Wenceslas looks out: Monarchy, locality, and the symbolism of power in fourteenth-century Bavaria[*]

Len Scales

An armed and armored man gazes out in life-sized stone effigy from an exterior choir buttress on the church of St Mary in the medieval mining town of Sulzbach in north-east Bavaria. (Fig. 1) He wears the fashionable, narrow-waisted armor of the later fourteenth century, with a broad cloak around his shoulders and a courtly dagger at his richly-worked belt-clasp. Who he might be has attracted various opinions over the centuries; but why he came to be there appears more readily explicable. His presence seems unmistakably to relate to the time, after mid-century, when Sulzbach with the lands round about fell under the lordship of the king of Bohemia, the energetic and image-conscious Charles IV (r. 1346/7-1378): the time when, no doubt partly in response to Charles's own actions, the church choir was rebuilt in the contemporary gothic style.[1]

Sulzbach's well-armed, petrified knight stands as a troubling reminder of an age in which, across Europe, the symbols of new lordship arrived in the train of companies of stylishly-dressed fighting men. The Swiss chronicler Diebold Schilling, writing in the century after the Sulzbach effigy, had no doubt as to the purpose of the rich banners and devices that the contemporary dukes of Burgundy bore with them: it was to "bring the common people into terror and fear" in the lands that they entered.[2] Late-medieval people learned to read with trepidation the visible signs of princely power. A notary engaged by the monks of Christ Church Canterbury, in dispute with the English king at the end of the thirteenth century, recounted how the community's granaries had been sealed by royal agents, who had placed

on them the king's device, "as if of a predatory lion."[3] Above all else, it seems, the visible signs of monarchy encoded the formative, compelling power of the monarch himself: in the kingdom of France, to damage or disrespect them was treason.[4]

By their signs, princes conquered, and in those same signs subjects daily read their subjection. Such is the conclusion of much recent scholarship on the late-medieval period, in which war and the building of extended dynastic polities are found to have been underpinned by strategies of visual representation and legitimation disseminated from princely court centers.[5] Mostly such studies focus on western Europe, rather than on the far-flung, loosely-knit territories of the Holy Roman Empire. Just one late-medieval emperor bucks the trend, to attain the front rank of image-making monarchs, alongside a Charles V of France, a Richard II of England, or a Philip the Good of Burgundy: Charles IV of Luxemburg. Charles, who combined the elective imperial crown with his hereditary kingdom of Bohemia, resembles other late-medieval monarchs in ruling over a large and complex, composite patrimony that—at least in the portion pertaining to the Bohemian crown—he worked tirelessly to extend. In pursuit of this goal, the current consensus seems clear, he relied heavily upon a visual culture of power rooted in a rich and settled court.[6] It is this—partially defensible, but unduly one-sided—perspective that the present essay will challenge, through an examination of local influences upon Caroline visual culture. To this end, we will need in due course to revisit our enigmatic armed man on his lonely pedestal outside St Mary's, Sulzbach.

Charles IV's current almost universally high profile is of fairly recent origin. Only in Czech historiography, which concentrated on his rule in Bohemia, is his reputation as a great medieval monarch old-established. There, a bourgeois nationalist tradition rooted in the nineteenth century, lauding the king as a wise state-builder and benevolent father to the Czech people, was perpetuated under the state Marxism of the ČSSR.[7] That Charles's face currently adorns the hundred-koruna banknote of the Czech Republic reflects long tradition.

Elsewhere, however, perspectives on the king were different, or hardly existed at all. Although Charles always commanded considerable attention in German historical scholarship, judgments upon a monarch whose main concern seemed to be for his Bohemian dynastic kingdom were for a long time ambivalent at best.[8] Set beside the perceived imperial glories of the preceding high-medieval *Kaiserzeit*, the Caroline era appeared from German-nationalist perspectives as an age of decline, under a monarch who to some hardly seemed German at all.[9] Anglophone scholarship, in Britain and North America, when it noticed late-medieval central Europe, was mainly interested in the ("proto-Protestant") Hussite era in Bohemia, whose origins lay in the generation after Charles's death.[10]

Things began to change during the final decades of the twentieth century. In part, the explanation lies in a shift in values among Charles's students, so that qualities previously regretted in some quarters—his perceived internationalism and cultural cosmopolitanism, for example—now attracted warm praise.[11] In an era of post-war reconciliation, rejection of strident nationalism, and east-west détente, the time seemed ripe to applaud (in the words of his most influential modern biographer) "an emperor in Europe."[12] But what did more than anything to launch Charles's modern career as a pre-eminent fourteenth-century image politician—a "statesman and artistic patron" in one telling formulation[13]—is the succession of high-profile exhibitions that he has enjoyed, beginning with those staged to mark the anniversary of his death in 1978.[14] The appetite for showcasing the splendors of Caroline court culture was boosted by the fall of the Iron Curtain, which made gathering up the treasures scattered across his vast central-European domains both practicable and politically attractive. The (usually beautifully produced and sumptuously illustrated) catalogues and essay-volumes accompanying these shows have published and summarized much of the immense recent research that the exhibition boom helped to stimulate. Their often unwitting effect has been to foster an assumption that the emperor's contemporaries were necessarily as

enthralled by the glittering artefacts of his court as are modern art historians and exhibition tourists. That same assumption has been fed by tenacious older views of Charles, as subtle arch-manipulator and Bohemian architect of state—a monarch with a political blueprint realized in gold, gems, and soaring masonry. The present paper aims significantly to qualify this view.

The current consensus is firm. "Art," for Charles, was above all an "instrument of rule," a medium for "propaganda."[15] His actions exemplify, as a recent general history explains, how in the late Middle Ages "artwork propagated the ideology of states."[16] Caroline politics was a "politics of presentation."[17] Charles's own directive role takes center-stage. He was the "visionary and founder," who instigated a full-blown "artistic policy," as a central element in his "strategy of rule" in the service of "state power."[18] He closely controlled all aspects: the king "was a master of political-dynastic stage-management; he had a virtuoso command of the whole score."[19] Caroline monarchy became its own "trademark": a distinctive visual brand, expressive and constitutive of political unity across his far-flung, diverse, and expanding territories.[20] It was encountered most intensely at the main centers of ritual political theatre in his realms, in Aachen and Nuremberg, and above all in and around Prague. But its distinctive products were also systematically exported from Charles's Bohemian capital, as visible assertions of power and a standing call for allegiance in the provinces.[21]

The present paper aims to disrupt and complicate this narrative and to off-center Caroline visual culture, by viewing it not from the court but from the perspective of provincial society. It concentrates upon the territories in north-eastern Bavaria, sometimes known collectively by their post-medieval appellations as the Upper Palatinate (*Oberpfalz*) or *Neuböhmen*, that were incorporated—although for the most part only briefly—into the Bohemian crown lands during the 1350s and 1360s. They have been seen as the subject of

particularly intensive efforts to impose the visible presence of the new regime. But what are we to make of the tangible traces left by the fleeting Caroline era in the region? Did the ubiquitous heraldic lion of Bohemia appear from local perspectives as menacing as that of the Plantagenets sometimes did the English king's recalcitrant subjects? Was it greeted as an unwelcome foreign predator? Did local people themselves have any constitutive role in making and interpreting images which are usually understood almost entirely as impositions from above?[22] Recent historians seem often to have been blinded to such questions by a series of assumptions about the character, origins, objectives, and consequences of Caroline visual culture, which must be interrogated before we proceed further. Praise for Charles's politics of symbolism usually rests upon the—generally undemonstrated and often unexamined—assumption that it was "successful." But was it? Did it advance his aims, for himself and his dynasty? Can we, indeed, glean enough about Charles's intentions and involvement from the scattered, sometimes enigmatic, artefacts made in his name to judge what "success" in his terms—rather than those of his modern admirers—might entail? The implications of such questions go beyond the specific case. They highlight the value of more searching assessment of the aims and achievements of "propagandist" princes elsewhere in late-medieval Europe, too.

Charles IV: the Grand Design

The view of Charles IV as the author of a "master plan" for dynastic and regnal aggrandizement,[23] into which all elements of his rule were systematically drawn, can appear compelling. An annalist of the Cistercian monastery of Altzella, recording the death of "the cunning Charles, emperor and king of Bohemia," reflected that he had "achieved many marvels by means of his cunning."[24] From a perspective closer to the court, it seemed clear

what these comprised. Heinrich von Wildenstein, in a funeral oration, declared that the emperor had "augmented the state [*rem publicam*], and set far and wide the bounds of the kingdom of Bohemia."[25] His main aim, in which he enjoyed spectacular though fleeting success, was to assemble a vast dynastic patrimony across central and east-central Europe, founded both upon his titles as Roman king and emperor and on a much-enlarged Bohemia.[26] His marriage diplomacy on behalf of his offspring included bids (the second successful) for the Polish and Hungarian crowns. By strengthening his influence over the process of election to the imperial throne he hoped to settle the Empire permanently on his Luxemburg heirs. In expanding his Bohemian kingdom, Charles continued a process begun under his father, King John (r. 1310-1346), who in his turn had followed the example of the later Přemyslid kings, notably Otakar II (r. 1253-1278).[27] Already at Charles's accession, much of Silesia, to the north-east, stood under the Bohemian crown, as did Upper Lusatia in the north. The first westward steps had also been taken. On all these fronts, Charles would continue to make gains.[28] But possession of the imperial crown gave him an immense advantage over previous Bohemian kings. It allowed him to formulate ambitious new plans, to incorporate Bohemia into a great composite polity, binding it to the Empire's mainly German-speaking territories north of the Alps and establishing, ultimately, a land bridge to his family's ancestral patrimony on the western imperial frontier.[29] In his pursuit of these goals, the imperial territories bordering Bohemia in the north and west, with north-east Bavaria among them, attained particular importance.

Charles's long occupancy of his two thrones stands out especially from the turbulent, under-resourced reigns of most of his immediate predecessors and successors in the Empire. He travelled his wide realms and the lands beyond as no emperor had done in two centuries, criss-crossing Europe from Paris to Kraków, from Rome to Lübeck. Over the course of his reign he made at least 1,227 attested stays at 438 different locations.[30] In tireless government

from the saddle, Charles resembles the greatest figures of an earlier imperial age, but in other respects his activities as king and emperor point in new directions. Towns had a particular importance as a foundation for Caroline rule, as well as for its legitimation through display.[31] He drew upon the financial resources and expertise of urban mercantile elites, and took a keen interest in the economic development of his realms.[32] Towns, both in the Bohemian crown lands and in the Empire at large, were favored, but were also heavily taxed to support the king's ambitious and costly projects.

Charles's visibility to his subjects displays clear geographical patterns, although with shifts of emphasis over his long reign. Particularly important were the towns and castles strung out along an extended east-west axis, running from Breslau (Wrócław) in his Silesian dynastic lands to the imperial city of Frankfurt am Main, on which he spent around half his reign.[33] Above all, he was to be found at major centers on the middle portion of this route: his dynastic capital of Prague, where he spent around thirty per cent of his time as king and emperor, and the major imperial center of Nuremberg, which saw some ten per cent of his presence.[34] The block of lands that Charles acquired in Bavaria straddled and controlled the communications arteries between these two key sites. He would justify their acquisition to the electors, whose formal assent he required, as enabling the king of Bohemia more easily to attend imperial elections in Frankfurt and assemblies in Nuremberg.[35] That they should have become a major focus of his attention seems only natural.

It is hard to think of a late-medieval ruler better qualified than Charles IV to devise and direct a *Kunstpolitik*. He was unusually well-educated for a late-medieval monarch, having spent his youth at the French royal court—an intellectual formation which was reflected in the university that he established in Prague (1348).[36] His linguistic powers inspired contemporary wonder.[37] Charles's learned interests, embracing theology, history, liturgy, and law, found reflection in his own Latin writings. These indicate a strong concern

with the doctrinal foundations of his rule as king and emperor, and include, in addition to his Autobiography, a coronation *ordo*, a new life of St Wenceslas, and a preface and *arengae* to the chapters of his Bohemian law code, the *Maiestas Carolina*.[38] Charles's close knowledge of the lands under his rule did not depend only upon his own wide travels: the concentration of imperial government in Prague encouraged greater sophistication in written communications and record-keeping. The close personal interest that Charles took in the visual representation of his monarchy is repeatedly attested;[39] and besides his own actions, the prestige of his court ensured that the distinctive styles of Caroline visual culture were widely disseminated and imitated—and doubtless widely recognizable, at least among the political classes of kingdom and Empire.

Accounts of the ideological, centrally-directed, and co-ordinated character of Caroline visual culture can point to its concentration at the main centers for the exercise and legitimation of his rule. The heavy focus of art-historical studies upon sites in and around Prague, and on the topography of the city itself, draws justification from the fact that it was in Prague that Charles's image as ruler attained the fullest articulation.[40] It is there, and at the nearby castle of Karlstein, that his own initiative role in giving his monarchy visible form is most evident. Karlstein came to house the imperial regalia, with their relics of Christ's Passion, while Prague became the site of their annual public veneration.[41] Both at the castle and within the city, elaborate visual programmes exalted the Bohemian and imperial monarchies and situated the monarch and his dynasty in relation to sacral, legitimizing, regnal and imperial pasts. It was at Prague and Karlstein that most of the known portraits and crypto-portraits of Charles himself were to be found.[42] Processional routes linking key sites within the city allowed participants to journey symbolically through sacral-regnal time as they moved through urban space.[43]

In Prague, the pictorial and ritual symbolisms of dynastic realm and elective Empire were visibly combined in mutual affirmation, just as Charles's Bohemian-regnal and imperial powers reinforced each other in the practice of rule. Through his own projects for reshaping urban topography—most notably, his founding in 1348 of the New Town, which tripled the city's size—Charles demonstrated how entire landscapes might be re-fashioned for ideological no less than material ends.[44] It is in Prague that the king is seen exploiting the broad vistas afforded by his imperial rule to recruit and gather together workers in the visual arts in varied media from diverse corners of his realms.[45] And it was not only the living whom he drew in to enrich his capital. Prague was transformed into a sacred treasury for the bones of saints, which Charles gathered from throughout the Empire and beyond.[46] For his relic-collection, just as for other material symbols of his monarchy, Prague acted not only as treasure house but clearing house, a hub for far-reaching distribution networks.

The cults of saints especially important to Charles as king and emperor were systematically translocated between principal sites. He established at Aachen, the main cult-center of the emperor-saint (and Charles's paternal ancestor) Charlemagne, an altar to the Bohemian patron (and the king's maternal ancestor) St Wenceslas.[47] Charlemagne's cult was in turn introduced into his New-Town foundation in Prague, where the church of the Augustinian convent of Karlshof was dedicated to the Frank and probably modelled architecturally on his minster-church at Aachen. Charlemagne's memory was celebrated at Karlstein, through the presence there of his relics – not least, the items of imperial regalia associated with him.[48]

Charles also sought to reproduce elements of the symbolic programmes of Prague and Karlstein at other ideologically important sites in his realms, such as Aachen, Nuremberg, and the palace that he founded at Tangermünde in the Mark Brandenburg.[49] More broadly, he established numerous and diverse ties to himself and his court through his many gifts of relics

to selected churches, in the Empire at large but particularly within his dynastic territories and at sites that he was in the process of binding to his rule. The Bavarian town of Sulzbach was, as we will see, among the centers to benefit in this way from the munificence of its new lord. Yet how far the monarch and his court were responsible for fashioning the local material settings for such gifts, in art and architecture, at these far-flung provincial locations is generally far from clear. Such indications as we have seem on occasion to point instead to the work of local hands.[50]

The Limits of Central Direction

The view of Charles IV as master-impresario of the visual, fashioning a symbolic empire of images and artefacts as a central resource of rule, is now commonplace. It is a view easily justified and, it seems, richly supported. But it does not represent the full picture and is potentially misleading. Habitual reference to Caroline visual culture as "propaganda" oversimplifies the impulses that called it into being and encourages over-optimistic assumptions about its political consequences.[51] Within the Empire at large, there are relatively few indications that visual invocations of Charles's rule did much to raise awareness of him, still less that they swayed contemporary judgments in his favor. Even in his dynastic territories, where exposure to the royal image was greater, the signs are that it was met on occasion with indifference or open hostility.

The negative verdicts on Charles delivered in some of the older historiography could cite in justification the judgments of contemporary chroniclers, particularly from the Empire's German lands.[52] In these accounts (admittedly often concentrating on his troubled early years on the throne), Charles commonly appears as lacking in the qualities of majesty.[53] Even in chronicles recounting the apogee of his reign as emperor, tales of unforeseen,

humiliating incidents suddenly befalling him are strikingly at odds with the transcendent

dignity of his visual imagery.[54] In chronicles from the imperial towns, where visible reference

to monarchy was always close at hand, it was the burden of Charles's taxation, and the

vexatious means by which he attained it, that tended to be remembered.[55] His development of

Prague is mentioned by some German writers, one of whom claimed that he had transferred

to the city the seat of Empire, which was previously at Rome and Constantinople.[56] His

devotion to the cult of saints and avid accumulation of relics are noted. But such references

often come combined with laments about the emperor's excessive favor for his Bohemian

kingdom, where he spent too much time and where he hoarded the Empire's treasures, sacred

and profane.[57]

Even in his Bohemian kingdom, the persuasive power of Caroline image-making was

evidently modest. It certainly did little to win over the native nobility, who would force their

king ignominiously to withdraw his legal reform for the kingdom, the *Maiestas Carolina*, and

to claim, implausibly, that the text had been accidentally destroyed.[58] Glimpses of the local

reception of Charles's royal image in his dynastic lands are afforded by the chronicle written

by Johannes von Guben, town scribe of Zittau in Upper Lusatia. These have particular

interest, since they relate to the small-town landscape of a largely German-speaking province

of the Bohemian crown, crossed by major communications routes and thus, it seems, broadly

comparable to eastern Bavaria. Johannes is unusual in engaging explicitly with the visual

symbolism of Caroline rule, describing closely the iconography of a Bohemian silver Heller,

with crowned bust and armorial lion.[59] Regnal imagery, even at its most "banal," could

evidently catch the attentive local eye.[60] That did not, however, prove to be of much help to

its royal subject. Charles, fulminated Johannes, was an "oppressive lord," who encouraged

disputes between Zittau's burghers in order to amerce them.[61] His recurrent theme is the

king's demands, for military manpower and, particularly, money payments. That Johannes

knew (and specifically mentions) that some of these latter had gone to fund the rebuilding of St Vitus' cathedral did nothing to lessen his resentment.[62] Charles, who had "enserfed" the town, is implicitly contrasted with an earlier Bohemian king, Otakar II, its founder, whose wise measures and generous grants of liberties and trading privileges had formed the basis of Zittau's prosperity.[63] Yet elsewhere in his domains, it was Charles himself who would appear as a founder and benefactor of towns, and not merely their exploiter. Where that was the case, the visible signs of his rule might enjoy a different reception—as becomes clear from the case of north-eastern Bavaria, to which we must now turn.

Charles IV and the Upper Palatinate

The surviving traces of Charles's involvement with the region indicate predictably wide ambition and ceaseless activity.[64] They also seem to disclose, viewed from a local perspective, royal government at its most tangible and burdensome. The nature of the Bavarian territories and their particular importance for the king encouraged a firm and busy hand and a keen eye for gain. Faced with a complete absence of contemporary texts reflecting local voices from Bohemia's Bavarian lands, it is tempting to fill the void with Johannes von Guben's pungent response to Caroline lordship in Upper Lusatia. Yet circumstances in Bavaria were in some ways different, resulting in different local experiences of Bohemian rule—which in turn found reflection in visual representation and memory.

Charles's properties in the region came into his hands over a period of years, by various means. Bohemian footholds west of the frontier already existed when he came to the throne, through the imperial pledges granted to King John by the Wittelsbach emperor Ludwig IV (r. 1314-1347). A substantial parcel of Wittelsbach castles and settlements fell to Charles himself in 1349, as the dowry of his second queen, Anna of the Palatinate, only to be

lost briefly at her death four years later. The real foundation for Charles's Bavarian territory was laid in 1353, when Anna's dowry properties returned to him, substantially augmented by new gains, including the valuable and growing town of Sulzbach, in settlement of the Palatinate Wittelsbachs' debts. Piecemeal acquisitions continued under various terms throughout most of the 1350s and 1360s.[65]

In a diploma dated 5 April 1355, the day of his imperial coronation in Rome, Charles legally incorporated his Bavarian acquisitions into the ambit of the Bohemian crown, thereby affirming their central importance to his wider territorial plans.[66] The *corona regni Bohemiae*, a transpersonal constitutional concept which attained particular importance under Charles, took on visible form in the new Bohemian crown that he had commissioned and that usually resided upon a bust reliquary of St Wenceslas in St Vitus' cathedral.[67] The burghers of Sulzbach accordingly swore fealty, in November 1353, "to our lord the king as king of Bohemia, to his heirs and successors as kings of Bohemia, and to the crown of the same kingdom [*der Kronen dez selben Künckreichs*], as our natural, perpetual lords."[68] The adherence of territories to the Bohemian crown had implications for the ways in which royal power was represented visually, as will shortly become clear. It also, in principle (and from a local perspective, importantly), endowed Charles's acquisitions with constitutional permanence, prohibiting their alienation.

By the late 1360s, however, the king's priorities were changing, as his eyes turned towards the still-richer prize of Brandenburg, with its electoral vote and routes into northern and north-eastern Europe.[69] In 1373, as part of his measures to raise the staggering sums needed to purchase the Mark, Charles handed back the—more important—southern portion of his Bavarian lands, including the town of Sulzbach, to the Wittelsbachs. Although this act took the form of redeemable pledges, the surrender proved permanent. The remaining Bohemian lands "beyond the forest" were then mostly lost under Charles's luckless heir

Wenceslas (r. 1363/76-1400/19). In something like its full extent, the Bavarian lordship of the king of Bohemia had existed for barely twenty years.

For most of that time, however, the king was building for the long term. It was not only the region's importance to Charles's wider goals that encouraged heavy intervention. The Bavarian lands lacked natural and historic unity: properties that had recently stood under different lords were now to be brought under a single administration. The potential gains were high, since the region was crossed by busy trade routes, running eastwards from Nuremberg towards Prague and beyond and north-eastwards to Eger (Cheb), and northwards from Regensburg into Thuringia and Saxony.[70] The lands themselves were rich in natural resources, including deposits of iron ore, along with abundant timber and fast-flowing streams to support metal-working industries. Intervention was also encouraged by the character of regional settlement. Towns were few and small at the start of Charles's reign, but an abundance of proto-urban market centres located on or close to long-distance highways signalled rich potential for growth.[71] To a monarch with an inexhaustible appetite for taxes and dues, and with a keen sense of the potential benefits of direct royal intervention, particularly in regions bordering his Bohemian kingdom, such growth appeared well worth fostering.[72]

Bohemian government quickly gained a firm grip on the new lands. "For who doubts that castles are truly necessary?," asks the *Maiestas Carolina*, in a passage that may originate with Charles himself.[73] And castles were duly acquired, rebuilt, and extended throughout the territory, some now gaining substantial permanent garrisons.[74] Institutions of justice and written administration were developed, centralized on Sulzbach.[75] A Captain, drawn from the Bohemian nobility, was placed in over-all charge of the land, although—importantly, for local perceptions of the new regime—many of the numerous lesser offices went to members of the regional nobility.[76] A detailed register of dues and renders owed to the crown, similar

to those compiled for other Luxemburg dependencies, was drawn up for use by the Sulzbach administration.[77] This included a full account of the arrangements for collecting tolls and providing armed escorts to travellers between specified points on the main east-west highway. The solid infrastructure of rule depended in turn upon heavy, though varying, dues and renders owed by individual communities.[78] The Bohemian lion stalking the land was hungry indeed. Yet the nature of the new territories invited royal behaviors more complex than mere rapacity; and the surviving visual deposit of Bohemian rule suggests that local responses were likewise complex.

Uncertain Signs: Looking for Bohemia in the Provinces

In Bavaria, too, Charles's efforts in the visual field are predictably highly rated in recent scholarship;[79] but their main fruits are far from easy to interpret. The most substantial of these is the castle at Lauf, around three hours' ride east of Nuremberg on the road towards Bohemia.[80] Built during the later 1350s on the site of an earlier fortress, it served as a toll-station but was clearly also designed to provide a visually magnificent representation of Bohemian lordship—although to whom and to precisely what end remains uncertain. It fulfils no defensive function but is richly decorated. Specifically, it includes a first-floor chamber with walls incised with more than a 120 armorials, portraying the political structure of the Bohemian kingdom with its component territories, major towns and churches, but emphasizing particularly the secular nobility.[81] The Bohemian patron St Wenceslas is twice represented: in a low-relief carving in the armorial hall and in a full-length statue on the gatehouse exterior (Fig. 2). Both images show the saint bearing a shield displaying the Bohemian lion, which also adorns a keystone and the gatehouse façade.[82]

That the project and its decoration are linked to the Caroline court is beyond doubt. Architectural details show affinities with Karlstein and with the choir of St Vitus—both works in progress when the castle at Lauf was under construction.[83] The armorials' identifying inscriptions signal the involvement of Czech-speakers.[84] Much less clear, however, are the purpose and meaning of its rich—and, among Charles's buildings, unique—iconography.[85] Lauf's common identification as a "residence" is misleading: although the king stayed there several times, all his visits were brief, and he spent much longer at nearby Sulzbach, as well as in Nuremberg.[86] Indeed, the castle is too small to have supported more than the shortest stays.[87] It is possible that the imagery at Lauf, which stood close to the westernmost limit of Bohemian lordship, was aimed particularly at high-status travellers entering the newly-established territory.[88] The armorial display may even represent a visualization of the promise expressed in Charles's 1355 incorporation diploma, which invokes the powers of the Bohemian kingdom as guarantor of the security of those passing through its Bavarian lands.[89] But it can never have reached or influenced a numerically large public. The works of the master-propagandist on the throne of Prague raise a surprising number of unresolved questions regarding their origin and communicative purpose.

In the problems that it poses for familiar accounts of Caroline image-policy, the castle at Lauf has a striking counterpart in another major building project dating from just a few years later, and also located towards the edge of the expanding Bohemian patrimony. In the mid-1360s, work began on an ambitious complex of buildings, combining a palace and a Celestine monastery, sited on a clifftop in a remote spot at Oybin, not far from Zittau in Upper Lusatia.[90] Here too, masons appear to have been employed with links to the Bohemian court, and a surviving armorial fragment from the now-ruinous church confirms it as a royal project. It was paid for in part by dues extracted from the nearby town.[91] Yet the purpose of the palace-monastery complex remains obscure, the intended public for its prestigious

architecture and decoration no less so.[92] Charles himself hardly ever stayed there, and the nature of the site would have ensured that few of the travellers taking the nearby highway to and from Bohemia encountered it close up.[93] The precise objectives of the "state-propaganda power play" with which the king is now credited can at times prove surprisingly elusive—particularly for works located far from his Prague court.[94]

But if one difficulty with Caroline image-politics concerns the narrow bounds of its demonstrable success, and another the uncertain communicative purpose of some of the ruler's prestige projects, there is a further one: where control over the making and meaning of the visible signs of rule actually lay. Other studies of monarchical imagery in the lands of the Empire have shown how established narratives of top-down direction are prone to break down when the images in question are inspected closely in their local settings.[95] For Charles IV, too, where the evidence is richest it often discloses a picture more complex than the familiar one of control from on high, with urban elites in particular active alongside the monarch as patrons.[96] Caroline image-making emerges recurrently as a collaborative, perhaps negotiated, venture involving multiple interested parties, local as well as courtly.

Complex interactions of this kind are suggested particularly by another, smaller, cluster of images evoking Bohemian rule in Bavaria: the fragments of painted glass preserved in the parish church at Hersbruck, some fourteen kilometres east of Lauf on the east-west highway. These include a roundel with the Bohemian armorial and a window depicting the Virgin (to whom the church is dedicated) as the apocalyptic Woman Clothed with the Sun.[97] The latter image in particular signals a connection to the Caroline court, where this exotic form of Marian devotion enjoyed a vogue. The painting style, too, finds parallels in the Bohemian heartlands. Yet other indicators point westwards, and hint at possible local involvement.

17

Why the king would have acted alone to establish these splendid (and in his Bavarian lands, unique) images at a modest settlement where he probably never lodged is unclear.[98] For the local population, however, their potential value seems more evident.[99] Hersbruck had done well out of Bohemian rule, which brought the market community in rapid succession grants of urban status and valuable privileges.[100] Symbolically placing the new town's welfare in the protective hands of the courtly Virgin and setting the Bohemian lion to stand guard in the most sacred urban space may have seemed prudent. Who could say, after all, when their generous, demanding, and restless king would next be in town—or what were his future plans for the region? Under such circumstances, the visible and lasting symbolic presence of Bohemian lordship was a potentially powerful reassurance. The involvement of local figures becomes more likely if, as recent scholarship has tentatively proposed, the glass-painters came not from Prague but nearby Nuremberg.[101] There, Hersbruck's elders could have found a model in the magnificent church of the Virgin (*Frauenkirche*), founded by Charles but with wealthy burghers as co-patrons. That church, too, boasted a *Madonna in Sole* window.[102]

Just how closely the king and his court were engaged in the comprehensive ideological branding exercise often claimed merits closer scrutiny than it tends to receive. It is noteworthy that the Caroline administration never evolved a unifying documentary vocabulary for the new acquisitions, which instead appear under a varied array of titles, such as "Bavaria beyond the Bohemian forest," "the king's lordship in Bavaria," "the Bavarian land," and "the land of Sulzbach."[103] Charles's own actions to establish a personal symbolic presence, moreover, were remarkably few. It seems that no unambiguous images of him were established, as they were particularly in and near to Prague. At most, his portrait circulated via small coins struck at the mint that he established in the newly-founded town of Lauf.[104] Whether local people were as alert to their iconography (about which we lack complete

knowledge) as was Johannes von Guben is impossible to say. Nor did he seek, as he

recurrently did in the Bohemian core-lands, to have castles or towns named from himself.[105]

Neither Lauf nor the main military strongpoint in Bavaria, nearby Rothenberg, was so

identified. Just one Caroline castle was linked by name with the new masters: the fortress

above the town of Pegnitz, which Charles purchased in 1357 and which gained (at whose

instigation is unknown) the tellingly impersonal appellation of Böheimstein.[106]

Lordship, Legitimacy, Locality: St Wenceslas

This depersonalized conception of Bohemian lordship found particular material form in a

figure recurrently encountered wherever Caroline rule in Bavaria was concentrated: St

Wenceslas.[107] The saint was present in royal chapel dedications at Lauf and Rothenberg.[108]

He was the dedicatee of the hospital which the king patronized, and may have founded, at his

regional administrative centre, Sulzbach.[109] Visual representations of Wenceslas at key

locations were doubtless more numerous than surviving indications allow us to tell. A

Wenceslas-figure once adorned the portal of the Sulzbach hospital-church; and mention of a

St Wenceslas bridge at Rothenberg indicates the likely presence there of an image of the

saint. Reference also appeared on coins minted locally. [110]

All this suggests a cult imposed by the new regime as the sacral legitimation and

visual embodiment of its rule. Charles's own devotion to St Wenceslas, whose name he

received at baptism and whom a court historian termed his "principal aid and protector," was

profound.[111] The westward extension of Wenceslas's cult has been viewed as a manifestation

of Charles's "state piety" (*Staatsfrömmigkeit*), the projection of personal religiosity as an

instrument of rule.[112] It afforded a means of conceptualizing and visualizing Bohemian

lordship in abstract, constitutional terms—particularly necessary, perhaps, in lands never

previously subject to the Bohemian king. Wenceslas gave visual articulation to the concept, repeatedly invoked in diplomas for the Bavarian territories, of the "Bohemian crown." The saint's image codified in Bavaria the same Bohemian regnal order that was articulated in detail in the armorial chamber at Lauf—where Wenceslas was also recurrently present.

The question of Wenceslas's acceptability to his Bavarian subjects is not, however, only a constitutional one. Late-medieval saints were understood as the protectors and embodiments of regnal communities, that is to say, communities of identification and sentiment also imaginable as unities of blood and descent.[113] Wenceslas's reputation in Bohemia was as the supernatural champion of a historical kingdom and its people, under kings who, like Charles IV, were his descendants.[114] But by Charles's day there are signs that the Bohemian kingdom was in some quarters coming increasingly to be identified with its Czech-speaking majority population, defined particularly against their German-speaking western neighbours.[115] Germans were also now a prominent, sometimes resented, element at court and among Bohemia's urban elites. On occasion Wenceslas himself was drawn into the fray, reputedly deploying his supernatural powers in order to teach Germans respect for his cult and his people.[116]

So was the saint viewed in the king's Bavarian lands as anything more than a symbol of foreign rule, imposed by the new master in Prague and his local agents? In fact, Wenceslas's cult had roots in the region long antedating the new lordship: his feast-day is recorded in Bamberg calendars already in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.[117] In the surrounding German-speaking regions, evidence of his cult goes back even further.[118] In the late Middle Ages, too, local veneration of Wenceslas in north-eastern Bavaria, as reflected in parish-church dedications and devotional images, flourished independently of royal actions. It did, however, reflect to a degree the ties that already bound both secular and spiritual lords in the region to the monarch and his court: to such men, and indeed to the inhabitants of eastern

Bavaria more broadly, Bohemia was no remote or alien world.[119] Within regional society there is little trace of the sentiments of cultural difference from, and antagonism towards, Czech-speakers, of which the nationalist historiographies of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries made so much, and which did indeed find a voice during the Hussite conflict in the fifteenth century.[120] When the Czech reformer Jan Hus himself travelled the road from Bohemia to Nuremberg in October 1414, bound for Constance, he had only praise for the warm hospitality and attentive audiences that he encountered in the German towns along the way.[121] The Bohemian Wenceslas was a supernatural champion to whom local populations too might look.

The complex relationship between royal agency and local interest, perception, and response, and St Wenceslas's role as mediator in that relationship, is most clearly observable in the town of Sulzbach. As the main centre of Bohemian rule in Bavaria, Sulzbach had a special importance for Charles IV. It was easily his most frequent place of stay in the new territories, his presence there attested on eighty-nine different days.[122] Sulzbach was the point of departure (on the feast of St Wenceslas, 1354) on his journey to Rome for coronation and his first place of lodging on Bohemian soil upon his return, while in the previous year he had probably also participated in the Corpus Christi procession there.[123] Sulzbach provided the stage for important acts of royal diplomacy.[124] But the people of the town also benefited from their visible and active new lord. Charles quickly perceived Sulzbach's economic and fiscal potential, confirming and extending the mining rights conceded to the burghers by his Wittelsbach predecessor and granting far-reaching trade privileges, including toll freedoms throughout Bohemia and the Empire.[125] Under Caroline rule, Sulzbach more than doubled in size, reaching an extent not surpassed before the nineteenth century.[126] And characteristically, the king paired economic with religious favors, donating relics to the town's church: a finger-joint of St Burkhard and, a particular treasure, a fragment of the skull of John the Baptist.[127] It

was probably these gifts, in 1355, that occasioned the church's rebuilding, starting with the choir—upon which would shortly afterwards be set the enigmatic armed man encountered at the start of this paper (Fig. 1), and to whom it is now time to return.[128]

The several identities ascribed to the figure at various times themselves help to illuminate his complex local significance. In the seventeenth century he was claimed to represent Charles IV's son Wenceslas, whom his father had invested as count of Sulzbach and who was mistakenly credited with building the church.[129] More recently, the statue was long believed to portray Charles himself.[130] There can today be little doubt, however, that it was intended to represent (primarily, at least) the Bohemian patron St Wenceslas.[131] It adheres closely to the established late-medieval iconography of the saint, showing him as a courtly knight wearing a ducal cap, a shield in his left hand – though the lance that he probably once held in his right was long ago lost. The rosettes on his breastplate signify martyrdom.[132] Stylistically, however, the statue does not display the flowing forms of the Wenceslas-figure outside the castle at Lauf, which has been associated with Charles's court artists, the Parlers, but instead shows affinities with late fourteenth-century Nuremberg sculpture.[133] It probably dates from shortly after the end of Bohemian rule in the town—raising the important, still too little considered, question of who commissioned its making, and why.

Its significance and purpose are not immediately obvious. The church is dedicated to the Virgin, though it is thought to have contained a Wenceslas-altar.[134] But the figure in any case stands not within the sacred structure but outside, isolated and exposed, facing onto urban space. This location, too, invites closer reflection than it has received.[135] The saint gazes directly across the market place towards the town hall. That building, symbolising Sulzbach's corporate existence and the municipal rights that Charles had confirmed and extended, was likewise constructed in the second half of the fourteenth century, and shares

architectural details with the adjacent church.[136] Who sponsored the Wenceslas-statue's

making—the court, local royal agents, Sulzbach burghers, or some mix of these groups—is

unknown, although its probable late date points strongly to local initiative. Perhaps

significantly, it was believed in the seventeenth century to have been made at the

townspeople's behest.[137]

That the saint should occupy an exterior location, relating to his urban surroundings,

fits a broader pattern: Wenceslas is recurrently found out of doors. He had a particular

affinity with bridges.[138] A famous statue of the saint, now in the Wenceslas chapel of St

Vitus, previously occupied a niche on the cathedral's south façade. From there, it has been

proposed, Wenceslas directed his approving gaze towards the nearby royal palace, habitation

of his descendants and successors on the throne.[139] But if St Wenceslas could thus shed

welcome legitimacy upon Charles IV in his capital, might he not also be co-opted to lend

visible and permanent endorsement to the king's precious but vulnerable grants to his new

subjects? Wenceslas stood, importantly, for the perpetual endurance of the Bohemian crown

and its subject lands, of which each king was regarded as a mere temporary trustee.[140] Such

undying symbolic affirmation might have seemed all the more welcome when it became clear

that Bohemian rule might not prove so permanent after all.[141] But the possibility cannot be

dismissed that the statue was also intended as a crypto-portrait of Charles IV (who was, after

all, Wenceslas's blood descendant), or quickly came to be understood as such by the

townspeople.[142] For Charles too is to be found gazing benevolently down from exterior

church fabric over urban space and its privileged occupants.

Embodying Urban Privilege

In the imperial town of Mühlhausen in Thuringia, the emperor peers down in over-life-sized effigy from above the south portal of the principal church, the Marienkirche, in company with his queen and two courtiers. (Fig. 3).[143] The figures are roughly contemporary with the Sulzbach Wenceslas, though there are no grounds to suppose a connection. In later tradition at least, the emperor's effigy participated directly in the town's constitutional life, as the council was annually sworn in under his gaze.[144] In Mühlhausen, too, the figure faces towards the *Rathaus*. And while little is known about why or at whose initiative these images came to be made, there are good grounds for thinking that the petrified emperor was understood as a guarantor of urban liberties—specifically, of Mühlhausen's continued enjoyment of direct imperial lordship, safe from the otherwise ever-present danger of pledging to a neighbouring prince.[145] For communities with much to lose, the perpetual symbolic presence of the ruler on whom their rights depended had obvious attractions.[146]

German towns were quite capable of invoking for themselves the monarch's talismanic presence in symbolically-charged locations. In certain cases, such as the monumental carved figure of Ludwig IV in the town hall at Nuremberg, the purpose seems to have been directly to embody the freedoms granted to the town under that emperor's seal.[147] The town hall front, the market place in its shadow, adjacent church portals and façades, and standing structures such as fountains, all came to bear cycles of figure-sculpture and heraldry, constructing the town's relationship with royal authority—usually on terms that visibly suited the burgher elite.[148] James Masschaele has written of late medieval England that "markets created an audience for the state, and the state gradually realized that it made sense to perform before it."[149] But in Germany urban audiences were performers too, with meanings of their own to inscribe upon the visible signs of power. Local symbols of lordship might thus become the subject of changing interpretations, rewritten over time as champions of urban liberties even against the town's lord.[150] The monumental figures of Charlemagne's paladin

Roland, widespread in towns across northern Germany in the late Middle Ages, came with time to symbolize the collective defence of urban privileges—in particular, trading privileges—understood as imperial grants.[151] The militantly sentinel Roland (himself a warrior-martyr in late-medieval estimation) invites at least broad comparison with the Sulzbach Wenceslas.

The saint was not, however, the only symbol of Bohemian rule facing Sulzbach's town hall across the market. On the façade of the adjacent house "Zur Krone" are still visible three carved armorials: the Bohemian lion and two eagles, one that of the Empire, the other perhaps the customary device of St Wenceslas. (Fig. 4)[152] Their significance has generally been regarded as straightforward: marking the monarch's lodgings with his arms was common practice.[153] The former patrician house may indeed have been Charles IV's occasional place of stay—though modern archaeological work on the palace outside the town has undermined the earlier belief that the house "Zur Krone" was his regular lodgings.[154] Yet the armorials' permanent sculpted form, their location facing the *Rathaus*, and the apparent invocation of St Wenceslas alongside the king, all seem to suggest a more substantial purpose, as do the deliberate steps that were taken locally to preserve them.[155] Nor were they unique in Caroline Bavaria. A carved Bohemian armorial of similar style survives on a house-front in Hirschau, again—and again perhaps significantly—adjacent to the *Rathaus*. (Fig. 5) Hirschau, still more than the larger Sulzbach, owed its late-medieval success to Charles IV, who not only granted the settlement urban status but in 1367 ordered the re-routing of the east-west highway to pass through the new town.[156] In eastern Bavaria, Bohemian lions long stood guard over a landscape transformed to the benefit of nascent burgher communities. It was not only the supposedly all-controlling Charles who might perceive advantage in their presence.[157]

Studies of Bohemian "state-making" in Bavaria tend to be particularly impressed by the fulsome language of allegiance spoken by the symbols and inscriptions on seals from the new, or newly privileged, towns.[158] "Hersbruck obediently faithful to Bohemia," declares that town's seal, first attested in 1364. At Neustadt an der Waldnaab, a pre-existing seal featuring St Martin came to include the Bohemian arms, with the words "Neustadt faithfully bound to the kingdom of Bohemia." Sulzbach's new seal (Fig. 6) showed a fortified town gate topped by a banner displaying the double-tailed lion, with the legend "Sulzbach faithful member of the crown of Bohemia."[159] Yet, while the new government doubtless made clear via local agents the expectation that towns symbolically declare their loyalty, what is striking about these seals is the absence of that standardization that might indicate close direction from above. Much was evidently left to local initiative. Nor can the sentiments expressed be dismissed as merely formal or coerced. Seen through local eyes, the banner flying above Sulzbach's stylized walls did not guard the king's rights alone. Who set it there—and at whose initiative other signs of Caroline lordship were established and maintained—has no simple answer.

Suggestive here is the tenacity with which some local communities clung on to the tangible legacy of Bohemian rule many years after its ending. References to the Caroline era on town seals survived far into the post-medieval period.[160] In Weiden, where Bohemian lordship ceased in 1406, the armorial lion still adorned the town gate in 1533, when someone was fined for breaking off a leg—though whether as vandalism or to secure a portion of its imagined tutelary power is unknown.[161] Only in 1586 did the painter's brush finally transform it into the golden, single-tailed beast of the Palatinate. Where artefacts of the Caroline era encoded enduring local privileges, their survival might be long indeed. The town of Neustadt an der Waldnaab preserves today a glove of Charles IV (Fig. 7), delivered to the town in 1354 in token of a grant of wood-cutting rights in the adjacent royal forests.[162] Other

major grants followed for Neustadt before the Caroline era closed (although the town, exceptionally, would remain under Bohemian lords, latterly the Lobkowitz family, down to the early nineteenth century).[163] The Caroline glove—seemingly specially made for such an occasion—was still being handed over to each incoming *Bürgermeister*, along with the town keys and seals, as proof of the community's inviolable privilege, in the late seventeenth century.[164] It offers a key to contemporary understandings of other visible deposits of Bohemian lordship in Bavaria—not only as tokens of a power enforced from above, but as material warrant for rights gained and guarded locally.

Conclusions

The surviving artefacts of Caroline visual culture are very numerous. The more portable ones alone would fill any exhibition space many times over, without considering the castles, churches, monastic sites, or entire townscapes created in Charles's name—or, indeed, the innumerable more fleeting manifestations of his visual style, glimpsed in ritual and performance. But his realms were very large too, while many of the most striking, ambitious, and ideologically eloquent works commissioned by the monarch and by members of his court were concentrated at just a few prestigious locations. Often, they were clearly destined for few eyes, sometimes almost solely Charles's own. This is not an art that, for much of the time, looks outward onto public spaces, to address the emperor's passing subjects. The annual relic-showings in Prague, which drew large crowds of pilgrims and in which Charles himself played a prominent part, represent an important but relatively isolated exception.[165]

But with increasing distance from the center the picture changes. The purpose and meaning of some surviving works become less obvious, and were perhaps less obvious to people at the time. Far from court and metropolis, the limits of the capacity of Caroline

image-culture to impress and persuade are occasionally starkly revealed. But also occasionally discernible, though almost never in detail, are the multiple and complex transactions between monarchy and locality, between agents of the centre and local elites, through which diverse signs of Caroline rule came into being and were inscribed, and re-inscribed, with meaning. If such processes seem particularly in play in Charles's Bavarian lands west of the Bohemian forest, that is perhaps a reflection of how much was at stake there for both sides: the monarch and his agents, intent on drawing maximum benefit from a strategically-located territory; and local populations, for whom that same strategic situation promised rich but possibly impermanent rewards.

Accounts of Charles IV's *Kunstpolitik* would benefit on occasion from a more cautious assessment of its character and aims and a less relentlessly optimistic (or, at least, more nuanced) estimate of its results. They might also usefully linger a little longer in the provinces. St Wenceslas looked out upon an array of diverse social and political landscapes, and where his gaze was favourably met this was often the result of local needs as much as central direction. The same principle, moreover, might usefully be extended to other late-medieval European polities. "Looking for the state" (in John Watts's phrase) can never mean looking only for the visible symbols of power projected downwards, even if these were what sometimes caught the shocked contemporary eye: it must also involve seeking out the often-elusive signs of negotiation, compromise, and the constitutive power of locality.

[1] Friedrich Fuchs, "Die Kirchen von Sulzbach-Rosenberg," in *Eisenerz und Morgenglanz: Geschichte der Stadt Sulzbach-Rosenberg*, ed. Stadt Sulzbach-Rosenberg, 2 vols. (Amberg: Oberpfalz, 1999), 2.773-93 (here 777). For Charles's patronage, see below, ***.

[2] *Die Berner-Chronik des Diebold Schilling 1468-1484*, ed. Gustav Tobler, vol. 1 (Bern: Wyss, 1897), 386; and see Claudius Sieber-Lehmann, *Spätmittelalterlicher Nationalismus: Die Burgunderkriege am Oberrhein und in der Eidgenossenschaft* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995), 49-54.

[3] Jeffrey H. Denton, *Robert Winchelsey and the Crown 1294-1313* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 111.

[4] S.H. Cuttler, *The Law of Treason and Treason Trials in Later Medieval France* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 47.

[5] For a striking instance, see D'A.J.D. Boulton, "The Order of the Golden Fleece and the creation of Burgundian national identity," in *The Ideology of Burgundy: The Promotion of National Consciousness 1364-1565*, ed. D'Arcy Jonathan Dacre Boulton and Jan R. Veenstra (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006), 21-97. Rare but important sceptical voices, warning against overstating the ubiquity, importance, and comprehensibility of visual symbols in late-medieval polities, include Paul Binski, "Hierarchies and orders in English royal images of power," in *Orders and Hierarchies in Late Medieval and Renaissance Europe*, ed. Jeffrey Denton (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999), 74-93; John Watts, "Looking for the state in later medieval England," in *Heraldry, Pageantry and Social Display in Medieval England*, ed. Peter Coss and Maurice Keen (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2002), 243-67. Malcolm Vale's observation, that "later, anachronistic assumptions about an equation between royal or princely power and an 'official', centrally determined and dictated court art, are out of place," is applicable to the subject-matter of the present essay: Malcolm Vale, *The Princely Court:*

Medieval Courts and Culture in North-West Europe, 1270-1380 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 252.

[6] Summarized in F. Seibt, "Karl IV.," *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 11 (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1977), 188-91 (here esp. 190).

[7] Hans Lemberg, "Der Kaiser und König im tschechischen Geschichtsbild seit 1945," in *Kaier Karl IV.: Staatsmann und Mäzen*, ed. Ferdinand Seibt (Munich: Prestel, 1978), 414-17. Representative of this tradition is the monumental, unfinished biography by Josef Šusta, *Karel IV.: Otec a syn, 1333-1346* (Prague: Laichter, 1946); *Za císařskou korunou, 1346-1355* (Prague: Laichter, 1948); for the Communist era, Jiří Spěváček, *Karel IV: Život a dílo, 1316-1378* (Prague: Svoboda, 1979).

[8] Generalisation is difficult, however, since the most detailed studies were often by Bohemian Germans and Austrians, who identified patriotically with Charles or regarded his composite realm as prefiguring that of the Habsburgs. See Beat Frey, "Karl IV. in der älteren Historiographie," in *Kaiser Karl IV.*, ed. Seibt, 399-404.

[9] For an admittedly extreme example, reflecting the values of the NS era, see Josef Pfitzner, *Kaiser Karl IV.* (Potsdam: Athenaion, 1938), esp. 106-7.

[10] An exception is Bede Jarrett, *The Emperor Charles IV* (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1935). No general, book-length study of Charles has been published in English since.

[11] Early signs of this shift, including a trend towards locating Charles approvingly within "European" contexts, are traced by Peter Moraw, "Kaiser Karl IV. 1378-1978: Ertrag und Konsequenzen eines Gedenkjahres," in *Politik, Gesellschaft, Geschichtsschreibung: Gießner Festgabe für F. Graus*, no editor (Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau, 1982), 224-318 (here esp. 269-86).

[12] Ferdinand Seibt, *Karl IV.: Ein Kaiser in Europa 1346 bis 1378* (Munich: Süddeutscher Verlag, 1978).

[13] *Kaier Karl IV.: Staatsmann und Mäzen*, ed. Seibt.

[14] Exhibitions dedicated to Charles's reign were held in 1978 in Nuremberg and Prague, with another, concentrating on the emperor's court artists, the Parler family, in Cologne. Subsequent major exhibitions with Charles as their theme took place in New York and Prague in 2005-6 and in Prague and Nuremberg in 2016-17. Charles's court painter Master Theodoricus was the subject of a Prague exhibition in 1998. Caroline artefacts have featured prominently in major exhibitions dedicated to the visual culture of the medieval western Empire more broadly, such as those staged at Aachen in 2000 and Magdeburg in 2006, as well as in numerous, more local and thematically specific exhibitions.

[15] *Kunst als Herrschaftsinstrument: Böhmen und das Heilige Römische Reich unter den Luxemburgern im europäischen Kontext*, ed. Jiří Fajt and Andrea Langer (Berlin and Munich: Deutsche Kunstverlag, 2009); Iva Rosario, *Art and Propaganda: Charles IV of Bohemia, 1346-1378* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000). Richard Němec, "Kulturlandschaft und 'Staatsidee': Architektur und Herrschaftskonzeption Karls IV.," in *Böhmen und das Deutsche Reich: Ideen- und Kulturtransfer im Vergleich (13. – 16. Jahrhundert)*, ed. Eva Schlotheuber and Hubertus Seibert (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2009), 63-102 (here 67), writes of Charles's reliance on "Propaganda und Repräsentation."

[16] Charles F. Briggs, *The Body Broken: Medieval Europe 1300-1520* (London and New York: Routledge, 2011), 111.

[17] Paul Crossley, "The politics of presentation: the architecture of Charles IV in Bohemia," in *Courts and Regions in Medieval Europe*, ed. Sarah Rees Jones, Richard Marks, and A.J. Minnis (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2000), 99-172. Crossley borrowed his title from Ferdinand Seibt.

[18] Jiří Kuthan and Jan Royt, *Karel IV. Císař a český král – vizionář a zakladatel* (Prague: Universitas Carolina Pragensis, 2016); Richard Němec, "Herrscher—Kunst—Metapher: Das

ikonographische Programm der Residenzburg Lauf an der Pegnitz als eine Quelle der Herrschaftsstrategie Karls IV.," in *Die Goldene Bulle: Politik – Wahrnehmung – Rezeption*, ed. Ulrike Hohensee, Mathias Lawo, Michael Lindner, Michael Menzel, and Olaf B. Rader, 2 vols. (Berlin: Akademie, 2009), 1.369-401; Jiří Fajt, "Brandenburg wird böhmisch: Kunst als Herrschaftsinstrument," in *Die Kunst des Mittelalters in der Mark Brandenburg: Tradition, Transformation, Innovation*, ed. Ernst Badstübner *et al.* (Berlin: Lukas, 2008), 202-51 (here 202, 210).

[19] Wolfgang Schmid, "Vom Rheinland nach Böhmen: Studien zur Reliquienpolitik Kaiser Karls IV.," in *Die Goldene Bulle*, ed. Hohensee, Lawo, Lindner, Menzel, and Rader, 1.431-64 (here 431).

[20] The term is used by Fajt, "Brandenburg wird böhmisch," 210. Jiří Fajt, "Charles IV: towards a new imperial style," in *Prague: The Crown of Bohemia 1347-1437*, ed. Barbara Drake Boehm and Jiří Fajt (London and New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 3-21 (here 10) writes of Charles sponsoring "a uniform aesthetic that was consistently employed in the service of imperial authority and dynastic policy."

[21] Jiří Fajt and Markus Hörsch, "Karl IV. und das Heilige Römische Reich: zwischen Prag und Luxemburg – eine Landbrücke in den Westen," in *Karl IV. Kaiser von Gottes Gnaden: Kunst und Repräsentation des Hauses Luxemburg 1310-1437*, ed. Jiří Fajt (Munich and Berlin: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 2006), 356-99 (here 372-7); Fajt, "Charles IV," 16.

[22] For "de-centered" forms of political agency in the Middle Ages generally, see Fabrizio Titone, "Introduction: the concept of disciplined dissent and its deployment: a methodology," in *Disciplined Dissent: Strategies of Non-Confrontational Protest in Europe from the Twelfth to the Early Sixteenth Century*, ed. Autori Vari and Fabrizio Titone (Rome: Viella, 2015), 7-22.

[23] The term is used by Němec, "Kulturlandschaft und 'Staatsidee'," 100.

[24] *Annales Veterocellenses*, ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* [henceforth *MGH*], *Scriptores*, vol. 16 (Hannover: Hahn, 1859), 45-6.

[25] Quoted in Michael Lindner, "Kaiser Karl IV. und Mitteldeutschland," in *Kaiser, Reich und Region: Studien und Texte aus der Arbeit an den Constitutiones des 14. Jahrhunderts und zur Geschichte der Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, ed. Michael Lindner, Eckhard Müller-Mertens, and Olaf B. Rader (Berlin: Akademie, 1997), 83-180 (here 126).

[26] Seibt, *Karl IV.*, ch. 7; Jörg K. Hoensch, *Die Luxemburger* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2000), 155-76.

[27] For background, see Ferdinand Seibt, "Die Zeit der Luxemburger und der hussitischen Revolution," in *Handbuch der Geschichte der böhmischen Länder*, vol. 1, ed. Karl Bosl (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1967), 349-568 (here esp. 362-82).

[28] Winfried Eberhard, "Ost und West: Schwerpunkte der Königsherrschaft bei Karl IV.," in *Zeitschrift für historische Forschung* 8, no. 1 (1981), 13-24 (here 21-2).

[29] For Charles's aims and acquisitions, see Hanns Hubert Hofmann, "Karl IV. und die politische Landbrücke von Prag nach Frankfurt am Main," in *Zwischen Frankfurt und Prag: Vorträge der wissenschaftlichen Tagung des Collegium Carolinum in Frankfurt/M. am 7. und 8. Juni 1962*, ed. Collegium Carolinum (Munich: Robert Lerche, 1963), 51-74; Lindner, "Kaiser Karl IV. und Mitteldeutschland," 102; Harriet M. Harnisch, "Königs- und Reichsnähe thüringischer Grafenfamilien im Zeitalter Karls IV.," in *Kaiser, Reich und Region*, ed. Lindner, Müller-Mertens, and Rader, 181-212 (here 189).

[30] Eberhard, "Ost und West," 15.

[31] A sample of his chancery documents found 27 percent addressed to urban recipients: Peter Moraw, "Vom Raumgefüge einer spätmittelalterlichen Königsherrschaft: Karl IV. im nordalpinen Reich," in *Kaiser, Reich und Region*, ed. Lindner, Müller-Mertens, and Rader, 61-81 (here 77).

[32] Peter Moraw, *Von offener Verfassung zu gestalteter Verdichtung: Das Reich im späten Mittelalter 1250 bis 1490* (Berlin: Propyläen, 1985), 245; Seibt, *Karl IV.*, 361-7; Wolfgang von Stromer, "Der kaiserliche Kaufmann – Wirtschaftspolitik unter Karl IV.," in *Kaiser Karl IV.*, ed. Seibt, 63-73.

[33] Eberhard, "Ost und West," 19; Moraw, "Vom Raumgefüge," 77.

[34] Moraw, "Vom Raumgefüge," 75.

[35] *MGH Constitutiones et Acta Publica Imperatorum et Regum*, vol. 11, ed. Wolfgang D. Fritz (Weimar: Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1978-1992), 208-18 (here 209), no. 390.

[36] Seibt, *Karl IV.*, 115-20, 179-85.

[37] See *Chronik des Jacob Twinger von Königshofen*, ed. C. Hegel (Chroniken der deutschen Städte [henceforth CdtS], vol. 8.i, Leipzig: Hirzel, 1870), 484-5.

[47] For Charles's known writings and their bearing upon his political conceptions, see: Reinhard Schneider, "Karls IV. Auffassung vom Herrscheramt," in *Beiträge zur Geschichte des mittelalterlichen deutschen Kaisertums*, ed. Theodor Schieder (*Historische Zeitschrift* Beihefte 2, Neue Folge, Munich: Oldenbourg, 1973), 122-150 (here esp. 124-5); Bernd-Ulrich Hergemöller, *Cogor Adversum Te: Drei Studien zum literarisch-theologischen Profil Karls IV. und seiner Kanzlei* (Warendorf: Fahlbusch, 1999), esp. 221-413.

[39] Fajt, "Charles IV," 9, for Charles's chancellor writing to inform him in detail about the abilities of a particular painter. Olaf B. Rader, "Aufgeräumte Herkunft: Zur Konstruktion dynastischer Ursprünge an königlichen Begräbnissen," in *Die Goldene Bulle*, ed. Hohensee, Lawo, Lindner, Menzel, and Rader, 1.403-30 (here 427) describes St Vitus cathedral as "bewusste Herrschaftsarchitektur," conceived and planned in detail by Charles himself.

[40] See generally Crossley, "The politics of presentation"; Rosario, *Art and Propaganda*.

[41] For Karlstein, see František Kavka, "The role and function of Karlštejn castle as documented in records from the reign of Charles IV," in *Magister Theodoricus: Court*

Painter to Emperor Charles IV, ed. Jiří Fajt (Prague: National Gallery, 1998), 15-28. For evidence of awareness far beyond Bohemia (in Cologne) of Prague's importance as a centre of sacral-monarchical display, see *Die Kölner Weltchronik 1273/88-1376*, ed. Rolf Sprandel (*MGH Scriptores rerum Germanicarum* [henceforth *SsrG*], Nova Series [henceforth NS], vol. 15, Munich: Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 1991), 108-10.

[42] See Marco Bogade, *Kaiser Karl IV.: Ikonographie und Ikonologie* (Stuttgart: Ibidem, 2005); Robert Suckale, "Die Porträts Kaiser Karls IV. als Bedeutungsträger," in *Das Porträt vor der Erfindung des Porträts*, ed. Martin Büchsel and Peter Schmidt (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2003), 191-204.

[43] Crossley, "The politics of presentation," 126-31; Paul Crossley and Zoë Opačić, "Prague as a new capital," in *Prague*, ed. Drake Boehm and Fajt, 59-73 (here esp. 71). For the ritual construction of urban space in the Middle Ages, see generally *Ritual and Space in the Middle Ages: Proceedings of the Harlaxton Symposium 2009*, ed. Frances Andrews (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2011).

[44] Crossley and Opačić, "Prague," esp. 63-6.

[45] Fajt, "Charles IV," esp. 10, 13-16; Jiří Fajt, "Magister Theodoricus – court painter to emperor Charles IV," in *Magister Theodoricus*, ed. Fajt, 217-77.

[46] Upon Charles's accession to the Bohemian throne, only 77 relics are attested in Prague (though there were doubtless others); by the time of his death 605 can be shown to have been present in the city (though, again, this cannot be a complete figure): Martin Bauch, *Divina favente clemencia: Auserwählung, Frömmigkeit und Heilsvermittlung in der Herrschaftspraxis Kaiser Karls IV.* (Cologne, Weimar, and Vienna: Böhlau, 2015), 317; and see also Schmid, "Vom Rheinland nach Böhmen."

[47] For what follows, see František Kavka, "Karl IV. (1349-1378) und Aachen," in *Krönungen: Könige in Aachen—Geschichte und Mythos*, ed. Mario Kramp, 2 vols. (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2000), 2.477-84.

[48] Jiří Fajt, "Karl IV. —Herrscher zwischen Prag und Aachen: Der Kult Karls des Großen und die karolinische Kunst," in *Krönungen*, ed. Kramp, 2.489-500 (here 495-6).

[49] For Aachen and Nuremberg, see Fajt and Hörsch, "Karl IV. und das Heilige Römische Reich," 358-9, 364-5; for Tangermünde, Evelyn Wetter, "Die Lausitz und die Mark Brandenburg," in *Karl IV. Kaiser von Gottes Gnaden*, ed. Fajt, 340-55 (here 346-8).

[50] An example is the church of St Nicholas in the town of Luckau in Lower Lusatia, which was the recipient of an important Caroline relic (part of the skull of St Paulinus), but where the small bust-figures, probably of Charles and his queen, on the north choir portal, created in all likelihood in connection with the gift, seem too modest to be courtly commissions: Marie-Luise Favreau-Lilie, "Von Lucca nach Luckau: Kaiser Karl IV. und das Haupt des heiligen Paulinus," in *Vita Religiosa im Mittelalter: Festschrift für Kaspar Elm zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Franz J. Felten and Nikolaus Jaspert (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1999), 899-915 (here 901).

[51] Schwarz, for example, warns against overstating the political motivations behind Charles's funerary sculptural programme in St Vitus: Michael Viktor Schwarz, "Felix Bohemia Sedes Imperii: Der Prager Veitsdom als Grabkirche Kaiser Karls IV.," in *Grabmäler der Luxemburger: Image und Memoria eines Kaiserhauses*, ed. Michael Viktor Schwarz (Luxembourg: CLUDEM, 1997), 123-53 (here 129).

[52] For what follows, see generally Beat Frey, *Pater Bohemiae – Vitricus Imperii: Böhmens Vater, Stiefvater des Reichs. Karl IV. in der Geschichtsschreibung* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1978), esp. 18-34.

[53] *Liber de Rebus Memorabilioribus sive Chronicon Henrici de Hervordia*, ed. Augustus Potthast (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1859), 275, for Charles's irregular election and coronation "sine consueta pompositate"; *Chronica Ludovici Imperatoris Quarti*, ed. Georg Leidinger in *Bayerische Chroniken des XIV. Jahrhunderts* (*MGH SsrG*, vol. 19, Hannover and Leipzig: Hahn, 1918), 137, claiming that while Charles was being acclaimed king at Bonn in 1346 the imperial banner fell into the Rhine and was lost.

[54] Thus the Strasbourg chronicler Twinger on Charles's return from imperial coronation in Rome, 1356, telling of how his queen was abducted into a brothel by the Pisans and how the imperial couple had to flee an angry mob in Siena through a window dressed only in their nightshirts: *Chronik des Jacob Twinger* ed. Hegel, 482; for Charles's hasty post-coronation retreat from Italy ("pauca de re publica imperii ibidem disponens"), *Die Kölner Weltchronik*, ed. Sprandel, 98-9.

[55] For a hostile view from Augsburg, see *Chronik von 1368 bis 1406 mit Fortsetzung bis 1447*, ed. F. Frensdorff (CdtS, vol. 4, Leipzig: Hirzel, 1865), 42. On Charles's taxation generally, see Moraw, *Von offener Verfassung*, 252-3; on visual symbolism in imperial towns, *Reichszeichen: Darstellungen und Symbole des Reiches in Reichsstädten*, ed. Helge Wittmann (Petersberg: Imhof, 2015); Daniela Kah, *Die wahrhaft königliche Stadt: Das Reich in den Reichsstädten Augsburg, Nürnberg und Lübeck im späten Mittelalter* (Leiden: Brill, 2018).

[56] Thus *Heinrich Dapifer de Diessenhoven 1316-1361*, in *Fontes rerum Germanicarum: Geschichtsquellen Deutschlands*, vol. 4, ed. A. Huber (Stuttgart: Cotta, 1868), 116; and see *Die Chronik des Mathias von Neuenburg*, ed. Adolf Hofmeister, *MGH SsrG*, NS, vol. 4 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1924-40), 442, for the claim that Charles "Pragam magnificavit in duplo."

[57] *Die Chronik des Mathias von Neuenburg*, ed. Hofmeister, 444, 456-7, (for Charles's avidity for relics) 470; *Chronik des Jacob Twinger*, ed. Hegel, 491; *Annales Matseenses*, ed. W. Wattenbach in *MGH Scriptores*, vol. 9 (Hannover: Hahn, 1851), 836, alleging that Charles transferred imperial lands to the Bohemian crown, "minorando regnum Romanorum, augmentando Bohemiam."

[58] For Charles and the nobility, see Seibt, "Die Zeit der Luxemburger." 397-9.

[59] *Jahrbücher des zittauischen Stadtschreibers Johannes von Guben*, ed. Ernst Friedrich Haupt (Scriptores rerum Lusaticarum, vol. 1, Görlitz: Heinze, 1837), 16.

[60] For the role of everyday, often-unnoticed, images and symbols in nurturing common identity in modern societies, see Michael Billig, *Banal Nationalism* (London:Sage, 1995).

[61] *Jahrbücher*, ed. Haupt, 23: "...wen wir habin leyder eynen swerren herren ... ."

[62] Ibid., 18.

[63] Ibid., 3-4, 52.

[64] For what follows, see generally: Siegfried Grotefend, *Die Erwerbungspolitik Kaiser Karls IV.: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur politischen Geographie des deutschen Reiches im 14. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: Eberling, 1909), 21-54; Karl Wild, "Baiern und Böhmen: Beiträge zur Geschichte ihrer Beziehungen im Mittelalter," *Verhandlungen des Historischen Vereins von Oberpfalz und Regensburg* 88 (1938), 3-166 (here 90-128); Erwin Herrmann, "Karl IV. und Nordostbayern," *Verhandlungen des Historischen Vereins für Oberpfalz und Regensburg* 118 (1978), 173-87; Heribert Sturm, "Des Kaisers Land in Bayern," in *Kaiser Karl IV.*, ed. Seibt, 208-12; Seibt, *Karl IV.*, 276-9; Alois Schmid, "Städte und Märkte in der Oberpfalz: Grundzüge ihrer Entwicklung im späten Mittelalter und in der beginnenden Neuzeit," in *Städtelandschaften in Altbayern, Franken und Schwaben: Studien zum Phänomen der Kleinstädte während des Spätmittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Helmut Flachenecker and Rolf Kießling (Munich: Beck, 1999), 113-51; Jiří Fajt, "Die Oberpfalz – ein neues Land

jenseits des Böhmischen Waldes," in *Karl IV. Kaiser von Gottes Gnaden*, ed. Fajt, 327-35; Bernhard Fuchs, *Die Städte und Märkte der nördlichen Oberpfalz unter Kaiser Karl IV.* (Regensburg: vulpes, 2012); Maria Rita Sagstetter, 'Sulzbach im "neuböhmischen" Territorium Kaiser Karls IV.', in *Eisenerz und Morgenglanz*, ed. Stadt Sulzbach-Rosenberg, 1.61-82.

[65] Details in Grotefend, *Die Erwerbungspolitik*, 21-54. The Bohemian Beneš Krabice summarized the extent of Charles's acquisitions, as reaching "a silva Boemicali usque ad muros civitatis Nuremberg, Pebenberg [i.e., Bamberg]": *Kronika Beneše z Weitmile*, ed. Josef Emler, in *Fontes Rerum Bohemicarum*, vol. 4 (Prague: Nákl. Musea Království českého, 1884), 517.

[66] *MGH Constitutiones*, vol. 11 ed. Fritz, 208-18, no. 390. On the canon-law concept of incorporation, see Hedwig Sanmann-von Bülow, *Die Inkorporationen Karls IV. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Staatseinheitsgedankens im späteren Mittelalter* (Marburg: Elwert, 1942).

[67] See Schneider, "Karls IV. Auffassung," 128; Lenka Bobková, "Bayern und die Oberpfalz in der Politik Karls IV.," in *Bayern und Böhmen: Kontakt, Konflikt, Kultur*, ed. Robert Luft and Ludwig Eiber (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2007), 35-57 (here 40-1).

[68] *Archivum coronae regni Bohemiae*, ed. Venceslaus Hrubý, vol. 2 (Prague: Sumptibus Ministerii Scholarum et Instructiones Publicae, 1928), 368-9, no 298.

[69] Seibt, *Karl IV.*, 279-85.

[70] Fuchs, *Die Städte*, esp. 22, 25-6; for the region's place within Charles's broader schemes for trade networks, Herrmann, "Karl IV. und Nordostbayern," 173-5.

[71] For a statistical overview of the development of towns and markets in the region, see Schmid, "Städte und Märkte," 117; for Charles's interventions to stimulate trade, Fuchs, *Die Städte*, esp. 48-50.

[72] For Charles's role in developing communications routes between Bohemia and Bavaria in the region to the south of the Upper Palatinate, see Franz-Reiner Erkens, "Karl IV. Ein Kaiser in Europa und der Weg durch den Wald," *Passauer Jahrbuch* 59 (2017), 89-108 (esp. 99-101).

[73] *Maiestas Carolina: Der Kodifikationsentwurf Karls IV. für das Königreich Böhmen von 1355*, ed. Bernd-Ulrich Hergemöller (Veröffentlichungen des Collegium Carolinum 74, Munich: Oldenbourg, 1995), 50, cap. vii.

[74] Details in *Das 'Böhmische Salbüchlein' Kaiser Karls IV. über die nördliche Oberpfalz 1366/68*, ed. Fritz Schnelbögl (Veröffentlichungen des Collegium Carolinum 27, Munich and Vienna: Oldenbourg, 1973). The Bohemian chronicler Beneš Krabice emphasized the strong fortifications that Charles constructed at the settlements he acquired, "que fecit cingi muris fortissimis": *Kronika Beneše z Weitmile*, ed. Emler, 517.

[75] Sagstetter, "Sulzbach," 71; Herrmann, "Karl IV. und Nordostbayern," 179-80; *Das 'Böhmische Salbüchlein'*, ed. Schnelbögl, 28-35.

[76] For local offices and servants, see Fuchs, *Die Städte*, 52-3; Richard Klier, "Tschechische Dienstmannen auf den Burgen der Luxemburger in Neuböhmen?," *Mitteilungen der Altnürnberger Landschaft* 12, no. 1/2 (1963), 1-14; Hellmut Kunstmann, *Die Burgen der östlichen Fränkischen Schweiz* (Würzburg: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1965), 379-91; Herrmann, "Karl IV. und Nordostbayern," 179-81. In 1365 Pope Urban V granted, at Charles IV's request, permission for priests in Rothenberg, Sulzbach, and Neustadt to hear confession in Czech. Some Czech-speakers undoubtedly settled in Bavaria, particularly as members of the households of Bohemian royal officials (who were themselves probably mostly bilingual), though firm evidence of their presence is limited, while Klier's prosopographical study of Charles's castellans found a predominance of local men.

[77] *Das 'Böhmische Salbüchlein'* ed. Schnelbögl; and see generally the catalogue entry by Franz Machilek in *Kaiser Karl IV. 1316-2016: Erste Bayerisch-Tschechische Landesausstellung: Ausstellungskatalog*, ed. Jiří Fajt and Markus Hörsch (Prague: Národní galerie v Praze, 2016), 472.

[78] For contrasting sums owed by different communities, see Fuchs, *Die Städte*, 54, 61-2, 84.

[79] For the region as a sphere of particularly intensive Caroline image politics, Bobková, "Corona regni Bohemiae," 127; Fajt, "Die Oberpfalz," 329. Němec, "Machtinszenierung," 475, writes of Charles's "future-oriented representation-strategy" in the region. See also Josef Staber, "Die Oberpfalz und Niederbayern im Kulturprogramm Kaiser Karls IV.," *Verhandlungen des Historischen Vereins für Oberpfalz und Regensburg* 109 (1969), 51-62.

[80] On Lauf, see generally: Fritz Schnelbögl, "Die 'Pfalz' Lauf," *Jahrbuch für fränkische Landesforschung* 19 (1959), 389-93; Wilhelm Kraft and Wilhelm Schwemmer, *Kaiser Karls IV. Burg und Wappensaal zu Lauf* (Nuremberg: Spindler, 1960); Němec, "Herrscher—Kunst—Metapher" (esp. 399-400, stressing Charles's agency and the castle's contribution to his "master-plan"); Richard Němec, *Architektur—Herrschaft—Land: Die Residenzen Karls IV. in Prag und den Ländern der Böhmischen Krone* (Petersberg: Michael Imhof, 2015), 87-147.

[81] Němec, "Herrscher—Kunst—Metapher," 378-9; for details of the armorial programme, Kraft and Schwemmer, *Lauf*, 44-92.

[82] Fajt, "Die Oberpfalz," 332; Bobková, "Corona regni Bohemiae," 127. The imperfect fit between statue and niche suggests that the figure was not made for its present location. That Wenceslas's shield here repeatedly bears the Bohemian lion, rather than his more common device of a black eagle on white, may reflect a desire to mark this frontier-point with the most unambiguous possible signs of Bohemian lordship: Němec, *Architektur—Herrschaft—Land*, 136.

[83] Němec, "Herrscher—Kunst—Metapher," 389-90; Němec, "Machtinszenierung," 473.

[84] Vladimír Růžek, "Neue Erkenntnisse zum Laufer Wappensaal: Bemerkungen zur Steinmetzhütte, Datierung und zum Wappenprogramm," in *Burg Lauf a.d. Pegnitz: Ein Bauwerk Kaiser Karls IV.*, ed. G. Ulrich Großmann (Nuremberg: Wartburg Gesellschaft zur Erforschung von Burgen und Schlösser e.V., 2006), 71-9 (here 74). A Prague connection has also been claimed for sculpture in the parish church of St John the Baptist in the settlement there, which was raised to a town in the 1350s: Fajt, "Die Oberpfalz," 332.

[85] Although broad comparisons can be drawn with the painted genealogies and galleries of rulers known to have been displayed in the Caroline palaces in Prague, Karlstein, and Tangermünde: Fajt, "Die Oberpfalz," 331. For theories about the armorial chamber's function, see: Barbara Schock-Werner, "Die Burg Karls IV. in Lauf als Mittelpunkt eines geplanten neuen Landes," in *Burg Lauf a.d. Pegnitz*, ed. Großmann, 19-24 (here esp. 19-21); Němec, *Architektur—Herrschaft—Land*, 140-6.

[86] What is known about Charles's stays at Lauf is summarized in Lenka Bobková, "Die Oberpfalz und die Burg Lauf in den territorial-dynastischen Plänen Karls IV.," in *Burg Lauf a.d. Pegnitz*, ed. Großmann, 25-34 (here 32-3).

[87] Schnelbögl, "Die 'Pfalz' Lauf," 392; Daniel Burger and Michael Rykl, "Die Raumordnung der Burg Karls IV. in Lauf," in *Burg Lauf a.d. Pegnitz*, ed. Großmann, 35-66 (here 63).

[88] Růžek, "Neue Erkenntnisse," 78, who sees a particular stimulus to the armorial programme in the gathering of leading figures from the Empire in nearby Nuremberg for the baptism of Charles's heir Wenceslas in April 1361; Němec, "Kulturlandschaft und 'Staatsidee'", 96.

[89] *MGH Constitutiones*, vol. 11, ed. Fritz, 209, no. 390.

[90] For what follows, see Richard Němec, "Die Burg- und Kosteranlage Oybin," *Burgen und Schlösser* 44, no. 4 (2003), 241-51.

[91] *Jahrbücher*, ed. Haupt, 18.

[92] The difficulties are made clear by Němec, "Die Burg- und Kosteranlage," despite his description of Oybin (247) as "karolinische Propaganda."

[93] Bobková, "Corona regni Bohemiae," 129; Wetter, "Die Lausitz," 342.

[94] The phrase is that of Fajt, "Die Oberpfalz," 335. Other royal sites also raise conundra: for uncertainties about the role and importance of the palace at Tangermünde under Charles, see Richard Němec, "Machtinszenierung Karls IV. Profane Architektur in den Ländern der Corona regni Bohemiae: Böhmen 1333—Obere Pfalz 1353—Mark Brandenburg 1373," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 74, no. 4 (2011), 449-88 (here 476-7).

[95] See Knut Görich, "BarbarossaBilder – Befunde und Probleme," in *Barbarossabilder: Entstehungskontexte, Erwartungshorizonte, Verwendungszusammenhänge*, ed. Knut Görich and Romedio Schmitz-Esser (Regensburg: Schnell & Steiner, 2014), 9-29.

[96] For patronage links between court and urban patriciate in Nuremberg, see Jiří Fajt, "Was ist karolinisch an der Hofkunst Karls IV.?," in *Die Goldene Bulle*, ed. Hohensee, Lawo, Lindner, Menzel, and Rader, 1.349-68 (here 362-4); for Prague, and for the lesser Caroline centre of Luckau in Lower Lusatia, Bauch, *Divina favente clementia*, 354, 414-15.

[97] Hartmut Scholz, *Die mittelalterlichen Glasmalereien in Mittelfranken und Nürnberg extra muros* (Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevi: Deutschland, vol. 10.i, Berlin: Deutscher Verlag für Kunstwissenschaft, 2002), 217-40; Fajt, "Charles IV," 6; Fajt, "Die Oberpfalz," 328, 333; *Karl IV. Kaiser von Gottes Gnaden*, ed. Fajt 336-9, cat. no. 118, with essay by Hartmut Scholz.

[98] *Regesta Imperii* records only one Caroline diploma which names Hersbruck as its place of issue, perhaps during a brief pause in Charles's travels: *Die Regesten des Kaiserreiches unter Kaiser Karl IV. (1346-1378)*, ed. Alfons Huber (Regesta Imperii, vol. 8, Innsbruck: Wagner, 1877) [henceforth *RI*], 216, no. 2648 (10 May 1357).

[99] It might be noted that the burghers enjoyed rights of self-government and low justice, though the town was subject to a Bohemian local agent (*voit*): Fuchs, *Die Städte*, 25; *Das 'Böhmische Salbüchlein'* ed. Schnelbögl, 32.

[100] Fuchs, *Die Städte*, 76-7. The precise date of Hersbruck's elevation to a town is unknown, but it probably occurred in the period 1359-64: Scholz, *Die mittelalterlichen Glasmalereien*, 218; also Bobková, "Corona regni Bohemiae," 129.

[101] Hartmut Scholz, "Prag oder Nürnberg? Die Luxemburger Fensterstiftungen in Nürnberg und Franken und die Frage ihrer künstlerischen Verortung," in *Kunst als Herrschaftsinstrument*, ed. Fajt and Langer, 221-33.

[102] Ibid., 221. Burgher co-patronage: Bauch, *Divina favente clemencia*, 397-8.

[103] Sturm, "Des Kaisers Land," 209; Bobková, "Die Oberpfalz und die Burg Lauf" 26.

[104] *Kaiser Karl IV.*, ed. Fajt and Hörsch, 587, cat. no. 16.3.

[105] For the remarkable number of foundations named from Charles, especially in Bohemia, see Ellen Widder, "Mons imperialis, Baldenau, Karlstein: Bemerkungen zur Namengabung luxemburgischer Gründungen," in *Studia Luxemburgensia: Festschrift Heinz Stoob zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Friedrich Bernhard Fahlbusch and Peter Johanek (Warendorf: Fahlbusch, 1989), 233-84.

[106] Ibid., 258-60, arguing that Charles himself deliberately pursued a different approach to naming in his Bavarian lands.

[107] See Marco Bogade, "Kulturtransfer im späten Mittelalter—Die böhmischen Landespatrone Wenzel, Sigismund und Ludmilla und ihre Bildtradition in Süddeutschland," in *Ztracená Blízkost: Praha – Norimberk v Proměnách Staletí*, ed. Olga Fejtová, Václav Ledvinka, and Jiří Pešek (Prague: Scriptorium, 2010), 85-121.

[108] Bobková, "Corona regni Bohemiae," 130; Fajt, "Die Oberpfalz," 330 n. 13.

[109] Sagstetter, "Sulzbach," 67-8.

[110] For the Sulzbach hospital sculpture, see Bogade, "Kulturtransfer," 94. The surviving figure dates from the fifteenth century, but may well have had a predecessor. Its presence above the church portal was noted in the late eighteenth century in [Thomas Leinberger], *Die Beherrscher der Stadt Sulzbach durch achthundert Jahre, vorgestellt an dem Jubeltage des durchlauchtigsten Kurfuersten von Pfalz und Bayern Karl Philipp Theodors funfzig Jahre regierenden Herzogens von Sulzbach (Den 20sten Julius im Jahr 1783)* (Sulzbach: no publisher, 1783), 34. For the St-Wenceslas bridge, see Gerd Zimmermann, "Die Verehrung der böhmischen Heiligen im mittelalterlichen Bistum Bamberg," *Bericht des Historischen Vereins für die Pflege der Geschichte des ehemaligen Fürstbistums Bamberg* 100 (1964), 211-39 (here 232). For coins, Bobková, "Die Oberpfalz und die Burg Lauf," 33; Ernst G. Deuerlein, "Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der 'neuböhmischen' Münzstätte zu Auerbach," *Mitteilungen der Altnürnberger Landschaft* 13, no. 1/2 (1964), 26-32.

[111] Reinhard Schneider, "Karolus qui et Wenceslaus," in *Festschrift für Helmut Beumann*, ed. Karl-Ulrich Jäschke and Reinhard Wenskus (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1977), 365-87 (here esp. 382-3).

[112] Bogade, "Kulturtransfer," 88. The term was coined by Franz Machilek: see his "Privatfrömmigkeit und Staatsfrömmigkeit," in *Kaiser Karl IV.*, ed. Seibt, 87-101.

[113] See Gábor Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses: Dynastic Cults in Medieval Central Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); and for sainthood and identity-formation more generally, *Patriotische Heilige: Beiträge zur Konstruktion religiöser und politischer Identitäten in der Vormoderne*, ed. Dieter R. Bauer, Klaus Herbers, and Gabriela Signori (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 2007).

[114] František Graus, *Lebendige Vergangenheit: Überlieferung im Mittelalter und in den Vorstellungen vom Mittelalter* (Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau, 1975), 160-76; Lisa Wolverton, *Hastening Toward Prague: Power and Society in the Medieval Czech Lands* (Philadelphia:

University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), ch. 5; and for St Wenceslas as Bohemia's military helper, František Graus, "Der Heilige als Schlachtenhelfer: Zur Nationalisierung einer Wundererzählung in der mittelalterlichen Chronistik," in *Festschrift für Helmut Beumann*, ed. Jäschke and Wenskus 330-48 (here 341-48). Wenceslas's cult in Bohemia is viewed in broad historical perspective in *Wenzel: Protagonist der böhmischen Erinnerungskultur*, ed. Stefan Samerski (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2018).

[115] See Rainer Christoph Schwinges, "'Primäre' und 'sekundäre' Nation: Nationalbewußtsein und sozialer Wandel im mittelalterlichen Böhmen," in *Europa slavica—Europa orientalis: Festschrift für Herbert Ludat zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Klaus-Detlev Grothusen and Klaus Zernack (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1980), 490-532 (here esp. 519-20).

[116] The chronicler Francis of Prague recounts under the year 1338 the story of a German craftsman struck dumb for mocking St Wenceslas as a "rustic." Francis adds that, on account of this miracle, "Deinceps Theutonici patronum nostrum in maiori reverencia habuerunt": *Chronicon Francisci Pragensis*, ed. Jana Zachová (Fontes rerum Bohemicarum, Series nova, vol. 1, Prague: Nadace Patriae, 1997), 168.

[117] Zimmermann, "Die Verehrung," esp. 219; Bogade, "Kulturtransfer," 89. Other Bohemian saints, notably Sigismund, whose cult Charles IV promoted, also enjoyed some local veneration in Franconia: Zimmermann, "Die Verehrung," 226; Franz Machilek, "Sigismund," in *Die Landespatrone der böhmischen Länder: Geschichte – Verehrung – Gegenwart*, ed. Stefan Samerski (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2009), 223-30 (here 229-30)—though there seems to be no evidence for Machilek's claim that Charles IV donated a Sigismund-relic to Sulzbach.

[118] František Graus, "Böhmen zwischen Bayern und Sachsen: Zur böhmischen Kirchengeschichte des 10. Jahrhunderts," *Historica* 17 (1969), 5-42 (here esp. 22-4).

[119] Bogade, "Kulturtransfer," 95-9; Fajt and Hörsch, "Karl IV. und das Heilige Römische Reich," 65-7. For the close ties between south-east German and Bohemian monastic houses, see Karl Richter, "Die böhmischen Länder im Früh- und Hochmittelalter," in *Handbuch der Geschichte der böhmischen Länder*, ed. Bosl, 163-347 (here 293-300); Peter Moraw, "Das Mittelalter," in *Böhmen und Mähren*, ed. Friedrich Prinz (Deutsche Geschichte im Osten Europas, Berlin: Siedler, 1993), 24-178 (here 102-9). The archbishop of Prague exercised a perpetual legateship, renewed in 1365, over the bishoprics of Bamberg and Regensburg: Zimmermann, "Die Verehrung," 211.

[120] Specifically, there appears to be no evidence of conflicts between members of the Czech entourages of Bohemian officials and local populations.

[121] *Jana Husi Korespondence a Dokumenty*, ed. Václav M. Novotny (Prague: Nákl. komise pro vydávání pramenů náboženského hnutí českého, 1920), 212-14, no. 93 (Nuremberg, 24 October 1414); Bernhard M. Baron, "Der Zug des Magisters Jan Hus 1414 durch die Obere Pfalz," *Oberpfälzer Heimat* 37 (1993), 75-80.

[122] Seibt, *Karl IV.*, 279. Since this relies on surviving documents issued in Charles's name, the total amount of time that he spent there is likely to have been considerably greater.

[123] *RI*, 154, no. 1928, 179, no. 2207; Franz Martin Pelzel, *Kaiser Karl der Vierte, König in Böhmen*, vol. 1 (Prague: Hagen, 1780), 400.

[124] It was there that on 1 August 1354 Charles reached a final reconciliation with Ludwig of Brandenburg and his Wittelsbach kinsmen: *RI*, 151-2, nos. 1899-1907.

[125] See Sagstetter, "Sulzbach," 63-7; Fuchs, *Die Städte*, 70-2; Max Piendl, *Herzogtum Sulzbach, Landrichteramt Sulzbach* (Historischer Atlas von Bayern, Teil Altbayern, vol. 10, Munich: Kommission für Bayerische Landesgeschichte, 1957), 72.

[126] Sagstetter, "Sulzbach," 74.

[127] Sagstetter, "Sulzbach," 69; Bauch, *Divina favente clemencia*, 419-20. Charles's supplications may also have resulted in grants of indulgences for chapels in the town.

[128] Fuchs, "Die Kirchen von Sulzbach-Rosenberg," 777, 780-1; Bauch, *Divina favente clemencia*, 420; Fajt, "Die Oberpfalz," 331; Petr Chotébor, "Kostel Panny Marie v Sulzbachu v souvislostech karlovského uměni," *Uměni* 51, no. 6 (2003), 506-9. Evidence of stylistic and workshop connections to both Prague and Nuremberg has been discerned in the new fabric.

[129] *Nordgauchronik von Johannes Braun Pastor und Superintendent zu Bayreuth, Anno 1648,* ed. Alfred Eckert (Amberg: Oberpfalz, 1993), 107; Sagstetter, "Sulzbach," 69-70.

[130] An interpretation revisited by Fritz Metz, "Karl IV. oder der hl. Wenzel," *Die Oberpfalz* 53, no. 6 (1965), 132-4.

[131] For what follows, see Fritz Schnelbögl, "Kaiser Karl IV. oder der hl. Wenzel?," *Oberpfälzer Heimat* 6 (1963), 33-8.

[132] For St-Wenceslas iconography, see Jan Royt, "Ikonografie Svatého Václava ve středověku," in *Svatý Václav: na památku 1100. výročí narození knížete Václava Svatého*, ed. Petr Kubín (Prague: Univerzita Karlova z Praze, 2010), 301-24; Otto Kletzl, "Typen der Wenzelsdarstellung," *Slavische Rundschau* 2, no. 8 (1930), 496-507. The sword which the Sulzbach figure currently bears dates from a modern repair, though a sword may already have been substituted for Wenceslas's lance in a seventeenth-century restoration: *Die Kunstdenkmäler von Oberpfalz und Regensburg*, vol. 19*: Sulzbach*, ed. Georg Hager and Georg Lill (Die Kunstdenkmäler des Königreichs Bayern, Munich: Oldenbourg, 1910), 89. For rose-motifs to designate martyrs in fourteenth-century German figure-sculpture, see Hans-Joachim Jacobs, "Das Bild Karls des Großen in der Stadt Frankfurt im 14. Jahrhundert," in *Karl der Große als vielberufener Vorfahr: Sein Bild in der Kunst der Fürsten, Kirchen und Städte*, ed. Lieselotte E. Saurma-Jeltsch (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1994), 63-86 (here 83 with n. 80).

[133] Schock-Werner, "Die Burg Karls IV.," 22; Fajt, "Die Oberpfalz," 332; *Die Kunstdenkmäler*, ed. Hager and Lill, 89, for affinities with the figures on Nuremberg's market-fountain, the *Schöne Brunnen*, datable to the 1380s/90s. Günther Bräutigam, "Gmünd—Prag—Nürnberg: Die Nürnberger Frauenkirche und der Prager Parlerstil vor 1360," *Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen* 3 (1961), 38-76 (here 72), dates the Sulzbach figure to c. 1380, pointing to the later style of armor in comparison to Prague (St Vitus) and Nuremberg (*Frauenkirche*) Wenceslas-figures, both probably of two decades earlier. The late date and a Nuremberg origin are supported in the catalogue-entry by Heinz Stafski, in *Die Parler und der schöne Stil 1350-1400: Europäische Kunst unter den Luxemburgern*, ed. Anton Legner, 3 vols. (Cologne: Museen der Stadt Köln, 1978), 1.364.

[134] Fajt, "Die Oberpfalz," 330 n. 13.

[135] The seventeenth-century chronicler Johannes Braun noted specifically that the statue faced the market and *Rathaus*: *Nordgauchronik*, ed. Eckert, 107.

[136] Fajt, "Die Oberpfalz," 330.

[137] *Nordgauchronik*, ed. Eckert, 107 (though an origin in Charles's initiative is nevertheless assumed by Bobková, "Die Oberpfalz und die Burg Lauf," 28). The same chronicler also claims that the Wenceslas-statue at Sulzbach's hospital-church was a local commission, in gratitude for Charles's favor towards the town: *Nordgauchronik*, ed. Eckert, 105.

[138] Jana Gajdošová, "The Charles Bridge: ceremony and propaganda in medieval Prague" (PhD diss., Birkbeck College, University of London, 2015), 40, 137, 142.

[139] Michael Viktor Schwarz, "Wenzel in der Welt," in *Kunst als Herrschaftsinstrument*, ed. Fajt and Langer, 184-91 (here 187); but see also Ivo Hlobil, "Die Wenzelsstatue mit Peter Parlers Zeichen im Veitsdom," *Uměni* 47, no. 5 (1999), 385-8. Jana Gajdošová has proposed that the statue may originally have been located near the Old Town Bridge Tower – another location in outdoor, public space: Gajdošová, "The Charles Bridge," 143-5. For the

Wenceslas chapel and its decoration, see generally Lucy Ormrod, "The Wenceslas chapel in St Vitus' cathedral, Prague: the marriage of imperial iconography and Bohemian kingship" (PhD diss., Courtauld Institute of Art, University of London, 1997).

[140] Marie Bláhová, "Die Kult des heiligen Wenzel in der Ideologie Karls IV.," in *Fonctions sociales et politiques du culte des saints dans les sociétés des rites grec et latin au Moyen Âge et à l'époque modern: Approche comparative*, ed. Marek Derwich and Michel Dmitriev (Wrócław: Larhcor, 1999), 227-36 (here 228, 232).

[141] It has been argued, based on evidence from Prague, that support for Wenceslas's cult was waning around the time that the statue was made: David C. Mengel, "A holy and faithful fellowship: royal saints in fourteenth-century Prague," in *Evropa a Čechy na konci středověku: Sborník přípěvků věnovaných Františku Šmahelovi*, ed. Eva Doležalová, Robert Novotný, and Pavel Soukup (Prague: Filosofia, 2004), 145-58 (esp. 156-7); Bauch, *Divina favente clementia*, 293-4. That he nevertheless retained his salience in Sulzbach seems to underline the importance of local and constitutional considerations.

[142] It would not be the only instance of the visual assimilation of monarch to saint: the seated figure of Charles on the Old Town Bridge Tower in Prague (1370s), for example, incorporates iconographic motifs for representing St Wenceslas: Rosario, *Art and Propaganda*, 78, 80. Another suggestive parallel is with the sculpture of Charlemagne on Frankfurt am Main's Galgentor (1365), which it has been suggested evoked both St Wenceslas and Charles IV: Jacobs, "Das Bild Karls des Großen," 84; Lieselotte E. Saurma-Jeltsch, "Karl der Große im Spätmittelalter: zum Wandel einer politischen Ikone," *Zeitschrift des Aachener Geschichtsvereins* 104/105 (2003), 421-61 (here 430-5).

[143] See Hans Peter Hilger, "Die Skulpturen an der südlichen Querhausfassade von St. Marien zu Mühlhausen in Thüringen," *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch* 22 (1960), 159-64; Christa Richter, *Die Thomas-Müntzer-Gedenkstätte Marienkirche zu Mühlhausen* (Mühlhausen

Thomas-Müntzer-Stadt: Zentrale Gedenkstätte "Deutscher Bauernkrieg," 1990); Hartmut

Boockmann, "Der Deutsche Orden in Mühlhausen," *Sachsen und Anhalt* 21 (1998), 9-35;

Andreas Puth "'Christus Dominus de hoc Seculo': Charles IV, Advent and Epiphany on the

south transept façade of St Mary's in Mühlhausen," in *Kunst als Herrschaftsinstrument*, ed.

Fajt and Langer, 515-33; Peter Bühner, "Das südliche Querhausportal der Marienkirche – ein

monumentales Gerichtsportal?," *Mühlhauser Beiträge* 26 (2003), 134-9; and the essays by

Peter Findeisen and Ernst Ullmann in *Die Parler*, ed. Legner, 2.560-1.

[144] Richter, *Marienkirche*, 18 n. 19; Boockmann, "Der Deutsche Orden," 28 with n. 84. The

evidence is from the early eighteenth century.

[145] Boockmann, "Der Deutsche Orden," 30-1.

[146] The burghers of Donauwörth, for example, placed an image of Charles's son Sigismund

(r. 1410/11-1437) on their fortifications in gratitude for his aid to the town against the duke of

Bavaria: Olaf B. Rader, "Zwischen Friedberg und Eco: Die Interpretation von

Urkundentexten Karls IV. oder Vom Gang durch die Säle der Erkenntnis," in *Kaiser, Reich

und Region*, ed. Lindner, Müller-Mertens, and Rader, 245-93 (here 269-70).

[147] Lieselotte E. Saurma-Jeltsch, "Zeichen des Reiches im 14. und 15. Jahrhundert," in

*Heiliges Römisches Reich Deutscher Nation 962 bis 1806: Von Otto dem Grossen bis zum

Ausgang des Mittelalters: Essays*, ed. Matthias Puhle and Claus-Peter Hasse (Dresden:

Sandstein, 2006), 337-47 (here 342).

[148] See generally Lieselotte E. Saurma-Jeltsch, "Das mittelalterliche Reich in der

Reichsstadt," in *Heilig—Römisch—Deutsch: Das Reich im mittelalterlichen Europa*, ed.

Bernd Schneidmüller and Stefan Weinfurter (Dresden: Sandstein, 2006), 399-439; Thomas

H. von der Dunk, *Das Deutsche Denkmal: Eine Geschichte in Bronze und Stein vom

Hochmittelalter bis zum Barock* (Cologne, Weimar, and Vienna: Böhlau, 1999), esp. 45-50.

In Frankfurt an der Oder in the Mark Brandenburg, the portal of the *Marienkirche* (a royal

project), with imperial, Bohemian, and Brandenburg armorials, faced the *Rathaus*: Bobková, "Corona regni Bohemiae," 129-30.

[149] James Masschaele, "The public space of the marketplace in medieval England," *Speculum* 77, no. 2 (2002), 383-421 (here 399).

[150] This seems to have been the late-medieval fate of the equestrian statue, probably representing the emperor Otto I (r. 936-73), set up in the market place in Magdeburg by the town's archiepiscopal ruler in the thirteenth century, as witness to the imperial privileges by which he ruled: Ernst Schubert, "Der Magdeburger Reiter," *Magdeburger Museumshefte* 3 (1994), 5-42; Von der Dunk, *Das Deutsche Denkmal*, 57-60. On the negotiated character of medieval urban space more generally, see Martha C. Howell, "The spaces of late medieval urbanity," in *Shaping Urban Identity in Late Medieval Europe*, ed. Marc Boone and Peter Stabel (Leuven: Garant, 2000), 3-23 (here esp. 18-19).

[151] Winfried Trusen, "Rolandsäulen," in *Handwörterbuch zur deutschen Rechtsgeschichte*, ed. Adalbert Erler and Ekkehard Kaufmann, vol. 4 (Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1990), 1102-6.

[152] Fajt, "Die Oberpfalz," 330 with n. 18. Identification of one of the eagles with St Wenceslas is supported by the observation of Johannes Braun in 1648 that the Sulzbach Wenceslas-statue bore on its shield a (recently renovated) "black imperial eagle"—surely in origin, given its location, the saint's own (similar) device: *Nordgauchronik*, ed. Eckert, 107; Sagstetter, "Sulzbach," 70. For a different interpretation of the two house-façade eagles, Bobková, "Corona regni Bohemiae," 124 n. 23. A broadly comparable armorial programme was placed on Charles's likely accommodation in Breslau—which also faced the *Rathaus*: Romuald Kaczmarek, "Schlesien—die luxemburgische Erwerbung," in *Karl IV. Kaiser von Gottes Gnaden*, ed. Fajt, 308-25 (here 311-12).

[153] For the houses of leading burghers as places of stay for late-medieval emperors when travelling, see Gerrit Jasper Schenk, *Zeremoniell und Politik: Herrschereinzüge im*

spätmittelalterlichen Reich (Cologne, Weimar, Vienna: Böhlau, 2003), 381-2; for the

marking of Charles IV's accommodation (in Passau, 1348) with his (imperial) armorial,

Saurma-Jeltsch, "Zeichen," 342; for the practice more broadly, with numerous examples,

Detlev Kraack, *Monumentale Zeugnisse der spätmittelalterlichen Adelsreise: Inschriften und*

Graffiti des 14.-16. Jahrhunderts (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997).

[154] Excavations during the 1990s revealed that the *Schloß*, previously regarded as a largely

post-medieval structure, had already attained appropriately regal proportions in Charles IV's

day. References in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century documents to a *Kaiserstube* and a *Kaysser*

Garten there suggest the place of stay of an emperor—who can only be Charles: Elisabeth

Vogl, "Das Sulzbacher Schloß," in *Eisenerz und Morgenglanz*, ed. Stadt Sulzbach-

Rosenberg, 2.755-776 (here 759). That Charles ever stayed at the house "Zur Krone" appears

to have no evidential basis beyond local tradition, supported by the house's armorial

decorations, though Thomas Leinberger, *Die Beherrscher der Stadt Sulzbach*, 34, claimed

that it was his "vorzüglichste Herberge und der Absteigort." However, archaeological

evidence of fire damage at the *Schloß*, probably still under repair in the early 1350s, does

support the likelihood that his early stays in Sulzbach were in a town house: Vogl, "Das

Sulzbacher Schloß," 760-1.

[155] The earliest reference to the existence of a document obliging the householder to maintain

the armorials appears to be [Carl Christoph Adolph von Seidel], "Historische

Denkwürdigkeiten des ehemaligen Herzogthumes Sulzbach," *Wochenblatt der Stadt*

Sulzbach, September 25 1844, 313-15 (here 315); and see also Georg Christoph Gack,

Geschichte des Herzogthums Sulzbach (Leipzig: Weigel, 1847), 92. Commemorating the

monarch's stay by means of an ephemeral painted armorial was far more common practice:

for marking Charles's (and his son Wenceslas's) visit to the town of Rothenburg ob der

Tauber in this way, see Michail Bojcov, "Ephemerität und Permanenz bei Herrschereinzügen

im spätmittelalterlichen Deutschland," *Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft* 24 (1997), 87-107 (here 102 n. 14).

[156] Heribert Batzl, *Geschichte der Stadt Hirschau* (Kallmünz: Laßleben, 1968), 44-5; Reinhard H. Seitz, "Hirschau: Eine Stadtgründung Kaiser Karls IV. an der Goldenen Straße?," *Oberpfälzer Heimat* 16 (1972), 69-82.

[157] The possibly non-royal origin of some armorials is conceded by Bobková, "Corona regni Bohemiae," 129. Němec, "Herrscher—Kunst—Metapher," 395, nevertheless argues for a centrally-directed Caroline image-programme in Bavaria.

[158] Thus Fajt, "Die Oberpfalz," 329. For what follows: Sturm, "Des Kaisers Land," 210-11; Fuchs, *Die Städte*, 80-1; Aleš Zelenka, *Böhmische Stadtsiegel aus der Sammlung Erik Turnwald* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1988), 9.

[159] Sagstetter, "Sulzbach," 66-7. For the Bohemian armorial on seals from the crown lands, Bobková, "Corona regni Bohemiae," 130.

[160] Johann Baptist Fröhlich, "Der böhmische Löwe in Weiden und Neustadt," *Oberpfälzer Heimat* 11 (1967), 101-3 (here 102); Batzl, *Geschichte der Stadt Hirschau*, plates between 8 and 9 (seals from the sixteenth, eighteenth centuries).

[161] Fröhlich, "Der böhmische Löwe," 102. For other late local survivals, see ibid., 103.

[162] *Kaiser Karl IV.*, ed. Fajt and Hörsch, 592, cat. no. 16.8, with essay by Jana Knejfl. The glove appears to be too small for an adult to wear.

[163] Heinrich Ascherl, "Neustadt WN unter Karl IV.," *Oberpfälzer Heimat* 23 (1979), 65-72 (here 70); Fuchs, *Die Städte*, 70; Heribert Sturm, *Neustadt an der Waldnaab, Weiden, Gemeinschaftsamt Parkstein, Grafschaft Störnstein, Pflegeamt Floß (Flossenbürg)* (Historischer Atlas von Bayern, Teil Altbayern, vol. 47, Munich: Kommission für Bayerische Landesgeschichte, 1978), 117-35.

[164] Thus Neustadt an der Waldnaab, Stadtarchiv B13 Ratsprotokoll 1686-97. I am grateful to Ursula Wiechert for her guidance on this, and on the post-medieval fortunes of Charles's glove and Neustadt's woodcutting rights more generally. Around 140 householders (the so-called *Corporation*) retain these rights today; their annual mass remembers Charles IV. See also Rainer Christoph, "Kaiser Karl IV. und die Oberpfalz," *Oberpfälzer Heimatspiegel* 40 (2015), 64-71 (here 68); Ursula Wiechert, "Neustädter Handschuh kehrt heim," *Oberpfälzer Heimatspiegel* 42 (2017), 62-4.

[165] For this occasion, with evidence for its popularity, Bauch, *Divina favente clementia*, 365-80.