Historical Distance and Difference in the Twelfth-Century Middle High German *Kaiserchronik*

Christoph Joseph Pretzer
Corpus Christi College

October 2017

This dissertation is submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

To my families

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements 5

I. Introduction 7

II. The Measure of History in the Kaiserchronik 21

II.1 Serial Form and Contingent Content 21

II.1.1. The Episodic Framework – a Reappraisal 21

II.1.2 Modified Episode Framework 31

II.1.3 Atomised Antiquity as the Quantitative Continuum of History 34

II.1.4 Dimensions of Qualitative Change: Political and Religious Identity of the Empire 39

II.2 Functions of Quantity: Exemplarity, Aetiology, and Continuity in the Kaiserchronik 48

II.2.1 Continuity 54

II.2.2 Exemplarity: Heraclius 59

II.2.3 Aetiology: Etymology, Toponyms, and the Pantheon 65

II.2.4 Aetiological Exemplarity: Titus & Trajan 70

III. The poeticity and historicity of the Kaiserchronik 75

III.1 The Kaiserchronik and the Historia Magistra Vitae Tradition 75

III.2 The Prologue of the Kaiserchronik 81

III.2.1 The Historical Programme of Medieval Prologues 81

III.2.2 The Rhetorical Structure of the Prologue 86

III.2.3 Antagonising Texts 94

IV. The First Dimension of Qualitative Change: the Religious Identity of the Empire 109

IV.1 The Problem of Salvation History 109

IV.1.1 A Short Account of the Development of Salvation Historical Historiography

Between the First and the Fifth Century CE 111

IV.1.2 Comparing the Kaiserchronik to Orosius and Otto 117

IV.1.3 Contingent and Contained Salvation History: the Sack of Jerusalem 133

IV.2. From Pagan to Christian Rome 140

IV.2.1 Christian Conversion 140

IV.2.2 Roman Christian Fragility 155

V. The Second Dimension of Qualitative Change: the Political Axis 159

V.1 Romans and Germans 159

V.1.1 Kings, Emperors, and Rulers in the Kaiserchronik 160

V.1.2 Rome's Historical Introduction 162

V.1.3 Of Kings and Emperors 165

V.1.4 The Romans and the German Kings 167

V.2 Shifting Perspectives on the Empire 171

V.2.1 Daniel, Caesar, and the Germans 171

V.2.2 Charlemagne and the Romans: Clash of Cultures 181

VI. Conclusion 187

Bibliography 190

Acknowledgements

I am greatly indebted to my supervisor Dr Mark Chinca, whose sage advise, circumspect counsel, and constructive criticism was indispensable for finishing this thesis. I am forever grateful that he tolerated my idiosyncratic work style and patiently taught me how to write on a German text in English. I also wish to express my gratitude to Prof. Christopher Young who was a great help with setting up my position in Cambridge at the *Kaiserchronik*-project and whose input during my first year of research proved very valuable. This thanks also extents to Dr Nora Behrend for her feedback after my first year and to Prof. Sarah Colvin for revising my work at the end my second and third year. Special thanks go to the Cambridge German & Dutch Department's secretary Ulrike Balser, to Corpus Christi College's Graduate Secretary Tessa Milne, and to Leckhampton's site manager Michael Martin and Aldona Maliszewska-Tomlin who heroically put up with me. I am grateful to the AHRC, the Tiarks Fund, and Corpus Christi College who provided me with the funds necessary for postgraduate study at the University of Cambridge.

Additional thanks go to Dr Helen Hunter, Dr Johanna Dale, and Dr Thomas Förster, from the *Kaiserchronik*-project without whom working on the *Kaiserchronik* in Cambridge would have been a much lonelier experience. My way would have never led me to Cambridge in the first place, had it not been for my academic teachers at the University of Bamberg. Far too many to mention them all, I would like to especially thank Prof. Ingrid Bennewitz and Prof. Klaus van Eickels for their long-standing and continuing support, and Dr Andrea Grafetstätter and Dr Detlef Goller who taught me everything. Many conversations with friends and colleagues have over the years helped to shape and develop this thesis, often without them being aware and to all of them I wish to extend my gratitude, but I am especially grateful to Prof. Michael Stolz, Ciaran McDonough, Atlanta Rae Neudorf, and Ayla Lepine for proofreading my draft chapters at different stages of production.

None of this would have been possible without the unconditional love, support, and trust of my family. My parents Edith and Raimund enabled me to pursue Medieval Studies in the first place. My brothers Benedikt and Valentin dutifully fulfilled their fraternal obligations to keep me grounded with their reliably relentless mocking. Finally, my wife Bernadette's part in this thesis cannot be overstated. Never would it have occurred to me to apply for a position at Cambridge to begin with and never would I have brought this to a conclusion without her in my life.

Do not compare me unfavourably
with the pyramids of stone
I surpass the other pyramids […]
for I was made out of bricks,
which were formed of mud,
which was collected from a pole it had stuck to,
when the pole was plunged down into a lake.

Inscription of the pyramid of Asychis, Herodotus's *Histories*, Book II, Chapter 136

I. Introduction

In April 1825 the English art connoisseur and critic Andrew Marbot finally arrived in Rome. Unlike most of his contemporaries he maintained a somewhat reserved distance from the ancient ruins, as his biographer Wolfgang Hildesheimer reported. Subsequently, when writing about his impressions, Marbot summarises them in the most sober manner:

> Everyone I meet here builds themselves their own city from the ruins and lives in the era of their own choosing. I too like to look at ruins, but I see them for what they really are: elements which do cast doubt on the past and thus the present, but do not elevate the past towards the absolute let alone the ideal. For me the present is not prolonged past but a state of mind, which one would sometimes wish to leave behind, if it were possible. […] Rome lives from the past, as it attracts droves of foreigners, who wish to enjoy this past and turn everything into the present.[1]

The Romantic gentleman who so succinctly captures the fascination, which Rome's ancient heritage exerted over the European imagination, is uniquely qualified to make this statement as he has the advantage of being entirely fictional. Andrew Marbot is the creation of his alleged biographer Wolfgang Hildesheimer.[2] His own fictionality mirrors the artifice of the image the Roman ruins conjure up. Nevertheless his concise analysis of Rome as a ruined repository for contemporary desires and a quarry from which to construct an era of one's own choosing resonates powerfully within Western cultural history. As Hildesheimer creates Marbot he climbs on the shoulders of generations of authors who turned to the Roman past to create meaning for their own times.

The first time this happened in German writing was nearly seven hundred years before Marbot's fictitious arrival in Rome, in the middle decades of the twelfth century, in a rather peculiar text, known to twenty-first-century Medieval German Studies as the *Kaiserchronik*.[3] Probably written by one or more anonymous ecclesiastics, somewhere in the southeast of the Empire – scholarship

---

1 Wolfgang Hildesheimer, *Marbot* (Frankfurt aM 1981), pp. 243-44. Translation is my own.

2 A creation so convincing that it fooled J.P. Stern who reviewed Hildesheimer's book for the *London Review of Books* without realising Malbot's non-existence. See Stern, J.P., 'Sweet Sin', London Review of Book, 4, 14, (1982), pp. 3-6 <https://www.lrb.co.uk/v04/n14/jp-stern/sweet-sin> [accessed 25.10.17].

3 See *Kaiserchronik eines Regensburger Geistlichen*, MGH S Dt. Chron. 1,1 ed. by Edward Schröder (Hannover 1895), pp. 1-441. Throughout this thesis when quoting from the *Kaiserchronik* I will refer to Schröder's edition using the abbreviation KC. When referring to Schröder's comments I will use the short title Schröder 1895.

habitually points to Regensburg – the text is the first chronicle in the German vernacular.[4] Starting with the Roman Empire's foundation, the *Kaiserchronik* quickly establishes an episodic structure, with each episode dedicated to the name and rule of an emperor. Beginning with Caesar, this sequence traces the history of the Empire from its beginnings all the way through Constantine and Charlemagne and down to Conrad III and the events of the year 1147, where it stops.

As the first German vernacular text to devote itself explicitly to the task of writing history the *Kaiserchronik* for a long time fell in between the disciplinary demarcation lines of history and literary studies. The apparent clash between the chronicle's vociferous claim to veracity, formulated in its prologue and elsewhere in the text, and its content, which mostly covers legendary, apocryphal, hagiographical, and mythological material, has led to a certain puzzlement and perplexity amongst scholars who have tackled the text. Compared to the established historiography, both modern and medieval, of the events that the chronicle covers, much of the *Kaiserchronik'*s historical account is confused, muddled, and downright wrong. This also gave rise to the notion that there must be some meta-structure hidden inside the text and some hermeneutical magical key, which only would have to be applied correctly to unlock the *Kaiserchronik*'s historiographical programme.

Hence the problem of the *Kaiserchronik*'s historiography has been the object of a rich, long, and often complex scholarly discussion. Before I develop my approach it will be helpful first of all to retrace the scholarly discourse that has shaped the state of the art on this topic. For the sake of both brevity and clarity this overview will aim to be more representative than comprehensive. This means a tight focus on the discussion of historiography and a selection of some exemplary studies. Chronologically it will focus on discussion in the wake of Ohly's seminal study *Sage und Legende in der Kaiserchronik,* first published in 1940.[5]

At an early phase in the discussion of the *Kaiserchronik*, the striking discrepancy between historiographical postulate and narrative content caused Schwietering to observe that 'es hieße den

---

[4] This thesis will not concern itself with the much discussed questions of who wrote the *Kaiserchronik*, when, and where. For the purpose of its examination it will suffice to assume that the chronicle was written by a well-read, well-connected, latinate ecclesiastical author from and in the southeastern parts (modern-day Bavaria or Austria) of the Empire some time after 1147.

[5] See Ernst Friedrich Ohly, *Sage und Legende in der Kaiserchronik: Untersuchungen über Quellen und Aufbau der Dichtung* (Darmstadt 1940; repr. 1968). A detailed overview of the academic discussion of the *Kaiserchronik* and especially its dating and conception down to 1939 can be found in Ralph George Crossley, *Die Kaiserchronik: Ein literaturhistorisches Problem der altdeutschen Literaturgeschichte* (Munich 1939), pp. 9-71. A helpful overview of the more recent scholarship down to 2004 can be found in Monika Pohl, 'Untersuchungen zur Darstellung mittelalterlicher Herrscher in der deutschen "Kaiserchronik" des 12. Jahrhunderts: Ein Werk im Umbruch von mündlicher und schriftlicher Tradition' (Doctoral thesis, Ludwig-Maximilians-University, Munich 2004), pp. 12-16. The one earlier scholar to be considered will be Ohly's teacher Schwietering; otherwise earlier contributions will only be addressed where context and significance warrant it.

Sinn der Dichtung verkennen, wollte man hier Geschichtliches vom Fabulistischen im modernen Sinne scheiden'. According to him, the truth of the *Kaiserchronik* is derived from its 'Gottbezogenheit' and not its claim to factuality. Where the text switches into the mode of episodic entertainment, this happens virtually against the will of the author, who follows a strictly eschatological scheme in the arrangement and adaptation of his material.[6]

Schwietering's perspectives had some influence on his student Ohly, who dealt with medieval 'Geschichtsanschauung' in the first chapter of his dissertation and placed great emphasis on the concept of salvation history and the unified scheme, according to which the *Kaiserchronik* was compiled. He distinguished between chronicles, which encompass 'den Gesamtraum göttlicher Heilsgeschichte' – amongst which he counts the *Kaiserchronik* – and 'Historien', which are mainly concerned with the genesis and development of particular peoples. In the second chapter he then attempted to isolate the formal elements, which characterise the chronicle as a genre. In his view, the German vernacular tradition that begins with the *Kaiserchronik* is to be distinguished from histories like, for example, the French, Norman, and Breton histories, in the tradition of Geoffrey of Monmouth's Latin *Historia Regum Britanniae*. He argued that those texts, while they aim to root themselves retrospectively in the universal historical frame of salvation historical events, do not strive to encompass the whole of it but rather take the mythical origins of the people they are presenting as the starting point of their narration. Thus he established a dichotomy between the latter 'mythisch-sagenhaft-national' and the former 'biblisch-heilsgeschichtlich-imperial' type of historiographical texts.[7] As representatives of the second he regarded a group of texts from around the year eleven-hundred, which go back to the birth of Christ to start their narratives, reviving the practice of older texts, like Jerome's translation and continuation of Eusebius, which seek to continue chronicles going even further back than Christ's birth.[8] As the culmination of this development he saw Frutolf of Michelsberg's and Otto of Freising's chronicles.[9]

Ohly identified the *Kaiserchronik*'s attempt to illustrate the struggle between good and evil as its fundamental 'Kompositionsgesetz'. The opposing forces are supposedly contained within every episode and the unfolding events enact punishment and reward according to the conduct of the historical protagonists caught between these forces. However, these processes are rarely expressed directly in the text and therefore must be made visible by an internal referential structure of

---

6 See Julius Schwietering, *Die deutsche Dichtung des Mittelalters* (Potsdam 1932), pp.97-98.

7 Ohly 1968, pp. 10-12; 15-16.

8 See Ohly 1968, p. 13: He lists Bernold of St Blase (1100), Hugo of Flavigny (1102), Lambert of St Omer (1120) and Siegebert of Gembloux (1112).

9 See Ohly 1968, p. 12.

typologies.[10]

Ohly went to great lengths to show how typology as an instrument of biblical exegesis could become separated from its theological roots. He differentiated between three typological relations: in addition to the established biblical typology he postulated the existence of semi-biblical and extra-biblical typologies. Semi-biblical typologies have one of their poles in the Bible but connect it to an antitype outside the biblical corpus. As examples Ohly referred very broadly to myths and legends, and more specifically to general natural phenomena as observed by the *Physiologus* and also certain cycles of images in which types from apocryphal traditions or pagan secular history are used to prefigure types from the New Testament or the other way round. He did not, however, offer concrete examples.[11]

But he did provide two examples of extra-biblical typologies. First the murals of the imperial palace in Ingelheim, which do not survive to the present day but are described in a ninth-century poem by Ermoldus Nigellus, and second the early twelfth-century relief at the church of St Zeno in Verona depicting the hunt of Theoderic. Ohly did not, however, elaborate on how alleged typological patterns in these unconnected artworks might indicate the existence of similar patterns in a twelfth-century Middle High German text from Bavaria. His argument is more transparent when referring to the works of his teacher Schwietering, who interpreted the development of early Arthurian romance as a typological overcoming of antique forms and contents.[12] He further developed the concept as a prevalent structure within medieval literature but characterised it so broadly that it becomes increasingly unclear how his typologies can be distinguished from regular literary relations and references. He concluded by stating that the *Kaiserchronik* is especially apt for the application of an internal typological reference framework because it narrates both the historical spaces of Roman antiquity and the Christian Middle Ages.[13]

Ohly's work has been lauded as '[g]rundlegend für alle weitere Arbeit'[14] on the *Kaiserchronik* and has served both as a stepping stone for further analysis and as a focal point for criticism of his usage of typology. An example for the latter are the thematically linked studies of Jantsch[15] and

---

[10] See Ohly 1968, p. 238.

[11] See Ohly 1968, p 27.

[12] See Ohly 1968, p 28. See also Julius Schwietering, 'Typologisches in Mittelalterlichen Dichtungen' in *Philologische Schriften* ed. by the author (Berlin / Leipzig 1925), pp. 40-55.

[13] See Ohly 1968, p. 29.

[14] Nellmann 1963, p. 85. Similarly Annegret Fiebig, 'vier wilde tiere: Weltdeutung nach Daniel in der "Kaiserchronik"' in *Deutsche Literatur und Sprache von 1050 – 1200: Festschrift für Ursula Henning zum 65. Geburtstag* ed. by the author and Hans-Jochen Schiewer (Berlin 1995), p. 30.

[15] See Jantsch 1959, esp. pp. 20-10.

Jentzmik[16] in which they disagree energetically with Ohly's conception of typology. Jantsch criticises his stress on the necessity of the fulfilment of types through anti-types, rendering the former inferior when compared to the latter. According to Jantsch, this ignores the fact that typology essentially serves as an apologetic strategy to justify the Old Testament and does not have the task of illustrating the self-evidently higher degree of perfection achieved with the events from the New Testament. Jantsch furthermore remarks that the terminology used by Ohly does not correspond to any type of biblical typology.[17] Moreover, he claims that it is constitutive for typologies to make explicit the semantics of the referential relation they describe, hence Ohly's characterisation of his findings as delineated by an unspoken connection between two antithetical poles disqualifies them from the term typology.[18] Additionally, he points out a distinct variation in the inner structures of Ohly's typologies and stresses the importance of discerning 'die lebendige Vielfalt des Erscheinenden' before putting it into a semantically fixed, terminological framework.[19]

Jentzmik agrees with Ohly in assigning the *Kaiserchronik* to salvation history. He believes the search for typological narratives in vernacular historiography is justified because the latter has a pivotal position when it comes to conveying 'heilsgeschichtliche[s] Gedankengut[...] und theologische[...] Deutung' from theological into other literature.[20] According to Jentzmik the passages identified by Ohly have a didactic quality firmly anchoring the text 'im Dienste der Heilsgeschichte'.[21] Yet, like Jantsch, he casts doubt on the existence of a 'gemeinsame Sinnmitte' between the two constituents of Ohly's typologies and suggests that they work much more as moral markers, which do not await their definite fulfilment by teleologically unfolding events but instead call on the audience of the text to perpetually emulate the preferred historical examples.[22]

It becomes increasingly apparent that both Jantsch and Jentzmik mainly take issue with Ohly's identification of the structures he describes as typological and are not convinced that they fulfil the rather rigid specifications of theological typology they apply. They do, however, acknowledge the existence of referential relations within the *Kaiserchronik* and between its episodes.[23] But Jantsch suggests that it would be more apt to refer to these relations not as typologies, but as a didactic

---

16 See Jentzmik 1973 esp. pp. 222-33.

17 See Jantsch 1959, pp. 204-07.

18 See Ohly 1968, p. 29; Jantsch 1959, p. 213.

19 See Jantsch 1959, p. 224.

20 See Jentzmik 1973, p. 222.

21 Jentzmik 1973, p. 234.

22 See e.g. Jantsch 1959, p. 205, See also Jentzmik 1973, pp. 235-42.

23 See Jantsch 1959, pp. 208-10.

reference network that employs exemplary contrasts.[24] Guided by salvation historical thinking they aim to edify by their examples and create a sense of a teleological unfolding of history directed at an increasingly Christian conduct of historical protagonists.[25] With their conclusions Jantsch and Jentzmik end up close to what Kartschoke would later characterise when speaking about the content of the Roman part of the *Kaiserchronik* as 'exemplary narratives in the form of tales and legends'.[26]

Ohly defended his terminology against the criticism launched against his book almost immediately after it was reprinted in 1968, but only in general terms and without providing any further insights into the typological scheme of the *Kaiserchronik*.[27] The criticism, however, did not prevent his work from continuing to elicit mainly productive responses and inspiring further investigations along the lines he had laid down. For example Annegret Fiebig uses Ohly's analysis of the *Kaiserchronik*'s idiosyncratic version of the dream interpretations by the biblical prophet Daniel to delve further into the text.[28] Daniel 7 tells of four mythical beasts coming out of the water in short succession. In an exegetical tradition beginning with Jerome, the beasts have traditionally been interpreted as four dominant, world-spanning empires succeeding one another and culminating with the fourth, the Roman Empire. This latter would, however, ultimately turn into the Empire of

---

24 See Jantsch 1959, pp. 226; 206: 'exemplarische Kontrastbelege'.

25 See Jentzmik 1973, p. 254.

26 See Kartschoke 2000, p. 356. Translation of the passage after Matthews,2012, pp. 4-5.

27 Not only does he refute the criticism launched against his broad terminological use of typology, he also provides a wealth of examples for different forms of extra-biblical typological thinking and imaging mostly from antique and medieval Latin literature, medieval art and traces the practice all the way down to Hölderlin's hymn 'Der Einzige'. The vernacular literature of the twelfth century, however, remains conspicuously without any further exemplification for this kind of interpretation. See Ernst Friedrich Ohly, 'Ausserbiblisches Typologisches zwischen Cicero, Ambrosius und Aelred von Rievaulx' in his *Schriften zur mittelalterlichen Bedeutungsforschung* (Darmstadt 1983), pp. 336-60; Ernst Friedrich Ohly, 'Halbbiblische und ausserbiblische Typologie', also in *Schriften zur mittelalterlichen Bedeutungsforschung*, pp. 361-99. Ohly further substantiated his global view of typology as a 'Denkform der Geschichtsbetrachtung' in a series of essays: 'Synagoge und Ecclesia: Typologisches in mittelalterlicher Dichtung' in *Schriften zur mittelalterlichen Bedeutungsforschung* ed. by the author (Darmstadt 1983), pp. 312-38; Ernst Friedrich Ohly, 'Typologie als Denkform der Geschichtsbetrachtung (1983)' in *Ernst Friedrich Ohly: Ausgewählte und neue Schriften zur Literaturgeschichte und zur Bedeutungsforschung* ed. by Uwe Rüber and Dietmar Peil (Stuttgart, Leipzig 1995), pp. 445-72.;Ernst Friedrich Ohly, 'Typologische Figuren aus Natur und Mythus (1979)' in *Ernst Friedrich Ohly: Ausgewählte und neue Schriften zur Literaturgeschichte und zur Bedeutungsforschung* ed. by Uwe Rüber and Dietmar Peil (Stuttgart, Leipzig 1995), pp. 473-508; Ernst Friedrich Ohly, 'Skizze zur Typologie im Mittelalter (1979)' in *Ernst Friedrich Ohly: Ausgewählte und neue Schriften zur Literaturgeschichte und zur Bedeutungsforschung* ed. by Uwe Rüber and Dietmar Peil (Stuttgart, Leipzig 1995), pp. 509-54.

28 Fiebig 1995, pp. 27-49.

the Antichrist and inaugurate the end times.[29] Fiebig argues convincingly that up until the twelfth century there was no singular and readily established tradition of reading the vision(s) of Daniel, and shows how the *Kaiserchronik*'s handling of the image of the four beasts and the four historical empires builds on a multitude of interpretations. Furthermore, she demonstrates that the scheme of the four beasts was regarded more as an explanatory image to justify the translation of dominion in the Middle Ages and less as a basic ordering system of history as Ohly would have it.[30] Yet for the actual analysis of the passage she largely builds on his results.[31] He showed how the changes in the *Kaiserchronik*'s treatment when compared to the biblical imagery and especially the *Annolied* – with which it shares about 225 lines of the passage[32] – are not mere inaccuracies or clumsy insertions[33] but instead serve a deliberate agenda of purposefully removing the stigma of representing the eschatologically last empire of mankind from the Roman Empire and its founder Caesar.[34] Moreover, Fiebig shows how the *Kaiserchronik* adapts the genealogy of the German peoples to its rearranged sequence of the four empires.[35] From this new succession she infers a salvation historical rationale for the Germans' claim to imperial power. She concludes that the more positive presentation of Caesar and his rule in the *Kaiserchronik* corresponds to the text's programmatic purpose, which is to present the history of the Empire as salvation history by shifting the soteriological turning point away from the *pax Augusta* to Caesar and his inauguration of the Roman Empire.[36]

Karl Stackmann's examination of narrative structure in the *Kaiserchronik*, which investigates the conditions under which the text narrates history, leads us towards the methodological approach this thesis will employ. Stackmann states that the *Kaiserchronik*'s author does follow factual history

---

[29] The Daniel passage in the *Kaiserchronik* (KC 526-90) is a loose adaption and conflation of the dream interpretations by the Prophet Daniel from the biblical books Daniel 2, where he interprets a dream of the Babylonian king Nebuchadnezzar, and Daniel 7 where he is himself the dreamer. The *Kaiserchronik*'s version is heavily informed by the *Annolied* (1070s) The canonical interpretation of the biblical prophecies of Daniel – the *Visio Danielis* – is mainly informed by the exegesis of Jerome's early fifth-century commentary *In Danielem* in which the church father offers an in-depth reading and interpretation of Daniel's visions that later were to become a cornerstone of Christian theology, especially christology. See St Jerome, *Commentariorum in Danielem libri III*, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 75a ed. by F. Glorie (Turnhout 1964). English translation: *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel* trans. by L. Archer Jr. Gleason (Grand Rapids 1958); see Régis Courtray, Der 'Danielkommentar des Hieronymus' in *Die Geschichte der Daniel-Auslegung in Judentum Christentum und Islam*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 371 ed. by Katharina Bracht, David Du Toit (Berlin, New York 2007), pp. 130-31.

[30] See Fiebig 1995, pp. 31-38

[31] See Fiebig 1995, pp. 39-48.

[32] See on this problem Stephan Müller, *Vom Annolied zur Kaiserchronik. Zur Text- und Forschungsgeschichte einer verlorenen deutschen Reimchronik* (Heidelberg 1999).

[33] See Schröder 1895, p. 90, footnote 1.

[34] See Ohly 1968, pp. 37-38; Fiebig 1995, p. 46.

[35] See below section V.2.1 Daniel, Caesar, and the Germans.

[36] See Fiebig 1995, pp. 43-49.

roughly along the lines of established historiography but at the same time maintains an extraordinary freedom towards it.[37] To explain this, Stackmann employs Hanna Vollrath's theorem of medieval societies being structured by the mutual influence and exchange of coexisting oral and written cultures.[38] Following this concept, medieval minds modulate the past not as something necessarily concluded but as something in a direct functional connection to the present, hence the past is not unchangeable history but an always shifting reflection of the present.[39] Stackmann argues against this opposition of medieval oral culture to the contemporary written culture and also to ideas like salvation history, which were predominantly cultivated by ecclesiastical authors:

> Geschichte wird vorgestellt als eine gerichtete Bewegung, die von einem Anfang – der Schöpfung – her in einer geordneten Folge bedeutsamer Ereignisse bis zur Zäsur des Erscheinens Christi und von da an über die Gegenwart weiter bis zum letzten Ziel – dem jüngsten Gericht – führt. Für ein solches Denken ist eine klare Unterscheidung der Vergangenheit, des bereits zurückgelegten Weges, von der Gegenwart und der noch bevorstehenden Zukunft eine Selbstverständlichkeit.[40]

The intriguing consequence of the clash of these two simultaneously used concepts of history is the transfer of oral narrative techniques into written texts and – as Stackmann argues – even into historiographical records like the *Kaiserchronik*, which allegedly presents history as reflected present within the framework of the Empire and its ecclesiastical institutions of salvation. To prove this he takes a closer look at the prologue to find 'gegenwartsbezogenes Interesse' and indicators for orality when the text is referred to first as a *liet* (KC 2) and the audience is encouraged to *gezogenlîche vernemen* (KC 4). The prologue's critique of the *scophelîchen worten* (KC 31), which educate the coming generations with *luge* (KC 35), is key for his argument: the fact that the *Kaiserchronik* with all its fantastic and fictional content sees itself as opposed to other texts of a similar nature can according to Stackmann only be understood if its content is seen as an ever-shifting reflection of the present. It is considered truth by the author and his audience because it is truth by the standards of medieval *frumichait* (KC 5) and reiterates the norms and rules by which

---

[37] See Karl Stackmann, 'Erzählstrategie und Sinnvermittlung in der Deutschen "Kaiserchronik"' in *Erscheinungsformen kultureller Prozesse: Jahrbuch 1988 des Sonderforschungsbereiches 'Übergänge und Spannungsfelder zwischen Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit'* ed. by Wolfgang Faible (Tübingen 1990), p. 63.

[38] See Hanna Vollrath, 'Das Mittelalter in der Typik oraler Gesellschaft', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 233 (1981), pp. 571-94.

[39] See Vollrath 1981, pp. 575-76.

[40] Stackmann 1990, p. 65.

medieval society abides and which it holds to be timelessly applicable; in this way these medieval norms are construed to be affirmed and not fabricated by their historical (re)occurrence.[41] Stackmann also identifies a different vein of 'Sinnvermittlung' in the *Kaiserchronik* based on Wolfgang Mohr's idea of symbolically opposed motifs, which are presented to the audience without being explicitly linked. This is left to the listener of the text. Referring to the episode of Henry IV with its enclosed excursus about the first crusade led by Godfrey of Bouillon, Stackmann shows how the text opposes the bad king Henry, whose reign terminates all order within the Empire, with an ideal prince like Godfrey who, with the extensive and frequently invoked help of God, leads the fight against the pagans to a victorious conclusion.[42] On the basis of these examples he postulates finding meaning in the text beyond the discretion of good and evil but also through the implementation of meaningful narrative structures.[43]

A multitude of interpretations abounds, only sometimes overlapping or corresponding with and to each other. The quest for the guiding historical principle of the *Kaiserchronik* has certainly proved to be a most productive one, the proposed answers, however, have so far only brought forward a plethora of disjunct explanatory matrices, which coexist largely independently of one another without scholars finding many contact points or theories gaining momentum from synergies (maybe with the prominent exceptions of Ohly, whose contribution is almost universally acknowledged and regularly built upon and Stock, whose contribution has great influence on the more recent scholarship). Their manifoldness serves as an apt illustration of the manifoldness of the narrative offerings of the text itself but also as an admission of the still unsatisfactory solution to the posed problem. So far no over-arching theoretical system of interpretation has proven to be quite sufficient to fully understand the narrative structure of the text. The question arises whether it can or even should be the aim to identify a coherent and guiding historical principle, which shapes the diverse and colourful textual representations that the *Kaiserchronik* finds for such a wide array of European legendary and historiographical motifs.

More recent prominent attempts to turn this unruly cluster of results into a positive approach include Alastair Matthews' 2012 book on the *Kaiserchronik* as a medieval narrative, Johannes Dickhut-Bielsky's 2015 dissertation examining the text's poetical and historiographical hermeneutics, and two 2017 articles by Mathias Herweg's on 'Kohärenzstiftung' resepctively

---

41 See Stackmann 1990, pp. 65-67.

42 See Stackmann 1990, pp. 71-77.

43 See Stackmann 1990, p. 81.

'Geschichte erzählen' with regard to the *Kaiserchronik*.[44] Matthews remarks that there is no encompassing reference to a framework of salvation history in the text, nor has it been possible to localise the chronicle convincingly between historiographical, literary, religious and didactic motives.[45] By launching an array of methodologically diverse examinations of selected episodes of the text he provides compelling close readings, which excel at opening the reader's eyes to the complicated and artistic narrative structures of the episodes under consideration. However, at the same time the limitations of a methodologically multi-pronged approach trained only at selected passages become all too evident as it neither provides the heuristic capacity to elucidate the text's narrative as a whole nor helps to clear up the question whether the text does in fact follow a consistent narrative scheme.

Dickhut-Bielsky sets himself the rather ambitious goal of seeking out the "Wahrheit" of the *Annolied* and *Kaiserchronik*; most of his work, however, is devoted to the latter text. While he acknowledges that the *Kaiserchronik* warrants an approach from different angles, he actually follows a "klassisches hermeneutisches Verfahren".[46] He identifies certain clues [cues?] in the chronicle's prologue, which according to him invite the reader to undertake hermeneutical readings of the text's episodes. He emphasises this as the so-called "Grundanliegen", which is expressed explicitly in the prologue:

> Dies wiederum macht deutlich, dass das vorliegende Werk einen Sinn verbirgt, der durch Ausdeutung ans Tageslicht befördert werden muss. Dieser Sinn ist das, wie wir es nennen, Grundanliegen des Werkes, welches sich sowohl in der Gesamtkonzeption als auch in den einzelnen Episoden realisiert. Der KC-Dichter macht damit deutlich, dass sich der Sinn der Erzählung erst in der Ausdeutung offenbart.[47]

His interpretations of these cues are sometimes more, sometimes less convincing and in some cases

---

[44] See Alastair Matthews, *The Kaiserchronik: A Medieval Narrative* (Oxford 2012); Johannes Dickhut-Bielsky, *Auf der Suche nach der Wahrheit in 'Annolied' und 'Kaiserchronik'. Poetisch-historiographische Wahrheitssuche in frühmittelhochdeutschen Geschichtsdichtungen,* ZfdA Beihefte 23 (Stuttgart 2015); Mathias Herweg, 'Kohärenzstiftung auf vielen Ebenen: Narratologie und Genrefragen in der "Kaiserchronik"', *Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik*, 47, 2 (2017), pp. 281-282; Mathias Herweg is also to be thanked for his very meritorious edition of an abridged version of the *Kaiserchronik* with Reclam, which will make the text much easier to access for future generations of students.

[45] Matthews 2012, pp. 4-5, pp. 16-22.

[46] Dickhut-Bielsky 2015, pp. 51-52.

[47] Dickhut-Bielsky 2015, p. 53:

appear rather forced.[48] In the main body of his analysis Dickhut-Bielsky realigns established problems of *Kaiserchronik* scholarship under the lens of "poetische Verfahren zur Wahrheitsfindung".[49] In the end, while Dickhut-Bielsky acknowledges the disparity of the text, he effectively only swaps one magical key for a dozen others, rather than doing away with the idea of hermeneutically unlockable meaning in the text altogether. He still subscribes to the traditional view that the *Kaiserchronik* has an over-arching and coherent meaning programmed into its idiosyncratic historiography only waiting for the literary scholar to unlock it.

The most recent representative of this new movement within *Kaiserchronik* scholarship is Mathias Herweg. Building on Stock's idea of the generation of meaning through strategies of repetition, variation, and combination – Dickhut-Bielsky's 'sinnstiftende Bezüge' – Herweg examines the creation of coherence in the *Kaiserchronik*. He discerns three concentric layers on which this is achieved 'der Erzählzyklus als Ganzes […] weitgehend autonome[…] Abschnitte (die Kaiserviten) als Sammelbecken autogener Stoffe, Gattungen und Stile […] Binnenepisoden und -narrative innerhalb der Abschnitte'.[50] On the first and outmost layer, 'Kohärenzstiftung' is achieved by the cyclical recurrence of patterns, terms, and motifs, which, although not interacting with each other explicitly, still create an implicit emplotment through their shared teleological trajectory. On the second layer he identifies a multitude of strategies for establishing coherence, which he illustrates convincingly through the two specific examples of the 'Zeit-Raum-Konzept […] und Konnex […]' and the 'abschnittsübergreifende Relektüre unter dem Vorzeichen metonymischen Erzählens'. On this level he also identifies several plot patterns and narrative motifs, whose potential is explored in the *Kaiserchronik* for the first time and would later become constitutive for the emerging genres of courtly literature.[51] I share much of Herweg's views on the implications macrostructure of the chronicle such as the emphasis on the interchangeability of individual episodes and often arrive at similar but not congruent conclusions.[52] However, much of his writing is also characterised by a great concern for questions of genre, which this thesis will not engage with at all.

---

[48] See Dickhut-Bielsky 2015, pp. 52-59. Especially his reliance on the semantics of *frumichait* seems rather overstretched. For a more detailled engagement with some of the points Dickhut-Bielsky makes concerning the prologue see chapter III.2.3 of this thesis.

[49] Dickhut-Bielsky 2015, p. 96. E.g. "Sinnstiftende Bezüge", pp. 96-112; "Predigthaft-belehrendes Erzählen", pp. 159-76; "Quellenberufungen", pp. 253-55..

[50] Herweg 2017, p. 286.Where Herweg uses the German term 'Abschnitt' for the emperor-centric units of the chronicle, I will in English and in German continue to use 'episode'.

[51] Herweg 2017, p. 294-96.

[52] Though it warrants emphasis that most of this thesis was written before Herweg's article was published. Where I arrive at similar conclusion this happened independently.

Still, this thesis is very much part of this recent movement within *Kaiserchronik* scholarship, which posits that the text generates meaning on many levels and uses a wealth of strategies to inform its narrative.[53] It does not propose a magical key, which might unlock the *Kaiserchronik*'s idiosyncratic historiographical account. Rather, the stories about the past that the *Kaiserchronik* offers are regarded as if through Marbot's skeptical eyes: as elements, which cast doubt on the present and hence need negotiation and narrative framing for the contemporary public, who gather to look at the ruins. For Marbot's visitors in Rome to be able to construct for themselves the eras they prefer to live in, they have to draw from a powerful, cultural mythology, which permeates Rome, so as to find something meaningful in the relics.

Similarly the *Kaiserchronik* – whether knowingly or not – has to bridge the gulf between the times, personages, and places it narrates and the present for which it narrates, in order for its audience to be able to derive something meaningful from its narrative offerings. This gulf has to be bridged on two levels. The first level, which I will refer to as historical *distance*, is constitutive for the very form of the *Kaiserchronik*: dozens of emperors and hundreds of years separate the time of the chronicle's stories from the twelfth century and its German vernacular audience, which hailed – at least in the early phase of reception – probably mostly from the aristocratic and monastic centres of the southeastern reaches of the Empire. This quantifiable distance between the narrated past and the medieval present is prominently marked in the very fabric of the text: in its episodic sequencing of emperors and in the counting, at the end of each episode, of the years, months, and days, which each emperor ruled. Thus distance will be a countable and quantifiable dimension. By contrast historical *difference*, the second level on which the gulf has to be bridged, is a qualitative dimension. Significant religious and political alterities create a distinct difference between the narrated past and the medieval present. Initially the Roman Empire is a pagan entity concentrated on the City of Rome and its cisalpine territories, strongly shaped by its veneration of multiple gods. But by the end of the *Kaiserchronik*, the Empire is a wholly Christian and transalpine entity. These two dimensions of distance and difference, which at the same time connect and separate the narrative and its audience. The analysis of the productive output of the narrative negotiations of these two dimensions will from the backbone of this thesis.

I believe this approach to be important because it addresses several factors, which are relevant for research in the *Kaiserchronik*. First, one of the most-discussed questions when studying the *Kaiserchronik* is why the part dealing with the ancient Roman past and the part dealing with the

[53] See Herweg 2017, pp. 294-96.

more recent Carolingian and German past receive such different narrative treatments. Applying those two dimensions to examine how the two parts are qualitatively different while they are quantitatively approaching the present of the twelfth century will reveal that this difference in treatment is caused by the differing historiographical premises on which ancient and medieval emperor episodes are predicated. Secondly, the approach offers an opportunity for bringing together a variety of enquiries concerned with the *Kaiserchronik*'s historiography from a variety of angles. This approach does not propose an all-encompassing theoretical framework to engage with the text. Nor does it take part in the extensive discussions of the chronicle's categorisation or genre classification. Rather it aims at something much more similar to a 'motivgeschichtliche' examination of two temporal structures and their narrative furnishings, which emerge when and wherever a text takes on the task of narrating the course of history. Several angles, from salvation history to rhetoric and to concepts of nation and empire, will be organised under the concepts of historical distance and difference in order to address how the *Kaiserchronik* negotiates the historicity of its narration.

The organising terminology employed throughout this thesis – quantitative distance and qualitative difference – is of course connected to several established theoretical discourses in literary and historiographical medieval studies. I will touch on some of these but in the second chapter I will mostly develop the theoretical understanding relevant for my examinations in Chapter II building on Hayden White, Richard Newald, Gert Melville, and Hans-Joachim Gehrke.

I regard the episodes and emperors of the *Kaiserchronik*, both in form and in content, as organised along the two lines of distance and difference, and pose my questions accordingly. Scholarship has often focussed on single, prominent episodes, like the reign of Caesar, or on internally coherent narratives like the ones of Faustinian or Crescentia. This thesis, however, will follow the approach of broader studies such as Pézsa, Stock, and Dickhut-Bielsky and draw from the full scope of the chronicle, from all episodes between Caesar and Conrad III.[54] Thus a conclusive picture of the *Kaiserchronik*'s historiographical negotiation of historical distance and difference will emerge.

Chapter II elaborates what I call the quantitative narrative dimension and thus lays the theoretical ground for investigating the *Kaiserchronik*'s method of creating and explaining historical distance. After reconsidering the episodic structure of the chronicle I will suggest that Hayden White's

[54] Though admittedly there is a slant towards the Ancient/Roman episodes of the chronicle. But this is well justified as they provide the more interesting narrative material, have accumulated more scholarly literature, and make up over 80% of the text.

reading of form as a semanticising structure may be productively aligned with Richard Newald's metaphor of the atomisation of ancient narrative traditions in the Middle Ages. From this premise I will discuss three examples how the episode framework makes quantitative distance available as a historiographical tool in the *Kaiserchronik*. The first of these examples focusses on the creation of continuity, the second and third on using quantified historical distance to construct examples from history, especially by narrating aetiological stories.

Chapter III extends the discussion of exemplarity to consider the role of the *Kaiserchronik* prologues's commitment to truthfulness. I will consider how this commitment shapes the chronicle's conception of history as an exemplary *magistra vitae* in the context of comparable texts from the second half of the twelfth century. In a discussion of a few select lines from the prologue I will show how the *Kaiserchronik* styles itself not as compositional artefact but as a manifested document of history's perpetual sameness, which serves as the backbone for historical exemplarity of the *magistra vitae* tradition.

Chapters IV and V turn to the qualitative dimension of history and investigate the chronicle's treatment of historical difference. In these chapters I pursue the question of how the text narrates change in history over time, as the narrated past comes closer to the medieval present and becomes more similar to the audience's lived experience. The examination of qualitative change will focus on two areas: Chapter IV looks at the religious composition of the Empire to see how the chronicle presents the Roman Empire's course from a polytheistic pagan entity to a monotheistic Christian one. Chapter V considers the same question, but within the arena of the Empire's political identity, and maps its course from a cisalpine empire centred on the City of Rome to a transalpine one under the aegis of the Germans, while always retaining its Roman quality.

II. The Measure of History in the *Kaiserchronik*

II.1 Serial Form and Contingent Content

II.1.1. The Episodic Framework – a Reappraisal

The *Kaiserchronik* is composed of a string of separate episodes, usually defined as the rule of one emperor. Establishing the exact number of these episodes is not as straightforward as expected. Ohly counts thirty-six 'Roman' and eighteen 'German' full emperor episodes.[55] Chinca and Young, the most recent contribution, count thirty-six Roman and nineteen German episodes.[56] In order to clarify what I will be speaking of when referring to episodes and what I understand as constitutive for these units of the text's macrostructure, I shall in this section endeavour a reappraisal of the *Kaiserchronik*'s episode structure. Also, my approach to discuss the text's handling of historical distance, will hinge much on a clear and nuanced understanding of what the chronicle's building blocks are and how exactly they are delineated.

Even the most cursory overview of the episodes of the framework, their arrangement and their succession reveals glaring deviations and obvious mistakes from the established timeline of Roman emperors.[57] The first fifteen emperors from Caesar down to Trajan (KC 5840) are presented roughly in the right order and in most cases the duration of the rule noted in the *Kaiserchronik* is reasonably close to the actual duration. Two notable exceptions, however, stand out. First, the inclusion of the entirely fictitious Faustinianus as the older brother of Claudius in order to allow for the telling of the tale of his many family disruptions and reunions facilitated by St Peter, based on the Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions. Second is the anachronistic inclusion of the legendary King Tarquin of Roman pre-history, who has been inserted between Nero and Galba and Piso, which is well over five hundred years out of time, to be able to tell the story of Lucretia, Tarquin, and Conlatinus.[58]

After Trajan's reign the chronicle never presents more than two successive emperors in the right order, the notable exceptions being Philip the Arab and Decius, Diocletian and Severus (provided it

---

[55] See Ernst Friedrich Ohly, *Sage und Legende in der Kaiserchronik: Untersuchungen über Quellen und Aufbau der Dichtung* (Darmstadt 1940; repr. 1968), pp. 17-18.

[56] See Mark Chinca, Christopher Young, 'Uses of the Past in Twelfth-century Germany: The Case of the Middle High German "Kaiserchronik"', *Central European History*, 49 (2016), p. 1.

[57] See Ohly 1968, pp. 17-18.

[58] The time of Tarquin's rule is usually given as 535 BC-509 BC. Nero died in 68 CE.

is indeed Severus II and not the more famous and more likely Septimus Severus who ruled over one hundred years earlier), and of course Constantius and Constantine. Aside from these, the *Kaiserchronik* in this block of episodes feels free to jump forwards and backwards in time between emperors, moving from Helius Pertinax (d. 193 CE) seventy-six years back to the ascension of Hadrian in 117 CE, or from Julianus's death in 363 CE 247 years into the future to Heraclius's accession in 610 CE. Most egregiously the text after Constantine V (r. 741-775 CE) jumps back 300 years to Emperor Zeno (r. 474-491 CE), only to return afterwards to the eighth century with the thoroughly Byzantine emperor Constantius VI (r. 780-797 CE).[59] The text freely includes largely or completely fictitious emperors like Achilleus or Narcissus, or composite figures like the emperor Galienus, who is probably a hybrid of Emperor Galerius (r. 293-311 CE) and the physician Galen.[60] For some of the emperors it is very difficult to identify the historical correspondent, for example for Severus (Septimus Severus or Severus II?), Theodosius (Theodosius I or Theodosius II?), or Constantius Leo (Leo I or Constantine V?). Moreover, the *Kaiserchronik* collides protagonists who lived years apart when, for example, Alaric kills the emperor Commodus, although they were chronologically separated by a gulf of over two hundred years. This is especially striking as the text itself criticises precisely this kind of historiographically confused conflation prominently in the Zeno episode, where it disparagingly comments on the impossibility of Dietrich and Ezzel having met, because their lifetimes were separated by forty-three years (KC 14,176-87).

Especially in the time between Emperor Constantine and Pope Silvester and Charlemagne, no two emperors properly succeed each other or are even remotely arranged in the correct order. There are several underlying reasons for this confusion, which will be elaborated later. One of these reasons is the suppression and pejoration of 'Greekness' and the structural illustration of the antagonism between two clashing religious systems. Usually there is little or no connection between the ending frame of the concluding episode, and the first frame of the opening episode.

The episodic structure of the *Kaiserchronik* has been the object of some scholarly scrutiny. Ohly characterised it as 'sich formelhaft wiederholende[…] Eingänge und Schlüsse der einzelnen Kaisergeschichten, deren locker parataktische Hintereinanderordnung typische Chronikfrom ist'. While he admits that it would in many cases refer to the historiographical record he also identifies it as a 'in ihrer Formelgestalt […] dichterisches Stilelement der Kaiserchronik, das als solches nie ohne inneres Leben ist und nie vollkommen starr wird' Ohly calculates that the framing phrases,

---

[59] The years for the rules of all Western Roman Emperors are taken from: Meijer, Fik: Emperors don't die in bed. Translated by S.J. Leinbach. London / New York 2004.

[60] See Ohly 1968, p. 161.

which state the duration of each emperor's rule from Caesar to Charlemagne, add up to about the same amount as from Charlemagne to Conrad III, adding up to precisely 1147 years, the year in which the *Kaiserchronik*'s record of history terminates. Considering how the chronicle takes great liberties with the individual emperor episodes, Ohly sees this as a clear sign of a 'besonderen Formwillen[…]'.[61] While the details of Ohly's flawed calculations have been debated,[62] this overall understanding of the episode framework as a malleable structure, which carries itself meaning and is at the disposal of the author of the *Kaiserchronik,* will be confirmed by this chapter and in turn inform its overall argument.

II.1.1.1 Episode Markers and Episode Borders

Urbanek noted how strictly the *Kaiserchronik* adhered to its episode scheme, even compared to other contemporary texts. He shared Ohly's appreciation of the text's 'Formwillen' but went further than him to look for the cause of the seemingly deliberate composition of the number of years of the durations of reigns and the numbers of emperors who ruled. The calculations he provides in order to support his claim that the *Kaiserchronik* firstly develops its own six *aetates mundi* scheme and secondly tries to upgrade the historical importance of the second – 'German' – part of the Empire, will not be reproduced here, as Urbanek's calculations are of course equally flawed. He misunderstands *vierdehalp* as four and a half and not three and a half,[63] he assumes that the *Kaiserchronik* would not have taken any liberties with the duration of the reign of Conrad III, and he neglects to include the duration of the reign of Pope Silvester in his calculations.[64] Pope Silvester is framed like an emperor and clearly envisioned as a temporal successor of Constantine: twenty-four years, six months, and five days (KC 10,614-18). Admittedly it remains unclear for how many of these years he is supposed to have survived Constantine and ruled by himself. However, the puzzling compositional symmetry of this episode's arrangement, which puts Charlemagne at the

---

61 Ohly 1968, pp. 16-18.

62 Ferdinand Urbanek was the first to point out Ohly's diverse computational mistakes e.g. confusing the dying date of Lothair of Supplingburg etc.. See Ferdinand Urbanek, 'Zur Datierung der "Kaiserchronik": Entstehung – Auftraggeber – Chronologie', *Euphorion*, 53 (1959), p. 146. Urbanek counts 409 years and eight months from Caesar to the Interregnum before Charlemagne takes over separated by thirty-six emperors. From the coronation of Charlemagne to the present day of the chronicler, which in the *Kaiserchronik* encompass eighteen emperors, he counts 394 years and eleven months. By adding the time Conrad III – whose reign is never concluded in the *Kaiserchronik* – reigned Urbanek arrives equally at 409 years and agrees with Ohly that this annalistic symmetry cannot be an accident.

63 As pointed out by Dickhut-Bielsky 2915, p. 60.

64 See Ferdinand Urbanek, 'Herrscherzahl und Regierungszeiten in der "Kaiserchronik"', *Euphorion*, 66 (1972), p. 223.

threshold of a two to one relation between ancient and medieval kings,[65] and Constantine as twenty-seventh emperor in the centre of the fifty-four emperors altogether,[66] cannot be denied.

From Ohly's and Urbanek's calculations it can be concluded that it is far from straightforward to define what actually constitutes an episode in the *Kaiserchronik*. The problem of what to make of the Silvester episode has already been mentioned, but the complications go far beyond this issue. For example, in several cases an episode merges with the following one, for instance when Claudius succeeds his fictitious brother Faustinianus after he and his wife withdraw into a monastery (KC 4025-38), when Piso and Galba jointly rule the Empire (KC 4835-64), or when Alaric kills Lucius Accommodus and takes over as emperor from him (KC 7420-25). Another problem is that the established counting of emperors as presented by Ohly and Urbanek takes the actual catalogue of Roman emperors as a reference and does not consider the structural markers the text offers to map out its episodes.

The first indication of the episodic framework that will later become so important to the text's structure can be found at the end of Caesar's reign:

> diu rîche er mit michelem gewalte habete
> die wîle daz er lebete,
> daz buoch saget uns vur wâr:
> niewan fiunf jâr.
> Rômâre in ingetrûwelîche sluogen,
> sîn gebaine si ûf ein irmensûl begruoben. KC 597-602

Elements from this passage will become recurring markers of the conclusion of an episode, most prominently the reckoning of years of the rule of a respective emperor and a short reference to the circumstances of his death.

The first episodic introduction of an emperor follows suit:

> Alse Juljus wart erslagen,
> Augustus daz rîche nâh im gewan,
> von sîner swester was er geborn.

---

65 He stands between thirty-six ancient emperors and eighteen medieval emperors.

66 If one focusses on kings, who actually ruled and does not consider the episode phrasings, which suggest a more nuanced approach, as laid out below.

duo er ze rihter wart erkorn KC 603-06

Later these inchoative formulas will become more reduced. Neither a causal connection to the events of the preceding episode nor the establishment of a genealogical or political connection to the preceding emperor (which would legitimise the following emperor's ascent to the throne) figure prominently in the Roman part of the *Kaiserchronik*. Here these episodes are usually introduced with a short tripartite formula of the following pattern:

Das buoch kundet uns sus,
daz rîche besaz dô Tybêrîus,
der gewan Rômaeren michel êre. KC 671-73

Quite similarly when Nero is introduced as the successor of Claudius:

Daz buoch kundet uns mêre:
daz rîche besaz duo Nêre;
der was der aller wirste man
der von muoter in dise welt ie bekom. KC 4083-86

And much later when Helius Pertinax succeeds Severus:

Du buoch chundet uns daz:
Hêlîus Pertinax
der besaz dô dâz rîche. KC 7136-38

The tripartite formula is simple. It often starts with a reference to the authoritative book, which reports the rule, then introduces the name of the emperor who ascends to the throne, and concludes with an often prefigurative phrase, which points to what the audience can expect from the content of the following episode.

Most of the time the connection between the emperor and his empire is contained in the word *besaz*, the third person singular preterite of the strong verb *besitzen.* One of its idiomatic meanings

is ‘to ascend the throne’ but is also carries connotations of ‘to sit in judgement’ and ‘to conquer’.[67] Three qualities pertaining to the new emperor are transported by this simple, recurring lexem in the beginning of episodes: the inaugural, the successive and the judicial.[68] Interestingly, there is a marked decline in interest for this phrase in the medieval part of the *Kaiserchronik*, where only three of the 18 emperors are introduced in this way.

In terms of content there is usually very little intratextual correspondence or explicit relation between the episodes. It comes almost as a surprise when at the beginning of the otherwise rather inconspicuous Achilleus episode the destruction of Rome by Alaric in the preceding episode is acknowledged and the new emperor has to do a fair amount of reconstruction (KC 7426-35). This extensive report of the construction and ornamentation works carried out in Rome under Achilleus would not be necessary for the remainder of the episode (which deals mostly with his assassination by Posthumus, see KC 7436-51) and is only required by the author because in the episode before Alaric thoroughly devastated the city and decimated its population (KC 7404-11; 7417-19). At the same time this narrative treatment of the destruction and rebuilding of Rome illustrates the clear conceptual cut each episode border marks. Events that are actually parts of a single historical sequence, like the devastation and subsequent reconstruction of Rome in this example, are not presented as such if they run over the boundary between reigns. This is corroborated by the role of the temple of Jupiter in the Gaius episode. Despite being extensively introduced in the Pagan Weekday Calendar in the very beginning of the *Kaiserchronik (*KC 139-56), when the temple next features it is treated to a fully fledged reintroduction: the sacrifice is carried to *ainem betehûs* (KC 1128) and both the god’s name *Jûpiter* and his domain as the god of weather are stated again as if they had never featured in the narrative before (KC 1127-32).

The content of each episode is self-contained and exists unaffected by previous references to the same material. This raises the question whether the text is at all interested in creating a coherent diegetic idea of Jupiter within its narrative or whether the two Jupiter temples exist in entirely disjointed story worlds mostly influenced by the source tradition and not by the narrative paradigmatic axis of the *Kaiserchronik*.

---

[67] See ‘be-sitzen’ in *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch* ed. by Matthias Lexer, vols 3 (Leipzig 1872) I, coll. 217-18; ‘sitzen’ in *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch* ed. by Matthias Lexer, vols 3 (Leipzig 1872) II, coll. 944-45.

[68] *Besaz* recurs at the beginning of most episodes: Tiberius 672, Caligula 1116, Faustinianus 1220, Claudius 4036, Nero 4084, Tarquin 4302, Galba & Piso 4835 (interestingly not in plural), Otho 4847, Vitellius 4851, Vespasian 5100, Domitian 5558, Nerva 5684, Trajan 5840, Philippus 6098, Decius 6157, Diocletian & Maximian (also not in plural) 6451, Severus 6623, Helius Pertinax 7138, Achilleus 7427, Galienus 7453, Constantius 7605, Julian 10,635, Heraclius 11,139, Narcissus 11,353, Justinian 12,814, Theodosius 13,068, Constantius Leo 13,671, Zeno 13,825, Ludwig II 15,318, Charles II 15,400, Otto II 15,977.

II.1.1.2 From Historiography to Genealogy

Alongside the confused historical account, a further quality of the *Kaiserchronik* has attracted scholarly scrutiny and sometimes provoked irritation. The chronicle seems to fall into two clearly divided parts, one dealing with the Roman emperors of antiquity, and one dealing with the 'German' emperors of the Middle Ages. Indeed the qualitative differences between both parts are striking.[69] As early as Ernst Scheunemann, who wrote the article on the *Kaiserchronik* in the 1936 Verfasserlexikon, scholars have remarked on the conceptual difference which seems to separate the two parts. Scheunemann contrasted the 'Wirklichkeitsbericht' of the German part with the 'geformte Wirklichkeit', aiming for 'epische Darstellung' of the Roman part.[70] Ohly argues that with the beginning of the German emperor episodes the greater legendary and mythological traditions faded out and gave way to smaller, sometimes still legendary or mythological but increasingly also historical reports. Ohly goes on to contend that the time of the ancient Roman emperors was more open to free narrative reshaping by the *Kaiserchronik*'s author and therefore became the main focus of the author's literary attention.[71]

More recently Christoph Petersen has taken an inverted stance on the question. Initially stating that the German part of the chronicle was written according to totally different premises from the Roman one, he sets out to look for a categorical differentiation of the past to explain the production of more expansive legendary, hagiographical, or mythological narrations only in the ancient part of the chronicle. Finally he attributes to the Roman part a negative meaning, as the history of the Empire has been semanticised retrospectively from the perspective of the twelfth century and through this lens the Ancient Roman part could only be read as a 'Aufschub des im Anfang der Geschichte schon angelegten Zieles'. The ancient history of the Empire has to be artificially injected with meaning, through narrativisation and abundant mythopoiesis, while the history of the Empire since Charlemagne shares a 'konzeptuelles Kontinuum' with the twelfth-century present

---

[69] Petersen provides a helpful summary of the four most evident categories of differences between both parts: 'Die Traditionsbindung: Vor Karl d. Gr. zeigt der Text Eingriffe in die überlieferte Kaiserfolge (Umstellungen, Auslassungen, Hinzufügungen), die dem Standardwissen mittelalterlicher Chronistik Hohn sprechen, danach nicht. Die Materie: Legenden- ,Sagen-, Mirakel- und Mirabilienstoffe werden bis Karl d. Gr. breit entfaltet, danach nicht. Die Quellenheuristik: Im antiken Teil sind höchst heterogene, kaum aber chronikalische Überlieferungen aufwändig kompiliert, danach beruht die Erzählung weitgehend auf der chronikalischen Tradition. Schließlich die Erzählweise: Personale Rede (Gespräche, Dispute, Ansprachen, Berichte) bestimmen im antiken Teil weithin die Erzählung, ist nach Karl d. Gr. aber nur sporadisch eingestreut; Schlachten sind unter Vespasian, Commodus oder Heraclius mit heldenepischer Topik ausgemalt, unter den deutschen Kaisern nur summarisch abgehandelt.' Christoph Petersen, 'Zeit, Vorzeit und Narrativierung von Geschichte in der "Kaiserchronik"', *ZfdPh*, 126 (2007), p. 323.

[70] Ernst Scheunemann, 'Kaiserchronik' in Verfasserlexikon ed. by Wolfgang Stammler and Karl Langosch, vols 5 (Berlin, Leipzig 1933-55), II 1936, pp. 732-46.

[71] See Ohly 1968, p. 7.

and therefore does not require such treatment.[72] His analyses offer punctually very satisfactory results, but they suffer strongly from very selective argumentation and also yield the rather stupendous consequence of rendering 83% of the content of the text, the entire Ancient Roman part, void of any inherent meaning. As Petersen remains vague about the implications and the borders of this conceptual continuum, the examination of its limitations and extensions will be an important task of the following sections.

Explanations like those offered by Ohly or Petersen share the focus on the content and its differing developments in both parts of the chronicle. They overlook, however, that the phraseology and the form of the episode framework itself do provide a useful conceptual distinction between both parts, which enables a definition of the dichotomy without speculating about the author's intentions or resorting to ascribing a negative meaning to 80% of the text. It is striking that the introductory phrases of the medieval emperor episodes after Charlemagne no longer refer to a *buoch* as the authoritative source for the presentation of the incipient next imperial reign but shift to a genealogical model.

During the ancient part of the *Kaiserchronik*, genealogical connections between subsequent emperors are rarely mentioned. Only Augustus is introduced as Caesar's nephew (KC 605: *von sîner swester was er geborn*), Domitian is introduced as Titus's brother (KC 5558), and Constantine as the son of his paternal predecessor Constantius and St Helena (KC 7610-13, 7806-09). But after the death of Charlemagne the *Kaiserchronik* focusses on the genealogical ties, which connect the subsequent emperors much more consistently. Most of the emperors ascending to the throne are introduced in relation to their imperial predecessors. Louis the Pious is presented as Charlemagne's rightful heir: *Do der maere kaiser versciet,* | *ain guoten erben er verliez* (KC 15,092-93).

Louis's son and successor Lothar is introduced in a similar pattern: temporal and causal connection to the death of the predecessor, explication of the family ties connecting the two men, then proclamation and affirmation by the princes of the realm (KC 15,236-41). The election by the princes is an element that is also new as a factor of political succession asserts itself at this point (e.g. KC 15,239-41).

When Louis II succeeds Lothair, the former has already been established as the latter's son (KC 15,304-15) and the struggle for mastery between Lothair's *edelre sune viere* (KC 15,305) drives the narrative of the following episode. The transition from Louis II to his older son Karl (KC 15,394-99) is constructed analogously, only in this case without the strife between the brothers.

---

[72] See Petersen 2007, pp. 352-53.

Arnulf of Carinthia is the first Carolingian king in the *Kaiserchronik* not to succeed to the throne in direct patrilinear descent; he is introduced as son of Karelmann (KC 15,522), Karl's younger brother (KC 15,398), and so the genealogical model remains unperturbed. When Arnulf dies, he is succeeded by his son, the young Louis IV, who is commonly singled out by scholarship and also the *Kaiserchronik* for becoming king while still a child (KC 15,582-87).

With the strengthening of the genealogical model by the establishment of the Carolingian dynasty at the beginning of the medieval part, the *besaz* phrase, which was characteristic of the ancient emperors fades into the background. It does not disappear altogether but rather loses its inaugural meaning and finds its way into different contexts. More generally the refrain following the pattern *daz buoch chundet uns sus* | *das rîche besaz do* […][73] of the ancient episode openers is replaced with the phrase *alse chaiser* […] *verschiet* | *einen guten sun/erben er liez*.[74] For both formulae the phrasing varies quite significantly from case to case but the logic of this new pattern is the same: the death of the father triggers the election and succession of his heir, usually his son. The *Kaiserchronik* no longer harks back to the authority of knowledge transmission via written tradition (*das buoch chundet uns sus*) but now deploys a straightforward genealogical model of succession. This marks a conceptual break in the episodic paradigm of the *Kaiserchronik*, not between Roman and German emperors, but rather between historiographically and genealogically legitimised ancient and medieval emperors.

The first break in the genealogical model is negotiated with the death of Louis the Child. Bishops and princes of the Empire elect Conrad I at a diet in Mainz. The text provides some context, such as the name of Conrad's father and the lands he owns, but does not tie him to the Carolingians or elaborate on his qualifications as king (KC 15,652-63). However, the phrase, which introduces the process of his succession, is quite similar to the established scheme: *Also der chunich Ludewîch erstarp* | *unt âne erben vur wart (*KC 15,652-53). Conrad I also dies without issue, whereupon the princes elect Henry I, the first of the Saxon Ottonians to be the next king (KC 15,760-66).

Here again, the election by a collective of princes is mentioned and a genealogical background at least hinted at, although no connection to previous incumbents is established. Additionally the

---

[73] In this or similar form opening the episodes of Tiberius (KC 671), Gaius (KC 1115), Faustinian (KC 1219), Nero (KC 4083), Tarquin (KC 4301), Vitellus (KC 4862), Vespasian (KC 5099), Domitian (KC 5557), Nerva (KC 5683), Trajan (KC 5839), Philip (KC 6097), Severus (KC 6622), Helius Pertinax (KC 7136), Achilleus (KC 7426), Galienus (KC 7452), Constantius (KC 7604), Julian (KC 10,634), Heraclius (KC 11,138), Narcissus (KC 11,352), Justinian (KC 12,813), Theodosius (KC 13,067), and the second Constantius (KC 14,194).

[74] In this or similar form opening the episodes of Louis II (KC 15,582), Lothair I (KC 15,236-37), Charles II (KC 15,394-95), Louis the Child (KC 15,582-83), Otto I (KC 15,850-51), Otto II (KC 15,974-75), Otto III (KC 16,064-65), and Henry III (KC 16,376-77).

chronicle stresses Henry's resistance to become king (KC 15,768-71). His reluctance to have his rank exalted is a classical trope of modesty that will feature again when Lothair of Supplinburg, another extra-dynastic king, is proclaimed. The following three generations of Ottos are all clearly marked as patrilinear genealogy going back to Henry I, passing the reign down from generation to generation. Otto I succeeds his father (KC 15,850-53) and his father's excellence as a ruler further qualifies the son in the eyes of the princes who elect Otto as their new king: *want der vater alsô biderbe was* | *sô lobeten si den sun deste baz* (KC 15,856-66).

The mechanism is already automated when his *tiurliche*[r] *sun* (KC 15,975) Otto II follows him onto the throne, and the *Kaiserchronik* quickly falls back into only pointing out that he *besaz* the Empire, without mentioning an election by the princes (KC 15,974-78). When the third Otto succeeds his homonymous father, the diet that elects him is again mentioned at length together with the fact that he *newas niht alt,* | *wan ze zwelf jâren gezalt* (KC 16,066-67). When finally the last Ottonian is elected by the princes, the *Kaiserchronik* only mentions that he is *der Baier herzoge* (KC 16,146) but Henry's II dynastic relation to the main line of the Ottonians is not mentioned at all. As if to compensate for this, the prefigurative praise, which concludes the opening of his episode, extols him all the louder (KC 16,147-49).

Henry's II successor Conrad II, the first Salian on the throne, is elected by the *vursten in dem rîche* (KC 16,255) without any further comment, and the following Salian emperors are clearly introduced as a patrilinear dynasty. Henry III is Conrad's II son (KC 16,377) and he is in turn succeeded by his son Henry IV (KC 16,534). His accession is accompanied by a remark, which mirrors the introduction of Otto I in relation to his father: *durch den michelen ruom* | *den der vater hête gewunnen* | *sô gunden si iz dem jungen* (KC 16,535-37). But unlike Otto I, Henry IV will not prove worthy of the advance in trust granted to him by the princes, as the *Kaiserchronik* turns him into the paradigmatic bad emperor among the German rulers.

The *Kaiserchronik* reduces Henry V to an antagonist to his father completely contained within Henry's IV episode (KC 16,804-16,920), and goes from Henry IV directly to the tumultuous election of the dynastically unconnected Lothair of Supplingburg (KC 16,942-71). Apart from being tied to Saxony he is not part of the genealogical lines established previously. As in the case of Henry I, Lothair is at first very apprehensive and seeks counsel about how to avoid this elevation of his rank before the princes manage to persuade him (KC 16,957-68). Lothair is greatly praised and lamented by the *Kaiserchronik* when he dies (KC 17,165-81) and the audience of his story is explicitly asked to pray for his soul in a way reminiscent only of the conclusion of the Silvester episode (KC 10,619-33). Lothair is succeeded by Conrad III, *der ê wider dem rîche was* (KC

17,184). This refers to Conrad becoming counter-king (in 1127) to Lothair in Lothair's episode (KC 17,039-69) but only succeeding Lothar after his death. The *Kaiserchronik* finally terminates mid-sentence as Conrad III is making preparations to go on crusade (KC 17,270-83).

This observation points towards several complex questions. Does the switch from a historiographical to a genealogical model of imperial authority and succession merely reflect the different traditions of knowledge about the ancient and the medieval Roman Empire that were available to medieval authors? Do the two models correspond to a change in the author's *modus operandi*, from compiling several written traditions into one account to building his writing on a more cohesive authority system, which allowed him to draw from knowledge more easily available to him? Certainly the conceptual implications for the *Kaiserchronik* are clear: while the ancient Empire emerges as an entity of historiographical knowledge and tradition, the medieval Empire takes on the shape of a genealogically organised polity. They are united by their shared Romanness and transpersonal or even transpolitical existence.

II.1.2 Modified Episode Framework

Building on the results of this new appraisal of the episode framework of the *Kaiserchronik* I would like to propose the following episodic breakdown of the work's content.

Episode number	Emperor	Non-Episodic Content	Lines	Corresponding Figure*
	Prologue			
		Invocatio	1-14	
		Narratio	14-26	
		Polemic	26-42	
	Pre-imperial Rome		43-246	
		Romulus & Remus	43-62	
		Pagan Weekday Calendar	63-185	
		Conversion of the Pantheon	186-208	
		Salvatio Romae	209-246	
1	***Juljus Cêsar***		247-602	Julius Caesar
2	***Augustus***		603-670	Augustus

3	***Tybêrîus***		671-1115	Tiberius
4	***Gâjus***		1116-1218	Gaius
5	***Faustinjânus***		1219-4037	Faustinian
			4038-4082	Claudius
6	***Nêre***		4082-4300	Nero
7	***Tarquînîus***		4301-4834	Tarquin
8	***Galbâ & Pîsô***		4835-4846	Galba & Piso
9	***Ottô***		4847-4857	Otho
10	***Vitellus***		4858-5098	Vitellus
11	***Vespasjânus***		5099-5364	Vespasian
12	***Tîtus***		5365-5556	Titus
13	***Domîcîânus***		5557-5682	Domitian
14	***Nervâ***		5683-5838	Nerva
15	***Traianus***		5839-6096	Trajan
16	***Philippus***		6097-6150	Philipp the Arab
17	***Dêcîus***		6151-6450	Decius
18	***Dioclêtîânus***		6451-6621	Diocletian
19	***Sevêrus***		6622-7135	Severus
20	***Hêlîus Pertinax***		7136-7211	Helius Pertinax
21	***Hêlîus Adrîânus***		7212-7243	Hadrian
22	***Lûcîus Accommodus***		7344-7419	Commodus?
			7420-7425	Alaric
23	***Achillêus***		7426-7451	Fictitious
24	***Gallîênus***		7452-7603	Galerius & Galen?
25	***Constantîus***		7604-7805	Constantius
26	***Constantînus***		7806-10,510	Constantine
27	***Sancte Silvester***		10,511-10,632	Pope Silvester
28	***Juljânus***		10,633-11,137	Julian the Apostate
29	***Herâclîus***		11,138-11,351	Heraclius
30	***Narcissus***		11,352-11,372	Fictitious
			11,373-12,812	Fictitious

31	***Justinjânus***		12,813-13,067	Justinian
32	***Theodôsîus***		13,068-13,650	Theodosius I and/or Theodosius II?
		Interregnum	13,651-13,667	
33	***Constantînus Lêô***		13,668-13,824	Leo I and/or Constantine V?
34	***Zênô***		13,825-14,193	Zeno
35	***Constantîus***		14,194-14,281	Constantius VI
		Interregnum	14,282-14,295	
36	***Karl***		14,296-15,091	Charlemagne
37	***Ludewîch***		15,092-15,235	Louis the Pious
38	***Liuther***		15,236-15,317	Lothair I
39	***Ludewic***		15,318-15,393	Louis the German
40	***Karl***		15,394-15,517	Charles the Bald
41	***Arnolt***		15,518-15,581	Arnulf of Carinthia
42	***Ludewîch***		15,582-15,651	Louis the Child
43	***Chuonrât***		15,652-15,760	Conrad I
44	***Hainrîch***		15,761-15,849	Henry I the Fowler
45	***Ottô***		15,850-15,973	Otto I the Great
46	***Ottô***		15,974-16,063	Otto II
47	***Ottô***		16,064-16,141	Otto III
48	***Hainrîch***		16,142-16,253	Henry II
49	***Chuonrât***		16,254-16,375	Conrad II
50	***Hainrîch***		16,376-16,531	Henry III
51	***Hainrîch***		16,532-16,941	Henry IV
52	***Liuther***		16,942-17,181	Lothair of Supplinburg
53	***Chuonrât***		17,182-17,283	Conrad III

*****The corresponding figure will in most cases be a historical Roman emperor but sometimes also an entirely literary or mythological figure.

This new scheme leaves the work with fifty-three emperor episodes altogether, thirty-five of them from Caesar to the second Constantius, and eighteen of them from Charlemagne to Conrad III. It

also singles out a block at the beginning of the *Kaiserchronik*, from the prologue to the *salvatio Romae*, which precedes the episode structure. At a later point in this thesis I will show that this pre-episodic part plays an important role in setting up the constitution of the qualitatively largely stable Roman Empire, which provides the axis for the episodic part of the chronicle.[75] Moreover, it will become clear that the conventional distinction between Roman and German emperors cannot be maintained. Where there are important conceptual distinctions to be made between both groups, in the future the first thirty-five will be referred to as the ancient Emperors and the latter eighteen as the medieval Emperors.

According to this reckoning Philipp and Decius have each discrete episodes, whilst Claudius and Alaric become codas to Faustinian and Commodus respectively. Piso and Galba or Diocletian and Maximian are given a joint episode. The scheme allows for an independent episode for Pope Silvester, who gets a similar episodic framing to the emperors of the *Kaiserchronik*, but leaves the reign of the two Dietrichs firmly confined in the Narcissus episode. Through this lens the two periods of interregnum, which frame the time of the problematic Greek emperors, become more pronounced and point towards the pivotal structural importance of this block of episodes.

This new format is of course not without its flaws. It does little to mitigate the fact that the Caesar episode is rather organically intertwined with the preceding pre-episodic *salvatio Romae* passage. This passage ends up lumped in together with the prologue and the other pre-imperial and pre-episodic material.

II.1.3 Atomised Antiquity as the Quantitative Continuum of History

Despite its failings and idiosyncrasies, a great deal of insight can be derived from the episodic structure of the *Kaiserchronik* if it is not regarded merely as a silent framework but more as a running commentary in its own right, which contributes to the generation of meaning as much as to the content of the episodes.

It is after all the form that has been regarded as the appropriate one by the author of the *Kaiserchronik* for realising the programmatic statements of the prologue. The *rîche* is presented as a succession of rules; a horizontal, linear, progressive, and continuous paradigm. It builds on long established and authoritative forms of imperial historiography, going back all the way to Suetonius and still informing Latin historiography at the time of the *Kaiserchronik*, as is evident in the

[75] See below section V.1.2 Rome's Historical Introduction.

examples of Otto's *Chronica* or Godfrey of Viterbo's *Pantheon*. The principle is applied coherently and consequently observed, providing the narrative with regularity and reliability. Continuity lies at the heart of this form of presentation: the history of the Empire as a continuum. Consequently the Empire remains Roman, even after the transalpine Carolingian and German kings or emperors take over its reign. The epithet *tiutsch* is only used together with *lant* or *rîche* in a transalpine-geographical sense, to localise a group of people (KC 464; 6811; 14,819; 16,495) or to define a destination (KC 253; 263; 462; 684; 15,554; 16,804; 16,816). It is never used to describe the political quality of the Empire; even under the rule of Charlemagne (KC 15,085), Otto II (KC 15,995), or Henry III (KC 16,504), the Empire stays Roman. This remains true even in the thirteenth-century continuations of the *Kaiserchronik*, where *roemisch* is now exclusively used in conjunction with *rîche* (KC1 157; 388; KC2 29; 69; 80; 146; 156). Thus, as the emperors change, and even as their ethnic and political background shifts from the Romans to the Greeks and on to the Carolingians and Germans, the Empire remains qualitatively unchanged.

Hayden White has provided a useful methodological approach to reading the imperial continuum of the *Kaiserchronik*'s episode framework as a semanticising structure. Adapting the ideas of his 1982 book *The Content of the Form* allows us to take the semantic achievement of non-narrative framing structures of medieval historiographical texts into account. White developed this approach with reference to a tripartite model, according to which medieval narrative historiographies are classified as either annals, chronicles, or histories. According to White's criteria of differentiation, the *Kaiserchronik* would clearly be a chronicle due to its 'higher' form of historical conceptualisation, greater comprehensiveness and narrative coherence, the organisation of its material by topics and reigns, and its focus on a central subject.[76] However, the theoretical principles applied here are mainly derived from White's work on annals. It will be argued that the episodic framing structures of the *Kaiserchronik* function analogously to the non-narrative, enumerative lists, which synchronise years and events in annals.

Building on Hegel, who wrote that 'it is only the state which first presents subject-matter that is not only adapted to the prose of History, but involves the production of such history in the very progress of its own being',[77] White states that a central requirement for historiography to happen is the existence of a presupposed legal and social system 'against which or on behalf of which the typical agents of narrative account militate'.[78] In the case of the *Kaiserchronik* the episodic framing

---

[76] Hayden White, *The Content of the Form* (Baltimore, London 1987), pp. 1-25.

[77] Georg Willhelm Friedrich Hegel, *Lectures on the Philosophy of History* trans. by J. Sibree (New York 1956). , p. 63.

[78] White 1987, p. 13.

structures can be read as constituting this presupposed system and the agents, which militate against it, are the disjunct, self-contained and often contingent stories which are framed by the episodic structural markers fleshed out above.

In relation to this presupposed system the stories, which the *Kaiserchronik* contains in its episodes are largely interchangeable, especially when dealing with the ancient history of the Empire. Antiquity in the *Kaiserchronik* is treated as what Richard Newald called atomised.[79] The process of atomising narratives detaches them from their historical meaning and unmoors them of their context, turning them into a highly fluid cloud of freely floating schemata readily available for insertion and rearrangement. The atomised narrative material is composed as sets of two elements: one authoritative label and a malleable and fluid pool of narrative material. The label, – usually the name of a prominent protagonist, like Lucretia or Alaric, which serves as a shorthand – attached to a story gives it authority and ensures instant recognisability. The fluid pool of narrative material surrounds the authoritative label and is actualised when and wherever the label is introduced into a new narrative context. Audience expectations would be disappointed if a story introduced with the label of Lucretia does not also tell of Conlatinus and Tarquin and does not end with Lucretia's suicide. In the *Kaiserchronik* the mobility and availability of these story atoms affects both the order and succession of emperors, and the narrative material contained in the frames labelled with the name of an emperor.

Prominent examples of these atomised narrative elements abound in the *Kaiserchronik*. First of all there is the cyclops who features in the *origo gentis* of the Franks (KC 346-60). In its version the *Kaiserchronik* connects the Trojan origin story of the Franks to the Aeneas material, well familiar to writers of the twelfth century through Virgil, but triggered by the reference to Troy and the Greeks.[80] It also inserts the short excursus into the Homeric story of Ulysses's fight against the cyclops who remains nameless in this case. Here Ulysses serves as the authoritative label and the cyclops as the core of the story material this label conjures. The passage appears as if entirely disconnected from the rest of the Frankish *origo gentis.* The place where it is inserted, however, reads like an attempt to transfer the mythical authority of the Homeric tale onto the Franks. Homer was largely unknown in the Middle Ages and his work mostly accessible through later Latin reworkings like the fifth-century *Historia de excidio Trojae* by Dares Phrygius*,* the fourth-century

---

[79] See Richard Newald, *Nachleben Des Antiken Geistes Im Abendland Bis Zum Beginn Des Humanismus: Eine Überschau* (Tübingen 1960), pp. 192-93.

[80] See Charles Homer Haskins, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* (Cleveland 1967), pp. 105-07; also Paul Klopsch, 'Vergil im Mittelalter, I. Lateinische Literatur' in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* ed. by Robert-Henri Bautier and others, vols 9 (München, Zürich 1980-98), VIII 1997, coll. 1522-26, esp. coll. 1525-26.

Ephemeris belli Trojani by Dictys Cretensis, or the anonymous and entirely independent tradition of the *Excidium Troie*, first conceived between the fourth and the sixth century.[81] But the narrative atom of Ulysses and the cyclops still seemed to contain enough authority from deep ancient history to be deemed valuable for insertion at this point of the narrative.

A similar case occurs in the Tarquin episode, when Lucretia is introduced: *si stât in Ovîdîô gescriben dâ* (KC 4337). To be able to tell the story of Lucretia the text needed to insert Tarquin, whose Latin epithet Superbus is contained in the introductory phrases the *Kaiserchronik* devotes to him: *der was der ubermuotigeste man | der ie von muoter in diese werlt bekom* (KC 4303-04).

Interestingly Ovid is not invoked with the introduction of Tarquin but only when the story turns to Lucretia. The story turns to Lucretia to introduce her as the chosen Roman wife of the episode's male main protagonist Conlatinus: *Ain furste bi den ziten ze Triere* (KC 4305). Conlatinus, nephew of King Tarquin and husband of Lucretia, figures both in Livy's and Ovid's version of the story. It is his boasting about the virtue of his wife that sets the whole chain of events in motion.[82] In the *Kaiserchronik*'s version he has to flee from Trier because he killed another prince there (KC 4310-13) and is honourably received in Rome where the Senate ponders how to adequately welcome such a great guest.

> duo gevuoct iz sih alsus,
> daz im gebôt der senâtus,
> daz er aine frowen von Rôme naeme,
> diu sîner edelkait wol gezaeme.
> Ainer frowen er duo bat:
> wie schiere man im sie gap!
> diu hiez Lucrêtîâ KC 4331-37

Ohly reads the reference to Ovid – who is the only ancient poet to be mentioned by name in the *Kaiserchronik* – as a sign of the emerging *aetas ovidiana* in the middle of the twelfth century.[83] More importantly he turns the *Kaiserchronik*'s explicit naming of Ovid into an argument for his

---

[81] See Elisabeth Heyse, 'Homer, I. Lateinisches Mittelalter' in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* ed. by Robert-Henri Bautier and others, vols 9 (München, Zürich 1980-98), V 1991, coll. 109-10.

[82] Titus Livius, *Ab urbe condita* ed. by Robert Seymour Conway and Charles Flamstead Walters (Oxford 1914), Lib I, Cap. 57-59, pp. 1085-88.

[83] See Ohly 1968, p. 89. In French Florilegies of the twelfth century about twelve times as much space is devoted to Ovid than it is to Vergil, See: Ernst Robert Curtius, 'Zur Literaturästhetik des Mittelalters', *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 59 (1938), p. 134.

typological system by arguing that medieval calendars would employ aetiological stories in the same way as Ovid's *Fasti,* where his Lucretia figures[84] and both the choice and the mentioning of Ovid as a source would indicate medieval typological thinking.[85] However, it could much more be just another marker for an atomised piece of Antiquity, required because of the Lucretia story's unmooring from its chronological context and its insertion into a new historical setting.

More examples of the atomised used of ancient narremes inform many of the *Kaiserchronik*'s more idiosyncratic narrative decisions. It does not matter if Caesar initially conquers the Gauls or the Germans as long as his conquests lead to him becoming the first emperor.[86] Faustinian could have been introduced as the brother of any other emperor, as long as St Peter can still be reasonably imagined to be alive and thus to allow the insertion of material from the fourth-century Pseudo-Clementine *Recognitiones.* Tarquin can be inserted anachronistically between Nero and Galba without inflicting any harm on the chronicle's narrative cohesion. The goal is not to present a causally integrated account of the chaotic circumstances of Nero's death and the following so-called 'Year of the Four Emperors' (69 CE) spanning over the episodes of Nero, Galba & Piso, Vitellus, and Vespasian but to insert the story atom of Lucretia. So the story of Lucretia, with its concomitant figures like Tarquin and Conlatinus and of action protocols like Lucretia's rape and subsequent suicide, can be anachronistically implanted without disrupting the narrative fabric or the paradigmatic structure of the chronicle. The only limitation to this mobility is that the narrative environment into which her story gets inserted still has to be dominated by pagan religious beliefs. The Christian discourse on her moral exemplarity, which goes back to Augustine, is too closely linked to her being a pagan.[87] And contrasting her behaviour as a woman who has been unjustly condemned in a meaningful way with Crescentia's behaviour from the Narcissus episode, as Ohly suggests, only works if Crescentia is read as a Christian antipode to the pagan Lucretia.[88]

The mobility of those story atoms also explains why the sack of Jerusalem and the diaspora of the people of Israel – the salvation historical watershed chiefly associated with Vespasian and Titus[89] – can be told entirely unconnected to the episodes, which are actually dedicated to the rule

---

84 See Publius Ovidius Naso, *Ovid's Fasti* ed. by Sir James Frazer (London, Cambridge MA 1931), Lib. II, pp. 111-14.

85 See Ohly 1968, p. 91.

86 Needless to say that this also happens in the source texts and in other chronicles of the time, like in Godfrey of Viterbo's *Pantheon* and once more the structure of the *Kaiserchronik* is mostly informed by its sources. This points at a more prevalent treatment of the ancient past as atomised, which the text shares with other texts, both older and contemporary and made those materials all the more attractive for narrative inclusion.

87 Saint Augustin of Hippo, *De civitate Dei* ed. by Jacques-Paul Migne, vols 11 (Paris 1938) VII, Lib. I, Cap. 19.

88 Ohly 1968, pp. 194-98.

89 See Manfred Kern, 'Titus' in *Lexikon der antiken Gestalten in den deutschen Texten des Mittelalters* ed. by the author and Alfred Ebenbauer (Berlin, New York 2003), p. 620; Ibid. 'Vespasian'. pp. 669-71.

of Vespasian and Titus. The authority of the ancient tradition of the Veronica story ties – as part of the *Vindicta Salvatoris* tradition[90] – the destruction of Jerusalem in retributive logic to the Jews' killing of Jesus. By turning the sacking of Jerusalem into a command from Tiberius in order to punish the Jews the Veronica tradition also incorporates Vespasian and Titus and thus separates the story from the reign of Vespasian where the events of 70 CE would be expected to end up canonically and chronologically.

In the *Kaiserchronik* antiquity becomes visible and readable in sign and tradition, by the paradigmatic implementation through story nuclei, which bring with them associated material from their narrative tradition. Antiquity gains a transtemporal and transspatial semantic.[91] The *Kaiserchronik* displays all the traits that Richard Newald singled out as characteristic for medieval adaption of ancient material: 'Mosaikartiges Zusammensetzen, Weiterspinnen oder naives Umdeuten des durch die Autorität Gesicherten, durch den Glauben Geheiligten und durch die Gewohnheit Gestärkten.'[92]

II.1.4 Dimensions of Qualitative Change: Political and Religious Identity of the Empire

As the example of the Lucretia story shows, there are limits to the mobility of story atoms. The principles, which determine these limits are in their turn shaped by two main dimensions of qualitative difference, which the chronicle must modulate for its twelfth-century audience: the political and religious identities of the Empire, and the changes within those identities. While the Empire remains a precisely measured and quantitatively anchored framework, within those two dimensions essential change has to be modulated, negotiated, and communicated. How did the cisalpine polytheist pagan Roman Empire become a transalpine Christian one? Frank Shaw already hinted at these two dimensions when he characterised the *Kaiserchronik*'s trajectory, whose poet sees the history of the Roman Empire 'as proceeding in two massive steps towards a God-ordained perfection and permanence. The first step is the embracing of Christianity by Constantine the Great;

---

90 See 'Vindicta Salvatoris' *e*d. by E.J. Cross in *Two Old English Apocrypha and their Manuscript Source; The Gospel of Nichodemus and the Avenging of the Saviour*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 19 (Cambridge 1996).

91 Curtius 1938, p. 139.

92 Newald 1960, p. 285. How 'naiv' the reinterpretation of ancient tradition in the *Kaiserchronik* and in medieval texts in general actually was would be a matter of some debate. Curtius too sees medieval reception of Antiquity as shaped by 'misunderstandings' but in a productive way see Ernst Robert Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages* (Princeton, Oxford 1953; repr. 2013). p. 19.

the second is the *translatio imperii* from the "Romans" to the "Germans"'.[93] Shaw's 'massive steps' correspond to the two dimensions of qualitative change, which the chronicle has to negotiate; but, as will become apparent in the later chapters of this thesis, the result of this change is neither perfect not permanent.[94]

Both dimensions of change are simultaneously marked by diegetic insertions into the narrative and by the more redactional decisions of episode arrangement and textual composition. At the very beginning of the chronicle the text establishes a pagan order of the world:

> Hier bevor bi der haiden zîten
> duo anbette man wîten
> abgot die unrainen.
> die haiden algemaine
> muosen si êren unt anebeten
> al nâch der chunige gebote. KC 43-48

When, after Caesar, Augustus is the first emperor to be presented in a fully fledged episode frame, his paganness is stressed by the text (KC 607). Philip is explicitly singled out as the first Christian emperor: *der was der aller êrste hêrre | der den gewalt und die êre | in dirre christenhait ie gewan* (KC 6099-6101). This new and heightened diegetic presence of Christianity in the *Kaiserchronik* is used by the author to present in short and anachronistic succession the rules of the two most infamous persecutors of Christians: Decius and Diocletian (KC 6151; KC 6451). If the episodic framework before Philip largely adhered to the historical order of emperors, the mobility of emperors as episode framework markers now appears much increased as the extratextual historical context of the *Kaiserchronik* enters a time of opposition between paganism and Christianity. The great confusion of this part of the chronicle could in itself be seen as a commentary on the confusion of the struggle between emergent Christianity and defensive paganism. The content of the episodes contained in this block does not foreground this struggle often, but it is certainly the defining element in the first episodes, focussing on Philip, Decius, and Diocletian, and again in the

---

93 Frank Shaw, '"Kaiserchronik" and "Enide"', *German Life and Letters*, 24, 4 (1971), p. 296.

94 The underlying premise of these observations –the form carries continuity while the content negotiates content – has recently already been described by Dickhut-Bielsky, but obviously with a slightly different focus: 'Aus der kompositorischen Perspektive ist die bewusste Prägung einer Makrostruktur auch nicht notwendig, geht es doch vor allem um die Zeichnung der Kontinuität des Römischen Reiches von Caesar bis bis in die Gegenwart […]. Diese Kontinuität wird durch das additive Erzählen erzähltechnisch umgesetzt. Die Entwicklung (*translatio fidei*, *translation imperii*) vollzieht sich auf der Inhaltsebene; kompositorisch bestimmend stellen sich die immer wiederkehrenden Einleitungs- und Ausgangsformel dar.' Dickhut-Bielsky 2015, p. 62.

last episodes, focussing on Constantine and Theodosius. Constantine introduces the official Christianisation of the Empire. The narrative uses Constantine's conversion and his seven days of coequal Christian legislations side by side with pope Silvester (KC 7986-8199), and the lengthy disputations of Silvester against the Jewish scholars – whom the *Kaiserchronik* presents as representatives of a universal heathendom – to introduce some of the dogmatic underpinnings of conversion and to present a string of mass conversion events (KC 8574-10,372).

The programmatic framing of this block of episodes is corroborated by the peculiar conception of time and space in the legend of the Seven Sleepers passage, which concludes the Theodosius episode. In it seven Christian princes of Ephesus go into hiding to escape Decius's persecution of the Christians only to be found again under the reign of the exemplarily Christian emperor Theodosius (KC 6421-42). At that point they have not only slept through 248 years but also several thousand lines of narrative (KC 13,496-13,503). The 248 years the author claims they have been sleeping (KC 6425-27) do not correspondent to the KC's own reckoning of time passed between Decius and Theodosius (ca. 110 years)[95] or the actual historical distance between the two (128 years).[96] When Serapion, the first of the sleepers to awake, realises that he, who went to sleep to evade persecution by pagan Roman authorities, is now surrounded by Christians his confusion is registered not in temporal but in spatial terms:

> Ich enwaiz wannen ich her bin komen
> sprah der hailige man.
> dô wir waerlîchen hôrten sagen,
> daz diu aehte geboten wart
> z'Effesô uber die stat,
> duo fluh wir hin -
> ich enwaiz aver in der welte, wâ ich pin -
> ad celeum montem.

---

[95] The sums of the reigns of Diocletian & Maximian (twenty years, six weeks), Severus (six years, six months), Helius Pertinax (seven months, five days), Helius Adrianus (eleven months), Lucius Accommodus (not specified), Alaric (four years, six months), Achilleus (nine months), Galienus (four years), Constantinus (seventeen years, five months), and Constantine (thirty years, six months) adds up to eighty-five years, three months, and two weeks. The number is obscured by the unspecified duration of Lucius Accommodus rule before he is slain and succeeded by Alaric and the insertion of the duration of the rule of Silvester (twenty-four years, six months, five days) where it remains unclear how much overlap has to be assumed with the duration of rule of Constantine. Adding the entire rule of Silvester brings the final sum to 109 years, nine months, two weeks, and five days (assuming for simplicity's sake that one month breaks down into four weeks).

[96] Decius died in 251 CE and Theodosius came into power in 379 CE. As the Theodosius of the *Kaiserchronik* seems to be an amalgam of the historical Theodosius I & II, the time would rise to 151 years as Theodosius II came into power in 402 CE.

[…]
hêrre, wi haizet diz lant?
oder wi bin ich der komen?
der berg haizet Cêlêôn.
ist er hie iht nahen bî?
ist hie iemen dem dar kunt sî? KC 13,550-57; 13,564-68

Even though Serapion just came down from the mountain, where he believes he has spent only four days, to get food and now expects to be martyred for it (KC 13,508-20), the spatial environment of Ephesus and Mount Celeon, which should be immediately familiar to him, loses all meaning when he realises that times have changed and he has returned into a Christian world. His confusion through historical change over time is expressed as a total loss of spatial orientation. He does not know where he is any more, what the country he is in is called, and how he got there. He does remember Ephesus and the mountain, to which he and his companions fled, but with the times having changed so dramatically he is no longer capable of reconciling the topography he remembers with the spatially unchanged but religiously differently semanticised topography he finds now and has to ask if the mountain, to which he fled is anywhere nearby and if anyone knows the way there.

Here the meaning of time and space are inseparably linked. Meaning is mainly bestowed by religion. As religion as a temporal structure changes over time it renders the space unrecognisable. As Serapion is asking for spatial orientation it becomes clear that it would also work the other way round: if he were to know where the mountain is he would be able to make sense of the time around him again.

The specific configurations of time, space, and meaning, which Serapion and the seven sleepers transcend, can be clarified by adapting Mikhail Bakhtin's concept of the chronotope:

> We will give the name chronotope (literally, 'time space') to the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are artistically expressed in literature. […] it expresses the inseparability of space and time (time as the fourth dimension of space). […] In the literary artistic chronotope, spatial and temporal indicators are fused into one carefully thought out, concrete whole. Time, as it were, thickens, takes on flesh,

> becomes artistically visible, likewise, space becomes charged and responsive to the movements of time, plot and history.[97]

If time is to be understood as the fourth dimension of the three-dimensional coordinate system of Serapion's movement through space, time has now been inexorably altered by the qualitative change in time's religious composition. The space Serapion inhabits, which is now no longer semanticised by Serapion's permanence in it but has been 'charged' by the altered time, responds to the temporal change by rendering itself unrecognisable. As the *Kaiserchronik* moves through its episodes, the passing of time is mainly registered quantitatively but between the Decius and the Theodosius episode also some qualitative developments have transpired; namely the establishment of Christianity as the dominant religion in the Empire. Serapion and the seven sleepers, however, have been suspended from any qualitative change over time, they remained out of time, and have now, as they return to the reshaped temporal continuum of the Theodosius episode, passed from a pagan chronotope into a Christian one.

The chronotopical change foregrounds the qualitative change, which is usually reduced, in the diegetic world of the *Kaiserchronik.* It also marks the preliminary end of the process of Christianisation. Neither the time nor the place of the sleepers' awakening are an accident. Emperor Theodosius is only in the vicinity because just before the return of the sleepers there was a synod in Ephesus to debate the Arian heresy, which in the narrative of the *Kaiserchronik* is about the truth of bodily resurrection (KC 13,377-88) and not about the christological debate concerning homoiusie/ homousie.[98] Now, after Arius has just died by divine decree (KC 13,475: *dâ rach got sîne cristenhait*) before the disputation could actually begin, the miraculous return of the sleepers proves the theological truth of the orthodox position, represented by the emperor (KC 6437-42). The events at the end of the Theodosius episode correspond to this prophetic passage after the sleepers have gone into hiding during Decius's rule. When Theodosius first hears of Serapion's wondrous

---

[97] Mikhail Bakhtin, Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel: Notes toward a Historical Poetics in *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin* ed. by Michael Holist (Austin 1998), p. 84.

[98] The christological debate of the fourth century circled around the question if Jesus was of the same (homo-ousios / ὁμοούσιος) or of similar (homoi-ousios / ὅμοιούσιος) substantial essence as God his father. The council of Nicaea in 325 ruled that Jesus was of the same substance as God. Arian's contrary christology was strongly coloured by, but not completely congruent with homoiousianism. He stressed the divinity of the father over the son and implied that the son was created, meaning that there was a time where Christ did not exist, and was not coeternal with the father. Later ecumenical councils, however, confirmed homoousianism as orthodoxy and Arian and his christology were after his death considered anathema. See Hermengild Biedermann, 'Homoiousios, Homoiousianer' in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* ed. by Robert-Henri Bautier and others, vols 9 (München, Zürich 1980-98), V 1991, col. 112; Hermengild Biedermann, 'Homoousios' in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* ed. by Robert-Henri Bautier and others, vols 9 (München, Zürich 1980-98), V 1991, coll. 112-13; Günther Binding, 'Arius, Arianismus, Arianer' in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* ed. by Robert-Henri Bautier and others, vols 9 (München, Zürich 1980-98), I 1990, coll. 949-51.

condition he echoes the prophetic words from the Decius episode full of hope to find divine truth – *urkunde | der jungisten urstende!* (KC 13,538-39) – revealed in them. Immediately Theodosius leads a procession back to Mount Celeon (KC 13,569-78). As the narrative's representative of the Christian chronotope, he knows the way. There the rocks hiding the other sleepers are miraculously destroyed and they find the other sleepers in a quasi-angelic state *âne wandel | in hâre unt in gewande| an in newas mail nehain* (KC 13,588-90).

The scene with the removed stone and the angel-like figures inside is certainly modelled on the biblical record of the discovery of the empty tomb (Mk 16:1-8; Lk 24:1-12; Mt 28, Jn 20:1-10), which signifies the resurrection of Christ. So this mirror scene can be used as a signifier of the truth of the bodily resurrection. Only now Serapion regains his spatial orientation when he exclaims: *hie ist der berg Cêlêon* (KC 13,594)! Moreover he announces that the revelation, which Theodosius and his people were hoping to witness, will indeed prove the truth of his word (KC 13,595-97). One of the sleepers confirms to Theodosius: *die wâren urstende ich dir kunde: | da disem lîbe wis gesunde (*KC 13,603-04).

The sleepers have crossed a gulf of centuries into a time-space without meaning for them, to bring meaning to it themselves: their miraculous crossing over from the pagan chronotope signifies the final and conclusive proof of a debate contemporary with the Christian chronotope. It also finalises the process of Christianisation, which is all but concluded in the *Kaiserchronik*'s narrative, after the last attacks from the outside (Astrolabe) and from the inside (Arius) have been thwarted by the end of the Theodosius episode. However, as it will be demonstrated later, this does not mean a clear teleological fulfilment of a programmatic trajectory of the *Kaiserchronik*; it is rather the case that Christianity and the Christians remain fragile and their religious identity can easily be threatened so as to generate narrative potential.

With the aetiological religious question of Christianisation for now resolved by the events of the Theodosius episode the focus can be put on the second dimension of qualitative change: the political identity of the Empire. The *Kaiserchronik* deploys a deliberate and programmatic pejoration of Greekness in order to manage the transition from the ancient to the medieval Empire. The foundation of Constantinople as the second Rome in the fourth century is only hinted at in the Constantine episode and without great consequence: to escape a looming food crisis Constantine leads the Roman citizens to Greece where he, after an angelic vision points out a specific site, founds Constantinople as the new Troy (KC 10,401-38). Originally the move was intended as a temporary measure of one year only to attenuate the stresses of famine on Rome but Constantine resolves to stay there for longer and must trick the Romans who came with him into staying and not

returning to Rome. He does this by transporting their wives and Roman soil to Constantinople, where they subsequently start building their new homes (KC 10,449-10,504). The founding of Constantinople is presented as a divine decree (KC 10,438; 10,441) and a monument to Constantine until the twelfth-century present day (KC 10,447-48) and even further until Judgement Day (KC 10,436-38). Nevertheless the historical impact of the event in the *Kaiserchronik* falls flat. At the end the foundation appears just as one of several cities, which the emperor founded, and after his death the focus of the chronicle moves seamlessly back to Rome (KC 10,511). After Constantine the chronicle returns to Constantinople only six times: as the place where Julian's soul languishes in fire and sulphur until Judgement Day (KC 11,108-13), three times as Greek antipole to Rome in the Constantius Leo episode (KC 13,712-16; 13,718-38; 13,739-68), and two times in the Zeno episode, firstly as the place, which Zeno prefers to rule from instead of Rome (KC 13,825-38), and secondly the place where he is finally put to rest (KC 14,188-93). All these cases frame Constantinople as a problematic place, which creates or amplifies the internal tensions within the Empire between Romans and Greeks that are negotiated in the episodes of Constantius Leo and Zeno.

The two famous Eastern Roman emperors Justinian and Heraclius, who both feature prominently in the *Kaiserchronik* directly after the Silvester episode, are neither explicitly labelled as Greek nor surrounded by circumstances, which would indicate a certain amount of Greekness. To maintain their positive position in the framework of the *Kaiserchronik*, they had to be expelled from the phase of Greek emperors and their Greekness had to be entirely suppressed. Uta Görlitz argues that the suppression of any Greekness of those emperors is part of a programmatic strategy of the *Kaiserchronik* to diminish the Greek imperial episode between Constantine and Charlemagne, not only because of the text's negative view of anything Greek but especially to marginalise the historical timeframe of great migrations and the reign of the Merovingians, which, as the 'heroic age', serves as the historical background to most heroic epics against which the *Kaiserchronik* seems to agitate in several instances.[99]

Theodosius is the first emperor whom the text introduces as *von Criechen geborn* (KC 13,069), but remains nevertheless an entirely positive figure who fears God, does good deeds, adores Christ, and is rewarded with great glory for it (KC13,067-75).

Constantius Leo, who could be an amalgamation of the fifth-century Thracian Eastern Roman

[99] Uta Görlitz, '(Un-)Wahrheit und (Nicht-)Erinnern. Erzählen ze diute in der frühmittelhochdeutschen "Kaiserchronik"' in *Damnatio in memoria. Deformation und Gegenkonstruktionen in der Geschichte*, Zürcher Beiträge zur Geschichtswissenschaft 4 ed. by Sebastian Scholz, Gerald Schwedler und Kai-Michael Sprenger (Berlin, New York 2014), pp. 238-42.

emperor Leo I and the eighth-century Eastern Roman emperor Constantine V, seems to be a hybrid figure with shared Roman and Greek roots. On the one hand the Greeks rejoice when he starts ailing *wande si daz rîche von rehte wolten hân* (KC 13,687) and the Romans promptly call for a *hervart* (KC 13,689) to defend him. On the other hand the Greeks send a delegation to Constantius Leo trying to dissuade him from this military campaign against Constantinople by appealing to his ancestral or family ties to the city: *dîn geslaehte ist ze Constenobile, | iz gezimet dir, hêrre, ubele* (KC 13,715-16).

When Zeno succeeds Constantius Leo his Greekness is explicitly fleshed out as something divisive:

> want er von Criechen geborn was.
> dô minnet er sîn geslähte baz
> danne Rômære;
> daz wart in harte swære. KC 13,827-30

The last emperor to be identified as Greek is another Constantius, who can be read as an approximation to Constantius VI, a contemporary of Charlemagne who ruled the Eastern Roman Empire from 780 CE to 797 CE. The *Kaiserchronik* relates of him that he was *von den Criechen geborn; | di hêten in ouch ze rihtære rekorn* (KC 14,196-97). The emphasis on *di*, who have elected him ruler, in the last line, contrasts the Greeks once more with the Romans and widens the gap between both groups. This ruler has been installed exclusively by the Greeks and without any Roman participation.

All in all, only three emperors are clearly identified as Greek: Theodosius, Zeno, and Constantine V. Theodosius's positive position in the *Kaiserchronik* remains unblemished by this attribution. He is succeeded by the ambiguously framed but ultimatelyRoman Constantius Leo whose episode mainly deals with war between the Romans and the Greeks. He is in turn succeeded by the two other Greek emperors Zeno and Constantine V, but in both cases their Greekness is portrayed as something divisive. This indicates that the episode centred on the fictitious Constantius Leo was mainly interpolated to mark the pejoration of Greekness in the intradiegetic continuum of the *Kaiserchronik*.

The murder of Constantius V by personal rivals finally leads to the Romans separating their Empire from the Greeks: *Von dannen wart Rômisc rîche | gesceiden von den Criechen* (KC 14,278-79). This separation creates a void in imperial power. However, the *rîche* continues to exist,

it features even as the subject of the line in which *sede vacante* is declared: *Daz rîche stuont dô laere* (KC 14,282). Under circumstances to be examined in a later chapter of this thesis, it is at this point that Charlemagne takes on power. His accession marks an essential shift of perspective on the Roman Empire, from an ancient Roman cisalpine Empire to a medieval German transalpine Empire.

But initially Charlemagne is a figure whom the *Kaiserchronik* is reluctant to pin down clearly. His father Pippin is king *von Karlingen* (KC 14,309), Charlemagne himself is initially introduced as one of his sons who stays at home with him, while his other son Leo is pope and away in Rome (KC 14,308-15). Later, after he has become Roman king, he resides in *den Riflanden* (KC 14,423). When he returns to Rome and finally takes on imperial dignity he is presented to the audience as *der êrste kaiser* […] *ze Rôme* | *von Diutisken landen* (KC 14,818-19). *Kerlingen* only features in the *Kaiserchronik* as the kingdom of Pippin, and is replaced by *Franckrich* in the fifteenth-century Zeil manuscript of the C recension.[100] *Riflanden* features only as a place, to which or from which Charlemagne moves to or away from. In the Zeil manuscript it is replaced by *Rinlanden*.[101] The convergence of these three terminologically distinct geographies or polities in Charlemagne will be examined at a later point.[102] For the time being it suffices to say that after Charlemagne all the emperors, including the later Carolingians, are unequivocally characterised as German.

To summarise: the story of continuous imperial rule is told by a linear axis of the episodic framework markers, the mobility of atomised narratives of antiquity is limited and the causal integration of a plot is organised by the two areas in which qualitative change has to be acknowledged and subsequently negotiated. This allows the maintenance of qualitative equivalence between the content of the episodes, which is necessary in order to keep the content available as didactic or exemplary reference points, and at the same time explain the main lines of qualitative historical change to the contemporary audience, who look to the text for orientation towards the audience's past and the historical role and responsibility that derives from it.

If the content of the episodes is (within the limitations sketched out above) contingent and therefore interchangeable and the correct succession of episodes is at the author's disposition, this indicates that all episodes belong to the same qualitative order of meaning. According to White it requires a 'metaphysical principle' to translate difference into similarity and thus be able to group a set of events together. He circumscribes such a principle as a '"subject" common to all of the

[100] E.g. Zeil manuscript ZAMs 30, folio 290 r.

[101] E.g. Zeil manuscript ZAMs 30, folio 292 v.

[102] See below section V.2.2 Charlemagne and the Romans: Clash of Cultures.

referents of the various sentences that register events as having occurred.'[103] In the case of the *Kaiserchronik* this principle, which translates the difference of the content of the episodes into qualitative similarity, is the registering of all the atomised events of the *Kaiserchronik* as having happened under the rule of a specific emperor. The reigns of the emperors emerge as White's 'common subject'. They are manifestations of the linear and continuous existence of the Empire. Untied from their historical causations the events are completely contained by the temporal unfolding of the Empire. They are no longer random events, which happen to occur at the time of one emperor or another, but from this perspective they are occasioned by the rule of the respective emperor. Not because his politics propel the action on a diegetic level, but because the time in which the event happens is a mere function of imperial rule and thus each historical event of the *Kaiserchronik* is existentially conditioned by the presence of a linear, imperial continuum.

Generally only the initial and the concluding formulae of the episodes, which introduce and conclude the rule of emperors and count the years of their reign, provide a sense of historical difference for the content of the respective episodes, of quantifiable progress in history through time. They are also the signifiers of qualitative change over time in history. The impression of an orderly progression of the course of history suggested by the form of the named and enumerative episodic frames is not, however, mirrored in their diverse content. The bewildering diegetic phenomenology of the narrative materials enclosed in the episodic markers does not speak as historical narrative itself, these materials are only semanticised as history by the framing phrases.

II.2 Functions of Quantity: Exemplarity, Aetiology, and Continuity in the *Kaiserchronik*

How does the *Kaiserchronik* make use of the historiographical technique of semanticising its episodic content as history mostly via its macrostructure on the level of form and less microstructurally on the level of content? To understand this the workings of historiography have to be examined more closely. Historiography is the constructive organisation of historical matter by the historiographer for his arguments: 'Geschichte […] ist nicht einfach "da", sondern wird erst durch das deutende, ordnende, auswählende Tun des Geschichtsschreibers geschaffen.'[104] The

[103] White 1987, p. 16.

[104] Hartwin Brandt, 'Historia magistra vitae? Orosius und die spätantike Historiographie' in *Jenseits der Grenzen. Beiträge zur spätantiken und frühmittelalterlichen Geschichtsschreibung*, Millenium-Studien zu Kultur und Geschichte des ersten Jahrtausends n. Chr. 25 ed. by Andreas Goltz, (Berlin 2009), p. 129.

writing of historical narration creates perspectives and brings order to the chaos of historical occurrence. Neither the perspective created in this way nor the plot, which shapes the resultant narration are rooted in factuality but shaped by the linguistic parameters of narration as the historian submits the past to a literary structure.[105] This means the textual phenomenology of the chronicle is always at least to some extent 'intentional history'[106] as the ancient historian Hans-Joachim Gehrke puts it. He laid out the basic principles of this intentional process of historiographical composition, which I paraphrase and summarise here:[107]

1. Intentional Historiography anchors the group, which it represents in its past, in the depth of time and explains its origins.
2. … connects to the group's present, often (metaphorically) with genealogical models.
3. … does not discern between 'fact' and 'fiction'. They fall together.
4. … converges past and present. It knows only quantitative not qualitative difference.
5. … collects and conveys through socialisation 'recipe knowledge' for cultural orientation.
6. … catalyses the sociocultural reification of history.

The traits Gehrke identifies for ancient Greek historiography are not only applicable to medieval historiography but also provide a useful umbrella for the different historiographical concepts to be discussed in this chapter. The sentiment expressed in point four resonates in particular with the findings of the previous section.

---

[105] See Chris Lorenz, 'Kann Geschichte wahr sein? Zu den narrativen Geschichtsphilosophien von Hayden White und Frank Ankersmit' in *Konstruktion von Wirklichkeit: Beiträge aus geschichtstheoretischer, philosophischer und theologischer Perspektive* ed. by Jens Schröter and Antje Eddelbüttel (Berlin, New York 2004), pp. 36-37. Lorenz is summarising the implications of the historical philosophies of Hayden White and Frank Ankersmit. I am aware of the criticism levelled at their ideas as Lorenz goes on to express and others have before him: See Lorenz 2004, e.g. pp. 41-44.

[106] Hans-Joachim Gehrke, 'Die Bedeutung der (antiken) Historiographie für die Entwicklung des Geschichtsbewußtseins' in *Die antike Historiographie und die Anfänge der christlichen Geschichtsschreibung* ed. by Eve-Marie Becker (Berlin, New York 2005), p. 30.
Much ink has been spilt over the question to what extent any author is in control of his narration since Derrida wrote: 'We should begin by taking rigorous account of this being held within [prise] or this surprise: the writer writes in a language and in a logic whose proper system, laws, and life his discourse by definition cannot dominate absolutely. He uses them only by letting himself, after a fashion and up to a point, be governed by the system. And the reading must always aim at a certain relationship, unperceived by the writer, between what he commands and what he does not command of the patterns of the language that he uses. This relationship is not a certain quantitative distribution of shadow and light, of weakness or of force, but a signifying structure that critical reading should produce.' See Jacques Derrida, *Of Grammatology* trans. by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (Baltimore 1967), p. 158. To counter the 'massive dehistoricization' inflicted on historiographical texts by Derrida and the deconstructivists following in his wake Gabrielle Spiegel suggested to understand texts as 'sites of linguistic usage, as lived events, [which] are essentially local in origin and therefore possess a determinate social logic of much greater density and particularity than can be extracted from totalizing constructs like "language" and "society."' See Gabrielle Spiegel, 'History, Historicism, and the Social Logic of the Text in the Middle Ages', *Speculum*, 65, 1 (1990), p. 77.

[107] See Gehrke 2005, pp. 30-31, 50-51.

> Das Verhältnis von Vergangenheit und Gegenwart war sehr eng, gleichsam distanzlos. Gerade was die moderne Geschichtswissenschaft betont und sichtbar zu machen sucht, das Differente, fehlte. Die Entfernung war eine zeitliche, aber keine qualitative. Es wurde immer nach den gleichen Regeln gespielt. Im Grunde war alles statisch und ließ für die Zukunft Ähnliches erwarten […].[108]

In the context of medieval texts this caters to the institutional desire for great age shared by most medieval audiences. To be considered as worthy or legitimate in the eyes of medieval audiences things had to possess as long a pedigree as possible, ideally all the way back to the earliest possible point beyond which there was not other point to connect back to. Melville calls such points 'unvordenkliche Anfänge'.[109] The demand for a pedigree reaching back to these beginnings coloured medieval discourses of history and legitimacy. In the *Kaiserchronik* it is most clearly displayed in the self-evident continuity which connects the ancient Roman empire with the medieval German one. Only through the confirmation of age could the Empire's rank and status be ascertained. The problem with this powerful mentality was that proof of great antiquity was hard to demonstrate for any entity, both because often these continuties simply did not exist and even if it had, because of the low degree of reliable recordkeeping throughout the Middle Ages. The requirement that one's own present should be legitimated by great age collided with the empirical reality in which this great age was either not there or not comprehensively demonstrable.[110] This renders the present different to the past:

> Dem Eigenen zeigte sich die Vergangenheit fern, sie vermochte anhand empirischer Gegebenheiten eben nicht zu legitimieren, sie konnte keine Rangerhöhung fördern, obgleich es von ihr fortwährend axiomatisch gefordert wurde.[111]

Thus it falls to historiography to reconcile Melville's axiomatic cultural demand with the empirical fact. In short, one of the core tasks of historiography was to translate empirical historical difference into cultural similarity or at least acceptability. The *Kaiserchronik* confronts this task through its episode framework, which registers all historical occurrence within qualitatively equalising

[108] Gehrke 2005, p. 50.
[109] Melville 2009, p. 100.
[110] See Melville 2009, p. 100-101.
[111] Melville 2009, p. 101.

parameters, expressed in the introductory and concluding phrases of the emperor episodes. Historical difference is thus translated through similarity into countable distance. The alienation between the present and the past is reduced and the axiomatic cultural demand for opening up the the past as an anchor point for the discursive creation of legitimacy is met.

Through the quantitative framework, which the episodic paradigm of the *Kaiserchronik* provides, the qualitative difference between the content of the single episodes collapses. As all historical narration in the text is organised according to the same ordering principles, their paradigmatic similarity suppresses their contextual and traditional diegetic differences. This process of conflating difference and distance in a narrative paradigm makes the individual links of the episode chain available for diachronous exemplary reference.

Gehrke's paraphrase echoes Aristotle's reflections on historiographical exemplarity in the *Rhetoric*. Aristotle grounds the oratorical authority of examples based on 'actual past facts' (πράγματα προγενομένα / pragmata progenomena)[112] in the unchanging nature of patterns of events and motivations, which remain the same for all times, past, present, and future. To illustrate, Aristotle devises an example: if the king of Persia conquered Egypt before he attacked Greece in the past, this means for the present that if the king of Persia conquers Egypt, Greece must ready for war. The difference is merely a quantitative one: if the first Persian king to attempt conquering Greece after having conquered Egypt was Darius, and the second one was Xerxes, the third king who conquers Egypt will undoubtedly proceed identically. The quality of the pattern and the results remain unchanged, thus the past can endow rhetorical examples with persuasive power for he present:

> But while it is easier to supply parallels by inventing fables, it is more valuable for the political speaker to supply them by quoting what has actually happened, since in most

[112] *Aristotelis opera omnia*. Volumen Alterum. Ed. by Bekker, Immanuel, Georg Reimer:. Berlin 1831, pp. 1393a-93b. Ancient Greek retrieved from: Perseus Digital Library ed. by Gregory Crane < http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0059%3Abook%3D2%3Achapter%3D20> [13.07.2017]. Aristotle provides the theoretical underpinnings for this in the preceding chapter, when he muses on the possibility and impossibility of future facts See Aristotle, *Rhetoric* trans. by William Rhys (New York 1954), Book II, Chapter 19, p. 109: 'How questions of Future Fact should be argued is clear from the same considerations: That a thing will be done if there is both the power and the wish to do it; or if along with the power to do it there is a craving for the result, or anger, or calculation, prompting it. That the thing will be done, in these cases, if the man is actually setting about it, or even if he means to do it later-for usually what we mean to do happens rather than what we do not mean to do. That a thing will happen if another thing, which naturally happens before it has already happened; thus, if it is clouding over, it is likely to rain. That if the means to an end have occurred, then the end is likely to occur; thus, if there is a foundation, there will be a house.'

respects the future will be like [ὅμοιος / homoios] what the past has been.[113]

This means a quantitative axis is required along which temporally discrete but similar stages of history can be plotted. In Aristotle's example this quantitative axis is the political constellation between Greece and Persia from the sixth to fourth century BCE. The group identities for both sides have necessarily to be assumed to remain unchanged for the example to hold any argumentative validity. In the case of the *Kaiserchronik*, the quantitative axis is provided by projecting back the group identity that the author shares with his presumed audience from its contemporary environment to the past extension of the Roman Empire. This identity finds textual expression in the episodic compartmentalisation of the Roman Empire and the narrating of its history. After naming kings and popes, both good and bad (KC 19), as the object of the *crônicâ*'s account, the text continues to qualify their relation to the present, the text and its audience *die vor uns wâren* | *und Rômisces rîches phlâgen* | *unze an disen hiutegen tac* (KC 20-22). The axis allows projection in both directions. Not only can exemplarity of the past be projected onto the present, but the present shapes expectations about the historical universe within which the past operates. Vollrath characterises this quality of medieval historiography as 'rückprojizierte Gegenwart'.[114] The past is qualitatively similar enough to the present to allow movement of mental patterns, which create meaning forwards and backwards.

Custodianship of the Roman Empire is the unifying, historical role, which connects the present *uns* containing both the *Kaiserchronik*'s author and audience with the past. The protagonists of this past – popes and kings – are removed from the present only in a quantifiable dimension of easily countable years and emperor episodes. This quantitative dimension forms the backbone of the *Kaiserchronik*'s compositional structure and its emperor-centric episodes. However, there is no awareness or interest in qualitative change along this axis of imperial continuity. The historical obligation to *phlêgen* the Roman Empire, which anchors the group identity of the present in the past remains unchanged *unze an dîsen hiutegen tac*. To emphasise this qualitatively constant responsibility the *Kaiserchronik* introduces the presence of the Germans in sometimes surprising places, and most prominently in the Caesar episode.[115] Consequently, the changes in governance as the *Kaiserchronik* modulates them, from the Romans, to the Greeks, and to the Carolingians and Germans, could be read as mere quantitative change, framing a qualitatively unchanged historical

[113] Aristotle, *Rhetoric*. Book II, Chapter 20, p. 110.

[114] Vollrath 1981, p. 575.

[115] See Chinca/Young 2016, p. 13.

mission at its core: the rule and care of the consistently Roman Empire. The old man from the *wîlsaelde* disputation in the Faustinian episode puts it bluntly:

> die werlt ienoh hiute stât
> sô si von allerêrste wart.
> si newirt niemer wirs noh paz,
> wan sô si ze allerêrste was. KC 3659-62

However, the purpose of this thesis is not to argue that the *Kaiserchronik* is not interested in qualitative change. It is, and one of its essential tasks is to negotiate qualitative change within historical premises, which leave only limited space for it. Besides, the twelfth century displayed keen awareness of its temporal alterity from the past. For example, the author of the anonymous Central Franconian Rhyming Bible (CFRB), written in the earlier twelfth century, comments on Elisabeth's childlessness in old age:[116]

> {Elisabet} vil ofte wart verwizzen, {thaz sie so lange a}ne kint havede gesezen.
> <w>{ande man tho ein} wif bose sagede, thie bi iren <jaren kint ne hav>ede.
> CFRB 21,107-08

The fact that Elisabeth's lack of children warranted societal scorn clearly needed at least some sort of comment and explanation, which the text provides by anchoring it in the past. In the twelfth century, female childlessness was not necessarily a reason for social marginalisation, at least not within the normative frameworks of matrimony or monasticism, where women could demonstrate their virtue by remaining chaste despite being married or aspire to even higher forms of female social validity by maintaining their virginity.[117]

Building on these preliminary observations further examination will show to what extent the *Kaiserchronik* utilises its paradigmatic, quantitative axis to manipulate its historical record, making its temporality visible either to develop historical continuity, toexploit the exemplary potential of

---

[116] *The Central Franconian Rhyming Bible ('Mittelfränkische Reimbibel'): An Early-Twelfth-Century German Verse Homiliary: A Thematic and Exegetical Commentary With the Text and a Translation into English* ed. and trans. by David Wells, Amsterdamer Publikationen zur Sprache und Literatur 155 (Amsterdam, New York 2004), pp. 6-7.

[117] See Georges Duby, *The Knight, the Lady and the Priest: the Making of Modern Marriage in Medieval France* (London 1984), pp. 4-8, p. 29; Christopher Brooke, *The Medieval Idea of Marriage* (Oxford 1989; repr. 2002), pp. 126-28; Klaus van Eickels, Ehe und Familie im Mittelalter in Geisteswissenschaften im Profil: *Reden zum Dies Academicus 2000-2007*, Schriften der Otto-Friedrich-Universität Bamberg 1 ed. by Godehard Ruppert (Bamberg 2008), pp. 43-65.

the past, or as a background for explanatory aetiological models.

II.2.1 Continuity

The first function of quantity I wish to examine is continuity. How does the episode framework accommodate a complex concept like religion over the course of several episodes? On a trajectory that purposefully leads the text from a pagan past to a Christian present how is the pagan religion imagined? Is it subject to change or does it retain a consistent core of traits, which the episode framework transports throughout the text? Is the influence of the differing source traditions problematic or does the *Kaiserchronik* endeavour to harmonise the different strands, which informed its account?

As a good starting point for this examination, the *sûle,* featuring at the end of the Astrolabe legend in the Theodosius episode presents itself (KC 13,086-13,375). This *sûle* is also connected to the present by the word *hiute* (KC 13,364). After the spell of the idol of Venus has been lifted from the boy Astrolabe, Emperor Theodosius decrees the erection of *in der gottes minne* | *ain ander hûs* (KC 13,351-52) at the same site. However, the *sûl* (KC 13,354) is not to be moved and the new church to be built around it because it is going to be rededicated to St Michael and the chronicle expands on in that *si ubertriffet ze Rôme alle di stat,* | *alse man hiute wol kiesen mach (*KC 13,363-64). The text remains vague as to what exactly the *sûl* is supposed to be. The idol with the miraculous *wurze* (KC 13,335-46) buried under it – which caused Astrolabe's sufferings to begin with – has previously been introduced as a *pilde lussam* (KC 13,109) and has since usually been referred to as *pilde* (KC 13,116; 13,122; 13,123; 13,128; 13,152; 13,344) or as *aine statuam* (KC 13,336) and sometimes further qualified as *in honore Veneris* (KC 13,124; 13,337), but it is never described as a *sûl*. Presumably the text assumes some sort of column on which the *pilde* stood and which is now, after the idol's removal, being repurposed. Like Titus's memorial column, this one is still present in Rome towering over the rest of the city, as anyone who goes there today, as line 13,363 implies, can see for themselves. As with Titus's column, the story is not aetiological but memorial in purpose and introduces a topographical element which ensures the visual commemoration of an apparently important event and at the same time invites the audience to go there themselves to verify the truthfulness of the *Kaiserchronik*'s account. But the memory of what exactly is being projected into the present time of the twelfth century? Two crucial things pertaining to the question of qualitative change on a quantitative time axis happen immediately before and

after the rededication of the column to St Michael.

At the beginning of the episode, Astrolabe had been introduced as one of two obdurately pagan brothers who have little regard for their own salvation, actively strive to honour the pagan gods, and are deaf to the emperor's personal pleas to renounce their erroneous faith (KC 13,086-13,100). Now that – thanks to the cunning of the priest Eusebius who is also well versed in the dark arts (KC 13,218) – Astrolabe has been saved from the *valânt*'s entrapment via the cursed *vingerlîn* (KC 13,125-26), the youth becomes Christian and with him all the other pagans who are present (KC 13,365-68).

Situated in the Theodosius episode, the conversion of Astrolabe marks the final occasion in the *Kaiserchronik* where Roman pagans become Christian. Thus it concludes one of the main strands running through the text: the transformation of the Empire from a pagan into a Christian entity. The ultimate victory of orthodox Christianity is further cemented in the second part of the Theodosius episode in which the Arian heresy is resolved by Arius's ignominious death on a privy (KC 13,475-83) and by the return of Serapion and the Seven Sleepers (KC 13,496-13,642).[118] Both pagans as external assailants and heretics as internal enemies of Christianity have been assimilated into, or have been repelled from the Empire. Christianity's introduction into the Empire, which started with Philip the Arab and culminated with Constantine and Silvester, is now complete. But this of course raises the question of how the process of Christianisation relates to the problem of historical qualitative change and quantitative historical distance. How does the *Kaiserchronik*'s episodic paradigm react when faced with a clear qualitative change in the religious makeup of the Empire? After all the episode structure quantifies temporal historical distance and does not show the qualitative changes, which separate the chronicle's present time from its narrated time. The beginning of a possible answer can be found at the heart of the Astrolabe legend directly before the rededication of the column through Pope Ignatius. In order to save Astrolabe from his predicament, Eusebius conjures a devil and follows him into a distant hellscape (KC 13,303: *in aines tiefen moses grunt*) where other devils guard Astrolabe's ring. There Eusebius extorts from the devils the release of the ring and of information crucial to redeem Astrolabe (KC 13,225-13,346). To Eusebius's question *von welhen dingen | daz aller êrist kôme, | daz dem jungelinge missescaehe* (KC 13,332-33) the distraught devil – much to his chagrin – has little choice but to answer as Eusebius is addressing him *in verbo domini* (KC 13,314): as the devil admits, Astrolabe's initial enthralment was not due to the statue itself having any kind of godly or magical powers but was solely due to a

[118] See above section II.1.4 Dimensions of Qualitative Change: Political and Religious Identity of the Empire.

miraculous root buried underneath it: *di wîle di wurze dar under ligent.* | *swer daz pilde oben an sihet,* | *der muoz iemer minnen* (KC 13,343-45). Everything that happens after was devised by the devil through Astrolabe's cursed ring. In a radical euhemeristic reduction the entire religious service of the pagans is reduced to a root's bewitching qualities, in respect of which the text gives no further indication as to whether they are natural or magical. The result remains the same: paganism is exposed as a fraud, a prestidigitation, which never related to any true gods. The cosmological forces in the background have always been the same and remain unchanged: God and the devils, who in Astrolabe's case deployed one of the pagan illusions he was so drawn to in order to corrupt his soul.

The pattern is corroborated by other episodes where devils act through or are associated with pagan edifices and gods. In the Julianus episode, the graven image of a pagan god is hidden in a river when a woman betrayed by her adoptive son Julianus happens upon it (KC 10,688-97). At first she gives the pagan idol a good thrashing with her laundry, which prompts the image to plead with the woman to stop. It is, however, not the image itself that speaks but a devil camouflaged as a deity speaking through – *ûz* (KC 10,701) – the image. When challenged by the woman the devil identifies itself more specifically: *wîp, ungebâre dû niht sô!* | *ich pinz, der got Mercûrîus (*KC 10,731-32). In the following the image is only referred to as a god in direct speech, for example when the woman orders the image to be raised from the waters (KC 10,771) or when Julianus begs it to relinquish its hold on him (KC 10,790). The narrator consequently calls the entity inhabiting it *tievel* (KC 10,721; 10,801; 10,817, 10,823; 10,844) or *vâlant* (KC 10,782; 10,813). When the idol is later actually recovered from the river on the order of Julianus to be reinstated as a cult object it is called an *abgot* (KC 10,839). The Christian martyrs Paul and John who are killed for their refusal to worship the idol (KC 10,848-10,935) naturally refer to it as *vâlant* (KC 10,902). The text does not specify whether a devil has possessed the image and now feigns an animated version of the pagan deity Mercurius or if the deity venerated by the pagan Romans as Mercurius was a demon all along. Both possibilities are present and converge in the idol's and the demon's shared name Mercurius by which they are referred to both by the narrator (KC 10,856) and by the protagonists of the episode (KC 10,896).

A look at the explanation of the pagan weekdays provides additional insights into the quality and the relationship of pagan god and devils as the *Kaiserchronik* conceives of them (KC 63-208). When the respective pagan gods are introduced together with the days dedicated to them they are often referred to as *got*: the nameless sun god in lines 77 and 82, the nameless god of war (*wîchgote)* in line 117, Jupiter in line 150, or Saturn in line 174. When the text is more interested in

the materiality of the idols representing these gods they are called *abgot* (e.g. KC 45; 65; 130). Interestingly these gods are always qualified by an article like *den got* (KC 77; 82), *der got* (KC 119) or *ein got* (KC 150). In contrast the Christian God is always set apart with great care from these and referred to as the *wâren* (KC 64; 74; 205) or *almehtigen* (KC 190) God. However, if we return to the pantheon passage at the end of the weekday calendar, directly after the introduction of the *got* Saturn the relationship between the pagan gods and the devils receives some elaboration:

> An dem sameztage sâ:
> einez haizzet Rotundâ,
> daz was ein hêres petehûs.
> der got hiez Saturnus,
> dar nach was iz aller tievel êre. KC 171-75

The Pantheon, primarily dedicated to Saturn, also serves in a subordinate function as a temple for all the devils. While the lines do not specifically group Saturn and the gods named before among the devils, it is strongly implied that Saturn is seen only as the first amongst the devils. When Boniface later rededicates the building this has a dramatic effect on the devils, who are imagined to inhabit the Pantheon physically: *die tievel brâsten oben ûz, | sumelîche in daz abgrunde* (KC 206-07). The pagan gods are revealed to have been devils all along, who tricked the humans into venerating them as pagan deities. The persistent cosmological stability this implies is heavily utilised as an argumentative foundation during the *wilsaelde* disputation when the incognito Faustinian makes the case for an unchanging universe to his unrecognised son Clement. He argues that the twenty-four hours of the day have always been and will always be *gelîch lanch* (KC 3523) and *neverwandelent sich nie mêre* (KC 3522); thus they remain beyond the reach of human manipulation (KC 3525-30).

Ancient authorities like Pythagoras are invoked to vouch for the perpetual validity of the cosmic laws, which govern time: what was an hour a thousand years ago, will also be an hour in the present and retains its temporally structuring authority unassailable by human agency.

The same notion of time is prevalent in both the Titus and in the Astrolabe passages analysed above. It is certainly no accident that both previous examples operate with columns to suggest the continuity of Roman exemplarity and history to the twelfth century's present. Neither the column in the Titus episode nor the column in the Astrolabe episode are taken from the source material. The Titus column seems to be entirely without precedent in the source material and if the author of the

Kaiserchronik, as Ohly claims,[119] really took the conversion of the Venus image into an image of St Michael from Cassiodorus's *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita*, he would not a have found a column there *expressis verbis* either.[120] Instead both columns seem to have been wilfully introduced by the compiler of the *Kaiserchronik*, who must have found something useful in the imagery of the ancient column. As Dale Kinney points out, the discourse on columns touches '*in nuce*, the medieval discourse of "Romanness"'.[121] After columns had ceased to be produced in the Carolingian era, Rome was perceived to be the only possible point of origin of all columns. Their connection to foreign geographies, which had made their erection in Rome a veritable map of the Empire, had been all but forgotten.[122] The *Kaiserchronik*'s quantitative paradigm of unchanging Romanness capitalises on this special meaning of columns to fortify and assert itself in passages, which actualise the historical difference between pagan past and Christian present.

Whether the examples discussed so far are modelling exemplarity, developing aetiology, or negotiating continuity, they all use the quantitative dimension of history, which the episode framework of the *Kaiserchronik* maps out, in different ways and to different effect.

Exemplarity has to be projected from the past forward to become available as a template for decisions based on historical analogies. For this to work it is necessary that the episode structure suppresses or at least significantly reduces the qualitative difference between the episodic past and the historical present. Only thus can the similarity, which is required for historical analogies to work, be maintained.

Aetiology sets out from the puzzlement of the present audience to look back at historical phenomenology and create meaning by bringing order to apparently chaotic phenomena by means of an explanatory model. Aetiologies have to translate difference, which triggered the audience's puzzlement in the first place, into similarity and give the present's question a tangible anchor point both in the present physical reality and in the text. Whether these anchor points correspond to actual physical spaces or places is secondary.

Finally, continuity transports content and meaning in a linear fashion through time to the present

---

[119] See Ohly 1968, p. 208.

[120] See Cassiodorus Senator, *historia ecclesiastica tripartita: historiae ecclesiasticae ex Socrate, Sozomeno et Theodorito: in vnvm collectae et nyper de graeco in latinvm translatae libri nvmero dvodecim*, Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 71 ed. by Walter Jakob and Rudolf Hanslik (Wien 1952), Lib II, Cap. 19: *Insignis itaque locus ex illo tempore claruit peregrinis et urbicis, ubi olim quidem Vesta colebatur, postea vero ecclesia facta est. Qui locus nunc Michahelium nuncupatur in dextra positus parte navigantium a Ponto ad Constantinopolim, distans ab ea navigio quidem stadiis fere triginta et quinque, per terram vero circueuntibus omnem sinum usque ad septuaginta et amplius tenditur*.

[121] Dale Kinney, 'The discourse of columns' in *Rome Across Time and Space: Cultural Transmission and the Exchange of Ideas c.500-1400* ed. by Claudia Borgia and others (Cambridge 2011), p.183.

[122] See Kinney 2011, p 192-193; 198-199.

to cause an effect of recognition and familiarity with the medieval audience. It conserves the temporal quality of the content it conveys.

All three strategies are intentionally implemented functions of the episode framework of the *Kaiserchronik* and preserve the semantic qualities of their contents and bypass the qualitative dimension of historical change, which separates the diegetic generation of meaning from its target audience. At the same time, all three functions are aimed at the present and the audience of the text and they all operate on the basis of translating historical difference, which suddenly actualises itself in the text, into similarity. They achieve this by quantifying it into distance and thus mitigating difference to an audience, which would use the *Kaiserchronik* as a discursive space to learn about their historical identity.

II.2.2 Exemplarity: Heraclius

There is a strong tradition in criticism to read the *Kaiserchronik* as a collection of historical tales aimed to inform, educate, and entertain a German-speaking lay audience. John of Salisbury provides a very illuminating tract on the value of exemplarity in one of his letters, written in 1167, quite close to the presumed writing of the *Kaiserchronik*:

> But if my advice is asked in the meantime, then before God, whom I call as witness of what I say at the last judgement, in full liberty of the spirit and in good faith promised and owed to him as to a father I reply that in all cases of stubborn doubt one should act as follows. First let us enquire and follow the prescriptions of the divine law on the matter; if this gives no certain solution, one should go back to the canons and examples of the saints; if nothing sure meets one there, one should finally investigate the mind and counsel of wise men in the fear of the Lord; and those should be preferred (be they few or many) who place God's honour before any personal convenience.[123]

John of Salisbury assigns exemplary value both to law and to ethical role models and personages with a particular focus on their generalisability. People take over the function of tropes as carriers of argumentative probability. At the core of these personalised examples lies an analogy, which allows

[123] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury* ed. by W.J Millor and Christopher Brooke, vols 2 (Oxford 1979), II., pp. 364-67. See Peter von Moos, *Geschichte als Topik: Das rhetorische Exemplum von der Antike zur Neuzeit und die historiae im 'Policraticus' Johanns von Salisbury* (Hildesheim, Zurich, New York 1988), pp. 1-2.

one to examine, affirm, or reject a practical decision in the present based on historical data.[124] John extols the general value of personalised historical exemplarity in his *Historia Pontificalis* when he writes that, except for the law and grace of God, no knowledge would be more beneficent for the living than the deeds of their ancestors.[125]

In the context of scholarly discourse the more exemplary and didactic elements of the *Kaiserchronik* have typically been emphasised by those who resist Ohly's influential typological reading of the text. Jantsch developed a nuanced model of the chronicle's exemplarity when criticising Ohly's approach:

> Die Kaiserchronik hat zum tragenden Gerüst den Gedanken des geschichtlich sich gründenden und sich durchsetzenden Gottesreiches auf Erden. Dies ist die Linie, die die einzelnen Herrscher und Epochen aneinanderreiht. Die Geschichte selbst also – wie man sie auffaßte – ‚nicht ein Kompositionsprinzip, 'macht' die Struktur des Werkes. Gestalten und Episoden weisen sich dabei jeweils aus als pro oder contra, 'gut' oder 'böse', als Organe oder Gegenspieler Gottes in diesem Prozeß. Sie sind repräsentierende 'Muster' des Erfülltseins oder Nichterfülltseins vom göttlichen geschichtlichen Auftrag: im positiven Falle verkörpern sie 'das Wahre', das sich durchsetzen will und durchsetzt. […] In der Linie des sich gründenden Gottesreiches sind Gestalten und Episoden exemplarisch und werden allenthalben also solche, z.T. moralisch didaktisch wertend, angesprochen und charakterisiert, jedoch nirgends als Exponenten einer 'Unvollkommenheit' oder 'Erfüllung' gegen- oder miteinander ins System gebracht.[126]

In order to explain his notion of exemplarity Jantsch states that an example by definition contains in itself a higher degree of fulfilment than it can be expected from those to whom the example appeals to emulate it. Jantsch continues to make a point of differentiating between a prefigurative use of examples (presumably the way Ohly reads them to categorise them as typologies) and a moral use, which precludes typology 'weil nämlich "der Antitypus" nicht gegeben, sondern erst noch zu leisten ist.' Thus, many of the cases Ohly treated as poles of a typological pairing he understands simply as 'Berufung auf Instanzen'.[127]

---

[124] See von Moos 1988, pp. 3-4.

[125] John of Salisbury, *Historia Pontificalis* ed. by Reginald Poole (Oxford 1927), p. 4: *nichilque post gratiam et legem Dei uiuentes rectius et ualidius instruit quam si gesta cognouerint decessorum*.

[126] Heinz Jantsch, *Studien zum Symbolischen in Frühmittelhochdeutscher Literatur* (Tübingen 1959), pp. 210-11.

[127] See Jantsch 1959, pp. 210-23.

Jentzmik, who follows Jantsch in much of his approach, emphasises 'Exemplarik' in contrast to typology as he finds that most factors constituting biblical typology are not present in the *Kaiserchronik*.[128] Instead he characterises the *Kaiserchronik* as exemplary in its approach towards its historical figures and events. They serve as either exemplary or deterring patterns or anticipations of salvation historical ideas. And while this means their exemplary framework is 'unzeitlich-jederzeitlich' it does not necessarily imply a typological system at its core. By pointing this out, Jentzmik shifts the perspective on Ohly's extrabiblical typologies and specifies them as 'Heilsgeschichtliche[r] Exemplarik'. Employing this terminology he hopes to get around the problematic lack of christocentricity in the *Kaiserchronik* while maintaining the salvation historical trajectory of the chronicle's interpretation.[129]

To stress the exemplarity of the *Kaiserchronik*'s episodes has since become a staple of scholarship on the work's historiographic agenda. Otto Neudeck sees 'Exemplarität' as the benchmark for the historical truth of the *Kaiserchronik* and identifies a concept of history, which utilises history as *magistra vitae*.[130] Pésza summarises the presentation of history in the *Kaiserchronik* as targeted at the present and motivated by didactic and pedagogic concerns. The text's 'Wirkungsabsicht' is to present certain prominent events and figures as exemplary value statements.[131]

Markus Stock likewise took the text's exemplarity as the baseline for his examination of 'korrelativer Sinnstiftung'.[132] Using Lotman's 'Sinngenerator'[133] terminology Stock identifies a duality in the text's arrangement of figures and events in three stories (Julianus, Jovinus, and Crescentia). By use of 'Äquivalenzrelationen' these dualities supplement and expand the paradigmatically linear narration of the chronicle to a point where the dualities concentrate the essential messages of each story.[134]

---

[128] As those factors he lists: 'Die gemeinsame Gottbezogenheit als Sinnmitte historischen Geschehens, der eschatologisch-geschichtliche Charakter des Antitypus, die Christozentrik, die jede biblische Typologie ausmacht, Vorausweis- und Verheißungsfunktion des Typus, die ausdrückliche Bezugnahme des Antitypus auf eine Präfiguration, das antitypische Selbstverständnis.' Peter Jentzmik, *Zu Möglichkeiten und Grenzen typologischer Exegese in mittelalterlicher Predigt und Dichtung* (Göppingen 1973), p. 244.

[129] Jentzmik 1973, pp. 244-46.

[130] Otto Neudeck, 'Karl der Große – Der beste aller werltkunige: Zur Verbindung von exegetischen Deutungsmustern und heldenepischem Erzählen in der Kaiserchronik', *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift*, 53 (2003), p. 277.

[131] Tibor Friedrich Pézsa, *Studien zu Erzähltechnik und Figurenzeichnung in der deutschen 'Kaiserchronik'*, Europäische Hochschulschriften Reihen I, Deutsche Sprache und Literatur 1378 (Frankfurt aM 1993), p. 19.

[132] Markus Stock, *Kombinationssinn: Narrative Strukturexperimente im 'Straßburger Alexander', im 'Herzog Ernst B' und im 'König Rother'*, Münchener Texte und Untersuchungen zur deutschen Literatur des Mittelalter 123 (Tübingen 2002), p. 37.

[133] See Jurij Michailowitsch Lotman, 'Vorwort zur deutschen Ausgabe' in *Kunst als Sprache: Untersuchungen zum Zeichencharakter von Literatur und Kunst* ed. by Klaus Städtke (Leipzig 1981), p. 15.

[134] See Stock 2002, p. 71.

Most recently Udo Friedrich has elaborated on 'Topik und Narration' in the *Kaiserchronik* to point out the range of functions exemplary narrations can fulfil. He shows how the author of the chronicle develops his exemplary themes by forming arguments with rhetorical tropes, which draw their authority from many different registers, like catalogues of vices and virtues, moral philosophy, common sense, or from their correspondence to conventional narrative patterns. For Friedrich the *Kaiserchronik* synthesises its examples out of both salvation history and collective historical experience.[135]

How can exemplarity be generated across historical distance and difference? Based on the observations made above, a group of structures in the text of the *Kaiserchronik* can be identified as anchor points for the implementation of literary exemplarity. Firstly, the instances where the use of language explicitly signals exemplarity, by means of words such as *bîspel* or *pilde*. The only relevant instance of *bîspel* occurs in lines 11,206-51 when Emperor Heraclius addresses his men before battle against Cosdras and the pagans who earlier sacked Jerusalem and stole the relic of the Holy Cross (KC 11,156-71).[136]

> owol ir helde snelle,
> ich sage iu ze aim bîspelle:
> ain liut haizet Hebrêî,
> dâ sult ir nemen pilde bî; KC 11,208-11

The language here explicitly foregrounds the exemplarity of the passage. The Old Testament story from Numbers 13-14 where the Israelites are led by God into the land of the Canaanites is introduced as a *bîspel* and Heraclius's audience is called up to follow its *bilde* (KC 11,211). The tale is utilised as an example to spur Heraclius's soldiers to greater courage in the impending battle. For the example of Heraclius the author of the chronicle reaches back into the past into imagery presented in the Old Testament. The carriers of the historical analogy are the Hebrew people and the specific situation for which their example is meant to provide a strategy of managing reality in the diegetic tension in the run-up to a battle.[137] The addressees are Heraclius's *helde snelle*, whom he addresses at the end of his exemplary tale as *helede Rômaere* (KC 11,247), who are at this point

---

[135] See Udo Friedrich, 'Topik und Narration: Zur rhetorischen und poetischen Funktion exemplarischen Erzählens in der "Kaiserchronik"', *Poetica*, 47, 1-2 (2016), p. 70.

[136] The other instance can be found in KC 10,011 where pope Silvester during the disputations refutes one of Zambris rhetorical suggestions as a *pôse bîspel*.

[137] von Moos 1988, p. 7.

fully synonymous with the *cristen* (KC 11,258) as which they rush to storm the enemy lines on the field of battle. The incentive offered in Heraclius's example is eschatological. Whoever joins him in shedding his blood that day will be saved, no matter how sinful they may be. The promised land of Canaan, to which God has decreed his people to move, signifies the Christian paradise, the Israelites who are cowed by the exaggerated reports of the hostile inhabitants of Canaan and refuse to carry out God's decree signify those who do not follow Heraclius's order to follow him into battle at the risk of death. The analogy is immediately understood by his troops, as their collective response shows: they swear that those who would not fight would not win the land they are about to conquer (KC 11,252-56).

After the explicit command by the voice of God to go out and recapture the Holy Cross (KC 11,176-86), the Old Testament analogy conveys the divinely decreed quality of Heraclius's campaign in the lands of the pagans to the collective he is addressing. As this collective is marked as Roman and Christian, in the conceptual logic of the *Kaiserchronik* his exemplary appeal can be read to aim far beyond the historical Roman army and at the German audience of the twelfth century. The text returns to this extension of its exemplary impact beyond its own diegesis at the end of the episode. Heraclius, having defeated Cosdras and recaptured the Holy Cross, approaches Jerusalem in triumph but is stopped by an angel who admonishes him to approach the Holy City in a more humble manner. Upon hearing this, the emperor carries the cross barefoot and in woollen clothes through the gate of the city. At this point, the narrator of the *Kaiserchronik* steps into the foreground and ties the Heraclius story up with an explicit unlocking of the exemplarity and elaboration of the moral of the story:

> daz ist uns armen gesaget ad exemplum:
> von diu suln wir unsern hêrren
> vurhten und flêgen
> mit zuhten unt mit guote
> mit grôzer deumuote. KC 11,339-43

From retrospectively characterising the Heraclius material as *exemplum* targeted at the contemporary community of author and audience, the narrator moves on to provide explicit instructions on religious observance and concludes with an almost sententious couplet: *ubermuot ist sô getân:* | *die gescendet ie den man* (KC 11,344-45).

The intradiegetic *bîspel* Heraclius devises for his men is mirrored by the final *exemplum*, which

now addresses the extradiegetic audience and author of the text: *uns armen*. The exemplarity of the Heraclius episode is generated by drawing on three temporal levels: the twelfth-century present, the imperial past, and the even more distant biblical past. The exemplary value for the twelfth-century present is the sum of the exemplary analogy of the biblical past to the imperial past, which is generated by Heraclius's reference to and interaction with the analogical potential of the biblical material. To enable the transposition of exemplarity from one historical diegetic collective to another present and extradiegetic, the *ubermuot* for which Heraclius is reprimanded is clearly developed as a collective transgression as it is the entire Roman army, which gets into *micheln nôten* (KC 11,313) because of their *grôze*[n] *ubermuote* (KC 11,312).[138]

Smits suggested we should read the Heraclius episode as an example of the fourfold exegetical sense of the bible.[139] As the monk and mystic John Cassian demonstrated in his *Conferences* in the early fifth century to illustrate the fourfold sense of the bible, Jerusalem can take on four dimensions of meaning:

> And so these four previously mentioned figures coalesce, if we desire, in one subject, so that one and the same Jerusalem can be taken in four senses: historically as the city of the Jews; allegorically as Church of Christ, anagogically as the heavenly city of God 'which is the mother of us all,' tropologically, as the soul of man, which is frequently subject to praise or blame from the Lord under this title.[140]

Applied to the Heraclius example of the *Kaiserchronik* this results in the following layers of interpretation: in the literary sense Heraclius's and his men's *superbia* imperils their service to the historical place Jerusalem, on the typological-allegorical level of the spiritual sense it imperils their

---

[138] See Kathryn Smits, 'Zweimal Heraclius: Zu Sprache und Erzählstil der Heraclius-Episode in der "Kaiserchronik" und im "Buoch der künige niuwer ê"' in *Deutsche Sprache: Geschichte und Gegenwart. Festschrift für Friedrich Maurer zum 80. Geburtstag* ed. by Hugo Moser and Heinz Wupp (Bern, München 1978), p. 159.

[139] 'Jerusalem ist zunächst die historische Stadt, die im Jahre 614 von den Sassaniden verwüstet wurde und zu der Heraclius 629 das geraubte Kreuz zurückführte. Allegorisch ist sie aber die Kirche, die Christenheit, für die Heraclius im Auftrag Gottes kämpft und deren Ehre er durch die Wiedergewinnung des Kreuzes rettet. Tropologisch ist sie die Seele des gläubigen Lesers, der vom Erzähler immer wieder dazu aufgefordert wird, das Geschehen auf sich zu beziehen. Anagogisch ist das himmlische Jerusalem gemeint: Heraclius *ubermuot* gefährdet ja gerade seinen Eingang in das Himmelreich.' Smits 1978, pp. 159-60; see Hans-Jürgen Horn, 'Origenes, Cassian, der vierfache Schriftsinn und seine Beziehung zu ontologischen Vorstellungen des Platonismus' in *Platonismus im Orient und Okzident* ed. by Ralf Georges Khoury and Jens Halfwassen (Heidelberg 2005), pp. 50-51.

[140] John Cassian, *Conlationes XXIIII* ed. by Michael Petschenig (Wien 1886). Book XIV, Chapter VIII: *Igitur praedictae quatuor figurae in unum ita si volumus confluunt, ut una atque eadem Jerusalem quadrifariam possit intelligi: secundum historiam civitas Judaeorum, secundum allegoriam Esslesia Christi, secundum anagogen civitatis Dei illa coelestis quae est mater omnium nostrum; secundum tropologiam anima hominis, quae frequenter hoc nomine aut increpatur, aut laudatur a Domino.* For a translation see *The Conferences of John Cassian* trans. by Edgar C.S. Gibson in A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church 11, 2nd ser. (New York 1894), pp. 291-545.

service to the temporal church, on the tropological and moral level of the spiritual sense it imperils their own soul, and ultimately on the anagogical-eschatological level of the spiritual sense it imperils their entry into the Kingdom of Heaven. The exemplary historical analogy with biblical authority to Heraclius and his men are the craven Israelites from Heraclius's example, who would not fight and to whom therefore entry into the promised lands would be forbidden (Numbers 14, 27-35).

The Heraclius episode employs all registers of exemplary writing available to a medieval author. It draws on biblical and historical authority, modulates the two, comments explicitly on them and addresses the target audience. This strategy is not singular in the *Kaiserchronik* and by no means consistently applied throughout the text. Other examples like Titus and Trajan employ similar strategies, as will be shown below, but the author does not display any programmatic strategy to turn all or even most possible episodes with exemplary potential into explicit examples. The stern justice Nerva displays in his treatment of the artisan who forged the moving horse, fuelled by the life energy of a living soul locked into it (KC 5779-5810), would have been a fitting place to implement an exemplary tale, but the text is conspicuously void of any commentary or analogical pattern and simply does not seem interested in turning Nerva into an example analogous to Heraclius.

II.2.3 Aetiology: Etymology, Toponyms, and the Pantheon

Oth possible functions of quantity identifiable in the *Kaiserchronik* have received much less scholarly attention than exemplarity. In the following the chronicle's aetiological episodes shall be examined closer.

Aetiologies are narratives, which aim to explain why something has come to be and how it became the way it is. These explanatory models often operate in detachment from the actual historical or etymological origins of the phenomenon they aim to explain. In some cases historical occurrence might be turned into aetiological narrative but generally the relationship between aetiology and factuality remains tenuous and to be critically examined from case to case.[141] Westermann defines aetiologies as narratives in which the answer to the question, which the aetiology sets out to explain, coincides with the general resolution of dramatic tension in a genuine

[141] Burke Long, *The Problem of Etiological Narrative in the Old Testament* in Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 108 (Berlin 1968), pp. 1-4.

narrative.[142]

A particularly striking example for an aetiology of the etymological variety can be found in the *Annolied*, when the Romans send out Caesar to fight the rebellious Germans: *duo santin si den edelin Cêsarem, | dannin noch hiude kuninge heizzint keisere (*AL 18,9-10).[143] These lines both showcase the narrator's erudition and connect the German present to the Roman past, and prefigure the close association Caesar and the Germans are going to have in the *Annolied*. In this case the etymological derivation happens to be correct but this is by no means necessary for explanatory models like this one to take full effect, as later examples will illustrate.[144]

When looking at the *Kaiserchronik* a natural connection from exemplarity to aetiology opens up when – given the scarcity of language, which explicitly indicates exemplarity – one starts to look for more subtle structures, which create narrative effect by negotiating the temporal gulf between the past and the present and thus mark a quantifiable connection between the diegetic past of the *Kaiserchronik* and the present of its audience. A worthwhile place to start looking is temporal adverbs like *hiute* or *nû*. For the purposes of this question enquiry is not aimed at the more prominent usage of these words throughout the text when they are used by an intradiegetic figure to denote their diegetic present time. An example of this is king Nerva's condemnation of the craftsman who created the iron horse only to suffer death in his own creation:

> mit dir wirt ouh verendet der list.
> in gelirnet hinnen vur niemer nehain man:
> er muoz hiute disses tages ende hân. KC 5760-62

The adverb marks an effect that is clearly consigned to the diegetic present time of Nerva punishing the presumptuous artisan, which anchors the event in the past for the extradiegetic audience. Similarly *nû* is overwhelmingly used in the sense of 'now' or 'in this moment', to indicate the present or a consecutive action.[145] But there are examples more relevant for our purpose, e.g. when Agrippa and Tiberius go about founding cities in the German lands.[146]

---

[142] Claus Westermann, *Forschung am Alten Testament*, Theologische Bücherei 24 (München 1964), pp. 18-20.

[143] For all verbatim quotes from the *Annolied* see *Deutsche Dichtung des Mittelalters: Band I: Von den Anfängen bis zum hohen Mittelalter*, ed. by Michael Curschmann and Ingeborg Glier (München 1980), pp. 92-147.

[144] See 'Kaiser' in *Kluge: Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache* ed. by Elmar Seebold (Berlin, Boston 2011), p. 464.

[145] W.F. Tulasiewicz, *Index Verborum zur Deutschen Kaiserchronik* (Berlin) 1972, pp. 228-29.

[146] The lands north of the alps have at this point already been mapped out as inhabited by various German peoples by Caesar's forays.

er hiez si Agrippînâ,
Colonjâ ist si nû genant,
si zieret elliu frenkiskiu lant. KC 648-50
[…]
ain stat worht er dâ
geheizen Tyburnîâ.
nû haizet si aver Ratispônâ KC 687-89

In both examples *nû* links the ancient past of the founding of the city with the medieval present by contrasting their past Latin with their present German name. The 'now' is not a diegetically consecutive 'now' but the present of the twelfth-century text, audience, and author.

The same gulf is often straddled by the temporal adverb *hiute*, and narratives, which connect both sides of this temporal divide with an aetiological purpose, are quite common in the *Kaiserchronik*. Establishing an enduring connection with the present day has been singled out as the key identifier of aetiological narratives.[147] Examples for these aetiologies are often tied to toponyms or topographical features, which could theoretically still be witnessed by the text's twelfth-century audience. A straightforward example is Constantine's renaming of *Bisantîâ* (KC 10,445) after him so it is until *hiute* known as *Constantînobele* (KC 10,448). In a slightly varied example in the Helius Adrianus episode the eponymous emperor rebuilds and refurbishes Jerusalem and is led by his hubris to rename the city after him:

er begunde di stat ze lieben,
harte wol zieren,
er verte wider die stat,
alse man hiute wol chiesen mach,
er verwandelt ir den namen,
er wolte si vur aigen haben:
si solte dô haizen Hêlîâ. KC 7222-28

In this case the aetiology does not pertain to the present-day name of the city. Adrianus's display of

[147] Martin Noth, 'Der Beitrag der Archäologie zur Geschichte Israels', *Vetus Testamentum*, Supplements 7 (1960), p. 287.

hubris when renaming the Holy City after himself is immediately punished directly by God when Adrianus is slain in Damascus and Jerusalem retains its name *also si dâ vor gehaizen was* (KC 7232). Rather, the aetiological explanation of the *Kaiserchronik* makes the topography of Jerusalem accessible to the *Kaiserchronik*'s present (KC 7225).

Other short aetiological remarks focus on specific landmarks in Rome. The most entertaining is certainly the etymological derivation of the toponym Lateran. Nero's alchemically induced attempts to bear a child occasion unforeseen results as he vomits out a massive toad. Upon this sight the Romans present call out 'lâtâ rânâ.' (KC 4152) literally 'wide toad' from which the site of the event further on draws its name *daz si hiute haizzet Lâterân* (KC 4154).

This example introduces a different function of aetiologies, which was already present in the earlier examples but is now more strongly focused on: the *Kaiserchronik*'s aetiologies not only serve as explanatory models to impart meaning to the phenomenological chaos of the past from the vantage point of the present, they also operate as strategies for verifying the truth of the *Kaiserchronik*'s historical narrations. Line 4150 is seemingly inserted to intervene in a passage that challenges the audience's credulity: a toad bursts out of Nero's throat after he is made pregnant by imbibing several alchemical concoctions. The narrator of the *Kaiserchronik* actualises himself, his audience and their communicative relationship to stress the truth – *zewâre* – of what he conveys. Paradoxically insertions like these, which interrupt the diegesis and bring the relational divide between narrator and audience into the foreground, can heighten the awareness of the artificiality of the reception situation. In this context the etymological aetiology of explaining the name Lateran by linking it to Latin *lata rana* for 'wide toad' not only works backwards by anchoring the origins for a well-known toponym in the historical record. It also works forward by assuring the audience of the historical veracity of the *Kaiserchronik*'s narration.

A more complex example can be found early in the chronicle at the end of the establishment of the pagan weekdays and the introduction of the pagan gods. Here the text inserts a short excursus into events, which, from the perspective of the diegesis, lie in the future, but from the perspective of the audience still lie in the past. Both perspectives are meaningfully connected by the *noch hiute* (KC 208) phrase. The object of the excursus is the exorcism and Christianisation of the Roman Pantheon, identified by the chronicle as a temple of Saturn (KC 171-75). The Pantheon passage develops a complicated temporal structure to link different historical stages of past occurrences to the present. While this passage is still part of the pagan weekday calendar the text now gets ahead of itself to give a preview of pope Boniface's exorcism and rededication of the temple as a church to Mary and all saints: *daz buoch saget uns daz;* | *der guote sancte Bonifâtîus* | *der wîhete sît daz*

selbe hûs (KC 186-88). The temporal conjunction *sît* clearly points to future events, out of line with the historiographical narration of the *Kaiserchronik.* Having just established a pagan ordering system of time,[148] the text invalidates this order and feeds in a temporal fragment from a future yet to come. To add at least some context to this passage, the text situates Boniface in time as the fourth pope since St Gregory (KC 193-95). While the popes as a structuring feature of the *Kaiserchronik* quickly fade into the background (with the notable exceptions of Silvester and other popes like Peter, Clement, and Leo featuring prominently in the content), at this point the line from the prologue where the text states that it would tell *von den bâbesen unt von den chunigen* (KC 19) still resonates. The historiographical principle is dispensed with in favour of a systematic one, the future fate, and the Christianisation of the Rotunda is clarified before the event itself occurs in the historical trajectory of the text. It does not recur at the chronological point in the textual narrative for this event, which happened under the Roman-Byzantine emperor Phocas in 609 CE.[149] As Phocas does not feature in the *Kaiserchronik*, from a chronological point of view the 'correct' place for it would have been in one of the three Greek emperor episodes.

Boniface decides to convert the Pantheon because he worries that immorality might still persist under his aegis:

> do besante sich der heilige man
> nâch allen den guoten christen
> die er ze Rome weste. KC 198-200

Within the textual excursus into the historical future Boniface's knowledge of many good Christians in Rome is well legitimated, but in the course of the *Kaiserchronik* this knowledge serves as a further glance into the future: Rome, which had just been presented as a place filled with pagan temples and inhabited by pagans who worship idols and celebrate pagan rites and feasts, will in future be a city inhabited by Christians who will overturn those pagan sites and customs. The conversion of the Pantheon was a staple of Christian historiography since Bede's *Historia*

---

[148] Thus creating a second stage of order, following the incipient 'promiscuous idolatry' of 'polluted idols' and predating the imperial order of the Empire established by Caesar. See Chinca/Young 2016, p. 11.

[149] *Liber Pontificalis*, MGH *Gesta pontificum Romanorum* ed. by Theodor Mommsen (Berlin 1895)., Life 69, p. 165: *Bonifativs IIII.* […] *Eodem tempore petiit a Focate principe templum qui appellatur Pantheum, in quo fecit ecclesiam beatae Mariae semper virginis et omnium martyrum.*
Bede dates the synod bishop Mellitus of London attended in Rome in Saint Bede, *The Complete Works of Venerable Bede, in the original Latin, collated with the Manuscripts, and various printed editions, and accompanied by a new English translation of the Historical Works, and a Life of the Author* ed. by J.A. Giles, vols 8 (London 1843), II, Lib. II, Cap. 4, p. 186: […] *et ipse Mellitus inter eos adsedit anno VIII imperii Focatis principis, indictione XIIIa, tertio die Kalendarum Martiarum.*

Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum.[150] It marks the first occasion on which a pagan temple was turned into a Christian church, *multitudo ibi sanctorum memoriam haberet*.[151] Its intrusion into the pagan calendar in the *Kaiserchronik* signifies the programmatic theme of the text that in the future the incipient pagan order will be overcome by a Christian one. The belief that pagan places of worship were inhabited by demons[152] finds strong expression in the *Kaiserchronik* when, as soon as Boniface consecrates the temple to the Christian God, *die tievel brâsten oben ûz, | sumelîche in das abgrunde* (KC 206-07).

The Rotunda excursus concludes with a passage, which reconnects it to the chronicle's main historical trajectory: *des ist ze Rôme noch hiute urchunde. | Nû sculen wir wider grîfen | dâ wir die rede liezen* (KC 208-10). Whilst *des* refers clearly to the story of the conversion of the Pantheon, *hiute* refers to the time of the *Kaiserchronik*'s compiler and the text's audience. The text gives an assurance of the historical persistence of an event that is from the point of view of the diegesis still one step away in the future but still in the past of the historical present of the twelfth century. Knowledge still available in the present time of the audience is causally linked back to the historical record of the *Kaiserchronik*. And only now can the record allow itself to revert to the diegetic present of the first century BCE and begin the Caesar episode.

II.2.4 Aetiological Exemplarity: Titus & Trajan

Another remarkable toponymical aetiology centres on a fictitious column situated in the city of Rome, which was imagined to still be visible to the *Kaiserchronik*'s contemporaries. Unlike the previous examples of aetiologies this account uses the transtemporal structure of aetiological narratives to intertwine them with a moral and didactic example, more closely related to the previously examined Heraclius episode. After the emperor Titus has thwarted a plot against his life, through personal cunning and a display of great civic justice, he has the twelve conspirators

---

[150] See Ohly 1968, p. 39; Saint Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, Lib. II, Cap. 4, p.186: *Hic est Bonifatius, quartus a beato Gregorio Romanae urbis episcopo, qui inpetrauit a Focate principe donari ecclesiae Christi templum Romae, quod Pantheon uocabatur ab antiquis, quasi simulacrum esset omnium deorum; in quo ipse, eliminata omni spurcitia, fecit ecclesiam sanctae Dei genetricis atque omnium martyrum Christi; ut, exclusa multitudine daemonum, multitudo ibi sanctorum memoriam haberet.*

[151] See Saint Bede, *Ecclesiastical History,* Lib. II, Cap. 4, p. 186.

[152] See Friedrich Wilhelm Deichmann, 'Frühchristliche Kirchen in antiken Heiligtümern' in *Rom, Ravenna, Konstantinopel, Naher Osten. Gesammelte Studien zur spätantiken Architektur, Kunst und Geschichte* ed. by the author (Wiesbaden 1982), pp. 56-59; Max Wehrli, 'Antike Mythologie im christlichen Mittelalter' in *Max Wehrli: Gegenwart und Erinnerung: Gesammelte Aufsätze*, Spolia Berolinensia, Berliner Beiträge zur Geistes und Kulturgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit 12 ed. by Fritz Wagner and Wolfgang Maas (Hildesheim, Zürich 1998), pp. 93-97.

executed (KC 5377-5530). The structural marker for historical continuity is *ienoch* in the sense of 'still' and not 'anyway'.[153]

> er hiez die aitgenôzze vâhen
> unt alle di an dem râte mit in wâren,
> er hiez si vuoren ûf den hof –
> daz urkunde ist ze Rôme ienoh –,
> mit rehter urtaile
> Rômære algemaine
> hiez er in diu houbet abslahen KC 5521-27

The bridge between the present and the past marked by *ienoch* ist *urkunde*, a word spanning a broad semantic field from 'sign' or 'proof', via 'argument' to 'testimony' and even 'testament'.[154] The place where this testimony is available is Rome. The issue, which is conveyed by the testimony from the past to the present, is the way Titus punishes his assailants *mit rehter urtaile* (KC 5525). It is not explicitly stated but the context suggests that after this the text now aims to further illustrate the specific shape, which secures the *urkunde* of Titus's justice: the emperor orders a *sûl êrîn* (KC 5533) to be built to memorialise his just verdict. The text claims that this column would be in Rome until *hiute* […] *anscîn* (KC 5534), although it corresponds to no actual topographical landmark in the city and is not part of a broader legendary tradition. Instead, its introduction is owed to the *Kaiserchronik*'s author, but it remains unclear if he perceived the column as a real monument or intentionally fabricated it. In either case, within the *Kaiserchronik*, the monument's purpose is decidedly public and civic: the statue on top of the column shows Titus as a just ruler, with the sword as the sign of his *imperium*, which entails the judicial authority to condemn perpetrators to death. As a deterrent he has the names of the twelve conspirators whose executions exemplify his justice engraved on the column *sô man hiute dâ lesen mac | ze ainem urkunde unz an den jungisten tac* (KC 5537-38).[155]

Not only is the column temporally still present but it is also visible over a wide spatial distance, as the column *scînet verre in di lant* (KC 5542). Indeed it is assumed to be still visible, as the

---

[153] See 'ie-noch′ in *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch* ed. by Matthias Lexer, vols 3 (Leipzig 1872) III, coll. 1415-1416.

[154] See 'ur-künde, -kunde′ in *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch* ed. by Matthias Lexer, vols 3 (Leipzig 1872) II, col. 2006.

[155] See Ohly 1986, p. 109.

present tense of *scînet* suggests.[156] The column is imagined as permanent in time and space and at least theoretically accessible to the audience of the text in the same way as Constantinople, Jerusalem, or the Lateran are.

The implications of this passage are complex. The fact that the column does not actually exist, does not mean that the passage loses its main qualifier as an aetiology. The author and the audience of the *Kaiserchronik* might well have thought it to be an actual Roman site. However, it becomes clear that the launching point for this particular enquiry into the Roman past is not puzzlement at present physical phenomenology but the wish to reify the continual historical exemplarity of the event the monument memorialises: the justice of Titus. It shines through the centuries not as an actual monument but as a textual anchor of the absoluteness of Titus's exemplarity. It becomes unchangeable in its validity. The text constructs it not with an interest in explaining a phenomenon of the past but to imbue a historical example with authority for the present.

daz wart umbe daz getân –
sô wir das buoch hôren sagen –
swer das zaichen iemer dâ ersaehe,
daz er bilde der bî naeme. KC 5543-46

Now the *Kaiserchronik* switches into explanatory mode, not, however, looking back from the present but the other way round looking forward from the diegetic past towards the present of the author and the audience. Everyone in the future – *wir* – should *iemer* benefit from the *zaichen* of Titus's justice from which they might *bilde nemen*.

The scene lends itself to comparison with the end of the Trajan episode, another case of exemplarity continued throughout time but without the disguised aetiology of the Titus episode and rather by the insertion of another fragment from the diegetic future (KC 6013-95). Trajan lends himself to comparison because he is, like Titus, singled out for his just adjudication (KC 5969-84; 6007-18). Because of this Pope Gregory the Great takes pity on the pagan emperor *sît uber zwai hundert jâr* (KC 6024), who is now supposedly languishing in hell. The two hundred years mark the distance between the pagan empire Trajan used to rule and a future Christian empire, not yet actualised but heavily foreshadowed in the *Kaiserchronik* in which Pope Gregory presides over the church. Gregory's concern echoes medieval considerations about the virtue of the gentiles who had

[156] Ablautreihe I, 3. person. singular, indicative, present tense.

not known God and yet displayed exemplary virtuousness as expressed for example by the *Kaiserchronik*'s contemporary John of Salisbury.[157]

Thinking of Trajan's *guot gerihte* (KC 6033) Pope Gregory wonders if he *iemer erlôset solte werden* (KC 6036). Thereupon an angel descends to grant Gregory the power over Trajan's salvation: Gregory could either let the soul of Trajan suffer as he has deserved it or the pope could vouch for the pagan emperor's soul personally. Should Gregory wish to preserve Trajan's soul until Judgement Day he will have to suffer seven ailments and ultimately die from them in return (KC 6052-61). It is implied but not explicitly stated that Gregory agrees to the terms as the narrator suddenly materialises and, speaking in the first person plural pronoun *wir*, includes his audience in an expression of hope for the redemption of Trajan's soul when the Last Judgement comes (KC 6080-82). The change of tone is significant because it shifts the text from a narrative into a more appellative style in which the narrator continues to elaborate the exemplarity of Trajan's administration of justice:

> Nû suln alle werltkunige
> dâ bî nemen pilede,
> wi der edel kaiser Trajân
> diese genâde umbe got gewan,
> want er rehtes gerihtes phlegete
> di wîl er an dirre werlte lebete.
> der selben genâden suln si gewis sîn,
> behaltent si an ir gerihte mînen trähtîn. KC 6083-90

Trajan's historical justice gains him a chance of salvation in an eschatological future even though he had the soteriological bad luck to live and die a pagan. If the *werltkunige* of the narrator's present take up his example – the phrase *pilede nemen* from line 6084 links Trajan to Titus (KC 5546) – and dispense justice with Jesus in their minds they too can hope for the same divine clemency. Trajan's

---

[157] See John of Salisbury, *Policratius* ed. by Clemens Webb (London, New York 1909), Lib. III, Cap. 9, pp. 197-98: 'For who is there that can embrace The very self of virtue? Who now clothes himself in even the shadow of the virtues in which we see that gentiles excelled, albeit having no Christ they did not attain the fruit of true blessedness? Who imitates the diligence of Themistocles, the gravity of Fronto, the continence of Socrates, the honor of Fabricius, the innocence of Numa, the modesty of Scipio, the patience of Ulysses, the frugality of Cato, or the pity of Titus? Who does not admire and venerate, since Honesty is praised but shivers in the cold.' For the translation see *Frivolities of Courtiers and Footprints of Philosophers. Being a Translation of the First, Second, and Third Books and Selections from the Seventh and Eighth Books of the Policraticus of John of Salisbury* trans. by Joseph Pike (New York1972), pp. 197-98.

good performance as a ruler has made him eligible for salvation and transports the question of his soteriological fate from a pagan into a Christian horizon. However, the final decision on Trajan's salvation remains open until the Last Judgement. Gregory's sacrifice does not actually redeem Trajan's soul – that would be dogmatically highly problematic – and does not mark any real qualitative change either; it merely enables a divine reconsideration of his fate. Again qualitative change in time is not thematised or problematised but in this case adjourned for the eschatological future. Nevertheless papal and angelic intervention ensures the continuity of his example and thus the availability of his beneficial exemplarity for a Christian audience. Interestingly, the text speaks about the *werltkunige* in the third person plural (KC 6083) and does not invite the audience directly to emulate the pagan emperor's example: here the *Kaiserchronik* truly becomes a mirror of princes and creates an opposition between the *wir* of the author and his audience, and the *si*, the temporal rulers of God's creation.

As a closing remark, the parallel with Boniface's conversion of the Pantheon is striking. Both passages are inserted towards the end of their episodic units. Both employ the figure of a virtuous pope, who features anachronistically as a visitor from a safely Christian future. In the Pantheon passage Boniface foreshadows a Christian future for the pagan city of Rome and affirms the validity of the twelfth-century religious axioms, which would have governed the chronicle's audience's world view, by temporarily levelling the chronological distance yet to be covered. In comparison Gregory in the Trajan episode also collapses chronological distance but in order to respond to questions about Trajan's salvation. Both respond to immediate concerns the *Kaiserchronik*'s audience would have had regarding the religious quality of the present they inhabit and its connection to the past. Crucially, both figure in their anachronistic spaces in the episode framework only and are not narrated later in their proper chronological turns. This shows how the episode paradigm creates quantitative distance and not qualitative difference, which makes it possible to collapse the distance and to suppress the difference between the past and the present. As the past is made similar enough to the present and only removed by quantities of time and not by qualities of composition it is not necessary to repeat the stories of the good Christian popes in there chronological turn.

III. The poeticity and historicity of the *Kaiserchronik*

The prominence of exemplary narratives in the *Kaiserchronik* warrants examination in a broader context than the one adopted by the previous chapter, which considered exemplarity as a function of the text's episode framework. But the relevance of exemplary narration in the chronicle goes beyond this; after all, the idea that history should provide a lesson to posteriority and that it is the historian's task to frame this lesson is a central topos of medieval historiography and is also emphasised in the *Kaiserchronik*'s prologue.

After contextualising the *Kaiserchronik* in the broader tradition of exemplary historiography I will examine how the chronicle's prologue articulates a programme of historical veracity and how the key claims of this programme help to model the text's poeticity as a chronographical account of historical truth. To achieve this I will undertake close readings of some core passages of the prologue, considering how they are linked to previous and contemporary medieval literature, and what can be gleaned from them for the

While this may seem like an excursus – if not a digression – from the main line of my argument, in the end I will show how the results of this examination corroborate the findings of the previous chapters and work out in the chronicle's negotiation of historical distance and difference.

III.1 The *Kaiserchronik* and the *Historia Magistra Vitae* Tradition

Cicero's famous dictum, of history as a *magistra vitae*, has become a label for a didactic and rhetorical tradition of historiography, which employs recurring historical patterns and contrasting examples to educate and edify. In Cicero's treatise *De Oratore*, his character Antonius asks (rhetorically):

> By what other voice, too, than that of the orator, is history, the witness of time, the light of truth, the life of memory, the directress of life (*magistra vitae*), the herald of antiquity, committed to immortality?[158]

The different aspects of history, which are presented as a string of metaphors, can only be imbued

[158] See Cicero, De Oratore in *Cicero Rhetorica* ed. by A.S. Wilkins, vols 2 (Oxford 1963), I, Lib. II, Cap. 36: *Historia vero testis temporum, lux veritatis, vita memoriae, magistra vitae, nuntia vetustatis, qua voce alia, nisi oratoris, immortalitati commendatur?*

with immortality by the orator. Cicero draws on Hellenistic rhetorical principles[159] to demonstrate how knowledge of history is mainly deployed for rhetorical ends,[160] providing many examples for instructive employment: *Plena exemplorum est historia*.[161]

To be conveyed from the first century BCE to the time of compilation of the *Kaiserchronik* in the mid twelfth century CE, the ancient notion of history as *magistra vitae* had to negotiate Christian scrutiny of much of pagan antique writing, which was categorised in opposition to the Bible's authority.[162] But history comes to be cultivated for educative Christian purposes by Augustine in his *De civitate Dei,* an approach which his student Orosius was the first to apply consistently in a historiographical context in his *Historiae adversum paganos* and not despite but because of history's pagan connotations. The exemplary and comparative retrospective on the horrors of events from a pagan past lends itself naturally to Orosius's agenda of presenting contemporary events in a more favourable light and educating his contemporaries about an appropriate understanding of their time. According to Orosius, it depends on the inner attitude with which history is reflected upon whether or not one can draw the right conclusions from it.[163] 'Oh, pain, are those who lament the present, not reading this about the past? They read it indeed, but they do not draw their conclusions with equanimity but with malevolence.'[164] This is where Orosius can apply the didactic lever of *historia magistra vitae* to demonstrate the beneficial influence on historical occurrence by the temporal presence of Christianity e.g. when he comments on an earthquake, which has been prophesied for his day and age: 'Out of modesty I would rather just mention these occurrences than explicate them so that those who know of it would remember and those who don't know would inquire more.'[165]

Over two hundred years later another Spaniard, Isidore of Seville, would acknowledge the

---

[159] See e.g. Polybius, *The Histories: Books 9-15* trans. by W.R. Paton in Loeb Classical Library 159, vols 6 (2011), IV. Lib. XII, Cap. 25b, p. 371: The peculiar function of history is to discover, in the first place, the words actually spoken, whatever they were, and next to ascertain the reason why what was done or spoken led to failure or success. 2 For the mere statement of a fact may interest us but is of no benefit to us: but when we add the cause of it, study of history becomes fruitful. 3 For it is the mental transference of similar circumstances to our own times that gives us the means of forming presentiments of what is about to happen, and enables us at certain times to take precautions and at others by reproducing former conditions to face with more confidence the difficulties that menace us.

[160] Reinhart Koselleck, *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time* (Cambridge MA, 1985), p. 23.

[161] Cicero: Marcus Tullius Cicero, *Über die Weissagung: De Divinatione* ed. and trans by Christoph Schäublin (Berlin 2013), Lib. I ,Cap. 50, p.56.

[162] See Koselleck 1985, p. 24.

[163] Brandt 2009, pp. 127-31.

[164] Paulus Orosius, *Historiarum Adversum Paganos Libri VII*, ed. by Karl Zangmeister (Wien 1882), Lib. IV, Cap. 6,34: *Pro dolor, leguntne ista de veteribus, qui de recentibus conqueruntur? Immo legunt et ea non aequitate sed aemulatione coniciunt*. All translations of Orosius are taken from: Paulus Orosius, *Seven Books of History against the Pagans*, Translated Texts for Historians 54, trans. by A. T. Fear (Liverpool 2010).

[165] Paulus Orosius, *Historiarum Adversum Paganos Libri VII,* Lib. III, Cap. 3,3: *Sed haec ut commemorata sint magis quam explicita uerecundiae concesserim ut et qui scit relocat at qui nescit inquirat.*

concept, albeit somewhat 'furtively',[166] in his *Etymologiae* and in doing so turn it into 'august and useful clichés'[167] readily accessible to Christian writers of the Middle Ages:

> Histories of peoples are no impediment to those who wish to read useful works, for many wise people have imparted the past deeds of humankind in histories for the instruction of the living. Through history they handle a final reckoning back through seasons and years, and they investigate many indispensable matters through the succession of consuls and kings.[168]

The *Kaiserchronik* prologue's announcement, that the chronicle will report the deeds of *bâbesen unt von den chunigen | baidiu guoten unt ubelen* (KC 19-20), fits into the moral extensions of this approach to history, implementing the presentation of didactic content in the tradition established in the preface of Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*:

> For if history relates good things of good men, the attentive hearer is excited to imitate that which is good; or if it mentions evil things of wicked persons, nevertheless the religious and pious hearer or reader, shunning that which is hurtful and perverse, is the more earnestly excited to perform those things which he knows to be good, and worthy of God.[169]

About four hundred years later, and at the same time as the compilation of the *Kaiserchronik*, Otto of Freising, in the dedicatory epistle of his *Chronica* to Frederick I, emphasised the immediate political usefulness of a knowledge of history for the present-day ruler:

---

[166] Koselleck 1985, p. 24.

[167] Nancy Partner, *Serious Entertainments: The Writing of History in Twelfth-Century England* (Chicago, London 1977), p. 3.

[168] See Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiarum sive originum libri XX* ed. by W. M. Lindsay, 2 vols (Oxford 1911; repr. 1957) I, Lib. I, Cap. 43: *Historiae gentium non inpediunt legentibus in his quae utilia dixerunt. Multi enim sapientes praeterita hominum gesta ad institutionem praesentium historiis indiderunt, siquidem et per historiam summa retro temporum annorumque supputatio conprehenditur, et per consulum regumque successum multa necessaria perscrutantur.* Translation by Stepehn Barney see Isidore of Seville, The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville trans. by Stephen Barney and others (Cambridge2006).p. 67.

[169] See Venerable Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum,* Prologue, p. 2: *Siue enim historia de bonis bona referat, ad imitandum bonum auditor sollicitus instigatur; seu mala commemoret de prauis, nihilominus religiosus ac pius auditor siue lector deuitando quod noxium est ac peruersum, ipse sollertius ad exsequenda ea, quae bona ac Deo digna esse cognouerit, accenditur.* Translation by L.C. Jane see The Ecclesiastical Hostory of the English Nation ny St Bede. Translated by L.C. Jane (New York 2007), p. 1.

> I have therefore obeyed your command willingly and gladly, so much more devotedly as I regard it as thoroughly in accord with your royal preeminence that you desire to know what was done in olden times by kings and emperor, and to know this not only for its better molding by laws and statutes.[170]

As we arrive in the twelfth century, next to the modelling of exemplarity as a function of the *Kaiserchronik*'s quantifying episode framework, the dimension of rhetorical presentation and communication of exemplarity arises: how does the *Kaiserchronik* use rhetorical devices to produce moral and didactic effects, and what are the sociocultural implications, which shape the chronicle's transmission of exemplarity? Nancy Partner's 1977 book *Serious Entertainments* provided a useful approach to this complex of questions by showing conclusively how in the twelfth century – and in fact up till the late eighteenth century – the historiographer's task was not merely to record hard facts but, moreover, to 'arrest the attention and divert the imagination' with a variety of different topics, among them 'accounts of exemplary lives and evidences of God's continuing interest in human affairs.'[171] To achieve this, historiography had to aspire to the dignity of literature by employing the most beautiful style a writer could command.[172] Historiography and poetic writing both aspired towards 'Wirklichkeitsbezug […]: die wählende, strukturierende, verwandelnde und doch glaubwürdig wirkende Umsetzung der Ereignisse in die Modellhaftigkeit einer epischen Sprache.'[173] The historiographies of the twelfth century were read by their audiences as 'serious entertainment'[174] containing within them both the style and the material to educate and to delight. As Chinca and Young have argued, the *Kaiserchronik*, which is roughly contemporary to the chronicles Partner examines,[175] seems to fit in with these texts.[176] And it is not the only text from the German lands form this time that can be read alongside Partner's texts: Reuter argued that the

---

[170] See Otto of Freising, *Chronica sive Historia de duabus civitatibus*, MGH SS rer. germ. 45 ed. by Adolf Hofmeister (Hannover 1912), Letter to Frederick I, p. 1: *Parui ergo libens et lubens vestro imperio tanto devotius, quanto regiae excellentiae concenientius esse considero ob rei publicae non solum armis tutandae, sed et legibus et iudiciis informandae incrementum antiqua regum seu imperatorum gesta vos velle cognoscere.* Translation by Charles Christopher Mierow see *The two Cities: A Chronicle of Universal History to the Year 1146 A.D.* trans. and ed. by Charles Christopher Mierow (New York 2002), p. 1.

[171] Partner 1977, p. 2. She also lists: 'scenes of great triumphs and failures, inside information about princes both secular and ecclesiastical, matter of provincial but intense interest, scandalous gossip, tales of exotic places'.

[172] See Partner 1977, pp. 2-3.

[173] Peter von Moos, 'Poeta und Historicus im Mittelalter: Zum Mimesis-Problem am Beispiel einer Urteile über Lucan', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Deutschen Sprachen und Literatur,* 98 (1973), p. 96.

[174] Partner 1977, p. 4.

[175] Henry of Huntingdon: *Historia Anglorum*, second quarter twelfth century; William of Newburgh: *Historia rerum Anglicarum*, mid to late twelfth century; Richard of Devizes: *Chronicon de rebus gestis Ricardi Primi*, late twelfth century.

[176] Chinca/Young 2016 p. 16.

'invention of a mythical past intended both as serious construction and as entertainment [can be found] in the anonymous author of the *Gesta Treverorum*, who supplied an elaborate pre-Roman history for his city, or in Godfrey of Viterbo, who in his works gathered together *exempla* from every possible source he could get his hands on.'[177] Chinca and Young propose to position the *Kaiserchronik* alongside those texts,[178] which Reuter goes on to characterise as 'counterparts of Geoffrey of Monmouth or perhaps to the *Policraticus'*.[179] The main areas of interest and lines of argument Reuter sketches out for twelfth-century historiography from the German lands only corroborates Chinca's and Young's claim: the 'question […] where the community had come from and where it was going' is deeply ingrained in the *Kaiserchonik*'s interest in aetiology. It is one of the texts which transmit – seemingly independently from each other – the story of Caesar's close affiliation with the Germans and their crucial importance for his rise to power. A couple of decades later Godfrey of Viterbo, who also knew of Caesar's special relation with the Germans,[180] would expand this connection by tracing the genealogy of Henry VI back to Julius Caesar and the Trojans.[181] Finally, the *Kaiserchronik* displays a certain interest in traditions of local history, which imbue particular regions or cities in the polycentric German Empire with historical authority,[182] like the Augustus episode for Cologne, Metz and Trier (KC 643-63), the Tiberius episode for Regensburg (KC 685-89), the Lucretia episode again for Trier (KC 4305-16), the Adelger episode for Bavaria (6622-7135), or the Henry II episode for Bamberg (KC 16,188-16,239). The *Kaiserchronik* has very much been part of a 'wider northern European historiographico-literary

---

177 Timothy Reuter, 'Past, Present and No Future in the Twelfth-Century Regnum Teutonicum' in *The Perception of the Past in Twelfth-Century Europe* ed. by Pau Magdalino (London, Rio Grande 1992), p. 17.

178 See Chinca/Young 2016, p. 16.

179 Reuter 1992, pp. 17-18. For John of Salisbury's *Policraticus* as 'Thesaurus exemplorum' see: von Moos 1988, pp. 134-38.

180 As the MGH edition by Georg Petz from 1872 (see below) is far from complete I am referring here to the much older but also more comprehensive edition by Johannes Herold from 1559. It has been made accessible online by the Heinrich Heine Universität Düsseldorf in 2011 (http://digital.ub.uni-duesseldorf.de/urn/urn:nbn:de:hbz:061:1-75610, retrieved on 26.10.17). Gottfried of Viterbo, *Pantheon Sive Vniuersitatis Libri*, ed. by Johannes Herold (Basel 1559), Caesar conquers the Germans see Cap. XII, col. 319: *Rheno etiam flumine transmeato, Germanos ferocissimos, tam bello quam muneribus, omnes deuicit. Germanorum autem virtutem & fortitudinem, qui scire desiderat, Suetonium legat. Iosephus etiam & Egesippus, de ipsis tamquam de hominibus mori non timentibus incredibilem audaciam & fortitudinem atque uirtutem describerunt.* Caesar, the Romans, and the Germans share a common ancestry see Cap. X, col. 248: *Dum fortuna duces Germanos laeta decorat, Crescitque alta sonat super omnia climata Roma, Cuius ad imperium, praelia magna tonant. Hanc quasi reginam metuit satis hora marina, Terra Cisalpina timet, aduentate ruina, Sed loca Germana, quadia magna parant. Nam quos Troia suos olim generauit alumnos, Romans & Germanos uidet undique; summos, Et quasi consocios semper habebit eos.*

181 See Gottfried of Viterbo, *Speculum Regnum*, MGH SS 22 ed. by Georg Pertz (Hannover 1872), p. 21: *Ad dominum Henricum VItum regem romanorum et theutonicorum, filium dominum Frederici imperatoris de genealogia omnium regum et imperatorum Troianorum et Romanorum et Theutonicorum a tempore diluvii usque in hodiernum diem.* For the use of rhetorical examples in Godfrey's Pantheon on the example of Alexander the Great see Anneke Mulder-Bakker, 'A Pantheon Full of Examples: The World Chronicle of Godfrey of Viterbo' in *Exemplum et Similitudo: Alexander the Great and Other Heroes as Points of Reference in Medieval Literature,* Mediaevalia Groningana 8 ed. by W.J. Aerts and M. Gosman (Gröningen 1988), pp. 88-92.

182 See Reuter 1992, pp. 26-27.

scene'.[183]

The unperturbed oscillation of twelfth-century chronicles, Latin or vernacular, between rhetorical education and entertainment, pertains to the broader question of their poeticity: a question highly relevant for the *Kaiserchronik*. The pairing of education and entertainment cannot of course simply be synchronised with fact and fiction, for it is the modern perspective that expects educational content to confine itself to factuality and only wants to allow fictitious material for purposes of literature and entertainment. It has become clear that this analytical segregation was not a preoccupation shared by historical texts, and that both historiographical and more literary texts could fulfil Aristotle's poetic imperative as paraphrased by Peter von Moos in his influential study on Lucan's poeticity: '[…] daß […] die symbolschaffende Organisation der rohstofflichen Fülle ereignishafter Erscheinungen zu einer allgemein intelligiblen Struktur, in der das Vergangene allein unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Verweisfunktion für eine zukünftige Entwicklung verallgemeinert wird.'[184]

Lucan is a useful example because critics since late antiquity have been arguing about whether he is *poeta an historicus*. Von Moos uses this controversy to show that the most important link between historicity and poeticity is rhetoric. At the beginning of Christian Latin literature lies the antique practice of rhetorical paraphrase of poetry, which in turn encompassed both poetic works like Ovid, works which were considered to be historiographical, like Virgil's *Aeneid,* but also books of the Bible. There is no discernible conceptual difference between for example metrical and non-metrical discourse, which would serve a modern audience as a touchstone: both were seen as interchangeable arts.[185] The medieval author follows the antique orator in his role as a rhetorical presenter, which translated into what Partner would call an amplification of his material.[186] Peter von Moos showed through the example of Lucan's *Pharsalia* and its reception in Antiquity and the Middle Ages how poetry and historiography were regarded as just two different manifestations of the same rhetoric, which he defines as 'die Kunst des vergrößernden Realitätsbezugs'.[187]

How the *Kaiserchronik* modulates its own poetological position in the context of other twelfth-century texts is the objective of the next section, which takes the text's prologue as the poetologically and rhetorically most charged part of the chronicle into focus.

---

[183] Chinca/Young 2016, p. 18.
[184] von Moos 1973, p. 97.
[185] See Curtius 1953, p. 148.
[186] See Partner 1977, p. 206.
[187] von Moos 1973, p. 116.

III.2 The Prologue of the *Kaiserchronik*

III.2.1 The Historical Programme of Medieval Prologues

The prologue has – alongside the epilogue and literary excursuses[188] – long been identified as the most important place in a medieval text to find theoretical insights concerning the poetics of a genre.[189] In many cases it remains the only instance for this kind of discussion. The prologue is the place where the medieval author locates himself in the tradition of the texts that preceded his own.[190] Here reflection on and the conventions of traditional poetics meet and become visible.[191] When writing the prologue the author has to rely on his own words and cannot simply take them over from a source, which, especially in a text like the *Kaiserchronik,* which is otherwise so heavily informed by its sources, makes a closer look at these passages all the more relevant.[192]

In the case of the *Kaiserchronik*, no epilogue survives – if there ever was one: it is a characteristic trait of chronicle writing to be continued from generation to generation as in fact happened with the *Kaiserchronik*.[193] So the lack of an epilogue as a reference point where the narration can be poetically reflected and closed is one of the typical implications of chronographic writing: while chronicles are written following a narrative sequence they do not integrate it into their textual execution. Content is organised strictly chronologically and therefore lacks an internal reference framework which makes it possible to register the events depicted as part of a greater narrative whole.[194] This remains all the more true for a text like the *Kaiserchronik* whose material

---

188 Walther Haug, *Literaturtheorie im deutschen Mittelalter. Von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Darmstadt 1992), p. 4.

189 See Ernst Friedrich Ohly, Wolframs Gebet an den Heiligen Geist im Eingang des Willehalm, *ZfdA*, 91 (1961/62), p. 19.

190 See Paul Zumthor, *Essai de poétique médiévale* (Paris 1972), pp. 79-82.

191 See Haug 1992, p. 3.

192 Eckart Conrad Lutz, *Rhetorica Divina: Mittelhochdeutsche Prologgebete und die rhetorische Kultur des Mittelalters* (Berlin, New York 1984), p. 87.

193 The Bavarian continuation was probably written in the middle of the thirteenth century and survives in 5 manuscripts of the C recension: Vienna Österreichische Nationalbibliothek Codex Nr. 2658 and Nr. 12487, Landesbibliothek Karlsruhe Cod. Aug. 52, Schloss Zeil ZAMs 30, München Staatsbibliothek Cgm 965. Edward Schröder left cgm 965 of the C recension by Christoph Tegernseer from 1594 out of his edition of the Bavarian continuation 'wegen ihrer jugend und der absonderlichen manieren ihres urhebers'. Schröder 1895, p. 393. The Bavarian continuation pushes the narrative till the death of Frederick II 1250. The second continuation, referred to as the Swabian continuation only survives in ZAMs 30 and continues the imperial succession till Rudolf of Habsburg in the year 1274. Edward Schröder feels confident in dating the Swabian continuation to 1281, so about another generation after the Bavarian continuation. See Schröder 1895, p. 409.

194 See Jörn Rüsen, 'Die vier Typen des historischen Erzählers' in *Formen der Geschichtsschreibung*, Beiträge zur Historik 4 ed. by Heinrich Lutz and Jörn Rüsen (Munich 1982), pp. 543-44.

organisation is ultimately non-chronological but whose formal structure at least projects a strict chronological trajectory.

This section aims to provide a close reading of the poetologically and rhetorically relevant passages of the *Kaiserchronik*'s prologue. Guiding questions of this reading will be how the prologue is structured and how it relates to other early Middle High German texts and the broader rhetorical tradition in Latin as it would have been available to the author in the middle of the twelfth century.

The prologue of a medieval text does several things: it usually depicts 'the narrator in the persona of a poet addressing imagined readers as peers'; it 'center[s] on language, literature, and knowledge'; finally it is used by poets to 'situate […] narrators or their narratives in relation to the past by means of conventional topoi that depict the past.'[195]

The first question to be answered will be whether or not the *Kaiserchronik* does in fact have a prologue that satisfies the standard rhetorical definitions of this *pars orationis*. Bernd Naumann claimed for early Middle High German religious poems that they do not have 'Pro- und Epiloge als formal und inhaltlich eigenständige Gebilde, für die die mittelalterliche Rhetoriktradition bestimmte Forderungen aus der Antike übernommen oder neu ausgebildet hat.' Naumann goes on to note that the manuscripts usually do not mark the prologues of the texts he is looking at. It could be objected that this lack of marking proves simply that contemporary or later scribes saw no need to demarcate these components. And Naumann concedes that they may contain 'einführende und abschließende Verspartien, die inhaltlich und sprachlich (anderes Tempus, Zeitadverbien, Wechsel der verwendeten Pronomina bei der Publikumsadresse) vom Hauptteil abgehoben sind'. However, as he points out, often it remains unclear how long these passages are and where they cross over into the main part of the text.[196] As the early religious texts Naumann examines provide the largest rhetorical context in German vernacular for the *Kaiserchronik* a certain amount of caution seems appropriate.

The second question to be considered is how the first forty-two lines of the *Kaiserchronik* operate in relation to the text as a whole and to other vernacular and Latin texts of the time. Traditionally the prologue would be the place for a medieval poet to 'display virtuosity' and at the same time use it as a 'metaliterary forum' to reflect on the medium and thus make the literary

---

[195] Sunhee Kim Gertz, *Poetic Prologues: Medieval Conversations with the Literary Past* in Analecta Romanica 56 (Frankfurt aM 1996), p. 19.

[196] Bernd Naumann, 'Ein- und Ausgänge: Frühmittelhochdeutsche Gedichte und die Predigt des 12. Jahrhunderts' in *Studien zur Frühmittelhochdeutschen Literatur.:Cambridger Colloquium 1971* ed. by Leslie Peter Johnson and others (Berlin 1974), pp. 38-39. The Middle High German *Hochzeit* wo be a prime example for this problem.

process visible for the audience who are about to embark on the reception of the text.[197] It also serves as the rhetorical platform to prepare readers for the content of the text and to influence in advance their verdict on what they are about to receive.[198]

Rhetoric provides a broad array of literary devices to achieve this. As part of the *septem artes liberales* rhetoric had been conserved from classical learning for the Middle Ages[199] and had by the twelfth century transferred its teachings and demands to historiography. Influential sources to transmit rhetorical tradition were e.g. Cicero's *De Inventione*, which was known as *rhetorica vetus* and for which Thierry of Chartres, the teacher of John of Salisbury, wrote one of the earlier medieval commentaries in his *Heptateuchon.* Additionally of influence was the anonymous first-century BCE rhetorical handbook *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, which was until the sixteenth century also ascribed to Cicero as his *Rhetorica nova.*[200] Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria* and the relevant sections of the encyclopaedic works of Martianus Capella or Isidore of Seville were influential maybe to a lesser degree.[201] Schulz identifies the three basic rules of rhetorical *narratio* to enter medieval Latin historiography as the demands for truth, for brevity, and for lucidity,[202] which correlate of course with Cicero's famous instructions on how to deliver a good speech: *Oportet igitur eam tres habere res: ut brevis, ut aperta, ut probabilis sit.*[203] Writing a hundred years later the Roman rhetorician Quintilian, whose *Institutio Oratoria* influenced medieval rhetoric until the mid-twelfth century before disappearing almost completely,[204] summarises the purpose of the prologue in as straightforward mission statement:

---

197 See Gertz 1996, p. 20.

198 Henning Brinkmann, 'Der Prolog im Mittelalter als literarische Erscheinung' in *Studien zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 2 vols ed. by the author (Düsseldorf 1966), II, p. 82.

199 Eckhard Kessler, 'Das rhetorische Modell der Historiographie' in *Formen der Geschichtsschreibung*, Beiträge zur Historik 4 ed. by Reinhard Koselleck and others (Munich 1982), p. 59.

200 James Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages; A History of Rhetorical Theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance* (Berkeley, Los Angeles 1974)., pp. 106-10. pp. 116-123.

201 Marie Schulz, *Die Lehre von der historischen Methode bei den Geschichtsschreibern des Mittelalters (VI-XIII. Jahrhundert)*, Abhandlungen zur Mittleren und Neueren Geschichte 12 (Berlin, Leipzig 1909), pp. 133-34; Paul Klopsch, *Einführung in die Dichtungslehren des lateinischen Mittelalters* (Darmstadt 1980), pp. 40-47.

202 See Schulz 1909, pp. 121-23.

203 Marcus Tullius Cicero, *On Invention. The Best Kind of Orator. Topics*, Loeb Classical Library 386 trans. by H. M. Hubbell (Cambridge MA, 1949), Lib. I, Cap. 28. p. 56.

204 The reception of Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria* in the Middle Ages really begun in the ninth century but by the eleventh and twelfth century it had become readily available even though its actual influence on the practice of medieval rhetorics remains unclear. See Franz Brunhölzl, 'Quntilianus' in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* ed. by Robert-Henri Bautier and others, vols 9 (München, Zürich 1980-98), VII 1995,coll. 123-30.

> The sole purpose of the exordium is to prepare our audience in such a way that they will be disposed to lend a ready ear to the rest of our speech. The majority of authors agree that this is best effected in three ways, by making the audience well-disposed, attentive and ready to receive instruction. I need hardly say that these aims have to be kept in view throughout the whole speech, but they are especially necessary at the commencement, when we gain admission to the mind of the judge in order to penetrate still further.[205]

The ancient foundations of rhetoric had to undergo a many-layered process of appropriation towards its application in the Middle Ages.[206]

The main difference between the classical and the medieval perspective of rhetoric for the purpose of historiography is the agency of divine *providentia* in history, which turns historical occurrence into soteriological revelation and renders everything that happened before as necessary events, which explicate the particularities of divine activity. Whatever happens in history is now semanticised by providence and therefore certifiable in its factuality. History becomes 'objektiv wahrheitsfähig'. The task of rhetoric is no longer to constitute history but merely to furnish the historiographical representation of this soteriological truth. To facilitate this, simply sticking to the facts may not prove sufficient. History not only has to be true, it also has to be probable.[207] Thus Schulz is wrong when she claims that the occasionally surfacing *probabilitas* as a goal of rhetoric is simply being used synonymously with historiographical *veritas*, due to a thoughtless mechanical adoption of rhetorical vocabulary.[208]

The textual explication of probable v*erisimilitudo* is very much a complementary not an adversary category of historical epistemology, as Quintilian writes when he echoes Cicero:

---

[205] See Marcus Fabius Quintilianus, *Institutio Oratoria: Books I-III*, Loeb Classical Library 124, vols 2 (Cambridge MA, London 1920; repr. 1963) II, Lib IV, Cap. 1, § 5, p. 7: *Causa principii nulla alia est quam ut auditorem quo sit nobis in ceteris partibus accommodatior praeparemus. Id fieri tribus maxime rebus inter auctores plurimos constat, si beniuolum attentum docilem fecerimus, non quia ista non per totam actionem sint custodienda, sed quia initiis praecipue necessaria, per quae in animum iudicis ut procedere ultra possimus admittimur.*

[206] See, Klopsch 1980.

[207] See Kessler 1982, pp. 59-62.

[208] See Schulz 1909, p. 122.

> The statement of facts consists in the persuasive exposition of that which either has been done, or is supposed to have been done […]. Most writers, more especially those of the Isocratean school, hold that it should be lucid, brief and plausible (for it is of no importance if we substitute clear for lucid, or credible or probable for plausible).[209]

Anticipating criticism for this, Quintilian justifies his focus on verisimilitude by pointing out that '[t]here are many things which are true, but scarcely credible, just as there are many things which are plausible though false. It will therefore require just as much exertion on our part to make the judge believe what we say when it is true as it will when it is fictitious.'[210] By bringing the plausibility and power to convince of rhetorical speech into focus, Quintilian paves the way for one of the essential traits of the medieval historiographical application of rhetoric: truth is no longer constituted by the congruence of factual occurrence with its representation but through a 'Kommunikationsgemeinschaft'[211] within which this representation can be accepted as truth. To achieve this historiography must be geared to the mental categories and cultural axioms which organise the reality of this 'Kommunikationsgemeinschaft'[212] and can thus be utilised to reconstruct the past as 'true' history.[213] In the earlier twelfth century Anselm of Laon in his commentary on Lucan's *Pharsalia* went so far as to single out verisimilitude and narrating plausibly as a binding obligation for every writer, historian and poet alike.[214]

However, despite the changed applications of rhetoric in the Middle Ages, its forensic, deliberative, and epideictic mandate largely remained unaltered: to provide a set of literary and linguistic tools apt for gaining the audience's attention, curiosity and favour.[215]

---

[209] Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria,* Lib.IV, Cap. 2, § 31, p.68: *Nunc, quae sit narrandi ratio, subiungam. narratio est rei factae aut ut factae utilis ad persuadendum expositio* […]. *Eam plerique scriptores maximeque qui sunt ab Isocrate uolunt esse lucidam breuem ueri similem. Neque enim refert, an pro lucida perspicuam, pro ueri simili probabilem credibilemque dicamus.*

[210] See Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria,* Lib. IV, Cap. 2, § 34, p.68: *Sunt enim plurima uera quidem, sed parum credibilia, sicut falsa quoque frequenter ueri similia. Quare non minus laborandum est ut iudex quae uere dicimus quam quae fingimus credat.*

[211] Kessler 1982, p. 50.

[212] See Karl-Otto Apel, *Das Apriori der Kommunikationsgemeinschaft*, Transformation der Philosophie, vols 2 (Berlin 1994) II, p. 429.

[213] See Kessler 1982, p. 50.

[214] Mark Chinca, *Studies in the Poetics of Gottfried's Tristan* in Modern Humanities Research Association, Texts and Dissertations 35 (London 1993), pp. 86-89.

[215] Brinkmann 1966, p. 83.

III.2.2 The Rhetorical Structure of the Prologue

In the light of these considerations the question arises whether the *Kaiserchronik* and especially its prologue reflect the narrative virtues and argumentative pattern laid out above that would link it to the medieval interpretation and application of classical rhetoric. With regard to content the first forty-two lines of the *Kaiserchronik* breaks down into three distinct passages, which in the Vorau manuscript are marked by one-line initials.[216] Lines one to fourteen address and admonish the audience, lines fifteen to twenty-six summarise the content of the chronicle, and lines twenty-seven to forty-two turn against *scophelîche*[…] *wort*[…] (KC 31) and warn of the consequences of listening to them. Schröder indicates this in his edition by indenting the respective lines, as he does to mark the end of the prologue and the beginning of the historical narration proper at line forty-three.

These are of course editorial measures but a look at the recension A *Kaiserchronik* manuscripts reveals that they do in fact mark the break between line forty-two and forty-three, although usually not in a way different from markers used earlier to structure the prologue or later to shape the rest of the account. However, the text as edited by Schröder clearly presents an introductory passage, starting with the topical prayer-like invocation of *des almähtigen gotes minnen* (KC 1) and ending with the inchoative *nû grîfe wir daz guote liet an* (KC 42). This last line clearly indicates that the forty-one lines, which preceded it, are not to be considered as diegetic part of the *guote liet* but as some sort of proem, even though the accordant rhetorical terminology had in the twelfth century not yet been transferred into the German vernacular.[217]

A closer look at Naumann's criteria (tense, temporal adverbs, pronouns for address of the audience) will help to consolidate the status of the first forty-two lines of the *Kaiserchronik* as an independent textual complex. Most of the prologue is written in the present tense. Prominent exceptions are *mahten* (KC 12) and *waere* (KC 14), where the mode shifts into preterite subjunctive (Konjunktiv II) to ironically illustrate the futility of trying to teach the *tumben* (KC 6), and also the preterite indicative forms *wâren* (KC 21) and *phlâgen* (KC 22) where the historical content of the *crônicâ* (KC 17) is summarised. The rest is consistently written in the present tense only to completely switch into past tense after line forty-two.[218]

---

[216] See Matthews 2012, p. 6.

[217] See Naumann 1974, p. 38, footnote 7.

[218] E.g. *anebette* (KC 44), *muosen* (KC 47), *wart* (KC 50), *tâten* (KC 51), *sagent* (KC 52) etc..

The use of temporal adverbs and personal pronouns confirms this division: in the passage that summarises the content of the text, the phrase *vor uns* (KC 21) creates a sense of temporal distance between the audience and the events about to be presented. [U]*nze an disen hiutegen tac* (KC 23) fixate the linear progress through time until this distance is nullified as the event horizon of the *crônicâ*. The audience is addressed by the narrator as *iuh* (KC 4) and *iu* (KC 25) and later the voice of the text includes itself in their number: *uns* (KC 16; 21; 36) and *wir* (KC 42). After this, the use of temporal adverbs marks not only a long jump back in time in relation to the audience's time – *Hie bevor* – but also specifies the main categorial difference in temporal semantics: *bi der haiden zîten* (KC 43).

Clearly the *Kaiserchronik* has 'einführende Verspartien'[219] in Naumann's sense, where the poet speaks about his audience and his intentions,[220] albeit in a very opaque way and – much to the chagrin of many a scholar – he does not make any statements about himself. But does it qualify as a prologue in the rhetorical sense of the term?

A prologue, or *prooemium* has several possibilities for rhetorically preparing the reader or the audience.[221] Three attitudes of the audience have to be won, each to varying degrees depending on the quality of the speech's or text's theme to follow: *in ancipiti* [*causa*] *maxime benevolum iudicem, in obscuro docilem, in humili attentum parare debemus*.[222]

It would be futile to try to categorise the *Kaiserchronik* and its prologue according to one of the five forensic classes – Lausberg calls them 'Vertretbarkeitsrangstufen' – that classical rhetoric developed[223] and allow this result to shape the course of further enquiry, as a direct adherence to these principles is not to be expected. Instead it seems more appropriate to look at the three parts of the prologue and try to identify the different rhetorical devices at work and then reconnect them to their deliberative background and point out where and why this might not be possible.

The first two lines for example, dedicating the *lied* (KC 2) about to begin to *des almähtigen gotes minnen* (KC 1) echo the *invocatio* used to begin Latin charters of the time[224] but was also quite common in other twelfth-century Middle High German texts like the *Wiener Genesis*, Heinrich von Veldeke's *Servatius*, or the *Rolandslied* and often combined with claims for the

---

[219] Naumann 1974, p. 38.

[220] See Naumann 1974, p. 42.

[221] See Heinrich Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik: Eine Grundlegend der Literaturwissenschaft* (München 1960)., p. 150, §264.

[222] Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, Lib. IV, Cap. I, § 41, p. 28.

[223] Lausberg 1960, pp. 56-58, § 64. Honestum genus, anceps genus, admirabile genus, humile genus, obscurum genus.

[224] See W. Koch, 'Invocation' in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* ed. by Robert-Henri Bautier and others, vols 9 (München, Zürich 1980-98), V 1991, coll. 483-84. Phrases invoking Christ or God find their way into the beginning of legal documents in the sixth century.

respective text's truthfulness.[225] According to Brinkmann this kind of introduction has a double importance: it posits a generally shared and believed 'Lebenswahrheit' at the beginning of the text and thus helps to establish a common space for the author and his audience which can subsequently be entered by the narration proper.[226] After invoking the name of God and thus creating the universally shared space in line one which creates the space for his narration to unfold in, line two introduces the narrator's first-person voice *ich* and characterises its object as a *liet*. The last line of the prologue line forty-two picks this up in plural form when it announces: *nû grîfe wir daz guote liet an.* Dickhut-Bielsky has cautioned against overestimating the self-identification of the *Kaiserchronik* as a *liet*, and rightly points out that the text displays a very fluid use of possible terminologies for sources and literature as there was no fixed terminology for these in the twelfth century to begin with. [227]

Nevertheless, the mirrored self-identification as a *liet* seems too deliberate to dismiss it altogether. For the rest of the *Kaiserchronik* the lexem *liet* is overwhelmingly used analogously to *buoch* to confirm to the audience: *daz liet kundet uns daz* (KC 622, also 1190; 5176; 5671). In two other cases it appeals to the audience after the conclusion of a shorter narrative to now say a prayer for the benefit of someone deceased: *swer daz liet vernomen habe | der sol einen pater noster singen.* In KC 10,619 this appeal is part of the curious reference to *der des liedes alre êrist began* (KC 10,626) and in KC 17,165 the appeal is for Emperor Lothair of Supplinburg.

It is also quite striking that several other roughly contemporary German vernacular texts, which share a quasi-historical conceptualisation with the *Kaiserchronik*, speak of their accounts as *liet.* The *Eneasroman* uses *liet* almost exclusively to frame the source for its narrative, by repeatedly employing the phrase: *alsus saget uns daz liet* (ER 1256; 3740; 7914; 10,392; 13,306). Like the *Kaiserchronik* Heinrich von Veldeke leaves it open if the *liet* refers to his own narration or the source from which he is drawing. In the *Alexanderlied* the Pfaffe Lamprecht uses *liet* twice to refer to his own work (AXL 1; 7279) and twice to refer to the work of his alleged source Alberic of Besançon (AXL 14; 19). Only once is it used in the now established pattern in which the *Kaiserchronik* and the *Eneasroman* use references to the *liet* as source and/or self-identification (AXL 1980). Finally, *König Rother* uses the term in a similar ambiguously self-referential manner (KR 1503; 1826; 1906; 3490).

---

[225] See Matthews 2012, p. 6.

[226] See Brinkmann 1966, p. 86.

[227] Dickhut-Bielsky 2015, p. 52.

Without wishing to belabour the point, the semantics of *liet* can effortlessly take on several dimensions, none of them exclusive of the others. It might suggest an oral performance of the *Kaiserchronik* or at least try to implicate an oral dimension if not in the presentation than at least in its conception as a collation of orally transmitted reports. No one will disagree with Dickhut-Bielsky's conclusion that the *Kaiserchronik* is an entirely literarily conceptualised text.[228] The same can certainly be said of the other texts drawn upon above.

The written identity of the *Kaiserchronik* is first foregrounded in the second part of the prologue: *Ein buoch ist ze diute getihtet, | daz uns Rômisces rîches wol berihtet (*KC 15-16). Both *buoch* and the two verbs connected to it, *tihten* and *berihten,* suggest a more poetically conceptualised approach to the compilation of the text.[229] This could, however, be more indicative of *liet* too being products of careful written compilation, only feigning their orality. As orality suggests immediate report by someone who directly witnessed an event this simulated connection of orality and witness can benefit from the high degree of authority granted to eyewitness accounts due to Isidore of Seville's connection of *historia* with optical perception through *videre* and *cognoscere*.[230]

The situation of any medieval text and its relations to its sources between orality and writing, and their antagonistic authorities, remain a complex matter carefully to be determined carefully considering each text's peculiarities.[231] On the one hand, everything fixed in writing benefits from the fact that the first contents to be put down in writing in the vernacular were of a predominantly spiritual and religious nature, making their inherent authority a reference point for succeeding vernacular texts.[232] With its invocational sentence at the beginning the *Kaiserchronik* clearly attempts to tap into this easily available authority pool. On the other hand, written records were often regarded with suspicion, especially when they dealt in the affairs of faraway lands, and orally transmitted eye-witness reports were granted a higher authority[233] notwithstanding their notorious

---

[228] Dickhut-Bielsky 2015, p. 52.

[229] See e.g. Ortnit und die Wolfdietriche, *Deutsches Heldenbuch* 3,1 ed. by Arthur Amelung and Oscar Jänicke (Berlin 1971), Wolfdietrich A 334,1: *Wolfdietrich in altem dichte hat siebenn hundert lied*.

[230] See Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiarum*, Lib. I, Cap. 41.: *Dicta autem Graece historia ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱστορεῖν, id est a videre vel cognoscere.* See also: Mark Amsler, *Etymology and Grammatical Discourse in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, Studies in the History of the Language Sciences 44 (Amsterdam, Philadelphia 1989), pp. 165-66.: 'He [Isidore] deploys the criterion of eyewitness truth to supplement his earlier explanation that *fabula* depicts what can never happen. […] By distinguishing between eyewitness *historia* and secondary *annales*, Isidore associates *historia* with the Gospels as eyewitness account (Jn 19:35) and with the rhetorical device of *adtestio rei visae*.'

[231] Stackmann 1990, p. 65.

[232] See Günter Butzer, 'Das Gedächtnis des epischen Textes: Mündliches und schriftliches Erzählen im höfischen Roman des Mittelalters', *Euphorion*, 89 (1995), p. 169.

[233] See Jens Hirt, *Literarisch-politische Funktionalisierungen: Eine Untersuchung mittelhochdeutscher Kreuzzugsdarstellungen: 'Wilhelm von Wenden', 'Die Kreuzfahrt des Landgrafen von Thüringen', 'Wilhelm von Österreich' und 'Das Buch von Akkon'* in Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik 766 (Göppingen 2012), p. 140.

unreliability.[234] Dickhut-Bielsky suggested shifting the focus from the dichotomy of orality and writing to the one of German and Latin 'Schriftkultur', which converge in the *Kaiserchronik*.[235] While I think that this is in general a more productive way to look at the problem, I would not wish to diminish the possibility of the *Kaiserchronik*'s feigning its own orality in order to benefit from the authority ascribed to oral tradition. This should of course not exclude the possibility that there actually could have been oral traditions influencing the chronicle. A differentiation between feigned and actual oralitiy does not seem possible at this point.

The oscillation between the four closely intertwined and interconnected concepts of orality and writing, of vernacularity and *latinitas* in the *Kaiserchronik*, is mirrored by the results of a quantitative lexical examination executed with the search algorithm of the MHDBDB.[236] Later the chronicle uses *liet* in eight instances to refer to the text or its presumed sources[237] whereas in ninety-nine cases the term is *buoch.* However, in fifty of these cases the verb that marks the relational process from source to audience is *sagen*, which in thirteen cases is paired with *hôren*,[238] in thirty-three with *kunden*, and once with *jehen.*[239]

Now these verbs imply the reading aloud of written books rather than some kind of oral tradition and might at this point already have acquired an extended literal meaning, like 'to inform'. Only in two cases the *buoch tuot kunt* (KC 277; 13,439), which can also imply an oral element, in one case it *zellet* (KC 11,309) by providing a list of Cyrillus's virtues, and in only one case it actually *urchundet* (KC 16,271). With the *buoch* being the actor in these lines, the goal of the relational process is almost exclusively marked by the first person plural pronoun *wir* or its accusative and dative form *uns*.[240] The narrator is including himself in the text's audience and vice versa incorporating the audience in the hermeneutic act of source analysis. The book is being imagined as speaking to the audience and the author; the text becomes an ector who performs in the hermeneutic act as much as the audience. This may relate to a performative way of presenting the contents of the *Kaiserchronik*, with a reader reading the text aloud to an audience but it also marks the combined

---

[234] See Johannes Fried, *Geschichte und Gehirn, Irritationen der Geschichtswissenschaft durch Gedächtniskritik* in Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse Mainz 7 (Mainz 2003), pp. 1-43.

[235] See Dickhut-Bielsky 2015, p. 55 esp. footnote 86. Similarly See Ernst Hellgardt, 'Dietrich von Bern in der deutschen "Kaiserchronik": Zur Begegnung mündlicher und schriftlicher Traditionen' in *Deutsche Literatur und Sprache von 1050-1200: Festschrift für Ursula Henning zum 65. Geburtstag* ed. by the author and Hans-Jochen Schiewer (Berlin 1995), p. 95.

[236] Mittelhochdeutsche Begriffsdatenbank (MHDBDB), ed. by Universität Salzburg, 1992-2017 <http://www.mhdbdb.sbg.ac.at/> [multiple accesses].

[237] See KC 622; 1190; 5176; 5671; 10,619; 10,624; 15,072; 17,165.

[238] Recurring throughout the text: *nû hôren wir diu buoch sagen*.(e.g. KC 13,417).

[239] KC 14,034 has *jehen* paired with *hôren*.

[240] Recurring throughout the text: *daz buoch chundet uns* (e.g. KC 15,335).

effort to (re)construct history within the mental categories shared by author and audience, becoming manifest in the text, both in the process of poetical conceptualisation and writing, and in the receptive process of performance.[241]

With this as background, the rhetorical devices employed as the prologue continues become clearer and help to determine whether the *Kaiserchronik*'s first forty-two lines can indeed be classified as a prologue in the rhetorical sense.

Walter Haug thought so too, as he includes this passage in his interpretations of early Middle High German prologues to glean insights into their texts' poetics.[242] He argues that it includes several arguments drawn from the repertoire of 'Exordialtopik',[243] for example the demand to receive the text adequately, that it will be useful for the audience to listen to it, because only the foolish would do without acquiring wisdom and reputation.[244]

Indeed, a closer analysis of the prologue unearths a sophisticated implementation of a multitude of rhetorical devices and strategies, for example when the narrator first addresses his audience: *jâ mac iuh vil wole gezemen | ze hôren älliu frumichait* (KC 4-5). The approach can be connected to the rhetorical strategy of *benevolum parare*,[245] first speaking to the audience *ab iudicium* […] *persona*, by appealing to its judgement and didactically pointing out the usefulness of the author's narration to his audience.[246] He then constitutes them as a group in contrast to those who are not interested in hearing his *liet: die tumben dunchet iz arebeit, | sculn si iemer iht gelernen | od ir wîstuom gemêren* (KC 6-8). History, or knowledge thereof is *ex negativo* developed as a useful resource to have for once own's educational betterment. No audience will be overly inclined to count themselves among the *tumben*. This corresponds to the rhetorical speaking *ab adversariorum nostrum persona*, which aims to denigrate the position of those averted from the *causa* of the speaker, or in this case the narrator. The next lines continue in this line of rhetoric by disqualifying an unsympathetic audience as *unnuzze* (KC 9) and denying them *guoter wizze* (KC 10). Simultaneously, lines seven to fourteen advertise in another well-established manoeuvre of this

---

[241] For more on the audience's participation in creating meaning in medieval texts see Gert Melville, 'Durch Fiktionen von der Wirklichkeit zur Wahrheit. Zum mittelalterlichen Umgang mit Widersprüchen zwischen Empirie und kultureller Axiomatik' in *Fiktion und Fiktionalität in den Literaturen des Mittelalters. Jan-Dirk Müller zum 65. Geburtstag* ed. by Ursula Peters and Rainer Warning (Paderborn 2009), pp. 98-104.

[242] See Haug 1992, p. 66.

[243] Haug 1992, p. 69. See Lutz 1984, p. 88.

[244] See Haug 1992, p. 69. Haug's interpretation is deeply coloured by Ohly's reading of the *Kaiserchronik* and he interprets the core concepts of the prologue like *minne*, *wîstuom* and *êre* as soteriologically charged and pointing at eschatological typologies.

[245] See Lausberg 1966, p. 156, § 273. I am using Lausberg in full awareness of the problems his systematic paragraph-based approach to rhetorics causes. See Ulla Fix, *Rhetorik und Stilistik: Ein internationales Handbuch historischer und systematischer Forschung* (Berlin 2008), pp. 152-53.

[246] See Lausberg 1966, p. 158, § 277.

rhetorical mode *ex negativo* what a well-disposed audience can expect from the text:[247] increase in wisdom and learnedness, but also *êre* (KC 13) and finally *frum der sêle* (KC 14). The emphasis of the moral value of receiving the text adequately is characteristic for this rhetorical figure especially when employed in the literary sphere.[248] This does not strip especially the last element from the soteriological connotations commonly attributed to it[249] but does put it into rhetorical perspective.

Consequently, the next rhetorical step, which dominates the second part of the prologue (KC 15-26), is focussed on arguments *ab nostra persona*,[250] in this case the text that is going to be presented to the audience.

However, it remains ambiguous throughout the passage whether the *buoch* that is introduced in line fifteen and which is referred to as a *crônicâ* in line seventeen is indeed meant to be the *Kaiserchronik.* The text could indeed be referring to itself, like other twelfth-century authors such as Hartmann von Aue or Frau Ava who refer to themselves in the third person.[251] But the term could also refer to another book: the *Kaiserchronik*'s source, presumably in Latin, be it fabricated or real. German derivations of the ancient Greek χρονικός via Latin *chronica* would not have been unheard of in the middle of the twelfth century[252] but only became widespread in the thirteenth-century.[253] The use of the latinised form here does not necessarily mean that it refers to a Latin source and not to the *Kaiserchronik.* But neither does it necessarily imply a conscious choice in order to align the text with the broader tradition of Latin universal historiography.[254] If anything it will have triggered associations with Isidore of Seville's definition of chronicle in his seventh-century *Etymologiae*:

> 'Chronicle' (*chronica*) is the Greek term for what is called a 'succession of times' (*series temporum*) in Latin. Among the Greeks Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea, compiled such a work, and the priest Jerome translated it into Latin. Χρόνος in Greek

---

247 See Lausberg 1966, p. 159, § 278.

248 See Curtius 1953, p. 94.

249 E.g. Haug 1992, p. 69.

250 See Lausberg 1966, p. 157, § 275.

251 See Matthews 2012, p. 8.

252 See 'krônike, krônik' in *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch* ed. by Matthias Lexer, vols 3 (Leipzig 1872) I, col. 1749.

253 Ulrich von Etzenbach uses it broadly in his *Alexanderroman*. See Ulrich von Etzenbach, *Alexander,* Bibliothek des Litterarischen Vereins in Stuttgart 183 ed. by Wendelin Toischer (Tübingen 1888), 157; 1186; 1737; 15,933; 16,177; 16,700; 16,871; 17,321; 20,977; 24,692; 24,709; 25,559; 25,651; 25,776; 25,833.

254 See Hellgardt 1995, p. 95.

means ‘time’ in Latin.[255]

If accepted as a self-identification of the text this suggests the kind of text the *Kaiserchronik* was conceptualised and received as by author and audience, a fact often overlooked by all too eager proposals to change its name into an alternative more descriptive of the structure and perceived quality of its content.[256]

The way the text uses *buoch* throughout, as elaborated above, indicates strongly that these lines indeed refer to the *Kaiserchronik*. The text refers to itself by verbalising its own mode of oral recital by a reader to an audience.[257] Similarly *chundet uns* (KC 18) anticipates the language later utilised throughout the text. But most likely a medieval audience might not have been that concerned about a clear analytical exclusion of the *buoch* being either a reference to the *Kaiserchronik* or to its sources.

The ambiguity of the nature of the text is mirrored by the ambiguity of its purpose *ze diute* (KC 15), which means both that the text is intended for clear and helpful induction and explanation, but also that it is written in the German vernacular.[258] These two semantic dimensions are of course not mutually exclusive, in this case they appear inseparably intertwined with each other: the text stands at the beginning of historiography in the German vernacular in order to convey history to its non-Latin-speaking audience. And to make history conceivable for this new audience it is not sufficient to simply write in their language, but, as developed in the rhetorical tradition from Quintilian to John of Salisbury, to model its objects towards their cultural axioms and historically preconceptualised expectations. The meaning of *ze diute* encompasses both basic linguistic understandability and categorical cultural comprehensibility. The manuscripts of the A recensions certainly don’t display a tendency to clarify: Vorau StAV-Ms 276 reads *divte* (fol. 1ra), Wolfenbüttel Cod. Guelf. 15.2 Aug. 2° *tewtfch* (fol. 23rb), Heidelberg cpg 361 *dúte* (fol. 1ra), Munich Cgm 37 *devte* (fol.1ra). Dickhut-Bielsky naturally argues for a translation with ‘Deutung’, ‘Auslegung’, or

---

[255] Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, Lib. V, Cap. 28.: *Chronica Graece dicitur quae Latine temporum series appellatur, qualem apud Graecos Eusebius Caesariensis episcopus edidit, et Hieronymus presbyter in Latinam linguam convertit. Χρόνος enim Graece, Latine tempus interpretatur.* Translation: Isidore of Seville, The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville trans. by Stephen Barney and others (Cambridge2006).p. 125.

[256] See e.g. Christian Gellinek, ‘The German Emperor's Chronicle: An Epic Fiction?’, *Colloquia Germanica*, 5 (1971), pp. 230-36. Gellinek suggests to rename it into ‘Deutsches Kaiserepos’.

[257] See Dennis Howard Green, *Medieval Listening and Reading: The Primary Reception of German Literature 800-1300* (Cambridge 1994), p. 101.

[258] See ‘diute, tiute’ in *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch* ed. by Matthias Lexer, vols 3 (Leipzig 1872) I, col. 443. The etymological relatedness and semantic connectedness of modern German ‘deutlich’ and ‘deutsch’ – both ‘deuten’ and ‘deutsch’ are derivations of Old High German *diot* – perpetuates this until today. See articles ‘deutlich’, ‘deuten’, ‘deutsch’ in *Kluge: Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache* ed. by Elmar Seebold (Berlin, Boston 2011)., pp. 194-95.

'Erklärung'. I doubt that the *Kaiserchronik* positions another clue here to invite the audience to its hermeneutical exegesis, but Dickhut-Bielsky is certainly right to point out that the ambiguity and polyvalence of the wording might be intentionally implemented in the text.[259]

The chronicle goes on to explain its purpose by the verb *berihten* in the following line (KC 16), the meaning of which goes beyond the modern German semantic value of 'zu berichten' as in to merely convey or relate information in a somehow formalised manner, but in its Middle High German use strongly infuses order and structure to the object it refers to, in this case *Rômisces rîche* […] (KC 16).[260] The passage goes on to identify the text as *crônicâ* (KC 17). So far in the second part of the prologue the technical language of rhetoric has been scant, the focus clearly fixed on conveying hard information on the what, how, and when of the *Kaiserchronik*. But it closes with a clearly more rhetorical formula, when the voice of the text announces: *sô ich aller beste mac | sô wil ich iz iu vor zellen* (KC 24-25). Here the author clearly deploys a modesty topos, usually deployed in rhetoric when arguing *ab nostra persona.*[261] When he declares that he will tell *iz* (his narration) according to the best of his ability, he is not just alluding to his alleged limitations as a narrator, but also drawing the audience's attention to his humility by acknowledging these. Compared to classical authors[262] but also to contemporary Latin and vernacular German texts, this happens in a comparably reduced form which suggests its implementation was perceived as more of a compulsory exercise, a testimony to the sustained commitment to rhetorical rules and norms.

III.2.3 Antagonising Texts

The third part of the prologue (KC 27-42), develops a much-discussed didactic programme which is framed by polemical rhetoric, which rears its head again when the voice of the narrator bemoans a new malpractice which is introduced as only having *in disen zîten* (KC 27) become established:

> manege erdenchent in lugene
> unt vuogent si zesamene
> mit scophelîchen worten. KC 27-31

[259] See Dickhut-Bielsky 2015, p. 54.

[260] See 'be-rihten' in *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch* ed. by Matthias Lexer, vols 3 (Leipzig 1872) I, col. 191.

[261] See Lausberg 1966, p. 157, § 275.

[262] See Curtius 1953, pp. 83-86.

The infamous *scophelîche*[…] *wort*[…] (KC 31), which the *Kaiserchronik* puts at the core of the literature the passage criticises have usually been read together with the *Annolied* prologue and its polemics against heroic epic, which admonishes that instead of getting engrossed by the *singen* (AL 1,1) of the heroic, military, social, and political topoi and topics of epic poetry, one would do far better to consider one's own mortality (AL 1,1-8).[263]

Coupled with Wissmann's linguistic analysis, where he connects the *Kaiserchronik*'s *scophelîchen* with the Old English *scop*, a singer of heroic oral poetry who figures in many Old English epics,[264] a derogative interpretation of *scophelîch* has become the critical consensus. According to Kartschoke it is used as a marker for the programmatic opposition between the more literarily conceptualised literary tradition of Christian authors and the minstrels, the carriers of oral poetry, who would only disseminate lies.[265] The most concise elaboration of this approach can be found in Hellgardt's examination of the Dietrich von Bern figure.[266] However, more recently Matthews has pointed out that the only other instance of the critical word – as *schoflichen* – can be found in the twelfth-century *Trierer Silvester*[267] in a passage taken almost verbatim from the *Kaiserchronik*. By developing the etymological connection of *scophelîch* with its derivations and profiling its meaning as mainly 'creative', or 'shaping', he casts doubt on the idea that the passage necessarily targets oral heroic poetry. Instead he contends it should be read as an expression of hostility against narrative currents which distract audiences from listening to religious teachings.[268] But the classical reading of the passage as a polemic against heroic epics or oral tradition in general persists. For example, it remains instrumental for Görlitz's argument. She aligns the polemical reading with the *Kaiserchronik*'s more general pejorisation of Greekness[269] as a usurpation of imperial – legitimately Roman – power. In her view, these two elements together prove that the chronicle's negative view of heroic epics not only extends to a narrative tradition but also to the entire historical timeframe to which this tradition of heroic epics is tied: the 'heroic age' of the great migrations between the fourth and the sixth century, which occurred at a time where there was no

---

263 See e.g. Gellinek 1971, pp. 22-25.

264 Wilhelm Wissmann, 'Skop', *Sitzungsberichte der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 2 (1955), p. 14.

265 Dieter Kartschoke, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur im frühen Mittelalter* (München 2000), p. 34.

266 See Hellgardt 1995, p. 95: 'Wenn aber von den hier attackierten Lügengeschichten gesagt wird, sie seinen mit *scophelîchen worten* zusammengefügt, so verweist dieser Ausdruck eindeutig auf die Praxis mündlicher Dichtungstradition, und im hier gegebenen Kontext von Geschichte als Gegenstand der Darstellung wird ma annehmen dürfen, daß dabei besonders an solche mündliche Dichtung gedacht ist, deren Inhalte für historisch wahr gehalten werden wollen und wurden, u.a. also z.B. an die Heldensage. Aus der polemischen Sicht des Kaiserchronikprologs aber wird der Wahrheitsanspruch mündlicher Dichtung bestritten und historisch gerade im Blick auf Gegenwart und Zukunft als verderblich gebrandmarkt.'

267 *Trierer Silvester*, MGH S Dt. Chron. 1,2 ed. by Carl Kraus (Hannover 1895), pp. 1-45.

268 See Matthews 2012, p. 13.

269 For some examples for this tendency see chapter II.1.4 of this thesis.

Latin but only a Greek Empire. Building on this, Goerlitz ascribes to the *Kaiserchronik* a general programme of denigrating and disqualifying this time marked by its 'Romferne'.[270]

The continuing currency of the reading that the polemic aims at heroic traditions is quite understandable. It fits in nicely with the established reading of the *Kaiserchronik* as a salvation historical account and also connects to the earlier lines of the prologue where it promises *frum der sêle* (KC 14) to those who turn to the text attentively. Another factor supporting this reading is the *Kaiserchronik*'s criticism of the anachronistic conflation of the lifetimes of Dietrich and Etzel (KC 14,176-87), as heroic epics are wont to do. However, if the passage were to be read as an attack on heroic literature, it would be a rather implicit one and, what is more, it does not reflect at all the rest of the *Kaiserchronik*'s treatment of historical protagonists, where it constantly conflates, omits, or mixes up personages. It has been pointed out that the passage follows Frutolf's similar observations on how, according to Jordanes's *Getica*, Dietrich and Attila could not have been contemporaries.[271] A couple of decades later Otto of Freising would echo Frutolf's remarks in language remarkably similar to the *Kaiserchronik*.[272] Both opt for impersonal formulations which leave it open whom exactly they are criticising. The topical offence that Frutolf, Otto, and the *Kaiserchronik* take was already articulated in the middle of the eleventh century, when Canon Meinhard of Bamberg voiced his concerns about his superior, Bishop Gunther of Bamberg, and his choice of entertainment: in a letter written between 1057 and 1063, he complained to a colleague, who was temporarily absent from Bamberg in Carinthia, that Gunther did not care about the Church Fathers Augustine or Gregory, and was only interested in the exploits of Attila, the Amalungs, and others.[273] Gunther's cultural interests, however, not only provoked criticism but also made him the lauded patron of the

---

[270] See Görlitz 2014, pp. 232-33; 238-39.

[271] See Ekkehard of Aura, Chronica, MGH SS 6 ed. by Georg Waitz (Hannover 1844), p. 130: *Haec Iordanis quidam grammaticus, ex eorumque stirpe Gothorum progenitus, de Getarum origine et Amalorum nobilitate, non omnia quae de eis scribuntur et referuntur, ut ipse dicit, complexus, exaravit, sed brevis pro rerum notitia huic opusculo inseruimus. His perlectis diligenterque perspectis, perpendat qui discernere noverit, quomodo illud ratum teneatur, quod non solum vulgari fabulatione et cantilenarum modulatione usitatur, verum etiam in quibusdam cronicis annotatur, scilicet quod Ermenricus tempore Marciani principis super omnes Gothos regnaverit, et Theodericum, Dietmeri filium, patruelem suum, ut dicunt, instimulante Odoacare, item, ut aiunt, patruele suo, de Veronapulsum, apud Attilam Hunorum regem exulare coegerit, hystoriographus narret, Ermenricum egem Gothorum multis regibus dominantem tempore Ventiniani et Valentis fratrum regnasse* […].

[272] See *Chronica sive Historia,* Lib. 5, Cap. 3, pp. 381-82. *Quod autem rursum narrant eum Hermanarico Attilaeque contemporaneum fuisse, omnio stare non potest, dum Attilam longe post Hermanaricum constet exercuisee tyrannidem istumque post mortem Attilae octennem a patre obsidem Leoni augusto traditum.*

[273] See Briefe Meinhards von Bambergs, MGH, Epistolae, Briefe d. dt. Kaiserzeit, *Briefsammlung der Zeit Heinrichs IV.* ed. by Carl Erdmann and Norbert Fickermann, vols 8 (Weimar 1949-2002) V, II, No. 74, p. 122: *Quid vero agit domnus 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 strpitus! 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.*

very first lines of the *Ezzolied* (ll. 1-6).[274] What Meinhard might have thought of religious poetry like the *Ezzolied* now being written in the German vernacular remains undisclosed. The eponymous author certainly would have steered clear of accusations of occupying himself with secular and heroic matters, as the *Ezzolied* focuses on the miraculous qualities of Christ and the salvation historical bringing together of the Old and the New Testament.

Looking at the Dietrich-Etzel passage of the *Kaiserchronik* with these observations in mind and linking it to the antagonised texts in the prologue the conclusion that these must be heroic epics derived from oral Germanic traditions seems not unlikely. Hence the *Kaiserchronik* has been identified as the first text to transfer 'Sagenkritik' into the German vernacular sphere.[275]

Yet this reading focusses only on one aspect of the polemic. Equally important is the preceding line *erdenchent in lugene* (KC 29), which provides the mental frame for the *scophelîche wort*. From this it becomes apparent that the chronicle takes umbrage with a certain 'Verbindung von Darstellungs- und Inhaltsebene'.[276] The context of the prologue suggests that the *lugene* result in texts *ân gottes minne*, while the *Kaiserchronik* is of course, as the first line announces explicitly, dedicated to *gottes minnen*. Millet interpreted the dichotomy visible in this contrast as a possible clash of secular and spiritual texts,[277] while Dickhut-Bielsky integrated it into his argument by reading it as an opposition between 'auslegungsbedürftiger und nichtauslegungsbedürftiger'[278] literature. The more recent trend in scholarship to move beyond the restriction to heroic epics is certainly welcome but should be expanded by a closer look at the third trait characterising the aim of the *Kaiserchronik*'s polemic, which can be found couched in between the mental frame of *lugene* and the mode of presentation in the *scophelîche worte.*

Both are quite literally conjoined by the phrase: *unt vuogent si zesamene* (KC 30), which is presented as the process of modelling the *lugen* (KC 29) by means of *scophelîchen worte* (KC 31). The implications of this process have so far not received the attention they deserve, as it does appear to be the crucial link. Its consideration will add to the levels analysed by Dickhut-Bielsky, by suggesting that in addition to presentation and content, there is also the level of the mode or technique of narration. Examining the literary discourse on a mode of narration that uses

---

[274] *Die kleinen Denkmäler der Vorauer Handschrift* ed. by Erich Henschel and Ulrich Pretzel (Tübingen 1963), p. 2.

[275] Elisabeth Lienert, *Die historische Dietrichsepik. Untersuchungen zu 'Dietrichs Flucht', 'Rabenschlacht' und 'Alpharts Tod'* (Berlin 2010), p. 36.

[276] See Dickhut-Bielsky 2015, p. 57.

[277] Victor Millet, 'Das 12. Jahrhundert und die Heldensage', *Wolfram-Studien*, 16 (2000), pp. 256-8;. 256-81.

[278] Dickhut-Bielsky 2015, p. 58.

scophelîchen worte will allow us to get a clearer view of how the texts the *Kaiserchronik* targets in its prologue are actually conceived to construct their content and why this warrants reprimanding.

The *Kaisechronik*'s phrase resonates with the very first reflection on writing in the German vernacular all the way back to the very beginning of German writing: the ninth-century Benedictine monk Otfrid of Weissenburg is the first author to devise a vernacular perspective on rhetorical writing. In the prologue to his Old High German South Rhine Franconian *Liber Evangeliorum*, a gospel harmony written in the 860s and the first substantial German text in rhyming couplets,[279] he contextualises his work against the background of his classical predecessors:

> Tharana datun sie ouh daz duam: ougdun iro wisduam,
> ougdun iro cleini in thes tihtonnes reini.
> Iz ist al thuruh not so kleino giredinot:
> iz dunkal eigun funtan, zisamane gibuntan.
> Sie ouh in thiu gisagetin, thaz then thio buah nirsmahetin
> joh wol er sih firwesti, then lesan iz gilusti. *Liber Evangeliorum* 5-10

As a semantic predecessor of the *Kaiserchronik*'s phrasing *vuogent si zesamene* (KC 39), the phrase *zisamane gibuntan* (l. 8) stands out. It indicates elaborated and artful framing of language, including but not limited to rhyming couplets and rhetorical refinement. This kind of language can usefully be applied to biblical accounts without any need for mediation: *Ouh selbun buah frono irreinont sie so scono;| thar lisist scona gilust ana theheiniga akust (Liber Evangeliorum* 29-30). While Otfrid is not at all opposed to artful language, but rather wants to unlock it for the German vernacular, he also aims to draw a clear line between his writing and use of language he does not deem dignified or beneficial and whose prevalence in his time played a crucial part in motivating him to undertake his vernacular gospel harmony.

Otfrid prefixes the *Liber Evangeliorum* with a Latin letter to Bishop Liutbert of Mainz asking for his examination and approval.[280] In this letter he criticises two different types of literary discourse between which he aims to situate his writings. Both of them pertain to the discourse established above on different levels. Firstly, near to the end of his letter he remarks: 'He does not expect from

---

[279] See Otfrid von Weissenburg, *Evangelienbuch: Auswahl* ed. by Gisela Vollmann-Profe (Stuttgart 1987), RUB 8384, pp. 250-51.

[280] *Frühe Deutsche Literatur und Lateinische Literatur in Deutschland 800-1150*, p. 82: *Ad Liutbertum* l. 137: *Hunc igitur librum vestrae sagaci prudentiae probandum curavi transmittere* […] *Qui si sanctitatis vestrae placet optutibus, et non deiciendum iudicaverit, uti licenter fidelibus vestra auctoritas concedat: sin vero minus aptus parque meae neglegentiae paret, eadem veneranda sanctaque contempnet auctoritas.*

us the flattery of smooth words, but the pious alignment of our thinking and many works made in pious eagerness, not empty lip service.'[281] Secondly, in the beginning of the letter he elaborates:

> As once the presentation of useless things insulted the ears of excellent men and the obscene singing of the lays disturbed them in their pious spirit, I have been asked by some brothers […], to write them a vernacular harmony of the gospels, so the presentation of the holy text might push back a little the entertainment with secular songs, and the people might learn, engrossed by the sweetness of the gospels in their mother-tongue, to turn away from useless things.[282]

The object of criticism is different in the two passages. The second, earlier passage, establishes a later well-trodden line of topical criticism of secular literature, which usually aims to highlight the spiritually beneficial quality of the writer's own text. Otfrid's deprecation foreshadows the polemic voiced in the prologue to the *Annolied* two hundred years later, but also the concerns of the song's contemporary Meinhard and later Frutolf, Otto, and the *Kaiserchronik*. But, where they sniped at heroic epics, Otfrid, several centuries earlier complained about the works of *gentilium vates*, like Vergil, Lucan, and Ovid, flooding the entire world.[283] The *Kaiserchronik*'s polemic against *lugen*[…] (KC 29) *ân gotes minne* (KC 34) could well take aim at both those kind of texts respectively texts which share both sets of traits.

The first passage from Otfrid's *Ad Liutbertum* quoted above is much harder to pin down. Andreas Gardt suggested reading it as an implicit criticism of rhetoric, which paves the ground for the argument that the vernacular as language is less ornate and artful and thus better suited to express profound religious feelings and beliefs and not prone to be misused for *labrorum inanem servitiem*. This, however, does not fit with what has been observed above about Otfrid's hopes of instrumentalising rhetoric for vernacular writing and appears to be an argument implemented with hindsight of the discourses to come in later centuries.[284]

---

[281] See *Ad Liutbertum* l. 133: […] *verbum in eis suae laudis sonare, qui non verborum adulationem politorum, sed quaerit in nobis pium cogitationis affectum operumque pio labore congierem, non labrorum inanem servitiem.*

[282] See *Ad Liutbertum* l. 133: *Dum rerum quondam sonus inutilium pulsaret aures quorundam probatissimorum virorum, eorumque sanctitatem laicorum cantus inquietaret obscenus, a quibusdam* […] *fratres rogatus* […] *partem evangeliorum propria lingua occupati dulcedine, sonum inutilium rerum noverint declinare.*

[283] See *Ad Liutbertum* l. 18: *petitioni quoque iungentes queremoniam, quod gentilium vates, ut Vergilius, Lucanus, Ovidius caeterique quam plurimi suorum facta decorarent lingua nativa, quorum iam voluminum dictis fluctuare cognoscimus mundum.*

[284] See Andreas Gardt, *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft in Deutschland: Vom Mittelalter bis ins 20. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, New York 1999), pp. 17-18. Gardt admits that this reading is very implicit and not very wide-spread in the Middle Ages and might very well have been triggered by Otfrid's making a virtue out of necessity.

The opaque phrasing of KC 30 also resonates with a very prominent Old French prologue, much more contemporary to the *Kaiserchronik* than Otfrid, namely what Chrétien de Troyes would describe as the process of the composition of his first great romance *Erec et Enide* (EE), which was probably written around 1160.

> Por ce dit Crestiiens de Troies,
> Que reisons est que totes voies
> Doit chascuns panser et antandre
> A bien dire et a bien aprandre,
> Et tret d'un conte d'aventure
> Une mout bele conjointure *Erec et Enide* 9-14[285]

Chrétien's famous *conjointure* signifies a 'juncture, a joining action [and] conscious craftmanship'.[286] It serves as the first indicator of the author's aiming for a 'well-ordered story' and a 'coherent narrative' and might even imply a 'latent architectonic structure in the romance'.[287] Chrétien goes on to contrast his approach with *Cil qui de conter vivre vuelent* (EE 22), professional performers who played a key part in conveying the *matiere de Bretagne*[288] to the French, but whom Chrétien criticises for their incoherent and corruptive storytelling (EE 19-21). But does the parallel go beyond the superficial lexical parallelism of *zesamene vuogen* and *conjoindre*? Both texts aim to distinguish themselves from only vaguely specified other texts and modes of narration, which share an oral dimension and through their chaotic and incoherent arrangement are even harmful to the audience: Chrétien's antagonists' narratives are the product of *depecier et corronpre* (EE 21), and the texts the *Kaiserchronik* is antagonising cause *daz diu sêle dar umbe brinne* (KC 33). However, while Chrétien is claiming good composition as a sign of the quality of his narration, in the *Kaiserchronik* it is precisely the other way around: composition marks the other texts. The language employed for this is not necessarily pejorative in itself. In the very first lines of the Pfaffe Lamprecht's *Alexanderlied*, written approximately at the same time as Chrétien's first romance and

---

[285] Chrétien de Troyes; *Erec und Enide*, Klassische Texte des Romanischen Mittelalters 17 trans. by Ingrid Kasten (Munich 1971), pp. 12-15.

[286] Chrétien des Troyes, *Erec and Enide: Notes on the Poem* trans. by Dorothy Gilbert (Los Angeles, London 1992), p. 253.

[287] Jean Frappier, *Chrétien de Troyes: The Man and his Work* trans. by Raymond Cormier (Athens OH, 1982), p 45.

[288] Jehan Bodel, *La chanson des Saisnes* ed. by Annette Brasseur, Textes littéraires français 369, vols 2 (Geneva 1989), I, p. 3: *Ne sont que .III. matieres a nul home atandant: | De France et de Bretaigne et de Rome la grant.*

a good decade after the *Kaiserchronik*, the terminology of an architectonically conjoining composition of narrative is clearly intended to signify the high quality of Lamprecht's work:

> Diz lît, daz wir hî wurchen,
> das sult ir rehte merchen.
> Sîn gevuoge ist vil reht. *Alexanderlied* 1-3[289]

Another different but emphatically positive reverberation of the artistic craft of story-composition can be found in the early lines of the early Middle High German *Hochzeit*, written roughly contemporary with the *Kaiserchronik*:

> Swer diu zeichene wil began,
> der sol guoten list haben,
> also der smit vil guot
> die wiere in daz golt tuot. *Hochzeit* 7-10[290]

The imagination of textual production as artisanal craftsmanship was well established in early Middle High German texts and would usually be implemented with a positive connotation to either showcase the author's skill like in the *Alexanderlied*, or to vie for the audience's favour, as in the *Hochzeit*.[291] But the *Kaiserchronik* uses language which indicates this kind of writing in a pejorative way.

This leads to an alternative mode of imagining the process of composing text, which contrasts with the *zesamene vuogen* of the antagonistic compositional mode and was available to vernacular German literature in the middle of the twelfth century. Many texts written in the decades before and after the *Kaiserchronik* invoke this mode in their very first lines. The *Wahrheit*, written at the same time, asks God to bestow upon the first-person voice of the text the *sinne* to relate his message

---

[289] Pfaffe Lamprecht, *Alexanderroman* ed. by Elisabeth Lienert (Stuttgart 2007) RUB 18508., p. 55. This did not spare him from ridicule, when just under a century later, Rudolf von Ems would write in his Alexanderroman that Lamprecht would not have written of Alexander *die rehten wârheit*. (*Alexanderroman* 15,783-88).

[290] *Frühe Deutsche Literatur und Lateinische Literatur in Deutschland 800-1150*, p. 784-785.

[291] Sarah Bowden, 'Zur Poetik des mehrsinnigen Verstehens. Der allegorische Stil der Hochzeit' in *Literarischer Stil: Mittelalterliche Dichtung zwischen Konvention und Innovation*, XXII. Anglo-German Colloquium Düsseldorf (Berlin / Boston 2015), pp. 305-21.

faithfully (*Wahrheit* 1-9).[292] Similarly, the *Lob Salomons*, from the same time, invokes divine inspiration for its rendition.

Inclita lux mundi
dû dir habis in dîner kundi
erdin undi lufti
unde alli himilcrefti,
dû sendi mir zi mundi,
daz ich eddilîchin deil muzzi kundi *Lob Salomons* 1-6

Where the *Wahrheit* asks more generally for *sinne* (*Wahrheit* 3), the author of the *Lob Salomons* specifically calls for the necessary words to be transferred to his mouth. Hence the author is no longer a craftsman who artistically conjoins his text but a mere rhapsode,[293] who only proclaims (*kunden*) the divinely inspired words. The *Rolandslied*, whose author, the Pfaffe Konrad, was long thought to be the author of the *Kaiserchronik*,[294] fully embodies this inspirational mode:

Schephaere aller dinge,
keiser aller künigine,
wol du oberester êwart,
lêre mich selbe dîniu wort.
dû sende mir ze munde
dîn heilige urkunde,
daz ich die lüge vermîde,
die wârheit scrîbe *Rolandslied* 1-8

---

[292] *Die kleinen Denkmäler der Vorauer Handschrift*, p. 50.

[293] Rhapsodes were professional performers of oral epic poetry in Ancient Greece. Many of the texts they performed prominently style themselves as being externally – divinely – inspired, e.g. in the first line of Homer's Odyssey: 'Tell me, O Muse, of the man of many devices, who wandered full many ways after he had sacked the sacred citadel of Troy' Ironically the word rhapsode derives from ῥαψῳδεῖν, which translates into 'to sew together' but refers more to the stringing together of several songs in oral performance than to a mode of textual composition. See Barbara Graziosi, *Inventing Homer: The Early Reception of Epic* (Cambridge 2002), pp. 21-40.

[294] A case most prominently made by Edward Schröder himself in the introduction to his edition See Schröder 1895, pp. 51-58. It was ultimately refuted by Wesle's thorough lexical comparison of both texts in 1924. Karl Wesle, '"Kaiserchronik" und "Rolandslied"', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 48 (1924), pp. 223-58; pp. 223-58.

While Lamprecht, whose *lît* […] *wir hî wurchen* (AXL 1) and who embodies the compositional type, shifted the burden of the truthfulness of his account from his ability onto his source, but could not exclude erroneous storytelling (AXL 16-18), in the *Rolandslied* the possibility of inadvertently telling lies is foreclosed from the outset by the invocation of divine inspiration turning its account into *heilige urkunde*, text of the highest conceivable authority.

The category of *sin* as *sensus,* denoting the receptive sensorium for God's message, necessary for this kind of inspiration, as laid out by Ohly,[295] features not only in the *Wahrheit* (l. 3) but also in the *Himmlisches Jerusalem*: *Nû sule wir beginnen | mit tiefen gesinnen* (ll. 1-2). In the *Hochzeit* the word turns from a receptive into a semanticising function, but stays closely connected to God's communicative signage.

> umbe manich schône zeichen,
> dâ michil sin an stât.
> gesach in got, der ez begât. *Hochzeit* 4-6

In the earlier *Ezzolied*, however, *sin* is still much more connected to the first-person voice of the text, which corresponds with the text identifying itself not as divinely inspired but rather as ordered to be made by bishop Gunther of Bamberg.

> Ich wil iu lieben allon
> ein wâre rede vore tuon
> nâch dem mînem sinne *Ezzolied* 13-15

It is not possible to draw a precise line between an inspirational and a compositional mode of conception in prologues nor to pin down a definite linear development from one type to the other, but the tendencies are undeniably visible.

The language utilised by these early Middle High German poets, most explicitly in the *Wahrheit* (l. 3), the *Lob Salomons* (l. 5), and the *Rolandslied* (ll. 4-8) invokes the words of Psalm 80:

> Ego enim sum Dominus Deus tuus,
> qui eduxi te de terra Aegypti.

[295] Ernst Friedrich Ohly, 'Gebet an den Heiligen Geist' in *Wolfram von Eschenbach*, Wege der Forschung 62 ed. by Heinz Wupp (Darmstadt 1966), pp. 455-518.

> Dilata os tuum, et implebo illud. Vulgate, Psalm 80. 11[296]

Latin authors have referred to this psalm to create a conceptual dichotomy of literary invention, which mirrors the two models employed in the prologues above. Quoting the psalm the anonymous author of the late seventh-century *Vita Sadalbergae Abbatissae Laudunensis*[297] urges his readers:

> […] non quaerat in his Tullianam eloquentiam nec oratorum facundiam, non philosophorum flosculos et stoicorum diversas assertiones, sed veritatem et simplicitatem historiae.[298]

Not the flourish which the diverse compositional techniques impart to a text is to be expected but rather the truth and simplicity of *historia*. The topical assertion of the *rusticitas* of the writer's style was a staple of medieval prologues, influenced by late antique rhetoric[299] and Augustine's and Jerome's newly discovered appreciation of the Bible's stylistic simplicity.[300] But there is more to it. The following lines from the *Vita Sadalbergae* emphasise the point that its simplicity is a conscious stylistic decision adequate for the matter of the text:

> Neque enim aquila extensis alis semper ad aethera volitat, sed aliquoties assolet ut remissioribus pennis descendat ad terras; et inter regias saepe dapes, etiam vilia poma lactucaeque aggrestes optima quaeque censentur.[301]

Both the Latin *Vita* and the German vernacular texts have recourse to the same biblical imagery to characterise their inception. These patterns are also pervasive in twelfth-century Latin texts,

---

296 For all Latin bible quotes see *Biblia Sacra Latina: ex Biblia Sacra Vulgatae Editionis* (London 1970).

297 *Vita Sadalbergae*, MGH S rer. Merov. 5 ed. by B: Krusch and W. Levison (Hannover, Leipzig 1810), pp. 40-66.

298 *Vita Sadalbergae*, p. 50.

299 See Curtius 1953, pp. 411-13.

300 See St Jerome, *Epistolae*, Patrologiae cursus completus, Series latina 22 ed. by J.-P. Migne (Paris 1845), No. 22, *Ad Eustochium* Cap 30: *Itaque miser ego lecturus Tullium ieiunabam; post noctium crebras vigilias, post lacrimas, quas mihi praeteritorum recordatio peccatorum ex imis visceribus eruebat, Plautus sumebatur in manibus. Si quando in memet reversus prophetam legere coepissem, sermo horrebat incultus, et quia lumen caecis oculis non videbam, non oculorum putabam culpam esse, sed solis*. See also Erich Auerbach, 'Sermon Humilis', *Romanische Forschungen*, 64 (1952), pp. 309-15.
See St Augustin, *Confessiones* ed. by James O'Donnell (Oxford 1992), Lib.3, Cap. 5: *itaque institui animum intendere in scripturas sanctas et videre quales essent. et ecce video rem non compertam superbis neque nudatam pueris, sed incessu humilem, successu excelsam et velatam mysteriis. et non eram ego talis ut intrare in eam possem aut inclinare cervicem ad eius gressus. non enim sicut modo loquor, ita sensi, cum attendi ad illam scripturam, sed visa est mihi indigna quam tullianae dignitati compararem.*

301 *Vita Sadalbergae*, p. 50.

contemporary with the *Kaiserchronik*, most prominently in the prologue to Otto of Freising's *Chronica*, where he calls his writing *impertius* and himself *indoctus* before elaborating: […] *dum, sicut nonnunquam erroris fomes arguta sit subtilitas, sic semper veritatis amica sancta sit rusticitas.*[302] The topos is also used by Godfrey of Viterbo, whose *Pantheon* (1160s) has been identified as sharing many characteristics with the *Kaiserchronik*,[303] but arguably he eschews Otto's solemn analytical phrasing and embraces a more affected style when he declares:

> Hanc etiam simplicitatis et imperitie mee lectionem non summis magistris et philosophis didascalis audeo exibere, sed tibi layco moderate philosophanti et aliis quasi pueris tibi coetaneis ista simplicia dicta proposui et adaptavi. Mei etiam parvitas ingenii ad illa philosophantica culmina philosophantium non attingit.[304]

Specifying the *rusticitas* or *simplicitas* with which a text was authored in this way is of course in itself a rhetorical topos,[305] a case of 'affected modesty'[306] which does not preclude the use of rhetorical devices but aims to gain the audience's favour by avoiding undisguised arrogance and – in case of the early German prologues – to heighten the text's authority by linking it to divine inspiration.

Where in between all these positions does the *Kaiserchronik* stand? The statement of intent from the first two lines of the text reverberates in the climax of its damning polemic:

> In des almähtigen gotes minnen
> sô wil ich des liedes beginnen KC 1-2
> […]
> nû vurht ich vil harte
> daz diu sêle dar umbe brinne:
> iz ist ân gotes minne. KC 32-34

---

[302] *Chronica sive Historia*, Lib. 1, prologue, pp. 9-10.

[303] See Ohly 1968, p. 15. Eberhard Nellmann, *Die Reichsidee in deutschen Dichtungen der Salier- und frühen Stauferzeit*, Philologische Studien und Quellen 16 (Berlin 1963), p. 84; Chinca / Young 2016, p. 16.

[304] See Gottfried of Viterbo, *Memoria Seculorum*, MGH SS 22 ed. by Georg Pertz (Hannover 1872), p. 105.

[305] See Lausberg 1966, p. 157, § 275 ß.

[306] Curtius 1953, p. 83.

The *Kaiserchronik* is dedicated to *gotes minnen*, the antagonistic texts are excluded from it and ultimately lead to damnation. And it is this commitment to the love of God that qualifies the *Kaiserchronik*'s account as preferable to the texts the prologue polemicises against. Because of their lack of this *minne* they only teach lies and pride.

> sô lêret man die luge diu chint:
> die nâh uns chunftich sint,
> die wellent sie alsô behaben
> unt wellent sie iemer fur wâr sagen.
> lugene unde ubermuot
> ist niemen guot. KC 35-40

Of course the invocation of *gotes minne*[…] is a readily available topos in Early Middle High German literature. The *Himmlisches Jerusalem*, which is transmitted with the *Kaiserchronik* in the Vorau manuscript, chooses almost identical words to start off its narration: *in sines namen minne | ditzes liedes sô beginne wir* (ll. 16-17). The love of God qualifies both accounts as truthful. It becomes clear that truth as a category is not subject to modern standards like verifiable evidence or empirical occurrence but probability, acceptability and imaginability within the historical logic of a creation conceived and represented in *gotes minne*. In a way, the *Kaiserchronik*'s concept of *gotes minne* becomes the textual agency realising Quintilian's demand for verisimilitude.

The modern irritation occasioned by the discrepancy between the prologue's prominent claim to truthfulness and the chronicle's often fabulous content was evidently not shared by readers of the period in which the text flourished. Godfrey of Viterbo, writing only a couple of decades later,[307] could claim *fabula non agitur, cronica vero cano*[308] without the apparent clash of claim and content being detrimental to his work's success: his *Pantheon* is transmitted in more manuscripts than Otto's *Chronica* and, just like the *Kaiserchronik*, continued to attract readers well into the later Middle Ages.[309]

---

[307] And proudly announcing in the preface of his *Memoria Seculorum* that he spent forty years compiling materials for his work, next to his obligations as envoy, lawyer and notary at the imperial court of Frederick Barbarossa. See Gottfried of Viterbo, *Memoria Seculorum*, p. 105.

[308] Gottfried of Viterbo, *Speculum Regnum*, p. 38.

[309] See Thomas Foerster, *Godfrey of Viterbo and his Readers: Imperial Tradition and Universal Historiography in Late Medieval Europe* (Routledge 2015).

With *gotes minne*, an external and divine agency qualifies the content of the chronicle. Moreover, unlike the *Ezzolied*, Lamprecht's *Alexanderlied*, the *Hochzeit*, or Chrétien's *Erec et Enide*, the *Kaiserchronik* does not use any of the language associated with the artfully compositional style in order to describe its underlying poetological conceptions. The *Kaiserchronik* does not conceive of itself as an artefact. Foregrounding that quality is ascribed to literature that will ultimately lead its readers to damnation.

The findings of this section show how the *Kaiserchronik* conceptualises itself in its prologue in contrast to other texts, which it antagonises on three levels: firstly as being presented by peripatetic performers in a courtly setting; secondly as untruthful within the logic of verisimilitude; and thirdly as being overly artefactual in composition and too self-satisfied in their rhetorical conception. Conversely this means that the *Kaiserchronik* presents itself as an inspired text and its antagonising of other texts aims less specifically at a certain genre of text – such as heroic epics – but rather at a more refined, compositional mode of storytelling. This criticism does of course not prevent the text itself from employing ample rhetorical devices to manufacture the impression of being beyond such artisanal preoccupations; in this respect the *Kaiserchronik* quite possibly precedes Wolfram's von Eschenbach self-presentation in *Parzival* by some fifty years. Both poles do not exclude each other, they simply represent a different emphasis on different rhetorical strategies to address the text's audience. It does not mean that the composer of the chronicle does not approve of rhetoric at all, but rather chooses to rhetorically foreground the inspirational aspect of literary composition.

This allows us to connect our poetological findings about the chronicle's self-stylisation with our initial question of historiography. As shown above, the *Kaiserchronik* speaks of its account as if it were speaking of a second text. This text seems not to be exclusively the *Kaiserchronik* and presents the relationship between the chronicle and its sources in an ambiguous way. Almost as if it were referring simultaneously to itself and to its source, this self-stylisation embodies the inspirational model the prologue espouses: it obfuscates the barriers between the *Kaiserchronik* as a text and the source texts as texts and reduces the necessity to specify the source of individual stories or motifs. Once the text has become fused with its context or source tradition, the author's compositional intervention is reduced. It means that there is nothing in the *Kaiserchronik*'s account brought into it by the author, no *conjointure*, which would construct history, but instead purely manifest truth: the truth to which the *Kaiserchronik* commits itself in its prologue and which is qualified by *gotes minne* as beneficial for its audience. Negating artefactuality and suppressing authorial intervention also catalyses the main task of the *Kaiserchronik*'s episodic paradigm, which is to create sameness in the account of historical events. This sameness is the prime condition for

historical episodes to be available as historical examples to instruct the contemporary audience of the *Kaiserchronik*.

Moreover, the overall episodic framework functions much to the same effect. Since the constituent episodes of the content of the chronicle are neither framed by explanatory narration nor by any attempt at explicit causal integration with each other or the overall historical trajectory of the Empire, but are rather presented by formulaic phrases and recurring patterns, the episode framework creates a distinct message: the form of the chronicle mirrors the form of history. There is no man-made artefactuality in the *Kaiserchronik*'s account of history, only manifestation of truth sanctioned by *gottes minne*.

IV. The First Dimension of Qualitative Change: the Religious Identity of the Empire

IV.1 The Problem of Salvation History

The first category within which the *Kaiserchronik* has to negotiate qualitative change concerns the religious identity of the Empire. Over the timeframe which the *Kaiserchronik* covers the Roman Empire changes its religious allegiance from a polytheistic pagan cult to the Catholic Christianity its medieval German audience would live and experience every day. This change has to be mediated without disturbing the paradigmatic continuity of Romanness in the Empire. This chapter will first develop a critical take on the main methodological approach previously employed to illuminate the *Kaiserchronik*'s religious dimension and then try to trace the narrative steps developed in the text to model the religious conversion of the Empire.

When looking at the *Kaiserchronik* in general, the idea that the form and the content of the text are somehow determined by the premises of salvation history has proven to be a popular, almost truistic approach, and the salvific negotiation of history in the chronicle has long been a focus of intense discussion. Salvation history is the guiding principle underlying Ohly's typological scheme of analysis and from there it became one of the main pillars of *Kaiserchronik* scholarship. Indeed as a historiographical concept it conveniently explains many of the text's idiosyncrasies and organised crucial elements of its content on a clear arc in a nicely ordered framework. However, it will become evident that this approach is not only overly neat but also has been overstretched in its application.

Even beyond main strands of research as in Ohly and others the assumption that the author's conscious or unconscious salvation historical thinking shapes the content of the *Kaiserchronik* is so pervasive that it can serve as an implicit explanation for all kinds of argument about the work. For example, Stengel, in his reappraisal of the dating of the *Kaiserchronik*, puts the text without any doubt in a long tradition of world chronicles reaching straight back to Jerome's and Eusebius's first Christian chronicle.[310] Urbanek suggests that the anonymous author was imbued with a 'christlich

[310] See Edmund Stengel, 'Die Entstehung der "Kaiserchronik" und der Aufgang der staufischen Zeit' in *Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte* ed. by the author (Cologne 1960), p. 395. Stengel claims that the *Kaiserchronik* could not have been written in the time of Conrad III but argues for a later dating either 1160/61 or 1164/65.

heilsgeschichtlichen Sinn des Römischen Reiches' and therefore chose for his numerical symbolic reference-system numbers that have a salvation historical meaning, such as three for the Trinity and six for the *aetates* of the world.[311]

Too many others to reference them all have contributed from different points of view and with different queries at the heart of their examinations: Eberhard Nellmann develops the idea of the representation of an idealised *imperium christianum.*[312] Frank Shaw tried to localise the text in the same sphere as other historical narratives like the *Alexanderlied* or *Rolandslied*.[313] Others, such as Bertau, have completely denied the existence of a guiding historical principle in the text and see it as a mere collection of legendary tales, determined in its shape and content by the limited intellectual capacity of the environment in and for which it was compiled.[314]

The recurring idea of attributing salvation historical and universal historical patterns to the text has come under increasing scrutiny from at least two angles. In the first place, the exact connectedness between the two terms has never been sufficiently established; 'salvation history' and 'universal history' are being used unreflectively and interchangeably. Secondly, many of the scholarly arguments seem to be afflicted by the problem of confirmation bias: the unquestioned assumption that salvation historical thinking in fact governs the *Kaiserchronik* has led scholars to perceive, however, vaguely a teleological unfolding of history in the ordering system of the text; this perception in turn confirms the initial assumption thus perpetuating the initial unexamined presupposition.

Indeed, the constant use of salvation historical terminology appears to be more a case of what Hans Blumenberg calls 'terminological metastasis', in which the term is largely detached from its actual meaning and semantic context and is used to signify any kind of somehow religiously charged history.[315] This apparent gap between the *Kaiserchronik*'s content and the terminology used to describe it certainly warrants a closer examination of how this terminology has been used in scholarly discussion to signify different or interconnected historical conceptions, and of what these terminological instruments entail within the historical texts and traditions in respect of which they have been developed. Only then will it be possible to decide if they are suitable for use in connection with the *Kaiserchronik* and where necessary to develop a more specific set of

---

311 See Urbanek 1972, p. 236.

312 See Nellmann 1963, pp. 95-115.

313 See Frank Shaw, 'Das historische Epos als Literaturgattung in frühmittelhochdeutscher Zeit' in *Studien zur Frühmittelhochdeutschen Literatur: Cambridger Colloquium 1971* ed. by Leslie Peter Johnson and others (Berlin 1974), pp. 276-82.

314 See Karl Bertau, *Deutsche Literatur im europäischen Mittelalter*, 2 vols (Munich 1972) I, pp. 316-18; 337-44.

315 Hans Blumenberg, *The Legitimacy of the Modern Age*, trans. by Robert Wallace (Cambridge MA 1983), p. 63.

terminologies to better specify the historical idea(s) and concept(s) which are productive in the text.

IV.1.1 A Short Account of the Development of Salvation Historical Historiography Between the First and the Fifth Century CE

The term 'salvation history' first appeared in the nineteenth century as German 'Heilsgeschichte' to signify a unified *historia salutis*,[316] which proceeds as a teleological linear process from the creation of man to the present and further on till the Last Judgment.[317] In its secularised form this idea turned into world history, a most influential notion about the passing of time.[318] When after the collapse of the Soviet Union Francis Fukuyama proclaimed the 'end of history' he was echoing this historiographical tradition. History had reached its destination: in his case western, liberal democracy which would now be universalised into mankind's final form of government.[319] The soteriological concept of history at the foundation of salvation history does not work very differently from this, only that its telos is not western democracy but the salvation of mankind from this temporal vale of tears. The way there does not lead through different stages of political systems but is deliberately and premeditatedly implemented by God and bestowed upon mankind in different stages of religious revelation.[320]

Up to this point the meaning of the term seems to be largely consistent with its usage in the scholarly discussion summarised above. The semantic dimension of salvation history contained in this discussion is, however, only the final stage in a historiographical process of representing and

---

316 .See Hans Freiherr von Campenhausen, *Urchristliches und Altkirchliches* (Tübingen 1979), p. 20. The term was first introduced in Johann Christian Konrad von Hofmann, *Weissagung und Erfüllung im Alten und Neuen Testamente. Ein theologischer Versuch* 2 vols (Nördlingen 1841-44). Von Hofmann was a student of Leopold von Ranke which shaped his approach to the Bible as 'weissagende Geschichte'. Von Hofmann 1841, p. 52. See Martin Hengel, 'Heilsgeschichte' in *Heil und Geschichte. Die Geschichtsbezogenheit des Heils und das Problem der Heilsgeschichte in der biblischen Tradition und in der theologischen Deutung*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 248 ed. by Jörg Frey, Stefan Krauter und Hermann Lichtenberger (Tübingen 2009), p. 3.

317 See Bernd Janowski, 'Vergegenwärtigung und Wiederholung. Anmerkungen zu G. Von Rads Konzept der Heilsgeschichte' in *Heil und Geschichte. Die Geschichtsbezogenheit des Heils und das Problem der Heilsgeschichte in der biblischen Tradition und in der theologischen Deutung* Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 248 ed. by Jörg Frey, Stefan Krauter und Hermann Lichtenberger (Tübingen 2009), p. 37.

318 Campenhausen 1979, pp. 20-25.

319 Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man* (London 1992), p. 338: 'It is possible that if events continue to unfold as they have done over the past few decades, that the idea of a universal and directional history leading up to liberal democracy may become more plausible […].'

320 For more on the discussion of modern historical theories as secularised Christian heuristics, see Blumenberg 1983, p. 65: 'What mainly occurred in the process that is interpreted as secularization, at least (so far) in all but a few recognizable and specific instances, should be described not as the *transposition* of authentically theological contents into secularized alienation from their origin but rather as *reoccupation* of answer positions that had become vacant and whose corresponding questions could not be eliminated.' He argues against Carl Schmitt's notion of all resonant concepts of modernity as secularised theological concepts. See Carl Schmitt, *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty* trans. by George Schwab (Cambridge MA, London 1985), p. 36.

interpreting history through a complex lens. Essentially it is an apologetic view of scriptural traditions and historical occurrence, and at this point the term's applicability to the *Kaiserchronik* becomes dubious. The prevalent reading of the chronicle often implies a linear reading of salvation historical arguments. Salvation history, however, does not begin at the beginning and does not progress in a linear pattern through historical occurrences. It starts with the core of salvation, Jesus, in the middle of history and works from that point outwards, interrogating the past BCE for prophecies of his coming, and the past CE for signs of the continuing validity of his salvific mission. Working back it stops only at the creation of the world and the first men, working forward it passes through the present of the chronicler on a trajectory clearly aimed at the end times.

Campenhausen identifies the first salvation historical narratives already in the books of the New Testament. Both Matthew and Luke try to connect Jesus by means of long genealogical chains to Abraham (Matthew) and even all the way back to Adam (Luke). This widens the impact of Christ's salvation to include the entirety of the human race.[321] Looking back at the Old Testament, the salvation historical perspective is indifferent to the original textual context, historical meaning or even the sequence of occurrence. Moreover, it tries to prise prophetic predictions from the Old Testament, at times forcibly breaking them out of their context and rearranging them into an alleged prophecy for the present without any regard for the Old Testament passages' historical context and composition.[322] The vessel for this kind of prophetic reconnection is often typologies, which form the foundation on which Ohly builds his concept of extra-biblical typologies:[323] certain events, persons or even single objects are extracted from earlier holy texts and notwithstanding their historical meaning and context, deployed as prefigurative types for the different aspects of salvation now manifest with Christ's incarnation. The writings of the early church and even the gospels themselves are replete with such typological connections, for example when Matthew 12. 39-40 and Luke 11. 29-30 interpret the three days the prophet Jonah had to wait in the belly of the whale before being returned to land as a prefiguration of Christ's fate to remain in hell for the same time before returning to life.[324] Many parts of the New Testament only become clear, when regarded through this lens. The notoriously odd passage in Matthew 21. 7, where Jesus rides into Jerusalem apparently on two donkeys, can be explained when read in conjunction with Zechariah 9. 9, where a righteous and victorious king rides towards Jerusalem on 'on a donkey, on a colt, the foal of a

---

321 Campenhausen1979, p. 25.

322 See Campenhausen1979, p. 30.

323 See Ohly 1968, pp. 26-29.

324 See Campenhausen1979, p. 29.

donkey' and the historical-critical analysis of the text argues that Matthew here, in his eagerness to prove the fulfilment of the ancient prophecy in the events of Palm Sunday, missed the classical Hebrew stylistic device of a *parallelismus membrorum* and translated it with two donkeys instead of one.[325]

The much-discussed *Visio Danielis* may serve as another more prominent example of this practice of decontextualising biblical material in order to make it yield christological prophecy. The Neo-Platonic philosopher Porphyry,[326] who wrote around 300 CE, agrees with most modern scholars that the Book of Daniel was originally written in the middle of the second century BCE and is deeply rooted in contemporary controversies surrounding the infringements of the Judaic service at the Temple through the Seleucid ruler Antiochos IV Epiphanes; in this context, the Book strives to justify Hasmonean claims for power against the Diadochean occupier.[327] Here, Antiochos is presented as the eleventh horn sprouting from the brow of the fourth beast, thus breaking the divinely ordained order of rule and veneration in Israel. The text expects him to die without foreign intervention (Daniel 11. 44-45) but as these prophecies fail to become literally true they open themselves up to further interpretation by later generations of Christian exegesis.[328]

The gospels are mainly interested in the concept of the 'son of man'[329] (Daniel 7. 13) and relate the prophetic content of the book tied to this term to the life of Christ, thereby turning it into one of the pillars of christology.[330] Parallel to this they no longer relate the fourth beast and its eleventh horn to Antiochos but to an 'Antichristos' who is yet to come and will bring a time of great blasphemy and corruption over mankind.[331] The most important propagator of this identification is

---

[325] See Barclay Newman and Philip Stine, *A Handbook on The Gospel of Matthew* (Stuttgart, New York 1988), pp. 637-41; John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Milton Keynes 2005), pp. 833-37. The notion that Matthew would have made such a glaring mistake or deliberately sacrificed a better translation for a more explicit connection to Zechariah has been energetically refuted. Charlene McAfee Moss, *The Zechariah Tradition and the Gospel of Matthew* in Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche 156 (Berlin, New York 2009), pp. 80-83, esp. p. 88 'Thus, this view, albeit advocated by some scholars, grants Matthew the desire to have prophecy fulfilled accurately but, by the same token, reduces his mental and theological capacity to simple causality. However, the author of the gospel of Matthew was anything but naïve and simple-minded, and his linguistic ability most likely exceeded such a low standard, he would not have made such a basic mistake.'

[326] Porphyry's copious anti-Christian works were later mostly destroyed and had to be reconstructed from the reiterations of his Christian contestants. See *Porphyry's Against the Christians: The Literary Remains* ed. and trans. by Joseph Hoffmann (Amherst 1994).

[327] See Klaus Koch, 'Das aramäisch-hebräische Danielbuch. Konfrontation zwischen Weltmacht und monotheistischer Religionsgemeinschaft in universalgeschichtlicher Perspektive' in *Die Geschichte der Daniel-Auslegung in Judentum Christentum und Islam*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 371 ed. by Katharina Bracht, David Du Toit (Berlin, New York 2007), pp. 6-7.

[328] See Koch 2007, pp. 23-24.

[329] בן–אדם *ben-'adam* See Koch 2007, p. 22. Footnote 29 on the problems of the term in its different translations from the Aramaic original.

[330] See Koch 2007, p. 8.

[331] Koch 2007, p. 24.

St Jerome, who reassesses the passage in his commentary *In Danielem*[332] between 406 and 408 CE.[333] For him, Antiochos is the type of the salvation historical truth revealed in the Antichrist.[334]

In addition to the typological legitimation of Christ, salvation historical narrative was also fuelled by anti-Judaic sentiment, which was strong in the early church, when it became apparent that most of the Jews would not accept Jesus as their Messiah: the idea took root of a truculent and unteachable people who killed the prophets sent to them by God to announce the coming of the Messiah, which prophecy the Christians of course saw fulfilled in Jesus. The notion of the Jews as a sinful people, incapable of accepting Jesus as the soteriological terminator of history led to the expectation of some kind of impending judgment that would be passed upon them. At first this expectation was projected forward into the impending end of days, but soon was historicised by actual events[335] when the Romans sacked Jerusalem and destroyed the Temple in 70 CE.[336] Starting with Hegesippus as mediated by Eusebius, a long line of Christian apologists from Justin to Tertullian used this historical fact as a signifier for the truth of the Christian message and the supersession of the old Judaic covenant by the new Christian one. For them, the destruction of Jerusalem is nothing but the albeit belated final act and concluding chapter of Old Testament history. History so far had been understood as the history of the Jewish people being congruent with the history of God's presence and revelations in his creation.[337]

With the fall of Jerusalem and the ultimate expulsion of the Jews from the Holy Land after the Bar Kokhba-revolt of ca. 132-136 CE[338] the prophetic range of the old prophets and Jesus's imminent soteriological potential, especially as represented by Luke, who managed to combine historiography with an eschatological vision[339], seem to have been considered more and more

---

[332] See above Introduction.

[333] See Courtray 2007, p. 123.

[334] See St Jerome, *In Danielem,* Cap. VIII, Vers. 14, col. 537: *Hunc locum plerique nostrorum ad Antichristum referunt, et quod sub Antiocho in typo factum est, sub illo in ueritate dicunt esse complendum.*

[335] See Campenhausen1979, pp. 32-35.

[336] Flavius Josephus describes the sack of Jerusalem in books V and VI of his *Judean War*. In book VI especially, which concludes 'So fell Jerusalem in the second year of Vespasian's reign, on the 8th of Gorpiaios, captured five times before and now for the second time utterly laid to waste. Shishak king of Egypt, followed by Antiochus, the Pompey, and after that Sosius and Herod together, captured the City but spared it. Earlier the king of Babylon had stormed it and laid it to waste 1,468 years and 6 months from its foundation. [...]The Canaanite inhabitants were driven out by the Jewish king David, who settled his own people there; then 477 years and 6 months after his time it was utterly destroyed by the Babylonians. From king David, the first Jew to reign in it, to the destruction by Titus it was 1,179 years.' See Flavius Josephus, *The Jewish War* trans. by G.A. Williamson ed. by Mary Smallwood (London 1959; repr. 1981), pp. 372-73. The system by which the figures in this section are derived remains obscure. See footnote 46.

[337] See Campenhausen1979, pp. 36-37.

[338] See Joan Taylor, *The Essenes, the Scrolls, and the Dead Sea* (Oxford 2012), pp. 167-72.

[339] See Garry Winston Trompf, *Early Christian Historiography: Narratives of Retributive Justice* (London, New York 2000), p. 109.

depleted.[340] No longer did reference to the prophets and the imminent expectation of the *parousia*[341] of the early church suffice to contain the queries Christians posed of their time,[342] which proved strangely reluctant to finally cross over into eschatology and appeared perfectly content to remain within the confines of historiography for just a while longer. But it fell to the Greek Irenaeus, who probably died around the year two hundred, to take up the different strands and be the first to present a cohesive salvation historical account. In his works he develops the idea of a progressive education of humanity by God through a string of historical covenants which provide a framework with the capacity to integrate and unify the whole of biblical history.[343]

Due to the parallel development of early Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism,[344] ongoing persecution by the Roman pagan authorities, and Gnostic defections in the fourth century, it happened in a climate of sectarian conflict[345] when with Eusebius's finishing off the *Ecclesiastical History*,[346] Christianity started to become aware of its own historicity and the need to secure it.[347] In the freshly institutionalised church it found a new, appropriate carrier of historical meaning to attach this new historiography to. However, the transformation of salvation history into ecclesiastical history did not imply a new quality of salvation at the disposal of the church. It remained the same, identical with the salvation managed and bestowed by Jesus and the martyrs, thus constituting a space of perpetual presence of salvation between the first incarnation of Christ and his putative second coming.[348]

In this context and building on the prior developments laid out above a 'logic of retribution'[349] was able to take root in the newly forming Christian historiography. Eusebius as the first Christian

---

340 See Campenhausen 1979, p. 35.

341 See S.J. Duffy, 'Parousia, 2. in Theology' in *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 15 vols (Washington 1967), X, coll. 1037-40.

342 See Campenhausen1979, p. 59.

343 See Campenhausen1979, pp. 51-52; Hengel 2009, p. 13; see St Irenaeus, *Libros quinque adversus Haereses* ed. by William Wigan Harvey, 2 vols (Cambridge 1857), II, Lib III, Cap. XI,11, p. 50: *Qualis igitur dispositio Filii Dei, talis et animalium forma: et qualis animalium forma, talis et [sic] character Evangelii. Quadriformia autem animaliam, et quadriforme Evangelium, et quadriformis dispositio Domini. Et propter hoc quatuor data sunt testamenta humano generi; unum quidem ante cataclysmum sub Adam; secundum vero, post cataclysmum sub Noe, tertum vero, legislatio sub Moyse; quartum vero, quod renovat hominem, et recapitulat in se omnia, quod est per Evangelium, elevans et pennigerans homines et coeleste regnum.*

344 See Philip Alexander, 'The parting of the ways from the perspective of Rabbinic Judaism' in *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, AD 70 to 135: the second Durham Tübingen Research Symposium on earliest Christianity and Judaism* ed. by James Dunn (Tübingen 1992), p. 2. He shows how until the fourth century Christian Jews and Rabbinism were competing within the broader scope of Judaism to determine its future shape and how only after the triumph of Rabbinism Christianity and Judaism separated.

345 See Campenhausen1979, p. 36.

346 Eusebius of Caesarea, *Historiae Ecclesiasticae Libri X* ed. by Friedrich Adolf Heinichen, vols 3 (Leipzig 1827).

347 See Trompf 2000, p. 109.

348 See Campenhausen1979, pp. 61-62.

349 See Trompf 2000, p. 3.

chronicler, for example, presents the fall of Jerusalem and the many miseries the Jews had to suffer after this as a direct punishment for the execution of Jesus;[350] Augustine sees the Judaic diaspora as an involuntary but therefore all the more credible testimony to the correctness of Jesus's role as messiah.[351]

This system of retributive logic later found a more universal employment to explain the sustained presence of evil in a world that was after the Constantinian shift in the early fourth century largely Christianised.[352] Arguably most trenchant in this regard is the *Historiae adversum paganos* by Orosius, student and friend of Augustine from Spain. Relying mainly on pagan sources and consciously eschewing biblical accounts he narrates the history of the world before the incarnation of Christ as a *historia calamitatum* continually plagued by trials and tribulations. Only after Jesus's birth and death, with the spread of Christianity in the Roman Empire and the establishment of a Christian church would things take a turn for the better.[353] This idea remains alive in theological thought and argument until the twentieth century:

> This parousial hope gives meaning and consistency to history and manifests God's immanence to its linear development. If Redemption works in and through historical evolution, only when the redemptive decree of God has run its divinely plotted course will Christ come forth to His abiding presence in His church.[354]

---

[350] See *Historia Ecclesiastica.* Lib. III,5, p. 195. As I do not read Ancient Greek I quote from the English translation. See Eusebius of Caesarea, *The History of the Church* trans. by G.A. Williamson ed. by Andrew Louth (London 1989), p. 68: 'Passing over the details of the successive disasters that befell them from the sword and in other ways I think it necessary to mention only the miseries they suffered from starvation, so that readers of this book may have some knowledge at least of their crime against the Christ of God a very little time later brought on them God's vengeance.'Also p. 73: 'Such was the reward of the Jews' iniquitous and wicked treatment of God's Christ.'

[351] See Campenhausen1979, p. 37; Bernhard Blumenkranz, *Die Judenpredigt Augustins: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der jüdisch-christlichen Beziehungen in den ersten Jahrhunderten,* Basler Beiträger zur Geschichtswissenschaft 25 (Basel 1946), pp. 176-77. For more on the discussion of Augustine's stance towards the jews see James Carroll, *Constantine's Sword: The Church and the Jews* (Boston, New York 2001), pp. 216-18, where he comes to an ambiguous evaluation of Augustine's teaching on the Jews. For a more positive assessment cf. Paula Fredriksen, *Augustine and the Jews: A Christian Defense of Jews and Judaism* (New York 2008). pp. 290-96. For Augustine's most important teachings on the Jews see St Augustine, *De civitate* Dei, Lib. IV, Cap. 34, p. 186: [E]*t nunc quod per omnes fere terras gentesque dispersi sunt, illius unius ueri dei prouidentia est, ut, quod deorum falsorum usquequaque simulacra arae, luci templa euertuntur et sacrificia prohibentur, de codicibus eorum probetur, quemadmodum hoc fuerit tanto ante prophetatum.*
Lib. XVIII, Cap. 46, pp. 851-52: [D]*emonstrauit ergo deus ecclesiae in eius inimicis Iudaeis gratiam misericordiae suae, quoniam, sicut dicit apostolus, delictum illorum salus gentibus; et ideo non eos occidit, id est non in eis perdidit quod sunt Iudaei, quamuis a Romanis fuerint deuicti et obpressi, ne obliti legem dei ad hoc, de quo agimus, testimonium nihil ualerent. ideo parum fuit, ut diceret: ne occideris eos, ne quando obliuiscantur legem tuam, nisi adderet etiam: disperge eos; quoniam si cum isto testimonio scripturarum in sua tantummodo terra, non ubique essent, profecto ecclesia, quae ubique est, eos prophetiarum, quae de Christo praemissae sunt, testes in omnibus gentibus habere non posset.*

[352] See Campenhausen1979, pp. 58-61; Trompf 2000, pp. 292-93.

[353] Paulus Orosius, *Seven Books of History against the Pagans*, p.8.

[354] Duffy 1967, p. 1039.

In conclusion, three aspects of salvation historical narrative can be identified. First, starting with Jesus in the centre, it encompasses the universality of history going back to the creation of the world and men, and going forward, passing through the present of the author and finally finding its conclusion in the end of days. Second, its main narrative matrix is apologetic. It starts with the soteriological apex of history and thenceforth interrogates historical occurrences along the time axis BCE for typological and prophetic prefigurations of Christ and along the time axis CE for affirmation of the ongoing validity and presence of Christ's salvation in unfolding history down to the present day. Third, following this basic assumption, it also seeks to assign salvation historical meaning to persons, constellations and occurrences that work to the detriment of the soteriological premisses it must maintain. They too must find their place in the axioms of the divine plan behind the factual unfolding of history.

IV.1.2 Comparing the *Kaiserchronik* to Orosius and Otto

Building on this outline I intend now to elucidate these three points by comparing the *Kaiserchronik* to Orosius's *Historiae adversum paganos* and Otto of Freising's *Chronica*[355]. Orosius on the one hand is relevant as an early representative of a fully fledged salvation historical narrative, his *casus scribendi* being an apologetical urge to explain the sack of Christian Rome by Alaric and his Visigoths in 410 CE and to defend Christianity against its pagan assailants who in his time argued that the sack of Rome occurred due to the Romans' neglect of the old, pagan gods.[356] Additionally, it has been established that Orosius's text was one of the direct sources the author of the *Kaiserchronik* was drawing from when he compiled his text.[357] Otto's *Chronica* on the other hand serves to demonstrate how a historiographical narrative that was written roughly at the same time and in the same cultural and political sphere as the *Kaiserchronik* and that explicitly positions itself in a salvation historical rationale can operate to achieve this goal.[358]

Of course these texts – especially Otto's *Chronica* and the *Kaiserchronik* despite their being so

---

[355] See Otto of Freising, *Chronica*. German translation in: Otto of Freising, *Chronica sive historia de duabus civitatibus*, FvSGA 16 ed. by Adolf Schmidt and Walther Lammers (Darmstadt 1990).

[356] See Paulus Orosius, *Seven Books of History against the Pagans,* pp. 7-12.

[357] Fiebig 1995, p. 94.

[358] For the most reliable resource on Otto's concept of history still see Hans-Werner Goetz, *Das Geschichtsbild Ottos von Freising* in Beihefte zum Archiv für Kulturgeschichte 19 (Cologne, Vienna 1984). But see also Walther Lammers, *Weltgeschichte und Zeitgeschichte bei Otto von Freising* in Sitzungsberichte der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main, 14, 3 (Wiesbaden 1977).

close to each other in time and place of origin – do not all operate on the same level of theological or historiographical sophistication, as Karl Bertau has demonstrated.[359] It is important not to set up comparisons between the *Kaiserchronik* and authors such as Orosius and Otto in such a way that that the *Kaiserchronik* will inevitably be found wanting.[360] In order to assess its cultural role and literary relevance in the twelfth century it is more appropriate to establish whether and to what extent the *Kaiserchronik* adheres to the premises of salvation history.

For this purpose three exemplary points of interest for a salvation historical argumentation that feature in all three texts will be explored. First, the scope of the narrative: where does it begin, where does it end, what does it cover and how does it comment on that, if it does so at all? Second, the treatment of the birth of Christ to illustrate how the introduction of this soteriological determinant into history is handled: how does it affect the continuing of the historical narrative and does it establish some sort of soteriological caesura? Third, the role played by Nero and his persecution of the Christian community as its first great historical antagonist in the narrative will be examined to determine how each text deals with the problem of the continuing presence of evil in factual history and how each one operates to integrate evil into a salvation historical framework.

IV.1.2.1 Beginnings and Endings in Orosius's *Historiae adversum paganos*, Otto's *Chronica*, and the *Kaiserchronik*

Before offering a detailed description of the known world and its countries and regions Orosius lays out the cornerstones of the historical programme of his chronicle at its beginning:

> But I have decided to trace the beginning of men's misery from man's original sin, merely gathering together a few short examples. 3,184 years passed from Adam, the first man, to Ninus, the so-called 'Great', when Abraham was born. These years are omitted by, or unknown to, all historians. There are then 2,015 years from Ninus, or from Abraham, to the time of Caesar Augustus: that is to the birth of Christ which took place in the 42nd year of Caesar's reign, when the peace was made with Parthia, the gates of Janus were closed, and wars ceased all over the world. During this time every form of action or inaction was either ground out by men of affairs or by those who wrote on

[359] See Bertau 1972, pp. 337-38.

[360] Bertau's approach being a prime example for this set-up. See Bertau 1972, pp. 339-40.

them.[361]

Orosius is committed to narrating secular history, if only to show the unfolding of God's plan in history to the pagans, who would not accept biblical records as historical evidence.[362] Because of this he merely touches on occurrences solely transmitted in biblical texts, like the creation of the world and of Adam the first man, though he of course maintains the importance of these events as the beginning of history.[363] As announced, the actual historiographical narrative sets off with Ninus *rex Assyriorum* [...] *Anno ante urbem conditam MCCC.*[364] Over the course of the first book Orosius briefly touches on the most important historical figures and events whilst virtually counting down to his main point of interest: the foundation of the City of Rome.[365] Rome succeeds and surpasses Babylon, which forms both a negative counter-image and a positive template to Rome's role in history.[366]

After following the course of Roman history over one-thousand years, Orosius catches up with his own present time, which he takes great pains to show in the best possible light:

> We have shown, I believe, and demonstrated almost as much by pointing, as by my words, that innumerable wars have come to an end, a great number of usurpers have been put down, and the most savage tribes have been defeated, restrained, surrendered, and emptied of their strength with the minimum of bloodshed, no battles and hardly any killing.[367]

---

[361] Paulus Orosius, *Seven Books of History against the Pagans*, p. 34. See: Paulus Orosius, *Historiarum Adversum Paganos Libri VII*, Lib. I,Cap. 1,4-6: 4 *Ego initium miseriae hominum ab initio peccati hominis ducere institui, paucis dumtaxat isdemque breuiter delibatis.* 5 *Sunt autem ab Adam primo homine usque ad Ninum magnum ut dicunt regen, quando natus est Abraham, anni III.CLXXXIIII, qui ab omnibus historiographis uel omissi uel ignorati sunt.* 6 *A Nino autem uel Abraham usque ad Caesarem Augustum id est usque ad natiuitatem Christi. Quae fuit anno imperii Caesaris quadragesimo secundo, cum facta pace cum Parthis Iani portae clausae sunt et bella toto orbe cessarunt, colliguntur anni II.XV in quibus se inter actors scriptoresque omnium otia negotiaque triuerunt.*

[362] See Paulus Orosius, *Seven Books of History against the Pagans*, pp. 7-8.

[363] See Paulus Orosius, *Historiarum Adversum Paganos Libri VII*, Lib. I, Cap. 3,1-2.

[364] Paulus Orosius, *Historiarum Adversum Paganos Libri VII*, Lib. I, Cap. 4,1.

[365] Regularly he begins his chapters in the first book with reckoning the years *ante urbem conditam*: I,4,1: MCCC; I, 5,1: MCLX; I,7,1: MLXX; I,8,1: MVIII; I,9,1: DCCCX; I,10,1: DCCCV; I,11,1: DCCLXXV; I,14,1 CCCCLXXX; I,17,1: CCCCXXX; I,19,1: LXIIII; I,21,1: XXX; I,21,3: XX.

[366] Paulus Orosius, *Historiarum Adversum Paganos Libri VII*, Lib. I, Cap. 3,2-5: *Itaque haec ob hoc praecipue commemoranda credidi, ut tanto arcano ineffabilium iudiciorum Dei ex parte patefacto intellegant hi, qui insipienter utique de temporibus Christianis murmurant, unum Deum disposuisse tempora et in principo Babyloniis et in fine Romanis, illius clementiae esse, quod uiuimus, quod autem misere uiuimus, intemperantiae nostrae.*

[367] Paulus Orosius, *Seven Books of History against the Pagans*, p. 413. See: Paulus Orosius, *Historiarum Adversum Paganos Libri VII*, Lib. VII, Cap. 43,17: *Manifestauimus, ut arbitror atque ostendimus non magis uerbo paene quam digito innumera bella sopita, plurimos extinctos tyrannos, conpressas coangustatas exinanitasque immanissimas gentes minimo sanguine, nullo certamine ac paene sine caede.*

Otto of Freising is separated by a gulf of over seven-hundred years from the Spaniard whom he quotes so frequently and whose description of the world he so warmly recommends to those who want to get to know the world's provinces, sites and countries.[368] After the preface, in which he explicates his historiographical programme on the model of Augustine's schema of the two cities,[369] he begins his account of the history of the world with the creation of man, but does not share Orosius's almost scrupulous avoidance of biblical material.[370] He concludes his historical narrative in the seventh book having equally arrived in his own day and age with the rule of king Conrad III,[371] which he caps with a short history of monasticism.[372] In the context of the problem of salvation history, Otto's addition of a final eighth book after having already completed the historiographical part deserves special consideration. In it he offers a short glimpse into the third and future mode *post presentem vitam* of mankind's spiritual fate within the two cities after the two antecedent periods *ante gratiam*[373] and *tempore gratiae*.[374] The Cistercian bishop thus logically concludes his rendition of salvation history by including a speculative account of the fate of the Catholic souls *post salvationem* in his *Chronica*.

Even at the most superficial glance it becomes blatantly clear that the *Kaiserchronik* does not share this broad salvation historical frame of reference. First, the text presents what appears to be a rather pedagogical programme in its prologue (KC 1-42). Initially it scoffs at the *tumben* (KC 6) for whom it is *arebait* (KC 6) to learn new things, and promises its reader an increase in *wîstuom unt êre* (KC 13). After this it comments disdainfully on a new *gewoneheit* (KC 27) of concocting new narratives and arranging them *mit scophelîchen worten* (KC 31) and even goes on to imply that those who propagate such *lugene* (KC 29) will burn for it in hell (KC 32-34). The prologue even goes so far as to express concern about these errors being taught to the following generation (KC

---

368 See Otto of Freising, *Chronica,* Lib. I, Cap I, p. 38: *Quarum provintias, situs, regiones qui velit cognoscere, legat Orosium.*

369 See Otto of Freising, *Chronica*, Lib. I, prologue, p. 6: *Cum enim duae sint civitates, una temporalis, alia eterna, una mundialis, alia caelestis, una diaboli, alia Christi, Babyloniam hanc, Hierusalem ille esse katholici prodidere scriptores.*

370 See Otto of Freising, *Chronica,* Lib. I, Cap. II, p. 38: *Ad orientem igitur, quantum ex scriptis Geneseos conici potest, in terra Eden creata paradisus creditur. Ubi dum primus homo positus* […].

371 See Otto of Freising, *Chronica*, Lib. VII, Cap. XXXIIII, p. 369: *Sed quia mutabilium rerum ab Adam usque ad presentem annum, qui ab incarnatione Domini Mus Cus XL us VI us, ab Urbe condita Mus DCCCCus XVIIIus. Conradi nonagesimi tercii ab Augusto nonus, Eugenii tercii summi pontificis secundus est, seriem qualitercumque percensui multiplicesque mortalium miserias involvi* […].

372 See Otto of Freising, *Chronica,* Lib. VII, Cap. XXXIIII, p. 369: […] *diversos religiosorum ordines, quorum, ut dixi, sanctitate a misericordissime iudice malignitas mundi subportatur, silentio preterire incongruum arbitramur, ut tantorum malorum turbulentiae clarorum virorum gesta insignia metam et articulum ponamus.*

373 Otto of Freising, *Chronica*, Lib. VIII, *prologus*, p. 391.

374 See Otto of Freising, *Chronica*, Lib. VIII, *prologus*, p. 391: *De tercio vero, quomodo videlicet haec ad summam beatitudinem profectura, illa ad ultimam miseriam defectura et casura sit, iudicante ac examinante in ultimo iudicio istissimo iudice utriusque urbis causam, in hoc octavo opere dicendum restat.*

35-38).

After this, the *Kaiserchronik* presents a short account of the foundation of Rome by Rômulus and Rêmus (KC 53-54) *bi der haiden zîten* (KC 43) without further relating it to prior events in history. Not even a genealogical connection back to Troy and the escaping Trojans is established. In the next two-hundred lines the narrative quickly introduces the Roman Senate (KC 57-61) and at length presents the pagan weekday calendar (KC 67-208) as a system for venerating their seven gods. The system clearly takes its cue to use the calendar as a pagan instrument to bring them closer to their gods and their place in time and space from Isidore's account of the pagan weekdays.[375] After a short prefiguration of the Christianisation of the Pantheon (KC 186-208) the *Kaiserchronik* then elaborates on the *salvatio Romae*[376] (KC 217-34) – in the text not identified as such – and then with line 247 dives into the first emperor-centric episode dealing with Julius Caesar. Fifty-three emperor-episodes and 17,037 lines later the texts stops in mid sentence when Pope Eugen III[377] (KC 17,270), Abbot Bernhard of Clairvaux[378] (KC 17,276) and the kings of the Roman Empire Conrad III[379] (KC 17,278) and France Louis VII[380] (KC 17,274) are readying for war to reconquer *Rôas*[381] (KC 17,250) recently conquered by a figure called *Sangwîn*[382] (KC 17,249).

This somewhat more detailed examination confirms the first appearance. The *Kaiserchronik*

---

375 See Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiarum*, Lib. V, Cap. XXX, 8: *Proinde autem ex his septem stellis nomina dierum gentiles dederunt, eo quod per eosdem aliquid sibi effici existimarent, dicentes habere a Sole spiritum, a Luna corpus, a Mercurio ingenium et linguam, a Venere voluptatem, a Marte sanguinem, a Iove temperantiam, a Saturno humorem. Talis quippe extitit gentilium stultitia, qui sibi finxerunt tam ridiculosa figmenta.*

376 See Ohly 1968, p. 40.

377 Pope Eugenius III called for a crusade to reclaim Edessa in 1145 and 1146 and also instructed Bernard of Clairvaux to campaign for such an endeavour in his sermons in France and Germany. See W. Maleczeck, 'Eugen, III. Papst' in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* ed. by Robert-Henri Bautier and others, vols 9 (München, Zürich 1980-98), IV 1989, coll. 78-80.

378 Bernard, Cistercian abbot of Clairvaux and most influential ecclesiastical authority of his day was the leading propagator to instigate a second crusade after the fall of Edessa. See R. Grégoire, 'Bernhard von Clairvaux, Leben und Wirken' in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* ed. by Robert-Henri Bautier and others, vols 9 (München, Zürich 1980-98), I, coll. 1992-94.

379 German King Konrad III led the German contingent of the second crusade in 1147-1149. See O. Engels, 'Konrad, III dt. Kg.' in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* ed. by Robert-Henri Bautier and others, vols 9 (München, Zürich 1980-98), V 1991, coll. 1339-40.

380 French King Louis VII led the French contingent on the second crusade in 1147-1149. See Bernd Schneidmüller, 'Ludwig, VII., Kg. v. Frankreich' in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* ed. by Robert-Henri Bautier and others, vols 9 (München, Zürich 1980-98), V 1991, coll. 2183-84.

381 Edessa. See Schröder 1895, p. 392, footnote 4. Conquered by the atabeg of Mosul Imad ad-Din Zengi in 1144 which caused Pope Eugenius III to call for a second crusade. See J. Ferluga, 'Edessa, Stadt in der heut. sö. Türkei, II. Die Grafschaft Edessa' in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* ed. by Robert-Henri Bautier and others, vols 9 (München, Zürich 1980-98), VIII 1986, coll. 1568-69. The article, however, confuses Imad ad-Din with his son and successor Nur ad-Din.

382 Imad ad-Din Zengi Schröder 1895 p. 392, footnote 3. Like Roâs for Edessa, Sanguinus seems to have been a common latinised name for Imad ad-Din. See Otto of Freising, *Chronica*, Lib. VII, XXX, p. 356: *Sanguinus enim Halapensis Syriae ac Mesopotamie, excepta Antiochia et Damasco, princeps, Persarum vero et Medorum regis seu soltani vassallus, Edyssam, quae nunc Rohas dicitur, […] cum infinita Saracenorum multitudine circumdedit ac in ipsa, ut dixi, nativitate Domini irrupit, cunctis ibidem cum epsicopo urbis Christianis in ore gladii occisis vel miserabili captivitate in servitutem redactis.*

differs significantly in scope from the representatives of salvation historical world chronicles. While they set out to encompass the entire history of creation, the *Kaiserchronik* is firmly focused on the Empire and its rulers. Moreover, even though they do all end up in the present time of the author – a characteristic trait of chronicles – their treatment of this present is tellingly different. Orosius uses it to once more reiterate the validity of his main point that humanity suffered before the arrival of Christ, all present suffering has its place in God's greater scheme and that things are actually much better now when compared to pagan times. Otto even surpasses the temporal end of history in the present by developing a vision of the soteriological future. The *Kaiserchronik*, however, simply breaks off without finding the opportunity to comment on present times or tie the ending back to the prologue. Thus it cannot create a meaningful narrative structure or reflect upon its historiographical arc.[383] This opens the text up to criticism like Bertau's and makes it all the more puzzling why Ohly went to such lengths to associate the *Kaiserchronik* with the salvation historical tradition.[384]

IV.1.2.2 Christ and the Soteriological Apogee of History in Orosius's *Historiae adversum paganos*, Otto's *Chronica*, and the *Kaiserchronik*

Having established the borders of history in all three cases it becomes now necessary to consider the textual centre of gravity of the historiographical narrative in the three texts in question. It has been shown that Jesus Christ's appearance and acting on earth during the reign of Augustus mark the soteriological threshold when God's creation passes into a new covenant and a new temporal continuum of salvation historical reference. The following examples will further illuminate this phenomenon and shed light on how the *Kaiserchronik* – again – does not adhere to these premises. Orosius explicitly states the importance of Christ's incarnation at this specific point in history:

> So in the same year when Caesar, whom God in His deep mysteries had marked out for this task, ordered that the first census be taken in each and every province and that every man be recorded, God deemed it right to be seen as, and become, a man.[385]

---

[383] See White 1987, p. 20.

[384] See Ohly 1968, pp. 14-15.

[385] Paulus Orosius, *Seven Books of History against the Pagans*, p. 316. See Paulus Orosius, *Historiarum Adversum Paganos Libri VII*, Lib. VI, Cap. 22,6: *Eodem quoque anno tunc primum idem Caesar, quem his tantis mysteriis paedestinauerat Deus, censum agi singularum ubique prouinciarum et censeri omnes homines iussit, quando et Deus homo uideri et esse dignatus est. Tunc igitur natus est Christus, Romano censui statim adscriptus ut natus est.*

Augustus bringing peace to the Empire and closing the gates of the temple of Janus had set the historical stage for Christ's incarnation.[386] Only now does God determine to become man.[387]

> So 752 years after the foundation of the City, Christ was born and brought to the world the faith that gives salvation. Truly, He is the rock set at the heart of things, where there is ruination for whoever strikes against Him, but where whoever believes in Him is saved.[388]

The passage illustrates nicely the key position of Christ *medio rerum*. Temporally his appearance marks the tipping point in history after which the fate of the world is gradually aligned to the will of God. Soteriologically believing in him marks the watershed between those who are going to be saved and those who are going to be damned. Both angles shape Orosius's narrative on both sides of Christ's incarnation.

Similarly in Otto's *Chronica*:

> But when the fullness of the time came, God sent forth his son to lead back into the highway mortal men, who were wandering like the brutes through trackless and devious places. By taking upon himself the form of a man He proferred mortal men a highway; to recall those who were utterly astray from the error of falsehood to the light of reason, He revealed Himself in the truth; to make over anew the perishing he showed Himself as the true life […].[389]

Otto echoes Orosius when introducing Christ as the decisive threshold which mankind has to cross on its teleological course towards salvation. He is not only the foretold saviour of his own creation,

---

[386] See *P*aulus Orosius, *Historiarum Adversum Paganos Libri VII*, Lib. VI, Cap. 22,1: *Itaque anno ab Vrbe condita DCCLII Caesar Augustus ab oriente in occidentem, a septentrione in meridiem ac per totum Oceani circulum cunctis gentibus una pace conpositis, Iani portas tertio ipse tunc clausit.*

[387] See Paulus Orosius, *Historiarum Adversum Paganos Libri VII*, Lib. VI, Cap. 22,8: […] *quia Dominus noster Iesus Christus hanc urbem nutu suo auctam defensamque in hunc rerum apicem prouexerit, cuius potissime uoluit esse cum uenit, dicendus utique ciuis Romanus census professione Romani.*

[388] Paulus Orosius, *Seven Books of History against the Pagans*, p. 323. See Paulus Orosius, *Historiarum Adversum Paganos Libri VII*, Lib. VII, Cap. 3,1: *Igitur anno ab Vrbe condita DCCLII natus est Christus salutarum mundo adferens fidem, uere petra medio rerum posita, ubi comminueretur qui offenderet, qui crederet saluaretur; uere ignis ardens,quem qui sequitur inluminatur, qui temptat exuritur.*

[389] Otto of Freising, *The two Cities: A Chronicle of Universal History to the Year 1146 A.D.* trans. and ed. by Charles Christopher Mierow (New York 2002), p. 217; see Otto of Freising, *Chronica*, Lib. III, prologue: *At ubi venit plenitude temporis, misit Deus filium suum, in terras, qui, ut homines per invia ac devia more pecudum oberrantes ad viam reducerent, viam se hominem assumendo hominibus prebuit, et ut a falsitatis errore exorbitantes ad rationis lumen revocaret, veritatem se ostendit, ut vero deficientes reficeret, vitam se vera exhibuit.*

he is also the creator of the circumstances that allowed his incarnation in the first place. Otto elaborates expansively on why Jesus had to be born at this point in time and no earlier.[390] He finds a very succinct way to illustrate the seminal importance of Christ's birth for the course of history when he has different systems of reckoning of time culminate in the incarnation and then dismisses all of these and establishes that he will henceforth count the years starting anew from Christ's birth.[391]

Again, the contrast to the *Kaiserchronik*'s approach is striking. The crucial importance of Augustus's rule – it creates peace and unifies the world to prepare it for the coming of Christ – so often and sophisticatedly stressed by Orosius and Otto, falls almost completely flat. In the entirety of the rather short Augustus episode (KC 604-70), only one scant reference to Jesus can be found when, after Augustus has imposed a tribute to be paid by *arm unde rîche | di dâ wâren in sînem rîche* (KC 635-36), it is said:

> der cins stuont unz an den tac
> daz der wâre hailant
> von himele wart gesant,
> uns allen ze trôste,
> der uns von dem cinse relôste. KC 638-42

What seems to be a salvation historical prefiguration that the text can later build on to illustrate Christ's role as a saviour is, however, never revisited. The text seems to have little interest in synchronising Augustus's rule with the birth of Christ. When Augustus dies – poisoned by the Romans (KC 669-70), another idiosyncrasy of the *Kaiserchronik*'s historical account[392] – Jesus has not yet appeared. When he finally figures in the narrative it only happens in retrospect because he is already dead. Augustus's heir Tiberius has fallen ill: *wurme also freissam | in sînem houbete wuohsen* (KC 693-94) and no physician and no remedy are able to cure him (KC 696-98). This is when the emperor learns of an *aller wîsiste man* (KC 701) said to be living in Jerusalem who allegedly raised the dead and cured illnesses and therefore should also be able to save the emperor

---

[390] Two reasons: 1) The spirit of mankind had to be unified to be prepared for higher insights. 2) A unified faith should be planted into the heart of one mankind unified by the rule one City; Rome. See Otto of Freising, *Chronica*, Lib. III, prologue, p. 133.

[391] See Otto of Freising, *Chronica*, Lib. III, Cap. VI, p. 143: *Igitur novo homine, qui veterem evacuavit, nato, annalibus quoque a Nino ad Urbem conditam ac inde usque ad id tempus productis terminum demus, ab eiusque ortu annales nostros ordiamur.*

[392] See Ohly 1968, p. 52.

(KC 703-09). He sends out his emissary *Volûsîânus* (KC 719) to find him this marvellous *arzât* (KC 711) and only now the *Kaiserchronik* finally identifies the goal of his quest as the person the audience might already have suspected him to be:

> do er [Volusianus] in die burc ze Jerusalêm
> begunde rîten unte gên,
> dô frâct der die gesinden
> wa er Jhêsum mahte vinden,
> den vil guoten arzât,
> ob er waere in der stat,
> ob er dannoh lebete,
> oder wie er sih gehabete. KC 721-28

Jesus's introduction happens so suddenly it almost seems to have been conceived as some sort of surprise for the audience. Maybe the author is even playing a conscious game with their expectations: Jesus Christ, son of God and saviour of all mankind, after being conspicuously absent from where he was expected to enter the narrative, is not introduced according to his historical and soteriological significance but as a mere physician of some renown who is sent for to heal the ailing emperor. The comic potential of this newly arranged constellation is even heightened by Veronica's eventual revelation that the man Volusianus is looking for is already dead (KC 749-52). The question whether the *Kaiserchronik* twists the introduction of Christ into an elaborate narrative jest cannot be pursued here. It remains to be stated that the *Kaiserchronik* finds a narrative role for Christ, which is quite different from the Latin salvation historical chronicles and is mainly implemented with regard to its own version of the legend of Veronica. Another reason for this particular treatment of Christ might be an attempt to historicise him by shifting him out of his soteriological position into a time and space where he might have entered the consciousness of the pagan majority for more mundane reasons, thus providing an alternative perspective on the factuality of Christ unencumbered by Christian partisanship. Even Bertau – who is generally skeptical of the *Kaiserchronik*'s historiographical and literary qualities – is ready to admit that the *Kaiserchronik* sometimes concerns itself – somewhat surprisingly and in a very peculiar way – with rationalistic enquiries into its narratives.[393] However, in twelfth-century Bavaria there seems to be

[393] See Bertau 1972, p. 342: 'Mit Erstaunen bemerkt man: Der Erzähler scheint eine rationalistische Frage erwogen zu haben […].'

precious little need to provide additional historiographical validation of the evidence of Christ's existence.

Moreover, the following passages also fail to display any further interest in Christ's soteriological function in historiography. Veronica responds to the imperial emissary by asking whether he knew Jesus and then gives an account of his death and resurrection in a very matter-of-fact manner (KC 735-55). In these and in the following lines the focus is clearly on the pagans not knowing Jesus and on opening a window for Veronica to introduce Christianity into the Roman Empire via the shroud in her possession (KC 756-838).

IV.1.2.3 Nero and the Problem of Evil in Orosius's *Historiae adversum paganos*, Otto's *Chronica*, and the *Kaiserchronik*

Lastly, the presentation of Emperor Nero as the first persecutor of Christians will be compared. All three texts present him as the major antagonist of early Christianity after his predecessor Claudius merely expelled the Jews and maybe the Christians too from Rome.[394] From a soteriological point of view Nero's actions raise the question why God permits the persecution of the people of his new covenant by the Roman pagan authorities and how salvation history, as an apologetic tool for rationalising even adverse events in historical occurrence, reacts to these. From the very off Orosius presents Nero in unambiguously negative terms:

> He was a follower of his uncle Gaius Caligula in all his crimes and vices and, indeed, surpassed him, for he practised wantonness, lust, extravagance, greed, and cruelty with every kind of crime.[395]

After this Orosius lists some of Nero's most egregious alleged crimes, like the burning of Rome,

---

[394] See Paulus Orosius, *Historiarum Adversum Paganos Libri VII*, Lib. VII, Cap. 6,15: *Anno eiusdem nono expulsos per Claudium Vrbe Iudaeos Iosephus refert. Sed me magis Suetonis mouet, qui ait hoc modo: Claudius Iudaeos inpulsore Christo adsidue tumultuantes Roma expulit; quod, utrum contra Christum simul uelut cognatae religionis homines uolerit expelii, nequaquam discernitur.*
As Fear points out Orosius takes the account not from Josephus but from Suetonius. See Paulus Orosius, *Seven Books of History against the Pagans*, p. 333, footnote 83; see Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus, *De vita Caesarum libri VIII* ed. by Robert A. Kaster (Oxford 2016), Lib. V, Cap. 25,4: I*udaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantis Roma expulit.*

[395] See Paulus Orosius, *Seven Books of History against the Pagans*, p. 333; see Paulus Orosius, *Historiarum Adversum Paganos Libri VII*, Lib. VII, Cap. 7,1: *Gai Caligulae auunculi sui erga omnia uitia ac scelera sectator immo transgressor, petulantiam libidinem luxuriam auaritiam crudelitatem nullo non scelere exercuit.*
Orosus directly quotes Suetonius. See Suetonis, *De vita Caesarum,* Lib. VI, Cap. 26,1: *Petulantiam, libidinem, luxuriam, avaritiam, crudelitatem sensim quidem primo et occulte et velut iuvenili errore exercuit, sed ut tunc quoque dubium nemini foret naturae illa vitia, non aetatis esse.*

and narrates the most flamboyant manifestations of his lust, greed, and cruelty, which he mainly takes from Eutropius and Suetonius. Then he climaxes with Nero's persecution of the Christians.

> He added to this mound of iniquities his rash impieties towards God. For he was the first to execute and put to death Christians at Rome and command that they be hunted out and tortured in the same way throughout all the provinces. He tried to extirpate the very name of Christian, killing the blessed apostles of Christ, Peter and Paul, crucifying the former and putting the latter to death by the sword.[396]

In Orosius's logic of imminent divine vengeance, these crimes against the Christian community and its pillars cannot of course go unpunished.

> Soon great numbers of disaster piled up and beset the wretched city from all sides. For the following autumn, such a great plague broke out in the city that 30,000 funerals were entered into Libitina's books. On its heels disaster occurred in Britain, where two main towns were sacked amidst a stupendous slaughter of Roman citizens and their allies. Moreover, in the East the important provinces of Armenia were lost, Roman legions passed beyond the Parthian's yoke, and Syria was only retained with great difficulty. In Asia three cities, namely Laodicea, Hierapolis, and Colossae, were levelled by an earthquake.[397]

Fear's comments on his translation of Orosius show the narrative and chronographical tricks Orosius employs here to give his account of Nero's deeds and the evident factual consequences the right salvation historical spin. For example he ignores the fact that Suetonius lists the persecution of

---

[396] See Paulus Orosius, *Historiarum Adversum Paganos Libri VII*, Lib. VII, Cap. 7,10: *Auxit hanc molem facinorum eius temeritas impietatis in Deum. Nam primus Romae Christianos supliciis et mortibus affecit ac per omnes prouincias pari persecutione excruciari imperauit ipsumque nomen exstirpare conatus beatissimos Christi apostolos Petrum cruce, Paulum gladio occidit.*

[397] See Paulus Orosius, *Historiarum Adversum Paganos Libri VII*, Lib. VII, Cap. 7,11-12: *Mox aceruatim miseram civitatem obortae undique oppressere clades. Nam subsequente autumn tanta Vrbi pestilential incubuit, ut triginata milia funerum in rationem Libitinae uenirent. Britannica deinde clades e uestigio accidit, qua duo praecipua oppida magna ciuium sociorumque clade et caeda direpta sunt.* 12 *Praeterea in oriente magnis Armeniae prouinciis amissis Romanae sub iugum Parthicum missae, aegreque Syria retenta est. In Asia tres urbes, hoc est Laudicia Hierapolis Colossae, terrae motu conciderunt.*

Christians amongst Nero's good deeds,[398] anachronistically exaggerates the situation in Armenia,[399] and moves the date of the earthquake in comparison to his source Jerome so it happens now after Nero's martyring of Peter and Paul and can thus be seen as a consequence of these transgressions against Christianity.[400] Whilst Orosius does not offer an explanation as to why Nero is allowed by the premises of salvation history to commit those crimes against Christianity he deftly creates a counterweight of only causally connected historical occurrences he can present as divinely administered retribution.

Otto's account takes the initial catalogue of Nero's sins almost directly from Orosius[401] but interpolates one crucial passage in which he aims to explain the reason for the suffering of Christians under Nero's rule:

> To these disgraceful deeds he added impiety towards God: he was the first to institute a persecution of the Christians. This we believe was not done without the design of God, namely that His City might first have a foe of this sort, a foe whom even the city of earth would abhor on account of his crimes involved in his monstrously wicked deeds, a foe to whom nothing seemed dishonorable save honor.[402]

Within the soteriological system of the two cities Otto reasons that the presentation of such a terrible adversary to the Christians was indeed God's will, to bring the budding *civitas Dei* closer to the still sinful *civitas terrena* by means of an enemy whose atrocities and vile deeds surpass even what the *civitas terrena* is able to tolerate. He picks up this strand of salvation historical argument

---

398 See Paulus Orosius, *Seven Books of History against the Pagans*, p. 335, footnote 98. Suetonius devotes the sixth book of his *De Vita XII caesarum* to Nero. After a short account of his childhood and how he became emperor he first lists his good deeds, and then starting with the twentieth chapter moves on to list his vile deeds. See Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus, *De vita Caesarum libri VIII* ed. by Robert A. Kaster (Oxford 2016), Lib. VI, Cap. 19,3, p. 114: *Haec partim nulla reprehensione, partim etiam non mediocri laude digna in unum contuli, ut secernerem a probris ac sceleribus eius, de quibus dehinc dicam.*
The persecution of Christians is featured in chapter 16,2 next to Nero infringing on the debaucheries of the chariot drivers and banishing pantomimes from the city. See *De vita Caesarum*, Lib. VI, Cap. 16,2, p.110: [A]*fflicti suppliciis Christiani, genus hominum superstitionis novae ac maleficae* […].

399 See Paulus Orosius, *Seven Books of History Against the Pagans*, p. 335, footnote 101.

400 See Paulus Orosius, *Seven Books of History against the Pagans*, p. 335, footnote 104.

401 See Otto of Freising, *Chronica*, Lib. III, Cap 15, pp. 153-54. Moreover, Frutolf's account might have been the actual source for Otto. See *Chronica* FvSGA, p. 243, footnote 99-99*.

402 Otto of Freising, *The two cities*, p. 241; see Otto of Freising, *Chronica*, Lib. III, Cap 15, pp. 153-54: *His flagitiosissimis factis impietatem in Deum adiecit. Primus enim persecutionem in Christianos movit. Quod non sine consilio Dei factum credimus, ut videlicet civitas sua talem hostem primo haberet, quem ob flagitiorum suorum scelera civitas etiam mundi abhorreret, cui nichil preter honestatem inhonestum videbatur.*

when Nero dies. First he narrates his suicide following Orosius's account,[403] but then adds another explanatory passage devised to connect it to a wider salvation historical framework:

> Yet there were not lacking men [Augustine[404]] to say that this which is contained in the writings of the apostle, 'And how ye know that which restraineth, to the end that he may be revealed in his own season,' [II Thessalonians 2, 6] and also, 'He that restraineth, let him restrain until he be taken out of the way', was spoken of Nero, under whom Paul wrote; and they thought that Nero was not dead but had been withdrawn alive from human affairs until the last day, to appear in that generation which then was, and that he himself would be Antichrist.[405]

Nero is turned into some sort of Proto-Antichrist in rapture which explains why his actions are not only permitted but necessary in the greater plan of divine providence. Not only is he evil *in eo ipso* and strives to destroy the *civitas Dei*[406] but he also has a salvation historical role to play in the future as the potential adversary of Christ in the Apocalypse.[407] This argument displays the maximal breadth of salvation historical argument: it ties the tribulations of the present to the biblically asserted future and turns earthly plights into soteriological preparation for the things to come beyond the horizon of historiography once the eschatological telos of salvation has been reached.

The *Kaiserchronik*'s account of Nero echoes the introductions of Orosius and Otto when it characterises him from the very beginning as *der aller wirste man | der von muoter in dise werlt ie bekom* (KC 4085-86). There can hardly be any retreating from this apodictic assessment of Nero's

---

[403] See Otto of Freising, *Chronica*, Lib. III, Cap 16, p. 155: *Nero, qui audivit in Hyspania Galbam ab exercitu imperatorem factum, animo concidens, cum perturbare rem publicam molitur, a senatu hostis pronunciatur. Videns itaque maliciam suam ad effectum se perducere nin posse, fugiens ad IIIItum ab Urbe lapidem XIIII imperii sui anno se interfecit, in ipsoque familia Cesarum defecit.* See Paulus Orosius, *Historiarum Adversum Paganos Libri VII*, Lib. VII, Cap. 7,13: *at uero Nero postquam Galbam Hispania imperatorem creatum ab exercitu cognouit, totus animo ac spe concidit. Cumque incredibilia perturbandae, immo subruendae reipublicae mala moliretur, hostis a senatu pronuntiatus et ignominiosissime fugiens, ad quartum ab Vrbe lapidem sese ipse interfecit, atque in eo omnis Caesarum familia consumpta est.*

[404] St Augustin, *De civitate Dei*, Lib. XX, Cap. XIX,3, p. 958: *Quidam putant hoc de imperio dictum fuisse Romano; et propterea Paulum apostolum non id aperte scribere voluisse, ne calumniam videlicet incurreret, quod Romano imperio male optaverit, cum speraretur aeternum: ut hoc quod dixit; Jam enim mysterium iniquitatis operatur, Neronem voluerit intelligi, cujus jam facta velut Antichristi videbantur. Unde nonnulli ipsum resurrecturum, et futurum Antichristum suspicantur.*

[405] Otto of Freising, *The two cities*, pp. 243-44; see Otto of Freising, *Chronica*, Lib. III, Cap 16, p. 155: *Non defuerunt tamen, qui dicerent hoc quod in apostolo habetur*: Et nunc quid detineat, scitis, donec reveletur in suo tempore, *et illud:* Qui tenet, teneat, donec de medio fiat, *de Nerone, sub quo Paulus scripsit, dictum fuisse, arbitrabanturque Neronem non mortuum, sed humanis rebus vivum substractum usque ad ultimum tempus, in ea, qua tunc fuit, etate appariturum ipsumque Antichristum.*

[406] See Otto of Freising, *Chronica*, Lib. III, Cap 16, p. 155: *Igitur dum Nero Christianos persequendo civitatem Dei destruere molitur* [...].

[407] See Revelations 12-14.

vile character. Subsequently, a string of Nero's atrocities is presented, structurally informed by Orosius and with regard to content enriched by legends from different sources.[408] The burning of Rome (KC 4087-4100) is the most famous one, with the greatest historical validity going back all the way to Suetonius;[409] in the *Kaiserchronik* it is expanded by Nero having tournaments conducted in the conflagration. The colourful array of vile deeds then continues with Nero's inquisitive killing of his mother (KC 4105-13) and his alchemically induced pregnancy and birth of a toad (KC 4113-54). These bizarre anecdotes of evil are intertwined and tied together by short transitions (e.g. KC 4101-04) and steered towards the apex of Nero's depravity and maledictions: the confrontation of the apostles Peter and Paul with their adversary Simon Magus, their triumph and subsequent murder at Nero's command (KC 4155-4253). His killing of the two, who are immediately received into heaven as saints (KC 4254-64), seals his fate:

> sîn dinc ergienc im ubele
> nâh dirre marter hêre,
> begunder siechen sêre,
> ze aller êrist von pôdagrâ –
> sô stât gescriben dâ –
> dar nâh von der vergihte,
> da nâh von miselsuhte;
> ze jungist begunder ze winnen. KC 4268-75

Nero's ignoble fate is directly causally linked to his killing of Peter and Paul: God punishes him for the death of his apostles. The miserable death of a subject who is presented in an unfavourable light and eviscerated by repellent and foul-smelling diseases is a frequent motif not only in the *Kaiserchronik* but throughout medieval historiography. By tarnishing the circumstances of the death of the person in question the chronicles imply a providential punishment for temporal sins, which

---

[408] See Ohly 1968, pp. 84-88: Ohly identifies Donizo's ca 1115 *Vita Mathildis* as the only text older than the *Kaiserchronik* to tell the tale of Nero killing his mother. Moreover, he manages to connect the toad-episode to a grammatician's fable on the etymology of the Latin toponym *Lateranum*, which can be traced back all the way to the early ninth-century, but finds its first narrative arrangement in the *Kaiserchronik*.

[409] Suetonius, *De vita Caesarum.* Lib. VI, Cap. 38,1: *Nam quasi offensus deformitate veterum aedificiorum et angustiis flexurisque vicorum, incendit urbem tam palam, ut plerique consulares cubicularios eius cum stuppa taedaque in praediis suis deprehensos non attigerint, et quaedam horrea circum domum Auream, quorum spatium maxime desiderabat, ut bellicis machinis labefacta atque inflammata sint, quod saxeo muro constructa erant.* 2 *Per sex dies septemque noctes ea clade saevitum est ad monumentorum bustorumque deversoria plebe compulsa. Tunc praeter immensum numerum insularum domus priscorum ducum arserunt hostilibus adhuc spoliis adornatae deorumque aedes ab regibus ac deinde Punicis et Gallicis bellis votae dedicataeque, et quidquid visendum atque memorabile ex antiquitate duraverat. Hoc incendium e turre Maecenatiana prospectans laetusque 'flammae,' ut aiebat, 'pulchritudine' Halosin Ilii in illo suo scaenico habitu decantavit.*

inaugurates damnation beyond the grave. One of the more prominent examples of medieval political thought on the topic which might be of relevance for the *Kaiserchronik* is, as Ohly pointed out,[410] John of Salisbury and his musings on the death of tyrants in his political work *Policraticus*.[411] Here he argues that tyrants might work in accordance with God's will – for example Cyrus and Darius who conquered Babylon[412] – but also that the historical record shows how it is just and honourable to deceive and ultimately kill tyrants who threaten the state.[413] Their deaths are decreed by God according to their rule as either just rulers or malevolent tyrants.[414] Combined with the medieval fear of the *mors peccatorum pessima* without final blessing, the last rites, and the forgiving of sins,[415] a powerful narrative tool emerges in the hands of contemporary chroniclers: to illustrate the quality of a historical personage's life they can render his or her death accordingly. A grim and miserable death signifies a life marked by debaucheries and sinfulness and indicates the damnation of the soul.[416]

The *Kaiserchronik* most prominently deploys this narrative schema in the case of the heretic *Arriûs* (KC 13,437), who dies before he can defend his heresy at the synod of Ephesus in a privy (KC 13,476) because *daz gewaide was von im gevallen* (KC 13,477).

Nero's death falls into the same category. Unambiguous signifiers of his damnation caused by his vicious life accompany each step of his passing. The fate of his body after his death illustrates especially well just how high a price he has to pay for his sins:

> die liute wolten in ûz tragen,
> bi den fuozen zôh man in in den burcgraben.
> Die tievel kômen dar

---

410 See Ohly 1968, pp. 18-20.

411 See John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, Lib. VIII, Cap. 18. See for books I to IV the newer edition: John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, Corpvs Christianorum Continuatio Mediaeualis 118 ed. by K.S.B. Keats-Rohan (Turnholt 1993). English translation: John of Salisbury, *Policraticus: The Statesman's Book* ed. by Murray Markland (New York 1973).

412 See John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, Lib. VIII, Cap. 18, p. 359: *Vnde propheta; Ingedientur portas Babilonis duces, uidelice Cirus et Darius; ego enim mandaui sanctificatis meis et uocaui fortes meos in ire mea et exultantes in gloria mea* [Isa. 13,2-3]. *Ecce quia sanctificatos uocat Medos et Persas, non quod sancti essent, sed Domini aduersus Babilonem implebant uoluntatem.*

413 See *Policraticus*, Lib. VIII, Cap. 18, p. 364: *Ex quibus facile liquebit quia semper tiranno licuit adulari, licuit eum decipere et honestum fuit occidere, si tamen aliter cherceri non poterat;* Lib. VIII, Cap. 19, p. 371: *Sicut ergo dampnatum hostem licet occidere, sic tirannum.*

414 See *Policraticus*, Lib. VIII, Cap. 19, p. 371: […] *sed quomodo omnium domuerit tirannidem aut represserit clementia Dei, qui pro decreto iustitiae, quando uult, flagellum inducit in delinquentium penam et, quando uult, quos fecit penitentes admittit ad ueniam.*

415 Olaf Rader, *Friedrich II. Der Sizilianer auf dem Kaiserthron: Eine Biographie* (München 2010), p. 485.

416 The many different renditions of the death of Emperor Frederick II about one hundred years after the *Kaiserchronik* was written exemplify this prominently. See Rader 2010, pp. 486-89.

mit ainer micheln scar
in swarzer vogele pilede.
In ainem michelem genibele
nâmen si die sêle:
die helle bûwet si iemer mêre.
Der lîchname was unraine.
Die wolfe frâzen sîn gebaine. KC 4291-4300

Nero is physically and metaphysically completely eradicated. His soul now dwells eternally in hell and wolves devour even his mere bones. The gravity of his sins corresponds proportionally to the graphicness of his demise. However, compelling the textual representation of Nero's deeds and his ultimate fate in the *Kaiserchronik* are, it must nonetheless be stated that the text does not move beyond the implementation of a simple narrative of just punishment for blatantly sinful behaviour. Salvation historical problems as to why Nero is allowed to act in the way he does and what part his actions play in the greater scheme of things are apparently of no concern and of no interest to the *Kaiserchronik*. His punishment appears to happen almost automatically due to very basic theological premises, which are engrained deeply enough in the cultural and theological sphere in which the text was written and received to work without being actually debated in the text itself.

It has been demonstrated that the *Kaiserchronik* does not adhere to the parameters of salvation historical presentation of history provided by texts such as Orosius's *Historiae adversum Paganos* and Otto's *Chronica*, which display its classic application. The *Kaiserchronik* either shows no interest in the narrative potential and historiographical problems created by a salvation historical expectation with regard to the unfolding of history, or it finds alternative and even idiosyncratic ways to integrate the objects of soteriological references for its own narrative purposes. While this does not exclude the presence of salvation historical thought in individual episodes, as shown below, it can be asserted that salvation history should be disregarded once and for all as an over-arching hermeneutical lens for the reading of the *Kaiserchronik*. Generally, more caution should be applied when using salvation history as a perspective. The above analysis has shown that far more is required in order to demonstrate a text's salvation historical structure than merely identifying a vague theological and teleological charge of historiography.

IV.1.3 Contingent and Contained Salvation History: the Sack of Jerusalem

This is not to say that salvation history does not play any role at all in the *Kaiserchronik*. There are passages which display clear soteriological content. But while they do exist it is doubtful that they were as formative and productive for the chronicle as the scholarly tradition usually assumes. Nevertheless, this assertion remains incomplete until those elements that form a part of the *Kaiserchronik* have been duly considered and positioned with regard to the results of the above analysis.

The second part of the already discussed Tiberius episode provides perhaps the most systematically salvation historical passage of the text: the indicators identified and commented on above as not actually present in the text are fully fleshed out here. Biblical prophecy introduces Titus's and Vespasian's march on Rome, which is introduced as a metadiegetic allusion on Luke 19. 41-44. Drawing on Christ's lamentation of the things to come for Jerusalem the *Kaiserchronik* expands the prophetical content of this passage. It aims to prepare the ground for an interpretation of the Roman sacking of Jerusalem as fulfilment of New Testament prophecy.

> dâ nâhet in daz zit
> daz in dâ vor gesaget was.
> daz êvangeljum kundet uns daz:
> dô unser hêrre vuor in die burc ze Jerusalêm,
> unt zuo der marter solte gên. KC 862-66

Almost every line provides crucial information and creates a sense of historic specificity and textual focus otherwise largely absent from the chronicle. Line 862 sets the stage for prophetic fulfilment, the following lines specify the source of the prophecy to be fulfilled. The personal pronoun *in* for third person dative plural is used twice to clearly target the prophecy at the Jews and contrasts with first person dative plural *uns* which indicates the audience of the prophecy: the object and the witnesses of salvation historical fulfilment become linguistically separated from each other. Lines 865 to 866 situate the utterance of the prophecy clearly in time and space: Jerusalem, shortly before Jesus arrives there on Palm Sunday to set in motion the events leading to the crucifixion five days later. These lines both help to localise the events referred to in the biblical memory of the audience and to create a salvation historical vantage point which imparts meaning to the following passages.

die stat er an sah,
daz wort er wainende sprach:[417]
‘Owî kint von Jerusalêm,
waz iu ze laide muoz gescehen!
wainet niht mînen tôt:
mîn vater hât iz von himel alsô geordenôt.
ir meget wol wainen diu dinc
die her nâh kunftic sint. KC 873-80

Now prophecy is complemented by divine predestination. The future, to which the text refers is not the crucifixion, which in the language of line 877 is already presupposed, but the events about to unfold in the primary narrative of the Tiberius episode. When Jesus refers to God as *mîn vater* (KC 878) he actualises the main point of friction between Judaism and Christianity and then clarifies that the suffering of the Jews is preordained. Jesus's prophecy permeates several layers of time. Metadiegetically situated in the biblical past he nevertheless verbalises the assumed biblical knowledge of a twelfth-century audience, thus providing a transition from two firmly established spheres of knowledge into the primary diegesis of the events leading to the sack of Jerusalem in 70 BC. This temporal intersection is exemplified by the three layers of crying in the text: Jesus himself is *wainende* (KC 874), when he denounces the implicit but not yet eventuated lamenting of his passing by the Jews (KC 877). He extends his lamentation forward to the sacking of Jerusalem in 70 CE where his prophecy and the audience's reception of the text are about to converge and where the crying of the Jews will be more appropriate (KC 880).

The last lines of the *Kaiserchronik*'s paraphrase of Christ's prophecy could be taken almost directly from Luke's biblical record in which the impending doom of Israel is causally linked to the Jewish refusal or failure to recognise Jesus as their foretold messiah:

ir werdet zevuoret,
allez iwer geslehte zestôret,
iwer salbe sâme in Israhêle
engesamenôt sih niemer mêre;
want ir des zîtes niht erkantet

[417] Almost verbatim from the bible, See Vulgate, Luke 19. 41: *Et ut adpropinquavit videns civitatem flevit super illam dicens*

dô iu got fride zu hûs sante.[418] KC 886-73

The excursus from Tiberius's age back to Jesus's lifetime comes to an end with a final assertion of the fulfilment of biblical prophecy in historical events about to occur: *Diu gotes wort wurden wâr* (KC 897).

The following accounts of Josephus's miraculous escape and the Romans' conquering and razing of the city are regularly infused with commenting excursuses which erect a cohesive explanatory background, something exceedingly rare in the *Kaiserchronik*, that clearly points to the salvation historical meaning of the depicted events. The mass suicide is depicted as another factor legitimating the divine retribution about to be meted out by the Romans (KC 1002-08). In this instance the *Kaiserchronik* fully subscribes to the salvation historical concept of the fall of Jerusalem marking a pivotal moment which divides history into a before – *da vôr* (KC 1004) in which the Jews are the beloved people of God – and an after in which they have lost this position. According to this logic, the destruction of Jerusalem becomes nothing but the belated final act and concluding chapter of Old Testament history. So far salvation history had been understood as the history of the Jewish people being congruent with the history of God's presence and revelations in his creation.[419] Now with this position cleared the Christians can succeed.

After the Romans storm the city, the text doubles back on the Jews' succession by the Christians as God's chosen carriers of salvation historical responsibility. Through repeated use of the adverb *ê* it illustrates the total reduction of the Hebrews from their former position in God's favour and *in extenso* as carriers of historical semantics and soteriological teleology:

die ê wâren chuone
die wurden alle blôde
die ê wâren siges helede
die wurden alle fremede;
der schalke werc si worhten
die man ê vorhte. KC 1055-60
[…]

[418] See Vulgate, Luke 19. 42-44: Q*uia si cognovisses et tu et quidem in hac die tua quae ad pacem tibi nunc autem abscondita sunt ab oculis tuis quia venient dies in te et circumdabunt te inimici tui vallo et circumdabunt te et coangustabunt te undique ad terram prosternent te et filios qui in te sunt et non relinquent in te lapidem super lapidem eo quod non cognoveris tempus visitationis tuae.*

[419] See Campenhausen 1979, p. 37.

duo wurden die gesceiden
di der ê wâren heime. KC 1065-66

After this the *Kaiserchronik* conjures the *althêrren* (KC 1068), the paragons of the soteriologically still relevant *alte ê* like Saul, Jonathan, David, and Salomon, but transposes the heritage of their authority to the Christians: *von ir wîsheit | frouwet sih noh diu cristenheit (*KC 1073-74). The text concludes this salvation historical commentary with a final explication of the Hebrews' fall from God's grace:

jâ stuont diu stat ze Jerusalêm
mit michelen êren
unz si merterten unsern hêrren:
do nemaht ir hêrchefte niemer sîn. KC 1080-83

The transgression against the son of God facilitates the epochal shift. In the end the surviving Hebrews are carried away in chains to be sold as slaves and to take up the societal place the medieval audience knows them to hold in their own time: an uprooted, marginalised diaspora.

wie maht in iemer wirs gescehen?
in ze laster unt ze scanden.
si sint in fremeden landen
unz an den jungisten tac,
daz in niemen gehelfen mac. KC 1100-04

In the last lines of the episode, the text picks up the topical helplessness of the Hebrews, introduced during Jesus's prophecy at its beginning in lines 881 and 882 (*iu kumt der tac | daz niemen dem anderem gehelfen mac*). With this it closes a framework which emphasises the preordained nature of the divine retribution that is visited upon the Hebrews. Simultaneously it projects the temporal duration of their suffering until the soteriological end of history itself, the *jungisten tac.*

To summarise, when it comes to the soteriological fate of the Hebrews, the *Kaiserchronik* proves itself quite capable of marshalling the narrative tools of salvation history: biblical prophecy, divinely preordained retribution, exacted fulfilment, eschatological perspective, and the concomitant historical commentary; taken together, these display a historiographical awareness

unique to the second part of the Tiberius episode. But the retributive logic of the sack of Jerusalem passage does not have any effect beyond the Tiberius episode. It does not inform other episodes or help to construct an overarching soteriological argument running through the rest of the *Kaiserchronik*. Comparing the text's version with its sources sheds light not only on the indebtedness of salvation historical elements to the source traditions but also on what the *Kaiserchronik* lacks for it to be a cohesive salvation historical narrative.

The notion that Jesus's prophecy according to Luke was fulfilled in the events of 70 CE had entered Christian historical conceptions from an early stage. Starting with Hegesippus as mediated by Eusebius, a long line of Christian apologists from Justin Martyr to Tertullian used this historical fact as a signifier for the truth of the Christian message and the supersession of the old Judaic covenant by the new Christian one.[420] From historiography the idea found its way into the late sixth-century homilies of Gregory the Great and Bede the Venerable. Ohly believes that the concept as it is presented in the *Kaiserchronik* is firmly rooted in contemporary sermons like e.g. those by Honorius Augustodunensis. Moreover, both the memory of the fall of Jerusalem and the potential for its polemical exploitation find their space in the Christian year in the sermons for the tenth Sunday after Trinity.[421]

The second part of the Tiberius episode, which tells of Vespasian's and Titus's sacking of Jerusalem, owes much to Flavius Josephus's account of the Jewish War. Josephus is held in high regard by the author of the *Kaiserchronik* as he praises his didactic quality as a source (KC 1041-44). This explicit appreciation of an author whose text directly or indirectly influenced the *Kaiserchronik*'s historical account is unique.[422] It is later echoed by Pope Silvester in the Constantine episode, when he utilises Josephus's established authority to refute a polemic argument during his disputation with the wise Jewish men (KC 8693-95).

Two episodes – Josephus's orchestrating of the collective Jewish mass suicide (KC 965-1001) and the desperate mother who kills and cooks her own child (KC 909-60) – originate in Josephus, and the rest of the sack of Jerusalem are largely constructed on the basis of Josephus's account of events.[423]

---

[420] See Campenhausen1979, pp. 36-37. For more on the early role of the fall of Jerusalem in Christian writing see the Heinz-Martin Döpp, *Die Deutung der Zerstörung Jerusalems und des Zweiten Tempels im Jahre 70 in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten n. Chr,*Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter 24 (Tübingen, Basel 2002).

[421] See Ohly 1968, p.58.

[422] Ohly suspects several layers of mitigating transmission especially an array of homilies since the ninth century: Haymo of Halberstadt, Radulphus Ardens, Honorius Augustodunensis, Werner of St Blase, and Sicardus of Cremona. See Ohly1968, pp. 60-61.

[423] *Judean War* III, 359, pp. 217-19; *Judean War* VI, 207, pp. 353-54. Ohly lists more texts transmitting this tradition, See Ohly 1986, p. 62. ; *J*

From the other longer narrative sources Ohly had identified for the Veronica legend and the Tiberius episode as a whole,[424] only the *Vindicta Salvatoris* seems to have informed the second part, albeit with limited effect.[425] This seventh- or eighth-century text originated in Aquitaine and is part of the Latin revenge legends, which formed as demotic interpretations of history to create a satisfying sense of retribution for the murder of Christ by the Jews amongst the legends' audience.[426]

Indeed in the *Vindicta Salvatoris* the logic of retribution is so persuasive that even the Jews themselves subscribe to it. They accept their death as a punishment, which leads some of them to kill themselves and others to subject themselves to the judgement of Vespasian and Titus, demanding: 'Judge for us how we ought to die, because we delivered Christ to death'.[427] The text is very explicit in developing motifs surrounding the death of Jesus Christ into prophetic and typological connections to the events of the sack of Jerusalem.

> And they went down into Judea and came into Jerusalem and seized your kings and sent them to judgement, so saying: 'Just as they did with Christ, so also let us do to them. They hung our Lord on a green tree and let us hang them on a dry tree; they killed Him without fault and let us kill them with the foulest death; they took his tunic and divided it into four parts and let us rent them into four parts and give their bodies to the beasts of the earth and birds of the air; they sold Christ for thirty silver pieces and we give thirty of them for one piece of silver and let their names be obliterated from the earth.[428]

Here, in Volusianus's account to Tiberius, Vespasian and Titus deliberately devise the atrocities which they are going to inflict upon the Jews in Jerusalem as inverted mirror images of the circumstances of Christ's death.

Another motif which runs though the *Vindicta Salvatoris* is the Christians' repeated proclamation

---

[424] The *Curia sanitatis Tiberii*, the *Vindicta Salvatoris*, and the Latin Pilate-prose. See Ohly 1986, p. 56.

[425] See Ohly 1968, p.60.

[426] See Heinz Schreckenberg, *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld*, European University Studies, Series 13, 172 (Frankfurt aM and others 1990), pp. 463-64.

[427] See *Vindicta Salvatoris*, §§ 15-17, pp. 266-68, esp. § 18: *Iudicate nobis quomodo mori debemus quia Christum ad morte tradidimus.*

[428] See *Vindicta Salvatoris*, §§ 30&31, p. 290: *Descenderuntque in Iudeam et uenerunt in Hierosolimam, adprehenderunt reges tuos es miserunt eos in iudicio, ita dicentes: 'Quomodo fecereunt de Christo, ita es nnos faciamus illos. Suspenderunt dominum nostrum in lignum uiride, et nos suspendemus eos in arido; occiderunt ille sine culpe, et nos occidamus illos morte turpissima; acceperunt tonciam eius et fecerunt de ea partes .IIII., et nos scindamus eos in quattuor partes et damus carnes illorum bestiis terre et uolatilibus caeli; uendiderunt Christum .XXX. argenteos, et nos damus pro uno argenteo .XXX. ex illis et deleantur nomina illorum de terra.'*

that their redeemer lives. This is most prominently performed by Veronica: 'And I shall worship Him and serve Him as long as I live because He, my Redeemer, lives and I shall see God, my Saviour on the last day.'[429] She echoes Volusianus's previous exclamation upon first setting eyes on the shroud of Veronica[430] and Joseph of Arimathea's confession of his belief in the bodily resurrection on Judgement Day.[431] The threefold repetition of the same phrase by exemplary Christians shows a clear wish for salvation historical shaping of the text's account. In these expressions Christian certainty of resurrection and eternal life, both for Christ and for themselves, is intertwined and projected towards the eschatological future. Both the death of Christ and the sack of Jerusalem are interpreted as historical events with an eschatological unfolding, thus marking the text's salvation historical trajectory. Similar notions are expressed in the *Kaiserchronik* but do not feature in the same structural form and remain contained within the source-bound premises of discrete episodes like the Tiberius episode.

In a way, Heinrich von Veldeke's *Eneasroman* is more of a salvation historical narrative than the *Kaiserchronik*. After Heinrich's narration has found its diegetic conclusion with the great celebration of the wedding and coronation of Eneas and Lavinia (ER 344,5-347,9), the narrator cannot bring himself to stop. The historical role of his material as a prequel to the foundation of Rome demands that the story should be carried on. From Eneas the text speeds through the rule of his sons Ascanius and Silvius Eneas at Alba Longa (ER 350,2-33) to Silvius's descendants Romulus and Remus (ER 350,34-351,9), quickly referencing the foundation of Rome, fast forwarding to Caesar, his conquests and his assassination (ER 351,11-26), and finally concluding with Augustus and his just and peaceful reign: *do vil wol waren behuot* | *wittewen vnd waisen* | *von vnrechten fraisen*, | *von arme vnd reiche* (ER 351,27-30). The role of these auspicious circumstances is of course – as with Otto or Orosius – to inaugurate the incarnation of Christ:

> bei den zeiten wart der gottes suon
> geboren ze Bethelehem,
> der seit gemartirt wart ze Ierusalem
> vns allen ze troste,
> wan er vns erloste

---

[429] *Vindicta Salvatoris* § 26, p. 284: *Et ego adorabo eum et seruiam ei usque dum uiua sum quia ipse, redemptor meus, uiuit et in nouissimo die uidebo Deum saluatorem meum.*

[430] *Vindicta Salvatoris* § 24, p. 280: *Viuit dominus et uiuit anima mea*.

[431] *Vindicta Salvatoris* § 21, p. 276: *Et ego credo quod ipse redemptor meus uiuit, et in nouissimo die de terra surrecturus sim, et in carne mea uidebo ipsum Deum saluatorem meum.*

auzir der freisleichen not,
wan er den ewigen tot
mit seinem tode ersterbite,
den Adam an vns erbote.
als hat er vns erlost,
daz ist vns ein michel trost,
ob wir es selbe helaten. ER 352,2-13

On his tour d'horizon through history from Eneas to Augustus, Heinrich von Veldeke follows the same lines as the *Kaiserchronik* lays out in its pre-episodic part and the early episodes, but – other than in the *Kaiserchronik* – the apogee towards which Heinrich's narrative is targeted is the incarnation. The birth of Christ might be completely irrelevant for the diegetic world of Eneas, Lavinia and Turnus, but to firmly anchor his text in the Christian present's cultural axioms it has to extend itself on the salvation historical axis through Roman history until the fulfilment of God's salvific promise.[432]

IV.2. From Pagan to Christian Rome

IV.2.1 Christian Conversion

IV.2.1.1 Early Contacts with Christianity: Tiberius, Faustinian, and Philip

The process of qualitative change affecting the religious identity of the Roman Empire is a process of conversion; and for long stretches the *Kaiserchronik* can be read as a history of conversion from pagan polytheism to Christianity and the formation of the Christian identity of the Empire. The *Kaiserchronik* develops certain episodes into important signposts along the way: from the city of pagan temples and statues of the weekday calendar, or the Gaius episode, to the first imperial brushes with Christianity in the Tiberius, Faustinian, and Philip episodes, to the persecutions by Nero, Decius, and Diocletian, on to the full onslaught of official imperial conversion under

[432] For more on salvation historical patterns in Heinrich von Veldeke's Eneasroman see Karen Opitz, Geschichte im höfischen Roman: Historiographisches Erzählen im Eneas Heinrichs von Veldeke, *Germanistisch Romanische Monatsschrift*, Beiheft 14 (Heidelberg 1996). pp. 199-216. And also slightly dated: Marie-Luise Dittrich, *Die Eneide Heinrichs von Veldeke: Quellenkritischer Vergleich mit dem Roman d'Eneas und Vergils Aeneis*, 2 vols (Wiesbaden 1966) I, pp. 560-64.

Constantine and Silvester, through the retarding interlude of Julianus up to Theodosius, whose reign marks the end of linear and teleological conversion to Christianity in the *Kaiserchronik*. The section on continuity from Chapter II has already done much to set up the starting point from which the gradual process of Christianisation launches in the *Kaiserchronik*:[433] the pagan gods were demons all along, the pagan worship of their idols is in the end nothing but a fraud set up by devils to corrupt the pagans. To arrive in the Christian present of the twelfth century the *Kaiserchronik* now has to introduce a momentum of conversions, which transforms the thoroughly pagan Rome into a Christian place.

The curious disinterest in the incarnation of Christ and his life and deeds has already been pointed out.[434] It is not Christ's birth, life, death, or resurrection, which puts Christianity on the narrative map of the *Kaiserchronik* but – in true form to its main narrative axis – Christianity's first contact with imperial authority in the Tiberius episode. Tiberius's healing elicits great rejoicing from the Romans (KC 836-38) and he speaks of Christ as the *hêrre* (KC 851) of whom the Jews have unlawfully robbed them. So even though Tiberius's conversion to Christianity is not made explicit, as it is in the source material from the *Vindicta Salvatoris*,[435] the language he uses, which includes him in the collective deprived of their lord, strongly implies it.

The first time Christianity appears as a collective in the diegetic historical paradigm of the *Kaiserchronik* is two episodes later, in the Faustinian episode, when it is pointed out that Zachary had been sent to Greece by St Peter der *christenheit ze trôste* (KC 1476).[436] It is not entirely clear whether this indicates an already existing Christian community there, which – presumably assailed by persecution by the Roman authorities – is supported by Zachary's new monastery or whether this is not rather to be understood as a more general statement about the monastery's beatific presence and function for the sake of Christianity. Both the nascent Christianity of the first century and the contemporary Christianity of the twelfth century as part of a universal and transhistorical Christian world could be covered by this statement. But the explicit establishment of Christianity as a converting and proselytising movement is – like Zachary's mission to Greece – firmly tied to St Peter, the *gruntveste der christenheit* (KC 2465). During his first disputation with Simon Magus, Peter relates the core of the apostolic mission he embodies:

---

[433] See above section II.2.4 Continuity.

[434] See above section IV.1.2.2 Christ and the Soteriological Apogee of History in Orosius's *Historiae adversum paganos*, Otto's *Chronica* and the *Kaiserchronik.*

[435] See *Vindicta Salvatoris* § 35, p. 292: *Credidit ille et baptizatus est et omnis domus eius tota.*

[436] See Ohly 1968, p. 82. There is one earlier instance of the lexems *christen* in l. 199 and *christenheit* in l.1074, but in both cases they are pointing towards the universally accepted Christianity of the twelfth-century present and say little about the state of Christianity in the early episodes of the *Kaiserchronik*.

unser hêrre der heilant
hât sîne jungere in die werlt gesant
ze toufen unt ze lêren,
die heiden ze bechêren. KC 2246-51

The narrator later confirms that Peter is doing just that and also cures the infirm from leprosy and palsy and raises the dead (KC 4043-54). The Christian mission and miracle-working permeate Peter's actions throughout the Faustinian episode, which develops him into the main protagonist in contrast to the most important sources the Latin Pseudo-Clementine *Recognitiones* and the *Vita Clementi* which both, as their titles suggest, focus on Clement.[437] Peter's mission is presented most prominently in certain individual acts of baptism e.g. when he heals the old woman who took Faustinian's incognito wife Mechthild into care after her shipwreck (KC 2857-74).

One of the first clashes between newly baptised Christians and Roman pagan polytheists is staged when a group of *koufliute von Rôme* (KC 1770) travel to Jerusalem, where they become Christians and return to Rome in the company of Barnabas, who has been commissioned by Peter to bring the gospel to Rome (KC 1798). Their interaction upon their arrival back home with the Romans they encounter in a *dinchûs* (KC 1830) and who press them for news from Jerusalem (KC 1828-37) is depicted in the text as a call and response exchange. Each proclamation of the *koufman* (KC 1838; 1844; 1858) is answered by the *Rômaere (*KC 1842; 1856; 1868). The merchants, who had been introduced as *von Rôme*, and are still called *Rômaere* as long as they are not actually back in Rome (KC 1826), suddenly find themselves in opposition with their compatriots, as they reenter the city. The qualitative marker that divides them now is religion. The merchants have undergone a qualitative change and become Christians. Their Christianity does not suspend their Romanness, but their confrontation with other Romans does. The Romans answer the christianised merchants' praise of Christ's wondrous qualities and deeds in a tripartite progression of acknowledgment: first with disbelief (KC 1843), then conceding that Jesus must have been a *guot arzât* (KC 1857), and finally announcing that Jesus *einem ir gote gelîch waere* (KC 1869). They do, however, not arrive at the desired conclusion, which is to recognise Christ's new monotheistic position, so Barnabas has to

[437] See Ohly 1968, pp. 78-82. Ohly had doubts if the author of the Faustinian episode had any other sources than the *Vita*, but Fromm showed that the author must in fact have had recourse to the *Recognitiones* as only they and not the *Vita* provide the Simon Magus material in the way the *Kaiserchronik* processes it. See Hans Fromm, 'Die Disputationen in der Faustinianlegende der "Kaiserchronik", Zum literarischen Dialog im 12. Jahrhundert' in *Deutsche Literatur und Sprache von 1050 – 1200: Festschrift für Ursula Henning zum 65. Geburtstag* ed. by Annegret Liebig and Hans-Jochen Schiewer (Berlin 1995), p. 53.

intervene (KC 1872-1902), trying to convince them of Christ's singular and divine nature, which results in angry responses from the Romans and finally Barnabas and the merchants being kicked out of the *dinchûs* (KC 1904). The Polytheists are only capable of gradually conceding Christ's special properties, but stay firmly within the premises of their pagan worldview to rationalise these as the traits of a skilled physician or as just another god. The merchants by contrast moved past these epistemological limitations when they allowed themselves to be christianised by the evidence that Lazarus gave them when they came to Bethany (KC 1791-97).

In the end, even Emperor Faustinian gets baptised by Peter, when he reunites him with his sons and with his wife and presents it as a true miracle from God (KC 3931-34). However, Faustinian's conversion does not occasion much of an effect on the religious constitution of the Empire, as he and his wife almost immediately afterwards gift all their estates in Rome to Peter and then take holy vows to withdraw into a monastery (KC 4035-37). Faustinian's brother and successor Claudius, whose transgressions against Faustinian's wife initiated the entire narrative, quickly falls under the sway of Peter's antagonist Simon Magus, who advises the emperor to bar Peter from ever entering Rome again (KC 4067-72). So Faustinian's conversion remains contained on a personal level and the Christian mission limited to the activities of Peter and his companions. The Empire and the Romans remain pagan. They do not resent and ultimately poison Claudius because he suppresses Christianity but because he falls in with a wizard and because he fornicates with their women (KC 4073-82).

Next to the introduction of conversion the *Kaiserchronik* also lays down some basic tenets of Christian dogma as a way of introducing the new and still struggling religion. This happens mostly but not exclusively in the two disputations taken from the source material and included in the *Kaiserchronik*. The first disputation between St Peter and Simon Magus in a *dinchûs* in Caesarea concerns the nature of God and Christ and negotiates – maybe unwittingly – the clash of orthodox and gnostic Christian concepts in the earliest days of the Church.[438] The second disputation – the so-called *wîlsaelde* disputation – happens between the incognito Faustinian, who confronts Peter, and the latter's young companions, who are Faustinian's long lost and likewise incognito sons. They debate whether fate is determined by stars and planets or rather man's choice to lead either a virtuous or a wicked life. Some of the more salient dogmatic points presented are e.g. KC 1898-1902: Christ wishes Christians to drive out evil and reap souls for him; 2282-2308: separation of family is good if done for the will of God; 2385-2424: God rules alone and is all-powerful,

[438] See Fromm 1995, pp. 54-58.

angels are subordinate to him; 2637-46: idle hands are sinful; 2939-48: Christ is the beginning and the end, his mercy fills the earth; 2976-84: Christ as creator and redeemer; 3024-27: Christ is a gatherer of souls; 3133-51: whoever teaches God's truth will be rewarded with eternal life in God's kingdom; 3241-69: God is onefold, without beginning or end, and indivisible, indestructible and therefore eternal; 3292-3301: God as omnipotent creator and protector of the world, virtues, and all goodness; 3359-74: man has to decide whether to surrender his soul to God or face damnation; 3413-54: nothing exists without God, but men are free to do either good or evil.

One passage during the *wîlsaelde* disputation in particular sheds an intriguing light on Christianity as a conceptually and qualitatively new religion in the historical logic of the *Kaiserchronik*. The old man (incognito Faustinian) claims that all events in a man's life are ordained by *wîlsaelde* – fate – as determined by the hour of his birth and by the movements of the *septem planêtê* (KC 3543) and that there is no escaping it (KC 3514-54). He cites Pythagoras as the authority for the astronomical underpinnings of his argument and scolds his disputant Aquila (unbeknownst to Faustinian one of his sons) for not having applied himself enough to have a sufficient grasp of astronomy to understand his point (KC 3532-33). As with his earlier statement that his disputants might choose their arguments according to their ability from the *siben listen frîen* (KC 3201), Faustinian anchors his argumentative platform firmly in the context of ancient erudition and philosophical learning. Aquila responds to this with a historical reference:

> 'Unser althêrren
> flizzen sih hie vor verre,
> daz si ettelîh wunder vur brêhten,
> dâ man ir iemer bî gedêhte;
> philosophi gwisse vunden
> wîle unde stunde,
> duo der hêrre Pytagoras
> in di hôhe der himele maz,
> daz wâren grôze sinne,
> sô menniske niht bezzers mahten vinden.
> si wâren alle wîse genuoch KC 3563-73

With *hie vor* and the reference back to their shared *althêrren*, Aquila's speech creates historical distance between the time they are inhabiting right now and the time of the creation of the arts and

sciences by the *althêrren*, among them the authority Pythagoras whom Faustinian had brought up earlier. Their discoveries are *wunder* which surpass all human invention. The verbs *vinden* and *vurbringen* are used to characterise the human activity which creates new knowledge. While *vinden* implies the finding of something that is already there, *vurbringen* marks the completion of a finite process. Both verbs indicate that the humans of the past have in their erudition fully mapped out the space which human ingenuity can hope to subject to invention. It allows no more space or time for further progress as expressed in line 3572, which points to the impossibility of expanding these inventions in the future. Thus, the only way to turn is to the creator behind the phenomena which human ingenuity subjected to arts and sciences.

der aver den wîstuom truoch,
daz himel und erde gescaffen wart,
und alle di werlt in sînem tenre beslozzen hât,
dem die engel lobent in dem himele,
und elliu sîn gescaft hie nidere
vurhtet unt êret;
unde die er selbe denne hât gelêret,
unt in eroffenet hât sîne tougen,
dem seuln wir mêr glouben
ir lêre sculn wir vesten unde tragen KC 3574-82

Aquila reveals that God is not only the creator of all the elements (*himel und erde*) that human ingenuity has exercised itself to describe and to measure, but also that he is the mediator of the knowledge (*er selbe* […] *hât gelêret*) needed for this. The intellectual achievement of the *philosophi* (KC 3567) of the first part of Aquila's speech is contrasted to God's creative work. But this contrast does not imply mutual exclusion, but rather the envelopment and strengthening of the first by the second. Belief in God can in turn confirm and maintain *ir lêre*, with *ir* referring back to both the *philosophi* and to God's *gescaft* (KC 3578), which of course fall together. In short: after human ingenuity has expanded as far as conceivably possible in the physical world, it can now only turn to God to gain any further insights into the metaphysical world, which lies beyond the temporal creation. This turns the introduction of Christianity into not only a qualitative change in religious identity but also into the breaking of an epistemological barrier hitherto impenetrable by human intellectual enquiry.

After the arguments of Niceta and Aquila have left the old man unmoved, Faustinian's youngest son Clement, who is also unrecognised by his father and in turn does not recognise him, challenges the old man's pagan religious practice, pointing out that it is inconsistent to believe that all events in life are preordained by the movements of the stars while at the same time making sacrifices to the gods in the hope of bettering one's lot on earth (KC 3681-3700; 3744-60). Faustinian's initial response provides valuable insight into the medieval imagining of ancient pagan practice: Faustinian concedes that sometimes the gods would have treated him well and sometimes ill (KC 3701-04). To bring sacrifices to the gods is described as a demand of *unser ê* (KC 3705). While *unser* sets the pagans apart as a collective constituted by law and custom from the Christians, who are represented by Faustinian's disputants, *ê* characterises religious observance as a lawful duty. In the Christian context *ê* is of course mainly used as a term for the two testaments of the bible but can also describe the norm and the form of religious belief.[439] Of the gods that Faustinian mentions, most are already known from earlier episodes (Mars, Mercury, Jupiter, Venus, Saturn, See KC 3709-42), others are introduced for the first time (e.g. Luna See KC 3706-08). To believe in them is a question of *erkennen* (cf KC 3681-84), just as it is for the Christian God (KC 74, 739, 3019, 8184). The language which marks the practice of both monotheistic Christianity and pagan Polytheism overlaps significantly. Since these indicators do not point towards a qualitative difference between the two belief systems, it must be sought in the content of religious practice as sketched during the disputation. And indeed, as to be expected, pagan polytheism does not compare well to Christianity. Faustinian's list mainly adheres to one simple pattern: naming the god, specifying what is sacrificed to the god, and why. There is a simple transactional relation implied: the god is offered sacrifice in exchange for support, protection, or blessing. The virtuousness of the gods is centred on them and has no moral implications for their followers (KC 3739-42). There is no consideration of ethical or social concerns and also no uneasiness about the lack thereof.[440] The relationship is purely individual and limited to the contractual exchange mechanisms enacted in sacrifice and reward. This reduced representation resonates with earlier Christian polemics and antagonistic representations of pagan polytheist veneration. For example, when Eusebius describes Constantine's considerations on which god to turn to in order to acquire their help:

[439] See '*êwe*' in *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch* ed. by Matthias Lexer, vols 3 (Leipzig 1872) I, coll. 715-16.

[440] See Ramsay MacMullen, *Christianizing the Roman Empire: A.D. 100-400* (New Haven, London 1984), p. 13.

> He sought a god to be his helper and depended on the soldiers and size of his army only in second place. For he thought that that was of no use anyway without the help of a god. He considered the divine aid to be invincible and unconquerable. So now he thought seriously about which god he should enlist as a helper, and it crossed his mind that most previous rulers had put their hopes in several gods when they came to power and had worshipped them with offerings of wine, sacrifices and votive offerings.[441]

This leads us to Emperor Philip. While on the one hand Tiberius's conversion is only implied, and Faustinian's conversion is immediately contained, Philip on the other hand is explicitly introduced as the first Christian ruler (KC 6099-6101).[442] Considering the circumstances of the conversions of Tiberius and Faustinian, this statement can be considered as accurate even within the *Kaiserchronik*'s imperial paradigm and not just in regard to the classical source tradition, which conventionally introduces Philip as the first Christian emperor since.[443] He also has Pope Sixtus baptise his son, and together they do their best to *bekêren | getoufen unde gelêren* (KC 6107-08) as many pagans as possible. It is their Christianity which raises the ire of Decius, a *fraislich man* (KC 6115). He cannot stand the prospect of *dehainer slahte cristen* (KC 6119) ruling the Empire and so proceeds to kill father and son and their entourage in their palace. As Ohly has pointed out, this marks a new element in the tradition to motivate Decius's later persecution of Christians, which had until then mainly been traced back to political antagonism.[444] The confrontation is framed as a remarkable passage of rhyming couplets which – in alternating parallelisms carrying contrasting pairs – contrast Philip's virtuousness with Decius's wickedness:

> Dêcius mit menige
> der cunic mit venie;
> Dêcius mit gewaefen,
> der cunic mit almuosen
> Dêcius mit gewalte,

---

[441] Eusebius of Caesarea, *De Vita Constantini: Über das Leben Konstantins*, Fontes Christiani 83 trans. and ed. by Bruno Bleckmann (Turnhout 2007), Lib. I, 27-28. For the English translation see *From Constantine to Julian: Pagan and Byzantine Views* ed. by Samuel Lieu and Dominic Montserrat (London, New York 1996), p. 73.

[442] See above section II.1.4 Dimensions of Qualitative Change: Political and Religious Identity of the Empire.

[443] See Ohly 1968, p. 128. The historiographical tradition to identify Philip the Arab as the first Christian emperor goes back to Eusebius's *Historia Ecclesiastica* and later Jerome's *Chronicon* and was also promulgated by Orosius in his *Adversum Paganos*. Launching from these widely read and available texts the idea became a staple of Christian medieval historiography between the fifth and the eighth century CE.

[444] See Ohly 1968, p 129.

der cunic mit ainvalte;
Dêcius mit grimme,
der cunic mit guoter minne;
Dêcius mit sêre
der cunic wegete sîner sêle. KC 6133-42

The passage is one of the few strongly formally shaped passages in the text, used only on a handful of occasions e.g. the anaphoric doxology on the virtue of Charlemagne (KC 15,075-83). Ohly connected this specific form of coupled anaphoric antitheses to the sermons of Honorius Augustodinensis.[445] Philip's virtues here – *almuosen*, *ainvalte*, *guote minne* – are of course decidedly Christian in nature. The sermon form complements the content. Together with the christening of his son and his work to convert as many pagans as possible, these virtues are Philip's only defining qualities, yet the text singles him out, because of his role as the first Christian king, to receive this treatment. Unlike his antagonist Decius, Philip is not referred to by his given name but by his title *cunic*, as if to emphasise the circumstance that he is indeed the first Christian king. The new motivational structure behind Decius's persecutions becomes more amplified as he decrees that *nehain cristen* (KC 6159) should remain in Rome under his reign. And it is the continued Christian work of Pope Sixtus who *die haiden lêrte*, | *toufte und bekêrte* (KC 6167-68) – the same three activities which previously marked Philip's reign and Peter's travels through the Empire – that triggers the string of martyrdoms that the *Kaiserchronik* presents in the rest of the Decius episode.

IV.2.1.2 Imperial Conversion: Constantine and Silvester

After emperors like Tiberius, Faustinian, or Philip have established preliminary points of contact between the Empire and Christianity, the actual conversion of the Romans to Christianity comes upon the Empire under Constantine. Without any causal integration or diegetic trigger Constantine's personal conversion begins with a misunderstanding. Suffering from a great *siechtuom* (KC 7814), and having rejected cures he has deemed immoral (KC 7818-41), in his sleep Constantine receives a divine vision of St Peter and St Paul. As a pagan (KC 7810) he does not recognise them, but they appeal to him to turn to Pope Silvester as his *gaistlîch vater* (KC 7857) in order to be cured of his ailment. When Constantine sends his messengers to Silvester both pope and emperor are initially

[445] See Ohly 1968, p. 130.

confused about the implications of the meeting Constantine asks for. The pope rejoices, believing his time for martyrdom has come (KC 7876-79), while the emperor believes that Silvester must be some sort of *arzât* (KC 7885). Why else would the two wise men from his vision have pointed Silvester out to him to be made *gesunt* (KC 7863) again? Only when they meet does Silvester realise *daz iz allez von gote chom* (KC 7905). He proceeds to verify the identity of the two men from Constantine's vision as indeed St Peter and St Paul – *ain was grâ* | […] | *der ander was chal* (7916-18) – and then explains the purpose of Constantine's vision to him:

> daz sint die hailigen hêrren,
> die dich an dem lîbe machent gesunden
> unt die sêle lôsent von den sunden.
> sô bin ich der arzât,
> der dir daz gotes wort vor saget;
> got hât dirz getân ze minnen:
> er wil dich im selben ze ainem dienestman gewinnen. KC 7925-31

As the cure from his bodily ailment equals the absolution of his soul from sin, Silvester becomes indeed an *arzât* to Constantine. He communicates God's explicit wish that the emperor should become his *dienestman*, which implies an almost feudal understanding of the relationship between God and emperor. Constantine does not hesitate, negotiate, or display any sign of doubt or disbelief. At once he agrees to turn to God completely (KC 7933) and is subsequently baptised by Silvester.

The initial misunderstanding is a categorical one. Constantine thinks of his suffering as a physical one, hence Silvester must be a physician. The category he applies is secular and physical. Silvester thinks of Constantine as a pagan emperor, who – like other pagan emperors before him – must have an interest in killing Christians. He thinks in religious and soteriological categories. Interestingly, the *Trierer Silvester* (TS), which was written about half a century later but draws heavily on the *Kaiserchronik*'s Silvester material, adds another dimension to make this categorical clash even more prominent. Constantine describes the two men from his vision to Silvester *zwein goten gelich getan* (TS 202), whereupon Silvester clarifies that *iz waren niet wen zwene gote,* | *iz waren zwene gotis knechte* (TS 208-09). Here, from Constantine's pagan perspective, Peter and Paul appear not as saints but as gods. This polytheistic perspective is not contained in the *Kaiserchronik*'s account, where Constantine describes the two men from his vision as *êrlich unt wolgetân* (KC 7899). This might point to the *Trierer Silvester*'s focus on the figure of the pope and

its emphasis on his role in converting the pagan Constantine, while the *Kaiserchronik* can only admit that Constantine was indeed pagan but nevertheless *vil bescaiden* (KC 7811). The categorical difference in their perception of the situation serves as a stark contrast to the extensively displayed unity in which Constantine and Silvester act throughout the rest of the episode.

After Constantine's conversion, pope and emperor jointly issue a string of decrees in a seven-day process, often holding one another's hands to emphasise their union. This process in many ways mirrors the pagan weekday calendar from the pre-episodic part of the *Kaiserchronik*. Where the calendar firmly semanticised Rome as pagan, both as a space and as a collective in time and space, the seven-day legislative ritual of Constantine and Silvester now re-programmes the Empire's condition. This process serves as the most prominent marker of Rome's qualitative transition from a pagan place ruled by pagan temples, rituals, and idolatry, into a Christian place, ruled by the seven days as ordained in the process of God's creation and by the religiously inspired laws of pope and emperor. The process also integrates several concepts and notions about pagan polytheism as the *Kaiserchronik* so far had conceived of it, and dissolves them through Christian legislation and transfers them into monotheistic practice.

Interestingly the beginning of this seven-day process is not explicitly marked. Only as the text arrives at the second day does the pattern become apparent (KC 7970). But before this, the unmarked first day sees the christening of Constantine, which immediately leads to his cure from his *siechtuom (*KC 7943-57). Through baptism Constantine is reborn as a Christian as he literally sheds his former pagan self: *die hût im elliu ab viel, | jâ wart im der lîp sîn | als ain niwe gebornez chindelîn* (KC 7945-47). The chronicle inverts the biblical metaphor of the wolf in sheep's clothing (Matthew 7. 15) to illustrate the personal change in Constantine which inaugurates the broader change in the religious identity of the Empire. Next, the *Kaiserchronik* explicitly harkens back to the gods in the City as presented in the weekday calendar. This mention prepares the implementation of the seven-day scheme. Finally, and as Silvester had recognised earlier, the conversion of the Empire is attributed to the will of the *waltinde*[n] *got*. This is echoed by the framing of the event on the next, the *anderen tage* (KC 7970): Constantine attends mass in St Peter's and prays: *owol dû waltinder got, | dû mich von der haidenscefte hâst erledigot* (KC 7980-81). Constantine's personal conversion is explicitly attributed to God and the repeated qualification of God as *waltinde* stresses God's active presence and shaping hand in history as the Empire is turning towards Christianity. Subsequently Constantine participates in the eucharist, whereupon Pope Silvester takes his hand (KC 7985-87). Together they issue an edict which prohibits pagan worship of the idols and decrees the veneration of one God and creator *ex nihilo*

(KC 7989-97). This mandated monotheism will be further fleshed out through the symbolic and legislative actions on the following days: on the third day, emperor and pope together praise the Holy Ghost, the pope again takes Constantine's hand, whereupon the emperor sits down *an daz gerihte* and from this position decrees the baptism of those who believe *an den wâren got* (c. KC 8008-16). Seemingly triggered by nothing more than Constantine's decree, many Romans recognise pagan worship as what the *Kaiserchronik* conceives it to be: a fraud (*wol rechanten si dar inne*,| *daz si lange wâren betrogen* KC 8019-20). On the fourth day, the legislative unity of emperor and pope is again emphasised when this time Constantine takes Silvester's hand (KC 8029) and proceeds to command the destruction of the pagan temples in Rome (KC 8032-35). The idea that devils act under the guise of pagan polytheism to deceive and corrupt humans – most explicitly articulated in the Pantheon, Astrolabe, and Julianus passages[446] – is mirrored by the fact that the devils have to accept their powerlessness and, as a consequence, Christianity spreads in Rome (KC 8036-39). The fifth day begins with a service to the twelve apostles and coincides with great pagan festivities (KC 8042-47). Again, Constantine gets into legislative mode when he sits in *gerihte* (KC 8048), and declares *swer der heidenscefte mêr phlaege* (KC 8052) to enemies of the emperor *unt aller Romaere* (KC 8054). This line is significant because it explicitly positions the Romans as a collective in opposition to pagans. Constantine's declaration makes clear that at this point the qualitative recoding of the Roman citizenry as a Christian collective is completed. Adhering to pagan beliefs now positions an individual outside of the premisses of Romanness.

The sixth and seventh day mainly see the installation and furnishing of Silvester's ecclesiastical papal court (KC 8065-83) and of Constantine's temporal aristocratic court (KC 8084-8115). The latter includes the explicit marking of the Roman aristocracy – all those who gird themselves with swords (KC 8102-06) – with crosses, and their commitment to fight against the devil and to protect Christianity (KC 8107-10).

Finally the proceedings are brought to a climax by the coronation and consecration of Constantine on a Sunday (KC 8116-34). His consecration is a singular process in the Roman part of the *Kaiserchronik*, since he is the only emperor to be exalted in this way before Charlemagne and the other German emperors. Subsequently he delivers a speech which encapsulates much of the more general concepts of pagan polytheism in the *Kaiserchronik* and appeals to the Roman public to turn towards Christianity.

[446] See above section II.2.4 Continuity.

‘owol ir Românî,
nu verstêt iuh wol dâ bî:
got ruochete sich erbarmen
uber unsich mennisce arme:
er sant uns sîn selbes sun,
zerlôsen uns von den sundun.
ê betten wir algemaine
an holz und staine;
daz war des tievels getroch.
nû tuot irz durch den wâren got KC 8138-47

The reduction of the pagan idols to their materiality as *holz und staine* and the characterisation of pagan worship as *tievels getroch* prefigures the events of the Astrolabius passage, whose main narrative points refer to these concerns. The temporal arrangement of the passage is also telling. The pair of *ê* and *nû* sets a pagan past over against a Christian future. The two periods are qualitatively separated by religious practice: idols of wood and stone versus the liturgy in the name of the true God. The contrast of two time layers is synchronised with the use of person in Constantine’s speech. Having initially addressed the Romans as a collective and appealed to their understanding in the second person plural (KC 8139) in the present tense, Constantine goes on to include himself in this group by consistently speaking in the third person plural (KC 8141-45) when he relates the previous pagan practices of Rome in the past tense. At the end he reverts to the second person and the present tense (KC 8147). Constantine includes himself in the pagan past of Rome but when he comes to the Christian present he does not include himself in his appellative speech. This should not be construed as some sort of exemption but much more as a stylistic device to better target and appeal to the Romans, who have just made the transition to Christianity or are about to make it. Constantine himself, while sharing their pagan past, has no need of persuasion, as his response to Silvester’s initial approach illustrated. His appellation becomes even more explicit later on when he urges the Romans: *rechennet ainen wâren got, | den Silvester hât gebredigot*. (KC 8184-85). Constantine’s address is immediately followed by *mêr denne siben tûsunt* (KC 8197) Romans converting to Christianity.

This great conversion event triggers an intervention from Constantine’s mother Helena, who remains pagan and wishes for Constantine to become pagan again. This development leads to a series of disputations which are supposed to resolve the religious crisis of the Empire and in which

Pope Silvester takes on the role of defender of the Christian faith. To make Helena's pagan case at the disputation, twelve *wîse redenaere* (KC 8571) are selected, *die under juden und under haiden wâren* (KC 8572). Jews and pagans are both presented together as *des tieveles geverte* (KC 8109). However, during the disputation it becomes clear that all those speakers who are presenting the pagan case are in fact Jewish, as they are explicitly marked as such or their questions reflect Jewish criticisms of Christianity.[447] Like the earlier Faustinian disputations, these disputations present some basic tenets of Christianity by confronting a defender of the faith with various figures of what has been referred to by scholarship as the 'hermeneutical Jew' who interrogates a number of established dogmatic problems with Christianity.[448] In the *Kaiserchronik* most of these arguments try to cast doubt on the monotheistic nature of Christianity and the doctrine of the Trinity,[449] on the virginity of Mary,[450] the mechanics of redemption,[451] or the nature of Christ.[452] All of these arguments are well established within the Christian *Adversus Judaeos* literature. These fictitious disputations did not aim to actually represent Jewish counterarguments or to convert Jews. Nor were they dialogues in the modern sense of two parties exchanging arguments with the aim of persuading the other or establishing common ground. Their result was literally not open to debate; the fact that the Christian side would prevail was from the outset part of the conceptualisation of the genre. Moreover, the texts engaged with points of uncertainty within the changing Christian belief system and developed an arsenal of arguments for defending them. In order to accomplish this they established a system of allegorical and typological readings of both books of the Bible. They aimed to consolidate their arguments within the Christian community and to create a sense of religious superiority among Christians. Thus Christians, not Jews, were the actual targets of these texts.[453]

At the conclusion of the disputation, the *Kaiserchronik* does introduce a differentiation between Jews and pagans. Over the course of the Jews' enquiries it has become clear that they deliberately tell untruths and know that their accusations against Christianity are wrong. Initially the

---

[447] See Christiane Witthöft, 'Zwischen Wahrheitssuche und Wunderglauben: Die christlich-jüdischen Disputationen der Silvesterlegende in der "Kaiserchronik"' in *Disputation 1200-1800: Form, Funktion und Wirkung eines Leitmediums universitärer Wissenskultur*, Trends in Medieval Philology 20 ed. by Marion Gindhart and Ursula Kundert (Berlin, New York 2010), pp. 291-310; Vera Milde, 'si entrunnen alle scentlîchen dannen: Christlich-jüdischer Disput in der Silvesterlegende der "Kaiserchronik"' in *Juden in der deutschen Literatur des Mittelalters. Religiöse Konzepte – Feindbilder – Rechtfertigungen* ed. by Ursula Schulze (Tübingen 2002), pp. 13-34.

[448] Marcel Müllenburg, Britta Müller-Schauenburg, Henrik Wels, 'Und warum glaubst du dann nicht? Zur ambivalenten Funktion der Vernunft in Religionsdialogen des 12. Jahrhunderts' in *Integration und Desintegration der Kulturen im europäischen Mittelalter*, Europa im Mittelalter 18 ed. by Michael Borgolte and others (Berlin 2011), pp. 261-324.

[449] E.g. Archisynagogus Abiathar KC 8602-8777; Bishop Jonas KC 8778-8905.

[450] E.g. Godolias KC 8906-9035; Aunan KC 9088-9193.

[451] E.g. Kusi KC 9194-9310, Didascali KC 9311-9437, Aroel KC 9438-9525, Tara KC 9580-9641.

[452] E.g. Doech KC 9036-87; Benjamin KC 9526-79; Jubal KC 9642-9807; Zeleon KC 9808-9957.

[453] See Schreckenberg 1990, p. 539; see also Daniel Lasker, *Jewish Philosophical Polemics Against Christianity in the Middle Ages* (New York 1977).

disputations seem to happen on some sort of common ground between Silvester and his disputants: the books of the Old and New Testament are the universally recognised authority, and the ability to read them is the shared hermeneutical means for gleaning theological insights. However, as soon as the Jews' arguments are refuted by Silvester's Christian or christological reading of the Bible, the Jews, without further explanation or resistance, accept his interpretation of Scripture and make a hasty retreat (e.g. KC 9085-86; 9193; 9246-51). The most explicit instance of this occurs when Silvester refutes Jubal:

> er hiez im Daviden bringen,
> do zaict er im dar inne
> 'tollite portas principes vestras'.
> der jude reblaichet und gesaz. KC 9744-47

This and all of Silvester's other refutations employ scripture from the Old Testament, both because it would have had more impact on a twelfth-century audience and because the likely Latin source tradition of the disputation lays this out as a ground rule. While this ground rule is never made explicit, the *Kaiserchronik* does clearly adhere to it. Tellingly, in refutation of Jubal Silvester quotes scripture in Latin, which remains the language of authority in the disputation, and also orders the physical production of the book of David. It is almost as if not only his citation but also the physical appearance of the book drive his point home immediately. This also fits in with the *Kaiserchronik*'s tendency to conclude its disputations not on a discursive level but with a performative act or an external intervention like Arius's untimely death by divine decree (KC 13,475-83) or Silvester's miraculous resurrection of the bull (KC 10,303-26)[454]

The Jews' reactions to Silvesters refutations imply that they knew all along that his Christian reading is in fact the one true reading of the Bible; the common ground suggested by the shared reference to the Bible has in fact been a comprehensively Christian ground all along. It further suggests that the Jews know they are in the wrong. Zeleon's final argument is undermined and makes the deceit of the Jews public when Silvester tricks him into perjuring himself. With their arguments the Jews have not only knowingly tried to deceive the Christians but also the Pagans which they were supposed to represent as a whole in the disputation. As Silvester destroys Zeleon's

[454] See Almut Suerbaum, 'Erzählte Geschichte. Dialog und Dialogizität in der "Kaiserchronik"' in *Aspekte des12. Jahrhunderts. Freisinger Kolloquium 1998*, Wolfram Studien XVI ed. by Wolgang Haubrichs and others (Berlin 2000), p. 242-45.

argument and makes his perjury visible, even the convinced pagan Helena, whose opposition to Constantine's christianisation triggered the whole disputation, recognises the truth: *an dem worte verstuont sich aller êrist diu chunigîn, | daz si mit dem geziuge betrogen was* (KC 9943-44). Once more, the development culminates in mass conversion events in which Silvester not only baptises his twelve disputants and the two judges who adjudicated the disputations, but also 83,500 more pagans who were present, and finally Helena herself (KC 10,359-81).

The events of the Constantine and Silvester episodes anchor Christianity firmly in the heart of Roman identity. Constantine's baptisms, his acts of legislation in conjunction with Silvester, his long speech to the Roman public, and Silvester's disputations and further baptisms mark the threshold which leads the *Romaere* of the *Kaiserchronik* from a pagan into a Christian chronotope.

IV.2.2 Roman Christian Fragility

Long after Constantine and Theodosius push the Romans firmly into the Christian chronotope, it comes as something of a surprise when Charlemagne is presented as the victor who brought Christianity to the Romans with his sword:

> von dem tage iemer mêre
> sô wuohsen Karle sîn êre,
> want er mit sînem swerte uberwant,
> daz er Rômære betwanch,
> daz si gote wurden undertân.
> vil manige sêle er dem tievel benam. KC 14,821-26

Charlemagne's second arrival to Rome is described as a salvific act: by conquering the city, apparently by military force even though this is not explicated in the text previous to this passage, he has now secured Rome for Christianity and saved many souls from damnation. This assessment appears entirely detached from the long and arduous process that the *Kaiserchronik* has painstakingly laid out, whereby the Empire is transformed from a pagan and polytheistic entity into a Christian one. Once again, the contingency of the text's episodic structure overrules any syntagmatic connection of events. Even so, there are instances to be found in the text before and after Charlemagne's Christian conquest of Rome which underpin the notion of Rome and in extenso

Italy as a place in which Christianity is imperilled and whose inhabitants constantly threaten to relapse into pagan rites.

Doubt emerges amongst the Romans for the first time when Pope Silvester, who earlier in the text facilitated the greatest and most decisive of all conversion events, has to defend them against the dragon.

> sumelîche cristen,
> di mit gote nihte wâren veste,
> die sprâchen, wâ ir grôzer got waere?
> wie im daz gezaeme?
> und wi er ouch daz verdolte,
> daz sie sô getânes tôdes retweln solten? KC 10,521-26

The religious backsliding of the Romans makes sense primarily to provide another obstacle for Silvester to overcome. Not only did his resurrection of the bull at the end of the disputation with the Jewish wise men trigger a massive conversion experience for many pagans, but his whole rule was generally characterised by his proselytising and catechetical work (KC 10,511-14). So of course it makes narrative sense to challenge his achievements towards the end of his episode as the dragon threatens Rome. But this threat also creates a precedent of Roman Christian fragility later episodes can capitalise on. Later during the *Kaiserchronik*, when cisalpine Rome has largely outlived its historical usefulness, this weakening of the Romans hard-won Christian identity makes them more easily available as narrative antipodes to the Germans who are now in charge of the Roman Empire. A good example for this can be found in the Otto I episode, when an insurgency of Milan against the pope in Rome is characterised as a pagan endeavour and the papal legates report to the emperor *daz die von Mailân | die Cristen viengen, | die haidenscaft mit in begiengen* (KC 15,864-66). This puzzling characterisation of the Milanese as pagans has been described as a sign of the chronicle's carelessness by Schröder,[455] while Neudeck set it in the context of the author's desire to present Otto as a successful fighter against the pagans, which necessitated the characterisation of the Milanese in these terms.[456] Most recently, Matthews has pointed out that the designation of the Milanese as pagans is confined to the reported speech of the papal legates who convey the news of the Milanese's actions to Otto. Matthews sees this as deft exploitation of the potential of reported

[455] Schröder 1895, p. 368.
[456] Neudeck 2003. p. 81.

speech to present different perspectives on events. He contrasts the perspective of the papal legates, who slander the Milanese as pagans, with the perspective of the narrator and Otto, who take a more secular approach.[457]

In my opinion this fragility of Christianity south of the Alps is a consequence of the twofold qualitative change in the identity of the Empire. In the Charlemagne episode, the Empire has not only changed into a fully Christian entity but also the perspective on its political identity is changing from a Roman-cisalpine to a German-transalpine one. The constellation of the conflict with Milan puts the pope and the emperor on the same side but reintroduces the notion of *haidenscaft* in the heart of the Christian Empire: Italy. This resonates with the shiftiness of the Romans in times of conflict, for example when Emperor Otto II has to fight the Greeks in Southern Italy (cf KC 15,998-16,063). As the rulership over the Empire migrates north of the Alps, Rome is painted in a rather ambivalent light. On the one hand, it is turned into a place constantly at risk of sliding back into heathendom or of undermining the emperor's authority. On the other hand, it is the Rome of the papacy and of the tombs of the apostles, which attract Charlemagne more than fraternal duty when he first visits the city (KC 14,334-36). There seems little need for the chronicle to reconcile these two qualities of the city. Depending on the angle both perspectives are applicable and create a Rome that becomes increasingly malleable now that it has lost its function as the seat of Roman central rule.

Looking at the qualitative development of religious identity in the *Kaiserchronik* revealed two important insights: declining salvation history as a scaffold for the trajectory of its historical account, the chronicle deliberately models crucial passages within its episode paradigm to frame the process of transition from pagan to Christian Empire. While imperial points of contact with Christianity mark the spread of the religion within the Empire, the disputations provide space to expand on dogmatic points of christology, theology, and liturgy. In these instances the chronicle displays an actual interest in presenting the new religion as something qualitatively new and different in its Roman pagan environment.

In this context Bakhtin's concept of the chronotope again proves useful. Under Constantine and Silvester the clearly marked transformation process lets the *Kaiserchronik*'s Rome emerge once as a pagan and then as a Christian chronotope. Here it is not a protagonist who moves in time through three-dimensional space,[458] but rather Rome as the space itself that is moved through time, analogous to a protagonist. As this movement is necessarily mutual, a change in the religious

[457] See Matthews 2012, pp. 109-13.

[458] As shown in the case of Serapion above, see chapter .

composition of time is accompanied by a concomitant change in the space in which the religious change unfolds, resulting in what Bakhtin described as time and space 'thickening' and becoming artistically visible.[459]

Several strands of motifs concerning Roman polytheism are bundled together here so as to be transferred into a Christian system of meaning. By deliberately mirroring the seven-day pattern of the pagan weekday calendar from its beginning the *Kaiserchronik* now switches the default identity of the Romans from pagan to Christian. However, neither Constantine and Silvester, nor Theodosius, in whose episode both internal and external threats to the newly established Christian identity are repelled, mark the end of a teleological arc towards complete and final Christianisation of the Roman Empire. The motif of Roman Christian fragility emerges just as the focus on the Roman Empire's political identity shifts to a transalpine Ger man perspective. The circumstances which create this change also lead to the final point this thesis wants to examine: the question how this shift of perspective when looking at the political identity of the Roman Empire in the *Kaiserchronik* is presented and negotiated.

[459] See Bakhtin 1998, p. 84.

V. The Second Dimension of Qualitative Change: the Political Axis

V.1 Romans and Germans

The focus of the final chapter of this thesis will be on the qualitative change which occurs on the level of the political identity of the Roman Empire in the *Kaiserchronik*: from an ancient polity centred on the city of Rome and Italian or Mediterranean localities to a polity firmly associated with the German *gentes* and the lands north of the Alps.

Scholarship has already dedicated much attention to the Germans and their role und profile throughout the *Kaiserchronik*. This is because, as a German vernacular chronicle, it has mainly interested Germanists, who have looked at it in the hope of gaining insights into the process of the becoming of the German nation, its language, and culture. Wolfgang Haubrichs has analysed the contribution of the *Kaiserchronik* to the emergence of vernacular terms for Germanness,[460] Heinz Thomas has added observations on the role of Caesar from the perspective of a historian, and most recently Uta Goerlitz has written on the literary construction of (pre)-national German identity from the eleventh to the sixteenth century. For the construction of the German identity in the *Kaiserchronik* she summarises:

> In den bisher betrachteten Partien der 'Kaiserchronik' hat sich das volkssprachige Konzept, das von den alten 'Deutschen' entworfen wird, eben nicht als jenes eindeutige, programmatisch durchgehaltene nationale Bild eines alten 'deutschen Volkes' und eines 'Landes' erwiesen, als das es häufig aufgefaßt wird. Vielmehr hat sich herausgestellt, daß dieses literarische Bild ein in sich differenziertes ist, für welches das Spannungsverhältnis konstitutiv ist, in das die Komponenten 'deutsch' sowie – um bei den vier tragenden Landen der Caesar-Episode zu bleiben – 'bayerisch', 'fränkisch', 'sächsisch', und 'schwäbisch' zueinander in Beziehung gesetzt sind. Hinzu kommt die Dialektik zwischen diesen Komponenten und dem Faktor 'römisch'. Kollektive

[460] Wolfgang Haubrichs, 'Theodiscus, Deutsch und Germanisch – drei Ethnonyme, drei Forschungsbegriffe. Zur Frage der Instrumentalisierung und Wertbesetzung deutscher Sprach- und Volksbezeichnungen' in Zur Geschichte der Gleichung "germanisch-deutsch", Sprache und Namen, Geschichte und Institutionen, Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde 34 ed. by Heinrich Beck and others (Berlin, New York 2004), pp. 199-228.

> Identitätskonstruktion erfolgt in der 'Kaiserchronik' daher auf unterschiedlichen Ebenen, deren Verhältnis zu beachten ist.[461]

With Goertlitz's focus on Germanness as multifaceted and non-unitary the question remains if the *Kaiserchronik* actually models qualitative change in the relationship between the Roman Empire and its two most prominent *gentes*: the Romans and the Germans. This touches on the long ongoing discussion about why and how the final part of the chronicle – the part after Charlemagne – is qualitatively different. I have referred to this question at several instances over the course of this thesis and will show here how this question ties into the broader issue of the political identity of the Empire.

To achieve this, the final chapter will proceed in two steps. In the first section the relationship of the city of Rome and its people to the emperor and the Empire will be examined. The second section will focus on the two pivotal episodes of Emperors Caesar and Charlemagne, to glean some insight into the question if and how they actually negotiate a qualitative change in the political fabric of the Roman Empire.

V.1.1 Kings, Emperors, and Rulers in the *Kaiserchronik*

The twelfth century witnessed not only an increased interest in textual exploration of Rome and its ancient sites but also their rediscovery for political purposes. When Henry IV was dealing with Roman interest groups in the late eleventh century he made the mistake of subsuming them all under one homogeneous group without being willing or able to acknowledge the internal fractures of Rome or the divergent interests of groups like the aristocratic oligarchs or the clergy. His son Henry V on the other hand showed a keen awareness of these problems when he opted for a more nuanced salutation when dealing with the Romans in the early twelfth century. By echoing the nomenclature Roman officials used for themselves, which derived from ancient titles, but of course had little in common with the offices of the Roman Republic or even the Empire, Henry V could make it clear when he wished e.g. only to address the representatives of the civic and not the ecclesiastical Rome.[462] It was also Henry V who revived imperial interest in Roman sites as stages

---

[461] Uta Görlitz, *Literarische Konstruktion (vor-)nationaler Identität seit dem Annolied, Analysen und Interpretationen zur deutschen Literatur des Mittelalters (11.-16. Jahrhundert)* in Quellen und Forschungen Literatur- und Kulturgeschichte 45 (Berlin, New York 2007), p. 160.

[462] See Jürgen Petersohn, *Kaisertum und Rom in spätsalischer und staufischer Zeit. Romidee und Rompolitik von Heinrich V. bis Friedrich II*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica Schriften 62 (Hannover 2010), pp. 14-16.

for public actions. He mainly utilised St Peter's church in the Vatican, but more remarkably also the Capitol of the city of antiquity. In early 1117 Henry V entered Rome to mediate in the conflicts between the Roman citizens and their pontiff. After trying unsuccessfully to confront the pope in St Peter's, Henry and his entourage on the next day climbed the Capitol and gave great gifts to those who supported him. The Capitol was the political and religious centre of ancient Rome, as Isidore of Seville had defined it in his *Etymologies* and it had been an integral part of ritual triumphal processions.[463] The Capitol had, however, since fallen into disrepair and during the early Middle Ages was at least in parts famously populated by goats.[464] In a way by this time the Capitol had returned to the bucolic state described in the Roman pre-history of the *Aeneid*, where cows and cattle roam at the site where later the magnificent urban sites of the imperial Rome of Virgil's time were to be erected.[465]

While the Capitol had since the late eleventh century been used as a site for markets and legal courts, it is doubtful if this provides sufficient semantic charging of the site to explain Henry's interest in it as a political stage. Some idea of the ancient importance of the place must have been present and available to Henry and his partners in Rome, even though these only become textually manifest in the decades after his early death. This rediscovered importance can be grasped in texts like the *Mirabilia urbis Romae,*the closely connected *Graphia aurae urbis Romae,* and also the *Kaiserchronik*. The *Mirabilia Romae* were written before September 1143 by an author familiar with ancient literature and rhetoric, and the topography of Rome.[466] For a long time the *Mirabilia* was attributed to Benedict of St Peter, but more recent scholarship has cast doubt on this and the author has since mostly been treated as anonymous.[467] The *Mirabilia* were quickly translated into German and are very likely to have been one of the more influential sources of the *Kaiserchronik*.[468] Two of the six short narratives which form the middle part of the *Mirabilia* show some similarities with episodes from the *Kaiserchronik*: the rededication of the Pantheon by Boniface, and the murder of Emperor Philip by Decius and the subsequent ploy of his son to prevent Philip's treasure

---

[463] See Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiarum* Lib. XV, Cap. 2,31; Petersohn 2010, p. 28.

[464] See Richard Krautheimer, *Rome Profile of a City: 312-1308* (Princeton 1980). p. 285.

[465] See Publius Vergilius Maro, *Aeneis* ed. by George Long, vols 3 (London 1883) II, Lib. VII, ll. 359-61.

[466] SeeNine Miedema, *Die Mirabilia Romae: Untersuchungen zu ihrer Überlieferung mit Edition der deutschen und niederländischen Texte*, Münchner Texte und Untersuchungen zur deutschen Literatur des Mittelalter 108 (Tübingen 1996), pp. 6-11.

[467] Benedict of St Peter was first identified as the most likely author by Duchesne in 1904, see Louis Duchesne, L'auteur des Mirabilia, *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, 24 (1904), p. 486. See also Bernhard Schimmelpfennig, *Die Zeremonienbücher der römischen Kurie im Mittelalter* (Tübingen 1973), pp. 8-12; Dale Kinney, 'Fact and Fiction in the "Mirabilia urbis Romae"' in *Roma Felix – Formation and Reflections of Medieval Rome* ed. by Carol Neuman de Vegvar and Éamonn Ó Carragáin (Routledge 2008), p. 236.

[468] See Miedema 1996, p. 263; 364, footnote 26; Ohly 1968, p. 41.

from falling into the usurper's hands by handing it over to Pope Sixtus instead. The text also shares the *Kaiserchronik*'s great interest in ancient pagan monuments likes temples[469] and the expressed intention to preserve knowledge about the past for posteriority.[470]

The *Mirabilia* also became a core part of the *Graphia aurae urbis Romae*, which must have been compiled shorty thereafter, but probably not before 1154.[471] The *Graphia* combines a free reworking of material from the *Mirabilia* with three other texts: a history of Rome from Noah to Romulus; the so-called *Graphia-Libellus*, a puzzling treatise which produces a largely fictional account of the ancient imperial court; and an older passage known as the 'Three formulas' which contains oaths for swearing-in ceremonies.[472] The provenance of the *Graphia* has long been contested until Bloch also managed to identify the Benedictine monk Peter the Deacon of Montecassino as the author.

These texts, which show great interest in the antiquities of Rome and its imperial past, colour the context in which the *Kaiserchronik* was first compiled.

V.1.2 Rome's Historical Introduction

Considering the increase of political and cultural interest in Rome in the time of the *Kaiserchronik*'s composition and the importance of the city as a place for the chronicle's narrative it is surprising how little time the text devotes to actually presenting the city. Roughly contemporary texts like *Herzog Ernst* or the *Eneasroman* contain rich descriptions of cities like Carthage (ER 284-89) or Grippia (HE 2212-47). In both texts a grand panoramic scene is presented to the audience, with shared points of interest being walls, towers, and fortifications as well as the respective city's topographical situation in the surrounding landscape, especially in relation to bodies of water such as the sea, rivers, or moats. Both descriptions are also provided with references to the authoritative source material, which vouches for the veracity of the account presented. Of course, at least in the case of Grippia a caveat applies. As a fantastic place, inhabited by crane-headed *monstra* far removed from the realm of empirical experience and accessibility of the text's audience, it requires

---

469 John Kenneth Hyde, 'Medieval Descriptions of Cities' in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 48 (1966), p. 322.

470 'Codice topografico della città di Roma. Saec. XII-XIV', vols 4, 3 ed. by Valentini, Roberto Valentini and Giuseppe Zucchetti in *Tipografia del Senato*, 90 (1946), 3.65: *Quantae etiam essent pulchritudinis auri et argenti, aeris et eboris pretiosorumque lapidum, scriptis ad posterum memoriam, quanto melius potuimus, reducere curavimus*.

471 See Herbert Bloch, 'Der Autor der "Graphia aureae urbis Romae"', *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 40 (1984), pp. 55-160, esp. p. 59.

472 See Petersohn 2010, pp. 49-50; Bloch 1984, p. 56; See also Ernst Percy Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio : Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Erneuerungsgedankens vom Ende des karolingischen Reiches bis zum Investiturstreit* (Darmstadt 1957), pp. 193-97.

a more detailed introduction. This introduction is strongly influenced by fairy-tales and by the newly made Western acquaintance with the East, as a projection of the fantastical Orient. Moreover, the description has its own narrative function beyond the mere descriptive as it is in itself part of the text's creation of an atmosphere of subliminal dread and impending doom, which is about to befall Ernst and his companions as they explore the city.[473] While this makes the comparison less effective on a contextual level, the aim of the comparison here is more on a structural level, designed to show which narrative strategies to describe cities would have been available to the author of the *Kaiserchronik*.

The lack of textual mapping of Rome in the *Kaiserchronik* has been noticed by Alastair Matthews who concludes that the 'description and perception of city space [...] were not exploited to the extent possible' and more attention is given to 'shaping space [...] in terms of defining places within it or of movement through it, and relating it to the exemplary roles of pope and emperor.'[474] This leads to the core of the problem. Both *Herzog Ernst* and the *Eneasroman* have a clearly defined, eponymous main protagonist. Both protagonists are itinerant for significant stretches of their narratives, and the narrative's focalisation moves with them to discover these foreign cities. Once discovered they require introduction and description.

The situation in the *Kaiserchronik* is rather different. Starting with the prologue, Rome is set to be the stage of the text's record (KC 16). The foundation and the basic political situation of Rome are sketched in just a few verses. Both quantifiable historical distance – *Hie vor* (KC 43) – and qualitative historical difference – *bi der haiden zîten* (KC 43) – are marshalled to contrast the situation of the narrator and his audience with the historical situation at the beginning of the narration. The main marker of this twofold historical alterity is the presence of *abgot diu unrainen* (KC 45) and of the pagans who worship them according to the law of their kings (KC 46-48). Interestingly, the foundation of Rome by Romulus and Remus (KC 49-54) is set apart temporally from the antediluvian age of 'promiscuous idolatry'[475] in which the only system of order was the rule of a king whose authority was vaguely tied to pagan worship. The city's foundation by Romulus and Remus happens *nâch der werlte* (KC 50), with *werlde* in its temporal usage meaning 'age' or 'century'.[476] The stratification of times marks again both a qualitative and a quantitative

---

[473] David Blamires, *Herzog Ernst and the Otherworld Voyage. A Comparative Study* (Manchester 1979), pp. 29-32.

[474] Matthews 2012 p. 57.

[475] Chinca/Young 2016, p. 11.

[476] See 'werlt' in *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch* ed. by Matthias Lexer, vols 3 (Leipzig 1872) III, coll. 782-84. In his mid twelfth-century *Rede vom Glauben* Der Arme Hartmann translated the Roman phrase *in saecula saeculorum* with *von werlde zo werlde.*

leap forward to prepare the stage for the foundation of Rome. After this, another temporal leap is indicated by *sît* in line 55, which positions the fearful service of *elliu die rîche* to Rome and its senate of *driu hundert althêrren* (KC 57) as a later occurrence than the city's foundation. No historical process of conquest, which might causally link the two, is referenced. Only the temporal adverb *sît* indicates a succession of events but without explicating their qualitative relation. Rome's introduction into the narrative automatically brings with it the city's supremacy over other countries. Or as Heinrich von Veldeke puts it:

> ez enmohte niht so ergan,[477]
> sint hete Rom den giwalt,
> daz man ir den chinz galt
> unde man in ir sande
> von uil manigeme lande.
> daz was sit uber manich iar,
> daz wizzent gnvoge livte fur war. ER 426-32

Rome's supremacy was common knowledge and did not require elaboration. The *uil manige*[*n*] *lande* which pay tribute to Rome in the *Eneasroman* correspond to the *Kaiserchronik*'s *elliu die rîche* (KC 56), which fearfully serve Rome after it has been founded by Romulus and Remus and also to *elliu diu lant* (KC 61), to which the *altherren* of the Roman Senate promulgate their decisions. Line 58 elaborates the relationship between the Senate and the lands obedient to Rome. The *altherren* are caretakers of their *zuhte* (discipline) and *êre* (reputation). The lines connecting the prologue to the pagan weekday calendar map out – in a brief space – a three-stage model of qualitative historical development in which an initially chaotic pagan world is put into order first by the foundation of Rome, and then by the rule of the Senate.

Other than Rome, Carthage and Grippia receive extensive descriptions of their cityscapes because they are both new and exotic places for the texts' protagonists to explore. Both Herzog Ernst and Eneas travel through changing sceneries with them as the focal point of narration. In the *Kaiserchronik*, however, Rome serves as an environment for the text's episodic narrative and the episodes' ever-changing personnel. The backdrop of the city is in a way for most of the text the only constant. As the deeds of the emperors and popes and of the many different protagonists of the

[477] Carthage was not to reign supreme *vber alliv div riche* (V. 423) as Juno decreed it when she supported Dido in founding Carthage. This role would fall to Rome the city later founded by Eneas' descendants.

Kaiserchronik are inextricably linked to the city it could be argued that Rome in its relation to and as carrier of Roman authority is the central protagonist of the *Kaiserchronik*, at least until the notion of Empire is detached from the city and crosses the alps to the North.

V.1.3 Of Kings and Emperors

If Rome serves as an anchor point for the Roman Empire's central authority, it has to be considered how this authority figures in the *Kaiserchronik* and how it relates to the ideas of Germanness and Romanness. As such Kingship is a ubiquitous notion in the *Kaiserchronik*, hence it is hardly surprising that it has attracted a great deal of scholarly attention. Indeed it was scholars rather the text itself that made the *Kaiserchronik* out to be a chronicle of emperors.

The ruler of the Roman Empire is mostly represented by the word *kunic*. However, the differentiation from the words *keiser*, which means 'emperor' and is also regularly employed, is very imprecise if it exists at all. The MHDBDB finds 136 hits for *kaiser*, with only one instance of *kaiserinne*, when referring to the wife of Henry III.[478] Furthermore the database shows 568 hits for *kunic*, sixty-three for *küniginne*, sixteen for *küniclich*, but only three for *künicriche*. With 319 hits *rîche* and its derivations are the favoured spatial term for the Empire whose story the *Kaiserchronik* sets out to narrate.[479]

Kings as historical agents are first introduced in the prologue (KC 19) along with popes as the protagonists of the *crônicâ* (KC 17). Rulers – be they kings or emperors – only become the structuring feature of the text with the death of Caesar and his succession by Augustus, when the *Kaiserchronik* for the first time utilises its characteristic closing and opening formulae (KC 597-605). Before Caesar's coronation kings are only referenced in passing as the nebulous authority behind the prehistorical pagan worship of the Romans (KC 48). Caesar himself is never called *kunic* but at one point, before he returns to Rome, conquers the city, and becomes its sole ruler, he is referred to as *chaiser* (KC 426). Otherwise he is regularly called either *Juljus* (KC 402; 406; 421; 434; 435) or *Cêsar* (KC 417; 437). Augustus is the first named ruler of the *Kaiserchronik* on whom the title of *kunic* is conferred (KC 614). After Caesar the title *kaiser* is used for the first time for Tiberius (KC 741).

---

[478] At the time of their imperial coronation in 1046, this would have been Agnes of Aquitaine Henry's second wife, which the *Kaiserchronik* does not name, however.

[479] Mittelhochdeutsche Begriffsdatenbank (MHDBDB), ed. by Universität Salzburg, 1992-2017 <http://www.mhdbdb.sbg.ac.at/> [17.02.17]

This overview of the early usage of the two terms shows that the *Kaiserchronik* assumes the presence of kings in Rome as a historical constant and permanent certainty. While structurally Caesar becomes the first ruler and Augustus is referred to as the first king, kingship as a political institution is imagined to have been always present, without need of narrative introduction or aetiological treatment, and largely identical with emperorship.

To form a clearer impression of the usage of the two congruent terms a qualitative examination will follow in order to distinguish which of the chronicle's rulers are titled either *kunic* or *kaiser* or both. With regard to all rulers it will be of special interest if there are tendencies along the lines of whether a ruler is presented as a positive or a negative figure. For the German kings it will be particularly interesting to see if the terminology switches with their imperial coronation, whenever it occurs in the text.

The *Kaiserchronik* knows two states of political modification with regard to the office of the emperor: papal consecration and *sede vacante*. The only ancient emperor who is consecrated is Constantine (KC 8128). After him there is of course the prominent consecration of Charlemagne (KC 14,751), but also for the emperors Henry III (KC 16,485), Henry IV (KC 16,915-21) and Lothar II (KC 17,083). Interestingly with regard to the consecration there seems to be a coherent application of the emperor title or at least a very clear tendency: Constantine and Lothair II are never referred to as emperors before they are consecrated, and Charlemagne is called *kaiser* only four times before Pope Leo consecrates him but overwhelmingly so after the event. Henry IV is twice called *kaiser* before receiving papal consecration, but concurrently with the title *kunic*; he is exclusively *keiser* in the short remainder of his reign afterwards.

The state of *sede vacante* occurs several times throughout the text: respectively before Titus, (KC 5364: *Daz rîche was duo lære*) Lucius Accommodus (KC 7848: *si sprâchen, daz des rîches stuol | stuonde ubel lære*), Constantine (KC 7806: *Diu rîche stuonden lære*), and Charlemagne (KC 14,282) take over power. Before Charlemagne enters the stage, the Roman Empire is already conceived as something transpersonal which can be detached from previous incumbents (KC 14,278-81) and finally the lacuna in rulership is presented the most prominently in this instance: *Daz rîche stuont do laere* (KC 14,282). Within the political imagination of the *Kaiserchronik* the Empire clearly has an abstract transpersonal and trans-temporal existence. It is also striking that all the emperors who come to power after such a situation are rather positive figures.

As far as the usage of the two titles *kunic* and *kaiser* for individual rulers of the *Kaiserchronik* is concerned, the text does not pursue a consistent strategy. Some episodes, however, do adhere to a scheme limited to their premises, but as is so often the case in the *Kaiserchronik* it remains

impossible to extrapolate more general conclusions for the entirety of the text. Two rulers are conspicuously only referred to as *kunic* and never as *kaiser*. Nero features as *kunic* eleven times and Tarquin twenty-five times. The case of Tarquin is easily explained with the comparative length of the episode and with the source tradition which would know Tarquin only as *rex* of the Roman royal period and never as *imperator*, a situation which doubtlessly informed the author of the *Kaiserchronik* when he compiled his version of the legend. This means the anonymous author does not think of Roman kings as constituting a distinct pre-Republican and pre-imperial phase of Roman history; *kunic* is just another form of manifestation of Roman rulers to him. With Nero one might be tempted to assume that he is denied the title of *kaiser* to deny him imperial honour and dignity, and this might well be true within the boundaries of the Nero episode, but it does not indicate a general trend of the chronicle as a whole. Claudius, who is certainly not a positive figure in the context of the *Kaiserchronik*, is referred to both as *kunic* and as *kaiser* three times. Another excellent example for the interchangeable use of the two titles is the Trajan episode. Trajan is called *kaiser* thirteen times, on eight of those occasions even very emphatically *kaiser Trajân*. But he is also called *kunic* six times and seemingly without discrimination. When Trajan rectifies the injustice an old widow has suffered she thanks him: *ze dem kunige si sprach: | jâ dû, kaiser Trajân (*KC 5982-83).

Within two lines Trajan, an exemplary and universally virtuous ruler, can be both king and emperor. This constellation serves as the default setting at least for the Roman part of the chronicle. Nerva, however, whose wisdom as a ruler is universally praised (KC 5832) and who at his death is lamented as a ruler *tiure und maere* (KC 5837) is consistently called *kunic*.

V.1.4 The Romans and the German Kings

It will not come as a surprise that the Romans are mentioned less and less as the chronicle crosses the threshold of Charlemagne. For the remainder of the text they feature only nine more times, which marks a drastic proportional decline.[480] The Romans of the medieval part of the *Kaiserchronik* usually appear as the opposite of the emperor, somehow relational to him but no longer identical with the Empire. They are needed to bestow legitimacy and authority but are no longer assumed as the default public of the Empire's workings.

[480] The German emperors comprise about 18 % of the *Kaiserchronik*, but only about 4% of the instances for *Romaere* can be found in this part.

The antagonism between Romans and the Empire starts with Charlemagne, who has to defeat them (KC 14,824) before he becomes the first emperor *von Diutisken landen* (KC 16,819). The Romans resurface again when King Arnold comes to Rome (KC 15,548-54). The textual existence of the Romans depends on the emperor's presence in Rome. As soon as he leaves the city they fade into the background. They are still an authority to assert the legitimacy and quality of an emperor's rule: his victory over the Huns marks him as a *guot rihtâre* in the eyes of the Romans and ensures him their gratitude. This same relation is invoked when the pope approaches King Otto I during a diet in Aachen (KC 15,858-61). The pope actualises the king's title as *Rômaere voget unt des rîches rihtâre* (KC 15,869), to compel him to intervene in Milan. Again it is a projection of the city of Rome, the pope in this case, who brings up the Romans, and again they are used solely as a means of bestowing power and legitimacy on a German king.

When the Romans reemerge in the episode of Otto II, this happens again in circumstances similar to Arnold's: the Romans are put back on the map to assure Otto II that they will help him to fight the Greeks in Southern Italy (KC 15,998), where he is poised to intervene on the side of a local noble called Regenwart who had been expelled by the Greeks from his holdings in Calabria (KC 15,978-87). It is not entirely clear where Otto gathers his princes in council (KC 15,996-97). Regenwart has to send letters to him to persuade him, but at the same time the entire setting of a conflict with Greeks between Apulia and Calabria firmly situates the action in Southern Italy. The pope tries to hold the emperor and his princes off from intervening on behalf of Regenwart (KC 16,002-04), but they nevertheless march on Apulia to do just that (KC 16,005). Both the presence of the pope and the fact that Otto and his entourage are able to move immediately to Apulia suggest that they are already in Italy albeit somewhat removed from Regenwart's position in Apulia; hence it seems not entirely unlikely that the text is implicitly localising them in Rome. This is further corroborated by the fact that, when Otto's army returns from battle, badly defeated by the Greeks and Roman treachery, the pope addresses the Senate to argue that the traitors should be put to death (KC 16,040-47). Here again Rome is not explicitly mentioned as destination – the Germans simply *kômen wider an daz lant* – but the presence of pope and Senate strongly suggests that they have returned to the city of Rome.

This would turn the Romans who initially assure Otto of their allegiance once more into citizens of the city of Rome and not a general term for the people of his empire. In accordance with the

wider historiographical tradition of the time, the Romans are associated with treacherousness:[481] as soon as *Rômaere sumelîche* (KC 16,006) have the opportunity, they change their allegiance and turn to the Greeks to help them in the fight against Otto (KC 16,006-10). This leads to his humiliating defeat, the death of many a German (KC 16,063), and ultimately the king's death (KC 16,058-63).

After Otto's II defeat the Romans only feature in two more episodes under the Salians. The first instance happens in a very clearly papal and municipal context, when Henry III has to resolve a papal schism (KC 16,455-57). This situation is not only closely tied to the city of Rome, but also again set up as an antagonistic scenario, which Henry resolves by deposing all three competing Roman popes and installing Bishop Suitger of Bamberg in the papal see (KC 16,476-84). The text enhances the Roman context of this episode further by moving the historical 1046 synod of Sutri from Sutri in the province of Viterbo, fifty kilometres south of Rome, to Rome directly (KC 16,466; 16,476; 16,489).

The second instance marks the last task the Romans have to perform in the *Kaiserchronik*, which is to provide the festive frame for Henry V's imperial consecration by the pope (KC 16,916-20). As soon as the German kings appropriate the Empire the position of the Romans within the text radically changes. They are pushed out of the role of default public and supporting power behind the emperor or king and mutate into a closely circumscribed entity inseparable from the city of Rome, and from political and religious contexts closely tied to it: the papacy, the consecration of emperors, the Senate, or more general Italian concerns like the crisis in Milan or the military conflict with the Greeks in Apulia and Calabria. This shift is mirrored by the emerging *Diutiscen*, who now take over the default role hitherto fulfilled by the Romans. Charlemagne is *von Diutisken landen* (KC 14,819), King Arnold returns *in Diutisk lant (*KC 15,554) as does Henry IV (KC 16,916) after they have each been consecrated, which suggests that the Empire's core is now considered unmoored from Rome. This becomes even more evident after the disappearance of Henry IV who is erroneously believed to be dead (KC 16,804-06). Only after the news reaches Germany, political consequences are triggered. The generative centre for the succession of power

[481] The presentation of the Romans in Otto of Freising's Chronica is of course complex. But a good example for the set of negative traits associate with the Romans – like unreliability, avarice, cowardice, and treachery – see *Gesta Friderici*, Lib. II, Cap. 31: Fearing a trap as he approaches Rome Frederick I asks Pope Hadrian for counsel. The pope responds: 'My son, you will learn more about the guile of the Roman rabble as times goes on. For you will discover that in treachery the came and in treachery have departed. But aided by the clemency of God, Who says "I shall take the wise in their own craftiness", we shall be able to circumvent their shrewd schemes.' see Otto of Freising and Rahewin, *The deeds of Frederick Barbarossa* trans. by Charles Christopher Mierow (Columbia 1966), p. 140. The entire episode does not shed a favourable light on the Romans; see Otto of Freising and Rahewin, *Gesta Friderici I. imperatoris*, MGH SS rer. Germ. 46 ed. by Georg Waitz and Bernhard de Simson (Hannover, Leipzig 1912), Lib. II, Cap. 31-33, pp. 139-41.

has clearly moved to Germany. Rome's only function in this remains to bestow the additional dignity of the imperial consecration and provide a legitimising framework of authority.

Finally, in Otto II's devastating defeat in Southern Italy, it is the Germans who have formed the bulk of his army and whose losses are greatly emphasised by the *Kaiserchronik*:

> welch wunder daz was,
> daz ie dehain Diutisker genas! KC 16,038-39
> […]
> der Diutisken wart dô vil reslagen. KC 16,063

Similarly, when Henry V finds himself in dire straits in Rome, he is assailed by the Romans, while the group surrounding him and fighting their way out of Rome are the Germans (KC 16,895-16,902).

In religious terms the Romans are clearly presented as polytheists. But they also subscribe to a courtly canon of values and interests as evidenced again in the Tarquin episode. During the protracted siege of Viterbo they while away the time by indulging in a discussion of their favourite topics: they begin by commenting on the performance of their fellow knights and their conduct in battle. From there the debate moves on to other courtly pastimes like beautiful horses, good dogs, trained falcons, and finally – last but hopefully not least – noble women, whom they dearly miss and who display no sign of imperfection (KC 4415-30). Drawing up this catalogue of courtly preoccupations is essential for the Tarquin episode in order to root the upcoming conflict between Tarquin and Conlatinus, Tarquin's wife and Lucretia, in a competition about the appropriate conduct of women, which ultimately leads to Tarquin's wife inciting Tarquin to rape Lucretia, Lucretia's subsequent demonstrative suicide and Conlatinus' slaying of Tarquin in revenge. But it also goes to show that it was perfectly conceivable to present ancient Romans as preoccupied by the same interests and pastimes as contemporary German nobles of the twelfth century, who presumably constituted a sizeable part of the *Kaiserchronik*'s public. The literary discourse on courtly norms, communality, and chivalric conduct is already present in the *Kaiserchronik*.[482] So, despite being devout polytheists the Romans are also knights and courtiers, or as the text frames it: *Rômaere hêten grôze rîterscaft* (KC 4565). This reduces the qualitative difference between the narrated personage and the audience significantly.

---

[482] See Joachim Bumke, *Höfische Kultur: Literatur und Gesellschaft im hohen Mittelalter* (München 2002), pp. 576-77. Bumke mentions the Totila episode in the context of an incipient culture of courtly 'Minnegeselligkeit' in Germany.

V.2 Shifting Perspectives on the Empire

Over the course of the *Kaiserchronik* the office of king or emperor is foregrounded in many crucial passages, two of which will be examined in the following section: firstly Caesar's conquest of the German peoples north of the Alps and his subsequent military return to Rome (KC 247-602), together with the amalgamated version of Daniel's prophetic dreams, which gets inserted after Caesar's victory in Rome (KC 526-90); secondly the rule of the first king the text presents as 'German': Charlemagne (KC 14,282-15,091). These two episodes are the crucial thresholds on the *Kaiserchronik*'s teleological trajectory towards the political approximation of the Empire towards its present state.

V.2.1 Daniel, Caesar, and the Germans

When approaching the Caesar episode of the *Kaiserchronik*, which is crucial for the text's political modulation of Empire, it is important to consider first the situation of the *Annolied*. Only one complete version of it survives in a print by Martin Opitz from 1639.[483] About 225 of the lines transmitted in this print can also be found in the *Kaiserchronik*,[484] mainly in the episodes on Caesar and Augustus. Amongst these is also the Daniel passage, sometimes following the model of the *Annolied* to the letter, sometimes, however, significantly altering it. The Daniel passages in the *Annolied* (AL 11,1-17,14) and the *Kaiserchronik* (KC 526-590) are loose adaptions and conflations of the Old Testament dream interpretations from Daniel chapter 2, where the prophet expounds a dream of the Babylonian king Nebuchadnezzar, and chapter 7, where Daniel is himself the dreamer. The canonical interpretation of these two dreams is mainly informed by Jerome's commentary on Daniel which offers an in-depth reading and interpretation of Daniel's visions that would later become a cornerstone of Christian theology, especially christology.[485]

Annegret Fiebig has demonstrated conclusively that the changes made by the *Kaiserchronik* should not be considered a corruption of an already canonical tradition of interpretations of the

---

[483] On the transmission of the *Annolied* see Eberhard Nellmann, 'Annolied' in Verfasserlexikon, vols 14, (Berlin, New York 1978), I, coll. 366-71.

[484] See Müller 1999, p. 1.

[485] See St Jerome, *In Danielem*. English translation: *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel* trans. by L. Archer Jr. Gleason (Grand Rapids 1958); see also Régis Courtray, 'Der Danielkommentar des Hieronymus' in *Die Geschichte der Daniel-Auslegung in Judentum Christentum und Islam*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 371 ed. by Katharina Bracht, David Du Toit (Berlin, New York 2007), p. 32.

dreams. Rather, it ought to be seen as an original version with its own narrative purpose.[486]

The idiosyncrasy of the *Kaiserchronik*'s version is especially striking when compared to the *Annolied*. The latter largely takes its cue from Jerome's interpretation of Daniel 7. Of special interest is the fourth animal emerging, the one characterised by its iron teeth. It is not identified in Daniel 7 but Jerome, referring to Psalm 79, specifies it as a boar with ten horns and sees it as a symbol of the Roman Empire.[487] When an eleventh horn with an eye and a mouth uttering overweening boasts sprouts from its forehead (Daniel 7. 8), this marks the destruction of the fourth beast and hence the empire represented by it and its transformation into something else. Jerome argues against the interpretation of the Neoplatonic philosopher Porphyry, who argued that the beast symbolises the Seleucid king Antiochos IV Epiphanes – a contemporary to the writing of the Book of Daniel and antagonist to the Hebrews – and tried to convince his readers that it in fact represented a human being in whom Satan will assume bodily form at the end of days.[488] Jerome aims to synchronise Daniel's vision from chapter 7 more explicitly with Nebuchadnezzar's dream from Daniel 2,[489] where a statue composed from four materials – or five if one considers that the feet are actually made out of two – is crushed by a huge boulder (Daniel 2. 31-45). The exegetical sum of Jerome's linked reading of both prophecies is that with the end of the fourth empire the end of creation itself will arrive.[490] This eschatological dimension of the fourth empire, the Roman Empire, is also present in the *Annolied*'s version. Here the boar is clearly identified with the Romans (AL 16,1-2) who have subjugated all their enemies (AL 16,10) and now rule *diu werlt al* (AL 16,12). The boar's ten horns are explained as *cîn kuninge, | dî mit Rômêrin rittint ce sturme* (AL 17,1-2). The eleventh horn signifies the Antichrist (AL 17,9), *der noch in diese werlt kunftig ist* (AL 17,10). It clearly points to an eschatological future yet to come. But as Fiebig has pointed out, the main function of the Daniel passage in the *Annolied* is not eschatological or to comment on and

---

[486] See Fiebig 1995, pp. 31-38.

[487] See St Jerome, *In Danielem,* Cap. VII, l.4: *Romanum regnum nulli bestiae compararit: nisi forte ut formidolosam faceret bestiam, vocabulum facuit, ut quidquid ferocius cogitaverimus in bestiis, hec Romanos untelligamus. Iloc quod hic tacitum est, Hebraei in Psalmis dictum putant: Devastavit eam aper de silva; et singularis ferus depastus est eam* (Psalms 79. 14); Cap. VII, l.7: *Quartum quod nunc urbem tenet terrarum, imperium Romanorum est, de quo in statua dicitur: Tibiae ejus ferrae: pedum quoedam pars ferrae, quoedam fictilis; et tamen ipsius ferri ex parte nunc meminit, dentes ejus ferreos, et magnos esse contestans.*

[488] See St Jerome, *In Danielem*, Cap. VII, l.8: *Ergo dicamus quod omnes scriptores ecclesiastici tradiderunt: in consummatione mundi, quando regnum destruendum est Romanorum* [...] *Ne eum putemus juxta quorumdam opinionem, vel diabolum esse, vel daemonum; sed unum de hominibus, in quo totus satanas habitaturus sit corporaliter.*

[489] See e.g. St Jerome, *In Danielem*, Cap. VII, l.5: *Bestia secunda urso similis, ipsa est de qua in visione statuae legimus (Supra II,32): Pectus ejus et brachia de argento, haec ob duritiam, et ferocitatem urso comparatur.*

[490] Most explicitly see St Jerome, *In Danielem*, Cap. VII, l.11: *In uno Romano imperio propter Anitchristum blasphemantem, omnia simul regna delenda sunt, et nequaquam terrenum imperium erit, sed sanctorum conversatio, et adventus Filii Dei triumphantis* [...].

interpret history, but simply to bridge the gap in the historical narrative between *Semîramis* (AL 10,16) and the Romans (from AL 18).[491]

The *Kaiserchronik* offers a distinctly modified version of the Daniel material. The *lewin* (KC 579), who takes up the first position and stands for Babylon in Jerome and the *Annolied* has moved to the final, fourth position and is immediately identified as the *Antichrist* (KC 585). Thus the lioness pushes the *fraislich eber* (KC 571) and with him *den tiurlîchen Julijum* (KC 572) and *daz rîche ze Rôme* (KC 578), to which the boar is linked into third position. Here one would more conventionally expect the *liebarte* (KC 536) representing the Greek empire or more specifically *den Chrîchisken Alexandrum* (KC 538) but it is not only shunted to the second position but all the way to the first one, where the lioness used to be. This leaves the second position for the mysterious *pere wilde* (KC 565) who supposedly illustrates *driu kunincrîche, | diu wider aim solten grîfen* (KC 567-68). Most notably the horn remains with the fourth beast and thus now adorns the lioness (KC 583). The other markers of the Antichrist too – *mennisclîchen sin* (KC 580) and *mennisken ougen und munt* (KC 581) – are transplanted to the lioness. While the *mennisclîchen sin* corresponds to AL 12,2, where they are attributes of the lioness, the *mennisken ougen und munt* are closest to AL 17,5, where they are clearly attributed to the eleventh horn and not the animal itself.[492] The mirroring of the adjective *mennisken,* which does not feature in AL 17,5 aims at an increased synchronisation of the two traits as defining qualities of the beast standing for the Antichrist.

This unique arrangement of the Daniel passage in the *Kaiserchronik* caught the attention of editors and scholars early on and attracted mostly scornful commentary when for example Schröder characterised the sequence as ‘sehr ungeschickt hier eingereiht und umgestellt’.[493] Ohly offered a more appropriate approach, in that he tried to make narrative sense of the idiosyncratic delivery of Daniel’s vision in the *Kaiserchronik*. For him the key is the altered point of insertion when compared to the *Annolied*. In the *Kaiserchronik*, the Daniel passage is inserted close to the end of the Caesar episode. Only the remuneration of the Germans and Caesar’s death at the hands of the Romans follow in the *Kaiserchronik* after Daniel’s prophecies. For Ohly, the purpose of the exegesis is to present Caesar’s rule and his inauguration of the Roman Empire in the light of prophetic providence. For him this explains the changes the *Kaiserchronik* makes, apparently consciously, to the template it takes from the *Annolied*. Ohly places great emphasis on the fact that

---

[491] See Fiebig 1995, p. 40.

[492] For Ohly the resemblance between KC 581 and AL 17,5 is not sufficiently close. He claims that this line does not have any equivalent in the *Annolied* and thus proves the conscious and deliberate adaptation choices made by the author of the *Kaiserchronik*. See Ohly 1968, p. 48.

[493] Schröder 1895, p. 90, footnote 1.

in the *Kaiserchronik* the four beasts are not supposed to signify four empires but are personalised as four *chunige rîche* (KC 534), 'powerful kings'.[494] In the Book of Daniel they are unambiguously identified as *quattuor regna* (Daniel 7. 17) and the *Annolied* sees them as representatives of four *künincrîche* (AL 11,11).

Since the *Kaiserchronik* needs Caesar as a positive founding figure for the Empire, Ohly argues that the text strives to exonerate him from the close association of the Roman Empire with the eschatological fourth beast as presented in Jerome and the *Annolied*.[495] For that reason the *Kaiserchronik* pushes the boar and the Romans from the fourth back to the third position and moves the Babylonian lioness from the first to the now vacated last position to have her stand in for the Antichrist; a well comprehensible decision given the significance of Babylon in the biblical Book of Revelations.[496] Now, eschatology and the Antichrist have one specific and exclusive representative whilst Caesar and the Roman Empire as represented by the boar have been disencumbered of this symbolic burden.

And indeed, comparing the respective presentations of Caesar in both the *Annolied* and the *Kaiserchronik* his more positive portrayal in the latter soon becomes evident.

In the *Annolied* he is introduced as the *edelin Cêsarem* (AL 18,9) but after this not much effort is devoted to develop him. Most mentions of him remain neutral: he is simply *Cêsar* or represented by a simple pronoun.[497] Only his adversaries level the accusation against him that because of his *geile* (AL 24,3) he lost too many men on his campaigns. On one occasion he is referred to as the *iunge man* (AL 28,1), but that is the limit of ornative epithets the *Annolied* can muster for Caesar. Of course it can be argued that this might simply be a trait of the sober language of the *Annolied*, but in comparison with the *Kaiserchronik* the sheer quantity of apparently deliberate changes becomes remarkable. Ohly sees in this the text's effort to complete Caesar 'nach seiner ethischen Seite hin.'[498]

This semantically enhanced Caesar of the *Kaiserchronik* is now connected to the four German

---

[494] See Ohly 1968, p. 48.

[495] See Ohly 1968, p. 50. More general on Caesar see Almut Suerbaum, 'Caesar als Integrationsfigur im Mittelalter?' in *Praktiken europäischer Traditionsbildung im Mittelalter. Wissen – Literatur – Mythos* ed. by Manfred Eikelmann and Udo Friedrich (Berlin 2013), pp. 229-43.

[496] See Revelations 17.

[497] See AL 18,11; 18,12; 18,13; 18,15; 18,17; 18,18; 19,2; 19,14; 20,1; 20,2; 20,3; 20,25; 20,26; 21,2; 21,2; 21,3; 21,4; 22,1; 23,25; 24,1; 24,3; 24,5; 24,7; 24,9; 24,11; 24,13; 24,14; 24,15; 24,16; 25,9; 25,10; 25,19; 26,2; 26,8; 27,14; 28,2; 28,3; 28,4; 28,8; 28,9; 28,11; 28,13; 28,14; 28,15; 29,1.

[498] Ohly 1968, p. 45.

gentes of the Swabians, the Saxons, the Bavarians, and the Franks.[499] Caesar is commissioned by the Roman Senate, who have been alarmed by the *salvatio Romae* (KC 235-46), to subjugate the Germans as they rise in rebellion against Rome. Generally the *Kaiserchronik*'s account follows the *Annolied*, but some significant details are added or changed; for example, in the *Annolied* the German peoples remain leaderless whereas in the *Kaiserchronik* the Swabians are commanded by *Prenne*, who is a *helt vil vermezzen* (KC 274), and the Bavarians are ruled by Duke Boimunt and his brother Ingram (KC 300-01). The addition of these named opponents Caesar has to face – the Swabian hero *Prenne* apparently even in direct combat (KC 273-79) – has been read as the *Kaiserchronik*'s attempt to not only distinguish the German peoples but also Caesar by establishing daunting adversaries for him to overcome.[500] In addition to this, each of the *origines gentium* of the four German *gentes* in the *Kaiserchronik* is slightly shortened, reorganised or adapted in comparison to the *Annolied*. Here of these especially the Swabians and the Franks are of interest.

When Caesar advances against the Swabians first they *werten wol ir land* (KC 282), before they finally and only after a *teidinge* (KC 284) yield to him. The *Kaiserchronik* almost completely does away with their *origo gentis*. The *Annolied* knows that they *dari cumin wârin ubir meri* (AL 19,4), which is a necessary trait for the ancestors of the German *gens* in the *Annolied* because only if they at some point migrated into the German lands is it possible to connect them genealogically to people of historical meaning and importance. These are of course to be rooted in the legitimising sphere of traditional historiography, ancient legend, and biblical record, and not in the German outback of history. Anneliese Grau argues that the *Annolied*'s presentation of the *origines* of the four *gentes* is influenced by Fredegar's origin legends, and that according to these each of the four German peoples descends from a historical *gens* of antique or biblical provenance.[501] The *Annolied* explicates this only in three cases: the Bavarians descend from *Armenie* (AL 20,16), the Saxons hail from the lands ruled by the heirs of Alexander the Great (AL 21,5-11), and the Franks can trace their genealogy all the way back to *Troie der altin* (AL 22,5). Apart from the fact that they came from beyond the sea, no further information is provided concerning the genealogy of the Swabians,

---

[499] On the problem of 'tribes' and '*gentes*' see Joachim Ehlers, 'Erfundene Traditionen? Zum Verhältnis von Nationsbildung und Ethnogenese im deutschen und französischen Mittelalter' in *Zur Geschichte der Gleichung "germanisch-deutsch": Sprache und Namen, Geschichte und Institutionen*, Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde 34 ed. by Heinrich Beck and others(Berlin, New York 2004), pp. 131-62. See also Jörg Jarnut, 'Die Entstehung des mittelalterlichen deutschen Reiches als Forschungsproblem' in *Zur Geschichte der Gleichung "germanisch-deutsch", Sprache und Namen, Geschichte und Institutionen*, Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde 34 ed. by Heinrich Beck and others (Berlin, New York 2004), pp. 255-64.

[500] See Ohly 1968, p. 44.

[501] See Anneliese Grau, *Der Gedanke der Herkunft in der deutschen Geschichtsschreibung des Mittelalters: Trojasage und Verwandtes* (Leipzig 1938), pp. 17-21.

but following Grau's parallel reading with Fredegar they would have to descend from the Babylonians. The *Kaiserchronik*, however, does not take over the Swabians' migrative origins and only picks up the naming of the Swabian *gens* from the mountain *Suêvo* (AL 19, 7), which now becomes *Swêro* (KC 288). This prompted Fiebig to assume that the *Kaiserchronik* presents the Swabians as an indigenous people of Germany who can give Caesar *ir lant* (KC 285).[502]

After the Swabians, Caesar deals with the Saxons and the Bavarians before he confronts the fourth and final German *gens*: the *vil edelen* (KC 345) Franks. Initially they are introduced as his *alten mâgen* (KC 344) whose ancestor Franko settled on the Rhine and hailed himself from the *Trôjâni* (KC 361). This passage clearly implies a shared Trojan heritage of Caesar and the Franks even though it is never explicitly mentioned in the *Kaiserchronik*. By and large their *origo* is taken over from the *Annolied* with only slight abridgement. It is the rearrangement of the Cyclops episode that seems particularly jarring. In the *Annolied* it appears as one in a sequence of episodes illustrating the fate of the Greek survivors of the Trojan war; basically it is employed to exemplify Ulysses and his travails (AL 22,16). After the Greeks the different groups of Trojan survivors are named,[503] culminating with *Franko* (AL 23,16) who builds a *luzzele Troie* (KC 23,20) on the Rhine and becomes the forefather of the Frankish *gens*. The *Kaiserchronik* on the other hand reduces the Greek context around the Cyclops episode mainly by omitting Agamemnon, whose ignoble fate precedes the Ulysses episode in the *Annolied* (AL 22,11-16). Without this context the Cyclops-Ulysses passage no longer appears as an illustrative passage to show what happened to the individual combatants of the Trojan war after the city's fall. The *Annolied* advances its version of the tales of the several survivors with the assessment that in them God's *urteil* (AL 22,7) upon the warring parties will be manifested (AL 22,7-10). Again, the *Kaiserchronik* does not provide this explanatory contextualisation. Instead, the episode begins with an almost defiant *Ob ir iz glouben wellent, | daz ih iu wil rehte zellen* (KC 349-350), maybe best translated with an explicating negation as 'If you believe it or not | this I will tell you truthfully'.[504] After the episode the text moves without any further transition to the Trojans and their fate, again narrated in much closer conformity to the *Annolied* (KC 361-75). The Greeks are only mentioned in passing as the ones who destroyed Troy (KC 348). As it stands, the Ulysses and the Cyclops of the *Kaiserchronik* are on both sides surrounded by Trojans. Possibly the chronicle was trying to turn the episode from the

---

[502] See Fiebig 1995, p. 43.

[503] All old acquaintances from the *Aeneid*: *Elenus* AL 23,3; *Antenor* AL,23,9; *Enêas* AL 23,13.

[504] Even though there is no negating particle in the verse. Chinca and Young translate: 'Believe if it you will | but I am going to tell you truthfully'; Herweg offers: 'Wenn ihr es glauben wollt, werde ich euch wahrheitsgemäß erzählen' see *Die Kaiserchronik: Mittelhochdeutsch Neuhochdeutsch* trans. by Mathias Herweg (Stuttgart 2014) RUB 19270, p. 33.

Annolied's exemplary illustration of a Greek fate following the Trojan war into a part of the Frankish *origo*. This would fit in with a tendency of the *Kaiserchronik* to very loosely and rather occasionally associate elements of German history with famous historical events or personages.

Having defeated all the rebellious German peoples, Caesar consolidates his victories by founding a string of cities and fortresses to defend them (KC 381-86: Deutz and Boppard, Andernach and Ingelheim, Mainz and Oppenheim). This passage does not correspond to any from the *Annolied* and supposedly aims to tie Caesar as a founding figure more closely to the German peoples and territories.[505]

After his victory Caesar remains with the Germans *unz im alle Dûtiske hêrren | willic wâren ze sînen êren* (KC 453-54). He manages to obtain the fealty of the German *gentes* and is now, just as in the *Annolied* (AL 24), able to summon them to his aid against Rome. The Senate refuses to welcome him back in the city, accusing him of waging war *in Dûtisken landen* (KC 459) without their permission and having lost too many men while doing so (KC 455-79). As Goerlitz has pointed out this army consisting of discrete German *gentes* becomes a unified German army as soon as it crosses the alps to the South.[506] With this German army, Caesar advances against Rome *als ain fluot* (KC 474) and puts the Senate – namely Cato and Pompey – to flight (KC 479-487). He follows them and finally defeats Pompey in a great battle (KC 499-510) not specifically identified as, but corresponding to, the battle of Pharsalus that ended the Roman civil war in 48 BCE.

In two instances the *Kaiserchronik*'s version of the events of the Roman civil war differs from the *Annolied*. Both texts emphasise that Caesar advances against Pompey with a much smaller army (KC 496; AL 26,7) and that the ensuing battle is the largest in written history (AL 26,10; KC 500). However, only in the *Kaiserchronik* is it explicitly *durh der Dûtiscen trôst* (KC 497) that Caesar prevails in the end. The second substantial change concerns Pompey. In the *Annolied* he simply disappears after the defeat (AL 28,13-14). But the *Kaiserchronik* takes an interest in his further fate and follows him to *Egipten lant* (KC 511) where he is ultimately killed (KC 513). This gives the author an opportunity to tell briefly of Caesar's revenge for Pompey's death (KC 514), thus alluding to the deeper personal bonds between the two men, which are again not part of the text but certainly part of the cultural and historical background-knowledge of author and audience.

The *Annolied*'s account of the Roman civil war is mainly informed by Lucan's *De Bello Civili*, which was an important part of the Latin school curriculum in the twelfth century and thus certainly widely read and known. Caesar's own works were not widely read in the Middle Ages and when

[505] See Ohly 1968, p. 44.

[506] See Görlitz 2012, p. 134-35.

they were, often wrongly attributed to other authors like Suetonius.[507]

In both the *Annolied* and the *Kaiserchronik* Caesar can only now, after he has defeated Pompey and unified the rule over the Roman Empire, return to Rome and celebrate his triumph (AL 28; KC 519-523). To honour him the Romans create a new custom: *si begunden irrizen den hêrren* (KC 520). Caesar orders that this new honorary style should be taught to *alle Dûtisce man* (KC 524-25). This marks the transfer of a Roman *site* (KC 524) to the Germans without, however, implying the implementation of a deeper political conduit of translation or even the planting of a political kernel into the German *gentes* that will later with the German emperors come into its inevitable blossoming. But certainly the episode marks a hiatus within the historical logic of the text. For the first time the *gewalt | der ê was getailet sô manicvalt* (KC 522-23) is now concentrated in one person: Caesar. Before him the text spun only a very vague web of pagan authorities: the founding myth of Romulus and Remus (KC 49-54), the three hundred wise men of the Senate (KC 57-61), and the weekday calendar with its festivals for the pagan gods (KC 75-208). Caesar's function in the text is now to usher in the sequence of kings and emperors that serves as the structural backbone of the text. This corresponds to the textual marking of his episode as discussed earlier: the episode centred on him grows organically out of the weekday calendar and the *salvatio Romae* passage, but he is treated to the full closing formula reporting on his death and quantifying the duration of his rule. After the instruction of the Germans in Roman *site* the *Kaiserchronik* finally comes to the vision of Daniel and its singular interpretation of it (KC 526-590) whilst of course the *Annolied*'s version is positioned before the Romans, let alone Caesar, even figure in the text.

The comparison of the Caesar episode from the *Kaiserchronik* with the older one from the *Annolied* sheds light on what appear to be deliberate changes by means of which the younger text aims firstly to embellish and idealise Caesar; secondly to turn the Germans into more profiled adversaries and subsequent allies of the Romans; and thirdly to associate or maybe even causally link the inception of a unified Roman Empire with the martial prowess of the German peoples. Simultaneously it maintains the *Annolied*'s strategy of connecting the Germans to historical peoples who hail back to a prehistory not narrated or only implied and alluded to in the *Kaiserchronik*. The text's upgrading of Caesar not only distinguishes it from the *Annolied* but also from other important sources like Frutolf or Orosius who all at least acknowledge the problematic nature of Caesar's bid for power and his subsequent sole reign in the Roman Empire.

The connection of Caesar and Daniel in one episode is of crucial importance for Ohly. He reads

[507] See Franz Brunhölzl, 'Caear im Mittelalter, A. Allgemeines' in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* ed. by Robert-Henri Bautier and others, vols 9 (München, Zürich 1980-98), II 1983, coll. 1352-53.

it as a programmatic foil for understanding the internal typological references of the text. For him, the Daniel excursus marks the beginning of a teleologically unfolding historical process of the Roman Empire that finds its providential conclusion in the shaping of an increasingly perfect Christian Empire. This empire might be contested by the trappings of the Antichrist but can never be thoroughly corrupted to eventually turn into his empire of evil, as the more conventional Daniel exegesis would have it.[508]

Ohly's ideas have dominated scholarly discourse until today but also created several problems. As Annegret Fiebig demonstrated, there was, at least at the time of the composition of the *Kaiserchronik* no fixed form of Daniel's dream exegesis and the conception of the four empires tied to it. Rather the interpretation only assumed its canonical form over the course of the twelfth century. Hence the *Kaiserchronik*'s version should not be regarded as an aberration from an established exegesis but rather as the late example of a long line of alternative interpretations of the Daniel tradition. Accordingly, Fiebig reads the Daniel passage of the *Kaiserchronik* quite differently from Ohly: not as a basic scheme of history, but merely as an image which illustrates the causes for the translation of power and thus can be seen as the foil for *translatio imperii* in the *Kaiserchronik.*

Another problem of Ohly's emphasis on the Daniel passage is that his argument hinges on the differentiation of *Künincriche* in the *Annolied* from *chunige rîche* in the *Kaiserchronik*, the allegedly intentional shift from 'kingdoms' in the older to 'mighty kings' in the younger text. The third animal is supposed to personify Caesar, thus raising the historical unfolding of the Empire to a salvation historical level. This conclusion, however, is largely based on Schröder's edition and not founded on the manuscripts. In his apparatus Schröder offers two variants, according to Vorau Cod. 276 fol. 3va *kuninc riche* and after Wolfenbüttel Cod. 15.2 Aug. 2º fol. 27ra *chunig reich* to underpin the text of his edition. He mainly bases his decision on context, arguing that the animals because of their rearrangement cannot signify the empires but point to the individual kings. But simply looking at Vorau asks for caution as only a few lines later *kůnincriche* (fol. 3rb) can be found, when the text tells about the three rows of teeth in the mouth of the bear, the second animal. Save for the digraph *ů* and the clear compound spelling of the word, the form is identical. Looking at the other manuscripts of recension A, like Munich cgm 37 or Heidelberg cpg 361, the findings are increasingly obfuscated. The Heidelberg manuscript does not contain the Daniel passage at all and the Munich one has *chvnichriche* (fol. 4vb), where it is quite difficult to ascertain whether the two words are supposed to be connected or not. For the bear, cgm 37 offers *chvnriche* clearly written as one word.

---

[508] See Ohly 1968, p. 50.

From the manuscripts of recension B Vienna Cod. 2693 presents quite clearly *kunicriche* and *kvnich riche*, Cod. 2770, however, offers *chûnig reich* and later *chûnigreiche*. The Prague Fragment Cod. 23 G. 43 provides an identical reading for both places *kvni(n)griche* with g and r clearly connected.

Finally, in the C recension, to which most of the complete manuscripts of the *Kaiserchronik* belong, the Daniel passage is not transmitted at all. This indicates that the Daniel passage possibly never had the crucial importance for the whole of the chronicle that scholarship had assigned to it. Or at least in the middle of the thirteenth century – at the height of *Kaiserchronik* reception and edition – its compilers and audiences did not consider it significant enough any more.

And even if we only consider recensions A and B, the unclear variance of readings has to be acknowledged. This makes it increasingly dubious whether the passage actually has the importance Ohly saw in it and whether there really was a planned shift from 'kingdom' to 'powerful king', from the *Annolied* to the *Kaiserchronik*, resulting in a purposeful personalisation of the Empire in Caesar.

The presentation of Caesar in the *Annolied* prompted the historian Heinz Thomas to speculate about the possibility of a retroactive construction of Caesar as a specifically German founding figure. His stylisation as such would have closed a gap for the *gens Teutonica*.[509] What Arthur became for the British, Charlemagne for the French, Piast for the Polish, and Premysl for the Czechs, Caesar would have become for the Germans. Thomas himself dismisses this notion as 'abwegig' and all things considered he is probably right to do so. He is, however, mainly looking at the *Annolied*. He only passes over the *Kaiserchronik* quickly when summarising the success of the *Annolied*'s German *origo gentis* without further considering what the *Kaiserchronik* actually makes of it.[510] It is very tempting to bring Thomas's idea together with the results of the comparison between the Caesar of the *Annolied* and the *Kaiserchronik* made above. This would of course by no means imply the deliberate modelling of Caesar into a German King Arthur. Rather the *Kaiserchronik* takes up the basic function of Caesar in the *Annolied* and shapes his character into the idealised founding figure which it needs for its own purposes. This is facilitated by weaving the Daniel passage into the Caesar episode. Ironically this would mean that the *Kaiserchronik* is much closer to the 'mythisch-sagenhaft-national[en]' texts Ohly calls 'Historien' than to the 'biblisch-

[509] See Heinz Thomas, 'Julius Caesar und die Deutschen: Zu Ursprung und Gehalt eines deutschen Geschichtsbewusstsein in der Zeit Gregors VII. und Heinrichs IV' in *Die Salier und das Reich: Gesellschaftlicher und ideengeschichtlicher Wandel im Reich der Salier* ed. by Stefan Weinfurter, vols 3 (Sigmaringen 1991), III, p. 254.

[510] See Thomas 1991, pp. 250-56.

heilsgeschichtlich-imperial[en]' Ohly refers to as 'Chroniken'.[511] All of a sudden the *Kaiserchronik* seems to be closer to Grundmann's Latin twelfth-century *origines gentium*[512] than to the – equally Latin – texts Ohly wants to associate it with because only the latter draw their meaning from the 'Gesamtraum göttlicher Heilsgeschichte'[513] and are therefore accessible for interpretation according to his salvation historical extra-biblical typologies.

To conclude I would like to suggest that we no longer consider the Caesar-Daniel episode as the text's matrix for a typological and salvation historical reading of events but rather as an example of the *Kaiserchronik*'s tendency to foreground German presence in history. The text achieves this by every now and then pointing out the anecdotal presence of Germans in famous and easily recognisable historical constellations and occurrences. The *Kaiserchronik*'s approach to this strategy is far from systematic and at times almost opportunistic towards the source material but does represent one of the main strands that run through especially the Roman part of the text. Often it vanishes for a considerable amount of lines or episodes even behind other material but it remains continuously available for narrative gain. In case of the Daniel-Caesar episode the Germans are prominently inserted to powerfully associate them with the inception of the Empire and to emphasise the continuity of German association with imperial power to its twelfth-century German public.

V.2.2 Charlemagne and the Romans: Clash of Cultures

The figure of Charlemagne in the *Kaiserchronik* has attracted a great deal of scholarly attention, not only because of the historical importance of *Carolus Magnus* but also because in the fabric of the *Kaiserchronik* the process of *translatio imperii* is perceived to hinge on the episode centred on him. The text does after all explicitly state that he *der êrste kaiser wart ze Rôme | von Diutisken landen* (KC 14,818-19). Several other markers single out his importance. First, Ohly pointed out that thanks to the modified length of the reigns of several of the chronicle's emperors, Charlemagne ends up in the middle of the regnal years which the *Kaiserchronik* encompasses.[514] Second, his

[511] Ohly 1968, pp. 15-16.

[512] See Herbert Grundmann, *Geschichtsschreibung im Mittelalter* (Göttingen 1965), pp. 12-14.

[513] Ohly 1968, p. 12.

[514] See Ohly 1968 p. 18: 'Die Regierungszeiten von Caesar bis zu Kaiser Karl ergeben also in ihrer Summe genau die gleiche Zahl von Jahren wie die Zeit von Karl dem Großen bis zum Abbruch der Dichtung.' This argument, however, does not take into account that the *Kaiserchronik* is open-ended and extendable, like any chronicle, hence this position could be purely coincidental.

episode concludes with an anaphoric doxology extolling his virtues, which is unique in the *Kaiserchronik* in this form (KC 15,073-87). Third, Charlemagne's episode is preceded by the rather puzzling Constantius episode, which – as Pézsa has argued – only makes sense if read as a mirroring prefiguration of the events of the Charlemagne episode.[515] This is amplified by both episodes not being separated by the formulaic framework that usually concludes and opens emperor episodes, but by a vacancy of the Empire. Neudeck might be slightly overstating this connection when he claims that the Constantius and the Charlemagne episode form a unity, but is correct to point out that the 'überhöhende Variation' of the passage structurally marks its importance for the chronicle as a whole.[516]

Geith characterised the Charlemagne episode mainly as a 'Wunderbericht', focussed on the person of the emperor and not on the historical plot.[517] He casts doubt on the idea that this passage marks a decisive turning point in the *Kaiserchronik*'s conception of history.[518] Neudeck, however, stresses this pivotal element very much, singling the Charlemagne episode out as a 'zentrale[er] Wendepunkt[…].'[519] He also elaborates the parallels between Charlemagne and preceding episodes, not only Constantius, but also Constantine the Great.[520] Rubel ventured to continue Ohly's work when he set out to examine the typological connection between Caesar and Charlemagne. He too sees in Charlemagne's rule a 'heilsgeschichtlich bedeutsamen Wendepunkt' which marks the *translatio imperii ad Francos*, which is in turn prefigured by Caesar's rise to power at the beginning of the *Kaiserchronik*. Thus the relationship between the two is one of 'gesteigerte[n] Spiegelung'.[521]

Most recently Uta Görlitz has tried to show that Charlemagne is not profiled as an explicitly German ruler, as he oscillates between a Carolingian and a German background, and his descent is never quite clarified. Furthermore she argues that, contrary to most of the preceding scholarly literature, the text does not support a straightforward reading of the Charlemagne episode as a document of *translatio imperii* as this concept was still being formed in the twelfth century and the *Kaiserchronik* itself is much closer to the idea of *renovatio imperii*.[522] While some of her observations are certainly true, the case cannot be considered closed just yet and the question

---

[515] See Pézsa 1993, pp. 116-17.

[516] See Neudeck pp. 281-82.

[517] See Karl-Ernst Geith, *Carlos Magnus: Studien zur Darstellung Karls des Großen in der deutschen Literatur des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts*, Bibliotheca Germanica 19 (Bern, München 1977), pp. 80-81.

[518] See Geith p. 53.

[519] Neudeck p. 279.

[520] See Neudeck pp. 283-87.

[521] Alexander Rubel, 'Caesar und Karl der Große in der "Kaiserchronik". Typologische Struktur und die translatio imperii ad Francos', *Antike und Abendland*, 47 (2001), pp. 146-63.

[522] See Görlitz 2012, pp. 183-86.

remains if the doubling of Charlemagne's coming to Rome could not also have a significance of its own, beyond the merely compositional with regard to the political changes happening in the Empire within this episode.[523]

The task of this section will be to examine if the rule of Charlemagne indicates a qualitative change in the trajectory of the *Kaiserchronik*'s emperor episodes. In this regard not the portrayal of the person of Charlemagne himself, but much more how he and his rule reorganise Romanness and Germanness are of interest. This should provide insights into how interested the *Kaiserchronik* actually is in notions of *translatio imperii* and how deep the conceptual divide between the Roman and the German emperors of the chronicle is conceived to be.

When Charlemagne first travels to Rome, prompted by an incorporeal voice, which informs him that his brother – Pope Leo in the *Kaiserchronik*'s account – needs his help (KC 14,316), Rome is characterised as the *houbetstete* (KC 14,327). This springs from a mechanism introduced earlier in the episode, which ties the different lands ruled by Rome closer to the capital: the system of sending young noblemen to Rome to receive a knightly upbringing before returning to their native lands causally underpins the disposition of those lands to serve Rome as their *houbetstete.* So, initially the hierarchy within the Empire seems to be coherent with what the narrative of the *Kaiserchronik* has developed so far: Rome is the capital and centre, and countries like *Karlingen* (KC 14,309), where Charlemagne's father Pippin rules as *chunich rîche* (KC 14,310) are subordinate satellites.

The question remains why Charlemagne does not deal with Leo's vulnerable situation in Rome when he is in the city for the first time (KC 14,346-14,412). It has been argued that his two 'steigernd wiederholte Romzüge'[524] are mainly motivated to mirror the constellation of Caesar conquering the Germans and returning to Rome to subdue the Senate.[525] Only this time it is a German who, after a first visit, returns to Rome to conquer the city. Pézsa contrasts the visits to Rome as follows: the first is undertaken by Charlemagne as a pilgrim, and the second as a warlord.[526]

Similarly Charlemagne's clash with the Romans unfolds on different levels: on the level of religious practice and the level of legal culture. Both areas set the new *voget und rihtaere* (KC 14,338) of Rome apart from the inhabitants of what was until now the centre of the Empire.

---

[523] Robert Folz for examples did not rely too much on typological and compositional arguments. See Robert Folz, *Le souvenir et la légende de Charlemagne dans l'Empire germanique médiéval* (Paris 1950), pp.160-70.

[524] Pézsa 1993, p. 117.

[525] See Rubel 2001, pp. 158-60.

[526] See Pézsa 1993, p. 117, footnote 249.

To start with, Charlemagne's first coming to Rome sees a voluntary and publicly acclaimed bestowal of the imperial crown and dignity by the Romans upon him (KC 14,376-80). This is connected to the idea that, after the crisis of the Greek rulers, the Romans express a wish to elect an absent king who would *entwichen* (KC 14,295) from them. Hence they give the imperial crown to Charlemagne because they have reason to believe he will go away once his primary interest in Rome – the tombs of the saints (KC14,334-38) – has been satisfied.

Instead he comes back, slaughters many Romans, and imposes his new legislation, which happens to be a restoration of Constantine's law. But equally important is that the legislation is forced on the Romans by an outsider. The text needs to mark the seizing of the Roman power with force to indicate a clear break: a foreign – transalpine, Carolingian, German – ruler comes in and restores the Empire but this time on his terms. The renewal of the Empire is entirely imposed and thus marks a qualitative change of who is in charge and who gets to determine the political structure of the Empire so that the changeover can indeed be read as a *translatio imperii* and not only as a *renovatio imperii*.[527]

Another reason why the chronicle splits the coronations and consecration of Charlemagne in two might be more structural: the format of the emperor episodes requires the rulers to become Roman rulers as soon as possible. For Charlemagne the *Kaiserchronik* reorganises the entire sequence of his life and rule to first solve the question of this succession (till KC 14,826) and only then to expound his achievements as a warlord and conquerer and the miracles connected to his rule (KC 14,827-15,091).

Charlemange's status as a foreigner in Rome is corroborated by the creation of a cultural gap between him and the Romans. The geographical opposition between *Karlingen* and later *Riflanden* on the one hand and Rome and Italy on the other is complemented by a clash of opposing legal cultures. After having besieged Rome and forced the gates of the city open, Charlemagne sits in judgement over the Romans who mutilated Leo, *di sculdigen* | *nâch rehter urtaile* (KC 14,642-43). Charlemagne's demand of a trial by combat to punish the Romans who assaulted his brother and closed the city to him scandalises the Romans; Charlemagne's idea of which legal procedure would be appropriate to resolve the issue clashes sharply with the customary *reht* (KC 14,654) of the Romans and sets an extraordinary precedent in their relationship to the imperial authority: *sie getwungens kaiser ê nie nehain;* | *si solten rihten mit ir vingeren zwain* (KC 14,655-56).

[527] I am very grateful to Mark Chinca for sharing with me his interpretation of the Charlemagne episode, which has greatly shaped the reading presented here. Together with Christopher Young he is expected to publish their ideas in a more expanded form soon.

Charlemagne's imported transalpine law is a law in which legal issues can be resolved by combat with the implication that God will know his own. The Romans conceive of the issue as being solvable by simply swearing an oath. The Romans' defence that *sie getwungens kaiser ê nie nehain* connects the episode back to the past of the Roman Empire where the Romans were ruled by an emperor of their own and a clash like this would have been unimaginable. Charlemagne is clearly singled out as the outsider whose foreign idea of legal practice clashes with the established Roman culture. But the *Kaiserchronik*'s negotiation of the relationship between the new emperor to be and the Romans is more nuanced than this seemingly stark opposition. This becomes evident when we look at the way Charlemagne resolves the situation. He acknowledges the Roman legal custom: *von iwerem rehte netrîbe ich iuh niht mêre* (KC 14,664). Subsequently he even goes so far as to appropriate it so that he can dictate the conditions of the oath. His condition, that the oath should be sworn in the church of St Pancras in the name of the saint, fills the Romans with dread (KC 14,671-82) as if they already knew that they will not be able to sustain their oath in the presence of the saint, who functions like a polygraph and would immediately make their deceit obvious. And, sure enough, Charlemagne can rely on divine support, because as the Romans congregate at the church of St Pancras one of them collapses and another one takes flight without being able to take the oath. Charlemagne, who deftly set this trap, can now regard the legal matter as judged in his sense, with all Romans guilty and he can pursue and massacre them for three days even as they flee into St Peter's church (KC 14,683-87).

Charlemagne is able on the one hand to respect the Romans' legal custom and on the other hand to turn it into a trap, with the result that the matter is finally resolved in a way which is probably very close to the outcome that would have been produced by the legal procedure of trial by combat initially suggested by him. But he is not only an outsider who outwits the Romans on their own turf and in their own legal practices, he is also a restorer, who rectifies changes made to the constitution of the Empire. This emerges in his exhortative prayer to Christ, after he has cleared the rebellious Romans out of the Vatican (KC 14,697-14,707). After his words are initially unsuccessful, Charlemange has to resort to threatening the saint in his second address to St Peter. Only now is the requested miracle granted and his brother Pope Leo regains his eyesight. Upon this Charlemagne and *daz volc uber al* (KC 14,748) prostrate themselves in the form of a cross and Charlemagne is subsequently consecrated as the new emperor (KC 14,751-56). Charlemagne's prayer has restored the pope's eyesight and his office, to which he was elected by the Romans and from which he was ignominiously removed by the Romans. But his work as a restorer of Romanness is not done. His first legislative measure as the new emperor, which reinstates the authority of priests and bishops, is

explicitly linked back to the earlier Roman emperor Constantine (KC 14,779-83) The Romans' negligence has allowed for Constantine's legislation, which the *Kaiserchronik* devoted a lot of time and space to and put at the heart of Rome's Christianisation (KC 7958-8199), to be all but forgotten. Charlemagne's role is not only to introduce the rule of the transalpine emperors but also to restore Christian religious practice which had become quintessentially Roman since the time of Constantine. Where Charlemagne's second coming to Rome, his massacre of the Romans, and his ascension to the throne marked him as a disruption in the political constitution of the Empire, his renewal of Constantinian legislation aims to foreground the continuity of his rule within the Romanness of the Empire. The emperor, with his ambiguously shifting Carolingian and German background acts within both the premises of a *renovatio imperii* and a *translatio.* Finding its own way without feeling the need to pick a side between the two concepts, the *Kaiserchronik* not only allows for breaks and ellipses in the chronology of its account but manages at the same time of maintain the 'vollkommene politisch-ideelle Kontinuität' evidenced by the chronicles strict emperor episode framework.[528]

The way the *Kaiserchronik* presents the political genesis of the Roman Empire is not as much a *translatio imperii* from the Romans to the Germans as it is a change of perspective on the same imperial entity. The chronicle's point of view shifts from a Roman cisalpine perspective to a Carolingian and German transalpine one, which, however, shares a lot of the underpinnings which have hitherto informed the Roman cisalpine Empire. This is hardly surprising considering how eager the *Kaiserchronik* is to consistently emphasise the continuing presence of the Germans in relation to this empire from its inauguration.

[528] Görlitz 2012, p. 176.

VI. Conclusion

Over the *Kaiserchronik*'s course the Roman Empire emerges as its actual protagonist. Its coherence is maintained throughout. The episodic framework allows for the employment of different narrative strategies to translate what could become jarring historical differences between narrated past and medieval present into a mere countable distance. Years of rules and imperial lifetimes are easier to present as the backbone of history than the structural changes which qualitatively alienate the past from the present. Where the quantitative axial paradigm encounters its limitations – especially regarding the transitions within the political and religious identity of the Empire – neither the Empire's turn from a pagan into a Christian, nor from a cisalpine into a transalpine Empire endangers the paradigm's continual Romanness. The pivotal stations of both processes show a purposeful and highly reflected implementation with passages explicitly referencing and repeating each other and reverberating meaningfully.

The transformation of the Roman Empire from a pagan into a Christian one follows the gradual substitution of the polytheistic worship of demons disguised as gods with Christian monotheism. This is the driving motivator behind the selection of much of the narrative material up until Constantine and Theodosius. The aim here is not to devise a teleological salvation historical trajectory but to negotiate the qualitative change of religious identity in the conceptually unchanged Roman Empire. This means that Christianity even after its assertion always remains vulnerable.

While the Roman Empire always remains Roman, the perspective on it and its rulers changes significantly. Even when the Roman Empire is ruled by Roman emperors the chronicle opportunistically latches on to several opportunities to emphasise the historical closeness of the Germans or of discrete German peoples to the body and history of the Roman Empire. This is especially poignant during the Caesar episode, which sees the inauguration of the Empire as an imperial genealogy and in the Charlemagne episode, which marks the switch of perspective from an internally and essentially Roman one to a transalpine one, which, however, never fully asserts a fully conceptualised Germanness.

This sheds a new light on one of the questions most frequently posed of the text. Why are the Roman and the German, respectively the ancient and the medieval parts so different? Petersen explained the differences by ascribing to the Roman part a negative sense: the history of the Empire has been semanticised retrospectively from the perspective of the twelfth century and through this lens the ancient Roman part can only be read as a 'Aufschub des im Anfang der Geschichte schon

angelegten Zieles'. The ancient history of the Empire has to be artificially injected with meaning, through narrativisation and mythopoiesis, while the history of the Empire since Charlemagne shares a 'konzeptuelles Kontinuum' with the twelfth-century present and therefore does not require such treatment. In Petersen's view this turns the Roman part of the *Kaiserchronik* into the account of a 'Vorzeit', which is categorically different from everything that happens with and after Charlemagne. But Petersen remains vague about what characterises this 'konzeptuelle[…] Kontinuum' the German part shares with the present.[529] His offhand suggestions for it – the temporal axis or the institution of the German-Roman Empire – are present throughout the text and run across the threshold of the Charlemagne episode instead of originating in it. Charlemagne's rule does not affect the quantitative framework of the chronicle's time axis, nor does it indicate any qualitative change in the Empire. It is merely a change of perspective on the always contingent, self-contained, and freely retrievable concepts which organise the history of the *Kaiserchronik*'s Empire. It is not the ancient part of the chronicle which suffers from a lack of meaning, but the German part, for the very reason Petersen cites, but the conclusion should be the other way round: after Charlemagne the text has caught up with the two columns of the conceptual continuum which the chronicle's content shares with the present: Christianity and Germanness. Having thus happily achieved its aetiological mission the *Kaiserchronik* can dutifully complete its linear account of the Empire's history by adding the German emperors in a very unified account until the chronicle catches up with its own present day. Because of their conceptual unity with the present, the episodes centred on the Carolingian and German emperors lack any potential for narrative semanticisation of history, which is the chronicle's main objective. The *Kaiserchronik* wants to narrate 'Vorzeit'. It does not provide an embarrassed compensation for an inherent lack of meaning of the past, but utilises the semantic openness of the past to establish an aetiological connection to the present. Over the course of the chronicle's own narration the distance between narrated time and medieval present necessarily collapses. Once the present day of the twelfth century is reached by the text's narrative advance, it is treated as categorically different, as 'Nachzeit' so to speak, which holds very little in which the chronicle's author is interested.

Yet, to pursue its narrative interests the text does not develop a coherent programme or inscribe into itself a hermeneutical meta-structure in need of unlocking. The importance of salvation historical thought and patterns in particular has traditionally been much overestimated in this regard. Rather the chronicle parcels out its complex and unwieldy object – the continual unfolding

[529] See Petersen 2007, pp. 352-53.

of imperial time and rule – in an encyclopaedia of diverse stories presented in all the possible modes of narration that German vernacular storytelling in the middle of the twelfth century was able to muster. Thus the *Kaiserchronik*'s past is not a foreign country but is turned into a space where a contemporary audience can negotiate its historical origin and role. As the past comes up to meet them within their premises they can themselves project back the questions they have about their identity and history and find their answers ranking as historical truths. Their ancestors' presence und role in the history and the continuity of the political entity they inhabited touch on contemporary points of irritation and excitement.

Andrew Marbot would probably not have approved of the *Kaiserchronik*'s use of the Roman past. Like the ruins of Rome he commented on, the *Kaiserchronik* allows its audience to live in an era of their own choosing. But the present the chronicle speaks to understands itself very much as a prolonged past, which shares the Romanness that is the qualitative backbone of the Empire with all stages of its earlier life. Just like the droves of visitors Marbot describes being drawn to the ruins of Rome, the author of the *Kaiserchronik* strives to appropriate the past and turn it into present. For those writing, reading, and listening to the *Kaiserchronik* in the second half of the twelfth century, the past has been the present all along.

Bibliography

Primary Texts: Editions and Translation

Aristotle, *Opera Omnia* ed. by Immanuel Bekker and Georg Reimer (Berlin 1831).

— *Rhetoric* trans. by William Rhys (New York 1954).

St Augustin, *Confessiones* ed. by James O'Donnell (Oxford 1992).

— *De civitate Dei* ed. by Jacques-Paul Migne, vols 11 (Paris 1938) VII.

St Bede, *The Complete Works of Venerable Bede, in the original Latin, collated with the Manuscripts, and various printed editions, and accompanied by a new English translation of the Historical Works, and a Life of the Author* ed. by J.A. Giles, vols 8 (London 1843).

Biblia Sacra Latina: ex Biblia Sacra Vulgatae Editionis (London 1970).

Bodel, Jehan, *La chanson des Saisnes* ed. by Annette Brasseur, Textes littéraires français 369, vols 2 (Geneva 1989).

John Cassian, *Conlationes XXIIII* ed. by Michael Petschenig (Wien 1886).

The Conferences of John Cassian trans. by Edgar C.S. Gibson in A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church 11, 2nd ser. (New York 1894), pp. 291-545.

Cassiodorus Senator, *historia ecclesiastica tripartita: historiae ecclesiasticae ex Socrate, Sozomeno et Theodorito: in vnvm collectae et nyper de graeco in latinvm translatae libri nvmero dvodecim*, Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 71 ed. by Walter Jakob and Rudolf Hanslik (Wien 1952).

The Central Franconian Rhyming Bible ('Mittelfränkische Reimbibel'): An Early-Tweflth-Century German Verse Homiliary: A Thematic and Exegetical Commentary With the Text and a Translation into English ed. and trans. by David Wells, Amsterdamer Publikationen zur Sprache und Literatur 155 (Amsterdam, New York 2004).

Chrétien de Troyes; "*Erec und Enide*, Klassische Texte des Romanischen Mittelalters 17 trans. by Ingrid Kasten (Munich 1971).

— *Erec and Enide: Notes on the Poem* trans. by Dorothy Gilbert (Los Angeles, London 1992).

Marcus Tullius Cicero, De Oratore in *Cicero Rhetorica* ed. by A.S. Wilkins, vols 2 (Oxford 1963).

— *Über die Weissagung: De Divinatione* ed. and trans by Christoph Schäublin (Berlin 2013).

— *On Invention. The Best Kind of Orator. Topics*, Loeb Classical Library 386 trans. by H. M. Hubbell (Cambridge MA, 1949).

Deutsche Dichtung des Mittelalters: Band I: Von den Anfängen bis zum hohen Mittelalter, ed. by Michael Curschmann and Ingeborg Glier (München 1980), pp. 92-147.

Ekkehard of Aura, *Chronica*, MGH SS 6 ed. by Georg Waitz (Hannover 1844), p. 1-267.

Eusebius of Caesarea, *Historiae Ecclesiasticae Libri X* ed. by Friedrich Adolf Heinichen, vols 3 (Leipzig 1827).

— *The History of the Church* trans. by G.A. Williamson ed. by Andrew Louth (London 1989).

— *De Vita Constantini: Über das Leben Konstantins*, Fontes Christiani 83 trans. and ed. by Bruno Bleckmann (Turnhout 2007).

Frivolities of Courtiers and Footprints of Philosophers. Being a Translation of the First, Second, and Third Books and Selections from the Seventh and Eighth Books of the Policraticus of John of Salisbury trans. by Joseph Pike (New York1972).

From Constantine to Julian: Pagan and Byzantine Views ed. by Samuel Lieu and Dominic Montserrat (London, New York 1996).

Frühe Deutsche Literatur und Lateinische Literatur in Deutschland 800-1150, Bibliothek des Mittelalters 1, ed. by Walter Haug and Benedikt Konrad Vollmann (Frankfurt aM 1991).

Gottfried of Viterbo, *Pantheon Sive Vniuersitatis Libri*, ed. by Johannes Herold (Basel 1559).

— *Speculum Regnum*, MGH SS 22 ed. by Georg Pertz (Hannover 1872), pp. 21-93.

— *Memoria Seculorum*, MGH SS 22 ed. by Georg Pertz (Hannover 1872), pp. 94-106.

Hegel, Georg Willhelm Friedrich, *Lectures on the Philosophy of History* trans. by J. Sibree (New York 1956).

St Irenaeus, *Libros quinque adversus Haereses* ed. by William Wigan Harvey, 2 vols (Cambridge 1857).

Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiarum sive originum libri XX* ed. by W. M. Lindsay, 2 vols (Oxford 1911; repr. 1957).

— *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville* trans. by Stephen Barney and others (Cambridge2006).

St Jerome, *Commentariorum in Danielem libri III*, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 75a ed. by F. Glorie (Turnhout 1964).

Jerome's Commentary on Daniel trans. by L. Archer Jr. Gleason (Grand Rapids 1958).

— *Epistolae*, Patrologiae cursus completus, Series latina 22 ed. by Jacques-Paul Migne (Paris 1845).

John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury* ed. by W.J Millor and Christopher Brooke, vols 2 (Oxford 1979).

— *Historia Pontificalis* ed. by Reginald Poole (Oxford 1927).

— *Policraticus* ed. by Clemens Webb (London, New York 1909).

— *Policraticus*, Corpvs Christianorum Continuatio Mediaeualis 118 ed. by K.S.B. Keats-Rohan (Turnhout 1993).

— *Policraticus: The Statesman's Book* ed. by Murray Markland (New York 1973).

Flavius Josephus, *The Jewish War* trans. by G.A. Williamson ed. by Mary Smallwood (London 1959; repr. 1981).

Die Kaiserchronik: Mittelhochdeutsch Neuhochdeutsch trans. by Mathias Herweg (Stuttgart 2014).

Die kleinen Denkmäler der Vorauer Handschrift ed. by Erich Henschel and Ulrich Pretzel (Tübingen 1963).

Pfaffe Lamprecht, *Alexanderroman* ed. by Elisabeth Lienert, RUB 18508 (Stuttgart 2007).

Liber Pontificalis, MGH *Gesta pontificum Romanorum* ed. by Theodor Mommsen (Berlin 1895).

Titus Livius, *Ab urbe condita* ed. by Robert Seymour Conway and Charles Flamstead Walters (Oxford 1914).

Briefe Meinhards von Bambergs, MGH, Epistolae, Briefe d. dt. Kaiserzeit, *Briefsammlung der Zeit Heinrichs IV.* ed. by Carl Erdmann and Norbert Fickermann, vols 8 (Weimar 1949-2002).

Paulus Orosius, *Historiarum Adversum Paganos Libri VII*, ed. by Karl Zangmeister (Wien 1882).

— *Seven Books of History against the Pagans*, Translated Texts for Historians 54 trans. by A. T. Fear (Liverpool 2010).

Otfrid von Weissenburg, *Evangelienbuch: Auswahl* ed. by Gisela Vollmann-Profe, RUB 8384 (Stuttgart 1987).

Otto of Freising, *Chronica sive Historia de duabus civitatibus*, MGH SS rer. germ. 45 ed. by Adolf Hofmeister (Hannover 1912).

— *Chronica sive historia de duabus civitatibus*, FvSGA 16 ed. by Adolf Schmidt and Walther Lammers (Darmstadt 1990).

— *The two Cities: A Chronicle of Universal History to the Year 1146 A.D.* trans. and ed. by Charles Christopher Mierow (New York 2002).

— and Rahewin, *Gesta Friderici I. imperatoris*, MGH SS rer. Germ. 46 ed. by Georg Waitz and Bernhard de Simson (Hannover, Leipzig 1912).

— *The deeds of Frederick Barbarossa* trans. by Charles Christopher Mierow (Columbia 1966).

Ortnit und die Wolfdietriche, *Deutsches Heldenbuch* 3,1 ed. by Arthur Amelung and Oscar Jänicke (Berlin 1971).

Publius Ovidius Naso, *Ovid's Fasti* ed. by Sir James Frazer (London, Cambridge MA 1931).

Polybius, *The Histories: Books 9-15*, Loeb Classical Library 159 trans. by W.R. Paton, vols 6 (Cambridge MA, London 2011).

Porphyry's Against the Christians: The Literary Remains ed. and trans. by Joseph Hoffmann (Amherst 1994).

Marcus Fabius Quintilianus, *Institutio Oratoria: Books I-III*, Loeb Classical Library 124, vols 2 (Cambridge MA, London 1920; repr. 1963).

Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus, *De vita Caesarum libri VIII* ed. by Robert A. Kaster (Oxford 2016).

Trierer Silvester, MGH S Dt. Chron. 1,2 ed. by Carl Kraus (Hannover 1895), pp. 1-45.

Ulrich von Etzenbach, *Alexander,* Bibliothek des Litterarischen Vereins in Stuttgart 183 ed. by Wendelin Toischer (Tübingen 1888).

Publius Vergilius Maro, *Aeneis* ed. by George Long, vols 3 (London 1883).

'Vindicta Salvatoris' *e*d. by E.J. Cross in *Two Old English Apocrypha and their Manuscript Source; The Gospel of Nichodemus and the Avenging of the Saviour*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 19 (Cambridge 1996).

Vita Sadalbergae, MGH S rer. Merov. 5 ed. by B: Krusch and W. Levison (Hannover, Leipzig 1810), pp. 40-66.

Reference Works and Auxiliaries

'be-rihten' in *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch* ed. by Matthias Lexer, vols 3 (Leipzig 1872) I, coll. 191.

'be-sitzen' in *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch* ed. by Matthias Lexer, vols 3 (Leipzig 1872) I, coll. 217-18.

Biedermann, Hermengild, 'Homoiousios, Homoiousianer' in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* ed. by Robert-Henri Bautier and others, vols 9 (München, Zürich 1980-98), V 1991, col. 112.

— 'Homoousios' in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* ed. by Robert-Henri Bautier and others, vols 9 (München, Zürich 1980-98), V 1991, coll. 112-113.

Binding, Günther , 'Arius, Arianismus, Arianer' in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* ed. by Robert-Henri Bautier and others, vols 9 (München, Zürich 1980-98), I, coll. 949-951.

Brunhölzl, Franz, ‘Caear im Mittelalter, A. Allgemeines’ in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* ed. by Robert-Henri Bautier and others, vols 9 (München, Zürich 1980-98), II 1983, coll. 1352-53.

Brunhölzl, Franz, ‘Quntilianus’ in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* ed. by Robert-Henri Bautier and others, vols 9 (München, Zürich 1980-98), VII 1995.

‘deuten’ in *Kluge: Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache* ed. by Elmar Seebold (Berlin, Boston 2011), p. 194.

‘deutlich’ in *Kluge: Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache* ed. by Elmar Seebold (Berlin, Boston 2011), p. 194.

‘deutsch’ in *Kluge: Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache* ed. by Elmar Seebold (Berlin, Boston 2011), p. 195.

‘diute, tiute’ in *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch* ed. by Matthias Lexer, vols 3 (Leipzig 1872) I, col. 443.

Duffy, S.J., ‘Parousia, 2. in Theology’ in New Catholic Encyclopedia, 15 vols (Washington 1967), X, coll. 1037-40.

Engels, O., ‘Konrad, III dt. Kg.’ in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* ed. by Robert-Henri Bautier and others, vols 9 (München, Zürich 1980-98), V 1991, coll. 1339-40.

‘*êwe*’ in *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch* ed. by Matthias Lexer, vols 3 (Leipzig 1872) I, coll. 715-16.

Ferluga, J., ‘Edessa, Stadt in der heut. sö. Türkei, II. Die Grafschaft Edessa’ in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* ed. by Robert-Henri Bautier and others, vols 9 (München, Zürich 1980-98), VIII 1986, coll. 1568-69.

Grégoire, R., ‘Bernhard von Clairvaux, Leben und Wirken’ in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* ed. by Robert-Henri Bautier and others, vols 9 (München, Zürich 1980-98), I, coll. 1992-94.

Heyse, Elisabeth, ‘Homer, I. Lateinisches Mittelalter’ in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* ed. by Robert-Henri Bautier and others, vols 9 (München, Zürich 1980-98), V 1991, coll. 109-10.

‘ie-noch' in *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch* ed. by Matthias Lexer, vols 3 (Leipzig 1872) III, coll. 1415-16.

‘Kaiser’ in *Kluge: Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache* ed. by Elmar Seebold (Berlin, Boston 2011).

Kern, Manfred, ‘Titus’ in *Lexikon der antiken Gestalten in den deutschen Texten des Mittelalters* ed. by the author and Alfred Ebenbauer (Berlin, New York 2003).

— ‘Vespasian’ in *Lexikon der antiken Gestalten in den deutschen Texten des Mittelalters* ed. by the author and Alfred Ebenbauer (Berlin, New York 2003).

Klopsch, Paul, ‘Vergil im Mittelalter, I. Lateinische Literatur’ in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* ed. by Robert-Henri Bautier and others, vols 9 (München, Zürich 1980-98), VIII 1997, coll. 1522-26.

Koch, W., ‘Invocation’ in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* ed. by Robert-Henri Bautier and others, vols 9 (München, Zürich 1980-98), V 1991, coll. 483-84

‘krônike, krônik’ in *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch* ed. by Matthias Lexer, vols 3 (Leipzig 1872) I, coll. 1749.

Lausberg, Heinrich, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik: Eine Grundlegend der Literaturwissenschaft* (München 1960).

Maleczeck, W., ‘Eugen, III. Papst’ in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* ed. by Robert-Henri Bautier and others, vols 9 (München, Zürich 1980-98), IV 1989, coll. 78-80.

Martinez, Matias, ‘Plot’ in *Reallexikon der Deutschen Literaturwissenschaft* ed. by Georg Braungart and others, vols 3 (Berlin, New York 1997-2003), III 2003, pp. 92-94.

Nellmann, Eberhard, ‘Annolied’ in Verfasserlexikon, 14 vols, (Berlin, New York 1978), I, coll. 366-71.

Schneidmüller, Bernd, ‘Ludwig, VII., Kg. v. Frankreich’ in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* ed. by Robert-Henri Bautier and others, vols 9 (München, Zürich 1980-98), V 1991, coll. 2183-84.

‘sitzen’ in *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch* ed. by Matthias Lexer, vols 3 (Leipzig 1872) II, coll. 944-45.

‘werlt’ in *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch* ed. by Matthias Lexer, vols 3 (Leipzig 1872) III, coll. 782-84.

Secondary Texts

Alexander, Philip, ‘The parting of the ways from the perspective of Rabbinic Judaism’ in *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, AD 70 to 135: the second Durham Tübingen Research Symposium on earliest Christianity and Judaism* ed. by James Dunn (Tübingen 1992), pp. 1-26.

Amsler, Mark, *Etymology and Grammatical Discourse in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, Studies in the History of the Language Sciences 44 (Amsterdam, Philadelphia 1989).

Apel, Karl-Otto, *Das Apriori der Kommunikationsgemeinschaft*, Transformation der Philosophie, vols 2 (Berlin 1994).

Auerbach, Erich, ‘Sermon Humilis’, *Romanische Forschungen*, 64 (1952), pp. 304-64.

Baasch, Karen, *Die Crescentialegende in der deutschen Literatur des Mittelalters*, Germanistische Abhandlungen 21 (Stuttgart 1968).

Bakhtin, Mikhail, Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel: Notes toward a Historical Poetics in *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin* ed. by Michael Holist (Austin 1998).

Bertau, Karl, *Deutsche Literatur im europäischen Mittelalter*, 2 vols (Munich 1972).

Blamires, David, *Herzog Ernst and the Otherworld Voyage. A Comparative Study* (Manchester 1979).

Bloch, Herbert, 'Der Autor der "Graphia aureae urbis Romae"', *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 40 (1984), pp. 55-176.

Blumenberg, Hans, *The Legitimacy of the Modern Age*, trans. by Robert Wallace (Cambridge MA 1983).

Blumenkranz, Bernhard, *Die Judenpredigt Augustins: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der jüdisch-christlichen Beziehungen in den ersten Jahrhunderten,* Basler Beiträger zur Geschichtswissenschaft 25 (Basel 1946).

Bowden, Sarah, 'Zur Poetik des mehrsinnigen Verstehens. Der allegorische Stil der Hochzeit' in *Literarischer Stil: Mittelalterliche Dichtung zwischen Konvention und Innovation,* XXII. Anglo-German Colloquium Düsseldorf (Berlin / Boston 2015), pp. 305-21.

Brandt, Hartwin, 'Historia magistra vitae? Orosius und die spätantike Historiographie' in *Jenseits der Grenzen. Beiträge zur spätantiken und frühmittelalterlichen Geschichtsschreibung*, Millenium-Studien zu Kultur und Geschichte des ersten Jahrtausends n. Chr. 25 ed. by Andreas Goltz, (Berlin 2009), pp. 121-33.

Brinkmann, Henning, 'Der Prolog im Mittelalter als literarische Erscheinung' in *Studien zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 2 vols ed. by the author (Düsseldorf 1966).

Brooke, Christopher, *The Medieval Idea of Marriage* (Oxford 1989; repr. 2002).

Butzer, Günter, 'Das Gedächtnis des epischen Textes: Mündliches und schriftliches Erzählen im höfischen Roman des Mittelalters', *Euphorion*, 89 (1995), pp. 151-88.

von Campenhausen, Hans Freiherr, *Urchristliches und Altkirchliches* (Tübingen 1979).

Carroll, James, *Constantine's Sword: The Church and the Jews* (Boston, New York 2001).

Chinca, Mark and Christopher Young, 'Uses of the Past in Twelfth-century Germany: The Case of the Middle High German "Kaiserchronik"', *Central European History*, 49 (2016), pp. 1-20.

Chinca, Mark, *Studies in the Poetics of Gottfried's Tristan* in Modern Humanities Research Association, Texts and Dissertations 35 (London 1993).

Courtray, Régis, Der 'Danielkommentar des Hieronymus' in *Die Geschichte der Daniel-Auslegung in Judentum Christentum und Islam*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 371 ed. by Katharina Bracht, David Du Toit (Berlin, New York 2007), pp. 123-50.

Crossley, Ralph George, *Die Kaiserchronik: Ein literaturhistorisches Problem der altdeutschen Literaturgeschichte* (Munich 1939).

Curtius, Ernst Robert, 'Zur Literaturästhetik des Mittelalters', *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 59 (1938), pp. 1-50; 129-232; 433-79.

— *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages* (Princeton, Oxford 1953; repr. 2013).

Derrida, Jacques, *Of Grammatology* trans. by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (Baltimore 1967).

Deichmann, Friedrich Wilhelm, 'Frühchristliche Kirchen in antiken Heiligtümern' in *Rom, Ravenna, Konstantinopel, Naher Osten. Gesammelte Studien zur spätantiken Architektur, Kunst und Geschichte* ed. by the author (Wiesbaden 1982), pp. 56-94.

Dickhut-Bielsky, Johannes, *Auf der Suche nach der Wahrheit in Annolied und Kaiserchronik. Poetisch-historiographische Wahrheitssuche in frühmittelhochdeutschen Geschichtsdichtungen,* ZfdA Beihefte 23 (Stuttgart 2015).

Dittrich, Marie-Luise, *Die Eneide Heinrichs von Veldeke: Quellenkritischer Vergleich mit dem Roman d'Eneas und Vergils Aeneis,* 2 vols (Wiesbaden 1966).

Döpp, Heinz-Martin, *Die Deutung der Zerstörung Jerusalems und des Zweiten Tempels im Jahre 70 in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten n. Chr.,*Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter 24 (Tübingen, Basel 2002).

Duby, Georges, *The Knight, the Lady and the Priest: the Making of Modern Marriage in Medieval France* (London 1984).

Duchesne, Louis, L'auteur des Mirabilia, *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, 24 (1904), pp. 479-89.

Ehlers, Joachim, 'Erfundene Traditionen? Zum Verhältnis von Nationsbildung und Ethnogenese im deutschen und französischen Mittelalter' in *Zur Geschichte der Gleichung "germanisch-deutsch": Sprache und Namen, Geschichte und Institutionen*, Ergängzungsbände zum Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde 34 ed. by Heinrich Beck and others(Berlin, New York 2004), pp. 131-62.

van Eickels, Klaus, Ehe und Familie im Mittelalter in Geisteswissenschaften im Profil: *Reden zum Dies Academicus 2000-2007*, Schriften der Otto-Friedrich-Universität Bamberg 1 ed. by Godehard Ruppert (Bamberg 2008), pp. 43-65.

Fiebig, Annegret, 'vier wilde tiere: Weltdeutung nach Daniel in der "Kaiserchronik"' in *Deutsche Literatur und Sprache von 1050 – 1200: Festschrift für Ursula Henning zum 65. Geburtstag* ed. by the author and Hans-Jochen Schiewer (Berlin 1995), pp. 27-49.

Fix, Ulla, *Rhetorik und Stilistik: Ein internationales Handbuch historischer und systematischer Forschung* (Berlin 2008).

Foerster, Thomas, *Godfrey of Viterbo and his Readers: Imperial Tradition and Universal Historiography in Late Medieval Europe* (Routledge 2015).

Folz, Robert, *Le souvenir et la légende de Charlemagne dans l'Empire germanique médiéval* (Paris 1950).

Frappier, Jean, *Chrétien de Troyes: The Man and his Work* trans. by Raymond Cormier (Athens OH, 1982).

Fredriksen, Paula, *Augustine and the Jews: A Christian Defense of Jews and Judaism* (New York 2008).

Fried, Johannes, *Geschichte und Gehirn, Irritationen der Geschichtswissenschaft durch Gedächtniskritik* in Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse Mainz 7 (Mainz 2003), pp. 1-43.

Friedrich, Udo, 'Topik und Narration: Zur rhetorischen und poetischen Funktion exemplarischen Erzählens in der "Kaiserchronik"', *Poetica*, 47, 1-2 (2016), pp. 1-24.

Fromm, Hans , 'Die Disputationen in der Faustinianlegende der "Kaiserchronik", Zum literarischen Dialog im 12. Jahrhundert' in *Deutsche Literatur und Sprache von 1050 – 1200: Festschrift für Ursula Henning zum 65. Geburtstag* ed. by Annegret Liebig and Hans-Jochen Schiewer (Berlin 1995), pp. 51-69.

Fukuyama, *Francis, The End of History and the Last Man* (London 1992).

Gardt, Andreas, *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft in Deutschland: Vom Mittelalter bis ins 20. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, New York 1999).

Gehrke, Hans-Joachim, 'Die Bedeutung der (antiken) Historiographie für die Entwicklung des Geschichtsbewußtseins' in *Die antike Historiographie und die Anfänge der christlichen Geschichtsschreibung* ed. by Eve-Marie Becker (Berlin, New York 2005), pp. 29-51.

Geith, Karl-Ernst, *Carlos Magnus: Studien zur Darstellung Karls des Großen in der deutschen Literatur des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts*, Bibliotheca Germanica 19 (Bern, München 1977).

Gellinek, Christian, 'The German Emperor's Chronicle: An Epic Fiction?', *Colloquia Germanica*, 5 (1971), pp. 230-36.

Gertz, Sunhee Kim, *Poetic Prologues: Medieval Conversations with the Literary Past* in Analecta Romanica 56 (Frankfurt aM 1996).

Geuenich, Dieter, 'Karl der Große, Ludwig "der Deutsche" und die Entstehung eines "deutschen" Gemeinschaftsbewusstseins' in *Zur Geschichte der Gleichung "germanisch-deutsch", Sprache und Namen, Geschichte und Institutionen*, Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde 34 ed. by Heinrich Beck and others (Berlin, New York 2004), pp. 185-98.

Goerlitz, Uta, '(Un-)Wahrheit und (Nicht-)Erinnern. Erzählen ze diute in der frühmittelhochdeutschen "Kaiserchronik"' in *Damnatio in memoria. Deformation und Gegenkonstruktionen in der Geschichte*, Zürcher Beiträge zur Geschichtswissenschaft 4 ed. by Sebastian Scholz, Gerald Schwedler und Kai-Michael Sprenger (Berlin, New York 2014), pp. 225-42.

— *Literarische Konstruktion (vor-)nationaler Identität seit dem Annolied, Analysen und Interpretationen zur deutschen Literatur des Mittelalters (11.-16. Jahrhundert)* in Quellen und Forschungen Literatur- und Kulturgeschichte 45 (Berlin, New York 2007).

Goetz, Hans-Werner, *Das Geschichtsbild Ottos von Freising* in Beihefte zum Archiv für Kulturgeschichte 19 (Cologne, Vienna 1984).

Grau, Anneliese, *Der Gedanke der Herkunft in der deutschen Geschichtsschreibung des Mittelalters: Trojasage und Verwandtes* (Leipzig 1938).

Graziosi, Barbara, *Inventing Homer: The Early Reception of Epic* (Cambridge 2002), pp. 21-40.

Green, Dennis Howard, *Medieval Listening and Reading: The Primary Reception of German Literature 800-1300* (Cambridge 1994).

Grundmann, Herbert, *Geschichtsschreibung im Mittelalter* (Göttingen 1965).

Haskins, Charles Homer, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* (Cleveland 1967).

Haubrichs, Wolfgang, ‘Theodiscus, Deutsch und Germanisch - drei Ethnonyme, drei Forschungsbegriffe. Zur Frage der Instrumentalisierung und Wertbesetzung deutscher Sprach- und Volksbezeichnungen’ in *Zur Geschichte der Gleichung “germanisch-deutsch”, Sprache und Namen, Geschichte und Institutionen*, Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde 34 ed. by Heinrich Beck and others (Berlin, New York 2004), pp. 199-228.

Haug, Walther, *Literaturtheorie im deutschen Mittelalter. Von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Darmstadt 1992).

Hellgardt, Ernst, ‘Dietrich von Bern in der deutschen “Kaiserchronik”: Zur Begegnung mündlicher und schriftlicher Traditionen’ in *Deutsche Literatur und Sprache von 1050-1200: Festschrift für Ursula Henning zum 65. Geburtstag* ed. by the author and Hans-Jochen Schiewer (Berlin 1995), pp. 93-110.

Hengel, Martin, ‘Heilsgeschichte’ in *Heil und Geschichte. Die Geschichtsbezogenheit des Heils und das Problem der Heilsgeschichte in der biblischen Tradition und in der theologischen Deutung*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 248 ed. by Jörg Frey, Stefan Krauter und Hermann Lichtenberger (Tübingen 2009), pp. 3-36.

Herweg, Mathias, ‘Kohärenzstiftung auf vielen Ebenen: Narratologie und Genrefragen in der “Kaiserchronik”’, *Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik*, 47, 2 (2017), pp. 281-02.

Hildesheimer, Wolfgang, *Marbot. Eine Biographie* (Frankfurt aM 1981).

Hirt, Jens, *Literarisch-politische Funktionalisierungen: Eine Untersuchung mittelhochdeutscher Kreuzzugsdarstellungen: ‘Wilhelm von Wenden’, ‘Die Kreuzfahrt des Landgrafen von Thüringen’, ‘Wilhelm von Österreich’ und ‘Das Buch von Akkon’* in Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik 766 (Göppingen 2012).

von Hofmann, Johann Christian Konrad, *Weissagung und Erfüllung im Alten und Neuen Testamente. Ein theologischer Versuch* 2 vols (Nördlingen 1841-44).

Horn, Hans-Jürgen, ‘Origenes, Cassian, der vierfache Schriftsinn und seine Beziehung zu ontologischen Vorstellungen des Platonismus’ in *Platonismus im Orient und Okzident* ed. by Ralf Georges Khoury and Jens Halfwassen (Heidelberg 2005), pp. 49-60.

Hunt, Tony, ‘Prodesse et Delectare: Metaphors of Pleasure and Instruction in Old French’, *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 80, 1 (1979), pp. 17-35.

Hyde, John Kenneth, ‘Medieval Descriptions of Cities’ in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 48 (1966), pp. 308-340.

Janowski, Bernd, ‘Vergegenwärtigung und Wiederholung. Anmerkungen zu G. Von Rads Konzept der Heilsgeschichte’ in *Heil und Geschichte. Die Geschichtsbezogenheit des Heils und das Problem der Heilsgeschichte in der biblischen Tradition und in der theologischen Deutung* Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 248 ed. by Jörg Frey, Stefan Krauter und Hermann Lichtenberger (Tübingen 2009), pp. 37-62.

Jantsch, Heinz, *Studien zum Symbolischen in Frühmittelhochdeutscher Literatur* (Tübringen 1959).

Jarnut, Jörg, ‘Die Entstehung des mittelalterlichen deutschen Reiches als Forschungsproblem’ in *Zur Geschichte der Gleichung “germanisch-deutsch”, Sprache und Namen, Geschichte und Institutionen*, Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde 34 ed. by Heinrich Beck and others (Berlin, New York 2004), pp. 255-64.

Jentzmik, Peter, *Zu Möglichkeiten und Grenzen typologischer Exegese in mittelalterlicher Predigt und Dichtung* (Göppingen 1973).

Kartschoke, Dieter, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur im frühen Mittelalter* (München 2000).

Kessler, Eckhard, ‘Das rhetorische Modell der Historiographie’ in *Formen der Geschichtsschreibung*, Beiträge zur Historik 4 ed. by Reinhard Koselleck and others (Munich 1982), pp. 37-85.

Kinney, Dale, ‘Fact and Fiction in the “Mirabilia urbis Romae”’ in *Roma Felix – Formation and Reflections of Medieval Rome* ed. by Carol Neuman de Vegvar and Éamonn Ó Carragáin (Routledge 2008), pp. 235-52.

— ‘The discourse of columns’ in *Rome Across Time and Space: Cultural Transmission and the Exchange of Ideas c.500-1400* ed. by Claudia Borgia and others (Cambridge 2011), pp. 182-99.

Klopsch, Paul, *Einführung in die Dichtungslehren des lateinischen Mittelalters* (Darmstadt 1980).

Koch, Klaus, ‘Das aramäisch-hebräische Danielbuch. Konfrontation zwischen Weltmacht und monotheistischer Religionsgemeinschaft in universalgeschichtlicher Perspektive’ in *Die Geschichte der Daniel-Auslegung in Judentum Christentum und Islam*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 371 ed. by Katharina Bracht, David Du Toit (Berlin, New York 2007), pp. 3-30.

Koselleck, Reinhart, *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time* (Cambridge MA, 1985).

Krautheimer, Richard, *Rome Profile of a City: 312-1308* (Princeton 1980).

Lammers, Walther, *Weltgeschichte und Zeitgeschichte bei Otto von Freising* in Sitzungsberichte der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main, 14, 3 (Wiesbaden 1977).

Lasker, Daniel, *Jewish Philosophical Polemics Against Christianity in the Middle Ages* (New York 1977).

Lienert, Elisabeth, *Die historische Dietrichsepik. Untersuchungen zu ‘Dietrichs Flucht’, ‘Rabenschlacht’ und ‘Alpharts Tod’* (Berlin 2010).

Long, Burke, *The Problem of Etiological Narrative in the Old Testament* in Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 108 (Berlin 1968).

Lorenz, Chris, ‘Kann Geschichte wahr sein? Zu den narrativen Geschichtsphilosophien von Hayden White und Frank Ankersmit' in *Konstruktion von Wirklichkeit: Beiträge aus geschichtstheoretischer, philosophischer und theologischer Perspektive* ed. by Jens Schröter and Antje Eddelbüttel (Berlin, New York 2004), pp. 33-63.

Lotman, Jurij Michailowitsch, ‘Vorwort zur deutschen Ausgabe’ in *Kunst als Sprache: Untersuchungen zum Zeichencharakter von Literatur und Kunst* ed. by Klaus Städtke (Leipzig 1981), pp. 7-19.

Lutz, Eckart Conrad, *Rhetorica Divina: Mittelhochdeutsche Prologgebete und die rhetorische Kultur des Mittelalters* (Berlin, New York 1984).

Matthews, Alastair, *The Kaiserchronik: A Medieval Narrative* (Oxford 2012).

MacMullen, Ramsay, *Christianizing the Roman Empire: A.D. 100-400* (New Haven, London 1984).

McAfee Moss, Charlene, *The Zechariah Tradition and the Gospel of Matthew* in Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche 156 (Berlin, New York 2009).

Meijer, Fik, *Emperors don’t die in bed* trans. by S.J. Leinbach (London, New York 2004)

Melville, Gert, ‘Durch Fiktionen von der Wirklichkeit zur Wahrheit. Zum mittelalterlichen Umgang mit Widersprüchen zwischen Empirie und kultureller Axiomatik’ in *Fiktion und Fiktionalität in den Literaturen des Mittelalters. Jan-Dirk Müller zum 65. Geburtstag* ed. by Ursula Peters and Rainer Warning (Paderborn 2009), pp. 83-104.

Miedema, Nine, *Die Mirabilia Romae: Untersuchungen zu ihrer Überlieferung mit Edition der deutschen und niederländischen Texte*, Münchner Texte und Untersuchungen zur deutschen Literatur des Mittelalter 108 (Tübingen 1996).

Milde, Vera, ‘si entrunnen alle scentlîchen dannen: Christlich-jüdischer Disput in der Silvesterlegende der “Kaiserchronik”’ in *Juden in der deutschen Literatur des Mittelalters. Religiöse Konzepte – Feindbilder – Rechtfertigungen* ed. by Ursula Schulze (Tübingen 2002), pp. 13-34.

Millet, Victor, ‘Das 12. Jahrhundert und die Heldensage’, *Wolfram-Studien*, 16 (2000), pp. 256-81.

von Moos, Peter, *Geschichte als Topik: Das rhetorische Exemplum von der Antike zur Neuzeit und die historiae im ‘Policraticus’ Johanns von Salisbury* (Hildesheim, Zurich, New York 1988).

— ‘Poeta und Historicus im Mittelalter: Zum Mimesis-Problem am Beispiel einer Urteile über Lucan’, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Deutschen Sprachen und Literatur,* 98 (1973), pp. 93-130

Mulder-Bakker, Anneke, ‘A Pantheon Full of Examples: The World Chronicle of Godfrey of Viterbo’ in *Exemplum et Similitudo: Alexander the Great and Other Heroes as Points of Reference in Medieval Literature,* Mediaevalia Groningana 8 ed. by W.J. Aerts and M. Gosman (Gröningen 1988), pp. 85-98.

Müller, Stephan, *Vom Annolied zur Kaiserchronik. Zur Text- und Forschungsgeschichte einer verlorenen deutschen Reimchronik* (Heidelberg 1999).

Müllenburg, Marcel, Britta Müller-Schauenburg und Henrik Wels, ‘Und warum glaubst du dann nicht? Zur ambivalenten Funktion der Vernunft in Religionsdialogen des 12. Jahrhunderts’ in *Integration und Desintegration der Kulturen im europäischen Mittelalter*, Europa im Mittelalter 18 ed. by Michael Borgolte and others (Berlin 2011), pp. 261-324.

Murphy, James, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance* (Berkeley, Los Angeles 1974).

Naumann, Bernd, ‘Ein- und Ausgänge: Frühmittelhochdeutsche Gedichte und die Predigt des 12. Jahrhunderts’ in *Studien zur Frühmittelhochdeutschen Literatur.:Cambridger Colloquium 1971* ed. by Leslie Peter Johnson and others (Berlin 1974), pp. 37-57.

Neudeck, Otto, ‘Karl der Große – Der beste aller werltkunige: Zur Verbindung von exegetischen Deutungsmustern und heldenepischem Erzählen in der “Kaiserchronik”’, *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift*, 53 (2003), pp. 273-94.

Nellmann, Eberhard, *Die Reichsidee in deutschen Dichtungen der Salier- und frühen Stauferzeit*, Philologische Studien und Quellen 16 (Berlin 1963).

Newald, Richard, *Nachleben Des Antiken Geistes Im Abendland Bis Zum Beginn Des Humanismus: Eine Überschau* (Tübingen 1960).

Newman, Barclay and Philip Stine, *A Handbook on The Gospel of Matthew* (Stuttgart, New York 1988).

Nolland, John, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Milton Keynes 2005).

Nöther, Ingo, *Die geistlichen Grundgedanken im Rolandslied und in der Kaiserchronik* (Hamburg 1970).

Noth, Martin, ‘Der Beitrag der Archäologie zur Geschichte Israels’, *Vetus Testamentum*, Supplements 7 (1960), pp. 262-82.

Ohly, Ernst Friedrich, ‘Gebet an den Heiligen Geist’ in *Wolfram von Eschenbach*, Wege der Forschung 62 ed. by Heinz Wupp (Darmstadt 1966), pp. 455-518.

— Wolframs Gebet an den Heiligen Geist im Eingang des Willehalm, *ZfdA*, 91 (1961/62), pp. 1-37.

— *Sage und Legende in der Kaiserchronik: Untersuchungen über Quellen und Aufbau der Dichtung* (Darmstadt 1940; repr. 1968).

— ‘Ausserbiblisches Typologisches zwischen Cicero, Ambrosius und Aelred von Rievaulx’ in *Schriften zur mittelalterlichen Bedeutungsforschung* ed. by the author (Darmstadt 1983), pp. 336-60.

— ‘Halbbiblische und Ausserbiblische Typologie’ in *Schriften zur mittelalterlichen Bedeutungsforschung* ed. by the author (Darmstadt 1983), pp. 361-99.

— ‘Synagoge und Ecclesia: Typologisches in mittelalterlicher Dichtung’ in *Schriften zur mittelalterlichen Bedeutungsforschung* ed. by the author (Darmstadt 1983), pp. 312-38.

— ‘Typologie als Denkform der Geschichtsbetrachtung (1983)’ in *Ernst Friedrich Ohly: Ausgewählte und neue Schriften zur Literaturgeschichte und zur Bedeutungsforschung* ed. by Uwe Rüber and Dietmar Peil (Stuttgart, Leipzig 1995), pp. 445-72.

— ‘Typologische Figuren aus Natur und Mythus (1979)’ in *Ernst Friedrich Ohly: Ausgewählte und neue Schriften zur Literaturgeschichte und zur Bedeutungsforschung* ed. by Uwe Rüber and Dietmar Peil (Stuttgart, Leipzig 1995), pp. 473-508.

— ‘Skizze zur Typologie im Mittelalter (1979)’ in *Ernst Friedrich Ohly: Ausgewählte und neue Schriften zur Literaturgeschichte und zur Bedeutungsforschung* ed. by Uwe Rüber and Dietmar Peil (Stuttgart, Leipzig 1995), pp. 509-54.

Opitz, Karen, *Geschichte im höfischen Roman: Historiographisches Erzählen im Eneas Heinrichs von Veldeke*, Germanistisch Romanische Monatsschrift, Beiheft 14 (Heidelberg 1996).

Partner, Nancy, *Serious Entertainments: The Writing of History in Twelfth-Century England* (Chicago, London 1977).

Pézsa, Tibor Friedrich, *Studien zu Erzähltechnik und Figurenzeichnung in der deutschen ‘Kaiserchronik’*, Europäische Hochschulschriften Reihen I, Deutsche Sprache und Literatur 1378 (Frankfurt aM 1993).

Petersen, Christoph, ‘Zeit, Vorzeit und Narrativierung von Geschichte in der “Kaiserchronik”’, *ZfdPh*, 126 (2007), pp. 321-53.

Petersohn, Jürgen, *Kaisertum und Rom in spätsalischer und staufischer Zeit. Romidee und Rompolitik von Heinrich V. bis Friedrich II*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica Schriften 62 (Hannover 2010).

Pohl, Monika, 'Untersuchungen zur Darstellung mittelalterlicher Herrscher in der deutschen "Kaiserchronik" des 12. Jahrhunderts: Ein Werk im Umbruch von mündlicher und schriftlicher Tradition' (Doctoral thesis, Ludwig-Maximilians-University, Munich 2004).

Przybylski, Martin, *Kulturtransfer zwischen Juden und Christen in der deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters*, Quellen und Forschungen zur Literatur- und Kulturgeschichte 61 (Berlin, New York 2010).

Rader, Olaf, *Friedrich II.: Der Sizilianer auf dem Kaiserthron: Eine Biographie* (München 2010).

Reuter, Timothy, 'Past, Present and No Future in the Twelfth-Century Regnum Teutonicum' in *The Perception of the Past in Twelfth-Century Europe* ed. by Pau Magdalino (London, Rio Grande 1992), pp. 15-36.

Rubel, Alexander, 'Caesar und Karl der Große in der "Kaiserchronik". Typologische Struktur und die translatio imperii ad Francos', *Antike und Abendland*, 47 (2001), pp. 146-63.

Rüsen, Jörn, 'Die vier Typen des historischen Erzählers' in *Formen der Geschichtsschreibung*, Beiträge zur Historik 4 ed. by Heinrich Lutz and Jörn Rüsen (Munich 1982).

Schmitt, Carl, *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty* trans. by George Schwab (Cambridge MA, London 1985).

Schimmelpfennig, Bernhard, *Die Zeremonienbücher der römischen Kurie im Mittelalter* (Tübingen 1973).

Schramm, Ernst Percy, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio : Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Erneuerungsgedankens vom Ende des karolingischen Reiches bis zum Investiturstreit* (Darmstadt

1957).

Schreckenberg, Heinz, *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld*, European University Studies, Series 13, Volume 172 (Frankfurt aM and others 1990).

Schulz, Marie, *Die Lehre von der historischen Methode bei den Geschichtsschreibern des Mittelalters (VI-XIII. Jahrhundert)*, Abhandlungen zur Mittleren und Neueren Geschichte 12 (Berlin, Leipzig 1909).

Schwietering, Julius , *Die deutsche Dichtung des Mittelalters* (Potsdam 1932).

— 'Typologisches in Mittelalterlichen Dichtungen' in *Philologische Schriften* ed. by the author (Berlin / Leipzig 1925), pp. 40-55.

Shaw, Frank, '"Kaiserchronik" and "Enide"', *German Life and Letters*, 24, 4 (1971), pp. 295-303.

— 'Das historische Epos als Literaturgattung in frühmittelhochdeutscher Zeit' in *Studien zur Frühmittelhochdeutschen Literatur: Cambridger Colloquium 1971* ed. by Leslie Peter Johnson and others (Berlin 1974), pp. 275-91.

Smits, Kathryn, 'Zweimal Heraclius: Zu Sprache und Erzählstil der Heraclius-Episode in der "Kaiserchronik" und im "Buoch der künige niuwer ê"' in *Deutsche Sprache: Geschichte und Gegenwart. Festschrift für Friedrich Maurer zum 80. Geburtstag* ed. by Hugo Moser and Heinz Wupp (Bern, München 1978), pp. 155-67.

Spiegel, Gabrielle, 'History, Historicism, and the Social Logic of the Text in the Middle Ages', *Speculum*, 65, 1 (1990), pp. 59-86.

Stackmann, Karl, 'Erzählstrategie und Sinnvermittlung in der Deutschen "Kaiserchronik"' in *Erscheinungsformen kultureller Prozesse: Jahrbuch 1988 des Sonderforschungsbereiches 'Übergänge und Spannungsfelder zwischen Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit'* ed. by Wolfgang Faible (Tübingen 1990), pp. 63-82.

Stengel, Edmund, ‘Die Entstehung der “Kaiserchronik” und der Aufgang der staufischen Zeit’ in *Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte* ed. by the author (Cologne 1960), pp. 395-417.

Stock, Markus, *Kombinationssinn: Narrative Strukturexperimente im ‘Straßburger Alexander’, im ‘Herzog Ernst B’ und im ‘König Rother’*, Münchener Texte und Untersuchungen zur deutschen Literatur des Mittelalter 123 (Tübingen 2002).

Suerbaum, Almut, ‘Erzählte Geschichte. Dialog und Dialogizität in der “Kaiserchronik”’ in *Aspekte des 12. Jahrhunderts. Freisinger Kolloquium 1998*, Wolfram Studien XVI ed. by Wolgang Haubrichs and others (Berlin 2000), pp. 235-55.

—- ‘Caesar als Integrationsfigur im Mittelalter?’ in *Praktiken europäischer Traditionsbildung im Mittelalter. Wissen - Literatur - Mythos* ed. by Manfred Eikelmann and Udo Friedrich (Berlin 2013), pp. 229-43.

Taylor, Joan , *The Essenes, the Scrolls, and the Dead Sea* (Oxford 2012).

Thomas, Heinz, ‘Julius Caesar und die Deutschen: Zu Ursprung und Gehalt eines deutschen Geschichtsbewusstsein in der Zeit Gregors VII. und Heinrichs IV’ in *Die Salier und das Reich: Gesellschaftlicher und ideengeschichtlicher Wandel im Reich der Salier* ed. by Stefan Weinfurter, vols 3 (Sigmaringen 1991), III, pp. 245-78.

Trompf, Garry Winston, *Early Christian Historiography: Narratives of Retributive Justice* (London, New York 2000).

Tulasiewicz, W.F., *Index Verborum zur Deutschen Kaiserchronik* (Berlin) 1972

Urbanek, Ferdinand, ‘Zur Datierung der “Kaiserchronik”: Entstehung – Auftraggeber – Chronologie’, *Euphorion*, 53 (1959), pp. 113-52.

—- ‘Herrscherzahl und Regierungszeiten in der “Kaiserchronik”’, *Euphorion*, 66 (1972), pp. 219-37.

Vollmann-Profe, Gisela, *Wiederbeginn volkssprachlicher Schriftlichkeit im hohen Mittelalter (1060/70-1160/70),* Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zum Beginn der Neuzeit ed. by Joachim Heinzle, vols 2 (Königstein 1986).

Vollrath, Hanna, ‘Das Mittelalter in der Typik oraler Gesellschaft’, *Historische Zeitschrift*, 233 (1981), pp. 571-94.

Wehrli, Max, ‘Antike Mythologie im christlichen Mittelalter’ in *Max Wehrli: Gegenwart und Erinnerung: Gesammelte Aufsätze*, Spolia Berolinensia, Berliner Beiträge zur Geistes und Kulturgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit 12 ed. by Fritz Wagner and Wolfgang Maas (Hildesheim, Zürich 1998), pp.90-104.

Wenzel, Horst, *Höfische Repräsentation: Symbolische Kommunikation und Literatur im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt 2005).

Wesle, Karl , ‘“Kaiserchronik” und “Rolandslied”’, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 48 (1924), pp. 223-58.

Westermann, Claus, *Forschung am Alten Testament*, Theologische Bücherei 24 (München 1964).

White, Hayden, *The Content of the Form* (Baltimore, London 1987).

Wissmann, Wilhelm, ‘Skop’, *Sitzungsberichte der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 2 (1955), pp. 1-30.

Witthöft, Christiane, ‘Zwischen Wahrheitssuche und Wunderglauben: Die christlich-jüdischen Disputationen der Silvesterlegende in der “Kaiserchronik”’ in *Disputation 1200-1800: Form, Funktion und Wirkung eines Leitmediums universitärer Wissenskultur*, Trends in Medieval Philology 20 ed. by Marion Gindhart and Ursula Kundert (Berlin, New York 2010), pp. 291-310.

Zumthor, Paul, *Essai de poétique médiévale* (Paris 1972).

Online Tools and Resources

Heinrich Heine Universität Düsseldorf, Digitale Sammlungen <http://digital.ub.uni-duesseldorf.de/urn/urn:nbn:de:hbz:061:1-75610> [accessed 26.10.17].

Mittelhochdeutsche Begriffsdatenbank (MHDBDB), ed. by Universität Salzburg, 1992-2017 <http://www.mhdbdb.sbg.ac.at/> [multiple accesses].

Perseus Digital Library ed. by Gregory Crane <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/> [accessed 13.07.2017]

Stern, J.P., 'Sweet Sin', London Review of Book, 4, 14, (1982), pp. 3-6 <https://www.lrb.co.uk/v04/n14/jp-stern/sweet-sin> [accessed 25.10.17].