his own for comfort. As 'Rainald H' the subordinate and dependant of the archchancellor, when acting the virtuoso in verse he pretends to intellectual equality and comradeship in cups. At one by affinity and affection, this singular pair excludes others. As private jokes raise barriers to the Archpoet's rivals in Rainald of Dassel's entourage, erudition erects a bulwark against the intrusions of ignorant laymen; and the Roman arbiters of orthodoxy who level excommunication on us 'Teutons' from their high horses are dismounted by Transmontane irony at their expense. They are taught a lesson in the culture of the 'barbarians'. It is a lesson that can be learnt anywhere—even, or especially, on a deathbed in the pub.

¹⁵ Cf. P. Godman, 'The World of the Archpoet', *Mediaeval Studies*, 71 (2009) 113 ff.

¹⁶ See Chapters VI and VII.

¹⁷ See Chapters III, VI, and VII.

II

The Ruin of the World

At lunchtime, in or around the year 1130, the silence of siesta was broken at the cathedral school of Hildesheim in what is now Lower Saxony. There an aristocratic boy began to talk in his sleep. 'I am' (*Ego sum!*), declared Rainald of Dassel. 'What are you?' (*Quid es tu?*), asked his perplexed teacher. 'I am the ruin of the world!' (*Ego sum ruina mundi!*), replied this precocious agent of apocalypse.¹ Or so a hostile chronicler, writing at Petersberg near Halle more than a century after the alleged event,² would have us believe. We are unlikely to do so.³ But we should not merely dismiss the anecdote. It provides evidence of the loathing that the Archpoet's patron was still capable of inspiring in the orthodox long after he anticipated their abuse. Deceptive the chronicler may be, yet he is far from crude. Justly doubting his own plausibility, he hesitates to advance the truth-claims of fact. 'It is held' (*fertur*), he alleges, slyly disclaiming responsibility while gossiping tongues wag. The prophetic boy, condemned with his own words, inverts an attribute of medieval saints. Biographers of holy men in the Middle Ages regularly insisted that their subjects' prescience in early years heralded feats of spiritual heroism that they would perform as adults. An anti-hero of unholiness, Rainald is off to a bad start. In a rehearsal of the part he would play as 'the ruin of the world', he is made to turn a hagiographical model on its head.

The shadows of the last judgement darken noon at Hildesheim and, in the gloom of *damnatio memoriae*,⁴ this singular figure is separated from his contemporaries. One of them, also born c.1120, was Thomas Becket. Although their juxtaposition may seem jarring, a precedent for taking them together was set in the twelfth century. Impressed by the insight into Realpolitik that Barbarossa had shown in 1159 with the promotion of his chancellor, Rainald of Dassel, to

¹ *Chronica montis sereni*, ed. E. Ehrenfeuchter, MGH SS 23 (Leipzig, 1996), 153, trans. W. Kirsch, *Chronik vom Petersberg (Cronica montis sereni) nebst der Genealogie der Wettiner (Genealogia Wettinensis)* (Leipzig, 1996), 46.

² On the date and identity of the chronicler of Petersberg (*Mons serenus*), see E. Rundnagel, *Die Chronik des Petersberg bei Halle (Chronica montis sereni) und ihre Quellen* (Halle, 1929), with B. Schmeidler, 'Nochmals der Verfasser der *Chronica montis sereni*', *HZ* 144 (1931), 296–9.

³ Cf. W. Grebe, 'Studien zur geistigen Welt Rainalds von Dassel' in G. Wolf (ed.), *Friedrich Barbarossa, Wege der Forschung* 390 (Darmstadt, 1975), 249 n. 6.

⁴ Cf. C. Henrick, *History and Silence: Purge and Rehabilitation of Memory in Late Antiquity* (Austin, 2000), 89–130, and K.-M. Sprenger, 'Damnatio memoriae oder Damnatio in memoria? Überlegungen zum Umgang mit so genannten Gegenpäpsten als methodologisches Problem der Papstgeschichtsschreibung', *QF* 80 (2009), 31–62.

the metropolitan see of Cologne, Henry II of England (1133–89) tried to follow suit three years later by making Chancellor Becket archbishop of Canterbury.⁵ Control of the English Church was to be secured through this creature of the king. No matter that the attempt backfired, and Becket resigned his secular office before embarking on the course of conflict that would end with his murder in 1170. None of that was predictable in 1162. Then Henry hoped that he had found a model for his minister in the Archpoet's unscrupulous patron. Now Rainald of Dassel is nearly forgotten, and it is his contemporary about whom everyone has heard.

An imbalance is evident. Saints continue to be cultivated while schismatics are shunned. The tilt of attention towards orthodoxy is apparent from the secondary literature. Volumes have been written about St Thomas,⁶ whose hagiographers set to work soon after his martyrdom in 1170.⁷ No medieval Life of Rainald survives, nor is it probable that one was composed, for he broke the biographical mould. The only monograph about him, although admirable for its time, can hardly be called modern. It was published in 1850.⁸ More recent studies are confined to aspects of Rainald's multiple activities.⁹ And the same asymmetry is maintained when we look lower down the hierarchy, from the archbishops to their entourages. John of Salisbury, who served Becket and wrote a Life of him, was an orthodox thinker whose achievement has received the recognition it deserves.¹⁰ Not so the Archpoet. He was on the wrong side. Or, to judge by the neglect with which his world is treated, on no side at all. If the legend of a wandering scholar has been supplanted by little less fanciful attempts to reconstruct his politics from his imagery or to compare him with Andrew Marvell,¹¹ the effect has been to detach Rainald of Dassel's client from the context in which he belongs.

In proximity to his patron, the once notorious and now obscure peer of Thomas Becket, the Archpoet may enable us to view the literary and

⁵ Ralph of Diceto (?Diss. in Norfolk), *Ymagines historiarum in Radulfi de Diceto decani Londonensis opera historica*, i, ed. W. Stubbs, RS 68, 1 (London, 1876), 306–7, and cf. W. Warren, *Henry II* (London, 2000), 449 ff. Note too the retention of the French chancellorship, with papal approval, by Hugh of Champfleury after his election as bishop of Soissons in 1159.

⁶ See D. Knowles, *Thomas Becket* (London, 1970), F. Barlow, *Thomas Becket* (London, 1986), P. Aubé, *Thomas Becket* (Paris, 1988), A. Duggan, *Thomas Becket* (London, 2004), H. Vollrath, *Thomas Becket, Höfling und Heiliger* (Zürich, 2004), J. Guy, *Thomas Becket: Warrior, Priest, Rebel, Victim: A 900-Year-Old Story Retold* (London, 2012).

⁷ Cf. M. Staunton, *Thomas Becket and his Biographers* (Woodbridge, 2006).

⁸ J. Ficker, *Rainald von Dassel: Reichskanzler und Erzbischof von Köln 1156–1167* (Cologne, 1850). A Graz dissertation of 1962 with the same title by R. Herkenrath remains unpublished.

⁹ e.g. H. Kluger, 'Friedrich Barbarossa und sein Ratgeber Rainald von Dassel', in S. Weinfurter (ed.), *Stauferreich im Wandel: Ordnungsvorstellungen und Politik in der Zeit Friedrich Barbarossas*, *Mittelalter-Forschungen* 9 (Stuttgart, 2002), 26–40, who adds little that is new.

¹⁰ See, best, P. von Moos, *Geschichte als Topik. Das rhetorische Exemplum von der Antike zur Neuzeit und die 'historiae' im 'Policraticus' Johanns von Salisbury*, *Ordo* 2 (Hildesheim, 1988).

¹¹ W. T. H. Jackson, 'The Politics of a Poet: The Archpoet as Revealed by his Imagery', in E. Mahoney (ed.), *Philosophy and Humanism: Renaissance Essays in Honor of P. O. Kristeller* (Leiden, 1976, 320–38, and P. Dronke, 'Functions of Classical Borrowing in Medieval Latin Verse', in R. Bolgar (ed.), *Classical Influences on European Culture AD 500–1500* (Cambridge, 1971), 163–4.

intellectual history of the High Middle Ages from a different perspective. As seen by the prevalent orthodoxy, this is a landscape of the mind in which John of Salisbury naturally looms large. Yet it is not perverse to survey the scene from what have been made to appear the margins of Latin Europe. The backwoods of barbaric Germany produced, in the same period, a sophistication that no Roman mandarin could match. Assessing that accomplishment need not require us to take sides. They are already taken: the Archpoet stood squarely behind Rainald of Dassel and against the likes of Becket. We stand between them and, through the prism offered by sources that are imperfect but rich, we can perhaps begin to perceive that the saintly archbishop of Canterbury and the schismatic archbishop of Cologne represent opposite poles of twelfth-century culture.

* * *

That culture was prey to a myth—the myth of empire.¹² No German pursued the imperial will o' the wisp more quixotically than Rainald of Dassel. Days before his death on 14 August 1167, Barbarossa, in a charter issued to reward him for a bloody victory over the Romans, declared that 'our most loyal prince Rainald' had 'exalted our empire in a manner that beggars the imagination' (*inexplicabiliter*).¹³ Little imagination was required to see how dependent the Hohenstaufen Caesar was on such princes of the Church. They, together with their lay colleagues, had elected him king of Germany in 1152. On their consensus he continued to rely after the ceremony, at Rome in 1155, of imperial coronation.¹⁴ It conferred on Barbarossa a dignity of illustrious aura and obscure origins. Did the emperor rule by grace of God or by favour of the pope? Why, if he was the 'lord of the world' (*dominus mundi*) described by Roman law, did his writ run so inadequately even in his nominal dominions of Germany, Italy, and Burgundy? Barbarossa, alert to the precariousness of his authority, stirred himself from the imperial pedestal. Seeking to strengthen its foundations, he campaigned, he legislated, he consulted experts. But he remained ill-equipped to answer such questions throughout his long reign. An emperor with only the illusion of an empire, he regularly relied on the facts of force.

Not primarily renowned for his intellectual qualities, Barbarossa may have mustered a little Latin. Semi-literate by the standards of his day, which privileged the international language of learning,¹⁵ he excelled in the sphere of

¹² Cf. the excellent and convincing critique, not confined to the medieval period, by H. Winkler, *Der lange Weg nach Westen: Deutsche Geschichte vom Ende des Alten Reiches bis zum Untergang der Weimarer Republik*, i (Munich, 2000), 5 ff.

¹³ DFL, no. 532.

¹⁴ See B. Schneidmüller, 'Consensuale Herrschaft: Ein Essay über Formen und Konzepte politischer Ordnung im Mittelalter', in P.-H. Heinig (ed.), *Reich, Regionen und Europa in Mittelalter und Neuzeit* (Berlin, 2000), 53–87, and cf. S. Patzold, 'Konsens und Konkurrenz: Überlegungen zu einem aktuellen Forschungskonzept der Mediävistik', *FmSt* 41 (2007), 75–103. Suggestive conclusions are drawn by K. Görich, 'Versuch zur Rettung von Kontingenz: Oder: Über Schwierigkeiten beim Schreiben einer Biographie Friedrich Barbarossas', *FmSt* 43 (2009), 179–97.

¹⁵ See Chapters III and XI.

vernacular orality. To ambassadors he preferred to speak in his native dialect, with translators at hand.¹⁶ Although the emperor had a reputation for rhetorical flair, his eloquence will have been lost on most foreigners and some Germans, who did not understand Alemannian. 'The lord of the world' stood on its fringes, both mighty and midget. For access to the medium of international culture, in which diplomacy was conducted and treaties were drawn up, Barbarossa relied on his clerics. More than interpreters of his will, they were also makers and executors of the policies that passed under his name.¹⁷ Better educated, in general, than their secular peers, the ecclesiastical advisers of Barbarossa had the imperial ear. None of them bent it more assiduously than Rainald of Dassel. What he murmured to his master in the privacy of their planning was a curious blend of radicalism and conservatism. Conservative in his attachment to the unreformed practices of the German Church, Rainald of Dassel was radical in his determination to establish the emperor's ascendancy over the pope. Rome was less the capital of the Catholic world than an imperial city subject to the will of Caesar, who, by virtue of his office, had the right to make and unmake Vicars of Christ.

So it was that the leading exponent of Hohenstaufen Realpolitik severed contact with reality. Such views might perhaps have aspired to plausibility one hundred years earlier, when the emperor Henry III (1039–56) appointed no fewer than four German popes. But Rainald of Dassel thought back even further. Focused on such revivers of empire as Otto III (996–1002), his political outlook was anachronistic. Europe in the High Middle Ages could not be mastered by a Hohenstaufen on horseback. Advanced in his cultural patronage, Rainald of Dassel was retrograde in his imperialistic nostalgia for the Ottonian dynasty, which, like him, stemmed from Saxony. There, in a remote region with a potent past, might be maintained a vision of ecclesiastical order that, through its intimacy with secular rulership, was at variance with the values of the post-Gregorian Church.¹⁸ The opinions expressed, with characteristic firmness, by this ruthless Saxon are echoed in the charters of 'Rainald H' and modulated in the verse of the Archpoet. But they were shared by few outside their immediate circle. Its exclusiveness set them apart, and turned them in on themselves. They formed a deviant duo.

If Rainald of Dassel and his doppelgänger had cemented a partnership by the 1160s, it is unlikely to have emerged suddenly. Durable links between them may be traced back to boyhoods spent together in northern Germany. Northern German is the script in which 'Rainald H' wrote his diplomata.¹⁹ Documents intended to impress beholders with the universality of the empire, they

¹⁶ *In tanto vero nativum Alemannie venerabatur eloquium ut, quamquam alterius linguae non inscius esset, aliarum tamen gentium missis non nisi per interpretem loqueretur* (*Das Itinerarium peregrinorum: Eine zeitgenössische Chronik zum Kreuzzug in ursprünglicher Gestalt*, ed. H. Mayer (Stuttgart, 1962), 300, 26).

¹⁷ See Chapter III.

¹⁸ See E. Schubert, in *Geschichte Niedersachsens* 2,1, *Politik, Verfassung, Wirtschaft vom 9. bis zum ausgehenden 15. Jahrhundert* (Hanover, 1997), 232 ff., 311 ff.

¹⁹ See H. Appelt, in *DFI*, v. 39.

will have had a local look to the archchancellor from Dassel. There or thereabouts—if not in the same place, then in an adjoining region of Lower Saxony—arose affinities with the notary-poet that developed into a bond based on experiences shared during a formative stage in their lives. Other literary clients in the Middle Ages advertise their familiarity with their patrons, but none equals this writer in his assurance that he knows his man. Theirs is the complicity of long and close acquaintance. Evidence of it is provided by the verse that the Archpoet composed for Rainald later in life, from which their earlier education is to be inferred. If we attempt to do so, we must reckon with the legitimate objection that the corpus of our author's works may be incomplete. Can a culture be reconstructed on the foundation of fragments that chance to survive from a lost and larger whole? Yes, is the answer, providing that allowance is made for the hazards of hypothesis. Ten poems may not be numerous, but they repay reflection. Certainty eludes us. Facts are few. Our choice lies between the safety of silence, which protects us from criticism and spares us thought, and the delicate duty of weighing probabilities.

It is probable that differences of social origin did not hinder, at a young age, the friendship between this pair. The Archpoet boasts of belonging to the ministerial order of knights who were upwardly mobile and legally unfree:²⁰ Rainald of Dassel perched on the lower rungs of the provincial aristocracy.²¹ The distance that separated them from one another in the feudal hierarchy was not insuperable, especially if their acquaintance began at school. And their schooling, in northern Germany, must have been similar, because both the charters that 'Rainald H' wrote for his chief in the chancery and the verse that the Archpoet composed to amuse or flatter him draw on an expertise in grammar and rhetoric that was distinctive in Latin Europe for its depth. Where was that expertise acquired? Geography, which smiled on the one, may have favoured the other. Near to Dassel, the small Saxon town from which Rainald's father was the first member of his family to take his title as count, flourished a cathedral school more distinguished than the modest establishments where Thomas Becket received his education.²² Hildesheim was renowned for training princes of the Church.

This was the career for which Rainald of Dassel, a second son who bore his father's name, was destined. His elder brother, Ludolf, remained a lordling on the estates; a sister, Gepa, may have entered a nunnery at Cologne.²³ No sign of vocation distinguished the archbishop of Cologne in youth, but there is every indication that he was swift to grasp that a high road of ecclesiastical preferment ran from Hildesheim. It offered a vantage-point from which earlier generations of aristocrats had been agile in launching their careers. And they

²⁰ See Chapter VI.

²¹ See N. Kruppa, *Die Grafen von Dassel (1097–1337/38)*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für historische Landesforschung der Universität Göttingen 42 (Bielefeld, 2002).

²² See Barlow, *Becket*, 10 ff.

²³ Kruppa, *Grafen von Dassel*, 31, 155 ff.

were legion. As many as forty-two members of the cathedral chapter were elevated to archiepiscopal or episcopal rank between the first quarter of the tenth century and the second half of the twelfth, often with the intervention of the emperor.²⁴ Glittering prospects of promotion enticed the young imperialist on the make. How the Archpoet reacted to the vaulting ambition of his future patron, we cannot know, but it would not be surprising if the worldly atmosphere at Hildesheim contributed to the urbanity of this cleric's wit.

Among the many pupils who flocked to the cathedral school, one who would hardly have appreciated our author's mirth was Gerhoh of Reichersberg, who studied at Hildesheim between 1112 and 1115.²⁵ Too early to have met Rainald of Dassel, this moralist was never tardy in denouncing the vices that the archbishop of Cologne went on to embody. The pride and pomp of the episcopate, its appropriation of wealth meant for the needy, its reprehensible similarity to laymen: such polemic by Gerhoh might have been written for, or against, the other alumnus of Hildesheim whom he does not name. Although these tracts for the times are seldom specific, they represent the kinds of jeremiad at which the Archpoet poked fun when he cast himself as a merry anti-type to contemporary prophets of gloom.²⁶ The same education in northern Germany produced clerical contraries. Opposites in ecclesiastical politics also attended school at Hildesheim, among them Archbishop Eskil of Lund. His appointment as primate of Scandinavia was repugnant to Rainald of Dassel, who, believing that the Church in the north should be ruled from Germany, ignored the old-boy network and had Eskil kidnapped during a journey through Burgundy in 1157.²⁷ He was a Dane; Gerhoh, a Bavarian. These facts are simple yet significant. At a time when many cathedral schools prevalently drew local pupils, the place of Rainald's studies was capable of attracting southern Germans and foreigners. There was a natural place for Adalbert of Saarbrücken, future archbishop of Mainz, who dabbled in the verbal arts at Hildesheim during 1128,²⁸ when Rainald of Dassel was probably his junior in this milieu of noble canons. From an early age he rubbed shoulders with others who were being groomed for high office in the German Church. Its old ways appealed to him, for he could see with his own eyes how helpful they were to a careerist in the present. The past was also instructive.

²⁴ See R. Schieffer, 'Domkapitel und Reichskirche', in M. Brandt and A. Eggebrecht (eds), *Bernward von Hildesheim und das Zeitalter der Ottonen*, Katalog der Ausstellung 1991 (Hildesheim, 1993), 269–73, and R. Meier, *Die Domkapitel zu Goslar und Halberstadt in ihrer persönlichen Zusammensetzung im Mittelalter (mit Beiträgen über die bis zum Jahre 1200 nachweisbaren Hildesheimer Domherren)*, Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte 5 (Göttingen, 1967), 72 ff.

²⁵ See P. Classen, *Gerhoch von Reichersberg: Eine Biographie* (Wiesbaden, 1960), 15.

²⁶ See Chapter X.

²⁷ Cf. C. Schambach, 'Friedrich Rotbad und Eskil von Lund', *Historische Vierteljahrschrift*, 13 (1910), 510–14. See further Chapter III.

²⁸ Anselm, *Vita Adalberti II Moguntini*, 82 ff, ed. P. Jaffé, *Monumenta Moguntina*, Bibliotheca Rerum Germanicarum iii (Berlin, 1861), 570, with J. Ehlers, 'Verfassungs- und sozialgeschichtliche Studien zum Bildungsgang Erzbischof Adalberts II. von Mainz', *Rheinische Vierteljahrsblätter*, 42 (1978), 161–84.

Hildesheim had regard for its history, in which one of the grandest figures remained Bishop Bernward (993–1022), moves towards whose canonization were being made during Rainald's boyhood.²⁹ Here was a model of ecclesiastical success, which, with minor adjustments, might be cut to the cloth of his ambition.

After studies at Hildesheim, Bernward had become a notary in the imperial chancery under Otto II (961–83). This, for Rainald of Dassel and others, was a crucial precedent. The itineracy of German kingship, which persisted from before the tenth century to the twelfth and beyond, meant that the chancery, linked to the chapel, of the ruler provided the sole centre of intellectual continuity at court.³⁰ To serve as chancellor or as one of his assistants was to obtain access to a major source of patronage. Bernward set a shining example of how to climb up the slippery pole. He had been tutor to the emperor's son, Otto III, who hailed him as his 'companion' (*sotius*), 'witness' (*testis*), and 'shaper' (*informator*). These warm words of praise, doubtless authentic, are recorded in a charter issued at Rome on 23 January 1001 and preserved at Hildesheim,³¹ where Rainald of Dassel read them and took them to heart. Such was the relationship of trust and mentorship that, through work in the same chancery, he established with Barbarossa. This Ottonian exemplar of prelaty was admired in twelfth-century Hildesheim. During Rainald's manhood in the early 1150s, a Life of Bernward was being revised, on the basis of earlier materials, to support the cause of his canonization.³² Passages dealing with that bishop's spirituality Rainald may be assumed to have skipped. What arrested his attention was military. Bernward is depicted by his biographer as bearing the holy lance, a trophy of empire, against rebellious Romans at Otto III's side.³³ Rainald of Dassel triumphed over Romans who had rebelled against Barbarossa in the battle of Tusculum on 29 May 1167.³⁴ The warrior-bishop, a recurrent figure in German history of the High Middle Ages,³⁵ was a role he transposed from literature to life. This military model or analogy occurred to others. One of them was the imperial partisan Rahewin, in his continuation of

²⁹ On Bernward, see Brandt and Eggebrecht (eds), *Bernward von Hildesheim*, *passim*.

³⁰ See J. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle der deutschen Könige*, 2 vols, MGH Schriften 16, 1–2 (Stuttgart, 1959/1966).

³¹ *Die Urkunden Ottos des Dritten*, ed. T. Sickel and K. Foltz, MGH Die Urkunden der deutschen Könige und Kaiser ii, 2 (Hanover, 1893), no. 390, 821, 18–19, with H. Hoffmann, 'Eigendiktat in den Urkunden Ottos III. und Heinrichs II.', *DA* 44 (1968), 392–9.

³² See K. Görich and H.-H. Kortüm, 'Otto III., Thangmar und die Vita Bernwardi', *MIÖG* 98 (1980), 1–57; M. Stumpf, 'Zum Quellenwert der Vita Bernwardi', *DA* 53 (1997), 461–96; and M. Giese, *Die Textfassungen der Lebensbeschreibung Bernwards von Hildesheim*, MGH Studien und Texte 40 (Hanover, 2006).

³³ [Thangmar], *Vita Bernwardi* 21, ed. G. Pertz, MGH SS 4 (repr. Stuttgart, 1981), 770, 16–17, and see Chapter VII.

³⁴ R. Knipping (ed.), *Die Regesten der Erzbischöfe von Köln im Mittelalter*, ii. 1100–1205, Publikationen der Gesellschaft für rheinische Geschichtskunde 21 (Bonn, 1901), 156.

³⁵ Cf. T. Reuter, 'Ep[iscop]i cum sua militia: The Prelate as Warrior in the Early Staufer Era', in Reuter (ed.), *Warriors and Churchmen in the High Middle Ages: Essays Presented to K. Leyser* (London, 1992), 79–94.

the early history of Barbarossa's reign begun by the emperor's uncle, Otto of Freising. Rahewin set Rainald of Dassel in parallel with Otto of Wittelsbach,³⁶ a violent thug seldom to be found in Hohenstaufen sources without his sword pointed at someone's throat. It is true that, in this passage, a legation to Italy undertaken by them both in 1158 is being described. And it is also true that a distinction is drawn between the two legates, with emphasis on the 'mildness' (*mansuetudo*) and 'mercy' (*misericordia*) practised by Rainald, in keeping with his clerical state.³⁷ Yet that was a view unlikely to have been held by those who observed him fighting 'as savagely as a leopard' (*ferax ut leopardus*) at the battle of Tusculum, where thousands of Romans (including two cardinals) were allegedly killed.³⁸ The real point of Rahewin's parallel was the resemblance between the man of the Church and the man of arms. Rainald and Otto, ardent imperialists, were kindred spirits. With more than a whiff of the military about him, the archbishop of Cologne did not exude an odour of holiness.

Where and when he was trained in combat is a mystery of no matter. More important is the canonical prohibition of weapon-bearing by clerics.³⁹ Often honoured in the breach, it is unlikely to have been flouted openly even at a Hildesheim resistant to reform. At Dassel, however, lived Rainald's brother Ludolf, with whom he maintained a lifelong closeness and who at least once accompanied him on an expedition to Italy. Sword-play may have been a pastime of vacations at home, but it is difficult to imagine acquaintance with Otto of Wittelsbach—later elevated to a dukedom for his bravery with the blade—unless one was skilled in parrying blows. In a book that dwells on the wit that Rainald of Dassel cultivated with such refinement, there may be a moment to pause at the steel behind the smile of this prelate. He picked and chose with the selectivity of self-interest from the example of Christianity offered by Bernward's Life. No one considering Rainald of Dassel's later career would guess that his model had died, clad in the habit of a monk, while praying in the chapel dedicated to St Martin at Hildesheim. Rainald always remained a secular cleric with little interest in, and less sympathy for, the ideals of monasticism. Yet he was keenly alert to the prestige and the potential of relics. Had not Bernward built that chapel to enshrine the remains of St Martin with which he had been presented, in 1007, at Saint-Denis during a journey to France?⁴⁰ Were they not a treasure as precious as silver and gold? For relics, revered as living links between heaven and earth, drew profitable pilgrims.

So reflected the future archbishop of Cologne who, filching what he claimed were the remains of the Magi from Milan in 1164, would make his city into a

³⁶ *Gesta Federici* iii. 22, ed. Schmale, 440, and see Chapters IV and VIII.

³⁷ See Chapter VIII.

³⁸ *Annales Cameracenses*, ed. G. Pertz, MGH SS 16 (repr. Stuttgart, 1994), 539, 37.

³⁹ See E.-D. Hehl, *Kirche und Krieg im 12. Jahrhundert: Studien zu kanonischem Recht und politischer Wirklichkeit*, Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters 19 (Stuttgart, 1980). See further Chapter V.

⁴⁰ See A. Angenendt, "In meinem Fleisch werde ich Gott sehen": Bernward und die Reliquien', in Brandt and Eggebrecht (eds), *Bernward von Hildesheim*, 361–8.

prosperous centre of pilgrimage.⁴¹ Rainald of Dassel had learnt the lesson of pious theft from the history of Hildesheim, back to which Bishop Othwin, in 962, had brought the relics of St Epiphanius purloined by him at Pavia. Home-grown saints were remunerative as well. In 1131, shortly after Rainald had arrived at Hildesheim, its former Bishop Godehard (1022–38) was canonized. As crowds flocked to his shrine, monies multiplied and building boomed. An elegant church, influenced by the latest French architecture, was constructed in honour of St Godehard.⁴² A tiresome reformer during his lifetime, after his death he increased the diocese's revenues. Forgetting Godehard's rigour but remembering its effects, Rainald of Dassel was to take pride in erecting monuments of piety, expressed by him in the material form of bricks and stone that recorded his largesse as the donor of a hospice to Hildesheim or as the rebuilder of the archiepiscopal palace at Cologne. Nothing more. Hardly a word is transmitted about his spirituality, except in the slights of his enemies on its absence. Rainald's zest for action made him the opposite of a recluse. His unreserved commitment to the imperial cause, on which he lavished the revenues of his archdiocese—its coffers were empty by the time of his death⁴³—led his contemporaries to believe that his character was far from complex. They summed him up with the simplicity of antithesis. Friends and admirers attributed to him stereotypical qualities of an ecclesiastical grandee: generosity, affability, learning,⁴⁴ but not austerity, asceticism, fear of God. Fearless in his disdain for the values of the reforming Church, Rainald of Dassel seemed to his detractors to personify all the failings of secular aristocrats. Both perceptions were near the mark. Although a cleric by profession, he did invite comparison with a lordly layman. Almost all the sources, however, ignore the intricacies of his background and view him from the outside. The only indication of Rainald's private personality is offered by the Archpoet, when he appeals to a kindred sense of humour.

Humour is a historical phenomenon. Culture conditions what we find funny. Hierarchical societies, in particular those composed of clerics, generate special forms of social irony. They were in evidence at Hildesheim long before patron and client studied at its cathedral school during the second quarter of the twelfth century. To appreciate traditions that then reached back over more than fifty years, a feature of local topography should be borne in mind. Poorer scholars, to whose number the Archpoet will have belonged, were lodged in a

⁴¹ See Chapter X, and cf. F. Hirschmann, 'Die herausragende Bedeutung der Metropole Köln im Mittelalter—eine datengeschützte Untersuchung', *Geschichte in Köln*, 59 (2019), 43–77.

⁴² See G. Lutz, 'Zur Skulptur des 12 Jahrhunderts in Hildesheim' in M. Brandt (ed.), *Abglanz des Himmels: Romanik in Hildesheim*, Katalog zur Ausstellung des Dommuseums Hildesheim, 2001 (Regensburg, 2001), 263 ff.

⁴³ See J. Fried, 'Die Wirtschaftspolitik Friedrich Barbarossas in Deutschland', *Blätter für deutsche Landesgeschichte*, 120 (1984), 203 n. 49.

⁴⁴ Cf. S. Burkhardt, *Mit Stab und Schwert: Bilder, Träger und Funktionen erzbischöflicher Herrschaft zur Zeit Kaiser Friedrich Barbarossas: Die Erzbistümer Köln und Mainz im Vergleich*, *Mittelalter-Forschungen* 22 (Ostfildern, 2008), 137.

hospice built in the cathedral grounds by St Godehard.⁴⁵ Up the hill, on the Moritzberg, boys of higher birth like Rainald stayed in a foundation of Bishop Hezilo (1054–79).⁴⁶ To him, a couple of generations before this pair arrived at Hildesheim, their impoverished predecessors addressed a protest about not getting enough to eat:

Lord father and most worthy of bishops, H.[ezilo], we visitors of the Hildesheim schools, starving and scarcely holding together body and soul, [wish you] a rich abundance of heavenly grace and an ample filling of the living bread that is Christ.⁴⁷

The compliment arrests attention less than the tongue-in-cheek tone. Food is the stated subject; complicity, the underlying theme. The poor but canny students in St Godehard's hospice expect Bishop Hezilo to be amused by the contrast between their literal lack of nourishment and the metaphor of his spiritual satiety. Hierarchical deference maintained, fun can be poked at their need. In the place where the Archpoet put up, an antecedent was set for the knowing irony with which he would address Rainald of Dassel about the woes of his want. An antecedent, not a model, it is simpler than his pleas for sustenance; it is less sophisticated; but it stands in a line of spoofs by 'visiting students' at eleventh-century Hildesheim. One of them wrote a play that treats sacred themes with a jocularly bordering on burlesque,⁴⁸ indicating that our author was not the first there to trespass beyond conventional limits between the holy and the profane in literature that had its origins in classroom practice. His forerunners, like him, attended the cathedral school in order to learn grammar and rhetoric. Strict rules required of them, even after they had completed the course, a daily writing-sample.⁴⁹ Empty-bellied but full of mirth, they demonstrate here that they have done their homework.

Having made this point, the wags will not let it alone. Down the hill, they look up to their benefactor for compassion:

We should describe to you, father, who are and deserve to be blessed, the dreadful harshness of hunger and fasting, which not only removes from us in our misery the will to study but even instils in us a distaste for living, in accordance with the severity of the situation, were it not that our veins are drained of strength, our jaws dry from long starvation, and our very palate encrusted with scurfy tartar, [which] prevent us from speaking . . .⁵⁰

⁴⁵ See F. Specht, *Geschichte des Unterrichtswesens in Deutschland von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Stuttgart, 1885), 346.

⁴⁶ See C. Erdmann, *Studien zur Briefliteratur Deutschlands im elften Jahrhundert*, Schriften des Reichsinstituts für ältere Geschichtskunde (MGH) 1 (Leipzig, 1938), 172.

⁴⁷ *Domno patri et episcoporum dignissimo H. famelici et vix harentes ossibus Hiltinisheimensium scholarum hospites uberem cælestis gratiæ sácietatem, plenam panis vivi, qui est Christi, refectionem* (Briefsammlungen der Zeit Heinrichs IV., ed. C. Erdmann and N. Fickermann, MGH Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit 5 (repr. Munich, 1981), 61).

⁴⁸ See *Tres clerici*, ed. P. Dronke, *Nine Medieval Latin Plays*, Cambridge Medieval Classics 4 (Cambridge, 1994), 70–7, and cf. *Briefsammlungen der Zeit Heinrichs IV.*, ed. Erdmann and Fickermann, 88–9.

⁴⁹ *Scholaris disciplinæ iugo absoluti strictiori habena in claustris servabantur et cotidianam scripturam decano presentare . . . cogebantur* (Fundatio Ecclesiæ Hildensemensis 4, ed. A. Hofmeister, MGH SS 30, ii (repr. Stuttgart, 1976), 144, 28–30).

⁵⁰ *Famis et inediæ diram asperitatem, quæ nobis miseris non solum aufert voluntatem studendi, sed etiam infert tædium vivendi tibi, benedice ac benedicende pater, pro rei asperitate describeremus, nisi quod venæ viribus*

Rarely has speechlessness been described with such verbosity. Yet the paradox is resolved in laughter. Like the Archpoet, these visiting students before him advertise their expertise in the clichés of Latin composition to hint with humour that, at least in the literary sphere, they measure up to their betters. Both our author and his predecessors nudge the prelates above them to acknowledge a form of cultural parity based on the same training in the same place. Clients and patrons, underlings and superiors, are linked by a nexus of social irony. Looser and subtler than the constraints of rank, the complicity created by this sport in scholarship was distinctive of the milieu at medieval Hildesheim. Higher in the hierarchy, as he had been on the Moritzberg, later in life Rainald of Dassel heard echoes of such boyhood pranks being modulated by a fellow-student. The Archpoet's tours de force are not diminished by being compared with these minor exercises in the comedian's art. They cast light on the depths of redundancy from which emerged a sparkling style.

* * *

Style in the learned language is shaped by books. There was an abundance of them in twelfth-century Hildesheim.⁵¹ The manuscripts available to Rainald of Dassel are notable both for their visual splendour and for the contacts that they document with the south of Europe. From Italy, during the journey on which he made off with the relics of St Epiphanius, Bishop Othwin had brought back theological and philosophical codices.⁵² Italian influence on the culture of Ottonian Germany was marked,⁵³ and it is as likely that Hildesheim possessed classical texts copied at Pavia or Rome as the Latin dramas written by Hros-witha in nearby Gandesheim. When, in 1159, as archbishop-elect of Cologne, Rainald became archchancellor of Italy *ex officio*, he assumed responsibility for the affairs of a kingdom with whose intellectual products he had been acquainted since his schooldays. It is improbable, however, that any manuscript of peninsular provenance that he inspected at Hildesheim could rival the opulence of codices put together at home. From Regensburg, in 1010, the gifted scribe and illuminator Gunthald was summoned by Bishop Bernward, who commissioned from him a *de luxe* exemplar of the Gospels.⁵⁴ Luxury

exhaustæ, fauces longa inedia siccae, ipse palatus scabra rubigine asper vocem nobis intercludant (Briefsammlungen der Zeit Heinrichs IV., ed. Erdmann and Fickermann, 61–2).

⁵¹ See S. Krämer, *Handschriftenerbe des deutschen Mittelalters*, i (Munich, 1989), 353–5; B. Gallisti, 'Schule, Bücher und Gelehrsamkeit am Hildesheimer Dom', in U. Knapp (ed.), *Ego sum Hildensemensis: Bischof, Domkapitel und Dom in Hildesheim 815 bis 1810*, Katalog des Dommuseums Hildesheim 3 (Petersberg, 2000), 213–26; and H. Wolter-von dem Knesebeck, 'Die Weisheit hat sich ein Haus gebaut': Bilder, Buchkunst und Buchkultur in Hildesheim während des 12. Jahrhunderts', in Brandt (ed.), *Abglanz des Himmels*, 97–136 (with excellent illustrations).

⁵² See B. Gallisti, *Epiphanius von Pavia, Patron des Hildesheimer Doms* (Hildesheim, 2000).

⁵³ See W. Huschner, *Transalpine Kommunikation im Mittelalter: Diplomatische, kulturelle und politische Wechselwirkungen zwischen Italien und dem nordalpinen Reich (9.–11. Jahrhundert)*, 2 vols, MGH Schriften 52 (Hanover, 2003).

⁵⁴ *Das kostbare Evangelium des Heiligen Bernward*, ed. M. Brandt (Munich, 1993).

in the adornment of sacred books appears to have been tolerated by heaven, which punished Bernward and his clerics with a thunderbolt for their extravagance in dress.⁵⁵ This tradition of bibliophilia was continued and varied by Rainald in ironical correspondence with Wibald, the influential abbot of Stablo, about writings by Cicero, two of whose rhetorical treatises are transmitted in a manuscript of the late eleventh or early twelfth century still preserved at Hildesheim.⁵⁶ It is striking that, when Wibald in 1149 wanted to borrow a work from the book-chests there, he turned to his younger and (at the time) less illustrious colleague. The request declined, unless on the usual terms of exchange, Rainald offered instead manuscripts of his own brought back from France.

In the age of the handwritten book, this was a demonstrative gesture of trust. Trust transformed into banter between ecclesiastical men of the world when one of them expressed himself in clerical commonplace. 'I know you are a Christian, not a Ciceronian,' quipped Rainald of Dassel.⁵⁷ This quotation from St Jerome was well worn by the twelfth century.⁵⁸ In its banality lurked its sting. Aping the 'holier than thou' attitude of the prim and sanctimonious among their colleagues in orders, Rainald aimed to draw a smirk of collusion from Wibald, just as the Archpoet would mock the pious for the amusement of his master.⁵⁹ Snideness at the expense of orthodoxy was not typical of high culture in the Hohenstaufen empire. These unusually urbane Germans learnt to spice the warmed-up cabbage of intellectual fare customarily served in the Reich with French ingredients. Both Wibald of Stablo and his correspondent had acquired *savoir faire* in France, where, at an unknown date probably in the late 1130s, Rainald went, following a fashion of studious youth in twelfth-century Germany.⁶⁰ Henry of Brabant, for example, who was his near-contemporary, attended the Parisian schools before leading the one at Hildesheim and going on to become bishop of Lübeck.⁶¹ The scholastic capital of the West was a desirable destination in the early stages of a clerical career. At Paris John of Salisbury made the rounds of the masters teaching there, one of whom was the famous Peter Abelard, now a refugee from murderous monks at Saint-Gildas in Brittany. John was to loathe Rainald, and there are indications

⁵⁵ Otto of St Emmeram, *Liber visionum* 5, ed. P. G. Schmidt, MGH Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 13 (Weimar, 1989), 61–4.

⁵⁶ Dombibliothek 625a. See Wolter-von dem Knesebeck, in Brandt (ed.), *Abglanz des Himmels*, 132, nos 3, 7.

⁵⁷ *Quamvis Tullii libros habere desideres, scio tamen Christianum te esse, non Ciceronianum* (Ep. 189, ed. M. Hartmann, *Das Briefbuch Abt Wibalds von Stablo und Corvey*, MGH Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit, ix (Hanover, 2012), 401, 20–1).

⁵⁸ Jerome, Ep. 30, ed. I. Hilberg, CSEL 54 (Vienna, 1910), 190, 11.

⁵⁹ See Chapters VIII and IX.

⁶⁰ See J. Ehlers, 'Deutsche Scholaren in Frankreich während des 12. Jahrhunderts', in J. Fried (ed.), *Schulen und Studium im Wandel des hohen und späten Mittelalters*, VuF 30 (Sigmaringen, 1986), 97–120.

⁶¹ Arnold of Lübeck, *Chronica Slavorum* 3, ed. G. Pertz, MGH SrG 14 (Hanover, 1868), 73. Gallisti, 'Schule, Bücher und Gelehrsamkeit', in Knapp (ed.), *Ego sum Hildensemensis*, 222, conjectures that Rainald had Henry appointed to Hildesheim.

that the antipathy dated from adolescence, before politics opposed them. Their Parisian training confronted them with a number of common issues, to which their different approaches may lead us to infer that they were disposed to clash. And we can be sure that, if they fell out in youth, Rainald and John voiced their disagreement in the international language of learning spoken throughout the Parisian schools.

Rainald of Dassel was to be trilingual⁶²—in Latin, which he had doubtless mastered before he travelled to Paris; in French, which he will have learnt there; and in his native German. Fellow-countrymen already studying in the city may have provided him with contacts, but it would not have done for a young aristocrat to arrive there unaccompanied. And who was more suitable, as a comrade and retainer, than an impecunious scholar from the hospice at Hildesheim? Three indications point to our author's presence at Paris. The first is his awareness, unprecedented and unparalleled in his homeland, of a topical issue in French theology.⁶³ The second is the Archpoet's use of verse-forms that, during his generation, were current among writers of Latin not in Germany but in France.⁶⁴ The third is his style of thought and expression, which is distinctly dialectical.⁶⁵ Dialectic was a fashionable subject in the Parisian schools that Rainald of Dassel frequented. The German ears of this patron, being attuned to French rhythms, in the poetry to which his client applied the techniques of *sic et non* caught reminiscences of the second phase in the studies they had shared, which was higher than the training in grammar and rhetoric provided at Hildesheim. Its cathedral school equipped them with tools of their trade: the wares of cultural commerce were to be found at Paris. French scholasticism mattered to German clerics, who rightly considered that it set them apart from their peers in the Reich. Nowhere is that sense of difference more eloquently expressed than in a letter, known but neglected, that was addressed to Rainald of Dassel in 1157 by Otto of Freising.⁶⁶ The emperor's uncle had written with apprehension. The formality of his Latin prose hardly hides its edginess. He was presenting his nephew with a copy of the world-chronicle in which he criticizes some of Barbarossa's predecessors for their conflicts with Rome. Tension between the empire and the papacy had been mounting since 1156.⁶⁷ Conciliation was not to be expected from Rainald by those who, like Otto, knew him. Worse still, it was the chancellor who would translate and interpret the chronicle to an emperor without enough Latin to read it himself. What to do? Otto of Freising's solution is subtle. He aims to win over his potential critic with a combination of directness

⁶² Saxo Grammaticus, *Gesta Danorum*, xiv. 18 ed. J. Olrik and H. Raeder (Havniae, 1931), 443.

⁶³ See Chapter VIII.

⁶⁴ K. Strecker, 'Die zweite Beichte des Erzpoeten', in *Mittelalterliche Handschriften ... Festgabe ... H. Degering* (Leipzig, 1926) 244ff.

⁶⁵ See Chapter VI.

⁶⁶ Ed. A. Hofmeister, *Ottonis Frisingensis Chronica sive Historia de duabus civitatibus*, MGH SrG 45 (Hanover, 1912) 4, 3–9.

⁶⁷ See Chapter III.

and ambiguity. Ambiguity—in its widest sense of equivocation, polysemy, fallacious speech-acts—was a leading theme of scholastic debate at Paris,⁶⁸ where Otto had studied shortly before Rainald. The chancellor is requested not to view the chronicle negatively but to be its ‘good interpreter’ (*bonum interpretem*). Is ‘good’ meant morally? Or does Otto refer to fidelity of translation? Both possibilities are valid, and the wordplay can be construed as a compliment. But it is a compliment that sends a muted signal that Otto was wary of malice, as indeed he had reason to be. That is why he betrays his nervousness in flattery laid on with a trowel. Rainald of Dassel is depicted ‘as a philosopher, not an ignoramus’ (*non ut rudi sed ut philosopho*). Otto appeals to the culture that elevates them above the common herd. Learned and scholarly—in unspoken contrast to the less Latinate, whose number included the emperor—Rainald will know how to mediate the work to ‘the imperial ears’, for he possesses ‘discernment’ (*discretio*).

Discretio, in Medieval Latin, connoted ethical perception, a quality requisite in confessors.⁶⁹ When referring to Rainald of Dassel even his most ardent admirer, the Archpoet, does not draw that religious implication from the term. Political canniness and shrewd insight are what our author means when he describes his patron as discerning.⁷⁰ Otto finds a further variant on the theme. If Rainald can be considered a philosopher, that is because he is trained in the liberal arts. Their technical diction of barbarisms, solecisms, syllogisms is accessible to a chancellor-sage familiar with both the terminology and the premisses of scholastic thought. On this subject, which whetted Otto’s appetite for digression,⁷¹ he for once gets briskly to the point, professing reliance less on Rainald’s goodwill than on his intellectual solidarity. Had they not both studied in Paris? Were they not members of the same community? The author and the interpreter of the chronicle grasped, on Parisian principles of unified learning, an insiders’ jargon that was unintelligible to the nominal recipient of the work. Barbarossa is implicitly excluded from their circle of mutual regard. The exclusion becomes plainer in Otto of Freising’s history of his nephew’s early reign, where the emperor is informed: ‘some things are written for you as yourself, some for you not as yourself, which the sharp eyes of your clerics must make out’.⁷² Clerical sharpness is more evident in this declaration than avuncular concern. The imperial reader of Latin may be defined as a composite persona or dismissed as a fiction, unlike the chancellor,

⁶⁸ See I. Rosier, ‘Évolution des notions d’equivocatio et d’univocatio au xii^e siècle’, in Rosier (ed.), *L’Ambiguïté: Cinq études historiques* (Lille, 1988), 103–66, and A. de Libera, ‘La Logique du Moyen Âge comme logique naturelle (*Sprachlogik*): Vues médiévales sur l’ambiguïté’, in B. Mojsisch (ed.), *Sprachphilosophie in Antike und Mittelalter* (Amsterdam, 1986), 403–38.

⁶⁹ See F. Dingjan OSB, *Discretio: Les Origines patristiques et monastiques de la doctrine de la prudence de saint Thomas d’Aquin* (Assen, 1967).

⁷⁰ *Carm.* IV, 1, 1, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 57. See Chapter VI.

⁷¹ *Gesta Frederici*, i, 5, ed. Schmale, 128–42.

⁷² *Scribuntur quedam tibi ut tibi, quedam tibi sed non ut tibi, que acutus clericorum tuorum discernere debuit oculus* (*Gesta Frederici*, i, 71, ed. Schmale, 280, 15–17).

on the subject of whose scholarship others agreed with Otto.⁷³ Real expertise had to be obtained where he and Rainald had gained it, in the French schools. A tour de force of cultural diplomacy, this letter shows how shrewdly one alumnus of Paris in Germany sought the backing of another.

Otto of Freising was not the only acquaintance of Rainald's to employ these tactics. In 1159 another appeal to his Parisian past was made by Ekbert, brother of the mystic Elisabeth and redactor of her visions, who figured first as monk, then as abbot at Schönau, in what had just become Rainald of Dassel's archdiocese.⁷⁴ Among the many edifying counsels offered to him by his only monastic friend, there is a striking reticence about the prophetesses of the Rhineland. No word is wasted on the communiqués from the other world that Eckbert's sister delivered with fervid frequency. The newly elected archbishop of Cologne, noted for his worldliness, was to avert his gaze from the cloisters of Schönau and Bingen, which, humming with heavenly messages received by seers such as Elisabeth and her heroine Hildegard, ran the risk of appearing asylums for cranks.⁷⁵ Instead Eckbert urged Rainald to focus on the past when, as students at Paris, they had sat together at the feet of Master Adam.⁷⁶ Adam of Balsham,⁷⁷ in Eckbert's portrayal, was a paragon of scholarship and conduct. The monastic terms used in this letter recall an antithesis between the simplicity of the cloister and the sophistry of the schools drawn by Peter of Celle writing to John of Salisbury.⁷⁸ Adam, for Eckbert, combined the advantages of both vocations. It is far from clear that this was an ideal for which the archbishop of Cologne, at the time of his election, had much sympathy. An admirer of sophists and a sceptic of monks, Rainald may not have warmed to Eckbert's attempt to mediate between their opposing values, although he will have appreciated the emphasis with which his friend singles out this Englishman, while excluding another teacher. Adam of Balsham, who taught on or near the Petit-Pont, is hailed as their mutual mentor, but silence surrounds a renowned German who, also at Paris, was capable of drawing pupils as distinguished as Peter Lombard and Robert of Melun.

Hugh of Saint-Victor was a Saxon (from Hammerstein in the diocese of Halberstadt),⁷⁹ like Rainald of Dassel and the Archpoet. Neither their works

⁷³ e.g. *ab adolescentia vir erat strenuissimus, tam liberali quam seculari scientia preditus, eloquentia insignis* (Annales Egmondani s.a. 1167, ed. G. Pertz, MGH SS 16 (repr. Stuttgart, 1994), 464, 49–50); *disertus et optime litteratus, facundus providus et sagacissimus* (Acerbus Morena, ed. Schmale, Quellen, 188).

⁷⁴ See Chapter III.

⁷⁵ See Chapter X.

⁷⁶ *In diebus adolescentie nostre conglutinauit mentes nostras [caritas], quando in scola electissima nostri amabilis doctoris domini Adae, viri eminentissimi tam vita quam scientia, simul dulces capiebamus cibos philosophice doctrine* (F. Roth (ed.), *Die Visionen der heiligen Elisabeth und der Schriften der Aebte Ekbert und Emecho* (Brunn, 1884), 313–14).

⁷⁷ The best study of Adam, by J. Marenbon, will appear in a forthcoming volume of the new *Überweg History of Philosophy*, ed. T. Ricklin. I thank John Marenbon for a preview.

⁷⁸ *Plus vita confert quam lectio, plus prodest simplicitas quam cavillatio* (Ep. 73 PL 202, 520A).

⁷⁹ See J. Ehlers, *Hugo von St Victor: Studien zum Geschichtsdenken und zur Geschichtsschreibung des 12. Jahrhunderts*, *Frankfurter Historische Abhandlungen* 7 (Wiesbaden, 1973). For Ehlers's later views on the German origins of Hugh, see Ehlers, *LMA* v. 177.

nor their lives display the faintest trace of his influence. If they shunned the German and turned to the English master, one of the reasons will have been the character of Hugh's theology. Its thrust is towards reformation, redemption, re-creation.⁸⁰ For an unregenerate conservative like Rainald of Dassel, all of this held little interest. The Biblical exegesis pursued at Saint-Victor in such detail did not attract him or his companion.⁸¹ Their tastes, described so vividly by Otto of Freising, were for *logica*: a blend of dialectic and rhetoric that, as it was taught by Adam of Balsham, extended and deepened the grounding in the verbal arts that they had received at Hildesheim. He, shortly before their arrival at Paris, in 1132 had begun but probably not completed a treatise on discourse taken to be the first logical textbook written during the Middle Ages under the impact of Aristotle's *Sophistici Elenchi*.⁸² All forms of argument, asserts this master, tend to ambiguity and equivocation.⁸³ Simplicity is the goal of analysis; straightforwardness should be cultivated, elaboration avoided. Excessive subtlety in *logica* Adam of Balsham condemns as 'trivial toughness'.⁸⁴ His purpose, however, was liable to be subverted by a particular feature of his teaching. Half of Adam's extant work, the main testimony to his lessons, deals with sophisms in which, the Archpoet's *œuvre* demonstrates beyond doubt,⁸⁵ he and his master revelled for their own sake. What the English logician offered them as problems to be solved with the aim of achieving univocality they used as springboards for mental gymnastics.

Sophistry in twelfth-century Paris is censured, from the opposite viewpoint, by John of Salisbury in his *Metalogicon*. Not without a dry sense of humour, he depicts Adam as a twelfth-century Russell in a city dominated by the likes of Derrida, who confused obscurity with profundity.⁸⁶ The English master was not to blame for the excesses of his followers. They lusted after complication in speech and thought. Had he taught dialectic with the straightforwardness it deserved, Adam claimed, he would have lost students.⁸⁷ One of them, not formally but in a type of private tutorial, was John himself, who reports that, during their conversations, Adam talked a plain language that he avoided in the schools. There a clique of *Parvipontani*, whom John associates with his

⁸⁰ See B. Coolman, *The Theology of Hugh of St Victor: An Interpretation* (Cambridge, 2010).

⁸¹ Cf. P. Godman, *The Silent Masters: Latin Literature and its Censors in the High Middle Ages* (Princeton, 2000), 273 ff.

⁸² L. Minio-Paluello (ed.), *Twelfth-Century Logic: Texts and Studies Adam Balsamiensis Parvipontani Ars Disserendi Dialectica Alexandri* (Rome, 1956). See L. M. De Rijk, *Logica Modernorum: A Contribution to the History of Early Terminist Logic* (Aasen, 1962), 62 ff., and K. Jakobi, 'Logic: The Later Twelfth-Century', in P. Dronke (ed.), *A History of Twelfth-Century Western Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1988), 238.

⁸³ *argumentum enim equivoce dicitur, tum ratio qua aliquid probatur, tum narratio ficta et verisimilis; sed et 'probari' equivoce dicitur, tum cuius fit fides ratione inducta, tum cui ultro adhibetur assensus, preter hec etiam id pro quo exhibition* (ed. Minio-Paluello, 42, 24–43, 3).

⁸⁴ *talibus non utentur nisi quos, specie subtilitatis, nugatoria fallit difficultas* (ed. Minio-Paluello, 66, 30–1).

⁸⁵ See Chapter VIII.

⁸⁶ *Metalogicon*, ii. 10, ed. J. B. Hall, CCCM 98 (Turnhout, 1991), 72, 59–64.

⁸⁷ *Metalogicon*, iii. 3, ed. Hall, 114, 192–9, and cf. IV, 3, ed. Hall, 142, 14–23.

own bugbear, the derided 'Cornificius',⁸⁸ was given to hair-splitting. Their sophistical brand of dialectic is dismissed as 'a wisdom of appearances, not reality... shrouding with illusory images, like shadows of deception, what should be the substance of language'.⁸⁹ Such shadows of deception, to Rainald of Dassel and the Archpoet, were shining figures of fun. Their differences with John of Salisbury first emerged at a level that was pre-political. On the intellectual plane, an earlier and deeper division inclined them to antagonism, although (or because) both parties in the dispute tried to apply to life what they had learnt at Paris. John became an advocate of academic scepticism and of hermeneutic restraint. Rainald ignored such scruples, if indeed he felt them. When he went on to manipulate ambiguity in order to foment strife between the papacy and the empire,⁹⁰ he was vulnerable to attack for perverting Adam's lesson about the chastity of single meanings. But then he, ingenious as ever, might have argued that the master had contradicted himself, in an opusculum on household utensils,⁹¹ by his promiscuity with synonyms.

Ingenuity in argument, which John of Salisbury sought to limit, is a prime source of the humour shared by Rainald of Dassel and the Archpoet. It serves to explain why, for what he would have doubtless considered the wrong reasons, they chose to sit at Adam of Balsham's feet, while steering clear of Hugh's. No one sought high jinks of the mind at Saint-Victor. The system of education developed there by the solemn Saxon—who regarded dialectic with suspicion, restricted the role of language, and relegated poetry to the level of an appendage to scholarship⁹²—repelled our author and his master. They sought learning that could be used in a spirit of selectivity alien to Hugh's encyclopaedic programme of study.⁹³ When the one hailed the other as endowed with the 'mind of Nestor and the voice of Ulysses',⁹⁴ John of Salisbury could have retorted that this sums up sophistry in classical clichés. Yet the Archpoet, addressing Rainald of Dassel with allusions he knew to be ambiguous, meant them to be taken for flattery. Avid students and faithless pupils of Adam, they numbered among the 'Cornificians' produced on the Petit-Pont whom the *Metalogicon* deplores. And the jeremiad goes further. John of Salisbury blends cultural criticism with nostalgia, looking back yearningly to a golden age before the unity of learning had been shattered. Then a direct correspondence between words and things had obtained. Now John discerns no more than a

⁸⁸ Cf. Godman, *The Silent Masters*, 152 and n. 19.

⁸⁹ *sophistica quae apparet et non existens... phantasticis imaginibus, velut umbris fallacibus involvat eum cum quo sermo conseritur* (*Metalogicon*, ii. 3, ed. Hall 60, 37–40).

⁹⁰ See Chapter IV.

⁹¹ *De utensilibus ad domum regendam pertinentibus*, ed. A. Scheler, *Lexicographie latine du xii^e et du xiii^e siècles* (Leipzig, 1867), 119–37.

⁹² *Didascalicon*, iii. 4, ed. T. Offergeld, *Fontes christianae* 27 (Freiburg, 1997), 230–2.

⁹³ *Didascalicon*, vi. 3, ed. Offergeld, 364, with J. Longère, 'La Fonction pastorale de Saint-Victor à la fin du xii^e et au début du xiii^e siècle', in Longère (ed.), *L'Abbaye parisienne de Saint-Victor au Moyen Âge*, *Bibliotheca Victorina* I (Paris, 1991), 294 ff.

⁹⁴ *in quo mens est Nestoris et vox Ulixee* (*Carm.* IV, 33, 2, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 61). See further Chapter V.

'linguistic hotch-potch' (*sartago loquendi*),⁹⁵ in which arcane language and empty arguments are deployed by ready-made specialists. Mental agility without intellectual depth is characteristic of these 'Cornificians', who have omitted essential parts of their education. A long-term student, he neglected no aspect of the liberal arts. But note the sorry results! Despite his merits, this intimate of the late pope has no time for study, as he groans under the burden of administering the entire English Church.⁹⁶ To read the self-importance with which John of Salisbury laments his lot in 1159 is to form the impression that he, not Becket, was next in line to become archbishop of Canterbury.

In the year when Rainald of Dassel was elected archbishop of Cologne, the gloom with which John bemoaned decline from the standards of the past was coming to seem a trifle dated. The present was changing not only the cultural scene but also the sphere of religion, about which, in the *Metalogicon*, next to nothing is said. Yet a gaze that ranged wider than John of Salisbury's might have detected analogies between these two areas of his experience. In both, the sophists he censured were making their presence felt. When he or Rainald or the Archpoet attended church at Paris, the topic about which they were most likely to hear was penance, a favourite theme among urban preachers.⁹⁷ They addressed an issue that stood at the centre of religious debate. Penance was promoted to the status of a sacrament during the lifetimes of Rainald and John, but only the German detected a phenomenon that, discussed in France, was ignored by theologians of the Hohenstaufen and Angevin empires during their generation. French thinkers, beginning with Bernard of Clairvaux, observed with alarm that this sacrament was receiving the same perverse treatment attributed by John of Salisbury to 'Cornificians', who tormented the letter of the text. The literal meaning of penance was being turned upside down. At the moment when the utmost authenticity was demanded of sinners, charlatans among them were acting out a fiction of faith. No, they did not pretend to be better than they were. These feigned penitents alleged themselves to be worse. And why did they do so? Because humility is a cardinal virtue of Christianity. Protesting their unworthiness, spiritual sophists were claiming a primacy of abasement.⁹⁸

Without knowledge of the phenomenon of feigned penance, the Archpoet's 'confession', outlined at the beginning of this book, is neither conceivable nor comprehensible.⁹⁹ That masterpiece of spiritual sophistry is addressed to an archbishop who is expected to find the phenomenon funny. Only one is attested in Latin Europe of the 1160s; and the unique sense of humour that Rainald of Dassel shared with his client about the falsification of moral identity derives from time spent on the Left Bank. There they learnt irreverence for

⁹⁵ *Metalogicon*, i. 3, ed. Hall, 16, 81.

⁹⁶ *Metalogicon*, iii. 1, ed. Hall, 101.

⁹⁷ See J. Longère, *Œuvres oratoires de maîtres parisiens au xii^e siècle*, i (Paris, 1975), 255 ff.

⁹⁸ Cf. P. Godman, *Paradoxes of Conscience in the Middle Ages: Abelard, Heloise, and the Archpoet* (Cambridge, 2009).

⁹⁹ See Chapter VIII.

clerical solemnity and returned, comrades in merriment, to Hildesheim with more than books in their baggage. Paris taught them to laugh at all John of Salisbury lamented—in speech, in reasoning, in religion. Some of this he saw with a jaundiced eye; the rest he missed. But John's cultural short-sightedness was minor by comparison with the myopia of Thomas Becket, who, although he had studied in the schools of Paris, was not styled a master of arts.¹⁰⁰ Nor did anyone lavish praise on his scholarly achievements, as Otto of Freising did in Rainald of Dassel's case. St Thomas will have read and written Latin, but he was not able to compose verse in it—except, allegedly, while half-asleep.¹⁰¹ Incapable of making a speech in the learned language at the council of Tours in 1163, four years later he could converse in it with the papal legates whom he met at Gisors-Trie.¹⁰² Fluency in a difficult tongue imperfectly learnt when still a youth is unlikely to have been acquired from a crash course in middle age: Becket had been primed by his clerks. One of them, whose stylistic imprint is evident in the letters that pass under his name, was John of Salisbury. While it may be true that 'a year or two in Paris was [sic] enough to complete [Becket's] transformation into an employable commodity',¹⁰³ in the intellectual sphere where the Archpoet and his patron met as equals the archbishop of Canterbury was no match for Master John.

Inadequate to the demands of the higher disciplines taught at Paris, Becket went on to study canon law at Bologna. There, from at least one of the masters at whose feet Thomas had sat, Barbarossa sought reassurance about his rights as 'lord of the world' in 1158. That title partly derived from Roman law. By then interest in its definitions of empire and imperial power had already been shown by Rainald of Dassel,¹⁰⁴ but there is no earlier evidence of legal studies, canon or civil, on his part. What concerned him was the terminology of late antique jurisprudence, whose stylistic majesty enhances the charters produced for him by our author in his notarial capacity as 'Rainald H'.¹⁰⁵ More significant than the plumes plucked from Justinian is the assurance with which they are made to adorn the Hohenstaufen cause. The chief ideologue of empire selected what suited his purposes with a cocksureness that he had acquired at Paris. Like Adalbert of Saarbrücken—who, according to his biographer or encomiast, emerged from the Parisian schools with multi-competence as an orator, an advocate, and a judge¹⁰⁶—Rainald of Dassel gained there an ability

¹⁰⁰ See Barlow, *Thomas Becket*, 20 ff.

¹⁰¹ Herbert of Bosham, *Vita S. Thomae*, in *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury*, iii, ed. J. C. Robertson, Rolls Series 67 (London, 1877), 461.

¹⁰² John of Salisbury, Ep. 231, ed. W. Miller and C. N. L. Brooke, *The Letters of the John of Salisbury*, ii. *The Later Letters (1163–1180)* (Oxford, 1974), 418.

¹⁰³ Duggan, *Thomas Becket*, 12.

¹⁰⁴ See Chapter III.

¹⁰⁵ Appelt, DFI v. 124–5.

¹⁰⁶ *Disputat, opponit, probat et contraria ponit, | infert concludens; fieri cavet hoc sibi prudens | nec sinit opponi quod ineptum sit rationi | quodque refragetur logicae vel inane probetur. | Set neque rethoricam renuens, Ciceronis amicam, | rethor et orator, defensor et insidiator, | iudex et testis, studiis intentus honestis | esse laborabat . . .* (Anselm, *Vita Adelberti II*, 714–21, ed. Jaffé, 590).

to pick, choose, and improvise that put him on a par with the archbishop-to-be of Mainz. Both of them were educated in an ideal of applicable oratory. Versatility in secular letters and civil issues was the goal that reached back to Alcuin in the eighth century and had been modernized, in the twelfth, by a Parisian master with whom they had studied, Thierry of Chartres.¹⁰⁷ Such was the level of learning to which Thomas Becket could not aspire, save at second hand.

* * *

Learning was a necessary, but insufficient, qualification for ascent in the hierarchy of the medieval German Church.¹⁰⁸ Rainald's rise was not meteoric, unlike that of Adalbert, who was born in a shade of the purple. After attending what his Life makes appear to be the French finishing schools of Paris, Reims, and Montpellier, Adalbert of Saarbrücken received rich benefices in Erfurt and Mainz, where he promptly succeeded his uncle as archbishop in 1138. The same year Otto, who belonged to the reigning dynasty, became in swift succession abbot of Morimont and bishop of Freising. Rainald did not spring from the high aristocracy, nor could he yet rely on such connections. He remedied these deficiencies of background by accumulating offices and allies until he achieved his breakthrough and, in 1156, was appointed German chancellor (before being promoted, three years later, to the archchancellorship of Italy). The evidence for his early career consists chiefly of charters that he witnessed or that mention him. No such sources exist for the Archpoet in the same period. If, after returning to Hildesheim, he remained at Rainald of Dassel's side, it was in a minor capacity, beneath the notice of documents that deal with property and power. A mere minister by birth, he was then far from the fame that he has since won for the wrong reasons. When he emerges as an author in the early 1160s, with notarial precision he describes his master as '[archbishop]-elect of Cologne' and 'archchancellor' of Italy. The emphasis placed on these titles, to which our author's pseudonym is parallel, indicates a reciprocity fundamental to their relationship.¹⁰⁹ Basking in the reflected glory of his lord, the minister boosts his own standing. Rainald of Dassel has achieved eminence, and some of the glamour spills over to intoxicate his companion in cups.

Redolent of the wine in which they toasted their triumphs, this stress on status may also be tinged with an aftertaste of lean years. Between the early

¹⁰⁷ On Alcuin, see S. Jaeger, *The Envy of Angels: Cathedral Schools and Social Ideals in Medieval Europe, 950–1200* (Philadelphia, 1994), 32 ff. On Thierry, see Chapter III.

¹⁰⁸ See O. Engels, 'Der Reichsbischof in ottonischer und frühsalischer Zeit', in I. Crusius (ed.), *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Struktur der mittelalterlichen Germania sacra, Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte* (Göttingen, 1989), 135–75, H. Stehkämper, 'Der Reichsbischof und Territorialfürst (12. und 13. Jahrhundert)', in P. Berglar and O. Engels (eds), *Der Bischof in seiner Zeit: Bischofstypus und Bischofsideal im Spiegel der Kölner Kirche. Festgabe für Joseph Kardinal Höffner...* (Cologne, 1986), 95, 184 (although his claim that Rainald of Dassel possessed 'den Vorzug hochadliger Herkunft' does not appear justified), and S. Jaeger, *The Origins of Courtliness: Civilizing Trends and the Formation of Courtly Ideals 939–1210* (Philadelphia, 1955), 19 ff.

¹⁰⁹ See Chapter VI.

1140s, by which time he had probably left Paris, and 1158, when his earliest extant charter was produced, there is no trace of 'Rainald H', nor the slightest sign of the Archpoet. The dual identity of our author is hidden under the shadow of his master, who, during this period, was making his way in the world. How long, how continuously, he served Rainald of Dassel before he became prominent, we cannot be sure, but a minister with patrons was not necessarily prevented by his social origins from a major career in the German Church. In 1153, the *ministerialis* Arnold of Selenhofen was elevated to the primacy as archbishop of Mainz after leading the royal chancery,¹¹⁰ where 'Rainald H' found employment five years later as the confidant of its chief. The office of German chancellor was many sided.¹¹¹ Less specialized than the duties of a modern bureaucrat, the various tasks undertaken by this influential official were a medieval mixture of administration, diplomacy, and politics. Among the qualities needed to perform them, loyalty to the ruler and practical experience ranked high. Rainald of Dassel began acquiring both soon after his return from Paris to Hildesheim, where, on 11 March 1146, he is attested in a charter as subdeacon at the cathedral.¹¹² The rapid promotion of an Adalbert or an Otto was not to be his fortune, and the chafing of frustrated ambition in early manhood may account for the high-handedness he displayed when, almost 40, he climbed to the top. Near the bottom he had commenced in an unexhilarating but demanding post. Rainald is first recorded, on 3 August 1146, as Hildesheim's *cellarius*.¹¹³

This position made the young man co-responsible for the finances and daily running of the diocese. Rainald worked together with the energetic bishop of Hildesheim, Bernhard (1130–53), who was the moving spirit behind St Godhard's canonization.¹¹⁴ Keen on building and zealous in pastoral care, Bernhard was also alert to the fact that he occupied a border zone between the spheres of influence in Saxony contested by the Hohenstaufen dynasty and its relatives or rivals, the Welfs. Rainald of Dassel was swift to decide on which side he stood. Had he not registered with envy and admiration how, before he had obtained so much as a sinecure, the Hohenstaufen King Conrad III (1138–51) had acquired, with 'help from friends' at Hildesheim,¹¹⁵ its cathedral provostship for his half-brother, Conrad of Babenberg? Conrad was a pluralist to be emulated.¹¹⁶ Already archdeacon of nearby Goslar and provost of Utrecht, this member of the family that ruled Austria and Bavaria then

¹¹⁰ See F. Hausmann, *Reichskanzlei und Hofkapelle unter Heinrich V. und Konrad III.*, MGH Schriften 14 (Stuttgart, 1956), 122–34, and, as background, Zielinski, *Reichsepiskopat*, 19 ff.

¹¹¹ Appelt, DFI v. 16 ff.

¹¹² *Urkundenbuch des Hochstifts Hildesheim und seiner Bischöfe bis 1221*, i, ed. K. Janicke (Berlin, 1896), no. 239.

¹¹³ *Urkundenbuch*, ed. Janicke, no. 241.

¹¹⁴ See H. Goetting, *Bistum Hildesheim: Die Hildesheimer Bischöfe von 815 bis 1221 (1227)*, Germania Sacra NF 20 (Berlin, 1984), 339 ff.

¹¹⁵ *annitentibus amicis (Annales Palidenses s.a. 1143)*, ed. G. Pertz, MGH SS 16 (repr. Stuttgart, 1994), 81, 7–8).

¹¹⁶ Cf. W. Heinemann, *Das Bistum Hildesheim im Kräftespiel der Reichs- und Territorialpolitik, vornehmlich des 12. Jahrhunderts* (Hildesheim, 1968), 170.

joined the select company of royal chaplains and was endowed with a canonry at Cologne.¹¹⁷ Through Conrad, not *via* his sister Gepa (for whose presence in a convent of that city the sources are late and dubious), Rainald of Dassel began to establish connections with the chancery and the archdiocese that he would head. His approach to them was smoothed by a prince of the blood. As long as their paths intersected, the way ahead seemed clear. But difficulties had arisen when Bishop Bernhard appointed a candidate of his own choice to the archdeaconry of Goslar. Apart from the affront to the king, whose royal right to prefer was violated, the traditional link between that position and the provostship of Hildesheim cathedral had been severed. Rainald of Dassel was shocked by this episcopal effrontery, all the more because an ally had been aggrieved. He took steps to redress the balance of influence. After a synod at Hildesheim presided over by a cardinal-legate failed to reinstate Conrad of Babenberg in March 1146, it is reasonable to assume that Rainald accompanied him to protest to the pope because, from Viterbo on 27 May, Eugenius III wrote to Bishop Bernard and his clergy ordering that the archdeaconry of Goslar be restored to Conrad and commending to their 'benevolence' a canon of Hildesheim identified as 'R'.¹¹⁸ Rainald of Dassel, after helping to undo an appointment made by his bishop, now needed backing from above. But his flank was secure. When, in 1149, Conrad of Babenberg resigned his Saxon benefices, the provostship at Hildesheim fell to his friend.

Why, in 1149, was a canon who had crossed his superior due for advancement? Rainald rose at Hildesheim partly on his own merits, partly through the misfortunes of others. Bernard's eyesight failed, and the affairs of the diocese had to be left to the younger man. So it was that, less because his bishop loved him than by being indispensable, Rainald attended in Bernard's stead a council of the universal Church held at Reims in March 1148. There he made his mark. In an outburst that rang in John of Salisbury's memory, this member of the minor clergy at Hildesheim resisted a decretal promulgated by Pope Eugenius III to ban the wearing of parti-coloured cloaks by the clergy.¹¹⁹ The issue was more than sartorial. Flashy and luxurious garments were considered emblems of a licence reprehensible even in laymen. Throughout Rainald of Dassel's lifetime, reformers of the Church inveighed against such foppery. In his statutes of 1132, for example, Peter the Venerable, with a barb of satire aimed at monks who looked like 'husbands strutting from the bedroom', had prohibited gaudy clothes and insisted that humble black habits be worn at Cluny.¹²⁰ Frinery was forbidden by Eugenius III to those who participated in the Second Crusade, on the grounds that they should demonstrate by their dress

¹¹⁷ See F. Hausmann, *Reichskanzlei*, 298.

¹¹⁸ *Urkundenbuch*, ed. Janicke, no. 235.

¹¹⁹ On Rainald of Dassel at the Council of Reims, see John of Salisbury, *Historia pontificalis* 3, ed. M. Chibnall (repr. Oxford, 1986), and J. Spörl, 'Rainald von Dassel auf dem Konzil von Reims 1148 und sein Verhältnis zu Johann von Salisbury', *Historisches Jahrbuch*, 60 (1940), 250–7.

¹²⁰ *sicut et ipse vidi talium vestium notabiliter inhonesta et turpis curiositas, qua olim multi nostrorum, non aliter quam seculares homines, sericis variis vel grisiis vestium generibus se comébant . . . velut sponsi procedentes de thalamo . . .* (Statutum 16, in *Statuts, chapitres généraux et visites de l'ordre de Cluny*, i, ed. G. Charvin

that they were undertaking a mission of penance.¹²¹ Rainald had learnt to laugh at penance during his youth in Paris. The council of Reims, however, posed problems that he could not shrug off with a smile. At stake were clerical discipline and Rome's right to interfere with the customs of local churches, to which Germans had objected since the time of Gregory VII (1073–85) and his 'tyranny'.¹²² That is why Rainald of Dassel and 'other Teutons' (*alii Teutones*), as reported by the hostile John of Salisbury, protested their dissent both then and in the future.¹²³ John recalled this scene at the distance of more than a decade and with an animus exacerbated by the schism, for which he held his enemy responsible. None the less, the outspokenness was authentically Rainaldian, and refusal of a sartorial separation between lay and ecclesiastical magnates remained a cause that he defended until he died nineteen years later. John of Salisbury, an eyewitness of the outburst at Reims, is broadly credible. Less credible, although beguiling, is the image of Rainald striding out of the council and returning to the backwoods of what John considered barbaric Germany, clad in a parti-coloured cloak.¹²⁴

Wibald of Stablo (like Thomas Becket) also attended the council of Reims. It is doubtful that he joined openly in the German opposition to this decretal, because his diplomacy was aimed at conciliation between the papacy and the empire. But he will have noted, with a mixture of wonder and regret, Rainald of Dassel's intervention. The two clerics were already acquainted. They had met in 1146, when the papal court sojourned at Viterbo and Conrad of Babenberg's case was heard. Since then links between them had become closer. Wibald needed support at Hildesheim, to whose Bishop Bernhard he had appealed for help in his difficulties with Henry, the deposed abbot of Corvey,¹²⁵ whom he had succeeded by royal preferment. Here was a contact worth pursuing with a leading figure in the chancery of Conrad III.¹²⁶ The jocularity of Rainald's letter to Wibald on the subject of 'Ciceronianism' in 1149 is that of a confidant in the know. Perhaps too knowing for his senior's taste, the younger man went on to inform him of rumours then circulating in Cologne about Archbishop Arnold I's imminent resignation and Wibald's alleged candidacy. Rainald offered his services in tapping the clerical grapevine during the Christmas he was planning soon to spend in that city.¹²⁷ This is not evidence that, in December 1149, he had acquired a canonry at Cologne

(Paris, 1965), 26, with G. Constable, 'The Statutes of Peter the Venerable', in Constable, *Cluniac Studies*, Variorum (London, 1980), iv. 21–5).

¹²¹ See E. Caspar, 'Die Kreuzzugsbullen Eugenius III.', NA 45 (1924), 285–305.

¹²² See I. Robinson, 'Periculosus Homo: Gregory VII and Episcopal Authority', *Viator*, 9 (1978), 103–31, and B. Schmeidler, 'Anti-asketische Äusserungen aus Deutschland im 11. und beginnenden 12. Jahrhundert', in *Kultur-und Universalgeschichte: Festschrift W. Götz* (Leipzig, 1927), 35–52.

¹²³ *reclamaverunt decretum hoc nec placere presentibus nec posteris placitum* (*Historia pontificalis* 3, ed. Chibnall, 7).

¹²⁴ See further Chapter XI.

¹²⁵ Goetting, *Bistum Hildesheim*, 360.

¹²⁶ Hausmann, *Reichskanzlei*, 167 ff., and see Chapter III.

¹²⁷ Ep. 195, ed. Hartmann, 421.

vacated by Conrad of Babenberg.¹²⁸ The letter to Wibald suggests that Hildesheim had become too hot to hold its recently appointed provost during a festive season over which the bishop, despite his disability, presided perforce; and it demonstrates that, among the gossips of what would become his metropolis a decade later, Rainald already had his ear to the ground. But Wibald, less enthusiastic and more prudent than he, advised this zealot for promotion to keep mum.¹²⁹

Never negligent in cultivating his contacts, Rainald of Dassel began to manoeuvre himself nearer to the ruler and, in June 1150 at the imperial assembly (*Reichstag*) of Würzburg, he witnessed a charter that entrusted the monastery of Ringelsheim to the bishop of Hildesheim, whom he represented.¹³⁰ Rainald was aware of the strategic importance of the site. Ringelsheim dominated the road to Goslar, where he was archdeacon. And, as he accumulated benefices while dominating the diocese, he learnt to lean on friends in high places. One of the imperial princes whose advice Conrad III had followed when he made Ringelsheim over to Hildesheim was Wibald of Stablo. Did Wibald introduce Rainald to the papal legate, Cardinal Octavian of S. Cecilia? We do not know, but we may be sure that, when Hildesheim wished to translate the remains of St Bernward, it had to seek the permission of this Roman aristocrat with his 'special fondness for the Germans'.¹³¹ And it was he who, nine years later as Victor IV, went on to be Rainald's antipope. The protagonists of his future policies were now within his horizons. Yet his alignment with the Hohenstaufen cause could become a source of tension. At Hildesheim Rainald had to cope with the aggressive proximity of Henry the Lion, who, in the last year of Conrad III's reign, clashed with the king. After the accession of his cousin Frederick I on 4 March 1152 there could be no doubt about Henry's grip on power in Saxony. His territories surrounded the bishopric of Hildesheim,¹³² on whose fiefs he had begun to encroach, and, in one of the earlier acts of the reign, his influence was acknowledged at silver-rich Goslar. There, on 9 May 1152, Barbarossa issued a charter to this effect.¹³³ Among its witnesses were the duke, Wibald of Stablo, and Rainald of Dassel.

It was on this occasion that Rainald met the ruler whom he was to serve for the rest of his life. The choices facing him were stark. If he remained at Hildesheim, there was no means of evading Henry the Lion's clutches. Ludolf of Dassel, his brother, by necessity became a member of the Welf court at

¹²⁸ Pace Heinemann, *Bistum Hildesheim*, 191 n. 336.

¹²⁹ Ep. 196, ed. Hartmann, 413–14.

¹³⁰ *Die Urkunden Konrads III. und seines Sohnes Heinrich*, ed. F. Hausmann, MGH Die Urkunden der deutschen Könige und Kaiser 9 (Vienna, 1969), no. 235.

¹³¹ *specialis amator Theutonicorum* (Balderich, *Gesta Alberonis archiepiscopi* 23, ed. G. Pertz, MGH SS 8 (repr. Stuttgart, 1992), 255, 10–11).

¹³² Goetting, *Bistum Hildesheim*, 371–3.

¹³³ DFI, no. 10. Note that the description of Henry the Lion as duke of Saxony and Bavaria is a later interpolation. See further Chapter III.

Braunschweig, maintaining a measure of independence only by participating in Barbarossa's campaigns and assemblies. Divisions of loyalty did not suit Rainald's character. His temperament was categorical, and his preference was plainly for the wider world opened up by royal service, which allowed him greater freedom of action and provided opportunities for travel, some of it significant for his future career. Later in 1152 Rainald of Dassel accompanied to Rome an embassy charged with negotiating a concordat between Frederick I and Eugenius III. In the holy city, on 3 January 1153, he obtained a papal charter confirming the donation of Ringelsheim to Hildesheim.¹³⁴ With the business of the diocese long concentrated in his hands, Rainald seemed a natural successor to Bishop Bernard when he resigned in 1153.¹³⁵ Not so. To the provostship of Hildesheim and the archdeaconry of Goslar he added a benefice at Münster, multiplying his revenues but avoiding the dubious dignity of episcopal office in north Germany, whose viceroy, in the flush of his tactical triumphs, promised nothing but aggravation or danger. There were other options. One of them presented itself in the person of Arnold of Wied, whose sphere of influence Rainald had entered as a witness to a charter issued in 1152 at Soest.¹³⁶ Here was an intimate of Wibald's who had done even better than the abbot of Stablo and Corvey. After serving as German chancellor, Arnold had achieved his ambition and become metropolitan of Cologne.¹³⁷ That was an alternative more enticing than a bishopric in the Saxony harried by Henry the Lion.¹³⁸

After his move away from Hildesheim, Rainald took care to leave a monument to his munificence. 'For the remedy of his soul', he declares in a document witnessed by this brother Ludolf, a feast for the clergy was to be held annually. A rich endowment of property supported the spread, together with a hospice that, with ostentatious charity, he later founded for the poor.¹³⁹ Poverty and plenty, open-handedness and calculation: Rainald had learnt the balancing act of lordly style. A provincial aristocrat had become a master of the arts with which an ecclesiastical magnate exerted influence above and below.

¹³⁴ *Urkundenbuch*, ed. Janicke, no. 281.

¹³⁵ Cf. Goetting, *Bistum Hildesheim*, 375–7, 385. The only evidence for his claim is an ambiguous letter of congratulation to him in 1159 (not 1153) from the monastery of Grafschaft: *auditum quidem fuerat in proprio solo Hildenesheimensi, licet renitentem, vos ad presulatum expeditum (Veterum scriptorum . . . amplissima collectio*, ed. E. Martène and U. Durand, i (Paris, 1724), 854). *Auditum* is the word, not *cognitum*. See Chapter V.

¹³⁶ *Die Urkunden Heinrichs des Löwen Herzogs von Sachsen und Bayern*, ed. K. Jordan, MGH Laienfürsten—und Dynastenerkunden der Kaiserzeit, i (repr. Stuttgart, 1995), no. 19. Jordan, *ad loc.*, presents his dating as conjectural, but it is supported by the fact that several of the witnesses come from Soest and by the royal itinerary.

¹³⁷ See H. Wolter, *Arnold von Wied, Kanzler Konrads III. und Erzbischof von Köln*, Veröffentlichungen des Kölnischen Geschichtsvereins 32 (Cologne, 1973), 47, and Chapter III.

¹³⁸ J. Ehlers, 'Heinrich der Löwe und der sächsische Episkopat', in Ehlers, *Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, ed. M. Kintzinger and B. Schneidmüller, Berliner Historische Studien 21 (Berlin, 1996), 454, and J. Ehlers, *Heinrich der Löwe: Eine Biographie* (Munich, 2008), 134.

¹³⁹ J. Gebauer, 'Die Stiftungsurkunde des St Johannishospitals zu Hildesheim von 1161', NA 49 (1932), 193–205.

By 1156 he had experience of administration and politics, both in the Saxon and in the universal Church. He combined high-placed connections with ample means.¹⁴⁰ What he then lacked was position and power. They would come his way, as they had reached his hero, Bishop Bernward of Hildesheim, through the imperial chancery.

¹⁴⁰ On Rainald of Dassel's benefices, cf. H. Erhard, *Regesta historiae Westfaliae*, ii (Münster, 1851), 38.

III

Culture and Conflict in the Chancery

'You are greater and worthier than [the archbishops of] Cologne and Mainz, for you hold the keys of the kingdom, and you ought to have pride of place in the royal council', wrote Wibald of Stablo in the early autumn of 1150 to Arnold of Wied, who, as German chancellor, then occupied the position to which Rainald of Dassel would be appointed six years later.¹ Formally, Wibald's assertion was not true. The archbishops of Cologne and Mainz were, *ex officio*, archchancellors of Italy and Germany. Arnold worked under the nominal direction of the primate, Henry of Mainz, in whose stead he verified and authorized documents issued on behalf of the king. Subordinate in status, the chancellor was nonetheless a key figure for the monarchy, as Wibald reassured him in this antithesis between apparent rank and real influence. The contrast was resolved, the point proven in short order. The following year, Arnold of Wied was elected to the archbishopric of Cologne. From his sources in that city, Rainald of Dassel will have been among the first at Hildesheim to hear the news about the absentee chancellor in 1151. Arnold, eager for promotion, had gone to ground at Cologne in what might be regarded as dereliction of his duties. But after his election, made without royal mandate by the college of priors, he took care to reconcile Conrad III, whose assent he sought before being consecrated. There was a lesson to be learnt! Much hinged on the good will of the ruler. Disfavour meant demotion from the heights that Rainald intended to scale. Was he not to witness how precipitously Henry of Mainz plummeted when, having opposed Frederick Barbarossa's elevation to the kingship in 1152, he was excluded from chancery affairs before losing the primacy?²

This is the level at which the history of the German chancery in the High Middle Ages has been written. Politics and power are its main themes; the technicalities of diplomatic its chief concerns. Little attention has been paid to issues of culture raised by 'the only articulate organ of Hohenstaufen government'.³ Staffed by clerics, all of whom were more Latinate than the laymen on the throne, the chancery specialized in formulaic prose. Behind their rhetoric

¹ *maior et dignior estis quam vel Col(oniensis) vel Moguntinus, quia claves regni vos habetis et summam consilii in regno vos regere debetis* (Ep. 261, ed. Hartmann, 557, 2–4).

² See H. Büttner, 'Erzbischof Heinrich von Mainz und die Staufer', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 69 (1958), 247–67.

³ K. Leyser, *Communications and Power in Medieval Europe: The Gregorian Revolution and Beyond*, ed. T. Reuter (London, 1994), 119.

of public interest, officials who enjoyed the sovereign's confidence were capable of harbouring private designs. How was a Conrad III or (still less) a Frederick I to restrain them? A king might command, an emperor demand that they produce documents along lines that he indicated. But the details were wholly in the hands of experts, who translated orally into the vernacular what they wished the royal and imperial ears to hear. The ruler's capacity to exercise control depended on his degree of literacy. Substantial or slight, it was never enough to trespass, alone and unaided, into the domain of composition. There he relied on the guidance of subjects, who, despite their show of deference, amounted to partners in consensual sovereignty.⁴ These servants who spoke for their masters in the learned language were not parrots of power. When opportunity offered, they could become ventriloquists and articulate, in the persona of the monarch, their own policies. How they were formulated is illustrated by correspondence between Wibald of Stablo and Arnold of Wied.

* * *

The music of their machinations is played to a timeless refrain: helping friends and harming enemies. 'The most faithful of all our princes,'⁵ as Wibald was described in a letter probably composed by Arnold but sent in the name of Conrad III, the abbot of Stablo knew how to exploit royal favour. He had protégés. One of them was Thietbold, provost of St Severin at Cologne, whose appointment to a comparable (but more lucrative) position at Xanten Wibald supported in a letter to Guido of Pisa, cardinal-deacon of SS Cosma and Damiano, the papal chancellor. Not by chance was another recommendation of Thietbold sent, at the same time, to Pope Eugenius III by the German chancery.⁶ The operation was coordinated. Wibald and Arnold wanted their man in a post that was pivotal to an archdiocese that one of them intended to rule. The provost of Xanten—where St Norbert, the founder of the Premonstratensian order, had begun his career—had jurisdiction over five deaneries on the Lower Rhine. His election, however, normally had to be confirmed by the archbishop of Cologne, who, in August 1149, had been suspended by the pope. To him Arnold, on behalf of the king, therefore turned instead. It is not difficult to see, from the correspondence between Germany and Rome, that an attempt was being made to circumvent and humiliate Archbishop Arnold I of Cologne. That is why Wibald describes Thietbold's appointment as a punishment for Arnold and a gratification for Conrad III in his confidential letter to the papal chancellor.⁷ Eugenius III approved the election, on condition that Thietbold resigned his provostship at Cologne.⁸ Such was the state of affairs when, towards the end of the year, the pope informed the king that he had

⁴ On the concept, see Chapter II n. 14, and cf. K. Richter, *Friedrich Barbarossa hält Gericht. Zur Konfliktbewältigung im 12. Jahrhundert* (Cologne, 1999), 212.

⁵ Ep. 159, ed. Hartmann, 340, 19–20.

⁶ Epp. 169 and 170, ed. Hartmann, 360–3.

⁷ *Sic et principi satis fiet et peccatum inobedientis poena principali punietur* (Ep. 170, ed. Hartmann, 363, 6–7).

⁸ Ep. 171, ed. Hartmann, 364.

summoned Arnold I to Rome.⁹ At this point, in November 1149, Rainald of Dassel entered into correspondence with Wibald, and reported the gossip about the archbishop's impending resignation.¹⁰ Small wonder that the abbot tried to hush tongues wagging about his chances of succeeding Arnold I, for he knew that one of the leading candidates for the see of Cologne was his ally, the German chancellor. Arnold of Wied, from his vantage-post in that city, had written to Wibald with the malice of clerical calculation, describing the suspended archbishop as 'that utterly useless and pernicious man'.¹¹ Abuse had been preceded by alarm when he reported Arnold I's intention to buy off Eugenius III at Rome and deprive Thietbold of the provostship at Xanten.¹² Counter-measures needed to be taken urgently. What of a letter to the pope, composed in the king's name, requesting that their protégé be allowed to hold both benefices as what Thietbold called 'an indulgence'?¹³

This euphemism provided the inspiration for Wibald's draft. No matter that pluralism violated canon law. What was the letter of legalism compared with the amplitude of papal power to dispense? How, protested the wily abbot, could the bickering of pedants, the schemes of intriguers distract Eugenius from his love for the king, demonstrable by indulgence granted to Thietbold?¹⁴ More significant than everything Wibald states, in his draft and in the letter to Arnold of Wied that accompanied it, is his pregnant silence. He never hints that he or the chancellor might consult Conrad III in advance of this manœuvre undertaken on his nominal authority. Royal assent is assumed. Expected to nod through the document being prepared, the king diminishes down to a persona played by his advisers. Unconcerned about usurping that role, they are scrupulous about protecting its dignity:

It did not seem to us the case to write a direct request in the persona of our lord king, because it is not fitting that an excellent prince ask for things which can be rightly refused him.¹⁵

While words may be put in the monarch's mouth, it will not do to voice a request that can be denied. Hence the obliquity, the obsequiousness, with which Wibald frames his case for a favour, running no risk of being turned down. With the royal persona manipulated, the papal arm may be twisted. And not only the arm of Eugenius III, that simple Cistercian whose election had been deplored in stentorian tones by his former superior, the overbearing Bernard of Clairvaux. Behind the pope stood the Roman curia, which knew the ropes that Wibald of Stablo understood how to oil so well. When he wrote the following sentences about his draft in the covering letter sent to Arnold of

⁹ Ep. 215, ed. Hartmann, 454–5.

¹⁰ See Chapter II.

¹¹ *Homo prorsus inutilis et perniciosus* (Ep. 206, ed. Hartmann, 436, 17–437, 1).

¹² Ep. 172, ed. Hartmann, 366–7.

¹³ Ep. 173, ed. Hartmann, 368.

¹⁴ Ep. 176, ed. Hartmann, 373–5, and *Diplomata Konradi III*, ed. Hausmann, no. 225.

¹⁵ *Non visum est nobis directam petitionem ex persona domini nostri regis scribere, pro eo quod principalem excellentiam non decet illa postulare, quae sibi iure negari valeant* (Ep. 175, ed. Hartmann, 371, 13–16).

Wied, he had in mind less the pope than his chancellor, whom he had already primed about Thietbold's case:

Therefore [the Church] will neither command nor confirm that one person be exalted in two dignities but, when this has been done without fuss, will dissimulate in paternal discernment. You can believe us on this issue not because of our acquaintance with canon law but on the basis of meaningful and effective experience.¹⁶

A master of the dissimulation to which he refers, Wibald envisages a smirk of satisfaction on curial lips at all that he does not make plain. If papal eyebrows are raised at the implied violation of canon law, this knowing operator can count on a wink from others at Rome. Conscious of the dexterity with which he struts the stages of the royal and pontifical chanceries, the engaging abbot cannot restrain a chuckle:

We have played the rhetor in the letter of our lord king, for we have affirmed by denial and made a request while not advancing one; and we pass it on to you not yet sealed so that you can, if you wish, change, add to, or subtract from our contrivance. Live, and love us.¹⁷

There is much that is lovable about Wibald of Stablo: not least, the wit of his wiliness. If the letter that he composed for Arnold of Wied is included among the diplomata of Conrad III, it also has a place in the history of Hohenstaufen culture. What Wibald ironically calls his 'contrivance'—*artificium*, in the sense of a stratagem or a trick—reflects the theatrical self-image of two partners in plot. Dissimulation, which they enact in the mask of the monarch and elicit from the Roman Curia behind the scenes, is directed at furthering the interests of a protégé with friends in high places, where deviousness delights in mental gymnastics. So it is that the abbot, with mild Machiavellianism, invites the chancellor to share his amusement at pursuing their own policy under the cover of a king who has no option but to write with the quills and read with the eyes of others. Like Otto of Freising's Barbarossa, Conrad III is, and is not, himself—a puppet pulled by clerical strings that twang to the tune of affirmation by denial. Such were the sophists of the generation previous to the Archpoet's who manoeuvred merrily in the German chancery that would employ him as 'Rainald H'.

* * *

After his studies at Paris, where he too developed a penchant for sophistry,¹⁸ and before his first recorded appearance as a notary, the Archpoet may not

¹⁶ *Non ergo mandabit neque confirmabit, ut in duabus dignitatibus una persona sublimetur; sed, cum sine querela factum fuerit, hoc ex paterna discretionem dissimulabit. Credere super hoc nobis potestis non pro noticia canonum, set pro sensu et efficacia experimentorum* (Ep. 175, ed. Hartmann, 371, 21–372, 1).

¹⁷ *Rethorici sumus in litteris domini nostri regis, quia negando affirmavimus et non rogando rogavimus; quas ideo vobis necdum consignatas transmisimus, ut possitis, si placuerit, de artificio nostro quedam immutare, addere vel minuere. Vivite, et nos diligite* (Ep. 175, ed. Hartmann, 372, 3–6).

¹⁸ See Chapter II.

have passed a decade at Rainald of Dassel's side, but perhaps spent some of the time as a schoolmaster at Cologne.¹⁹ Perhaps. Awkwardness arises from the fact that the city, in the twelfth century, yields more than one *magister* (both of them named Rudolf²⁰) with whom our author has been identified, despite the want of external evidence to link him to a classroom in the Rhineland. Who will clutch at such Rudolfian straws to fill this gap in our knowledge of his career? What we know is that, when 'Rainald H' entered the chancery, he was equipped for the further training needed to discharge his duties.²¹ That argues for the earlier exercise of a literate profession, to which a discrepancy in dates may point. Rainald of Dassel was appointed German chancellor in 1156; the first extant charter by 'Rainald H' is two years later.²² Not necessarily indicative of a separation between them, this difference of chronology could simply arise from a lacuna in the transmission of Barbarossa's diplomata, a number of which are lost. Rather than speculate about *deperdita* by 'Rainald H', let us reflect on his patron's position when he began in office. Then the time had not yet come to hail Rainald of Dassel as the emperor's equal and the brains behind the imperial enterprise.²³ That was the rhetoric of the early 1160s, when the archbishop-elect of Cologne and archchancellor of Italy reached the apex of his influence at court. There he started with a diminishing asset. The ascendancy of his ally, Wibald, was on the wane by 1156. Before Rainald's arrival there is no evidence of his acquaintance with the other advisers to whom Barbarossa was turning, such as Bishop Eberhard of Bamberg.²⁴ In a milieu that, by dint of effort and force of personality, he intended to dominate, the newly appointed chancellor commenced as a relative outsider. Insiders had to be kept on to ensure administrative continuity. Notaries appointed by his predecessor were retained by Rainald,²⁵ although they were not his own men, who took time to put into place. Far from being an habitu   of the court, at the outset of his ever-upward career in imperial service Rainald needed a retainer below and beside him whom he could trust.

Trust was essential between a superior and an underling who composed and copied the writings that appeared under the chancellor's aegis. Diplomata were not his only responsibility. All forms of imperial correspondence passed through his hands, apart from a myriad of oral communications. He was the eyes and the ears of the emperor, to make a metaphor of terms that Barbarossa's uncle used literally.²⁶ Naturally, no one in this position could deal with the unpredictable volume of official business—some of it controversial, some

¹⁹ See Schieffer, 'Bleibt der Archipoeta anonym?', 171 ff.

²⁰ See J. Fried, 'Der Archipoeta—ein K  lner Scholaster?', in K. Herbers et al. (eds), *Ex ipsius rerum documentis: Beitr  ge zur Medi  vistik: Festschrift f  r Harald Zimmermann zum 65. Geburtstag* (Sigmaringen, 1991), 85–90.

²¹ See Chapter IV. ²² DFI, no. 202.

²³ *Carm.* VII, 3, 3; 7, 1–3, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 66, 67, and see Chapter IV.

²⁴ See K. Zeilinger, 'Friedrich Barbarossa, Wibald von Stablo und Eberhard von Bamberg', *MI  G* 78 (1970), 210–33.

²⁵ Appelt, DFI v, 51–2, 54–6.

²⁶ See Chapter II.

confidential—alone. Nor was it usual for the chancellor to write documents himself. He dictated. And that custom congenial to Rainald of Dassel's imperious temperament demanded more than the skills of a scribe. A cleric fluent in Latin composition, able to write up what his master had set down verbally, perhaps only in outline, combining discretion with a loyalty derived from personal and professional dependence: such qualities were uncommon. Even a grand seigneur in the Middle Ages could not conjure them up at command. They needed to be nurtured in a context of reciprocity unlikely to have been brief, until there emerged a private secretary who would remain faithfully at his flank. The only member of the chancellor's entourage who fits this bill is 'Rainald H'.

When he appears on record, he does not behave like his colleagues, whose presence in the chancery is intermittent. 'Rainald H' acts like the Archpoet, a client who declares that he and his patron are inseparable.²⁷ So they were, on charter-evidence. Their movements intersect with a regularity matched by no other notary,²⁸ which is why the specialists in this subject rightly call 'Rainald H' his master's intimate.²⁹ And if it was mistaken, because discordant with chancery-practice, to attribute diplomata written by him to Rainald of Dassel,³⁰ the idea should not be dismissed as inept. They looked the same. Less the same than similar by background, taste, and travel, the chancellor and his confidant—probably from 1156, certainly from 1158—faced together life on the road. This is an aspect of the Archpoet's legend that, if modified, can be maintained. Not as a 'wandering scholar' but as a notary and writer, he was much on the move. Itinerancy, rather than vagabondage, was a condition of our author's existence, bound to the peripatetic plenipotentiary of a monarch who seldom dismounted. When Rainald of Dassel was not undertaking a legation or campaign on Barbarossa's behalf, he accompanied the emperor on his incessant journeys. The Reich, such as it was, hardly possessed a capital; and the ruler resided infrequently at Aachen³¹—indeed he can scarcely be said to have been resident anywhere.³² The meticulousness with which Barbarossa's mobility has been traced highlights his likeness to a displaced person. Propelled by a principle of *honor* that evolved in reaction to circumstances,³³ the emperor was anything but a systematic thinker. A headstrong magnate on

²⁷ *Carm.* II, 94, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 56.

²⁸ See Schieffer, 'Bleibt der Archipoeta anonym?', *passim*.

²⁹ Appelt, DFI v. 59.

³⁰ Cf. R. Herkenrath, 'Reinald von Dassel als Verfasser und Schreiber von Kaiserurkunden', *MIÖG* 72 (1964), 34–62.

³¹ See F. Oppl, *Stadt und Reich im 12. Jahrhundert (1125–1190)*, *Forschungen zur Kaiser- und Papstgeschichte des Mittelalters Beihefte zu J. F. Böhmer, Regesta Imperii* 6 (Vienna, 1986), 163–208 (six stays amounting to a total of two months).

³² F. Oppl, *Das Itinerar Friedrich Barbarossas (1125–1190)*, *Forschungen zur Kaiser- und Papstgeschichte des Mittelalters Beihefte zu J. F. Böhmer, Regesta Imperii* 1 (Vienna, 1978).

³³ K. Görich, *Die Ehre Friedrich Barbarossas: Kommunikation, Konflikt und politisches Handeln im 12. Jahrhundert* (Darmstadt, 2001).

horseback who usually responded to events at the gallop, he presented Rainald of Dassel with the problem of stamping a strategy on his erratic tactics.

Not only erratic but also ill-informed and suspicious, Barbarossa had displayed all these attributes in a diplomatic *éclat* that occurred months before Rainald became his chancellor. At Sutri, previous to his imperial coronation at Rome on 18 June 1155, the then king of Germany refused to hold the stirrup and guide the horse of Pope Adrian IV (1150–9). Unaware that his predecessor Lothar III (1125–37) had undertaken this office of marshal (*officium stratoris*) for Pope Innocent II (1130–43) at Liège in 1131, Barbarossa misconstrued a ceremony of deference as an act of homage. Or so it was thought on the basis of Cardinal Boso's eyewitness report that 'the king did not perform the traditional duty of marshal for the pope'.³⁴ It is difficult to reconcile this unvarnished claim of an offence against custom and obligation (*de more officium*) with a theory of muddled proceedings.³⁵ Even if Barbarossa bumbled, grasping the left rather than the right stirrup, Adrian IV took umbrage, refusing the papal embrace and kiss of peace. Only after he was advised of Emperor Lothar's example and repetition of the ceremony was approved by the German princes did the king comply. Perhaps it is as just as it is charitable to play down this incident as a product of misunderstandings on both sides.³⁶ But Barbarossa was not easy to move from mistrust. It took two days to bring him round. A counsellor ill-disposed to the papacy—such as Rainald of Dassel, who doubtless heard of the happenings at Sutri and remembered them later—might have profited from the interval to pour further reasons for suspicion into his sovereign's receptive ear. The *éclat* betrayed Barbarossa's uncertainty, his precipitousness, and therefore his susceptibility to insinuation. For Otto of Freising, who, as bishop and uncle, occupied a delicate position between pope and king, their confrontation was embarrassing and is omitted from his account of events leading up to his nephew's coronation. The first, but not the last, of the silences that we will register in the history of Otto and his continuator Rahewin, this is far from the crudeness that falsifies evidence. Subtler manipulators of their materials, they suppressed or rearranged them. One of our aims, in the remainder of this chapter, will be to attend to what they do not say.

* * *

Silence cannot wholly compensate for a setback. Otto offsets the *éclat* at Sutri with panache. Near the same place he stations Barbarossa's reception of a letter from the Roman commune, demanding payment for the privilege of elevating him.³⁷ We are no more capable of assessing the accuracy of the location than

³⁴ *cum . . . rex de more officium stratoris eidem pape non exhiberet* (Boso, *Vita Hadriani IIII*, in *Le liber pontificalis*, ii, ed. L. Duchesne (repr. Paris, 1981), 391).

³⁵ R. Deutinger, 'Sutri 1155: Missverständnisse um ein Missverständnis', *DA* 60 (2004), 97–133.

³⁶ Deutinger, 'Sutri 1155'.

³⁷ *Gesta Frederici*, ii, 31, ed. Schmale, 342–6.

we can verify the text of the document. We can see, however, that the geography was dramatically appropriate. Sutri, in Otto's narrative, is transformed from the site of a stand-off between the papacy and the empire into the vicinity of a clash between cultural identities that were hardly compatible. The Germans, bristling at what they perceived as Roman arrogance, find in the historian a champion able to convey the city's superciliousness. Here are the words that Otto of Freising attributes to personified Rome: 'You were a guest: I made you a citizen. You were a newcomer from Transalpine parts, and I appointed you emperor.'³⁸ Unaware of the contrast between its political pretensions and its actual weakness, the Roman commune employs the slighting expression 'from Transalpine parts'. Negative in nuance, this phrase connotes a complex of superiority. Barbarossa is styled a 'backwoods' bumpkin whom the eternal city alone can transform into an imperial ruler. Sent packing after a caustic speech by the emperor-to-be,³⁹ the urban snobs receive their reckoning when German troops suppress the riot that followed the coronation at St Peter's:

You would see our men felling and slaying and slaying and felling the Romans with as much violence as bravery, as if they were saying: 'Rome, now receive Teutonic iron instead of Arabian gold! This is the money which 'your' prince offers you for 'your' crown! So it is that empire is purchased by the Franks!⁴⁰

This vignette of vengeance is drawn in the hypothetical subjunctive. Otto of Freising's subject is not what the readers saw or the Germans said but how both might be imagined. Appearance is contrasted with reality in a triad of antitheses: 'our men' (*nostri*) as opposed to the Romans, 'Teutonic iron' instead of 'Arabian gold', military might versus venality. Hostility to the corruption of Rome, traditional in medieval Latin invective,⁴¹ is recast by the historian as a form of patriotism—the patriotism of 'us' against 'them'. 'They' are not only the Roman money-grubbers but also those (such as, later, John of Salisbury⁴²) who used 'Teuton' as a dirty word. 'We' show them that *furor Teutonicus* is not an attribute of barbarians, but a property of 'Frankish' valour. The ancestral name, dear to the emperor's uncle, is chosen in memory of Charlemagne and Otto I. It completes this inversion of platitudes with a mixture of defiance and insecurity characteristic of Hohenstaufen politics, for the unstable foundation of the dynasty's title to rule over Italy was, as Otto of Freising knew, right of conquest.

³⁸ *Hospes eras, civem feci. Advena fuisti ex Transalpinis partibus, principem constitui* (*Gesta Frederici*, ii. 31, ed. Schmale, 344, 28–9).

³⁹ *Gesta Frederici*, ii. 32, ed. Schmale, 346–52, and see Chapter IV.

⁴⁰ *Cerneres nostros tam immaniter quam audaciter Romanos cedendo sternere, sternendo cedere ac si dicerent: 'Accipe, Roma, pro auro Arabico Teutonicum ferum! Hec est pecunia, quam tibi princeps tuus pro tua' offert corona! Sic emitur a Francis imperium!* (*Gesta Frederici*, ii. 35, ed. Schmale, 356, 1–5). The punctuation is mine.

⁴¹ Cf. J. Benzinger, *Invectiva in Romam: Romkritik im Mittelalter vom 9. bis zum 12. Jahrhundert*, *Historische Studien* 404 (Lübeck, 1968), 55 ff., 91 ff.

⁴² See Chapter V.

It was less as rightful conquerors than as resented invaders that the Germans appeared to a curial observer of the ceremony in the basilica. Cardinal Boso, an intimate of Adrian IV and his biographer, was present when the pope crowned the emperor before his princes and troops, who took the part traditionally played by the Roman people in the ritual. Although by no means sympathetic to the cause of the commune, Boso evokes the repugnance at acclamation by foreigners shared by a prince of the Church with the plebs in the streets. After Barbarossa had received the insignia of empire, the Germans bellowed with such din that it sounded 'like a hideous thunderclap'.⁴³ Why a simile, not a statement? Because the holy place speaks for itself. In the figurative language of prodigies, the noise does not denote heaven's sanction. It signifies a rumble of divine wrath at St Peter's being profaned. In the optic of a civilization that considered others barbarian, a dim view was taken of the aliens from over the Alps whom Otto of Freising paints in glowing colours. Perhaps deeming that discretion formed the better part of what his uncle called Teutonic or Frankish valour, the emperor left Rome only a day later.

Barbarossa ought to have headed for the south. Under the terms of the concordat of Constance (1153), which he had just renewed, he was obliged to provide military aid to the papacy against the threat posed by King William I of Sicily (1154–66).⁴⁴ But the emperor reverted to his role as a displaced person, behaving like one whose movements were beyond his control. When he proposed to the princes a southern offensive, they declined on grounds of the summer heat. With less perspiration than mortification, Barbarossa returned to Germany after what has been described, accurately enough from the papal perspective, as a 'fiasco'.⁴⁵ On the imperial side, Otto of Freising emphasizes his nephew's 'heart-felt regret' (*non sine cordis amaritudine*⁴⁶). *Amaritudo* is a biblical term for the bitterness of remorse (cf. Job 10:147), and the emperor had much to rue. He was unable to persuade or compel those on whose consent he depended to mount a campaign against the Sicilian monarchy that he denounced as illegitimate; and a strike against the south would remain an illusion, often planned and always deferred, of his long reign.⁴⁸ More immediately and damagingly, Barbarossa's failure to fulfil the terms of the concordat signed at Constance, which Rainald of Dassel had helped to negotiate,⁴⁹ induced Adrian IV to take up arms in alliance with baronial rebels against William I. Their ignominious defeat led, in June 1156, to the concordat of Benevento, which secured a lasting peace between the papacy and Sicily,

⁴³ *Statim tam vehemens et fortis Teutonicorum conclamatio in vocem laudis et letitiae concrepuit, ut horribile tonitruum crederetur de celis subito cecidisse* (Boso, *Vita Hadriani IIII in Le liber pontificalis*, ii. ed. Duchesne, 342, 19–20).

⁴⁴ See J. Petersohn, *Kaisertum und Rom in spätsalischer und staufischer Zeit: Romidee und Rompolitik von Heinrich V. bis Friedrich II.*, MGH Schriften 62 (Hanover, 2010), 131–47.

⁴⁵ P. Partner, *The Lands of St Peter* (London, 1972), 188–91.

⁴⁶ *Gesta Frederici*, ii. 39, ed. Schmale, 362.

⁴⁷ Cf. Godman, *Paradoxes of Conscience*, 170, and see Chapter VIII.

⁴⁸ See Chapter X. ⁴⁹ See Chapter II.

now a power to reckon with on the international scene.⁵⁰ The emperor, despite his co-responsibility for this reversal, was aggrieved. We know of his disgruntlement from a southern source,⁵¹ not from his uncle. Otto of Freising says nothing about the concordat of Benevento. Another silence serves to bolster Barbarossa's authority, a leitmotif of the *Gesta Frederici* repeatedly sustained by such omissions in the history of his early reign. It was an undertaking aimed to soothe nerves that were raw. Consider the circumstances in which the first two books of the *Gesta* came to be written or revised in 1157–8. Otto had recently presented his nephew with the world-chronicle, requesting Rainald of Dassel's benevolent mediation.⁵² The wish for another work by the historian indicates that the earlier one had been received with favour. When he set about composing his account of Barbarossa's beginnings in power, the direction to be taken was pointed out by Rainald, writing to him in the imperial persona.⁵³ The goal that the chancellor wanted the only living intellectual of the Hohenstaufen dynasty to reach was shaped by his own experience since taking office. Not all of that was encouraging, as may be read between the lines of his earliest extant charter issued at Boyneburg on 10 May 1156.⁵⁴

Neither the occasion nor the location can have failed to impress. Boyneburg, an imperial castle in what is now Hessen, ought to have been a citadel of Barbarossa's might. Instead it provided the background for what a paladin of empire like Rainald cannot but have regarded as yet another in a series of lamentable concessions to Henry the Lion, who had his eye on the monastery of Hilwarthausen, to which were transferred ministers under imperial control. If the *ministerialis* 'Rainald H' was present in his capacity as private secretary to the chancellor, he had reason to reflect on the limits of freedom—a theme about which, in his role of Archpoet, he would later write.⁵⁵ Properties held in fief by members of his order are described, in the charter, as *beneficia*. This was the technical term that the chancellor authorized in 1156, 'all contradiction and ambiguity dispelled'.⁵⁶ At that point Rainald, who had studied the subject of equivocation with Adam of Balsham,⁵⁷ was well aware that the word had a second sense of 'favours'. For a cultivated cleric, this was a banality. The banality would become charged, the ambiguity explosive, the next year. More than ambiguous is the title that this document attributes to Henry the Lion: duke of Saxony and Bavaria. The Bavarian dukedom, on 10 May 1156, was legally in the hands of Henry Jasomirgott, another of Barbarossa's relatives,

⁵⁰ See G. Loud, *The Latin Church in Norman Italy* (Cambridge, 2007), 164–7.

⁵¹ *Audiens autem Fredericus imperator Adrianum papam cum rege W[ilhelmo] concordatum et quod eum de regno Sicilie et ducatu Apulie investisset, molestissime tulit* (Romuald of Salerno, *Chronicon*, ed. C. Garufi, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores* vii, 1 (Città di Castello, 1938), 242). Note that Romuald represented William I at the Beneventan negotiations in June 1156. Cf. D. J. A. Matthew, 'The Chronicle of Romuald of Salerno', in R. H. C. Davis and J. M. Wallace-Hadrill (eds), *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to R. W. Southern* (Oxford, 1981), 271–2.

⁵² See Chapter II.

⁵³ See Chapter IV.

⁵⁴ DFI, no. 138.

⁵⁵ Chapter VII.

⁵⁶ *omni contradictione et ambiguitate remota* (ed. Appelt, 232, 32).

⁵⁷ See Chapter II.

who contested the Lion's claims to his heritage. Not until 5 June would the compensatory offer of Austria be made to Jasomirgott, nor did he accept it before 8 September.⁵⁸ Authorizing what he knew to be, at most, an anticipation of Henry the Lion's double dukedom or, at least, an outright lie, Rainald of Dassel assuredly acted in concert with the emperor. And what a lame runner in the race for power Barbarossa must have appeared to this Hohenstaufen partisan! Here, months after being overruled near Rome by princes flinching at southern sun and weeks before being outmanouvered by what he would regard as papal double-dealing in Benevento, he was at Boyneburg to sign away imperial rights in favour of an over-mighty subject who had harassed his chancellor at Hildesheim. Indignation might have reached for the *codex Udalrici*, a model-manuscript of eleventh-century prose from Bamberg, which travelled with the chancery.⁵⁹ But—alas!—its examples of invective were directed against presumptuous popes, not manipulative magnates. The moment, however, was fast approaching when Rainald of Dassel would vent again the sound and fury of the investiture crisis;⁶⁰ and in the meantime, with a discretion born of necessity, he simply employed the formulas offered by that codex to emphasize continuity, describing the emperor in semi-sacral terms.⁶¹ There lay the rub. How to present, in documents intended to affirm his power, a ruler who, buffeted by every breeze, appeared merely to reign? Before addressing that problem, the chancellor had to consider his own position.

* * *

We can reconstruct what was in Rainald's mind not long after he took office. He calculated on rosy prospects of advancement. How many, how recent, were the instances of his predecessors who had climbed high up the slippery pole: why should a man of his merits be denied further promotion? Evidence of this ambition is not contained in the exemplary edition of charters issued under his direction that was produced during the twentieth century. A collection of historical miscellanea, made in the eighteenth century, records an agreement drawn up in 1157 between Rainald of Dassel and the monastery of Fulda.⁶² To it belonged a fishery and a farm on the Weser, which, with no consideration for rights or religion, the chancellor's brother Ludolf had occupied. Playing the role of mediator, Rainald sought to profit from this dispute. He offered to rent the properties from Fulda, in return for an annual payment in cash and kind. No mention is made of dividends to be shared between the bullying Dassel brothers. What Rainald is reported to admit, in a discussion preliminary to this agreement, is nonetheless revealing. He undertakes to restore the fishery and the farm to the monastery, ensuring that Ludolf would meddle no more, 'if he

⁵⁸ For context, see *Die Geburt Österreichs: 850 Jahre Privilegium minus*, ed. P. Schmid and H. Wanderwitz, Regensburger Kulturleben 4 (Regensburg, 2007).

⁵⁹ Appelt, DFI v. 118–21.

⁶⁰ See Chapter IV.

⁶¹ *nostris oraculis, imperiale ministerium a Domino susceptum* (ed. Appelt, 232, 13, 15–16).

⁶² B. G. Struve, *Rerum Germanicarum veteres Scriptores . . . editio tertia*, ed. B. G. Struve (Regensburg, 1726), no. 587, 653–4.

should rise to higher things by God's purpose' (*si . . . divina dispositione ad altiora conscenderit*). Uninhibited by false (or genuine) modesty, the chancellor plainly considered himself destined for an archbishopric two years before acquiring the see of Cologne. That this was not a private dream, but a real probability that others recognized, is indicated by Rainald of Dassel's opposite number in the deal. Abbot Markward of Fulda was a skilful politician, noted for his determination to regain properties lost by the monastery.⁶³ It is unlikely that he felt enthusiasm for alienating the farm and the fishery, even on a temporary basis. However, reasoned Markward, 'the condition of the times' (*qualitas temporum*)—meaning, Rainald had chosen a moment when Henry the Lion was out of reach—and the fact 'that the chancellor was the spiritual brother' of the monks (*quod cancellarius spiritualis frater esset*)—despite an aversion from them which he barely disguised—inclined the abbot of Fulda to part with his property. Of these two reasons, the pragmatic and the ecclesiastical, it was the first that prevailed. Was not Rainald able, in more than one respect, to lend particular support to the cause of the monastery at court (*in curia . . . in multis nobis specialius posse prodesse*)?

Telling testimony both to Rainald of Dassel's ruthlessness, when furthering his financial interests in partnership with his brother, and to others' acknowledgement that his present position heralded future advancement, this document is wholly unlike the sources for Thomas Becket's chancellorship.⁶⁴ No word, in the case of his German colleague, about elegant dress, opulent plate, or the custody of castles—even the Tower of London. Instead of the monkeys and the wolves that the Englishman kept in imitation of the king, what we note in the record from Fulda is fish. Thomas's style was royal: Rainald's was rough. And they operated on different scales. Innumerable advantages may have accrued by employing our author as a notary, but 'Rainald H' remained a single member of a small staff that reckoned its costs in chickens and eggs.⁶⁵ Among the fifty-two clerks and fifteen scribes who served Becket, one controlled the Exchequer and another recorded the Great Roll of the Pipe. The administrative apparatus of the Angevin empire outclassed anything in the Hohenstaufen Reich, whose chancellor, more intellectual and less magnificent, resorted to the dupery of documents with a fishy flavour.

The upward thrust demanded a direction. Higher office, for Rainald of Dassel, was not an end in itself. He had a cause composed of two parts. Barbarossa acknowledged this double devotion when, after his death on 14 August 1167, the notary and diplomat Wortwin wrote in the emperor's name to dignitaries at Cologne extolling their archbishop's achievement: 'it was always the supreme desire and purpose of his resolute mind to put the honour

⁶³ *Gesta Marquardi*, in *Traditiones et antiquitates Fuldenses*, ed. E. Dronke (Fulda, 1844), 153–7, and J. Leinweber, *Die Fuldaer Äbte und Bischöfe* (Frankfurt-a.-M., 1989), 56–9.

⁶⁴ Cf. Duggan, *Becket*, 16 ff., and Barlow, *Becket*, 41 ff.

⁶⁵ S. Schröder, *Macht und Gabe: Materielle Kultur am Hof Heinrichs II. von England*, *Historische Studien* 481 (Berlin, 2004), 89–90; Appelt, *DFI* v. 24–74; and, for a comparative context, T. Reuter, *Medieval Politics and Modern Mentalities*, ed. J. Nelson (Cambridge, 2006), 432–58.

of the empire and the promotion of the state before his private interests and ardently to further whatever seemed to conduce to our glory'.⁶⁶ The Reich and its ruler are set at the same level by Wortwin, who presents as complementary both aspects of Rainald's dual cause. One of them was enough to authenticate Hohenstaufen partisanship. A handful of years earlier, Burkhard, another notary who also served as a diplomat, voiced his admiration for that charismatic figure who was 'the beginning, the middle, and the end of the emperor's honour'.⁶⁷ The last is the key term for Burkhard and Wortwin. *Honor* represents the goal towards which Rainald of Dassel strived. A concept defined in action,⁶⁸ this was the ideal that motivated an imperialism that could be perceived as general or particular. The distinction made little difference, and elaboration was not required. Neither of these notaries familiar with the chancery and its chief employs a superfluous slogan of which much—too much—has been made. No word of the 'holy empire'.

Sacrum imperium appears, for the first time during Rainald's eleven years of office, in a document datable to the last week of March 1157.⁶⁹ Then the empire is held to have become holy, although the expression, supplemented by 'Roman', did not become current until the thirteenth century,⁷⁰ and its alleged reviver appears to have flagged in his enthusiasm. During the decade from 1157 until Rainald's death, 267 documents (not counting those that have been lost) were issued by the chancery. Only ten of them refer to *sacrum imperium*, and one is a forgery.⁷¹ Far from heralding a revolution in imperial ideology, this term may be regarded as a relative flop. But the illusion of a Grand Design lives on.⁷² Undeterred by the infrequency with which he and his underlings mention the 'holy empire', proponents of the master plan it signals so cryptically insist that 1157 marked a sea change in Rainald of Dassel's thought. Hitherto concrete and conservative, it then turned to radical abstraction.⁷³ Rather than being concerned with promotion, property, and the position of the ruler, the chancellor began to develop elaborate theories with the aid of the Justinian Code, from which he derived *sacrum imperium*. It is irrelevant that

⁶⁶ *Huius enim summum desiderium et perseverantis animi propositum semper extitit honorem imperii et rei publicae augmentum privatis suis commodis anteponeere et quicquid ad gloriam nostram conducere visum fuit ardentè promovere* (DFI, no. 535).

⁶⁷ *ipse est principium, medium, et finis honoris imperatoris* (F. Güterbock (ed.), 'Le lettere del notaio imperiale Burcardo intorno alla politica del Barbarossa nello scisma ed alla distruzione di Milano', *Bullettino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano*, 61 (1949), 63–4).

⁶⁸ See Görich, *Ehre*. ⁶⁹ DFI, no. 163.

⁷⁰ See J. Petersohn, 'Rom und der Reichstitel *Sacrum Romanum Imperium*', *Sitzungsberichte der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der Johann Goethe Universität, Frankfurt am Main* 32, 4 (Stuttgart, 1994).

⁷¹ DFI, nos 291, 341, 405, 406, 413, 455, 500, 516, 530 (forged). Cf. J. Schwartz, *Herrscher- und Reichstitel bei Kaisertum und Papsttum im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert*, Beihefte zu J. F. Böhmer, *Regesta Imperii* 22 (Cologne, 2003), 88 ff.

⁷² For an older version, cf. P. Munz, *Frederick Barbarossa: A Study in Medieval Politics* (London, 1969), 136 ff.

⁷³ S. Weinfurter, 'Wie das Reich heilig wurde', in B. Jussen (ed.), *Die Macht des Königs: Herrschaft in Europa vom Frühmittelalter bis in die Neuzeit* (Munich, 2006), 190–204.

Rainald had never studied law, civil or canon,⁷⁴ and insignificant that the document in question contains no other reference to late antique jurisprudence. Unaccompanied and unexplained, this singular expression yields multiple and momentous conclusions: the holiness of the empire replacing at a stroke the monarch's sacrality, Barbarossa was no longer to be designated 'the anointed of the Lord' (*christus Domini*).⁷⁵ If that was a title with which Rainald of Dassel wished to do away in 1157, why is it employed in an imperial encomium composed at his urging by his confidant a few years later?⁷⁶ Doubtless because the Archpoet was not privy to the arcane inferences that draw, from two words, an attempt to elevate the Hohenstaufen Reich above Byzantine rivalry and Roman hauteur—to neither of which this document even alludes. Sagging under the weight of the ideological burden imposed on it, what remains no more and no less than an encyclical addressed to the princes is incapable of sustaining the strain of an antithesis between imperial sacrality and ecclesiastical holiness.⁷⁷ *Sacrum imperium*, with its inexact adjective and nondescript noun, acquired such meaning as it could muster from the context in which it appeared during the last week of March 1157.

At that time Barbarossa wished to summon the princes to an assembly at Ulm the evening before Pentecost of the following year. His objective was to launch the campaign against Milan that they had deliberated and approved. None of them, the emperor assured, would be compelled to cross the Appennine. The Transmontane invader of 1155, preparing to descend on Italy for the second time, needed the military support of his magnates. They are the recipients of this document, which both records and courts their assent. *Sacrum imperium* occurs in a context of appeal to their loyalty, and it is therefore pertinent to enquire how they might have reacted to this expression revived by Rainald of Dassel. From such secular princes as his friend Otto of Wittelsbach precious little was to be expected. On hearing *sacrum imperium* being translated as *heiliges Reich* in Bavarian dialect, he probably turned to sharpening his sword. Quite different is the case of the emperor's uncle Otto of Freising, who, citing this encyclical in the *Gesta Frederici*,⁷⁸ picks up its allusion to political geography. By returning to 'Transalpine parts' (*ad Transalpina rediens*) in 1155,⁷⁹ Barbarossa had restored peace to the 'Franks' and removed it from the Italians. This is the reason Otto gives for the campaign being planned: he does not argue that, if the empire is holy, it follows that the war must be just. Implicit in his case for intervening in Italy is the historian's vision of the unity,

⁷⁴ See Chapter II.

⁷⁵ 'In diesem Sinne ersetzte die "Heiligkeit" des Reichs die Sakralität des Herrschers. Bezeichnend für diesen Vorgang ist es, daß just 1157 der Kaiser zum letzten Mal als *christus domini* bezeichnet wird, also als "Gesalbter des Herrn", dessen Heiligkeit mit seiner Person verbunden war' (Weinfurter, 'Wie das Reich heilig wurde', 204).

⁷⁶ See Chapter VII.

⁷⁷ 'Die "Sakralität" des "Kaiserlichen", die im *Codex Iustinianus* weitere Überlieferung fand, war vollkommen unabhängig von der kirchlichen Heiligkeit, der "Sanktität" der Kirche' (Weinfurter, 'Wie das Reich heilig wurde', 199).

⁷⁸ *Gesta Frederici*, ii. 52, ed. Schmale, 384–6.

⁷⁹ *Gesta Frederici*, ii. 53, ed. Schmale, 386.

rather than the sacrality, of the Reich. It is envisaged by Otto as an integrated whole formed of two components, in which the Alps signify just the same as the Appenine does in Rainald's document. The mountains are less barriers than borders in what the circular of March 1157 issued in the name of 'the emperor of the Romans' calls, with emphatic repetition, 'the Roman empire'. The terminology was traditional; normality prevailed over neologism. *Sacrum imperium*, to an intellectual at least as accomplished as Rainald of Dassel, did not evoke the jurisprudence of Justinian, the bogey of Byzantium, or the religion of Rome. The expression is likelier to have made Otto of Freising wince. Neither he nor anyone else who received the encyclical understood what was meant by Rainald's slogan, because it meant next to nothing.

Roman law was hardly at issue. The connotations, not the derivation, of *sacrum imperium* are the point. Rainald of Dassel does not attempt to elaborate on ideas he might have taken from Justinian's Code, nor is there evidence that he was equipped to do so. If his empire is made holy, the canonization is instant, but not even an imperial high priest in a hurry could ignore the recipients of a document whom it aimed to impress. And that raises the question, neglected yet relevant, of how the legal language of late antiquity rang in twelfth-century ears. Such expressions sounded offensive, objected John of Salisbury.⁸⁰ His case was unanswerable. Taken in its literal sense, the Latin generally and misleadingly translated as 'holy empire' did amount to blasphemy in 1157, and could not be construed figuratively. Metaphor ruled out, ingenuity has resorted to relativism. *Sacrum imperium* was 'para-ecclesiastical', we are told.⁸¹ What does that mean? A term of the Church used in a secular context? If so, John of Salisbury's objection is confirmed. It was topical in the wake of the investiture crisis, one of whose effects was a sharper distinction between the holy and the profane drawn by reformers who condemned the misuse of sacral language for lay purposes. They repudiated the category of 'para-ecclesiastical', as Rainald of Dassel was aware. Asserting the 'holiness' of the empire, he did not merely turn to Roman law in 1157 but, with the defiance that marked his many outrages in the eyes of the orthodox, flouted the standards defended by John and his likes. Creating an antipope or plundering relics, the 'ruin of the world' made light of their scruples in the course of his ruthless career. *Sacrum imperium* posed a related problem. The expression was meant as a challenge to the reforming cause. When the reformers failed to rise at the slap to their sensibilities, the chancellor persisted, commanding 'Rainald H' to multiply and intensify the epithet in synonyms and superlatives.⁸² But the empire did not become holier, nor did repetition render this sound without sense any more convincing. Intended as a slogan, it remained a

⁸⁰ *Policraticus*, iii.10 (496a), ed. C. Webb, *Ioannis Saresberiensis episcopi Carnotensis Policratici . . . Libri VIII* (Oxford, 1909), 202, 20 ff.

⁸¹ E. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology* (Princeton, 1957), 207.

⁸² Cf. Appelt, DFI v.141.

solecism, to be ignored as soon as opportunity offered. Writing, in his role as Archpoet, about the same subject in verse that his patron could not dictate, our author pointedly omitted to mention the *sacrum imperium*.⁸³ The alleged reviver of this 'holy empire' could not retain interest in it even on the part of his closest collaborator. It was not with the myth of the Reich that Rainald of Dassel in 1157 advanced closer to his goal of promotion but through a political drama that he stage-managed using subtler skills in language.

* * *

The scene was set for the dramatic clash between the empire and the papacy that occurred at Besançon in October 1157 by Otto of Freising, with unconscious irony, when he wrote to the chancellor requesting that he be a 'good interpreter' of his world-chronicle.⁸⁴ That work and the letter to Rainald that accompanied it were presented at court by Rahewin and Abbot Rapoto of Weißenstephan in late September of the same year. The setting was splendid: an assembly held at Würzburg, where the pride of Byzantine envoys was humbled and the submission of the Polish duke Boleslav IV was received.⁸⁵ Here at last was a show of imperial might to satisfy a Hohenstaufen partisan. On this gratifying occasion, Rainald of Dassel for the first time met Rahewin, who would narrate the confrontation that was about to be played out.⁸⁶ The two men were contemporaries. Otto of Freising, their mutual acquaintance, was only a few years older; and their affinities with him were to be matched by ties with one another. Rahewin and Rainald, in 1157, were inferior to Otto by birth and rank. The Saxon chancellor had already attained a position that the Bavarian cleric would never reach, and the atmosphere at Würzburg in the early autumn of that year was doubtless conducive to admiration on Rahewin's side when he handed over Otto of Freising's letter. After his death, in November 1158 Rahewin travelled to Italy, where he remained for six months at the imperial court. There, in a milieu over which the chancellor loomed large, the continuator of the *Gesta Frederici* will have heard, perhaps more than once, Rainald of Dassel's version of recent events. None of this reduces Rahewin to the part of an imperial propagandist, nor is there any indication that the Archpoet's patron attempted to coordinate his work with the historian's.⁸⁷ Rainald's influence on the last two books of the *Gesta Frederici* was less direct. Through oral exchanges between them during 1158 and 1159, the powerful

⁸³ See Chapter VII.

⁸⁴ See Chapter II.

⁸⁵ A. Duggan, 'Totius christianitatis caput: The Pope and the Princes', in A. Duggan and B. Bolton (eds), *Adrian IV, The English Pope (1154–1159): Texts and Studies* (Aldershot, 2013), 133.

⁸⁶ On Rahewin, see R. Deutinger, *Rahewin von Freising: Ein Gelehrter des 12. Jahrhunderts*, MGH Schriften 47 (Hanover, 1999).

⁸⁷ For a convincing critique of 'court historiography', see R. Deutinger, 'Imperiale Konzepte in der hofnahen Historiographie der Barbarossazeit', in S. Burkhardt et al. (eds), *Staufisches Kaisertum im 12. Jahrhundert: Konzepte-Netzwerke-Politische Praxis* (Mainz, 2009), 25–39.

personality and decided views of the chancellor will have formed a factor that, when writing about them, Rahewin took into account.

A skilful author, not often given to declarations of sympathy or aversion, Rahewin was far from the pseudo-objectivity that believes that documents speak for themselves. Like Otto of Freising, he selected, omitted, and rearranged his sources. Rahewin also followed Otto's example by submitting to the German chancellor for approval the draft of the *Gesta Frederici* that he had composed.⁸⁸ When Ulrich of Dürrenz, together with the proto-notary Heinrich, in their treble function as 'teachers, witnesses, and judges', exercised on the work the preliminary censorship requested by the historian,⁸⁹ they were performing a more formal version of the service that Rainald of Dassel had supplied in interpreting Otto's world-chronicle to the emperor.⁹⁰ 'It is your responsibility to decide what you will make public, your right to judge what is to be deleted,' Rahewin declares at the end of the *Gesta*.⁹¹ Perhaps he meant to recall the authorities who, during late antiquity, issued imperial edicts;⁹² certainly he was aware that, in Latin Europe of the twelfth century, *censura praevia* was normally reserved for theological tracts.⁹³ No medieval precedent existed for treating history with such solemnity; and the first readers of his draft, as Rahewin knew before he made it, would be chancery officials. They had a vested interest in what they are invited to regard as a joint venture: more than Otto of Freising, his continuator depended on information from the court.⁹⁴ If he aimed to produce an authorized version of what Ulrich and Heinrich had experienced at first hand,⁹⁵ that did not mean that Rahewin had to take the imperial line on every issue.⁹⁶ But it implied that, perhaps even more than the emperor, his chancellor in 1157 had to be handled with care.

About the causes of the confrontation that occurred a month after Rahewin met Rainald, the historian says nothing in his own words. Besançon figures in the *Gesta Frederici* as the climax in a sequence of triumphs. First, the imperial assembly at Würzburg, where Rahewin witnessed Barbarossa's magnanimity in knightng Duke Frederick of Swabia.⁹⁷ That the fortunate boy was the son of Conrad III is recorded, but not the fact that, in 1152, he had been the rival candidate for the throne. Past tensions are buried in pacific silence. Loud and bombastic, by contrast, is the letter from Henry II, which the historian goes

⁸⁸ *Gesta Frederici*, iii. Ep. Rahewini, ed. Schmale, 392–4.

⁸⁹ vos . . . in hoc opere preceptores, testes, et iudices eligo (*Gesta Frederici*, iii. Ep. Rahewini, ed. Schmale, 394, 18–19).

⁹⁰ See Chapter II.

⁹¹ Vobis enim adiudicandum erit quod editis, per vos iudicandum quod delendum duxeritis (*Gesta Frederici*, iv. 86, ed. Schmale, 714, 14–15).

⁹² N. Rubinstein, 'Political Rhetoric in the Imperial Chancery during the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries', *Medium Aevum*, 14 (1945), 33.

⁹³ Cf. Godman, *The Silent Masters*, 14 ff.

⁹⁴ See Deutinger, *Rahewin*, 136.

⁹⁵ rebus ipsis tamquam familiares et conscii secretorum interfuistis (*Gesta Frederici*, iii. Ep. Rahewini, ed. Schmale, 394, 20–1).

⁹⁶ See Deutinger, *Rahewin*, 137 ff.

⁹⁷ *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 6, ed. Schmale, 404.

on to cite without comment.⁹⁸ Declaring his willingness to submit to the emperor's will, the king of England does not specify his refusal, conveyed orally by his envoy Herbert (? of Bosham), to restore the relic of St James, which Barbarossa had requested.⁹⁹ No one would know that from Rahewin, although he was likely to have been informed about this setback by his sources at court. The hot air of empire dispels a chill in Anglo-German relations, before the scene shifts to Besançon, where papal legates arrive. The only reasons given for their journey to Burgundy are contained in the papal bull that they bear.¹⁰⁰ It is Adrian IV, not Rahewin, who speaks. The pope's tone is far from diplomatic. He upbraids the emperor for his dissimulation and negligence (not once, but three times), attributing the strife between them to 'the machination of a depraved man sowing tares' (*suggestione perversi hominis zizania seminantis*).¹⁰¹ At Matthew 13:25 that metaphor of discord is applied to the devil.

Diabolically astute, Rainald of Dassel will not have been deceived by the anonymity of the reference. He knew that he was regarded as an enemy at Rome. But, if the pope and the curia were right on that count, they played into his hands on another, overlooking a feature of protocol at the imperial court. There it was customary for papal bulls to be scrutinized by the chancellor before all others, because it was he who translated them from Latin to the emperor. Worse still, the controversy with which this document deals fell into the category of ecclesiastical politics, on which Barbarossa was advised by Rainald. An adamant advocate of the German Church's independence from Rome and of its dominance in the north, he deplored the papal decision, taken when Adrian IV had been a legate in Scandinavia,¹⁰² to make Archbishop Eskil of Lund the Danish primate. Danes like him ought to have remained subordinate to the metropolitan of Hamburg-Bremen,¹⁰³ this northern German was convinced. Neither the solidarity of school ties at Hildesheim nor Christian charity tempered Rainald's iron resolve when, returning from Rome in 1157, Eskil was captured by brigands in German-dominated Burgundy. Nothing was done to secure his release. The archbishop blamed the emperor for prolonging his captivity:¹⁰⁴ the pope and the curia, plausibly, held the chancellor responsible for the kidnap. Recrimination failed to resolve the impasse. Eskil still languished as a political pawn in the stand-off between Rome and the German Church when the papal legates arrived at court. A German churchman such as the continuator of the *Gesta Frederici* had ample grounds for hesitation as he

⁹⁸ *Gesta Frederici*, iii, 8, ed. Schmale, 406–8.

⁹⁹ See K. Leyser, 'Frederick Barbarossa, Henry II and the Hand of St James', in Leyser, *Medieval Germany and its Neighbours 900–1250* (London, 1982), 215–40.

¹⁰⁰ *Gesta Frederici*, iii, 11, ed. Schmale, 410–14.

¹⁰¹ *Gesta Frederici*, iii, 11, ed. Schmale, 414, 2–3.

¹⁰² See A. Bergquist, 'The Papal Legate: Nicholas Breakspear's Scandinavian Mission', in Duggan and Bolton (eds), *Adrian IV*, 41–8.

¹⁰³ See O. Engels, 'Friedrich Barbarossa und Dänemark', in Engels, *Stauferstudien: Beiträge zur Geschichte der Staufer im 12. Jahrhundert*, ed. E. Meuthen and S. Weinfurter (Sigmaringen, 1996), 301 ff.

¹⁰⁴ See M. Macarrone, *Papato e impero dalla elezione di Federico I alla morte di Adriano IV (1152–1159)* (Rome, 1969), 167–73.

embarked on his account of the ensuing confrontation at Besançon, which lent, and still lends, itself to contrary interpretations.¹⁰⁵ Hence ambiguity and evasiveness. Too much has been written about the alleged impartiality of Rahewin; too little about his real reticences.

Reticence about chronology, for example, is accompanied by volubility about numbers. Rahewin's narrative is notable both for its circumstantial detail and for its deliberate omissions. We are told that envoys from 'foreign peoples' gathered at Besançon.¹⁰⁶ The French, the English, and the Spaniards are described generically, but the Italians are distinguished into four categories: Romans, 'Apulians' (= Southerners), Tuscans, *Itali*. And, as the geographical extent of support for Barbarossa on the eve of his second expedition to Italy is suggested, the legates sent by Pope Adrian IV to protest against the kidnapping of Archbishop Eskil make their appearance. Cardinal Roland of San Marco, the chancellor of the Roman Church and the future Alexander III, and Cardinal Bernard of San Clemente were received 'in the secluded recess of an oratory'.¹⁰⁷ Almost as if the occasion were prayer, Barbarossa granted them a private audience.¹⁰⁸ Since curial Latin was spoken, it is probable that the chancellor was present to translate, as he would do later. But Rahewin does not say so. With Rainald of Dassel off stage, the limelight beams on the graciousness of the emperor. Barbarossa is made to appear a trusting and cordial host: the legates, by contrast, are presented as interlopers, malevolent in their motives.¹⁰⁹ Then, after recording the paternal salutation of the pope and the fraternal greetings of the sacred college (to which, despite the implication of equality between the cardinals and the emperor, no objection is reported, because this was indeed their relationship in the spiritual sphere), Rahewin turns to the papal bull that produced such strife.¹¹⁰ Here his silence is different. He will not comment on the document, he states—which is both true and misleading, for at the very point, in the tenth chapter of the third book of the *Gesta Frederici*, where Rahewin affirms what has been taken to be his impartiality, he slants the evidence. Because the text of the bull is cited immediately after the account of the private audience, readers may believe that the translation of this document followed, with no interval between them, the reception of the legates by Barbarossa. His innocence thus enhanced, their malevolence is

¹⁰⁵ See W. Heinemeyer, 'Beneficium—non feudum, sed bonum factum. Der Streit auf dem Reichstag zu Besançon', *Archiv für Diplomatik*, 15 (1969), 155–236; Görich, *Ehre*, 106–18, and K. Görich, 'Eine internationale Sprache der Ehre? Gesandte vor Friedrich Barbarossa', in H. Vollrath (ed.), *Der Weg in eine weitere Welt: Kommunikation und 'Aussenpolitik' im 12. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 2008), 54 ff.

¹⁰⁶ *exterarum gentium hominibus* (*Gesta Frederici*, iii. 10, ed. Schmale, 408, 12 ff.).

¹⁰⁷ *in cuiusdem oratorii privatiore recessu* (ed. Schmale, 410, 3) does not mean 'in einer abgelegenen Kapelle', as Schmale, 411, 2–3, translates.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. G. Althoff, 'Colloquium familiar—colloquium secretum—colloquium publicum. Beratung im politischen Leben des frühen Mittelalters', in Althoff, *Spielregeln der Politik im Mittelalter: Kommunikation in Frieden und Fehde* (Darmstadt, 1997), 157–84.

¹⁰⁹ *Causa vero adventus eorum speciem sinceritatis videbatur habere; sed fermentum et occasionem malorum intus latuisse postmodum evidenter deprehensum est* (*Gesta Frederici*, iii. 10, ed. Schmale, 408, 31–409, 1).

¹¹⁰ *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 10–11, ed. Schmale, 410–14.

magnified; and the emperor is made to appear the wronged party in the ensuing dispute.

This effect is achieved by eliding chronology. We know, from an encyclical that Barbarossa issued after the confrontation at Besançon, that the reading and translation of the bull took place, before the princes, the day following the private audience.¹¹¹ As Rahewin cites this document three chapters later, he cannot be accused of suppressing sources, but he has rearranged them, in order to cast the hero of the *Gesta Frederici* in a more favourable light. And not only Barbarossa. At least a night passed between the first audience and the second. This nocturnal interval gave Rainald of Dassel time to prepare his translation of *beneficia*, in the papal bull, as 'fiefs', which was a normal sense of the term. But its implication, in the tense setting of Besançon, was intended to be controversial: the emperor's feudal dependence on the pope. Aiming to exacerbate the strife between these powers, Rainald chose the one among two possible meanings that he calculated would cause trouble. Impunity, for him, was assured. Who could contradict the chancellor? Alone among those present, he moved effortlessly between the Latin and the vernacular spheres. None other of Barbarossa's ecclesiastical advisers attended the assembly.¹¹² The emperor and the princes were dependent on Rainald of Dassel to interpret from the learned language into German. He did so in a translation that Rahewin describes as 'very faithful', the emphasis betraying an edge understandable in the circumstances. His censors were even more alert to this issue, amending the adverb to 'exceedingly'.¹¹³ Such were the politics of textual criticism imposed on a draft of the *Gesta Frederici* by Ulrich of Dürrmenz and the protonotary Heinrich. More revealing than their intervention in Rahewin's work is what they omit to say. Accuracy, in high or superlative degree, is attributed to Rainald, but not the quality evoked in Otto of Freising's expression *bonus interpres*. Goodwill could hardly be ascribed to a translator who decided not to inform the emperor and the princes that *beneficia* had a second sense of 'favours', with none of the feudal connotations of 'fiefs'. Praising Rainald's fidelity to the Latin, Rahewin does not say that the meaning that was to provoke a clash had been chosen deliberately, although he knew, from Otto, that the chancellor had been schooled in ambiguity at Paris.

The éclat that followed was enacted by the legates and the secular princes, whose pronouncements (*Fürstensprüche*), delivered at an assembly with the emperor, had legal force. Rainald's translation of the bull was greeted less by

¹¹¹ Quos [= legatos] cum prima die adventus sui honorifice suscepissemus et secunda, ut mos est, ad audiendam legationem eorum cum principibus nostris consedissemus (*Gesta Frederici*, iii. 13, ed. Schmale, 418). This was usual procedure. See P. Chaplais, *English Diplomatic Practice in the Middle Ages* (London, 2003), 218 ff., and, for the encyclical, Chapter IV.

¹¹² The Burgundian, rather than the German, episcopate, was represented at Besançon. See DFI, nos 183–5, and R. Locatelli, 'Frédéric I et le royaume de Bourgogne', in A. Haverkamp (ed.), *Friedrich Barbarossa: Handlungsspielräume und Wirkungsweisen des staufischen Kaisers*, VuF 4 (Sigmaringen, 1992), 180.

¹¹³ litteris...per Rainaldum cancellarium fida satis | nimis interpretatione diligenter expositis (*Gesta Frederici*, iii. 12, ed. Schmale, 414, 20–1).

a *Fürstenspruch* than by a *Fürstenschrei*; and the bellow of indignation was not only dramatic but also stage-managed. Rahewin discloses by whom, in an attempt to provide a setting for the princes' sound and fury. He claims that they recalled offensive frescoes in the Lateran palace at Rome, with a Latin superscription describing Emperor Lothar III as a papal vassal,¹¹⁴ and linked them to Rainald's rendering of *beneficia* as 'fiefs'. Here selective reticence gives way to specious assertion. Such memories, such associations in high medieval Germany, were products of a clerical education. Military dynasts, not renowned for their knowledge of the learned language and ecclesiastical iconography, neither recalled nor understood such minutiae of curial pedantry, unless they were explained to them.¹¹⁵ Explanations unfavourable to the papal cause were offered by the translator of the bull, whom Rahewin contrives to keep as far away as possible from centre-stage at Besançon. In order to spread among the secular princes his allegation of the pope's dark design to reduce the emperor to the rank of a vassal, Rainald of Dassel was not obliged to contact them all during the night. What he required was an ally among their number, who would square the rest. And the chancellor had one in Otto of Wittelsbach, his companion on a legation to Italy the following year. Not by chance does Rahewin describe them as an inseparable pair of heroes.¹¹⁶ Nor was it fortuitous that, when one of the cardinals (probably Bernard of San Clemente, who had been a legate in Germany and a friend to Wibald of Stablo, rather than Roland of San Marco, who had never travelled outside Italy until 1157¹¹⁷) objected to the uproar—'From whom does he have the empire, if not from the lord pope?'¹¹⁸—Otto advanced on him with drawn sword. A life spent in the camps and on the estates had not prepared this imperial stalwart to grasp the political implications of a rhetorical question in Latin.¹¹⁹ Otto had been primed. With the connection between fiefs and frescoes so deftly prompted to mind by his clerical accomplice, he was angry less at what the legate said than at the fact that he had opened his mouth. That is why it is mistaken to claim that 'there

¹¹⁴ *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 12, ed. Schmale, 414–16, with R. Deutinger, 'Kaiser und Papst: Friedrich I. und Hadrian IV.' in J. Dendorfer and R. Deutinger (eds), *Das Lehnswesen im Mittelalter: Forschungskonstrukte—Quellenbefunde—Deutungsrelevanz* (Ostfildern, 2010), 332–7.

¹¹⁵ Cf. Wipo, *Tetralogus*, 199–200, ed. H. Bresslau, MGH SrG 16 (Hanover, 1915), 81, and see Chapters VI and XI.

¹¹⁶ *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 22, ed. Schmale, 440, 15–18, and see Chapter IV.

¹¹⁷ W. Ullmann, 'Cardinal Roland and Besançon', *Sacerdozio e regno da Gregorio VII a Bonifacio VIII Miscellanea Historiae Pontificae*, 18 (1954), 121 ff., identifies the cardinal as Roland and concludes that this was the source of his later hostility, as Alexander III, to Rainald. The issue here is an ability to understand (not to speak) German, for which the cardinal of San Clemente is the stronger candidate. See B. Zenker, 'Die Mitglieder des Kardinalkollegiums von 1130 bis 1159', unpublished dissertation (Würzburg, 1964), 29 ff.; 85 ff.

¹¹⁸ *A quo habet, si a domno papa non habet, imperium?* (*Gesta Frederici*, iii. 12, ed. Schmale, 416, 16–17).

¹¹⁹ Cf. H. Glaser, 'Auftakt: Der Dynastiegründer. Pfalzgraf Otto II. von Wittelsbach, Kaiser Friedrich Barbarossa und der Hoftag von Altenburg am 16. September 1180', in Glaser (ed.), *Die Zeit der frühen Herzöge. Von Otto I. zu Ludwig dem Bayern. Beiträge zur bayerischen Geschichte und Kunst 1180–1350*, Wittelsbach und Bayern I, 1 (Munich, 1980), 5–11, and S. Weinfurter, 'Der Aufstieg der frühen Wittelsbacher', *Geschichte in Köln*, 14 (1983), 13–46.

was no answer' to the cardinal's question.¹²⁰ The answer was, Otto's unsheathed blade. Acquaintance with Gelasian symbolism was not needed to interpret it.

Noteworthy, in the second act of this drama directed by Rainald, is the minor role assigned to Barbarossa. He is kept in the background, exalted and aloof, while the princes and the legates play out their clash, intervening only to prevent violence. The encyclical issued in the emperor's name after this incident justifies the expulsion of the pope's envoys that followed by the 'discovery', in their baggage, of licences to plunder the German Church.¹²¹ Warrants to commit larceny, rather than commissions to inspect: the language of the encyclical is as one-sided and polemical as Rainald's translation of *beneficia*; and will have been dictated by him to his private secretary.¹²² The Archpoet understood the chancellor's motives. His interests, as much as the emperor's, were served when the legates were sent packing. A visitation of the German Church—vexing not only to Barbarossa, its would-be master, but also to Rainald, that uncanonical holder of plural benefices—had been avoided; and Rome would not repeat the attempt during the remaining decade of his office and influence. The cause célèbre of Archbishop Eskil had not even been discussed. Moreover, the pope, after failing to rally the German bishops behind him, was later forced to explain himself.¹²³ That *beneficia*, in Roman usage, signified favours was neither here nor there. In the hermeneutic contest between the empire and the papacy, Rainald of Dassel had succeeded in forcing his own meaning on the term. It was that the Germans would not tolerate meddling by the pope.

Pope Adrian IV and his advisors, in October 1157, were outflanked by a master of manipulation shrewder than any member of the Roman curia. The curia, in drafting the bull conveyed to Barbarossa, had demonstrated none of the finesse on which it prided itself. The terms employed are tart. The tone alternates between unctuousness and abrasiveness. And the bull commits the gross error of distinguishing the emperor, who is both browbeaten and cajoled, from his chancellor, who is simply reviled. This 'depraved man sowing tares',¹²⁴ in need of no provocation for translating *beneficia* as 'fiefs', was far from disposed to accept a curial definition of what constituted 'the prestige and supremacy of the empire'.¹²⁵ He defined that concept in his own terms of symmetry and inversion. The papal accusation of wrongdoing was turned on its head and levelled against the legates, transforming a rebuke into an affront. But was this an affront to Barbarossa's 'system of honour' or to Rainald's?

¹²⁰ Ullmann, 'Cardinal Roland and Besançon', 121.

¹²¹ *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 13, ed. Schmale, 420, 2–8.

¹²² See Chapter IV.

¹²³ *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 19, ed. Schmale, 430–4, and see Chapter IV.

¹²⁴ In a letter to Wibald of Stablo, dated 19 January 1157, Adrian IV used a similar expression. See *Ep.* 442, ed. Hartmann, 917, 16. The information probably derived from Archbishop Frederick II of Cologne, who visited Rome at the beginning of 1157. Cf. H. Wolter, 'Erzbischof Friedrich II. von Köln (1156–1158)', *Jahrbuch des Kölner Geschichtsvereins*, 46 (1975), 23 ff.

¹²⁵ *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 22, ed. Schmale, 441, 3–4, 15.

Should he be regarded as the emperor's agent or as his 'evil genius'?¹²⁶ The answers to these questions depend on whether Barbarossa had a system. And the evidence suggests that, in 1157, he did not.

Even if we suppose that Rainald of Dassel, during his nocturnal operations between the first and second audiences, recalled the suspicion of the papacy shown by Barbarossa at Sutri and consulted his nominal master—a far from secure hypothesis in the case of one who, in 1164, would create an antipope without the emperor's permission—the fact remains that both parties to the dispute were in the hands of the chancellor. Just as Barbarossa was incapable of discussing the papal bull with the legates in Latin, so they were unable to communicate with the secular princes in their own language. Rainald, the intermediary between them, exploited his pivotal position in order to guarantee a dialogue of the deaf. In the ensuing silence, he did not raise his voice. He induced others, louder and less sophisticated, to bellow with rage, before withdrawing behind the scenes and leaving his traces to be covered by the complicity of Rahewin. He, without a hint of irony, quotes a letter in which the German bishops reported to the pope, after Adrian IV had demanded Rainald's head, that they had found the chancellor as meek as a lamb, full of humility and peace.¹²⁷ The Archpoet, on perusing this document of duplicity, will have exchanged a wry smile with his patron.

¹²⁶ 'Rainald von Dassel war nicht Barbarossas böser Geist, sondern er war genau der Mann, den das "System Barbarossa" brauchte, das eben auch ein "System der Ehre" war' (Görich, *Ehre*, 376).

¹²⁷ *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 20, ed. Schmale, 438 ff. See further Chapter IV.

IV

Transmontane Identity

No echo of Besançon is audible in the second book of the *Gesta Frederici*, although Otto of Freising wrote his account of the recent past in the aftermath of that confrontation. Reminiscent of the strife between the empire and the papacy during the investiture crisis, this was a subject to which he avoided even alluding. It aggrieved him.¹ Had he lived long enough to relate developments after 1156, how to insert that caesura of conflict into a seamless narrative of peace restored? Besançon was alien to Otto's eirenic conception of the *Gesta Frederici*. Conceptions might be more accurate, for his half of this work is composed of two distinct, if related, books. The first of them probably existed, at least in draft, before Rahewin presented the world-chronicle to the emperor and the chancellor at Würzburg in the early autumn of 1157. Between then and the following summer, when Otto departed for France and died at Morimond on 22 September 1158, both parts of his history are unlikely to have been composed from scratch. One of them emerged during the previous period when he was revising the world-chronicle, which it extends and complements. Book I begins long before Barbarossa's accession in 1152 and ranges widely, surveying the affairs of the universal Church. Particular attention is paid to events in religious and intellectual life that are later ignored, such as the trials and tribulations of Peter Abelard or Gilbert de la Porrée.² In the second book, Otto's focus narrows. Ecclesiastical topics recede, and the imperial theme is brought to the fore. We know why. The shift, suggested by the historian himself in a letter to the emperor,³ was warmly approved by the chancellor who translated it. What Book II of the *Gesta Frederici* relates about the early years of Barbarossa's reign was the product of an understanding between his uncle and Rainald of Dassel.

Alumni of Paris and Hohenstaufen partisans, they were in league, if not in sympathy. There may be little warmth in Otto's letter to Rainald,⁴ but there is ample evidence of common cause. The chancellor had reason to be gratified by the historian's acknowledgement of his influence over the emperor, and, after Besançon, Otto had grounds to congratulate himself on his own foresight in

¹ *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 25, ed. Schmale, 448, 17–20.

² *Gesta Frederici*, i. 50 ff., ed. Schmale, 224 ff.

³ *Itaque si vestrae placuerit maiestati gestorum vestrorum nobilissimam in posterorum memoriam stilo commendare seriem, per notarios vestrae celsitudinis digestis capitulis mihi que transmissis, Deo dante vitaque comite, ea laeto animo prosequi non pigritabor* (*Chronicon*, ed. Hofmeister, 3, 6–11).

⁴ See Chapter II.

seeking Rainald's friendly mediation of the world-chronicle. Their interests converged. Why should they not be allies? reasoned the politician who was 'the beginning, the middle, and the end' of imperial honour? If Barbarossa, at the outset of his period in power, could be seen to have stumbled, who better to correct that perception than a member of the dynasty with such a positive approach to the past? 'Upright' and 'useful', history should be an account of 'deeds by strong men', declared Otto,⁵ who had already proved his mettle. This admirable statement of principle needed only the nudge of guidelines, which Rainald promptly drew up in a report, selective and emphatic, on the first four years of the reign that Rahewin bore back to Freising.⁶ This document will have been dictated by the chancellor, on the basis of headings (*capitula*) supplied by notaries,⁷ to his secretary in late September or early October 1157. Then, at the latest, our author came into contact with the chancery that he would shortly join as 'Rainald H'. The group with which he established or strengthened links was small but significant. It formed the primary audience of the *Gesta Frederici*. Its author referred to the Archpoet and his colleagues when he told Barbarossa that he had written in expectation of his work being scrutinized by 'the sharp eyes of your clerics' (*acutus clericorum tuorum . . . oculus*).⁸ Just as they were to interpret the history to his nephew, so they had sent him guidelines for its second book. After influencing its character, they were in a position to sway its reception at court. Had they wished Otto to celebrate the hallowing of the empire supposedly effected the previous March, they had only to insert into their report the expression *sacrum imperium*. Familiarity with it on the historian's part could be assumed, because he had acknowledged receipt of the encyclical in which it is contained.⁹ Nothing of the kind occurred. Barbarossa's deeds are situated 'in the Roman world' (*in orbe Romano*¹⁰), where the emperor's persona, echoing a sentiment recurrent in charters of this period,¹¹ expresses an ardent wish 'to be shaped' to virtue by his predecessors' example (*per magnifica gesta imperatorum ad virtutes informari preoptamus*¹²). The language is semi-liturgical.¹³ Humble in tone but hard-headed in sense, the passive infinitive *informari* acknowledges that Barbarossa had much to learn.

What he had to learn from his uncle, primed by the chancellor, was unmistakable. The Archpoet, taking down Rainald's dictation, will have been in no doubt about which headings supplied by the notaries were to be highlighted or discarded. The foundation of empire, as seen by the sharp eyes of these clerics, was military. 'Barbarossa' portrays himself as a conqueror

⁵ *Honesta ergo erit et utilis excellentiae vestrae historiarum cognitio, qua et virorum fortium gesta Deique regna mutantis et cui voluerit dantis . . .* (ed. Hofmeister, 2, 25–7).

⁶ Ed. Schmale, 82–8. On the dating, cf. Deutinger, *Rahewin*, 89.

⁷ See n. 3.

⁸ See Chapter II.

⁹ *Chronicon*, ed. Hofmeister, 3, 14–18.

¹⁰ *Gesta Frederici*, ed. Schmale, 82, 17.

¹¹ Cf. G. Wolf, 'Imperator und Caesar—zu den Anfängen des staufischen Erbreichsgedanken', in Wolf (ed.), *Friedrich Barbarossa*, 360–74.

¹² *Gesta Frederici*, ed. Schmale, 82, 9–10, and see Chapter VII.

¹³ Cf. Blaise, *Vocabulaire*, 418 ff.

restoring his rights, especially in Italy. The Lombards in 1155, for example, were no more than insolent rebels—‘not knights but servitors’ whose castles had to be destroyed ‘with due and just ferocity’.¹⁴ Categorical claims are matched by glaring omissions. All that happened at Sutri was a joyous welcome given by the pope to the king of Germany.¹⁵ If he fell out with the Roman commune, that was because he considered it beneath his dignity to ‘buy empire and swear an oath to the mob’.¹⁶ The coronation that followed in St Peter’s is reduced to a papal ‘blessing’, dispensed with generosity but without implications . . .¹⁷ More salient than the facts reported are the reversals left out. Signposts of silence are provided to byways that should be avoided on a road that does not lead to Rome. Neither purchased from the commune nor conferred by the pope, Barbarossa’s imperial dignity derives from his God-given merits. As *pauca paucis* Rainald of Dassel describes what he sent to Otto of Freising in the emperor’s name. The historian was to expand and elaborate (*dilatanda et multiplicanda*) this selection made on a small scale.¹⁸ It was more than enough. Less a report on the early years of the reign than a series of indications about how they should be presented, the document signalled to Otto Rainald’s wish for history writ large.

Epic proportions being to the chancellor’s taste, it was palatable when the historian cited among earlier authors on the same subject Virgil and Lucan.¹⁹ What they had achieved in verse, he would attempt in prose: but how to find a style capable of conveying the magnificence of one victory after another?²⁰ Ironical in his mock-modesty, Otto was serious in his purpose. The issues faced in the *Gesta Frederici* are more than literary. In the sphere of Latin letters an emperor from the north posed problems of cultural identity. The Roman commune had condescended to him as a ‘stranger from over the Alps’,²¹ and Otto might have rejoined by characterizing his nephew as a Teuton or a Frank. But he was not quite a German.²² That term of nationality becomes current after 1157/8.²³ Then Germanness was hardly a concept, or even a term.²⁴ Dominant ‘in the Roman world’ yet distinct from it,

¹⁴ *Gesta Frederici*, ed. Schmale, 82, 28–83, 4. See further Chapter VII.

¹⁵ *Gesta Frederici*, ed. Schmale, 86, 3ff.

¹⁶ *imperium emere noluimus et sacramenta vulgo prestare non debuimus* (*Gesta Frederici*, ed. Schmale, 86, 11–12).

¹⁷ *Gesta Frederici*, ed. Schmale, 86, 19–20.

¹⁸ *Gesta Frederici*, ed. Schmale, 88, 27–8.

¹⁹ *Gesta Frederici*, ed. Schmale, 120, 7.

²⁰ *Gesta Frederici*, ed. Schmale, 282, 2–3.

²¹ See Chapter III.

²² See Reuter, *Medieval Politics and Modern Mentalities*, 101, and cf. J. Fried, *Der Weg in die Geschichte: Die Ursprünge Deutschlands bis 1024* (Berlin, 1994), 15.

²³ See H. Thomas, ‘Die Deutschen und die Rezeption ihres Volksnamen’, in W. Paravicini (ed.), *Nord und Süd in der deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters*, Kieler Historische Studien 34 (Sigmaringen, 1999), 19–50.

²⁴ See H. Thomas, ‘Zur Geschichte des Wortes “deutsch” vom Ende des 11. bis zur Mitte des 12. Jahrhunderts’, in M. Nikolay-Panter et al. (eds), *Geschichtliche Landeskunde der Rheinlande: Regionale Befunde und raumübergreifende Perspektiven. G. Droege zum Andenken* (Cologne, 1994), 131–58, and cf. U. Goerlitz, *Literarische Konstruktion (vor-)nationaler Identität seit dem Annolied: Analysen und Interpretationen zur deutschen Literatur des Mittelalters*, Quellen und Forschungen zur Literatur- und Kunstgeschichte 45 (Berlin, 2007), 122 ff.

Barbarossa had to be invested with an aura of the supranational authority that set him apart. Apartness from the papacy was too evident, too controversial in the wake of Besançon, and Otto skilfully redirects the antagonism generated by that clash against the commune at Rome. Not only did the spokesmen of the city aspire to ancient virtues; they also voiced their claims with verbosity. What means of deflating such pretensions could be more effective than a speech denying them in the language over which Rome asserted rights of origin? Realism was irrelevant; Rahewin scarcely contradicted Otto when, later in the *Gesta Frederici*, he betrayed Barbarossa's semi-literacy by the euphemism that he understood Latin better than he spoke it.²⁵ No medieval reader expected from fictive oratory the truth-claims of fact. In historiography the place of imagined eloquence had been established since time immemorial, and just as significant as what a figure could be made to say was how he said it.

The medium reinforcing the message, Otto crafts this speech with care. A masterpiece in the medieval literature of national stereotypes,²⁶ it forms a focus of the *Gesta Frederici*. With a malice that is manifest and a subtlety that has been ignored, the historian hits on the cliché of Italian long-windedness. Readers in the Reich are told to expect from their emperor an effusion 'in the Italian manner', a harangue 'dragged out at length with rambling periodic sentences'.²⁷ This is not simply a rhetorical definition of style. It is also a satirical expression of animosity. Adopting the attitude of 'us' against 'them' with which he recounts how the Romans were crushed in the riot after Barbarossa's coronation,²⁸ Otto prepares his audience for the prolixity it had endured from windbags in the peninsula. Then, to sighs of relief that he anticipates wryly, the historian has his nephew change his mind. 'Improvising but not improvidently' (*ex improviso non improvisse*), Barbarossa speaks in laconic Latin. Pungent and pithy, the voice of his ventriloquism sounds as clipped as Julius Caesar's. Five words suffice to formulate his thesis: *non cessit nobis nudum imperium*²⁹ ('the empire did not descend to us undressed'). The metaphor is both sartorial and legal. Declining to be robbed in the borrowed finery of the commune, Barbarossa is not naked, because empire is a property over which he has inherited rights (*non . . . nudum*). The past tense of the verb hammers home the point. Near to Sutri, before being crowned in the holy city, the king of Germany claims that *imperium* has already descended to him (*cessit*). His people has appropriated the classical qualities of the Romans; he should be revered as the heir of Charlemagne and Otto the Great; and his cultural identity is expressed in a Transmontane version of the imperial language. Deliberately

²⁵ *Gesta Frederici*, iv. 86, ed. Schmale, 719, 22–3.

²⁶ On this problem, see P. Meyvaert, 'Rainaldus est malus scriptor Francigenus: Voicing National Antipathy in the Middle Ages', *Speculum*, 66 (1991), 743–63, and L. Schmugge, 'Über "nationale Vorurteile" im Mittelalter', *DA* 38 (1982), 439–59.

²⁷ *more Italico longa continuatione peryodorumque circuitibus sermonem producturus* (*Gesta Frederici*, ii. 32, ed. Schmale, 346, 7–8).

²⁸ See Chapter III.

²⁹ *Gesta Frederici*, ii. 32, ed. Schmale, 348, 1–2.

different from the wordiness of the southerners, the succinct oratory of this Caesar from the north consigns Italian pretensions to the past. The future belongs to *romfreies Kaisertum*:³⁰ empire without meddling from Rome. Music to Rainald of Dassel's ears, attuned as they were to Ottonian variations on the same theme,³¹ the speech attributed by Otto of Freising to Barbarossa demonstrates how well the historian had understood the indications for writing the *Gesta Frederici* that the chancellor had sent to him. And the Archpoet, blinking at the brilliance that transformed the outline of the reign he had taken down, can hardly have failed to register that, in a prose as economical as it is poetical, Otto had indeed risen to epic heights.

* * *

The same issue was approached from a different angle by Rainald of Dassel in an encyclical issued after Besançon.³² Unlike the bishop of Freising, the chancellor took aim at Adrian IV. To the cardinal's question: 'From whom does he have the empire, if not from the lord pope?', the answer is uncompromising. From God alone the ruler derives his royal and imperial rights. That is why, less than seven months after the title is alleged to have been abolished, Barbarossa is described as 'the anointed [of the Lord]' (*christus*³³). How then did the Lord anoint? Through election by the princes.³⁴ The implied argument is both clear and obscure. Clearly Rainald meant that the dignity of Roman emperor followed directly, without papal intervention, from the German kingship. But this amounted to another QED. If the pope, at coronation in St Peter's, merely bestowed a blessing, logic entailed that God's grace had been received by Barbarossa previous to that insignificant ceremony. The chronological priority of princely election could not be doubted. Its sacramental significance might. No theology of political elevation by lay magnates existed in the twelfth century, nor was Rainald of Dassel qualified to supply one. His assertion, as obscure as his myth of the 'holy empire', remained unexplained by him or anyone else,³⁵ until it was consigned to history's dustbin with other rubbish of the Reich. What the chancellor lacked in theoretical lucidity he possessed in rhetorical vehemence, reviving with menaces of schism and abuse

³⁰ For the concept, see the succinct account by R. Schieffer, 'Konzepte des Kaisertums', in B. Schneidmüller and S. Weinfurter (eds), *Heilig. Römisch. Deutsch: Das Reich im mittelalterlichen Europa* (Dresden, 2006), 48 ff.

³¹ Still classic is C. Erdmann, 'Das ottonische Reich als Imperium Romanum', *DA* 6 (1943), 412–44.

³² DFL no. 186 (= *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 11, ed. Schmale, 418–20). The ascription, repeated from the older bibliography by Appelt, ad loc., of this encyclical to Eberhard of Bamberg, whose policy was aimed at reconciliation between the empire and the papacy, rather than to the chancellor who was responsible for such documents, is unconvincing.

³³ *Cum divina potentia, a qua omnis potestas in caelo et in terra, nobis, cristo eius, regnum et imperium regendum commiserit* (ed. Appelt, 314, 23–4).

³⁴ *Cumque per electionem principum a solo Deo regnum et imperium nostrum sit* (ed. Appelt, 315, 8–9).

³⁵ Cf. U. Schmidt, 'A quo ergo habet, si a domino papa non habet imperium? Zu den Anfängen der staufischen Kaiserwahlen', in S. Lorenz and U. Schmidt (eds), *Von Schwaben bis Jerusalem: Facetten staufischer Geschichte* (Sigmaringen, 1996), 61–88.

of papal legates the polemic of the investiture crisis.³⁶ The German bishops to whom this encyclical is chiefly addressed were to be whipped into line.

The line they took, after being browbeaten by Rainald and admonished by Adrian IV,³⁷ was to throw up their hands. They did so in a letter to the pope whose tone of conciliation is attributable to the emollient Eberhard of Bamberg.³⁸ Yet the duplicity of this document stems from Rainald of Dassel. When he was questioned about Besançon, he played the innocent. With the irascible Otto of Wittelsbach absent from court, bluster could be avoided. All was smoothly consigned to the linguistic level by the chancellor doubling the role of the dove.³⁹ Humble and pacific,⁴⁰ Rainald denied his wish for confrontation, leaving the bishops with no option but to stone-wall.⁴¹ Worst of all, again, the pope had to explain in a second bull that *beneficia*, at Rome, meant 'favours' not 'fiefs'.⁴² In vain did Adrian IV insist that a text should be construed according to its author's purpose. That lesson in hermeneutics was lost on Barbarossa. Suspicion had been sown and damage done, as his chancellor intended, ensuring that the imminent expedition to Italy would be made on the warpath. This time, however, Rainald of Dassel was away on a legation, and the emperor chose his uncle to translate the communiqué from Rome. Among the representatives of clerical culture who stood nearest to Barbarossa, Otto of Freising offered the obvious alternative. But Otto would die within a matter of months, and his nephew would be left in Rainald's perilous proximity. The danger that he posed to peace is revealed in hawkish documents being prepared behind the scenes. Bellicose notes had sounded in the encyclical issued after Besançon, although war had not yet been declared. The chancery lapsed into a relative lull during the first half of 1158. Between January and June of that year, only seventeen charters are transmitted⁴³—neither a high rate of production nor proof that this period was uneventful. It was then that the Archpoet, in his capacity as 'Rainald H', became an imperial notary.⁴⁴ Northern German in his orthography, he was visibly not an old hand, committing slips of detail and presentation that indicate that he had been brought in from

³⁶ ... a capite sanctae ecclesiae, cui Christus pacis ac dilectionis suae caracterem impressit, causae dissensionum, seminarium malorum, pestiferi morbi venenum manare videntur, de quibus, nisi Deus avertat, totum corpus ecclesiae commaculati, unitatem scindi, inter regnum et sacerdotium scisma fieri pertimescimus. . . ipsi quasi de mammona iniquitatis inflati de altitudine superbiae, de fastu arrogantiae, de execrabili tumidi cordis elatione legationem apostolicis litteris conscriptam nobis presentaverunt (ed. Appelt, 314, 26–30, 35–7). In an article commonly ignored, because its thesis of imperial authorship is discredited, E. Otto pointed out valid parallels between Rainald's encyclical and the polemical literature of the investiture crisis. See Otto, 'Friedrich Barbarossa in seinen Briefen', DA 5 (1941), 79 n. 1. On the polemic of the investiture crisis, see C. Mirbt, *Die Publizistik im Zeitalter Gregors VII.* (Leipzig, 1894); I. Robinson, *Authority and Resistance in the Investiture Crisis: The Polemical Literature of the Late Eleventh Century* (Manchester, 1978), and I. Robinson, 'The Colores Rhetorici in the Investiture Contest', *Traditio*, 33 (1976), 209–328.

³⁷ *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 19, ed. Schmale, 430–4.

³⁹ *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 20, ed. Schmale, 436, 1–2.

⁴⁰ *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 20, ed. Schmale, 438, 8–10.

⁴¹ *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 20, ed. Schmale, 438, 7–8.

⁴² *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 25, ed. Schmale, 448 ff.

⁴³ DFI, nos 202–19.

⁴⁴ DFI, no. 202.

³⁸ *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 20, ed. Schmale, 434–8.

outside.⁴⁵ Near to but not of the chancery, this confidant of its chief was entrusted with more than the routine business handled by his colleagues and with less than the diplomacy of reconciliation practised, in exceptional circumstances, by Eberhard of Bamberg. An influential bishop, previously selected to soothe the pope, was neither suited nor qualified to meet the urgent needs of the moment. In Rainald of Dassel's entourage at the beginning of 1158 different skills were called for, one of which was rhetorical proficiency in polemic. Rhetoric had been taught at Paris, when the chancellor and his protégé studied there, by Thierry of Chartres.⁴⁶ He provided the weapons needed for what Rainald envisaged as a war of words.

Thierry had lectured about the art of presenting a case for and against a given thesis known, from ancient practice, as *controversia*.⁴⁷ In the midst of a controversy with Rome, Rainald wished to anticipate blows that might be struck on both sides. The arsenal of arguments stored in the *codex Udalrici* needed to be updated. Its eleventh-century invective was unilateral, largely confined to urging the imperial cause and leaving the papal case ill-defined. Modernization was required by a writer familiar with the latest techniques of disputation: 'Rainald H'. At the beginning of his term in the chancery, it was of little moment that he dabbled inexpertly at a charter in collaboration with a colleague. He possessed skills that other notaries lacked. Recording transactions of politics and property, they documented what had been done. They were not trained to devise what might be said in the stress and strife between rival powers. Hypothetical harangues were beyond their brief. To envisage how the pope might respond to the replay of the investiture crisis at which Rainald's encyclical hinted, to give vent to his wrath at being likened to the devil in one bull and in another damned as a blasphemer:⁴⁸ all of this demanded an intellectual flexibility that exceeded the range of single-minded clerics in the chancery. The new recruit to their number, supplying that want, reflected on its implications in early 1158. At the same time as Otto of Freising was composing the second book of the *Gesta Frederici*, our author too recognized that the void of Transmontane identity might be filled with broadsides against Rome.

The works in which 'Rainald H' undertook this task are misleadingly known as 'stylistic exercises from Trier'⁴⁹—misleadingly because they are not stylistic exercises in the ordinary sense of the term, nor do they have much to do with

⁴⁵ Appelt, ad loc., 338, 17 ff., and Appelt, DFI v, 18, 39–40, 129.

⁴⁶ See K. Fredborg, *The Latin Rhetorical Commentaries by Thierry of Chartres*, Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies. Studies and Texts 84 (Toronto, 1988), 12 ff.

⁴⁷ Fredborg, *The Latin Rhetorical Commentaries*, 79, 17–23.

⁴⁸ *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 19, ed. Schmale, 432, 24–7.

⁴⁹ See N. Höing (ed.), 'Die "Trierer Stilübungen": Ein Denkmal der Frühzeit Kaiser Friedrich Barbarossas', *Archiv für Diplomatik, Schriftgeschichte, Siegel- und Wappenkunde*, 1 (1955), 257–329, and 2 (1956), 125–249. See too N. Höing, 'Der angebliche Briefwechsel Papst Hadrians IV und Kaiser Friedrichs I: Ein Werk aus dem Kreis um Bischof Eberhard II von Bamberg', *Archiv für Diplomatik, Schriftgeschichte, Siegel- und Wappenkunde*, 3 (1957), 162–206.

Trier. Produced in the aftermath of Besançon,⁵⁰ they represent a fictive debate, in epistolary form, between the empire and the papacy. Exaggeration is of its essence; satire is strained to caricature. The hostility with which the enemy was to be hounded is apparent from the first letter composed in Barbarossa's name to Archbishop Hillin of Trier.⁵¹ Hillin enjoyed the status of a papal legate, and his see had ancient claims to the primacy. That is why it is described as 'the heart of the kingdom' (*cor regni*) and 'the second Rome' (*secunda Roma*),⁵² before being transported into a realm of irreality, where it figures as the potential centre of an imperial church ruled by the pope's alienated representative. Such fantasy fits into a pattern of tit-for-tat that opens by levelling against Adrian IV the same charge of blasphemy that, in his letter to the German bishops, he had made against Rainald of Dassel and Otto of Wittelsbach.⁵³ All of this might have been accomplished by our author's predecessors as polemicists in the investiture crisis. It is not until he imagines abuse then circulating at Rome that he departs from the models offered by the *codex Udalrici* and makes an effort to anticipate his critics:

Why on this side of the Alps should we fear his excommunication, which is made light of by those boors on the other side? At Rome, in his capital, his excommunication is utterly despised, and we should take seriously his being enraged? What a laughing matter! Beyond doubt you see and hear how they hold us up to ridicule, calling us stupid Alemannians, as though we obeyed his orders, while the entire world could not withstand our grasp!⁵⁴

As aware as Otto of Freising that their people was the target of a Roman hauteur that marked at the Alps the limit of civilization and orthodoxy, 'Rainald H' responds with a challenge to the negative image of the men from over the mountains. Centred on the antithesis north-south, his polemic paints in glaring colours a picture of cultural identity that Otto shades more subtly. Despised as inferior by a pope who lacks authority even in the holy city, the 'stupid Alemannians' assert their cleverness and their power. 'On this side of the Alps' (*cis Alpes*), their flattering self-image counters its distorted reflection from Rome. But if, in the grasp of their 'right hands', they wish to encompass everything, the assertion of Cisalpine superiority amounts to a form of

⁵⁰ W. Goetz, *Translatio Imperii: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Geschichtsdenkens und der politischen Theorien im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit* (Tübingen, 1958), 142 ff., rightly criticizes Höing's conclusions but, because he does not recognize the genre of these compositions, argues unpersuasively for a later date.

⁵¹ Ed. Höing, I, 318–21.

⁵² Ed. Höing, I, 7, 321.

⁵³ *Ecce auditis blasphemiam!* (Cf. Matthew 26:65) (ed. Höing, I, 3, 319). Cf. *Gesta Frederici*, iii, 19, ed. Schmale, 432, 24–7.

⁵⁴ *Quid eius cis Alpes timemus excommunicationem, quam trans Alpes ipsi vulgares parvipendunt? Rome in sede sua ex integro vilipenditur sua excommunicatione, et nobis tam gravis est sua indignatio? Ecce qualis subsannatio! Certe vos ipsi vidistis et audistis, quam derisui nos habuerint, vocantes nos stultos Alemannos, quod ad preceptum eius staremus subiecti, quorum dexteris totus orbis ferre non posset!* (ed. Höing, I, 6, 320). At the beginning of the second clause Höing prints *dum*, which leaves the transitive verb without an object. I conjecture *quam*.

reassurance. Reassuring himself that his people was the master, not the servant, of what was feared to be a resurgent papacy, our author betrays, by his brashness, an insecurity that Otto masks with tact. For such invective would hardly have needed to be fabricated, had he and his colleagues not considered themselves vulnerable to spiritual sanctions. In Rainald of Dassel's circle, drawn in on itself, refuge was sought in a rhetoric of dominance. Arms were not the sole basis of this utopian hegemony. Those 'boors on the other side of the Alps' were to understand that culture provided one of the empire's most trenchant weapons—the Latin culture of the European élite, which 'Rainald H' employed to prove to himself and others that they were vituperative rivals of the Roman curia.

The Rome that he addressed with a mixture of derision and dread was no less overweening than the city satirized by Otto of Freising. The historian dwelt on the perceived arrogance of the commune: the newly appointed notary pilloried the supposed ignorance of the pope. Adrian IV, viewed in the jaundiced perspective of the German chancery, suffers from the delusion that he is Gregory VII, and turns with scorn on Barbarossa 'in his mere backwater, the Teutonic kingdom'.⁵⁵ *Teutonicum regnum*, in Gregorian usage, had connotations that were pejorative and provincial. What Gregory meant when he used the expression was that 'Teutonic' kings had no right to become emperors without papal permission.⁵⁶ Contrary to their efforts to free the Reich from its links with Rome,⁵⁷ 'Adrian IV' insists on the subjection of the Teutons. Compared with the city of the Caesars, Aachen is no more than a forest-hut.⁵⁸ Before a pope crowned Charlemagne, who had ruled these barbarians other than buffoons wheeled around in carts?⁵⁹ Besides betraying that he cannot read straight the first chapter of Einhard's *Vita Karoli Magni*, 'Adrian IV' mixes up his predecessors, confusing the last Greek pope, St Zacharias (741–52), with Leo III (795–816). The error was too crass to be taken seriously. No longer political invective, this has become the obloquy of lampoon. Its absurdity is its

⁵⁵ *in solo suo angulo, videlicet in Teutonico regno* (ed. Höing, III, 5, 326).

⁵⁶ See E. Müller-Mertens, *Regnum Teutonicum: Aufkommen und Verbreitung der deutschen Reichs- und Königsfassung im früheren Mittelalter*, *Forschungen zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte* 15 (Vienna, 1970), 170 ff., and cf. K. Werner, 'Das hochmittelalterliche Imperium im politischen Bewusstsein Frankreichs', *HZ* 200 (1965), 1–60, especially 39–40.

⁵⁷ E. Müller-Mertens, 'Römisches Reich im Besitz der Deutschen, der König an Stelle des Augustus: Recherche zur Frage: Seit wann wird das mittelalterlich-frühneuzeitliche Reich von den Zeitgenossen als römisch und deutsch begriffen?' *HZ* 282 (2006), 1–58.

⁵⁸ Ed. Höing, III, 7, 327. The emphasis on coronation at Aachen, *locus regalis et caput Gallie trans Alpes*, as a prerequisite for the imperial dignity, with no need of Roman consent, expressed by the decretal forged in the name of Charlemagne by the German chancery (see *Aachener Urkunden 1101–1250*, ed. E. Meuthen, Publikationen der Gesellschaft für Rheinische Geschichtskunde (Cologne, 1972), no. 1; 115) may be related to this imagined charge. The decretal is set in the context of Besançon by Meuthen (*Aachener Urkunden*, 108 ff.), and its use at the canonization of Charlemagne in 1165 is interpreted by J. Petersohn, 'Kaisertum und Kultakt in der Stauferzeit', in Petersohn (ed.), *Politik und Heiligenverehrung im Hochmittelalter*, *VuF* 42 (Sigmaringen, 1994), 128–9. Aachen, where the archbishop of Cologne crowned the German king, lay in the archdiocese to which Rainald of Dassel would be elected in 1159.

⁵⁹ Ed. Höing, III, 6, 327.

point. Equally absurd is 'Adrian IV's' offer to divide up the world north and south of the Alps.⁶⁰ The idea, although patent nonsense in 1158, was not inconsistent with the recognition, already expressed in the letter by 'Barbarossa', that the identity of the men from over the mountains should be seen as a thing apart. Unwilling to be reduced to the regional level of Alemannians and unable, as yet, to proclaim themselves German, they are made by 'Rainald H' to acknowledge for the purposes of polemic their Transmontane separateness.

*Et Transmontanos, vir Transmontane, iuva nos!*⁶¹

Man from over the mountains, help your compatriots!

This verse, written by the Archpoet in Italy during the early 1160s, reverses the perspective of the polemic he composed in 1158. Then, 'on this side of the Alps', our author looked to Rome. What he saw, or fancied seeing, was a caricature of German barbarity, to which he responded in kind. His examples of invective, rude in their rhetoric, were never meant for use outside the chancery. Within it they were soon outclassed. What 'Rainald H' had produced by the spring of 1158 was superseded the following winter. In November Rahewin arrived at court, bearing the news that Otto of Freising had died and a copy of the first two books of the *Gesta Frederici*. The second of them treated the Roman theme with a sophistication unmatched by 'Rainald H' or any other intellectual of the empire in living memory. Otto bequeathed a monument to be admired, not a model to be imitated until its originality had been absorbed. Three decades would elapse before the *Gesta Frederici* was reworked by Gunther of Pairis on a suitably epic scale,⁶² and from 1159 Rahewin was engaged with its continuation. That path in prose was blocked. It is not necessary to invoke what cliché calls the anxiety of influence to see why a writer in late 1158 might recognize that any attempt to follow Otto of Freising down the trail he had blazed ran the risk of ending in failure to reach the same goal. If 'Rainald H' was not yet the Archpoet, he already had grounds for choosing a different medium and making his own way in verse.

There is no trace of verse by the Archpoet definitely datable to the end of the 1150s. He may have discarded his early experiments; surely nothing he wrote then possessed the official status of the documents he composed and copied as 'Rainald H'. The notarial side of our author's dual identity establishes that he then lived in close proximity to the most powerful man in the Reich after the emperor. All the extant works by the Archpoet are subsequent to Rainald of Dassel's election as archbishop of Cologne in 1159 and can be assigned to a period of two years (1162–4) when Rome, or antagonism to the city and the symbol, had ceased to be a pressing concern.⁶³ And a significant number of poems in the corpus are located in northern Italy, where his master, now

⁶⁰ *Divisum itaque habemus: nos cis Alpes, ille trans Alpes!* (ed. Höing, III, 7, 327).

⁶¹ *Carm.* III, 14, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 56.

⁶² See Chapter VIII.

⁶³ See J. Johrendt, 'Barbarossa, das Kaisertum und Rom', in Burkhardt et al. (eds), *Staufisches Kaisertum im 12. Jahrhundert*, 75–107.

archchancellor of the *regnum Italicum* and effectively its viceroy,⁶⁴ was occupied in imposing what he deemed the imperial right to rule on subjects who resented him and his entourage as oppressors. This is the perspective of political geography that 'Transmontane' in the verse above reflects. The term used by Italians to abuse the Archpoet and his likes is transformed to convey a sense of solidarity in a context of alienness.

Their identity, however, retained a trace of ambivalence. They looked both ways over the Alps and were capable, at times, of seeing themselves as others saw them in Italy. Defensive as well as aggressive, our author and his colleagues were not 'stupid Alemanni' precisely because they could anticipate that taunt from Rome. When Rome receded from their attention and northern Italy came to the fore, the chancery continued, even after Rainald of Dassel's lifetime, to take account of how Germans were perceived in the peninsula. During the early autumn of 1167, for example, an unidentified notary wrote in Barbarossa's name to Bishop Albert of Freising, deploring a rebellion by the Lombard cities:

They are attempting to deny and destroy the empire of the Teutons, which has been acquired and preserved up to the present by great efforts and considerable losses with the blood of very many princes and eminent men, saying: 'We do not want him to reign over us, nor shall the Teutons dominate us any longer!'⁶⁵

Here, in the only instance of ethopoeia offered by imperial encyclicals, the Reich is viewed with the disaffected gaze of its subjects. They do not describe it as Roman, still less holy, but as Teuton, which by now had become a jibe. Achievements celebrated with pathos in Barbarossa's name are regarded by the citizens of Lombardy as tyrannical. An effort (doubtless countered in the remainder of the document that has been lost) is made to enter into the minds of the rebels by one of those who tyrannized them. Ambivalence is the effect. Based on consciousness of hostility, tempered by pride in overlordship, and concentrated on the word 'Teuton', a related ambivalence is detectable in the *Gesta Frederici*, when Otto of Freising, in an antithesis of rehabilitation, opposes Teutonic iron to the Arabian gold coveted by Roman cupidity.⁶⁶ In 1158, as in 1167, 'Teutons' were to take pride in the diction used to disparage them. Less negative in nuance but far from positive, 'Transmontane', like its synonym 'Transalpine', served a complementary purpose. A terminology of togetherness was being forged from the obloquy of others. Others ought to know their

⁶⁴ See R. Herkenrath, 'I collaboratori tedeschi di Federico I', in R. Manselli and J. Riedmann (eds), *Federico Barbarossa nel dibattito storiografico in Italia e in Germania*, *Annali dell'Istituto italo-germanico* 10 (Bologna, 1982), 217–20.

⁶⁵ *Teutonicorum imperium, quod multo labore multisque dispendiis et plurimorum principum et illustrium virorum sanguine emptum et hactenus conservatum refutare et exterminare conantur, dicentes: 'Nolumus hunc segnare super nos, nec Teutonici amplius dominabuntur nobis!'* (DFI. no. 538, 486, 3–7, where the last word is *nostri*). The context is alienation, not irony, and the deponent verb is transitive. I propose *nobis*. For the biblical colouring of this rejection of rulership, cf. 1 Kings 11:12.

⁶⁶ See Chapter III.

place, which was the subordination of subjects to masters or the deference of liege-men to lords, according to Rainald of Dassel. This was an opinion that the Archpoet will have had opportunity to ponder when he accompanied the chancellor and Otto of Wittelsbach on a legation to Italy in the spring of 1158.

That the imperial legates charged with preparing the way for Barbarossa's second Italian expedition required the services of a secretary is indicated by a dispatch that survives from the series that they addressed to the emperor. He camped on the bank of the river Lech, awaiting the arrival of troops, for a week in June 1158. By then, Rahewin informs us,⁶⁷ Rainald and Otto had long been absent from court. The historian is one of the main sources of information about their activities; the chancellor is another; and, since Rahewin, during his stay at court in 1158–9, had access to oral reports of the legation by participants in it, we can distinguish how, under their influence, he presented the learned readership of the *Gesta Frederici* with a version of events strikingly different from the one earlier offered to Barbarossa. Revision of the past was at stake. The dispatch sent during the spring of 1158 seemed, by the winter, a product of wishful thinking that had been overtaken by developments since it was composed.⁶⁸ Yet it remains a revealing document in the formation of Transmontane identity, and deserves more attention than it has received. Unavailable in translation and uncommon in the original,⁶⁹ this dispatch coincides with Rahewin's account in presenting the chancellor and the count-palatine as champions of the imperial cause.⁷⁰ Both follow similar procedures, down to such details of style as wordplay and sarcasm. And in both, directly or at one remove, Rainald's presence is still palpable. The image that he began by projecting onto Barbarossa preserves a reflection of himself:

To the splendidly triumphant Lord Frederick, by divine grace the most glorious, ever-august emperor of the Romans [and] unvanquished ruler without equal Chancellor Rainald and Count-Palatine Otto [offer the assurance of their] willingness to perform wholeheartedly the services which they are bound by allegiance to render.⁷¹

Two of the terms employed in this salutation were unusual in the spring of 1158. Neither *triumphator* nor *dominator* had previously been used by the chancery, as its chief was aware. For the first there was no precedent in documents of the reign; a cognate of the second served to proclaim that the

⁶⁷ *Gesta Frederici*, iii, 21, ed. Schmale, 438.

⁶⁸ This aspect is largely ignored by P. Lamma, *Comneni e Staufer: Ricerche sui rapporti fra Bizanzio e l'Occidente nel secolo xii*, Istituto di Studi per il Medioevo 14 (Rome, 1955), 289–306, who considers the dispatch as a document in the history of relations between the Byzantine and Hohenstaufen empires. See further D. Abulafia, 'Ancona, Byzantium and the Adriatic, 1153–1173', in Abulafia, *Italy, Sicily and the Mediterranean 1100–1400*, Variorum (London, 1987), 198 ff.

⁶⁹ *Registrum oder merkwürdige Urkunden für die deutsche Geschichte*, i, ed. H. Sudendorf (Jena, 1849), no. liv, 131–3, and (extract) J. Watterich, *Pontificum Romanorum Vitae*, ii (Leipzig, 1862), 365 n. 1.

⁷⁰ See Chapter II.

⁷¹ *Inclito triumphatori, domino suo Frederico, dei gratia Romanorum imperatori gloriosissimo, semper augusto, dominatori invictissimo Reinoldus cancellarius et Otto comes palatinus servitium suum et debitae fidelitatis integritatem* (ed. Sudendorf, 131).

Poles had been defeated in September 1157.⁷² It was in such a spirit of victory, exceptional and exciting, that Rainald of Dassel greeted Barbarossa: even before entering Italy he had won successes so signal that the dispatch announcing them resounds like a blast from a herald. Blowing the imperial trumpet, the chancellor introduces notes of self-praise. In the account of the legation that follows, the shift to a simpler style is calculated to conceal the deviousness of the thought:

After the cardinals who have been sent to you withdrew from us, we made our way to Bologna and, our business there completed, set out for Ravenna. On our arrival in that city the lord archbishop, together with fourteen bishops whom he had summoned out of respect for your glory, received us with such honour and reverence that the pomp of his welcome would have seemed adequate for yourself.⁷³

What is not said here is significant. Henry, cardinal-deacon of SS Nereo and Achilleo, and Hyacinth, cardinal-deacon of S. Maria in Cosmedin—the legates sent by Pope Adrian IV with a bull explaining that, at Rome, *beneficia* meant ‘favours’ rather than ‘fiefs’—are not even named. Nor are they accorded the title of ‘lord’ that graces their hierarchical inferior, Anselm of Havelberg, who owed his appointment as archbishop and exarch of Ravenna to the services that he had performed for Barbarossa and his two predecessors. The princes of the Church are demoted with silent scorn. But their movements are noted. Rainald implies that they are engaged in a parallel mission. As he and Otto of Wittelsbach advance southwards, the agents of the pope proceed to the north. This is the only hint that the two operations are causally related. It is Rahewin, not Rainald, who provides the information or allegation that, on hearing of the imperial envoys’ arrival in Italy, Adrian IV took fright (*in melius mutato consilio*).⁷⁴ Threatened by the presence of the two enemies whom he had singled out in his bull to the German bishops, he sent his legates to mollify Barbarossa. A movement in the dispatch has become a motive in the *Gesta Frederici*.

The pope had acted not on his own initiative, but on advice from others, who included Henry the Lion.⁷⁵ His presence is invisible yet pervasive in Rainald of Dassel’s dispatch. Hence the emphasis on the achievements that the chancellor and Otto had won on Barbarossa’s behalf. Unlike Henry, these loyal servants of the crown were not pursuing an independent policy. Unspoken at this point is the incompatibility of Rainald’s wish for war and the Lion’s desire for peace, which made the meeting between the imperial and the papal legates less neutral, less casual, than the chancellor has it appear.

⁷² *iuga dominationis nostre* (DFI, no. 181, 304, 27, and cf. 305, 7).

⁷³ *Recedentibus a nobis cardinalibus, qui ad vos missi sunt, processimus usque Bononiam, peractisque ibidem nostris negotiis, iter nostrum versus Ravennam direximus. Venientes itaque ad eandem civitatem dominus archiepiscopus habens secum XIII episcopos, quos ob reverentiam gloriæ vestræ convocaverat, cum tanto honore et reverentia nos suscepit, quod apparatus eiusdem susceptionis vestre personae sufficere videretur* (ed. Sundendorf, 131).

⁷⁴ *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 21, ed. Schmale, 438, 25–6.

⁷⁵ Well discussed by Macarrone, *Papato e impero*, 246 ff.

Aware that he and Otto were unwilling to receive them, Henry and Hyacinth had to travel from Ferrara to Modena for the encounter. Such an appearance of humility had not been customary in the past⁷⁶ is the cutting comment by Rahewin, our main source for that meeting, about which he can only have learnt from Rainald or from an informant in the chancellor's entourage, such as his secretary. This sarcasm conveyed the imperial legates' hostility to the cardinals, whose reception Rahewin indicates was brief and brusque. After explaining the pacific purpose of their mission, the papal envoys 'were dismissed' (*dimittuntur*). The historic present tense highlights the violence of the verb. If it is not Rainald's own, it echoes the animosity that he half-hides from the emperor in his dispatch. There the cardinals 'withdraw': here, in Rahewin's continuation of the *Gesta Frederici*, they are sent packing. The historian lifts the veil previously drawn by the chancellor over his humiliation of Rome's representatives.

Rome was not the only adversary with which Rainald and Otto had to contend; there was also the menace of Byzantine machinations in northern Italy to be countered:

When we wished to present your legation to the citizens of Ravenna, Guglielmo Traversari, its podestà or prefect together with all the nobles and knights of the city set out for Ancona to receive money from the Greeks and swear the oath demanded of them. Indeed they had sworn to the self-same Greek who is staying at Ancona that they would protect and safeguard him and his possessions against everyone. We were staying in the lord archbishop's palace and waiting for them to return, as he had requested. When they did not do so, we left the city in anger and outrage, accompanied by the archbishop. The citizens of Ravenna who had departed encountered us on their return from Ancona, bearing the gold that they had received. There were some three hundred of them, and we had no more than ten knights. When we set eyes on them, we flew into a violent rage and set upon their horde with our few forces, the chancellor taking the lead. We captured this Traversari and his son Pietro and another six of the better citizens, although the rest escaped our clutches.⁷⁷

Self-heroizing, the chancellor brings himself to centre-stage in the role of imperial paladin. That claim may be believed: less credible are his figures. In every account of action on the battlefield given by himself, Rainald of

⁷⁶ *humilitatis formam prebentes, quod insolitum antea fuerat* (*Gesta Frederici*, iii. 24, ed. Schmale, 446, 13–14).

⁷⁷ *Cumque legationem vestram eiusdem urbis civibus vellemus presentare, Wylhelmus Traversarius, eiusdem potestas sive prefectus, totaque eiusdem civitatis nobilitas et militia Anconam profecti sunt pecuniam a Greco recepturi et iuramentum, quod ab eis exostulabatur, prestaturi. Iuratum est enim ab eis eidem Greco, qui Ancone moratur, quod ipsi personam eius et res contra omnem hominem tueri debeant ac manuteneri. Nos vero in palatio domini archiepiscopi morantes et reditum ipsorum ex petitione archiepiscopi prestolantes, cum non redirent, pleni ira et indignatione a civitate recessimus archiepiscopo in comitatu nostro existente. Egressi de civitate occurrerunt nobis Ravennates ab Ancona revertentes et aurum, quod acceperant, secum deferentes. Erant enim fere CCC et nos non amplius quam decem milites habebamus. Cumque eos intueremur, animo vehementer indignati sumus et in paucitate nostra ipsorum multitudinem, cancellario haec precipue agente, assalivimus. Cepimus itaque predictum Traversarium eiusque filium Petrum et alios VI de melioribus civitatis, alii vero de manibus nostris vix elapsi sunt* (ed. Sudendorf, 131–2).

Dassel's enemies are cast as numerically superior but militarily inferior to his irresistible might. Such auto-encomium, suitable for a dispatch to Barbarossa, was out of place in the *Gesta Frederici*. Rahewin alters it, on Rainald's instruction, assigning to Otto of Wittelsbach the main part in attacking and punishing the traitors from Ravenna.⁷⁸ Decorum demanded a revision of roles, for the historian was ill-placed to celebrate a display of bellicosity on the part of a cleric whose 'gentleness and mercy' he had just praised for their conformity to his order (*ex ordine clericali necessaria*).⁷⁹ Rainald's features remain, however, after the application of these cosmetics, when the victory against all odds is lent a comic character in Rahewin's rewriting. He alters the surname of the ringleader at Ravenna from Traversari to Maltraversari.⁸⁰ Perhaps, during the six months he spent in the peninsula, the historian had learnt enough Italian to know that *maltraversare* connotes misdemeanours with money. But it is more likely that he was seduced by the chancellor, a gifted linguist noted for his promiscuity with puns.⁸¹ Maltraversari, the rogue who accepted Byzantine bribes, is clapped into shackles of sarcasm heavier than those that weigh on the cardinal-legates.

For the clerical public who would read the *Gesta Frederici* Rainald of Dassel furnished an account of his activities during the legation designed to play down their military aspect. In a report written without restraint to Barbarossa, boasting about his exploits at arms could be complemented by a paean on power. Its setting is the last judgement; its language that of the Psalms:

As we approached Rimini we sent our messengers ahead so that the consuls would come to meet and receive us, together with our prisoners. This was done with due honour. The next day we summoned knights from all parts because friends of the Guglielmo who has been mentioned were said to have occupied the mountain-passes, and set out for Ancona, followed by the archbishop, who entreated us repeatedly on behalf of the men whom we had taken captive. You would have seen the entire earth tremble! Such was the terror that seized everyone, from the least to the greatest, that even those who lived in very well-fortified towns and castles seemed imprisoned and bound. The entire earth cried out, saying: 'Since the men of Ravenna, who are called the lords of the world, have been captured, who else can escape the clutches of such mighty binders?'⁸²

The trembling of the earth at Psalm 75: 9–10 is construed as a sign of the last days by its most influential exegete in the Middle Ages.⁸³ The retribution then

⁷⁸ *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 23, ed. Schmale, 442, 29–444, 13.

⁷⁹ *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 22, ed. Schmale, 440, 11–12, and see Chapters II and V.

⁸⁰ *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 23, ed. Schmale, 444, 7. ⁸¹ See Chapter V.

⁸² *Dum vero Ariminum appropinquaremus, premisimus nuntios nostros, ut nobis consules occurrerent et nos cum captivis nostris susciperent. Quod et factum est honorifice. Sequenti die collectis undique militibus pro eo, quod amici predicti Wylhelmi montana iam occupasse dicebantur, versus Anconiam iter nostrum direximus, archiepiscopo nos sequente et pro hominibus captivis multas preces fundente. Videretis totam terram tremere! Tantus enim terror omnibus a minimo usque ad maximum invasit, quod etiam illi, qui in munitissimis civitatibus et castris erant, capti et ligati esse videbantur. Tota enim terra clamabat dicens: 'Ex quo Ravennates, qui domini terrae dicuntur, capti sunt, quis de caetero poterit evadere de manibus tantorum ligatorum?' (ed. Sudendorf, 132).*

⁸³ *Sancti Aurelii Augustini Enarrationes in Psalmos*, LI-C, ed. E. Dekkers and J. Fraipont, CCSL 39 (Turnhout, 1956), 1046, 1–3.

taken by God on sinners is now being visited on traitors by legates who are described, in a pun defter than Maltraversari, as *ligatores*—both binders who chain rebels and enforcers of imperial rights over liege-men. Such was the sense of wordplay to which Rahewin responded. Here Rainald's *jeu de mots* is multiple, for, when 'the entire earth' calls the citizens of Ravenna 'lords of the world', it attributes to them a title reserved for the emperor. The chancellor had reason to believe that, after his dispatch had been translated, Barbarossa would grasp these allusions. Their bases were the Bible, with whose diction he was familiar from his assiduous attendance at liturgy,⁸⁴ and titulature, in which every monarch takes an interest. And the message was clear: for those disloyal to the Reich in the northern Italy of 1158, Armageddon had arrived.

Both the common notion that the end was nigh and the rarer inversion of rebels as emperors were to figure in the Archpoet's *œuvre*.⁸⁵ From Rainald of Dassel, in the spring of 1158, he began to acquire a number of the terms and concepts that made him into a distinctively Transmontane author. But there was more to be learnt from the ways in which his master thought and expressed himself. Some of them, veering between the solemn and the comic, were unusual in a dispatch to an emperor and anticipated the juxtapositions of register that would characterize the Archpoet's style. Describing the camp set up in preparation for the siege of Ancona, for instance, Rainald located it at a spot on the Adriatic coast 'where you and the count-palatine went swimming'.⁸⁶ As he had not accompanied Barbarossa on the first expedition to Rome in 1155, his knowledge of this aqueous episode derived from Otto of Wittelsbach. Familiarity tempers the formality of the tone. In the midst of an account of how he thwarted Byzantine attempts to bribe the maritime cities, Rainald finds the time to insert a domestic detail meant to appeal to the imperial sense of humour. Rahewin omits this aside and alters the order of events, not without confusion of places and persons.⁸⁷ He may have relied on the different and longer account that, in his dispatch, the chancellor promised to deliver orally;⁸⁸ undoubtedly he leaves out what was intended to be a highpoint of the narrative:

The archbishop, who was still with us and making efforts to have his men set free, after much prayerful insistence obtained the release of our captives with all their possessions, on condition that the entire city swore the oath of fidelity which it owed us. We could not do otherwise, for the archbishop waited upon us and the prisoners were virtually taken in his presence and, had we not released them, he would have been expelled from the city. We assure you, however, that in the past two hundred years Ravenna has never sworn fidelity to any emperor!⁸⁹

⁸⁴ *Gesta Frederici*, iv. 86, ed. Schmale, 708, 30–710, 3. Cf. Blaise, *Vocabulaire*, 216.

⁸⁵ See Chapters VII and X.

⁸⁶ *ubi et vos et palatinus balneastis* (ed. Sudendorf, 132).

⁸⁷ *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 23, ed. Schmale, 442, 12 ff., and see 443 n. 21.

⁸⁸ *vobis viva voce cum aliis multis, quae scribere longum foret, dicemus* (ed. Sudendorf, 132).

⁸⁹ *Archiepiscopus vero adhuc nobiscum existens et pro liberatione hominum suorum laborans multa precum instantia hoc obtinuit quod captivos cum integritate rerum suarum dimisimus, hac conditione quod tota civitas*

This last sentence situates the events of 1158 squarely in the context of Rainald's Ottonian ideals. It hardly mattered that, in 958, Otto I had not yet been crowned emperor. The imperial dignity followed from the German kingship, to which he had been elected in 936, believed his fellow-Saxon. There is no evidence that Rainald verified documents to support his claim. All he wanted to assert was Barbarossa's overlordship in northern Italy. Long years spent at Hildesheim had left their mark.⁹⁰ Through the efforts of this imperial paladin, the Hohenstaufen ruler was regaining the status of the last dynasty and requiring from the citizens of Ravenna an oath of allegiance. But it was bought at the price of prisoners' release, without which Rainald reckoned that Anselm of Havelberg would be driven out. On that pillar of authority rested a temporary settlement presented by the chancellor as a lasting success; and the precariousness of the actual position was soon exposed when Anselm died on 12 August. Writing after that date, Rahewin was encouraged to avert his readers' gaze from Ravenna. Instead he sets the oath of allegiance in Verona, and dwells on Byzantine setbacks.⁹¹ Rearrangement of material overstated in the dispatch makes Rainald of Dassel appear, in the *Gesta Frederici*, as less hot-headed than he cast himself.

To the chancellor, in the euphoria of that temporary triumph, an opportunity for action was to be seized. Rumour or gossip offered a basis for boldness; even the enemy might indicate why:

We have heard that William, the tyrant of Sicily, has dismissed the cardinals sent to him with these words: 'You have been sent to us to do down the Roman emperor and another two of you have been sent to him to seek peace and grace from him and connive at diminishing our standing! Withdraw then, withdraw from us forthwith, otherwise we shall punish you as traitors!' Consider, dearest of lords, the works of the Lord in us and the condition in which He wishes to place your empire, and on no account be swayed by advice or affection to receive with full favour the cardinals who have come to you but, after you have received a clear and satisfactory explanation from them about the letters and written materials [they are bearing], put off dealing with all other topics until we meet in Italy, for God has at this moment put you in such a position that you can, if you wish, both destroy Rome and impose your will on the pope and the cardinals!⁹²

debitam nobis juret fidelitatem. Et aliter facere non potuimus, quia archiepiscopus in nostro servitio nobiscum erat et ipsi fere eo presente capti sunt et, nisi eos dimissemus, ille expelleretur de civitate. Hoc autem vobis dicimus, quod CC anni transacti sunt quod Ravenna nulli imperatorum fidelitatem fecit! (ed. Sudendorf, 132–3).

⁹⁰ See Chapter II.

⁹¹ *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 23, ed. Schmale, 440, 19 ff., and 444, 18, and cf. Lamma, *Comneni e Staufer*, 301 ff.

⁹² *Accipimus quod Wilhelmus tyrannus Siciliae cardinales ad se missos in haec verba dimiserit: 'Vos ad nos missi estis pro contumelia imperatoris Romani et e converso alii duo missi sunt ad imperatorem, ut et pacem et gratiam eius quaerant et nostro honori insidiantur. Recedite ergo, recedite a nobis quanto citius; alioquin tanquam proditores vos puniemus!' Considerate, carissime domine, quid Dominus nobiscum operetur et in quali statu vestrum imperium esse vult et nullius unquam consilio aut dilectione cardinales, qui ad vos venerunt, in plenam gratiam suscipiatis, sed accepta ab ipsis de literis et scriptura manifesta et sufficiente satisfactione caetera omnia capitula usque ad conventum nostrum in Italia differatis, quia in tali statu Deus vos in praesenti*

Hearsay is adequate for aggression. No source is specified for the tittle-tattle from Sicily. Yet the alleged dismissal of cardinal-legates by William I bears a close and disquieting resemblance to Rahewin's account of the high-handed treatment of their colleagues by Rainald of Dassel and Otto of Wittelsbach at Modena. Was such behaviour being attributed, without cause, to the king? Suspicion creates symmetries, as Barbarossa is warned against the influence of 'advice or affection'. Among the secular and ecclesiastical princes then counselling reconciliation with Adrian IV, the most probable, because the most powerful, candidate in this category was Henry the Lion.⁹³ Between him and Rainald of Dassel tensions, which were long-standing,⁹⁴ here find a focus in the issue of relations with the papacy. Hence the chancellor's request that Barbarossa put off a decision until, in Italy, he could hear about the plans for war being made by his legates. Bellicose in its tone and vindictive in its intention, this fantasy of Rome in ruins is motivated by memories of the double-dealing that, Rainald was convinced, had led to the concordat of Benevento in 1156. Then Adrian IV, by allying himself with William I, had severed his dependence on the emperor. Now, two years later, the duplicitous diplomacy of the pope had backfired; and he should resume his proper role of subordination to Barbarossa. No German prelate in the High Middle Ages voiced openly such animus against Rome;⁹⁵ and it was typical of Rainald that he attributed to divine favour the opportunity of exacting revenge on the Vicar of Christ. Naturally none of this found its way into Rahewin's history. He suppresses the advice being urged on the emperor by his legates, describing instead how, after the papal bull had been delivered to Barbarossa and 'translated benevolently' by Otto of Freising,⁹⁶ relations were restored. Who would guess, from the *Gesta Frederici*, that the prompt making of peace represented a defeat for what Rainald of Dassel considered the cause of holy war?

His anxieties on that score are revealed by repetition. Barbarossa is again warned off other counsellors:

Nor indeed should you let those cardinals loose into the Teutonic kingdom after you have left it, should anyone you care for make this request. Otherwise, as we have written both now and previously, you will doubtless say: 'I repent not having followed your advice.' On the Sunday when *Iubilate!* is sung the Roman senators and nobles were due to come to us together with Otto, the nephew of Cardinal Octavian, in order to render to us, on the people's part, those things that regard the honour of the empire. When we have received their embassy, we will write a true account of it to you. But we do not know why you do not reply with a single

constituit quod, si vultis, et Romam destruere et de papa et cardinalibus omnem vestram voluntatem habere! (ed. Sudendorf, 133).

⁹³ Lamma, *Comneni e Staufer*, 305, suggests Otto of Freising. The reference is sufficiently general to include him, but he is unlikely to have been Rainald's main target.

⁹⁴ See Chapters II and III.

⁹⁵ Cf. Stehkämper, 'Der Reichsbischof und Territorialfürst', 148.

⁹⁶ *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 27, ed. Schmale, 452.

word to such frequent letters—assuredly either for lack of parchment or lordly negligence or the extreme slowness of the scribe in writing back.⁹⁷

The bantering tone on which this dispatch ends is related to the repetition in the first sentence. Rainald of Dassel suspects, but does not state, that those in Barbarossa's favour are delaying his replies to the legates, because they are offering him contrary advice about Adrian IV's emissaries. Neither a shortage of writing materials nor imperial dilatoriness nor scribal sloth is the real reason why communications are interrupted. No one understood better than the chancellor how important was access to the emperor.⁹⁸ But Rainald had other cards to play. His mission promised indirect contact with Cardinal Octavian of S. Cecilia. That is why his nephew, Otto of Monticelli, is singled out among the Roman emissaries due to arrive on Sunday 11 May 1158,⁹⁹ The cardinal and the chancellor had met during Rainald's youth, when Octavian was already known for his pro-imperial sympathies.¹⁰⁰ Once a papal legate in Germany, he was related to the emperor and other members of the high nobility.¹⁰¹ The pointed allusion to an aristocratic member of the Roman curia in this dispatch forms part of a process of building him up that had begun, the previous autumn, in the guidelines for the *Gesta Frederici* sent by Rainald of Dassel to Otto of Freising. There Octavian's role in leading the German troops into St Peter's by cover of night before Barbarossa's coronation is highlighted.¹⁰² No less striking, as a sign of the favour with which the emperor and his chancellor regarded the cardinal, was the enfiefment of the town and county of Terni to 'our most beloved and faithful friends',¹⁰³ Octavian and his brothers, in the late spring of 1159. And the process culminated in September of the same year with his election as Victor IV, the imperial antipope. If Rainald was far from Barbarossa's ear, absence did not deter him from signalling that his strategy was long term. At Rome he already had a cardinal on whom he could impose his will.

* * *

No one who read this dispatch doubted the identity of the imperialist who had dictated it. Rainald of Dassel is styled, unequivocally, a conqueror from the north. He may have admired the Ottonian dynasty, but he never considered recommending that Barbarossa adopt Otto III's self-description as 'Roman,

⁹⁷ *Nec etiam alicuius petitione aut amore eosdem cardinales post vos in regnum Teutonicum dimittatis. Quod si aliter quam et nunc et prius vobis scripsimus, feceritis, dicetis procul dubio: 'Poenitet me consilium vestrum non fecisse.' In dominica, qua canitur 'Jubilate!', senatores et nobiles Romanorum cum Ottone, nepote cardinalis Octaviani, ad nos venturi erant ea, quae ad honorem imperii spectant, ex parte populi ad nos delaturi. Cum acceperimus illorum legationem, verum vobis scribemus. Sed nescimus, quid detineat quod tam frequentibus literis nec una voce responderis—et certe aut membrana nulla est aut dominus negligens aut scriptor ad rescibendum tardissimus* (ed. Sudendorf, 133).

⁹⁸ Cf. Görich, *Ehre*, 36 ff.

⁹⁹ See Petersohn, *Kaisertum und Rom*, 174 n. 10.

¹⁰⁰ See Chapter II.

¹⁰¹ See P. Kehr, 'Zur Geschichte Viktors IV.', *NA* 46 (1926), 53–85.

¹⁰² *Gesta Frederici*, ed. Schmale, 86, 13–15.

¹⁰³ *dilectissimi nostri fideles et amici* (DFI, no. 275, ed. Appelt 83, 45–84, 3).

Saxon, and Italian'.¹⁰⁴ The Hohenstaufen ruler was to be perceived by his subjects as a *triumphator* and a *dominator*, and his authority imposed by legates on inferiors in the peninsula with vaunted violence and grudging concessions. The metaphors selected by Rainald and his homonym are apocalyptic. Just as the chancellor describes the earth trembling with terror at the passage of the emperor's representatives, so in the polemic by 'Rainald H' the world quivers in the clutches of the men from over the mountains. During the period in which they were developing their intimidating images of Transmontane identity, Otto of Freising worked on the second book of the *Gesta Frederici*. It both complements their ideas and marks an evolution in his own thought about the empire. Earlier, in the world-chronicle, his chief standard had been imperial unity. Even when the collapse of the whole was undeniable, Otto clung to the hope of integrity.¹⁰⁵ Then that concept gave way to another: the *Transalpinum imperium*, which does not figure in his writing until his nephew accedes to the throne. Barbarossa's presence is necessary to guarantee the rule of law. When he is in Italy, sedition spreads. This is the context in which *Transalpinum imperium* first appears, in the forty-fifth chapter of the second book of the *Gesta*. It introduces an account of the imperial assembly held at Regensburg in October 1155:

And so while the emperor dallied in Italy almost the entire Transalpine empire was shaken by sedition and thrown into disorder by violence, arson, and public feuding; and it felt the absence of its guardian.¹⁰⁶

Note the noun 'guardian' (*presul*). Applicable to a bishop, it connotes sacrality. That connotation is specified by antithesis. Unholy disorder breaks out in the Reich deprived of Barbarossa's protection. It follows that ruler and ruled are linked by a bond of mutual interest that can be expressed in a term that is more than territorial. *Transalpina*, in Otto's diction, is synonymous with *patria*.¹⁰⁷ A homeland for the Germans, the Transalpine empire is visualized by its historian as an awesome phenomenon. Reporting how, in 1156, Barbarossa condemned an imperial prince and several counts who were his accomplices in arson and larceny to the humiliating punishment of carrying dogs for a mile,¹⁰⁸ Otto notes with admiration the preventive terror spread by the

¹⁰⁴ See K. Görich, *Otto III. Romanus, Saxonicus et Italicus: Kaiserliche Rompolitik und sächsische Historiographie* (Sigmaringen, 1993).

¹⁰⁵ *Miserum imperium . . . scinditur ac tam in Transalpinis quam in Cisalpinis regionibus intra se colliditur* (*Chronicon*, vii. 15, ed. Hofmeister, 239, 24–240, 2). Cf. H.-W. Goetz, *Das Geschichtsbild bei Otto von Freising: Ein Beitrag zur historischen Vorstellungswelt und zur Geschichte des 12. Jahrhunderts* (Cologne, 1984), 291 ff. On earlier ideas of unity in Germany, see L. von Padberg, "Unus populus ex diversis gentibus": Gentilismus und Einheit im frühen Mittelalter', in C. Lüth et al. (eds), *Der Umgang mit dem Fremden in der Vormoderne* (Cologne, 1997), 155–94.

¹⁰⁶ *Denique manente in Italia principe totum pene Transalpinum imperium seditionibus motum, ferro, flamma, publicisque congressionibus turbatum absentiam sui sensit presulis* (ed. Schmale, 372, 29–31).

¹⁰⁷ . . . *ad Transalpina redire cogitur. Igitur signo dato cunctis ad patriam licentia repedandi conceditur* (*Gesta Frederici*, ii. 39 and 40, ed. Schmale, 362, 16–19).

¹⁰⁸ See B. Schwenk, 'Das Hundetragen: Ein Rechtsbrauch im Mittelalter', *Historisches Jahrbuch*, 110 (1990), 289–309.

severity of this judgement 'through the length and breadth of the entire Transalpine empire'.¹⁰⁹ Its dimensions enhance a unity imposed by law. Barbarossa, viewed in the spacious setting of his *Transalpinum imperium*, rose to the status of *pater patrie*.¹¹⁰

That title of honour in classical Latin is attested, from the beginning of the reign, in documentary sources—in the notice of Barbarossa's election, for instance, composed by Wibald of Stablo and Eberhard of Bamberg that was sent to Pope Eugenius III in the spring of 1152.¹¹¹ Otto of Freising, identifying the fatherland with the Transalpine empire, was in line with this precedent; and his example was developed further by Rahewin in the third book of the *Gesta Frederici*. There, after describing Barbarossa's ceaseless efforts on behalf of law and order in Germany, Otto's continuator declares:

The result was that, because he took measures so providently for such a mighty empire on this side of the Alps and subdued the fierceness of such great peoples with immense wisdom and without recourse to arms—wondrous to say!—he was considered not the ruler of a kingdom but the head of household to one home, the home of a single state.¹¹²

Related to Otto's concept of *pater patrie* but distinct from it,¹¹³ Rahewin's idea marks more than a nuance.¹¹⁴ Barbarossa's authority is presented as not only imperial but also paternal; the Reich is conceived as both public and domestic—a home and a state in one. Oneness and singularity, hammered home by repetition (*unius . . . unius*), are Rahewin's themes. Around the father-figure of the emperor, the peoples of Germany unite. With ethnicity shelved and conflict subdued, they possess a distinct identity. Whether it is viewed from the north or the south of the Alps makes little difference. The point is, to reassure the Germans that they are on the right side of the mountains.

On the wrong side, in Italy, stands the opposite of this ideal or idyll. Otto's irony at the expense of the Romans gives way to Rahewin's sarcasm about the northern Italians. This sarcasm hinges on the term *Conlatini*. A place name or a cognomen in classical Latin,¹¹⁵ at *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 47, it refers to the citizens of

¹⁰⁹ *Hoc tam districto iudicio per totam Transalpini imperii latitudinem promulgato tantus omnes terror invasit, ut universi magis quiescere quam bellorum turbini inservire vellent* (*Gesta Frederici*, ii. 48, ed. Schmale, 378, 18–20).

¹¹⁰ *Porro tanta ab ea die usque inpresentiarum toti Transalpino pacis iocunditas arrisit imperio, ut non solum imperator et augustus, sed et pater patrie iure dicatur Fridericus* (*Gesta Frederici*, ii. 58, ed. Schmale, 390, 12–15).

¹¹¹ DFI, no. 5, ed. Appelt, 10, 35.

¹¹² *Inde fuit, quod tam valido cis Alpes imperio ita provide consulisset, ferocitatem tantarum gentium tanto consilio ac sine armis delinisset, ut—quod dictu mirum est—iam non regni rector, sed unius domus, unius rei publice paterfamilias haberetur* (*Gesta Frederici*, iii. 17, ed. Schmale, 428, 12–16).

¹¹³ Cf. T. Eichenberger, *Patria: Studien zur Bedeutung des Wortes im Mittelalter* (6.–12. Jahrhundert), Nationes 9 (Sigmaringen, 1991), 175 ff.

¹¹⁴ The distinctness of Rahewin's approach from Otto's is rightly noted by H.-P. Appelt, 'Name und Land der Deutschen in den "Rahewini Gesta Friderici I Imperatoris"', in *Liber ad magistrum: Festgabe J. Spörl* (Munich, 1964), 63–8, but his account is not wholly accurate, nor does he discuss this passage.

¹¹⁵ Cf. Virgil, *Aeneid* vi. 774 and Livy i. 57. 6.

Cremona, Pavia, and Milan. The word means 'fellow Latins'. And what are the relations of fellow Latins with one another? Violence and vendetta:

When they are combating with swords and, by chance which both alike experience on the one side or on the other, an unfortunate is taken captive, those who are posted further afield in view of the enemy either plunge their sword-points into his throat or skew him with a javelin, while those who are inside, in order not to appear backward in their cruelty, chop up his limbs and toss them outside as a pitiable sight to his companions. Such were the relations of fellow Latins with one another.¹¹⁶

A double inversion is performed in this passage: an inversion, first, of the concord Rahewin has described in the *Transalpinum imperium*, where ethnic peace prevails under the rule of law. Secondly, the platitude that represented the Teutons as wild men is turned on its head and applied to the Italians. They, during one of the campaigns by Barbarossa that gave a new lease of life to the expression *furor Teutonicus*, are made to seem more ferocious than the Germans, because the brutality of these 'fellow Latins' is unleashed against one another. This is why it is significant that the speech that, in Rahewin's account, leads to the capitulation of Milan in 1158 is made by the Italian Count Guido of Biandrate, for whom, the following year, 'Rainald H' would compose and copy a privilege.¹¹⁷ Referring to the ancestors he shared with the citizens of Milan, Guido declares, at *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 49, that: 'they were incapable of resisting the Transalpine empire',¹¹⁸ and goes on to cite the precedents of Charlemagne and Otto I. From them to Barbarossa descends legitimacy by right of conquest, for they, like him, were rulers of the *Transalpinum imperium*. With a hierarchy within the empire established, predominance is assigned to its northern part.

If there are occasions when the subordination of the Italians seems to be modified into a form of equality, appearances deceive. During military service, for example, although the same rules applied to the 'entire army, both Cisalpine and Transalpine',¹¹⁹ no 'Teuton' was allowed to be accompanied by a 'Latin', unless he knew the 'Teutonic' tongue.¹²⁰ Orders were given in German, and Italians were expected to understand how to obey. The same attitude, expressed by Rainald of Dassel and his notary in the dispatch and the polemic of early 1158, was voiced by the historians linked with them, not in the vernacular but in distinctive idioms of the learned language. The laconic Latin that Otto of Freising attributes to Barbarossa is contrasted with peninsular prolixity. Rahewin's 'fellow Latins' demonstrate their solidarity by slitting

¹¹⁶ *Quando gladiis inter se res ageretur et mutuo casu vel hac vel illac quispiam infelix caperetur, hii qui extra in conspectu hostium aut mucronem iugulo condere aut spiculo configere, qui vero intus, ne crudelitate inferiores invenirentur, captum per membra dividere forasque suis miserabile spectaculum proicere. Et tale quidem Conlatinorum inter se commercium fuit* (*Gesta Frederici*, iii. 47, ed. Schmale, 488, 26–32).

¹¹⁷ DFI, no. 257. On Guido of Biandrate, see Chapter VII.

¹¹⁸ *imperio . . . Transalpino resistere non potuerunt* (ed. Schmale, 492, 30–1).

¹¹⁹ *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 32, ed. Schmale, 460, 31.

¹²⁰ *Gesta Frederici*, ii. 31, ed. Schmale, 460, 10–11.

one another's throats, and his Maltraversari is reduced to a pun on the penchant for venality of his co-degenerates. The taunt 'stupid Alemanni' imagined by 'Rainald H' on Roman lips exposes the boorishness on the other side of the Alps. There his master considers the only good Italian one who grovels. All these Transmontane intellectuals paint a picture of their cultural identity with broad strokes of antithesis. Coaxed or commanded by Rainald of Dassel, from different directions they converged on his ideal of empire to produce results that were rich, vivid, and combative. But what this context of strain and stress did not yield was the Archpoet. Paradoxically, his future patron, 'the beginning, the middle, and the end of the emperor's honour', inhibited his client from singing on that subject.

As 'Rainald H', our author was his master's voice. Taking down or making up in charters and dispatches what the chancellor dictated or indicated, he remained safe. More perilous was the position of Rahewin, who, in his continuation of the *Gesta Frederici*, had the unenviable task of shaping that history to suit a protagonist's reinterpretations of recent events. A misleading mention, a slighting aside, ran the risk of crossing that iron will, a risk that no one near Rainald of Dassel wished to take. At his flank in late 1158, as a series of diplomata shows,¹²¹ our author knew that political themes were as dangerous as they were delicate. The Archpoet chose not to emerge, even when circumstances called out for an encomiast. Milan had surrendered, and, after an assembly at Roncaglia where the legal lore that Rainald lacked had been applied by Italian experts in jurisprudence to defining imperial rights,¹²² Barbarossa had at last been elevated above the magnates in whose milieu he had grown up. More than any moment since his coronations in 1152 and 1155, November 1158 marked a rise in prestige. Elected, not born, to the throne, the martial duke from the Alemannian backwoods had been recognized as a Roman emperor whose legitimacy was reinforced by law. Did this achievement not deserve praise? Yet the Archpoet refrained from hymning the Hohenstaufen ruler who had scaled new heights.

No, no! rejoins the positivist. This is an argument from silence. If an occasion has been identified on which a panegyric might have been expected from our author, its absence may be ascribed to the hazards of transmission and the lacuna filled by postulating *deperdita*. Nothing arouses the repressed romanticism of those who profess fealty to facts more than such speculation about lost texts. And who will grudge them their pleasure in a game without

¹²¹ DFI, nos 221, 225, 233, 236.

¹²² G. Dilcher, 'Das staufische Herrschaftskonzept in der roncalischen Gesetzgebung und im Konstanzer Frieden: Tragende Prinzipien und innere Widersprüche', in G. Dilcher and D. Quaglioni (eds), *Gli inizi del diritto pubblico: L'età di Federico Barbarossa: legislazione e scienza del diritto*, Annali dell'istituto italo-germanico in Trento 19 (Bologna, 2007), 19–44, and K. Görich, 'Fragen zum Kontext der roncalischen Gesetze Friedrich Barbarossas', in Dilcher and Quaglioni (eds), *Gli inizi del diritto pubblico*, 305–23. Cf. G. Dilcher, 'Die staufische Renovatio im Spannungsfeld von traditionalem und neuem Denken: Rechtskonzeptionem als Handlungshorizont der Italienpolitik Friedrich Barbarossas', *HZ* 276 (2003), 613–46, and Görich, *Ehre*, 314–20.

rules? What does not survive may have existed. Yet the existential problem of proving a negative is hardly relevant here, for the Archpoet's decision against composing a work about Roncaglia conforms to a pattern of reticence. In November 1158 he had a cause to celebrate, a side to take, and a patron to please. Nonetheless he avoided the occasion, because he was not an occasional writer. Nor was he a political one, except under duress, continuing to plod in the prose of charters until his time came to take wing in verse. None of the grand happenings at which he was present or of which he heard inspired him to soar as the Archpoet. Every genre that was commemorative, each event that was public, our author shunned scrupulously, not only for motives of caution or taste. From the sense of Transmontane separateness in his milieu he deduced the principle that his own work should offer an alternative to that of his peers and predecessors. The traditional themes, the conventional forms of Latin literature in the High Middle Ages, were too boring and banal for an Archpoet. That status to which he aspired entailed symmetry with his patron. An exceptional man of the Church called for an extraordinary man of letters, who understood that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. But our author, at this point in his career, also had reason to know that one of the preconditions for his emergence was not yet fulfilled. In November 1158 Rainald of Dassel had still to reach the goal of his ambition. Months would pass until the Doppelgänger of the Archpoet, elected archbishop of Cologne, became arch-chancellor of Italy in more than name. Then the duo that had been developing in parallel approached the point at which it was free to be formed.

V

‘A Depraved Man Sowing Tares’

On 15 December 1158, Archbishop Frederick II of Cologne died at Pavia. Unlike his successor, Rainald of Dassel, he had been a natural candidate for that dignity. A member of the influential Berg family, which produced no fewer than four metropolitans in the span of a century,¹ he belonged to the high aristocracy of the Rhineland, unlike Rainald. Nor had an exact precedent for his rise been set by Arnold II (of Wied) when he was promoted from the German chancellorship to this second see of the realm in 1151. By then Arnold had been cathedral-provost at Cologne for more than twenty-three years, the last of which he spent in the city lobbying the college of priors that elected him. An outsider from Dassel who was absent in Italy would have stood small chance of winning their votes, had it not been for a mandate from the emperor. Imperial favour overcame barriers of region and rank. Rainald's election, at an indeterminable date between the mid-winter and the late spring of 1159,² was unanimous. To this commanding position in the richest city of the Reich was attached the archchancellorship of Italy, where he had already exercised legatine powers that he aimed to amplify. Was this not a cause for celebration by a writer who, while his master waited impatiently for death to oblige by creating a vacancy at Cologne,³ had stayed at his side? No, is the answer. At Rainald of Dassel's election in 1159, as at his consecration in 1165, the Archpoet remained silent.

One of the motives for his muteness is indicated by Rahewin, who was present at court both before Frederick II's death and after Barbarossa's mandate was sent, some weeks later, to the priors of Cologne. This document urging Rainald's elevation had probably been drafted by himself. Knowing that he was likely to be elected, he took measures to avoid a snag set by the boasts about martial exploits at Ravenna contained in his dispatch of 1158.⁴ A year later that was not the version of events that an archbishop-to-be wished to have preserved in a semi-official history that might be perused by clergy at Cologne. Their sensibilities could be offended by an account of their spiritual head roughing up rebels. Better, then, to reassign the leading role to Otto of

¹ See Stehkämper, 'Der Reichsbischof und Territorialfürst'.

² Knipping (ed.), *Regesten*, ii. 110, rightly draws attention to the imprecision of dating in the sources from Cologne. On the evidence of charters (DFI, nos 267 and 270), I incline to the late spring of 1159.

³ See Chapter II.

⁴ See Chapter IV.

Wittelsbach. No one would doubt the bellicosity of that layman among the legates. Nor has anyone since 1159; Rahewin is still read without suspecting him of this engaging exercise in duplicity. If that was not enough to give pause to an observer of both the original and the revised accounts of the legation, other grounds soon presented themselves to our author in the letters of congratulation that, as Rainald's secretary, he saw in 1159. One of them by Ekbert of Schönau, their former companion at Paris,⁵ was concerned with the problem of how to distinguish between spiritual status and worldly activism. Circumstances were dire. Schism had erupted in September, while Rainald was making his first visit to Cologne as its archbishop-elect. At the outset of what Ekbert described as an ecclesiastical civil war,⁶ he thought his friend in need of guidance, which he offered with a forthrightness matched only by its lack of tact. Schönau, situated in Rainald's archdiocese, was remote from his real world. Italy provided the battlefields on which this tireless campaigner in the Hohenstaufen cause would fight his way to a plenitude of vice-regal power; Cologne or the Rhineland, which he visited infrequently after 1159, were there to furnish revenues and troops. More an arch-imperialist than an archbishop in the orthodox sense of the term, Rainald of Dassel had no intention of conforming to traditional ideals of sanctity. Yet that is what Ekbert urged him to do.

Among the instances of archepiscopal virtue that he cited, the saintly Heribert (c.970–1021) figured prominently.⁷ Since he had served as chancellor to Otto III, a parallel might be drawn between him and Rainald. But the likeness was far from deep. Heribert had won fame for energetic support of monastic reform, in which his successor never displayed the slightest interest. Almost the only quality Rainald shared with him was open-handedness,⁸ and even then the Christian charity of the one resembled a magnate's munificence in the other. If this example of a predecessor to be imitated was wide of the mark, nearer to it was an Ottonian archbishop of Cologne whom Ekbert does not mention. The mighty Bruno (925–65),⁹ archduke of Lotharingia and brother of Otto the Great, whom he accompanied on his travels and campaigns, offered an apter model from Rainald's favourite period in the past. Combining authority in Church and State with imperial affinities, Bruno came to signify for the archbishop-elect what Bernward of Hildesheim had meant to him in his boyhood.¹⁰ Both of them, on his wilful misreading, represented paragons of power. Although disinclined to draw on edifying literature,

⁵ See Chapter II.

⁶ *Ecce enim effusa est contentio super principes principalis ecclesiae, que omnium mater est, et sciderunt unitatem summi sacerdotii, ruperunt vinculum pacis ecclesiastice, ita ut invicem mordeant, invicem se interficiant, anathematizando alterutrum* (ed. Roth, 315).

⁷ See H. Müller, *Heribert, Kanzler Ottos III. und Erzbischof von Köln* (Cologne, 1977).

⁸ See Rupert of Deutz, *Vita Heriberti: Edition mit Kommentar und kritischer Untersuchung*, ed. P. Dinter (Bonn, 1976), 66.

⁹ On Bruno, see best H. Mayr-Harting, *Church and Cosmos in Early Ottonian Germany: The View from Cologne* (Oxford, 2007), 1–64, with excellent bibliography.

¹⁰ See Chapter II.

Rainald might have found inspiration, not in Rupert of Deutz's Life of Heribert, but in Ruotger's biography of Bruno.

Brushing Bruno aside, Ekbert persisted in his moralizing moans. Worldly success—meaning, vainglory—had embraced Rainald, and he was succumbing to its charms.¹¹ Only by resisting them with the rigour of his predecessors would he avoid the snares of avarice and corruption.¹² Those two vices were among the few that even his enemies did not impute to the archbishop-elect. Irrelevant in Rainald's case, the admonition nonetheless had a familiar ring to the trained ear of the Archpoet. Ekbert, a sometime student of logic and dialectic, had regressed to the platitudes of monastic reformers during the investiture crisis. Such were the commonplaces that our author would go on to mock for the amusement of a patron who had little time for the scruples of the cloister and less patience for the meddling of monks. After the frustration of being denied the labour of a lay-brother by Prior Ulrich of Steinfeld on the grounds that he should be working for his soul,¹³ Rainald of Dassel dealt briskly with business at Cologne, gathered a force of 300 select knights,¹⁴ and returned to Italy in order to serve at Barbarossa's side. Military campaigns for the sake of empire took precedence over pastoral care.

The same issue was treated with greater diplomacy by Philip of Harvengt, writing from Bonne-Espérance after the election.¹⁵ An expert on clerical conduct, he was also aware of how much regular canons like himself owed to the support of the German episcopate.¹⁶ Philip praises Rainald's statesmanship and scholarship, which qualified him for high office in the Church, before adding that it was there, not in secular affairs, that he should realize his treble vocation as a cleric, a priest, and a bishop. At the time this claim was made, Rainald of Dassel had been neither ordained nor consecrated; and six years would pass before he proceeded to higher orders. It is possible that Philip, at Bonne-Espérance, was ill-informed about the situation at Cologne, but it is certain that he knew, from Rainald himself, of the recent expedition to Italy where he describes the archbishop-elect as a leader among the leaders who campaigned without unsheathing his sword.¹⁷ In that assertion of falsehood Philip coincides with Rahewin. Duped or complicit, both of them circle warily around the same point. Rainald of Dassel might ignore Ekbert of Schönau's strictures on the topic of worldliness, but in 1159 he took precautions to keep up clerical appearances on the specific heading of a prelate-at-arms. Hence the ill-ease, tinged with comedy, of the intellectuals who wrote to or about him at

¹¹ *Felicitur, ut dicunt, incedis, utinam bene, non enim omne quod felicitur, bene. Felicitas mundi porrexit tibi manum, et amplexata est te, et inisti fedus cum ea* (ed. Roth, 312).

¹² Ed. Roth, 313.

¹³ Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus miraculorum*, iv. 62, ed. J. Strange, i (Cologne, 1851), 230.

¹⁴ Knipping (ed.), *Regesten*, ii. 114.

¹⁵ PL 203, 160A–165A.

¹⁶ See S. Weinfurter, 'Reformkanoniker und Reichsepiskopat im Hochmittelalter', in Weinfurter, *Gelebte Ordnung—Gedachte Ordnung. Ausgewählte Beiträge zu Königtum, Kirche und Reich*, ed. H. Kluger et al. (Ostfildern, 2005), 3–34.

¹⁷ PL 203 160D.

this time. Yet neither Philip nor Ekbert nor Rahewin equalled the unconscious humour of the monks at Grafschaft in Westphalia, who, admittedly in an attempt to placate Rainald at a tense moment between them, hailed him on his election as a prince of peace.¹⁸

In the immediate proximity of this chameleon, the Archpoet held his tongue. How to speak out on the subject of an ecclesiastical man of the world who, although obdurate in his opposition to separating the clergy from the laity, had to acknowledge the impact of this ideal on others? It was one thing to eulogize an Ottonian archbishop in the manner of Ruotger before the reform: after it, quite another to reconcile twelfth-century qualms of conscience with Rainald's unscrupulousness. He never displayed any trace of the crisis that would lead Thomas Becket, after receiving the *pallium* from Alexander III in August 1162, to resign the English chancellorship.¹⁹ Retaining the seal of his former office and ruling Italy as its effective master, Rainald dispensed with that band of white wool embroidered with crosses.²⁰ Symbolic of acknowledgement by and loyalty to the pope, the *pallium* was a treasure of trust for which earlier archbishops in Germany had strived.²¹ Not Rainald of Dassel, whose motives were multiple and compelling. His election had been condemned by Adrian IV, John of Salisbury reports credibly,²² since that pope had likened him to the devil and deplored him as a blasphemer. Moreover, Rome in the recent past had taken a dim view of imperial candidates for metropolitan sees, demonstrated by its rejection of Count Guido of Biandrate's son to succeed Anselm of Havelberg in the archbishopric of Ravenna.²³ Why seek the *pallium*, when the request was sure to be turned down? Why bother to be consecrated, when the act, which might be annulled, required Rainald to forgo an ample income from plural benefices?²⁴ Flush with funds, he was secure in his position as an imperial prince and could afford to thumb his nose at the indignation of the orthodox. For the dukedom of Cologne, created in 1151 by Conrad III,²⁵ he answered only to Barbarossa. With the appreciative emperor he was on the best of terms. Since October 1157 he had been at

¹⁸ See *Veterum scriptorum . . . amplissima collectio*, ed. Martène and Durand, i. 856A.

¹⁹ See Duggan, *Becket*, 25 ff.

²⁰ See H. Leclercq, 'Pallium', in *Dictionnaire d'art chrétien et de liturgie* (Paris, 1934), xiii. 931–40. For an illustration, cf. J. Majo, *A History of Ecclesiastical Dress* (London, 1984), 163, no. 92. See further Chapter IX.

²¹ The *locus classicus* in the earlier ecclesiastical history of medieval Germany is Ruotger, *Vita Brunonis*, chs 26–7, ed. I. Ott, *Ruotgers Lebensbeschreibung des Erzbischofs Bruno von Köln*, MGH SrG NS 10 (Weimar, 1951), 26–7. For strife about the *pallium*, see T. Zotz, 'Pallium et alia quaedam archiepiscopatus insignia: Zum Beziehungsgefüge und zu Rangfragen der Reichskirchen im Spiegel der päpstlichen Privilegierung des 10. und 11. Jahrhunderts', in H. Maurer and H. Patze (eds), *Festschrift für B. Schwinköper* (Sigmaringen, 1982), 155–76.

²² Ep. 124, *The Letters of John of Salisbury*, i, ed. Millor, Butler, and Brooke, 212.

²³ See *Gesta Frederici*, iv. 18 ff., ed. Schmale, 552 ff., with Macarrone, *Papato e impero*, 278 ff.

²⁴ Cf. K. Schambach, 'Das Verhalten Rainalds von Dassel zum Empfang der höchsten Weihen', *Zeitschrift des historischen Vereins für Niedersachsen*, 80 (1915), 173–95.

²⁵ See M. Groten, *Priorenkolleg und Domkapitel im Hohen Mittelalter: Zur Geschichte des kölnischen Erzstifts und Herzogtums*, *Rheinisches Archiv* 109 (Bonn 1980), 143 ff., and cf. Stehkämper, 'Der Reichsbischof und Territorialfürst', 134; Engels, *Stauferstudien*, 145 and, for background,

daggers drawn with the papacy. So the patron of the Archpoet bided his time until, in a gesture emblematic of his career and character, he received the *pallium* from Paschal III, an antipope of his own making.

* * *

Paschal III was imposed by Rainald of Dassel in order to prolong a schism that had begun, shortly after the death of Adrian IV on 1 September 1159, with the contested election of Victor IV.²⁶ One of the first of those to whom this antipope announced his dubious dignity, on 7 September, was his 'brother' (*frater*) of Cologne.²⁷ That term implied a recognition of Rainald's archepiscopal status that Adrian had denied.²⁸ Pledging his friendship, Victor looked forward to the restoration of harmony between the empire and papacy that had been inaugurated by his choice of name. Victor II (1055–7), the last of four German popes nominated by the emperor Henry III, was an opponent of Sicilian expansion; and that issue remained live a century later. The concordat of Benevento, which the imperialists viewed with suspicion as an alliance between the pope and King William I of Sicily that threatened their interests, had been negotiated in 1156 by Roland, then cardinal of S. Marco and chancellor of the Roman Church, who was now styling himself Alexander III. For his presumption at Besançon the following year he had been menaced with Otto of Wittelsbach's unsheathed sword²⁹—not for the last time, to judge from a protest by the Alexandrian cardinals to Barbarossa about the count-palatine, then a legate in Rome, and his use of 'excessive force' in the papal election.³⁰ Violence was invariably Otto's tactic, but he did not lack a strategy. The brawn of Hohenstaufen imperialism was accustomed to guidance from its brain, and Rainald of Dassel had shown unmistakable signs of favour to Victor IV when he was Cardinal Octavian of S. Cecilia. In the first act of the schism's drama, the emperor remained in the wings, laying siege to Crema. Absent at Cologne, Rainald had prompted Otto for his part of armed intervention long before the curtain rose in the holy city.

Schism is a fundamental feature of the Archpoet's world to which he never refers directly. Before, throughout, and after his lifetime the Church was turned

G. Droege, 'Lehnrecht und Landrecht am Niederrhein und das Problem der Territorialbildung im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert', in *Festschrift für F. Steinbach* (Bonn, 1960), 278–307, especially 295.

²⁶ Cf. T. Reuter, 'The Papal Schism, the Empire and the West', unpublished D.Phil. thesis (University of Oxford, 1975), and J. Laudage, *Alexander III. und Friedrich Barbarossa*, *Forschungen zur Kaiser- und Papstgeschichte des Mittelalters*. Beihefte zu J. F. Böhmer, *Regesta Imperii*, 16 (Köln, 1997).

²⁷ *Regesta pontificum Romanorum*, ii, ed. P. Jaffé (Leipzig, 1888), no. 14425, and *Chronica regia Coloniensis*, ed. G. Waitz, Sr 9 18 (Hanover, 1880), 106–7.

²⁸ In a letter of 27 February 1160 to Abbot Henry of Lorsch (*Regesta*, ed. Jaffé, ii, no. 14436), Victor IV referred to Rainald as *electus Coloniensis*.

²⁹ See Chapter III.

³⁰ *comes palatinus, nuntius vester, auctoribus eiusdem schismatis vires non modicas imperiali potentia ministravit* (W. Holtzmann (ed.), 'Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte Friedrich Barbarossas', NA 48 (1930), 399, and cf. *Gesta Frederici*, iv. 63, ed. Schmale, 642, 14–18).

upside down. Antipopes had abounded since the beginning of the twelfth century, which was more fertile of such figures than any other in ecclesiastical history: Theodoric (1100–1), A[da]lbert (1101), Silvester IV (1105–11), Gregory VIII (1118–21), Celestine II (1124–5/6), Anacletus II (1130–8), Victor IV (March–May 1138)—and then, cancelling the memory of his ephemeral predecessor, another of the same name and number (1159–64). No less than eight antipopes to date, without an end in sight, suggest that the concept of apostolic succession had become as hazy as the notion of imperial authority was imprecise. While others hesitated on such subjects, Rainald of Dassel was adamant. Long after the realities of high-medieval politics should have suggested the need for adaptation, he persisted in the ill-founded convictions of his youth. As late as 10 November 1163, for example, he instructed 'Rainald H' to imitate Justinian and refer to a series of popes as 'bishops of our agreeable city' (*alme urbis nostre pontifices*).³¹ If Rome was an imperial capital, it followed that the Roman pontiff should be appointed by the emperor. But Barbarossa was neither Henry III nor Otto III, who were able to impose their nominees; and Rainald of Dassel remained inflexible in his refusal to acknowledge that times had changed.

So did his opponents. Both sides in the Victorine schism employed a rhetoric that was out of touch with contemporary developments. Recording, a generation later, how the antipope had condemned his opponents as heretics and schismatics, a chronicler at Cologne remarked that they did the same.³² The dryness of his comment on this tit-for-tat should not obscure its perceptiveness. The mud-slinging was symmetrical; each stood the other's claims on their heads; and a rich talent for inversion was undermined by a poverty of arguments. No one addressed with the attention it deserved the key issue of whether an election by the *pars sanior*—meaning, a minority whose 'sound opinion' ought to prevail—of cardinals was valid. Nor did anyone link that problem to the resolution, made at Adrian IV's deathbed, to proceed by 'common consent' in order to avert the strife provoked by the Anacletan schism of 1130.³³ Barely had the Victorines alleged that pretext for opposing the election of Cardinal Roland than they passed to accusations of conspiracy and recriminations about 'godless oaths'. The Alexandrians, equally swift to abuse and just as slow to explain, were hardly different from their antagonists. Consider, for instance, a document that, because it is preserved in Rahewin's continuation of the *Gesta Frederici* and in another letter-collection, was probably available to the imperialists late in 1159. It is a bull addressed by Alexander III to the bishop, jurists, and scholars of Bologna during October of the year that attempts to convey how Victor IV's behaviour during the conclave undermined his title to the papacy:

³¹ DFI, no. 413, ed. Appelt, 298, 3–4; cf. Rahewin: *status urbis, que caput imperii nostri est* (*Gesta Frederici*, iv. 65, ed. Schmale, 646, 8–9). For context, see J. Johrendt, 'Barbarossa, das Kaisertum und Rom', in Burkhardt et al. (eds), *Staufisches Kaisertum*, 82–3.

³² *Chronica*, ed. Waitz, 107.

³³ *Gesta Frederici*, iv. 62, ed. Schmale, 636.

And so [having obtained the support of two cardinal-electors] Octavian degenerated into such crazy waywardness that, as if possessed by an evil spirit, he seized violently with his own hands from our neck the mantle in which Odo, the prior of the [cardinal-]deacons, according to ecclesiastical custom had dressed us, despite our resistance and refusal on account of our self-evident inadequacy, and carried it off with him amid noisy growls. But when a number of the senators caught sight of such an enormity, one of them, illuminated by the Holy Spirit, snatched the same mantle from the lunatic's hand. He, there and then, turned his fiery gaze on a chaplain of his who had come instructed and prepared for this eventuality and, beside himself, shouted and glared that he should produce with all haste the mantle which he had brought with him fraudulently. When it was delivered without delay, Octavian took off his hat and bent his head, although all his fellow-cardinals were either absent or opposed, and, helped by the same chaplain and another cleric of his, put on the mantle with overweening ambition; he himself served as assistant to the chaplain and the cleric in this task, for there was no one else. But, by divine judgement, as we believe, it happened that the part of the mantle which should have covered the front went over the back, to the mirth of many witnesses, and while he made determined efforts to put this right, he attached the fringes to his neck because, out of his mind, he could not find the top of the mantle, with the effect that it at least appeared to be stuck onto him in one way or another. And so it occurred that, just as he was of perverse mind and crossed purpose, so the mantle he had put on crosswise and twisted bore witness to his damnation.³⁴

Both satirical and symbolic, this passage from Alexander III's letter touches on a topic with which Ekbert of Schönau had dealt when writing to Rainald of Dassel on his election. Then papal vestments had been described as emblematic of virtue:³⁵ now the subject is a robing constitutive of the pope's authority. But, in the topsy-turvy world of schism, Victor IV's mantle is as askew as his state of mind. Crazily seizing the garment that his rival, with the modesty becoming to a candidate for the highest office, desired to decline, he is aided not by princes of the Church but by clerical stooges. The vestment is back to front, the procedure upside down. Reduced to an object of ridicule, the profaner of immantation lacks identity of his own, becoming, in the rest of

³⁴ *Unde et ipse Octavianus in tantum audaciam vesaniamque prorupit, quod mantum, quo nos reluctantes et renitentes, quia nostram insufficientiam videbamus, iuxta morem ecclesie Oddo prior diaconorum induerat, tamquam arreptitius a collo nostro propriis manibus violenter excussit et secum inter tumultuosos fremitus asportavit. Ceterum cum quidam de senatoribus tantum facinus inspexissent, unus ex eis spiritu divino succensus mantum ipsum de manu eripuit sevientis. Ipse vero ad quendam capellanum suum, qui ad hoc instructus venerat paratus, ilico flammeos oculos fremebundus inflexit clamans et innuens, ut mantum, quem fraudulenter secum portaverat, festinanter afferret. Quo utique sine mora delato idem Octavianus astracto pilleo et capite inclinato cunctis fratribus aut loco inde aut voluntate remotis mantum per manum eiusdem capellani et cuiusdam alterius clerici sui ambitiosius assumpsit, et ipse idem, quia non erat alius, in hoc opere capellano et clerico extitit coadiutor. Verum ex divino credimus iudicio contigisse, quod ea pars manti, que tegere anteriora debuerat, multis videntibus et ridentibus posteriora tegebat; et cum ipse idem hoc emendare studiosius voluisset, quia capitium manti extra se raptus non poterat invenire, collo fimbrias circumduxit, ut saltem mantus ipse appensus ei quodam modo videretur. Sicque factum est, ut, sicut torte mentis erat et intentionis oblique, ita ex transverso et obliquo mantum fuerit in testimonium sue dampnationis indutus (Gesta Frederici, iii. 61, ed. Schmale, 626, 33–628, 23, and Ep. 41, in Die Admonter Briefsammlung, ed. G. Hödl and P. Classen MGH, Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit (Munich, 1983), 81, 7–27).*

³⁵ Ed. Roth, 316–17.

the letter, nothing more than a statue of self-glory, an idol, a phantom. Such stereotypes scarcely varied, in orthodox polemic, from the fourth century to the twelfth. Eloquent in expressing hostility and horror, they were inarticulate on the plane of argument. For all its vividness and length, this passage tells us nothing more than that Victor IV's claim to have been immantated first, with Alexander III's consent, was utterly and absurdly false. The schism, pursued so dogmatically both by Rainald of Dassel and by his adversaries, gave a new lease of life to cliché, but inspired little else from Latin authors.³⁶ Rahewin, in the imperialist camp, calls the conflict a major event,³⁷ before breaking off to relate the siege of Crema. Recurring with reluctance to the invidious task, he makes a point of citing documents from both sides without comment of his own.³⁸ This is not objectivity but aversion, which the Archpoet shared for the subject of how the unity of Christendom had been severed. In close proximity to the leading supporter of Victor IV, our author never refers directly to the antipope or to the Alexandrians.

* * *

On the Alexandrian side the most vociferous spokesman of orthodoxy was John of Salisbury. Religious motives heightened and hardened his long-standing antipathy to the Germans.³⁹ At Paris, during the 1130s, he had learnt to loathe such 'Cornifician' sophists as our author and his master. A decade later, at the council of Reims, John identified in Rainald of Dassel a 'Teutonic' opponent of ecclesiastical reform.⁴⁰ Experience widened the rift. John boasted of his intimacy with Adrian IV, the English pope who condemned the German chancellor as 'a depraved man sowing tares', and went on to serve Thomas Becket, who roundly rejected the model of clerical subordination to secular power that Rainald was meant to set him. But even earlier, while working for Theobald, Becket's predecessor as archbishop of Canterbury, John had expressed misgivings about the man whom he described as the emperor's agent in a plot to dupe Henry II of England into supporting the German antipope.⁴¹ No matter that this letter refers to Rainald as Barbarossa's chancellor in May–June 1160, when he no longer occupied that office: what counted was the perception of partnership in schismatic error with Barbarossa. Within weeks John would be portraying them as a diabolic duo.

Writing in the early summer of the same year to Master Ralph of Sarre, he characterizes the assembly recently convened at Pavia to decide the schism in favour of Victor IV as a 'mini-meeting' (*conventiculum*).⁴² The diminutive,

³⁶ Cf. MGH Libelli de lite imperatorum et pontificum, iii. 526–54, 561–2.

³⁷ *Gesta Frederici*, iv. 52, ed. Schmale, 610.

³⁸ *Gesta Frederici*, iv. 59, ed. Schmale, 620, 27 ff.

³⁹ See T. Reuter, 'John of Salisbury and the Germans', in M. Wilks (ed.), *The World of John of Salisbury*, Studies in Church history Subsidia 3 (Oxford, 1984), 415–26.

⁴⁰ See Chapter II.

⁴¹ Ep. 121, *The Letters of John of Salisbury*, i. ed. Millor, Butler, and Brooke, 200.

⁴² Ep. 124, *The Letters of John of Salisbury*, i. ed. Millor, Butler, and Brooke, 205. On the synod of Pavia, see H. Wolter, 'Friedrich Barbarossa und die Synode zu Pavia im Jahre 1160', in H. Vollrath

redolent of heterodoxy, was meant to be dismissive. But the convocation rewritten in the emperor's name by Rainald of Dassel avoids the term 'synod',⁴³ and, although the opening speech attributed to Barbarossa by Rahevin cites late antique and medieval precedents for his right to summon ecclesiastical dignitaries to determine who was the legitimate pope, it explicitly disclaims any imperial right of appointment.⁴⁴ Such was the official line, contradicted by other sources. The eyewitness Vincent of Prague reports that, at Pavia, Rainald of Dassel, the patriarch of Aquileia, and the archbishop of Mainz declared that 'Roland', *alias* Alexander III, should be held in contempt for having spurned the emperor's summons and the judgement of the Church.⁴⁵ 'Which Church?' John of Salisbury might have retorted. All he saw was a conspiracy of imperialists, a *conventiculum* of heretics. The Victorines, according to their opponents, behaved with a scarcely credible clumsiness in which John believed. He supports that far from impartial source, Cardinal Boso, in relating that, even before the meeting took place at Pavia, Barbarossa addressed Victor reverently as the pope, while demoting Alexander to his former rank as chancellor.⁴⁶ Such obvious bias is incompatible with an underhand design, but that is what John of Salisbury attributes to 'the emperor of the Teutons' in his alleged attempt to outwit Henry II of England by his 'machinations'. John's term 'machinations' (*fraudentiae*) is a synonym of Adrian IV's 'tares' (*zizania*).⁴⁷ Literal or figurative, the language of orthodoxy placed Barbarossa and Rainald in parallel. Their iniquity, according to John, had emerged at Besançon, to which Pavia was the sequel. The case that he proceeds to develop against the Germans is framed in a triad of rhetorical questions.

First John asks: 'Who has subjected the universal Church to the judgement of a particular church?' (*Universalem Ecclesiam quis particularis ecclesiae subiecit iudicio?*) Just as in 1148 at Reims the German dissidents, among whom Rainald of Dassel stood out, rejected a canon that should have been binding for all, so in 1160 at Pavia they were setting themselves apart from and above the rest. That is why they are now to be taken down a peg. *Particularis* connotes not individuality but estrangement—the presumption of a part claiming to exercise judgement over the whole, in the classic definition of a sect. The term that John uses to ridicule its members is the same that is employed by the persona of Adrian IV in invectives written by the Archpoet after Besançon: 'Who has

and S. Weinfurter (eds), Köln: *Stadt und Bistum in Kirche und Reich des Mittelalters: Festschrift für O. Engels zum 65. Geburtstag*, Kölner Historische Abhandlungen 39 (Cologne, 1993), 415–53.

⁴³ *Gesta Frederici*, iv, 65, ed. Schmale, 644 ff. (= DFI, no. 285). On Rainald's authorship of this document, see H.-J. Kirfel, *Weltherrschaftsidee und Bündnispolitik: Untersuchungen zur auswärtigen Politik der Staufer*, Bonner Historische Forschungen 12 (Bonn, 1959), 179.

⁴⁴ *Non est nostrum de vobis iudicare* (*Gesta Frederici*, iv, 74, ed. Schmale, 662, 8–9).

⁴⁵ *Quia Rolandus vocationem imperatoris et iudicium Ecclesie spernit, spernatur et ipse* (*Annales* s. a. 1160, ed. W. Wattenbach, MGH SS 17 (Hanover, 1861), 679, 9).

⁴⁶ Boso, *Vita Alexandri III*, in *Liber pontificalis*, ii, ed. Duchesne, 401.

⁴⁷ *Nos autem timemus supra modum, ne Teutonicus imperator circumveniat fraudulentis suis et subvertat serenitatem principis nostri* (Ep. 124, in *The Letters of John of Salisbury*, i, ed. Millor, Butler, and Brooke, 205).

appointed the Teutons to be the judges of nations?’ (*Quis Teutonicos constituit iudices nationum?*) With Teutonic arrogance is contrasted the humility of Christ (Luke 12:14 and cf. Exodus 2:14 and Acts 7:35); against the boasts of Barbarossa and Rainald about the empire’s authority is erected the barrier represented by the ‘nations’ who maintain their independence in realms where the imperial writ does not run.⁴⁸ Then the limits of sovereignty are linked to the boundaries of civilization by the third element in John’s triad: ‘Who has given this authority to brutish and headstrong men that they presume to set a prince over the heads of mankind’s sons?’ (*Quis hanc brutis et impetuosos hominibus auctoritatem contulit, ut pro arbitrio principem statuunt super capita filiorum hominum?*)⁴⁹ God, Rainald of Dassel might have answered, had endowed the emperor with comprehensive jurisdiction. But that was a category that John of Salisbury did not acknowledge. He recognized only the *universalis Ecclesia*—one, holy, apostolic. Outside it lay particularism, presumption, and barbarity—a wilderness of ‘brutish’ and ‘headstrong’ savages whom his polemic relegates beyond the pale of rationality. John does not say ‘stupid Alemanni’, but that is what he means.

In 1158 the Archpoet was able to anticipate such polemic, because it operated with hoary stereotypes. Telling is the term in which John’s invective culminates: *furor*, the insensate ferocity ascribed to ‘Teutons’ since the Germanic invasions.⁵⁰ Revived by him and others among the conflicts of the schism and against the background of Barbarossa’s wars in Italy,⁵¹ it served as a slogan for hostility masquerading as secret information. ‘I know what the Teuton is plotting’ (*Scio quod Teutonicus molitur*⁵²), declared John of Salisbury, before revealing Barbarossa’s design to conquer the world with the spiritual aid of the papacy. Neither the notice of his election to the kingship of Germany, delivered to Eugenius III in 1152 when John was at Rome, nor the concordat of

⁴⁸ See J. Ehlers, ‘Was sind und wie bilden sich *nationes* im mittelalterlichen Europa (10.–15. Jahrhundert)? Begriff und allgemeine Konturen’, and B. Schneidmüller, ‘Reich—Volk—Nation: Die Entstehung des deutschen Reiches und der deutschen Nation im Mittelalter’, in A. Bues and R. Rexheuser (eds), *Mittelalterliche nationes—neuzeitliche Nationen. Probleme der Nationsbildung in Europa* (Wiesbaden, 1995), 7–26, 73–102. Cf. Ehlers, ‘Imperium und Nationsbildung im europäischen Vergleich’, in Schneidmüller and Weinfurter (eds), *Heilig. Römisch. Deutsch*, 84–100.

⁴⁹ Ep. 124, in *The Letters of John of Salisbury*, i, ed. Millor, Butler, and Brooke, 206.

⁵⁰ See E. Dümmler, ‘Über den *furor Teutonicus*’, in *Sitzungsberichte der königlichen preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, (Berlin) Philologisch-historische Klasse IX (1897), 112–26, and F. Curta, ‘*Furor Teutonicus*: A Note on Ethnic Stereotypes in Suger’s Deeds of Louis the Fat’, *Haskins Society Journal: Studies in Medieval History*, 16 (2005), 62–76. For context, cf. K. Heitmann, ‘Das Deutschenbild im Italien des Mittelalters’, in Heitmann (ed.), *Spiegelungen: Romanistische Beiträge zur Imagologie*, ed. G. Pichernell and O. Roth, *Studia Romanica* 86 (Heidelberg, 1996), 163–201, and H. Zug Tucci, ‘Dalla polemica antiimperiale alla polemica antitedesca’, in P. Cammarosano (ed.), *Le forme della propaganda politica nel Due-Trecento*, Collection de l’École française de Rome 20 (Rome, 1994), 45–64.

⁵¹ See W. Giese, ‘*Rex ruffe, furoris Teutonici ductor!* Kaiser Friedrich Barbarossas Kriegsführung in Italien—Ein Wiederaufstehen des *furor Teutonicus*’, in U. Lindgren et al. (eds), *Sine ira et studio: Militärgeschichtliche Studien zur Erinnerung an H. Schmidt, Münchener Historische Studien*, Abt. Mittelalterliche Geschichte (Kallmünz, 2001), 41–50, and H. Krieg, *Herrscherdarstellung der Stauferzeit: Friedrich Barbarossa im Spiegel seiner Urkunden und der staufischen Geschichtsschreibung*, *VuF Sonderheft* 50 (Ostfildern, 2003), 69–76, 97 ff., 180, 199 ff., 219 ff.

⁵² Ep. 124, in *The Letters of John of Salisbury*, i, ed. Millor, Butler, and Brooke, 207.

Constance in the following year even hints at such fabrications of imperialist fantasy. Groundless gossip is purveyed by this polemicist, in order to ridicule the motives of his opponents. The worst of them, Rainald of Dassel, did not hesitate to be consecrated by Victor IV because he feared 'imminent ruin', as John alleges, but ignored the issue, for he had the antipope in his pocket. And, however influential Count Guido of Biandrate was in Ravenna after Adrian IV had denied his son preferment there, as a layman he could not act as archbishop . . . Such speculation and innuendo invite a comment made with inadvertent humour by their author: 'To whom would these things not seem absurd? This is a sort of stage-play . . .' (*Cui non haec ridicula videantur? Scaenae theatralis haec species est . . .*).⁵³ Indeed it was: a theatre of the absurd acted out in John of Salisbury's mind.

When the play reopened, in the late summer of 1165, little had changed in John's farce of animus and inaccuracy. He informed Becket that Archbishop-elect Christian of Mainz was Rainald of Dassel's successor in the German chancellorship,⁵⁴ an office that by 24 September of that year he vacated.⁵⁵ That detail, however, mattered less than the association between imperial service and what John condemned as 'persecution of the Church, conflict and carnage among peoples, and subversion of cities' (*persecutione Ecclesiae et collisione et strage gentium et eversione civitatum*). Christian and Rainald were partners in crime, emboldened by the prophecies of pseudo-seers who, besides being 'Teutonic', were discredibly female (*nescio quas prophetissas Teutonicas*). This pantomime of profanity that John imagined on the German scene was interrupted when, later in that year, a member of Becket's circle, Gerard Pucelle, went to Cologne to teach canon law.⁵⁶ Whether he was sent as an intermediary between the Alexandrians and the Victorines, we cannot tell: if Gerard had a secret mission, John of Salisbury was not in the know. He urged his friend to act as an evangelist, 'calling the aberrant back from schism' (*ut errantes studeatis a scismate revocare*). Striking, in this passage of ill-conceived advice, is the image of the audience that John urged Gerard to address. They were 'barbarians', susceptible to being intimidated by Barbarossa or misled by Rainald of Dassel.⁵⁷ Yet the schismatics were also sophisticated enough to revere learning and regard Gerard as an oracle.⁵⁸ How then were these 'brutish' and 'headstrong'

⁵³ Ep. 124, in *The Letters of John of Salisbury*, i. ed. Millor, Butler, and Brooke, 212.

⁵⁴ Ep. 152, in *The Letters of John of Salisbury*, ii, *The Later Letters (1163–1180)*, ed. W. Millor, SJ, and C. Brooke (Oxford, 1979), 54.

⁵⁵ DFL, no. 491 (and cf. 490).

⁵⁶ See S. Kuttner and E. Rathbone, 'Anglo-Norman Canonists of the Twelfth Century', *Traditio*, 7 (1949–50), 279–358, and J. Fried, 'Gerard Pucelle und Köln', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Kanonistische Abteilung* 68 (1982), 125–35. Cf. J. Huffmann, *Family, Commerce, and Religion in Cologne and London. Anglo-German Emigrants, c.1000–c.1300* (Cambridge, 1999), 220 ff.

⁵⁷ . . . nec se metu imperatoris aut scismatici Coloniensis circumventionem patientur a Christi corpore separari; nam fortasse pro salute multorum vos Dominus ad hos barbaros destinavit (Ep. 158, in *The Letters of John of Salisbury*, ii, ed. Millor, Butler, and Brooke, 70).

⁵⁸ quadam litterarum et virtutum praemineatis auctoritate, ut apud barbaros quod discretio vestra dictaverit reputent sacrosanctum (Ep. 158, in *The Letters of John of Salisbury*, ii, ed. Millor, Butler, and Brooke, 68).

Teutons able to appreciate an Englishman's pearls of scholarship? Why, if they were so backward, did they develop under Gerard Pucelle's influence a major school of canon law?⁵⁹ John of Salisbury might have answered such questions, had he accepted his friend's request to visit him at Cologne.⁶⁰ Or maybe Gerard, remembering the rantings inflicted on him, meant this invitation into the lion's den ironically.

Rainald of Dassel's responsibility for the schism was never doubted by John, and time only increased his animosity. The archbishop-elect—or, more accurately, the 'usurper' of Cologne, in league with the emperor—was conceived by his enemy in biblical terms of bestiality. Yet, when John, drawing on Revelations (9:3, 10, 19), likened Rainald to 'the greatest among the locusts of the beasts, whose power is in their tongue and their tails',⁶¹ he cites an instance of wordplay that rings credible. 'The schismatic of Cologne', according to him, called King Louis VII of France *regulus*—kinglet, basilisk, devil. The term was polyvalent, and John describes its use as 'shameless linguistic tomfoolery' (*impudenti scurrilitate verborum*).⁶² That condemnation was voiced with the same disapproval of sophistry and hair-splitting expressed in the *Metalogicon*.⁶³ In the political arena Rainald of Dassel, a master of equivocation and obliquity, displayed the faults that John abhorred in the 'Cornificians' of the Parisian schools. The 'stage-play' has become a slapstick, and the central figure in the farce is no longer a locust but a clown. Accordingly the criteria, repeated with such vehemence over so many years, undergo a marked change in this letter to Gerard Pucelle of October 1166. Previous abuse of barbarity has disappeared. No mention of ferocity or irrationality. There is not even a slight on 'Teutonic' inferiority. John of Salisbury, belatedly, has recognized in his long-term bugbear the antagonist of his youth. That is why Rainald of Dassel's linguistic levity had to be deprecated as the antic of a buffoon. In the orthodox camp of Latin Europe the potentially ambiguous expression *impudens scurrilitas verborum* could not be construed favourably as a brazen play with words. What the German prized as wit the Englishman censured with severity. Regarded as a virtue to be emulated by the Archpoet,⁶⁴ his patron's taste for provocation was considered by John of Salisbury a vice to be damned.

* * *

To whom was this wordplay directed? To whose sense of humour did it appeal? What can be established about the colleagues of the Archpoet in Rainald of Dassel's entourage? These are difficult questions. Most of the

⁵⁹ See P. Landau, *Die Kölner Kanonistik des 12. Jahrhunderts: Ein Höhepunkt der europäischen Rechtswissenschaft*, Kölner rechtsgeschichtliche Vorträge I (Badenweiler, 2009).

⁶⁰ Ep. 167, in *The Letters of John of Salisbury*, ii, ed. Millor, Butler, and Brooke, 99.

⁶¹ *Ille Coloniensis praesumptor ecclesiae, maximus inter locustas bestiae, quarum potestas est in linguis et caudis earum* (Ep. 186, in *The Letters of John of Salisbury*, ii, ed. Millor, Butler, and Brooke, 227).

⁶² Ep. 186, in *The Letters of John of Salisbury*, ii, ed. Millor, Butler, and Brooke, 228. Cf. *fraudulenta verborum astucia* (Ep. 186, in *The Letters of John of Salisbury*, ii, ed. Millor, Butler, and Brooke, 216).

⁶³ See Chapter II.

⁶⁴ See Chapter VI.

notaries with whom he worked are concealed from our gaze by professional anonymity. There is one, however, whom we can identify by name and whose writings reveal a vivid personality. Burkhard, a member of the imperial chancery and chapel, was a partisan of Rainald and an admirer of Barbarossa.⁶⁵ The emperor entrusted him with diplomatic missions, about which he corresponded with Abbot Nicholas of Siegburg. Burkhard held decided opinions, which were influenced by his origins. He came from Cologne. To its archbishop-elect he probably owed his appointments at court; and one of the reasons why Rainald of Dassel secured his services was the education he had received at Siegburg. Evidence of it is provided in the letters that Burkhard addressed to his friend Nicholas, describing himself as that abbot's 'first and favourite son'. A less-refined stylist than John of Salisbury, he was nonetheless a forceful author. What Burkhard wrote to Nicholas, in late 1161 and early 1162, offers insight into the culture and mentality of the Victorines among whom the Archpoet worked.

In the confidentiality of his letter to his foster-father, Burkhard did not mince his words. On a journey from northern Italy to Hungary, during which he raised forces and funds for Barbarossa's campaign against Milan, he encountered Archbishop Eberhard of Salzburg, on whose slobbering senility (*delirus senex*⁶⁶) he commented. The acerbic sarcasm in the letters of this notary imitates that of his chief in the chancery. Burkhard, for example, twice echoes Rainald's term 'kinglet' (*regulus*) when referring to foreign sovereigns.⁶⁷ Barbarossa, by contrast, is the Roman emperor of whom all other rulers stand in awe and dread. The illusions of imperialism proclaimed so loudly by the archbishop-elect of Cologne were shared by his subordinate from that metropolis. One of them, transmitted only by Burkhard, was a plan to hold a council at Rome, after the defeat of Milan, in order to impose Victor IV during the absence of the Alexandrians.⁶⁸ There is no reason to doubt this information, although the design was never implemented. Its significance lies in the optimism about the future that it evinces. By December 1161, the path ahead seemed clear to a Victorine partisan in the know. Burkhard believed it would be easy to settle the schism in the empire's interests (*facilis erit via, ut ad honorem imperii componantur universa*⁶⁹), and his unfounded elation derived from Rainald of Dassel. Their high spirits seemed to have been warranted between 26 March and 1 April 1162, when Burkhard witnessed the levelling of Milan's walls. This triumph was celebrated by the notary as a mark of divine favour to the empire.⁷⁰ Among the imperial princes, whose 'head' Burkhard identified in 'our lord of Cologne',⁷¹ opinion was divided about whether the city should be forced to an unconditional surrender or whether, as Count Guido of

⁶⁵ See Güterbock, 'Le lettere', and P. Scheffer-Boichorst, *Gesammelte Schriften*, ii (Berlin, 1905), 225–47.

⁶⁶ Güterbock, 'Le lettere', 54.

⁶⁷ Güterbock, 'Le lettere', 56 and 57.

⁶⁸ Güterbock, 'Le lettere', 57.

⁶⁹ Güterbock, 'Le lettere', 58.

⁷⁰ Güterbock, 'Le lettere', 59.

⁷¹ Güterbock, 'Le lettere', 61.

Biandrate urged, Milan might be allowed to come to terms. Burkhard describes the proceedings, drawn out over three days, the most dramatic of which was the third:

the people came with the *carroccio*, which we call the standard, accompanied by the rest of the knights in throngs, bearing the banners of all the neighbourhoods, which were over a hundred in number. And so they entered New Lodi in order, with the people preceding the three-wheeled chariot and the rest of the crowd following right up to the emperor's palace. He was enthroned on high, and they caught sight of him immediately. Trumpeters standing in the chariot blasted on their brazen instruments as if they were sounding the last call to their pride, which at that moment was expiring and doomed to be buried on the spot. As soon as the din ceased, the trumpets were presented to the emperor. Then the elders from each district came forward, bearing their banners in order and surrendering them from first to last. The chariot, massively reinforced, stood in a high state of combat-readiness, toughly bound with iron. Out of its centre a tall tree rose up, firmly intertwined with iron, wires, and ropes from top to bottom. At its loftiest point there loomed an image of the cross, bearing on the front a likeness of St Ambrose looking forward and making a sign of blessing in any direction the chariot might wheel. After all the insignia of Milan's honour had been surrendered, this was the last to approach and bow its head in submission. The mechanics skilfully lowered the entire vehicle and its tree to the ground, and such were their efforts that we, stationed beside the emperor's throne, trembled with dread that the contraption would topple. But the tree, bent down, neither fell nor rose again until the emperor gathered together the fringes on its standard, pulled the chariot up, and made it stand in subjugation.

Then the knights and the people to a man fell on their faces, weeping and pleading for mercy. After that one of their consuls made a moving speech and, when it was over, the entire crowd prostrated itself on the ground, stretching out the crosses which it held, and with an immense wail implored mercy for the symbol's sake. So it was that all who heard this were mightily moved to tears, but the emperor's expression remained impassive. Thirdly, the count of Biandrate, in a compassionate oration on behalf of his former friends, had a powerful effect on everyone, making them weep. He bore the cross forward and the entire crowd fell to its knees with him in supplication; but the emperor simply remained stone-faced. Then my lord of Cologne made it so crystal-clear that they should surrender, and they replied with such an unqualified admission of fault that there was to be no room in the sequel for quibbling about terms or conditions that might be thought up. And you know that he is the beginning, the middle and the end of the emperor's honour . . .⁷²

⁷² *Venit populus cum barroccio, quod apud nos standart dicitur, et cum reliqua militum multitudine afferens omnium viciniarum vexilla numero centum et paulo plura. Per ordinem igitur Novam Laudam ingressi, populus trium rotarum currum precedebat, reliqua vero multitudo sequebatur usque ad imperatoris palacium. Qui in solio excelsior residens, quam cito ab illis videbatur. Tubicines stantes in curru tubis ereis fortius intonabant et superbie sue tunc morienti ibidemque sepeliende quasi supremas exequias compulsabant; et finito clangore statim imperatorie receptioni sunt oblate tube. Deinde singuli viciniarum maiores procedebant, profitentes et vexilla sua per ordinem a primo usque ad ultimum resignantes. Stabat autem currus multiplici robore conceptus, ad pugnandum desuper satis aptatus, ferro fortissime ligatus, de cuius medio surrexit arbor procera, ab imo usque ad summum ferro, nervis, et funibus tenacissime circumtexta. In huius summitate supereminebat crucis effigies, in cuius anteriori parte beatus depingebatur Ambrosius ante prospiciens et benedictionem intendens, quocumque currus verteretur. Is post omnis Mediolanensium honoris resignationem ultimus accessit, et ipse caput suum declinaturus. Cui qui preerant arte totam machinam illam et arborem ipsam usque ad terram declinabant, adeo*

The *carroccio*, or flag-waggon making one of its earliest recorded appearances,⁷³ on which the image of St Ambrose, patron-saint of Milan,⁷⁴ had been borne into battle against Barbarossa is now conveyed into New Lodi, the town refounded by the emperor after the old one had been destroyed by its neighbour on 23 April 1158.⁷⁵ In this setting redolent of revenge, trumpeters blare forth a death knell to fallen pride. Alternating between poetic metaphor and factual detail, Burkhard evokes what he refrains from stating—least of all, the deception that had contributed to the enemy's defeat.⁷⁶ Instead the notary dwells on the combat-readiness of the flag-waggon, topped by the image of Ambrose blessing any direction in which he might be led by the militarism of Milan, leaving the reader to infer that neither the saint nor the city he has failed to protect has anywhere to go. Once hyperactive and aggressive, Milan is now reduced to the same passivity as the fringes on its emblem of communal identity tugged by Barbarossa as he pleases. He is not the smiling sovereign, receptive to petitions and prepared to forgive, depicted by Rahewin.⁷⁷ Enthroned on high and surrounded by his followers, the emperor is no less adamant about his rights in 1162 than, seven years earlier, he had been dismissive of Rome's pretensions in the speech attributed to him by Otto of Freising.⁷⁸ The rebels' wailing contrasts with Barbarossa's wordlessness, amplified as it is by the curtness of his minister. Rainald's *distinctio* of non-negotiable surrender admits no reply other than an avowal of fault (*confessio*) that precludes future quibbles. The tears and groans that accompanied medieval rituals of surrender have failed to produce their effect.⁷⁹ Compassion ruled out,

ut nos, qui iuxta solium domini imperatoris eramus, ruinam machine veriti excuteremur. Sed arbor deflexa nec cecidit nec reascendit, donec imperator fimbrias vexilli collegit currumque reascendere fecit et stare subiugatum.

Tunc milites et populus unanimiter in facies sua ceciderunt, plorantes et misericordiam invocantes. Post haec quodam consule miserabiliter perorante, finita oratione, omnis multitudo rursus prociidit et cruces, quas tenebat, extendens cum eiulatu magno in virtute crucis misericordiam invocavit. Unde vehementer moti sunt ad lachrymas quicumque audierunt; sed imperatoris facies non est immutata. Tertio comes Blandratensis pro illis olim amicis suis miserabiliter perorans vim fecit omnibus, ut possint lachrymari, ipso crucem preferente et tota multitudine item cum ipso suppliciter procidente; sed solum imperator faciem suam firmavit ut petram. Dehinc a domino Coloniensi facta est deditionis eorum tam pura distinctio, et ab ipsis responsa est tam mera confessio, ut deinceps locum habere non debeat alicuius ingenii vel pacti vel conventionis obiectio. Et sciatis, quod ipse est principium, medium et finis honoris imperatoris (Güterbock, 'Le lettere', 62–4).

⁷³ See E. Voltmer, *Il carroccio* (Turin, 1994), 39 ff., and H. Zug Tucci, 'Il carroccio nella vita comunale italiana', *QF* 65 (1985), 14–15, 25, 48.

⁷⁴ See H. Peyer, *Stadt und Stadtpatron im mittelalterlichen Italien*, Zürcher Studien zur allgemeinen Geschichte 13 (Zürich, 1955), 32 ff., and cf. cf. D. Webb, *Patrons and Defenders: The Saints in the Italian City-States* (London, 1996), 174 ff.

⁷⁵ Cf. cf. F. Oppl, 'Friedrich Barbarossa und die Stadt Lodi: Stadtentwicklung im Spannungsfeld zwischen Reich und Städtebündnis', in H. Maurer (ed.), *Kommunale Bündnisse Oberitaliens und Oberdeutschlands im Vergleich*, *VuF* 33 (Sigmaringen, 1987), 63–96.

⁷⁶ See Görich, *Friedrich Barbarossa*, 341.

⁷⁷ *Gesta Frederici*, iv. 86, ed. Schmale, 708, 19, 30.

⁷⁸ *Nonne multo et forti stipatus milite inclitus sedeo?* (*Gesta Frederici*, ii. 32, ed. Schmale, 350, 26; cf. Burkhard: *in solio excelsior residens*).

⁷⁹ Cf. M. Becker, 'Cum lacrimis et gemitu: Vom Weinen der Sieger und der Besiegten im frühen und hohen Mittelalter', in G. Althoff (ed.), *Formen und Funktionen öffentlicher Kommunikation im Mittelalter*, *VuF* 50 (Stuttgart, 2001), 42–3.

Christian diction is turned to a profane purpose. In the lightly liturgical phrase with which this passage ends,⁸⁰ 'our lord of Cologne' is hymned as the high priest of imperialism.

* * *

Between paeans of praise from the imperial camp and abuse against barbarity on the Alexandrian side, the Archpoet, during the early 1160s, turned to the subject of his patron. With a notarial precision learnt in his other métier, our author never refers to Rainald of Dassel as an archbishop. He is always addressed as an archchancellor, a prelate, or an elect.⁸¹ If canon law set limits to the authority that such figures were entitled to wield,⁸² there were other means of extolling his position. One was to stress Rainald's combination of secular office and ecclesiastical charisma. That is why, in a wide-ranging panegyric, the Archpoet begins by calling him 'archchancellor' and then hails him as a source of illumination to the Church comparable to the sun in heaven.⁸³ This stereotype counters another. The subject is a cleric reviled by Adrian IV as 'a depraved man sowing tares'. In an age more alert than ours to scriptural signals, everyone understood the pope's allusion to the devil and no one was deceived by its anonymity. Such was the example that the Archpoet followed when he refrained from naming Rainald and depicted the diabolic figure of Roman polemic as a paragon in Church and State. The two categories that Ekbert of Schönau and Philip of Harvengt, in 1159, had sought to separate were to be fused. Praise of his patron is composed by the client with the punctiliousness of a rejoinder to others' admonition or abuse.

The structure of thought, characteristically dialectical, opposes Alexandrian reproof to Transmontane affirmation. An argument emerges. Rainald of Dassel's worldly role, which Rahewin had concealed and Ekbert had censured, is presented as consistent with age-old virtue. At the same time a claim is made that was novel in the twelfth century. No minister of the German empire since Charlemagne had been hailed in such terms as these:

- | | | |
|----|-------------------------------|--|
| 2. | <i>Laudes tibi canimus,</i> | <i>cuius luce iubaris</i> |
| | <i>illustratur animus</i> | <i>Friderici Cesaris,</i> |
| | <i>quod libenter facimus</i> | <i>cum sis dator hilaris.</i> |
| 3. | <i>Pollens bonis moribus</i> | <i>et nitore generis,</i> |
| | <i>in humanis artibus</i> | <i>et divinis litteris</i> |
| | <i>cum sis maior omnibus,</i> | <i>nullo minor crederis.</i> ⁸⁴ |

⁸⁰ Cf. Blaise, *Vocabulaire*, 24 ff.

⁸¹ *Carm.* III, 2, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 56; IV, 26, 4, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 60; VII, 9, 1, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 67; X, 24, 1, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 76.

⁸² See R. Benson, *The Bishop-Elect: A Study in Medieval Ecclesiastical Office* (Princeton, 1968).

⁸³ *Iubar es Ecclesie, sicut sol est etheris* (*Carm.* VII 1, 3, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 66).

⁸⁴ *Carm.* VII, 2-3, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 66.

2. We sing your praises, for by your radiant brilliance
the intelligence of Emperor Frederick is illuminated;
and we do so willingly, since you give with good cheer.
3. Pre-eminent for moral conduct and splendid ancestry,
you are master of the liberal arts and theology;
greater than all, you are considered second to none.

'Second to none' (3, 3) is a definition that includes the emperor. Represented as the brains behind the imperial enterprise, Rainald of Dassel takes the place customarily occupied by the ruler in the medieval Latin tradition of panegyric.⁸⁵ An archbishop might be lauded for his sanctity, a duke eulogized an account of his valour, but no such dignitary had been described in the learned literature of the German Reich as a partner in power. Here too experience as 'Rainald H' informs the Archpoet's writing. He is inspired not by literary models but by charters of the early 1160s, in which the viceroy of Italy declared that he was acting on imperial authority '*and our own*'.⁸⁶

Burkhard would have grasped the allusion, and doubtless approved, for his phrase 'the beginning, the middle, and the end of the emperor's honour' makes much the same claim. But he was not addressing Rainald in his letter to Nicholas of Siegburg and the Archpoet, who does so, typically takes advantage of the circumstances. A panegyrist was also a postulant; and in this work as in others the client never fails to remind his patron of reciprocity's economic implications. The humour with which our author tempers his importunity in the first strophe above is spiked by another reference to advice given in 1159. If Rainald gives with the good cheer loved by the Lord at II Corinthians 9:7 (2, 3), that proves Ekbert of Schönau's admonitions concerning avarice to be groundless. This controversial figure possesses in full the archiepiscopal credentials that his detractors denied him. So it is that Rainald's indubitable command of the liberal arts is equalled by a competence in theology that merits as much scepticism as his illustrious ancestry or moral eminence (3, 1–3). Every score on which he might be criticized is trumped by a writer versed in the tit-for-tat of polemic. And, if the Archpoet's language is topical, it never declines into cliché, for he is capable of transforming apparent banalities into a private code:

5. *Ulixē facundior* *Tullianē loqueris,*
columba simplicior *nullī fraude ingeris,*
serpente callidior *a nullo deciperis.*⁸⁷
5. More eloquent than Ulysses, of Ciceronian speech,
simpler than the dove, you deceive no one,
wiser than the snake, none takes you in.

⁸⁵ Cf. P. Godman, *Poets and Emperors: Frankish Politics and Carolingian Poetry* (Oxford, 1987).

⁸⁶ See Herkenrath, 'I collaboratori tedeschi di Federico I', in Manselli and Riedmann (eds), *Federico Barbarossa nel dibattito storiografico*, 217–20.

⁸⁷ *Carm.* VII, 5, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 67.

The 'linguistic tomfoolery' deplored by John of Salisbury is extolled in this strophe as a political virtue. No one denied that Rainald had a way with words. That indeed was the problem, John claimed, tracing the guile with which his *bête noire* manipulated them back to Besançon. The éclat and its aftermath are the Archpoet's subjects here, for both during the imperial assembly and after it the 'wicked man sowing tares' had first outmanoeuvred the papal legates, then taken in the German bishops by what was a show of 'dove-like innocence' combined with 'serpentine cunning'. Cunning could be regarded as a positive attribute of medieval aristocrats,⁸⁸ which the client attributes to his patron. To these former students of dialectic, the snake and the dove at Matthew 10:6 are figures of shrewd duplicity.

If encomium amounted to defence, there was a difference between countering the criticisms of Rainald's enemies and addressing an issue that he had wished to avoid in 1159. Then his military prowess was a topic so touchy that the historian of his legation to Italy refrained, or was restrained, from handling it. Now the Archpoet celebrates loudly what Rahewin had not dared to mention:

6. *Alexandro forcior inimicos conteris,*
David mansuetior a cunctis diligeris,
*Martinoque largior das quod iuste peteris.*⁸⁹

6. Mightier than Alexander, you crush your enemies,
 more merciful than David, you are loved by all,
 more generous than Martin, you give what you are justly requested.

The munificence of St Martin was a recurrent theme in archiepiscopal encomium,⁹⁰ and the likeness to King David enhanced the virtue of mercifulness attributed to Rainald by his historian. The Alexandrian analogy with which this strophe begins, however, is exactly what Rahewin avoided when he attributed the martial exploits of the past to that belligerent layman, Otto of Wittelsbach. What was inadmissible three years earlier has become laudable in 1162. On All Saints' Day (1 November) of that year,⁹¹ the Archpoet speaks out. His audience is not the same as that of the *Gesta Frederici*. Restricted to clerical members of Rainald's entourage, like Burkhard, who accompanied him to Italy, the Transmontane public before whom this poem was recited does not share the scruples with which Rahewin reckoned. Those who heard our author employing Alexandrian analogy were partisans. They subscribed to Burkhard's view of their master as an embodiment of imperial honour, or at least had the sense to dissemble their misgivings. But even they, blunted by the obsequiousness of life at court, could not fail to notice that the Archpoet had become repetitive in his insistence and retrospective in his outlook:

⁸⁸ See P. Zotz, 'Odysseus im Mittelalter? Zum Stellenwert von List und Listigkeit in der Kultur des Adels', in: H. von Senger (ed.), *Die List* (Frankfurt, 1999), 212–40.

⁸⁹ *Carm.* VII, 6, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld.

⁹⁰ Cf. Jaeger, *The Envy of Angels*, 44 ff.

⁹¹ *Dum sanctorum omnium colitur celebritas* (*Carm.* VII, 5, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 67, and cf. 124–5).

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| 7. | <i>In regni negocio
qui sine consilio
viget tanto socio</i> | <i>fit quodcunque precipis
nichil prorsus incipis;
mens Romani principis.</i> |
| 8. | <i>Adhuc starent menia
nec Cesar per prelia
nisi Dei gracia</i> | <i>Mediolanensium
victor esset hostium,
te dedisset socium.⁹²</i> |
7. In affairs of the realm your word is a command,
for you undertake nothing at all without reflection;
the intelligence of the Roman emperor thrives on such a partnership.
8. The walls of Milan would still stand
and the emperor would not have vanquished his enemies in battle,
unless God's grace had made you his partner.

This is the second time (notable in a work of eleven strophes) that our author dwells on Rainald of Dassel's partnership with Barbarossa (7, 3; 8, 3). Here the iteration is linked with the levelling of Milan's walls. We recall what Burkhard wrote as he witnessed that triumph between 26 March and 1 April 1162. The trumpeters sounding the death knell for urban pride, the *carroccio* pulled into a position of surrender, the saint blessing in the direction of nowhere: these suggestive details might have offered food for poetic thought. And yet, at that time, the most gifted man of letters in Rainald's circle chose not to write a eulogy. He celebrated the major victory of the reign seven months after it had occurred. What we observe is less an exception to his habit of silence about public events than further evidence of his reluctance to commemorate them on the spot. Unlike Burkhard, the Archpoet avoids playing the part of an eyewitness. He looks back later, and emphasizes how much Barbarossa owed to the strategist of his success. Is this celebration or consolation? Did our author overcome his reticence not when his patron was riding the crest of the wave but after it broke? To answer these questions, we must consider Rainald of Dassel and his actions between 1 April and 1 November 1162, and set them in the wider context of his policy.

* * *

In 1162 the Archpoet's patron was revealed at his most aggressive and least realistic. After Alexander III had fled to France at the beginning of that year, Rainald wrote in Barbarossa's name to the chancellor of King Louis VII, Bishop Hugh of Soissons, describing that pope as 'an appalling enemy'—*atrox inimicus*, standard Latin for the devil—of the empire and threatening strife if he were given shelter.⁹³ It was characteristic of Rainald's imperious approach to diplomacy that he did not reckon with the French king's need to accommodate the Alexandrian loyalties of his episcopate. All should be settled between potentates related to one another: Barbarossa, Victor IV, and Louis's envoy, Count Henry of Troyes.

⁹² *Carm.* VII. 7–8, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld.

⁹³ M. Bouquet, *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, xvi (Paris, 1878), no. 10; 202.

The plan for a council at Rome lapsed. Instead it was announced that, on 29 August at Saint-Jean-de-Losne-sur-Saône, Louis VII, together with his princes and the entire French Church, would announce their obedience to the imperial antipope.⁹⁴ In Rainald of Dassel's mind, the schism had already been settled one month after the fall of Milan. The summons which he issued to German magnates on imperial authority announce a *fait accompli*.⁹⁵ That is why, at the meeting between Rainald and Louis that took place on a bridge over the Saône, the arch-imperialist did not even attempt to persuade the French king. Rainald simply conceived of his task as laying down the law. The emperor, he declared, had the right to select the pope. Scarcely a rearguard action or an attempt to save face,⁹⁶ the diplomatic affront represented no more or less than the conviction of a Saxon imperialist persisting in the illusions of his youth. Louis VII did not answer that this was rubbish of the Reich. The 'kinglet' was more majestic. With a faint smirk (*modicum subridens*) he replied that the successors of Christ were directed to look after all his flock, from which the French were not excluded, and galloped away.⁹⁷ Louis's sarcasm was related to John of Salisbury's antithesis between the universal and a particular church. Both of them aimed their barbs at Rainald's recklessness. And John, in a letter of June 1166, dated from this moment the ebb in the fortunes of the 'Teutonic tyrant' (*Teutonicus tyrannus*).⁹⁸ He did not say, although he doubtless gloated on reflecting, that Barbarossa's setback had been caused by his partner in power.

Against this background of reversal emerged the encomium of Rainald's farsighted vision that the Archpoet recited before the archbishop-elect's entourage on 1 November 1162. Unable to refer to the failure of the high summer, our author dwells instead on the success of the early spring. The work offers reassurance when it was needed, at a time when the patron's memory of having been worsted was still fresh; and it invites him to regard as durable achievements undermined by his own precipitousness. Hence the stress on strategy. For the capitulation of Milan, as Burkhard reveals and our author had reason to know, was not an end in itself but a preliminary to settling the schism at Rome. After that did not occur, Rainald repeated his earlier effort at deception in 1165. Then, again on Barbarossa's authority, he proclaimed that the king of England was about to acknowledge Victor IV's successor, Paschal III.⁹⁹ This assertion has been described, bluntly but rightly, as a lie.¹⁰⁰ Yet its

⁹⁴ DFI, no. 363, and cf. nos 364 and 365.

⁹⁵ This aspect of the evidence does not appear to have been considered in the secondary literature on Saint-Jean-de-Losne-sur Saône, the best concise account of which is Görich, *Ehre*, 135 ff.

⁹⁶ Kirfel, *Weltherrschaftsidee*, 23, and H.-J. Schmale, 'Friedrich I. und Ludwig VII. im Sommer des Jahres 1162', *Zeitschrift für bayerische Landesgeschichte*, 31 (1968), 365. The declaration is regarded as a legal theory by Laudage, *Alexander III. und Friedrich Barbarossa*, 146 ff.

⁹⁷ Boso, *Vita Alexandri*, III, ed. Duchesne, *Liber pontificalis*, ii. 407, 21–7.

⁹⁸ Ep. 168, in *The Letters of John of Salisbury*, ii, ed. Millor, Butler, and Brooke, 102.

⁹⁹ DFI, nos 480, 481, 482, 483.

¹⁰⁰ H. Vollrath, 'Lüge oder Fälschung? Die Überlieferung von Barbarossas Hoftag zu Würzburg im Jahre 1165 und der Becket-Streit', in Weinfurter (ed.), *Stauferreich im Wandel*, 149–72.

mendaciousness is less the issue than the mentality that produced it. Having tried and failed to pressure Louis VII into compliance with his designs, Rainald did the same, three years later, with Henry II. Both the first and the second attempts are recorded in public documents with which the Archpoet was acquainted, because they were produced by the chancery in which he worked. These encyclicals were far from being products of Realpolitik. The archchancellor's grasp of political reality was as partial as his intransigence was total; and it is a tribute to our author's insight that he avoided treating such sensitive topics. Prudence counselled silence about August and praise of April on All Saints' Day of 1162.

Although events of the next three years were no more reassuring, throughout his vicissitudes Rainald of Dassel never flinched. In May 1163, at the council convened by Alexander III at Tours that Archbishop Thomas of Canterbury and virtually the entire English episcopate attended, he was excommunicated by name. Undaunted by that anathema or by the death of Victor IV on 20 April 1164, he hastened to Lucca, where, after an uncanonical election carried out by two schismatic cardinals, two German bishops and the prefect of Rome, he had Guido of Crema, cardinal-priest of S. Callisto, consecrated pope by the bishop of Liège on 26 April. Paschal III († 1168) was an expression of the same impetuosity that had announced the imagined allegiance of Louis VII and Henry II to the schismatic side. Barbarossa, not consulted about this *démarche*, had no alternative but to ratify it. Misgivings are later recorded by a hostile witness of the assembly at Würzburg, when the emperor reacted with fury to Rainald's hesitation at taking the oath of obedience to the antipope that he was seeking to impose on others.¹⁰¹ A partisan of Alexander III, writing to him in a transparent attempt to expose divisions within the imperial camp, reports the demands made by Wichmann, archbishop of Magdeburg, that Rainald swear first and, after being ordained, accept consecration. This was an issue raised by John of Salisbury in 1162. If the partisan-reporter is to be believed, the archbishop-elect of Cologne burst into tears. Emotion was expressed by Rainald at pressure from others. Enough of his own had been generated by his hot-headedness. Returning in haste to Würzburg from an embassy to England, he had written to Louis VII, requesting that his failure to wait on him not be ascribed to arrogance.¹⁰² The 'kinglet' of France, remembering their last encounter on the Saône, cannot but have thought in just such terms. The German princes may have shared the same view when, according to another report of the assembly at Würzburg,¹⁰³ they then heard Rainald of Dassel demanding that his advice should be followed to the letter and stating that he had secured the obedience of more than fifty English bishops to Paschal III, although that many did not exist in the insular kingdom of Henry II. There, during Rainald's embassy of late 1164–early 1165, the Chief Justice, Robert of

¹⁰¹ Ep. 99, in *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury*, v. ed. J. C. Robertson (London, 1881), 188–91.

¹⁰² Bouquet, *Recueil*, xvi, 120, no. 369.

¹⁰³ Ep. 98, in *Materials*, v., ed. Robertson, 184–6.

Leicester, refused to grant him the symbolic kiss of peace; the empress Matilda declined to receive him because she feared offending her episcopate; and the altars on which those accompanying the 'archschismatic' had celebrated mass were overturned.¹⁰⁴ Such was the English establishment that Rainald of Dassel asserted he had swung behind Paschal III. This claim was made in the presence of two English envoys, John of Oxford and Richard of Leicester, who were induced to take the oath to the antipope on behalf of their king. Excommunicated for that action by Becket in 1166, they were soon received back into the Church by Alexander III. The swiftness of the papal pardon deserves more attention than it has received. John and Richard attended an assembly at which they could be manipulated no less unscrupulously than the papal legates at Besançon in 1157. The language spoken at Würzburg was German, with which there is no evidence that the Englishmen were acquainted. Rainald of Dassel was again in a position to put words into their mouths.

Mistrust of his minister appears to have occurred even to Barbarossa. Taking umbrage at Rainald's reluctance to swear allegiance to Paschal III, the emperor accused him of treachery and declared that he would fall into the trap he had laid.¹⁰⁵ Among the many terms of abuse applied to 'the ruin of the world', the noun *proditor* had never been employed. A more stinging accusation can hardly be imagined, and the clash invites us to reflect further on the 'system' that Rainald is supposed to have served.¹⁰⁶ Nothing constrained him to the deceptions that he practised, or the delusions under which he laboured, from Besançon to the Saône and Würzburg; they reflected his own choices. Uncompromising and unrealistic, he brooked no opposition. Nor did the patron of the Archpoet implement the emperor's ideas, since one of Barbarossa's most salient characteristics is his cluelessness, except in military matters and in creating consensus for decisions taken jointly with the princes. Almost a decade after Rainald of Dassel's death in 1167 the schism persisted,¹⁰⁷ and the same baleful policy was pursued in Italy.¹⁰⁸ The nominal ruler, accustomed to having the imperial cause defined by his partner, seldom thought for himself about strategy. That is why it was not hyperbole but realism when the Archpoet described Rainald as 'second to none' and why Barbarossa, in his ire at Würzburg, called him a traitor, who appeared to be betraying a common cause. If its stated principle was *honor imperii*, its latent premise was mutual interest. Tearfully flinching before the consequences of his own impetuosity, Rainald of Dassel had lapsed in his duty, not to a system, but to its figure-head. Suddenly confronted with the economic effects of ordination and consecration—the loss of plural benefices, the barren coffers at Cologne—he

¹⁰⁴ See Ralph of Diceto, *Capitula ymaginum historiarum*, ed. Stubbs, 318, with Vollrath, 'Lüge oder Fälschung?', 159 and 164.

¹⁰⁵ Ep. 99, in *Materials*, v, ed. Robertson, 190.

¹⁰⁶ Görich, *Ehre*, 144 ff and 176.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Kluger, 'Friedrich Barbarossa und sein Ratgeber Rainald von Dassel', in Weinfurter (ed.), *Stauferreich im Wandel* 40.

¹⁰⁸ 'Unselige Kaiserpolitik' J. Fried, *Das Mittelalter, Politik und Kultur* (Munich, 2008), 244.

gave way to tears at losing a financial pillar of his ascendancy. The schism, for him, was less an ecclesiastical issue than a problem of power. His income, rather than his loyalty, was at stake. But consistency demanded that material advantage yield to political necessity. On 29 May 1165 he was ordained; the following 2 October he was consecrated at Cologne in the presence of the emperor and the empress; and on 29 December at Aachen he canonised Charlemagne—about all of which the Archpoet says nothing.

Far from being a master-strategist, his patron was a figure of transient triumphs and ephemeral victories. Much of our author's writing about him satisfies an understandable craving for reassurance. Not only the encomium that deals with Milan but also two other works celebrate Rainald's fame in terms that are so qualified as to give pause:

*Tu cum trans Alpes famosus ut hic habearis,
re famam superas, non a fama superaris.*¹⁰⁹

Although beyond the Alps you are as famous as here,
you surpass your fame in fact, and are not outdone by it.

Why, in Transmontane circles, from whose perspective the Archpoet writes, was it necessary to insist that Rainald of Dassel's standing was equal on both sides of the Alps? Because *fama* is ambiguous, denoting both good and ill. The notoriety of Rainald in the peninsula was a delicate issue that required adjustment to partisan perceptions,¹¹⁰ not once but twice, as is revealed by a fragment on the same subject of reputation and reality:

*ne sit fama mendax de te;
vita famam superas.*¹¹¹

Let fame not lie about you;
you surpass your fame in your life.

At one level, the couplet above can be construed as: 'You are even better in reality than is claimed.' At another, it may mean: 'What is alleged about you is defamation, as your conduct bears witness.' In either case, the *sic* of panegyric acknowledges that there is a *non* of detraction to be answered.

The answer might be offered in boasts that, before an entourage of partisans, no one would challenge. There the Archpoet might affirm, in semi-private verse, what could hardly be maintained in the public domain. Previous Transmontane intellectuals, from Burkhard to Otto and Rahewin, had composed prose intended to convince a readership, which ranged from the learned abbot of Siegburg to the Latinate clerics of the Reich, that the imperial cause was irresistible. The epistolary and historiographical genres practised by these writers were ancient and established. Not so the sphere of creative endeavour chosen by our author. His works were experimental, and directed primarily to

¹⁰⁹ *Carm.* VI, 33–4, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 66.

¹¹¹ *Carm.* VIII 5–6, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 68.

¹¹⁰ See Chapter X.

his patron. With other members of their circle ignored or set aside, they formed a partnership in provocation. The terms of its togetherness were to be defined by complicity and humour. From a common background at Hildesheim, the Archpoet shared with Rainald of Dassel zest for learned mirth. At Paris they had developed an enthusiasm for sophistry and wordplay that, during the éclat of Besançon and in asides on the French 'kinglet', the archchancellor continued to flaunt in the face of those who deplored such levity. Defiant in their merriment, these doppelgänger from over the mountains celebrated their differences from their orthodox peers. Wit and urbanity opposed to solemnity and censure, the Archpoet designed the roles he played before the archchancellor as alternatives to norms of clerical decorum. The first of these alternatives was formulated in an attempt to clear the literary stage of the mimers, minstrels, and mountebanks who were occupying the limelight he intended to take as an anti-actor.

VI

The Anti-Actor

The role that our author chose was not the one his patron wished him to play. Imperious and hot-headed, Rainald of Dassel was unaccustomed to taking 'no' for an answer. Yet he could not dictate the details of verse in the way he might order 'Rainald H' to compose a document. In the literary sphere, outside the chancery where he had to follow instructions, the Archpoet was his own man, who might decline to write the epic on Barbarossa which the archchancellor of Italy now needed. Triumph over Milan in the spring of 1162 had been followed by setback on the Saône, and a work was required to redress the balance by celebrating eternal victory. A long poem lying about events he had witnessed ran political risks that our author had hitherto avoided, and the tedium of narrative was not to his taste. He wished to evade this unwelcome task, but he knew that the viceroy of Italy had to be charmed into brooking a refusal. From the effort to prove that negative arose the most extensive and beguiling *recusatio* in the Latin literature of the Middle Ages. No medieval writer before this seasoned sophist had produced so many, such ingenious reasons for failing to deliver what his patron expected of him. In doing so, he defined his literary persona. The Archpoet waxed autobiographical, claiming that he was not to be confused with a mere entertainer. Nor did he simply make his identity plain on the page. As our author recited his work aloud, its meaning was enhanced for its original audience by his gestures, tone, and appearance. Poetry amounted to performance, meant to surprise and shock. If we can no longer hear or view the spectacle, by attending to the text we may recover part of its audial and visual effect:

1. *Archicancellerie, vir discrete mentis,
cuius cor non agitur levitatis ventis
aut morem transgreditur viri sapientis,
non est in me forsitan id quod de me sentis.*
2. *Audi preces, domine, veniam petentis,
exaudi suspiria gemitusque flentis
et onus impositum ferre non valentis;
quod probare potero multis argumentis.*
3. *Tuus in perpetuum servus et poeta
ibo, si preceperis, eciam trans freta,
et quodcumque iusseris scribam mente leta,
sed angusti temporis me coartat meta.*

4. *Iubes angustissimo spacio dierum
me tractare seriem augustarum rerum,
quas neque Virgilium posse nec Homerum
annis quinque scribere constat esse verum.*
5. *Vis ut infra circulum parve septimane
bella scribam forcia breviter et plane,
que vix in quinquennio scriberes, Lucane,
vel tu, vatum maxime, Maro Mantuane.*¹
1. Archchancellor, man of discernment,
your heart is not disturbed by gusts of levity,
nor do you trespass beyond the bounds of wisdom,
[but] your opinion of me perhaps diverges from reality.
2. Listen, lord, to the pleas of one seeking pardon,
attend to the sighs and groans of my weeping
at not being able to bear the burden you impose;
which I shall succeed in proving with many arguments.
3. As your eternal servant and poet
I will travel, if you command, even over the oceans,
and will joyfully write whatever you order,
but my style is cramped by want of time.
4. Within the narrowest span of days
you order me to compose a narrative of lofty events
which—it is a fact beyond all doubt—
neither Virgil nor Homer could write in five years.
5. You desire that, within the space of a short week,
I write briefly and clearly about mighty wars,
which Lucan or the greatest of poets, Virgil from Mantua,
could barely treat over a five-year period.

Only the vocative (*archicancellarie* 1, 1) indicates that the setting of this poem is Italy. There what matters more than Rainald of Dassel's ecclesiastical title is his secular function as chief of the chancery. The one does not exclude the other at different points in the same work, but at the beginning this nuance is noteworthy. The honey of ceremoniousness coats the Archpoet's pill of refusal to write an epic on Barbarossa's exploits in the peninsula. That enterprise, in its ambition, was consistent with all the sources relate about Rainald of Dassel's character.² The German Rahewin's emphasis on his devotion to the imperial cause is complemented by a similar stress in the history of the Italian Acerbus Morena.³ Both of them dwell on Rainald's way with words. No less eloquent than Cicero for the Archpoet, he is similarly compared to that master of

¹ *Carm.* IV, 1–5, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 57.

² Listed by Burkhardt, *Mit Stab und Schwert*, 137, 149, 179, 187–8, 197 ff.

³ *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 22, ed. Schmale, 440, and *Libellus*, ed. Schmale, 188.

ancient oratory by the Pisan annalist Caffaro.⁴ There is no question of dependence. These were terms that came naturally to observers of the archchancellor, who seemed to combine accomplishments of culture with qualities of courtliness to those on his side. They admired his open-handedness, good humour, and affability,⁵ or insisted on his skill at winning over the emperor's subjects.⁶ None of these partisans stood near to him, and he doubtless appeared different to an author in his company. During the early 1160s, when the Archpoet began to write about him, Rainald of Dassel increasingly displayed his harsher side. As Barbarossa's chief representative in the north of Italy, he was occupied with exacting regalian rights. Chief among them were tribute and taxation,⁷ which the archchancellor or his subordinates levied with a ruthlessness that came to be loathed.⁸ It is revealing that neither at the beginning nor in the course of this poem so lavish in praise of his patron does our author mention Rainald's benevolence to Italians. That half-truth was wholly left to others.

To Italians our author displays only indifference or hostility. There is no sign, in any of his works, of the regard for peninsular civilization shown by Otto of Freising. Unlike the Archpoet, who spent many months in Italy serving Rainald of Dassel, Otto had been there only for a short stay in 1141 and a longer one in 1145. Despite reservations about the less than feudal society that he had observed,⁹ he voiced enthusiasm for that 'garden of delights' (*hortus deliciarum*) capable of taming even the Lombard savages who had conquered it centuries earlier:

But after casting off the repulsiveness of their barbaric ferocity, perhaps because they married natives and produced sons who had their mothers' blood and were affected by the character of the land and the climate which gave them a degree of Roman civilisation and savoir-faire, they preserve the elegance of the Latin language and refinement of behaviour.¹⁰

A counter-image can be discerned between the historian's lines. Contrary to the taunts of Teutonic barbarity that were beginning to mount in Latin Europe

⁴ *Annali Genovesi di Caffaro e di suoi continuatori dal MXCIX al MCCXCIII*, ed. L. Belgrano Fonti per la Storia d'Italia 11 (Genua, 1890) 66, 15 ff.

⁵ *Largus, hilaris, affabilis* (Libellus, ed. Schmale, 188).

⁶ *ad imperatoris amorem et obsequium mirabiliter placavit* (Libellus, ed. Schmale, Quellen, 186).

⁷ See A. Haverkamp, *Herrschaftsformen der Frühstauffer in Reichsitalien*, 2 vols, Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters, 2 vols (Stuttgart, 1970). Cf. D. von der Nahmer, *Die Reichsverwaltung in der Toscana unter Friedrich I. und Heinrich VI.* (Freiburg i. B, 1965), 30 ff., and D. von der Nahmer, 'Zur Herrschaft Friedrich Barbarossas in Italien', *Studi Medievali*, 15 (1974), 587–703. See further Chapter VII.

⁸ See Görich, *Friedrich Barbarossa*, 349 ff., and Chapter VII.

⁹ See L. Grill, 'Das Itinerar Ottos von Freising', in H. Ebner (ed.), *Festschrift F. Hausmann* (Graz, 1977), 153–78, and H. Keller, *Adelsherrschaft und städtische Gesellschaft in Oberitalien* (9.–12. Jahrhundert), Bibliothek des Deutschen Historischen Instituts in Rom 52 (Tübingen, 1979), 97 ff.

¹⁰ *Verumtamen barbarice deposito feritatis rancore, ex eo forsan, quod indigenis per conubia iuncti filios ex materno sanguine ac terre erisve proprietate aliquid Romane mansuetudinis et sagacitatis trahentes genuerint Latini sermonis elegantiam morumque retinent urbanitatem* (*Gesta Frederici*, ii. 14, ed. Schmale, 308, 8–12). On the rest of the passage, see Chapter VII.

at the time he wrote in 1157–8, Otto's image of acculturation holds out hope for the wild men from over the mountains then seeking to subdue the peninsula. None of them responded. The Archpoet, for example, never evinces the slightest interest in the Latin literature of contemporary Italy,¹¹ and that amounted to a limitation. In the north and in the centre of the country, which boasted a flourishing tradition of local historiography,¹² our author might have learnt that it was not necessary to be a cleric in order to excel as a writer. Contrary to his disdain for the laity, trenchantly expressed in this poem, among its ranks were numbered able historians, some of whom he may well have met. At the small town of Lodi, which he visited several times with the court, two prominent citizens, Otto and Acerbus Morena, were fluent in Latin. Otto had been a notary, like 'Rainald H', and his pro-imperial narrative of recent events was being continued by his son Acerbus at the time when the Archpoet resided in their community. But affinities between them do not appear to have developed. Our author equated Italian with German laymen, and looked down on both. He writes from and for a circle closed to outsiders.

Although unreceptive to Italian influence, Rainald of Dassel's entourage was far from immobile. The notarial activities of his confidant document their itineracy together. Active at Cremona on 13 July 1162,¹³ days later 'Rainald H' moved on to Lucca, before working at Turin.¹⁴ This experience gave him insight into what his master anticipated from an epic about recent events. The treaties that the notary recorded during this brief but intense period made it clear that the archchancellor intended to construct a network of urban allies. Both Cremona and Lucca were favoured with fiscal exemptions and the right to choose their own consuls,¹⁵ while justice was done at Turin, whose bishop acknowledged the antipope. All of these centres and several of the measures taken to secure their loyalty would have to be mentioned, if not celebrated at length, in a poem made to the measure of Rainald's policy. He wanted a work on the grand scale, composed in Otto of Freising's rousing spirit. That is why he was on the Archpoet's mind when, in the first verse quoted above, he described his patron as 'discerning' (*vir discrete mentis* 1, 1). The same notion had been applied to Rainald of Dassel by the historian in the letter that accompanied his world chronicle, voicing concern about how it might be interpreted.¹⁶ Equally anxious not to be misconstrued by this *vir discrete mentis*, the Archpoet also recalls examples of literary eminence that Otto had applied to his own work. Virgil and Lucan, whom our author cites in support of his refusal to write an epic, are the poets adduced at the end of the prologue to the *Gesta Frederici*, in order to indicate the loftiness of the theme. It had ceased to be

¹¹ A survey, often inexact and impressionistic, is provided by F. Bertini in *Storia sociale e culturale d'Italia*, ii. *La letteratura latina medioevale in Italia* (Busto Arrizio, 1987).

¹² See J. Busch, *Die Mailänder Geschichtsschreibung zwischen Arnulf und Galvancus Flamma: Die Beschäftigung mit der Vergangenheit im Umfeld einer oberitalienischen Kommune vom späten 11. bis zum frühen 14. Jahrhundert*, Münstersche Mittelalter-Studien 72 (Munich, 1972).

¹³ DFI, no. 369.

¹⁴ DFI, nos 375, 383.

¹⁵ Cf. Oppl, *Stadt und Reich*, 313.

¹⁶ See Chapter II.

treated in 1160, when Rahewin laid down his quill; and now the archchancellor was pressing for it to be pursued in a different medium. The prose was to be versified and brought up to date in a form familiar to medieval readers as the 'double work'.

The *opus geminatum* had tradition. In the eighth century Alcuin, a possible predecessor in the Germanic line of Latin authors, had composed such a work on the basis of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*.¹⁷ Historical verse survived about Charlemagne,¹⁸ much of it cast in a classical mould. In the third book of an epic that deals with that emperor in the manner that Rainald intended the Archpoet to imitate when writing about Barbarossa,¹⁹ Aachen is depicted as a new Rome founded by a second Aeneas.²⁰ Here was a Carolingian specimen of imperial style; and, if a more recent model was needed, it could be found in the encomiastic narrative of the Ottonian dynasty between 919 and 965 composed at Gandersheim by the nun Hroswitha.²¹ These and other writers of the Reich had elevated its cause onto a timeless plane where the tarnish of temporary setbacks was effaced by the glory of perpetual triumph. So much for the Saône. Broad brushstrokes and glaring colours should paint away that stain of reversal, calculated Rainald of Dassel. He had not reckoned with the scruples of the Archpoet, who crafted his works with the care of a miniaturist.

It took pluck to defy the archchancellor. That quality is evident from the opening of this poem. Hexameters, the traditional verse-form of ancient epic, are not to be heard. Instead, to Rainald's surprise, classicism is rejected in medieval rhythm and rhyme, which set in motion a dialectic between overt and latent meaning. Appearing to praise the archchancellor's discernment, while seeming to extol his senses of balance and measure (1, 1–3), our author is actually counselling that notoriously irascible figure to contain his rage. Criticism phrased as compliment, eulogy entails self-denial. Blame, such as it is, may be attributed not to the patron's importunity but to the incapacity of his client (1, 4). And, as each of these reassurances raises a doubt that it purports to allay, a tone of debate emerges. After striking the penitent's pose (2, 1–2), the Archpoet begins to play the role of the sophist. Hence the declaration, at 2, 4, that he will prove his case with many arguments (*probare . . . multis argumentis*). Why are they needed in verse? Because the archchancellor, trained at Paris,²² had acquired there a zest for disputation. Anticipating Rainald's objections, our author appeals to the criterion of real or pseudo-rationalism prevalent

¹⁷ Cf. P. Godman (ed.), *Alcuin: The Bishops, Kings and Saints of York* (Oxford, 1982), and M. Ferrari, 'Opus geminum', in P. Stotz (ed.), *Dichten als Stoff-Vermittlung: Formen, Ziele, Wirkungen: Beiträge zur Praxis der Versifikation lateinischer Texte im Mittelalter* (Zürich, 2008), 247–64.

¹⁸ Cf. A. Ebenbauer, *Carmen Historicum: Untersuchungen zur historischen Dichtung im karolingischen Europa*, i, *Philologica Germanica* 4 (Vienna, 1978).

¹⁹ E. Dümmler, *MGH Poetae latini aevi Carolini* 1 (repr. Munich, 1987), 366–79.

²⁰ Cf. P. Godman, *Poetry of the Carolingian Renaissance* (London, 1985), no. 25, 97 ff.

²¹ *Hrosvitae opera*, ed. P. v. Winterfeld (repr. Munich, 1978), 201–28.

²² See Chapter II.

in the schools.²³ The former student of dialectic whom he addresses can be expected to recognize methods of drawing distinctions learnt by them both in youth. The first, implicit but unmistakable, is between *opus* and *onus* (2, 3). Only a consonant separates the Latin terms for 'work' and 'burden', yet the gulf that yawns between them is as wide as the oceans that the poet-slave proclaims his readiness to traverse (3, 1). Unable to bear the oppressiveness of classicism, our author enlists its heroes as his allies in evasion. The space of a week is insufficient for a theme so grand that Virgil or Homer would take five years to essay it (4, 3–4), and perhaps fail in the attempt (5, 3–4). For the real obstacle is not talent but time. Asserting openly that he lacks leisure, the Archpoet tacitly compares himself with leading figures of ancient literature.

It follows, in the logic of this sophistry, that the precipitate Rainald of Dassel is like Lucan's Caesar. Thinking nothing accomplished if anything remained to be done (*Bellum civile* ii. 656–7), he proves both unrealistic in his haste and aberrant in his criteria. It is not just that an epic on 'mighty wars' (*bella fortia* 5, 2) cannot be tossed off in a mere week, but also that the subject defies 'brief and clear' (*breviter et plane* 5, 224) treatment. The 'Atticism' of the archchancellor is inappropriate for such an 'Asian' theme. So too is his peremptoriness, as Rainald is beginning to grasp. Confronted by a penitent who persists in sin, he has to deal with a servant whose professions of obedience add up to insubordination. *Sic* entailing *non* and vice versa, the structure of thought is delightfully dialectical. Delight is assumed, because the Archpoet is confident that his patron will be amused by the versatility of what he aptly calls his multiple arguments. Recalling a common culture of scholasticism, they invite their recipient to laugh not at but with his client. Parity is the point of the mirth. Nowhere else in the Latin literature of the High Middle Ages, which consistently maintains regard for rank, is a hierarchical superior transformed with such subtlety into the intellectual peer of his dependent.

Complicity is the truth that the Archpoet sets out to affirm. He cares nothing for the (originally Aristotelian) distinction between historical veracity and poetic fiction blurred by Otto of Freising when, in the prologue to his *Gesta Frederici*, he cited the controversial example of Lucan.²⁵ Lucan, Virgil, and Homer serve our author as instances less of blur than of bluff. Enhancing his status and licensing his refusal, they are figures neither of philosophical controversy nor even of literary relevance. He had no desire to write like them or to engage with the issues they raised. Classicism, for the Archpoet,

²³ Cf. F. Bezner, 'Wissensmythe: Lateinische Literatur und Rationalisierung im 12. Jahrhundert', *Wolfenbütteler Studien*, 20 (2009), 4–31.

²⁴ At 5, 2 Watenphul–Krefeld print *nane*, which is not a Latin adverb (thanks are due to the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* and *Mittellateinisches Wörterbuch*, Munich, which allowed me to consult their files) and would have been redundant, after *breviter*, if it were. M. Manitius (*Die Gedichte des Archipoeta*, ed. M. Manitius, *Münchener Texte* 5 (Munich, 1913), 33), conjectures *plane*, which Watenphul–Krefeld, 107, support by citing Horace, *Ep.* i.2.4, but which none of them admits to the text, which remains disfigured by the nonsense *nane*.

²⁵ See P. von Moos, 'Poeta und Historicus im Mittelalter: Zum Mimesis-Problem am Beispiel einiger Urteile über Lucan', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 98 (1976), 121–3.

was a dead letter, which he left to be revived by an anonymous author from Bergamo who composed the work he declined to produce.²⁶ Among Italian partisans of the imperial cause, not in an intimate who accompanied his German entourage, Rainald of Dassel found the epic stylist he sought. This intermediary poised between two sides was capable of conveying, by deft shifts of register, how each viewed the other. Cultural identity was a theme that the Italian poet treated with ambivalence, voicing criticism of his compatriots in an account of Barbarossa's attempt, on 23 July 1158, to lead his troops across the river Adda at a point on its western bank near to Trezzo. There rebels from Milan defied the emperor with this stinging speech:

*'Non datur hac transire tibi, rex ruffe, furoris
Teutonici doctor! Cursum mutare necesse est!
Non sinit externas huc gressum ferre catervas
Adua, que patriam defendit ab hoste sacratam!
I procul hinc tecumque acies averte rapaces!
I procul et nostras non ingrediaris in horas!
Non sine morte tua nostri dammove cruoris
Mediolanensis patrie violabis honorem!'*²⁷

'Here you are not allowed to cross, ruddy king,
leader of Teutonic savagery! You must change course!
The Adda does not permit foreign hordes
to advance here and defends its hallowed fatherland from the foe!
Go away, and take your ravening forces with you!
You shall not profane Milan's fatherland
without perishing, even if our blood has to be spilt!'

Does the 'Teutonic savagery' at vv. 2086–7 derive from Lucan (*Bellum civile* i. 255–6) or is it as clichéd as the originally Virgilian expression for advance (*gressum ferre* v. 2088; cf. *Aeneid* xi. 99)? The Italian poet is operating with classical stereotypes, against the drab background of which his vernacular coinage stands out vividly. 'Ruddy king!' (*rex ruffe!*) at v. 2086 is a nickname that Italians, not Germans, first gave Barbarossa from the colour of his beard.²⁸ Redheads, during the Middle Ages, were figures of popular suspicion whom Ruodlieb, the hero of an eleventh-century German romance written in Latin, is warned never to trust by a king.²⁹ Nothing regal is meant by this jibe. Unlike Rahewin, who, in a description of Barbarossa that abounds in ancient reminiscences, states without irony that his barber kept his hair short 'out of respect for the empire' (*pro reverentia imperii*³⁰), the Italian poet sets the loftiness of the

²⁶ *Carmen de gestis Frederici I. imperatoris in Lombardia*, ed. I. Schmale-Ott MGH SrG (Hanover, 1965).

²⁷ *Carmen* 2086–93, ed. Ott-Schmale, 69.

²⁸ Cf. O. Holder-Egger, 'Bericht über eine Reise nach Italien im Jahre 1891', NA 17 (1892) 512, 515.

²⁹ *Ruodlieb* 451 ff., ed. K. Vollmann, *Frühe Deutsche Literatur und lateinische Literatur in Deutschland*, Bibliothek des Mittelalters 1 (Frankfurt, 1991) 454.

³⁰ *Gesta Frederici*, iv. 86 ed. Schmale, 708, 15–16.

diction with which the rebels begin their address against the vulgarity of the taunt into which they lapse. *Rex ruffe!* is colloquial Latin. Its plebeian connotations, jarring with the classical register, betray the uncertain grasp of culture that characterizes arrogance at Milan. So, during the early 1160s, the high-sounding rhetoric of rebellion in that city was exposed as low abuse by a partisan of Barbarossa from Bergamo.

Dissonance of tone and style is further developed at the ethnic level. How, wondered the Italian poet, could his compatriots cooperate with Germans? This question, directly relevant to his own work, he answered differently from Otto of Freising and Rahewin.³¹ With the aid of Lucan (*Bellum civile* vii. 272–3), his chief model for the literary presentation of barbarity, he describes how it was overcome by making common cause:

*Illic barbaries et centum dissona linguis
Verba sonant, illic vario gens plurima cultu
Sub domino pariter sine murmure cogitur uno;
Teutonic mixtis loca servant iussa Latinis.*³²

There barbarity in a hundred tongues rings out its cacophony,
there many peoples of different backgrounds
are forced together to submit without complaint to a single lord;
Teutons mingle with Latins and keep the places assigned to them.

In such a medley of peoples and languages, the army's regulation that only Italians who knew German should be allowed to serve is abrogated by harmony between the emperor's adherents. The creator of this concord is none other than Rainald of Dassel, stationed near the Porta Romana in command of troops from Pavia. That 'imperial city', as it is described in Hohenstaufen charters,³³ was Milan's mortal enemy; and as such it looked up to its leader who voiced Barbarossa's will:

*Cum patre Rainaldo Frederici interprete regis.*³⁴
with the paternal Rainald, spokesman of King Frederick.

Even in the puff of panegyric, the Archpoet never came close to such hyperbole. At home in epic, it was as alien to his work as an ecumenical view of Italians. Subjects to be ruled, not children to be cherished, they deserved less a father-figure than a master with the ruthlessness of Rainald. His paternal feelings, our author knew, were reserved for subjects on his side. The exuberance of the Italian and the reticence of the German writers are not only due to differences of genre. From the distance of Bergamo it was possible to maintain an illusion that would not sustain scrutiny at close quarters, and to amplify without nuance what the Archpoet cast in subdued shades of gray.

In the grey zone between professed obedience and real denial it was advisable to seem a supplicant:

³¹ See Chapter III.

³³ See Chapter VII.

³² *Carmen* 2305–8, ed. Schmale-Ott, 76.

³⁴ *Carmen* 2314, ed. Schmale-Ott, 77.

6. *Vir vivorum optime, parce tuo vati,
qui se totum subicit tue voluntati;
precor, cum non audeam onus tantum pati,
ut rigorem temperes ardui mandati.*³⁵
6. Best of men, spare your poet,
who submits wholly to your will;
since I should not venture to bear such a burden,
I beg you to temper the toughness of your severe order.

Supplication, however, amounted only to a tactic for reassuring Rainald that he was still in command. Then, with the dialectic of contradiction that shapes this work, the Archpoet turns to the strategy of his many arguments. Although subordinate to his patron's will (6, 2), the client has one of his own (6, 3). Its freedom should not be constrained by severity (*rigorem . . . ardui mandati*), for Christian doctrine taught that voluntary labour alone was valid.³⁶ Couched as an appeal, not stated as a precept, the request for mercy (*precor | . . . ut temperes* 6, 3–4) reminds the archchancellor of his duties as a prelate. Episcopal rule was meant to be mild: Rainald's *rigor* is at odds with this pastoral ideal. That is why, after enlisting ancient poets to support his cause, our author now turns to Old Testament prophets. The archbishop-elect of Cologne who, under Otto of Freising's influence, had been entertaining profane thoughts about Virgil and Lucan is urged to concentrate on biblical figures:

7. *Nosti quod in homine non sit eius via;
prophecie spiritus fugit a Helya,
Helyseum deserit sepe prophetia,
nec me semper sequitur mea poetria.*³⁷
7. You know that men cannot choose their own course;
the spirit of prophecy fled from Elias,
his gifts as a seer often deserted Elisha,
and my poetry does not always follow me.

Supplication is transformed into sententiousness. Our author depicts himself as a *vates*, both a poet and a prophet, in roles that are aligned at 7, 3 and 7, 4. Although writing-blocks are attested before him, few had thought of seers unable to produce the goods. Elias, for example, was regularly cited as the foremost among them;³⁸ and Elisha, in his ability to predict the future, could be construed as a forerunner of Jesus.³⁹ The words, not the silence, of both

³⁵ *Carm.* IV, 6, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 58.

³⁶ Cf. V. Postel, *Arbeit und Willensfreiheit im Mittelalter*, Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte 207 (Stuttgart, 2009), 125 ff.

³⁷ *Carm.* IV, 7, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 58.

³⁸ *Elias dicitur eximius prophetorum in Repertorium Biblicum Medii Aevi*, vii. *Commentaria anonyma P-Z*, ed. F. Stegmüller (Madrid, 1961), 184, no. 10663.

³⁹ *Elias dicitur eximius prophetorum*, ed. Stegmüller, 476, no. 11680.

were quoted in religious polemic.⁴⁰ And yet these standard examples of inspiration are adduced by the Archpoet as precedents for his temporary lack of that gift. He is thinking of a seldom-cited passage in Gregory the Great's first homily on Ezekiel,⁴¹ and counting on his patron not to know about its relative rarity. On the basis of biblical exegesis, which Rainald had skimmed at Paris, the exceptional might be cast as ordinary and the contingent as normal:

8. *Aliquando facio versus mille cito
et tunc nulli cederem versuum perito,
sed post tempus modicum cerebro sopito
versus a me fugiunt carminis obliro.*⁴²
8. Now and then I write a thousand lines quickly
and yield at that point to no expert versifier,
but after a while my brain nods off,
I forget my poem, and verse flees from me.

Mille at 8, 1 does not just mean 'a thousand' as the literal translation above suggests. The number was (and remains) synonymous with 'countless'; the connotations were proverbial.⁴³ How then can the Archpoet be equated with Horace, who uses a similar expression (*mille . . . versus*, *Serm.* ii. 1. 4),⁴⁴ or his patron compared to Maecenas in what is claimed to be a display of 'highly classicizing talent for *imitatio*'?⁴⁵ Classicism entails consciousness on the part of writer and audience. References need to be recognizable. Horace, at *Serm.* ii. i. 4, is simply reporting criticisms of his own work. The original context of *mille . . . versus* has nothing to do with the relationship between patron and client, nor is a metaphor of infinitude adequate to establish a parallel between our author's refusal to compose an epic on Barbarossa and Augustan poets' reluctance to write about Augustus.⁴⁶ For even if we posit medieval memories different from our own,⁴⁷ superhuman powers of syncretism would have been required to induce, from a figure of speech that by the twelfth century was at best commonplace and at worst banal, an 'intertextuality' designed to cast the

⁴⁰ e.g. Peter Damian, Ep. 96, ed. K. Reindel, *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani* 3. Nr. 91-150 MGH Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit iv, 3 (Munich, 1989) 63, and Gerhoh of Reichersberg, *Opusculum de edificio Dei*, 39, ed. E. Sackur, MGH Libelli de lite iii (Hanover, 1897), 161, 285 and *De investigatione Antichristi*, 74, ed. E. Sackur, MGH Libelli de lite iii (Hanover, 1897), 395, 31 ff.

⁴¹ I, 15, ed. C. Morel, SJ, *Grégoire le Grand: Homélies sur Ézéchiel*, i. SC 327 (Paris, 1986), 70.

⁴² *Carm.* IV, 8, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 58.

⁴³ See H. Walther, *Lateinische Sprichwörter und Sentenzen des Mittelalters in alphabetischer Anordnung*, ii. *Carmina Medii Aevi Posterioris Latina* II/2 (Göttingen, 1964), nos 14848 ff.

⁴⁴ Watenphul-Krefeld, 107-8, ad loc.

⁴⁵ S. Harrison, 'The Archpoet, Poem IV and some Horatian Intertexts', *MLJb* 32 (1997), 37-42, at 41, and cf. O. Zwierlein, 'Antike Motive beim Archipoeta und im *Ligwinus*', *MLJb* 7 (1972), 102-24, for a similar approach.

⁴⁶ Cf. J. Griffin, 'Augustus and the Poets: *'Caesar qui cogere posset'*', F. Millar and E. Segal (eds), *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects* (Oxford, 1984), 189-218.

⁴⁷ Cf. M. Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 10 (Cambridge, 1990), and Carruthers, *The Craft of Thought: Meditation, Rhetorics and the Making of Images 400-1200*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 34 (Cambridge, 1998).

medieval pair in classical roles. Rainald of Dassel did not need Maecenas to hit on the idea of poetry in praise of the emperor. Nor did our author think of Horace when he employed a literary *koinê* that was more than a millennium old, never naming these alleged models for his master and himself. Without citing them, the Archpoet adduces Virgil, Lucan, and Homer. They take their place in his literary lineage beside Elias and Elisha. Antiquity, for him, is both biblical and classical.

Eclecticism, admitting no single or dominant source, characterizes our author even when he appears to quote:

9. *Que semel emittitur nescit vox reverti;
scripta sua corrigunt eciam disertī,
versus volunt corrigi denuoque verti,
ne risum segnicies pariat inertī.*⁴⁸
9. Once released a word cannot be restrained;
even the eloquent correct their writings;
verse needs to be given a fresh coat of correction
to prevent authors being derided for sloth.

Twelfth-century ears, hearing the Archpoet ring the changes on this familiar theme of the irrevocably spoken word,⁴⁹ were not attuned to detecting in the first verse above an echo of the *Ars poetica* (390 and cf. *Ep.* i. 18. 17). The contexts, again, are dissimilar. Horace refers to the elimination of unpublished verse: the Archpoet expresses caution about writing for a critical audience, which pounces on lack of polish (9, 4). Sloth (*segnicies*) is the charge he anticipates, revision being a condition of his craft. This is the first hint of the public for which our author wrote, and it merits attention, because he later felt free to recycle the strophes that follow.⁵⁰ Duplication of verse delivered orally was permissible if, transposed into a different setting, the original product acquired fresh meaning. There was no room for slackness, however, the first time he read aloud. Attentive hearers, ready and able to sneer, might grant the Archpoet a degree of flexibility denied to authors of written literature,⁵¹ only if he rose to the occasion. The occasion could appear alarmingly frequent. Saints' days, festivals, and seasons in the liturgical year were times at which he was expected to produce. Hence the need for a repertoire on which to draw at demand; hence the Archpoet's preference for small-scale efforts. The laborious processes of writing and revision indispensable to epic demanded leisure that 'Rainald H', occupied in the chancery, did not have at his disposal.

Despite the irony of his tone and the sophistry of his arguments in this poem, these claims may be believed, for they are borne out by the textual tradition of the *œuvre*. Multiple copies are exceptional. Most works survive in

⁴⁸ *Carm.* IV, 9, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 78.

⁴⁹ Cf. Walther, *Lateinische Sprichwörter*, no. 38724b.

⁵⁰ See Chapter VIII.

⁵¹ Cf. D. H. Green, *Medieval Listening and Reading: The Primary Reception of German Literature 800–1300* (Cambridge, 1994).

the form of a single witness or in excerpts. No one assembled a corpus of the Archpoet's writings comparable to the Horatian canon. His itinerancy impinged on the transmission of our author. To him may be applied, with allowance for its hyperbole, what another imperial notary and poet, Godfrey of Viterbo, claimed twenty years later:

for I improvised those things in corners of the emperor's palace or riding on the road beneath a tree or hidden in a forest, in the midst of camp-sieges and many dangerous battles, not in a hermitage or monastery or place of peace as I composed but in continuous movement and endless uproar among wars and military operations and in the din of the vast court, which I had to attend on a daily basis in my capacity as chaplain—day and night, at mass, at every hour of the clock, at table, during lawsuits, while writing letters, looking after guests every day, and seeking out salaries for myself and my colleagues . . . All of which, in its quantity and tiresomeness, makes it even more remarkable that I managed to achieve these things amid such bustle, such carousing, such pandemonium and worries . . .⁵²

These were hardly the circumstances that led an author to muse on a monument more enduring than bronze. Classicism's aspirations to immortality were remote from the Archpoet's experience, and he poked fun at them in strophes whose wit he rightly considered so winning as to warrant repetition:

10. *Loca vitant publica quidam poetarum
et secretas eligunt sedes latebrarum,
student instant vigilant nec laborant parum
et vix tandem reddere possunt opus clarum.*
11. *Ieiunant et abstinere poetarum chori,
vitant rixas publicas et tumultus fori
et, ut opus faciant quod non possit mori,
moriuntur studio subditi labori.*
12. *Unicuique proprium dat Natura munus:
ego nunquam potui scribere ieiunus;
me ieiunum vincere posset puer unus:
sitim et ieiunium odi quasi funus.*
13. *Unicuique proprium dat Natura donum:
ego versus faciens bibo vinum bonum
et quod habent melius dolia cauponum;
tale vinum generat copiam sermonum.*

⁵² *cum ego in angulis palatii imperialis aut in via equitando sub aliqua arborum aut in silva aliqua absconsus ad horam ista scripserim, in obsidionibus castrorum, in periculo preliorum multorum, non in heremo vel in claustro aut aliquo quietis loco positus hec dictaverim, set in omni motu et rerum turbatione assidua et in guerra et in rebus bellicis, in strepitu tante curie, ubi me oportebat cotidie esse assiduus, utpote capellanum, die ac nocte, in missa, in omnibus horis diei, in mensa, in causis agitandis, in epistolis conficiendis, in cotidiana cura novorum hospitiorum, in stipendiis conquirendis mihi meisque . . . Que omnia quanto plura et graviora sunt, tanto mirabilius est, quod ego in tanto motu, in tanta crapula, tanto strepitu et sollicitudine ista potui operari. Memoria saeculorum prol.* (ed. G. Waitz, MGH SS 22 (repr. Stuttgart, 1979), 105, 24–31, 34–6).

14. *Tales versus facio, quale vinum bibo;
nihil possum facere nisi sumpto cibo;
nihil valent penitus que ieiunus scribo;
Nasonem post calicem carmine preibo.*
15. *Mihi nunquam spiritus prophetie datur,
nisi prius fuerit venter bene satur;
dum in arce cerebri Bachus dominatur.
in me Phebus irruit et miranda fatur.*⁵³
10. Certain poets avoid public places
and seek out hiding-spots in the darkness,
they strive, press on, stay awake and labour a lot,
and at long last they are scarcely able to produce a masterpiece.
11. Bands of poets fast and abstain,
avoiding public brawls and marketplace-din,
and in order to write an immortal work,
they die from exertion, drudges to toil.
12. To each person Nature gives a distinctive gift;
I could never write on an empty stomach;
when I am hungry a boy could beat me:
I hate hunger and thirst like a funeral.
13. To each person Nature gives a distinctive gift:
writing verse, I drink good wine,
the best that innkeepers' jars can furnish;
such is the wine that produces eloquence.
14. My poetry matches the quality of the wine I drink;
I can do nothing unless I have eaten;
what I write on an empty stomach is utterly worthless,
and after a glass I am a better poet than Ovid.
15. The spirit of prophecy is never given to me,
unless my stomach is well filled previously;
while Bacchus controls the peak of my brain,
Phoebus rushes into me and announces marvels.

Classical idealization of the countryside and longing for creative withdrawal are recast as the dull drudgery of bucolic bores.⁵⁴ The greyness of their group (*chori* 11, 1) contrasts with our author's vivid individuality. It is by no means the individuality of one who, wishing to be alone with his art, looks down on the crowds in the marketplace as vulgar brawlers (11, 2). Horatian hauteur is rejected. *Odi profanum vulgus et arceo* (*Carm.* iii. 1.1) is not the Archpoet's

⁵³ *Carm.* IV, 10–15, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 78–9. At 11, 3, I print *possit* (transmitted by several manuscripts, see Watenphul–Krefeld, 81) instead of Watenphul–Krefeld's *possint*.

⁵⁴ Horatian parallels are assembled by Watenphul–Krefeld, 144, ad *Carm.* X, 14–15, where these strophes are recycled. Cf. Godman, *Paradoxes of Conscience*, 185 ff.

inspiration but his target. With the mockery that he reserves for the prim and the solemn of all complexions or periods, he styles himself an exponent of anti-classicism.

With self-indulgence opposed to self-denial, he seeks a principle to justify the antithesis; and finds it, at 12, 1 and 13, 1, in the words of St Paul (Corinthians 7:7). Yet it is not God who bestows His gift on each man, as the apostle declares, for the Christian deity is conspicuous by His absence from this irreverent world. There hearty appetites and thirsty tongues produce superlative eloquence. Bacchus and Apollo, figures of intoxication and inspiration (15, 3–4), take the place of Christ and the Holy Spirit. Emphasizing again that he is both a poet and a prophet (15, 1), the vinous *vates* rejects two paths to the goal of achievement. As mockery is made of the ancients' rural retreat, fun is also poked at the high medieval road of asceticism. Mortification of the flesh, urged on the faithful by generations of ecclesiastical reformers, is derided as unnatural; and Nature itself becomes a personification of creative *crapula* (12, 1, 13, 1). That vice abhorred by St Benedict and by those who followed his Rule is now elevated into a standard of virtue.

Rainald of Dassel is invited to laugh at this irreverence in an unepiscopal manner meant to intimidate our author's potential detractors. If they will not tolerate formal faults, their literary criteria are inadequate to gauge or to grasp what the Archpoet recites, which has nothing to do with decorum as it was conceived by twelfth-century clerics. Nonplussed by his affront to classical and Christian standards, they may quibble at the style, but they dare not slight the content of the poem, because he has ensured that their master is on his side. The complicity of the patron with the client sets them apart from *bien-pensants* at court. We do not know whether members of Rainald's entourage were shrewd enough to join in the mirth at their expense, but we may be sure that their first reaction was to feel excluded. So they were, for this is verse written for an anticonformist who, in late 1162, was deemed schismatic. In the wit with which the Archpoet turns orthodoxy upside down, the 'ruin of the world' is invited to detect a mirror-image of himself.

Symmetries of inversion shape our author's style. Mocking the moralists, he presents his own version of a *sententia*. When St Paul, at Corinthians 7:7, wishes that everyone should be chaste like himself, conceding that each has his particular gift from God, he does not mean the subjectivity celebrated at 12, 2, where *ego* transforms apostolic precept into idiosyncratic preference. As with chastity, so with wine. Between bibulousness and eloquence the link was proverbial,⁵⁵ but the level of humour rarely rose above this sorry stuff:

*Vinum, quod est optimum, loqui facit Latinum.*⁵⁶
Excellent wine makes [me] talk Latin.

⁵⁵ See Walther, *Lateinische Sprichwörter*, no. 33455f.

⁵⁶ See Walther, *Lateinische Sprichwörter*, no. 33489a.

Finding creativity in his cups, at strophes 13 to 15, the Archpoet strikes an anti-metaphysical pose. No word of the wine that signifies Christ's Passion.⁵⁷ The mysteries of the altar are replaced by innkeepers' jars (13, 3) by a *vates* whose high vocation depends on low appetites. It is a cleric, perhaps a priest, who writes in denial of the dualism between body and spirit fundamental to much Christian thought. Alcohol makes him oracular; a full belly leads to literary feats; and, while everyone appreciates the gaiety, no one notes that the target of his irreverence is religious.

* * *

How could a conventional epic on Barbarossa in Italy be expected from such a transgressive author? Unable to state as much, the Archpoet leaves it to be inferred, adducing a different but equally diverting reason for his reluctance:

16. *Scribere non valeo pauper et mendicus
que gessit in Latio Cesar Fredericus,
qualiter subactus est Tuscus inimicus,
te propter, qui cesaris integer amicus.*⁵⁸

16. Poor and needy, I am unable to write
about Emperor Frederick's deeds in Italy
or how the Tuscan enemy was subdued
on your account, trusty friend of the sovereign.

'Rainald H' lurks behind the silences of this strophe. On 6 April 1162 he had copied a treaty that assigned trading privileges and future conquests in the south to Pisa,⁵⁹ and was aware that Rainald of Dassel, as imperial legate in Tuscany, sought confederates there. The Pisan annalist Bernard Maragone stresses the role of his city in subduing that region to Barbarossa's rule.⁶⁰ Such alliances could not be inferred from the strophe above, which represents the *Tuscus* less as an ally to be cultivated than as an enemy to be vanquished (16, 3). So Rainald treated other Tuscan cities, which complained about his oppression;⁶¹ although Pisa, the richest sea-power among them, remained on his side. There our author depicts him as flanked only by the emperor. The

⁵⁷ See A. Härdelein, *Aquae et vini mysterium: Geheimnis der Erlösung und Geheimnis der Kirche im Spiegel der mittelalterlichen Auslegung des gemischten Kelchs* (Münster, 1973), 33 ff.

⁵⁸ *Carm.* IV, 16, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 59. I print *propter* instead of Watenphul-Krefeld's *preter* at 16, 4.

⁵⁹ DFI, no. 356, with D. Abulafia, *The Two Sicilies: Economic Relations between the Kingdom of Sicily and the Norman Kingdom* (Cambridge, 1977), 124 ff. See further Chapter X.

⁶⁰ Rainaldus Coloniensis archiepiscopus et Italie archicancellarius venit Pisas et cum magno honore receptus est; et voluntatem imperatoris Frederici Pisani honorifice fecerunt, et per totam Tusciam, Marchas et Romagniam perrexit. . . Luca, Florentia et omnes civitates et castella omnia precepta imperatoris Frederici et predicti cancellarii obtentu Pisanorum et timore iuraverunt, tributa et dona plurima et infinitam pecuniam ei dederunt. Nullus enim marchio et nullus nuntius imperii fuit, qui tam honorifice civitates Italie tributaret et Romano subiceret imperio (Gli Annales Pisani di Bernardo Maragone, ed. M. Lupo Gentile, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores* vi, 2 (Bologna, 1930), 29, 19–27, and cf. Boso, *Vita Alexandri III*, ed. L. Duchesne, *Liber pontificalis*, ii, 411, 30–5).

⁶¹ Cf. Görich, *Friedrich Barbarossa*, 355.

presence of Italians is not acknowledged, unless they figure in the margins as defeated foes. This is one of the reasons why, at Lodi, the Archpoet proved unreceptive to the Morenas and why he was reluctant to compose an epic on Barbarossa. Others were negligible or nuisances. Only Rainald of Dassel would do.

The allegiance was not disinterested. It derived from neediness (cf. 16, 1–2), about which our author never ceases to complain:

17. *Poeta pauperior omnibus poetis
nichil prorsus habeo nisi quod videtis,
unde sepe lugeo quando vos ridetis;
nec me meo vitio pauperem putetis.*⁶²
17. A poet poorer than them all,
I have nothing at all but what you see,
and so I weep when you laugh;
do not ascribe my poverty to vice.

The shift from the singular to the plural (17, 2, 3, 4) indicates that not only Rainald of Dassel but also his entourage is being addressed. The tone changes too, from jocular but respectful intimacy to defensiveness. Pre-empting the uncharitable moralism that associates material need with shame,⁶³ our author styles other members of his audience snobs. Mean-minded when patron and client are merry, these colleagues are consigned to the role of outsiders. Excluded from the charmed circle that numbers two, they are to observe without comment or criticism how he gestures to attract his patron's attention, pointing to the sad state of his dress (17, 2). In the sign-language of poverty,⁶⁴ the garment speaks for itself. Probably of coarse grey cloth,⁶⁵ it serves to authenticate his penury. Pride, however, may be vaunted on grounds of his origins and education:

- 18 *Fodere non debeo, quia sum scolasticus
ortus ex militibus preliandi gnaris;
sed quia me terruit labor militaris,
malui Virgilium sequi quam te, Paris.*⁶⁶
18. I should not dig, because I am a schoolman,
sprung from knights, skilled at battle;
but, because I was terrified by martial toil,
I preferred to follow Virgil rather than Paris.

⁶² *Carm.* IV, 17, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 59.

⁶³ On this subject, cf. G. Ricci, *Povert , vergogna, superbia: I declassati fra Medioevo e et  moderna* (Bologna, 1996), 55 ff., and see Chapter VII.

⁶⁴ See *The Sign Languages of Poverty*,  sterreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Forschungen des Instituts f r Realienkunde des Mittelalters und der Fr hen Neuzeit. Diskussionen und Materialien 8 (Vienna, 2007).

⁶⁵ On the realia, cf. K. Kania, *Kleidung im Mittelalter: Ein Handbuch* (Cologne, 2010).

⁶⁶ *Carm.* IV, 18, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 59.

Here, for the first time in the learned literature of medieval Germany, a minister links his knightly descent with clerical culture. The affirmation would stand unchallenged until, two generations later, Wolfram of Eschenbach boasted about his birth and his standing as a layman in the vernacular (*Parzifal* 115).⁶⁷ This attitude was alien to our author, who detected in it danger of being confused with a peasant. The potential consequences of his misery are reprehensible, because at variance with his order: 'I ought not to dig' (*fodere non debeo*: 18, 3), he writes, altering the apostle's text at Luke 16:3. There 'I cannot dig' (*fodere non valeo*) is a humble statement of incapacity, which the Archpoet transforms into an ambiguous boast of rights. *Fodere*, in feudal society, was a verb with multiple meanings. If demotion to the ranks of the serfs was one of its connotations, another, perhaps more pertinent in the light of Rainald of Dassel's anti-Cistercian measures of the early 1160s,⁶⁸ may be the manual labour prescribed by the version of the Rule followed at Cîteaux and Clairvaux.⁶⁹ Declining to become one of those monks opposed to his patron or to work the earth like a menial, the Archpoet adds the category of theft to the apostle's rejection of beggary,⁷⁰ before stating plainly the company in which he is convinced that he belongs:

20. *Sepe de miseria mee paupertatis
conqueror in carmine viris litteratis.
Laici non sapiunt ea que sunt vatis
et nil michi tribuunt, quod est notum satis.*⁷¹

20. I often lament in verse
about my miserable poverty to learned men.
Laymen do not understand the poet's craft,
and give me nothing, as is well known.

Once again the *sic* of identity is balanced by *non* of exclusion. Shut out from the Archpoet's audience are unlettered laymen, among whom was the emperor. Learned culture admits no intruder,⁷² and our author displays the aloofness

⁶⁷ Ed. K. Lachmann, tr. W. Spicwok (Stuttgart, 1981), 198. It is unclear to me why J. Heinze (LMA ix. 310) writes: 'Welchem Stand W[olfram] von Geburt angehörte, ist unbekannt.' I thank Susanne Koebele and Jan-Dirk Müller for advice on this point.

⁶⁸ See T. Reuter, 'Das Edikt Friedrich Barbarossas gegen die Zisterzienser', *MIÖG* 84 (1976) 328–36.

⁶⁹ See G. Zimmermann, *Ordensleben und Lebensstandard: Die cura corporis in den Ordensvorschriften des abendländischen Hochmittelalters*, Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Mönchtums und des Benediktinerordens 32 (Münster, 1973).

⁷⁰ *Carm.* IV, 19, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 59.

⁷¹ *Carm.* IV 20, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 59.

⁷² See the still-classic study by H. Grundmann, 'Litteratus—illiteratus: Der Wandel einer Bildungsnorm vom Altertum zum Mittelalter', in Grundmann, *Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, 3. *Bildung und Sprache*, Schriften der MGH 25, 3 (Stuttgart, 1978), 1–66, and Y. Congar, 'Clercs et laïcs du point de vue de la culture au Moyen Âge: *laïcus* = sans lettres', in Y. Congar, *Études d'écclésiologie médiévale*, Variorum (London, 1983), 309–32. Cf. L. Prosdocimi, 'Chierici e laici nella società occidentale del secolo xii: A proposito di Decr. Grat. C. 12.q.1.c. 7: *Duo sunt genera Christianorum*', in S. Kuttner and J. Ryan (eds), *Proceedings of the Second Annual Congress of Medieval Canon Law*, Monumenta Iuris Canonici, Series C, Subsidia I (Vatican, 1962), 105–22.

that Wolfram would counter when, at *Parzifal* 115, he advertised his inability to read or write. With the illiteracy that clerics attributed to his order refuted by the evidence of his achievement in vernacular verse, he draws attention to a sphere of literature that the Archpoet considered beneath his notice. Beyond his ken was a future in which Rudolf of Ems would compose, in Middle High German for a knightly patron, *Der gute Gerhard*, whose hero is a merchant, or in which another minister, Konrad of Hermesfurt, might dedicate his *Urstede* to a bishop of Eichstätt.⁷³ Such works, had he known them, would have seemed to our author sub-literary. The only writing that counted was in Latin, from whose pinnacle it was permissible to sneer at the cluelessness of vernacular churls. But a Provençal poet who was far from churlish had anticipated him a generation earlier. The clerically educated Guilhelm IX of Aquitaine decried as peasants those who did not understand his work.⁷⁴ For him as for the Archpoet, cultural inferiority entails social degradation. Less assured of his position than Guilhelm IX, the minister in need is forced to distinguish between reduced circumstances and undiminished status. Despite his shabbiness, he remains a *scolaris* (18, 1).

This term, a badge of rank and a title of learning, by no means signifies the peripatetic proletariat of the schools;⁷⁵ still less does it designate authors of what continues to be called *Vagantenlyrik*—a term that no one understands, for it means nothing. The poem before us is a case in point. It is not a lyric, nor was its author a wandering scholar. A notary in Rainald of Dassel's entourage affirms his prestige, established by birth and extended by knowledge acquired at Hildesheim and Paris. It is as a *scolaris* that he lays claim to a place among the clerical élite, which he stations above the illiterate laity. If knights, noblemen, or even the emperor happen to pass by while the Archpoet is reciting these jibes against their order, his impunity is ensured by their ignorance. They do not understand the spoken Latin intelligible only to *scolares*. So it is that a third grade of exclusion may be added to the other two. Beyond the pale that consigns Italians to the wilderness and the barrier that wards off carping critics, there looms the formidable obstacle of the schools. This was the Archpoet's ideal, in terms of which he expresses a preference for Virgil, symbol of literary excellence, over Paris, the Trojan hero and medieval prototype of martial valour (18, 4).⁷⁶ Knights are nobodies compared with men of culture.

⁷³ *Der gute Gerhard*, ed. J. Asher (Tübingen, 1971), with H. Brackert, *Rudolf von Ems: Dichtung und Geschichte* (Heidelberg, 1968), and *Der Urstende*, ed. K. Gärtner and W. Hoffmann (Tübingen, 1989), xi ff. See further Green, *Medieval Listening and Reading*, 212 ff., 223 ff., 275.

⁷⁴ *Companho, farai un vers [qu'er] covinen . . . Etenhatz lo per vilan, qui non l'enten.* (Guglielmo IX d'Aquitania, *Poesie* I, 1, 1; 2, 1, ed. N. Pasero (Modena, 1973), 16). On the knights (*companho*) addressed as Guilhelm's entourage, see L. Paterson, *The World of the Troubadours* (Oxford, 1993) 107.

⁷⁵ Pace O. Riha, in *Sachwörterbuch der Mediävistik*, ed. P. Dinzelsbacher (Stuttgart, 1992), 736–7.

⁷⁶ Watenphul–Krefeld, ad loc. (109), rightly draw attention to the portrayal of Paris as a hero by Dares Phrygius and cf. *Anonymi Historia Trojana Daretis Frigii*, 190 ff., 665 ff., ed. J. Stohlmann, *Beihefte zum MJb* 1 (Cologne, 1968).

Our author's paradigm of values is striking for its omission of the faith. As he addresses Rainald of Dassel, who is not known to have employed a theologian, mysteries of the spirit are passed over by his clerical client, who is voluble about affairs of the flesh. The credentials that he lists so lovingly do not include belief. Devotion is a detail compared with the main point of materialism:

21. *A viris Teutonicis multa solent dari,
digni sunt pre ceteris laude singulari.*
.
22. *Presules Italie presules avari,
pocius ydolatre debent nominari;
vix quadrantem tribuunt pauperi scolari:
quis per dona talia poterit ditari?*⁷⁷
21. Germans, accustomed to being open-handed,
deserve special praise before others.
.
22. Italian bishops are stingy,
they should rather be called idolators;
they barely bestow a penny on a poor scholar:
who could get rich through such gifts?

Generosity is German. The ethnic term *Teutonicis*, in the first verse of strophe 21, contrasts with *presules Italie* at 22, 1. The Italian experiences of 'Rainald H' motivate the Archpoet's antithesis, which rests on an aggrieved perception of asymmetry within the empire. As a notary he was occupied in recording how the subjects of the Reich were benefiting from its bounty. With a minister's attention to reciprocity and a client's craving for patronage, he also observed that the largesse failed to flow in more than one direction. Grasping prelates of a land less acquiescent than its masters fancied were breaching, in his case as in others, the principle of *do, ut des*. Hence our author's antithesis between Italian meanness and German open-handedness. Hence his moralism, voiced in a tone that is humorous but tart, about the related vices of avarice and hypocrisy. For the declining influence of peninsular prelates, especially in the north, he shows no more understanding than he does for other facts of life in Italy: the Archpoet's sole standard of comparison is the episcopate at home.⁷⁸ Imagining the Italian bishops as flush of funds and reluctant to part with them as they had been during the investiture crisis,⁷⁹ he taxes them with vices for which they had long been pilloried.⁸⁰

⁷⁷ *Carm.* IV, 21–2, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 59.

⁷⁸ See G. Tabacco, 'Vescovi e communi in Italia', in C. Mor and H. Schmidinger (eds), *I poteri temporali dei vescovi in Italia e in Germania nel Medioevo* (Bologna, 1979), 253–82, and H. Jakobs, 'Vescovi e città in Germania', in Mor and Schmidinger (eds), *I poteri temporali*, 283–328.

⁷⁹ C. Violante, 'Il vescovo dell'Italia centro-settentrionale e lo sviluppo dell'economia monetaria' in *Vescovi e diocesi in Italia nel Medioevo (sec. ix–xiii)*, Italia Sacra 5 (Padua, 1964), 193–217, especially 201 ff.

⁸⁰ Cf. H. Schüppert, *Kirchenkritik in der lateinischen Lyrik des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts*, Medium Ævum 23 (Munich, 1972).

Yet these terms are not merely topical. Our author's likeness of avarice to idolatry, based on St Paul (*avarus, quod est idolorum servitus*: Ephesians 5:5), acquires edge in the schism that raged at the time he wrote. *Ydolatre* (22, 2) signified followers of the antipope, who, seen from the imperialist perspective, was Alexander III. The Alexandrian bishops of northern Italy adhere to his side for motives of money, with which they are reluctant to part even to help 'a poor scholar' (22, 3). *Pauperes scholares* were those whom Barbarossa had intended to protect, not least with the support of the episcopate, when in November 1158 he reissued the edict *Habita* promulgated at Roncaglia three years earlier.⁸¹ Among the Italian bishops who attended that assembly Raymond of Brescia (1153–73) is an identifiable target of the Archpoet's invective.⁸² He, like several of his Lombard colleagues in office who are named by Acerbus Morena, had been excommunicated by Victor IV at Lodi in 1161.⁸³ The events of the previous year colour the polemic of our author, concerned as ever about his penury. The implication is that only the Germans recognize his standing as a *scolaris* (22, 3) and act on Barbarossa's legislation. In the imperial camp, where generosity is an episcopal virtue embodied by Rainald of Dassel, there is none of that penny-pinching 'idolatry' that looks up to Alexander III and down on needy poets.

Legal language is adapted with irony, and the mock-moralism of our author is developed tongue-in-cheek:

23. *Doleo, cum video leccatores multos
penitus inutiles penitusque stultos
nulla prorsus animi ratione fultos
sericis et variis indumentis cultos.*⁸⁴

23. I grieve when I see many buffoons,
utterly useless and completely stupid,
without rhyme or reason in their minds,
dressed up in silk and brightly coloured garments.

This is not the generalized invective of the twelfth century against the corruption of courtiers, the foppery of fools.⁸⁵ More specific and acerbic, the Archpoet equates with morons and madmen those he abuses as *leccatores*. The term, unclassical and injurious, was applied by theologians to popular entertainers

⁸¹ DFI, no. 243, with W. Stelzer, 'Zum Scholarenprivileg Friedrich Barbarossas (*Authentica 'Habita'*)', *DA* 34 (1978), 123–65.

⁸² *Gli antichi vescovi d'Italia: La Lombardia*, II, I, ed. F. Savio SJ (Bergamo, 1929), 229–32.

⁸³ Acerbus Morena, ed. Schmale, *Quellen*, 164.

⁸⁴ *Carm.* IV, 23, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 60.

⁸⁵ Cf. P. Ganz, 'Curialis/hövesch', in G. Kaiser and J.-D. Müller (eds), *Höfische Literatur, Hofgesellschaft, höfische Lebensformen um 1200*, *Studia humaniora* 6 (Düsseldorf, 1986), 39–56, C. Uhlig, *Hofkritik im England des Mittelalters und der Renaissance: Studien zu einem Gemeinplatz der europäischen Moralistik* (Berlin, 1973), and the studies, with bibliography, in J. Fleckenstein (ed.) *Curialitas: Studien zu Grundfragen der höfischen-ritterlichen Kultur*, Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte 100 (Göttingen, 1990).

who made mockery of the sacraments.⁸⁶ The Archpoet is anxious to distinguish between his sophistication and the vulgarity of buffoons. Their mindlessness is amplified by their anonymity. Antitypes of his poverty, they are recognizable only by their luxurious dress.⁸⁷ The topic about which Rainald of Dassel had demonstrated his intransigence at the council of Reims 1148 and about which Ekbert of Schönau had admonished him in 1159 now defines the Archpoet's identity. Although poorly clothed, as he has admitted (17, 1–2), he is neither an exhibitionist nor crazed. Insanity and stupidity were attributed to performers by moralists such as Gerhoh of Reichersberg.⁸⁸ Mimicking the same stance of indignation, our author assigns 'brightly coloured garments' (23, 4) to stooges on the stage. This sartorial dividing-line is drawn from Pope Eugenius III's attempt to separate, by dress, the clergy and the laity.⁸⁹ Now our author ironizes the papal distinction:

24. *Vellem, soli milites eis ista darent
et de nobis presules nostri cogitarent,
non leonum spoliis asinos ornarent;
sed dum querunt gloriam, pietate carent.*⁹⁰

24. I wish that only knights would patronize them,
and that our prelates would think of us,
not adorning asses with lion-skins;
but they seek glory and lack charity.

The chivalrous fighters from whom, six strophes earlier, the Archpoet had derived his origins and status have become a focus of clerical contempt for the laity. Knights, not prelates, should give to fools and showmen: discriminating bishops ought to reserve their patronage for their own order.⁹¹ Hence the possessive pronouns ('us' and 'ours' *nobis, nostri*: 24, 2) that insist on a solidarity traduced by the princes of the Church whose ambition and secular pursuits, such as encouragement of actors and jongleurs, were regularly deplored in the polemic of the High Middle Ages:⁹²

⁸⁶ See Godman, *Paradoxes of Conscience*, 59, n. 64.

⁸⁷ Cf. L. v. Wilckens, *LMA* vii. 1701–2.

⁸⁸ Gerhoh, *De investigatione Antichristi* 5, ed. Sackur, *MGH Libelli de lite* iii. 315, 16 ff., and cf. Gerhoh, *Commentarius in Psalmum CXXXIII*, ed. Sackur, 499, 1 ff., with M. Harris, *Sacred Folly: A New History of the Feast of Fools* (Cornell, 2011), 42 ff.

⁸⁹ See Chapter II.

⁹⁰ *Carm.* IV, 24, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 60.

⁹¹ See Caesarius of Heisterbach on Archbishop Engelbert of Cologne: *Vestimenta sua . . . non histrionibus sed sacerdotibus, non scurris sed clericis dare consueverat* (*Fontes rerum Germanicarum*, ii, ed. J. Boehmer (Stuttgart, 1845) 364). Cf. Peter the Chanter, *Contra dantes histrionibus*, in *Verbum abbreviatum* 49, PL 205, 153–5.

⁹² Classic is Peter Damian, *Contra clericos aulicos*, PL 145, 463 ff. See C. Casagrande and S. Vecchio, 'Clerics et jongleurs dans la société médiévale, XIIe et XIIIe siècles', *Annales*, 344 (1979), 913–28, and R. Köhn, 'Militia curialis: Die Kritik am geistlichen Hofdienst bei Peter von Blois und in der lateinischen Literatur des 2.–12. Jahrhunderts', in *Soziale Ordnungen im Selbstverständnis des Mittelalters*, *Miscellanea Mediaevalia* 12/1 (Berlin, 1979), 227–57.

25. *Eia nunc, pontifices pietatis mire!
Cum poeta soleat foris esurire,
mimi solent cameras vestras introire,
qui nil sciunt facere preter insanire.*⁹³
25. Oh, how remarkable is the piety of today's prelates!
Although the poet is accustomed to starve outside,
actors are used to entering your chambers,
knowing nothing but how to rave.

A hundred years before this poem was written, between 1057 and 1061, related reproaches had been made by the cathedral-schoolmaster Meinhard to Bishop Gunther of Bamberg (1057–65).⁹⁴ So idle that he spent the day sleeping, so fat that he needed to be rolled out by mechanical contraptions (*mechanicis apparatusibus . . . evolendus*), Gunther had a weakness for heroic poetry.⁹⁵ Such 'courtly fictions' (*fabulae curiales*) were incompatible with his episcopal dignity and duties, Meinhard protested in another letter to a cleric of Bamberg:

What is our lord up to? What is his army of helmeted hares doing? With what wars, what battlelines are they grappling? Which triumphs do they celebrate? Good God! What a jumble not of men but of flies! What a splendid and squalid din! There is no sense of seriousness or control! How pathetic and pitiable is the bishop's lifestyle! He never pays the slightest heed to Augustine or Gregory and always has Etzel, Dietrich of Berne, and the like brought on. He handles not books but spears, and marvels not at the letters of the alphabet but at an array of sword-points.⁹⁶

Bishop Gunther and his army of 'helmeted hares', or actors, who recite heroic poetry when the fathers of the Church should be studied are the forebears of the *leccatores* whose antics the Archpoet condemns as 'raving' (*insanire* 25, 4). Meinhard was his predecessor, not his model, which derived from a tradition of hostility to the stage reaching back to the patristic period.⁹⁷ Distinct from less specific contrasts between literate authors and oral minstrels,⁹⁸ this

⁹³ *Carm.* IV, 25, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 60.

⁹⁴ The best study of this subject, as of many others, is by C. Erdmann, 'Fabulae curiales: Neues zum Spielmannsgesang und zum Ezzo-Liede', *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, 73 (1936), 87–98.

⁹⁵ *Ep.* 63, ed. Erdmann and Fickermann, *Briefsammlungen*, 110, 14–19.

⁹⁶ *Quid vero agit dominus noster? Quid suus ille exercitus galeatorum leporum? Que bella, quas acies tractant? Quos triumphos celebrant? Dii boni, quanta ibi colluvio non virorum, sed muscarum! Quam magnifici et vani strepitus! Nulla ibi gravitas, nulla disciplina. Et o miseram et miserandam episcopi vitam, o mores! Numquam ille Augustinum, numquam ille Gregorium recolit, semper ille Attalam, semper Amalungum et cetera id genus portare tractat. Versat ille non libros, sed lanceas, miratur ille non litterarum apices, sed mucronum acies* (*Ep.* 73, ed. Erdmann and Fickermann, *Briefsammlungen*, 121, 3–11).

⁹⁷ Cf. H. Jürgens, *Pompa diaboli: Die lateinischen Kirchenväter und das antike Theater* (Stuttgart, 1972), and cf. A. Weisjohann, 'Ut . . . stultus vel fatuus putaretur—"Fehlritte" früher Franziskaner?', in P. v. Moos (ed.), *Der Fehltritt: Vergehen und Versehen in der Vormoderne*, Norm und Struktur 15 (Cologne, 2001), 218 ff. (with bibliography). On the Greek side, excellent is S. Halliwell, *Greek Laughter: A Study of Cultural Psychology from Homer to Early Christianity* (Cambridge, 2008), 486 ff.

⁹⁸ Cf. Green, *Medieval Listening and Reading*, 164.

insistence that there should be no place at an episcopal court for such antics marks a return to Ekbert of Schönau's admonitions against bishops behaving like secular magnates. So it is that the Archpoet slights real or potential rivals. Undermining others, he establishes his own interest. From the premise that the clergy should stick together and not waste its largesse on laymen, the conclusion follows that Rainald's patronage ought to be reserved for him.

To himself our author applies his second anti-type. Subtler than the first, it has no parallel in classical and medieval literature. Censuring the lowly *mimi*, he stations himself on a higher plane, where he takes the limelight as an anti-actor. The link between performance and hypocrisy was familiar to him from Isidore's *Etymologiae* (x. 118–20).⁹⁹ Rejecting the despised role of buffoon, declining the shameful part of entertainer,¹⁰⁰ the Archpoet, whose admission of tipping might seem to have disqualified him from moralism, now claims an authenticity that justifies his vituperation of others' vices:

26. *Pereat ypocrisis omnium parcorum!*
Scimus quod avarus est cultor ydolorum!
Commendetur largitas presulum;
*electus Colonie primus est eorum!*¹⁰¹
26. May the hypocrisy of all the stingy perish!
 We know that the avaricious are idolators!
 Let the generosity of open-handed prelates be praised;
 the archbishop-elect of Cologne is the first of them!

Antithesis has become affirmation. If he is no actor, neither is Rainald of Dassel a stingy, hypocritical idolator—or Alexandrian. With generosity extolled as the opposite of three sins now identified with one another, the lord is reminded of the economic interests of his minister.¹⁰² Again behaving like the 'cheerful giver' of 2 Corinthians 9:7, the archchancellor fulfils the obligations of reciprocity, about which the Archpoet reminds him in painstaking detail:

27. *Inde fit, ut aliquid petere presumam,*
nudus ego, metuens frigus atque brumam,
qui vellus non habeo nec in lecto plumam:
*tam libenter mihi det, quam libenter sumam!*¹⁰³
27. So it is that I presume to make a request,
 naked, as I am, afraid of the cold and frost,
 without a woollen cloak or a featherbed:
 let him give to me as willingly as I should receive!

⁹⁹ Cf. Godman, *Paradoxes of Conscience*, 34–5.

¹⁰⁰ See J. Ogilvy, 'Mimi, scurrae, histriones: Entertainers of the Early Middle Ages', *Speculum*, 38 (1963), 603–19, and W. Hartung, *Die Spielleute: Eine Randgruppe in der Gesellschaft des Mittelalters*, *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte Beiheft* 72 (Wiesbaden, 1982) 30 ff.

¹⁰¹ *Carm.* IV, 26, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 60.

¹⁰² J. Keupp, *Dienst und Verdienst: Die Ministerialien Friedrich Barbarossas und Heinrichs VI* (Stuttgart, 2002), 434 ff.

¹⁰³ *Carm.* IV, 28, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 60.

Sincerity may be symmetrical in this mock-moralism, but the balance of *do, ut des* is made to tilt towards him who has not received what he is owed. Penniless and pitiable, the Archpoet disposes of other resources. His complaint is less about the figurative nudity of religious conviction¹⁰⁴ than a literal lack of money beneath the dignity of his order.¹⁰⁵ The woollen cloak and warm bedding to which he refers were among the benefits, codified at Cologne since the eleventh century and being revised at the time this poem was written, that the archbishop-elect provided for his ministers.¹⁰⁶ For the clothing of each of them, a sum of between four and six marks was set aside.¹⁰⁷ The Archpoet's plea for patronage can, and should, be understood as a reminder of rights.¹⁰⁸ This right to demand dues is quite unlike a generic protest about the inadequacy of garments. The work that the French poet Hugh Primas had written, a generation previously, lamenting the shortcomings of a cloak received from a bishop did not amount to a model for our author.¹⁰⁹ Aside from their substantial differences of form, style, and tone, their situations are not comparable. The Primas is displaced: the Archpoet stable. Despite the wanderings to which he refers with more than a touch of fantasy,¹¹⁰ he belongs, or returns, to Rainald of Dassel's entourage. There, in that itinerant and exclusive circle, the ministerial client is entitled to make legitimate demands. He does not beg, in the manner of Martial that Primas apes,¹¹¹ nor is he in any position to imprecate. From the abuse and irony of his cloak-poem to his egocentric eulogy on Amiens,¹¹² Hugh Primas harps without respite on his social and economic precariousness. He receives alms or accepts charity, the variable levels of which serve only to highlight his constant condition of dependence. Our author, by contrast, refers humorously to a shamelessness (*libenter sumam* 28, 4) that is permissible, because based on reciprocity.

¹⁰⁴ See G. Constable, 'Nudus nudum Christum sequi and Parallel Formulas in the Twelfth Century', in F. Church (ed.), *Continuity and Discontinuity in Church History: Essays Presented to G. Huntston Williams* (Leyden, 1979), 143–50.

¹⁰⁵ Pace A. Betten, 'Lateinische Bettellyrik: Literarische Topik oder Ausdruck existentieller Not?', *MJb* 11 (1976), 143–50.

¹⁰⁶ See U. Ritzerfeld, *Das Kölner Erzstift im 12. Jahrhundert: Verwaltungsorganisation und wirtschaftliche Grundlagen*, *Rheinisches Archiv* 132 (Cologne, 1994), 222 ff., 243 ff.

¹⁰⁷ See 'Das Recht der Dienstmänner des Erzbischofs von Köln', ed. F. Frensdorff, *Mitteilungen aus dem Stadtarchiv von Köln* 1, 2 (1883), c. XI, 9 [= *Quellen zur deutschen Verfassungs-, Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte bis 1250*, ed. L. Weinrich (Darmstadt, 1977), 276], and H. Loesch (ed.), 'Das kürzere Kölner Dienstmännerrecht', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, 57 Germ. Abt. 44 (1924) c. II, 298. Cf. Burkhardt, *Mit Stab und Schwert*, 350.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. W. Weise, *Der Hof der Kölner Erzbischöfe in der Zeit Kaiser Friedrich Barbarossas*, *Studia humaniora* 38 (Brühl, 2004), 189 ff.

¹⁰⁹ Printed as continuous verse by C. McDonough (ed.), *The Oxford Poems of Hugh Primas and the Arundel Lyrics* (Toronto, 1984), no. 230 (cf. McDonough, *The Arundel Lyrics and the Poems of Hugh Primas*, *Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library* 2 (Cambridge, MA, 2010)), and in three parts by F. Adcock (ed.), *Hugh Primas and the Archpoet*, *Cambridge Medieval Classics* 2 (Cambridge, 1994), no. 2 4. On "eine Linie von dem Primas über den Archipoeta... bis zum letzten großen Vagantendichter Frankreichs: François Villon", cf. T. Latzke, 'Die Mantelgedichte des Primas Hugo von Orléans und Martial', *MJb* 5 (1968), 54–8.

¹¹⁰ See Chapter X.

¹¹¹ *Hugh Primas*, ed. Adcock, x.

¹¹² *Hugh Primas*, ed. Adcock, no. 18, 44–9; *Hugh Primas*, ed. McDonough, no. 18, 61–5.

Reciprocity entailed that request be matched by encomium,¹¹³ and the principle of giving is developed in the Archpoet's claim to have redistributed wealth lower down the ecclesiastical ladder.¹¹⁴ Not only is the parallel to Rainald of Dassel's largesse striking here but also the fact that the bounty of both is confined to the secular clergy. The client-donor chooses a recipient of alms in conformity to the patron, whose anti-monastic policy is maintained. No member of a religious order opposed to the imperialist pope profits from what his backer has bestowed. This share in the takings is reserved for a 'poor priest' (*pauperem presbiterum* 30, 1) who, at least in Germany, might be prevailed upon to swear the oath of allegiance to Victor IV. With Rainald of Dassel, who was uncompromising on such issues, one might jest only if one remembered the hostility of others:

*et coram te corruant inimici pravi*¹¹⁵

may your wicked enemies collapse before you

Only at this level of hints and allusions does the Archpoet touch on the crisis during which his works were composed. All of them were meant for insiders—the archbishop-elect and members of his entourage—who understood that Rainald's enemies were the Alexandrians. Unnamed but identifiable, these spectres of hostility occupy the background of the corpus. Centre-stage is taken by a pair presented as doppelgänger of liberality:

28. *Largum habens dominum nolo parcus esse,
nolo sine socio mea frui messe:
nobilis est animi pluribus prodesse,
largo numquam poterit animo deesse.*¹¹⁶

28. Having a generous lord, I wish not to be stingy,
or enjoy the bounty I have harvested by myself:
to be of general benefit is the mark of a noble mind,
never to lack in open-handedness.

This is alleged by the poet who, fifteen strophes earlier, had pleaded poverty as a reason for not writing epic. Just as knights are transformed in his work from martial forebears about whom he boasts to lay patrons whom he disdains, so the client now usurps the patron's place. In the topsy-turvy world of schism, intellectual parity implies matching munificence. No one before our author had played his superior's role as donor. Hugh Primas, for example, addresses a generous or a stingy Maecenas with sycophantic praise and mordant satire, but, for all his obsequiousness and his verve, he never dares to represent himself as their double. That latitude is allowed to the Archpoet, because he understands that he must observe tacit rules:

¹¹³ *Carm.* IV, 29, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 60.

¹¹⁴ *Carm.* IV, 30, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 60.

¹¹⁵ *Carm.* IV, 30, 4, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 60.

¹¹⁶ *Carm.* IV, 31, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 60.

29. *Secundum quod habeo tribuo libenter,
neque panem comedo solus et latenter
et non sum qui curias intrem imprudenter,
sicut illi faciunt quorum deus venter.*¹¹⁷
29. According to my means, I am open-handed,
nor do I eat my bread alone and secretly,
and I am not one to enter the court rashly,
as do those whose god is their belly.

Gluttony formed part of a complex of seven capital vices that biblical exegetes linked with one another.¹¹⁸ The physical obtuseness caused by over-indulgence was twinned with mental vacuity in Christian tradition. Complementary to it was a classical one, reaching from Persius (*prol.* 11) to Petrarch, which associated bondage to the belly with a crass materialism that excluded inspiration.¹¹⁹ Both are combined by our author in his lampoon on the *leccator* whose thoughtless guzzling is contrasted with his own *prudencia*. Antithetical to such vices of actors and courtiers, this was the cardinal virtue that enabled a poet—and, *a fortiori*, an Archpoet—to claim a freedom different from what was denied to ministers by law. Yet his was a liberty within limits. They are indicated by the double meaning of *prudencia*: intelligence and canniness. That quality was to be linked by later moral thinkers, such as Thomas Aquinas' teacher, Albert the Great, with circumspection, forethought, and caution.¹²⁰ *Non . . . imprudenter*, its emphasis enhanced by the double negative, in the strophe above adumbrates the same association of ideas. There are restrictions to the freedom that the Archpoet takes. Such subjects as defeat are out of bounds; others, like the schism, admit only an oblique approach. Outspokenness is held in check by these latent limits, beyond which our author takes pains not to trespass. Knowing the range of Rainald's prejudices and understanding the extent of his tolerance, he is allowed to lambast the stinginess of Italian prelates, so long as the scorn is restricted to a 'Teutonic' circle guided and rewarded by the archchancellor.

There a minister might aspire, if hardly to be the master, then at least to act as his accomplice. This member of the ministerial class that was evolving into vassalage displays pride in its ascent,¹²¹ and his assurance is a corollary of the criticism that he and his likes were upstarts. Reinforcing the social

¹¹⁷ *Carm.* IV, 32, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 61.

¹¹⁸ See C. Casagrande and S. Vecchio, *I sette vizi capitali: Storia dei peccati nel Medioevo* (Turin, 2000), 124 ff.

¹¹⁹ Cf. R. Lokaj, 'Il calamus ispirato nelle *Familiari*', in *Motive e forme delle 'Familiari' di Francesco Petrarca*, Quaderni di *Acme* 57 (2003), 339–418, especially 410–11. On medieval (re)interpretations of Persius, and the connotations of *leccator*, see B. Bischoff, 'Living with the Satirists', *Mittelalterliche Studien. Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte*, iii (Stuttgart, 1981), 260–70, especially 266–7.

¹²⁰ Albertus Magnus, *De Bono*, ed. H. Kühle, C. Feckes, B. Geyer, and W. Kübel, *Alberti, Magni Opera omnia* 28 (Münster, 1951), 254 ff., with Zotz, 'Odysseus im Mittelalter?', 234 ff.

¹²¹ See W. Pötter, *Die Ministerialität der Erzbischöfe von Köln vom Ende des 11ten bis zum Ausgang des 13ten Jahrhunderts* (Düsseldorf, 1967), 156 ff.

consciousness of the Archpoet is a sense of cultural superiority. He poses as the spokesman of an elite for which others are boors. And yet he knows his place. His relationship with Rainald of Dassel was governed not by one of the charters that he devised as a notary but by an unwritten compact. The principle underlying its implicit rules is legible between the lines of the verse-dialectic in which it is drafted. For, in a world dominated by the ignorant, the avaricious, the hypocritical, the vulgar, and—that composite of them all—the laity, it would not do to play the part of a clerical fool. And 'Rainald H', in his alternative identity as the Archpoet, did not. He projected his own image of prudence onto his master in terms familiar from his earlier encomium:

Archicancellarie . . .

*in quo mens est Nestoris et vox Ulixee*¹²²

Archchancellor . . .

with the intelligence of Nestor and the voice of Ulysses.

What were once metaphors that extolled Rainald of Dassel's singularity have now developed a code of complicity.

¹²² *Carm.* IV, 33, 1–2, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 61.

VII

The Reluctant Encomiast

A year passed, leaving no trace of our author in his notarial capacity or in his poetic role. When he re-emerged, in November 1163, it was with a burst of activity in both parts. There is symmetry between these two sides of his life. As personal secretary and companion to Rainald of Dassel, he travelled with his master throughout northern Italy, where he witnessed how the archchancellor, together with Count Guido of Brandrate, demanded dues to the treasury in Barbarossa's name.¹ With tears in their eyes, Italians who considered themselves victims of extortion implored mercy. Rainald asked them how much they would offer voluntarily. When they remonstrated that they were penniless, he flew into a rage and threatened them with violence unless they swore, under oath, to pay up by the feast of St Mary (26 January 1164). So reports an anonymous source from Milan,² aware that Rainald of Dassel had been a prime mover behind the city's destruction in 1162. How dangerous it was to cross that iron will the Archpoet had come to understand when he withdrew his refusal to compose a work about the emperor:

4. *Unde diu cogitans quod non esset tutum
cesari non reddere census vel tributum,
vidua pauperior tibi do minutum,
de cuius me laudibus pudet esse mutum.*³
4. And so, after long reflection that it would be unsafe
not to pay the emperor tax or tribute,
more impoverished than the widow, I make my tiny offering
to you whose praises I should be ashamed not to sing.

The key term is 'unsafe' (*non . . . tutum* 4, 1). Neither 'right' (*rectum*) nor 'good' (*bonum*) nor another of several synonyms (*ius, fas, aequum*) for justice and equity. It is perilous not to write what is required. The thought follows logically (*unde* 4, 1) from 'long reflection' (*diu cogitans* 4, 1). Deeming opportunism preferable to threat of reprisal, our author makes a virtue of necessity by substituting an encomium for an epic in the spirit of the widow at Mark 12:41–4. This biblical metaphor does not put the emperor in the position of Christ. Realizing that it would be useless to plead poverty, intellectual or material, the Archpoet casts

¹ Anon., *De Longobardie oppression*, ed. Schmale, *Quellen*, 282–4.

² Anon., *De Longobardie oppression*, ed. Schmale, *Quellen*, 282.

³ *Carm.* IX, 4, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 68.

himself in the role of one who gives in reduced circumstances. Many northern Italians were being driven to play the part of involuntary donors at the time this strophe was composed. To the evidence of oppression perceived at Milan should be added protests on the same score from once loyal Lodi. Acerbus Morena, continuing the history intended by his father Otto to celebrate Barbarossa, deplores the rapacity of the imperial legates;⁴ and his lamentations, amplified by a continuator,⁵ swell into *fortissimo* at Piacenza.⁶ Even the formerly staunch Pavia and Cremona were alienated by such levies, claimed a correspondent of Thomas Becket in the spring of 1164.⁷ By then tyranny was the name being given by contemporaries to what others now hesitate even to describe as overlordship by foreigners.⁸ With their memories of Barbarossa's wrath still fresh,⁹ his victims found it hard to tell taxation apart from tribute—or worse.

Likening his encomium, known by its incipit as *Salve, mundi domine!*, to a payment it would be unsafe not to make, the Archpoet alludes to these facts of force. Although he gloats later in the poem over the fortune being fleeced from Milan, he is not naive enough to believe that others, including himself, are exempt from comparable coercion. That insight lends historical substance to a thesis of dynastic discontinuity that our author would develop in this work. Barbarossa's accession, as viewed from Italy, did mark a caesura. He differed from previous emperors not in levying taxes but in the severity, regularity, and legalism with which he did so.¹⁰ The Italians regarded this as an unjust break with the administrative tradition that reached from Henry IV to Conrad III; and it was in order to resist the baleful effects of the rupture that the Lega Lombarda of 1167 and earlier alliances were formed against the German overlords.¹¹ More than most, the Archpoet listened to the groans of their subjects. He understood that, for him as for them, the bond between fiscality

⁴ Acerbus Morena, ed. Schmale, *Italische Quellen*, 194.

⁵ Anon., Lodensis, ed. Schmale, *Italische Quellen*, 198.

⁶ See F. Güterbock, 'Alla vigilia della Lega Lombarda: Il dispotismo dei vicari imperiali a Piacenza', *Archivio Storico Italiano*, 95/1 (1937), 188–217; 95/2 (1937), 64–77, 181–92.

⁷ Ep. 29, in *The Correspondence of Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury 1162–1170*, i, ed. A. Duggan (Oxford, 2000), 90.

⁸ Haverkamp, 734, who provides ample evidence to the contrary in his chapter on fiscality (ibid. *Herrschaftsformen*, ii. 669–98). See too C.-R. Brühl, 'Die Finanzpolitik Friedrich Barbarossas in Italien', in Brühl, *Aus Mittelalter und Diplomatie*, i. *Studien zur Verfassungsgeschichte und Stadttopographie* (Hildesheim, 1989), 267–91.

⁹ Cf. H. Bernwinkel, *Verwüsten und Belagern: Friedrich Barbarossas Krieg gegen Mailand*, Beiträge des Deutschen Historischen Instituts in Rom 114 (Tübingen, 2007), and G. Althoff, 'Ira Regis: Prolegomena to a History of Royal Anger', in B. Rosenwein (ed.), *Anger's Past. The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY, 1998), 71 ff.

¹⁰ See V. Colorni, *Die drei verschollenen Gesetze des Reichstages bei Roncaglia, wiederaufgefunden in einer Pariser Handschrift* (Bibl. Nat. Cod. Lat. 4671, trans. G. Dolezalek, Untersuchungen zur deutschen Staats- und Rechtsgeschichte, NF 12 (Aalen, 1969), 36 ff.

¹¹ See R. Bordone, 'L'amministrazione nel regno d'Italia' in Lori Sanfilippo (ed.), *Federico Barbarossa e l'Italia*, 133–56, especially 140–1; G. Fasoli, 'La Lega Lombarda: Antecedenti, Formazione, Struttura' in Fasoli, *Scritti di storia medievale*, ed. F. Bocchi et al. (Bologna, 1974), 267, and G. Raccagni, *The Lombard League, 1167–1225* (Oxford, 2011).

and politics was based on fear. Empathy with the oppressed is not necessarily the conclusion to be drawn from this remarkable strophe: rather, perhaps, a shared sense of danger that no one who came near to Rainald of Dassel can have failed to feel. The Archpoet was regularly at the archchancellor's side; and proximity to power lends his encomium significance among the sources of the early 1160s. At a time when historiographical evidence from Germany is scant,¹² the testimony of *Salve, mundi domine!* is consistent with that of Italian witnesses. They weep and wail: our author, practising a genre that excluded open criticism, does not disguise his wariness. When he declared it 'unsafe' (*non . . . tutum* 4, 1) not to render his literary version of taxes or tribute, he was far from being ironical.

* * *

Do such declarations transform the Archpoet into a political writer, as he is still described?¹³ This label began to be applied to him under the influence of the leadership-cult in the Third Reich. Amid hymns to Hitler, a '*Kaiserhymnus*' about Barbarossa was foisted on our author, as the heady myth of empire triumphed over the sombre fact of anachronism.¹⁴ During the twelfth century secular panegyric and sacred praise, although related, were distinct. No one committed the solecism of conflating them and running the risk of sacrilege, least of all the fastidious Archpoet. Yielding in 1163 to pressure that Rainald of Dassel had begun to exercise a year earlier, he reluctantly sang the emperor's praises on a reduced scale. The length of narrative verse was unpalatable to him, and the clichés that were expected from a genre of commemoration savoured of staleness. Only pressure from his patron drove him to write against the grain. How and why he forced himself, or was compelled, to become an imperial encomiast are questions that can be answered by the when and where of context. The date of his panegyric is a problem that leads us to a core of the Archpoet's creativity.

To the summer of 1162 this work is attributed by some.¹⁵ Others assign *Salve, mundi domine!* to the autumn of 1163.¹⁶ But if views differ about when the poem was written, there is unanimity about where. Novara is its location,

¹² Cf. Schmale, *Quellen*, 2, who presents this as a ground for his useful collection.

¹³ Cf. P. Landau, *Der Archipoeta—Deutschlands erster Dichterjurist: Neues zur Identifizierung des Politischen Poeten der Barbarossazeit*. Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 2011, 3 (Munich, 2011).

¹⁴ W. Stach, 'Salve, mundi domine! Kommentierende Betrachtungen zum Kaiserhymnus des Archipoeta', *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, phil.-hist. Kl. Bd. 91 (1939), and K. Langosch, *Politische Dichtung um Kaiser Friedrich Barbarossa* (Berlin, 1943). On Langosch and Stach in the Third Reich, see F.-R. Hausmann, 'Das Fach Mittellateinische Philologie in der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus (I)', *MJb* 44/1 (2009), 14 ff., 39 ff., and (II) *MJb* 4/2 (2009), 22 ff., now gathered in his *Das Fach Mittellateinische Philologie an deutschen Universitäten von 1930 bis 1950*, *Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters xvi* (Stuttgart, 2010), 70 ff., 230 ff.

¹⁵ July 1162, according to Oppl, *Das Itinerar Kaiser Friedrich Barbarossas*, 30 and n. 40.

¹⁶ November 1163 states B. Bischoff, 'Archipoeta', in *Neue deutsche Biographie*, i. 336. Neither he nor Oppl presents arguments for his date.

all agree; and free association imagines the Archpoet crossing the Alps with the German army led by Barbarossa on his third Italian campaign before comparing the sempiternal snow on their peaks with the 'immortal fame' of the backwater whose praises are sung in these strophes:¹⁷

18. *Prima suo domino paruit Papia,
urbs bona, flos urbium, clara potens pia;
digna foret laudibus et topographia,
nisi quod nunc utimur brevitatis via.*
19. *Post Papiam ponitur urbs Novariensis,
cuius pro imperio dimicavit ensis
frangens et reverberans viribus inmensis
impetum superbie Mediolanensis.*
20. *Carmine, Novaria, semper meo vives,
cuius sunt per omnia commendandi cives;
inter urbes alias eris laude dives,
donec desint Alpibus frigora vel nives!*
21. *Letare, Novaria, numquam vetus fies,
meis te carminibus renovari scies:
fame tue terminus nullus erit dies;
nunc est tibi reddita post laborem quies!*
22. *Mediolanensium dolor est inmensus,
pre dolore nimio conturbatur sensus;
civibus Ambrosii furor est accensus,
dum ab eis petitur ut a servis census.*¹⁸
18. The first to obey its lord has been Pavia,
a good, a superlative city, famous, powerful, pious;
it would merit being praised in local detail,
were we not now taking a short cut.
19. After Pavia, place is taken by the city of Novara,
whose sword has fought for the empire,
with gigantic efforts smashing and smithearing
the onslaught of Milan's arrogance.
20. Novara, you shall be immortal in my poetry,
your citizens are to be thoroughly commended,
among other cities you will abound in praise
until ice and snow disappear from the Alps!
21. Rejoice, Novara, you shall never age,
knowing that you are rejuvenated in my poetry,
there will be no temporal limit to your fame;
now peace is restored to you after your efforts!

¹⁷ Stach, 'Salve, mundi domine!', 69.

¹⁸ *Carm.* IX, 18–22, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 70.

22. The grief of Milan knows no bounds,
its understanding is blunted by intense pain,
burning rage seizes the citizens of St Ambrose,
when taxes are exacted from them as serfs.

The Transalpine passes and Barbarossa's policy towards them are not the issue here;¹⁹ the mountains count for less than the perspective. In the Transmontane optic of the Archpoet,²⁰ the myth of empire is made to appear reality after the fall and destruction of Milan in March–April 1162, to which strophe 22 refers. This provides us with a *terminus post quem*, which need not extend far into the summer. In June of the same year Barbarossa was again planning to campaign against Sicily, a recurrent target of imperial policy in the south.²¹ Uprisings against Norman rule seemed to favour the emperor's purpose, extolled by our author with hyperbole:

32. *Iam tiranno Siculo Siculi detrectant;*
Siculi te siciunt, cesar, et exspectant;
iam libenter Apuli tibi genu flectant,
*mirantur quid detinet, oculos humectant.*²²
32. Now the Sicilians are speaking ill of the Sicilian tyrant,
they are athirst and agog for the emperor;
now the Southerners willingly kneel before you,
and wonder what detains you with tears in their eyes.

If tears of expectation at the Germans' arrival may be imagined (32, 4), they had been welling in 'Apulian' or southern Italian²³ eyes since the Byzantine offensive of 1155–6 was defeated. The interval of several years argues either for long-term lacrimosity or for a generous measure of exaggeration. Occupied in northern Italy, Barbarossa had not intervened when revolt broke out in the south and a clique of aristocrats sympathetic to his antipope, Victor IV, brought Capua and Salerno under its control. Recent turmoil in the Mezzogiorno is amplified in this strophe of *Salve, mundi domine!*, which rings like the rhetoric of the conspirators against King William I of Sicily in 1162.²⁴ That our author was privy to the emperor's plans is demonstrable because, as 'Rainald H', on 6 April 1162 he participated in drawing up a treaty that assigned future conquests in the south to Pisa.²⁵ Between that city and Genoa, then at odds

¹⁹ Cf. F. Büttner, 'Die Alpenpasspolitik Friedrich Barbarossas bis zum Jahre 1164/5', in *Grundfragen der alemannischen Geschichte*, VuF 1 (Lindau, 1955), 243–76.

²⁰ See Chapter III.

²¹ For background, see H. Houben, 'Barbarossa und die Normannen: Traditionelle Züge und neue Perspektiven imperialer Süditalienpolitik', in Haverkamp (ed.), *Friedrich Barbarossa*, 109–28.

²² *Carm.* IX, 32, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 72.

²³ Cf. *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 10, ed. Schmale, 468, 14.

²⁴ *La Historia o Liber de Regno Sicilie di Ugo Falcando*, ed. G. Siracusa, *Fonti per la storia d'Italia* 22 (Rome, 1897), 112–13.

²⁵ See Chapters VI and X.

with one another, Rainald of Dassel mediated in July 1162. His aim was to obtain the support of their fleets in the attack that was being prepared:

*Archicancellarius viam preparavit,
dilatavit semitas, vepres extirpavit.*²⁶
The archchancellor prepared the way,
widened roads and uprooted thorns.

Such are the indications that may point to a date in the midsummer of 1162 for *Salve, mundi domine!* But they fall short of proof that the Archpoet was at Novara when he composed his work, for the town never figures in Barbarossa's well-documented itinerary for that year or the next.²⁷

Hailed with an imitation of the *introitus* to the fourth Sunday in Lent (*Laetare, Jerusalem!* cf. 21, 1)—the occasion of Barbarossa's coronation at Aachen on 9 March 1152—Novara is treated in three strophes (19–21). Only one (18) is devoted to Pavia, Barbarossa's chief ally, celebrated as 'imperial' in diplomata written by 'Rainald H'.²⁸ Another strophe (22) suffices to dismiss Milan, the emperor's vanquished enemy.²⁹ These proportions are incongruent with the political geography of the *regnum Italicum*.³⁰ With the two urban centres of northern Italy consigned to the wings, a minor municipality takes the lime-light. It is clear that our author is magnifying Novara beyond measure, but it does not follow, from the eulogy lavished on the town, that either he or his master or the emperor made an unrecorded visit to this provincial backwater. The judicial activities of an imperial legate, *magister* Stephanus,³¹ there in May 1163 reinforce the probability that Barbarossa and Rainald of Dassel, occupied with the pacification and organization of Lombardy and Tuscany, had neither time nor reason to set foot in Novara. It was less a city than an episcopal see, despite the Archpoet's boast (*urbs* 19, 1 and cf. 20, 3). Other Hohenstaufen sources accurately call it a small town.³² If Novara aspired to a degree of

²⁶ *Carm.* IX, 33, 1–2, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 72.

²⁷ Oppl, *Das Itinerar Friedrich Barbarossas*, 31 ff, 192 ff.

²⁸ DFl, nos 258, 299, 312. On these charters in context, see R. Herkenrath, 'Die Urkunden Friedrich Barbarossas und Italien', in Lori Sanfilippo (ed.), *Federico I Barbarossa*, 225 and nn. 135–6, who notes that *imperialis* is otherwise reserved for Aachen. Cf. Acerbus Morena, ed. Schmale, *Quellen* 180, and Oppl, *Stadt und Reich*, 366–76. See further chapter VIII.

²⁹ See A. Haverkamp, 'Das Zentralitätsgefüge Mailands im hohen Mittelalter', in Haverkamp, *Verfassung, Kultur, Lebensform: Beiträge zur italienischen, deutschen und jüdischen Geschichte im europäischen Mittelalter*, ed. F. Burgardt et al. (Mainz, 1997), 189–222, and Haverkamp, 'Die Städte im Herrschafts- und Sozialgefüge Reichsitaliens', in F. Vittinghoff (ed.), *Stadt und Herrschaft: Römische Kaiserzeit und Hohes Mittelalter*, HZ Bd 7 (Munich, 1982), 149–246.

³⁰ See G. Tabacco, 'La costituzione del Regno Italicum al tempo di Federico Barbarossa', in *Popolo e stato nell'età di Federico Barbarossa: Alessandria e la Lega Lombarda* (Turin, 1970), 163–77.

³¹ See G. Gabotto et al. (eds), *Le carte dello archivio capitulare di Santa Maria di Novara (1034–1172)* (Pinerolo, 1915), 357–8, with Oppl, *Stadt und Reich*, 357 and n. 36 and Oppl, 'La politica cittadina di Federico I Barbarossa nel *Regnum Italicum*', in Lori Sanfilippo (ed.), *Federico I Barbarossa*, 110–11 and n. 87.

³² e.g. *parva Novaria* Gunther, *Ligurinus*, ii. 319, ed. E. Assmann, MGH SrG 63 (Hanover, 1987), 213, *Novara civitas non magna*, Otto of Freising, *Gesta Frederici*, ii. 19, ed. Schmale, 316, 20–1.

cultural significance in the early Middle Ages,³³ by the early 1160s it could claim no more than relative importance in politics, as a member of the alliance on the German side.³⁴ And that raises a further question: why does our author shower praise on this town rather than on others equally valorous in the imperial cause, such as Cremona, Como, and especially Lodi?

From Lodi and the complaints about Milan's economic repression by two of its merchants before the emperor at Constance in 1153 had proceeded the *casus belli*. Refounded by Barbarossa with astonishing rapidity on 3 August 1158, Lodi was loyal in his service and received warm expressions of imperial gratitude. It would be comprehensible if the Archpoet, who worked in the chancery that produced them, found it hard to believe that more eulogy was needed. But he can have been in no doubt about the key position of this town. At Lodi the emperor based his headquarters during the autumn of 1163. There, in November, Barbarossa, Rainald of Dassel, and the Archpoet were together, as is demonstrated by the fact that, between the 4th and the 13th of the same month, 'Rainald H' devised and wrote a series of privileges that confirms the archchancellor's policy in Tuscany and Umbria.³⁵ Neither they nor other charters issued in northern Italy between 1162 and 1164 mention Novara.³⁶ No one was in a better position to note this lacuna than 'Rainald H'. Are strophes 19–21 of *Salve, mundi domine!* an attempt to make amends to the town in his alternative role of Archpoet?

Not on his own initiative. If our author performed in verse a service to Novara that, as a notary, he was unauthorized to render in prose, the difference between a privilege and a panegyric was determined by the viceroy of Italy. Rainald of Dassel was at the apex of his influence, documented by the diplomata of this period, near the end of which his name figures prominently, as recognizant, in keeping with chancery custom. Exceptional, by contrast, is his appearance in *Salve, mundi domine!*³⁷ Places were admissible: individuals were not, with rare exceptions.³⁸ And the one exception represented in *Salve, mundi domine!* by Rainald of Dassel poses the possibility that it is related to the other: the attention lent by the Archpoet to a town that, in 'Rainald H's' charters of 1162–4, never occurs. What then did our author mean by the word 'Novara'? *De Novaria eiusque comite* writes the emperor's uncle in the rubric to the nineteenth chapter of the second book of the *Gesta Frederici*.³⁹ Otto of Freising's link between person and place is characteristic of Hohenstaufen sources, which

³³ See E. Cau, 'Scrittura e cultura a Novara (secoli VIII–X)', *Ricerche medievali*, 6–7 (1971–4), 3–87.

³⁴ See Opll, *Stadt und Reich*, 356 ff., and F. Cognasso, *Novara e il suo territorio* (Novara, 1952), 96 ff.

³⁵ DFI, nos 405–17, with Herkenrath, 'Urkunden', in Lori Sanfilippo (ed.), *Federico I Barbarossa e l'Italia*, 205. Note too Rainald of Dassel's rebuilding of the castle of Montemalo, near to Lodi, in 1163, recorded by Acerbus Morena (ed. Schmale, *Italische Quellen*, 192).

³⁶ The episcopal church received one diploma (DFI, no. 96), the town none in the entire reign. For context, cf. F. Opll, 'Italica Expeditio: Die Italienzüge und die Bedeutung Oberitaliens für das Reich zur Zeit Kaiser Friedrich Barbarossas (1152–1190)', in *Deutschland und Italien zur Stauferzeit*, *Schriften zur staufischen Geschichte und Kunst* 22 (Göppingen, 2002), 93–135.

³⁷ See Chapter V. ³⁸ See Chapter X.

³⁹ Ed. Schmale, 98 and cf. 316.

present Count Guido of Biandrate as 'Mr Novara'.⁴⁰ There and in the *contado* this native Milanese, as he is described by Rahewin,⁴¹ owed his authority to the influence of that city.⁴² Guido occupied a pivotal position between Milan, to which he professed loyalty, and the imperial court, which he attended assiduously; and this produced tensions that are expressed in the fictive but not implausible speech attributed to him, in the *Gesta Frederici*, at the siege of the city in August 1158.⁴³ To judge by his record in the recent past, Guido of Biandrate might swing to either side.⁴⁴ In June 1157, for example, he had led Milan's army against the castle of Vigevano, a stronghold of the imperial party at Pavia headed by his own brother-in-law, Margrave William of Monferrato. It is in this context of unstable allegiances, where Rainald of Dassel grasped the necessity of forming a network of urban and municipal allies under Barbarossa's leadership,⁴⁵ that strophes 18–22 can be understood. Pavia—or William of Monferrato—and Novara—or Guido of Biandrate—have resolved their conflict, and are united in triumph over Milan. The once wavering count, no longer depicted as Rahewin's *naturalis in Mediolano civis*, is now detached from his native city and located on the imperial side, where the significance of his sphere of influence is enhanced. 'Novara', more than a place name, had the political advantage of antonomasia.

Antonomasia, a deft device for not naming this individual below the august level of the emperor and his minister, also served to further the process of wooing Guido of Biandrate with which the Archpoet was familiar in his other role. Between 1152 and 1162 the chancery issued no fewer than five privileges in the count's favour, one of which was composed and copied by 'Rainald H'

⁴⁰ See S. Boesch Gajano, 'Biandrate, Guido di', in *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, 10 (1968), 267–74; F. Cognasso, *Il Piemonte nell'età sveva* (Turin, 1968), 318–19; Haverkamp, *Herrschaftsformen*, ii. 428, and Haverkamp, 'Friedrich I. und der hohe italienische Adel', in *Beiträge zur Geschichte Italiens im 12. Jahrhundert*, VuF SBd. 9 (Sigmaringen, 1971), 64 ff.; G. Tabacco, 'I rapporti tra Federico Barbarossa e l'aristocrazia italiana', in Lori Sanfilippo (ed.), *Federico I Barbarossa e l'Italia*, 65 ff.; P. Brezzi, 'Gli alleati italiani di Federico Barbarossa (feudatari e città)', in Manselli and Riedmann (eds), *Federico Barbarossa nel dibattito*, 163 ff., and G. Andenna, 'I conti di Brandrate e le città della Lombardia occidentale (secoli XI e XII)', in *Formazione e strutture dei ceti dirigenti del Medioevo: Marchesi, conti e visconti nel Regno Italico* (Rome, 1996), 57–84.

⁴¹ *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 48, ed. Schmale, 490.

⁴² *Gesta Frederici*, ii. 19, ed. Schmale, 316, 20–5: *Novaria . . . comitem habens in sua diocesi Guidonem Blanderatensem, qui preter morem Italicum totum ipsius civitatis territorium, vix ipsa civitate excepta, Mediolanensium possidet auctoritate.*

⁴³ *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 48, ed. Schmale, 490, with Haverkamp, 'Friedrich I. und der hohe italienische Adel', 65.

⁴⁴ Self-interest appears to have been his only principle. Informed c.1150 that he was wrong to claim jurisdiction over the dependants of a monastery, the count replied: *Tortum immo habeo, sed tamen plus mihi carum tortum quam rationem!* See *Codicis Astensis, qui de Malabayla communiter nuncupatur*, ed. Q. Sella et al., *Atti della R. Accademia dei Lincei*, 174 (Rome, 1880), no. 815, 902, quoted by R. Bordone, 'L'influenza culturale e istituzionale nel Regno d'Italia', in Haverkamp (ed.), *Friedrich Barbarossa*, 149–50 and n. 8.

⁴⁵ Cf. P. Schulte, 'Friedrich Barbarossa, die italienischen Kommunen und das politische Konzept der Treue', *FmSt* 38 (2004), 153–72.

on 7 February 1159.⁴⁶ These documents aimed to guarantee Guido's control over Novara and its *contado*, which were vital to Barbarossa when he led his armies over the Alps.⁴⁷ Strategy, not snow, accounts for the allusion at 20, 4. Self-interest motivates the hyperbole. Handsomely rewarded for the privilege he had written in the count's favour, as was customary,⁴⁸ our author, in whose *œuvre* money is a frequent theme, had reason to expect advantages for himself in Barbarossa's prolonged efforts to draw Guido of Biandrate onto his side. The task was not simple, nor was the ally a mere puppet. 'Mr Novara', contrary to the archchancellor's intransigence and notwithstanding the emperor's displeasure, had ventured to plead for mercy when the destruction of Milan was being debated by the princes in 1162.⁴⁹ Is it chance that, at the beginning of the same year, the series of favours granted to Guido over the past decade comes to a halt? Yet Rainald of Dassel was subsequently shrewd enough not to alienate a useful aristocrat, and he is recorded in the company of the count exacting the considerable sum of 880 silver pounds from Milan in 1163.⁵⁰ There the tax lists drawn up by the successors of these companions in extortion were to be known as the *liber tristium sive doloris*,⁵¹ as the Archpoet may be fancied to have foreseen when he refers, with the gloating prescience of strophe 21, to that city's pain and grief at its demotion to the rank of a slave.

Rainald of Dassel, after being crossed by Guido of Biandrate in 1162, had his own reasons for conciliating him later. If Novara never enjoyed the privileges issued to other allies of the emperor, such as Cremona,⁵² the town's geographical relevance to the archchancellor increased when, in the sequel to the fall of Milan, he received among the spoils a number of fiefs that abutted directly onto Novarese territory.⁵³ As feudal overlords in the north, Rainald of Dassel and Guido of Biandrate became neighbours; and on travels during the autumn and winter of 1163–4 they are to be found side by side.⁵⁴ Such was the background of *Salve, mundi domine!* The Archpoet celebrates less the transient triumph over Milan than the enduring bond between aristocracy and *civitas* that is a leitmotif of Italian history in the High Middle Ages.⁵⁵ Urban status is attributed to Novara in order to highlight Count Guido of Biandrate's importance for the imperial cause. With Pavia honoured, Lodi praised, and Cremona privileged, the town whose name was antonomastic for its overlord is compensated

⁴⁶ DFI, no. 257 (7 February 1159). Cf. DFI, no. 36 (October 1152); no. 134 (20 February 1156); no. 224 (post 8 September 1158); no. 347 (19 January 1162).

⁴⁷ Büttner, 'Alpenpasspolitik' 254 ff. ⁴⁸ Haverkamp, *Herrschaftsformen*, ii. 703–4.

⁴⁹ See Chapter V.

⁵⁰ Anon., *De Longobardie oppression*, ed. Schmale, *Quellen*, 283–4, and cf. Büttner, 'Alpenpasspolitik', 272.

⁵¹ Anon., *De Longobardie oppression*, ed. Schmale, *Quellen*, 284–6.

⁵² DFI, no. 369. The form is that of a treaty, but the content amounts to a privilege.

⁵³ DFI, no. 445. For a map, see P. Darmstädter, *Das Reichsgut in der Lombardei und Piemont (568–1250)* (Strassburg, 1896) 178.

⁵⁴ Gajano Boesch, 'Biandrate', 272.

⁵⁵ See Haverkamp, 'Friedrich Barbarossa und der hohe italienische Adel', 92; Haverkamp, *Herrschaftsformen*, ii. 382, 424, 546; Keller, *Adelsherrschaft*, and P. Jones, *The Italian City-State: From Commune to Signoria* (repr. Oxford, 2004), 152 ff.

by the flattery of a prominence it did not possess in the network of alliances being erected by Rainald of Dassel. And the notary who was once the recipient of Guido's munificence has grounds for hope that a second helping is in store. Might not 'Mr Novara', resting from labours that Milan resents (21, 4; 22), pass on a portion of the takings to the Archpoet who has sung so subtly about his lucrative change of side?

* * *

Little more than this reciprocity survived the débâcle of Barbarossa's fourth Italian campaign. Fleeing from Rome after the epidemic that decimated his army in August 1167,⁵⁶ the emperor, pursued by troops of the Lega Lombarda, found refuge in Guido of Biandrate's territories before escaping to Germany. Four years after *Salve, mundi domine!* was written, the enterprise that it exalts had dwindled into defeat and Novara, once an ally in the forefront of conquest, became a last resort in the imperial retreat. Of that catastrophe and its consequences we hear nothing from the Archpoet, nor do we have a charter by 'Rainald H' that is later than 1 August 1167.⁵⁷ Whether he perished in the plague that carried off his master cannot be established with certainty, but it is worth recalling that all the datable works by our author were composed between 1162 and 1164. Within this brief yet intense period their political and cultural background changed. Just as Barbarossa was a 'different beast' north and south of the Alps,⁵⁸ so context impinged on the content of writings about him in Italy or in Germany. For a German poet taking the measure of his contested emperor at Lodi in November 1163, what did it signify to begin a panegyric with the words *Salve, mundi domine!*?

Less a salutation than an acclamation, this incipit is distinct from the liturgical formulae whose chanting by the clergy contributed to 'the establishment of imperial authority'.⁵⁹ How established that authority seemed to the ruler acclaimed in *Salve, mundi domine!* is uncertain. Nothing is said, here or elsewhere in the poem, about the dynasty to which Barbarossa belonged. He is cast as the successor of no ruler more recent than Charlemagne. The near past elided, a distance of three and a half centuries separates Frederick I from his imperial model that culminates, for those who believe in it, in the solecism *sacrum imperium*.⁶⁰ It is doubtful that our author, in the early 1160s, counted among their number. As a notary, 'Rainald H' was obliged to put aside his misgivings and describe the Reich as 'holy' or

⁵⁶ See P. Herde, 'Die Katastrophe vor Rom im August 1167: Eine historisch-epidemiologische Studie zum vierten Italienzug Friedrichs I. Barbarossas', *Sitzungsberichte der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft . . . Frankfurt*, 27/4 (1991), 139–66.

⁵⁷ DFI, no. 532. See Chapter X.

⁵⁸ See T. Reuter, 'Vom Parvenü zum Bündnispartner: das Königreich Sizilien in der abendländischen Politik des 12. Jahrhunderts', in T. Kölzer (ed.), *Die Staufer im Süden: Sizilien und das Reich* (Sigmaringen, 1996), 49.

⁵⁹ See E. Kantorowicz, *Laudes regiae: A Study in Liturgical Acclamations and Medieval Ruler Worship* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1946), 83.

⁶⁰ See Chapter III.

'holiest' in charters. In verse, however, the Archpoet eschews such slogans. This difference merits emphasis, because it indicates a freedom that he lacked when writing prose on commission and establishes a parallel between him and his apparent opposite, John of Salisbury. Both of them were clerics attentive to religious implications of the learned language. A similar ear for nuance, a corresponding sensitivity to silence, are needed to understand what our author states and to appreciate what he does not say. His interpreters have been tone-deaf. Contrary to the opinion of those who represent him as an uncritical spokesman of imperial ideology,⁶¹ the fact remains unnoticed that *sacrum imperium* and its synonyms are excluded from *Salve, mundi domine!*

The form of this acclamation points to the direction in which our author was thinking. He was not looking forward to the myth of the Holy Roman Empire, nor did he season his work with a 'biblical-liturgical flavour'.⁶² Sacrality was at the back of his mind. It was turned to an older practice of hailing rulers with *Salve!* on their arrival,⁶³ often to musical accompaniment,⁶⁴ early evidence of which is preserved in such manuscripts as St Gallen 381.⁶⁵ Dedications and commemorations were introduced in the same time-honoured form.⁶⁶ Ancient, too, by the twelfth century, was the title *dominus mundi*.⁶⁷ As the Archpoet may have known from Widukind and others,⁶⁸ this was the formula traditionally used by the army to hail rulers at the moment of victory,⁶⁹ and it is consistent with the beginning of the poem that, in its course, one of the bases of Barbarossa's *imperium* is depicted as military. Success at arms as a ground for imperial recognition was an idea current among the Archpoet's contemporaries. Recounting the surrender of Milan in 1162, Vincent of Prague, for example, presents it as an occasion on which Barbarossa entitled himself *dominus mundi*:

⁶¹ Cf. J. Fried, 'Imperium Romanum: Das römische Reich und der mittelalterliche Reichsgedanke', *Millennium*, 3 (2006), 31.

⁶² Stach, 'Salve, mundi domine!', 70.

⁶³ See W. Bulst, 'Susceptacula regum: Zur Kunde deutscher Reichsaltertümer', in Bulst, *Lateinisches Mittelalter: Gesammelte Beiträge*, ed. W. Berschin (Heidelberg, 1984), 130–68, and P. Wilmes, *Der Herrscher—'Adventus' im Kloster des Frühmittelalters*, Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften 22 (Munich, 1976), 83 ff.

⁶⁴ Cf. D. Schaller and E. Könsgen, *Initia carminum Latinorum saeculo undecimo antiquorum: Bibliographisches Repetitorium für die lateinische Dichtung der Antike und des früheren Mittelalters* (Göttingen, 1977), no. 14561 ff., and the supplement ed. T. Klein (Göttingen, 2005), no. 14569.

⁶⁵ See *Sylloga codicis Sangallensis VIII*, ed. P. v. Winterfeld, MGH Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini iv.1. (repr. Berlin, 1964), 323, and, for the manuscript in context, E. Tremp in *Das Kloster St Gallen und seine Schule: Zum 200. Geburtstag der katholischen Kantonsschule 'Flade'* (St Gallen, 2009), 150.

⁶⁶ e.g.: *Hroswithae opera*, ed. P. v. Winterfeld, MGH SrG (repr. Berlin, 1965), 4, and *Die Tegernseer Briefsammlung (Froumund)*, ed. K. Strecker, MGH Epistolae selectae iii (repr. Munich, 1978), 118–19.

⁶⁷ The essential information is assembled, with characteristic clarity and economy, by C. Erdmann, *Forschungen zur politischen Ideenwelt des Frühmittelalters*, ed. F. Baethgen (Berlin, 1951), 45 and n. 7.

⁶⁸ Erdmann, *Forschungen*, 44 ff.

⁶⁹ See E. Stengel, 'Den Kaiser macht das Heer: Studien zur Geschichte eines politischen Gedankens' in Stengel, *Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisergedankens im Mittelalter* (Cologne, 1965) 1–69. Cf. too the proemium to Justinian's *Institutes* trans. O. Behrends et al. *Corpus Iuris Civilis. Text und Übersetzung* (Heidelberg, 1990), xiii.

*His eorum imperator auditis precibus, claves portarum Medio-lanensium recipit et sic contra respondet, quod sicut per quatuor partes orbis terrae innotuit, quod contra **dominum imperatorem, orbis terrae dominum**, arma movere presumpserunt, sic per quatuor partes orbis terrae eorum poena innotescat.*⁷⁰

After hearing these pleas, the emperor received the keys to Milan's gates and retorted as follows: 'Just as the world, in [all] four of its parts, had seen that they had dared to take up arms against the lord emperor, lord of the world, so their punishment should be made known throughout the world'.

The redundancy here differs from the Archpoet's concision, but the point is the same. The issue of Barbarossa's authority, which had flared into a dispute with the Curia after the assembly at Besançon in 1157,⁷¹ is now settled by sieges and battles.

Sacrum imperium, lordship over the holy city, the claims of the papacy, the pretensions of the Roman commune and aristocracy: these causes of conflict during the late 1150s are swept aside by our author at the beginning of the next decade. The void is filled with the concept of empire minus meddling from Rome. For the Archpoet as for Otto of Freising,⁷² right of conquest took precedence over all others. But if the first half—verse of acclamation—evokes the facts of force, the second—*cesar noster, ave!*—tempers the military tone. The possessive pronoun is inclusive, not antithetical; and the noun should be printed without a capital. Rulership being defined by what it excludes, the title, rather than the name, of the Caesars belongs to 'our' emperor, a German who needs neither a dynasty to legitimate nor a pope to crown him.

* * *

The Archpoet did not compose a 'Kaiserhymnus'. This anachronism lacks relevance to the Latin culture of the High Middle Ages. It lent profane dignity to panegyrics of rulers by emulating classical models, which was the route our author had already decided not to take. As he contemplated the emperor at or near whose court he had spent five years since beginning his career as a notary in 1158, he realized that Barbarossa, seen by many as a schismatic, now required a form of religious vindication. Virgil would not do. Nor did Augustan Rome provide a model for the German empire, such as it was, in northern Italy. Something less literary and more compelling was needed in 1163, and that is why the Archpoet goes on to cite the biblical texts that came naturally to his pen and lips in the verses which complete the first strophe of *Salve, mundi domine!*:

1. *cuius bonis omnibus iugum est suave;
quisquis contra calcitrat putans illud grave,
obstinate cordis est et cervicis prave.*⁷³

⁷⁰ *Annales* s.a.1163 (recte 1162), Wattenbach 680, 28–31.

⁷¹ See Chapter III.

⁷² *Gesta Frederici*, ii. 32, ed. Schmale, 348, 9 ff.

⁷³ *Carm.* IX, 1, 2–4, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 68.

1. To all the good your yoke is sweet;
and whoever, thinking it heavy, kicks against it
is obstinate of heart and wicked of spirit.

Here too the eloquence is amplified by what is not said. No word, now or later, about emperors ranging from the late antique Constantine, Theodosius, and Justinian to the medieval Otto the Great whose precedents Barbarossa had cited in order to justify his convocation of the council at Pavia in 1160 that was intended to settle the schism in favour of the imperial candidate.⁷⁴ The attempt had failed, and the Archpoet realized that, if he wanted to cast his subject as the Church's rightful arbiter, he would have to find a different exemplar of orthodoxy. Since the emperor's subjects are 'all the good' at v. 2, it follows that his rule is ethical. And because, within the fold of the faithful, his yoke is sweet as Christ's at Matthew 11:30, it is also consequent that, outside it, immoral adversaries be described as 'obstinate of heart and wicked of spirit' (v. 4). The allusion is not only to Acts 19:19 but also to a standard theory of *pertinacia*.⁷⁵ Error creates heresy less than persistence in it, compounded by malevolent intent; and v. 4 offers an exact definition of such sin. It is so defined by an author whose patron had been excommunicated by name in May 1163 by Pope Alexander III, following a general ban of the imperial schismatics on Maundy Thursday 1160.⁷⁶ In line with Rainald of Dassel's policy of eye for eye and tooth for tooth, the Archpoet matches an acclamation of the emperor with a malediction that stands the curse of his papal opponent on its head.

Anathema was in the air. It could be partly cleared by hailing Barbarossa as 'prince of princes' and 'king of kings' (2, 1; 3, 2).⁷⁷ These sonorous terms, reminiscent of the chancery,⁷⁸ needed reinforcement if they were to amount to more than hot air, for they could be construed no more literally than our author's image of himself paying homage in the company of tigers and ants (2, 3). Beyond the natural world, whose submission is as spontaneous as it is unthinking (2, 4), ideas adumbrated in the first strophe are developed in the realm of reason, where *prudentes* have the discrimination to be sure that

⁷⁴ *Gesta Frederici*, iv. 74, ed. Schmale, 662, 1–6, and see Chapter V.

⁷⁵ See A. Momigliano, 'Empietà ed eresia nel mondo antico', in Momigliano, *Sesto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico* (Rome, 1980), 437–58, and R. Maceratini, *Ricerche sullo status giuridico dell'eresia nel diritto romano-cristiano e nel diritto canonico classico* (Padua, 1994).

⁷⁶ Cf. Chapter VIII.

⁷⁷

Princeps terre principum, Cesar Friderice,

*cuius tuba titubant arces inimice,
tibi colla subdimus, tygres et formice
et cum cedris Libani vepres et mirice.*

*Nemo prudens ambigit te per Dei nutum
super reges alios regem constitutum
et in Dei populo digne consecutum
tam vindictae gladium quam tutele scutum.*

(*Carm.* IX, 2–3, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 68 and 131–2 ad loc.). Cf. too Blaise, *Vocabulaire*, 257 ff.

⁷⁸ Cf. *Romani imperii dignitas excellenciori gloria et magnitudine omnia regna et reliquas potestates vel dignitates videtur precellere* (DFI, no. 389 (1162)).

Barbarossa's power is God-given (*per Dei nutum* 3, 1). An antithesis is implied. Others, who do not recognize this self-evident truth, must be *imprudentes*. This was a highly charged term of the insiders' diction which the Archpoet shared with Rainald of Dassel, signifying their unnamed but identifiable opponents—in particular, Alexander III and his followers.⁷⁹ Such godless and clueless opponents of divine will are relegated from the fold of 'God's people' (*in Dei populo* 3, 3), in which the ruler performs his duties of revenge and defence (3, 4). Empire identified with orthodoxy, the pope deserves the ostracism inflicted on heretics. The thought—an inversion more imaginative and less disreputable than *sacrum imperium*—presages the policy that Rainald of Dassel would enforce in 1165 at Würzburg, when he imposed on the princes an oath of allegiance to his antipope, Paschal III. This article of imperial faith was sworn by law. His master's determination to prolong the schism until it ended in victory echoes in the religious language with which the Archpoet exalts his own side. The other, damned and dismissed with the anonymity of antithesis, is meant to smart at the lash of what is left unsaid.

* * *

Allusion and obliquity were suitable for scathing Barbarossa's adversaries. Praise of the emperor, however, had to be spelt out. Adopting an official tone, our author recurs to his notarial experience:

5. *Tu foves et protegis magnos et minores,
magnis et minoribus tue patent fores;
omnes ergo cesari sumus debitores,
qui pro nostra requie sustinet labores.*⁸⁰
5. You further and protect the great and the lesser
to them your doors are open;
we are all in the debt of the emperor,
who bears burdens to let us rest.

Such was the stock-in-trade of imperial encomium, amply attested throughout the reign. The wares on display here acquire additional worth, however, in the context of the charters that 'Rainald H' composed and copied at Lodi in November 1163. Although allowance must be made for the generic disparities between a privilege and a panegyric, their correspondences are too close and too frequent to be a matter of chance. The verse and the prose were written, by the same author, in the same period and location. When they differ, not in style but in substance, an independent mind is at work. In the chancery directed by his chief, 'Rainald H' was obliged to parrot the received wisdom of the 1150s. At the beginning of the next decade, the Archpoet regarded a number of imperial slogans as out of date. Freed from the constraints of notarial practice, he experimented with some of his own ideas in *Salve, mundi domine!* With its

⁷⁹ See Chapter VI.

⁸⁰ *Carm.* IX, 5, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 69.

fifth strophe, cited above, it is instructive to compare the arenga of a charter devised, on 10 November 1163 at Lodi, by 'Rainald H'. In the voice of his ventriloquism Barbarossa is made to declare:

*Inter saluberrimas imperialium nostrarum sollicitudinum varietates, quas pro communi generalitatis commodo mente gratuita et indefesso animo sustinemus, excellentis nostrae maiestatis felicissima ac specialis est intentio, ut sub piissimo nostro imperio tanta moderatione per potiores et humiles equabilis currat iustitia, ut nec pauper a divite nec impotens opprimatur a potente . . .*⁸¹

Among the most fruitful forms of our imperial responsibility, which we bear altruistically and tirelessly for the common benefit of all, it is a most happy and specific intention of our excellent majesty that, under our most pious rule, equitable justice runs its course among the mighty and the humble alike, in such a way that the poor are not oppressed by the rich nor the powerless by the powerful . . .

To justice and equity, protection of the poor, defence of the weak—traditional virtues in Latin rhetoric—is added an affective element that is less trite: the altruism of the emperor. That undercurrent of pathos in the privilege swells into the panegyric's mainstream, changing the direction in which it had formerly flowed. A relentless taker in the fourth strophe of *Salve, mundi domine!*, Barbarossa becomes a selfless giver in its fifth. While he strives on behalf of his subjects, they relax (5, 4). To the implied question—Is this deserved repose or sinful sloth?—the answer is predictable. Beneficiaries of imperial bounty should respond in kind. The relationship between governor and governed, now founded on more than might, can be cast as reciprocal and ethical; which is why moral obligation induces the poor poet to make his offering, like those who harvest, fish, or hunt birds and wild beasts.⁸² More Caesarean than previously (5, 3; 6, 4), Barbarossa deserves the rights defined by Luke 20:25: *Reddite ergo quae sunt Caesaris Caesari*. As the Archpoet interprets the apostle's precept in the light of Roncaglian theory and legatine practice, everything is due to the emperor—even a second, spicier helping in verse of the bland banalities he had served up in prose.

Ringling the changes on themes he was obliged to rehearse in the formulaic language of charters might have been tedious for a less ingenious author. The ingenuity of the Archpoet consists not only in transforming topoi but also in manipulating them to avoid what he is reluctant to treat. All that follows, in strophe 7, had been stated countless times by Christian writers before him. None of them, however, invested these hackneyed themes with so much implicit meaning:

7. *Filius Ecclesiae fidem sequor sanam,
contempno gentilium falsitatem vanam;
unde iam non invoco Febum vel Dianam
nec a Musis postulo linguam Tullianam.*⁸³

⁸¹ DFI, no. 413, ed. Appelt, 297, 30–5.

⁸² *Carm.* IX, 6, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 69. The tribute in kind that the Archpoet depicts as voluntary is portrayed by Italian sources as whole-scale oppression. Cf. J. Laudage, *Friedrich Barbarossa: Eine Biographie* (Regensburg, 2005), 212–13.

⁸³ *Carm.* IV, 7, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 69. See Chapter VIII.

7. A son of the Church, I follow the sound faith,
despising the senseless falsehood of pagans,
so it is that I do not invoke Apollo or Diana,
and decline to ask the Muses for Cicero's eloquence.

This strophe, like his 'confession' which was also composed during the winter of 1163 at Pavia,⁸⁴ raised a vexing question. Of which church does the Archpoet claim to be a son? Neither *una* nor *sancta* nor *catholica*, the *Ecclesia*, since 1159, was divided between the supporters of Alexander III and Victor IV—about whom, here as elsewhere, not a word is said explicitly. From silence on the head of schism is evoked a utopia of orthodoxy. That is why it is more than a Christian commonplace when our author rejects the inspiration and eloquence of the ancients (7, 3–4). Reticence serves to draw a further veil over crisis. Posing naive piety, the Archpoet shrewdly turns to a profession of imperial faith:

8. *Christi sensus imbuat mentem Christianam,
ut de christo Domini digna laude canam,
qui potenter sustinens sarcinam mundanam
relevat in pristinum gradum rem Romanam!*⁸⁵
8. May understanding of Christ inspire my Christian mind,
in order to sing the deserved praises of the Lord's anointed!
Bearing with strength the burdens of the world,
he restores the Roman cause to its former status!

If the 'Roman cause' (*rem Romanam* 8, 4) might be considered timelessly valid, the issue of Rome was by now past its prime. Yet the empire had no more determined champion than the archchancellor, who is praised as its restorer in another privilege issued, also at Lodi, on 6 November 1163.⁸⁶ It is amusing to reflect that the eulogy on Rainald of Dassel may well have been dictated by him to the notary who was his intimate. But having heard and copied this self-celebration, 'Rainald H' felt free to modify its details, while maintaining its form, in his alternative role of Archpoet. The panegyric and the privilege have the theme of imperial restoration in common, and they treat it in similar style. When, for example, 'Barbarossa' declares 'our most glorious prince Rainald' to be responsible for 'recalling the rights of our most sacred empire to their former wholeness',⁸⁷ *ad pristinam integritatem revocata* in the prose is mirrored by *relevat in pristinum gradum* in the verse (8, 4). Reading or hearing the eighth strophe of *Salve, mundi domine!*, the archchancellor will have recognized that the emperor was being cast in his own mould. This imitation was flattering but partial. In the panegyric there is no trace of sacrality, which, in the privilege, is emphasized by the redundant superlative *sacratissimi*. What 'Rainald H' had to promote, up to and beyond the limits of realism or sense, could be pruned by the Archpoet.

His position, like his language, is clear. The religious and secular spheres might be set in parallel, but a distinction between them had to be upheld.

⁸⁴ See Chapter VIII.

⁸⁵ *Carm.* IX, 8, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 69.

⁸⁶ DFI, no. 409.

⁸⁷ *sacratissimi nostri iura imperii . . . ad pristinam integritatem revocata sunt* (ed. Appelt, 290, 15–17).

It is not obscured by the expression 'anointed of the Lord' (*christo Domini* 8, 2) applied to the emperor. So his predecessors are described in charters,⁸⁸ none of which states that he was *rex et sacerdos*, as Otto of Freising does in his likeness of Frederick I's coronation to the consecration of a homonymous bishop at Aachen on 9 March 1152.⁸⁹ By the 1160s, Otto's approach was behind the times;⁹⁰ and it is consistent with the Archpoet's sceptical sense of how they were changing that he never attributes Rahewin's *divus* or other epithets of sacrality to the emperor.⁹¹ As *christus Domini*, Barbarossa receives charisma and authority on earth where, a layman among the laity, he bears what is no more or less than a 'worldly burden' (*sarcina mundana* 8, 3). In a milieu where so many—among them 'Rainald H', acting on orders—were doing so much to conflate the sacred and the secular aspects of rulership, it is not the least of our author's achievements that he kept these incommensurables apart.

* * *

The Archpoet displays a striking coolness about issues that excited the fervour of hotheads, among whom his master was the most ardent. Rainald of Dassel's line is not always followed in *Salve, mundi domine!*, nor does our author hesitate to diverge from interpretations of history adopted by other exponents of the imperial cause. Why, for instance, did the *res Romana* need to be 'restored' (*relevant* 8, 4)? Because of 'sloth' (*desidia* 9, 1) on the part of previous emperors.⁹² This is criticism, reinforced by the charge of common knowledge (*scimus* 9, 1). Milder terms, which echo Rahewin's account of the measures taken at Roncaglia, are used in the charter that 'Rainald H' wrote on 6 November 1163 at Lodi: *Neglecta diu predecessorum nostrorum imperatorum seu regum tempore . . . nostri iura imperii*.⁹³ The tone was set by the emperor's uncle who had adopted the factual, nearly neutral, explanation: *principum in Transalpinis manere assuetorum absentia*.⁹⁴ From such understatements of officialdom the Archpoet departs—emphasizing, in Barbarossa's breach with slackness, his own thesis of dynastic discontinuity. This incisiveness made little allowance for merit on the enemy's side. While Otto of Freising was capable of voicing admiration for the Lombards' revival of Roman government and civilization,⁹⁵ our author has not a good word to say for these godless rebels:

⁸⁸ e.g. DFI, no. 209, ed. Appelt, 351, 6–7.

⁸⁹ *Gesta Frederici*, ii. 3, ed. Schmale, 288.

⁹⁰ Cf. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies*, 89.

⁹¹ See Krieg, *Herrscherdarstellung der Stauferzeit*.

⁹²

*Scimus per desidiam regum Romanorum
ortas in imperio spinas impiorum
et sumpsisse cornua multos populorum,
de quibus commemoro gentem Lombardorum.*

(*Carm.* IX, 9, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 69).

⁹³ DFI, no. 409, ed. Appelt, 290, 14–15, and cf. *neglectu regum* at *Gesta Frederici*, iv. 7, ed. Schmale, 520, 27.

⁹⁴ *Gesta Frederici*, ii. 14, ed. Schmale, 310.

⁹⁵ See Chapter IV.

10. *Que dum turres erigit more giganteo
volens altis turribus obviare Deo,
contumax et fulmine digna ciclopeo
instituta principum spreuit ausu reo.*⁹⁶
10. While they built towers in gigantic style
wishing to defy God by their height,
disobedient and deserving a cyclopean thunderbolt,
they scorned imperial doctrine with criminal boldness.

The tone and style to be adopted in this strophe posed delicate problems for the Archpoet. Differences of political opinion within the Hohenstaufen camp were raised by the issue of the Lombards. For them Rainald of Dassel did not share the regard expressed (with qualification) by the emperor's uncle. The archchancellor's view of the rebels was strict, single-minded, and merciless. To portray his enmity to those who had opposed him, categorical terms of condemnation were needed, and supplied by the Bible. Giants are figures of monstrosity at Numbers 13:34. In the fourth and fifth verses of the eleventh chapter of Genesis, towers represent human presumption in defiance of God's will. These strands of Scripture are drawn together by St Augustine in his account of the earthly city with its lofty towers built by the giant Nimrod.⁹⁷ Babylon, the biblical den of iniquity, and Milan, its fortified walls symbolic of overweening pride,⁹⁸ are associated by the Archpoet. Should this Italian centre of rebellion against Barbarossa be struck by a 'cyclopean thunderbolt' (10, 3), it is no more 'grotesque and mindless'⁹⁹ than the weapons forged in heaven at *Aeneid* viii.424 ff. On the meta-historical level where the conflict between the emperor and the Lombards is set, those who despise imperial doctrine are annihilated by divine force (10, 4). With style being scriptural and tone prophetic, the Cyclops on the sideline merely hints at the Virgilian epic that our author did not write.

* * *

The context in which he worked as notary made its mark on the Archpoet's political ideas—on their character, their sequence, and, in minor measure, their style of expression. *Salve, mundi domine!* is related to the charters devised by 'Rainald H' at Lodi in the first half of November 1163. Nonetheless this poem is more than a product of the chancery. Our author thought for himself, altering or suppressing in verse what his chief had dictated in prose. Silence is a vehicle of the Archpoet's independence, and he proceeds with a wariness to which attention is drawn (4, 1). *Prudentia*, extolled as a virtue (3, 1), was a necessity when writing, supposedly on the subject of the emperor, a panegyric actually

⁹⁶ *Carm.* IX, 10, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 69.

⁹⁷ *De civitate Dei*, xvi, 4, ed. B. Dombart and A. Kalb *Aurelii Augustini Opera*, xiv, 2, Corpus SEL 48 (Turnhout, 1955), 504, 21–505, 55.

⁹⁸ Cf. H. Koller, 'Die mittelalterlichen Stadtmauern als Grundlage städtischen Selbstbewusstseins', in B. Kirchgässer et al. (eds), *Stadt und Krieg* (Sigmaringen, 1989), 9–26.

⁹⁹ Dronke, 'Functions of Classical Borrowings in Medieval Latin Verse', 163.

addressed to the imperialist known as the 'ruin of the world'. It had been ruined, thought Rainald of Dassel's many detractors, by the schism he had caused and was prolonging. About this issue the Archpoet could not afford to be explicit, although he alludes between the lines to the conflict of papacy and empire (1, 2–4; 3). Their spheres of authority are depicted as parallel but separate (7–8). Less sacral than God-given and divinely sanctioned (3, 8–10), the power on which Barbarossa's purchase was tenuous required the support of solid orthodoxy. Hence our author's professions, overt and latent, of faith in the imperial cause (1, 3, 8). His truth-claims, made in verse—the traditional medium of mendacity¹⁰⁰—depend on dialectic. A sombre recorder of facts in his notarial function, as Archpoet he displays the virtuosity of a sophist who turns others' ideas on their heads.¹⁰¹ All this skill at inversion is now applied to the political situation of northern Italy in the early 1160s, where 'suddenly the word *libertas* is everywhere'.¹⁰²

11. *'Libertatis' titulo volens gloriarī,
nolens in Italia regem nominari,
indignata regulis legum cohartari
extra legum terminos cepit evagari.*¹⁰³
11. Wishing to revel in the title of 'freedom'
and not wanting a king to be named in Italy,
outraged at being confined by the rule of law,
[the Lombards] began to trespass beyond legal limits.

More is meant here than '*libertas* simply as a pretext for rebellion'.¹⁰⁴ The Archpoet contrasts the Italian notion of freedom with the imperial concept of legality in terms familiar to him from privileges issued by the chancery. *Libertas salva in omnibus imperiali iustitia*¹⁰⁵ is a typical example of the proposition that freedom has legal limits. Its corollary was defined by 'Rainald H' at the time he was composing *Salve, mundi domine!* On 6 November 1163 he produced a document that deals with Barbarossa's power to dispose of *liberi* and *ministeriales*.¹⁰⁶ Those who enjoyed his protection were 'not to suffer the undeserved yoke of alien slavery'.¹⁰⁷ The emperor, conceived in the Roman manner as the source of all law, guaranteed freedom. Disputing his sovereignty, the Lombards had only the style (*titulum* 11, 1), not the substance, of *libertas*. The legal lore of 'Rainald H' placed inverted commata around this political slogan of the rebels.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. Godman, *Paradoxes of Conscience*, 167, 179.

¹⁰¹ See Chapter VI.

¹⁰² R. Benson, '*Libertas* in Italy (1152–1226)', in *La Notion de liberté au Moyen Âge: Islam, Byzance, Occident*, Penn–Paris–Dumbarton Oaks Colloquia IV (Paris, 1985), 195.

¹⁰³ *Carm.* IX, 11, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 69.

¹⁰⁴ Benson, '*Libertas* in Italy', 194.

¹⁰⁵ DFI, no. 247 (Savona), with H. Appelt, 'Der Vorbehalt kaiserlicher Rechte in den Diplomen Friedrich Barbarossas', in Wolf (ed.), *Friedrich Barbarossa*, 33–57.

¹⁰⁶ On this power in its wider context, see J. Fried, 'Über den Universalismus der Freiheit im Mittelalter', *HZ* 240 (1985) 333.

¹⁰⁷ *non decet, ut spetialis domus nostra indebitum aliene servitutis iugum sustineat* (DFI, no. 409, ed. Appelt, 290, 33–4).

Beginning as perverse, their form of freedom ended as servile (22, 4). And, though the Archpoet often differed from Rahewin, for once he might have agreed with the argument (attributed in the *Gesta Frederici* to Guido of Bian-drade¹⁰⁸) that, while 'liberty' is as 'priceless a possession' as the Digest declares, Milanese rhetoric should yield to the reality of force majeure.

This was the lesson the city needed to be taught:

12. *De tributo cesaris nemo cogitabat,
omnes erant 'cesares', nemo censum dabat;
civitas Ambrosii velud Troia stabat:
deos parum, homines minus formidabat.*¹⁰⁹
12. No one thought about the tribute due to the emperor,
all were 'emperors', none paid taxes;
the Ambrosian city stood like Troy:
with little fear of gods and less of men.

The 'Caesarian populism' of v. 2 amounts to a reversal of roles. With tribute and taxation being the emperor's dues, refusal to pay them is equivalent to usurpation of his rank. At the very moment when Barbarossa's fiscal regime was being criticized as tyrannical, his detractors are tarred with the same brush. No allowance is made for the Italian city-state with vocations that were more than mercantile,¹¹⁰ nor is sympathy shown for the view, expressed so perceptively by Otto of Freising, that, in their zeal for liberty and aversion to 'insolence of power', the Lombards preferred to be ruled by consuls rather than emperors.¹¹¹ They were all 'emperors', is the Archpoet's retort. On the *Gesta Frederici* he exercises that correction which the historian had requested from Rainald of Dassel for his *Chronicle*.¹¹²

Interpretations of the commune diverged widely among imperial thinkers, and the opinions advanced by the emperor's uncle in the late 1150s were unacceptable to the archchancellor and his accomplice by the early 1160s. If Otto of Freising is ticked off anonymously in *Salve, mundi domine!*, Milan is vituperated by name as 'the city of Ambrose' (*civitas Ambrosii* 12, 3). This sarcasm was intended to recall the beating recently given to civic pride. For more than a hundred years the city had linked its lot with the saint,¹¹³ whose protection was implored at times of crisis. Ambrose's image had been carried into battle against Barbarossa on the famous *carroccio*, or flag-waggon. Now the flags were in German hands, and a lavish feast to mark the levelling of urban towers, walls, and buildings had been held by the emperor on Palm Sunday (1 April 1163) at the symbolic site of San Ambrogio, a monastery near to Milan.¹¹⁴ So much for its tutelary saint, scourge of emperors. When the city he

¹⁰⁸ *Gesta Frederici*, iii. 49, ed. Schmale, 492, 17 ff.

¹⁰⁹ *Carm IX*, 12, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 89.

¹¹⁰ Cf. Jones, *The Italian City-State*, 150–1.

¹¹¹ *Libertatem tantopere affectant, ut potestatis insolentiam fugiendo consulum potius quam imperantium regnatur arbitrio* (*Gesta Frederici*, ii. 14, ed. Schmale, 308, 15–16).

¹¹² *Chronica*, ed. Hofmeister, 4, 9 ff., and see Chapter II.

¹¹³ See Chapter V.

¹¹⁴ Anon., *De Longobardie oppression*, ed. Schmale, *Italische Quellen*, 278 ff.

had failed to protect is compared with Troy (12, 3), the aim is not to 'suggest that the rebels belong to a world of heroes',¹¹⁵ but to project them back to the heathen past against which our author had railed at 7, 3. If they had little fear of 'the gods' (*deos* 12, 4), this plural of idolatry compounds their sin of arrogance toward men (12, 4). The Archpoet's censure is even more stinging than Christ's words at Luke 18:4, on which it is based: *Deum nec timeo nec hominem revereor*. Rebellion against the emperor can now be identified as resistance to fate and, consistent with the paradoxes developed in previous strophes, the height of liberty is willingness to render Caesar his dues.¹¹⁶

* * *

How then to represent the victor over profane foes at Milan? Only scriptural quotation could convey his valour:

14. *Surrexit interea rex iubente Deo,
metuendus hostibus tamquam ferus leo,
similis in preliis Jude Machabeo,
de quo quicquid loquerer minus esset eo.*¹¹⁷
14. Meanwhile the king rose up at God's command,
as terrible to his enemies as a wild lion,
like Judas the Macchabee in battle;
whatever I might say would be beneath his level.

Even as the Archpoet echoes his biblical model—*surrexit Judas, qui vocabatur Machabeus* (1 Maccabees 3:1¹¹⁸)—the wordplay (*surrexit/rex* 14, 1) underlines a difference between these two warriors blessed by God's grace. Unlike Judas Maccabeus, Frederick I was a king. His royalty ensures that the lion of v. 2 is not the proverbial beast of cruelty and wrath,¹¹⁹ for his ferocity is displayed in a good cause. So Maccabean analogy had been employed for centuries.¹²⁰ Alcuin described him as a cleanser of the temple and liberator of the people;¹²¹ and these ideas were in keeping with the Archpoet's identification of Milan as a Babylonian perverter of freedom in strophes 10 and 11. Our author stands squarely in a familiar tradition. But he also stands apart from contemporary currents of thought. A few months after the composition of *Salve, mundi domine!*, others

¹¹⁵ Dronke, 'Functions of Classical Borrowing in Medieval Latin Verse', 163.

¹¹⁶ *Carm.* IX, 13, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 69.

¹¹⁷ *Carm.* IX, 14, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 69.

¹¹⁸ Noted by Watenphul-Krefeld, ad loc., 134.

¹¹⁹ See St Augustine on Psalm 7:4, *S. Aurelii Augustini Enarrationes in Psalmos*, i, ed. E. Dekkers and J. Fraipont, CCSL 38 (Turnhout, 1956), 38, and Chapter VIII.

¹²⁰ See J. Dunbabin, 'The Maccabees as Exemplars in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries', in *The Bible in the Medieval World: Essays in Memory of B. Smalley*, Studies in Church History Subsidia 4 (Oxford, 1985), 31–41, and H. Keller, 'Machabaeorum pugnae. Zum Stellenwert eines biblischen Vorbilds in Widukinds Deutung der ottonischen Königsherrschaft', in H. Keller and N. Staubach (eds), *Iconologia sacra: Mythos, Bildkunst und Dichtung in der Religions—und Sozialgeschichte Alteuropas*. Festschrift K. Hauck . . . (Berlin, 1994), 417–37.

¹²¹ *Mementote Iudam Machabeum, qui templum Dei purgavit et populum a servitute liberavit* (Ep. 20, in MGH Epistolae, iv, ed. E. Dümmler (Berlin, 1895), 57.

were likening the 'plague' (*plaga*) of Maccabean civil war to strife in the Church.¹²² The analogy used so traditionally by the Archpoet was becoming double-edged. So too is his declaration, at 14, 4, that all he might say would be beneath the level of his subject. Is this an affirmation of the emperor's sublimity? Or is it a yawn of tedium at composing an encomium under duress?

Not for the first time (cf. 7, 3–4) nor for the last, what appears to be a topos of modesty is ambiguous. Almost halfway through *Salve, mundi domine!*, our author begins to nod. After reciting somnolent clichés,¹²³ he seeks to wake his flagging imagination with a historical figure more recent than the second century BC:

16. *Quanta sit potencia vel laus Frederici,
cum sit patens omnibus, non est opus dici;
qui rebelles lancea fodiens ultrici
representat Karolum dextera victrici.*¹²⁴
16. How powerful and praiseworthy Frederick is
does not need to be said, as it is obvious to all.
Skewing the rebels with his lance of vengeance,
he figures forth Charlemagne in success and victory.

The style, once tired, now becomes telegraphic. Fear of redundancy is the motive adduced for this terseness (16, 2). Whether sincere in his wish to avoid repeating common knowledge or in search of another pretext for not dilating on the emperor, the Archpoet is too elliptical to allow us to judge whether the lance Barbarossa bears (16, 3) is that of St Maurice.¹²⁵ Yet the thought of what he might have said is not absurd. This is just the kind of detail that would have appealed to Rainald of Dassel. In the letter to Otto of Freising composed by him in the emperor's name at the end of March 1157,¹²⁶ he described the synopsis of the reign he was sending as *pauca paucis*, which the historian was to expand and enlarge in the *Gesta Frederici*.¹²⁷ Virgilian proportions were expected from the epic that our author declined.¹²⁸ Resisting such pressure with one declaration of inadequacy or inexpressibility after another, this reluctant encomiast opted for brevity.

Brief and compressed, the Archpoet's style in the strophe above is also pregnant. *Representat* at 16, 4, for example, is less vague than 'resembles'. A precise correspondence is signified by the term that, in Christian Latin, is employed to define the relationship between eucharistic bread and

¹²² *Civilis enim atque domestica vetus illa Machabeorum plaga eventu consimili nostram hodie perturbat ecclesiam* (Ep. 32, in *The Correspondence of Thomas Becket*, i, ed. Duggan, 110, and see Chapter X).

¹²³ *Carm.* IX, 15, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 70.

¹²⁴ *Carm.* IX, 16, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 70.

¹²⁵ R. Folz, *Le Souvenir et la légende de Charlemagne dans l'Empire germanique médiévale*, Publications de l'Université de Dijon (Paris, 1950), 200.

¹²⁶ Ed. Schmale, 82–8.

¹²⁷ *dilatanda et multiplicanda* (ed. Schmale, 88, 27–8), and see Chapter III.

¹²⁸ *Carm.* IV, 4–5, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 57–8, and see Chapter VI.

Christ's body.¹²⁹ Rainald of Dassel, a cultivated cleric, understood how to use semi-sacral paradigms of rulership. In the same letter to Otto of Freising written in 1157, he made Barbarossa declare: *per magnifica gesta imperatorum ad virtutes informari preoptamus*.¹³⁰ To this concept of modelling the Archpoet alludes in *Salve, mundi domine!* His verb is a synonym of his master's, but there is a difference in sense. The passive infinitive *informari* refers to a task and a hope for the future that the indicative *representat* announces to be complete here and now. In *Salve, mundi domine!*, the imperial exemplar, no longer plural, becomes singular; and the identification is exact. Not 'shaped' by Charlemagne, Frederick I embodies him actively. 'Figuring forth' his Carolingian prototype, the Hohenstaufen emperor is lent the lustre of a pedigree devised by Rainald of Dassel at Lodi in November 1163. Then, either to his dictation or on his inspiration, 'Rainald H' specified Charlemagne as Barbarossa's 'ancestor' (*progenitor*).¹³¹ In all the documents that mention them both since the accession of Frederick I in 1152, this is the first claim of consanguinity. Taken together, the charter and the encomium mark a high point in the history of ideas that were toned down in the famous privilege issued for Aachen after the canonization of 1165.¹³² Two years earlier, a model of early medieval rulership had been imagined as a familial affinity, developed into an equation with Charlemagne. Long before he was proclaimed a saint, such were the images of proximity and similarity conjured up by Rainald of Dassel and the Archpoet as they enlarged the present in the magnifying mirror of the past.

* * *

The Charlemagne of Lodi is a hero of reconquest. None of the virtues celebrated in his later Lives is mentioned except prowess at arms, the manifestation of God's grace, which aligns the Carolingian and Hohenstaufen rulers with Judas Maccabeus. Like him in this respect (*similis in preliis* 14, 3), Barbarossa is emphatically different in the ways he wields power:

17. *Hic ergo considerans orbem conturbatum
potenter agreditur opus Deo gratum
et, ut regnum revocet ad priorem statum,
repetit ex debito census civitatum.*¹³³

¹²⁹ Blaise, *Vocabulaire*, 383, no. 3, quotes Tertullian, *Adversus Marcianum* i.4: *panem, quo ipsum corpus suum representat*.

¹³⁰ Ed. Schmale, 82, 9–10.

¹³¹ DFI, no. 417, ed. Appelt, 303, 27. The date is not preserved, but Appelt is clearly right to assign the charter to this period.

¹³² *desiderium fuit, ut divos reges et imperatores, qui nos precesserunt, precipue maximum et gloriosum imperatorem Karolum quasi formam vivendi atque regendi sequeremur et sequendo pre oculis semper haberemus* (DFI, no. 552, ed. Appelt, 432, 25–7). On this document in context, see E. Meuthen, 'Karl der Große–Barbarossa–Aachen: Zur Interpretation des Karlsprivilegs für Aachen', in W. Braunfels and P. E. Schramm (eds), *Karl der Grosse. Lebenswerk und Nachleben*, iv. *Das Nachleben* (Düsseldorf, 1967), 54–76.

¹³³ *Carm.* IX, 17, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 76.

17. And so considering that the world was in turmoil,
 he undertook with vigour a task blessed by God
 and, to restore the realm to its previous condition,
 he duly levied back taxation from the cities.

Two elements of this strophe are striking. The first is the absence of the title *cesar*, which has figured frequently in *Salve, mundi domine!*¹³⁴ The second is the repetition of themes already treated in strophes 8 and 12. Restoration and taxation, however, acquire new meanings by association with Charlemagne. In a line of direct descent from him, Barbarossa exercises royal rights that can be traced back to the eighth century (*repetit ex debito* 17, 4). So it is that the Archpoet replies to Italian criticisms of fiscal innovation that overturned the policy of German rulers from Henry IV to Conrad III. Far from imposing a new practice, our author asserts, the Hohenstaufen king of Italy revived an old one by military methods of the great Carolingian:

representat Karolum dextra victrici (16, 4).

To the complex web of theories about *translatio imperii*¹³⁵ is added the simple strand of *translatio regni Italici*. From this premise of legitimation there follows, in the logic of twelfth-century politics, the pattern of alliances being woven from imperial Pavia to provincial Novara by Rainald of Dassel. Both advanced and backward-looking in his ideas on rulership, the viceroy of Italy spent more time and energy there than he did in Germany or Burgundy. Italian issues loom so large in *Salve, mundi domine!* because it was to their subjects in that kingdom that the archchancellor most needed to justify Barbarossa's regime. Internal matters were consequently at the forefront of the Archpoet's mind. But foreign affairs also loomed large, for the *regnum Italicum* was threatened from outside by another empire loathed and feared in the West:¹³⁶

23. *Interim precipio tibi, 'Constantine',
 iam depone dexteram, tue cessent mine!
 Mediolanensium tante sunt ruine,
 quod in urbe media modo regnant spine.*¹³⁷

23. Meanwhile I command you, 'Constantine',
 to cease laying on hands and threatening!
 Such is the ruin of Milan
 that thorns preside over the city-centre.

The Archpoet issues order to an emperor. He is not the founder of Constantinople, nor is he called *basileus*. *Constantine* at 23, 1 refers to Manuel I Komnenos, whose machinations in the peninsula had aroused Rainald of Dassel's hostility since his first legation to Italy in 1158.¹³⁸ That odium is

¹³⁴ 1, 1; 2, 1; 4, 2; 5, 3; 6, 4; 12, 1; 13, 4.

¹³⁵ See Goetz, *Translatio Imperii*.

¹³⁶ P. Magdalino, 'Wie das Bild des Basileus in Westeuropa genutzt wurde' in Jussen (ed.), *Die Macht des Königs*, 179–89.

¹³⁷ *Carm.* IX, 23 ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 71.

¹³⁸ See Chapter IV.

mirrored in our author's caustic counterpart to Barbarossa's title. Constantine is the name given to the villainous 'king' of Byzantium in *König Rother*, a Middle High German romance of state.¹³⁹ This work and *Salve, mundi domine!* reflect anti-Byzantine attitudes formulated as early as 1153 in the treaty of Constance.¹⁴⁰ The brief parenthesis during which Frederick I, after his divorce from Adela of Vohburg in 1156, pondered a marriage alliance with the imperial house at Constantinople was forgotten. Had not Milan, a focal point of Manuel Komnenos' meddling, been destroyed beyond hope of repair (23, 3–4)?

Hardly had the strophe above been written than the *basileus* was supplying subsidies for the reconstruction of that city and its walls.¹⁴¹ The Archpoet's warning fell on deaf ears. Or rather on no ears at all in Byzantium. This sabre-rattling was inaudible beyond the imperial camp. And even inside it such invective was confined to the circle dominated by Rainald of Dassel. Dealing with Manuel Komnenos, no Hohenstaufen diplomat or writer of official documents ever dared to use a nickname as derogatory as 'Constantine' is made to appear here. Invoked by Barbarossa with reverence as a predecessor in 1160,¹⁴² two or three years later he has dwindled into shorthand for a sneer. Not until seven more strophes have been composed does our author bring himself to refer to Manuel Komnenos as *imperator Grecus* (31, 2), in the public style of his chancery-colleagues.¹⁴³ To them and their superior is addressed the intervening medley of taunts at the Eastern emperor and eulogy on the Caesar in the West (24–30). Reminiscent of the fictive letters composed by our author after the clash at Besançon,¹⁴⁴ *Salve, mundi domine!* continues in verse a polemic begun in his prose of the previous decade. At that moment of crisis between the papacy and the empire in 1157, members of the German chancery at least had an inkling of reality at Rome. The Archpoet's view of Byzantium was blinkered, and a comparable myopia curtailed the vision of Manuel Komnenos. During the summer of 1164 he wrote a letter to King Stephen III of Hungary lamenting that the Roman Empire had fallen into the hands of barbarians who were servile to the pope.¹⁴⁵ The death of his wife, Berta of Sulzbach, the adoptive daughter of Conrad III, in 1159 cannot explain why the *basileus*,

¹³⁹ Ed. R. Stein and I. Bennewitz (Stuttgart, 2000). On the political character of *König Rother*, cf. W. Störmer, 'Königtum und Kaisertum in der mittelhochdeutschen Literatur der Zeit Friedrich Barbarossas', in Haverkamp (ed.), *Friedrich Barbarossa*, 587 ff.

¹⁴⁰ See Chapter IV.

¹⁴¹ Fundamental are the studies by P. Classen reprinted in Classen, *Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, ed. J. Fleckenstein (Sigmaringen, 1983), 147–85.

¹⁴² *Gesta Frederici*, iv, 74, ed. Schmale, 612, 2.

¹⁴³ See P. Schreiner, 'Byzanz und der Westen: Die gegenseitige Betrachtungsweise in der Literatur des 12. Jahrhunderts', in Haverkamp, *Friedrich Barbarossa*, 567–8.

¹⁴⁴ See Chapter IV.

¹⁴⁵ Johannes Kinnamos, v, 7, in *Ioannis Cinnami epitome rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio Comnenis gestarum*, ed. A. Meineke (Bonn, 1836), 218, 6–220, 24. For a translation and notes, see Schreiner, 'Byzanz und der Westen', 578–80, with Lamma, *Comneni e Stauffer*, i, 1–6, and E. Bach, 'Imperium Romanum: Études sur l'idéologie politique du XIIe siècle', *Classica et Mediaevalia*, 7 (1945), 138–45.

wrongly considered Latinophile by his contemporaries, was so ill-informed about German attitudes to the Church five years after the outbreak of schism. Aside from a possible allusion to the éclat at Sutri in 1155, when neither Barbarossa nor Pope Adrian IV appears to have interpreted correctly the protocol of deference to the pope,¹⁴⁶ the chief significance of this remark lies in Manuel Komnenos' well-known aspiration to supplant his Hohenstaufen rival, about which he was then negotiating with Alexander III to no avail. The Greeks were the Archpoet's target, not his subject. That, he assured the arch-chancellor, might have been an epic on Barbarossa's exploits:

26.
*quam si mihi liceat plenius referre,
 hoc opus Eneidi poteris preferre.*
27. *Modis mille scriberem bellicos conflictus . . .*¹⁴⁷

26.
 were I allowed to treat the war more fully,
 you might prefer this work to the *Aeneid*.

27. I would write about the battle-clashes in a thousand ways . . .

The conditions are unreal, the mood subjunctive. Rather than being forbidden to compose on Virgilian scale, our author has declined Rainald of Dassel's request to do so. With an actual 'no' cast as a half-'yes', the emperor is left with an epic between the lines. Not everything, however, is hypothetical. One of the Archpoet's many modes of writing about a subject he should have preferred to avoid is indeed worth the thousand he does not deliver:

29. *Cesaris est gloria, cesaris est donum,
 quod iam patent vie regionum,
 dum ventis exposita corpora latronum
 surda flantis boree captant aure sonum.*¹⁴⁸

29. It is the emperor's glorious gift
 that the highways are now open,
 while the brigands' corpses are exposed to the storms,
 with deaf ears they attend to the blowing of the Northern wind.

It is November 1163 and wind blows from Germany on Lodi (29, 4). Winter is on the way. During this season the highways are usually not open but closed.¹⁴⁹ In the reversal of normal order wrought by Barbarossa's glorious achievement, the biblical connotations of deaf ears enhance the sense of inside out.¹⁵⁰ The brigands, strung up along the routes they had terrorized,¹⁵¹ listen in vain to what is not the song of an empty-handed traveller. An inversion of

¹⁴⁶ See Chapter IV. ¹⁴⁷ *Carm.* IX, 26, 3–4; 27, 1, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 71.

¹⁴⁸ *Carm.* IX, 29, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 71.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Burkhard, 'clausis . . . per hyemem stratis', ed. Güterbock, 'Lettere', 60.

¹⁵⁰ See Watenphul–Krefeld, 37 ad loc. ¹⁵¹ Cf. Görich, *Friedrich Barbarossa*, 253.

Juvenal x. 22 (*cantabit vacuus coram latrone viator*) may have contributed to this image, but the theme of punitive justice is treated with poetic originality. Unlike the scriptural and classical pastiche that follows it,¹⁵² our author's pyrotechnic of paradox reveals him thinking for himself.

When the direction was set by others, the Archpoet followed the shortest route. Obligatory in the context of Barbarossa's Italian policy was, after mention of Byzantium, reference to Sicily and the south. Rainald of Dassel's role in preparing a campaign had not been forgotten by 8 November 1163, for in a charter then issued at Lodi, of which he is the recognisant and 'Rainald H' is the scribe, the objective of striking against 'Apulia' is presented as still imminent.¹⁵³ Noteworthy here is the parallel drawn between the patron's image as a 'liberator' in the Mezzogiorno and the client's plight in the north of Italy:

*ipse iugo cesaris terram subigavit
et me de miserie lacu liberavit.*¹⁵⁴

he subdued the land to the emperor's yoke,
and freed me from a slough of misery.

After taking the unusual step of including a minister in an imperial encomium, our author commits the solecism of referring to himself. These departures from convention point to the complicity between them, expressed again in their shared sense of humour. Although the Archpoet denied sacral-ity to the empire, he had no qualms about hallowing Rainald of Dassel. And the wit, irreverent to the point of irreli-giousity, is calculated to make his master laugh.

Panegyric was not meant to be a laughing matter. Something had to be said about the emperor. But what? While Barbarossa might be distanced from his immediate predecessors and aligned with Charlemagne, there existed no Hohenstaufen programme of reform comparable to the Carolingian *renovatio*. In 1158 Frederick I had reissued a privilege that favoured learning, at least in Bologna.¹⁵⁵ He had consulted experts in jurisprudence. Yet he remained, above all, a military magnate. Arms were the primary means by which he enforced policy, and the first decade of his reign would lack intellectual history were it not for the chancery to which Otto of Freising and Rahewin submitted their writings. There, in the sole institution of culture attached to the imperial court, Rainald of Dassel reigned supreme. About him, the John the Baptist of empire, and his friends or enemies from Constantinople to Novara the Archpoet was capable of waxing eloquent. Words failed him on the subject of Barbarossa, and he brings *Salve, mundi domine!* to a syncopated conclusion:

¹⁵² *Carm.* IX, 30, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 71. Cf. Luke 2:1 and Horace, *Carmen saeculare* 57 ff.

¹⁵³ DFI, no. 410, and see Chapter X.

¹⁵⁴ *Carm.* IX, 33, 3–4, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 72. Cf. Psalm 39:3.

¹⁵⁵ See Chapter VI.

34. *Imperator nobilis, age sicut agis!*
Sicut exaltatus es, exaltare magis!
Fove tuos subditos, hostes cede plagis
*super eos irruens ultione stragis!*¹⁵⁶
34. Noble emperor, continue as before!
 As you are exalted, exalt more!
 Cherish your subjects, destroy your enemies with blows,
 falling upon them with vengeful massacre!

Sublimity and slaughter: only taxation is absent. It is a meagre muster of concepts. To the imperial theme our author rises with reluctance. He declines to invoke the Muses, declares his work to be substandard, refuses to repeat common knowledge, takes a shortcut, and promises but does not deliver epic better than Virgil's¹⁵⁷—a series of excuses that is too long to be literal. Years spent in the chancery hailing the would-be master of the world had taken their toll on 'Rainald H'. The effect can be felt in the poverty of ideas at the end of this work by such a richly gifted writer. 'Continue as before!' (34, 1) may express hope of eternal victory, but how to tell the perseverance of a hero from the obstinacy of a brute? No answer to the question is provided by an encomium notable for all it does not say. Yet the reticence of *Salve, mundi domine!* speaks volumes by implication. Barbarossa, for the Archpoet, was boring.

¹⁵⁶ *Carm.* IX, 34, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 72.

¹⁵⁷ 7, 4; 14, 4; 16, 2; 18, 4; 26, 3–4, 27, 1.

VIII

The Penitent at Pavia

Some twenty years after the Archpoet strained himself to sing the emperor's praises, there appeared, in the early 1180s, the first reaction to his work. Gunther of Pairis, tutor to the empress Beatrix and her sons, set out in his *Ligurinus* to provide the epic on Barbarossa that writers before him had failed to supply. Applauding their efforts half-heartedly, Gunther sarcastically disparaged their results:

*Qui scripsere prius cupientes ordine certo
historie servare fidem non pauca videntur
inseruisse suis (liceat modo dicere) chartis,
que neque cesareos augent vehementer honores
nec contexta rei, sed tanquam adsuta coherent.*¹

Previous writers, aiming to maintain historical accuracy with chronological precision, appear (if I may say so) to have included many details in their narratives which do not greatly exalt the emperor, nor are they properly integrated but, as it were, tacked on.

The anonymity is transparent. Otto of Freising and Rahewin are being criticized.² Although patchiness is hardly fair comment on the *Gesta Frederici*, there is no doubt that these historians made free of their materials when writing about the early years of the reign. After disposing of the methods practised by his unacknowledged models, Gunther turns to the manner of his only recognizable rival:

*Preterea rerum freti splendore simulque
artifici sermone suo sensuque profundo
materie insigni metricas adsciscere leges
spreverunt puduitque (reor) puerilibus illos
lascivire iocis et inanes texere nugas.*³

Moreover, reliant both on the splendour of the subject and on their contrived language and deep understanding, they disdained to apply the laws of metre to their noble theme, and it is a shame (I think) that they indulged in childish jokes, stringing along meaningless trivialities.

¹ *Ligurinus*, I, 124–8, ed. Assmann, 159.

² Cf. Assmann, 103.

³ *Ligurinus*, I, 144–8, ed. Assmann, 160–1.

The plural is deceptive; the subject is singular. This attack was not launched on the author of the *Gesta Frederici I in Lombardia*, whose hexametrical poem, transmitted incomplete in a single manuscript, neither circulated outside Italy nor sparkles with a sense of humour. Gunther means the Archpoet, who wrote rhythmical verse. Abstract the tone of disapproval, and insight can be detected. Despite his pomposity, Gunther is far from inaccurate. What he deplores as 'childish jokes' and 'meaningless trivialities' had been damned by John of Salisbury as 'linguistic tomfoolery'.⁴ Such were the vices of the arch-chancellor that the Archpoet mimicked not in his encomium on Barbarossa but in the previous work written to avoid the burden that Gunther preens himself on shouldering.⁵ In his mind, two decades later, these two performances by our author were linked; and neither of them fitted the bill. The imperial bill, as drafted by Gunther, required grand proportions and stately style, exemplified by his version of the *Gesta Frederici*, which exceeds its prose—sources in detail and elaboration.⁶ The *Ligurinus* delivers what Rainald of Dassel had demanded with a frown at frivolities in the past. Barbarossa, according to this stern conformist, merited more than a wag. Gunther emphasized the difference between himself and the Archpoet when he described the emperor's triumphant arrival at Pavia, after victory over Tortona, on 24 April 1155:⁷

- 175 . . . Tycini leta iuventus
ad sua victorem divertere menia regem
flagitat insignes antiquo more triumphos
exhibitura duci. 'Non est in finibus', inquit,
'Italie tanto locus aptior ullus honori,
quemve tuo cupias magis illustrare triumpho,
- 180 *quam que fida tibi per leta, per aspera queque*
extitit et nullo defecit tempore sedes!
Adde quod iste tuus nostros procedit in usus
sudor et ista tuae gessisti bella Papiac:
hostilem nostrisque malis inhiare paratam
- 185 *hostibus et sevis astricto federe iunctam—*
quid referemus ad haec?—vertisti funditus urbem.
Non sumus ingrati, liceat modo solvere grates
ingressuque sui regis gaudere Papiam.'
Paret et exhibitum non aspernatus honorem
- 190 *menia victor adit. Non est tractabile sensu*
eloquiove meo que gaudia, quantus ab urbe
occursus populi, quo scilicet ordine castus
antistes letusque suo cum presule clerus
vestibus ornatī nitidis preciosa ferentes

⁴ See Chapter V.

⁵ See Chapter VI.

⁶ Cf. Assmann, 103 ff.

⁷ The date given by Otto of Freising, *Gesta*, ii. 29, ed. Schmale, 336, 27–8, is corrected by Schmale, 337, 11–69, ad loc.

- 195 *signa crucis textusque sacros turisve vaporem*
prodierint; ut purpureo velamine passim
belligeros instratus equos fulgencia late
signa ferens faleratus eques fremebunda lupatis
ora terat cogatque leves subsistere cursus;
- 200 *utve nurus matresque simul mitesque puellae*
candida Sidonio velatae corpora textu
gestantes nitido baccata monilia collo
fulvaeque gemmatis incincte tempora ciclis
urbis utrumque latus densa stacione tenentes
- 205 *vocibus acclamant faustis dominumque salutent;*
ut domus auleis late pendentibus omnis
et picturatis constrata platea tapetis
rebus odoriferis et pingui ture vaporet;
ut tuba terribili spiramine, tibia leni,
- 210 *cornua ventoso strepitu, cava tympana rauco*
seu lyra percussis dulci modulamine nervis
murmure mirantes placido demulceat aures;
ut pueri populusque minor venientibus ultro
exuvias substernat equis peanaque letum:
- 215 *'loque triumphae!' canat. Hec omnia pluraque nobis,*
si modo suppeterent vires, memoranda fuerunt.
Deficit ingenium, non nec fiducia menti,
ut penitus meminisse velim rerumque nitorem
voce sequi: vix hec stimulatus Apolline toto
- 220 *vel Maro vel magnus verbis equaret Homerus.⁸*

... with joy the young men of Pavia
 entreat the victorious king to pay a visit
 to their walled town, which would celebrate his leadership
 in a splendid triumph on the ancient model.
 'Nowhere', they declare, 'in Italy is more suitable
 for so great an honour, nowhere preferable to
 celebrate your victory, for Pavia
 has proved faithful to you through thick and thin
 and, as your capital, has never wavered!
 Moreover your efforts have benefited us
 and you have waged those wars on behalf of your Pavia:
 you have utterly destroyed that city
 which, hostile and intent on harming us,
 was bound by treaty to savage foes.
 What should we add? We are deeply grateful
 and hope that Pavia will be allowed
 to give thanks in delight at the entrée of its own king.'

⁸ Ligurinus, I, 174–220, ed. Assmann, 240–2.

The victor acquiesced and, accepting
 the honour offered him, entered the town.
 I am unable to fathom or express how
 the people rejoiced and thronged from the city,
 or in what order the chaste priests and the happy clergy
 with their bishop, decked out in resplendent vestments
 and bearing the precious crucifix with the Bible,
 processed forth amid clouds of frankincense;
 or how here and there knights dressed up
 in purple garments, mounted on war-chargers,
 and bearing standards that sparkled in all directions,
 bridled back their horses' chafing mouths
 and forced them to slow their nimble course;
 or how women, married and mothers, together with
 gentle girls covered their spotless bodies
 with cloth of Sidon, wearing pearl-necklaces
 on their gleaming necks and double braids
 arranged around their blonde temples,
 as they took their places in tight-packed throngs
 on both sides of the city to acclaim
 their lord with greetings of welcome;
 or how each house was adorned with billowing curtains
 and the piazza, strewn with embroidered tapestries,
 was redolent with the perfume of rich frankincense;
 how trumpets blasted frighteningly and flutes blew gently,
 horns with noisy din and hollow drums
 in cacophony, accompanied by the sweet
 melody of the lyre when its strings are strummed,
 soothed admiring ears with their peaceful murmurs;
 or how boys and commoners of their own free will
 cast spoils before the oncoming horses
 while singing a joyous paean:
 'Lo, triumph!' All of these things and more
 I should mention, had I the force.
 Inspiration is wanting and I lack the confidence
 to recall in detail and recount the splendid theme.
 Virgil or the great Homer would hardly be equal to it,
 even if Apollo inspired them all his might.

These verses were written by one who had registered our author's precedent. Gunther echoes the Archpoet's instance of Virgil and Homer being inadequate to celebrate Barbarossa's exploits, and imitates (v. 215 ff.) his rhetoric of reluctance. If he has not itemized every aspect of the emperor's arrival in Pavia, Gunther implies that he has recounted more than enough. None of the details that he elaborates so verbosely is taken from his source, Otto of Freising, who, at *Gesta Frederici*, ii. 29, deals briskly with the subject in two sentences.⁹ The purple garments on spotless bodies, like the braids around

⁹ Ed. Schmale, 336, 26–30–338, 2.

blonde temples (vv. 201–3), are the semi-erotic products of Gunther's imagination. For the rest, he draws on expectations formed by familiarity with the liturgical ceremonies that were performed at the entry of medieval rulers into cities. Most of the minutiae mentioned in the *ordines ad regem suscipiendum* are included or indicated by the poet: 'the costumes of the clergy as well as those of the children, who always have a prominent place at liturgical receptions; the ritual, which includes the aspersion of the clergy; finally the arrangements for the procession of cross-bearers, bearers of holy water, thurifers, candles and sacred books, not to mention all the others who conduct their secular lord and likeness of the Lord in Heaven under a canopy into the city'.¹⁰ For an author so candid in his criticism of the liberties taken by others with historical accuracy, Gunther is uninhibited in making Barbarossa conform to this pattern of majesty in arrival. And yet the emperor scarcely appears in person. Emphasis is placed on how he is welcomed and acclaimed, since an *adventus* resembled a triumph. Both were acts of symbolic communication,¹¹ and both had religious implications,¹² which are evident here in Barbarossa's being hailed by his admiring subjects as a saviour amid clouds of frankincense.

The theme of this set-piece, traditional in Latin literature since antiquity,¹³ is consensus. Nothing in the Archpoet's *œuvre*, least of all his encomium on the emperor, is composed to fit such a formula. It is not just that he writes differently, rejecting the hexametrical hyperbole that Gunther considers suitable for imperial epic. It is also that our author thinks about Barbarossa in a quite different way, praising him not for his popularity among the Italians but for the toughness with which he subdued and taxed them. The Archpoet is concise and specific: Gunther prolix and clichéd. His bland banalities might have been applied as aptly to the arrival of a Carolingian or Ottonian monarch as to the *adventus* of this Hohenstaufen sovereign. Little is individual about his exercise in stereotype other than its setting.

Pavia, however, was a place that our author could not afford to ignore. There, in late November 1163, Rainald of Dassel returned with Barbarossa to the scene of a celebration held on Easter Sunday (4 April) 1162 that had marked, after the victory over Milan, a high point of German rule in

¹⁰ E. Kantorowicz, 'The "King's Advent" and the Enigmatic Panels in the Doors of Santa Sabina' in Kantorowicz, *Selected Studies* (Locust Valley, NY, 1965), 39.

¹¹ For bibliography, cf. R. Schweers, 'Die Bedeutung des Raumes für das Scheitern oder Gelingen des Adventus', in P. Johanek and A. Lampen (eds), *Adventus: Studien zum herrscherlichen Einzug in die Stadt*, Städteforschung A. 75 (Cologne, 2009), 37–56. A valuable analysis of the visual evidence is provided by M. Mersiowsky and E. Widder, 'Der Adventus in mittelalterlichen Abbildungen', in *Der weite Blick des Historikers: Einsichten in Kultur-, Landes- und Stadtgeschichte*, P. Johanek zum 65. Geburtstag (Cologne, 2002), 55–98. G. Kipling, *Enter the King: Theatre, Liturgy and Ritual in the Medieval Civic Triumph* (Oxford, 1998), deals mainly with late medieval and early modern evidence.

¹² On the religious dimension and precedents, see Kantorowicz, 'The "King's Advent"', and W. Dotzauer, 'Die Ankunft des Herrschers: Der fürstliche "Einzug" in die Stadt bis zum Ende des Alten Reichs', *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, 55 (1973), 245–88.

¹³ Cf. P. Dufraigne, *Adventus Augusti, Adventus Christi: Recherche sur l'exploitation idéologique et littéraire d'un cérémonial dans l'antiquité tardive*, Collection des Études augustiniennes 141 (Paris, 1994).

northern Italy.¹⁴ The grandeur of the occasion, which impressed the historian Acerbus Morena, will not have escaped the Archpoet, who was in attendance on his master:

On the next day of Easter almost all the *podestà* of Lombardy and a very large number of bishops and margraves and counts and many other Italian aristocrats were at Pavia, where the emperor, together with the most serene empress, was crowned at mass in the greater church amid pomp and jubilation. This the emperor had not done for the last three years, after vowing that he would never bear the crown on his head until he had conquered Milan. After the mass the emperor most winningly invited to luncheon all the Italian bishops, margraves, counts, and urban consuls who were present. I, Acerbus, the son of Otto who has been mentioned and the author of this book, attended; at that time I was *podestà* at Lodi. The emperor and the empress wearing their crowns on their heads lunched in the company of a number of bishops who sat to their right and left at table with their chasubles and episcopal insignia. The banquet was held in the bishop's curia where the citizens of Pavia conduct their assemblies, and there was the utmost rejoicing and gaiety about the success that God had recently accorded to the emperor.¹⁵

Such was the decorous image of Pavia conjured up by an Italian imperialist. His enthusiasm is matched by his compatriot who, in the *Carmen de gestis Frederici I*, describes the city as 'the glory of the realm' (*regni decus*¹⁶). There Barbarossa stayed, in his palace adjacent to the monastery of S. Salvatore, more often than anywhere else in the peninsula.¹⁷ For Rainald of Dassel, however, Pavia had less positive associations. In 1160 it had hosted the assembly that failed to impose his antipope, with consequences that can be read between these lines. Among the guests whom Acerbus Morena describes attending this luncheon, Peter, former bishop of Pavia, is neither singled out (as was customary) nor even mentioned, since he had been deposed as punishment for his allegiance to Alexander III and rejection of Victor IV.¹⁸ No Alexandrian dared to show his face in the city at the time of the Archpoet's visit in late November 1163.¹⁹ With the atmosphere cleared of orthodox solemnity, our author depicted the imperial capital of northern Italy as a whorehouse:

¹⁴ DFI, no. 419, with Oppl, *Das Itinerar Friedrich Barbarossas*, 34.

¹⁵ *Proximo vero die pasche fuerunt Papie fere omnes Longobardie potestates et quam plures episcopi et marchiones et comites alique multi nobiles Ytalie, fuitque imperator ea die incoronatus Papie ad missam in ecclesia maiori una cum serenissima augusta cum magnis solemnitatibus maximaque leticia, quod ipse imperator a tribus annis retro minime fecerat. Proposuerat enim, quod nunquam coronam sumeret in capite, donec Mediolanum superasset. Post missam vero fecit imperator dulcissimus invitare ad prandium suum omnes Italie episcopos, marchiones, comites et civitatum consules, qui ibi aderant; inter quos ego Acerbus filius predicti Ottonis, qui hunc librum composui, qui tunc eram potestas Laude, comedique imperator et imperatrix cum coronis in capite et cum quibusdam episcopis, qui erant in mensa sua a dextris et a sinistris cum infulis aliisque ornamentis episcopalibus. Et fuit ipsum convivium in curia episcopi, ubi Papienses concionem faciunt, fuitque ibi maxima leticia maximumque gaudium propter fortunam, quam Deus imperatori proxime donaverat* (ed. Schmale, *Quellen*, 180).

¹⁶ *Carmen*, 1757, ed. Ott, 58.

¹⁷ See P. Majocchi, *Pavia città regia: Storia e memoria di una capitale medievale* (Rome, 2008), 102 ff.

¹⁸ Helmut of Bosau, *Chronica Slavorum*, ed. B. Schmeidler, MGH SrG 32 (Hanover, 1937), 206.

¹⁹ See K.-M. Sprenger, 'Die Klöster von Pavia zwischen Friedrich I. und Alexander III: Zu einem verlorenen Mandat Friedrich Barbarossas und den Auswirkungen des Schismas in Pavia', *QF 77* (1997), 18–50, especially 40.

6. *Presul discretissime, veniam te precor:
morte bona morior, dulci nece necor;
meum pectus sauciat puellarum decor,
et quas tactu nequeo, saltem corde mechor.*
7. *Res est arduissima vincere naturam,
in aspectu virginis mentem esse puram;
iuvenes non possumus legem sequi duram
leviumque corporum non habere curam.*
8. *Quis in igne positus igne non uratur?
Quis Papie demorans castus habeatur,
ubi Venus digito iuvenes venatur,
oculis illaqueat, facie predatur?*
9. *Si ponas Ypolitum hodie Papie,
non erit Ypolitus in sequenti die:
Veneris in thalamos ducunt omnes vie;
non est in tot turribus turris Alethie.*²⁰
6. Most discerning prelate, I beg your pardon:
I am dying a good death, perishing in sweet destruction;
pretty girls pierce my heart
and those I cannot caress I lust after in the heart.
7. It is most difficult to subdue nature,
to think clean thoughts while gazing at a girl;
we young men cannot follow the harsh law
and pay no attention to smooth bodies.
8. Who is not burned when tossed into the fire,
who can be considered chaste while staying at Pavia,
where Venus makes predatory gestures to the young,
luring them with her gaze and ensnaring them by her beauty?
9. If you put Hippolytus down at Pavia today,
he will not be Hippolytus tomorrow:
all roads lead to Venus' bedroom;
among so many towers there is not Alethia's.

The 'harsh law' (*legem duram* 7, 3) to which the Archpoet refers is that of the moralists, such as the much-read Peter Damian, who, a century earlier, had written to Pope Alexander II to condemn lust of the flesh and the gaze.²¹ Quoting St John and Genesis, he linked physical desire and visual concupiscent with the mortal sin of pride. The whole world, deplored Damian, was nothing but greed, avarice, and promiscuity.²² The last is the vice that our

²⁰ *Carm.* X, 6–9, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 74.

²¹ On the influence of Damian, see S. Freund, *Studien zur literarischen Wirksamkeit des Petrus Damiani*, MGH Studien und Texte 13 (Hanover, 1995).

²² *Omne quod est in mundo concupiscentia carnis est et concupiscentia oculorum et superbia vitae. Concupiscentia scilicet carnis ad corporis voluptatem, concupiscentia oculorum ad visibilia rerum pertinet*

author locates at Pavia, attributing to the fleshpots of that city his own inversion of ethical order. Contrary to the saint and others who condemned sex as an evil to be countered by the bitterness of repentance, he revels in a 'good death' and a 'sweet destruction' (6, 2). Lusting in the heart (*corde mechor* 6, 2) after pleasures as illicit as they are irresistible, the Archpoet selects the very place where the Bible stations conscience. With its claims negated by dirty thoughts, he issues an implicit challenge to the lesson of Christ (Matthew 5:28), while trespassing far beyond the usual limits of twelfth-century tolerance. Some moral theologians were capable of leniency towards such transgressions, which they considered venial, but none of them entertained the outrageous idea of extenuating an individual's failings by the errancy of his age group.

Iuvenes non possumus, declares our author at 7, 3. The plural is inclusive. Rainald of Dassel, an archbishop-elect, is enlisted as his partner in peccancy. Contemporaries born c.1120, they were in their early forties by 1163—*iuvenes*, according to medieval reckoning.²³ Their companionship in anticonformity is paralleled by troubadours who vaunted their youthful sensuality and compensated for their social marginality by bonds between themselves.²⁴ Togetherness in separation from others is an attitude struck similarly by the Archpoet, who represents Rainald and himself as members of a generation that, caught in the compulsions of the whorish goddess who presides over Pavia, cannot exercise moral choice. All roads led not to Rome but to Venus' bedroom (9, 3): the point made by manipulation of the proverb is less to assert that they are forced to fornicate than to draw a contrast between Victorine values of laxity and the urban symbol of Alexandrine strictness. Emphasis is lent to this antithesis by the towers that had captured the Archpoet's imagination at Milan.²⁵ Among the multitude of them that loom over Pavia, Alethia's is conspicuous by its absence (9, 4). No room is made in that city of sin for a classical figure of truth. Hence the misadventure of Hippolytus (9, 1–2), losing the chastity for which he was famed. This notion, familiar from ancient literature,²⁶ would have smacked of staleness, had the name not been spiced with a local flavour appealing to the palate of an archbishop-elect from Cologne. There the chapel of St Hippolytus was situated next to the church of the Holy Virgins.²⁷ What

*pulchritudinem, superbia vero vitae, terreni honoris atque fastigii exprimit sublimitatem. Per haec enim primus homo temptatus agnoscitur, sicut scriptura testator: 'Vidit', inquit, 'mulier quod bonum esset lignum ad vescendum': ecce concupiscentia carnis; deinde sequitur: 'Et pulchrum oculis aspectuque delectabile': ecce superbia oculorum. Per oculos enim superbire vincitur, quisquis in his, quae Deus prohibet, delectatur. Superbia vero vitae fuit, cum mulier eadem ex ore serpentis libenter audivit: 'Eritis sicut dii, scientes bonum et malum. Totus itaque mundus hoc tempore nichil est aliud, nisi gula, avaricia atque libido' (Ep. 96, in *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani* 3, Nr. 91–150, ed. K. Reindel, MGH *Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit* (Munich, 1989), 56, 18–28–57, 1–2). The quotations are from John 2:16, Genesis 3:6, and Genesis 3:5.*

²³ Cf. E. Sears, *The Ages of Man: Medieval Interpretations of the Life Cycle* (Princeton, 1986), 47, 130.

²⁴ See E. Kohler, 'Sens et fonction du terme "jeunesse" dans la poésie des troubadours', in P. Gallais and Y.-J. Riou (eds), *Mélanges offerts à R. Crozet* ... (Poitiers, 1966), 569–83.

²⁵ See Chapter VII.

²⁶ Watenphul–Krefed ad loc. (142), cite Ovid, *Amores* ii. 4. 32.

²⁷ G. Amberg, 'Die Hippolytuskapelle in Köln', *Jahrbuch des kölnischen Geschichtsvereins*, 56 (1985), 190–4.

would be the consequences for them—11,000 in number, according to legend²⁸—if he succumbed to the temptations of Pavian promiscuity? The third-century saint was more topical than the mythical hero, since Hippolytus, like Rainald, had been involved in a conflict about papal authority.²⁹ A hint of the schism raging at the time this poem was written enhances its humour, which has little to do with the 'goliardic' gaiety of wine, women, and song. The subject here is less sex than truth—the elusive truth of multiple meanings that are far from riotousness on the road. The Archpoet, styling himself an apologist of ethical irregularity, inverts the prescriptive categories of Peter Damian and his likes, viewing the same issues of clerical conduct from the opposite perspective. While he rebuts the moralists' affirmations of rigour and self-denial, he remains linked to them by a dialectical bond in which every *non* depends on the *sic* of others. This symmetry is one of the reasons why we must appeal against the judgement of a high authority who rules that the 'confession' is 'the most diffused of all secular songs in Medieval Latin'.³⁰

Irreverent, irreligious, and unorthodox the work may be, but *secular* it is not. Our author, uninhibited in his disdain for ignorant laymen, composed it for a prelate banned by the ecclesiastical establishment. The poem is the product of a counter-culture—counter to the strictures, the decorum, and the mores of Rome. The opposition is directed at a mentality rather than a policy. Challenging Roman conformism, the Archpoet leaves the institution unscathed. There is no hint of abandoning the order to which he belongs, nor does he display the slightest affinity with anti-clerical rebels like Arnold of Brescia's adherents. What his rejection of asceticism, distinctively German,³¹ serves to demonstrate is a difference between the archbishop-elect of Cologne and his orthodox contemporaries, such as the future archbishop of Canterbury. Even as the companion of royal revels, Thomas Becket is never recorded violating norms of chastity. Neither during his chancellorship nor after becoming primate of the English Church was the seemly saint inclined to the risqué wit that amused Rainald of Dassel. Abstemiousness on the topic of the clergy's erotic inclinations was characteristic of Latin culture in twelfth-century Europe. If richness is one of its features, another is reticence. There were taboos to be observed in a silence of embarrassment about clerics in bed. They could be broken during confession, when penitents were supposed to come clean about their sexual sins. This sacrament was being redefined and discussed with the utmost earnestness throughout the Archpoet's lifetime.³² Other writers in the hybrid

²⁸ See W. Levison, *Das Werden der Ursula-Legende* (Cologne, 1928).

²⁹ A. Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church in the Third Century: Communities in Tension before the Emergence of a Monarch-Bishop*, Supplement to *Vigiliae Christianae* 31 (Leiden, 1995).

³⁰ 'Die Beichte ist nach der Zahl der Handschriften wohl das verbreitetste aller weltlichen mittellateinischen Lieder' (B. Bischoff, in *Carmina Burana*, i, 3 *Die Trink- und Spiellieder—Die geistlichen Dramen* (Heidelberg, 1970) 12 (emphasis added), and cf. Bischoff, *Carmina Burana: Einführung zur Faksimile-Ausgabe der Benediktbeuer Liederhandschrift* (Munich, 1970), 12).

³¹ Cf. Schmeidler, 'Anti-asketische Äußerungen'.

³² On the theology of confession in the twelfth century, see M. Colish, *Peter Lombard*, ii (Leiden, 1994), 516–697.

genre to which the term 'confession' may be applied were deadly serious;³³ and our author appeared to echo their tone of humourlessness when, in the first two verses of his work, he claimed to be contrite in the spirit of Job 10:1:

*Aestuans intrinsecus . . . | in amaritudine*³⁴
Seething inwardly . . . | with bitterness

The acrid taste of remorse, not the sweet savour of pleasure, was expected by his audience, which knew of no precedent for a sinner publicly celebrating his transgressions. Nor, to judge from the surviving evidence, had anyone before the Archpoet 'confessed' in verse to a prelate who, since he had been excommunicated, ought to have been debarred from administering this act of atonement:³⁵

As he has not yet acknowledged his fault or confessed it, and since he has persevered in the malice he had undertaken with the devil hardening his heart, according to the words of the apostle: 'In keeping with his obduracy, his impenitent heart shall store wrath for itself on the day of vengeance', we therefore separate him, together with all those who support and have dealings with him, from partaking in the precious body and blood of our Lord and from the whole of Christian society and exclude him from the threshold of the Holy Mother Church in heaven and on earth by the judgement of Omnipotent God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit and of St Peter, the prince of the apostles, and of all the saints with the authority invested in us, despite our inadequacy, and with the power to bind and to loose in heaven and on earth that has been divinely conferred on us. We pronounce him excommunicate and damned with the devil and his angels and all the wicked and consign him to eternal fire, unless he happens to see his error and free himself from the snares of the devil and reverts to mending his ways and to penance and making amends to God's Church, which he has harmed. Let all reply in the sequel: 'Amen!' or 'So be it, so be it!' or 'May he be damned!' The priests should surround the bishop and hold blazing candles in their hands which, when the excommunication has ended, they should throw on the ground and trample underfoot. Then the bishop should explain the excommunication to the common people in plain words so that everyone understands how horrifyingly he has been damned and realise that from then on forever he is to be considered not a Christian but a pagan . . .³⁶

³³ For the genre, cf. K. Morrison, *Conversion and the Text: The Cases of Augustine of Hippo, Herman-Judah and Constantine Tsatsos* (London, 1992), C. Schmitt, *The Conversion of Herman the Jew: Autobiography, History, and Fiction in the Twelfth Century*, trans. A. Novikoff (Oxford, 2010), and M. Banniard, 'Vraies aveux et fausses confessions du IX^e au XI^e siècle: Vers une écriture autobiographique?', in J.-C. M. Vigueur (ed.), *L'Aveu: Antiquité et moyen-âge*, Actes de la table ronde organisée par l'École française de Rome avec le concours du CNRS et de l'Université de Trieste, Collection de l'École française de Rome 88 (Rome, 1986), 215–41.

³⁴ *Carm.* X, 1, 1–2, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 73.

³⁵ Cf. Gratian C.2.1.21, ed. E. Friedberg, *Corpus iuris canonici* I (Leipzig, 1879) 449, 34–5, C.9.1.2, ed. Friedberg, 601, 8–9; C.24.1.37, ed. Friedberg, 981, 10, C.11.3.108–9, ed. Friedberg, 675.11 ff., with T. Lenherr, *Die Exkommunikations- und Depositionsgewalt der Häretiker bei Gratian und den Dekretisten bis zur Glossa ordinaria des Johannes Teutonicus*, Münchener Theologische Studien III. Kanonistische Abteilung 42 (St Ottilien, 1987), 253 ff.

³⁶ *Quia culpam suam necdum cognovit nec confessus est, quia in coepta malitia, diabolo cor eius indurante, perseverat, et iuxta quod Apostolus dicit: 'Secundum durtiam suam cor impenitens thesaurizat sibi iram in die*

Rainald of Dassel did not hear this anathema, or a version of it, when it was pronounced against him, six months earlier in May 1163, at the council of Tours. But he was familiar with the formulae of excommunication which were transmitted in legal compilations by Burchard of Worms, Ivo of Chartres, and others. Common knowledge made him aware that, after he had been separated from the Church and its sacraments, the only way of reconciling himself with the orthodox was by performing penance, to which this text refers twice. Rainald's dilemma ought to have been dire. Expelled from the Christian communion, the archbishop-elect of Cologne had become a damned outsider (*paganus*). Such was the state of alienation that, perhaps more than any other, might have induced what 'inner turmoil and bitter remorse'. Instead he is invited by his client to laugh. And as the patron joins in the mirth at a sacrament of atonement which he has no intention of undertaking, this comedy of conscience reveals the singularity of its author and addressee. Alone among his predecessors and peers, the Archpoet stood a foundation of the faith on its head to amuse a schismatic prince of the Church.

* * *

Surprise contributed to the effect. Verse-confessions are rare in the Latin literature of the Middle Ages, and none previous to our author's served as its model. Comparison with an earlier instance of the genre, however, may indicate how unfamiliar his experiment will have appeared to conventional clerics. They had no reason to revere the memory of the ninth-century poet and theologian Gottschalk, who had been condemned as a heretic. Yet his *O mi custos*³⁷ is more orthodox than our author's 'confession'. Set squarely in the 'today' (*hodie* 9, 1) of Pavia in November 1163, this work deliberately designed to break rules draws some of its subversive force from the time and place in which it is positioned. *O mi custos*, by contrast, is unlocated and undatable.³⁸

*irae', idcirco nos eum cum universis complicitibus et communicatoribus, fautoribusque suis, iudicio Dei omnipotentis, Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus sancti, et beati Petri principis apostolorum, et omnium sanctorum, necnon et nostrae mediocritatis auctoritate et potestate nobis divinitus collata ligendi et solvendi in coelo et in terra a pretiosi corporis et sanguinis Domini perceptione et a societate omnium Christianorum separamus et a liminibus Sanctae Matris Ecclesiae in coelo et in terra excludimus et excommunicatum et anathematizatum esse decernimus, et damnatum cum diabolo et angelis eius et omnibus reprobis in igne aeterno iudicamus, nisi forte a diaboli laqueis respiscat et ad emendationem et poenitentiam redeat et Ecclesiae Dei, quam laesit, satisficiat. Et respondeant omnes tertio, 'Amen' aut 'Fiat, fiat', aut, 'Anathema sit'. Debent enim sacerdotes episcopum circumstare et lucernas ardentes in manibus tenere, quas in conclusione anathematis vel excommunicationis proicere debent in terram et conculcare pedibus. Post haec episcopus plebi ipsam excommunicationem communibus verbis debet explanare, ut omnes intelligant quam terribiliter damnatus sit et ut noverint quod ab illa hora in reliquum non pro Christiano sed pro pagano habendus sit. . . (Burchard of Worms, *Decretum* xi, 2 PL 140, 857 D–858 C, and cf. Ivo of Chartres, *Decretum* xiv. 75 ff., PL. 161, 844 C ff.).*

³⁷ Ed. H. Fickermann, *MGH Poetae latini Aevi Carolini* vi, 1 (repr. Munich, 1978), 89–97, with P. von Moos, 'Gottschalks Gedicht *O mi custos*—eine *Confessio*', *FmSt* 4 (1970), 201–30, and 5 (1971), 317–58.

³⁸ The poem is placed, correctly but not chronologically, against the background of Gottschalk's ideas on predestination by J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, *The Frankish Church* (Oxford, 1983), 369.

It enacts a drama of atonement in a perpetual present where lamentation is accompanied by longing:

*Pectus adamantinum reddere ut carneum,
tu mutare nunc belvinum in humanum animum
veteremque vel antiquum in iam novum spiritum!*³⁹

Transform now my adamantine heart into one of flesh,
my bestial into a human soul,
and my old or deceitful spirit into one renewed!

It follows, in the impeccable theology of Gottschalk's ideas on penance, that sorrow is a sign of grace:

*Manuum tuarum opus respice clementius;
si respexeris, ploratus sequetur uberrimus,
immo simul ululatus erit amarissimus.*⁴⁰

Look with clemency on the work of Your hands;
should You gaze, an abundance of tears will follow,
and at the same time wailing will be most bitter.

The affectivity is positive. Grief at sin, the emotion that melts the adamantine heart, may be considered a divine gift. It is God who accepts the penitent as a prodigal son (*O mi custos*, 29 ff.); He who raises the contrite back to life as incarnations of the biblical Lazarus (*O mi custos*, 42 ff.). Compunction, so plangently evoked in Gottschalk's style, is the beginning of a process that evolves on three levels: confession of wrongdoing, followed by one of faith and another of divine praise, in conformity to the triad defined by St Augustine.⁴¹ Although lyrical in its intensity and personal in its style, *O mi custos* cannot be construed as a private composition. It dramatizes an existential predicament with a rigour that even Gottschalk's accuser, Archbishop Hincmar of Reims, could hardly have faulted; and may have been intended for liturgical use.⁴²

No one associated the Archpoet's 'confession' with the liturgy and, among the many who tinkered with his text, few surpassed the obtuseness of the scribe who, at 8, 2, altered 'in Pavia' (*Papie*) to 'in the world' (*in mundo*).⁴³ This crass rewriting betrays, however, an understandable perplexity. A type, not an individual, was called for in circumstances of contrition that, unlimited by chronology or location, were to be considered universally valid. Hence the intelligibility of Gottschalk, whose *O mi custos* fitted this requirement, and the discomfort of the Archpoet's copyists, who added the rubric 'confession' to his work. Their literalism, ingenuous or edifying, was ill-equipped for an

³⁹ *O mi custos*, 16, ed. Fickermann, 91.

⁴⁰ *O mi custos*, 28, ed. Fickermann, 92.

⁴¹ J. Ratzinger, 'Originalität und Überlieferung in Augustinus' Begriff der *Confessio*', *Revue des études augustiniennes*, 3 (1957), 357–92.

⁴² Cf. Moos, 'Gottschalks *O mi custos*—eine *Confessio*', 340 ff.

⁴³ See Bischoff, *Carmina Burana*, ii. 13–14, 16 (ad loc.).

innovation that twisted self-accusation into self-celebration; that began by announcing the bitterness of remorse and ended by advocating the sweetness of indulgence; and that, decrying continence as a harsh law made by sour old men, declared promiscuity to be natural among the hard-drinking young. All this was beyond the horizons of conservatives and conformists, medieval or modern. Removing God from the centre of his immoral universe, the Archpoet substitutes his elusive self.

His elusiveness is not the vagrancy of a 'wandering scholar'. Our author's sights are trained on a target, which represents itself as immovable and unshakeable. When he appears to denounce his instability, it is in terms that evoke the settled life advocated by that former monk, Pope Gregory the Great:⁴⁴

1 . . . *factus de materia levis elementi*
folio sum similis, de quo ludunt venti.

2 *Cum sit enim proprium viro sapienti*
supra petram ponere sedem fundamenti,
stultus ego comparor fluvio labenti
*sub eodem aere nunquam permanenti.*⁴⁵

1 . . . made of material slight in substance,
 I am like a leaf played about by the wind.

2 Although it is the mark of a wise man,
 to build the seat of his foundation on stone,
 I, a fool, am like a gliding river,
 never lingering under the same sky.

Such were the similes and metaphors of transience or temporizing that Gregory had developed from the Bible to censure misconduct in his *Moralia in Iob*. That classic work exercised an influence on later thinkers. Peter Damian, for example, echoed the *Moralia* in a famous letter of admonition addressed to his hermetical congregation at Fonte Avellana almost half a millennium after Gregory.⁴⁶ Widely diffused in the Latin West, the biblical exegesis by him, together with its adaptation by Peter, are likely to have been familiar, at least in excerpt, to the Archpoet and to his colleagues, because they formed staples of ecclesiastical education. Hearing our author recite these commonplaces on which they had been reared, members of his audience had reason to expect the line of austerity taken by his models. Then, as they await repetition of pious platitudes, he launches into aphorisms that negate all he has seemed to assert:

*mihi cordis gravitas res videtur gravis*⁴⁷
 gravity of heart seems to me no laughing matter

⁴⁴ Cf. Godman, *Paradoxes of Conscience*, 172 ff.

⁴⁵ *Carm.* X 1, 3–4–2, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 73.

⁴⁶ Cf. Ep. 18, ed. K. Reindel, *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani*, i Nr. 1–40 MGH, *Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit*, iv (Munich, 1983) 169, 13 ff. (*folia*), 16 (*venti*), 19 (*nullo manente permaneat*).

⁴⁷ *Carm.* X, 4, 1, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 74.

and:

*mortuus in anima curam gero cutis*⁴⁸
 dead in the soul I take care of my body.

Each of these epigrams might have been framed by a medieval moralist as an accusation. The ethical categories of their criticisms furnish the Archpoet's defence. Admitting the wrongs he commits against decorous deportment and approved standards, our author extols what others censured. Their grounds for attack are pre-empted by a wit that can hardly be answered, for it has anticipated the terms of their predictable charges. Superficially on the subjects of wine, women, and song, the provocations of our author in fact amount to a dialectic directed against clerical codes.

* * *

The first of them, chastity, has been undermined by his extenuation of sex. With the meticulousness of a casuist enumerating arguments to be refuted, he turns to the second:

- 10 *Secundo redarguor etiam de ludo,
 sed cum ludus corpore me dimittit nudo,
 frigidus exterius mentis estu sudo;
 tunc versus et carmina meliora cudo.*⁴⁹
- 10 Secondly, I am reproved for gambling,
 but when the game casts me out unclothed,
 outwardly chilled I sweat with mental heat
 and at that moment fashion my best poetry.

Who is reproving (*redarguor* 10, 1) this reprobate? The critic in a confession ought to have been himself, because auto-accusation was taken to be proof of sincerity. But the Archpoet declares that his vice produces virtuosity. Winning poetry emerges from the loss of a game; the best arises from the worst; and the precondition of creativity is a moral state turned inside out. In a single strophe our author disposes of jeremiads by Peter Damian, who condemned dice-playing together with chess,⁵⁰ and laughs at the lamentations of pseudo-Cyprian—his model at 10, 2—who bewailed that ‘nefarious art’ as a cause of nakedness and poverty.⁵¹ Treatments of gambling are uncommon in the Latin poetry of the Middle Ages,⁵² and the corpus of prescriptive literature on the subject is far from exhilarating.⁵³ All of it drives home the same point, which is

⁴⁸ *Carm.* X, 5, 4, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 74.

⁴⁹ *Carm.* X, 10, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 74.

⁵⁰ Ep. 57, ed. Reindel, *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani*, 2. 188, 10 ff. See *Carmina Burana*, 209, 210, ed. Bischoff, 55–6, and cf. O Ferm and V. Honemann (eds), *Chess and Allegory in the Middle Ages*, Sällskapet Runica et Mediaevalia, *Scripta minora* 12 (Stockholm, 2005).

⁵¹ *O ars infesta studentibus et studium libidinosum, qui[a] non divitias sed nuditatem et inopiam praestat!* (*De aleatoribus* 9, ed. G. Härtel, CSEL 3, iii (Vienna, 1891), 101, 18–102, 1, and cf. 103, 12 ff.).

⁵² e.g. *Carmina Burana*, 207, ed. Bischoff, 54.

⁵³ Cf. W. Tauber, *Das Würfelspiel im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit: Eine Kultur- und sprachgeschichtliche Darstellung*, Europäische Hochschulschriften 959 (Frankfurt, 1987).

prohibition. If the Archpoet was acquainted with Liutprand's history of Otto I, he will hardly have been surprised to learn that among the enormities cited to justify that emperor's deposition of Pope John XII was his unpontifical zest for dice.⁵⁴ Our author's lot is happier, for defeat in this illicit game spurs him on to literary achievements. Transgression, affirms the anti-conformist, entails triumph.

Rebuked on two headings and resurgent on both, he deals punctually with the third, stationing himself in a place where no cleric was supposed to set foot:

- 11 *Tercio capitulo memoro tabernam.
Illam nullo tempore spreui neque spernam,
donec sanctos angelos venientes cernam
cantantes pro mortuis: 'Requiem eternam'.*⁵⁵

On the third heading I mention the pub.
I have never spurned it nor ever shall
until I witness the arrival of holy angels
singing 'Eternal rest' for the deceased.

English translation cannot convey the resonance of the last word in the first line above. *Taberna*, in Medieval Latin, was not equivalent to 'pub' or 'tavern', nor did it neutrally signify a place of relaxation and conviviality. The term, intensely pejorative to the ears of an educated cleric, connoted abuse. A numerous and monotonous sequence of condemnations had, by the twelfth century, made *taberna* synonymous with sin;⁵⁶ and the Archpoet's diction was calculated to unsettle his audience. Accustomed to formulae of prohibition that were so regularly, so stereotypically levelled against bars out of bounds, few of his jaded hearers will have mustered the bloody-mindedness displayed by this unidentifiable author of an episcopal capitulary issued c.850 in Western Francia:

Holy Scripture plainly declares that priests should not enter pubs, and seeks to keep not only them but even laymen away from such low company. Who is unaware that in places of this kind nothing edifying rather than disgraceful is ever heard? There is usually an uproar of men quarrelling with one another and immense strife arises for minuscule motives. The ancient, crafty enemy has dragged many men to hell through the pub, persuading them to murder or egging them on to adultery and various crimes. What King Balach could not achieve with his army the devil managed by the pub!⁵⁷

⁵⁴ Liutprand of Cremona, *Historia Ottonis* 10, ed. J. Becker (repr. Hanover, 1977), 167, 24–6.

⁵⁵ *Carm.* X, 11, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 74.

⁵⁶ See H. Peyer, *Viaggiare nel Medioevo: Dall'ospitalità alla locanda* (Bari, 1999), 106 ff.

⁵⁷ *Presbiteros tabernas non ingredi debere Scriptura Sancta manifeste denuntiat et non solum presbiteros, sed omnes laicos ab hoc contubernio repellere certat. Quis nesciat, quod in loco tali nihil umquam audiet quod aedificet, sed potius quod condempnet? Ibi sonant adversantium hominum inter se iurgia, ibi lites ex parvissimis rebus solent exoriri grandes. Antiquus siquidem et callidus hostis per has multos secum ad infernum detraxit homicidia sua dndo, adulteria et diversa crimina ministrando. Ecce, quod Balac rex per exercitum suum agere non potuit, per tabernas egit!* (ed. R. Pokorny, *MGH Capitula episcoporum* iii (Hanover, 1995), 44, 12–19, with 13 n. 4).

Balach, the king of Moab whom Joshua (24:9 ff.) describes as the enemy of Israel, God's people, is cited because this zealot is not treating a current breach of the canons; he is dealing with a timeless outrage against divine precepts. On the moral plane of mega-history that reaches from Balach to Charlemagne's successors, a crime and a sin are one and the same. Untypical in its originality about the horrors of the pub, the capitulary resembles a curse. Although no one in the Archpoet's audience is likely to have recalled its precise wording, all his critics in orders were aware that, on mention of the *taberna*, such was the pose of righteousness that they were supposed to strike.

The priggishness, the prudery, the puritanism of clerical conduct are our author's butts. He does not attack them directly but mocks from an ironical distance. Imagining angels singing a requiem mass for him (11, 3–4), the Archpoet alludes to the ceremony, entitled *de angelis* by Gregory the Great, in which the dead were commemorated throughout medieval Germany.⁵⁸ None of these services was performed in the profanity of a *taberna*, nor were they conducted with the impenitent jubilation that recalls the angelic chorus *Gloria in excelsis*!⁵⁹ The highest is being reduced to the lowest in ecclesiastical terms, but our author has no model that he mimics or distorts, for he is not making fun of angels and commemorative masses. He is combining their associations of celestial purity and ceremonial pomp to extol an earthiness abhorred in the humbug of his colleagues. Those who profess to look down on his errancy are sent up in a spoof of their own pomposity:

12 *Meum est propositum in taberna mori,
ut sint vina proxima morientis ori.
Tunc cantabunt letius angelorum chori:
'Sit Deus propitius huic potatori!'*⁶⁰

12 It is my intention to die in a pub,
in order to have wines close to my expiring throat.
Then angelic choruses will sing joyfully:
'May God take mercy on this drinker!'

Observe how this famous strophe begins. The first three words—'It is my intention' (*Meum est propositum* 12, 1)—might have been written by a moralist. Programmatic in tone, they are biblical in flavour (cf. Acts 11:23). The lofty register of the noun derives from divine ordinances in the Latin Vulgate (cf. Ephesians 1:5, 11). But the indulgent God of the Archpoet is neither expected to command nor entreated to forgive. He is portrayed as countenancing the death of our author in a den of iniquity debarred to his order. The other members of it who heard his prayer will have identified the reference both to the text of Scripture and to a ritual of penance that began with the apostle's

⁵⁸ A. Franz, *Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter* (Freiburg, 1902), 254 ff.

⁵⁹ Cf. G. Eversen, *Chanter avec les anges: Poésie dans la messe médiévale. Interprétations et commentaires* (Paris, 2001), 104 ff.

⁶⁰ *Carm.* X, 12, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 75.

words: *Deus propitius esto mihi peccatori*.⁶¹ So it is that the sinner of Luke 18:13 becomes the carouser (*potatori*) of the Archpoet, whose pun is set at a different intellectual level from the wordplay in parodies with which it has been compared, such as the *Tractatus Garsiae* and the *Evangelium secundum marcas argenti*.⁶² To grasp that a gospel according to marks of silver imitates the gospel according to St Mark requires no mental effort, for the verbal resemblance is as obvious as the antithesis is crude. The *jeu de mots peccatori—potatori*, by contrast, occupies a delicate position between irony and blasphemy. Is our author guilty of sacrilege against St Luke and the ritual function of his prayer? Or is he exposing the meaninglessness with which it is recited at the start of a sacrament that routine had made into mumbo-jumbo? In either case or in both, the target is a mechanical faith that goes through the motions without thinking how, by the alteration of one syllable, they can be put into reverse. The unpredictability of the Archpoet is no less notable than his precision, as sin is sanctified in the first reference to confession since the work began, eleven strophes and forty-two lines earlier (1, 1–2).

By now his audience can be pardoned if it has forgotten that our author commenced by adopting a stance of remorse. All that followed was a joyous manifesto of ethical irregularity, which reaches its climax in this splendid strophe. It is nothing like a drinking-song, despite the company it is made to keep by the *Codex Buranus*, where it survives alongside such works as:

*In taberna quando sumus,
non curamus, quid sit humus.*⁶³

When we are in the pub
we do not care what the earth is.

In a rhythm and a rhyme as simple as his subject, the author of this companion piece to carousals was not expressing hopes of an alcoholic ascent to heaven. No angels exalt at his inebriation, since all he offers is a joke in verse. The same medium of mendacity voices the Archpoet's claims to be an apologist of immorality. Does it follow, then, that he is a mega-liar? That is just the charge that his detractors would have made, had the impenitent in the pub not justified sin by sophistry. Refutation of what he has called his 'many arguments' requires a comparable cleverness that no one, then or since, has possessed.

* * *

For all its ingenuity and intricacy, the train of thought is clear. What others condemned categorically the Archpoet defends point by point. Borders drawn

⁶¹ Cf. Regino of Prüm, *De synodalibus causis et disciplinis ecclesiasticis*, ed. F. Wasserschleben (Leipzig, 1840), 140, repeated in later penitential and canonical literature.

⁶² *Tractatus Garsiae*, ed. R. Thomson, *Textus minores* 46 (Leiden, 1973), *Evangelium secundum marcas argenti* (prol.), in *Carmina Burana*, i, 2, ed. A. Hilka and O. Schumann, *Die moralisch-satirischen Dichtungen* (Heidelberg, 1930), 86.

⁶³ *Carmina Burana*, 196, ed. Bischoff, 35–6.

between the sacred and the profane are blurred, as he trespasses into territory where it is difficult to tell them apart. Hence his systematic application of religious language to irreligious subjects. Wine counted among them. Decried as a cause of drunken violence in guides to clerical conduct,⁶⁴ it is applauded by our author as a source of spiritual exaltation:

13 *Poculis accenditur animi lucerna;
cor inbutum nectare volat ad superna.*⁶⁵

The lantern of the mind is lit by drinking;
hearts permeated with nectar fly up to heaven.

Nectar, the tipples of pagan gods, conveys the Archpoet to an empyrean that is barely Christian. This noun never occurs in the Latin Vulgate. Nor does the expression *animi lucerna*, although the metaphor has a scriptural savour. Our author's diction, like his view of alcohol, resists the dilution into weaker doses that he goes on to lament:

*Mihi sapit dulcius vinum de taberna
quam quod aqua miscuit presulis pincerna.*⁶⁶

Wine from the pub tastes sweeter to me
than what the prelate's butler mixes with water.

Here, behind the teasing tone, may be detected genuine disapproval. Watered wine was considered fraudulent in the Middle Ages.⁶⁷ The butler, a high official at Rainald of Dassel's court,⁶⁸ has been indulging in underhand practices that are well known. But when the Archpoet declares his preference for the pub over the archiepiscopal table, he is not only settling scores with a rival for Rainald's favour. He is also drawing a distinction between types of taste. Sweet wine, which was considered stronger,⁶⁹ shares with other sins he has extolled the attribute of *dulcedo*,⁷⁰ in antithesis to the *amaritudo* with which he professed to begin his work (1, 2). With the bitterness of repentance superseded by the sweetness of indulgence, an argument against the restraint recommended by the Bible emerges. Ecclesiasticus 31:39, for example, equates heavy wine-drinking with bitterness of the soul. *Amaritudo animae vinum multum potatum* was a tag quoted in an array of moral manuals.⁷¹ They offered more than warnings

⁶⁴ See R. Kaiser, *Trunkenheit und Gewalt im Mittelalter* (Cologne, 2002).

⁶⁵ *Carm.* X, 13, 1–2, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 75.

⁶⁶ *Carm.* X, 13, 3–4, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 75.

⁶⁷ See B. Pferschy, 'Weinfälschung im Mittelalter', in *Fälschungen im Mittelalter* MGH Schriften 33, 5 (Hanover, 1988), 669–702, and cf. R. Wunderer, *Weinbau und Weinbereitung im Mittelalter unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der mittelhochdeutschen Pelz- und Weinbücher* Wiener Arbeiten zur germanischen Altertumskunde und Philologie 37 (Berne, 2001) 175ff.

⁶⁸ See Ritzerfeld, *Das Kölner Erzstift im 12. Jahrhundert*, 122 ff.

⁶⁹ See A. Grieco, 'Le Goût du vin entre doux et amer: Essai sur la classification des vins au Moyen Âge', in G. Garrier (ed.), *Le Vin des historiens*, Actes du 1^{er} symposium Vin et Histoire 12 (Suze-la Rousse, 1990), 89–97.

⁷⁰ *iocus . . . dulcorque favis* (4, 2) *labor . . . suavis* (4,3), *dulci neci necor* (6, 2).

⁷¹ e.g. Sedulius Scottus, *Collectaneum miscellaneum*, ed. D. Simpson, CCCM 67 (Turnhout, 1988), 60.

against hangovers, seeking to guide clerics away from drink and to sobriety. It is against them and their received wisdom that the Archpoet directs his irony. The real sinner, judged by his vinous criteria, is the water-wielding butler. Dilution of drinks is not a virtue but a vice.

The theme attracted more attention than gambling. The incompatibility of water and wine was proverbial;⁷² and a debate-poem on the subject, which is transmitted shortly after our author's 'confession' in the *Codex Buranus*, casts light on his audience:

- 1 *Denudata veritate
succinctaque brevitatem
ratione varia
dico, quod non copulari
debent, immo separari,
que sunt adversaria.*
- 2 *Cum in scypho reponuntur,
vinum aqua coniunguntur;
sed talis coniunctio
non est bona nec laudari
debet, immo nuncupari
melius confusio.*⁷³
- 1 With unvarnished truth
and succinct brevity
for diverse reasons
I say that opposites
should not be combined,
but kept apart.
- 2 When they are poured into a goblet
wine and water are coupled,
but such a union is not good
nor praiseworthy; rather it should
be termed a mess.

Like much of the Archpoet's writing, this too is an exercise in dialectical virtuosity, its 'diverse reasons' (1, 3) comparable to his 'many arguments'.⁷⁴ Both distinguish between overt and latent meaning in the scholastic style. *Coniunctio* at 2, 3, for example, is ambiguous, the double-entendre emphasized by nominal repetition of the verb (2, 2). 'Coupling', in the sexual sense, connotes a liaison both illicit and ill-sorted. *Confusio* (2, 6) is the product, as it were, of an unwanted pregnancy. The technicality of these terms serves to heighten the humour with which muddle and mess are conveyed. Inconsistency, incompatibility, and contradiction—cardinal sins in logic—are the issues

⁷² Walther, *Lateinische Sprichwörter*, 33477, 33479, 33479a, and cf. H. Wilson, *Wine and Words in Classical Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (London, 2003), 114–67.

⁷³ *Carmina Burana*, 193, 1–2, ed. Bischoff, 22.

⁷⁴ See Chapter VI.

at stake. Overtly the *adversaria* of 1, 6 are wine and water; none too latently the prescriptive style (*debet* 1, 5; *debet* 2, 5) defines them as a form of mock-nominalism (*dico* 1, 4; *nuncupari* 2, 5). In the background, gradually to make its presence felt, lurk the disputations conducted in the schools of Paris where, during the late 1130s, Rainald of Dassel and the Archpoet had studied.

The pub is a place for depraved devotees of wine, claims the personification of water in the midst of their debate:

*Tales tibi famulantur,
tales de te gloriantur
tabernali curia.*⁷⁵

Such are your slaves,
such are those who vaunt you
while they hold court in the pub.

Tabernalis curia is not an inaccurate description of the setting evoked for his deathbed by the Archpoet. Nor does the resemblance end there, for wine goes on to boast that it is the source of all wisdom:

15 *Ego deus, et testatur
istud Naso; per me datur
cunctis sapientia.
Cum non potant me magistri,
sensu carent, et ministri
non frequentant studia.*⁷⁶

I am divine, as Ovid
attests; through me
wisdom is granted to all.
Masters who do not drink me
lack understanding and ministers
drop out of their studies.

Why are masters and ministers singled out among the beneficiaries of such bounty? Because they form the select audience that relishes not only the bottle but also this bookish joke. Men of learning like the ministerial Archpoet and his patron, members of the generation of Germans who took the title *magister* from their studies at Paris,⁷⁷ appreciate a dialectic that affirms what it purports to deny. Such *adversaria* (1, 6) are meant for ecclesiastical men of the world with their training and experience, who will not be shocked by the attribution of divinity to wine on Ovid's pagan authority. Accustomed to the irreverence practised in scholastic spoofs, they are also able to recognize the persona assumed at the poem's conclusion:

⁷⁵ *Carmina Burana*, 193, 10, 4–6, ed. Bischoff, 23.

⁷⁶ *Carmina Burana*, 193, 15, ed. Bischoff, 23.

⁷⁷ See R. Herkenrath, 'Studien zum Magistertitel in der frühen Stauferzeit', *MIÖG* 88 (1980), 3–35.

29 *Ego Petrus disputator
huius cause terminator
omni dico populo
quod hec miscens excretur
et a Christo separetur
in eterno seculo! Amen.*⁷⁸

I Peter the debater
conclude this dispute
by saying to all the people
that those who mix water and wine
shall be cursed and separated from Christ
for all time! Amen.

The Peter who pronounces this malediction is Abelard, a leading proponent of the scholastic method, whose techniques are turned on their heads. At pains to show, in his *Sic et non*, that apparent opposites were not *adversaria* (1, 6) but reconcilable,⁷⁹ he now finds relief in arbitrating against those who produce *confusio* (2, 6) between wine and water. Authority, the goal that eluded him throughout his long and tormented career as a dialectician-theologian,⁸⁰ is awarded posthumously to the *magister* by one of his pupils. Among them Rainald of Dassel and the Archpoet had mingled. In such company, mindless drinking-songs and vacuous parody were substandard. They sought the refinement of intellectual art, and found refuge from clerical clichés in wanton wit that mocked the mores of the orthodox.

* * *

The audience both of the Archpoet's 'confession' and of this debate on water and wine is a twelfth-century avant-garde. A common culture and a shared sense of humour mark their difference from others but do not bridge the gap between themselves. The debate advertises its origins in scholasticism. Its style is pedantic. The skills it assumes or demands on the part of its readers and hearers are not unlike those needed for a crossword puzzle. Spot the letters, the word, the allusion, and you have cracked the enigma. The enigma is far from complex; a slight degree of learning suffices to penetrate it. The Archpoet's erudition, by contrast, is deeply subversive. Every affirmation undercuts, subtly and exactly, a truism or a banality. The inspiration of alcohol is an issue marginal to his main purpose in arguing for the counter-culture whose topsyturvy values he celebrates amid the pleasures of Pavia. There, secure in the support of Italian imperialists and immune to Alexandrian hostility, the arch-chancellor will appreciate the skill with which his doppelgänger recycles the five strophes that, in the poem previously composed to decline Rainald's request for an epic,⁸¹ had served to correlate our author's creativity and

⁷⁸ *Carmina Burana*, 193, 29, ed. Bischoff, 25.

⁷⁹ *Sic et non*, prol., ed. B. Boyer and R. McKeon (Chicago, 1977), 89.

⁸⁰ Cf. Godman, *The Silent Masters*, 65 ff.

⁸¹ See Chapter VI.

his bibulousness. They diverge only on a single point from the Archpoet's earlier effort,⁸² but in this context their meaning is transformed. What were once excuses for not writing about Barbarossa have become instances of anticonformity that follow from the magniloquent but mirthful *Meum est propositum* (12, 1). The intention is less to die in a pub than to live in Rainald of Dassel's company, secluded and safe from critics at court.⁸³ All types of moralists, at hand and afar, are challenged in our author's 'confession', which is why this masterpiece has been misunderstood.

The lineage of those who strove to construe the Archpoet's work literally, or who tried to make it more conventional, is long. The first among many to be foxed by his originality was Salimbene, the thirteenth-century chronicler, who confused him with Hugh Primas and, in his inability to grasp the character of the 'confession', alleged that it was written to apologize for the sins it extols.⁸⁴ After blunder followed bowdlerization. To the strophe (12) whose incipit is *Meum est propositum* were added these leaden lines:

- 2 *Potatores singuli sunt omnes benigni
tam senes quam iuvenes; in eterno igni
cruciantur rustici, qui non sunt tam digni,
qui bibisse noverint vinum boni ligni!*
- 3 *Vinum super omnia bonum diligamus,
nam purgantur vitia, dum vinum potamus!
Cum nobis sit copia vini, tunc clamamus:
'qui vivis in secula, te Deum laudamus.'*⁸⁵
- 2 Each and every drinker is kindly,
both young and old; may bumpkins
who are not worthy enough to know how to drink wine
from a good keg be tormented in fire eternal!
- 3 Let us love good wine above all,
for we cleanse ourselves of vice by drinking wine!
When we have plenty of wine, we cry:
'God everlasting, we praise you!'

In the pub, where bumpkins under the table are incapable of rising to our author's verve, these strophes belong. The Archpoet's manipulation of religious language is mirrored, or distorted, at 2, 2–3, in the image of the uncouth being consigned to hell-fire, as refined irony dwindles into coarse parody. Failing to alter a solo performance into a choral song, the 'we' of the third strophe croon their dim ditty in repetitive rhyme. Group recital is incompatible with a style and tone adopted to set this client apart and at one with his

⁸² *Carm.* X, 14–19, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 75 = *Carm.* IV, 10–15. The divergence is *poetrie* instead of *prophetie* at *Carm.* X, 19, 1.

⁸³ See Chapter VI.

⁸⁴ Quoted by Bischoff, ed. cit. 10. Cf. Schieffer, 'Bleibt der Archipoeta anonym?', *ad fin.*

⁸⁵ Ed. Bischoff, 19–20.

patron. Their separateness and complicity were hardly intelligible to those outside their immediate circle, whom the Archpoet sought to exclude with his obliquity, but, when he arrives at the end of the work, he is dramatically direct:

- 20 *Ecce mee proditor 'pravitatis' fui,
de qua me redarguunt servientes tui!
Sed eorum nullus est accusator sui,
quamvis velint ludere seculoque frui.*⁸⁶
- 20 Look! I have betrayed my 'wickedness',
for which your servants criticize me.
But none of them accuses himself,
although they wish to live it up in the world.

To Rainald of Dassel is addressed this attack on our author's critics. Theirs is the term 'wickedness', which he has rendered meaningless in a treble refutation of their charges. Now the would-be moralists are both disarmed and reduced in rank. *Servientes* at 20, 2 connotes a crawl or a cringe. Servile before their master, they cannot aspire to be his double like the Archpoet. Denunciation entails demotion, not only of social status but also of ethical standing. The accusers have become the accused. No less hypocritical than the Italian episcopacy which he has already lambasted,⁸⁷ they do not grasp that, by their double-dealing, they have forfeited the goodwill of their lord. This is a revealing appeal to the values that prevailed at court. Ridicule of the dull and provocation of the pious were allowed, but no tolerance might be expected for falsity. Diluted wine and carping criticism betray the pettiness of rivals who lack the generosity that our author associates with Rainald's open-mindedness. The ordinary language of morality has been inverted, and in its place is set a standard by which duplicity can be measured. It is a standard less of sincerity than of brazenness. Conforming to no one else's rules, the Archpoet evokes one that the archbishop-elect respects. He approves of candour about misconduct.

Observing that law and none other, our author can afford to ape a ceremony that was considered intimidating. The severest form of atonement for sins was performed in public, before a prelate and a crowd of onlookers. Such was the setting when Rainald, whom Pope Alexander III decried as a 'criminal, treacherous, and cruel teacher of schismatic error',⁸⁸ heard our author describing him as 'blessed':

- 21 *Iam nunc in presentia presulis beati
secundum dominici regulam mandati
mittat in me lapidem neque parcat vati,
cuius non est animus conscius peccati!*⁸⁹

⁸⁶ *Carm.* X, 20, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 75.

⁸⁸ *Ep.* 254, PL 200, 297D–298B, and cf. 417D.

⁸⁹ *Carm.* X, 21, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 76.

⁸⁷ See Chapter VI.

- 21 Now in the presence of the blessed bishop
according to the rule laid down by the Lord,
without pity for the poet let he stone me
whose conscience is clear of sinning!

Dominici regulam mandati, of biblical origin,⁹⁰ is the type of expression that may be pictured on the pursed lips of conventional clerics. Mimicking the solemnity with which they cited the Old Testament, our author caps this allusion by one to the New. The compassionate words of Christ, at John 8:7, in defence of a sinner serve to reinforce the Archpoet's onslaught on his enemies. In the presence of their master (21, 1) none of these 'servants' will dare to criticize Rainald's partner. What ought to have been an admission of wrongdoing before a public that witnessed his humiliation is now transformed into an attack on most of its snide and supercilious members. Only one of them is excepted. To the archbishop-elect, who will relish this turning of tables, a bow of reverence is implied. Then, with a finger pointed at the self-righteous who have forgotten the lesson of Jesus, the Archpoet teaches his own. None of them should repeat the mistake of running him down behind his back or to their lord's face.

If gestures are easy to envisage during the recitation of this strophe, it is hard to imagine the one that follows being read aloud without a grin:

- 22 *Sum locutus contra me quicquid de me novi
et virus evomui quod tam diu fovi!
Vita vetus displicet, mores placent novi;
homo videt facem, sed cor patet Iovi.*⁹¹
- 22 Against myself I have declared all I know,
and spewed forth the poison I long cherished!
My old life displeases me, a new course beckons;
man sees the face, but the heart is open to Jove.

The rejection of impurity may be ritual,⁹² but the tone is arch. Everything our author has said against himself counts in his favour. Jove, not the Christian God, scrutinizes the secrets of his heart⁹³—which remain impenetrable, for the reality of his regeneration can be assessed only on the basis of declarations that are ambiguous. Proclaiming himself to be as immaculate as the garments worn on the Sunday successive to baptism at Easter, the Archpoet evokes the language of the liturgy performed at the mass *in albis*⁹⁴ (if he is not drawing directly on its source, 1 Peter 2:2):

⁹⁰ Cf. 3 Kings 2: 34, 38; Deuteronomy 4:40; 4 Esdra 16:77.

⁹¹ *Carm.* X, 22, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 76.

⁹² Cf. G. Scheidegger, 'Das Neugeborene und der Teufel: Kindheitsgeschichte als Reinheitsgeschichte', *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, 84 (2002), 259–91.

⁹³ See P. von Moos, *Entre histoire et littérature: Communication et culture au Moyen Age* (Florence, 2005), 579–610.

⁹⁴ See Watenphul-Krefeld, *ad loc.*, 147. The language, poetic and metaphorical, does not date the poem to 31 March 1163.

- 23 *Iam virtutes diligo, viciis irascor;
renovatus animo spiritu renascor:
quasi modo genitus novo lacte pascor,
ne sit meum amplius vanitatis vas cor.*⁹⁵
- 23 Now I love virtue and loathe vice,
renewed in the mind, I am reborn in the spirit,
like a newborn baby I feed on fresh milk;
may my heart no longer be a vessel of vanity.

Like Ecclesiasticus (1:2), our author condemns his former vanities. But how can he renounce them if, as he has argued, they are the sources of his art? Who warrants his transformation from wine-bibber to milk-drinker? Rainald of Dassel, is the answer. He is put in the position of a spiritual godparent to this newborn child,⁹⁶ and, in the strophe that follows, he is addressed formally as ‘archbishop-elect of Cologne’ (*electe Colonie* 24, 1). Co-responsibility for the alleged conversion is thus imputed to a prince of the Church, from whom it was legitimate to expect the episcopal virtue of mercifulness:⁹⁷

- 25 *Parcit enim subditis leo, rex ferarum,
et est erga subditos immemor irarum,
et vos idem facite, principes terrarum:
quod caret dulcedine, nimis est amarum!*⁹⁸

The lion, king of beasts, spares his subjects
and forgets his wrath toward them,
and you do the same, princes of the earth:
what lacks sweetness, is bitter to excess!

The images of this strophe, ranging from the lion to sweetness, recall the metaphors of Judges 14:18. Biblical too is the analogy between leonine growls and royal wrath (cf. Proverbs 19:12, 20:2), but Scripture does not wholly account for the Archpoet’s train of thought. He seeks forgiveness from Rainald of Dassel, requesting the clerical *mansuetudo* that Rahewin had emphasized as one of his distinctive qualities.⁹⁹ Yet that is not the term that our author employs, nor does he resort to one of its synonyms. He speaks (25, 4) of *dulcedo*, the sweetness associated with sin throughout his poem. The appeal is rather to a magnate’s willingness to turn a blind eye than to a bishop’s mildness. Despite the sacred origins of the diction, the ideal developed from them here is as profane as the analogy drawn from the natural world.

⁹⁵ *Carm.* X, 23, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 76.

⁹⁶ See B. Spinks, *Early and Medieval Rituals and Theologies of Baptism: From the New Testament to the Council of Trent* (Aldershot, 2006), 135 ff., and cf. P. Cramer, *Baptism and Change in the Early Middle Ages, c.700–c.1150* (Cambridge, 1993), 221 ff. See further Chapter X.

⁹⁷ See S. Jaeger, ‘The Courtier-Bishop in *Vitae* from the Tenth to the Twelfth Century’, in Jaeger, *Scholars and Courtiers: Intellectuals and Society in the Medieval West*, Variorum (Aldershot, 2002), X, 137.

⁹⁸ *Carm.* X, 25, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 96.

⁹⁹ See Chapter III. For the episcopal quality of *mansuetudo*, cf. Jaeger, ‘Courtier-Bishop’, 138 ff., who misattributes to Otto of Freising the term used by his continuator, Rahewin.

With lions, secular monarchs, not spiritual pastors, were usually compared—*surrexit . . . tamquam ferox leo* writes the Archpoet in his encomium on Barbarossa.¹⁰⁰ The strongest of the beasts (cf. Proverb 30:30) was infamous for violence, a reputation that its role as an emblem of St Mark hardly offset.¹⁰¹ Similar to this ambiguous animal was the curious creature that Rainald of Dassel, earlier in his career, had chosen to represent himself on the seals issued during his various provostships. They were engraved with a griffin.¹⁰² Traditionally regarded as a predator,¹⁰³ the leonine and aquiline griffin was construed by Rainald's near-contemporary, Hildegard of Bingen, as a figure of cunning.¹⁰⁴ If she was not thinking of the archbishop-elect, she had hit on a plausible interpretation of his self-image, to which the Archpoet lends a telling nuance. Rainald, who typified the German prelate-at-arms, was less a pillar of the Church than an imperial prince. Hence the accuracy of the expression *principes terrarum* (25, 3). Notorious for his ferocity, this ecclesiastical man of the world is being asked to show the leniency linked by our author with pleasure and opposed by him to remorse. Such a plea has no place in the genre of advice to rulers,¹⁰⁵ nor is it a version of the proverbial mean. From the schismatic archbishop-elect, debarred from dispensing an absolution, is expected the understanding of an accomplice. Our author, aware of Rainald's taste for the bitter-sweetness of sin, ends by addressing his urbanity, confident that it will be expressed in a laugh.

* * *

The laughter that the Archpoet roused from Rainald of Dassel was that decried by the moralists. Shortly after his creation as cardinal, in the autumn of 1057, Peter Damian wrote to his colleagues at the Lateran:

Let it be legible from our way of living what should be done or avoided, may superfluous words not trip over our tongues and the speech of priests be chastened by the control of discerning silence, not relaxed by jokes, nor should immoderate mirth throw our hearts into turmoil! Away with childish jesting, biting eloquence, sophisticated chatter! Beware of frivolous speech and idle talk on any occasion, for how can pure prayer be directed to God from a priest's mouth that is tainted with the filth of depraved speech?¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁰ *Carm.* IX, 14, 1–2, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 70, and cf. Chapter VII.

¹⁰¹ See U. Liebl, LMA v. 2141–2. For context, see *L'Animal exemplaire au Moyen Âge v^e–xv^e siècles*, ed. J. Berlioz (Rennes, 1994).

¹⁰² Cf. Burkhardt, *Mit Stab und Schwert* 647, nos. 28–31.

¹⁰³ See P. Armour, *Dante's Griffin and the History of the World. A Study of the Earthly Paradise* ('Purgatorio', cantos xxix–xxxiii) (Oxford, 1989), 15–45.

¹⁰⁴ Cited by Armour, *Dante's Griffin*, 33. On Hildegard, see further Chapter X.

¹⁰⁵ Watenphul–Krefeld, ad loc. (147), draw a parallel to ps.-Ovid, *De mirabilibus mundi*, 106 ff., without noting that it had already been adduced by P. Lehmann, *Pseudo-antike Literatur des Mittelalters*, Studien der Bibliothek Warburg 13 (Berlin, 1927), 7. As the date of the pseudo-Ovidian work is uncertain (cf. M. Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, iii (Munich, 1931), 735–6), who imitated whom cannot be determined. A common model, as yet unidentified, is possible. The generic difference remains.

¹⁰⁶ *In vita nostra legatur, quid agi, quid vitari conveniat, ex labiis nostris verba otiosa non effluent, sacerdotalem linguam discreti silentii censura compescat, non ioci solvant, non pectus nostrum laetitia*

This concept of self-censorship, still influential in the twelfth century,¹⁰⁷ represented a standard of decorum that our author knowingly breached. He did so by employing *scurrilia verba*, the unbridled language that since antiquity had been linked with the antics of entertainers and buffoons.¹⁰⁸ Their lack of control was not only unclerical but also unmonastic, as St Benedict makes clear in his Rule,¹⁰⁹ where *scurrilitas* is opposed to *gravitas*.¹¹⁰ *Mihi cordis gravitas res videtur gravis* declares the Archpoet at 4, 1, aware that, by casting seriousness as dreary, he will be condemned for *scurrilitas* by those who continued to think in Peter Damian's terms. They were categorical because the reformers and the ascetics detected in such levity a laxness unbecoming to sacerdotal deportment. Yet even the advocates of gravity were aware of the enemy within:

Buffoonery has indeed been my constant companion, and has never wholly left me even on account of my religious way of life . . . But as the Lord says: 'Blessed are those who mourn, for they shall be consoled', what judgement looms for those who not only fail to persist in tears but are even given to guffaws and inane laughter in the manner of entertainers? . . . "Woe upon you who laugh, for you shall weep": on the terrifying Day of Judgement what will they say who not only laugh themselves, but, what is more, violently extract laughter from those who listen to them by reciting jests! . . . With what abundant rivers of tears we should always flow, with what uninterrupted sorrow we should continuously press on and not force others to laugh at the sophisticated wit of a wordy buffoon but always seem mournful with a permanently cast-down expression, so that external appearances too embody perfect penance, which seethes chiefly in the hidden bitterness of the heart!¹¹¹

Aestuans intrinsecus . . . | in amaritudine: the Archpoet's 'confession' inverts Damian's position. Merriment, rather than the mourning that should be the

inmoderata concutiat! Puerilis ludus abscedat, mordax eloquentia, urbana dicacitas evanescat! Caveantur scurrilia verba, nec aliquando misceantur fabulosa colloquia. Quomodo enim ex ore sacerdotis oratio ad Deum munda dirigitur, quod videlicet pravi sermonis sordibus inquinatur? (Ep. 48, ed. Reindel, *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani*, 2, 60, 3–10).

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Godman, *The Silent Masters*, 1–31.

¹⁰⁸ The noun *scurra* is to be sought under the (not entirely accurate) rubric of 'Unterhaltungskünstler' in the *Neuer Pauly*, 12, i (Stuttgart, 2002), 1004–6, which does not supersede the entry at *Paulys Real-Enzyklopädie der Altertumswissenschaften (R-Z)* (Stuttgart, 1921), 911–12.

¹⁰⁹ e.g. *Regula* 43, 1, ed. A. de Vogüé and J. Neufville, *La Règle de Saint Benoît*, ii, SC 182 (Paris, 1972).

¹¹⁰ 586.110. Cf. C. Gindele OSB, 'Das scurrile in der Benediktus- und Magisterregel', *Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktiner-Ordens und seiner Zweige*, 81 (1970), 480–1.

¹¹¹ *Scurrilitas nimirum michi semper familiaris fuit, quae et propter conversionem nunquam me perfecte deseruit . . . Sed dum Dominus dicat: 'Beati qui lugent, quoniam ipsi consolabuntur,' quale illis iudicium imminet, qui non modo fletibus non insistent, sed ultro etiam cachinnis et vanis risibus istrionum more deserviant? Ve vobis qui ridetis, quoniam flebitis', quid in tremendo iudicio dicturi sunt, qui non solum ipsi ridet, sed insuper quaedam scurrilia proferentes risum audientibus violenter extorquent? . . . Quam uberibus lacrimarum rivis debemus semper affluere, quam continuo maerori necesse fuerat iugiter insudare et non alios in risum faceta quadam dicacis scurrae urbanitate compellere, sed ipsi potius dimisso semper vultu lugubres apparere, quatinus perfectae paenitentiae formam ipse quoque exterior cultus exprimeret, quae in occulta cordis amaritudine principaliter aestuaret!* (Ep. 138, ed. Reindel, *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani*, 3, 474, 8–9, 20–3, 26–8; 476, 10–16). The quotations are from Matthew 5:5 and Luke 6:25.

sinner's duty in this vale of tears, is his stance. But a feigned penitent is not a *scurra*, against whom he has already inveighed,¹¹² and Peter Damian, capable of detecting the fault of frivolousness in himself, conceded as much in another letter of 1058:

Take note of the witticisms, the pleasantries, the wisecracks, the *bons mots*, the gossiping, the voluminous controversies, the empty verbosity in its full and pestilential extent of total arrogance, which demonstrates that we are no longer priests but rather orators and rhetoricians or, to our disgrace, buffoons.¹¹³

The key word is 'we' (*nos*). This admonition is directed not against outsiders but against those within the Church whose dignity as priests is compromised by their gift of the gab. The arts of language are blameworthy; entertainers amount to idiots. This last was the claim that the Archpoet set out to refute in his masterpiece, while cheerfully accepting the rest. Deflating the solemnity of a sacrament, he does not play the fool. His jokes and epigrams, in their calculated outrageousness, establish him as the opposite of a mindless mimier. The pariah status attributed to performers cannot degrade this double of his lord.¹¹⁴ An orator but no buffoon, he has produced his own version of ecclesiastical eloquence in the jocular spirit that Damian decried. The part of an anti-actor with which our author made his *début* transformed into the related role of comedian in confession, his experiments with religious rhetoric subvert, one by one, clerical identities fixed for more than a millennium. By November 1163, the leading exponent of anticonformity in medieval Latin literature had emerged. After delighting Rainald of Dassel with an intellectual panache and a verbal wit that outclassed even his 'linguistic tomfoolery', the Archpoet turned to confounding his critics from the pulpit.

¹¹² See Chapter VI.

¹¹³ *ecce sales, ecce facecia, lepores, urbanitates, dicacitates, volumina questionum omnesque verborum inanum pestes insolenter erumpunt, quae nos, non iam sacerdotes sed potius oratores ac rhetores, sive—quod inhonestum est—scurras ostendunt* (Ep. 57, ed. Reindel, *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani*, 2, 186, 17–20).

¹¹⁴ For the term 'pariah' and its implications, see M. Dobozý, *Re-membering the Present: The Medieval German Poet-Minstral in Cultural Context*, *Disputatio* 6 (Turnhout, 2005), 33–84.

IX

The Preacher of Sin

At the beginning of December 1163 Barbarossa, accompanied by Rainald of Dassel, moved to Monza, where, after issuing a privilege on the sixth of that month,¹ two days later they observed the first Sunday in Advent. Both the time and the place were significant. Monza is described in another document of 26 January 1159 as 'the capital of Lombardy'.² There the emperor, following an example set by Conrad III, had been crowned. A key factor in Barbarossa's northern Italian strategy, Monza enjoyed the favour he reserved for loyalists.³ The Archpoet, during a handful of weeks in the early winter of 1163, travelled from one imperial stronghold at Pavia to another nearby, shunning as it were the ruins of devastated Milan. His spirits had reason to rise at the expanses of what appeared to be a landscape of conquest. The season, however, may have dampened his elation. Advent, as Pope Alexander III reminded King Louis VII of France, was to be considered a time for abstinence and fasting.⁴ Penance ought to have been performed between the first and the third Sundays (8–22 December) of Advent 1163,⁵ when our author recited his next work.

The four weeks of Advent symbolized the 4,000 years that were reckoned to reach from Adam to the coming of Christ.⁶ The prayers said during mass in this month emphasized the claims of conscience.⁷ The Incarnation and the Last Judgement were traditional themes of preaching, vividly exemplified in sermons by Bernard of Clairvaux.⁸ Although the Archpoet probably did not know these works, he was certainly familiar with the style of ecclesiastical eloquence practised at Advent. Its tone was sombre. To someone who had just celebrated sin in a joyous feigning of remorse, Advent presented an ideal occasion to redeem himself by performing atonement. Our author, no less alert to the liturgical calendar than other medieval writers,⁹ chose his moment and selected his spot with care when, at Monza, he mounted the pulpit. An

¹ DFI, no. 422. ² *caput Lombardiae et sedes regni illius*, DFI, no. 253, ed. Appelt, 53, 25.

³ See Görich, *Friedrich Barbarossa*, 300–1. ⁴ *Ep.* 268, PL 200, 308 B.

⁵ See J. Jungmann, *Gewordene Liturgie: Studien und Durchblicke* (Leipzig, 1941), 269 ff.

⁶ K. Kellner, *Heortologie oder das Kirchenjahr und die Heiligenfeste in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (Freiburg, 1901), 107.

⁷ Cf. W. Croce, 'Die Adventsmessen des römischen Missale in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung', *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 74 (1952), 227–317, and cf. K.-H. Bieritz, *Das Kirchenjahr. Feste, Gedenk- und Feiertage in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Munich, 1987), 202 ff.

⁸ *S. Bernardi Opera*, iv. *Sermones*, i, ed. J. Lerclercq OSB and H. Rochais (Rome, 1966), 161–81.

⁹ The best account of the subject, chiefly from a political standpoint, is H.-M. Schaller, 'Der heilige Tag als Termin mittelalterlicher Staatsakte', *DA* 30 (1974), 1–24.

inappropriate setting could constitute grounds for challenging a sermon;¹⁰ and the Archpoet advanced to an *ambo* that, at Monza cathedral as elsewhere in northern Italy of the twelfth century, was stationed in the nave of the church.¹¹ When he did so, all present assumed that he was acting on a directive of his bishop.¹² This may indicate that our author had been ordained and was entitled to preach as an episcopal *coadiutor et cooperator*; it also points to an anomaly. Here was Rainald of Dassel, an excommunicate prelate, commanding or countenancing that a self-declared reprobate, who had recently made fun of a sacrament, should produce a sermon for Advent. His appearance in the pulpit rested on the more than questionable authority of a renegade from the orthodox Church. It forbade priests to interpret and restricted them to reading aloud what their bishops licensed.¹³ Naturally this rule might be bent as freely as episcopal oversight was lax,¹⁴ but on the formal level the Archpoet was perceived as having, if not Rainald's *imprimatur*, at least his *nil obstat*. Other clerics at court were doubtless chagrined. If they were as prim, proper, and censorious as they are depicted in the 'confession', they must have regarded our author as literally the last among their number who was fit to preach. It is pertinent to ask what they expected from such an orator in general terms, before considering works written particularly for Advent.

A recent example of ecclesiastical eloquence in a public setting was offered by Arnulf of Lisieux, who, six months earlier, had preached before the pope and the fathers assembled at the council of Tours that excommunicated Rainald of Dassel.¹⁵ Although a convinced Alexandrian, Arnulf resisted the temptation to inveigh against the Victorines. No names are mentioned; allusions to the schism are few and far between. Instead, in crowded conditions that impaired his audibility, he drew attention to his hearers' distinction and dwelt on his own qualifications. In doing so, Arnulf singled out three attributes of the preacher, with all of which the Archpoet would deal differently: an uprightness that bore out his message, breadth of learning, a way with words. None of these was known to our author from his contemporary's sermon, which did not become available in written form until 1166. Both of them drew on a common culture that regarded oratory as a vehicle of morality and scholarship, to be articulated in general style. Arnulf, for example, referred to

¹⁰ See B. Kienzle, 'Preaching as Touchstone of Orthodoxy and Dissidence in the Middle Ages', *Medieval Sermon Studies*, 43 (1999), 18–53.

¹¹ For the pulpit at Monza, elegantly engraved in the fourteenth century by Matteo da Campione, see S. Lomartire, 'Ille magnus edificator devotus: La personalità di Matteo da Campione', in R. Cassanelli (ed.), *Monza Anno 1300: La Basilica di S. Giovanni Battista e la sua facciata* (Monza, 1998), 78, and illustrations 86–9. Cf. L. Aventin, 'L'Ambon, lieu liturgique de la proclamation de la parole dans l'Italie du XII^e et XIII^e siècle', in N. Beriou and F. Morenzoni (eds), *Prédication et liturgie au Moyen Age* (Turnhout, 2008), 132–3.

¹² Cf. M. Menzel, 'Predigt und Predigtorganisation im Mittelalter', *Historisches Jahrbuch*. 111 (1991), 337–84.

¹³ Menzel, 'Predigt und Predigtorganisation im Mittelalter', 345–7.

¹⁴ Cf. Alcuin, Ep. 136, ed. Dümmler, *MGH Epistolae Aevi Carolini* iv. 2. 209, 22 ff.

¹⁵ T. Haye (ed.), *Oratio: Mittelalterliche Redekunst in lateinischer Sprache*, *Mittellateinische Studien und Texte* 27 (Leiden, 1999), 143–65.

the Church's liberty but did not specify that it was being menaced, at the time he spoke in May 1163, by Barbarossa and Rainald of Dassel. Rather, with a rigour that appealed to the high-mindedness of the Alexandrian grandees in his audience, he praised poverty. Other-worldliness, not opulence or power, should be cultivated by Christ's representatives on earth. There was nothing controversial about such positions in an orthodox context. They readily commanded assent, or at least lip service. But their conventionality merits mention, because they indicate what was anticipated from a preacher at the time when the Archpoet assumed that role at Monza.

At Pavia, weeks before, he had drawn attention to himself. Now attention, he knew, would be doubly critical because, in his 'confession', he had trounced his detractors. They were waiting to pounce. Hence the defensiveness of his mock-modesty, calculated to unsettle those eager to condemn him from their seats of self-appointed authority in church:

1. *Lingua balbus hebes ingenio*
*viris doctis sermonem facio*¹⁶
1. Tongue-tied, dull witted,
I sermonize to men of learning.

No man of learning in the High Middle Ages was prepared for a sermon 'stammered' in verse. Prose was the customary medium of Latin preaching.¹⁷ Earlier exceptions to this norm are vernacular.¹⁸ Rare and rudimentary, they have nothing in common with the Archpoet's work, which, in its very first couplet, set itself apart. Others mediated to mixed audiences between the high culture of the *docti* and the lower level of the *simplices*.¹⁹ Not so our author. Like Hildebert of Lavardin in his fifth sermon on Advent,²⁰ he claims to address an elite of the erudite. Yet how secure about its learning could the 'Transmontane' circle of clerics in Rainald of Dassel's entourage feel on hearing their colleague, a German like them, reciting rhymed decasyllabic verses, which were characteristic

¹⁶ *Carm.* I, 1–2, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 47.

¹⁷ For a survey, see B. Kienzle (ed.), *The Sermon*, Typologie des sources du Moyen Age occidental 81–3 (Turnhout, 2000), 143–362. For speculation about prosimetric preaching by Hildegard of Bingen, cf. Kienzle, *Hildegard of Bingen and her Gospel Homilies. Speaking New Mysteries*, Medieval Women: Texts and Contents 12 (Turnhout, 2009), 58–9. There is no obvious relationship between this work and rhymed offices, on which see R. Jonsson, *Historia. Études sur la genèse des offices versifiés*, Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis 15 (Uppsala, 1968).

¹⁸ C. Segre, 'Le Forme e le tradizioni didattiche', in H. R. Jauss and E. Köhler (eds), *Grundriss der romanischen Literaturen des Mittelalters*, i (Heidelberg, 1968), 60 ff., notes only Norman evidence from the first half of the twelfth century. On the *Reimpredigt* in Middle High German, see G. Vollmann-Profe, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zum Beginn der Neuzeit*, i. *Von den Anfängen zum hohen Mittelalter*, 2. *Wiederbeginn volkssprachiger Schriftlichkeit im hohen Mittelalter (1050/60–1160/70)* (Königstein, 1986), 160 ff.

¹⁹ For a valuable analysis, see G. Constable, 'The Language of Preaching in the Twelfth Century', *Viator*, 25 (1994), 131–52.

²⁰ PL 171, 364C, and cf. Arnulf of Lisieux, PL 201, 162C.

of Latin authors in France?²¹ The form of *Lingua balbus*, with its melodious cadences against which Augustine had cautioned,²² was as unfamiliar as its medium was unsettling. Alien in their combined effect, both contributed to creating more than 'a topos of affected modesty'.²³

Modesty affected, authority is at stake between the lines. The stammering and the dullness are those of Isaiah (32:4)—a prophet, as our author, who styles himself *vates vatum* ('archpoet' and 'mega-seer'²⁴), and his audience knew. They were also aware that *sermo* designated a moral genre,²⁵ which made high demands of its practitioners, to which Arnulf of Lisieux had drawn attention. Only those with age, expertise, and insight were entitled to preach, Arnulf and others had been taught by Gregory the Great in his much-studied *Pastoral Rule* and other writings.²⁶ These are the qualities attributed by the Archpoet not to himself but to his hearers, which is why he goes on to call them judges.²⁷ If this inversion assigns them the part traditionally taken by the preacher, the audience of the new Isaiah, flattered by his deference yet flabbergasted by his unconventionality, could not know whether it should condemn or approve the work he was beginning to 'stammer' with such polish. A paradox thus emerges in the first two verses. It is compounded by the motive adduced for the Archpoet's 'unknowing speech':

1. *Sed quod loquor, qui loqui nescio,
necessitas est, non presumption.*²⁸
1. But that I speak, not knowing how to,
is necessity, not presumption.

This is the language of hagiography. Virtually identical terms were used in the previous generation by William of Saint-Thierry, in his *Life of Saint Bernard of Clairvaux*.²⁹ Neither William nor our author simply quoted Scripture.³⁰ They amplified resonances acquired by Jeremiah's declaration *nescio loqui* (1:6) from

²¹ On this verse-form, see W. Meyer, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur mittellateinischen Rhythmik*, ii (Berlin, 1905), 300 ff.

²² *De doctrina christiana*, iv, 20, ed. J. Martin, CCSL 32 (Turnhout, 1962), 148, 99–100.

²³ E. R. Curtius, 'Der Archipoeta und der Stil der mittellateinischen Dichtung', *Romanische Forschungen*, 54 (1940), 153 ff.

²⁴ *Carm.* III, 59, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 55. See Chapter X.

²⁵ See C. Mohrmann, *Études sur le latin des chrétiens*, ii, *Latin chrétien et médiéval Storia e letteratura* 87 (Rome, 1961), 63–72, and J. B. Schneyer, *Die Unterweisung der Gemeinde über die Predigt bei scholastischen Predigern. Eine Homiletik aus scholastischen Prothemen Veröffentlichungen des Grabmann-Institutes NF 4* (Munich, 1968).

²⁶ Cf. *Regula Pastoralis*, pref., iii, 25 eds. B. Judic, F. Rommel, and C. Morel, SC 381, 382 (Paris, 1992), 126, 258, 436, and *Homiliae in Hiezechilem prophetam*, ii, 3, ed. C. Morel, SC 327 (Paris, 1986), 84–8. See B. Judic, 'La Bible miroir des pasteurs dans la Règle Pastorale de Grégoire le Grand', in J. Fontaine and C. Pietri (eds), *Le Monde latin antique et la Bible* (Paris, 1985), 455–78.

²⁷ *Carm.* I, 26, 1; 29, 4, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 50.

²⁸ *Carm.* I, 1, 3–4, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 47.

²⁹ *in tantum ut . . . defleret necessitatem quod silere non liceret, cum nesciret loqui S. Bernardi vita prima* vi (PL 185, 243D–244A).

³⁰ Cf. P. Dronke, 'The Art of the Archpoet: a Reading of *Lingua balbus*', in Dronke, *Latin and Vernacular Poets of the Middle Ages*, Variorum (Aldershot, 1991), IX, 24.

Gregory the Great's account of it in the seventh chapter of the *Pastoral Rule*. Here was an exemplar of modesty. The prophet did not seek to speak out, nor did he crave status. He had to be compelled to preach. His authenticity is contrasted with the hypocrisy of the seemingly humble whose self-abasement amounts to pride.³¹

There is never a thesis without an antithesis in Gregory the Great's dialectic of the moral life, to the comic potential of which the Archpoet was sensitive. An ambiguity not intended by the saint is the result in *Lingua balbus*. As inarticulate a seer as Isaiah at the beginning of the poem, our author trumps this card of equivocality by then becoming as involuntary a prophet as Jeremiah. Want of will, complemented by lack of eloquence, guarantees his sincerity. Or do they? Deferring to unspecified necessity (1, 4), he now implies his worthiness to assume the preacher's office that he has just disclaimed to deserve. From this *sic et non* of affirmation and denial re-emerges the figure of a spiritual sophist elaborated, in order to defy his detractors, in the 'confession'.³² In *Lingua balbus* too the aim remains provocation of carping critics. The propriety and decorum attributed to the Archpoet's enemies serve to alienate them from his patron. Types, not individuals, of orthodoxy, they are ill-placed to curry favour with the schismatic to whom, in fact though not in name,³³ the work is directed. Anonymity enveloping these less likeable members of his audience, our author transforms what they think they know into what they cannot guess:

2. *Ego iuxta divum eloquium
viris bonis hoc reor congruum,
ut subportet magnus exiguum,
egrum sanus et prudens fatuum.*³⁴
2. I, according to the divine word,
think it fitting for good men
that the great should sustain the tiny,
the healthy the sick, and the wise the foolish.

Who is who? Self-revelation, seemingly announced by the personal pronoun, is immediately withdrawn into the cover of quotation. Hiding himself behind God's word, our author lures others into the open. Previous tribute to the learning of his hearers may lead them to infer that the higher parts are being assigned to them. But that is not what the elusive preacher says. He declares only that his public is acquainted with the scriptural texts (Galatians 6:2, Ephesians 4:2) to which he refers. If they identify with the mighty, the healthy,

³¹ Ed. Judic–Rommel–Morel, 250 ff.

³² See Chapter VIII.

³³ *Carm.* I, 39, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 51.

³⁴ The text of *Carm.* I, 2, 1–2, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 47, is modified to conform to the Göttingen codex (philol. 170), for whose reading *divinum* the disyllabic *divum* is substituted in its adjectival sense. See *Mittelaltinisches Wörterbuch*, iii D–E (Munich, 2007), 899, 67 ff., and cf. W. Bulst in his review of Watenphul–Krefeld, *Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur*, 72 (1960), 146.

and the wise, they lay themselves open to the charge of presumption evoked in the last word of the first strophe. There he avoids the trap that he lays for others here.

Evasive eloquence is the Archpoet's speciality, even (or especially) when he claims to talk straight:

3. *Ne sim reus et dignus odio,
si lucernam premam sub modio,
quod de rebus humanis sentio
pia loqui iubet intentio.*³⁵
3. In order not to be guilty and odious,
if I suppress my light under a bushel,
what I feel about human affairs
a pious intention commands me to declare.

Here too the language is topical, and Gregory the Great again makes his presence felt. Commenting on the light under a bushel at Matthew 5:15, he interprets it as a requirement that preachers reveal their own lives, in order to win the respect of their hearers.³⁶ The ideal of harmony between speech and conduct, emphasized by Arnulf of Lisieux but derived from ancient oratory, is repeatedly mentioned in Gregory's *Pastoral Rule*;³⁷ and it represents the prime necessity (1, 4) that the author of a sermon, at this point in the exordium of his work, was meant to fulfil. The Archpoet does not, delaying to speak autobiographically for more than thirty strophes. The only assurance offered to his hearers is the piety of his intention (3, 4). But, if an Abelardian morality of intended action is being invoked,³⁸ why does the speech-act that follows not deal *de rebus humanis*, as promised (3, 3), rather than *de rebus divinis*?

All is not what it seems. Before preaching at length, our author pledges to be brief:

4. *Brevem vero sermonem facio,
ne vos gravet longa narratio,
ne dormitet lector pre tedio
et 'Tu autem' dicat in medio.*³⁹
4. My sermon is indeed brief,
to avoid taxing you with a long tale,
so that the reader may not nod off from boredom,
saying *Tu autem* in the middle.

³⁵ *Carm.* I, 3, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 47.

³⁶ *Moralia in Iob*, xix. 23, 36, ed. M. Adriaen, CCSL 143A (Turnhout, 1979), 985, 30–4.

³⁷ Pref., ii, 3; iii, 40, ed. Judic–Rommel–Morel, 24, 180 ff., 530 with V. Paronetto, 'La figura del *praedicator* nella *Regula Pastoralis* di Gregorio Magno', in *Miscellanea A. P. Frutaz* (Rome, 1978), 167–82.

³⁸ See J. Marenbon, *The Philosophy of Peter Abelard* (Cambridge, 1997), 251 ff.

³⁹ *Carm.* I, 4, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 47.

The aim of brevity was standard among medieval preachers;⁴⁰ fear of sending the audience to sleep was commonly voiced by them;⁴¹ and the reference to a reader (*lector* 4, 3), together with the versicle *Tu autem [domine, miserere nobis]* that was used to conclude the lesson at matins,⁴² yield a context. The Archpoet's hearers, attending night-office at Monza on one of the first three Sundays in Advent 1163, are promised a short sermon. That means, to those acquainted with his dialectical style of deception, that he is threatening to be lengthy.

* * *

The exordium has ended. No word, no expression, is out of place, yet none of them signifies quite what was expected in a *sermo*. Accustomed to reassure by its predictability, this genre is now set to surprise. How is indicated by the tension between overt and implicit meaning. When has to be inferred from the themes. The Incarnation and the Last Judgement, which loom large in the next thirty strophes, were generally treated together at Advent, when our author turned to Gregory the Great, stylistic details of whose homilies on Ezeckiel are imitated eclectically.⁴³ Near enough to such exemplars to be recognizable as a variation on patterns of preaching before Christmas, *Lingua balbus* does not cling to them with the closeness of parody.⁴⁴ Satire too had developed on different lines in the German empire, as the Horatian *sermones* produced during the eleventh century by Sextus Amarcus illustrate.⁴⁵ Polemical and hard-hitting, they are poles apart from the obliquity of the Archpoet's work. There is no obvious target against which he aims. Irony is the indirect route chosen by our author, and his sights are set on a dual goal—the one sanctimonious and plural, the other heterodox and singular. To distinguish between them, without offending either, demanded skill.

Skill is displayed in the Archpoet's manipulation of pieties that his critics among the lower clergy construed *au pied de la lettre*. Combining the new with the old, *Lingua balbus* exudes a whiff of Cretan paradox:

10. *Poetarum seductos fabulis
veritatis instruxit regulis;
signis multis atque miraculis
fidem veram dedit incredulis.*⁴⁶

⁴⁰ Cf. Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermons pour l'année* 1, 2, intro. M. Lamy, trans. M.-I. Huille, ann. A. Solignac, Sources chrétiennes 480 (Paris, 2004) 108, 25ff.; 118, 29–30, and 260 with Godfrey (?) of Admont, PL 174, 21B.

⁴¹ Cf. Kienzle, 'The Monastic Sermon', in Kienzle (ed.), *The Sermon*, 275

⁴² See J. Harper, *The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy: From the Eight to the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford, 1991), 81.

⁴³ e.g. with the repeated use of adverbial asyndeton at *Carm.* I, 7, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 47, cf. Gregory, *Homiliae* VIII, 3, ed. Morel, 278.

⁴⁴ As Dronke, 'The Art of the Archpoet', *passim*, insists. On the genre, cf. J. Gilman, *The Parodic Sermon in European Perspective: Aspects of Liturgical Parody from the Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century*, Beiträge zur Literatur des XV bis XVIII Jahrhunderts (Wiesbaden, 1974), 11 ff., and, for a general survey, M. Bayliss, *Parody in the Middle Ages: The Latin Tradition* (Michigan, 1996).

⁴⁵ Ed. K. Manitius, MGH Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 6 (Weimar, 1969).

⁴⁶ *Carm.* I, 10, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 48.

10. [God] instructed with the rules of truth
those seduced by poetic fables;
with many signs and miracles
He gave true faith to the unbelieving.

The task of a preacher may be to announce eternal verities, but this dated truism is belied by the medium in which it is expressed. Our author's paradox operates on two levels. For a clergy literal-minded to the point of banality, traditional objections to poetic lies are pre-empted. For their master, worldly beyond the bounds of decorum, mirth is made of the clichéd contrast between literary fiction and religious truth. This second level of the dual audience is opposed to the first, in a joke at the expense of those adequately erudite to rehearse the commonplace but insufficiently sharp to discern that it has been stood on its head. The bien-pensants provoked with ambiguity, Rainald of Dassel is charmed with wit. Chiaroscuro is the tone in which the Archpoet's public is portrayed. A vivid image of the patron's heterodox humour is set against the sombre grey in which the client depicts the received opinions of his rivals. They are at a loss. Having blinded them by his brilliance, he goes on to assure them that all is clear:

11. *Obmutescant humana somnia;
nil occultum, iam patent omnia;
revelavit fata latentia
non 'sapiens' sed Sapientia!*
12. *Conticescat falsa temeritas,
ubi palam loquitur veritas;
quod divina probat auctoritas
non inprobet humana falsitas!*⁴⁷
11. May human delusions fall mute;
nothing is mysterious, all is clear;
hidden destiny has been revealed
not by a 'wise man' but by Wisdom!
12. Let false rashness hold its tongue,
where truth speaks in plain words;
what divine authority demonstrates
human falsity should not question!

The key term is *palam* (12, 2). But what is plain about these gnomic words? They are modelled on Christ's promise, at John 16:25, to cease to speak in parables and to talk directly about God. If He is identified with Wisdom, *sapiens* at 11, 4 should be read with the reservation of inverted commata. The reservation is warranted, the antithesis inspired by Job 37:24: *qui sibi videntur esse sapientes*. Commenting on this passage in his *Moralia*, Gregory the Great

⁴⁷ *Carm.* I, 11–12, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld.

gives the would-be wise a name. He identifies them with the arrogant Elihu.⁴⁸ For the first, but not the last, time in *Lingua balbus*, a biblical anti-type of humility is evoked. Its function is to frighten. Who among the Archpoet's hearers wishes to be associated with Elihu and his likes? Deluded (11, 1), false (12, 1, 4), and rash (12, 1), they speak out when they should be silent. Yet it is not our author who tells them to hold their tongues. His voice is raised only in the ventriloquism of quotation. Scripture furnishes the plain words and simple style of his *sermo humilis*. Demoting his work to the lowest register, the poetic preacher claims the highest authority. The authority of the learned and the lettered—of clerics, in short—was a recurrent topic of Advent-preaching. Hildebert of Lavardin, for example, stressed clerical competence to penetrate mysteries of God's kingdom, which, for laymen, remained veiled in parable.⁴⁹ The Archpoet goes on to twist that *topos* from his audience to himself. In the strophes that follow (13–25), his message is minatory. Fire and brimstone, the wailing of sorrow, the gnashing of teeth: the hell that our author imagines on the basis of Matthew 25:30–41 as a torment for sinners is by no means the sphere of interiority conjured up by Bernard of Clairvaux in another sermon for Advent.⁵⁰ Nor is this inferno the place of self-chastisement envisaged by Gregory the Great.⁵¹ As the last judgement approaches, there is scarcely time for penance. The *dies irae* looms, and the tardy shall be damned.⁵²

Clerical members of Rainald of Dassel's entourage were aware that they incurred the canonical sanctions against those who consorted with excommunicates like him.⁵³ If their master was unmoved by the papal maledictions that the Archpoet echoes, his retinue could not afford to remain indifferent to a call to repent. Taken literally, the object of the emotions of empathy and grief to which our author directs them is Christ on the cross (strophes 19–23). Yet the passion is a pretext. Intimidation is the aim, for the cowed audience is to implore the pardon not of gentle Jesus but of a judge as severe—the adjective *districtus*, applied to Him, is unbiblical⁵⁴—as He is inexorable:

24. *Ecce redit districtus arbiter,
qui passus est misericorditer;
redit quidem, sed iam minaciter;
coactus est: non potest aliter.*

⁴⁸ *Moralia in Iob*, xxviii, 46, 75, and 79, ed. Adriaen, CCSL 143B (Turnhout, 1985), 1389, 5 ff.; 1392, 102 ff.

⁴⁹ *Ad nos praecipue dirigitur sermo, ad litteratos, inquam, quibus datum est nosse mysteria regni Dei—caeteris autem in parabolis—et his maxime, qui ecclesiasticae dant operam disciplinae* (PL 171, 364C).

⁵⁰ *De triplici inferno*, in *S. Bernardi opera*, vi, I, ed. J. Leclercq and H. Rochais (Rome, 1970), 9–20.

⁵¹ *Moralia in Iob*, xxxiv, 19, 36, ed. Adriaen, CCSL 143B (Turnhout, 1985), 1759, 25 ff., and xxxiv, 19, 37, *ibid.* 1759, 57–1760, 60.

⁵² *Carm.* I, 23, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 23.

⁵³ Gratian, *Decretum* c.xi.q.iii. 102, ed. Friedberg, *Corpus iuris canonici*, i. 672.

⁵⁴ See *Mittellateinisches Wörterbuch*, iii, D–E 854, 68 ff.

25. *Mundus totus conmotus acriter
vindicabit auctorem graviter
et torquebit reos perhenniter
quamvis iuste, tamen crudeliter.*⁵⁵
24. Behold! The severe judge returns,
whose suffering commands compassion;
He returns indeed, but menacingly;
He is compelled: He is unable to do differently.
25. The entire world, bitterly moved,
will revenge its maker harshly,
and torment the guilty forever,
with equal justice and cruelty.

The premise that justice is necessary did (and does) not entail constraint on Christ (24, 4) in orthodox thought. It had always condemned hypothetical restrictions to divine power, and even Abelard, in his successive analyses of the proposition that God cannot do other than He does, added the caveat that He is able to do many things that He does not.⁵⁶ Trespassing outside these limits, the Archpoet was confident of impunity. If the pious ears of one part of his dual audience were offended, there was no point in its appealing to the other. Rainald of Dassel, who had the antipope in his pocket, cared not a fig for the niceties of doctrine. Secure in his favour, our author enjoyed more than literary licence, and he exploited his freedom to intimidate others. Christ contributes to the effect. 'Compelled, unable to do differently', the severe judge of the last days is not an executor of divine determinism. He is a bogey-man who serves to scare those who usurp His role:

26. *Vos iudicis estis discipuli,
in Scriptura divina seduli,
Christiani lucerne populi,
contemptores presentis seculi.*⁵⁷
26. You are the disciples of the judge,
diligent in divine Scripture,
lanterns for the Christian people,
despisers of this world.

So Honorius Augustodunensis, in his *Speculum Ecclesiae*, had recommended that judges be addressed.⁵⁸ The Archpoet, significantly, does not count himself among their number. The first person plural, so emphatically repeated in previous strophes (17, 1; 18, 1, 3; 19, 1; 20, 4; 23, 1), has been replaced by the second. The 'you' whom he goes on to praise as paragons of Christian

⁵⁵ *Carm.* I, 24–5, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 60.

⁵⁶ Marenbon, *Philosophy of Peter Abelard*, 69, 217 ff., 223, 225.

⁵⁷ *Carm.* I, 26, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 60.

⁵⁸ *Sermo generalis*, PL 172, 863 C–864 A.

virtue (strophes 26–9) are judges in the moral and metaphorical sense defined by Gregory the Great as those who assess the behaviour of others.⁵⁹ This was just what they had done. Critics of his conduct in Rainald of Dassel's retinue had passed a negative verdict on our author's worldliness, to which he had replied that they too wished to live it up.

The counter-argument of the 'confession' appears to have become flattery in the Archpoet's sermon. After describing his detractors in terms that recall the hypocrites identified by Gregory the Great who condemn others without questioning themselves,⁶⁰ he resorts to the antiphrasis of feigned praise. At Advent 1163 it had an unnerving ring. Earlier that year Hildegard of Bingen had preached at Cologne. Like the notary Burkhard,⁶¹ members of the Archpoet's audience sprang from that city, or had connections with it, when they entered Rainald of Dassel's service. His future successor to the archbishopric, Philip of Heinsberg, was prior of the cathedral-chapter at the time, when he wrote in honeyed terms to Hildegard, imploring her for spiritual guidance.⁶² She replied with a blast of rebuke and admonition,⁶³ which echoed in reports sent to Italy by colleagues or in a copy forwarded to Rainald and perused by his secretary. Our author will have read this tirade with Schadenfreude. Here was confirmation of his claim that his enemies and their likes were not all they pretended to be. Hildegard, with the authority of a prophetess, had lambasted the clergy at Cologne in rough language that the Archpoet smoothed to the satisfaction of his audience. The image of illumination (26, 3), for example, had been anticipated by her:

He has put you in the position of the sun and other sources of light, to illuminate men through fiery teaching, radiant with the good word and making hearts ready to be ardent.⁶⁴

So too the concept of divine justice mediated or transmitted by these men of learning (26, 1 ff.):

The trumpet of the Lord is God's justice, which you should contemplate with great attention in holiness, repeating it to the people with the law and obedience due to your office and hallowed discernment at appropriate times, not driving it home to them in excess.⁶⁵

⁵⁹ *Moralia in Iob* xi, 12, 20, ed. Adriaen, CCSL 143A (Turnhout, 1979), 597, 42–8.

⁶⁰ *Moralia in Iob* xi, 36, 49, ed. Adriaen, 614, 14, 33. For the influence of this passage, cf. Peter of Blois, *Sermo ad sacerdotes*, PL 207, 753 D.

⁶¹ See Chapter V.

⁶² Ep. 15, in *Hildegardis Bingensis Epistolarium*, i, CCCM 91, ed. L. van Acker (Turnhout, 1991), 32–3, and cf. T. Altenburg, *Soziale Ordnungsvorstellungen bei Hildegard von Bingen*, Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters 54 (Stuttgart, 2007).

⁶³ Ep. 15^r, *Hildegardis Bingensis Epistolarium*, ed. Acker.

⁶⁴ *Vos constituit sicut solem et cetera luminaria, ut luceretis hominibus per ignem doctrine, in bono rumore fulgurantes et ardentia corda parantes* (Ep. 15^r, *Hildegardis Bingensis Epistolarium*, ed. Acker, 35, 39–41).

⁶⁵ *Tuba Domini iustitia Dei est, quam magno studio in sanctitate ruminare deberetis, eam quoque in officiali lege et obedientia cum sancta discretione per conuenientia tempora iterando populis, et non in nimietate eam illis incutiendo* (Ep. 15^r, *Hildegardis Bingensis Epistolarium*, ed. Acker, 36, 55–9).

Such is the ideal of uprightness that the Archpoet, in his sermon, projects onto his public, contrary to Hildegard's accusation that the clergy at Cologne fell short of these high standards:

But you do not do this, because you follow the unbridled impulses of self-will. That is why the illumination of your tongues is missing from the firmament of divine justice, as it is when the stars have no light. You are night panting with darkness like a people unemployed and not walking in radiance out of boredom but hiding itself in a pit as if it were a skinless serpent: so you enter the filth with sheepish abjection.⁶⁶

Against this background of reprimand should be set the Archpoet's eulogy of his critics. He draws, with the unilateralism of exaggeration, on one side of Hildegard's contrast. His colleagues from Cologne, previously the targets of tit-for-tat, are now extolled in hyperbole that mirrors and magnifies their self-regard. But even they, after their recent dressing-down by the seer of the Rhineland, must acknowledge that they have few grounds for righteousness. The message between the lines is the opposite of their booming bombast:

29. *Decus estis ecclesiasticum:
cum venerit iudex in publicum,
ut puniat omne maleficum,
sedebitis in thronis iudicum.*⁶⁷

29. You are the glory of the Church:
when the judge appears in public
to punish all evil deeds, you shall
sit on thrones of judgement.

These are not simply the thrones described at Luke 22:30; they also resemble the episcopal seats of judgement from which excommunication was levelled.⁶⁸ Members of the clergy in Rainald of Dassel's entourage—none of them bishops—are beginning to look like those who, seven months before, had banned him. The presumption at which our author has hinted is reinforced by the fact that they are not only in the wrong place but also in a false position. In the presence of Christ the Church was to stand, not to sit.⁶⁹ The Archpoet, by contrast with his critics, is on his feet. Uprightness in imitation of the Lord lent preachers divine authority.⁷⁰ At a stage in the development of medieval studies when the ritual importance of gestures is beginning to be appreciated,⁷¹ perhaps attention is due to symbolic stance. Our author, as he recited his

⁶⁶ *Sed hoc propter petulantiam proprie uoluntatis uestre non facitis. Vnde firmamento iustitie Dei luminaria in linguis uestreis desunt, uelut cum stelle non lucent. Vos enim nox spirans tenebras estis et quasi populus non laborans, nec propter tedium in luce ambulans, sed uelut nudus coluber in cauernam se abscondit: sic uos feditatem in uilitate pecorum intratis* (Ep. 15^r, Hildegardis Bingensis Epistolarium, ed. Acker, 36, 60–5).

⁶⁷ *Carm.* I, 29, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 60.

⁶⁸ Burchard of Worms, PL 140, 855 D.

⁶⁹ Cf. Arnulf of Lisieux, PL 201, 164D.

⁷⁰ e.g. *Stat autem in gradu ligneo, quem fecerat ad loquendum, quando singulari imitatione dominicae passionis altiore se caeteris facit. Unde merito fiduciam libere verbum Dei praedicandi obtinet* (Amalarius of Metz, *De ecclesiasticis officiis* iv. 17 (*De ascensu in pulpitu*) PL 105, 1124 B).

⁷¹ Cf. J.-C. Schmitt, *La Raison des gestes dans l'Occident médiéval* (Paris, 1990).

sermon, was in the pulpit, to which ecclesiastical authors of the twelfth century attributed spiritual significance.⁷² The humble is exalted where he ought to be; the haughty are stationed where they should not; and the Archpoet's perfidious praise of his detractors allows the literal-minded to delude themselves that they are being complimented. At this point, in a characteristically sudden shift of tone, he warns these 'lanterns for the Christian people' (26, 3) that the light they shed is tinged with sepulchral white:

30. *Veruntamen in mundi fluctibus,
ubi nemo mundus a sordibus,
que dicitis in vestris cordibus
compungendum est in cubilibus.*⁷³
30. None the less on the waves of the world,
where no one is pure of filth,
what you say in your heart
you should repent in your lairs.

The 'lairs'—rather than the bed(chamber)s—of 30, 4 are the hiding-places of the heart at Psalm 4:5, where exegetical tradition located sins secreted from public gaze.⁷⁴ There the 'filth' in which the clergy wallows, according to Hildegard, taints hearers more wordly than they care to admit. The gaze of his public, once turned on the Archpoet's faults, is now redirected to its own conscience, which has cause to be troubled. Demoted from their thrones, those who had censured his errant conduct are urged to repent their peccant thoughts (*compungendum*). The diction is deft. *Compunctio*, a term not only of atonement but also of affective empathy,⁷⁵ is recommended to the sanctimonious who lacked fellow-feeling and were unused to such directness. *Ad status*-preaching had accustomed them to bland admonition, not to the bald rebuke that they had something to hide.

After judges, the rich are the next category to which Honorius Augustodunensis recommends that preachers should turn,⁷⁶ and the Archpoet follows his sequence while diverging from his approach:

31. *Insistite piis operibus
bene vestris utentes opibus;
nam Deo dat, qui dat inopibus:
ipse Deus est in pauperibus.*⁷⁷

⁷² e.g. Honorius Augustodunensis, *Gemma Animae* i. 22, PL 172, 551 B–C.

⁷³ *Carm.* I, 30, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 50.

⁷⁴ Cf. Cassiodore, *Expositio Psalmorum*, ed. M. Adriaen CCSL 97 (Turnhout, 1958) 58 and Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, ed. Dekkers and Fraipont, 16. See P. von Moos, 'Herzenseheimnisse' (*oculta cordis*): Selbstverwahrung und Selbstentblößung im Mittelalter', in Moos, *Öffentliches und Privates: Gemeinsames und Eigenes: Gesammelte Studien zum Mittelalter*, iii, ed. G. Melville, Geschichte: Forschung und Wissenschaft 16 (Berlin, 2007), 5–28, and cf. S. Vecchio, 'Segreti e bugie: I peccata occulta', *Micrologus*, 14 (2006), 41–58.

⁷⁵ See J. Pegon, *Dictionnaire de spiritualité*, xii (Paris, 1949), 1312 ff. s.v.

⁷⁶ PL 172, 864B. ⁷⁷ *Carm.* I, 31, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 50.

31. Press on with pious works,
 using well your wealth,
 for he gives to God who donates to the needy:
 God Himself is in the poor.

Although the responsibility of the rich to the poor was a stock theme of twelfth-century preaching,⁷⁸ it is one thing to repeat that the poor are blessed, for theirs shall be the kingdom of heaven (Luke 6:20; cf. Matthew 5:3): quite another to detect God's presence in the needy. And, if the transition from penance to good works is natural enough in a sermon,⁷⁹ it hardly follows from it that alms-giving is the highest of virtues, as the Archpoet goes on to assert (*summa virtus est elemosina* 32, 3). *Caritas*, which, beside faith, is the obvious contender for the title of supremacy in Christian ethics, has already been defined as a measurable merit.⁸⁰ The religious emotion of love is equated with a financial donation of charity, so the audience is invited to open less its heart than its purse. Here, declares this moral minimalist, is a remedy for sin and a passport to eternal life.⁸¹ Hectoring with repetitive insistence,⁸² he addresses the clergy present both collectively and individually.⁸³ All of them grasp that the Archpoet's sermon has descended from the higher plane of dogma to a lower level of pastoral theology. It remains to be seen how the lesson about alms-giving that he thrusts on others applies to himself.

* * *

The main body of the *sermo* has concluded (34, 4), with the words of Christ (*omni petenti tribue!* Luke 6:30). But the familiar quotation does not reassure. Many of our author's admonitions are based on the Bible, and all of them are double-edged. Those nodding off at the length with which he develops the theme of hell have been startled awake by his departure from orthodox doctrine. Soothed into smugness by eulogy of their outstanding virtues, they have been rudely woken with criticism of their concealed vices. Despite the analogy to a lection drawn at the beginning (4, 3), *Lingua balbus* develops into nothing like a reading in church, nor is there anyone other than the poetic preacher to interrupt his flow with *Tu autem!* (4, 4). He assails his audience with a sermon such as it had never heard. The work being recited was neither straightforwardly of the schools nor clearly of the cloister. Even slighter

⁷⁸ See J. Longère, 'Pauvreté et richesse chez quelques prédicateurs durant la seconde moitié du xii^e siècle', in M. Mollat (ed.), *Études sur l'histoire de la pauvreté*, i (Paris, 1974), 255–74.

⁷⁹ Cf. Hildebert of Lavardin, PL 171, 428D–456C.

⁸⁰ *Carm.* I, 27, 3–4–28, 1–4, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 50.

⁸¹ *Carm.* I, 33–4, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 50.

⁸² *Hanc commendo vobis pro ceteris*
Hanc commendo vobis precipue
 (*Carm.* I, 33, 1; 34, 1, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 50).

⁸³ *crede mihi: si quid deliqueris,*
per hanc Deum placare poteris
 (*Carm.* I, 33, 3–4, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 50).

was its similarity to the idealization of poverty by such rebels against the establishment as Robert of Arbrissel.⁸⁴ Between that uncouth ascetic and the refinement of our author there yawned an abyss. Less wide, but equally deep, was the distance that separated him from earlier preachers in the season of Advent. None of their works is so deeply indebted to the thought-forms of dialectic as *Lingua balbus*. Singular in the context of earlier prose, *sic et non* on a sacred theme had only one precedent in Latin verse and it had been set by the Archpoet himself, in the comedy of conscience devised to celebrate his sins and refute his antagonists.

That experiment in falsifying ethical identity is now carried a stage further. The accused, from the eminence of the pulpit, admonishes his judges. Shaken in their solemnity, they have no idea of what to expect when he pretends to defer to their knowledge:

35. *Scitis ista, neque vos doceo,
sed quod scitis, facere moneo;
pro me loqui iam tandem debeo;
non sum puer; etatem habeo.*⁸⁵

35. You know all that, and I am not teaching you,
but I am urging you to carry out what you know;
now at last I should speak on my own behalf;
I am not a boy; I am of age.

At last (*tandem* 35, 3), thirty strophes after the exordium, our author appears to meet Gregory the Great's requirement that autobiographical justification be offered for a sermon. But *pro*, at 35, 3, is out of place. *De* might accord with the verb of obligation (*debeo*), certainly not the notion that a homilist should plead on his own behalf. Nor has he returned to quite the point where he ceased to refer to himself. With the inarticulateness of Jeremiah at 1, 3 forgotten, his childlikeness is also set aside. No longer like the exemplar of modesty described in the seventh chapter of the *Pastoral Rule*, the Archpoet takes authority for his transformation from John 9:23, where *aetatem habet* are the words attributed to the parents of a blind boy whom Christ restored to sight. The most recent exegete of this passage in the German empire had interpreted that declaration as legitimate self-defence.⁸⁶ Rupert of Deutz's biblical exegesis was so influential at Cologne that Arnold of Wied drew on it when he commissioned paintings for the lower chapel of his church at Schwarzreindorf.⁸⁷ Rupert, whom our author follows, thought it right when the father and

⁸⁴ See J. Dalarun, *L'Impossible sainteté: La Vie retrouvée de Robert d'Arbrissel* (v. 1045–1116) *fondateur de Fontevraud* (Paris, 1985), and D. Lapsanski, *Perfectio evangelica: Eine begriffsgeschichtliche Untersuchung im frühfranziskanischen Schrifttum*, Veröffentlichungen des Grabmann-Institutes 22 (Munich, 1974), 13 ff.

⁸⁵ *Carm.* I, 35, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld.

⁸⁶ *Ruperti Tuitensis Commentaria in Evangelium Sancti Iohannis*, ed. R. Haacke OSB, CCCM 9 (Turnhout, 1969), 502, 1103–5 and cf. 503, 1130–4.

⁸⁷ See J. Kunisch, *Konrad III., Arnold von Wied und der Kapellenbau von Schwarzreindorf* (Düsseldorf, 1966).

mother at John 9:23 affirmed that their son was of age to speak for himself, in order to avert the danger to their safety posed by Pharisees whom he regarded as murderous. Such are the connotations of the Archpoet's *etatem habeo* (35, 4). Endangered by his pharisaical detractors, he states that he is a man and implies that his eyes are as open as his circumstances are reduced:

36. *Vitam meam vobis enucleo,
paupertatem meam non taceo:
sic sum pauper et sic indigeo,
quod tam siti quam fame pereō.*⁸⁸
36. I shall reveal my life to you,
and not be silent about my poverty:
so reduced are my circumstances
that I perish from hunger and thirst.

Striking a pose of supplication that indicated hardship in medieval art,⁸⁹ our author departs from other models.⁹⁰ Preachers were supposed to show that their lives bore out their lessons, which, held in the interest of the others, they illustrated by *exempla*.⁹¹ The two procedures, although related, were distinct. Conflating them in this instance of his own want, our author not only violates the rules of altruism; he also represents himself as what the dialecticians among whom he had studied at Paris called a *casus*: an issue to be debated for and against.⁹² So it is that he clarifies a term that had remained obscure in his exordium. The *necessitas* that impelled him to speak at 1, 3 is now defined as neediness. This is a theme to which the Archpoet recurs repeatedly,⁹³ and his hearers were doubtless familiar with the lamentation that he was out of pocket. They were also to be reminded more than once that he languished at death's door.⁹⁴ But they were unmoved by his efforts at pathos, because they attributed the frequency of this sorry state to his own fault. More than a renewed wail of poverty was needed to move them to display the highest virtue and give

⁸⁸ *Carm.* I, 36, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 51.

⁸⁹ See T. Raff, 'Das Bild der Armut im Mittelalter', in G. Oexle (ed.), *Armut im Mittelalter*, VuF 58 (Sigmaringen, 2004), 9–26.

⁹⁰ Cf. D. Kartschoke, 'Armut in der deutschen Literatur des Mittelalters', in Oexle (ed.), *Armut im Mittelalter*, 27–78, and J. Larmat, *Les Pauvres et la pauvreté dans la littérature française du Moyen Âge* (Nice, 1994).

⁹¹ Cf. P. Roberts, *Stephanus de Lingua-Tonante: Studies in the Sermons of Stephen Langton*, Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies. Studies and Texts 16 (Toronto, 1968) 63ff.

⁹² On the distinction between *casus* and *exemplum*, see the valuable studies by P. von Moos, *Geschichte als Topik: Das rhetorische Exemplum von der Antike zur Neuzeit und die historiae im 'Policraticus' Johanns von Salisbury*, Ordo 2 (Hildesheim, 1988), 131, 145, 583–97, and 'L'Exemplum et les exempla des prêcheurs', in J. Berlioz and M. Pollo de Beaulieu (eds), *Les Exempla médiévaux: Nouvelles perspectives* (Paris, 1998), 67–83.

⁹³ *Carm.* II, 77, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 55; III, 13, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 56; IV, 17, 20, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 59; VI, 16–17, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 65; VIII, 9, 2, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 67; IX, 4, 3; 33, 4, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 68, 72. See Chapters VI and X.

⁹⁴ *Carm.* V, 21–2, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 64; VI, 11, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 65.

alms on his behalf. So it is that, second-guessing their reservations, the cunning supplicant anticipates their grounds for refusal:

37. *Non sum nequam, nullum decipio;
uno tantum laboro vitio:
nam libenter semper accipio
et plus mihi quam fratri cupio.*⁹⁵
37. I am not wicked, I deceive none;
I suffer from a sole vice:
for I always receive willingly
and desire more for myself than for my brother.

Among the three categories of the poor that intellectuals distinguished during the High Middle Ages,⁹⁶ it is the third and the worst that applies to our author. Not for him the voluntary self-denial identified with St Peter by Gerhoh of Reichersberg,⁹⁷ nor the unwilling want typified in Lazarus. The neediness of the Archpoet is due to cupidity. That 'sole vice' among the seven rules out any further attempt to play the moralist. Other grounds have to be found to argue his shaky case. The first of them, not ethical but social, derives from the emotion of shame:

38. *Si vendatur propter denarium
indumentum quod porto varium,
grande mihi fiet obprobrium;
malo diu pati ieiunium.*⁹⁸
38. If this parti-coloured garment I am wearing
should be sold for money,
it will be a great source of shame to me;
I prefer long-term fasting.

Here our author returns to the theme of his ministerial origins and vaunts his rights. One of them, defined in the shorter version of the Cologne *Dienstrecht* drawn up for Rainald of Dassel around the time of this poem's composition, was to clothing provided by the archbishop-elect when a minister entered his service or prepared for an 'expedition'.⁹⁹ On the expedition of Barbarossa's third Italian campaign the Archpoet does not specify the nature of his garment.

⁹⁵ *Carm.* I, 37, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 51.

⁹⁶ See B. Tierney, *Medieval Poor Law: A Sketch of Canonical Theory and its Application in England* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1959), 11 ff.

⁹⁷ Cf. A. Lazzarino del Grosso, *Armut und Reichtum im Denken Gerhohs von Reichersberg* (Munich, 1973), 51 ff., and K. Bosl, 'Das Problem der Armut in der hochmittelalterlichen Gesellschaft', *Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte* 294, 5 (Vienna, 1974), 23 ff.

⁹⁸ *Carm.* I, 38, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 51.

⁹⁹ H. von Loesch, 'Das kürzere Kölner Dienstmännerrecht', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Germanistische Abteilung* 44 (1924), 298–9, nos 2 and 8. On the date, cf. Weise, *Der Hof*, 189.

Visible to beholders as he recited his work, it counted less for its cut or material than for its colours.

A signal was being sent by client to patron. In 1148, at the council of Reims, Rainald of Dassel had stood out among those who opposed a papal prohibition of brightly coloured clothing for the clergy.¹⁰⁰ Sartorial solidarity with him indicated defiance of Rome a decade and a half after that council and four years into the schism. The *opprobrium* of 38, 3 amounts to more than embarrassment at a buyer of worn goods or loss of face among colleagues.¹⁰¹ The Archpoet stood in danger of forfeiting status before the archchancellor of Italy. Imperial is the allegiance, ministerial the bond that would be severed if this garment were to be sold:

39. *Largissimus largorum omnium
presul dedit hoc mihi pallium,
magis habens in celis premium
quam Martinus, qui dedit medium.*¹⁰²

39. Most open-handed of all the generous,
the prelate gave me this *pallium*,
gaining more of a reward in heaven
than Martin who gave a half.

Why does our author employ the term *pallium* at 39, 2, rather than *mantellum* or *tunica*, which he uses elsewhere?¹⁰³ And why has he referred generically to an *indumentum* (38, 2), if what he now means is a cloak?¹⁰⁴ That sense is hardly warranted by the analogy to St Martin, who gave half of his *tunica* (or *chlamys*, not *pallium*) to a beggar, as Alan of Lille, in a similar context of alms-giving, would point out.¹⁰⁵ Moreover, the semantic range of the word extended from a monk's habit to a nun's veil, an altar-cloth or a drapery.¹⁰⁶ Ambiguity attached to this versatile garment, which our author intended to be interpreted in one way by the lower clergy of his audience and in another by their superior. For Rainald of Dassel the term *pallium* had a special significance: the band of white wool embroidered with coloured crosses that archbishops wore as a symbol of their loyalty to the pope.¹⁰⁷ Stripped of standing among the orthodox, the excommunicate enemy of Alexander III was well aware that he had no chance

¹⁰⁰ See Chapter III.

¹⁰¹ The sale of garments received as gifts was characteristic of immoral entertainers. See K. Polheim, 'Der Mantel', in *Corona Quernea: Festgabe K. Strecker*, Schriften des Reichsinstituts für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde (MGH) 6 (Leipzig, 1941), 45.

¹⁰² *Carm.* I, 39, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 50.

¹⁰³ *Carm.* VII, 11, 3, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 67.

¹⁰⁴ Dronke, 'Art of the Archpoet', IX, 35.

¹⁰⁵ 'Qui habet duas tunicas, det non habenti.' *Ideo tunicam nominat, non pallium, quia tunica est magis necessaria; ad insinuandum quod non tantum superflua, verum etiam necessaria dare tenemur. Quod in beato confessore Martino claruit, qui asperitate temporis partem chlamidis, qua sola indutus erat, pauperi erogavit.* *Ars praedicatoria* 33(PL 210, 176C).

¹⁰⁶ *Mediae latinitatis lexicon minus* ii M-Z, ed. J. Niermeyer, C. van der Kieft, and J. Burgers (Leiden, 2002), 984-5.

¹⁰⁷ See Chapter II.

of obtaining such recognition from the Roman pontiff. Alluding to this rebuff, our author pours upon it the balm of jest. If his patron could not boast of a *pallium*, the reason was his generosity in giving it away to his client. The garment, no longer a sign of strife, becomes emblematic of identity transferred from a higher to a lower level in the ecclesiastical hierarchy,¹⁰⁸ as the Archpoet preens himself on archiepiscopal dress. The joke, lost on his modern interpreters, was not meant to be appreciated by his medieval colleagues. Gazing at the brightly clad double of their master, they simply failed to see the band of honour that he was not wearing.

The prelate (39, 2), who does not need to be specified further, has moved from the wings to centre-stage. His presence, constantly implied, is now a potent guarantee of favour. Favoured and favourer are linked by a token of togetherness as imaginary as Rainald's open-handedness was real in practice. Reciprocity is the theme. Frequent and fundamental in the Archpoet's works, it is highlighted by the reference to St Martin, in whose chapel at Hildesheim, constructed by Bishop Bernward,¹⁰⁹ Rainald of Dassel had worshipped earlier in his career and whose aura accompanied him throughout it.¹¹⁰ More than the archetypal monk, this saint signified to the archchancellor of Italy a principle of give and take. Not for nothing had he determined that taxes should be collected in that kingdom on 11 November, St Martin's day.¹¹¹ Shortly after his Italian subjects had paid their dues, his German client did the same, praising Rainald of Dassel as a mightier Martin in an encomium whose hyperbole equals the exuberance of what had (or had not) been received. The tone is tongue-in-cheek, but the thought is serious. This minister conceives of his relationship to his lord as a largesse that extended to others as well. So it did, but on terms different from those used by the Archpoet.¹¹² When he appeals for a *collecta mutua* (42, 4), the noun connotes not only alms-giving but also tribute or taxation;¹¹³ and the biblical *exemplum* of the poor widow's offering, which he cites (41, 3) from Mark 12:41–4, is employed, in the encomium on Barbarossa, of himself.¹¹⁴ Although the rule may be universal, its application here is particular. Apparently asked to show their financial mettle, the clerical members of his audience are in fact being browbeaten by their master's protégé. On his behalf, now aligned with that of Rainald, Judgement Day has arrived in Advent. Reduced to their proper place in the ranks of the archbishop's servants, his erstwhile judges are to follow the example set by their chief and pay up to the one among them who claims first place.

¹⁰⁸ See P. von Moos, 'Das mittelalterliche Kleid als Identitätssymbol und Identifikationsmittel', in Moos (ed.) *Unverwechselbarkeit: Persönliche Identität und Identifikation in der vormodernen Gesellschaft*, Norm und Struktur 23 (Cologne, 2004), 23–46 and J. Keupp, *Die Wahl des Gewandes: Mode, Macht und Möglichkeitssinn in Gesellschaft und Politik des Mittelalters*, Mittelalter-Forschungen 33 (Berlin, 2011), 39 ff.

¹⁰⁹ See A. Angenendt, '“In meinem Fleisch werde ich Gott sehen”: Bernward und die Reliquien', in Brandt and Eggebrecht (eds), *Bernward von Hildesheim*, 365.

¹¹⁰ See Chapter X.

¹¹¹ See Haverkamp, *Herrschaftsformen*, ii, 584.

¹¹² See Chapter VI.

¹¹³ *Mittelateinisches Wörterbuch*, iii C, 836, 41 ff.

¹¹⁴ See Chapter VIII.

The request for a donation is beginning to resemble a demand of extortion, as the sermon that he promised would be short (4, 1–4) waxes long and insistent. Professing for his audience a concern of which he has shown no sign, the Archpoet varies other themes of his exordium:

43. *Mea vobis patet intencio.*
Vos gravari sermone sencio;
unde finem sermonis facio,
*quem sic finit brevis oracio:*¹¹⁵
43. My intention is clear to you.
 I feel that you are burdened by the homily;
 and so I make an end of it
 with the following short prayer:

With the clarity of Christ (*patent omnia* 11, 2) our author's intention to speak about human affairs (3, 3–4) is fulfilled. By now the sacred and the secular are thoroughly conflated, yet the message is unmistakable. All members of the audience feel the urgency with which they are being asked to open their purses. Behind the importunate author, or beside him, looms his protector. Rainald of Dassel's is the aegis that shelters him from the charge of being double-tongued. Each liberty taken with the virtue of alms-giving is licensed by their shared sense of fun. To those unwarmed by the wit is offered the cold comfort of prayer:

44. *Prestet vobis creator, Eloy,*
caritatis lechitum olei,
spei vinum, frumentum fidei,
*et post mortem ad vitam provehi!*¹¹⁶
44. May the creator, Eloy, grant you
 the phial of oil's charity,
 the wine of hope, the corn of faith,
 and promote you to life after death!

Is this a benediction or a malediction? The Archpoet's exegetes opt for the first choice, pointing to Jesus's Aramaic invocation of the Lord God at Matthew 27: 46–7 (cf. Mark 15: 34–5).¹¹⁷ And they are nearly right. So our author wished all but one member of his audience to understand the last word of the first verse above. As it is printed, *Eloy* suggests the sort of apostrophe to be heard on the lips of the pious. But print does not help us to determine how it was pronounced, nor does the orthography of the manuscripts—none of which is autograph—offer reliable guidance. That is why we should not accept the text as it stands without considering the ambiguities that might be exploited in its recitation. It is far from surprising that the Archpoet owes a debt to the close

¹¹⁵ *Carm.* I, 43, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 51.

¹¹⁶ *Carm.* I, 44, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 52.

¹¹⁷ Watenphul–Krefeld, 93 ad loc.; Dronke, 'Art of the Archpoet', IX, 32.

reading of Gregory the Great's *Moralia in Iob* that was required of the clergy.¹¹⁸ Astonishing, by contrast, is his exploitation of a work that others regarded as a source of morality for its funds of humour. The eagle eyes that detected, in the would-be wise, an anti-type of humility whom Gregory identifies with Elihu were fully capable of noting that, in the *Moralia in Iob*, both that proper name and the Aramaic for the Lord God are spelt as *Eliu*.¹¹⁹ How to tell these Oriental vocatives apart in conditions of Latin orality? What our author read aloud could have been understood as:

Prestet vobis creator, Eliu!

Elihu! May the creator grant you . . .

This pun was intended for the sensitive ears of the archbishop-elect. His subordinates might be relied on to miss the equivocal taunt. But even they, deaf to tone and obtuse to nuance, could not fail to recognize the dramatic dénouement of the final strophe, in which the mask of obliquity is cast aside and the dual audience is split apart:

45. *Nobis vero mundo fruentibus,
vinum bonum sepe bibentibus,
sine vino deficientibus
nummos multos pro largis sumptibus!*
*Amen.*¹²⁰

45. But to us enjoying the world,
frequent quaffers of fine wine,
expiring when wineless,
[may He grant] lots of money for ample expenses!
Amen.

No attempt to link bibulousness and inspiration, no effort to relativize the charge of worldliness, is made here in the manner of the 'confession'. Gaily defiant of bans on self-indulgence, 'we' acknowledge our fault. *Nobis* at 45, 1, is the motto of a select society formed by the Archpoet and Rainald of Dassel. The pronoun implies 'not for you'. Beyond the bounds of their partnership are relegated the pious, the censorious, and the sanctimonious in the archiepiscopal retinue. Yet the scope of the provocation extends to virtually all others as well.

* * *

¹¹⁸ See R. Wasselnyck, 'Les Compilations des *Moralia in Iob* du VII^e au XII^e siècle', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 29 (1962), 5–32; Wasselnyck, 'L'Influence de l'exégèse de saint Grégoire le Grand sur les commentaires bibliques médiévaux (VII^e–XIII^e siècles)', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 32 (1965), 157–204; and Wasselnyck, 'La Présence de saint Grégoire le Grand dans les ouvrages de morale du XII^e siècle', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 35 (1968), 197–240.

¹¹⁹ *Moralia in Iob*, praef. ix, 19, ed. M. Adriaen, CCSL 143 (Turnhout, 1979), 23, 1–12; *Moralia in Iob* xxiii, 1, 7, ed. Adriaen, CCSL 143B 1148, 194 ff.; xxiv, 12, 36, ed. Adriaen, 1214, 13 ff., and xxiv, 14, 28, ed. Adriaen, 1216, 5 ff.

¹²⁰ *Carm.* I, 45, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 52.

The traditional culture of the Latin West was unprepared to take the measure of this phenomenon. Humour had existed in homilies and preachers might jest from the pulpit,¹²¹ but no one before the Archpoet had stood an ideal that Christians inherited from ancient oratory so wholly on its head. His work—the product not of a *vir bonus dicendi peritus* (Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* xii. 1. 1) but of a *vir pessimus dicendi peritissimus*—mocks the ideal of harmony between lesson and life. For those who craved the consolation of simple symmetries, *Lingua balbus* presented a problem that, in the next generation, Alan of Lille partly recognized and completely failed to solve. Alan had a talent for detecting the paradoxes generated by the spiritual inwardness of twelfth-century religion. It was he who coined the expression ‘sophistical penance’, and he who described monastic misuse of biblical quotation as ‘pharisaical’.¹²² These are insights relevant to understanding the Archpoet. There is no evidence that Alan of Lille knew *Lingua balbus*, but his comments on some of the issues it posed, in *De arte praedicatoria*, reveal the range of his learning and the limits of his imagination. The first and simplest of Alan’s observations is that a sermon should be public because it is offered to a number of people, not to one.¹²³ That is just the distinction around which our author constructs his work. Ostensibly addressed to a plural audience, it is in reality directed to a singular spectator, playing him off against the others. ‘Preaching aims to teach morality’ (*praedicatio enim est . . . ad morum instructionem*¹²⁴), adds Alan in a commonplace with which next to no one would have quarrelled. No one, that is, except the Archpoet. His work is ‘theatrical’—scurrilous in diction, melodious in rhythm¹²⁵—and advocates deplorable idolatry of Bacchus rather than due worship of God,¹²⁶ as he gleefully admits. A *scurra* who employs flattery to extract funds,¹²⁷ a mercenary who abuses his position for enrichment,¹²⁸ he falls into several categories of malpractice identified by Alan.¹²⁹ And, with the virtuosity of an intellectual acrobat, this preacher of sin transcends them all to create a prototype of Chaucer’s Pardoner.

Chaucer, in his experimentation with categories of scholastic theology,¹³⁰ would come close to matching this preacher’s adventurousness. But not in the first person. The Pardoner, a character in *The Canterbury Tales*, speaks in a voice distinct from the author’s. *Lingua balbus*, by contrast, is autobiographical; and

¹²¹ Cf. J. Horowitz and S. Menache, *L’Humour en chaire: Le Rire dans l’Eglise médiévale* (Besançon, 1963), and S. Wenzel, ‘The Joyous Art of Preaching, or the Preacher and the Fabliau’, *Anglia* 92 (1979) 304–25.

¹²² See Godman, *Paradoxes of Conscience*, 61 and nn. 76, 77.

¹²³ PL 201 112A. ¹²⁴ PL 201 112A.

¹²⁵ *Praedicatio enim in se non debet habere verba scurrilia vel puerilia vel rhythmorum melodias et consonantias metrorum, quae potius fiunt ad aures demulcendas quam ad animum instruendum: quae praedicatio theatralis est et mimica* (PL 201 112B–C).

¹²⁶ PL 201 120C. ¹²⁷ PL 201 167B. ¹²⁸ PL 201 185B.

¹²⁹ Cf. M. Zink, ‘La Rhétorique honteuse et la convention du sermon *ad status* à travers la *Summa d’arte praedicatoria* d’Alain de Lille’, in H. Roussel and F. Suard (eds), *Alain de Lille, Gautier de Châtillon, Jakemart Giélée et leur temps* (Lille, 1980), 171–85.

¹³⁰ See A. Minnis, *Fallible Authors: Chaucer’s Pardoner and Wife of Bath* (Philadelphia, 2008).

its manifesto of immorality may have led the Archpoet's audience to wonder whether its baiter had taken leave of his senses. The doubt was partly justified. Although he did not play the holy fool, his role raised similar questions about the difference between appearance and reality. Simulating the part of an ecclesiastical orator at the opening and in the course of a mostly orthodox work, our author dissimulates until its end his intention to provoke the pious. He begins by following a rhetorical pattern akin to Arnulf of Lisieux's and concludes by departing from it radically, in order to mock the poverty and altruism that had been Christian ideals for centuries. At the front of his thoughts, in the 'confession', is the medieval figure of mourning, whom he turns into a celebrator of sin. After feigning penance for the worldliness with which he had been taxed, in defiance of his detractors he goes on to confirm their criticisms in the sermon. There, at the back of his mind, the Archpoet has the holy fool, an expert in the arts of simulation and dissimulation.¹³¹

He knew that his hearers were familiar with alleged entertainers and apparent idiots pretending to be out of their minds. Holy folly took multiple forms. One of them was practised by Bernard of Clairvaux, who, as God's jongleur, turned somersaults of divine praise.¹³² He foreshadowed St Francis, *unus novellus pazzus* in the macaronic report by Leo of Assisi,¹³³ whose antics could be construed as innovative imitation of Christ. Such men and women, with their deliberate eccentricity, were mimers or hypocrites by divine grace.¹³⁴ In self-abasement aimed at self-exaltation (Matthew 23:12; Luke 18:14), they expressed the paradox of their anti-conformist faith. The Archpoet opens his sermon as their opposite, in a style suitable for Advent, only to wax ambiguous with hardly credible praise. When he has unsettled his audience by hyperbole, which, after Hildegard's rebukes, even the most complacent among them find difficult to take literally, he presents himself not as one of the instances adduced by other preachers to justify an argument or illustrate a truth, but as a counter-case. Contrary to the holy fools who, inverting secular values, humbled themselves like Jesus, the Archpoet's claim to sincerity is based on blatant sinfulness. An *exemplum* of Christian charity is transformed into a *casus* of profane self-interest.

A *casus* was meant to be debated, and our author reckoned with controversy for abusing the dialectic that he had learnt at Paris. The comic potential of

¹³¹ See R. Lachmann, 'Der Narr in Christo und seine Verstellungspraxis', in Moos (ed.), *Unverwechselbarkeit*, 379–409.

¹³² Ep. 87, in S. Bernardi Opera, vii, ed. J. Leclercq and H. Rochais (Rome, 1974), 231, 11 ff., with J. Leclercq, *Receuil d'études sur saint Bernard et ses écrits*, v. Storia e letteratura, 183 (Rome, 1992), 347–90.

¹³³ *Le Speculum perfectionis ou Mémoires de frère Léon sur la seconde partie de la vie de Saint François d'Assise*, I, ed. P. Sabatier (Manchester, 1928), 196, quoted by P. von Moos, 'Beschämendes und schamloses Schweigen im Mittelalter: Facetten einer Provokation', in K. Gvozdeva and H. R. Velten (eds), *Scham und Schamlosigkeit: Grenzverletzungen in Literatur und Kultur der Vormoderne*, Trends in Medieval Philology 21 (Berlin, 2011), 282 and n. 50. This essay (264–99) offers valuable observations on, and extensive bibliography to, the issues treated here.

¹³⁴ Cf. Lachmann, 'Der Narr in Christo', 403–4.

casuistry offered advantages, one of which was exposing the witlessness of his rivals to a patron already described as a 'prince of the earth'.¹³⁵ First non-plussed, then undermined, finally the others are excluded. In the last strophe, which begins with *nobis*, that pronoun of partnership between our author and Rainald of Dassel alters the tone of their mirth. It is no longer the laughter of togetherness that resounds so companionably in the 'confession'. Taunting and transitive,¹³⁶ this mockery of derision is directed at the 'lanterns of the Christian people' glowing with sepulchral whiteness. The colour of their cheeks is likely to have turned livid as they heard themselves being pilloried from the pulpit. If they were given to voicing their moralism in scriptural quotation as often as the Archpoet implies, the biblical text that will have come to mind was Galatians 6:7: *God is not mocked!* Bernard of Clairvaux, in his sixteenth interpretation of the Song of Songs, had quoted this maxim against those who, making merry of secular pursuits, bordered on blasphemy.¹³⁷ That is exactly the category into which our author fitted himself at Monza, where no one was ready for a preacher who compounded such an offence in verse, the medium of mendacity. One of the most established, widely diffused genres of medieval literature is subverted by this sermon. The diptych that it forms with the 'confession' offers an image of witty worldliness, as the brushstrokes follow the flow of inversion and antithesis in a picture that begins with religion and ends in irreverence.

¹³⁵ See Chapter VIII.

¹³⁶ Cf. J.-C. Schmitt, 'Les Images de la dérision', in E. Crouzet-Pavan and J. Verger (eds), *La Dérision au Moyen Âge: De la pratique sociale au rituel politique* (Paris, 2007), 263–74, and G. Althoff, 'Vom Lächeln zum Verlachen', in Röcke and Velten (eds), *Lachgemeinschaften*, 3–16.

¹³⁷ S. Bernardi Opera, i, ed. J. Leclercq, H. Rochais, and C. Talbot (Rome, 1957), 94–5.

X

The Roving Prophet

Itinerancy, not vagrancy, is a leitmotif of the Archpoet's works. Although many of his movements in Rainald of Dassel's entourage can be documented by charters composed or copied between 1162 and 1164, we do not know when they parted company, nor should we believe all that we are told in verse. The sole journey allegedly made without his Doppelgänger is recorded by our author in terms of a return:

*En habeo versus te precipiente reversus!
Sit tibi frons leta versus recitante poeta!*¹

Here are the verses I have to offer on return at your command!
Beam with joy at the poet reciting them!

Obedience is emphasized in this opening couplet. If the Archpoet had been commanded to come back, does that imply that he had been told to travel? And why was he made to go to a place in the Mezzogiorno where his master never set foot?

- Laudibus eternum nullus negat esse Salernum;
illuc pro morbis totus circumfluit orbis;*
5. *nec debet sperni, fateor, doctrina Salerni,
quamvis exosa mihi sit gens illa dolosa.*²

- None denies that Salerno is immortal in praise;
there the entire world flocks when ill;
5. nor do I think that Salernitan learning is to be undervalued,
although I loathe that race of crooks.

Low opinion and high reputation: the mythical city is being taken down a peg. Famous for its wealth and prestige since the early Middle Ages,³ it had long been a hypothetical target of Hohenstaufen strategy. By the sixth decade of the twelfth century Salerno can hardly have seemed within range to the emperor and the archchancellor, neither of whom ventured south of Rome. When Rainald of Dassel heard these verses being recited, he was in northern Italy, planning yet another campaign against King William I of Sicily that was not to be waged. Our author knew that his patron's sights were set on Salernitan

¹ *Carm.* VI, 1–2, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 65.

² *Carm.* VI, 3–6, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 65.

³ P. Delogu, *Mito di una città meridionale (Salerno, secoli VIII–XI)* (Naples, 1977).

territories because, as 'Rainald H', on 6 April 1162 he had participated in drawing up a treaty that assigned some of them to Pisa in return for its naval support during an expedition against the 'Sicilian tyrant' that was frequently threatened and repeatedly postponed.⁴ The archchancellor's pipe dream was the Archpoet's experience, we are left to infer from these verses. Why should we doubt his word?

At Salerno, in 1160–2, an uprising against William I had been attempted by local aristocrats.⁵ One of them, William of Sanseverino, was deprived of his lands and sought refuge at the imperial court. There our author may have met him, or at least have been informed of the troubles that motivated his attendance on Barbarossa. Did William put the Archpoet in touch with his family at Salerno? This is unlikely, for the baron's mother and sister languished in a Palermitan prison.⁶ And, when the nobility was not in revolt, Salerno was noted for its loyalty to the Norman kings of Sicily,⁷ arch-enemies of the empire. A sojourn of study or a trip of tourism there was an implausible enterprise for a Hohenstaufen partisan. No more likely is a mission undertaken on Rainald's instructions, which this poem never mentions. It begins by insinuating (*te precipiente*) that the archchancellor of Italy's writ ran as effectively in the south as in the north, and continues by being specific only when it cannot be checked. The standing of Salernitan medicine was common knowledge.⁸ Our author adds to it nothing he could not have learnt outside the city except dislike for its inhabitants. *Exosa . . . gens illa dolosa* (v. 6) rhymes with the rancour expressed by his patron against foes whom he had failed to subdue. Those villains were hardly worth the effort, Rainald of Dassel is assured by his doppelgänger, because they had reduced him to beggary. So it is that, in the imagined context of the Mezzogiorno, the Archpoet reintroduces themes familiar from works that he had written in Lombardy. Salerno varies the setting, and provides the pun:

- Quid sim passus ibi, nequit ex toto modo scribi;
iam febre vexatus nimioque dolore gravatus
sic infirmabar, quod vivere posse negabar,
10. et michi dicebant medici, qui signa videbant:
'Ecce, poeta, peris: non vives, sed morieris!'
Sed febrem tandem medicina fugavit eandem,
nostri languoris testis tibi sit color oris
(in vultu pallor apparet adhuc, nisi fallor.)*

⁴ DFI, no. 356, ed. Appelt, 200, 14.

⁵ E. Cuozzo, 'Salerno e la ribellione contro re Guglielmo d'Altavilla nel 1160/62: La versione delle fonti narrative e la testimonianza di quelle documentarie', in F. D'Oria (ed.), *Civiltà del Mezzogiorno d'Italia: Libro scrittura documento in età normanno-sveva* (Salerno, 1994), 29–40.

⁶ E. Cuozzo (ed.), *Catalogus Baronum. Commentario, Fonti per la Storia d'Italia 101*** (Rome 1994), 120–2 (437–9).

⁷ See D. Matthew, 'Semper fideles. I Salernitani nel Regno Normanno', in P. Delogu and P. Peduto (eds), *Salerno nel XII secolo: Istituzioni, società, cultura* (Salerno, 2004), 27–45.

⁸ See D. Jacquart and A. Paravicini Bagliani (eds), *La Scuola medica salernitana: Gli autori e i testi* (Florence, 2007).

15. *Dum sapiens fieri cupio medicusque videri,
insipiens factus sum mendicare coactus.
Nunc mendicorum socius sum, non medicorum.*⁹

What I suffered there cannot be wholly expressed;
tormented by fever and wracked by intense pain,
I fell so ill that they said I could not survive,

10. and the doctors, on seeing the symptoms, declared:
‘Poet, you are perishing: you will not live but die!’
But eventually the medicine put that fever to flight,
the colour of my face bears out the infirmity, as you can see.
(Unless I’m mistaken, I still look pale.)
15. Seeking to become a wise man and play the doctor’s part,
I was reduced to being a fool and a beggar.
Now I keep the company of mendicants, not medics.

All hinges on the wordplay in the last line quoted here. At Salerno, a city renowned for its riches,¹⁰ our author endures poverty after failing to become a member of the medical profession so respected that it could be credited with sanctity.¹¹ When the mistaken diagnosis of the experts gives rise to a characteristic combination of verbal similarity and social inversion—*mendicorum* . . . *medicorum* (v. 17)—we know where we are. As usual, the Archpoet is in penury. As often, he is at death’s door. Varying themes on which he harps elsewhere,¹² he has found a novel method of authenticating his constant need for succour. First, his pallor attests to his illness (vv. 13–14); then the gods bear witness (*dii mihi testes*, v. 22) that he has had to sell his clothes for food (v. 21). Pagan deities provide evidence as reliable as a white face. Pseudo-testimonies support the claim that our author, wishing to be elevated to the status of a medical authority, was demoted to the level of a mendicant-fool. Up and down: in the topsy-turvy world imagined by the Archpoet his cleverness consists in his unverifiability. Salerno providing a material motive, the journey to the south of Italy offers a pretext for requesting largesse in the north. Having declared that he did not wish to beg (*mendicare nolo*¹³), he justifies his importunity by alleging that the odious crooks who defy his master have forced him to plead for alms. QED.

As if to separate this fiction from his real objective, our author alters the form of his work. Leonine hexameters are supplanted by *caudati*: strophes of

⁹ *Carm.* VI, 7–17, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 65. At v. 9 I print J. Fickermann’s conjecture *sic* (recorded 122 ad loc.) rather than the transmitted *hic*.

¹⁰ See V. d’Arienzo (ed.), *Una città nel Mediterraneo: l’Opulenta Salernum* (Salerno, 2001).

¹¹ Cf. V. Flint, ‘The Early Medieval *medicus*, the Saint—and the Enchanter’, *Social History of Medicine*, 2 (1989), 127–45, and, for practice, see P. Skinner, *Health and Medicine in Early Medieval Southern Italy* (Leyden, 1997), 79 ff.

¹² See Chapters VI and IX.

¹³ *Carm.* IV, 19, 1, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 59, and see Chapter VI.

four verses with disyllabic final rhyme. The subject, wholly predictable, is Rainald of Dassel's open-handedness:

*Cum de presulibus male quisque loquatur avaris,
omnes extollunt te laudibus undique claris.
Tu cum trans Alpes famosus ut hic habearis,
re famam superas, non a fama superaris.*¹⁴

Although everyone speaks ill of avaricious bishops,
all praise you to the skies throughout the world.
While you are as famous across the Alps as here,
you surpass your fame in reality, nor does it outmatch you.

We have encountered such eulogy in more than one context.¹⁵ Both ambiguous and reassuring, the praise lacks a geographical focus. On the location of *hic* depends the view over the Alps. But the perspective is Transmontane, for it is Italian bishops who have been branded as avaricious by our author;¹⁶ and, when he goes on to describe his master as 'ruling well, although over a violent people' (*bene cuncta regis, quamvis in gente proterva*, v. 36), he means Rainald's rebellious subjects in the north of the peninsula. In the south, not yet bent to the imperial yoke, the Archpoet has decried a *gens exosa* (v. 6). The two expressions, in the span of thirty verses, are parallel. They differ, however, in their degree of disdain. Aversion to Lombardy is surpassed by antipathy to the Mezzogiorno. And, as our author echoes the loathing that Rainald of Dassel voiced for potential insurrection and actual resistance, the poem draws to its conclusion in two familiar words: *do, das* (v. 42). Reciprocity and patronage here and now are the subjects, not a fictive escapade in the past.

Fiction and falsification were not alien to the archbishop-elect who would make a saint of Charlemagne. After creating an antipope, Paschal III, on 22 April 1164 in succession to Victor IV, he wrote from Vercelli to the cathedral-provost, clergy, and laymen of Cologne on 12 June, announcing his imminent return to that city, which he had not visited for three years. Since the journey was imperilled by 'your enemies and ours'¹⁷—Alexander III and Conrad of Staufen, the emperor's half-brother, who in May had menaced Cologne¹⁸—Rainald of Dassel announced that he would be travelling through Burgundy and France. Caution recommended a circuitous route that avoided Geneva.¹⁹ Care was also needed for the booty in his baggage. With satisfaction he informed his flock that he was bringing from Milan relics of the Magi, together

¹⁴ *Carm.* IV, 31–4, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 66.

¹⁵ See Chapters V and VI.

¹⁶ See Chapter VI.

¹⁷ *Nos siquidem, quia nobis suspecta est via per inimicos vestros ac nostros, iter nostrum per Bungundiam ac Gallias ad vos disposuimus* (H. Floss (ed.), *Dreikönigenbuch: Die Übertragung der heiligen Dreikönige von Mailand nach Köln* (Cologne, 1864), 113).

¹⁸ See B. Brinken, *Die Politik Konrads von Staufen in der Tradition der Rheinischen Pfalzgrafschaft*, *Rheinisches Archiv* 92 (Bonn, 1974), 182 ff.

¹⁹ On the route, see D. Lohrmann, 'Das Papsttum und die Grafschaft Burgund im 11.-12. Jahrhundert', in E.-D. Hehl et al. (eds), *Das Papsttum und die Welt des 12. Jahrhunderts*, *Mittelalter-Forschungen* 6 (Stuttgart, 2002), 62.

with those of the martyrs Nabor and Felix. This translation, which aroused comment from England to Iceland,²⁰ was the major event in Rainald's pontificate before his consecration fifteen months later. His entry into Cologne was greeted with jubilation.²¹ Praise was showered on the benefaction that would make the city into a major centre of pilgrimage. But the Archpoet, who accompanied his patron back to Germany, remained mute.

His silence about these relics was circumspect. Although Rainald of Dassel claimed that they had been presented to him by Barbarossa, he did not state whether he had requested the gift (which is more than likely) nor did he reveal that there had never been a cult of the Magi at Milan. It was manufactured at Cologne by its unscrupulous archbishop-elect,²² possibly on the model of veneration for Charlemagne at Aachen and certainly with an eye to the financial implications of sacral prestige. To this pious fraud the Archpoet never refers, despite his eloquence about a setback that his master endured on territory that had witnessed his first political victory seven years earlier.²³ Besançon in October 1157 may have been on Rainald of Dassel's mind when, en route to Cologne, he entered Vienne late in June 1164. The see maintained primacy in Burgundy against the claims of Arles.²⁴ After the death of Archbishop Stephan, an adherent of Barbarossa, no successor had yet been found.²⁵ Into this vacuum of authority—deepened by divisions within the local episcopate, members of which longed for an end to the schism²⁶—advanced Rainald of Dassel. No bribes were too lavish, no fortifications too costly, to maintain what he conceived as *honor imperii*.²⁷ Flush with funds and legitimized by law, the archchancellor believed that he was in a position to impose his will. Had he not come as the emissary of an emperor who, in a charter of 1157,²⁸ required the citizens of Vienne to satisfy his needs, political and financial, on each of his visits? Was Barbarossa not the master of Burgundy since his happy marriage, in 1156, to Beatrix, daughter of Count Rainald III?²⁹ Here was a golden opportunity to impose Paschal III and efface memories of defeat that

²⁰ See Ralph Niger, *Chronica anglica*, ed. R. Pauli, MGH SS 27 (repr. Stuttgart, 1967), 343, and *Annales islandici*, ed. F. Jónsson, MGH SS 29 (repr. Stuttgart, 1975), 259, with H. Hofmann, *Die Drei Heiligen Könige: Zur Heiligenverehrung im kirchlichen, gesellschaftlichen und politischen Leben des Mittelalters*, Rheinisches Archiv 94 (Bonn, 1975), 103 ff.

²¹ Knipping (ed.), *Regesten*, ii, 132.

²² Plausibly argued by P. Geary, *Living with the Dead in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY, 1994), 243–56.

²³ See Chapter III.

²⁴ See B. Galland, *Deux archevêchés entre la France et l'Empire: Les Archevêques de Lyon et les archevêques de Vienne*, Bibliothèque de l'École française de Rome 282 (Rome, 1994), 43 ff., and, as background, B. Schilling, *Guido von Vienne—Papst Calixt II* MGH Schriften 45 (Hanover, 1998), 42 ff.

²⁵ The date of Archbishop Stephen's death is uncertain, but he disappears from the records in September 1162 and his successor, William de la Tour, does not figure in the sources until 1165. See Galland, *Deux archevêchés*, 51 with n. 80, 716, 730.

²⁶ See P. Fournier, *Le Royaume d'Arles et de Vienne (1138–1378)* (Paris, 1891), 47 ff.

²⁷ See PL 200, 300B–C.

²⁸ DFI, no. 184.

²⁹ See F. Büttner, 'Das politische Handeln Friedrich Barbarossas im Jahre 1156', *Blätter für deutsche Landesgeschichte*, 166 (1970), 54–67, and Büttner, 'Friedrich Barbarossa und Burgund: Studien zur Politik der Staufer während des 12. Jahrhunderts', in *Probleme des 12. Jahrhunderts*,

had dogged the archchancellor since his Burgundian blunder of 1162.³⁰ He failed, however, to reckon with the adamancy of the local episcopate, which, according to a correspondent of Thomas Becket,³¹ rejected his demands and refused to cooperate. Vienne, for Rainald of Dassel, marked a reversal in ecclesiastical politics that acclaim at Cologne three weeks later barely offset. That is why the Archpoet, circumventing the split within the Church, chose to treat instead a breach between himself and his patron. Burgundy provided a background to their mini-schism:

*Fama tuba dante sonum
excitata vox preconum
clamat viris regionum
advenire virum bonum,*

5. *patrem pacis et patronum,
cui Vienna parat tronium.*³²

Fame roused by the sound of trumpets,
heralds' voices bellow to the country-folk
that a good man is making his entry,

5. the father and fosterer of peace,
for whom Vienne prepares a throne.

These verses were written about one of the two most controversial prelates in Christendom during the summer of 1164. At that time Thomas Becket was embroiled in the struggle with King Henry II of England that would lead to his exile during the winter.³³ The archbishop of Canterbury, orthodox and anti-royalist, may seem to present an obvious contrast to the schismatic and imperialist archbishop-elect of Cologne. Much hinged, however, on whether the travails of these contemporaries could be viewed as triumphs; and the Archpoet had an eagle eye for ambiguity. It is evoked in his first word, *fama*. Just as Thomas Becket, to some, was famous for his defence of the Church's liberty and, to others, notorious on account of his obduracy about clerical privileges, so Rainald of Dassel was both extolled by Barbarossa as the chief agent of *honor imperii* and execrated by Alexander III as the leading fomentor of schism. These symmetries of inversion made the related concepts of *fama* and *infamia* appear Siamese twins.³⁴ At an apex of his infamy among the orthodox,

VuF 12 (Stuttgart, 1968), 79–119. For a wider context, cf. F. Baethgen, *Mediaevalia*, i, Schriften der MGH 17, 1 (Stuttgart, 1960), 25–50.

³⁰ See Chapter V.

³¹ Ep. 33, in *The Correspondence of Thomas Becket*, i, ed. Duggan, 124 and n. 16.

³² *Carm.* II 1–6, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 54.

³³ See Barlow, *Thomas Becket*, 88 ff.

³⁴ Cf. P. von Moos, 'Das Öffentliche und das Private im Mittelalter: Für einen kontrollierten Anachronismus' in G. Melville and P. v. Moos (eds), *Das Öffentliche und das Private in der Vormoderne*, Norm und Struktur 10 (Cologne, 1998), 32 ff.; Godman, *Paradoxes of Conscience*, 92 ff., and A. Grondeux, 'Le Vocabulaire latin de la renommée au Moyen Age', in *La Renommée* [= *Médiévalia* 24 (1993)] 15–26.

a year after being excommunicated by the pope, with Paschal III so recently rejected by the Burgundian episcopate, Rainald of Dassel could not but seem contested to the Archpoet.

Unable to state so much, our author implies little less by his choice of a rhythm and a rhyme that, for centuries, had been employed in the poetry of the last days.³⁵ Its form lends his work that air of apocalypse felt by others who called the archchancellor the 'ruin of the world'. Such was his *fama*, in the midsummer of 1164, that it needed to be 'roused' (*excitata*). The participle in the second verse is passive, and its meaning is scarcely specified by the ablative of instrumentality in the first. Which instrument? The *tuba* of divine praise at Psalm 150:3?³⁶ Or the trumpets that sound before the fall of Jericho at Joshua 6? Here and throughout the poem, its diction is biblical; and the most resonant *tubae* of the Latin Vulgate, at Revelations 8:6–9:13, announce God's judgment. Is His verdict on an excommunicate benevolent or damning? No certain answer is provided by v. 4, which proclaims Rainald of Dassel a 'good man', because that proclamation is made by heralds, a role in which our author casts him in another work.³⁷ There the archchancellor is praised as John the Baptist to the emperor's Jesus—at a time when others reviled them both as precursors of the Antichrist.

The message that Rainald of Dassel is arriving is sent to the 'country-folk' of v. 3. This is the point where the Archpoet's diction intersects with the polemic of his peers. At 1 Maccabees 9:61 the expression *virī regionum* is applied to the rural nobility killed by Jonathan, son of Mathiathas, in the struggle against King Antiochus IV Epiphanes of Syria. The schism raging in 1164 was compared with that struggle by one of Becket's correspondents who, like the Archpoet, wrote in the midsummer of the same year.³⁸ Thinking in topical terms of Maccabean analogy, which cast the conflict of the second century bc as a prefiguration of the strife between empire and papacy more than a millennium later, our author draws back. Heralds, not he, announce to gullible rustics that Alexander III's 'criminal, treacherous, and cruel teacher of schismatic error' is a 'father and fosterer of peace' (v. 5). That is why the scene set in these and the following verses is less a majestic advent than a farce. All those who counted at Vienne are absent. No word of the Alexandrian bishops. Far from preparing a 'throne' (v. 6) of homage to Rainald of Dassel or his antipope, they threatened to excommunicate Paschal III in the archchancellor's presence, according to Becket's informant.³⁹ The only actors present on the stage are the secular magnates and entertainers whose idiocy has already been ridiculed.⁴⁰

³⁵ e.g. *Apparebit repentina dies magna Domini* with D. Schaller and G. Könsgen, *Initia carminum latinorum saeculo undecimo antiquiorum* (Göttingen, 1977), no. 46, and F. Brunhölzl, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, i (Munich, 1975), 155, 168, 339. Fundamental remains W. Meyer, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur mittellateinischen Rythmik*, iii (Berlin, 1936), 171 ff.

³⁶ So Watenphul–Krefeld, 95, ad loc.

³⁷ See Chapter VII.

³⁸ See Chapter VII, n. 124.

³⁹ Ep. 33, in *The Correspondence of Thomas Becket*, i, ed. Duggan, 125.

⁴⁰ See Chapter VI.

10. *Multitudo marchionum*
turba strepens istrionum—
iam conformat tono tonum
genus omne balatronum—
intrat ante diem nonum;
15. *quisque sperat grande donum.*⁴¹
10. A multitude of margraves,
 a tumultuous crowd of entertainers—
 every kind of buffoon
 matches note to note—
 enters on the eighth day;
15. each of them hoping for a big gift.

The staccato syntax conveys cacophony. In the uproar of Rainald of Dassel's entry into Vienne, divisions of rank and status lapse. Margraves and jesters merge into the common category of *balatrones*, an unflattering synonym of *leccatores*. Not even the heralds who have announced the 'good man's' arrival can be exempted from the censure. Despite their later pretensions to gentility, they too were classified by the High Middle Ages as a sub-species of entertainer.⁴²

The Archpoet's master is preceded and surrounded by throngs of bellowing buffoons. This is by no means the arrival of a 'vice-emperor' revered by worthy subjects. Their motive for assembling, on the eighth day of judgement (*ante diem nonum* v. 11), at Vienne is the eagerness of venality. What they want, in blunt diction, is a 'big gift' (*donum grande* v. 6). Giving alms to such hangers-on and parasites, rather than to the poor, was a regular target of clerical criticism.⁴³ Having established the negative nature of Rainald of Dassel's retinue, the Archpoet draws a sharp distinction between himself and these clowns:

15. *Ego caput fero pronum,*
tanquam frater sim latronum,
reus inops rationum,
*sensus egens et sermonum.*⁴⁴
15. With bowed head I am
 like a brother of thieves,
 a criminal without extenuation,
 deprived of understanding and words.

⁴¹ *Carm.* II, 7–12, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 54. The punctuation is mine.

⁴² See P. von Moos, 'Der Herold: Ein Kommunikationsexperte', in P. von Moos, *Rhetorik, Kommunikation und Medialität: Gesammelte Studien zum Mittelalter*, ii, Geschichte: Forschung und Wissenschaft 15 (Münster, 2006), 153–72.

⁴³ See Peter the Chanter, *Verbum abbreviatum* 47–8, PL 205, 147–53. Cf. E. Schubert, *Fahrendes Volk im Mittelalter* (Bickfeld, 1995), 112 ff., and Casagrande and Vecchio, 'Clercs et jongleurs'.

⁴⁴ *Carm.* II 13–16, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 54.

Only sackcloth and ashes are missing from his penitent's pose. Yet the stance, in terms of an ethical theory current when these verses were composed, is ambivalent. If a moral agent is deprived of the capacity to reason and understand, Abelard and others claimed,⁴⁵ then guilt cannot be attributed to him. Ambivalent too is the Archpoet's taciturnity. Silent in the tumult, he presents himself as an outsider. Exclusion from the company of greedy fools, however, does nothing to hinder his erudite eloquence:

- Nomen vatis vel personam
manifeste non exponam;
sed quem fuga fecit Ionam,*
20. *per figuram satis bonam
Ione nomen ei ponam.*⁴⁶
- The name and person of the poet
I shall not explain openly;
but to him whom flight made into Jonah,
20. by a fitting prefiguration,
I shall assign Jonah's name.

The outsider advertising his insider's knowledge is a revealing paradox. It reveals the level of culture that the Archpoet assumed on Rainald of Dassel's part. The assumptions, compressed into five octosyllabic verses, were hardly intelligible to a twelfth-century hearer or reader who lacked an advanced training at a cathedral school, such as Hildesheim, fine-tuned by further education in the academic circles of Paris. There the patron had learnt to recognize signals sent so cryptically by the client. His obliquity of style, his denial of directness, were familiar to the archbishop-elect from his own studies of integumental theology. It exalted obscurity in works that made demands that the uninitiated were incapable of meeting.⁴⁷ The primacy of the interpreter, not the text, is an axiom of this hermeneutic method. Restricted to an elite of which his master was a member, it is recalled by our author in order to imply that, despite their breach, he continues to belong to the select company kept by Rainald of Dassel. The only alteration is in the terms of their togetherness.

His double identity as *vates* (v. 17) 'veiled' by a third, the Archpoet is cast as an exegete of himself. To the auto-interpretation, based on the Bible and grammatical theory, is applied the technical term of *figura* (v. 20).⁴⁸ Prefiguring this runaway by his flight, Jonah offers the advantage of anonymity and the comfort of cover. The allusion at v. 21 is to the semantic tradition, derived

⁴⁵ Peter Abelard's *Ethics*, ed. D. Luscombe (Oxford, 1971), 56, 18–22.

⁴⁶ *Carm.* II 17–21, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 54.

⁴⁷ See F. Bezner, *Vela Veritatis. Hermeneutik, Wissen und Sprache in der 'Intellectual History' des 12. Jahrhunderts*, Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 85 (Cologne, 2005).

⁴⁸ See E. Auerbach, 'Figura', in Auerbach, *Scenes from the Drama of European Literature* (Manchester, 1984), 11–78.

from Priscian, which emphasized name-giving and the speaker's intentions.⁴⁹ Intending to mimic the only prophet of the Old Testament whose narrative is enlivened by humour,⁵⁰ and to recall the divine mercy that delivers the fugitive from the belly of a whale, our author puts Rainald of Dassel in the position of God with graceful wit. Unlike the Maccabean analogy at v. 3, which serves to imply but not to state, the *figura* of Jonah leads to an authoritative inference. As construed by Christ (Matthew 12:39–40), the runaway shall be redeemed. Redemption, the Archpoet acknowledges, involves shedding his former self:

- Lacrimarum fluit rivus,
quas effundo fugitivus,
intra cetum semivivus*
25. *tuus quondam adoptivus;
sed pluralis genitivus
nequam nimis et lascivus
mihi factus est nocivus.*⁵¹
- There flows a stream of tears,
which I pour out in flight,
half-dead within the whale,
25. your erstwhile adoptive son;
but the genitive plural
in its exceedingly lewd evil
has been my undoing.

The thought is as dense as the style is paratactic. Both are concentrated on a plight that is redefined rapidly. For the sea away to which Jonah ran is substituted a flood of penitential tears, where the whale has swallowed a figure who resembles less this prophet in flight than the traveller from Jerusalem to Jericho saved, while 'half-dead' (*semivivus* v. 24), by the good Samaritan of Luke 10:30 ff. What began as an image of remorse turns into a metaphor of rescue. And if Rainald of Dassel is to act as the saviour of his 'adoptive son' in the past (v. 25), then the archbishop-elect is also obliged to acknowledge that their relationship persists in the present. *Adoptivus*, recurrent in the liturgy, was applied to Christians after baptism and employed by the law to designate foster children with title to the paternal heritage.⁵² Our author points to a

⁴⁹ Cf. K. Fredborg, 'Speculative Grammar', in P. Dronke (ed.), *A History of Twelfth-Century Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1988), 181 ff.

⁵⁰ See P. Southwell in J. Barton and J. Muddiman (eds), *The Oxford Biblical Commentary* (Oxford, 2001), 593 ff., and cf. C. Fortune, 'The Book of Jonah as a Comic Novella', *Scripture Bulletin*, 36 (2006), 64–73.

⁵¹ *Carm.* II, 22–8, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 54.

⁵² See Blaise, *Vocabulaire*, 527 ad fin., and A. Guerreau-Jalabert, 'Qu'est-ce l'adoptio dans la société médiévale?', in D. Lett and C. Lucken (eds), *L'Adoption: Droits et pratiques [Médiévales 35 (1998)]*, 33–49. The fullest study of legal and historical aspects is B. Jussen, *Patenschaft und Adoption im frühen Mittelalter: Künstliche Verwandtschaft als soziale Praxis* (Göttingen, 1991).

bond deeper and more durable than the court-category of *familiaris*. Intimacy is reaffirmed in an insinuation of filial rights.

Those rights, those obligations, have been violated not by the Archpoet but by the grammar of sex.⁵³ With a grammarian's attention to mood, he alludes in the passive to the effect on him of the 'genitive plural' (v. 26 ff.).⁵⁴ The moralists' term *luxuria*, with its connotations of active promiscuity, is avoided. Fault confessed, blame can be eschewed. A claim is thus made on Rainald of Dassel's complicity. If, as confessor, he notes the equivocality of this avowal, as an ecclesiastical man of the world he is expected not to frown on the solecism in the syntax of penance. Contrary to the rules of religious authenticity that made the sacrament so solemn, the Archpoet extenuates and celebrates what he should damn and deplore:

- Voluptate volens frui*
 30. *comparabar brute sui,*
nec cum sancto sanctus fui.
Unde timens iram tui
sicut Ionas Dei sui
*fugam petens fuga rui.*⁵⁵
- Wishing to enjoy pleasure,
 30. I was like one of his beasts,
 nor was I holy with a holy man.
 And so, fearing your wrath,
 as Jonah did God's,
 I took to flight and perished fleeing.

Genitives again command attention in these verses—genitives of personal pronouns chosen instead of possessives, in order to highlight nuances in the relationship between client and patron. In their inverted world, the schismatic can be described as a saint (v. 31). To him (*sui* v. 30) belongs the beast with whom the Archpoet compares his sexuality. The third person maintaining distance between this sinner and his judge, a degree of proximity is admissible only on conditions of chastisement (*tui* v. 32). Then Rainald of Dassel's anger can be aligned with the wrath of Jonah's God (*sui* v. 33).

The fineness with which these distinctions are drawn between personal pronouns in the genitive has nothing to do with the requirements of rhyme.⁵⁶ The Archpoet's purpose is exact. It is to link the archchancellor with his correction and to dissociate him from its cause. Equal ingenuity and more humour are applied to the whale that swallowed Jonah at vv. 35–49, which is lent a prominence it lacked in the exegetical tradition of this biblical

⁵³ Cf. J. Ziolkowski, *Alan of Lille's Grammar of Sex: The Meaning of Grammar to a Twelfth-Century Intellectual* (Cambridge, MA, 1985).

⁵⁴ See G. van Poppel, 'Der "Genitivus" bei den Vaganten', *Neophilologus*, 5 (1920), 180–1.

⁵⁵ *Carm.* II, 29–34, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 54.

⁵⁶ *Pace* Watenphul–Krefeld, ad loc.

book since Jerome.⁵⁷ At Cologne there were no fewer than three manuscripts, ranging from the eighth to the tenth century, of the saint's commentary,⁵⁸ which had recently been updated by Rupert of Deutz.⁵⁹ As metropolitan of that city, Rainald of Dassel had reason to be aware that this minor prophet aroused interest in his diocese, but neither his scriptural studies, which lacked range and depth, nor the idiosyncratic iconography of medieval fishes prepared him for what our author makes of the whale.⁶⁰ Looming large in the sea of the client's alienation from his patron,⁶¹ it is not only a *figura* of punishment but also a figure of fun. The mirth, however, stops short of the Archpoet's judge. Recalling to Rainald that pardon is expected from one who hears a penitent's avowals, he addresses this 'holy man' in terms of divine adoration.⁶² They are consistent with a dogmatic definition that the archchancellor had witnessed in his youth. In 1148, at the council of Reims which he attended,⁶³ Pope Eugenius III defined confessors as being in the position of God.

Sixteen years had passed, and the conservative opponent of ecclesiastical reform then had now become a frustrated imperialist. His frustration at failure to secure obedience to Paschal III during the synod of Vienne might be exploited. Considered unforgivable by the orthodox, Rainald of Dassel needed a nudge to grant more than pardon to the Archpoet. An opportunity for flattery was offered by the redundant rhetoric of the last days,⁶⁴ to which Barbarossa's minister, always inclined to view Hohenstaufen supremacy in apocalyptic terms, attached significance. Such was the moribund rubbish of redemption that our author brought to life:

*Si remittas hunc reatum
et si ceto des mandatum—
cetus cuius os est latum—*
55. *more suo dans hiatum
vomet vatem decalvatum
et ad portum destinatum
feret fame tenuatum,
ut sit rursus vates vatum*

⁵⁷ See Jerome, *In Ionam* ii, 1 and ii, 8, ed. M. Adriaen, *S. Hieronymi Presbyteris Opera* I, 6, *Commentarii in prophetas minores*, CCSL 76 (Turnhout, 1969), 393, 1 ff., and 401, 268 ff. On the influence of this work, see J.-M. Duval, *Le Livre de Jonas dans la littérature grecque et latine: Sources et influence du Commentaire sur Jonas de saint Jérôme*, 2 vols (Paris, 1973).

⁵⁸ Cologne, Dombibliothek, 52, 53, 54. See Jérôme, *Commentaire sur Jonas*, ed. Y.-M. Duval, SC 323 (Paris, 1985), 126, 132, 136.

⁵⁹ PL 168, 399D ff.

⁶⁰ Cf. E. Fernández Gonzales, 'Realidad, tradición religiosa y maravillas legendarias: Iconografía de la pesca en la Edad Media', in *La Pesca en la Edad Media*, Monografías de la Sociedad Española de Estudios Medievales 1 (Madrid, 2009), 55–70.

⁶¹ On the metaphor of the sea as alienation, see H. Rahner, *Symbole der Kirche. Die Ekklesiologie der Väter* (Salzburg, 1964), 239–303.

⁶² *Carm.* II, 50–1, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 55.

⁶³ See Chapter II.

⁶⁴ See H. Rauh, *Das Bild des Antichrist im Mittelalter: Von Tyconius zum deutschen Symbolismus* (Münster, 1979), 365 ff.; H. Möhring, *Der Weltkaiser der Endzeit: Entstehung, Wandel und Wirkung einer tausendjährigen Weissagung* (Stuttgart, 2000), 176 ff., and, in general, B. Töpfer, *Das kommende Reich des Friedens: Zur Entwicklung chiliastischer Zukunftshoffnungen im Hochmittelalter* (Berlin, 1964).

60. *scribens opus tibi gratum . . .
Te divine mentis fatum
ad hoc iussit esse natum,
ut decore probitatum
et exemplis largitatum*
65. *reparares mundi statum.*⁶⁵
- If you remit this transgression
and command the whale—
the broad-mawed whale—
55. to gape, as is its wont,
and spew forth the scalped prophet
and bear him, wasted with hunger,
to an appointed port,
again to become an Archpoet
60. writing works that please you . . .
An ordinance of divine design
commanded that you be born to this purpose,
by the grace of your valour
and your exemplary open-handedness
65. putting the universal order to rights.

The syntax of this prophetic phantasmagoria is more than staccato. The first clause of unreal condition lacks a second one of fulfilment. The mood is optative, and the writer's identity remains indeterminate. A *vates vatum* (v. 59) only on the plane of wishful thinking, he prefers pseudonymous celebrity to figural disgrace. Small wonder, for he has been 'scalped' (*decalvatum*, v. 56). Unprecedented in Latin exegesis of the Book of Jonah, this term was used literally of punishment by humiliation and figuratively of the crucified Christ.⁶⁶ A saviour is needed, which is why Rainald of Dassel is extolled, at v. 65, as *reparator mundi* in liturgical language normally reserved for Jesus on the day of judgement.⁶⁷ The judge of our author, however, is spared the stress of the last days and the torment of the passion, since he is not required to give up his life. Giving generously at Vienne is enough to put the world to rights.

The world to which the Archpoet refers is unashamedly his own, and in it he hastens to restore the reciprocity of *do, ut des*:

70. *Non timebo Ninivitas,
neque gentes infrontas;
vincam vita patrum vitas
vitans ea que tu vitas.
Poetrias inauditas*

⁶⁵ *Carm.* II 52–65, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 55–6.

⁶⁶ A good survey is offered in *Mittelateinisches Wörterbuch*, iii. D–E (Munich, 2007), 65, 25 ff. On the hairless Jonah in sculpture, see Strecker, 'Die zweite Beichte des Erzpoeten', 246.

⁶⁷ Blaise, *Vocabulaire*, 375–6.

75. *scribam tibi, si me ditas!*⁶⁸
70. I shall not fear the Ninevites,
nor the shameless unbelievers;
my life shall surpass that of the Fathers,
avoiding what you avoid.
I shall write unheard of poetry
75. for you, if you enrich me!

The fearlessness is feigned. What grounds has a non-Jonah to dread the Ninevites? They represent penitents in the exegetical tradition,⁶⁹ from which our author departs once again. This time too the subject is identity. Just as his hovers in the void of a pseudonym (v. 59), so theirs is hidden by the obscurity of an anagram (v. 70). No one is named. As vague as 'Viennites', the Alexandrian bishops of Burgundy, 'impenitent' in their opposition to the antipope, serve as foils to the Ninevites of remorse. In their company are placed the 'disbelievers' (*gentes*) of the next line. Those so 'shameless' (*infronitas* v. 71) as to doubt the authority of Paschal III are threatened with the same treatment they had meted out to Rainald of Dassel the previous year. Assuming an attitude of 'holier than thou' at v. 72, the Archpoet goes on to define his anathema in terms of the ostracism prescribed by St Paul (Titus 3:10–11) for those who err in faith (v. 73). With the orthodox thus stigmatized as heretics, excommunication boomerangs back on Alexander III and his supporters. Only self-interest can impose order on such a topsy-turvy world. No less bluntly than those hoping for a 'a big gift' at v. 12, our author proffers poetry in exchange for wealth. If 'unheard of' (*inauditas* v. 74) verse is on offer, so is the sample delivered by this descent in register. It lowers reciprocity to the level of barter. The deal is direct, but it has been reached by an oblique route.

The obliquity with which the Archpoet writes, in contrast to this exclamation of plain speech, made stringent demands on his hearers. The audial impact of tirades of disyllabic rhyme—variable in length, ominous in their associations of the last days, and unfamiliar to Germanic ears in a verse-form then current among French authors⁷⁰—was meant to be unnerving. Intending both to shock and to amuse in a medium that amplifies his message, our author stages a carnival of concepts where identity is masked by analogy, penance shades into provocation, and irony borders on blasphemy. Training in the liberal arts hardly prepared Rainald of Dassel or anyone else for this combination of outrageousness and originality. Yet it is not the level of culture presupposed by the Archpoet that arrests our attention. Knowledge of the Bible, its exegesis, and grammar, or familiarity with themes of scholastic

⁶⁸ *Carm.* II, 70–5, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 55. The punctuation is mine.

⁶⁹ Cf. Jerome, *In Ionam* ii. 5 ff., ed. Adriaen, 405, 74 ff., 134.

⁷⁰ Cf. K. Langosch, *Hymnen und Vagantenlieder: Lateinische Lyrik des Mittelalters mit deutschen Versen* (Darmstadt, 1954), 336, drawing (without specific acknowledgement) on Strecker, 'Die zweite Beichte', 250 ff.

philosophy and hobby-horses of Parisian theology were unexceptional among his clerical contemporaries. The singularity of his style and thought derives rather from his wit than from his erudition.

Remarkable less for learning than for the uses to which it is put, his *œuvre* stands apart from, and above, even the most accomplished words of his peers in Latin Europe. Others had polish and virtuosity, but none of them wrote with the risqué yet refined sense of humour that the *vates vatum* assumes his patron will share. Narrow in its boundaries yet broad in its horizons, this compact of comedy enables the Archpoet to talk straight to Rainald of Dassel:

- Ut iam loquar manifeste:
paupertatis premor peste.
Stultus ego qui penes te
nummis equis victu veste*
80. *dies omnes duxi feste;
nunc insanus plus Oreste,
male vivens et moleste,
trutannizans inhoneste
omne festum duco meste;*
85. *res non eget ista teste.*⁷¹
- Now to speak openly:
I am plagued by poverty.
As a fool in your entourage
with money, mounts, food, and clothing,
80. I spent every minute on holiday;
now, madder than Orestes,
leading a bad and troublesome life,
a disreputable tramp,
I pass every holiday in sadness;
85. that fact needs no witness.

The notarial attestation in which 'Rainald H' specialized as an official of the chancery is unnecessary on the scene of his disgrace. This fallen favourite, once showered with the material benefits that a minister received from his lord (v. 79),⁷² has been reduced to the desolate circumstances of a tramp. Nothing could be further from a 'goliardic' idealization of life on the road. The Archpoet's is the lament of a displaced courtier, but hardly of the kind whose bondage to the belly he pillories elsewhere. When his past life is recalled as a daily revel (v. 80), the liturgical image is not of terrestrial parties but of joys in heaven.⁷³ Likening his mental distress to that of Orestes in an echo of Persius

⁷¹ *Carm.* II. 76–85, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 55–6.

⁷² See Keupp, *Dienst und Verdienst*, 83 ff., and Wiese, *Hof*, 47 ff.

⁷³ Cf. Blaise, *Vocabulaire*, 448 ff.

(iii. 118) at v. 81,⁷⁴ our author caps the classical allusion with a medieval verb of vagrancy (*trutannizans*, v. 83). High and low, sophisticated and vulgar: these shifts of register mark divisions of identity. Split within himself, the Archpoet claims that he can become whole only in the company of his patron:

*Pacis auctor, ultor litis,
esto vati tuo mitis
neque credas imperitis;
genitivis iam sopitis*

90. *sanctior cum heremitis—
quicquid in me malum scitis
amputabo, si velitis!—
ne nos apprehendat sitis,
ero palmes et tu vitis!*⁷⁵

Founder of peace, avenger of strife,
be merciful to your poet
and do not believe the inexpert;
with the genitives laid to rest,

90. I shall be holier with hermits—
whatever you consider evil in me
I shall prune, if you wish!—
and to avoid the snares of thirst,
I shall be the branch and you the vine!

Three audiences—real, hypothetical, and anonymous—are invoked in these verses. Decried by others as the chief troublemaker in Christendom, Rainald of Dassel is depicted by his client as a prince of peace. The language is again liturgical;⁷⁶ the tone is tongue-in-cheek; and the nouns, pronouns, and optative mood referring to this messiah are singular (vv. 87, 88, 94). He does not keep the company of humble hermits, who are secluded from the scene in a plural of parenthesis (vv. 91–2). Their ‘pruning’ represents an adynaton, evoked only to complement the biblical image of viticulture that forms the conclusion. Between these two audiences is placed a third. By his request that they be disbelieved (v. 98), the Archpoet implies that it is composed of his detractors. But the language of enmity is not used. A different criterion is employed to undermine their credibility. They are written off as *imperiti*. In the mock-morality of insiders’ knowledge created by our author, lack of skill (*imperitia*) is a vice opposed to the virtue of *prudentia*. If it follows, by antithesis, that his saviour and he are *periti*, then others must be unbelievable on account of their inexpertise. What, then, is it that they do not know?

⁷⁴ This source is identified by Manitius, *Gedichte*, ad loc, 53.

⁷⁵ *Carm.* II 86–94, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 56. The punctuation is mine.

⁷⁶ Blaise, *Vocabulaire*, 272, 607.

Others in the archbishop-elect's entourage may have been aware that, a generation earlier in his diocese, across the river from Cologne, Rupert of Deutz had performed the feat of revising Augustine's commentary on the Gospel of St John. Defending his liberty to reinterpret the sacred text against critics of his presumptuousness, Rupert had described Scripture as 'an exceedingly spacious field held in common by all Christians, in which no one can be denied the right to work'.⁷⁷ That right is now claimed by the Archpoet in a display of his own skill. Rupert, commenting on John 15:4,⁷⁸ had identified the branch and the vine to which the apostle refers with the minister of the sacraments and the unity of the Church, concluding that to divide them is to cause schism; and our author adapts the same thought to a trope of his inseparability from Rainald of Dassel (vv. 93–4). Against the background of crisis between Alexander III and the antipope that still persisted, in the context of this client's breach with his patron now reverting to togetherness, the complicit couple savours the spice of a private joke for which others have no taste. Here can be detected a cultural difference between two sides locked in conflict. On the one, Alexandrian and solemn, mirth so unsparing of clerical propriety was deprecated as the moral fault of *scurrilitas*. On the other, imperialist and defiant, criticisms so devoid of humour were dismissed as the intellectual and social flaw of *imperitia*. Similarly subjective criteria led to opposite verdicts, because the values on which they were based are incommensurable. The prime value of our author and his master amounts to more than skill. The sophistication needed to appreciate what Rainald of Dassel applauded and John of Salisbury deplored is not possessed by the numerous if nameless opponents of the duo that the Archpoet contrives to reunite. Having turned to his own advantage his patron's setback in the midsummer of 1164, he deflects the power-hungry politician's attention to drink. Hailed as a redeemer, how can the 'ruin of the world' decline this invitation to companionship in cups?

* * *

From Vienne, Rainald of Dassel set out for the Rhine and sailed downstream, the relics of the Magi that he bore with him performing prodigies en route until, on 23 July 1164, he and his entourage arrived at Cologne. Before their departure for the imperial assembly convened at Bamberg on 18 November, our author stayed in the richest city of the Reich. A flourishing economy, invigorated by the wine trade,⁷⁹ supplied but did not suffice the archbishop-elect's need for funds, which he lavished on campaigning in Italy. Neither prudent in the management of his finances nor concerned with the commerce

⁷⁷ PL 169, 827–8, with M. Arduini, *Neue Studien über Rupert von Deutz*, Siegburger Studien 17 (Siegburg, 1985), 55–63, and Godman, *The Silent Masters*, 24 ff.

⁷⁸ *Commentaria in Evangelium S. Iohannis*, ed. R. Haake, CCCM 9 (Turnhout, 1969), 650, 1937 ff.

⁷⁹ See E. Ennen, 'Kölner Wirtschaft im Früh- und Hochmittelalter', in H. Kellenbenz (ed.), *Zwei Jahrtausende Kölner Wirtschaft*, i (Cologne, 1975), 87–194, and cf. P. Strait, *Cologne in the Twelfth Century* (Gainesville, FL, 1974).

that made viticulture profitable, Rainald of Dassel was not graced with the episcopal title 'father of the vineyards' (*vinearum pater*⁸⁰), which he ignored. Such mundane matters were beneath his notice, trained at the time on building a new palace in the city,⁸¹ and he may have been taken aback when the Archpoet, in the last of his datable works, dwelt on a rise in wine prices at Cologne. There, in contrast to Vienne, this worldly prince of the Church might be accepted as he was and could even be styled what he was not—a defender of the faith.⁸² That task was undertaken in Rainald's name by subordinates during his prolonged absences from his archdiocese. Heresy had been detected and smoke had cleared from the pyres where, on 5 August 1163, Cathar heretics were burnt to death. One of the earliest attempts to analyse Catharism along Augustinian lines was dedicated to him by Ekbert, the friend of his youth who was soon to become abbot of Schönaue.⁸³ No such road to preferment was viable for the Archpoet, who never refers to the Cathars and spares only a quizzical glance for other developments in religious life on the Rhine.

A distinctive feature of Rhineland religiosity was the presence of what John of Salisbury snidely called 'Teutonic prophetesses'.⁸⁴ The most influential among them was Hildegard of Bingen, who preached both to the clergy at Cologne and against the Cathar heresy.⁸⁵ Despite her singularity, Hildegard was not alone. Her correspondent and acolyte, Elisabeth of Schönaue,⁸⁶ the sister of Ekbert, was another visionary, about whom tongues had wagged at Cologne for years.⁸⁷ Unlike many others of her ilk, who inclined to vagueness,⁸⁸ Elisabeth was specific about the supernatural. She provided details about the occasions—in general, Sundays—on which her transports into the other world took place. Heaven, for her, was not a formless throng of saints and angels, but a hierarchy, rigidly regimented.⁸⁹ Oral tradition at Cologne diffused these features of her experiences, situated midway between the

⁸⁰ See N. Grass, *Alm und Wein: Aufsätze aus Rechts- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, ed. L. Carlen and H. Faussner (Hildeheim, 1990), 302 ff.

⁸¹ Cf. Burkhardt, *Mit Stab und Schwert*, 649, no. 42.

⁸² PL 195, 11–14.

⁸³ The best study of Catharism in the Rhineland and of Ekbert's role in combatting it is now U. Brunn, *Des contestataires aux 'cathares': Discours de réforme et propagande antihérétique dans le pays du Rhin et de la Meuse avant l'Inquisition*, Collection des Études Augustiniennes. Série Moyen Âge et Temps Modernes 41 (Paris, 2006), 207 ff.

⁸⁴ See Chapter V.

⁸⁵ See Brunn, *Des contestataires aux 'cathares'*, 245 ff., and cf. B. Kienzle, 'Defending the Lord's Vineyard: Hildegard of Bingen's Preaching Against the Cathars', in Muessig (ed.), *Medieval Monastic Preaching*, 170–3.

⁸⁶ Cf. J. Loos, 'Hildegard von Bingen und Elisabeth von Schönaue', in A. Brück (ed.), *Hildegard von Bingen, 1179–1979: Festschrift zum 800 Todestag der Heiligen* (Mainz, 1979), 263–72, and A. Clark, *Elisabeth of Schönaue: A Twelfth Century Visionary* (Philadelphia, 1992), 21 ff.

⁸⁷ *Visionen*, ed. Roth, 2, 73–4, and Brunn, *Des contestataires aux cathares*, 280 ff.

⁸⁸ See C. Carozzi, *Le Voyage de l'âme dans l'au-delà d'après la littérature latine (Ve–XIIIe siècle)*, Collection de l'École française de Rome 189 (Paris, 1990), and cf. P. Dinzelsbacher, *Vision und Visionsliteratur im Mittelalter* (Stuttgart, 1981).

⁸⁹ See *Visionen*, ed. Roth, 11 ff. Noted by P. Dinzelsbacher, 'Klassen und Hierarchien im Jenseits' in *Soziale Ordnungen im Selbstverständnis des Mittelalters*, *Miscellanea Medievalia* 12/1 (Berlin, 1979), 38–9, and cf. Clark, *Elisabeth of Schönaue*, 68–128.

vernacular culture prevalent among ecstasies of the twelfth century and the learned literature ascendant in the thirteenth.⁹⁰ Figures like Elisabeth and Hildegard did not fit seamlessly into masculine models of the Church. Divine oracles to their admirers, they appeared cranks to their critics. Ironical by temperament, the Archpoet, on returning to the Rhineland, was confronted by holy women who vied for the supremacy as a mega-seer (*vates vatum*) he had so recently attributed to himself. The time had come at Cologne to show how prophecy could be turned into prank and offer, against the background of a monastery restricted to men, an alternative to the effusions of such female visionaries in the archdiocese. Neither of them had addressed Rainald of Dassel, who was excommunicated in this world. In the next, however, he might be shown that our author had his interests at heart.

Above in the heaven of the blessed, not below in the hell of the damned, tact rather than truth had to locate a vision presented to the archbishop-elect of Cologne. In that city, where the influence of Elisabeth was not uncontested, the occasion of the poem could only be a Sunday—more or less:

1. *Nocte quadam sabbati somno iam refectus,
cum michi fastidio factus esset lectus,
signo crucis muniens frontem vultus pectus
indui me vestibus quibus eram tectus.*⁹¹

1. On a Saturday night, refreshed by sleep,
after I had become bored by lying in bed,
making the sign of the cross on my forehead, face, and chest,
I dressed in the clothes with which I was covered.

It is not quite Sunday but, the Archpoet adds (3, 1), the moment before dawn when the morning star appears. With ironical pedantry he labours the occasion on which Elisabeth of Schönau was accustomed to dwell with solemn precision. Yet the apparatus of ecstasy that she laid on with a trowel is pared away. Far from being ravished with joy or dumbfounded by terror, our author does not even bother to get out of bed. 'Neither lying back nor standing upright' (*nec accumberem nec starem rectus* 2, 1), this semi-supine visionary dresses because he is bored.

Dressing in the clothes under which he has been sleeping, the Archpoet reminds Rainald of Dassel that he has again failed to supply the bedding owed to his minister.⁹² Down to earth even when being elevated to heaven, our author can hardly conceal his lack of interest in all that enraptured Elisabeth. The other world is so sublime as to be inexpressible—*non valet exprimere verbis os facundum* (4, 4)—meaning that it is tedious to rehearse a catalogue of celestial banalities. Only what he does not see arouses his eloquence. No Homer, no Aristotle: Augustine alone dominates philosophy (7). Such bigotry about

⁹⁰ Cf. Richalm von Schöntal, *Liber revelationum*, ed. P. G. Schmidt, MGH Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 24 (Hanover, 2009), XXVIII.

⁹¹ *Carm.* V, 1 ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 62.

⁹² See Chapter VI.

secular learning was mocked by Rainald of Dassel in his correspondence with Wibald of Stablo,⁹³ and the Archpoet mimics their mirth at narrow-minded orthodoxy. The profane studies represented by Homer and Aristotle were not incompatible with Augustinian theology for these ecclesiastical men of the world. From the private terms of a joke shared with his patron, our author turns to the public sphere, the way to which in heaven begins with the archangel Michael, whose cult had boomed within living memory.⁹⁴ Taking this visionary into his confidence, he enhances his importance but restricts his ability to prophesy because, at the top of the celestial hierarchy, secrets revealed may not be divulged (8 ff.). Lower down the ladder of the other world, however, discretion is not required by Rainald of Dassel's guardian angel. A windbag of war, he backs the most belligerent and least realistic ambitions of the imperialists:

2. *Per hunc regnum Siculi fiet tui iuris,
ad radicem arboris ponitur securis;
tyrannus extollitur et est sine curis,
sed eius interitus venit instar furis.*⁹⁵
2. Through him the Sicilian's kingdom will become yours by right,
an axe is pointed at the root of his tree;
the tyrant may be elated and free of care,
but his destruction approaches furtively.

How seriously can this prophecy have been taken in 1164? Two years earlier Barbarossa had broken off preparations for the campaign against Sicily that he had long been making and hastened north, leaving Rainald of Dassel to settle strife between Genoa and Pisa.⁹⁶ Now the emperor had again returned from Italy to Germany, and his archchancellor at Cologne remained as preoccupied with the schism and its consequences as previously. In this stalemate of imperial policy, King William I of Sicily had every reason to be 'free of care'. Secure in his anti-Hohenstaufen alliance with Byzantium, he was occupied in embellishing pleasure palaces.⁹⁷ To abuse him in such terms as *Siculus . . . tyrannus* was merely to parrot the polemic of an earlier generation against his father, King Roger II.⁹⁸ The expression, already dated, had begun to ring hollow.⁹⁹ By 1164 the conquest of Sicily seemed less an object of prophecy

⁹³ See Chapter II.

⁹⁴ See A. Schaller, *Der Erzengel Michael im frühen Mittelalter: Ikonographie und Verehrung eines Heiligen ohne Vita*, *Vestigia Bibliae* 26/27 (Berne, 2009), 1993 ff.

⁹⁵ *Carm.* V, 12, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 63.

⁹⁶ See *Annali Genovesi di Caffaro*, ed. Belgrano, 32, and Chapter IX.

⁹⁷ Romuald of Salerno, *Chronicon*, 1164–5, ed. C. Garufi, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores vii* (Città di Castello, 1938), 252, 21–253, 2, and cf. D. Matthew, *The Norman Kingdom of Sicily* (Cambridge, 1992), 270.

⁹⁸ Cf. H. Wieruszowski, 'Roger II of Sicily, Rex-Tyrannus, in Twelfth-Century Political Thought', *Speculum*, 38 (1963), 46–78.

⁹⁹ Cf. T. Reuter, 'Vom Parvenü zum Bündnispartner: Das Königreich Sizilien in der abendländischen Politik des 12. Jahrhunderts', in T. Kölzer (ed.) *Die Staufer im Süden: Sizilien und das Reich* (Sigmaringen, 1996), 54 and n. 37.

than an illusion of the past. Militant but outmoded, Rainald of Dassel's guardian angel exposed the supernatural as unreal.

Less unreal, because more directly linked with the Archpoet's circumstances at Cologne, was the figure of St Martin, praise of whom rises to hymnic heights (14 ff.). In the other world he had to be entreated not to complain to God about Rainald, who had failed to halt the 'savage wolves' (*lupi sevi* 17,2) that were depredating his possessions. The reference is to the monastery of Great St Martin, which was then locked in a dispute about its properties. Although its rights had been confirmed by Pope Adrian IV in a charter that Abbot Adelhard, who still held office, obtained in 1158,¹⁰⁰ one of the benefactions was challenged.¹⁰¹ Distracted by his many concerns (18, 1–2), Rainald of Dassel was neglecting the needs of Great St Martin, where the Archpoet had convalesced in its noted hospital (21–2, 25).¹⁰² The topography is exceptionally detailed. Rarely does our author specify the place where his works were recited, the only parallel being Pavia, the city in which he sets his 'confession'.¹⁰³ Here the urban context is diminished, but the choice of location remains significant. This poem is not situated in the cathedral close, whose chapter during the autumn of 1164 was acquiring prominence in the life of the local church that had hitherto been dominated by the college of priors.¹⁰⁴ One of them, in his capacity as abbot of a Benedictine monastery, was Adelhard, who had received none of the relics of the Magi from which the cathedral-chapter profited handsomely. Recompense is offered to him in the Archpoet's humorous warning to Rainald of Dassel. The subject is less St Martin than the foundation that bore his name, to which is attributed a central position in the ecclesiastical politics of the city at the very time it was beginning to lose influence. So it is that our author's request on behalf of the monastery is cast as an intercession with its patron in favour of the archbishop-elect, whose salvation is jokingly made to depend on a property dispute at Cologne. There he is urged to give priority to the affairs of Great St Martin. In the autumn of 1164, that meant demoting to second place another regional issue—Rainald of Dassel's feud with Count-Palatine Conrad of Staufen:

20. *Fac ergo concordiam cum sancto Martino
qui pro te multociens me potavit vino;
quod hec pax sit melior quam cum Palatino
novit quisquis agitur spiritu divino.*¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁰ See P. Opladen, *Gross St Martin. Geschichte einer stadtkölnischen Abtei*, Studien zur Kölner Kirchengeschichte 2 (Düsseldorf, 1954), 27, 127.

¹⁰¹ Cf. G. Frenken, 'Der Erzpoet und das Kloster St. Martin in Köln', *Jahrbuch des Kölnischen Geschichtsvereins*, II (1929), 130–5.

¹⁰² Opladen, *Gross St Martin*, 122 ff., and cf. K. Schambach, 'Ein neuer Versuch zur Erklärung des Carmen V ('Nocte quadam' usw.) des Archipoeten', *Annalen des historischen Vereins für den Niederrhein*, 102 (1918), 82–98.

¹⁰³ See Chapter VIII.

¹⁰⁴ See Groten, *Priorenkolleg und Domkapitel von Köln im Hohen Mittelalter*, 78 ff., 211 ff.

¹⁰⁵ *Carm.* V, 20, 4, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 64; cf. with B. Schmeidler, 'Noch einige Bemerkungen zum Carmen V (IX) des Archipoeta', *Annalen des historischen Vereins für den Niederrhein*, 103 (1919), 186–91.

20. Come to terms with St Martin
 who, on your behalf, has so often doused me with wine;
 that peace with him is better than with the [Count-]Palatine
 everyone animated by the Holy Spirit knows.

Observe the title at 20, 3. Only the archchancellor and the emperor are similarly specified by rank in the Archpoet's *œuvre*. Every other spiritual or secular magnate is assigned to anonymity. At a moment of tension between Barbarossa's half-brother and his own master, whose animosity reached back to a clash in Italy,¹⁰⁶ our author singles out Conrad of Staufen. In the autumn of 1164, he is not described as the arch-enemy, although that is what he must have seemed since threatening Cologne in the spring. A settlement between these hostile parties was on the agenda of the imperial assembly scheduled for 18 November, which the Archpoet anticipates. A week earlier, on the feast day of St Martin, before the archbishop-elect of Cologne and Abbot Adelhard, a 'good shepherd' (*bonus pastor* 25, 4) who is flattered to his face, our author begins by addressing the concerns of his host and goes on to make a demand in his own interest:

*debes mihi magnum quid in hoc festo dare*¹⁰⁷
 you should give me a big present on this feast day

These were timely words, calculated to jog Rainald of Dassel's memory. On 11 November, the feast day of St Martin who shared his cloak with a beggar, it was customary to offer largesse and to appeal for generosity (or to pay taxes in the kingdom of Italy). When, during their journey from Milan, the Archpoet accompanied the archchancellor to Remagen, legend maintained that the convoy transporting the relics of the Magi had been held up by St Martin until some of the holy loot was deposited in a chapel dedicated to him.¹⁰⁸ Protector of the Franks and pillar of monasticism.¹⁰⁹ this spiritual giant dwarfed the count-palatine. A conflict with the mighty Martin took precedence over a feud with Conrad of Staufen, who seemed a laughable lightweight even to an observer who was, as ever, at death's door:

22. *Quamvis tamen moriar et propinquum fini*
et me fata terreant obitus vicini,
non possum diligere nomen Palatini,
*per quem facta carior est lagena vini.*¹¹⁰
22. Although I am dying and near the end,
 terrified by being destined to perish so soon,
 I cannot care for the 'Palatine',
 who has made a gallon of wine dearer.

¹⁰⁶ See Görich, *Friedrich Barbarossa*, 336 ff.

¹⁰⁷ *Carm.* V, 20, 4, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 64.

¹⁰⁸ Hofmann, *Die Drei Heiligen Könige*, 107.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. D. von der Nahmer, 'Martin von Tours: Sein Mönchtum und seine Wirkung', *Francia*, 15 (1987), 1–41.

¹¹⁰ *Carm.* V, 22, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 64.

The audience that heard this strophe being recited at Great St Martin on 11 November 1164 will have known that the monastery possessed extensive vineyards affected by Conrad of Staufen's embargo,¹¹¹ and understood that Cologne was a centre of the German wine trade.¹¹² But the point here is not primarily economic. Just as the Archpoet is unequal to Jesus' command to love one's enemies, so he is incapable of the Christian virtue of moderation in drink. Although *in extremis*, he wants wine by the gallon. The rise in its price, caused by a blockade on the Rhine, is our author's theme; and the butt of this joke is as much himself as the count-palatine:

23. *Afflixit iniuriis populum et clerum,
sed de tot iniuriis diversarum rerum
ego non conquerer, ut iam loquar verum,
nisi michi carius venderetur merum.*
24. *Ut tyrannis comitis exponatur ipsi,
tales versus facio, quales nunquam scripsi:
omne ve quod legitur in Apocalipsi
ferat, nisi liberet vites ab eclipsi!*¹¹³
23. He has afflicted the clergy and people,
but about so many wrongdoings of various kinds,
to tell the truth, I should not complain,
had not the price of undiluted wine become dearer for me.
24. To expose the count's tyranny to him,
I write such poetry as I've never composed:
he shall suffer all the woes about which one reads in Apocalypse
unless he frees the vines from embargo!

It is worth noting that Conrad of Staufen was a member of the confraternity that supported Great St Martin's.¹¹⁴ Among the lay associations that performed charitable tasks at Cologne, this was one of the most active.¹¹⁵ A self-appointed spokesman of the monastery's interests could not afford to alienate a donor who, however vexing at present, might prove useful in the future. Hence an amused chuckle, not an angry curse, at the count-palatine. As unreal as the epic that might have composed about Barbarossa,¹¹⁶ the imprecations against Conrad's 'tyranny' remain hypothetical. Had the Archpoet seriously intended to give him the apocalyptic treatment, rather than

¹¹¹ Opladen, *Gross St Martin*, 165.

¹¹² This, and not a reference to Gratian (*pace* Landau, *Der Archpoeta*, 34), is the point, which demonstrates nothing about legal lore.

¹¹³ *Carm.* V, 23–4.

¹¹⁴ Opladen, *Gross St Martin*, 81.

¹¹⁵ See H. Jakobs, 'Bruderschaft und Gemeinde: Köln im 12. Jahrhundert', in B. Schwineköper (ed.), *Gilden und Zünfte: Kaufmännische und gewerbliche Genossenschaften im frühen und hohen Mittelalter*, VuF 29 (Sigmaringen, 1985), 304 ff., and B. Laqua, *Bruderschaften und Hospitäler während des hohen Mittelalters: Kölner Befunde in westeuropäisch-vergleichender Perspektive*, Monographien zur Geschichte des hohen Mittelalters 58 (Stuttgart, 2011).

¹¹⁶ See Chapter VII.

threatening it in jest, models were offered by the visionary literature of the earlier Middle Ages. The work might have been set not in heaven but in hell, where the count could have been depicted suffering the torments of the damned, like Charlemagne in Walahfrid Strabo's *Visio Wettini*.¹¹⁷ Instead our author makes light of the embargo he professes to deplore, quaffing wine denied to others in Great St Martin (25, 3). In that 'cloister of pasturing' (*in pascue clauastro* 25, 2)—a refuge for beginners in the faith, according to the most authoritative exegete of the Psalms¹¹⁸—he enjoys an idyll of self-indulgence wholly at odds with the Rule of St Benedict.¹¹⁹ Monastic values of penance and abstemiousness turned on their heads, this image of *crapula* in the cloister serves to ingratiate the foundation with Rainald of Dassel. A sceptic of monks and their other-worldly ideals, he had reason to relish with Schadenfreude a vision that so wittily brought both down to earth. There, in the Benedictine asceticism observed by Abbot Adelhard, whom the Archpoet praises for having fed him well (*me bene pavit* 25, 4), St Martin's was notorious for its frugal table.¹²⁰

* * *

On earth and in heaven our author imagined a world unlike the schools where he had studied and the chancery in which he served. If the other notaries who were his colleagues attended the oral delivery of this vision in verse, they cannot have failed to note that 'Rainald H' was again setting himself apart from them. Although a degree of flexibility was admissible in their work, names, dates, and places are indispensable in charters. From such drudgery of authentication our author exempted himself on 11 November 1164. 'Here' (*hic* 25, 3) at Great St Martin, the occasion was indicated by the context, which made it superfluous to name the abbot or to specify that *presul* (9, 4) and *domine* (17, 4) refer to Rainald of Dassel. In this poetry for insiders nothing is spelt out, other than a demand for patronage. Cryptic and concentrated, the Archpoet makes little allowance for those who lack his mental agility. Before a gathering of initiates whose number is unlikely to have run into double figures,¹²¹ the mega-seer can afford to be oracular. He is not, however, portentous in the moralizing manner of Hildegard and Elisabeth. These 'Teutonic prophetesses' remain in the background at Bingen and Schönau, where women know their place, as foils to the irony with which the vinous *vates* chides Conrad of Staufen for a rise in wine prices at Cologne. Local politics are reduced to a joke at the expense of the meddling visionaries and the troublesome count by a writer wary of polemic and brazen in self-interest. The charm of his importunity is enhanced by this prophetic pose in what is, for us, the final scene of a series

¹¹⁷ See *Poetry of the Carolingian Renaissance*, ed. Godman, no. 27, 214.

¹¹⁸ Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos* I—1, ed. Dekkers and Fraipont, 134, 1–3.

¹¹⁹ See Chapter I, n. 3.

¹²⁰ Opladen, *Gross St Martin*, 78.

¹²¹ Cf. P. Ganz, 'Friedrich Barbarossa: Hof und Kultur', in Haverkamp (ed.), *Friedrich Barbarossa*, 127 ff.

that inverts religious roles. After taking the limelight as feigned penitent, the Archpoet made a second and hardly less spectacular appearance as a preacher of sin, before bowing out in his costume of anti-actor. Comedy is not clowning, he has demonstrated to Rainald of Dassel, the main audience and chief inspiration of the parts he has enacted. That is why there is piquancy in the fact that the last extant charter of 1 August 1167 by 'Rainald H' records Barbarossa's gratitude for 'the many splendid services' of 'our most faithful prince and venerable archbishop of Cologne',¹²² the most recent of them being his victory at the battle of Tusculum on 29 May.¹²³ Thirteen days after this document was issued, on 14 August, the 'ruin of the world' perished in the epidemic that decimated the German army at Rome, and the precondition for the alternative identity of our author ceased to exist. Deprived of his doppelgänger, the Archpoet was no more.

¹²² DFI, no. 532.

¹²³ Knipping (ed.), *Regesten*, ii. 156.

XI

The Culture of the Barbarians

Medieval emperors seldom deferred to medieval scholars. ‘Your excellency’, ‘so mighty a mentor’, ‘the authority of your expertise’ are rare acknowledgements of intellectual superiority with which Otto III, in a well-known letter of late 996 or early 997 to Gerbert of Aurillac, disarmingly contrasted ‘our ignorance’.¹ With the plural of majesty qualified by the noun of humility, Otto went on to oppose the ‘Saxon lack of sophistication’, which (he implied but did not state) he had inherited from his father, to the Greek subtlety transmitted by his mother, the Byzantine princess Theophanu († 991). A rough diamond, in short, whose paternal edges, if burnished by Gerbert, the future Pope Sylvester II, might be brought to a maternal sheen. They already glowed with irony. Declaring his marginality to the world of learning, Otto III demonstrated his membership of it while reciting its clichés. A semi-barbarian by ethnic origin,² he aspired to belong to the élite of high culture; and signalled his eagerness with six verses that, limping in irregular rhyme, confirm all too clearly the want of training to which he refers.³ Yet they offer the most touching testimony to the prestige of Latin verse composition by a Saxon before the Archpoet.⁴

Our author, who never mentions his background in Saxony, describes himself as a Teuton only when praising German generosity and slighting Italian avarice. No cloud of cultural disadvantage that he should dispel by humility or humour darkens his Transmontane horizon as he gazes quizzically at both sides of the Alps. Secure in his membership of the *res publica litterarum*,

¹ *Vestrae dilectionis omnibus venerandam nobis adiungi volumus excellentiam et tanti patroni sempiternam nobiscum stabilitatem adoptamus, quia vestre doctrine disciplinata proceritas nostre simplicitati semper fuit haud fastidians auctoritas. Attamen ut omni ambage dimota ad vos nude veritatis fruamur loquela, iudicavimus et firmum disposuimus, ut hoc manifestet vobis haec nostre voluntatis epistola, quod in hac re summa nostre adoptionis et singularitas est petitionis, quatinus nobis indoctis et male disciplinatis vestra sollers providentia in scriptis necnon et dictis non praeter solitum adhibeat studium correctionis et in re publica consilium summe fidelitatis. Huius ergo nostre voluntatis in non neganda insinuatione volumus vos Saxoniam rusticitatem abhorre, sed Greciscam nostram subtilitatem ad id studii magis vos provocare, quoniam si est, qui suscitaret illam, apud nos inveniatur Grecorum industrie aliqua scintilla* (Ep. 186, in *Die Briefsammlung Gerberts von Reims*, ed. F. Weigle, MGH Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit 2 (Weimar, 1966), 221, 8–12–222, 1–8).

² Cf. K. Modzelewski, *Das barbarische Europa: Zur sozialen Ordnung von Germanen und Slaven im frühen Mittelalter*, trans. H. Petersen (Osnabrück, 2011), 37–64, and A. Borst, *Barbaren, Ketzer und Artisten: Welten des Mittelalters* (Munich, 1989), 19–32.

³ *Versus numquam composui | nec in studio habui. | Dum in usu habuero | et in eis viguero, | quot habet viros Gallia | tot vobis mittam carmina* (ed. Weigle, 223, 1–6).

⁴ Cf. T. Haye, ‘Die lateinische Poesie im niedersächsischen Raum’, *Niedersächsisches Jahrbuch für Landesgeschichte*, 82 (2010), 221–40.

the Archpoet shares the self-confidence expressed by Otto of Freising. Beyond the Roman empire ruled by his nephew, where peace prevailed, he discerned mere barbarians and Greeks, who had reason to quail at Barbarossa's might.⁵ All the hauteur of Latin civilization was directed by Otto against those who did not know its tongue. No matter that the Byzantine historian Niketas Choniates likened the language of Westerners to oil and its words to 'darts, sharper than a two-edged sword'.⁶ At his most incisive when voicing scorn for the degenerate citizens of Rome, Otto of Freising regarded them as his nearest version of the 'other'⁷—attached to the *orbis Romanus* but not part of it, verbose in their venality and absurd in their arrogance.⁸ The real Romans, by virtue and achievement, were his own people, to which had passed cultural leadership together with imperial dominion.

In the course of little more than a century and a half, the self-image of German thinkers had been transformed, unlike the stereotypes that continued to be applied to them during the Victorine schism. Then categories of culture and religion were merged in an age-old manner, and the imperialists, schismatic from the Alexandrian point of view, could be abused as barbarians. The most adamant, the least-informed, purveyor of these platitudes was John of Salisbury. Regularly missing the mark with his barbs, he once hit it, although not as he aimed. When he censured the 'linguistic tomfoolery' displayed by Rainald of Dassel, John summed up with inadvertent shrewdness a distinctive feature of Transmontane culture. It was developed in the verse of the Archpoet after he had countered clichés of anti-German polemic in prose.⁹ Beginning as a retainer and companion to Rainald of Dassel, he was commissioned to become a defender of their cause. The chancery's chief, who first employed him there less for his skill in drawing up documents than for his expertise in rhetoric, knew that his predecessors had been masters at advancing the interests of their side. Wibald of Stablo, the doyen of the older generation, both impersonated the king and cozened the pope with the subtlety of a sophist in which he took pleasure.¹⁰ Virtuosity without scruple characterized the milieu in which our author moved at the outset of his public career and, in 1157 at Besançon, he witnessed his master exploiting the ambiguity of a Latin term to intimidate papal legates. Observing the theory of equivocation that they had both studied at Paris being turned to practical use, the Archpoet may have been gratified but not surprised. Otto III, for his part, never imagined a Saxon outwitting curial cardinals.

⁵ *Unde hoc tempore scribentes quodammodo iudico beatos, dum post turbulentiam preteritorum non solum pacis inaudita relaxit serenitas, sed et ob victoriosissimi principis virtutes tanta Romani imperii pollet auctoritas, ut et sub eius principatu gens vivens humiliter silendo conquiescat, et barbarus quique vel Grecus, extra terminos ipsius positus, auctoritatis eius pondere pressus contremiscat* (Prol., ed. Schmale, 114, 6–13).

⁶ See R. Browning, 'The Greeks and Others: From Antiquity to the Renaissance', in T. Harrison (ed.), *Greeks and Barbarians* (Edinburgh, 2002), 271.

⁷ For the concept, see W. Nippel, 'The Construction of the "Other"', in Harrison (ed.), *Greeks and Barbarians*, 278–310.

⁸ See Chapter III.

⁹ See Chapter IV.

¹⁰ See Chapter III.

The significance of the éclat at Besançon is not only political. Three cultures clashed in that famous scene. The first of them was Transmontane and more than equal in sophistication to the second, which, despite Roman pride in refinement, had to acknowledge that it had been worsted. The third, to which Barbarossa belonged, remained in the wings, while clerics occupied centre-stage. Marginal to this drama enacted in Latin, laymen depended on Rainald of Dassel's translation into the vernacular. That made them liable to manipulation, as Wibald had noted with an amusement that the Archpoet altered into dismissal: *laici non sapiunt ea que sunt vatis*.¹¹ The laity did not understand verse, which he describes as particular, because it was set in a world exempt from secular control. Even if they had an oral grounding in the learned language without acquiring skills in reading and writing,¹² outsiders were unable to grasp what our author recited from a text that, possibly committed to memory, had certainly been composed for the bookish insiders of his circle. The verbal competence of semi-literacy was distant from the fluency of bilingualism that the Archpoet presupposes; and the gap between them is illustrated by an anecdote about Barbarossa, who was better able to understand Latin than to talk it, according to Rahewin.¹³

This story about the emperor is not above suspicion, for, transmitted in a thirteenth-century version of Otto Morena's chronicle, it is also recounted of his son, Henry VI;¹⁴ but it commands a degree of plausibility because it corresponds to a pattern attested in other sources that, exaggerating Barbarossa's abilities, reveal his limitations. On a ride with the Bolognese jurists Bulgarus and Martinus in 1158, he enquired whether he was the master of the world.¹⁵ Against the background of Roncaglia, five years before that question was answered so emphatically by the Archpoet,¹⁶ the right to rule was on the imperial mind. As Barbarossa did not know Italian and it is highly improbable that Bulgarus and Martinus spoke Alemannian, in the absence of an interpreter a *lingua franca* was required. Riding between the experts on a palfrey, the emperor may be credited with the modest capacity to ask: *Anne sum dominus mundi?*—rather than what he meant, which was: *Nonne sum dominus mundi?* (a rhetorical form entailing the answer 'yes'). This reconstruction is supported by the fact that, when Bulgarus gave the wrong answer and Martinus the right one, the Hohenstaufen Caesar dismounted from his horse and made a present of it to the obliging jurist.

¹¹ *Carm.* IV, 20, 3, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 59.

¹² Cf. A. Wendehorst, 'Who could Read and Write in the Middle Ages?', in A. Haverkamp and H. Vollrath (eds), *England and Germany in the High Middle Ages: Festschrift K. Leyser* (Oxford, 1996), 57–88.

¹³ *Gesta Frederici*, iv, 86, ed. Schmale, 710, 22 ff.

¹⁴ See J. Fried, *Die Entstehung des Juristenstandes im 12. Jahrhundert: Zur sozialen Stellung und politischen Bedeutung gelehrter Juristen in Bologna und Modena*, *Forschungen zur neueren Privatrechtsgeschichte* 21 (Cologne, 1974), 110 and 136 n. 30.

¹⁵ Ed. F. Güterbock, *MGH SrG NS 7* (Berlin, 1930), 59, 16–26.

¹⁶ See Chapter VII.

The successor by election, not the son and heir, of Conrad III, Barbarossa was seeking reassurance from specialists in law about his authority as Roman emperor. In that role he made appearances at theological debates, less out of enthusiasm for divinity than in order to make the imperial presence felt. Yet no one appealed to the intellectual acumen of a layman whose background was military; and even Gerhoh of Reichersberg, who conversed (or argued) with him in the vernacular on more than one occasion, denounced the errors of his opponent, Folmar of Triefenstein, not to the ruler of the world but to his chaplains.¹⁷ They were the eyes of his nephew, in Otto of Freising's accurate metaphor, reading and translating from Latin what was to be heard by that ruler's ears.¹⁸ The literacy of Angevin monarchs during his lifetime was beyond Barbarossa's range;¹⁹ and he remained distant from a milieu where his praises were sung by the Archpoet in a language of which he had only a smattering.²⁰ Encomium on the emperor was meant for his partner in power.

It is Rainald of Dassel who emerges as the key figure in the cultural history of the reign. Notable for the Latin literature, ranging from the history by Otto of Freising and Rahewin to the works of our author, produced with the encouragement or complicity of his master, it is negligible for the Middle High German prose and poetry connected with Barbarossa's court.²¹ Imperial patronage of the vernacular is attested in Old French, the native language of his consort, the Burgundian Beatrix, to whom was dedicated Walter of Arras's *Ille et Galeron*, the sole and remote resemblance of which to the Archpoet's works consists in techniques of casuistry.²² Just as alien to the audience of his *œuvre* as the courtly romance was Provençal verse, whose fortuitous affinities with his writing owe nothing to influence on either side.²³ The youthful exuberance of our author, different from that of the *trobar clus*,²⁴ is intended for those at home in the learned language. Impervious to the *langues d'oïl et d'oc*, which he might have picked up in France where he developed an ear for rhythms practised by Latin poets, and indifferent to literary developments in his native land, he wrote for members of a circle not only closed to laymen but also divided among themselves. Others in the archiepiscopal entourage are

¹⁷ See Classen, *Gerhoh von Reichersberg*, 252 ff.

¹⁸ See Chapter II.

¹⁹ Cf. V. Galbraith, 'The Literacy of Medieval English Kings', in Galbraith, *Kings and Chroniclers: Essays in Medieval English History* (London, 1982), 92 ff.

²⁰ Cf. V. Huth, "'Gekrönter Esel" oder "zweiter Sokrates?" Das Bild Barbarossas und seines Hofes im Kontext zeitgenössischer Wissenskultur', in *Friedrich Barbarossa und sein Hof*, Schriften zur staufischen Geschichte und Kunst 28 (Göppingen, 2009), 99–126.

²¹ See P. Johnson, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zum Beginn der Neuzeit ii. Vom hohen zum späten Mittelalter i. Die höfische Literatur der Blütezeit (1160/70–1220/31)* (Tübingen, 1999), 5 ff.

²² Gautier d'Arras, *Ille et Galeron*, ed. Y. Lefèvre (Paris, 1988). The date of the romance is (poorly) discussed by C. Pierreville, *Gautier d'Arras: L'Autre chrétien [?Chrétien]* (Paris, 2001), 13 ff., and its matrimonial casuistry by R. Schnell, 'Von der kanonistischen zur höfischen Ehekasuistik: Gautiers *Ille et Galeron*', *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 48 (1982), 257–95.

²³ See Chapter VI.

²⁴ On the category, see U. Mölk, *Trobar clus—Trobar leu: Studien zur Dichtungstheorie der Troubadors* (Munich, 1968).

reduced by the Archpoet to anonymity as carping critics and boring boneheads, over whom Rainald of Dassel towers in verse that, on the datable evidence, was recited before him between the autumn of 1162 and that of 1164. During this brief and concentrated period, it is implausible that our author composed many works that do not figure in his extant *œuvre*. It may be incomplete, but it is representative. No epic, no lyric, by the Archpoet has been lost; and formalism's attempt to foist on him instances of the very commemorative genres that he avoided assiduously misjudges the character of his writing,²⁵ which admitted neither satires nor parodies such as *Carmen Buranum* 42.²⁶ Ironical where others are hard-hitting, oblique when they are direct, he styles himself the exponent of a deviant culture, turned in on itself.

* * *

A root of that deviancy is irreverence. Thinking about Christendom, or the parts of it he had seen on his travels, the Archpoet did not envisage a city of God. He imagined an urban expanse, like those he had visited in Italy, over which loomed symbolic towers. Some stood for pride, others for aggression; none of them was a monument to truth.²⁷ The truth-claims that might be made by literature left him cold; our author warmed instead to the verisimilitude of lies. When he observes that Alethia's tower is absent from Pavia,²⁸ he intends to commend that scene of his misdeeds. Room for eternal verities is not made by a town of transgression that accommodates mendacity. In verse, the medium of untruthfulness that it had been taught to mistrust, the Archpoet's audience is invited to view his sins as sources of inspiration. But where was it to look? Tradition, which offered no precedent, hardly helped. If this rogue could not be taken at his word, how should it be construed? The shrewdness of his stance derived from the fact that, although plainly reprehensible, it was hardly refutable in the twelfth century. Not only did an answer to the sophistical arguments of the Archpoet need to be found; account had also to be taken of their humorous form, which made them both more and less than affirmations. No high medieval theory of literature prepared his critics for our author's pyrotechnics of paradox; all they had were musings on St Augustine's concept of the 'joking lie'.²⁹ So the literal-minded copied the

²⁵ The attribution to the Archpoet of the sequence about Charlemagne's canonization, *Urbs Aquensis, urbs regalis* (*Analecta Hymnica* 21), is rightly rejected by E. Eisenlohr, 'Die älteste Niederschrift der Sequenz *Urbs Aquensis, urbs regalis* im letzten Viertel des 12. Jahrhunderts und ihre mögliche Verbindung zum Kaiserkult Barbarossas', *Zeitschrift des Aachener Geschichtsvereins*, 96 (1989), 35–68.

²⁶ *Carmina Burana*, ed. A. Hilka and O. Schumann, i. 2, *Die moralisch-satirischen Dichtungen* (Heidelberg, 1930), 76 ff., and Fried, 'Der Archipoeta—Ein Kölner Scholaster?', for further speculation of this kind.

²⁷ See Chapter VIII. ²⁸ See Chapter VIII.

²⁹ On Augustine in the twelfth-century discussion about mendacity, see the valuable analysis of M. Colish, 'Rethinking Lying in the Twelfth Century', in I. Bejczy and R. Newhauser (eds), *Virtue and Ethics in the Twelfth Century* (Leiden, 2005), 155–74, and A. Landgraf, 'Die Einschätzung der Scherzflüge in der Frühscholastik', *Theologisch-praktische Quartalschrift*, 93 (1940), 3–11.

'confession', generally ignoring the rest of the *œuvre*, and travestied that masterpiece of irony into a drinking-song. Perhaps the Archpoet would have claimed pyrrhic victory at leading them so far down the path; but he is unlikely to have wandered up it to the dictum: 'an ironical statement is not a statement.'³⁰

What our author refrains from stating is rich in implication. When, for example, he declares:

*meum est propositum in taberna mori*³¹
it is my intention to die in a pub

it is not just that the pomposity in the first half of the verse is undercut by the profanity in the second. It is also that his ventriloquism speaks in two tones—the one moral, the other mocking. This combination of contraries inhibits the Archpoet's readers or hearers from asking whether he means what he says. The issue of sincerity has become ingenuous in a 'confession' that, far from baring the secrets of his heart, conceals them. That is the point of the irony. More than a rhetorical device or a political ploy,³² it conveys the elusiveness of his moral identity. He plays Proteus to a dual audience that includes detractors who realize that he is anticipating their reproaches. But they cannot pin him down to a charge because, whenever he comes within range of their rancour, he changes shape. Amused by these metamorphoses, Rainald of Dassel grasps that this verse, construed *au pied de la lettre*, invites censure as a statement by a reprobate. And he also understands that it is meant as an aphorism of anti-conformity. In six words our author conveys to his patron a fundamental feature of the mentality that separates them from others. It drew on a millennial tradition of thought and expression, whose chief resource was the Latin Vulgate. Inaccessible to laymen, it was intelligible to conventional clerics only in part. They may have detected biblical details of the Archpoet's style, but they are unlikely to have drawn, from this amalgam of the secular and the sacred, its implication: ethical order inverted amid the topsy-turvy of schism.

The image of our author is also turned upside down by symmetries of strife. A weapon in the arsenal of what he calls his 'many arguments', irony is not used in open combat. Avoiding the polemical battlefield and its tactics of assault, he chooses a subtler strategy to outflank his foe. The Archpoet's foe was in the ascendant at the time he wrote, and would rise to dominance as scholasticism imposed its criteria of univocality. They were already ripe by the time he began to resist them, as is illustrated by the *Metalogicon*, the first book of which John of Salisbury sets in the Paris where they had both studied. From the same milieu emerged incompatible approaches to the issue of hermeneutic control. The text is not to be forced, declares John; 'soft beatings' are

³⁰ B. Williams, *Truth and Truthfulness: An Essay on Genealogy* (Princeton, 2002), 73.

³¹ *Carm.* X, 12, 1, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 75, and see Chapter VIII.

³² Irony is still discussed in these terms by G. Althoff and C. Meier, *Ironie im Mittelalter: Hermeneutik—Dichtung—Politik* (Darmstadt, 2011).

recommended to yield its meaning;³³ polysemy and ambiguity should be reduced or eliminated.³⁴ The exegete, bent on extracting ethical implications from the classics, is less a devotee than a rationalist. Reason is sceptical of the fictionality dreamt up in visions, for the holiest of holies is the primary reference at a literal level.³⁵ Interpretative restraint being the guiding principle, sophistry is dismissed by John of Salisbury. His bugbear is the Archpoet's idol. Revelling in mental gymnastics,³⁶ he builds his work on principles of dialectic. There is seldom a *sic* without a *non* in writings that consistently imply the opposite of what they state. Irony is of their essence, for our author does not believe in a single or simple truth to be teased out of the text. Instead he teases into his poems the complexity that results from orthodox values being stood on their heads.

All is not inversion. There are standards that remain upright. The first, the most salient, is self-interest, by which the Archpoet measures the importunity of his requests or demands. Frequently insistent, he never begs. With 'goliards' who eek out a living from alms he has nothing in common. If need, accompanied by illness, requires him to stretch out his hand, he also stands on his rights as the minister, confidant, and doppelgänger of his lord. Although their obligations are mutual, reciprocity does not only mean coins for verse. Symbolic significance is attached to material commodities, chief among them garments. They form a leitmotif of the *œuvre*. Few Latin writers of the Middle Ages harp more on how they are outfitted and look. When our author appears hard up, a reproach is implied to the patron responsible for clothing him. This, however, is merely the literal level of his sartorial speech. On a figurative plane he recalls Jesus Sirach (19:27), who affirms that the ways we dress, smile, and behave reveal our character,³⁷ which is why congruence between garments and status was expected.³⁸ Protesting that he ought not to dig on account of his background and culture,³⁹ the Archpoet fears the social degradation that was indicated by shabbiness.⁴⁰ A visual image is evoked, a contrast between the splendour of the scarlet livery in which Rainald of Dassel arrayed his ministers and the drabness of the grey dress prescribed for peasants since Charlemagne. What our author does not mention is the difference to be expected between a cleric's sobriety and the flair of a knight.⁴¹

³³ Cf. Godman, *The Silent Masters*, 149 ff.

³⁴ Cf. Bezner, *Vela Veritatis*, 626 ff.

³⁵ Bezner, *Vela Veritatis*, 616–17.

³⁶ Cf. Moos, *Geschichte als Topik*, 280 ff.

³⁷ Quoted by Keupp, *Die Wahl des Gewandes*, 39, whose recent study of the subject is the best available.

³⁸ See M. Dinges, 'Der "feine Unterschied": Die soziale Funktion der Kleidung in der höfischen Gesellschaft', *Zeitschrift für historische Forschung*, 1 (1992), 49–76.

³⁹ See Chapters VI and VIII.

⁴⁰ See M. Dinges, 'Von der Lesbarkeit der Welt zum universalisierten Wandel durch individuelle Strategien: Die soziale Funktion der Kleidung in der höfischen Gesellschaft', *Saeculum*, 44 (1993), 90–112, and G. Jaritz, 'Social Grouping and the Languages of Dress in the Late Middle Ages', *The Medieval History Journal*, 3 (2000), 235–59.

⁴¹ Cf. S. Krüger, 'Charakter militaris und charakter indelebilis: Ein Beitrag zum Verhältnis von miles und clericus im Mittelalter', in L. Fenske et al. (eds), *Institutionen, Kultur und Gesellschaft im Mittelalter. Festschrift J. Fleckenstein* (Sigmaringen, 1984), 567–80.

The only reference to ecclesiastical apparel in his *œuvre* is deliberately misleading: the *pallium*, which he claims to wear and which was denied to Rainald of Dassel by the pope.⁴² Papal prohibitions account for the ostentatious air of worldliness with which the Archpoet elsewhere alludes to clothing, for his doppelgänger had long refused to part with the finery that made him resemble a secular magnate. 'Now and in the future', he and other Germans had announced in 1148, resistance would be adamant to the sartorial reform announced by Eugenius III at the council of Reims.⁴³ Unreformed and unreformable, they persisted in going their way, which led to schism in 1159. Seven years before that rupture and one previous to his death, in 1152 Bernard of Clairvaux lamented to the self-same pope that his efforts had been in vain. Modish garments and provocative tailoring were still in vogue among the clergy:

Raise your gaze now and see whether ill-suited commodities in skin do not disfigure the sacred order just as much as before and, yet again, whether outsized slits virtually unbare the private parts! They are accustomed to say: 'Is God more concerned about clothes than conduct? No!' But this pattern of sartorial unseemliness reveals their mentality and morality! What is the point of clerics wishing to be and seem different—that is, less chaste and less authentic? They display themselves as knights by their dress, as clerics by their acquisitiveness, and as neither by their actions, for they do not fight like knights, nor do they preach like clerics. To which order do they belong? Wishing to be in both, they abandon and confuse them.⁴⁴

Here are the issues, here are the metaphors, on which our author drew in his preoccupation with garments. If the Archpoet does not dress up, that is only because in his reduced circumstances he lacks the means mustered by Rainald of Dassel, who, contrary to the ruling at Reims, still wears a parti-coloured cloak. Concern with social prestige is magnified by resistance to religious conformity. In such prohibited clothing members of what John of Salisbury called an *ecclesia particularis* made their estrangement visible.⁴⁵ No matter if righteous prigs took exception to a joke about the *pallium*. Their disapproval merely heightened its humour for one who revelled in playing the 'other'. Otherness was a charge of barbarity that the Archpoet refuted by voicing the claims of a different civilization.

Difference does not entail inferiority is his retort to those who, appalled by misbelief and misconduct in the imperial camp, rehearsed platitudes of

⁴² See Chapters II and IX.

⁴³ See Chapter II.

⁴⁴ *Et nunc leva oculos tuos, et vide si non aequae, ut prius, pellicula discolor sacrum ordinem decolorat, si non aequae, ut prius, fissura enormis paene inguina nudat? Solent dicere: 'Num de vestibus cura est Deo et non magis de moribus?' At forma haec vestium deformitatis mentium et morum indicium est! Quid sibi vult quod clerici aliud esse, aliud videri volunt? Id quidem minus castum minusque sincerum. Nempe habitu milites, quaestu clericos, actu neutrum exhibent. Nam neque pugnare ut milites, neque ut clerici evangelizant. Cuius ordinis sunt? Cum utriusque esse cupiunt, utrumque deserunt, utrumque confundunt. De consideratione v. 19, (S. Bernardi opera, ed. J. Leclercq and H. Rochais, iii (Rome, 1963), 447, 21–448, 1). The passage is well discussed by Keupp, *Die Wahl des Gewandes*, 68, who, however, garbles the text.*

⁴⁵ See Chapter V.

anti-German polemic and repeated slogans of reform. Our author set out to show how far such admonition and abuse lagged behind the times in works that shattered traditional expectations. From their fragments he constructed an alternative in opposition to received wisdom. Unlike many of his peers and predecessors in the Latin literature of the Middle Ages, the Archpoet did not worship at the shrine of antiquity. The proportions of his *œuvre* set him apart from admirers of the classics who aspired to erect a monument as enduring as their models. The grand scale, incompatible with his occupations as a notary on the move, is left by our author to the historians at Freising. Who could match, in prose, the Virgilian splendour and the Lucan-like pungency displayed by Otto of Freising? Certainly not the worthy Rahewin nor, perhaps, even our author. In verse he might cater to a select audience and discriminating palates. Rainald of Dassel shared his Transmontane taste for spice, the piquancy of which was enhanced by contrast with their colleagues' diet of intellectual cabbage. The high table of the Archpoet is laid for two.

From the elevation of their exclusiveness this duo looks down on the rest of the retinue. One of its members may be named, although not on evidence provided by our author. The notary Burkhard was the archchancellor's admirer, as his colleagues will have wished to seem. All are implied to be types of the toady and the backbiter. Hypocrisy is ascribed to them, since they practise the vices they criticize. Secretive about their faults, they are reluctant to open their purses. Meanness with money, duplicity, gullibility: the archiepiscopal entourage is composed of foils to the generosity, urbanity, and shrewdness exemplified by the Archpoet and Rainald of Dassel. They form the centre of a court that is little more than a name,⁴⁶ the only official identified being a butler, at whose dilution of wine fun can be poked with the mildness due to an open secret.⁴⁷ Consider the tirades against vile drink, miserable food, permanent chaos, and corrupt functionaries that Walter Map, Peter of Blois, and others pen with poison. By such twelfth-century standards of ferocity, our author is reticent and restrained. He journeys throughout the empire, its breadth indicated by three places: Italian Pavia, Burgundian Vienne, and, at German Cologne, Great St Martin's. This is an imperial itinerary, often documented by dates and locations in charters, not aimless vagrancy. The stately progress of the Archpoet has little to do with the turmoil and torment that high medieval courtiers claimed to have suffered during their errant lives. If, like them, he complains about penury, it is with the sense of fun that imagines an escapade to Salerno, a city of fabled learning that imparts to him as little knowledge of medicine as it does to Burnellus the Ass in Nigel of Longchamps's *Speculum Stultorum*.⁴⁸ The Archpoet's world is a haven of humour that seldom collides with reality. When accident imposes a clash, he soon withdraws to the confines of the enclosure shared by Rainald and himself. There harmony prevails and

⁴⁶ *Carm.* IV, 32, 3, ed. Watenphul-Krefeld, 61, and see Chapter VI.

⁴⁷ See Chapter VIII.

⁴⁸ *Speculum Stultorum* 717 ff., ed. F. Albin (Genoa, 2003), 50 ff.

soul-searching is minimal. On the subject of the potential conflict between his roles as courtier and cleric, about which Peter of Blois and his likes fretted so fruitlessly,⁴⁹ our author remains relaxed. There is no hint of dilemma.

Above whispers of denigration from colleagues his voice rings out crisp and clear, separating the Archpoet from their number and cementing his partnership with his patron. Yet their mutual understanding, which condones his boldness, does not permit familiarity. Deference is displayed. Even in works that play on complicity with his *doppelgänger*, our author attends to hierarchy. Unlike the emperor and his half-brother, whose titles—*caesar*, *imperator*, *dominus mundi*, *palatinus*—trumpet their rank or pretensions, Rainald of Dassel is addressed in lower-keyed terms of strict accuracy. After being chosen by the priors of Cologne as their *presul*, he did indeed become, *ex officio*, archchancellor of Italy and long remained *electus* because he had not been consecrated. This diction, precise and prosaic, serves to subdue a figure viewed by his enemies as a monster of arrogance. Circumspection is the obverse of the archness vaunted on different subjects. Amply attested in the correctness with which our author refers to his lord, a similar caution is revealed by the triad of problems avoided or scarcely mentioned: defeat, schisma, excommunication. The dominant impulse is to rouse the spirits of his chief in the chancery. Yet the verse, however partisan, does not duplicate what 'Rainald H' was employed to write in prose. The Archpoet draws selectively on his notarial work, omitting solecisms that had been imposed on him. *Sacrum imperium*, for example, which the archchancellor had favoured since 1157, is dropped in the following decade, when our author diverged from his master with reticence. The wariness of one who declared that he never set foot in the court without being on guard (*non . . . imprudenter*⁵⁰) balances the refinement he attributes to Rainald of Dassel. The more emphatically the Archpoet dwells on his patron's courtliness, the deeper is his awareness of a darker side.

Medieval German bishops could be depicted as ecclesiastical men of the world, with qualities of self-mastery, dignity, real or affected concern for others.⁵¹ Few of them, however, required so voluminous a veil to be drawn over their perceived faults as the 'ruin of the world'. His wit and intelligence were offset by impetuosity and ruthlessness. To avoid crossing that iron will, our author drew the conclusion that it was wiser to make Rainald laugh than to venture a political view. Although the laughter might border on blasphemy and candour was permitted on topics that were taboo for others, these elastic limits are not stretched by the Archpoet to include manifest frauds. His silence, already deafening about events between 1158 and 1163, continues to fall later when encomium was called for: no word of Rainald's triumph at Cologne with

⁴⁹ See J. Cotts, *The Clerical Dilemma: Peter of Blois and Literate Culture in the Twelfth Century* (Washington, 2009), with the review by S. Jaeger, *English Historical Review*, 127 (2012), 137–9 and Jaeger, *The Origins of Courtliness*, 54 ff.

⁵⁰ *Carm.* IV, 32, 3, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 61, and see Chapter VI.

⁵¹ See Jaeger, *The Origins of Courtliness*, 19 ff.

faked relics of the Magi in July 1164, his consecration against his wishes and interests in October 1165, or his canonization of Charlemagne the following December. The answer to the objection that works on these subjects may have been lost is provided by the extant *œuvre*. Its outspokenness on private matters is equalled by its determination to skirt controversy on public issues. After an effort to sing Barbarossa's praises against the grain, the Archpoet declined to respond to the whim of the moment or the need of circumstances. Never an occasional writer, he had a talent individual to the point of idiosyncrasy, which was not adaptable to topics that involved risk. This is indicated by the muteness he maintained during a period of upheaval; why he did so may be illustrated by an example from counter-factuality. Had Paschal III died in the epidemic of August 1167 and Rainald of Dassel survived, a German candidate—possibly himself—would have been likely to be elevated to the throne of St Peter by the Hohenstaufen forces then occupying Rome. Although that would have been a foreseeable consequence of the policy pursued since September 1159, it is far from clear that the Archpoet would have seized the opportunity and extolled the papal virtues that his patron was required to sham against all evidence. Our author had grounds to hesitate at hailing the spurious sanctity of Rainald after refusing to celebrate the dubious holiness of Charlemagne. And, if he had complied in 1167, he would have ceased to be our author.

* * *

The Archpoet we have come to know is like none other, which may be why he is unrecognized. In a work that describes itself as 'the major reference-resource for all aspects of the Middle Ages' he merits only the briefest of misleading entries⁵²—but, then, so does medieval Latin literature, unless it is allegorical or written in England, although space is made for Faroese ballads.⁵³ The fact that there has never been a book about our author would not seem, among claims of comprehensiveness, to be the only reason for such elisions.⁵⁴ In his case, they amount to a large lacuna. But a lacuna of what sort? Literary terms alone are inadequate to fathom this thinker, who championed a clericalism that was cultural. The rites of observance, the dictates of decorum, the habits and humbug of his order moved the Archpoet to mirth. What concerned him was the status of scholar defined rather by command of the learned language than by religious vocation. Latin granted him membership of an elite hardly distinguishable from knights by conduct or dress. The social class from which he descended was not to be spurned, unless it trespassed on territory that he considered his own. To him and other clerics belonged the domain of letters,

⁵² *The Oxford Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, i. ed. R. Bjork (Oxford, 2010), 127.

⁵³ *The Oxford Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, i. 1002–11.

⁵⁴ The pamphlet by G. Luhde, *Der Archipoeta: Seine Persönlichkeit und seine Gedichte* (Berlin, 1932), is a contribution less to scholarship than to aestheticism and is never cited, perhaps because it has become a rarity. I have consulted it, not without pleasure, in the Lyrik-Kabinett of Munich University.

beyond whose bounds he relegated actors and idiots. They should be restricted to the largesse of laymen as abysmally ignorant as themselves. Higher in our author's hierarchy figured Rainald of Dassel, giving as cheerfully as the gospel enjoins, not in order to practise the virtue of charity but to lend the lustre of gratitude to images of himself being painted by his client. These portraits are set within a temporal frame provided by the Christian calendar, beginning and ending on holy days: All Saints (1 November) 1162 and St Martin (11 November) 1164. Orthodox time-reckoning is applied to a schismatic with no sense of incongruity, and each work by the Archpoet forms a diptych. On one side Rainald beams in full colour: on the other our author, in proximity to his patron, lurks half-concealed by the chiaroscuro of irreligiosity. We detect his grin, but do not see his face.

It is hidden behind masks worn by members of his order for centuries. The penitent and the preacher, the encomiast and the visionary, were roles established in Christian culture long before the Archpoet played them, corroding the burnish of belief they were meant to entail with the sophistry of his scepticism. John of Salisbury might have called him a Cornifician. The term, although pertinent, does not quite fit the bill. More than a hair-splitter, a logic-chopper, and obscurantist, our author questions the possibility of truthfulness. Spiritual authenticity, for him, is not demonstrated by avowal; criticism of misconduct falls short of proving uprightness; commonplaces, truisms, platitudes are exposed as inept. Nor does the Archpoet believe in Peter Abelard's morality of intended action. Intention is regarded by him as unknowable: action, at best ambivalent, provides no guarantee of ethical purpose. And while our author deals with doctrine in his sermon, its unholy conclusion casts doubt on the preceding pieties.

Less dubious is what he disbelieves. The Archpoet's irony is aimed not at the substance of Christianity but at its forms. His target is a clerical code that was thought by many to have dwindled into dull and empty ritualism. That is why there is a paradoxical likeness between this sceptic and earnest advocates of reform.⁵⁵ Both of them aimed to turn back the Church's clock either to a time of apostolic purity and an age when the Rule of St Benedict was observed in its original strictness or, in our author's case, to a happier past untroubled by such rigorism. His values are Victorine, in the sense that obedience to an antipope under Rainald of Dassel's thumb licensed laxity in a client who invoked the 'ruin of the world' more often than its creator. The God of the Archpoet is an implied presence, interchangeable with Jove. His son serves as a bogey-man to frighten off detractors. There is little reference to the Holy Spirit, nor much to saints other than Martin, whose generosity was, of course, inferior to the openhandedness of the archchancellor. To him is offered incense with a whiff of narcissism, since the qualities ascribed to his patron are those admired by our author. Indulgence, brazenness, and unconventionality are not the attributes of

⁵⁵ The classic account is G. Constable, *The Reformation of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 1996).

an ideal prelate in high medieval Europe. Yet their distance from accepted standards establishes how far the Archpoet aimed to set his doppelgänger and himself apart. On the singular terms of their togetherness, they needed no one else. Members of a clerical order whose rules they broke, they made a cult of transgression.

It was launched from a biblical basis. Behind the scorn expressed by our author for medieval buffoons there stands their older opposite: St Paul, the fool of Christ at 1 Corinthians 1–4.⁵⁶ Ironically simulating weakness before the strong and stupidity to the wise, he anticipated the Archpoet's virtuosity,⁵⁷ which reached heights of Pauline provocation when, in a context that presupposed religious sincerity, he demonstrated how it might be feigned.⁵⁸ Concealing his message in enigma before its meaning was unveiled, our author mimicked the apostle's combination of obscurity and clarity in borrowings from the New Testament.⁵⁹ Scripture, to him, represented less sacred nourishment than food for irreverent thought. This is not the usual position of twelfth-century doubters, who respectfully pointed out apparent contradictions or inconsistencies in the Bible,⁶⁰ nor does it resemble John of Salisbury's academic scepticism.⁶¹ The Archpoet's challenge to the assumptions on which divine and human knowledge rested is more akin to that of thinkers in the later Middle Ages, who sought to distinguish a firm centre of belief from softer accretions that were susceptible to probing.⁶² As he did so without regard for custom or propriety, he raised suspicions that he was heterodox. They could not be ignored. Since the excommunication of May 1163 that specified Rainald of Dassel and included all who consorted with him, our author knew that he too was banned from the Alexandrian fold. This was a factor in his critical attitude to the ecclesiastical establishment outside Germany, which also drew on resistance to reform entrenched in the indigenous Church.⁶³ The Archpoet questioned comprehensively the beliefs and the norms being thrust on his order, while accepting that scholars ought to be intellectually separate from the laity. Culture was the credo to which he subscribed. To the dogmatism of detractors our author replied with a wry smile.

The smile of the sceptic is rare among those who, in the High Middle Ages, asserted a clerical monopoly of learning.⁶⁴ More familiar is the hierophant of

⁵⁶ See L. Welborn, *Paul, the Fool of Christ: A Study of I Corinthians 1–4 in the Comic-Philosophic Tradition* (London, 2005).

⁵⁷ See Welborn, *Paul, the Fool of Christ*, 57 ff., and Chapter VI.

⁵⁸ Welborn, *Paul, the Fool of Christ*, 99 ff., and Chapter VIII.

⁵⁹ See M. Mitchell, *Paul, the Corinthians and the Birth of Christian Hermeneutics* (Cambridge, 2010), 58 ff., and Chapter VI.

⁶⁰ S. Flanagan, *Doubt in an Age of Faith: Uncertainty in the Long Twelfth Century*, *Disputatio* 17 (Turnhout, 2009), 58 ff.

⁶¹ See Moos, *Geschichte als Topik*, 235 ff., 473 ff.

⁶² See D. Perler, *Zweifel und Gewissheit: Skeptische Debatten im Mittelalter*, *Philosophische Abhandlungen* 92 (Frankfurt, 1967).

⁶³ See Chapter VIII.

⁶⁴ The fullest recent study is S. Stockel, *Kulturen des Lehrens im Früh- und Hochmittelalter: Autorität, Wissenskonzepte und Netzwerke von Gelehrten* (Cologne, 2011).

scholarship, ushering in the chosen few and warding off the many profane, while he frowns before a sanctum confined to the elect.⁶⁵ The Archpoet scorned such mystification. Implying that his work is directed to the initiate—who effectively number one—he links its creativity with places of public disorder.⁶⁶ The pub and the piazza are highlighted because they were supposed to be avoided by the clergy. Not only the conformists among them are mocked by our author but also adherents of the ancients who pursued immortality in rural retreats. Intellectual art is possible and preferable under rough conditions thought to rule it out. It is this denial of proportionality, an idea common in medieval handbooks of penance that sought to match the ‘tarif’ or punishment to the sin or crime,⁶⁷ that leads him to write:

*tales versus facio, quale vinum bibo*⁶⁸

my poetry matches the quality of the wine I drink

If the sentiment is provocative, the style is prescriptive; and the humour arises from hostility to regulations that governed a medieval life in orders. For the code that dictated proportionality in chastisement the Archpoet substitutes a pleasure principle correlating bibulousness with writing. Although literature and wine are his subjects, the theme is scepticism about clerical categories of thought. He turns them to purposes for which they were not intended, while remaining within the elite whose ideals he undermines. No inclination to popular culture can be deduced from his enthusiasm for the tavern and the marketplace. Our author delights in them to the extent that they are prohibited. Yet he insists on his identity as a cleric, peeling much he considered superfluous from its cultural core.

* * *

Culture combined with worldliness was not a self-definition accepted by the secular clergy of the Archpoet’s generation. Few members of his order renounced aspirations to sacrality with his buoyant confidence. It stands in contrast to the pessimism diffused during the twelfth century, but hardly warrants a rhetoric of renaissance.⁶⁹ Nothing was born again in the work of our author; it marked a radically new development. Nor can his innovations be perceived in the optic of romantic and national mythology, which, because it has misrepresented him since he began to be brought to the attention of a wider public 100 years ago, requires autopsy before burial. In 1911, Bernhard Schmeidler, who produced valuable studies of the Archpoet⁷⁰ (and caused controversy when he denied that the correspondence between Abelard and Heloise was authentic), published an elegant, if not always accurate,

⁶⁵ Cf. Godman, *The Silent Masters*, 87 ff., and Bezner, *Vela veritatis*, 641 ff.

⁶⁶ See Chapter VI.

⁶⁷ Cf. Godman, *Paradoxes of Conscience*, 38 ff.

⁶⁸ *Carm.* IV, 14, 1, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 59 = *Carm.* X, 18, 1, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 75.

⁶⁹ See S. Jaeger, ‘Pessimism in the Twelfth-Century “Renaissance”’, *Speculum*, 78 (2003), 1151–83.

⁷⁰ e.g. Chapter X, n. 106.

translation.⁷¹ Schmeidler, who would establish a reputation for range and depth,⁷² was admirably equipped to provide a historical context for the verse he translated. Instead he stationed one of the most vivid writers of the Latin Middle Ages in the drab company of 'goliards', *vagantes*, and the 'clerical-intellectual proletariat'.⁷³ This is the myth of a movement that still keeps the Archpoet on the romantic road and out of medieval institutions. But to recognize that he worked for a chancery, like other intellectuals in the long tradition that reaches to Machiavelli and beyond, is not to reduce him to a bureaucratic cipher; and, while his talent transcends the circumstances in which his verse was composed, reverence for culture as a higher vocation was compatible with employment as a notary. Our author's profession formed one of the bonds with his patron that lend the relationship that is central to his *œuvre* its special closeness. Although Schmeidler realized that the Archpoet stood at Rainald of Dassel's side, he did not distinguish between membership of an itinerant entourage and literary vagabondage, for that would have involved renouncing illusions that he preserved at the cost of the biographical fallacy. Ignoring the concept of persona that was ancient even a century ago,⁷⁴ Schmeidler proceeded to invent what he took to be the Archpoet's personality from his writings.⁷⁵

Hard on Schmeidler's heels there followed, in 1913, Max Manitius, who adopted a complementary approach in the notes to his edition, rising to unintended hilarity when he speculated that our author's description of himself as 'scalped' indicated that hair from his head or beard had been torn out during an amorous episode.⁷⁶ Consultation of Du Cange's *Medieval Latin dictionary*, reprinted in 1884, might have informed Manitius about the religious and punitive connotations of the adjective *decalvatus*,⁷⁷ but the repressed romanticism of this positivist made different demands: *cherchez la femme*. She or, rather, they are to be found in the Archpoet's admission that he is attracted to pretty girls. Subtler than Manitius allowed, the avowal is cast in terms not only of lust but also of conscience:

*et quas tactu nequeo, saltem corde mechor*⁷⁸
and those I cannot touch I lust in the heart

In the heart, an ethical organ of the Bible, our author commits a sin deplored by Christ, blatantly breaching a moral code and telling us nothing about his sex

⁷¹ *Die Gedichte des Archipoeta*, trans. B. Schmeidler (Leipzig, 1911).

⁷² Cf. O. Herding, *Zeitschrift für bayerische Landeskunde*, 22 (1959), 534–6, and H. Grundmann, *DA* 16 (1960), 306.

⁷³ *Die Gedichte des Archipoeta*, trans. Schmeidler, 15.

⁷⁴ Cf. M. Fuhrmann, 'Persona, ein römischer Rollenbegriff', in D. Marquard and K.-H. Stierle (eds), *Identität, Poetik und Hermeneutik* 5 (Munich, 1975), 83–106.

⁷⁵ *Die Gedichte des Archipoeta*, trans. Schmeidler, 28–31.

⁷⁶ *Die Gedichte des Archipoeta*, trans. Schmeidler, 52. On the text, see Chapter X.

⁷⁷ *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*, iii (Nior, 1884), 17–18.

⁷⁸ *Carm.* X, 6, 4, ed. Watenphul–Krefeld, 74, with Chapter VIII.

life. His wit, however, raised a question about what he was up to in bed that reveals more about the fantasies of Max Manitius than the art of the Archpoet.

Artistry proved no obstacle to those who went on to cut him to the measure of a coarser myth. In 1936, Karl Langosch attempted to purge our author from the stigma of foreignness—foreign, that is, to the Reich. Indignant at the suggestion that he might have been a Romance-speaker, Langosch asserted the Germanic character of the Archpoet with a vehemence matched only by its incoherence.⁷⁹ Perhaps it is unreasonable to expect coherence from one who believed he was defending a source of ‘national strength’ (‘nationale Kraft’⁸⁰) or who, in a Nazi newspaper, urged the study of Medieval Latin on Hitler Youth.⁸¹ Nonetheless Langosch perceived a problem that he chose to distort. His study accumulates evidence of the unclassical noun *Transmontanus*. Its usage by the Archpoet is the primary issue that deserved to be addressed, not the secondary detail of our author’s ethnic origins. His *œuvre* is a manifesto of Transmontane identity in its distinctness. Nationalism is irrelevant to these works, because they are both supranational and specific. In the learned language of the *res publica litterarum*, the Archpoet celebrated the standards of a culture alternative to that of his clerical contemporaries. Many of them matched his inventiveness with words or rivalled his agility in argument. None challenged so boldly the moralism and mores prevalent among his peers. That challenge is effected less on the technical level, where he perfected verse-forms practised before him, than on the plane of ideas.

Questioning values shared by others, this sceptic figured as a detached member of the intellectual community. The ramifying contacts cultivated by John of Salisbury are not attested in his case or in that of his colleagues.⁸² The only letters extant by an acquaintance of the Archpoet, the notary Burkhard, were written to a German abbot known to sympathize with the imperial cause. Conspicuous by their absence from Rainald of Dassel’s circle are the epistolary collections that point to a didactic enterprise of European scope.⁸³ Our author sought to educate no one; he set out to be unedifying and break a dominant mould of conformity. An outsider to the *bien pensants*, he responded by creating an inner circle reserved to Rainald of Dassel and himself, with the result of rendering them barely intelligible to those excluded by the terms of their togetherness. More conventional clerics were able to understand Thomas Becket, whom, shortly after his death, they extolled as a martyr, an ascetic, a

⁷⁹ K. Langosch, ‘Der Archipoeta war ein Deutscher!’, *Historische Vierteljahresschrift*, 30 (1936), 493–547. This study is omitted from Langosch’s collected papers.

⁸⁰ Langosch, ‘Der Archipoeta war ein Deutscher!’, 547.

⁸¹ K. Langosch, ‘Die mittellateinische Philologie und Deutschland’, *Geistige Arbeit*, 25 (1938), 1–2, and cf. Langosch, *Mittellatein als Deutschkunde—eine nationale Aufgabe deutscher Wissenschaft und Schule* (Breslau, 1937), 142–50.

⁸² See C. Nedermann, ‘Textual Communities of Learning and Friendship Circles in the Twelfth Century: An Examination of John of Salisbury’s Correspondence’, in C. Mews and J. Crossley (eds), *Communities of Learning: Networks and the Shaping of Intellectual Identity in Europe, 1100–1500* (Turnhout, 2011), 73–84.

⁸³ Nedermann, ‘Textual Communities’, 83.

defender of the Church's liberty. These were ecclesiastical categories into which Rainald did not fit, and the excommunicate styled a sophisticate by the Archpoet was repudiated as an alien beyond comprehension. When his death was attributed to an act of God by a curial cardinal,⁸⁴ his memory could be damned. No biographers, no defenders of his patron, are to be found after our author. Both of them have been assigned a place remote from modern mainstreams of intellectual history, which continue to flow in directions determined by medieval currents of orthodoxy. And yet, resistant to Lethe or legend, Rainald of Dassel and the Archpoet persist in offering us insight into their brief and brilliant world.

⁸⁴ Boso, *Vita Alexandri III*, ed. Duchesne, *Liber pontificalis*, ii. 418, 1–5.

Bibliography

I. PRIMARY SOURCES

- Aachener Urkunden 1101–1250*, ed. E. Meuthen, Publikationen der Gesellschaft für Rheinische Geschichtskunde (Cologne, 1972).
- Abelard, Peter, *Ethics*, ed. D. Luscombe (Oxford, 1971).
- Abelard, Peter, *Sic et non*, ed. B. Boyer and R. McKeon (Chicago, 1977).
- Adam of Balsham, *De utensilibus ad domum regendam pertinentibus*, ed. A. Scheler, *Lexicographie latine du xii^e et du xiii^e siècles* (Leipzig, 1867), 119–37.
- Adam of Balsham, *Ars disserendi*, ed. L. Minio-Paluello, *Twelfth-Century Logic. Texts and Studies* (Rome, 1956), 1–112.
- Admont, *Letter-Collection*, ed. G. Hödl and P. Classen, *MGH Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit* 6 (Munich, 1983).
- Albertus Magnus, *De Bono*, ed. H. Kühle, C. Feckes, B. Geyer, and W. Kübel, *Alberti Magni Opera omnia* 28 (Münster, 1951).
- Alcuin, *The Bishops, Kings, and Saints of York*, ed. P. Godman (Oxford, 1982).
- Alexander III, pope, *Letters*, PL 200, 59–1318.
- Amalarius of Metz, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, PL 105, 985–1242.
- Annales Cameracenses*, ed. G. Pertz, *MGH SS* 16 (repr. Stuttgart, 1994), 509–54.
- Annales Egmundani*, ed. G. Pertz, *MGH SS* 16 (repr. Stuttgart, 1994), 442–79.
- Annales Palidenses*, ed. G. Pertz, *MGH SS* 16 (repr. Stuttgart, 1994), 48–98.
- Anselm, *Vita Adalberti II Moguntini*, ed. P. Jaffé, *Monumenta Moguntina Bibliotheca Rerum Germanicarum* iii (Berlin, 1861), 565–603.
- Archpoet, *Die Gedichte des Archipoeta*, trans. B. Schmeidler (Leipzig, 1911).
- Archpoet, *Die Gedichte des Archipoeta*, ed. M. Manitius, *Münchener Texte* 5 (Munich, 1913).
- Archpoet, *Des Archipoeten erhaltene Gedichte: Metra quaedum Archipoetae*, trans. W. Stapel (Hamburg, 1927).
- Archpoet, *Die Lieder des Archipoeta*, trans. K. Langosch (Stuttgart, 1973).
- Archpoet, *Der Archipoeta*, trans. H. Krefeld (Berlin, 1992).
- Archpoet, *Hugh Primas and the Archpoet*, trans. F. Adcock, *Cambridge Medieval Classics* 2 (Cambridge, 1994).
- Arnold of Lübeck, *Chronica Slavorum*, ed. G. Pertz, *MGH SrG* 14 (repr. Hanover, 1978).
- Arnulf of Lisieux, *Sermones*, PL 201, 151–72.
- Augustine, St, *De civitate Dei*, ed. B. Dombart and A. Kalb, *Corpus CSEL* 47, 48 (Turnhout, 1955).
- Augustine, St, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, ed. E. Dekkers and J. Fraipont, *CCSL* 38, 39, 40 (Turnhout, 1956).
- Augustine, St, *De doctrina christiana*, ed. J. Martin, *CCSL* 32 (Turnhout, 1962).
- Balderich, *Gesta Alberonis archiepiscopi*, ed. G. Pertz, *MGH SS* 8 (repr. Stuttgart, 1992), 243–60.
- Benedict, St, *Rule*, ed. A. de Vogüé and J. Neufville, 6 vols, *SC* 181–6 (Paris, 1972–7).
- Bernard, St, *Opera*, ed. J. Leclercq, H. Rochais, and C. Talbot, 8 vols (Rome, 1957–77).
- Boso, Cardinal, *Vita Hadriani III*, ed. L. Duchesne, *Liber Pontificalis*, ii (repr. Paris, 1981), 388–97.

- Boso, Cardinal, *Vita Alexandri III*, ed. L. Duchesne, *Liber Pontificalis*, ii (repr. Paris, 1981), 397–446.
- Bouquet, M., *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, xvi (Paris, 1878).
- Briefsammlungen der Zeit Heinrichs IV.*, ed. C. Erdmann and N. Fickermann, MGH Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit 5 (repr. Munich, 1981).
- Burchard of Worms, *Decretum*, PL 140, 537–1058.
- Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus miraculorum*, ed. J. Strange (Cologne, 1851).
- Caffaro, *Annals*, ed. L. Belgrano, *Fonti per la Storia d'Italia* 11 (Genoa, 1890).
- Carmen de gestis Frederici I. imperatoris in Lombardia*, ed. I. Schmale-Ott, MGH SrG (Hanover, 1965).
- Carmina Burana*, ed. A. Hilka and O. Schumann, i. 2, *Die moralisch-satirischen Dichtungen* (Heidelberg, 1930).
- Carmina Burana*, ed. O. Schumann and B. Bischoff, i. 3, *Die Trink- und Spiellieder—Die geistlichen Dramen* (Heidelberg, 1970).
- Cassiodore, *Expositio Psalmorum*, ed. M. Adriaen, CCSL 97 (Turnhout, 1958).
- Catalogus Baronum*, ed. E. Cuzzo, *Commentario Fonti per la Storia d'Italia* 101** (Rome, 1994).
- Chronica regia Coloniensis*, ed. G. Waitz, SrG 18 (Hanover, 1880).
- Chronicon montis sereni*, ed. E. Ehrenfeuchter, MGH SS 23 (Leipzig, 1996), 130–226.
- Cologne, *Dienstrecht 'Das kürzere Kölner Dienstmannenrecht'*, ed. H. Loesch, *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, Germ. Abt. 44 (1924), 298–317.
- Cologne, *'Das längere Kölner Dienstrecht'*, ed. L. Weinrich, *Quellen zur deutschen Verfassungs- . Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte bis 1250*, *Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters* 32 (Darmstadt, 1977), 266–78.
- Conrad III, *Charters*, ed. F. Hausmann, MGH Die Urkunden der deutschen Könige und Kaiser 9 (Vienna, 1969).
- Damian, Peter, *Contra clericos aulicos*, PL 145, 463–72.
- Damian, Peter, *Letters*, ed. K. Reindel, MGH Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit 4, i–v (Munich, 1983–93).
- 'Dares Frigius', *De excidio Troiae*, ed. J. Stohlmann, *Beihefte zum MIfb* 1 (Cologne, 1968).
- Das Itinerarium peregrinorum: Eine zeitgenössische Chronik zum Kreuzzug in ursprünglicher Gestalt*, ed. H. Mayer (Stuttgart, 1962).
- Die Tegernseer Briefsammlung (Froumund)*, ed. K. Strecker, MGH *Epistolae selectae* iii (repr. Munich, 1978).
- Die Visionen der heiligen Elisabeth und der Schriften der Aebte Ekbert und Emecho*, ed. F. Roth (Brunn, 1884).
- Falcando, Ugo, *Liber de Regno Sicilie*, ed. G. Siracusa, *Fonti per la storia d'Italia* 22 (Rome, 1897).
- Fredborg, K., *The Latin Rhetorical Commentaries by Thierry of Chartres*, *Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies. Studies and Texts* 84 (Toronto, 1988).
- Fundatio Ecclesiae Hildensemensis*, ed. A. Hofmeister, MGH SS 30, 2 (repr. Stuttgart, 1976), 939–46.
- Gautier d'Arras, *Ille et Galeron*, ed. Y. Lefèvre (Paris, 1988).
- Gerbert von Aurillac, *Letters*, ed. F. Weigle, MGH Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit 2 (Weimar, 1966).
- Gerhoh of Reichersberg, *De edificio Dei*, ed. E. Sackur, MGH *Libelli de lite imperatorum et pontificum* iii (repr. Hanover, 1956), 136–202.

- Gerhoh of Reichersberg, *De investigatione Antichristi*, ed. E. Sackur, MGH Libelli de lite imperatorum et pontificum iii (repr. Hanover, 1956), 302–95.
- Godfrey(?) of Admont, *Homilies*, PL 174, 21–1134.
- Godfrey of Viterbo, *Memoria seculorum*, prol. ed. G. Waitz, MGH SS 22 (repr. Stuttgart, 1979), 94–9.
- Gottschalk, *Carmina*, ed. H. Fickermann, MGH Poetae latini Aevi Carolini vi, 1 (repr. Munich, 1978), 89–106.
- Gratian, *Decretum*, in *Corpus iuris canonici*, i, ed. E. Friedberg (repr. Graz, 1959).
- Gregory the Great, *St, Moralia in Iob*, ed. M. Adriaen, CCSL 143A–143C (Turnhout, 1979–85).
- Gregory the Great, *St, Homilies on Ezeckiel*, ed. C. Morel SJ, SC 327 (Paris, 1986).
- Gregory the Great, *St, Regula Pastoralis*, ed. B. Judic, F. Rommel, and C. Morel, SC 381, 382 (Paris, 1992).
- Gunther, *Ligurinus*, ed. E. Assmann, MGH SrG 63 (Hanover, 1987).
- Helmuth of Bosau, *Chronica Slavorum*, ed. B. Schmeidler, MGH SrG 32 (Hanover, 1937).
- Henry the Lion, *Charters*, ed. K. Jordan, MGH Laienfürsten—und Dynastenerkunden der Kaiserzeit 1 (repr. Stuttgart, 1995).
- Herbert of Bosham, *Vita S. Thomae*, in *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury*, ed. J. C. Robertson, RS 67, iii (London, 1877), 155–534.
- Hildebert of Lavardin, *Sermones*, PL 171, 343–964.
- Hildegard of Bingen, *Letters*, ed. L. van Acker, CCCM 91, 91A, 91B (Turnhout, 1991–2001).
- Hildesheim, *Charters*, ed. K. Janicke (Berlin, 1896).
- Höing, N. (ed.), ‘Die “Trierer Stilübungen”: Ein Denkmal der Frühzeit Kaiser Friedrich Barbarossas’, *Archiv für Diplomatik, Schriftgeschichte, Siegel- und Wappenkunde*, 1 (1955), 257–329, and 2 (1956), 125–249.
- Honorius Augustodunensis, *Gemma animae*, PL 172, 542–753.
- Honorius Augustodunensis, *Sermo generalis (Speculum Ecclesiae)*, PL 172, 859–70.
- Hroswitha, *Opera*, ed. P. v. Winterfeld (repr. Munich, 1978).
- Hugh of St Victor, *Didascalicon*, ed. T. Offergeld, *Fontes christianae* 27 (Freiburg, 1997).
- Ivo of Chartes, *Decretum*, PL 161, 47–1022.
- Jerome, *In Ionam*, ed. M. Adriaen, CCSL 76 (Turnhout, 1969).
- Jérôme, *Commentaire sur Jonas*, ed. Y.-M. Duval, SC 323 (Paris, 1985).
- Jerome, *Letters*, ed. I. Hilberg, CSEL 54 (Vienna, 1910).
- John of Salisbury, *Historia pontificalis*, ed. M. Chibnall (repr. Oxford, 1986).
- John of Salisbury, *Letters i: The Early Letters (1153–1161)*, ed. W. Millor, H. Butler, and C. N. L. Brooke (Oxford, 1974).
- John of Salisbury, *Letters ii: The Later Letters (1163–1180)*, ed. W. Millor and C. N. L. Brooke (Oxford, 1979).
- John of Salisbury, *Metalogicon*, ed. J. B. Hall, CCCM 98 (Turnhout, 1991).
- John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, ed. C. Webb, 2 vols (Oxford, 1909).
- Justinian, *Institutes*, trans. O. Behrends et al., *Corpus Iuris Civilis: Text und Übersetzung* (Heidelberg, 1990).
- Liutprand of Cremona, *Historia Ottonis*, ed. J. Becker, SrG 41 (repr. Hanover, 1977), 159–75.
- Maragone, Bernardo, *Pisan Annals*, ed. M. Lupo Gentile (Bologna, 1930).
- MGH Epistolae Aevi Carolini iv, ed. E. Dümmler (Berlin, 1895).

- Morena, Otto, and Acerbus, *Historia Frederici I*, ed. F. Güterbock, MGH SrG NS 7 (Berlin, 1930).
- Nigel of Longchamps, *Speculum Stultorum*, ed. F. Albin (Genoa, 2003).
- Otto III, *Charters*, ed. T. Sickel and K. Foltz, MGH Die Urkunden der deutschen Könige und Kaiser 2, 2 (Hanover, 1893).
- Otto of Freising, *Chronicle*, ed. A. Hofmeister, MGH SrG 45 (Hanover, 1912).
- Peter of Blois, *Sermo ad sacerdotes*, PL 207, 721–39.
- Peter the Chanter, *Verbum abbreviatum*, PL 205, 25–370.
- Poetry of the Carolingian Renaissance*, ed. P. Godman (London, 1985).
- Primas, Hugh, *The Oxford Poems of Hugh Primas and the Arundel Lyrics*, ed. C. McDonough (Toronto, 1984).
- Primas, Hugh, *Hugh Primas and the Archpoet*, ed. F. Adcock, Cambridge Medieval Classics 2 (Cambridge, 1994).
- Pseudo-Cyprian, *De aleatoribus*, ed. G. Härtel CSEL 3, iii (Vienna, 1891).
- Ralph of Diceto, *Ymagines historiarum in Radulfi de Diceto decani Lundenensis opera historica*, i, ed. W. Stubbs, RS 68, 1 (London, 1876), 291–440.
- Regesta pontificum Romanorum*, 2 vols, ed. P. Jaffé (Leipzig, 1888).
- Regino of Prüm, *De synodalibus causis et disciplinis ecclesiasticis*, ed. F. Wasserschleben (Leipzig, 1840).
- Registrum oder merkwürdige Urkunden für die deutsche Geschichte*, I, ed. H. Sudendorf (Jena, 1849).
- Rerum Germanicarum veteres Scriptores . . . editio tertia*, ed. B. G. Struve (Regensburg, 1726).
- Richalm von Schöntal, *Liber revelationum*, ed. P. G. Schmidt, MGH Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 24 (Hanover, 2009), XXVIII.
- Romuald of Salerno, *Chronicon*, ed. C. Garufi, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores vii*, 1 (Città di Castello, 1938).
- Roncaglia, *Laws*, ed. V. Colorni, *Die drei verschollenen Gesetze des Reichstages bei Roncaglia, wiederaufgefunden in einer Pariser Handschrift* (Bibl. Nat. Cod. Lat. 4671), trans. G. Dolezalek, *Untersuchungen zur deutschen Staats- und Rechtsgeschichte NF 12* (Aalen, 1969).
- Ruodlieb, ed. K. Vollmann with W. Haug, *Frühe Deutsche Literatur und lateinische Literatur in Deutschland*, Bibliothek des Mittelalters 1 (Frankfurt, 1991), 388–551.
- Ruotger, *Vita Brunonis*, ed. I. Ott, MGH SrG NS 10 (Weimar, 1951).
- Rupert of Deutz, *Commentary on S. John*, ed. R. Haacke, OSB, CCCM 9 (Turnhout, 1969).
- Rupert of Deutz, *Vita Heriberti*: Edition mit Kommentar und kritischer Untersuchung, ed. P. Dinter (Bonn, 1976).
- Saxo Grammaticus, *Gesta Danorum*, ed. J. Olrik and H. Raeder (Havniae, 1931).
- Sedulius Scottus, *Collectaneum miscellaneum*, ed. D. Simpson, CCCM 67 (Turnhout, 1988).
- Sextus Amarius, *Sermones*, ed. K. Manitius, MGH Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 6 (Weimar, 1969).
- Sudendorf, H. (ed.), *Registrum oder merkwürdige Urkunden für die deutsche Geschichte*, i (Jena, 1849).
- Sylloga codicis Sangallensis*, ed. P. v. Winterfeld, MGH Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini iv.1. (repr. Berlin, 1964). 315–49.
- [Thangmar?], *Vita Bernwardi*, ed. G. Pertz, MGH SS 4 (repr. Stuttgart, 1981), 754–82.
- Thierry of Chartres, *Rhetoric*, ed. K. Fredborg, Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies. Studies and Texts 84 (Toronto, 1988).
- Thomas Becket, *Correspondence*, i, Oxford Medieval Texts, ed. A. Duggan (Oxford, 2000).
- Tractatus Garsiae*, ed. R. Thomson, Textus minores 46 (Leyden, 1973).

- Traditiones et antiquitates Fuldenses*, ed. E. Dronke (Fulda, 1844).
Tres clerici, ed. P. Dronke, *Nine Medieval Latin Plays*, Cambridge Medieval Classics 4 (Cambridge, 1994), 70–7.
Urkundenbuch des Hochstifts Hildesheim und seiner Bischöfe bis 1221, i, ed. K. Janicke (Berlin, 1896).
Veterum scriptorum . . . amplissima collectio, ed. E. Martène and U. Durand, i (Paris, 1724).
 Vincent of Prague, *Annales*, ed. W. Wattenbach, MGH SS 17 (Hanover, 1861), 658–83.
 Wibald of Stablo and Corvey, *Letters*, ed. M. Hartmann, MGH Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit 9 (Hanover, 2012).
 Wipo, *Tetralogus*, ed. H. Bresslau, MGH SrG 16 (Hanover, 1915).

II. SECONDARY SOURCES

- Abulafia, D., *The Two Sicilies: Economic Relations between the Kingdom of Sicily and the Norman Kingdom* (Cambridge, 1977).
 Abulafia, D., *Italy, Sicily and the Mediterranean 1100–1400*, Variorum (London, 1987).
 Althoff, G., *Spielregeln der Politik im Mittelalter: Kommunikation in Frieden und Fehde* (Darmstadt, 1997).
 Althoff, G., 'Ira Regis: Prolegomena to a History of Royal Anger', in B. Rosenwein (ed.), *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY, 1998), 59–74.
 Althoff, G., and Meier, C., *Ironie im Mittelalter: Hermeneutik—Dichtung—Politik* (Darmstadt, 2011).
 Amberg, G., 'Die Hippolytuskapelle in Köln', *Jahrbuch des kölnischen Geschichtsvereins*, 56 (1985), 190–4.
 Antenna, G., 'I conti di Biandrate e le città della Lombardia occidentale (secoli XI e XII)', in *Formazione e strutture dei ceti dominanti del Medioevo: Marchesi, conti e visconti nel Regno Italico* (Rome, 1996), 57–84.
 Appelt, H., 'Der Vorbehalt kaiserlicher Rechte in den Diplomen Friedrich Barbarossas', in G. Wolf (ed.), *Friedrich Barbarossa* (Darmstadt, 1975), 33–57.
 Arduini, M., *Neue Studien über Rupert von Deutz*, Siegburger Studien 17 (Siegburg, 1985).
 Armour, P., *Dante's Griffin and the History of the World. A Study of the Earthly Paradise* ('Purgatorio', cantos xxix–xxxiii) (Oxford, 1989).
 Auerbach, E., 'Figura', in E. Auerbach, *Scenes from the Drama of European Literature* (Manchester, 1984), 11–78.
 Bach, E., 'Imperium Romanum: Études sur l'idéologie politique du XIIe siècle', *Classica et Mediaevalia*, 7 (1945), 138–45.
 Baethgen, F., *Mediaevalia*, i, Schriften der MGH 17, 1 (Stuttgart, 1960).
 Barlow, F., *Thomas Becket* (London, 1986).
 Bayliss, M., *Parody in the Middle Ages: The Latin Tradition* (Michigan, 1996).
 Becker, M., 'Cum lacrimis et gemitu: Vom Weinen der Sieger und der Besiegten im frühen und hohen Mittelalter', in G. Althoff (ed.), *Formen und Funktionen öffentlicher Kommunikation im Mittelalter*, VuF 50 (Stuttgart, 2001), 25–52.
 Benson, R., *The Bishop-Elect: A Study in Medieval Ecclesiastical Office* (Princeton, 1968).
 Benson, R., 'Libertas in Italy (1152–1226)', in *La Notion de liberté au Moyen Age: Islam, Byzance, Occident*, Penn–Paris–Dumbarton Oaks Colloquia IV (Paris, 1985), 191–213.
 Benzinger, J., *Invectiva in Romam: Romkritik im Mittelalter vom 9. bis zum 12. Jahrhundert*, Historische Studien 404 (Lübeck, 1968).
 Bériou, N., and Morenzoni, F. (eds), *Prédication et liturgie au Moyen Age* (Turnhout, 2008).

- Brandt, M., and Eggebrecht, A. (eds), *Bernward von Hildesheim und das Zeitalter der Ottonen*, Katalog der Ausstellung 1991 (Hildesheim, 1993).
- Bernwinkel, H., *Verwüsten und Belagern: Friedrich Barbarossas Krieg gegen Mailand*, Beiträge des Deutschen Historischen Instituts in Rom 114 (Tübingen, 2007).
- Bezner, F., *Vela Veritatis: Hermeneutik, Wissen und Sprache in der 'Intellectual History' des 12. Jahrhunderts*, Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 85 (Cologne, 2005).
- Bezner, F., 'Wissensmythen: Lateinische Literatur und Rationalisierung im 12. Jahrhundert', *Wolframstudien*, 20 (2009), 4–31.
- Bieritz, K.-H., *Das Kirchenjahr: Feste, Gedenk- und Feiertage in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Munich, 1987).
- Bischoff, B., *Carmina Burana: Einführung zur Faksimile-Ausgabe der Benediktbeurer Liederhandschrift* (Munich, 1970).
- Bischoff, B., *Mittelalterliche Studien: Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte*, 3 vols (Stuttgart, 1966–81).
- Boesch Gajano, S., 'Biandrate, Guido di', in *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, 10 (1968), 267–74.
- Bordone, R., 'L'amministrazione nel regno d'Italia', in I. Lori Sanfilippo (ed.), *Federico Barbarossa e l'Italia nell'ottocentesimo anniversario della sua morte*, Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medioevo (Rome, 1990), 133–56.
- Borst, A., *Barbaren, Ketzer und Artisten: Welten des Mittelalters* (Munich, 1989).
- Bosl, K., 'Das Problem der Armut in der hochmittelalterlichen Gesellschaft', *Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte* 294, 5 (Vienna, 1974).
- Brandt, M. (ed.), *Abglanz des Himmels: Romanik in Hildesheim* (Regensburg, 2001).
- Brinken, B., *Die Politik Konrads von Staufen in der Tradition der Rheinischen Pfalzgrafschaft*, *Rheinisches Archiv* 92 (Bonn, 1974).
- Brühl, C.-R., *Aus Mittelalter und Diplomatie, i. Studien zur Verfassungsgeschichte und Stadttopographie* (Hildesheim, 1989).
- Brunn, U., *Des contestataires aux 'cathares': Discours de réforme et propagande antihérétique dans le pays du Rhin et de la Meuse avant l'Inquisition*, Collection des Études Augustiniennes. Série Moyen Âge et Temps Modernes 41 (Paris, 2006).
- Bulst, W., 'Susceptacula regum: Zur Kunde deutscher Reichsaltertümer', in W. Bulst, *Lateinisches Mittelalter: Gesammelte Beiträge*, ed. W. Berschin (Heidelberg, 1984), 130–68.
- Bumke, J., *Mäzene im Mittelalter: Die Gönner und Auftraggeber der höfischen Literatur in Deutschland 1150–1300* (Munich, 1979).
- Burkhardt, S., *Mit Stab und Schwert: Bilder, Träger und Funktionen erzbischöflicher Herrschaft zur Zeit Kaiser Friedrich Barbarossas: Die Erzbistümer Köln und Mainz im Vergleich*, *Mittelalter-Forschungen* 22 (Ostfildern, 2008).
- Burkhardt, S., et al. (eds), *Staufisches Königtum im 12. Jahrhundert: Konzepte, Netzwerke—Politische Praxis* (Mainz, 2009).
- Busch, J., *Die Mailänder Geschichtsschreibung zwischen Arnulf und Galvancus Flamma: Die Beschäftigung mit der Vergangenheit im Umfeld einer oberitalienischen Kommune vom späten 11. bis zum frühen 14. Jahrhundert*, *Münstersche Mittelalter-Studien* 72 (Munich, 1972).
- Büttner, F., 'Die Alpenpasspolitik Friedrich Barbarossas bis zum Jahre 1164/5', in *Grundfragen der alemannischen Geschichte*, VuF 1 (Lindau, 1955), 243–76.
- Büttner, F., 'Friedrich Barbarossa und Burgund: Studien zur Politik der Staufer während des 12. Jahrhunderts', in *Probleme des 12. Jahrhunderts*, VuF 12 (Stuttgart, 1968), 79–119.

- Büttner, F., 'Das politische Handeln Friedrich Barbarossas im Jahre 1156', *Blätter für deutsche Landesgeschichte*, 166 (1970), 54–67.
- Büttner, H., 'Erzbischof Heinrich von Mainz und die Staufer', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 69 (1958), 247–67.
- Carozzi, C., *Le Voyage de l'âme dans l'au-delà d'après la littérature latine (Ve—XIIIe siècle)*, Collection de l'École française de Rome 189 (Paris, 1990).
- Carruthers, M., *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 10 (Cambridge, 1990).
- Carruthers, M., *The Craft of Thought: Meditation, Rhetorics and the Making of Images 400–1200*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 34 (Cambridge, 1998).
- Casagrande, C., and Vecchio, S., 'Clercs et jongleurs dans la société médiévale, XIIe et XIIIe siècles', *Annales*, 34 (1979), 913–28.
- Casagrande, C., and Vecchio, S., *I sette vizi capitali: Storia dei peccati nel Medioevo* (Turin, 2000).
- Caspar, E., 'Die Kreuzzugsbullen Eugenius III.', *NA* 45 (1924), 285–305.
- Cau, E., 'Scrittura e cultura a Novara (secoli VIII–X)', *Ricerche medievali*, 6–7 (1971–4), 3–87.
- Chaplais, P., *English Diplomatic Practice in the Middle Ages* (London, 2003).
- Clark, A., *Elisabeth of Schönau: A Twelfth-Century Visionary* (Philadelphia, 1992).
- Clark, P., and Duggan, A. (eds), *Pope Alexander III (1159–81): The Art of Survival* (Farnham, 2012).
- Classen, P., *Gerhoch von Reichersberg: Eine Biographie* (Wiesbaden, 1960).
- Classen, P., *Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, ed. J. Fleckenstein (Sigmaringen, 1983).
- Cognasso, F., *Novara e il suo territorio* (Novara, 1952).
- Cognasso, F., *Il Piemonte nell'età sveva* (Turin, 1968).
- Colish, M., *Peter Lombard*, 2 vols (Leyden, 1994).
- Colish, M., 'Rethinking Lying in the Twelfth Century', in I. Bejczy and R. Newhauser (eds), *Virtue and Ethics in the Twelfth Century* (Leyden, 2005), 155–74.
- Congar, Y., 'Clercs et laïcs du point de vue de la culture au Moyen Âge: laïcus = sans lettres', in Y. Congar, *Études d'ecclésiologie médiévale*, Variorum (London, 1983), 309–32.
- Constable, G., 'Nudus nudum Christum sequi and Parallel Formulas in the Twelfth Century', in F. Church (ed.), *Continuity and Discontinuity in Church History: Essays Presented to G. Huntston Williams* (Leyden, 1979), 143–50.
- Constable, G., *Cluniac Studies*, Variorum (London, 1980).
- Constable, G., 'The Language of Preaching in the Twelfth Century', *Viator*, 25 (1994), 131–52.
- Constable, G., *The Reformation of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 1996).
- Coolman, B., *The Theology of Hugh of St Victor: An Interpretation* (Cambridge, 2010).
- Cotts, J., *The Clerical Dilemma: Peter of Blois and Literate Culture in the Twelfth Century* (Washington, 2009).
- Cramer, P., *Baptism and Change in the Early Middle Ages, c.700–c.1150* (Cambridge, 1993).
- Croce, W., 'Die Adventsmessen des römischen Missale in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung', *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 74 (1952), 227–317.
- Cuozzo, E., 'Salerno e la ribellione contro re Guglielmo d'Altavilla nel 1160/62: La versione delle fonti narrative e la testimonianza di quelle documentarie', in F. D'Oria (ed.), *Civiltà del Mezzogiorno d'Italia: Libro scrittura documento in età normanno-sveva* (Salerno, 1994), 29–40.
- Curta, F., 'Furor Teutonicus: A Note on Ethnic Stereotypes in Suger's Deeds of Louis the Fat', *Haskins Society Journal: Studies in Medieval History*, 16 (2005), 62–76.

- d'Arienzo, V. (ed.), *Una città nel Mediterraneo: ll'Opulenta Salernum* (Salerno, 2001).
- Dalarun, J., *L'Impossible sainteté: La Vie retrouvée de Robert d'Arbrissel* (v. 1045–1116), *fondateur de Fontevraud* (Paris, 1985).
- Darmstädter, P., *Das Reichsgut in der Lombardei und Piemont (568–1250)* (Strasburg, 1896).
- De Rijk, L. M., *Logica Modernorum: A Contribution to the History of Early Terminist Logic* (Aasen, 1962).
- Delogu, P., *Mito di una città meridionale (Salerno, secoli VIII–XI)* (Naples, 1977).
- Dendorfer, J., and Deutinger, R. (eds), *Das Lehnswesen im Mittelalter: Forschungskonstrukte—Quellenbefunde—Deutungsrelevanz* (Ostfildern, 2010).
- Deutinger, R., *Rahewin von Freising: Ein Gelehrter des 12. Jahrhunderts*, MGH Schriften 47 (Hanover, 1999).
- Deutinger, R., 'Sutri 1155: Missverständnisse um ein Missverständniss', *DA* 60 (2004), 97–133.
- Deutinger, R., 'Imperiale Konzepte in der hofnahen Historiographie der Barbarossazeit', in S. Burkhardt et al. (eds), *Staufisches Königtum im 12. Jahrhundert: Konzepte—Netzwerke—Politische Praxis* (Mainz, 2009), 25–39.
- Dilcher, G., 'Die staufische Renovatio im Spannungsfeld von traditionalem und neuem Denken: Rechtskonzeptionem als Handlungshorizont der Italienpolitik Friedrich Barbarossas', *HZ* 276 (2003), 613–46.
- Dilcher, G., 'Das staufische Herrschaftskonzept in der roncalischen Gesetzgebung und im Konstanzer Frieden: Tragende Prinzipien und innere Widersprüche', in G. Dilcher and D. Quaglioni (eds), *Gli inizi del diritto pubblico: L'età di Federico Barbarossa: Legislazione e scienza del diritto*, *Annali dell'istituto italo-germanico in Trento* 19 (Bologna, 2007), 19–44.
- Dinges, M., 'Der "feine Unterschied": Die soziale Funktion der Kleidung in der höfischen Gesellschaft', *Zeitschrift für historische Forschung*, 1 (1992), 49–76.
- Dinges, M., 'Von der Lesbarkeit der Welt zum universalisierten Wandel durch individuelle Strategien: Die soziale Funktion der Kleidung in der höfischen Gesellschaft', *Saeculum*, 44 (1993), 90–112.
- Dingjan, F., OSB, *Discretio: Les Origines patristiques et monastiques de la doctrine de la prudence de saint Thomas d'Aquin* (Assen, 1967).
- Dinzelbacher, P., 'Klassen und Hierarchien im Jenseits', in *Soziale Ordnungen im Selbstverständnis des Mittelalters*, *Miscellanea Medievalia* 12/1 (Berlin, 1979), 20–40.
- Dinzelbacher, P., *Vision und Visionsliteratur im Mittelalter* (Stuttgart, 1981).
- Dobozy, M., *Re-membering the Present: The Medieval German Poet-Minstral in Cultural Context*, *Disputatio* 6 (Turnhout, 2005).
- Dotzauer, W., 'Die Ankunft des Herrschers: Der fürstliche "Einzug" in die Stadt bis zum Ende des Alten Reichs', *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, 55 (1973), 245–88.
- Droege, G., 'Lehnrecht und Landrecht am Niederrhein und das Problem der Territorialbildung im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert', in *Festschrift für F. Steinbach* (Bonn, 1960), 278–307.
- Dronke, P., 'Functions of Classical Borrowing in Medieval Latin Verse', in R. Bolgar (ed.), *Classical Influences on European Culture, AD 500–1500* (Cambridge, 1971), 159–64.
- Dronke, P. (ed.), *A History of Twelfth-Century Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1988).
- Dronke, P., 'The Art of the Archpoet: A Reading of *Lingua balbus*', in P. Dronke, *Latin and Vernacular Poets of the Middle Ages*, *Variorum* (Aldershot, 1991), IX, 22–43.
- Dufraigne, P., *Adventus Augusti, Adventus Christi: Recherche sur l'exploitation idéologique et littéraire d'un cérémonial dans l'antiquité tardive*, *Collection des Études augustinienes* 141 (Paris, 1994).

- Duggan, A., 'Totius christianitatis caput: The Pope and the Princes', in A. Duggan and B. Bolton (eds), *Adrian IV: The English Pope (1154–1159): Texts and Studies* (Aldershot, 2003), 105–56.
- Duggan, A., *Thomas Becket* (London, 2004).
- Duggan, A., and Bolton, B. (eds), *Adrian IV: The English Pope (1154–1159): Texts and Studies* (Aldershot, 2003).
- Dümmler, E., 'Über den *furor Teutonicus*', in *Sitzungsberichte der königlichen preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, (Berlin) Philologisch-historische Klasse IX (1897), 112–26.
- Dunbabin, J., 'The Maccabees as Exemplars in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries', in *The Bible in the Medieval World: Essays in Memory of B. Smalley*, *Studies in Church History Subsidia* 4 (Oxford, 1985), 31–41.
- Duval, J.-M., *Le Livre de Jonas dans la littérature grecque et latine: Sources et influence du Commentaire sur Jonas de saint Jérôme*, 2 vols (Paris, 1973).
- Ebenbauer, A., *Carmen Historicum: Untersuchungen zur historischen Dichtung im karolingischen Europa*, i, *Philologica Germanica* 4 (Vienna, 1978).
- Ehlers, J., *Hugo von St Victor: Studien zum Geschichtsdenken und zur Geschichtsschreibung des 12. Jahrhunderts*, *Frankfurter Historische Abhandlungen* 7 (Wiesbaden, 1973).
- Ehlers, J., 'Deutsche Scholaren in Frankreich während des 12. Jahrhunderts', in J. Fried (ed.), *Schulen und Studium im Wandel des hohen und späten Mittelalters*, *VuF* 30 (Sigmaringen, 1986), 97–120.
- Ehlers, J., 'Was sind und wie bilden sich *nationes* im mittelalterlichen Europa (10.–15. Jahrhundert)? Begriff und allgemeine Konturen', in A. Bues and R. Rexheuser (eds), *Mittelalterliche nationes—neuzeitliche Nationen: Probleme der Nationsbildung in Europa* (Wiesbaden, 1995), 7–26.
- Ehlers, J., 'Imperium und Nationsbildung im europäischen Vergleich', in B. Schneidmüller and S. Weinfurter (eds), *Heilig. Römisch. Deutsch: Das Reich im mittelalterlichen Europa* (Dresden, 2006), 84–100.
- Ehlers, J., 'Heinrich der Löwe und der sächsische Episkopat', in J. Ehlers, *Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, ed. M. Kintzinger and B. Schneidmüller, *Berliner Historische Studien* 21 (Berlin, 1996), 451–88.
- Ehlers, J., *Heinrich der Löwe: Eine Biographie* (Munich, 2008).
- Eichenberger, T., *Patria: Studien zur Bedeutung des Wortes im Mittelalter (6.–12. Jahrhundert)*, *Nationes* 9 (Sigmaringen, 1991).
- Eisenlohr, E., 'Die älteste Niederschrift der Sequenz *Urbs Aquensis, urbs regalis* im letzten Viertel des 12. Jahrhunderts und ihre mögliche Verbindung zum Kaiserkult Barbarossas', *Zeitschrift des Aachener Geschichtsvereins*, 96 (1989), 35–68.
- Engels, O., 'Der Reichsbischof in ottonischer und frühalsalischer Zeit', in I. Crusius (ed.), *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Struktur der mittelalterlichen Germania sacra*, *Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte* (Göttingen, 1989), 135–75.
- Engels, O., *Stauferstudien: Beiträge zur Geschichte der Staufer im 12. Jahrhundert*, ed. E. Meuthen and S. Weinfurter (Sigmaringen, 1996).
- Ennen, E., 'Kölner Wirtschaft im Früh- und Hochmittelalter', in H. Kellenbenz (ed.), *Zwei Jahrtausende Kölner Wirtschaft*, i (Cologne, 1975), 87–194.
- Erdmann, C., 'Fabulae curiales: Neues zum Spielmannsgesang und zum Ezzo-Liede', *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, 73 (1936), 87–98.
- Erdmann, C., 'Das ottonische Reich als Imperium Romanum', *DA* 6 (1943), 412–44.
- Erdmann, C., *Forschungen zur politischen Ideenwelt des Frühmittelalters*, ed. F. Baethgen (Berlin, 1951).

- Eversen, G., *Chanter avec les anges: Poésie dans la messe médiévale. Interprétations et commentaires* (Paris, 2001).
- Ferm, O., and Honemann, V. (eds), *Chess and Allegory in the Middle Ages*, Sällskapet Runica et Mediaevalia, *Scripta minora* 12 (Stockholm, 2005).
- Fernández Gonzales, E., 'Realidad, tradición religiosa y maravillas legendarias: Iconografía de la pesca en la Edad Media', in *La Pesca en la Edad Media*, Monografías de la Sociedad Española de Estudios Medievales 1 (Madrid, 2009), 55–70.
- Ferrari, M., 'Opus geminum', in P. Stotz (ed.), *Dichten als Stoff-Vermittlung: Formen, Ziele, Wirkungen: Beiträge zur Praxis der Versifikation lateinischer Texte im Mittelalter* (Zürich, 2008), 247–64.
- Flanagan, S., *Doubt in an Age of Faith: Uncertainty in the Long Twelfth Century*, *Disputatio* 17 (Turnhout, 2009).
- Fleckenstein, J. (ed.), *Curialitas: Studien zu Grundfragen der höfischen-ritterlichen Kultur Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte* 100 (Göttingen, 1990).
- Flint, V., 'The Early Medieval medicus, the Saint—and the Enchanter', *Social History of Medicine*, 2 (1989), 127–45.
- Floss, H. (ed.), *Dreikönigenbuch: Die Übertragung der heiligen Dreikönige von Mailand nach Köln* (Cologne, 1864).
- Folz, R., *Le Souvenir et la légende de Charlemagne dans l'Empire germanique médiévale*, Publications de l'Université de Dijon (Paris, 1950).
- Fournier, P., *Le Royaume d'Arles et de Vienne (1138–1378)* (Paris, 1891).
- Franz, A., *Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter* (Freiburg, 1902).
- Fredborg, K., 'Speculative Grammar', in P. Dronke (ed.), *A History of Twelfth-Century Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1988), 177–95.
- Frenken, G., 'Der Erzpöet und das Kloster St Martin in Köln', *Jahrbuch des Kölnischen Geschichtsvereins*, II (1929), 130–5.
- Freund, S., *Studien zur literarischen Wirksamkeit des Petrus Damiani*, MGH Studien und Texte 13 (Hanover, 1995).
- Fried, J., *Die Entstehung des Juristenstandes im 12. Jahrhundert: Zur sozialen Stellung und politischen Bedeutung gelehrter Juristen in Bologna und Modena*, *Forschungen zur neueren Privatrechtsgeschichte* 21 (Cologne, 1974).
- Fried, J., 'Gerard Pucelle und Köln', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Kanonistische Abteilung* 68 (1982), 125–35.
- Fried, J., 'Der Archipoeta—ein Kölner Scholaster?', in K. Herbers et al. (eds), *Ex ipsis rerum documentis: Beiträge zur Mediävistik: Festschrift für H. Zimmermann zum 65. Geburtstag* (Sigmaringen, 1991), 85–90.
- Fried, J., *Der Weg in die Geschichte: Die Ursprünge Deutschlands bis 1024* (Berlin, 1994).
- Fried, J., *Das Mittelalter, Politik und Kultur* (Munich, 2008).
- Fuhrmann, M., 'Persona, ein römischer Rollenbegriff', in D. Marquard and K.-H. Stierle (eds), *Identität, Poetik und Hermeneutik* 5 (Munich, 1975), 83–106.
- Galbraith, V., *Kings and Chroniclers: Essays in Medieval English History* (London, 1982).
- Galland, B., *Deux archevêchés entre la France et l'Empire: Les Archevêques de Lyon et les archevêques de Vienne*, Bibliothèque de l'École française de Rome 282 (Rome, 1994).
- Ganz, P., 'Curialis/hövesch', in G. Kaiser and J.-D. Müller (eds), *Höfische Literatur, Hofgesellschaft, höfische Lebensformen um 1200*, *Studia humaniora* 6 (Düsseldorf, 1986), 39–56.
- Ganz, P., 'Friedrich Barbarossa: Hof und Kultur', in A. Haverkamp (ed.), *Friedrich Barbarossa: Handlungsspielräume und Wirkungsweisen des staufischen Kaisers*, *VuF* 4 (Sigmaringen, 1992), 623–50.
- Geary, P., *Living with the Dead in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY, 1994).

- Gebauer, J., 'Die Stiftungsurkunde des St Johannishospitals zu Hildesheim von 1161', NA 49 (1932), 193–205.
- Giese, W., 'Rex ruffe, furoris Teutonici ductor! Kaiser Friedrich Barbarossas Kriegsführung in Italien—Ein Wiederaufstehen des *furor Teutonicus*?' in U. Lindgren et al. (eds), *Sine ira et studio: Militärhistorische Studien zur Erinnerung an H. Schmidt*, Münchener Historische Studien, Abt. Mittelalterliche Geschichte (Kallmünz, 2001), 41–50.
- Gilman, J., *The Parodic Sermon in European Perspective: Aspects of Liturgical Parody from the Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century*, Beiträge zur Literatur des XV bis XVIII Jahrhunderts (Wiesbaden, 1974).
- Gindele, C., OSB, 'Das scurrile in der Benediktus- und Magisterregel', *Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktiner-Ordens und seiner Zweige*, 81 (1970), 480–1.
- Godman, P., *Poets and Emperors: Frankish Politics and Carolingian Poetry* (Oxford, 1987).
- Godman, P., *The Silent Masters: Latin Literature and its Censors in the High Middle Ages* (Princeton, 2000).
- Godman, P., *Paradoxes of Conscience in the Middle Ages: Abelard, Heloise, and the Archpoet* (Cambridge, 2009).
- Godman, P., 'The World of the Archpoet', *Mediaeval Studies*, 71 (2009), 113–56.
- Godman, P., 'Transmontani: Frederick Barbarossa, Rainald of Dassel, and Cultural Identity in the German Empire', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 132 (2010), 200–29.
- Godman, P., 'The Archpoet and the Emperor', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 76 (2011), 31–58.
- Goerlitz, U., *Literarische Konstruktion (vor-)nationaler Identität seit dem Annelied: Analysen und Interpretationen zur deutschen Literatur des Mittelalters*, Quellen und Forschungen zur Literatur- und Kunstgeschichte 45 (Berlin, 2007).
- Goetting, H., *Bistum Hildesheim: Die Hildesheimer Bischöfe von 815 bis 1221 (1227)*, Germania Sacra NF 20 (Berlin, 1984).
- Goetz, H.-W., *Das Geschichtsbild bei Otto von Freising: Ein Beitrag zur historischen Vorstellungswelt und zur Geschichte des 12. Jahrhunderts* (Cologne, 1984).
- Goez, W., *Translatio Imperii: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Geschichtsdenkens und der politischen Theorien im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit* (Tübingen, 1958).
- Görich, K., *Otto III: Romanus, Saxonicus et Italicus: Kaiserliche Rompolitik und sächsische Historiographie* (Sigmaringen, 1993).
- Görich, K., *Die Ehre Friedrich Barbarossas: Kommunikation, Konflikt und politisches Handeln im 12. Jahrhundert* (Darmstadt, 2001).
- Görich, K., 'Eine internationale Sprache der Ehre? Gesandte vor Friedrich Barbarossa', in H. Vollrath (ed.), *Der Weg in eine weitere Welt: Kommunikation und 'Aussenpolitik' im 12. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 2008), 35–57.
- Görich, K., *Friedrich Barbarossa: Eine Biographie* (Munich, 2011).
- Grass, N., *Alm und Wein: Aufsätze aus Rechts- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, ed. L. Carlen and H. Faussner (Hildesheim, 1990).
- Green, D. H., *Medieval Listening and Reading: The Primary Reception of German Literature 800–1300* (Cambridge, 1994).
- Grieco, A., 'Le Goût du vin entre doux et amer: Essai sur la classification des vins au Moyen Âge', in G. Garrier (ed.), *Le Vin des historiens, Actes du 1^{er} symposium Vin et Histoire 12* (Suze-la Rousse, 1990), 89–97.
- Grill, L., 'Das Itinerar Ottos von Freising', in H. Ebner (ed.), *Festschrift F. Hausmann* (Graz, 1977), 153–78.

- Grondeux, A., 'Le Vocabulaire latin de la renommée au Moyen Age', in *La Renommée* [= *Médiévales* 24 (1993)], 15–26.
- Groten, M., *Priorenkolleg und Domkapitel im Hohen Mittelalter: Zur Geschichte des kölnischen Erzstifts und Herzogtums*, Rheinisches Archiv 109 (Bonn, 1980).
- Grundmann, H., 'Litteratus—illiteratus: Der Wandel einer Bildungsnorm vom Altertum zum Mittelalter', in H. Grundmann, *Ausgewählte Aufsätze, 3. Bildung und Sprache*, Schriften der MGH 25, 3 (Stuttgart, 1978), 1–66.
- Guerreau-Jalabert, A., 'Qu'est-ce l'adoptio dans la société médiévale?', in D. Lett and C. Lucken (eds), *L'Adoption: Droits et pratiques* [*Médiévales*, 35 (1998)], 33–49.
- Güterbock, F., 'Alla vigilia della Lega Lombarda: Il dispotismo dei vicari imperiali a Piacenza', *Archivio Storico Italiano*, 95/1 (1937), 188–217; 95/2 (1937), 64–77, 181–92.
- Güterbock, F., 'Le lettere del notaio imperiale Burcardo intorno alla politica del Barbarossa nello scisma ed alla distruzione di Milano', *Bullettino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano*, 61 (1949), 1–66.
- Härdelein, A., *Aquae et vini mysterium: Geheimnis der Erlösung und Geheimnis der Kirche im Spiegel der mittelalterlichen Auslegung des gemischten Kelchs* (Münster, 1973).
- Harper, J., *The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy: From the Eight to the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford, 1991).
- Harris, M., *Sacred Folly: A New History of the Feast of Fools* (Cornell, 2011).
- Harrison, S., 'The Archpoet, Poem IV and some Horatian Intertexts', *MLJb* 32 (1997), 37–42.
- Harrison, T. (ed.), *Greeks and Barbarians* (Edinburgh, 2002).
- Hartung, W., *Die Spielleute: Eine Randgruppe in der Gesellschaft des Mittelalters*, Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte Beiheft 72 (Wiesbaden, 1982).
- Hausmann, F.-R., *Das Fach Mittellateinische Philologie an deutschen Universitäten von 1930 bis 1950*, Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters xvi (Stuttgart, 2010).
- Hausmann, F., *Reichskanzlei und Hofkapelle unter Heinrich V. und Konrad III.*, MGH Schriften 14 (Stuttgart, 1956).
- Haverkamp, A., *Herrschaftsformen der Frühstauffer in Reichsitalien*, 2 vols, Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters, 2 vols (Stuttgart, 1970).
- Haverkamp, A., 'Friedrich I. und der hohe italienische Adel', in *Beiträge zur Geschichte Italiens im 12. Jahrhundert*, VuF Sbd. 9 (Sigmaringen, 1971), 53–92.
- Haverkamp, A., 'Die Städte im Herrschafts- und Sozialgefüge Reichsitaliens', in F. Vittinghoff (ed.), *Stadt und Herrschaft: Römische Kaiserzeit und Hohes Mittelalter*, HZ Bd 7 (Munich, 1982), 149–246.
- Haverkamp, A. (ed.), *Friedrich Barbarossa: Handlungsspielräume und Wirkungsweisen des staufischen Kaisers*, VuF 4 (Sigmaringen, 1992).
- Haverkamp, A., *Verfassung, Kultur, Lebensform: Beiträge zur italienischen, deutschen und jüdischen Geschichte im europäischen Mittelalter*, ed. F. Burgardt et al. (Mainz, 1997).
- Haye, T. (ed.), *Oratio: Mittelalterliche Redekunst in lateinischer Sprache*, Mittellateinische Studien und Texte 27 (Leyden, 1999).
- Hehl, E.-D., et al. (eds), *Das Papsttum und die Welt des 12. Jahrhunderts*, Mittelalter-Forschungen 6 (Stuttgart, 2002).
- Heinemeyer, W., 'Beneficium—non feudum, sed bonum factum: Der Streit auf dem Reichstag zu Besançon', *Archiv für Diplomatik*, 15 (1969), 155–236.
- Heinemann, W., *Das Bistum Hildesheim im Kräftespiel der Reichs- und Territorialpolitik, vornehmlich des 12. Jahrhunderts* (Hildesheim, 1968).

- Heitmann, K., 'Das Deutschenbild im Italien des Mittelalters', in K. Heitmann, *Spiegelungen: Romanistische Beiträge zur Imagologie*, ed. G. Pichernell and O. Roth, *Studia Romanica* 86 (Heidelberg, 1996), 163–201.
- Herde, P., 'Die Katastrophe vor Rom im August 1167: Eine historisch-epidemiologische Studie zum vierten Italienzug Friedrichs I. Barbarossas', *Sitzungsberichte der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft . . . Frankfurt*, 27/4 (1991), 139–66.
- Herkenrath, R., 'Reinald von Dassel als Verfasser und Schreiber von Kaiserurkunden', *MIÖG* 72 (1964), 34–62.
- Herkenrath, R., 'Studien zum Magistertitel in der frühen Stauferzeit', *MIÖG* 88 (1980), 3–35.
- Herkenrath, R., 'I collaboratori tedeschi di Federico I', in R. Manselli and J. Riedmann (eds), *Federico Barbarossa nel dibattito storiografico in Italia e in Germania*, *Annali dell'Istituto italo-germanico* 10 (Bologna, 1982), 199–232.
- Hofmann, H., *Die Drei Heiligen Könige: Zur Heiligenverehrung im kirchlichen, gesellschaftlichen und politischen Leben des Mittelalters*, *Rheinisches Archiv* 94 (Bonn, 1975).
- Horowitz, J., and Menache, S., *L'Humour en chaire: Le Rire dans l'Eglise médiévale* (Besançon, 1963).
- Houben, H., 'Barbarossa und die Normannen: Traditionelle Züge und neue Perspektiven imperialer Süditalienpolitik', in A. Haverkamp (ed.), *Friedrich Barbarossa: Handlungsspielräume und Wirkungsweisen des staufischen Kaisers*, *VuF* 4 (Sigmaringen, 1992), 109–28.
- Huffmann, J., *Family, Commerce, and Religion in Cologne and London: Anglo-German Emigrants, c.1000–c.1300* (Cambridge, 1999).
- Jacquot, D., and Paravicini Bagliani, A. (eds), *La Scuola medica salernitana: Gli autori e i testi* (Florence, 2007).
- Jaeger, S., *The Origins of Courtliness: Civilizing Trends and the Formation of Courtly Ideals 939–1210* (Philadelphia, 1985).
- Jaeger, S., *The Envy of Angels: Cathedral Schools and Social Ideals in Medieval Europe, 950–1200* (Philadelphia, 1994).
- Jaeger, S., 'The Courtier-Bishop in *Vitae* from the Tenth to the Twelfth Century', in S. Jaeger, *Scholars and Courtiers: Intellectuals and Society in the Medieval West*, Variorum (Aldershot, 2002), X, 117–37.
- Jaeger, S., 'Pessimism in the Twelfth-Century "Renaissance"', *Speculum*, 78 (2003), 1151–83.
- Jakobi, K., 'Logic: The Later Twelfth-Century', in P. Dronke (ed.), *A History of Twelfth-Century Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1988), 227–54.
- Jakobs, H., 'Vescovi e città in Germania', in C. Mor and H. Schmidinger (eds), *I poteri temporali dei vescovi in Italia e in Germania nel Medioevo* (Bologna, 1979), 283–328.
- Jakobs, H., 'Bruderschaft und Gemeinde: Köln im 12. Jahrhundert', in B. Schwineköper (ed.), *Gilden und Zünfte: Kaufmännische und gewerbliche Genossenschaften im frühen und hohen Mittelalter*, *VuF* 29 (Sigmaringen, 1985), 281–310.
- Jaritz, G., 'Social Grouping and the Languages of Dress in the Late Middle Ages', *Medieval History Journal*, 3 (2000), 235–59.
- Johanek, P., 'Kultur und Bildung im Umkreis Friedrich Barbarossas', in A. Haverkamp (ed.), *Friedrich Barbarossa: Handlungsspielräume und Wirkungsweisen des staufischen Kaisers*, *VuF* 4 (Sigmaringen, 1992), 651–78.
- Johnson, P., *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zum Beginn der Neuzeit*, ii. *Vom hohen zum späten Mittelalter*, i. *Die höfische Literatur der Blütezeit (1160/70–1220/31)* (Tübingen, 1999).

- Johrendt, J., 'Barbarossa, das Kaisertum und Rom', in S. Burkhardt et al. (eds), *Staufisches Königtum im 12. Jahrhundert: Konzepte, Netzwerke—Politische Praxis* (Mainz, 2009), 75–107.
- Jones, P., *The Italian City-State: From Commune to Signoria* (repr. Oxford, 2004).
- Jonsson, R., *Historia: Études sur la genèse des offices versifiés*, Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis 15 (Uppsala, 1968).
- Judic, B., 'La Bible miroir des pasteurs dans la Règle Pastorale de Grégoire le Grand', in J. Fontaine and C. Pietri (eds), *Le Monde latin antique et la Bible* (Paris, 1985), 455–78.
- Jungmann, J., *Gewordene Liturgie: Studien und Durchblicke* (Leipzig, 1941).
- Jürgens, H., *Pompa diaboli: Die lateinischen Kirchenväter und das antike Theater* (Stuttgart, 1972).
- Jussen, B., *Patenschaft und Adoption im frühen Mittelalter: Künstliche Verwandtschaft als soziale Praxis* (Göttingen, 1991).
- Jussen, B. (ed.), *Die Macht des Königs: Herrschaft in Europa vom Frühmittelalter bis in die Neuzeit* (Munich, 2005).
- Kaiser, R., *Trunkenheit und Gewalt im Mittelalter* (Cologne, 2002).
- Kania, K., *Kleidung im Mittelalter: Ein Handbuch* (Cologne, 2010).
- Kantorowicz, E., *Laudes regiae: A Study in Liturgical Acclamations and Medieval Ruler Worship* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1946).
- Kantorowicz, E., *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology* (Princeton, 1957).
- Kantorowicz, E., 'The "King's Advent" and the Enigmatic Panels in the Doors of Santa Sabina', in E. Kantorowicz, *Selected Studies* (Locust Valley, NY, 1965), 37–75.
- Kartschoke, D., 'Armut in der deutschen Literatur des Mittelalters', in G. Oexle (ed.), *Armut im Mittelalter*, VuF 58 (Sigmaringen, 2004), 27–78.
- Kehr, P., 'Zur Geschichte Viktors IV.', *NA* 46 (1926), 53–85.
- Keller, H., *Adelsherrschaft und städtische Gesellschaft in Oberitalien (9.–12. Jahrhundert)*, Bibliothek des Deutschen Historischen Instituts in Rom 52 (Tübingen, 1979).
- Keller, H., 'Machabaeorum pugnae: Zum Stellenwert eines biblischen Vorbilds in Widukinds Deutung der ottonischen Königsherrschaft', in H. Keller and N. Staubach (eds), *Iconologia sacra: Mythos, Bildkunst und Dichtung in der Religions—und Sozialgeschichte Alteuropas. Festschrift K. Hauck . . .* (Berlin, 1994), 417–37.
- Kellner, K., *Heortologie oder das Kirchenjahr und die Heiligenfeste in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (Freiburg, 1901).
- Keupp, J., *Dienst und Verdienst: Die Ministerialien Friedrich Barbarossas und Heinrichs VI* (Stuttgart, 2002).
- Keupp, J., *Die Wahl des Gewandes: Mode, Macht und Möglichkeitssinn in Gesellschaft und Politik des Mittelalters*, *Mittelalter-Forschungen* 33 (Berlin, 2011).
- Kienzle, B., 'Defending the Lord's Vineyard: Hildegard of Bingen's Preaching against the Cathars', in C. Muessig (ed.), *Medieval Monastic Preaching*, Brill's Studies in Intellectual History 90 (Leiden, 1998), 163–81.
- Kienzle, B., 'Preaching as a Touchstone of Orthodoxy and Dissidence in the Middle Ages', *Medieval Sermon Studies*, 43 (1999), 18–53.
- Kienzle, B. (ed.), *The Sermon*, Typologie des sources du Moyen Age occidental 81–3 (Turnhout, 2000).
- Kienzle, B., *Hildegard of Bingen and her Gospel Homilies: Speaking New Mysteries*, *Medieval Women: Texts and Contents* 12 (Turnhout, 2009).
- Kirchgässner, B., and Scholz, G. (eds), *Stadt und Krieg* (Sigmaringen, 1989).

- Kirfel, H.-J., *Weltherrschaftsidee und Bündnispolitik: Untersuchungen zur auswärtigen Politik der Staufer*, Bonner Historische Forschungen 12 (Bonn, 1959).
- Kohler, E., 'Sens et fonction du terme "jeunesse" dans la poésie des troubadours', in P. Gallais and Y.-J. Riou (eds), *Mélanges offerts à R. Crozet . . .* (Poitiers, 1966), 569–83.
- Köhn, R., 'Militia curialis: Die Kritik am geistlichen Hofdienst bei Peter von Blois und in der lateinischen Literatur des 2.–12. Jahrhunderts', in *Soziale Ordnungen im Selbstverständnis des Mittelalters*, Miscellanea Mediaevalia 12/1 (Berlin, 1979), 227–57.
- Koller, H., 'Die mittelalterlichen Stadtmauern als Grundlage städtischen Selbstbewusstseins', in B. Kirchgässner and G. Scholz (eds), *Stadt und Krieg* (Sigmaringen, 1989), 9–26.
- Kölzer, T. (ed.), *Die Staufer im Süden: Sizilien und das Reich* (Sigmaringen, 1996).
- Knapp, P. (ed.), *Ego sum Hildesemensis: Bischof, Domkapitel und Dom in Hildesheim 815 bis 1810*, Katalog des Dommuseums Hildesheim 3 (Petersburg, 2000).
- Knipping, R. (ed.), *Die Regesten der Erzbischöfe von Köln im Mittelalter*, ii. 1100–1205, Publikationen der Gesellschaft für rheinische Geschichtskunde 21 (Bonn, 1901).
- Krieg, H., *Herrscherdarstellung der Stauferzeit: Friedrich Barbarossa im Spiegel seiner Urkunden und der staufischen Geschichtsschreibung*, VuF Sonderheft 50 (Ostfildern, 2003).
- Kruppa, N., *Die Grafen von Dassel (1097–1337/38)*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für historische Landesforschung der Universität Göttingen 42 (Bielefeld, 2002).
- Krüger, S., 'Charakter militaris und charakter indelebilis: Ein Beitrag zum Verhältnis von miles und clericus im Mittelalter', in L. Fenske et al. (eds), *Institutionen, Kultur und Gesellschaft im Mittelalter: Festschrift J. Fleckenstein* (Sigmaringen, 1984), 567–80.
- Kunisch, J., *Konrad III., Arnold von Wied und der Kapellenbau von Schwarzeindorf* (Düsseldorf, 1966).
- Kuttner, S., and Rathbone, E., 'Anglo-Norman Canonists of the Twelfth Century', *Traditio*, 7 (1949–50), 279–358.
- Lachmann, R., 'Der Narr in Christo und seine Verstellungspraxis', in P. von Moos (ed.), *Unverwechselbarkeit: Persönliche Identität und Identifikation in der vormodernen Gesellschaft*, Norm und Struktur 23 (Cologne, 2004), 379–409.
- Lamma, P., *Comneni e Staufer: Ricerche sui rapporti fra Bizanzio e l'Occidente nel secolo xii.*, Istituto di Studi per il Medioevo 14 (Rome, 1955).
- Landau, P., *Die Kölner Kanonistik des 12. Jahrhunderts: Ein Höhepunkt der europäischen Rechtswissenschaft*, Kölner rechtsgeschichtliche Vorträge I (Badenweiler, 2009).
- Landau, P., *Der Archipoeta—Deutschlands erster Dichterjurist: Neues zur Identifizierung des politischen Poeten der Barbarossazeit*, Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte 2011, 3 (Munich, 2011).
- Landgraf, A., 'Die Einschätzung der Scherzlüge in der Frühscholastik', *Theologisch-praktische Quartalschrift*, 93 (1940), 3–11.
- Langosch, K., 'Der Archipoeta war ein Deutscher!', *Historische Vierteljahresschrift*, 30 (1936), 493–547.
- Langosch, K., *Mittelaltin als Deutschkunde—eine nationale Aufgabe deutscher Wissenschaft und Schule* (Breslau, 1937), 142–50.
- Langosch, K., *Politische Dichtung um Kaiser Friedrich Barbarossa* (Berlin, 1943).
- Langosch, K., *Hymnen und Vagantenlieder: Lateinische Lyrik des Mittelalters mit deutschen Versen* (Darmstadt, 1954).
- Lapsanski, D., *Perfectio evangelica: Eine begriffsgeschichtliche Untersuchung im frühfranziskanischen Schrifttum*, Veröffentlichungen des Grabmann-Institutes 22 (Munich, 1974).

- Laqua, B., *Bruderschaften und Hospitäler während des hohen Mittelalters: Kölner Befunde in westeuropäisch-vergleichender Perspektive*, Monographien zur Geschichte des hohen Mittelalters 58 (Stuttgart, 2011).
- Larmat, J., *Les Pauvres et la pauvreté dans la littérature française du Moyen Age* (Nice, 1994).
- Latzke, T., 'Die Mantelgedichte des Primas Hugo von Orléans und Martial', *MJfB* 5 (1968), 54–8.
- Laudage, J., *Alexander III. und Friedrich Barbarossa*, Forschungen zur Kaiser- und Papstgeschichte des Mittelalters. Beihefte zu J. F. Böhmer, *Regesta Imperii*, 16 (Cologne, 1997).
- Laudage, J., *Friedrich Barbarossa: Eine Biographie* (Regensburg, 2005).
- Lazzarino del Grosso, A., *Armut und Reichtum im Denken Gerhohs von Reichersberg* (Munich, 1973).
- Leclercq, J., *Receuil d'études sur saint Bernard et ses écrits v. Storia e letteratura* 183 (Rome, 1992).
- Leclercq, J., 'Pallium', *Dictionnaire d'art chrétien et de liturgie* (Paris, 1934), xiii. 931–40.
- Lehmann, P., *Pseudo-antike Literatur des Mittelalters*, Studien der Bibliothek Warburg 13 (Berlin, 1927).
- Lenherr, T., *Die Exkommunikations- und Depositionsgewalt der Häretiker bei Gratian und den Dekretisten bis zur Glossa ordinaria des Johannes Teutonicus*, Münchener Theologische Studien III. Kanonistische Abteilung 42 (St Ottilien, 1987).
- Levison, W., *Das Werden der Ursula-Legende* (Cologne, 1928).
- Leyser, K., *Medieval Germany and its Neighbours 900–1250* (London, 1982).
- Leyser, K., *Communications and Power in Medieval Europe: The Gregorian Revolution and Beyond*, ed. T. Reuter (London, 1994).
- Libera, A. de, 'La Logique du Moyen Âge comme logique naturelle (Sprachlogik): Vues médiévales sur l'ambiguïté', in B. Mojsisch (ed.), *Sprachphilosophie in Antike und Mittelalter* (Amsterdam, 1986), 403–38.
- Longère, J., 'Pauvreté et richesse chez quelques prédicateurs durant la seconde moitié du xii^e siècle', in M. Mollat (ed.), *Études sur l'histoire de la pauvreté*, i (Paris, 1974), 255–74.
- Longère, J., *Œuvres oratoires de maîtres parisiens au xii^e siècle*, 2 vols (Paris, 1975).
- Longère, J., (ed.), *L'Abbaye parisienne de Saint-Victor au Moyen Âge*, Bibliotheca Victorina I (Paris, 1991).
- Loos, J., 'Hildegard von Bingen und Elisabeth von Schönau', in A. Brück (ed.), *Hildegard von Bingen, 1179–1979: Festschrift zum 800 Todestag der Heiligen* (Mainz, 1979), 263–72.
- Lori Sanfilippo, I. (ed.), *Federico Barbarossa e l'Italia nell'ottocentesimo anniversario della sua morte*, Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medioevo (Rome, 1990).
- Loud, G., *The Latin Church in Norman Italy* (Cambridge, 2007).
- Luhde, G., *Der Archipoeta: Seine Persönlichkeit und seine Gedichte* (Berlin, 1932).
- Macarrone, M., *Papato e impero dalla elezione di Federico I alla morte di Adriano IV (1152–1159)* (Rome, 1969).
- Magdalino, P., 'Wie das Bild des Basileus in Westeuropa genutzt wurde', in B. Jussen (ed.), *Die Macht des Königs: Herrschaft in Europa vom Frühmittelalter bis in die Neuzeit* (Munich, 2005), 179–89.
- Majo, J., *A History of Ecclesiastical Dress* (London, 1984).
- Majocchi, P., *Pavia città regia: Storia e memoria di una capitale medievale* (Rome, 2008).
- Marenbon, J., *The Philosophy of Peter Abelard* (Cambridge, 1997).
- Matthew, D. J. A., 'The Chronicle of Romuald of Salerno', in R. H. C. Davis and J. M. Wallace-Hadrill (eds), *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to R. W. Southern* (Oxford, 1981), 239–74.

- Matthew, D. J. A., *The Norman Kingdom of Sicily* (Cambridge, 1992).
- Matthew, D. J. A., 'Semper fideles: I Salernitani nel Regno Normanno', in P. Delogu and P. Peduto (eds), *Salerno nel xii° secolo: Istituzioni, società, cultura* (Salerno, 2004), 27–45.
- Mayr-Harting, H., *Church and Cosmos in Early Ottonian Germany: The View from Cologne* (Oxford, 2007).
- Menzel, M., 'Predigt und Predigtorganisation im Mittelalter', *Historisches Jahrbuch*, 111 (1991), 337–84.
- Mersiowsky, M., and Widder, E., 'Der Adventus in mittelalterlichen Abbildungen', in *Der weite Blick des Historikers: Einsichten in Kultur-, Landes- und Stadtgeschichte P. Johanek zum 65. Geburtstag* (Cologne, 2002), 55–98.
- Meuthen, E., 'Karl der Große–Barbarossa–Aachen: Zur Interpretation des Karlsprivilegs für Aachen', in W. Braunfels and P. E. Schramm (eds), *Karl der Grosse: Lebenswerk und Nachleben*, iv, *Das Nachleben* (Düsseldorf, 1967), 54–76.
- Meyer, W., *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur mittellateinischen Rhythmik*, 3 vols (Berlin, 1905–36).
- Meyvaert, P., 'Rainaldus est malus scriptor Francigenus: Voicing National Antipathy in the Middle Ages', *Speculum*, 66 (1991), 743–63.
- Minnis, A., *Fallible Authors: Chaucer's Pardoner and Wife of Bath* (Philadelphia, 2008).
- Mirbt, C., *Die Publizistik im Zeitalter Gregors VII.* (Leipzig, 1894).
- Mitchell, M., *Paul, the Corinthians and the Birth of Christian Hermeneutics* (Cambridge, 2010).
- Modzelewski, K., *Das barbarische Europa: Zur sozialen Ordnung von Germanen und Slaven im frühen Mittelalter*, trans. H. Petersen (Osnabrück, 2011).
- Möhring, H., *Der Weltkaiser der Endzeit: Entstehung, Wandel und Wirkung einer tausendjährigen Weissagung* (Stuttgart, 2000).
- Mohrmann, C., *Études sur le latin des chrétiens*, ii, *Latin chrétien et medieval*, *Storia e letteratura* 87 (Rome, 1961).
- Mölk, U., *Trobar clus—Trobar leu: Studien zur Dichtungstheorie der Troubadors* (Munich, 1968).
- Momigliano, A., 'Empietà ed eresia nel mondo antico', in A. Momigliano, *Sesto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico* (Rome, 1980), 437–58.
- Moos, P. von, 'Gottschalks Gedicht O mi custos—eine Confessio', *FmSt* 4 (1970), 201–30, and 5 (1971), 317–58.
- Moos, P. von, 'Poeta und Historicus im Mittelalter: Zum Mimesis-Problem am Beispiel einiger Urteile über Lucan', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 98 (1976), 93–130.
- Moos, P. von, *Geschichte als Topik: Das rhetorische Exemplum von der Antike zur Neuzeit und die historiae im 'Policraticus' Johanns von Salisbury*, *Ordo* 2 (Hildesheim, 1988).
- Moos, P. von, 'L'Exemplum et les exempla des prêcheurs', in J. Berlioz and M. Polo de Beaulieu (eds), *Les Exempla médiévaux: Nouvelles perspectives* (Paris, 1998), 67–83.
- Moos, P. von, 'Das Öffentliche und das Private im Mittelalter: Für einen kontrollierten Anachronismus', in G. Melville and von Moos (eds), *Das Öffentliche und das Private in der Vormoderne*, Norm und Struktur 10 (Cologne, 1998), 3–83.
- Moos, P. von, *Unverwechselbarkeit: Persönliche Identität und Identifikation in der vormodernen Gesellschaft*, Norm und Struktur 23 (Cologne, 2004).
- Moos, P. von, *Entre histoire et littérature: Communication et culture au Moyen Age* (Florence, 2005).
- Moos, P. von, *Rhetorik, Kommunikation und Medialität: Gesammelte Studien zum Mittelalter*, ii, *Geschichte: Forschung und Wissenschaft* 15 (Münster, 2006).
- Moos, P. von, *Öffentliches und Privates: Gemeinsames und Eigenes: Gesammelte Studien zum Mittelalter*, iii, *Geschichte: Forschung und Wissenschaft* 16 (Berlin, 2007).

- Muessig, C. (ed.), *Medieval Monastic Preaching*, Brill's Studies in Intellectual History 90 (Leyden, 1998).
- Müller, H., *Heribert, Kanzler Ottos III. und Erzbischof von Köln* (Cologne, 1977).
- Müller-Mertens, E., *Regnum Teutonicum: Aufkommen und Verbreitung der deutschen Reichs- und Königsauffassung im früheren Mittelalter*, Forschungen zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte 15 (Vienna, 1970).
- Müller-Mertens, E., 'Römisches Reich im Besitz der Deutschen, der König an Stelle des Augustus: Recherche zur Frage: Seit wann wird das mittelalterlich-frühneuzeitliche Reich von den Zeitgenossen als römisch und deutsch begriffen?', *HZ* 282 (2006), 1–58.
- Munz, P., *Frederick Barbarossa: A Study in Medieval Politics* (London, 1969).
- Nahmer, D. von der, *Die Reichsverwaltung in der Toscana unter Friedrich I. und Heinrich VI.* (Freiburg i. B., 1965).
- Nahmer, D. von der, 'Zur Herrschaft Friedrich Barbarossas in Italien', *Studi Medievali*, 15 (1974), 587–703.
- Nahmer, D. von der, 'Martin von Tours: Sein Mönchtum und seine Wirkung', *Francia*, 15 (1987), 1–41.
- Nedermann, C., 'Textual Communities of Learning and Friendship Circles in the Twelfth Century: An Examination of John of Salisbury's Correspondence', in C. Mews and J. Crossley (eds), *Communities of Learning: Networks and the Shaping of Intellectual Identity in Europe, 1100–1500* (Turnhout, 2011), 73–84.
- Ogilvy, J., 'Mimi, scurrae, histriones: Entertainers of the Early Middle Ages', *Speculum*, 38 (1963), 603–19.
- Opladen, P., *Gross St Martin: Geschichte einer stadtkölnischen Abtei*, Studien zur Kölner Kirchengeschichte 2 (Düsseldorf, 1954).
- Oppl, F., *Das Itinerar Friedrich Barbarossas (1125–1190)*, Forschungen zur Kaiser- und Papstgeschichte des Mittelalters Beihefte zu J. F. Böhmer, *Regesta Imperii* 1 (Vienna, 1978).
- Oppl, F., *Stadt und Reich im 12. Jahrhundert (1125–1190)*, Forschungen zur Kaiser- und Papstgeschichte des Mittelalters Beihefte zu J. F. Böhmer, *Regesta Imperii* 6 (Vienna, 1986).
- Oppl, F., 'Friedrich Barbarossa und die Stadt Lodi: Stadtentwicklung im Spannungsfeld zwischen Reich und Städtebündnis', in H. Maurer (ed.), *Kommunale Bündnisse Oberitaliens und Oberdeutschlands im Vergleich*, VuF 33 (Sigmaringen, 1987), 63–96.
- Oppl, F., 'Ytalica Expeditio: Die Italienzüge und die Bedeutung Oberitaliens für das Reich zur Zeit Kaiser Friedrich Barbarossas (1152–1190)', in *Deutschland und Italien zur Stauferzeit*, Schriften zur staufischen Geschichte und Kunst 22 (Göppingen, 2002), 93–135.
- Padberg, L. von, "'Unus populus ex diversis gentibus": Gentilismus und Einheit im frühen Mittelalter', in C. Lüth et al. (eds), *Der Umgang mit dem Fremden in der Vormoderne* (Cologne, 1997), 155–94.
- Paronetto, V., 'La figura del praedicator nella Regula Pastoralis di Gregorio Magno', in *Miscellanea A. P. Frutaz* (Rome, 1978), 167–82.
- Partner, P., *The Lands of St Peter* (London, 1972).
- Paterson, L., *The World of the Troubadours* (Oxford, 1993).
- Perler, D., *Zweifel und Gewißheit: Skeptische Debatten im Mittelalter*, Philosophische Abhandlungen 92 (Frankfurt, 1967).
- Petersohn, J., 'Kaisertum und Kultakt in der Stauferzeit', in J. Petersohn (ed.), *Politik und Heiligenverehrung im Hochmittelalter*, VuF 42 (Sigmaringen, 1994), 128–9.

- Petersohn, J., 'Rom und der Reichstitel *Sacrum Romanum Imperium*', Sitzungsberichte der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der Johann Goethe Universität, Frankfurt am Main 32, 4 (Stuttgart, 1994).
- Petersohn, J., *Kaisertum und Rom in spätsalischer und staufischer Zeit: Romidee und Rompolitik von Heinrich V. bis Friedrich II.*, MGH Schriften 62 (Hanover, 2010).
- Peyer, H., *Stadt und Stadtpatron im mittelalterlichen Italien*, Zürcher Studien zur allgemeinen Geschichte 13 (Zürich, 1955).
- Peyer, H., *Viaggiare nel Medioevo: Dall' ospitalità alla locanda* (Bari, 1999).
- Pferschy, B., 'Weinfälschung im Mittelalter', in *Fälschungen im Mittelalter*, MGH Schriften 33, 5 (Hanover, 1988), 669–702.
- Polheim, K., 'Der Mantel', in *Corona Querneae: Festgabe K. Strecker*, Schriften des Reichsinstituts für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde (MGH) 6 (Leipzig, 1941), 41–64.
- Poppel, G. van, 'Der "Genitivus" bei den Vaganten', *Neophilologus*, 5 (1920), 180–1.
- Postel, V., *Arbeit und Willensfreiheit im Mittelalter*, Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte 207 (Stuttgart, 2009).
- Pötter, W., *Die Ministerialität der Erzbischöfe von Köln vom Ende des 11ten bis zum Ausgang des 13ten Jahrhunderts* (Düsseldorf, 1967).
- Prosdomici, L., 'Chierici e laici nella società occidentale del secolo xii: A proposito di Decr. Grat. C. 12.q.I.c. 7: *Duo sunt genera Christianorum*', in S. Kuttner and J. Ryan (eds), *Proceedings of the Second Annual Congress of Medieval Canon Law*, Monumenta Iuris Canonici, Series C, Subsidia I (Vatican, 1962), 105–22.
- Raccagni, G., *The Lombard League, 1167–1225* (Oxford, 2011).
- Raff, T., 'Das Bild der Armut im Mittelalter', in G. Oexle (ed.), *Armut im Mittelalter*, VuF 58 (Sigmaringen, 2004), 9–26.
- Rahner, H., *Symbole der Kirche: Die Ekklesiologie der Väter* (Salzburg, 1964).
- Ratzinger, J., 'Originalität und Überlieferung in Augustinus' Begriff der *Confessio*', *Revue des études augustinienes*, 3 (1957), 357–92.
- Rauh, H., *Das Bild des Antichrist im Mittelalter: Von Tyconius zum deutschen Symbolismus* (Münster, 1979).
- Reuter, T., 'The Papal Schism, the Empire and the West', unpublished D.Phil. thesis (University of Oxford, 1975).
- Reuter, T., 'Das Edikt Friedrich Barbarossas gegen die Zisterzienser', *MIÖG* 84 (1976), 328–36.
- Reuter, T., 'John of Salisbury and the Germans', in M. Wilks (ed.), *The World of John of Salisbury*, Studies in Church History Subsidia 3 (Oxford, 1984), 415–26.
- Reuter, T., *Medieval Politics and Modern Mentalities*, ed. J. Nelson (Cambridge, 2006).
- Ricci, G., *Povert , vergogna, superbia: I declassati fra Medioevo e et  moderna* (Bologna, 1996).
- Richter, K., *Friedrich Barbarossa h lt Gericht: Zur Konfliktbew ltigung im 12. Jahrhundert* (Cologne, 1999).
- Ritzerfeld, U., *Das K lner Erztift im 12. Jahrhundert: Verwaltungsorganisation und wirtschaftliche Grundlagen*, Rheinisches Archiv 132 (Cologne, 1994).
- Roberts, P., *Stephanus de Lingua-Tonante: Studies in the Sermons of Stephen Langton*, Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies. Studies and Texts 16 (Toronto, 1968).
- Robinson, I., 'The *Colores Rhetorici* in the Investiture Contest', *Traditio*, 33 (1976), 209–28.
- Robinson, I., *Authority and Resistance in the Investiture Crisis: The Polemical Literature of the Late Eleventh Century* (Manchester, 1978).
- Robinson, I., 'Periculosus Homo: Gregory VII and Episcopal Authority', *Viator*, 9 (1978), 103–31.

- Röcke, W., and Velten, H. (eds), *Lachgemeinschaften: Kulturelle Inszenierungen und soziale Wirkungen von Gelächter im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit*, Trends in Medieval Philology 4 (Berlin, 2005).
- Rosier, I. (ed.), *L'Ambiguïté: Cinq études historiques* (Lille, 1988).
- Schaller, A., *Der Erzengel Michael im frühen Mittelalter: Ikonographie und Verehrung eines Heiligen ohne Vita*, Vestigia Bibliae 26/27 (Berne, 2009).
- Schaller, D., and Könsgen, E., *Initia carminum Latinorum saeculo undecimo antiquiorum: Bibliographisches Repertorium für die lateinische Dichtung der Antike und des früheren Mittelalters* (Göttingen, 1977).
- Schaller, H.-M., 'Der heilige Tag als Termin mittelalterlicher Staatsakte', *DA* 30 (1974), 1–24.
- Schambach, K., 'Das Verhalten Rainalds von Dassel zum Empfange der höchsten Weihen', *Zeitschrift des historischen Vereins für Niedersachsen*, 80 (1915), 173–95.
- Schambach, K., 'Ein neuer Versuch zur Erklärung des Carmen V ('Nocte quadam' usw.) des Archipoeten', *Annalen des historischen Vereins für den Niederrhein*, 102 (1918), 82–98.
- Scheffer-Boichorst, P., *Gesammelte Schriften*, 2 vols (Berlin, 1905).
- Scheidegger, G., 'Das Neugeborene und der Teufel: Kindheitsgeschichte als Reinheitsgeschichte', *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, 84 (2002), 259–91.
- Schieffer, R., 'Bleibt der Archipoeta anonym?', *MIÖG* 98 (1990), 59–79.
- Schilling, B., *Guido von Vienne—Papst Calixt II*, MGH Schriften 45 (Hanover, 1998).
- Schmeidler, B., 'Noch einige Bemerkungen zum Carmen V (IX) des Archipoeta', *Annalen des historischen Vereins für den Niederrhein*, 103 (1919), 186–91.
- Schmeidler, B., 'Anti-asketische Äusserungen aus Deutschland im 11. und beginnenden 12. Jahrhundert', in *Kultur-und Universalgeschichte. Festschrift W. Götz* (Leipzig, 1927), 35–52.
- Schmid, P., and Wanderwitz, H., *Die Geburt Österreichs: 850 Jahre Privilegium minus*, Regensburger Kulturleben 4 (Regensburg, 2007).
- Schmidt, P.-G., 'The Quotation in Goliardic Poetry: The Feast of Fools and the Goliardic Strophe *cum auctoritate*', in P. Godman and O. Murray (eds), *Latin Poetry and the Classical Tradition. Essays in Medieval and Renaissance Literature* (Oxford, 1990), 39–56.
- Schmidt, U., 'A quo ergo habet, si a domino papa non habet imperium? Zu den Anfängen der staufischen Kaiserwahlen', in S. Lorenz and U. Schmidt (eds), *Von Schwaben bis Jerusalem: Facetten staufischer Geschichte* (Sigmaringen, 1996), 61–88.
- Schmitt, J.-C., *La Raison des gestes dans l'Occident médiéval* (Paris, 1990).
- Schmitt, J.-C., 'Les Images de la dérision', in E. Crouzet-Pavan and J. Verger (eds), *La Dérision au Moyen Âge: De la pratique social au rituel politique* (Paris, 2007), 263–74.
- Schmugge, L., 'Über "nationale Vorurteile" im Mittelalter', *DA* 38 (1982), 439–59.
- Schneidmüller, B., and Weinfurter, S. (eds), *Heilig. Römisch. Deutsch: Das Reich im mittelalterlichen Europa* (Dresden, 2006).
- Schnell, R., 'Von der kanonistischen zur höfischen Ehekasuistik: Gautiers *Ille et Galeron*', *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 48 (1982), 257–95.
- Schneyer, J. B., *Die Unterweisung der Gemeinde über die Predigt bei scholastischen Predigern: Eine Homiletik aus scholastischen Prothemen*, Veröffentlichungen des Grabmann-Institutes NF 4 (Munich, 1968).
- Schreiner, P., 'Byzanz und der Westen: Die gegenseitige Betrachtungsweise in der Literatur des 12. Jahrhunderts', in A. Haverkamp (ed.), *Friedrich Barbarossa: Handlungsspielräume und Wirkungsweisen des staufischen Kaisers*, VuF 4 (Sigmaringen, 1992), 557–80.
- Schröder, S., *Macht und Gabe: Materielle Kultur am Hof Heinrichs II. von England*, Historische Studien 481 (Berlin, 2004).

- Schubert, E., *Fahrendes Volk im Mittelalter* (Bickfeld, 1995).
- Schulte, P., 'Friedrich Barbarossa, die italienischen Kommunen und das politische Konzept der Treue', *FmSt* 38 (2004), 153–72.
- Schüppert, H., *Kirchenkritik in der lateinischen Lyrik des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts*, *Medium Ævum* 23 (Munich, 1972).
- Schweers, R., 'Die Bedeutung des Raumes für das Scheitern oder Gelingen des Adventus', in P. Johanek and A. Lampen (eds), *Adventus: Studien zum herrscherlichen Einzug in die Stadt*, *Städteforschung A* 75 (Cologne, 2009), 37–56.
- Schwenk, B., 'Das Hundetragen: Ein Rechtsbrauch im Mittelalter', *Historisches Jahrbuch*, 110 (1990), 289–309.
- Sears, E., *The Ages of Man: Medieval Interpretations of the Life Cycle* (Princeton, 1986).
- Skinner, P., *Health and Medicine in Early Medieval Southern Italy* (Leyden, 1997).
- Spinks, B., *Early and Medieval Rituals and Theologies of Baptism: From the New Testament to the Council of Trent* (Aldershot, 2006).
- Sprenger, K.-M., 'Die Klöster von Pavia zwischen Friedrich I. und Alexander III: Zu einem verlorenen Mandat Friedrich Barbarossas und den Auswirkungen des Schismas in Pavia', *QF* 77 (1997), 18–50.
- Stach, W., 'Salve, mundi domine! Kommentierende Betrachtungen zum Kaiserhymnus des Archipoeta', *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, phil.-hist. Kl. Bd. 91 (1939), 1–104.
- Stegmüller, F. (ed.), *Repertorium Biblicum Medii Ævi: Commentaria anonyma* (Madrid, 1961).
- Stehkämper, H., 'Der Reichsbischof und Territorialfürst (12. und 13. Jahrhundert)', in P. Berglar and O. Engels (eds), *Der Bischof in seiner Zeit: Bischofstypus und Bischofsideal im Spiegel der Kölner Kirche. Festgabe für Joseph Kardinal Höffner . . .* (Cologne, 1986), 95–184.
- Stelzer, W., 'Zum Scholarenprivileg Friedrich Barbarossas (Authentica "Habita")', *DA* 34 (1978), 123–65.
- Stengel, E., 'Den Kaiser macht das Heer: Studien zur Geschichte eines politischen Gedankens', in E. Stengel, *Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisergedankens im Mittelalter* (Cologne, 1965), 1–69.
- Stockel, S., *Kulturen des Lehrens im Früh- und Hochmittelalter: Autorität, Wissenskonzepte und Netzwerke von Gelehrten* (Cologne, 2011).
- Störmer, W., 'Königtum und Kaisertum in der mittelhochdeutschen Literatur der Zeit Friedrich Barbarossas', in A. Haverkamp, *Friedrich Barbarossa: Handlungsspielräume und Wirkungsweisen des staufischen Kaisers*, *VuF* 4 (Sigmaringen, 1992), 581–601.
- Strait, P., *Cologne in the Twelfth Century* (Gainesville, FL, 1974).
- Strecker, K., 'Die zweite Beichte des Erzpoeten', in *Mittelalterliche Handschriften . . . Festgabe . . . H. Degering* (Leipzig, 1926), 244–52.
- Tabacco, G., 'La costituzione del Regno Italico al tempo di Federico Barbarossa', in *Popolo e stato nell'età di Federico Barbarossa: Alessandria e la Lega Lombarda* (Turin, 1970), 163–77.
- Tabacco, G., 'Vescovi e comuni in Italia', in C. Mor and H. Schmidinger (eds), *I poteri temporali dei vescovi in Italia e in Germania nel Medioevo* (Bologna, 1979), 253–82.
- Tauber, W., *Das Würfelspiel im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit: Eine kultur- und sprachgeschichtliche Darstellung*, *Europäische Hochschulschriften* 959 (Frankfurt, 1987).
- The Oxford Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, i. ed. R. Bjork (Oxford, 2010).
- The Sign Languages of Poverty*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Forschungen des Instituts für Realienkunde des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit. Diskussionen und Materialien 8 (Vienna, 2007).

- Thomas, H., 'Zur Geschichte des Wortes "deutsch" vom Ende des 11. bis zur Mitte des 12. Jahrhunderts', in M. Nikolay-Panter et al. (eds), *Geschichtliche Landeskunde der Rheinlande: Regionale Befunde und raumübergreifende Perspektiven. G. Droege zum Andenken* (Cologne, 1994), 131–58.
- Thomas, H., 'Die Deutschen und die Rezeption ihres Volksnamen', in W. Paravicini (ed.), *Nord und Süd in der deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters*, Kieler Historische Studien 34 (Sigmaringen, 1999), 19–50.
- Tierney, B., *Medieval Poor Law: A Sketch of Canonical Theory and its Application in England* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1959).
- Töpfer, B., *Das kommende Reich des Friedens: Zur Entwicklung chiliastischer Zukunftshoffnungen im Hochmittelalter* (Berlin, 1964).
- Uhlir, C., *Hofkritik im England des Mittelalters und der Renaissance: Studien zu einem Gemeinplatz der europäischen Moralistik* (Berlin, 1973).
- Ullmann, W., 'Cardinal Roland and Besançon', *Sacerdozio e regno da Gregorio VII a Bonifacio VIII, Miscellanea Historicae Pontificae*, 18 (1954), 107–25.
- Vecchio, S., 'Segreti e bugie: i peccata occulta', *Micrologus*, 14 (2006), 41–58.
- Violante, C., 'Il vescovo dell'Italia centro-settentrionale e lo sviluppo dell'economia monetaria', in *Vescovi e diocesi in Italia nel Medioevo (sec. ix–xiii)*, *Italia Sacra* 5 (Padua, 1964), 193–217.
- Vollmann-Profe, G., *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zum Beginn der Neuzeit*, i. Von den Anfängen zum hohen Mittelalter, 2. Wiederbeginn volkssprachiger Schriftlichkeit im hohen Mittelalter (1050/60–1160/70) (Königstein, 1986).
- Vollrath, H., 'Lüge oder Fälschung? Die Überlieferung von Barbarossas Hoftag zu Würzburg im Jahre 1165 und der Becket-Streit', in S. Weinfurter (ed.), *Stauferreich im Wandel: Ordnungsvorstellungen und Politik in der Zeit Friedrich Barbarossas*, *Mittelalter-Forschungen* 9 (Stuttgart, 2002), 149–72.
- Voltmer, E., *Il carroccio* (Turin, 1994).
- Waddell, H., *The Wandering Scholars* (London, 1932).
- Walther, H., *Lateinische Sprichwörter und Sentenzen des Mittelalters in alphabetischer Anordnung*, 5 vols (Göttingen, 1963–1967).
- Wasselnick, R., 'Les Compilations des *Moralia in Iob* du VIIe au XIIe siècle', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 29 (1962), 5–32.
- Wasselnick, R., 'L'Influence de l'exégèse de saint Grégoire le Grand sur les commentaires bibliques médiévaux (VIIe–XIIIe siècles)', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 32 (1965), 157–204.
- Wasselnick, R., 'La Présence de saint Grégoire le Grand dans les ouvrages de morale du XIIe siècle', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 35 (1968), 197–240.
- Webb, D., *Patrons and Defenders: The Saints in the Italian City-States* (London, 1996).
- Weinfurter, S., 'Der Aufstieg der frühen Wittelsbacher', *Geschichte in Köln*, 14 (1983), 13–46.
- Weinfurter, S. (ed.), *Stauferreich im Wandel: Ordnungsvorstellungen und Politik in der Zeit Friedrich Barbarossas*, *Mittelalter-Forschungen* 9 (Stuttgart, 2002).
- Weinfurter, S., 'Reformkanoniker und Reichsepischat im Hochmittelalter', in S. Weinfurter, *Gelebte Ordnung—Gedachte Ordnung. Ausgewählte Beiträge zu Königtum, Kirche und Reich*, ed. H. Kluger et al. (Ostfildern, 2005), 3–34.
- Weinfurter, S., 'Wie das Reich heilig wurde', in B. Jussen (ed.), *Die Macht des Königs: Herrschaft in Europa vom Frühmittelalter bis in die Neuzeit* (Munich, 2005), 190–204.

- Weise, W., *Der Hof der Kölner Erzbischöfe in der Zeit Friedrich Barbarossas* (Düsseldorf, 2004).
- Welborn, L., *Paul, the Fool of Christ: A Study of I Corinthians 1–4 in the Comic–Philosophic Tradition* (London, 2005).
- Wendehorst, A., 'Who Could Read and Write in the Middle Ages?' in A. Haverkamp and H. Vollrath (eds), *England and Germany in the High Middle Ages: Festschrift K. Leyser* (Oxford, 1996).
- Wenzel, S., 'The Joyous Art of Preaching, or the Preacher and the Fabliau', *Anglia* 92 (1979), 304–25.
- Werner, K., 'Das hochmittelalterliche Imperium im politischen Bewusstsein Frankreichs', *HZ* 200 (1965), 1–60.
- Wieruszowski, H., 'Roger II of Sicily, Rex-Tyrannus, in Twelfth-Century Political Thought', *Speculum*, 38 (1963), 46–78.
- Wilmes, P., *Der Herrscher—'Adventus' im Kloster des Frühmittelalters*, Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften 22 (Munich, 1976).
- Winkler, H., *Der lange Weg nach Westen: Deutsche Geschichte vom Ende des Alten Reiches bis zum Untergang der Weimarer Republik*, i (Munich, 2000).
- Wolf, G. (ed.), *Friedrich Barbarossa* (Darmstadt, 1975).
- Wolter, H., *Arnold von Wied, Kanzler Konrads III. und Erzbischof von Köln*, Veröffentlichungen des Kölnischen Geschichtsvereins 32 (Cologne, 1973).
- Wolter, H., 'Erzbischof Friedrich II. von Köln (1156–1158)', *Jahrbuch des Kölner Geschichtsvereins*, 46 (1975), 1–50.
- Wolter, H., 'Friedrich Barbarossa und die Synode zu Pavia im Jahre 1160', in H. Vollrath and S. Weinfurter (eds), *Köln: Stadt und Bistum in Kirche und Reich des Mittelalters. Festschrift für O. Engels zum 65. Geburtstag*, Kölner Historische Abhandlungen 39 (Cologne, 1993), 415–53.
- Wunderer, R., *Weinbau und Weinbereitung im Mittelalter unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der mittelhochdeutschen Pelz- und Weinbücher*, Wiener Arbeiten zur germanischen Altertumskunde und Philologie 37 (Berne, 2001).
- Zeilingner, K., 'Friedrich Barbarossa, Wibald von Stablo und Eberhard von Bamberg', *MIÖG* 78 (1970), 210–33.
- Zenker, B., 'Die Mitglieder des Kardinalkollegiums von 1130 bis 1159', unpublished dissertation (Würzburg, 1964).
- Zielenski, H., *Der Reichsepiskopat in spätottonischer und salischer Zeit (1002–1125)*, i (Stuttgart, 1984).
- Zimmermann, G., *Ordensleben und Lebensstandard: Die cura corporis in den Ordensvorschriften des abendländischen Hochmittelalters*, Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Mönchtums und des Benediktinerordens 32 (Münster, 1973).
- Zink, M., 'La Rhétorique honteuse et la convention du sermon *ad status* à travers la *Summa d arte praedicatoria* d'Alain de Lille', in H. Roussel and F. Suard (eds), *Alain de Lille, Gautier de Châtillon, Jakemart Gielée et leur temps* (Lille, 1980), 171–85.
- Zotz, T., 'Pallium et alia quaedam archiepiscopatus insignia: Zum Beziehungsgefüge und zu Rangfragen der Reichskirchen im Spiegel der päpstlichen Privilegierung des 10. und 11. Jahrhunderts', in H. Maurer and H. Patze (eds), *Festschrift für B. Schwineköper* (Sigmaringen, 1982), 155–76.
- Zotz, T., 'Odysseus im Mittelalter? Zum Stellenwert von List und Listigkeit in der Kultur des Adels', in H. von Senger (ed.), *Die List* (Frankfurt, 1999), 212–40.

Zug Tucci, H., 'Il carroccio nella vita communale italiana', *QF* 65 (1985), 1–104.

Zug Tucci, H., 'Dalla polemica antiimperiale alla polemica antitedesca', in P. Cammarosano (ed.), *Le forme della propaganda politica nel Due-Trecento*, Collection de l'École française de Rome 20 (Rome, 1994), 45–64.

Zwierlein, O., 'Antike Motive beim Archipoeta und im *Ligurinus*', *MJb* 7 (1972), 102–24.

General Index

- Aachen 36, 62, 100, 106, 134, 145, 151, 213
 Abelard, Peter 16, 54, 177, 190, 194, 217,
 245, 247
 actors, anti-actors 102ff., 122, 123, 127,
 215, 245
 Adalbert, antipope 83
 Adalbert of Saarbrücken 10, 23, 24
 Adam of Balsham 19ff., 40
 Adela of Vohburg 153
 Adelhard, abbot of Great St Martin's 229,
 230, 232
adoptivus 181, 218ff.
 Adrian, IV, pope 37ff., 48ff., 58ff., 66ff., 81, 82,
 83, 85, 86, 93, 99, 154, 229
 Advent 185ff.
adventus 161
 Aeneas 106
 Alan of Lille 202, 206
 Albert of Freising 64
 Albert the Great, St 127
 Alethia 163ff., 238
 Alexander III, pope 3, 49ff., 81, 82ff., 95, 96,
 98, 99, 121, 141, 142, 144, 154, 162, 179,
 185, 202, 212, 214, 215, 222, 225
 All Saints' Day 95, 98
 Alps 39, 45, 56ff., 74, 76, 100, 132ff., 137, 138,
 212, 234
amaritudo 39, 174ff.
 ambiguity 18, 20, 21, 40ff., 49ff., 180, 189,
 192, 202, 214, 235, 240
ambo 186
 Ambrogio, san 148
 Ambrose, St 91ff., 133, 148ff.
 Amiens 125
 Anacletus II, antipope 83
 Ancona 67ff.
 angels 1, 166, 171, 172, 173
 Anselm of Havelberg 66ff., 81
 anti-conformity 115ff., 164ff., 178, 184, 239
 antipopes 83ff.
 antonomasia 136
 'Apulians' (= Southern Italians) 49, 133, 155
 Aquinas, Thomas, St 127
 Aramaic 205
 Archpoet
 as notary *see* 'Rainald H'
 as preacher 185ff.
 as prophet 110ff., 209ff.
 conditions of composition 112ff.
 cultural clericalism of 118ff., 247
 education of 8ff., 117ff.
 irony of 1ff., 164ff., 191ff., 222ff., 239ff.
 itinerary of 2, 36ff.
 lost works by 4, 9, 35
 origins 8
 scepticism of 246ff.
 transmission of 9, 112ff.
 Aristotle, Aristotelian 20, 107, 227, 228
 Arnold I, archbishop of Cologne 27, 32ff.
 Arnold II, archbishop of Cologne 29, 31ff.,
 78, 199
 Arnold of Brescia 165
 Arnold of Selenhofen 25
 Arnolf of Wied, chancellor *see* Arnold II
 Arnulf of Lisieux 186ff.
 asceticism 13, 115, 165ff., 232
 'Asianism' 107
 'Atticism' 107
 Augustine, St 123, 146, 168, 188, 225,
 227, 238
 Augustus 111ff.
 authenticity, spiritual 124, 245
 avarice 80, 94, 120ff., 124, 234
 Babylon 146, 149
 Bacchus 114, 115, 206
 Balach 171–2
balatrones 216
 Bamberg, assembly of 225
 barbarians, barbarity 3, 4, 38, 61ff., 104ff., 108,
 109, 153, 234ff., 241
 Barbarossa, Emperor Frederick I 3, 5ff., 108ff.,
 129ff., 141ff., 178ff., 201ff., 228ff.
 barber, imperial 108
 beard 108, 248
 Beatrix, empress 100, 157, 213, 237
 Becket, Thomas, St 5ff., 22, 42ff., 81ff., 130,
 150, 165, 214, 215, 183, 204, 249
 Bede, St 106
 Benedict, St; Rule of 115, 232, 245
beneficia 40ff., 50ff., 59, 66
 Benevento, concordat of 39ff., 71, 82
 Bergamo 108ff.
 Bernard of Clairvaux, St 22, 33, 185, 188, 193,
 207, 208, 241
 Bernard of Hildesheim 25ff.
 Bernard of San Clemente, cardinal 49ff.
 Bernward of Hildesheim, St 11, 15–16, 28, 30,
 79, 203
 Berta of Sulzbach 153
 Besançon 46ff., 61, 62, 82, 86, 95, 99, 101, 140,
 153, 206, 213, 235–6
 Bible, exegesis of 20, 69, 111, 146, 169, 199,
 219–22
 bitterness *see amaritudo*
 blasphemy 1, 60ff., 173, 208, 222, 243

- Boleslav IV, duke 46
 Bologna 23, 66, 83, 155
 Bonne-Espérance 80
 Boso, cardinal-historian 37, 39, 86, 250
 Boyneburg 40, 41
 Braunschweig 29
 brigands 48, 154
 Bruno, archbishop of Cologne 79–80
 Bulgarus, jurist 236
 Burchard of Worms 167
 Burgundy 2, 7, 10, 48, 152, 195, 212, 213, 214, 222
 Burkhard, notary 43, 90ff., 195, 242
 butler 174ff., 242
 Byzantium 44–5, 133, 152–5, 228
- Caesar, Julius 57, 107
 Caffaro, annalist 104
 Capua 133
Carmina Burana 173, 175ff., 238
carroccio 91ff., 96, 148
casus 200, 207
 Cathars 226ff.
 Celestine II, antipope 83
 censorship, preliminary 47, 148
 chancery, German 24ff., 31ff., 62, 153
 Charlemagne 4, 38, 57, 62, 75, 93, 100, 106, 138, 150–2, 155, 172, 212–213, 232, 238, 240, 244
 Chaucer, Geoffrey 206
 chess 170
 Christian of Mainz 88
christus Domini 44, 58, 145
 Cicero 16, 27, 94, 102, 103, 144
 Cistercians 33, 118
 Cîteaux 118
 civitas 137
 Clairvaux 118
 classicism and anti-classicism 106ff.
 cloaks 26ff.
 clothing 11, 26ff., 117, 122, 124ff., 160, 170, 201ff., 223, 227, 240ff.
codex Udalrici 41, 61
 Cologne
 archbishopric of 27ff., 42, 78
 city of 27, 78–80
 dukedom of 81
compunctio 197
 confession 22, 144, 165ff., 195, 205ff., 229, 239
Conlatini 74ff.
 Conrad III, king 25, 27–8, 31ff., 47, 81, 130, 152, 153, 185, 237
 Conrad of Babenberg 25ff.
 Conrad of Staufien 212, 229ff.
 conscience 1, 164, 167, 180, 185, 197, 199, 248
 Constance, concordat of 39ff., 87–8
 Constantine 141, 152–4
controversia 60
- Cornificius, 'Cornificians' 21ff., 89, 245
crapula 1, 115, 232
 Crema 82, 85
 Cremona 75, 105, 130ff.
 Cyprian, pseudo- 170
- Damian, Peter 163ff., 169–70, 182ff.
damnatio memoriae 5
 Dassel, town 9ff.
 debate-poetry 106ff., 175
 devil 48, 60, 81, 89, 93, 96, 166, 171
 dialectic, and dialectical forms of thought 4, 17ff., 80, 93ff., 100, 106–7, 118ff., 147ff., 170, 175ff., 191, 199, 200, 207, 240
Dienstrecht, of Cologne 125, 201, 227
discretio 18, 105
do, ut des 120, 125, 221
 dog-carrying, as punishment 73
dominator 65, 73
dominus mundi 7, 23, 69, 138ff., 236, 243
dulcedo 174ff., 181
- Eberhard of Bamberg 35, 58–9, 60, 74
 Eberhard of Salzburg 90
 eclecticism 112ff.
 Einhard 62
 Ekbert of Schönaue 19, 79ff., 84, 93, 94, 122, 124, 226
 Elias 110, 112
 Elihu 193, 205
 Elisabeth of Schönaue 19, 226ff., 232
 Elisha 110, 112
 eloquence, ecclesiastical 184ff.
 empire, ideology of 7ff., 43ff., 61ff., 73, 133ff., 139
 encomium 129ff.
 entertainers 102, 121ff., 183–4, 207, 215–16
 epic, poetry 56, 102, 105, 146, 157, 231
 Epiphanius, St 13, 15
 Eskil of Lund 10, 48ff.
 ethopoeia 64
 Etzel 123
 Eugenius III, pope 26ff., 32ff., 74, 87, 122, 220, 241
 excommunication 3–4, 61, 121, 141, 166, 186, 193, 196, 202, 215, 222
exemplum 200, 203, 207
 Ezekiel, prophet 110–11, 191
- fama* 100, 212, 214ff.
 Felix, martyr 213
 Ferrara 67
figura 217, 218, 220
fodere 117, 118
 Folmar of Triefenstein 237
 Francis, St 207
 Frederick I, emperor *see* Barbarossa
 Frederick II, archbishop of Cologne 78
 Frederick of Swabia, duke 47

- Fulda 41ff.
furor Teutonicus 38, 75, 87
- gambling 170ff.
 Gandersheim 15, 106
 garments *see* clothing
 Geneva 212
 genitives, grammatical and metaphorical 219, 224
 Genoa 133ff., 228
 Gepa 9, 26
 Gerard Pucelle 88ff.
 Gerbert of Aurillac 234
 Gerhoh of Reichersberg 10, 122, 201, 237
Gesta Frederici I in Lombardia 108ff., 158, 162
 giants 146
 Gilbert de la Porrée 54
 Gisors-Trie 23
 gluttony 127
 Godehard, St 13, 14, 25
 Godfrey of Viterbo 113
 Goslar 25, 26, 28, 29
 Gottschalk 167ff.
 Grafschaft 81
gravitas 183
 Great St Martin, monastery 229ff.
 Gregory the Great, pope and saint 111, 123, 169, 172, 188ff., 205
 Gregory VII, pope 27, 62
 Gregory VIII, antipope 83
 Guido of Biandrate 75, 81, 88, 90ff., 129, 136ff., 148
 Guido of Crema, cardinal *see* Paschal III
 Guido of Pisa, cardinal 32
 Guilhelm IX of Aquitaine 119
 Guntbald 15
 Gunther of Bamberg 123
 Gunther of Pairis 63, 157–61
- hagiography 5ff., 188
 haircut, imperial 108
 Hamburg–Bremen 48
 Heinrich, protonotary 47ff.
 Henry II, king 6, 47ff., 85–6, 98, 214
 Henry III, emperor 8, 82–3
 Henry IV, emperor 130, 152
 Henry VI, emperor 236
 Henry Jasomirgott 40–1
 Henry of Brabant 16
 Henry of Corvey 27
 Henry of Mainz 31
 Henry of SS. Nereo e Achilleo, cardinal 66ff.
 Henry of Troyes 96ff.
 Henry the Lion 28ff., 40ff., 66ff.
 heralds 214–16
 Herbert of Bosham 48
 Heribert, St 79–80
 hermeneutics 21, 52, 59, 217, 239ff.
 Hezilo, bishop 14
- Hildebert of Lavardin 187, 193
 Hildegard of Bingen 19, 182, 195ff., 207, 226ff., 232
 Hildesheim 5ff., 101, 119, 203, 217
 Hillin, archbishop of Trier 61ff.
 Hilwarthausen 40
 Hincmar of Reims 168
 Hippolytus, classical hero 163, 164
 pope and saint 164–5
 historiography, Italian 105
 Hitler, Adolf 131
 holy fools 207ff.
 Homer 103, 107, 112, 123, 159, 160, 227, 228
honor (imperii) 36, 43, 90, 99, 213, 214
 Honorius Augustodunensis 194, 197
 Horace 111–12
 Hroswitha of Gandersheim 15, 106
 Hugh of St Victor 19, 20, 21
 humility 22, 53, 67, 87, 193, 205, 234
 Hyacinth of S. Maria in Cosmedin, cardinal 66ff.
- identity, cultural 3, 54ff., 102, 108, 234ff., 247, 249
 moral 22, 239
 immantation 84ff.
imperitia 224ff.
informari 55, 151
 Innocent II, pope 37
 investiture crisis 41ff., 58–61, 80, 120
 Isidore of Seville 124
 Italy, kingdom of
 northern 63ff., 74ff., 121, 129ff., 140, 147, 162, 186, 209, 212
 perceptions of 104ff., 109, 120
 southern 133ff., 155, 209ff.
- Ivo of Chartres 167
- Jeremiah, prophet 188ff., 199
 Jerome, St 16, 220
 Job, prophet 39, 166, 192ff.
 John of Salisbury, antagonism to Cornificians 20ff.
 anti-German polemic 27ff., 38, 85ff., 225–6, 235
 intellectual attitudes 6ff., 19, 45, 139, 158, 239ff.
 John the Baptist 155, 215
 John XII, pope 171
 John, St 163, 180, 192, 199ff., 225
 joking lies 238
 Jonah, prophet 217ff.
 Jove 180
 Justinian Code 23, 43ff., 148
 Juvenal 155
- knights 9, 56, 67–8, 80, 91, 117ff., 126, 160, 241, 244
 Konrad of Hermesfurt 119

- labour, voluntary 110
 laity, laymen 4, 10, 26, 31ff., 118ff., 236ff.
 Langosch, Karl 249
 Latin, uses of 7ff., 51ff., 57ff., 62, 75ff., 89, 118ff., 236
 laughter, communal 2, 13ff.
 derisive 208
 mocking 183
 law, canon 23, 34, 44, 88–9, 93
 civil 23, 44
leccatores 121, 123, 127, 216
 Lech, river 65
 Lega Lombarda 130, 138
 Leo III, pope 62
 Leo of Assisi 207
libertas 147ff.
 lions, symbolic 181–2
 literalism 168ff., 178ff.
 Liutprand of Cremona 171
 Lodi (New) 91ff., 105ff., 117, 121, 130ff., 135, 137, 138, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 151, 154, 155, 162
logica 20
 Lombardy, Lombards 64, 134, 145ff., 162, 185, 210, 212
 Lothar III, emperor 37, 51
 Louis VII, king 89, 96ff., 185
 Lübeck 16
 Lucan 56, 103, 105, 107, 108, 109, 110, 112, 242
 Lucca 98, 105
 Ludolf, of Dassel 9, 12, 28ff., 41–2
 Luke, St 1, 87, 118, 143, 149, 173, 196, 198, 207, 218
 lust, varieties of 163ff., 248–9
- Maccabean analogy 149ff., 215, 218
 Maccabeus, Judas 149ff.
 Magi, relics of 12, 212ff., 244
 Mainz 24
maltraversare 68
 Manitius, Max 248–9
mansuetudo 12, 181
 Manuel I Komnenos, emperor 152–4
 manuscripts 15ff., 139, 204, 220
 Maragone, Bernard 116
 Mark, St 129, 173, 182, 203, 204
 Markward of Fulda 42
 Martial 125
 Martin, St 12, 95, 202, 203, 228, 229, 230, 232
 Martinus, jurist 236
 mass, *in albis* 180
 requiem 1, 172
 Matthew, St 48, 141, 164, 190, 193, 198, 204, 207, 218
 Maurice, St 150
 medicine 210ff., 242
 Meinhard of Bamberg 123
- mendacity of poetry 147, 173, 192, 208, 238
 Michael, archangel and saint 228
 Milan 12, 44, 75ff., 90ff., 96, 97, 109, 129ff., 146, 148, 149, 152, 153, 161, 162, 164, 185, 212, 213, 230
 ministers, *ministeriales* 6, 9ff., 24, 25, 40, 92, 93, 99, 117ff., 122ff., 127, 147, 176, 240
 Modena 67, 71
 Monza 185ff., 208
 Moralism, moralists 3, 117, 120, 121, 124, 165, 170ff., 182ff., 208, 249
 Morena, Otto and Acerbus 103, 104, 105, 117, 121, 130, 134, 162, 236
 Moritzberg 14, 15
- Nabor, martyr 123
 Nature, personified 114, 115
 Nestor 21, 128
 Nicholas of Siegburg 90, 94, 100
 Nigel of Longchamps 242
 Niketas Choniates 235
 Nimrod 146
 Ninevites 222
 Norbert, St 32
 Novara 131, 132, 134ff., 152
 nudity 124ff.
- Octavian of S. Cecilia, cardinal *see* Victor IV
officium stratoris 37
opus geminatum 106
ordines ad regem suscipiendum 161
 Orestes 223
 Othwin, bishop 13, 15
 Otto I, emperor 38, 57, 70, 75, 141, 171
 Otto II, emperor 11, 234
 Otto III, emperor 8, 11, 72, 79, 83, 234, 235
 Otto of Freising 12, 17ff., 20, 23, 34, 37ff., 44, 46, 54ff., 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 71, 72, 73, 74, 92, 104ff., 107, 109, 110, 134, 135, 140, 145, 148, 150, 151, 155, 157, 158, 160, 181, 235, 237, 242
 Otto of Monticelli 71–2
 Otto of Wittelsbach 12, 44, 51ff., 59, 61, 65ff., 82, 95
 Ovid 114, 176
- palatinus* 230ff., 243
pallium 81, 202ff., 241
 panegyric *see* encomium
 Paris, prototype of valour 117ff.
 Paris, schools of 16ff., 23, 24, 54, 89, 101, 106, 119, 176ff., 200, 217, 223, 235, 239
Parvipontani 20ff.
 Paschal III, antipope 82, 97ff., 142, 212, 213, 215, 220, 222, 244
pater patrie 74ff.
 patronage 2ff., 8, 11, 120, 122, 123ff., 212, 232, 237

- Paul, St 115, 121, 222, 246
 Pavia 1, 13, 15, 75, 78, 85ff., 109ff., 130, 132,
 134, 136, 137, 141, 144, 152, 157ff., 185,
 187, 229, 238, 242
 penance, feigned 22f.
 performance 102ff., 124, 158, 178
peritia 224ff.
 Persius 127, 223–4
 Peter Lombard 19
 Peter of Celle 19
 Peter the Venerable 26
 Petersberg (Halle) 5
 Petit-Pont 19, 21
 Petrarch 127
 Philip of Harvengt 80ff., 93
 Philip of Heinsberg 195
 Pisa 116, 133, 210, 228
 poetry, as performance 102ff.
potator 1, 172, 173, 178
 poverty 117, 118, 122, 126, 129, 156, 170, 187,
 197ff., 200ff., 207ff., 223
 preaching 185ff.
presul 73, 120, 122, 124, 158, 163, 174, 179,
 202, 212, 232, 243
 Primas, Hugh 125ff., 178
 Priscian 218
 promiscuity 21, 68, 163, 165, 219
 prophecy 5, 110ff., 209ff., 227ff.
 prophetesses 19, 88, 195ff., 226ff., 232
prudentia 127, 141, 146, 224
 Psalms, and their exegesis 68ff., 197, 232
 pub 1ff., 171ff.
 pulpit 184ff., 206, 208
- Quintilian 206
- Rahewin 11ff., 37ff., 46ff., 63ff., 95, 100, 103,
 106, 108, 109, 130, 145, 148, 155, 157,
 181, 236, 237
 ‘Rainald H’ 2, 8, 23ff., 59ff., 78ff., 83, 92ff.,
 105ff., 108, 109, 112, 133
 Rainald of Dassel
 archbishop-elect of Cologne 2ff., 15, 24,
 78ff.
 archchancellor of Italy 2ff., 15, 24, 78
 consecration of 80ff., 100
 donations and buildings of 13,
 29, 226
 education of 5ff., 16ff.
 finances of 29
 militarism of 11
 ordination of 100
 origins of 5ff.
 politics of 8ff., 48ff., 54ff., 58ff., 65ff.,
 70ff., 91ff., 97, 118, 126, 129ff., 144,
 152, 213
 qualities of 13, 18–19, 94ff., 127ff.
 seal of 182
- trilingualism of 17
 ‘viceroi’ of Italy 64, 94, 102
 Ralph of Sarre 85
 Rapoto of Weihenstephan 46
 rationalism 87, 89, 106ff., 240
 Ravenna 66f., 68, 69, 70, 81, 88, 89
 Raymond of Brescia 121
 reciprocity 24, 36, 94, 124, 125, 126, 138, 203,
 212, 222, 240
 recitation 102, 112ff., 180, 204
recusatio 102
 reform, ecclesiastical 3, 45, 79, 80, 81, 85, 115,
 183, 220
 Regensburg 15, 73
regulus 89, 90
 Reims, council of 26ff., 85–6, 122, 202, 220, 241
 relics 12ff., 45, 212ff., 225, 243–4
 Remagen 230
representare 150ff.
 rhetoric 9, 14, 16, 17, 20, 31, 35, 60ff., 83ff.,
 143, 148, 160, 184, 207, 220, 235,
 239, 247
 Richard of Leicester 99
 Rimini 68
 Ringelsheim 28–9
 roads 1, 134, 154, 163–5
 Robert of Arbrissel 199
 Robert of Leicester 98–9
 Robert of Melun 19
 Roger II, king of Sicily 228
 Roland of San Marco, cardinal
 see Alexander III
 Rome, city 8, 15, 62ff.
 commune 37ff., 56ff., 140
 symbol of orthodoxy 3, 62ff., 144
romfreies Kaisertum 58
 Roncaglia 76–7, 121, 143, 145, 236
 Rudolf of Ems 119
Ruodlieb 108
 Ruotger 80–1
 Rupert of Deutz 80, 199ff., 225
- sacrilege 1, 45, 131, 173
sacrum imperium 43ff., 55, 137ff., 243
 Saint-Denis 12
 Saint-Gildas, monastery 16
 Saint-Jean-de-Lozne-sur-Saône 97ff.
 St Peter’s, basilica 38–9, 56, 58, 72, 166,
 201, 244
 Salerno 133, 209ff., 228, 242
 Salimbene 178
 Saxony, Lower 5
 scepticism, academic 21, 246
 scepticism, religious 246ff.
 schism 3, 27, 58, 79, 82ff., 90, 97, 99, 100, 121,
 126, 127, 141, 142, 144, 147, 154, 165,
 186, 202, 213, 214, 215, 225, 228, 235,
 239, 241, 243

- Schmeidler, Bernhard 247ff.
 scholasticism 17ff., 107ff., 177, 239
 Schwarzreindorf 199
scolaris 117, 119ff.
scurrilitas 89, 183ff., 206, 225
 serfs 118ff., 133
sermo 113, 157, 185, 186, 187, 188, 190, 191, 193
 seven deadly vices, the 127
 sex 164, 165, 170ff., 219
 Sextus Amarcus 191
sic et non see dialectic
 Silvester IV, antipope 83
 sin, sinner 1, 4, 22, 107, 124, 141, 143, 149, 163, 164, 165, 166, 168, 171, 172, 173, 175, 178, 179, 181, 182, 184, 185ff., 219, 233, 238, 247, 248
 sophistry, sophist 19, 20ff., 33ff., 85, 89, 102ff., 106ff., 122, 147ff., 173, 206, 235, 238, 240, 245, 250
 S. Salvatore, monastery 162
 stammering 188
 Stephan, archbishop of Vienne 213
 Stephanus, *magister* 134
 Stephen III, king of Hungary 153
 stereotypes, national 57ff., 85, 87, 108, 235
 Sutri 37, 38, 53, 56, 57, 154
 Sylvester II, pope see Gerbert of Aurillac

taverna see pub
 taxation 104, 129ff., 148, 152, 156, 203
 Terni 72
 Theobald, archbishop of Canterbury 85
 Theodoric, antipope 83
 Theophanu, empress 234
 Thierry of Chratres 24, 60
 Thietbold 32ff.
 Tortona 158
 Tours, council of 23, 98, 167, 186
Transalpinum imperium 38, 44, 64, 73ff., 133, 145
translatio imperii 152
 Transmontane 3ff., 44, 54ff., 93, 95, 100, 133, 187, 212, 234–6, 242, 249
 Traversari, Guglielmo 67ff.
 Trezzo 108
 tribute 98, 104, 129ff., 148, 189, 203
 Trier, 'stylistic exercises' of 60ff.
triumphator 65, 73
 troubadours 164ff.
 Troy 148–9
tuba 141, 159, 214–15
 Turin 105

 Tuscany 116ff., 134–5
 Tusculum, battle of 11, 233

 Ulm 44
 Ulrich of Dürrmenz 47ff.
 Ulrich of Steinfeld 80
 Ulysses 21, 94, 128
 Umbria 135
 Utrecht 25

vates vatum 188, 220, 221, 223, 227
 Venus 163, 164
 Vercelli 212
 vernacular, languages and literatures 8, 32, 50ff, 75, 108, 118, 119, 187, 227, 236, 237
 Verona 70
 Victor II, pope 82
 Victor IV, antipope 3, 28, 72, 82ff., 96, 97, 98, 121, 126, 133, 144, 162, 212
 Vienne 213ff., 242
 Vigevano 136
 Vincent of Prague 86, 139ff.
 Virgil, Virgilian 56, 103, 105, 107, 108, 110, 112, 117, 119, 140, 146, 150, 154, 156, 159, 160, 242
 Viterbo 26, 27, 113

 Walahfrid Strabo 232
 Walter of Arras 237
 water 174ff.
 Weser 41
 Wibald of Stablo and Corvey 16ff., 27, 28, 29, 31ff., 51, 74, 228, 235
 Wichmann of Magdeburg 98
 Widukind 139
 William I, king of Sicily 39, 70ff., 82, 133, 209, 210, 228–9
 William of Monferrato 136
 William of Saint-Thierry 188
 William of Sanseverino 210
 wine 1, 2, 113ff., 165, 170, 172, 174ff., 225ff., 230ff., 247
 Wolfram of Eschenbach 118ff.
 Wortwin 42
 Würzburg, imperial assemblies of 28, 46ff., 54, 98, 99, 142

 Xanten 32ff.

 youth 164ff., 237

 Zacharias, pope and saint 62