Chapter 7

Purposeful Pasts: Godfrey of Viterbo and Later Medieval Imperialist Thought

Len Scales

Fra Salimbene of Parma's recollection of the shock which came upon him on learning of the death of Emperor Frederick II has justly become famous:

> When I heard this, I was horrified and could scarcely believe it. For I was a Joachimite, and I fully believed and even hoped that Frederick would do even greater wicked deeds in the future than he had yet done, numerous as his past evils had already been.[1]

Only the fact that the news had come to him from the mouth of Pope Innocent IV himself compelled the Italian friar to accept its truth. But it was not only Salimbene's Joachimite vision of the course of history that was shaken by the extinction of Frederick, and of his offspring in the years that followed. The fall of the Hohenstaufen marked an inescapable caesura for many: for those contemporary and later medieval chroniclers who ended or began their narratives around the year 1250, no less than for the bookish patriots who several hundred years later would lay down their pens at the close of the *deutsche Kaiserzeit*.[2] But the perceived historical breach of the early to mid-thirteenth century, within the empire as well as in Latin Europe more broadly, has also withstood the sober scrutiny of modern scholarship – even if it can no longer be reduced to just one pivotal date or to the downfall of a single dynasty.

---

[1]   *Cronica Fratris Salimbene de Adam Ordinis Minorum*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, 32 (Hanover, 1905–13), 174. I follow here the translation in *The Chronicle of Salimbene de Adam*, ed. J.L. Baird, G. Baglivi and J.R. Kane (Binghampton, NY, 1986), 164.

[2]   See L. Scales, *The Shaping of German Identity: Authority and Crisis, 1245–1414* (Cambridge, 2012), 345–46. Martin of Troppau, whose popes-and-emperors chronicle was highly influential in the late Middle Ages, declared the empire to have been 'vacant' since the deposition or death of Frederick II, and still to be in a state of 'schism' as he wrote, c. 1270: *Martini Oppaviensis Chronicon Pontificum et Imperatorum*, ed. L. Weiland, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, 22 (Hanover, 1872), 472. Perhaps the most celebrated modern history of high-medieval emperorship from a German-patriotic perspective (although concluding already with the death of Barbarossa) is W. von Giesebrecht, *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit*, 6 vols (Leipzig, 1855–95), publication of which bracketed the establishment of the Wilhelmine *Reich*.

Modern scholarship has, indeed, traced a whole array of profound changes, affecting not least the mainly German-speaking core lands of the *Reich* north of the Alps at this time.[3] The empire's political structure came now to be conceptualized as a complex series of stratified, pyramidal relationships, defined in terms of feudal law.[4] The new constitutional model in its turn reflected and underpinned deep-rooted shifts in the distribution of power in the German lands. Increasingly, it was the princes who set the pace of change, consolidating and extending territorial patrimonies which in their government showed a capacity for development that the imperial monarchy itself could not match.[5] The growth of urban communities, their political self-assertion and the proliferating leagues and alliances through which this found expression were further elements in a picture now marked by luxuriating complexity and a predominance of regional and local powers.[6]

The choice of candidates for the imperial throne came increasingly to lie with a small group of northern princes, secular and ecclesiastical, whose collective privileges as an electoral college would, in the fourteenth century, receive definitive constitutional expression.[7] Dynastic succession to the empire was radically broken: between 1190 and 1493, son followed father on the throne just once. For much of the time the imperial title itself was in abeyance, particularly in the later thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, during the decades of rule by 'small kings', only one of whom was ever able to call himself emperor.[8] After Frederick II's imperial coronation in 1220, no emperor was created in Rome for

---

[3]   S. Weinfurter, 'Politischer Wandel und Wertewandel im frühen 13. Jahrhundert', in *Aufbruch in die Gotik: der Magdeburger Dom und die späte Stauferzeit*, vol. 1 (Essays), ed. M. Puhle (Mainz, 2009), 352–61; S. Weinfurter, 'Konkurrierende Herrschaftskonzepte und Ordnungsvorstellungen in den Stauferreichen nördlich und südlich der Alpen', in *Die Staufer und Italien: drei Innovationsregionen im mittelalterlichen Europa*, vol. 1 (Essays), ed. A. Wieczorek, B. Schneidmüller and S. Weinfurter (Darmstadt, 2010), 411–19.

[4]   H.K. Schulze, *Grundstrukturen der Verfassung im Mittelalter*, 2 vols (Stuttgart, 1985–86), vol. 1, 63–67.

[5]   E. Schubert, *Fürstliche Herrschaft und Territorium im späten Mittelalter* (Munich, 1996).

[6]   See M. Kaufhold, *Deutsches Interregnum und europäische Politik: Konfliktlösungen und Entscheidungsstrukturen 1230–1280* (Hanover, 2000); also cf. the chapter by T. Foerster in the present volume.

[7]   For the historiography of the emergence of the college of electors, see T. Ertl, 'Alte Thesen und neue Theorien zure Entstehung des Kurfürstenkollegiums', *Zeitschrift für historische Forschung*, 30 (2003), 619–42; for the fourteenth century, see *Die Goldene Bulle: Politik – Wahrnehmung – Rezeption*, 2 vols, ed. U. Hohensee, M. Lawo, M. Lindner et al. (Berlin, 2009).

[8]   Henry VII of Luxembourg (emperor 1312–13). For 'small' kings, see: P. Moraw, *Von offener Verfassung zu gestalteter Verdichtung: das Reich im späten Mittelalter 1250 bis 1490* (Berlin, 1985), 211–28; idem, 'Rudolf von Habsburg: Der "kleine" König im europäischen Vergleich', in *Rudolf von Habsburg 1273–1291: Eine Königsherrschaft zwischen Tradition und Wandel*, ed. E. Boshof and F.-R. Erkens (Cologne, Weimar and Vienna, 1993), 185–208.

nearly a century; and it was to be more than two centuries before a monarch was again crowned personally by a generally recognized pope.[9] But the imperial monarchy's standing in the world was not only shaken by changes within the empire itself. The same period was marked in Latin Europe by the consolidation of other monarchical realms, notably that of the empire's western neighbour, the kingdom of France, as well as by the claims of an increasingly monarchical papacy.[10] On the European stage too, therefore, political plurality attained a new visibility and a clearer voice, while the claims of universal *imperium* were now increasingly challenged, scrutinized, constrained and appropriated by others.[11]

Yet change was far from being the whole story. Most obviously, the imperial monarchy itself endured, albeit at times obscurely, and in the hands of a bewildering array of different bearers. The later medieval empire in some respects held firm to patterns already established during the central Middle Ages – not least, down to the mid-fourteenth century, through the continuation of periodic, highly disruptive, constitutional wrangles with the papacy.[12] There were even attempts artificially to prolong the Hohenstaufen dynasty itself, most spectacularly via the succession of imposters who appeared, particularly in parts of western and southern Germany, during the later thirteenth century, mainly in the guise of a returning Frederick II.[13] Yet, in spite of the obvious hazards of so doing, the empire's lawful rulers also sought in various ways to link themselves to their Hohenstaufen forebears, as well as to a broader tradition of illustrious past emperorship.[14]

The imperial idea itself lived on, receiving ever more grandiloquent formulation, even as the material powers of the monarch shrank.[15] Friedrich Heer

---

[9]   See B. Schneidmüller, *Die Kaiser des Mittelalters: Von Karl dem Großen bis Maximilian I.* (Munich, 2006), 73–117.

[10]   H.J. Mierau, *Kaiser und Papst im Mittelalter* (Cologne, Weimar and Vienna, 2010), 189–97.

[11]   See generally M. Wilks, *The Problem of Sovereignty in the Later Middle Ages: The Papal Monarchy with Augustinus Triumphus and the Publicists* (Cambridge, 1963); H.G. Walther, *Imperiales Königtum, Konziliarismus und Volkssouveränität* (Munich, 1976).

[12]   Mierau, *Kaiser und Papst*, 115–29.

[13]   H. Möhring, *Der Weltkaiser der Endzeit: Entstehung, Wandel und Wirkung einer tausendjährigen Weissagung* (Stuttgart, 2000); R.C. Schwinges, 'Verfassung und kollektives Verhalten: Zur Mentalität des Erfolges falscher Herrscher im Reich des 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts', in *Mentalitäten im Mittelalter*, ed. F. Graus (Sigmaringen, 1987), 177–202.

[14]   Rudolf of Habsburg thus famously chose to be interred alongside Philip of Swabia and other rulers of the high-medieval empire, in the imperial mausoleum at Speyer. His two immediate successors on the throne also ultimately found a resting place there. For the tradition, see C. Ehlers, *Metropolis Germaniae: Studien zur Bedeutung Speyers für das Königtum (751–1250)* (Göttingen, 1996).

[15]   For the late-medieval imperial tradition, see A. Fößel, 'Die deutsche Tradition vom Imperium im späten Mittelalter', in *Imperium/Empire/Reich: Ein Konzept politischer Herrschaft*

long ago emphasized the profound conservatism of late-medieval imperialist doctrine, particularly as articulated by German writers.[16] Historians of political thought have denounced this traditionalist vision of the Two Powers, pope and emperor, heading a universal Christian order as hopelessly anachronistic, incapable of adjusting to a changed world of many sovereign realms and political identities.[17] In examining here the appeal of the works of Godfrey of Viterbo to just such late-medieval imperialist writers, it will be important to consider, but also to be prepared to reassess, both the breaches and the ties that are commonly traced between the Hohenstaufen age and the centuries that followed.

To read Godfrey's histories alongside these later works is to be struck by the great gulf which appears to lie between them, and between their respective authors.[18] Although the precise nature and the closeness of Godfrey's relationship with the Hohenstaufen court are now the subject of considerable uncertainty, that he enjoyed at least a degree of proximity to the monarchy and its affairs remains beyond doubt.[19] Godfrey's status as an imperial chaplain

---

im deutsch-britischen Vergleich, ed. F. Bosbach and H. Hiery (Munich, 1999), 17–30.

[16] F. Heer, 'Zur Kontinuität des Reichsgedankens im Spätmittelalter', *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, 58 (1950), 336–50; A. Dempf, *Sacrum Imperium: Geschichts- und Staatsphilosophie des Mittelalters und der politischen Renaissance* (Munich, 1929).

[17] J.B. Morrall, *Political Thought in Medieval Times* (3rd edn, London, 1971), 95: they 'suffered from their inability to adduce satisfactorily rational arguments for their allocation of universal political supremacy to the German monarchy'; W. Ullmann, *A History of Political Thought: The Middle Ages* (Harmondsworth, 1965), 186: they were 'retrospective and introspective, and did not put forward constructive plans' (referring specifically to Alexander of Roes); Walther, *Imperiales Königtum*, 219: 'Die deutschen Theoretiker sahen das Kaisertum meist im Glanz vergangener Zeiten'.

[18] For short biographies of the principal treatise-writers mentioned below, see: M. Hamm, 'Alexander von Roes', in *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*, ed. K. Ruh (2nd edn, Berlin and New York, 1978–2008), vol. 1, cols 222–26; J. Leuschner, 'Dietrich von Nieheim', in ibid., vol. 2, cols 140–44; S. Krüger, 'Engelbert (Pötsch?) von Admont', in *Neue Deutsche Biographie* (Berlin, 1953–), vol. 4, 509–10; G. Steer, 'Konrad von Megenberg', in *Verfasserlexikon*, vol. 5, cols 221–36; K. Colberg, 'Lupold von Bebenburg', in ibid., vol. 5, cols 1071–78; eadem, 'Person, Gobelinus', in ibid., vol. 7, cols 411–16.

[19] For Godfrey and his works, see: F.-J. Schmale and W. Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter: Vom Tode Kaiser Heinrichs V. bis zum Ende des Interregnum*, vol. I* (Darmstadt, 1976), 77–92; G. Baaken, 'Zur Beurteilung Gottfrieds von Viterbo', in *Geschichtsschreibung und geistiges Leben im Mittelalter: Festschrift für Heinz Löwe zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. K. Hauck and H. Mordek (Cologne and Vienna, 1978), 373–96; O. Engels, 'Gottfried von Viterbo und seine Sicht des staufischen Kaiserhauses', in *Aus Archiven und Bibliotheken: Festschrift für Raymund Kottje zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. H. Mordek (Frankfurt am Main, 1992), 327–45; F. Hausmann, 'Gottfried von Viterbo: Kapellan und Notar, Magister, Geschichtsschreiber und Dichter', in *Friedrich Barbarossa: Handlungsspielräume und Wirkungsweisen des staufischen Kaisers*, ed. A. Haverkamp (Sigmaringen, 1992), 603–21; L.J.

and notary was, indeed, specifically remarked upon by the fourteenth-century treatise-writer Lupold of Bebenburg, whose debt to him, as will become clear, was considerable.[20] There is ample evidence – much but not all of it from his own writings – of Godfrey's presence, in the course of his imperial service, at some of the great events of his day.[21] None of the late-medieval champions of the empire who drew upon Godfrey's works appear to have been close to the imperial court.[22] Indeed, except for a brief period under Ludwig the Bavarian (r. 1314–47), whose conflict with the papacy attracted distinguished outsiders to his service, imperialist theoreticians are rarely to be found in the entourages of late-medieval kings and emperors.[23] A number of German writers on the empire came from regions lying, in Peter Moraw's celebrated schema, 'remote' from the king: several, for example, were natives of Westphalia, where late-medieval rulers virtually never came in person.[24] But the impression of detachment from the court goes beyond geography. Whereas Godfrey had sought to flatter the monarch, Dietrich of Niem, writing early in the fifteenth century, was scathing in his denunciations of contemporary and recent occupants of the imperial throne (though he would have endorsed Godfrey's praise of the Staufer).[25] Alexander

---

Weber, 'The Historical Importance of Godfrey of Viterbo', *Viator*, 25 (1994), 153–95; M.E. Dorninger, *Gottfried von Viterbo: Ein Autor in der Umgebung der frühen Staufer* (Stuttgart, 1997).

[20] Lupold of Bebenburg, *Tractatus de Iuribus Regni et Imperii Romanorum*, in *Politische Schriften Lupolds von Bebenburg*, ed. J. Miethke and C. Flüeler, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Staatsschriften des späteren Mittelalters*, 4 (Hanover, 2004), 245.

[21] See Dorninger, *Gottfried von Viterbo*, 30–59.

[22] Among the German treatise-writers, the closest was perhaps Lupold of Bebenburg, who, as a member of the circle of Archbishop Baldwin of Trier, was involved in the constitutional affairs of Ludwig the Bavarian's reign. His *Tractatus de Iuribus Regni et Imperii Romanorum* can be understood as a commentary on the 1338 Declaration of Rhens: J. Miethke, 'Practical Intentions of Scholasticism: The Example of Political Theory', in *Universities and Schooling in Medieval Society*, ed. W.J. Courtenay and J. Miethke (Leiden, 2000), 211–28, at 226–28.

[23] For Ludwig's court circle, see: D.E.H. De Boer, 'Ludwig the Bavarian and the Scholars', in *Centres of Learning: Learning and Location in Pre-Modern Europe and the Near East*, ed. J.W. Drijvers and A.A. MacDonald (Leiden, 1995); A. Schütz, 'Der Kampf Ludwigs des Bayern gegen Papst Johannes XXII. und die Rolle der Gelehrten am Münchner Hof', in *Wittelsbach und Bayern: Die Zeit der frühen Herzöge – von Otto I. zu Ludwig dem Bayern*, ed. H. Glaser (Munich, 1980), 388–97.

[24] Moraw, *Von offener Verfassung*, 175; H. Grundmann, 'Politische Gedanken mittelalterlicher Westfalen', *Westfalen*, 27 (1948), 5–20. It would be possible to dispense with the qualifier 'virtually', were it not for the element of irreducible uncertainty regarding the details of some monarchs' itineraries.

[25] For Charles IV, who 'wrecked the imperial chariot', and for the 'foolishness and idleness' of his son and successor Wenceslas (r. 1376–1400), see Dietrich of Niem, *Viridarium Imperatorum et Regum Romanorum*, ed. A. Lhotsky and K. Pivec, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Staatsschriften*

of Roes, Dietrich's thirteenth-century forebear and one of his sources, did not mention the reigning king, Rudolf of Habsburg, at all.

An examination of Godfrey's viewpoint on the empire makes his attractiveness to its later German defenders seem still harder to explain. A striking illustration of the disjunctions between them is provided by Alexander of Roes, the earliest of the treatise-writers to draw significantly on his works. Not only was Godfrey a vocal partisan of the Hohenstaufen, but he believed he could trace in history an unbroken principle of hereditary succession, from Jupiter and the Trojans, via Charlemagne, down to Henry VI.[26] It appears surprising, therefore, that he should have influenced the thinking of the Rhinelander Alexander, who blamed the Staufer for what he saw as the empire's recent precipitate decline.[27] That imperial rule had passed from men of Frankish blood into the hands of 'Swabians, Bavarians and remote Alemannians' had, he thought, been an unmitigated disaster.[28] Just as importantly, in Alexander's view, the empire had been entrusted by God to no single family, but to the German princes collectively.[29] The course of history showed clearly that the imperial office, as the

---

des späteren Mittelalters, 5 (Stuttgart, 1956), 3. Frederick II, by contrast, earned Dietrich's praise for having advanced the *honor imperii* through his achievements as a crusader.

[26] Godfrey thus assures Henry: *Semine Troiano descendis et a Ioviano*; Henry 'wields the sceptre' of Charlemagne: Godfrey of Viterbo, *Speculum regum*, ed. G. Waitz, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, 22 (Hanover, 1872), 38 and 48. In the *Pantheon*, Godfrey's conception of unbroken 'Frankish' rulership is even more sweeping: *Ecce habes, lector, ab Adam usque ad Fredericum et filium eius Henricum plenam genealogiam et plenum cathalagum regum sive imperatorum Francorum* (Godfrey of Viterbo, *Pantheon*, ed. G. Waitz, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, 22 (Hanover, 1872), 107–307, at 302). For Godfrey and heredity/continuity, see: Engels, 'Gottfried von Viterbo', 338–40; T. Struve, 'Vorstellungen von "König" und "Reich" in der zweiten Hälfte des 12. Jahrhunderts', in *Stauferreich im Wandel: Ordnungsvorstellungen und Politik in der Zeit Friedrich Barbarossas*, ed. S. Weinfurter (Sigmaringen, 2002), 288–311, at 299–301; and B. Schneidmüller, 'Ordnung der Anfänge: Die Entstehung Deutschlands und Frankreichs in historischen Konstruktionen des Hoch- und Spätmittelalters', in *Die Suche nach den Ursprüngen: Von der Bedeutung des frühen Mittelalters*, ed. W. Pohl (Vienna, 2004), 291–306, at 302–3; T. Foerster, 'Der Prophet und der Kaiser: Staufische Herrschaftsvorstellungen am Ende des 12. Jahrhunderts', in *Staufisches Kaisertum im 12. Jahrhundert: Konzepte – Netzwerke – Politische Praxis*, ed. S. Burkhardt, T. Metz, B. Schneidmüller and S. Weinfurter (Regensburg, 2010), 253–76, at 259–60.

[27] Alexander of Roes, *Memoriale de Prerogativa Imperii Romani*, in *Alexander von Roes: Schriften*, ed. H. Grundmann and H. Heimpel, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Staatsschriften des späteren Mittelalters*, 1.i (Stuttgart, 1958), 134–35: *Et ita sub Suevorum imperio potestas et auctoritas imperialis augeri desiit et vehementius decrescere incepit.*

[28] Ibid., 134.

[29] Alexander thus addresses himself to *principes, presertim hii, ad quos pertinent ius et potestas eligendi regem in imperatorem postmodum promovendum*: *Memoriale*, ed. Grundmann and Heimpel, 100. Godfrey also acknowledged the constitutional centrality of the German princes,

sanctuarium dei, ought never to be transmitted by heredity, but always be filled, like any office of the church, by the princes' 'canonical election'.[30] Godfrey's grandiloquent universalism, his belief in the imperial monarchy's place within sacred history and prophecy, appears to offer the reader little help in adjusting to the narrower horizons of the post-Staufer *Reich*.[31] And later writers, it seems, were not blind to the realities of the world in which they subsisted. Godfrey's universal vision thus contrasts starkly with the down-to-earth constitutionalism of Lupold of Bebenburg, for whom the empire was, for practical purposes at least, a finite and largely un-mysterious political entity – essentially, a sovereign realm among others.[32]

To establish the value of Godfrey's works for the treatise-writers, it is necessary first to identify the elements in them that they most often cited and interpreted.[33] One source of their attractiveness for historically minded defenders of the *Reich* lay in their detailed and sweeping narrative of imperial history and accounts of the deeds of past emperors. It was as a source of such material that Dietrich of Niem cited with approval the *autenticus cronista*, Godfrey.[34] Yet it was a series

---

however, making *omnes principes regni Teutonicorum* the co-dedicatees of his *Memoria seculorum*, along with Henry VI: Godfrey of Viterbo, *Memoria seculorum*, ed. G. Waitz, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, 22 (Hanover, 1872), 94–106, at 94.

[30] Alexander of Roes, *Memoriale*, ed. Grundmann and Heimpel, 124; and *Noticia seculi*, ibid., 164.

[31] See, for example, the Christian-Roman universalist interpretations which Godfrey applied to the imperial regalia: Godfrey of Viterbo, *Pantheon*, ed. Waitz, 272–76. The importance of eschatology in Godfrey's works is examined in M. Haeusler, *Das Ende der Geschichte in der mittelalterlichen Weltchronistik* (Cologne and Vienna, 1980), 42–51. For the *Endkaiser* theme at the Staufer court in Godfrey's time, see also H. Jakobs, 'Weltherrschaft oder Endkaiser? Ziele staufischer Politik im ausgehenden 12. Jahrhundert', in *Die Staufer im Süden: Sizilien und das Reich*, ed. T. Kölzer (Sigmaringen, 1996), 13–28.

[32] For Lupold's constitutional thought, see: R. Most, 'Der Reichsgedanke des Lupold von Bebenburg', *Deutsches Archiv für Geschichte des Mittelalters*, 4 (1941), 444–85; G. Barisch, 'Lupold von Bebenburg: Zum Verhältnis von politischer Praxis, politischer Theorie und angewandter Politik', *Bericht des Historischen Vereins Bamberg*, 113 (1977), 219–432; C. Hirschi, *Wettkampf der Nationen: Konstruktionen einer deutschen Ehrgemeinschaft an der Wende vom Mittelalter zur Neuzeit* (Göttingen, 2005), 93–107; K. Ubl, 'Die Rechte des Kaisers in der Theorie deutscher Gelehrter des 14. Jahrhunderts (Engelbert von Admont, Lupold von Bebenburg, Konrad von Megenberg)', in *Konrad von Megenberg (1309–1374) und sein Werk: Das Wissen der Zeit*, ed. C. Märtl, G. Drossbach and M. Kintzinger (Munich, 2006), 353–87.

[33] Godfrey's importance for late-medieval and Renaissance German historiographers generally is briefly discussed in F.L. Borchardt, *German Antiquity in Renaissance Myth* (Baltimore, 1971), 235–38.

[34] Dietrich of Niem, *Historie de Gestis Romanorum Principum*, in Dietrich von Nieheim, *Historie de Gestis Romanorum Principum, Cronica, Gesta Karoli Magni Imperatoris*, ed. K. Colberg and J. Leuschner, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Staatsschriften des späteren Mittelalters*, 5.ii

ȯf specific claims and narratives that attracted the more recurrent attention of German authors. One of these was Godfrey's account of the descent from Troy of two parallel, Roman-Italian and Frankish-German, ruling lines.[35] It was this, admittedly not altogether novel, idea that provided the basis for the claim advanced by Alexander of Roes that the (Frankish) Germans, as rightful holders of the empire, were kinsmen, indeed brothers, of the Romans or Italians.[36] As such, they were entitled to parity of treatment by the emperor's universal co-ruler, the pope – who, in Alexander's ideal world, would be an Italian.[37]

The distinctions which Godfrey introduced into his account of the origins of the Franks were evidently judged especially valuable by some of his late-medieval readers. According to Godfrey, the first and authentic Franks, who came from Troy, the followers of Priam the Younger (King Priam's nephew) and their descendants, were – or, at any rate, eventually (after a lengthy migration via the Maeotian marshes) became – German.[38] The Germans' neighbours in the west,

---

(Stuttgart, 1980), 48. Konrad of Megenberg, *De translacione Romani imperii*, caps 7, 8 and 9, in *Unbekannte kirchenpolitische Streitschriften aus der Zeit Ludwigs des Bayern (1327–1354): Analysen und Texte*, ed. R. Scholz, pt. 2 (Texte) (Rome, 1914), thus cited Godfrey as a source for imperial affairs on matters as varied as the succession of Otto III (274), the iconoclasm of the eastern emperors Leo III and Constantine V (275), and the splitting apart of the eastern and western empires (280). For the numerous references, by name, to Godfrey and his 'chronicle' in the works of Lupold of Bebenburg (where they are often cited together with Frutolf-Ekkehard and Martin of Troppau), see the index to *Politische Schriften*, ed. Miethke and Flüeler, 562–63.

[35] For the Frankish Trojan myth, see: F. Graus, *Lebendige Vergangenheit: Überlieferung im Mittelalter und in den Vorstellungen vom Mittelalter* (Cologne and Vienna, 1975), esp. 83–86; K. Görich, 'Troia im Mittelalter – der Mythos als politische Legitimation', in *Der Traum von Troia: Geschichte und Mythos einer ewigen Stadt*, ed. M. Zimmermann (Munich, 2006), 120–34 (here esp. 122–23 and 129–30). For the foundational works for the later medieval myth, the 'Fredegar' chronicle and *Liber historiae Francorum* of the seventh and eighth centuries, see A. Plassmann, *Origo gentis: Identitäts- und Legitimitätsstiftung in früh- und hochmittelalterlichen Herkunftserzählungen* (Berlin, 2006), 116–90.

[36] Godfrey of Viterbo, *Speculum regum*, ed. Waitz, 62 and 64; Alexander of Roes, *Memoriale*, ed. Grundmann and Heimpel, 102. For earlier accounts of parallel Roman-Italian and Frankish descent from Troy, see H.H. Anton, 'Trojaner, Franken, Deutsche im Königsspiegel des Gottfried von Viterbo', in *Studien zu Literatur, Sprache und Geschichte in Europa: Wolfgang Haubrichs zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet*, ed. A. Greule, H.-W. Herrmann, K. Ridder and A. Schorr (St Ingbert, 2008), 617–33, at 619–20. The theme of Frankish-Roman kinship, and its Trojan roots, had already entered the vernacular tradition in the eleventh century, in the *Annolied*: *Das Anno-Lied*, ed. M. Opitz (1639, reprinted Heidelberg, 1946), 27.

[37] Alexander of Roes, *Noticia seculi*, ed. Grundmann and Heimpel, 164; H. Grundmann, 'Sacerdotium – Regnum – Studium: Zur Wertung der Wissenschaft im 13. Jahrhundert', *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, 34 (1951), 5–21.

[38] Godfrey of Viterbo, *Pantheon*, ed. Waitz, 301. Priam was accompanied by Anthenor as far as Padua, where the latter is interred. Lupold of Bebenburg follows Godfrey (while drawing also

the French, were by contrast a later and lesser offshoot of the original Frankish stem: properly speaking, not *Franci* at all, but *Francigenae* – 'Franklings', rather than true Franks.[39] Again, the terminological distinction between *Franci* and *Francigenae* was not itself new, but the compelling narrative through which Godfrey elucidated and justified it *was*.[40] More than one of the treatise-writers – Alexander of Roes and Lupold of Bebenburg are salient examples – seem to have been drawn independently to its significance. 'True' Frankia, where Priam's Trojans had put down roots – *Francia prima*, as Alexander of Roes terms it – lay around the Rhine.[41] Its 'principal seat', as Lupold says, citing the authority of the *cronica Godefridi*, is Aachen.[42] By contrast, the region to the west, around the Loire and the Seine – once called the *provincia Gaudina*, and home to the *Francigenae* – was a zone of Frankish conquest and subjugation.[43] Charles Martel had thus named it from himself, in his own Germanic tongue, *Karlinga*, just as earlier conquerors, Caesar and Alexander, gave their names to Caesarea and Alexandria.[44]

---

on the Frutolf-Ekkehard chronicle) in tracing the migration of a group of Trojans to 'Pannonia' and the Maeotian marshes, where they found the city of 'Sicambria' and are thus known first as *Sicambri*, before their eventual settlement in Germany: *Tractatus de Iuribus*, in *Politische Schriften*, ed. Miethke and Flüeler, 242–46.

[39]   Godfrey of Viterbo, *Pantheon*, ed. Waitz, 203. Lupold of Bebenburg, *Tractatus de Iuribus*, cc. 1 and 3, in *Politische Schriften*, ed. Miethke and Flüeler, 245 and 262. Cf. Konrad of Megenberg, *De Translacione*, in *Unbekannte kirchenpolitische Streitschriften*, ed. Scholz, 268.

[40]   The historical importance of Godfrey's account is emphasized by R. Folz, *Le Souvenir et la légende de Charlemagne dans l'Empire germanique médiéval* (Paris, 1950), 255–56. An earlier explanation of the historic relationship between Franks and *Francigenae*, in terms of conquest and intermarriage, was given in the late eleventh-century chronicle of Ekkehard. Although not rooted in a developed mythic narrative, as was Godfrey's, this account too was influential among late-medieval writers: *Ekkehardi chronicon universale*, ed. G. Waitz, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, 6 (Hanover, 1854), 116.

[41]   Godfrey of Viterbo, *Pantheon*, ed. Waitz, 232. For *Francia prima*, see Alexander of Roes, *Noticia seculi*, ed. Grundmann and Heimpel, 158. Like Godfrey, Lupold of Bebenburg contrasts *Francia orientalis*, which is *cis citraque Renum* and the site of the original Frankish settlement, with *Francia occidentalis*, which is *cis citraque Ligeriam et Senacam fluvios*: *Tractatus de Iuribus*, in *Politische Schriften*, ed. Miethke and Flüeler, 308.

[42]   Godfrey of Viterbo, *Pantheon*, ed. Waitz, 159; Lupold of Bebenburg, *Tractatus de Iuribus*, c. 10, in *Politische Schriften*, ed. Miethke and Flüeler, 335. Cf. Konrad of Megenberg, *De Translacione*, in *Unbekannte kirchenpolitische Streitschriften*, ed. Scholz, 304.

[43]   Godfrey of Viterbo, *Speculum regum*; *Pantheon*, ed. Waitz, 66 and 203. This western region is also termed *Francia parva*.

[44]   Godfrey of Viterbo, *Pantheon*, ed. Waitz, 203 and 232. Cf. *Speculum regum*, ed. Waitz, 91; Lupold of Bebenburg, *Tractatus de Iuribus*, in *Politische Schriften*, ed. Miethke and Flüeler, 309.

͘ Not only the Franks but their most famous son was the subject of what proved to, be a highly influential interpretation. Charlemagne, in Godfrey's famous formulation, was a Byzantine Roman (*Romuleus*) through his mother, named as Bertha, but a German (*Theutonicus*) from his Frankish father, Pepin.[45] The claim was to be reproduced first in somewhat garbled form by Alexander of Roes, later by others (notably, Lupold of Bebenburg), following Godfrey more closely.[46] Godfrey also seems to have been the first writer to assert that Charles was born at Ingelheim, on the Rhine.[47] This contention was to be taken up in the fourteenth century by Lupold, who cites directly the relevant verse from the *Pantheon* in order to underline, once again, Charlemagne's German-ness. The same claim was repeated several decades later by Dietrich of Niem, and some time after that by Peter of Andlau.[48]

The use made of Godfrey's works by late-medieval imperialist writers therefore reveals some clear points of concentration: upon past emperors, on origin myths – particularly that of the Franks – and on the historic interrelation of ethnic and political groups around the Franco-imperial frontier. Why did precisely these elements appear important to German readers in the post-Staufer period? One part of the explanation is rather prosaic, though it does shed a revealing light on the character of political identities in late-medieval Germany. This is the fact that those treatise-writers who drew most extensively upon Godfrey's works came themselves mainly from regions of western and southern Germany associated with the settlement of the Franks. This is true not only of Alexander of Roes, probably a native of Cologne, but also of the Franconians Lupold of Bebenburg and his follower and critic Konrad of Megenberg. For

---

[45]   Godfrey of Viterbo, *Speculum regum*; *Pantheon*, ed. Waitz, 62, 92, 205 and 209. Godfrey identified Bertha as the daughter of the Emperor Heraclius, and thus *Greca*, though she is also 'from Hungary'.

[46]   Alexander of Roes, *Memoriale*, ed. Grundmann and Heimpel, 121; Lupold of Bebenburg, *Tractatus de Iuribus*, in *Politische Schriften*, ed. Miethke and Flüeler, 260; Konrad of Megenberg, *De Translacione*, in *Unbekannte kirchenpolitische Streitschriften*, ed. Scholz, 260. Alexander named Charlemagne's mother 'Teberga' and made her the sister of the Byzantine emperor, Michael. The claim that Charles was of 'Roman mother, German father' was repeated in the fifteenth century by Peter von Andlau: *Kaiser und Reich: Libellus de Cesarea Monarchia*, tit. XIII, ed. R.A. Müller (Frankfurt am Main and Leipzig, 1998), 144 (appealing to the reference made by *Gotifridus in sua cronica*). J. Hürbin believed that Peter's knowledge of Godfrey was only indirect: *Peter von Andlau, der Verfasser des ersten deutschen Reichsstaatsrechts: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Humanismus am Oberrhein im XV. Jahrhundert* (Strasbourg, 1897), 169.

[47]   Godfrey of Viterbo, *Pantheon*, ed. Waitz, 209.

[48]   Lupold of Bebenburg, *Tractatus de Iuribus*, c. 3, in *Politische Schriften*, ed. Miethke and Flüeler, 260–61; Dietrich von Nieheim, *Cronica*, ed. Colberg and Leuschner, 152; Dietrich of Niem, *Viridarium*, ed. Lhotsky and Pivec, 1. The claim was subsequently reproduced by Peter von Andlau: *Kaiser und Reich: Libellus de Cesarea Monarchia*, tit. XIII, ed. Müller, 144.

these writers, founding a contemporary German political identity upon a historic Frankish one made perfect sense. The authentic *Germani*, Lupold and (following him) Konrad insist, were not Swabians, Bavarians, Saxons, Thuringians or Frisians, but Franks. Lupold also drew upon Godfrey's *Pantheon* to recount the settlement of Franconia ('whose metropolis is Würzburg'), under the leadership of one 'Duke Franco'.[49] By contrast, the Westphalian Dietrich of Niem, while he placed substantial reliance on Godfrey's writings, did not make them the basis of his model of German identity; and he was also more tentative than were the Rhenish-Franconian party on the matter of Charlemagne's ethnic ascription.[50] But observing how Godfrey's writings nourished Frankish conceptions of German-ness only draws attention to a larger question: why problems of ethnicity and ethnic boundaries should have mattered at all, to writers ostensibly concerned with the defence of Christian-Roman *imperium*.

In order to explain this, it is necessary to recall just how substantially the empire's situation had changed in the decades between Godfrey and the treatise-writers. For it was paradoxically those very changes, which had swept away the Hohenstaufen court for which Godfrey had written, and whose members he had (for a time, at least) sought to influence, that ensured the long-lasting relevance of some of his distinctive ideas. A continuity of succession to imperial rule, which Godfrey had traced back over millennia, was now radically and unmistakably broken. A reigning emperor, of the dynasty which Godfrey had written to exalt, had been deposed at a council of the church under the pope. The empire now became, in the eyes of many, an unresolved problem, its shortcomings, particularly in its German-speaking core lands, the ostensible source of a wide array of contemporary political and social ills.[51]

Meanwhile, other kingdoms rose to overshadow the *Reich*. Most prominent among them was the kingdom of France, whose rulers had, since the start of the thirteenth century, asserted with growing insistence their own descent from the emperor Charlemagne.[52] Nor was the ascendancy of the western Frankish monarchy, in contemporary perception, only narrowly political; the idea of the French royal dynasty as the church's historic defender, pitted against its imperial

---

[49] Lupold of Bebenburg, *Tractatus de Iuribus*, c. 3, in *Politische Schriften*, ed. Miethke and Flüeler, 263; Konrad of Megenberg, *De Translacione*, c. 5, in *Unbekannte kirchenpolitische Streitschriften*, ed. Scholz, 262. Cf. Godfrey of Viterbo, *Pantheon*, ed. Waitz, 203, for Duke Franco. Lupold, a member of the Würzburg cathedral chapter, added the reference to the Franconian 'metropolis'.

[50] See Scales, *The Shaping of German Identity*, 334.

[51] For the state of affairs in Germany after the Hohenstaufen, see Martin Kaufhold, *Interregnum* (2nd edn, Darmstadt, 2007).

[52] W. Kienast, *Deutschland und Frankreich in der Kaiserzeit (900–1270): Weltkaiser und Einzelkönige*, 3 vols (Stuttgart, 1974–75), vol. 2, 506–11; Jean-Marie Moeglin, *Kaisertum und allerchristlichster König 1214 bis 1500* (Darmstadt, 2010), 311.

'persecutor, though hardly new, gained fresh affirmation in the age of Charles of Anjou and the last of the Staufer.[53] So high was the prestige of French learning and culture by this time that Alexander of Roes felt compelled to accord the *Francigene* a general responsibility for scholarship in the service of the church (*studium*): a universal office, paralleling the *sacerdotium* and *regnum* of the more ancient Romans and Germans.[54] Now for the first time, moreover (much to Alexander's distress), the prospect was seriously mooted of a French candidature for the imperial throne itself.[55]

The crises and controversies which had engulfed the empire in the thirteenth century therefore moved some to ask fundamental questions about its character and future form, about who should rightly provide its rulers, and even about the justification for the Roman Empire continuing to exist at all. Alexander of Roes, who spent time at the papal court in Viterbo, was acutely sensitive to the discussions of such matters that were current in curial circles under the French pope, Martin IV (1281–85), stimulated by the presence at court of Angevin partisans.[56] It is not unlikely that it was during his time in Godfrey's home town that Alexander first became acquainted with his writings.[57] And it may have been in response to alarming rumours reaching his ears there that he now turned to them, to underline the empire's territorial integrity by enumerating its four 'principal sites', namely Aachen, Arles and Milan, along with the city of Rome

---

[53]   For the idea of the French as defenders of the church, see G. Jostkleigrewe, *Das Bild des Anderen: Entstehung und Wirkung deutsch-französischer Fremdbilder in der volkssprachlichen Literatur und Historiographie des 12. bis 14. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, 2008), 315–60; for prophetic hopes in favour of the French and their kings, see D. Kurze, 'Nationale Regungen in der spätmittelalterlichen Prophetie', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 202 (1966), 1–23.

[54]   Alexander of Roes, *Memoriale*, c. 25 and *Noticia seculi*, c. 12, ed. Grundmann and Heimpel, 126–27 and 159; Grundmann, 'Sacerdotium – Regnum – Studium'.

[55]   For French candidatures for the imperial throne at this time, see P. Roscheck, *Französische Kandidaturen für den römischen Kaiserthron in Spätmittelalter und Frühneuzeit (1272/73–1515)* (PhD diss., University of Saarbrücken, 1984), esp. 16–31; for Alexander's alarm at the prospect of a new *translatio imperii* in favour of the French, see Alexander of Roes, *Memoriale*, c. 14, ed. Grundmann and Heimpel, 104–5.

[56]   Hence Alexander's alarm at discovering, while celebrating mass in Viterbo, that the prayer for the emperor had been excised from the papal missal: Alexander of Roes, *Memoriale*, c. 2, ed. Grundmann and Heimpel, 92; and see W. Mohr, 'Alexander von Roes: Die Krise in der universalen Reichsauffassung nach dem Interregnum', in *Universalismus und Partikularismus im Mittelalter*, ed. P. Wilpert (Berlin, 1968), 270–300, at 298–99.

[57]   H. Grundmann, 'Über die Schriften des Alexander von Roes', *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 8 (1950), 154–237, at 168–69, believed that Alexander had brought with him from Germany some of the numerous sources on which he drew while in the Colonna circle: however, the practicalities of travel make it likely that he relied mainly on manuscripts made available to him in the south.

itself.[58] In this way he reaffirmed the conception of a multi-regnal *imperium*, at a time when speculation in some quarters – perhaps also among figures close to the Curia – had begun to countenance its dismantling.[59]

Among the changes in the wider climate of thought about the empire characteristic of the later Middle Ages, one with particular significance for German writers was the emergence of increasingly radical interpretations of the well-established idea of *translatio imperii*.[60] This was the doctrine which maintained that imperial rule had passed over the course of history between a succession of different bearers, each of whom gained for a time universal *imperium*, only to lose it to another as their power and fitness to rule declined. By the thirteenth century, thought about the empire's translation was increasingly cast in an explicitly ethnic framework, reflecting a broader trend at this time towards imagining peoples as the repositories of institutionalized power. Viewed from this perspective, imperial rule had passed over the course of history between a succession of ethnic groups, the latest of which, as rulers of the Roman Empire, were the Germans. This perception had been powerfully affirmed by Pope Innocent III's bull *Venerabilem* of 1202, which had spoken of a *translatio imperii in Germanos* as having taken place, at papal initiative, in the person of Charlemagne.[61]

But if one trend was towards emphasizing the empire's ethnic base, this now came combined with other elements which, particularly in view of the enfeebled and crisis-stricken state of the contemporary imperial monarchy, seemed to some observers highly ominous. One of these was the heightened stress now placed in some quarters upon the mutability of the empire's constitution and on the importance of an appropriately qualified and obedient son of the church being appointed at its head.[62] Responsibility for inspecting the suitability of the empire's ruler, but also for ensuring the fitness of its entire constitution, including its bearer-people, was now increasingly understood to rest with the papacy: what popes had translated in the past, the pope might translate afresh. Such thoughts were being expressed, moreover, at a time when other would-be

---

[58] Alexander of Roes, *Memoriale*, c. 25, ed. Grundmann and Heimpel, 127 (*quatuor loca principalia*); cf. Godfrey of Viterbo, *Pantheon*, ed. Waitz, 221 (*De quatuor principalibus sedibus imperii Romani*). Alexander substituted Milan for the Monza of his source.

[59] See Scales, *The Shaping of German Identity*, 165–71. One such scheme had been mooted by Humbert of Romans, a former Master of the Dominicans, as a contribution to the discussions on church reform at the 1274 Council of Lyon.

[60] The standard work remains W. Goez, *Translatio Imperii: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Geschichtsdenkens und der politischen Theorien im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit* (Tübingen, 1958).

[61] *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, ed. A. Friedberg, 2 vols (Leipzig, 1879–81), vol. 2, cols 79–82; and see Goez, *Translatio Imperii*, ch. 7.

[62] Mierau, *Kaiser und Papst*, 100–115.

'imperial' peoples were making their own voices heard. Foremost among these were Charlemagne's descendants in western Frankia, who by the 1260s had already entered into the Hohenstaufen inheritance in southern Italy.[63]

The shock delivered by such upheavals is strongly evident in the words of Alexander of Roes, one of the earliest of the German treatise-writers. In 1285, while still south of the Alps, in the entourage of Cardinal Giacomo Colonna, Alexander composed an allegorical Latin poem, the *Pavo*.[64] The work portrays a parliament of fowls, at which the eponymous peacock, representing the pope, aided and abetted by the French cockerel, strips the imperial eagle of his feathers and seizes them for himself. For all his antipathy to the Hohenstaufen, Alexander's poem derives much of its force from the recent memory of papal action against Frederick II, as well as reflecting a more immediate alarm at the close ties between the Curia and the French Angevins in the early 1280s.

In the perceptions of some literate imperialists, the popes, in alliance with the empire's western neighbour, were claiming the power to re-fashion the universal political order, which was now also increasingly imagined as an order of peoples, each invested with distinctive qualities. Half a century after Alexander, another well-travelled German cleric, Konrad of Megenberg, completed a lengthy plaint in Latin verse, his *Planctus Ecclesiae in Germaniam*.[65] In this *Jugendwerk*, composed while its author was pursuing patronage at the Avignon Curia, a personified church pleads the case of her imperial protector, *Germania*, before an unsympathetic pope. Like Alexander before him, Konrad, through his figure of *Ecclesia*, sought especially to argue the unsuitability of the Romance-speaking populations of western Europe for the rule of the empire, in place of the Germans.[66]

The same mix of constitutional defensiveness and explicit stress upon the empire's German character (though without Konrad's Gallophobic accents)

---

[63] Moeglin, *Kaisertum und allerchristlichster König*, 301–2. On the French imperialist tradition in this period, see J. Krynen, *L'Empire du roi: idées et croyances politiques en France xiii–xve siècle* (Paris, 1993); on contemporary French perceptions of the empire, see C. Jones, *Eclipse of Empire? Perceptions of the Western Empire and its Rulers in Late-Medieval France* (Turnhout, 2007).

[64] Alexander of Roes, *Pavo*, in *Alexander von Roes: Schriften*, ed. Grundmann and Heimpel; and see H. Heimpel, 'Über den "Pavo" des Alexander von Roes', *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 39 (1983), 131–206.

[65] Konrad von Megenberg, *Planctus Ecclesiae in Germaniam*, ed. R. Scholz, in *Die Werke des Konrad von Megenberg*, vol. 1, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Staatsschriften des späteren Mittelalters*, 2 (1941, reprinted Stuttgart, 1977). Not all late-medieval German writers on the empire were hostile to the papacy: Konrad himself, in his later writings, defends the pope's role in imperial affairs.

[66] Thus, for example, Konrad von Megenberg, *Planctus Ecclesiae in Germaniam*, ed. Scholz, pars I, c. 33, 49.

is encountered in a prose treatise composed a few years later, with different objectives. Lupold of Bebenburg's *De iuribus regni et imperii*, which in its earliest version probably dates from 1339, sought to argue for the effectively sovereign status of the empire – which, Lupold insisted, was essentially the same, fundamentally German, polity it had been in Charlemagne's day. A particular objective here was to rebuff papal interference in imperial affairs, as manifested in the claim to confirm all candidates for the throne.

While the various Latin treatises and polemics composed in the empire's defence by German-speaking authors between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries thus often differ substantially from one another in character and purpose, most (though certainly not all) of them have in common a marked ethnocentrism.[67] Not only is the German character of the *Reich* emphasized and celebrated, but neighbours and perceived rivals are pointedly belittled (though the denigration is sometimes mixed with carefully measured praises) through a recurrent repertoire of ethnic stereotype.[68] These qualities become more, not less, remarkable when it is noted how untypical they are of their time and place: accounts by other late-medieval German writers of the empire's relations with its western neighbours mostly do not display such a starkly polarizing quality.[69] To account for the distinctly ethnocentric tone which characterizes much of the Latin treatise literature, it is helpful to consider both the works and their authors in terms of their debts to, and affinities with, Godfrey of Viterbo.

Admittedly, neither debts nor affinities should be overstated. Some of the contrasts between Godfrey and the treatise-writers, in personal situation, concerns and perspective, have been noted already. Their purposes in writing (insofar as these can be known) were also different, as (to a degree) were the genres in which they wrote. Although the empire of Barbarossa's later years was scarcely free from crisis, it still offered little basis for perceptions of existential danger of the kind that moved later defenders to pick up their pens.[70] Godfrey had thus evidently felt no need to write at any length about that staple

---

[67] Notes of inter-ethnic rivalry and Germanophilia are thus largely absent from the works of Engelbert of Admont – though he too was concerned with how a world of different peoples might be subjected to political order. See Engelbert von Admont, *Vom Ursprung und Ende des Reiches und andere Schriften*, ed. W. Baum (Graz, 1998), esp. chs 12 and 15, 56–57 and 76–77. Highly abstract, and therefore free of ethnic identification or polemic, is the short work by Jordan of Osnabrück which prefaces the *Memoriale* of Alexander of Roes. For Jordan's treatise, see Grundmann and Heimpel, 'Einleitung', in *Alexander von Roes: Schriften*, ed. Grundmann and Heimpel, 16–19.

[68] Scales, *The Shaping of German Identity*, 353–82.

[69] See Jostkleigrewe, *Das Bild des Anderen*.

[70] For the 1180s as a period of failure and crisis, see B. Schneidmüller, 'Hof und Herrschaft im 12. Jahrhundert', in *Friedrich Barbarossa und sein Hof*, ed. Gesellschaft für staufische Geschichte (Göppingen, 2009), 10–36, at 24. Engels believed that Godfrey's writings were part of an attempt

preoccupation of late-medieval imperialists, the empire's *translatio*.[71] Not all those who wrote in the empire's defence drew on Godfrey's works at all, and for those who did he was in every case just one source – indeed, as a historiographer, a representative of just one genre of source – among others used.[72] In none of the treatises is his visibility over-riding. But these facts only serve to underline the significance of *how* he was drawn upon; for different writers tended to put his ideas to remarkably similar use, and to find their way independently to the same statements and themes.

Godfrey purveyed usable history. His works constituted an accessible quarry of data and *exempla*, in this resembling the universal or pope-and-emperor chronicles, such as those of Vincent of Beauvais or Martin of Troppau, upon which the treatise-writers also drew.[73] His writings offer a contrast – one which scholars of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries readily pointed out, much to Godfrey's disadvantage – with those of a more illustrious Hohenstaufen courtier and historiographer, Otto of Freising. It can be no coincidence that Otto's chronicle, despite Godfrey's own heavy reliance upon it, was little known or used by imperialist writers in Germany during the later Middle Ages.[74] Otto's subtle formulations and complex distinctions, so congenial to modern, post-national conceptions of political identity, were of less utility to the empire's late-medieval defenders than were the solid dividing lines which Godfrey laid down.[75] What these writers required was what Godfrey supplied: history with which to argue.

---

to endow an imperilled Staufer emperorship with a new basis of legitimacy, capable of resisting contemporary papal claims to superiority: Engels, 'Gottfried von Viterbo', 340–41.

[71]   For the little he has to say on the matter, see Goez, *Translatio Imperii*, 126–30.

[72]   Lupold of Bebenburg, for example, drew on canon law, as well as on Godfrey and a number of other chronicles: J. Miethke and C. Flüeler, 'Einleitung', in *Politische Schriften*, ed. Miethke and Flüeler, 124. Some treatise-writers used Godfrey only marginally. Engelbert of Admont's debt to him appears to have been modest at best: Engelbert of Admont, *Speculum Virtutum*, ed. K. Ubl, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Staatsschriften des späteren Mittelalters*, 1.ii (Hanover, 2004), 17–23; G.B. Fowler, *Intellectual Interests of Engelbert of Admont* (New York, 1967), ch. 8. Even more perfunctory seems to have been the acquaintance of the Westphalian Gobelinus Person, whose *Cosmidromius* was completed in 1418: *Cosmidromius Gobelini Person*, ed. M. Jansen (Münster, 1900), xlvii.

[73]   For the *Pantheon* as a quarry of *exempla*, see A.B. Mulder-Bakker, 'A Pantheon Full of Examples: The World Chronicle of Godfrey of Viterbo', in *Exemplum et similitudo: Alexander the Great and Other Heroes as Points of Reference in Medieval Literature*, ed. W.J. Aerts and M. Gosman (Groningen, 1988), 85–98. The debt of other such works to Godfrey is argued by Weber, 'The Historical Importance', 157.

[74]   Weber, 'The Historical Importance', 154–55.

[75]   Schneidmüller, 'Ordnung der Anfänge', 295–96. Only with the humanists did Otto's works come into their own: A. Lhotsky, 'Das Nachleben Ottos von Freising', in idem, *Aufsätze und Vorträge*, vol. 1, ed. H. Wagner and H. Koller (Munich, 1970), 29–48, at 41–43.

Elements in Godfrey's works served especially well the treatise-writers' quest for clear distinctions, hierarchies and affinities. On one side of the line thus stood the true and original, German, Franks, descendants of the Trojans and rightful holders of the empire; on the other, a later western offshoot population, the French *Francigenae*, subjects of historic Frankish conquest and thus devoid of any claim of their own to universal rule.[76] South of the Alps lived the descendants of Aeneas; to the north, around the Rhine, those of his kinsman, the younger Priam: each an illustrious royal progeny. Here, for Alexander of Roes, were two historically distinct yet inseparable branches of the same ancient stock who, as such, ought to share between them the two interdependent governing powers of Christendom, namely papacy and empire. Locating the birth of Charlemagne – for the treatise-writers the key transmitter of the Roman Empire to the northern peoples – beside the Rhine resolved to their satisfaction the debate with the western neighbour regarding the nature of his Frankish identity. Charles' dual – Roman and German – parentage, meanwhile, pointed to the dual, trans-Alpine, Christian order of government, of which the empire was one indispensable component.

The established source categories of modern scholarship on the Middle Ages tend to erect artificial boundaries between Godfrey and his late-medieval users, and to obscure important affinities between their respective works. Yet to a considerable degree the late-medieval treatise-writers (although they are commonly categorized as 'publicists', their works as contributions to the history of political thought) simply form part of an ongoing, partisan tradition of Latin historiography on the empire and its rulers. Many of their works are scarcely less histories than are Godfrey's *Pantheon* or *Speculum regum*. That was clearly the perception of contemporaries: more than half of the many surviving manuscripts of the *Memoriale* of Alexander of Roes label it a *cronica*.[77] Their channels of late-medieval dissemination were also comparable: not only Alexander's *Memoriale* but also Godfrey's *Pantheon* were among the works whose circulation was boosted by copying at the great church council at Constance (1414–18).[78] Imperialist thought in late-medieval Germany based its arguments upon, and derived its claims from, the traces of a past understood as being, on the whole,

---

[76] Over the course of time, the treatise-writers were able to take these ideas over, not only directly from Godfrey, but from one another: Peter of Andlau thus relied on the *Memoriale* of Alexander of Roes for the Trojan origin and German identity of the Franks: Hürbin, *Peter von Andlau*, 173–77; Peter von Andlau, *Kaiser und Reich: Libellus de Cesarea Monarchia*, tit. XV, ed. Müller, 150–52.

[77] See the list in *Alexander von Roes: Schriften*, ed. Grundmann and Heimpel, 42–80.

[78] P. Lehmann, 'Konstanz und Basel als Büchermärkte während der großen Kirchenversammlungen', in idem, *Erforschung des Mittelalters: Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, vol. 1 (Stuttgart, 1959), 253–80, at 263.

-far more illustrious than the present and as offering crucial lessons for the future: it had a strongly historical character.

Yet these later works do also show real differences from Godfrey, for times had indeed changed since he wrote. Late-medieval imperialist tracts tended to be composed in order to address specific needs and emergencies or in response to more general perceptions of crisis – in the church no less than the empire itself.[79] The treatise-writers thus instrumentalized the past more directly than Godfrey had done. They did so in the service of visions of an *imperium* that they wished to see established or defended, that they feared was about to be swept away or usurped – or indeed that, except in idealized parchment form, could never exist at all. Their histories were subordinated to consistently argumentative ends, as Godfrey's more diffuse, didactic compilations were not. Instead, these latter acted as an essential element of substratum, upon which later German imperialists built their own metahistories, imbued with supra-historical meaning and purpose.

Godfrey's writings do, however, also look forward in significant ways to the more stridently polarized visions of some late-medieval imperialists. The later twelfth century is distinguished by the production, in various parts of Europe, of a number of ambitious historical and ethnographic works. These have in common the invocation of worlds of distinct and competing peoples, which are imagined also as the bearers of political titles and as a foundation for rival political communities.[80] Their authors, characteristically, were well-educated, Latinate clerics – figures such as Saxo Grammaticus, Rigord and Gerald of Wales: products of the schools, but typically also linked to the courts of secular and ecclesiastical princes.[81] This was the milieu of Godfrey of Viterbo. Far from expressing, in their accounts of the differences between peoples, mere unconsidered prejudice, their works were highly crafted and artificial. They reflected not only the advanced intellectual training of their authors, but also the rhetorical contests through which that training was applied and tested, in

---

[79] Thus, for example, Dietrich of Niem's numerous writings reflect an urgent concern with reform of the church (and necessarily, therefore, also the empire), against the backdrop of the Great Schism and attempts to resolve it: Leuschner, 'Dietrich von Nieheim', col. 142.

[80] N. Kersken, *Geschichtsschreibung im Europa der 'nationes': Nationalgeschichtliche Gesamtdarstellungen im Mittelalter* (Cologne, Weimar and Vienna, 1995), 825–27, identified a *Verdichtungsphase* in the writing of 'national' histories in Latin Europe, beginning c. 1180.

[81] For Saxo, see: Kersken, *Geschichtsschreibung*, 444–57; T. Foerster, *Vergleich und Identität: Selbst- und Fremddeutung im Norden des hochmittelalterlichen Europa* (Berlin, 2009), esp. 115–51; for Rigord, see: P. Bourgain, 'Rigord', in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* 7 (Munich, 1995), cols 849–50; J.W. Baldwin, *The Government of Philip Augustus: Foundations of French Royal Power in the Middle Ages* (Berkeley, 1986), 362–93 and 396–97; for Gerald, see R. Bartlett, *Gerald of Wales 1146–1223* (Oxford, 1982), chs 6 and 7.

lecture hall and household.[82] They bear witness to what appears to be a marked ethnocentric turn in literate European culture of the time: a new, more insistent undergirding of claims to political power with constructions of common culture and descent. In this context, the etching of deep and clear lines of identity and alterity now perhaps seemed all the more needful, precisely because such lines were otherwise far from easily made out. Indeed, they were ever liable to melt into air upon contact with the complex interactions of daily social and political life – and nowhere more so than along the empire's western frontier with France. It was now, therefore, that the Trojan myth began to carry the burden of political argument which was to be one of its salient characteristics in the later Middle Ages.[83] Godfrey's account of the peoples which came from Troy represents an early, rather tentative, instance of this development.[84]

In attempting to understand the reception of Godfrey's works into late-medieval imperialist thought, it is important to go beyond mere comparison of texts. For, despite all initial impressions to the contrary, the social and cultural orbits of the treatise-writers in fact had a good deal in common with those of their twelfth-century source. That, in its turn, goes far to explain why discussion of the empire by German writers in the post-Staufer period took the forms it did. Debating the *imperium* long remained an activity for Latinate clerks. Often they were men of comparatively obscure social origin: the sons of petty-noble or substantial burgher families.[85] For such individuals the church provided, as it had for Godfrey, a solid education, professional training and skills, interaction

---

[82] For the role of the schools, their training and polyglot milieu in sharpening ethnic distinctions, see: L. Schmugge, 'Über "nationale" Vorurteile im Mittelalter', *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 38 (1982), 439–59; P. Meyvaert, '"Rainaldus est malus scriptor Francigenus": Voicing National Antipathy in the Middle Ages', *Speculum*, 66 (1991), 743–63. For the constructed and inter-relational qualities of collective identity and alterity, see V. Scior, *Das Eigene und das Fremde: Identität und Fremdheit in den Chroniken Adams von Bremen, Helmolds von Bosau und Arnolds von Lübeck* (Berlin, 2002), 'Einleitung'.

[83] K. Wolf, *Troja – Metamorphosen eines Mythos: Französische, englische und italienische Überlieferungen des 12. Jahrhunderts im Vergleich* (Berlin, 2008), 289–90; Görich, 'Troia im Mittelalter', esp. 125–26. For Franco-German competition over the Frankish-Trojan legacy, see Moeglin, *Kaisertum und allerchristlichster König*, 308–15.

[84] Wolf, *Troja*, 110–12.

[85] For the treatise-writers, see Scales, *The Shaping of German Identity*, 244 (with reference to further literature). An origin in the lower, ministerial nobility has also been plausibly proposed for Godfrey: see Dorninger, *Gottfried von Viterbo*, 33 with n. 11, for the relevant sources and specialist literature. An obvious contrast suggests itself with Godfrey's high-aristocratic counterpart, Otto of Freising: H.W. Seiffert, 'Otto von Freising und Gottfried von Viterbo', *Philologus*, 115 (1971), 292–301.

with others like themselves and opportunities to experience a world of broader horizons than that into which they had been born.[86]

Like Godfrey (on his own celebrated account), the late-medieval treatise-writers tended to be well-travelled.[87] Also like him, their travels often led them back and forth across the Alps, between Germany and Italy, as well as westward, to the schools of France or, in the fourteenth century, the Avignon Curia.[88] Such journeys not only opened up new sources of knowledge about the world at large, but also about the varied political formations which it encompassed. Through the strong contrasts of place, people and opinions which they afforded (and afforded particularly to pro-imperial travellers taking the north–south route), they also stimulated reflection and shaped opinion. The *imperium* was apt to appear a somewhat different – and at times less secure – institution when viewed from papal or urban Italy, rather than from a snug clerical bolthole on familiar ground in the north. The world of the late-medieval imperialists was, like Godfrey's, a world of households – although mainly those of prominent churchmen (including the papal Curia), rather than the courts of secular monarchs. The treatise-writers, too, were in search of favour and patronage, but often it was not kings but high-ranking prelates who were made the dedicatees of their works.[89] Like Godfrey, they sometimes found themselves close to the great events of their day: close enough, that is, to observe, reflect and draw lessons, though seldom close enough to shape the course of the action.[90]

It is against this background that their works must be read. Characteristically, the treatise-writers lived out their lives within a succession of privileged clerical corporations: bodies of masters and students, the chapters of rich collegiate and

---

[86]   For Lupold of Bebenberg's career of ecclesiastical office-holding, for example, which eventually culminated in the bishopric of Bamberg, see: Colberg, 'Lupold von Bebenburg', cols 1071–73; Miethke, 'Practical Intentions', 225–26. For Godfrey's training as a papal chancery clerk, see Hausmann, 'Gottfried von Viterbo', 618.

[87]   Godfrey of Viterbo, *Memoria seculorum*, ed. Waitz, 105. For Godfrey's travels, see Dorninger, *Gottfried von Viterbo*, 58.

[88]   For Konrad of Megenberg's repeated journeys to Avignon during the course of his career, for example, see Steer, 'Konrad von Megenberg', col. 221.

[89]   Thus, the *Memoriale* of Alexander of Roes was dedicated to Cardinal Giacomo Colonna, Lupold of Bebenberg's *Tractatus de Iuribus Regni et Imperii Romanorum* to Archbishop Baldwin of Trier, and Dietrich of Niem's *Nemus Unionis* to Frederick of Saarwerden, archbishop of Cologne.

[90]   Dietrich of Niem, for example, had been present at the torture of five cardinals at the instigation of Pope Urban VI: H. Heimpel, *Dietrich von Niem (c. 1340–1418)* (Münster, 1932), 20. One biographer characterizes Dietrich's life as 'animated, almost adventurous', offering 'constantly new experiences': Leuschner, 'Dietrich von Nieheim', col. 141. For Alexander of Roes' alarming discovery while in papal Viterbo, see above, n. 56. Weber's revisionist view of Godfrey casts him in a similar light: Weber, 'The Historical Importance', 173 (arguing that, while Godfrey witnessed the Treaty of Constance, he is unlikely to have had any significant part in its negotiation).

cathedral churches, occasionally monastic communities. Such bodies furnished opportunities for sociable interaction and office-holding, and would also often have provided imperialist writers with access to the sources upon which their works were built. And it was within those same clerical communities that their own works often found their first reception – through oral exposition and debate, as well as through the circulation of manuscripts.[91] It was via such circles, too, that the treatise-writers would have hoped to bring themselves and their arguments to the attention of those, mostly ecclesiastical, princes whose powerful actions they aspired to sway.

The views to which imperialist tracts give expression must accordingly be understood as those of a small, fairly self-contained and, in its members' education, experiences and mode of life, rather untypical *Teilöffentlichkeit*.[92] Indeed, the treatise-writers, their readers and interlocutors can be understood as constituting a plurality of such localized 'publics', which only occasionally and partially interacted, even with one another.[93] They thus attest not to a general but a particular mode of thought and discourse. As has been noted already, the articulate ethnic partisanship to which some of their works give voice is rather less representative of the broad mass of historical-political writings from late-medieval Germany (in the vernacular *or* in Latin) than an earlier, nationalist tradition of scholarship supposed.

Yet the manuscript circulation of imperialist tracts, and thus their influence (and, through them, that of Godfrey), did not long remain confined to such narrow spheres. While it is true that dissemination varied greatly between individual works, some of which can have found only very few medieval readers, and true also that no such text attained rapid or spectacular fame, the readership of some did grow markedly over time, in both size and social diversity. In the later fourteenth century, for example, the *Memoriale* of Alexander of Roes was known to the compiler of a vernacular chronicle in the town of Magdeburg – a

---

[91] The colophon to a manuscript of Lupold of Bebenburg's *Tractatus de Iuribus Regni et Imperii Romanorum* records that Lupold had expounded the work orally at the *curia* of the bishop of Eichstätt: J. Miethke, 'Wirkungen politischer Theorie auf die Praxis der Politik im Römischen Reich des 14. Jahrhunderts: Gelehrte Politikberatung am Hofe Ludwigs des Bayern', in *Political Thought and the Realities of Power in the Middle Ages/Politisches Denken und die Wirklichkeit der Macht im Mittelalter*, ed. J. Canning and O.G. Oexle (Göttingen, 1998), 173–210, at 209.

[92] For the concept of the 'partial' or 'segmental' public as characteristic of the Middle Ages, see W. Faulstich, *Medien und Öffentlichkeit im Mittelalter 800–1400* (Göttingen, 1996), ch. 1. J. Miethke, similarly, has written of late-medieval political theorists as addressing a 'closed public': 'Das Publikum politischer Theorie im 14. Jahrhundert: Zur Einführung', in *Das Publikum politischer Theorie im 14. Jahrhundert*, ed. Jürgen Miethke (Munich, 1992), 1–24, at 11–12.

[93] Konrad of Megenberg, for example, despite his violent disagreement with the doctrines of William of Ockham, may not have had direct access to Ockham's works: Miethke, 'Das Publikum', 9–10.

- milieu socially, culturally and geographically far remote from that of the work's origin.[94] In this way, the treatise literature came to serve as a conduit for some of Godfrey's more distinctive ideas. The notion of Charlemagne's German (rather than French) identity entered German vernacular historiography notably late:[95] around the close of the fourteenth century, in the Strasbourg chronicle of Jakob Twinger von Königshofen.[96] Among the works which Twinger evidently consulted was the *Tractatus de Iuribus Regni et Imperii Romanorum* of Lupold of Bebenburg.[97] Lupold's own prominent ruling on Charles' ethnic ascription had rested, however, upon the authority of Godfrey's *Pantheon*.[98]

Still more significant was the role of the treatise-writers as a bridge between Godfrey and a later, mainly Latin, historiography in Germany. German scholars of the age of humanism, in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, were avid collectors and readers both of the imperialist literature of the *Barbarossazeit* and of the later medieval tracts written in the empire's defence.[99] The outspoken patriotism of these writers – a number of whom were, like the thirteenth- and fourteenth-century treatise-writers, natives of 'Frankish' Germany – drew sustenance from these sources. The humanists reiterated the arguments that they encountered in works such as Lupold's *Tractatus de Iuribus* (which had been popularized among them through its robustly Germanophile exploitation by the Sienese arch-humanist Enea Silvio Piccolomini), sharpening their notes of ethnic division.[100] For writers such as Heinrich Bebel and Jakob Wimpfeling, the

[94] Grundmann, 'Über die Schriften', 198–99.

[95] R. Schnell, 'Lateinische und volkssprachliche Vorstellungen: zwei Fallbeispiele (Nationalbewußtsein; Königswahl)', in *Latein und Volkssprache im deutschen Mittelalter 1100–1500*, ed. N. Henkel and N.F. Palmer (Tübingen, 1992), 123–41 (here esp. 131–32); Jostkleigrewe, *Das Bild des Anderen*, 162–70.

[96] *Chronik des Jacob Twinger von Königshofen*, ed. C. Hegel, in *Chroniken der deutschen Städte*, 8 (Leipzig, 1870), 402.

[97] The affinity between the two works is particularly clearly evident in Twinger's criticism of contemporary Rhenish nobles for calling themselves 'Rhinelanders', rather than acknowledging their (Trojan, and German) Frankish heritage: *Chronik des Jacob Twinger*, ed. Hegel, in *Chroniken der deutschen Städte*, 9 (Leipzig, 1871), 624; cf. Lupold von Bebenburg, *Tractatus de Iuribus*, c. 3, in *Politische Schriften*, ed. Miethke and Flüeler, 264–65. That Twinger should have consulted Lupold's treatise is not inherently implausible, since he is known to have also made use of the Latin history of the papal Schism by Dietrich of Niem: Heimpel, *Dietrich von Niem*, 171.

[98] Lupold von Bebenburg, *Tractatus de Iuribus*, c. 3, in *Politische Schriften*, ed. Miethke and Flüeler, 260–61.

[99] For humanist interest in the reign of Barbarossa, see H. Krieg, 'Die Staufer in der Wahrnehmung des späten Mittelalters', in *Von Palermo zum Kyffhäuser: staufische Erinnerungsorte und Staufermythos*, ed. K.-H. Rueß (Göppingen, 2012), 77–96, at 83–90; for their use of late-medieval imperialist texts, see generally Borchardt, *German Antiquity*.

[100] H. Münkler and H. Grünberger, 'Enea Silvio Piccolominis Anstösse zur Entdeckung der nationalen Identität der "Deutschen"', in H. Münkler, H. Grünberger and K. Mayer,

German-ness of Charlemagne, the imperial claims of the German people and the distinct, and distinctly second-class, status of the *Franci occidentales* were matters of urgent concern. The Franks, who came from Troy, and who had gained the empire and the protection of the church on account of their outstanding martial skills, were emphatically not to be confused with their western neighbours, the *Francigenae*. On all these points, the humanists discovered, the treatise-writers of the post-Staufer era had had much to say. In significant part, however, that was because those writers had already assembled and elucidated salient passages from the writings of Godfrey of Viterbo, upon which the Alsatian humanists were thus now also able to seize.[101]

Salimbene's record of his shock on learning of the death of the last Hohenstaufen emperor is but one memorable testimony to the profound changes which appear to constitute the defining element of his age. Change, and the expectation of further radical upheavals to come, dominated contemporary reflections, and change remains the guiding theme of many modern accounts of the period. In what ways do the writings of Godfrey of Viterbo, in their use by the empire's post-Staufer defenders, confirm or modify this view? The picture they present appears a more complex one, composed of mixed elements of change and continuity, than we are accustomed to see. The mere fact that a writer of Godfrey's strong Staufer partisanship and grandiose imperial vision continued to be read after 1250 represents a significant element of continuity. Yet the imperialist treatises, whose arguments his writings were now called upon to serve, constituted in important respects a new genre. Their vision is, on the whole, of an *imperium* not ascendant but enfeebled, crisis-stricken and threatened: of a new world in which old certainties are no longer secure and must be defended. They also signal change in a different way, in their strongly ethnocentric conception of the empire (as the rightful inheritance of the German people) and of a hostile and predatory wider world in which it must subsist. In all this, they were able to adopt and adapt narratives and interpretations from Godfrey. Yet their vision of a world divided did not draw only upon themes of inter-ethnic conflict and competition, but on a conception of separate political spheres which made substantial concessions to the realities of the day. Here was no mere thoughtless perpetuation of Carolingian-Ottonian, or Hohenstaufen, political theology. More than one of the treatise-writers was ready to concede to the empire's French neighbour a quite distinct and separate, constitutionally

---

Nationenbildung: Die Nationalisierung Europas im Diskurs humanistischer Intellektueller: Italien und Deutschland (Berlin, 1998), 163–233; Hirschi, *Wettkampf der Nationen*, 107–23.

[101] In addition to absorbing Godfrey's influence via the treatise-writers, some humanists also read him directly: Weber, 'The Historical Importance', 155; Borchardt, *German Antiquity*, 12, n. 9 and 236, n. 37.

- inviolable, sphere of life.[102] At least in their broad vision, of a divisible western political world of multiple, if interconnecting, histories, they again followed where Godfrey had led.

Considered from a different perspective, however, the political legacy of Godfrey's writings illuminates fundamental continuities between his world and what came after. The literate political culture of the late twelfth century in Latin Europe already looks towards later times, not least in its increasingly insistent founding of political claims upon constructions of common identity and history. In this – but not only this – respect there are good grounds for regarding Godfrey as the first in a succession of writers on the empire characteristic of the later Middle Ages.[103] Current scholarship casts doubt upon the closeness of his ties with members of the Staufer inner circle.[104] More fundamentally, older views of Barbarossa's court, as home to a tightly knit and co-ordinated school of poets and historiographers, receiving and disseminating official doctrines, have recently begun to give way to an altogether less regimented, more diffuse, picture.[105]

Godfrey's *Königsnähe* has thus hitherto probably been overstated, or at least oversimplified. He too, like most of the empire's late-medieval defenders, stood mainly on the outside, looking in.[106] There are no secure grounds for thinking that Henry VI paid Godfrey's works any more attention than the Luxembourg

---

[102] See Alexander of Roes, *Memoriale*, c. 24, ed. Grundmann and Heimpel, 125, for the claim that Charlemagne granted the French a portion of his realm to hold free of any temporal superior; and see: L.E. Scales, 'France and the Empire: The Viewpoint of Alexander of Roes', *French History*, 9 (1995), 394–416; M. Fuhrmann, *Alexander von Roes: Ein Wegbereiter des Europagedankens?*, Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, 1994, Bericht 4 (Heidelberg, 1994), 31 (for Alexander's 'pluralistic' thinking). Lupold of Bebenburg acknowledged that it was 'the opinion of many' that the king of France was free of subjection to the empire: *Tractatus de Iuribus*, Capitulatio, in *Politische Schriften*, ed. Miethke and Flüeler, 237.

[103] Godfrey's method of working also appears to resemble that of later imperialist writers. Alexander of Roes seems to have constructed his *Memoriale* via a succession of drafts, in a manner which, as his editors noted, shows parallels with Godfrey: Grundmann and Heimpel, 'Einleitung', in *Alexander von Roes: Schriften*, ed. Grundmann and Heimpel, 31.

[104] Weber, 'The Historical Importance', 162. The closeness of Godfrey's relationship with Henry VI had already been called into question by Baaken, 'Zur Beurteilung', 379.

[105] R. Deutinger, 'Imperiale Konzepte in der hofnahen Historiographie der Barbarossazeit', in *Staufisches Kaisertum im 12. Jahrhundert: Konzepte – Netzwerke – Politische Praxis*, ed. S. Burkhardt, T. Metz, B. Schneidmüller and S. Weinfurter (Regensburg, 2010), 25–39. An important earlier study is T. Szabó, *Herrscherbild und Reichsgedanke: Eine Studie zur höfischen Geschichtsschreibung unter Friedrich Barbarossa* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1971).

[106] For the view of Godfrey and other contemporary writers as projecting their conceptions onto Barbarossa's court from without, rather than these being generated and co-ordinated from within, see: Deutinger, 'Imperiale Konzepte', 38; P. Ganz, 'Friedrich Barbarossa: Hof und Kultur',

emperor Charles IV (r. 1346–78) was to bestow upon the writings so solicitously but fruitlessly addressed to him by Konrad of Megenberg.[107] Godfrey's milieu was not only – perhaps not even mainly – that of the imperial entourage: much of his surviving oeuvre was probably written far remote from the Staufer court.[108] In common with the later treatise-writers, his was also a world formed of communities of educated, Latinate clergy.[109] In the late twelfth century, as also in the thirteenth and fourteenth, imperialist thought was incubated within the structures of the church. It is hardly surprising, then, that Godfrey's readers in the late Middle Ages found him to be speaking a language they could readily understand.

The imperial metahistories which the treatise-writers were driven to construct, in substantial part out of components furnished by Godfrey, and which the German humanists later repeated, elaborated and further disseminated, were destined to enjoy a remarkably long life. In 1935, 'eight [very distinguished] German historians' still felt impelled to offer 'answers' to that question which had so avidly preoccupied Godfrey's late-medieval readers: why did Charles the Great's Frankish-ness make of him a German rather than a Frenchman?[110] Revealingly, their book appeared in a series entitled *Contemporary Problems* (*Probleme der Gegenwart*). As late as the 1970s, an octogenarian Walther Kienast was still to be found chiding Rahewin for getting Charlemagne's identity 'wrong', and praising Otto of Freising for avoiding the trap of equating the Franks with the French.[111] Recent scholarship on the emergence in the Middle Ages of a historically grounded 'German' identity has concentrated particularly upon the influential vernacular origin myth, first set down in the eleventh century in the

---

in *Friedrich Barbarossa: Handlungsspielräume und Wirkungsweisen des staufischen Kaisers*, ed. A. Haverkamp (Sigmaringen, 1992), 623–50, at 634–35.

[107] For the dedications, see Konrad of Megenberg, *De Translacione* and *Tractatus contra Wilhelmum Occam*, in *Unbekannte kirchenpolitische Streitschriften*, ed. Scholz, 249 and 346; for Konrad's evident failure to elicit a response from Charles IV, see J. Miethke, 'Konrads von Megenberg Kampf mit dem Drachen: Der Tractatus contra Occam im Kontext', in *Konrad von Megenberg (1309–1374) und sein Werk: Das Wissen der Zeit*, ed. C. Märtl, G. Drossbach and M. Kintzinger (Munich, 2006), 73–97.

[108] Weber, 'The Historical Importance', 190.

[109] In addition to the ecclesiastical offices which he held on both sides of the Alps, Godfrey appears, like Alexander of Roes, to have spent time in the entourage of a cardinal – Octavian, later Pope Victor IV: Baaken, 'Zur Beurteilung', 385. For his canonries, see: Hausmann, 'Gottfried von Viterbo', 611–14; (more cautiously) Weber, 'The Historical Importance', 164–65.

[110] *Karl der Große oder Charlemagne? Acht Antworten deutscher Geschichtsforscher*, ed. K. Hampe (Berlin, 1935). For the character and significance of these essays, which were not written to serve official propaganda objectives, see B. Schneidmüller, 'Sehnsucht nach Karl dem Großen: Vom Nutzen eines toten Kaisers für die Nachgeborenen', *Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht*, 51 (2000), 284–301, at 284–85.

[111] Kienast, *Deutschland und Frankreich*, vol. 2, 524 and 529.

Annolied, and disseminated from the twelfth via the *Kaiserchronik*.[112] The Latin account of a German *origo*, at whose fountainhead stands Godfrey, has up till now been less closely studied. This imbalance demands to be redressed, for there is a strong case for arguing that, even if its medieval readership was the smaller of the two, the Latin tradition was ultimately to prove more significant. For the Latin treatise-writers of the troubled post-Staufer era did more than merely narrate their history: they *argued*. Their German past was a purposeful past, a foundation for the parchment defence of political claims and the refutation of allegedly dangerous rivals. If German medievalists of the mid-twentieth century still deemed the nationality of Charlemagne to be a fruitful topic for argument, the explanation for that fact must be sought, in part at least, with Godfrey of Viterbo and his late-medieval readers.

---

[112] H. Thomas, 'Julius Caesar und die Deutschen: Zu Ursprung und Gehalt eines deutschen Geschichtsbewußtseins in der Zeit Gregors VII. und Heinrichs IV', in *Die Salier und das Reich*, 3 vols, ed. S. Weinfurter (Sigmaringen, 1992), vol. 3, 245–77; H. Thomas, 'Sprache und Nation: Zur Geschichte des Wortes deutsch vom Ende des 11. Bis zur Mitte des 15. Jahrhunderts', in *Nation und Sprache: Die Diskussion ihres Verhältnisses in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ed. A. Gardt (Berlin and New York, 2000), 47–101.