

Uses of the Past in Twelfth-Century Germany: The Case of the Middle High German
Kaiserchronik

Mark Chinca and Christopher Young

Abstract: Despite its broad transmission and its influence on vernacular chronicle writing in the German Middle Ages, the *Kaiserchronik* has not received the attention from historians that it deserves. This article describes some of the ideological, historical, and literary contexts that shaped the original composition of the chronicle in the middle of the twelfth century: Christian salvation history, the revival of interest in the Roman past, the consolidation of a vernacular literature of knowledge, and the emergence of a practice of writing history as “serious entertainment” by authors such as Geoffrey of Monmouth and Godfrey of Viterbo. Placed in these multiple contexts, which have a European as well as a specifically German dimension, the *Kaiserchronik* emerges as an important document of the uses of the past in fostering a sense of German identity among secular and ecclesiastical elites in the high Middle Ages.

The *Kaiserchronik*, completed probably in Regensburg ca.1150, is a seminal work.¹ Monumental in scale, it comprises over seventeen thousand lines of Middle High German verse and is the first verse chronicle in any European language. Through a grand narrative of the reigns of thirty-six Roman and nineteen German emperors filling a timespan of twelve centuries, it throws the spotlight on ethnicity, religion and cultural identity, and on the relationship between church and empire, as these issues play out on the various stages of Rome, Germany and their territorial outposts in the Mediterranean basin.²

The *Kaiserchronik* has several claims to uniqueness. No other medieval chronicle focuses solely on the Roman Empire. No other German work of the period draws on such

heterogeneous sources, from the *Mirabilia Romae*, Hellenistic novels, and Ovid to contemporary historiography and oral legend.³ None points so clearly to the complex relationship between Latin learning and popular culture in terms of its manuscript transmission, its status among clerics, and its retranslation into Latin.⁴ So far as the last feature is concerned, the only other vernacular German texts of the period to receive similar treatment are the prologue to *Willehalm*, an adaptation by Wolfram von Eschenbach of a chanson de geste from the William of Orange cycle, and Hartmann von Aue's religious legends *Der Arme Heinrich* and *Gregorius*.⁵

At the latest count, there are fifty surviving manuscripts (including fragments and excerpts) of the *Kaiserchronik*. The earliest of these (Klagenfurt, Landesarchiv, Cod. GV 6/26; Vorau, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod. 276) are from the last quarter of the twelfth century, and the last (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, cgm 965) is dated 1594; around two thirds of the extant transmission is from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.⁶ Moreover, the manuscripts transmit three distinct versions of the chronicle, testifying to a productive engagement with the text over a long span of time.⁷ Recension A (ca. 1150) and Recension B (ca. 1200) recount the history of Roman and German rulers, beginning with the foundation of Rome by Romulus and Remus and breaking off in the reign of Conrad III and his preparations for the crusade (1147). The main innovation of Recension B is that it modernizes the language and diction of A, making rhyme and metre conform to what had become the norm for courtly narrative literature ca. 1200; it also abbreviates the text by around sixteen hundred lines, sometimes in a manner that is detrimental to the content and intelligibility. Recension C (ca. 1250) again updates the rhyme and metre of A, though independently of B and so as to preserve textual content; it also adds a new prologue and continues the chronicle down to the end of the reign of Frederick II in 1250; one manuscript of the family (Leutkirch, Fürstlich Waldburg zu Zeil und Trauchburgsches Gesamtarchiv, ZAMs 30) includes a second continuation which extends the narrative of imperial history through the Interregnum and

down to the year 1274.⁸ It is important to note that each new recension did not supersede the older ones, which continued to be copied, and also that the transmission is geographically diverse: although the surviving manuscripts are preponderantly Austro-Bavarian, the *Kaiserchronik* was also transmitted in southwestern and central Germany, and (via ingestion into the *Sächsische Weltchronik*) in the Low German-speaking regions of the north.⁹

Given the multifaceted presence of the chronicle in German culture for almost half a millennium, it is remarkable that our grasp of the work and its influence should still be so tenuous. Literary medievalists have neglected it because they associate it with a genre (historiography) and a period (the mid twelfth century) that have traditionally been marginal to their interests; historians do not always have sufficient philological training to read a long text in a nonstandard version of Middle High German. Yet vernacular texts can tell us much about medieval attitudes, popular as well as elite, to the past, and the *Kaiserchronik* in particular affords an opportunity to connect historical and literary studies in much the same way as Gabrielle Spiegel accomplished over twenty years ago when, in her study of vernacular chronicles from early thirteenth-century France, she argued that the literary form of the chronicles (in this case prose) was no less instrumental than their historical content for procuring effects of historical authentication and ideological legitimation.¹⁰

Even within the broad canons of medieval historiography, the *Kaiserchronik* is no ordinary history.¹¹ Its principle of narrative organization is admittedly regnal: the chronicle proceeds through the reigns in sequence, in every case beginning with the formula “The book tells us that X became ruler” (where it is not clear whether the “book” refers to a putative written source or to the *Kaiserchronik* itself, from which one must imagine a reciter reading aloud), and ending with the length of the reign in years, months, and days. But in the Roman part, the sequence of emperors includes a fictitious ruler—Narcissus—and crass anachronisms, the most egregious of these being that Tarquin the Proud, the last Roman king before the Republic, is placed between Nero (54-68 CE) and Galba (68-69 CE)

(*Kaiserchronik*, lines 4301-34).¹² Moreover, the chronicle-like account of the events of each reign (with the accent on wars, persecutions of Christians, and councils and synods of the Church) is filled out with narratives of legendary or hagiographical or literary provenance that by modern standards of history writing are sheer fabulation and fabrication. The narrative of the reign of Claudius, for example, has hardly anything to say about the emperor at all, and focuses instead on his fictitious brother Faustinianus, who is supposedly the father of Pope Clement I. The story, which recounts the unfortunate separation through shipwreck of various members of Faustinianus's family, and their subsequent miraculous reunion, is not historical, but derived ultimately from the model of the Hellenistic novel, with an overlay of hagiographical accounts (sermons and *vitae*) of the life of Clement (lines 1115-1218).¹³ Narcissus, the invented emperor, proves to be merely a peg on which to hang the story of his equally fictitious daughter-in-law Crescentia. Her tale is a version of the popular story-type of the virtuous woman falsely accused; condemned to death twice over for an offense she never committed (first adultery, then infanticide), Crescentia is rescued by God twice over and endowed with the miraculous power of healing any sick person who is willing to confess their sins; she uses this power to cure and be reconciled with both of her accusers, whom God had punished for their transgressions by striking them down with leprosy (lines 11352-12812).¹⁴

Legendary, hagiographical, and literary narratives are less prominent in the German part of the *Kaiserchronik*, but the author continues nonetheless to take great liberties with the historical facts. The narrative involves actors who are not historically attested, prominent historical persons may be conflated or confused, and salient events in German history of the early and central Middle Ages are either omitted or given only cursory treatment. For example, the divisions of empire after Charlemagne pass completely unmentioned, and the outbreak of the Investiture Controversy together with its resolution are dealt with entirely within the reign of Henry V (lines 16848-941); the result of this practice of narrative containment is that the account of Henry IV, which opens with the theme of Henry's dissolute

youth before moving on to Godfrey of Bouillon's campaigns in Antioch, Jerusalem, and Babylon (lines 16532-847), leaves readers with the impression that Canossa and all that never happened.¹⁵

The medieval public seems not to have had any difficulty with the *Kaiserchronik's* inaccurate and often idiosyncratic account of history. On the contrary, the facts of recension, transmission, and reception all combine to suggest that the chronicle enjoyed widespread acceptance as a work that transcended distinctions between fact and fable, history and poetry, and also secular and religious – distinctions that medieval audiences certainly recognized, but considered secondary to other criteria, such as moral utility or religious orthodoxy, when it came to determining whether a narrative located in the historical past had a serious claim on their attention.¹⁶ Neither the B nor the C recension of the *Kaiserchronik* attempts to make factual corrections to the account of Roman and German history presented in A. So far as the transmission is concerned, although the surviving complete manuscripts almost always contain only the *Kaiserchronik*, the small number of instances where the chronicle forms part of a larger collection of works is remarkable for its generic diversity. The *Kaiserchronik* appears together with religious texts: Bible epics and vernacular theology in the case of Vorau, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod. 276 (last quarter of the twelfth century; Recension A), saints lives in that of Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky, Cod. XXIII G 43 (second quarter of the thirteenth century; Recension B); it keeps company with secular courtly romances and epics in Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. 2779 (first or second quarter of the fourteenth century; Recension B); it is also transmitted with historiography: Heidelberg, Universitätsbibliothek, cpg 154 (1474; Recension A) inserts the episodes of Theodosius and Julianus into the text of a German translation of Martin of Troppau's chronicle of popes and emperors, and the fascicle containing the *Kaiserchronik* in the Vorau Codex was bound together with a second fascicle, copied in Vorau between 1185 and 1202, transmitting Otto of Freising's *Gesta Friderici imperatoris*; probably the two fascicles were not originally meant

for each other (the vernacular part may not even have been copied in Vorau) but the binding of the codex is fifteenth-century, so they must have been joined together by then.¹⁷ The reception of the *Kaiserchronik*, finally, also indicates an interest on the part of writers of both vernacular and Latin chronicles. Three manuscripts of Recension C of the *Sächsische Weltchronik* (Strassburg, Stadtbibliothek, no signature, destroyed 1870; Pommersfelden, Gräflisch Schönbornsche Schloßbibliothek, Cod. 107, 1370; Copenhagen, Det Kongelige Bibliotek, GKS 457,2^o, mid fourteenth century) transmit texts into which around five sixths of the A recension of the *Kaiserchronik* (sometimes recast from verse into prose) have been integrated;¹⁸ a late twelfth-century manuscript of the continuation of Frutolf of Michelsberg's world chronicle by Ekkehard of Aura (Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, Cod. hist. fol. 411) includes a Latin translation of the explanation of the Roman names for the days of the week from *Kaiserchronik* Recension A (lines 42-234).¹⁹

It is evident therefore that the *Kaiserchronik* was a widely disseminated text from the time of its inception, and very possibly because rather than in spite of its blend of history and fiction. What the facts of recension, transmission, and reception cannot explain, however, is the meaning that the chronicle may have had for the medieval audiences among whom it was so popular. To be more exact, they cannot tell us what compelling version of the historical past the chronicle offered to its various and evidently numerous readers and listeners. In the following we focus on the first recension (A) of the *Kaiserchronik*, and seek to explain some of the appeal that its version of Roman and German history may have held for the original public around the middle of the twelfth century. Drawing on insights from literary scholars and historians, we begin with the model of history writing that has traditionally been considered as the productive matrix for the *Kaiserchronik*, namely the paradigm of salvation history, before proceeding to situate the chronicle in the twin contexts of German vernacular literature and the writing of history as “serious entertainment” in the twelfth century; these

latter contexts have not, we believe, received the attention they merit from *Kaiserchronik* scholarship.

Salvation History

Research on the *Kaiserchronik* has been conducted primarily by literary historians rather than historians. After the emphasis on rulership in sociologically driven readings of the 1950s through to the 1970s, followed by a lull in the 1980s, research has revived somewhat, especially in the last fifteen or so years, when narratological approaches have predominated, although rarely in a manner that is wholly convincing.²⁰ The reason is that literary scholars have tended to think of the chronicle as they would of a work of literature, namely as an intentional whole with an internally consistent compositional structure. In the case of the *Kaiserchronik*, this is a category error: even the most fundamental source criticism indicates that the work can only have come into being through a process of accretion, possibly carried on by more than one author, and over a longer period of time; the process moreover resulted not in a finished composition, imbued with a narrative design, but in an “open” work always in principle subject to further stages of continuation.²¹

One approach among literary scholars has therefore been to analyze single prominent episodes of the chronicle; the problem is that the resulting interpretations are difficult to generalize. There is often a focus on longer stories that, because of their specific sources, present all the features of a well-formed, self-contained narrative, for example Faustinian, Silvester, and Crescentia, but the rules that can be derived from these episodes hardly hold for the others.²² Some of the anecdotes recounted in the chronicle do not seem functional at all; for example, the story of the widow who kills her own child for food during the famine that breaks out when Vespasian and Titus lay siege to Jerusalem: it is narrated at some length, but has no connection to what turns out to be the focus of the account of the sack of Jerusalem, namely how the Jewish historian Josephus manages to save his life and write his *History of the Jews* (lines 909-1044). It is furthermore difficult to make out any principle determining

the inclusion of narrative detail: the chronicle is capable of paying minute attention to particularities, but it is also capable of total insouciance. For example, there is a meticulous account of how the poison that the bad emperor Galienus has put into the River Tiber is detected by a physician using two dogs: he is able to locate the source precisely when the dog swimming upstream of it lives and the one swimming downstream dies (lines 7562-83). On the other hand, the next but one emperor Constantine, who is a good ruler, appears to be willing to allow innocent children to be put to death in order that their blood may provide a cure for the illness from which he is suffering; he desists from the plan only when he perceives the distress of the children's mothers; it is impossible to tell whether this is careless motivation or whether the author really wished to depict Constantine doing something reprehensible (lines 7813-41).

A second, thornier problem is that while literary scholars have not failed to register that the *Kaiserchronik* is a narrative of history, the operative model of historical narrative that they assume is a simplistic one: they tend to assume, more or less tacitly, that the primary motivation of the chronicle's author (or authors) was the desire to make the narratable history of empire intelligible to readers by imposing on it the structure of Christian salvation history. This view goes back at least to Ernst Friedrich Ohly and in his pioneering study *Sage und Legende in der Kaiserchronik*, first published in 1940.²³ With only occasional exceptions, this classification has become the standard currency of literary histories and interpretations right down to the present day: Gisela Vollmann-Profe characterizes the content of the *Kaiserchronik* as a "Darstellung der nachchristlichen Heilsgeschichte," and for Walter Haug the chronicle narrates "Heilsgeschichte ... ganz unter ihrem eschatologischen Aspekt";²⁴ essentially the same view, with greater nuance and distance, is put forward in narratological studies by Otto Neudeck, who states that "in der *Kaiserchronik* [werden] die Denkform der Typologie [und] die Weltreichlehre instrumentalisiert und modifiziert," and Christoph Petersen, for whom the *Kaiserchronik's* narrative strategies allude to Christian universal

history with its basal structure of the “erfüllende Wiederkehr” of a “geschichtliche Ursprungskonstellation.”²⁵

There are good reasons to question the assumption that the narrative and explanatory structures of the *Kaiserchronik* are pervaded through and through by models of Christian salvation history. In the following, we sketch out the grounds of our skepticism with reference to two important aspects of salvation history: the problem of detectable patterns of divine influence on the course of human affairs, and the scheme of the four world monarchies, which often underlies narrativizations of universal history *sub specie aeternitatis*.²⁶ The point that we wish to make is not that salvation history possessed no relevance whatsoever for the author and the original public of the *Kaiserchronik*, but rather that its role was neither structural in respect of the chronicle’s composition nor wholly determinative in respect of its meaning.

Salvation history posits that God is either visibly or invisibly active in the course of human events. A salient concern among late antique practitioners of Christian salvation history was therefore with what G.W. Trompf has identified as questions arising from the presumption of a logic of retributive justice: whether there is a correlation between the moral character of humans and the success or misery they experience in this life, and whether historically documented patterns of human fortune and misfortune reveal the hand of a deity who distributes earthly punishment and reward in accordance with absolute justice.²⁷ Different authors in late Roman antiquity responded to these questions in different ways. For Augustine, the fact that the wicked sometimes enjoy good fortune whereas the virtuous may suffer hardship does not constitute proof that divine justice is absent from human affairs; rather it suggests that the course of history is ordained by God in “an order of things and times which is hidden from us, but entirely known to Him”;²⁸ Orosius and Sulpicius Severus by contrast sought to demonstrate that God metes out punishment and reward in a manner whose equity is already revealed in the course of earthly history.²⁹

A similar correlation has been assumed for the *Kaiserchronik*. Ohly claimed that the fundamental compositional principle of the chronicle—its “Kompositionsgesetz”—consisted in the struggle between the cosmic forces of good versus evil, with God rewarding the former and punishing the latter.³⁰ According to Ohly, this struggle is played out in every single reign of the chronicle, at least down to Charlemagne. Furthermore, the general direction of historical travel towards its telos in the Last Days and the inauguration of the Heavenly Kingdom is indicated by a network of what Ohly labeled “typological” relations between pagan and Christian rulers, the former constituting the types that “prefigure” their fulfillment in the corresponding antitypes. Thus, for example, Vespasian’s campaigns against the Babylonians (lines 5099-364) are interpreted by Ohly as prefiguring subsequently narrated campaigns by Heraclius and Geoffrey of Bouillon to defend Christendom and Jerusalem against the pagans (lines 11138-351; 16618-789).³¹ Ohly’s application of a technique of Bible hermeneutics to a non-biblical text and persons (typology was developed as a way of explicating the relationship between the Old and New Testaments) has come in for a great deal of criticism over the years;³² it is not that aspect of his thesis that we wish to comment on here, however, but rather his claim that God’s retributive justice is manifestly revealed in the *Kaiserchronik*’s narrative of the events of imperial history.

In his commentary, Ohly made the claim that the author of Recension A followed John of Salisbury in demonstrating a correlation between the moral character of the ruler and the manner of his death: tyrants are murdered, a sure sign of divine disapproval and punishment, whereas righteous rulers are rewarded with a peaceful death from illness or natural causes; this correlation obtains for pagan and Christian rulers alike.³³ Ohly’s thesis is over-tidy. What the *Kaiserchronik* in fact displays is a consistent, but by no means exceptionless correlation between the moral character of an emperor and his eternal (but not earthly) punishment or reward. Thus, the soul of Nero, styled “the most evil man ever born of woman into this world” (lines 4085-6) [der aller wirste man / der von muter in dise werlte ie

bekom], is conveyed by demons to hell (lines 4293-8); the same fate befalls Domitian (lines 5277-8), Decius (line 6450), and Julian the Apostate (line 11137), all persecutors of Christianity, whereas angels summon the souls of Constantine (line 10510), Narcissus (line 12812), Theodosius (line 13650), Henry II (line 16245) and others to their company in heaven. So far as the manner of the ruler's dying is concerned, there is no perceptible correlation: exemplary rulers are murdered no less than wicked ones. Tiberius, for example, said to have earned his salvation because he punished the Jews for murdering Christ, is poisoned (lines 674, 1114); conversely Zeno, negatively characterized for his dereliction of duty towards Rome (lines 13828-30), dies a natural death. When it comes to happiness or misfortune in this life in general, the chronicle offers only the most occasional commentary which moreover yields nothing consistent by way of thematizing retributive justice. Helius Adrianus is killed in an act of divine retribution for having had the impertinence to rename Jerusalem after himself (lines 7229-30); similarly the exile and suicide of Maximian are said to be God's vengeance for his villainy (line 6620); on the other hand, when Louis III, scourge of the Hungarians who defeats an entire army of them with God's help, falls to his death from a tower, the narrator comments in lapidary fashion on the inscrutability of God's ways: "everything happens according to God's will" (line 15651) [aller dinge gelîch ist alsô got wil]. That God's involvement in human affairs is sometimes intelligible and sometimes not could of course be theorized into a consistent account of retributive justice by following the model of Augustine, who suggested in the *City of God* that divine punishment and reward are neither wholly reserved for the Last Judgment nor wholly apparent from the fortunes of individuals while they are still in this life: if the former were true, one would be obliged to admit that Christianity had not made the world in any way better, whereas if the latter held, humans would worship God purely for the sake of the material blessings he confers in this world.³⁴ The author of the *Kaiserchronik* attempts no such theorization of the distribution of blessings and misfortunes in this life; this deficiency—whether out of reluctance or lack of

interest—suggests that it was not the intention to narrate theologically and philosophically informed salvation history in the vernacular, but rather to produce what Dieter Kartschoke has called “exemplarische Erzählungen sagenhaften und legendenmäßigen Zuschnitts.”³⁵ Such a classification certainly fits well with the statement in the A prologue that the purpose of the chronicle is to inform “about the popes and kings, both good and wicked, who lived before our times and ruled the Roman Empire down to the present day” (lines 19-23) [von den baâbesen unt von den chunigen, / baidiu guoten unt ubelen, / die vor uns wâren / unt Rômisches rîches phlâgen / unze an disen hiutegen tac].³⁶

Claims about the theological conception of history supposedly underlying the entire *Kaiserchronik* generally rest on the reference made in the chronicle to Daniel’s dream of the four beasts that rise up from the sea (Dn 7; *Kaiserchronik*, lines 526-90). This prophetic dream and its exegesis laid the basis for Christian narratives of universal history as a sequence of four world monarchies, with the Roman Empire representing the fourth and last such monarchy before the end of the world. (In the most influential interpretation, that of Jerome in his late fourth-century commentary on Daniel, the monarchies in sequence are the Babylonian, the Persians, the Macedonian, and finally the Roman.)³⁷ The *Kaiserchronik* rehearses the dream and its exegesis at the point in its narrative of Roman history where Julius Caesar has defeated his adversary Pompey with the help of an army of Germans (*Dutiske*) and been recognized as sole and undisputed lord (*herre*) of Rome. At this juncture, the author of Recension A declares that “In those days the things came to pass of which the prophet Daniel foretold when King Nebuchadnezzar recounted the dreams he had seen” (lines 526-9) [In den zîten iz geschach / dannen der wîssage Dâniêl dâ vor sprach / daz der kunich Nabuchodonosor sîne troume sagete / die er gesehen habete].³⁸

The ensuing account and interpretation of the dream of the four beasts display numerous idiosyncrasies.³⁹ First, the *Kaiserchronik* author conflates Daniel’s dream of the ferocious beasts (Dn 7) with Nebuchadnezzar’s earlier dream of the statue with feet of clay

(Dn 2). Second, the order of the beasts differs from that of Daniel's dream as it is reported in the Old Testament: instead of lion, bear, leopard, and an unspecified ten-horned beast which Jerome identified with the destructive boar of Psalm 79:14, the *Kaiserchronik* has the sequence leopard, bear, boar, and lioness.⁴⁰ Third, and above all, in the *Kaiserchronik* the Roman Empire is not fourth and last in the succession of world monarchies, but third and penultimate: it is preceded by the Macedonian Empire of Alexander the Great (the leopard) and by three kingdoms that fought as allies against another one (the bear, equated by Jerome with the Medes and Persians who sacked Babylon); Rome's rule is succeeded by the kingdom of the Antichrist (symbolized by the lioness with a horn reaching to the heavens).

Not only is this sequence of world monarchies conspicuously anachronistic (the exploits of Alexander the Great precede the warring of the Babylonians, Medes, and Persians), it does not map on to the *Kaiserchronik* author's own narrative of world history down to the inauguration of the Roman Empire under Julius Caesar. This history falls into two phases, but they are not the world monarchies of the dream. First, there is the period known simply as "heathen times" (line 43) [der haiden zîten], when everyone worshipped unnamed "polluted idols" (line 45) [abgot diu unrainen]. Then, "after this age" (line 50) [nâch der werlte] of promiscuous idolatry, Rome was founded by Romulus and Remus, and the seven-day week was instituted, with each day dedicated to its particular named deity; during this pre-imperial phase of its history, Rome is ruled by its Senate.⁴¹

It follows, then, that the scheme of the four world monarchies was not structural in the sense that the sequence of kingdoms provides the chronicle with its basic framework of chronological reference.⁴² Nor is the scheme thematic, by which we mean that it becomes an object of theoretical consideration, as it is, for example, for the late antique Christian historian Orosius, on whose *Seven Books of History* the author of the A recension of the *Kaiserchronik* drew, or for the author's contemporary, Otto of Freising.⁴³ Both of these writers give special prominence to the first and the last in the sequence of empires, Orosius explaining that Rome

was already rising as Babylon fell,⁴⁴ Otto stating that the kingdom of the Romans succeeded the kingdom of the Babylonians “as a son succeeds a father,” and assigning to the intervening Persian and Greek kingdoms the role of “guardian” and “guide” to the infant Rome; Otto further expends considerable energy on the *translatio imperii*: the theory that rulership was transferred from the Romans to the Greeks and from the Greeks to the Franks in continuation of the Roman Empire to the end of the world.⁴⁵ The *Kaiserchronik* narrates the succession of Roman, then Byzantine, then Frankish emperors, but without advancing any explicit theory of *translatio imperii*. Of Zeno, the first of the Greek emperors in the sequence of the *Kaiserchronik*, the author says merely that he loved his Greek kin more than the Romans, and went on pilgrimage to Constantinople with no intention of ever returning (lines 13825-38); after the death of his successor Constantius, the Romans decided to choose no more emperors from their own families but to elect foreigners instead (lines 14282-95); this state of affairs is the background to the accession of Charlemagne, who is summoned by a heavenly voice to join his brother Pope Leo in Rome, where he is made king (lines 14316-81). None of these transfers of power is ever linked back to the world monarchy symbolized by the boar of Daniel’s dream.

The dream and its exegesis are an isolated reference in the *Kaiserchronik*. That does not make them insignificant—quite the contrary, given their placement at the inauguration of Roman imperial history with Julius Caesar, whose accession is said to be the fulfillment of the Danielic prophecy. Their significance is not however as *Kaiserchronik* scholarship has commonly supposed. From the fact that the author recounts and expounds the details of the dream it does not follow that the narrative and explanatory structures of the chronicle are derived from the model of Christian salvation history, specifically from the scheme of the four world monarchies; as we have already outlined, this is simply not the case. Rather, it is the auratizing potential of the scheme that is exploited, its ability to confer legitimacy and cachet on certain events and persons, and not its structural or explanatory possibilities. It is no

coincidence that the German tribes emerge as important players on the stage of world history at the same time as Julius Caesar, whose accomplices and allies they are. As the *Kaiserchronik* tells it, without the loyal support of the Germans Caesar would not have defeated Pompey, would not have become the first Roman emperor, and would not have made Daniel's prophecy come true. Through the allusion to the prophetic dream, the German tribes acquire the aura of playing an instrumental part in the course of world history from the beginning of the Roman Empire until the coming of the Antichrist.

What we are suggesting, therefore, is that the *Kaiserchronik* author was less interested in narrating and explaining salvation history than he was in exploiting the cachet of salvation history so as to endow the Germans with historical time-depth and significance. Moreover, the schema of the world monarchies is merely one device among several for promoting the antiquity and historico-cultural importance of the Germans. The various German tribes are provided with an historical, a biblical and a literary pedigree: the author repeats traditional stories of how the Franks were descended from the Trojans, and the Bavarians from Armenia, the place where Noah's ark came to rest (lines 317-20, 346-8); the Trojan diaspora was led by Ulysses, whose men were devoured in Sicily by the Cyclops (lines 351-2); Lucretia, raped in the *Kaiserchronik* by Tarquin the Proud (rather than his son, which is how Ovid has it) is married to Conlatus, a "prince of Trier" (line 4305).⁴⁶ From details like these it is clear that the author wanted to establish that the Germans were present not only in the historical world of the Old Testament and classical antiquity, but also in the canonical *literature* of that world, hence the mention of Ulysses and the Cyclops, and the statement (the only one of its kind in the entire chronicle) that Lucretia, the wife of a German prince, "is written in Ovid" (line 4338) [si stât in Ovîdîo geschriben dâ]. We suggest that the *Kaiserchronik*'s reference to the scheme of the four world monarchies should be demoted from the master-key status it has enjoyed in the majority of scholarship and be subsumed instead under the broader category of

historically and culturally legitimating devices that the author mobilizes in order to confer prestige and aura on the Germans.⁴⁷

The Production of Historical Knowledge: The German and the Northwestern European Contexts

A more nuanced understanding of the deployment of salvation historical schemata in the *Kaiserchronik* yields an appreciation of it as an attempt to produce a particular kind of knowledge about the German past. This production has two contexts: vernacular writing in twelfth-century Germany, and the writing of history in northwestern Europe. The following remarks elucidate these contexts in turn.

Around the middle of the eleventh century, the continuous production of written texts in the German language resumed after an interruption of 150 years.⁴⁸ This development marked the inception of a literary tradition which has remained unbroken down to the present day. Notwithstanding its epochal significance, the large and varied corpus of vernacular literature produced during what literary history conventionally calls the Early Middle High German period (ca.1050-ca.1170) has received less attention than the classical literature of the immediately following *Blütezeit*: the period around the turn of the thirteenth century when chivalric romances and courtly love lyrics derived from French models flourished at the courts of the secular nobility.⁴⁹ To the extent that historians of German literature have attempted an overall assessment of the earlier period, rather than just concentrating on isolated highlights, their heuristic categories as well as their evaluative criteria have on the whole been shaped by the normative influence of the *Blütezeit*. The result is that early MHG literature has been treated predominantly as a prelude, whose interest for literary historians is owed chiefly to the fact that one may detect in it the incipient promise of developments whose fulfillment will come only in the decades after 1170: signs of authors' emancipation from theological modes of thought and religious genres, occasional flashes of awareness of literariness or even fictionality, intermittent reflections of the independent interests of a

secular literary public. In general, however, the early MHG period has been characterized in terms that typically contain some kind of privative or negative prefix: the ethos of its literature is regularly said to be “pre-courtly” (*vorhöfisch*), the level of the authors’ own reflexions on their art is categorized as “pre-theoretical” (*vorthoretisch*), written text production is dominated by “nonfictional” modes and genres.⁵⁰ Such metaphors of incipience and deficit are inadequate to the corpus. If one takes away the unflattering comparison with the *Blütezeit*, however, the positive and epoch-making features of the earlier period are readily apparent. There are three such features which together form the literary-historical context of the *Kaiserchronik*.

First, at the time when Recension A of the *Kaiserchronik* was being composed, there already was a critical mass of writing in the German vernacular. By the middle of the twelfth century, German had produced or (in most cases) was still producing: Bible epics, Bible exegeses, theological, moral, and natural historical literature, saints lives, sermons, Marian lyrics, narratives of ancient history (Lamprecht’s *Alexander*) and of Roman imperial History (*Kaiserchronik*; *König Rother*), quite possibly (although the dating is not completely certain) secular love lyrics, and almost certainly some literary form of heroic epic, in the shape of a version of the *Nibelungenlied* (the earliest transmitted form of which is dated to ca. 1200).⁵¹

Second, the habit of looking forwards to the 1170s and westwards to France has blinded historians of medieval German literature to Germany’s quite advanced position. In fact, as pointed out by Rodney Thompson, who has argued persuasively for a reconsideration of the German lands in relation to France, England, and Italy in the twelfth century, “Germany stands out from the rest of Europe at this period in the volume of written vernacular literature, and the status accorded to it, even when compared with northern and southern France.” If the surviving manuscripts of vernacular works are anything to go by, Germany was clearly outstripping France. Compared to around sixty-six northern French items in twelfth-century manuscripts the German tally reaches some two hundred, with

another forty from the turn of the twelfth and thirteenth century. This is hardly surprising given the statistics before 1100, when only three (fragmentary) items in French survive against forty-eight in German.⁵² Thus, contrary to the usual narrative of France's dominance over German literature, in this period the reverse is apparent. Take as an example the genre of the Bible epic. By the early twelfth century, in the *Altdeutsche Genesis* and the *Exodus*, German has two verse texts, which are reworked throughout the century and whose sophistication is quite unjustly neglected; by contrast, there is virtually no biblical literature in French (apart from prose psalters) before 1150, with the Bible not entering verse until the late twelfth century.⁵³

Finally, what has typically been considered a deficit—the overwhelmingly factual and functional orientation of early MHG literature, at the expense of qualities such as fictionality or literariness—may be turned to cognitive advantage. Texts from the period 1050-1170 may be said to be engaged in the discursive production of a vernacular knowledge which covers a wide range of domains: theology, the Bible, history, natural history, morality, behavioral norms and etiquette.⁵⁴ This discourse of vernacular knowledge is heavily dependent on the learned Latin tradition, yet it is not a straightforward transform (in the guise of translation, selection, or simplification) of Latin clerical discourse, but constitutes an independent corpus.

The *Kaiserchronik* thus emerged at a point of high productivity in a range of genres, and contributed to that same productivity and diversity. Scholarship has yet to appreciate and understand the specific nature of its contribution, which we see as lying in the vernacular's mediation of a specific view of the imperial past. Historians have pointed to a number of ways in which twelfth-century German writers used the past to deal with the uncertainty of the present—the “crisis of confidence in the twelfth-century regnum Teutonicum,” as Timothy Reuter called it.⁵⁵ The period saw a revival of interest in Roman history, and an enthusiasm for the writing of local history, often with reference to the ancient world. Many German towns were believed to have been founded by Julius Caesar—Mainz, Magdeburg, Worms,

Speyer, to name but some of the most prestigious; others, such as Augsburg and Nuremberg, claimed the pedigree of other Roman emperors; Regensburg, as the *Kaiserchronik* trumpeted, drew its breath from Tiberius. Roman history itself, however, had become increasingly important in the late eleventh century, when German rulers, in contrast to their predecessors who had been circumspect about claiming their imperial title, began to refer to themselves as “King of the Romans” even before their coronation as emperor. There was a concomitant change in the nature of interest in ancient history, which took on a sharply political focus, and under Frederick Barbarossa in the mid twelfth century the significance of the pre-Constantinian Roman empire became marked.⁵⁶

Still other aspects of history are vital for an understanding of the *Kaiserchronik*. For many educated members of the elite, the past was, in Nancy F. Partner’s resonant phrase, “serious entertainment”: both a source of exemplum and an opportunity to show off one’s culture and education. History was expected to deliver “information, morality, amusement and the beauty of language” and “to arrest the attention and divert the imagination.”⁵⁷ Certainly, the black-and-white nature of the *Kaiserchronik*’s judgments on successive emperors aligned with the impressive list of sources on which the author (or authors) drew fit with this composite motivation of moral improvement and cultural capital. Reuter notes that: “In Germany, we find the invention of a mythical past intended both as a serious construction and as an entertainment 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 drawn from every possible source he could get his hands on.” These, he observes, “may stand as counterparts to Geoffrey of Monmouth.”⁵⁸ We would like to suggest, however, that not only the *Gesta Treverorum* (on which the *Kaiserchronik* occasionally draws)⁵⁹ and Godfrey of Viterbo (who in turn draws upon Geoffrey of Monmouth) should be considered in the same breath as Geoffrey’s *Historia regum Britanniae*, but also the *Kaiserchronik*.

Despite or perhaps because of its loose relation to sources, Geoffrey's *Historia*, which was dedicated to, and served the propaganda interests of the Anglo-Norman rulership, became the most popular history written in the Middle Ages.⁶⁰ While there is no simple explanation for the work's success, certain aspects stand out. Geoffrey "provided the unique connected account of [the] period, creating history out of pre-history; he illustrated, at a time when England was threatened with civil war, the effects of strong unified kingship; and he met current popular taste for romance, toponymic legend, prophecy, and magic."⁶¹ The figure of Arthur is the most striking case in point, but in our context it is the king's interaction with the Roman world that is particularly noteworthy. In a series of events unattested in recorded history, Geoffrey's Arthur defeats the Saxons, conquers the whole of Britain, and subjugates Ireland, Norway, territories in Gaul, and a large swathe of southeastern Europe. Pitted against the Roman Empire, moreover, he defeats General Lucius and a host of tributary rulers from the Middle East, Asia, and Africa, and it is only news of his nephew Mordred's nefarious deeds at home that prevents him from pressing on and crossing the Alps.⁶²

"Arthur's argument for war on Rome," Andrew Lynch argues, "is unashamedly acquisitive ... In effect Geoffrey's Arthur seeks to carry off Rome's prestige back to Britain, not to fill the emperor's shoes ... The thought of spoil supersedes imperial occupation and rule. The shadowy 'Romanness' of the Continent provides some sense of cohesion for the lands that Geoffrey's Arthur takes over. Rome embodies what is pre-eminently desirable but the Romans are enemies; the idea is for the British to beat them, not to be them."⁶³ Much the same could be said too of Arthur's British precedents, the brothers Belinus and Brennius, who occupied Rome with the latter remaining to cause devastation across Italy. In these two fictitious confrontations, one before and one after Julius Caesar's invasion, Geoffrey makes the "long relationship between Britain and Rome" intrinsic to his "imposed pattern" of events and "glorif[ies] two British conquests of the Roman empire."⁶⁴

The basic scenario in the *Kaiserchronik* is obviously very different. As shown earlier, unlike Geoffrey's Arthurians, the *Kaiserchronik* is not ashamed of wanting to be Roman, or at least as Roman as possible. At key moments, the author is keen to stress how the Germans not only took up the mantle of the Romans at the transfer of imperial power, but that they were there with the Romans all along. Nonetheless, the interest and potential for grasping the self-understanding of European elites in distinct political contexts lie precisely in this signal difference between these two highly popular works which emerged within decades of each other. The full dimensions of the possible relationship have not yet been fully appreciated by scholarship. In Germany, at least, this is due to the influence of Ohly, who compared the *Kaiserchronik* with Geoffrey of Monmouth only to assign them to opposing categories: the former to a kind of history writing that he labeled "biblisch-heilsgeschichtlich-imperial," the latter to a type characterized as "mythisch-sagenhaft-national."⁶⁵

As this brief comparison suggests, the *Kaiserchronik* is important for two reasons: first, because it belongs to a broader northwestern European context of writing history as serious entertainment; and second, because it casts new light on Geoffrey of Monmouth. The *Kaiserchronik* is indispensable for an understanding of the context which includes, among others, Wace (who finished his translation of Geoffrey into Anglo-Norman ca. 1155) and Godfrey of Viterbo (whose *Liber universalis* or chronicle of world history is somewhat later, from the 1180s).⁶⁶ German literature of the mid twelfth century was thus part of a wider northern European historiographico-literary scene—and if, as John Burrow aptly notes, Geoffrey's Arthur is "a great king and commander, in the moulds of Caesar and Charlemagne, rather than the later knight errant," then the Caesar and Charlemagne of German vernacular history require for their part to be contemplated in relation to Arthur and his early manifestations.⁶⁷

More specifically, it may be possible to read the *Kaiserchronik* as a German response to Geoffrey of Monmouth. More work will need to be done to test and ground this argument,

but there is certainly enough evidence for now to postulate it. First, already in the twelfth century, Geoffrey's history (completed ca. 1134) became an instant success with a very wide transmission, particularly outside the British Isles. In fact, the manuscript evidence suggests that at the height of the work's popularity its presence on the Continent overshadowed that in Britain. Flanders, Normandy, and Champagne were the main centres of interest;⁶⁸ so far as contemporary German is concerned, it is surely significant that Godfrey of Viterbo, who was educated in Germany from 1133 before becoming notary in turn to Conrad III, Frederick Barbarossa, and Henry VI, used Geoffrey of Monmouth as a source for his works, which combined saga and fable with more orthodox history to create a Trojan genealogy for the Hohenstaufen family in the 1180s.⁶⁹

Second, throughout the twelfth century there were important connections between Anglo-Norman households and Germany. Matilda (daughter of Henry I of England) was married to the Roman emperor and German king Henry V. She was betrothed at the age of eight, and married in Mainz cathedral at the age of twelve in 1114; Henry V died in 1125.⁷⁰ When Henry I of England lost his son in the White Ship disaster (1120), he persuaded his barons to accept Matilda as his successor. She returned to England, almost certainly bringing with her the manuscript of the *Imperial Chronicle* that ended up in Corpus Christi, Cambridge, a beautiful object she might have claimed as part of the sweep through the imperial treasury, believed by Leyser to have been condoned in lieu of claims on her dower lands.⁷¹ The chronicle runs from the origins of the Franks in Troy to the reign of Henry V, the codex in question portrays Matilda on her wedding day in its final illumination, and codicological evidence suggests that it was a presentation copy intended as a gift for her.⁷² Matilda married Geoffrey Plantagenet, and their son King Henry II married Eleanor of Aquitaine, who was a patron of the arts, specifically of Wace when he was translating Geoffrey of Monmouth. Their daughter, also named Matilda, became the second wife of Henry the Lion (in 1168), and she is generally recognized as the "noble duchess, daughter of a

powerful king” [edele herzoginne, / aines richen chuniges barn] who inspired the translation of the *Chanson de Roland* into German.⁷³ Matilda and Henry the Lion were forced to spend three years in exile in England (from 1182), and scholars have noted the distinct similarities in the style of illustrations in an early *Rolandslied* manuscript and the *Corpus Christi Imperial Chronicle*.⁷⁴ Even if our argument is necessarily suggestive—there is no positive proof that Geoffrey inspired the *Kaiserchronik* (or even that the *Imperial Chronicle* had some influence on Geoffrey)—these dynastic links and the works that thread in and out of them are a significant and enriching context in which to think about the *Kaiserchronik* in future. In sum, the *Kaiserchronik* opens up new avenues and perspectives of the use of the past as entertainment and legitimation in the high Middle Ages.

Conclusion

We have argued that the *Kaiserchronik* is an important document for the way in which German-speaking elites saw themselves in history around the middle of the twelfth century. By advocating a more nuanced approach to salvation history, we have demonstrated more clearly how the text mediates German identity.⁷⁵ And by pointing to the broader northwestern European context of serious historical entertainment, we have opened up new avenues of inquiry into the chronicle and, at the same time, begun to delineate a context in which authors such as Geoffrey of Monmouth might be profitably understood.

This article has concentrated on Recension A of the *Kaiserchronik* alone, and its twelfth-century context. The full critical and synoptic edition on which we are working, and which will be accompanied by a commentary to replace Ohly’s, will however open up longer chronological vistas.⁷⁶ For, in order to edit and elucidate a work of such extraordinary scope and longevity it must be located in the manifold contexts that shaped its composition, rewriting, and reception from the twelfth to the sixteenth century. This is a marked departure from the usual practice of literary historians, which is to place the chronicle solely in the context of early MHG literature, when religious and historical themes predominated; once the

classical period or *Blütezeit* of chivalrous romances and courtly love lyric is underway, the *Kaiserchronik*, if mentioned at all, is demoted to the status of museum-piece and mere fact of transmission. Yet the ongoing reception of the chronicle throughout the *Blütezeit*, together with its modernizing Recension B, suggest that the new courtly genres by no means had the monopoly of innovation, and had not eclipsed the older tradition of historical narrative in the vernacular. On the contrary, from around the middle of the thirteenth century the *Kaiserchronik* assumed an undisputed centrality in German textual culture, as rhymed chronicles became *the* productive genre of the late Middle Ages. Future research will have to examine how the three recensions of the *Kaiserchronik* relate to the different ideologies, structures, and techniques of the major vernacular chronicles of the mid to late thirteenth century, such as Rudolf von Ems's *Weltchronik*, the anonymous *Christherre-Chronik*, and Jans Enikel's *Weltchronik*.⁷⁷ Why did this group come to eclipse the courtly romance at this stage in literary history? Such questions will have to be pursued in relation to chronicle writing in the later Middle Ages too, asking for example whether the *Kaiserchronik* in combination with Rudolf von Ems served as a model for Heinrich von München's mammoth *Weltchronik* compilation in the fourteenth century.⁷⁸ Although we do not as yet know the answers, the fact that these questions can even be formulated testifies again to the enduring productivity of the *Kaiserchronik* in German culture throughout the high and the late Middle Ages.

University of Cambridge

¹ *Die Kaiserchronik eines Regensburger Geistlichen*, ed. Edward Schröder (1892; repr., Munich: Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 2002). This is the only critical edition of the chronicle to date; all references and citations are from it unless indicated to the contrary, and will be given in text. A select edition of the chronicle, based on Schröder's text and with

accompanying modern German translation, is *Die Kaiserchronik. Eine Auswahl*.

Mittelhochdeutsch / Neuhochdeutsch, transl. Mathias Herweg (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2014); for a recent translation into modern English, again based on Schröder, see *The Book of Emperors*, transl. Henry A. Myers (Morgantown: West Virginia University Press, 2013).

² For basic orientation see the survey article by Eberhard Nellmann, “‘Kaiserchronik’,” in *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters. Verfasserlexikon*, ed. Kurt Ruh, vol. 4 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1983), 949-64.

³ The fundamental study of the sources of the *Kaiserchronik* is still Ernst Friedrich Ohly, *Sage und Legende in der Kaiserchronik* (1940; repr., Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968).

⁴ András Vizkelely, “Eine lateinische Übersetzung der Kaiserchronik,” in *Beiträge zur Überlieferung und Beschreibung deutscher Texte des Mittelalters* (Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1983), 25-40; András Vizkelely, “Eine lateinische Prosabearbeitung der ‘Kaiserchronik’,” in *Editionsberichte zur mittelalterlichen deutschen Literatur. Beiträge zur Bamberger Tagung ‘Methoden und Probleme der Edition mittelalterlicher deutscher Texte’. 26.- 29. Juli 1991*, ed. Anton Schwob (Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1994), 341-5.

⁵ Erich Kleinschmidt, “Die lateinische Fassung von Wolframs ‘Willehalm’-Prolog und ihr Überlieferungswert,” *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum* 103, no. 2 (1974): 95-114; Hartmann von Aue, Gregorius. Der arme Heinrich. Iwein, ed. Volker Mertens (Frankfurt/Main: Deutscher Klassiker Verlag, 2004), 938-41; Sylvia Kohushölter, *Die deutsche und lateinische Rezeption von Hartmanns von Aue ‘Gregorius’ im Mittelalter* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006).

⁶ A handlist of manuscripts is maintained by the database “Handschriftencensus. Eine Bestandsaufnahme der handschriftlichen Überlieferung deutschsprachiger Texte des Mittelalters” (<http://www.handschriftencensus.de/werke/189>).

⁷ On the differences between the recensions see Jürgen Wolf, “Die Kaiserchronikfassungen A, B und C oder die Gleichzeitigkeit des Ungleichzeitigen,” in *Interdisziplinäre Germanistik im Schnittpunkt der Kulturen*, ed. Michael Szurawitzki and Michael M. Schmidt (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2008), 91-108. Schröder edited the A recension alone, and dismissed the B and C recensions as being “für den Historiker ohne jedes Interesse” and worth consulting only to the degree that they supported the editor in his attempt to establish the original text of A (*Kaiserchronik*, ed. Schröder, 26). Schröder’s assessment, which reflects the methods and priorities of editorial philology at the end of the nineteenth century, has become increasingly untenable in the context of the reorientation that has taken place in the theory and practice of text-editing since the middle of the last century. Textual instability, variation, and recension are considered nowadays as fundamental aspects of a manuscript culture in which works were prone to mutation and transformation over time; this reevaluation has led to calls for a critical edition of all three recensions of the *Kaiserchronik*; see Kurt Gärtner, “Die *Kaiserchronik* und ihre Bearbeitungen. Editionsdesiderate der Versepiik des 13. Jahrhunderts,” in *bickelwort und wildiu mære. Festschrift für Eberhard Nellmann zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Dorothee Lindemann, Berndt Volkmann and Klaus-Peter Wegera (Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1995), 366-79. Since 2012, such an edition has been in progress as part of the project “*Kaiserchronik: Literature and History in the German Middle Ages*” which is sponsored by the U.K. Arts and Humanities Research Council and led by Christopher Young and Mark Chinca at the University of Cambridge. When complete, the new edition will present texts of the three recensions, each from a base manuscript, in synoptic format and with accompanying English translation, introduction, and commentary.

⁸ These continuations are included as appendices in *Kaiserchronik*, ed. Schröder, 393-416.

⁹ See Thomas Klein, “Ermittlung, Darstellung und Deutung von Verbreitungstypen in der Handschriftenüberlieferung mittelhochdeutscher Epik,” in *Deutsche Handschriften 1100-*

1400. *Oxford Kolloquium 1985*, ed. Volker Honemann and Nigel F. Palmer (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1988), 110-67, especially 114-20, 128-30; Kurt Gärtner, "Grundlinien einer literarischen Sprachgeschichte des deutschen Mittelalters," in *Sprachgeschichte. Ein Handbuch zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und ihrer Erforschung*, ed. Werner Besch, Anne Betten, Oskar Reichmann, and Stefan Sonderegger, vol. 4 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004), 3018-42, especially 3028-9.

¹⁰ Gabrielle M. Spiegel, *Romancing the Past: The Rise of Vernacular Prose Historiography in Thirteenth-Century France* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993).

¹¹ See for example *Historiography in the Middle Ages*, ed. Deborah Mauskopf Deliyannis (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

¹² On the Tarquin episode, which is mainly an account of the rape of Lucretia based on Ovid's *Fasti*, see Wolfgang Mohr, "Lucretia in der 'Kaiserchronik'," *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift* 26, no. 4 (1952): 433-46; Claus Riessner, "Die Stadt Viterbo und die Almenia-Totila-Episode in der Kaiserchronik," in *Miscellanea di studi in onore di Bonaventura Tecchi*, ed. Paolo Chiarini (Rome: Edizioni dell'Anteo, 1969), 57-66; Frank Shaw, "Ovid in der Kaiserchronik," *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 88, no. 3 (1969): 378-89; Ingrid Bennewitz, "Lukretia, oder: Über die literarischen Projektionen von der Macht der Männer und der Ohnmacht der Frauen. Darstellung und Bewertung von Vergewaltigung in der Kaiserchronik und im Ritter von Thurn," in *Der frauwen buoch. Versuche zu einer feministischen Mediävistik*, ed. Ingrid Bennewitz (Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1989), 113-34; Teresa Wintgens, "Was geschah mit Lucretia? Ein Irrtum des B-Redaktors der 'Kaiserchronik'," *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum* 142, no. 1 (2013): 33-44.

¹³ For the episode and its sources see Hans Fromm, "Die Disputation in der Faustinianlegende der Kaiserchronik. Zum literarischen Dialog im 12. Jahrhundert," in *Deutsche Literatur und Sprache von 1050-1200. Festschrift für Ursula Hennig zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Annegret

Fiebig and Hans-Jochen Schiewer (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1995), 51-69.

¹⁴ See Siegfried Jäger, *Studien zur Komposition der Crescentia der Kaiserchronik, des Vorauer und Straßburger Alexander und Herzog Ernst B* (Ph.D. diss., University of Bonn, 1967); Karen Baasch, *Die Crescentiallegende in der deutschen Dichtung des Mittelalters* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1968); Claudia Bornholdt, “Tricked into the Tower: The Crescentia Tower Episode of the *Kaiserchronik* as Proto-Märe,” *Journal of English and German Philology* 99, no. 3 (2000): 395-411.

¹⁵ See Monika Winterling, “Zur Darstellung Heinrichs V. und Lothars III. in der deutschen *Kaiserchronik* des 12. Jahrhunderts,” in *Grafen, Herzöge, Könige. Der Aufstieg der frühen Staufer und das Reich (1079-1152)*, ed. Hubertus Seibert and Jürgen Dendorfer (Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2005), 397-408; Monika Pohl, *Untersuchungen zur Darstellung mittelalterlicher Herrscher in der deutschen Kaiserchronik des 12. Jahrhunderts* (Ph.D. diss, University of Munich, 2004). The treatment of German history in the *Kaiserchronik* is the subject of ongoing research by Johanna Dale as part of the Cambridge editorial project (n. 7 above).

¹⁶ See, in the context of German vernacular narratives, *Historisches und fiktionales Erzählen im Mittelalter*, ed. Fritz Peter Knapp and Manuela Niesner (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2002); Elisabeth Lienert, *Die “historische” Dietrichepik. Untersuchungen zu “Dietrichs Flucht”, “Rabenschlacht” und “Alpharts Tod”* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010), 231-54.

¹⁷ On the Vorau codex see Kurt Gärtner, “Vorauer Hs. 276,” in *Verfasserlexikon*, vol. 10 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999), 516-21; on Prague, NK, Cod. XXIII G 43: Hartmut Beckers, “Handschriften mittelalterlicher deutscher Literatur aus der ehemaligen Schloßbibliothek Blankenheim,” in *Die Manderscheider. Eine Eifeler Adelsfamilie. Herrschaft – Wirtschaft – Kultur. Katalog zur Ausstellung Blankenheim, Gildehaus (4.5.-29.6.1990) und Manderscheid, Kurhaus (16.8.-11.11.1990)* (Cologne: Rheinland-Verlag, 1990), 57-82, especially 66-7, 72; on Vienna, ÖNB, Cod. 2779: Hermann Menhardt, *Verzeichnis der altdeutschen literarischen*

Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, vol. 1 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1960), 287-93; on Heidelberg, UB, cpg 154: Karin Zimmermann, *Die Codices Palatini germanici in der Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg (Cod. Pal. Germ. 1-181)* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2003), 335-7.

¹⁸ On these manuscripts see Jürgen Wolf, *Die Sächsische Weltchronik im Spiegel ihrer Handschriften. Überlieferung, Textentwicklung, Rezeption* (Munich: Fink, 1997), 105-10. For the *Sächsische Weltchronik* and in particular its relationship with the *Kaiserchronik*, see Hubert Herkommer, *Überlieferungsgeschichte der Sächsischen Weltchronik. Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Geschichtschreibung des Mittelalters* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1972); Michael Menzel, *Die Sächsische Weltchronik. Quellen und Stoffauswahl* (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1985); Dagmar Neuendorff, “Vom erlösten Heidenkönig zum Christenverfolger. Zur *Kaiserchronik* und ihre Integration in die *Sächsische Weltchronik*,” in *Deutsche Literatur und Sprache*, ed. Fiebig and Schiewer, 181-98.

¹⁹ See Wilhelm von Heydt, *Die historischen Handschriften der königlichen öffentlichen Bibliothek zu Stuttgart*, vol. 1, *Die Handschriften in Folio* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1891), 185-7.

²⁰ The secondary literature up to the beginning of the 1980s is listed in Nellmann, “‘Kaiserchronik’.” For narratological approaches since then see Karl Stackmann, “Dietrich von Bern in der *Kaiserchronik*. Struktur als Anweisung zur Deutung,” in *Idee – Gestalt – Geschichte. Festschrift Klaus von See*, ed. Gerd Wolfgang Weber (Odense: Odense University Press, 1988), 138-42; Otto Neudeck, “Karl der Große – der beste aller *werltkunige*. Zur Verbindung von exegetischen Deutungsmustern und heldenepischem Erzählen in der *Kaiserchronik*,” in *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift* 53, no. 3 (2003): 273-94; Ludger Lieb and Stephan Müller, “Situationen literarischen Erzählens. Systematische Skizzen am Beispiel von *Kaiserchronik* und Konrad Flecks *Flore und Blanscheflur*,” *Wolfram-Studien* 18

(2004): 33-57; Jürgen Wolf, “Narrative Historisierungsstrategien in Heldenepos und Chronik vorgestellt am Beispiel von *Kaiserchronik* und *Klage*,” *Wolfram-Studien* 18 (2004): 323-46; Christoph Petersen, “Zeit, Vorzeit und die Narrativierung von Geschichte in der ‘Kaiserchronik’,” *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 126, no. 3 (2007): 321-53; Armin Schulz, “Fremde Kohärenz. Narrative Verknüpfungsformen im *Nibelungenlied* und in der *Kaiserchronik*,” in *Historische Narratologie – mediävistische Perspektiven*, ed. Harald Haferland, Matthias Meyer, and Carmen Stange (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010), 339-60; Alistair Matthews, *The Kaiserchronik. A Medieval Narrative* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

²¹ Whether or one or more writers were involved in the composition of the chronicle, and over how many years, remain open questions; see Joachim Bumke, *Mäzene im Mittelalter. Die Gönner und Auftraggeber der höfischen Literatur in Deutschland, 1150-1300* (Munich: Beck, 1979), 79-80.

²² On Faustinian and Crescentia see n. 13 and n. 14 above. On Silvester see L. Peter Johnson, “Silvester und Anfortas,” in *Studien zur frühmittelhochdeutschen Literatur*, ed. L. Peter Johnson, Hans-Hugo Steinhoff, and Roy A. Wisbey (Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1974), 344-57; Vera Milde, “Christlich-jüdischer Disput in der Silvesterlegende der *Kaiserchronik*,” in *Juden in der deutschen Literatur des Mittelalters. Religiöse Konzepte, Feindbilder, Rechtfertigungen*, ed. Ursula Schulze (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2002), 13-34; Christiane Witthöft, “Zwischen Wahrheitssuche und Wunderglauben. Die christlich-jüdische Disputation der Silvesterlegende in der *Kaiserchronik*,” in *Disputatio 1200-1800. Form, Funktion und Wirkung eines Leitmediums*, ed. Marion Gindhart (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010), 291-310.

²³ Ohly was not entirely original in his interpretation, since he was building on the view of his supervisor Julius Schwietering, who had already asserted that the *Kaiserchronik* was imbued

with an Augustinian conception of history; see Schwietering, *Die deutsche Dichtung des Mittelalters* (Potsdam: Athenaion, 1932), 95.

²⁴ Gisela Vollmann-Profe, *Wiederbeginn volkssprachiger Schriftlichkeit im hohen Mittelalter (1050/60-1160/70)* (Königstein: Athenäum, 1986), 91; Walter Haug, *Literaturtheorie im deutschen Mittelalter von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 13. Jahrhunderts*, 2nd ed. (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1992), 67.

²⁵ Neudeck, “Karl der Große,” 287; Petersen, “Zeit,” 351-2.

²⁶ A complete critical assessment of the relevance of salvation historical paradigms to the *Kaiserchronik* is being undertaken by Christoph Pretzer as part of his doctoral research in the framework of the Cambridge editorial project (n. 7 above).

²⁷ G. W. Trompf, *Early Christian Historiography: Narratives of Retributive Justice* (London and New York: Continuum, 2000).

²⁸ Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, ed. Bernhard Dombart and Alfons Kalb (Turnhout: Brepols, 1955), 4.3: “pro rerum ordine ac temporum occulto nobis, notissimo sibi”; English translation from *The City of God against the Pagans*, ed. R.W. Dyson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998). See Trompf, *Early Christian Historiography*, 255-82.

²⁹ For these writers see Trompf, *Early Christian Historiography*, 284-322.

³⁰ Ohly, *Sage und Legende*, 238.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 26-9, 234-47.

³² See especially Heinz Gerhard Jantsch, *Studien zum Symbolischen in frühmittelhochdeutscher Literatur* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1959), 203-26; Peter Jentzmik, *Zu Möglichkeiten und Grenzen typologischer Exegese in mittelalterlicher Predigt und Dichtung* (Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1973), 222-53.

³³ Ohly, *Sage und Legende*, 19-20; cf. John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, ed. Miguel Angel Ladero (Madrid: Nacional, 1984), 8.19.

³⁴ Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, 1.8-9.

³⁵ Dieter Kartschoke, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur im frühen Mittelalter* (Munich: dtv, 1990), 356.

³⁶ Recension B has an abbreviated version of the same prologue, with the statement about good and bad popes and kings; Recension C replaces the prologue with an entirely new one, which praises the power of the Holy Trinity before introducing the subject-matter of the chronicle with the words: “Here begins a long discourse on how the Roman Empire began; how it will end no one can rightly know” [Sich hebt ain lange rede hie / Wie roemisch riche an gie. / Wie aber es sich enden sol / Daz mach niman wizen wol]; text of C cited from Vienna, ÖNB, Cod. 12487.

³⁷ Jerome, *Commentatorium in Danielelem*, ed. François Glorie (Turnhout: Brepols, 1964), 837-50.

³⁸ The passage is based on the exegesis of Daniel’s dream in a late eleventh-century vernacular life of Archbishop (and subsequently Saint) Anno II of Cologne (d. 1075); cf. *Das Annolied*, ed. Eberhard Nellmann (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1975), lines 179-262. The question of the relationship between the *Kaiserchronik* and the *Annolied* has been reopened by Stephan Müller, *Vom Annolied zur Kaiserchronik. Zu Text- und Forschungsgeschichte einer verlorenen deutschen Reimchronik* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1999).

³⁹ On these see Ohly, *Sage und Legende*, 45-50, and especially Annegret Fiebig, “vier tier wilde,” who points out that the exegesis of the dream in the twelfth century was not fixed, but fluid and variable.

⁴⁰ Jerome, *Commentatorium in Danielelem*, 838-44.

⁴¹ Recension B preserves this periodization; C, on the other hand, omits the heathen prehistory entirely and begins the chronicle of events at Romulus and Remus.

⁴² How little the schema was embedded in the narrative structure of the chronicle is further indicated by that fact that Recension C omits the dream and its interpretation entirely.

⁴³ Orosius is one of the sources for the chronicle's account of Caligula; see Ohly, *Sage und Legende*, 66-74.

⁴⁴ Orosius, *Historiarum adversum paganos libri VII*, ed. Karl Zangemeister (Leipzig: Teubner, 1889), 2.2.1; English translation by A.T. Fear, *Seven Books of History against the Pagans* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2010).

⁴⁵ Otto of Freising, *Chronicon sive historia de duobus civitatibus*, ed. Adolf Hofmeister (Hanover and Leipzig: Hahn, 1912), 2.27, 3-5. English translation by Charles Christopher Mierow, *The Two Cities: A Chronicle of Universal History to the Year 1146 A.D., by Otto, Bishop of Freising* (1928; repr., with a foreword and updated bibliography by Karl F. Morrison, New York: Columbia University Press, 2002). On Otto's treatment of the *translatio* see now especially J.G.A. Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion*, vol. 3, *The First Decline and Fall* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 98-126.

⁴⁶ In Ovid's version of the story, Collatinus is named for his town of origin, Collatia, near Rome; cf. *Fastorum libri sex*, ed. E.H. Alton, D.E.W. Wormell, and E. Courtney (Leipzig: Teubner, 1978), 2.733. For the literature on the Tarquin-Lucretia episode, see n. 12 above.

⁴⁷ A notable exception to the scholarly consensus is Annegret Fiebig, who describes the dream in the *Kaiserchronik* as "ein Bild, ... mehr nicht" ("vier tier wilde," 38).

⁴⁸ On this interruption and the possible reasons for it, see D.H. Green, *Medieval Listening and Reading: The Primary Reception of German Literature 800-1300* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 270-2; Wolfgang Haubrichs, *Die Anfänge: Versuche volkssprachiger Schriftlichkeit im frühen Mittelalter* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1995), 364-5.

⁴⁹ The most important recent literary histories of the early MHG period are Vollmann-Profe, *Wiederbeginn*; Kartschoke, *Geschichte*. For the *Blütezeit* or classical period see Joachim

Bumke, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur im hohen Mittelalter* (Munich: dtv, 1990);

Helmut de Boor, *Die höfische Literatur. Vorbereitung, Blüte, Ausklang 1170-1250*, 11th ed.

(Munich: Beck, 1991); L. Peter Johnson, *Die höfische Literatur der Blütezeit* (Tübingen:

Niemeyer, 1999).

⁵⁰ For examples of the epithet “vorhöfisch” applied to works composed either before the courtly *Blütezeit* or during it but deemed to display “archaic” features, see de Boor, *Die höfische Literatur*, 6, 19, 24, 35, 54, 123, 125, 142, 181, 184, 191, 192, 248, 249, 382.

“Vortheoretisch” is the term used by Christoph Huber in his review of Walter Haug’s *Literaturtheorie im deutschen Mittelalter*, *Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum* 99, no. 2 (1988): 60-8.

⁵¹ For surveys of these various genres and text-types see the relevant sections in Vollmann-Profe, *Wiederbeginn*, and Kartschoke, *Geschichte*; also the following introductions and studies: Rolf Grimminger, *Poetik des frühen Minnesangs* (Munich: Beck, 1969); Dieter Kartschoke, *Altdeutsche Bibeldichtung* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1975); Achim Masser, *Bibel- und Legendenepik des deutschen Mittelalters* (Berlin: Schmidt, 1976); Markus Stock, *Kombinationssinn. Narrative Strukturexperimente im “Straßburger Alexander”, im “Herzog Ernst B”, und im “König Rother”* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2002); Sarah Bowden, *Bridal-Quest Epics in Medieval Germany: A Revisionary Approach* (London: MHRA, 2012). If the inclusion of this last work seems surprising, then we must simply point to the long-standing consensus in scholarship that the *Nibelungenlied* made the crucial jump from oral tradition to literary form around 1150; see Joachim Heinzle, *Das Nibelungenlied. Eine Einführung* (Frankfurt/Main: Fischer, 1994), 27-46. Somehow, this fact is always acknowledged, yet its implications for literary history are seldom followed through.

⁵² Rodney Thompson, “The Place of Germany in the Twelfth-Century Renaissance,” in *Manuscripts and Monastic Culture. Reform and Renewal in Twelfth-Century Germany*, ed.

Alison I. Beach (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 19-42, especially 27. The statistics on which Thompson draws are: Brian Woledge and Ian Short, "Liste provisoire de manuscrits du XIIe siècle contentants de textes en langue française," *Romania* 102, no. 1 (1981): 1-17; Ruth J. Dean, *Anglo-Norman Literature: A Guide to Texts and Manuscripts* (London: Anglo-Norman Text Society, 1999); Ernst Hellgardt, "Die deutschsprachigen Handschriften im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert. Bestand und Charakteristik im chronologischen Abriss," in *Deutsche Handschriften*, ed. Honemann and Palmer, 35-81.

⁵³ *Die frühmittelhochdeutsche Wiener Genesis*, ed. Kathryn Smits (Berlin: Schmidt, 1972); *Die altdeutsche Exodus*, ed. Edgar Papp (Munich: Fink, 1969). For the French tradition, see *Grundriss der romanischen Literaturen des Mittelalters*, vol. 6, *La littérature didactique, allégorique et satirique*, ed. Hans Robert Jauss, part 1 (Heidelberg: Winter, 1968), 25-31, 48-57; part 2 (Heidelberg: Winter, 1970), 54-67, 81-96.

⁵⁴ See Kartschoke, *Geschichte*, 258-63, 367-87; Vollmann-Profe, *Wiederbeginn*, 190-3.

⁵⁵ Timothy Reuter, "Past, Present and No Future in the Regnum Teutonicum," in *The Perception of the Past in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. Paul Magdalino (London: Hambledon, 1992), 15-36 (quotation at 19), on whose argument this paragraph is based.

⁵⁶ See Robert L. Benson, "Political Renovation: Two Models from Antiquity," in *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, ed. Robert L. Benson and Giles Constable (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 339-86.

⁵⁷ See Nancy F. Partner, *Serious Entertainments: The Writing of History in Twelfth-Century England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977), 2-3.

⁵⁸ Reuter, "Past, Present and No Future," 17

⁵⁹ Ohly, *Sage und Legende*, 170.

⁶⁰ The literature on Geoffrey is extensive. For a discussion in the context of the rise of literary fiction in Germany see D.H. Green, *The Beginnings of Medieval Romance: Fact and Fiction, 1150-1220* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 160-75.

⁶¹ *The Historia Regum Britannie of Geoffrey of Monmouth*, vol. 4, *Dissemination and Reception in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. Julia C. Crick (Cambridge: Brewer, 1991), 8-9.

⁶² Geoffrey of Monmouth, *The History of the Kings of Britain: An Edition and Translation of "De gestis Britonum" ("Historia regum Britanniae")*, ed. Michael D. Reeve, transl. Neil Wright (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007), chapters 143-76.

⁶³ Andrew Lynch, "Imperial Arthur: Home and Away," in *The Cambridge Companion to the Arthurian Legend*, ed. Elizabeth Archibald and Ad Putter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 171-87 (quotations at 173, 175, 176). In the same volume see also Ad Putter, "The Twelfth-Century Arthur," 36-51.

⁶⁴ *Wace's Roman de Brut: A History of the British*, ed. and transl. Judith Weiss, 2nd ed. (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2002), xvii. For a review of recent scholarship on twelfth-century British history writing and its emphasis on empire see David Rollo, "The Legacy of Geoffrey of Monmouth: Some Studies on Medieval Insular History and Fiction," *Exemplaria* 27, no. 3 (2015): 262-9.

⁶⁵ Ohly, *Sage und Legende*, 15-16.

⁶⁶ On Godfrey of Viterbo see Lauren J. Weber, "The Historical Importance of Godfrey of Viterbo," *Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 25, no. 2 (1994): 153-95; Maria E. Dorninger, *Godfrey von Viterbo. Ein Autor in der Umgebung der frühen Staufer* (Stuttgart: H.-D. Heinz, 1997); *Godfrey of Viterbo and His Readers: Imperial Tradition and Universal History in Late Medieval Europe*, ed. Thomas Foerster (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015).

⁶⁷ John Burrow, *A History of Histories: Epics, Chronicles, Romances and Inquiries from Herodotus and Thucydides to the Twentieth Century* (London: Allen Lane, 2007), 236.

⁶⁸ For the transmission of Geoffrey of Monmouth see *The Historia Regum Britannie of Geoffrey of Monmouth*, vol. 3, *A Summary Catalogue of the Manuscripts*, ed. Julia C. Crick (Cambridge: Brewer, 1989), and vol. 4, *Dissemination and Reception*, ed. Crick, 216-17.

⁶⁹ See Kai Hering, “Godfrey of Viterbo: Historical Writing and Imperial Legitimacy at the Early Hohenstaufen Court,” in *Godfrey of Viterbo and His Readers*, 47-66.

⁷⁰ See Marjorie Chibnall, *The Empress Matilda: Queen Consort, Queen Mother, and Lady of the English* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991).

⁷¹ Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 373. See Karl Leyser, “Frederick Barbarossa, Henry II and the Hand of St James,” *The English Historical Review* 90, no. 356 (1975): 481-506. We are grateful to Marcus Bull for drawing our attention to this possible connection.

⁷² For a summary of the wider scholarship on the work and manuscript see Johanna Dale, “Imperial Self-Representation and the Manipulation of History in Twelfth-Century Germany: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 373,” *German History* 29, no. 4 (2011): 557-83.

⁷³ Pfaffe Konrad, *Das Rolandslied*, ed. Dieter Kartschoke (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1993), lines 9074-5; cf. Johnson, *Die höfische Literatur*, 96.

⁷⁴ Wolf, *Buch und Text*, 215-16, with references to further literature.

⁷⁵ On German identity in the later Middle Ages see Len Scales, *The Shaping of German Identity: Authority and Crisis, 1245-1414* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

⁷⁶ See n. 7 above.

⁷⁷ For these authors and chronicles see Wolfgang Walliczek, “Rudolf von Ems,” in *Verfasserlexikon*, vol. 8 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1992), 322-45; Norbert H. Ott, “Christherre-Chronik,” in *Verfasserlexikon*, vol. 1 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1978), 1213-17; Karl-Ernst Geith, “Jans Enikel,” in *Verfasserlexikon*, vol. 2 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1980), 565-9; also R. Graeme Dunphy, *History as Literature: German World Chronicles of the Thirteenth Century in Verse*

(Kalamazoo, MA: Western Michigan University, 2003); Ralf Plate, *Die Überlieferung der "Christherre-Chronik"* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2005).

⁷⁸ On Heinrich von München see *Studien zur "Weltchronik" Heinrichs von München*, ed. Horst Brunner, Johannes Rettelbach, Dorothea Klein, 3 vols. (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1998); also Frank Shaw, "Die *Kaiserchronik*-Rezeption in der *Weltchronik* Heinrichs von München," in *bickelwort und wildiu mære*, ed. Lindemann, Volkmann, and Wegera, 380-92; Kurt Gärtner, "Die *Kaiserchronik* als Quelle der *Weltchronik* Heinrichs von München," in *Die "Kaiserchronik."* *Interdisziplinäre Studien zu einem buoch gehaizzen cronica. Festgabe für Wolfgang Haubrichs zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Nine Miedema (forthcoming).