



HERWIG WOLFRAM

Translated by Denise A. Kaiser

Conrad II, 990-1039

Emperor of Three Kingdoms

Conrad II, 990–1039

OTHER BOOKS BY HERWIG WOLFRAM IN ENGLISH TRANSLATION:

History of the Goths

The Roman Empire and Its Germanic Peoples

HERWIG WOLFRAM

translated by Denise A. Kaiser



Conrad II
990–1039
Emperor of Three Kingdoms

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS
UNIVERSITY PARK, PENNSYLVANIA

Disclaimer: Some images in the printed version of this book are not available for inclusion in the eBook.

This English translation of *Konrad II*
was made possible through the kind support of the
Austrian Ministry for Education, Science, and Culture.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Wolfram, Herwig.
[Konrad II, 990–1039. English]
Konrad II, 990–1039 : emperor of three kingdoms / Herwig Wolfram ;
translated by Denise A. Kaiser.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-271-02738-X (cloth : alk. paper)

1. Konrad II, Holy Roman Emperor, ca. 990–1039.
2. Holy Roman Empire—Kings and rulers—Biography.
3. Holy Roman Empire—History—Konrad II, 1024–1039.

I. Title: Conrad the Second, 990–1039.

II. Kaiser, Denise Adele, 1953–.

III. Title.

DD142.W65I3 2006

943'.022092—dc22

2006000633

First published in Germany as
Konrad II, 990–1039: Kaiser dreier Reiche
© C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Munich, 2000

English translation © 2006 The Pennsylvania State University
All rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America
Published by The Pennsylvania State University Press,
University Park, PA 16802-1003

The Pennsylvania State University Press is a member of the
Association of American University Presses.

It is the policy of
The Pennsylvania State University Press
to use acid-free paper. This book is printed on
Natures Natural, containing 50% post-consumer waste,
and meets the minimum requirements of
American National Standard for Information Sciences—
Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Material,
ANSI Z39.48–1992.

IN MEMORY OF *Heinrich von Fichtenau and Reinhard Wenskus*

CONTENTS

<i>List of Illustrations</i>	ix
<i>Translator's Note</i>	xi
<i>Introduction to the English-Language Edition</i>	xiii
<i>Our Story Opens</i>	i

PART ONE: FROM WORMS TO BASLE

1	Conrad II	15
2	Gisela	31
3	The Royal Election of Conrad II	42
4	Coronation, Assumption of Office, and Royal Progress	46

PART TWO: CONFLICTS AND THEIR RESOLUTION

5	Family Ties or Intrafamilial Disputes	71
6	Sitting Out Conflict: The Dispute over Gandersheim (1025–30/31)	89
7	Engaging in Conflict: The First Expedition to Italy (1026–27)	95
8	The Emperor in Germany (1027): Court Diets, Synods, Confidential Discussions, and Compromises	114
9	Engaging in Conflict: The Second Expedition to Italy (1036–38)	118

PART THREE: THE REALM

10	The Sovereign	141
11	The “People”	169

PART FOUR: FOREIGN POLICY

12	Bilateral Diplomacy: The Imperial Embassy to Constantinople (1027–29)	197
13	Conrad's Policies Toward the Peoples to the Empire's North and East	204
14	Consolidation of Sovereignty over Burgundy (1032–38) and the Accord with France	239

PART FIVE: THE CHURCH

15	The Ecclesiastical Policy of Conrad II	249
16	The Six Archbishoprics of Germany	255

- 17 The Most Important Bishoprics North of the Alps 271
18 Open Conflicts with Bishops 290
19 Conrad's Monastic Policy 294
20 Issues of Canon Law 308
21 Summary 314

PART SIX: EPILOGUE

- 22 Personality and Policies 321
23 The Emperor's Life Draws to a Close: Utrecht, June 4, 1039 343

Appendix: Genealogy of the Early Salians 349

List of Abbreviations 353

Notes 355

Bibliography 431

Index 457

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

MAPS

1. The Kingdoms of Europe ca. 1050. (Adapted from Hagen Keller, *Zwischen regionaler Begrenzung und universalem Horizont*, Propyläen Geschichte Deutschlands, 2 [Berlin, 1986], 19) 2
2. The Northern Tier, Bohemia, and Moravia. (Adapted from Hans Karl Schulze, *Hegemoniales Kaisertum: Ottonen und Salier*, 3rd ed. [Berlin, 1994], 226) 208

FIGURES

1. The widowed Empress Gisela entering the abbey church at Echternach in Trier. From the Pericope Book of Henry III, ca. 1040; Bremen Universitätsbibliothek, MS b.21, fol. 2r. (photo: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, Wiesbaden, Germany) 39
2. Deposing a lord. From the fresco cycle in the west choir of the abbey church at Lambach, ca. 1080 (photo: Bundesdenkmalamt, Vienna, Austria) 82
3. Fresco depicting Henry III, Conrad II, and Gisela (on the right), and Adalbero of Carinthia (?) and Poppo of Aquileia (on the left), with larger-than-life-size representations of saints. In the apse of the basilica of Aquileia (photo: Prof. Ernst-Dieter Hehl, Mainz, Germany) 110
4. Conrad's imperial seal (August 23, 1028) bearing the inscription HEINRICUS SPES IMPERII, or HENRY HOPE OF THE EMPIRE. From the Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Nuremberg, Germany 143
5. The Imperial Cross. From the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, Austria 145
6. The Imperial Crown. From the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, Austria 148–149
 - a. Plate depicting King David (I).
 - b. Plate depicting King Solomon (III).
 - c. Plate depicting Isaiah and King Hezekiah (VII).
 - d. Plate depicting Christ in majesty (V).
7. Burial crowns of Conrad (bottom) and Gisela (top). From the Historisches Museum der Pfalz, Speyer, Germany (photo: Kurt Diehl) 156

8. Early medieval jewelry unearthed in Mainz (1880) 158
 - a. Fibula depicting an eagle or a peacock. From the Landesmuseum Mainz.
 - b. “Loros,” pectoral ornament. From Kunstgewerbemuseum, Staatliche Museen, Berlin (photo: Bildarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz/Art Resource, NY)
9. Conrad and Gisela kneeling before Christ in a mandorla. From the Golden Evangeliary of Henry III, ca. 1045; Escorial, Madrid, Cod. Vitrinas 17, fol. 2v. (photo: Badische Landesbibliothek Karlsruhe) 160
10. Henry and Agnes presenting Mary, the Mother of God, with the Golden Evangeliary. From the Golden Evangeliary of Henry III, ca. 1045; Escorial, Madrid, Cod. Vitrinas 17, fol. 3r. (photo: Archiv für Kunst und Geschichte Berlin) 161
11. Coin minted in Speyer, silver, eleventh century. From the Grote collection, 1879; Muenzkabinett, Staatliche Museen, Berlin (photos: Bildarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz/Art Resource, NY) 166
 - a. Two crowned busts (Conrad and Henry) flanking a crosier.
 - b. A bust of the Virgin Mary with hands raised and the head of the Christ child in the foreground.
12. Rome, Gallia, Germania, and Scлавinia (left to right) paying homage to Emperor Otto III. From the Evangeliary of Otto III, ca. 1000; Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich, Clm 4453, fols. 23v–24r 206–207
13. Ring that belonged to Archbishop Aribio of Mainz. From the Cathedral and Diocesan Museum of Mainz 257
14. The cathedral at Speyer (photo: Foto Marburg/Art Resource, NY) 279
15. Interior of the Chapel of Saint Bartholomew, cathedral at Paderborn (photo: Diocesan Museum of Paderborn) 285
16. The parable of the wicked vinedressers. From the Codex Aureus, ca. 1030, in Echternach; Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Nuremberg, Germany, MS 156142/KG 1138, fol. 77r 305
17. Lead plaques found in the graves of Conrad II (top) and Gisela (bottom) in the cathedral at Speyer. From the Historisches Museum der Pfalz, Speyer, Germany (photo: Kurt Diehl) 346

TRANSLATOR'S NOTE

The original version of this book by Herwig Wolfram, professor emeritus at the University of Vienna, was first published in German with the title *Konrad II, 990–1039: Kaiser dreier Reiche* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 2000). That the Pennsylvania State University Press elected to commission a translation so soon after its appearance is a testament to the work's importance and its author's reputation.

While it is not unusual today for foreign scholars to be fluent in English, it is rare for them to enjoy as strong a command of the language and a sense of stylistic voice as Prof. Wolfram. As a result, a sentence-by-sentence comparison of this translation with the original would reveal that, in the interests of clarity, conciseness, and accessibility, the English version on occasion captures the conceptual, instead of the literal, meaning of the German text. Geographical references have been amplified as necessary, and all foreign-language words and phrases rendered in English, except for commonplaces, technical terms, and quotations of interest to the scholarly reader. In the latter case, translations are provided for the nonspecialist; those in square brackets represent my own efforts. Whenever possible, the notes have been expanded to embrace English translations of medieval sources and edited to cite the English versions of contemporary studies originally published in another language. A few alterations have been made to the text and/or notes to accommodate more recent scholarship. All references to biblical passages rely on either the English Revised Standard Version or the Vulgate.

I wish to thank Prof. Wolfram for his encouragement in general and for his prompt and clear responses to all my questions in particular; Peter Potter and the staff of the Pennsylvania State University Press and Keith Monley for providing excellent editorial support; and my husband, Dr. Gregory Dworkin, for his steady encouragement and good-humored technical assistance.

INTRODUCTION TO THE ENGLISH-LANGUAGE EDITION

The historian selects his own history from within history.

—Gaston Bachelard, *L'eau et les rêves: Essai sur l'imagination de la matière*
(Paris, 1947), 26

King Frederick II “the Great”—if you will—of Prussia (1712–86) was incensed by the authors of historical studies because he deemed most of them bourgeois “pedants” or “members of the Benedictine congregation of Saint Maur” who presumed to judge long-dead sovereigns and their ministers even though they lacked even the slightest comprehension of political or military issues.¹ There was and still is a grain of truth to that complaint, even though the political landscape has experienced extensive democratization since his day and military matters have attained such importance that they are no longer entrusted to soldiers alone. Even so, “Old Fritz,” as he was called, did have a point: It is difficult for historians to produce an accurate and balanced description of the past dealings and the underlying motives of royal decision makers. It also matters whether the ruler died a century or, as in the case of Conrad II, somewhat less than one thousand years ago. We can imagine some fictive sovereign dying on, say, “June 4, 1905,” but what about Conrad II, who in 1039 “departed this life on the 11 of the nones of June (in other words, on June 4), the second day of the week (Monday) in the seventh indiction (the seventh year in the fifteen-year cycle used by the Romans to calculate taxes)”² The differences between them extend far beyond that between the levels of effort—not to mention historical and chronological training—necessary to decipher the respective dates. So much time has passed since Conrad’s day that we are justified in wondering whether it is even possible for someone of our day and age to write the biography of an individual who lived in the eleventh century.

The paucity and nature of medieval sources—their supposed or actual disregard of personality and individuality, their penchant for preconceptions and for interpretations that treat the actions as well as the motives of the actors as exemplars—do not provide the sort of material that Europeans, who think of things from a psychological point of view, demand in a biography today. “When it comes to the early Middle Ages, our ability to discern a person’s individuality is limited, and we are often obliged to proceed in a cautious and roundabout manner, primarily by inferring information from

the interactions between the person and his environment. . . . The appraisals (of contemporaries) are mostly monotonous recitations of good or evil that focus on a few undifferentiated, typical virtues and vices, with an eye to the presumed consequences—positive and negative—in the hereafter.”³

Today, everyone knows—even without having studied psychology—that childhood and adolescence are the formative periods of one’s life. While it is debatable whether “youth is the loveliest age,” as Curt Goetz (d. 1960), a Swiss humorist, once put it, for long stretches of human history it was not treated as a distinct stage, even though youth was one of the ages of man. A person’s early years were of so little interest in the Middle Ages that even the biographer Einhard (d. 840) could assert—no doubt contrary to fact—that he knew nothing about Charlemagne’s childhood and youth.⁴

Next, what about the choice of a spouse, which we find so revealing today? To what extent did an individual in that era allow him- or herself be swayed by personal passion and emotion? All cultures have marriage customs, and the more formalized those customs are, the more informative a deviation from the norm is, the more a conscious violation of the norm—such as, for instance, a woman’s consenting to a bridal abduction—says about an individual’s personality. For example, Carolingian queens were often accused of having committed adultery, but as Johannes Fried so rightly put it, such accusations signaled “crises, not always within the marriage, but always within the kingdom.”⁵

Should our suspicions be not equally aroused by information and appraisals found in our sources that strike us as modern in tone? Thus, we learn that Conrad changed his name upon his election in 1024, dropping the name Cuno in favor of Conrad; the change in his “honor” triggered an “improvement” in his name.⁶ In the same way, who in this part of Europe has not heard tell of a Much or Hias hailing from the remotest reaches of the Pitz valley in the Tyrolean Alps of southwestern Austria who, upon receiving a tenured professorship at the University of Innsbruck, suddenly claims that he has always gone by the name of Michael or Matthias?

In this work, we are interested in a single individual from the past. As even Jacques Le Goff (b. 1924)—a proponent of the *Annales* school of historical thought who has recently published a biography of the saintly French king, Louis IX (1226–70)—stated some years ago, “Sick and tired of abstractions, the investigator of historical structures felt a need for concrete facts. In actuality, he wished to become the sort of historian Marc Bloch said was ‘like a man-eater in a fairy tale: Wherever he smelled the flesh of a human, there he caught the scent of his prey.’ And indeed not just any prey, no longer people within a community, the collectivity of human potential; no, what filled his nostrils was the scent of an individual person, a quite specific historical figure.”⁷ “Willingly or unwillingly, in the West today the historian again enjoys

to some degree much the same social status and performs much the same function as in the nineteenth century: intellectual, author, national or European celebrity.” Stylistic considerations have also regained importance. “His chances of tapping the full potential of *écriture historique* [historical writing] are better with a biography, however, than with the other historical genres.”⁸

At the end of the twelfth century, Abbess Herrad of Landsberg commissioned a work titled the *Hortus deliciarum*, or *Garden of Delights*, which includes a portrait—rendered in the style of a relief on a Roman gravestone—of each of the sixty nuns in her Alsatian cloister of Odelienberg-Hohenburg. The sixty busts are arranged in six rows, with eleven drawings on each of the lower three rows, and nine on each of upper three. In recognition of her rank, Abbess Herrad alone is depicted as a standing figure, stretching from the bottommost to the topmost of the six rows. Even though there is a separate portrait for each nun, they are barely distinguishable from one another. In fact, the “portraits” are practically identical. The work’s patroness and its artist obviously discerned “the individuality of each nun not in her outward appearance, but elsewhere,” and it is we modern viewers who fail at first glance to find the key to enter this “elsewhere.”⁹ Some follow in the footsteps of the nineteenth-century historian Jacob Burckhardt and aver that a sense of the individual first developed in the Renaissance. During the Middle Ages, in contrast, “[m]an was conscious of himself only as member of a race, people, party, family, or corporation—only through some general category.” The ban on human individuality was first lifted in the Italian city-states of the fifteenth century, as we read at the beginning of “The Development of the Individual,” part 2 of Burckhardt’s famous study *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*.¹⁰ If we accept this view, it seems applicable to the series of nuns’ portraits. Consonant with the Anglo-American scholarly tradition, on the other hand, some roll back the onset of the Renaissance to the twelfth century. According to that approach, the discovery of the individual began around 1050 and was complete by the end of the twelfth century. By the way, this is the very same period covered by the eminent Austrian medievalist Heinrich Fichtenau (d. 2000) in his last book, which bears the noteworthy title *Heretics and Scholars*.

Generally speaking, a historian turns to biography only after he or she has reached a certain stage in life, bolstered by the experience that comes with age. The exception to this rule is Ernst Kantorowicz (d. 1963), who published his life of Emperor Frederick II in 1927 at the age of thirty-two. Whoever has been able to spend years learning to observe, examine, indeed penetrate, one’s fellow creatures begins—like Jacob Burckhardt—to seek out the “individual and general” characteristics of “historical stature”; in doing so, “we fervently wish to become better acquainted with individuality.”¹¹

“How enchantingly beautiful this likeness is!” sings Prince Tamino in Mozart’s opera *The Magic Flute*. At first glance at her portrait, he falls in love

with a girl whom he has never met and yet on whose account he is nonetheless prepared to face the greatest trials. The prince is so captivated that he does not inquire into her paternity—not to speak of that gentleman’s financial status—or into the good reputation and character of his presumptive mother-in-law. In any case, the blessed naïf Papagano has the wit to point out that the portrait, unlike the real thing, lacks hands and feet! At a far remove from the operatic stage, likenesses were also exchanged on the stage of world history; in early modern times, for example, members of the Spanish and Austrian branches of the Hapsburg dynasty exchanged portraits as a prelude to the marriage bonds being brokered by their chancellors. The ancients even believed that the *imago imperatoris* [image of the emperor] did not merely depict the emperor but actually *was* the emperor.

Our subject’s physical attributes are also significant, since a biographer must immediately grapple with questions like Was he tall or short? Was she beautiful or plain? Fair or dark? Ready and able to undertake physical exertion? Furthermore, did he or she marry and have children, or was the marriage without male issue or even barren? Was there generational conflict? Did our subject make any personal statements, utter any witticisms, or figure in any anecdotes? Percy Ernst Schramm (d. 1970) studied the witticisms of Charlemagne, Otto III, and Henry IV,¹² and Gerd Althoff relied to no small measure on anecdotes and witticisms in his analysis of “what made a person famous in the Middle Ages.” The latter scholar cited examples of the highly valued quick-wittedness, of “a way with words, be they pointed, ironic, sarcastic or even conceited, [that] rendered one’s partners, opponents, or enemies speechless and cunningly stopped them in their tracks.”¹³ Moreover, “holding forth was simply an attribute of lordship, an attitude of dominion in an oral community,” wrote Johannes Fried. “The ritualized word of the king, *verbum regis*, possessed the force of law.”¹⁴

Penetrating further, we inquire into the individual’s origins, education, religious devotion, political influence, or even power. Of particular interest are the hero’s or heroine’s relationships with others, particularly family members; in fact, the familial community encompassed the dead as well as the living, since part of an individual’s “kinship mores”¹⁵ involved cultivating the memory of the dead. Furthermore, how did the individual resolve and manage conflict? That topic has garnered increased attention in recent years.¹⁶ Even in periods that may have been marked by “a correlation between minimal interest in individuality and only modest attention to an individual’s training,”¹⁷ we cannot be absolutely sure that conflicts were sufficiently ritualized as to be managed “in a routine manner.” If we were to compare how different individuals resolved conflicts during a given epoch, we probably would be able to identify distinguishing characteristics that might qualify as “individual” in nature. Did the person proceed in the traditional manner or—as in Conrad’s

case—employ approaches so novel that they either met with surprisingly swift success or fell flat, forcing him to make amends along traditional lines?

The following study does not purport to be a biography of Conrad II in the fullest sense of the word. That is also true of the intelligent book by Franz-Reiner Erkens, which was published in 1998 as part of a series titled *Historische Biographien*. While they are learned in tone, these attractive volumes are aimed at a broader readership and must provide their target audience appropriate breadth, structure, and scholarly apparatus, as well as depth of analysis. Given the editorial guidelines for the series, the book's author is to be congratulated on a remarkable achievement and to be thanked as well for permitting this scholar to consult the work when his own study was approximately four-fifths finished.¹⁸

Furthermore, the second edition of Werner Goetz's book *Lebensbilder aus dem Mittelalter* [Biographical Sketches of Medieval Figures] proved to be very helpful. In a mere eighteen pages, Goetz successfully paints a convincing as well as stirring portrait of Conrad II.¹⁹ A book titled *Kaiser Konrad II. und seine Zeit* [The Life and Times of Emperor Conrad II], published not all that long ago, covers more ground than a pure biography—hence the “and Times” in the title²⁰—and relies extensively on the two-volume work *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs unter Konrad II* [Annals of the German Empire Under Conrad II], published in 1879 and 1884 by Harry Bresslau (d. 1926). This nineteenth-century study was the crown jewel in the series *Jahrbücher der deutschen Geschichte: Auf Veranlassung Seiner Majestät des Königs von Bayern: Herausgegeben durch die historische Commission bei der Königl. Akademie der Wissenschaften* [Annals of German History: Commissioned by His Majesty the King of Bavaria: Published by the Historical Commission of the Royal Academy of Arts and Sciences]. We owe Bresslau a debt of gratitude for a remarkable number of works—including his editions of Conrad's diplomas and of *The Deeds of Conrad II* by Wipo—that remain authoritative to this day. In an unsurpassable achievement, he consulted and knowledgeably evaluated German, European, and even non-European historical sources. It took Bresslau fifteen years—one year for each year of Conrad's reign²¹—to bring this awe-inspiring work to fruition. While the work is structured along chronological lines, it includes many digressions highlighting connections and providing thoroughgoing analysis.²²

On December 1, 1918—less than one month after the signing of the armistice that ended World War I—Bresslau was expelled from France on the charge of being a “militant Pan-Germanist.” At seventy years of age, the German medievalist, father-in-law of the Protestant theologian and future Nobel Peace-prize winner Dr. Albert Schweitzer, and, lastly, adherent of the—to quote the parlance favored in assimilationist circles at the time—“Mosaic Confession,” that is, Jewish faith, found himself summarily dismissed from his

professorship at the University of Strasbourg—founded during the nineteenth-century German occupation of Alsace—and forced “to haul the forty kilos [eighty-eight pounds] of luggage allowed him across the bridge over the Rhine River at Kehl by himself.”²³ In truth, the representatives of the victorious *Grande Nation* of France treated him ignobly, and the label “militant Pan-Germanist” was not merely overblown but patently unjust. Be that as it may, the general reader today may very well find Bresslau’s point of view and style redolent of German nationalism, and if the *Jahrbücher*—deservedly reprinted in 1967—were the only work available, the public would understandably be dismissive of Conrad II. And therein lies the first reason for undertaking this study, namely, to tell Conrad’s story in modern language, from a modern perspective, and with an eye to modern modes of interpretation.

The content of the story has also changed over the last 115 years. For instance, we have learned to distinguish between the Cluniac monasticism that arose in Burgundy and the reform movements that took root in German soil: Even though the proponents of the latter types of reform may have sought to approximate the *ordo* [rule] observed at Cluny, their foundations nevertheless remained imperial monasteries duty-bound to the emperor and, unlike the Cluniac houses, never attained “liberty” from secular power.²⁴ This distinction was still beyond the ken of Harry Bresslau and his successors. Also, the passage of time has fostered markedly different interpretations of certain issues, such as the social tensions in northern Italy during Conrad’s day.²⁵

To no small measure, the same holds true for our understanding of politics. And therein lies the prime reason for a new study of this ruler: Conrad II sometimes resembles a modern politician, and at the same time he presents us moderns with a paradox. Here we have a bearded medieval emperor who let his wife take part in much, if not most, important political decision making, who turned to her for advice and deferred to her opinion. The reigns of Conrad and his son Henry III (1039–56) may have marked the pinnacle of “German imperial grandeur,” as it was once commonly and anachronistically termed,²⁶ but that is a matter of lesser interest to us. A more pressing issue is that phenomenon we term “political engagement,” the ability to avail oneself of the existing official, social, and economic structures in order to assert one’s own authority and marginalize one’s opponents. While his predecessor and successor both aroused serious and even mortal opposition their whole lives long, Conrad is not known to have been targeted for assassination. It hardly comes as a surprise that one roughly contemporary non-German could attribute the Salian’s sudden and broadly backed rise to imperial power to only one thing, the help of the devil.²⁷ In our day and age we are hardly satisfied with this sort of explanation, yet even nowadays we speak of someone’s having a “magic touch” in politics, although a politician may work his or her “wizardry” only for a given time.

It is commonly said that a good politician is like a good actor; both of them measure their success in the here and now on the basis of a well-received performance. Hence, we ought not to equate good political instincts with greatness in an individual.²⁸ Seeking to implement far-reaching decisions through wide-ranging proposals is only rarely good politics, since such plans tend to strike contemporaries as overly burdensome and can be adequately evaluated only by posterity. In his day Chancellor Otto von Bismarck (d. 1898) was successful—in other words, “good”—at foreign affairs, and yet the results were catastrophic. British prime minister Winston Churchill (d. 1965) won World War II and then resigned after losing in the next parliamentary elections. Chancellor Helmut Kohl (b. 1930) brought about the reunification of Germany in 1990, promoted the integration of Germany into Europe, and was voted out of office. Konrad Adenauer (d. 1967), chancellor of West Germany from 1949 to 1963, and Bruno Kreisky (d. 1990), chancellor of Austria from 1970 to 1983, were both known for keeping their ears to the ground and dealing with issues proactively, if possible, or at least reacting very swiftly—for being good tacticians in the short run but also for reversing their decisions if circumstances changed. All of these traits make for good politics, once it is possible to resolve or defuse a conflict and forge an agreement between opposing parties. In short: Good politics involves keeping one’s eye on the ball, not being too short-sighted or looking beyond the immediate horizon; it is the “art of the possible” for a given age.

While we may allege that Conrad and his “indispensable helpmate” Gisela were good politicians, we do not with the same breadth claim that they were great historical figures, that their policies reflected grand political designs, or that we must always sanction or even admire their methods and the ramifications of their actions. To the extent possible, we should of course rise above the moral and hence anachronistic ivory-tower standards of our and bygone ages in making our assessments; those ought to rest instead on a critical reading of the historical sources and our own experience in life. The latter should serve as a reality check, lest—in Procrustean fashion—we be tempted to stretch our interpretations of even the most personal statements to fit some predetermined political framework.²⁹ Life also teaches us that things never work out the same for two people; in other words, two politicians may appear to be saying or doing the same thing, yet one falls flat on his or her face, while the other is praised to the skies. Our investigation of Conrad II, ruler of the High Middle Ages, will put this theory to the test.

An acknowledgement is also in order here. I am grateful for an amazing stroke of luck that two scholars, having started work on related topics unbeknownst to one another, could become more and more forthcoming with each other as their studies progressed, to the point that they could even exchange their completed manuscripts, from which they derived mutual benefit

and support. The book on Henry II by Stefan Weinfurter may, however, have profited less by the exchange than did this biography of Conrad II, since the latter's author is something of a newcomer to the eleventh century, which cannot be said of Weinfurter.

And yet another acknowledgement is in order, one that readers familiar with medieval scholarship may themselves have already deduced. Just as twenty years ago I was able to apply material found in Reinhard Wenskus's book *Stammesbildung und Verfassung: Das Werden der frühmittelalterlichen "gentes"* [Ethnogenesis and Governance: Tribal Formation in the Early Middle Ages] to my own scholarly work on the Goths, so the biography before you attempts to draw concrete lessons from Fichtenau's work *Lebensordnungen des 10. Jahrhunderts* [*Living in the Tenth Century*]. Hence, it is with gratitude that I dedicate *Conrad II* to the memory of these scholars.

My special thanks go to the translator, Denise A. Kaiser, for her historical and linguistic talents, abiding patience, and effort, and to Keith Monley for his editorial expertise. I also wish to express my gratitude to Peter Potter of the Pennsylvania State University Press, who ventured to publish this book at the recommendation of Professors Rosamond McKitterick, University of Cambridge, and Patrick Geary, UCLA. Finally, I thank the Austrian Ministry for Education, Science, and Culture for generously subsidizing the publication of this book.

HERWIG WOLFRAM

Vienna, Austria

Spring 2006



OUR STORY OPENS

Our story opens in the last decade of the tenth century. For four generations central Europe had been under the rule of the Saxon dynasty, whose members—Emperor Otto III (983–1002) in particular—envisaged renewing the Roman Empire. In actuality, the Ottonian empire comprised two kingdoms: North of the Alps lay the kingdom of the Franks, embracing the Saxons and Bavarians, who jockeyed for preeminence, as well as the Alamanni, Thuringians, and East Franks, after whom the kingdom was known. Each of the latter groups maintained its own political unit—termed a *regnum*—and likewise did not wish to be shortchanged.¹ The Frankish kingdom corresponded for the most part to ancient Germania, whose largest province was now the land of the Slavs between the Elbe and Vistula Rivers. In contrast with Roman times, however, the easternmost portions of this region lay beyond the latter river.² The other half of this empire, the kingdom of the Langobards, or the Italian kingdom, was located south of the Alps and maintained relations with Roman Italy, that is, with the city of Rome and with the territories that stretched across that part of the peninsula to the Adriatic Sea and retained a strong Roman identity because they had remained under Romano-Byzantine rule into the latter half of the eighth century.³

While familiar modern concepts like “polity” or “border” are of little use to us in the face of this almost dizzying multiplicity of peoples and regions, odd institutions, and seemingly awkward forms of public life, that does not mean that we should discount the possibility of describing medieval organizational systems and concepts in current terms. Kings were itinerant; in other words, they lacked a fixed seat and were thus continually on the move. The only times they met with and exerted control over regional and local lords—like dukes, margraves, and counts, bishops and abbots—were at court and imperial diets. During the Carolingian period, the *missi dominici* [royal emissaries] were empowered to act as liaisons between the central and intermediate authorities, whom they sought to compel to act in the court’s interests.

From the start of the tenth century, however, they began to fade from the landscape north of the Alps and to exercise different functions to the south.⁴

Our story has so many contradictory elements that it is probably best to start with a historically based description of the geographical areas in which it unfolds. Thus, the kingdom in which Conrad II was born and which he ruled for almost fifteen years was the medieval Roman Empire. To this empire, comprising the one kingdom essentially north of the Alps and the other to the south, Conrad would later add a third, Burgundy. The transalpine *regnum* encompassed the kingdom of East Francia—but not West Francia—that had been granted to Louis the German in the Treaty of Verdun (843). Before the end of his exceptionally long life, Louis succeeded in laying the groundwork for the East Frankish annexation of Lotharingia. As a result, the kingdom

Image not available

MAP 1 The Kingdoms of Europe ca. 1050. (Adapted from Hagen Keller, *Zwischen regionaler Begrenzung und universalem Horizont*, Propyläen Geschichte Deutschlands, 2 [Berlin, 1986], 19.)

of the eastern Franks extended far beyond German-speaking regions. The margraviate of Flanders was subject to the West Frankish–French crown, but the eastern portion of Flanders, containing Antwerp, as well as Cambrai, Liège, Metz, Verdun, and Toul, belonged to Lower Lotharingia and thus was part of the eastern kingdom.⁵

From the mouth of the Schelde in the west to the mouth of the Eider in the east, the North Sea marked the northern boundary of the kingdom. Hedeby, near the town of Schleswig, was still part of Denmark, and for a short period during Conrad's reign some areas further south were subject to Danish control. The border followed the Eider for the most part, eastward to the border with the Slavs. That latter border began in the Kiel Bay of the Baltic Sea, extended southward to the town of Lauenburg, where it met the Elbe and continued upstream to the mouth of the Saale River. The border with the Slavs then followed the Saale southward to its headwaters in the Fichtel Mountains, finally meeting up with the Bohemian Forest. There it turned eastward to the Erzgebirge, which, along with the adjacent Sudetes range, marked the border of the kingdom, since the Christian Czechs of Bohemia and, from 1029 on, Moravia recognized the suzerainty of the East Frankish king.⁶ The border then skirted the Sudetes Mountains down to the White Carpathian Mountains—much like the modern border between Poland and the Czech Republic—and then dipped southward along the Morava River to the Danube. Hence, the Morava marked the boundary between the kingdom and Hungary, just as it does today between the Czech Republic and Slovakia.

To the north of the Danube the kingdom's borders were to a large extent open to debate vis-à-vis Poland and Hungary. South of the river, the eastern and southern borders of the kingdom followed regional demarcations that had already emerged in the early Middle Ages and were formalized by Louis the Pious in 828. This system of boundaries was extraordinarily stable; during the realm of the Hapsburgs, it still represented the official borderline between Lower Styria and Carniola, on the one hand, and Hungary and Croatia, on the other.⁷

Although Istria, as well as Friuli and the areas around the cities of Verona, and Trento had been ruled from the north since approximately 950,⁸ they continued to be part of Italy.⁹ The northeastern border of Italy ran roughly along the Isonzo River; the northern border stretched along the Carnic Alps and traversed South Tyrol westward to the region of Graubünden. The present-day Swiss canton of Ticino belonged to Italy. In the Rhine forest the border of the East Frankish kingdom veered north toward the Rhine, meeting up with its waters east of the current ethnographic boundary between the French and German speakers and continuing along the river to the bend near Basle. The stretch between the Rhine forest and Basle formed the boundary between the East Frankish and Burgundian kingdoms, but the ancient ties between Basle

and Burgundy had been unraveling since the early tenth century.¹⁰ From this bend in the Rhine, the border proceeded in a generally westerly direction until east of Langres it met up with the West Frankish–French kingdom.¹¹ The kingdom we have thus described was traditionally associated with the East Franks and was hence a *regnum Francorum* [Frankish kingdom]. The term “kingdom of the Germans,” or “German kingdom,” was adopted only much later, in the new millennium.¹²

The other kingdom that belonged to the medieval western empire was the kingdom of the Langobards, or Italian kingdom.¹³ Skirting the Aosta Valley but embracing the area of Ticino, the borders of this Italy stretched from the Adige River south of the town of Bolzano to the northern borders of Apulia and Calabria, where the western empire and Byzantine empire abutted one another. Sicily was in Arab hands, its emir subordinate to the Fatimids in Egypt. While the powers that be in the Mediterranean vied nominally over Sardinia and Corsica, the residents of those islands were in fact left to their own devices.

In present-day terms, the northern portion of this dual kingdom, which would be exalted into the Western Roman Empire, consisted of the Federal Republic of Germany minus some of its easternmost areas, the Czech Republic, Austria minus the Burgenland, most of Slovenia and South Tyrol, the Romansh-speaking Swiss canton of Graubünden, the German-speaking part of Switzerland east of Lake Lucerne, Alsace and Lorraine in France, as well as the Benelux countries minus the western portion of Flanders. Although the southern portion of the kingdom technically encompassed more than two-thirds of today’s Italy, the political structure was much less uniform. On the plains of the Po and in Tuscany the traditions of the Langobard kingdom continued to hold sway. From Ravenna southward beyond Rome stretched Roman Italy, where the pope would soon set to work carving out the papal states. In the south, Langobard traditions were preserved in the Beneventine principedom and its sister states, while Spoleto alternated between Langobard independence and dependence on the pope or emperor. In the High Middle Ages the Imperium Romanum covered approximately 700,000–800,000 square kilometers (270,300–308,900 square miles) and, following the absorption of Burgundy, about 100,000 square kilometers (38,600 square miles) more. The population of this area was approximately eight to ten million people, of whom more than two-thirds lived south of the Alps.¹⁴

In the early Middle Ages the Franks and Langobard had organized central Europe into kingdoms, or *regna*, and the restoration and rise of the Frankish kingdom during the eighth century was to no small degree possible because the ruling Carolingian house recognized and expanded upon that structure. Contemporary sources employed the term *regnum* to denote three different entities: the entire Carolingian kingdom, the Frankish or the Langobard-Italian

kingdom within the larger kingdom, or a political unit named after a people who lived according to a commonly held law. The first two were ruled almost without exception by kings, while the third could be led either by a king's son—with or without the kingly title—or by someone of nonroyal birth, like a prince, duke, or margrave. Thus, the Carolingian empire acquired a flexible structure, made up of a varying number of building blocks, that allowed it to pursue a wide range of imperial interests while strengthening its base at the local level. The magnates commonly demanded a role in the exercise of imperial authority by the Carolingians, and these “imperial aristocrats” considered themselves even more entitled to participate in the political life of the third sort of kingdom. Members of these aristocratic groups competed for the king's confidence, for power and influence, and the winners emerged as “second to the king.” In royal diplomas and other sources closely associated with a king, such magnates are referred to as the king's representatives, as *comites* (counts), and only later on as *marchiones* (margraves), even if they themselves were the rulers of *regna*. Nevertheless, even in Carolingian times such a *secundus a rege* could attain the princely rank of *dux gentis*, a position that past scholars somewhat anachronistically termed a “tribal duke.”¹⁵

During the tenth century the East Frankish principalities developed along diverging lines. Up until 1002, when Henry II ascended the throne, Bavaria and Swabia were kingdomlike entities whose rulers felt entitled to invest bishops without the king's prior permission. The duchy of the Franks was dismantled early on, and Lotharingia was divided into two duchies—Upper and Lower Lotharingia—in 959. The duchy of Carantania/Carinthia was created in 976 for the primary purpose of providing the king with princely titles to bestow upon his powerful intimates. It never became strong enough to put its stamp on the multiethnic region of the southeastern Alps. Even the duchy of Saxony, which had been strong initially, suffered a substantial diminution in power once the Saxon dukes—the Ottonians—achieved royal stature; in fact, the descendents of the viceroy Hermann Billung (d. 973) did not consolidate their hold on the Saxon duchy until the beginning of the eleventh century.¹⁶

None of these alleged “tribal principalities” was actually tribal in the sense meant by the term's nineteenth-century coiners, who were partial to the concept of “tribes” because it allowed them “to sidestep the impression that the German people, on the road to forging political unity, had originally consisted of various peoples.”¹⁷ Linguistically speaking, none of the seven duchies was monoglot: Saxony was home not just to the major population group from which the duchy took its name but also to Frisians and Thuringians, as well as to a large number of Slavs who lived west of the Elbe and Saale. Bavaria and the duchy of Carantania were inhabited by Bavarians, western Slavs residing along the borders with Bohemia and Moravia, Carantanian and Carnic Alpine Slavs, and Romans in the Alps proper, as well as Alamanni along the

Lech River, which marked the relatively open border between Bavaria and Swabia. Alamanni were also found in the kingdom of Burgundy and in Lotharingia (present-day Alsace and Lorraine), while Alamannia itself was home to a contingent of Romans in the area around Chur. Lotharingia was populated predominantly by bilingual Franks, but also contained a considerable number of Frisians. The former duchy of Francia may have lost its political unity but retained much of its demographic homogeneity, although the eastern Franks were joined by western Slavs settled along the upper Main and Rednitz Rivers.¹⁸ Lastly, in 976 a number of holdings originally granted to the dukes of Bavaria by the Ottonians—namely, the Slavic portion of Carniola that lay within the kingdom of the East Franks, certain Italian territories, Slavic-Roman Istria, and Friuli, as well as the march of Verona, which encompassed the county of Trento—were bestowed upon the duke of Carinthia. In like manner, the duke of Swabia was entrusted with the Italian county of Chiavenna.¹⁹

The balance of power at a given moment determined whether counts or margraves performed their duties on an equal footing with the duke or in his service. During the Carolingian age the comital system of governance was an essential instrument of royal authority over the realm; as representatives of the king, counts saw to the administration of justice, local affairs, and military matters. The count personified not only the royal mandate by which he held office but also the nobility's claim to possess a role in regional rule. The fundamental aspects of the comital system of governance dated back to the Carolingian age, so that, for example, the southern German dukes predominated over the counts within their *regnum*.²⁰ The Carolingian count exercised a royal mandate, and his set of duties, much like a bishop's, was regarded as a *ministerium*; in spite of all the changes time had wrought, this word continued to connote the classical concept of an office whose incumbent was subject to both hiring and firing. The phrase *ministerium comitis*, or office of count, did not just refer to the duties of the count, however, but also to his assistants and subordinates, even the judges assigned to him. Lastly, the *ministerium* comprised the possessions of a count as well. Originally, the count could neither inherit nor otherwise obtain his office by virtue of his own authority; it was up to the king to make the appointment, although, from the close of the Carolingian age on, he did take hereditary claims into account.²¹ Thus, the comital system of governance became increasingly feudal in nature, but even so, it appears—contrary to the prevalent view—to have retained much of its original power. The relationship of king–duke–count came to be regulated by the bonds of feudal law, but only in a “provisional” sense; that is, a king would subordinate a count to a duke only in those cases where the arrangement was not contrary to royal interests.²² In the mid–eleventh century even a duke was presumed to be, within his principality, the *vicarius imperii*,

or representative of the emperor or king, whose duty it was to enforce the king's law and preserve clerical immunity.²³

To a greater extent than the secular dukes, margraves, and counts whose positions were by then protected by hereditary rights,²⁴ the bishops and abbots of the great imperial abbeys had to remain on good terms with the sovereign. The obverse was also true, however, since the monarchy lacked “a broad-based institutional foundation, and alliances based on personal friendship and feudalism—involving sharply delineated groups of regional and local lords or ‘magnates’—could serve as only a quite imperfect substitute. With its fully developed pastoral organization and vast holdings, the church seemed better suited to the establishment of a quasi-efficient central power. Hence, the frequent conveyance of royal properties, revenues, and sovereign rights to bishops and abbots seems to represent not so much the alienation as the alteration of these possessions into a usable form that served the interests of the grantor as well—in any case as long as the arrangement continued to protect his controlling interest in the appointment of the ecclesiastics empowered to dispose of the possessions and his guarantee of collecting a steady return on his investment.” “Moreover, the bestowal of material gifts upon churches was considered an act of merit, upon which—in the words of innumerable charters—the donor’s prospects of heavenly reward were based. Through his donations, the ruler guaranteed that a group of indispensable individuals remained at his side and ready to serve him. Finally, involvement in the large churches enabled the ruler to solidify his authority without sparking a confrontation with the secular nobles, out of whose ranks the vast majority of bishops and abbots were drawn and with whom those ecclesiastics maintained lifelong relationships. In summary, the Liudolfing and early Salian kings evidently understood how to develop an objective political organization, consonant with the mental constructs of their day, that provided integral support to the large churches.”²⁵

In pursuit of this course, the East Frankish–German kings had at their disposal approximately forty bishoprics spread across six ecclesiastical provinces of greatly disparate size. Four of the metropolitans, or archbishops, oversaw provinces named after seats located within the borders of the former Roman Empire; Mainz, Cologne, and Trier lay west of the Main River in ancient Gallia, while Salzburg was situated in the Roman province of Noricum.²⁶ The “junior” archbishoprics of Hamburg-Bremen and Magdeburg, both the outgrowths of missionary activity, were founded far beyond the former Roman boundaries in a region the ancient and then medieval world termed Germania. Thanks to Boniface (d. 754), who led the mission and later became the metropolitan of Mainz, most of Germania belonged to the archbishopric of Mainz, which extended from the town of Verden southeast of Bremen on the Aller River to Chur in Graubünden, and from Strasbourg in the west to Prague and Olomouc in the east. In contrast, Trier was for the most part confined to

the western, or “Roman,” bank of the Rhine River, while the metropolitan of Cologne exercised jurisdiction over an area embracing the bishoprics of Liège and Utrecht on the western bank of the Rhine, and Münster, Osnabrück, and Minden on the eastern bank. The archbishoprics of Hamburg-Bremen and Magdeburg were circumscribed to the north and east by the same seas and rivers as the kingdom, though the two metropolitans harbored hopes of expanding their reach into the as-yet-to-be-converted regions beyond those waters. The Bavarian ecclesiastical province of Salzburg in the southeast embraced the suffragan bishoprics of Passau, Regensburg, Freising, and Säben-Brixen (present-day Sabiona and Bressanone, Italy), thus covering more territory than Cologne, but nowhere near as much as Mainz.

The East Frankish–German kingdom, which easily covered 600,000 square kilometers (231,700 square miles), was served by six archbishoprics; the kingdom of Burgundy, with an area of approximately 100,000 square kilometers (38,600 square miles), by seven; and in Italy the plains of the Po River alone were served by three.²⁷ This disparity can be traced back to the days of the early church, when each Roman city had a bishop, and each provincial capital had an archbishop. As a result, the church in the High Middle Ages was organized into an irregular patchwork of bishoprics and archbishoprics, whose seats were closer or further apart depending on the degree to which the old Roman system was still in force when and where they were established. Due in no small measure to this practice, there was a crucial difference between the East Frankish–German and Italian-Langobard kingdoms: The vast bishoprics found in the former were, if anything, the exception in the latter, and in trying to flex their political muscle, metropolitans like Poppo of Aquileia or Aribert of Milan caused a stir and provoked resistance. In contrast to the episcopate, the upper echelons of the ruling lay aristocracy were structured similarly south and north of the Alps because they shared Carolingian roots. In Italy, however, the office of duke developed into a slightly different institution, and hence its holders were termed margraves.²⁸

With his coronation in Rome on February 2, 962, Otto I restored the western empire of Charlemagne and hence reinstated the Carolingian tradition by which the king of the Franks acquired the right to an imperial coronation at the hands of the pope in Rome once he had attained the Langobard crown in Pavia. Therein lay preeminence in Europe, along with the obligation to come to terms with Byzantium and gain the recognition of the emperor in Constantinople, but also the duty to protect the church and to foster the spread of Christianity. Consonant with these functions, the emperor was to pursue a peaceful—or at least not an imperialistic—policy toward the West Frankish–French kingdom, as well as the Hungarians, Croats, and Czechs, who had converted to Christianity and thus were fully recognized as European *regna*. On the other hand, the Slavs living between the Elbe and Oder, who were

still heathen or—what was even worse in contemporary eyes—apostate, were the targets of steady expansion, indeed aggression, from the west. This policy placed the emperors at loggerheads with the Christian Poles, who were pursuing the same course of action, if just from the opposite direction; Otto III was the last to advocate a completely different concept, one of cooperation, as seen in the establishment of the archbishopric of Gniezno in 1000.²⁹

Since public discourse focused on the expansiveness of the kingdom and the wide-ranging interests of the ruler and the members of his elite, contemporary sources reflect these preoccupations. In the eyes of the members of this elite, *honor*, material power, dignity, as well as personal integrity, were the most important motivating forces. When Conrad II forgave his rebellious cousin and took him back into favor, a contemporaneous account of the deed employed the following language: “He received him into favor and restored his full honor.”³⁰ The deposition of the abbot of Hersfeld stripped him of “the honor that was his alone.”³¹ The abbot of the monastery of Reichenau in the diocese of Constance was granted the privilege by Rome “to say Mass in the vestments of a bishop.” For this reason, the duly responsible bishop complained to the emperor that the abbot “had usurped his [episcopal] office and his honor.”³² “Honor” originally meant an office, before the term became appropriated, if not totally absorbed, by feudalism.³³ An individual’s honor enabled him to assume his place in the complex nexus of social, economic, and political relationships. Honor was the respect shown an individual but also the things given to him as signs of respect. Not the least of these was the fief, by which was meant landed property, the land and its inhabitants, as well as duchies and margraviates. When the French king Robert II (996–1031) withdrew his favor from his vassal Odo II of Champagne, declaring him “unworthy from now on of holding any fiefs,” even those held “by hereditary right due to his ancestry,” the count felt compelled to fight for his honor, because he preferred to die an *honoratus*, or man of honor, than to live a *dishonoratus*. However, a man could also forfeit his honor, his feudal holdings, indeed his entire well-being, if he were not careful. Outside the walls of a Swabian castle, a prominent lord was tricked out of a standard he had just received from the king upon enfeoffment with an important holding. As a result, he lost not only the standard and the fief but also his *honor*; the only thing left him was sorrow, the beginning of the end for him.³⁴

While it was the duty of a lord to rule—that was one of the obligations placed upon him by God and king—he was still never to forget *prodesse magis quam praesesse*, to be useful rather than preeminent, to quote chapter 64 of the Benedictine Rule, an oft-expressed precept through history. On the other hand, no matter how exalted a man might be, if he was subject to another, then he was duty-bound to serve. Fruitful and faithful service merited temporal and eternal rewards. Whether the ties that bound a lord and the individual who

owed him service were governed by feudal law or not, the decisive factor in their relationship was faithfulness, with a sworn oath as its cornerstone. A Christian noble was a *fidelis Christi et regis*, a believer in Christ and faithful to the king. Whoever was *fidelis*, or faithful, could rely on *gratia Dei et regis (imperatoris)*, the grace of God and the favor of the king (or emperor).³⁵ Nowadays, we need four distinct words to translate the concepts of *fidelis* and *gratia*. Faithfulness, or loyalty, invoked a reciprocity of duties between a “man” and his lord. If the vassal violated his oath of loyalty, then he committed a capital offense, a felony, even if remaining loyal would have gone against his better interests. In like manner, the lord had just as little freedom to repudiate his obligation, even if remaining loyal to his vassal brought misfortune upon himself, his family, or even his realm.³⁶

The Frankish form of feudalism was the product of the convergence of three Merovingian institutions during the mid–eighth century. Each—vassalage; commendation, by which a freeman placed himself and his lands under the protection of a lord; and the traditional system of benefices, by which a powerful lord granted landed property to a person in need who was prepared to perform service—assumed a definitively different meaning as it was incorporated into a single system. In Merovingian times, a vassal was still a poor wretch, who was not infrequently of unfree status; the very term *gwas*, or young boy/servant, or *gwaswal* (adjectival form), which was derived from Celtic, denotes as much. Yet, by 787 it was feasible for Charlemagne to make his own cousin, Duke Tassilo III, a vassal by enfeoffing him with a *regnum*, the royal duchy of Bavaria. By the ninth century this precedent became the norm: For example, the Slavic and Breton princes became the vassals of the Frankish king. In the latter half of the ninth century feudalism served to bind the divergent parts of the kingdom to whichever Carolingian king enjoyed predominance. When the Carolingian Charles the Simple, king of the western Franks, and the non-Carolingian Henry I, king of the eastern Franks, concluded a treaty in Bonn in 921, the western Franks interpreted the event as the enfeoffment of Henry I by Charles.³⁷ Henry I himself sought to use feudalism to his own advantage in establishing his royal dominion over the kingdom of the eastern Franks.³⁸

Feudalism proved so successful in a minimally organized society because enfeoffment enabled the owner of a property to tap new human resources without ceding his property rights to the recipient. To put it another way, feudal law drew a distinction between the *ius in re aliena*, or right to something owned by someone else, and actual ownership; the former only pertained to the *possessio* of, or the right to exercise control over, the property, while the latter conferred *dominium* or *dominatio* over the holding. This distinction has its roots in Roman law. The barbarians who steadily encroached upon the provinces of the ancient Roman Empire almost never received legal

title to those lands.³⁹ Even when they conquered the Roman heartlands and sought its *possessio* by means of prescription, or the acquisition of title or right through continued use over a long period of time, they were never able to exercise complete control, or *dominium*, in terms of either constitutional or private law. Only in the church could this legalistic mode of thought have survived until the Middle Ages, and it was likewise on behalf of the church that the earliest charters employing feudal terminology were issued. However, secular feudal lords, too, could only profit from this practice. The church and the lay nobility, along with their serfs, or *proprii homines*, would never have made full use of their property had they not enlisted the participation of free, as well as unfree, vassals.⁴⁰

The vast majority of people, including the members of the local upper classes, lived out their days within a rather circumscribed geographical area, but even on this level a man always had to be prepared to protect his rights and the members of his household if he wished to remain *honoratus*. His was a world fraught with insecurity, the ever-present threats of hunger and misery, sickness and death. Life spans were short, for falsehood and deceit reigned, and humans were apt to consume noxious foods; one poem puts such insights in the mouths of dwarves because humans could not see these things with their own eyes. We also read of demons and spirits who appeared wherever one smelled the stench of the devil; for that reason, it was better not to visit latrines or lavatories at night, or, at the very least, not on one's own.⁴¹ The devil's stench could also be detected wherever Christians were not totally irreproachable, "just when doubt had the upper hand or a crime was being plotted or a [dangerous] change was imminent." In like manner, evil spirits were found wherever people still venerated "secondary" household gods such as the benevolent demon Hennial, a Slavic deity, not a miniature Wotan.⁴² Such beings spoke only the local vernacular⁴³ and were powerless to prevent war or hostilities from breaking out with tribes from beyond the deep marshes and endless virgin forests, but they could be effective against enemies closer to home, like those from a neighboring village, a nearby clan, or a distant branch of the family. Enmities and friendships were inherited; hope, on the other hand, lay in reconciling with one's enemy and in procuring peace.

However, only the *bellatores*, or members of the warrior class, who were a small minority of the population, were charged with striking the actual blows in the interests of peace; they possessed the monopoly on providing protection to the *oratores*, or members of the clergy, and the working population, the *laboratores*.⁴⁴ Their lock on the business of warfare explains this seemingly paradoxical account of a nonsanctioned defensive effort, penned by a noble ecclesiastical contemporary: "The Danes ravaged the places beyond the Schelde. Some of the common people living between the Seine and the Loire formed a sworn association amongst themselves, and fought bravely against the Danes

on the Seine. But because their association had been made without due consideration, they were easily slain by our more powerful [noble] people.”⁴⁵

In the years following the European invasions by the Normans, Saracens, and Hungarians,⁴⁶ the social structure everywhere became increasingly fluid, and social mobility—up as well as down the social ladder—took a more rapid course. In regions that were predominantly rural, those who had hitherto been members of the elite came to accept and ultimately appreciate this process; they even made it serve their own interests. In contrast, they did not comprehend and continued to oppose associations among members of the urban middle classes, “sworn” to by shoemakers, tailors, bakers, butchers, and sailors. There was no room in the tripartite system for the town dwellers.⁴⁷ It was bad enough when their “revolutionary” organizations and movements drove out the episcopal lords of a town, but it was even worse when—as occurred in Italy—an urban lord made common cause with them.⁴⁸ The future belonged to the town dwellers and their communes, but that lay over the horizon and beyond the ken of almost everyone able to formulate or write about political policy at the time.

A decorative cross symbol with four ornate, leaf-like ends, centered on the page.

Part One

FROM WORMS TO BASLE



1. The Beginnings (July 12, 990–1016/17)

Conrad II was a Salian and a German. The former designation was certainly unknown to him, as was in all likelihood the latter. The term “Salian” denotes the dynasty to which he belonged and must have been coined before the line’s extinction upon the death of Henry V in 1125. There are two known occurrences of the term dating to the twelfth century: The first is in a register of kings and archbishops compiled in Mainz sometime between 1138 and 1141,¹ and the second is in a chronicle by Bishop Otto of Freising (d. 1158). Otto, whose mother, Agnes, was the great-granddaughter of Conrad II, explained that the Franks were called Salians because they had adopted the Salic law during the reign of Clovis, their ruler and the founder of the Merovingian kingdom, and still bore that name because they continued to observe the Salic law. The bishop was neither the first nor the only one to propound this view: One of the earliest diplomas issued by his half brother Conrad III in 1132 and the very first one issued by his nephew Frederick I in 1152 assume that the Franks were governed by Salic law, thus lending official corroboration to Otto’s assertion; interestingly enough, the bishop of Freising witnessed both of these diplomas.² Although the Frankish duchies in both the west and east had long since disappeared, the line of Franks who drew their authority from their holdings on the Rhine, particularly around the towns of Worms and Speyer, were considered Salians, direct descendents of those “most noble Franks” and members of Clovis’s own clan. These “new” Salians had best maintained the Frankish traditions and even titled their leader “duke of the Franks.”

Most dynastic appellations had markedly different origins and histories. Early eponyms like Merovingian, Carolingian, Capetian, and Ottonian memorialized the lineage’s founder or most illustrious member, whereas later toponyms like Hohenstaufen, Hapsburg, Wittelsbach, and Luxembourg were

derived from the names of the clan's ancestral stronghold; the ethnic designation *Salici* entered into use somewhere in between chronologically. From an etymological point of view, however, it may appear to be an anachronistic hearkening back to the name of a *gens*, or clan, except that the Ottonians also came to be known by a tribal name, as the Saxons or kings of the Saxon line.³

Bishop Otto's text not only contains the most credible explanation for his imperial forebears' designation as Salians, but also spurred the term's adoption many centuries after its author's death. Otto maintained that the Hohenstaufen and the Salians belonged to the same familial line and were descended from the "Henry of Waiblingen," whose clan "was wont to produce emperors." In the eyes of posterity, Conrad's father, Henry of Worms, may have been considered the founder of this line of Henrys, although "Henry" did not become the Salian's "leading name" until Conrad's firstborn son was given his grandfather's name.

Interestingly, the tradition behind the application of the toponym Waiblingen to Conrad was based on a misconception: The castle was not an original part of the Salian holdings but probably a dotal acquisition associated with his marriage to Gisela. On the other hand, Limburg an der Haardt, which was part of Conrad's legacy, was mistakenly associated with his wife on at least the one occasion when Theodore, a monk at Echternach, wrote in 1191 that "Conrad of Waiblingen married Gisela of Limburg." The same author also noted that Conrad of Waiblingen had been entrusted with the kingdom, following the death of the childless Henry II, because he was "one of the princes descended from the very famous Ottonian line." Another twelfth-century source also describes Conrad as *de Weibelingin*, "which is one of the most preeminent strongholds in Swabia."⁴ Thus, the founder of the Salian dynasty⁵ was also known by a toponym, which, had it remained in use, would have made Conrad the first dynast to be designated in the "modern" style. The name Waibling lived on in its Italian form of Ghibelline, used south of the Alps to denote a supporter of the empire, in contrast to Guelf (derived from Welf), which denoted an opponent.

Conrad's ancestors had been known by another title, however, which represented an older tradition centered on the dynasty's ancestral seat of Worms [for genealogy, see Appendix, p. 349]. His grandfather was called Otto "of Worms," while Conrad the Younger, another grandson and first cousin to Conrad II, was called *Wormatiensis dux Francorum*, the duke of the Franks who was a man of Worms, after his grandfather.⁶ Hence, Conrad II was born a "man of Worms," and he was aware of the existence as well as the importance of this line. For this reason, Conrad and the members of his household were referred to as "people of Worms" before his royal election in 1024.⁷

But all these attempts at coining a name for the line according to the then common toponymic model foundered. In 1002 Otto of Worms was pressured

by the king to relinquish his possessions and his family's stronghold in Worms entirely, and he was the only one of Conrad's immediate forebears not to be buried with the rest of the line in the cathedral of Worms. The withdrawal of the "men of Worms" from their city, which was accomplished in two phases, to judge from a diploma issued by Otto I and four diplomas issued by Henry II, was acknowledged by King Conrad II at the beginning of 1026 without reservations.⁸ And in 1080, on the eve of a battle against Rudolph of Rheinfelden, just hours before God would decide the fate of the Salian kingdom, Henry IV issued the "votive charter," in which he commended Waiblingen to the Mother of God, patroness of the church at Speyer.⁹ As a consequence, both ancestral seats—Worms and Waiblingen—no longer qualified as points of reference for a dynastic nomenclature, and the resulting vacuum was not filled with a comparable substitute—like Limburg an der Haardt or Bruchsal¹⁰—but instead with the ethnic Frankish name of "Salian," which lent the greatest prestige.

Furthermore, Otto of Freising provided the key to answering another question: Did Conrad II consider himself a German? The bishop was of course familiar with the term "kingdom of the Germans," but he understood it to be in fact a Frankish kingdom, or, if you will, a kingdom of German-speaking Franks. This is in line with the fact that Conrad II himself was identified as a Frank, *natione Francus*, when he succeeded Henry II.¹¹ Otto of Freising believed that those Franks who had advanced as far as Gallia picked up the language of the Romans, while their tribal brethren who remained behind on the Rhine and in Germania proper came to speak German; no one knew what language they spoke originally.¹² Otto, who also provided his Babenberg forebears with both a name and Frankish ancestry,¹³ espoused the conservative view—one that might have been shared by his great-great-grandfather Conrad—that the first Salian and his cousin, likewise named Conrad, were both "very noble men in German Francia." And Francia, which was made up of "kingdoms" (*regna*), "was wont, by the decision of the princes of these kingdoms, to elect kings."¹⁴

Conrad's biographer Wipo spotlighted his hero's Frankish ancestry by tracing it all the way back to those early days when the Franks—to borrow from Otto of Freising—may still have spoken their "unknown" original language. According to this same author, Conrad's ancestors on his mother's side, "it is said, came from the [ancient family of Trojan kings, who submitted their necks to the yoke of the [Christian] faith under St. Remigius the Confessor."¹⁵ With these words, the author displayed his firm knowledge of the Bible, as well as of the Franks' legendary origins in Troy and of the words allegedly uttered by Bishop Remigius of Rheims upon his baptism of King Clovis, as reported by Gregory of Tours.¹⁶

Conrad "the Elder"—for modern historians follow Wipo's example¹⁷ and

use that epithet when referring to him before his coronation¹⁸—probably entered this world on July 12, 990, the son of Henry and Adelheid. He was named after his paternal great-grandfather, who was in turn named after King Conrad I (911–18).¹⁹

Conrad's father, Henry, was the oldest of the four sons known to have been born to Duke Otto and Judith; the others were Bruno, who became Pope Gregory V (996–99); Conrad, duke of Carinthia (1004–11); and William, bishop of Strasbourg (1028/29–1046/47). Although little definite information is available concerning Conrad's grandmother Judith,²⁰ more is known about his grandfather Otto; he was the grandson of Emperor Otto I, whose daughter Liutgard had married Duke Conrad the Red of Lotharingia in 947. Conrad the Red ruled over an area centered on the mid-Rhine between Worms and Speyer.²¹ This imperial son-in-law was not merely a powerful lord—and on occasion extremely ruthless toward his enemies, as well as toward his wife—but also a “hero,”²² who fell in the battle against the Hungarians at Lechfeld on August 10, 955.²³ Thus, Conrad the Red was the heroic founder of the Salian house.²⁴ He enjoyed a very long chain of famous ancestors reaching back into the late Merovingian period. Hence, he embodied a familial continuity “the likes of which is scarcely rivaled by another line in the early medieval history of Western aristocracy.”²⁵

Such interrelationships are the stuff of modern genealogists,²⁶ and while Conrad's contemporaries were also interested in his lineage, their knowledge of his Trojan (Merovingian) ancestry was limited to his maternal side.²⁷ Adelheid was descended from one of the most important Lotharingian families: She was the daughter of Count Richard of Metz and the sister of Count Gerhard of Metz, Hugo III of Egisheim, and Adalbert of Saargau. Hence, her marriage to Henry enabled her father-in-law, Duke Otto, to forge wide-reaching familial ties with the inhabitants of the Frankish lands on the western bank of the Rhine. Since his father, Conrad the Red, had been stripped of the duchy of Lotharingia following a rebellion in 953/54, we must not dismiss the possibility that Otto hoped through his son's marriage to regain the office for his house, a policy that would in the future pit his grandson Conrad the Elder against the ruling dukes of Lotharingia.²⁸ Playing the Lotharingian card may also have been a means of attaining a goal inherited from his father, that of “achieving ducal status for his homeland [on the mid-Rhine].”²⁹

Duke Otto probably arranged for his son Henry's marriage to Adelheid of Metz during the period when he lacked a duchy. In 978 Otto regained the rank once held by his father, becoming duke of the very new—and very distant—duchy of Carinthia, including the march of Verona. In 983 Otto relinquished the title, smoothing the way for the conclusion of a peace treaty between the imperial Ottonians, their Bavarian cousins, and the remnants of the Luitpolding line in Bavaria. Except for the period between 985 and 989,

Carinthia was reunited with Bavaria until 1002, when Otto reached an agreement with Henry II that reinstated him as duke of a reconstituted duchy of Carinthia, a position he held until his death, in 1004, upon which he was succeeded by his son Conrad until 1011. From 978 on, however, Otto was always deemed a duke and was termed *dux* even in royal charters.³⁰

Conrad's father, Henry, died early, and his mother, Adelheid, left the kindred to marry a Frankish count. She probably outlived her son from her first marriage; when her grandson Henry III endowed the church at Speyer with a part of her estate, he described it as a recently received bequest from his grandmother. The diploma issued on that occasion mentions her as the testatrix of the property in question, but notes that Henry made the bestowal for the sake of the souls of his parents and deceased first wife, Gunhild, as well as himself and his second wife, Agnes.³¹ As for Conrad's relationship with Adelheid, the only documented direct contact between them occurred as many as ten years before his death and more than a generation after she had left him behind, when the emperor presented his by then twice-widowed mother with some of the precious relics brought back by a legation to Constantinople in 1029 for her foundation at Öhringen.³² The implication is that Adelheid and Conrad were in some way estranged, although the discovery of reliable evidence supporting the theory that Conrad had had a daughter named Adelheid would necessitate a reconsideration of this point, since it would mean that Conrad had named his first daughter, perhaps even his first child, after his mother. However, no such evidence has come to light.³³ In any case, there certainly was no breakdown in relations between Conrad and his mother's kin, a possibility that was not even broached until the rise of the bourgeois mental categories in the nineteenth century. In his first known military exploit, Conrad was wounded while fighting at the side of his mother's brother, Gerhard of Metz.³⁴

The death of his father must have been terrible for Conrad, and the situation was exacerbated by his mother's departure. What immediate effects these two events had on him naturally depended on when they took place. The last reference to Henry concerns a legal transaction concluded on September 28, 989, where he is named along with his father, Otto, and brother Conrad. He was certainly no longer alive when Burchard became the bishop of Worms in 1000. Since there was an annual commemoration of Henry, we do know the day, if not the year—a superfluous piece of information by medieval standards—of his death: Accordingly, Henry must have died on a March 28 falling after September 28, 989, and before the year 1000.³⁵ Conrad was born in the summer of 990; he is just as likely to have been born posthumously as to have been orphaned at the age of ten. Our sole source for this early and quite difficult period in Conrad's life is a biography of Burchard of Worms,³⁶ which relates that Burchard, newly appointed bishop in

1000, took in Conrad as a *iuvenis*. The proper translation of this word—in light of the then accepted belief in the six ages of man—is “young man,” which referred to someone in the fourth stage of life, which extended up to age fifty.³⁷ The bishop’s biographer is not to be taken too literally in this case, however, since he also used *iuvenis*—and more appropriately—to describe the king at thirty-five years of age.³⁸ Even so, if Conrad was born at the beginning of the 990s and hence was approximately ten years old when Burchard took him in, the word is still broadly applicable, since it could not be applied to an infant.³⁹

By the time Conrad came to live with Burchard, his sister, Judith—it is not known whether she was older or younger than he—must already have been dead,⁴⁰ and the “mature” Conrad would have been old enough to perceive the loss of honor, status, and respect connected with the death of his father. According to Frankish law, it was natural “to deprive of any inheritance those grandsons whose fathers had died before the grandfather.”⁴¹ Moreover, Conrad’s own grandfather Otto sought to imbue his oldest surviving, lay son with a sort of seniority in order to ensure the continuity of his house. In total compliance with the law, Conrad’s entire *potentia*, or power,⁴² all the royal offices and lordly rights to the duchy of Carinthia, the march of Verona, and numerous counties in the mid-Rhine region, had been earmarked by his guardian—his own grandfather—for his uncle, also named Conrad, and that one’s progeny.⁴³ The boy had no prospects of ever coming into any of his inheritance; such were the circumstances under which Burchard, the new bishop of Worms (1000–1025), took him in.⁴⁴

To measure the significance of this occurrence, we need to take something else into consideration. In the course of establishing its might and power, the ducal house had come into conflict with the local bishops: In 913 Werner, the count of Speyer—as well as father of Conrad the Red and grandfather of Otto of Worms—had his adversary, the bishop of Speyer, blinded, which resulted in the man’s death. A generation later, in 946, Conrad the Red performed a substantial penance for the deed and presented the bishopric with properties and rights belonging to his clan as well as derived from the king.⁴⁵ The antagonism between Conrad’s forebears and the episcopate of the Rhineland and Lotharingia persisted, however, and Worms probably bore the brunt of it. In the words of Burchard’s biographer, “His whole life long he detested this line,” meaning Duke Otto and his household, probably because Worms was the center of the family’s dominion, upheld by a well-fortified castle regarded by the bishop as a refuge for thieves and brigands. Burchard, a man of God, was compelled to fortify his residence in like manner, which is why he lacked the money to rebuild the allegedly devastated city.⁴⁶ Only one member of this horrible bunch was different, a youth whom his paternal and maternal kindred “had spit out because he was peace loving and cherished a life of innocence. The venerable man of God summoned this one, taught him to be pious

and love God, and nurtured him like an adopted son. And because he perceived him to be strong of mind, he loved him greatly before all others. God, through His goodness, later elevated him to the royal throne.”⁴⁷

Whether this “storybook tale” arouses our sympathy or suspicion, it does provide some insight into Conrad’s alleged hard-heartedness and abrupt treatment of his own family, of his mother and her son born of a second marriage, and above all of the memory of his paternal grandfather. His disdain for Otto seems to be substantiated by the terms of the famed endowment of January 30, 1034, that Conrad established for the sake of his family’s salvation: The cathedral of Worms was charged with observing the Salian *memoria*, with reciting prayers in commemoration of the members of the line buried there. The endowment was made in perpetual memory of Conrad, his wife Gisela, and their children Henry and Beatrix, but also for the salvation of his paternal line, namely Conrad the Red; his grandmother Judith; his father, Henry, for whom a special anniversary was additionally established; his uncle Conrad and his uncle’s wife, Matilda, who was Gisela’s sister; and finally his prematurely deceased sister, Judith. There is no mention of his grandfather, and even though a tomb stood ready for him in Worms, Otto was never buried there. It is not even known where he died or found his final resting place.⁴⁸

It may very well be that the charter of 1034 named only those family members who were actually buried in the cathedral of Worms.⁴⁹ However, the ruling couple’s younger daughter, Matilda (d. 1034), is also omitted from the list, appearing neither among the living, like her older siblings, Henry and Beatrix, nor among the dead, and yet she is buried in the tomb at Worms, most probably in the very grave originally occupied by the heroic founder of the clan, Conrad the Red. Furthermore, why was Otto never buried in the tomb that stood ready for him in the cathedral of Worms? Why is it that from this point onward the name Otto is absent from the family tree, when naming a male child Otto would have emphasized the link to an honorable protodynasty?⁵⁰ Was Duke Otto absent from the tomb “by his own choice, in remembrance of his expulsion from Worms in 1002, which turned him against the city? Or by the choice of his family? Who disposed of the places in the family tomb? In any case, two areas of friction—on the one hand, the tensions within the Salian family itself and, on the other, the strained relationship between the Salians and the bishop—may be responsible for these anomalies, although we possess no firm answers to these questions. Duke Otto’s grave is unknown. Was he perhaps buried in Bruchsal, which he had been given in 1002 as compensation?”⁵¹ And what about the use of Otto as a “leading name”? Conrad’s contemporaries, even his own son Henry III, knew about the genealogical link between the Salians and the Ottonians. Conrad, on the other hand, made no reference to it,⁵² except perhaps in his physical appearance: Contrary to the prevailing fashion of the time, Otto I, Conrad’s

great-great-grandfather, had supposedly sported a long beard, and the Salian wore his the same way.⁵³

What significance should we attach to Conrad's being raised at the episcopal court of Worms? As is standard for such works, the bishop's biography considers events in chronological order. Since Conrad's reception by the bishop comes close upon the heels of Burchard's consecration, which occurred in 1000, Burchard had in all likelihood only recently assumed the episcopate. Interwoven with this "storybook tale" are references to the struggle waged by Bishop Burchard against Duke Otto and his son Conrad, in other words, to the events leading up to a provisional settlement of antagonisms on October 3, 1002, that included Otto's written promise to relinquish his fortification in Worms.⁵⁴ Burchard's biographer surely overdramatized the strain in relations between the "men of Worms" and their bishop, since members of the family continued to be buried in his cathedral; nevertheless, it was not a matter of course that young Conrad go to live with Burchard. In spite of the biographer's assertion to the contrary, Conrad's grandfather and guardian must have initiated the move, since the bishop did not, after all, abduct his "adoptive son."

In and of itself, it was quite common for great lords to entrust their offspring to bishops and cathedral schools. For example, Bishop Abraham of Freising took in Henry, the future Henry II, son of the duke of Bavaria, during his father's imprisonment. Henry later attended the cathedral school attached to the church at Hildesheim, to which his parents pledged him as a canon. Following the reconciliation between his father and Otto III, the young Henry moved to Regensburg in June 985, whereupon Bishop Wolfgang took charge of his education.⁵⁵ Henry III, the son of Gisela and Conrad II, was placed in the guardianship first of Bishop Bruno of Augsburg and then of Bishop Egilbert of Freising, even though his mother also saw to it that he received an excellent literary education, including the ability "to read books, so that he could distinguish between various customs of law."⁵⁶ Both Henrys were very well educated and, as kings, perfectly capable of dictating their own diplomas.⁵⁷ On the other hand, even the well-meaning Wipo had to admit that Conrad II "was ignorant of letters [*litterarum*]," and those who did not mean him as well termed him a *rex idiota*, or illiterate king, an utterly uneducated individual. To be sure, Wipo's statement does not necessarily mean that the Salian could neither read nor write. A ten-year-old residing for some period at the court of the bishop of Worms would not have remained illiterate; however, Conrad certainly did not have the benefit of a particularly literary education. His teacher could, in any case, count on him: In July 1025, shortly before his death, Burchard received a visit from his former pupil that so raised his spirits that the bishop was able to accompany Conrad to a court diet at the imperial palace of Tribur.⁵⁸

Why was Conrad's training at the cathedral school at Worms so brief, as well as relatively unproductive? His grandfather had not handed him over to the bishop so that Conrad might receive literary and religious instruction; on the contrary, Otto had always marked Conrad for a career in the secular sphere. Around 1000, Conrad was the sole grandson, with hereditary rights, since the marriage of his uncle Conrad to Matilda of Swabia and certainly the birth of their son Conrad the Younger had not yet taken place.⁵⁹ Moreover, the young Conrad lived at the bishop's court in Worms, less than five hundred meters (fifteen hundred feet) away from the Salian fortification, hence not truly separate from the members of his family, should he need them.⁶⁰ And that is how things remained until 1002, when the prospects were seemingly good that Conrad's grandfather Otto would succeed Otto III, who had died young. The operative word here is "seemingly." Even though Otto of Worms was more closely related to the late emperor than the Bavarian Liudolfing Henry was—and Henry seemed to grant him precedence—the "man of Worms" did not succeed in establishing his claim. Henry II and Otto of Worms came to terms quickly, if not amicably. A residue of conflict remained, which cost the duke and his household their ancestral stronghold, their spiritual home. In October 1002, Otto relinquished this *Handgemal*, the family's spiritual home, in exchange for the valuable royal court of Bruchsal and the royal forest of Lusshardt, possessions of vastly greater material value than what he had given up in Worms. Moreover, Otto once again became the duke of Carantania/Carinthia.⁶¹ All in all, however, these grants did not fill the spiritual void caused by the loss of Worms. The beneficiary of this cession was Conrad's "adoptive father," Burchard, a loyal supporter of Henry II; he ordered the Salian stronghold demolished and had the canonry of Saint Paul built in its place.⁶²

Just as it was unlikely that these events were concealed from Conrad, so no secret would have been made of the great defeat his grandfather suffered at the very beginning of 1003 in the Val Sugana, east of Trento, while fighting to pave the way for the new king into Italy. With a force allegedly twice as large as that fielded by the Germans, King Arduin of Italy won the day at the "Hungarian mount." In addition to Otto of Carinthia, Otto of Hammerstein and Ernst—a Babenberg who later became the duke of Swabia—are said to have distinguished themselves in battle, while a third Otto, probably commanding troops provided by his brother, Bishop Gebhard I of Regensburg, did not.⁶³

While the father Otto was far from his power base on the Rhine—even if he did act in his capacity as margrave of Verona—sticking out his neck for Henry II, this new king sought to undermine the son Conrad. In mid-January 1003, a synod was convened in the old royal palace of Diedenhofen/Thionville in conjunction with a Lotharingian court diet. Smelling a rat, Dietrich,

who actually ruled the duchy of Upper Lotharingia, and Duke Hermann II of Swabia attempted in vain to forestall both gatherings. And the king did, in fact, aim his sights on Hermann's son-in-law and leveled the inflammatory charge that the marriage between Otto's son Conrad and Matilda of Swabia was within three degrees of consanguinity. Ever eager to be of service, Bishop Adalbero of Metz backed the king and even constructed an argument for two degrees. The assembly quickly came to a tumultuous end, and the attendees ran for their lives, Conrad and the overzealous bishop of Metz taking off in separate directions. Conrad's flight lasted for two whole days and probably came to a close only after he had reached one of his properties on the eastern bank of the Rhine.⁶⁴

The members of the house of Worms and their Swabian relations were surely unhappy with the turn of events in fall 1002 and early 1003, and must have expressed their discontent privately. Young Conrad was old enough to reason out for himself that here was a king who never forgot an animosity, even if his antagonists capitulated, and who considered a conflict resolved only when his enemies were annihilated.⁶⁵ In that same year of 1003, Hermann II of Swabia died, and Henry II took the son, a minor named after his father, under his own guardianship. Hermann III was still referred to as a "child" when he died in 1012; in other words, nine years after the nominal begin of his reign, he had yet to turn fifteen years of age.⁶⁶

On November 4, 1004, Conrad's grandfather Otto of Carinthia died;⁶⁷ none of the surviving sources record where.⁶⁸ Conrad was then fourteen years old. How he reacted to all these events is as little known to us as where he resided at the time. Did he still live with Bishop Burchard, or had he returned to his family? The latter seems probable. Since he was a Frank, it goes without saying that Conrad was subject to Frankish law, but there were two strains within that legal tradition—the Salian and the Ripuarian—with different definitions of the age of majority. The former held that individuals came of age upon their twelfth birthday, the latter upon their fifteenth. The Carolingians had already shown a preference for the later date whenever the young man or young woman was slated to accede to the throne upon coming of age. Similarly, Conrad's grandson Henry IV was invested with his arms at the age of fifteen.⁶⁹ Conrad, however, was neither slated to accede to the throne nor the son of a king, and so he may have reached his majority upon turning twelve and perhaps left the bishop of Worms in 1002.⁷⁰ Being of age hardly affected his status, however, since Conrad remained under his grandfather's domestic authority until late 1004. After that, he belonged to his uncle Conrad's household, until such time—for whatever reason and whenever that may have been—as he was "dispatched" and provided with his own household.⁷¹

Following Otto's death, his son Conrad succeeded him as duke of Carinthia,

marking the first time that dominion over the young duchy was passed down from father to son. Conrad may, however, already have borne the title during his father's lifetime, since one contemporaneous account of the synod at Diedenhofen (1003) refers to him as a "duke."⁷² Conrad I is not known to have issued a single charter in his capacity as the duke of Carinthia, however, and an account of his death provides the earliest clear evidence of his having occupied that office.⁷³ When Conrad I died, on December 12, 1011, Henry II easily "divested" the duke's underage son of the same name, Conrad the Younger, of the ancestral duchy and granted it to Adalbero of Eppenstein, who was married to Beatrix, the boy's maternal aunt. If during his seven years as duke the father had not been able to find or make the time to govern Carinthia, then the *puer*, or boy, was even less expected to do so. Nevertheless, Hermann of Reichenau, who was a great scholar from Swabia, described the king's action as unjust.⁷⁴ Conrad the Elder would have shared these sentiments when he reached the age of twenty-one and became the head of the house, hence, in all likelihood assuming guardianship over his cousin, that same boy whose very name communicated his own ostracism from the family. Nevertheless, Conrad the Elder must have been the one to arrange for the interment of his uncle Conrad, the deceased duke of Carinthia, in the family's burial site in Worms.⁷⁵

By the winter of 1011/12, Conrad had already long been full-grown. He was between 1.80 and 2 meters tall (5 feet 11 inches to 6 feet 7 inches), a height that was not in fact as rare among his upper-class contemporaries as we might think today.⁷⁶ Even so, the Salian made an unusually striking appearance. When he came to terms with his first cousin Conrad in 1024 at Kamba and gave him a kiss of peace, Conrad the Elder had to bend down, if only "a little" (*paululum*). Whether he already sported the long beard that appears in almost all the iconic likenesses of him, one cannot say. He no doubt already possessed the enormous physical prowess that later would continually elicit amazement and redound to his renown. In the year he was crowned emperor (1027), it was remarked that he could cover 150 kilometers (90 miles) in twenty-four hours on horseback. In the depths of a most icy winter (1033), he rode across the breadth of Germany to Burgundy in order to secure his inheritance there. And, in the battle against the Slavs in 1035, he stood up to his hips in the mire and successfully fought off the enemy.⁷⁷

Conrad had become a lord. But over what dominion? He held "but little in fief and in power" from the kingdom, as it was euphemistically put upon the occasion of his royal election. As a candidate for the throne, he was doubtlessly not "among men of singular power [*potentia*], among so many dukes and margraves," who would act as his electors. The younger Conrad, on the other hand, did possess the very *potentia* that his older cousin lacked.⁷⁸ In fact, Wipo listed him as one of the dukes of the kingdom in 1024, terming

him “Cuono of Worms, duke of the Franks,” even though there was no duchy of Francia and certainly not one of Worms.⁷⁹ Conrad the Younger, however, had inherited the ducal status and rank of his grandfather through his father, Conrad I of Carantia.⁸⁰ And what is more, even during the period he was probably the younger man’s guardian, Conrad the Elder did nothing to alter the situation. While Wipo admittedly wrote his work—completed in 1046—from a retrospective point of view and may have altered certain details to reflect his notions of the ideal Christian and universal emperor, he was nevertheless very well informed about the situation before and during the meeting at Kamba.

It is also possible, however difficult, to check his use of institutional terminology against other surviving sources. As a result, it has become accepted wisdom that neither Conrad the Elder nor Conrad the Younger bore the title duke or count before 1024.⁸¹ And yet, there is some evidence to the contrary. In 1020 Henry II concluded with the pope the traditional *pactum*, or treaty, confirming the Roman church’s long-standing possessions and bestowing upon it new gifts. The diploma is structured differently from the usual privilege and thus authenticated by a long list of witnesses. Nine counts affixed their marks to the diploma; the second belongs to a count named Cuno, and the third to a count named Kunrat. It is highly probable that these two are the cousins Conrad the Elder and Conrad the Younger, with the older one listed first.⁸² The form of his name found in this pact accords exactly with an observation made by a roughly contemporaneous writer, that before his accession Conrad the Elder was called Cuno.⁸³

If the future king was acknowledged to be a count in one of the most important official charters issued by Henry II—obviously subsequent to their reconciliation—then another reference to *Cunradus comes*, or Count Conrad, may also be to him. The venerable monastery of Weissenburg in Alsace had been one of the most important imperial abbeys since the days of the Carolingians and controlled vast expanses of property on both sides of the Rhine. No later than 985, two years after relinquishing Carinthia for the sake of the peace dear to all, Duke Otto of Worms had received Weissenburg as compensation, replacing an enemy of the crown as its lord. He must have held many fiefs of the abbey even beforehand, since an inventory of Weissenburg’s properties contains an extensive list of holdings that made up the *beneficium Ottonis filii Cunradi ducis* [benefice of Otto, son of Conrad the duke (i.e., Conrad the Red of Lotharingia)]. That entry is soon followed by a list of fiefs and privileges in the Pfingz region held by a “Count Conrad.”⁸⁴ While it is conceivable that this was a reference to Otto’s son Conrad, two arguments can be raised against this contention. First, while the inventory calls Otto the son of Duke Conrad (the Red), this other Conrad lacks a patronym, which would

have been expected if he were the son of Otto. Second, Otto's son Conrad of Carinthia was already regarded as a duke, not a count, during his father's lifetime. Mutatis mutandis, the same arguments may be made against identifying the count with Conrad the Younger. These points lend credence to the hypothesis that the *comes* [count] of the Weissenburg inventory was the future king.⁸⁵

So what did Conrad definitely own, and how did he gain those possessions? Limburg an der Haardt was his *locus hereditarius*, a property that was his by hereditary right.⁸⁶ The properties that Conrad and Gisela donated to the cathedral chapter at Speyer immediately after his royal election, in fulfillment of a vow, are more likely to have come to him through marriage than to have been part of his ancestral estate. On the other hand, the properties located primarily on the eastern bank of the Rhine that he donated later were probably part of his inheritance.⁸⁷ Waiblingen belonged to Conrad, since in later sources it even appears as his toponym, but that Swabian castle probably entered into his possession only as a result of his marriage to Gisela, who for her part received joint possession of Limburg upon donating personal property to the cloister established there. Hence, it could later be said at the monastery of Echternach that Conrad of Waiblingen had married Gisela of Limburg.⁸⁸ Conrad certainly inherited those properties his father, Henry, received upon being "dispatched" to marry Adelheid. As was to be expected, Conrad did not receive any of his mother's personal property. It is possible that the benefices connected with Weissenburg Abbey were also a part of Conrad's inheritance. In that case, however, he must have possessed at least a county. How much more he "came into" from his grandfather's legacy must remain an open question. A case adjudicated during the reign of Otto in 938 had already addressed the issue of what grandsons were entitled to; the winning party had "counted the sons of the sons among the sons, and the court determined that they had to share in the legacy jointly with their uncles according to eternal law." Nevertheless, it is open to question whether this contested and hence controversial principle was observed by the men of Worms, whose domestic usages tended rather to favor seniority.⁸⁹

The idea that Conrad was, if not entirely without means, then possessed a markedly modest dominion can easily be dismissed. Given the lack of concrete evidence, it is open to debate whether he exercised guardianship over his younger cousin—an arrangement that would have granted the older Conrad a significant amount of economic power. The same is true regarding Conrad's first marriage, said to have taken place after his uncle's death and to have involved a woman from the comital families of the Kraich and Speyer regions, which were marked by the "leading names" of Wolfram and Zeizolf. However, there is absolutely no doubt that Conrad married Gisela, one of the richest heiresses in Germany, in the second half of 1016 or the beginning of 1017 at

the latest, when he was probably twenty-six. Her first two marriages had been to men looking to succeed Henry II, who was expected to die without issue, and she would never have jeopardized her *honor* by marrying a poor wretch, even if he did come from an excellent family. Or did he simply abduct her? Not likely.⁹⁰

Had Conrad already been married before his union with Gisela? This question is addressed by neither contemporary sources nor modern scholars, nor would it be here were it not for a local legend—admittedly dating to early modern times—that Conrad had sired a son named Wolfram. According to the tradition, recounted in a chronicle about Worms written in 1570 by Frederick Zorn and published in the mid-nineteenth century by Wilhelm Arnold, a three-line inscription commemorating the child's death adorned the crypt—allegedly consecrated in 1031 by Bishop Azecho—below the chancel of the cathedral at Worms. However, there is no crypt below the chancel at Worms, which was probably confused with the one at Limburg an der Haardt. On the other hand, the bishop credited with the consecration, Azecho (1025–44), fits in well chronologically as well as “politically” with Conrad II. In fact, there were many Wolframs among the “lesser counts” dependent on the house of Worms. Moreover, Bishop John I of Speyer (1090–1104) was allegedly the fruit of the marriage between a man named Wolfram and the sister—rather than the daughter—of Henry IV. Hence, it is conceivable that the Wolframs were related by marriage to the Salians.⁹¹ For these reasons, we should not dismiss the possibility that Conrad had married a daughter of a Count Wolfram of Speyer, who appears in documents dated 992 and 1007, and that the union produced a son named after his maternal grandfather. The choice of name may indicate that Conrad had entered into a *Friedelehe* [marriage without a dowry] with the mother of his first child.⁹² This union has also been credited with producing a daughter; the extant references to her, however, inspire even less confidence than those to Conrad's son Wolfram. Only a few weak pieces of indirect evidence suggest that Henry III once had a half brother on his paternal side: A questionable, and in any case highly irregular, diploma allegedly issued by Conrad in October 1024 confirms a donation made for the salvation of the king's “sons.” Some accounts of a court diet held in Augsburg in February 1026, at which Conrad designated his son Henry as his successor, identify the boy as the *filium ex Gisla*, or the son born by Gisela. From February 1028 on, whenever Henry III is included in a document issued by his father, he is given the epithet “sole son.”⁹³

Whatever one's opinion of a *Friedelehe* between Conrad and a member of the Wolfram-Zeizolf clan may be, there is no denying that his marriage to Gisela represented a renewal of the familial ties between the men of Worms and the dukes of Swabia, for, as one chronicler put it, he had been illegally married to his own cousin [*neptis*], “the widow of Duke Ernst (I).”⁹⁴

2. Conrad the “Bastard”


If the question of Conrad’s alleged illegitimate descent from Otto III did not daunt a scholar like the twentieth-century German Karl August Eckhardt, who himself traced his lineage back to the Salians and Ottonians and claimed Otto III as a direct ancestor, although through an extramarital liaison,⁹⁵ then we lesser mortals must not shy away from considering that possibility, since it would provide a key to Conrad’s personality. In doing so, we again part ways with most modern researchers, who either do not address the question at all or dismiss the very idea out of hand as preposterous, but we would be remiss if we were to do the same without a word, since the tradition is not based on such flawed sources. For example, a passage written sometime before 1080 notes that Henry III referred to Theophanu and Otto II as having been “the founders of his line,”⁹⁶ and he may very well have uttered that—admittedly vague—sentiment. Hugh of Flavigny, on the other hand, made the outright claim that his maternal grandmother was the daughter of Otto III and the sister of Conrad II, who was hence the son of Otto III.⁹⁷

And the counterarguments? The passages of interest to us here do not appear in all the manuscripts of Hugh’s work, and even then only as insertions or as interlinear jottings. Born around 1065,⁹⁸ Hugh entered this world at least sixty-three years after the birth of his grandmother Chrotildis, since Otto III died on January 23 or 24, 1002.⁹⁹ While it goes without saying that it is biologically possible for sixty-something years to have passed from the birth of Chrotildis to that of her daughter Dada and then of her grandson Hugh, from a genealogical point of view, the gap seems too wide. If we assume that women bore their children at, on average, age twenty, then there should have been four generations during that period. Also, the name of Hugh’s alleged grandmother, Chrotildis, is quite archaic, since comparable names dropped the letters “Ch” or at least “C” by the end of the eighth and during the ninth centuries.¹⁰⁰ Were the assertion true, then Henry III (born 1017) would have been named after his father’s “foster father,” which seems far-fetched, and even more unlikely, there would have been little reason for the “Salians’ concern for their *memoria*.” Indeed, they would have been acting in a highly deceptive manner, considering the important role Henry, son of Otto of Worms, assumed in the cultivation of the memory by Conrad II, whose famous donation to the cathedral at Worms for the eternal memory of the living and the salvation of the deceased members of the family prominently singles out Henry twice: In the first instance the phrase “of blessed memory,” or *beate memorie*, is added after his name, and in the second is a pledge to offer prayers and masses annually in his memory.¹⁰¹

The remaining references to Conrad’s Ottonian ancestry may be somewhat exaggerated, such as the references to Otto and Theophanu as “the founders

of his line,¹⁰² or to the Ottonians in general as Conrad's forebears,¹⁰³ or to Conrad as the offspring of kings.¹⁰⁴ All the same, they are not falsehoods, since Otto the Great was indeed Conrad's great-great-grandfather.¹⁰⁵ Hugh of Flavigny is not to be reviled as a liar, if only because we do not know today how much credence he lent to the traditions of his family.

But let us leave it at that. Since Conrad was probably born on July 12, 990,¹⁰⁶ there is just no way Otto III, who was born in 980, could have been the first Salian's father. Conrad II was not illegitimate, although that would have been a fine item for the storybooks, far better than the tale of bridal abduction. It takes a great deal of psychological energy to compensate for a secret, to sustain the construct. When it comes to matters of this life and the next, of the ultimate questions, however, no one can sustain a pack of lies. What name comes to one's lips? The name of one's natural father, not of a foster father who died young and hardly played a role in one's upbringing. And who was Conrad's natural father? Henry, the eldest son of Otto of Worms.¹⁰⁷



1. The Beginnings (November 11/13, 989/90–1016/17)

Gisela was a Conradine,¹ although neither she, nor her contemporaries, nor her descendents ever described themselves as such. The word represents one of those handy abstractions coined by modern genealogists, who take the most preeminent and/or prevalent first name among male members of an identifiable kinship group—the “leading name”—and use it to distinguish a hitherto unnamed clan. In this sense, the Conradines included the dukes of Swabia and, not least, King Conrad I, from whom they take their identity even though he himself had no male descendents.

Devotees of history who make fun of an ancillary discipline do so at their own risk; it is like cutting off one’s nose to spite one’s face. On the other hand, sometimes it is hard to stifle a smile when practitioners of genealogy engage in disputes whether an individual—known to be long dead on November 10, 1014—could still have entered into a marriage after May 31, 1015. Or when they have nine-year-olds sire offspring, attribute grandchildren to boys buried at ten years of age,² and bestow four or five children—all singletons—on seventeen-year-old women blessed with remarkable fertility and three husbands in quick succession. And this is exactly what Gisela would have accomplished had she actually been born in the year proposed by many genealogists. The only way to find out whether information derived by ancillary means holds up is through critical scrutiny using the same methodological tools. Besides, if we are to square her genealogy with basic common sense, Gisela cannot have been born in 999.³

Thus, we may assume that Gisela of Swabia entered this world on either November 11, 989, or November 13, 990, and thus was approximately the same age as Conrad the Elder. Her father was Duke Hermann II of Swabia, and she had three siblings: a brother, Hermann III, who succeeded his father as duke of Swabia in 1003 but died early in 1012; an older sister Matilda (983–1031/32);

and a sister Beatrix, who was probably younger. Gisela's mother, Gerberga, was the daughter of King Conrad of Burgundy (937–93) and Matilda, the daughter of King Louis IV (936–54), the Carolingian king of the West Franks.⁴ Since Hermann II was also a direct descendent of Charlemagne,⁵ Gisela was a descendent of Charlemagne on both sides of her family, in the eighth or ninth degree according to the calculations of modern genealogists.⁶ According to Wipo, however, one needed to count “the fourth line after the tenth” in order to determine Gisela's Carolingian lineage.⁷ It is not clear what he meant by this cryptic statement, which illustrates how tricky it was even then to calculate the passage of generations.⁸

And that is by no means the last of our problems regarding Gisela; on the contrary, they have just begun. Conrad was her third husband; she had already been married to a man named Brun(o) of Brunswick, a distant relative of the Liudolfings, and to Ernest I, a member of the Babenberg family.⁹ According to one twelfth-century source, Gisela married Ernest first and then Bruno,¹⁰ but that would mean that she contracted two marriages and had her first-born, a son named Liudolf, and perhaps even a daughter named Gisela as well,¹¹ with the Saxon noble from Brunswick all within the space of approximately eighteen months. This account is also contradicted by the fact that on July 1, 1028, Liudolf was already old enough to witness a diploma issued by his stepfather Conrad, an impossibility had his father, Bruno, been Gisela's second husband and he himself barely twelve years old at the time.¹² In any event, a close reading of Thietmar's chronicle provides us with the key to a commonsensical solution to this genealogical conundrum: The wording of the entry implies that Bruno must have been long dead by November 10, 1014,¹³ and thus the Saxon can only have been the first of Gisela's three husbands. Therefore, Gisela was first married to Bruno of Brunswick, then to Ernest I until Pentecost 1015, and from 1016/1017 to 1039 to Conrad II. There is no record of the date she embarked upon her nuptial career.

In 1002 Bruno was one of the candidates to succeed Otto III, but he was not Henry's most fearsome challenger. That was Hermann II of Swabia, Gisela's father.¹⁴ It would have made sense for the Swabian duke to marry off his younger—twelve- or thirteen-year-old—daughter Gisela to a Saxon claimant to the throne at approximately the same time as he sought to win over the house of Worms by offering his older daughter Matilda in marriage to Conrad, whose father, Otto of Worms, had the strongest hereditary claim to the throne. The latter wedding must already have taken place before June 24, 1002, and the union between Bruno and Gisela may well have been celebrated at around the same time.¹⁵ Bruno's chances for election were squashed on July 25, 1002, when the Saxons decided in Merseburg to support Henry II.¹⁶ Hermann recognized the new king on October 1, 1002.¹⁷

How long were Gisela and Bruno of Brunswick married? Unlike those who

base their calculations on the need to credit Gisela's subsequent union with Ernest I of Swabia with producing as many daughters as possible—all nameless, by the way—to serve as the matriarchs of the most diverse clans,¹⁸ we believe her first marriage lasted from 1002 to 1008/10.¹⁹ In a chronicle entry for November 10, 1014, Thietmar described Bruno's murder at home.²⁰ Hence, Bruno's violent death must have taken place sometime in the past. The marriage produced a son, Liudolf, who was born before 1010 and passed away in 1038,²¹ and perhaps a daughter Gisela.²²

Gisela married Ernest I, son of the Austrian margrave Leopold I and a member of the Babenberg line, sometime after 1008/10. She bore him two sons, Ernest II (1010/13–1030) and Hermann IV (before February 1016–1038). After the death of Gisela's brother, Hermann III, on April 1, 1012, Ernest I succeeded his brother-in-law as duke of Swabia. It is more likely that Gisela secured the duchy for her spouse than that Ernest received it on the occasion of their marriage,²³ but this union highlighted the weaknesses of both the Worms line and the Conradines.

The link between the dukes of Swabia and the dukes of Worms had been severed by the death of Conrad of Carinthia in 1011, and thus the interests of both houses would have been much better served had Gisela married Conrad the Elder, the nephew of the deceased, at that point. Henry II kept Swabia and its duke, Hermann III, under his guardianship, as it were, and was disinclined to promote the renewal of ties between the two families, which he had battled on so many fronts, by reaching into the Worms kindred for a successor to such an important ducal post. Thus, he settled on the scion of a powerful south German princely line, the Babenbergs; even though Ernest had not always shown him loyalty, he had in any event not opposed Henry's accession. What is more, the king had entrusted him—along with Otto of Carinthia—with a bold, if ultimately unsuccessful, venture that would have cleared the way for Henry II to enter Italy in early 1003. Not long after their defeat in the Val Sugana, near Trento, the two men celebrated Easter with Henry II at the royal palace in Quedlinburg, where they were showered with costly gifts. Just then, however, word reached the court of a revolt by Henry of Schweinfurt, one of the new king's staunchest supporters, who felt that he had been cheated out of his due—namely, the duchy of Bavaria, which he considered justifiably his now that Duke Henry had become king—and thus almost compelled to respond forcibly to the insult. When Henry of Schweinfurt entered into an alliance with Bolesław Chrobry, the prince of Poland, his cousin Ernest had to follow suit,²⁴ even though the king had clearly instigated the dispute.²⁵ The formal process for playing out the affair was dramatic: Ernest was taken prisoner and sentenced to death, but, like his cousin, then pardoned. The incident's resolution illustrates “the unconditional subordination and royal clemency performed almost like a ritual when ending a

conflict.²⁶ Hence, the Ottonian methods for settling conflicts could still be relied upon, and Ernest, along with his brother Henry I, margrave of Austria, found himself again in the king's camp.²⁷ Ernest's loyalty was ultimately rewarded with the duchy of Swabia, but he did not enjoy this office for long: While out hunting on May 31, 1015, the first Tuesday after Pentecost, Ernest was mortally wounded by an arrow shot by one of his retainers.²⁸

Gisela's first husband was murdered in his own home, whereas the second died "under questionable circumstances, which Thietmar—with strikingly pointed understatement—described as a simple hunting accident."²⁹ In the course of hunting illicitly, Ernest was wounded, "more from ignorance than intention," by one of his hunting companions, who "was trying to shoot a doe." Ernest was acting unlawfully, because the Tuesday of Whitsuntide was such a solemn feast as to preclude hunting. In fact, a synod convened in Ingelheim during the reign of Otto I (948) had decreed that "the entire week after Easter and the Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday after Pentecost were to be observed no less solemnly than Sunday," and the synod's pronouncements were deemed binding during the reigns of Henry II and Conrad II. This would explain why Thietmar used the word *illicite*. But what did he mean when he wrote that Ernest's vassal killed him "more from ignorance than intention"? Was there then an element of premeditation to the hunting accident? And why was his hunting companion "trying" to shot the hind? Who was behind the whole incident? Gisela? And do the doomed man's last words confirm or dispel this suspicion? Spare the guilty one, receive my confession, and "admonish my wife to preserve her own *honor* and be mindful of mine as well." Ernest charged his widow with honoring his *memoria*, praying for his sins, a most common last wish.³⁰ To this very day, the reminder to preserve her honor is almost invariably interpreted from a nineteenth-century point of view; that is, Gisela should preserve her "womanly honor," or chastity.³¹ Some accounts even credit Ernest with the ability to divine the future and aver that he wished thereby to warn of her coming marriage. Was Conrad perhaps to blame for the hunting accident? It is, after all, alleged that he abducted Gisela.³²

However, nothing of the sort may have happened. To begin with, what was at stake was the *honor* of a politically engaged woman, who had already been married to two "potential German kings" and now stood to marry a third.³³ Besides, she was the heiress of Swabia, as the king acknowledged not three weeks later by giving "Duke Ernest's duchy to his [i.e., Henry II's] cousin and her son" on June 24, 1015, at Goslar.³⁴ And what is more, Gisela could make a serious claim to the kingdom of Burgundy.³⁵ All this made up the *honor* that she was to preserve for herself and her children. For the purposes of comparison, let us consider the other reference the chronicler made to a woman's honor, this one in connection with Liutgard, the great-grandmother of Conrad II, no less. As the wife of Conrad the Red, Liutgard clearly did not

have an easy life; she was even accused of infidelity, although she was able to prove her innocence in a performance worthy of Elsa's dramatic scene in Richard Wagner's nineteenth-century opera *Lohengrin*. Liutgard bore all the attacks with "manly patience" and was probably quite capable of preserving her innate *honor*. That is to say, in spite of all the wrongful accusations leveled against her, she was able to retain her privileged position and her political standing, since her chastity and womanly honor were never again openly challenged.³⁶

As for Conrad's alleged abduction of Gisela, that is a story that past and present-day scholars do not dismiss out of hand. Perhaps he wanted their union to be a *fait accompli*, lest the emperor take the same course as in 1012 and again arrange for Gisela to enter into a union contrary to the interests of the Worms line. Two points, however, controvert the story: First, the earliest source to mention the abduction lacks credibility, since it makes a muddle of Gisela's other marriages, among other things, and furthermore alleges that she and her sister Matilda, as well as her two brothers, were born in Westphalia. The second source to refer to the incident is even more fanciful than the first.³⁷ Second, why did Thietmar of Merseburg, who in some detail recounted the story of a violent abduction involving his own family, charge that the marriage between Gisela and Conrad was unlawful solely due to their excessively close kinship? Resorting to an *argumentum e silentio* is always dangerous, to be sure, but that does not mean such lines of reasoning do not sometimes hit the nail on the head.³⁸ At the beginning of the eleventh century, kidnappings and bridal abductions were not unusual, in spite of contravening tendencies in canon law,³⁹ and the tale of one would add a nice touch to any medieval biography. All the same, it would not be seemly for a scholarly work about Conrad and Gisela to linger on it for too long, even though the authors of the *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs* did not find it entirely implausible.⁴⁰

The accusation that their marriage violated canonical precepts must have enjoyed wide dissemination, for the supplement to the holographic copy of Thietmar's chronicle contains a reference to the charge in the author's own hand. The entry must have been made in 1017/18, since Thietmar died on December 1, 1018, and the reference to the union between Conrad and Gisela, which was celebrated at the latest in January 1017, appears in conjunction with the account of an injury Conrad suffered on August 27, 1017.⁴¹ In a letter dated 1043 to Abbot Poppo of Stavelot, Abbot Siegfried of Gorze included a detailed examination of the kinship ties between the parents of Henry III and cited the relationship between them as a poor precedent for Henry's own—just as questionable, canonically speaking—marriage to Agnes of Poitou.⁴² Rodulfus Glaber, who spent time as a monk at the monastery of Cluny, in Burgundy, availed himself of the same rebuke as evidence of Conrad's untrustworthiness

and as justification for the coolness Henry II showed the Salian. However, he also claimed that Conrad was not the first of Gisela's husbands to be a close relation, a probable reference to Ernest of Swabia. And yet, could Henry II have been "angry" with Conrad "solely" because of the marriage to Gisela, when he had tolerated the same transgression on the part of "his" vassal Ernest?⁴³ It is true that Henry II had publicly attacked the union between Gisela's sister Matilda and Conrad's uncle Conrad, and had also subjected Otto and Irmgard of Hammerstein to the gravest difficulties because of their marriage.⁴⁴ This latest marital scandal in a family inimical to his rule may have so enraged the emperor that he took action against Gisela and revoked her guardianship over her son Ernest and thus over the duchy of Swabia. This is one scenario that might explain the fact that in 1024 Archbishop Poppo of Trier, a brother of the deceased Ernest I, was also the trustee of the duchy of Swabia, by virtue of his guardianship over his brother's son Ernest II.⁴⁵ But what was the real story?

Poppo had been invested with the archbishopric by Emperor Henry II in Trier on Christmas Day 1015.⁴⁶ Just one year or so later, Gisela remarried. The chronicle account by Hermann of Reichenau treats both occurrences quite succinctly: The "duchy [of Swabia] went to his son of the same name [Ernest], but his widow went to Conrad, the son of Henry the son of Duke Otto, who later became emperor. Archbishop M(a)egingaud of Trier died, and he was succeeded by the venerable Poppo, the brother of the aforementioned Duke Ernest." It is strange indeed that there is no entry for 1016, but just as perplexing is the way in which Ernest's death, the transfer of Swabia to his son, and his widow's recent remarriage are presented as concurrent events in an entry that ends with an incident that occurred on December 25, 1015. In addition, the chronicler utters not one word of reproach concerning Gisela's third marriage, which would have been forbidden outright or at least have engendered great controversy in Byzantium.⁴⁷ Thus, Henry II may have ordered that the guardianship over Swabia be transferred to someone else, not because Gisela and Conrad were too closely related, but because her remarriage meant that Gisela was no longer part of the Babenberg family. We should note that unlike Irmgard of Hammerstein, who refused to abandon her threatened marriage even in the face of her husband Otto's capitulation and who saved their union by enlisting the pope's aid against the emperor and the archbishop of Mainz, and unlike Conrad's uncle and Gisela's sister, who feared for their marriage and perhaps even their lives, Conrad and Gisela were spared such persecution and attacks.

What is more, some charged that Gisela initiated the marriage. Thietmar, who was the first to note the unlawfulness of the union, did so with the following words: "Conrad [Cono] whom his own cousin had illegally married."⁴⁸ As one of the former ruler's most loyal retainers, the bishop of Merseburg

knew that the last thing the king needed was the renewal of marriage ties between the house of Worms and the Conradines, irrespective of which side took the initiative. In any case, the story of the bridal abduction hardly squares with this oldest and probably most reliable source.

That leaves us with the following cautiously drawn conclusion: Gisela married Conrad because this union best enabled her to preserve her *honor*, her manifold legal claims to the duchy of Swabia on up to the kingdom. She was—like her husband—twenty-six or twenty-seven years old at the time and had already born three sons and perhaps a daughter. Within the first year of her marriage to Conrad, on October 28, 1017, the couple was blessed with the birth of her “Benjamin,” Henry, her fourth and last son. A later source tries to model Henry’s conception on the biblical story of Abraham, Sarah, and their son Isaac, by stating that Gisela and Conrad were advanced in years, or *in senio*, when they became parents, which was naturally untrue but provided a good narrative motif. Henry III had two younger sisters, neither of whom ever married, dying childless at a young age: Beatrix (ca. 1020–36) and Matilda (after mid-1025–beginning of 1034).⁴⁹ Thus, Gisela is known to have born four sons and two, at most three, daughters: Henry III and his full sisters were her children by Conrad, while two sons, Ernest II and Hermann IV, were the fruits of her marriage to Ernest I, and Liudolf and perhaps a girl named Gisela of her marriage to Bruno of Brunswick. Before marrying Gisela, Conrad allegedly had a son named Wolfram and, what is even less likely, a daughter, Adelheid, as a result of a *Friedelehe* he contracted with a woman belonging to the Wolfram-Zeizolf clan. Conrad and Gisela additionally adopted the orphaned offspring of Gisela’s sister Matilda and her husband Frederick of Upper Lotharingia, two girls named Sophia and Beatrix, whom the empress brought to court in 1033/34.⁵⁰

Gisela was an extremely beautiful woman; “having her constantly in view” might have proved the undoing of one of the clerics at court had he not buried himself in his scriptural studies.⁵¹ “[H]er abundant golden hair” was still to be found when her grave was opened in Speyer in 1900.⁵² Yet, Gisela was also intelligent and possessed all the virtues expected of a noblewoman in the Middle Ages. However, just as time and time again we find that the text of a particular diploma deviates from the highly formulaic norms of the medieval chancery due to some unique circumstance, so too the standard catalog of virtues may reveal something of a particular individual’s character. Accordingly, Gisela is said to have evinced only “the merest arrogance,” even though she in fact possessed the greatest nobility and most extraordinary beauty. Moreover, Wipo had a specific purpose in mind when drawing up the catalog of her virtues; he was not looking to depict a type or conform to a style but instead to substantiate her possession of a role that set her apart, for Gisela was, in his words, her husband’s “necessary companion,” or *necessaria comes*.

Wipo's assertion is supported by the dozens of diplomas that contain formulae attesting to her intervention in issues, as well as by the innumerable references to her itinerary. And Conrad? He must have been quite a man and taken after his heroic great-grandfather whose name he bore.⁵³

But was their marriage a love match? We possess little information on that score, although her husband and family called her by the pet name "Gisle." Her youngest child, their daughter Matilda, may have been born in the second half of 1025, when Gisela may have been as old as thirty-six; as far as we know, she did not give birth again. Was she no longer able to conceive, or had her husband, who was the same age as she, become impotent? It should be noted that as of February 1028 Conrad began designating Henry III as his "sole son." Did the canonical strictures on the *tempus amplexandi*, or time for marital relations, place too great a toll on the couple?⁵⁴

So there is yet another thing that we do not know, although one can very well imagine that Gisela actually preferred not to have any more children, so that she could actively attend to her political duties as queen. Just how important participating in public life was to her can be seen in her reaction to a serious falling-out between her and the young king Henry III following Conrad's death.⁵⁵ And just before her death of dysentery four years later—on February 15, rather than 14, 1043—she still sought the reassurance of fortune-tellers that she would outlive King Henry.⁵⁶ Of Gisela's known offspring, her oldest son, Liudolf, died in May 1038, Ernest II in 1030, and Hermann IV in the summer of 1038, just a few months after the death of his older half brother. The older daughter born of her marriage to Conrad II, Beatrix, died on September 26, 1036, and the younger daughter, Matilda, who was engaged to Henry I of France, died in early 1034.⁵⁷ If she had indeed given birth to a daughter—also named Gisela—during her first marriage, then perhaps that child also survived her.⁵⁸ Of her children, only Henry is definitely known to have outlived her, and it seems that she would have liked to see him buried, too. In his seemingly neutral account of her death, in 1043, the chronicler Hermann of Reichenau may very well have struck the proper note of criticism: It is obvious that he had a different vision of the dignified death.⁵⁹

2. Conrad and Gisela Before Their Coronations (1016/17–September 1024)

Mother and son would presumably have never experienced that short-lived conflict had Henry entered the world as a posthumous child, and the possibility that he would had not been negligible: On August 27, 1017, Conrad was wounded in a military action initiated by his maternal uncle, Count Gerhard of Metz, against Duke Godfrey of Lower Lotharingia, a supporter of Emperor

Image not available

FIG. 1 The widowed Empress Gisela entering the abbey church at Echternach in Trier. From the Pericope Book of Henry III, ca. 1040; Bremen Universitätsbibliothek, MS b.21, fol. 2r.

Henry II. Even in a panegyric written long after this event, Wipo made a point of the Salian's willingness to take up the causes of his kindred and friends with all his power and might as if they were his own.⁶⁰ In this "deadly clash" Adelheid's brother, who was also Empress Cunigunde's brother-in-law, was dealt a defeat marked by many casualties. Count Gerhard was a longtime supporter of the empress's brothers, who were members of the Luxembourg line, and already many years before he had backed their efforts to assume

control over the archbishopric of Trier.⁶¹ In attacking Godfrey of Lower Lotharingia, Gerhard was also targeting Henry II. Yet, it was commonly held that the first duty of a warrior—and not just a Germanic one—was to lend support to his mother’s brother, or *Oheim*. Interestingly enough, the Latin equivalent, *avunculus*, literally means “little grandfather,” a diminutive variant of their common Indo-European root, and is the source of the English word “uncle.” The accounts of Conrad’s first independent actions—intervening personally on behalf of his uncle and then assisting the son of his father’s brother—read in fact much like the opening lines of an Icelandic saga.⁶²

In a battle near the town of Ulm two years later, probably in the summer of 1019, the two cousins—Conrad the Elder and Conrad the Younger—defeated Adalbero of Eppenstein, the husband of Beatrix, who was the older Conrad’s sister-in-law and the younger one’s aunt. Again, the target was a loyal follower of Henry II, but the battle’s location suggests that the dispute was actually sparked by conflicting claims to the estate of Gerberga—the deceased mother of the three sisters Beatrix, Gisela, and Matilda—than belated revenge for Conrad the Younger’s being passed over as duke of Carinthia in favor of Adalbero in 1011. In any event, the attack against Adalbero was initiated by his wife’s nephew, the younger Conrad, who had grown up during the almost eight years since he “was robbed of the duchy of Carinthia.” It is instructive to cite in its entirety the entry Hermann of Reichenau made in his chronicle for 1017: “Godfrey, the duke of some of the Lotharingians, defeated Count Gerhard, brother of the future Emperor Conrad’s mother.” The entry for 1019 is similarly terse: “The young Conrad, son of the dead Duke Conrad of Carinthia, with the help of his cousin on his father’s side, the future Emperor Conrad, defeated the then duke of Carinthia, Adalbero, in battle near Ulm and put him to flight.”⁶³

Yet again, Conrad had drawn his sword indirectly against the emperor and broken the peace that Henry II so valued.⁶⁴ Conrad lost the emperor’s favor and was probably banned. Wipo interpreted this misfortune as a trial from God, but gave it only short shrift as an edifying experience, without explaining why or for how long the emperor withdrew his favor, or noting the consequences the incident had for Conrad or his cousin.⁶⁵ It is quite probable that the falling-out between the emperor and the two Conrads had already been settled nine months later, since the two counts are presumed to be among those named as witnesses to Henry’s pact with the Roman church in April or May 1020.⁶⁶

Conrad had proved himself on the battlefield, and he was ever prepared to risk his life protecting his kindred’s rights and claims. He was married to a rich heiress, who was as ambitious as she was intelligent and lovely, and who had already born him a son and perhaps even a daughter. When his lord and longtime adversary Henry II died on July 13, 1024, in Grone, near the city of

Göttingen, and was buried soon afterward in the cathedral at Bamberg, Conrad the Elder stood at the ready. Later sources contend that Henry had designated one or another of the two members of the Worms house as his successor, but there is barely a grain of truth to that assertion, which is no more than the way following generations interpreted the fact that the two cousins were the only serious candidates for election to the throne.⁶⁷

Just because Conrad the Elder took his kindred's part in their affairs should not lead us to conclude that he was to an extraordinary degree a "family man" and more loyal than others to his friends. Wipo has his hero Conrad swear to his cousin that he will uphold the "indissoluble friendship" among kindred, a principle to which—in Wipo's own words—Conrad the Younger also subscribed.⁶⁸ Such behavior is markedly different from the way in which Henry II, the "monk-king," treated Henry of Schweinfurt or his own brothers-in-law during the feud over the bishopric of Metz, on the Moselle River.⁶⁹ In contrast, Conrad personified the proper way of doing things, the mentality of the worldly noble. He represented an "alternative" to what came before and to a political agenda that favored the princes of the church, if for the very fact alone that his—unlike his predecessor's—marriage was blessed with children and a male heir.⁷⁰ "The ideal marriage pair would be described thus: the man is full of (military) virtue, of good family and bodily proportions, and possesses prudence; the woman is likewise well formed, from a good house (= family), and possesses wealth and good manners."⁷¹ Thus, "Conrad and Gisela, Inc." was very well positioned in the event that the emperor and king, their kinsman and adversary—and involuntary testator—died.

The purpose of Wipo's biography of Conrad II was to recount the deeds, or *acta vel gesta*, of the emperor and his son, and so his subject's early years as Conrad the Elder were of little interest to him. The text commences with the deeds of now Conrad II, whose entire life before the royal election served as a trial from God, after which he "performed an operation with good effect upon the commonwealth, that is, the Roman Empire."¹ Although Wipo had probably attended the election assembly at Kamba, which is thought to have been located on the eastern bank of the Rhine, across from present-day Oppenheim, in his capacity as biographer he painted an idealized picture of the first Salian king's election² and asserted that the Saxons and others eligible to participate in the election had been present, even though it is certain that they had not.³ All the same, it is important to review the information he imparted concerning the steps taken to manage the crisis period between the death of Henry II, on July 13, 1024, and the election of Conrad II at the imperial assembly summoned for September 4, 1024.⁴

We read that Henry's passing had thrown the kingdom—that is, the magnates of the individual peoples and territories, including Italy—into great upheaval, and some feared for its unity. A replay of the events of 1002 and their aftermath was clearly to be avoided at all costs, since the hard-fought battles Henry II had waged at that time in order to secure the throne had devastated the kingdom's heartlands, and events that occurred during the early years of his reign left him with an internal opposition active practically up until his death.⁵ In contrast, the interregnum following his death lasted no more than a few weeks, during which the widowed Empress Cunigunde conducted the kingdom's affairs unchallenged and with the assistance of her brothers, Bishop Dietrich II of Metz (1006–47) and Duke Henry V of Bavaria (1004–9 and 1017–26), as well as Archbishop Aribio of Mainz (1021–31). With the events of late winter 1002 probably weighing on everyone's mind,⁶ the empress retained the imperial insignia so that she could hand them over to whoever was elected

king and thereby empower “him for governance as far as lay within the authority of her sex.”⁷

The only known evidence for the discord that Wipo asserts broke out everywhere in the empire was the destruction of the royal palace in Pavia.⁸ The men “of very great power” who “strove by force rather than by the qualities of . . . character . . . to become the first man [in the kingdom]” did not stand a chance against the two cousins of the Worms line.⁹ In addition, very little—probably no more than the tip of the iceberg—is known about the numerous exchanges and negotiations that made it possible to bring the election to such a strikingly swift conclusion. We do possess a letter sent by Abbot Bern of Reichenau to Bishop Alberic of Como in July or August 1024, which indirectly reached Leo of Vercelli and Henry of Parma, announcing the time and place set for the election assembly—September 4 at Kamba—and urgently pleading that they await the results, block any threat to the unity of the two *regna*, and see to the maintenance of peace within the Italian kingdom. Around the same time, a diet of Saxon princes met at Werla, where the participants consulted with each other about the royal election, although they spent the interregnum focused on cutting Bishop Meinwerk of Paderborn, whom Henry II had unduly favored, down to size.¹⁰

The well-prepared individuals who made their way to Kamba were for the most part grouped by nation. The Lotharingians—with Duke Frederick of Upper Lotharingia representing his absent father, Dietrich—apparently camped on the western bank of the Rhine, and the Saxons, “with their neighbors, the Slavs,” probably stayed home altogether, contrary to Wipo’s assertion. The Italians also did not attend, while Abbot Odilo of Cluny participated in both the election and the coronation.

When the election assembly finally convened on September 4 in Kamba, more than just the two candidacies—of Conrad the Elder and Conrad the Younger—was at stake. It was crucial that the two men reach an agreement, and they must have done so in a private tête-à-tête initiated by the older man. According to Wipo, the elder Conrad, who was approximately thirty-five years old at the time, won over his younger kinsman of around twenty with a long speech that must have been of the author’s own invention, if for no other reason than that the two cousins came to terms without witnesses. Conrad the Elder then sealed—and publicly proclaimed—their understanding with a kiss.¹¹

Notwithstanding its rhetorical flourishes, Wipo’s account provides us with some reliable or, at the very least, plausible pieces of information: First, Conrad the Elder must have suggested to his cousin that the contest between them be decided by majority vote, or *maior pars populi*; the royal election of 1002 offered an important precedent for this proposal. At the funeral of Otto III in Aachen, the overwhelming majority of the princes had vowed to help Hermann II of Swabia accede to the throne, because they considered Duke Henry

of Bavaria “not suitable,” or *non idoneus*, for the kingship.¹² Yet, while the princes may have intended to support Hermann, they never followed through. At Kamba in 1024, on the other hand, the majority must already have indicated their support for Conrad the Elder before the vote, thus paving the way for a “modern” elective process.

Second, “the assembly to elect a successor to the king did not single out a particular nobleman but, strictly speaking, the noble house of the Salians; which member of this house would then become king was left up to the Salians themselves to decide. The biographer [Wipo] stresses this idea further by having the older cousin go on to add that the luster of the royal dignity is also imparted to the king’s relatives and that only solidarity between relatives gives the kingdom the strength it needs.” Moreover, in 1024 Conrad the Elder already had a seven-year-old son, who as heir apparent to the throne enhanced the long-term prospects for the policies of the Salian house as well as of the elective assembly.¹³

Third, by voting for the chosen representative of the cohesive house of Worms, who could extend to the entire realm what his forebears had already put into place along the mid-Rhine, the electors clearly showed that they looked to the new king to preserve the kingdom’s unity by means of the “modern concept of lordship,” instead of the old structures of an ethnic duchy.¹⁴

Fourth, while both of these members of the house of Worms did fulfill a basic prerequisite for office, kinship with the Saxon ruling house, in this case it seems that their idoneity, or suitability, for the kingship—in other words, their ability to wield authority successfully—gave them a leg up over those noblemen within and outside the kingdom who were even more closely related to the deceased sovereign.¹⁵ It is no wonder that even the first Salian king never made reference to his kinship with the Ottonians, but instead based his legitimacy on his Frankish royal ancestry, the Merovingians and Carolingians. Almost all later writers, including Otto of Freising, assert that Henry II designated Conrad the Elder or both cousins as his successor, even though that was probably not the case.¹⁶

Fifth, only after “intrafamilial” unity was established did the majority of the electors actually decide in favor of the older Conrad. At that point, the younger Conrad’s Lotharingian kindred withdrew; his ties to that family had been forged by his widowed mother’s marriage to Frederick II, the co-duke of Upper Lotharingia, around 1020.¹⁷ The way was now cleared for the *sanior pars*, or the “sounder part,” to conduct a unanimous election, just as in the good old days. Aribo of Mainz, the archbishop presiding over the proceedings, thereupon broke with tradition by being the first to voice his choice. The other archbishops and members of the upper clergy, except for Pilgrim of Cologne, expressed their concurrence. Meanwhile, somewhere in the background or with backs turned to the election assembly, Conrad the Younger

continued negotiating with his Lotharingian supporters and probably Archbishop Pilgrim as well. According to Wipo, as soon as the members of the clergy had finished making their choice known, the young man immediately turned around and became the first secular elector to cast a vote for his cousin. The elder Conrad took his cousin's hand and "made him sit beside him," while the members of the upper secular nobility—grouped by realm, or *regna*—cast their votes.¹⁸

After the magnates had voted in expression of the electoral will, or *Kur*, the people acclaimed the new king; this act constituted the legal foundation for Conrad's kingship, which the widowed Empress Cunigunde then confirmed by handing over the royal insignia.¹⁹ Without bidding farewell and without participating in the election, Pilgrim of Cologne and the Lotharingians left Kamba.²⁰

CORONATION, ASSUMPTION OF OFFICE,
AND ROYAL PROGRESS

I. Coronation (September 8, 1024)

With the new king's coronation slated for September 8, the solemn Feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, it was only natural that Archbishop Aribo, who had presided over the election, perform the ceremony in the cathedral at Mainz. That may have been another—or even the primary—reason why Aribo's nephew and rival, Archbishop Pilgrim of Cologne, and the Lotharingians had “departed [Kamba] belligerent . . . [and] at the instigation of the Devil.” In his capacity as the duly—if perhaps only recently—appointed archbishop of Cologne, Pilgrim was the metropolitan of Aachen, where, according to Carolingian and Ottonian legal tradition, royal coronations were to take place, but he must have realized that his prospects of exercising the right to crown the new king were at that point nil.¹ Yet, for reasons that still elude us, and even though he had exhibited the utmost care and considerable enthusiasm in pleading the elder Conrad's case, Aribo, once success was his, threw it all to the winds by refusing to crown Gisela. Pilgrim sensed an opportunity to secure once and for all coronation rights for Cologne, and thirteen days later, on September 21, 1024, the Feast of Saint Matthew, he made up for lost ground by crowning Gisela at his cathedral.²

Aribo of Mainz was known to advocate the rigorous enforcement of the canon laws concerning marriage, and in the case of one couple, Otto and Irmgard of Hammerstein, his attempts to stymie Irmgard's appeal to the pope even placed his pallium in jeopardy.³ His refusal to crown the queen may thus have stemmed from the excessively close kinship between the king and queen. Still, Conrad II, who owed his kingship to Aribo, was as closely related to Gisela as she was to him, so there must have been something untoward about her that gave rise to the archbishop's objections. Scholars have repeatedly identified the consanguineous relationship between Gisela's mother and father, who were two or three degrees more closely related than Conrad and Gisela,

as the source of the problem. The royal couple, on the other hand, was related within the ninth degree (5:4), since Conrad's great-great-great-grandfather Henry I was Gisela's great-great-grandfather; if Gisela's ancestry is traced through her father, then they share the great-great-grandfather Otto I and were related within the eighth degree (4:4).⁴ Such relationships would have been general knowledge, by the very fact that they were members of the nobility, or *nobilitas*, for as Isidore of Seville had already noted, "Noble (or of noble birth) and not base is he whose name and family are known."⁵

The charge that Conrad and Gisela were too closely related, which had already been leveled just a few months after their marriage by Thietmar of Merseburg, undoubtedly stuck,⁶ and the chronicler was not the only one to voice this criticism. Rodulfus Glaber went so far as to assert that prior to his election Conrad had promised the bishops he would sever his ties with Gisela, an implausible story not borne out by actual events. Furthermore, each of Gisela's previous marriages was also said to have involved irregularities.⁷ As late as 1043, no less a figure than Abbot Siegfried of Gorze complained of the too close kinship between the parents of Henry III in a letter addressed to Poppo of Stavelot. In fact, according to the strict notions of someone like Henry II, the union of two individuals related within the seventh degree or less was "contrary to the sacred precepts of canon law." An obsession with the incest taboo marked the entire era, and policy makers knew how to use it to their advantage.⁸ All the same, Aribo would not have played up the consanguinity issue as an impediment to Gisela's coronation, because doing so could have jeopardized his own undertaking: The daughter of the Swabian duke had born Conrad a son, Henry, whose very existence may have tipped the balance in the election, but the boy could only inherit the throne if he was the legitimate issue of a canonically incontrovertible union.

But what if there were no connection between the charge that they were too closely related and the delay in Gisela's coronation? No other writer besides Rodulfus Glaber drew an association between the excessively close kinship and the difficulties attendant upon Conrad's election. Moreover, no source alleges outright that Aribo refused to crown Gisela. Hence, at least one scholar has pointed out that "it was not yet the custom in Germany to consecrate the king and queen at the same time," and that the sole "precedent, namely the consecration of Cunigunde, the consort of Henry II, was also performed at a different time and place from the ceremony for the king."⁹ Besides, "the mistrust toward Gisela had been sparked by social envy, which, while it would prove short-lived, had as yet to be overcome. Wipo's text contains no substantive information." What the biographer did report was that "the manly probity in the woman was victorious" and that she was her husband's "necessary companion."¹⁰

So why then the delay and change in venue? Cunigunde was also not

crowned at the same time as her husband, but the sources did not read anything negative into that. Did Aribo of Mainz take his cue perhaps from the Byzantines and take umbrage at Gisela's many marriages, at her "successive polygamy," as it were? In point of fact, after much controversy the Eastern church in 920 resolved that it was permissible for someone younger than forty to enter into a third marriage, even if the prior union had produced children. However, this determination was not accepted as normative for a long time and continued to be the subject of debate in the eleventh century.¹¹ The archbishop's misgivings about crowning Gisela may have been prompted by the controversy in Constantinople.

Wipo mentions the victory of Gisela's "manly probity" and her role as Conrad's "necessary companion" in one and the same breath as her coronation "by the consent and petition of the princes." Perhaps the solution to the puzzle lies in this pastiche of information: Is it not possible that, in the face of Aribo's intransigence, Gisela of her own accord initiated a dialogue with Pilgrim of Cologne in order to jump-start the stalled discussions regarding her coronation—which took place only thirteen days later—and to divide as well as win over the Lotharingian opposition associated with her kin? By doing so, she would, of course, have completely antagonized and alienated Aribo of Mainz, who was a quarrelsome and hot-tempered man. For example, in early 1025 the archbishop prevented the duly appointed diocesan bishop for Hildesheim from celebrating Mass at the high altar at the convent of Gandersheim, all the while hurling invective and showing no regard for "his" king. Even near the end of his life, Aribo's actions suggest that his was an impulsive temperament: In the wake of three major defeats—the loss of the right to perform royal coronations, the suppression of the case against the Hammersteins, and the cession of the archbishopric's claim to Gandersheim—he announced his resignation in an impressive, emotionally charged sermon delivered in Paderborn on Christmas 1030, in order to go on a pilgrimage to Rome. Only after he had breathed his last would he return to his see.¹² On September 8, 1024, however, Aribo reached the pinnacle of his career, so to speak, although his position as the metropolitan of Mainz—a province that stretched from the outskirts of the present-day city of Bremen southward almost all the way to Meran in Italy, and from Prague westward to the headwaters of the Rhine in Graubünden and beyond—left little room for further attainment.¹³

"When the election was over, everyone, with the greatest eagerness, hastened to follow the King to Mainz, where he was to receive the most holy unction. They went rejoicing; the clergy chanted psalms, the lay folk sang, each in his own fashion. At no time have I found that God received such great praises from men on one day in one place. If Charlemagne had been present, alive, with his scepter, the people would not have been more eager, nor could

they have rejoiced more at the return of so great a man than at the first coming of this (new) King.”

Such are the opening lines in Wipo’s chapter on the king’s consecration, which includes a long, rhetorically ornate speech ostensibly delivered by the archbishop of Mainz. Like the description of Conrad’s election, the oration serves to convey the political theories of its age rather than reproduce the actual words of its deliverer. It is purposeless to speculate what Aribo in fact said, what gestures he made, how he conducted himself, whether he indeed referred to Conrad’s difficulties with Henry II as a trial from God. Like Abraham before him, the new king had been put to the test; like David, he had had to bear the wrath of his King Saul. Having experienced the loss of his predecessor’s favor, he would take pity on those who in the future lost his favor. Before making him king, God had purified Conrad by means of injustice and misery. “You have come to the highest dignity: you are the vicar of Christ,” the *vicarius Christi*. “No one but his imitator is a true ruler.” Conrad was admonished to exercise justice and protect the churches and the clergy, the widows and the orphans; a nobleman named Otto, who had once insulted Conrad, stood ready to petition the new king for his favor. For the sake of God’s love, which on that day had made Conrad into a new man, the archbishop begged the new king to show clemency toward this individual and others like him. The king let out a sigh, broke down in tears, and fulfilled the wish expressed by all. Thereupon, the people began to weep for joy at his show of so much goodness and forgiveness. After the High Mass and royal consecration were concluded, the king commenced the procession, striding like King Saul, “as though he went higher” by a head, transformed in his bearing and followed by the clergy. With a serene expression and majestic gait he returned to his chambers, where the banquet celebrating the ruler’s consecration was then held.¹⁴

One important incident that occurred during the procession into the cathedral of Mainz appears two chapters later in Wipo’s work, however. As indicated by its very title, the biography focuses on the deeds of Conrad II; hence, it opens with the actions leading up to the coronation and, after a two-chapter digression on the coronation, the disposition of offices, and the queen, returns to its main theme, which encompasses this incident. As the procession into the cathedral that was part of the coronation ritual, or *ordo*, for Mainz began, three commoners—a tenant farmer of the archbishopric of Mainz, an orphaned boy, and a widow—stepped forward and presented Conrad with legal complaints. Even though the princes attending upon the king-elect ceremoniously urged him to proceed, Conrad halted, meted out justice to the petitioners, and justified the interruption to the ceremony on the grounds that he was performing the duties of his royal office. In other words, his election, and not the later coronation, marked the inception of his reign. As the king continued on,

yet a fourth individual, a man who had been banned unjustly, approached him and likewise petitioned for justice. Conrad took this man by the hand, walked with him all the way to the throne, which was probably placed inside the church, and entrusted the matter to one of his princes.¹⁵

Therein lay the basic motto of royal rule: defend the church, widows, and orphans. We may be sure that the participants as well as their legal claims were very closely reviewed beforehand, so that nothing was left to chance. Yet, as Wipo states, while Conrad's first deeds "may seem small, nonetheless they are eminently significant in a mystical way." The new king had to imitate Christ and set a clear example by his actions, not just mouth empty phrases.¹⁶

The man named Otto who had insulted the king—and on whose behalf Aribo pleaded for forgiveness—and the man who had allegedly been banned unjustly cannot have been one and the same person. The exile must have suffered his "injustice" at the hands of the deceased Henry II, who may have banned Conrad and who certainly banned his own brother Bruno in early 1024.¹⁷ Otto, on the other hand, must have personally insulted Conrad sometime before the royal election, yet none of the sources mentions such a nobleman. Since the regal name Otto was hardly uncommon at the time, any attempt at identifying him would seem pointless, were it not for the fact that the untimely flight of a commander named Otto had caused Conrad's grandfather to suffer a serious defeat in the Val Sugana.¹⁸ True, more than twenty years had passed since that incident, and Duke Otto of Carinthia had borne the brunt of the offense, but there was no statute of limitations on insult and injustice. Expiation was a hereditary duty, as was "the old obligation of blood revenge."¹⁹ Even the costly gifts Henry II had bestowed as recompense upon the men vanquished at the "Hungarian mount"²⁰ would not completely have wiped the slate clean, because it was not possible to put a "price" on the honor of Conrad's grandfather. But who stood ready to receive Conrad's forgiveness right before the coronation? Was it the elderly Otto himself, brother of Bishop Gerhard I of Regensburg, or was it perhaps his son Otto? We may never know.

2. Assumption of Office and Establishment of the Royal Household

Less than three days after his coronation, Conrad departed Mainz, accompanied by Gisela. A host of problems awaited his disposition: The king had yet to forge a durable accord with his cousin Conrad the Younger, not to mention with his cousin's mother, Matilda, whose second husband was Duke Frederick of Upper Lotharingia. The time had now come to win over the duke's followers along with the Lower Lotharingians. He also had yet to win over the Saxons, but they had major problems of their own, as their borders were

threatened in the north by the Danes, along the lower Elbe by the pagan Slavs, and in the southeast by the Christian Poles and Bohemians. Since the new king could hardly walk away from the problems bequeathed him by his predecessor, he was forced to take up the Saxon's cause.

Conrad faced a much more favorable situation in the mid-Danube basin thanks to the efforts of that political and religious genius King Stephen I to lead the Hungarians into the Christian and European fold. Hungary, however, maintained very close ties with Venice, whose prior agreements with the East Frankish kingdom remained to be renewed. On the other side of the maritime republic loomed the Byzantine Empire, whose good will was key to maintaining peace in the northern Adriatic Sea and along the shores of Croatia and Istria, and whose recognition was craved by the Western emperor. However, the new king first had to establish his imperial rule, by winning over the Lombard-Italian kingdom and then receiving the crown in Rome. Last, there was Burgundy. Henry II had been recognized as the heir to the throne by the kingdom's childless king, but Conrad would have to overcome stiff internal and external competition before securing this kingdom for himself, and then only with Gisela's aid.

Enormous challenges confronted the royal couple, yet they immediately set to work. Chipping away at a mountain of problems, they showed great physical stamina, as well as diplomatic skill. They were forceful, single-minded, and unafraid of taking strong action, while never failing to reward their faithful supporters. No one believed Conrad capable of attaining such rapid success, and as a result some of his startled contemporaries jumped to the conclusion that there had to be something shady about his accession, which, according to the millenarian point of view expressed by Rodulfus Glaber, posed a well-nigh heretical threat to the world: The archfiend Satan, accompanied by "a great crowd of beings with black clothes and very sinister faces," had elevated this Salian, who was "somewhat lacking in faith," to the position of ruler.²¹

After the coronation the leaders of the realm—in Wipo's words, the "bishops, dukes, and the other princes, vassals of primary rank and those of ordinary rank, indeed, free-born men if they be of any moment"—participated in the traditional swearing of an oath, in effect rendering fealty to the new king. This act often came directly on the heels of an election, but in Conrad's case the decision was made to follow the example set by Henry II, perhaps because the new king wished to highlight the proceeding or because the archbishop was merely following in the footsteps of his own predecessor, Archbishop Willigis, who had officiated over Henry's coronation and the swearing of the oath in 1002.²²

Before commencing on his lifelong itinerancy through his kingdom, the new king had to determine who would accompany him. Wipo deals with the establishment of the royal household in a cursory manner; only Bishop Bruno

of Augsburg, who was the deceased emperor's brother, Bishop Werner of Strasbourg, and Werner, a little-known knight, whose faithful service to Conrad obviously predated Kamba, appear by name as members of the royal court. The last individual was a vassal who had proved himself by "word and deed" and was richly rewarded for his loyalty probably as early as 1025. Bishop Bruno of Augsburg acted as the "intervenor" in the matter by appealing to the king for the gift and the attendant charter. Werner is not mentioned further.

The following court offices proper would also have been filled in 1024: mayor of the palace, head chamberlain, steward, and cupbearer, as well as other positions. The anonymous author of the *Ruodlieb*, a Latin epic romance written in the latter half of the eleventh century at the monastery of Tegernsee, probably modeled his depiction of a royal court, with its strict protocol and vice-regent, who exercises power on behalf of the ruler, on the court of an actual king, most likely Conrad II. Of the officers who served during the Salian ruler's reign, we know of a steward named Conrad who was commemorated for his bravery as a casualty of the revolt at Parma on Christmas 1037. Furthermore, we know the name of one other steward, Liudolf, which appears in some correspondence concerning the cloister of Saint Maximin in Trier.²³

The court clergy, or royal chaplains, were considerably better organized and known to the outside world, because they were often tapped to serve as bishops, archbishops, and—due to their ability to read and write—royal emissaries, or *missi*, to the literate Italians. The royal chapel was headed by the archbishop of Mainz, who served as archchaplain, an arrangement Conrad had no cause to alter. Since it was within the purview of the royal chapel to train clerics in the specialized art of drawing up royal diplomas, the archchaplain was, from the ninth century on, customarily entrusted with the office of archchancellor as well. During the reign of Conrad's son and successor, Henry III, the two functions became increasingly distinct and in the end totally independent.²⁴

Diplomas reveal a great deal about a sovereign's exercise of power. When did his reign begin and end? How vigorously did he rule? A king issued diplomas routinely, and yet the activity was anything but routine. Diplomas, or royal charters, were highly formalized legal documents reflecting the level of literacy found among their primarily ecclesiastical beneficiaries. Preserved through the ages, original exemplars are still available for our perusal today. Diplomas are not historical works drawn up with an eye to posterity, but functional written instruments encapsulating human relationships at a specific point in time, whose archaic form and language can present the modern interpreter with a challenge and a chore. We gain insight into the state of the king's practical as well as theoretical policies simply by identifying who was or could be entrusted with issuing or—better—drafting diplomas. The most diverse group of individuals—representatives of the ecclesiastical beneficiary, members of the king's permanent or temporary circle of advisors—may have had a hand

in the issuance of a particular diploma without compromising its authenticity. However, the preparation of a diploma was assigned principally to those royal chaplains with the requisite expertise. They served under the direction of a chancellor and the nominal oversight of an archchancellor, and while scholars refer to these clerics in the aggregate as the “chancery,” it is actually anachronistic to use that term for Conrad’s period.²⁵ Beginning with the Ottonians, there was a “German”—to use yet another anachronism²⁶—as well as an “Italian chancery,” which was responsible for issuing diplomas concerning the *regnum Italicum*.²⁷

Judging by Henry’s last charters and his successor’s earliest ones, no changes were made to the chancery beyond one new appointment, which was very important in theory but had no practical effect on the operations of the royal chapel and the as yet makeshift division of labor within the chancery. The “German” chancery remained in the hands of Udalrich, the chancellor, and Aribo of Mainz, the archchancellor, but the archiepiscopal kingmaker was also entrusted with the archchancellorship of Italy. He succeeded Bishop Eberhard of Bamberg probably in the immediate wake of the coronation, while the future bishop of Parma, Hugh, who had been appointed chancellor for Italy in 1023 by Henry II, continued to exercise the duties of that office.²⁸ By retaining Hugo and replacing Eberhard, Conrad II demonstrated that he both appreciated continuity and at the same time was prepared to reject the status quo and reward faithful service. What is more, Conrad showed considerable skill in not arousing Bishop Eberhard’s antagonism, although for a long time malicious tales circulated far and wide accusing the Salian of planning to abolish the bishopric of Bamberg, which had been founded by Henry II.²⁹ In actuality, by as early as January 1025, Bishop Eberhard was the recipient of no fewer than four diplomas confirming the claims of his church.³⁰ Conrad made no other changes regarding Italy until he himself had traversed the Alps.

Before the twelfth century, royal charters did not always contain lists of witnesses, but even older diplomas occasionally include the names of individuals who were probably present at the drafting of the charter as members of the king’s court and thus contributed to the decision-making process at the time the charter was legally executed. Given their contents and legal concerns, Conrad’s earliest documents may at first glance appear formulaic, and they are as a rule confirmations of older diplomas, yet they are more than routine affairs. First of all, since the charter presented for confirmation might be a counterfeit, care had to be taken that the new king and his subordinates did not act out of ignorance or political expediency.³¹ Second, the identities of the beneficiaries—their number, importance, and official office—reveal information concerning the strengths and weaknesses of the incipient kingship. Third, differences in the wording of the diplomas indicate that they were drafted individually.

The oldest of Conrad's extant diplomas provides significant support for these points. It was issued on September 9, 1024, to no less a figure than Abbot Odilo of Cluny, in response to his presentation of diplomas issued by Otto I, Otto II, Otto III, and Henry II acknowledging Cluny's right to the monastery of Payerne in eastern Burgundy, and his request that they be reconfirmed by the new king. The diploma also provides incontrovertible evidence of the archabbot's attendance at Conrad's coronation in Mainz. While the chancellor Udalrich and the archchancellor Aribo of Mainz are named in the so-called *recognitio* line of the diploma, in which the drafter attests to the accuracy of his work, it was undoubtedly drafted or, better, copied—if imperfectly—by someone in Odilo's retinue from an original issued by Henry II.³²

Two further extant diplomas date from the remaining two days Conrad spent in Mainz. The first is of questionable authenticity, but the other is a confirmation issued to the eminent Bishop Egilbert of Freising.³³ As in the case of the diploma for Cluny, one of the beneficiary's own clerics was entrusted with preparing the diploma on the basis of an original issued by Henry II. Quite soon afterward the royal chancery assumed exclusive or overriding authority to issue diplomas, and Conrad's fourth charter was probably drafted by the royal chancery; in it the royal couple is described as ruling by the grace of God.³⁴

We know little about the daily goings-on at the royal court. One source recounts that the court chaplain Wazo of Liège bested Conrad's Jewish doctor in a religious disputation. From the passage, we learn that the king availed himself of one of the best medical specialists of the period, granting him complete freedom of religion and, in this instance, immunity from the victor of the debate. It seems that the scholarly Jewish doctor had staked one of his right-hand fingers against a cask of wine on the outcome. Forfeiting the pledged digit, Wazo extricated himself from the situation by jokingly "loaning" it to the doctor until further notice. The presence of experienced doctors in the king's entourage is also noted by Wipo.³⁵

Life at Conrad's court could be downright provincial at times and entirely lacking in the sort of sophisticated decorum later found at the courts of Madrid, Versailles, or Schönbrunn. A sentimental and touching anecdote in Ekkehard IV's chronicle of the monastery of Saint Gall speaks volumes about court life. Ekkehard had been summoned to Mainz by Aribo to serve as a master at the cathedral school, and in 1030 he accompanied the archbishop to the royal palace in nearby Ingelheim to celebrate Easter Mass. The monk was to lead the chants, particularly those sequences that, if they were not written at Saint Gall, then at least played a special role in the monastery's observances. "As he was about to lift his arms to give the downbeat, three bishops in the king's retinue who had once enjoyed his [Ekkehard's] tutelage requested Conrad's permission to show their venerable teacher that they had not forgotten what he

had taught them. With the emperor's consent, they stepped down from the dais on which the members of the court were seated, bowed to their former teacher, whose eyes overflowed with tears of joy and emotion at this demonstration of their devotion, and assisted him in his duties." Following the conclusion of the Mass, the "humble monk" collected a boon from the emperor—"as was the custom"—in the form of some ounces of gold, which the emperor had placed between his feet. As if that were not enough, "with the emperor laughing, he [Ekkehard] was then forcibly dragged over to the empress," where he likewise retrieved some gold from between her feet. Sitting next to the empress was her sister Matilda, duchess of Upper Lotharingia, who made the markedly more "courtly" gesture of placing a golden ring on the monk's finger, over his continuing objections.³⁶

Much information may be gleaned from this vignette. First of all, the royal couple, their closest relatives, and the episcopal members of their company sat on a raised platform, while the celebrants of the solemn Mass stood in the church's center. Little may be learned from the Mass itself, although it did offer the three bishops and former students at Saint Gall the opportunity to voice their prearranged, if seemingly extemporaneous, request, but the occurrences afterward tell us much more about the very easygoing, perhaps even chaotic and uncouth, atmosphere at court.

Sources that recount the lofty policies and the constant comings and goings of great lords occasionally contain little set pieces that reveal something of life at court. In 1036 Conrad's son, Henry, married Gunhild, the daughter of King Cnut of England and Denmark. Bishop Azecho of Worms gave the child bride almonds and consoled her like a father; after he had departed, the young queen missed his small gifts and kind words. Evidently, no one at court bothered with the lonely girl, and in spite of his kindness her Danish chaplain probably just did not have the right touch. However, whenever Danish ambassadors arrived at court, they visited her first and gave her detailed news of home.³⁷

A king and his court were constantly on the move. They were allowed—in fact constrained—to suspend this "royal itinerancy" only for the solemn feasts of Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost. During those periods they tarried in one place for at least one week, if not more, participating in liturgical observances. For the most part, they spent these respites at royal palaces, but after the tenth century kings increasingly chose to stay in episcopal towns and for longer periods. The Ottonian royal palace in Magdeburg, for example, fell into disrepair during the Salian period, which attests to its disuse.

Recent research has refined our understanding of this shift from royal palaces to episcopal towns. The three major centers of political power during Conrad's reign were Lower Lotharingia, Rhenish Francia, and East Saxony–North Thuringia. The Harz region around Magdeburg retained its preeminence, even if the first Salian king did not spend as much time there as his

Ottonian predecessors had. Moreover, Conrad II succeeded in extending his sovereignty over regions that had hitherto been subject to only marginal rule—like Bavaria, Swabia, and Alsace—and in integrating them more closely into the kingdom. In the age-old centers of royal power, palaces continued to dominate, but in regions only recently subject to the king's full sovereignty, episcopal towns became the favored places of sojourn.³⁸

3. Royal Progress (September 1024 to June 1025)

In order to celebrate his coronation on the solemn Feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, September 8, Conrad had left Kamba for Mainz in haste. He showed the same alacrity when it came to his first official acts and departed on his royal progress quite soon afterward (September 11, 1024). To some, this represents a further indication that Conrad was following in the footsteps of his predecessor, whom they credit with “inventing” the royal progress. In fact, the “journey of the king through the realms” in the wake of his coronation was no more than a distinct stage in Conrad's continual travels through his lands. Wipo accordingly recounts only this first journey in detail and announces that he does not intend to touch upon all of Conrad's travels or all the places where he celebrated Christmas or Easter. “Henry and his successors may be credited with one innovation; they covered the entire realm in their royal progresses.”³⁹

On their way to Cologne for Gisela's coronation, Conrad and his wife stopped at the royal palace at Ingelheim (September 11, 1024). Here they made a votive offering to the cathedral chapter of Speyer for the salvation of their souls and those of their ancestors and descendents, generously fulfilling a vow Conrad had made prior to—and contingent upon—his successful election. Incidentally, the diploma recording the endowment was probably not drawn up on the stated date of the gift. The king, together with his wife, made the donation at Ingelheim before her coronation as his queen, and yet in the charter she is referred to by that title.⁴⁰ They offered the donation at the altar of the episcopal church at Speyer, whose patroness was the Virgin Mary, since it was with her manifest aid that Conrad had become king.⁴¹

Lotharingia

Ten days later (September 21, 1024), Archbishop Pilgrim crowned Gisela queen in the cathedral at Cologne. What transpired on the royal progress in the interim is not known, but the king must have engaged in extensive negotiations and done much, apart from traveling on average seventeen kilometers (10.6 miles) a day.⁴² Already the archchancellor for Germany, Aribio of Mainz

assumed the mantle of archchancellor for Italy and furthermore received a Lower Saxon county once ruled by the late Count Dodico and most recently held by Bishop Meinwerk of Paderborn as a quite tangible token of the king's favor. Notably, a diploma was neither requested nor issued to mark this transaction, which was of dubious legality because the bishop of Paderborn had done nothing to warrant the transfer. The king's grant was rescinded only many years after Aribo's death, and according to the extant charter recording the later action, the archbishopric of Mainz was not compelled to cede the county without recompense.⁴³ In any event, the expropriation in Meinwerk's day need not have been either the result of a unilateral decision by Conrad or part of a deal cut with the archbishop of Mainz, since it would have had broad support in Saxony. Even before the election at Kamba, steps had been taken to roll back the inordinate advantages Henry II had granted his favorite, the bishop of Paderborn.⁴⁴

The Lotharingian opposition to Conrad's election collapsed, in spite of or due to the actions of its leader, Duke Gozelo of Lower Lotharingia. Not only had he personally boycotted the royal election at Kamba, but along with Duke Dietrich of Upper Lotharingia, Gozelo had extracted oaths from the majority of the Lotharingian bishops not to do homage to Conrad without ducal approval. Archbishop Pilgrim of Cologne was the first to extricate himself from this *coniuratio*, or sworn association, and his fellow ecclesiastics must soon have followed suit—perhaps fearing a rumored invasion by the French king—for the common people began to sing malicious ditties about the perjurious Lotharingian bishops. By establishing closer relations with the new ruler and crowning his consort as queen, Pilgrim killed two birds with one stone: First, he redressed “an old injustice,” an allusion no doubt to his opposition at Kamba, by committing his support to the king. Second, he gained clear acknowledgment of his right to perform coronations, as established by papal privilege and by virtue of his status as the metropolitan for Aachen.⁴⁵

Conrad and his queen reached Aachen two days later (September 23), after an eventless journey through Lower Lotharingia. They had come to the royal palace in order to occupy “the regal throne of state . . . set up by the kings of old, and especially by Charles,” and convene a general court diet of ecclesiastical and secular princes. According to Wipo, this throne was “regarded as the archthrone of the whole realm,” the *publicus thronus regalis*, or “regal throne of state.” His tautological phrasing—the words *publicus* and *regalis* mean the same thing—places a semantic emphasis on the aura of sovereignty surrounding the royal throne at Aachen. Conrad was clearly developing a special knack for serving up the proper mix of symbolism and rough-and-tumble everyday politics, which appealed primarily to the *milites*, the members of a social stratum that was coming increasingly into the fore. Wipo's account is entirely credible: Conrad was soon compared to Charlemagne and adjudged worthy

of the throne, indeed second only to the great emperor. These sentiments gave rise to the saying “The saddle of Conrad has the stirrup of Charles.”⁴⁶ Like his immediate predecessor, the new king, upon his later visit to Italy, underscored this association by assuming the same royal titles as Charlemagne had used.

Not all of the Salian king’s enemies became his steadfast friends, nor were they immediately won over. Yet the Lotharingian opposition, which seemed so firmly entrenched, collapsed without his striking a single blow; once the new king entered the region, the French coalition disintegrated, the victim of incompetence and bad luck. Of course, Conrad probably knew which strings to pull behind the scenes in order to fan the flames of internal discord in Lotharingia over such issues as the conflicting claims to the counties of Verdun and Drenthe.⁴⁷

The royal couple and their entourage—including Aribo of Mainz—made their next documented stop in Liège (October 2), and then moved on to Nijmegen, although they had in all likelihood first returned to Aachen, continued on to the town of Neuss, and from there proceeded down the Rhine by boat. The royal palace at Nijmegen, on the Waal River in the present-day Netherlands, would become Conrad’s favorite stopping place; the king spent more time there overall than he did at the next three most-visited places combined. Conrad may have traveled to Utrecht from Nijmegen, but by mid-November he was already in Westphalia looking to win over the Saxons by diplomatic means.

Saxony

On November 14, 1024, Conrad probably visited Gendt, an estate belonging to the monastery of Lorsch and located just a few kilometers upstream from Nijmegen, on the Waal. From there the royal retinue made its way to the Saxon cloister of Vreden, where the king and queen “were warmly received, as is the custom between relations,” by Abbess Adelheid of Quedlinburg, under whose jurisdiction Vreden fell, and by her sister, Abbess Sophie of Ganderheim. Journeying forth to greet a sovereign—undertaking, as it were, an *occursio Caesari*—into the far reaches of one’s sphere of activity was a highly symbolic act, all the more significant in this case because the two abbesses were imperial princesses—their parents were Otto II and Theophanu⁴⁸ and their brother Otto III—who had already acted as kingmakers at the time of Henry’s accession, in 1002; Ekkehard of Meissen, a pretender to the throne who discounted their influence, reaped not merely failure but also an early and violent death.⁴⁹

The first Saxons to meet with Conrad officially—at the beginning of December 1024, in the town of Dortmund—were the bishops and secular lords of Westphalia. They engaged in detailed negotiations that would pave

the way for the masterfully staged court diet held in the town of Minden on Christmas day, which was the first day of the new year, 1025, according to imperial reckoning. Like Henry II, who had received their homage in Merseburg in 1002, Conrad confirmed the right of the Saxons to follow, in the words of the non-Saxon Wipo, “the very cruel law of the Saxons,” whereupon their magnates recognized him as king. Thus, in just a little more than three months, Conrad’s election at Kamba was acknowledged in the northern reaches of Germany as well. There is solid evidence that Archbishops Aribio of Mainz, Pilgrim of Cologne, Hunfried of Magdeburg, and Unwan of Hamburg-Bremen attended the diet at Minden, along with Bishops Bruno of Augsburg and Wigger of Verden and the local noble, Sigibert of Minden. Duke Bernard II of Saxony and the Saxon counts Siegfried and Hermann were also present. Conrad and Gisela were probably pleased with the showing and the—surviving—*laudes regiae*, or royal panegyric, sung on that occasion.⁵⁰

The royal couple spent more than three months in Saxony, actively promoting their policies on the practical as well as theoretical level. Crisscrossing the region, they journeyed to Paderborn and lingered a while in Corvey, traveled to Hildesheim and Goslar, stopped at the cloisters of Gandersheim and Quedlinburg in order to pay the obligatory return visit to the two Ottonian abbesses, and got as far east as Magdeburg.⁵¹ Acting in the archbishop’s interests, the king granted the local merchants economic and legal guarantees that were meant to be legally binding not just in the Christianized portion of Saxony but among pagans as well. The king’s reception of a delegation of Slavs from the Elbe region in February 1025 was the perfect complement to this policy. They arrived during or soon after Conrad’s visit to the town of Merseburg in order to pay “all the income owed” to the king. All in all, Conrad and Gisela did very well in Saxony, particularly since, by the time famine hit the area later that year, they had already moved on.⁵²

East Francia and Bavaria

After departing Saxony in March 1025, the king traveled through Fulda and Augsburg on the way to Regensburg. Over the course of the next fifteen years, this Bavarian “royal city” would host Conrad almost as often as the royal palace on the Waal. From the start, the court diets held in Regensburg focused on problems along the area’s southeastern border from the Babenberg march on the Danube to the Carantanian county on the Sann and Sava Rivers.⁵³

Before reaching Regensburg, the royal couple celebrated Easter (April 18, 1025) in Augsburg, where they must have remained for at least nine days in order to fulfill their liturgical obligations.⁵⁴ They were joined there by the abbot of the prominent Swabian monastery of Saint Gall, who came to procure the reconfirmation of his foundation’s privileges, and by the king’s first Italian

petitioner, Abbot Ambrose of San Ponziano in Lucca, who similarly appealed to the king for royal protection of the restored abbey, for a reconfirmation of its possessions, and for the extension of royal immunity. According to the extant originals, the diploma for the monastery of Saint Gall confirms a privilege issued by Otto III and thus overrides restrictions on the free election of abbots ordered by Henry II; the one issued to the Luccan monastery is the earliest diploma known to have been witnessed by both Hugh, the chancellor for Italy appointed by Conrad's predecessor, and the newly appointed archchancellor, Aribo of Mainz. The northerner who drafted the diploma initially entered the name of the chancellor for Germany, erased his mistake, and then wrote in Hugh's name. This indicates just how recently the arrangement had been introduced and what steps were being taken to implement the more complex system.⁵⁵

Augsburg was the scene of something even more important than these dealings, however, namely, the first open clash between Conrad the Elder, who was now the king, and Conrad the Younger, who had left Kamba empty-handed. Only the annals of the monastery of Saint Gall recount the incident, which occurred as its abbot was collecting his privilege.⁵⁶ Since he did not appear in the king's entourage either before or after Easter 1025, it is clear that Conrad the Younger had come to Augsburg to await the sovereign's arrival. Although it is not stated for what purpose, we can easily guess: He sought recompense for ceding his claim to the throne at Kamba. He may have hoped to receive a share of royal authority and the Burgundian legacy, perhaps enfeoffment with the duchy of Carinthia, which had been "stolen" from him. The latter seems particularly plausible, because in the coming weeks the king did indeed engage in a thoroughgoing review of Carantania's status. What is more, when Conrad the Younger finally acquired the duchy, in 1036, in the aftermath of the ouster of Duke Adalbero of Eppenstein, he became the most loyal adherent of his preeminent cousin.⁵⁷ In Augsburg, however, the king rebuffed him, in spite of the fact that Conrad the Younger made his request in private on "the most holy day of Easter." Clearly, not just the ecclesiastical princes received a demonstration of Conrad's "fitting discipline in secret," as Wipo termed it.⁵⁸ Moreover, by Easter 1025 it must already have been apparent that King Conrad II had no intention of placing the house of Worms, as personified by Conrad the Younger, on a par with the now regal Salian kinship.⁵⁹

From Bavaria, the king traveled through East Francia to Swabia, making stops along the way in Bamberg, Würzburg, and Tribur.⁶⁰ On this leg of the royal progress, Conrad was no longer seeking recognition; on the contrary, people approached their acknowledged king seeking his favor. Magnates came looking to have their rights reconfirmed, but also to procure new privileges, especially if they oversaw "critical" areas in, for example, the Bavarian march along the Danube or Carinthia.

Yet again, Conrad performed a successful balancing act vis-à-vis various interest groups. He made a broad range of determinations at his first court diet in Regensburg (early May), but because his stay there was so brief, most were “written up” in diploma form during the journey to Bamberg. Such delays in issuing diplomas were not uncommon. For example, the bishop of Minden had received legal title to a county during the king’s Christmas visit (1024), yet the diploma confirming the grant was first issued in Regensburg.⁶¹ Another charter issued there records the release from unfree status of one of the widowed empress’s maidservants at her mistress’s behest and upon the performance of the customary *Schatzwurf*.⁶² Yet, only after Conrad had departed from Regensburg was the issue of Cunigunde’s widow’s portion first addressed.⁶³ It almost goes without saying that the cloisters of Obermünster and Niedermünster in Regensburg received privileges from the king,⁶⁴ who also made his first documented contact with Bishop Egilbert of Freising, the deceased Henry’s staunchest supporter in Bavaria.⁶⁵

In the long run, Conrad’s measures with regard to the Ostarrîchi, or the easternmost reaches of Bavaria, as well as the duchy of Carantania/Carinthia, would prove to be of even greater significance. The king granted at least fifty hides of land in the present-day Marchfeld in Lower Austria to Arnold of Wels-Lambach, a count in the Traungau, his Frankish wife, Reginlind, and their sons, so that they could establish themselves along the border with Hungary. The members of the Wels-Lambach family did not make much headway, but once they received the grant, they joined the pool of Salian supporters in the southeastern portion of the realm.

It is also likely that upon the request of Adalbert, the margrave of Austria, Conrad confirmed a grant first issued in 1002 by King Henry II to Henry I of the Babenberg line. In 1018, Adalbert had ceded allodial land in lower Francia to Henry II in return for the emperor’s recognition of his assumption of his deceased brother Henry’s post. Conrad II concomitantly bestowed one royal hide of the margrave’s feudal holdings on the see of Freising. Adalbert did not receive any new grants from Conrad until 1035, however, when—in writing at least—he was generously rewarded for his crucial aid in the ouster of Duke Adalbero of Carinthia. The new king clearly did not yet consider the Babenbergs his close friends; they would have to prove themselves worthy of that distinction.⁶⁶

In spring 1025, Conrad instituted similar measures in Carantania with two purposes in mind: to lend his support simultaneously to competing clans and to offer a gesture of goodwill. On May 11, 1025, the king bestowed thirty royal hides of land on Count William II of Friesach, who was to carve out this allotment from his own county or march, which took its name from the Savinja/Sann River. The grant comprised local mountains, valleys, and forest belonging to the throne. Judging from all the rivers mentioned in the diploma,

the land was located in the fertile region northeast of the town of Celje in lower Styria (the present-day region of Štajerska) and extended southward across the Sava to the plain of the Krka River; this area would later be considered part of Carniola and is today part of Slovenia.⁶⁷

On the very next day, May 12, 1025, the “matron Beatrix”—clearly the queen’s sister—received allodial rights to one hundred hides of land encompassing the entire Aflenz basin, perhaps all the way north to the small town of Mariazell in the present-day Austrian province of Styria. This immense swath of crown property was probably transferred to Beatrix as restitution for the defeat of her husband, Adalbero, in 1019 by Conrad the Younger, her sister Matilda’s son, and Conrad the Elder, her sister Gisela’s husband, in a battle at Ulm over their mother’s legacy. The gift was nominally equivalent to the hundred hides of land in Carantania that Adalbero had himself already received as margrave from Otto III.⁶⁸ Gisela’s name naturally heads the list of intervenors in the transaction, which is indicative of the royal couple’s approach: Make the smallest investment—that is, use property of the least value to the crown—for the highest potential return—that is, grant it to an appreciative beneficiary. Thus, the king extended an olive branch to his brother-in-law in the form of a substantial gift of land located in the middle of Adalbero’s duchy but far removed from those regions potentially useful to the Salian king. The events of the years to come show that while the olive branch was accepted, the peace still did not go unbroken.⁶⁹

Swabia, or “I Am But the Emperor Who Never Dies”

Even though—or perhaps because—Gisela came from Swabia, not everyone in the duchy greeted the royal couple with open arms. It was also during this leg of their journey that Conrad would for the first time give expression to his concept of the “transpersonal” nature of kingship. Before setting off, however, and probably while still in Würzburg, the king made a generous gift to his retainer Werner, “on account of the intervention and loyal services performed by Bishop Bruno of Augsburg.”⁷⁰ Then, on May 20, 1025, during a visit to Tribur—a royal castle near Kamba, the site of his election—the king confirmed two privileges for the church of Würzburg.⁷¹

This next portion of their progress took Conrad and Gisela as far as Constance and Zurich. Though it is not known where they stopped en route, the royal couple covered on average between 22 and 30 kilometers (ca. 14–19 miles) daily,⁷² perhaps by going up the Rhine and disembarking only to bypass the falls near the town of Schaffhausen. Wipo noted that the purpose of Conrad’s stays in Constance and Zurich was to bolster his rule in Swabia.⁷³ Moreover, given the presence of a group of Italian magnates led by Archbishop Aribert of Milan, the Pentecostal observances in Constance (June 6, 1025) took on

the trappings of an *occursio Caesari*. According to Wipo, “all” the Lombards rendered homage to the new king, although the biography fails to note the absence of those Lombards who would meet with the king later on in Zurich and differs substantively from the Milanese version, according to which Aribert made an unaccompanied journey to Germany in order to participate in the German royal election.⁷⁴

While celebrating Pentecost in Constance, Conrad also met for the first time with rebels from the Italian city of Pavia, and it was during these exchanges that the king supposedly made his most famous comment. Upon learning of the death of Henry II, the Pavians had demolished the royal palace dating from the reign of Theodoric the Great and magnificently redecored by Otto III, in hopes of thereby eliminating all traces of the royal hold on their city and, what is more, the very seat of royal administration in the realm. In Constance emissaries excuplated their fellow Pavians by asserting that the compound had not been a royal palace at all, because at that particular point in time there was no king. In his famous reply, Conrad employed the metaphor of a ship: “Even if the king died, the kingdom remained, just as the ship whose steersman falls remains.” From this perspective, the Pavians destroyed royal, not private, structures, which were subject to others’ laws and not to their own, hence running afoul of the king. None of the Pavians’ further explanations carried any weight with Conrad, and, unlike the other Lombards, they departed in enmity. The king subsequently traveled to Zurich, where he graciously received those Lombards who had not made it to Constance.⁷⁵

The city of Pavia had already served as a quasi-capital for Theodoric the Great between 490 and 493, and during the Gallic war of 508 it temporarily replaced Ravenna as the residence of the king of the Goths. After the fall of imperial Ravenna, in 540, Pavia became the foremost city first for the Italian Goths and then for their successors, the Langobards.⁷⁶ Upon its capture in early June 774, Charlemagne became the “king of the Franks and the Langobards” and entered into a formal alliance with the Langobard magnates; establishing control over the city enabled him—in his capacity as *patricius Romanorum*—to make an open claim to Rome.⁷⁷ Under the Ottonians and Henry II, Pavia gradually lost its traditional status as a seat of royal administration and, to a lesser extent, as the site of the Langobard royal coronations. For example, in the immediate wake of Henry’s coronation as king of the Langobards, on May 14, 1004, “a minor incident” sparked a revolt by the townspeople, who trapped their new king in this very same royal palace.⁷⁸ Word of the Pavians’ destruction of the magnificent royal palace once they had learned of Henry’s death spread through not just Lombardy and the region north of the Alps but also Burgundy and France. Since they refused to make any recompense for their actions, no immediate settlement could be reached between them and this new king who conceived his kingdom in “transpersonal” terms. The influence

of Conrad's political theory spread far beyond the court, as evidenced by an apparently hitherto overlooked chronicle entry describing Emperor Conrad's unsuccessful siege of Bautzen in 1029. According to its Saxon author, the fortified city, abandoned by Henry II in 1018, had "once been part of *his* [i.e., Conrad's] kingdom."⁷⁹

Led by the prominent archbishop Aribert of Milan, the Italian magnates came to Constance in order to pay tribute to the new king, and their visit played a seminal role in the development of an active Salian policy toward Italy. There was still a chance, after all, that Conrad II might encounter serious competition for Italy, just as his predecessor, Henry II, had when, in the wake of the death of Otto III, some Lombard magnates elevated Margrave Arduin of Ivrea to the throne in Pavia on February 15, 1002.⁸⁰ Negotiations must have commenced not long after the royal election at Kamba and certainly before the end of 1024. A group of Italian secular princes contacted King Robert of France and offered to install him or his oldest son, Hugh, on the Langobard throne, but the French king declined. Probably this same group then approached Duke William V of Aquitaine, who was willing to have his son proposed for the kingship but only if the candidacy were to have the unanimous backing of the secular and ecclesiastical magnates of Italy.⁸¹ The Italian emissaries were amenable to fulfilling the duke's conditions, but they were undercut by the tide of events. During the visit to Constance and in response to Gisela's intervention, Conrad had already issued a privilege to the bishopric of Novara, endowing it with a cloister in—where else?—Pavia, and another one to the bishopric of Ivrea, a diocese serving the geographical and political heartland of his Italian opposition. The exceedingly eminent Italian churchman Leo of Vercelli, who attended the meeting in Constance, may also have dictated the diploma issued to Novara.⁸² After assembling a coalition of Conrad's opponents, Duke William V of Aquitaine proceeded to Italy in the summer of 1025, but once there, he quickly recognized the futility of his son's bid and abandoned the candidacy.⁸³ As had become apparent in Constance and Zurich, the new king had hit upon the proper course to win over the Italians and was gaining the upper hand. Even though much remained to be accomplished before he could title himself the king of the Langobards—to say nothing of Roman emperor—for the time being Conrad let matters rest south of the Alps. In the second half of June 1025, he left for Basle in order to make his mark in yet another non-German arena.

Basle

Even though King Rudolph III of Burgundy had ceded Basle to Henry II, the town was still considered part of the Burgundian kingdom. Its bishop had died just before the royal couple's arrival, and his successor was forced to hand over

so much money to Conrad and Gisela that even Wipo accused them of simony. The new king convened a court diet in Basle on or about June 23, 1025, and, by taking a strong stand with the Burgundian king and nobility, made it quite clear that as the successor to the German throne he expected them to uphold the terms of an agreement between Henry II and King Rudolph concerning the disposition of the latter's kingdom upon his death.

According to Wipo, the royal progress ended in Basle, although the true conclusion of the *iter regis per regna*, or journey of the king through the realms, came with the king's death in 1039. The second year of Conrad's itinerancy followed so seamlessly upon the first that—but for Wipo's artificial periodization—one is hard pressed to draw a line between them. As even Wipo allowed, the king's visit to Basle had exacerbated, rather than resolved, the Burgundian problem, leaving Gisela, who was the daughter of Rudolph's sister Gerberga, with her work cut out for her when she undertook to negotiate a "lasting peace" between her uncle and her husband.⁸⁴

The king's actions in Basle exemplified his political and military ideas, as well as his notions of imperial and canon law, and had the added advantage of producing an economic gain for the royal couple. Furthermore, they took direct aim at Gisela's kindred. King Rudolph III of Burgundy (993–1032) had three sisters: Gerberga, whose marriage to the Swabian duke produced three daughters, Matilda, Beatrix, and Gisela; Berta, who was the mother of Odo II of Champagne; and Gisela, the mother of Henry II,⁸⁵ who had exploited his kinship with King Rudolph III to gain Basle for the empire in mid-July 1006 and obtain reconfirmation of his designation as the Burgundian king's heir in late spring 1016. The bequeathal may also have been seen as an act of homage or oath of allegiance, for when the king of Burgundy handed over his crown and scepter to Henry II in February 1018, the gesture was described as a *confirmatio sacramenti*, or renewal of his homage and allegiance to his sovereign.⁸⁶ All the same, "in spite of the tacked on feudal justifications, the arrangement rested chiefly on hereditary principles and was directly tied to the person of Emperor Henry II. But when he died in 1024 before his uncle Rudolph, prevailing legal practice rendered the original agreement null and void." Count Odo II of Champagne (d. 1037) was the only kinsman whose hereditary claim to the throne equaled that of the deceased emperor, whereas the sons of Rudolph's nieces Matilda and Gisela—Conrad the Younger and Henry III, respectively—were both one level further down in the line of succession. The Salian ruler's claim, in contrast, could be justified only on the basis of the feudal law binding the Burgundian king to his sovereign.⁸⁷

Wipo recounted that in order to acquire Burgundy, "Emperor Henry . . . used often—indeed, very often—an infinite amount of money. But when Emperor Henry died, King Rudolph sought to invalidate his promises. King Conrad, however, intent on increasing the kingdom rather than decreasing it,

and wishing to reap the labors of his predecessor, subjected [Basle] to himself, so that he could observe carefully whether King Rudolph would attend his promises.”⁸⁸ Just a chapter before, Wipo had attributed Conrad’s rejection of the Pavians’ exculpation for destroying the royal palace to the new king’s belief in a transpersonal *regnum*; here, too, Conrad’s behavior toward the Burgundian king is explained by his concept of the realm as a higher entity, almost a polity. The preceding ruler had invested a tremendous amount of his realm’s wealth in its expansion, and his successor could hardly then curtail its reach; on the contrary, contemporary notions of an “august” ruler obliged him to augment the *regnum* by protecting and enlarging it.⁸⁹

Wipo may just have hit the nail on the head with this interpretation. Even in his dealings with his wife’s kindred, Conrad may have been motivated by a belief in the transpersonal nature of the kingship, although, when the opportunity later presented itself, he admittedly switched tracks and espoused the right of succession in favor of his own son and heir, Henry III.⁹⁰ However, his biographer may have captured the tenor, if not the exact wording, of Conrad’s response in the face of the demands made by his sister-in-law’s family. It is possible that Conrad the Younger had already expressed an interest in Burgundy, among other things, when he and his cousin first clashed in Augsburg at Easter 1025. Given that Carinthia was to remain under the dominion of his Aunt Beatrix and her clan, he wished to be equitably recompensed in Burgundy, at the very least.

One of the most important discoveries made by German medievalists after World War II was just how valuable the entries in memorial books could be when researching the history of the period in general and of important religious foundations in particular. The following example provides an excellent illustration of the singular nature of these remarkably comprehensive—and hitherto remarkably neglected—sources: The memorial book maintained at Reichenau contains a series of entries that provide our sole evidence that a sort of sororial “summit conference” was held at the island monastery probably during the course of the royal court’s sojourn in nearby Constance at Pentecost 1025. Because all of the names are entered in the same bold script on the same leaf of the memorial book, it may be inferred that Matilda, accompanied by her second husband, Duke Frederick of Upper Lotharingia, as well as her two sons by her first marriage, Conrad the Younger and Bruno, and her son by her second marriage, Frederick, must have met there with Conrad and Gisela. The respected Abbot Bern of Reichenau would have served as mediator between the two sisters’ camps. During his abbacy, the old-style *Liber memorialis*, or memorial book, was reborn as a “book of life” and regained its liturgical importance, since prayers were offered for all the individuals entered in the book, regardless of their political stance and influence.⁹¹

We can be certain of two things: The meeting at Reichenau concerned

Burgundy, and the attempted mediation by Abbot Bern as well as by Queen Gisela proved fruitless. Matilda's kin wanted to inherit Burgundy, while Conrad wanted to preserve the kingdom and his rights, or at least that was what he could and would have argued. He went on to intervene militarily in Basle, and the Swabians and Lotharingians revived their opposition to the king under the leadership of Duke Frederick, joined this time by his stepson Duke Conrad (the Younger) of Worms and his nephew Duke Ernest II of Swabia, who, as Queen Gisela's son by a previous marriage, was another one of Rudolph's great-nephews.⁹²

4. Summary

The king's first progress may have come to an end, but his almost continual royal itinerancy through the realm had only just begun. His travels resulted in a redefinition of the kingdom's "heartlands," for only his homeland along the mid-Rhine—blessed with trade routes and economic stature—would retain its time-honored role. The various duchies, or *regna*, hosted meetings between the king and the regional magnates obliged to attend upon him; whether one terms these assemblies provincial or court diets depends on one's perspective. These encounters provided the king with a forum for building political consensus, issuing diplomas that addressed local needs, and striking a balance between the interests of the kingdom and those of individual regions.

These practices did not originate with Conrad II, but he purposefully applied what he had adopted from his predecessor. It was within this context that the Salian king traversed and won over the kingdom, but he still had to win over his and his wife's kindred, while making sure that the Lotharingian opposition did not ally itself with his external enemies. This was no simple task, but not because the devil had addled Conrad's adversaries, as Wipo and other contemporaries alleged. The problem was that the one form of inheritance they recognized as legally binding—the "time-honored" unbroken line of succession—conflicted with the "new" royal right to a transpersonal polity.⁹³



Part Two

CONFLICTS AND THEIR RESOLUTION



5

FAMILY TIES OR INTRAFAMILIAL DISPUTES

Karl Kraus (d. 1936), an Austrian writer with a strong philosophical bent, once made the trenchant observation that the term “family ties” sums up the internal dynamics of the familial system perfectly, since every family is subject to the opposing forces of care and neglect, mutuality and competition, selflessness and envy, protection and exploitation, security and brutality. Yet, the members of a family are so interdependent that anyone who even attempts to sunder “family ties” suffers dire consequences and invites deadly revenge. Thus, we read that Conrad the Red of Worms fell into a rage during a battle against some rebellious Lotharingians and “killed with his own hand an incredible number of them, for the death of one of his blood relations had filled him with the ferocity of a rapacious animal.” In effect, “the killing of a relative is the epitome of terror, dishonor, and misfortune, all rolled up into one,” just as it should be, since relatives can provide and in turn draw strength from one another. “Bears are well-acquainted with this human quality, as can be seen from a proverb attributed to these clever animals in a folktale from northern Sweden: ‘It is better to fight twelve men than two brothers.’”¹

In the High Middle Ages, the duty to exact revenge on behalf of a slain relative was hardly the half-forgotten relic of a primitive time, but a quite current reality. A priest hearing confession was supposed to ask the penitent if he were guilty of committing a murder “to revenge a relative.” Conrad’s tutor Burchard of Worms permitted the members of his household, who, it should be noted, are termed his *familia*, to seek “blood revenge, but only for the next of kin.”² In a world shaped by “kinship mores” and the “familial model,” a bloody clash between members of the same clan or house inevitably led to catastrophe and tragedy, since it was impossible to restore peace no matter how one fulfilled the commitment to seek revenge.³ The events depicted in the twelfth-century epic poem *Nibelungen Not* (The last stand of the Nibelungen)—its very title, taken from the closing words of the work, captures the horrific, since inexpiable ruin of the Burgundians—may strike the reader as

singularly extreme, but upper-class and royal houses were in fact prone to engage in the sort of “fight-to-the-death” discord that often involved the murder of one’s relatives, particularly when the establishment of a new monarchy was at stake.⁴ Just because the murder or manslaughter took place within the familial group did not obviate the commitment to seek revenge; for example, before final action could be taken against Gisela’s son Ernest II, she had publicly to abjure her right to seek revenge.⁵

Among his own kindred, Conrad II was opposed by his cousin Conrad the Younger, who was backed by the Upper Lotharingian house into which his mother, Matilda, had married. Both Duke Dietrich and his son Duke Frederick II had been staunch supporters of Henry II, and they now took up the cause of Frederick’s stepson. Gisela’s sister Matilda was also the aunt of Ernest II, who was anything but his royal stepfather’s friend and at that point the number two member of Conrad’s opposition. Adalbero of Eppenstein, who was married to Gisela’s other sister, Beatrix, was the third member of this alliance. Thus, Conrad’s German adversaries were bound together by their kinship with Gisela through her sisters, Matilda and Beatrix, and on the lookout for supporters beyond the southern, western, and eastern borders of the kingdom. Conrad II could ill afford to underestimate the potential power of his opponents, particularly given their tenacity, born of disappointment, and the non-rational constraints on his countermoves.

The military force that accompanied Conrad on his royal progress must have been formidable, since he did not encounter any opposition in Lotharingia or Saxony that the sources deemed worthy of mention. The first serious familial clash occurred in Augsburg at Easter 1025, when Conrad the Younger presented his demands to no avail.⁶ The parley on the island of Reichenau during Pentecost 1025, again regarding the claims of Conrad the Younger and his Lotharingian kindred, involved a substantially larger crowd. We should not discount the possibility that Queen Gisela was behind this negotiating session between her royal husband and the members of her sister Matilda’s clan; in any case, the attempt was no more successful.⁷ Then, during the second half of June 1025, the royal couple flexed their military and political muscle in Burgundian Basle, thus signaling to Gisela’s uncle Rudolph III that they were prepared to fight.⁸ Although the king of Burgundy bided his time and did not take the bait, other members of the royal kindred soon rose up in open rebellion. At court, Conrad’s stepson Ernest II was credited with being the ringleader, not merely a participant, and thus appears at the head of Wipo’s list of those who violated the peace “by the suasions of . . . the Devil,” followed by Dukes Conrad the Younger and Frederick II of Upper Lotharingia. Naming them in this order also highlighted the contrast between Ernest II, the thoroughly defiant “bad boy,” and Hermann IV, his “good,” younger sibling.⁹ Hermann of Reichenau, on the other hand, accorded the primary role

in the revolt to Conrad the Younger and relegated Ernest II to the second spot on his list. There is no mention of Conrad's stepfather, the duke of Upper Lotharingia, but a count "Welf of the Swabian kindred," who was the ill-fated Swabian duke's most faithful and steadfast supporter, does figure in Hermann's account.¹⁰

In any case, Ernest played a prominent, if perhaps not dominant, role in the rebellion against the king. But just where was his guardian, Archbishop Poppo of Trier, during all this? To throw some light on this question, consider the situations of Ernest II and his younger brother: When Hermann IV in 1030 replaced Ernest II as duke of Swabia, he remained under the *tutela*, or tutelage, of Bishop Warmann of Constance for three more years. Hence, Gisela's younger son from her marriage to Ernest I did not officially attain his majority until mid-1033, when he was at least seventeen years of age.¹¹ Her older son's case had been handled quite differently: On September 4, 1024, Ernest II was under the guardianship of his father's brother, Poppo of Trier,¹² but by the summer of 1025—less than one year later—he no longer was. The archbishop must have felt that he had fulfilled his assignment, either because Ernest II had in fact turned fifteen and no further impediments prevented him from attaining his majority, or because he was granted his majority at the earliest possible age, namely when he turned twelve, at the insistence of Matilda's clan—Trier was, after all, in Upper Lotharingia.¹³

In either case, her protégés' strengths and weaknesses would have been as clear as clear could be to Matilda, and she could not have done a better job of setting the stage. Her own son Conrad seems to have taken after his paternal grandfather much as her sister Gisela's son Ernest II took after his maternal one, for the former was a procrastinator like Otto of Carinthia, the latter a persistent fighter for his rights like Hermann II of Swabia, as evidenced by their behavior during the jockeying for the throne after the death of Otto III, in 1002.¹⁴

1. Conrad the Younger

The rebels were willing to fight for their rights, but for which one in particular? The duchy of Carinthia was controlled by their aunt Beatrix and her husband, so for the moment the younger Conrad's only option was to press his hereditary claim to the Burgundian throne. For that, he needed the support of his Lotharingian kindred. Perhaps as early as autumn 1025, his mother, Matilda, sent a liturgical manuscript to Prince Mieszko II of Poland, who was the son-in-law of Ezzo, count palatine of Lotharingia. The dedicatory letter praises Mieszko, who had just consolidated his rule over the Poles, as a faithful Christian and divinely appointed king. The application of such laudatory language

to a ruler who had succeeded his father as a “usurper of the royal title” indicates that the gift was at the very least meant to open lines of communication between the Lotharingian opposition and one of King Conrad’s external foes.¹⁵

In any case, it was all to naught, since support for Duke Conrad’s cause soon collapsed in the West. As part of his plan to secure Italy for his son, William V of Aquitaine sought to assemble a coalition against Conrad II and to this end brokered a reconciliation between Count Odo II of Champagne and the count’s sovereign, King Robert II of France, whereupon both entered into an alliance with Frederick of Upper Lotharingia. With an invasion apparently looming on the horizon, Bishop Gerard of Cambrai took the precaution of begging the French king to spare his diocese and at that point, at least, declined to acknowledge Conrad II, but all the other Lotharingian bishops joined the German king’s camp. Two additional events proved even more disastrous for the opposition. First, the death of the heir to the French throne triggered a falling-out between the king and queen of France and had a paralyzing effect on royal politics. Second, Count Odo II of Champagne made a major miscalculation: He decided to take on the count of Anjou, thereby entangling himself in a long series of drawn-out skirmishes that produced many casualties and precluded his participation in any other military actions. The die was now cast.¹⁶

In November 1025, Ezzo, count palatine of Lotharingia—and supporter of the new king—invited the Lotharingians to a gathering in Aachen to discuss their next move. Presumably, Pilgrim of Cologne attended, as may have Poppo of Trier, but the names of all the participants are no longer known. And the outcome of the meeting? On Christmas Day 1025 Duke Gozelo of Lower Lotharingia; Frederick’s father, Duke Dietrich of Upper Lotharingia; the hitherto reluctant Bishop Gerard of Cambrai; and a host of other important Lotharingian magnates paid homage to the king in Aachen. The official ceremony had been planned down to the smallest detail during negotiations involving no less a figure than Abbot Poppo of Stavelot; consequently, neither side lost any face or had their feathers unduly ruffled. Duke Gozelo appears to have been able—given the absence of royal objections—to make good on his hereditary claim to the long-disputed county of Verdun, thus receiving a quite tangible token of the king’s favor. It should be noted, however, that his sole rival, Count Louis of Chiny, who had enjoyed the backing of the bishop of Verdun and probably Conrad II as well, was no longer in the picture, having, opportunely enough, been forcibly released from his earthly chains in 1025. The duke’s acknowledgment of the new king’s rule may also have been contingent upon his receipt of another item on his wish list, the county of Drenthe, north of Deventer in western Frisia.¹⁷

In a chapter titled “On the Conspiracy of Certain Germans,” Wipo states that Conrad the Younger, “who was neither faithful to the Emperor nor, on

the other hand, very harmful to him, remained quiet for the time being.” And this depiction of the young man’s behavior rings true. The cousin of the emperor may have felt that he had no alternative, particularly after the deaths of his stepfather and perhaps his step-grandfather Dietrich as well in 1026/27, which rendered military action useless.¹⁸ Furthermore, a major contingent of the emperor’s Swabian adversaries, led by Ernest II and Welf II, capitulated in July 1027, while the resistance mounted by Count Werner of Kyburg likewise dissipated just a few weeks later.¹⁹

In August 1027 the emperor traveled from Zurich to Basle and on to the neighboring village of Muttentz, where he and King Rudolph III of Burgundy resumed their “familiar discussion.” Gisela mediated the dialogue, which culminated in the signing of a treaty reestablishing peaceful relations by stipulating that Conrad was to inherit Burgundy under the same terms as had been worked out with Henry II. Furthermore, they probably resolved that in the event of Conrad’s untimely death, Henry III would succeed in lieu of his father. The fact that Otto William, the son of the late King Adalbert of Italy and a powerful Burgundian count “who was in name the vassal of the (Burgundian) king, but was in fact his lord,” had died almost a year earlier only served to enhance the value of this agreement.²⁰

Sometime before September 9, 1027, Conrad II visited Worms, where he may have accepted the subordination of his cousin Conrad, conditional upon the destruction of some of the latter’s strongest castles and his voluntary submission to temporary custody. Conrad the Younger thereafter regained the king’s favor as well as all of his honor. While in Worms Conrad II is known to have settled a dispute with his stepson Ernest’s former guardian, Archbishop Poppo of Trier, who had contested one of the emperor’s directives.²¹ The younger Conrad’s brother Bruno was promoted from the royal chapel to the chancellorship for Italy, perhaps even by the end of May 1027.²² In any case, Conrad the Younger offered no further resistance. Since the emperor and the king of Burgundy had come to terms only shortly beforehand, the fact that the younger man could no longer look to Rudolph III for help surely bolstered his decision.

Thus, it makes sense that Matilda was invited to celebrate Easter 1030 at Ingelheim with her sister Gisela and her brother-in-law Conrad, attending as a result the court diet at which Ernest II lost the duchy of Swabia. Prior to taking action against Odo of Champagne in August 1033, the emperor and empress met with Conrad the Younger and numerous other magnates in Limburg an der Haardt; a diploma issued on that occasion includes—atypically—a list of witnesses, headed by the young man. One year later, Bruno—Matilda’s other son—was named bishop of Würzburg, and upon his elevation to this exceedingly wealthy see in spring 1034, he was able to exert his influence on behalf of his brother Conrad the Younger in 1035 and 1036.

Wipo's account of the younger Conrad's capitulation in 1027 tellingly concludes with the deposition of the duke of Carinthia, Adalbero of Eppenstein, "shortly" thereafter, even though the latter event did not take place until 1035, thus leading the reader to infer that the rapprochement between the two cousins was a lasting one. In reality, Conrad the Younger had to wait until 1036 before receiving the vacant duchy of Carinthia, "which the father of this very Cuono [Conrad] is said to have had once. So Duke Cuono, as long as he lived, remained faithful and one who strove well for the Emperor and also for his son, King Henry." For his part, Conrad II did not even hold his cousin accountable, only the patriarch Poppo of Aquileia, when Archbishop Aribert of Milan broke his word and escaped from their joint custody, in which he had been placed in March 1037.²³

Outwardly, the two Conrads put a most amicable end to their conflict, but only because the younger one submitted to his assigned role: His interests were entirely overshadowed by the king's, and their unitary "house," or *una domus*, was sundered into the powerful royal line and the ever weaker house of Worms. The latter became so eviscerated that the emperor even monopolized its *memoria* by absorbing some of its members into the Salian commemorations. Thus, Duke Conrad's parents and brother Bruno were mentioned in endowments made by the emperor, but the young man himself—the cousin who had relinquished his claim to the throne—was erased from the memory of the lineage. Even his half sisters, Sophia and Beatrix, were adopted by the royal family.²⁴ Moreover, Conrad the Younger paid a high price for his compliance: The palace at Bruchsal and the surrounding forest of Lusshardt—important holdings for the men of Worms—were expropriated by the Salian royal house and endowed to Speyer cathedral for the upkeep of the royal tombs.²⁵ Conrad the Younger had no descendants, but his sterility was familial and not physiological in origin: The clan probably lopped off his branch of the family tree by not recognizing his offspring.²⁶ With Conrad's death his family came to a tragic and unheroic end.

2. Ernest of Swabia

Both tragedy and heroism marked the end of Ernest II of Swabia. While the emperor's stepson did, to be sure, play an instrumental role, his downfall itself was meted out by Conrad II, who simultaneously made sure that the "contagion" of this tragedy did not affect the Salian clan. Since none of the primary sources explain why Duke Ernest turned against his stepfather, past generations of scholars tended to attribute their public discord to "purely personal differences," an analysis that reflected the bourgeois respect for "private" matters characteristic of the nineteenth century. In his study of Conrad's reign,

Bresslau accordingly wrote that Ernest's actions were prompted by personal antipathy, an opinion accepted even today.²⁷ Now, politicians are at times surely motivated by personal animosity, sometimes maybe even more than the facts. And, indeed, the two men—stepfather and stepson—certainly came to hate each other intensely, so much so that Emperor Conrad compared Ernest's final downfall to the death of a rabid dog.²⁸ All the same, it seems implausible that Ernest would have allowed himself—twice, in fact—to have been led astray by the devil just because he hated his mother's husband.²⁹ Moreover, unlike his younger brother, Hermann, he probably was not brought up anywhere near Conrad II or the royal court, once Poppo of Trier became his guardian, which may have occurred as early as 1016/17. In essence, the two antagonists had similar childhoods and adolescences, having both lacked a father and a mother while growing up. They encroached upon one another's turf because the much younger man placed tremendous demands on the older one, egged on by Swabian magnates like Count Welf II and Count Werner of Kyburg, who took advantage of the situation to promote their own political interests.

In any case, we are justified in attributing the falling-out to “personal reasons,” provided that they are not limited to Ernest's “maternal deprivation.” One reason his downfall is so tragic is that he brought it upon himself through his adherence to the view that authority was vested in the person of the lord.³⁰ In fact, “centralization of authority in the realm,”³¹ “concentration of authority,” and the “transpersonal view of the polity”³² were already in many respects hallmarks of theoretical as well practical politics during the realm of Henry II, even north of the Alps. But that does not represent the whole story: An impartial reader of those chroniclers of the Merovingian age, Gregory of Tours (d. 594) and Fredegar (fl. seventh century), and of that “prime witness” of Henrican politics Thietmar of Merseburg (d. 1018) will note that the latter's superior command of the Latin language represents the only major difference in their discussions of “kinship mores” and “blood revenge,” of the establishment and preservation of authority. In fact, Thietmar introduced his readers to almost as many murdered and murderous individuals as his early medieval counterparts had.³³

As one study of “royal authority and conflict settlement” concluded, “How kings and magnates conducted their conflicts in the tenth and eleventh centuries owed less to principles of ‘polity’ and more to those governing the pursuit of discord in the ‘private’ sphere. In such conflicts, the king does not yet appear to have been accorded a special status recognized by all parties.” The Carolingians, in contrast, had still sought to check opposition from the nobility by requiring a general oath of fealty, prohibiting the formation of any sworn associations, or *coniurationes*, and taking sharp measures against the perpetrators of “lèse majesté.” As the Carolingian empire declined, however, the

conceptual norms that had developed during Charlemagne's reign lost their currency. Upon assuming power, the Ottonians had to start off modestly; thus, Henry I entered into compacts and alliances with the leading noblemen, thereby successfully fashioning a policy based on ritual friendship, or *amicitia*. Otto the Great, on the other hand, harkened back to the Carolingian model and attempted to exercise his power coercively; the severe crises that accompanied his reign were to no small extent the products of this policy. As a result, "behavioral patterns" that placed a premium on the "dignity and personal integrity," or *dignitas*, of all the parties involved in a dispute became such a fixed part of conflict resolution that the whole process may be thought of as a series of rituals whereby the resistant offered total submission to the lord and consequently regained his favor. Total rehabilitation was, of course, contingent upon the fulfillment of specific conditions arrived at through negotiation, but the ultimate goal of these efforts was always a foregone conclusion. These rituals lost much of their efficacy during the reigns of Henry II and Conrad II; the first Salian king in particular tried to settle conflicts by invoking the same formal procedures—not their actual content—as applied in cases of high treason. The broadened leeway consequently exercised by the sovereign tipped the balance of power so far in his favor that the approach was considered a cruel breach of tradition.³⁴

That the disagreement between Conrad II and his cousin took a comparatively undramatic course was probably at least partially due to the latter's temperament. The enmity between the sovereign and Ernest of Swabia, on the other hand, culminated in the institution of judicial proceedings by Conrad II, albeit only after the conflict had steadily escalated for many years and eluded resolution by traditional means.³⁵ The proceedings themselves were an amalgam of the traditional, noble concept of politics and the new, imperial one: Conrad saw to it that his wife abjured her right to seek revenge for her son's sentence and at the same time arranged for his stepson's banishment for being a "state enemy," or *hostis rei publicae*.³⁶ In its incipient stages, however, the conflict was not so bitter and its final outcome not inevitable.

Surprisingly little is known about Conrad's activities over the course of the summer and autumn of 1025, the very period during which the coalition opposing the king—Ernest of Swabia, Conrad the Younger, and the Lotharingians, along with their French, Polish, and Italian supporters—reached the pinnacle of its influence. Ernest's ability to take up arms against Conrad II that summer indicates that he had been released from the guardianship of Poppo of Trier, even though he was at most fifteen years old. The king himself may have terminated the archbishop's service while attending to matters in Swabia preparatory to the court diet in Zurich (June 1025).³⁷ The paucity of contemporary source material may reflect the opposition's success at stymieing the king's policies, but that is not the only possible reason for the king's difficulties: If

the royal couple's youngest known child, Matilda, was indeed born in the second half of 1025, then Conrad's "necessary companion" would not have been available at the time to solve a familial problem that the sovereign was neither inclined nor able to tackle alone. By the way, these two possibilities are not mutually exclusive. Thus, the coalition had disintegrated by Christmas 1025, although the individual participants in the opposition were still not entirely defeated; even before then, Conrad II had decamped for the eastern borders of the realm, far from the seat of conflict, where he is known to have issued a diploma on November 1, 1025.³⁸

The submission of the Lotharingians convinced Ernest II to follow suit, in accordance with the traditional ritual: The supplicant humbled himself and capitulated unconditionally, while highly placed mediators pressed his case before the king, who finally restored his regal favor.³⁹ Although Ernest ultimately achieved his end, the road was bumpier than it might have been in the past. In early 1026, the king left Aachen and, traveling via Trier, headed for Augsburg, from which he planned to stage an expedition to Italy. Ernest II probably joined the royal procession in Swabia and accompanied the king "humbly" to Augsburg, where he regained the king's favor on Candlemas 1026 (February 2). His mother, Gisela, played an extremely active role in the proceedings: She "appealed" to Ernest to make peace and not only mediated between the two men but also enlisted the aid of other princes, including the eight-year-old Henry. Even so, it proved quite difficult to change Conrad's mind. He "refused for a long time" and then reestablished relations with his stepson on the condition that the young man provide military assistance and join the king on the Italian expedition. Conrad concurrently paid fitting heed to "the counsel and petition of the princes of the realm" and designated his son, Henry, as his successor. In all likelihood, these princes were the very same individuals who had intervened on Ernest's behalf and whose "counsel and petition" in favor of the planned succession was the price of Conrad's accession to their entreaties. Hence, the king's pardon of his stepson and designation of his own son as his heir may very well have been parts of the same deal. The future Henry III was for the first time accorded a role in both proceedings.⁴⁰

At the same time, Bishop Bruno of Augsburg was named the young boy's guardian in an arrangement similar to a regency, whose primary function was to let Conrad II keep his options open and keep the lingering opposition—even if it was "of little moment"—in check.⁴¹ Henry's half brother Ernest accompanied Conrad across the Alps into Italy and was certainly present at his stepfather's coronation as king of the Langobards in Milan at the end of March 1026.⁴² He would also have witnessed Conrad's futile attempts at crushing the Lombard opposition and occupying Pavia, and experienced firsthand the terrible—and perhaps even personally life-threatening—riots in Ravenna at the beginning of summer 1026.

The region was soon locked in the grip of the overwhelming and unwholesome Mediterranean heat, and the king retreated to the Trentine highlands of northern Italy for the rest of the summer. Since it was the king's responsibility to provision his troops, even while waiting out the hot season, Conrad may have sought to minimize his expenses by granting to some of the northern ecclesiastical and secular magnates, along with their retinues, leave to break camp "with honor." Among those who left for home was Ernest of Swabia, who had been well recompensed for his service to his lord: With no heed to the ensuing scandal, Conrad had enfeoffed his stepson with the Swabian imperial monastery of Kempten. Another important reason for sending the duke of Swabia home was that Ernest's ally, Count Welf II—who controlled the important county of Norital, stretching from the Eisack River valley to the Brenner Pass and into the Inn River valley—had launched a feud against the "imperial regent" and grievously attacked the bishopric of Augsburg. It was up to Ernest II to protect the duchy and establish peace, and his possession of Kempten, which bordered on Augsburg, enabled him to act as a physical barrier between the two adversaries.⁴³

In any case, the king's plan never panned out and instead proved to be a recipe for trouble. Not only did Duke Ernest make common cause with Count Welf in Swabia, he also set his sights on Alsace, of which his Swabian grandfather, Hermann, had been deprived,⁴⁴ as well as on Burgundy. Instigated in all likelihood by the very same vassals who had "counseled" the—at most—sixteen-year-old duke to subenfeoff them with Kempten's holdings, Ernest first ravaged Alsace and destroyed the strongholds of Hugh IV of Egisheim, one of Conrad's first cousins on his mother's side. This not-so-motley crew must have met with some success, for Ernest II suddenly had "a great army of young men" at his command; they proceeded up the Aare River into Burgundy and entrenched themselves on an island near Solothurn. Ernest obviously hoped to establish contact with Rudolph III, but it is unclear whether the island fortification was meant as a finger in the Burgundian king's eye or a carrot to induce him to enter into an alliance or perhaps even both. In any event, having already decided to establish closer ties with Conrad II, Rudolph rebuffed the advance. Ernest returned to Swabia, erected a castle overlooking Zurich, and began siphoning off wealth from the imperial abbeys of Saint Gall and Reichenau. According to Wipo, he thereby caused enormous damage to his own land (*patria*). "With law and justice thus set aside, he stood fast in his iniquitous endeavors until the return of the Emperor."⁴⁵

The young duke probably engaged in these activities in late autumn and early winter 1026, and some time passed before his sovereign could react. Upon reaching Brixen in southern Bavaria (the present-day Italian town of Bressanone) on his return from Italy, the newly crowned Emperor Conrad issued a diploma that in effect stripped Count Welf II of the county of Norital

by bestowing the territory upon his episcopal host.⁴⁶ Ernest himself was forced to submit yet again at a court diet in Ulm convened in the second half of July 1027. The members of Ernest's circle were confident that the "Ottonian ritual" would again prove workable, but they were sorely disappointed. The young duke made no headway in the negotiations and in the end was compelled to capitulate unconditionally, and the count was ordered to recompense the bishop of Augsburg. While the punishments meted out to their anonymous supporters who also submitted to the crown were not deemed worthy of mention by contemporary sources, these do recount Ernest's fate: Conrad's stepson was deposed from his duchy, sent into exile, and imprisoned at Giebichenstein, a sort of "state prison" near the town of Halle on the Saale River in distant Saxony. He came to grief due to a major miscalculation: The Swabian duke and his closest advisors had assumed that they would be able to flaunt their military prowess upon entering Ulm and conclude an agreement with the emperor or, if the negotiations broke down, withdraw armed and unharmed.

As the Swabian forces had neared Ulm, Ernest II had reminded his men of their oaths of allegiance and promised them and their progeny fame, honor, and riches. According to Wipo, two of his supporters, Counts Frederick and Anselm, had countered that as free vassals they were not bound to undertake any actions that would undermine their king and emperor, the ultimate protector of their freedom, and hence would not do so. Their remarks are yet another example of Wiponian eloquence, marked by rhymed passages and citations from Sallust. While Frederick and Anselm obviously did not use such devices in stating their position, the import of their actual statement must have been loud and clear: When it came to the duke's jurisdictional authority, the more or less youthful members of Ernest's inner circle subscribed to an outdated Ottonian view; the counts, on the other hand, considered themselves answerable to the Salian king—now the emperor—and would render to the emperor the things that were the emperor's.

What had paved the way for the counts' profession of loyalty? In the first half of July 1027, Conrad II had held "an assembly of the royal household with his vassals in Augsburg" to solicit advice on combating his Swabian adversaries. This sort of consultation involved more than mutual discussion; the attendees were expected to initiate a dialogue with the opposing camp. The assembly in Ulm was a testimony to their success, as were Conrad's military measures in Swabia at the end of July and beginning of August 1027, and even perhaps Gisela's visit to Saint Gall with the young Henry in tow at around the same time. Was Henry being promoted as an alternative to his Babenberg half brother or merely "presented" at the monastery? And as Ernest entered exile and his men were hunted down in Swabia (1027), just where was his younger full brother, Hermann IV?⁴⁷

Image not available

FIG. 2 Deposing a lord. From the fresco cycle in the west choir of the abbey church at Lambach, ca. 1080.

And now for the penultimate and final acts in this tragedy: Ernest returned to Swabia from his imprisonment at Giebichenstein and regained his ducal office “on the condition that, with all his men, he would pursue as an enemy of the commonwealth” his vassal Werner of Kyburg, who had disturbed the public peace. Ernest, however, had obviously not experienced the hoped-for change of heart and refused to swear an oath to perform that service, essentially declining to exercise his ducal obligations—when it meant opposing his most steadfast confidant and ally—and to impose peace. This refusal rendered him “a state enemy of the Emperor,” since he was committing *lèse majesté*. Conrad II deposed Ernest once and for all and appointed his brother Hermann IV to the office of duke. According to Wipo, this all took place in Ingelheim at Easter 1030 (March 29). What is more, Ernest and his men were excommunicated by the attending bishops; still, the imposition of an ecclesiastical censure for *lèse majesté* was not unheard of, since Henry II had already been able to prevail upon the bishops to excommunicate Henry of Schweinfurt. Because Empress Gisela had publicly abjured her right to seek revenge for any measures taken against her outlawed son, Ernest II took flight at the

eleventh hour with a handful of men, which action elicited the confiscation of his and his adherents' possessions.⁴⁸ Wipo heightens the drama of Ernest's downfall by speeding up the action and packing it all into a single day (Easter 1030), but these events must actually have unfolded over the course of a longer time span. An imperial diploma dated July 1, 1028, names Dukes Adalbero of Eppenstein and Ernest of Swabia, as well as Count Liudolf—Conrad's oldest stepson and Ernest's half-brother—one right after the other, as witnesses; while the text diverges somewhat from the usual format, its authenticity is not in doubt. We may infer from this list that Ernest regained his duchy by summer 1028 or perhaps even earlier, on the occasion of Henry's coronation at Aachen (April 14). He had probably paid some sort of reparations, perhaps in the form of the abbey of Weissenburg, located in the Nordgau of Bavaria, which passed into the possession of the emperor at around this time.⁴⁹

Even after he was deposed, Ernest did not become an outcast or outlaw. His political options were certainly not yet exhausted, especially vis-à-vis Count Odo of Champagne, who seemed to be a natural ally and, as Rudolph's nephew, had an even stronger hereditary claim to Burgundy than Ernest, a grandnephew. Accompanied by Werner of Kyburg and others, Ernest visited his West Frankish kinsman, seeking *consilium et auxilium*, or counsel and aid. Maybe Odo did not wish to be burdened with this temperamental competitor, or maybe he just squandered the opportunity, much as he had in 1025, but in any case, the count rebuffed the duke. The Swabians returned home and took up residence in the Black Forest surrounding the castle at Falkenstein; there, Ernest, Werner of Kyburg, and their entourage were reduced to living "by petty brigandage."⁵⁰ After suffering the loss of their best horses, they fell into such dire straits that they heroically resolved that it was "better to die with honor than to live in shame." In the wooded highlands of Baar, on a plateau between the Jura Mountains and the Black Forest in the area of Donaueschingen and Fürstenberg, they realized that they were being pursued. Count Manegold, "a vassal of the Emperor, holding a great fief of the abbey of Reichenau," had been charged by his lord, Bishop Warmann of Constance—who was also Duke Hermann's guardian—with restoring the peace breached by Ernest and his men. Before long, the two sides came within hailing distance and began to fight. Manegold had vastly greater military resources at his disposal and consequently most of his quarry, including Ernest, Count Werner, the noblemen Adalbert and Warin, and others, died in the resulting bloodbath. The imperial side lost its leader, as well as numerous other combatants. Manegold was buried on the island of Reichenau, while the erstwhile duke of Swabia was laid to rest in the church of the Virgin Mary in Constance, following the rescission of his excommunication. The monastery of Saint Gall, which suffered so much at Ernest's hands, commemorated him as the *dux et decus Alamannorum*, the "duke and pride of the Alamanns." The emperor, on

the other hand, is said to have remarked, upon hearing of Ernest's death, "Rarely will rabid dogs [live to] multiply with offspring."⁵¹

3. Adalbero II of Eppenstein

While the immediate members of the imperial family did not always see eye to eye, as evidenced by the falling-out between Gisela and Henry III following Conrad's death,⁵² the differences between the emperor and his successor became public as a result of the former's dispute with Duke Adalbero II of Carinthia.⁵³ The process for settling the conflict culminated in Adalbero's deposition and loss of the duchy at a court diet held in Bamberg around May 18, 1035.⁵⁴

The reasons behind the diet's action are not explained by either Wipo or Hermann of Reichenau,⁵⁵ or in fact by the author of a detailed report of the events leading up to the duke's ouster sent to Bishop Azecho of Worms by one of his clerics, who signed himself only as "G." He did not, however, repeat the general rumor that the emperor was biased against Adalbero due to a long-standing hatred.⁵⁶ Conrad's feud with his brother-in-law way back in 1019 would have provided sufficient grounds for his harboring an old grudge,⁵⁷ yet there is clear evidence that the relationship between the duke and his sovereign had been fair to middling up until 1028.

Even though he had yet to be anointed king, Conrad II had in essence declared a general amnesty in the course of his coronation ceremony, "as the bishops and the dukes with all the people petitioned." In that spirit, one of his earliest official acts upon visiting Bamberg, in Bavaria, was to grant a most generous swath of land in present-day northern Styria to Adalbero's wife, Beatrix (1025). The duke was not present at the diploma's issuance, however, but in Regensburg witnessing the settlement of a widow's portion on Empress Cunigunde.⁵⁸ A court proceeding held in Verona on May 19, 1027, and presided over by Conrad II and his son on their way home from Italy only seemingly disfeoffed Adalbero of possessions pertaining to the church of Aquileia and awarded them to the patriarch. Adalbero "lost" the county of Trento barely two weeks later, but in that case Conrad II merely confirmed a determination made by Henry II in 1004, many years before Adalbero became the duke of Carinthia and assumed the attendant office of margrave of Verona, which— theoretically at least— included jurisdiction over Trento. Thus, the events of May 19, 1027, hardly amounted to a "defeat" for Adalbero. What is more, the duke— along with various major saints, the members of the royal family, and the patriarch— may very well be immortalized in a magnificent fresco painted around this time in the apse of the basilica of Aquileia, built by the patriarch Poppo. If he is, then he must have enjoyed an amicable, not an estranged, relationship with the others. Just a few months later (September 23–24, 1027),

Adalbero—the sole layman in attendance—served as the emperor’s shield bearer at the imperial synod of Frankfurt.⁵⁹ He was also present at the royal coronation of Henry III, the emperor’s son and duke of Bavaria, at Aachen on April 14, 1028, and appears—along with other, fellow Bavarians—as an intervenor in a privilege issued there five days later on behalf of the bishopric of Säben-Brixen. A diploma issued in Magdeburg on July 1, 1028, recording a court decision in favor of the monastery of Corvey, also contains his name, although Duke Bernard of Saxony, under whose jurisdiction Magdeburg fell, precedes him in the list of laymen. Finally, Adalbero is credited with having intervened in an important imperial diploma issued on September 11, 1028, granting privileges to Poppo of Aquileia.⁶⁰ For some reason, however, Adalbero’s name does not appear on any court document after that date, whereas his enemy William received confirmation of a privilege from the emperor and in the presence of the patriarch at or even before Christmas 1028.⁶¹

The catastrophic conclusion to the estrangement between the emperor and the duke of Carinthia in May 1035 may have been precipitated by both sides, however. According to one view, Adalbero’s value to the emperor plummeted following the reconciliation between Conrad II and Conrad the Younger, since the former could at any time appoint the latter duke of Carinthia and still keep the duchy within the family. Then why would it have taken Conrad II more than one year to dispense with his brother-in-law’s presence at court?⁶² In fact, Adalbero’s position must increasingly have resembled that of the ninth-century Carolingian counts in the eastern border regions, who were required to reach decisions independently but in so doing risked being charged with overstepping their mandate in the view of the distant central authority, when losing the favor of one’s sovereign could spell the end—figuratively and perhaps literally—of a Carolingian margrave. On the one hand, he waged wars and concluded peace treaties with neighboring tribes; on the other, however, his measures possessed only provisional authority until they were confirmed by the king or emperor, with whom he met on an annual basis. If that confirmation were not forthcoming, it was but a matter of time before the margrave and the sovereign parted ways.⁶³

It has commonly been observed that the criteria Conrad II applied to his political dealings—not least with his dukes and counts—were based on Carolingian norms, and Adalbero’s deposition makes the most sense when the relationship between the emperor and the duke from 1030 to 1035 is viewed against this background.⁶⁴ Unbeknownst to his father, the emperor’s son and King Stephen of Hungary entered into a peace agreement (1031) spearheaded by Adalbero, who then single-handedly implemented the agreement in the region bordering Hungary, Croatia, and the Byzantine Empire. Except for the names of the peoples, this contemporary remark could just as well have been written in the ninth century: “It was said that Adalbero wanted to resist

the king's authority with the backing of the Croats and Mirmidons [Hungarians].” The threat from the east was credible enough that the Bavarians, so that they might better arm themselves, were exempted from participating in the emperor's campaign against the Liutizi in the northeast (summer 1035). At the advice of Adalbero's kinsman Bishop Egilbert of Freising, Henry III entered into a sworn agreement with his uncle to render mutual aid, in effect signing off on the duke's all too independent political dealings. Still, the proceedings leading up to the deposition cannot have been precipitated by this compact, because only in the course of the hearings did Conrad II even learn of its existence. They were in all probability triggered by complaints against Adalbero lodged by some citizens of the town of Koper on the Istrian Peninsula, who arrived in Bamberg at just the right time.⁶⁵

These observations in no way contradict G's contention that Conrad II harbored an old grudge against his brother-in-law Adalbero of Carinthia, who had done him an *iniuria*, or grave injustice to be avenged. And the contretemps over the legacy left by Gerberga, the former duchess of Swabia, in 1019 would certainly fit that bill.⁶⁶ These two explanations—Adalbero's perforce unauthorized political dealings in the southeastern portion of the empire and the old enmity among Gerberga's heiresses and their husbands and sons—are not mutually exclusive, nor is either disproved by the emperor's actions in the immediate aftermath of May 18, 1035. Cutting short his stay in Bamberg, Conrad hurried to Mainz to consult secretly with Archbishop Pilgrim of Cologne and Bishop Bruno of Würzburg—the younger Conrad's brother—regarding, no doubt, the ducal vacancy in Carinthia. Conrad the Younger set off right away to join the emperor but had to wait until Candlemas (February 2) to receive the—albeit whittled down—duchy.⁶⁷

The proceedings did not go without a hitch in spite of the fact that they were focused solely on the sovereign's complaint against Adalbero. Conrad had initially approached the matter as an exercise in transpersonal authority, but in order to achieve the result he desired, he backtracked significantly and recast the issue in traditional terms of personal conduct and bonds. Contemporary sources do not mention any specific charges relating to “matters of state.”⁶⁸ In the eyes of Hermann of Reichenau, the loss of the emperor's favor was sufficient reason for the deposition, but in Wipo's account the duke's punishment is attributed to his having been “convicted of *lèse majesté*,” probably including high treason, an allusion to the transpersonal polity.⁶⁹

Accordingly, the breakdowns in the proceedings were also of a personal, even private nature. The two presiding judges, Margraves Ekkehard II of Meissen and Adalbert of Austria, demanded on behalf of the princes that Henry III be consulted, and they declined to conduct the judicial review without him. The emperor sent for his son, who was to pronounce the sentence. Henry entered and—much to his father's astonishment—refused, noting that

he had entered into a personal compact with Adalbero and was thus unable to fulfill the emperor's command or desire. Conrad admonished, pleaded, and threatened, but all to no avail. Overcome by shock at his son's defiance, the emperor was struck dumb and fainted. Regaining consciousness, Conrad reconvened the princes and fell to his knees at his son's feet. Through his torrid tears he implored the young man not to bring joy to his father's enemies while heaping ignominy and shame upon the kingdom and its sovereign. Henry responded by confessing that he had sworn to Adalbero never to sanction the withdrawal of the duke's possessions, offices, and honors without a court ruling, all at the advice of his tutor, Bishop Egilbert of Freising. Now it was the bishop's turn to justify his actions: Egilbert maintained that there was nothing unusual about the sworn association, nor was it in any way directed against the sovereign. Instead of assuaging the emperor, these words only stoked his anger. Spouting invective, Conrad threw this quite skillful, if not entirely blameless, advisor and aide out of the chamber and dismissed him from the court. Once the dust had settled, the judicial proceedings resumed, and Conrad got what he wanted: Adalbero lost his duchy and the march of Carantania. While the latter was immediately granted to Count Arnold of Wels-Lambach, the duchy remained vacant until February 2, 1036.⁷⁰

Henry's behavior and statement speak volumes. He justified his position by citing the agreement with Adalbero, which stipulated that the young king was to safeguard the duke's assets unless they were confiscated in a legal manner; thus, he clearly did not acknowledge the validity of the judicial proceedings in Bamberg. Second, Conrad II considered the very existence of the sworn association an assault on the rights of the royal clan and hence insisted that Henry's defiance not be a cause for Conrad's (personal) enemies to gloat. What is more, in his view the very existence of the pact threatened the personal and the transpersonal natures of the realm.⁷¹ Once again, Conrad II admirably succeeded at conflating the two political spheres by publicly humiliating himself before his son. Losing his self-control and getting so worked up that he lost consciousness were not part of the script, of course, but the emperor nonetheless proved himself to be a high-powered politician as well as an individual who was willing to reach down to the very depths of his being in order to achieve what he thought was right. There is no mention of Gisela's playing a supporting role in any of this.

The quick disposition of the Carantanian march had far-reaching repercussions, leading as it eventually did to the formation of present-day Styria.⁷² After a suitable delay, the "remainder" of Adalbero's former holdings fell to Conrad the Younger, who had long aspired to be the duke of Carinthia. Success—so long in coming—was gratifying, as was his continued recognition as a prince of the realm, without the roundabout reference to Worms.⁷³

And so the intrafamilial disputes came to an end. But at what cost? Zurich,

the gateway to Swabia, was lost, as was the duchy's cohesiveness as a political entity. While it could never claim to be in the same league as Bavaria or Swabia, the duchy of Carinthia—the repository of German, Romansh, and Slavic hopes since the early Middle Ages—lost whatever remained of that legacy. Furthermore, the house of Worms commenced an inexorable decline.⁷⁴

How much mischief can a family member accomplish under the watchful eyes of his kin? The answer can be gleaned from the bloody epilogue to this story. Sometime before Easter 1036, Adalbero killed William II, who had received an ample endowment from Conrad II as early as 1025 and then a strong confirmation of his position on December 30, 1028. Even though he was married to Saint Hemma, the margrave must not have been totally blameless in the matter of Adalbero's deposition.⁷⁵

4. Gebhard III of Regensburg

The relationship that developed between Conrad and his half brother, Gebhard, was neither openly hostile nor particularly warm. The product of Adelheid's second marriage, Gebhard had as a young boy been entrusted to a monastery in Würzburg for religious training. As a young man he fled this involuntary vocation and reclaimed his secular rank, which may have been that of a count in what is currently part of Styria. Gebhard's case was one of the important matters adjudicated in Conrad's presence at the synod of Frankfurt held upon the newly crowned emperor's return from Italy (1027). Adelheid's son was forced to lay down his arms and rejoin the clergy. The emperor did not lift a finger on his half brother's behalf, even though he did intervene forcefully on the behalf of Otto and Irmgard of Hammerstein.⁷⁶ The young man went on to become Bishop Gebhard III of Regensburg. One year after his elevation, he and his mother founded the collegiate church of Öhringen in the diocese of Würzburg (1037). Bishop Bruno of Würzburg—Gebhard's kinsman—was away at the time, having accompanied his cousin Conrad II on the second expedition to Italy, but the charter establishing Öhringen was issued in the diocese of Würzburg, so Bruno's deputy would have been informed beforehand.⁷⁷ Gebhard occupied the see of Regensburg until 1060, outliving both his half brother, Conrad, and nephew Henry III. Even judged by the standards prevalent before the Investiture Contest, he was no credit to the German episcopate; indeed, his nephew Henry III was said to have feared him.⁷⁸

6SITTING OUT CONFLICT: THE DISPUTE OVER
GANDERSHEIM (1025–30/31)

Insofar as a ruler like Conrad II, who was almost continuously on the move, can at all be said to have “sat out” a conflict, that was the tack he took—successfully, moreover—in the dispute over Gandersheim.¹ The dispute had its roots in the cloister’s foundation in the mid-ninth century by the then bishop of Hildesheim at the behest of his cousin, Duke Liudolf of Saxony. Gandersheim was located on the Gande River within the diocese of Mainz, but since the foundation was subject to the jurisdiction of the bishop of Hildesheim, the boundaries of his diocese were in effect shifted southward. For almost 150 years the archbishops of Mainz did nothing about this matter in the northernmost corner of their diocese; as a consequence, Gandersheim and its surrounding territory continued to belong to the see of Hildesheim, and the erstwhile infringement seemed to have faded from memory. During the reign of Otto III, the issue entered a new phase when the bishop of Hildesheim claimed that the cloister was a proprietary institution. In probably 987 the community at Gandersheim responded to this threat by recollecting that it actually lay within the diocese of Mainz. The bishop died shortly thereafter, and the dispute again lay dormant until autumn 1000, when it erupted with even greater intensity. Almost a generation before, the minster at Gandersheim had been damaged by fire, and the time had come to reconsecrate the restored structure. The incumbent abbess was gravely ill, and her appointed successor, the emperor’s daughter Sophie, invited Archbishop Willigis of Mainz to officiate at the consecration, while Bishop Bernward of Hildesheim was asked merely to attend. The archbishop chose a date but then postponed his visit; taking advantage of the ensuing confusion, the bishop of Hildesheim sought to proceed with the consecration as originally planned. Sophie had all of the cloister’s residents submit to the archbishop’s oversight, and the canonesses disrupted the bishop’s attempt at celebrating Mass, putting him to flight. Of course, this hardly spelled the end of the matter; the aggrieved Bernward appealed to Rome, which served merely to escalate tensions, even though both the emperor and the pope took his side.

When Otto III died soon after, the crown passed to Henry II, who may even have been born in Hildesheim.² All the same, almost five years would elapse before a settlement was announced at the minster's consecration, on January 5, 1007: "Willigis transferred his rights to Bernward of Hildesheim, who had actually possessed them all along."³ When Bernward died, in November 1022, Henry II chose a Bavarian named Godehard as his successor. His candidate was not at all pleased, however, since he had his reasons for strongly preferring the bishopric of Regensburg or Passau: Before his consecration, Godehard had received a visit from his future archbishop and adversary, who warned him not to exercise his episcopal duties in Gandersheim or its surrounding territory under threat of excommunication. This quarrelsome prince of the church was none other than Aribo, and while both men hailed from Bavaria, Aribo was descended from a much more illustrious family than Godehard, who traced his roots back to the *familia*, or household, of the monastery of Niederalteich.⁴

A little more than eighteen months later, Henry II was dead, and Saxony received a visit from the new king and his extensive entourage, which included the kingmaker Aribo of Mainz. Abbess Sophie, who still advocated the archbishop's position, traveled to Vreden to meet the royal couple. Bishop Godehard of Hildesheim must have feared that she had prejudiced Conrad and Gisela against him, so he invited the king, who was staying at the monastery of Corvey at the time, to visit Hildesheim. The king arrived in mid-January 1025 for a three-day sojourn, but all that Godehard elicited from him was a promise to adjudicate the matter in Goslar before the month was out. Conrad was in a quandary: Should he uphold the rights of the diocesan bishop, as confirmed by Henry II, or those of the archbishop to whom he owed his kingdom and crown? In the face of those choices, he issued the following judgment on January 27, 1025: Both parties to the dispute were to surrender jurisdictional authority over Gandersheim to the bishop of Halberstadt until such time as a subsequent hearing settled the matter.

After a short interval, the king arrived in Gandersheim together with his entourage (mid-February 1025). In the cloister church Aribo excoriated the bishop of Hildesheim and prevented his rival from celebrating Mass at the high altar. The canonesses of Gandersheim, who for the most part now saw things otherwise than their abbess,⁵ combined forces with the attending priests to prevent Aribo from officiating. That was it for Conrad: He again postponed consideration of the matter, but only until a synod was convened at Grone—today part of the city of Göttingen—between March 2 and 29, 1025. It was attended by Bishops Bruno of Augsburg, Eberhard of Bamberg, Adalbold of Utrecht, Meginhard of Würzburg, and Meinwerk of Paderborn, as well as many abbots, the duke of Saxony, and a great number of other laymen. The synod awarded provisional authority over Gandersheim to the bishop of

Hildesheim until such time as a general imperial synod rendered a final decision in the matter.⁶

It would have been entirely out of character for Archbishop Aribo of Mainz simply to accept the determination and let the matter rest, but he remained with the king until the royal progression came to a close in late July 1025.⁷ With the waning of summer, Aribo resumed his activities, probably from his seat on the banks of the Rhine. At the beginning of September, he dispatched a messenger bearing invitations to a synod that would convene at Gandersheim within six weeks. The bishop of Hildesheim got wind of this plan and complained in a letter to Conrad II. The king most likely spent the latter half of September 1025 in Worms, looking for a successor to Bishop Burchard, who had died on August 20, and thus was occupied with another matter, but in his reply Conrad referred Godehard to the findings of the synod at Grone. The two rivals met in mid-October, but their mutual displays of humility were as fruitless as their serious attempts at negotiation; with nothing to show for their efforts, they parted. Subsequently, Archbishop Aribo and Bishop Godehard of Hildesheim held rival synods at Gandersheim—the former on October 16, the latter five days later, on October 21, 1025.⁸

The king had himself covered: The bishop of Hildesheim would think that he had royal support, while the archbishop of Mainz would not get the sense that he was opposed by the king. In any case, the king took advantage of Aribo's preoccupation with Gandersheim and consequent absence from court to settle the episcopal succession in Worms privately and without the "counsel and consent" of the archbishop. The "clergy, vassals, and ministerials" chose Azecho as the new bishop of Worms; he may have been a kinsman of the king, who certainly attended the election.¹⁰ Once Conrad had arranged this fait accompli in Worms, he did not chance a discussion with Aribo; instead, he directed the electors to ask the archbishop to perform Azecho's consecration. Aribo's response was vitriolic and laced with unstinting criticism of the king, though in the end he consented to consecrate the new bishop of Worms. The ceremony probably took place on December 5, 1025, either in Worms or in neighboring Tribur, where Conrad, Gisela, and Aribo are known to have spent the previous day on more or less friendly terms.¹¹

The deceased emperor's daughter Abbess Sophie took a strongly partisan stance, which may have induced Conrad to remain above the fray, a decision that certainly paid off. As long as the abbess of Gandersheim supported the archbishop of Mainz, it was not possible to enforce any royal ruling in favor of the bishop of Hildesheim. The tables suddenly turned, however, when Aribo antagonized the abbess of Gandersheim; the tale of their falling-out is brief, but it took many years—until after Aribo's death, in 1031, in fact—to settle the issue. Ezzo, the palatine count of Lotharingia, and his wife, Matilda, also the daughter of Otto II and hence the abbess's sister, had two daughters, Sophie

and Ida, who were canonesses at Gandersheim. The archbishop invited the young sisters to visit Mainz, and their superior granted them leave to go. Once they arrived, however, they sent back their extensive entourage with the message that they never wanted to return to Gandersheim. Bishop Godehard's biographer intimated that the canonesses fled because they disdained his lowly birth, but the two were also led astray by "petty envy" and induced to flee at the incitement of some—of course, nameless—people behind the scenes.¹² Since they went on to become nuns, their "going astray" may mark the incipient phase of a reform movement that turned its back on the *canonica institutio*, or institution of canonical life, and attracted other dissatisfied canonesses at Gandersheim, like the three women who managed under some pretext to join the two in Mainz.¹³

This indignity, which occurred during winter 1025/26, gave rise to a protracted estrangement between Gandersheim and Mainz. Abbess Sophie contacted Bishop Godehard of Hildesheim and requested his support, while in early 1026 Aribo joined Conrad II on an expedition to Rome that effectively precluded any further developments concerning Gandersheim. Upon his early—and brief—return to his diocese,¹⁴ Aribo sought to settle the matter at a provincial synod held in Seligenstadt on September 21, 1026. His rival received a written invitation to attend the synod, and although the letter was marked by bitter invective, it did contain an acknowledgment of the bishop's irreproachable leadership. In Hildesheim, the letter was interpreted as a summons "in the name of the pope and the king,"¹⁵ even though there is no mention of that in the text. What Aribo did cite as the basis for his action was a canonical precept, revived during the Carolingian reform of the church, which stipulated that each diocese should convene two synods annually.¹⁶

At that point Aribo may have seemed to enjoy not just the pope's but also the king's backing in his dispute with Godehard. However, even in his absence Conrad saw to it that a sort of "weapons parity" was maintained at the synod, in that Bishop Werner of Strasbourg took the part of his archbishop, while Bishop Bruno of Augsburg acted on behalf of Godehard of Hildesheim.¹⁷ These men were Conrad's most important advisors and intimate confidants; Werner may have been the senior bishop in terms of ecclesiastical rank, but that was probably balanced by the fact that Bruno had exercised a sort of regency over the realm since February 1026.¹⁸ It is unconceivable that they would have done anything in Seligenstadt without their sovereign's approval. Hence, it comes as no surprise that the synod, in which Aribo had put so much stock, dissolved without issuing a determination, on the grounds that the matter could only be deliberated in the presence of the king and the bishops who were absent from Seligenstadt. Most of the nine bishops who attended the synod were trusted supporters of the king, which may explain why they insisted first and foremost on Conrad's participation. Unbeknownst to all at

the time, the synod's adjournment would last almost exactly one year while the king stayed on in Italy.

On September 23–24, 1027, Aribio presided over a general synod for Germany in the palatine chapel at Frankfurt. It was attended by the emperor, who acted as a sort of “honorary chairman,” much as he had earlier that the year in Rome. There was some allusion to the dispute over Gandersheim already on the first day, when Aribio had to defend his decision to harbor the five canonesses in violation of canon law. With these preliminaries out of the way, on the second day the synod addressed the jurisdictional dispute itself. Bruno of Augsburg again advocated Godehard's position, while Aribio publicly declined the support of Werner of Strasbourg. After a show of humility, the archbishop demanded that the bishop of Hildesheim accept a stay in judgment. The members of the assembly reacted by jeering Aribio, who flew off the handle and made some highly imprudent comments. Werner of Strasbourg, who was the most senior of the suffragan bishops of Mainz and thus entitled to respond first, increasingly took Godehard's side, until it became inevitable that Aribio lose his case. The synod rendered its judgment following a discussion of the events at Gandersheim in 1007, when Willigis, the archbishop of Mainz at the time, had relinquished all jurisdictional claims to the cloister. Seven bishops—most notably Bruno of Augsburg—attested that they had been present at that event. Begrudgingly, Aribio ceded the floor to Werner of Strasbourg, who announced the synod's determination: The imperial cloister of Gandersheim and its surrounding territory were part of the bishopric of Hildesheim. The general synod had, in effect, done nothing more than reiterate the findings of the synod at Grone in March 1025. On the next day, the matter of the canonesses who had fled Gandersheim and in the meantime become nuns was apparently settled in favor of Gandersheim and the see of Hildesheim. However, the archbishop was as disinclined to bow out on this matter as he was on the jurisdictional one, and final action on the status of the five women was taken only after his death. As for the jurisdictional dispute, Aribio experienced a magnanimous change of heart before his resignation in 1030 and established what would prove to be a lasting peace with Godehard based on the understanding that Mainz would relinquish its claims to Gandersheim. However, one more hurdle and one last lap remained before this long-running dispute could be declared over.

At a provincial synod held at Geisleden during the first half of 1028, the archbishop of Mainz tried unsuccessfully to initiate a review of the determination made by the Frankfurt assembly. An imperial synod held at the palatine castle of Pöhlde on October 6, 1028, revisited the topic of Gandersheim, and thanks to the active participation of the emperor—along with the ecclesiastical and secular members of his retinue—a workable compromise was finally formulated: Jurisdictional authority over Gandersheim was awarded to

the bishop of Hildesheim, but the settlements in the surrounding territory were to be apportioned between the two sides. On the surface, the agreement was the product of concessions the emperor had prevailed upon Godehard to make; in actuality, Conrad had provided Aribo with the means to save face and show magnanimity. Thus, in Merseburg on Monday, May 17, 1030, in the course of the sovereign's weeklong observance of Pentecost, the archbishop of Mainz visited Godehard's bedchamber and admitted his error. The epilogue to this story came some months later, when Aribo, in the course of delivering his Christmas sermon in the cathedral at Paderborn, announced that he was taking leave of the "emperor, clergy, and people" in order to go on a pilgrimage to Rome. The archbishop then died on the return journey, in Como, Italy, on April 6, 1031.¹⁹ His successor, Bardo, did not reopen the dispute over Gandersheim; on the contrary, he returned the four surviving religious women to Godehard, who assigned them to the cloister of Saint Mary's in Gandersheim and appointed Ida, Abbess Sophie's niece, the abbess of that foundation. The plan to apportion the properties in the vicinity of Gandersheim was never instituted, because it ran afoul of the bishopric's vassals and ministerials—if that is the correct interpretation of the Latin term *nostrates*, "the members of our household."²⁰

Conrad had weathered the dispute over Gandersheim; he sat out the conflict—perhaps intentionally—in order to keep the man who had engineered his accession to the throne occupied, even in check, without antagonizing him. Gisela probably encouraged her spouse by not allowing the archbishop to atone for his affront of September 1024. The royal couple's political interests would have benefited from a more vigorous approach, however, given that Aribo was, in the words of one long-popular anecdote, a "typically unbridled Bavarian," capable of gravely insulting the queen's kinsman Bardo by rescinding his right to carry a valuable abbot's crosier. On the other hand, no one could accuse the ruler of ingratitude toward Aribo, nor, for that matter, could Abbess Sophie of Gandersheim voice any complaint about Conrad's stance. With his hot temper, pride, derisive nature, and lack of self-control, Aribo brought about his own downfall.²¹ Conrad II and anyone else who had it in for the archbishop barely had to lift a finger.

Gandersheim continued to be a thorn in Conrad's side up until his death: Following Sophie's death, in January 1039, her sister Adelheid expressed the desire to succeed her as abbess. For some unknown reason the emperor refused to grant this request, and only after Henry III assumed power did she get her wish.²²



ENGAGING IN CONFLICT: THE FIRST
EXPEDITION TO ITALY (1026–27)

1. Events Preceding the Imperial Coronation

Louis the Pious, Lothar I, and Otto II each became emperor during his father's lifetime. While such was not the case with Conrad II, he, along with his consort Gisela, attained the imperial throne with greater speed than any of his medieval predecessors. Not surprisingly, the Salian's meteoric rise aroused suspicion, particularly outside the realm, and some even attributed it to the devil's intervention.¹ By winter 1025/26, Conrad appeared to have substantially defeated—though not in fact completely eradicated—his local opponents, and all that remained were those he deemed “of little moment.”² The king wasted no time in announcing an expedition to Italy; his force was to muster in Augsburg—as was customary—and break camp at the end of February 1026. Prior to their departure, the royal couple ensured the continuity of their dynastic line by staging Ernest's subjugation and Henry's appointment as Conrad's successor in a manner that lent itself to the cause-and-effect depiction found in the emperor's biography. First, Gisela induced her son Ernest to agree to submit himself unconditionally to her husband. Then, she had her son Henry act as the most highly ranked mediator and intercessor on his half brother's behalf. After much hesitation, Conrad took his stepson back into royal favor, and then he had the same princes who had supported his son's intercession request that Henry be named the heir apparent. While Henry appears here for the first time as an active participant in regal affairs, he was still just eight years old and naturally in need of a guardian during his parents' upcoming absence. Bishop Bruno of Augsburg was chosen to serve in that capacity.³

In the second half of February 1026, Conrad departed Augsburg “with a copious army” for what would be an approximately fifteen-month-long sojourn south of the Alps. There is evidence that he was accompanied by Archbishops Aribo of Mainz and Pilgrim of Cologne, some of their suffragan bishops, and Duke Ernest of Swabia. The number of troops was “copious”;

judging from the use of that term by the more forthcoming writers of the Ottonian age, the army may have comprised anywhere up to ten thousand armed horsemen.⁴ Moving swiftly to intervene in Italy was advisable for many reasons: Conrad's opponents there had been dealt a significant—if not fatal—and in some ways self-inflicted blow by the almost simultaneous retreat of his French and Aquitanian rivals. Following his election, a group of Lombard magnates had approached the king of France with an invitation to become their king, but Robert II declined on behalf of himself and his son Hugh. They then approached the duke of Aquitaine with the same offer, which in effect conferred dominion over not just the *regnum Italiae* but the *Romanum imperium* as well.⁵ What the secular princes of Lombardy expected in return was that their new ruler replace those bishops allied with the East Frankish–German king with individuals they trusted. Outraged by this proposal,⁶ William V followed the welcome counsel of the margrave and margravine of Turin—Manfred and his wife, Bertha—and withdrew himself and his son from consideration.⁷ Thus, the two individuals who possessed the military prowess to challenge Conrad's right to Italy eliminated themselves from contention. Even so, a myriad of conflicts still required royal engagement, not distance; when cutting those Gordian knots, Conrad did on occasion act rashly, but—as it turned out—never to his lasting detriment.

Although few individuals living south and west of the Alps expected much of Conrad II,⁸ he nevertheless acted with remarkable swiftness, showed political astuteness, and reaped success, even outside of his native land. One gets the impression that Conrad defined his goals retrospectively on the basis of his accomplishments; he accordingly suffered few reversals.

Ever since his election at Kamba, in early September 1024, Conrad had set his sights above all on becoming the king of Italy, or, to use the traditional phrase, of the Langobards, which was a prerequisite for achieving the imperial crown.⁹ Thus, the *intitulatio*, or superscription, to the first royal diploma issued in Italy—modeled on an older privilege—refers to Conrad as the king of both the Franks and the Langobards. Issued in Verona along with a slew of other diplomas, it confirms the enfeoffment of Bishop Alberich of Como with the county of Chiavenna, in effect securing the three most important Alpine passes in the present-day Swiss canton of Graubünden for the king.¹⁰ However, the first diploma to contain a complete dating clause was issued in Peschiera, on the Lago di Garda, just west of Verona, on March 15, 1026. Judging from a surviving diploma dated March 23, 1026, Conrad was in Milan eight days later; he then celebrated Easter (April 10, 1026) in Vercelli with its bishop and his loyal supporter, Leo.¹¹ Wipo includes only the most general overview of Conrad's first few months in northern Italy, mentioning little more than the Easter celebration in Vercelli and the bishop's death during the “days of the Easter season,” by which he probably means the octave following the solemn

feast.¹² The biographer indicates that the expeditionary force proceeded from Verona—bypassing Milan and Pavia on either flank—to the diocesan city of Vercelli, on the Sesia River, then briefly notes Leo’s death and succession by Harderic, a canon from Milan. In the next breath, Wipo reports that the Pavians and the margraves allied with the city persisted in their opposition to the king, and Conrad was allegedly compelled to respond by laying the region thoroughly to waste over the course of two years.¹³

Wipo’s account notwithstanding, documentary evidence suggests that the king and his closest advisors were in Milan on March 23, 1026.¹⁴ Furthermore, Wipo’s assertion that the expedition bypassed Milan is entirely implausible because there was no Roman road or similar thoroughfare on which they could have traveled.¹⁵ According to one Milanese source, Conrad was crowned king of the Langobards by Archbishop Aribert (1018–45) “as was the custom,” and the annals of the imperial monastery of Nonantola, near Modena, also make reference to the ceremony, which leads one to infer that the archbishop of Milan crowned Conrad in his cathedral. Given Conrad’s veneration of the Virgin Mary—as evidenced by his coronation as king of the Germans on the solemn Feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin (September 8)—it is conceivable that the rite was celebrated on the solemn Feast of the Annunciation (March 25, 1026), two days after the issuance of the surviving diploma in Milan.¹⁶ In any event, the royal procession cannot have tarried long in Milan, which would explain why Wipo was under the impression that Conrad’s route had taken him between Milan and the as-yet-inaccessible city of Pavia, where the king of the Langobards was traditionally crowned. Time would have been of the essence, moreover, if Conrad hoped to reach his loyal supporter, Bishop Leo, before he died.

The amity between the bishop of Vercelli and the German kings dated back to Otto III, whom Leo had served as a royal chaplain. A lifelong and implacable enemy of Arduin of Ivrea, the bishop had even written a poem in which he asserted that once Henry II assumed the imperial office, he would never allow the margrave to live on. Thus, out of self-interest alone, Leo supported the kings and emperors from the north. In Constance, on June 10, 1025, he placed himself by word and deed at Conrad’s service, assisting in the issuance of the first royal diploma concerning Italy, and was promptly remembered by the king with a privilege.¹⁷ In an exchange of letters with Duke William of Aquitaine during the second half of 1025, Leo offered his counsel concerning the Italian escapade—which the duke had probably already abandoned—and appealed for some long-promised gifts. The duke responded with a most singular mix of resignation and sarcasm, friendship and lack of understanding for the bishop’s political stance. As evident from this correspondence, Leo of Vercelli, whose bishopric lay on the invasion route from Aquitaine and Burgundy to Italy, was quite astutely playing for time.¹⁸ He was now on his deathbed,

however, and while he lingered long enough to celebrate Easter with his sovereign, he breathed his last during the octave that followed.¹⁹

Aribert of Milan thereupon became the unchallenged leader of the northern Italian bishops backing Conrad. He and Bishop Leo of Vercelli have been described as the ardent members of a “German party,”²⁰ but the concept is untenable in this context and the very term anachronistic. Most of the northern Italian bishops supported transalpine candidates for the Italian throne because they had probably learned from experience that limiting the field to Lombards was never successful in the long run. Bishop Leo would have drawn a cautionary lesson from the downfall of Margrave Arduin of Ivrea, whose whole career was marked by drawn-out and casualty-ridden battles, particularly following the collapse of his less-than-glorious kingdom in Vercelli.²¹ Given the predilections of the northern Italian episcopate, it made perfect sense for the margraves of Lombardy to make the removal of the bishops a condition of their support for their preferred candidate, the duke of Aquitaine.²² In the view of the upper clergy, a king who was wont to spend his time north of the Alps but had a good—and legitimate—shot at acceding to the Langobard and imperial thrones was simply a better bet than a king who was at hand yet had to contend constantly with rivals and might not even pull off a coronation in Pavia or Milan, to say nothing of Rome. William of Aquitaine clearly understood the connection between the Langobard kingdom and the Roman Empire, and he sought Leo’s support for his bid as late as mid-1025,²³ but he appeared to lack the very energy and determination needed to prevail, as both the bishop and Margrave Manfred of Turin recognized.²⁴ Given the military resources at the German king’s disposal, the result was much as was to be expected: Henceforth, the Italian-Lombard *regnum* and the evolving German kingdom constituted a single entity, to the extent that Conrad II was the first and the last Salian to receive the Langobard crown in a separate ceremony. It thus makes sense that Wipo did not even note that the event had taken place; the custom, which had steadily declined in importance since the death of Otto I, was simply beyond his ken.²⁵

The Lombard opposition was still far from crushed, however, and posed a danger to no less a figure than the future bishop of Toul, who took his leave of the royal force, accompanied by an inadequate military escort.²⁶ According to Wipo, the army’s first action was to attack Pavia, but to no avail, since the “fortified metropolis” was just too populous. Then, under the very noses of the Pavians, the royal forces waged a protracted war of destruction that allegedly lasted for two years, and blocked all trade and shipping. Since the king spent a total of fifteen months in Italy, this passage may be understood to mean that, but for summer 1026, one contingent of the royal army continually “beset” the area surrounding Pavia. The military onslaughts ended in January or February 1027 with the submission of Pavia and its allied margraves

under terms mediated by Abbot Odilo of Cluny in a reprise of his services to Henry II: In a negotiated compact all the members of the northern Italian opposition recognized the “future emperor.”²⁷

There were many ways for Conrad to harass his enemies—torching homes and fields, assaulting peasants, chopping down vineyards, sinking ships, destroying warehouses—but none possessed lasting appeal or represented a long-term military strategy. In the days just before or after May 1, 1026, Conrad and his army burned down a castle situated on the Orbe River, south of the Po River and Pavia (present-day Capriata d’Orba, or Castelletto d’Orba), as well as other strongholds belonging to the margraves allied with Pavia, including two we know by name: Adalbert, a member of the Otbertini (Este) family, and William, a member of the Aledramid family.²⁸ While these successful attacks did not bring Conrad’s enemies to their knees, they would have demonstrated the ability of his army to make short work of capturing the military bastions in the countryside. Over the next two months (May and June), the king advanced upstream through the Po valley, issuing diplomas to various local beneficiaries along the way. Much like the privileges Henry II had granted in northern Italy, they do not for the most part contain complete dating clauses—the calendar date is often omitted and occasionally the place where the charter was issued (*actum*) as well—and thus they provide only sketchy information about Conrad’s itinerary. Turning away from the Orba River, he may have visited the monastery of Bremeto and proceeded from there to Vescovera (present-day Episcoparia). It is likely that he then made a stop in Piacenza, and it is certain that he was in Cremona on June 14 and 19, 1026.²⁹

Most likely in late June 1026, the king and his army encamped in Ravenna, which was quite a populous city by contemporary standards, sparking the predictable outbreak of violence between the outsiders and the locals saddled with quartering them.³⁰ Ravenna was merely a prelude to Rome, where a brawl over a cattle hide escalated into a bloodbath.³¹ Much the same had happened after the imperial coronation of Henry II in Rome (February 1014), and indeed even earlier during his royal coronation in Pavia (1004).³² It is tempting to summarize each with the same pat description, but it should be noted that the names of the individuals who perished in these clashes have been preserved. In the end, the episodes were smoothed over with a ritualistic display of submission by the vanquished: All stood barefoot, the freemen wielding unsheathed swords as if they were to carry out their own executions, and the unfree wearing braided willow twigs around their necks as if they were to be hanged. Material satisfaction was also provided.³³ Contrary to the conventional wisdom of the time, neither the proverbial unfriendliness of the Lombards and Romans nor the noxious climate had anything to do with such incidents.³⁴ For example, on the heels of Cunigunde’s royal coronation in Paderborn (summer 1002), her husband’s Bavarian followers pillaged the town, but the locals

mounted such an effective defense that the conflict grew heated and claimed the lives of some of the king's most eminent advisors. Fortunately, Henry II enjoyed the protection of a quasi-bodyguard, which combined forces with a contingent of Saxon warriors to restore order. The bishop of Paderborn expressed his "grief" over the incident, paving the way for a significant donation from the king.³⁵

Although Henry II suitably bided his time before atoning for the incident in 1002 to, moreover, a member of the upper clergy, Conrad reacted much more swiftly in 1026, exhibiting his determination to fulfill general expectations; in fact, his behavior in Ravenna epitomized his governing style. Visiting a seriously injured German warrior who had lost a foot and part of his shin during the clashes in Ravenna, "King Conrad displayed in his accustomed fashion the greatest munificence. . . . He ordered that [the man's] leather leggings be brought, and he had both of them filled with coins and placed upon the cot of the wounded soldier beside him."³⁶ This was exactly how a leader was supposed to act, according to tales popular in Conrad's era. What did Gudrun advise her husband, Sigurd, when Brynhild prepared to take revenge? "Give her gold and thus assuage her anger." And when Egill bluntly, even importunately demanded satisfaction for his brother's death from the ruler whom they had both served, King Aethelstan did not have the unruly man ejected from his hall—an entirely reasonable reaction from a modern standpoint—but instead consoled him with a hefty armlet and a large amount of silver. With his good spirits thus restored, Egill recited a splendid paean to his king's generosity.³⁷

The serious clashes in and around Ravenna were a new experience for Conrad. In Italy, one could not assume that a populous city was a safe haven just because it had not posted a defensive force at its walls and seemed to offer peaceful entry. Such incidents were simply unheard-of north of the Alps, and the German kings and their troops were repeatedly thrown off guard when they ventured south. In Rome at Easter 1027, in Milan almost ten years later, and in Parma at the end of 1037, Conrad was forced to repeat this dismal experience, and, not surprisingly, the locals bore the even more devastating consequences.³⁸ Nevertheless, when the king decided to interrupt his journey to Rome and retreat to the mountains of northern Italy near or to the west of present-day Trentino, it was not in response to the Ravennese turmoil but in hopes of protecting his army from the noxious summer heat. Many magnates were granted leave to break camp with their entourages, which reduced the number of troops needing provision; Archbishop Aribert of Milan supplied the imperial army generously for more than two months, thus fulfilling his obligations "due a king," as Wipo termed it.³⁹

Conrad's decision to withdraw to the mountains may also have been influenced by the terrible experience Henry II had during his siege of the Apulian

castle of Troia from April to late June 1022, when a virulent plague carried off an appreciable portion of his army; the emperor, along with his forces, beat a hasty retreat into the northern mountains in order to avert total catastrophe.⁴⁰ Because he was receptive to learning from his predecessor's reversals, Conrad kept his losses under control, and after breaking camp north of Verona, his intact military force could invade the Po valley with renewed vigor in the fall and eventually fight its way into Rome.

Yet, this analysis leaves us with a conundrum: How could Conrad, who showed such prudence in 1027, demonstrate such lack of judgment just eleven years later, on his second expedition to Italy, which ended as disastrously as Henry's debacle and claimed heavy losses even among his own kin? (Both his son's wife, the young queen Gunhild, and Gisela's son, Duke Hermann IV of Swabia, lost their lives in 1038.) The answer lies in the dramatically changed circumstances behind, and outside forces affecting, Conrad's second expedition, when "communal uprisings" occurred first in Milan and then in Parma at the very outset of the expedition and again at Christmas 1037.⁴¹ Furthermore, Conrad's unseemly treatment of Archbishop Aribert of Milan that same year incited many northern Italians against him. With the approach of summer 1037, the emperor lifted his siege of Milan and, in a replay of his actions more than a decade earlier, avoided the threatening heat by quartering his troops in an Alpine region.⁴² But come early 1038, he was confronted by a dilemma: Should he quickly sweep through southern Italy without bringing any influence to bear—as he had in 1027—or should he intervene like an *augustus*, or "augmenter of the realm," in the ancient Langobardia south of the imperial abbey of Montecassino, namely, in Capua and in Benevento? Conrad decided that it was vital to take the latter course, all the more so since the venerable monastery of Saint Benedict "languished under the oppressive rule of the prince of Capua, Pandolph IV." Conrad and Gisela probably did not even approach the choice as a calculated risk, although, in a replay of 1022, they did avert catastrophe and with their son lived to see their homeland again.⁴³

With the onset of autumn 1026 Conrad and his army forsook their summer quarters in the mountains, descended into the Po valley, and proceeded westward from the Adige River to "the border of Italy and Burgundy,"⁴⁴ by which Wipo probably meant the valley of the Dora Baltea River between the towns of Aosta and Ivrea. In the course of the progression, the king engaged in various confidence-building and peacekeeping measures in the area, convening court diets and rendering legal decisions.⁴⁵ That is the full extent of our knowledge regarding Conrad's activities in autumn 1026, only a tad more than what we know of the same period a year earlier. In the next breath, Wipo recounts that the king and his troops arrived outside Ivrea, the gateway to the Val d'Aosta in Burgundy, which in turn leads over the Great and Little Saint Bernard Passes to the valleys of the Rhône and Isère Rivers, respectively.

Just as Arduin of Ivrea had styled himself the anti-king in the day of Henry II, so his sons probably opposed this latest transalpine sovereign, but regardless of its composition, the opposition must have collapsed between December 20 and 25, because Conrad celebrated Christmas 1026 in Ivrea. During his sojourn, the king received a delegation from King Rudolf of Burgundy, who indicated his intention to attend Conrad's upcoming imperial coronation in Rome. In order to fulfill his liturgical obligations, the king would have remained in Ivrea from December 24, 1026, to at least January 1, 1027,⁴⁶ after which he embarked on his "march to Rome," probably by way of Pavia, where Abbot Odilo of Cluny negotiated a formal agreement between the defiant city and the king. Contemporary sources allege that the city "submitted" to Conrad, but that is highly unlikely, if for no other reason than that the Pavians did not have the slightest intention of rebuilding the royal palace whose destruction had sparked the dispute.⁴⁷ Crossing the Po River, the expedition then proceeded to Lucca, where Margrave Rainer had rallied the Tuscan opposition for a short-lived stand against the king. A charter issued in that city attests—after a long silence on that score—to Gisela's presence in the king's company. On March 21, 1027, Conrad, along with his consort, son Henry, and army, made a ceremonial entry into Rome.⁴⁸

2. Conrad in Rome

"And on the holy day of Easter, which fell that year on the VII of the kalends of April [March 26], he was elected emperor by the Romans, and he received the imperial benediction from the Pope [John XIX], 'called Caesar and Augustus by the Roman name.' And more, Queen Gisela received at the same time the consecration and the name of empress."⁴⁹ Wipo's concise account does not contain any information about the extravagant pageantry associated with the coronation, which unfolded over the course of a full week and opened with a ceremony in Saint Peter's Basilica,⁵⁰ at which a dispute over primacy flared up publicly between the archbishops of Milan and Ravenna. Archbishop Aribert of Milan was supposed to escort Conrad, who had been acclaimed emperor by the Romans—this qualified as his "election"—into Saint Peter's, where the pope, along with a contingent of clerical and lay representatives, waited. Archbishop Heribert of Ravenna, however, pushed his way forward, grabbed Conrad's hand, and refused to let go. Aribert stepped back and disappeared into the crowd in order to take charge of his men in the growing tumult with the supporters of the Ravennese archbishop. After consulting with the pope and a few bishops, Conrad endorsed the stance of the Milanese archbishop, who, as it turned out, was nowhere to be found. He thereupon joined hands with Harderic, a former cathedral canon of Milan who had been

elevated to the see of Vercelli just one year earlier, for the procession into the apostolic church. Afterward, the fighting between the Milanese and Ravennese camps resumed, allegedly until April 6, 1027, and the opening of a Lateran synod. No doubt in response to this incident, the so-called Salian imperial *ordo* stipulates that the emperor was henceforth to be escorted into the church by the pope, to his right, and the archbishop of Milan, to his left.⁵¹

Gisela was consecrated empress concurrently with her husband. Rudolph III of Burgundy attended the ceremony as promised, but so did Cnut the Great, king of England, Denmark, and Norway. Following the coronation Mass, the two kings escorted the emperor with due “honor” to his chamber, probably at the Lateran Palace, where the coronation dinner was held.⁵² The powerful Scandinavian king had another motive for coming to Rome, other than to save his soul or honor Conrad. His trip also had a concrete economic purpose; but while his negotiations did not break entirely new ground, they did result in a compact confirming prior agreements: Pilgrims to Rome were in principle exempt from all tolls, and this exemption was now extended to English and Scandinavian merchants, who were additionally promised safe passage not only through territories subject to imperial authority but more importantly through the Alpine passes, which in the western portion of the mountain range were predominantly located within the Burgundian kingdom. In a letter to the English bishops, Cnut seems to indicate that written guaranties to that effect were exchanged. The pope reduced the payment expected from an archbishop in Cnut’s realm in return for the pallium and exempted the Anglo-Saxon *schola*, or school, in Rome from all fees and tolls. In appreciation the king bestowed many valuable gifts upon the pope, the emperor, the king of Burgundy, and other princes, and received many costly items in return, beautiful vessels of precious metal as well as opulent garments. True, a Scandinavian saying holds that gifts must be reciprocated, but in Rome, as elsewhere, it was also customary to form and seal friendships with expensive presents.⁵³ Coincidentally, Cnut’s letter contains one further interesting piece of information: Princes from southern Italy attended the imperial coronation of Conrad and Gisela.⁵⁴

As demonstrated by his trip to Rome, Rudolph’s policy consisted in making overtures to the empire and the emperor.⁵⁵ Cnut, on the other hand, exercised increasing clout beyond his borders, which is why the Burgundian ruler found himself in a weak bargaining position vis-à-vis the Scandinavian and English maritime king.⁵⁶ “Dear to the emperor, close to [Saint] Peter” (*kaerr keisara, klüss Pétrúsi*),⁵⁷ Cnut was able to wrest advantageous economic terms for his subjects, but he adopted a more conciliatory stance in a jurisdictional dispute over the Scandinavian episcopacy. His predecessors—particularly his father, Swein Forkbeard—had long ousted bishops hailing from Germany in favor of individuals consecrated in England, which threatened the

ability of the archbishopric of Hamburg-Bremen to exercise its authority within Scandinavia. Cnut perpetuated this policy; in fact, four Danish bishops were consecrated in England during his reign. Bishop Gerbrand, however, was intercepted on the way from Roskilde to England by Archbishop Unwan of Bremen, who not only compelled the bishop to acknowledge the jurisdictional authority of the metropolitan see but also won his friendship. This dual approach positioned the archbishop to broker a settlement between himself and Conrad II, on the one hand, and Cnut, on the other. Unwan's tactics also probably served to postpone, even if not ultimately prevent, the establishment of an independent archbishopric for Scandinavia, and the archbishop's successor was able to consecrate Gerbrand's successor in Roskilde. That did not mark the end of the challenges to German archiepiscopal authority, however, and in 1103 the archdiocese of Lund broke away from Hamburg-Bremen. Cnut's letter to the English bishops contains no information regarding his negotiations with the emperor on this topic, since it would hardly have served the Scandinavian king's interests to divulge any backtracking or compromises on his part. The two would certainly have discussed taking joint action against the Slavs residing along the banks of the Elbe River and the Baltic Sea, but there is no reason to believe that the subject of forging a nuptial bond between the two families—in the persons of Henry III and Cnut's daughter Gunhild—came up in Rome in March 1027, since Conrad dispatched an impressive delegation to Constantinople not six months later to fetch a Byzantine princess for the young prince.⁵⁸

From their arrival on March 21, 1027, the emperor and empress spent at least two and a half weeks in Rome. Conrad is known to have issued seventeen diplomas between March 28 and April 7, mostly—though not exclusively—to Italian beneficiaries.⁵⁹ The king of Burgundy also had concrete business to attend to in Rome: In the emperor's presence at the Lateran Palace on March 28, 1027, the pope granted Abbot Odilo the sought-after confirmation of Cluny's exemption from Mâconese episcopal jurisdiction—which also mandated that King Robert II of France, the bishop of Mâcon, and the archbishop of Lyon respect the privilege—in conjunction with a gift to the great Burgundian monastery. The abbot, who had witnessed Henry's coronation, was present for Conrad's assumption of the imperial rank, having probably accompanied the king since Pavia.⁶⁰

Judging from the proceedings of the synod and the diplomas issued in Rome, young Henry and his mentor, Bishop Bruno of Augsburg, along with four of the six German archbishops—Aribo of Mainz, Poppo of Trier, Thietmar II of Salzburg, and Hunfried of Magdeburg—attended Conrad's coronation. Archbishop Pilgrim of Cologne apparently did not even venture across the Alps; his kinsman and rival, the archbishop of Mainz, had probably seen to that. Already the archchancellor for Germany, Aribo also became the

archchancellor for Italy in 1024 and from that point on seems to have systematically shunted his colleague aside when it came to Italy. For example, not a single diploma issued in 1027 lists Pilgrim of Cologne as an intervenor, even though—or perhaps because—he had served as Henry’s archchancellor for Italy (1016–21) and, what is more, had successfully exercised broad responsibilities as a military commander during the emperor’s campaign against Capua and qualified as an “expert” on Italy. Archbishop Unwan of Bremen was also not present, perhaps because he was exempted from undertaking the arduous journey in light of his advanced age—even though he had brokered the peace between Cnut and Conrad—or for some other unknown reason. Only a few bishops made the transalpine trek to Rome, while approximately forty members of the Italian episcopate attended; they were headed by Archbishops Aribert of Milan and Heribert of Ravenna—vying with each other for control—as well as the patriarch Poppo of Aquileia. In all, perhaps seventy bishops and archbishops participated in Conrad’s imperial coronation, making it truly a magnificent affair.⁶¹

Of course, not all of these churchmen had descended on Rome for the sole purpose of enjoying the pageantry, although much effort had been expended in that regard, given the presence of an emperor and a pope, of kings and ecclesiastical as well as lay princes. Such occasions involved displays of rank, which announced the status of an institution as well as that of the individual who served as its temporal personification and which sometimes had to be handled delicately, with great finesse, a willingness to act without hesitation or fear of creating a scene, and exceptional presence of mind. Thus, when the Ravennese archbishop’s determination to assert his primacy over the Italian episcopate triggered a bloody dispute between the Milanese and Ravennese at the entrance to Saint Peter’s before the imperial coronation, the king was called upon to decide the issue and reconcile the opposing parties without violating legal norms, social conventions, and tradition, making any enemies, or exposing any weaknesses. Conrad’s swift response to the dispute between the two metropolitans showed that his sense of politics was highly developed; he did the right thing and knew how to communicate that to others. By taking Harderic’s hand, Conrad not only honored a bishop of great personal stature but also confirmed Milan’s status, since the man he favored had succeeded Leo as the bishop of Vercelli due to his association with Archbishop Aribert. The Ravennese, who were the rowdier of the two parties, may have been unhappy with this turn of events, yet it did set the stage for a resolution—if through compromise—of the issue: At Conrad’s behest, the pope convened a synod at the Lateran on April 6, 1027, which was attended by all the members of the upper clergy then in Rome. While they ruled in favor of Milan, the determination was not as unequivocal or dismissive of Ravenna’s rights as the Milanese sources contend.⁶² The protocol alone tells a different story:

Archbishop Heribert of Ravenna and his suffragan bishops are listed ahead of Archbishop Aribert of Milan and his suffragan bishops, followed by Archbishops Aribo of Mainz along with his suffragans, Poppo of Trier, Thietmar of Salzburg, and probably Hunfried of Magdeburg.⁶³ The claims of a third contender for rank—the patriarch of Aquileia—were not addressed by the compromise; come the right opportunity, he was sure to rejoin the fray.⁶⁴ In April 1027, however, Poppo of Aquileia focused on a more specific goal than primacy over the Italian episcopate: Locked in a five-hundred-year-old dispute with the metropolitan of Grado, the patriarch had every reason to believe that his friend the emperor would prevail upon the weak pope to award him jurisdiction over the lagoon guarding the Adriatic coastland.

3. Poppo of Aquileia Takes on Grado and Venice

Poppo of Aquileia (1019–42) was descended from the Chiemgau branch of the Otakar family, which had put down roots generations before in both the duchy of Carinthia and the Friuli region; the Styrian branch of the family would later ascend to the margraviate and then duchy of Styria.⁶⁵ The patriarchate had been split in two since the sixth century: The mainland was subject to Aquileia, while the Istrian coastland as far as Venice constituted the metropolitan territory of Grado.⁶⁶ In early 1024, Poppo concluded that the time was ripe to put an end to this arrangement and took sudden action.

The patriarch of Grado, Orso, was the brother of the doge of Venice, Otto Orseolo, and their filial ties were emblematic of the strong institutional ties between Grado and Venice, whose ecclesiastical autonomy had over time come to be increasingly dependent on Grado's maintaining its rank within the church hierarchy. Had Poppo's plan to make Grado a "parish" of his church succeeded—the term "parish" actually appears in one of Conrad's diplomas—the ramifications would have been far-reaching, since it granted an imperial bishop ecclesiastical jurisdiction over a city that was not subject to the emperor's authority. This arrangement had seemed in the offing toward the end of Henry's life, when the Venetians revolted against Otto Orseolo and expelled both the doge and his brother, Orso of Grado. In the midst of this ticklish situation Poppo of Aquileia offered to assist the inhabitants of Grado, stating that he wished—allegedly at least—to safeguard the rights of "his fellow ecclesiastic," the patriarch, and "his friend the doge." No fewer than eighteen individuals witnessed the letter; perhaps the patriarch hoped that the large number would persuade the mistrustful residents of Grado and Venice of his sincerity.

Having thus gained entrée to Grado, "he disregarded his oath in the manner of a savage heathen," as one contemporary put it, by allowing the city, including its churches, cloisters, and nuns, to be despoiled; by ordering the

removal of Grado's ecclesiastical treasures, including the relics of Saint Hermagoras and other martyrs, to his residence; and, on top of that, by placing the conquered city under occupation. According to an account of his deeds that circulated at the monastery of Benedictbeuern, Poppo provided the beleaguered inhabitants of Grado with food and concluded his "Bavarian rescue operation" with a shipment of forty gigantic jars, each of which concealed a soldier armed with a sword.⁶⁷ As it happened, Poppo did not seize "authentic" relics, for upon retaking Grado, the Venetians discovered that Saint Hermagoras and his companions had not forsaken "their" city; even so, Poppo would find a political use for what he would later contend were Saint Felix's relics.⁶⁸ Coming off the success of his surprise attack, Poppo sought to safeguard his gains with a papal privilege, which he elicited from Pope John XIX, containing a significant "salvation clause," or proviso, stipulating that Grado become part of the church of Aquileia only upon the patriarch's submission of earlier privileges that explicitly substantiated his claim.⁶⁹

In the wake of Poppo's assault on Grado, the outraged Venetians quickly revised their negative opinion of the exiled doge and his brother, and summoned them back from exile, most likely in Istria. Poppo was stripped first of Grado and then of his jurisdiction over the city. At the end of 1024, Pope John XIX convened a synod of Roman churchmen at the Lateran Palace to review the matter, which was unequivocally decided in favor of the patriarch of Grado.⁷⁰

For the moment at least, Poppo was foiled and friendless, but he did not despair and set his sights on Conrad II. He met the king and the royal entourage in Italy before the imperial coronation, perhaps as early as late winter 1026. The patriarch secured the king's support thanks to the intercession of Meinwerk of Paderborn, who was promised the relics of Saint Felix—at least that is what Poppo called the items he had secured in Grado—in return. Even Meinwerk harbored doubts about their authenticity, and after the relics finally arrived in Paderborn, on October 3, 1031, along with two "pallia," he subjected them to a rather extreme test before laying them to rest in the cloister of Abdinghof, in the western outskirts of Paderborn. Three times the bishop consigned the body of Saint Felix to the flames of a funeral pyre built in the open courtyard of the cloister. Each time, to everyone's overwhelming joy, the saint's bones remained unscathed, and they were placed upon the cloister's high altar.⁷¹ Meinwerk was related to the Saxon emperors, and he had been plucked from the royal chapel to serve as the bishop of Paderborn, though he continued to be a confidant of Henry II. With the ascension of a new king, Meinwerk found himself sidelined, but he evidenced such vigor and intelligence in the face of this setback that when it came time to visit Rome, Conrad "took him on as a traveling companion, one who was loyal and serviceable in both private and public matters." To no small measure, Poppo was able to call upon

Meinwerk to intercede on his behalf because they were related. Furthermore, since the powerful bishop boasted of his kinship with Henry II, Poppo could bolster his case by claiming that—by extension—he, too, was of royal blood.⁷²

Henry II had renewed the age-old compact with Venice in autumn 1002, long before he received the Langobard or imperial crowns.⁷³ At Poppo's urging, Conrad broke with his predecessors' policies—perhaps for the first time—and did not even initiate negotiations with the Venetians, whom for years he would continue to deem rebels and enemies of the realm.⁷⁴ On April 6, 1027, just days after Conrad's imperial coronation, Poppo was able to put this new approach to the test: "In a case brought by Poppo, the patriarch of Aquileia, a synod presided over by Pope John XIX and Emperor Conrad finds that, in accordance with documents submitted thereto and most particularly with the acts of a synod held in Mantua in 827, Grado is a *plebs*, or parish, subject to the jurisdiction of Aquileia, especially since Ursus of Grado, who unduly exercises the functions of a patriarch, has not—in spite of numerous invitations—appeared before the synod. The pope and emperor accordingly invest Poppo with Grado and instruct the Roman librarian to prepare the appertaining privilege."⁷⁵ The protocol for the synod—dated according to the emperor's regnal year—states that John XIX and Conrad, who both presided over the proceedings, jointly entrusted the patriarch with the crosier symbolizing his authority over the "parish of Grado."⁷⁶ In autumn 1027 Poppo sealed his victory with a papal bull in which John XIX recalled that the synod of April 6, 1027, "was convened in response to the intervention and invitation of our beloved son, the august emperor Conrad," and at the direction of both the pope and the emperor had codified its findings in a privilege for Poppo.⁷⁷

The fruits of the patriarch's labors did not long outlast him. The decisions reached by the synod—under imperial pressure—bore the usual "lifetime warranty," so to speak: In 1044, some two years after Poppo's death, Pope Benedict IX effectively, if not explicitly, overrode the ruling of 1027 by hearkening back to the decrees issued by his predecessor in 1024.⁷⁸ As it was, Poppo probably reaped only limited practical benefits from his triumph in 1027, such as some confiscated Venetian holdings on the mainland that the emperor bestowed upon the patriarchate of Aquileia in recompense for the loss of Grado.⁷⁹ Right before his death, in 1042, Poppo again took Grado by force, but soon it was his turn to suffer a hellish fate, for he was "called away from this life by divine judgment, without having done penance or making provision for his journey," even before Pope Benedict IX could take him to task for the attack.⁸⁰

At first glance, Poppo's dispute with Grado seems to have revolved around its status, a common point of contention at the time, as seen from the dispute over Gandersheim. The attack on Grado should not be dismissed lightly, however, because it had broad—even international—political implications. The patriarch's efforts were bound to fail, because their success was predicated on

halting, indeed reversing, the tide of history—namely, Venice’s rise to greatness—which Conrad’s predecessors had expressly acknowledged for hundreds of years. Taken to its logical extreme, Poppo’s stance would have given him jurisdiction over the “parish” of Venice. Conrad’s decision to support this totally unrealistic enterprise was a consequence of his politically conservative mentality—characteristic of the rural German aristocracy—and proved to have a major impact on the emperor’s policies. For example, insofar as Conrad continued to brand the Venetians rebels, he alienated the Hungarians as well, because their king, Stephen I, was the brother-in-law of the doge of Venice, Otto Orseolo.⁸¹ Since the most important gateway to Byzantine territory remained in Venetian hands, Conrad’s delegation to Constantinople was from the outset (autumn 1027) beset with difficulties. While it might be an overstatement to claim that Conrad jeopardized or even sabotaged his own policies in the southeastern and Adriatic regions of his realm by favoring Poppo, his stance did interfere with their full realization. Conrad probably did not think through the long-term implications of his decision in sufficient detail, and Gisela—to say nothing of their son, Henry—was hardly in the position to foresee the consequences of this dubious policy.⁸²

Poppo’s influence and charisma were apparently hard to resist, and even today his episcopate is described as “the golden age of the patriarchate of Aquileia.”⁸³ He initiated the rebuilding of the basilica of Aquileia in 1027 at the latest and officiated at its dedication in 1031; the project “was meant to substantiate his demand that the ancient patriarchate be reinvested with its rights.” Furthermore, “the artwork in the apse was without doubt central” to this enterprise, depicting as it did the members of the imperial family (ca. 1027/28). In yet another singular move, Poppo minted coins embossed with Conrad’s portrait, thus breaking with a tradition dating back to the ninth century that coins minted in Italy bear the ruler’s name alone. The oath of obedience sworn by the suffragan bishops of Aquileia also merits mention, since it stipulates that they obey the patriarch *salva fidelitate Cunonradi impertoris filique eius Einrici*, that is, “without detriment to the [feudal] loyalty owed Emperor Conrad and his son, Henry.”⁸⁴ That was Poppo: He had something to offer on both the temporal and eternal levels, even to the imperial couple and their son.

4. After the Imperial Coronation

The extant sources place the new emperor in Rome until April 7 and then in Ravenna on May 1, 1027. During the intervening three and a half weeks, Conrad II advanced south as far as Apulia for the purposes of promoting order, receiving homage from the princes of Capua, Benevento, and Salerno, and,

Image not available

FIG. 3 Fresco depicting Henry III, Conrad II, and Gisela (on the right), and Adalbero of Carinthia (?) and Poppo of Aquileia (on the left), with larger-than-life-size representations of saints. In the apse of the basilica of Aquileia.

most especially, forging with the Normans who had settled in the region a defensive pact against Greek attack. On his way to Ravenna, Conrad arranged for the capture and execution of a noble leader of a robber band in the county of Fermo.

Given the brevity of his visit to Apulia, Conrad's expedition cannot have been very extensive in scope, and yet he surely acquired a greater understanding of the exceedingly complex situation in southern Italy. Furthermore, he must have gained impressions and amassed information that convinced him to devote himself immediately to addressing the "Greek question." Paramount in this effort was his imperial coronation, which both legitimized and necessitated opening a direct line of communication with Constantinople. The emperor spent some time in Ravenna and then moved on to Verona with his troops.⁸⁵

Conrad probably celebrated Pentecost (May 14, 1027) in Verona and on May 19 convened a judicial diet in nearby San Zeno. The resulting *placitum*, or judgment, was drafted according to Langobard legal norms and contains one of the very few dating clauses to cite Conrad's Italian regnal year.⁸⁶ The royal court was charged with adjudicating a legal dispute between Adalbero of Eppenstein, duke of Carinthia and thus duly responsible for the Italian march of Verona, and Poppo of Aquileia over the *fodrum*, an important general levy

used to provide “fodder” for the military. At the time, it consisted of a one-time payment to the king out of ecclesiastical assets; that was to remain unchanged. The king’s representatives in the region—dukes, margraves, counts, and royal emissaries—were also required to provide “fodder” for the king and his army, but the crown had exempted most Italian bishoprics and abbeys from that levy, also termed a *fodrum*; Poppo had received a privilege to that effect from Henry II.⁸⁷ As it happened, however, he did not present this diploma to the court, but instead took a different legal tack open to most Italian bishops⁸⁸ and rested his case on the sworn testimony of four respected vassals.⁸⁹

The duke of Carinthia also appeared before the court, accompanied by his advocate, Wezellan-Werigand, a royal emissary who had served as a count in both Friuli and Istria. Both men asserted that Adalbero of Eppenstein was entitled to the disputed tax on the basis of his ducal and margravian authority.⁹⁰ Poppo and his advocate, Walpert, raised an objection, at which point the latter summoned four vassals of Aquileia to act as compurgators. The patriarch and his advocate then took the floor and asked Adalbero and the royal emissary whether they would acknowledge the rights of Aquileia. The two men stated that they were ready to do so and vowed to pay one hundred pounds of pure gold were they ever to violate this pledge. With that, the case was closed, in the words of the notary who prepared the judgment at the emperor’s behest and at the judges’ direction.⁹¹

The imperial couple and their entourage must have left Italy soon afterward, since documentary evidence places Conrad II in Brixen—hence on Bavarian soil—as early as May 31, 1027.⁹² Before his departure from Verona, however, he received many visitors seeking to have privileges reconfirmed and expanded, like the nuns of Saint Zaccaria in Venice, who availed themselves of this opportunity—with the mediatory services of an upper clergyman, just to be on the safe side—to secure a diploma from the emperor.⁹³ While in Verona Conrad may also have appointed Hugh, his chancellor for Italy, to the see of Parma and filled the empty position at court with his cousin Bruno, who was the brother of Conrad the Younger and served in the royal chapel.⁹⁴ Shortly thereafter, the emperor resumed his travels, following the Adige River north until—according to the sources—Trento, where he reiterated and reconfirmed a determination made by Henry II in 1004 to partition the county along diocesan lines and to enfeoff the regional bishops of Trento and Feltre—the latter’s see included the Val Sugana—with the lands under their ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

While the legalities were probably thrashed out during the waning days of the emperor’s stay in Italy, the diploma itself was issued in Brixen on May 31, 1027. One day later (June 1), Conrad issued a second diploma that fundamentally expanded the Trentine sphere of influence by granting the Italian bishopric secular control over two counties considered parts of the German kingdom. The county of Bozen, which had been part of the Bavarian county of Norital,

lay within the ancient borders of the diocese of Trento, while the county of Vinschgau, to the northwest of Bozen, also belonged to Bavaria but fell under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Chur. By exempting the diocese of Trento from the oversight of all other “dukes, counts, and margraves,” Conrad may be said to have laid the foundation for the future independence of Trentino from both the margraviate of Verona and “the jurisdiction of the duke of Carinthia.” With the passage of time, the Trentine “system of governance became discernibly more like that of its neighbors to the north,” and “[a]ccordingly, from—at the latest—the beginning of the twelfth century, the county of Trento and the more northern areas ruled by its bishop-prince belonged to Germany.” The gist of Conrad’s diploma of June 1, 1027, was an outgrowth of Henry’s policies; the actual text, however, was modeled on the charter issued just the day before. Yet, nowhere are the “dukes, margraves, and counts” to whom the two counties were no longer subject identified. The phrase itself may have been formulaic and is commonly found in “Italian” grants of immunity, but here it was applicable to only one individual, the duke of Bavaria, whose territory had until now encompassed Bozen and Vinschgau.

Conrad’s next extant diploma substantiates this supposition. On June 7, 1027, the bishopric of Brixen was also granted a county, namely the *comitatus* of Norital, which covered quite a large expanse straddling the Eisack (the present-day Isarco) and Inn Rivers, although one may assume that it no longer included Bozen. A court diet—probably convened in Brixen—had stripped Welf II of this territory at the end of May, in retribution for his involvement in the rebellion led by Ernest II. Interestingly, while the county was granted to the bishop of Brixen, it was not exempted from ducal and margraval authority. The diocese received another privilege from the emperor on May 19, 1028—just days after the emperor’s son, Henry, duke of Bavaria, was crowned king at Aachen—investing Count Engilbert, who was the brother of Bishop Hartwig of Brixen and served as the advocate for the cathedral church, with the county of Norital. The enfeoffment was in the form of a tollhouse in the town of Klausen (present-day Chiusa), located at the foot of a mountain topped by the present-day convent of Säben, in other words, right on the border between the dioceses of Trento and Sabiona/Säben. Conrad’s son, Henry, the duke of Bavaria and king of Germany, appears in the list of intervenors, as does Adalbero of Eppenstein, the duke of Carinthia and margrave of Verona, who still had a role to play, even though the county had been granted immunity from his jurisdiction.⁹⁵

It was time for swift action: Conrad’s opponents were flocking to his stepson Ernest; Welf had to be punished for waging a private war against the “imperial regent” Bruno of Augsburg; and more than a year had already passed since the death of Duke Henry V of Bavaria, a member of the Luxembourg house. Some issues had perhaps yet to be resolved, but there was no question

why Conrad had granted the privileges to Trento and Brixen: At the start of his expedition through Italy, Conrad had secured the Alpine passes connecting Italy and Graubünden by bestowing the county of Chiavenna on the bishop of Como; now at the end, he moved to secure the Brenner Pass and the “upper road” over the Resia Pass by entrusting their defense to the bishoprics straddling the Isarco and Adige Rivers.⁹⁶

THE EMPEROR IN GERMANY (1027):
COURT DIETS, SYNODS, CONFIDENTIAL DISCUSSIONS,
AND COMPROMISES

By the time the Feast of Saint John the Baptist rolled around (June 24, 1027), Conrad was already in Regensburg seeing to the election of his son Henry as the duke of Bavaria.¹ The measure was unprecedented, for the duchy had never been invested in such a young prince—the boy was not yet ten years old—who was not of Bavarian descent. There were, it is true, two previous royal sons who had assumed ducal offices to which they were not born—Henry, the son of Henry I and the brother of Otto I, had become duke of Bavaria in 947, and Liudolf, Otto's son and the pretender to the throne at the time, received the duchy of Swabia two years later—but in both cases they were married to the daughters of the former dukes and long past the age of majority.² In any event, no one opposed Conrad's action, probably because it did not overturn any hereditary claims: Duke Henry V of Bavaria—the brother of Empress Cunigunde—had died in 1026 without heirs, and Conrad II kept the office vacant for more than one year, during which time Bavaria was treated as part of the royal demesne.³ Upon his return to Germany from Italy, the emperor bestowed the duchy on his son, because the person with the strongest hereditary claim was an ecclesiastic, namely, Bishop Bruno of Augsburg, the brother of the former duke, Henry IV—better known as Emperor Henry II—and brother-in-law of Duke Henry V, and thus ineligible to inherit the secular office. It is possible that his appointment as the young Henry's guardian in February 1026 was made in anticipation of the boy's assumption of the office; after Bruno's death, in 1029, Bishop Egilbert of Freising was enlisted as his replacement.⁴

During his sojourn in Regensburg, Conrad commissioned a thorough inventory of Bavarian imperial holdings (late June 1027). The sole extant record of this survey was preserved thanks to this same Bishop Egilbert, who received juridical confirmation of his see's ownership of the abbey in Moosburg. The notice also describes how the survey was conducted: The emperor

summoned all the incumbent counts and judges for Bavaria to Regensburg for a court diet and directed them to identify—under oath—all of the properties “they knew legally belonged to the throne of his empire.”⁵ Conrad also took the first known steps to abrogate the rights of the dowager empress. During his previous visit, in May 1025, the king had departed “just in time” to sidestep a confrontation with Cunigunde, who had provided such strong support for his reign. In his absence, she was able to host a large and lavish gathering that implied—in appearance, if not in fact—that she retained free rein over her widow’s portion (spring 1025). More than two years later, however, the now emperor, Conrad, granted the archdiocese of Salzburg control over the immense Heit forest on the Mörn River in southern Bavaria, even though it was part of Cunigunde’s appanage, or widow’s portion (July 5, 1027).⁶ In fact, once the dowager empress died (1033), Conrad treated all of her former possessions as part of the imperial fisc, as can be seen from an imperial diploma reconfirming her grants in language reminiscent of his predecessor Charlemagne: Conrad declared that he was acting of his own free will, for “if we had wished, we could have declared them null and void.”⁷ In early summer 1027 Conrad moved to put his espousal of a transpersonal polity⁸—whether he actually coined the metaphor of the state as a ship at Pentecost 1025 is immaterial—into action. The concept informs the court’s confirmation of Freising’s holdings, which states that the royal fisc is the property of the “throne of the realm” and is part of the “insignia” of sovereignty. The stone throne at Aachen—the “archthrone of the whole realm”—was for Wipo a concrete representation of that “sovereignty.”⁹

The court diet at Regensburg in June 1027 may also have provided the occasion for the resolution of a dispute between the sees of Brixen and Regensburg over tithes collected in the village of Prutz, located in the upper reaches of the Inn River valley, some twelve kilometers (seven miles) upstream from Landeck in present-day Austria. The record of the settlement was not drafted by the chancery and lacks a date, but the roster of participants—Archbishop Pilgrim of Cologne and the entire Bavarian episcopacy, including the metropolitan Archbishop Thietmar II of Salzburg, as well as the diocesan bishops of Bamberg and Eichstätt—suggests that it was issued by the regional court diet. June 1027 would have been an opportune time for pursuing a settlement. For several weeks Conrad had not stirred up any contentious issues, instead courting the bishops who controlled the important transit routes through the Adige and Isarco River valleys. The lower Inn River valley, however, was probably already under the watchful eye of the bishop of Regensburg, whose strongholds could serve to defend this Alpine route. Now that the emperor had reached the northern side of the mountains, he could secure another important transalpine route, one that connected the upper Adige River valley upstream from Bozen and Meran over the Resia Pass with the upper Inn River

valley (Engadin) upstream from Landeck. The bishops of both Regensburg and Brixen would be entrusted with safeguarding this “upper road,” so called in contrast with the “lower road,” which led over the Brenner Pass.¹⁰

Next on the agenda was the establishment of peace in Swabia, where it had become imperative that the emperor take strong action against Duke Ernest II and his followers. First, the two parties held a “confidential conversation” in Augsburg, which, as the seat of young Henry’s guardian, Bishop Bruno, had become the de facto “capital” of the realm. Ernest was compelled to subordinate himself to his stepfather at a court diet convened by the emperor in Ulm during the second half of July 1027.¹¹ Count Werner, an ally of the emperor’s stepson, did not surrender. Conrad responded by unleashing his military forces on German soil for the first time in his reign and crushed his implacable opponent by laying successful siege to Kyburg, in present-day Switzerland. Gisela and Henry did not accompany their sovereign on this campaign, traveling instead to the monastery of Saint Gall, where they each bestowed a generous gift upon the foundation and were admitted into its prayer confraternity.¹² The emperor and empress must have parted ways sometime after July 26, upon or subsequent to leaving Ulm; Conrad was still without his consort in Zurich on August 19, 1027. They were soon reunited in the village of MuttENZ, near Basle, where Empress Gisela mediated a peace agreement between her husband and her uncle King Rudolph of Burgundy, again following a “confidential conversation.”¹³

Conrad the Younger subordinated himself to his older cousin by September 9, 1027, probably in Worms. Archbishop Poppo of Trier, who was a member of the Babenberg family, had also been summoned to the Salian’s native town under imperial orders to come to terms with his suffragan bishop, Bruno of Toul. Their dispute dated back to Conrad’s expedition to Italy: The mortally ill bishop of Toul had provided Conrad with a military contingent, and the young cleric Bruno of Egisheim, Conrad’s cousin on his mother’s side, led the force in the bishop’s stead. While the army was engaged in the siege of Pavia in spring 1026, the bishop died, and Bruno was sent home in order to assume the vacant post. Conrad II had sought to have his cousin’s consecration celebrated in Rome in the course of the imperial coronation, but Archbishop Poppo of Trier voiced his opposition. Even though the new suffragan bishop concurred with his metropolitan on that score, the incident was not the last of Bruno’s difficulties: When he presented himself in Trier for the consecration, Poppo demanded that Bruno swear a special oath of obedience. This time, he refused to comply and must have sent word to his cousin the emperor. Conrad summoned the disputants to Worms, where he brokered a settlement by compelling both sides to compromise.¹⁴

Departing from Worms, the emperor and his entourage continued on to

Frankfurt, where Conrad used his imperial authority to strengthen the peace, hand down final judgments, resolve some moderate problems, and gain—at the very least—cognizance of some serious conflicts. These would be addressed at a general synod for Germany held at the main church in Frankfurt on September 23–24, 1027.¹⁵

9ENGAGING IN CONFLICT: THE SECOND
EXPEDITION TO ITALY (1036–38)

During his first expedition to Italy, Conrad II had made wise use of the resources at his disposal, paid close attention to climatic conditions, and avoided nonessential stopovers. As a result, he made it back across the Alps into Germany with his army and household essentially intact; for that reason alone, his foray south qualified as a success. He had also been crowned king of the Lombards and emperor, having prevailed over the northern Italian opposition with the support of the local episcopate, most importantly Archbishop Aribert II of Milan (1018–45). Finally, the emperor even had enough time to squeeze in a quick—yet imposing—show of authority in the Langobard-Norman region of southern Italy bordering Greek territory. Except for Boniface of Canossa, who—in line with family tradition—had supported the transalpine king and future emperor, the margraves in northern and central Italy had been inimical to Conrad.¹ Sometime before 1032, Boniface became the margrave of Tuscany and thus gained control of numerous counties in northern Italy; in 1034 he again took a proimperial stance and teamed up with Archbishop Aribert in providing pivotal support in Conrad’s subjection of Burgundy.²

Initial appearances proved deceiving, however. After Conrad had departed the episcopal see of Trento and started wending his way up the Adige River valley at the end of May 1027, a fundamental change in political climate began to sweep across northern Italy. The formerly mutinous margraves now favored the emperor and “awaited impatiently” the return of their sovereign. The suffragan bishops of Aquileia and Ravenna were ever more firmly entrenched in the proimperial camp, particularly since their metropolitans pursued a “personnel policy” of appointing Germans to vacant sees. The church of Saint Ambrose, however, was preoccupied with the socioeconomic change sweeping through Milan. Archbishop Aribert was just the man to grab the bull by the horns, since he knew how to bring his political and pastoral forces to bear on the situation. Only a very self-confident and deft manipulator of traditional structures in the face of contemporary challenges could harness—and not be

trampled underfoot by—the extremely factious urban movements in Italy, especially Lombardy.³ In time, the imperial cause's most pivotal Italian advocate became its most outspoken and implacable adversary. "I helped him get the crown, and I will get it back from him!" Whether Aribert actually made this assertion or not, it does sum up his later policy.⁴

On the Feast of Candlemas (February 2) 1036, Conrad II convened a memorable court diet in Augsburg, at which he bestowed the duchy of Carinthia upon his cousin Conrad the Younger.⁵ The usual term for an assembly was *conventus publicus*, or public (i.e., royal) gathering,⁶ which was truly applicable in this case, because Conrad II did meet "with all the magnates of the surrounding areas."⁷ What is more, Italian issues were always addressed in Augsburg, even when the emperor had no immediate plans of leaving home, and the army was always mustered there whenever he did.⁸ In February 1036 Conrad was joined by all of the "Italian experts" he had consulted in the past: His cousin Bruno of Würzburg, the former chancellor for Italy (1027–34), and Egilbert of Freising, the former head of the chancellery (1002–8)—still unified under Henry II—and now back in Conrad's good graces, naturally attended, because they were regional magnates duty-bound to attend. Others, however, were there not as a matter of course: Archbishop Pilgrim and his close confidant Hermann came all the way from Cologne, and Hugo of Parma had an even longer journey behind him. Pilgrim was a former chancellor for Italy and had assumed the archchancellorship following the death of his cousin Archbishop Aribert of Mainz, in 1031. At the time of the diet, Hermann, a cathedral canon at Cologne, served as the chancellor for Italy; following Pilgrim's death later that year, he would come to occupy both of his patron's high offices. Hugh had been appointed the chancellor for Italy by Henry II and continued to hold that position under Conrad II until his elevation to bishop of Parma in 1027, at which point the emperor's cousin Bruno received the chancellorship.⁹ Even Bishop Eberhard of Bamberg attended the diet; initially Henry's chancellor, he had focused his energies increasingly on Italian affairs from 1009 on and finally became the archchancellor for Italy (1011–24).¹⁰

For these individuals to converge on Augsburg cannot have been mere coincidence, especially since a comparable gathering took place later that same year. On that occasion Conrad, his family, and his court took up residence in Nijmegen for more than a month. There, they celebrated Pentecost and then the Feast of Saint John the Baptist (June 24). On June 29, Pilgrim of Cologne officiated at the nuptial Mass for Henry III and Gunhild, as well as the young queen's attendant coronation and anointment. A week later (July 5, 1036), Conrad issued a diploma listing Gisela; Henry III; Pilgrim, the archchancellor for Italy; and Hermann, the chancellor for Italy, as intervenors¹¹

Even today, the trip from Italy to Nijmegen is not undertaken lightly; Boniface must therefore have had a commensurably grave reason for making

the arduous trek from Tuscany in 1036. He had already proved his willingness to traverse the Alps and provide decisive military aid to Conrad II (1034),¹² but the battlefield had been in neighboring Burgundy and not in the faraway margins of the empire. Conrad's fondness for the palace at Nijmegen was not universally shared; in fact, the metropolitan of Cologne was the only archbishop to join the emperor at the numerous celebrations and intricate ceremonies marking his extended stays there.¹³

In early summer 1036 Boniface had an urgent reason for coming to Nijmegen: "A great turmoil, unheard of in modern times," raged across broad areas of Italy, striking widespread terror in its inhabitants, who thought this *confusio*, or disorder, might augur the end of the world. Did the margrave of Tuscany have a secondary motive for making the journey, like obtaining a new bishop for his hometown of Arezzo? There is good cause to doubt it, and yet, when the margrave left for home, he was accompanied by Immo, the enterprising court chaplain and cathedral canon at Worms, who had seen to it that Conrad appointed him to the vacant see.¹⁴

1. The Rebellion of the *Valvassores* (1035–37)

Sometime in early 1036, a large army of *valvassores* overwhelmingly defeated a military contingent representing the propertied upper nobility on the Campo Malo, or "evil plain," near Motta, located southeast of Milan midway along the road to Lodi on the Adda River. The vanquished force included troops provided by Archbishop Aribert as well as by the margrave of Turin; the house of Canossa, in contrast, probably did not get directly drawn into the battle. As Wipo put it, "the incredible multitude of the lesser [vassals] was victorious through the mere pressure of their troops." While he does not specify who these "lesser" individuals were, they were clearly not illiterate peasants rising in rebellion. Instead, he must have meant the *valvassores*—the first known use of this term on Italian soil occurs in Conrad's feudal edict of 1037—who were free vassals well practiced in combat. Their rebellion shook the very foundations of Conrad's authority in Italy, because they were first and foremost "the noblemen from whose ranks were drawn the vassals of the bishops and the margraves, but who were also duty-bound to the monarch." There were, however, two types of *valvassores*, distinguishable by the level of power they wielded. Thus, the members of an upper echelon of subvassals, or *capitanei*, as well as their subvassals, were termed *valvassores*. The *capitanei*, as they came to be known in the mid-eleventh century, had been "subenfeoffed with imperial and ecclesiastical properties" by the ecclesiastical and secular lords who were themselves vassals of the king. By the twelfth century, however, the

term *valvassores* was applied exclusively to the lower echelon of subvassals, and a similar change occurred in Middle High German at around the same time, as the word *Ritter* (knight) came primarily to denote a vassal at the bottom of the feudal pyramid.¹⁵ One Swabian chronicler states that there were also unfree individuals among the *valvassores*; he clearly understood that there were two categories of armed men, the *militēs superiores* and *militēs inferiores*, or greater and minor *valvassores*, respectively, but he may have assumed that the social structure of northern Italy resembled that of Germany and hence mistakenly drawn an analogy between the lower *valvassores* and the *militēs servi*, or unfree knights found north of the Alps.¹⁶ Even so, we should not dismiss the possibility that some unfree ecclesiastical serfs sought to improve their social and economic status by taking advantage of the general upheaval.¹⁷ The tide of the battle at the Campo Malo turned with the death of Adelrich, bishop of Asti (1009–36) and kinsman to the margraves of Turin. He was an elderly corpulent gentleman, and it would have been better for him—a bishop, no less—to have forgone the “unworthy” physical exertions associated with the confusion of warfare. Be that as it may, once he fell, the princely army took flight.¹⁸

This grave conflict was precipitated by Aribert of Milan, due to whose influence a respected *valvassor* lost his fief in 1035, whereupon the man’s fellow vassals took to the streets in protest. When negotiations between the two sides reached an impasse, the *valvassores* took up arms, only to suffer heavy casualties, defeat, and expulsion from Milan. It should be noted that all this transpired within the city itself, not somewhere out in its *contado*, or rural surroundings. The vassals found themselves in a temporarily weakened position within Milan, so they felt constrained to look elsewhere for allies. Wherever Aribert’s markedly traditional brand of authority had engendered a heightened potential for conflict—in the region south of the Lago Maggiore, in the episcopal town of Lodi, which was for all intents and purposes under the thumb of the archbishop, as well as in areas much farther afield—they met with support. Indeed, it was the general impression north of the Alps that all the Italian *valvassores* backed their Milanese fellows.¹⁹

Of course, more than a single incident provoked the rebellion. The compact by sworn association, or *foedus validae coniurationis*, binding the *valvassores*²⁰ was but one feature of a communal movement whose socioeconomic bases and politico-military consequences were so poorly understood by those experiencing it firsthand that it is hardly surprising that the kings from the north lacked a grasp of these factors altogether. This is best exemplified by the situation in Milan, although that city also represents the “exception that proves the rule.”²¹ The greater *valvassores*—the *capitanei* who maintained castles in the countryside—and the minor *valvassores*—the vassals of the *capitanei*—had occupied a position of strength in Milan, bolstered to no small measure

by the fact that their kinsmen were ensconced as cathedral canons. From the second half of the tenth century on, however, both groups depended almost exclusively on the archbishop for their fiefs; until the mid–eleventh century members of the comital families also could enter into a feudal relationship with the archbishop. This system of vassalage did not develop without a hitch; clashes—even armed ones—broke out between the great feudatories and their episcopal overlords, and not merely in Milan, but in the dioceses of Pavia, Piacenza, and Cremona as well. Thus, the rebellion of the *valvassores* in 1035–37 was just the first time tensions came to a head. The potential for violence between the nobles and the nonnoble city dwellers increased with the gradual institution, in episcopal towns, of judiciaries with the authority to adjudicate feudal cases involving both the greater and lesser vassals. Archbishop Aribert imposed a peace of God on the restive city of Milan around 1040, but that did not prevent the outbreak of civil unrest in 1042–44.²²

But back to the events of 1035–36: The nonnoble residents of Milan were organized into an infantry militia, which sided with the metropolitan against their mutual mortal enemy, the *valvassores*. And all of the parties waited for the emperor to impose a law, which he was clearly willing to do, in order to squelch any form of self-legislation.²³

2. Conrad II in Italy (Late Autumn 1036 to May 1037)

The emperor, the empress, their son, the young king, and his bride attended the extravagantly staged reconsecration of the newly rebuilt cathedral of Mainz by Archbishop Bardo on the Feast of Saint Martin (November 11, 1036). Soon afterward, they wended their way south and probably parted ways in Augsburg: Conrad II proceeded to Italy, while Gisela, Henry III, and Gunhild traveled to Regensburg, where they celebrated Christmas. The emperor celebrated the feast in Verona and after a brief stay continued on to Milan, passing through Brescia and Cremona.²⁴ He had probably traversed the Alps accompanied by a modest military force and only a few magnates: Bishop Kadeloh of Naumburg, the new chancellor for Italy, and the brothers Bishop Bruno of Würzburg and Duke Conrad of Carinthia, as well as Abbot Burchard of Saint Emmeram, were part of this first contingent.²⁵ Conrad II clearly counted on receiving strong and capable military aid from the Italians. First, on his visit to Nijmegen in June, Margrave Boniface of Tuscany had likely assured him that troops would be forthcoming. Second, the Italian forces were able fighters, having proved their mettle in the Burgundian campaign (1034) and in local civil strife (1035). Also, Conrad was making this second expedition, not at his own initiative, but in response to the entreaties of most, if not all, of the mutually antagonistic Italian factions.²⁶

Conrad and his army reached Milan in either January or February 1037. The emperor was ceremoniously welcomed by the archbishop and citizenry in the cathedral, but the deferential and celebratory air evaporated within hours, when all of Milan rose in open rebellion against the emperor, who was vituperated to his face. Someone had started the rumor—perhaps at Aribert’s instigation—that Conrad wished to divest the archbishop and the city of the suffragan bishopric of Lodi and thereby harm the city’s interests. The rebels also allegedly demanded that the emperor recognize the compact they had sworn. Be that as it may, the emperor quit the city for Pavia and announced that he would convene a court diet there during the latter half of March 1037.

The diet only served to formalize the breach, however. Archbishop Aribert brazenly joined Conrad’s entourage and attended the assembly, even though he could have anticipated that his “case” would be the primary, indeed sole focus of the proceedings: Heading up a group of fellow noblemen and others wronged by the archbishop, the count of Milan, who was a member of the Otbertini family, charged Aribert with overstepping his authority; the archbishop’s adroit political dealings had in fact rendered the count practically powerless. Conrad took the side of the plaintiffs and urged the metropolitan of Milan to make restitution. After conferring with his retinue, Aribert returned to the noble assembly and declared that he was not in the least bit amenable to compromise or the surrender of any archiepiscopal property or privileges and that he furthermore would not acknowledge any commands or requests regarding this matter from any quarter whatsoever. The attendees asked him not to include the emperor under that blanket refusal, but Aribert spurned their attempts at mediation. Probably dispensing with a formal legal hearing, they charged the archbishop with high treason for violating his oath of allegiance to the emperor. Conrad placed Aribert in the custody of Poppo of Aquileia and Duke Conrad of Carinthia, decreed that the usurped properties be returned, and declared Aribert’s nephew Girard, who had for years enriched himself at the expense of the diocese of Cremona, an outlaw.²⁷

This nephew personified the complex nature of Aribert’s stance. The archbishop not only pursued a “modern” ecclesiastical, territorial, and urban policy with respect to the counts and other feudal potentates but also sought to make good on dynastic and familial claims to authority by traditional means. Girard, who bore the same name as his father—Aribert’s brother—and grandfather before him, had expropriated some church property from the ailing bishop of Cremona in the late 1020s, with the express support of his uncle, who had designated the young man as his heir. Indeed, when it came time to fill the vacant bishopric of Cremona in 1031, Aribert went so far to as make Hubald’s consecration contingent upon his agreeing to renounce formally and completely any claim to the alienated ecclesiastical holdings. Once in office, the new bishop applied himself energetically and fearlessly to the retroactive

removal of these extortionary terms by crossing the Alps in the dead of winter (1031) and journeying to Goslar to petition the emperor. As apparent from the legal and concrete issues addressed in the two extant imperial diplomas Hubald received, Aribert's nephew was only one—and unnamed to boot—of the legion of individuals opposed to the new bishop. Even the residents of Cremona attempted—with Aribert's encouragement, no doubt—to forgo paying the fees legally due the bishop, like customs duties, anchorage fees, and unloading charges, when the municipal authorities came to call. Unmoved by the imperial diplomas, Hubald's many Cremonese adversaries expelled him from the city and razed the episcopal palace later that year (1031). As sweeping as the emperor's support had been—in writing at least—it availed Hubald so little that by fall 1037 the bishop was compelled to join forces with his former enemies.²⁸

In the immediate wake of the diet in Pavia, the emperor and his allies among the Italian margraviate appeared to have successfully implemented their entire agenda, but the tables turned dramatically just a short time later: Aribert, who had been transferred to Piacenza, a mere two-day march east of Pavia, escaped from custody and returned to Milan. The emperor held Poppo of Aquileia solely responsible for the archbishop's flight and did not apportion any blame to his cousin Conrad, in whose custody Aribert had been equally placed, or to the archbishop of Ravenna, in whose province Piacenza was located, or to the local suffragan bishop, Peter of Piacenza, who—like his Cremonese counterpart—apparently shifted his allegiance to the anti-imperial camp later on in the fall.²⁹ Conrad reacted to the challenging situation with a mixture of alacrity and prudence, leaving no stone unturned in his preparations for war against Milan and its metropolitan. Aribert was placed under imperial ban, and a call to arms was issued across the empire, which meant that all the princes on both sides of the Alps were duty-bound to provide troops. Accompanied by his wife and his mother, Henry III departed for Italy “with a great many heavily armed mounted warriors.” They reached the outskirts of Milan before the end of May 1037, at much the same time as Conrad's army, which had been bolstered significantly with reinforcements provided by the Italian princes subject to the emperor.³⁰ Conrad was on the march against his earliest ally—to whom he owed his coronation in 1026—with mounted troops provided by his erstwhile enemies. The archbishop's forces comprised not only his own mounted troops but also an urban militia that could be employed offensively. Aribert came up with the idea of giving this newly organized citizens' army—whose members were called *pedites* because they fought on foot—an equally innovative symbol, the *carroccio*, the famous standard-wagon of Milan. This battle standard would assume an unforeseen symbolic force, probably because its massive size and primal expressiveness proved so evocative to the lower classes. “A tall pole resembling the mast of

a ship rose from the huge wagon, and it was topped by a golden apple. Two snow-white pennants hung from this mast. Affixed halfway up the mast was a crucifix bearing the likeness of the savior with his arms outstretched and his gaze directed at the troops gathered around him, so that regardless of the military situation, they might draw heart from his countenance.³¹

The unbridled psychological warfare that both sides engaged in following Aribert's arrest only intensified after his flight. Proimperial sources attempted to justify Aribert's unprecedented arrest by asserting that the archbishop had hired an assassin to murder Conrad at a feast he hosted.³² Imperial opponents countered that the Milanese, "from the youngest to the most elderly [among them], had mourned" the loss of their shepherd and offered hostages in exchange for their archbishop's freedom. For his part, Aribert reminded the emperor that he had performed many services on the Salian ruler's behalf, but all to no avail. Conrad turned them down because he wished to consign his prisoner to "everlasting exile."³³ Although even Milanese sources report that Aribert was treated with due respect, his account elevated his imprisonment to a spiritual martyrdom, because his life was in constant danger. He also let it be known that he took advantage of the stupidity and gluttony—particularly when it came to drink—of his German guards when staging his escape with the aid of the abbess of the convent of Saint Sixtus in Piacenza.³⁴ Conrad, in the meantime, had dispatched Abbot Burchard of Saint Emmeram to Rome in order to garner the pope's backing for the legal proceedings against Aribert and possibly induce him to excommunicate the archbishop. Burchard died—probably on April 10, not April 9, 1037—before fulfilling his mission, however, and when Pope Benedict IX visited the imperial camp outside Cremona in spring 1037, Conrad himself was unable to get his way. Over the course of the ensuing year, Aribert's battle with the emperor so jeopardized the pope's standing that—upon the advice of numerous bishops—he finally excommunicated the archbishop of Milan on Easter 1038. The pope did not leave Rome to make the pronouncement, nor did he meet with the emperor in Spello to preside over a synod, which—in spite of the many assertions to the contrary—was never held.³⁵

In no time, however, the cold war waged by the propagandists gave way to actual warfare. Soon after May 7, 1037, the imperial army crossed the Po River near Piacenza; advancing toward Milan, Conrad's forces encountered one of the archbishop's strongholds, Landriano, near Lodi, which they quickly overran and razed to the ground. The army resorted to the usual slash-and-burn tactics of medieval warfare, unimpeded by the Milanese forces ensconced in the many well-manned outposts in its path, although their harassment of the imperial army induced the emperor to set up camp three miles away from the city's walls. Clearly counting on the support of these strongholds and their overwhelming manpower, the Milanese engaged their attackers in open battle,

the course of which can be reconstructed from various accounts: On the Feast of Christ's Ascension (May 19, 1037), the emperor broke camp with his entire military force. The right flank was made up of Italian troops and the left of German troops under the leadership of a massive German—or perhaps Bavarian—nobleman whom the Milanese sources identify as a kinsman of the emperor; he handed over his banner to Margrave Wido, a member of the Aledramid family, and then joined the right flank. These two noblemen, along with many other members of the imperial vanguard, were cut down by the Milanese archers, who themselves suffered heavy losses. The battle ended in a deadlock, and both armies withdrew, the Milanese behind their city walls, the imperial troops to their encampment. In the words of one source, the Milanese had in effect ceded the plain, but the same could not be said of all of their castles and strongholds. Corbetta, an outpost located to the west of the city and thus not in the direct path of the imperial forces that had advanced from Lodi, in the east, did not come under siege until ten days later (May 29). Conrad's army almost certainly did not attack the city itself on this occasion, not only because their camp was many kilometers away but also because the Milanese still commanded outlying fortifications.³⁶

A decade before, no one would have dreamed that a member of the Aledramid family would fall in battle against Milan while serving as a standard-bearer for the imperial vanguard. This time around, Conrad attempted to counter the burgeoning social tensions in northern Italy by jettisoning his predecessor's policy of backing the local episcopate in its disputes with feudatories, and his resolute pursuit of the opposite tack resulted in a reversal of alliances. Concurrently, the emperor continued to "Germanize" the northern Italian church by appointing his countrymen to bishoprics or to the few remaining imperial abbeys as they became vacant. The patriarchate of Aquileia and archbishopric of Ravenna were already in the hands of Germans who owed their appointments to Henry II, and Conrad enjoyed particular success in those provinces. Henry II had also installed Germans in Tuscan sees, but they were held in check by the powerful and unified margraves. The Italian dioceses were structured differently from those north of the Alps; here, Conrad had to deal with an organizational relic of late antiquity, whereby each see encompassed a single city and its surrounding countryside. This alone made it almost impossible for an Italian bishop to build a geographically broad power base or, from around 1200 on, an ecclesiastically based principality, even for a metropolitan like Aribert, who allied himself with newly emerging political forces in hopes of attaining just that sort of dominion. Much as the emperor appointed royal chaplains to vacancies in the other archbishoprics of northern Italy, Aribert sought to install cathedral canons from Milan to vacancies in the suffragan bishoprics of not just his own province but—as in the case of Piacenza—of neighboring Ravenna as well. He also brought his

influence increasingly to bear—directly or indirectly—on the bishops themselves. Aribert had in 1025 already gained from Conrad the right to install the bishop of Lodi and did not hesitate to exercise that privilege by force of arms. In Cremona, he availed himself of both the urban movement and his nephew to browbeat his suffragan bishop into compliance.³⁷

Given his experiences in Germany, Conrad can hardly have been taken unawares by Aribert's tactics or attempts to have his own functionaries usurp the authority of the imperial emissaries. The archbishop's policies with respect to Milan, however, threatened the interests of powerful margravian families like the Otbertini, who were still the lawful counts of the city and of the county of Milan. From at least the early 1030s on, Conrad aligned his interests with those of the margravian families by arranging or encouraging as many as four marriages between them and the German princely families. Sometime after the death of Count Welf II, in 1030, Margrave Albert Azzo II (of Este) married the Swabian's daughter Chuniza, who was related through her mother to the Luxembourg family of the dowager empress. By arranging the union, Conrad provided the Otbertini family with substantial resources to support their struggle for Milan, since Chuniza's bridal portion comprised eleven thousand manors that belonged to the Welf family in northern Italy. This was a staggering amount of property; when the venerable monastery of Tegernsee was stripped of the same number of hides in the tenth century, it collapsed. Neither the manor nor the hide was equivalent to a fixed square area of land, but instead each represented a particular level of yield—how much land was actually needed to produce that yield varied from place to place—and in this respect they were comparable measurements.³⁸

In summer 1034 Margrave Boniface of Tuscany had contributed mightily to the emperor's success in Burgundy, thereby proving his loyalty to Conrad. Perhaps out of gratitude, the imperial couple made the widower from Canossa their son-in-law in no later than 1037 by granting him the hand of Beatrix, Gisela's Lotharingian niece and adoptive daughter, in marriage. She went on to bear him three children, the youngest of whom bore the name of her grandmother and Gisela's sister and grew up to be the renowned Matilda of Canossa. "Since they were related by blood to the ruling dynasty, the issue of this union could lay claim to preeminence among the Italian princes."³⁹

Margrave Olderich-Manfred II of Turin (d. 1034/35) was survived by three daughters, of whom Adelheid, the eldest, wed Duke Hermann IV of Swabia, the emperor's stepson. In 1036, Conrad not surprisingly invested the young man—Gisela's second son by her second marriage—with the margraviate of Turin. Hermann was approximately twenty years old at the time and deemed an excellent warrior and prince; only Burgundy, which was poorly organized, politically speaking, lay between his two power bases on either side of the Alps. This pair seemed to have a bright future ahead of them.⁴⁰

Olderich-Manfred's youngest daughter, Imgard-Immula, married Otto of Schweinfurt, a member of the Babenberg family. In 1035 Otto had agreed to marry Matilda, the youngest daughter of Prince Boleslaw I Chrobry of Poland, but in early May 1036 a synod held in Tribur decreed that the proposed union violated canonical strictures, and Otto broke the engagement of his own free will. Since Otto and Matilda do not appear to have been that closely related, the young Babenberger must already have been approached by the emperor about marrying the young woman from Turin. Besides, Conrad would hardly have taken exception to a consanguineous union.⁴¹

These marriages were illustrative of Conrad's totally revamped policy toward the northern Italian elite, the margravian families who, after all, belonged to the same world and shared the same political interests as the Salian ruler. Next on his agenda was winning over the *capitanei* by settling the conflict between them and their subvassals, on the one side, and the ecclesiastical and secular lords, on the other. And no one was better suited to tackle this matter than Conrad II, who "disposed his vassals [*militēs*] well toward himself in that he did not suffer the ancient benefices of parents to be taken away from any of their progeny. Besides, as regards the frequent gifts by which he constrained them to dare brave deeds, they thought that his like could not be found in the whole world."⁴² Applying these same principles in Italy, Conrad was sure to forge a reconciliation with the *valvassores*. The emperor realized that the future belonged to them; what he did not envision was a future that would belong equally to the then nascent communes.

3. The *Constitutio de Feudis* (May 28, 1037)

During the siege of Milan, Conrad II issued a decree regulating feudal relationships in Italy appropriately known as the *Constitutio de feudis*, or feudal code, since it cites a *constitutio antecessorum nostrorum*, or "legal code of our predecessors," as its precedent and does concern fiefs. An almost contemporaneous copy of the text indicates that while the privilege was not a product of the imperial chancery, its format and formulas were clearly modeled on those usually found in the emperor's diplomas.⁴³ The text lacks both an *arenga*, or preamble, and a *narratio* providing further relevant background details, instead opening with the *publicatio* that notifies the diploma's intended public of its issuance and proceeding immediately to the *dispositio*, which in its allusions to both the past and the future explains the diploma's purpose in almost narrative terms: "The feudal lords and the feudatories are to be reconciled, so that they may coexist harmoniously and the latter may be counted upon to serve us and their feudal lords faithfully." The privilege thus draws a clear distinction between the feudal lords—the bishops, abbots, abbesses, margraves, and

counts, as well as “other” magnates who are designated *seniores*, or lords—and the feudatories, or *militēs*—the *capitanei*, or *maiores vassalores* [greater *valvassores*], and *eorum milites*, *minores vassalores* [their vassals, the minor *valvassores*]. Conrad II and his—undoubtedly Italian—amanuenses recognized that there were two groups of lesser nobles with a commonality of interests intrinsic to their “social partnership” with the *seniores*, or lords. The *capitanei* and the *valvassores* are indistinguishable except in one extremely significant respect: The emperor adjudicated all legal disputes involving greater vassals, while the minor *valvassores* submitted their legal disputes—or at least those involving *capitanei*—to the adjudication of the lord or a royal emissary.⁴⁴

The chief object of the decree was to put a stop to arbitrary disfeoffment; it was effective retroactively and across the board, but only applied to those imperial and ecclesiastical properties with which the *seniores*, or “crown vassals,” subfeoffed their feudatories. Fiefs received directly from the emperor, on the other hand, were exempt,⁴⁵ as were fiefs consisting of allodial properties that the feudal lords granted to their immediate vassals, the *capitanei*, who then subfeoffed the minor *valvassores* with them. Such transactions were—prudently—never subject to official regulation. The decree states that a “benefice drawn from our public (royal) holdings or from ecclesiastical estates” may only be withdrawn upon the vassal’s violation of feudal norms as defined by—in all likelihood Carolingian—capitularies, which, for example, adjudge refusing to provide military support as grounds for disfeoffment,⁴⁶ or upon the judgment of his peers (*iudicium parium suorum*). The latter provision did not represent anything new, since there had long been courts for *valvassores*, but it did give legal expression to the growing demand that one be judged by one’s peers, a world-famous, if not worldwide, basic civil right since the *Magna Charta*.⁴⁷

In addition, the male heirs of both the *capitanei* and *valvassores* were guaranteed the right to inherit the decedent’s fiefs; eligible beneficiaries included not just sons and grandsons but also brothers born of the same father. In the case of the *capitanei*, the transfer occasioned the payment of the customary “recognition fee” in the form of horses and weapons.⁴⁸ Next, the feudal lords were enjoined from bestowing, investing, or trading the fief without the consent of the incumbent enfeoffee. No mention was made of the outright alienation of a fief, since the purchaser would—in his role as feudal lord—assume the obligations of his predecessor.⁴⁹ Finally, the emperor retained his customary right to levy the *fodrum*, or dues for protection, but he abstained from instituting any nontraditional “duties of hospitality.”⁵⁰ The diploma concludes with a penalty clause stating that each violation of the decree would incur the disproportionately steep fine of one hundred pounds of gold. Half of the fine was payable to the injured party, half to the imperial exchequer, or *fisc*.⁵¹

The decree took a two-pronged approach to achieving the emperor's objective: First, both groups of feudatories—the *capitanei* and the minor *valvasores*—were for the most part guaranteed their rights. Second, the two groups of feudal overlords—the secular lords who were drawn from the ranks of the margravian families and the ecclesiastical lords who belonged to the uppermost ranks of the church—were not impacted with equal severity. The former were cushioned from the decree's effects because they were blessed with an abundance—even surfeit—of allodial lands.⁵² The latter, on the other hand, bore the brunt of its provisions because they were unable to make profitable use of most ecclesiastical properties without the free vassals. This dynamic explains why the rebellion of the *valvasores* broke out in the archbishopric of Milan and why Aribert commanded the force defeated at Campo Malo.

4. The Inauspicious Miracle at Corbetta (May 29, 1037)

By May 24, 1037, Milan itself was under siege, and the intensity of the attack neither waxed nor waned with Conrad's promulgation of the feudal code four days later. The next day (May 29) was Whitsunday, and an "encrowned" Conrad II played his traditional part in the solemn ceremonies marking the beginning of Pentecost by leading the royal procession into the church where High Mass was to be celebrated. On this occasion, however, the traditional rituals had to be performed in a small rural chapel on the outskirts of Corbetta, a Milanese castle west of the city. The emperor was accompanied by Henry III, who had arrived in his father's camp by then; although probably accompanied by his mother and his wife, the German king was certainly at the head of a large military force and princely escort. The solemnities commenced with the consecration of a new bishop, Bruno of Minden, by his metropolitan, Hermann of Cologne. During Bruno's celebration of High Mass, however, they were hit by a dreadful storm that directly or indirectly claimed the lives of many people and animals; some were robbed of their wits by the thunder. What is more, the flashing bolts of lightning are said to have revealed the figure of Saint Ambrose, the patron saint of Milan, overcome with rage at the emperor for taking measures against his city. The recipient of this harrowing vision, Count Berthold-Bertholf, was not the type to be swayed by a specter bearing an anti-imperial message; to the contrary, this count was one of Conrad's closest confidants and possessed a special competency in Italian law, of which the emperor availed himself both before and after Pentecost 1037. Before the siege of Milan, Berthold-Bertholf, who was probably a member of the Zähringer family from Swabia, had served in Tuscany, in conjunction with Archbishop Hermann of Cologne, as a royal emissary responsible for mustering a military force against Archbishop Aribert. He again served as an emissary

in late winter 1038, as evidenced by a *placitum*, or court judgment, that he and Kadeloh, chancellor for Italy, jointly issued in Conrad's presence. In any case, the vision was said to have temporarily robbed him of his senses, a condition in which many others also supposedly found themselves.⁵³

While it may be that such stories sprout up only with the passage of time, they are nevertheless redolent of the aura associated with an event and rooted in the experiences and impressions of the immediate participants, who in this case had come to the realization that Milan was not theirs for the taking. What is more, the weather's growing warmth signaled that it was time again to retreat to the mountains for the summer. Before lifting the siege, however, the emperor took an irrevocable step that precluded any future compromise with Aribert: Conrad declared the archbishopric of Milan vacant and designated his royal chaplain Ambrose as the new metropolitan. Although this canon and cardinal-priest was a member of an eminent and well-to-do Milanese family,⁵⁴ his appointment soon proved to be a serious misstep on Conrad's part, because the new archbishop could never make good on his claim to office, his saintly name notwithstanding. Even Pope Benedict IX, who had been summoned to Cremona by the emperor, was not prepared to support Conrad's high-handed treatment of Aribert. We must not dismiss the possibility that the pope and members of the Italian episcopate were engaged in behind-the-scenes negotiations with the archbishop of Milan, which in the end proved as ineffectual as the emperor's confrontational policy. Be that as it may, Conrad lifted the siege and along with his army departed for Lago di Garda east of Milan. The emperor reached the lake no later than June 18, 1037, and is known to have spent the next month in Verona and the surrounding countryside.⁵⁵

5. The Second Half of 1037

Sometime during this period, Aribert of Milan contacted Odo of Champagne, whom he had so resoundingly defeated in Burgundy just three years earlier, and offered to crown him king of Italy, perhaps even emperor. Such a move was in keeping with the archbishop's alleged declaration that he had helped the emperor attain the crown and would now take it back. Underlying that remark was a sense of self-approbation that even the emperor's proponents would not have found overweening; in fact, years later Henry III would remark that Aribert had used his discretion when governing the kingdom of Italy.⁵⁶ Still, the archbishop's offer was credible only if he had the broadest possible backing of the Lombard episcopate, and, indeed, Harderic of Vercelli, Peter of Piacenza, and Hubald of Cremona are on record as having supported the archbishop. The first two were Aribert's protégés and hence

understandably supportive of his policies, but Hubald of Cremona had long been a victim of Aribert's and his nephew Girard's machinations. What made him take up the archbishop's cause? Was he tired of fighting a hopeless battle against the all too powerful gang, or was he driven into the arms of his declared enemy by the provisions of the emperor's feudal decree? There is probably some truth to both of these theories.

The coalition forged against the emperor should not be thought of as a sworn association, even though the proimperial camp labeled it as such; its avowed purpose was no more or less than the expulsion of Conrad—dead or alive—from Italy. Looking to take joint counsel with their allies, Odo of Champagne and Aribert of Milan exchanged many messages about a possible meeting date, but before long their envoys were intercepted by Margravine Bertha of Turin, who was the mother-in-law of Hermann, duke of Swabia and margrave of Turin. She forwarded the letters implicating the three bishops to the emperor with such stealth and speed that he was able to seize, render a verdict, and consign them to a German exile, all without warning.⁵⁷ Even after he had been deprived of this crucial support and then of his ally, Odo of Champagne (November 15, 1037),⁵⁸ Archbishop Aribert did not abandon his cause. Emperor Conrad, however, declined to endorse some diplomas prepared by his chancery for Hubald of Cremona, and he reestablished good relations with Poppo, the patriarch of Aquileia. After being greeted with the usual civic violence, the ruling family—Emperor Conrad, Empress Gisela, King Henry, and Queen Gunhild—celebrated Christmas 1037 in Parma.⁵⁹ The emperor then applied himself to a different task, while allowing the conflict in Milan to smolder.

6. The Episode in Southern Italy (1038)

Conrad II was drawn to southern Italy, but not to Rome. In fact, he never returned to the Eternal City after making the obligatory visit in spring 1027 for his imperial coronation; instead, he summoned the pope to the imperial camp whenever he needed him, as in May 1037, for example.⁶⁰ Conrad II, Gisela, Henry III, and Gunhild left Parma after the beginning of the new year, and there is evidence that they reached Nonantola, north of Bologna, by January 23, 1038. The imperial army then crossed the Apennine Mountains and proceeded to Pistoia, where Conrad II issued on the town's behalf a diploma in which Gisela and Henry appear as intervenors (February 7, 1038).⁶¹ The emperor then took the Via Vinaria through Luccan territory to Florence; while in transit, he issued privileges benefiting the bishop, cathedral chapter, and clergy of Lucca (February 22 and 23, 1038). On February 22, Margrave Boniface of Tuscany hosted a royal court at one of his local residences; the

assembly was convened at the emperor's behest and presided over by the chancellor for Italy.⁶²

In early March the procession finally reached Florence; during his stay, Conrad charged Bishop Rotho/Rudolph of Paderborn, who was of Italian descent, with consecrating a church for the hermits of Vallombrosa.⁶³ The emperor traveled on to Arezzo (mid-March) and Perugia (March 20) and celebrated Easter in Spello (March 26), a town near Spoleto. During Easter week Conrad II issued the only surviving diploma for Burgundy that is dated later than 1032 (March 31, 1038). Kadeloh, the chancellor for Italy, was entrusted with its preparation, since there was—understandably enough—no separate chancellery for Burgundy. On the very same day, Pope Benedict IX issued his excommunication of the archbishop of Milan.⁶⁴

The emperor and the empress parted ways right after Low Sunday (April 2, 1038). Gisela left for Rome, moved by the desire to pray at the apostles' graves; the next time she is encountered in the sources, she is back at her husband's side for their ceremonial entry into the abbey of Montecassino.⁶⁵ “[G]oing to the borders of his empire,” Conrad and his forces proceeded forthwith to distant Troia, which was located southwest of the town of Foggia on the road to Benevento. This exceptionally well fortified Apulian stronghold had been founded by the Byzantines on Western soil and well nigh proved the undoing of Henry II in 1022.⁶⁶ By expending a great deal of effort and showing what was for him a surprising receptivity to political compromise, the Salian emperor's predecessor had succeeded in winning at least nominal control over this crucial military foothold. Exactly sixteen years later, Conrad II took over where Henry II had left off; southern Italy had lost none of jurisdictional diversity and cultural disparity in the interim, however, and remained a land of contradictions at the confluence of the Latin Christian, Eastern Orthodox, and Moslem religious traditions.

Just as in northern Italy, Conrad II could count on achieving some measure of success in the south only if the regional elite was riven by strife and the majority party looked to the emperor for aid in its struggle against an autocratic lord who opposed the existing political system. In the north the trouble had been stirred up by Archbishop Aribert of Milan; in southern Italy that role fell to Prince Pandolph IV of Capua (1026–38), who was something of a big fish in a small pond. And yet, he was not the only or even the mightiest force in the region: Greater still were the Byzantines on the heel of Italy and the Saracen emir in Sicily, but these offshoots of the two great Mediterranean powerhouses were too distracted by their own troubles and each other to sustain a long-term involvement in the affairs of the neighboring principalities, those post-Carolingian political shards of the once-proud Langobard principality of Benevento. Hence, two alliances vied for southern Italy: One was led by Pandolph, prince of Capua as well as duke of Gaeta, who had

appropriated properties from the imperial abbey of Montecassino and was allied with a number of princes and lords. The other was headed by Prince Waimar of Salerno and Pandolph of Benevento, along with the duke of Naples and the counts of Teano. Amalfi was still apparently on the fence.⁶⁷

While the Western emperor had no authority over the Byzantine region in southernmost Italy or the emirate of Sicily, a satellite of the Fatimid caliphate in Egypt, he did—nominally at least—exercise suzerainty over the Langobard principality of Benevento and its successor states. The *regnum gentis Langobardorum*, or kingdom of the Langobard people, traditionally included the entire Po River valley and Tuscany, as well as—to a greater or lesser extent—overlordship over the duchy of Spoleto and the even larger princely duchy of Benevento. By dint of military pressure and clever negotiating tactics, Charlemagne was able to reunite these territories under his rule in June 774: Spoleto became part of the Italian kingdom of the Carolingians, while Benevento was able to bolster its position as a principality and a buffer state between the Carolingian empire and Byzantium without ever evidencing either the ability or the willingness to shake off the suzerainty of the Western Empire for any length of time. Even after its breakup into two and then three separate principalities—Benevento, Salerno, and Capua—during the ninth century and its various territorial reconfigurations during the Ottonian period, the region did not undergo any fundamental changes in status. Otto II, whose wife was the Greek princess Theophanu, grandly assumed that he would conquer the region; his inroads were in fact insignificant at best.⁶⁸ Their son, Otto III, fared even worse: The failure of his Italian policy almost cost him the Langobard portion of the south; it passed—if only temporarily—into the nominal control of Byzantium, which established a defensive outpost on Western imperial lands far north of the old borders and named it—tellingly enough—Troia, after Homer's Troy.

In the early eleventh century, the Moslem overlords of Sicily were preoccupied with internecine strife that weakened their military and diplomatic capabilities abroad. The Byzantine rulers of southernmost Italy, on the other hand, were strong enough to mount a successful naval expedition against Croatia, on the other side of the Adriatic Sea, capture the ruling prince, and then ship him off to Constantinople. The backdrop to this muscle flexing on the western periphery of the Eastern Empire was the conquest of the Balkans by Emperor Basil II, which would earn him the epithet “Bulgar-slayer.” It seemed entirely possible that the Byzantines would advance northward as far as Rome; what is more, they were poised to implement their plans for retaking Sicily. When an externally supported uprising against the Eastern throne was violently squashed on the ancient battlefields of Cannae in October 1018, Norman knights were among the casualties. Some of these battle-hardened men had left their homeland of Normandy, along the English Channel, in 1017 on

a pilgrimage to the church of Saint Michael the Archangel on Monte Gargano, where thanks to their military expertise they quickly found employment with the local magnates.

Yet, even the Normans could lose a battle, as could be seen from the events at Cannae. Thus, not just Pope Benedict VIII but also the leader of the revolt and his Norman ally presented themselves before the emperor in Bamberg at Easter 1020, in hopes of inducing him to intervene in southernmost Italy. Henry II laid the groundwork for his third expedition with great care, and by the time he began what would turn into a months-long siege of Troia, in Apulia, it was spring 1022. Concurrently, a force twice that size, commanded by Poppo of Aquileia, conquered part of the region, while two columns led by Pilgrim of Cologne made their way to Capua via Rome. Their mission was to capture Pandolph IV and his brother Atenolf, whom he had installed as the abbot of Montecassino. Pilgrim captured the city of Capua and took its lord into custody; continuing on to Troia, the archbishop also defeated Waimar IV of Salerno.

Confronted by a combined imperial force amassed before its walls, Troia rendered a conditional surrender. Since his troops were already succumbing to plague, Henry II immediately departed for the north with his prisoner Pandolph IV in tow. The exiled prince of Capua was held under lock and key in Germany until a delegation arrived from southern Italy to buy—and sweet-talk—his release. By that time, however, Henry II was dead, and Pandolph was set free, without—it seems—any input from Conrad. In the immediate wake of his imperial coronation, in 1027, Conrad II spent just a few days in southern Italy, where he received oaths of allegiance from the Langobard princes of Benevento, Capua, and Salerno, but did not otherwise intervene.⁶⁹

The second expedition to Italy, in 1038, represented Conrad's first serious foray into the southernmost reaches of his realm, and he took up politically where his predecessor had left off, just as he had in his first expedition against the Slavs, in 1029.⁷⁰ While the course of the operation proved distressingly similar to Henry's experiences sixteen years earlier—down to the delayed withdrawal and the concomitant outbreak of plague among the troops—it would have a greater historical impact. First, Conrad II installed a new abbot at Montecassino, a Bavarian who spearheaded the intellectual and spiritual resurgence of the venerable institution. Second, while in Salerno the emperor worked to unify the many separate political entities in the south; he was able to sustain this process only with the aid of the Normans, who would as a result usurp control over the entire region on both sides of the imperial border. While Conrad II expected the new abbot of Montecassino to institute a program of reform, he could not possibly have foreseen the consequences of his political decisions.⁷¹

At first, everything seemed to go according to plan. This time around the

emperor had no need to capture Troia when he arrived there at the end of April or early May. Furthermore, Pandolph's wife—along with her son—approached the emperor with this compact: In return for peace, she offered an extraordinary two or three hundred pounds of gold in reparations, half of which she handed over then and there, and her children in surety for the remainder. Since arriving in southern Italy, the emperor had demanded that the prince of Capua relinquish control over the imperial monastery of Montecassino and its bountiful properties; the princess also accepted this condition.

The rapprochement was short-lived, however. The son who was held hostage—probably Pandolph VI—was able to escape, and in the end Conrad II was forced to stay on in southern Italy and march on Capua. Assuming command over the army's main forces, Henry III advanced to the immediate outskirts of the enemy's camp and captured the city. Meanwhile, Conrad II, Gisela, and their daughter-in-law, Gunhild, made a side trip to Montecassino, where the emperor—at the urging of his consort—installed Richer, the incumbent abbot of the monastery of Leno, near the town of Brescia, and former monk at the monastery of Niederalteich, in Bavaria, as the new abbot. Having “liberated” the imperial monastery from Capuan domination, the imperial couple was given a hearty welcome, and Gisela's candidate for abbot, who embodied her personal religious policies, was met with general approval.⁷²

Conrad II did not encounter any resistance upon entering the city of Capua in mid-May, and on the very next day he participated in the ceremonies marking Whitsunday, every bit the victorious bringer of peace. Although it behooved him not to tarry, Conrad set up camp in the central plaza of the ancient city and attended to various matters until the end of May 1038. A court diet attended by the local magnates and the members of the imperial entourage tried Pandolph in absentia for high treason; the Capuan was stripped of his principality and banished. Concurrently, Prince Waimar received his principality of Salerno as a fief from the emperor, along with Capua and perhaps Gaeta as well. By acceding to Waimar's request that Rainulf—a Norman—be recognized as his vassal, the emperor opened the door to Norman participation in the governance of southern Italy. Rainulf was enfeoffed with the county of Aversa, which was located between Capua and Naples and hence under the prince's jurisdiction; in effect, the Norman became the vassal of a prince, but not an imperial prince, like his immediate suzerain, in an arrangement reminiscent of that which Charles the Simple had brokered with Rollo/Robert and the Normans at the beginning of the tenth century.⁷³ As for Pandolph, the exiled prince repaired to Constantinople, but this longtime Byzantine ally accomplished nothing during the two years there; the Eastern Empire had changed in the thirteen years since Basil's death (1025).

It was finally possible for Conrad II and his army to withdraw from southern Italy. They marched east to the Adriatic coast via Benevento and then

made their way north toward Ravenna, where the emperor may have planned to take counsel and make preparations for the resumption of hostilities against the archbishop of Milan. However, it was already too late: The deadly summer heat was upon them, and plague—its executioner—ran rampant through the imperial ranks.⁷⁴ The scourge decimated not just the troops, who continued to fall sick even after recrossing the Alps, but the royal family as well: The young queen Gunhild died on July 18, 1038, and Hermann IV of Swabia succumbed ten days later (July 28), despite the ministrations of “the most experienced physicians.” The queen was carefully embalmed, and it was possible to transport her body to Limburg an der Haardt for her interment. Duke Hermann was to be buried in Constance, next to his brother Ernest, but the plan was abandoned due to the heat, and he was buried in Trento.⁷⁵

By August 11, 1038, Conrad II was in Brixen, where he issued a privilege on behalf of the count of Treviso and his sons.⁷⁶ The expedition to Italy was concluded at last, having brought the emperor an even measure of success and failure. On the one hand, he had been defeated by nature and the southern climate, his army was in disarray, and the loss of his daughter-in-law and stepson took an emotional as well as political toll on Conrad. On the other hand, although he returned home in poor health, the emperor, the empress, and the heir apparent had survived, and many—though by no means all—of his measures in Italy would be of lasting influence. For example, Conrad II had issued two mandates addressing the role of judges in Rome and the papal state; one concerned exceptional legal cases, but the other provided blanket approval for the use of Roman—instead of Langobard—law within the region.⁷⁷ In the course of his march through Italy, the emperor had resolved many jurisdictional issues, issued privileges, and rendered at least one court judgment. Even the young queen had intervened—for the first and last time—in the issuance of a diploma not a month before her death.⁷⁸

Conrad II may not have forced Aribert of Milan to surrender on the battlefield or to subordinate himself at court, but even in his rush to depart Italy, the emperor exercised sufficient power to sustain the alliance against Milan and obligate the magnates to continue the military campaign against the archbishop. This is reminiscent of the emperor’s tactics in 1033, when he extracted a vow from the Saxon princes to continue the war against the Slavs even in his absence. The Italian princes kept their promise, and their troops were in the midst of laying siege to Milan when in June 1039 word came of Conrad’s death. At that, the army disbanded with such alacrity and lack of discipline that the Parmese standard-bearer “ignobly” lost his life.⁷⁹ When the emperor departed southern Italy in 1038, the residents of Troia—to no one’s surprise—renewed their allegiance to the Byzantine authorities,⁸⁰ and when Conrad departed this earth one year later, Aribert’s nephew Girard—also to no one’s surprise—reappropriated the possessions of the Cremonese church.⁸¹



Part Three

THE REALM



1. Founding a Dynasty and Ensuring Its Survival

Even in their own day, Conrad II and Gisela were acknowledged as the founders of a dynasty.¹ Their son received an exemplary literary education at his mother's insistence² and shouldered increasingly pivotal institutional and political positions at his father's: In anticipation of the first expedition to Italy, the king designated Henry heir to the throne at a mere eight years of age and entrusted him to the guardianship of Bishop Bruno of Augsburg, a member of the Bavarian branch of the Liudolfing family (February 1027).³ On Easter 1027 the boy and his guardian attended the imperial coronation in Rome, the high point of his parents' trip.⁴ Back in Regensburg (June 24, 1027), the emperor had the magnates of Bavaria choose his son as their duke, thereby filling an office that had been vacant for over a year.⁵ From February 1028 on, Henry was described as Conrad's "only son," and following his election by the "clergy and people," the boy was consecrated and crowned king by Archbishop Pilgrim of Cologne on Easter 1028.⁶

The emperor had in autumn 1027 already dispatched to Byzantium an embassy that was charged with forging a marriage alliance between the two imperial families. Evidence suggests that he was banking on its success—and the legitimization of the new Salian imperial line—even before its return: On August 23, 1028—less than six months after Henry's coronation—Conrad issued a privilege to the cloister of Gernrode, which was headed by Abbess Adelheid, the daughter of Empress Theophanu. According to its *corrobatio*, a seal was affixed to the diploma to certify its authenticity, but the extant original is actually graced with the earliest known example of a bull used by Conrad II, which bears on its obverse a full-length portrait of Henry III in the classic style and an inscription: "HEINRICUS SPES IMPERII" [Henry hope of the empire]. Here was Conrad's forward-looking response to his predecessor's motto, which had hearkened to the past: "RENOVATIO REGNI FRANCORUM"

Image not available

FIG. 4 Conrad's imperial seal (August 23, 1028) bearing the inscription HEINRICUS SPES IMPERII, or HENRY HOPE OF THE EMPIRE. From the Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Nuremberg, Germany.

[renewal of the kingdom of the Franks].⁷ The diploma that the loyal count Manegold I of Donauwörth received after his return from Constantinople would also have originally borne a seal, probably the same one with the optimistic inscription. To well-informed contemporaries Conrad's designation of his already crowned heir as the "hope of the empire" would have been reminiscent of the Ottonian practice of joint father-and-son rule, which was in turn a borrowing from Byzantium. Conrad revived this concept on a coin minted in Speyer "in 1033–39 at the latest (and perhaps even somewhat earlier)," which depicts the busts of two crowned men identified as Conrad and Henry. Struck on the obverse is "an extremely uncommon depiction of the Madonna" modeled on a Byzantine coin minted in Conrad's own day and not—as has been averred—from "a gold histamenon minted in 1042 by the imperial Princesses Zoë and Theodora."⁸

Henry III was knighted in the summer of 1033, just a few months shy of his sixteenth birthday. The ceremony marking his official coming-of-age was performed at a court diet in either Merseburg on June 29 or Memleben on or immediately before July 19. With that, the young man's mentor, Bishop Egilbert of Freising, was released from his duties and given two handsome grants by the Salians—father and son—as a measure of their gratitude (July 19, 1033).⁹

At a court diet in Bamberg on May 18, 1035, Conrad II announced his son's engagement to the princess Gunhild, daughter of King Cnut of England and Denmark, who was probably the most powerful ruler in Europe after the emperor. The marriage between the eighteen-year-old groom and the strikingly beautiful, if somewhat frail, sixteen-year-old bride took place at Nijmegen one

year later (Pentecost 1036).¹⁰ Although Gunhild was never particularly happy at the imperial court, her union with Henry offered the Salians—insofar as was humanly possible—the prospect of perpetuating their dynasty with international backing. All these plans quickly came to naught, however: King Cnut died before the nuptials were even celebrated, and the young queen Gunhild perished during Conrad's second expedition to Italy, leaving behind a daughter named Beatrix, whom her father, Henry III, later appointed abbess of Quedlinburg (1045/46–1062).¹¹

None of the sources describe Henry's reaction to his first wife's death, nor should we today read too much into the young man's spending five of the prime years of his life as a widower (1038–43).¹² Regardless of how the loss affected him emotionally, it certainly set him back politically, although his father made up for the reversal that same year by having him succeed his half brother Hermann—who had also died on the second expedition to Italy, on July 28, 1038—as the duke of Swabia.¹³ Just weeks later at Solothurn, the emperor designated his son king of Burgundy “with the acclaim and at the request of the first men of the realm with all the people.”¹⁴ No father could have done more for his son: Henry III controlled the kingdoms of Germany and Burgundy, as well as the two most powerful and institutionally stable German duchies, Swabia and Bavaria. The young king also had Duke Conrad of Carinthia—the emperor's younger cousin and decade-long supporter of the family line—as his neighbor in Carantania to the southeast. Did Conrad II perhaps already have a foreboding in autumn 1038 that less than a year later his provisions for the dynasty's future would be put to the test?¹⁵

2. The Insignia of Conrad's Reign

Conrad's reign was marked by the “transpersonalization” of statehood.¹⁶ In a parallel development, the insignia—in other words, the objects signifying sovereignty—were no longer thought of as the personal property of a given ruler but were instead considered embodiments of the realm, indeed as the realm itself.¹⁷ Thus, it should come as no surprise that the two most valuable and important insignia—the Imperial Crown and the Imperial Cross—date back to the reign of Conrad II, who commissioned the cross and had the crown reworked into essentially its current form. It was possible for an emperor or a king to own many crowns and to donate one of them to a worthy recipient, usually a religious foundation. King Henry II was probably wearing a crown when he entered the basilica in Rome for his imperial coronation (1014); upon becoming emperor, he presented this crown to Saint Peter. He also donated a complete set of royal regalia to Cluny; when the area surrounding the monastery was later hit by famine, Abbot Odilo had the crown melted down

and used the proceeds to buy food. In 1027 Conrad II seems to have imitated his predecessor by presenting Cluny with “the insignia that he wore in Rome when he was granted sovereignty,” or the *regnum*.¹⁸ As generous as Henry II had been, his widow Cunigunde still possessed royal insignia that she in turn bestowed upon the newly elected King Conrad; in doing so, she provided *corroboratio*, or validation, for his assumption of the royal office. As for Conrad’s regalia, his remodeled Imperial Crown survives to this day.¹⁹

One of the insignia that Cunigunde passed on to Conrad II was a Holy Lance. This object had been obtained by Henry I (919–36) and was held in great esteem up to the beginning of the millennium; its importance subsequently waned, even though the blade contained a nail from the True Cross.²⁰ Originally the weapon of a free warrior, the lance symbolized the sovereignty of the early medieval kings,²¹ and sometime before 1000 it came to be associated with the lance of Saint Maurice, a Roman soldier who led the Theban Legion before his martyrdom in the fourth century. His bones were preserved at the monastery of Saint Maurice in Burgundy, and an invocation to this saint was already part of the Carolingian imperial *laudes*. While the lance continued to be an important symbol of sovereignty in eastern Europe,²² at the beginning of the eleventh century the Imperial Cross assumed not just the symbolic but even the physical function of the Holy Lance in the West by ultimately becoming the receptacle for the nail of the True Cross. The wooden core of the Imperial Cross is outfitted with two compartments: The blade of the Holy Lance fits into the recess in the crossbeam, and a fragment of the True Cross from the imperial treasury fits into the cavity in the shaft.²³

Scholars disagree on the provenance of the second relic, which is still extant today. Some claim that the fragment of the True Cross “had presumably already belonged to the Carolingians, but certainly to Otto III,”²⁴ while others propose that it was a gift from the Byzantine emperor Romanus III to the Western emperor in 1029.²⁵ No matter when it became part of the imperial treasury, the relic was without a doubt highly revered, even venerated, by Conrad II, as evidenced by the treasure piece in which he had it housed. Although work on the Imperial Cross may have started during the reign of Henry II, this precious object was certainly finished by around 1030. The sides of the cross bear an inscription that further reinforces its association with the first Salian emperor: “Behold, may the hosts of the evil Enemy flee the cross of the Lord, [and] accordingly may all enemies yield to you, Conrad.” Originally used in religious processions, the Imperial Cross measures seventy centimeters (twenty-eight inches) across and, as a result of some modifications made during the reign of Charles IV in the fourteenth century, currently stands seventy-seven centimeters (thirty inches) high. Precious gems and pearls set in raised mounts, as well as gold filigree, decorate the front of the object, while niello, a black enamel-like alloy, was used on the inscribed sides and the back, which is

Image not available

FIG. 5 The Imperial Cross. From the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, Austria.

adorned with a depiction of the Lamb of God and the apostles, and the symbols of the four evangelists on the four square beam ends of the cross. Since the Imperial Cross could serve as a receptacle not only for the Holy Lance and the fragment of the True Cross but also for other relics, Conrad II and his consort Gisela must have deemed this hallowed object the principle insigne of sovereignty in the imperial treasury.²⁶

Just as the Imperial Cross currently on display in Vienna contains elements that postdate the transferal of the “regal insignia” from the dowager empress to the new king in 1027,²⁷ the Imperial Crown found in the same museum collection has also been modified through the addition of an arch and inscription worked in pearls linking it to an Emperor Conrad. Which pieces of the crown were already part of the legacy left by Henry II—or even the Ottonians—is a topic of a scholarly debate that became particularly contentious after a museum exhibition mounted in 1992 caused a sensation by dating the crown to Conrad II’s day.²⁸ Now that cooler heads prevail, however, it should be possible to engage in a dispassionate discussion of this extraordinary memorial to medieval imperial splendor.

Some date the crown to an even later monarch, Conrad III (1138–52),²⁹ hence minimizing the difficulty presented by the fact that the first Hohenstaufen king was never even emperor. The proponents of this theory allege there is a substantial body of evidence that “Conrad considered himself the emperor even though he was never crowned in Rome,³⁰ but they then substantiate this claim by citing two sorts of proof, remarks by observers and the king’s own words. A review of the latter reveals that Conrad III referred to himself as the emperor—“C[onradus] dei gratia Romanorum imperator augustus” [Conrad, august emperor of the Romans by the grace of God]—in only one context, namely in the *intitulationes*, or superscriptions, at the beginning of his letters to Byzantium.³¹ His son Henry (VI), who served as coruler until dying early in 1150, addressed his father with the same title in both of his extant letters to Emperor Manuel and Empress Irene, his aunt.³² No doubt Conrad III liked to style himself the emperor, as can be seen from the many instances in which he titled himself (*et semper*) *augustus*, or “(and eternally) august,” in the imperial manner.³³ Even so, there is quite a difference between using the imperial title in diplomatic correspondence with Byzantium in order to indicate that one held a rank commensurate with the eastern *basileus*, or emperor—and was not just another *rhix*, or king, of a barbarian realm—and having the corroborative imperial *intitulatio* inscribed on the arch of the Imperial Crown for all and sundry to see, without having first been crowned by the pope in Rome.³⁴ While Conrad III “may have commissioned the crown for his oft-projected imperial coronation in Rome” and thus had it fitted with the pearl inscription in anticipation of his ascendancy,³⁵ this supposition can be neither proved nor disproved and hence does little to settle the debate. Suffice it to

say that the crown's provenance will remain an open question "until such time as the art historians are able to prove beyond a doubt that the (underlying structure of the) Imperial Crown dates back to Ottonian times."³⁶ In what follows, let us—for the sake of argument—proceed from the assumption that they have.

The Imperial Crown consists of eight individual gold plates of two slightly different widths. The four narrower plates (I, III, V, and VII) bear images rendered in cloisonné enamel and surrounded by jewels, while the four wider plates (II, IV, VI, and VIII) are encrusted with precious gems. The plates are attached in an alternating pattern, and the resulting crown has the sacred shape of an octagon.³⁷ The piece was last modified during Conrad's reign, when a gold-filigree arch spanning the top of the crown was fitted to the brow plate in the front (IV) and the neck plate in the rear (VIII); the arch is decorated with gemstones and the following inscription worked in pearls: "CHVONNRADVS DEI GRATIA ROMANORV(M) IMPERATOR AVG(USTUS)" [Conrad, august emperor of the Romans by the grace of God]. The original crown was decorated with small hanging ornaments (*pendilia*) and decorations atop each of the bejeweled plates (II, IV, VI, and VIII). During Conrad's day, the large cross rising from the brow plate (IV) was reconstructed.³⁸

According to this scenario, the Imperial Crown looks the way it does today thanks to Conrad II, who undertook to have it modified even though—or specifically because—the original crown in all likelihood dated all the way back to tenth-century Ottonian dynasty and the cross rising from the brow plate dated back to Henry II.³⁹ By adding his own touches to the Imperial Crown, Conrad II continued a tradition established by his predecessor and produced a lasting synthesis of their visions. This insigne of sovereignty says as much about Conrad's views as does his introduction of imperial burials at the cathedral of Speyer.⁴⁰

What did the crown symbolize to Conrad and the members of his household? Its most prominent feature is the brow plate (IV), adorned with twelve large gemstones arrayed in four rows of three gems each, which probably represent the twelve apostles. The heart-shaped sapphire currently in the center of the top row is a post-mid-fourteenth-century replacement; the original stone was a larger, round gem. A verse by Walter von der Vogelweide (d. ca. 1230) celebrating the coronation of King Philip in 1198 makes clear mention of this singular stone, which the poet termed the *Waise*, or orphan. A gem by that name also appears in *Herzog Ernst*, a late-twelve-century epic recounting the exploits of its eponymous hero, Duke Ernest, who had fetched it from the Orient. Since he was probably modeled on Conrad's rebellious stepson, there is even stronger reason to believe that this stone graced the crown in the Salian ruler's day. During the Middle Ages almost all gemstones—except Hungarian opals—came from India or Ceylon "because only there are such stones to be

Image not available

FIG. 6 The Imperial Crown. From the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, Austria. Plates (opposite): a. King David (I); b. King Solomon (III); c. Isaiah and King Hezekiah (VII); d. Christ in majesty (V).

Image not available

found in alluvial deposits rather than in mines.” Moreover, all sorts of antique gemstones were also available, as evidenced by the Imperial Crown.⁴¹ If the twelve gemstones on the brow plate represented the twelve apostles, then the *Waise* stone may have symbolized Saint Peter, the Prince of the Apostles. The neck plate (VIII) of the crown is likewise adorned with twelve jewels, probably an allusion to the twelve sons of Jacob, the patriarch of the twelve tribes of Israel. The two matching temple plates (II and VI) refer to the high priest and are integral to the octagon shape signifying the heavenly Jerusalem.

Interspersed between the bejeweled plates are four representational plates that form a programmatic series commencing with the plate between the neck plate and the temple plate on the wearer’s left (I). It depicts David, the king and prophet, the founder of a dynasty, a secular ruler who was God’s anointed and hence not a layman; at the synod of Frankfurt in 1027 Conrad II was similarly not included among the laymen.⁴² Proceeding clockwise, the next cloisonné plate (III) portrays David’s son Solomon, who was anointed during his father’s lifetime at the urging of his mother, Bathsheba, and the prophet Nathan to forestall an older half brother from making good on his regnal claims; after their father’s death, King Solomon had Adonijah executed for attempting to usurp the throne. The imperial coronation of Louis the Pious at the hands of his father, in 813, was viewed in terms of Solomon’s anointment by his father, especially since Charlemagne had already been extolled as a latter-day David. The same was true for Otto I, the founder of the Ottonian imperial dynasty, and his young son Otto II, who was crowned not just king (961) but also emperor (967) during his father’s lifetime. (That these parallels were drawn indicates that the concepts of “anointment” and “coronation” were considered interchangeable during this era.) When Otto II received the royal crown, the insurgencies fomented by Liudolf, his older half brother—another motif found in *Herzog Ernst*—still posed a very real threat to their father’s rule; by the time the young boy received the imperial crown, however, Liudolf had met with a violent end.⁴³ What did all this have to do with Conrad II? Well, he also founded a dynasty with a young son—a Solomon, if you will, even though there was no Adonijah to challenge the boy’s dominion. According to one source, however, the emperor did on one occasion enjoin his son to stay a Solomon and not turn into an Absalom, David’s defiant son.⁴⁴

To the right of the neck plate is a plate (VII) depicting the encounter between the prophet Isaiah and King Hezekiah, who is deathly ill and sits slumped on the throne with his right hand supporting—or shielding—his head. God has told Isaiah that the king will succumb to his ailment, and the gesture may express Hezekiah’s reaction to the prophet’s message: “Then Hezekiah turned his face to the wall, and prayed to the Lord. . . . And Hezekiah wept bitterly” (Isa. 38:2f.). The Lord thereupon directs Isaiah to inform the king that he has been spared; the prophet again fulfills his charge

and delivers the verse inscribed on the banderole: “[B]ehold, I will add fifteen years to your life” (Isa. 38:5). All that is missing from the plate is the retrograde movement of the sun miraculously wrought by God (Isa. 38: 8). Completing the cloisonné cycle is a portrayal of Christ in Majesty flanked by two angels (v). As noted above, the plates on the wearer’s left depicting Kings David and Solomon (I and III) are companion pieces; they are even visually connected, in that the father and son direct their gazes toward one another. The two plates on the wearer’s right (VII and v) are similarly related; Isaiah’s vision provides the link, but on a thematic and not a representational level. This leads one to believe that the figure of the enthroned Christ bears a direct relationship to Hezekiah, who symbolizes all kings, above and beyond Isaiah, and this supposition seems to be supported by the accompanying inscription, “By me kings reign” (Prov. 8:15). Accordingly, all four of the pictorial plates function as paeans to the divine favor and legitimization bestowed upon the Lord’s anointed. Some scholars base their analysis of the plates on the function of each figure, but the division into “kings” and “prophets” does not hold up; to begin with, David was both a king and a prophet.⁴⁵

Can enough information to date the crown be teased out of this gathering-together of David, Solomon, and Hezekiah? The Imperial Crown is such a remarkable insigne of sovereignty that one is strongly tempted to scour the historical record for a specific occurrence that could have prompted its commission. “The somewhat overpowering symbolism” of the piece suggests that it was “produced during wartime” and undatable by art-historical criteria alone.⁴⁶ While there is no denying the Christological dimension to the crown’s representations, one should not focus on that as a unifying principle to the exclusion of other, concrete interpretations, since medieval works—and their constituent parts—can be understood on many levels. Thus, within a Christological framework David and Solomon function as exemplars of the Christian sovereign, but to the Carolingians and their successors, these biblical kings were individual examples of theocratic kingship. Similarities likewise existed between King Hezekiah and Otto I, who fell deathly ill in 958, made a miraculous recovery, and lived for another fifteen years before dying in 973.⁴⁷ During his lifetime there would have been little reason to commission a crown with a pictorial cycle incorporating a representation of Isaiah’s prophecy; accordingly, this insigne would date—at the earliest—to the reign of his son Otto II.

This supposition is not incompatible with two facts often cited in the debate over the crown’s provenance. Hezekiah may invariably appear in the liturgies celebrating the consecration and coronation of the emperor and empress, yet never in the same context as David and Solomon.⁴⁸ He is also mentioned on an ivory situla preserved in the treasury of the cathedral at Milan that was fabricated in the last quarter of the tenth century for an Emperor Otto. The vessel is banded with inscriptions, one of which closes with the

following verse: “May the [heavenly] Father, who apportioned Hezekiah an additional three times five years, grant Emperor Otto many *lustra* [five-year periods]. O Caesar, the carver [of this piece] respectfully requests that he be remembered through his artistry.”⁴⁹ Of course, unlike Hezekiah, who received a specific number of extra years, the living emperor is wished an open-ended number of additional *lustra*. What really mattered, however, was not the mathematical but the moral lesson of the story: God is moved to extend the reign of a humble ruler, thus conferring legitimacy on the sovereign and his successor.⁵⁰

Influential contemporaries likened Otto I and Otto II to David and Solomon, at least in the aftermath of the son’s imperial coronation, on Christmas 967. For example, Hrotsvitha of Gandersheim explicitly extolled Otto I as a second David in the *Gesta Ottonis* (Deeds of Otto), a work commissioned by Abbess Gerberga of Gandersheim at the alleged request of her first cousin Otto II, a young boy of barely ten years at the time. His older half brother, Archbishop William of Mainz, was to review the completed manuscript and no doubt deliver it to the dual emperors, but he died beforehand (d. 968). The text itself concludes with Otto’s imperial coronation in 962, but it is dedicated to both the father and the son and contains two dedicatory poems. The second is addressed exclusively to Otto II and must have been written after 967, because it likens his imperial coronation at the behest and in the presence of his father to Solomon’s; in the same vein, the “greatly desired state of peace” in which Otto I would bequeath his kingdom to his son echoes David’s accomplishment.⁵¹ Hrotsvitha did not, however, liken Otto I to Hezekiah, whose name does not even appear in the work.

Only after Otto I had passed away was it feasible to associate him with David and Solomon, on the one hand, and Hezekiah, on the other, and, indeed, the “Epitaphium Ottonis Magni imperatoris” (Epitaph for Emperor Otto the Great), which was written in the early eleventh century, compares Otto I to each of the three Old Testament kings depicted on the crown: “Shielded by this small stone was the august and preeminent Otto, / Mighty in authority [*imperium*] as David in ancient times, / By his own deeds renowned, as wise and peace loving as Solomon; / Like the elder Hezekiah, he was filled with hope / That peace would come, indeed would flourish down through the centuries.”⁵² This poem and the representational plates are unique for their day in hearkening to just these three exemplary kings, which suggests that the epitaph’s author—who was, if not Abbot Odilo of Cluny himself, then at the very least a member of the abbot’s circle—must have been familiar with the conceptual underpinnings to the coronal composition. The lack of concrete details in his verse does not preclude the possibility of his having seen the crown in person.⁵³

Odilo participated in the imperial coronations of Henry II, in 1014, and of Conrad II, in 1027; he also attended the latter’s royal election and coronation,

in 1024, and mediated the conflict in Pavia in 1027.⁵⁴ Of course, the abbot of Cluny did not travel alone, and thus the epitaph may actually have been penned by a member of his suitably extensive entourage. In any case, it appears quite likely that Henry II received an Ottonian version of the Imperial Crown at his coronation in Rome, on February 14, 1014, after having set aside the royal crown earmarked for the Prince of the Apostles.⁵⁵

If Emperor Henry II did indeed use a crown with decorative elements that were so clearly applicable to the Ottonians, then may we not infer that the Imperial Crown was in fact fabricated around 980? In that case, it was commissioned by Otto II, who may or may not have been moved by the fall of Aachen—and the imperial insignia—into the hands of his Carolingian challenger, King Lothar of West Francia, in 978. Be that as it may, Otto II was a qualified, indeed fervent participant in philosophical and theological debates, and a moderator of scholarly disputations, who would surely have been conversant with the concepts behind the representational cycle.

There is no doubt that David and Solomon, as well as Hezekiah, typified the exemplary king; hence, anyone who exercised royal authority—except a tyrant, of course—could be identified with them. In the Middle Ages, exemplars possessed a dual nature that accounted for their overwhelming success: They embodied generic attributes, yet these could be cited in concrete situations. In other words, writers used exemplars to communicate historical facts.⁵⁶ Conrad II consciously adopted this traditional mode of conveying ideas when he and the members of his inner circle undertook—probably for the first time—to develop the concept of the “emperor who never dies.” Furthermore, his new concept of the polity appears to inform his reworking of the traditional crown, which is of a piece with the metaphor of the ship attributed to him and with other evidence that he understood his authority, as well as his realm, in a transpersonal sense.⁵⁷

3. Public Display and Private Religiosity

Even today, it is almost impossible for us to distinguish between a politician’s public display of piety—that pose of solemn reverence he or she strikes while engaging in a religious observance—and the individual’s private feelings of religiosity. To do so, we would need to be privy to a different type of information, which is in particularly short supply, if not totally lacking, in the case of a certain royal couple of the eleventh century. One thing we can say is that religiosity must be exhibited in public if it is to have an effect. Furthermore, deeply held religious beliefs inspire and sustain the gamut of human endeavors, not least of which would be the perilous enterprise of establishing a new kingship and new dynasty.⁵⁸

Customs Surrounding Crowns and Coronations

The customs surrounding crowns and coronations were one—if not the most important—expression of public religiosity on the king’s part. Since the attendant rituals followed various formats and were performed on various occasions, modern scholars have coined a host of terms to distinguish between them; the most tenable are “initial” coronation, “joint” coronation, and “solemn” coronation.⁵⁹ Conrad II participated in four “initial” coronations, three royal and one imperial, each of which was preceded by his anointment, in accordance with the East Frankish–German tradition observed without fail since Otto I. The “sacramental nature” of this consecration rendered the coronation unrepeatable.⁶⁰ He received the crown of the East Frankish–German kingdom in Mainz on September 8, 1024,⁶¹ of the Langobard-Italian kingdom in Milan most likely on March 25, 1026,⁶² and of the Burgundian kingdom on February 2, 1033, perhaps filling in for his son.⁶³ Conrad’s—and by extension Gisela’s—first two royal coronations were prerequisites for their imperial coronations at Saint Peter’s Basilica in Rome on Easter Sunday 1027 (March 26). The imperial coronation was modeled on a formal election: Conrad was acclaimed emperor by the inhabitants of Rome and then consecrated, that is, anointed, by the pope before receiving the crown.⁶⁴

Since Gisela was not crowned along with Conrad in Mainz on September 8, 1024, the sacramental rite celebrated in Cologne on September 21 probably included her husband’s first “joint” coronation. Only two contemporary sources mention the ceremony, and although neither notes that Conrad was also crowned, it was standard to celebrate a “joint” coronation whenever an individual “was crowned with unction in the presence of someone who had already been anointed.” Hence, “it does not matter whether the sources do or do not make reference to a ‘joint’ coronation for the senior monarch.”⁶⁵ Much the same must have occurred in Aachen on April 14, 1028, when the ten-year-old Henry III was consecrated and crowned king.⁶⁶ Ten years later, at the diet of Solothurn (autumn 1038), Henry III was solemnly escorted into the royal chapel of Saint Stephen’s by the bishops and other magnates and, in his father’s presence, apparently became king of the Burgundians solely by acclamation of “the people.”⁶⁷

A distinction should be drawn between Conrad’s four “initial” coronations, as well as the two—probably not three—“joint” coronations, and his “solemn” coronations.” The latter, “as the term suggests, were celebrated in conjunction with solemn religious feasts, though it should be noted that his initial coronations were all also scheduled on solemn feast days.”⁶⁸ Conrad II is known to have observed this custom during the last three years of his life, but “the close chronological proximity” of the accounts and their wording indicate that it was a long-standing practice.⁶⁹ The solemn feasts of Easter, Pentecost, and

Christmas lent themselves particularly well to staging solemn coronations and proceeding “to Mass resplendent in the royal crown.”⁷⁰ Contemporary accounts of Conrad’s appearing “encrowned” are in all likelihood references to this sort of ceremony.⁷¹

Solemn coronations are known to have taken place on the Sundays of Pentecost 1037, 1038, and 1039, as well as on Christmas 1038 in Goslar, but their inclusion in the historical record is in all likelihood due to the unusual circumstances under which each was celebrated. Conrad II was in northern Italy in 1037 when “Pentecost approached, on which it was customary to crown the king in the course of celebrating Mass.” On Whitsunday the imperial entourage finally came across a small church on the devastated outskirts of the besieged city of Milan, but upon commencement of the ceremony, a most terrible storm broke out, severely battering man and beast alike.⁷² On Pentecost 1038 Conrad’s solemn coronation took place in Capua, and it must have been quite an event for a border city unfamiliar with the custom—the neighboring empire of Byzantium did not subscribe to the practice—and for that reason alone found its way into local and regional accounts. Furthermore, the fact that Pentecost fell quite early that year (May 14) may also have made an impression on more or less knowledgeable observers, who knew just how inauspicious it would have been for the feast to fall just one day later: Pentecost is celebrated on May 15 only when the movable feast of Easter falls on March 27, which, according to Augustine’s calculations, is the (fixed) day of Christ’s resurrection; any year in which the movable and fixed feasts coincided could easily see the world come to an end.⁷³

In fact, a terrifying display of nature’s power also occurred that Christmas in Goslar: Just as Conrad “wished to proceed in his regal regalia to Mass,” between the third (10:30 A.M.) and the sixth hours (12:00 P.M.), in the depths of winter, ominous cloud formations aroused amazed consternation in onlookers.⁷⁴ Not six months later, the portents were realized: Following the solemn coronations of Conrad II, Henry III, and Gisela on the morning of Pentecost 1039, the emperor fell seriously ill at around noontime and succumbed on June 4, 1039. Even in death, however, Conrad II was not bereft of his crown, for he was the first German sovereign to be entombed with a burial crown, and after his wife was similarly interred less than four years later, the new custom took root. Both crowns are still extant.⁷⁵

How Conrad looked when “sumptuously crowned in procession with his son and his Empress”⁷⁶ is perhaps best conveyed by the splendid fresco in the apse of the cathedral of Aquileia that was probably executed in 1028—just one year after the imperial coronation—and certainly by 1031. Young Henry III—as yet uncrowned—is portrayed first, followed by a sumptuously attired Conrad, who towers over the others and whose head is graced with the Imperial Crown, and then Gisela, an empress adorned with a diadem that resembles

FIG. 7 Burial crowns of Conrad (bottom) and Gisela (top). From the Historisches Museum der Pfalz, Speyer, Germany.

Image not available

a cap. It is possible that the fresco depicts the Salians in processional order, although here they are accompanied by larger-than-life saints.⁷⁷ Painstaking examinations of the work have revealed that the emperor's mantle was originally painted blue and that his red tunic was edged in yellow overlaid with green and red circles: "There is a yellowish raised and very jagged edge to [the tunic], which was probably meant to represent gold braiding set with jewels. . . . The hose are bound tight around the calves with white laces. The crown is especially interesting: It consists of a circlet encrusted with pearls or gemstones and topped by a high arch adorned with 'fleurs-de-lis' affixed to the circlet. The area beneath the arch is filled by a puffed-up cap" suggestive of a miter. Small hanging ornaments too can clearly be made out on the crown. The empress wears a long white mantle edged in gold set with jewels over a blue garment striped in gold. Henry III is garbed in a long red mantle "that touches his feet; a green tunic edged in red and hose of indeterminable hue, which are fastened just below the knee by what appears to be a band," complete his attire.⁷⁸

What sort of jewelry the empress wore may be gleaned from a treasure excavated in 1880 at a construction site in Mainz, consisting of "individual items of jewelry that would have adorned a queen." "The jewelry was once thought

to have belonged to Empress Gisela, but the random assortment of unmatched pieces suggests that they are instead part of a larger collection of ornaments worn by Ottonian and Salian queens and assembled over the course of many generations and perhaps hidden away during the upheaval of the late eleventh century.⁷⁹ Antiquarians and other lovers of antique jewelry have questioned this dating. Could they have adorned Gisela or even her predecessor Cunigunde, or was Gisela's (second) daughter-in-law Agnes of Poitou the first to wear them?⁸⁰ Another question has triggered a heated debate: Could one of the pieces, a fibula, or large clasp, depicting an eagle or peacock, have served as the model for the following passage from the *Ruodlieb*? "Moreover, there was added to these gifts [in the royal treasury] a large brooch suitable for a queen, which had been cast in clay and had neither been made with hammers nor constructed with any craftsman's tool. It was completely solid and not at all trimmed. In the middle of the brooch was the image of a flying eagle, and in the tip of its beak was a crystal ball, in which three little birds seemed to move as if they were alive and ready to fly about. A golden ring surrounded the eagle in a circle. The brooch was so wide that it covered the breast of the wearer completely. It was wide for good reason since it had been cast from a talent of gold."

The eagle unearthed in Mainz does not hold a crystal ball in its beak, and there is no evidence that three little birds ever perched on the fibula before taking to wing. It measures less than ten centimeters (four inches) in diameter—barely enough to cover the breast of a small child—and weighs much less than the brooch described by the poem's anonymous author, since the piece contains nowhere near one talent—that is, one pound—of pure gold.⁸¹ Yet, both the extant fibula and the vivid verse provide an idea of how magnificent and valuable the royal jewelry must have been.⁸²

Gisela may also have originally owned an armband that "was remodeled in the twelfth century into a small crown adorning the reliquary of Saint Oswald in Hildesheim" and the majestic earring parts found in the shrine to Saint Godehard in Hildesheim; neither attribution has been substantiated, however. It is also possible that the ring the empress's sister Matilda bestowed upon the "humble monk" Ekkehard in appreciation for his conducting the solemn chant during the Easter Mass celebrated at Ingelheim in 1030 resembled one of the many rings found in Mainz.⁸³ Ekkehard's account of this incident at the royal palace discloses something else: A public display of one's private religiosity included rendering thanks to the professionals charged with officiating at religious ceremonies, whether by the bestowal of a ring or, much less elegantly, by placing some ounces of pure gold between one's imperial feet for the recipient to retrieve.⁸⁴

The sovereign and his immediate family inhabited a public space; nothing they did was "private." Yet, they enjoyed sufficient leeway in their decision

FIG. 8 Early medieval
jewelry unearthed
in Mainz
(1880).

a. Fibula depicting an eagle
or a peacock. From the
Landesmuseum
Mainz.

Image not available

b. "Loros," pectoral
ornament. From
Kunstgewerbemuseum,
Staatliche Museen, Berlin.

Image not available

making to express their “private religiosity” in an individualistic manner. For example, all three of Conrad’s initial royal coronations are known or presumed to have been held on solemn feasts of the Virgin Mary; in fact, the anniversary of his initial coronation on September 8, 1024, was observed merely as part of the annual *memoria* for Conrad, Gisela, and their son, Henry, performed on the solemn Feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin by the canons at the cathedral of Worms, which involved the distribution of alms and the recitation of the litany.⁸⁵ There was nothing unique about the royal couple’s veneration of the Virgin Mary, which was an ancient custom among the Byzantines and after 1000 caught on not just in the Western Empire but in Poland and Hungary as well. Electing to hold the coronation on September 8 was also not without precedent: Henry II had assumed the throne in Aachen on the Feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin in 1002. Copious evidence indicates that Henry II and his consort, Cunigunde, actively venerated the Virgin Mary, and their devotion hearkens back to Otto II and Theophanu, whose marriage seems to mark the introduction of the idea of “establishing an association between Mary and imperial, that is, royal, authority in the West.” Thus, “it can be demonstrated that a form of ‘political’ devotion to the Virgin Mary existed among the members of the sovereign’s inner circle and his family” long before the reign of Henry II.⁸⁶ Conrad II—along with the nascent Salian dynasty—consciously decided to uphold this tradition, but he gave it an unmistakably personal touch.

Conrad was crowned on September 8, Gisela a mere thirteen days later, on September 21. Only part of the interlude was spent in travel, since the relatively short journey by boat down the Rhine from Mainz to Cologne would not have taken long. The royal couple attended to pressing administrative matters before finally departing on September 11; that first day they traveled only as far as Ingelheim. Given the narrow time frame, they must have initiated the intense negotiations over Gisela’s coronation quite early on; leaving nothing to chance, the new king and his consort would not have departed Mainz until they knew exactly what to expect in Cologne. With Archbishop Pilgrim’s assent, Conrad might have spent some time in a last attempt at changing Archbishop Aribó’s mind about not crowning Gisela. As for his own coronation, however, the first Salian ruler was clearly determined that it take place on September 8 during the celebration of the solemn Marian feast, which was marked by a reading from the *Liber generationis*, or “the book of the genealogy” of Christ in the opening verses of the Gospel according to Matthew. As has been noted, “The conjunction between the coronation day and the liturgy highlighted the Christological and sacral aspects of kingship.” Gisela’s coronation also did not take place on just any old day, for September 21 is the Feast of the Apostle Matthew, to whom this gospel—so meaningful to any nascent dynasty—is attributed.

Image not available

FIG. 9 Conrad and Gisela kneeling before Christ in a mandorla. From the Golden Evangeliary of Henry III, ca. 1045; Escorial, Madrid, Cod. Vitrinas 17, fól. 2v.

The Salians' attachment to the Virgin Mary was evidenced in other ways as well. The focal point of the fresco in the apse of the cathedral of Aquileia is an enthroned Virgin Mary, Mother of God, or "Theotokos," holding the Christ child. The figure of the young Henry III is placed in such close proximity to the mandorla encircling them that he is grazed by her holy aura. In 1026 this same boy was named the heir apparent on the Feast of Candlemas

Image not available

FIG. 10 Henry and Agnes presenting Mary, the Mother of God, with the Golden Evangeliary. From the Golden Evangeliary of Henry III, ca. 1045; Escorial, Madrid, Cod. Vitrinas 17, fol. 3r.

(February 2), which commemorates the Virgin Mary's purification in the Temple, and from mid-1028 on, at the latest, was hailed as the "hope of the empire." A portrait of Henry and his father graces one side of a coin modeled on a Byzantine original; the Madonna appears on the obverse. Long after his parents' death, Henry III commissioned the Golden Evangeliary of Speyer, which contains a representational cycle characteristically evocative "of the community of the dead, the living, and those yet to be born, particularly the longed-for sons and successors." One folio shows Conrad and Gisela kneeling before Christ, who will hopefully be a kind judge, while another depicts Henry and his wife Agnes humbly approaching the Mother of God, the patron of the cathedral of Speyer. These illuminations convey a clear message: While the Son sits in judgment over what is past and done, Maria represents hope and the future.⁸⁷

Even though many difficulties and unsettled issues had yet to be resolved prior to Gisela's coronation, the royal couple took the time to endow the cathedral of Speyer in the first royal expression of the "Salians' concern for their memory." Such were their gratitude to the Virgin Mary and their eagerness to fulfill a prelection vow.⁸⁸

The Founder's Tomb in the Cathedral of Speyer

Even though Speyer was well situated on the Rhine River, neither the Carolingians nor the Ottonians had paid it any special mind.⁸⁹ Bishop Walter of Speyer (1004–27) wrote that when he was a young man, he had considered his diocesan seat a *vaccina*, or "cow town," and it had not been wealthy before coming under the wings of the Salian family.⁹⁰ As fate would have it, this somewhat run-down episcopal town on the Rhine would become the site of royal burials for centuries; even Rudolph I of Hapsburg (1273–91) came here to die, since "it was the custom from time immemorial to inter the kings of the Romans in the city of Speyer."⁹¹ Conrad's ancestors, collateral relatives, and sister, as well as his youngest child, Matilda, however, were buried in the family tomb in Worms.⁹² One legend states that the emperor laid the cornerstone to the abbey church at Limburg an der Haardt on the very same day as construction commenced on the cathedral of Speyer, but the date given—July 12, 1030—undercuts the credibility of this "storybook tale," since the emperor was still in Hungary at the time. There is no doubt, however, that both building projects—the abbey church in the Salian family's former seat and the cathedral in the Rhenish town—were undertaken concurrently and that work on the former progressed more quickly than on the latter. When completed, the church in Limburg was only one meter (three feet) smaller than the cathedral Emperor Henry II had built in Bamberg and probably longer than the structure originally planned for Speyer. In spite of its size, however, stretching

seventy-three meters (239.5 feet), the edifice was consecrated sometime during the 1040s, long before construction was completed in Speyer.⁹³ Conrad II allegedly presented Limburg with a crown and a scepter, but what occasioned the gifts remains unknown, nor has it even been possible to confirm this account.⁹⁴ The cathedral town also soon reaped the benefits of the Salian's favor: In Limburg on February 20, 1032, Conrad II issued a privilege for Bishop Reginger of Speyer (1027/28–1032) establishing an endowment for the salvation of his, Gisela's, and Henry's souls, an endowment underwritten by proceeds from the abbey of Schwarzach, which was located just east of the Rhine and southwest of present-day Baden-Baden. The recipient of the grant was also entrusted with protecting the abbey of Limburg an der Haardt, Conrad's "ancestral property." The abbey church's crypt and its three altars were probably consecrated at around this time; as the duly appointed ordinarius, Bishop Reginger likely officiated at a ceremony also attended by Bishop Azecho of Worms.⁹⁵

Almost exactly three years later, Conrad and Gisela allegedly issued a diploma granting the abbey certain valuable estates and stipulating the services to be rendered by the abbey's new ministerials. The text expressly refers to the royal couple as the founders of a church in honor and praise of God. It is unclear what to make of the diploma establishing a *memoria* to the Salians in Limburg; just because it was forged does not mean that the contents are untrue. The documentary evidence for the imperial family's presence at the monastery on August 2, 1033, is firm, however, and consists of a diploma awarding Bishop Meinwerk of Paderborn, who had obviously accompanied them on the journey, considerable recompense from Mainz.⁹⁶ The imperial family made its last known visit to Limburg on the first Sunday in Advent 1038 (December 3), during which a regional synod resolved a dispute concerning the start of the Advent season.⁹⁷

As far as is currently known, Conrad traveled to Limburg three or four times for a total of at most eleven days, two of which were spent at court diets or similar assemblies.⁹⁸ Limburg consequently ranks nineteenth among the locations "Conrad II is reported to have visited four or more times, or for a total of ten or more days." Speyer, in comparison, does not even make this list, because the Salian ruler's sole known sojourn lasted a mere two days (July 14–15, 1025),⁹⁹ and when he returned practically fourteen years later, it was only for his burial (July 3, 1039).¹⁰⁰ Even so, the town's fortunes began to improve under his reign, which ushered in "the ascendancy of Speyer and its cathedral, measured in terms of the founders' and rulers' tombs."¹⁰¹ While the new ruler may have taken his time before seeing to the *memoria* of his ancestors at Worms, Conrad and Gisela moved swiftly in the aftermath of the coronation in Mainz to fulfill a vow that he or perhaps they had made before the election, to endow Speyer—that is, the bishop and the cathedral canons—with considerable property.¹⁰²

To quote Conrad's fourth known diploma, issued on September 11, 1024, they made the donation "in nostram nostrorumque progenitorum et progignendorum memoriam" [in memory of ourselves and both our ancestors and progeny], hence not just because their votive prayers had been answered but also because they wanted to cultivate the memory of his flesh-and-blood ancestors and progeny, as well as himself; in other words, the bestowal was made on behalf of the present, past, and future members of his family, not his predecessors and successors on the throne. Two valid conclusions have been drawn from this fact: First, Conrad and Gisela already attached great importance to Speyer before the election, as can be seen from their assumption of a sworn religious obligation to the cathedral and its patron saint, the Virgin Mary. Second, not only they and their descendents were to be remembered in prayer, but also their forebears, probably even those two counts of Worms who had blinded Bishop Einhard of Speyer in 913, causing him to languish in pain up until his death in 918. Consequently, Conrad—the namesake of one of those counts—and Gisela may have made and swiftly fulfilled the vow in atonement for this heinous crime and to reconcile the new Salian royal house with Speyer and the Mother of God. Conrad may have been motivated to favor Speyer for yet a third reason, first advanced in the twelfth century: The new Salian king was not able to build a new bishopric from the ground up, as Henry II had done in Bamberg, so instead he showered such favor on the run-down see of Speyer that his act of devotion in effect equaled that of his predecessor.¹⁰³

It remains uncertain when Conrad determined that he—and by extension the other Salians—would be interred at the Speyer cathedral, in whose renovation he had been so extensively involved. While initially reticent on that score, upon closer analysis the sources reveal that the town was probably from the very beginning the preferred burial site for Conrad, Gisela, and Henry. Construction on the new cathedral church did not, however, proceed as quickly as on the abbey church at Limburg, which was a no less imposing structure. As a result, when the time came to bury Conrad (1039), his "coffin was consigned to what may be termed a construction site and perhaps for that reason was secured with a metal strap." Just one year earlier (1038), the young queen Gunhild had been buried in the founders' tomb, so to speak, at Limburg, "in the place of greatest honor, immediately in front of the high altar, at the intersection of the nave and transept," which was a logical choice, since the abbey had been under the authority of the bishop of Speyer since February 1032. Gunhild had born Henry a daughter but not the wished-for heir to the throne; she may have been near and dear to the family, but she had not contributed to its dynastic future. It is also possible that Limburg had from the very beginning been designated the Danish princess's morning gift and future widow's portion.¹⁰⁴ Moreover, as has been rightly observed, the Salian's family

monasteries were never used for burials. Speyer's rise has also been compared with that of Naumburg on the Saale River in Saxony, which took over from Zeitz as a diocesan seat in the early eleventh century, but whether the two situations are truly analogous hinges on one's assessment of the Ekkehardine family's cultivation of its *memoria*.¹⁰⁵ Only after Henry III poured almost unlimited resources into the cathedral's construction was the burial crypt at Speyer fit for a medieval emperor or German king. At a length of 134 meters (402 feet), the edifice eclipsed all churches built hitherto in the West. Just as the so-called crucifix of four churches in Utrecht was commissioned by Henry as a tribute to his father, so too would "Speyer [be] imbued with a unique symbolism by means of Henry's favor and generosity." And Conrad's son fulfilled his own prophetic words, found in the *Codex Aureus*, or Golden Evangelary, a magnificent manuscript he bestowed upon the cathedral at Speyer sometime between 1043 and 1046. Today, it is among the exceptional treasures preserved at the Escorial Palace Library north of Madrid.¹⁰⁶

Of course, being only human, Conrad also had a practical reason for choosing Speyer. The Salians exercised dominion and influence over an area along the Rhine that included the major churches of Mainz, Worms, and Speyer.¹⁰⁷ Conrad would never have been able to get what he wanted in either Mainz or Worms; that left him with Speyer, a bishopric that probably could have benefited from the sovereign's patronage and yet was not so powerless that it would be putty in the hands of an active secular ruler. The town probably found it quite acceptable to open its doors to a defunct one, even if he were "the emperor who never dies."

Veneration of the Crucifix, Enrollment in Prayer Confraternities and "Books of Life"

The nineteenth-century playwright Franz Grillparzer may have put into the mouth of Rudolph of Hapsburg the statement about the emperor who never dies, a basic tenet of the ancien régime, but in fact Conrad II was probably one of the first rulers—perhaps the very first—to appreciate its veracity. The sovereign and his consort expressed their belief in the undying nature of sovereignty by venerating the crucifix, which was hardly a unique devotional practice at the time but was still a sincere reflection of their religiosity.¹⁰⁸ It was only natural that the Salians would expect the "wood of the life-giving and most triumphant crucifix"¹⁰⁹ to assure their dynasty's future, and the family's patronage of the crucifix at Limburg an der Haardt probably dates back to Conrad's day. It is not clear, however, whether the monastery possessed a fragment of the True Cross, derived perhaps from the magnificent cache of relics brought back to Germany by Conrad's delegation to Byzantium (1027–29).¹¹⁰ However, a Byzantine coin did serve as the model for an imperial coin Conrad

minted in Speyer that draws a link between the crucifix and the Mother of God. Struck on one side of the coin are the names “Conrad” and “Henry” in the genitive case and the busts of two crowned men flanking a crosier. On the obverse is a bust of the Mother of God with her hands raised; the head of the Christ child can be made out in the foreground, as well as the inscription “† SCA MARIA,” that is, Sancta Maria, or Saint Mary. “This is the only instance of an Ottonian or Salian German coin depicting two rulers—father and son—together.”¹¹¹

Much like his predecessor—albeit to a far lesser extent—Conrad II established affiliations with cathedral canonries. He joined the prayer confraternity at Worms sometime after the start of his reign, but certainly no later than February 14, 1026.¹¹² Conrad and Gisela became members of the confraternity at Eichstätt after having obtained the imperial crowns.¹¹³ In all likelihood, Conrad’s inclusion in the confraternity at Worms strengthened his long-standing ties to his home town and reinforced his adherence to family traditions there; accordingly, a great many of his “brothers” rose to important positions in the royal administration both north and south of the Alps. Little comparable information has survived regarding Eichstätt, however.¹¹⁴

Conrad’s enrollment in a third prayer confraternity—this time along with both his consort and son—is of particular, even singular significance. In a diploma dated April 30, 1029, Conrad confirmed and restored a grant made by Henry II to the nunnery of Obermünster in Regensburg, which, for its part, accepted him, Gisela, and Henry into its confraternity. In other words, the nuns

Image not available

FIG. 11 Coin minted in Speyer, silver, eleventh century. From the Grote collection, 1879; Muenzkabinett, Staatliche Museen, Berlin.

- a. Two crowned busts (Conrad and Henry) flanking a crosier.
- b. A bust of the Virgin Mary with hands raised and the head of the Christ child in the foreground.

agreed to pray for their souls, and their three names do in fact appear in the cloister's necrology. However, Conrad required material recompense for the arrangement, namely three prebends, one each for himself, his wife, and his son. According to the *corroboratio*, or authenticating clause, of the extant diploma, Conrad validated the exchange by bestowing a scepter on the cloister, which was highly unusual: "We have invested the cloister with our imperial gift and left this scepter there as an eternal proof [thereof]."¹¹⁵

While this diploma holds great interest for a historian tracing the rise of royal prebends, its value to a historian analyzing Conrad's policies lies more in what it reveals about the emperor's motives for entering into the confraternity at Obermünster along with the empress and the young king and duke of Bavaria, and for taking the unusual step of granting and handing over a scepter. Clearly, Conrad's object was to confirm the foundation's *libertas*, or freedom from all but imperial secular jurisdiction, without making a specific pronouncement to that effect. This was in essence a recapitulation of a policy articulated by his predecessor, Henry II—a former duke of Bavaria—in the earliest known diploma granted Obermünster, at a time when the ducal office was vacant (1010). Following the reassumption of the title by the emperor's brother-in-law Henry V in 1017/18, however, the cloister soon lost its imperial freedom. At a court diet convened in Regensburg a decade later (1027), Conrad II instituted proceedings aimed at recovering all the border fortifications and abbeys to which the realm held a claim. It is not clear what he accomplished by this initiative, but perhaps the diploma issued to the nunnery in 1029 was part of the sovereign's program to reclaim crown properties. True to form, Conrad did not take Obermünster under his protection, "even though he should have, in view of his reclamation program," but instead bestowed his imperial scepter upon the foundation and concurrently entered into a "confraternity" with the sisters. "We can only assume that he was not able to overcome the opposition mounted by the beneficiaries of the status quo. However, he may have executed an end run around his opponents by means of this diploma" and the scepter symbolizing the kingdom.¹¹⁶

At the end of July or beginning of August 1027, Gisela and Henry III journeyed to Saint Gall without the emperor. They presented the monastery with valuable gifts and were enrolled in the foundation's prayer confraternity and "book of life." In return, the monastery presented the empress with excerpts from a German translation of the Psalms and Lamentations of Job made by Notker of Saint Gall, who had died five years previously.¹¹⁷ Interestingly enough, Gisela, the former duchess of Swabia, and her youngest son visited Saint Gall, one of the two foremost monasteries in Swabia, just as her husband was engaged in a struggle over the region with her older son Duke Ernest II; the young man himself had already capitulated to his stepfather, while the last of his loyal retainers were in the midst or on the verge of doing likewise.¹¹⁸

After his death Conrad II was inscribed in more “books of life” than any other Salian ruler. The data underlying this striking fact are derived from a category of sources still under study and are hence incomplete, but further research is unlikely to bump Conrad from the top of the list.¹¹⁹ His frequent inscription tallies with his circumstances: A secular nobleman who acknowledged the impossibility of discharging his worldly duties without committing sin would need to have the most prayers recited by the most people at the most places possible on his behalf after his death. Therein lay his sole hope for salvation. However, this presupposes the existence of “a purifying fire that purged souls of their sins after death.” Who knows to what extent Conrad, the members of his family, and the numerous clerics who inscribed their names in the “books of life” were cognizant of the fact that Conrad’s tutor Burchard of Worms had devoted the last section of his collection of decretals to a discussion of purgatory. According to Burchard, “We are to believe that prior to the [Last] Judgment a fire purges certain minor sins” and that only a sin committed against the Holy Spirit is never forgiven, in either this world or the next.¹²⁰ The frequency with which Conrad’s name appears in the necrologies also mitigates a complaint made by the annalist for the monastery of Hildesheim, who wrote that hardly anyone had mourned Conrad, the sort of man “whose passing deprived almost the whole world of a leader and force for virtue.” Yet even the annalist was certain of one thing: Henry’s “elevation to his father’s throne had, thank God, taken place under the most harmonious circumstances in Christendom,” and the world had not come to an end.¹²¹



1. The Middle Stratum: *Milites et Servi(tores)*—Free Vassals and Unfree Ministerials

The “people” in the eleventh century were not the common people, the *laboratores*, or workers, who are mentioned only in passing, if at all, by medieval sources. No, the word *populus* encompassed those individuals who were entitled to participate in the political life of the age; they fell into myriad groupings and were strictly stratified according to their status as free or unfree. Dominion and dependence were embodied by the relationship between the lord and his vassal, as regulated for the most part by Frankish feudalism. Still, adherence to feudal norms was a function of location: The further east one traveled from the Rhine, the less pervasive its institution. Thus, there was room in these regions for other, less rigid organizational modes, the earliest example of which was the ministerialage.¹ Of all the population groups subject to his rule, Conrad’s closest bonds were with the “gentry,” an admittedly anachronistic term for the social stratum that emerged below the princely and comital nobility. Occupying its uppermost rung were the free vassals, or *milites*, whose interests Conrad championed with special vigor both north and south of the Alps. The era also witnessed the “rise of the ministerialage,”² a legally protected class of individuals who were fundamentally unfree, yet would in just a few generations qualify as knights in the true sense of the word.

“Passing over the wealthy counts [retainers?] at table, he [the king] talks and jokes with us [the royal huntsmen] instead when he dines.” This is how the ideal king comports himself, in the words of the *Ruodlieb*, a contemporaneous “tale of chivalry” composed at the Bavarian monastery of Tegernsee. In contrast, the Salian king did not normally have any contact with the peasants—who occupied the lowest strata of society—even if they were free. Wipo reports that Conrad did, however, have a good rapport with the free vassals: “He disposed his vassals [*milites*] well toward himself in that he did not suffer

the ancient benefices of parents to be taken away from any of their progeny. Besides, as regards the frequent gifts by which he constrained them to dare brave deeds, they thought that his like could not be found in the whole world.”³ This observation appears in a chapter devoted to Conrad’s first actions as a ruler, his principles, and the quick acceptance of his governance. According to Wipo, the new king preserved the peace, maintained good relations with his ecclesiastical as well as secular subjects, and possessed great vigor; hence, he was most honorably compared to Charlemagne. Significantly, Wipo inserts this digression, which includes a catalog of Conrad’s—subsequently displayed—kingly virtues that reads like an abridged “mirror of princes,” between accounts of Conrad’s accession to the throne at Aachen barely twenty days after his election and the commencement of the royal progression. Here, Wipo employs a stylistic device called *hysteron proteron*, which entails reversing the logical order of elements in a narrative in order to heighten the effect.⁴

While Wipo may have composed this description of Conrad’s comportment in Charlemagne’s Aachen with an eye to drawing an association between the two rulers, he also probably wanted to communicate that the “people” expected positive things from the new king, particularly the *milites*. After all, Conrad had lived the life of a free vassal, and his closest confidant was a *miles* named Werner.⁵ He would have shared their attitudes toward the ecclesiastical hierarchy, as expressed in the satirical ditties about the clergy such men composed while on military campaigns—like one tune popular during the dispute over Lotharingia in 1024/25, which lambasted the bishops for their treachery—and in the anticlerical Latin lays they applauded while at the “table of a great prince”—like the poem *Unibos*, which features a cunning peasant named Einochs (One-ox).⁶ It comes as no surprise that what these free vassals expected of a suzerain was a shot at sharing in the church’s immense wealth. And the Salian king did not disappoint them, as can be seen from his enfeoffment of his stepson Duke Ernest II, who had “for some time provided military service to the king,” with the abbey of Kempten in 1026, whereupon the young man “divided it among his *milites*.”⁷ By any reckoning, an analysis of surviving documents reveals that when it came to bestowing property on laymen, Conrad II outdid Henry II both quantitatively and qualitatively, since he issued numerous privileges expanding the legal rights of the beneficiaries, in most cases by declaring a fief hereditary, even through the maternal line.⁸ But just who were these *milites*?

Just as a property of “one hundred hides” was not equivalent to a fixed area of land as would appear on a surveyor’s map today, so other medieval terms could connote various, even antithetical, meanings.⁹ Such semantic paradoxes were due in no small measure to the multiplicity of lexical usages found in medieval Latin, whose vocabulary was derived from classical works, the Vulgate Bible, and patristic treatises—to name the most important sources—

leavened with administrative terminology. Thus, while it is not possible to trace the history of a medieval concept with exactitude, one can identify lexical changes and certain semantic trends.

In the tenth century, common feudal terms like *vassus*, *vasallus*, and *homo* (man) were supplanted by the classical Latin word *miles* (soldier) because a freeman's ability to retain or improve his status under feudalism was predominantly—if not exclusively—a function of the military service he rendered as a knight; it was his lifelong duty to hone his skills during peacetime and prove them in battle. Hence, the *miles* was a fighter and a vassal, at least relative to his suzerain, on whose behalf he had sworn to fight, or *militare*, as Wipo put it in reference to Duke Ernest II of Swabia.¹⁰ Elsewhere, the duke's like-named Babenberg cousin, who later became the margrave of the Bavarian march on the Danube in present-day Austria (1055–75), is termed a *miles* to Conrad's grandson Henry IV,¹¹ and Ernest's grandfather Hermann II of Swabia had been "a *miles* and ally" of Henry II in 1002.¹² Even earlier, Duke Arnulf of Bavaria (907–37) had enjoyed the same status vis-à-vis Henry I.¹³ In his chapter on the Ravennese rebellion in mid-1026 Wipo describes Count Eppo, who was the king's standard-bearer and played a particularly heroic role in the incident, as "a very good knight [*miles*] from Bavaria." Sources written from the perspective of the upper nobility, however, do not refer to an overlord as a *miles* but use the term exclusively for a free vassal below the rank of a count.

In other words, a *miles*, or vassal, was someone who occupied a lower feudal rank than his lord; the higher the rank held by the lord, the higher the rank held by his vassals. The totality of these relationships—from the king on down—formed a feudal pyramid, as it were. Thus, the king enfeoffed the duke of Swabia with the abbey of Kempten in return for rendering military service, or *militare*, to quote Wipo; the duke in turn parceled out the abbey's holdings as subfiefs among his own free vassals, or *milites*, to quote a local chronicler.¹⁴ According to Wipo, Conrad honored an unnamed German who was grievously wounded in Ravenna by having the man's "leather leggings . . . filled with coins and placed upon the cot of the wounded soldier [*miles*] beside him." Similar disturbances erupted between Conrad's forces and the natives of Rome during Easter 1027, resulting in the death of Berengar, the son of a Swabian count and "dear to him [the emperor] and a member of his household." Conrad had the young man, who is described as having been "very noble and extremely warlike"—but not a *miles*—honorably interred beside the tomb of Otto II in the chapel of Saint Mary at Saint Peter's.¹⁵

One can draw two lessons from such accounts: First, Conrad understood the mentality of his nobles, and, second, the nobles were beginning to constitute an identifiable group, although not—at least at this point—a legally defined stratum. However, "during the course of Conrad's reign, the nobles

evinced their awakened sense of authority by erecting impregnable castles on the tree-covered summits,” which became the seats of toponymous family lines. The number of sources from either side of the Alps that differentiated between the upper and lower strata of *militēs*, that is, the vassals and their subvassals, concurrently increased. Until the mid–eleventh century, northern Italians used the term *valvassores* to denote both the *capitanei* and their subvassals, as evidenced by the *Constitutio de feudis* promulgated in 1037 by Conrad II, who declared that fiefs held by all Lombard vassals were inheritable.¹⁶ In this feudal code the term *militēs* is reserved for those free vassals who are below comital rank, and the term *seniores* is employed for the secular and ecclesiastical princes whose feudal overlord is the king.¹⁷ Unlike their German peers, even the most powerful knights in eleventh-century Italy—and France even more so—used *miles* as an honorific whose meaning transcended social class.

North of the Alps, however, things took a much slower course because a new social element was pressing for admittance into the emerging knightly class.¹⁸ In Conrad’s day, the members of this ascendant group—the unfree but specially trained ministerials who served the king, the imperial church, and the uppermost members of the secular hierarchy—were still known as *servi*, or servants, or, at best, *servitores*, or servitors; the terms *servientes*, which referred to those rendering service, and *ministeriales* came into use later on, as this group became more established. During Conrad’s reign, however, these *servi imperatoris vel regis*, or servants of the emperor or king, as well as their fellows serving the imperial churches, were able to make their way into the ministerialage with ease, as indicated by the barbs members of the “establishment” hurled from the onset at these social climbers. According to one school of thought, the character of “Der Rote” [the Red One] in the *Ruodlieb* is just such a retainer; if so, all of these untrustworthy, mercurial, and licentious fellows—red-haired or not—warranted watching.¹⁹

Over time, these terms experienced a semantic and social shift, as most aptly illustrated by a biography of Gebhard of Salzburg (1060–88). The work survives in two redactions, both of which contain a passage describing a journey home by the archbishop. In the older version, which dates to the late eleventh century, he is escorted by a count, as well as free vassals (*militēs*) and numerous servitors (*servitores*). The later version, written in the twelfth century, repeats the passage almost verbatim, but for some slight—and thus all the more striking—emendations: There his escort consists of a count and ministerials accompanied by their unfree knights (*militēs*). A twelfth-century German could not conceive of a *miles* preceding the ministerial to whom he was subordinate. There were no longer any free *militēs* or unfree *servitores*: The former had made way for the powerful, if also unfree, ministerials, while the latter had been supplanted—in a formal and to a great extent functional sense—by the unfree knights. In fact, the two terms had supplanted one another, and *miles* now

denoted the unfree individuals at the very bottom of the noble hierarchy; the term *valvassores* had already suffered a similar fate in mid-eleventh-century Italy, when it came to be reserved for the subvassals of the *capitanei*, who were still termed *maiores vavassores* or *valvassores* in 1037.²⁰ In Germany, the ministerial split apart, while *miles* took on a new meaning. Not all—by a long shot—of those who qualified as ministerials could lay claim to that title after the 1060s; a relatively large number probably continued to live, function, and serve as *militēs*, which term in everyday speech denoted the members of the lowest stratum of fighters recognized as knights under German feudal rules. These knights rendered service to the king, the ecclesiastical and secular princes of the realm, the counts, and both the free and unfree nobles, the latter of which were termed ministerials from around 1100 onward. However, the term *miles* (knight) was also used in a nonlegal, ethical sense: In the twelfth century the word came to connote adherence to the chivalric ethos and in that sense to denote any of the freemen listed above and even the king and emperor.²¹

In 1057 Queen Richeza of Poland endowed the cathedral at Würzburg with the estate of Salz, which included free vassals (*militēs*) and unfree individuals who rendered service (*servientes*) and “belonged to the Salz household (*familia*) by virtue of marriage or some other cause.” The privilege confirms the ancient custom and right of the free vassals to pass down their fiefs to their sons and grants the same hereditary prerogative to the unfree functionaries. In this case, the traditional feudal rights enjoyed by the free vassals were clearly considered normative.²²

Similar usage is found in another, roughly contemporaneous source, a biography of Archbishop Bardo of Mainz (1031–51), whose alleged ineptitude as a lord drove many of those who served the archdiocese into the imperial fold. Bardo’s retainers are described as falling into two groups: the free vassals (*militēs*), who decided on their own to render *contubernia*, or military service to the king, and the unfree in service to the church, who were handed over—the text does not say by whom—in accordance with feudal law to render service at the royal court. In this case, too, the unfree ministerials followed the example set by the free vassals, whose change in allegiance probably had the legal backing of the king. The account calls to mind a passage by Wipo in which the ostensible speakers note that a king or emperor could transfer his unfree servants to the authority of another. In Bardo’s case, however, the transfer was in exactly the opposite direction.²³

What befell the archbishop of Mainz cannot be ascribed solely to “incompetence,” however, because this was not the only instance in which Conrad abrogated jurisdictional rights over ecclesiastical servants. For example, the sovereign bestowed an estate near Ingelheim on a certain Magnus who—as contemporary sources indicate—was a ministerial to the diocese of Bamberg at the time. Given the nature of the grant, the only recompense the man would

have been able to render the ruler was in the form of service. A *cliens*, or vassal, named Magnus was among the emperor's vassals killed during an uprising in Parma at Christmas 1037, and it is conceivable that these two were one and the same person. Short of reviewing the entire extant historical record, suffice it to say that no contrary information has come to light, and there is much evidence that other "clients" provided military service on the second imperial expedition to Italy. One individual named Conrad also served as the emperor's steward, an office that in the future would typically be filled by a ministerial.²⁴

As in classical times, medieval society encompassed a wide range of free and unfree social strata and exhibited a remarkable tolerance—even by modern standards—for social mobility. The successful management of even a medium-sized estate in the early Middle Ages was predicated on the service of numerous specially trained individuals, who may have been unfree yet were in the position to accumulate not just property but also money in the form of coinage to enhance their financial freedom. It is true that the "age of migrations" from the fourth to the sixth centuries was marked by a resurgence of the dualistic social order of antiquity, with its categories of "master" and "slave," but it was also witness to what would prove to be a countervailing phenomenon, the rise of the "people at arms": A barbarian people, for example, was one and the same as its army when on the move. The exigencies of life on the road entailed dramatic social mobility within such a people's ranks, which were open to anyone—regardless of ethnic or social background—who was adept and accomplished in battle. Simply put, specialized service—in this case, on the battlefield—could lead to social advancement. It is extremely hard to estimate what proportion of an early medieval force was unfree, and the figure varied from region to region. The West Goths in Spain, for example, used a higher percentage of unfree fighters in their armies than did the Franks or the Langobards. Whatever the exact percentage may have been, however, the situation was fundamentally the same across the board: The ranks of feudal armies were increasingly filled with unfree individuals. The revolution in medieval warfare triggered by the switch to a heavily armored, mounted force during the Carolingian period steeply raised the cost of outfitting a fully equipped fighter—a chain-mail tunic alone was worth as much as a medium-sized piece of property—and the level of training an individual needed to perform his duties with distinction. Since there were never enough free vassals capable of fulfilling the military needs of an overlord, it fell to the king or magnate to equip the requisite number of unfree men and earmark them for lifelong training.²⁵ Given the unique institutional history of the medieval empire, however, Ottonian and Salian military leaders were able—indeed constrained—to rely upon the imperial church for their troops. Hence, the earliest ministerials were drawn from the imperial church, which was in the very broadest sense part of the royal fisc, and from the royal fisc in the narrow

sense.²⁶ It is thus hardly surprising that Otto III delegated the "royal right to muster the free and unfree *militēs*" of his diocese to the bishop of Halberstadt (September 18, 992),²⁷ since one of Charlemagne's capitularies had already stipulated that "the *servi* who are dignified with fiefs and render service, or dignified through vassalage, are, along with their lords, obligated to provide military service and should possess horses, armor, shield, lance, sword, and short sword."²⁸

Thus, even though Conrad II surely knew how to use the ministerialage to his advantage, its rudimentary origins predated him. The Salian may have contributed to the "formation of the ministerialage,"²⁹ however, insofar as the first law codes for the unfree attainees of that rank were promulgated during his reign or—what was more often the case—attributed to him in later redactions; the prevalence of the latter makes it difficult to speak confidently anymore of the "a royal ministerialage emerging during the reign of Conrad II and of ministerial codes dating to the eleventh century."³⁰ These royal ministerial codes purport to be privileges—that is, they are addressed to a defined group of beneficiaries—and do not lend themselves to generalization. Furthermore, it is unclear to what extent they reflect the incremental emergence of the ministerialage. Nevertheless, it is still possible to make a few—albeit cautious—observations about the ministerials in the early eleventh century based at the very least on the *Lex familiae Wormatiensis ecclesiae*, an indisputably contemporaneous household law code compiled by Bishop Burchard of Worms. The holders of certain offices—or, better, the performers of certain functions—like the royal steward, cupbearer, chamberlain, or steward of the local estate, were recruited from the royal or princely household, a *familia* that was subject to a particular household law. As part of this arrangement, they were granted service tenancies and concomitantly subjected to a special ministerial code, if only for a finite time period. Thus, the household law of Limburg abbey—a twelfth-century document alleging to be an imperial diploma issued on January 17, 1035—stipulates that if the abbot "requires the personal services [of an individual] and appoints him steward, cupbearer, or *miles*, that individual will hold the [concomitant] tenancy for only as long as he conducts himself properly toward the abbot; should he fail to do so, he will again become subject to his former code."³¹ With the passing of a century, the equerry mentioned in Burchard's code had become a *miles* who was no longer a free vassal but instead an unfree armored knight equipped by the abbot and earmarked for service in the imperial army.³²

The status of the unfree royal ministerials did improve during Conrad's admittedly brief reign, for while his diplomas refer to them by the conventional term of *servi*, these individuals had attained personhood, so to speak: The texts acknowledge their patronyms and their control over widely scattered holdings; even a bishop might engage in property exchanges with them.

In fact, Conrad II was the first ruler to bestow a hide of land belonging to a free nobleman on an unfree member of his household and to issue a diploma to that effect (May 8, 1034), which lists the empress, young king, and Archbishop Pilgrim of Cologne—a native of Bavaria, where the property was located—as intervenors. The recipient of this most profitable and prestigious grant in the region of Vilsgau was one Pabo, a *servus imperatoris*, or servant of the emperor, who thus laid the groundwork for his successors' rise to positions as imperial and ducal ministerials. Raffold of Schönberg, a *ministerialis regni*, or ministerial of the (German) kingdom, who presented the property and the imperial privilege to the nearby Cistercian monastery of Raitenhaslach in 1149, may or may not have been Pabo's direct descendent, but the office he held was certainly the institutional equivalent.³³ Furthermore, as is clear from the later household code for Limburg abbey, unfree individuals who climbed the social ladder and became subject to a ministerial code could enjoy enormous legal advantages during their lifetimes, but their status would for a long time remain uninheritable. Conrad II appears to have bestowed land and privileges only on royal ministerials hailing from Bavaria, although statistically speaking the sample size is scarcely significant. Even Magnus, the ecclesiastical servant who was granted an estate near Ingelheim, qualifies as a "Bavarian," since he was a ministerial of the diocese of Bamberg, which lay within that duchy. Did the rise of the ministerialage proceed otherwise in Bavaria than in the rest of Germany, akin to the divergent evolution of the unfree strata in Germany and France?³⁴ Assuming that the data support this hypothesis, what might have been the cause? In the tenth and eleventh centuries no other region in Germany had as high a proportion of unfree denizens as Bavaria.³⁵ Accordingly, traditionally distinct groups, like the *Barschalken*, or newly evolved strata, like the royal ministerials, might have served to differentiate the unfree masses of Bavaria. And yet, just the opposite was the case.³⁶

The primary purpose of Burchard's household code for Worms was to uphold the communal way of life practiced by the *familia sancti Petri*, or the individuals attached to Saint Peter's cathedral. Among the issues it addressed were inheritance and nuptial law, judicial proceedings, the abduction of women, property crimes, as well as homicide and the obligation to extract blood revenge for a slain member of the bishop's household. One may discern only the most rudimentary elements of a ministerial code in the rules applicable to a select cohort within the cathedral household. Lesser dependents were also the focus of the household code for Limburg abbey,³⁷ which was allegedly issued by the emperor on January 17, 1035, and specifically guaranteed the rights of the household members, or *familiae*, attached to various properties slated for transfer from royal to monastic dominion. Indeed, the section in which the individual provisions are delineated opens with this strong statement: "However, lest either any future abbot demand more of the members

of the monastery's household than he should or the members of the household become remiss over time in the performance of their legal obligations, arrogant toward their abbot, and neglectful in the fulfillment of their duties toward the monastery, it seemed sensible to us to put down in writing the services that the abbot may demand as needed and that the members of the household are obligated to perform."³⁸

A mandate issued by Conrad II sometime after his imperial coronation, in 1027, to Duke Bernard II of Saxony (1011–59), Siegfried II of Stade, and a certain Margrave Bernard expresses his reaction in no uncertain terms to a sale—perhaps under duress—of male and female servants, or *mancipia*, by the cathedral church of Verden: The institution had acted wrongfully, because, according to canon law, a cathedral chapter was permitted to exchange land and people only in return for something of equal or greater value. In addition to being illegal, however, the transaction was also abominable, because dependents had been sold off like “dumb beasts.” By the power vested in him as emperor, Conrad ordered the Saxon dignitaries whom he had charged with the region's oversight to undo this outrage and arrange for the repurchase of the servants, all for God's—and his—sake. What makes this mandate so unique is that we possess the original text, which—one must admit—betrays a certain concern for the well-being of the lower strata. Even so, one must neither romanticize the contents of the mandate and turn Conrad II into the Abraham Lincoln of the eleventh century³⁹ nor discount them in light of the seemingly contradictory account of some freemen—probably members of the middle stratum—from the town of Wohlen in present-day Switzerland who were denied access to the ruler because their representatives were too boorish to express their rights in the proper language at a court diet.⁴⁰ While securing the best return on the cathedral chapter's holdings was surely foremost in Conrad's mind, the mandate also indicates that the dependents were sold off to widely dispersed locales as if they were dumb beasts, which must have caused the breakup of their family units. The emperor sought to undo this as well, because it violated canon law. This appeal to ecclesiastical legal norms brings to mind the fact that the first German household law was written by Bishop Burchard of Worms, who also compiled the first—and, for many years, the most influential—collection of canon law: the “Compendium of Canon Law as Practiced at the Episcopal Court.”⁴¹

2. The Upper Stratum: Dukes, Margraves, and Counts

Picture for a moment a map of the Ottonian-Salian kingdom in a historical atlas: It is a multicolored patchwork of mostly duchies bearing names that seem to presage the states of the present Federal Republic of Germany. Yet,

the plates in a historical atlas represent no more than a virtual reality—as well they must—since the printed page cannot reproduce boundaries that were continually in flux and continuously changeable. One should not attribute too much significance to the persistence of these individual geographical units, although—or even because—they once referred to specific tribal groups whose names still grace many German states today, like present-day Lower Saxony. It was, however, incumbent upon the sovereign of the East Frankish–German kingdom to stay on good terms with the dukes, who were preeminent among the lay princes and stood at the pinnacle of the secular nobility; they had long enjoyed—albeit with some restrictions—the right to inherit fiefs, which the common free vassals would first achieve during the Salian period. A duchy was a land, a political entity of its own—a *patria*, a *provincia*, a *regnum*—that was nonetheless held as a fief from the crown and just as contradictorily constituted an office, or *honor*, bestowed upon its holder by the king.

In Wipo's estimation⁴²—and probably others' as well—there were eight “great men” among the lay princes at the time of Conrad's accession to the throne following Henry's death: Chief among them was Bernard II of Saxony (1011–59), who would live to a ripe old age, followed by Adalbero of Carantania/Carinthia (1012–35); Henry V of Bavaria (1004–9, 1017/18–1026), who was the brother of the dowager empress Cunigunde; and Ernest II of Swabia (1015–30), in spite of the fact he was still a minor and under the guardianship of his paternal uncle, Archbishop Poppo of Trier (1015–47). The list continues with Duke Frederick II of Upper Lotharingia (ca. 1020–26/27)—there is no mention, however, of his father, the ruling duke Dietrich I (978–1026/27)⁴³—and Duke Gozelo I of Lower Lotharingia (1023–44). “Cuono of Worms, duke of the Franks,” that is, Conrad the Younger, his older cousin's rival for the throne in 1024, is seventh on the list, which ends with Udalrich of Bohemia (d. 1034).⁴⁴

It is not exactly clear why Wipo ranked the dukes in this order. Bavaria represented “the most estimable honor in the German kingdom,”⁴⁵ and thus one would expect its suzerain to head the list. If the ranking were based on simple seniority, then one would expect Henry V of Bavaria to be named first, since he was appointed duke in 1004,⁴⁶ although he was deposed in 1009 and then reinstated in 1017/18, all at the hands of his imperial brother-in-law, Henry II.⁴⁷ Thus, on the basis of his initial appointment, this member of the Luxembourg house should have preceded both Bernard II of Saxony and Adalbero of Eppenstein, who received their duchies in 1011 and 1012, respectively.⁴⁸ If Duke Henry's ranking was based on his reinstatement, then he should have followed Ernest II of Swabia, who—nominally at least—succeeded his father in 1015. The remaining four dignitaries do appear in the “proper” order, however: Frederick became the co-duke of Upper Lotharingia around 1020, and Gozelo was named duke of Lower Lotharingia in 1023. Conrad's “duchy” was

not a princely realm but rather a conglomeration of less venerable—hence more successful in a modern sense—entities associated with the house of Worms,⁴⁹ while Bohemia was an autonomous tribal principality subject to the king solely by feudal bonds. In *Heliand*, a ninth-century Old Saxon retelling of Christ's life, the Roman emperor's emissary Pontius Pilate is termed a *heritogo*. Thus, it makes sense to term a German duke a *Herzog*, while it is not correct to apply the same German honorific to a Slav—and hence a Czech—duke, who was instead a *knez-kn(j)az*.⁵⁰

There were, however, historical precedents for referring to a tribal prince with the Latin honorific *dux*. During the Carolingian age, tribal princes exercised what was tantamount to regnal authority within their territories, even though they had sworn fealty to the king, indeed submitted themselves to his suzerainty and the control of the Frankish counts. Their title indicates that these princes were equated with the military commanders who waged war on behalf of the Carolingian rulers, and not without reason, as can be seen from the following episode recounted by Paul the Deacon (d. 799) in his history of the Langobards: In the 630s a group of Bulgarians fled first to the Bavarians and then to the Alpine Slavs; a generation later they proceeded into Italy. The king of the Langobards, Grimoald (662–71), accepted these refugees and sent them to his son, the duke of Benevento, where they were allowed to settle. The Bulgarians had their own ruler, named Alzecco/Alcious, who was, in the words of Paul the Deacon, a *Vulgarum* [sc. *Bulgarum*] *dux*, or duke of the Bulgars, and entered Benevento “with the whole army of his dukedom.” The duke of Benevento made their resettlement contingent upon the fulfillment of one nonnegotiable demand: He “directed that Alzecco himself, the name of his title being changed, should be called *gastaldius* [a rank equal to that of a Frankish count] instead of duke.”⁵¹

While a list of ducal witnesses in a literary work does not carry the same weight as a list of witnesses in a legal instrument, by including these names Wipo was able to sidestep an exceedingly awkward fact: Only two of the leading German magnates are known to have participated in Conrad's election. There is no question that Conrad the Younger played an active role at Kamba, since he was the first lay prince to cast his vote for his older cousin. Duke Henry V of Bavaria attended, clearly in order to lend support to his sister, the dowager empress Cunigunde, who was there to transfer the regal insignia to the newly elected king.⁵² In contrast, Dukes Bernard II of Saxony and Gozelo I of Lower Lotharingia definitely did not attend the assembly at Kamba; Dietrich I of Upper Lotharingia was also absent, which explains why he is not on Wipo's list, while his son Frederick II, who made an appearance but departed with his men before the election, is included. Adalbero of Carinthia and Udalrich of Bohemia are not named in Wipo's account of the election, probably because they, too, did not attend. Archbishop Poppo of Trier

definitely participated in the election, and it is possible, though by no means certain, that his young charge, Duke Ernest II of Swabia, accompanied him to Kamba, although the boy was not legally entitled to vote.⁵³ All in all, Conrad's accession to the throne was not ratified by a majority of the dukes and the tribal prince of Bohemia; those who were absent at best adopted a wait-and-see attitude or at worst were openly hostile. Gaining their affirmation posed no small challenge, but why did Conrad need it? What authority did the dukes exercise at the time?

All of the dukes on Wipo's list straddled two operational realities: On the one hand, they were agents of the sovereign, constrained to function like vice-regents; on the other, they were rulers in their own right whose claims to regnal authority were secured by hereditary and property law. The dukes had yet to establish their place in the power structure and whenever possible sought to exercise the former role in the furtherance of the latter.⁵⁴ The duke was in theory the supreme commander of a military contingent drawn from his . . . what? One hesitates to say *Stamm* (stem), because the word has fallen into such disfavor as a result of its biological connotations.⁵⁵ One could replicate the terminology of the original sources and state that the duke led his "people" into battle, but the image of a German-speaking leader urging his *Volk* to war also grates on modern sensibilities.⁵⁶ In any case, it was traditional for dukes to provide military service, and Conrad II expected no less. With the western borders of the empire under threat, the emperor reunited the two duchies of Lotharingia in 1033 and appointed Gozelo I, a gifted military leader, duke of all the Lotharingians; Conrad would not be disappointed by his choice.⁵⁷ The principality of Saxony and its military forces had already been placed under Billung command by Otto I, and the continual warfare in the borderlands along the Elbe and Saale Rivers provided the members of this line with many opportunities to exercise this authority.⁵⁸ Adalbero of Eppenstein may have forfeited the duchy of Carinthia in 1035, because—unlike Hermann Billung and his successor, Bernard—he was unwilling to assume the "Maccabean" mantle of a *princeps militae*⁵⁹ and "enlarge" the southeastern borders of the kingdom. Hermann IV of Swabia, on the other hand, was probably a willing partner to his stepfather's expansionist Italian policies, which bore no fruit only because of the young man's untimely death.⁶⁰

Providing military leadership for one's tribe or people was by no means a duke's sole function; if anything, Salian sources depict duchies as loca of provincial authority. These references have prompted the—unwarranted—assertion that therein lay "the rudiments of a territorially and not tribally based principality,"⁶¹ or, alternatively, harbingers of "a seamless transition into a territorial duchy."⁶² One must bear in mind, however, that in the eleventh century there was in fact no fixed concept of a duchy, which was variously thought of as a *regnum*,⁶³ *provincia*,⁶⁴ or *patria*.⁶⁵ Each of these terms emphasizes the

territorial nature of the entity and in the late Middle Ages came to denote a territorial principality.⁶⁶ Nevertheless, all of the dukedoms continued to be thought of in tribal terms, even in instances where that element was lacking, at least in the traditional sense; hence, in Wipo's work both Conrad's grandfather and cousin bear the appellation "of Worms, duke of the Franks,"⁶⁷ although their rules have been said to represent a "'modern' concept of lordship" heralding the future.

A duke was expected to uphold the law and administer justice, as well as maintain internal peace, although actual performance often fell far short.⁶⁸ Two provincial diets were convened in Saxony in the latter half of 1024; one was held before Conrad's election, most probably at Werla, and the second, presided over by Duke Bernard II, met afterward on September 13 at a long since abandoned location.⁶⁹ Contrariwise, there is "no direct evidence [that] even a single ducal provincial diet [was convened] in Regensburg by the duke" of Bavaria during this period—or the periods before and long after—that was comparable to the diet convened at Ranshofen in the late tenth century. The supposition that "such—undocumented—eleventh-century ducal diets served to maintain the internal order of Bavaria and above all to lay the groundwork for military campaigns" remains no more than that.⁷⁰ In terms of the rule of law, dukes were not normally the ones to bring charges or serve as judges; they were, rather, the ones charged and judged, as indicated by the extraordinary "legal cases" brought against Ernest II of Swabia and Adalbero of Carinthia.⁷¹

The military and judicial functions of a duke were predicated on his theoretical supremacy over the margraves and counts of his duchy. In point of fact, however, contemporary sources tell quite a different story: In his account of Duke Ernest's submission to Conrad II, Wipo applauds the sovereign for taking immediate action to preserve comital "liberty."⁷² When Conrad sought to undo an outrageous abuse in Saxony, it was not enough for him to issue a mandate to Duke Bernard II; the emperor was compelled to turn as well to both the count and the margrave also responsible for the region.⁷³ The judicial diet commissioned by the sovereign during early summer 1027 to conduct an inventory of royal properties in Bavaria included "Franks and princes of this land," but the Bavarian counts clearly dominated the proceedings, while the newly installed duke, Conrad's ten-year-old son, Henry, is never even mentioned.⁷⁴ After being stripped of his duchy and convicted of *lèse majesté*, Ernest II was hunted down by a Swabian count.⁷⁵ The court diet that tried Adalbero of Eppenstein, duke of Carinthia, on charges brought by Conrad II was presided over by two imperially appointed margraves who had no ties to the duchy.⁷⁶

After having stepped down as duke of Bavaria, Emperor Henry II took various precautions to ensure that no successor could set himself up as a quasi-monarchical intermediary power. In the throes of a conflict with his imperial brother-in-law over Trier, Duke Henry V of Bavaria attempted to cover himself

by extracting an obligation from the magnates of Bavaria “not to elect another [duke] for three years.” The Bavarians initially honored their vow, since they and the duke had common interests; both parties feared the possible economic and political repercussions of the emperor’s founding of a new bishopric in Bamberg. Even so, when Henry II subsequently convened a court diet in Regensburg and ordered the magnates to attend, they all did so; there, “a combination of promises and threats convinced them to abandon their support and aid for him [the duke] and ally” themselves with the sovereign.⁷⁷

As duke of Bavaria, Conrad’s predecessor, Henry II, had probably wielded more power than any other German duke before him, and for that very reason, he had been particularly keen as king and emperor to institute policies that would significantly curtail ducal authority. As a result, he not merely gained a freer hand in establishing Bamberg, which the emperor endowed with many properties appropriated from the royal and ducal holdings, but he also tapped a tendency among the Bavarian magnates to pursue an active role in provincial politics. Even though Henry II appears to have been the first duke since Arnulf “the Bad” in the early tenth century⁷⁸ to be either elected or at least acclaimed duke of Bavaria by the provincial magnates,⁷⁹ upon his royal coronation he declared that the Bavarians possessed the “ancient” right to elect their duke, thereby thwarting the rise of his presumptive successor, Margrave Henry of Schweinfurt.⁸⁰

In Bavaria and Swabia “the duke and ducal authority played an intimate role in the communal life of the region,”⁸¹ which is not to say that the Lotharingian magnates were either indifferent or even impotent when it came to eliciting a duke from the king. For example, it was on behalf of the regional nobility that Bishops Gerard of Cambrai and Balderic of Liège effected the reestablishment of the duchy of Lower Lotharingia in 1012. As a result, the counts of Verdun secured the ducal office for themselves, although their dynasty’s claim to the post would prove weaker than that of the dukes in Upper Lotharingia.⁸² The Lotharingian dukes were, however, the last to wrest recognition of their hereditary rights from the throne; the Bavarian, Swabian, and even Saxon ducal houses had already established their dynastic traditions in the tenth century.⁸³

The fact that “provincial law” served as an anchor for the ducal families is not incompatible with the notion that dukes exercised royal mandates over their provinces. The duke was a regional *vicarius imperii*, or vicar of the emperor, charged with executing the sovereign’s decrees and guaranteeing that the ruler would grant favors and immunities—in other words, preserve the *libertas imperialis*, or imperial liberty—within his ducal territory.⁸⁴ The duke was in a delicate position vis-à-vis the king because his administrative authority over the secular nobility—to say nothing of the ecclesiastical magnates—was not integral to his office. Thus, Duke Bernard II of Saxony made the

infuriating discovery during the reign of Henry III that Archbishop Adalbert of Bremen represented the emperor's "fifth column" in the duchy.⁸⁵ Moreover, the duchy was all too often squeezed between two opposing forces, that of "centralized authority and the power of the provincial nobility."⁸⁶ It should be noted that Conrad II and his son pursued significantly different policies depending on the duchy: Those of "upper" Germany—Swabia, Bavaria, and the latter's offshoot, Carinthia—were under the direct jurisdiction of the crown, with no regard for hereditary rights, while Lotharingia—reunited under the rule of a single duke—and Saxony remained under the authority of the indigenuous ducal families.⁸⁷

While the duchies north of the Alps and their cisalpine counterparts, the Italian margraviates, do not—at first glance at least—appear to be of "ancient" provenance, a review of the source material reveals that the duchies and margraviates that cropped up south of the Alps in the eleventh century were actually new—and the word has been chosen advisedly, because they were not renewed—entities based on foundations laid in the ninth and particularly tenth centuries by the Franks.⁸⁸ In his dealings with these comparatively recent institutions, Conrad showed his political stripes by jettisoning the old ways of doing things and thus preventing his hands from being tied by allegedly "ancient" conventions.⁸⁹ He apparently faced sharp political opposition from the dukes north of the Alps, to say nothing of the Italian margraves. Just the mere fact that even without their cooperation in 1024 Conrad's election was held in a legally binding manner and no anti-king stepped forward to challenge the results on either the state or regional level throws into stark relief the actual balance of power: The ducal and margravian wielders of intermediary authority in these kingdoms, provinces, and lands lacked the political will to act in concert and, in this case, muster and sustain opposition to the king.

Lotharingia

As a young man Conrad had participated in a feud against the then duke of Lower Lotharingia (1017); seven years later, Gozelo I, who had succeeded his father in 1023, probably bore the new king some attendant ill will, much as did Conrad's other former adversary, Adalbero of Carinthia.⁹⁰ However, it is unclear whether the memory of their past animosity was the determining factor in Gozelo's decision to act as the spokesman for the opposition in 1024, when he organized the resistance to Conrad's rule in his own duchy and sought to win the confidence of the Upper Lotharingians.⁹¹ While Gozelo obviously could count on the broad support of his own "people," he was not in the position to speak out against Conrad II in the name of all Lower Lotharingia and thus all Lotharingia. In the aftermath of the election at Kamba, his metropolitan bishop Pilgrim of Cologne took his part for no more than a few

days before making peace with Conrad II and Gisela. *Ezzo*, the count palatine of Lower Lotharingia, who headed the venerable household at Aachen and was the second most powerful lay prince in the entire duchy, never joined the opposition to the Salian king; in fact, this son-in-law of Emperor Otto II probably participated in the election in Kamba.⁹² The duke of Upper Lotharingia had sent his son Frederick II to Kamba, although the young man and his entourage withdrew from the proceedings without bidding farewell. Archbishop Poppo of Trier, the metropolitan of Upper Lotharingia, was clearly not a member of this party; as guardian to the young duke of Swabia, Ernest II, he is unlikely to have declined to participate in either the election or the coronation. The likelihood that Bishop Dietrich II of Metz attended is even greater, since he—in tandem with his brother Duke Henry V of Bavaria—was responsible for organizing, in aid of his sister, the widowed empress Cunigunde, the quick and orderly royal succession in the wake of his brother-in-law's death.⁹³

The Lotharingians were thus unable to put up a united front in the face of Conrad's royal progress through their territory in early summer 1024. Under the circumstances, it was merely a matter of time—and diplomacy—before both dukes and their entourages submitted to the king at Christmas 1025; Conrad had ensured the success of the negotiations by making substantial concessions to Gozelo and probably to the Upper Lotharingians as well.⁹⁴ In a countermove, the king confirmed the inheritability of both the Upper and the Lower Lotharingian ducal offices. As a result, Frederick III, grandson and son of the co-dukes and nephew of Gisela, succeeded to the duchy of Upper Lotharingia after the deaths of both Dietrich I and Frederick II in 1026/27—the exact dates are unknown. In 1033, upon his untimely demise without issue, at least sons, the office reverted to royal control, and Conrad II installed his successful and loyal—particularly given their commonality of interests since 1025—vassal Gozelo as the duke of Upper Lotharingia “at a most dangerous time for Lotharingia.”⁹⁵

Saxony

While preparations for the royal election were being laid during summer 1024, the Saxons held a provincial diet at Werla, their ancient place of assembly. The sole surviving evidence for the gathering is a concord concluded between Bishop Meinwerk of Paderborn and Count Dietmar, the brother of Duke Bernard II of Saxony. One may assume that the duke was there as well, consulting with the other attendees in formulating a response to the events unfolding along the Rhine River.⁹⁶ In any case, the vast majority of the Saxon magnates along with their duke skipped the election at Kamba, presumably because they had already reached a unanimous political decision to boycott the proceedings.

During the diet at Werla or—at the latest—an assembly at Hirtveldun on September 13, 1024, the Saxons obviously agreed to take the same tack as they had in 1002, which had consisted in recognizing and paying homage to Henry II in Merseburg under the leadership of the current duke's father, Bernard I. A reliable source recounts that in 1002, "with the consent of all[,] Duke Bernhard [I] stood before the king and revealed the will of the assembled people, expounding in particular the necessity and law of all," and at the same time asked Henry II "what he wished from compassion to promise them orally or to grant them by the deed." The assemblage included almost the entire Saxon episcopate, the margraves, the count palatine, and other counts, even Bolesław of Poland. For his part, Henry II made a number of guarantees, most notably confirming the Saxon tribal code, whereupon Bernard "grasped the" Holy Lance "and faithfully committed the care of the kingdom to him."⁹⁷

No comparably detailed description exists of the rituals performed at Minden on Christmas 1024, although Conrad's biographer did make telling reference to the Saxons' demand for confirmation of their law code, which the south German Wipo describes as "very cruel."⁹⁸ There is documentary evidence only for Duke Bernard's presence at the diet in the new king's honor,⁹⁹ but the behavior of the Saxons was doubtlessly comparable to that of their predecessors in 1002.¹⁰⁰ The Salian electee, in turn, modeled his actions entirely on those of his predecessor and orchestrated the acknowledgment of his sovereignty accordingly: Just as Henry II had established ties with the sisters of the deceased Otto III, Sophie of Gandersheim and Adelheid of Quedlinburg, so, too, Conrad II paid his respects to these most influential abbesses—their support having played as pivotal a role in his accession to the throne as it had in his predecessor's twenty-two years earlier—immediately upon reaching Saxon soil. Just as some Saxon magnates had traveled south in 1002 to negotiate with the new king, so, too, some Saxon princes were probably among the electors at Kamba in 1024. Wipo avers as much,¹⁰¹ in a possible reference to Margrave Ekkehard of Meissen and Count Hermann, whose brother, Archbishop Gunther of Salzburg, is known to have attended the assembly; furthermore, neither nobleman appears among the participants in the provincial diet at Werla or the assembly at Hirtveldun.¹⁰²

From the royal perspective, Bernard II was the foremost Saxon magnate, yet he acted as neither a mediating force nor an intermediary authority between the king and the Saxon people. Besides the duke, there were in fact numerous functionaries on whom Conrad could draw as needed to attend to "the governance of these provinces," either in concert with or following upon the duke's lead. From the ducal perspective, however, Bernard occupied a unique position in Saxony and performed his functions as he saw fit, free of royal oversight. A particularly reliable, though somewhat younger source supports this contention in an account of the situation on the border between Saxony

and the Slavs during the 1030s: “The archbishop [Liawizo II of Hamburg-Bremen (1029–32)] frequently visited the metropolis of Hamburg. Because of the valor of Canute [Cnut], the king, and of Bernhard, the duke, there was at that time a firm peace beyond the Elbe, since Caesar [Conrad] also had reduced the Winuli [Wends] by war.” As noted in a separate addendum: “The Emperor Conrad led his army against the Slavs for several years, and for this reason there was great peace beyond the Elbe.”¹⁰³

When Gottschalk, prince of the Abodrites, cruelly violated the peace in 1029, the Saxon duke determined his response not in the manner of a royal agent entrusted with “the governance of these provinces.” Instead, he exercised his own judgment after taking counsel with the Saxons, the Slavs, and the other peoples of the north. Gottschalk, a former student at the monastery of Lüneburg, had ruthlessly attacked the Saxons in revenge for his father’s murder by one of their number, but in the end he was captured by Bernard, who in spite of all “respected him as a man of great bravery, . . . made an alliance with him, and let him go.” Gottschalk departed for England, where he became a *huscarl*, or bodyguard, for King Cnut the Great, and ultimately, enlightened by his Christian faith, returned to his homeland. In common cause with the Saxon duke and the church at Hamburg, he made such progress converting the Abodrites that he was equated with Charlemagne and Otto the Great. Bernard II may have used the episode with Gottschalk as an excuse for not participating in Conrad’s military campaign in Poland that same year.¹⁰⁴

The duke of Saxony died in early summer 1059, after having outlived both Conrad II and Henry III and, as one chronicler noted, having “vigorously administered the affairs of the Slavs and the Nordalbingians, and our own,” for many decades; neither an emperor nor a king is mentioned in this context. Much the same was true for Bernard’s son Ordulf, except that he was no hero and lost all of his wars against the Slavs, becoming in the end the laughingstock of his own people. His ineptitude was certainly attributable to more than the appearance of Halley’s Comet, even though this cosmic phenomenon was associated with the ill fortune suffered by his more famous contemporary King Harold II of England in 1066, as evidenced by that magnificent panel in the renowned Bayeux tapestries.¹⁰⁵

As can be seen from a case in Magdeburg on July 1, 1028, Conrad could be called upon to render judgment—with Bernard’s assistance—in a Saxon legal matter, but only if he already happened to be in the duchy and not merely occupied on the eastern battlefield. The notice of the court’s findings contains the customary list of witnesses, in this instance headed by Bernard II, the most senior of the lay princes, thus preceding even Adalbero of Carinthia and Ernest II of Swabia. As informative as this ducal list may be, the inclusion of these two southern dukes, who had fittingly accompanied their sovereign to the north, is not unusual, since these two intimate advisors to the

king often ventured far from their "provinces."¹⁰⁶ Bernard, on the other hand, is not known ever to have left Saxony—except on forays eastward—or to have led Saxon troops beyond his borders, to say nothing of going to Italy or Burgundy. Yet, the emperor and the duke clearly respected one another, if mostly from a distance. As a result, "Conrad II was the only eleventh-century sovereign against whom, as far as is known, the Saxon upper nobility did not mount strong opposition or an open revolt." An alleged plot to murder the ruler was nothing more than an unsuccessful ruse to get rid of two Saxon nobles. In contrast, a member of the Billung family probably did plan to murder Conrad's son, Emperor Henry III.¹⁰⁷ Conrad enjoyed a comparatively good relationship with the Saxons: On the one hand, the realm's "eastward enlargement"—to borrow a phrase from recent European history—provided them with ample common interests, and, on the other, the Ekkehard family, which was related to the Billung dukes, had from the very start been allied with the Salian ruler. Conrad II and Gisela are even listed in the "Lüneburg necrology, which was compiled from the vantage point of the Billung family." Yet, there are no grounds for saying that the Saxons grieved inconsolably upon hearing of the sovereign's death.¹⁰⁸

Bavaria, Swabia, and Carinthia

In 1004 Emperor Henry II, "with the approval of all present, gave a banner-lance, which signified the Duchy of Bavaria, to Henry, his vassal and brother-in-law." The new duke probably was seated on the Latron (Lateran), which was the Bavarian duke's stone seat. The emperor removed Henry V from office five years later but, at the active encouragement of his wife, Cunigunde, reenfeoffed his brother-in-law with the duchy in 1017. At the reinstatement ceremony in early summer 1018, the empress "enthroned her brother Henry as duke of Bavaria."¹⁰⁹ Following the death of Duke Henry V in 1026, the office remained vacant for more than one year. Upon returning from his imperial coronation in Rome, Conrad II arranged for the Bavarian magnates to elect his son, Henry III, as their duke in Regensburg on June 24, 1027.¹¹⁰ This was but the first step in the young man's accrual of ducal authority over southern Germany; the duchies of Swabia and Carinthia came under his control in 1038 and 1039, respectively, the latter soon after his accession to the throne.¹¹¹ With regard to Bavaria, Henry could cite the magnates' "ancient" right of election—or, better yet, affirmation—as legitimizing his rule.¹¹² Furthermore, the young Salian's claim to the office was supported by hereditary law: Except for the Hungarian pretender to the throne, Henry II's nephew Emeric,¹¹³ Henry III was next in line, since he was a distant relative of the childless former emperor and no one could lawfully inherit the office from Henry V. Both Henry II and Henry III were descendants of the Saxon royal

dynasty's founder, Henry I; Emperor Henry II, the last of the Saxon line, was his great-grandson, whereas the young Salian Henry III was his great-great-grandson. It is possible that Conrad's choice of a tutor and guardian for his son in 1026 reflected his concern for the boy's hereditary as well as long-term interests, since Bishop Bruno of Augsburg was the brother of Henry II. In other words, it seems that even before his departure for Rome and during Henry V's lifetime, Conrad was already preparing for his son's succession to the ducal office in Bavaria.¹¹⁴

In the case of Bavaria Conrad II overrode what were perhaps the stronger hereditary claims of the Hungarian prince Emeric; when it came to Swabia, however, the sovereign strictly adhered to the laws of inheritance: After the death of the rebellious—and childless—Ernest II, the duchy passed to his younger brother, Hermann IV, and after the latter died, in 1038, also without issue, their half brother and Gisela's remaining son, Henry III, succeeded to the office.¹¹⁵

The imperial policy toward Carinthia during Conrad's reign—and then his son's—was primarily shaped by the principle of hereditary. Henry II had seized the opportunity presented by Duke Conrad's death, in 1011, to deprive the duke's son, Conrad the Younger, of his claim. The emperor's enfeoffment of Adalbero of Eppenstein with the duchy in 1012 was not a gross violation of hereditary law, however, since his appointee was, after all, the dead duke's brother-in-law and husband of the boy's maternal aunt.¹¹⁶ Adalbero's removal from office in 1035 cleared the way for the restoration of direct succession in the duchy. Conrad II used the occasion to strip the territory of its march, a move best understood in conjunction with his experience in Swabia. In both cases, Conrad drastically curtailed the resources of a duchy that had served as a power base for a rebellious duke, before entrusting it to the rightful heir. The emperor resolved the issue of Carinthia by granting the duchy proper to Conrad the Younger but the march to a count, Arnold of Wels-Lambach. This measure indicates just how comparable in rank and power the German margraves were to the German dukes; moreover, it should be noted that Conrad the Younger was forced to wait almost nine months before receiving his legacy, while Count Arnold assumed office in the immediate wake of Adalbero's deposition, on March 18, 1035. The discrepancy is a clear indication that Conrad II kept his political options open and adopted the "right" solution only after engaging in lengthy negotiations.

Was he already weighing the possibility of appointing his son? That is a valid question, although it belies a knowledge of future events and probably gives too short a shrift to the state of affairs at the time. In 1036 there was every reason to believe that the new duke could be relied upon to perpetuate the ducal line of Worms. How could Conrad II possibly have foreseen that a mere three years later, first he, then his cousin Conrad of Carinthia, whom he

had installed as duke only after much hesitancy, and finally Adalbero of Eppenstein, the deposed holder of that office, would all come to their final rest?¹¹⁷ Whether or not Conrad spent the months following the diet at Bamberg on May 18, 1035, eyeing the prospect of investing Henry III with the duchy, by the end of 1039 the emperor's "only son" was yet again next in the line of succession. Following the deaths of Conrad the Younger and Emperor Conrad in 1039, Henry III kept the duchy of Carinthia, and as far as is known, the magnates did not oppose his decision to assert his hereditary claim.¹¹⁸

Italy: Margraves and Royal Emissaries

Given the disparities in their structures, only limited comparisons can be drawn between the duchies in Germany and the margraviates in northern Italy, including Tuscany. However, just as the dukes were the preeminent lay princes in the East Frankish–German kingdom, so the margraves were the chief secular nobles in northern and central Italy, while the amount of power and influence wielded by counts varied on both sides of the Alps. Only in Italy were there still royal emissaries, who were termed *missi dominici* [emissaries of the lord], *missi regales vel imperiales* [royal or imperial emissaries], or *missi sacri palatii* [emissaries of the holy palace].¹¹⁹ The primarily juridical duties of the office could be bestowed upon a regional or local secular or ecclesiastical magnate¹²⁰ or entrusted to an outside appointee. The latter approach, which dated back to the Carolingians, was clearly in the interests of those subject to royal purview, which accounts for the office's continued—if peculiarly ad hoc—existence.¹²¹ Thus, lower *valvassores* could submit judicial matters to the competency of either their feudal lord's court or the royal emissary.¹²² When the proimperial monastery of Leno, in the archdiocese of Milan, sought an emissary's authorization for its investiture with a property whose status was not entirely beyond dispute, Conrad sent no less than his cousin Bruno, the court chaplain, soon-to-be chancellor for Italy (1027–34), and future bishop of Würzburg (1034–45).¹²³

As evident from two surviving judicial protocols from February 1038, the confluence of regional and extraregional elements created a system of checks and balances whose proper functioning was clearly in the interests of all involved. The cases were brought by the bishop and the cathedral chapter of Lucca, which, respectively, submitted their claims to a court convened in a residence of the regional administrator, Margrave Boniface of Tuscany, and presided over by the chief royal emissary and chancellor for Italy, Bishop Kadeloh of Naumburg. The court met twice in the presence of the emperor, as well as the regional counts, various palatine judges, a notary, and the imperial judge Flaibert, who was also one of Margrave Boniface's advocates, in order to establish "unimpeachably" the proprietary rights of the two Luccan

claimants. From the extant records, it is clear that all of the parties, including the bishop and the cathedral chapter of Lucca and their advocates, had of necessity cooperated in the formal proceedings; the involvement of a royal emissary empowered to exercise the royal ban imparted even greater legal weight to the judgment.¹²⁴

While Conrad laid the groundwork in late winter 1026 for his accession to the Lombard throne and the attendant imperial coronation in Rome, the margraves—except for the house of Canossa in Tuscany—mounted very stiff opposition, attempted to install an Italian anti-king, and then had to be pacified one by one as all of their efforts came to naught.¹²⁵ When the emperor declared himself ready to return to Italy in 1036, it was at the urging of those very same Italian princes—and not just the “ever loyal” Boniface, margrave of Canossa since 1032—who had in the interim become his closest allies. In the course of his first expedition to Italy, Conrad had made it quite clear that he had no intention of perpetuating his predecessor’s policy of providing sustained support for the bishops’ attempts to recoup their authority.¹²⁶ Although this message was directed primarily at the noncomital vassals, Conrad won over their secular lords with different measures, like the promotion of intermarriage between the Italian margravian families and the German princely and ducal houses. This policy served not only to accentuate the commonality of upper-class interests on both sides of the Alps but also to introduce a modicum of uniformity into the institutions these magnates represented. That the Salian ruler adhered to this policy provides perhaps the strongest argument against the contention that he planned to undermine the duchies and for the most part bypass the margraviates. In fact, Conrad did exactly the opposite, which is not to say that he did not seek to impede the rise of largely autonomous intermediaries wielding quasi-monarchical authority: For the good of the kingdom—and his line—Conrad strove to integrate the uppermost “provincial” institutions and their functionaries. Hence, seemingly contradictory measures—like promoting the establishment of a network of duchies from Swabia all the way to the margraviate of Tuscany while “accruing” duchies in southern Germany for his son—were congruous expressions of his policy.¹²⁷

3. The Crown Properties, or Royal Fisc

Even though Conrad attempted to disentangle—or at least distinguish—his familial property from the royal fisc,¹²⁸ he made very little progress on that score. Typically, whenever a new king and queen acceded to the throne, their holdings became the property of the crown, a practice that only posed a problem when a new dynasty assumed the reins of governance during the lifetime of a dowager queen. This is just what happened in 1024: Empress Cunigunde

had "outlived" Henry II and held an all too valuable widow's portion consisting for the most part of crown properties in Bavaria, of which she had once been the duchess.¹²⁹ Look in any comprehensive German historical atlas, and you will find a colorful map of the Salian royal fisc; stretching from the coast of the North Sea to the banks of the Danube River,¹³⁰ its broad expanse is covered with a profusion of contrasting dots that represent Salian familial holdings as documented by active local and regional researchers. A critical review of their data drawn directly or indirectly from documentary sources—grants of crown properties, as well as juridical determinations and confiscations—exposes the limitations of such a map: It is not so much a snapshot as a photographic negative of a bygone reality. The sources specify the exact locations of the income-producing properties, but they do not indicate the status of abutting areas, which may or may not have belonged to the royal fisc. In spite of the gaps in the historical record, however, it still appears that even the first Salian sovereign controlled a significant economic base in the kingdom; his son, Henry III, was said to possess "the vast wealth of his realm."¹³¹

"Given the economic, technological, social, and political conditions of the age, ruling from the saddle allowed the monarch to keep his organizational options open in the promotion of efficiency. An itinerant kingship possessed great advantages when it came to providing for the court's needs. The Ottonian and Salian rulers had only limited monetary resources at their disposal. . . . The only way the king could be assured of obtaining lodging and material support from the church was to take up residence at or near the bishoprics and cloisters obligated to perform those services. . . . Hence, the large royal landholdings constituting the crown properties, or royal fisc, provided the material basis of the monarchy. . . . The most important and most extensive portions of the royal domain served as 'mensal land' directly provisioning the ruler's court. Given the limited capacity for transporting goods, it was more practical to consume the surplus agricultural production of the royal domain on site than to ship [foodstuffs] long distances to the site of the royal court."¹³² Little monetary gain was to be had from grain, which was difficult to transport, except perhaps by ship,¹³³ or meat, dairy products, eggs, and lards, which did not travel well at all; their value lay in their consumption, provided that these foodstuffs could be delivered to the kitchen of one of the royal palaces.

What measures did Conrad II take to use, develop, and expand the crown holdings? To recoup possessions, he expended a great deal of effort in late June 1027 convening a diet charged with inventorying all the crown properties in Bavaria, but the proceedings are not known to have been successful in any immediate sense.¹³⁴ Even though the emperor was apparently stymied in his efforts to take radical and geographically broad action, the failure does not seem to have induced him to abandon his goals completely. Jettisoning the

sweeping approach that marked his first German court diet as emperor, Conrad adopted a more measured policy. For example, a diploma issued in 1029 de facto reinstated direct imperial authority over the nuns of Obermünster in Regensburg, but refrained from making any explicit claims to that effect and thus directly challenging the regional magnates' privileges.¹³⁵ Conrad II handled the issue of Cunigunde's widow's portion in a similarly single-minded, yet politically savvy manner by quitting the court diet in Regensburg before the Bavarian "fans" of the former duchess and empress could stage an elaborate ceremony reaffirming her economic base (May 1025). When Henry III became the duke of Bavaria two years later, however, the event's value proved fleeting: Except for some properties that the dioceses of Salzburg and Freising held by means of *precaria*—a particularly apt legal term for agreements that the grantor could revoke at will—the duchy was already deemed part of the royal fisc and—fortunately—available for the young duke's use. Following Cunigunde's death in 1033, Conrad recognized only a few of her lesser grants.¹³⁶

Overall, Conrad II showed great care when bestowing crown properties. Donations that at first glance seem to have been quite generous are revealed upon closer examination to have been more like quid pro quos, as the "beneficiaries" of his largesse—like Bishop Egilbert of Freising, upon the completion of his guardianship over Henry III,¹³⁷ or Archbishop Meinwerk of Paderborn, upon the performance of unparalleled services on behalf of the kingdom¹³⁸—could very well have attested.¹³⁹ Even the most exalted lay princes and bishops paid dearly to regain the sovereign's favor, as did anyone seeking an unusual boon. To cite just a few examples: As part of his reconciliation with the emperor in 1027, Conrad the Younger had to cede Bruchsal and the forest of Lusshardt. To gain his stepfather's forgiveness, Duke Ernest II of Swabia probably had to relinquish the abbey of Weissenburg in the Nordgau of Bavaria.¹⁴⁰ In the summer of 1037 the emperor took Poppo of Aquileia back into his good graces only after the patriarch had transferred a considerable amount of property to the bishopric of Cittanuova.¹⁴¹ Udo of Katlenburg and his wife, Bertrada/Beatrix, apparently paid a great deal of money for a privilege that confirmed his investment with an imperial fief and—probably for the first time in German history—the hereditary rights of both their male and female heirs.¹⁴²

Land obtained by the emperor through conquest or legal confiscation was crown property. Conrad II was no conqueror, but he availed himself of every possible legal avenue to augment the royal holdings, as evidenced by the number of properties awarded to the crown by a court or forfeited as a penalty for breaking the law. After all, as the sovereign noted in a decree issued in Italy, the *lex omnium gentium*, or law of all peoples—that is, natural law—prescribed that individuals guilty of lèse majesté surrender their possessions to the crown.¹⁴³ A well-connected noblewoman named Emma—sister of Meinwerk of Paderborn, longtime widow of Count Liudgar (who was the brother of Duke

Bernard I), kinswoman of Archbishop Unwan of Hamburg-Bremen, and member of a noble Saxon family group known today as the Immedings¹⁴⁴—bequeathed much of her property to the diocese of Bremen and some to her Billung in-laws. Conrad, however, confiscated the crown jewel of her holdings—the demesne of Lesum on the Wimme River near Bremen, encompassing seven hundred hides of land—on the grounds that Emma’s daughter, clearly the sole legitimate heir, had through some “fault” abrogated the right to her legacy. An account of this incident is found in a chronicle by Adam of Bremen, whose phrasing implies a certain coolness toward—if not displeasure over—the emperor’s dealings. Contrary to what some have written, the Billung and Immeding families did not accept this massive confiscation with equanimity.¹⁴⁵ Adam claims that Henry III journeyed to Bremen at the invitation of Archbishop Adalbert thirteen years later (1047), with the ostensible intention of proceeding to Lesum and meeting with King Swein of Denmark, but actually in order “to test the [Saxon] dukes’ loyalty.” Why the one should exclude the other is not specified. In any case, Henry III visited Lesum, where Count Thietmar—brother of Duke Bernard II, nephew of Countess Emma, and member of the Billung family—lay in ambush; the attack was thwarted, however, thanks to Adalbert’s foresight. In order to clear himself, Count Thietmar engaged in a judicial duel against a vassal of the Billung family; this perfidious twist was clearly the emperor’s doing. The vassal killed Thietmar but was then seized and put to death by the count’s son in a manner as gruesome as it was ignominious: The vassal was “hanged by the legs between two dogs until he died.” In meting out this archaic public humiliation, the vengeful son struck back at the duel’s victor, who served as a proxy for the inimical Salian Henry III and his archiepiscopal accomplice, even—by extension—Adalbert’s predecessor, Archbishop Bezelin, who in 1038 had accompanied Empress Gisela to Lesum so that she could invest the crown with the property in her husband’s name.¹⁴⁶

On the demise of the recipients, the sovereign “inherited” all royal fiefs or crown properties that had been bestowed upon individuals lacking either the legal standing to bequeath holdings or legally recognizable heirs.¹⁴⁷ The detailed history of one such legacy may be gleaned from two original diplomas corroborated by a biography of Bishop Meinwerk of Paderborn: Count Ha(h)old of Westphalia entered into a dowerless “marriage” with a daughter of a count named Bernard; their union produced a son who was—as customary—named after his maternal grandfather. When Count Hahold died, in 1011, his illegitimate son succeeded to the comital office, which was still known by his father’s name. Bernard passed away no later than the first half of 1030, whereupon the emperor inherited the county because the deceased “had been a bastard, or what is termed *wanburtich* [of questionable birth] in the vernacular.” Furthermore, only the emperor could inherit the possessions

of Bernard's full sister Hazecha.¹⁴⁸ This was not the end of it, however. One of Hahold's noble vassals had been induced by false promises to relinquish an allod to his feudal lord without the consent of his lawful heir. The deceitful count had then bestowed the property on his common-law wife as a morning gift. Many years later—both the feudal lord and the vassal whom he had defrauded were dead, as was the illegitimate son, Bernard, whose responsibility it would have been to protect his mother's legal interests—the noble vassal's mother lodged a formal complaint against the unlawful proprietress of her ancestral land in the royal court, which included three Westphalian counts whose names have been recorded. Conrad II was moved by pity, Gisela intervened on the woman's behalf, the three Saxon counts weighed in with their counsel, and the mother of the naïve vassal regained her rights and her son's bequeathal.¹⁴⁹

The sovereign did not inherit this particular parcel of land, because it was neither a royal fief nor a crown property, but there is evidence for his acquisition of properties that were. Most were located in northern Germany, although some were in the regions of Speyer, Lower Lotharingia, and Bavaria, where Conrad often enlisted the aid of the courts.¹⁵⁰ None of these cases involved more than ten hides of land,¹⁵¹ making the seven hundred hides at Lesum a striking exception to the rule. Similar penalties were levied against individuals—like Werner of Kyburg and his ilk—who rebelled against the kingdom or committed *lèse majesté*.¹⁵² Sometimes the inheritance was “untainted,” as it were: The death of Conrad's distant kinsman Otto of Hammerstein in 1036 spelled the demise of that line, and all of Otto's possessions, including the castle that had provided his toponym, reverted to the crown.¹⁵³ Sometimes it was even possible for a defendant with means to purchase a reprieve from the court.¹⁵⁴ The reason information has survived concerning Conrad's successful attempts at enlarging his kingdom is the seemingly paradoxical use to which he put these gains: The emperor turned around and granted most of these properties to the church, to no small measure to settle conflicts and set a good example for others.



Part Four

FOREIGN POLICY

BILATERAL DIPLOMACY: THE IMPERIAL EMBASSY
TO CONSTANTINOPLE (1027–29)

Werner of Strasbourg, the most senior and respected suffragan bishop of the archdiocese of Mainz, occupied an exalted position at the synod at Frankfurt (September 23–24, 1027) and even took a formal stand against his own metropolitan during the debate over Gandersheim.¹ Although preliminary discussions or even negotiations likely preceded the synod, Archbishop Aribio must not have accepted the situation with good grace, given the other breaches in decorum he was made to suffer.² Werner was a particularly close confidant of the emperor and, thus, surely acted as Conrad's mouthpiece at the synod. Soon afterward, he was again recruited by the emperor, this time to lead an important embassy to Constantinople for the purpose of arranging a marriage between the venerable Macedonian dynasty and the recently installed Salian dynasty in the West.

It was a normal part of the diplomatic give-and-take between the West and the East to dispatch an embassy, since the newly crowned emperor had to establish relations with Byzantium and thereby receive confirmation of the status quo instituted under the Saxon emperors. Tradition also dictated that Conrad II attempt to forge a matrimonial alliance with the Eastern Empire. The last such match had foundered a quarter of a century earlier, when the young Byzantine princess affianced to Otto III had abruptly set sail for home from Bari upon hearing of his death.

Bishop Werner had accompanied Conrad II on his first expedition to Italy and participated in the imperial coronation. While in Rome, he assisted the emperor with some important matters of state (April 4 and 6, 1027) and some weeks later played a similar role in San Zeno, near Verona (May 19, 1027). The bishop of Strasbourg was one of the most distinguished imperial bishops of his time: A former member of the court chapel, he had been tapped for the bishopric of Strasbourg by Otto III in 1001, and his friendship with Emperor Henry II dated back to their youth. Contrary to a genealogy composed at the monastery of Muri in commemoration of its founder, Werner

was neither an early nor indeed the first Hapsburg. In addition to having been an intimate of the two last Saxon rulers, the bishop immediately became one of the Salian king's three most important and exalted advisors.³ The appointment of such an eminent figure indicates that Conrad intended to assemble as prestigious an embassy as possible. Bishop Werner was joined by Bishop Branthog of Halberstadt (1023–36), who chose to go into exile on a diplomatic mission as a form of protest against the depredations committed against his chapter; unlike his fellow ecclesiastic, he would live to tell the tale of his adventures among the Greeks. Count Manegold of Donauwörth in Swabia held the highest rank among the secular participants.⁴

The two leaders of the embassy—Werner and Manegold—decided to travel eastward along the Danube on an ancient pilgrimage route to Jerusalem only recently reopened by Saint Stephen, king of Hungary, after a decades-long hiatus. This ruler had reaped the official recognition and gratitude of all of Europe not just for drastically reducing the threat of attack by robber bands but also for subsidizing pilgrims and even bestowing valuable gifts upon those of higher rank. Even travelers setting out from northern Italy immediately favored the land route to the East, although the “customary sea route” remained more popular for the return trip. Pilgrims departed in autumn, traveled downriver as far as Belgrade, and then proceeded via Niš (in present-day Serbia) to Constantinople and the East. After celebrating Easter in Jerusalem, they made the return trip by boat during—ideally—the most pleasant time of year. According to one extent itinerary, a group that left Angoulême, in eastern France, on October 1, 1026, arrived in Jerusalem the first week of March and returned home the third week of June 1027.⁵ Hence, taking the land route enabled pilgrims to the Holy Land to complete the round trip in less than one year, avoid the austral summer heat, and still celebrate the resurrection in its original setting. Making the round-trip by ship was comparatively more time-consuming, since sea voyages were not normally undertaken between November 10 and March 10; Venice prohibited ships from putting out to sea between November 15 and January 10 as late as the sixteenth century. Due to this so-called *mare clausum*, or closure of the sea, during winter, pilgrims taking the maritime route who wished to celebrate Easter in Jerusalem were forced to spend two periods of potentially hot weather—one in each direction—aboard a ship. Hence, people much preferred taking the reopened land route to the East, since, after all, the less time one spent in travel, the greater one's chances of surviving the trip.⁶

Bishop Werner, Count Manegold, and the members of their entourage departed in autumn 1027 on what was billed as a pilgrimage to Jerusalem; they were either being disingenuous or honestly hoping to travel on to the Holy Land, which was probably true for the bishop of Strasbourg at least. King Stephen's political interests took precedence over his generous impulses, however:

From 1015 to 1018, the king of Hungary had contributed troops to the Byzantines' subjugation of Bulgaria and then (ca. 1020) married off his son—and heir apparent—Emeric to a Byzantine princess. In fact, Basil II had been so successful as a “Bulgar-slayer” that Hungary came to share a border with the Eastern Empire, whose idea of neighborliness included launching an extraordinarily successful naval attack against Croatia from the port of Bari in 1024. King Stephen I was confronted not just by the threat of a growing imperial power to his southeast but also by the expanding influence of the imperial power to his west. Soon after acceding to the royal throne, Conrad II had taken an inimical stance toward Venice, which—but for some unwelcome interruptions—was ruled by Stephen's brother-in-law, the doge Otto Orseolo. The revival of diplomatic ties between the two empires posed a dangerous threat to Hungarian interests, and thus, in a logical move to forestall his marginalization, Stephen refused to recognize the German emissaries as pilgrims and prohibited their passage through his kingdom.⁷

Bishop Werner and Count Manegold had no alternative but to make a detour and take the dreaded sea route. Abandoning the Danube, they would have journeyed south to Venice, sailed across the Adriatic Sea to Dyrrachium (Durrës in present-day Albania), and followed the ancient Via Egnatia to Thessaloníki and then on to Kaválla, from which they could sail across the Aegean Sea to Constantinople. Another alternative would have been to make the entire journey by sea, but this is less likely, since that would have meant circumnavigating the Greek peninsula, which was a risky business given the *meltemi*, a strong northwestern wind that visited the area in the summer, and the craggy coastlines below Mounts Pelion and Athos, not to mention the dangers posed by the Peloponnese in the first place. Liudprand of Cremona, who was sent to Constantinople by Otto I, recounted that he began his return journey on a “boat,” but reached the town of Návpektos, at the mouth of the Gulf of Corinth, “after forty-nine days of ass riding, walking, [and] horse riding.” Since it was already late in the season, the journey by ship from there to Patras, Levkás, Corfu, and probably Otranto, in Italy, would have been arduous and time-consuming; forty-five days elapsed between Liudprand's departures from Návpektos and Corfu, since he was forced to make some lengthy involuntary layovers.⁸

Conrad's embassy journeyed “through Bavaria,” which suggests that they were planning on using the Brenner Pass to cross the Alps; all of the more easterly passes within their reach were located in a region that even then was not considered Bavarian, but subject to the “duke of the Istrians and Carinthians.” Wipo notes that the embassy “tarried much about the territorial bounds of (the march of) Verona,” a further indication that they had journeyed over the Brenner Pass, and then “reached with very great labor the Adriatic Sea through Venice.” Among the travelers' great hardships was “a calamitous sea voyage,”

but since Wipo does not specify when they crossed the Adriatic, it is impossible to know whether that was due to the very early date at which they set sail or a late end to the foul wintry weather. The preceding leg of the journey—across the Alps to the border between Verona and Venice—must have gone smoothly enough, since the long wait for permission to enter Venice marked the beginning of the embassy's difficulties. Repeatedly denied admittance, the emissaries were forced to spend a considerable amount of time in the borderlands and expend a "very great labor" to overcome, not the forces of nature, but the angry backlash to the anti-Venetian pronouncements of a synod convened at the Lateran in 1027 at Conrad's behest and attended by Bishop Werner.⁹

It is not known when the embassy finally made landfall in Constantinople, although it is definitely known that its leader, the bishop of Strasbourg, died there on October 28, 1028, long after the embassy's honorable reception. Werner may have entertained thoughts of making good, if perhaps belatedly, on his original plan to go on a pilgrimage "to Jerusalem with the assistance of the emperor" Constantine VIII. Did he plan on meeting up with Archbishop Poppo of Trier,¹⁰ or were the two trips to the Holy Land totally unrelated?

The embassy's mission was to establish and ensure good relations between the West and the East by means of a matrimonial alliance. The emissaries were forearmed with the knowledge that the mighty Macedonian dynasty had already outlived its heyday and that Constantine VIII had no male heirs, only three daughters on whose purple-robed shoulders rested a legacy of greatness. None of them, however, was a proper match for Henry III, who had just celebrated his tenth birthday. Eudokia, the oldest, had been so disfigured by smallpox that she had taken the veil; Zoë, the fifty-year-old middle sister, had devoted her life to the pursuit of pleasure; and Theodora, the youngest, refused to marry, perhaps because she was the Byzantine princess formerly affianced to Otto III and thus had forsworn marriage. Their elderly father had assumed sole rule upon the death of his accomplished brother Basil II in 1025, but he remained as phlegmatic as ever and paid no heed to the question of succession until he was at death's door; needless to say, Conrad's aspirations were of no concern to him. Thus, when the Western ruler expressed the wish to secure a "daughter of the emperor" for his son,¹¹ he cannot have had any of the Byzantine princesses in mind, since Conrad would have known enough about the situation at the Macedonian court to dismiss the three outright as potential parties to the continuity of the Salian dynasty. Under the circumstances, the only alternative was to find an acceptable bride for the young king among the Eastern ruler's kinswomen, as had been done decades earlier when Theophanu was secured for Otto II.

Just two weeks after Bishop Werner died, Emperor Constantine VIII took to his deathbed. Before breathing his last, he appointed Zoë empress and on November 12, 1028, swiftly married her off to her sixty-year-old cousin

Romanus III Argyrus, who had been threatened with having his eyes put out if he did not repudiate his wife. Still at the Byzantine court, the surviving members of the German embassy would have witnessed the entire affair.¹²

One can only speculate when and under what circumstances Count Manegold and the members of his entourage departed for home. If they took the sea route, as was customary, then they would not have set sail before spring 1029. There is no evidence for Manegold's renewed presence in northern Germany in the second half of January 1030, by which time he could have spent many weeks—if not months—at home on the upper Danube. Conrad II celebrated Christmas 1029 in Paderborn and, judging from an imperial diploma issued there on New Year's Day 1030, stayed on to fulfill his liturgical duties.¹³ While the privilege granted to Manegold was drawn up on January 17, 1030, in Dortmund, it may be yet another example of what was a common enough occurrence during Conrad's reign, the issuance of a diploma recording a legal transaction subsequent to its conclusion. If so, Manegold may have received the grant in Paderborn while celebrating the Feast of the Nativity with Conrad and Gisela and then accompanied the imperial couple westward as they resumed their travels.¹⁴

The count is the central character in a singular work written for the abbot of Donauwörth by one of his monks during a visit to Constantinople in the early twelfth century. Brother Berthold's account of his experiences is richly embellished with the stories of other visitors to Byzantium, including Manegold, who is depicted as a most circumspect individual and the fully accountable leader of the delegation, and the count's traveling companion, the bishop of Strasbourg, who comes in for some criticism. The Swabian count received such positive treatment because during his stay he had acquired a *staurotheca*, a reliquary containing a fragment of the True Cross, which he promptly sent home, and upon his return founded the monastery of the Holy Cross in Donauwörth to serve as its repository.¹⁵

From Berthold's perspective the embassy had been a complete success, since the translation of the "the holy and life-giving cross of Christ," to which the monastery at Donauwörth traced its foundation, was much more important than securing a mere profane princess, no matter how venerable her lineage. As it happens, it was also a success from Conrad's perspective, since Constantine's successor, Romanus III, had acknowledged his imperial status. A Byzantine embassy was dispatched to deliver a "golden epistle" to that effect, as well as many relics, including another fragment of the True Cross, thus setting in motion a transfer of holy items of perhaps even greater and longer-lasting impact than the translation of the fragment to Donauwörth. Conrad bestowed some of the relics upon his mother, Adelheid, who later donated them to the collegiate church of Öhringen, of which she was a founding benefactress, and may have consigned the fragment of the True Cross to the

imperial treasury.¹⁶ Conrad II would have considered Manegold's embassy to Constantinople a success for all of these reasons and more, given the emperor's tendency to define his policies retrospectively to fit the "successful" results. The count of Donauwörth received a significant token of the emperor's favor "in recognition of his steadfast and devoted service," a phrase that encapsulates the sovereign's satisfaction with his emissary. To all appearances, the balance of power between the West and the East, which had first been struck during the Ottonian period, was unequivocally confirmed.¹⁷

In light of the foregoing, why did the embassy to Constantinople spark such a negative reaction in Wipo,¹⁸ even though its spiritual leader had been none other than the bishop of Strasbourg, a prominent royal advisor for whom he had expressed the highest praise?¹⁹ First of all, it may have been because he subscribed to the traditional Ottonian and early Salian antipathy for Byzantium born of the conflict in southern Italy and therefore had such a negative opinion of "the Greeks." Elsewhere Wipo notes that "the Normans, who, compelled by some necessity or other, had flocked together" in southern Italy after having left their homeland, were appropriately employed by Conrad II "to defend the borders of the realm against the treachery of the Greeks."²⁰ His account of the embassy to Constantinople in 1027 is not merely detached and cool in tone but also critical—if indirectly—of Conrad himself, which suggests a second reason for his negative reaction: Like many other Westerners, Wipo held Saint Stephen of Hungary in extremely high regard, and yet the embassy was out to hoodwink the very king who aspired to show generosity to all pilgrims! Werner of Strasbourg and the members of his entourage alleged that they were on their way to Jerusalem, but "[b]y the judgment of the Lord, whom no one will be able to deceive," they were miraculously prevented from carrying out the subterfuge. So far, so good, but Wipo's next comment lends a decidedly bizarre cast to the enterprise: The embassy's leader, Conrad's biographer asserted, brought along "many worldly delicacies—all beyond measure," as well as herds of horses, oxen, sheep, and pigs. Such an overloaded and thus painfully slow-moving procession must have struck even contemporary observers as absurd instead of awe-inspiring. The provisions that the embassy took on in Donauwörth—clearly supplied by Count Manegold—are by an ironic twist of phrasing transformed into a giant herd of livestock, a cacophonous menagerie or traveling circus that the Hungarians could never have mistaken for a pious procession of pilgrims. Wipo clearly took King Stephen's side, just as he would in the matter of the peace treaty concluded between Henry III and the Hungarian ruler in 1031.²¹

This does not mean that Wipo disapproved of Werner of Strasbourg in any way or subscribed to the debased depiction of the man found in later fictionalized accounts. In the days after the coronation of Henry II, the new king's loyal aide had been subject to the enmity of Gisela's father, Hermann

of Swabia, who grievously attacked the episcopal seat and properties in the struggles over the throne. The bishop would have been appropriately recompensed by the Swabian duke as part of the latter's submission to the sovereign, and there is no evidence of any subsequent friction between Gisela's kindred and the bishop of Strasbourg. On the contrary, contemporary sources often place Werner in her company, which makes the later disparagement, indeed crimination, of the bishop all the more striking. What might have tipped the scales against him was his failure to return home and burial in a foreign land. To the monastic mind, such a fate was redolent of divine punishment or retribution, and a writer's advocacy of this view was in direct proportion to his monastery's animus against the bishopric of Strasbourg. Wipo's portrayal of Werner is still untainted by such accusations, and his detached description of the embassy is not a reflection on its leader but rather one example of the author's candid criticism of Conrad II, as can be seen in other passages as well. Wipo clearly viewed Werner as the victim of a subterfuge, which its intended object was able to see through with God's help, and blamed Conrad II for acting less than honorably by misrepresenting the embassy as a pilgrimage. As far as is known, there was no subsequent diplomatic contact between the Salian emperor and Constantinople.²²

CONRAD'S POLICIES TOWARD THE PEOPLES TO THE
EMPIRE'S NORTH AND EAST

Since inquiries into the past are inextricably rooted in the present, it comes as no surprise that historians gain new perspectives and then develop new conceptual frameworks by viewing bygone epochs through the prism of contemporary events. Let's put this to the test by recasting Conrad's *Ostpolitik*, or policy toward eastern Europe, in modern terms as the "eastern enlargement one thousand years ago." While the latter phrase encapsulates current ideas with—*mutatis mutandis*—limited applicability to a former age, the European Union's "eastern enlargement" in 2004 did encompass many elements reminiscent of the first Salian's policies. First, both efforts focused on "enlarging" the scope of diplomatic ties in the area and not on "expanding" sovereignty over partially or completely dismantled polities. Second, both undertakings resulted in the integration of formerly distinct worlds whose newly established sense of unity and solidarity quickly became accepted as the norm. Borrowing a motif from classical and Carolingian art, Ottonian illuminated manuscripts often depict the emperor receiving homage from four female figures. In earlier works they personify Germania, Francia, Italia, and Alamannia, or, as the nineteenth-century historian Leopold von Ranke put it, the "Germano-Roman peoples," but in later works the four lands subject to Emperor Otto III are identified as either Italia, Germania, Gallia, and Sclavinia or Roma, Gallia, Germania, and Sclavinia; the Slavic peoples have replaced the Alamanni. Third, in neither case did the "eastern enlargement" proceed in a clearly systematic fashion, since the focus was on a general framework, not on a meticulously choreographed process. Fourth, reaching out to its eastern neighbors served the interests of the West, since otherwise the pressures on its borders would have continued to mount uncontrollably. Fifth, the "eastern enlargement"—be it of the East Frankish–German kingdom or the European Union—was accompanied by a parallel "western enlargement" of the peoples and polities of central Europe. Sixth and last, there was a mixed reaction to the enlargement—in the recent and distant pasts—from both those involved in, as well

as those bearing the brunt of, its implementation. Of course, there were also profound differences between the two processes, particularly with regard to the causes, conduct, and conclusion of the military conflicts associated with each.

During the early Middle Ages, contact between the Romano-German and nomadic Slavic peoples occurred within a broad swath of land stretching from the Baltic southward to the northern Adriatic Sea. The extensive European heartland was a place of convergence, not partition; the lack of a fixed boundary was a legacy of the Carolingian hegemony over a realm—or, rather, commonwealth—that initially ranged from the Pyrenees in the southwest all the way to the Elbe and Enns Rivers in the east and the manner in which the dynasty had perpetuated its rule militarily and institutionally. The region west of the two rivers served as a staging area for further seizures of borderlands by Carolingians seeking to defend their domain and expand their suzerainty, two goals that were not mutually exclusive in either theory or practice, since they both promoted the Christian mission to the pagan tribes. Charlemagne attempted to consolidate his rule over a greatly enlarged Frankish kingdom by organizing the borderlands into “marches.” Given the lexical inexactitude of the official Carolingian documents in which the word primarily occurs, it is hard to tell whether a *marca* was a (border) area to be defended on the periphery of a long settled politico-ethnic entity or a freestanding administrative unit, a march or margraviate, as it was termed in the tenth century. The use of a single word to convey both meanings suggests that the distinction was not important to contemporaries.

The capitulary of Diedenhofen/Thionville (805) contains a list of border posts permitted to trade with the Slavs and Avars and beyond which the export of particularly high-quality defensive and offensive weaponry was forbidden. The outposts formed a line from the Elbe River in Saxony down to the Danube River in present-day Austria. In Saxony they were located north of the Thuringian Forest: Bardowick, on the Ilmenau River some distance upstream from its confluence with the Elbe; Schezla, which may have been located south of the river in Wendland; and—skipping over the Altmark, an area west of the Elbe settled by Slavs—Magdeburg, on the river’s banks. The capitulary goes on to name Erfurt, which is located a good forty kilometers (twenty-four miles) to the west of the Saale River; a district of present-day Bamberg; Forchheim; Pfreimd; Regensburg, on the banks of the Danube; and, lastly, Lorch at the mouth of the Enns River. There is insufficient evidence to conclude that these outposts demarcated a fully established march. The castle at Lorch seems to have been the sole major stronghold of the Bavarian march on the Danube; all the other locations were, in all likelihood, no more than outposts on an interior frontier of the empire and functioned as jumping off points for exerting control over a more or less broad border area that may or may not have been organized as a freestanding march.¹

Image not available

a.

FIG. 12 Rome, Gallia, Germania, and Scлавinia (a) paying homage to Emperor Otto III. (b) From the *Evangelary of Otto III*, ca. 1000; Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich, Clm 4453, fols. 23v–24r.

Somehow, the Ottonians reinstated the East Frankish kingdom on the foundations laid by the Carolingians. The term “somehow” is used advisedly, because the lines of influence between the two periods are too faint to be definitively traced and are further obscured by the organizational structure superimposed by the Ottonians. Particularly in the areas along and east of the Elbe and Saale Rivers, they divided the marches into burgwards, or garrisons, and castellanies, and founded bishoprics among the barely Christianized Slavs, hence providing more forms of “administrative oversight” than

Image not available

b.

ever before.² The situation on the lower Elbe was quite different, since the Ottonians did not exercise anywhere near as much control over their northern border with the Liutizi as they did in the southern marches, which slowly became full-fledged margraviates, or *Länder*, that is, integral parts of the kingdom; the region east of the lower Elbe did not attain that status until well into the twelfth or even thirteenth century.³

The Ottonian and Salian marches in the north served as buffers against ethnic groups that were for the most part still organized into pagan tribes, a fragmented social structure that impeded the establishment of principalities founded on dynastic and monarchical principles. Some princely families were stymied in their efforts to extend their dominion by their inability to lay

the necessary groundwork, which consisted in bringing their people into the Christian fold and promoting a solid episcopal infrastructure to safeguard the top-down conversion. Since it was not unusual for Christian princes to rule predominantly pagan populations, these *duces gentium*, or tribal dukes, and their entourages were often expelled in violent paroxysms of antagonism exacerbated by inimical political and familial interests. However, Christian princely families that adopted a monarchical structure and successfully overcame opposition to their rule—foremost among them were the Piasts of Poland, as well as the Přemyslids and Arpads, the up-and-coming ruling families of Bohemia and Hungary, respectively—were able to maintain their grasp on the reins of power for long periods. In the tenth century the survival of all the tribal entities on either side of the marches along the Elbe and the Saale hinged on their response to certain challenges: “Would they be able to dismantle the old tribal structures and develop the new ascendant modes of governance? Would the individual tribes and ethnic groups embark upon the road to political

Image not available

unification? Would they be able to retain their sovereignty in the face of the growing East Frankish–German hegemony that was ever more eager to grab control of the east?”⁴

The meaning of the German term *Ostpolitik* has been badly tarnished by its association with the National Socialists, who called for the expansion of the “people lacking space,” who sang of their yearning “to ride out into the east!” and who wished to fight, indeed exterminate, the “inferior peoples of the east.” In short, a long history underlies the unspeakable preconceptions that gave birth to the *Drang nach Osten*, or German eastward expansion, and culminated in the mind-boggling events of the last century. At first glance, it may appear that the heinous crimes of the Nazi era and the attitudes that promoted their commission can be traced back to the High Middle Ages. However, works by contemporaneous authors like Thietmar of Merseburg and Wipo, as well as the slightly later accounts by, for example, Cosmas of Prague and Polish writers, use much the same language and manner to describe both the bitter, bloody, and often brutal conflicts between the Germans and the Slavs and the internal feuds waged by the Danes, Saxons, Bavarians, the predominantly pagan Slavs settled between the Elbe and Oder Rivers, the Christian Poles, Hungarians, and Czechs. Such discord was driven not by national differences—it would be a long time before those arose—but by a shared tribal pathos, as evidenced by the strategies and mechanisms commonly employed to reestablish a precarious and temporary peace—furnishing hostages, paying and withholding tribute, contracting and celebrating marriages, canceling betrothals and dissolving marital unions, ceding territory with or without performing the concomitant feudal legalities—which reflect a society still devoid of nationalism.⁵

For example, the Scandinavian king Cnut the Great and the Polish king Mieszko II shared familial as well as spiritual ties: They were first cousins, and both bore the Christian name Lambertus.⁶ In 1013 Mieszko married Richeza, who was the niece of Otto III, granddaughter of Otto II and Theophanu, great-granddaughter of Otto the Great, and the daughter of Ezzo, count palatine of Lower Lotharingia and descendent of the Carolingians. Their union was the result of political groundwork well laid by Richeza’s uncle Otto III and Mieszko’s father, Bolesław Chrobry, in 1000 at Gniezno, where the Christian ruler and quasi-king of the Poles was recognized as a member of the Imperium Romanum, a political entity that was oriented toward the west and south but looking to expand its reach eastward, as well as to the north. In this world of shifting enmities and shaky alliances, only the Jews put down roots in every region as a matter of course; they enjoyed a markedly higher literacy rate than their contemporaries and clearly excelled in their theoretical and practical knowledge of geography.⁷

Bohemia was an East Frankish–German feudal principality and thus, in

theory, part of the German kingdom, but, in reality, it was a largely independent Slavic body politic. The Piast rulers of Poland held only portions of their realm—and even then only transiently—as fiefs. Saint Stephen of Hungary was able to evade the suzerainty of an outside power altogether, probably because he was married to the sister of Henry II and by that very fact alone deemed bound to the empire. The Hungarian king enjoyed an analogous relationship with the doge of Venice, who was married to one of the Arpad dynast's sisters. While the fact that Stephen had a choice of partners in Hungary's "western enlargement" may not have sparked Conrad's antagonism toward Venice, it certainly was an aggravating factor. As a result the Arpad family became entwined in the loosely interlocking network of polities extending from the northern Adriatic Sea to the Byzantine border.⁸

Against this background of extremely tangled relationships and astoundingly rapid vicissitudes in political fortune, rulers could continually reconfigure their coalitions. Early in his reign Conrad II clearly grasped that in this arena, too, he would—for better or for worse—reap the fruits of his predecessor's policies. From 1031 on, however, he appears to have taken an alternative approach and sought to control the eastern borderlands mostly through diplomacy. Before that point Conrad had suffered heavy military losses; for example, his conflict with the Hungarians cost him an entire army. Yet, when all was said and done, he came out ahead in central Europe, where the very concept of "borders" is particularly anachronistic,⁹ even though—in spite of his personal bravery—he never achieved a clear-cut military victory.¹⁰ What brought the Salian ruler luck were his diplomatic and political skills; given those talents, he could sometimes even afford to pass up the easy shots.¹¹

1. The Northern Tier

The existence of a Danish march between the Eider and Schlei Rivers can be traced back to the Carolingians,¹² and the Sorbian march east of the Saale may date back as far as the mid-ninth century.¹³ Not until the Ottonian period did the marches come to be clearly demarcated, however, due no doubt to their association with garrisons and diocesan seats east of the Elbe and Saale. For example, the march entrusted to Duke Hermann Billung (935/61/66–973) stretched northeast from the Elbe near Lenzen and covered approximately the same territory as the bishopric of Oldenburg. The march of his adversary, Margrave Gero I (937–65), lay immediately upstream and corresponded to the bishoprics of Havelberg and Brandenburg; when Gero died without legal heirs, his march was divided into the Nordmark, or North March, and the Ostmark [East March], or March of Lusatia [present-day Lausitz]. The Sorbian territory to the south, between the Saale and Elbe and, in theory, even

as far east as the Oder, was long part of the Bohemian sphere of influence. Thus, the first clear references to the three Sorbian marches date back only to 968. Almost a decade and a half later, these marches were temporarily consolidated under the command of a single margrave into the new march of Meissen (982), which encompassed the bishoprics of Merseburg, Zeitz-Naumburg, and Meissen.¹⁴

The marches served as staging grounds for the military defense of the kingdom, the expansion of its dominion, and—last but not least—the propagation of Christianity, as most strikingly illustrated by Margrave Gero's advances in 963 against the Piast prince of Poland, Mieszko I (d. 992), who was forced to cede his influence over almost all the territory to the west of the Oder and to pay tribute to the emperor for portions of his dominion. In a related move, the pagan Piast married a woman from the Christian Přemyslid family, a union predicated on the groom's conversion to the bride's faith, whereupon Mieszko I was admitted into the ranks of the European elite and accounted a "friend of the emperor."¹⁵

With that, the push to build broadly based domains east of the Saale, headed by the Christian dynasts of Bohemia and Poland, came to a temporary standstill. The northern marches might eventually have achieved the same goal had it not been for a devastating setback suffered in the summer of 983: Banding together in a pagan backlash, the Liutizi torched the episcopal seats of Brandenburg and Havelberg, plundered cloisters, ravaged the Slav-populated Altmark west of the Elbe in Saxony, and even laid Hamburg to waste.¹⁶ Looking to salvage what it could, the German kingdom pinned its hopes on a coalition with the Piasts; the involvement of their fellow Christians, the Přemyslids, was effectively precluded by the extreme hostility between the Bohemians and Poles.¹⁷ Cooperation between the German kingdom and Poland culminated in "the magnificently staged encounter between Otto III and Bolesław Chrobry in 1000 in Gniezno," which lent the Piast ruler the enhanced stature of, if not exactly a king, then a quasi-royal suzerain and "lord" outranking the German dukes¹⁸

In his capacity as the former duke of Bavaria, Emperor Henry II had learned to maintain a strong coalition with the Přemyslids of Bohemia, who had in turn established ties with the pagan Liutizi to counterbalance the alliance between the Saxons and the Poles.¹⁹ Furthermore, since it had always been part and parcel of Bavarian policy to contract alliances whenever the situation warranted, even peace agreements with heathen partners only seemingly incapable of upholding such arrangements, why should the former Bavarian duke not do the same in his new role as king when he felt menaced by the dangerous, albeit Christian, coalition dominated by the Poles? After all, that tactic had worked with the Avars and Hungarians.²⁰ Hence, to the unmitigated horror of Saxons like Brun of Querfurt, the "saintly" King Henry II in 1003 took the

fatal step of entering into an alliance with the Liutizi.²¹ Whatever the ultimate cause—Bavaria’s political experience, fear of Bolesław’s superior military strength and remarkably effective policy of encirclement, or a personality trait of the last Liudolfing king that led him to resolve conflicts by the use of force—the two camps became embroiled in a fifteen-year-long war that Henry II could not win, because it offered no victory.

On January 30, 1018, imperial emissaries and Bolesław Chrobry signed a peace agreement at Bautzen castle in present-day Saxony. The specifics of the concord are unknown, but its substance cannot have been favorable to the emperor, for in the opinion of one German chronicler, “This was not as it should have been, however. Rather, it was the best that could be accomplished under the circumstances.”²² In other words, the peace agreement constituted a confirmation of the status quo: The victorious Piast prince, the “lord of Sclavinia,” retained not just Moravia but also the disputed marches east of the mid-Elbe River without acknowledging overlordship of the German emperor, who furthermore promised to provide the prince with German troops for the latter’s forays against the East Slavs, or “Rus,” settled in the region around Kiev. For his part, Bolesław married Oda, a sister of Margrave Hermann of Meissen, even though the Lenten period had already started and he had no ecclesiastical dispensation for the union. The unlikelihood of receiving one—given that it was Bolesław’s fourth marriage—does not, however, account for the dispatch with which the union was celebrated: The ceremony was held without delay in order to safeguard the peace concluded at Bautzen and to help the Polish prince maintain his momentum in Kiev.²³

The concord was greeted with mixed emotions by the Saxons—and no doubt by the rest of the Germans as well—who regarded it as tantamount to capitulation,²⁴ but the relationship it forged between Poland and the West proved tenable, as can be seen from amicable gestures like the inclusion of the prince’s son, the future king Mieszko II, in the prayer confraternity at the cloister of Saint Michael in Bamberg. Moreover, Bolesław came to consider himself part of the German kingdom and put off his royal coronation as long as Henry II was alive.²⁵ The pagan Liutizi must have felt threatened by the peace agreement, because they immediately attacked the Christian prince of the Abodrites, who sympathized with the new coalition between Christian Germany and Poland. After ousting him and his family from power, the Liutizi engineered the Abodrites’ (re)adoption of a pagan, reactionary form of rule analogous to their own tribal and nonmonarchical system. The emperor shied away from intervening in this conflict between his enemies and semi-allies, so it fell to King Cnut, the energetic ruler of Denmark and England and Bolesław’s Christian brother-in-law, to resolve the matter. Archbishop Unwan of Hamburg-Bremen seized the opportunity to broker a reconciliation between Henry II and the Saxon members of the Billung family, who

were allies of the Abodrite prince and rivals of the emperor. With that, the area surrounding the lower Elbe settled into a more or less satisfactory state of peace. The detrimental features of Henry's alliance with the Liutizi cast never more than the faintest shadow over the remainder of his reign, thus sparing him the necessity of either abrogating or altogether abandoning the agreement.²⁶

And that was how things stood upon Conrad's accession to the throne. Wipo declares that "the Saxons, with their neighbors, the Slavs," participated in the election at Kamba. Is this pronouncement no more than a stylistic device to indicate the inclusivity of the proceedings, or does it contain a kernel of truth after all? The Saxons first paid homage to the new king at Christmas 1025, on their native soil; it is highly unlikely that representatives of the Slavs residing along the Elbe who were subject to the Saxons would have attended the assembly at their own risk. Yet, it is quite possible that Wipo refers to members of the pagan Liutizi tribe accompanying not an official Saxon delegation but some individuals who happened to be Saxon—like the brothers Ekkehard and Hermann of Meissen—and seeking to determine whether the decades-old alliance would be honored now that Henry II was dead. If so, then the brand-new ruler's eyes would have been opened right away to the fact that he had to contend with the political legacy—or, better, debts—of his predecessor.²⁷

In any case, even if this encounter occurred, it produced no immediate results. Some two or three months after the Saxons acknowledged his sovereignty at an assembly held in Minden on Christmas Day 1025, Conrad II finally reaped the fruits of his labors, when, "exactng tribute payments from the barbarians who border on Saxony, he received all the income owed him." Wipo's use of the term "barbarians" suggests that he had pagan Slavs in mind, perhaps the Abodrites or even the Liutizi who resided along the lower Elbe, whereas the payments to the royal fisc had probably been owed by Slavs who had established settlements on the eastern bank of the Saale that were absorbed into and remained part of the imperial system of marches.²⁸

Be that as it may, all seemed quiet on the eastern front, but appearances were deceiving: In spring 1025 Boleslaw Chrobry adopted royal insignia and title, a move that was—strictly speaking—no more than the logical culmination of the not entirely consistent policy initiated by Otto III in March 1000.²⁹ Henry II, his alliance with the Liutizi in 1003 notwithstanding, had never completely scrapped the principles upon which his predecessor's policy had been based, as the peace concluded at Bautzen so clearly proves. Thus, the Piast prince had safeguarded the fundamental interests of the empire for the duration of Henry's reign, but once that was over, the time seemed to have arrived for a *fait accompli*: Boleslaw Chrobry declared himself king over a kingdom that, like the one to which he had been subject, was European in its structure,

scope, and profession of Christianity. His own death soon afterward was heralded in the West as divine retribution, but the swift measures taken by his son Mieszko II to preserve the Polish kingdom prove that this view was not shared by his heir.³⁰

Conrad II considered the successive accessions to the Polish throne in 1025 hostile acts and affronts to his rights as a sovereign but, beset as he was with other cares that precluded a military expedition across the Elbe as far as the Oder, put his faith in time and diplomacy. Bolesław's numerous marriages had produced other sons, one of whom might serve as a wedge against the Poles united behind Mieszko's policies.³¹ Moreover, it was possible to isolate the Polish king by depriving him of his able and strong cousin Cnut as a coalition partner. This is exactly what Archbishop Unwan, an extremely successful peacemaker who had even brokered the amicable agreement between the Billungs and Henry II, was able to achieve. Before the end of 1025, the metropolitan of Bremen mediated a concord between Cnut the Great and Conrad II, which blossomed into a personal friendship whose effects outlived even the Danish king. "Up until that point, the Danish, Piast, Billung, and Abodrite dynasties had maintained good relations among themselves and had from time to time opposed Henry II, although never as a cohesive power block. Conrad II succeeded in dissolving these bonds by reaching an agreement with the king of England and Denmark."³²

That, in a nutshell, was Conrad's overall policy, but what were his immediate reactions to Bolesław Chrobry's proclamation of kingship in spring 1025, the Polish monarch's death on June 17, and the assumption of the vacant office by Mieszko II shortly thereafter? A royal diploma issued on November 1 to a monastery in Venice is the sole source of information regarding the Salian king's whereabouts or actions from late July to early December 1025. That the historical record would be almost entirely blank for the second half of the year is baffling and raises many questions. The diploma was drawn up at the royal palace of Bodfeld, in the forests of the Harz Mountains in eastern Saxony, the perfect backdrop for the sovereign's traditional autumn hunt. Gisela appears—for whatever reason—to have stayed home on the Rhine, in the western part of the kingdom; clearly the Lotharingians and their French allies were not deemed as serious a threat to that region as some scholars have assumed. Did the king have other business in Bodfeld besides engaging in a deer hunt timed to coincide with a rutting season that would have almost spent its course by All Saints' Day (November 1)? Conrad may have, for example, engaged in talks with the Saxons concerning a response to the developments in Poland,³³ as well as with emissaries from the Polish prince Bezprym. Since it is not possible to pinpoint exactly when after Bolesław Chrobry's death the events leading up to the latter exchange took place, the timing of such a meeting can only be surmised.

Mieszko II was the son of Emnildis, whom Bolesław had taken as his third

wife in 987; she was the daughter of Prince Dobromir, who was probably the margrave of Lusatia.³⁴ Bezprym, on the other hand, was Bolesław's second son by his second wife, who was a sister of Stephen I of Hungary.³⁵ Driven into exile by his younger half brother, Bezprym had fled to the court of Yaroslav, the grand prince of Kiev. His subsequent contacts with Conrad II would lead to the reinstatement of relations between Russia and the empire,³⁶ but no one could possibly have foreseen in 1025 that these efforts would eventually culminate in Mieszko's overthrow and Poland's disintegration. To the contrary, the outlook for Mieszko II was quite bright. Conrad's aunt Matilda, whose son Conrad the Younger was the central figure in the Lotharingian opposition to Salian rule, probably chose this moment to send the "king of the Poles" a most courteous letter and a valuable manuscript, which were calculated to put him in her debt.³⁷ Mieszko, furthermore, was married to Richeza, whose father, Ezzo, the count palatine of Lotharingia, had always been on good terms with Conrad II.³⁸ It should be noted that the Salian king never omitted to address her by the honorific of "Queen." Conrad appears to have been amenable to acknowledging the royal status of the Piasts, once they had acknowledged the rights of the empire.³⁹

The uneven playing field and disparate interests of the participants initially induced them to perform a precarious balancing act that precluded the outbreak of open hostilities. The interested parties and potential belligerents—the empire, Poland, and Kiev—were clearly too preoccupied with other problems to engage in open hostilities. Although the historical record is silent on this point, one may safely dismiss the contention that had war broken out between the empire and Poland, the Piasts could have counted on the support of Přemyslids of Bohemia.⁴⁰

Following the conclusion of the concord at Bautzen, a sort of inertia set in on both sides that survived even the death of Henry II and helped perpetuate the peace within the borderland with Poland, whose reach at the time extended as far west as the eastern bank of the mid-Elbe. Why Mieszko, "who through usurpation had for a number of years been the tyrannical ruler of a Slavic kingdom in contravention of imperial majesty," would under those circumstances launch a military assault against eastern Saxony in spring 1028 remains unaddressed in the *Annales Hildesheimenses* or in any other source.⁴¹ The Polish king's violation of the decadelong peace was probably related to the coronation of the emperor's son that same year, and surely caught Conrad and the members of his inner circle by surprise. Mieszko seems to have mounted the desperate preventive attack in reaction to the insufferable—in his view, at least—events in Aachen, rather than in a calculated move to promote a long-standing Polish policy. But how could one expect any different of a "tyrannical ruler"? Even if left alone, he would behave in a devilish manner.⁴² That would have been reason enough for the author of the annals of

Hildesheim, and even in some places today people find it difficult to purge their minds of fundamentalist and nationalistic superstitions when considering what motivates another's actions.

When Conrad II returned to Germany from Italy in 1027, he was not just the emperor, who would in no time take significant measures to ensure the survival of his dynasty, but also a much closer friend of King Cnut, who was the central figure in the coalition uniting the Danes, Billungs, Abodrites, the archbishopric of Bremen-Hamburg, and the empire. Accordingly, Mieszko's "campaign would primarily have affected lands inhabited by Slavs, probably the Hevelli, who lived in the march of Haldensleben [northeast of Magdeburg] and had never dropped their claim to the legacy of Mieszko I."⁴³ At the court diet at Pöhlde in October 1028, Conrad II heard the first complaints about Mieszko's behavior, which were lodged by emissaries of the Liutizi requesting imperial aid. Their tribal league seems to have suffered a reversal in fortune that exacerbated internal tensions to the breaking point, so that some of the Liutizi wished to take sides with Mieszko, while others—namely the Hevelli—turned to the empire.⁴⁴

In December 1028 Pope John XIX confirmed the transfer of an episcopal seat from Zeitz to Naumburg. The medieval German church rarely took such a step,⁴⁵ but Emperor Conrad II had openly lobbied for the move and elicited the pope's approval "by means of emissaries and letters." Proponents of the transfer had argued that Zeitz was under the constant threat of destruction by its enemies, but modern researchers believe they have identified the true impetus behind the move, namely the concern of Margrave Hermann of Meissen and his brother Ekkehard II, both of whom were childless, to preserve not just their *memoria* but also that of their father, Ekkehard I, who had been murdered in 1002. Transferring the seat, however, did little to enhance its safety: Today, Zeitz, on the White Elster River, is a mere twenty-eight kilometers (seventeen miles) or so by car from Naumburg, on the Saale; in the Middle Ages a Polish invasionary force setting out from Lusatia could have covered the extra distance in a single day's march. Thus, for the margraves of Meissen a more lasting and prestigious remembrance in a cathedral setting might have represented a stronger rationale for the move to Naumburg, although it should be noted that in the end the remains of Ekkehard I were not laid to rest there, but in the cloister of Saint George at Naumburg. The contention that Zeitz was vulnerable to enemy invasion was not, however, a mere canard designed to hoodwink the canon lawyers, since Naumburg was aptly termed a *burg*, commanding as it did a bird's-eye view of the surrounding area. Even four years later, Conrad II asserted that he had himself decreed the move "in the interests of safeguarding the peace and the propagation of the faith," as well as piously preserving the memories of not just the Ekkehardine kindred but also the three imperial Ottos and his predecessor, Henry II.⁴⁶

The import of this statement—if we take it at face value, and there is no reason for us not to—is that Conrad II personally initiated the transfer and pulled back the boundaries of the diocese to the Saale, which had long marked the imperial boundary for the march of Meissen. Notwithstanding the boon to the Ekkehardine family, it must have seemed as if the emperor had yielded to Mieszko II. In actuality, Conrad II was taking no more than a little breather, if that, and gathering his strength while laying the diplomatic groundwork for a major retaliatory strike by which—after a few false starts—he would attain a swift victory that must have come as a surprise even to his contemporaries.

While arrangements were under way for the counterattack along the Saale and Elbe, an incident occurred downriver that may not have abetted, but certainly did not hinder, those efforts: Uto, prince of the Abodrites, was stabbed to death by a renegade Saxon, prompting his son Gottschalk to abandon his Christian and scholarly pursuits at the monastery of Saint Michaelis in Lüneburg and return home to his people; in early 1029 he assumed leadership of the pagan multitude intent on revenge. It is not exactly clear who took whose side in the regional skirmishes that followed. Northeastern Saxony bore the brunt of Gottschalk's vengeful attacks, and Duke Bernard II was drawn into the fray,⁴⁷ which precluded at least some of his troops from participating in the imperial attack on Mieszko II. Yet, even if Gottschalk had not appeared on the scene, it is questionable whether the duke would have cooperated with the emperor. In any case, what doomed the campaign in 1029 was not the absence of this contingent but Conrad's basic decision to adopt the military approach favored by his predecessor, even though he had already established such a strong diplomatic framework for dealing with the issue.

Conrad II probably celebrated Christmas 1028 in Augsburg, where on New Year's Day 1029 he issued a privilege to a hermit named Gunther. This individual was not merely an impressive man of God but also an intermediary between the German king and the princes of Bohemia; as a Thuringian he surely possessed some insight into the policies of the Poles as well. The bishops listed as intervenors in the diploma on behalf of the hermit's cell at Rinchnach (in the Bavarian Forest south of Zwiesel) were also considered experts on Germano-Slavic relations. Since they had all attained their current prominence during the reign of Henry II, these counselors would certainly have recommended continued adherence to the "old" policy.

The various contingents of the imperial army must have crossed the Elbe in late summer 1029 near Magdeburg, because they assembled at Leitzkau, one day's march east of the metropolitan seat within the see of Brandenburg and the same place where, twelve years earlier, Henry II had gathered his troops and waited for stragglers; Empress Cunigunde is reported to have accompanied her husband as far as this already ravaged spot before turning back. Her successor, Empress Gisela, may have done the same before proceeding south

to Merseburg, on the Saale, to await the return of her husband and his troops,⁴⁸ from which it may be gathered that the imperial army was expected to reenter German territory somewhere in that vicinity. While it might have been strategically preferable to launch the attack against the Polish-occupied portions of the march of Meissen and Lusatia from Merseburg, Conrad II followed the invasion route taken by Henry II in 1017—and probably 1015 as well—and mounted his military expedition from a comparatively northern location. Like his predecessor, the Salian clearly expected to receive assistance from the Liutizi and probably with good reason, since the emissaries who had sought his assistance against Mieszko II in October 1028 had likely been members of the Hevelli tribe, which was in league with the Liutizi and resided in Brandenburg, quite near the invasion route.

In any case, Conrad never received that support, probably because those Liutizi who advocated abandoning the alliance with the empire in favor of one with the Piast prince had gained the upper hand. Deprived of local assistance, the imperial army soon found itself in dire straits “in forests, off the beaten track, in swamps, and in desolate and dangerous places,” sustaining serious losses even in the absence of armor-clad Polish knights. When the force finally reached Bautzen, Conrad placed the fortification under siege; both sides suffered heavy casualties, and the emperor ultimately withdrew in hopes of enjoying greater success the following year. Had Conrad and the Přemyslids agreed to cooperate against Mieszko? Whatever their plans might have been, the Bohemians kept their distance from the field of battle to their north. With the Polish forces deployed against the Germans, the Bohemian prince’s son Břetislav conquered and permanently annexed all of Moravia. Shifting their attention to the south, the Přemyslids profited from their newly achieved proximity to the Hungarians by selling Polish prisoners—allegedly “by the hundreds”—to the Magyars. This minor frontier traffic soon dried up, however.⁴⁹

Margrave Thietmar, who was the son of Gero II and oversaw the march along the mid-Elbe River, died in early 1030. The succession of his son Odo put an end to intrafamilial jockeying for the office but prompted Siegfried, an unsuccessful claimant who was a member of the Wettin family and the count of Nizizi—a region stretching from the settlement of Belgern to the mouth of the Mulde downriver on the Elbe—to make common cause with the king of Poland. Mieszko struck while the iron was hot and—again—catching the Saxons totally by surprise, laid waste to the region between the Elbe and Saale in January 1030. The attack was devastating: Multitudes were killed or carried off, among them Bishop Luizo of Brandenburg, who may have chanced a return to his diocese east of the Elbe in the wake of the Liutizi delegation to the emperor in October 1028. Since his captors were allied with the Polish ruler, their clan was probably different from that of the emissaries. Mieszko and his sundry Saxon-Liutizi allies may have wreaked great damage, but the

Polish king had not escaped totally unscathed: Like only Henry II before him, this champion of the Christian empire now bore the stigma of having allied himself with heathens against the “Holy Church.”⁵⁰

Even though Mieszko’s winter campaign caused quite a stir, within the scheme of things that year its effects were relatively local in scope. In contrast, the situation along the mid-Danube had become so critical that it seemed worthwhile in view of the empire’s interests to chance taking preventive action against King Stephen I of Hungary. At the very least, the timing appeared to be right, since not only were the Bavarians pressing for an attack, but the Bohemians under the leadership of the prince’s son Břetislav of Moravia were willing to participate by attacking Hungary north of the Danube (present-day Slovakia) from Moravia.⁵¹

By early autumn 1031 Conrad II was back in the mid-Elbe region, this time making camp in Belgern, within the county of the “renegade” Count Siegfried, whose alliance with Mieszko II must have brought him a quick end.⁵² The emperor had learned his lesson from the failures of the past two years: For all intents and purposes he jettisoned—or at least no longer relied on—the dubious alliance with the Liutizi. He did not muster his troops in Leitzkau, but significantly further to the east in Belgern, which was more favorably situated for a direct attack on Polish territory. The force he assembled was not a huge undisciplined host of fighters drawn from all corners of the German kingdom, difficult to provision and outfit properly,⁵³ but a compact and battle-hardened cohort of well-armed mounted Saxons.⁵⁴ Conrad could also rest assured that the diplomatic ties he had cultivated as far afield as Kiev would bear fruit, although the attack against Poland’s eastern flank would not be launched until a full month after the successful—and relatively bloodless—conclusion of the imperial campaign.⁵⁵ Mieszko II had barely enough time to retreat from Lusatia—specifically, the districts inhabited by the Lusatians and Milzens—and from Bautzen and its surroundings, the focus of Conrad’s offensive in 1029, as well as return booty previously seized from the Saxons. He was also able to strike and swear to uphold a formal peace agreement with the empire,⁵⁶ but then his half brother Bezprym invaded the eastern portion of Poland with Russian help. Otto, another half brother, backed the assault, while a first cousin named Dietrich, who belonged to the Haldensleben branch of the family established by their common grandfather Mieszko I, announced his claim to the throne.⁵⁷

The defeats suffered at the hands of these foreign forces cost Mieszko II the unwavering support of the central Poles, and the factionalization of the local magnates drove the second Piast king to abandon his cause and flee to the Přemyslids in autumn 1031. Mieszko II had the option of going into exile at Udalrich’s court, because, unlike in years past, the Bohemians had not participated in the latest round of fighting against the Poles. It is possible that

their interests in Moravia had suffered a setback with the conclusion of a peace agreement between Henry III and Stephen I; although negotiated without the emperor's knowledge, the pact gained his subsequent acceptance.⁵⁸ After all, Udalrich's son Břetislav had already advanced with his troops as far as Gran (present-day Esztergom), while the imperial army made it no further than the Rába River.⁵⁹ On the other hand, Conrad II is known to have harbored what he might have considered a legitimate grievance against his former Bohemian ally. As Wipo puts it, Mieszko "fled into Bohemia to Duke Udalrich, against whom at that time the Emperor was enraged." What is more, the annals of the monastery of Hildesheim date the inception of the Bohemians' hostility toward the empire in 1032 back two years, to 1031 or even autumn 1030. Be that as it may, Udalrich sought of his own accord to be reconciled with Conrad and offered to hand over Mieszko. Conrad answered as a true emperor: He would not "buy an enemy from an enemy." Besides, with the Polish leader removed from the scene, the Salian ruler put his full backing behind Bezprym's bid for succession. Once he had achieved his goal, this son of a Hungarian princess surrendered the royal Polish insignia wielded by his father and half brother, and submitted to the emperor's suzerainty.⁶⁰

Soon thereafter, however, Bezprym was assassinated. Mieszko II ended his exile with the Bohemians and sought to reassert his authority. Empress Gisela—and probably Mieszko's Ezzonian in-laws as well—interceded on his behalf, and the Piast leader succeeded in regaining the emperor's favor, although Conrad's initial reaction to the Polish leader's reemergence on the scene had been to launch a military campaign (1032) that, as it turned out, never escalated into open warfare: King Rudolph of Burgundy died in September, and as soon as the news reached Conrad, he abandoned the eastern front and set about securing his western inheritance. Consequently, the empress and Mieszko's Lotharingian kin must have intervened with the emperor either right before or during the court diet held in Merseburg on July 7, 1033. Mieszko appeared before the assembly, regained the emperor's favor, and received one third of Poland as his dominion; his cousin Dietrich and his half brother Otto were each granted authority over one of the remaining two thirds.

Which of these imperial pronouncements was implemented and to what effect is another matter altogether.⁶¹ Otto died—probably of natural causes—right after assuming power. Dietrich may never even have set foot in his appor-tioned principality or, if he did, limited his presence to the borderland of Pomerania, which was not even part of Poland proper. Yet again, Mieszko II was the sole ruler and king of the Poles,⁶² but his second reign proved quite fleeting and ended with his death on May 10, 1034, which triggered five years of internal strife and heathen backlash. His wife, Richeza, and son Casimir were forced to flee to Saxony; the young man's exile outlasted Conrad's reign, and it was only with the support of Henry III that Casimir, who was named Carolus

(Charles in Latin), reclaimed his father's throne and like a latter-day Charlemagne restored his homeland to its former greatness. However, as long as he was alive, Conrad II saw to it that Poland was no regional power broker. This approach allowed the Salian to abjure once and for all his predecessor's policy toward the Liutizi and thus win over those Saxons who were allegedly so "alienated from the king."⁶³

The seeds for the shift were planted early on, nourished by an increasing awareness of just how useless the coalition with the factionalized Liutizi was. The empire had paid dearly when the relationship was put to the test in summer 1029,⁶⁴ and the Liutizi played practically no role in the subsequent conflicts with the Poles. Turning their backs on broader political issues, the region's inhabitants reverted to petty, yet extremely bloody, local—or, at worst, regional—warfare between neighbors. After the court diet at Merseburg had normalized relations with the Poles in early summer 1033—and probably after Henry III had assumed his first independent military command and led an imperial force against the Bohemians—the Saxons again encroached on Liutizi territory. The casualties included one of the counts in the borderlands and perhaps forty Saxon fighters, or the equivalent of a whole tribal army,⁶⁵ who fell in battle at Werben. This was a castle located on the western bank of the Elbe River in the Slavic Altmark across from Havelberg, the main fortification of the Neletici. The emperor arrived under Saxon escort and convened a court diet to render an impartial judgment in the dispute, which threatened to escalate beyond the norm and spiral out of control. The Liutizi charged the Saxons with violating the peace and proposed settling the dispute by means of a duel, a suggestion that appealed to the Saxon aggressors. Then, according to Wipo, "[t]he Emperor, even though he took the counsel of his princes, did not act cautiously enough and permitted this matter to be adjudged by a duel between them." The duel's outcome moved Conrad's biographer to voice this criticism: The heathen won on behalf of the Liutizi, while the Christian contender was seriously wounded. Had it not been for the emperor, the Liutizi "would have thrown themselves upon the Christians straightway." When they parted, the two sides were still at loggerheads; the emperor strengthened Werben's fortifications and stationed a large force in the castle. Conrad II also made the Saxon magnates swear an oath to stand together against the Liutizi. "Then he returned to Franconia."⁶⁶

Wipo's account is edificatory in tone and yet open to interpretation, reminiscent of his reaction to another juridical determination wholeheartedly—or at least benignly—sanctioned by the emperor that at first glance seems to have ended unfavorably.⁶⁷ A different story emerges, however, upon closer inspection: The emperor arrived in Werben at the head of a Saxon army and took the advice of the Saxon princes, which must have been along these lines: Take an impartial stance as the upholder of the law and ascertain the truth

by means of divine judgment. In other words, Conrad acceded to what was for him and the Saxons a win-win proposition: If the Saxon champion triumphed,⁶⁸ then the Saxons were in the right, and the heathens would have to make reparation. If the Liutizi warrior triumphed, it would seem—ostensibly at least—that the imperial side had suffered a defeat, which explains Wipo’s criticism of the emperor’s decision. In actuality, however, the latter result enabled the Saxons to sustain, indeed intensify, their belligerency toward the Liutizi with imperial backing. And the Liutizi played right into the Saxons’ hands: Rather than parlay the victory to their advantage at the negotiating table, they tried to attack the Saxons and committed an injustice. Conrad II had the castle at Werben reinforced—not erected, as Wipo mistakenly reports—and elicited an oath from the Saxon princes—no arm-twisting here—to continue the fight. While there is no evidence for the prior existence of a sworn defensive and offensive league, alliance with the Saxons would have been quite consonant with the imperial policy that Henry II had rejected so radically in 1003. Relations between Conrad II and the Saxons could not have been friendlier in 1031, 1033, and 1036, but the common interest drawing them together was the contest over the Slavic borderlands; when it came to the Saxon heartland, the sovereign intervened only in extreme circumstances. Duke Bernard II does not appear to have troubled himself too much about the emperor’s leading a Saxon force, since his name never comes up in connection with the military expeditions that Conrad II undertook from Saxon soil.⁶⁹

The events—both positive and negative—of the following years proved the inherent validity of the imperial policy. Before long (1034) the Liutizi again crossed the Elbe River and skirmished with the Saxons, who suffered casualties, primarily in the vicinity of Werben.⁷⁰ In late winter 1035 the Liutizi seized the castle and again exacted a heavy toll in Saxon lives. Count Dedi, who oversaw the Saxon Ostmark, was among the captured members of the garrison; since Werben was located in the Nordmark, he must have been acting on orders to defend the castle.⁷¹

That was it. The empire declared an all-out war against the Liutizi, and no Christian who knew what had happened would have doubted for a moment that it was a legitimate reaction. On May 18, 1035, a landmark court diet at Bamberg decreed that an army be mustered for the campaign. Prince Břetislav, along with a contingent of Bohemians, answered the call to arms; only the Bavarians were permitted to remain home, since they had to be on their guard against the “dangerous” Duke Adalbero of Carinthia. On the same day, Henry III was engaged to marry the Danish princess Gunhild, whose father, Cnut, was promised “Schleswig along with the march on the other side of the Eider [River];” perhaps the only measure approved by the diet to which the Saxons may have objected. Otto of Schweinfurt was betrothed to Matilda, Bolesław Chrobry’s youngest daughter.⁷² These actions show that the entire Christian

West was united in the fight against the “Slavic heathen dogs,”⁷³ who were—much to everyone’s dismay—quite accomplished in battle, indeed prepared for the western attack. With the almost forty-year lull in hostilities now completely breached, the Liutizi mounted a stiff resistance against the imperial army on the banks of the Elbe and then retreated to the hinterlands, stranding their attackers. Much as in the days of Otto III, the imperial troops were reduced to a scorched-earth campaign. Following their withdrawal and the death of Cnut the Great sometime after November 12, 1035, the Liutizi went on the offensive and wreaked havoc on Danish territory. In fact, one should not exclude the possibility that the Liutizi had a hand in the flight of Mieszko’s wife, Richeza, and son Casimir to Saxony.⁷⁴ Wipo asserts that Conrad ravaged the plain “except in impregnable places,” a description that encapsulates the whole wretched situation. Yet, Conrad’s only hope for success lay in waging a war of attrition. The empire had far greater resources at its command, and the Liutizi had to run out of breath eventually and resume regular tribute in recognition of the emperor’s suzerainty, even if they did not submit to the rule of the Cross.

Christian and missionary propagandists had of course long declared Conrad II the victor over the Liutizi. Wipo recounts that the campaign against the apostate Slavs inspired “one of us” (i.e., Wipo himself) to compose a poem heralding the Salian emperor as an “avenger of the Faith” like the storied “Roman princes Titus and Vespasian.” Conrad merited the comparison because he had ordered the brutal mutilation of captured heathens in revenge for their alleged disfigurement of an effigy of Christ. The two first-century Flavian emperors had engaged in warfare against the nonbelieving Jews—though it was falsely reported that the Romans had acted in retaliation for Christ’s death—during which thirty Jewish captives were sold into slavery; the number symbolizes the silver pieces Judas received for his treachery.⁷⁵ This panegyric to Conrad’s wartime feats against the Slavs is now lost, but judging from Wipo’s summary of the poem, it appears to have been a harbinger of the spirit that would infuse the crusade against the Wends in 1147.⁷⁶

Wipo’s assertion that the war against the Liutizi in 1035 resulted in the resumption of tribute from the tribal alliance does not appear to be mere hyperbole.⁷⁷ When Conrad II and his army returned to Liutizi territory sometime after August 15, 1036, he was presented with hostages and paid tribute without having to resort to war. For a time, the Abodrites showed a similar—perhaps even stronger—inclination toward peace and, unlike the Liutizi, a receptivity to the Christian religion that lent some measure of success to the efforts at proselytization mounted by the archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen and Duke Bernard II.⁷⁸ Two events associated with the synod at Tribur in May 1036 illustrate how secure the northeastern borders of Saxony and the empire were thought to be: First, the ecclesiastical assemblage decreed that

the Slavs would henceforth be tithed at the full rate, thus putting an end to the centuries-old custom of allowing them to pay only half. Second, Otto of Schweinfurt broke off his engagement to Boleslaw Chrobry's daughter Matilda, ostensibly on the grounds of consanguinity but in all likelihood actually because Conrad wanted him to marry the daughter of the widowed margrave of Turin in furtherance of the imperial policy in Italy.⁷⁹

Conrad II appeared to have had his way along the empire's perimeter, from the mid-Elbe to its lowest reaches and beyond. He celebrated his last Christmas in eastern Saxony at the imperial palace in Goslar (1038); the neighboring peoples sent envoys bearing tribute, who were sent home bearing expensive gifts. Much the same thing occurred on Candlemas (February 2, 1039) in Allstedt (Thuringia) to the Slavs from east of the Saale and Elbe who appeared at the festivities.⁸⁰ Conrad's successes were indeed great when compared to the misguided policies of his predecessor, but hardly enduring when viewed in terms of the conquest, subjugation, and forced conversion of the region's inhabitants. To regain the upper hand enjoyed by Otto III, Conrad II would have had to understand what an "eastern enlargement" truly encompassed, something beyond his ken and that of policy makers for centuries to come.

2. Bohemia and Moravia

The Carolingian sphere of influence had embraced both Bohemia and Moravia since at least 805, when Charlemagne's oldest legitimate son, Charles the Younger (d. 811), received command over the first Frankish campaign against Bohemia and led the advance as far east as Moravia.⁸¹ In 817 Louis the Pious, Charles's only surviving full brother, organized the empire into three kingdoms and entrusted his youngest son, Louis, with the easternmost portion, which consisted of three politico-ethnic entities, Bavaria, Carantania, and Bohemia.⁸² The arrival of a Moravian delegation to the emperor in 822 brought the Bohemians' eastern neighbors to the attention of the West. The Bohemians retained a decentralized form of rule until at least 845, when fourteen Bohemian princes and their entourages came to Regensburg to be baptized,⁸³ but the Moravians were from around 830 on subject to a single ruling family that was able to extend its influence over a broad swath of central Europe during the second half of the ninth century.⁸⁴ In 890 the Moravian prince Zwentibald I was even able to conquer Bohemia from the Carolingian king, Arnulf of Carinthia, who regained the region a mere five years later. Hence the empire's continuous, if not always firm, hold on Bohemia may be said to date back to 895.⁸⁵

In the early tenth century the Moravian kingdom was overwhelmed by the Hungarians, who split the region, home today to the Czechs and Slovaks,

in two: The eastern portion was annexed outright by the Magyar kingdom and remained so for centuries, while Moravia proper—even more than Bohemia—became subject to Hungarian influence. As a result, the political heartland of the Czechs shifted westward from the Morava to the Vltava River, where it remains even today.⁸⁶ For a short time, the Hungarians also held sway over the Sorbian clans; together they brought considerable pressure to bear on Saxony and Thuringia. However, since the Magyar horsemen continued their depredations against their Slavic allies, the Bohemians and Sorbians supported Otto the Great in his victorious battle against the Hungarians at the Lech River near Augsburg on August 10, 955. The emperor had long sought to subjugate Bohemia militarily, and after decades of conflict the Czech princes in 950 finally agreed to acknowledge the emperor's overlordship and to promote the Christian mission to their people.⁸⁷ At the beginning of 976 Archbishop Willigis of Mainz consecrated a Saxon named Thietmar as Prague's first bishop, thereby stripping the diocese of Regensburg of its traditional field for missionary work but also binding Bohemia much more firmly to the empire.⁸⁸

Otto II died in late 983, leaving behind a young son, Otto III, who already wore the royal crown but was in effect under the thumb of Duke Henry the "Quarrelsome" of Bavaria. Acting prematurely, the duke convened a court diet at Quedlinburg on Easter 984, at which his supporters elected him king. Among the attendees were the prince of the Abodrites and the mutually inimical Mieszko I of Poland and Boleslav II of Bohemia. Placing great store in his Přemyslid neighbor's support, Henry awarded him military oversight of the march of Meissen; as a result, the duke not only lost the backing of his Piast ally but also fueled the rivalry between the Poles and the Bohemians, triggering decades of conflict.⁸⁹ Henry's dream of acceding to the throne was shattered in 985, and the Bohemians were forced to relinquish Meissen in 987 at the latest.⁹⁰

From 990 on Poland and Bohemia were continually at war, with deleterious results for their neighbors as well, particularly the Saxons and the pagan Liutizi, both of whom often took to the battlefield in support of the Přemyslids. One consequence of this aid was that the Bohemian prince became a feudatory of the powerful margrave of Meissen, Ekkehard I. The combination of external pressure and curtailed independence of the dominant clan prince and his kinsmen often sparked factionalism and internal strife; the violent clashes between the Přemyslids and the Slavniks almost spelled the extermination of the latter clan,⁹¹ while the former suffered the admittedly indirectly related loss of control of Prague for a brief time (1003–4) to a Piast cousin. In autumn 1012 Henry II enfeoffed Udalrich, a Přemyslid prince who had placed all of his bets on the emperor, with Bohemia, thus ushering in a period of relative peace for the tribal principality. Moravia had fallen under Piast control at the same time as Bohemia, but unlike its western neighbor, it remained under Polish rule until 1029.⁹²

Conrad's accession to the throne after Henry's death had no effect on the relationship between the empire and Bohemia; Udalrich remained at the principality's helm, obviating the need for the new king to assert his traditional sovereign rights.⁹³ The first time Conrad II could have called upon Udalrich to fulfill his military obligations would have been during the conflict with Mieszko II in 1029, but the Bohemian forces, much like those of the Liutizi, stayed clear of the battlefield. Meanwhile, Udalrich's son Břetislav took advantage of the Poles' predicament to wrest control of Moravia in a campaign that claimed many enemy casualties.⁹⁴ To top off his conquests, Břetislav abducted Judith of Schweinfurt, the "very beautiful" daughter of Margrave Henry and sister of Otto of Schweinfurt; citing some pretext, the Bohemian prince had arrived with his entourage at the cloister in Schweinfurt and seized the young woman, sacrificing many of his followers in the process. By marrying Judith, this "illegitimate" son of Udalrich proved his "worthiness."⁹⁵ Just one year later (1030), the Germans and Bohemians undertook a joint attack against Hungary, in which Břetislav again distinguished himself for his heroism and, in contrast with the imperial warriors, also experienced military success: While Conrad's army advanced only as far as the Rába River and then retreated quickly westward to Vienna, the Bohemian forces proceeded "victoriously" all the way to the Hungarian "capital" of Gran, which they were—not surprisingly—unable to capture.⁹⁶

Shortly before his seventeenth birthday, Henry III was entrusted with his first military command, that of leading an imperial contingent against Udalrich. The Bohemian ruler had evidently boycotted the court diet at Merseburg (July 1033), where his very presence would have been tantamount to a bid for the emperor's favor or its renewal; in retribution he was found guilty of high treason and sent into exile. Or, at least, that is one possible reading of the extant sources. An alternative explanation is that Břetislav usurped the office of which his father had been stripped—by whom remains unsaid—without imperial sanction, in which case Henry's intended target would have been Břetislav and not Udalrich. In any event, the young German king engaged and subjected his Bohemian enemy.⁹⁷

With that, our sources on this topic are pretty much exhausted, except for Wipo's comment that Conrad II was "enraged" at Udalrich at the time of Mieszko's exile.⁹⁸ Why that was so, one can only speculate, but the goal of the emperor's policies toward the Přemyslids is crystal clear: He sought to carve up Bohemia, just as he had Poland, but things never got that far. At the court diet at Regensburg on Easter Sunday 1034, the hermit Gunther, Gisela, and other unnamed princes and dignitaries intervened on the Bohemian's behalf. Conrad took Udalrich back into his favor, but the prince died just a few months later, on November 9, 1034. Next in line to the Bohemian throne was Yaromir, who had been blinded and imprisoned at his brother Udalrich's command,

but he waived his rights to the office. Břetislav, who had pretty much “strong-armed” his way into the Schweinfurt family, that bastion of enmity toward Henry II in times past,⁹⁹ “immediately sought the emperor’s approval and received it in return for the promise to provide military support against the Liutizi.”¹⁰⁰ Conrad’s wars against the Liutizi may not have been very successful in and of themselves, but they sent a clear message that the Christian powers were locked in battle against the heathens; when the Piasts of Poland dropped out of the picture, the Přemyslids took their place without contest. As long as Conrad lived, Břetislav did not take on his “sworn enemy,” the Poles, but once the emperor died, on June 4, 1039, the prince of Bohemia, with the bishop of Prague at his side, attacked Poland, ravaged the countryside, and stole the relics of Saint Adalbert and other martyrs preserved in Gniezno. Yet, from a political perspective, the devastating Bohemian invasion of Poland had as fleeting an effect as the Polish occupation of Prague in 1003: The Poles and the Czechs had developed such strong senses of their own identity by the eleventh century that no military incursion could quash their spirit for long.¹⁰¹

3. Hungary, Venice, and Croatia

Europeans first became aware of the “Hungarians” in 862, while Bavarian sources date the earliest appearances of this group to 881 and 892. The Hungarians advanced against Italy in 899/900, and their withdrawal in 900 brought devastation to Pannonia, which served in turn as a springboard for an attack on Bavaria west of the Enns River that same year. After having suffered defeats in both the East and West, all—or at least most—of the Hungarian clans merged into the single force that dealt a mortal blow to the Moravian kingdom in 905/6. The Hungarians defeated the Bavarians at Pressburg (present-day Bratislava) in June 907 and thanks to this victory retained a lasting hold on all of Pannonia and on the eastern portion of the Moravian kingdom (present-day Slovakia and northern Hungary), as well as the areas east of the Enns River and the Fischbach Alps (in present-day Austria) that had been part of early medieval Pannonia.¹⁰² Duke Arnulf of Bavaria, whose father, Margrave Luitpold, had fallen at Pressburg, was in the end able to reestablish the Bavarian principality by defeating and coming to terms with the Hungarians, feats that no other contemporary Frankish king or prince had been able to achieve.¹⁰³

This Bavarian policy only reinforced the Hungarians’ inclination to spread their influence over Moravia and Bohemia as far as the mid-Elbe River, as evidenced by their impressment of both Sorbs and Saxons. Here, as elsewhere, alliances shifted with the outbreak of open warfare, and in the famous battle on the plains of the Lech River on August 10, 955, Bohemian and Sorbian contingents fought on the side of the emperor against the Hungarians.¹⁰⁴

Duke Henry the “Quarrelsome” of Bavaria (d. 995) took up the struggle against the Hungarians in the 970s, resumed his efforts from 985 until his death, and “triumphed over the Hungarians” in 991. As a result, the Arpad dynasty was again compelled to come to a rapprochement with its western neighbor, and sometime before the death of the Hungarian prince Géza, in 997, his son Stephen, who had been baptized in 994/95 and would go on to attain sainthood, was married off to Gisela, the daughter of Duke Henry the “Quarrelsome” and sister of the new duke, Henry IV, who would go on to become king and emperor. The union, which had the approval of the Ottonian court and established kinship ties with the Ottonians’ eventual successor, put the relationship between the empire and the Hungarians on a solid footing for years to come. Gisela was accompanied east not just by reinforcements for the Christian mission but also by a considerable entourage of Bavarian “guests,” who influenced a broad range of Hungarian undertakings, from the deployment of military resources—the Bavarians helped Stephen assert his authority after his father’s death, in 997, and even against the emperor in 1030—to the issuance of diplomas and laws. The new ruler’s Christian name was also redolent of the West: Upon baptism, Vaik had taken the name of the patron saint of Passau, not because that diocese had mediated his conversion, but probably because the rite had been performed on the feast day of Saint Stephen (December 26). Any hopes the bishopric may have harbored of exercising permanent jurisdiction over Hungary or even of becoming the metropolitan seat for the entire Danube basin were dashed when the pope, emperor, and duke of Bavaria agreed to recognize Hungary as a Christian kingdom and—almost concurrently—Gran as its metropolitan seat. Stephen I was subsequently crowned and anointed the first Christian king of Hungary in 1000/1001.¹⁰⁵

The amicable relationship between the empire and Hungary terminated upon the death of Stephen’s brother-in-law Henry II. No contemporary source explains why Conrad II broke with his predecessor’s policies toward Hungary as well as Venice. Some modern scholars contend that the Salian ruler was motivated by an “imperialistic” penchant to carve up external territories into feudal principalities dependent upon his suzerainty, but this explanation inaccurately equates Hungary with Poland and Bohemia. In light of the fleeting success of his son’s costly campaigns against the Hungarians in the 1040s and 1050s, it becomes clear that Conrad’s more modestly provisioned war in the summer of 1030 was even less likely to achieve that goal.¹⁰⁶ In fact, unlike the military strikes against the Poles, the fight against the Hungarians lacked a specific rationale; it was not, for example, waged in order to force them to surrender usurped royal insignia, since Conrad never questioned Stephen’s right to wear the Hungarian crown.

Bishop Bruno of Augsburg may have played a key role in Conrad’s decision.

He was not only the brother of the deceased emperor, whose policies he opposed, but also the Hungarian king's brother-in-law; when he and his brother had a falling-out early in Henry's reign, Bruno went into exile in Hungary. After their reconciliation, Henry II installed Bruno as the bishop of Augsburg, but the emperor's founding of Bamberg only rekindled his episcopal brother's defiance. Just a few months before he died, Henry again banished Bruno, perhaps because he had been excessively zealous in his support of his metropolitan Aribo of Mainz in the latter's dispute with the pope. Since the annals of the monastery of Einsiedeln (in present-day Switzerland) contain the sole account of this banishment, it is possible that Bruno spent his exile in a Swabian religious foundation, perhaps even Einsiedeln itself. In any case, he does not appear to have returned to Hungary. By the time of his brother's death, Bruno again occupied his high ecclesiastical office; he was an especially energetic supporter of Conrad II and served as one of the new king's most intimate advisors and confidants.¹⁰⁷ With the backing of the recently elected king, Bruno also sought to have the bishopric of Bamberg abolished.¹⁰⁸ There is no evidence, however, that the friction between Henry II and Bruno was sparked by the German sovereign's stance toward Hungary or that the bishop experienced a discernible change of heart during the five years he outlived his brother and served Conrad.¹⁰⁹ In any case, much like the other members of the German episcopacy—including his fellow bishop and close "colleague" Werner of Strasbourg—the bishop of Augsburg had supported Conrad's belligerent attitude toward Grado and Venice, which came to a head—for the first time at least—in spring 1027.¹¹⁰ It was in all likelihood this policy that prompted the breach between the empire and Hungary, since the Salian's measures against Venice posed a threat to the Arpad's interests as well.

After he met with Bolesław Chrobry in Gniezno (1000), and at around the same time as he and the pope recognized the Hungarian kingdom, Emperor Otto III visited Venice in the utmost secrecy to engage in negotiations sparked by a successful Venetian naval expedition along the Dalmatian coast. The emperor may well have planned to offer the maritime city-state a royal or quasi-royal role in the northern and mid-Adriatic region on the empire's southeastern periphery akin to the dominion already accorded Poland and Hungary over their respective spheres of influence. It is not at all clear how such an arrangement might have affected the Croats or been greeted by the Byzantines, whose possession of Bari enabled them to launch a successful attack against Croatia following Otto's death, in 1002. In any case, Henry II adopted a passive approach toward Venice, yet renewed the customary agreement. The policy Conrad II would adopt was, in contrast, a stark repudiation of tradition that would put pressure on Venice.¹¹¹

In 1009 a sister of King Stephen of Hungary married the doge of Venice, Otto Orseolo, whose very name reflected the especially warm relationship that

had existed between his father, Peter II, and Otto III. The doge's wife was presumably among the members of the Orseolo family who were driven into exile when Conrad II brought pressure to bear on Venice and "its" patriarchate Grado.¹¹² Although the banishment was brief, the doge was never a friend of the emperor, nor, presumably, was his Hungarian wife. The depth of Saint Stephen's attachment to this anonymous sister is revealed in his naming of her son Peter, a native of Venice, as the heir-designate to the Hungarian throne in the 1030s, although this fact does not account for policies pursued during the second half of the 1020s, when Stephen's son and heir apparent, Emeric, was still alive.¹¹³

In fact, the conflict between the Salian and the Arpad rulers appears to have been triggered by the former's perceived ill-treatment of the latter's scion. According to a single, much later source, when Duke Henry V died, in 1026, leaving the dukedom of Bavaria vacant, Emeric hoped to inherit the office once held by his maternal grandfather, Duke Henry the "Quarrelsome." If so, why then had the Hungarians not pursued this claim in 1017/18, when Emperor Henry II reinstated his brother-in-law Henry of Luxembourg—albeit at the undoubtedly strong urging of Empress Cunigunde—to the post? Still, the assertion that Emeric felt that he had a claim to the Bavarian duchy is not baseless.¹¹⁴ Tensions between Hungary and the empire escalated sharply in the immediate aftermath of the young Henry's appointment to the post by his father on June 24, 1027, as illustrated by King Stephen's refusal to recognize the imperial emissaries to Constantinople as pilgrims in the latter part of that year. This unfriendly measure in effect barred the embassy from traveling eastward along the Danube and forced its members to retrace their steps; it was an affront to the emperor as well. In any case, Venice had never entirely severed its ties with Conrad II—it could hardly have afforded to—and served as the point of embarkation for the imperial embassy to Byzantium in 1027. After a long hiatus the maritime city-state's mints resumed striking coins bearing the name of a Western emperor—*CONRADVS IMPERATOR*—as their legend.¹¹⁵

Thus, in little more than one year, Stephen I found himself on the receiving end—directly or indirectly—of a series of developments: On April 6, 1027, Poppo, the patriarch of Aquileia, received confirmation of his metropolitan rights over the patriarchate of Grado, which effectively relegated Orso, the Venetian doge's brother, to the status of a suffragan bishop. On June 24 Henry III was appointed duke of Bavaria by his father, the emperor, in total disregard of Emeric's legitimate hereditary claims to the duchy and legal rights to compensation. In autumn 1027 a group of imperial emissaries purporting to be on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem was denied permission to travel through Hungary; the emperor and his closest advisors were clearly no longer willing to chance showing their hand to Stephen I; hence the ruse. In 1028 the delegation's leader, Bishop Werner of Strasbourg, died in Constantinople, and

then, only months later, Bishop Bruno of Augsburg also passed away (April 6, 1029). None of the remaining advisors at court wielded sufficient influence over the emperor to prevent the “long smoldering enmity toward the king of Hungarians” from flaring up into open warfare.¹¹⁶

In the years that immediately followed, Poland remained the emperor's most pressing “foreign-policy” concern, with Bohemia running a close second. The Elbe, Saale, and Oder Rivers, as well as the Bohemian Forest, provided the stages for the military engagements in which Conrad II and Henry III took part. Like a chess grand master who takes on many challengers simultaneously and wanders among the chessboards making moves, the emperor shifted his attention from one battlefield to another, from the Elbe to the Danube, where he would be handed his only loss. The pieces in that game, it should be noted, were quite hastily set up, and Conrad had not had the time to plan more than his opening moves. As a result, he “forfeited” the assault on Poland in 1029 and declared that he would return the following year for a more successful rematch.¹¹⁷

The tables abruptly turned in 1030: According to Wipo, the Bavarians provoked the Hungarians into attacking the Danube march, and suddenly the emperor had a considerable military force at his disposal for an assault on Hungary; the Bohemians even sent a contingent from Moravia.¹¹⁸ In fact, the imperial force that assembled at the Danube included various non-Bavarian troops; for example, there is evidence for the participation of Lotharingian knights, as well as for the presence of Count Henry of Luxembourg. Once it had reached the Fischa River in the Danube basin southeast of Vienna, the imperial army cut a devastating swath through the countryside to the Rába River, where it was forced to turn around due to a lack of supplies.¹¹⁹ Two sentences in the annals of the cloister of Niederalteich (on the Danube River in Bavaria) sum up the grim nature of the campaign: “Emperor Conrad went to Hungary with an army and spent the night of Sunday, June 21 (1030), in the cloister of Niederalteich. He returned from Hungary without an army and without achieving anything, because the army was threatened by starvation and was captured by the Hungarians at Vienna.” An alternative reading of the last clause produces a different translation: “and Vienna was captured by the Hungarians.”¹²⁰

Scholars have long debated whether the monastic chronicler used the Latin place-name *Vienni* in the nominative or locative case. Since the German historian Harry Bresslau found it inconceivable that an imperial army could be captured by a force of barely “domesticated Hungarian swineherds,” he rejected the locative translation “at Vienna” first proposed by the Austrian scholar Hans von Voltolini. The vast majority of German historians have adopted Bresslau's interpretation,¹²¹ arguing that if *Vienni* represented the locative form of the Latin word for Vienna, then the nominative form would have to have been

Viennis, a construction not found anywhere. First of all, it should be noted that no less an author than Bishop Otto of Freising called Vienna *Hienis*, which ends in *-is*.¹²² More to the point, however, is the question whether any other Slavic place-names—and *Vienni* is, after all, of Slavic derivation¹²³—share the same construction. And, in fact, there are many contemporaneous examples reflecting a variety of grammatical and phonetic premises. The Latin equivalent of the popular place-name Werben—referring to a willow tree—is *Wiribeni/Wirbeni*, which can be treated grammatically like a Latin noun of the first declension, that is, a noun ending in *-a*, like the place-name *Vienna*.¹²⁴ However, most writers treated this strange word as indeclinable¹²⁵ and used the same form for all cases—nominative and oblique (genitive, dative, accusative, and ablative)—as well as locative usages. As a result, the phrase *in Wiribeni*¹²⁶ and the single word *Wirbeni*¹²⁷ appear interchangeably to denote “at Werben.”¹²⁸ The same is true for *in Palithi* and *Palithi* [“at Pöhlde”]. The imperial chancery, however, used the *-a*-stem form of this place-name—as it did with *Wirbena*—and hence the grammatically “correct” locative form of *Peolidae*.¹²⁹ Hence, Bresslau’s interpretation is no less valid linguistically than Voltelini’s, but the latter’s reading produces a more internally logical text: On his way to Hungary the emperor spent the night at the cloister. He returned unvictorious and without an army, because the army, threatened by starvation, had been captured by the Hungarians at or near Vienna.

The sweeping Hungarian victory notwithstanding, Stephen I proved himself more than just a successful warrior by exhibiting an ability to win the peace as well. With the last act in the tragedy involving his stepson Ernest about to unfold, Conrad II delegated the matter of the Hungarians to his son, Henry, who—at the advice of former councilors to Henry II—reached a peaceful settlement with his father’s adversary. As becomes quite clear by the end of Wipo’s account, Conrad’s (mis)adventure in Hungary was not fomented by the Bavarians as a whole, but by a group of Bavarians; neither Henry III nor his mentor, Bishop Egilbert of Freising, and certainly not Adalbero of Eppenstein, duke of Carinthia, were of their number. The “warmongers” probably included Margrave Adalbert, who was a member of the Babenberg family; Arnold of Wels-Lambach; and Margrave William II, who was a count in Carantania; all of them were the beneficiaries—before and after Adalbero’s downfall—of royal land grants in coveted areas to the east awarded in order to bolster their position.¹³⁰

Once the emperor departed, the members of the Bavarian “peace party” cleaned up the mess he had left behind. Bishop Egilbert of Freising, who is mentioned by name, probably conducted peace negotiations on behalf of young Henry, who was not even thirteen at the time. In the end, King Stephen dispatched to Bavaria an embassy charged with securing peace and reconciliation, as well as royal favor. Wipo goes on to note: “[A]cting justly and

wisely, he [Henry III] received in friendship the King who had been wrongly wronged and who sought favor voluntarily." The young German king and duke of Bavaria reached this decision at the advice not only of his guardian but also of a majority of the princes; he did not, however, consult his father first. Wipo clearly took great pains to lay out the facts of the case, as evidenced by the careful—if ambiguous—wording of this passage: The Bavarians provoked Stephen I, and as a result the Hungarians attacked imperial territory. Conrad II then retaliated by devastating the Hungarian borderlands and thereby "avenged his injury." In the end, however, it is the Hungarian king who is redressed for his injury by means of a quickly concluded peace agreement backed by a majority of the Bavarian magnates. The friendly regard in which Stephen was obviously held is reflected in a folktale still related by natives of the German-speaking portion of the Altenburg area, which in 1030 was part of Hungary but now belongs to Austria. According to the legend, the Virgin Mary rescued Saint Stephen, who had made camp on the Kirchenberg, from Conrad and his army.¹³¹

Much as in his account of the imperial embassy to Constantinople, which had sought to enter Hungary under false pretenses, Wipo took Stephen's side here, a stance that the biography's recipient, Henry III, certainly applauded.¹³² Advocates of peace, who believed it important to remain on good terms with Christian Hungary, probably worked to preserve Henry's policies. One of them—Egilbert—had had a very close relationship with the former emperor Henry II; he became Henry's first chancellor in 1002 and was appointed to the see of Freising in 1005.¹³³ The bishop represented much the same interests as Adalbero of Eppenstein, whom Henry II—turning a blind eye to the hereditary claims of the Worms kindred—had installed as the duke of Carantania in 1012.¹³⁴ The exact details of their efforts remain unknown, but the Bavarian magnates who favored peace with Hungary must have prevailed, since the emperor abided by the settlement.¹³⁵

Two questions still remain: When was peace concluded, and under what terms? The conflict is generally believed to have been settled in 1031, which is probably correct, although the year 1033 is also encountered in the source material. The annals of the monastery of Niederalteich, for example, report that Henry III went to Hungary in 1033 in order to make peace with Stephen. All of the other sources that mention the accord—and not all do—provide much the same information as Wipo, who notes that a Hungarian embassy came to Germany. Given the young king's itinerary in 1030 and immediately thereafter, the only possible time he could have engaged in peace negotiations without his father's knowledge would have been spring 1031.¹³⁶

The agreement presumably stipulated that all imperial troops were to withdraw from the border area between the Fischa and Leitha Rivers in return for a promise of safe passage by the Hungarians. On the one hand, there is no

question that the Bavarians were forced to pull back from their borders in return for peace, because Henry III regained these lands as part of an agreement reached in 1043.¹³⁷ On the other hand, it is quite unlikely that the lands they abandoned lay between the Fischa and Leitha Rivers, since that would imply that the empire's boundaries already extended as far east as the Leitha before 1030 and then receded to the Fischa in the aftermath of Conrad's defeat. The mere fact that the emperor unleashed his devastating campaign immediately upon crossing the Fischa argues against this supposition, since it is inconceivable that a war against an external foe would be launched within any emperor's or king's own kingdom.¹³⁸ The first "fixed limits"¹³⁹ between the empire and Hungary are well documented, since in accordance with the peace treaty of 1043 the region bound on the west by the Fischa and extending "all the way to the Leitha" became imperial territory.¹⁴⁰ In 1051 Henry III issued a diploma that concludes with a detailed description of the entire borderlands—south as well as north of the Danube River—ceded as part of the 1043 agreement. According to the extant original, "the territory along the borders with Hungary captured from the enemy by means of the sword [was located] in Austria and the county . . . on the [south] bank of the Danube between the Fischa and Leitha and on the other [north] bank from Strachotin [a village north of Mikulov, on the northern bank of the Dyje River in Moravia] down to the Danube across from the mouth of the Fischa and the Morava."¹⁴¹ None of the diplomas known to have been issued before 1030—and precious few of the later ones—confirm rights or properties in the region south of the Danube and east of the Fischa,¹⁴² but two royal grants issued long before then by Henry II and Conrad II make the implicit assumption that German authority extended north of the Danube as far as the Morava River.¹⁴³ This suggests that the lands ceded in 1030 were located north of the Danube. The Hungarians would have had good reason to covet that region, since the warfare of 1030 must have brought home yet again the realization that the "Pannonians"—Avars or Magyars—living north of the river were, in comparison with their fellows south of the Danube, disproportionately more vulnerable and easily defeated. Ceding territory north of the river would also have made sense to Henry III and his subordinates, since "warmongers" like Margrave Adalbert and Arnold of Wels-Lambach, both of whom held possessions to the west of the Morava—but not south of the Danube—would thus be called to account for their bellicosity toward Hungary.¹⁴⁴

An interesting, if not always strictly accurate, source titled "A Description of the Route to the Holy Land" opens with a passage containing this advice to the reader: "Whoever intends to go to Jerusalem can note for himself how to travel from his home to Hungary. Here follows in writing the route from Hungary to Jerusalem: Hungary begins in the middle of a river called the Fischa. A little over one mile further [in fact, twenty-eight kilometers or

seventeen miles] is a city called Heimenburch/Hainburg. Two miles from there lies the city of Raab/Győr.¹⁴⁵ If this complex work gives any indication of geographical notions around 1030, then Conrad's war against the Hungarians that year may indeed have promoted the establishment of a "fluvial" imperial border, although this distinction would eventually pass from the Fischa to the Morava and Leitha Rivers after 1043.¹⁴⁶

Much as in the case of the Byzantine Empire, Conrad II did not directly compete in the Hungarian arena again. Was it because he felt that contending with those two powers could be left to his successor? Depending on how they are interpreted, three imperial diplomas drafted on July 21, 1033, may support that suggestion, at least as far as the Babenberg stretch of the Danube is concerned. After Henry III attained his majority, his former guardian Bishop Egilbert of Freising was regally rewarded with one property in the traditional heartland of Bavaria and with another, the estate of Ollern, in the Tullner Feld on the western slope of the Cumeoberg, or Chumberc, as the Vienna Woods west of Vienna were then called. Concurrently, however, the emperor bestowed twenty royal hides of land on the eastern slope of the Vienna Woods along the Liesing River on Bishop Heribert of Eichstätt. This latter recipient was a member of the Conradine family and was probably expected to provide a counterweight to the bishop of Freising—as well as Henry III—along the Hungarian border, much as he had in the heartland of Bavaria.¹⁴⁷

Conrad II might have been pushed over the brink, into a second conflict with the aging Stephen I, however, had Adalbero of Eppenstein moved more vigorously against the emperor. In the second half of May 1035, a court diet at Bamberg stripped the duke of Carinthia of his office and charged him with two specific offenses: first, that he had oppressed the citizens of Koper,¹⁴⁸ and second, that he had planned to revolt against the emperor with the help of the Croats and the "Mirmidons."¹⁴⁹ By the latter term the diet's chronicler must have meant the Hungarians, since it was, after all, in anticipation of such an attack that the Bavarians had been exempted from participating in the campaign against the Liutizi in 1035, so that they could mount a proper defense.¹⁵⁰ There are literary instances in which this Homeric tribe is equated with the Hungarians, but in the Middle Ages the term "Mirmidon" was usually applied to the Bulgarians,¹⁵¹ who in turn were—from a traditional ethnographic perspective at least—considered much the same as the Hungarians, like the Scythians and the Huns.¹⁵² Thus, in a work addressed to Emperor Otto I, Liudprand of Cremona painted the appearance of a Bulgarian in familiar terms, noting that the man had "his hair cut in the Hungarian fashion."¹⁵³ Whether or not there was any truth to the charge that Adalbero counted on receiving aid from the Hungarians and Croats—and it is possible that he promised the latter certain cities on the Istrian and Dalmatian coasts in return for their support¹⁵⁴—such an alliance was imputed to him and not him alone. Bishop

Egilbert of Freising had a hand in this game, as did even Henry III, who was, if anything, a little too deeply involved. These three representatives of the Bavarian leadership were the selfsame individuals who played a role and had an interest in the peace agreement of 1031. Hence, as the proceedings of the diet at Bamberg on Pentecost 1035 make clear, the Austrian-Carantanian border, or, in other words, the entire southeastern border of the German kingdom, had enjoyed peace—except for a brief interlude in 1030—for almost two generations thanks to this constellation of political forces. This was no mean feat by any human standards, especially since it involved bucking the central power.

To term Conrad's policies toward the East a "systematic" *Ostpolitik* would be, not surprisingly, decidedly anachronistic. The military actions taken during his reign were to an overwhelming degree isolated, regional campaigns in which the interests of the central and peripheral powers were all too often and too greatly at odds. In the conflict against the pagan Liutizi, the more Conrad dissociated himself from his predecessor's policy of forging alliances, the more the Saxons agreed with him. On another front, Conrad II was able to build upon the concord between the Christian Poles and the emperor concluded at Bautzen in 1018, which had rendered the dynastic ties between the Piasts and the Ekkehardines effectively moot; as a result, the margraves of Meissen would be the first Saxons to back the Salian ruler just a few years later.¹⁵⁵ Concurrently, the coalition that had opposed Henry II became practically purposeless: The Christian princes of the Abodrites were expelled by the Liutizi leadership, who imposed their way of life upon the remaining common people. As a result, the Piasts could count only upon their kinsman Cnut the Great and the members of the Billung family for support. Then, however, the farsighted Saxon politician and master mediator Unwan of Hamburg-Bremen, who had engineered a Billung defection from the anti-imperial alliance just before Henry's death, brokered a reconciliation between the new king and the Scandinavian sovereign right after Conrad II assumed the reins of power. Since the Přemyslids of Bohemia were also untrustworthy partners, Mieszko II took the rather novel tack of launching an attack against the empire in a bid to end his political isolation (1028). Following in his predecessor's footsteps, Conrad II mounted a series of unsuccessful military campaigns against the Piast ruler in 1029, even though there was only one obvious bone of contention between them, namely that the prince of Poland had declared himself his father's successor in 1025 and adopted the royal insignia without first engaging in negotiations with the empire.

Conrad II may have been a "noble" knight who continued fighting even when mired in mud up to his hips,¹⁵⁶ but he lacked talent as a military strategist, for which deficiency he compensated by excelling as a politician and diplomat. It was Mieszko's policy of westward expansion that landed Poland in trouble; whereas Henry II had in 1018 eagerly come to terms with Bolesław

Chrobry in hopes of forestalling an alliance between the Piast ruler and the grand prince of Kiev, Conrad II pinned his hopes on forging an alliance with Russia, since it could mount an attack on Poland from the east. In 1031 the emperor led a small well-armed Saxon force in a rematch against Mieszko II; this time the Polish kingdom toppled like a flimsy house of cards. Peace settled over the march of Sorbia/Meissen and even for a time over Lusatia, which had reentered the imperial fold, thus rendering the emperor's further presence unnecessary. Conrad's war against the Liutizi in 1036 would have a similar, pacifying effect, although the circumstances and internal repercussions were markedly dissimilar. As one regional chronicler observed almost fifty years later, "The Emperor Conrad led his army against the Slavs for several years, and for this reason there was peace beyond the Elbe."¹⁵⁷

In contrast to his policies toward the empire's "northern tier," Conrad II's approach toward Bohemia and Hungary was more simplistic and disengaged. The legacy of Henry II included suzerainty over the principality of Bohemia, and the Salian king was determined to preserve its feudal status, regardless of which family— Přemyslid, Slavnikid, or Piast—ruled from Prague. He does not appear to have reacted to the Přemyslids' slaughter of the Slavnikids or the Polish occupation of—or eviction from—the Moravian hinterlands. Udalrich's son Břetislav had proved his mettle by conquering the Moravians and could have proved quite helpful in the war against the Hungarians in 1030 had Conrad II known how to secure the young Přemyslid's aid; instead, the result was significant ill will between the two men.

The emperor took much the same tack with Stephen I, who in the course of the conflict in 1030 exhibited more military and political cunning than his Salian opponent. One has to wonder whether the emperor took the actions he did merely in response to Hungarian attacks provoked by the Bavarians, as Wipo asserted.¹⁵⁸ Since Conrad II was a politician at heart, he surely had "political" motives, in which case his war against the Hungarians in 1030 was a preventive—if ill-prepared—strike against the powers that be on the empire's weak, southeastern flank. From almost the moment he acceded to the throne in 1024, Conrad had to deal with Hungary and Venice, and he was so displeased by their coalition that he did not renew the empire's concord with Venice. Once Bishop Egilbert of Freising, a former intimate of Emperor Henry II, became the guardian and councilor to the king's young son and future successor, Duke Henry VI of Bavaria, in 1029, he—along with his kinsman Duke Adalbero of Carinthia—used his position to further a pro-Magyar policy aimed at bringing stability to both sides of the border. The policy proved successful and had the support of the emperor's son. This idyllic peace was shattered in 1030 by the thunderbolts of war, but, like a violent summer rainstorm, the military onslaught came to a quick end: The imperial force was laid to waste, and Conrad II was pressed for time in the face of his stepson

Ernest's renewed revolt. Even five years later, Adalbero of Eppenstein was made to pay with his office, but the duke of Carinthia was the only member of the "southeastern alliance" to fall into the emperor's clutches, although an imperial diploma issued in late winter 1034 declares that the Venetians were "always rebels against our imperial authority."¹⁵⁹ Conrad's attitude toward the Adriatic city-state was quite straightforward, to be sure, but it was not rooted in any political ideology or lasting policy; nor did it take Byzantium into account.

Describing the embassy to Constantinople in 1027–29 as a successful foray into the "relic trade" is anachronistic and does not do justice to the devotional significance of the Holy Cross. Yet, establishing contact with Byzantium did not have any concrete political results. Even in southern Italy, where the two empires pursued markedly conflicting interests, they maintained a respectful distance. In fact, one has the impression that as soon as Conrad II reached the southern border of Italy, the Byzantines cleared the stage for a display of Western imperial might and then, upon his withdrawal, immediately retook the stage—namely Troia—without even a curtain change. Be it in southern Italy, Istria, or Dalmatia, or along the Austrian-Carantanian border, conflicts rarely escalated into open warfare, and—in stark contrast to the northern tier—the imperial army was deployed only twice in these regions, once along the Danube River (1030) and once in Apulia (1038). Conrad II may not have escaped so easily, however, had the great Byzantine emperor Basil II not passed away in 1025, relatively soon after the Salian's assumption of power.

CONSOLIDATION OF SOVEREIGNTY OVER BURGUNDY
(1032–38) AND THE ACCORD WITH FRANCE

King Rudolph III of Burgundy died in September 1032, probably breathing his last on the sixth—not the fifth—of the month. With that, the time had come to put into effect a five-year-old compact between the Burgundian king and the emperor stipulating that the former recognize the latter as the heir to Henry's rights and his feudal lord. Conrad II had, in fact, been deemed a sort of "superking" of Burgundy, at least by those individuals who subscribed to the Cluniac view that his reign began with the signing of the agreement in the village of Muttentz in August 1027.¹ King Rudolph had even shown his good faith by charging one of his magnates, a man named Seliger, with delivering the crown and other Burgundian royal insignia to Conrad,² thereby designating the Salian ruler as his heir. Thus, the emperor's claim to the Burgundian throne was certainly stronger than that of Count Odo II of Blois (996–1037), who sought to inherit his uncle's kingdom "solely" on the basis of kinship.³ He was, however, a powerful vassal of the French crown, and the count of Champagne, of Blois, Chartres, and Tours, and of Meaux and Troyes; Odo's domain stretched from Lotharingia, on the border with the empire, to the Loire River and Bretagne, surrounding and perhaps surpassing the royal domains of the Capetians in Francia in terms of area and population. In any case, the only thing that stood between the count's vast network of holdings and the Welf kingdom of Burgundy was the French duchy of Burgundy, although the assumption of the dukedom by the French king's younger brother—and Odo's close associate⁴—Robert in 1032 granted him easy access to the Burgundian kingdom. Conrad II, in the meantime, was for a number of years preoccupied by events in the eastern portion of his kingdom; the news of the Burgundian king's death reached him on the Slavic battlefield along the mid-Elbe River.⁵ The emperor immediately called off the campaign, but securing a safe withdrawal must have taken some time. Even so, although a diploma for the cathedral church of Naumburg places Conrad in Quedlinburg on December 17, 1032, he—and the members of his chancery—had surely

covered the distance between the Bode and Rhine Rivers by then; a concomitant change in imperial chancellors probably accounts for the discrepancy in the dating clause.⁶ In any case, Conrad II and his son, Henry III, celebrated Christmas 1032 in Strasbourg with Gisela, who is listed as one of the intervenors in the diploma.⁷

Although the imperial couple and their son traveled at an astonishingly fast pace, Odo still had enough time to put in an appearance in most corners of the kingdom and seize “by craft or battle” important fortifications “between the Jura [Mountains] and the Great Saint Bernard Pass [in the Alps].” The residents of Provence recognized the count as their king, but he encountered resistance in those parts of Burgundy where the dowager queen Irmgard still held sway. It took a siege to induce the archbishop of Vienne, lord of the seat of royal power in lower Burgundy, to come to terms with the pretender to the throne: To receive his support Odo had to be elected king and present himself to be crowned in Vienne by a specified—if no longer known—date. Irmgard had probably taken up residence in Vienne following her husband’s death and may already have departed for discussions with Conrad II before the signing of this accord.⁸

The emperor was in Basle on January 24, 1033,⁹ proceeded to Solothurn, probably skirted Murten, and concluded his journey in Payerne, a monastery with ties to the ruling house of Burgundy. This foundation east of Lake Neuchâtel served as a royal palace and was such an important Cluniac bastion that Odilo, the abbot of Cluny and one of Conrad’s earliest supporters,¹⁰ termed himself the abbot of Payerne if the “occasion warranted.” The monastery’s ties to the imperial house were established in the days of the Ottonians, confirmed in Conrad’s first known diploma, and then reaffirmed upon the Salian’s imperial coronation in Rome (1027). The emperor was thus clearly not in “enemy territory” when an assembly of “greater and lesser [feudatories]” elected him ruler of Burgundy on February 2, 1033—the Feast of the Purification of the Blessed Virgin—and crowned him “on the same day.” For at least the second, if not the third, time, Conrad arranged for an “initial coronation” to occur on a Marian feast day.¹¹ Furthermore, the monastery of Payerne was dedicated to the Virgin Mary and continued to venerate her as its patron saint even after becoming a daughter house of Cluny.¹² In his—the sole surviving—account of the event, Wipo stated that Conrad was elected and crowned not as king but *pro rege*, or “for the king,”¹³ a rather unusual phrase that may indicate that he participated in the ceremony on behalf of someone who was absent, namely his son. If so, the “supraterritorial sovereignty” that Conrad already exercised was in effect reinforced by Henry’s assumption of a “territorially based sovereignty” over Burgundy.¹⁴ In any case, the “initial coronation” performed at Payerne was legally binding; as for Odo, he was reputed “never [to have] wished to be king, yet always to be the master of a king.”¹⁵

The Salian ruler then undertook to capture Murten and the other castles seized by his opponent, but those efforts were stymied by a spell of weather so frigid that it inspired Wipo to pen a one-hundred-verse poem—now lost—about this natural disaster. According to Conrad's biographer, the nocturnal temperatures got so low during the encampment at Murten that horses' hooves froze to the ground and had to be knocked free with axes and hatchets, and the troops, both young or old, quickly came to look as if they were made of ice. Although Wipo notes that "[s]carcely was this the reason that Caesar abandoned the wars," Conrad hastily withdrew to his palace in Zurich, on German soil. He was joined there by the dowager queen, Irmgard of Burgundy, her advocate Count Humbert Whithand, who was a member of the house of Savoy, and other magnates, all of whom had come to do homage to the emperor and his son. In other words, the entire party had traversed Mont Cenis (altitude 2,098 meters, or approximately 6,900 feet) under arctic weather conditions in order to ally themselves with the emperor.¹⁶

The gathering in Zurich probably occurred in February/March 1033.¹⁷ Thus, it comes as a surprise to find Conrad and his household celebrating Easter (April 22, 1033) in Nijmegen, near the other end of the Rhine, where they stayed until almost mid-May.¹⁸ Why did they beat what appears to have been a complete retreat without even attacking the castles Odo had seized in western Switzerland, never mind attempting to conquer the kingdom of Burgundy? First, Odo had extended the hostilities into Lotharingia: Operating from his perch in neighboring Champagne, the count had his troops besiege Toul and lay the surrounding countryside to waste.¹⁹ Second, given his less-than-distinguished record as a general, Conrad again decided to rely on his diplomatic and political skills and quit Nijmegen for Deville, located on the Meuse River just within imperial territory, at the end of May 1033 to meet with King Henry of France. The high-level talks, mediated by Bishop Bruno of Toul and Abbot Poppo of Stavelot,²⁰ proved very productive: The young king of France became engaged to Matilda, the eight-year-old, younger daughter of Conrad and Gisela, while the emperor was promised French military aid and access to French territory so that he could launch an attack against Odo's heartland from imperial Lotharingia. The French king's willingness to deal with Conrad indicates that he recognized the Salian ruler as the king of Burgundy.²¹

While the claim that the portion of the *Ruodlieb* describing peace negotiations between a "great" and a "lesser" king represents a versified eyewitness account of a meeting between the German king and a neighboring ruler may be somewhat overblown, the text in book V does tell us something about the ceremonial aspects—etiquette, social protocol, gestures, symbols—traditionally associated with such a meeting. First, the rulers exchange envoys and, after taking counsel with their closest advisors, establish a meeting place, exchange gifts, and finally, at the end of a predetermined interlude, converge upon the

agreed-upon location. The rulers and the members of their respective entourages exchange the kiss of peace, and the “great” king goes on to kiss—in order of rank—the abbots and bishops associated with the “lesser” king (vv. 30f.). In the course of the negotiations, it is very important that no one wound the *ius aut honor* (“right or honor”) of the other (vv. 55). After further expressions of mutual esteem, the two rulers withdraw to their respective tents and eat breakfast with their retinues (vv. 73f.), followed by another exchange of expensive gifts, including valuable and rare animals, like camels, leopards, lions, and polar bears, and also, “[a]lthough they had no value, an ape with a short nose, a naked hind, and a truncated tail, and a long-tailed monkey with the voice of a hawk and with gray skin” (vv. 130f.). In the end, the victorious “great” king nobly declines to accept most of the gifts offered him by the submissive “lesser” king; to do otherwise would violate the social equality between them (vv. 202ff.).²²

Declaring that “if Odo sought unjustly in Burgundy things belonging to others, he ought, by the aid of God, to lose something of his own,” Conrad unleashed a brief and thus all the more intense slash-and-burn campaign against the count of Champagne from mid-August to the end of September 1033. Recruited from across the empire, the imperial troops exhibited a keen aptitude and eagerness for their task and wreaked havoc on the monastery of Saint-Mihiel on the Meuse River while still in imperial territory; the foundation’s abbot was awarded a golden buckle in recompense for their depredations. Bishop Bruno of Toul was also the recipient of imperial largesse in the form of a diploma issued at Saint-Mihiel on August 20, 1033, concerning the episcopal monastery of Saint-Ère on the city’s outskirts; the text confirms and expands upon privileges granted during Ottonian times with no reference to harm suffered at the hands of either friend or foe.²³ King Henry I of France concurrently placed Sens under siege, thus bringing the conflict to Odo’s home soil. Realizing that further resistance was futile, the count appealed to Duke Gozelo of Lotharingia and Bishop Dietrich II of Metz to act as mediators. With their aid, he was granted safe conduct to the imperial court, where he swore to subordinate himself completely to Conrad, withdraw from all of Burgundy, and render full recompense for the damage done in Lotharingia, allegedly in compliance with a ruling handed down by an imperial court or with a decree of the emperor.²⁴ The solar eclipse of June 29, 1033, truly appears to have been a bad omen for the count of Champagne.²⁵

Odo’s ill fortune lay not in his stars, however; he was the author of his own bad luck, and it was just a matter of time before he came to ruin, with Conrad’s help, of course. The count had already demonstrated a lack of discernment in 1025: Instead of taking the pragmatic course and joining his feudal lord, the king of France, in steadfastly supporting the Lotharingian opposition to the new king, Odo had been distracted by his private animus toward the count

of Anjou and had focused his military resources against the wrong enemy, thus relegating himself to the sidelines in a game that was soon decided in Conrad's favor.²⁶ He showed equal ineptitude, if greater perseverance, in his handling of the Burgundian succession: In the months following King Rudolph's death, Odo launched attacks on one front after the next; from the flanks of the eastern Jura Mountains to the banks of the Moselle River in Lotharingia, and up the Rhône valley into the Provençal-speaking reaches of southern France, his supporters and troops kept up the fight. And yet, Odo professed that he was not even interested in becoming king; his adversaries gleefully seized upon such statements and recast them as admissions of weakness.²⁷

Odo's reluctance to claim the throne may have been born of realism: King Rudolph's death had come at an inopportune time, since most of the count's likely allies against the Salian emperor had given way to a new generation of rulers. Count Otto William, who was the son of a king and the lord of a region that included the future free county of Burgundy, or Franche-Comté, had died in late summer 1026, and the vast network of holdings controlled by this most powerful—and intractable—of the Burgundian crown vassals was carved up among four heirs. Count Rainald I (1026–57) retained the area around Besançon, but he was just a shadow of his mighty father, who would never have abided the imperial annexation of Burgundy.²⁸ On only one occasion is Rainald known to have registered his opposition to the transfer: In 1038, instead of joining the Burgundian magnates gathered in Solothurn to offer homage to Conrad II and Henry III upon their return from Italy, the count visited the court of Duke Robert I of the French duchy of Bourgogne.²⁹ Since the duke had only attained his office in 1032, however, supporting the count could hardly have been his foremost concern, which was instead the consolidation of his rule. Robert's chief enemy was his older brother Henry, who had succeeded to the French throne upon the death of their father, Robert II “the Pious,” on July 20, 1031. The question of succession had first raised its ugly head in 1025, following the death of the oldest brother—and heir apparent—Hugh; the elder Robert favored his second son, Henry, while Queen Constance preferred their third-born, also named Robert. The king arranged for Henry's consecration, but this stratagem did not put an end to his difficulties: Henry I leagued himself with Odo of Champagne against his father. Following King Robert's death, the queen and her favorite son sustained their opposition to Henry I, while the now superfluous alliance between the new king of France and the count of Champagne immediately succumbed to the bitter rivalries between them. Thus, it was only “natural” for the king of France to back Emperor Conrad and for the duke of Bourgogne to support—if only halfheartedly—Count Odo of Champagne and Blois.³⁰

The alliance between the Capetian king and the Salian emperor was sealed by a marriage compact in spring 1033, even though the prospective bride was

a mere child and the union may have violated canonical strictures against consanguinity, since Henry of France and Matilda shared a common Liudolfing ancestor, King Henry of East Francia. This ancient Henry was the great-great-grandfather of the French king and the great-great-great-great-grandfather of the German king's daughter.³¹ Be that as it may, the purpose of the marriage compact was to seal an alliance with France. Quite soon afterward—probably during the summer campaign against the count of Champagne—Conrad reinforced the empire's western flank by enfeoffing Duke Gozelo of Lower Lotharingia with the duchy of Upper Lotharingia, which had been left vacant by the recent death of Frederick III, and thus reuniting the territory under a single lord.³²

None of this spelled the end of the dispute over Burgundy, which flared up again the very next year (1034). Conrad had apparently not devoted enough time to waging war against Odo in 1033, but then again he had been compelled to conduct military campaigns on both the eastern and western fronts almost simultaneously that year. In the second half of May 1033, the emperor was in Lotharingia, at the westernmost reaches of the German kingdom, and, after entrusting his son with the command of a military force against Bohemia, convened a court diet in July in Merseburg, followed by an assembly in Memleben, both located in the easternmost parts of the kingdom. Conrad then turned his steps westward, arriving in Limburg by early August and launching the attack against Odo in the second half of that month. By the closing weeks of the same year, he was back in the mid-Elbe region and East Saxony.³³

Much care went into laying the military and diplomatic groundwork for the campaign against Odo in summer 1034. Conrad II convened a court diet in Regensburg during the preceding late April/early May in order to consult with various Lotharingian magnates and eminent Italians about the situation in Burgundy,³⁴ which was now in the throes of a civil war. Odo's followers found themselves hard pressed by the growing cohort around the dowager queen and her advocate Humbert, who was probably a—if not the—major architect of the strategy behind the imperial incursion: Archbishop Aribert of Milan and Margrave Boniface of Tuscany led a contingent of Italian troops through the Val d'Aosta, which was under the advocate's dominion, traversed the Great Saint Bernard pass to the Rhône valley, and met up with the German force near Geneva. Having set off from Basle, where the empress remained, the German contingent had proceeded through Solothurn before marching into Burgundy. In the absence of their leader, Odo's followers defected to the emperor all the more quickly. Everything went according to plan: One by one, the opposition's strongholds were surrounded and captured. On August 1, 1034, the emperor made a solemn entrance into Geneva, where Archbishop Burchard III of Lyon, Count Gerold of Geneva, and other former supporters of Odo II did him homage, after which the last bastion of resistance in the

region, Murten, finally surrendered to Margrave Boniface. Conrad II marched back across Alsace and rejoined Gisela—and probably Henry as well—in Strasbourg. Burgundy was finally under the emperor's control.

Thereafter, in good times or bad, Conrad II did not play a very active role in the Burgundian kingdom's affairs.³⁵ Of all the beneficiaries of diplomas known to have been issued after 1032, only one is a Burgundian; of all Conrad's regal visitations, the briefest were to Burgundy.³⁶ The emperor's personal intervention was not called for even when Archbishop Burchard III entered—and lost—a violent feud in 1036 against Udalrich, a member of the Salian camp whose father, Seliger, had delivered Rudolph III's royal insignia to Conrad after the Burgundian king's death.³⁷ Udalrich was able to reimpose order all on his own, but in doing so subjected the metropolitan bishop to particularly harsh treatment: Udalrich had Burchard III taken prisoner and handed over to the emperor, who supposedly let the archbishop languish in chains for many years in Germany. Taking much the same tack with the Burgundian primate as he would with the Milanese one, Henry III made restitution for the ordeal by allowing the prelate to return to Lyon soon after his father's death.³⁸

By spring 1037 Conrad's accord with Aribert of Milan, which dated back to the inception of the Salian's reign, was long defunct. With the emperor away in Italy, Odo of Champagne again undertook to strike Lotharingia, and the beleaguered Milanese archbishop seized this chance—probably during the summer—to offer him the Italian crown, perhaps even leading the count to believe that the imperial crown might also someday be his. In any case, that fall Odo again tested his luck in Lotharingia, clearly with an eye to making it as far as Charlemagne's venerable city of Aachen. He succeeded in capturing Bar, a border stronghold, where on November 15, 1037, he came under attack by a large army led by Gozelo of Lotharingia, the duke's son Godfrey, and Conrad's cousin Gerard, a count in Alsace. The bishops of Metz and Liège contributed men as well; in fact, the participation of the experienced warrior Bishop Reginard of Liège (1025–37) at the head of his contingent has been credited with deciding the battle in the Lotharingians' favor. Odo's troops suffered a crushing defeat, and the count himself was killed as he fled in retreat, bringing to grief all attempts to install an anti-king and to mount a serious challenge to Salian rule over Burgundy.³⁹

A review of the public behavior and personal background of Archbishop Burchard III of Lyon (1033–40) puts into stark relief the contrasting interests of regional secular magnates and their ecclesiastical counterparts, as well as the emperor's policy of siding with the former. Like his two like-named predecessors, Burchard III was closely related to the Burgundian king. He began his ecclesiastical career as the bishop of Aosta and during the abbacy of his uncle and immediate predecessor as archbishop, Burchard II, served additionally as the prior of the wealthy monastery of Saint-Maurice d'Againe in

the present-day canton of Valais, Switzerland. After Burchard II of Lyon died in summer 1031—predeceasing his brother Rudolph III of Burgundy by one year—the younger Burchard sought to succeed his archiepiscopal uncle. The count of Lyon viewed the royal candidate as a threat to his interests and countered by nominating his own—very young—son for the office. Burchard III behaved in such an ungodly manner as the bishop of Aosta—his evil reputation is recorded in chronicles penned at such diverse monasteries as Reichenau and Cluny⁴⁰—that reformers tried to convince Abbot Odilo of Cluny to accept the post. They gained the support of no less than Pope John XIX, who excoriated Odilo for proposing to ignore the results of the election and sent him the pallium and bishop's ring. The abbot accepted the insignia, planning to hand them over once a worthy candidate had been chosen, but in Cluniac fashion declined to move to Lyon.⁴¹ By 1034 Burchard's hold over the metropolitan see was uncontested, even if he had not obtained the pallium and ring from either Rome or Cluny. Along with Count Gerold of Geneva, the archbishop of Lyon was one of the last holdouts against the imperial troops that summer. However, in 1036 war broke out between Burchard III and Udalrich over regional rivalries, not at Conrad's command, even though the archbishop continued to oppose the emperor and his removal might have served imperial interests. Burchard's capture in 1036 and—more important—Odo's death in 1037 cleared the field.⁴²

Conrad II had nothing more to fear and, apparently for the first time, allowed Henry III to set foot on Burgundian soil, where, at an imperial diet in Solothurn, he received the kingdom from his father (fall 1038).⁴³ The empire and France maintained their peaceful relations, however.⁴⁴ In fact, it was thanks to Henry I of France that Conrad II had been able to extend his rule over Burgundy, which for hundreds of years would serve as a buffer between France and Italy. The German kings gained control over the western Alps and mountain passes, but exercised only limited authority in the kingdom itself. In essence, their power extended only over present-day western Switzerland.⁴⁵ As one scholar put it, “We know next to nothing about Conrad's rule of his Burgundian kingdom.”⁴⁶ But did he in fact ever “rule” Burgundy?

A decorative cross symbol with four ornate, leaf-like ends, centered on the page.

Part Five

THE CHURCH

I. General Observations

Conrad's ecclesiastical policy traditionally presents the greatest challenge in any study of his reign, because in it the scholar must somehow make the impossible seem possible. Sprinkling in a few biographical details for flavor, historians have come up with observations like "Conrad grew up a lusty layman [who was] handy with a sword, clear-eyed and sober in his thinking and possessed of a healthy sense of authority, affected little by the world of ideas, with both feet always planted firmly on the ground, and he mastered all the worldly tasks of German rule in amazingly short order." Or: "He [Conrad] was a man very little to the liking of the reformers, and the ruthless disregard he exhibited toward canon law and religious sensibilities cast in equally stark relief the incompatibility between this style of rule and the ideal of ecclesiastical independence; furthermore, his heir apparent was known not to share his father's attitude. While Conrad's limited understanding of the inner life of the church and his cool, unprincipled handling of the ideals behind its cultivation may have represented the sorest point of his overall policy, it should be emphasized that there was no way to eliminate this problem as long as people sought to maintain a strong imperial authority."¹ This was hardly a fresh take on the subject; as no less an authority than Harry Bresslau, whose nineteenth-century understanding of Conrad's era remains the gold standard even in light of twenty-first-century scholarship, had averred decades earlier: "Our emperor's relationship with the church was clearly the weakest aspect of his policy. It undeniably prepared the way for the Romanization of the German church that would make continuous strides during his successor's reign." Or: "During its entire existence, the Germano-Roman empire had never been and would never again be so thoroughly secular in nature as during the fifteen years the crown graced the noble brow of Conrad II."² In essence, he was exactly what late-nineteenth-century Germans, whose enthusiasm for their

glorious medieval imperial heritage was bridled only by the fact that the heroes of that age all too rarely freed themselves of the priests and their hangers-on, liked in a ruler. Here was an emperor who had been able to pull it off . . . but had he really? What kinds of images do the terms “Romanization of the church” and the “priests and their hangers-on” conjure up, and are they at all true to fact?

A reappraisal of this memorable and convincing portrait of Conrad II became possible after the end of World War II, when many of the preconceptions fostered by late-nineteenth-century medievalists were finally put to rest.³ Scholars now grasp that the eleventh-century emperor did not have a “relationship with the church” but occupied a place *within* the church. “It would not have been possible for pre-Gregorian royal theocrats to show such powerful moral defiance during the Investiture Controversy had the system been so internally flawed that one of its greatest representatives was an anointed of the Lord in name only and in actuality a proto-Machiavellian practitioner of power politics who valued the church merely as an instrument of rule.”⁴ The successful restoration of Conrad’s portrait necessitated the stripping away of “two layers of paint applied in the eleventh and nineteenth centuries” by the participants in the ecclesiastical reform movement and the Investiture Controversy and by the author of the *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs unter Konrad II.* [Annals of the German Empire under Conrad II], respectively.⁵ Another notion had to go by the board as well, namely the assumption that at the time of Conrad’s election, in 1024, there existed an “established party within the Cluniac hierarchy advocating reform”⁶ and laying the groundwork for the Romanization of the imperial church, since this assumption was based on a factual error: The “mixed observance” of the Lotharingians was not identical to the way of life observed at Cluny. Indeed, a fundamental difference distinguished two reform movements: The Lotharingians asserted that the monarch was the source of monastic liberty, or *libertas*, a view gainsaid by the Cluniacs.⁷

So, what are we to make of Conrad’s ecclesiastical policy, and how did it differ from that of Henry II? These two questions have cropped up again in the more recent scholarship, none of which breaks particularly new ground. The resulting “portrait is one of an ‘un-Christian’ Conrad, or, to put it more delicately, of a not very pious Conrad II, based on Wipo’s *Gesta Chuonradi.*” The figure that emerges from those pages is a “layman who was little affected by specifically spiritual concerns and who appears to have devoted little thought to specifically spiritual matters.”⁸ Conrad was thus “outside of the system,” so to speak; he was not a total fool but a *rex idiota*, or illiterate king, who could neither read nor write, spoke no Latin or foreign language, and entrusted the decision making on all religious and spiritual issues to people like Poppo of Stavelot, his councilors, and his consort, with the result that he did little overall to shake things up.⁹ The very illogic of this statement is a testament to its

honesty, since it upholds a central tenet of historians, that it is their job to explain the contradictions of the past. But what was the “system” into which Conrad both did and did not fit?

2. The “System”

For the past fifty years or so, scholars have used the term “imperial church system” to describe the ecclesiastical system in place during the Ottonian and Salian periods.¹⁰ According to this model, Otto the Great and his successors filled bishoprics, certain collegiate foundations, and important imperial monasteries with individuals of their own choosing, whom they personally invested with the symbols of office—bishop’s crosier or abbot’s staff—and to whose institutions they granted valuable sylvan, toll, market, and mintage rights, even whole counties, as well as legal and economic immunity. In return these men were required to provide *servitium regis*, a broad range of administrative, military, and economic services to the king, in addition to praying for the kingdom’s well-being and the ruler’s salvation. Otto the Great instituted this system in response to the serious challenge to his rule mounted by his rebellious son, Liudolf, in 953–54; forced to acknowledge that the political cohesiveness of his family was in tatters, the sovereign looked for alternative—and reliable—sources of support.¹¹ For a king, who was—in spite of the sacral nature of his office—the very embodiment of secular authority, to invest a high cleric with his office clearly violated canon law, but legal norms and actual legal practice were two very different things, as the case of Burchard I of Worms so aptly illustrates: His famous collection of canon laws contains three determinations regarding canonical election by the clergy and people, as well as the duty to dissociate oneself from bishops who owed their offices to secular powers. Yet, Burchard himself had received his bishopric from Otto III in 1000.¹² As long as people found ways to resolve or accommodate the inherent contradictions of the “system,” it did work; in the early tenth century, one pope even voiced his approval of the arrangement.¹³

This descriptive model enjoyed great favor at first, though some critics pointed out that the system could be traced back to the *do ut des* approach taken by the fourth-century Roman emperor Constantine the Great.¹⁴ One prominent postwar medievalist went so far as to suggest that the “imperial church system” was termed the Ottonian-Salian system because it had been “invented” by the Merovingians.¹⁵ Of course, scholars are generally of two minds when it comes to generalizations or stereotypes: On the one hand, they are necessary tools of the trade, but on the other, they almost never do justice to individual cases. Just as “confidential documents” are never truly confidential, the “imperial church” of the Ottonians and Salians was nothing like

the perfect, well-oiled machine suggested by this label. With that caveat in mind, it is probably accurate to say, “We can continue to employ this term, as long as we do not lose sight of the fact that it does not denote a coherent and monolithic system in the modern sense, but one shaped by the cumulative forces of history into a matrix of institutions and practices that meshed together well and in a certain sense formed a whole.”¹⁶ In terms of his policy toward the imperial church, Conrad II falls somewhere between the two Henrys who flanked him in office and had aroused such antithetical emotions in the first Salian: For the former—Henry II—there was no love lost, even though he was Conrad’s predecessor; for the latter—Henry III—Conrad felt love beyond measure, even though his son did give him trouble on occasion.¹⁷ The first Salian emperor apparently opted to foster the system’s continuity but with a minimum of creativity. His policy did not “rock the boat,” so to speak; rather, he sailed along with the current instead of trying to steer the imperial church on a particular heading. Of course, it behooves us to justify this statement, which is a cross between an observation and a thesis, on the basis of the often random selection of historical sources still extant today. Since a policy is only as good—or bad—as the personnel entrusted with its implementation, it is appropriate to start off with a review of how Conrad dealt with the members of the upper clergy.

3. Conrad’s “Personnel Policy”

There were six archbishoprics in the German kingdom, or *regnum Teutonicum*, that succeeded the East Frankish kingdom: Mainz, Cologne, Trier, Salzburg, Hamburg-Bremen, and Magdeburg. Each metropolitan oversaw four to six suffragan bishops, except for the archbishop of Mainz, who counted sixteen dioceses in his province. Since the archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen was charged with converting the pagans to his north, the borders of his diocese were to a certain extent unfixed, but even allowing for that, the German kingdom and its church were not coterminous: The bishop of Cambrai in Lower Lotharingia answered to the French metropolitan in Rheims, and at least as far back as the reign of Henry II, the Burgundian diocese of Basle was considered part of Germany, even though its bishop was subordinate to the archbishop of Besançon. Trento was subject to the ecclesiastical authority of the patriarchate of Aquileia and the political jurisdiction of the kingdom of Italy, but Conrad II—and perhaps even Henry II before him—treated this bishopric on the Adige River in “the German manner.”¹⁸ Nominally speaking, there were more than forty German dioceses, of which only thirty-eight were completely functional. Since Conrad II made thirty-seven or thirty-eight episcopal appointments, statistically at least it might appear that he had the opportunity

to fill each diocese with a candidate of his choosing, but in reality nine of the episcopal and two—Trier and Magdeburg—of the archiepiscopal sees never became vacant during his reign, while he was thrice called upon to install a new archbishop in Hamburg-Bremen.¹⁹ Ultimately, however, whether or not a bishop or archbishop had been invested with his see by Conrad II or Henry II had little practical effect on his relationship with the sovereign. In marked contrast to his predecessor, Conrad drew his candidates for high ecclesiastical office exclusively from the ranks of the aristocracy,²⁰ and yet the emperor did not leave Bishop Godehard of Hildesheim, a man of modest birth, the son of a Bavarian ministerial, who owed his post to Henry II, in the lurch when he locked horns with Archbishop Aribio of Mainz, the proud scion of the upper nobility.²¹

Conrad II clearly judged the imperial bishops and abbots on the basis of their ability and willingness to promote his pragmatic policy. Hence, it is legitimate to ask how great a role monastic reform, conciliar policy, simony, episcopal appointments, and the foundation of churches played in his—as opposed to his predecessor's—dealings. Was Conrad's political success predicated on his equaling or outdoing Henry II in those areas? Did he really want to imitate Henry II, and if not, why should he have wanted to?²² The parameters to which the Salian ruler was subject in the pursuit of his ecclesiastical policy reflected certain assumptions about the churchmen—or -women—he was dealing with, most aptly summed up by the descriptors “friendly, receptive, [or] unfriendly to the king.”²³ Conrad was guided by two considerations, neither of which was nearly as trivial as it might appear at first glance: How important were the imperial rights exercised by the ecclesiastical officeholder, and what kind of person was he or she? For example, the province of Salzburg played an enormously important role in the exercise of imperial control over the southeastern Alpine region and covered more territory than any other German archdiocese or diocese except for Prague, in Bohemia. It was enough of an economic powerhouse to contribute significantly to the maintenance of the imperial army, although the sovereign was able to extract more from the wealthier bishoprics of Bavaria. Salzburg was also among the most favored ecclesiastical recipients of royal diplomas.²⁴ And yet, like most of his predecessors and successors, Conrad II did not travel to Salzburg even once.²⁵ Which episcopal seats did this early-eleventh-century German sovereign have to visit in order to fulfill his duties? He spent time in the major cathedral towns along the Rhine, of course, and not just because they were easily accessible and wielded great economic power; in the bishoprics that lined the route to Italy, starting with Augsburg, where the imperial army mustered; in Regensburg, on the Danube River, the political heart of the southeastern territories of Bavaria and Carantania, and the gateway to Bohemia; and in Magdeburg, on the Elbe, most of whose suffragan bishops were prevented

from occupying their sees on the eastern banks of the river. Let us not forget the diocese of Paderborn, halfway between Magdeburg and Nijmegen, the site of Conrad's favorite palace.²⁶ It comes as no surprise that the holders of these episcopal offices enjoyed especially close ties with the king, their kinsman, if not by blood, then by marriage.²⁷ By virtue of their birth alone, these individuals had a stake in the monarch's policy and were practiced in both promoting their own interests and balancing the discordant interests of others.

I. Mainz: Unrivalled Primacy

Thanks to the efforts of Boniface (d. 754), who successfully lobbied for his bishopric's elevation to an archdiocese, and of his student and immediate successor, Lul (d. 786), who from 782 on established its primacy, the metropolitan of Mainz was the primate of Germany.¹ The archbishop came to be closely associated with the most important religious office at court—the archchapelaincy—during the reign of Louis the German, who placed the royal chancery under the direction of his chief royal chaplain in 854² and then entrusted both offices to the metropolitan of Mainz sixteen years later (870). From that point on, the incumbent archbishop usually—although not always—also served as archchaplain and archchancellor. The Ottonians were unable to buck what had by their time become an entrenched tradition, particularly in light of the archbishops' ability to exercise their coronation rights between 936 and 1024. The members of the Salian dynasty chipped away at that claim, as well as the connection between the archbishopric and the archchapelaincy, but the incumbent German primate continued to serve as archchancellor without interruption from 965 until the old empire was dissolved in 1806.³

The early Salians still bestowed both offices upon the archbishop, however, to judge from the titles holders of that office bore in imperial diplomas of the period. Overseeing the archchancery surely did not require the performance of any practical duties on the archbishop's part, but in his capacity as archchaplain he supervised the court chapel, which served as a boot camp, as it were, for the future members of the German episcopate. In fact most of the ecclesiastical appointees chosen by Henry II and Conrad II had first "sweated it out at court."⁴ An archbishop with personal drive and political connections could parlay these two honorary court offices into membership in the royal inner circle. Occasionally, just the opposite occurred, and the traditional linkage between the two posts was broken or rendered moot because

the sovereign did not trust the primate or dispensed with his services altogether. The same situation applied to the chancery for Italy, which received its own archchancellor and chancellor during the reign of Otto I (962) but remained part of the undivided archchapel.⁵ Following the death of Otto III, the then archchancellor for Italy, Peter of Como, decided to shift his allegiance to Arduin of Ivrea instead of recognizing Henry II; the new king responded by awarding this office as well to Archbishop Willigis of Mainz, to whom he owed his election in 1002.

After Willigis's death, in 1011, Henry II dispensed with what almost qualified as a long-standing tradition and granted the Italian office to Bishop Eberhard of Bamberg, who was the emperor's personal friend and erstwhile chancellor for Italy before his investment with the newly established bishopric of Bamberg. Conrad II, in turn, removed Eberhard from office and, following in his predecessor's earliest footsteps, awarded the post to Archbishop Aribo of Mainz, to whom he owed his election in 1024; this was a most proper gesture of gratitude⁶ toward a man who had been elevated to the archbishopric of Mainz—and hence the archchlaincy and archchancellorship of the *regnum Teutonicum*—in 1021 at the hands of his kinsman Henry II.⁷

Aribo (1021–31)

Aribo was undoubtedly an exceptional individual who far surpassed most of his ecclesiastical colleagues in intelligence and piety.⁸ He was known for composing and commissioning works on topics of theological and chronological import. In conjunction with his appointment of Ekkehard IV of Saint Gall as director of the cathedral school at Mainz, Aribo probably became acquainted with the heroic poem *Vita Waltharii manu fortis* (The Life of Walter the Strong-Handed), composed at most two generations earlier by one of his new schoolmaster's forerunners at Saint Gall, Ekkehard I. Displeased with the quality of the original author's Latinity, the archbishop charged Ekkehard IV with correcting the Germanisms that marred the text, which says a great deal about not just his intellectual and linguistic judgment but also his technical expertise as a literary stylist.⁹ Aribo, who bore the "leading name" of the Bavarian noble family from which he was descended, began his ecclesiastical career at the cathedral of Salzburg. The future archbishop saw to fruition the establishment of the monastery of Goess in Styria, begun by his like-named father,¹⁰ and once in office founded the monastery of Hasungen near the town of Kassel.¹¹ Acting as his own building contractor, Aribo initiated the restoration of the cathedral at Mainz, which had been gutted by fire during Willigis's archbishopric (1009). The project was completed, however, under the direction of Aribo's successor, Bardo, who was a simple monk and did not restore the marvelous frescoes that had graced the original edifice.

FIG. 13 Ring that belonged to Archbishop Aribo of Mainz. From the Cathedral and Diocesan Museum of Mainz.

Image not available

There was nothing ordinary about the archbishop: His penchant for honesty could give rise to incivility; his certitude rendered him intolerant and uncompromising. According to one of his contemporaries, Aribo's pursuits in life were "work and an uncompromising authority."¹² Nonetheless, for many years Conrad II got along well with the archbishop and not just because he was the king and emperor; indeed, the Salian nobleman must have won over the Bavarian ecclesiastic while his accession to the throne was still far from guaranteed. It comes as no surprise that none of the sources recount how that was accomplished, but given Aribo's subsequent treatment of Conrad's consort,¹³ one may assume that Gisela had not played a contributing role. Another high-ranking lady may have brought the two men together, however: Toward the end of Emperor Henry's reign, Aribo found his influence increasingly overshadowed by that of his nephew Archbishop Pilgrim of Cologne, so he compensated by becoming the "man," so to speak, of Empress Cunigunde, with whom—and with whose immediate kin—her husband had not always seen eye to eye. In fact, it was this alliance between the Luxembourg family—the dowager empress and her two brothers, Bishop Dietrich II of Metz and Duke Henry V of Bavaria—and Archbishop Aribo of Mainz that not merely preserved the peace following the sovereign's death but also brought the interregnum to a quick end in Conrad's favor.¹⁴ Hence, at Kamba in 1024 Pilgrim may have championed not just the interests of the Lotharingians but also the policies of Henry II, which were not exactly favorable to the older of the two Conrads in attendance, until he learned—with great alacrity—to do otherwise.¹⁵

The warm understanding between the new king and the archbishop of Mainz was sorely tested right after the election, when Aribo refused to crown Gisela jointly with Conrad. His exact reasons for doing so have not been completely elucidated and probably never will be.¹⁶ Nevertheless, Conrad's coronation in the cathedral at Mainz proved to be a solemn celebration that confirmed Aribo's standing and policy. From autumn 1024 on, the archbishop absented himself from his seat and accompanied the ruling couple on their

progression through the realm. While one may be sure that he did not attend Archbishop Pilgrim's coronation of Queen Gisela on September 21 in Cologne, it is less clear, judging from the relevant diplomas, whether Aribo was already by Conrad's side when the new king and queen visited Liège on October 2, 1024.¹⁷ The archbishop had certainly joined them by Christmas 1024, when he participated in a magnificent court diet convened at Minden, and the repeated appearance of his name—often in conjunction with that of his kinsman and rival, the archbishop of Cologne—in subsequent diplomas indicates that he continued to accompany the royal couple.¹⁸ From early 1025 on, Aribo became so wrapped up in the second phase of the dispute over Gandersheim, which dragged on beyond year's end, that Conrad could for the first time free himself from the excessively powerful ecclesiastical prince's interference: Following the death of his fatherly friend and teacher, Burchard of Worms, in August, the king appointed a successor without the archbishop's counsel and advice. This move must have raised a protest from the enraged ecclesiastic, but in the end Aribo backed down enough to consecrate the new bishop of Worms on December 5, 1025.¹⁹

Given that he was archchancellor for Italy, it goes without saying that the archbishop of Mainz joined the royal party in Augsburg at the beginning of February 1026 in preparation for the king's first expedition to Italy.²⁰ Conrad II spent a good two weeks there and on a single day toward the end of his stay issued three diplomas that clearly illustrate how intervenors or even petitioners shared or at least openly promoted the interests of royal beneficiaries. Two of the diplomas benefited the bishopric of Worms and its local churches, and in both cases Gisela acted as the sole intervenor and the new bishop of Worms as petitioner. Apart from the queen's concern and duty to promote royal policy in general, her advocacy of the grant to the cathedral of Saint Peter in Worms was also born of her solicitude for the members of her immediate family, since she, her husband, and her son were included in the church's prayer confraternity. The third diploma, on which Gisela and the archbishop of Mainz are listed both as intervenors and petitioners, concerns a gift to Seeon, in upper Bavaria, a monastery founded by Aribo's father and thus on whose behalf it was only fitting that he intercede.²¹

Soon after, the archbishop of Mainz accompanied the royal couple on their journey across the Alps toward Rome for the imperial coronation. These plans were temporarily put on hold, however, when the expedition encountered opposition from the northern Italians and, more crucially, the noxious summer heat. At the end of June 1026, Aribo and other magnates were given leave to depart; documentary evidence places him back in Rome on April 4, 1027,²² but he was certainly there already on March 26 for Conrad's imperial coronation and stayed on for the Lateran synod on April 6, 1027.²³ Soon after

April 7 the archbishop probably took his leave and headed for home, rejoining the imperial court in Regensburg on July 5 and 7, 1027.²⁴ Aribo's strenuous schedule continued into the fall, when by virtue of his status as metropolitan he presided over the synod of Frankfurt on September 23–24, 1027, at which he was dealt two blows: One—the synod's dismissal of his objections to the marriage between Otto and Irmgard of Hammerstein—may have been no more than a formal recognition of a settlement reached long before between Conrad and Aribo, but the second—the public humiliation and significant loss of face the archbishop suffered over Gandersheim—was anything but. Moreover, the emperor stood by and let the chips fall where they might, offering not a word of support for the little-loved Bavarian native; in fact, Conrad publicly upbraided Aribo for his obstreperous behavior toward the imperial princess, Abbess Sophie of Gandersheim. While the emperor's coolness toward the archbishop lasted until the latter met his tragic end, in 1031, Conrad never stripped Aribo of any of his appointments or authority.²⁵

Bardo (1031–51)

“Archbishop Aribo of Mainz departed from this life while on his way to pray in Rome; he was succeeded in office by Bardo, a man worthy of veneration because of his monkish manner and garb.”²⁶ This brief chronicle entry penned at the monastery on the island of Reichenau suffices to capture the essence of Aribo's successor, a former monk from Fulda whose *simplicitas*, born of modesty and restraint, often rendered him unmanipulable during the twenty years—twice as long, by the way, as his predecessor—he served as archbishop. However, the prospect of manipulating the metropolitan may have been the reason Conrad appointed Bardo,²⁷ and it certainly motivated Gisela to convince her husband to invest her kinsman with Mainz so soon after he had traded the abbacy of Werden for that of Hersfeld, also at her recommendation.²⁸

The sources do note that Bardo was not Conrad's first choice for the archbishopric, which was to go to a relative newcomer to the court chapel, Wazo of Liège. An extremely gifted theologian with an ascetic temperament that made him a proponent of the Lotharingian reform movement, Wazo had moreover made quite a name for himself by besting Conrad's learned Jewish physician in a theological debate. His exceptional intellectual prowess had propelled him through the ecclesiastical ranks into the directorship of the cathedral school, but because he was not of particularly high birth, the proud sons of the upper nobility made things difficult for their lower-born schoolmaster. Due to his entanglement in the conflicts between the reformers and their opponents, Wazo was compelled to leave Liège and attach himself to Poppo of Stavelot, who was one of the king's confidants and recommended

that the theologian be accepted into the court chapel. He did not stay very long, however, and returned to the cathedral chapter at Liège, which elected him provost and archdeacon.²⁹

When Wazo declined the position in Mainz, Conrad twice tried to convince him to accept the bishopric of Liège, both times to no avail. The provost's behavior brings two similar instances to mind: His mentor, Abbot Poppo of Stavelot, refused to succeed Bishop Werner I of Strasbourg in 1028, and Abbot Odilo of Cluny declined to serve as the archbishop of Lyon in spite of his election to that office, sparking a most pointed rebuke from Pope John XIX in 1032.³⁰ It is furthermore possible that the royal chaplains had objected to Wazo's candidacy, thus making it all the easier for him to decline the appointment. The long-held plan of investing Wazo with a bishopric was finally realized in 1042, although Henry III received a great deal of help from Archbishop Hermann of Cologne and Bishop Bruno of Würzburg against Wazo's high-born opponents at court, who continued to stand between him and the bishopric of Liège. They had never accepted him as one of their own, perhaps because they were put off by his ascetic disregard for personal hygiene: It was said that the odoriferous Wazo never bathed.³¹

The dismissal of Conrad's first choice to succeed Aribo cleared the way for Gisela's protégé. Since Bardo was one of the Conradine kindred, the upper-class clique at court could hardly question his pedigree, so they focused instead on his lack of good looks³² and, even more important, his seeming lack of intelligence and education. They greeted his short and simple sermon on Christmas 1031 at the palace in Goslar with derision, which caused Conrad to regret his choice and become so consumed with anger that he did not eat a single bite at the feast that followed.³³ His reaction provides further evidence that he would have preferred to appoint someone other than Bardo—Wazo or perhaps Richard of Fulda³⁴—to the vacancy, and “making a face” at his wife, he placed the blame on her.³⁵ The magnificent sermon delivered the next day by Bishop Dietrich of Metz only stoked Conrad's anger. Against his friends' advice, Bardo tried again on the following day (December 27) and “avenged” himself by delivering a wide-ranging sermon that was firmly rooted in the Bible and yet qualified as a realistic and emotional piece of oratory, and thereby filling his detractors with shame. Bardo was, at any rate, generally praised for his kindheartedness, particularly toward society's fringe elements and outcasts; unlike Henry III, who had beggars and minstrels ejected from his wedding celebration, Bardo lent such people a hand.³⁶

Needless to say, such behavior cost the new archbishop almost all of his influence at Conrad's court, and his incessant anxiety about staying in the emperor's good graces robbed him even of his ability to make good on the feudal rights associated with his office.³⁷ A diploma issued in the period between Bardo's investiture with ring and crosier on May 30 and his consecration

on June 29 provides the earliest evidence for his loss of the Italian archchancellorship to Pilgrim of Cologne.³⁸ It even appears that Conrad may have considered depriving the new archbishop of the archchaplaincy and—concomitantly—the German archchancellorship. The news of Aribo's death on April 6 could have reached the court at Nijmegen by April 20–23, 1031,³⁹ yet the emperor did not name Bardo to those two court posts until September 14, long after he had been invested and consecrated archbishop of Mainz.⁴⁰ Almost one quarter of the 165 Salian diplomas issued during Aribo's lifetime list him as an intervenor,⁴¹ while none of the diplomas issued between September 1031 and May 1039 were the product or even admitted of his successor's intervention.⁴² A diploma issued on August 2, 1033, revoking the transfer of a county from Meinwerk and the bishopric of Paderborn to Aribo and the archdiocese of Mainz, excoriates the dead archbishop but makes no mention of the incumbent officeholder.⁴³ During Bardo's tenure, the cathedral advocate oppressed the citizens and ministerials of Mainz and brought them to trial before the royal court, thus threatening them with physical harm. Unable to protect either his property or his people, Bardo proved himself a poor lord and was consequently abandoned by his retainers, who swore fealty to the emperor and entered his service at court.⁴⁴ Much as one might expect, Bardo also decided to yield in the dispute over Gandersheim, which was, of course, exactly what the imperial couple wanted.⁴⁵

The only time Bardo is known to have played a role in Conrad's imperial policy was in the immediate aftermath of his consecration in 1031, when the new archbishop of Mainz consecrated the new bishop of Prague; Severus was truly unworthy of the office, but Bardo surely had no choice in the matter.⁴⁶ The archbishop did not even attend an assembly convened in Limburg to settle a dispute that had broken out in the suffragan bishopric of Strasbourg over the beginning of Advent, but sent his cathedral provost in his stead (December 1038). This tidbit comes from a source not known for its trustworthiness but whose account of the dispute is substantiated elsewhere. The chronicle goes on to note that Conrad and Gisela had a single heir named Henry, "who was born to them late in life, just as the saintly Bardo had prophesized."⁴⁷ The first part of the remark—with its allusion to Abraham, Sarah, and Isaac—is nonsense, of course, since the two were approximately twenty-seven years old at the time of Henry's birth,⁴⁸ but there may be a kernel of truth in the second clause: Following Gisela's marriage to Conrad, Bardo may very well have told his kinswoman that she would bear her husband a son. That probably would help explain why she had such an abiding interest in Bardo's advancement; after all, he was appointed abbot of Hersfeld at her instigation just before making the leap to archbishop of Mainz.⁴⁹

Bardo was, to be sure, anything but the typical imperial bishop of the Ottonian or early Salian period. Is that why he was also such an abject failure? Did

his successor allow Bardo to be styled a saint in order to deflect attention from his own inadequacies? Or was the veneration of this naïve, cheerful, and innocent monk orchestrated by the monastery of Fulda?⁵⁰ The answer to each of these questions is a resounding no, if only because Bardo was more multifaceted than his biographer makes him out to be. The reconstruction of the monastery of Saint Martin, as contemporaneous writers archaically termed the cathedral of Mainz that had burned down in 1009, was completed under his direction, although in a somewhat simplified form. Bardo celebrated the building's consecration on the eve of the Feast of Saint Martin (November 10, 1036) in the presence of the emperor and empress, as well as their son and his consort. No fewer than seventeen bishops officiated as cocolebrants.⁵¹

The *vita communis*, or common life, that Bardo stressed for the cathedral clergy at Mainz presaged—to a degree almost unequaled elsewhere—the later practices of regular canons, and he applied the same standards to his own life, which consisted of the traditional Benedictine combination of prayer and work.⁵² Moreover, the archbishop knew how to lay the groundwork for a successful ecclesiastical career. When Conrad visited the monastery of Saint Andreas at Fulda at the tail end of his royal progression in spring 1025, Bardo, then a prior, was able to gain entrée to the new king thanks to his kinship with the queen and presented Conrad with an opulent folding chair that he had commissioned long before, “upon the order and with the permission of Abbot Richard.” Conrad accepted the gift and promised the prior a speedy “promotion.” Yet, Bardo also knew how to cut a proper figure as an officeholder in the church triumphant, otherwise Aribio would never have been in the position to rebuke him for wielding an unduly ornate abbot's staff and to force him to come to terms in the matter. During the reign of Henry III Bardo even tried his hand at leading an armed force against the Bohemians and perhaps the Hungarians as well.⁵³

All in all, the archbishop remained a Benedictine at heart. Within the cathedral close he replicated the relationship between an abbot and the monks in his care, while in the countryside he promoted the maintenance—or the reformative restoration—of a pristine Benedictine way of life. From the eighth and ninth centuries on, ecclesiastical leaders had repeatedly admonished monks to cease performing pastoral duties and withdraw to their monasteries,⁵⁴ a demand that proved to have enormous economic repercussions for both sides once the parish and concomitant tithing systems were regularized. Bardo became a vigorous advocate of the secular clergy's stance, which he sought to further by requiring that the monasteries in his province remit to the metropolitan a sizable proportion of what they collected in tithes. Not surprisingly, this radical departure from traditional practices sparked sharp resistance.⁵⁵

When viewed in terms of his enthusiasm for the religious life and his firm policy regarding tithes, Bardo's appointment to the see of Mainz takes on a

different cast. Choosing an apolitical religious shepherd to succeed an inveterate politician like Archbishop Aribo was, it must be conceded, bound to reduce friction between the imperial and archiepiscopal courts. This is not to say, however, that Bardo was a simpleton plucked from the monastery as a substitute for the reform-minded Wazo of Liège just because he was one of the empress's Conradine kindred. Upon the order of the emperor, Bardo's vacated abbacy at Hersfeld was quickly filled by Rotho/Rudolph, the former provost of Stavelot, who appears to have wasted little time in introducing the strict standards of religious observance propounded by his teacher, Abbot Poppo (summer 1031). Much as Bardo had been elevated in 1029 from monk at Fulda to the abbacy at the imperial monastery of Werden in order to institute its reform, so two years later exactly the same thing occurred to his brother monk Gerold, who was charged with taking up where his predecessor had left off at Werden.⁵⁶ Seen thusly, Bardo was a credible alternative to Wazo of Liège, and while he may have prevailed thanks to Gisela's support, he did participate in the reform movement of his age, just not as an advocate for either Poppo of Stavelot or Godehard of Niederalteich. When Frederick of Lotharingia—the future Pope Stephen IX—sought counsel and aid for the canonry established by his family at Namur many years later (1047), he turned to Archbishop Bardo of Mainz for the needed relics and liturgical books, even though the reformers of Lotharingia and Burgundy were right at his doorstep.⁵⁷ It was not by mere happenstance that after his death, Bardo was venerated as a saint.

2. Cologne: The Countertype

Pilgrim of Cologne (1021–36) was Aribo's first cousin or nephew and, by virtue of his kinship with the Aribo family of Bavaria, a distant relative of Henry II and thus Conrad II as well.⁵⁸ The two Rhenish archbishops were frequently rivals, but Pilgrim, the younger of the two, was without a doubt more adroit than Aribo and enjoyed success his whole life long. When the older man landed in hot water with Rome for his intransigence over the marriage between Irmgard and Otto of Hammerstein and as a result temporarily lost the right to wear the pallium, Pilgrim took advantage of Aribo's predicament and had his own pallium "plated in gold," which some have suggested was prompted by a papal confirmation of his right to crown the German king.⁵⁹ Pilgrim was, like Aribo, an intimate of Henry II, but he may have jeopardized his position at court by casting his lot in with the Lotharingians—instead of Conrad—at Kamba and withdrawing unreconciled. In no time at all, however, he disengaged himself from that political alliance and was able to come up with a solution to the impasse: On September 21, 1024, Pilgrim crowned Gisela queen in a rite that Aribo had either forbore or refused to celebrate in Mainz.⁶⁰ In

doing so, the archbishop of Cologne established a powerful precedent that served him in good stead four years later, when he managed to crown the young Henry III in Aachen (1028), and that paved the way for his successors to perform later Salian coronations there.⁶¹

Although Pilgrim did not intervene in nearly as many imperial transactions as Aribo, he is named on more of Conrad's diplomas than any of the remaining members of the German episcopate.⁶² Like his kinsman, Pilgrim left Germany in the second half of February 1026 on Conrad's first expedition to Rome and, like most of his German episcopal colleagues, was granted leave to return home that summer; he did not rejoin the emperor, however, clearly because Aribo, the archchancellor for Italy, found his presence intrusive.⁶³ The archbishop of Cologne witnessed the trouncing of his kinsman and rival at the synod of Frankfurt in September 1027 and succeeded to the Italian archchancellorship upon Aribo's death, in 1031,⁶⁴ again setting—though probably not by his and the emperor's design—what would prove to be a centuries-long precedent. The bottom line was that Pilgrim was the right candidate for the office: He had served as the chancellor for Italy from 1016 to 1021 and as a successful military commander in southern Italy in 1022, during the reign of Henry II, and had intervened on behalf of Italian beneficiaries even before 1031.⁶⁵

Pilgrim's policy of joining forces with the regional magnates—especially Ezzo, count palatine of Lotharingia—proved advantageous to the Bavarian-born archbishop and his archbishopric. Ezzo's efforts to transform the family monastery of Brauweiler, near Cologne, into the religious heart of his domain received Pilgrim's support, as did familial efforts to promote monastic reform. It was thus only natural for the archbishop to establish contact with the most important reform abbot of the age, Poppo of Stavelot and Saint Maximin in Trier (1024). Four years later, Pilgrim consecrated the first building at Brauweiler (1028) and in 1030 installed Ello, a monk from Saint Maximin, as the founding abbot (1030). The monastery of Deutz, which had been established across the Rhine from Cologne by Pilgrim's immediate predecessor, Archbishop Heribert, also enjoyed his support, as did the Church of the Holy Apostles within the city limits; the archbishop arranged for its expansion, procured relics from Rome for its canonry, and upon its completion officiated at the reconsecration. After his death, on August 25, 1036, it was here that he was laid to his rest.⁶⁶ The archbishop may not have been particularly learned in theology or literature, yet he still fostered the cathedral school and commended students for their achievements; it was at his suggestion that Abbot Bern of Reichenau composed a tonary.⁶⁷

In almost all respects, Pilgrim was the very model of an imperial bishop: He was an intellectually engaged member of the upper clergy and shepherd of his flock who not only had a feel for the religious needs of his social peers in the secular world and thus for monastic reform but also vigorously exploited

his personal connections in championing those causes. As evidenced by the man chosen to succeed him, these were precisely the qualities Conrad and Gisela sought in the holder of this ecclesiastical office, one of the highest ranked in the kingdom.

During his predecessor's tenure, Hermann II (1036–56) rose to the position of cathedral provost, served in the court chapel, and succeeded Bishop Bruno of Würzburg as the chancellor for Italy. His parents were Ezzo, count palatine of Lotharingia, and Matilda, the daughter of Emperor Otto II; his brother Ludolf, who predeceased him in 1031, had served as the commander of Cologne's military contingent under Archbishop Pilgrim, and of his many sisters, five, including Sophie of Gandersheim, were abbesses, and one, Richeza of Poland, a queen.⁶⁸ Hermann succeeded to the archchancellorship of Italy straightaway, accompanied Conrad II on the second expedition to Italy (1037–38), and after the emperor's death in Utrecht, on June 4, 1039, arranged for Conrad's corpse to be carried through all of Cologne's religious foundations on its way to Speyer.⁶⁹ Archbishop Hermann reached the pinnacle of his influence and prominence during the reign of Henry III, but even long before then his actions validated the decision-making process underlying Conrad's local "personnel policy," although his appointment occurred "by the grace of God, by means of an election involving all of the clerics (of Cologne), and with the approval of all the people." As even those living outside of Cologne noted, his assumption of the archbishopric inspired the "ineffable joy of the devout."⁷⁰ In all likelihood Conrad II had been willing to name a "logical successor" to fill the vacancy in Cologne, just as long as the individual possessed—in addition to royal blood—as spiritual a nature as possible for an intimate of the sovereign. That Gisela might look for the same qualities in a candidate is clear from her involvement in an appointment to the archbishopric of Bremen, another countertype to Mainz.

3. Hamburg-Bremen: A Countertype of Sorts

During the reign of Charlemagne the diocese of Bremen was established as a suffragan see of Cologne for its founding bishop, Willehad (787–89); during the reign of Charlemagne's successor, Emperor Louis the Pious, the archdiocese of Hamburg was established as a base for Ansgar (831–65), who had undertaken to convert the Scandinavians. In 845 the Danes destroyed Hamburg and routed the archbishop, who remained officially homeless until 848, when he was tapped to fill the newly vacant bishopric of Bremen. In 864 "Ansgar's authority, which, as the people of Bremen recognized, was a function of his more senior appointment as archbishop of Hamburg, was invested in the bishop of Bremen and his episcopal seat." In effect, Bremen gained its

independence from the metropolitan of Cologne by becoming associated with a missionary enterprise that transcended the empire's northern and northeastern borders; this involvement in Scandinavia and the Slavic lands east of the lower Elbe accounted for the unique character of the fifth oldest "German" province and its relationship with the rulers of the East Frankish–German kingdom. Hence, "the fact that the [officeholder's] dignity was rooted in Hamburg, even though the archbishop himself was associated with the *sedes* in Bremen, is of overwhelming importance to the internal history of the archbishopric."⁷¹

In many respects, the interests of the archbishops of Hamburg-Bremen conflicted with those of the local ducal family, the Billungs, but the enmity between them did not reach its peak until later in the Salian period. Archbishop Unwan (1013–29), who owed his appointment to Henry II, was a member of the Immeding family, a noble line related to the Billungs. He and his kinsman Bishop Meinwerk of Paderborn served as mediators during the revolt by the Billungs against the emperor in 1019/20, at a time when it was still possible for an archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen on amicable terms with the king to establish common ground with the independent-minded members of the ducal house. According to Adam of Bremen, "Unwan had with him at most of the Easter festivals seven bishops, also abbots, and, no less, the duke and certain count of his province." This state of mutual cooperation continued, if fitfully, under Unwan's immediate successor, Liawizo/Libentius II (1029–32), but came to an end with Bezelin-Alebrand (1035–43).⁷² Like other Saxons, Unwan was absent from the assembly at Kamba but showed up at Minden on Christmas 1024 in order to pay homage to the new king.⁷³ Approximately one year later, he performed the diplomatic feat of reconciling Conrad II and Cnut the Great, thereby establishing a lasting peace underwritten by a personal friendship.⁷⁴ As has been rightly pointed out, Unwan was recruited for the archbishopric out of the royal chapel, which gave him a decisive edge over an equally competent rival. Since both his predecessor and successor—albeit twice removed—most probably shared the same background, these valuable connections served to "strengthen the province's close ties to the king and for a long time shape its fundamental policies." Unwan did not, however, make the journey to Rome in 1027 for Conrad's imperial coronation, probably due to his advanced age.⁷⁵ He died in early 1029 and was succeeded in office by Liawizo/Libentius II, the former provost of the cathedral in Bremen, as well as nephew and namesake of Unwan's immediate predecessor. Conrad II made this appointment upon Gisela's recommendation,⁷⁶ in spite—or just because—of the fact that Liawizo had never served at the court chapel.⁷⁷

Both Unwan and Liawizo aggressively asserted their metropolitan rights in the Scandinavian reaches of their province; throwing an—in his opinion—improperly consecrated bishop into prison did not give Unwan even a moment's pause. When it came to Cnut the Great, Liawizo naturally followed in his

predecessor's footsteps and immediately established good relations with the Scandinavian sovereign, thus perpetuating a policy that had the added benefit of safeguarding Hamburg.⁷⁸ Like his colleague Bishop Thietmar of Merseburg and his kinsman Bishop Meinwerk of Paderborn, Archbishop Unwan owed his appointment to his ability—as a man of private means—to provide his impecunious church with a quick infusion of funds. He may have been forced upon his archdiocese, a practice that reeked of simony to the later eleventh-century churchmen but only enhanced the utility of an imperial bishopric to Henry II and Conrad II.⁷⁹ Unwan clearly understood how much some clerics yearned for a wife and family, so he relaxed the appertaining rules for the cathedral canons, leaving it to his successor to retighten the reins. In any case, Unwan reportedly did away with the mixed rule governing the clerics attached to the cathedral and declared them all canons. The local marsh dwellers were purged of any lingering pagan beliefs, and the lumber harvested from their sacred groves was allegedly employed in an extensive building program. The archbishop was particularly celebrated, however, for his reconstruction of Hamburg, where he erected a canonry to which each of the archdiocese's four monasteries was enjoined to contribute three members.⁸⁰

These two successful archbishops were followed by Hermann II (1032–35), who was probably of noble descent from southeastern Saxony and enjoyed the strong backing of the ecclesiastics in Halberstadt, where he had served as cathedral provost. The local clergy and ministerials had already sought to have him elevated to that bishopric in 1023, but neither they nor the large monetary inducement offered up by his fervent supporters, the ministerials, swayed Henry II. It is difficult to say why Conrad II considered Hermann a viable candidate for the vacant post in Bremen twelve years later. Was the emperor somehow making up for the alleged or true injustice done the provost by Henry II? In any case, the appointment was a monumental mistake, whose only saving grace was its brevity. Hermann got along well with the local nobles and the ministerials in his household, erected ramparts around Bremen, and considered Hamburg a “briny waste” to be stripped bare. In one respect, however, Hermann resembled the other holders of his office in the first half of the eleventh century: He tapped his personal wealth to purchase items for the archbishopric. But though he allegedly planned to rebuild the church compound from the ground up, he actually spent little time in Bremen, preferring the familiar surroundings of Halberstadt, in whose outskirts he eventually died.⁸¹

Hermann may at one time have served in the royal chapel; that would at least explain his appointment. Yet, if Conrad knew this son of the provincial nobility from his time at court, how could the emperor have misjudged him so? In any case, Hermann's successor, Bezelin-Alebrand (1035–43), is known to have been a royal chaplain: In the words of Adam of Bremen, “The Emperor Conrad gave him the staff,” and he had every reason to be satisfied with

his choice. Bezelin had been a canon at Cologne and probably a member of Archbishop Pilgrim's inner circle. The new archbishop of Bremen was accorded a most joyous welcome by all and would be memorialized as embodying all the virtues. He reinstated the building program initiated by his earlier predecessors, with particular focus on Hamburg, where he arranged for the construction of a new stone cathedral and a sturdy stronghold to serve as his official residence. Up until then, the archbishop and duke had shared a domicile, but with Bezelin's withdrawal from that arrangement, the Billung family moved into the "new fortress" they constructed on the island near the site of the future Church of Saint Nicholas. "Starting with Bezelin, who erected the stone residence next to the cathedral of Hamburg, the archbishops disappear from Billung commemorations for their dead." As later events would prove, the archbishops paid dearly for asserting their authority in Hamburg.⁸² Archbishop Bezelin did not ignore the ecclesiastical aspects of his office: He was concerned about the levels of discipline and obedience exercised by the canons, and in tandem with his colleague in Cologne ingeniously settled the remaining points of contention surrounding Bremen's release from the senior metropolitan's jurisdiction,⁸³ although their efforts and achievements postdate Conrad's death.

4. Salzburg, Trier, and Magdeburg: All Quiet on the Empire's Fronts

Both Poppo of Trier (1015–47) and Hunfried of Magdeburg (1023–51) had been installed by Henry II and went on to outlive Conrad II by not just a couple, but many years.⁸⁴ Hence, how they exercised their authority or conceived of their duties does not—for better or worse—reflect on Conrad's ecclesiastical policy. Archbishop Poppo, a member of the Babenberg family, was an avid traveler and often ventured beyond the boundaries of his province; he journeyed even as far as Jerusalem and Baghdad, and brought Symeon, a highly venerated monk from the East, to Trier. Conrad's stepson Ernest II of Swabia was under his guardianship, though probably not long beyond 1024. Poppo was present at Conrad's election in Kamba as well as the imperial coronation in Rome at Easter 1027, which Hunfried of Magdeburg also attended. The last documented encounter between Poppo and Conrad II took place in Parma at the end of December 1037, during the emperor's second expedition to Italy.⁸⁵

The archbishop of Salzburg at the time of Conrad's accession to the throne was Gunther (d. 1025), a member of the Ekkehardine family who had served for many years as a royal chaplain and from 1008 as Henry's chancellor. Although it is possible that this son of the upper nobility from the Saxon-Slavic border area was installed in office at the same time as Hunfried of Magdeburg,

he spent less than two years as metropolitan of this Bavarian-Slavic province.⁸⁶ As far as is known, Gunther was involved in only one nonlocal matter of imperial as well as ecclesiastical import, namely the delicately negotiated agreement that provided Cunigunde with a portion of the financial guarantees that she considered her due as dowager empress; as can be seen from a companion agreement issued in Freising, its legal terms were not entirely favorable to the king.⁸⁷ Gunther came from an excellent family, yet was modest and “good before God and men.”⁸⁸ There is no way of knowing what he might have accomplished had he lived longer.

Thietmar II (1025–41), who succeeded Gunther in office, also did not make a name for himself on the imperial stage, although, like the other German archbishops, except Unwan of Bremen, he attended Conrad’s imperial coronation in Rome at Easter 1027.⁸⁹ On the provincial level, however, Thietmar possessed the authority to act in the pope’s or a papal legate’s stead and resolve issues that would otherwise have been reserved to the jurisdiction of Rome. He had been personally invested with this right on June 5, 1026, along with the pallium and other honors associated with his office, thus laying the groundwork for a late-twelfth-century successor’s assumption of the office of *legatus natus* and the archiepiscopal exercise of legatine authority within the province of Salzburg up until today.⁹⁰ During Thietmar’s tenure, Conrad II issued no fewer than five imperial diplomas to the archdiocese of Salzburg that had the effect of making the archbishop the dowager empress’s heir.⁹¹

A review of the diplomatic record reveals that Archbishop Hunfried intervened on behalf of both ecclesiastical and secular beneficiaries within his province, while Archbishop Thietmar II intervened only on his own behalf.⁹² Common occurrences like the installation of a new bishop or even a new archbishop did not as a rule attract broad attention, and thus accounts of Thietmar’s ordination are limited to sources regarding Salzburg,⁹³ while his investment by Conrad II goes entirely unmentioned. To gain an indication of the intellectual niveau of the Salzburg clergy before 1000, one need only consider a mathematical treatise penned by Walter of Speyer and dedicated to his “colleagues at Salzburg”—including Liutfried, a famous teacher associated with Archbishop Frederick (954–90)—whose expertise in the subject could be taken for granted. There is no indication for the existence of such intellectual leaders and networks in Salzburg a generation later.⁹⁴ Regardless of what one may infer from the self-imposed local focus of the archbishops of Salzburg and their closest advisors, they were probably acting in concert with the wishes of the faraway sovereign, who in all likelihood preferred that the metropolitan maintain order within the kingdom’s huge southeastern territory of Bavaria and preserve the peace in cooperation with secular magnates, or, to put it in different words, practice “creative” provincialism in the service

of the kingdom. To put this to the test, one need only review the *Codex Thietmari*, a collection of documents and other notices concerning property transfers that provides an overview of the archdiocese's real estate dealings and was commissioned by the archbishop in order to establish his place among the holders of his office, past and future.⁹⁵

THE MOST IMPORTANT BISHOPRICS
NORTH OF THE ALPS

1. Strasbourg: A Great Bishop Followed by the Uncle of an Emperor

The bishops of Strasbourg, Würzburg, and Augsburg were the most prominent suffragan bishops of Mainz, regardless of how the individual incumbent officeholder might rank in seniority.¹ According to a list drawn up in 981, the diocese of Strasbourg was responsible for contributing one hundred knights in armor to the imperial army, a sizable contingent matched only by the archbishoprics of Mainz and Cologne, and much larger than those fielded by the provinces of Trier, Salzburg, Magdeburg, and probably Hamburg-Bremen. Of the German episcopal sees, only Augsburg provided as large a force.² Bishop Werner I of Strasbourg died and was buried in Constantinople,³ having passed away far from his homeland while serving as an emissary to Byzantium on the emperor's behalf (October 28, 1028).⁴ His tenure spanned the reigns of three emperors: Otto III, who appointed him bishop in 1001; Henry II, his former schoolmate; and Conrad II, who accorded him a particularly important role at court. Along with Bishop Bruno of Augsburg, Werner was one of the king's foremost advisors; he accompanied the first Salian king to Rome for the imperial coronation and set the scene for the emperor's resolution of the dispute over Gandersheim. He had, of course, attended the assembly at Kamba,⁵ although he was a former member of what would today be termed the "opposition party": During the contested succession to the throne in 1002, Werner had quickly and decisively come out in support of Henry II, only to reap the enmity of the rival claimant—and local suzerain—Gisela's father, Hermann II of Swabia. The duke responded by seeking through force of arms to assert his dominion over Strasbourg, "the main city of his duchy," but he was forced to pay for the terrible devastation he wreaked upon the episcopal seat: When he submitted himself to Henry II, the duke was stripped of his authority over Strasbourg.⁶

Bishop Werner had almost certainly served at the court chapel during the

reign of Otto III,⁷ and his successor, William I (1028/29–1046/47), received his training there as well. One source terms William the “archchaplain to the queen,”⁸ but that was not an official title, just a descriptive phrase indicating that he was the chief chaplain assigned to the queen.⁹ Both Werner and William came from very good families: The former was descended from the ducal house of Upper Lotharingia, the Bar family,¹⁰ and the latter counted Henry of Worms—Conrad’s father—and Pope Gregory V, who had died young, as brothers.¹¹ Still, the two could not have been more different, as a comparison of the extensive coverage the sources lavish on Werner and his activities with the paucity of references to William quickly brings home. Conrad II had not initially favored his uncle for the office, but his original candidate, Poppo of Stavelot, the most important monastic reformer in the kingdom, had disqualified himself from the weighty office by claiming that he was the son of a priest and thus “tainted by birth.” This would not be the last time that the emperor’s wishes would be thwarted; just two years later, for example, Poppo’s student Wazo declined the archbishopric of Mainz. When the emperor learned from his good kinswoman Irmgard of Hammerstein that the abbot had deceived him out of piety, he roundly excoriated the reluctant candidate but did not hold it further against him.¹²

William accomplished almost nothing noteworthy during his first decade in office, which overlapped with Conrad’s last on the throne; the remainder of his tenure was equally undistinguished, except perhaps for the fact that he outlived his nephew by almost nine years.¹³ Only one incident deserves mention, the embarrassing dispute in 1038 over the beginning of Advent, a product no doubt of William’s deficient education: He may have learned how to read and write while a chaplain, but obviously not how to add and subtract, even though the Venerable Bede (d. 735) had already urged clerics to master arithmetic lest they be consigned to hell’s torments for miscalculating the proper date on which to celebrate the moveable Feast of Easter. The dispute in the fall of 1038, however, concerned the earliest date on which the first Sunday in Advent could fall, a markedly simpler and less theologically fraught mathematical reckoning, since it did not affect the observance of Christ’s passion and salvation.¹⁴ When Conrad II and his son, Henry, stopped off in Strasbourg on Sunday, November 26, 1038, on the journey from Burgundy to Goslar, Bishop William took it upon himself to celebrate jointly the *adventus imperatoris*, or emperor’s arrival, and the *adventus domini*, or Lord’s arrival, observed beginning on the first Sunday of Advent. The emperor and his closest advisors vetoed the idea and instead celebrated the first Sunday of Advent in Limburg an der Haardt one week later (December 3, 1038) in the company of Gisela, the bishops of Worms, Speyer, Verona, Eichstätt, and Hildesheim, as well as numerous legates from other dioceses, including the province of Mainz. Whether or not this gathering may be said to represent a “synod,” the

attendees decreed that the first Sunday of Advent was to be celebrated no earlier than November 27 and no later than December 3—thus, not on November 26. Their determination was in keeping with tradition as codified at least a decade earlier by Abbot Bern of Reichenau in a treatise that drew upon Bede's tract *De ratione temporum* [On the calculation of dates] and was addressed to Archbishop Aribio of Mainz, who had endorsed its contents.¹⁵

There could only be one sanctioned start to Advent and the associated public fast. While Conrad certainly and Gisela likely lacked the expertise to weigh in on the question, they were anything but passive bystanders; on the contrary, the sovereign was obligated to clear up any question that might impinge upon public discipline and general order. Conrad may not have evinced as great an interest in ecclesiastical matters as either his predecessor or successor, but he showed no tolerance at all for confusion; to do so would have violated his sovereign duty.¹⁶ As a former archchaplain and the emperor's kinsman, William was so very well connected that it is puzzling he was not promoted earlier. Once he had been elevated from the Strasbourg canonry, however, he more than fulfilled his episcopal duty to build and establish churches and, what is more, comported himself irreproachably,¹⁷ which was perhaps a feat in itself.

2. Bruno of Augsburg (1006–29), the Brother of an Emperor, Followed by a Mismatch

Augsburg, the gathering place for German royal expeditions to Rome since Ottonian days, had been able to leverage coinage and market rights obtained in the mid-tenth century into a major trade relationship with northern and eastern Europe, as well as great wealth. Bruno, the brother of Henry II and royal chancellor since 1005, succeeded to the episcopal seat after it became vacant in 1006; although the exact date of his appointment is unknown, his consecration was celebrated in 1007. In spite of the fact that they were full brothers, the relationship between Bruno and Henry was often less than ideal; the bishop went into exile at least twice, and the news of the emperor's death reached him far away from home, at a monastery in Alamannia, perhaps Einsiedeln in present-day Switzerland. Bruno of Augsburg immediately became Conrad's foremost advisor and in February 1026 was entrusted with the new king's son and heir apparent, Henry III—and thus with the kingdom's administrative oversight—for the duration of the first expedition to Italy, probably because he and the king had such a remarkable political rapport.¹⁸ Along with Werner of Strasbourg, Bruno not only attended Conrad's imperial coronation in Rome but also played a pivotal role in the synod at Frankfurt (September 1027), not to mention the resolution of the dispute over Gandersheim.¹⁹ The

bishop joined the imperial court during a lengthy stay in Regensburg that extended into Easter (April 6, 1029) and beyond; Bruno appears as an inter-venor on an imperial diploma dated April 13, but his health must have taken a sudden turn for the worse, since he died on April 24, 1029. After the emperor paid his last respects, Gisela and Henry accompanied the body to Augsburg. Thereafter, according to Wipo, “Eberhard received the bishopric of Augsburg.”²⁰ Almost nothing is known about Bruno’s successor, beyond the fact that he died in 1047, the same year as William I of Strasbourg.²¹

3. Dietrich II of Metz (1005/6–1047), the Brother-in-Law of an Emperor

According to Wipo, Bishop Dietrich of Metz and Duke Henry V of Bavaria played an extraordinary role in their sister Cunigunde’s success in keeping the interregnum between the death of her husband, Henry II, and the election of his successor, Conrad II, relatively brief and free of unrest. It is indicative of the esteem in which the biographer thus held Dietrich that in listing the eminent members of the imperial episcopate he named the bishop right after the three Rhenish archbishops.²² The bishop of Metz also refused to pledge that he would not establish relations or do homage to the new king without Duke Gozelo’s permission.²³ In the latter half of May 1026, Dietrich himself installed his kinsman Bruno as the bishop of Toul, because the duly appointed archbishop, Poppo of Trier, had placed some awkward stipulations upon the consecration.²⁴ Like most of his episcopal colleagues, Dietrich was a great supporter of building projects,²⁵ but he also must have been an educated man and a gifted orator, because his eloquent sermonizing reaped the praise of the royal chaplains, even though he himself was not one of their number.²⁶ Even in the absence of direct proof for his participation in the meeting between Conrad II and Henry I of France in Deville (May 1033), the possibility cannot be dismissed. The sources do recount that in the aftermath of the emperor’s defeat of Odo of Champagne in September 1033, the French count appealed to Bishop Dietrich II of Metz and Duke Gozelo of Lotharingia to mediate an—albeit short-lived—peace.²⁷ In early summer 1036 the bishop attended the landmark court diet at Nijmegen,²⁸ and while he himself was apparently too advanced in years to participate in the great battle over the stronghold of Bar, in Lotharingia (November 1037), he did contribute the requisite military contingent.²⁹ As it happened, Dietrich occupied his office for an additional ten years, until his death in 1047; considering that he had been installed in 1005/6—under somewhat dubious circumstances—by his brother-in-law Henry II, he must have lived to a ripe old age.³⁰

Unlike Henry II, whose conflict of interest with his two brothers-in-law

over Trier escalated into open warfare in 1008,³¹ Conrad II enjoyed the stalwart support of the bishop and the remaining members of the Luxembourg kindred. The first Salian king knew that he could rely on the bishop of Metz, and the feeling was reciprocated.³²

4. Worms, or How to Advance One's Career

The first time Conrad entered an episcopal residence he was just a boy, but the months—or perhaps even the year or two—he spent under the tutelage of the newly appointed Bishop Burchard of Worms (1000–1025) seem to have made a lifelong impression on him. When the recently elected king decided to visit the churchman, who had been a fatherly friend to him and now did not have long to live, the former student even sent advance notice of his arrival. The frail and elderly Burchard bitterly bemoaned his inability to attend to his royal guest properly and withdrew for an entire day, which he spent—as was his wont—alone in meditative prayer. He emerged revitalized, appearing invigorated and healthy, his serenity restored. At the end of what would prove to be his last visit with Burchard, Conrad took him along to an assembly in Tribur, but the bishop withdrew from the proceedings after three days and received leave to depart; as he did so, the bishop quipped that he would never see the king again.³³

Bishop Azecho of Worms (1025–44), Burchard's successor, was the king's close companion and perhaps kinsman, although there is no definitive proof of the latter. It is known, however, that Azecho was not exceptionally tall³⁴ and that Conrad appointed him bishop without first obtaining the approval of Archbishop Aribio of Mainz, who protested the action yet did not decline to officiate at the consecration.³⁵ It is also known that Azecho received two generous tokens of the king's favor shortly thereafter: Just before his departure from Augsburg on the first expedition to Italy, Conrad issued two invaluable imperial diplomas to the newly installed bishop of Worms (February 14, 1026). The first confirmed all of his predecessors' gifts to the bishopric, in particular the family stronghold in Worms relinquished by his grandfather Otto; in the other, Conrad granted a detailed set of property rights to "his brethren," the cathedral canons of Worms, and to the monastery of Saint Cyriacus at Neuhausen.³⁶ The next documented case of imperial largesse is dated eight years later, when Azecho received a large gift from the emperor, who wished to enhance the cultivation of his ancestors' memory and to recognize other unspecified services rendered by the bishop.³⁷ Unlike Bruno of Würzburg, Reginbald of Speyer, Abbot Humbert of Lorsch, and even Bardo of Mainz, Azecho was apparently called up along with the contingent from Worms to participate in the war against the Liutizi (1035) and used his influence with

Bardo to have the archiepiscopal estate of Nörten, near Göttingen, placed at his force's disposal on their way to the battlefield.³⁸

It is impossible to overstate the significance of the *Decretum Burchardi*, penned by the bishop of Worms in 1010. Unsurpassed in importance until the twelfth century, this collection of canon laws survives in approximately eighty manuscripts today. Burchard produced a similarly groundbreaking compendium of statutes for the household of Worms cathedral, although its audience was, of course, predominantly regional.³⁹ The value of the former collection was already evident during the bishop's lifetime, and later users deemed its author a master whose like the world would never again see; it is hard to tell whether the latter sentiment was just an effusive expression of esteem for Burchard or a brickbat aimed at his successor.⁴⁰ In any case, the cathedral school was intellectually vibrant during Azecho's tenure, as evidenced by the much-studied collection of contemporary letters that reveal a colorful picture of ecclesiastical life at the time.⁴¹ The *Vita Burchardi* (Life of Burchard), on the other hand, does not seem to measure up to these masterpieces and has been disparaged by modern historians scouring the text in vain for sought-after information.⁴² When viewed in terms of its avowed purpose, however, the work quickly elicits an entirely different reaction, as does the suggestion that it was written by Ebbo, director of the cathedral school. Not only that, this hagiographical composition probably predates the epistolary collection, which attests to not only the high level of literacy but also the pronounced communal spirit of the canons of Worms around 1030. Both works are products of the Burchardine tradition, since the *vita* "was not just a pious memorial to the deceased bishop for his [the author's] students but a continuation of Burchard's program to maintain an educated, pious, and self-assured canonry."⁴³

In this milieu anyone with an education could enjoy professional success, even a woman, provided she could lay claim to a suitable ancestry and became a religious. Burchard's biography states that he was born in the region of Hesse "to parents who, according to the worldly scheme of things, [were] not of insignificant rank" and whose son Franko (994–99) preceded Bruno in office.⁴⁴ There was also a sister named Matilda, who lived in the episcopal residence but "spent all her days involved in worldly things." She was, among other things, an accomplished fabricator of precious textiles and clothing, as well as instructor of other women.⁴⁵ Burchard may very well have placed the *gymnasium*, or women's workshop—sweatshop is perhaps too harsh, and anachronistic, a term, although women were physically confined to the premises—of the church of Worms under her supervision. When the abbess of the Worms canonry of Nonnenmünster died, the residents of that neglected foundation supposedly begged the bishop, "as if with one voice," to appoint his sister as their abbess. Insofar as their petition met the then common requirement that requests to the bishop to establish or even restore a foundation not

originate at the episcopal court, Burchard wanted to entrust his own sister with the task. The ensuing dialogue between the siblings also proceeds according to ritual: The bishop pressed Matilda to accept, but the timid and modest woman rejected the proposal. As conventionally worded as their exchange is, it does reveal certain facts of historical interest. For example, while the young woman had always lived a secular life, she was nonetheless able to read a psalter; in other words, she was sufficiently literate to warrant her brother's confidence in her ability to grasp everything she needed to know as a canoness.⁴⁶ Burchard had her study the canons' rule⁴⁷ and master the skill of computing dates, that is, determining when Easter and the attendant feasts and fasts of the religious year were to be celebrated, which was no mean feat, since the tricky mathematics could ensnare even the most devout individual.⁴⁸ According to Burchard's biographer, Matilda's reading list also included the lives of the fathers, the *Dialogues* by Gregory the Great, which contains a life of Saint Benedict, and other, unspecified titles that—unless the author just used that phrase as a medieval equivalent of today's “etc., etc.”—must have included some basic manuals on administration, since performing the practical duties expected of an abbess clearly caused her the most worry.⁴⁹

Since Burchard's biographer wanted his fellow canons at Worms to model themselves on the bishop, he depicted the successful education of the bishop's sister as a step-by-step process driven “by necessity.”⁵⁰ Quite the opposite may have occurred, however: Matilda may already have possessed the requisite education and consequently have been entrusted with the organizational as well as physical restoration of Nonnenmünster. What really happened is hard to say and perhaps even immaterial; of far greater interest is the detailed account of what a young woman was expected to know prior to becoming abbess to a house of canonesses. In any case, Burchard's sister passed the test with flying colors, was consecrated by her brother,⁵¹ and then presented to the canonesses. Her performance in office was irreproachable,⁵² and she obviously never miscalculated the beginning of Easter.

While Matilda's career reached its apex within her brother's jurisdictional domain, some of the canons at Worms took advantage of what the greater world had to offer. Their command of classical literature was one key to their international success, but it did not hurt that Conrad II was one of their number, having joined the confraternity at Worms no later than February 14, 1026, and perhaps even before Burchard's death, on August 20, 1025.⁵³ As a result, more of the royal chaplains were from Worms than from any other cathedral canonry in Germany.⁵⁴ Burchard's successor, Azecho, also spent a great deal of time at court, and while he rarely intervened in matters of state, he did apparently cultivate strong ties with the noblewomen of the court. This information comes from Immo/Irmenfred, cathedral canon at Worms and court chaplain,⁵⁵ whose letters touch upon some of the steps he took out of the

public eye to further his career, such as providing his bishop with more or less secret information about life and the goings-on at court during the summer of 1036.⁵⁶ Immo had had to work his way up: Even after attaining the posts of imperial chaplain and notary to the chancellor for Italy, Bruno of Würzburg,⁵⁷ he sent a request to Abbot “R.”—in all likelihood Abbot Reginbald of Lorsch, the future bishop of Speyer (1033–39)—for a fur coat for the upcoming Easter celebration, all the while apologizing for his inability to visit personally, because he had to attend to some imperial business.⁵⁸ Immo was soon in the position to strike the following deal with a high-ranking fellow canon from Worms: In return for having some strings pulled on his behalf with Bishop Azecho so that he received a valuable prebend in Worms that he coveted, Immo promised to put in a good word for his correspondent with the emperor. There was half a pound or more of gold in it for the bishop and an attractive coat for his correspondent, who would hopefully assist in the matter. Immo may already have known that he was up for an episcopal appointment himself and thus able to offer not just material inducements but also future service positions. If this supposition is correct, then the letter must have been written in 1036,⁵⁹ the year in which Immo finally achieved his goal of becoming a bishop; Arezzo, his see, lay within the secular jurisdiction of the powerful Boniface of Tuscany.⁶⁰

Ebbo’s advancement was somewhat less spectacular as well as less tainted by simony, a practice no one spoke about openly.⁶¹ Custodian and director of the cathedral school, he was one of the most important clerics in Worms and played a major role in the educational dispute with Würzburg. He was almost certainly the selfsame Ebbo chosen to succeed his brother Warmann as bishop of Constance by Conrad II in 1034.⁶²

5. Eichstätt and Speyer: Near and Dear to the Sovereign in Life and Death

Conrad II also belonged to the confraternity of the cathedral chapter at Eichstätt. Judging from the sole surviving membership list, he—and this time his consort, too—must have joined sometime after their imperial coronations; Gisela was moreover not the only female member.⁶³ The bishop of Eichstätt at the time was Heribert (1022–42), a member of the Conradine family and kinsman of Archbishop Heribert of Cologne (d. 1021). Both he and his brother Gezemann had been raised in Würzburg and were close to Conrad II. None of the canons from Eichstätt is known to have advanced as far as some of their counterparts from Worms. During Conrad’s reign the cathedral chapter at Eichstätt clearly did not serve as a breeding ground for future bishops, but rather as a place to settle reliable court chaplains and canons from eminent

Image not available

FIG. 14 The cathedral of Speyer, Germany. Exterior apse.

cathedral chapters.⁶⁴ A place like Speyer, on the other hand, offered its canons the opportunity to be “promoted from within the ranks,” so to speak.

Conrad II and the members of his household were much more strongly attached to Speyer than to Eichstätt, and their attachment only increased with time. Bishop Walter (1004–27) was a throwback to Ottonian times: Burchard’s biography may have been dedicated to him, and he certainly provided his friend with encouragement during the composition of the *Decretum*.⁶⁵ Walter himself had studied under Bishop Balderic of Speyer (970–86), a product of the monastery school of Saint Gall who had introduced its standards to Speyer, and was thus the recipient of a classical education similar to that provided by

the cathedral school at Worms.⁶⁶ While still a young man, Walter had composed an autobiographical poem titled the *Scholasticus*, an “intellectual *curriculum vitae*,” as it were,⁶⁷ which he preferred to his later masterpiece, a prose and verse life of Saint Christopher. Although adapted from prior works, the poem was a major undertaking. Walter clearly placed greater significance on this work, since it is the only one he mentioned in a letter to a nun named Hazecha. His correspondent, it should be noted, was a woman of some accomplishment herself: At that time treasurer of the cloister of Quedlinburg under the imperial princess, Abbess Matilda, Hazecha had studied with Bishop Balderich in Speyer and upon the completion of her studies composed her own life of Saint Christopher. She had submitted the work to the bishop for correction, but as occasionally happens with doctoral dissertations even today, her “faculty advisor” misplaced the manuscript due to a lapse on the part of his assistant, the monastery librarian. At least that was the official story. Since Balderich subsequently assigned the very same project to Walter, who was probably his most gifted student, one suspects that the bishop was dissatisfied with Hazecha’s work but hesitated to say so outright, in light of her noble birth. Hazecha is the feminine form of Azecho, the name borne by the somewhat younger bishop of Worms, who may have been her nephew. Was she truly in the same league as Hrotsvitha of Gandersheim—as some aver—or actually comparable to Matilda of Nonnenmünster? How one answers that question is a matter more of literary taste than literary criticism. At any rate, these women were extremely well educated, attended cathedral schools almost as a matter of course, and produced literary works, all of which lends credence to the theory that a woman wrote the annals of the cloister of Quedlinburg.⁶⁸

Conrad II appointed the next two bishops of Speyer: The first, Reginger (1027/28?–1032), had—like his immediate predecessor—studied at the cathedral school of Speyer and served as cathedral provost prior to his elevation; it was with his assistance that the emperor began to implement his plans for Speyer and Limburg. The second, Reginbald II (1033–39), had spent most of his professional life in Augsburg—he may have been related to a former bishop there, Saint Ulrich (d. 972)—and was without a doubt a more eminent figure. He probably received his education at the monastery school at Tegernsee and then served in some unknown capacity in Augsburg before entering the monastery of Cluny. In 1007 Reginbald was called back to Augsburg by Henry II, who appointed him abbot of the reform monastery of Saints Ulrich and Afra. His abbacy at the monastery of Ebersberg was also marked by reform and was followed by his assumption of the same office at Lorsch in 1018 at the earliest. Reginbald was not just a prominent reformer but also an accomplished supervisor—if not architect—of building projects, two qualities that were, among others, clearly needed in Speyer and would keep him tied to the see, instead of serving the emperor on his travels.⁶⁹

6. Würzburg, or a Studied Mistrust of the Classics

In its dispute with Worms over the role of classical learning in ecclesiastical education, Würzburg championed religious orthodoxy by launching well-aimed attacks against those scholars who borrowed from the pagan works of antique authors. The two cathedral schools propounded different definitions of orthodox scholarship, and the debate could easily have escalated beyond mere rhetoric had the bishops of Würzburg become embroiled in this dispute, but they were above that: A reliable, if not quite contemporaneous, list of the most prominent bishops during the reigns of Henry II and the early Salians names one each for the sees of Worms (Burchard), Strasbourg (Werner), and Bremen (Unwan), but then two for Würzburg, Meginhard and Bruno. The inclusion of both men was not necessarily the last word on the subject, however, and the author himself moved Unwan's name up to the list of archbishops.⁷⁰ It is possible that Meginhard/Meinhard I (1018/19–1034) had served in the royal chapel, but his training, as well as his background, remains shrouded in mystery.⁷¹ The bishop of Würzburg was one of the numerous ecclesiastical and secular magnates who affixed their signatures to the renewed compact between Henry II and the pope in spring 1020. He supported Aribo of Mainz when his metropolitan ran into difficulties with Rome, but switched sides in the dispute over Gandersheim. Meginhard participated in Conrad's election at Kamba but did not spend much time in the emperor's service, as evidenced by the fact that he does not appear as an intervenor on any diploma issued by Henry II and Conrad II; his visits to the imperial court were for the most part occasioned by a desire to obtain written confirmation of gifts or other favors granted his church.⁷²

Conrad II appointed only one bishop of Würzburg during the course of his reign, choosing his first cousin Bruno (1034–45), the brother of Conrad the Younger, to succeed Meginhard. Bruno and his predecessor were cut from entirely different cloth: A member of one of the most noble families in the realm, Bruno had ties to Worms and Würzburg, and before his assumption of the episcopal see of Saint Kilian, he had served as a royal chaplain, and from spring 1027 on, as the chancellor for Italy.⁷³ Just one year into his episcopate, he participated in secret talks held in Mainz following the breakup of the court diet in Bamberg (May 1035); the meeting probably concerned the planned enfeoffment of his older brother, Conrad, with the duchy of Carinthia in the wake of the deposition of Adalbero of Eppenstein.⁷⁴ Bruno accompanied his cousin Conrad II on the second expedition to Italy (1037), acting as a sort of special advisor to the emperor for Italian affairs, for which he apparently felt an abiding responsibility even though he was no longer the chancellor for Italy. This was entirely in line with the fact that he had not resigned immediately upon becoming bishop of Würzburg in 1034. Bishop Bruno

reached the height of his prominence during the reign of Henry III, and in recognition of his diligent work on behalf of his diocese and impeccable character, he was venerated as a saint soon after his death.⁷⁵

Judging from the forty armored knights levied on Würzburg in 981 for an imperial expedition to Rome, it was not then one of the richer dioceses. A mere century later (ca. 1080), however, Adam of Bremen observed that Würzburg outstripped all the other German sees in power and glory. The driving force behind this transformation was the bishop's exercise of secular authority: "[S]ince he himself held all the counties of his diocese, the bishop also possessed ducal authority over the province."⁷⁶ The practice of enfeoffing the bishop with counties had begun with Otto III and continued under his successor, Henry II, leading to the development "of the much puzzled-over duchy of Würzburg."⁷⁷ Thus, it is quite surprising to find no evidence that Conrad II favored Bishop Bruno, his own first cousin, in any way or enfeoffed him with more than a single county.⁷⁸ Bruno is listed as an intervenor on numerous imperial diplomas, most of which, however, were of purely regional import, focusing as they did on Italy and the southeastern Alps.⁷⁹ His name has been affixed to a wide variety of exegetical works that he probably did not pen, but it is telling that such diverse tracts, like the interpretations of the Lord's Prayer and Apostle's Creed—both authored by Alcuin—or the commentary on the Psalms written a century later, were attributed to him. The dramatic nature of his death, on May 16, 1045, by drowning after his boat capsized in a treacherous whirlpool in the Danube near Grein (located upstream from Persenbeug in present-day Lower Austria) may perhaps have burnished his image.⁸⁰

7. Hildesheim: A True Reformer Whose Legacy Went Begging

In 1022 Henry II appointed a fellow Bavarian named Godehard as the bishop of Hildesheim. This son of a Bavarian ministerial was the most prominent champion of "the southern German school of the monastic reform practiced at Gorze," which regarded stricter observance of the Benedictine Rule as a means to not just restoring discipline and order but also safeguarding the economic foundations of a monastic community. Godehard was a particularly close confidant of Henry II since the latter's days as a duke; he was appointed abbot of Niederalteich in 995/96, as well as of Tegernsee in 1001/2, and then assumed the abbacy of Hersfeld in 1005. In 1012 he returned to the monastery of Niederalteich, where the secular members of his kindred served as advocates, in hopes of living out his life there, though he never severed his ties to the imperial court. Godehard was probably more than sixty years old when he commenced his episcopate (1022–38) and reopened the dispute over Gandersheim with Archbishop Aribio of Mainz, over whom he would in the

end prevail. As befitted his position, the bishop was also a great builder and founder of churches, and he similarly gave the cathedral school no short shrift.⁸¹ He did, however, have a stubborn streak that impeded his ability to forgive. According to one “prophecy after the fact,” Abbess Sophie of Gandersheim visited Godehard shortly before his death in hopes of smoothing things out between them once and for all, but the reconciliation between the imperial princess and the bishop was never duly formalized, because he put off the ceremony until the next Marian feast (February 2, 1039), by which time both of them were dead. It is unlikely that Conrad II witnessed the scene, since the sources mention no stiff imperial rebuke of the sort delivered to Aribo in 1027, upon his failure to show due respect toward his social better, Abbess Sophie, and the archbishop of Mainz was of much nobler birth than the bishop of Hildesheim.⁸² Godehard was succeeded by a cleric from the royal court, the Danish priest Tymme/Thietmar, who had been sent to Germany to serve young Henry’s wife, Gunhild, and required a position after her death. A man of above average intelligence and piety, he was also a lovable individual who never did anyone any harm and thus against whom no criticism is leveled in the sources.⁸³

8. Regensburg: Providing for the Brother of an Emperor

Gebhard II served as the bishop of Regensburg from 1023, when he was appointed by Henry II, until his death on March 17, 1036. He did not distinguish himself in any way—good or bad—and was neither a powerful imperial bishop nor an ascetic reformer. He was succeeded in office by the emperor’s half brother, Gebhard III, who—apart from sharing the name of two predecessors—was ill suited for the position. In 1037 the new bishop, along with his mother, Adelheid, founded the collegiate church of Öhringen in the diocese of Würzburg; the financial wherewithal came from Gebhard’s paternal inheritance, the relics from Conrad II. The inhabitants of his own diocese, however, found his episcopate to be less than a blessing; one local monk even had a vision of the deceased bishop of Regensburg roasting in hell alongside Bishop Severus of Prague.⁸⁴ Only after Henry III acceded to the throne did Gebhard III begin to intercede forcefully in royal politics and always with an eye to furthering his own interests.⁸⁵ He was unconstrained by scruples in the pursuit of his “personnel policy”: Unlike his half brother, the emperor, who had questioned the propriety of appointing a priest’s son to the episcopate, Gebhard backed a candidate for bishop of Eichsätt who possessed that very flaw. In such matters Henry III was of much the same view as his father and rejected the aspirant, but in the end he and his uncle were able to settle on a compromise candidate who had also garnered the support of the “saintly

Bardo, archbishop of Mainz.⁸⁶ The only reason Conrad II could have had for appointing his half brother as the bishop of Regensburg in 1036 was to see him provided for in an office befitting his rank.⁸⁷

9. Paderborn: A Little Bishopric Led by Great Bishops

In spring 1036 Conrad II observed the Feast of Christ's Ascension (May 27) in Paderborn and then left for Nijmegen, where he planned to celebrate the onset of Pentecost (June 6). Bishop Meinwerk's health had taken a serious turn for the worse, and he was consigned to what would be his death bed, probably before the emperor's departure; the bishop passed away on Saturday, June 5, the eve of Pentecost, in a year that would witness the deaths of no fewer than seven pastoral leaders and the creation of as many vacancies for the emperor to fill.⁸⁸ Meinwerk (1009–36) was an almost perfect exemplification of the "system": Of noble, indeed royal descent, he was a former royal chaplain and had been installed in the see of Paderborn by Henry II in 1009 because he possessed the private means to invigorate the relatively impoverished diocese, although he did receive a promise of help from the sovereign. In both public and private matters Meinwerk provided what was surely indispensable aid to Henry II and, after some initial difficulties had been smoothed over, to Conrad II as well. While he had been compelled to cede a county to Mainz at the beginning of the Salian's reign, the territory was restored to Paderborn in 1033 with the emperor's profuse apologies.⁸⁹ He oversaw a great deal of construction, including the costly renovation of the cathedral, which had burned down during his predecessor's tenure, and established the monastery of Abdinghof, recruiting the founding abbot and monks from Cluny; he did not, however, grant his cloister "the legal status, the *libertas*," enjoyed by its model. Meinwerk established parishes so that the members of his flock could attend local churches, and also expanded and enwalled his episcopal seat. At the same time, the bishop raised academic standards at the cathedral school until it became a first-class institution, producing individuals like the future archbishop of Cologne, Anno II (1056–75).⁹⁰

In the anecdotes that continued to circulate long after his death, Meinwerk is portrayed as an imperious representative of a triumphant church and at times harsh ecclesiastical prince in service to the emperor, a magnate who even overstepped social boundaries: According to one tale, Henry II possessed an especially valuable cape that Meinwerk coveted and snatched away from him in public. The emperor promised to retaliate, but the bishop felt secure enough to have the cloth hung in the cathedral in praise of God. Knowing that his former schoolmate's command of Latin was shaky at best, Henry II decided to play a practical joke on Meinwerk and ordered one of the court

Image not available

FIG. 15 Interior of the Chapel of Saint Bartholomew, cathedral of Paderborn.

chaplains to take a missal and erase out the syllable *fi* wherever the phrase “pro defunctis famulis et famulabus” (for the deceased male and female servants [of God]) appeared in the litany. As a result, when Meinwerk officiated at the Christmas Mass for the emperor in 1022, he prayed “pro defunctis mulis et mulabus” (for the deceased male and female mules). After the service, Henry II called Meinwerk to task, stating that he thought he had endowed the Mass in honor of his mother and father, not male and female mules. Sensing that the emperor had “in his usual way” made a laughingstock of him, the bishop threatened his own retaliation, but, of course, it was the royal chaplain who suffered the brunt of his anger: Meinwerk had the man flogged, then provided with a full set of new clothes, and sent back to the imperial court.⁹¹

Judging from his somewhat later biography, Meinwerk was an excellent and knowledgeable feudal lord, often solicitous of his peasants. For example, the bishop provided a special meal to anyone performing *corvée* and bought up surplus grain when the situation warranted. Still, he was quick to dispense physical punishment when confronted with dishonesty or sloth; at his order a dairy worker’s wife who had let her garden go to weed was stripped of her finery and dragged across the plot of land on her bare behind until all the

weeds were “flattened to the ground.” When he inspected her garden the following year and found it tended beyond reproach, he rewarded the woman handsomely.⁹² Heimrad, a peculiar holy man who had tried to pass himself off as the brother of Henry II in Hersfeld and reaped only blows in return, showed up in Paderborn one day all tattered and pale. Meinwerk wanted to know where this devil had come from, and when some not entirely orthodox liturgical texts were found in his possession, the bishop ordered them burned and the man beaten yet again.⁹³

Once the initial difficulties had been overcome, this high-powered politician and unquestioning servant of both the empire and the church placed himself entirely at Conrad’s disposal.⁹⁴ Meinwerk was succeeded by Rotho/Rudolph (1036–51), an Italian who had studied under Poppo of Stavelot and assumed the abbacy of Hersfeld in 1031, following Abbot Bardo’s elevation to the archbishopric of Mainz. Unlike his teacher, Poppo, and fellow monk Wazo, he had not spurned the office and thus became the first of his stripe to join the Saxon episcopate. Rotho’s appointment marked the turning point in yet another diocese that had experienced the era of the great imperial bishops.⁹⁵

10. Toul: A Future Pope as Bishop

Bishop Bruno of Toul was descended from the counts of Egisheim and was thus related to Conrad II through the sovereign’s mother, who also belonged to that Lotharingian clan. Bruno’s own mother had been “French,” and he was as a result bilingual. He served as a court chaplain and in his capacity as a canon at Toul accompanied Conrad on the first expedition to Italy, at the head of the bishopric’s modest contingent of knights. He received the news of his bishop’s death and of his own election by the clergy and people in April 1026, while camped near the Orba River, in northwestern Italy. In 1048/49 Emperor Henry III engineered Bruno’s assumption of the papal throne, and the new Pope Leo IX was the first adherent of reform to lead the see of Saint Peter. The pope’s biography includes an account of his early years in Toul that is strongly colored by expectations and views popularized by the reform movement in the second half of the eleventh century. The work may provide an idealized and even distorted portrait of the future pope, but one observation rings true: Conrad and Gisela had intended to appoint Bruno to a more prosperous and prominent bishopric, but he decided to accept the results of the canonical election at Toul. His elevation enabled the Lotharingian reform movement finally to gain a firm foothold in the diocese, which would go on to become a bastion of support. In all likelihood, this is what sparked a dispute between the newly appointed bishop and his metropolitan, Archbishop Poppo of Trier, which the newly crowned emperor, Conrad II, was forced to mediate.⁹⁶

II. Constance: The Brothers Warmann (1026–34) and Ebbo/Eberhard (1034–46)

In 1026 Conrad II was already on Italian soil when the bishopric of Constance fell vacant and passed to Warmann, a highborn monk from Einsiedeln. While his younger brother and eventual successor, Ebbo, was a product of the court chapel, it is unclear whether Warmann enjoyed the same background.⁹⁷ At Easter 1030 Conrad II entrusted his underage stepson, Duke Hermann IV of Swabia, to the guardianship of the bishop, who would boldly intervene in imperial politics that summer. It had become necessary to “neutralize” Gisela’s older son, the outlawed and excommunicated Duke Ernest, who finally fell in battle. Moving quickly, Warmann had the body transported to Constance, lifted the ban, and arranged for Ernest’s interment in Saint Mary’s Church.⁹⁸

In addition to serving as the vice-regent of Swabia until almost August 9, 1033,⁹⁹ Warmann was as active as his metropolitan, Bardo of Mainz, in squelching monastic or monkish appropriations of clerical prerogatives. For example, Abbot Bern of Reichenau possessed broad privileges that dated back to Pope Gregory V (d. 999), including the right to wear pontifical vestments along with sandals. When Pope John XIX confirmed these privileges on October 28, 1031, the bishop of Constance vigorously protested the abbot’s usurpation of the episcopal insignia and garnered the emperor’s support. Conrad II and Warmann placed so much pressure on Bern that the abbot finally surrendered the privilege, pontificals, and—last but not least—the sandals to the bishop, who consigned them to a public bonfire at a diocesan synod convened on Maundy Thursday, March 30, 1032.¹⁰⁰

In retribution for his pettiness toward Bern, a man of God, Warmann and everyone in his entourage were allegedly struck dead while on a journey to Rome. If there is even a shred of truth to this tale, which was probably inspired by the fate of a later successor, then Warmann may well have undertaken a pilgrimage to Rome as penance for burning the papal privilege. Yet, it hinges on the illogical supposition that the bishop of Constance, who is known to have died in 1034, made such a journey two years after John XIX, who was allegedly aggrieved by the insult, had himself passed away. Be that as it may, Conrad remained faithful to Warmann and, after the bishop’s death, filled the vacancy with the deceased man’s brother Ebbo/Eberhard, who was a member of the court chapel.¹⁰¹ The new bishop was not an unknown quantity, having distinguished himself for his learning while yet a canon; he was in all probability the same Ebbo who had become head of the cathedral school at Worms in 1016 and went on to serve as the custodian of the canons there. He has also been credited with composing the *Vita Burchardi*, which must have been written soon after 1025. The text includes a detailed description of how Burchard went about compiling his collection of decretals, a copy of which,

interestingly enough, Bishop Ebbo commissioned for Constance.¹⁰² For the most part, however, Ebbo's episcopate fell within the reign of Henry III.

12. Halberstadt and Its Brave Bishops

The career of Bishop Branthog (1023–36) poses something of a puzzle: Before attaining his episcopal post, he was cathedral provost of Halberstadt, a title also held by Hermann II and Adalbert before their successive assumptions of the archbishopric of Hamburg-Bremen. However, even before then, Branthog had served as the abbot of Fulda, where he had run into serious trouble with most of the monks; as a result, he lost the confidence of Henry II, who had swiftly removed him from office (1013). Yet, a decade later the same emperor installed him as the bishop of Halberstadt, although the appointment not only contravened the local church's basic canonical right to hold an election but represented a slap in the face to the regional nobility, whose members had settled on Hermann, the cathedral provost and future archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen, and were prepared to pay to get their way. In light of his background, Bishop Branthog was definitely a promoter of monastic reform; for example, the cloister of Stötterlingenburg embraced the Benedictine Rule during his episcopate, and the nuns there revered him as a second founder.¹⁰³ Like his former fellow monk and successor at Fulda, Archbishop Bardo of Mainz,¹⁰⁴ Branthog stirred up a great deal of trouble when he tried to assert his rights as a feudal lord. Indeed, his agents were stripped of all of their possessions and, deprived of draft animals, reduced to yoking themselves to their wagons. Driven to protest the depredation perpetrated by members of the local nobility, whom Conrad II could not or would not take to task, the bishop of Halberstadt decided to go into exile by joining the imperial embassy to Byzantium; but unlike the delegation's leader, Werner of Strasbourg, he returned to his homeland and served his flock for at least seven more years.¹⁰⁵

"In the year 1036 a bright light shone over the church of Halberstadt" in the person of Branthog's successor, Burchard I (1036–59), a member of the Diepolding family of Bavaria who had been elevated from the royal chancery to the chancellorship for Germany in late 1032. Burchard was praised for his learning—by a later source, at least—and, given his active involvement in Saxon affairs while chancellor, may not have been deemed an outsider. For example, in 1035(?) Conrad II presided over a court diet probably held at Goslar—not Werla, the traditional Saxon meeting place—that found two Saxon nobles guilty of plotting a murderous assault against the emperor and sentenced them to death. Learning of the verdict, Bishop Burchard realized that the men's execution had been engineered by their enemies and set out immediately to save their lives: "The man of God heard the report, burst into tears, cried out

to heaven for help, bravely forced his way into the emperor's chambers, like Daniel rescued the falsely accused men, and happily led them away."¹⁰⁶

The author of this account, who lived and wrote in Halberstadt approximately one generation after Burchard's tenure, painted a stock portrait of the bishop that seems to obscure his subject's true personality. A "man of God" was supposed to burst into tears when confronted with sin and injustice; this stylistic device is common in hagiographical writing.¹⁰⁷ Daniel is cited as Burchard's exemplar because the Biblical figure rescued a falsely charged individual from execution. Since the author is alluding to Daniel 13:45–61, that passage from the Vulgate warrants closer review here: After two elders bore false testimony against Joakim's wife, Susanna, she was found guilty of adultery and condemned to death. The young Daniel, who possessed no authority in the matter, bravely stepped forward at great personal risk and convinced the crowd to set aside the judgment and allow him to reexamine the accusers. Daniel's interrogation of the two elders, who had in truth tried to force Susanna to sleep with them, revealed a contradiction in their testimony; their slander exposed, the two were the ones put to death.

Thus, if Burchard truly modeled himself on Daniel, then he probably held a countertrial that must have exposed the slanderers. But had he really taken as great a risk as Daniel? After all, Burchard was not a mere royal chaplain but a "councilor of the realm" and chancellor whom Conrad had accepted into his inner circle. Did it really take exceptional boldness for such a man "to force his way into the emperor's chambers" and reverse a previously reached decision? Now, Conrad II did over the course of his reign withdraw his grace and favor at the blink of an eye from a fair number of prominent ecclesiastics, like Egilbert of Freising and Poppo of Aquileia, because they had challenged his interests and lent their support to the wrong people.¹⁰⁸ In this case, however, the imperial judge—and, moreover, intended victim of the alleged assassination—did not withdraw one iota of his goodwill from Burchard; on the contrary, just a few years—or even months—later, Conrad II appointed him bishop of Halberstadt. While the stock nature of the description—the man of God whose actions mirror those of a biblical exemplar (the young Daniel)—may obscure Burchard's true lineaments, that does not mean he was devoid of individuality. Indeed, the very fact that the author of the account identified the bishop with "the man of God" and Daniel provides the key to its meaning: Burchard must have made the individual and personal decision to model himself on these two figures by being a just and brave man. His motivation is unclear, however. Did he, for example, act on behalf of a kinsman? In any case, the emperor did not merely tolerate Burchard's intrusion but indeed awarded him for it.¹⁰⁹

Conflict between the throne and the cathedra was never totally absent, since the holders of these two powerful offices were so closely linked in theory and in practice: The sovereign's influence was not limited to the secular sphere, and bishops were almost always involved in worldly affairs, indeed even called into royal service. In a perhaps telling indication of how Conrad exercised his authority, the most serious conflicts between the emperor and the members of the episcopate—those that led to the withdrawal of imperial favor—occurred during the last five years of his reign and involved bishops occupying sees located along the periphery—at least from the German perspective—of the empire. During his first decade of rule and with bishops from his kingdom's heartland, Conrad II either moved swiftly to settle differences of opinion, as evidenced by the quick end to the *contretemps* with Pilgrim of Cologne,¹ or held his ground patiently, as evidenced by his masterful handling of the dispute with Aribio of Mainz. The latter situation never escalated into the open showdown that the diverse points of contention between the emperor and the pugnacious archbishop from Bavaria might have made seem inevitable; the refusal to crown Gisela, the invalidation of the marriage between Otto and Irmgard of Hammerstein, and the assertion of authority over Gandersheim each presented sufficient cause for a battle to the finish between Conrad II and Aribio.² Even after the emperor had installed Azecho as the bishop of Worms without consulting the metropolitan of Mainz, they did not quarrel.³ Aribio's successor, Bardo, on the other hand, must have been a thorn in Conrad's side, and the emperor appears to have threatened to withdraw his favor on numerous occasions; what aroused his displeasure, however, was not the archbishop's excessive attention to politics but his inability and disinclination to perform the worldly tasks associated with his office.⁴

Conrad II refrained from involving himself in matters of ecclesiastical discipline or canon law, except when the bishop of a diocese within the empire was pitted against a "foreign" entity, as when Poppo of Aquileia found

himself in conflict with Grado and Venice.⁵ When Conrad's cousin Bruno of Toul became embroiled in a dispute with his metropolitan, Poppo of Trier, however, the emperor was willing to trust in time and compromise to effect a reconciliation.⁶

The emperor was drawn into a controversy over the convent of Wunstorf, in the diocese of Minden, but his involvement did not create any deep-seated ill will between himself and the local bishop, although it should be noted that Bruno of Minden adhered to Conrad's decision in form only and got his way in the end. His predecessor, Bishop Sigibert, had appointed Alberada of Mollenbeck as abbess of Wunstorf against the community's will and in contravention of the nuns' admittedly limited electoral rights. Bishop Bruno attempted to restore peace by removing Alberada from office, but she appealed to the emperor, who found in her favor at the court diet in Goslar on Christmas 1038. Even so, the bishop of Minden induced her to resign "voluntarily or involuntarily" on Easter of the following year.⁷ Since Bruno could not have known that Conrad II would die only a short time later, was his conduct a signal of religious opposition that the emperor chose to tolerate? Hardly. Conrad II took an entirely different tack when bishops in the southeastern portions of the empire—in Bavaria or Carantania, where the Salian ruler's grip on the reins of power was already precarious—decided to promote their own unacceptable political agendas.

I. Egilbert of Freising (1005–39)

Egilbert was probably descended from the Bavarian counts of Moosburg and was already a royal chaplain when in 1002 Henry II acceded to the throne and tapped him for the chancellorship of Germany. After spending three years in that office, he was promoted to bishop of Freising and relieved of his duties at court by Bruno, the emperor's brother and the future bishop of Augsburg; in turn, when Bruno passed away, in 1029,⁸ Egilbert was entrusted with the guardianship over Conrad's son and reaped generous thanks for his services upon Henry's coming-of-age in 1033. The pertaining privileges are personal, even affectionate in tone and represent the only imperial diplomas countersigned by Henry III at his own request, as confirmed by the one surviving original.⁹ However, Freising was the beneficiary of Conrad's largesse even before its bishop became Henry's guardian: In 1027 the cloister of Moosburg, which was in all likelihood the spiritual center for Egilbert's kindred, was officially placed under the bishopric's jurisdiction in spite of certain legal impediments.¹⁰ The close relationship between the bishop and the sovereign, and all the service the former had provided to the latter, counted for naught, however, when Conrad II concluded that Egilbert had undermined the imperial

policy toward the Hungarians and thus the political setup in the southeastern Alpine region. The court diet in Bamberg that deposed Adalbero of Eppenstein (May 18, 1035) laid bare the bishop's entanglement in the self-aggrandizing policies pursued out of necessity by the ousted duke of Carinthia. Henry's complicity in this policy and sworn pact with Adalbero must have reeked of conspiracy, indeed treason, to his father, and without waiting to hear the bishop's defense, Conrad had Egilbert ejected from the assembly hall.¹¹ The emperor did not remain angry at the bishop for long, however, and received his otherwise proven loyal servant back into his favor in early February 1036, during a court diet in Augsburg at which Conrad the Younger was invested with the duchy of Carinthia. A diploma issued on behalf of a cloister in the neighboring diocese of Regensburg just a few days later (February 12, 1036) lists Egilbert of Freising right after his former ward, Henry III, as an inter-venor; the scribe who composed the privilege may even have been a member of the episcopal staff.¹² What Egilbert did to regain Conrad's favor is not known, but how such situations were normally handled may be gleaned from the story of Poppo of Aquileia.

2. Poppo of Aquileia (1019–42)

Practically no other imperial bishop—and certainly not an Italian one—was as strongly championed by Conrad as Poppo of Aquileia, on whose behalf the emperor incurred the enmity of Venice and its allies, Byzantium and Hungary; forced the pope to rescind decisions inimical to Poppo's interests; and submitted the patriarchate's claims to a Roman synod.¹³ Even so, these not very dissimilar men did become embroiled in a grave conflict.

In the latter half of March 1037 Conrad II convened a court diet at which he and Aribert of Milan clashed publicly, whereupon the emperor had the archbishop arrested on charges of high treason and placed in the custody of Poppo of Aquileia and Duke Conrad II of Carinthia. The three accompanied the court to Piacenza, but Aribert succeeded in making a break for Milan before the month was even over. Singled out for blame by Conrad II, Poppo beat his own hasty retreat from court and withdrew to his episcopal seat, but before summer's end he would gain the emperor's forgiveness: The patriarch invited Conrad II and his entourage to Aquileia, and, as they neared the city, he walked out toward the imperial party unshod and clad in a penitent's raiment, beseeching the emperor to show him favor, which Conrad did. Even though no record of prior negotiations survives, it may be assumed that the details of the ritualistic subordination had been worked out ahead of time. This rapprochement, which took place sometime before August 17, 1037, was not motivated by the patriarch's fear that Conrad was about to modify his policy toward Venice;

the supposition that the emperor had only shortly beforehand decided to send his son there on a diplomatic mission rests on a faulty reading of a diploma issued years later by Henry III, who, once he had acceded to the throne, did restore the erstwhile peace between Venice and the empire. Poppo did not get away scot-free in a material sense either: He had to relinquish properties on the mainland, which the emperor bestowed upon the “impoverished” bishopric of Cittanuova in a diploma issued in Aquileia on August 17, 1037.¹⁴

3. Irreconcilable to the End: In Conflict with the Episcopates of Lombardy and Burgundy

Toward the end of his life Conrad II found himself at loggerheads with Burchard III of Lyon (1033–40) and Aribert of Milan (1018–45), as well as Harderic of Vercelli (1026–44), Hubald of Cremona (1030–44), and Peter of Piacenza (1031–38). Neither the sovereign nor the individual episcopal leaders proved amenable to reconciliation in these conflicts, because they were in the main competitions for political authority. Conrad’s Lombard opponents struggled to safeguard secular rights, asserted secular claims, and entered into secular coalitions.¹⁵ Still, they were ordained priests and consecrated men of God, imbued with a sacramental quality that was different from and superior to the sacral nature of any king or even emperor. As a result, Conrad II must have known that he would garner resistance within his own ranks whenever he treated these ecclesiastical adversaries in the same manner as secular opponents and enemies; he could not even count on his son’s support, and the sources give no indication of his wife’s reaction.¹⁶ The major accusation leveled against the emperor concerned the deposition and banishment of Archbishop Aribert of Milan and three of his allies without the benefit of a formal ecclesiastical trial; the same objection was raised against Conrad’s treatment of Burchard of Lyon. It comes as no surprise that Henry III later tried to revoke all of his father’s measures against the three Italian ecclesiastics and the archbishop of Lyon. These measures were striking in two respects: First, only in the case of Milan did Conrad appoint an anti-archbishop, Ambrose, while he allowed the bishoprics of Lyon, Vercelli, Piacenza, and Cremona to remain vacant. Second, only in the case of Aribert did Conrad pressure the pope to excommunicate his opponent, although Pope Benedict IX delayed issuing his pronouncement for a full year, when the archbishop’s alliance with Odo of Champagne became public knowledge.¹⁷ However, Henry’s attempts at reconciliation came too late for Peter of Piacenza, who had died in exile in early 1038 and was promptly replaced while Conrad II was still in southern Italy.¹⁸

It is only natural that an analysis of the emperor's monastic policy focus on his relationship with the imperial abbeys and use that as the touchstone for evaluating his overall policy.¹ Imperial abbeys enjoyed unique legal status because their *libertas* was based on their association with the sovereign, who was expected to promote and ensure their exercise of this liberty. When the Aribon family established the Benedictine nunnery of Goess in Styria, its members granted primary rights over the foundation to the sovereign and acknowledged their subsidiary position, with the stipulation, however, that if the cloister were deprived of its imperial liberty, then it would revert to the family's control until such time as its original liberty was restored.² Since the provision of liberty was a seigneurial right reserved to the sovereign, Henry II staved off his forfeiture of this prerogative by maintaining a sharp distinction between the imperial abbeys and the Burgundian monastery of Cluny, which enjoyed absolute freedom from outside interference. Thus, in spite of the extraordinarily high esteem in which the emperor held the great reform monastery and its abbot, Henry II did not appoint a single Cluniac monk to an imperial abbacy, except for a Bavarian named Reginbald, who had taken his vows at Cluny and, following a meeting between Odilo and Henry II, was recruited to become abbot of the monastery of Saints Ulrich and Afra in Augsburg. The leaders of the two other reform movements of the day—Abbot Richard of Saint-Vanne at Verdun and his student Poppo, both of whom advocated the “mixed observance” practiced in Lotharingia,³ and Abbot Godehard of Niederalteich, a proponent of monastic reform in southern Germany⁴—were treated quite differently. In fact, Henry II maintained such an active—today one would say existential—interest in all forms of monasticism requiring a serious commitment to a disciplined life, especially to the Rule of Saint Benedict, that it comes as no surprise that his contemporaries considered him the “father of the monks.”⁵

While it might seem that Henry II pursued an incongruous monastic policy—on the one hand, he alienated an appreciable number of imperial abbeys

to bishops, but on the other, he granted *libertas* to religious foundations owned by nobles—it did accord with his efforts to centralize his sovereign authority and with his acknowledged duty to intervene in the disciplinary and organizational aspects of monastic life. Indeed, the monasteries that lost their liberty were almost exclusively foundations that appeared unlikely to sustain themselves economically.⁶ As soon as it was clear that his marriage would produce no issue, Henry II, to a remarkable degree, availed himself of “the boom in confraternities triggered by the start of the new millennium” and entrusted the cultivation of his and his consort’s memory to the monastic community in particular.⁷ In pursuit of his single-minded monastic policy, Henry II thought nothing of intervening in monastic affairs whenever he perceived that moral standards and order were on the line; to this end he installed and removed abbots even in the face of fierce opposition. It was in this context that Godehard of Niederalteich, the son of a ministerial, enjoyed such a remarkable career, rising not just to the abbacy of his own monastery but also briefly to the abbeys of Tegernsee and Hersfeld.⁸ For the same reason, Richard’s student Poppo, whose brand of Lotharingian reform was close to, if not associated with, the Cluniac movement, came to occupy the abbeys of Stavelot-Malmédy in 1020 and Saint Maximin in Trier in 1023.⁹

Conrad II adopted Henry’s policy toward the imperial abbeys, but he never became a “father of the monks,” and his consort did not compensate for his lapses by taking a “maternal” interest, as it were, in monasticism, although Gisela’s advice sometimes proved valuable. The new king initially perpetuated his predecessor’s policy regarding matters of property and personnel and, upon request, confirmed the episcopal ownership of former imperial abbeys. The death of Bishop Werner I of Strasbourg freed the monastery of Schwarzach from outside control, but within months Conrad II granted the former imperial abbey to Speyer (around 1029/30), on the condition that the bishop of that neighboring diocese commit to safeguarding the Salian family foundation of Limburg an der Haardt. The emperor lavishly wrote over the monastery of Moosburg to the bishop of Freising, thus in theory only confirming a deed transmitted in a diploma issued by King Arnulf (887–99) in 895.¹⁰ It is true that Conrad sometimes showed minimal concern for an imperial abbey’s liberty and enfeoffed a secular magnate with a religious institution, something that had not been done since the Carolingian era. For example, the emperor granted the imperial abbey of Kempten, in Swabia, to Ernest II, thereby enabling Gisela’s son to support his vassals and rewarding him for the only known instance in which he obeyed the king.¹¹ To gain an accurate picture of Conrad’s conduct, however, one should keep the following in mind: First, it is not known whether either Schwarzach or Kempten sought to recover their lost liberty. Second, there is no indication that Conrad ever conferred *libertas* on a noble or episcopal proprietary monastery in order to appropriate it for

the crown. Finally, like so many other eleventh-century noblemen, Conrad II undertook to transform an ancestral castle—Limburg—into a religious institution, probably a canonry, although he was the first and last member of the Salian dynasty to do so. While the effort ultimately proved unsuccessful, Conrad, by entrusting his foundation to his predecessor's protégé, Abbot Poppo of Stavelot and Saint Maximin, between 1025 and 1032, ensured that the monastic experiment did at least get off the ground.¹²

Conrad II appears to have established such good rapport with Poppo that he held this son of a knight in even greater estimation than his predecessor Henry II had. Even though he was at one point tricked into believing that Poppo was of “less than flawless birth,” an age-old canard in noble circles, Conrad did not long hold the incident against the abbot.¹³ Poppo was born in imperial Flanders near the French border and was orphaned, within weeks of his birth, by the death of his father, Tizekinus, in an attack on Lotharingia and Aachen in 978 by King Lothar (954–86).¹⁴ Still, he was clearly brought up to favor reconciliation over retaliation, and once West Francia had passed from Carolingian rule to that of a new dynasty in 987, that stance must have been all the easier to maintain. The time he spent in Lotharingia studying under the reform-minded Abbot Richard of Saint-Vanne only contributed to Poppo's success as a mediator between the ascendant French and German kingdoms. Just as his mentor had worked with Bishop Gerard of Cambrai in spring 1023 to pave the way for a meeting between Henry II and Robert II of France the following August 10 and 11, at which the two rulers renewed their alliance of 1006,¹⁵ so, too, Bruno of Toul and Poppo of Stavelot laid the groundwork for the peace negotiations between Conrad II and Henry I in Deville at the end of May 1033.

In fact, Conrad's reliance on Poppo's mediatory abilities dated back to the very beginning of his reign over, not Burgundy, but the East Frankish-German kingdom, at a time when the first Salian king's sovereignty was still not universally acknowledged. Poppo, “the son of evangelical peace,” played a significant role in the Lotharingians' journey to Aachen at Christmas 1025 to pay homage to Conrad. He never lent his voice to those who criticized—at the monastery of Gorze, for example—the legitimacy of Conrad's and Gisela's marriage, although he lent a patient ear to Abbot Siegfried's arguments against the union as late as 1043.¹⁶ It thus comes as no surprise that soon enough the “love once borne him [Poppo] by Henry II was not withdrawn but bestowed in equal, indeed even greater, measure by the [deceased emperor's] successor.”¹⁷ Or, as a modern scholar put it, Henry II “had never granted his most important monastic counselor and colleague, Godehard of Niederalteich, as much functional latitude as Conrad II did Poppo of Stavelot.”¹⁸

Poppo's biographer states that Conrad II granted “all” vacant imperial abbaties to the abbot of Stavelot so that he might effect their reform, but his list

of monasteries is not all that long: Between 1028 and 1037, Poppo entrusted Limburg¹⁹ to his nephew John, who had already succeeded him to the abbacy of Saint Maximin;²⁰ Hersfeld to the Italian cleric Rotho/Rudolph;²¹ Saint Gall to Norbert, the future bishop of Paderborn;²² Weissenburg to Folmar;²³ Echternach to Humbert;²⁴ and Saint-Ghislain to someone named Heribrand.²⁵ In embracing reform, these seven institutions—six imperial abbeys and the Salian family monastery at Limburg an der Haardt—were joined by a number of noble and episcopal proprietary monasteries that experienced similar changes in personnel: Brauweiler, which had been founded by the Ezzo family, received Ello as its abbot; Busendorf/Bouzonville, in the diocese of Metz, which traced its roots back to Adalbert, an Alsatian count, was entrusted to Cono; and Hohorst, in the diocese of Utrecht, came under the leadership of Heriger, a monk from Stavelot.²⁶ Three proprietary monasteries belonging to the diocese of Metz, and the monastery of Saint Eucharius in Trier, under the direction of Abbot Bertulf, also fall into this category.²⁷

The circle of reformers around Abbot Poppo, a “monastic taskmaster” whose demise was greeted with a sigh of relief in some quarters,²⁸ did not institutionalize or perpetuate their association by establishing a “mother house” or drafting a written set of rules, or *consuetudines*. After all, their mentor’s avowed purpose had been to institute more rigorous compliance with the Benedictine Rule, as hallmarked by Poppo’s own asceticism; reliance on Saint Benedict as a model; and insistence on unconditional obedience. A swift divine punishment awaited those subordinates who disobeyed or behaved injudiciously, while an abbatial box in the ears sufficed for lesser transgressors, as Saint Benedict demonstrated. Most impressive to the modern observer, however, are the monastery churches associated with Abbot Poppo; in a foreshadowing of Cistercian architecture, they are built according to a uniform plan, and in imitation of Cluniac style, sumptuously adorned. Even though Poppo is no longer spoken of as having been a “brilliant architect,” that assessment still holds true.²⁹

The abbot of Stavelot and his appointees encountered varying degrees of resistance in most of the cloisters they reformed. While it was once thought that Conrad II never removed an abbot to clear the way for Poppo, in whom he had invested overall monastic authority,³⁰ the emperor’s intervention in Hersfeld, Montecassino, and perhaps even Tegernsee gives the lie to that supposition, as well as to the underlying assumption that the sovereign took no particular interest in monastic reform.

1. Hersfeld, Niederalteich, and Montecassino

In 1005 Henry II appointed Abbot Godehard of Niederalteich and Tegernsee, in Bavaria, to the abbacy of Hersfeld, in Francia, as well and charged him with

rooting out the irregular practices that threatened the monastery's economic underpinnings, a task that necessitated instituting stricter compliance with the Rule of Saint Benedict.³¹ Seven years later Godehard relinquished the office to Arnold, a fellow monk at Niederalteich, who proved even stricter than his predecessor and ran into increasing difficulties at Hersfeld until his exalted birth no longer afforded him protection from replacement by a rival (1031): "Arnold lost the abbacy of Hersfeld." "Arnold, brought up on charges before [Conrad], was removed from the abbacy." "After having been charged with an unspecified crime, the accused was robbed of his *honor* in a regrettable fashion."³² The vacancy was filled by Gisela's kinsman Bardo, a former monk at Fulda and abbot of Werden, whose biographers tellingly smooth over the transition by having Arnold's death precede the saintly Bardo's assumption of office.³³ The actual details emerge elsewhere: Conrad II banished Arnold to one of Hersfeld's daughter houses in Göllingen, on the Wipper River, and following Bardo's brief stint in office, the abbacy went to Poppo's student Rotho, who was "charged by the emperor with changing the monks' customs."³⁴ Considering how the incident played out, only the most obdurate hairsplitter would demur to holding Conrad responsible for Arnold's ouster. There was, however, yet another dimension to this "mysterious affair," as one scholar has so aptly termed the incident,³⁵ that muddies the waters even further: In 1031 Hersfeld was the setting for a competition between two or—strictly speaking—three monastic trends in which the brand of reform propounded by the abbot of Stavelot carried the day. Arnold instituted a strict, ascetic form of compliance with the Benedictine Rule as practiced by the south German reformers associated with the monastery of Gorze. Rotho advocated a strict, ascetic form of compliance with the Benedictine Rule as practiced by the members of Poppo's circle and representative of the Lotharingian "mixed observance" associated with Richard of Saint-Vanne. And Bardo, who owed his short-lived appointment to Gisela, was just as good a Benedictine as the other two, a "father of the monks,"³⁶ who retained his extraordinary monkish zealotry and abiding concern for the purity of the regular monks even after becoming archbishop of Mainz. Like Abbot Arnold, his predecessor at Hersfeld, Bardo was repeatedly brought up on charges at the imperial court and often found himself on the verge of losing the emperor's favor, were it not for the intervention of his good kinswoman Gisela. In sum, Bardo's continued recognition as an authority on monasticism suggests that he might have been as potent an exemplar as the Lotharingian or Burgundian advocates of reform.³⁷

Conrad's decision in 1031 "to switch Hersfeld from the Godehardine brand of reform derived from Gorze to the Lotharingian 'mixed observance' promoted by Poppo of Stavelot"³⁸ does not in any way exemplify some overarching monastic policy. After all, at the landmark court diet in Regensburg less

than four years earlier (June 24, 1027), Conrad II had entrusted the monastery of Niederalteich to Godehard's nephew Ratmund, who was a product of the monastery school of Hersfeld reestablished during his uncle's abbacy. Also, eighteen months later (New Year's Day 1029), the emperor made a generous grant to a hermit named Gunther, who was the son of a Thuringian count and had ties to Godehard and Niederalteich, in support of his cell at Rinchnach, in the northern Bavarian woods.³⁹ Ratmund, in turn, may have been a very close associate of a monk from Niederalteich named Richer,⁴⁰ of whom Conrad and especially Gisela thought quite highly and whom the emperor would later appoint abbot of the imperial abbey of Leno, in the province of Milan. Richer assumed this vulnerable position between 1027 and 1033.⁴¹ In 1038 he accompanied Conrad II on the expedition to southern Italy, where he figured in an incident of lasting importance: According to an account found in the original redaction of a Cassinese chronicle—one untouched by the reform spirit of later times—Conrad II ordered twelve Benedictine monks from Montecassino to join him in Capua and elect one of their number as their abbot. The monks either neglected to comply or deferred the matter to the emperor, who repeatedly declined to make the determination, citing the Benedictine Rule that they elect a member of their order: "I namely have no one at hand to offer you." The monks still refused to yield, whereupon the empress stepped in and proposed the former monk at Niederalteich and current abbot of Leno; at that, Conrad asked the brothers to conduct the election. Strictly speaking, Richer's assumption of the abbacy did not follow upon the ouster—by either himself or the emperor—of an incumbent officeholder, since even though his predecessor, Basilius, had been duly elected as the thirty-third abbot of Montecassino and installed by Prince Pandolph IV of Capua, in 1038 he was clearly no longer recognized as such. For the office to qualify as officially vacant, however, Basilius's election must have been declared null and void, and that could not have happened without the emperor's cooperation. Accordingly, this episode further undercuts the assertion that Conrad never removed an abbot in order to clear the way for reform. Whatever the sovereign's role may have been, the decision to entrust Montecassino to Richer's stewardship marked the beginning of the venerable abbey's resurgence.⁴²

2. Tegernsee and Benedictbeuern

Conrad II exercised only limited influence over the monasteries of Tegernsee and Benedictbeuern, in southern Bavaria. After the Carolingians died out, the ancient imperial abbey of Tegernsee slid into ruin and had to be reestablished at the end of the tenth century: In 978 Emperor Otto II summoned an abbot and twelve monks "from Saint Maximin in Trier, the epicenter of the imperial

monastic reform movement associated with Gorze,” and one year later again placed the Bavarian monastery “under royal and imperial protection.”⁴³ When the abbacy became vacant in 1001, Duke Henry IV of Bavaria—the future emperor—had his confidant Abbot Godehard take charge of this imperial abbey as well, in circumvention of the monks’ right to elect their abbot—as guaranteed by their founding charter—and the jurisdictional authority of the bishop of Freising, who reacted by accusing the abbot of cupidity and “thievish depredation of the Lord’s flock.” Indeed, Godehard stepped down just one year later (1002), though he made a point of informing the diocesan *ordinarius* that his appointment was consonant with the Benedictine Rule and had been legitimized by the “highest prince [Duke sc. Henry IV].” Godehard did everything in his power to help the duke settle on a successor who would not roll back the advances he had introduced to Tegernsee.⁴⁴ A mere seedling at the start of his tenure, the monastery school put down strong roots and ultimately bore artistic and literary fruit, as evidenced even today by works like the renowned collection of epistles, having flourished under the care of Abbot Froumund (960–1008) and of Ellinger, a monk and sometime abbot who died in 1056. The latter individual was a passionate man who hobnobbed and quarreled with even the most powerful magnates and was as a result twice installed and twice deposed from the abbacy (1018–26 and 1031–41). “Master and copyist, dictator [of manuscripts] and director all rolled up into one, he played a preeminent role in the history of Tegernsee in the first half of the eleventh century.”⁴⁵ As interesting a topic as it may be, this is not the place to delve into Ellinger’s role, at both the beginning and end of his career, in the educational dispute between Worms and Würzburg; but the controversy itself, which was sparked by a minor work, a mere “academic exercise,” as it were,⁴⁶ does shed significant light on the state of reform monasticism, particularly among the Bavarian foundations associated with Godehard of Niederalteich: While the monks at Worms learned rhetoric using a classical curriculum replete with pagan gods and mythological figures, their opponents structured their education around Christ, the holy cross, the archangels and angels, Christ’s precursor John the Baptist, the apostles, and saints like Stephen the archmartyr and Kilian of Würzburg, as well as Quirinus—the patron saint of Tegernsee—and, last but not least, Saint Benedict.⁴⁷

Ellinger had been an extremely gifted student at Tegernsee and for a time continued his education at Augsburg and Würzburg; he may have composed two poems recited in praise of Henry II at Bamberg in 1014. He assumed the abbacy of his home monastery in 1017 and received grants of land from the emperor in both 1019 and 1020; as a result, the cloister expanded its holdings in the Wachau region of present-day Lower Austria and obtained properties along the Triesting and Piesting Rivers, south of Vienna. Both privileges list Godehard of Niederalteich as an intervenor, on the former after the empress,

but on the latter alone.⁴⁸ In spring 1025 Conrad reconfirmed a privilege originally issued by Henry II that had confirmed and guaranteed the foundation's holdings in general.⁴⁹ If, as it appears, Ellinger continued to be held in such high regard at court even after transfer of power in 1024,⁵⁰ why then was he deposed in 1026? The paucity of source material makes this question particularly hard to answer. Since Conrad II was in Italy from late winter 1026 until spring 1027, the decision must have originated with the "regnal regent," Bishop Bruno of Augsburg, who was the only one duly authorized to act in the king's name.⁵¹ The imperial abbey of Tegernsee was located in the diocese of Freising, but Bishop Egilbert would have respected the sovereign's rights over the institution, unlike his successor, who was responsible for engineering Ellinger's second deposition in 1041.⁵² Thus, the abbatial crisis in 1026 may have been part of the feud launched by the members of Duke Ernest's camp, particularly Count Welf II, against the bishop of Augsburg and perhaps supported by the nobility of neighboring Bavaria. If so, then Bruno's desire to reduce the pressure along the eastern flank of his bishopric may have necessitated the abbot's deposition.

Moving from pure speculation to hard fact, it should be noted that Ellinger's deposition proceeded according to the rules; his duties were assigned to a monk from Hersfeld named Albinus, who was appointed to the lesser office of prior and served only until 1031, when he fell ill and resigned, dying soon afterward. Bishop Bruno of Augsburg, too, was by this time dead, and Bishop Egilbert of Freising, who had succeeded him as the young Henry's guardian, undertook in his ward's name to reverse what was perceived as an injustice against the deposed abbot. There is no evidence that Conrad II played a direct role in this endeavor, which culminated in the monks' unanimous reelection of Ellinger.⁵³ On behalf of his fellow monks, the "new" abbot sent formal word of the results not just to Bishop Egilbert, the duly responsible *ordinarius* and former monk at Tegernsee, but also to Bishop Godehard, the incumbent bishop of Hildesheim and former reform abbot of Hersfeld as well as Tegernsee. The former letter includes an appeal to the bishop of Freising to confirm the election on behalf of the church, along with an account of how it was held: As his last act before resigning, their former prior had assembled all the monks, who proceeded to vote unanimously for Ellinger. It was now up to Egilbert to use his influence and convince the emperor to acknowledge the results and thereby sanction the monks' right to free elections. The explanation given for their choice is also interesting: For legal and economic reasons the monks wished to preclude the appointment of an outsider as abbot.⁵⁴ The letter to Godehard, written on the community's behalf by its returning abbot, criticizes the former prior even more bluntly: Albinus, the outsider from Hersfeld, had put "the monastery almost entirely under the authority of alien and unfamiliar powers without the knowledge (of the brethren)." The monks

were filled with worry “day in and day out” that the emperor might not just refuse to acknowledge the election but also confiscate the monastery’s holdings. It was up to Godehard to prevent either from occurring. The letter also notes that “the machinations of enemies [may] impede” enforcement of Ellinger’s election.⁵⁵

Just who were these enemies? Judging from a collection of visions compiled by Otloh of Saint Emmeram (d. ca. 1070), they were probably senior members of the monastery. This work, however, is the sole source to refer to the abbot’s opponents, and it postdates both Ellinger’s second deposition and death. In one vision, an old monk and kinsman of Otloh heard heavenly voices that warned of imminent danger. When he recounted his experience to the abbot, Ellinger dismissed it gruffly out of hand as the dream of a senile old man and constrained him to silence. Thus, when the prophecy came true in 1035 and a portion of the monastery was destroyed by fire, it was the abbot’s fault. According to the second vision, Ellinger refused to take appropriate action even in the wake of the disaster, so a deceased fellow monk appeared to him one night and not only reprimanded but brutally chastised the abbot. Even so, Ellinger did not learn his lesson and, evincing little care for the proper exercise of his office, was deposed a second time.⁵⁶

Temporarily at least, Ellinger regained the favor of the powers that be. Not long after his resumption of the abbacy of Tegernsee, which could not have occurred without Conrad’s approval, he set to work restoring the monastery of Benedictbeuern as well. It is unclear from the sources whether he took on the assignment at the behest of Conrad II or of Henry III acting in concert with Egilbert of Freising, since the emperor had in 1031 granted the young king—and thus his guardian—a free hand not only in safeguarding the duchy’s eastern border with Hungary but also in the internal affairs of Bavaria. In any case, the abbot of Tegernsee was the right man for the job: Within a mere eleven months, Ellinger brought Benedictbeuern back from the brink of ruin by not just seeing to the renovation of the monastery’s buildings and providing for new liturgical vestments, instruments, and manuscripts, including—tellingly enough—a copy of the Rule of Saint Benedict, but also by installing a new abbot, who observed the rule and proved both remarkably effective and extraordinarily long-lived. During Abbot Gotahelm’s more-than-twenty-year tenure, Benedictbeuern flourished and even regained its status as an imperial abbey.⁵⁷

In a subsequent letter to Bishop Egilbert, Abbot Ellinger described in dramatic detail the dire financial repercussions of Albinus’s priorate and indicated that the bishop should therefore intercede with the emperor on the monastery’s behalf. In a flowery exhibit of politesse, the new abbot inquired of the bishop how he might best use the many hours of daylight available at that time of year in the furtherance of his studies. This seasonal reference suggests

that the letter—and Ellinger's reinstatement as abbot—date to early summer 1031. The reader of the letter also learns that the abbot's fellow monks greeted him with great affection upon his return.⁵⁸

Conrad's treatment of Tegernsee is hard to square with his concern for Benedictbeuern, which was for a time so closely associated with the former foundation. The matter is further complicated by the fact that most of the surviving sources are subjective accounts penned by monks from Tegernsee who clearly feared that their foundation would suffer the same fate as Kempten, which Conrad II had bestowed upon his stepson Duke Ernest II in the same year as Ellinger's first removal from office (1026).⁵⁹ Indeed, the one thing known about Albinus's priorate is that this monk from Hersfeld sought to change the manner in which Tegernsee administered its holdings, obviously with the emperor's consent.⁶⁰ Conrad II did not, however, put very much of his own weight behind these efforts, and Albinus, the emperor's alleged confidant, was not even appointed abbot.⁶¹ To top things off, the prior was not an especially successful businessman,⁶² and whatever the sovereign hoped to achieve regarding Tegernsee's properties never progressed beyond the level of a threat. The metropolitan for Bavaria, Archbishop Thietmar II of Salzburg (1025–41), on the other hand, succeeded in undercutting the foundation's economic footing by alienating a property it had received from Henry II, as confirmed by a diploma bearing the royal seal.⁶³ While one may debate the significance and the emperor's possible support—direct or indirect, for personal or institutional reasons—of the mysterious machinations of the abbot's enemies, one thing is sure: Ellinger cannot be said to have lost his abbacy in 1026 because of laxity or noncompliance with the Benedictine Rule. The mere fact that he was dispatched to Benedictbeuern so soon after his reinstatement in 1031 and effected the reform of that monastery with such success and alacrity dispels any such notion. While Prior Albinus—not to be confused with another monk of the same name from Hersfeld, a master and provost who went on to become abbot of the monastery of Nienburg, on the Saale River—had probably come to know Godehard during the seven years the abbot of Niederalteich oversaw Hersfeld (1005–12), he did not belong to the abbot's inner circle; if he had, Ellinger would never have written about him in such pointed terms to the former abbot and now bishop of Hildesheim in 1031.⁶⁴

3. Echternach and Saint-Ghislain

In 1028 the abbot of Echternach was deposed from his office, probably because this once competent individual had surrendered to the “lusts of the flesh” and set such a negative example for the monks. Who initiated Urold's ouster—the monks at Echternach, perhaps the archbishop of Trier, in whose province

the monastery was located, or even the emperor himself—is not known; the sources are equally reticent on the subject of who arranged for the abbot's banishment to the monastery of Weissenburg. Yet, who could it have been if not the emperor, who then delegated the task of filling the vacancy to Poppo of Stavelot? The abbot recruited a monk from the monastery of Saint Maximin in Trier for the post, and—uncharacteristically—Humbert's appointment went unopposed by the members of his new community. The new abbot had the savvy to exploit the traditionally good ties between his home monastery of Saint Maximin and Gisela by sending her a letter in which he appealed for her active support of the reestablishment of Echternach's economic base. Humbert's urgent plea went long unheeded, because granting the abbot's request would have put the emperor at loggerheads with Count Henry of Luxembourg, the monastery's advocate. Even so, the monks at Echternach were probably far from destitute, since just three years later they possessed the financial wherewithal to celebrate not just the translation of the bones of their founder, Willibrord, but also the completion and consecration of a new abbey church (1031). It is quite possible that the splendid *Codex Aureus* was commissioned in honor of that occasion. Unlike the wicked vinedressers so magnificently depicted in the manuscript (Matt. 21:33–41, Mark 12:1–12, and Luke 20:9–19), Humbert and his fellow monks clearly wished to labor industriously in the vineyard of God, even though they had been called at different times in the “day of their lives” (Matt. 20:1–16). If the lord of the house had invited them to a great feast, the monks of Echternach would surely have attended and not offered up excuses to their host (Luke 14:16–24).⁶⁵

The imperial abbey of Saint-Ghislain was in even worse straits, having been brought to the edge of ruin by the monks' flouting of the Benedictine Rule and by the lack of sustained countermeasures from Emperor Henry II and the local nobility; even the duly responsible bishop of Cambrai could not be induced to perform his duty. The situation appears to have been set right in 1029, when Emperor Conrad II reached an agreement with Bishop Gerard, “as is proper,” and installed Her(i)brand, “whom he wanted,” as abbot, or at least that was the local take on the episode.⁶⁶ A somewhat different story emerges from Poppo's biography, which credits the abbot of Stavelot with seizing the initiative.⁶⁷ There must have been broad support for the practical measures involved in the imperial abbey's restoration, because, in addition to Bishop Gerard of Cambrai and Abbot Poppo, Empress Gisela, King Henry III, Archbishop Pilgrim of Cologne, and Duke Gozelo of Lotharingia all intervened in a diploma issued at Regensburg on Saint-Ghislain's behalf (May 3, 1034). Although the privilege speaks of the abbey's continued indigence, the long drawn-out process of putting the abbey back on its feet was by then essentially complete.⁶⁸ In order to garner attention for its plight, the community had engaged in a rather dramatic measure: In 1030 Abbot Heribrand and his

Image not available

FIG. 16 The parable of the wicked vinedressers. From the Codex Aureus, ca. 1030, in Echternach; Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Nuremberg, Germany, MS 156142/KG 1138, fol. 77r.

monks, bearing the corpse of Saint Ghislain, had appeared at the imperial court to complain about the abbey's miserable economic state. This supplicatory procession must have met with at least some, if not overwhelming, success.⁶⁹

4. Limburg, Saint Gall, and Saint Maximin

Limburg an der Haardt was the sole religious house established by Conrad II and Gisela; that they entrusted its administration to Poppo of Stavelot sometime between 1025 and 1032 provides further proof of the high esteem in which the imperial couple held the abbot. After an initial and probably brief period as a canonry, the foundation was converted into a Benedictine monastery during the period, perhaps a decade, it spent under Poppo's oversight, although to little lasting effect. By February 1032 Limburg was well-enough established to host the imperial court, and the "crypt and the three altars therein" may have been consecrated at that time. Yet, what is known of Conrad's actions on that visit is telling: In return for an episcopal promise to safeguard the monastery at Limburg, the emperor granted another imperial abbey to the bishop of Speyer and may have additionally bestowed a golden crown and golden scepter upon the foundation, thus treating Limburg as if it were another Cluny, upon which his predecessor, Emperor Henry II, had bestowed the imperial insignia used at his coronation in Rome. While there is firm evidence for Henry's action, Conrad's similar gesture can only be inferred from a later incident from which it is impossible to glean when and why he handed over the sacred objects: In 1060, upon his elevation to bishop of Speyer, Abbot Einhard of Limburg is known to have brought the crown and scepter with him. Since Conrad II had on February 20, 1032, charged his immediate predecessor with safeguarding Limburg, one may surmise that the gift was related to the imperial couple's concurrent sojourn at the monastery, but nothing more.⁷⁰

It is possible that portions of the abbey church were consecrated in February 1032⁷¹ and that Poppo of Stavelot entrusted the monastery as a whole to his nephew John at the beginning of 1036. Although his uncle had only recently chosen him to succeed to the abbacy of Saint Maximin as well, John never set much store in Poppo's work and monastic practices, having instead sided with the members of the "opposition," like his friend Ekkehard IV of Saint Gall, whose aversion to "Roman customs" he most probably shared. In fact, the course taken by Saint Gall, which ascribed to the generally agreed-upon need to reintroduce stricter compliance with the Benedictine Rule, highlights what was unique about Poppo's brand of reform, namely his focus on those regulations, or *consuetudines*, that pertained to daily life. In 1034 Emperor Conrad charged Poppo with reforming Saint Gall as well, and to that end the

abbot entrusted the venerable Swabian monastery to Norbert, a monk from Stavelot, under whose direction “we do not live as [observantly as] he or we desire, but rather as we are able.”⁷²

As it happened, Abbot John did not plant the seeds of either Saint Maximin's or Saint Gall's downfall. After a few stormy years, Poppo relieved his nephew at the helm of the former foundation, albeit at the emperor's command.⁷³ The latter abbey regained its erstwhile internal unity and external stature thanks to Norbert's accomplished—and lengthy—abbacy and his adversary Ekkehard's death sometime after 1056.⁷⁴ Limburg, however, was doomed by the “schism” propagated by its new abbot, who did not live out the first year of his tenure. The foundation may have ceased to function as a monastery upon his death (1036), and it reverted (?) to a canonry not long thereafter (1038).⁷⁵ Thus, while Limburg may have become a monastic institution relatively soon after its establishment, the terms of its founding charter were consigned to oblivion by John and his successors from 1036 on, until the institution was salvaged—perhaps by the duly responsible bishop of Speyer—to serve as a canonry.⁷⁶ Conrad and Gisela lost all interest in their religious foundation, which was no more than a former ancestral castle that was never intended to serve as the family monastery housing their mortal remains. After all, the Salians had long ago decided to entrust the cultivation of their memories to the cathedral at Speyer. In summer 1038 the young queen Gunhild was interred in the uncompleted abbey church at Limburg, which had obviously been earmarked as her widow's portion. The massive proportions of the structure would have been discernible even then, just as its ruins inspire awe even today, but the disjunction between the church's magnificence and the foundation's paltry glory has always been its most striking feature.⁷⁷



20
ISSUES OF CANON LAW

1. Simony

“No one disputes that Conrad was a simoniac.”¹ Case closed . . . or is it? None of the accounts of Conrad’s bestowing high ecclesiastical office or honors in return for money and in full awareness of the act’s sinfulness stand up to close examination.² “Reformists at the papal court deemed . . . Henry III the first to declare war on simony, which is another—if indirect—way of saying that Conrad II engaged in that vice.”³ Peter Damian’s remark that simoniacs defend their practice as the oil that greases the wheels of state can only have applied to the first Salian.⁴ It was this aspect of simony that prompted a more modern observer to note, “The portrait of Conrad II as a ‘simoniac,’ which was painted in two sittings—first in the eleventh century by Rodulfus Glaber and then in the nineteenth by Harry Bresslau—is due for a cleaning.”⁵ Rodulfus Glaber addressed “the eradication of simony” in a chapter devoted to Henry III, whom he credited with acknowledging the widespread prevalence of simoniacal avarice in Gaul and Germany and most severely reprimanding the archbishops and bishops at a synod for tolerating this sinful abuse. The sovereign purportedly threatened to purge the episcopate of all those in thrall to simony, a sin that was practiced at every level of the church hierarchy, from the pope down to the doorkeepers, by not just the bishops of France but especially the ecclesiastics of Italy. Nor did Henry III excuse Conrad’s behavior, which he attributed to a lifelong and damnable devotion to greed that gave him reason to worry about his father’s soul.⁶

While Rodulfus Glaber, an “inconstant monk from Cluny,” may not be the most credible source, there is good reason to believe that his account of Henry’s blanket condemnation of simony refers to the resolutions passed by the synod of Pavia in 1046 and directed against Pope Gregory VI.⁷ Yet, although the passage captures the mood and practices of the eleventh century, it tells the reader very little about Conrad’s ecclesiastical policies. The same is true for

Wipo's famous reproach of Conrad and Gisela, whom he accused of having invested a noble cleric named Udalrich with the bishopric of Basle in return for "an immense sum of money." The sovereign later rued his sin and solemnly vowed never to take money for a bishopric or abbacy. According to his biographer, Conrad II "kept to this vow fairly well," but Henry III always honored it thoroughly and thus atoned for his father's lapses.⁸ Wipo, however, wrote these lines from the perspective of the 1040s—as the many references to Henry III, the work's recipient, indicate—and not of Conrad's day. Still, he implied that such payments fell "within the broader parameters of obligatory service [to a suzerain]."⁹ Since the new bishop of Basle was installed in June 1025, in conjunction with Conrad's, if not conquest, then military occupation of this Burgundian town, Udalrich's payments may have been considered a sort of contribution or deposit toward the *servitium regis*, or service due the sovereign, that would up until then not have been a normal part of the diocese's dues; Gisela may have also thought of them as down payments on holdings that had been part of her mother's legacy. While in Basle, the king issued a diploma directing the new bishop to restore a considerable amount of property that had been confiscated from the Alsatian monastery of Murbach by Henry II and bestowed upon Udalrich's predecessor, Bishop Adalbero (June 23, 1025). Archbishop Aribo of Mainz and Bishop Werner of Strasbourg played a part in this transaction.¹⁰ The royal couple was thus not the only party to profit from Udalrich's appointment.

The other accusations of simony leveled against Conrad II either are barely worth mentioning—like the lament supposedly expressed by Bruno of Toul, the future pope Leo IX, that serving at court might prove corrupting and lead to a lucrative episcopal appointment somewhere¹¹—or involve actions that fall within the parameters of behavior consonant with the administration of ecclesiastic properties. For example, Conrad's handling of the Piemontese cloister of Breme, a daughter house of the monastery of Novalesse, is reminiscent of his predecessor's approach, which consisted of strengthening bishoprics to the detriment of what—it should be remembered—were predominantly ill-disciplined and economically weak monastic institutions.¹² Following the death of Breme's abbot at the beginning of 1027, the abbot of Cluny induced the emperor—most likely in the immediate aftermath of the imperial coronation—to entrust the monastery to the care of the Burgundian abbot's like-named nephew. The new abbot's attempts to restore discipline were fiercely opposed by the monks, who in addition to all else were probably related to the local nobility and able to count on familial support. Odilo of Breme responded by throwing his weight around and enfeoffing free vassals with a substantial portion of the monastery's property, thus plunging the foundation into dire economic straits. The abbot, who had taken such a strict stance initially, conducted himself like a child, insofar as he—the chronicler felt compelled to add—

went to the opposite extreme and devoted his time to amusements. Odilo may also have neglected to cultivate the members of the imperial court as he ought, with the result that Conrad II finally invested Bishop Alberic of Como with the monastery. While the imperial coffers may have profited greatly from the transfer, placing Breme under Como's jurisdiction also made sense from a geopolitical point of view; in fact, at the beginning of his first expedition to Italy, Conrad II had already strengthened the hand of Alberic, who controlled the Lombard side of the Bündner Pass, by endowing him with a number of royal properties. Clearly, the trustworthy bishop was expected to safeguard the important routes along the northern bank of the Po River.¹³

Other alleged instances of simony are known only from later sources. For example, two works written in Liège in the first and second halves of the twelfth century, respectively, accuse Bishop Reginard (1025–37) of having compensated Conrad II for his office. A former student at the monastery of Gorze, Reginard had been elected bishop of Verdun in 1025 by the diocesan clergy and residents—hence in accordance with canon law—and then paid the new king to appoint him instead to the concurrently vacated bishopric of Liège, from which he hailed. The material found in these two accounts attests more to the acrimony stirred up by the Investiture Controversy, however, than to the attitudes of an earlier age.¹⁴ The chronicle of Lorsch, a “history of the monastery based on charters” also dating to the twelfth century, contains an entry for 1032 alleging that Abbot Humbert, a man of evil repute, was neither elected by the brothers and ministerials nor appointed canonically (*canonica institutione*), but instead acquired his post by buying the favor of sycophantic courtiers. Even in his own day, however, Humbert had been denounced for squandering the monastery's possessions, and it should be noted that neither Conrad nor Gisela was implicated in his irregular appointment. Much the same was true for an incident involving a dealer in prebends and a court chaplain named Immo, who later became the bishop of Arezzo; with the former's help, the latter sought to exploit his position at court in order to enhance the terms of his canonate at Worms. In return, Immo offered to pay the individual handsomely and take him under his protection, but the deal was to remain secret.¹⁵ Finally, according to an anonymous twelfth-century Venetian chronicler Conrad II engaged in the most reprehensible behavior, even selling the “gifts of the Holy Ghost,” but this author does not appear to be very reliable. For example, while the work correctly notes that Conrad I was a successor to Louis the Child, its content actually concerns the first Salian rulers from Conrad II to Henry IV. In any case, the passage levels the same accusations against Henry III, whom contemporaries deemed above suspicion when it came to simony.¹⁶

And that is the full extent of the surviving references to Conrad II the “simoniac.” The results of this survey are entirely congruent with the contents

of two decrees addressing simoniacal practices issued at a synod in Tribur convened and presided over by the sovereign (May 1036). Instead of coming to a consensus on the matter at the upper echelons of the church, which they occupied, the assembled ecclesiastical dignitaries banned priests from selling chrism and accepting money for performing baptisms and burials, and banned both the sale of altars by bishops and archdeacons and their purchase by priests.¹⁷

2. Participation in Synods

“The synods convened during the first Salian’s reign dealt with issues that had already come to the fore under Henry II.”¹⁸ This observation refers to the dispute over Gandersheim,¹⁹ the ostensible settlement of the century-old antagonism pitting Aquileia against Grado and Venice,²⁰ and the rejection once and for all of canonical challenges to the marriage between Otto and Irmgard of Hammerstein.²¹ Yet, since questions of church discipline were also submitted for synodal review, the flow of new cases to be settled was continuous, as is evident from the proceedings of the synod at Tribur in 1036.²² The sources barely mention Conrad’s participation in synods: He attended only five such ecclesiastical assemblies and did not get very involved in the proceedings. From a quantitative point of view, his record pales beside that of his predecessor, who presided over four times as many synods, and it fares even worse in a qualitative comparison. Conrad II obviously considered the synod a tool for dealing with highly technical issues that had attained significance in his eyes because of their perceived potential to disturb the kingdom’s peace, be they jurisdictional disputes, like those over Gandersheim, between the archbishop of Mainz and his suffragan, the bishop of Hildesheim, and Grado, which was sparked by the patriarch of Aquileia;²³ or charges of consanguinity, like those raised against Otto and Irmgard of Hammerstein and cited in the broken engagement between Otto of Schweinfurt and Matilda, the Piast princess;²⁴ or quarrels over primacy, like the attempt by the archbishop of Ravenna to supercede the archbishop of Milan at the imperial coronations of Conrad and Gisela;²⁵ or liturgical mix-ups with broad implications, like the confusion surrounding the proper calculation of the beginning of Advent.²⁶

Conrad II first addressed the case involving Gandersheim in a synodal setting at Grone in the middle of March 1025, and for a new king he took a remarkably active part in the assembly’s deliberations and decrees; indeed, both the invitations to the synod and the determinations reached in his presence were supposedly issued in his name. Yet, there is no reason to believe that he also presided over the proceedings, which were certainly subject to episcopal oversight.²⁷ The synod held in the aftermath of the imperial coronations in Rome also involved a similar division of labor: Conrad II and John XIX were

said to have jointly presided over the proceedings that April 1027, yet “the pope officiated over the assembly.” Together they pronounced the synod’s determination in Aquileia’s favor and Poppo’s consequent investiture with Grado, but the papal diploma recording the settlement states that Conrad acted as an intervenor and petitioned the synod. An imperial diploma issued six years later, on the other hand, states that the emperor had convened the synod in Rome “in accordance with the joint decision of our loyal retainers, namely Pope John and the venerable patriarch Poppo; Archbishop Aribo of Mainz, Archbishop Poppo of Trier, Archbishop Aribert of Milan, Archbishop Heribert of Ravenna, and the remaining bishops and loyal retainers of our realm.”²⁸

Archbishop Aribo of Mainz not only laid the groundwork and convened the synod at Frankfurt on September 23–24, 1027, but also presided over its deliberations; the pomp surrounding Conrad’s participation clearly indicates that he served as “honorary chair.”²⁹ The dispute over Gandersheim occupied center stage at this synod as well, but other contentious issues of direct or indirect concern to the emperor were also addressed. While there is no indication that Conrad II played a role in his stepbrother Gebhard’s forced resumption of the religious life, the emperor specifically saw to it that the case was closed on the Hammerstein marriage, which the archbishop had again placed on the agenda.³⁰ Tellingly enough, the one time Conrad did openly intervene was after Aribo lost his temper and gave a tongue-lashing to Abbess Sophie, who was supported by Wigger, the cathedral provost at Gandersheim.³¹

On October 6, 1028, Conrad II attended yet a third synod on the dispute over Gandersheim, which was convened in Pöhlde and again chaired by Aribo of Mainz for the purpose of settling the matter once and for all. Both sides petitioned the emperor to render judgment, but while Conrad let himself be drawn into the deliberations somewhat, he maintained enough distance that the final determination was issued in the name of all the synod’s attendees.³²

The next known instance of Conrad’s participation in a synod occurred eight years later at Tribur, an ancient palace where, at the end of April or beginning of May 1036, approximately one-third of the German episcopate gathered in order to review various disciplinary matters and the proposed abolition of the separate tithe on the Slavs—of which, up until then, only half of what was due was regularly collected—as well as some suspected cases of consanguinity. The emperor is credited with issuing the invitations and presiding over the proceedings, if “only because his seat was raised [above the others] and he acted as cochair,” although one of the metropolitans—probably Archbishop Bardo of Mainz—oversaw the actual proceedings. Fifteen bishops were in attendance, including the metropolitans of Mainz, Cologne, Trier, and Salzburg, who represented the four most important archdioceses in Germany.³³ Even though Otto of Schweinfurt was forced to break off his engagement to Matilda of Poland after the synod determined that their marriage would violate

the canonical strictures against consanguineous unions, Conrad II was probably just as interested in the decision to abolish the tithe levied against the Slavs, which dated back to the early Carolingians. The remaining agenda items also involved internal church matters, as was the norm from what is known of the relatively well documented provincial synods at Trier³⁴ and of synods convened by Italian or West Frankish bishops.³⁵

If it were clear that an upcoming synod would issue the desired determinations, Conrad might skip the assembly altogether, as happened in March 1038, when the excommunication of Archbishop Aribert of Milan by Pope Benedict IX was a foregone conclusion. The emperor's behavior speaks volumes about his attitude toward the pope, who was clearly expected to perform whatever assignment he received, even if it took him a year to do so.³⁶ However, if an ecclesiastical controversy affected the public weal and had the potential to sow "confusion" or cause a perilous "segregation" of usages, Conrad II acted swiftly and decisively. Thus, when his uncle William, bishop of Strasbourg, sought to celebrate the beginning of Advent on November 26, 1038, in tandem with the emperor's arrival in his city, Conrad not only vetoed the idea but saw to it within one week (December 3) that a synod decided in favor of the good old tradition of commencing Advent between November 27 and December 3.³⁷

All in all, the preceding chapters paint a rather sobering picture of Conrad's ecclesiastical policy: Even allowing for the "advice" he received from his consort, the emperor did not have a broadly defined vision, but instead reached politically motivated decisions on a case-by-case basis with an eye to, at most, their medium-term effects. Moreover, he let his personal feelings dictate many of his "personnel" selections, with the result that his record in this area was decidedly mixed. An imperial kinsman who craved an episcopal appointment was likely to get his wish, as was a member of the royal chapel, but the man who combined these traits enjoyed the best chances. Furthermore, having a brother who had already proved his episcopal mettle did not hurt a man's—or woman's—career in the church. Like all true members of the secular nobility, Conrad II and Gisela were concerned that monks and nuns conduct themselves in a disciplined, devout, and reputable manner, even though the emperor—and the empress, too, for that matter—showed anything but consistent support for monastic reform. And how were they to decide which type of monasticism—the *vita monastica* of the cloister or the regimented life of the canonry—was better, when even the most prominent clerics could not say¹ and, as happened at Hersfeld in 1031, the representatives of the three competing reform groups were at loggerheads and no one else knew the answer? Under such circumstances it was only natural to turn first to one's kin, starting with Gisela's family, and then to individuals backed by Poppo of Stavelot, Conrad's personal favorite among the reformers. The imperial couple turned their backs on the third option, which was represented by Godehard of Niederalteich, but they did support his brand of reform at the abbot's own monastery as well as in Italy, and not just at Montecassino.

While it may be warranted to describe "our emperor's relationship with the church [as] clearly the weakest aspect of his policy,"² that formulation begs the question whether a "better relationship" was even possible in Conrad's day and age. The reformers of the latter half of the eleventh century were still

in their cradles, and the “protoreformers,” even impressive and persuasive figures like Poppo of Stavelot and Godehard of Niederalteich, did not propound new ideas, just the restoration of standards. As Godehard tellingly wrote to the bishop of Freising, his copy of the Rule of Saint Benedict was so worn from daily use that it was falling apart, yet he had found nothing therein to preclude his installment as the abbot of Tegernsee by the *summus princeps*, or highest prince, that is, Henry II in his capacity as duke of Bavaria.³ It is also telling that Ellinger had to bring a copy of the Benedictine Rule with him from Benedictbeuern when he undertook the reform of Tegernsee in 1031/32.⁴ The reformers who called for absolute obedience to the rule may have laid the foundation for the future, but tellingly none of them produced a written set of “operational guidelines,” or *consuetudines*, before the mid–eleventh century. Instead, they focused their ire on the unwritten “customs” of their counterparts, as exemplified by the remonstrations of Ekkehard IV of Saint Gall, who actually wanted nothing more than to be a good, observant Benedictine.⁵

Judging from the purported conversation between the emperor and the monks of Montecassino before their election of a new abbot, if religious communities were to return to their—in some cases quite deeply buried—roots, then someone would have to set them on the right course. While even the original redaction of the text should not be mistaken for a word-for-word rendition of the exchange, it probably does capture the atmosphere at Montecassino. Given the foundation’s history—the foisting of its last abbot upon the brothers by the prince of Capua, Basilus’s mismanagement of the monastery and subsequent disappearance at the approach of the imperial army—the monks were simply not capable of filling the vacant abbacy with one of their own. Even after the emperor reminded them that the rule mandated their election of a suitable candidate from within their ranks, the monks did not comply; only an outside nominee presented by a powerful magnate would do. According to the account, Conrad’s assertion that there was no suitable candidate at hand came after the monks declared themselves unable to hold an election but before Gisela’s proposal that Abbot Richer of Leno be put up for a vote.⁶ This and similar occurrences have been cited as evidence “that Conrad II was actually indifferent to matters of ecclesiastical import, while Gisela formulated ecclesiastical policy;²⁷ an interpretation that misconstrues the context of imperial decision making. After all, the imperial court was not structured like a modern European government, with Gisela functioning as the medieval equivalent of a politically appointed cabinet minister for religion and education aided by a state secretary—in this case, Poppo of Stavelot—drawn from the career civil service.

This last observation holds up even when one considers the circumstances behind the appointment of a reformer to the abbacy at Saint Trond. Bishop Reginard of Liège, a staunch and lifelong opponent of Poppo of Stavelot,

thwarted all attempts by his nemesis to reform foundations within his diocese, even Saint Trond, a proprietary monastery belonging to the bishop of Metz, whose abbot enjoyed Reginard's support and shared his aversion to reform. In 1034, however, once this Abbot Adelard had passed away, Gisela stepped in and presented the bishop of Metz with a suitable replacement, one whom even the bishop of Liège was finally compelled to accept and consecrate. The empress appears to have acted independently, although she would scarcely have violated the emperor's wishes.⁸ As far as one can tell, she did not go it alone when the kingdom and its churches were involved and instead played a joint, although more often than not pivotal, role, as is plain from the biography of Bishop Bruno of Toul, the future Pope Leo IX.⁹ Gisela was, after all, the emperor's "necessary companion,"¹⁰ particularly when it came to ecclesiastical matters. Even so, only three of her protégés, who would receive a total of four high church offices—two archbishoprics as well as the abbacies of Hersfeld and Montecassino—at her recommendation, are still known by name today.¹¹ Another assumption that does not stand up to examination is Conrad's alleged preference for monastic over episcopal members of the church, as evidenced by his support for Poppo of Stavelot and his choice of a monk, Bardo, to assume the archbishopric of Mainz. It is possible, for example, to draw the opposite conclusion from Conrad's support of Bishop Warmann of Constance in his dispute with Abbot Bern of Reichenau over the latter's right to wear pontificals, which had even been confirmed by Pope John XIX.¹²

Likewise, Conrad II did not possess a "monastic policy" worthy of the name. How could he have? In the days of the "protoreformers" the church was riven by internal struggles sparked by the emphasis on regional and personal "customs." While they may have been blazing different paths, these male as well as female religious—like the canonesses at Gandersheim who wished to become nuns¹³—were in the last analysis all focused on the same goal, the reinstitution of the good old way of doing things. All of them sought to be as true as possible to the letter of the Benedictine Rule, to celebrate feasts and observe fasts on the proper days, and to dress, eat, and drink in strictest observance of monastic regulations. None of them, however, wished to abandon tradition, be he the archbishop of Mainz who insisted upon his metropolitan rights or a minor Spanish monk who celebrated the Feast of the Annunciation on December 18.¹⁴ There was no one north or south of the Alps, not even in Rome, able to represent the entire church in a dialogue with a political creature like Conrad II—and likely Gisela as well—about ecclesiastical issues. It is to the emperor's credit that he was a good enough judge of human nature to seek out the advice of individuals who saw the big picture beyond their foundations' walls; in tandem with men like Poppo of Stavelot he was even able to get some things done. In other areas, however, the lack of a broadly defined vision behind Conrad's ecclesiastical and monastic policies is quite

striking, although it probably reflected the lack of a broadly defined policy on the part of the church. Even a well-meaning third party to the educational dispute between Worms and Würzburg would have been hard-pressed to perceive an official ecclesiastical position on the matter, since not even the canons of Würzburg could have really meant it when they accused the canons at Worms of believing in Jupiter instead of Christ.¹⁵



Part Six

EPILOGUE

The imperial couple's policies and public displays of religiosity, which were also politically charged, formed the backdrop against which contemporaries perceived Conrad's and Gisela's personalities.¹ Since Wipo was almost the only contemporary author to recount not merely what political measures the first Salian took but also what he said, and to seek to compare—as well as independently critique—these two aspects of Conrad's rule, his biography is the principal source for this portion of our investigation. The work is prefaced by a dedicatory letter addressed to Henry III, which contains the famous and oft-cited observation that Conrad had “performed an operation with good effect upon the commonwealth, that is, the Roman Empire.” As most excerptors note, however, the passage goes on to credit Henry III with healing the incision “according to the dictates of reason,” a phrase calculated not just to honor but also to exalt the son over his father.² While it is, of course, preferable from a methodological—as well as an author's—point of view to interpret a passage only within its context, these few lines convey a significant message about Wipo's perception of his subject: Conrad's accession to the throne ushered in, if not a complete break, then at least a realignment of the traditional policies pursued by Henry II during his “conflictual kingship.”³ The “operation” was indicated because it had a “good effect” on the kingdom, yet it fell to the son to bring this “effect” to fruition. Wipo may have used a complex figure of speech, but his meaning is clear: Conrad's policies were not only new but a drastic change from the past.

However, the new king did not immediately introduce an entirely new set of policies, but instead adopted his predecessor's political methods and goals, put them to the test, and then made a drastic break with tradition as soon as he recognized their deficiencies. On his first expedition to Italy, Conrad initially followed in Henry's footsteps and placed the power of the throne behind the bishops and upper clergy as opposed to the margraves, *valvassores*, and their feudatories. As emperor, however, he diverged from his predecessor's policies.

On his second expedition, which had been occasioned by the rebellion of the *valvassores*, Conrad had the opportunity to pursue an entirely different policy. After all, the dissatisfaction spurring the great feudatories and their subvassals had its roots to no small extent in decrees promulgated by Henry II that empowered the ecclesiastical magnates to take measures calculated to turn back the clock and attack the *valvassores'* most basic interests. This policy had, of course, also won the enmity of Arduin's allies, the margravian families, who fully expected Henry's successor to do the same following his accession to the throne in 1024.⁴

Conrad's military engagements against the Slavs residing east of the Elbe and the Poles (1029–31) provide another example of the new king's initially—if cautiously—adopting a policy pursued by Henry II and then taking an entirely different course once he recognized the untenability of its theoretical underpinnings and the infeasibility of its practical execution.⁵ When it came to the ecclesiastical hierarchy, the Salian ruler did not pursue an antimonastic or antiepiscopal or even a broadly antichurch policy, nor would he have entertained one. He did, however, swiftly and utterly dispense with the sort of favoritism Henry had shown the clergy to the detriment of the secular nobility. After all, Conrad felt a strong kinship with the members of the secular elite, whose thoughts, feelings, and modes of behavior accorded with his own. While Henry II had impressed the most important representatives of the imperial church with his remarkably spiritual, Moses-like concept of sovereignty,⁶ Conrad and the members of his retinue were motivated by a markedly more modest set of ideas—or pragmatic perceptions of reality—that reflected their nonliterary, noble background. Among these was the not merely ancient but actually timeless belief that a person's name captured his—or her—essence.

1. Personality and Name

During Conrad's era the manner in which nobles named their offspring underwent a profound shift: Whereas noble children formerly bore “old-fashioned” variants of the familial name that communicated membership in a particular kinship group, for a variety of reasons children at all ranks of the social hierarchy now received “modern” names—like Conrad or Henry—drawn from a much more limited pool of choices. It should be noted, however, that a preponderance of noble children continued to be named after illustrious ancestors who had brought prestige to the family or embodied its values.⁷ Two scions of the Salian family born within just a few years of one another were given the name Conrad: The younger of the two, the son of Duke Conrad of Carinthia, was born between 1002/3 and 1005 and was the namesake of both his father and his preeminent ancestor, Conrad the Red of Worms, a choice

that signaled that the boy was to inherit his father's preeminent role within the family.⁸ History would have it otherwise, however, and the branch of the family that named their children Conrad in accordance with noble tradition lost out to the branch that favored the name Henry. Much the same thing had already happened with the name Otto, which harkened back to Otto of Worms, grandfather to the two Conrads, and fell into disuse on the part of both the Salians and the members of the house of Worms.⁹ The names William and Bruno, given to males of Ottonian descent destined for the clergy, were borne by two members of Emperor Conrad's father's generation yet also went out of fashion among the Salians rulers, although the name Bruno does crop up in the nonregal line.¹⁰

As far we know, all of the male members of the Salian dynasty were named either Conrad or Henry, and, as fate would have it, all of the Salians who occupied the throne from 1039 until almost a century later (1125) were namesakes of Conrad's father, Henry. Otto of Worms had initiated the tradition of naming sons earmarked for a secular career either Henry or Conrad: Henry, the oldest son of Otto of Worms, was the namesake of Otto's mother's grandfather and founder of the Saxon royal house, King Henry I (919–36), while his third son, Conrad, was named after Otto's father, Liutgard's "heroic" husband, Duke Conrad the Red,¹¹ the same ancestor after whom Conrad II would be named. Duke Conrad the Red had himself been the namesake of a great uncle, Conrad I, to whom the Conradine family, from which Gisela was descended, in part also owed its identity.¹² Conrad II let it be known in no uncertain terms that he, too, was related to Conrad I: Diplomas with full dating clauses—even those issued after the imperial coronation—refer to the first Salian ruler as the "second" Conrad, as if King Conrad I had also been emperor. In this respect, Conrad obviously took his cue from Henry II, who had referred to himself as the "second" Henry in the dating clauses of his diplomas, thereby establishing a link with King Henry I and bestowing the rank of emperor posthumously upon the founder of the Saxon dynasty.¹³ However, only in Conrad's case did later commentators contend that what to call himself had posed a "real-world" problem for Conrad, whose solution offered insight into his policies, indeed, personality. From the late twelfth century on, writers—at least those familiar with Wipo's biography—noted that the first Salian ruler is referred to as Cuno before his election and then only afterward by his "full" name of Conrad, which they—and his biographer, too, no doubt—probably felt was a more suitable name for the holder of the kingly *honor*.¹⁴ One medieval author, who mistakenly identified the emperor as the son of his like-named uncle, Conrad of Carinthia, drew an association between the first Salian's name and personality by making a telling, if not isolated,¹⁵ allusion to both etymologically plausible meanings of the name Conrad in his description of the sovereign as a bold giver of counsel and as a councilor to nations.¹⁶

2. Sayings, Speeches, and Exchanges

Conrad II may have had occasion to criticize his predecessors,¹⁷ but he also acknowledged his own mistakes, at least in those instances where he sought to undo the damage. Not many politicians admit their mistakes, and even Conrad did so only when he was quite sure of himself; he admitted as much in a diploma issued by the imperial chancery in summer 1033 that reversed his confiscation of a county from Bishop Meinwerk of Paderborn and its bestowal upon Archbishop Aribio of Mainz in fall 1024. According to the privilege's narration, "new and raw to kingship, we were induced to make an unreasonable transfer by the unjust counsel [of the archbishop of Mainz]. Now, however, that we possess confirmation and confidence in the fullness of our imperial authority, we return the county and recompense Mainz with another comital holding in order to strengthen the peace." These words were not drafted by the party being redressed for the injustice done him nine years earlier, but by the chief notary under the direction of Burchard, the imperial chancellor who would soon be elevated to the bishopric of Halberstadt.¹⁸

The speech that Wipo has his hero, the duly elected king of Germany, deliver upon entering the cathedral of Mainz on the occasion of his royal coronation is a compilation of aphorisms mainly drawn from the Psalms and New Testament. The text even includes a citation from Sallust, making it seem as if Conrad had not merely received a firm grounding in the Scriptures but a classical education as well.¹⁹ Since he had in actuality enjoyed neither, this oration is a product of his biographer's imagination. Like others of his day, Wipo had been brought up on edificatory sayings and exemplary quotes, with the result that his work examines not just the "memorable doings" but also the "memorable sayings" of its subject.²⁰ To what extent the speeches found in the biography accurately reproduce Conrad's own words is, of course, a legitimate question. For example, even though Wipo's account of the emperor's response to the envoys from the rebellious city of Pavia credits him with likening the kingdom to a ship that continued to exist even in the absence of a steersman, it is unlikely that Conrad explicated the transpersonal nature of the realm using that turn of phrase, which, as it happened, became the most famous saying attributed to him. Yet, other notable sources also attest to Conrad's espousal of the idea that authority did not die with the lord in whom it was vested. The emperor designated Speyer as his burial place without, as far as can be discerned, an eye to establishing a tradition; still, it was during his rule that the Imperial Crown together with the Holy Cross probably came to be thought of as the eternal symbols of the kingdom and not merely as insignia that could be given away or melted down at will.²¹ A judicial notice issued in summer 1027 stated that the royal fisc belonged to the "throne of the kingdom,"²² a concept that crops up in Wipo's work as well, where Charlemagne's

stone throne in Aachen is described as the “archthrone of the whole realm.” In this passage Wipo in effect declares that Conrad was the first king since Charlemagne worthy of that royal insigne, much as Thietmor of Merseburg, a contemporary of Henry II, had said of Otto the Great. The way the biography is structured, the metaphor of the throne occurs in the chapter immediately preceding the one containing the metaphor of the ship; the close proximity of the two highlights Conrad’s belief in the transpersonal nature of the realm.²³

Otto III displayed his link to Charlemagne by “visiting” with his Carolingian predecessor in the imperial tomb at Aachen.²⁴ Conrad’s association with the great emperor was, according to his biographer, evidenced by a proverb to the effect that the saddle of Conrad has the stirrups of Charles. Luckily for the reader, the biographer then cited a versified alternative to the awkwardly worded original that he, an aspiring poet, had composed for the *Gallinarius*, a now lost metric account of Conrad’s “conquest” of Burgundy.²⁵ Knowing that Wipo reworked this one saying into a more poetic and polished form leads one to wonder to what extent the versifications found elsewhere in this biography approximate Conrad’s actual sayings.

Thus, the reader learns that upon hearing of his stepson Ernest’s death the Salian ruler responded with what has become his second most famous—if less momentous—saying: “Raro canes rabidi foeturam multiplicabunt.” Yet, he most surely did not frame his witticisms in a somewhat halting Latin hexameter. It should be noted that the saying has traditionally been translated as “Vicious dogs rarely bear young,” which is artless and just plain wrong. No one would have said that vicious dogs do not reproduce, but it is common knowledge that rabid dogs cannot bear young, because they die so soon after manifesting the disease. Also, the ideas of madness and rabies fit in quite well with Wipo’s depiction of the young Swabian duke’s conduct, which had, in fact, not really been irrational. Therein lay the pathos of Ernest’s tragic end: He was brought low by his adherence to an anachronistic belief in the precedence of a lord’s loyalty to his vassals over his “duties” as a duke.²⁶

Did Wipo at least communicate the gist of Conrad’s comment, albeit in polished form? The saying belongs to the same class of royal remarks as one attributed to Henry IV by Otto of Freising. When Rudolph of Rheinfelden was buried in Merseburg, Emperor Henry IV was asked how he could permit such a regal interment for an enemy. He responded: “I would that all my enemies lay as honorably buried.”²⁷ Conrad’s reaction to his stepson’s death was admittedly much less “regal,” as well as cooler and harsher in tone, but it bespeaks a familiarity with nature and hunting, and perhaps even something of a common touch on his part. Assuming—and with all due caution, of course—that Wipo merely recast Conrad’s words into classical Latin, then this saying sheds some light not just on how he expressed himself but also on his character.

Wipo rendered the crux of Conrad's rationale for undertaking the second expedition to Italy in late autumn 1036 in another hexameter: "If Italy hungers now for law, God granting, I shall sate it well with laws."²⁸ There is a certain genuineness about what this saying conveys: While the sovereign did not exactly welcome the prospect of again establishing the rule of law south of the Alps, he realized that he was compelled to undertake the task, in light of the *valvassores'* rebellion in northern Italy. Before his departure, however, Conrad evidently prepared himself for what lay ahead, as indicated by his consultations at Candlemas 1036 with the German experts in Italian affairs, and he may even have been urged to intervene by a major Italian figure, Boniface of Tuscany, who traveled all the way to Nijmegen that summer to meet with the emperor. The purpose of the passage may even have been to impress upon the reader that Conrad had not made the decision lightly.²⁹

A child of his age, Wipo would have placed a premium on the well-crafted and apt turn of phrase, the witticism that established one's name and celebrated one's fame.³⁰ Whether one enjoyed a good reputation or was saddled with a bad one, it was possible to reinforce or counter either by means of words—or, better, propaganda. The emperor's biographer employed both forms of this rhetorical device in a single chapter in order to glorify Conrad and denigrate his enemy, Odo of Champagne. First, he recounted a rumor concerning the French count, who supposedly often declared that he did not wish to be the king of Burgundy, but instead the master of a king. This tale had probably been circulated by the members of the Salian "camp," who sought to portray Odo as an irresolute and irresponsible individual. Conrad II, on the other hand, took the chivalrous course even if it proved disadvantageous to his political interests: According to his biographer, Udalrich of Bohemia offered to turn over Mieszko II, who had taken refuge in his land, to the emperor in autumn 1031. The prince had every reason to believe that his offer would be gratefully accepted, but instead Conrad rejected it resoundingly, "saying he did not wish to buy an enemy from an enemy."³¹ Wipo returned to this theme in a later chapter, writing that the emperor had rallied his forces before the devastating military campaign against Odo's French holdings by "saying if Odo sought unjustly in Burgundy things belonging to others, he ought, by the aid of God, to lose something of his own."³²

Each of these three sayings juxtaposes Conrad II, the successful politician, with an enemy whose cause never even got off the ground. Odo forfeited not only his allodial properties and his claim to the Burgundian throne but his very life.³³ Mieszko II ceased to be a threat and died soon afterward, as did Udalrich, who remained a figure of controversy until the very end.³⁴ Moreover, the content of Conrad's sayings conforms to the symbolic and ritualistic expectations and practices of his age: Thus, after Odo was killed in the battle near Bar on November 15, 1037, the victorious Duke Gozelo I sent the

defeated man's banner—and probably head as well—to the emperor in Italy.³⁵ The conflict with Mieszko II was to an extent triggered by the Polish prince's appropriation of the royal title and insignia in imitation of his father,³⁶ and, consequently, regaining possession of these insignia was one of Conrad's reasons for going to war; only later, however, did one of Mieszko's half brothers capitulate to this demand. Conrad was also able to reestablish the tradition whereby representatives of dependent principedoms sought "the emperor's presence" and participated in imperial and court diets.³⁷

It was "dishonorable" for a knight, who was by definition bound by the dictates of *honor*, to "buy an enemy from an enemy," and, by the same token, "fitting" for a lord to recompense a severely wounded loyal vassal by filling the man's boots—made superfluous by the man's loss of his legs—with coins.³⁸ The cleric who officiated at Easter Mass also received a generous reward for his services, although the jocular fashion in which it was bestowed served to highlight the social divide separating the imperial family and the elite inner circle from the lower echelon at court.³⁹ There were gradations in rank even among the uppermost nobles, which only lends further credence to the observation that "nobility" was not an absolute but a relative quality and that "each family occupied a unique and exclusive rank, one family more noble than another."⁴⁰ Thus, when Archbishop Aribio of Mainz, a scion of the upper nobility and the highest-ranked ecclesiastical prince in Germany, lost his temper and spoke out of turn in an argument with Abbess Sophie of Gandersheim, the daughter of Emperor Otto II, Conrad II called him to task and, ordering Aribio to "keep in mind who he was and who she was," quickly silenced the archbishop. Whoever had Ottonian blood flowing in their veins commanded the highest prestige and occupied the highest rank. The marriage between Sophie's sister Matilda and Ezzo, the palatine count of Lotharingia whose Carolingian descent and dominion over Aachen were nothing to sneeze at, seemed such an improbable match that it was alleged that the count had won her hand by besting her brother at a game of trictrac. In fact, Otto III would have been no more than ten to thirteen years old at the time of their marriage (990/93) and hardly qualified to take on an adult opponent. A more sober source notes only that disapproval of the union was widespread, but her brother provided Matilda with a substantial dowry so that "the inborn honour she possessed by virtue of her celebrated ancestors would not be degraded."⁴¹

It comes as no surprise that even the free peasants of the Swiss town of Wohlen lacked entrée to the Salian court or to imperial and court diets to lodge complaints. The very same ruler who had symbolically assumed the duty to protect the rights of the underclass at his royal coronation in 1024⁴² would not even allow members of the middle class to address him in 1038, and not merely because their Swiss German dialect would have been incomprehensible

to the emperor and the members of his predominantly Frankish-speaking court. On the other hand, a supplicant from Westphalia known only as “poor” Daia cannot have been that destitute or lacking in social graces, because he was able to gain access to the sovereign, plead his case, and obtain restitution.⁴³

Of course, Conrad did more than utter aphorisms. It is known that he was also a successful orator in both public and private, at imperial and court diets, as well as in secret meetings.⁴⁴ According to Wipo, the emperor addressed members of the clergy, and probably other listeners as well, in an affable and easygoing manner in public, yet assumed a firm and unyielding tone when speaking one-on-one or to a small circle of listeners.⁴⁵ Conrad’s success seems to have been a function of his ability to pursue two incongruous political courses—the exercise of personal authority and the institution of a transpersonal polity—almost simultaneously. He availed himself of the tools associated with each as needed and often threw his adversaries completely off guard when he switched focus from one to another. For example, in autumn 1033 the emperor arranged for a duel between a Saxon and a Liutizian in order to assert his juridical authority over these two warring groups and his position as representative of the transpersonal state that transcended the archaic, personal mentality. The Liutizian champion may have won the duel, but the members of his tribe squandered the victory by reacting chaotically, as Conrad had probably foreseen.⁴⁶ Three years earlier, Conrad had his stepson Ernest II found guilty of high treason but made his consort, Gisela, promise not to exercise her right to seek revenge.⁴⁷ The emperor pursued the same two-pronged strategy at the trial of Adalbero of Eppenstein in 1035, although he almost lost control of the personal aspect of the proceedings, which had such an emotional impact on him that he nearly severed his ties with his only son.⁴⁸

3. Conrad’s “High-handedness” and “Ruthlessness”

In the *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs* Bresslau spotlights Conrad’s “high-handedness,”⁴⁹ which falsely implies that the Salian ruler reached decisions in isolation and after only minimal consultation with the affected parties. In actuality, the Salian ruler had good advisors, whom he consulted whenever a difficult problem arose, as well as a politically astute consort, whose input was, according to Wipo, indispensable.⁵⁰ Conrad often delegated official tasks to Gisela and so relied on her drive that he may even have taken a break from politics when she was not available at the beginning of his reign.⁵¹ The emperor also delegated certain matters to his son, like the conclusion of a peace treaty with Hungary in 1031, while Henry was still under the guardianship of Egilbert of Freising,⁵² and leadership of a military expedition against the Bohemians in 1033, soon after the young man achieved the age of majority.⁵³ Yet,

Conrad also consulted experts and those affected by his decisions: In 1035 he recessed the imperial diet in Bamberg so that he could attend a meeting in Mainz with a group of individuals whose “counsel and aid” mattered when it came to appointing a new duke of Carinthia.⁵⁴ Prior to embarking on his second expedition to Italy, the emperor engaged in extensive consultations with Italians and experts on the region in order to assess his odds of either success or failure.⁵⁵ Like any politician, he blamed his mistakes on bad advisors whom he had, of course, already dismissed.⁵⁶

Bresslau’s introduction to the legal drama surrounding Duke Adalbero of Carinthia opens with a sentence that has since repeatedly appeared in print, even attained the status of gospel truth: “Whenever he encountered opposition, Conrad ruthlessly crushed whoever stood in his way, and, as far as we know, only once in his life was he compelled, if just for a moment, to come to terms with an opponent.”⁵⁷ The mixture of admiration and rebuke conveyed by these words suggests that their late-nineteenth-century author was actually thinking of Otto von Bismarck (d. 1898), not the Salian ruler whose personality was not at all like that of the “Iron Chancellor.” If he wanted to be successful as a politician, Conrad could not have acted in either a high-handed or ruthless manner, and none of the arguments offered to the contrary hold any water. For the most part, how he dealt with his oppositional relatives—by engaging in interminable negotiations and investing enormous amounts of time in hopes of winning their cooperation—was dictated by political necessity. Furthermore, just because Conrad’s methods almost always proved successful does not mean that every favorable settlement was the product of his “ruthlessness.” In fact, he believed in the same axiom as his predecessor, Otto III: A sovereign was to “rule, show clemency, bestow, and reward.”⁵⁸

Conrad’s stepson Ernest II was given no less than five years to come to his senses and content himself with unchallenged possession of the Swabian duchy. His innumerable revolts were each resolved through negotiation, his merest inclination to perform his duty was imperially rewarded, and his negligence was repeatedly forgiven. After half a decade, however, the emperor was left with no choice but to rein in this miscreant, lest his ability to maintain the peace be called into question. Although there were some serious misunderstandings along the way, the reconciliation with the emperor’s like-named cousin was achieved in significantly less time and opened the door to the younger man’s eventual assumption of the ancestral suzerainty over Carinthia, once Conrad II had deposed the incumbent duke, Adalbero of Eppenstein. It took the sovereign almost a decade to reach that point (1035), however, and while he may seem to have acted “ruthlessly” in the matter, that is only because in the end he had to bring his own personal weight to bear in order to attain his goal. At the imperial diet in Bamberg during the latter half of May 1035, the emperor adjudged Adalbero guilty of an *iniuria*, or grave injustice,

that cried out to be avenged, indeed obligated the sovereign to depose its perpetrator. In that instant, Conrad was forced to acknowledge that his brother-in-law had entered into a *coniuratio*, or sworn association, with a substantial number of the Bavarian magnates and, what is more, had won over Henry, the young king and duke of Bavaria, thus achieving immunity for his independent policy toward Hungary and Croatia, and probably Venice as well. Conrad did not react like a ruthless politician, but like a distraught father, whose sudden, if only temporary, powerlessness rendered him literally unconscious. Still, he soon forgave Bishop Egilbert of Freising, who was implicated in the matter, and perhaps would eventually have come to terms with Adalbero of Eppenstein as well, in spite of the outstanding charge of murder against the latter in the case of Count William. Ekkehard II of Meissen was accused of ordering his vassals to kill his brother-in-law Dietrich in November 1034, but he could easily get away and did not lose Conrad's grace.⁵⁹ Still, Conrad and Adalbero never had the chance to come to terms, because the emperor, then the incumbent duke, and finally the deposed duke all died in 1039. Even so, "the Eppenstein family business continued almost without a break."⁶⁰

It has been said that Conrad exhibited "ruthlessness" in his behavior toward refractory and even oppositional bishops, but this observation is also an overstatement. According to Wipo, Aribio of Mainz addressed the newly crowned king as the *vicarius Christi*, or vicar of Christ, which represented not just a title but also an actual office that imbued Conrad with special rights vis-à-vis the episcopate. Yet, while he had had valid reasons for withdrawing his favor from both Egilbert of Freising and Poppo of Aquileia, the emperor was quick to reestablish good relations with both ecclesiastics. Contrariwise, Conrad II proved implacable against Aribert of Milan and the archbishop's Lombard supporters, as well as Burchard III of Lyon, and not so much because these two ecclesiastical princes had aroused his enmity but because they were the focus of stiff opposition from the regional and local nobility. In the end the archbishop of Lyon received his comeuppance on diocesan soil from a Burgundian nobleman who was the emperor's man but acted on his own.⁶¹ The ease with which Conrad induced Aribert's enemies to swear that they would fight the archbishop until "ultimate victory" was theirs indicates that the Milanese ecclesiastic had done much more to undermine the interests of the northern Italian margraves than the prerogatives of the emperor. Since there really is no such thing in life as an "ultimate victory," that goal was by definition elusive, but the untimely death of the emperor, who had functioned as a unifying force for the northern Italian secular princes, put it completely beyond reach. Conrad's actions engendered criticism because they evidenced a callous disregard for the fact that Aribert and his episcopal supporters, as well as Burchard III of Lyon, were anointed men of God subject to the authority of the ecclesiastical judiciary. Among Conrad's critics was Henry III, who revoked

his father's measures soon after acceding to the throne. True to form, however, Conrad did not completely burn his bridges with the suffragan bishops of Milan: Although he did install an anti-archbishop following Aribert's excommunication for "high treason," the emperor never filled the sees vacated by the bishops allied with Aribert. He showed much the same political acumen with regard to Lyon.⁶²

4. Conrad's "Lack of a Conceptual Framework" and "Luck"

A review of the modern scholarly literature reveals that some historians do not credit Conrad with having had any grand conceptual goals, just a lot of good luck and no more. Conversely, a perusal of his almost contemporary biography indicates that Wipo was well aware of what motivated him: The first Salian ruler was a staunch advocate of the Carolingian and imperial tradition, whereby an "august" ruler was expected to enhance, not diminish, the kingdom. Furthermore, he definitely tended to take a transpersonal view of rulership, whereby the sovereign did not need to be physically present or even alive for his decrees to be valid and his kingdom to endure. Conrad's policies also reflect a certain penchant for efficiency on the part of their crafter, as evidenced by his attempts to enforce elections decided by a simple majority. In addition, the emperor always explored his options to the fullest extent possible and kept them open as long as he could. For example, the mere fact that less than two weeks elapsed between Conrad's coronation in Mainz, on September 8, and Gisela's in Cologne, on September 21, strongly suggests that the newly elected king had negotiated simultaneously with Archbishops Aribert and Pilgrim, with the probable assistance of his consort.

Conrad II was a man who always had many irons in the fire and spent his life stoking its flames. Still, he did not found a single bishopric, convert a single pagan tribe, or even swear the traditional oath to render protection and allegiance to the pope, although he probably did confirm and add his signature to the pact concluded between Emperor Henry II and Pope Benedict VIII in 1020.⁶³ Indeed, Conrad possessed no more than the barest rudiments of a "papal" policy and one hardly worth mentioning, because the popes of his time were for all intents and purposes irrelevant. The emperor's pragmatic policy reflected the low esteem in which he held the pope, but the sentiment was a common one. Burchard of Worms, who was, if only briefly, Conrad's tutor, expressed the alienation from Rome in highly intellectual terms: He titled the first book of his compendium of decretals "On the Primacy of the Roman See"—not of the pope—and in chapter 3 of that book opened his discussion of the papacy's founding with an African conciliar decree issued in late antiquity declaring the pope the "bishop of the first see,"

not the “prince of the bishops.” The two preceding chapters are devoted to the priesthood, an order Burchard traced back to Peter.⁶⁴ Instead of establishing a bishopric, which would have consumed enormous economic resources, Conrad contented himself with promoting the episcopal seat of Speyer, which only received the requisite funding to do it up in style after Henry III assumed the reins of power. Since it was impossible for him to make headway with the Liutizi, the only pagans available for forcible conversion, the first Salian ruler had to settle for the role of “avenger of the Faith,” which he could fulfill by killing and mutilating heathen Slavs.⁶⁵ Conrad II also jettisoned the traditional imperial policy toward Venice, clearly because he felt as threatened by the Venice-Hungary axis as his predecessor had by the league between the peoples to the kingdom’s north and the Christian Slavs, which Henry II had countered by entering into an alliance with the Liutizi. Adalbero of Eppenstein probably fell from favor because he decided to join forces with, instead of against, the Venetian-Dalmatian-Hungarian league.

Last, but not least, Conrad’s willingness to implement new ideas had a profound effect on imperial policies, and the fact that many of his most lasting innovations were not introduced with an eye to their long-term adoption does not negate the value of his contributions. The first Salian ruler probably hit upon just the right measures for his day and age, a time of radical change and widespread optimism, as evidenced by the enormous number of building projects undertaken at the time.⁶⁶ Here are some further examples: Conrad was the first ruler to call upon all of his magnates and functionaries to swear to uphold his policies even in his absence,⁶⁷ and he instituted the legal traditions whereby the archbishop of Cologne crowned the king in Aachen and became the standing archchancellor for Italy.⁶⁸ While the first Salian ruler retained most of his predecessor’s royal chaplains, thus enabling the chancery to maintain a fairly consistent level of output,⁶⁹ the format and contents of the items they drafted on his behalf underwent modification. First, diplomas increasingly included lists of witnesses to the transactions and even discussions of their necessity.⁷⁰ Second, Conrad issued the first privilege allowing for the matrilineal inheritance of a fief.⁷¹ Third, he fostered the Italian usage of obtaining judicial confirmation of rights by referring the case to a special court intended to uphold their validity.⁷² There is one known instance of this practice on German soil as well.⁷³ Finally, while he did not issue any decrees pertaining specifically to the ministerialage, the oldest surviving compilations of such laws trace their existence back to the first Salian ruler, who, like Charlemagne, the emperor to whom he was so often compared, came to be credited, even by writers who could no longer place him genealogically, with having established the means for dealing with even latter-day practical issues.⁷⁴

Realistically, demands that a politician put more effort into pursuing grand strategies or ideas have the effect of overwhelming the desired policy and raise

expectations that only ideologues and fundamentalists, who subscribe to cynical agendas, could possibly fulfill. Here is a modern analogy: After 1948 no German chancellor could have gotten away with painting himself as anything less than an avid proponent of reunification, yet no holder of that office could have claimed to have focused his full attention on that goal from day one. When opportunity finally knocked, Helmut Kohl, who had hewed to the traditional line, was the first to recover from the initial shock, grabbed his chance, . . . and hit it lucky. Conrad II, another fine politician, also knew how to take advantage of a lucky break; after all, “*Fortuna fortem iuvat*” [Fortune favors the brave].

5. Law and Politics

Considering that even today there is nothing unusual about politics occasionally trumping the administration of justice, or political considerations predetermining the course of a criminal investigation, it comes as no surprise that in Conrad’s day and age—hundreds of years before the institution of a constitutional “separation of powers”—gathering evidence and meting out justice were political tools. The judicial system and individual courts were subject to the king,⁷⁵ who convened court hearings, or *placita*, presided over by judges of his choosing⁷⁶ and was also often a witness,⁷⁷ indeed a party, to the case under review. The lack of a clear distinction between the sovereign’s “official juridical’ and regal functions” is reflected by contemporary terminology.⁷⁸ Conrad also issued numerous diplomas on behalf of ecclesiastical institutions that had prevailed in court cases ranging from mundane disputes to spectacular lawsuits.⁷⁹

For example, a contentious case brought by Adalbero of Eppenstein against the patriarch of Aquileia was decided by a court consisting of eleven ecclesiastical and secular judges, including Poppo’s brother Otakar (Orekcerio),⁸⁰ and presided over by Conrad II and Henry III on May 19, 1027. The panel ruled that Poppo was legally entitled to collect certain public levies, including the *fodrum*, on his church’s behalf, but—contrary to what previous generations of scholars assumed—this rejection of Adalbero’s claims did not really represent a defeat for the duke; it was merely a sign of the times that the decision was in the Italian church’s favor. Up until autumn 1028 Adalbero was a favorite at court and may even have been immortalized in the fresco commissioned by his erstwhile judicial adversary for the apse of the renovated basilica in Aquileia.⁸¹ Furthermore, Poppo was not the only one able to place an ally on the bench; as many as four of the judges acknowledged Adalbero as their suzerain.⁸² However, given the absence of acrimony between the two parties, who did not view the court proceedings as a form of warfare, and the

apparent strength of Poppo's claim, which rendered his victory and Adalbero's loss almost a foregone conclusion even before the court was called to order under the arcades of the monastery of San Zeno, why then, if all that was true, did the duke of Carinthia and his deputy⁸³ put themselves through the whole rigmarole? Was it no more than a ritual, like Poppo's prostration before the pope and emperor at the Lateran synod one month before and his humble plea that they and the assembled ecclesiastics finally treat him and his church justly?⁸⁴ Or was the hearing no more than a public display engineered by Poppo to demonstrate which of the emperor's two intimates—the patriarch of Aquileia or the duke and margrave for the south and southwestern empire—possessed more power? Finally, what did the emperor accomplish by staging the trial? After all, the losers did not promptly forfeit their positions of authority.⁸⁵

A court hearing convened in Tittenkofen, Bavaria, at the end of summer 1027—concerning a similar case, decided in favor of Egilbert of Freising—sheds additional light on Conrad's juridical activities. Why the bishop adopted the Italian practice of “obtaining legal title to more and more of his acquisitions by submitting proofs of ownership to sham courts that declared the documents valid and incontrovertible and issued written legal decisions to that effect” is not sufficiently explained by his erstwhile role as the chancellor for Italy during the early years of Henry's reign.⁸⁶ The only unsettling thing about this quote is the reference to “sham” courts, which implies that there was something fake about these rituals and symbols, when instead the rituals were really performed and the symbols represented something real to the participants. In conjunction with his son's election to the office of duke of Bavaria in Regensburg on June 24, 1027, Conrad II commissioned a survey of the crown properties in the Bavarian duchy, as well as in the margraviate of Austria. According to the extant court protocol, a certain Count Poppo contended that the monastery of Saint Castulus in Moosburg did not belong to the diocese of Freising but was actually a “free,” or imperial, abbey. Adalbero of Ebersberg, the duly responsible count for the district in which the foundation was located, therefore convened a court hearing in Tittenkofen on August 8, 1027, which in accordance with Bavarian law took the form of an inquisition. Bishop Egilbert of Freising, who had a stake in the outcome, and Count Adalbero of Ebersberg presided over the proceedings, while Count Poppo served as one of the judges; both the bishop and the emperor, who was not present, were represented by their advocates. In any case, Count Poppo's testimony included a no doubt previously agreed-upon escape clause: He held the foundation to be a free imperial abbey “if this [finding] is not reversed within the county and at a public court hearing by jurors who are legal experts,” which is exactly what happened. The judges discussed the case thoroughly and then rendered their finding under oath: The disputed abbey legally belonged to Freising.

The protocol does not indicate whether the court at Tittenkofen was given the opportunity to examine an extant diploma issued by the Carolingian king Arnulf of Carinthia in 895 confirming the diocese's ownership of the monastery, just as the account of the earlier proceedings in San Zeno, near Verona, makes no mention of Poppo's having submitted a copy of the privilege issued by Henry II bestowing the *fodrum* upon the patriarch of Aquileia. Yet, judging from an imperial diploma issued in summer 1028, Conrad II did lend credence to a diploma attributed to Arnulf of Carinthia in settling a dispute between the monastery of Corvey and the secular nobility. Why was there a difference in how these cases were adjudicated? The reason may lie in the different evidentiary admissibility accorded royal diplomas in Italy and Germany. After Otto the Great reestablished the right of complainants in Italian legal proceedings to impeach royal diplomas and to prove the validity of a claim by force of arms in a duel, Italian bishops consigned their ancient privileges to the archives and strove to obtain unimpeachable royal verdicts that settled disputes once and for all. What is more, the two parties to a dispute would have ironed out their differences prior to the court's issuance of such verdicts. In any case, this much is certain about both of the *placita*, or court hearings, held in 1027: Neither Duke Adalbero nor Count Poppo really suffered defeat. In fact, the count may very well have furthered the interests of the emperor or the bishop—or even both of them—by getting the ball rolling, so to speak. As a member of the noble Moosburger clan that viewed the monastery of Saint Castulus as the family's spiritual seat, Egilbert had more than a professional interest in the foundation, and as a royal intimate, the bishop had the ear of the king, no longer Henry II, but now Conrad II, who in 1029 even appointed him guardian over Henry III.⁸⁷

Were the two court hearings held in such quick succession in 1027 no more than public displays in which the amicable participants performed their assigned roles, with the part of the “loser” played first by Adalbero and his deputy, and then by Count Poppo from Bavaria? It certainly appears so: At both a predetermined outcome was publicly ratified and rendered “unimpeachable” in conformance with the Italian model.⁸⁸ Thus, the proceedings at San Zeno and Tittenkofen are two further examples of Conrad's not infrequent use of a judicial forum to lay to rest a conflict in which he may or may not in some way have been a party.⁸⁹ Since none of these cases involved defendants or traitors to the throne, all the participants had to do was state their competing legal positions. Later cases were, of course, fundamentally different.⁹⁰

The legal proceedings that accompanied Adalbero's removal from office in 1035 are perhaps a better example of a “trial by royal court” than even the court diet that had marked the emperor's severance of ties with his stepson Ernest five years earlier. With the help of the participating princes, Conrad II appointed a royal court presided over by two “eastern experts,” Margraves

Ekkehard II of Meissen and Adalbert of Austria; brought Adalbero of Carinthia up on the charge of having committed an *iniuria*, an injustice for which Conrad, as the victim, was entitled to take revenge; and asked the court to order the duke's deposition. The defendant did not attend the proceedings; indeed, he probably had not even been invited. Thus, the court did not pronounce him guilty simply because he was absent, which was the regular practice with a defendant who ignored a summons and was held in contempt of court. The fact that the court was convened in the Frankish town of Bamberg and not somewhere in Bavaria or Carinthia indicates that the proceedings were not governed by tribal law or the law of the land; in contrast, Duke Ernest's removal from office was carried out in Ulm, located in Swabia. Finally, the manner in which the court was conducted did not really comply with feudal law either, which demanded that a defendant be granted every opportunity to defend himself. That leaves only one alternative: Conrad II held the proceedings in accordance with "Carolingian" legal norms; in other words, he invoked a suzerain's authority to punish and discipline a refractory vassal or functionary, as exemplified by numerous cases in the eastern reaches of Bavaria during the ninth century.⁹¹

Ernest II and Adalbero of Eppenstein were not the only ones to be found guilty of high treason: In 1035 Conrad, the son of Alberic, was also adjudged a *reus maiestatis*, or traitor to the throne, and banished. At around the same time, two Saxon noblemen who had been brought up on charges of attempted murder of the emperor were slated for execution when Burchard, the future bishop of Halberstadt, realized how flimsy the case against them was and interceded to block their judicial murder. It is not clear whether these two incidents on Saxon soil were connected in any way.⁹²

In the midst of his hasty and harrowing retreat from Italy in 1038, Conrad II took time to convene a court diet to address a matter of some importance: The judges pronounced the defendants—ecclesiastical and secular, male and female—guilty of contempt of court for failing to honor court summons, penalized them with forfeiture of property, and then confiscated their rights of ownership so that the emperor might bestow the holdings upon the cloister of the Virgin Mary in Florence. The imperial diploma recording the ruling contains important information about the individuals involved, including their social status and real estate ties, and in exceptional detail, as was the norm in Italy.⁹³ Another public court hearing took much the same action concerning a single property owned by a cleric about whom nothing more than a name is known; the court ruled against him and confiscated the holding so that the emperor might pass it on to a monastery.⁹⁴ Imperial court diets did more than order confiscations, however; in situations where the party faced with an unfavorable ruling was held in high regard and enjoyed the support of other sufficiently respected individuals, they often brokered compromises. Thus, when

Abbot Druthmar submitted a diploma issued by King Arnulf confirming Corvey's ownership of a large piece of commercial property as well as other holdings, the judges decided that this piece of evidence was countered by the hereditary rights of a noblewoman and her son and their documented long-term "usucaption" of this complex of estates. As a consequence, they brokered a compromise: The monastery recovered the properties with which it had been enfeoffed by the Carolingian ruler, but the mother and son then received appropriate compensation.⁹⁵

During a visit to his former ancestral castle and now monastery of Limburg an der Haardt (August 9, 1033), Conrad II issued a diploma, still extant today, that reflects the extent to which these juridical rituals were incumbent upon, indeed embraced by, even the emperor and empress. Drawn up in the format of a *placitum*, or court judgment, this diploma records an agreement between the members of the family, not of a specific legal proceeding. Conrad and Gisela wished to bestow Regenbach, one of the empress's hereditary holdings, upon the bishopric of Würzburg, but Hermann and Henry, her sons and legal heirs in Swabia, had to agree to and participate in the transaction for it to be legally valid. Young King Henry gave his consent, and his older half brother Duke Hermann IV of Swabia, who was his mother's advocate, transferred the estate to the church of Saint Kilian. As was customary in court and royal family documents,⁹⁶ this diploma contains a list of witnesses, which is headed by Conrad the Younger but includes both Ottos of Hammerstein—father and son—and the palatine counts of Lotharingia, Ezzo and his son Otto. Hermann IV is also listed as a witness to his mother's grant.⁹⁷

On September 23–24, 1027, not long after his return from Italy, Conrad II attended a German general synod held in Frankfurt's main church. Even though the duly responsible archbishop of Mainz was a party to two of the cases under deliberation, he and the recently crowned emperor together presided over the gathering. Thanks to an astute chronicler, much is known about the splendid and well-thought-out staging—down to the seating arrangements—of this ecclesiastical assembly,⁹⁸ which had been convened to tackle long-standing cases as well as more recent transgressions and abuses. After celebrating Mass in a most decorous and elaborate manner, the synod spent the first day on the dispute over Gandersheim in response to a complaint lodged by Abbess Sophie, but soon turned its attention to various cases involving violations of monastic discipline. Aribo then attempted to add the marriage between Otto and Irmgard of Hammerstein to the agenda, though perhaps only so that the emperor could request in public that the case be dismissed.⁹⁹ Two distinguished ladies were charged with attempted manslaughter. One was accused of inciting an unknown individual to murder a count, the other her own son, but the cases were not settled.¹⁰⁰ Five men were found guilty of committing murder in the abbey church of Heiningen—thus desecrating the

shrine—and were, along with their accomplices, excommunicated for their crimes.¹⁰¹ The emperor's younger half brother, Gebhard, who was already old enough to “bear arms,” was forced to resume the religious life, which he had abandoned without permission.¹⁰²

The second day of the synod was devoted to a review of the dispute over Gandersheim, and Aribo may have been dealt a severe blow on that Sunday, September 24, 1027: The archbishop found himself the object of derision after humbling himself—in all likelihood spontaneously—before his opponent, the bishop of Hildesheim, and accordingly lost his case before the assembled ecclesiastics. Even though the ruling of the Frankfurt synod did not mark the end of the dispute, it did lay the groundwork for a later accord.¹⁰³

The imperial couple then traveled up the Rhine to Tribur, where on October 19, 1027, Conrad II issued a diploma to Bishop Walter, who had not attended the synod, confirming a privilege granting immunity to the church of Speyer.¹⁰⁴ A legal notice bearing the same date reports that a court proceeding held “at the order and with the counsel” of the emperor resolved a dispute between the monastery of Michelsberg and a Count Dietrich over the fief of Büdesheim in Wetterau, northwest of Frankfurt. In the presence of both Saxon and Frankish witnesses, the count and his son swore to relinquish their claim to the property, first by crossing the thumb and index and middle fingers of their right hands in accordance with Saxon law, and then by placing their right hands on a *festuca*, or bundle of straw, symbolizing the estate in accordance with Frankish law.¹⁰⁵ One of a ruler's primary duties was to maintain peace, and there was a range of measures he could take—from exercising force to brokering compromises and settlements—to achieve that goal. From the moment he was crowned king, Conrad had to attend to such tasks on a daily basis, but it is striking how many more options and how much greater success he enjoyed from 1027 on, once he was imbued with the prestige of an emperor. Even medieval sources trace back his policies that year to his imperial coronation.¹⁰⁶

Although—to an outsider at least—the Saxon legal code was alien and barbaric to the point of cruelty, the recently elected Conrad II was nevertheless compelled to ratify its use in return for the Saxons' recognition of his sovereignty.¹⁰⁷ One naturally wonders what these laws looked like and to what extent they represented an intermediate step between the *Lex Saxonum* [Law of the Saxons] issued by Charlemagne and the *Sachsenspiegel* [The Saxon mirror], the law of the Saxon land compiled during the first half of the thirteenth century by a single author with jurisprudential training. Following the Billung family's assumption of suzerainty over the duchy, the term “Saxon” gradually came to refer to its easternmost parts only. At the same time, the territorialization of princely authority would be mirrored by a shift from personal to territorial law that involved such a fundamental change in legal thinking that

one scholar was led to conclude, “There is no connection between the *Lex Saxonum* and the *Sachsenspiegel*.” Nevertheless, the codes do deal with some of the same issues.¹⁰⁸ Once the Saxons received royal confirmation of their legal practices, Conrad had no further call to participate in the administration of their law codes, and he probably did not take independent action, unless a mandate he issued to his Saxon functionaries that claims the unfree were treated like “dumb beasts” was in actuality aimed at mitigating their “cruelty.”¹⁰⁹

When it came to the territorialization of Italian law, however, the emperor took a quite different tack. Following in the footsteps of his ancient predecessors, Conrad II issued a *sanctio*, or imperial statute, to the civil judges of the city of Rome whereby perjury was no longer punishable by death and city judges were ordered to base their rulings exclusively on Roman law, even if the charges were filed by and/or brought against a Langobard. Of course, these decrees were promulgated at the request of the city judges, but they are indicative of the open-mindedness Conrad and his closest advisors showed toward new modes of legal thought and perception of the law. His treatment of the Burgundians, on the other hand, appears more in tune with the “cruel” ways of the Saxons than the enlightened approach he himself took in Italy. According to his biographer, the emperor convened an imperial diet at Solothurn in autumn 1038 and “made Burgundy then, for the first time, taste the law, long disused and almost wiped from the books.” This passage is commonly interpreted to mean that he reinstated the *Lex Gundobada*, the Burgundian law code compiled shortly after 500, but how can that be true? Would Conrad, who planned on transferring sovereignty over Burgundy to his son, really have embraced a legal code that prescribed punishments reminiscent of those cited by Tacitus in the *Germania*: “If a wife should dismiss her lawful husband, then she should be put to death by submersion in a swamp.” Or: “If a free girl should join herself to an unfree man [*servus*], we decree that they both be put to death.”¹¹⁰ At a time when the word *servus* already denoted an unfree nobleman, the precursor of the ministerial, the latter precept would have made no sense at all.

Conrad also took a very open-minded approach to the “merchants of our kingdom,”¹¹¹ as evidenced not only by his confirmation of rights previously granted to members of this nonnoble stratum of society but also by his award of the freedom of movement crucial to their trade, a right he derived from “the law of the people,” in other words, “natural law.”¹¹² He is known to have granted rights to the *mercatores* of Magdeburg, Naumburg, and Quedlinburg, and probably issued privileges to the merchants of Goslar and Halberstadt as well.¹¹³ Given the location of the towns on this list, it may seem that Conrad bestowed rights solely on merchants from eastern Saxony, but that cannot have been the case, if for no other reason than that his own diplomas attest to his involvement with merchants in other portions of the kingdom.¹¹⁴ Conrad may,

however, have had a good reason for following in the footsteps of his Ottonian predecessors and favoring the merchants of eastern Saxony: Soon after his accession to the throne, the new Salian ruler issued a diploma confirming a privilege granted by Otto II to the merchants of Magdeburg and guaranteeing them freedom of movement and exemption from tolls, except in Mainz, Cologne, Thiel, and Bardowick. Otherwise, they were allowed to enjoy their freedoms “everywhere in our kingdom, not just in Christian but also in barbaric [i.e., pagan-Slavic] regions.”¹¹⁵ In effect, the merchants of Magdeburg were not as free to ply their trade west of the Elbe as they were along the banks and east of the river, the very territory, in other words, where they might also serve as the agents of the crown, something that Conrad and his closest advisors had probably factored into their calculations. In any case, this policy was pursued on a personal level: Conrad granted privileges to individual merchants, not to merchant guilds, to say nothing of a town’s citizenry. Given the time and place, there would simply have been no reason for him to initiate the latter practice, and the Salian king was to an unparalleled degree a man of his day and age. Central Europe was experiencing a demographic and economic upswing, as illustrated by the building boom unmatched until the Baroque era, that pushed tensions into the background and suffused the region with an optimism unknown to prior and subsequent generations, paving the way for the political mergers and lasting alliances with northern Europe, France, and Burgundy marking Conrad’s reign.

6. The Emperor of Three Kingdoms

As a ruler in the Carolingian tradition, Conrad II sought to “enhance the kingdom” and thus fulfill his imperial duty as the *augustus*, or the “augmenter,” as the term was understood in medieval popular etymology. Wipo puts his finger on this aspect of Conrad’s thinking in his very first reference to his hero’s policies toward Burgundy. It was for this reason that the Salian ruler fought to acquire the western kingdom by both nonmilitary and military means, which proved successful in the end, even though Conrad never ventured much further into Burgundy than present-day western Switzerland, the *Suisse romande*, and only spent a tiny portion of his overall reign there. Conrad II was the first German emperor to exercise sovereignty over three kingdoms at once, thus setting the standard against which all future emperors would measure their reigns, although he himself probably viewed his success within the context of Carolingian policies.¹¹⁶

Conrad spent much more time in Italy, which he visited on two occasions for a total of over thirty-two months,¹¹⁷ or almost one-fifth of his reign (177 months), a significantly greater amount of time in both absolute and percent

terms than his immediate predecessor, Henry II.¹¹⁸ On his two expeditions to Italy Conrad also covered far more territory and stopped at least once in almost every part of the Italian kingdom. He played an active role in its rule, reaping great political rewards and revealing great political talent whenever he took up the cause of the upper and middle strata of the lay nobility. His marriage policy, which aimed at forging ties between the ducal families north of the Alps and the margravian dynasties of Italy, as well as his social and legal policies toward the great and lesser feudatories, were the products of his personal decision making.

As the duly elected king of Germany, Conrad replaced Henry's "conflictual kingship"¹¹⁹ with a policy of reconciliation, of winning over a majority of the "people" who were politically relevant, and of marginalizing his opponents. His use of novel juridical procedures against his enemies may have aroused disaffection but did not diminish his success. Conrad II was not an accomplished general; his most important military triumphs were achieved by others, particularly in Lotharingia and Burgundy, and his victories against the Poles, as well as his defeats at the hands of the Hungarians, were essentially thrown into his lap. All of Conrad's wars, regardless of where they were waged—in the west, south, or east—served basically the same purpose, that is, to preserve and protect, or, if you will, "defend," the kingdom. A few of his military campaigns may have come suspiciously close to being attacks on his opponents, but if so, that was due more to a lack of coordination and understanding of the situation on his part than any overriding expansive strategy. In short, Conrad II, the emperor of three kingdoms, sought to implement an imperial, not an imperialistic, policy, and the empire under his purview was centered on Rome.

Conrad II, the *Romanorum imperator augustus* [august emperor of the Romans], visited the city of Rome only once, for his imperial coronation, but during only his third year on the throne, whereas Henry II had to wait twelve years before undertaking the same journey.¹²⁰ Conrad's stay lasted less than three weeks.¹²¹ Wipo wrote that he was "called caesar and augustus [*caesar et augustus*] by the Roman name" at the imperial coronation, and the biographer's recollection is substantiated by a privilege, "actually a synodal instrument," issued by Pope John XIX on March 28, 1027, in conjunction with a Lateran synod, on behalf of Abbot Odilo of Cluny, which refers to the election and coronation "domni Conradi regis, divi augusti . . . , in imperium Romani orbis" ["of the lord, King Conrad, divine augustus . . . for the empire of the Roman world"] by the grace of God and the pope. It should be noted that at the time it was highly unusual for an emperor to be extolled with the formal title of "divine augustus" in the late antique manner.¹²² Wipo's account makes clear that the kings of Burgundy and of England and Denmark not only participated in the imperial coronation but also served as the new emperor's escorts, a fact understandably repressed by Anglo-Saxon chroniclers.¹²³

Rome and the Roman empire continued to play a decisive role in Conrad's political formulations; in this regard, too, his policy marked a break from that of Henry II. For example, a lead bull dating back to at least summer 1028 proclaims that the young King Henry is the "SPES IMPERII," or "hope of the empire." The second known version of the imperial seal, which dates back to summer 1033, not only bears a portrait of both Conrad II and his son, but also—"as if no one had ever held any reservations about the emphasis on Rome in the policies of Otto III"—an inscription that served henceforth as the imperial motto: "ROMA CAPUT MUNDI REGIT ORBIS FRENA ROTUNDI," or "Rome, head of the world, holds the reins to the entire globe."¹²⁴ Conrad must have attached great importance to the city his whole life long; even the inscription on his burial crown praises him as a promoter of peace and benefactor of Rome.¹²⁵

THE EMPEROR'S LIFE DRAWS TO A CLOSE:
UTRECHT, JUNE 4, 1039

As broad a swath as his scythe may have cleared through the ranks of the German elite on Conrad's second expedition to Italy, Death reaped just as rich a harvest among its members in 1038 to early winter 1039 in their homeland north of the Alps. Even before Duke Hermann IV of Swabia, Gisela's son by her second husband, the Babenberg scion Ernest, took ill and died in Italy, on July 28, 1038, Count Liudolf of Brunswick, her son by her first husband, Bruno, had already been laid to rest.¹ In the aftermath of such terrible suffering and loss, the emperor must have been thoroughly pleased with the course of events over the last four months of 1038, or at least that is the—hopefully accurate—impression one gains from the limited source material. In any case, Conrad II proclaimed his son, Henry III, heir to the duchy of Swabia, an occurrence only the annals of Saint Gall deemed worthy of mention,² and then at a ceremony in Solothurn, which is now part of modern-day Switzerland, he granted the young man nominal sovereignty over the kingdom of Burgundy, an event that aroused greater interest and broader notice.³ Resuming his continual “journey . . . through his realms,”⁴ Conrad stopped next in Basle, as was his wont, where the imperial party must have boarded ships for the voyage down the Rhine. When the father and son disembarked in Strasbourg on Sunday, November 26, 1038, Bishop William thought he would honor his imperial nephew by celebrating Conrad's arrival in conjunction with the onset of Advent, but his well-intentioned proposal sparked a veritable scandal: Heeding the sage counsel of his closest advisors, the emperor declined his uncle's offer and probably departed soon afterward, since he was in Limburg an der Haardt by the following Sunday. There, he not only partook of the rite marking the first Sunday of Advent but also took advantage of the broad episcopal participation in the celebration to have the traditional start of the Christmas season—between November 27 and December 3—reaffirmed by the assemblage.

Gisela, who had not accompanied Conrad and Henry on their visits to Solothurn, Basle, or Strasbourg, rejoined the court at Limburg.⁵ Eight days

later the imperial couple, their royal son, and the members of their court were back on the Rhine, at the palace of Nierstein, on the western bank of the river south of Mainz (December 11). They were joined there by Archbishop Bezelin of Hamburg-Bremen, the likely bearer of the news that Emma, a wealthy member of the Immeding family and sister to Bishop Meinwerk of Paderborn, had died on December 3, 1038. The prospect of seizing the prosperous demesne of Lesum—nominally for the throne but in fact to serve as Gisela's appanage and widow's portion—inspired two actions on Conrad's part: On December 11, 1038, he bestowed a valuable privilege on the archbishop, who had in exchange probably declared his willingness to support Gisela's investment with Emma's prime holding, and sometime before—rather than after—Christmas allowed the empress to journey alone to Bremen.⁶ Why did Conrad agree to her departure so soon after they had been reunited, and why did he allow her to tend to the matter on her own? The sources do not say, although, if a hexameter penned by Wipo is to be believed, after leaving Basle Conrad wended his way through eastern Francia and Saxony, all the way to Frisia—Utrecht, which was the last stop on this journey, was deemed a Frisian town⁷—and engaged “in confirming peace, in making law.”⁸ If so, the emperor must have had business to attend to that made it imperative for him to adhere to his itinerary, and there is in fact evidence that he was actively engaged in preserving the peace and rule of law in eastern Saxony during the winter of 1038/39.⁹ The sources also indicate that Conrad was confined to Nijmegen, his favorite palace, from late February to late May 1039 due to illness,¹⁰ and his hurry to reach the well-appointed palace of Goslar at the end of 1038 may have been due to the flare-up of serious health problems. Once there, he celebrated Christmas in the company of his family and court, donned the crown for a procession to Mass, and witnessed a terrifying natural phenomenon—cloud towers—that must have struck them all as a bad omen.¹¹

But how did Conrad's contemporaries and, more important, the emperor and his closest advisors react to this omen? Nothing can be gleaned from his sojourn, since his itineraries in Saxony reveal no more than “a slight preference for the palace at Goslar,” which harkened back to his predecessor, Henry II, and at the same time set the stage “for his son and successor, Henry III.” In a region “where Conrad II had conducted himself cautiously, Henry III emphatically and methodically exercised prerogatives that could have just as well been associated with the Ottonians. The Harz region was fully reinstated to its former role as the heartland of the kingdom, and he visited East Saxony—North Thuringia at least once every year during his reign.”¹² In any case, Conrad's son and successor was not one to be driven off from Goslar by cloud formations. As for the emperor, he probably stayed on for some time after Christmas 1038, since the only other place he is known to have visited during this period was the palace of Allstedt on Candlemas (February 2) 1039.¹³

Conrad arrived at Nijmegen toward the end of winter and remained there through Lent and Ascension Day (May 26, 1039).¹⁴ Sometime before or after his arrival, the emperor was yet again involved in some unpleasantness involving Gandersheim: Abbess Adelheid of Quedlinburg and Gernrode sought to succeed her deceased sister, Abbess Sophie, at Gandersheim, but for some unknown reason Conrad II denied her request, later granted by Henry III.¹⁵ The emperor attended to his final items of state business while in Nijmegen, two diplomas, one issued on behalf of an Italian magnate and the other on behalf of Count Pilgrim of Mattiggau (Bavaria).¹⁶ Conrad's health had improved sufficiently by the beginning of June for him to undertake the river voyage from Nijmegen to Utrecht, where he celebrated Pentecost (June 3, 1039) in the company of his family and court, again donned the crown for a church procession, and then moved on to the feast. At that instant the emperor was seized with pain, but finding that he was able to bear it, he concealed his discomfort from the others in order not to disrupt the feast. He suffered another attack on Pentecost Monday, again at mealtime, but on this occasion the pain was so severe that he asked his wife and son to leave the room. Conrad commended himself to the bishops, who heard his confession, administered communion in both kinds, and fetched relics, including a particle of the Holy Cross, which offered strong protection against the forces of evil. Gisela and Henry were then readmitted into Conrad's chamber, whereupon, "after faithful admonitions, he bade farewell to the Empress and to his son, King Henry, and departed this life" at around noontime on June 4, 1039.¹⁷

Conrad died "unexpectedly," and his cause of death remains a mystery to this day, although—or perhaps because—the sources unanimously attribute his demise to *podagra*, or gout.¹⁸ Yet, as the author of one careful study of "the emperor's death" noted, it is common knowledge today that while attacks of gout may be accompanied by terrible pain, they do not normally prove fatal.¹⁹ According to one mid-eleventh-century Italian chronicler, Conrad already suffered from a foot ailment and overall weakness on his return trip from Italy,²⁰ but a source written in Cambrai, and hence nearer to the emperor's place of death, avers that the emperor first fell ill after recrossing the Alps.²¹ Conrad's body appears to have been so weakened by the unremitting and extraordinary strain to which it was subjected over the course of the first Salian ruler's life that a bad attack of gout was sufficient to trigger kidney failure and therefore prove fatal. It is also possible that Conrad's age—at fifty he had already lived five years longer than the average Ottonian or Salian ruler²²—had diminished his ability to withstand the disease.²³

Be that as it may, Conrad II was dead, but his interment was yet to follow. "The internal organs of the emperor were buried at Utrecht, and the King [Henry] enriched the place of the tomb with gifts and estates."²⁴ Later, Henry had the famous "crucifix" of churches built around Saint Martin's Cathedral

in Utrecht, an architectural project of impressive scope to even modern observers.²⁵ The emperor's body was probably embalmed and certainly shrouded in precious textiles before being placed in a coffin and transported by boat upstream to Speyer. For thirty days—by medieval calculations, at least—Gisela and Henry led the mourning progression, which stopped first in Cologne, where Conrad's mortal remains were carried through all the churches of the town. The same occurred in Mainz, Worms, and the places “situated in between, with all the people following and praying.” Upon reaching Speyer, his corpse was interred in the founders' tomb in the crypt of the cathedral on July 3, 1039. At every church portal, including that to the cathedral at Speyer, Henry is said to have raised the coffin upon his shoulder before entering, in a proper display of not just filial piety toward a dead father but also pious

Image not available


FIG. 17 Lead plaques found in the graves of Conrad II (top) and Gisela (bottom) in the cathedral at Speyer. From the Historisches Museum der Pfalz, Speyer, Germany.


reverence due a suzerain from a vassal. Much of this information is derived from Wipo's account of the funeral observances, which was based, as he himself noted, on the recollections of eyewitnesses like Bishop Henry of Lausanne and "the other Burgundians." In Speyer at the latest the deceased sovereign's brow was graced with a simple burial crown, which was fabricated of copper sheeting and survives even today, in what is the first known instance of this custom. The crown bears the following well-considered inscription: "PACIS ARATOR ET VRBIS BENEFACTOR," that is, "The sower of peace and the benefactor of the city [of Rome]."²⁶

Empress Gisela, who was the same age as Conrad, outlived him by a little more than three and a half years. She died on February 15, 1043, in the palace at Goslar and was buried at her husband's side in Speyer. Her burial crown bears the inscription: "GISLE IMPERATRIX," that is, "Empress Gisle." The contrast between the two words is striking. Empress was the loftiest title a woman could bear, unless she titled herself an emperor,²⁷ but Gisle was a name that could just as well have belonged to a Swabian dairymaid. Henry III may not have gotten along very well with his mother during the last years of her life,²⁸ yet in death he probably harkened back to the name by which her closest family members—Conrad among them—had known her.²⁹

According to Wipo, the deceased Salian ruler enjoyed more divine favor than any other emperor, as evidenced by the universal outpouring of mourning, prayers, and almsgiving on his behalf.³⁰ In a lament appended to the biography, Conrad's demise is described as one in a series of setbacks suffered by the German upper nobility in 1038 and 1039, particularly the deaths of that "morning star," Henry's wife, Gunhild, and Hermann of Swabia; a later interpolation refers to Conrad the Younger, the "duke of the Franks," as well. The remaining stanzas touch upon the emperor's major achievements; the omission of his victories over the pagan Slavs is corrected in another interpolation, perhaps by the same writer as before. According to the poet, "The populace sighs for [its] lord in vigils and through [its] sleep";³¹ in other words, the entire world was in mourning. And yet, this sentiment was not universal: The author of the annals of Hildesheim complained bitterly that many Saxons were only moderately grieved by the death of the man who had, in his view, been "the head and the power of almost the entire world."³²

APPENDIX:
GENEALOGY OF THE EARLY SALIANS





Abbr.: bp. = bishop; c. = count; d. = daughter; dk. = duke; emp. = emperor; k. = king
Based on: Weinfurter, *The Salian Century*, 184f.

From the Salian genealogical table in the *Chronica* by Ekkehard of Aura, ca. 1125; Staatsbibliothek Berlin, Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Cod. Lat. 295, fol. 81r.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

a., aa.	<i>annus/o, anni/is</i> [year(s)]
<i>AfD</i>	<i>Archiv für Diplomatik</i>
<i>AUF</i>	<i>Archiv für Urkundenforschung</i>
c., cc.	<i>capitulus, capituli</i> [chapter(s)]
<i>DA</i>	<i>Deutsches Archiv</i>
ep., epp.	<i>epistola, epistolae</i> [letter(s)]
<i>FMSt</i>	<i>Frühmittelalterliche Studien</i>
<i>HJ</i>	<i>Historisches Jahrbuch</i>
<i>HRG</i>	<i>Handwörterbuch zur deutschen Rechtsgeschichte</i>
<i>HZ</i>	<i>Historische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>MGH</i>	Monumenta Germaniae Historica
DD	Diplomata
A	<i>Die Urkunden Arnolfs</i>
C.II	<i>Die Urkunden Konrads II.</i>
C.III	<i>Die Urkunden Konrads III. und seines Sohnes Heinrich</i>
Car.I	<i>Die Urkunden Pippins, Karlmanns und Karls des Großen</i>
F.I	<i>Die Urkunden Friedrichs I.</i>
H.II	<i>Die Urkunden Heinrichs II. und Arduins</i>
H.III	<i>Die Urkunden Heinrichs III.</i>
H.IV	<i>Die Urkunden Heinrichs IV.</i>
O.I	<i>Die Urkunden Konrads I., Heinrichs I. und Ottos I.</i>
O.II	<i>Die Urkunden Ottos II.</i>
O.III	<i>Die Urkunden Ottos III.</i>
Rudolf III	<i>Die Urkunden der burgundischen Rudolfinger</i>
LL	Leges [laws]
SS	Scriptores
<i>MIÖG</i>	<i>Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung</i>
<i>PL</i>	J. P. Migne, <i>Patrologiae cursus completus Latinae</i>
<i>UTB</i>	Urban Taschenbücher
<i>VIÖG</i>	Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung
<i>VF</i>	Vorträge und Forschungen
<i>ZGO</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins</i>
<i>ZRG</i>	<i>Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte</i>
GA	<i>Germanistische Abteilung</i>
KA	<i>Kanonistische Abteilung</i>

NOTES

INTRODUCTION

1. Frederick the Great, in the preface to *Geschichte meiner Zeit*, in *Ausgewählte Werke in deutscher Übersetzung*, ed. Gustav Berthold Volz (Berlin, 1928), 1:26.

2. Wipo, *Gesta Chuonradi II. imperatoris*, c. 39, in *Die Werke Wipos (Wiponis Opera)*, ed. Harry Bresslau, MGH SS rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi, 61 (Hannover and Leipzig, 1915; rpt., Hannover, 1993); Eng. trans., *The Deeds of Conrad II*, trans. Theodor E. Mommsen and Karl F. Morrison, in *Imperial Lives and Letters of the Eleventh Century*, ed. Robert L. Benson, Records of Western Civilization (New York, 1962; rpt. 2000), 98.

3. Gerd Tellenbach, "Der Charakter Kaiser Heinrichs IV.: Zugleich ein Versuch über die Erkennbarkeit menschlicher Individualität im hohen Mittelalter," in *Person und Gemeinschaft im Mittelalter: Karl Schmid zum fünfundsiebzigsten Geburtstag*, ed. Gerd Althoff et al. (Sigmaringen, 1988), 346; rpt. in *Ausgewählte Abhandlungen und Aufsätze*, 5:111f. (Stuttgart, 1996).

4. Matthias Becher, "Neue Überlegungen zum Geburtsdatum Karls des Großen," *Francia* 19 (1992): 43f., based on Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni*, c. 4, ed. Oswald Holder-Egger, MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 25, 6th ed. (Hannover, 1911); Eng. trans., *The Life of Charlemagne*, trans. Lewis Thorpe, in *Two Lives of Charlemagne* (Baltimore, 1969), 59.

5. Johannes Fried, *Der Weg in die Geschichte: Die Ursprünge Deutschlands bis 1024*, Propyläen Geschichte Deutschlands, 1 (Berlin, 1994), 122.

6. Harry Bresslau, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs unter Konrad II.*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1879; rpt., Berlin, 1967), 348.

7. Jacques Le Goff, "Wie schreibt man eine Biographie?" in Fernand Braudel et al., *Der Historiker als Menschenfresser: Über den Beruf des Geschichtsschreibers*, Wagenbach Taschenbuch, 189 (Berlin, 1990), 103f.

8. *Ibid.*, 112.

9. Aron Gurevich, *The Origins of European Individualism*, trans. Katherine Judelson (Oxford and Cambridge, Mass., 1995), 1f. Bruno Reudenbach, "Individuum ohne Bildnis? Zum Problem künstlerischer Ausdrucksformen von Individualität im Mittelalter," in *Individuum und Individualität im Mittelalter*, ed. Jan A. Aertsen and Andreas Speer, *Miscellanea Mediaevalia*, 24 (Berlin and New York, 1996), 808ff.

10. Jan A. Aertsen, "Die Entdeckung des Individuums," introduction to *Individuum und Individualität im Mittelalter*, ix. Quote from Jacob Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, trans. S. G. C. Middlemore (New York, 1958), 1:143.

11. On Kantorowicz, see Wolfgang Ernst and Kornelia Wisman, eds., *Geschichtskörper: Zur Aktualität von Ernst H. Kantorowicz* (Munich, 1998), 13f. and 171ff. Jacob Burckhardt, *Über das Studium der Geschichte: Der Text der "Weltgeschichtlichen Betrachtungen" auf Grund der Vorarbeiten von Ernst Ziegler nach den Handschriften*, ed. Peter Ganz (Munich, 1982), 396.

12. Percy Ernst Schramm, "'Bonmots' mittelalterlicher Kaiser," in *Kaiser, Könige und Päpste: Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Geschichte des Mittelalters*, vol. 3 (Stuttgart, 1969), 299–301.

13. Gerd Althoff, "Gloria et nomen perpetuum: Wodurch wurde man im Mittelalter berühmt?" in *Person und Gemeinschaft im Mittelalter: Festschrift Karl Schmid zum fünfundsiebzigsten Geburtstag*, ed. Gerd Althoff et al. (Sigmaringen, 1988), 307.

14. Fried, *Der Weg in die Geschichte*, 133f.

15. Heinrich Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century: Mentalities and Social Orders*, trans. Patrick J. Geary (Chicago, 1991), 87.
16. Cf. Gerd Althoff, *Spielregeln der Politik im Mittelalter: Kommunikation in Frieden und Fehde* (Darmstadt, 1997), 21ff.
17. Tellenbach, "Der Charakter Kaiser Heinrichs IV.," 346.
18. Franz-Reiner Erkens, *Konrad II. (um 990–1039): Herrschaft und Reich des ersten Salierkaisers* (Regensburg, 1998).
19. Werner Goetz, *Lebensbilder aus dem Mittelalter: Die Zeit der Ottonen, Salier und Staufer*, 2nd ed. (Darmstadt, 1998), 121–38.
20. Werner Trillmich, *Kaiser Konrad und seine Zeit* (Bonn, 1991); see also the text on the flaps of the book's dust jacket. Cf. Tellenbach, "Der Charakter Kaiser Heinrichs IV.," 346 (rpt., 112).
21. Harry Bresslau, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs unter Konrad II.*, vol. 2 (Leipzig, 1884; rpt., Berlin, 1967), vi.
22. See esp. *ibid.*, 2:18–68 (on Burgundy), 2:171–213 (on northern and central Italy), 2: 288–304 (on southern Italy), and 2:338–423 (on Conrad's reign).
23. Horst Fuhrmann, "Sind eben alles Menschen gewesen": *Gelehrtenleben im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1996), 104ff., esp. 107 (quote); cf. 204, s.v. "Bresslau."
24. Joachim Wollasch, "Cluny und Deutschland," in *Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktinerordens*, 103 (Saint Ottilien, 1992), 7–32, esp. 17–22. Theodor Schieffer, *Heinrich II. und Konrad II.: Die Umprägung des Geschichtsbildes durch die Kirchenreform des 11. Jahrhunderts*, Libelli, 285, 2nd ed. (Darmstadt, 1996), 19, incl. n. 3; orig. publ. in *DA* 8 (1951).
25. Cf. Hagen Keller, *Adelsherrschaft und städtische Gesellschaft in Oberitalien, 9. bis 12. Jahrhundert*, Bibliothek des Deutschen historischen Instituts in Rom, 52 (Tübingen, 1979), 271ff., esp. 273 n. 107.
26. Cf. Hagen Schulze, *Staat und Nation in der europäischen Geschichte* (Munich, 1994), 184ff.
27. Leo of Vercelli, *Versus de Ottone et Heinrico*, strophe 8 (concerning Henry II), ed. Karl Strecker, *MGH Poetae Latini*, 5:482 (Berlin, 1937/39; rpt., Dublin and Zurich, 1970, and Munich, 1978). Hartmut Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig und rex idiota: Studien zur Kirchenpolitik Heinrichs II. und Konrads II.*, *MGH Studien und Texte*, 8 (Hannover, 1993), 115 (concerning Henry III). Rodulfus Glaber, *Rodulfi Glabri Historiarum Libri Quinque/The Five Books of the Histories*, IV.5, ed. and trans. John France (Oxford, 1989), 178f. Cf. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 1 (*Deeds*, 57–60), with *ibid.*, c. 39 (97–98).
28. Cf. Burckhardt, *Über das Studium der Geschichte*, 377ff., concerning the stature of a person, esp. 378 n. 6: "No one is irreplaceable, but those few who are, are great."
29. An example of such a stretch may be found in Andreas Urban Friedmann, *Die Beziehungen der Bistümer Worms und Speyer zu den ottonischen und salischen Königen*, *Quellen und Abhandlungen zur mittelhochdeutschen Kirchengeschichte*, 72 (Mainz, 1994), 102f., where the author construes a passage in the *Vita Burchardi episcopi*, c. 21, ed. Georg Waitz, *MGH SS* 4:844 (Hannover, 1841; rpt., Stuttgart, 1981), to mean that there was political conflict between Bishop Burchard I of Worms and Conrad II, when there was anything but.

OUR STORY OPENS

1. Fried, *Der Weg in die Geschichte*, esp. 564ff. Hagen Keller, *Zwischen regionaler Begrenzung und universalem Horizont: Deutschland im Imperium der Salier und Staufer, 1024–1250*, *Propyläen Geschichte Deutschlands*, 2 (Berlin, 1986), 18ff.
2. For an informative look at the terms used to delineate Germania (Saxony and Francia being the most important regions of Germania), see Adam of Bremen, *Gesta Hammaburgensis ecclesiae*, II.21 (18), as well as I.1, ed. Bernhard Schmeidler, *MGH SS rerum Germanicarum*, 2, 3rd ed. (Hannover and Leipzig, 1917; rpt., Hannover, 1993); Eng. trans., *History of the Archbishops of Hamburg-Bremen*, trans. Francis J. Tschan (New York, 1959), 64ff. and 6f., which is based on Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni*, c. 15 (*The Life of Charlemagne*, 68–70).

See also Adam, *Gesta*, I.10 (11) (*History*, 12f.), on the southern boundaries of Germania, the areas covered by the missionary activities of Boniface; I.22 (24) (*History*, 27f.), on Germania as the kingdom of Louis the German; III.29 (28) (*History*, 138), on Germania as Germany; and IV.21 (*History*, 202), equating the Swedes with the Suebi, who lived at the time of the Roman Empire, hence placing Sweden within Germany. Tacitus, *Germania*, cc. 38–46.1, ed. Michael Winterbottom (Oxford, 1975), trans. H. Mattingly in *On Britain and Germany* (Baltimore, 1969), 132–40, had already included the Swedes (c. 44) among the tribes of the Suebi; cf. c. 45.6, where he uses the term *Suebicum mare* [Suebian sea] for the Baltic Sea. Betraying a knowledge of the terms used by the Romans to describe the lands within their sphere, Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 2 (*Deed*, 61), describes Germania as lying between the Rhine and Vistula Rivers, bounded by an ocean to the north and the Danube in the south. (Herwig Wolfram, *Grenzen und Räume: Geschichte Österreichs vor seiner Entstehung*, 378–907, *Österreichische Geschichte* [Vienna, 1995], 323, incl. nn. 239f.) Elsewhere Wipo locates the city of Limburg an der Haardt, which lay to the west of the Rhine, within Germania, in the sense of Germany; *Gesta*, c. 37 (*Deeds*, 96).

3. Percy Ernst Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio: Studien und Texte zur Geschichte des römischen Erneuerungsgedankens vom Ende des karolingischen Reiches bis zum Investiturstreit*, Studien der Bibliothek Warburg, 17 (Leipzig, 1929; 2nd ed. Darmstadt, 1957), esp. 1:116ff. Herwig Wolfram, *Intitulatio I: Lateinische Königs- und Fürstentitel im 9. und 10. Jahrhundert* (MIÖG, suppl. vol. 21) (Vienna, 1967), 185ff., 220ff., and 225ff.; idem, *Intitulatio II: Lateinische Herrscher- und Fürstentitel im 9. und 10. Jahrhundert*, ed. Herwig Wolfram, (MIÖG, suppl. vol. 24) (Vienna, 1973), 137ff.; and Brigitte Merta, “Die Titel Heinrichs II. und der Salier;” in *Intitulatio III: Lateinische Herrschertitel und Herrschertitulaturen vom 7. bis zum 13. Jahrhundert* (MIÖG, suppl. vol. 29), ed. Herwig Wolfram and Anton Scharer (Vienna, 1988), 165ff. and 173. Proof for the use of the term *regnum Italicum* may be found in MGH DD C.II, 547, s.v.

4. For a recent study, see Andreas Kränzle, “Der abwesende König: Überlegungen zur ottonischen Königsherrschaft,” *FMSt* 31 (1997): 120ff., esp. n. 10 (*missi*). Cf. Egon Boshof, *Königtum und Königsherrschaft im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert*, Enzyklopädie deutscher Geschichte, 27 (Munich, 1993), 1f.

5. Fried, *Der Weg in die Geschichte*, 372ff. and 417ff. Hans Karl Schulze, *Hegemoniales Kaisertum: Ottonen und Salier*, 3rd ed. (Berlin, 1994), 77f. See also idem, *Vom Reich der Franken zum Land der Deutschen: Merowinger und Karolinger*, 3rd ed. (Berlin, 1994), 329, 334, 342, and 349.

6. Friedrich Prinz, “Die Grenzen des Reiches in frühsalischer Zeit: Ein Strukturproblem der Königsherrschaft,” in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Stefan Weinfurter et al. (Sigmaringen, 1991), 1:168f., incl. n. 34.

7. Herwig Wolfram, *Salzburg, Bayern, Österreich: Die Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum und die Quellen ihrer Zeit* (MIÖG, suppl. vol. 31) (Vienna, 1995), 76–84 and 306–10.

8. Fried, *Der Weg in die Geschichte*, 509, 583, and 630.

9. Josef Riedmann, “Deutschlands Südgrenze,” in *Deutschlands Grenzen in der Geschichte*, ed. Alexander Demandt, 3rd ed. (Munich, 1993), 169ff. Eckhard Müller-Mertens and Wolfgang Huschner, *Reichsintegration im Spiegel der Herrschaftspraxis Kaiser Konrads II*, Forschungen zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte, 35 (Weimar, 1992), 356ff.

10. Fried, *Der Weg in die Geschichte*, 620f.

11. Cf. H. K. Schulze, *Hegemoniales Kaisertum*, 77f. and 93 (map).

12. Carlrichard Brühl, *Deutschland—Frankreich: Die Geburt zweier Völker* (Cologne, 1990), esp. 715ff. Cf. Wolfram, *Salzburg*, 59–66.

13. *Intitulatio II*, ed. Wolfram, 138, and Merta, “Die Titel,” 164ff. and 173.

14. Cf. H. K. Schulze, *Hegemoniales Kaisertum*, 77.

15. Wolfram, *Salzburg*, 380.

16. Hagen Keller, “Reichsstruktur und Herrschaftsauffassung in ottonisch-frühsalischer Zeit,” *FMSt* 16 (1982): 74ff., esp. 103ff. Stefan Weinfurter, “Die Zentralisierung der Herrschaftsgewalt im Reich durch Kaiser Heinrich II,” *HJ* 106 (1986): 243ff. Odilo Engels, “Das

Reich der Salier—Entwicklungslinien,” in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 3:479ff. Matthias Becher, *Rex, Dux und Gens: Untersuchungen zur Entstehung des sächsischen Herzogtums im 9. und 10. Jahrhundert*, Historische Studien, 444 (Husum, 1996), 275ff., esp. 298f. Karl Brunner, *Herzogtümer und Marken: Vom Ungarnsturm bis ins 12. Jahrhundert, 907–1156*, Österreichische Geschichte (Vienna, 1994), 137ff. (on Carantania/Carinthia).

17. Engels, “Das Reich der Salier,” 483, incl. n. 17.

18. H. K. Schulze, *Hegemoniales Kaisertum*, 75 and 94f.

19. Hagen Keller, “Zum Charakter der ‘Staatlichkeit’ zwischen karolingischer Reichsreform und hochmittelalterlichem Herrschaftsaufbau,” *FMSSt* 23 (1989): 251, incl. n. 15.

20. Weinfurter, “Die Zentralisierung,” 244ff., esp. 253. Keller, “Reichsstruktur,” 103ff. See, for example, Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 20 (*Deeds*, 82).

21. Wolfram, *Salzburg*, 156.

22. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 20 (*Deeds*, 82).

23. Ekkehard IV of Saint Gall, *Casus sancti Galli*, c. 96, ed. Hans F. Haefele, Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters, 10 (Darmstadt, 1980).

24. See, for example, Weinfurter, “Die Zentralisierung,” esp. 244ff. and 285.

25. See Rudolf Schieffer, *Der geschichtliche Ort der ottonisch-salischen Reichskirchenpolitik*, Nordrhein-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vorträge G 352 (Düsseldorf, 1998), 6f. (quote).

26. Wolfram, *Salzburg*, 68ff., and 103ff.

27. Cf. H. K. Schulze, *Hegemoniales Kaisertum*, 77, incl. n. 102 (map), in conjunction with Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:30.

28. Keller, *Adelsherrschaft*, 325ff. For example, see the discussion of Friuli in Adolf Hofmeister, “Markgrafen und Markgrafschaften im italischen Königreich in der Zeit von Karl dem Großen bis auf Otto den Großen (774–962),” *MIÖG*, suppl. vol. 7 (1907): 316ff.

29. Fried, *Der Weg in die Geschichte*, 595–98.

30. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 21 (*Deed*, 83).

31. *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1031, ed. Georg Waitz, MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 8 (Hannover, 1878; rpt. 1990).

32. Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon aa. 901–1053*, a. 1032.

33. Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century*, 141f.

34. Fulbert of Chartres, *Epistolae*, no. 86, in *The Letters and Poems of Fulbert of Chartres*, ed. and trans. Frederick Behrends, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford, 1976), 153f. Thietmar of Merseburg, *Chronicon*, v.21 (13), ed. Robert Holtzmann, MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, n.s., 9 (Berlin, 1935; rpt., Munich, 1996); Eng. trans., *Ottonian Germany: The Chronicle of Thietmar of Merseburg*, trans. David A. Warner (New York, 2001), 219f. (on Swabian trickery).

35. MGH DD C.II, 144. *Die Regesten des Kaiserreiches unter Konrad II. 1024–1039*, ed. Johann Friedrich Böhmer and Heinrich Appelt (Graz, 1951), 133 (hereafter cited as *Regesten Konrads II.*).

36. Wolfram, *Grenzen und Räume*, 337.

37. Wolfram, *Salzburg*, 123ff. and 145.

38. Gerd Althoff and Hagen Keller, *Heinrich I. und Otto der Große*, Persönlichkeit und Geschichte, 122/23 (Göttingen, 1985), esp. 65ff.

39. Herwig Wolfram, *The Roman Empire and Its Germanic Peoples*, trans. Thomas J. Dunlap (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1997), 62, incl. n. 28.

40. Wolfram, *Salzburg*, 140f.

41. *Ruodlieb*, XVIII, vv. 18–25, in *Waltharius, Ruodlieb, Märchenepen*, ed. and trans. Karl Langosch, 3rd ed. (Darmstadt, 1967); Eng. trans. Gordon B. Ford Jr. (Leiden, 1965), 103f. (on the wisdom of dwarves). Cf. Ekkehard IV of Saint Gall, *Casus sancti Galli*, c. 91, in conjunction with Guibert of Nogent, *Autobiographie*, 11.5, ed. Edmont-René Labande, *Les classiques de l'histoire de France au Moyen Âge*, 34 (Paris, 1981), 254; Eng. trans. *A Monk's Confession*, trans. Paul J. Archambault (University Park, Pa., 1996), 111–16; along with the story of Thorstein's *thátrr skelks* (a creepy monster), in Kurt Ranke, “Abort,” in *Reallexikon*

der germanischen Altertumskunde (Berlin, 1973), 1:18. On the appearance of the devil, see Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century*, 311f., 326 (stench), and 332.

42. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VII.68f. (*Ottoman Germany*, 355f.). According to Trillmich, *Kaiser Konrad II.*, 431 n. 243, Hennil was the same as Wotan, a “German notion.” In contrast, see Jacob Grimm, *Teutonic Mythology*, trans. James Steven Stallybrass (New York, 1966), 749f. *Vita Burchardi*, c. 15, 839f., relates that the devil, in the guise of a gardener, told Burchard that a great misfortune was to occur; the following night, the western chancel of the newly built Worms cathedral collapsed. Cf. Wolfram, *Grenzen und Räume*, 342f.

43. According to Ekkehard IV of Saint Gall, *Casus sancti Galli*, c. 41, the devil speaks German.

44. Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century*, 304f.; cf. 4f.

45. *Annales Bertiniani*, a. 859, ed. Georg Waitz, MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 5 (Hannover, 1883); Eng. trans., *The Annals of St-Bertin*, trans. Janet L. Nelson (New York, 1991), 89.

46. See H. K. Schulze, *Vom Reich der Franken*, 364, 373, and 377, for relevant maps.

47. See Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century*, 4ff., based on Adalbero of Laon, *Carmen ad Rotbertum regem*, vv. 275–305, esp. v. 296 (close), ed. Claude Carozzi, *Les classiques de l'histoire de France au Moyen Âge*, 32 (Paris, 1979); cf. *Gesta episcoporum Cameracensium*, III.27, ed. Ludwig Bethmann, MGH SS 7:475 (Hannover, 1846; rpt., Stuttgart, 1995).

48. See Chapter IX, at note 3.

CHAPTER I

1. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:519f., based on MGH SS 6:175 (Gotha manuscript, codex 5, of Ekkehard's chronicle), and MGH SS 13: 314 (index). Cf. Karl Schmid, “Haus- und Herrschaftsverständnis der Salier,” in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 1:21ff., for some fundamental points about the concept of dynasty, and 49f., on the genealogy table in Ekkehard's chronicle (see fig. 1).

2. Otto of Freising, *Chronica sive Historia de duabus civitatibus*, IV.32, ed. Adolf Hofmeister, MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 45 (Hannover and Leipzig, 1912; rpt., Hannover, 1984); Eng. trans., *The Two Cities*, trans. Charles Mierow, ed. A. P. Evans and Charles Knapp (New York, 1928; rpt. 1966), 319. Cf. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:519. Stefan Weinfurter, *The Salian Century: Main Currents in an Age of Transition*, trans. Barbara M. Bowlus (Philadelphia, 1999), 5. Karl Schmid, “Die Sorge der Salier um ihre Memoria,” in *Memoria*, ed. Karl Schmid and Joachim Wollasch, Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften, 48 (Munich, 1984), 717 n. 268, including an extensive bibliography. Egon Boshof, *Die Salier*, UTB, 387, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart, 1992), 8. On Otto's sources, see Edwin Mayer-Homburg, *Die fränkischen Volksrechte im Mittelalter* (Weimar, 1912), 1:19ff., based on MGH DD C.III, 5, and MGH DD F.I, 1. On identifying the *gens Salica* [Salian clan] with the “Franks, those of Frankish origin,” see, for example, *Historia Welforum*, c. 8, ed. and trans. Erich König, Schwäbische Chroniken der Stauferzeit, 1 (Stuttgart, 1938; rpt. 1978), 14, also in *Historia Welforum Weingartensis*, c. 8, ed. Ludwig Weiland, MGH SS 21:460 (Hannover, 1869; rpt., Stuttgart, 1988).

3. K. Schmid, “Haus- und Herrschaftsverständnis,” 50f. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:520. On the practice of naming a family line after an ancestral castle, which evidently originated in the West, see Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century*, 85 and 94; for the associated note, see the German original, *Lebensordnungen des 10. Jahrhunderts*, Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters, 30 (Stuttgart, 1984), 1:130 n. 65.

4. On *Conradus de Weibelingin* [Conrad of Waiblingen], cf. Otto of Freising, [*Ottonis et Rahewini*] *Gesta Friderici I. imperatoris*, II.2, ed. Georg Waitz and Bernhard von Simson, MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 46 (Hannover, 1912; rpt., Hannover, 1997); Eng. trans., *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*, trans. Charles C. Mierow, with Richard Emery (New York, 1953; rpt., Toronto, 1994), 116, with *Annales Palidenses auctore Theodoro monacho*, a. 1024, ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz, MGH SS 16:67 (Hannover, 1859; rpt., Stuttgart, 1994). *Liber aureus*, prologue II, ed. Camillo Wampach, in *Geschichte der Grundherrschaft Echternach im*

Frühmittelalter, 1, pt. 2 (Luxembourg, 1930), 9ff., incl. n. 30; cf. note 88 below. *Codex Laureshamensis*, no. 95, ed. Karl Glöckner, Arbeiten der Historischen Kommission für den Volksstaat Hessen, 1 (Darmstadt, 1929), 378. Dieter Mertens, "Vom Rhein zur Rems: Aspekte salisch-schwäbischer Geschichte," in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 1:221ff. and 250f. Boshof, *Die Salier*, 8f. Karl Schmid, "De regia stirpe Waiblingensium," *ZGO* 124, n.s., 85 (1976): 63–73. Idem, "Haus- und Herrschaftsverständnis," 48ff. On Henry as the Salian "leading name," see Weinfurter, *The Salian Century*, 16.

5. As noted in MGH SS 6:175: "Reges Salici: Rex oritur Salicus, Cuonradus nomine dictus" [The Salian kings: The king, Conrad by name, was of Salian birth]. K. Schmid, "Haus- und Herrschaftsverständnis," 24: "The four rulers who reigned over the empire from 1024 to 1125 were Salians."

6. MGH DD O.I, 199 (dated 979): "Otto Wannie" [Otto of Worms]. Cf. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 1 (*Deeds*, 59), with *ibid.*, c. 2 (61). K. Schmid, "De regia stirpe Waiblingensium," 73, and *idem*, "Die Sorge," 68f.

7. Cf. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 2 (*Deeds*, 63): Conrad the Elder reminded Conrad the Younger that the goodwill given them is "unius stirpis propago, una domus, indissolubilis familiaritas," that is, "to the shoot of one root; just as to one house, so to an indissoluble friendship." Stefan Weinfurter, "Herrschaftslegitimation und Königsautorität im Wandel: Die Salier und ihr Dom zu Speyer," in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 1:63–66. The proposal that the regal line be named after Speyer (see, for instance, Boshof, *Die Salier*, 27) also does not hold water, because, much like the term "Salian," it is also based on an anachronistic view, in this case of the association between Conrad and that city after 1024 or 1039.

8. Cf. MGH DD H.II, 20 (*Die Regesten des Kaiserreiches unter Heinrich II. 1002–1024*, ed. Johann Friedrich Böhmer and Theodor Graff [Vienna, 1971], 1509 [hereafter cited as *Regesten Heinrichs II.*]) with MGH DD C.II, 204 (*Regesten Konrads II.*, 211). MGH DD C.II, 50 (February 14, 1026), was clearly a compilation based on MGH DD O.I, 392, as well as MGH DD H.II, 20, 22f., and 319, meant for the recipients of the privileges. See Weinfurter, *The Salian Century*, 15f., and K. Schmid, "Die Sorge," 719. The first phase of the withdrawal by the "men of Worms" from their city began in Ottonian times; see MGH DD O.II, 199, and Johann Lechner, "Die älteren Königsurkunden für das Bistum Worms und die Begründung der bischöflichen Fürstenmacht," *MIÖG* 22 (1901): 562f.

9. MGH DD H.IV., 325 (October 14, 1080). Cf. Boshof, *Die Salier*, 9.

10. At the very beginning of his reign, Conrad II transformed the castle at Limburg into a monastery; see Weinfurter, "Herrschaftslegitimation," 57–59, and MGH DD C.II, 198 and 216. Bruchsal, which Otto of Worms had acquired in 1002, was not a meaningful substitute for Worms; see Weinfurter, "Herrschaftslegitimation," 67f. Mertens, "Vom Rhein," 221. K. Schmid, "Die Sorge," 718f.

11. On Otto's remarks in the *Chronica*, vi.28 (*The Two Cities*, 317f.), see Mertens, "Vom Rhein," 221. Cf. Everhelm, *Vita Popponis abbatis Stabulensis*, c. 18, ed. Wilhelm Wattenbach, MGH SS 11:304 (Hannover, 1854; rpt., Stuttgart, 1994): "quorum unus, id est Cuonradus, Romanorum sive Orientalium, alter vero, id est Henricus, Occidentalium populis Francorum imperavit" [one of them, namely Conrad, ruled the people of the Roman, or eastern, Franks; however, the other, namely Henry, ruled the people of the western Franks].

12. Otto of Freising, *Chronica*, iv.32; vii.17, 22, and 24 (*The Two Cities*, 318ff., 423f., 430f., and 433f.). Cf. Brühl, *Deutschland—Frankreich*, 721.

13. Otto of Freising, *Chronica*, vi.15 (*The Two Cities*, 375).

14. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 1f. (*Deeds*, 57f. and 61f.). Cf. Heinz 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*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 3:245–77, esp. 263f.

15. On Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 2 (*Deeds*, 60ff.), see Arno Borst, *Der Turmbau von Babel: Geschichte der Meinungen über Ursprung und Vielfalt der Sprachen und Völker*, vol. 2 (Stuttgart, 1958), 1:574. On Otto of Freising, *Chronica*, iv.32 (*The Two Cities*, 320), cf. note 2 above.

16. Cf. Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francorum*, 11.31, ed. Bruno Krusch and Wilhelm

Levison, *MGH SS rerum Merovingicarum* 1, pt. 1 (Hannover, 1937/51; rpt. 1992); Eng. trans., *History of the Franks*, ed. and trans. Ernest Brehaut, Records of Civilization (New York, 1969), 40f.; with 2 Esr (RSV Neh.) 3:5 and Sir. 51:34 (RSV Sir. 51:26). On the Frankish Trojan legend, see Eugen Ewig, "Troja und die Franken," *Rheinische Vierteljahrsblätter* 62 (1998): 1–16. K. Schmid, "Haus- und Herrschaftsverständnis," 49, incl. n. 105; František Graus, "Troja und trojanische Herkunftssage im Mittelalter," in *Kontinuität und Transformation der Antike im Mittelalter*, ed. Willi Erzgräber (Sigmaringen, 1989), 25–43; Erich Zöllner, *Geschichte der Franken bis zur Mitte des 6. Jahrhunderts* (Munich, 1970), 5, incl. nn. 4f. Cf. Jonathan Barlow, "Gregory of Tours and the Myth of the Trojan Origins of the Franks," *EMSt* 29 (1995): 86–95.

17. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 2 (*Deeds*, 61).

18. *Regesten Konrads II.*, a–m.

19. Mechthild Black-Veldtrup, *Kaiserin Agnes (1043–1077): Quellenkritische Studien*, Münstersche historische Forschungen, 7 (Cologne, 1995), 112–14 (on Conrad II's date of birth). Cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, a. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:4, incl. n. 3. Boshof, *Die Salier*, 11f. On whom he was named after, see, for instance, Wolfgang Metz, "Wesen und Struktur des Adels Althessens in der Salierzeit," in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 1:352, incl. nn. 142–44. On the inclusion of Conrad I in Conrad II's ancestry, see Chapter XXII, at note 13.

20. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:2f., incl. n. 4. Hans Werle, "Titelherzogtum und Herzogsherrschaft," *ZRG GA* 73 (1956): 246. According to Otto von Dungen, *Wie Baiern das Österreich verlor* (Graz, 1930), 69, Judith was the daughter of Duke Berthold, the brother of Duke Arnulf. Andreas Thiele, *Erzählende genealogische Stammtafeln zur europäischen Geschichte*, 2nd ed. (Frankfurt am Main, 1993), no. 14, lists her as the granddaughter of Duke Arnulf of Bavaria. On Conrad II's uncles, see Weinfurter, *The Salian Century*, 184. Wolphere, *Continuatio vitae Bernwardi*, ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz, *MGH SS* 11:166 (Hannover, 1854; rpt., Stuttgart, 1994), reports that Conrad II's father was the duke of Carinthia, who bore the same name.

21. Werle, "Titelherzogtum," 260. Weinfurter, "Herrschaftslegitimation," 64ff. (incl. map). *Die Regesten des Kaiserreiches unter Heinrich I. und Otto I.*, ed. Johann Friedrich Böhmer and Emil von Ottenthal, 2nd ed. (Hildesheim, 1967), 148a. The wedding between Conrad of Lotharingia and Otto's daughter Liutgard took place on April 11, 947 (Easter).

22. See Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century*, 144; for the associated note, see the German original, *Lebensumnungen*, 1:191 n. 31, based on Widukind of Corvey, *Res gestae Saxonicae*, III.17, ed. Paul Hirsch and Hans-Eberhard Lohmann, *MGH SS rerum Germanicarum*, 60 (Hannover, 1935; rpt. 1989). Cf. Wolfram, *The Roman Empire*, 20ff., and K. Brunner, *Herzogtümer*, 180ff., on the nature of a hero.

23. *Die Regesten des Kaiserreiches unter Heinrich I. und Otto I.*, 239g, for the battle of Lechfeld, taken primarily from Widukind, *Res gestae Saxonicae*, III.44.

24. Hansmartin Schwarzmaier, *Von Speyer nach Rom: Wegstationen und Lebensspuren der Salier* (Sigmaringen, 1991), 27.

25. Boshof, *Die Salier*, 7; cf. K. Schmid, "Haus- und Herrschaftsverständnis," 23, incl. n. 7, and 24, incl. n. 10. Werle, "Titelherzogtum," 242f.

26. See the groundbreaking work by Hermann Schreibmüller, "Die Ahnen Kaiser Konrads II. und Bischof Brunos von Würzburg," *Würzburger Diözesangeschichtsblätter* 14/15 (1952/53): 179ff. Cf. Schwarzmaier, *Von Speyer*, 25–27, for his trenchant observations concerning that work.

27. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 2 (*Deeds*, 62). Borst, *Der Turmbau*, 2, 1:574.

28. Boshof, *Die Salier*, 19f. Werle, "Titelherzogtum," esp. 242 and 249; Regino of Prüm, *Continuatio*, a. 954, in *Chronicon*, ed. Friedrich Kurze, *MGH SS rerum Germanicarum*, 50 (Hannover, 1890; rpt. 1989). Karl Brunner, "Die fränkischen Fürstentitel im 9. und 10. Jahrhundert," in *Intitulatio II*, ed. Wolfram, 294, incl. n. 87. On Adelheid's brothers, cf. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 2 (*Deeds*, 62), with *ibid.*, c. 19 (81), in which he mentions Hugo IV of Egisheim. On the origins of the conflict between Conrad II and the Lotharingians, see Chapter II, at notes 60–63.

29. Werle, "Titelherzogtum," 240. Schreibmüller, "Die Ahnen," 205.

30. Stephan Weinfurter, *Heinrich II. (1002–1024): Herrscher am Ende der Zeiten* (Regensburg, 1999), 62, incl. nn. 21f. Cf. Kurt Reindel, "Bayern vom Zeitalter der Karolinger bis zum Ende der Welfenherrschaft (788–1180): Die politische Entwicklung," in *Handbuch der bayerischen Geschichte*, ed. Max Spindler, 2nd ed. (Munich, 1981), 1:300–304. On Carinthia, see *Monumenta historica ducatus Carinthiae*, 3:61–97, nos. 149–223, ed. August Jaksch (Klagenfurt, 1896ff.). Werle, "Titelherzogtum," 245. Schreibmüller, "Die Ahnen," 206f. K. Brunner, *Herzogtümer*, 70ff. See esp. MGH DD O.II, 203, 205, and 216 (dating from 979–83), as well as MGH DD O.III, 11 (March 28, 985).

31. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:4 n. 5, based on MGH DD H.III, 168 and 171 (September 7, 1046); cf. the introductory remarks to diploma 167, as well as *Regesten Konrads II.*, c. To be sure, the daughter born to Henry III and Agnes in 1045 was named Adelheid; see Black-Veldtrup, *Kaiserin Agnes*, 11.

32. Herwig Wolfram, "Die Gesandtschaft Konrads II. nach Konstantinopel (1027/29)," *MIÖG* 100 (1992): 169, incl. n. 34. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 140a.

33. Gerd Wunder, "Gisela von Schwaben," *Lebensbilder aus Schwaben und Franken* 14 (1980): 14, referred to a Wolfram and an Adelheid, children of Conrad II and Gisela "buried in Limburg an der Ha(a)rdt." This is surely incorrect, as Gisela could not have been their mother. It is much likelier that Wunder's statement rests on a much more recent, entirely apocryphal legend concerning the founding of Limburg abbey; see August Becker, *Die Pfalz und die Pfälzer*, 2nd ed. (Neustadt an der Haardt, 1913), 225 and 227. Cf., in contrast, Johannes Emil Gugumus, "Die Speyerer Bischöfe im Investiturstreit," *Archiv für mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte* 4 (1952): 45f. and 48f., incl. n. 335. On pp. 51–54, Gugumus purports to explain how Conrad's daughter received the name Adelheid. It is very possible that he mistook her for Henry III's like-named daughter, who, according to Speyer tradition, was the mother of Bishop Henry and the wife of Count Wolfram. See Hansjörg Grafen, "Spuren der ältesten Speyerer Necrologüberlieferung," *FMSt* 19 (1985): 379–431, esp. 418. Concerning Wolfram, see also Georg Berthold, "Speyerer Geschichtsbeiträge I," *Mitteilungen des historischen Vereines der Pfalz* 31 (1911): 81. Schreibmüller, "Die Ahnen," 217, mentions a "little son (Wolfram?) of Duke Conrad of Carinthia (uncle of Conrad II)" who died at age three. On that point, see Caspar Ehlers, *Metropolis Germaniae: Studien zur Bedeutung Speyers für das Königtum: 751–1250*, Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte, 125 (Göttingen, 1996), 227 n. 155.

34. *Regesten Konrads II.*, f. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VII.62 (*Ottoman Germany*, 351f.). Cf. Chapter II, at notes 60f. and 63f.

35. *Regesten Konrads II.*, b. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:4, based on *Vita Burchardi*, c. 7, 835.

36. *Vita Burchardi*, c. 7, 835. On Burchard's own youth, see the close of the prologue and opening of the first chapter to the same work. On this topic, cf., for instance, Becher, "Neue Überlegungen," 43ff., in reference to the assertion by Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni*, c. 4 (*The Life of Charlemagne*, 59), that nothing was known about Charlemagne's childhood and youth.

37. Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, XI.2, ed. W. M. Lindsay (Oxford, 1911), 2:1–16.

38. *Vita Burchardi*, c. 21, 843.

39. Berthold, "Speyerer Geschichtsbeiträge I," 80, assumed that Henry had died in 990, since Wolfram had already succeeded him as count of Speyer by 992. However, there is no evidence that Henry had been the count of Speyer; see Gugumus, "Die Speyerer Bischöfe," 48 (list).

40. MGH DD C.II, 204 (January 30, 1034), lists the sister—named after her paternal grandmother—at the end of a necrology. Weinfurter, "Herrschaftslegitimation," 66, assumed she died in 998.

41. Tilmann Schmidt, "Konrads II. Jugend und Familie," in *Geschichtsschreibung und geistiges Leben im Mittelalter: Festschrift für Heinz Löwe zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Karl Hauck and Hubert Mordek (Cologne, 1978), 317ff. Quote from Gerd Althoff, *Verwandte, Freunde und Getreue* (Darmstadt, 1990), 58. See, on the other hand, the qualifying remarks by Weinfurter, "Herrschaftslegitimation," 63f., incl. n. 31.

42. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 7 (*Deeds*, 74).
43. *Regesten Konrads II.*, b. Weinfurter, "Herrschaftslegitimation," 63ff.
44. Cf. notes 59f. below.
45. Schwarzmaier, *Von Speyer*, 20ff. (incl. a German translation of the charter issued in 946 making the gift, III.13). Ingrid Heidrich, "Bischöfe und Bischofskirche von Speyer," in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 2:188 and 190. See Chapter X, at note 103.
46. *Vita Burchardi*, cc. 6f., 835. On the biography, see Stephanie Coué, "Acht Bischofsviten aus der Salierzeit—neu interpretiert," in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 3:35off. Cf. Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century*, 429.
47. *Vita Burchardi*, c. 7, 835. On the meaning of "adopted son," see Eduard Hlawitschka, "Die Widonen im Dukat von Spoleto," *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 63 (1983): 88f.
48. On MGH DD C.II, 204 (January 30, 1034), see T. Schmidt, "Konrads II. Jugend," 314f., and K. Schmid, "Die Sorge," 719, incl. n. 275.
49. *Regesten Konrads II.*, d. T. Schmidt, "Konrads II. Jugend," 314 and 323 n. 23. Schwarzmaier, *Von Speyer*, 49.
50. K. Schmid, "Die Sorge," 684f. (on Matilda) and 719f. Odilo Engels, "Der Dom zu Speyer im Spiegel des salischen und staufischen Selbstverständnisses," *Archiv für mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte* 32 (1980): 27–40; on this point, 30. Schreibmüller, "Die Ahnen," 212f.
51. Quote from Schreibmüller, "Die Ahnen," 213. Cf. *Vita Burchardi*, c. 7, 835. Schwarzmaier, *Von Speyer*, 49, speculates that Otto of Worms was buried at Saint Lambrecht in the Palatine, which he had founded.
52. Bern of Reichenau, *Die Briefe des Abtes Bern von Reichenau*, ep. 26, ed. Franz-Josef Schmale, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für geschichtliche Landeskunde in Baden-Württemberg, ser. A: Quellen, 6 (Stuttgart, 1961), 56, incl. n. 9. Cf. Wolfram, "Die Gesandtschaft," 171, with Adam, *Gesta*, III.32 (31) (*History*, 140): In response to a letter from Emperor Constantine IX Monomachos, Henry III noted that he "took pride among other things in being descended from Greek stock, being Theophanu and the most valorous Otto were the founders of his line." On this and comparable passages, see notes 95ff. below.
53. On Otto I's sporting a beard, see Widukind, *Res gestae Saxonicae*, II.36, 97; on Conrad's, see note 77 below.
54. Cf. *Vita Burchardi*, cc. 6f. and 9, 835 and 836f., with MGH DD H.II, 20.
55. *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 1483b.
56. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. II, 23, and 26 (*Deeds*, 76, 84, and 86). Quote from Kurt-Ulrich Jäschke, "*Tamen virilis probitas in femina vicit*: Ein hochmittelalterlicher Hofkapellan und die Herrscherinnen—Wipos Äußerungen über Kaiserinnen und Königinnen seiner Zeit," in *Ex ipsis rerum documentis: Beiträge zur Mediävistik: Festschrift Harald Zimmermann zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Klaus Herbers, Hans Henning Kortüm, and Carlo Servatius (Sigmaringen, 1991), 437 n. 100, based on Wipo, *Tetralogus*, vv. 161–63, in *Gesta*.
57. Hartmut Hoffmann, "Eigendiktat in den Urkunden Ottos III. und Heinrichs II.," *DA* 44 (1988): 399ff. (MGH DD H.II); cf. MGH DD H.III, 236 (June 4, 1049).
58. Cf. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 6 (*Deeds*, 72), with *Chronicon Novaliciense*, app. c. 17, ed. Ludwig Konrad Bethmann, MGH SS 7:128 (Hannover, 1846; rpt., Stuttgart, 1995), or *ibid.*, ed. Carlo Cipolla, *Fonti per la storia d'Italia*, 32 (Rome, 1901), 304. On the intellectual atmosphere at Burchard's court, see Chapter XVII, at notes 39ff. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 43a and b (July 18–24 and 26, 1025). *Vita Burchardi*, c. 21, 844.
59. Conrad, the son of Otto of Worms, must have married Matilda of Swabia in 1002, sometime before June 24. See Thietmar, *Chronicon*, v.12 (*Ottonian Germany*, 213f.). *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 1487a; cf. 1524d. Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 54f. The birth of his son, named Conrad the Younger, is hence assumed to have taken place between 1002/3 and approximately 1005. Schwarzmaier, *Von Speyer*, 48, deduces the latter date from Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1019, where Conrad the Younger is termed an *adolescens* [adolescent]. According to Isidore, *Etymologiae*, XI.2, 2:3f., *adolescencia* refers to the period from fifteen to twenty years of age, from which one may deduce that Conrad may have been born as early

as 1002/3. Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1012, referred to Conrad as a *puer*, which would also support dating his birth to between 1002/3 and 1005. According to Isidore, *Etymologiae*, XI.2, 2:1f., *pueritia* [childhood] refers to the period from seven to fourteen years of age.

60. Weinfurter, *The Salian Century*, 12 (plan of Worms); cf. *ibid.*, 11: The Salian comital castle stood “where the canonry of Saint Paul was later built . . . ; this location was probably identical with that of the old Carolingian palace.”

61. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, v.25 (*Ottoman Germany*, 222). Weinfurter, *The Salian Century*, 15f. *Idem*, *Heinrich II*, 62, incl. nn. 20f. Cf. Mertens, “Vom Rhein,” 227–29. Boshof, *Die Salier*, 25, was right to use the term *Handgemal*. J. Lechner, “Die älteren Königsurkunden,” 565. When referring to the duchy in the tenth and eleventh centuries, it seems to be a matter of personal preference whether to still call it Carantania or to use the newer name Carinthia. In any case, both terms are used interchangeably below.

62. *Vita Burchardi*, c. 7, 835. See note 60 above.

63. *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 1524a and 1527a. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, v.24 (16)–v.26 (*Ottoman Germany*, 221ff.).

64. For a general account, see Heinz Wolter, *Die Synoden im Reichsgebiet und in Reichsitalien von 916 bis 1056*, Konziliengeschichte, ser. A, Darstellungen (Paderborn, 1988), 215ff., and Weinfurter, *Heinrich II.*, 76ff. and 200ff. Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century*, 94ff., and Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 52ff.; cf. *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 1524d and 1525 [MGH DD H.11, 34 (January 15, 1003)]. For primary sources, see in particular Constantinus of Metz, *Vita Adalberonis II. Mettensis episcopi*, cc. 15–20, ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz, MGH SS 4:663–65 (Hannover, 1841; rpt., Stuttgart, 1981). Adalbold of Utrecht, *Vita Heinrici II imperatoris*, 11.19, ed. Georg Waitz, MGH SS 4:688. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, v.27 (*Ottoman Germany*, 223f.). N.B.: Due to a derogatory remark Thietmar made in this passage about Dukes Hermann II of Swabia and Dietrich of Upper Lotharingia, *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 1524d, erroneously characterizes both of them as “titular dukes.” (The remark is analogous to one found in Everhelm, *Vita Popponis*, c. 20, 305: “a quodam Joanne, nomine non opere monacho” [by a certain John, a monk in name, not act].) The argument that Diedenhofen took place in 1005—see, for instance, Armin Wolf, “Königskandidatur und Königsverwandtschaft,” *DA* 47 (1991): 83, incl. n. 118, who cited the documented presence at the synod of Bishop Walter of Speyer, who became bishop on August 8, 1004—is refuted by Thietmar, *Chronicon*, v.27 (*Ottoman Germany*, 223f.), who relates that Hermann II of Swabia sought to prevent the meeting at Diedenhofen. Hermann died on May 4, 1003; however, see note 66 below. For more on the date for the meeting at Diedenhofen, see Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 53, incl. n. 119, and Ernst-Dieter Hehl, “Herrscher, Kirche und Kirchenrecht im spätottonischen Reich,” in *Otto III.—Heinrich II.: Eine Wende?* ed. Bernd Schneidmüller and Stefan Weinfurter, *Mittelalter-Forschungen*, 1 (Sigmaringen, 1997), 185, incl. n. 52.

65. Weinfurter, “Die Zentralisierung,” 270–73. Mertens, “Vom Rhein,” 226–30.

66. Mertens, “Vom Rhein,” 227, incl. nn. 36f. Cf. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VI.9 (*Ottoman Germany*, 243f.), with *ibid.*, VI.82 (292). Isidore, *Etymologiae*, XI.2, 2:1f.: *pueritia* [childhood] refers to the period from seven to fourteen years of age.

67. *Annales necrologici Fuldenses*, a. 1004, ed. Georg Waitz, MGH SS 13:209 (Hannover, 1881; rpt., Stuttgart, 1985). *Kalendarium necrologicum Weissenburgense*, *Fontes rerum Germanicarum*, 4 (Stuttgart, 1868), 313.

68. See notes 48–51 above.

69. Mayer-Homberg, *Die fränkischen Volksrechte*, 1:295–97 and 376–86, esp. according to *Lex Salica*, 33.1 and 9, in *Pactus legis Salicae*, ed. Karl August Eckhardt, MGH LL nationum Germanicarum, 4:1 (Hannover, 1962); *Lex Ribuarua*, 84 (81), ed. Franz Beyerle and Rudolf Buchner, MGH LL nationum Germanicarum, 3:2 (Hannover, 1951); *Ordinatio imperii a. 817*, c. 16, ed. Alfred Boretius, MGH Capitularia regum Francorum, 1 (Hannover, 1883; rpt., Stuttgart, 1984), no. 136; Lampert of Hersfeld, *Annales*, a. 1065 (concerning Henry IV), in *Opera*, ed. Oswald Holger-Egger, MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 38 (Hannover, 1894; rpt. 1984).

70. Cf. T. Schmidt, “Konrads II. Jugend,” 318, incl. nn. 47f.

71. Werner Ogris, "Hausgemeinschaft," in *HRG*, vol. 1, cols. 2024–26 (Berlin, 1971); and Hans Karl Schulze, "Hausherrschaft," in *ibid.*, cols. 2030–33. The answers to why and when Conrad had his own household may hinge on his possible marriage to Wolfram's daughter; see notes 91–93 below.

72. Constantinus, *Vita Adalberonis II.*, cc. 17f., 664. On Dietrich I and Fredrick II, dukes of Upper Lotharingia, cf. Walter Kienast, *Deutschland und Frankreich in der Kaiserzeit, 900–1270*, Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters, 9, vol. 1 (Stuttgart, 1974), 151f.

73. August Jaksch, *Geschichte Kärntens bis 1335*, 1:163 (Klagenfurt, 1928). *Monumenta historica ducatus Carinthiae*, 3:96f., nos. 222f. K. Brunner, *Herzogtümer*, 137ff.

74. Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1012; cf. a. 1036. Hans-Werner Goetz, "Das Herzogtum im Spiegel der salierzeitlichen Geschichtsschreibung," in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 1:258f. On the probable sequence of events (first Adalbero and Beatrix were married; then he was invested with Carinthia), see Gerald Ganser, "Die Mark als Weg zur Macht am Beispiel der 'Eppensteiner' (2. Teil)," *Zeitschrift des Historischen Vereins für Steiermark* 85 (1994): 73–122; on this point, 105.

75. MGH DD C.II, 204 (January 30, 1034). See note 48 above. On the giving of names in the Worms and Salian lines, see Chapter XXII, at notes 8ff. On the probable guardianship of Conrad the Younger by Conrad the Elder, see Mertens, "Vom Rhein," 230, and T. Schmidt, "Konrads II. Jugend," 318.

76. Roman Sandgruber, *Ökonomie und Politik: Österreichische Wirtschaftsgeschichte vom Mittelalter bis zur Gegenwart*, Österreichische Geschichte (Vienna, 1995), 16f.

77. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 2 (Kamba, 1024), and cc. 18, 30, and 33 (*Deeds*, 64, 80, 89, and 92). On the last reference, cf. Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century*, 173. Even Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum Libri Quinque/Five Books*, IV, preface 1, 170–71, termed Conrad "audax animo et viribus ingens" [a bold and strong fellow]. On the speed at which Conrad traveled, see Heinrich Fichtenau, "Reisen und Reisende," in *Beiträge zur Mediävistik*, vol. 3 (Stuttgart, 1986), 19, incl. n. 65, who considered the information in Wipo's account improbable, and Müller-Mertens and Huschner, *Reichsintegration*, esp. 124ff. On speed of travel in general, see Reinhard Elze, "Über die Leistungsfähigkeit von Gesandtschaften und Boten im 11. Jahrhundert," in *Päpste—Kaiser—Könige und die mittelalterliche Herrschaftssymbolik*, ed. Bernhard Schimmelpfennig und Ludwig Schmutge, XIV (London, 1982), 1–10; on this point, 9f. On studies of Conrad's physical attributes, see Weinfurter, *The Salian Century*, 44 (2 meters [6.6 feet] in height); Erkens, *Konrad II.*, 10, incl. n. 3, and 223 (1.8 meters [5.9 feet]); and Hermann Grauert, "Die Kaisergräber im Dome zu Speyer: Bericht über die Öffnung im August 1900," *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-philologisch-historische Klasse* (1900): 539–617, esp. 576f.; cf. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 3 and 40, v. 22 (*Deeds*, 68 and 99). On pictorial representations of Conrad sporting an impressive beard, see Percy Ernst Schramm and Florentine Mutherich, *Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige in Bildern ihrer Zeit, 751–1190* (Munich, 1983), 222–27, 386–94, pls. 132–43, as well as the famous family portrait in the *Weltchronik* by Ekkehard of Aura, in *ibid.*, 250 and 444 n. 184, and Weinfurter, *The Salian Century*, 30–31 and 33–34, pls. 5–8.

78. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 2 (*Deeds*, 65).

79. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 1 (*Deeds*, 59). On this issue, cf. Hagen Keller, "Schwäbische Herzöge als Thronwerber," *ZGO* 131 (1983): 143f., incl. n. 119; Weinfurter, *The Salian Century*, 6; and Werle, "Titelherzogtum," 251ff.

80. Weinfurter, "Herrschaftslegitimation," 63f., incl. n. 31.

81. On *Regesten Konrads II.*, b, see, for instance, Weinfurter, "Herrschaftslegitimation," 63 n. 31. Cf. note 79 above.

82. *Regesten Konrads II.*, h, and MGH DD H.II, 427. Cf. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:9, incl. nn. 36f.; Anna M. Drabek, *Die Verträge der fränkischen und deutschen Herrscher mit dem Papsttum von 754 bis 1020*, VIÖG, 22 (Vienna, 1976), 78ff.; and *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 1968.

83. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:348, on the *Annales Palidenses*, a. 1024, 67. Cf., for instance, Hugh of Flavigny, *Chronicon*, II.16, ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz, MGH SS 8:392 (Hannover, 1848; rpt., Stuttgart, 1987). Schreibmüller, "Die Ahnen," 222.

84. Schwarzmaier, *Von Speyer*, 28ff. *Liber possessionum Wizenburgensis*, nos. 261–79 (Otto's fiefs) and 281–90 (Conrad's fiefs), ed. Christoph Dette, *Quellen und Abhandlungen zur mittelhheinischen Kirchengeschichte*, 59 (Mainz, 1987), 145–47. See also nos. 301 and 311, pp. 150 and 154f. (in which Otto is termed a “church-robbing” *dux* [duke]).

85. *Liber possessionum Wizenburgensis*, 40. Cf. Weinfurter, “Herrschaftslegitimation,” 63 n. 31, which refers to a doctoral thesis from the University of Heidelberg by H. Krabusch. Mertens, “Vom Rhein,” 243f., identifies Count Conrad as the Duke of Carinthia (d. 1011).

86. MGH DD C.II, 180 (February 20, 1032). *Regesten Konrads II.*, 186. Cf. Everhelm, *Vita Popponis*, c. 19, 305: “hereditaria sorte” [by hereditary allotment]. Cf. note 88 below.

87. On MGH DD C.II, 4, see Mertens, “Vom Rhein,” 240, incl. n. 117, and Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:7 n. 3. This last and MGH DD C.II, 204 and 216, list later donations from Conrad's personal estate.

88. Mertens, “Vom Rhein,” 221ff. MGH DD C.II, 215. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 223. *Liber aureus*, prologue II, 9–11, incl. n. 30 (a. 1191). Cf. note 4 above.

89. Widukind, *Res gestae Saxonicae*, II.10. Cf. also Weinfurter, “Herrschaftslegitimation,” 64 n. 31. E. Kaufmann, “Erbfolgeordnung,” in *HRG*, vol. 1, cols. 959–62 (Berlin, 1971). On Weissenburg, see notes 84f. above. On the estates governed by Otto of Carinthia, see Werle, “Titelherzogtum,” 256–64. On the role seniority played with the “men of Worms,” see notes 41–43 above. Although it was legal for Adelheid to take her *dos* [dowry] and inheritance with her into her second marriage—see Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century*, 103f. and 107f.—it was an isolated event, as shown by MGH DD H.III, 168 and 171 (see note 31 above).

90. Cf. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VII.14 (*Ottoman Germany*, 316f.). On Duke Ernest I's warning to his wife Gisela, see Chapter II, at notes 30–35. See Mertens, “Vom Rhein,” 240, on Gisela's *proprietas hereditaria* [hereditary property], based on MGH DD C.II, 199. On the tale of the bridal abduction, see Chapter II, at note 32.

91. Gugumus, “Die Speyerer Bischöfe,” esp. 45–49, incl. nn. 324f., 331f. (cf. MGH DD O.III, 87, and MGH DD H.II, 125), and 335. Cf. Friedmann, *Die Beziehungen*, 107f. n. 541. On Azecho, see Weinfurter, *The Salian Century*, 10 and 57. Cf. Grafen, “Spuren,” 418, who has rejected the uncritical acceptance of the Speyer tradition according to which Bishop John's mother was a Salian. Heidrich, “Bischöfe,” 204.

92. Werner Ogris, “Friedelehe,” in *HRG*, vol. 1, cols. 1293–96 (Berlin, 1971). Cf. the choice of name for the Saxon count Ha(h)old's illegitimate son, who was named Bernhard after his maternal grandfather: see MGH DD C.II, 152, and *Vita Meinwerici episcopi patherbrunnensis*, c. 203, ed. Franz Tenckhoff, MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 59 (Hannover, 1921; rpt. 1983).

93. See MGH DD C.II, 114ff.; cf. note 33 above. On the scattered indirect evidence, see *Regesten Konrads II.*, 6, 49b, and 117.

94. On Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VII.62 (*Ottoman Germany*, 352), see *Regesten Konrads II.*, c. There is little reason to translate the word *neptis* as “niece,” if only because Gisela was—strictly speaking—her groom's aunt. See, for instance, the genealogical table in Mertens, “Vom Rhein,” 252.

95. See Karl August Eckhardt, “Theophanu als Ahnfrau,” in *Genealogische Funde zur allgemeinen Geschichte*, 2nd ed. (Witzenhausen, 1963), 91–124.

96. See note 52 above. Cf. Mathilde Uhlirz, “Waren Kaiser Konrad II. und dessen Sohn, Kaiser Heinrich III., Nachkommen Theophanus?” *ZGO* 105, n.s., 66 (1957): 328–33. Werner Ohnsorge, “Waren die Salier Sachsenkaiser?” *Niedersächsisches Jahrbuch* 30 (1958): 28–53.

97. Uhlirz, “Waren Kaiser Konrad II. und dessen Sohn,” 330, on Hugh of Flavigny, *Chronicon*, I and II.16, 366 and 392. See also esp. *Necrologium*, in Hugh of Flavigny, *Chronicon*, 287; cf. IV. Non. Dec. with XVI Kal. Nov.

98. Uhlirz, “Waren Kaiser Konrad II. und dessen Sohn,” 330, incl. n. 11.

99. *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, dd.

100. Cf. *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum*, cc. 1f., ed. Fritz Lošek, MGH Studien und Texte, 15 (Hannover, 1997); *Breves Notitiae*, cc. 1ff., in *Notitia Armonis und Breves Notitiae*, ed. Fritz Lošek, *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für Salzburger Landeskunde* 130 (1990): 5ff.;

ibid., in *Salzburger Urkundenbuch*, vol. 2, ed. Willibald Hauthaler and Franz Martin (Salzburg, 1916), app., 1–23; *Notitia Arnonis*, preface and cc. 1ff., in *Notitia Arnonis und Breves Notitiae*; and ibid., in *Salzburger Urkundenbuch*, vol. 1, ed. Willibald Hauthaler (Salzburg, 1910), 1:1ff.

101. MGH DD C.II, 204 (January 30, 1034). *Regesten Konrads II.*, 211.

102. Adam, *Gesta*, III.32 (31) (*History*, 140).

103. *Liber aureus*, prologue II, 9f.

104. Wipo, “Cantilena in Chuonradum II. factum imperatorem,” 5b, in *Die Werke*, 103: “Ortus avorum/stemmate regum” [proceeding from a family tree of regal grandfathers]. *Annales Quedlinburgenses usque ad a. 1025*, a. 1024, ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz, MGH SS 3:89 (Hannover, 1851; rpt., Stuttgart, 1987): “Conradus, inclyta regum prosapia ortus, in regnum eligitur” [Conrad, born into a renowned family of kings, was elected to the kingship].

105. Weinfurter, *The Salian Century*, 184–85 (genealogical table).

106. Black-Veldtrup, *Kaiserin Agnes*, 112–14.

107. For a last word repudiating Conrad’s illegitimate descent from Otto III, see Winfried Glocker, *Die Verwandten der Ottonen und ihre Bedeutung in der Politik*, Dissertationen zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte, 5 (Cologne, 1989), 296f.

CHAPTER 2

1. On this family line, see Weinfurter, *Heinrich II.*, 199; Eduard Hlawitschka, “Wer waren Kuno und Richlind von Öhningen?” *ZGO* 128, n.s., 89 (1980): 1–49; as well as the bibliography in Hans-Werner Goetz, “Der letzte ‘Karolinger’? Die Regierung Konrads I. im Spiegel seiner Urkunden,” *AfD* 26 (1980): 56–125, esp. 56f., incl. n. 2.

2. On genealogists’ marrying off the dead, see note 13 below. On deceased minors’ becoming grandfathers, see Herwig Wolfram, *History of the Goths*, trans. Thomas J. Dunlap (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1988), 252, incl. n. 42. Emperor Maximilian I (1459–1519), alleged to have been the father of Matthäus Lang (1468–1540), would have been only nine years old at his son’s birth; see Hans Wagner, “Kardinal Matthäus Lang,” in *Lebensbilder aus dem bayerischen Schwaben* (Munich, 1956), 5:45ff.

3. According to the inscription on the lead plaque affixed to Gisela’s grave, in the cathedral of Speyer (see fig. 18), she was born on November 11, 999; this date has given rise to a flood of theories and proposed emendations, ever since the imperial tombs were opened in August 1900. The following works are of interest: *Regesten Konrads II.*, c; Norbert Bischoff, “Über die Chronologie der Kaiserin Gisela und über die Verweigerung ihrer Krönung durch Aribo von Mainz,” *MIÖG* 58 (1950): 283ff.; Eduard Hlawitschka, “Beiträge und Berichte zur Bleitafelinschrift aus dem Grab der Kaiserin Gisela,” *HJ* 97/98 (1978): 439–45, esp. 444f.; and Schwarzmaier, *Von Speyer*, 50ff. Wunder, “Gisela von Schwaben,” 2.

4. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 4 (*Deeds*, 69). Hlawitschka, “Beiträge,” esp. 444f.; and Wunder, “Gisela von Schwaben,” 2. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:4f. and 62.

5. Karl Ferdinand Werner, “Die Nachkommen Karls des Großen bis zum Jahre 1000,” in *Karl der Große*, 4:476 n. VIII.16.

6. Erich Brandenburg, *Die Nachkommen Karls des Großen* (Neustadt an der Aisch, 1935; rpt. 1995), 7 n. IX.19. Wunder, “Gisela von Schwaben,” 3.

7. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 4 (*Deeds*, 69), and idem, *Tetralogus*, vv. 159f., in *Die Werke*, 80.

8. Cf., for instance, Jäschke, “*Tamen*,” 436, with Schwarzmaier, *Von Speyer*, 51.

9. Mertens, “Vom Rhein,” 230, expresses some uncertainty whether Ernest became the duke of Swabia before or after his marriage to Gisela. According to Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1012, “Herimannus . . . iunior dux Alamaniae defunctus Ernestum, sororis suae Giselaе maritum, successorem accepit” [after Hermann the Younger, duke of Swabia, died, he received Ernest, the husband of his sister Gisela, as successor], which seems to indicate that Ernest was already her husband when he became duke.

10. *Annalista Saxo*, a. 1026, ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz, MGH SS 6:676 (Hannover, 1844; rpt., Stuttgart, 1980).

11. Cf. Bischoff, "Über die Chronologie," 286, incl. n. 7, with Emil Kimpen, "Ezzonen und Hezeliniden in der rheinischen Pfalzgrafschaft," *MIÖG*, suppl. vol. 12 (1933): 1–91, esp. 50, incl. n. 4.

12. Cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, c. On the other hand, the Count Liudolf named in a list of signatories to MGH DD H.II, 255 (dated 1013), was certainly not Gisela's son, since the list itself dates back to 1007. See Harry Bresslau, *Handbuch der Urkundenlehre für Deutschland und Italien*, 2nd ed., vol. 2 (Leipzig, 1915), 203, incl. n. 1. Cf. MGH DD H.II, 263 (March 26, 1013), which makes reference to a county of a Count Liudolf on or near the Leine River; he may have been the same individual as mentioned above. See *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 1771 and 1780.

13. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VII.6 (*Ottoman Germany*, 311f.). *Regesten Konrads II.*, c. *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 1851c and d. The date is confirmed by MGH DD H.II, 325, and Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VII.8 (6) (*Ottoman Germany*, 313).

14. *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 1487a and 1508a. Keller, "Schwäbische Herzöge," 135ff., esp. 137 n. 88 and 143 (Bruno of Brunswick). On the latter, see Bernd Schneidmüller, "Otto III.–Heinrich II.: Wende der Königsherrschaft oder Wende der Mediaevistik?" in *Otto III.–Heinrich II.: Eine Wende?* 17, incl. n. 29.

15. *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 1487a and b. Wolf, "Königskandidatur," 93, based on Thietmar, *Chronicon*, v.25 (*Ottoman Germany*, 222), and MGH DD H.II, 34, *narratio*.

16. That Bruno was a candidate is based on *Vita Meinwerci*, c. 7, 13f., and Thangmar, *Vita Bernwardi*, c. 38, ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz, MGH SS 4:775 (Hannover, 1841; rpt., Stuttgart, 1981). Siegfried Hirsch and Harry Bresslau, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs unter Heinrich II.*, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1862), 457, incl. n. 6, however, deny—probably unjustly—their reliability. Cf., for instance, Wunder, "Gisela von Schwaben," 4, and Schwarzmaier, *Von Speyer*, 51f., as well as Wolf, "Königskandidatur," 93.

17. *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 1508a.

18. The attempt made by Kimpen, "Ezzonen," 50ff., is particularly egregious.

19. See, for example, Wunder, "Gisela von Schwaben," 4, and Schwarzmaier, *Von Speyer*, 51f.

20. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VII.6 (*Ottoman Germany*, 311f.).

21. MGH DD C.II, 124; MGH DD H.III, 279 (where Liudolf is called Bruno's son and the father of Ekbert); and *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1038, 43: "Liudolfus comes, privignus imperatoris, IX. Kal. Maii inmatura morte obiit. Et eius frater Herimannus, Alemanniae dux, subita infirmitate preventus, bonis flebilis omnibus XVI Kal. Iulii denotavit" [Count Liudolf, the emperor's stepson, suffered an untimely death on the ninth kalends of May (April 23). And his (step)brother Hermann (IV), duke of Swabia, having been laid low by a sudden illness, was recorded into memory on the sixteenth kalends of July (June 16) to the lament of all good people]. Cf. note 57 below.

22. Kimpen, "Ezzonen," 50, incl. n. 4. However, is this yet another example of Kimpen's "constructive"—not to say speculative—approach to genealogy? For a critique of his methodology, see, for instance, Schneidmüller, "Otto III.–Heinrich II.," 11 n. 10.

23. Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1012 (see note 9 above). Ernest II died on August 18, 1030, according to Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 28 (*Deeds*, 86f.); on August 17, according to Swabian sources (Trillmich, in Wipo, *Gesta*, 587 n. 245). Hermann IV died on July 28, 1038, according to Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 37 (*Deeds*, 96). Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VII.14 (*Ottoman Germany*, 316f.) (date of Ernest I's death). See note 9 above, as well as Mertens, "Vom Rhein," 230f. If the marriage between Gisela and Ernest I was not celebrated until after April 1, 1012, then Ernest II would have been unthinkable young when he first rebelled against his stepfather Conrad II; see Chapter v, at notes 12f. Hermann IV reached his majority before August 9, 1033, since he appears as his mother's guardian in MGH DD C.II, 199.

24. *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 1467c, 1494a, 1537b, and 1539a. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, v.13, v.18., and v.31–32 (*Ottoman Germany*, 214, 217f., and 225ff.). For a detailed discussion of "kinship mores," see Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century*, 87ff. Gerd Althoff, "Königsherrschaft und Konfliktbewältigung im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert," *EMSt* 23 (1989): 268ff.; rpt. in *Spielregeln*, 24ff. Weinfurter, *Heinrich II.*, 186ff.

25. Timothy Reuter, "Unruhestiftung, Fehde, Rebellion, Widerstand: Gewalt und Frieden in der Politik der Salierzeit," in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 3:313.

26. Althoff, "Königsherrschaft," 270–73 (rpt. 24ff.), on Thietmar, *Chronicon*, v.34 (*Ottonian Germany*, 227f.); cf. *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 1580b, incl. references to other registers.

27. Cf. Karl Lechner, *Die Babenberger*, VIÖG, 23, 5th ed. (Vienna, 1994), 60.

28. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VII.14 (*Ottonian Germany*, 316f.). Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1015.

29. Mertens, "Vom Rhein," 231.

30. Cf. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VI.39 (*Ottonian Germany*, 264): *debita memoria*, or due remembrance. On the synod in Ingelheim in 948, see Müller-Mertens and Huschner, *Reichsintegration*, 89f.

31. See, for instance, Hirsch and Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, vol. 3 (Berlin, 1875), 24.

32. *Annalista Saxo*, a. 1026, 676, and Godfrey of Viterbo, *Pantheon (Selections)*, cc. 34f., ed. Georg Waitz, MGH SS 22:241ff. (Hannover, 1872; rpt., Stuttgart, 1976), for the fabulous stories, and 242, for the account of the kidnapping without mentioning Gisela's name. Boshof, *Die Salier*, 28 and 31. Cf. the somewhat odd explanation given for Ernest's behavior in *Regesten Konrads II.*, 40c.

33. Cf. Wunder, "Gisela von Schwaben," 5f.

34. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VII.16 (*Ottonian Germany*, 317).

35. See Chapter IV, at notes 85–87.

36. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, II.39 (*Ottonian Germany*, 120f.). Cf. Armin Wolf, "Wer war Kuno 'von Öhningen?'" *DA* 36 (1980): 25–83; on this point, 47–49. *Innatus honor* [innate honor] is at all events not the womanly honor associated with *integritas famae* [upstanding in repute] and preserving one's virtue, which count more than one's parentage; see, for instance, the pastoral works of Pope Gregory VII, *Registrum*, II.44, ed. Erich Caspar, MGH *Epistolae selectae* 2 (Berlin, 1920; rpt., Munich, 1990), pt. 1, 180–82, esp. 181, lines 34–37, addressed to Queen Judith-Sophia of Hungary, a granddaughter of Gisela and Conrad II.

37. See, in addition to note 32 above, Eduard Hlawitschka, *Untersuchungen zu den Thronwechseln der ersten Hälfte des 11. Jahrhunderts und zur Adelsgeschichte Süddeutschlands*, VE, special vol., 35 (Sigmaringen, 1987), 52, 138f. n. 108, and 152f., and idem, "Beiträge"; on this point, 442 n. 19. Cf. Schwarzmaier, *Von Speyer*, 55, with the current chapter, at notes 15–22.

38. Cf. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VII.4(5)–7, along with VII.62 (*Ottonian Germany*, 310ff. and 352).

39. Matthäus Bernards, "Die Frau in der Welt und die Kirche während des 11. Jahrhunderts," *Sacris Erudiri* 20 (1971): 44.

40. *Regesten Konrads II.*, c.

41. Ibid. and Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VII.62 (*Ottonian Germany*, 352). Wilhelm Wattenbach and Robert Holtzmann, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter: Die Zeit der Sachsen und Salier*, vol. 1, rev. ed. (Cologne, 1967), 54–56.

42. Siegfried of Gorze, "Epistola ad Popponem abbatem Stabloensem," ed. Wilhelm von Giesebrecht, in Giesebrecht, *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit*, vol. 2, 5th ed. (Leipzig, 1885), 714ff. n. 10. Nora Gädeke, *Zeugnisse bildlicher Darstellung der Nachkommenschaft Heinrichs I.*, Arbeiten zur Frühmittelalterforschung, 22 (Berlin, 1992), 72–99, esp. 87ff. Cf. Hans-Walter Klewitz, "Namengebung und Sippenbewußtsein," *AUF* 18 (1949): 23–37; on this point, 26–28.

43. Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum Libri Quinque/Five Books*, IV, preface 1, 170–73. On this passage, cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, m (second half of entry), 9; on the author's attitude toward Conrad II in general, see Karl Ferdinand Werner, "Das hochmittelalterliche Imperium, im politischen Bewußtsein Frankreichs (10.–12. Jahrhundert)," *HZ* 200 (1965): 1–60; on this point, 26ff.

44. See Chapter I, at note 64, concerning Conrad and Matilda. On the troubles of Otto and Irmgard of Hammerstein, see Weinfurter, *Heinrich II.*, 199ff., and Wilfried Hartmann, "Probleme des geistlichen Gerichts," *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto Medioevo* 44, 2 (1997): 662, incl. nn. 71f.; cf. Werner Maleczek, "Echte und zweifelhaft Stammbäume bei kanonischen Eheprozessen bis ins frühe 13. Jahrhundert," *Veröffentlichungen*

des *Innsbrucker Stadtarchivs*, n.s., 18 (1988): 123–43; on this point, 127f.; and Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 52–54.

45. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 1 (*Deeds*, 58).

46. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VII.26 (*Ottonian Germany*, 325). *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 1870b.

47. Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1015. On Orthodox canon law concerning marriage, see Hans-Georg Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich*, Byzantinisches Handbuch 2, 1 (Munich, 1959), 89, or Karl Eduard Zachariä von Lingenthal, *Geschichte des griechisch-römischen Rechts*, 3rd ed. (Berlin, 1892), 81–83.

48. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VII.62 (45): “Cono cui iam inlicita nupsit neptis sua”; cf. *ibid.* VI.86 and IV.64 (294 and 196); the latter entry concerns a Saxon nun of noble parentage who married a Slavic magnate.

49. On Conrad’s date of birth, see Chapter I, at note 19. On terming Henry III “Benjamin” [Gen. 35:18], see *Chronicon Novaliciense*, c. 17. See *Annales Spirenses*, a. 1038, ed. Ludwig Bethmann, MGH SS 17:82 (Hannover, 1844; rpt., Stuttgart, 1980), on Henry’s conception by aged parents. Henry’s date of birth may be deduced from Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 23 (*Deeds*, 84), and Lampert of Hersfeld, *Annales*, a. 1056: He was born on the Feast of Saints Simon and Judas, i.e., October 28. Beatrix died on September 26, 1036: K. Schmid, “Die Sorge,” 696 n. 167, and Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:101 n. 1; cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 46a and 243. According to the *Annales Quedlinburgenses*, a. 1025, 90, Conrad and Gisela handed Beatrix over to Abbess Adelheid of Quedlinburg to be raised in mid-1025, at which time she was still their only daughter. They may have done so in preparation for their upcoming trip to Rome (Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:90f.) or because Gisela had again—and for the last time—become pregnant (see Chapter V, at note 38). Beatrix probably remained at the cloister of Quedlinburg until the time of her death; the donation made for the sake of her soul (MGH DD C.II, 233 [October 25, 1036]) supports this theory. In Quedlinburg Beatrix received a public and respectful welcome; thus, she was not a very young child. She may have been approximately five or six years old at the time and thus would have been born around 1020. Her sister, Matilda, was born in fall 1025 at the very earliest (see Chapter V, at note 38) and died in early 1034, at which time she was already engaged to marry the king of France. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 32 (*Deeds*, 90). *Regesten Konrads II.*, 210d; see esp. K. Schmid, “Die Sorge,” 684f.: Matilda must be the young girl who was buried in the central grave of the Worms family tomb; Conrad the Red was obviously “transferred to another grave, located to the front and side,” to accommodate her.

50. See Chapter I, at notes 33 and 91–93. On the two sisters from Lotharingia, see Hansmartin Schwarzmaier, “Reichenauer Gedenkbucheinträge aus der Anfangszeit der Regierung König Konrads II.,” *Zeitschrift für württembergische Landesgeschichte* 22 (1963): 22, incl. n. 15, based on *Chronicon s. Michaelis monasterii in pago Virdunensi*, c. 32, ed. Georg Waitz, MGH SS 4:84 (Hannover, 1841; rpt., Stuttgart, 1981). Not found in *Regesten Konrads II.*

51. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 4 (*Deeds*, 69), and *idem*, *Tetralogus*, v. 133. Concerning Gisela’s effect on the clergy at court, see “Februarius,” in *Acta Sanctorum*, 3:548 (Antwerp, 1658; rpt., Brussels, 1966).

52. Edith Ennen, *The Medieval Woman*, trans. Edmund Jephcott (Oxford, 1990), 69.

53. Jäschke, “*Tamen*,” 434ff., esp. incl. nn. 62 and 119. On Conrad’s height, see Erkens, *Konrad II.*, 10, incl. n. 3, and 223 (bibliography), as well as Chapter I, at note 76.

54. Wolfram, *Grenzen und Räume*, 349f., on the *tempus amplexandi*; on Matilda’s birth and engagement, which quite possibly took place in 1038, in other words, when she was approximately eight years of age, see Chapter V, at note 38, and Chapter XIV, at note 21, as well as *Regesten Konrads II.*, 194b; cf. *ibid.*, 210d, and the supplementary material in K. Schmid, “Die Sorge,” 684f. On Beatrix, see *Regesten Konrads II.*, 46a. Insertion of the words *unici filii nostri* [our sole son] in the diplomas issued by Conrad from MGH DD C.II, 114, on indicate Henry’s intervention. On the possibility that the empress was called Gisle, see Hansmartin Decker-Hauff, “Die ‘Reichskrone,’ angefertigt für Kaiser Otto,” in *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik*, ed. Percy Ernst Schramm, Schriften der MGH, 13, pt. 2 (Stuttgart, 1955), 630.

55. Jäschke, "Tamen," 434 n. 65f. and 437f. Cf. Wipo, *Tetralogus*, vv. 157–82.
56. On Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1043, see Arno Borst, "Ein exemplarischer Tod," in *Tod im Mittelalter*, ed. Arno Borst et al., Konstanzer Bibliothek, 20 (Constance, 1993), 29. On the date of Gisela's death, see Karl Schmid, ed., *Die Klostersgemeinschaft von Fulda*, Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften, 8 (Munich, 1978), vol. 2, 1:318.
57. See note 21 above, concerning Liudolf; *Regesten Konrads II.*, 158c, on Ernest II; and *Regesten Konrads II.*, 285a, on Hermann IV. See Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:101 n. 1, and K. Schmid, "Die Sorge," 694 and 696 n. 167, concerning Beatrix, and *Regesten Konrads II.*, 210d, and the supplementary material in K. Schmid, "Die Sorge," 684f., concerning Matilda.
58. See note 22 above.
59. Borst, "Ein exemplarischer Tod," 29.
60. Wipo, "Cantilena," c. 6a, 104. *Regesten Konrads II.*, f, esp. vis-à-vis Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VII.62 (*Ottomanian Germany*, 352), and Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1017. Cf. Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century*, 86ff. and 158; for the associated note, see the original German publication, *Lebensordnungen*, 1:217 n. 5.
61. *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 1693a.
62. Cf. Rudolf Much, *Die Germania des Tacitus*, 3rd ed. (Heidelberg, 1967), 297f., on Tacitus, *Germania*, c. 20 (Mattingly trans., 117–18).
63. Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, aa. 1017 and 1019; cf. a. 1012. Karl Engelhardt Klaar, *Die Herrschaft der Eppensteiner in Kärnten*, Archiv für vaterländische Geschichte und Topographie, 61 (Klagenfurt, 1966), 25 n. 26. Mertens, "Vom Rhein," 232f., on the year Gisela's mother, Gerberga, died.
64. Cf., for instance, Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VII.6 (*Ottomanian Germany*, 311).
65. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 3 (*Deeds*, 67).
66. MGH DD H.II, 427. *Regesten Konrads II.*, h. See Chapter I, at notes 82f.
67. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 2063a and m.
68. Cf. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 2 (*Deeds*, 62–63), with *ibid.*, close (64).
69. Cf. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, v.14–32 and VI.22 (*Ottomanian Germany*, 214ff. and 252). Weinfurter, *Heinrich II.*, 187ff. and 193ff.
70. Cf. Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 110ff. and 134ff.
71. Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century*, 91; for the associated, see the original German publication, *Lebensordnungen*, 1:125 n. 46, based on Hucbald of Saint-Amand, *Vita s. Rictrudis*, c. 5, in *PL*, 132:834, written in 907.

CHAPTER 3

1. For the quote, see Wipo's introductory letter, or *epistola*, to the *Gesta* (*Deeds*, 53). The context clearly indicates that Wipo titled his work *The Deeds*, or *Gesta*, of Conrad II. See also *idem*, prologue to *Gesta* (*Deeds*, 53ff.). Cf. Weinfurter, *The Salian Century*, 15f.
2. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 1–3 (*Deeds*, 57–68), contains so many details that its author must have been an eyewitness to the proceedings. Even though there is no unambiguous statement to that effect, his use of the ablative absolute in the Latin phrase *pluribus videntibus* [with many looking on] suggests that Wipo was among those who from a distance saw Conrad the Elder give Conrad the Younger the kiss of peace and concord; see Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 2 (*Deeds*, 64).
3. See, for instance, Weinfurter, *The Salian Century*, 19f., and *Regesten Konrads II.*, m.
4. Cf. Weinfurter, *The Salian Century*, 19ff., and in general Lothar Bornscheuer, *Miseriae Regum*, Arbeiten zur Frühmittelalterforschung, 4 (Berlin, 1968), esp. 183ff. The election assembly was called for September 4, 1024; see Bern of Reichenau, *Die Briefe*, no. 10, 37. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:25, incl. n. 4, assumes that the election was held on either September 6 or 7, 1024.
5. Cf. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 1 (*Deeds*, 57): "In the year 1024 from the incarnation of the Lord, the Emperor Henry II, although sound of mind, was taken with an infirmity of the

body. . . . The Empire was sound, its affairs well ordered; and after long labor, he had finally begun to reap the ripe fruit of peace.” On the events of 1002, see Weinfurter, *Heinrich II.*, 36ff.; cf. Chapter II, at notes 14ff.

6. *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, gg.

7. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 1–2 (*Deeds*, 58 and 65). The quote refers to the transfer of the imperial insignia to Conrad II after his election.

8. Cf. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 1 (*Deeds*, 58), with *ibid.*, c. 7 (73f.), and *Regesten Konrads II.*, i.

9. Cf. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 1 (*Deeds*, 58), and Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1024, which mentions only the two Conrads by name, adding that it was “chiefly” (*praecipue*) they who endeavored to succeed Henry II.

10. *Regesten Konrads II.*, k and l. Cf. Chapter XI, at notes 97–102.

11. *Regesten Konrads II.*, m, concerning Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 2 (*Deeds*, 62ff.). On the Slavs’ participation, see Christian Lübke, *Regesten zur Geschichte der Slaven an Elbe und Oder (vom Jahr 900 an)*, vol. 4 (Berlin, 1987), no. 570. On the import of the confidential conversation between the Conrads, see Althoff, *Spielregeln*, 164–66. On the import of the kiss (of peace), see Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century*, 38ff., and Klaus Schreiner, “Er küßte mich mit dem Kuß seines Mundes’: Metaphorik, kommunikative und herrschaftliche Funktionen einer symbolischen Handlung,” in *Höfische Repräsentation: Das Zeremoniell und die Zeichen*, ed. Hedda Ragotzky and Horst Wenzel (Tübingen, 1990), esp. 113ff. On Odilo of Cluny, see *Regesten Konrads II.*, 1, on MGH DD C.II, 1. On the Lotharingians, see Matthias Werner, “Der Herzog von Lothringen in salischer Zeit,” in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 1:436f., and Boshof, *Die Salier*, 34. Cf. Weinfurter, “Die Zentralisierung,” 245f.: The future Henry II was his father’s *condux* [co-duke].

12. Cf. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 2 (*Deeds*, 65), with Thietmar, *Chronicon*, IV.54 (34) (*Ottonian Germany*, 190), or *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, ss.

13. Quote from Engels, “Der Dom zu Speyer,” 28, as cited by K. Schmid, “Haus- und Herrschaftsverständnis,” 30, who concurs.

14. Weinfurter, *The Salian Century*, 19f., and *idem*, “Die Salier und das Reich,” introduction to *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 8, incl. nn. 32–35. Cf. the oldest evidence for the inheritance of a county through the female line, in MGH DD F.I, 200 (January 1, 1058); Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:371 and 500ff.

15. See esp. Weinfurter, “Die Salier und das Reich,” 8, incl. n. 36, based on Hlawitschka, *Untersuchungen*, 79ff., as well as Boshof, *Die Salier*, 34. Cf. Chapter I, at notes 4 and 95f. (kinship with Ottonians).

16. On Conrad’s ancestors, see Chapter I, at notes 14f. and 50–52; Boshof, *Die Salier*, 9. Cf. also Chapter II, at notes 4–8. On the issue of Henry II’s designation of his successor, see *Regesten Konrads II.*, m (middle of entry), 9, and Boshof, *Die Salier*, 33.

17. Althoff, *Spielregeln*, 296. Weinfurter, *The Salian Century*, 50f., and Schwarzmaier, “Reichenauer Gedenkbucheinträge,” 21f. On Frederick’s position during the lifetime of his father, Dietrich I, see Goetz, “Das Herzogtum,” 269; cf. M. Werner, “Der Herzog,” 436f.

18. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 2 (*Deeds*, 64f.).

19. Weinfurter, *The Salian Century*, 21f. Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio*, 122f.

20. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 2 (*Deeds*, 65). Althoff, *Spielregeln*, 296.

CHAPTER 4

1. On the significance of the Marian feast, see Ernst-Dieter Hehl, “Maria und das ottonisch-salische Königtum: Urkunden, Liturgie, Bilder,” *HJ* 117 (1997): 271ff. On the letter from Aribio to Cunigunde (“Aribio an Kaiserin Kunigunde,” in *Epistolae Moguntinae*, ed. Philipp Jaffé, *Bibliotheca rerum Germanicarum*, 3 [Berlin, 1866], no. 24, pp. 360–62, esp. 361), see *Regesten Konrads II.*, m (close), 10. Schramm, *Kaiser, Könige und Päpste*, 3:122, incl. n. 61. See Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 2 (*Deeds*, 65), and Althoff, *Spielregeln*, 296, incl. n. 40, on the departure of the “unreconciled” Archbishop Pilgrim. Herbert Zielinski, *Das Reichsepiskopat*

in *spätottonischer und salischer Zeit (1002–1225)*, vol. 1 (Stuttgart, 1984), 33, concerning Aribo and Pilgrim.

2. Cf. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 2 and 4 (*Deeds*, 65 and 69), with Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1024, which reports both coronation dates, September 8 and 21, without comment.

3. Weinfurter, *Heinrich II.*, 203f. Wolf, “Königskandidatur,” 91, incl. nn. 139f. *Regesten Konrads II.*, m (close), 10: Aribo’s letter to Cunigunde, “Aribo an Kaiserin Kunigunde,” in *Epistolae Moguntinae*, 3:360ff.

4. Wolf, “Königskandidatur,” 87f. and 90f. Bischoff, “Über die Chronologie,” 306. *Regesten Konrads II.*, o. One of the best descriptions and critiques of the attempts so far to clarify Aribo’s actions may be found in Hlawitschka, *Untersuchungen*, 140f. n. 114.

5. Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century*, 145f., on Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, x.184: “nobilis, non vilis, cuius et nomen et genus scitur.” Siegfried of Gorze, “Epistola ad Popponem,” 714f., evidenced a knowledge of the royal pair’s ancestry; cf. Wolf, “Königskandidatur,” 90, incl. n. 134.

6. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, vii.62 (45) (*Ottonian Germany*, 352). See Chapter I, at note 94, and Chapter II, at notes 41ff.

7. Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum Libri Quinque/Five Books*, iv, preface 1, 170–73, esp. 170–71, called Gisela “affinis, quam etiam primitus quidam cognatus ipsius duxerat” (close to him [Conrad] in blood, one previously, moreover, married to a cousin of his). John France translated *ipsius* with “of his” (i.e., of Conrad’s), although “of hers” would surely make more sense and be more correct grammatically. This hardly changes the fundamental meaning of the passage, however, since Conrad’s blood relative would have been Gisela’s, too.

8. Constantinus, *Vita Adalberonis II.*, cc. 16–20, 663f. Wolf, “Königskandidatur,” 63–87. Siegfried of Gorze, “Epistola ad Popponem,” 714ff. Cf. Chapter II, at note 42.

9. *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 1483yy and 1496a. Jäschke, “*Tamen*,” 433 and 435.

10. Jäschke, “*Tamen*,” 437, on Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 4 (*Deeds*, 68f.). Werla was located in the southeastern portion of present-day Lower Saxony.

11. Beck, *Kirche*, 89. Lingenthal, *Geschichte des griechisch-römischen Rechts*, 81–83.

12. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 112d, 155a and 163a. *Ibid.*, 172b. See Boshof, *Die Salier*, 58. On the dispute over Gandersheim, see Hans Goetting, comp., *Das Bistum Hildesheim*, vol. 3, *Die Hildesheimer Bischöfe von 815 bis 1221 (1227)*, Germania Sacra, n.s., 20 (Berlin, 1984), 239–47. Except for the reference to Byzantium, the interpretation of Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 4 (*Deeds*, 69) (cf. note 10 above), offered here was proposed by Erna Ramser in her senior thesis (University of Vienna, 1998).

13. For a map of the ecclesiastical provinces, see, for example, Weinfurter, *The Salian Century*, 23, or Zielinski, *Das Reichsepiskopat*, 286.

14. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 3 (*Deeds*, 66–68).

15. See Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 4f. (*Deeds*, 68–71). In the last line of his section “On the Disposition of Offices and On the Queen” Wipo allows that he has digressed from his theme: “intermissis regalibus gestis nunc ad eadem revertar. / Ad gesta . . . regis Chuonradi stilo provoluto” (interrupting the account of the deeds of the King; now I shall return to the latter). Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 5 (*Deeds*, 70–71); Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio*, 48f. and 124, incl. n. 70 (banquet celebrating the royal coronation); cf. Althoff, “Königsherrschaft,” 30f. (rpt. 272), for a similar scene in which Henry II grants someone a pardon. Contrariwise, Frederick I did not show mercy to a ministerial who had insulted him before the royal election; see Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici I. imperatoris*, II.3 (*The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*, 117). On this topic in general, see Bornscheuer, *Miseriae Regum*, esp. 194ff.

16. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 3 and 5 (*Deeds*, 67 and 70–71); see esp. the beginning and close of c. 5. Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio*, 123f. (*ordo* of Mainz) and 124 (exercising duties of office prior to coronation). Althoff, “Königsherrschaft,” 35f. (rpt. 275f., incl. n. 37).

17. Cf. *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 2054b, with *Regesten Konrads II.*, h.

18. See Chapter I, at note 63.

19. Cf. Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century*, 90 and 390ff.

20. *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 1537b.

21. Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum Libri Quinque/Five Books*, IV, prefaces 1–2 and 5, 170ff. and 176ff.

22. Cf. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 4 (*Deeds*, 68), with Thietmar, *Chronicon*, v.11 (*Ottonian Germany*, 213). Georg Waitz and Gerhard Seliger, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*, 2nd ed. (Berlin, 1896; rpt., Darmstadt and Graz, 1956), 6:480ff.

23. On the knight Werner, cf. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 4 (*Deeds*, 69), with MGH DD C.II, 35, and *Regesten Konrads II.*, 35. On the steward Conrad, see Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 37 (*Deeds*, 95), and Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:275, incl. n. 4. For a discussion of the term *miles*, which Wipo uses to identify Werner, see Franz-Reiner Erkens, “Militia und Ritterschaft: Reflexionen über die Entstehung des Rittertums,” *HZ* 258 (1994): 632. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:29f., incl. n. 3. *Ruodlieb*, IV, vv. 68, 165, and 185 (Ford trans., 24, 27, and 28).

24. Josef Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle der deutschen Könige*, Schriften der MGH, 16, pt. 2, *Die Hofkapelle im Rahmen der ottonisch-salischen Reichskirche* (Stuttgart, 1966), 156ff., esp. 160ff.; and 238ff., esp. 240f., as well as 191f., incl. n. 266, concerning chaplains as royal emissaries.

25. Heinrich Appelt, “Die Kanzlei Friedrich Barbarossas, in *Die Zeit der Staufer: Geschichte, Kunst, Kultur*, exh. cat. (Stuttgart, 1979), 5:17–34. Peter Csendes, “Kanzlei, Kanzler,” in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. 5 (Munich and Zurich, 1991), cols. 910–12.

26. Brühl, *Deutschland—Frankreich*, 580f., uses the term “East Frankish chancery” even in reference to the reign of Otto III.

27. Bresslau, *Handbuch*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1912), 441–45 and 467–73. MGH DD C.II, 547, s.v. *regnum Italicum*.

28. *Regesten Konrads II.*, o. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 161ff. and 171ff.; cf. 98f. Cf. Müller-Mertens and Huschner, *Reichsintegration*, 291 and 360ff.

29. Conrad II’s loyal aide Bishop Bruno of Augsburg had to the bitter end opposed the foundation of Bamberg as a bishopric by his brother, Emperor Henry II. *Regesten Konrads II.*, p, counters the claim that the bishop hoped to use his influence over Gisela to achieve the see’s abolition.

30. MGH DD C.II, 11–14; cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 11–14.

31. For example, cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 2, with MGH DD C.II, 2.

32. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 1; MGH DD C.II, 1.

33. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 2f.; MGH DD C.II, 2f.

34. MGH DD C.II, 4. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 4.

35. Anselm of Liège, *Gesta episcoporum Leodiensium*, c. 44, ed. Rudolf Koepke, MGH SS 7:216 (Hannover, 1846; rpt., Stuttgart, 1995). Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:342, incl. n. 2. On the importance of the pledge in Jewish business dealings with fellow Jews and with non-Jews, see Hans-Georg von Mutius, *Rechtsentscheide rheinischer Rabbinen vor dem ersten Kreuzzug*, Judentum und Umwelt, 13 (Frankfurt am Main, 1984 and 1985), 1:21ff. and 56ff.; 2:1ff., 59ff., 113ff., and 116ff. Cf. Chapter IX, at note 75. Wipo, *Gesta*, 37 (*Deeds*, 96), concerning the summer of 1038.

36. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:286f., based on Ekkehard IV of Saint Gall, *Casus sancti Galli*, c. 66.

37. *Die ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*, no. 5, ed. Walther Bulst, MGH Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit, 3:20ff. (Weimar, 1949; rpt., Munich, 1977). Schwarzmaier, *Von Speyer*, 72ff. On Gunhild’s Danish chaplain, see Chapter XVII, at note 83.

38. Müller-Mertens and Huschner, *Reichsintegration*, esp. 116ff., 372ff., and 382. Eckhard Müller-Mertens, “Reich und Hauptorte der Salier: Probleme und Fragen,” in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 1:139ff., esp. 145ff. and 154ff. Keller, “Reichsstruktur,” 87ff. Carlrichard Brühl, *Fodrum, Gistum, Servitium Regis*, Kölner historische Abhandlungen, 14 (Cologne, 1968), 1:197ff. and 207. Wolfgang Metz, *Das Servitium regis*, Erträge der Forschung, 89 (Darmstadt, 1978), 74ff. and 87ff.

39. See Müller-Mertens and Huschner, *Reichsintegration*, 330, where the authors concur with the source of the quote, Keller, “Reichsstruktur,” 117. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 6 (*Deeds*, 71). Roderich Schmidt lay the groundwork for this area of study in his work titled *Königsumritt und Huldigung in ottonisch-salischer Zeit*, VF, 6:91–233 (Constance, 1961), esp. 106ff. and 150ff.

40. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 4; MGH DD C.II, 4.
41. On the veneration of the Virgin Mary, see Hehl, "Maria," 271ff., esp. 275.
42. Müller-Mertens and Huschner, *Reichsintegration*, 384.
43. MGH DD C.II, 198 (July 2, 1033). *Regesten Konrads II.*, 205. Cf. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:14, incl. n. 2, and 325.
44. *Regesten Konrads II.*, k and l. Hartmut Hoffmann, "Grafschaften in Bischofshand," *DA* 46 (1990): 427ff. Cf. Chapter III, at note 10.
45. *Regesten Konrads II.*, s and 4a. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 4 (*Deeds*, 69). Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1024. Weinfurter, *The Salian Century*, 24. See note 1 above. Kienast, *Deutschland und Frankreich*, 1:150ff.
46. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 6 (*Deeds*, 72). *Regesten Konrads II.*, 5 and 5a. Weinfurter, *The Salian Century*, 26. On equating *publicus* with "regal," see Walter Schlesinger, "Über germanisches Heerkönigtum," in *Beiträge zur deutschen Verfassungsgeschichte des Mittelalters* (Göttingen, 1963), 1:77 n. 124; rpt. in *Das Königtum: Seine geistigen und rechtlichen Grundlagen*, VF, 3, 4th ed. (Sigmaringen, 1973), 130. The royal demesne is termed *publicum regale* in MGH DD C.II, 54. On the meaning of *milites*, see Erkens, "Militia und Ritterschaft," 628ff.
47. Merta, "Die Titel," 165f. and 173f., esp. on MGH DD H.II, 70, 74–76, 78f., 84–86, and 95, as well as MGH DD C.II, 52 and 64. Cf. Weinfurter, "Die Zentralisierung," 242 and 294f. On the internal weakness of the French alliance, see Kienast, *Deutschland und Frankreich*, 1:152f., and Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:31, 77 and 109f. Brühl, *Deutschland—Frankreich*, 691–93, offers some solid arguments undercutting the contention that the French seriously intended to mount an invasion at that time. On Verdun, see Hoffmann, "Grafschaften," 447ff. and 475f.; cf. Chapter v, at note 17. The Lotharingians lampooned the bishops for being the first to break the oath not to recognize Conrad: *Gesta episcoporum Cameracensium*, III.50, 485.
48. Müller-Mertens and Huschner, *Reichsintegration*, 22 and 137, concerning *Regesten Konrads II.*, 6–8a. See esp. *Annales Quedlinburgenses*, a. 1024. On the *occursio Caesari*, see Harald Krahwinkler, *Friaul im Frühmittelalter*, VIÖG, 30 (Vienna, 1992), 31, incl. n. 10.
49. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, v.3 (2)–6 (4) (*Ottoman Germany*, 207ff.). Cf. *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 1483, tt–vv. Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century*, 25.
50. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 8c and 26. On the confirmation of the Saxon tribal law, see, for example, Weinfurter, "Die Zentralisierung," 288f. Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *Laudes Regiae* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1958), 98f.
51. Müller-Mertens and Huschner, *Reichsintegration*, 97f. and 384f.
52. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 8f–22a. See esp. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 6 (*Deeds*, 72), and Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 573, on the tribute from the Slavs, and MGH DD C.II, 18, on the diploma for the merchants of Magdeburg. On the Saxon famine of 1025, see Fritz Curschmann, *Hungersnöte im Mittelalter*, Leipziger Studien aus dem Gebiet der Geschichte, 6:1 (Leipzig, 1900), 111f.
53. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 6 (*Deeds*, 72f.). *Regesten Konrads II.*, 23–27. Müller-Mertens and Huschner, *Reichsintegration*, esp. 319ff. and 382; see also 446, s.v. "Carinthia."
54. Müller-Mertens and Huschner, *Reichsintegration*, 86ff., 373, 376, and 385 nn. 21f.
55. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 24f., along with MGH DD C.II, 24f.
56. *Annales Sangallenses maiores*, a. 1025, in Wipo, *Gesta*, and *ibid.*, ed. C. Henking, in *Mitteilungen zur vaterländischen Geschichte*, Historischer Verein in St. Gallen, n.s. 9 (Saint Gall, 1884). *Regesten Konrads II.*, 23b.
57. Cf. Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, aa. 1012 and 1036, with esp. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 21 (*Deeds*, 83).
58. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 6 (*Deeds*, 72).
59. Cf. Mertens, "Vom Rhein," 234ff.
60. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 28–35.
61. *Ibid.*, 26, along with MGH DD C.II, 26.
62. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 27, along with MGH DD C.II, 27. The *Schatzwurf* was a ritual dating from Frankish times, in which the master or mistress knocked a small coin out of the freed servant's hand.

63. Weinfurter, *Heinrich II.*, 103ff. MGH DD H.II, 2f. Wilhelm Störmer, "Kaiser Heinrich II., Kaiserin Kunigunde und das Herzogtum Bayern," *Zeitschrift für bayerische Landesgeschichte* 60 (1997): 456ff. Cf. K. Brunner, *Herzogtümer*, 149, with *Regesten Konrads II.*, 25a. MGH DD C.II, 30 (cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 30), in which Conrad reconfirmed a gift made by Henry II for the sake of his and Cunigunde's souls.

64. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 28 and 31, along with MGH DD C.II, 28 and 31.

65. MGH DD C.II, 29; cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 29.

66. MGH DD C.II, 33; cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 33, and K. Brunner, *Herzogtümer*, 155f. *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Babenberger in Österreich*, vol. 4, pt. 1, ed. Heinrich Fichtenau, Publikationen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung, 3rd ser. (Vienna, 1968; rpt. 1997), 7–13, incl. nos. 556–65. MGH DD H.II, 22. On MGH DD C.II, 221, see 432. Erwin Kupfer, *Das Königsgut im mittelalterlichen Niederösterreich vom 9. bis zum 12. Jahrhundert*, Studien und Forschungen aus dem Niederösterreichischen Institut für Landeskunde, 28 (Saint Pölten, 2000), 119ff.; cf. 181f. (list of diplomas issued by Salian emperors for landholders in Austria).

67. MGH DD C.II, 32; cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 32, and K. Brunner, *Herzogtümer*, 149.

68. See Chapter II, at note 63. MGH DD O.III, 355 (April 13, 1000). Klaar, *Die Herrschaft der Eppensteiner*, no. 22, 23f. Josef Riegler, *Aflenz* (Hausmannstätten, 1990), 20f. and 25.

69. MGH DD C.II, 34; cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 34, and K. Brunner, *Herzogtümer*, 137ff., esp. 137–53 and 155–57.

70. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 4 (*Deeds*, 69). The verse in the subhead is from Franz Grillparzer, *König Ottokars Glück und Ende* (1825), act III, line 1790.

71. MGH DD C.II, 35–37; cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 35 and 37f.

72. Cf. Müller-Mertens and Huschner, *Reichsintegration*, 385.

73. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 6 and 7 (*Deeds*, 73–74), in each case at the close of the chapter.

74. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 38a and 40b. Arnulf of Milan, *Gesta archiepiscoporum Mediolanensium*, II.2, ed. Ludwig Bethmann and Wilhelm Wattenbach, MGH SS 8:12 (Hannover, 1848; rpt., Stuttgart, 1987), or idem, *Liber gestorum recentium*, II.2, ed. Claudia Zey, MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 67:146f. (Hannover, 1994).

75. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 7 (*Deeds*, 73–74). Helmut Beumann, "Zur Entwicklung transpersonaler Staatsvorstellungen," in *Das Königtum: Seine geistigen und rechtlichen Grundlagen*, VI, 3 (Sigmaringen, 1954), 185ff.; rpt. in idem, *Wissenschaft vom Mittelalter* (Cologne, 1972), 135ff. As Coué, "Acht Bischofsviten," 350, points out, the ship metaphor is also found in the contemporary *Vita Burchardi*, c. 17, 840. On the concrete economic and legal associations, see most recently Carlrichard Brühl and Cinzio Violante, *Die "Honorantie civitatis papie,"* cc. 1ff. (Cologne, 1983), 17 and 32ff. Cf. idem in *Instituta regalia et ministeria camerae regum Longobardorum et Honorantie civitatis Papiae*, cc. 1ff., ed. Adolf Hofmeister, MGH SS 30, pt. 2, 1451ff. (Hannover, 1934; rpt., Stuttgart, 1976).

76. Wolfram, *History of the Goths*, 289f., incl. n. 205; 291, incl. n. 9; and 339ff.

77. Wolfram, *Intitulatio I*, 217ff.

78. Merta, "Die Titel," 165f. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VI.6–8 (*Ottoman Germany*, 241ff.). *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 1562g. Cf. Carlrichard Brühl, "Das 'Palatium' von Pavia und die 'Honorantie civitatis Papiae,'" in *Aus Mittelalter und Diplomatie*, vol. 1 (Hildesheim, 1989), 138–69, esp. 150ff.

79. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 1 and 38a. See esp. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 7 (*Deeds*, 73–74). On Bautzen, see Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, nos. 534 and 589, esp. vis-à-vis Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:276f. n. 4, concerning the comment found in *Annalista Saxo*, a. 1029, 678.

80. *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, ce.

81. *Regesten Konrads II.*, q and r.

82. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 39, along with MGH DD C.II, 38 and 84.

83. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 40b.

84. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 8 (*Deeds*, 74–75). *Regesten Konrads II.*, 39a and 40. Weinfurter, *The Salian Century*, 47ff. Helmut Beumann, "Das Imperium und die Regna bei Wipo," in *Aus Geschichte und Landeskunde* (Bonn, 1960), II–36; rpt. in idem, *Wissenschaft vom Mittelalter*, 175–200.

85. See Weinfurter, *The Salian Century*, 46, for a genealogy of the Burgundian house.

86. *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 1616a, 1886a, and 1921a. Cf. esp. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VII.28 and VIII.7 (5) (*Ottoman Germany*, 326f. and 366).
87. Weinfurter, *The Salian Century*, 48f., quote from 48.
88. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 8 (*Deeds*, 75).
89. Herwig Wolfram, "Augustus," in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. 1 (Munich, 1980), col. 1233. Isidore, *Etymologiae*, VII.6, 1:43, and esp. IX.3, 1:16. Cf. Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton, 1957; rpt. 1997), 58f., incl. n. 34.
90. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 30 (*Deeds*, 89). *Regesten Konrads II.*, 192a–c.
91. Schwarzmaier, "Reichenauer Gedenkbucheinträge"; facsimile follows p. 24. Helmuth Kluger, "Propter claritatem generis: Genealogisches zur Familie der Ezzonen," in *Köln: Stadt und Bistum in Kirche und Reich des Mittelalters: Festschrift Odilo Engels zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Hanna Vollrath und Stefan Weinfurter, Kölner historische Abhandlungen, 39 (Cologne, 1993), 243f. Weinfurter, *The Salian Century*, 51. Müller-Mertens and Huschner, *Reichsintegration*, 176, incl. n. 116, and 200, incl. n. 325, aver that the meeting at Reichenau took place sometime from midsummer to fall of 1025, when there is a "gap" in Conrad's itinerary (cf. *ibid.*, 386 nn. 34f.), which seems less likely in the face of Schwarzmaier's calculations.
92. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 10 (*Deeds*, 75). Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1025; the entire entry concerns the rebellion by Conrad the Younger in league with Ernest and Welf II, a Swabian count.
93. Keller, "Reichsstruktur," esp. 99f. Beumann, "Zur Entwicklung."

CHAPTER 5

1. See Widukind, *Res gestae Saxonicae*, III.17, concerning Conrad the Red. The two remaining quotes are from Vilhelm Grönbeck, *Kultur und Religion der Germanen*, 5th ed. (Stuttgart, 1954), 1:63f. The author wishes to thank Georg Kugler for providing the reference to Karl Kraus, *Sprüche und Widersprüche*, 3rd ed. (Vienna, 1924), 97, and Artur Rosenauer for identifying Kraus—not the Austrian dramatist Johann Nestroy (d. 1862)—as the source of the observation concerning "family ties." Nestroy had, however, made similar comments; see esp. his theater piece *Zu ebener Erde und erster Stock*.
2. Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century*, 390f.
3. *Ibid.*, 87 and 120ff.
4. Reinhard Wenskus, *Stammesbildung und Verfassung: Das Werden der frühmittelalterlichen "gentes"*, 2nd ed. (Cologne, 1967), 10f., 36, and 423.
5. Wipo, *Gesta* cc. 25 and 28 (*Deeds*, 85 and 86f.). Althoff, *Spielregeln*, 186.
6. See Chapter IV, at notes 56ff.
7. See Chapter IV, at notes 91f.
8. See Chapter IV, at notes 84–90.
9. Wipo, *Gesta* cc. 10, 19f., 25, and 28, as well as 37 (close) (*Deeds*, 75, 81f., 85, and 86f., as well as 96).
10. Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1025. Cf. K. Brunner, *Herzogtümer*, 153f. and 175 (genealogical table).
11. See Chapter II, at note 23. According to Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VII.14 (*Ottoman Germany*, 316f.), Gisela's marriage to Ernest I ended on May 31, 1015; thus, Hermann IV must have been born by February 1016. See Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:125f., concerning his majority.
12. Wipo, *Gesta* c. 1 (*Deeds*, 58).
13. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 40 c. Mayer-Homberg, *Die fränkischen Volksrechte*, 297. Cf. Chapter II, at note 23.
14. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, v.3 (12) and 25 (*Ottoman Germany*, 207f. and 222).
15. Brygida Kürbis, "Die Epistola Mathildis Suevae an Mieszko II. in neuer Sicht: Ein Forschungsbericht," *FMSt* 23 (1989): 318 (ed. 337)–338, 326ff. on the meaning of the official terminology and 337 on dating. Schwarzmaier, "Reichenauer Gedenkbucheinträge," 26, incl. n. 35, based on Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:248 n. 1; not found in *Regesten Konrads II.* Schwarzmaier

dates the letter to 1026/early 1027. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:247, who lists it under the year 1028, remarks that it was written “in the same years.” It makes the most sense, however, if Matilda had contacted Mieszko II in the latter half of 1025, immediately after his assumption of power and before the capitulation of the Lotharingians. According to the letter, he had built many churches, but even that long-term accomplishment does not preclude the earlier date, for Mieszko had ruled as *dux* since 1013 from his fortification atop the Wawel Hill in Cracow (Kürbis, “Die Epistola Mathildis,” 327). On Mieszko II’s marriage to Richeza, the daughter of Ezzo and granddaughter of Otto II, see Herbert Ludat, *An Elbe und Oder um das Jahr 1000: Skizzen zur Politik des Ottonenreiches und der slavischen Mächte in Mitteleuropa*, 2nd ed. (Weimar, 1995), 207 (entry), and Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 3, no. 465.

16. Keller, *Zwischen regionaler Begrenzung*, 90. Kienast, *Deutschland und Frankreich*, 1:150ff. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:20, incl. n. 3, 37f. (on Ezzo), 106–13, esp. 111f., incl. nn. 1–4. Cf. Brühl, *Deutschland—Frankreich*, 691ff., and Hans-Dietrich Kahl, “Die Angliederung Burgunds an das mittelalterliche Imperium,” *Schweizerische numismatische Rundschau* 48 (1969): 48f. See esp. Fulbert, *Epistolae*, nos. 104 and 111–13, in *The Letters*, 188 and 196ff.

17. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 48a; cf. 49. Paul Ladewig, *Poppo von Stablo und die Klosterreformen unter den ersten Saliern* (Berlin, 1883), 102. Everhelm, *Vita Popponis*, c. 18, 304. On the county of Verdun, see Hoffmann, “Grafschaften,” 447ff. and 475f. On the counties of Verdun and Drenthe, see M. Werner, “Der Herzog,” 416–20. On Gerard of Cambrai, see Theodor Schieffer, “Ein deutscher Bischof des 11. Jahrhunderts: Gerhard I. von Cambrai (1012–1051),” *DA* 1 (1937): 323ff.

18. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 19 (*Deeds*, 80f.). Drawing on Adolf Hofmeister, “Rezension,” *MIÖG* 38 (1920): 503ff., Schwarzmaier, “Reichenauer Gedenkbucheinträge,” 21f., incl. n. 13, differs with Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:72f., on the date of Duke Frederick II’s death.

19. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 20f. (*Deeds*, 80ff.). *Regesten Konrads II.*, 109a and b, as well as 111b.

20. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 21 and 29 (*Deeds*, 82f. and 87f.). *Regesten Konrads II.*, 112. On the “familiar discussion,” or *familiare colloquium*, see Althoff, *Spiegelregeln*, 164ff. On Otto William of Burgundy, see Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:39ff. See *ibid.*, 1:221 n. 6, for his date of death, September 21, 1026, and not 1027, as alleged by Brühl, *Deutschland—Frankreich*, 684, incl. n. 444, who clearly mistook Otto William for Odo of Champagne.

21. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 112b and c. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 21 (*Deeds*, 82f.).

22. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 103a. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 172f.

23. On the diet in Limburg (1033), see MGH DD C.II, 199 (August 9, 1033). Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 21 (*Deeds*, 83). Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1036. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 232a. For a discussion of what Conrad the Younger ceded in exchange for Carinthia, see Mertens, “Vom Rhein,” 235ff. On the strikingly coincidental timing of the compact with Burgundy and the subordination of Conrad the Younger, see Kahl, “Die Angliederung,” 50. On Aribert of Milan, see *Regesten Konrads II.*, 244g and h. On Bruno of Würzburg, see Alfred Wendehorst, *Das Bistum Würzburg I*, *Germania Sacra*, n.s., 1 (Berlin, 1962), 92ff.; cf. note 67 below. On the wealth of the bishopric, at least ca. 1080, see Peter Johaneck, “Die Erzbischöfe von Hamburg-Bremen und ihre Kirche in Reich der Salierzeit,” in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 2:91, based on Adam, *Gesta*, III.46 (45) (*History*, 152ff.). According to an Ottonian assessment, on the other hand, Würzburg had to provide only forty armed knights; *Indiculus loricatorum Ottoni II. in Italiam mittendorum*, in *Constitutiones et acta publica imperatorum et regum inde ab a. DCCCCXI usque ad a. MCXCVII (911–1197)*, no. 436, ed. Ludwig Weiland, MGH *Constitutiones et acta publica imperatorum et regum*, 1:633 (Hanover, 1893; rpt. 1963).

24. Mertens, “Vom Rhein,” 234f. Cf. MGH DD C.II, 204, and MGH DD H.III, 218, on the commemoration of Conrad’s parents and brother. On his half sisters, see Chapter II, at note 50, esp. Schwarzmaier, “Reichenauer Gedenkbucheinträge,” 22, incl. n. 15. On the younger Conrad’s mother, Matilda, see *Regesten Konrads II.*, 153a–b, and Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:286f., based on Ekkehard IV of Saint Gall, *Casus sancti Galli*, c. 66.

25. Mertens, “Vom Rhein,” 236ff.

26. Cf. *ibid.*, 236ff. and 240ff., stating that Conrad the Younger had a son by the same

name, with Kluger, “Propter claritatem generis,” esp. 245f., where this Cuni/Conrad is identified as Conrad’s nephew. See also C. Ehlers, *Metropolis Germaniae*, 227 n. 155, and Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:350, incl. n. 2.

27. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:92ff. and 460ff. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 40c. Trillmich, in Wipo, *Gesta*, 563 n. 159.

28. Concluding line in Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 28 (*Deeds*, 87).

29. Cf. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 10 and 19 (*Deeds*, 75 and 80f.).

30. For example, cf. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 20 (*Deeds*, 81f.). At a court diet in Ulm in 1027, Ernest was abandoned by “his own men” because he demanded their personal fealty even if it meant defying the emperor and kingdom. For a critical interpretation of the passage, see Althoff, “Königsherrschaft,” 270, incl. n. 15 (rpt. 27, incl. n. 15).

31. Weinfurter, “Die Zentralisierung,” 241ff.

32. Beumann, “Zur Entwicklung,” 185ff. (rpt. 135ff.).

33. Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century*, 87 and 390 (quote); cf. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:128, on the murder of Dietrich of Meissen.

34. See Althoff, “Königsherrschaft,” 288–90 (quote) (rpt. 53–56); as well as Keller, “Zum Charakter,” 261–64.

35. On the conflict’s escalation, see Althoff, “Königsherrschaft,” 278–80 (rpt. 39–41), based on Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 10f., 19f., 25, and 27f. (*Deeds*, 75f., 80f., 85, and 86f.). Cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 40c, 71c and e, 109a and b, 135a, 152a, and 158c.

36. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 25 (*Deeds*, 85).

37. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 7 (*Deeds*, 74). *Regesten Konrads II.*, 40a and c. See notes 12f. above. On Ernest’s age in 1025, see Chapter II, at note 23.

38. Müller-Mertens and Huschner, *Reichsintegration*, 175f. Cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 40c, as well as the gap between 46 and 48. In the MGH DD C.11, Gisela is listed as an intervenor in diplomas 45 (July 16, 1025) and 47 (December 4, 1025). Diploma 46 (November 1, 1025) was issued in Bodfeld during a royal hunting trip to eastern Saxony, suggesting that the western borders of the realm were not under imminent threat; see Brühl, *Deutschland—Frankreich*, 691–93. There is also evidence that Conrad II was in Worms without Gisela in September 1025; see Goetting, *Bistum Hildesheim*, 3:242, and Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:353f. On the other hand, it is striking that diplomas 45 and 47 from MGH DD C.11 were both issued in Tribur. Had Conrad ensconced his wife there so that Gisela would be well rested when the time came to deliver Matilda? On the behavior of Conrad the Younger, see Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 19 (*Deeds*, 81). On the opposition’s sporadic resurgence, see Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1026, and Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 10 (*Deeds*, 75). On Gisela, cf. *Gesta*, c. 4 (*Deeds*, 69), and Chapter II, at note 57.

39. Althoff, “Königsherrschaft,” esp. 270–75 (rpt. 29–34).

40. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 49a and b. See esp. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 10f. (*Deeds*, 75f.), and Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1026. Cf. Müller-Mertens and Huschner, *Reichsintegration*, 176 and 386. Althoff, *Spielregeln*, 209ff.

41. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 10f. and 23 (*Deeds*, 75f. and 84). Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1026.

42. Merta, “Die Titel,” 173. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 59a and 60.

43. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 11 and 13f. (*Deeds*, 76f.). Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1026; cf. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 19 and 23 (*Deeds*, 80f. and 84), as well as *Regesten Konrads II.*, 52a–71c. Wilhelm Störmer, “Die Welfen in der Reichspolitik des 11. Jahrhunderts,” *MIÖG* 104 (1996): 252–65; on this point, 253 and 255–57. On Kempten, see Hubertus Seibert, “Libertas und Reichsabtei: Zur Klosterpolitik der salischen Herrscher,” in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 2:503–69, esp. 521f., 526, incl. n. 104, and 568.

44. On the loss of Alsace by Hermann II of Swabia, see Thietmar, *Chronicon*, v.20–22 (*Ottoman Germany*, 219f.).

45. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 19 (*Deeds*, 80f.). Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1026. Helmut Maurer, *Der Herzog von Schwaben* (Sigmaringen, 1978), 149, incl. n. 124. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 71c and 72a.

46. MGH DD C.II, 103 (June 7, 1027); cf. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:210f. Müller-Mertens and Huschner, *Reichsintegration*, 23ff., on the location of “Stegon,” where the diploma was issued.

47. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 20 (*Deeds*, 81f.), and *Regesten Konrads II.*, 109b and 111a and b. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:221. See Chapter VIII, at note 11. H. Maurer, *Der Herzog*, 148f. According to Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VII.1 (1) (*Ottonian Germany*, 306f.), one of the Romans who stirred up a revolt against Henry II was sent to Giebichenstein and remained there at least until Thietmar’s death, on December 1, 1018. On the significance of familiar or confidential conversations, see Althoff, *Spielregeln*, 164ff. Cf. Althoff, “Königsherrschaft,” 279 (rpt. 40), keeping in mind that in all likelihood no high court of justice was held in Ulm. *Ibid.*, 269f. (rpt. 27f.), along with other works cited there, questions “whether the representation of the king as a feudal lord to a league of nobles—found in Wipo’s work—was more a reflection of the author’s conceptual norms than of eleventh-century reality?” In contrast, see Weinfurter, *The Salian Century*, 51ff., on Ernest’s outdated concepts concerning the jurisdictional authority of dukes over counts.

48. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 25 (*Deeds*, 85). Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1030. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 153a. Althoff, “Königsherrschaft,” 280 (rpt. 41). Weinfurter, *Heinrich II.*, 191f., incl. nn. 33f., based on Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VI.2 (*Ottonian Germany*, 237f.).

49. MGH DD C.II, 124; cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 127 and 135a. On Weissenburg, see MGH DD C.II, 140, incl. prefatory note.

50. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 27f. (*Deeds*, 86). On the term “robber,” which was also used to describe Conrad’s grandfather Otto and uncle Conrad of Carinthia, see Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century*, 429f.

51. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 28 (close) (*Deeds*, 87). See Chapter XXII, at note 26.

52. See Chapter II, at notes 55–59.

53. See notes 70f. below; Chapter VI, at note 22; and Chapter XVIII, at notes 16–18.

54. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 225d and f.

55. Cf. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 21 and 33 (*Deeds*, 82f. and 92 [close]), with Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, aa. 1035f.

56. *Ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*, no. 27, 49ff.

57. *Regesten Konrads II.*, g. See Chapter II, at note 63.

58. Adelheid Krahn, “Die Absetzung Adalberos von Kärnten und die Südostpolitik Kaiser Konrads II.,” *HJ* 110 (1990): 335, on Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 3 (*Deeds*, 68). MGH DD C.II, 34. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 34. On the possible extent of this grant, see Riegler, *Aflenz*, 20f. and 25. On the widow’s portion granted Cunigunde, see Weinfurter, *Heinrich II.*, 103ff., and MGH DD H.II, 2f.

59. On Verona and Trento, see Chapter VII, at notes 86ff. and 95. On the depiction of Adalbero in the apse of the basilica of Aquileia, see Chapter VII, at note 84; *Regesten Konrads II.*, 95 and 112d. See page 110 above for a reproduction of the fresco. On the synod of Frankfurt, see Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century*, 18f.

60. MGH DD C.II, 115, 124, and 131. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 118, 127, and 134.

61. MGH DD C.II, 134, and *Regesten Konrads II.*, 139.

62. Boshof, *Die Salier*, 61. Cf. notes 21–23 above.

63. Wolfram, *Salzburg*, 190f.

64. This train of thought was already propounded by Ingrid Heidrich, “Die Absetzung Herzog Adalberos von Kärnten durch Kaiser Konrad II. 1035,” *HJ* 91 (1971): 70–94. Krahn, “Die Absetzung.” Cf. Weinfurter, *The Salian Century*, 54ff. K. Schmid, “Haus- und Herrschaftsverständnis,” 31ff. Althoff, “Königsherrschaft,” 280–82 (rpt. 41–43). Adelheid Krahn, *Absetzungsverfahren als Spiegelbild von Königsmacht*, Untersuchungen zur deutschen Staats- und Rechtsgeschichte, n.s., 26 (Aalen, 1987), 355–59. The best discussion of this topic is provided by Gänsler, “Die Mark,” 101–21.

65. Cf. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 26 and 21, as well as 33 (*Deeds*, 86, 83, and 92). *Regesten Konrads II.*, 172a and 225b and d. *Ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*, no. 27, 51 (on the Mirmidons and the exemption of the Bavarians from the campaign against the Liutizi). MGH DD C.II, 219, and *Regesten Konrads II.*, 227 (Koper in Istria). See Chapter XIII, at notes 144ff.

66. Mertens, "Vom Rhein," 232f. Reuter, "Unruhestiftung," 312f. *Ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*, no. 27, 50. Cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, g.
67. Cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 225f. with 232a, and *Ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*, no. 27, 51.
68. *Ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*, no. 27, 50. On Adalbero's external alliances, see Chapter XIII, at notes 148ff.
69. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 21 (*Deeds*, 83). On losing the sovereign's favor, see Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 33 (*Deeds*, 92), and Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1035.
70. *Ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*, no. 27, 50f. K. Schmid, "Haus- und Herrschaftsverständnis," 31f. Weinfurter, *The Salian Century*, 55f. Boshof, *Die Salier*, 61ff. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 225d and 232a. Egilbert was on the best of terms with Stephen I of Hungary: see *Ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*, no. 47, 84f., and note 5 to Chapter XIII.
71. Cf. Althoff, "Königsherrschaft," 281f. (rpt. 43).
72. K. Brunner, *Herzogtümer*, 155f.
73. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 21 (*Deeds*, 83). Cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 225f. with 232a. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:350.
74. Weinfurter, *The Salian Century*, esp. 54f. H. Maurer, *Der Herzog*, 125. Keller, "Reichsstruktur," 101ff.
75. MGH DD C.II, 32 and 134. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 139. K. Brunner, *Herzogtümer*, 150ff. Klaar, *Die Herrschaft der Eppensteiner*, 30ff. n. 38. *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1036 (William's murder).
76. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1: 230. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 112d. On Gebhard's secular career, see Gänser, "Die Mark," III, based on MGH DD H.II, 488f., and MGH DD C.II, 34, incl. n. b.
77. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:163; cf. 1:340ff. Wendehorst, *Das Bistum Würzburg I*, 97f.
78. Stefan Weinfurter, *Die Geschichte der Eichstätter Bischöfe des Anonymus Haserensis*, Eichstätter Studien, n.s., 24 (Regensburg, 1987), 182f. n. 177. Paul Kehr, *Vier Kapitel aus der Geschichte Kaiser Heinrichs III.*, Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, 3 (Berlin, 1931), 27. Egon Boshof, "Bischöfe und Bischofskirchen von Passau und Regensburg." In *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 2:122–30.

CHAPTER 6

1. Goetting, *Bistum Hildesheim*, 3:230ff., esp. 239–47. Cf. Stephanie Coué, *Hagiographie im Kontext: Schreibenlaß und Funktion von Bischofsviten aus dem 11. und vom Anfang des 12. Jahrhunderts*, Arbeiten zur Frühmittelalterforschung, 24 (Berlin, 1997), 41ff. Wolter, *Die Synoden*, 315ff., and Ernst Schubert, ed., *Politik, Verfassung, Wirtschaft vom 9. bis zum ausgehenden 15. Jahrhundert*, vol. 2, pt. 1, of *Geschichte Niedersachsens*, Veröffentlichungen der Historischen Kommission für Niedersachsen und Bremen, 36 (Hannover, 1997), 252–54.
2. Weinfurter, *Heinrich II.*, 24ff. *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 1483a.
3. Goetting, *Bistum Hildesheim*, 3:159ff. and 183–200. Wolter, *Die Synoden*, 227ff.
4. Goetting, *Bistum Hildesheim*, 3:231f. and 237ff. Zielinski, *Das Reichsepiskopat*, 21f.
5. On the canonesses who supported Aribio, see nn. 12ff. below.
6. Goetting, *Bistum Hildesheim*, 3:239ff. Wolter, *Die Synoden*, 316ff. Cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 15a, 17a and b, as well as 20b. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:46–51 and 54–56, as well as 353–55. For a contemporary account, see esp. Wolphere, *Vita Godehardi episcopi Hildesheimensis prior*, cc. 1–26, ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz, MGH SS 11:170–87 (Hannover, 1854; rpt., Stuttgart, 1994).
7. See MGH DD C.II, 23 (March 29, 1025, in the aftermath of the synod at Grone) to 45 (July 26, 1025). Aribio's name appears in the formulaic list of intervenors in many, though not all, of these diplomas. Cf. Rudolf Schetter, *Die Intervenienz der weltlichen und geistlichen Fürsten in den deutschen Königsurkunden von 911–1056* (Bottrop, 1935), 48ff.
8. Goetting, *Bistum Hildesheim*, 3:242f. Wolter, *Die Synoden*, 319ff. Wolphere, *Vita Godehardi prior*, c. 28, 188. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:96–98.

9. See the salutation of a letter from Aribo to Worms: *Ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*, no. 13, 29.

10. On Azecho, see Weinfurter, "Herrschaftslegitimation," 66; Zielinski, *Das Reichsepiskopat*, 47; and Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, esp. pt. 2, 223f.

11. MGH DD C.II, 47 (December 4, 1025). Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:104f. *Ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*, no. 13, 29f.

12. On Wolfhere, *Vita Godehardi prior*, cc. 29, 34, and 36, 188f. and 192–94, see Hans Goetting, comp., *Das Bistum Hildesheim*, vol. 2, *Das Benediktiner(innen)kloster Brunshausen, das Benediktinerinnenkloster St. Marien vor Gandersheim, das Benediktinerkloster Clus, das Franziskanerkloster Gandersheim*, *Germania Sacra*, n.s., 8 (Berlin, 1974), 106 and 142f., and idem, *Bistum Hildesheim*, 3:243, incl. n. 90. On the basis of Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:193ff., Goetting asserts quite accurately that the canonesses who fled Gandersheim found refuge at the cloister of Göß. On the other hand, by attributing this event to circumstances pre-dating Conrad II and Godehard of Hildesheim, he is unwarrantedly skeptical of its crucial importance.

13. Wolter, *Die Symoden*, 321, incl. n. 27, concurred with the older scholarship maintaining that the canonesses from Gandersheim entered a foundation for canonesses in Mainz (Altenmünster?). Wolfhere, *Vita Godehardi prior*, c. 29, 188f., on the other hand, remarked that the refugees from Gandersheim had renounced the *canonica institutio* there and assumed the *monachicus habitus*, monastic garb, in a cloister headed by Aribo's sister.

14. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 52a and 71b.

15. Wolfhere, *Vita Godehardi prior*, c. 30, 189. Wolter, *Die Symoden*, 321ff.

16. *Mainzer Urkundenbuch*, no. 272, ed. Manfred Stimming (Darmstadt, 1932), 1:170. On the Carolingian reforms, see Wolfram, *Grenzen und Räume*, 175, incl. n. 225.

17. Wolfhere, *Vita Godehardi prior*, c. 30, 189.

18. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 4 and 11 (*Deeds*, 69 and 76). *Regesten Konrads II.*, 49b.

19. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 163a. On the events in Frankfurt, Geisleden, and Merseburg, see note 20 below.

20. Goetting, *Bistum Hildesheim*, 3:243–47. *Ibid.*, 2:106 and 142f. Wolter, *Die Symoden*, 332ff. and 338ff. The fact that five of the seven individuals present in 1007 were not yet bishops does not in and of itself undercut *Constitutiones*, no. 40, 1:85f.; see Wolter, *Die Symoden*, 337 n. 84. Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century*, 18ff. and 37, on the derision of Aribo at the synod at Frankfurt. Wolfhere, *Vita Godehardi prior*, cc. 30–36, 189–94. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 112d, 134a, and 155a. *Mainzer Urkundenbuch*, no. 272, 1:170. Cf. Müller-Mertens and Huschner, *Reichsintegration*, esp. 310–12 and 388. *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1030. On the symbolism of visiting an erstwhile enemy in his private chambers early in the day, see Gerd Althoff, "Zur Bedeutung symbolischer Kommunikation für das Verständnis des Mittelalters," *FMSr* 31 (1997): 380, incl. n. 37.

21. *Vita Bardonis archiepiscopi Moguntinii maior*, cc. 7 and 10, ed. Wilhelm Wattenbach, MGH SS 11:326f. (Hannover, 1854; rpt., Stuttgart, 1994). Cf. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:305f. and 476f., as well as Zielinski, *Das Reichsepiskopat*, 44, incl. n. 161. Wolfhere, *Continuatio vitae Bernwardi*, 167, stated outright that Conrad wished neither to insult the bishop of Hildesheim *propter Deum* [because of God] nor to abandon the archbishop of Mainz, who had anointed him king.

22. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:333f., based on *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1039, and *Annalista Saxo*, a. 1039, 682.

CHAPTER 7

1. Cf., for example, the comments of William V of Aquitaine to Bishop Leo of Vercelli, in Fulbert, *Epistolae*, no. 113, in *The Letters*, 200, with Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum Libri Quinque/Five Books*, IV.2.5, 178–79.

2. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 10 (*Deeds*, 75).

3. See Chapter v, at notes 39f. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 10f. (*Deeds*, 75f.).
4. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 52a. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:119ff. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 11 (*Deeds*, 76). On the army's size, see Karl Ferdinand Werner, "Heeresorganisation und Kriegführung im deutschen Königreich des 10. und 11. Jahrhunderts," in *Ordinamenti militari in occidente nell'Alto Medioevo*, Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto Medioevo, 15 (Spoleto, 1968), 2:791–856; on this point, 828ff.; rpt. in idem, *Structures politiques du monde franc (VIe–XIIIe siècle)* (London, 1979).
5. Fulbert, *Epistolae*, nos. 103 and 109, in *The Letters*, 186 and 194. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 1.
6. Fulbert, *Epistolae*, no. 113, in *The Letters*, 202.
7. *Ibid.*, nos. 111 and 113, in *The Letters*, 198–200 and 202.
8. Cf. *ibid.*, no. 113, in *The Letters*, 200: In a letter to Bishop Leo of Vercelli written at the end of 1025, William V of Aquitaine expressed his surprise that his correspondent had approached Conrad, even though the king had neither granted him anything in Germany nor possessed the ability as of yet to grant or acquire anything in Italy.
9. Cf. Wolfram, ed., *Intitulatio II*, 138ff., and Merta, "Die Titel," 172ff.
10. MGH DD C.11, 52. Werner Goetz, "Rainald von Como: Ein Bischof des 11. Jahrhunderts zwischen Kurie und Krone," in *Historische Forschungen für Walter Schlesinger*, ed. Helmut Beumann (Cologne, 1974), 468ff.
11. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 53–61a. MGH DD C.11, 52–59.
12. Müller-Mertens and Huschner, *Reichsintegration*, 89f.
13. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 12 (*Deeds*, 76f.).
14. MGH DD C.11, 58. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 60.
15. Cf. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 12 (*Deeds*, 76f.), with *Tabula imperii Romani sulla base della Carta internazionale del mondo alla scala di 1:1.000.000: Foglio L 32 (Milano): Mediolanum, Auenticum, Brigantium* (Rome, 1966).
16. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 59a and f. MGH DD C.11, 58.
17. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 39 and 87. MGH DD C.11, 38 and 84. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 90ff.; cf. the entry for Leo of Vercelli, 307. Weinfurter, *Heinrich II.*, 227ff., based on Leo of Vercelli, *Versus de Ottone et Heinrico*, strophe 12, 482. Cf. Fulbert, *Epistolae*, no. 112, in *The Letters*, 198f., incl. n. 2.
18. Fulbert, *Epistolae*, nos. 103 and 112f., in *The Letters*, 186 and 198f.; cf. *ibid.*, no. 109, in *The Letters*, 194.
19. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 12 (*Deeds*, 76). Müller-Mertens and Huschner, *Reichsintegration*, 89f.
20. Fulbert, *Epistolae*, no. 111, in *The Letters*, 198 n. 2.
21. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VI.93 (57), VII.2 (3), and 24 (17) (*Ottoman Germany*, 299f., 307ff., and 323).
22. Fulbert, *Epistolae*, no. 113, in *The Letters*, 202.
23. *Ibid.*, no. 103, in *The Letters*, 186; cf. *ibid.*, no. 109, in *The Letters*, 194.
24. *Ibid.*, nos. 111 and 113, in *The Letters*, 196ff. and 202.
25. Brühl, *Deutschland—Frankreich*, 677f., incl. n. 385; 679, incl. n. 401; and 680, incl. n. 416. See note 15 above.
26. [Wibert], *Vita Leonis IX*, I.10, ed. Johannes Matthias Watterich, in *Pontificum Romanorum Qui Fuerunt ab Exeunte Saeculo IX Usque ad Finem Saeculi XII Vitae*, 1: 139f. (Leipzig, 1862; rpt. Aalen, 1966). Even though the putative author of this work, Wibert, archdeacon of Toul, probably never existed, it is helpful to continue citing him as the author—if in brackets—in order to avoid confusing this work with other anonymous lives of the pope; see Hans Georg Krause, "Über den Verfasser der Vita Leonis IX papae," *DA* 32 (1976): 49ff., esp. 77.
27. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 12 (*Deeds*, 76f.). *Regesten Konrads II.*, 61c and d, as well as 72c. On Odilo of Cluny as the mediator, see Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 45f. On the addendum to Conrad's title, *ad imperium designatus Romanorum* [designated emperor of the Romans], in MGH DD C.11, 64, issued in Cremona on June 14, 1026, see Merta, "Die Titel," 176.
28. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 61c and d. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:125 n. 3 (2), dates the siege of the castle between April 1 (death of Bishop Hermann of Toul) and May 19 or 20, 1026

(consecration of his successor, Bruno), because Bruno—the future Pope Leo IX—learned of his episcopal election and received the king's consent during the course of the siege. [Wibert], *Vita Leonis IX*, I.11, 140, dates the consecration *tertio decimo Kalendas Iunii* [May 20], on the Feast of the Ascension, but he miscalculates by one day, since in 1026 the feast fell on May 19.

29. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 62–71; cf. MGH DD H.II, xxii.
30. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 13 and 40, v. 33 (*Deeds*, 77f. and 100). *Regesten Konrads II.*, 71a.
31. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 16 (*Deeds*, 79). *Regesten Konrads II.*, 73c.
32. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VI.7 and VII.1 (*Ottonian Germany*, 241f. and 306f.).
33. Cf. Althoff, *Spielregeln*, 34ff.
34. Cf. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VI.3 (*Ottonian Germany*, 238f.).
35. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, v.19 (*Ottonian Germany*, 218f.). MGH DD H.II, 121 (October 24, 1006).
36. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 13 (close) (*Deeds*, 77f.).
37. Grönbech, *Kultur und Religion*, 2:16f. Gurevich, *The Origins*, 67f.
38. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 73c, 244e, and 264b.
39. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 11 and 14 (*Deeds*, 76 and 78). *Regesten Konrads II.*, 71b and c. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, I:132f.
40. *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 2019a. On Troia, see Vera von Falkenhausen, *Untersuchungen über die byzantinische Herrschaft in Süditalien vom 9. bis ins 11. Jahrhundert*, Schriften zur Geistesgeschichte des östlichen Europa, I (Wiesbaden, 1967), 53 and 55f.
41. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 37 (*Deeds*, 95f.). *Regesten Konrads II.*, 264b and 285a.
42. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 36 (*Deeds*, 95). *Regesten Konrads II.*, 254b.
43. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 37 (*Deeds*, 96). *Regesten Konrads II.*, 280a–291. (MGH DD C.II, 277, was issued in Brixen on August 11, 1038.)
44. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 14 (*Deeds*, 78).
45. *Ibid.*
46. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 15 (*Deeds*, 78). Müller-Mertens and Huschner, *Reichsintegration*, 91.
47. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 72c. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 12 and 15 (*Deeds*, 76f. and 78); cf. c. 7 (*Deeds*, 73f.).
48. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 15 (*Deeds*, 78). *Regesten Konrads II.*, 72d and 73–73b. On Henry's presence, see Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, I:138f., which is based on the account of Arnulf, *Gesta*, II.2f., 12 (*Liber*, 146–48).
49. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 16 (*Deeds*, 79).
50. Schramm, *Kaiser, Könige und Päpste*, 3:385.
51. Arnulf, *Gesta*, II.3–6, 12–13 (*Liber*, 148–50), as well as *Commemoratio superbie Ravenatis archiepiscopi*, ed. Claudia Zey, MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 67:249ff. (Hannover, 1994); *Regesten Konrads II.*, 73c and 82c. Schramm, *Kaiser, Könige und Päpste*, 3:383–85. *Die Ordines für die Weihe und Krönung des Kaisers und der Kaiserin*, XIII, ed. Reinhard Elze, MGH Fontes iuris Germanici antiqui, 9:34f. (Hannover, 1960; rpt. 1995).
52. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 16 (*Deeds*, 79); cf. c. 15 (*Deeds*, 78) for Rudolph's promise to attend Conrad's imperial coronation. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 73c. Cnut the Great, *Epistola*, in Florentius Wigorniensis, *Chronica Chronicarum (selectiones aa. 781ff.)*, ed. Reinhold Pauli, MGH SS 13:126–28 (Hannover, 1881; rpt., Stuttgart, 1985). Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, I:145, incl. n. 2.
53. Cnut the Great, *Epistola*. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 73d. Cf. Grönbech, *Kultur und Religion*, 2:55ff., and *Hávamál*, strophes 32f., in *Edda: Die Lieder des Codex Regius nebst verwandten Denkmälern*, ed. Gustav Neckel and Hans Kuhn, 5th ed., vol. I (Heidelberg, 1983), on the exchange of gifts. On payments to Pavia, see *Honorantie*, ed. Brühl and Violante, c. 2, 19, 36f., and 78, incl. nn. 86–89, and *ibid.*, in *Instituta regalia*, cc. 2f., pt. 2, 1452. Cf. Fichtenau, "Reisen," 42ff. and 56f., on the *scholae* and other residential facilities for pilgrims in Rome and Pavia, respectively.
54. According to Cnut the Great, *Epistola*, 127, lines 9f., all the princes from Monte Gargano, "down to its sea," were in attendance and paid him—Cnut—honor.
55. See Chapter IV, at notes 84–92, and note 46 above.

56. Adam, *Gesta*, II.65 (63) (*History*, 100), on Cnut as the ruler of Denmark, Norway, and England.

57. Roberta Frank, "King Cnut in the Verse of His Skalds," in *The Reign of Cnut: King of England, Denmark, and Norway*, ed. Alexander R. Rumble (London, 1994), 106–24; on this point, 118 (based on Sighvatr, *Knútsdrápa*, ed. Ernst Albin Kock, in *Den norsk-isländska skaldediktningen*, 1:611–68 [Lund, 1946]). Cf. M. K. Lawson, *Cnut: The Danes in England in the Early Eleventh Century* (London, 1993), esp. 64, 108ff., and 203f.

58. Adam, *Gesta*, II.37 (35), 41 (39), and esp. 55f. (53f.) (*History*, 80, 83, and 92ff.). Niels Lund, "Cnut's Danish Kingdom," in *The Reign of Cnut*, ed. Rumble, 27–42; on this point, 40f. See Chapter XII, at notes iff., on Conrad's delegation to Byzantium.

59. MGH DD C.II, 72–88. Diploma 84 contains the latest date of issuance, namely April 7, 1027. Cf. Müller-Mertens and Huschner, *Reichsintegration*, 386f.

60. Harald Zimmermann, ed., *Papsturkunden 896–1046*, vol. 2, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Denkschriften, 177 (Vienna, 1985), nos. 570–74, pp. 1083–89; cf. no. 558, pp. 1052–54. Cf. Wolter, *Die Synoden*, 325ff. The following excerpt from the privilege indicates that it was issued by the pope at a church assembly attended by Conrad II: "cum ceteris coepiscopis et fratribus meis in conventu Rome congregatis in praesentia domni Conradi regis, divi Augusti, nuper a Deo et nobis in imperium Romani orbis electi et coronati" [with certain others of my fellow bishops and brothers assembled at a council in Rome in the presence of Conrad, the lord king, divine Augustus, recently elected and crowned emperor of the Roman world by God and us]. The privilege's format also implies that it might have been a "synodal instrument"; see Zimmermann, *Papsturkunden*, 2:1084 (introductory remarks and text). On Odilo of Cluny, see Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 45f.

61. With the reservations expressed by Wolter, *Die Synoden*, 325, incl. n. 42, in mind, see Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:139f. MGH DD C.II, 82 (issued in Rome on April 7, 1027), confirms the presence of Bruno of Augsburg and Meinwerk of Paderborn. Most of the names are recorded in the protocol of the synod held at the Lateran on April 6, 1027: see *Constitutiones*, no. 38, 1:83f.; Zimmermann, *Papsturkunden*, no. 576, 2:1090f.; and Georgine Tangl, *Die Teilnehmer an den allgemeinen Konzilien des Mittelalters*, 2nd ed. (Weimar, 1969), 124ff. On Unwan's advanced age, see Adam, *Gesta*, II.47 (45), Schol. 34 (35) (*History*, 87). On Pilgrim of Cologne, see also Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 169, incl. n. 80; *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 1012a; and Schetter, *Die Interventionen*, 50f.

62. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 82c. Wolter, *Die Synoden*, 325ff. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:149.

63. *Constitutiones*, no. 38, 1:83.

64. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:149.

65. Heinz Dopsch, "Die steirischen Otakare: Zu ihrer Herkunft und ihren dynastischen Verbindungen," in *Das Werden der Steiermark*, ed. Gerhard Pferschy, Veröffentlichungen des Steiermärkischen Landesarchivs, 10 (Graz, 1980), 75–139; on this point, 96ff. and 111 (genealogical table). Idem, "Il patriarca Poppone di Aquileia (1019–1042)," in *Poppone: L'età d'oro del Patriarcato di Aquileia*, exh. cat. (Aquileia, 1996), 16f. nn. 30ff.

66. For historical background, see Krahwinkler, *Friaul*, 77–84. On the events of 1024, see Paul Kehr, "Rom und Venedig bis ins 12. Jahrhundert," *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 19 (1927): 83ff. Wolter, *Die Synoden*, 330f. Zimmermann, *Papsturkunden*, no. 561, 2:1057–61. *Translatio sanctae Anastasiae auctore Gotschalco*, cc. 4f., in *Chronicon Benedictoburanum*, ed. Wilhelm Wattenbach, MGH SS 9:225 (Hannover, 1851; rpt., Stuttgart, 1983).

67. Cf. Zimmermann, *Papsturkunden*, no. 561, 2:1058f. *Translatio sanctae Anastasiae*, cc. 4f., 225f. On the value of this "fabrication," see Ludwig Holzfurtner, *Gründung und Gründungsüberlieferung: Quellenkritische Studien zur Gründungsgeschichte der bayerischen Klöster der Agilolfingerzeit und ihrer hochmittelalterlichen Überlieferung*, Münchener historische Studien, Abteilung bayerische Geschichte, 11 (Kallmünz, 1984), 57. See also Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:150ff. On the inhabitants of Grado as a *plebs* [parish] of Aquileia, see MGH DD C.II, 205. Cf. Kehr, "Rom und Venedig," 88ff.

68. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:152 n. 2. Cf. *Vita Meinweri*, cc. 199 and 209, 115 and 121f. On the role of saints in disputes that lasted for centuries, see Patrick Geary, *Furta sacra* (Princeton, 1978; rpt. 1990), 88–91.

69. See the insert in Zimmermann, *Papsturkunden*, no. 561, 2:1059.

70. *Ibid.*, no. 561, 2:1057–61. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:153f.

71. *Vita Meinweri*, cc. 199 and 209, 115 and 121f. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:152 n. 2. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 61b. *Monumenta historica ducatus Carinthiae*, 3:99f. n. 238.

72. *Vita Meinweri*, cc. 5 and 198f., 7 and 114f. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 308, s.v. “Meinwerk von Paderborn.” On Meinwerk’s kinship with the king, see Zielinski, *Das Reichsepiskopat*, 36f., incl. nn. 113 and 122, based primarily on MGH DD H.II, 262 and 341, and *Vita Meinweri*, cc. 5 and 9, 7 and 15.

73. MGH DD H.II, 24. Wolfram, “Die Gesandtschaft,” 165 n. 16.

74. MGH DD C.II, 205 (March 8, 1034). *Regesten Konrads II.*, 61b. Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, IX (3), ed. Ester Pastorello, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, 12 (Bologna, 1937–38), 194f.

75. Zimmermann, *Papsturkunden*, no. 576, 2:1090f.

76. *Constitutiones*, no. 38, 1:83–84.

77. Cf. *Constitutiones*, no. 38, 1:84 (close), with Zimmermann, *Papsturkunden*, no. 578, 2:1092–94, esp. 1094 (middle).

78. Cf. Zimmermann, *Papsturkunden*, no. 618, 2:1159–64, with nos. 561f., 2:1057–63.

79. MGH DD C.II, 205.

80. Zimmermann, *Papsturkunden*, no. 618, 2:1161 (bottom).

81. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 38 (*Deeds*, 96). Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1039. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:295, incl. n. 1.

82. Cf. MGH DD C.II, 92 (May 19, 1027), with *ibid.*, 205 (March 8, 1034), esp. the formulas listing the intervenors. According to Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:260ff., Henry III visited Venice in 1037, after Poppo had fallen into disfavor and his reaction to the trip was no longer of concern; contrariwise, see MGH DD H.III, 57 (July 2, 1040) (introduction).

83. A recent (1996/97) exhibition in Aquileia bore this subtitle.

84. K. Schmid, “Haus- und Herrschaftsverständnis,” 26ff., esp. 27f., incl. n. 25 (quote). Schramm and Mütterich, *Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige*, 107f. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:224f. n. 4 and 2:177 n. 1 (oath of obedience).

85. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 17f. (*Deeds*, 79f.). *Regesten Konrads II.*, 91a and b and 92f. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:178. Wolfram, “Die Gesandtschaft”; on this point, 161f.

86. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 95, concerning MGH DD C.II, 92. Cf. *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 299. MGH DD H.II, 299. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:30f., and *Regesten Konrads II.*, 270.

87. Krah, “Die Absetzung,” 350–53 (synopsis). See esp. MGH DD H.II, 426 (April 26, 1020). Dopsch, “Il patriarca Poppone,” 29f., incl. nn. 163–67.

88. U. Kornblum, “Beweis,” in *HRG*, vol. 1, cols. 401–8 (Berlin, 1971). Krah, “Die Absetzung,” 342, incl. n. 128, esp. on MGH DD H.II, 426.

89. MGH DD C.II, 92.

90. K. Brunner, *Herzogtümer*, 66f.: In Carantania, Carolingian royal emissaries were known by a slightly different vernacular term (*walpoto*) because there they possessed more authority than normally associated with their comital function. On Wezellan-Werigand, see *ibid.*, 558, s.v. “Wezellan,” and Klaar, *Die Herrschaft der Eppensteiner*, no. 33, 28. According to MGH DD C.II, 132, Count Wezellan was the brother of Bishop Helmger of Ceneda, and his consent was sought when Poppo requested hunting privileges in Friuli. See Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:182, 485, and 488.

91. MGH DD C.II, 92 (close).

92. *Ibid.*, 101.

93. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:184ff., on MGH DD C.II, 93–100, esp. diploma 94, and *Regesten Konrads II.*, 96–103, esp. 97.

94. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 103a. Judging from MGH DD C.II, 100, Bruno was at the time Conrad’s *missus*, or emissary, to Brescia.

95. As can be seen from MGH DD F.I, 340 (dated 1161), the county of Trento had already

received an exemption from Henry II. Cf. Hoffman, "Grafschaften," 39of. (Brixen) and 436–39 (Trento). See Müller-Mertens and Huschner, *Reichsintegration*, 22ff., for a discussion of MGH DD C.II, 101 (issued in Brixen on May 31, 1027), 102 (issued in Kaltbrunn auf dem Ritten on June 1, 1027), and 103 (issued in Stegen on June 7, 1027), and of the difficulties associated with determining where and when they were issued. For a discussion of "the position of the Trento-Bozen-Vinschgau region in terms of legal governance within the imperial union," see Müller-Mertens and Huschner, *Reichsintegration*, 354ff., as well as Josef Riedmann, "Mittelalter," in *Geschichte des Landes Tirol*, 2nd ed. (Bozen, 1990), 1:325–28, and idem, "Deutschlands Südgrenze," on this point, 170ff. It should be noted that diplomas 101f. for Trento were reviewed by the "German" chancellor, as evidenced by their recognition clauses. However, that does not prove that Trento no longer belonged to the *regnum Italicum*, even though most people at the time subscribed to a "personal" concept of authority—the territorial affiliation of the beneficiary determined which chancellor was authorized to review the charter—as noted by Wilhelm Erben, *Die Kaiser- und Königsurkunde des Mittelalters* (Munich, 1907), 63f. It is much more likely that Conrad had appointed his chancellor for Italy to the see of Parma while still in Verona and planned to name his cousin Bruno to the vacated office. According to MGH DD C.II, 100, Bruno must have been in northern Italy at the time, but it is not known why he was not available in Brixen and Kaltbrunn auf dem Ritten; see also Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:183ff. and 211, incl. n. 2 (court diet in Brixen), as well as *Regesten Konrads II.*, 103a. On *Regesten Konrads II.*, 118, and MGH DD C.II, 115, see Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:243f.

96. Cf. Goetz, "Rainald von Como," 468ff., which is also based on MGH DD C.II, 52. On the death of Henry V of Bavaria, on either February 27 or 18, 1026, see Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:193. On Welf II's conflict with Bruno of Augsburg, see *ibid.*, 197ff.

CHAPTER 8

1. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 106a. Müller-Mertens and Huschner, *Reichsintegration*, 103. MGH DD C.II, 104 (July 5, 1027), contains the earliest reference to Henry III as Duke Henry VI of Bavaria.

2. Helmut Beumann, *Die Ottonen*, UTB, 384, 3rd ed. (Stuttgart, 1991), 62.

3. Reindel, "Bayern"; on this point, 312f.

4. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:269–71 and 2:348f. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 143b. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 24 (*Deeds*, 84). On the kinship ties between Conrad's son, Henry, and Emperor Henry II, see Mertens, "Vom Rhein," 252.

5. On *Die Traditionen des Hochstiftes Freising*, ed. Theodor Bitterauf, Quellen und Erörterungen zur bayerischen Geschichte, n.s., 5 (Munich, 1909), no. 1422, 2:278, see Chapter xxii, at notes 87f.

6. Weinfurter, *Heinrich II.*, 103ff. On *Regesten Konrads II.*, 25a, as well as MGH DD H.II, 2f., MGH DD C.II, 104, and *Regesten Konrads II.*, 107, see Störmer, "Kaiser Heinrich II.," 456ff. (map of properties on 459), as well as K. Brunner, *Herzogtümer*, 149.

7. Cf. MGH DD C.II, 191 (June 26, 1033), with MGH DD Car.I, 134 and 169.

8. See Chapter IV, at note 75.

9. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 6 (*Deeds*, 72). Cf. Beumann, "Zur Entwicklung," 199ff. (rpt. 149ff.)

10. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 109, on MGH DD C.II, 106. Cf. Riedmann, "Mittelalter," 326f.

11. See Chapter V, at note 47. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 109a and b. Cf. Chapter X, at notes 115f. (diploma for Obermünster).

12. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 111a and b.

13. Cf. MGH DD C.II, 108, with *ibid.*, 109. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 112 and 112a. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 21 (*Deeds*, 82f.). See Chapter V, note 20.

14. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:119; 125, incl. n. 2; and 224f. n. 4 (comparable oaths of obedience). Wolter, *Die Synoden*, 345ff. [Wibert], *Vita Leonis IX*, 1.10 and 12, 139f. and 141f.

15. Wolter, *Die Synoden*, 332ff.

CHAPTER 9

1. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:69ff., esp. 71; cf. 434ff. Hans Hubert Anton, "Bonifaz von Canossa, Markgraf von Tuszien und die Italienpolitik der frühen Salier," *HZ* 214 (1972): 534ff.
2. Arnulf, *Gesta*, II.8, 14 (*Liber*, 152f.). Anton, "Bonifaz," 536–40. See Chapter XIV, at notes 34f.
3. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 34 (*Deeds*, 93). Hagen Keller, "Mailand im 11. Jahrhundert: Das Exemplarische an einem Sonderfall," in *Die Frühgeschichte der europäischen Stadt im 11. Jahrhundert*, ed. Jörg Jarnut and Peter Johaneck, Städteforschung, A 43 (Cologne, 1998), 90ff. Gerhard Dilcher, *Die Entstehung der lombardischen Stadtkommune: Eine rechtsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*, Untersuchungen zur deutschen Staats- und Rechtsgeschichte, n.s., 7 (Aalen, 1967), 93f. and 98ff. Paolo Tomea, "L'agiografia milanese nei secoli XI e XII: Linee di tendenza e problemi I," in *Atti dell'11° Congresso internazionale di studi sull'alto Medioevo* (Spoleto, 1989), 2:668–76, esp. 674.
4. H. K. Schulze, *Hegemoniales Kaisertum*, 347, incl. n. 18.
5. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 232a.
6. Cf., for example, Kränzle, "Der abwesende König," 120ff., esp. 129ff. and 144ff.
7. *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1036.
8. Cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 25, 49a–52, and 232a–234.
9. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 158f., 166f., 169, and 172ff. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:157f.
10. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 167ff. and 174f.
11. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 328c–240. MGH DD C.II, 231. On the clerics in attendance, see also *Ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*, no. 5, 21. Anton, "Bonifaz," 540, incl. n. 37. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:169f. *Die Geschichte von den Dänenkönigen*, cc. 16 and 21, ed. and trans. Walter Baethge, Thule II, 19:239f. and 244 (Jena, 1924).
12. See Chapter XIV, at note 35.
13. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:170. On Nijmegen as Conrad II's favorite stopping place by far, see Müller-Mertens and Huschner, *Reichsintegration*, 382.
14. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 34 (*Deeds*, 92). Cf. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:212 nn. 1f. and 214. On *confusio*, see Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century*, 379ff. On Immo, see Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 205–7; Gerhard Schwartz, *Die Besetzung der Bistümer Reichsitaliens unter den sächsischen und salischen Kaisern mit den Listen der Bischöfe 951–1122* (Leipzig, 1913), 201; and Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:534ff.
15. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 34 (*Deeds*, 92). Keller, *Adelsherrschaft*, 270–91, esp. 285ff. and 289 (quote), as well as 49ff. (terminology), 142ff., 156ff., and 338ff.
16. *Annales Sangallenses maiores*, a. 1035. On the *milites servi*, see MGH DD O.III, 104.
17. Wolter, *Die Synoden*, 283ff., esp. 286ff. Cf. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:212, incl. nn. 4f.
18. Arnulf, *Gesta*, II.11, 14 (*Liber*, 155). Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 34 (*Deeds*, 93). Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1035. Benzo of Alba, *Ad Heinricum IV. imperatorem libri VII*, IV.4, v. 35, ed. Karl Pertz, MGH SS II:638 (Hannover, 1854; rpt., Stuttgart, 1994). Cf. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:213.
19. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:210ff. Arnulf, *Gesta*, II.10f., 14 (*Liber*, 154f.).
20. *Annales Sangallenses maiores*, a. 1035.
21. Cf. Keller, "Mailand," 81ff., subtitled "Das Exemplarische an einem Sonderfall" [The exception that proves the rule].
22. Keller, "Mailand," 91–93, esp. incl. n. 58.
23. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 34 (*Deeds*, 93).
24. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 244b–d. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 35 (*Deeds*, 93). *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1036. Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1037.
25. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:227f., which relies particularly on the lists of intervenors to MGH DD C.II, 235 and 240, and on evidence that Conrad of Carinthia participated in a court diet held in Pavia in mid-March 1037; see *Regesten Konrads II.*, 244f., and Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 35 (*Deeds*, 93f.). This court diet must have convened before Conrad's promulgation of the *Constitutio de feudis* (see MGH DD C.II, 244), on May 28, 1037.
26. On the war in Burgundy (1034), see Chapter XIV, at note 35; on Boniface's stay in

Nijmegen, see MGH DD C.II, 231 (issued in Nijmegen on July 5, 1036); cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 238c and 240.

27. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 244f. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:228ff. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 35 (*Deeds*, 93f.). Arnulf, *Gesta*, II.12, 15 (*Liber*, 156f.).

28. MGH DD C.II, 162f. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 168f. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:192f. Heinz Stooß, "Über den Aufbruch zur Städtebildung in Mitteleuropa," in *Die Frühgeschichte der europäischen Stadt*, ed. Jarnut and Johaneck, 8. Cf. MGH DD C.II, 251–53; *Regesten Konrads II.*, 262–64; and MGH DD H.III, 29; cf. *ibid.*, 26ff.

29. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 244g and h. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:235ff. and 266f.

30. Cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 252a with 254a and b. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:240ff.

31. Arnulf, *Gesta*, II.16, 16 (*Liber*, 161f.). Keller, "Mailand," 92f. Stooß, "Über den Aufbruch," 8. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:319f. (includes a loosely translated description of the *carraccio*).

32. *Annales Altahenses maiores*, a. 1037, ed. Edmund von Oefele, MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 4, 2nd ed. (Hannover, 1891; rpt. 1997).

33. Arnulf, *Gesta*, II.12, 15 (*Liber*, 156f.).

34. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 244h. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:234f. Landulf the Elder of Milan, *Historia Mediolanensis*, II.22, ed. Ludwig Bethmann and Wilhelm Wattenbach, MGH SS 8:58–60 (Hannover, 1948; rpt., Stuttgart, 1987), wrote that "non tamen constrictus, ut alii dampnati solent, sed curialiter a Teutonicis munitus" [he was not shackled, as is customary with other prisoners, but was made secure in a courtly manner by the Germans]. On Aribert's depiction, see Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:235 n. 3.

35. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 244i and 254d. *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1038. Wolter, *Die Synoden*, 358f.

36. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 252a and 254b. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:241ff. Arnulf, *Gesta*, II.13f., 15 (*Liber*, 157ff.). Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 35f. (*Deeds*, 94f.).

37. On the social tensions in northern Italy and their impact on Conrad's policies, see Keller, *Adelsherrschaft*, 258f. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:177–87. On Lodi, see *Regesten Konrads II.*, 38a, and Arnulf, *Gesta*, II.2, 12 (*Liber*, 146f.). Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:80.

38. *Historia Welforum*, cc. 8 and 10, ed. König, 14ff., or ed. Weiland, 460 and 461. On the Elisina estate, see Katrin Baaken, "Elisina curtis nobilissima: Welfischer Besitz in der Markgrafschaft Verona und die Datierung der *Historia Welforum*," *DA* 55 (1999): 63–94. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:188f.; cf. 1:421ff. Johann Weissensteiner, *Tegernsee, die Bayern und Österreich*, Archiv für österreichische Geschichte, 133 (Vienna, 1983), 144ff. Philippe Dollinger, *Der bayerische Bauernstand vom 9. bis zum 13. Jahrhundert*, trans. Ursula Irsigler, ed. Franz Irsigler (Munich, 1982), 106ff., on manses and hides; orig. publ. as *L'évolution des classes rurales en Bavière depuis la fin de l'époque carolingienne jusqu'au milieu du XIII siècle* (Paris, 1949).

39. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:190f. and 191 (quote). Anton, "Bonifaz," 540–42. Cf. Chapter II, at note 50, as well as Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:435. Bresslau avers that the wedding took place sometime between 1034, when Boniface and Aribert were in Burgundy exercising joint high command over the Italian troops, and 1037. It is unlikely that the marriage was celebrated as early as 1034, however, since the two sisters from Lotharingia, Sophia and Beatrix, did not join the imperial court until 1033/34 and were "raised" there (see Chapter II, at note 50). Thus, the marriage between Boniface and Beatrix could have been celebrated in 1036 at the earliest, during his sojourn in Germany; cf. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:191, incl. n. 1, with *Regesten Konrads II.*, 238c and 240.

40. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:189. Cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 153a, as well as Chapter II, at note 23, concerning the date of Hermann's birth (February 1016 at the latest).

41. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:162 and 190. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 237b, contains an incomplete recapitulation of Bresslau's material.

42. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 6 (*Deeds*, 72); cf. *ibid.*, c. 13 (close) (*Deeds*, 77f.).

43. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 254, on MGH DD C.II, 244, esp. the prefatory note.

44. On the terminology, see note 15 above; Keller, *Adelsherrschaft*, 286ff., esp. 289. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:145f., incl. nn. 1f.

45. Keller, *Adelsherrschaft*, 286.

46. The Latin phrase is “benefitium de nostris publicis bonis aut de ecclesiarum prediis.” See, for example, *Capitulare Aquisgranense*, c. 20, ed. Alfred Boretius, MGH Capitularia regum Francorum, 1:172.
47. Keller, *Adelsherrschaft*, 287f. Wolfgang Sellert, “Iudicium parium,” in *HRG*, vol. 2, cols. 465–67 (Berlin, 1978).
48. Cf. Werner Ogris, “Anerkennungsziins,” in *HRG*, vol. 1, cols. 166f. (Berlin, 1971).
49. Cf. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:246.
50. Cf. Brühl, *Fodrum*, 553f., incl. n. 543. Keller, *Adelsherrschaft*, 287, incl. nn. 189–91.
51. See Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:244–47, based on MGH DD C.II, 244, and *Constitutiones*, no. 45, 1:89. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 254.
52. Cf., for example, Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:374f.: Olderich-Manfred II and his wife, Berta, controlled over one million *iugera* [hides] of allodial property in 1021.
53. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:239f., 249, and 284. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 36 (*Deeds*, 95). Arnulf, *Gesta*, II.14, 15 (*Liber*, 159f.). *Gesta episcoporum Cameracensium*, III.55, 487.
54. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 193, incl. n. 284, based on *Annalista Saxo*, a. 1038, 681, and Arnulf, *Gesta*, II.14, 15 (*Liber*, 159f.).
55. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 254c, d, and g, as well as 255–58. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 36 (*Deeds*, 95). Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1037.
56. H. K. Schulze, *Hegemoniales Kaisertum*, 347, incl. n. 18. MGH DD H.III, 29; Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:191 n. 3.
57. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 254e and f. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 35 (*Deeds*, 94). *Gesta episcoporum Cameracensium*, III.55, 487. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:265ff.
58. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 264a.
59. *Ibid.*, 258b–264b. See Chapter IV, at note 23.
60. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 254d. On *ibid.*, 278a, see Wolter, *Die Synoden*, 358f.
61. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 266–68. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 37 (*Deeds*, 96). MGH DD C.II, 255.
62. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 270–73. MGH DD C.II, 258–61.
63. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 273a; cf. *ibid.*, 274, and MGH DD C.II, 262. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:284f.
64. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 279f. MGH DD C.II, 265f. On Aribert’s excommunication, see note 35 above.
65. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 280b.
66. *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 2019a and 2020. Falkenhausen, *Untersuchungen*, 53 and 55ff.
67. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:288–304.
68. Elisabeth Garms-Cornides, “Die langobardischen Fürstentitel (774–1077),” in *Intitulatio II*, ed. Wolfram, 34iff. Wolfram, *Intitulatio I*, 194ff. and 202ff. H. K. Schulze, *Hegemoniales Kaisertum*, 255ff.
69. *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 2012a–2024. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:170–78.
70. See Chapter XIII, at notes 48ff.
71. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:312–16. *Chronica monasterii Casinensis*, II.63ff., ed. Hartmut Hoffmann, MGH SS 34:288 (Hannover, 1980).
72. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 280a–c. See Chapter XIX, at note 42.
73. *Intitulatio II*, ed. Wolfram, 125f.
74. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 280d–288. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 37 (*Deeds*, 96). Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:308–17.
75. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 37 (*Deeds*, 96). *Regesten Konrads II.*, 285a. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:316f.
76. MGH DD C.II, 277. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 291.
77. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 289f. MGH DD C.II, 275f. Arnulf, *Gesta*, II.14, 15 (*Liber*, 159f.), and *Gesta episcoporum Cameracensium*, III.55, 487, concerning Conrad’s health.
78. MGH DD C.II, 272f. Schetter, *Die Intervenienz*, 120.
79. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 37 (*Deeds*, 96). Arnulf, *Gesta*, II.14, 15 (*Liber*, 159f.). Cf. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 33 (*Deeds*, 91f.), concerning the Saxons. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:97f., as well as 317 and 320.
80. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:307, incl. n. 1.
81. MGH DD H.III, 29.

CHAPTER 10

1. Cf., for example, K. Schmid, "Haus- und Herrschaftsverständnis," 21ff. and 37ff., including ill. 3–7. In his dedicatory letter to King Henry III, Wipo refers to Conrad's reign as an "operation with good effect" upon the realm; see the "Epistola ad regem Heinricum," in *Gesta*, 3 (*Deeds*, 4).

2. Wipo, *Tetralogus*, vv. 162f., in *Gesta*, 80.

3. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 49b.

4. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:138f. That Henry III and his mentor were present may be deduced from MGH DD C.II, 82 (April 7, 1027), and Zimmermann, *Papsturkunden*, no. 576, 2:1090f.

5. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 106a.

6. Beginning with MGH DD C.II, 114, the first diploma in which Henry is listed as an intervenor, he bears the epithet "only son." *Regesten Konrads II.*, 117a. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 23 (*Deeds*, 84).

7. Cf. MGH DD C.II, 129, with Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 39 (*Deeds*, 97): The Salian ruler died in 1039 "when the Emperor Conrad was confident that now the actual state of the kingdom, nay 'the hope for the Empire,' had been set well upon his son, King Henry." On the motto inscribed on Henry's seal, see Weinfurter, *Heinrich II.*, 77ff.

8. Wolfram, "Die Gesandtschaft," 170. MGH DD C.II, 144 and xxvi, incl. n. 2. On Bernd Kluge, *Deutsche Münzgeschichte von der späten Karolingerzeit bis zum Ende der Salier, ca. 900–1125*, Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum, Monographien, 29 (Mainz, 1991), 51 and 171 ill. 143, see Johannes Laudage, "Heinrich III.: Ein Lebensbild," *Aureo Estudio* 1 (1999): 30ff.; cf. references in Wolfram, "Die Gesandtschaft," 171 n. 42, and Schramm and Mütterich, *Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige*, 105f. See page 165 above for a reproduction of the coin.

9. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 197a and 202f. MGH DD C.II, 195f.

10. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 225c and 238c.

11. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:169, incl. n. 5. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 285a. Schwarzmaier, *Von Speyer*, 72ff. *Annales Altahenses*, a. 1046.

12. Cf. Chapter II, note 42.

13. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 285a and 291a.

14. *Ibid.*, 291b. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 38 (*Deeds*, 97). Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1038.

15. Cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 296c: Conrad died on June 4, 1039.

16. Beumann, "Zur Entwicklung," 185ff. (rpt. 135ff.). See pages 62ff. above.

17. Cf. Herwig Wolfram, *Splendor Imperii: Die Epiphanie von Tugend und Heil in Herrschaft und Reich* (MIÖG, suppl. vol. 20, pt. 3) (Vienna, 1963), 154.

18. Decker-Hauff, "Die 'Reichskrone,'" 627f., based on Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VII.1 (*Ottoman Germany*, 306f.) and Ademar of Chabannes, *Historiae*, III.37, ed. Georg Waitz, MGH SS 4:133 (Hannover, 1841; rpt., Stuttgart, 1981), or *idem*, *Chronicon*, ed. Pascale Bourgain et al., Corpus Christianorum, 129:1 (Turnhout, 1999). Cf. Percy Ernst Schramm, "Herrschaftszeichen: Gestiftet, verschenkt, verkauft, verpfändet: Belege aus dem Mittelalter," *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, philosophisch-historische Klasse*, 5 (1957): 175 and 177f.

19. Decker-Hauff, "Die 'Reichskrone,'" 628, based on Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 2 (*Deeds*, 65). See notes 37ff. below.

20. Johannes Fried, *Otto III. und Boleslaw Chrobry*, Frankfurter historische Abhandlungen, 30 (Stuttgart, 1989), 127f.

21. Cf. Gregory of Tours, *Historia*, VII.33: King Guntram bestows his kingdom upon Childebert by presenting him with the royal lance.

22. Fried, *Otto III. und Boleslaw Chrobry*, 128ff.

23. Schramm, *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik*, 2:501–13. It should be noted, however, that Otto I did not defeat the Hungarians at Lechfeld on the Feast of Saint Maurice (September 22), as noted on 2:510, but on August 10, 955, which is the feast day of Saint Laurence.

24. *Ibid.*, 511, incl. nn. 3f. Cf. Hermann Fillitz, “Bemerkungen zur Datierung und Lokalisierung der Reichskrone,” *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 56 (1993): 331f., incl. n. 65.

25. Wolfram, “Die Gesandtschaft,” 169, incl. n. 35, based on K. Schmid, “Die Sorge,” 685, and Berent Schweinböper, “Christus-Reliquien-Verehrung und Politik,” *Blätter für deutsche Landesgeschichte* 117 (1981): 224ff., 236–38, and 270ff.

26. Percy Ernst Schramm and Florentine Mütterich, *Denkmale der deutschen Könige und Kaiser*, Veröffentlichungen des Zentralinstituts für Kunstgeschichte in München, 2nd ed. (Munich, 1981), 170 n. 145, incl. suppl., p. 486. *Das Reich der Salier, 1024–1125: Katalog zur Ausstellung des Landes Rheinland-Pfalz* (Sigmaringen, 1992), 243–46 n. 2. For a color reproduction of the Imperial Cross, see www.khm.at/system2E.html?/staticE/page489.html.

27. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 2 (*Deeds*, 65).

28. *Das Reich der Salier*, 242f. n. 1. Mechthild Schulze-Dörrlamm, *Die Kaiserkrone Konrads II. (1024–1039)*, Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum, Monographien, 23 (Sigmaringen, 1991), esp. 123–25, which contain something of an overview.

29. See, most recently, Hans Martin Schaller, “Die Wiener Reichskrone—entstanden unter König Konrad III.,” in *Die Reichskleinodien*, Schriften zur staufischen Geschichte und Kunst, 16 (Göppingen, 1997), 58–105.

30. *Ibid.*, 72, incl. n. 106.

31. MGH DD C.III, 69, 126, 219, 224, and 229; the last three are taken from a collection of letters compiled by Abbot Wibald of Stavelot.

32. MGH DD H.(vi), 10f.

33. Odilo Engels, “Beiträge zur Geschichte der Staufer im 12. Jahrhundert (I),” *DA* 27 (1971): 373ff., makes a number of pertinent observations—pointing out, for example, that the king counted himself the second Emperor Conrad—which are all the more valuable because they draw upon MGH DD C.III, as well as the scholarly work of Rainer M. Herkenrath.

34. Cf. Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum Libri Quinque/Five Books*, 1.23, 38–39, who has harsh words for all those who do not wait to be crowned by the pope. In his imperial diplomas Conrad II used the *intitulatio* “C. divina favente clementia Romanorum imperator augustus” [Conrad the august emperor of the Romans by favor of divine clemency] (MGH DD C.II, 72ff.), although the diplomas issued right after his imperial coronation (see, for example, MGH DD C.II, 78, 89 [orig.], 93 [orig.], 99 [orig.], 101f. [orig.], and 108 [orig.]) often contain the corroborative phrase “dei gratia” [by the grace of God] (on the basic formulaic title, see Wolfram, *Intitulatio I*, 28f., and *Intitulatio II*, ed. Wolfram, 59f.), before it became the norm to use the other *intitulatio*. The corroborative phrase was used after 1027, however, especially in letters to Italian recipients (see, for example, MGH DD C.II, 131 and 261 [orig.], as well as 244, the famous *Constitutio de feudis*).

35. Schaller, “Die Wiener Reichskrone,” 72, incl. n. 105.

36. Herwig Wolfram, “Rezension ‘Die Salier’: Bemerkungen zu achtzehn Bänden,” *DA* 49 (1993): 175 n. 18 (quote). See, most recently, Hagen Keller, “Herrschaftsrepräsentation im ottonischen Sachsen: Ergebnisse und Fragen,” in Gerd Althoff and Ernst Schubert, ed., *Herrschaftsrepräsentation im ottonischen Sachsen*, VF, 46 (1998), 448–50.

37. Cf. Hubert Herkommer, “Der Waise, ‘aller fürsten leitesterne,’” in *Die Reichsidee in der deutschen Dichtung des Mittelalters*, Wege der Forschung, 589 (Darmstadt, 1983), 374.

38. Schramm and Mütterich, *Denkmale*, 141 n. 67. For a color reproduction of the Imperial Crown, see www.khm.at/system2E.html?/staticE/page71.html.

39. Fillitz, “Bemerkungen,” 328ff.

40. Cf. C. Ehlers, *Metropolis Germaniae*, 235ff.

41. Georg Johannes Kugler, *Die Reichskrone*, Die Kronen des Hauses Österreich, 5, 2nd ed. (Vienna, 1986), 25ff. and 27ff.

42. Wolthere, *Vita Godehardi prior*, c. 31, 190.

43. Herwig Wolfram, “Überlegungen zur Datierung der Wiener Reichskrone,” *MIÖG* 78 (1970): 84ff.

44. Klaar, *Die Herrschaft der Eppensteiner*, no. 38, 32. *Ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*, no. 27, 51.

45. Wolfram, "Überlegungen," 85–87.
46. *Ibid.*, 90, based on Kugler, *Die Reichskrone*, 52.
47. *Ibid.*, 85.
48. *Die Ordines*, 206, s.v. "Hezekiah."
49. Schramm and Mütterich, *Denkmale*, no. 77, 145, based on MGH Poetae Latini, 5:371 (Berlin, 1937/39; rpt., Dublin and Zurich, 1970, and Munich, 1978). Cf. Wolfram, "Überlegungen," 90 n. 27.
50. Bornscheuer, *Miserae Regum*, 13, 41, and 213ff. Cf. Wolfram, "Überlegungen," 84.
51. Hrotsvitha of Gandersheim, *Gesta Ottonis*, vv. 54–58, ed. Paul von Winterfeld, MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 34:204 (Hannover, 1902). Cf. Wolfram, "Überlegungen," 88f., incl. n. 20.
52. "Epitaphium Ottonis Magni imperatoris," vv. 1–4, ed. Karl Strecker, MGH Poetae Latini, 5:282. Cf. Decker-Hauff, "Die 'Reichskrone,'" 626f.
53. Wolfram, "Überlegungen," 89.
54. Hirsch and Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, vol. 2 (Berlin, 1864), 421–25: Odilo must have attended the imperial coronation of Henry II, because the new emperor took the imperial orb he had received from the pope and bestowed it upon Cluny, that is, its abbot. See *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 1800a, especially in light of Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum Libri Quinque/Five Books*, 1.23, 40–41. On Odilo's participation in the various events involving Conrad II, see Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:34, based on MGH DD C.11, 1, 72c, and 73c. Cf. Chapter VII, at notes 47 and 60.
55. Decker-Hauff, "Die 'Reichskrone,'" 627f. See note 18 above.
56. Wolfram, "Überlegungen," 92f.
57. Beumann, "Zur Entwicklung," 185ff. (rpt. 135ff.). Cf. Chapter VIII, notes 8f.
58. See Eugen Ewig, "Der Gebetsdienst der Kirchen in den Urkunden der späteren Karolinger," in *Festschrift für Berent Schwineköper*, ed. Helmut Maurer und Hans Patze (Sigmaringen, 1982), 45ff., and idem, "Die Gebetsklausel für König und Reich in den merowingischen Königsurkunden," in *Tradition als historische Kraft: Interdisziplinäre Forschungen zur Geschichte des früheren Mittelalters (Festschrift Karl Hauck)*, ed. Norbert Kamp und Joachim Wollasch (Berlin and New York, 1982), 87ff., for observations applicable beyond the Merovingian period.
59. Carlrichard Brühl, "Fränkischer Krönungsbrauch und das Problem der 'Festkrönungen,'" in *Aus Mittelalter und Diplomatie*, esp. 355ff., and idem, "Kronen- und Krönungsbrauch im frühen und hohen Mittelalter," in *Aus Mittelalter und Diplomatie*, esp. 421ff.
60. Brühl, "Kronen- und Krönungsbrauch," 415f., incl. nn. 14–16. Cf. Franz-Reiner Erkens, "Der Herrscher als *gotes drūt*: Zur Sakralität des ungesalbten ostfränkischen Königs," *HJ* 118 (1998): 15ff., which includes many valuable bibliographical citations.
61. See Chapter IV, at note 1.
62. See Chapter VII, at note 16.
63. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 30 (*Deeds*, 89). See Chapter XIV, at note 1.
64. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 73c. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 16 (*Deeds*, 79). Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1027.
65. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 2 and 4 (*Deeds*, 65 and 69). Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1024. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 4a. Brühl, "Kronen- und Krönungsbrauch," 417, incl. n. 21 (quotes).
66. Wipo makes much of the fact that Henry was crowned king a mere one year after his father's imperial coronation. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 117a. See esp. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 23 (*Deeds*, 84), and idem, "Cantilena," strophes 1–13, esp. 7f., pp. 105f.
67. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 291b. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 38 (*Deeds*, 97). Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1038.
68. Brühl, "Kronen- und Krönungsbrauch," 418, incl. n. 26. Idem, "Festkrönungen," in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. 4, col. 409.
69. Hans-Walter Klewitz, "Die Festkrönungen der deutschen Könige," *ZRG KA* 28 (1939): 52f. (quote).
70. The quote is a pastiche of *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1039, and *Annalista Saxo*, 682, which is based on the former work. Cf. Klewitz, "Die Festkrönungen," 53, incl. nn. 2–4.

71. Brühl, "Fränkischer Krönungsbrauch," 353ff.
72. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 254b. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 36 (*Deeds*, 95). *Gesta episcoporum Cameracensium*, III.55, 487.
73. On *Regesten Konrads II.*, 280d, see Klewitz, "Die Festkrönungen," 52f. See Wolfram, *Salzburg*, 240f., on the computations of some medieval scholars who based their speculations predominantly on Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, IV.5 and 9.
74. Klewitz, "Die Festkrönungen," 53, on *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1039, 43, and *Annalista Saxo*, 682.
75. See Klewitz, "Die Festkrönungen," 53, incl. nn. 2 and 3, on *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1039, 43, and Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 39 (*Deeds*, 97f.). On the two burial crowns, see Chapter XXIII, at notes 26ff.
76. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 39 (*Deeds*, 97).
77. K. Schmid, "Haus- und Herrschaftsverständnis," 26ff., as well as ills. 1a–c, following p. 48. See page 110 above for a reproduction of the fresco.
78. Schramm and Mütterich, *Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige*, 226f. n. 142.
79. Schramm and Mütterich, *Denkmale*, 168f. n. 144.
80. Mechthild Schulze-Dörrlamm, *Der Mainzer Schatz der Kaiserin Agnes: Neue Untersuchungen zum sogenannten "Gisela-Schmuck"*, Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum, Monographien, 24 (Sigmaringen, 1991), 8ff.
81. *Ruodlieb*, v, vv. 340–51 (Ford trans., 43–44). The description of the entire treasury may be found in *ibid.*, vv. 308–86 (42–45). Cf. Schulze-Dörrlamm, *Der Mainzer Schatz*, 117 and 127f. nn. 11f., as well as Schramm and Mütterich, *Denkmale*, 169.
82. Cf. *Ruodlieb*, trans. Fritz Peter Knapp, Reclam Universal-Bibliothek, 9846 (Stuttgart, 1977), 184f., on vv. 340ff. Cf. *Ruodlieb*, ed. Langosch, 369ff., esp. 373.
83. Schramm, "Herrschaftszeichen," 178 (Hildesheim). Cf. Chapter IV, at note 36, for the incident with the ring, as well as Schulze-Dörrlamm, *Der Mainzer Schatz*, 115 and 122, although the ring depicted in *ibid.*, 121 ill. 3, would probably have been too valuable.
84. See Chapter IV, note 36.
85. See notes 61–63 above. On the *memoria* for the Feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, see MGH DD C.II, 51 (February 14, 1026).
86. Hehl, "Maria," 273ff., esp. 294 (quote). Weinfurter, *Heinrich II.*, 56ff.
87. Hehl, "Maria," 288f. and 294 (quote). On the coins depicting the Virgin Mary minted in Byzantium and Speyer, see *ibid.*, 278f., and note 8 above, as well as note III below. On the inscription "HEINRICUS SPES IMPERII," found on a seal, see note 7 above. On the fresco in the apse of the cathedral at Aquileia, see K. Schmid, "Haus- und Herrschaftsverständnis," 26ff., as well as ills. 1a–c, following p. 48. On the chronology of the events of September 1024, see *Regesten Konrads II.*, 1–4a. On the portrayals of the sovereigns in the Golden Evangeliary from Speyer and now in the Escorial, Madrid, see Schramm and Mütterich, *Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige*, 394 and 406, ills. 143 and 157. Cf. note 106 below.
88. See Hehl, "Maria," 272ff., on MGH DD C.II, 4. K. Schmid, "Die Sorge der Salier um ihre Memoria," 681–88; the title of this famous study is the source of the quote.
89. C. Ehlers, *Metropolis Germaniae*, 60ff. and 73ff.
90. *Ibid.*, 74f., incl. n. 13, based on Walter of Speyer, *Scholasticus*, "Prologus," vv. 28, in *Opera*, MGH Poetae Latini 5, pt. 1, 12. See also Weinfurter, "Herrschaftslegitimation," 69.
91. Ellenhard, *Chronicon usque ad a. 1209*, a. 1291, ed. Philipp Jaffé, MGH SS 17:134 (Hanover, 1861; rpt., Stuttgart, 1990).
92. On MGH DD C.II, 204 (January 30, 1034), see Chapter I, at notes 48–51, and esp. Weinfurter, "Herrschaftslegitimation," 66, as well as K. Schmid, "Die Sorge," 681ff.
93. Weinfurter, "Herrschaftslegitimation," 57–59. C. Ehlers, *Metropolis Germaniae*, 80f. Friedmann, *Die Beziehungen*, 107f. n. 541 (detailed discussion of the widely disparate consecration dates in the sources).
94. Schramm, "Herrschaftszeichen," 177f.
95. On MGH DD C.II, 180, see K. Schmid, "Die Sorge," 686, incl. nn. 112f., and Friedmann, *Die Beziehungen*, 107f., esp. incl. n. 541.

96. On MGH DD C.II, 216 (January 17, 1035), see Thomas Zotz, “Zur Grundherrschaft des Königs im Deutschen Reich vom 10. bis zum frühen 13. Jahrhundert,” in *Grundherrschaft und bäuerliche Gesellschaft im Hochmittelalter*, ed. Werner Rösener, Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte, 115 (Göttingen, 1995), 84ff. MGH DD C.II, 198. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 205.

97. See Chapter XVII, at notes 14–16.

98. On the use of this terminology, see C. Ehlers, *Metropolis Germaniae*, 55ff.

99. Cf. Müller-Mertens and Huschner, *Reichsintegration*, 380 and 382, as well as 385, based on MGH DD C.II, 41f. (July 14 and 15, 1025). C. Ehlers, *Metropolis Germaniae*, 258 n. 6.

100. C. Ehlers, *Metropolis Germaniae*, 258 n. 7.

101. *Ibid.*, 73.

102. MGH DD C.II, 4 and 204. Cf. Friedmann, *Die Beziehungen*, 110, as well Chapter I, at notes 48–50.

103. C. Ehlers, *Metropolis Germaniae*, 75ff., based on Norbert of Iburg, *Vita Bennonis II. episcopi Osnabrugensis*, c. 4, ed. Harry Bresslau, MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 56:4f. (Hanover, 1902; rpt. 1997), and MGH DD C.II, 4. Cf. C. Ehlers, *Metropolis Germaniae*, 229ff. and 235ff.

104. Weinfurter, “Herrschaftslegitimation,” 59 and 67 (quotes).

105. *Ibid.*, 59. C. Ehlers, *Metropolis Germaniae*, 225–28. On Naumburg, see Chapter XIII, at notes 45f.

106. Weinfurter, “Herrschaftslegitimation,” 73ff. Schramm and Mutherich, *Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige*, 232f. n. 157 and 258 (quote). Cf. note 87 above. On the “crucifix of churches” in Utrecht, see Aart J. J. Mekking, “Een kruis van kerken rond Koenraads hart: Een bijdrage tot de kennis van de functie en symbolische betekenis van het Utrechtse kerkenkruis alsmede van die te Bamberg en te Paderborn,” in *Utrecht, kruispunt van de middeleeuwse kerk*, ed. Ank C. Esmeijer, Clavis kunsthistorische monografieën, 7 (Utrecht, 1988), 21ff.; Eng. trans., “A Cross of Churches Around Conrad’s Heart: An Analysis of the Function and Symbolism of the Cross of Churches in Utrecht, and Those of Bamberg and Paderborn,” in *Utrecht, Britain, and the Continent: Archaeology, Art, and Architecture*, ed. E. Bièvre (Leeds, 1996), 99–111. The author wishes to thank Johanna Maria van Winter, Utrecht, for bringing this most valuable monograph to his attention.

107. See Weinfurter, “Herrschaftslegitimation,” 65, for a map.

108. Schweineköper, “Christus-Reliquien-Verehrung,” 212, offers statistical evidence that from the tenth century onward the number of accounts concerning the veneration of the crucifix grew.

109. *Ibid.*, 229.

110. See Chapter XII, at notes 15ff., as well as Chapter X, at notes 23ff.

111. On Kluge, *Deutsche Münzgeschichte*, 47, 51, and 171 n. 143, see note 8 above.

112. Manfred Groten, “Von der Gebetsverbrüderung zum Königskanonikat: Zur Vorgeschichte und Entwicklung der Königskanonikat an den Dom- und Stiftskirchen des Deutschen Reiches,” *HJ* 103 (1983): 15, on MGH DD C.II, 51.

113. *Ibid.*, 16.

114. See Chapter XVII, at notes 53f. and 63f.

115. MGH DD C.II, 139. Hartmut Boockmann, “Eine Urkunde Konrads II. für das Damenstift Obermünster in Regensburg: Zu einem verschenkten Königszepter und zum Königskanonikat,” in *Institutionen, Kultur und Gesellschaft im Mittelalter: Festschrift Josef Fleckenstein*, ed. Lutz Fenske, Werner Rösener, and Thomas Zotz (Sigmaringen, 1984), 207ff., esp. 209ff.

116. Boockmann, “Eine Urkunde Konrads II.,” 215f. According to MGH DD C.II, 139, the nuns at Obermünster were subject to the Benedictine Rule; on such foundations, see, for example, MGH DD H.II, 428 (cloister of Göß in the Styrian Alps of present-day Austria). On Conrad’s reclamation program, see Chapter VIII, at notes 5ff.

117. *Annales Sangallenses maiores*, a. 1027. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:221. Schwarzmaier, “Reichenauer Gedenkbucheinträge,” 22.

118. See Chapter v, at note 47.
 119. K. Schmid, "Die Sorge," 689ff. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:335f. n. 2. Cf. Goetz, *Lebensbilder*, 138.
 120. Burchard of Worms, *Decretorum libri xx*, ed. Gérard Fransen and Theo Kölzer (Cologne, 1548; expanded rpt., Aalen, 1992), 68; cf. 69ff.
 121. *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1039, 44.

CHAPTER II

1. John B. Freed, "The Origins of the European Nobility: The Problem of the Ministerials," *Viator* 7 (1976): 212f. Wolfram, *Grenzen und Räume*, 341. K. Brunner, *Herzogtümer*, 407ff. While "ministerial" is currently the generally accepted term for the unfree household servants of this era, the usage is, in fact, anachronistic, as the word *ministerialis/es* does not occur in contemporary sources until approximately 1100.

2. Thomas Zotz, "Die Formierung der Ministerialität," in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 3:3ff.

3. *Ruodlieb*, I, vv. 104f. (Ford trans., 13). Benedikt Konrad Vollmann, *Ruodlieb*, Erträge der Forschung, 283 (Darmstadt, 1993), 28. Werner Rösener, "Bauern in der Salierzeit," in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 3:62f.: Free peasants lack access to the king. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 6 (*Deeds*, 72).

4. *Regesten Konrads II.*, m and 5a.

5. See Chapter I, at notes 76f., and Chapter II, at notes 60–71, as well as Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 4 (*Deeds*, 69); cf. MGH DD C.II, 35, and *Regesten Konrads II.*, 35.

6. Cf. Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 134f., based on Thietmar, *Chronicon*, III.6 (4) (*Ottonian Germany*, 131), along with *Gesta episcoporum Cameracensium*, III.50, 485. *Unibos*, strophes 2 and esp. 42f., 95ff., 38ff., in *Ruodlieb*, ed. Langosch. Cf. Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century*, 405.

7. Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1026, and Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 11: "aliquantum regi militans" (*Deeds*, 76: "after he had fought for some time for the King").

8. See the list of diplomas issued to laymen by Henry II and Conrad II in Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 142f. See *ibid.*, 140f., incl. n. 395, and Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:368ff. (inheritability of fiefs) and 510ff., on MGH DD F.I, 200.

9. Cf. for example, Hans Karl Schulze, "Mediävistik und Begriffsgeschichte," in *Festschrift für Helmut Beumann zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Kurt-Ulrich Jäschke and Reinhard Weniskus (Sigmaringen, 1977), 388ff., esp. 402 (*miles*).

10. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 11 (*Deeds*, 76).

11. MGH DD H.IV, 271 (March 22, 1074); see the genealogy table in K. Brunner, *Herzogtümer*, 318, which shows how they were related.

12. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, v.22 (*Ottonian Germany*, 220).

13. Wolfram, *Grenzen und Räume*, 390, based on Liudprand of Cremona, *Antapodosis*, II.21–23, in *Opera*, ed. Josef Becker, MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 41:47–49, 3rd ed. (Hannover, 1915; rpt. 1993); Eng. trans. in *The Works of Liudprand of Cremona*, trans. F. A. Wright (London, 1930), 80ff. See also Erkens, "Militia und Ritterschaft," 628–31.

14. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 13 and 11 (*Deeds*, 77 and 76). Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1026.

15. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 13 (*Deeds*, 77f.). Cf. Chapter VII, at notes 36f. On the incident in Rome, see Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 16 (*Deeds*, 79).

16. Erkens, "Militia und Ritterschaft," 631f., based on *Annales Sangallenses maiores*, a. 1035; Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 4 (*Deeds*, 68); and MGH DD C.II, 244 (see Chapter IX, at notes 43ff.).

17. Karl Schmid, *Geblüt, Herrschaft, Geschlechterbewußtsein: Grundfragen zum Verständnis des Adels im Mittelalter*, VF 44 (Sigmaringen, 1998), 101f. (quote). Keller, "Mailand," 91–93, established that in Milan the archbishops also enfeoffed comital families. Cf. Chapter IX, at note 22.

18. Erkens, "Militia und Ritterschaft," 645ff.

19. Zotz, "Die Formierung," esp. 10ff. Karl Bosl, *Die Reichsministerialität der Salier und Staufer*, Schriften der MGH, 10 (Stuttgart, 1950), pt. 1, 32ff., reached plausible conclusions on the basis of questionable premises. Wilhelm Störmer, *Früher Adel: Studien zur politischen Führungsschicht im fränkisch-deutschen Reich vom 8. bis 11. Jahrhundert*, Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters, 6 (Stuttgart, 1973), 2:504f., on the *Ruodlieb*.

20. *Vita Gebehardi archiepiscopi Salisburgensis* I, 4, and II, 9, ed. Wilhelm Wattenbach, MGH SS 11:26 and 39 (Hannover, 1854; rpt., Stuttgart, 1994). On the evolution of the terms in the Italian kingdom, see note 17 above.

21. Freed, "The Origins," 231. Herwig Wolfram, "Die Ministerialen und das werdende Land," in *Die Kuenringer: Das Werden des Landes Niederösterreich*, Katalog des Niederösterreichischen Landesmuseums, n.s., 110 (Vienna, 1981), 14f.

22. Zotz, "Die Formierung," 32.

23. *Ibid.*, 3ff., based esp. on Vulculd, *Vita Bardonis archiepiscopi Moguntini brevior*, cc. 5–7, ed. Wilhelm Wattenbach, MGH SS 11:319f. (Hannover, 1854; rpt., Stuttgart, 1994) (cf. Chapter XVI, at note 44), and Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 20 (*Deeds*, 82).

24. On Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 37 (*Deeds*, 95), and MGH DD H.III, 223, see *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1037, 42; Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:275, incl. n. 4, doubts that the two men named Magnus were one and the same; Bosl, *Die Reichsministerialität*, pt. 1, 35, on the other hand, tends to support the contention.

25. Wolfram, *History of the Goths*, 242; idem, *The Roman Empire*, 60f.

26. See esp. John B. Freed, "The Formation of the Salzburg Ministerialage in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries," *Viator* 9 (1978): 67ff.

27. Erkens, "Militia und Ritterschaft," 631, based on MGH DD O.III, 104.

28. Wolfram, *Salzburg*, 154, based on *Capitularia regum Francorum*, no. 25, c. 4, 1:67. The short sword, or *semispatum*, was probably the narrow-bladed sax.

29. Zotz, "Die Formierung," 3ff.

30. Cf. MGH DD C.II, 140, with *Regesten Konrads II.*, 145, which contains a law code for the ministerials of the monastery of Weissenburg, in the Nordgau region of Bavaria, which was forged sometime before 1125 on the basis of an authentic privilege that is difficult to date with any precision and probably postdates the reign of Conrad II. MGH DD C.II, 216. Contrary to *Regesten Konrads II.*, 224, Zotz, "Zur Grundherrschaft," 76ff., esp. 87ff. and 96, maintains that the ministerial code for Limburg is a forgery dating to the early twelfth century. Burchard of Worms, *Lex familiae Wormatiensis ecclesiae*, ed. Ludwig Weiland, in *Constitutiones*, no. 438, 1:639–44. *Quellen zur deutschen Verfassungs-, Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte bis 1250*, ed. and trans. Lorenz Weinrich, *Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters*, 32, 2nd ed. (Darmstadt, 1977; rpt. 2000), no. 23, 88ff., dated 1024/25. Bosl, *Die Reichsministerialität*, pt. 1, 32–48. Zotz, "Die Formierung," esp. 24ff. Cf. Gerhard Theuerkauf, "Burchard von Worms und die Rechtskunde seiner Zeit," *FMS* 2 (1968): 144ff., esp. 156ff.

31. MGH DD C.II, 216.

32. Cf. *ibid.* with MGH DD O.III, 104 (September 18, 992); concerning the latter diploma, cf. Erkens, "Militia und Ritterschaft," 631; concerning the household code for Limburg abbey, see Zotz, "Die Formierung," esp. 24ff., as well as idem, "Zur Grundherrschaft," 76ff., esp. 87ff. and 96: The fact that the code uses the term *miles* to designate a knight with ministerial status—to say nothing of other problems with the document—also militates against dating it to Conrad's reign.

33. MGH DD C.II, 29 and 214. *Die Traditionen des Hochstiftes Freising*, 1423, 2:279f. Zotz, "Die Formierung," 16. Herwig Wolfram, "Zisterziensergründung und Ministerialität am Beispiel Zwetls," *Jahrbuch des Vereins für Landeskunde von Niederösterreich*, n.s., 46/47 (1981): 22ff. On MGH DD C.II, 139, incl. n. g, see Zotz, "Die Formierung," 16, incl. n. 99.

34. See esp. Dollinger, *Der bayerische Bauernstand*, 45 n. 1 and 264f. n. 90. On Magnus, see Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:275, incl. n. 4, and MGH DD H.III, 223, as well as Bosl, *Die Reichsministerialität*, pt. 1, 35.

35. Dollinger, *Der bayerische Bauernstand*, 215ff.
36. See esp. *ibid.*, 245ff. The *Barschalken* were free persons who were nevertheless subject to levies on their properties.
37. See Zotz, "Die Formierung," 12ff. and 24ff.
38. MGH DD C.II, 216. See note 32 above.
39. See Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:352f., incl. n. 2, on MGH DD C.II, 130, and *Regesten Konrads II.*, 133.
40. Rösener, "Bauern," 62f. The sovereign of the story may very well have been Conrad II, who convened a court diet in Solothurn in the fall of 1038; see *Regesten Konrads II.*, 291b. Cf. H. K. Schulze, *Hegemoniales Kaisertum*, 365f., and Erkens, *Konrad II.*, 146f.
41. Wilfried Hartmann, "Autoritäten im Kirchenrecht und Autorität des Kirchenrechts in der Salierzeit," in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 3:425ff.
42. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 1 (*Deeds*, 59).
43. Cf. Mertens, "Vom Rhein," 244, and Chapter v, at note 18 (the deaths of father and son at around the same time). See also Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 19 (*Deeds*, 81).
44. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 619.
45. Lampert of Hersfeld, *Annales*, a. 1071, 199 or 132.
46. On March 21, 1004, according to Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VI.3, 21 (*Ottonian Germany*, 238f.). There is no mention of the event in *Regesten Heinrichs II.*
47. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VI.35 and 41, VII.66, and VIII.18 (*Ottonian Germany*, 261f., 265f., 354, and 373f.).
48. Gerd Althoff, "Die Billunger in der Salierzeit," in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 1:316, incl. n. 35. See Chapter I, at note 74, concerning Adalbero's appointment as duke of Carinthia.
49. See Chapter III, at note 14.
50. Wolfram, *Salzburg*, 171f. K. Brunner, "Die fränkischen Fürstentitel," 194 and 303. Cf. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, v.15: "ducibus autem Bernhardo ac Bolizlavo" (*Ottonian Germany*, 216: "also present were dukes Bernard [of Saxony] and Boleslav [of Poland]").
51. Wolfram, *Salzburg*, 166–69, based esp. on Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum*, v.29, ed. Georg Waitz, MGH SS rerum Langobardicarum (Hannover, 1878; rpt. 1988), 154; Eng. trans., *History of the Lombards*, trans. William Dudley Foulke, ed. Edward Peters (Philadelphia, 1974), 234.
52. Cf. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 1 and 2 (*Deeds*, 59, 61, and 64f.).
53. See the analysis of Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 1 (*Deeds*, 57ff.), in Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:19f.
54. See esp. Weinfurter, "Die Zentralisierung," 243ff.
55. Cf. the discussion in Becher, *Rex, Dux und Gens*, 15ff.
56. Engels, "Das Reich der Salier," 483ff.
57. M. Werner, "Der Herzog," 398f. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 194a. Schwarzmaier, "Reichener Gedenkbucheinträge," 21f., incl. n. 13.
58. Becher, *Rex, Dux und Gens*, 251ff. Cf., for example, the criticism of Bernard II's policy toward the Wends in Adam, *Gesta*, II, n. 71.
59. Becher, *Rex, Dux und Gens*, 251f., based on Widukind, *Res gestae Saxonicae*, II.4. See Hagen Keller, "Machabaeorum pugnae: Zum Stellenwert eines biblischen Vorbilds in Widukinds Deutung der ottonischen Königsherrschaft," in *Iconologia Sacra: Mythos, Bildkunst und Dichtung in der Religions- und Sozialgeschichte Alteuropas: Festschrift für Karl Hauck zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. Hagen Keller and Nikolaus Staubach, Arbeiten zur Frühmittelalterforschung, 23 (Berlin, 1994), 417ff., on an Ottonian analogy between the *princeps militiae* and the Maccabees.
60. See Chapter IX, at notes 40 and 75.
61. On the concept of a "provincial duchy," see Goetz, "Das Herzogtum," 257f. and 268–70 (quote).
62. Engels, "Das Reich der Salier," 505, incl. n. 109. M. Werner, "Der Herzog," esp. 468–73 (summary).
63. The term *regnum* was applicable to all duchies, as seen from the title of chapter 2 in

Wipo's *Gesta*: "iter regis per regna" (*Deeds*, 71: "On the Journey of the King through the Realms"). On its use in reference to Lotharingia, see M. Werner, "Der Herzog," 372ff., esp. 376f.; to Bavaria, see Wolfram, *Salzburg*, 388 and 391, although the "Modus de Heinrico," strophe 1, in *Carmina Cantabrigiensia*, ed. Karl Strecker, MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 40:57 (Berlin, 1926), also uses the term *thero Beiaro riche* [the kingdom of the Bavarian].

64. See Goetz, "Das Herzogtum," 257f., based esp. on Hermann of Reichenau.

65. On the duchy of Swabia, see Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 19f. (*Deeds*, 80ff.).

66. See Otto Brunner, "*Land*" and *Lordship: Structures of Governance in Medieval Austria*, trans. Howard Kaminsky and James Van Horn Melton (Philadelphia, 1992), 139ff.

67. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 1f. (*Deeds*, 61f.). In chapter 19 Wipo refers to Cuono as the "duke of Worms," without mentioning the tribal association, while in chapter 2 he refers to Otto, the grandfather, as having been the "duke of the Franks," without mentioning Worms, although evidence for his association with that town is provided by other sources (*Deeds*, 81 and 61); see Chapter I, at note 6. On the "modern" concept of lordship" within the territory surrounding Worms, see Weinfurter, *The Salian Century*, 19f., and idem, "Die Salier und das Reich," 8, incl. nn. 32–35.

68. Goetz, "Das Herzogtum," 271. M. Werner, "Der Herzog," 389ff.

69. *Vita Meinwerci*, cc. 195 and 197.

70. Wilhelm Störmer, "Bayern und der bayerische Herzog im 11. Jahrhundert," in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 1:535 (quote).

71. See Chapter v, at notes 47ff. and 68ff.

72. On Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 20 (*Deeds*, 81f.), see Goetz, "Das Herzogtum," 256, and Engels, "Das Reich der Salier," 496f.

73. See Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:352f., incl. n. 2, on MGH DD C.II, 130, and *Regesten Konrads II.*, 133.

74. See Chapter VIII, at notes 5ff., and Chapter XXII, at notes 86f. Cf. Störmer, "Bayern," 527.

75. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 28 (*Deeds*, 86f.).

76. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 225d. See Chapter v, at note 70.

77. On Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VI.41 (*Ottoman Germany*, 265f.), see Störmer, "Bayern," 526, incl. n. 94.

78. Wolfram, *Salzburg*, 388f.

79. Engels, "Das Reich der Salier," 490f., incl. n. 55.

80. Weinfurter, "Die Zentralisierung," 243ff. Störmer, "Bayern," 503ff., esp. 511ff. and 526. M. Werner, "Der Herzog," 367ff. Althoff, "Die Billunger," 309ff.

81. H. Maurer, *Der Herzog*, 205. Cf. Weinfurter, "Die Zentralisierung," 263.

82. M. Werner, "Der Herzog," 398; for a comparison with the northern German duchies, see 430.

83. See, for example, Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:348ff. Goetz, "Das Herzogtum," 258f. and 270 n. 5.

84. Cf. MGH DD C.II, 130, with Ekkehard IV of Saint Gall, *Casus sancti Galli*, c. 96.

85. Adam, *Gesta*, III.5 (*History*, 118).

86. Keller, "Reichsstruktur," 100ff. Engels, "Das Reich der Salier," 492. M. Werner, "Der Herzog," 386f., for a discussion of certain anomalous features in the development of Lotharingia. Störmer, "Bayern," 511ff. and 518ff.

87. Keller, "Reichsstruktur," 101ff. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:348ff.

88. See the subtitle to Becher, *Rex, Dux und Gens*, "Studies on the Rise of the Saxon Duchy in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries," as well as *ibid.*, 9ff. and 302ff.

89. Cf. the discussion in Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:348ff. See also, for example, Becher, *Rex, Dux und Gens*, 9ff.; Engels, "Das Reich der Salier," 479ff.; and K. Brunner, "Die fränkischen Fürstentitel," 187f.

90. See Chapter II, at notes 60ff.

91. *Regesten Konrads II.*, s.

92. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:20, incl. n. 3, and 37f.

93. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 1 and 2 (*Deeds*, 58f. and 65).
94. See Chapter v, at notes 16f.
95. Mertens, "Vom Rhein," 244. M. Werner, "Der Herzog," 398f. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 194a.
96. *Regesten Konrads II.*, l. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:11f., incl. n. 1, based on *Vita Meinwerci*, c. 195. On Werla's importance as a Saxon meeting place, see Engels, "Das Reich der Salier," 494f., incl. n. 71.
97. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, v.15–18 (*Ottoman Germany*, 215ff.). Weinfurter, *Heinrich II.*, 53f.
98. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 6 (*Deeds*, 72).
99. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 26. MGH DD C.II, 26.
100. Althoff, "Die Billunger," 319.
101. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 2 (*Deeds*, 61).
102. Cf. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, v.3f. (*Ottoman Germany*, 207f.), with *Annales Quedlinburgenses*, a. 1024 (*Regesten Konrads II.*, 8a), as well as with Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:20 n. 3, on Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 2 (*Deeds*, 61), and *Vita Meinwerci*, c. 197. On the diet of Saxon princes on September 13, 1024, see Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:12f., incl. n. 7.
103. Adam, *Gesta*, II.66 (64), incl. Schol. 46 (47); cf. II.48 (46) and 56 (54), as well as 71 (69) (*History*, 100f.; cf. 87f. and 93f., as well as 105f.), for a clear discussion of Bernard's policies toward the Wends and the church. On the latter, cf. Chapter XIII, at note 78.
104. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, nos. 585f. Adam, *Gesta*, II.66 (64); cf. II.79 (75), as well as III.19–20 (18–19) and 50f. (49f.) (*History*, 100f.; cf. 108f., as well as 130f. and 156ff.). See Chapter XIII, at notes 47f.
105. Adam, *Gesta*, III.43 (42) (Ordulf and Hermann inherit the duchy from Bernard II) and III.51 (50) (Ordulf's defeats, appearance of a *horribilis cometa* around Easter time, the victory of William the Conqueror over King Harold II at Hastings) (*History*, 150f. and 157f.).
106. On MGH DD C.II, 124, and *Regesten Konrads II.*, 127, see Chapter v, at notes 49 and 59, as well as Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:251.
107. Cf. Adam, *Gesta*, III.8 (*History*, 120f.), with *Gesta episcoporum Halberstadensium*, ed. Ludwig Weiland, MGH SS 23:94 (Hannover, 1874; rpt., Stuttgart, 1986).
108. Schubert, *Politik, Verfassung, Wirtschaft*, 203f. Althoff, "Die Billunger," 318f.
109. Störmer, "Bayern," 513, based on Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VI.3, VII.66, and VIII.18 (*Ottoman Germany*, 238f. [quote], 354, and 373f. [quote]).
110. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 106a.
111. *Ibid.*, 291a. *Annales Sangallenses maiores*, a. 1038. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:321f.
112. Störmer, "Bayern," 512f., based on Thietmar, *Chronicon*, IV.20 and V.14 (*Ottoman Germany*, 165f. and 214f.).
113. See Chapter XII, at note 7, and Chapter XIII, at notes 113ff.
114. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 106a. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:212f. and 2:348f. Störmer, "Bayern," 513f.
115. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2: 349f.
116. Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1012. Cf. Goetz, "Das Herzogtum," 258.
117. Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1039.
118. See Chapter v, at notes 70–74. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:350. K. Brunner, *Herzogtümer*, 156f.
119. See entries for these titles in MGH DD C.II, 543. That the terms *missus regalis* and *missus sacri palatii* were synonymous is evidenced by MGH DD C.II, 258f. Cf. Kränzle, "Der abwesende König," 121, incl. n. 10.
120. E.g., MGH DD C.II, 89 (a bishop) and 280 (a secular lord); cf. 75, 186, and 250.
121. *Ibid.*, 100, 244, and 258f.
122. *Ibid.*, 244.
123. *Ibid.*, 100. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 172f.
124. MGH DD C.II, 258. Cf. the prefatory remarks to 258 with Bresslau, *Handbuch*, 1:90f.
125. See Chapter VII, at notes 5ff.
126. Weinfurter, *Heinrich II.*, 237f.

127. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:188ff. and 348ff.
 128. See Chapter VIII, at notes 6f.
 129. See *ibid.*
 130. Cf., for example, Kupfer, *Das Königsgut*, 119ff., concerning the Danube area in Austria.
 131. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:364, incl. n. 3, based on Adam, *Gesta*, III.28 (27) (*History*, 137f.).
 132. H. K. Schulze, *Hegemoniales Kaisertum*, 370.
 133. See, for example, *Vita Meinwerci*, c. 151, 79; cf. the shipment of wine, MGH DD C.II, 248 (in the Po River valley).
 134. On *Die Traditionen des Hochstiftes Freising*, no. 1422, 2:278f., see Chapter VIII, at note 5, and Chapter XXII, at notes 87ff.
 135. See Chapter X, at notes 115f.
 136. See Chapter VIII, at notes 6f. Weinfurter, *Heinrich II.*, 103ff.
 137. See Chapter XVIII, at notes 9f.
 138. MGH DD C.II, 82, 152, 158–60, 171, 177f., 188, and 198.
 139. Cf. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:355f.
 140. See Chapter V, at notes 25 and 49.
 141. See Chapter XVIII, at note 14.
 142. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:371 and 510ff., concerning MGH DD F.I, 200 (January 1, 1158). Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 140f., incl. n. 395, rightfully points out some problems with the diploma's provenance, but does not address the reference to the considerable payments the couple were to make to Conrad, which is in itself quite unusual and perhaps an indication that the diploma is after all authentic.
 143. See Harald Dickerhof, "Wandlungen im Rechtsdenken der Salierzeit am Beispiel der *lex naturalis* und des *ius gentium*," in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 3:450f., incl. n. 25, based on MGH DD C.II, 54.
 144. See the entry for Emma in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 3:574. Gerd Althoff, "Immedinger," in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. 5 (Munich and Zurich, 1991), cols. 389f.
 145. Adam, *Gesta*, II.80 (76) and III.45 (44) (*History*, 109f. and 152). Wolfgang Giese, "Reichsstrukturprobleme unter den Saliern—der Adel in Ost Sachsen," in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 1:279 incl. n. 27.
 146. On Adam, *Gesta*, II.80 (76) and III.8 (*History*, 109f. and 120f.), see Althoff, "Die Billunger," 319f., incl. nn. 53–58. Giese, "Reichsstrukturprobleme," 279.
 147. Giese, "Reichsstrukturprobleme," 277 n. 21, rightfully points out the distinction between these two types of properties, first noticed by Karl J. Leyser, which reflects early medieval modes of thought (Wolfram, *Salzburg*, 127ff.), as well as the need to expand upon this fruitful approach.
 148. MGH DD C.II, 152 and 158. *Vita Meinwerci*, cc. 205f. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 158 and 164. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:506, incl. nn. 1f.; cf. 1:253f. n. 2 and 292f. n. 5.
 149. MGH DD C.II, 157. *Vita Meinwerci*, cc. 203. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 163.
 150. Giese, "Reichsstrukturprobleme," 277, incl. nn. 21f., based on MGH DD C.II, 9, 141, 164, 182, and 232, as well as the examples in Bavaria: *ibid.*, 125, and MGH DD H.III, 74, 167, and 172 (dated 1041 and 1046); see Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:361 nn. 2f.
 151. MGH DD C.II, 152.
 152. Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1027. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 20f. (*Deeds*, 81ff.).
 153. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:360f.
 154. See Vulculd, *Vita Bardonis*, c. 6, 320.

CHAPTER 12

1. See Chapter VI, at notes 18f.
2. Cf. Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century*, 37.
3. K. Schmid, *Gebliut*, 60ff. Wolfram, "Die Gesandtschaft," 162f. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 4 (*Deeds*, 69).

4. Wolfram, "Die Gesandtschaft," 163, incl. n. 11. On Branthog of Halberstadt, see *Gesta episcoporum Halberstadensium*, 93.
5. Ademar, *Historiae*, III.65, 145f. Azecho of Worms wrote his fellow bishop Egilbert of Freising, requesting a letter of recommendation for a friend and vassal who wished to make a pilgrimage to the Holy Land via Hungary and needed the document in order to obtain a letter of safe conduct from King Stephen I: *Ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*, no. 47, 84f. Fichtenau, "Reisen," 21, incl. n. 73; cf. Adam, *Gesta*, II.81 (77) B Schol. 57 (58) (*History*, 110), for a description of a pilgrimage that lasted from July 25 to April 11 of the following year.
6. Fichtenau, "Reisen," 21, incl. n. 73, and 45–49, esp. incl. n. 73. Wolfram, "Die Gesandtschaft," 163f. Michael Alram, "Der Beginn der Münzwirtschaft in Österreich und die Geschichte des Kremser Pfennigs," *Jahrbuch für Landeskunde von Niederösterreich*, n.s., 60/61 (1994/95): 14: A group of Lotharingian pilgrims brought some money back with them from the East, and one of their coins—a dinar—was later found in the town of Enns.
7. Wolfram, "Die Gesandtschaft," 164f. Cf. Fichtenau, "Reisen," 29, on assuming the guise of a pilgrim in order to pursue political goals.
8. Wolfram, "Die Gesandtschaft," 165, incl. n. 17, based on Liudprand of Cremona, *Legatio constantinopolitana*, cc. 58 (quotes) and 59, in *Opera* (*The Embassy*, 271, in *Works*).
9. See Chapter VII, at notes 75–77. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 22 (*Deeds*, 83).
10. Albert Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, 8th ed. (Berlin and Leipzig, 1954), 3:488f.
11. *Regesta pontificum Romanorum ab condita ecclesia ad annum post Christum natum 1198*, no. 4207, ed. Philipp Jaffé and Samuel Loewenfeld, 2nd ed., 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1885 and 1888; rpt., Graz, 1956).
12. Wolfram, "Die Gesandtschaft," 166f.
13. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 147c and 148. MGH DD C.II, 143.
14. MGH DD C.II, 144; cf. Wolfram, "Die Gesandtschaft," 167.
15. Wolfram, "Die Gesandtschaft," 167, incl. n. 28. Schwineköper, "Christus-Reliquien-Verehrung," 224f., pl. facing 193 (a drawing of the now lost cover to the *staurotbecca*), and 235.
16. For a description of the letter and the proper terminology—a piece of foreign correspondence should not be termed a "chryso-bull"—see Otto Kresten, "Correctiunculae zu Auslandsschreiben byzantinischer Kaiser des 11. Jahrhunderts," *Aachener Kunstblätter* 60 (1994): 149f. On the Imperial Cross and the fragment of the True Cross that it contained, see Chapter X, at notes 23ff.
17. MGH DD C.II, 144 (quote). Wolfram, "Die Gesandtschaft," 168–70.
18. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 22 (*Deeds*, 83f.).
19. Cf. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 4 (*Deeds*, 69), with *ibid.*, c. 22 (*Deeds*, 83f.).
20. *Ibid.*, c. 17 (79f.).
21. In *ibid.*, cf. c. 22 (83) with c. 26 (85f.). Wolfram, "Die Gesandtschaft," 172f. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VIII.4 (*Ottonian Germany*, 363f.).
22. Wolfram, "Die Gesandtschaft," 173.

CHAPTER 13

1. Wolfram, *Salzburg*, 175–85, esp. 181f. Matthias Hardt, "Linien und Säume, Zonen und Räume an der Ostgrenze des Reiches im frühen und hohen Mittelalter," in *Grenze und Differenz im frühen Mittelalter*, ed. Walter Pohl and Helmut Reimitz, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse: Denkschriften, 287, Forschungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters, 1 (Vienna, 2000), 39–56.
2. Christian Lübke, "Mark, -grafschaft," in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. 6 (Munich, 1993), cols. 302f. Hans Karl Schulze, "Burgward, Burgwardverfassung," in *ibid.*, vol. 2 (Munich, 1983), cols. 1101ff.
3. Brunner, "Land" and *Lordship*, 169f. (quote), and Wolfram, *Salzburg*, 191f.
4. H. K. Schulze, *Hegemoniales Kaisertum*, 229.

5. See esp. Ludat, *An Elbe und Oder*, 3ff., as well as the genealogical tables in the book's back pocket. Cf. František Graus, *Die Nationenbildung der Westslawen im Mittelalter*, Nationes, 3 (Sigmaringen, 1980), 54 (Bohemia) and 73ff. On furnishing hostages, see Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 633; on contracting and dissolving marriages, see *ibid.*, nos. 623 and 631.

6. Ludat, *An Elbe und Oder*, 175f. n. 514, based primarily on Adam, *Gesta* II.35 (33) Schol. 24 (25) and II.52 (50) Schol. 37 (38) (*History*, 78 and 91).

7. Ludat, *An Elbe und Oder*, esp. 87ff. Cf. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 3, nos. 337, 461, and 463–65, and Knut Görich, “Eine Wende im Osten: Heinrich II. und Boleslaw Chrobry,” in *Otto III.–Heinrich II.: Eine Wende?* ed. Schneidmüller and Weinfurter, 125 and 159. On the presence of Jews in both western and eastern Europe, see Mutius, *Rechtsentscheide*, 1:178 and 2:175, esp. 2:41ff. and 47ff.

8. On Hungary, see notes 101ff. below; on Bohemia's feudal status, see, for example, Thietmar, *Chronicon*, v.31 (*Ottoman Germany*, 225f.); on the Piasts as crown vassals, see *ibid.*, v.10 and v.1.90 (212 and 297). Cf. Görich, “Eine Wende im Osten,” 135, incl. n. 232, and 155f.

9. Wolfram, *Salzburg*, 175f.

10. Cf., for example, Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 33 (*Deeds*, 91f.).

11. *Ibid.*, c. 29 (88). Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 602.

12. Wolfram, *Salzburg*, 180, incl. n. 455.

13. K. Brunner, “Die fränkischen Fürstentitel,” 304f.

14. Lübke, “Mark, -grafschaft,” cols. 302f. *Idem*, *Regesten*, vol. 3, nos. 212a and 213. Becher, *Rex, Dux und Gens*, 251–99, esp. 275ff. and 298f. Althoff, “Die Billunger,” 311ff.

15. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 2, esp. nos. 122f. and 125.

16. *Ibid.*, vol. 3, nos. 220–26.

17. Cf. Graus, *Die Nationenbildung*, esp. 55. Görich, “Eine Wende im Osten,” esp. 101ff.

18. See Görich, “Eine Wende im Osten,” 95 (quote), 98f., and 148ff., including the extensive bibliographical citations, and Fried, *Otto III. und Boleslaw Chrobry*, 123–25.

19. Görich, “Eine Wende im Osten,” 99ff., 104ff., and 164ff. (summary). Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 3, nos. 251–55.

20. Arbeo of Freising, *Vita Haimbrammi episcopi*, cc. 3–5, ed. Bruno Krusch, MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 13 (Hannover, 1920), and *Vita et passio sancti Haimbrammi martyris/Leben und Leiden des heiligen Emmeram*, ed. Bernhard Bischoff (Munich, 1953). Wolfram, *Salzburg*, 384f. Walter Pohl, *Die Awaren: Ein Steppenvolk in Mitteleuropa, 567–822 n. Chr.* (Munich, 1988), 314.

21. Ludat, *An Elbe und Oder*, esp. 80ff. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, for example vi.22–25 and 31 and viii.5f. (*Ottoman Germany*, 252ff., 258, and 364f.). Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 3, no. 366. Brun of Querfurt, “Epistola ad Henricum regem,” ed. Jadwiga Karwasińska, *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, n.s., 4 (Warsaw, 1973), pt. 3, 97–106; Görich, “Eine Wende im Osten,” 109–15 and 162–64; Hubertus Seibert, “Herrscher und Mönchtum im spätottonischen Reich: Vorstellungen—Funktion—Interaktion,” in *Otto III.–Heinrich II.: Eine Wende?* ed. Schneidmüller and Weinfurter, 251, incl. n. 240. Reinhard Wenskus, *Studien zur historisch-politischen Gedankenwelt Bruns von Querfurt*, Mitteldeutsche Forschungen, 5 (Münster, 1956), 148–52, and Althoff, “Die Billunger,” 316, incl. n. 36.

22. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, viii.1 (*Ottoman Germany*, 361). Görich, “Eine Wende im Osten,” 160ff.

23. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, nos. 534f. Ludat, *An Elbe und Oder*, esp. 88f.

24. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, viii.1 (*Ottoman Germany*, 361).

25. Ludat, *An Elbe und Oder*, 89f.

26. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, nos. 537f. and 548ff.; cf. vol. 3, nos. 366ff. (alliance with the Liutizi). *Die Regesten der Erzbischöfe von Bremen*, no. 176, ed. Otto Heinrich May, vol. 1, Veröffentlichungen der Historischen Kommission für Hannover, Oldenburg, Braunschweig, Schaumburg-Lippe und Bremen, II (Hannover, 1937), 44.

27. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, nos. 570f., concerning Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 2 (*Deeds*, 61). Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:20, incl. n. 3.

28. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 6 (*Deeds*, 72f.). Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 573.

29. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 3, nos. 337–39. On the contradictory aspects of the assembly at Gniezno, see Fried, *Otto III. und Boleslaw Chrobry*, 81ff. and 123–25, as well as Görich, “Eine Wende im Osten,” esp. 98f. and 148ff.

30. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 9 (*Deeds*, 75). Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, nos. 575f.

31. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 9 (*Deeds*, 75).

32. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 577 (quote). Adam, *Gesta*, II.56 (54) and 60 (58) (*History*, 93f. and 96). Johanek, “Die Erzbischöfe,” 109, incl. n. 157.

33. See Chapter V, at note 38. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 47, and MGH DD C.II, 46. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, I:98f. On Bodfeld, see Schubert, *Politik, Verfassung, Wirtschaft*, 109, incl. n. 202.

34. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 3, no. 246; cf. Ludat, *An Elbe und Oder*, 21ff.

35. See the genealogy table in Ludat, *An Elbe und Oder* (insert).

36. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 576a. See also Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 9 and 29 (*Deeds*, 75 and 88).

37. See Chapter V, at note 15.

38. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, I:20 n. 3. Kluger, “Propter claritatem generis,” 241f. On the initially negative relations between Ezzo and Henry II, cf. Görich, “Eine Wende im Osten,” 125 and 165, and Weinfurter, *Heinrich II.*, 62f. and 197ff.

39. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, nos. 576 and 740.

40. Cf. Graus, *Die Nationenbildung*, 56.

41. *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1028. On the Saale River as the “western front” of Poland, see Gallus Anonymus, *Chronicon et gesta ducum sive principum Polonorum*, c. 6, ed. Karol Malcezyński, Monumenta Poloniae Historica, n.s., 2 (Cracow, 1952), pt. 2, 16f. or 428, lines 20ff.

42. Cf. Wolfram, *Splendor Imperii*, 164f.

43. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 580; cf. no. 577. However, see esp. vol. 3, no. 426, as well as vol. 4, no. 609.

44. *Ibid.*, vol. 4, no. 583. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 134b.

45. The transfer of an episcopal seat from Säben to Brixen finally took place near the end of the tenth century; see Riedmann, “Mittelalter,” 306. Heribert of Eichstätt wanted to transfer his episcopal seat to Neuburg on the Danube River; see Weinfurter, *Die Geschichte der Eichstätter Bischöfe*, 174.

46. Heinz Wiessner, *Das Bistum Naumburg I*, Germania Sacra, n.s., 35 (Berlin, 1997), pt. 1, 123ff. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 584. Zimmermann, *Papsturkunden*, no. 581, 2:1097f., and MGH DD C.II, 184.

47. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, nos. 585f. Adam, *Gesta*, II.66 (64); cf. II.79 (75), as well as III.19–20 (18–19) and 50 (49) f. (*History*, 100f., 108, 130f., and 156ff.).

48. In Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, cf. nos. 520ff. with no. 589. See Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, I:266f., based on MGH DD C.II, 135, and *Regesten Konrads II.*, 140.

49. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, nos. 492ff., 520ff., 583, and 589. On Bautzen, cf. *ibid.*, no. 534, as well as Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, I:276f. n. 4, and the account Bresslau borrowed from *Annalista Saxo*, a. 1029, which was in turn based on the lost *Annales Hildesheimenses maiores*. In Cosmas of Prague, *Chronica Boemorum*, ed. Berthold Bretholz, MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, n.s., 2 (Berlin, 1923; rpt., Munich, 1980), cf. I.40 (Břetislav conquers Moravia) with II.4 (Břetislav wishes to sell divorced individuals and other “evildoers” to Hungary legally). Cf. Chapter IV, at note 79.

50. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, nos. 590f.

51. See the current chapter, at note 96.

52. Cf. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:82f.

53. On assembling an imperial army and the undisciplined nature of such forces, see *Regesten Konrads II.*, 206a, and *Chronicon s. Michaelis*, c. 29, 84.

54. *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1031. *Vita Meinwerici*, c. 208. Konrad Schünemann, “Deutsche Kriegführung im Osten während des Mittelalters,” *DA* 2 (1938): 80f. Cf. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, IV.12 (*Ottoman Germany*, 159), for the respect in which the Poles held a Saxon army: “This army is small in number, but of the best quality and armed entirely in iron.”

55. *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1031: “post mensis tantum spatium” [after the space of a month].

56. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 599.
57. Ludat, *An Elbe und Oder*, 54–56.
58. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 172a. See the current chapter, at notes 131ff.
59. Cf. Cosmas, *Chronica Boemorum*, 1.41, with Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1030.
60. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 600. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 29 (*Deeds*, 88).
61. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, nos. 603f., 607, and 609. See esp. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 29 (*Deeds*, 88).
62. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, nos. 612–15, based for the most part on Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 33 (*Deeds*, 91–92 [quotes]), and *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1032. Cf. Chapter IX, at note 79.
63. Cf. Chapter XXII, at notes 86ff.
64. Cf. Adam, *Gesta*, II.18 (15) (*History*, 63) (Burwid wins the duel with a Slav). Wolfram, *Grenzen und Räume*, 343, incl. n. 101.
65. Cf. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:82f. For an enumeration and explanation of Conrad's visits to eastern Saxony and northern Thuringia, see Giese, "Reichsstrukturprobleme," 277ff., but in conjunction with the description of the overall situation in Althoff, "Die Billunger," 319, incl. n. 52. On Bernard II's "independent" policy toward the Slavs, see Adam, *Gesta*, II.66 (64), incl. Schol. 46 (47) (*History*, 100f.).
66. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 618.
67. Ibid., no. 621.
68. Ibid., nos. 622f. Adam, *Gesta*, II.56 (54) (*History*, 93f.), dates the transfer of the march along the Eider River to the marriage between Henry and Gunhild.
69. Cf., for example, *Conversio*, c. 7, or Adam, *Gesta*, II.42 (40) Schol. 27 (30) (*History*, 83).
70. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 625; cf. no. 617, as well as vol. 3, no. 323 (Otto III in 997).
71. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 33 (*Deeds*, 92).
72. Hans-Dietrich Kahl, "Zum Ergebnis des Wendenkreuzzuges 1147, zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des sächsischen Frühchristentums," *Wichmann-Jahrbuch für Kirchengeschichte im Bistum Berlin* 11/12 (1957/58): 99–120.
73. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 33 (*Deeds*, 92).
74. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, nos. 628 and 633.
75. Ibid., nos. 630f.; cf. no. 623. *Constitutiones*, no. 44, c. 6, 1:89 (early May 1036). *Regesten Konrads II.*, 237a. Wolter, *Die Synoden*, 355, proves that the synod at Tribur considered another case of consanguinity as well.
76. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 293a and c. Giese, "Reichsstrukturprobleme," 278 n. 14.
77. *Regesta imperii*, vol. 1, *Die Regesten des Kaiserreiches unter den Karolingern, 751–918*, no. 411b, ed. Johann Friedrich Böhmer, rev. Engelbert Mühlbacher, and completed by Johann Lechner, 2nd ed. (Innsbruck, 1908); rev., exp. ed., ed. Carlrichard Brühl and Hans H. Kaminsky (Hildesheim, 1966). Wolfram, *Grenzen und Räume*, 392 n. 277.
78. *Regesta imperii*, vol. 1, no. 648b. *Capitularia regum Francorum*, no. 136, c. 2, 1:271. Wolfram, *Salzburg*, 47, incl. n. 195.
79. *Annales Fuldenses*, a. 845, ed. Friedrich Kurze and Heinrich Haefele, MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 7, 2nd ed. (Hannover, 1891; rpt. 1978).
80. Wolfram, *Grenzen und Räume*, 315ff.; cf. 259ff.
81. Cf. Regino of Prüm, *Chronicon*, a. 890, with *Annales Fuldenses*, a. 895.
82. Wolfram, *Grenzen und Räume*, 320f., and Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 2, nos. 2 and 6–8.
83. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 2, nos. 48, 80, 85, and 98.
84. Ibid., no. 186.
85. Ibid., vol. 3, nos. 227–32.

90. Ludat, *An Elbe und Oder*, 24f. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 3, no. 245.
91. Graus, *Die Nationenbildung*, 204ff.
92. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 3, nos. 251–55, 301, 313f. (cf. 323a), 329, 358f., 364f., 387, and 455. Cf. Graus, *Die Nationenbildung*, 48 (discussion of the Bohemian conquest of Moravia, 1017/19) and 55, as well as 208ff. (Polish conquest of Bohemia). See Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, nos. 589 and 619, as well as note 49 above.
93. Cf. Wolfram, *Salzburg*, 170ff., esp. 174, incl. nn. 420–24.
94. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 589.
95. Cosmas, *Chronica Boemorum*, 1.40. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:278f. Cf. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 3, no. 356, and vol. 4, no. 623.
96. Cf. Cosmas, *Chronica Boemorum*, 1.41, with Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1030. In Hungarian scholarship, one occasionally comes across the assertion that Cosmas gave the wrong date for Břetislav's expedition against the Hungarians (1030), while making no reference to the Bohemian prince's participation in military expeditions led by Henry III in 1042 and 1051; see, for example, György Györffy, *King Saint Stephen of Hungary*, trans. Peter Doherty (New York, 1994), 149; cf. *Annales Altahenses*, a. 1042, and Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1051. In fact, Cosmas, *Chronica Boemorum*, 11.13, refers to two executed and one planned military expedition against the Hungarians under the leadership of his hero Břetislav.
97. *Annales Altahenses*, aa. 1032 and 1034. *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1034. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 33 (*Deeds*, 91). Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, nos. 609 and 612.
98. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 600. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 29 (*Deeds*, 88).
99. See Chapter II, at notes 24–26.
100. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, nos. 616, 619, 622, and 625, as well as note 97 above. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 212a.
101. Graus, *Die Nationenbildung*, 55f. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 638.
102. Herwig Wolfram, "Wortbruch I: Nachträge zu 'Salzburg, Bayern, Österreich,'" *MIÖG* 105 (1997): 467–70. Idem, *Salzburg*, 316f. and 384f.
103. Wolfram, *Salzburg*, 386ff.
104. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 2, nos. 98ff.; cf., for example, no. 39. See notes 86f. above.
105. János Bak, "Stephan (István) I. d. Hl.," in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. 8 (Munich and Zurich, 1996), col. 112. Weinfurter, *Heinrich II.*, 90, incl. n. 95. On the date of Stephen's baptism, see Ademar, *Chronicon (Historiae)*, III.31.
106. Cf. Schünemann, "Deutsche Kriegführung," esp. 69ff., and Egon Boshof, "Das Reich und Ungarn in der Zeit der Salier," *Ostbairische Grenzmarken* 28 (1986): 178ff.
107. *Die Regesten der Bischöfe und des Domkapitels von Augsburg*, nos. 217–40, ed. Wilhelm Volkert, Veröffentlichungen der Schwäbischen Forschungsgemeinschaft bei der Kommission für bayerische Landesgeschichte, ser. 11b (Augsburg, 1985), 1:124–39. See *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 1547c, 1555b, and 2054b.
108. *Regesten der Bischöfe von Augsburg*, no. 241, 1:139f.
109. *Ibid.*, no. 262, 1:150f.
110. *Ibid.*, no. 249; cf. no. 252, 1:144f.
111. Fried, *Der Weg in die Geschichte*, 598. Gerd Althoff, *Otto III*, trans. Phyllis G. Jestice (University Park, Pa., 2003), 110ff. Gerhard Rösch, *Venedig und das Reich*, Bibliothek des Deutschen historischen Instituts in Rom, 53 (Tübingen, 1982), 14ff. Cf. Wolfram, "Die Gesandtschaft," 164, concerning the Byzantine attack on Croatia.
112. The marriage between Stephen's sister and the doge is recorded by Dandolo, *Chronica*, IX, 203. See Chapter VII, at notes 66–77 and 81f. Dandolo, *Chronica*, IX, 205f. Concerning Otto III and Peter II Orseolo (d. 1009), see Gerhard Rösch, "Orseolo," in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. 6 (Munich and Zurich, 1993), cols. 1476f.
113. *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1031. Györffy, *King Saint Stephen*, 168ff.
114. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VII.66 and VIII.18 (*Ottonian Germany*, 354 and 373f.). *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 1916a and 1934b. Konrad Schünemann, *Die Deutschen in Ungarn bis zum 12. Jahrhundert*, Ungarische Bibliothek, ser. 1, 8 (Leipzig, 1923), 30, and Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*,

r:296f. Cf. Reindel, “Bayern,” 314, incl. n. 84, on Emeric’s claim to Bavaria according to the sixteenth-century chronicler Aventinus (Johannes Turmair).

115. Wolfram, “Die Gesandtschaft,” 160–66. Rösch, *Venedig*, 12, incl. n. 19.

116. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 142a and 143b. Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, aa. 1929f. On Venice’s humiliation in spring 1027, see Chapter VII, at notes 75ff.

117. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:276f. n. 4, as well as Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 589.

118. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 26 (*Deeds*, 85f.). Cf. Cosmas, *Chronica Boemorum*, 1.41 (cf. the current chapter, at note 96).

119. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 158b.

120. *Annales Altahenses*, a. 1030.

121. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 158b, according to Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:299 n. 4.

122. Alphons Lhotsky, *Aufsätze und Vorträge*, vol. 1, ed. Hans Wagner and Heinrich Koller (Vienna, 1970), 231, incl. n. 35, and Schünemann, *Die Deutschen in Ungarn*, 55, based on Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici I. imperatoris*, 1.34 (*The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*, 67).

123. Elisabeth Schuster, *Etymologie der niederösterreichischen Ortsnamen*, 3, *Historisches Ortsnamenbuch von Niederösterreich*, ser. B (Vienna, 1994), 3:431 W 279.

124. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 33 (*Deeds*, 91).

125. Cf., for example, Wolfram, *Salzburg*, 60, incl. n. 302.

126. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, vi.28 (*Ottonian Germany*, 256: “At Werben . . .”).

127. *Annales Hildesheimenses*, aa. 1032f.

128. For a complete list of instances, see the relevant entries in Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 5, nos. 102 and 105.

129. *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1029. On the locative *Peolidae*, see MGH DD C.II, 132. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 135a.

130. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 26 (*Deeds*, 85f.). MGH DD C.II, 32 and 134 (William II), 33 (Arnold of Wels-Lambach; cf. Kupfer, *Das Königsgut*, 120), and 221 (Adalbert of Austria). On Adalbert, see also *Urkundenbuch*, vol. 4, pt. 1, II, no. 562, and Kupfer, *Das Königsgut*, 47f. and 124f.

131. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 26 (*Deeds*, 85f.). On the legends about Stephen I, see Joseph Maurer, *Geschichte der landesfürstlichen Stadt Hainburg* (Vienna, 1894), 160. The author wishes to thank Wolfgang Häusler for bringing this account to his attention.

132. Cf. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 22 (*Deeds*, 83f.).

133. Bresslau, *Handbuch*, 1:470. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 166f.

134. Klaar, *Die Herrschaft der Eppensteiner*, nos. 25f., pp. 25 and 84f.

135. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 172a.

136. *Ibid.* and Bresslau, *Die Jahrbücher*, 1:312, incl. n. 2; cf. 304 n. 4.

137. *Annales Altahenses*, a. 1043.

138. *Annales Sangallenses maiores*, a. 1030.

139. Cf. MGH DD H.III, 376 (July 10, 1056), which uses the phrase “usque ad definitas notas Ungaricorum terminorum” [all the way to the fixed limits of the Hungarian frontiers] to denote the northern portion of present-day Weinviertel, a region north of Vienna bordering on the Czech Republic. Cf. the *meta ferrea*, a boundary post made of iron that Boleslaw Chrobry is said to have placed in the Saale River to mark the border of his kingdom; see Weinfurter, *Heinrich II.*, 213, incl. n. 48, based on Gallus Anonymus, *Chronicon*, c. 6, 16f., or 428, lines 20ff.

140. Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1043.

141. On MGH DD H.III, 277 (October 25, 1051), see Peter Csendes, “Regio finibus Ungarorum gladio ab hostibus adquisita: Überlegungen zur Geschichte der Ungarnmark in Österreich,” *Jahrbuch für Landeskunde von Niederösterreich*, n.s., 42 (1976): 38–51, esp. 43.

142. MGH DD H.III, 277 (October 25, 1051).

143. MGH DD H.II, 22 (1002), and esp. MGH DD C.II, 33 (1025). Kupfer, *Das Königsgut*, 119ff. K. Lechner, *Die Babenberger*, 62f. Cf. Max Weltin, “Ascherichsbrugge—Das Werden einer Stadt an der Grenze,” *Mitteilungen aus dem Niederösterreichischen Landesarchiv* 10 (1986/87): 7, incl. nn. 37–39, for some trenchant observations.

144. See esp. the account in Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1042. Cf. notes 96

and 118 above (the Bohemians advance as far as Gran in 1030). Wolfram, *Grenzen und Räume*, 271, incl. n. 348 (annihilation of a Hungarian contingent north of the Danube in 900). Schünemann, “Deutsche Kriegführung,” 70ff. Csendes, “Regio,” 42. On the distribution of holdings west of the Morava, see note 141 above.

145. On this work, *Descriptio itineris*, see Albin Franz Gombos, *Catalogus fontium historiae Hungaricae*, vol. 2 (Budapest, 1937), 844f. n. 1965, and Györffy, *King Saint Stephen*, 150. The surviving redaction probably dates to the twelfth century, but the opening passage probably reflects the political geography of the region before 1043. The author is grateful to János Bak of Budapest for identifying the source, since it is cited without attribution in Györffy, *King Saint Stephen*, 150.

146. MGH DD H.III, 277 and 376. Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici I. imperatoris*, I.34 (*The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*, 67f.); cf. I.47 (79), where it is noted that the Fischa is “almost” at the imperial border, while the Leitha marks the actual boundary.

147. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 197a and 202f. MGH DD C.II, 195–97. Kupfer, *Das Königsgut*, 121ff. On Cumeoberg, or Kaumberg, see Wolfram, *Salzburg*, 54, and Schuster, *Etymologie*, 2:363 K 80. *Ibid.*, 3:72f. O 84 (Ollern). On Heribert’s family background, see Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 192f.

148. MGH DD C.II, 219, and *Regesten Konrads II.*, 227; cf. Chapter v, at note 65.

149. *Ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*, no. 27, 51. Cf. Chapter v, at note 65.

150. *Ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*, no. 27, 51.

151. Gyula Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 2nd ed. (Budapest, 1983), 2:207. The author thanks Johannes Koder of Vienna for this reference. Cf. Heidrich, “Die Absetzung,” 91, incl. n. 129.

152. Wolfram, *Salzburg*, 16f.

153. Liudprand of Cremona, *Legatio constantinopolitana*, c. 19 (*The Embassy*, 246). Again, the author thanks Johannes Koder for this reference.

154. Cf. Dandolo, *Chronica*, IX, 196–98 and 204, concerning Croatian attacks against Dalmatia.

155. Gabriele Rupp, *Die Ekkehardiner, Markgrafen von Meißen, und ihre Beziehungen zum Reich und zu den Piasten*, Europäische Hochschulschriften, ser. 3, Geschichte und ihre Hilfswissenschaften, 691 (Frankfurt am Main, 1996), 171ff. and 189ff.

156. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 33 (*Deeds*, 92).

157. Adam, *Gesta*, II.66 (64), incl. Schol. 46 (47) (*History*, 100f.).

158. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 26 (*Deeds*, 85f.).

159. MGH DD C.II, 205.

CHAPTER 14

1. See Chapter v, at note 20, and Chapter VIII, at note 13, as well as most esp. Kahl, “Die Angliederung,” 44, incl. n. 47, based on *Recueil des chartes de l’Abbaye de Cluny*, ed. Auguste Bernard and Alexandre Bruel, nos. 2916f. and 2920f. (Paris, 1876 and 1903; rpt., Frankfurt, 1974), 4:116, 118, and 122. Brühl, *Deutschland—Frankreich*, 688, incl. n. 475, rejects Kahl’s interpretation.

2. Seliger appears as a witness—without his comital title—in MGH DD Rudolf III, 110 and 156. He did not hand over the lance of Saint Maurice, however; see Brühl, *Deutschland—Frankreich*, 685 n. 450, based on *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik*, ed. Schramm, 2:514f. Of the sources listed in *Regesten Konrads II.*, 189b, see esp. Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1032, and *Chronicon Suevicum universale*, a. 1032, ed. Harry Bresslau, MGH SS 13 (Hannover, 1881; rpt., Stuttgart, 1985); the latter source is the only one to state that the transfer of the insignia was the last official act taken by the dying king of Burgundy.

3. See note 2 above and Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:10, and Brühl, *Deutschland—Frankreich*, 684f. Kahl, “Die Angliederung,” 51ff.

4. Karl Ferdinand Werner, “Westfranken—Frankreich unter den Spätkarolingern und

frühen Kapetingern (888–1060),” in *Vom Frankenreich zur Entfaltung Deutschlands und Frankreichs* (Sigmaringen, 1984), 253. Kahl, “Die Angliederung,” 48f., 52f., 57, incl. n. 19, and 61f.

5. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 607. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 29 (*Deeds*, 88).

6. MGH DD C.II, 184. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:II, incl. n. I. Cf. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 171, incl. n. 103.

7. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 30 (*Deeds*, 89). MGH DD C.II, 184.

8. See Hugh of Flavigny, *Chronicon*, II.29, 401, concerning Odo’s capture of “cities and castles” from the Jura to the Great Saint Bernard, and Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 29 (*Deeds*, 88), concerning his use of cunning and military force, as well as cc. 29f. (87ff.). Cf. Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1032, and the general information in *Regesten Konrads II.*, 189c. Kahl, “Die Angliederung,” 58 and 62.

9. Admittedly, MGH DD C.II, 186, is not impeccably accurate, but no objections have been raised to the information of interest to us here. Kahl, “Die Angliederung,” 67, incl. nn. 3f.

10. See Chapter III, at note 11 (*Regesten Konrads II.*, 1), and Chapter VII, at notes 27 (Odilo mediates the conflict between Conrad II and Pavia) and 60 (Odilo participates in Conrad’s coronation in Rome).

11. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:70. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 30 (*Deeds*, 89). See Chapter IV, at note 1, and Chapter VII, at notes 14–16. MGH DD C.II, 1 and 87, are based on MGH DD H.II, 69 (Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 45f.). Cf. Hehl, “Maria,” 282.

12. Kahl, “Die Angliederung,” 69, incl. n. 11.

13. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 30 (*Deeds*, 89).

14. See Brühl, *Deutschland—Frankreich*, 687f., on Kahl, “Die Angliederung,” 70ff.

15. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 29 (*Deeds*, 88).

16. *Ibid.*, c. 30 (89). Brühl, *Deutschland—Frankreich*, 687–90, and Kahl, “Die Angliederung,” 77ff. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 192a–c. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:70ff. On Count Humbert, see Kahl, “Die Angliederung,” 25–27, and Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:60ff.

17. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 192c.

18. *Ibid.*, 192d and 193f.

19. *Chronicon s. Michaelis*, c. 28, 83f. Kahl, “Die Angliederung,” 83, contends that Odo’s attack came after the meeting between Emperor Conrad and King Henry of France in Deville.

20. Cf. Everhelm, *Vita Popponis*, c. 18, 304, with [Wibert], *Vita Leonis IX*, I.14, 145. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:74f., incl. n. 2. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 194b.

21. See Chapter V, note 38. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:78f. Kahl, “Die Angliederung,” 82f.

22. *Ruodlieb*, IV, vv. 1ff.–v, v. 210, esp. v, vv. 30ff. (Ford trans., 21–36, esp. 32ff.). Vollmann, *Ruodlieb*, 4 (date of composition).

23. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 206a, 207, and 209a. *Chronicon s. Michaelis*, cc. 28f., 84. MGH DD C.II., 200. See Brühl, *Deutschland—Frankreich*, 694, on Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 31 (*Deeds*, 90 [quote]). Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:87f.

24. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:88f. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 31 (*Deeds*, 90). Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1033.

25. Cf. *Chronicon Suevicum universale*, a. 1033.

26. See Chapter V, at note 16.

27. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 29 (*Deeds*, 88). Kahl, “Die Angliederung,” 64.

28. Kahl, “Die Angliederung,” 27–29.

29. Cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 291b, and Kahl, “Die Angliederung,” 93ff., with Jean Richard, *Les ducs de Bourgogne et la formation du duché du Xe au XIVe siècle* (Paris, 1954; rpt., Geneva, 1986), 13.

30. Kahl, “Die Angliederung,” 48f., 57, and 61f. Cf. Brühl, *Deutschland—Frankreich*, 693f., incl. nn. 515–20, with K. F. Werner, “Westfranken—Frankreich,” 254f.

31. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:78, incl. n. 2, based on Siegfried of Gorze, “Epistola ad Popponem.”

32. Joachim Ehlers, *Geschichte Frankreichs im Mittelalter* (Stuttgart, 1987), 72–74. M. Werner,

“Der Herzog,” 398f. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:73f. On Frederick of Upper Lotharingia and the question of just which Frederick died in spring 1033 (*Regesten Konrads II.*, 194a), see Chapter v, at note 18.

33. See *Regesten Konrads II.*, 194a–210c. On Henry’s campaign against the Bohemians, see Chapter XIII, at note 97.

34. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:104f., based on MGH DD C.II, 207–10.

35. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 222a–c. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 32 (*Deeds*, 90). Kahl, “Die Angliederung,” 86f. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:117, incl. n. 2, and 60–64, as well as 109ff., based for the most part on Arnulf, *Gesta*, II.8, 14 (*Liber*, 152f.).

36. MGH DD C.II, 1 and 87, were issued in 1024 and 1027, respectively. Only *ibid.*, 265 (March 31, 1038), dates to Conrad’s reign over Burgundy; its recipient, tellingly enough, was Leodegar of Vienne. Wolfram, “Rezension ‘Die Salier,’” pl. following 184. Müller-Mertens and Huschner, *Reichsintegration*, esp. 202–5. Brühl, *Fodrum*, 458.

37. See note 2 above.

38. Kahl, “Die Angliederung,” 93f., and Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:421, incl. n. 2. Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 132.

39. See pages 132f. above. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 254c. Rupert, *Chronicon s. Laurentii Leodiensis*, c. 29, ed. Wilhelm Wattenbach, MGH SS 8:272 (Hannover, 1848; rpt., Stuttgart, 1992).

40. Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1036. Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum Libri Quinque/The Five Books*, v.4, 21; 244ff.

41. See Chapter XVI, at note 30, concerning Odilo of Cluny. On the history of the archbishopric of Lyon, see Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:53ff., 114, and 421, incl. n. 2.

42. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 254c and 264a. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 35 (*Deeds*, 94). *Annales Alta-henses*, a. 1037. *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1037. Brühl, *Deutschland—Frankreich*, 682f. Kahl, “Die Angliederung,” 93f. See moreover Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1036.

43. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 291b. Brühl, *Deutschland—Frankreich*, 690f. Kahl, “Die Angliederung,” 94ff. See the list of intervenors to MGH DD C.II, 278f. (December 11, 1038, and May 1, 1039) for Henry III’s titles.

44. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 264a.

45. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:113–16. K. F. Werner, “Westfranken—Frankreich,” 255. Lactitia Boehm, *Geschichte Burgunds: Politik, Staatsbildungen, Kultur*, UTB, 134 (Stuttgart, 1971), esp. 125ff.

46. Kehr, “Vier Kapitel,” 42.

CHAPTER 15

1. Karl Hampe, *Deutsche Kaisergeschichte in der Zeit der Salier und Staufer*, 10th ed. (Heidelberg, 1949), 7 and 19f. (quotes).

2. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:420 and 389 (quotes).

3. T. Schieffer, *Heinrich II. und Konrad II.*, 1ff. (orig. publ. 384ff.).

4. *Ibid.*, 48 (431).

5. *Ibid.*, 54 (437); cf. *ibid.*, 46f. (429f.).

6. *Ibid.*, 49 (432).

7. *Ibid.*, 17–27, esp. 18f. and 24f. (400–410, 401f. and 407f.). Seibert, “Libertas,” esp. 514f. On the “Romanization” of the German church, see also Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 17.

8. Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 127. Seibert, “Libertas,” 517.

9. Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 138f., incl. n. 387 (based on the *Chronicon Novaliciense*, app. c. 17, 128 [Bethman] or 304 [Cipolla]; cf. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 4 and 6 [*Deeds*, 68f. and 70ff.]), 144 (outsider), and 147 (yet part of the system). Seibert, “Libertas,” 516–24, esp. 524, incl. n. 90.

10. R. Schieffer, *Der geschichtliche Ort*, 7f., incl. nn. 6f.

11. *Ibid.*, 5f. and 8. Brühl, *Fodrum*, 116ff.

12. Cf. *Vita Burchardi*, cc. 5f., 835, with Burchard, *Decretorum*, 1.7 and 11, as well as III.109. See Bernt Schütte, “Bischofs-erhebung im Spiegel von Bischof-iten und Bischof-esten

der Ottonen- und Salierzeit,” in *Die früh- und hochmittelalterliche Bischofserhebung im europäischen Vergleich*, ed. Franz-Reiner Erkens (Cologne, 1998), 139ff. Rudolf Schieffer, *Die Entstehung des päpstlichen Investiturerbots für den deutschen König*, Schriften der MGH, 28 (Stuttgart, 1981), esp. 36.

13. R. Schieffer, *Die Entstehung*, 14ff., esp. 25 (Pope John X in 921).

14. R. Schieffer, *Der geschichtliche Ort*, 17ff. The phrase *do ut des* [I give so that you give (in return)] encapsulates the Romans’ expectation of a reciprocal relationship with their god(s).

15. Eugen Ewig, personal conversation with author, Bonn, Germany, spring 1980. Cf. R. Schieffer, *Die Entstehung*, 18, incl. n. 43.

16. Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 18, incl. n. 12.

17. Cf., for example, the formulas listing the intervenors in MGH DD C.11, 121ff.

18. Zielinski, *Das Reichsepiskopat*, 8f. On Trento, see Müller-Mertens and Huschner, *Reichsintegration*, 356ff.

19. Zielinski, *Das Reichsepiskopat*, 8f., 13f., and 16f., incl. n. 97; cf. 167. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 224–26, concerning thirty-four episcopal investitures, as well as appointments to the metropolitan see of Hamburg-Bremen.

20. Zielinski, *Das Reichsepiskopat*, 20–22.

21. See Chapter VI, at note 4; cf. *ibid.*, at note 13.

22. Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 18; cf., for example, 108: “A comparison of Henry II’s record for founding churches with that of his successor quickly devolves into an almost embarrassing exercise, since whatever the latter accomplished is so overshadowed by the former’s significant achievements on that score.” Such statements undercut Hoffmann’s empathetic and helpful text, since even by his own admission they involve applying modern standards to bygone deeds and do not sufficiently take into account the wishes and abilities of the performers of those bygone deeds.

23. See, for example, Johaneck, “Die Erzbischöfe,” 79, incl. n. 1, concerning the descriptive model developed by Prof. Peter Moraw of the Justus-Liebig University in Giessen, Germany.

24. *Indiculus loricatorum*, 633: Like Trier and Regensburg, Salzburg supported seventy knights in armor, but Strasbourg, Cologne, Mainz, and Augsburg each supported one hundred. Zielinski, *Das Reichsepiskopat*, 286f. and 301. On the issuance of diplomas, see also Müller-Mertens and Huschner, *Reichsintegration*, 242 and 265.

25. Zielinski, *Das Reichsepiskopat*, 205ff. Müller-Mertens and Huschner, *Reichsintegration*, 380.

26. Müller-Mertens and Huschner, *Reichsintegration*, 308 and 382.

27. Zielinski, *Das Reichsepiskopat*, 31ff.

CHAPTER 16

1. Alois Gerlich, “Mainz,” in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. 6 (Munich and Zurich, 1993), col. 135.

2. Cf. Chapter IV, at note 25, concerning the “chancery.” Csendes, “Kanzlei, Kanzler.”

3. Bresslau, *Handbuch*, 1:431ff. and 467ff. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 174ff. and 2:163ff., as well as 2:238ff. Cf. Hagen Keller, “Widukinds Bericht über die Aachener Wahl und Krönung Ottos I,” *EMSt* 29 (1995): 431.

4. Anselm, *Gesta*, c. 50, 219. Cf. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 208ff., esp. 211ff. and 225ff.

5. Bresslau, *Handbuch*, 1:429.

6. See Chapter IV, note 22.

7. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 160ff. and 180 (concerning MGH DD H.11, 428 and 437). Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 73 and 81. Zielinski, *Das Reichsepiskopat*, 33.

8. Hirsch and Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 3:229, and Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:317f.

9. Hans F. Haefele, “Ekkhard IV von St. Gallen,” in *Die deutsche Literatur des*

Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon, 2nd ed., ed. Kurt Ruh, vol. 2 (Berlin, 1980), col. 464; cf. Peter Stotz, "Ekkehard I. von St. Gallen," in *ibid.*, col. 448f.

10. Hirsch and Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 3:231.

11. Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 81.

12. Frank G. Hirschmann, *Stadtplanung, Bauprojekte und Großbaustellen im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert: Vergleichende Studien zu den Kathedralstädten westlich des Rheins*, Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters, 43 (Stuttgart, 1998), 305ff. Hirsch and Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 3:232f. On the quoted phrase *labor et tyrannis*, see Thangmar, *Vita Bernwardi*, c. 48, 778 n. 1.

13. See Chapter IV, at notes 3f.

14. See Chapter III, at notes 6f.

15. Cf. Hirsch and Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 3:234, with Chapter III, at notes 19f.

16. See Chapter IV, at notes 3–12.

17. MGH DD C.II, 6.

18. Cf. Schetter, *Die Intervenienz*, 48ff. MGH DD C.II, 26 (issued in Minden), and *Regesten Konrads II.*, 7c; MGH DD C.II, 9f.; *Regesten Konrads II.*, 15a, 17a and b; MGH DD C.II, 23, etc.

19. See Chapter VI, at notes 9–11.

20. See Chapter V, at notes 40f., and Chapter VII, at note 3.

21. MGH DD C.II, 49–51. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:118f.

22. Cf. MGH DD C.II, 69 (June 27, 1026), with *ibid.*, 77 (April 4, 1027). On his second stay in Rome, cf. MGH DD C.II, 78. See Chapter VII, at note 39.

23. See Chapter VII, at notes 61 and 63.

24. MGH DD C.II, 104f.; cf. 107f., incl. introductory remarks.

25. See Chapter VI, at notes 19–21. On the scene between Aribo and Sophie, see Wolter, *Die Synoden*, 338, incl. n. 85, based on Wolthere, *Vita Godehardi prior*, c. 34, 192.

26. Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1031. Cf. Weinfurter, *Die Geschichte der Eichstätter Bischöfe*, c. 34, 62, and 185f.

27. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:327, incl. n. 3. Bardo is the subject of two roughly contemporaneous biographies; on the motives behind their composition, see Coué, *Hagiographie*, 100–126.

28. For more on the biographies mentioned in the previous note, see Coué, "Acht Bischofsviten," 380ff. On the kinship between Gisela and Bardo, see *Vita Bardonis maior*, c. 7, 326. On the role Gisela played in his promotion, see Vulcud, *Vita Bardonis*, c. 5, 319, and *Vita Meinwerici*, c. 210, 122. On Bardo's *simplicitas*, see Wolthere, *Vita Godehardi posterior*, c. 24, ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz, MGH SS II: 209 (Hannover, 1854; rpt., Stuttgart, 1994), and Vulcud, *Vita Bardonis*, c. 9, 321, who recount that during his lifetime Bardo's simplicity was mistaken for a lack of intelligence and that only after his death was it recognized for what it was, thanks to many miracles. Cf., for example, Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 164, and Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:323f. *Ibid.*, 477f., rejects *Vita Bardonis maior*, c. 7, 236, in favor of *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1031, which recounts that Bardo stepped down from his position as abbot of Werden before assuming the abbacy of Hersfeld, from which he resigned upon elevation to the archbishopric of Mainz.

29. Anselm, *Gesta*, cc. 44–50, 213–19. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 193f. Zielinski, *Das Reichsepiskopat*, 23 and 114–16.

30. Anselm, *Gesta*, cc. 39, 44, and 49, 210, 216, and 218f. Cf. Everhelm, *Vita Popponis*, c. 19, 304f., with Zimmermann, *Papsturkunden*, no. 594, 2:1119f.

31. Anselm, *Gesta*, c. 50, 219f. *Ibid.*, c. 48, 218: "corporis membra, quibus numquam lavacrum . . . praebebat" [the parts (of his body), which he had never bathed]. Zielinski, *Das Reichsepiskopat*, 115, incl. n. 241.

32. Vulcud, *Vita Bardonis*, c. 5, 319.

33. *Vita Bardonis maior*, c. 15, 329f. Cf. Althoff, "Zur Bedeutung," 379f.

34. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:322, incl. n. 1, based on *Vita Bardonis maior*, cc. 11–13, 327f.

35. Cf. Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century*, 36; for the associated note, see the German original, *Lebensordnungen*, 1:53 n. 19. Althoff, "Zur Bedeutung," 373, incl. n. 13.

36. Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 77. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:323, based on *Vita Bardonis maior*, cc. 15f., 330–35. On Bardo's relations with those on the fringes of society, see Vulcud, *Vita Bardonis*, c. 8, 320f.; cf. Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1043, as well as Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:324.

37. Vulcud, *Vita Bardonis*, cc. 5f., 319f. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:326f. Zotz, "Die Formierung," 3ff.

38. See MGH DD C.II, 167 (June 8, 1031). Cf. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:322 and 324. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 172b and c.

39. Cf. MGH DD C.II, 165f., which contain recognition clauses naming the chancellor Ulrich, who authenticated the earlier ones on behalf of Aribo but on the later ones acted in his own right.

40. See MGH DD C.II, 169ff. Cf. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:324, incl. nn. 4–7, and Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 238ff.

41. MGH DD C.II, 1–165, as well as 192 (July 2, 1033), which lists Aribo posthumously. Schetter, *Die Interventionen*, 48ff.

42. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 172b–296. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:325, incl. n. 1, is a forgery based on MGH DD C.II, 204; see the last three lines of Bresslau's introductory remarks.

43. MGH DD C.II, 198; cf. Chapter XXII, at note 18, and *Vita Meinweri*, c. 198.

44. Vulcud, *Vita Bardonis*, cc. 5–7, 319f. Cf. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:326f., and Zotz, "Die Formierung," 3ff.

45. See Chapter VI, at note 20.

46. Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 79, incl. nn. 202f. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:300f. Cosmas, *Chronica Boemorum*, 1.41, 77. *Annalista Saxo*, a. 1031, 678.

47. On the *Annales Spirenses*, a. 1038, 82, see Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:326, incl. n. 2. On the dispute over Advent, see Chapter XVII, at notes 14–16.

48. See Chapter I, at note 19, and Chapter II, at note 49.

49. *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1031. Thomas Vogtherr, "Die Reichsklöster Corvey, Fulda und Hersfeld," in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 2:434f.

50. Cf. Coué, *Hagiographie*, 100ff. and 110ff.

51. Vulcud, *Vita Bardonis*, c. 10, 321, incl. n. 8. Hirschmann, *Stadtplanung*, 306f. Franz Staab, "Reform und Reformgruppen im Erzbistum Mainz," in *Reformidee und Reformpolitik im spätsalisch-frühstaufischen Reich*, Quellen und Abhandlungen zur mittelhessischen Kirchengeschichte, 68 (Mainz, 1992), 137. On terming an archiepiscopal seat a *monasterium*, see, for example, *Traditionen Mondsee—Das älteste Traditionsbuch des Klosters Mondsee*, no. 7 (April 11, 799), ed. Gebhard Rath and Erich Reiter, Forschungen zur Geschichte Oberösterreichs, 16 (Linz, 1989), 106.

52. Staab, "Reform," 138f. and 145.

53. Vulcud, *Vita Bardonis*, c. 7, 326, and *Regesten Konrads II.*, a (gift to the king); Vulcud, *Vita Bardonis*, c. 10, 327 (clash with Aribo). *Annalista Saxo*, aa. 1040 and 1042, 684f. (actions against Bohemia). Cf. Zielinski, *Das Reichsepiuskopat*, 194. The folding chair, or *kliotetra*, had two legs on either side that crossed and formed an X.

54. Franz Staab, "Die Mainzer Kirche, Konzeption und Verwirklichung in der Bonifatius- und Theonestradition," in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 2:50, incl. n. 72; cf. Wolfram, *Grenzen und Räume*, 175f.

55. Staab, "Die Mainzer Kirche," esp. 52f. Cf., for example, MGH DD H.III, 61 (July 27, 1040), esp. the *narratio*, which refers back to the state of affairs under Conrad II.

56. Vogtherr, "Die Reichsklöster," 434f. *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1031. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:477f.

57. Staab, "Reform," 139.

58. *Die Regesten der Erzbischöfe von Köln im Mittelalter*, no. 683, ed. Friedrich Wilhelm Ödiger, Publikationen der Gesellschaft für rheinische Geschichtskunde, 21 (Bonn, 1954), 1:206. Zielinski, *Das Reichsepiuskopat*, 32–33. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 1 (*Deeds*, 58). Anselm, *Gesta*, II.9, 195. Aribo, "Aribo an Kaiserin Kunigunde," 360ff., esp. 361.

59. Aribo, "Aribo an Kaiserin Kunigunde," 361. *Regesten Konrads II.*, m (close). Rudolf

Schieffer, "Erzbischöfe und Bischofskirche von Köln," in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 2:2f., does not include this possibility—probably correctly—in his observations.

60. R. Schieffer, "Erzbischöfe," 2f. Cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, n and 4a. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 2 and 4 (*Deeds*, 65 and 69).

61. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 117a. *Regesten der Erzbischöfe von Köln*, nos. 730 and 832, pp. 211 and 240. R. Schieffer, "Erzbischöfe," 3 and 6. Cf. Keller, "Widukinds Bericht," 431.

62. Schetter, *Die Intervenienz*, 48–53. See notes 41f. above.

63. See Chapter VII, at note 61.

64. See Chapter VI, at note 20 (synod at Frankfurt), and note 38 above (archchancellor for Italy). R. Schieffer, "Erzbischöfe," 3, incl. n. 13, and 4, incl. n. 22. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 163f.

65. Bresslau, *Handbuch*, 1:471ff. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 169, incl. n. 80. See Chapter VII, at note 61.

66. Hirschmann, *Stadtplanung*, esp. 44ff. R. Schieffer, "Erzbischöfe," 4f. *Regesten der Erzbischöfe von Köln*, nos. 708–10, as well as nos. 732 and 738, pp. 210, 215, and 219.

67. Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 74, based on Bern of Reichenau, *Die Briefe*, no. 17, 50f., and Anselm, *Gesta*, II.41, 214. A *tonarius* is a musical compendium of liturgical chants arranged according to the various church modes. (The author wishes to thank Meta Niederkorn for kindly providing this information.)

68. *Regesten der Erzbischöfe von Köln*, nos. 770–74, pp. 225–27. R. Schieffer, "Erzbischöfe," 5.

69. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 39 (*Deeds*, 98).

70. *Regesten der Erzbischöfe von Köln*, no. 774, 227. R. Schieffer, "Erzbischöfe," 5. Kehr, "Vier Kapitel," 25.

71. Johanek, "Die Erzbischöfe," 87.

72. *Ibid.*, 89f. *Regesten der Erzbischöfe von Bremen*, nos. 176 and 185, p. 44. Adam, *Gesta*, II.50 (48) Schol. 36 (Easter festivals), II.67 (65) (Liawizo/Libentius II), and II. 60 (58) and 70 (68) (the archiepiscopal and ducal residence in Hamburg) (*History*, 89, 101, and 96 and 105). *Vita Meinweri*, c. 165, 86f.

73. *Regesten der Erzbischöfe von Bremen*, no. 182, 45. Cf. Chapter IV, at note 50.

74. *Ibid.*, no. 184, 45. Adam, *Gesta*, II.56 (54) (*History*, 93f.).

75. Johanek, "Die Erzbischöfe," 90. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 181f. and 209f.; cf. 177f. (Meinwerk's *familiaritas*, or close ties, to the king). On the imperial coronation, see Chapter VII, at note 61.

76. *Regesten der Erzbischöfe von Bremen*, no. 189, 47. Adam, *Gesta*, II.63 (61) (*History*, 98f.).

77. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 196 and 225f.

78. Adam, *Gesta*, II.55 (53), 64 (62), and 66 (64) (*History*, 92f. and 99f.). *Regesten der Erzbischöfe von Bremen*, nos. 179 and 191, pp. 44 and 47.

79. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, VI.40 (*Ottoman Germany*, 264f.). Adam, *Gesta*, II.47 (45) incl. Schol. 34 (35) (*History*, 86f.). *Vita Meinweri*, c. 11, 17f.

80. Adam, *Gesta*, II.48f. (46), incl. 63 (61), and Schol. 42 (43) (*History*, 87ff. and 98f.).

81. *Ibid.*, II.68 (66), incl. Schol. 48–51 (52) (*History*, 101ff.). *Regesten der Erzbischöfe von Bremen*, no. 195, 48. Johanek, "Die Erzbischöfe," 92; cf. Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 68 and 78. *Annales Quedlinburgenses (Continuatio)*, a. 1023, 89 (Hermann's failure to receive the appointment in Halberstadt).

82. Adam, *Gesta*, II.69 (67), incl. Schol. 52 (53)–55 (56) (*History*, 103ff.). Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 226. Johanek, "Die Erzbischöfe," 90; cf. Adam, *Gesta*, III.27 (26) (*History*, 136f.). *Regesten der Erzbischöfe von Bremen*, nos. 201ff., pp. 49ff.

83. Adam, *Gesta*, II.69 (67) Schol. 53 (54) and 55 (56) (*History*, 103ff.).

84. *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 1870b (Poppo) and 2054a (Hunfried).

85. Hirsch and Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 3:281ff. Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte*, 3:488f. Cf. Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 82, who limits his discussion to the building programs of Poppo and Conrad II. See, in contrast, Wolter, *Die Synoden*, 345ff., on Poppo's extensive involvement in synods during the 1030s, following his return from Jerusalem. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 1 (*Deeds*,

58–59) (Poppo at Kamba). See Chapter VII, at note 61 (Poppo and Hunfried in Rome in 1027). MGH DD C.II, 254 (Poppo in Parma in 1037; cf. Chapter IV, at note 23).

86. Rupp, *Die Ekkehardiner*, 196f. Hirsch and Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 3:284f.

87. See Chapter VIII, at note 6. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:62f. and 215f. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 25a. MGH DD H.II, 2f. *Salzburger Urkundenbuch*, no. 73, 2:127ff. Heinz Dopsch, ed., *Geschichte Salzburgs*, 2nd ed. (Salzburg, 1983), vol. 1, pt. 1, 213. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 168f. and 226.

88. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 1 (*Deeds*, 58).

89. See Chapter VII, at note 61.

90. Zimmermann, *Papsturkunden*, no. 566, 2:1072. Heinz Dopsch, “Der Primas im Purpur: Eigenbistümer, Legatenwürde und Primat der Erzbischöfe von Salzburg,” in *1200 Jahre Erzbistum Salzburg*, ed. Heinz Dopsch, Peter F. Kramml, and Alfred Stefan Weiss (Salzburg, 1999), 137f., and idem, *Geschichte Salzburgs*, vol. 1, pt. 1, 229, although the investment did not occur on July 21, as claimed there, but on June 5, 1026.

91. MGH DD C.II, 104f., 108, 149, and 229. Cf. *Salzburger Urkundenbuch*, no. 73, 2:128 (introductory remarks), with nos. 75–79, 2:131–36. See also Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:215f.

92. Schetter, *Die Intervenienz*, 53, to which MGH DD C.II, 229, should be added.

93. *Annales breves s. Rudberti Salisburgensis*, a. 1025, ed. Wilhelm Wattenbach, MGH SS 9:757 (Hannover, 1851; rpt., Stuttgart, 1983). Cf. *Annales s. Rudberti Salisburgenses*, a. 1026, *ibid.*, 772. Since Thietmar’s ordination took place at the very end of 1025, the author of the second chronicle may have associated it with 1026, which would account for the one-year discrepancy.

94. Walter of Speyer, “Epistola,” in *Scholasticus*, 10, incl. n. 1.

95. *Salzburger Urkundenbuch*, vol. 1, ed. Willibald Hauthaler (Salzburg, 1910), 210–28. Dopsch, *Geschichte Salzburgs*, vol. 1, pt. 1, 230.

CHAPTER 17

1. See Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century*, 18ff., based on Wolphere, *Vita Godehardi prior*, c. 31, 190.

2. Leopold Auer, “Der Kriegsdienst des Klerus unter den sächsischen Kaisern,” pt. 1, *MIÖG* 79 (1971): 372ff., based on *Indiculus loricatorum*, 633. Zielinski, *Das Reichsepiskopat*, 15f.: Trier was later responsible for providing one hundred men. Michael Horn, “Zur Geschichte der Bischöfe und Bischofskirche von Augsburg,” in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 2:251f.: Augsburg still provided one hundred knights in armor to the armies of Emperor Frederick I (d. 1190).

3. *Regesten der Bischöfe von Straßburg*, no. 258, ed. Paul Wentzcke, Kommission zur Herausgabe elsässischer Geschichtsquellen, 1, 1–XXVII (Innsbruck, 1908), 272.

4. See pages 197ff. above.

5. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 1 and 4 (*Deeds*, 58 and 69). MGH DD H.II, 34 (January 15, 1003). *Regesten der Bischöfe von Straßburg*, no. 220, 263f. *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 1525. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 99f.

6. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, v.12 (*Ottoman Germany*, 213f.). MGH DD H.II, 34. H. Maurer, *Der Herzog*, 88ff.

7. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 100, incl. n. 289, based on MGH DD H.II, 34.

8. *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1029.

9. Cf. *Annales Altabenses*, a. 1045, 45—“Egilbertus regine (sc. Agnetis) capellanus” [Egilbert, chaplain to the queen (sc. Agnes)]—with Wolphere, *Vita Godehardi posterior*, c. 33, 215, and *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1038, where Gunhild’s Danish chaplain is termed *capellanus regius* [royal chaplain]. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 193 and 255.

10. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 100.

11. Schwarzmaier, *Von Speyer*, 66ff.

12. Everhelm, *Vita Popponis*, c. 19, 304f. See pages 259f. above.

13. Cf. *Regesten der Bischöfe von Straßburg*, nos. 259–75, pp. 272–76.
14. Bede the Venerable, *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum I–V*, III.17, ed. Charles Plummer (Oxford, 1956); Eng. trans., *A History of the English Church and People*, trans. Leo Sherley-Price and Rev. R. E. Latham (Oxford, 1955; rev. and rpt. 1984), 169.
15. Bern of Reichenau, *Die Briefe*, no. 13, 39ff. Arno Borst, *Die karolingische Kalenderreform*, Schriften der MGH, 46:426 (Hannover, 1998). Wolter, *Die Synoden*, 359ff.
16. *Annales Spirenses*, a. 1038, 82. Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 50f. Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century*, 52ff. (*adventus*) and 379ff. (*confusio*). *Regesten Konrads II.*, 292a and b. *Regesten der Bischöfe von Straßburg*, nos. 264f., p. 232. See also Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:275f.
17. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 2 (*Deeds*, 61). Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:276 n. 3.
18. *Regesten der Bischöfe von Augsburg*, no. 245, 1:142. Horn, “Zur Geschichte,” 252f. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 49b.
19. *Regesten der Bischöfe von Augsburg*, no. 254, 1:146f.
20. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 24 (*Deeds*, 84f.). *Regesten Konrads II.*, 142–43a. *Regesten der Bischöfe von Augsburg*, nos. 262f., 150–52.
21. Cf. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:268–70, as well as 276 and 2:331.
22. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 1 (*Deeds*, 58).
23. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:32.
24. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 112c. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:192.
25. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:396. Sigebert of Gembloux, *Vita Deoderici episcopi Mettensis*, I, c. 23, ed. Georg Waitz, MGH SS 4:483 (Hannover, 1841; rpt., Stuttgart, 1981).
26. *Vita Bardonis maior*, c. 15, 330. See Chapter XVI, at note 36.
27. Cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 194b with 209a, as well as Chapter XIV, at note 24.
28. *Ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*, no. 5, 21. See Chapter IX, at notes 11–13.
29. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 264a. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:269f. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 35 (*Deeds*, 94).
30. Zielinski, *Das Reichsepiskopat*, 40. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 211 and 290. There is some discrepancy in the dating of his elevation: Markus Twellenkamp, “Das Haus der Luxemburger,” in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 1:482.
31. Twellenkamp, “Das Haus,” 480–85.
32. Lotharingia was not the only place where the bishops needed the king just as much as he needed them; see, for example, note 47 to Chapter IV.
33. See Chapter I, at notes 44ff. The reading in Friedmann, *Die Beziehungen*, 103, belies the fundamental message of *Vita Burchardi*, c. 21, 844. On other occasions as well, Burchard engaged in prayer prior to reaching a major decision; see *ibid.*, “Prologus,” 832, lines 14f., and c. 20, 844, lines 7 and 14ff. See Coué, “Acht Bischofsviten,” 350ff., on the objectives of a hagiography.
34. *Ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*, no. 52, 90.
35. *Ibid.*, no. 13, 29f. Friedmann, *Die Beziehungen*, 104.
36. On MGH DD C.II, 50f., see Friedmann, *Die Beziehungen*, 104f. MGH DD H.III, 375, contains the first blanket confirmation of MGH DD H.II, 319.
37. On MGH DD C.II, 204, see K. Schmid, “Die Sorge,” esp. 681–85.
38. On *Ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*, no. 54, 93f., see Lübkke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 625. Cf. Chapter XII, at notes 72ff.
39. Max Kerner, “Burchard von Worms,” in *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*, 2nd ed., ed. Kurt Ruh, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1978), cols. 1121–27.
40. Cf. *Vita Burchardi*, c. 10, 837, with c. 20, 844, lines 21–24.
41. *Ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*, 1ff. Cf. Coué, “Acht Bischofsviten,” 358f.
42. Coué, “Acht Bischofsviten,” 350, incl. n. 10.
43. *Ibid.*, 358–59 (quote).
44. *Vita Burchardi*, cc. 1 and 3ff., 832 and 834f.
45. *Ibid.*, c. 12, 837, lines 29–31, and 838, line 5 (quote).
46. *Ibid.*, c. 12, 838, lines 6–16. See Coué, “Acht Bischofsviten,” 355, incl. nn. 36f.
47. On the movement to restore Carolingian ideals to the canonical life around 1000,

see Rudolf Schieffler, *Die Entstehung von Domkapiteln in Deutschland*, Bonner historische Forschungen, 43 (Bonn, 1976), 259.

48. See Wolfram, *Grenzen und Räume*, 346, incl. n. 120.

49. Cf. *Vita Burchardi*, c. 12, 838, lines 6f.

50. Cf. Coué, "Acht Bischofsviten," 355, incl. nn. 36f.

51. *Vita Burchardi*, c. 12, 838.

52. *Ibid.*, lines 16–29.

53. On MGH DD C.II, 51, see Groten, "Von der Gebetsverbrüderung," 15f., as well as Friedmann, *Die Beziehungen*, 105, incl. n. 530.

54. Cf. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 204f., incl. nn. 354 and 361, as well as 232, incl. n. 471.

55. *Ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*, nos. 4f., pp. 19ff.

56. *Ibid.*, no. 5, 20–22.

57. *Ibid.*, no. 5, 20 n. 3.

58. *Ibid.*, no. 31, 56f.

59. *Ibid.*, no. 44, 80f.

60. *Ibid.*, nos. 18f., pp. 35–37, as well as no. 4, pp. 19f. On the date of Immo's elevation, see Chapter IX, at note 14.

61. *Ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*, no. 44, 31 (close).

62. See the current chapter, at notes 101f.

63. Gundekar, *Liber pontificalis Eichstetensis*, ed. Ludwig Bethmann, MGH SS 7:250 (Hannover, 1846; rpt., Stuttgart, 1995). Groten, "Von der Gebetsverbrüderung," 16.

64. Weinfurter, *Die Geschichte der Eichstätter Bischöfe*, 171, identifies two former canons at Eichstätt who became bishops during Conrad's reign: Gebhard of Ravenna and Burchard of Padua. *Ibid.*, 173f. (Heribert's role). Groten, "Von der Gebetsverbrüderung," 16. Cf. MGH DD C.II, 197 (July 21, 1033), which granted the bishop of Eichstätt property in present-day Lower Austria (Wienerwald, Liesing), with *ibid.*, 195f., which bestowed gifts on Bishop Egilbert of Freising as tokens of the emperor's gratitude. See also Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 192f.

65. *Vita Burchardi*, prologue and c. 10, 830 and 837.

66. Cf. Walter of Speyer, *Vita et passio s. Christophori martyris*, c. 29, in *Opera*, 78 (closing verses). *Idem*, *Opera*, 1ff.

67. Walter of Speyer, *Scholasticus*, which opens with a dedication addressed to the author's "colleagues" at Salzburg. Cf. also Peter Vossen, *Der Libellus Scholasticus des Walther von Speyer: Ein Schulbericht aus dem Jahre 984* (Berlin, 1962), 36–44 (Latin text) and 47–55 (excellent and helpful German translation).

68. Walter of Speyer, *Passio s. Christophori martyris*, I–VI, in *Opera*, 26–63; *idem*, "Epistola ad Hazechem," in *Opera*, 63f., and *idem*, *Vita et passio*, prologue and cc. 1–29, pp. 64–78 (79). On the work itself, see *idem*, *Opera*, 2ff., as well as Vossen, *Der Libellus Scholasticus*, 3ff. For the gender of the author of the *Annales Quedlinburgenses*, see *Die Annales Quedlinburgenses*, ed. Martina Giese, MGH Scriptorum rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi, 72:37ff., esp. 63, incl. n. 91 (Hannover, 2004).

69. Joachim Wollasch, "Neues zu Froumunds von Tegernsee Briefpartner R.," in *Festschrift für Eduard Hlawitschka zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Karl Rudolf Schnith and Roland Pauler, Münchener historische Studien, Abteilung mittelalterliche Geschichte, 5 (Kallmünz/Opf., 1993), esp. 224. Stefan Weinfurter, "Kaiser Heinrich II. (1002–1024)—ein Herrscher aus Bayern," *Oberbayerisches Archiv* 122 (1998): 43. Friedmann, *Die Beziehungen*, 106–13. On the important role played by Speyer in Conrad's personal religiosity, see Chapter X, at notes 88f.

70. *Vita Meinverci*, c. 192, 110, incl. d. On the educational dispute, see Chapter XIX, at notes 46f.

71. Wendehorst, *Das Bistum Würzburg* 1, 89. For an indication of the uncertainties surrounding Meginhard's prior service, see Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 212 (indicating he probably had served as a royal chaplain) and 2:226 (not a member of the royal chapel).

72. Wendehorst, *Das Bistum Würzburg* 1, 90–92.

73. *Ibid.*, 1:92–94. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, esp. pt. 2, 172f. Wendehorst's reservations

aside, *Ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*, no. 15, 32, does, as the collection's editor avers, refer to Bruno.

74. See Chapter v, at notes 23 and 67.

75. Wendehorst, *Das Bistum Würzburg I*, 94–100.

76. Adam, *Gesta*, III.46 (45) (*History*, 152ff.).

77. Hoffmann, "Grafschaften," 452ff.

78. Wendehorst, *Das Bistum Würzburg I*, 96.

79. *Ibid.*, I:94f. Schetter, *Die Intervenienz*, 66ff.

80. *Annales Altahenses*, a. 1045; Wendehorst, *Das Bistum Würzburg I*, 98f.

81. On Tegernsee, see *Die Tegernseer Briefsammlung (Froumund)*, nos. 51f., ed. Karl Strecker, MGH Epistolae selectae, 3:60–62 (Berlin, 1925). Seibert, "Herrscher," esp. 257–59, and idem, "Libertas," 514 and 524. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 212. See Chapter vi, at note 4, as well as Zielinski, *Das Reichsepiskopat*, 21f. and 116–19. Coué, *Hagiographie*, 41ff. Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, esp. 39–41 and 73. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:309 and 2:329–31.

82. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:333. Wolfhere, *Vita Godehardi posterior*, c. 32, 215. Cf. Chapter vi, at notes 4 and 13.

83. Adam, *Gesta*, II.79 (75) (*History*, 108f.). Wolfhere, *Vita Godehardi posterior*, c. 33, 215. *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1038. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:331f. Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 78, incl. n. 200.

84. See Chapter I, at note 32, and Chapter v, at notes 76–78. Boshof, "Bischöfe," 122ff. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:162ff. On the vision of hell, see Othlo of Saint Emmeram, *Liber visionum*, XI and XIV, ed. Paul Gerhard Schmidt, MGH Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters, 13:383 and 384 (Weimar, 1989).

85. MGH DD H.III, 303, 306, 333, and 336. Boshof, "Bischöfe," 124ff.

86. Boshof, "Bischöfe," 123, based on Weinfurter, *Die Geschichte der Eichstätter Bischöfe*, c. 34, 61f.

87. Karl Hausberger, *Geschichte des Bistums Regensburg* (Regensburg, 1989), I: esp. 73, claims, though not quite convincingly, that he apologized for the appointment.

88. Cf. *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1036, with *Vita Meinweri*, c. 219, 131f. See also Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 262.

89. *Vita Meinweri*, cc. 9 and 11, as well as 198, 15 and 17f., as well as 114. MGH DD C.II, 198. Cf. Chapter XVI, at note 43.

90. Seibert, "Libertas," 512, incl. n. 32. *Vita Meinweri*, cc. 28 and 219, 32 and 132: The thirteen founding monks of Abdinghof came from Cluny. Wollasch, "Cluny und Deutschland," 8–22 (quote). *Vita Meinweri*, cc. 154–60, 81–84. On construction as a bishop's duty and its influence on a bishop's ranking, see Wolfgang Giese, "Zur Bautätigkeit von Bischöfen und Äbten des 10. bis 12. Jahrhunderts," *DA* 38 (1982): 388ff.; Günther Binding, *Der früh- und hochmittelalterliche Bauherr als sapiens architectus*, 2nd ed. (Darmstadt, 1998), 85ff., and Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 79ff.

91. *Vita Meinweri*, c. 186, 106f. On Henry II and Meinwerk as schoolmates, see *ibid.*, c. 3, 6. On the biographer's credibility, see Wollasch, "Cluny und Deutschland," 18, incl. n. 71.

92. *Vita Meinweri*, cc. 146–48 and 151, 77f. On this passage and others, see Rösener, "Bauern," 56f.

93. Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century*, 249, based on Ekkebert, *Vita s. Haimeradi*, cc. 7 and 10, ed. Rudolf Köpke, MGH SS 10:600f. (Hannover, 1852; rpt., Stuttgart, 1987).

94. See Chapter VII, at note 72, and MGH DD C.II, 198 (August 2, 1033), as well as *ibid.*, 441, entry for Paderborn, which contains a list of the extraordinarily large number of grants Conrad made to Paderborn during Meinwerk's episcopate.

95. *Annales Hildesheimenses*, aa. 1031 and 1036. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:167f. and 418. Cf. Vogther, "Die Reichsklöster," 436ff. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 226 and 290.

96. Rudolf Schieffer, "Leo IX," in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. 5 (Munich and Zurich, 1991), cols. 188of. Goetz, *Lebensbilder*, 150ff. See esp. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 61c and d. Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 63f. [Wibert], *Vita Leonis IX*, I.7–9, 134–38. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:190ff. On the conflict between Bruno of Toul and Poppo of Trier, see Chapter VIII, at note 14.

97. *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1034. Zielinski, *Das Reichsepiskopat*, 132ff. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 193. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:189f.

98. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 28 (*Deeds*, 86f.); cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 158c—which, it should be noted, mistakenly refers to a “Werner” of Constance, instead of Warmann—as well as Chapter v, at note 51.

99. MGH DD C.II, 199: Duke Hermann possessed the authority to act as his mother’s advocate on August 9, 1033, so he must have been released from the bishop’s guardianship before that date. See Chapter v, at note 11.

100. Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1032. Zimmermann, *Papsturkunden*, no. 592, 2:117f. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:124f. Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 131.

101. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:125f.: Warmann died on April 10, 1034. *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1034, specifically refers to Ebbo as a court chaplain, so there is no need to identify him as such on the basis of the numerous references to “E.” in the *Ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*.

102. Coué, “Acht Bischofsviten,” 356f. *Vita Burchardi*, c. 10, 837 (how the *Decretum Burchardi* was composed). Cf., for example, *Ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*, no. 28, 52 (works about Boethius); no. 32, 57f. (works about chronology and Boethius); nos. 34–36 and 42, pp. 60–68 and 77f. (Ebbo’s problems as schoolmaster); and no. 55, 95 (Ebbo already bishop of Constance).

103. *Gesta episcoporum Halberstadensium*, 92f. Michel Parisse, “Die Frauenstifte und Frauenklöster in Sachsen vom 10. bis zur Mitte des 12. Jahrhunderts,” in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 2:492. Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 32. Zielinski, *Das Reichsepiskopat*, 127. On the family backgrounds of the two future archbishops of Hamburg-Bremen, see Adam, *Gesta*, II.68 (66) and III.2 (*History*, 101f. and 115). *Annales Quedlinburgenses (Continuatio)*, a. 1023, 89 (Hermann’s failure to become bishop of Halberstadt).

104. See Chapter XVI, at notes 26ff.

105. *Annales Quedlinburgenses*, 93. See Chapter XII, note 4.

106. *Gesta episcoporum Halberstadensium*, 94 (quotes). Zielinski, *Das Reichsepiskopat*, 58. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 171. Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 139. Cf. Kurt-Ulrich Jäschke, *Die älteste Halberstädter Bischofschronik*, *Mitteldeutsche Forschungen*, 63:1 (Cologne, 1970), 231, s.v. “Burchard I.” While the account of the court diet places it in Werla, the author may have confused the traditional Saxon meeting place with the palace at Goslar; see Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:131, incl. n. 4, who has already addressed this issue. On Werla’s replacement by Goslar, see Engels, “Das Reich der Salier,” 494f.

107. Cf., for example, Wolfram, *Grenzen und Räume*, 47f. and 51, incl. n. 202 (Saint Severinus).

108. See Chapter v, at note 70, and Chapter XVIII, at notes 11ff.

109. Cf. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:131.

CHAPTER 18

1. Cf. Chapter III, at note 20, with Chapter IV, at note 45.
2. See Chapter IV, at notes iff., and Chapter VI, at notes iff.
3. See Chapter VI, at notes 9–11.
4. See Chapter XVI, at notes 33 and 43f.
5. See Chapter VII, at notes 65ff.
6. See Chapter VIII, at note 14.
7. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 293. *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1039. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:327f.
8. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 166f., 211, and 289. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 143a. Cf. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 1 and 26 (*Deeds*, 59 and 86).
9. MGH DD C.II, 195f. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 202f. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:84f.
10. See Chapter XXII, at note 87.
11. See Chapter v, at note 70, and Chapter XIII, at notes 133–35.

12. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 232a and 233. MGH DD C.II, 225.
13. See Chapter VII, at notes 65–96.
14. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 244f–h, 258b, and 259f. See MGH DD H.III, 57 (introduction), for a partial corrective to Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:260–65. Furthermore, see esp. *Annales Alta-henses*, a. 1037; *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1037; Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1037; and Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 35 (*Deeds*, 93ff.).
15. See Chapter IX, at notes 27ff., and Chapter XIV, at notes 37–39.
16. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 36 (*Deeds*, 95).
17. See Chapter IX, at note 35. Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, aa. 1037f. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 36 (*Deeds*, 95).
18. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:267, incl. n. 1.

CHAPTER 19

1. Cf. Seibert, “Libertas,” 516.
2. *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 1969. MGH DD H.II, 428 (May 1, 1020); cf. *ibid.* 437, as well as Seibert, “Libertas,” 514, incl. n. 43.
3. Everhelm, *Vita Popponis*, c. 9, 298f.
4. On this topic, see Seibert, “Libertas,” 514, and *idem*, “Herrscher,” 220ff. and 256ff., supplemented by Wollasch, “Neues,” esp. 224, and Weinfurter, “Kaiser Heinrich II.,” 43.
5. Seibert, “Herrscher,” 266, based on *Codex Laureshamensis*, c. 89, 1:371; cf. c. 96, 1:378.
6. Seibert, “Libertas,” 510ff., and *idem*, “Herrscher,” esp. 236ff.
7. Seibert, “Herrscher,” 239ff.
8. *Ibid.*, 257–59.
9. Seibert, “Libertas,” 515, incl. n. 46.
10. On MGH DD C.II, 7, 11–14, 37, 127, and 180, and MGH DD A, 136, as well as *Die Traditionen des Hochstiftes Freising*, 1422, 2:278f., see Seibert, “Libertas,” 517–20, as well as Chapter XXII, at note 87.
11. See Chapter V, at note 43.
12. Seibert, “Libertas,” 517, incl. n. 60, based on Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 37 (*Deeds*, 96); Everhelm, *Vita Popponis*, c. 19, 305; and MGH DD C.II, 180 (confirmed by MGH DD H.III, 226) and 216. Cf. Ladewig, *Poppo*, 79ff., and Gerhard Streich, *Burg und Kirche während des deutschen Mittelalters*, VF 29 (Sigmaringen, 1984), 431f.
13. Everhelm, *Vita Popponis*, c. 19, 304f. See Chapter XVI, at note 30.
14. See Ladewig, *Poppo*, 24f., based on Everhelm, *Vita Popponis*, c. 1, 294f.
15. *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 2037d and 2041a.
16. Giesebrecht, *Geschichte*, 2:714ff. See Chapter IV, at note 8.
17. Everhelm, *Vita Popponis*, c. 18, 304. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 48a (Aachen 1025), and see Chapter XIV, at notes 20f. (Deville, 1033).
18. Seibert, “Libertas,” 524, incl. n. 90.
19. Ladewig, *Poppo*, 79ff. Everhelm, *Vita Popponis*, c. 19, 305.
20. Ladewig, *Poppo*, 75ff. Everhelm, *Vita Popponis*, c. 19, 305.
21. Ladewig, *Poppo*, 93ff. Everhelm, *Vita Popponis*, c. 19, 305.
22. Ladewig, *Poppo*, 96ff. Everhelm, *Vita Popponis*, c. 19, 305.
23. Ladewig, *Poppo*, 92ff. Everhelm, *Vita Popponis*, c. 19, 305.
24. Ladewig, *Poppo*, 86ff. Everhelm, *Vita Popponis*, c. 19, 305.
25. The imperial abbey, which was located in the diocese of Cambrai, was still considered poor in spring 1034; see MGH DD C.II, 209, and *Regesten Konrads II.*, 217, as well as Ladewig, *Poppo*, 68–70. The monastery of Hau(t)mont, which is listed after Saint-Ghislain, was entrusted to Poppo during the reign of Henry III; see Ladewig, *Poppo*, 71ff., and Everhelm, *Vita Popponis*, c. 19, 305.
26. Ladewig, *Poppo*, 64ff. (Brauweiler), 90ff. (Busendorf), and 66f. (Hohorst). Everhelm, *Vita Popponis*, c. 19, 305.

27. Ladewig, *Poppo*, 57ff., 85f., and 89f. Everhelm, *Vita Popponis*, c. 19, 305.
28. Ladewig, *Poppo*, 63.
29. Everhelm, *Vita Popponis*, c. 21, 306 (Poppo as a “second Benedict”). On the swift death accorded bad abbots, imposed particularly at Limburg, see Ladewig, *Poppo*, 81ff., based most esp. on Everhelm, *Vita Popponis*, cc. 19f. and 23, 305f. and 309, as well as Dorothee Schäfer, *Studien zu Poppo von Stablo und den Klosterreformen im 11. Jahrhundert* (Ph.D. thesis, University of Munich, 1991), 61ff. On “Popponic” architecture, see Hermann Graf, “Mönche und Geistliche als Architekten und Bauverwalter beim Bau des Klosters Limburg und des Speyerer Domes im 11. Jahrhundert?” *Mitteilungen des Historischen Vereins der Pfalz* 54 (1956): 155ff., esp. 179ff. Hirschmann, *Stadtplanung*, esp. 215f. Schäfer, *Studien*, 63ff., and Ladewig, *Poppo*, 50–53.
30. Seibert, “Libertas,” 524 n. 90, cites Gerhard Ladner, *Theologie und Politik vor dem Investiturstreit: Abendmahlstreit, Kirchenreform, Cluny und Heinrich III*, VIÖG, 2 (Baden bei Wien, 1936; rpt., Darmstadt, 1968), 143f. n. 315, who neither states nor insinuates as much.
31. Seibert, “Herrscher,” 258f., based on Wolthere, *Vita Godehardi prior*, c. 13f., 177f., and idem, *Vita Godehardi posterior*, cc. 6f., 201f.
32. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:309, incl. n. 6, based esp. on *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1031; Lampert of Hersfeld, *De institutione Herveldensis ecclesiae*, in *Opera*, 349f.; *Vita Meinwerici*, c. 210, 122; and Wolthere, *Vita Godehardi prior*, c. 36, 194.
33. Vulcud, *Vita Bardonis*, c. 3, 318f., and *Vita Bardonis maior*, c. 9, 326.
34. *Annales Hildesheimenses*, aa. 1031f.; cf. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:310, based on Lampert of Hersfeld, *Annales*, aa. 1031f., 54, as well as idem, *De institutione*, 349f.
35. Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 39.
36. Vulcud, *Vita Bardonis*, c. 3, 319.
37. See Chapter XVI, at note 57.
38. Seibert, “Libertas,” 524, incl. n. 89. On “the Bavarian version of reform monasticism derived from Gorze,” see Friedrich Prinz, “Bayern vom Zeitalter der Karolinger bis zum Ende der Welfenherrschaft (788–1180): Die innere Entwicklung: Staat, Gesellschaft, Kirche, Wirtschaft,” in *Handbuch der bayerischen Geschichte*, ed. Max Spindler, 2nd ed. (Munich, 1981), 1:477ff., esp. 474ff. (group at Niederalteich), and Hubert Glaser, “Wissenschaft und Bildung,” in *ibid.*, 535ff., esp. 538f. (quote).
39. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 106c. Wolthere, *Vita Godehardi prior*, c. 31, 189f.; cf. the letter from Wolthere to Albin, the schoolmaster at Hersfeld, on p. 168.
40. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:217, incl. n. 1
41. Wilhelm Wühr, “Die Wiedergeburt Montecassinus unter seinem ersten Reformabt Richer von Niederaltaich († 1055),” *Studi Gregoriani* 3 (1948): 390f., based on MGH DD C.11, 227 (February 26, 1036). Cf., on the other hand, Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:186, incl. n. 5, based on MGH DD C.11, 57 and 227. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 58 and 235. Hermann of Niederalteich, *De institutione monasterii Altabensis*, a. 1033, ed. Philipp Jaffé, MGH SS 17:371 (Hanover, 1861; rpt., Stuttgart, 1990); cf. Wolthere, *Vita Godehardi prior*, c. 15, 178f.
42. *Chronica monasterii Casinensis*, II.61–65, 285–95, esp. II.63, 291ff. On Richer’s assumption of office, see *ibid.*, II.89, 340f., and the discussion in Wühr, “Die Wiedergeburt,” esp. 397ff. and 404ff., and Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:311–13.
43. Prinz, “Bayern,” 468, based on MGH DD O.11, 192 (June 10, 979). Seibert, “Herrscher,” 257f.
44. On *Tegernseer Briefsammlung*, no. 52, 61f., see Seibert, “Herrscher,” 257f.
45. Glaser, “Wissenschaft,” 545ff., esp. 547 (quote). Bernhard Schmeidler, *Abt Ellinger von Tegernsee, 1017–1026 und 1031–1041*, Schriftenreihe zur bayerischen Landesgeschichte, 32 (Munich, 1938), remains the basic work on the abbot’s life, although note should be made of the reservations expressed by Franz Unterkircher, “Ellinger von Tegernsee,” in *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*, vol. 2, cols. 504ff.
46. *Ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*, no. 15, 32. The situation may have been further aggravated by a student’s flight from Worms to Würzburg; see *ibid.*, no. 42, 78.
47. See *ibid.*, app., vv. 1ff., esp. vv. 141ff. and 165ff., pp. 119ff. and 123–25. See also Schmeidler,

Abt Ellinger, esp. 126–31, and Glaser, “Wissenschaft,” 539f. The fact that Quirinus (v. 181, 125) is invoked right after Saint Kilian strongly suggests that the author was a monk from Tegernsee who belonged to the school at Würzburg. According to *Ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*, no. 42, 78, a Bavarian induced Humfried, a student at Worms, to flee to Würzburg.

48. MGH DD H.II, 398, in confirmation of 194 (Wachau), and 431 (Triesting and Piesting).

49. MGH DD C.II, 30, based on MGH DD H.II, 193 (May 22, 1009).

50. Schmeidler, *Abt Ellinger*, 168–70.

51. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 49b. See Chapter v, at note 41, and Chapter VII, at note 3.

52. See Schmeidler, *Abt Ellinger*, 170ff.

53. *Ibid.*, 171ff. See esp. *Ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*, nos. 105f., pp. 108f. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:399f.

54. *Tegernseer Briefsammlung*, no. 105, 108.

55. *Ibid.*, no. 106, 109f.

56. Otloh of Saint Emmeram, *Liber visionum*, 8f., 69–72. On this account, see Schmeidler, *Abt Ellinger*, 179ff.

57. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:400ff., based on *Chronicon Benedictoburanum*, cc. 13ff., 218–21, as well as *Breviarium Gotschalchi*, cc. 3ff., in *ibid.*, 222ff. On Conrad’s withdrawal from Bavarian politics in 1031, see Chapter XIII, at notes 131ff.

58. On *Tegernseer Briefsammlung*, no. 107, 110f., see Schmeidler, *Abt Ellinger*, esp. 174f.

59. See Chapter v, at note 43.

60. Cf. *Tegernseer Briefsammlung*, nos. 105f., pp. 108 and 110; cf. no. 107, pp. 110f.

61. *Ibid.*, no. 105, 108: “pastoralem curam deponens atque prioratum suum” [resigning from his pastoral duties and priorate].

62. *Ibid.*, no. 107, 110.

63. *Ibid.*, no. 113, 120. On Thietmar II, see Chapter XVI, at notes 89ff.

64. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:399. See Chapter XVII, at note 81 (Godehard in Hersfeld), as well as *Tegernseer Briefsammlung*, no. 106, 109, from the monks of Tegernsee—that is to say, Ellinger—to Bishop Godehard of Hildesheim concerning Albinus.

65. Keller, *Zwischen regionaler Begrenzung*, following 160. *Miracula s. Willibrordi Epternacensis*, c. 5, ed. Wilhelm Levison, MGH SS 30, pt. 2 (Hannover, 1934; rpt., Stuttgart, 1976), 1369f., incl. nn. 12ff. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:366, incl. n. 6, and 408f.

66. *Gesta episcoporum Cameracensium*, III.21, 21.

67. Everhelm, *Vita Popponis*, c. 19, 305.

68. MGH DD C.II, 209.

69. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:409, incl. n. 5. Ladewig, *Poppo*, 69, incl. n. 2, based on MGH DD H.III, 69, and *Ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*, no. 7, 23f.

70. MGH DD C.II, 180. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 186. On the consecration of the crypt, see Chapter x, at note 95, and Friedmann, *Die Beziehungen*, 107, incl. n. 541. On the bestowal of the insignia, see Schramm, “Herrschaftszeichen,” 175 and 177f. See Chapter x, at notes 18 and 115f., and Chapter XI, at note 135; cf. note 12 above.

71. See Chapter x, at note 95.

72. Ekkehard IV of Saint Gall, *Casus sancti Galli*, “preloquium.” Cf. *ibid.*, c. 87. Ekkehard, too, believed that the Benedictine Rule was the highest good and that he was duty-bound to obey; see, for example, *ibid.*, cc. 100, 105, esp. 115, and 139. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:414f. Ladewig, *Poppo*, 97ff.

73. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:407f. Everhelm, *Vita Popponis*, c. 23, 309.

74. Ladewig, *Poppo*, 97–99.

75. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 37 (*Deeds*, 96). Ladewig, *Poppo*, 82ff. Cf. Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 43, incl. n. 83.

76. MGH DD C.II, 180.

77. Weinfurter, “Herrschaftslegitimation,” 57–59 and 67f. Cf. K. Schmid, “Die Sorge,” 685f., 702f., and 718, and Chapter x, at note 104. On the abbey church at Limburg, see Chapter x, at note 93.

CHAPTER 20

1. Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 61.
2. It is important to note that the vast majority of the sources cited in *ibid.*, 61ff., are interpreted in a manner that undermines, rather than bolsters, the author's thesis.
3. *Ibid.*, 63, incl. n. 145, based on Humbert of Silva Candida, *Adversus simoniacos I–III*, III.7, ed. Friedrich Thaner, MGH Libelli de Lite 1:206 (Hannover, 1891), and Peter Damian, *Liber gratissimus*, ed. Lothar Heinemann, MGH Libelli de Lite 1:15–75, and *idem*, *Epistolae*, no. 40, ed. Kurt Reindel, MGH Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit, 4 (Munich, 1983), pt. 1, 470.
4. Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 63 n. 145, based on Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte*, 3:546 n. 5, in reference to Peter Damian, *Epistolae*, no. 40, 503.
5. T. Schieffer, *Heinrich II. und Konrad II.*, 54 (orig. publ. 437).
6. Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum Libri Quinque/The Five Books*, v.5.25, 250–53. Cf. T. Schieffer, *Heinrich II. und Konrad II.*, 40f. and 44f. (orig. publ. 423f. and 427f.).
7. Wolter, *Die Synoden*, 360–80; cf. T. Schieffer, *Heinrich II. und Konrad II.*, 42f. (orig. publ. 425f.), as well as Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 62, incl. n. 142.
8. On Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 8 (*Deeds*, 74), see T. Schieffer, *Heinrich II. und Konrad II.*, 43f. (orig. publ. 426f.). Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 60.
9. T. Schieffer, *Heinrich II. und Konrad II.*, 32 and 41 (orig. publ. 415 and 424).
10. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 39a and 40. MGH DD C.II, 39. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 8 (*Deeds*, 74f.). Seibert, “Libertas,” 508, incl. n. 16.
11. Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 63f., based on [Wibert], *Vita Leonis IX*, c. 6, 134.
12. Seibert, “Libertas,” esp. 508ff.
13. MGH DD C.II, 60 (privilege for Breme in spring 1026) and 52–54 (Bishop Alberic of Como invested with substantial rights in spring 1026). *Chronicon Novaliciense*, app. c. 5, 124. Cf. Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 60f., incl. nn. 137f., with Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:163ff. and 2:179f. On the relationship between Novalesse and Breme, see Giorgio Sergi, “Novalesa,” in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. 6 (Munich, 1993), cols. 1299f.
14. Zielinski, *Das Reichsepiskopat*, 64, 83, and 349 (entry for Reginhard). Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 62, incl. n. 140, on Rupert, *Chronicon s. Laurentii Leodiensis*, cc. 28 and 30, 271 and 272f. Reiner of Saint Laurentius, *Vita Reginardi episcopi Leodiensis*, c. 3, ed. Wilhelm Arndt, MGH SS 20:572 (Hannover, 1868; rpt., Stuttgart, 1989). Cf. Jan van Engen, “Rupert von Deutz und das sogenannte Chronicon sancti Laurentii Leodiensis: Zur Geschichte des Investiturstreites in Lüttich,” *DA* 35 (1979): esp. 62f. and 70f., on evaluating the chronicle's entries concerning eleventh-century events.
15. *Chronicon Laureshamensis*, c. 120, in *Codex Laureshamensis*, 1:385f. On the composition and dating of this source, see 1:16f. *Ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*, no. 67, 112. Cf. Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 62, incl. n. 141. On Immo, see Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 206f., based on *Ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*, no. 44, 80f.
16. On *Chronicon Altinate*, II, ed. Roberto Cessi, in *Origo civitatum Italie seu Venetiarum*, Fonti per la storia d'Italia, 73 (Rome, 1933), 101, or X, ed. H. Simonsfeld, MGH SS 14:57 (Hannover, 1883; rpt., Stuttgart, 1988), see Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 62, incl. n. 139.
17. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 237a. *Constitutiones*, no. 44, 1:88. *Gesta episcoporum Cameracensium*, III.51, 485.
18. Wolter, *Die Synoden*, 315.
19. See pages 89ff. above.
20. See Chapter VII, at notes 65ff.
21. See Chapter XXII, at note 99.
22. Wolter, *Die Synoden*, 315f.
23. See Chapter VII, at notes 65ff.
24. See Chapter XIII, at note 79.
25. See Chapter VII, at notes 62–64.
26. See Chapter XVII, at notes 14f.
27. Wolter, *Die Synoden*, 315ff., esp. 318 nn. 18f.

28. *Ibid.*, 325ff., esp. 328f., incl. nn. 54 and 58, based on Zimmermann, *Papsturkunden*, no. 578, 2:1092ff., and MGH DD C.II., 205 (March 8, 1034).
29. Wolter, *Die Synoden*, 332, incl. n. 68, and 334, incl. n. 75.
30. *Ibid.*, 335, incl. nn. 79–82. See Chapter V, at note 76, and Chapter XXII, at note 99.
31. Wolthere, *Vita Godehardi prior*, c. 34, 192.
32. Wolter, *Die Synoden*, 342, incl. n. 99.
33. *Ibid.*, 353f., based on *Gesta episcoporum Cameracensium*, III.51, 485, and MGH DD C.II, 228f., as well as the other sources listed in Wolter, *Die Synoden*, 354 n. 136. Only a fragmentary version of the statutes survives today; see *Constitutiones*, no. 44, 1:88f.
34. Wolter, *Die Synoden*, 345ff. Heinrich Felix Schmid, “Die Entstehung des kirchlichen Zehentrechts auf slavischem Boden,” in *Festschrift W. Abraham* (Lemberg, 1930), iff. Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 630.
35. Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum Libri Quinque/The Five Books*, III.12, 112ff.
36. Wolter, *Die Synoden*, 358f. Cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 254d with 279.
37. Wolter, *Die Synoden*, 359f. See Chapter XVII, at notes 14f. On the necessity of segregating those who celebrated rites differently from the rest of the community, see Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum Libri Quinque/The Five Books*, III.12, 114–15.

CHAPTER 21

1. Coué, “Acht Bischofsviten,” 355 nn. 38f., based on *Vita Burchardi*, c. 17, 840.
2. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:420.
3. *Tegernseer Briefsammlung*, no. 52, 62f.
4. *Chronicon Benedictoburanum*, c. 13, 219.
5. Ekkehard IV of Saint Gall, *Casus sancti Galli*, c. 87, attacks the brand of reform advocated by Poppo of Stavelot, but in cc. 99f., 105, esp. 115, and 139, he maintains that the Benedictine Rule represents a higher good. On written *consuetudines*, see Rudolf Schieffer, “Consuetudines monasticae und Reformforschung,” *DA* 44 (1988): 164, who describes “the rule apparently drawn up for the monks of Saint Emmeram in Regensburg around 980/90 . . . [as] the only surviving example of the genre produced at a German cloister during the Ottonian and Salian eras.”
6. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 280c. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:312, as well as Chapter IX, at notes 71f.
7. For a critique of Ladewig, *Poppo*, 120 (quote), see Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:418 n. 1.
8. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:410. Ladewig, *Poppo*, 57ff. Everhelm, *Vita Popponis*, c. 19, 305. In Rodulfus, *Gesta abbatum Trudonensium*, ed. Rudolf Köpke, MGH SS 10:231f. (Hannover, 1852; rpt., Stuttgart, 1987), cf. c. 6 with c. 5.
9. [Wibert], *Vita Leonis IX*, 1.6, 133; cf. Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 63f.
10. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 4 (*Deeds*, 69).
11. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:418 n. 1. See Chapter XVI, at notes 28 (Bardo) and 76 (Liawizo).
12. Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1032; see Chapter XVII, at note 100.
13. See Chapter VI, at note 13 above.
14. Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum Libri Quinque/The Five Books*, III.12, 114f.
15. See Chapter XIX, at notes 46f., as well as *Ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*, nos. 25f., pp. 46ff.

CHAPTER 22

1. Cf. Chapter X, at note 58.
2. Wipo, “Epistola,” 3 (*Deeds*, 53).
3. Weinfurter, *Heinrich II.*, 186ff.
4. *Ibid.*, 237f.
5. See Chapter XIII, at notes 47ff.
6. Weinfurter, *Heinrich II.*, 42–44.

7. Michael Mitterauer, "Senioris sui nomine": Zur Verbreitung von Fürstennamen durch das Lehenswesen," *MIÖG* 96 (1988): 275ff. Metz, "Wesen und Struktur," 350ff. Cf. Grönbech, *Kultur und Religion*, 2:43ff.

8. See Chapter I, at notes 19 and 59.

9. See Chapter I, at note 50.

10. Mertens, "Vom Rhein," 241.

11. See, for example, the genealogical table in Weinfurter, *The Salian Century*, 184.

12. See Chapter I, at note 19, and Chapter II, at note 3.

13. MGH DD C.II, 1ff. Cf. Weinfurter, *Heinrich II.*, 43, incl. n. 64.

14. With regard to Schreibmüller, "Die Ahnen," 222, see *Annales Palidenses*, a. 1024, 67. Cf. Chapter I, at note 83.

15. For example, Archbishop Adalram of Salzburg was once described as a "noble raven" and on another occasion as a "noble ram and protector of the flock," based on the etymological meaning of his name; see Wolfram, *Grenzen und Räume*, 181, incl. nn. 252f.

16. Wolthere, *Continuatio vitae Bernwardi*, 166.

17. MGH DD C.II, 139. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 144.

18. MGH DD C.II, 198. Cf. *Vita Meinwerci*, c. 198, which reproduces the text but puts a different spin on its meaning. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 205. On Burchard, see Chapter XVII, at notes 106ff.

19. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 5 (*Deeds*, 70f.).

20. Cf. Valerius Maximus, *Factorum et dictorum memorabilium libri novem: Cum incerti auctoris fragmento De praenominibus*, ed. Karl Kempf (Berlin, 1854; 2nd ed. 1888), or *Factorum et dictorum memorabilium libri novem: Iulii Paridis et Ianuarii Nepotiani epitomis adiectis*, ed. Karl Halm (Leipzig, 1865); Eng. trans., *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, ed. and trans. D. R. Shackleton Bailey, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 2000).

21. See Chapter X, at notes 23ff., 40, and 57.

22. See Chapter VIII, at note 5, and the current chapter, at notes 87f.

23. Cf. Thietmar, *Chronicon*, II.45 (*Ottoman Germany*, 124f.), on "the royal throne," with Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 6f. (*Deeds*, 71ff.).

24. Fried, *Der Weg in der Geschichte*, 598f. Althoff, *Otto III.*, 104ff.

25. On Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 6 (*Deeds*, 71f.), see Trillmich, in Wipo, *Gesta*, 515.

26. For the correct translation of Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 28 (close), see *Deeds*, 87; Goetz, *Lebensbilder*, 134 and 506; Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 21; and Jäschke, "Tamen," 441, incl. n. 149. Wipo discussed Ernest's madness in cc. 25 and 28. Althoff, "Königsherrschaft," 280 (rpt. 41), incl. n. 54, clearly illustrates the logic inherent in one's personal ties to vassals and friends.

27. Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici I. imperatoris*, 1.7 (*The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*, 40f.).

28. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 34 (*Deeds*, 93).

29. Cf. *ibid.* with Chapter IX, at notes 8–14.

30. Cf. Althoff, "Gloria," 297ff.

31. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 29 (*Deeds*, 88). Lübke, *Regesten*, vol. 4, nos. 600 and 602.

32. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 31 (*Deeds*, 90).

33. See Chapter XIV, at notes 23ff. and 39.

34. See Chapter XIII, at notes 62f. and 100.

35. Cf. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 35 (*Deeds*, 94), with *Annales Altahenses*, a. 1038, and Arnulf, *Gesta*, II.14, 15 (*Liber*, 160). Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:274 n. 1, rejected the latter two accounts because they do not concur with Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum Libri Quinque/Five Books*, III.38, 162–63, but his reasons for doing so are unconvincing. Cf. also *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1037.

36. See Chapter XIII, at notes 29f. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 9 (*Deeds*, 75).

37. See Chapter XIII, at notes 59f. Cf. Wolfram, *Salzburg*, 167 and 174.

38. On *honestum*, or honorable behavior, cf. the inscription to the plate depicting the coronation of Henry II and Cunigunde in Weinfurter, *Heinrich II.*, 98, incl. n. 42, reproduced from the Pericope Book of Henry II, Munich Staatsbibliothek MS clm. 4452, fol. 2r, 434. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 13 (*Deeds*, 77f.).

39. Ekkehard, *Casus s. Galli*, c. 66. See Chapter IV, at note 36.
40. Reinhard Wenskus, "Adel," in *Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde* (Berlin, 1973), 1:60f.
41. Wolfhere, *Vita Godehardi prior*, c. 34, 192 (Sophie). Weinfurter, *Heinrich II.*, 197, incl. nn. 75f., based on *Fundatio monasterii Brunwilarensis*, c. 6, ed. Hermann Papst, in *Die Braunweiler Geschichtsquellen*, Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde (Hannover, 1874), 12:158; cf. c. 10, 162, and Thietmar, *Chronicon*, IV.60 (*Ottoman Germany*, 194) (Matilda). On the board game of trictrac, see Antje Kluge-Pinsker, *Schachspiel und Trictrac: Zeugnisse mittelalterlicher Spielfreude aus salischer Zeit*, Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum, Monographien, 30 (Sigmaringen, 1991), 55ff. On Ezzo's marriage (990/93), see Kluger, "Prop-ter claritatem generis," 235 and 239.
42. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 3 (*Deeds*, 67).
43. See Chapter XI, at note 40, and *Vita Meinweri*, c. 204. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:378 (Daia).
44. For a definitive discussion of this topic and the technical terms *colloquium familiare* [confidential conversation], *colloquium secretum* [secret conversation], and *colloquium publicum* [public conversation], see Althoff, *Spielregeln*, 157ff. See Chapter III, at note 11; Chapter IV, at notes 57f. and 91f.; Chapter V, at notes 7, 15, 20, and 21; Chapter VII, at note 58; and Chapter VIII, at note 13.
45. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 6 (*Deeds*, 72).
46. See Chapter XIII, at notes 65f.
47. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 25 (*Deeds*, 85). See Chapter V, at note 36.
48. See Chapter V, at notes 69ff.
49. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:353.
50. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 4 (*Deeds*, 69).
51. See Chapter II, at note 54, and Chapter V, at note 38 (no policies carried out without Gisela's input?); Chapter XVII, at note 20 (episcopal appointment of Bruno of Augsburg confirmed); and Chapter XI, at notes 146f., as well as Chapter XXIII, at note 6 (Gisela invested with Lesum).
52. See Chapter XIII, at note 133.
53. See Chapter XIII, at note 97. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 197a and 202f. MGH DD C.II, 195f.
54. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 225b–229.
55. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:157f. See Chapter IX, at notes 5ff.
56. See note 18 above.
57. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:353.
58. *Annales Quedlinburgenses*, a. 1000, 77.
59. On *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1034, cf. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:128f., whose analysis of the incident leaves something to be desired. On the cases referred to here, see pages 71ff. above.
60. On Adalbero of Eppenstein, see K. Brunner, *Herzogtümer*, 157, as well as Klaar, *Die Herrschaft der Eppensteiner*, nos. 38ff., pp. 30ff.
61. Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 3 and 5 (*Deeds*, 67 and 70) (vicar of Christ). On Burchard of Lyon, see Chapter XIV, at note 42.
62. See Chapter XVIII, at notes 16–18.
63. MGH DD H.II, 427 (*pactum* of ca. 1020). Trillmich, *Kaiser Konrad II.*, 339.
64. Hartmann, "Autoritäten," 426.
65. On that topic, see Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 33 (*Deeds*, 92).
66. Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum Libri Quinque/Five Books*, III.4.13, 114ff.
67. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:97f., 317, and 320. See Chapter IX, at note 79, and Chapter XIII, at note 66.
68. See Chapter XVI, at notes 59ff.
69. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 172ff.
70. Cf. MGH DD C.II, 124, 189, 199, and 212f.
71. See Chapter XI, at note 8.

72. Bresslau, *Handbuch*, 1:90.
73. See Chapter XI, at note 134.
74. Wolphere, *Continuatio vitae Bernwardi*, 166.
75. See *Regesten Heinrichs II.*, 2013 (February 1022), for a particularly apt example.
76. MGH DD C.II, 259. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 271.
77. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 204.
78. See the extremely helpful historical review of the conceptual terminology in C. Ehlers, *Metropolis Germaniae*, 55–57.
79. See, for example, MGH DD C.II, 157, 212, and 225.
80. Dopsch, “Il patriarca Poppone,” 20, incl. n. 72.
81. Krah, “Die Absetzung,” 354. Dopsch, “Il patriarca Poppone,” 30, incl. n. 174. See Klaar, *Die Herrschaft der Eppensteiner*, nos. 34–37, pp. 29f., for Adalbero’s subsequent actions in partnership with the emperor. K. Schmid, “Haus- und Herrschaftsverständnis,” 32ff.
82. Heidrich, “Die Absetzung,” 76, incl. n. 45.
83. MGH DD C.II, 92, p. 127, line 7.
84. *Constitutiones*, no. 38, 1:84.
85. For example, according to MGH DD C.II, 132, Count Wezellan was the first person, along with his brother, Bishop Helmger of Ceneda, asked to consent to an important donation in central Friuli. The forest under discussion was located in a county subject to Count Varientus, a namesake of the first vassal and compurgator of Aquileia; see *ibid.*, 92. Adalbero’s intervention on Aquileia’s behalf (*ibid.*, 131) indicates that he consented to the patriarchate’s minting of coinage.
86. Bresslau, *Handbuch*, 1:90 (quote) and 470. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 166f.
87. Bresslau, *Handbuch*, 1:90f., 2:75f. (sham court), and 1:653ff. (duel); *Die Traditionen des Hochstiftes Freising*, 1422, 2:278. Cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 127; MGH DD C.II, 124; and K. Lechner, *Die Babenberger*, 68. MGH DD A, 136 (July 16, 895) and MGH DD H.II, 426. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:269–71. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle*, pt. 2, 303, s.v. “Egilbert.” Prinz, “Bayern”; on this point, 414. Störmer, “Bayern,” 527. Reinhard Schneider, “Landeserschließung und Raumerfassung durch salische Herrscher,” in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 1:126f., whose cautious assessment of the modest success accorded Conrad’s measures is probably right on the money; cf. Chapter XI, at note 134. Seibert, “Libertas,” 518–20.
88. Bresslau, *Handbuch*, 1:90.
89. MGH DD C.II, 258f., contains the decisions of royal courts at which Conrad was present but in which he has not been shown to have had an immediate interest.
90. Cf. Chapter V, at notes 48 and 67ff.
91. Boshof, *Die Salier*, 63. Althoff, “Königsherrschaft,” 280ff. (rpt. 41ff.). Wolfram, *Salzburg*, 190f. Reuter, “Unruhestiftung,” 312f.
92. On *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1035, and Chapter XVII, at notes 106ff., see Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:131.
93. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 287. MGH DD C.II, 273.
94. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 128. MGH DD C.II, 125.
95. MGH DD C.II, 124, whose list of witnesses is notable for the names it includes. Cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 127, and MGH DD A, 20.
96. For an early example, cf. MGH DD Car.I, 16.
97. MGH DD C.II, 199. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 206. On Regenbach, see Mertens, “Vom Rhein,” 232, incl. n. 72, and 240, incl. n. 116.
98. See Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century*, 18ff., on Wolphere, *Vita Godehardi prior*, c. 31, 190; cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 112d. Wolter, *Die Synoden*, 332ff.
99. See Wolphere, *Vita Godehardi prior*, c. 31, 190.
100. Wolter, *Die Synoden*, 335, incl. n. 78. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:128, incl. nn. 2f.
101. *Constitutiones*, no. 42, 1:86.
102. See Chapter V, at notes 76–78.
103. See Chapter VI, at note 20. Cf. Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century*, 37. Wolter, *Die Synoden*, 332ff.

104. On MGH DD C.II, 110 (October 19, 1027), see *Regesten Konrads II.*, 113, and Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:237f.

105. MGH DD C.II, 111, and *Regesten Konrads II.*, 114. Cf. Gerhard Theuerkauf, “Sachsenrecht im Übergang von der Lex Saxonum zum Sachsenspiegel,” in *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 3:417.

106. Cf. *Die Traditionen des Hochstiftes Freising*, no. 1422, 2:278, with Wolffhere, *Vita Godehardi prior*, c. 31, 190, line 4, and *Vita Meinweri*, c. 200, 153f.

107. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 6 (*Deeds*, 72). Cf. Chapter XI, at notes 97f. Theuerkauf, “Sachsenrecht,” 418.

108. Theuerkauf, “Sachsenrecht,” 418–23 (quote).

109. See Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:352f., incl. n. 2, on MGH DD C.II, 130. Giese, “Reichsstrukturprobleme,” 276, discusses the possibility that the legal practices of the Saxons were deemed “cruel” not because of the criminal law underlying them but because of the attitude the “tribal law of the Saxons [evinced] toward kingship,” an interpretation proposed by Walter Schlesinger. This interpretation is based on sources like Thietmar, *Chronicon*, v.15f. (*Ottomanian Germany*, 215f.), not the *Gesta* by Wipo, since there is no reason to believe that when Conrad’s biographer referred to their “very cruel law,” he had anything other than criminal law in mind.

110. MGH DD C.II, 275f. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 289f. The diploma uses the verb *sancimus* to describe Conrad’s issuance of the statute. On the debate over the *Lex Gundobada*, see Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 38 (*Deeds*, 97), as well as Hermann Nehlsen, “Lex Burgundionum,” in *HRG*, vol. 2 (Berlin, 1978), cols. 1901ff., esp. 1913. On the precepts quoted here, see *Leges Burgundionum*, cc. 34.1 and 35.2, ed. Ludwig Rudolf von Salis, MGH LL nationum Germanicarum, 2:1 (Hanover, 1892; rpt., Munich, 1973), as well as Nehlsen, “Lex Burgundionum,” cols. 1910f. In a personal conversation with this author on June 18, 2004, Hermann Nehlsen allowed that he, too, now found it hard to imagine that Conrad II confirmed the use of an unamended version of the *Lex Gundobada*. Cf. Tacitus, *Germania*, cc. 12 and 19 (Mattingly trans., 110f. and 116f.).

111. Cf. MGH DD C.II, 131 and 245.

112. Dickerhof, “Wandlungen,” 450f., incl. n. 23, on MGH DD C.II, 194.

113. See Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:380, on MGH DD C.II, 18 and 194, as well as MGH DD H.III, 93.

114. MGH DD C.II, 131 and 245 (both issued in Italy); cf. *ibid.*, 190 (issued in northern Hesse).

115. *Ibid.*, 18, based on MGH DD O.II, 112. See also MGH DD H.III, 93.

116. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 8 (*Deeds*, 74f.); on the etymology of the title, see Wolfram, “Augustus,” cols. 1232f., and on Conrad’s continuation of Carolingian policies, see Wipo, *Gesta*, cc. 3, 4, and 6 (*Deeds*, 66f. and 71ff.).

117. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 52a–103a and 244d–290.

118. Hoffmann, *Mönchskönig*, 100.

119. Weinfurter, *Heinrich II.*, 186ff. and 189, incl. n. 21.

120. *Ibid.*, 237ff. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 73c.

121. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 73b–91: Conrad was in Rome from March 21 until approximately April 7, 1027.

122. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 16 (*Deeds*, 79). See esp. Zimmermann, *Papsturkunden*, no. 570, 2:1084. Cf. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 73f., which, like Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 1:143 n. 5, omits the word *divi*. On the use of the word *divus* in late antiquity, see *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, 5:1 (Leipzig, 1909/34), cols. 1658f. Otto of Freising/Rahewin, *Gesta Friderici I. imperatoris*, iv.84 (*The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*, 331), used the words *divus augustus* (divine augustus) with reference to Frederick I. For more details, see Tilman Struve, “Kaisertum und Romgedanke in salischer Zeit,” *DA* 44 (1988): 425, incl. n. 5, based on Wipo’s passage.

123. Struve, “Kaisertum,” 425f., based on Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 16 (*Deeds*, 79).

124. *Ibid.*, 426f., based esp. on MGH DD C.II, 129 and 195; cf. xxvi. See also Chapter x, at notes 7f.

125. See Chapter xxiii, at note 26.

CHAPTER 23

1. See Chapter II, at notes 21, 23, and 57. Cf. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:328ff.
2. *Annales Sangallenses maiores*, a. 1038.
3. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 38 (*Deeds*, 97). Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1038. *Annales Sangallenses maiores*, a. 1038.
4. See the chapter heading to Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 6 (*Deeds*, 71 [quote]).
5. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 292a and b. See Chapter XVII, at notes 14f., and Chapter XX, at note 37.
6. Adam, *Gesta*, II.80 (76) and III.45 (44) (*History*, 109f. and 151f.). *Regesten Konrads II.*, 239 and 239b–c. Cf. notes 136f. to Chapter XI.
7. Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1039.
8. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 38 (*Deeds*, 97).
9. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 239a and c.
10. *Ibid.*, 294a.
11. *Ibid.*, 293a. See Chapter X, at notes 72–75.
12. Giese, “Reichsstrukturprobleme,” 278–80 (quotes from 279 and 280).
13. On *Regesten Konrads II.*, 293c, cf. Giese, “Reichsstrukturprobleme,” 278 n. 14 (table).
14. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 294a.
15. See Chapter VI, at note 22.
16. MGH DD C.II, 279f. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 295f. Cf. Störmer, *Früher Adel*, 409, based on MGH DD H.II, 315.
17. *Regesten Konrads II.*, 296b and c, based esp. on Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 39 (*Deeds*, 97f.); *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1039; and Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, a. 1039.
18. Cf. the table in *Regesten Konrads II.*, 294a, and Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:234f.
19. Erkens, *Konrad II.*, 194f.
20. Arnulf, *Gesta*, II.14, 15 (*Liber*, 159f.).
21. *Gesta episcoporum Cameracensium*, III.55.
22. Schulze, *Hegemoniales Kaisertum*, 39.
23. Cf. Erkens, *Konrad II.*, 195f.
24. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 39 (*Deeds*, 98).
25. See Chapter X, at note 106, and MGH DD H.III, 43–45 (May 21, 1040), on the significant donations Henry made for his father’s salvation.
26. On Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 39 (*Deeds*, 97f.), see Erkens, *Konrad II.*, 214–17. On the date of Conrad’s burial in Speyer, which Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:336f., incl. n. 4, identified as July 12, see the lead plaque from his coffin (fig. 18), as well as Schramm and Mütterich, *Denkmale*, 171 n. 149. On the burial crowns, cf. Joachim Ott, *Krone und Krönung* (Mainz, 1998), 190f., and see fig. 8.
27. *Intitulatio II*, ed. Wolfram, 96, incl. n. 63.
28. See Chapter II, at notes 55ff.
29. Schramm, *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik*, 2:630, as well as Schramm and Mütterich, *Denkmale*, 171f. n. 150. See Chapter II, at note 54.
30. Wipo, *Gesta*, c. 39 (*Deeds*, 98).
31. *Ibid.*, c. 40 (99f.).
32. On the *Annales Hildesheimenses*, a. 1039, see Erkens, *Konrad II.*, 197–99, and Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 2:337, incl. nn. 2–4.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SOURCES

- Acta Sanctorum*. Vol. 3. Antwerp, 1658; rpt., Brussels, 1966.
- Adalbero of Laon. *Carmen ad Rotbertum regem*. Ed. Claude Carozzi. Les classiques de l'histoire de France au Moyen Âge, 32. Paris, 1979.
- Adalbold of Utrecht. *Vita Heinrici II imperatoris*. Ed. Georg Waitz. MGH SS 4:679–95. Hannover, 1841; rpt., Stuttgart, 1981.
- Adam of Bremen. *Gesta Hammaburgensis ecclesiae*. Ed. Bernhard Schmeidler. MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 2. 3rd ed. Hannover and Leipzig, 1917; rpt., Hannover, 1993.
- . *History of the Archbishops of Hamburg-Bremen*. Trans. Francis J. Tschan. New York, 1959.
- Ademar of Chabannes. *Chronicon*. Ed. Pascale Bourgain et al. Corpus Christianorum, 129:1. Turnhout, 1999.
- . *Historiae*. Ed. Georg Waitz. MGH SS 4:106–48. Hannover, 1841; rpt., Stuttgart, 1981.
- Die ältere Wormser Briefsammlung*. Ed. Walther Bulst. MGH Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit, 3. Weimar, 1949; rpt., Munich, 1977.
- Annales Altahenses maiores*. Ed. Edmund von Oefele. MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 4. 2nd ed. Hannover, 1891; rpt. 1997.
- Annales Bertiniani*. Ed. Georg Waitz. MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 5. Hannover, 1883.
- . Ed. Reinhold Rau. Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters, 6:11–287. Darmstadt, 1969.
- Annales breves s. Rudberti Salisburgensis*. Ed. Wilhelm Wattenbach. MGH SS 9:757f. Hannover, 1851; rpt., Stuttgart, 1983.
- Annales Fuldenses*. Ed. Friedrich Kurze and Heinrich Haefele. MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 7. 2nd ed. Hannover, 1891; rpt. 1978.
- . Ed. Reinhold Rau. Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters, 7:1–177. Darmstadt, 1969.
- Annales Hildesheimenses*. Ed. Georg Waitz. MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 8. Hannover, 1878; rpt. 1990.
- Annales necrologici Fuldenses*. Ed. Georg Waitz. MGH SS 13:161–218. Hannover, 1881; rpt., Stuttgart, 1985.
- Annales Palidenses auctore Theodoro monacho*. Ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz. MGH SS 16:48–98. Hannover, 1859; rpt., Stuttgart, 1994.
- Die Annales Quedlinburgenses*. Ed. Martina Giese. MGH SS rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi, 72. Hannover, 2004.
- Annales Quedlinburgenses usque ad a. 1025*. Ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz. MGH SS 3:18–90. Hannover, 1839; rpt., Stuttgart, 1987.
- Annales s. Rudberti Salisburgenses*. Ed. Wilhelm Wattenbach. MGH SS 9:758–810. Hannover, 1851; rpt., Stuttgart, 1983.

- Annales Sangallenses maiores*. In Wipo, *Die Werke*, 91–102.
 —. Ed. C. Henking. In *Mitteilungen zur vaterländischen Geschichte*. Historischer Verein in St. Gallen, n.s., 9:265–323. Saint Gall, 1884.
- Annales Spirenses*. Ed. Ludwig Bethmann. MGH SS 17:80–85. Hannover, 1861; rpt., Stuttgart, 1990.
- Annalista Saxo*. Ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz. MGH SS 6:542–777. Hannover, 1844; rpt., Stuttgart, 1980.
- The Annals of St-Bertin*. Trans. Janet L. Nelson. New York, 1991.
- Anselm of Liège. *Gesta episcoporum Leodiensium*. Ed. Rudolf Koepke. MGH SS 7:134–234. Hannover, 1846; rpt., Stuttgart, 1995.
- Arbeo of Freising. *Vita Haimbrammi episcopi*. Ed. Bruno Krusch. MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 13:1–99. Hannover, 1920.
 —. *Vita et passio sancti Haimbrammi martyris/Leben und Leiden des heiligen Emmeram*. Ed. Bernhard Bischoff. Munich, 1953.
- Aribo of Mainz. “Aribo an Kaiserin Kunigunde.” In *Epistolae Moguntinae*, ed. Philipp Jaffé, Bibliotheca rerum Germanicarum, 3:36off., no. 24. Berlin, 1866.
- Arnulf of Milan. *Gesta archiepiscoporum Mediolanensium*. Ed. Ludwig Bethmann and Wilhelm Wattenbach. MGH SS 8:1–31. Hannover, 1848; rpt., Stuttgart, 1987.
 —. *Liber gestorum recentium*. Ed. Claudia Zey. MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 67:115–232. Hannover, 1994.
- Bede the Venerable. *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum I–V*. Ed. Charles Plummer. Oxford, 1956.
 —. *A History of the English Church and People*. Trans. Leo Sherley-Price and Rev. R. E. Latham. Oxford, 1955; rev. and rpt. 1984.
- Benzo of Alba. *Ad Henricum IV. imperatorem libri VII*. Ed. Karl Pertz. MGH SS 11:591–681. Hannover, 1854; rpt., Stuttgart, 1994.
- Bern of Reichenau. *Die Briefe des Abtes Bern von Reichenau*. Ed. Franz-Josef Schmale. Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für geschichtliche Landeskunde in Baden-Württemberg, ser. A: Quellen, 6. Stuttgart, 1961.
- Breves Notitiae*. In *Notitia Arnonis und Breves Notitiae*.
 —. In *Salzburger Urkundenbuch*, vol. 2, appendix, 1–23.
- Breviarium Gotschalchi*. In *Chronicon Benedictoburanum*, 221–24.
- Brun of Querfurt. “Epistola ad Henricum regem.” Ed. Jadwiga Karwasińska. *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, n.s., 4, pt. 3, 85 (ed. 97)—106. Warsaw, 1973.
 —. “Letter to King Henry II (1008).” In Giesebrecht, *Geschichte der Kaiserzeit*, 2:702–5.
- Burchard of Worms. *Decretorum libri XX*. Ed. Gérard Fransen and Theo Kölzer. Cologne, 1548; expanded rpt., Aalen, 1992.
 —. *Lex familiae Wormatiensis ecclesiae*. Ed. Ludwig Weiland. In *Constitutiones*, 639–44, no. 438.
- Capitulare Aquisgranense*. Ed. Alfred Boretius. MGH Capitularia regum Francorum, 1:172, no. 77. Hannover, 1883; rpt., Stuttgart, 1984.
- Capitularia regum Francorum*. MGH Capitularia regum Francorum, 1–2. Vol. 1, ed. Alfred Boretius, Hannover, 1883; rpt., Stuttgart, 1984; vol. 2:1–3, ed. Alfred Boretius and Victor Krause, Hannover, 1890–97; rpt., Stuttgart, 2001.
- Chronica monasterii Casinensis*. Ed. Hartmut Hoffmann. MGH SS 34. Hannover, 1980.
- Chronicon Altinate*. Ed. Roberto Cessi. In *Origine civitatum Italiae seu Venetiarum*, Fonti per la storia d’Italia, 73. Rome, 1933.
 —. Ed. H. Simonsfeld. MGH SS 14:1–69. Hannover, 1883; rpt., Stuttgart, 1988.

- Chronicon Benedictoburanum*. Ed. Wilhelm Wattenbach. MGH SS 9:210–38. Hannover, 1851; rpt., Stuttgart, 1983.
- Chronicon Laureshamensis*. In *Codex Laureshamensis*, ed. Karl Glöckner, Arbeiten der Historischen Kommission für den Volksstaat Hessen, 1:265ff. Darmstadt, 1929.
- Chronicon Novaliciense*. Ed. Ludwig Konrad Bethmann. MGH SS 7:73–133. Hannover, 1846; rpt., Stuttgart, 1995.
- . Ed. Carlo Cipolla. *Fonti per la storia d'Italia*, 32. Rome, 1901.
- Chronicon s. Michaelis monasterii in pago Virdumensi*. Ed. Georg Waitz. MGH SS 4:78–86. Hannover, 1841; rpt., Stuttgart, 1981.
- Chronicon Suevicum universale*. Ed. Harry Bresslau. MGH SS 13:61–72. Hannover, 1881; rpt., Stuttgart, 1985.
- Cnut the Great. *Epistola*. In Florentius Wigorniensis, *Chronica Chronicarum*, 126–28.
- Commemoratio superbie Ravennatis archiepiscopi*. Ed. Claudia Zey. MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 67:237–52. Hannover, 1994.
- Constantinus of Metz. *Vita Adalberonis II. Mettensis episcopi*. Ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz. MGH SS 4:658–72. Hannover, 1841; rpt., Stuttgart, 1981.
- Constitutiones et acta publica imperatorum et regum inde ab a. DCCCCXI usque ad a. MCXCVII (911–1197)*. Ed. Ludwig Weiland. MGH Constitutiones et acta publica imperatorum et regum, 1. Hannover, 1893; rpt. 1963.
- Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum*. Ed. Fritz Lošek. MGH Studien und Texte, 15. Hannover, 1997.
- Cosmas of Prague. *Chronica Boemorum*. Ed. Berthold Bretholz. MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, n.s., 2. Berlin, 1923; rpt., Munich, 1980.
- Dandolo, Andrea. *Chronica*. Ed. Ester Pastorello. *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, 12. Bologna, 1937–38.
- Descriptio itineris ad Terram Sanctam*. In Gombos, *Catalogus*, 2:844f., no. 1965.
- . Ed. J. Georg Ekkard. *Corpus historicum medii aevi*, 2:1345–48. Leipzig, 1723.
- Einhard. *The Life of Charlemagne*. Trans. Lewis Thorpe. In *Two Lives of Charlemagne*, 47–90. Baltimore, 1969.
- . *Vita Karoli Magni*. Ed. Oswald Holder-Egger. MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 25. 6th ed. Hannover, 1911.
- . *Vita Karoli Magni*. Ed. Reinhold Rau. *Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters*, 5:157–211. Darmstadt, 1968.
- Ekkebert. *Vita s. Haimeradi*. Ed. Rudolf Köpke. MGH SS 10:595–612. Hannover, 1852; rpt., Stuttgart, 1987.
- Ekkehard IV of Saint Gall. *Casus sancti Galli*. Ed. Hans F. Haefele. *Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters*, 10. Darmstadt, 1980.
- Ekkehard of Aura. *Chronica*. Ed. Franz-Josef Schmale and Irene Schmale-Ott. In *Frutolfi et Ekkardi Chronica necnon anonymi Chronica imperatorum*. *Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters*, 15. Darmstadt, 1972.
- Ellenhard. *Chronicon usque ad annum 1299*. Ed. Philipp Jaffé. MGH SS 17:118–41. Hannover, 1861; rpt., Stuttgart, 1990.
- “Epitaphium Ottonis Magni imperatoris.” Ed. Karl Strecker. MGH *Poetae Latini*, 5:282. Berlin 1937/39; rpt., Dublin and Zurich, 1970, and Munich, 1978.
- Everhelm. *Vita Popponis abbatis Stabulensis*. Ed. Wilhelm Wattenbach. MGH SS 11:291–316. Hannover, 1854; rpt., Stuttgart, 1994.
- Florentius Wigorniensis. *Chronica Chronicarum (selectiones aa. 781ff.)*. Ed. Reinhold Pauli. MGH SS 13:124–30. Hannover, 1881; rpt., Stuttgart, 1985.
- Fulbert of Chartres. *Epistolae*. In *The Letters and Poems of Fulbert of Chartres*. Ed. and trans. Frederick Behrends. *Oxford Medieval Texts*. Oxford, 1976.

- Fundatio monasterii Brunwilarensis*. Ed. Hermann Papst. In *Die Brauweiler Geschichtsquellen*. Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde, 12:147–92. Hannover, 1874.
- Gallus Anonymus. *Chronicon et gesta ducum sive principum Polonorum*. Ed. Karol Maleczynski. Monumenta Poloniae Historica, n.s., 2, pt. 2. Kraków, 1952.
- . *Chronicon et gesta ducum sive principum Polonorum*. Ed. J. Szlachtowski and Rudolf Köpke. MGH SS 9:418–78. Hannover, 1851; rpt., Stuttgart, 1983.
- Die Geschichte von den Dänenkönigen*. Ed. and trans. Walter Baethge. Thule II, 19:223–392. Jena, 1924.
- Gesta episcoporum Cameracensium*. Ed. Ludwig Bethmann. MGH SS 7:393–489. Hannover, 1846; rpt., Stuttgart, 1995.
- Gesta episcoporum Halberstadensium*. Ed. Ludwig Weiland. MGH SS 23:73–123. Hannover, 1874; rpt., Stuttgart, 1986.
- Godfrey of Viterbo. *Pantheon (Selections)*. Ed. Georg Waitz. MGH SS 22:107–307. Hannover, 1872; rpt., Stuttgart, 1976.
- Gombos, Albin Franz. *Catalogus fontium historiae Hungaricae*. Vol. 2. Budapest, 1937.
- Gregory VII. *Registrum I–IV*. Ed. Erich Caspar. MGH Epistolae selectae, 2, pt. 1. Berlin, 1920; rpt., Munich, 1990.
- Gregory of Tours. *Historia Francorum*. Ed. Bruno Krusch and Wilhelm Levison. MGH SS rerum Merovingicarum 1, pt. 1. Hannover, 1937/51; rpt. 1992.
- . *History of the Franks*. Ed. and trans. Ernest Brehaut. Records of Civilization. New York, 1969.
- Guibert of Nogent. *A Monk's Confession*. Trans. Paul J. Archambault. University Park, Pa., 1996.
- . *De Vita Sua/Autobiographie*. Ed. and trans. Edmont-René Labande. Les classiques de l'histoire de France au Moyen Âge, 34. Paris, 1981.
- Gundechar. *Liber pontificalis Eichstetensis*. Ed. Ludwig Bethmann. MGH SS 7:239–53. Hannover, 1846; rpt., Stuttgart, 1995.
- Hávamál*. In *Edda: Die Lieder des Codex Regius nebst verwandten Denkmälern*, ed. Gustav Neckel and Hans Kuhn, 5th ed., 1:17–44. Heidelberg, 1983.
- Hermann of Niederalteich. *De institutione monasterii Altahensis*. Ed. Philipp Jaffé. MGH SS 17:369–73. Hannover, 1861; rpt., Stuttgart, 1990.
- Hermann of Reichenau. *Chronicon aa. 901–1053*. In Wipo, *Die Werke*, 94–100.
- Historia Welforum*. Ed. and trans. Erich König. Schwäbische Chroniken der Stauferzeit, 1. Stuttgart, 1938; rpt. 1978.
- Historia Welforum Weingartensis*. Ed. Ludwig Weiland. MGH SS 21:454–71. Hannover, 1869; rpt., Stuttgart, 1988.
- Honorantie civitatis Papie*. In Brühl and Violante, “*Honorantie civitatis papie*.”
- . In *Instituta regalia et ministeria camerae regum Longobardorum et Honorantie civitatis Papiae*. Ed. Adolf Hofmeister. MGH SS 30, pt. 2, 1444–60. Hannover, 1934; rpt., Stuttgart, 1976.
- Hrotsvitha of Gandersheim. *Gesta Ottonis*. Ed. Paul von Winterfeld. MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 34:201–28. Hannover, 1902.
- Hucbald of Saint-Amand. *Vita s. Rictrudis*. In *PL*, 132:827–48.
- Hugh of Flavigny. *Chronicon*. Ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz. MGH SS 8:280–502. Hannover, 1848; rpt., Stuttgart, 1987.
- Humbert of Silva Candida. *Adversus simoniacos I–III*. Ed. Friedrich Thaner. MGH Libelli de Lite, 1:95–253. Hannover, 1891.
- Indiculus loricatorum Ottoni II. in Italianam mittendorum*. Ed. Ludwig Weiland. In *Constitutiones*, 632f., no. 436.

- Isidore of Seville. *Etymologiae*. Vols. 1–2. Ed. W. M. Lindsay. Oxford, 1911.
- Kalendarium necrologicum Weissenburgense*. Fontes rerum Germanicarum, 4:313. Stuttgart, 1868.
- Lampert of Hersfeld. *Annales*. In *Opera*, 1–304.
- . *De institutione Herveldensis aeclesiae*. In *Opera*, 343–54.
- . *Opera*. Ed. Oswald Holger-Egger. MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 38. Hannover, 1894; rpt. 1984.
- Landulf the Elder of Milan. *Historia Mediolanensis*. Ed. Ludwig Bethmann and Wilhelm Wattenbach. MGH SS 8:32–100. Hannover, 1948; rpt., Stuttgart, 1987.
- Leges Burgundionum*. Ed. Ludwig Rudolf von Salis. MGH LL nationum Germanicarum, 2:1. Hannover, 1892; rpt., Munich, 1973.
- Leo of Vercelli. *Versus de Ottone et Heinrico*. Ed. Karl Strecker. MGH Poetae Latini, 5:480–83. Berlin 1937/39; rpt., Dublin and Zurich, 1970, and Munich, 1978.
- . *Versus de Ottone et Heinrico*. In Bornscheuer, *Miserae Regum*, 170ff.
- Lex Ribuarua*. Ed. Franz Beyerle and Rudolf Buchner. MGH LL nationum Germanicarum, 3:2. Hannover, 1951.
- Lex Salica*. See *Pactus legis Salicae* below.
- Liber aureus*. Ed. Camillo Wampach. In *Geschichte der Grundherrschaft Echternach im Frühmittelalter*, 1, pt. 2. Luxembourg, 1930.
- Liber possessionum Wisenburgensis*. Ed. Christoph Dette. Quellen und Abhandlungen zur mittelherrnischen Kirchengeschichte, 59. Mainz, 1987.
- Liudprand of Cremona. *Antapodosis*. In *Opera*, 1–158.
- . *Antapodosis (Tit-for-Tat)*. In *Works*, 25–212.
- . *The Embassy to Constantinople*. In *Works*, 233–77.
- . *Legatio constantinopolitana*. In *Opera*, 175–212.
- . *Opera*. Ed. Josef Becker. MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 41. 3rd ed. Hannover, 1915; rpt. 1993.
- . *The Works of Liudprand of Cremona*. Trans. F. A. Wright. London, 1930.
- Mainzer Urkundenbuch*. Vol. 1. Ed. Manfred Stimming. Darmstadt, 1932.
- Miracula s. Willibrordi Epternacensia*. Ed. Wilhelm Levison. MGH SS 30, pt. 2, 1368–71. Hannover, 1934; rpt., Stuttgart, 1976.
- “Modus de Heinrico.” In *Carmina Cantabrigiensia*. Ed. Karl Strecker. MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 40. Berlin, 1926.
- Monumenta historica ducatus Carinthiae*. Ed. August Jaksch. Klagenfurt, 1896ff.
- Necrologium*. In Hugh of Flavigny, *Chronicon*, 285–87.
- Norbert of Iburg. *Vita Bennonis II. episcopi Osnabrugensis*. Ed. Harry Bresslau. MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 56. Hannover, 1902; rpt. 1997.
- Notitia Arnonis*. In *Notitia Arnonis und Breves Notitiae*.
- . In *Salzburger Urkundenbuch*, 1:1–16.
- Notitia Arnonis und Breves Notitiae*. Ed. Fritz Lošek. *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für Salzburger Landeskunde* 130 (1990): 5–192.
- Ordinatio imperii a. 817*. Ed. Alfred Boretius. MGH Capitularia regum Francorum, 1:270–73, no. 136. Hannover, 1883; rpt., Stuttgart, 1984.
- Die Ordines für die Weihe und Krönung des Kaisers und der Kaiserin*. Ed. Reinhard Elze. MGH Fontes iuris Germanici antiqui, 9. Hannover, 1960; rpt. 1995.
- Otloh of Saint Emmeram. *Liber visionum*. Ed. Paul Gerhard Schmidt. MGH Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters, 13. Weimar, 1989.
- Otto of Freising. *Chronica sive Historia de duabus civitatibus*. Ed. Adolf Hofmeister. MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 45. Hannover and Leipzig, 1912; rpt., Hannover, 1984.

- . *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*. Trans. Charles C. Mierow, with Richard Emery. New York, 1953; rpt., Toronto, 1994.
- . [*Ottonis et Rahewini*] *Gesta Friderici I. imperatoris*. Ed. Georg Waitz and Bernhard von Simson. MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 46. Hannover, 1912; rpt., Hannover, 1997.
- . *The Two Cities*. Trans. Charles Mierow. Ed. A. P. Evans and Charles Knapp. New York, 1928; rpt. 1966.
- Pactus legis Salicae*. Ed. Karl August Eckhardt. MGH LL nationum Germanicarum, 4:1. Hannover, 1962.
- Papsturkunden*. See Zimmermann, ed., *Papsturkunden 896–1046*.
- Paul the Deacon. *Historia Langobardorum*. Ed. Georg Waitz. MGH SS rerum Langobardicarum, 12–187. Hannover, 1878; rpt. 1988.
- . *History of the Lombards*. Trans. William Dudley Foulke. Ed. Edward Peters. Philadelphia, 1974.
- Das Perikopenbuch Heinrichs II.* Ed. Karl Strecker. MGH Poetae Latini, 5:433f. Berlin, 1937/39; rpt., Dublin and Zurich, 1970, and Munich, 1978.
- Peter Damian. *Epistolae*. Ed. Kurt Reindel. MGH Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit, 4, pt. 1. Munich, 1983.
- . *Liber gratissimus*. Ed. Lothar Heinemann. MGH Libelli de lite, 1:15–75. Hannover, 1891.
- Quellen zur deutschen Verfassungs-, Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte bis 1250*. Ed. and trans. Lorenz Weinrich. Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters, 32. 2nd ed. Darmstadt, 1977; rpt., 2000.
- Recueil des chartes de l'Abbaye de Cluny*. Ed. Auguste Bernard and Alexandre Bruel. 6 vols. Paris, 1876 and 1903; rpt., Frankfurt, 1974.
- Regesta imperii*. Vol. 1, *Die Regesten des Kaiserreiches unter den Karolingern, 751–918*. Ed. Johann Friedrich Böhrer. Rev. Engelbert Mühlbacher. Completed by Johann Lechner. 2nd ed. Innsbruck, 1908. (Rev., exp. ed. Ed. Carlrichard Brühl and Hans H. Kaminsky. Hildesheim, 1966.)
- Regesta pontificum Romanorum ab condita ecclesia ad annum post Christum natum 1198*. Ed. Philipp Jaffé and Samuel Loewenfeld. 2 vols. 2nd ed. Leipzig, 1885 and 1888; rpt., Graz, 1956.
- Die Regesten der Bischöfe und des Domkapitels von Augsburg*. Ed. Wilhelm Volkert. Veröffentlichungen der Schwäbischen Forschungsgemeinschaft bei der Kommission für bayerische Landesgeschichte, ser. 11b, 1. Augsburg, 1985.
- Die Regesten der Bischöfe von Passau*. Ed. Egon Boshof and Franz-Reiner Erkens. Regesten zur bayerischen Geschichte. Vol. 1. Munich, 1992.
- Regesten der Bischöfe von Straßburg*. Ed. Paul Wentzcke. Kommission zur Herausgabe elsässischer Geschichtsquellen, 1, 1–xxvii:211–416. Innsbruck, 1908.
- Die Regesten der Erzbischöfe von Bremen*. Ed. Otto Heinrich May. Vol. 1. Veröffentlichungen der Historischen Kommission für Hannover, Oldenburg, Braunschweig, Schaumburg-Lippe und Bremen, 11. Hannover, 1937.
- Die Regesten der Erzbischöfe von Köln im Mittelalter*. Ed. Friedrich Wilhelm Ödiger. Publikationen der Gesellschaft für rheinische Geschichtskunde, 21. Vol. 1. Bonn, 1954.
- Die Regesten der Erzbischöfe zu Trier von Hetti bis Johann II. 814–1503*. Ed. Adam Görz. Trier, 1881; rpt., Aalen, 1969.
- Die Regesten des Kaiserreiches unter Heinrich I. und Otto I.* Ed. Johann Friedrich Böhrer and Emil von Otenthal. 2nd ed. Hildesheim, 1967.
- Die Regesten des Kaiserreiches unter Heinrich II. 1002–1024*. Ed. Johann Friedrich Böhrer and Theodor Graff. Vienna, 1971.

- Die Regesten des Kaiserreiches unter Konrad II. 1024–1039.* Ed. Johann Friedrich Böhmer and Heinrich Appelt. Graz, 1951.
- Regesten zur Geschichte der Mainzer Erzbischöfe.* Vol. 1. Ed. Johann Friedrich Böhmer and Cornelius Will. Innsbruck, 1877; rpt., Aalen, 1966.
- Regino of Prüm. *Chronicon.* Ed. Friedrich Kurze. MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 50. Hannover, 1890; rpt. 1989.
- . *Continuatio.* In *Chronicon*, 154–79.
- Reiner of Saint Laurentius. *Vita Reginardi episcopi Leodiensis.* Ed. Wilhelm Arndt. MGH SS 20:571–78. Hannover, 1868; rpt., Stuttgart, 1989.
- Rodulfus. *Gesta abbatum Trudonensium.* Ed. Rudolf Köpke. MGH SS 10:227–72. Hannover, 1852; rpt., Stuttgart, 1987.
- Rodulfus Glaber. *Rodulfi Glabri Historiarum Libri Quinque/The Five Books of the Histories.* Ed. and trans. John France. Oxford, 1989.
- Ruodlieb.* In *Waltharius, Ruodlieb, Märchenepen.* Ed. and trans. Karl Langosch. 3rd ed. Darmstadt, 1967.
- . Trans. Fritz Peter Knapp. Reclam Universal-Bibliothek, 9846. Stuttgart, 1977.
- The Ruodlieb.* Trans. Gordon B. Ford Jr. Leiden, 1965.
- Rupert. *Chronicon s. Laurentii Leodiensis.* Ed. Wilhelm Wattenbach. MGH SS 8:261–79. Hannover, 1848; rpt., Stuttgart, 1992.
- Salzburger Urkundenbuch.* Vol. 1, ed. Willibald Hauthaler; vol. 2, ed. Willibald Hauthaler and Franz Martin. Salzburg, 1910/16.
- Siegfried of Gorze. “Epistola ad Popponem abbatem Stabloensem.” Ed. Wilhelm von Giesebrecht. In Giesebrecht, *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit*, 2:714–18, no. 10.
- Sigebert of Gembloux. *Vita Deoderici episcopi Mettensis.* Ed. Georg Waitz. MGH SS 4:461–83. Hannover, 1841; rpt., Stuttgart, 1981.
- Sighvatr. *Knútsdrápa.* Ed. Ernst Albin Kock. In *Den norsk-isländska skaldediktningen*, 1:611–68. Lund, 1946.
- Tabula imperii Romani sulla base della Carta internazionale del mondo alla scala di 1:1.000.000: Foglio L 32 (Milano): Mediolanum, Auenticum, Brigantium.* Rome, 1966.
- Tacitus. *Germania.* Ed. Michael Winterbottom. Oxford, 1975.
- . *Germania.* Trans. H. Mattingly. In *On Britain and Germany.* New York, 1969.
- Die Tegernseer Briefsammlung (Froumund).* Ed. Karl Strecker. MGH Epistolae selectae, 3. Berlin, 1925.
- Thangmar. *Vita Bernwardi.* Ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz. MGH SS 4:754–82. Hannover, 1841; rpt., Stuttgart, 1981.
- Thesaurus Linguae Latinae.* 5:1. Leipzig, 1909/34.
- Thietmar of Merseburg. *Chronicon.* Ed. Robert Holtzmann. MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, n.s., 9. Berlin, 1935; rpt., Munich, 1996.
- . *Ottonian Germany: The Chronicon of Thietmar of Merseburg.* Trans. David A. Warner. New York, 2001.
- Die Traditionen des Hochstiftes Freising.* 2 vols. Ed. Theodor Bitterauf. Quellen und Erörterungen zur bayerischen Geschichte, n.s., 4–5. Munich, 1905 and 1909.
- Traditionen Mondsee—Das älteste Traditionsbuch des Klosters Mondsee.* Ed. Gebhard Rath and Erich Reiter. Forschungen zur Geschichte Oberösterreichs, 16. Linz, 1989.
- Translatio sanctae Anastasiae auctore Gotschalco.* In *Chronicon Benedictoburanum*, 224–29. *Unibos.* In *Ruodlieb*, ed. Langosch.
- Die Urkunden Arnolfs.* Ed. Paul Kehr. MGH DD regum Germaniae ex stirpe Karolorum, 3. 2nd ed. Berlin, 1955; rpt., Munich, 1988.

- Die Urkunden der burgundischen Rudolfinger*. Ed. Theodor Schieffer. MGH Regum Burgundiae e stirpe Rudolphina, DD et Acta. Munich, 1977; rpt. 1980.
- Die Urkunden Friedrichs I.* Ed. Heinrich Appelt. MGH DD regum et imperatorum Germaniae, 10, pts. 1–5. Hannover, 1975–90.
- Die Urkunden Heinrichs II. und Arduins.* Ed. Harry Bresslau et al. MGH DD regum et imperatorum Germaniae, 3. Hannover, 1900 and 1903; rpt., Munich, 1980.
- Die Urkunden Heinrichs III.* Ed. Harry Bresslau and Paul Kehr. MGH DD regum et imperatorum Germaniae, 5. Berlin, 1926 and 1931; rpt., Munich, 1983.
- Die Urkunden Heinrichs IV.* Ed. Dietrich von Gladiss and Alfred Gawlik. MGH DD regum et imperatorum Germaniae, 6, pts. 1–3. Pt. 1, Berlin, 1941; rpt. 1978. Pt. 2, Weimar, 1952; rev., 1959 and 1978. Pt. 3, Hannover, 1978.
- Die Urkunden Konrads I., Heinrichs I. und Ottos I.* Ed. Theodor Sickel. MGH DD regum et imperatorum Germaniae, 1. Hannover, 1879 and 1884; rpt., Munich, 1997.
- Die Urkunden Konrads II.* Ed. Harry Bresslau. MGH DD regum et imperatorum Germaniae, 4. Berlin, 1909; rpt., Munich, 1980.
- Die Urkunden Konrads III. und seines Sohnes Heinrich.* Ed. Friedrich Hausmann. MGH DD regum et imperatorum Germaniae, 9. Vienna, 1969; rpt., Munich, 1987.
- Die Urkunden Ottos II.* Ed. Theodor Sickel. MGH DD regum et imperatorum Germaniae, 2:1. Hannover, 1888; rpt., Munich, 1980.
- Die Urkunden Ottos III.* Ed. Theodor Sickel. MGH DD regum et imperatorum Germaniae, 2:2. Hannover, 1893; rpt., Munich, 1980.
- Die Urkunden Pippins, Karlmanns und Karls des Großen.* Ed. Engelbert Mühlbacher. MGH DD Karolinorum, 1. Hannover, 1906; rpt., Munich, 1979.
- Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Babenberger in Österreich.* Vol. 4, pt. 1. Ed. Heinrich Fichtenau. Publikationen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung, 3rd ser. Vienna, 1968; rpt. 1997.
- Valerius Maximus. *Factorum et dictorum memorabilium libri novem: Cum incerti auctoris fragmento De praenominibus.* Ed. Karl Kempf. Berlin, 1854; 2nd ed. 1888.
- . *Factorum et dictorum memorabilium libri novem: Iulii Paridis et Ianuarii Nepotiani epitomis adiectis.* Ed. Karl Halm. Leipzig, 1865.
- . *Memorable Doings and Sayings.* Ed. and trans. D. R. Shackleton Bailey. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass., 2000.
- Vita Bardonis archiepiscopi Moguntinii maior.* Ed. Wilhelm Wattenbach. MGH SS 11:321–42. Hannover, 1854; rpt., Stuttgart, 1994.
- Vita Burchardi episcopi.* Ed. Georg Waitz. MGH SS 4:829–46. Hannover, 1841; rpt., Stuttgart, 1981.
- Vita Gebehardi archiepiscopi Salisburgensis 1 et 11.* Ed. Wilhelm Wattenbach. MGH SS 11:25–28 and 35–40. Hannover, 1854; rpt., Stuttgart, 1994.
- Vita Meinwerci episcopi Patherbrunnensis.* Ed. Franz Tenckhoff. MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 59. Hannover, 1921; rpt. 1983.
- Vita Popponis.* See Everhelm above.
- Vulculd. *Vita Bardonis archiepiscopi Moguntini brevior.* Ed. Wilhelm Wattenbach. MGH SS 11:317–21. Hannover, 1854; rpt., Stuttgart, 1994.
- Walter of Speyer. “Epistola ad Hazecham.” In *Opera*, 63f.
- . *Opera.* MGH Poetae Latini 5, pt. 2, 1–79. Ed. Karl Strecker. Berlin 1937/39; rpt., Dublin and Zurich, 1970, and Munich, 1978.
- . *Passio s. Christophori martyris.* In *Opera*, 26–63.
- . “Prologus” to *Vita et passio.* In *Opera*, 64f.
- . *Scholasticus.* In *Opera*, 10–26.

- . *Vita et passio s. Christophori martyris*. In *Opera*, 66–78.
Wampach. See *Liber aureus* above.
- [Wibert]. *Vita Leonis IX*. Ed. Johannes Matthias Watterich. In *Pontificum Romanorum Qui Fuerunt ab Exeunte Saeculo IX Usque ad Finem Saeculi XII Vitae*, 1:127–70. Leipzig, 1862; rpt., Aalen, 1966.
- Widukind of Corvey. *Res gestae Saxonicae*. Ed. Paul Hirsch and Hans-Eberhard Lohmann. MGH SS rerum Germanicarum, 60. Hannover, 1935; rpt. 1989.
- Wipo. “Cantilena in Chuonradum II. factum imperatorem.” In *Die Werke*, 103f.
- . *The Deeds of Conrad II*. Trans. Theodor E. Mommsen and Karl F. Morrison. In *Imperial Lives and Letters of the Eleventh Century*, ed. Robert L. Benson, 52–100. Records of Western Civilization. New York, 1962; rpt. 2000.
- . *Gesta Chuonradi II. imperatoris*. In *Die Werke*, 3ff.
- . *Tetralogus*. In *Die Werke*, 75–86.
- . *Die Werke Wipos (Wiponis Opera)*. Ed. Harry Bresslau. MGH SS rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi, 61. Hannover and Leipzig, 1915; rpt., Hannover, 1993.
- Wolffere. *Continuatio vitae Bernwardi*. Ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz. MGH SS II:165–67. Hannover, 1854; rpt., Stuttgart, 1994.
- . *Vita Godehardi episcopi Hildesheimensis prior*. Ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz. MGH SS II:167–96. Hannover, 1854; rpt., Stuttgart, 1994.
- . *Vita Godehardi posterior*. Ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz. MGH SS II:196–218. Hannover, 1854; rpt., Stuttgart, 1994.

SECONDARY WORKS

- Aertsen, Jan A. “Die Entdeckung des Individuums.” Introduction to *Individuum und Individualität im Mittelalter*, ix–xviii.
- Aertsen, Jan A., and Andreas Speer, eds. *Individuum und Individualität im Mittelalter*. Miscellanea Mediaevalia, 24. Berlin and New York, 1996.
- Aram, Michael. “Der Beginn der Münzwirtschaft in Österreich und die Geschichte des Kremser Pfennigs.” *Jahrbuch für Landeskunde von Niederösterreich*, n.s., 60/61 (1994/95): 9–41.
- Althoff, Gerd. “Die Billunger in der Salierzeit.” In *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 1:309–29.
- . “Gloria et nomen perpetuum: Wodurch wurde man im Mittelalter berühmt?” In *Person und Gemeinschaft im Mittelalter: Festschrift Karl Schmid zum fünf- undsechzigsten Geburtstag*, ed. Gerd Althoff et al., 297–313. Sigmaringen, 1988.
- . “Immedinger.” In *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. 5, cols. 389f. Munich and Zurich, 1991.
- . “Königsherrschaft und Konfliktbewältigung im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert.” *FMSt* 23 (1989): 265–90. Rpt. in *Spielregeln der Politik*, 21–56.
- . *Otto III*. Trans. Phyllis G. Jestice. University Park, Pa., 2003.
- . *Spielregeln der Politik im Mittelalter: Kommunikation in Frieden und Fehde*. Darmstadt, 1997.
- . *Verwandte, Freunde und Getreue*. Darmstadt, 1990.
- . “Zur Bedeutung symbolischer Kommunikation für das Verständnis des Mittelalters.” *FMSt* 31 (1997): 370–89.
- Althoff, Gerd, and Hagen Keller. *Heinrich I. und Otto der Große*. Persönlichkeit und Geschichte, 122/23. Göttingen, 1985.

- Althoff, Gerd, and Ernst Schubert, eds. *Herrschaftsrepräsentation im ottonischen Sachsen*. VF, 46. Sigmaringen, 1998.
- Anton, Hans Hubert. "Bonifaz von Canossa, Markgraf von Tuszien und die Italienpolitik der frühen Salier." *HZ* 214 (1972): 529–56.
- Appelt, Heinrich. "Die Kanzlei Friedrich Barbarossas." In *Die Zeit der Staufer: Geschichte, Kunst, Kultur*, exh. cat., 5:17–34. Stuttgart, 1977.
- Auer, Leopold. "Der Kriegsdienst des Klerus unter den sächsischen Kaisern." Pt. 1, *MIÖG* 79 (1971): 316–407; pt. 2, *MIÖG* 80 (1972): 48–70.
- Baaken, Katrin. "*Elisina curtis nobilissima*: Welfischer Besitz in der Markgrafschaft Verona und die Datierung der *Historia Welforum*." *DA* 55 (1999): 63–94.
- Bak, János M. "Stephan (István) I. d. Hl." In *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. 8, cols. 112–14. Munich and Zurich, 1996.
- Barlow, Jonathan. "Gregory of Tours and the Myth of the Trojan Origins of the Franks." *FMSt* 29 (1995): 86–95.
- Becher, Matthias. "Neue Überlegungen zum Geburtsdatum Karls des Großen." *Franzia* 19 (1992): 37–60.
- . *Rex, Dux und Gens: Untersuchungen zur Entstehung des sächsischen Herzogtums im 9. und 10. Jahrhundert*. Historische Studien, 444. Husum, 1996.
- Beck, Hans-Georg. *Kirche und theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich*. Byzantinisches Handbuch 2, 1. Munich, 1959.
- Becker, Alphons. "Beobachtungen zur Geschichte der Provence in der Salierzeit (1032–1125)." In *Ex ipsis rerum documentis: Beiträge zur Mediävistik: Festschrift Harald Zimmermann zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Klaus Herbers, Hans Henning Kortüm, and Carlo Servatius, 449–57. Sigmaringen, 1991.
- Becker, August. *Die Pfalz und die Pfälzer*. 2nd ed. Neustadt an der Haardt, 1913.
- Bernards, Matthäus. "Die Frau in der Welt und die Kirche während des 11. Jahrhunderts." *Sacris Erudiri* 20 (1971): 39–100.
- Berthold, Georg. "Speyerer Geschichtsbeiträge 1." *Mitteilungen des historischen Vereines der Pfalz* 31 (1911): 80–83.
- Beumann, Helmut. "Das Imperium und die Regna bei Wipo." In *Aus Geschichte und Landeskunde*, 11–36. Bonn, 1960. Rpt. in *Wissenschaft vom Mittelalter*, 175–200.
- . *Die Ottonen*. UTB, 384. 3rd ed. Stuttgart, 1991.
- . *Wissenschaft vom Mittelalter*. Cologne, 1972.
- . "Zur Entwicklung transpersonaler Staatsvorstellungen." In *Das Königtum: Seine geistigen und rechtlichen Grundlagen*, VF 3:185–224. Sigmaringen, 1954. Rpt. in *Wissenschaft vom Mittelalter*, 135–74.
- Binding, Günther. *Der früh- und hochmittelalterliche Bauherr als sapiens architectus*. 2nd ed. Darmstadt, 1998.
- Bischoff, Norbert. "Über die Chronologie der Kaiserin Gisela und über die Verweigerung ihrer Krönung durch Aribon von Mainz." *MIÖG* 58 (1950): 285–309.
- Black-Veldtrup, Mechthild. *Kaiserin Agnes (1043–1077): Quellenkritische Studien*. Münstersche historische Forschungen, 7. Cologne, 1995.
- Blok, Dirk P. "Friesen, Friesland." In *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. 4, cols. 972f. Munich and Zurich, 1989.
- Boehm, Laetitia. *Geschichte Burgunds: Politik, Staatsbildungen, Kultur*. UTB, 134. Stuttgart, 1971.
- Boockmann, Hartmut. "Eine Urkunde Konrads II. für das Damenstift Obermünster in Regensburg: Zu einem verschenkten Königszepter und zum Königskanonikat." In *Institutionen, Kultur und Gesellschaft im Mittelalter: Festschrift Josef*

- Fleckenstein*, ed. Lutz Fenske, Werner Rösener, and Thomas Zotz, 207–19. Sigmaringen, 1984.
- Bornscheuer, Lothar. *Miseræ Regum*. Arbeiten zur Frühmittelalterforschung, 4. Berlin, 1968.
- Borst, Arno. "Ein exemplarischer Tod." In *Tod im Mittelalter*, ed. Arno Borst et al., Konstanzer Bibliothek, 20:25–58. Constance, 1993.
- . *Die karolingische Kalenderreform*. Schriften der MGH, 46. Hannover, 1998.
- . *Der Turmbau von Babel: Geschichte der Meinungen über Ursprung und Vielfalt der Sprachen und Völker*. 4 vols. in 6. Stuttgart, 1957–63.
- Boshof, Egon. "Bischöfe und Bischofskirchen von Passau und Regensburg." In *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 2:113–54.
- . *Königtum und Königsherrschaft im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert*. Enzyklopädie deutscher Geschichte, 27. Munich, 1993.
- . "Das Reich und Ungarn in der Zeit der Salier." *Ostbairische Grenzmarken* 28 (1986): 178–94.
- . *Die Salier*. UTB, 387. 2nd ed. Stuttgart, 1992.
- Bosl, Karl. *Die Reichsministerialität der Salier und Staufer*. Schriften der MGH, 10, pts. 1–2. Stuttgart, 1950.
- Brandenburg, Erich. *Die Nachkommen Karls des Großen*. Neustadt an der Aisch, 1935; rpt. 1995.
- Bresslau, Harry. *Handbuch der Urkundenlehre für Deutschland und Italien*. 2 vols. 2nd ed. Leipzig, 1912 and 1915.
- . *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs unter Konrad II*. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1879 and 1884; rpt., Berlin, 1967.
- Brühl, Carlrichard. *Aus Mittelalter und Diplomatie*. Vol. 1. Hildesheim, 1989.
- . *Deutschland—Frankreich: Die Geburt zweier Völker*. Cologne, 1990.
- . "Festkrönungen." In *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. 4, col. 409. Munich and Zurich, 1989.
- . *Fodrum, Gistum, Servitium Regis*. Kölner historische Abhandlungen, 14, 1–2. Cologne, 1968 and 1969.
- . "Fränkischer Krönungsbrauch und das Problem der 'Festkrönungen.'" In *Aus Mittelalter und Diplomatie*, 1:351–412.
- . "Kronen- und Krönungsbrauch im frühen und hohen Mittelalter." In *Aus Mittelalter und Diplomatie*, 1:413–43.
- . "Das 'Palatium' von Pavia und die 'Honorantiae civitatis Papiae.'" In *Aus Mittelalter und Diplomatie*, 1:138–69.
- Brühl, Carlrichard, and Cinzio Violante. *Die "Honorantiae civitatis papie"*. Cologne, 1983.
- Brunner, Karl. "Die fränkischen Fürstentitel im 9. und 10. Jahrhundert." In *Intitulatio II*, ed. Wolfram, 179–340.
- . *Herzogtümer und Marken: Vom Ungarnsturm bis ins 12. Jahrhundert, 907–1156*. Österreichische Geschichte. Vienna, 1994.
- Brunner, Otto. *"Land" and Lordship: Structures of Governance in Medieval Austria*. Trans. Howard Kaminsky and James Van Horn Melton. Philadelphia, 1992.
- Burckhardt, Jacob. *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*. Trans. S. G. C. Middlemore. 2 vols. New York, 1958.
- . *Force and Freedom: Reflections on History*. Ed. and trans. James Hastings Nichols. New York, 1943.
- . *Über das Studium der Geschichte: Der Text der "Weltgeschichtlichen Betrachtungen" auf Grund der Vorarbeiten von Ernst Ziegler nach den Handschriften*. Ed. Peter Ganz. Munich, 1982.

- Coué, Stephanie. "Acht Bischofsviten aus der Salierzeit—neu interpretiert." In *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 3:347–413.
- . *Hagiographie im Kontext: Schreibenlaß und Funktion von Bischofsviten aus dem 11. und vom Anfang des 12. Jahrhunderts*. Arbeiten zur Frühmittelalterforschung, 24. Berlin, 1997.
- Csendes, Peter. "Kanzlei, Kanzler." In *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. 5, cols. 910–12. Munich and Zurich, 1991.
- . "'Regio finibus Ungarorum gladio ab hostibus acquisita': Überlegungen zur Geschichte der Ungarnmark in Österreich." *Jahrbuch für Landeskunde von Niederösterreich*, n.s., 42 (1976): 38–51.
- Curschmann, Fritz. *Hungersnöte im Mittelalter*. Leipziger Studien aus dem Gebiet der Geschichte, 6:1. Leipzig, 1900.
- Decker-Hauff, Hansmartin. "Die 'Reichskrone,' angefertigt für Kaiser Otto." In *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik*, ed. Schramm, 2:560–637.
- Dickerhof, Harald. "Wandlungen im Rechtsdenken der Salierzeit am Beispiel der *lex naturalis* und des *ius gentium*." In *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 3:447–67.
- Dilcher, Gerhard. *Die Entstehung der lombardischen Stadtkommune: Eine rechtsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Untersuchungen zur deutschen Staats- und Rechtsgeschichte, n.s., 7. Aalen, 1967.
- Dollinger, Philippe. *Der bayerische Bauernstand vom 9. bis zum 13. Jahrhundert*. Trans. Ursula Irsigler. Ed. Franz Irsigler. Munich, 1982. (Orig. publ. as *L'évolution des classes rurales en Bavière depuis la fin de l'époque carolingienne jusqu'au milieu du XIII siècle*. Paris, 1949.)
- Dopsch, Heinz. "Il patriarca Poppone di Aquileia (1019–1042)." In *Poppone: L'età d'oro del Patriarcato di Aquileia*, exh. cat., 15–40. Aquileia, 1996.
- . "Der Primas im Purpur: Eigenbistümer, Legatenwürde und Primat der Erzbischöfe von Salzburg." In *1200 Jahre Erzbistum Salzburg*, ed. Heinz Dopsch, Peter F. Kramml, and Alfred Stefan Weiss, 131–55. Salzburg, 1999.
- . "Die steirischen Otakare: Zu ihrer Herkunft und ihren dynastischen Verbindungen." In *Das Werden der Steiermark*, ed. Gerhard Pferschy, Veröffentlichungen des Steiermärkischen Landesarchivs, 10:75–139. Graz, 1980.
- , ed. *Geschichte Salzburgs*. Vol. 1, pts. 1–2. 2nd ed. Salzburg, 1983.
- Drabek, Anna M. *Die Verträge der fränkischen und deutschen Herrscher mit dem Papsttum von 754 bis 1020*. VIÖG, 22. Vienna, 1976.
- Dungern, Otto von. *Wie Baiern das Österreich verlor*. Graz, 1930.
- Eckhardt, Karl August. "Theophanu als Ahnfrau." In *Genealogische Funde zur allgemeinen Geschichte*, 2nd ed., 91–124. Witzhausen, 1963.
- Ehlers, Caspar. *Metropolis Germaniae: Studien zur Bedeutung Speyers für das Königtum: 751–1250*. Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte, 125. Göttingen, 1996.
- Ehlers, Joachim. *Geschichte Frankreichs im Mittelalter*. Stuttgart, 1987.
- Elze, Reinhard. "Über die Leistungsfähigkeit von Gesandtschaften und Boten im 11. Jahrhundert." In *Päpste—Kaiser—Könige und die mittelalterliche Herrschaftssymbolik*, ed. Bernhard Schimmelpfennig und Ludwig Schmugge, xiv:1–10. London, 1982.
- Engels, Odilo. "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Staufer im 12. Jahrhundert (I)." *DA* 27 (1971): 373–456.
- . "Der Dom zu Speyer im Spiegel des salischen und staufischen Selbstverständnisses." *Archiv für mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte* 32 (1980): 27–40.

- . “Das Reich der Salier—Entwicklungslinien.” In *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 3:479–541.
- Engen, John van. “Rupert von Deutz und das sogenannte Chronicon sancti Laurentii Leodiensis: Zur Geschichte des Investiturstreites in Lüttich?” *DA* 35 (1979): 33–81.
- Ennen, Edith. *The Medieval Woman*. Trans. Edmund Jephcott. Oxford, 1990.
- Erben, Wilhelm. *Die Kaiser- und Königsurkunde des Mittelalters*. Munich, 1907.
- Erkens, Franz-Reiner. “Der Herrscher als *gotes drit*: Zur Sakralität des ungesalbten ostfränkischen Königs.” *HJ* 118 (1998): 1–39.
- . *Konrad II. (um 990–1039): Herrschaft und Reich des ersten Salierkaisers*. Regensburg, 1998.
- . “Militia und Ritterschaft: Reflexionen über die Entstehung des Rittertums.” *HZ* 258 (1994): 623–59.
- Ernst, Wolfgang, and Kornelia Wisman, eds. *Geschichtskörper: Zur Aktualität von Ernst H. Kantorowicz*. Munich, 1998.
- Ewig, Eugen. “Der Gebetsdienst der Kirchen in den Urkunden der späteren Karolinger.” In *Festschrift für Berent Schwineköper*, ed. Helmut Maurer und Hans Patze, 45–86. Sigmaringen, 1982.
- . “Die Gebetsklausel für König und Reich in den merowingischen Königsurkunden.” In *Tradition als historische Kraft: Interdisziplinäre Forschungen zur Geschichte des früheren Mittelalters (Festschrift Karl Hauck)*, ed. Norbert Kamp und Joachim Wollasch, 87–99. Berlin and New York, 1982.
- . “Troja und die Franken.” *Rheinische Vierteljahrsblätter* 62 (1998): 1–16.
- Falkenhausen, Vera von. *Untersuchungen über die byzantinische Herrschaft in Süditalien vom 9. bis ins 11. Jahrhundert*. Schriften zur Geistesgeschichte des östlichen Europa, 1. Wiesbaden, 1967.
- Fichtenau, Heinrich. *Living in the Tenth Century: Mentalities and Social Orders*. Trans. Patrick J. Geary. Chicago, 1991. (Orig. publ. as *Lebensordnungen des 10. Jahrhunderts*. Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters, 30. 2 vols. Stuttgart, 1984.)
- . “Reisen und Reisende.” In *Beiträge zur Mediävistik*, 3:1–79. Stuttgart, 1986.
- Fillitz, Hermann. “Bemerkungen zur Datierung und Lokalisierung der Reichskrone.” *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 56 (1993): 313–34.
- . “Studien zur Römischen Reichskrone.” *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien* 50 (1953): 23–52.
- Fleckenstein, Josef. *Die Hofkapelle der deutschen Könige*. Schriften der MGH, 16. Pt. 2, *Die Hofkapelle im Rahmen der ottonisch-salischen Reichskirche*. Stuttgart, 1966.
- Förstemann, Ernst. *Altd deutsches Namenbuch*. Vol. 1, *Personennamen*. 2nd ed. Bonn, 1900.
- Frank, Roberta. “King Cnut in the Verse of His Skalds.” In *The Reign of Cnut*, ed. Rumble, 106–24.
- Frederick the Great. *Geschichte meiner Zeit*. In *Ausgewählte Werke in deutscher Übersetzung*, ed. Gustav Berthold Volz, 1:26ff. Berlin, 1928.
- Freed, John B. “The Formation of the Salzburg Ministerialage in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries.” *Viator* 9 (1978): 67–102.
- . “The Origins of the European Nobility: The Problem of the Ministerials.” *Viator* 7 (1976): 211–41.
- Fried, Johannes. *Otto III. und Boteslaw Chrobry*. Frankfurter historische Abhandlungen, 30. Stuttgart, 1989.
- . *Der Weg in die Geschichte: Die Ursprünge Deutschlands bis 1024*. Propyläen Geschichte Deutschlands, 1. Berlin, 1994.

- Friedmann, Andreas Urban. *Die Beziehungen der Bistümer Worms und Speyer zu den ottonischen und salischen Königen*. Quellen und Abhandlungen zur mittelhiesischen Kirchengeschichte, 72. Mainz, 1994.
- Fuhrmann, Horst. "Sind eben alles Menschen gewesen": Gelehrtenleben im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. Munich, 1996.
- Gädeke, Nora. *Zeugnisse bildlicher Darstellung der Nachkommenschaft Heinrichs I.* Arbeiten zur Frühmittelalterforschung, 22. Berlin, 1992.
- Gänsler, Gerald. "Die Mark als Weg zur Macht am Beispiel der 'Eppensteiner' (2. Teil)." *Zeitschrift des Historischen Vereins für Steiermark* 85 (1994): 73–122.
- Garms-Cornides, Elisabeth. "Die langobardischen Fürstentitel (774–1077)." In *Intitulatio II*, ed. Wolfram, 341–452.
- Geary, Patrick. *Furta Sacra*. Princeton, 1978; rpt. 1990.
- Gerlich, Alois. "Mainz." In *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. 6, cols. 134–41. Munich and Zurich, 1993.
- Giese, Wolfgang. "Zur Bautätigkeit von Bischöfen und Äbten des 10. bis 12. Jahrhunderts." *DA* 38 (1982): 388–438.
- . "Reichsstrukturprobleme unter den Saliern—der Adel in Ostsachsen." In *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 1:273–308.
- Giesebrecht, Wilhelm. *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit*. Vol. 2. 5th ed. Leipzig, 1885.
- Glaser, Hubert. "Wissenschaft und Bildung." In *Handbuch der bayerischen Geschichte*, ed. Max Spindler, 2nd ed., 1:519–82. Munich, 1981.
- Glocker, Winfried. *Die Verwandten der Ottonen und ihre Bedeutung in der Politik*. Dissertationen zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte, 5. Cologne, 1989.
- Goetting, Hans, comp. *Das Bistum Hildesheim*. Vol. 2, *Das Benediktiner(innen)kloster Brunshausen, das Benediktinerinnenkloster St. Marien vor Gandersheim, das Benediktinerkloster Clus, das Franziskanerkloster Gandersheim*. Germania Sacra, n.s., 8. Berlin, 1974.
- , comp. *Das Bistum Hildesheim*. Vol. 3, *Die Hildesheimer Bischöfe von 815 bis 1221 (1227)*. Germania Sacra, n.s., 20. Berlin, 1984.
- Goetz, Hans-Werner. "Das Herzogtum im Spiegel der salierzeitlichen Geschichtsschreibung." In *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 1:253–71.
- . "Der letzte 'Karolinger'? Die Regierung Konrads I. im Spiegel seiner Urkunden." *AfD* 26 (1980): 56–125.
- Goez, Werner. *Lebensbilder aus dem Mittelalter: Die Zeit der Ottonen, Salier und Staufer*. 2nd ed. Darmstadt, 1998.
- . "Rainald von Como: Ein Bischof des 11. Jahrhunderts zwischen Kurie und Krone." In *Historische Forschungen für Walter Schlesinger*, ed. Helmut Beumann, 462–94. Cologne, 1974.
- Görich, Knut. "Eine Wende im Osten: Heinrich II. und Boleslaw Chrobry." In *Otto III.—Heinrich II.: Eine Wende?* ed. Schneidmüller and Weinfurter, 95–167.
- Graf, Hermann. "Mönche und Geistliche als Architekten und Bauverwalter beim Bau des Klosters Limburg und des Speyerer Domes im 11. Jahrhundert." *Mitteilungen des Historischen Vereins der Pfalz* 54 (1956): 155–225.
- Grafen, Hansjörg. "Spuren der ältesten Speyerer Necrologüberlieferung." *FMSt* 19 (1985): 379–431.
- Grauert, Hermann. "Die Kaisergräber im Dome zu Speyer: Bericht über die Öffnung im August 1900." *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-philologisch-historische Klasse* (1900): 539–617.
- Graus, František. *Die Nationenbildung der Westslawen im Mittelalter*. Nationes, 3. Sigmaringen, 1980.

- . "Troja und trojanische Herkunftssage im Mittelalter." In *Kontinuität und Transformation der Antike im Mittelalter*, ed. Willi Erzgräber, 25–43. Sigmaringen, 1989.
- Grimm, Jacob. *Teutonic Mythology*. Trans. James Steven Stallybrass. New York, 1966.
- Grönbech, Vilhelm. *Kultur und Religion der Germanen*. 2 vols. 5th ed. Stuttgart, 1954.
- Groten, Manfred. "Von der Gebetsverbrüderung zum Königskanonikat: Zur Vorgeschichte und Entwicklung der Königskanonikat an den Dom- und Stiftskirchen des Deutschen Reiches." *HJ* 103 (1983): 1–34.
- Gugumus, Johannes Emil. "Die Speyerer Bischöfe im Investiturstreit." *Archiv für mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte* 4 (1952): 45–78.
- Gurevich, Aron. *The Origins of European Individualism*. Trans. Katherine Judelson. Oxford and Cambridge, Mass., 1995.
- Györfly, György. *King Saint Stephen of Hungary*. Trans. Peter Doherty. New York, 1994. (Orig. publ. as *König Stephan der Heilige*. Budapest, 1988.)
- Haefele, Hans F. "Ekkehard IV von St. Gallen." In *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*, 2nd ed., ed. Kurt Ruh, vol. 2, cols. 455–65. Berlin, 1980.
- Hampe, Karl. *Deutsche Kaisergeschichte in der Zeit der Salier und Staufer*. 10th ed. Heidelberg, 1949.
- . *Germany Under the Salian and Hohenstaufen Emperors*. Trans. Ralph Bennett. 1909; rpt., Totowa, N.J., 1973.
- Hardt, Matthias. "Linien und Säume, Zonen und Räume an der Ostgrenze des Reiches im frühen und hohen Mittelalter." In *Grenze und Differenz im frühen Mittelalter*, ed. Walter Pohl and Helmut Reimitz, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse: Denkschriften, 287, Forschungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters, 1:39–56. Vienna, 2000.
- Hartmann, Ludo Moritz. *Geschichte Italiens im Mittelalter*. Vol. 4:1. Gotha, 1915.
- Hartmann, Wilfried. "Autoritäten im Kirchenrecht und Autorität des Kirchenrechts in der Salierzeit." In *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 3:425–46.
- . "Probleme des geistlichen Gerichts." *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto Medioevo* 44, 2 (1997): 631–74.
- Hauck, Albert. *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*. Vol. 3. 8th ed. Berlin and Leipzig, 1954.
- Hausberger, Karl. *Geschichte des Bistums Regensburg*. Vol. 1. Regensburg, 1989.
- Hehl, Ernst-Dieter. "Herrscher, Kirche und Kirchenrecht im spätottonischen Reich." In *Otto III.–Heinrich II.: Eine Wende?* ed. Schneidmüller and Weinfurter, 169–203.
- . "Maria und das ottonisch-salische Königtum: Urkunden, Liturgie, Bilder." *HJ* 117 (1997): 271–310.
- Heidrich, Ingrid. "Die Absetzung Herzog Adalberos von Kärnten durch Kaiser Konrad II. 1035." *HJ* 91 (1971): 70–94.
- . "Bischöfe und Bischofskirche von Speyer." In *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 2:187–224.
- Herkommer, Hubert. "Der Waise, 'aller fürsten leitesterne.'" In *Die Reichsidee in der deutschen Dichtung des Mittelalters*. Wege der Forschung, 589:364–83. Darmstadt, 1983.
- Hirsch, Siegfried, and Harry Bresslau. *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs unter Heinrich II.* 3 vols. Berlin, 1862, 1864, and 1875.
- Hirschmann, Frank G. *Stadtplanung, Bauprojekte und Großbaustellen im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert: Vergleichende Studien zu den Kathedralstädten westlich des Rheins*. Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters, 43. Stuttgart, 1998.

- Hlawitschka, Eduard. *Die Anfänge des Hauses Habsburg-Lotharingen*. Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für saarländische Landesgeschichte und Volksforschung, 4. Saarbrücken, 1969.
- . "Beiträge und Berichte zur Bleitafelinschrift aus dem Grab der Kaiserin Gisela." *HJ* 97/98 (1978): 439–45.
- . *Untersuchungen zu den Thronwechseln der ersten Hälfte des 11. Jahrhunderts und zur Adelsgeschichte Süddeutschlands*. VF, special vol., 35. Sigmaringen, 1987.
- . "Wer waren Kuno und Richlind von Öhningen?" *ZGO* 128, n.s., 89 (1980): 1–49.
- . "Die Widonen im Dukat von Spoleto." *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 63 (1983): 20–91.
- Hoffmann, Hartmut. "Eigendiktat in den Urkunden Ottos III. und Heinrichs II." *DA* 44 (1988): 390–423.
- . "Grafschaften in Bischofshand." *DA* 46 (1990): 375–480.
- . *Mönchskönig und rex idiota: Studien zur Kirchenpolitik Heinrichs II. und Konrads II.* MGH Studien und Texte, 8. Hannover, 1993.
- Hofmeister, Adolf. "Markgrafen und Markgrafschaften im italischen Königreich in der Zeit von Karl dem Großen bis auf Otto den Großen (774–962)." *MIÖG*, suppl. vol. 7 (1907): 215–435.
- . "Rezension." *MIÖG* 38 (1920): 503ff.
- Holzfurtner, Ludwig. *Gründung und Gründungsüberlieferung: Quellenkritische Studien zur Gründungsgeschichte der bayerischen Klöster der Agilolfingerzeit und ihrer hochmittelalterlichen Überlieferung*. Münchener historische Studien, Abteilung bayerische Geschichte, 11. Kallmünz/Opf., 1984.
- Horn, Michael. "Zur Geschichte der Bischöfe und Bischofskirche von Augsburg." In *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 2:251–66.
- Jaksch, August. *Geschichte Kärntens bis 1335*. 2 vols. Klagenfurt, 1928 and 1929.
- Jäschke, Kurt-Ulrich. *Die älteste Halberstädter Bischofschronik*. Mitteldeutsche Forschungen, 63:1. Cologne, 1970.
- . "*Tamen virilis probitas in femina vicit*: Ein hochmittelalterlicher Hofkapellan und die Herrscherinnen—Wipos Äußerungen über Kaiserinnen und Königinnen seiner Zeit?" In *Ex ipsis rerum documentis: Beiträge zur Mediävistik: Festschrift Harald Zimmermann zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Klaus Herbers, Hans Henning Kortüm, and Carlo Servatius, 429–48. Sigmaringen, 1991.
- Johaneck, Peter. "Die Erzbischöfe von Hamburg-Bremen und ihre Kirche in Reich der Salierzeit." In *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 2:79–112.
- Kahl, Hans-Dietrich. "Die Angliederung Burgunds an das mittelalterliche Imperium." *Schweizerische numismatische Rundschau* 48 (1969): 13–105.
- . "Zum Ergebnis des Wendenkreuzzuges 1147, zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des sächsischen Frühchristentums." *Wichmann-Jahrbuch für Kirchengeschichte im Bistum Berlin* 11/12 (1957/58): 99–120.
- Kantorowicz, Ernst H. *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology*. Princeton, 1957; rpt. 1997.
- . *Laudes Regiae*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1958.
- Kaufmann, E. "Erbfolgeordnung." In *HRG*, vol. 1, cols. 959–62. Berlin, 1971.
- Kehr, Paul. "Rom und Venedig bis ins 12. Jahrhundert." *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 19 (1927): 1–180.
- . *Vier Kapitel aus der Geschichte Kaiser Heinrichs III.* Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, 3. Berlin, 1931.

- Keller, Hagen. *Adelsherrschaft und städtische Gesellschaft in Oberitalien, 9. bis 12. Jahrhundert*. Bibliothek des Deutschen historischen Instituts in Rom, 52. Tübingen, 1979.
- . "Herrschaftsrepräsentation im ottonischen Sachsen: Ergebnisse und Fragen." In *Herrschaftsrepräsentation im ottonischen Sachsen*, ed. Althoff and Schubert, 431–52.
- . "*Machabaeorum pugnae*: Zum Stellenwert eines biblischen Vorbilds in Widukinds Deutung der ottonischen Königsherrschaft." In *Iconologia Sacra: Mythos, Bildkunst und Dichtung in der Religions- und Sozialgeschichte Alteuropas: Festschrift für Karl Hauck zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. Hagen Keller and Nikolaus Staubach, Arbeiten zur Frühmittelalterforschung, 23:417–37. Berlin, 1994.
- . "Mailand im 11. Jahrhundert: Das Exemplarische an einem Sonderfall." In *Die Frühgeschichte der europäischen Stadt im 11. Jahrhundert*, ed. Jörg Jarnut and Peter Johanek, A 43:81–104. Cologne, 1998.
- . "Reichsstruktur und Herrschaftsauffassung in ottonisch-frühsalischer Zeit." *FMSt* 16 (1982): 74–128.
- . "Schwäbische Herzöge als Thronwerber." *ZGO* 131 (1983): 123–62.
- . "Widukinds Bericht über die Aachener Wahl und Krönung Ottos I." *FMSt* 29 (1995): 390–453.
- . "Zum Charakter der 'Staatlichkeit' zwischen karolingischer Reichsreform und hochmittelalterlichem Herrschaftsaufbau." *FMSt* 23 (1989): 248–64.
- . *Zwischen regionaler Begrenzung und universalem Horizont: Deutschland im Imperium der Salier und Staufer, 1024–1250*. Propyläen Geschichte Deutschlands, 2. Berlin, 1986.
- Kerner, Max. "Burchard von Worms." In *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*, 2nd ed., ed. Kurt Ruh, vol. 1, cols. 1121–27. Berlin, 1978.
- Kienast, Walter. *Deutschland und Frankreich in der Kaiserzeit, 900–1270*. 3 vols. Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters, 9. Stuttgart, 1974 and 1975.
- Kimpen, Emil. "Ezzonen und Hezeliniden in der rheinischen Pfalzgrafschaft." *MIÖG*, suppl. vol. 12 (1933): 1–91.
- Klaar, Karl Engelhardt. *Die Herrschaft der Eppensteiner in Kärnten*. Archiv für vaterländische Geschichte und Topographie, 61. Klagenfurt, 1966.
- Klewitz, Hans-Walter. "Die Festkrönungen der deutschen Könige." *ZRG KA* 28 (1939): 48–96.
- . "Namengebung und Sippenbewußtsein." *AUF* 18 (1949): 23–37.
- Klopsch, Paul. "Walter von Speyer." In *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*, 2nd ed., ed. Kurt Ruh, vol. 10, cols. 660–64. Berlin, 1999.
- Kluge, Bernd. *Deutsche Münzgeschichte von der späten Karolingerzeit bis zum Ende der Salier, ca. 900–1125*. Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum, Monographien, 29. Mainz, 1991.
- Kluge-Pinsker, Antje. *Schachspiel und Trictrac: Zeugnisse mittelalterlicher Spielfreude aus salischer Zeit*. Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum, Monographien, 30. Sigmaringen, 1991.
- Kluger, Helmuth. "Propter claritatem generis: Genealogisches zur Familie der Ezzonen." In *Köln: Stadt und Bistum in Kirche und Reich des Mittelalters: Festschrift Odilo Engels zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Hanna Vollrath und Stefan Weinfurter, Kölner historische Abhandlungen, 39:223–58. Cologne, 1993.
- Kornblüm, U. "Beweis." In *HRG*, vol. 1, cols. 401–8. Berlin, 1971.
- Krah, Adelheid. "Die Absetzung Adalberos von Kärnten und die Südostpolitik Kaiser Konrads II." *HJ* 110 (1990): 309–69.

- . *Absetzungsverfahren als Spiegelbild von Königsmacht*. Untersuchungen zur deutschen Staats- und Rechtsgeschichte, n.s., 26. Aalen, 1987.
- Krahwinkler, Harald. *Friaul im Frühmittelalter*. VIÖG, 30. Vienna, 1992.
- Kränzle, Andreas. "Der abwesende König: Überlegungen zur ottonischen Königsherrschaft." *FMSt* 31 (1997): 120–57.
- Kraus, Karl. *Sprüche und Widersprüche*. 3rd ed. Vienna, 1924.
- Krause, Hans Georg. "Über den Verfasser der *Vita Leonis IX papae*." *DA* 32 (1976): 49–85.
- Kresten, Otto. "Correctiunculae zu Auslandsschreiben byzantinischer Kaiser des 11. Jahrhunderts." *Aachener Kunstblätter* 60 (1994): 143–62.
- Kugler, Georg Johannes. *Die Reichskrone*. Die Kronen des Hauses Österreich, 5. 2nd ed. Vienna, 1986.
- Kupfer, Erwin. *Das Königsgut im mittelalterlichen Niederösterreich vom 9. bis zum 12. Jahrhundert*. Studien und Forschungen aus dem Niederösterreichischen Institut für Landeskunde, 28. Saint Pölten, 2000.
- Kürbis, Brygida. "Die Epistola Mathildis Suevae an Mieszko II. in neuer Sicht: Ein Forschungsbericht." *FMSt* 23 (1989): 318–38.
- Ladewig, Paul. *Poppo von Stablo und die Klosterreformen unter den ersten Saliern*. Berlin, 1883.
- Ladner, Gerhard. *Theologie und Politik vor dem Investiturstreit: Abendmahlstreit, Kirchenreform, Cluny und Heinrich III*. VIÖG, 2. Baden bei Wien, 1936; rpt., Darmstadt, 1968.
- Laudage, Johannes. "Heinrich III.: Ein Lebensbild." *Aureo Estudio* 1 (1999): 30ff.
- Lawson, M. K. *Cnut: The Danes in England in the Early Eleventh Century*. London, 1993.
- Lechner, Johann. "Die älteren Königsurkunden für das Bistum Worms und die Begründung der bischöflichen Fürstenmacht." *MIÖG* 22 (1901): 361–419 and 529–74.
- Lechner, Karl. *Die Babenberger*. VIÖG, 23. 5th ed. Vienna, 1994.
- Le Goff, Jacques. "Wie schreibt man eine Biographie?" In Fernand Braudel et al., *Der Historiker als Menschenfresser: Über den Beruf des Geschichtsschreibers*, Wagenbach Taschenbuch, 189:103f. Berlin, 1990.
- Lhotsky, Alphons. *Aufsätze und Vorträge*. Vol. 1. Ed. Hans Wagner and Heinrich Koller. Vienna, 1970.
- Lingenthal, Karl Eduard Zachariä von. *Geschichte des griechisch-römischen Rechts*. 3rd ed. Berlin, 1892.
- Lübke, Christian. "Mark, -grafschaft." In *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. 6, cols. 302–4. Munich, 1993.
- . *Regesten zur Geschichte der Slaven an Elbe und Oder (vom Jahr 900 an)*. Vols. 1–5. Berlin, 1984–88.
- Ludat, Herbert. *An Elbe und Oder um das Jahr 1000: Skizzen zur Politik des Ottonenreiches und der slavischen Mächte in Mitteleuropa*. 2nd ed. Weimar, 1995.
- Lund, Niels. "Cnut's Danish Kingdom." In *The Reign of Cnut*, ed. Rumble, 27–42.
- Maleczek, Werner. "Echte und zweifelhafte Stammbäume bei kanonischen Eheprozessen bis ins frühe 13. Jahrhundert." *Veröffentlichungen des Innsbrucker Stadtarchivs*, n.s., 18 (1988): 123–43.
- Maurer, Helmut. *Der Herzog von Schwaben*. Sigmaringen, 1978.
- Maurer, Joseph. *Geschichte der landesfürstlichen Stadt Hainburg*. Vienna, 1894.
- Mayer-Homberg, Edwin. *Die fränkischen Volksrechte im Mittelalter*. Vol. 1. Weimar, 1912.

- Mekking, Aart J. J. "A Cross of Churches Around Conrad's Heart: An Analysis of the Function and Symbolism of the Cross of Churches in Utrecht, and Those of Bamberg and Paderborn." In *Utrecht, Britain, and the Continent: Archaeology, Art, and Architecture*, ed. E. Bièvre, 99–111. Leeds, 1996.
- . "Een kruis van kerken rond Koenraads hart: Een bijdrage tot de kennis van de functie en symbolische betekenis van het Utrechtse kerkenkruis alsmede van die te Bamberg en te Paderborn." In *Utrecht, kruispunt van de middeleeuwse kerk*, ed. Ank C. Esmeijer, Clavis kunsthistorische monografieën, 7:21–53. Utrecht, 1988.
- Merta, Brigitte. "Die Titel Heinrichs II. und der Salier." In *Intitulatio III*, ed. Wolfram and Scharer, 163–200.
- Mertens, Dieter. "Vom Rhein zur Rems: Aspekte salisch-schwäbischer Geschichte." In *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 1:221–52.
- Metz, Wolfgang. *Das Servitium regis*. Erträge der Forschung, 89. Darmstadt, 1978.
- . "Wesen und Struktur des Adels Althessens in der Salierzeit." In *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 1:331–66.
- Mitterauer, Michael. "'Senioris sui nomine': Zur Verbreitung von Fürstennamen durch das Lehenswesen." *MIÖG* 96 (1988): 275–330.
- Moravcsik, Gyula. *Byzantinoturcica*. 2 vols. 2nd ed. Budapest, 1983.
- Much, Rudolf. *Die Germania des Tacitus*. 3rd ed. Heidelberg, 1967.
- Müller-Mertens, Eckhard. "Reich und Hauptorte der Salier: Probleme und Fragen." In *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 1:139–58.
- Müller-Mertens, Eckhard, and Wolfgang Huschner. *Reichsintegration im Spiegel der Herrschaftspraxis Kaiser Konrads II*. Forschungen zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte, 35. Weimar, 1992.
- Mutius, Hans-Georg von. *Rechtsenscheide rheinischer Rabbinen vor dem ersten Kreuzzug*. 2 vols. Judentum und Umwelt, 13. Frankfurt am Main, 1984 and 1985.
- Nehlsen, Hermann. "Lex Burgundionum." In *HRG*, vol. 2, cols. 190ff. Berlin, 1978.
- Ogris, Werner. "Anerkennungszins." In *HRG*, vol. 1, cols. 166f. Berlin, 1971.
- . "Friedelehe." In *HRG*, vol. 1, cols. 1293–96. Berlin, 1971.
- . "Hausgemeinschaft." In *HRG*, vol. 1, cols. 2024–26. Berlin, 1971.
- Ohnsorge, Werner. "Waren die Salier Sachsenkaiser?" *Niedersächsisches Jahrbuch* 30 (1958): 28–53.
- Ott, Joachim. *Krone und Krönung*. Mainz, 1998.
- Parisse, Michel. "Die Frauenstifte und Frauenklöster in Sachsen vom 10. bis zur Mitte des 12. Jahrhunderts." In *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 2:465–501.
- Pohl, Walter. *Die Awaren: Ein Steppenvolk in Mitteleuropa, 567–822 n. Chr.* Munich, 1988.
- Prinz, Friedrich. "Bayern vom Zeitalter der Karolinger bis zum Ende der Welfenherrschaft (788–1180): Die innere Entwicklung: Staat, Gesellschaft, Kirche, Wirtschaft." In *Handbuch der bayerischen Geschichte*, ed. Max Spindler, 2nd ed., 1:352–518. Munich, 1981.
- . "Die Grenzen des Reiches in frühsalischer Zeit: Ein Strukturproblem der Königsherrschaft." In *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 1:159–74.
- Ranke, Kurt. "Abort." In *Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde*, 1:17f. Berlin, 1973.
- Das Reich der Salier, 1024–1125: Katalog zur Ausstellung des Landes Rheinland-Pfalz*. Sigmaringen, 1992.
- Reindel, Kurt. "Bayern vom Zeitalter der Karolinger bis zum Ende der Welfenherrschaft (788–1180): Die politische Entwicklung." In *Handbuch der bayerischen Geschichte*, ed. Max Spindler, 2nd ed., 1:249–349. Munich, 1981.

- Reudenbach, Bruno. "Individuum ohne Bildnis? Zum Problem künstlerischer Ausdrucksformen von Individualität im Mittelalter." In *Individuum und Individualität im Mittelalter*, ed. Aertsen and Speer, 807–18.
- Reuter, Timothy. "Unruhestiftung, Fehde, Rebellion, Widerstand: Gewalt und Frieden in der Politik der Salierzeit." In *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 3:297–325.
- Richard, Jean. *Les ducs de Bourgogne et la formation du duché du XI^e au XIV^e siècle*. Paris, 1954; rpt., Geneva, 1986.
- Riedmann, Josef. "Deutschlands Südgrenze." In *Deutschlands Grenzen in der Geschichte*, ed. Alexander Demandt, 3rd ed., 166–96. Munich, 1993.
- . "Mittelalter." In *Geschichte des Landes Tirol*, 2nd ed., 1:293–698. Bozen, 1990.
- Riegler, Josef. *Aflenz*. Hausmannstätten, 1990.
- Rösch, Gerhard. "Orseolo." In *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. 6, cols. 1476f. Munich and Zurich, 1993.
- . *Venedig und das Reich*. Bibliothek des Deutschen historischen Instituts in Rom, 53. Tübingen, 1982.
- Rösener, Werner. "Bauern in der Salierzeit." In *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 3:51–74.
- Rumble, Alexander R., ed. *The Reign of Cnut: King of England, Denmark, and Norway*. London, 1994.
- Rupp, Gabriele. *Die Ekkehardiner, Markgrafen von Meißen, und ihre Beziehungen zum Reich und zu den Piasten*. Europäische Hochschulschriften, ser. 3, Geschichte und ihre Hilfswissenschaften, 691. Frankfurt am Main, 1996.
- Sandgruber, Roman. *Ökonomie und Politik: Österreichische Wirtschaftsgeschichte vom Mittelalter bis zur Gegenwart*. Österreichische Geschichte. Vienna, 1995.
- Schäfer, Dorothee. *Studien zu Poppo von Stablo und den Klosterreformen im 11. Jahrhundert*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Munich, 1991.
- Schaller, Hans Martin. "Die Wiener Reichskrone—entstanden unter König Konrad III." In *Die Reichskleinodien*, Schriften zur staufischen Geschichte und Kunst, 16:58–105. Göppingen, 1997.
- Schetter, Rudolf. *Die Intervenienz der weltlichen und geistlichen Fürsten in den deutschen Königsurkunden von 911–1056*. Bottrop, 1935.
- Schieffer, Rudolf. "Consuetudines monasticae und Reformforschung." *DA* 44 (1988): 161–69.
- . *Die Entstehung des päpstlichen Investiturverbots für den deutschen König*. Schriften der MGH, 28. Stuttgart, 1981.
- . *Die Entstehung von Domkapiteln in Deutschland*. Bonner historische Forschungen, 43. Bonn, 1976.
- . "Erzbischöfe und Bischofskirche von Köln." In *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 2:1–29.
- . *Der geschichtliche Ort der ottonisch-salischen Reichskirchenpolitik*. Nordrhein-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vorträge G 352. Düsseldorf, 1998.
- . "Leo IX." In *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. 5, cols. 188of. Munich and Zurich, 1991.
- Schieffer, Theodor. "Ein deutscher Bischof des 11. Jahrhunderts: Gerhard I. von Cambrai (1012–1051)." *DA* 1 (1937): 323–60.
- . *Heinrich II. und Konrad II.: Die Umprägung des Geschichtsbildes durch die Kirchenreform des 11. Jahrhunderts*. Libelli, 285. 2nd ed. Darmstadt, 1996. (Orig. publ. in *DA* 8 (1951): 384–437.)
- Schlesinger, Walter. "Über germanisches Heerkönigtum." In *Beiträge zur deutschen*

- Verfassungsgeschichte des Mittelalters*, 1:53–87. Göttingen, 1963. Rpt. in *Das Königtum: Seine geistigen und rechtlichen Grundlagen*, VF, 3, 4th ed., 105–41. Sigmaringen, 1973.
- Schmeidler, Bernhard. *Abt Ellinger von Tegernsee, 1017–1026 und 1031–1041*. Schriftenreihe zur bayerischen Landesgeschichte, 32. Munich, 1938.
- Schmid, Heinrich Felix. “Die Entstehung des kirchlichen Zehentrechts auf slavischem Boden.” In *Festschrift W. Abraham*, 1–24. Lemberg, 1930.
- Schmid, Karl. “De regia stirpe Waiblingensium.” *ZGO* 124, n.s., 85 (1976): 63–73.
- . *Gebliüt, Herrschaft, Geschlechterbewußtsein: Grundfragen zum Verständnis des Adels im Mittelalter*. VF, 44. Sigmaringen, 1998.
- . “Haus- und Herrschaftsverständnis der Salier.” In *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 1:21–54.
- . “Die Sorge der Salier um ihre Memoria.” In *Memoria*, ed. Karl Schmid and Joachim Wollasch, Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften, 48:666–726. Munich, 1984.
- , ed. *Die Klostersgemeinschaft von Fulda*. 3 vols. in 5. Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften, 8. Munich, 1978.
- Schmidt, Roderich. *Königsumritt und Huldigung in ottonisch-salischer Zeit*. VF, 6:91–233. Constance, 1961.
- Schmidt, Tilmann. “Konrads II. Jugend und Familie.” In *Geschichtsschreibung und geistiges Leben im Mittelalter: Festschrift für Heinz Löwe zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Karl Hauck and Hubert Mordek, 312–24. Cologne, 1978.
- Schneider, Reinhard. “Landeserschließung und Raumerfassung durch salische Herrscher.” In *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 1:117–38.
- Schneidmüller, Bernd. “Otto III.–Heinrich II.: Wende der Königsherrschaft oder Wende der Mediaevistik?” In *Otto III.–Heinrich II.: Eine Wende?* ed. Schneidmüller and Weinfurter, 9–46.
- Schneidmüller, Bernd, and Stefan Weinfurter, eds. *Otto III.–Heinrich II.: Eine Wende?* Mittelalter-Forschungen, 1. Sigmaringen, 1997.
- Schramm, Percy Ernst. “‘Bonmots’ mittelalterlicher Kaiser.” In *Kaiser, Könige und Päpste*, 3:298–301.
- . “Herrschaftszeichen: Gestiftet, verschenkt, verkauft, verpfändet: Beilage aus dem Mittelalter.” *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, philosophisch-historische Klasse*, 5 (1957): 161–226.
- . *Kaiser, Könige und Päpste: Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Geschichte des Mittelalters*. Vols. 2–3. Stuttgart, 1968 and 1969.
- . *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio: Studien und Texte zur Geschichte des römischen Erneuerungsgedankens vom Ende des karolingischen Reiches bis zum Investiturstreit*. Studien der Bibliothek Warburg, 17. Leipzig, 1929; 2nd ed., Darmstadt, 1957.
- , ed. *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik*. Schriften der MGH, 13, pts. 1–3. Stuttgart, 1954–56.
- Schramm, Percy Ernst, and Florentine Mutherich. *Denkmale der deutschen Könige und Kaiser*. Veröffentlichungen des Zentralinstituts für Kunstgeschichte in München. 2nd ed. Munich, 1981.
- . *Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige in Bildern ihrer Zeit, 751–1190*. Munich, 1983.
- Schreibmüller, Hermann. “Die Ahnen Kaiser Konrads II. und Bischof Brunos von Würzburg.” *Würzburger Diözesangeschichtsblätter* 14/15 (1952/53): 173–233.
- Schreiner, Klaus. “‘Er küßte mich mit dem Kuß seines Mundes’: Metaphorik, kommunikative und herrschaftliche Funktionen einer symbolischen Handlung.” In

- Höfische Repräsentation: Das Zeremoniell und die Zeichen*, ed. Hedda Ragotzky and Horst Wenzel, 89–132. Tübingen, 1990.
- Schubert, Ernst, ed. *Politik, Verfassung, Wirtschaft vom 9. bis zum ausgehenden 15. Jahrhundert*. Vol. 2, pt. 1, of *Geschichte Niedersachsens*. Veröffentlichungen der Historischen Kommission für Niedersachsen und Bremen, 36. Hannover, 1997.
- Schulze, Hagen. *Staat und Nation in der europäischen Geschichte*. Munich, 1994.
- . *States, Nations, and Nationalism: From the Middle Ages to the Present*. Trans. William E. Yuill. Oxford and Cambridge, Mass., 1996.
- Schulze, Hans Karl. “Burgward, Burgwardverfassung.” In *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. 2, cols. 1101–3. Munich, 1983.
- . “Hausherrschaft.” In *HRG*, vol. 1, cols. 2030–33. Berlin, 1971.
- . *Hegemoniales Kaisertum: Ottonen und Salier*. 3rd ed. Berlin, 1994.
- . “Mediävistik und Begriffsgeschichte.” In *Festschrift für Helmut Beumann zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Kurt-Ulrich Jäschke and Reinhard Wenskus, 388–405. Sigmaringen, 1977.
- . *Vom Reich der Franken zum Land der Deutschen: Merowinger und Karolinger*. 3rd ed. Berlin, 1994.
- Schulze-Dörrlamm, Mechthild. *Die Kaiserkrone Konrads II. (1024–1039)*. Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum, Monographien, 23. Sigmaringen, 1991.
- . *Der Mainzer Schatz der Kaiserin Agnes: Neue Untersuchungen zum sogenannten “Gisela-Schmuck.”* Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum, Monographien, 24. Sigmaringen, 1991.
- Schünemann, Konrad. “Deutsche Kriegführung im Osten während des Mittelalters.” *DA* 2 (1938): 54–84.
- . *Die Deutschen in Ungarn bis zum 12. Jahrhundert*. Ungarische Bibliothek, ser. 1, 8. Leipzig, 1923.
- Schuster, Elisabeth. *Etymologie der niederösterreichischen Ortsnamen*. Historisches Ortsnamenbuch von Niederösterreich, ser. B. 3 vols. Vienna, 1989–94.
- Schütte, Bernt. “Bischofserhebungen im Spiegel von Bischofviten und Bischofgesten der Ottonen- und Salierzeit.” In *Die früh- und hochmittelalterliche Bischofserhebung im europäischen Vergleich*, ed. Franz-Reiner Erkens, 139–91. Cologne, 1998.
- Schwartz, Gerhard. *Die Besetzung der Bistümer Reichsitaliens unter den sächsischen und salischen Kaisern mit den Listen der Bischöfe 951–1122*. Leipzig, 1913.
- Schwarzmaier, Hansmartin. “Reichenauer Gedenkbucheinträge aus der Anfangszeit der Regierung König Konrads II.” *Zeitschrift für württembergische Landesgeschichte* 22 (1963): 19–28.
- . *Von Speyer nach Rom: Wegstationen und Lebensspuren der Salier*. Sigmaringen, 1991.
- Schwineköper, Berent. “Christus-Reliquien-Verehrung und Politik.” *Blätter für deutsche Landesgeschichte* 117 (1981): 183–281.
- Seibert, Hubertus. “Herrscher und Mönchtum im spätottonischen Reich: Vorstellungen—Funktion—Interaktion.” In *Otto III.—Heinrich II.: Eine Wende?* ed. Schneidmüller and Weinfurter, 205–66.
- . “Libertas und Reichsabtei: Zur Klosterpolitik der salischen Herrscher.” In *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 2:503–69.
- Sellert, Wolfgang. “Iudicium parium.” In *HRG*, vol. 2, cols. 465–67. Berlin, 1978.
- Sergi, Giorgio. “Novalesa.” In *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. 6, cols. 1299f. Munich, 1993.
- Staab, Franz. “Die Mainzer Kirche, Konzeption und Verwirklichung in der Bonifatius- und Theonestradition.” In *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 2:31–77.
- . “Reform und Reformgruppen im Erzbistum Mainz.” In *Reformidee und*

- Reformpolitik im spätsalisch-frühstaufischen Reich*. Quellen und Abhandlungen zur mittelhochdeutschen Kirchengeschichte, 68:119–87. Mainz, 1992.
- Stoob, Heinz. "Über den Aufbruch zur Städtebildung in Mitteleuropa." In *Die Frühgeschichte der europäischen Stadt im 11. Jahrhundert*, ed. Jörg Jarnut and Peter Johanek, Städteforschung, ser. A, 43:1–20. Cologne, 1998.
- Störmer, Wilhelm. "Bayern und der bayerische Herzog im 11. Jahrhundert." In *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 1:503–47.
- . *Früher Adel: Studien zur politischen Führungsschicht im fränkisch-deutschen Reich vom 8. bis 11. Jahrhundert*. Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters, 6. Vol. 2. Stuttgart, 1973.
- . "Kaiser Heinrich II., Kaiserin Kunigunde und das Herzogtum Bayern." *Zeitschrift für bayerische Landesgeschichte* 60 (1997): 437–63.
- . "Die Welfen in der Reichspolitik des 11. Jahrhunderts." *MIÖG* 104 (1996): 252–65.
- Stotz, Peter. "Ekkehard I. von St. Gallen." In *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*, 2nd ed., ed. Kurt Ruh, vol. 2, cols. 447–53. Berlin, 1980.
- Streich, Gerhard. *Burg und Kirche während des deutschen Mittelalters*. VF, 29. Sigmaringen, 1984.
- Struve, Tilman. "Gunther, Eremit." In *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. 4, col. 1793. Munich, 1989.
- . "Kaisertum und Romgedanke in salischer Zeit." *DA* 44 (1988): 424–54.
- Tangl, Georgine. *Die Teilnehmer an den allgemeinen Konzilien des Mittelalters*. 2nd ed. Weimar, 1969.
- Tellenbach, Gerd. "Der Charakter Kaiser Heinrichs IV.: Zugleich ein Versuch über die Erkennbarkeit menschlicher Individualität im hohen Mittelalter." In *Person und Gemeinschaft im Mittelalter: Karl Schmid zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Gerd Althoff et al., 345–67. Sigmaringen, 1988. Rpt. in *Ausgewählte Abhandlungen und Aufsätze*, 5:111–33. Stuttgart, 1996.
- Theuerkauf, Gerhard. "Burchard von Worms und die Rechtskunde seiner Zeit." *FMSt* 2 (1968): 144–61.
- . "Sachsenrecht im Übergang von der Lex Saxonum zum Sachsenspiegel." In *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 3:415–23.
- Thiele, Andreas. *Erzählende genealogische Stammtafeln zur europäischen Geschichte*. 2nd ed. Frankfurt am Main, 1993.
- Thomas, Heinz. "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*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 3:245–77.
- Tomea, Paolo. "L'agiografia milanese nei secoli XI e XII: Linee di tendenza e problemi 1." In *Atti dell'11° Congresso internazionale di studi sull'alto Medioevo*, 2:623–87. Spoleto, 1989.
- Trillmich, Werner. *Kaiser Konrad II. und seine Zeit*. Bonn, 1991.
- Twelkenkamp, Markus. "Das Haus der Luxemburger." In *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 1:475–502.
- Uhlirz, Mathilde. "Waren Kaiser Konrad II. und dessen Sohn, Kaiser Heinrich III., Nachkommen Theophanus?" *ZGO* 105, n.s., 66 (1957): 328–33.
- Unterkircher, Franz. "Ellinger von Tegernsee." In *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*, 2nd ed., ed. Kurt Ruh, vol. 2, cols. 504–8. Berlin, 1980.
- Vogtherr, Thomas. "Die Reichsklöster Corvey, Fulda und Hersfeld." In *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 2:429–64.
- Vollmann, Benedikt Konrad. *Ruodlieb*. Erträge der Forschung, 283. Darmstadt, 1993.

- Vossen, Peter. *Der Libellus Scholasticus des Walther von Speyer: Ein Schulbericht aus dem Jahre 984*. Berlin, 1962.
- Wagner, Hans. "Kardinal Matthäus Lang." In *Lebensbilder aus dem bayerischen Schwaben*, 5:45–69. Munich, 1956.
- Waitz, Georg, and Gerhard Seliger. *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*. Vol. 6. 2nd ed. Berlin, 1896; rpt., Darmstadt and Graz, 1956.
- Walther, Peter T., and Wolfgang Ernst. "Ernst H. Kantorowicz: Eine Archäobiographische Skizze." In *Geschichtskörper*, ed. Ernst and Wismann, 207–31.
- Wattenbach, Wilhelm, and Robert Holtzmann. *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter: Die Zeit der Sachsen und Salier*. Vol. 1. Rev. ed. Cologne, 1967.
- Weinfurter, Stefan. *Die Geschichte der Eichstätter Bischöfe des Anonymus Haserensis*. Eichstätter Studien, n.s., 24. Regensburg, 1987.
- . *Heinrich II. (1002–1024): Herrscher am Ende der Zeiten*. Regensburg, 1999.
- . "Herrschaftslegitimation und Königsautorität im Wandel: Die Salier und ihr Dom zu Speyer." In *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 1:55–96.
- . "Kaiser Heinrich II. (1002–1024)—ein Herrscher aus Bayern." *Oberbayerisches Archiv* 122 (1998): 31–55.
- . *The Salian Century: Main Currents in an Age of Transition*. Trans. Barbara M. Bowlus. Philadelphia, 1999.
- . "Die Salier und das Reich." Introduction to *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 1:1–20.
- . "Die Zentralisierung der Herrschaftsgewalt im Reich durch Kaiser Heinrich II." *HJ* 106 (1986): 241–97.
- Weinfurter, Stefan, et al., eds. *Die Salier und das Reich*. 3 vols. Sigmaringen, 1991.
- Weissensteiner, Johann. *Tegernsee, die Bayern und Österreich*. Archiv für österreichische Geschichte, 133. Vienna, 1983.
- Weltin, Max. "Ascherichsbrugge—Das Werden einer Stadt an der Grenze." *Mitteilungen aus dem Niederösterreichischen Landesarchiv* 10 (1986/87): 1–42.
- Wendehorst, Alfred. *Das Bistum Würzburg 1*. Germania Sacra, n.s., 1. Berlin, 1962.
- Wenskus, Reinhard. "Adel." In *Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde*, 1:60–75. Berlin, 1973.
- . *Stammesbildung und Verfassung: Das Werden der frühmittelalterlichen "gentes"*. 2nd ed. Cologne, 1967.
- . *Studien zur historisch-politischen Gedankenwelt Bruns von Querfurt*. Mitteldeutsche Forschungen, 5. Münster, 1956.
- Werle, Hans. "Titelherzogtum und Herzogsherrschaft." *ZRG GA* 73 (1956): 225–99.
- Werner, Karl Ferdinand. "Heeresorganisation und Kriegführung im deutschen Königreich des 10. und 11. Jahrhunderts." In *Ordinamenti militari in occidente nell'alto Medioevo*, Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto Medioevo, 15, 2:791–856. Spoleto, 1968. Rpt. in *Structures*.
- . "Das hochmittelalterliche Imperium im politischen Bewußtsein Frankreichs (10.–12. Jahrhundert)." *HZ* 200 (1965): 1–60. Rpt. in *Structures*.
- . "Die Nachkommen Karls des Großen bis zum Jahre 1000?" In *Karl der Große*, 4:403–84. Düsseldorf, 1967.
- . *Structures politiques du monde franc (VIe–XIIIe siècle)*. London, 1979.
- . "Westfranken—Frankreich unter den Spätkarolingern und frühen Kapetingern (888–1060)." In *Vom Frankenreich zur Entfaltung Deutschlands und Frankreichs*, 225–77. Sigmaringen, 1984.
- Werner, Matthias. "Der Herzog von Lothringen in salischer Zeit." In *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 1:367–473.

- Wiessner, Heinz. *Das Bistum Naumburg I. Germania Sacra*, n.s., 35, pt. 1. Berlin, 1997.
- Wolf, Armin. "Königskandidatur und Königsverwandtschaft." *DA* 47 (1991): 45–117.
- . "Wer war Kuno 'von Öhningen?'" *DA* 36 (1980): 25–83.
- Wolfram, Herwig. "Augustus." In *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. 1, cols. 1232f. Munich, 1980.
- . "Die Gesandtschaft Konrads II. nach Konstantinopel (1027/29)." *MIÖG* 100 (1992): 161–74.
- . *Grenzen und Räume: Geschichte Österreichs vor seiner Entstehung, 378–907*. Österreichische Geschichte. Vienna, 1995.
- . *History of the Goths*. Trans. Thomas J. Dunlap. Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1988.
- . *Intitulatio II: Lateinische Herrscher- und Fürstentitel im 9. und 10. Jahrhundert* (*MIÖG*, suppl. vol. 24). Vienna, 1973.
- . "Die Ministerialen und das werdende Land." In *Die Kuenringer: Das Werden des Landes Niederösterreich*, Katalog des Niederösterreichischen Landesmuseums, n.s., 110:8–19. Vienna, 1981.
- . "Rezension 'Die Salier': Bemerkungen zu achtzehn Bänden." *DA* 49 (1993): 171–88.
- . *The Roman Empire and Its Germanic Peoples*. Trans. Thomas J. Dunlap. Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1997.
- . *Salzburg, Bayern, Österreich: Die Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum und die Quellen ihrer Zeit* (*MIÖG*, suppl. vol. 31). Vienna, 1995.
- . *Splendor Imperii: Die Epiphanie von Tugend und Heil in Herrschaft und Reich* (*MIÖG*, suppl. vol. 20, pt. 3). Vienna, 1963.
- . "Überlegungen zur Datierung der Wiener Reichskrone." *MIÖG* 78 (1970): 84–93.
- . "Wortbruch 1: Nachträge zu 'Salzburg, Bayern, Österreich.'" *MIÖG* 105 (1997): 467–71.
- . "Zisterziensergründung und Ministerialität am Beispiel Zwettl." *Jahrbuch des Vereins für Landeskunde von Niederösterreich*, n.s., 46/47 (1981): 1–39.
- , ed. *Intitulatio I: Lateinische Königs- und Fürstentitel im 9. und 10. Jahrhundert* (*MIÖG*, suppl. vol. 21). Vienna, 1967.
- Wolfram, Herwig, and Anton Scharer, eds. *Intitulatio III: Lateinische Herrschertitel und Herrschertitulationen vom 7. bis zum 13. Jahrhundert* (*MIÖG*, suppl. vol. 29). Vienna, 1988.
- Wollasch, Joachim. "Cluny und Deutschland." In *Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktinerordens*, 103:7–32. Saint Ottilien, 1992.
- . "Neues zu Froumunds von Tegernsee Briefpartner R." In *Festschrift für Eduard Hlawitschka zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Karl Rudolf Schnith and Roland Pauler, Münchener historische Studien, Abteilung mittelalterliche Geschichte, 5:213–29. Kallmünz/Opf., 1993.
- Wolter, Heinz. *Die Synoden im Reichsgebiet und in Reichsitalien von 916 bis 1056*. Konziliengeschichte, ser. A, Darstellungen. Paderborn, 1988.
- Wühr, Wilhelm. "Die Wiedergeburt Montecassinos unter seinem ersten Reformabt Richer von Niederaltaich († 1055)." *Studi Gregoriani* 3 (1948): 369–450.
- Wunder, Gerd. "Gisela von Schwaben." *Lebensbilder aus Schwaben und Franken* 14 (1980): 1–16.
- Zielinski, Herbert. *Das Reichsepiskopat in spätottonischer und salischer Zeit (1002–1225)*. Vol. 1. Stuttgart, 1984.
- Zimmermann, Harald, ed. *Papsturkunden 896–1046*. Vol. 2. Österreichische Akademie

der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Denkschriften, 177. Vienna, 1985.

Zöllner, Erich. *Geschichte der Franken bis zur Mitte des 6. Jahrhunderts*. Munich, 1970.

Zotz, Thomas. "Die Formierung der Ministerialität." In *Die Salier und das Reich*, ed. Weinfurter et al., 3:3–50.

———. "Zur Grundherrschaft des Königs im Deutschen Reich vom 10. bis zum frühen 13. Jahrhundert." In *Grundherrschaft und bäuerliche Gesellschaft im Hochmittelalter*, ed. Werner Rösener, Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte, 115:76–115. Göttingen, 1995.

INDEX

- Aachen, 57–58
 abbots. *See* monasticism
 Abdinghof, 107, 284
 Abodrites, 186, 217, 223, 236
 Abraham of Freising, 22
 Adalbero II of Basle, 309
 Adalbero of Ebersberg, 334
 Adalbero of Eppenstein, 110
 accord with, 62, 83
 battles with, 40
 death of, 188–89
 dukedom of, 25, 177–80, 185–87, 232, 335
 Egilbert of Freising and, 87, 235, 292, 330
 election of Conrad II and, 178
 Henry III and, 86–87
 Hungary and, 232, 234–35, 332
 military tax and, 110–11
 opposes Conrad II, 72, 76, 84–88, 329–30
 ouster of, 60, 61, 84–88, 235, 238, 292, 329–30, 335–36
 Poppo of Aquileia and, 333–34, 335
 Adalbero II of Metz, 24
 Adalbert (German nobleman), 83
 Adalbert, margrave of Austria, 61, 86, 232, 234
 Adalbert of Hamburg-Bremen, 182–83, 192, 288
 Adalbert of Italy, 75
 Adalbert, count in Alsace, 297
 Adalbert (Italian nobleman), 99
 Adalbert of Saargau, 18
 Adalbold of Utrecht, 90–91
 Adalram of Salzburg, 425n. 15
 Adam of Bremen, 193, 266, 267–68, 282
 Adelheid (daughter of Conrad II), 19, 37, 362n. 33
 Adelheid (daughter of Olderich-Manfred II), 127
 Adelheid of Metz, 18, 19, 27, 88, 201, 283
 Adelheid, abbess of Quedlinburg and Gernode, 58, 94, 141, 185, 345, 370n. 49
 Adelrich, bishop of Asti, 121
 Adenauer, Konrad, xix
 Advent scandal, 272–73, 313, 343
 age of majority, 24, 73
 Agnes of Poitou, 19, 35, 157, 161
 Alamannia, 6, 204
 Alberada of Möllenbeck, 291
 Alberic of Como, 43, 96, 310
 Albert Azzo II, 127
 Albinus, abbot of Tegernsee, 301–3
 Alciun, 282
 Allstedt, 223, 344
 Althoff, Gerd, xvi
 Altmark, 207, 211, 221
 Alzeco-Alcious, 179
 Ambrose (anti-archbishop of Milan), 131
 Ambrose, Saint, 130
 Ambrose of San Ponziano, 60
 Anjou, count of, 74
Annales Hildesheimenses, 215
Annals of the German Empire under Conrad II (Bresslau), xvii–xviii, 250, 328
 Anno II of Cologne, 284
 Anselm, Count, 81
 Ansgar of Hamburg-Bremen, 265
 Apulia, 4, 109–10, 238
 Aquileia, 126, 155, 160, 252, 292–93. *See also* Poppo of Aquileia
 archbishoprics. *See also* bishoprics; *individual archbishops*
 of Cologne, 252–53, 263–65
 governance, role of in, 7–8
 of Hamburg-Bremen, 252–53, 265–68
 of Italian kingdom, 293
 of Magdeburg, 252–53, 268
 of Mainz, 7, 56–57, 252–53, 255–63
 policies toward, 252–54, 290, 330–31
 of Salzburg, 192, 252–53, 268–70
 of Trier, 252–53, 268
 archchancellorships. *See also* chancellorships; *individual archchancellors*
 in Frankish kingdom, 261
 in Italian kingdom, 56–57, 256, 260–61, 264, 265
 held by archbishop of Mainz, 255–56
 overview of, 52–53
 archchaplains, 52, 255
 Arduin, margrave of Ivrea, 23, 64, 97, 98, 256, 322
 Arezzo, 120, 133, 310

- Aribert of Milan
 arrest of, 123–24, 292
 Burgundy kingdom and, 244
 at coronation of Conrad II, 97, 102–3,
 105–6, 118
 excommunication of, 123–25, 133, 293, 313
 opposes Conrad II, 76, 119, 123–27,
 130–32, 137, 245, 292, 293, 330–31
 at royal progress, 62–63, 64
 supports Conrad II, 98, 100, 118–19
valvassores rebellion and, 8, 121, 122
- Aribo of Mainz
 as archbishop, 256–59, 263, 290
 as archchancellor, 52, 53, 56–57, 104–5, 256
 Basle and, 309
 at coronation of Conrad II, 46–49, 51,
 104–5, 257, 258, 331
 Cunigunde, Empress, and, 42, 257
 death of, 94, 119, 259, 261, 264
 diplomas and, 258, 261, 324
 at election of Conrad II, 44
 at Frankfurt, synod of, 198, 259, 264, 312
 Gandersheim and, 90–94, 258, 259, 312,
 327, 338
 Gisela and, 46–48, 257
 in Italian kingdom, 95
 in royal chapel, 52
 at royal progress, 59, 60, 90, 257–58
- Arnold, Wilhelm, 28
- Arnold of Hersfeld, 298
- Arnold of Wels-Lambach, 61, 87, 188, 231–32,
 234
- Arnulf of Bavaria, 171, 227, 361n. 20
- Arnulf of Carinthia, 224, 295, 335, 337
- Arpad family, 210, 228
- Atenolf, 135
- Augsburg, 59–60, 66, 72, 81, 95, 116, 119, 217,
 253, 271, 273–74. *See also* Bruno of
- Augsburg
- Austria, 334
- Avars, 206
- Azecho of Worms
 as bishop, 84, 91, 275–76, 277–78, 290
 diplomas for, 275
 Gunhild and, 55
 pilgrimages and, 402n. 5
 Wolfram, crypt of, and, 28
- Balderic of Liège, 182
- Balderic of Speyer, 279
- Bamberg, 41, 53, 61, 84, 254
- Bardo of Mainz
 as archbishop, 122, 256, 259–63, 290
 as archchancellor, 260–61
 diplomas and, 261
- Gandersheim and, 94, 261
 monasticism and, 262–63, 298
 at royal progress, 262
 social class and, 172
- Basil II, 135, 137, 199, 200, 237
- Basilius of Montecassino, 299, 316
- Basle, 3–4, 64–67, 252, 309
- battles
 with Adalbero of Eppenstein, 40
 with Bohemia, 231
 for Burgundy kingdom, 240–44, 326–27
 at Campo Malo, 120–22
 in Capua, 135–36
 of Conrad the Red, 71
 of Conrad the Younger, 40
 of Conrad II, generally, 38–40, 341
 of Ernest I, 23
 of Ernest II, 83
 of Henry III, 136, 221
 on Hermann of Reichenau, 40
 with Hungary, 229–32
 in Italian kingdom, 120–22, 124–27,
 130–31, 135–36
 in Kyburg, 116
 in Milan, 120–22, 124–27, 130–31
 of Otto of Carinthia, 23, 50
 of Otto of Hammerstein, 23
 in Pavia, 98–99
 of Pilgrim of Cologne, 135
 with Poland, 217–20, 231, 236–37, 322
 of Poppo of Aquileia, 135
 in Ravenna, 99–101
 of Saxony, 221–24
 Val Sugana, 23, 33, 50, 111
- Bautzen, 64, 212, 214, 218
- Bavaria
 diplomas on, 234
 dukedom of, 114, 141, 142–43, 177, 180–82,
 186–87, 229, 230
 Emeric and, 229, 235
 extent of, 114–15, 191–92
 governance of, 5
 Henry II and, 187
 Hungary and, 218–19, 227–29, 231–35
 language in, 5
 Liutizi and, 222
 ministerialage in, 175
 royal progress in, 59–60, 84
- Beatrice (daughter of Conrad II), 21, 37, 38,
 370n. 49
- Beatrice (daughter of Frederick II of Upper
 Lotharingia), 37, 76, 127, 389n. 39
- Beatrice (daughter of Henry III), 142
- Beatrice (sister of Gisela), 25, 31, 40, 62, 65,
 72, 84

- Bede, 273
 Belgern, 218
 Benedictbeuern, 107, 299, 302–3, 315
 Benedict VIII, 135, 331
 Benedict IX, 108, 125, 131, 133, 293, 313
 benefices, system of, 10
 Benevento, 4, 101, 109, 133–35, 178
 Berengar, 170
 Bern of Reichenau, 43, 66–67, 264, 273, 287
 Bernard (count), 192–93
 Bernard (margrave), 176
 Bernard I, 180, 185
 Bernard II
 dukedom of, 177, 180–86, 223
 election of Conrad II and, 179, 184–85
 Gottschalk and, 217
 at royal progress, 59
 Saxony and, 221
 social class and, 177
 Bernward of Hildesheim, 89–90
 Berta (aunt of Gisela), 65
 Bertha of Turin, 96, 132, 223
 Berthold (monk at Donauworth), 201
 Berthold, Duke, 361n. 20
 Berthold-Bertholf, Count, 130–31
 Bertrada/Beatrix, 191
 Bertulf, 297
 Besancon, 252
 Bezelin-Alebrand, 192, 266–68
 Bezprym, 214, 219–20
Biographical Sketches of Medieval Figures
 (Goez), xvii
 bishoprics. *See also* archbishoprics; *individual bishops*
 of Aachen, 57–58
 of Aquileia, 292–93
 of Arezzo, 310
 of Augsburg, 273–74
 of Bamberg, 53
 of Basle, 309
 of Burgundian kingdom, 293
 of Constance, 287–88
 of Eichstätt, 278–79
 of Freising, 192, 291–92
 governance, role of in, 7–8
 of Halberstadt, 175, 288–89
 of Hildesheim, 282–83
 of Italian kingdom, 126–27, 293
 of Ivrea, 64
 of Liège, 310
 of Metz, 274–75
 of Minden, 291
 of Naumburg, 165, 211, 216
 of Novara, 64
 of Paderborn, 265, 284–86
 policies toward, 252–54, 290–91, 315–16, 330–31
 of Regensburg, 283–84
 simony and, 308–11
 of Speyer, 20, 162–65, 279–80
 of Strasbourg, 271–73
 of Toul, 286
 of Worms, 91, 258, 275–78, 280, 300, 317
 of Würzburg, 75, 280–82, 300, 317
 of Zeitz, 165, 211, 216
 Bismarck, Otto von, xix, 329
 Bodfeld, 214
 Bohemia
 battles with, 231
 extent of, 3, 208, 209–10
 foreign policy on, 224–27, 231, 237
 Henry II and, 211–12, 225, 237
 Henry III and, 220, 226
 Hungary and, 219, 226, 228
 Liutizi and, 223
 Moravia and, 218, 220
 Poland and, 220, 224–26, 236
 Boleslav II of Bohemia, 225
 Boleslaw Chrobry, 33, 185, 208, 211–14, 225, 237
 Boniface, 7, 255
 Boniface of Canossa
 Burgundy kingdom and, 118, 243–44
 marriage of, 127, 389n. 39
 at Nijmegen court diet of 1036, 119–20, 122, 326
 royal court of 1038 hosted by, 132–33
 supports Conrad II, 118, 190
 books of life, 66, 167–68
 Bozen/Bolzano, 4, 111–12
 Branthog of Halberstadt, 90, 199, 288
 Brauweiler, 264, 297
 Breme/Bremeto, 99, 309–10
 Bremen. *See* Hamburg-Bremen
 Bresslau, Harry
 on the church, 249, 250
 on Ernest II, 76–77
 on Hungary, 232
 Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs unter Konrad II, xvii–xviii
 on politics, 328, 329
 on simony, 308
 Bretislav of Bohemia, 219, 222, 226–27, 237
 Brixen/Bressanone, 8, 80, 111–13, 115–16, 137, 404n. 45
 Bruchsal, 17, 21, 76, 192, 360n. 10
 Bruno of Augsburg
 on Bamberg, 374n. 29
 as bishop, 273–74
 at coronation of Conrad II, 104, 141, 385n. 61

- Bruno of Augsburg (*continued*)
 death of, 114, 231, 274
 Ellinger of Tegernsee and, 301
 Gandersheim and, 90–91, 92, 93
 Henry II and, 228
 Henry III and, 22, 79, 95, 114, 141, 187, 273
 Hungary and, 228
 in royal court, 51–52, 271, 291
 at royal progress, 59, 62
- Bruno of Brunswick, 32–33, 34, 37, 38
- Bruno of Minden, 130, 291
- Bruno of Toul, 116, 241, 286
- Bruno of Würzburg
 at Augsburg court diet of 1036, 119
 as bishop, 75, 280–82
 Carinthia and, 86
 as chancellor, 75, 111, 119, 281–82, 387n. 95
 death of, 282
 as emissary, 189
 Gebhard III of Regensburg and, 88
 in Italian kingdom, 122
 Wazo of Liège and, 260
- Bulgaria, 199
- Burchard of Halberstadt, 288–89, 324, 336
- Burchard II of Lyon, 244–46
- Burchard III of Lyon, 244–46, 244–46, 293, 330–31
- Burchard of Padua, 417n. 64
- Burchard of Saint Emmeram, 122, 125
- Burchard of Worms
 as bishop, 276–77
 Conrad II raised by, 19–20, 20–21, 22–23, 275, 331–32
 death of, 91, 258, 275, 277
 law codes of, 175–77, 251, 276
 on purgatory, 168
 on revenge, 71
- Burckhardt, Jacob, xv
- Burgundy kingdom
 accord with, 51, 239
 annexation of, 2, 4, 75, 219, 239–46, 326–27, 340
 battles for, 241–45, 326–27
 bishoprics of, 8, 293
 Conrad the Younger and, 66
 coronation in, 154–55, 240
 diplomas for, 133
 extent of, 3–4
 Gisela and, 65, 66–67, 72, 75, 116
 Henry III and, 142–43, 153, 240, 246
 Italian kingdom and, 244–45
 language in, 6
 law codes in, 339
 Lotharingia and, 241
 royal progress in, 64–67, 72
- Busendorf/Bouzonville, 297
- Byzantine empire
 accord with, 51, 141–42
 conflict with, 134–35
 diplomas in, 141–42
 embassy to, 197–203, 229, 230, 238
 extent of, 4
- Cambrai, 3, 252, 304, 345
- Campo Malo, 120–22, 130
- capitanei*, 120–22, 128, 172–73
- Capua, 101, 105, 109, 133–36, 155
- Carantania. *See* Carinthia
- Carinthia
 Adalbero of Eppenstein and, 84–88
 Conrad the Younger and, 60, 86–88
 dukedom of, 59, 119, 143, 179, 180, 186–89, 232, 253
 governance of, 5, 18–19
 language in, 6
 royal progress in, 60, 61–62
- Carolingian kingdom
 Church and, 92
 Conrad II and, 44
 eastern Europe and, 204–10
 extent of, 1, 2–4, 177–78, 190–94, 205–208, 233–34
 feudalism in, 6–11, 129
 governance in, 1–2, 4–11, 77–78
 language in, 4–5
 Northern Tier of, 208, 204–24
 social class in, 11–12
- Casimir, 220, 223
- chancellorships. *See also* archchancellorships;
individual chancellors
 in East Frankish-German kingdom,
 56–57, 288–89
 in Italian kingdom, 53, 57, 60, 75, 104–5,
 111, 119, 281–82, 387n. 95
 overview of, 52–53
- Charlemagne
 Conrad II compared with, 48–49, 57–58,
 170, 325
 Frankish kingdom and, 209
 Italian kingdom and, 63, 134
 lineage of, 32
 military and, 174
 vassalage and, 10
- Charles the Simple, 10, 137
- Charles the Younger, 224
- Chiavenna, 6, 96, 113
- childhood, in history, xiv
- Christianity. *See also* church
 Advent scandal, 272–73, 313, 343
 books of life in, 165–68

- coronations and, 154–62
 crosses in, 143–46, 145, 165–66
 crowns in, 146–56
 feast days in, 34, 46, 55, 130–31, 153, 159
 governance and, 8–9, 9–10
 Hungary and, 51
 Northern Tier and, 207–9
 Poland and, 9
 prayer confraternities in, 165–67, 212, 258,
 277, 279–80, 295
 private aspects of, 157–62
 public displays of, 153–62
 Slavs and, 8–9, 220–23
 social class and, 11
 veneration of the crucifix, 165–66
 in West Francia kingdom, 8
 Christopher, Saint, 279
 Chrotildis, 29
 Chuniza, 127
 church. *See also* archbishopsrics; bishopsrics;
 Christianity; monasticism
 ecclesiastical system of, 251–52
 in election of Conrad II, 44–45
 enfeoffment and, 11
 governance, role of in, 7–9, 11
 law codes for, 28, 174–77, 276
 military and, 173–74
 policies toward, 249–51, 252–54, 290–91,
 294–97, 314–17, 322, 331–32
 simony and, 308–11
 synods and, 311–13
 Cittanuova, 192, 293
 Churchill, Winston, xix
 Clovis, King, 15, 17
 Cnut the Great
 accord with, 186, 214, 216, 223, 236,
 266–67
 at coronation of Conrad II, 103–4
 death of, 142, 223
 Liawizo II and, 266–67
 Mieszko II and, 209
 Poland and, 212–13
 Unwan of Hamburg-Bremen and,
 266–67
Codex Aureus (Henry III), 165, 304, 305
 coins, 142, 162, 166, 166, 230
 Cologne, 7, 8, 252–53, 263–66
 commendation, 10
 “Compendium of Canon Laws Practiced at
 the Episcopal Court,” 177
 conflict
 with bishopsrics, 290–91
 at coronations, 99–100, 102–3, 105–6
 for Henry II, 33–34
 in history generally, xvi–xvii
 rituals for resolution of, 77–78, 81,
 241–42
 confraternities. *See* prayer confraternities
 Cono, 297
 Conrad (steward), 52, 174
 Conrad of Burgundy, 32
 Conrad of Carinthia, 21, 23, 25, 26, 40, 188,
 363n. 59
 Conrad of Worms, 164
 Conrad the Red (duke of Lotharingia), 18,
 20, 21, 26, 71, 370n. 49
 Conrad the Younger
 accord with, 50, 75–76, 85, 116, 192, 329
 Aribert of Milan and, 123, 124
 battles of, 40
 birth of, 23, 363n. 59
 burial crown, 155
 Burgundy kingdom and, 66
 Carinthia and, 60, 25–26, 60, 66, 76,
 86–88, 119, 122, 143, 178, 187, 329
 as a count, 26
 death of, 76, 187–88, 347
 divestment of, 25
 at election of Conrad II, 178
 depictions of, 154–55
 in Italian kingdom, 122
 lineage of, 360n. 7
 merchants and, 339
 name of, 16
 opposes Conrad II, 67, 72–73, 73–76
 at royal progress, 60, 66
 succession by possible, 41, 43–45
 Conrad I
 death of, 25, 33
 dukedom of, 19, 24–25
 estate of, 20
 lineage of, 18
 marriage of, 23, 24, 32, 36, 363n. 59
 Conrad II, 110, 160, 165
 banned by Henry II, 40
 birth of, 17–18, 19–20, 30
 burial of, 154, 161, 163, 324, 345–47
 childhood of, 19–25
 children of, 19, 21, 28, 37, 38
 as a count, 26–27
 death of, xiii, 137, 154, 167, 187–88, 265,
 345, 391n. 7
 education of, 22–23, 324
 German, Conrad II as, 15, 17
 health of, 344, 345
 household of, 24, 25, 54–55, 365n. 71
 illegitimacy, question of, 29–30
 inheritance of, 20–21, 27, 75
 itinerancy of, 55–56, 67, 343–45
 language of, 17

- Conrad II (*continued*)
 lineage of, 15–25, 28–30, 46–47
 lordship of, 25–28
 marriage of, 16, 27–28, 32, 35–38, 46–47, 261, 365n. 71
 murder plots against, 186, 288, 336
 name of, xiv, 26, 322–23
 parents of, 18–19, 30
 personality of, 21, 29, 38, 49–50, 249, 323, 324, 328–31
 physical attributes of, 25
 property of, 27
 royal court of, 51–52
 sayings of, 63, 152, 324, 324–28
 scholarship on, xviii, xix–xx
 speeches of, 43, 328
 succession by likely, 41, 43
- Conrad III, 15, 145–47
 Constance, bishopric of, 63, 64, 287–88
 Constance, Queen, 242
 Constantine VIII, 200–201
 Constantinople, 197–203, 229, 230, 237. *See also* Byzantine empire
Constitutio de feudis, 128–30, 171
 Corbetta, 126, 130–31
- coronations
 Christianity and, 153–54, 158–59
 conflicts at, 99–100, 102–3, 105–6
 of Conrad II: in Burgundy kingdom, 153, 239; in Frankish kingdom, 46–50, 151–53, 158, 183, 257, 324; in Italian kingdom, 51, 97, 98, 102–6, 118, 132, 135, 141, 153, 154–56, 189, 197, 258, 268, 269, 341–42
 of Cunignude, Empress, 47–48, 99–100
 customs for, 153–59
 feast days and, 153–54, 158
 of Gisela, 46–48, 56, 102–6, 153, 154–56, 158–59, 257, 258, 263–64, 331
 of Gunhild, 119
 of Henry II, 47–48, 51, 99, 143–44, 151–52, 158
 of Henry III, 85, 112, 141, 153, 154–55, 167, 264
 of Otto II, 149, 151
 pope's role in, 8, 102–3, 153, 392n. 34
 of Stephen I, 227
 types of, 153–54
- Corsica, 4
 Corvey, 59, 85, 90, 335
 Cosmas of Prague, 208
 counts, 5, 6–7, 26–27, 180, 188. *See also individual counts*
- Cremona, 99, 123–24, 131, 293
- crosses
 in crown, 147
 Imperial Cross, 143, 144–45, 146
 True Cross, 144–45, 164, 201, 237
 veneration of the crucifix, 164–65
- crowns, 143–44, 153–155, 161. *See also* coronations
 burial crowns, 155, 347
 imperial crowns, 145–152, 148, 324
- Cunignude, Empress
 Aribo of Mainz and, 257
 coronation of, 47–48, 99–100
 death of, 115
 at election of Conrad II, 45
 Henry II and, 186, 217
 insignia and, 144, 178
 interregnum and, 42–43, 274
 Virgin Mary and, 158
 widow's portion for, 84, 115, 189–90, 191, 269
- Dada, 29
 Daniel, prophet, 289
 David, King, 148, 149–52
Decretum Burchardi (Burchard of Worms), 276, 279
 Dedi (count), 221
 Deville, 274
Deeds of Otto (Hrotsvitha), 151
 Denmark, 3
De rationae temporum (Bede), 273
 Diedenhofen/Thionville, capitulary of, 25, 206–7
 Dietmar (count), 183
 Dietrich of Metz (II), 42, 183, 241, 257, 260, 274–75
 Dietrich I of Upper Lotharingia, 23–24, 43, 57, 72, 74, 75, 177, 178, 183
- diplomas
 Aribo of Mainz and, 258, 261, 324
 for Azecho of Worms, 275
 Bardo of Mainz and, 261
 on Bavaria, 234
 for Bruno of Toul, 241
 for Burgundy kingdom, 133
 in Byzantine empire, 141–42
 of Conrad II, generally, 53–54, 79, 83, 379n. 38, 392n. 34
 of Henry II, 53, 54
 in Italian kingdom, 96, 99, 104–5, 111–13, 128–30, 132–33, 137
 in justice proceedings, 335, 337
 for Luccan monastery, 60
 for Manegold, Count, 201
 for Meinwerk of Paderborn, 161, 324
 for Obermünster nunnery, 165–66, 191
 for Poppo of Aquileia, 85

- for Saint Gall monastery, 60
 - for Salzburg, 269
 - significance of, 52–53
 - for Trento, 111–13
- Dobromir, Prince, 214
- doctors, 54
- Dodico, Count, 57
- Donauwörth, 201–2
- Druthmar, 337
- duchies. *See also individual duchies and dukes; margraviates*
 - of Bavaria, 114, 141–43, 177, 180–82, 186–87, 229, 230
 - of Carinthia, 179, 180, 187–88, 232
 - election of Conrad II and, 44, 178–79, 182–84
 - governance by, 6–7, 177, 179–82
 - of Lotharingia, 179, 181, 182–83, 243
 - military and, 178
 - of Saxony, 179, 180, 181–82, 183–86
 - social class and, 176–82, 189
 - of Swabia, 179, 180–82, 186, 187
 - of Worms, 180
- dynastic appellations, 15–16
- East Frankish Kingdom/East Francia, 2, 5, 6, 60–62, 153, 188, 252
 - archbishoprics and bishoprics of, 7–8, 252
 - archchancellors and chancellors in, 256, 261, 288–89
 - coronation and election in, 17, 46–50, 151–52, 257, 324
 - eastern Europe and, 204–9, 235–37
 - Ebbo of Constance, 287–88. *See also* Ebbo of Worms
 - Ebbo of Worms, 278, 287. *See also* Ebbo of Constance
 - Eberhard of Augsburg, 274
 - Eberhard of Bamberg, 53, 90–91, 115, 119, 256
 - Echternach, 27, 297, 303–4
 - Eckhardt, Karl August, 29
 - economy, 103–4, 190, 339–40. *See also* property
 - extent of, 176–77, 205–10, 233–34
 - Northern Tier of, 206, 207–23
- education
 - of Conrad II, 22–23, 324
 - ecclesiastical, 280, 300
 - of Henry III, 22, 141
 - of Matilda (sister of Burchard of Worms), 276–77
- Egilbert of Freising
 - Adalbero of Eppenstein and, 87, 235, 292, 330
 - at Augsburg court diet of 1036, 119
 - as bishop, 114, 291–92
 - diplomas issued to, 54
 - Ellinger, abbot of Tegernsee and, 301–3
 - enfeoffment of, 191, 234
 - Henry III and, 22, 87, 114, 142, 191, 291
 - Hungary and, 86, 231, 232, 235, 237, 291–92
 - pilgrimages and, 402n. 5
 - at royal progress, 61
 - Saint Castulus monastery and, 334–35
- Eichstätt, 165, 278–79, 283
- Einhard, xiv
- Einhard I of Speyer, 163
- Einhard II of Speyer, 306
- Einsiedeln, 228, 273, 287
- Ekkehard I of Meissen, 58, 215, 224
- Ekkehard I of Saint Gall, 256
- Ekkehard II of Meissen, 86, 184, 215–16, 330, 336
- Ekkehard IV of Saint Gall, 54–55, 256, 315, 422n. 72
- elections, 42–45, 178–79, 182, 183–84, 212, 268
- Ellinger, abbot of Tegernsee, 300–303, 315
- Ello, 264, 297
- embassies, 197–203, 229, 230, 237
- Emeric, 186, 187, 199, 229, 230
- emissaries, 188
- Emma, 191–92, 344
- Emnildis, 214
- endowments, 21, 29, 56, 161, 161–63
- enfeoffment. *See also* property
 - church and, 11
 - by Conrad II, generally, 169–70, 191
 - dukedom and, 177
 - of Egilbert of Freising, 234
 - of Ernest II, 169
 - in feudalism, 10–11, 128–30
 - inheritance of, 192–93
 - social class and, 169–70, 172–73, 174–75
- Engilbert, Count, 112
- Eppo, Count, 170
- Erkens, Franz-Reiner, xvii
- Ernest of Babenburg, 170
- Ernest I
 - battles of, 23
 - children of, 33, 37, 38
 - death of, 34–35, 36
 - dukedom of, 33, 367n. 9
 - marriage of, 32, 33–34, 36
- Ernest II
 - accord with, 79–80, 81, 83, 95, 116, 166, 180, 191, 329
 - battles of, 83

- Ernest II (*continued*)
 birth of, 33, 37
 death of, 38, 187, 287, 325, 368n. 23
 dukedom of, 36, 177, 180, 185–86
 at election of Conrad II, 179
 enfeoffment of, 169
 Gisela and, 79, 95
 Henry III and, 79, 95
 in Italian kingdom, 95
 as *miles*, 170
 opposes Conrad II, 67, 72–73, 75, 76–84, 329
 Poppo of Trier and, 73, 77, 78, 183, 268
 Rudolph III and, 80
- Ethnogenesis and Governance* (Wenskus), xx
- Eudokia, 200
- Europe, eastern, 204–9, 235–37. *See also specific kingdoms*
- European Union, 204–5
- Ezzo, 73, 74, 91–92, 183, 208, 214, 264, 327, 337
- faithfulness, 9–10, 109. *See also honor*
- family ties, 71–72, 176
- feast days, 34, 46, 55, 130–31, 153–54, 158
- Felix, Saint, 107
- Feltre, 111
- feudalism, 6–11, 120–22, 128–30, 168, 171. *See also social class*
- Fichtenau, Heinrich, xv, xx
- Fischa, 230, 233–34
- Flaibert, 188–89
- Flanders, 3, 4, 296
- Folmar, 297
- France, 4, 9, 240–43, 245, 274
- Francia/Frankish kingdom, 1, 2–4, 8, 15, 141, 204, 344
 extent of, 1–4
 Henry III and, 142–43
- Frankfurt, 116–17, 197, 259, 264, 312, 337–38
- Franko, 276
- Fredegar, 77
- Frederick (son of Matilda), 66
- Frederick (count), 81
- Frederick I, 15, 373n. 15
- Frederick II of Upper Lotharingia
 children of, 37
 death of, 183
 dukedom of, 177
 at election of Conrad II, 43, 44, 178, 183
 marriage to Adelheid, 44
 opposes Conrad II, 67, 72, 74
 at royal progress, 66
- Frederick II “the Great,” xiii
- Frederick III of Upper Lotharingia, 66, 183, 243
- Frederick of Lotharingia, 263
- Frederick of Salzburg, 269
- Freising, 8, 191, 291–92
- Fried, Johannes, xiv, xvi
- Froumund of Tegensee, 300
- Fulda, 59, 259, 262, 288, 298
- Gandersheim
 Aribo of Mainz and, 90–94, 258, 259
 Bardo of Mainz and, 94, 261
 dispute over, 89–94
 royal progress and, 59
 synods on, 92–94, 311, 312, 338
- Garden of Delight*, xv
- Gebhard of Ravenna, 417n. 64
- Gebhard of Salzburg, 171–72
- Gebhard I of Regensburg, 23, 50
- Gebhard II of Regensburg, 283
- Gebhard III of Regensburg, 88, 283–84, 312, 338
- genealogy, 31. *See also lineage*
- Gerard of Alsace, 244
- Gerard of Cambrai, 74, 181, 296, 304
- Gerberga (mother of Gisela), 32, 40, 65, 86
- Gergerga of Gandersheim, 151
- Gerbrand, Bishop, 104
- Gerhard I of Regensburg, 50
- Gerhard of Metz, 18, 19, 38–40
- Germania, 1, 204, 205, 308, 356n. 2
- German kingdom. *See Francia/East Frankish kingdom*
- Gernrode, 141
- Gero I, 210
- Gero II, 217
- Gerold of Geneva, 243–44, 245
- Gerold of Werden, 263
- Gesta Ottonis* (Hrotsvitha), 151
- Girard (nephew of Aribert of Milan), 123–24, 127, 132, 137
- Gisela (aunt of Gisela), 65
- Gisela (daughter of Gisela), 32, 33, 37, 38
- Gisela (daughter of Henry II of Bavaria), 227
- Gisela (wife of Conrad II), 39, 110, 160
 abduction of, 34, 35, 37
 Aribo of Mainz and, 46–48, 257
 Bardo of Mainz and, 259, 261, 263
 birth of, 31–32, 35
 Burgundy kingdom and, 65, 66–67, 72, 75, 116
 burial of, 154, 163, 367n. 3
 burial crown, 155
 children of, 32, 33, 37, 38
 the church and, 316
 coronation of, 46–48, 56, 57, 102–6, 153, 154–56, 158–59, 257, 258, 331

- death of, 38, 347
 depictions of, 154–155
 Ekkehard IV and, 55
 Ernest II and, 79, 95
 Gandersheim and, 94
 honor of, 34, 37
 in Italian kingdom, 124, 132, 133, 136
 at Lesum, 192
 Liawizo II and, 266
 lineage of, 16, 31–32, 46–47, 65
 marriages of, 16, 27–28, 32–38, 46–48, 261
 monasticism and, 294, 315
 personality of, 37–38
 physical attributes of, 37
 Poland and, 217, 219
 political engagement of, xviii, xix, 38, 51, 62
 property of, 27, 344
 at royal progress, 62, 66–67, 72
 Saint Gall monastery and, 116, 166
 Swabia and, 81
 Udalrich and, 226
 Werner of Strasbourg and, 202–3
 Worms and, 258
- Godehard of Hersfeld. *See* Godehard of Hildesheim
- Godehard of Hildesheim
 as abbot, 294, 295, 297–98, 300, 314–15
 Aribo of Mainz and, 253
 as bishop, 282–83
 Ellinger, abbot of Tegernsee and, 301–2
 Gandersheim and, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94
- Godehard of Niederalteich. *See* Godehard of Hildesheim
- Godehard of Tegernsee. *See* Godehard of Hildesheim
- Godfrey of Lower Lotharingia, 38–40, 244
- Goess, 256, 294
- Goetz, Curt, xiv
- Goetz, Werner, xvii
- Golden Evangelary* (Henry III), 160, 162, 164
- Gorze, 282, 296, 298, 310
- Gotahelm of Benedictbeuern, 302
- Gottfried, 244
- Gottschalk, 186, 216
- governance. *See also* politics
 of Carinthia, 18–19
 in Carolingian kingdom, 1–2, 4–11, 77–78
 of conflict, 77–78
 by counts, 5, 6–7, 188
 by dukes, 6–7, 179–82
 duties of, 9–10, 49–50
 by margraves, 5, 6–7
- Gozelo I of Lower Lotharingia
 Burgundy kingdom and, 241, 244, 326–27
 dukedom of, 177, 179, 183, 243
 election of Conrad II and, 178
 opposes Conrad II, 57, 182–83
 supports Conrad II, 74
- Grado, 106–9, 228, 229–30, 311–12
- Gran, 225
- Gregory of Tours, 17, 77
- Gregory V, 18, 272, 287
- Gregory VI, 308
- Grillparzer, Franz, 164, 376n. 70
- Grimoald, 178
- Gunhild
 burial of, 163, 307
 children of, 142
 coronation of, 119
 death of, 101, 137, 142, 347
 engagement of, 222
 in Italian kingdom, 124, 132, 136
 marriage of, 55, 104, 119, 142
- Gunther (hermit), 216–217, 226, 299
- Gunther of Salzburg, 184, 268–69
- Hahold, Count, 192–93
- Halberstadt, 174, 288–89
- Hamburg-Bremen, 7, 8, 252–53, 265–68
- Hampe, Karl, 249
- Harderic of Vercelli, 97, 102–3, 105, 131–32, 293
- Harold II, 185
- Havelburg, 210, 220
- Hazecha (sister of Count Bernard), 193
- Hazecha (treasurer at Quedlinburg), 279
- Heliand*, 178
- Helmger of Ceneda, 427n. 85
- Henry (son of Henry I), 114
- Henry II of Bavaria “the Quarrelsome,” 224, 227, 229
- Henry of Lausanne, 347
- Henry of Luxembourg, 230, 304
- Henry of Parma, 43
- Henry of Schweinfurt, 33–34, 41, 181
- Henry of Worms, 16, 18–19, 21, 27, 30, 362n. 39
- Henry I (king of France), 240–41, 242–43, 245, 274, 296
- Henry I (margrave of Austria), 34, 61
- Henry I, 10, 78, 144, 323
- Henry II
 in Apulia, 100–101
 bans Conrad II, 40
 Basle and, 64–66
 Bavaria and, 114, 186

- Henry II (*continued*)
 birth of, 90
 Bohemia and, 210–11, 225, 236
 Boleslaw Chrobry and, 210–12, 236
 Bruno of Augsburg and, 228, 273
 the church and, 252, 253, 256, 294–95, 296, 300, 306, 311, 411n. 22
 coronation of, 47–48, 51, 99, 143–44, 151–52, 158, 306
 crowns of, 143–44, 145, 147, 151–52
 death of, 16, 40–41, 42–43, 63, 227, 371n. 5
 diplomas of, 53, 54
 dukes and, 180–81
 education of, 22
 election of, 32, 43–44
 Gandersheim and, 90
 governance by, 23–24, 26, 63, 78, 321–22
 Hermann II (archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen) and, 267
 Hermann II (duke of Swabia) and, 24, 202–3
 Italian kingdom and, 63, 97, 126, 133, 135, 256
 marriage of, 55
 marriage of Conrad II, feelings on, 36, 47
 Meinwerk of Paderborn and, 284–85
 Obermünster nunnery and, 166
 Odilo of Cluny and, 294
 Otto of Carinthia and, 23
 Paderborn, conflict in, 99–100
 pardons by, 373n. 15
 Poland and, 210–12, 217, 236
 pope and, 26
 Saxony and, 77, 184, 211–12
 on successor, 44
 Trento and, 111, 112
 Venice and, 108, 229
 Virgin Mary and, 158
 Werner of Strasbourg and, 197, 271
 Worms dynasty and, 17
- Henry III, 110, 162, 165
 Adalbero of Eppenstein and, 86–87
 Aribert of Milan and, 131
 battles of, 136, 220
 birth of, 37, 261, 370n. 49
 Bohemia and, 220, 225
 Bruno of Augsburg and, 22, 79, 95, 114, 141, 187, 273
 Bruno of Toul and, 286
 Burchard III of Lyon and, 244
 Burgundy kingdom and, 142–43, 153, 239, 245
 burial of, 163
 children of, 142
 the church and, 252, 308, 309, 310, 330–31
 coronation of, 85, 112, 141, 153, 154–55, 167
 at coronation of Conrad II, 104, 141
 death of, 38
 depictions of, 154–55
 dukedom of, 85, 114, 141, 142–43, 180, 186–88, 230
 education of, 22, 141
 Egilbert of Freising and, 22, 87, 114, 142, 191, 291
 in endowment of 1034, 21, 29
 engagement of, 222
 Ernest II and, 79, 95
 Frankish kingdom and, 142–43
 at funeral procession, 345–47
 Gebhard III of Regensburg and, 283–84
 governance by, xviii, 328
 Hungary and, 85–86, 231–35
 inheritance of, 75
 in Italian kingdom, 124, 130, 132, 136, 293
 knighthood of, 142
 lineage of, 28, 29, 35, 38, 186–87, 363n. 52
 marriage of, 35, 104, 119, 142, 260
 murder plots against, 186, 192
 name of, 29
 Poland and, 220
 Saint Gall monastery and, 116, 166
 Speyer cathedral and, 19, 164
 Stephen I and, 85–86, 219
 succession by, 44, 47, 66, 79, 95, 141–43, 186–88, 343
 Swabia and, 81
 Venice and, 293
 Virgin Mary and, 159
 Wazo of Liège and, 260
- Henry IV, xvi, 17, 24, 28, 170, 300, 325
 Henry V, 15
 Henry VI, 145
 Henry II of Bavaria
 Henry IV of Bavaria. *See* Henry II
 Henry V of Bavaria
 death of, 114, 186, 229
 dukedom of, 177, 180–81, 186
 at election of Conrad II, 178
 interregnum and, 42, 257
 Obermünster nunnery and, 166
- Heribert of Cologne, 264, 278
 Heribert of Eichstätt, 234, 272, 278, 404n. 45
 Heribert of Ravenna, 102–3, 105–6, 124, 312
 Heribrand of Saint-Ghislain, 297, 304–6
 Heriger, 297
 Hermagoras, Saint, 107
 Hermann Billung, 5, 179, 210
 Hermann of Meissen, 59, 184, 211, 215, 235
 Hermann of Reichenau, 25, 36, 38, 40, 72–73, 84, 86

- Hermann II (archbishop of Cologne), 119, 130, 260, 265
- Hermann II (archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen), 267, 288
- Hermann II (duke of Swabia)
- children of, 31–32
 - Henry II and, 24, 202–3
 - lineage of, 32
 - as *miles*, 170
 - succession by seemingly likely, 32, 43–44
 - Werner of Strasbourg and, 271
- Hermann III, 24, 31, 33
- Hermann IV
- birth of, 33, 37
 - death of, 38, 101, 137, 142, 187, 343, 347, 368nn. 21, 23
 - dukedom of, 73, 82, 127, 179, 187
 - marriage of, 127
 - Warmann of Constance and, 287, 419n. 99
- Herrad of Landsberg, xv
- Hersfeld, 259, 297–99
- Herzog Ernest*, 147
- Hevelli, 215
- Hezekiah, King, 148, 149–51, 152
- Hildesheim, 89–94, 282–83
- history, xiii–xvii
- Hohorst, 297
- honor
- family ties and, 71–72
 - in feudalism, 9
 - of Gisela, 34, 37
 - in governance, 9
 - of Liutgard, 34–35
 - in negotiations, 241
 - of Otto of Carinthia, 50
 - for people, 11
- Hortus deliciarum*, xv
- households, 24, 25, 54–55, 365n. 71. *See also* royal court
- Hrotsvitha of Gandersheim, 151, 279
- Hubald of Cremona, 123–24, 131–32, 293
- Hugh of Flavigny, 29, 30
- Hugh III of Egisheim, 18
- Hugh IV of Egisheim, 80
- Hugh of France, 64, 242
- Hugh of Parma, 53, 60, 111, 119
- Humbert of Echernach, 297, 304
- Humbert of Lorsch, 275, 310
- Humbert Whithand, 240, 243
- Hunfried of Magdeburg, 59, 104, 268, 269
- Hungary
- battles with, 230–31
 - Bavaria and, 218, 226–27, 231–35
 - Bohemia and, 218, 225, 227
 - Bulgaria and, 198–99
 - Christianity and, 51
 - Egilbert of Freising and, 291–92
 - extent of, 3
 - foreign policy on, 209, 226–37
 - Henry III and, 85–86, 231–35
 - Moravia and, 224, 226–27
 - Otto I and, 391n. 23
 - peace negotiations with, 231–34
 - Venice and, 199, 209, 228–30, 236–37, 332
- Ida (daughter of Ezzo), 92, 94
- illegitimacy, question of, 29–30
- Imgard-Immula, 128
- Immo/Irmenfred of Arezzo, 277–78, 310
- individuality, xiii–xvii
- Ingelheim, 56, 75
- inheritances, 20–21, 27, 129, 187, 192–93
- insignia, imperial, 143–52, 178, 324–25
- interregnum, 42–43, 274
- Irmgard of Burgundy, 239, 240, 243
- Irmgard of Hammerstein, 36, 46, 88, 259, 263
- Isaiah, 148, 149–50
- Isidore of Seville, 47
- Italian kingdom. *See also* Roman Italy
- after coronation, 109–13
 - battles in, 120–22, 124–27, 130–31, 135–36
 - bishoprics of, 8, 126–27, 293
 - Burgundy kingdom and, 243–44
 - chancellorships in, 53, 56–57, 75, 104–5, 111, 119, 256, 260–61, 264, 265, 281–82, 387n. 95
 - Charlemagne and, 63, 134
 - before coronation, 95–102, 107
 - coronation in, 51, 97, 98, 102–6, 118, 132, 135, 141, 153, 154–56, 189, 197, 258, 268, 269, 341–42
 - diplomas in, 96, 99, 104–5, 111–13, 128–30, 132–33, 137
 - extent of, 1, 3, 4
 - feudalism in, 120–22, 128–30
 - Henry II and, 63, 126, 133, 135, 256
 - Henry III and, 293
 - justice in, 128–30, 137, 171, 326, 339
 - margraves in, 8, 127–28, 182, 188–89
 - marriages linking, 127–28
 - opposition to Conrad II in, 78–79, 98–102, 120–37, 189, 244, 258, 321–22
 - Otto II and, 134
 - Otto III and, 134
 - Pilgrim of Cologne and, 104–5
 - policies toward, 340–41
 - royal progress in, 62–64
 - southern Italy, 109–10, 132–36, 137, 237
 - supports Conrad II, 118–19

- itinerancy, 55–56, 67, 343–45. *See also* royal progress
 Ivrea, 64, 101–2
- Jacob, 149
Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reichs unter Konrad II (Bresslau), xvii–xviii, 250, 328–29
 Jesus Christ, 148, 150, 159, 160, 165
 jewelry, 155–56, 157, 257
 John of Limburg, 297, 306–7
 John I of Speyer, 28
 John XIX
 at coronation of Conrad II, 102, 104
 Grado and, 107, 108, 311–12
 Lyon and, 245
 Milan/Ravenna dispute and, 105
 Naumburg and, 215
 Warmann and, 287, 316
- Judaism, 54, 209
 Judith (grandmother of Conrad II), 18, 21
 Judith (sister of Conrad II), 20, 21
 Judith of Schweinfurt, 225
 justice. *See also* law codes
 for Adalbero of Eppenstein, 86–87
 for Aribert of Milan, 123
 at coronation of Conrad II, 49–50
 dukes, role of in, 180
 on Gandersheim, 93–94
 in Grado dispute, 107, 108
 in Italian kingdom, 137, 326
 margraves, role of in, 188–89
 in Milan/Ravenna dispute, 105–6
 in military tax dispute, 110–11
 policies toward, 333–40
 in Saxony, 185–86
 synods for, 311–13
- Kadeloh of Naumburg, 122, 131, 133, 188–89
Kaiser Konrad II. und seine Zeit (Trillmich), xvii
 Kamba, 42–45, 60, 178
 Kantorowicz, Ernst, xv
 Kempten, 80, 169, 295, 303
 Kiev, 211, 214, 236
 Klausen/Chiusa, 112
 knighthood. *See* vassalage
 Kohl, Helmut, xix, 333
 Kraich (region), 27
 Kraus, Karl, 71
 Kreisky, Bruno, xix
 Kyburg, 116
- lances, 144
 Lang, Matthäus, 367n. 2
 language, 4–5, 17
- Langobards, 1, 4, 8, 63, 64, 96, 98, 101, 108, 110, 118, 134–35, 137, 153, 339
 law codes. *See also* justice
 in Burgundy kingdom, 339
 the church and, 28, 174, 175–76, 276
 in Italian kingdom, 128–30, 171, 339
 property and, 191
 in Saxony, 338–39
 social class and, 174–76
Lebensbilder aus dem Mittelalter (Goez), xvii
Lebensordnungen des 10. Jahrhunderts (Fichtenau), xx
 Le Goff, Jacques, xiv–xv
 Leitha, 233–234
 Leitzkau, 217, 218
 Leno, monastery of, 136, 188, 299
 Leo of Vercelli, 43, 64, 96–97, 97–98, 383n. 8
 Leo IX. *See* Bruno of Toul
 Lesum, 192–3, 344
Lex familiae Wormatiensis ecclesiae, 174, 175, 176
 Lex Gundobada, 339
 Liawizo/Libentius II, 185, 266–67
 Liège, 8, 58, 310
Life and Times of Emperor Conrad II (Trillmich), xvii
Life of Burchar. *See* *Vita Burchardi*
The Life of Walter the Strong-Handed (Ekkehard I), 256
 likeness, xv–xvi
 Limburg an der Haardt
 church at, 28, 159–61
 crucifix at, 164
 Gisela's property at, 27
 Gunhild buried at, 163
 law code for, 175–76, 397n. 30
 monasticism at, 297, 306, 307, 360n. 10
 stays at, 75, 161
- lineage
 of Charlemagne, 32
 of Conrad I, 18
 of Conrad II, 15–25, 28–30, 46–47
 of Conrad the Younger, 360n. 7
 of Gisela (wife of Conrad II), 16, 31–32, 46–47, 65
 of Henry III, 28, 29, 35, 38, 186–87, 363n. 52
 of Henry of Worms, 16, 18–19
 of Hermann II (duke of Swabia), 32
 of Otto I, 18
 of Otto II, 29–30
 of Otto III, 29
- Liudgar (count), 191
 Liudolf (son of Gisela)
 accord with, 83

- birth of, 32, 33, 37
 death of, 38, 343
 Liudolf, Count, distinguished from,
 368n. 12
 Liudolf (son of Otto I), 114, 149, 251
 Liudolf (steward), 52
 Liudprand of Cremona, 199, 235
 Liutgard, 18, 34–35, 323
 Liutizi, 210–12, 215, 217–23, 235, 236. *See also*
 Slavs
Living in the Tenth Century (Fichtenau), xx
 Lombards. *See* Italian kingdom
 Lorch, 207
 Lorsch, 58, 280, 310
 Lothar I, 95
 Lotharingia
 accord with, 50
 annexation of, 2–3, 18
 Burgundy kingdom and, 240, 244
 the church and, 250
 dukedom of, 179, 181, 182–83, 243
 governance of, 5
 language in, 6
 opposes Conrad II, 67, 72–76, 182–83
 Poland and, 73–74
 royal progress in, 56–58, 183
 Louis of Chiny, 74
 Louis the German, 2–3, 223, 255
 Louis the Pious, 3, 95, 149, 223, 265
 Louis IV, 32
 Lucca, 60
 Luizo of Brandenburg, 218
 Lul, 255
 Lusatia, 210, 217, 218
 Lusshardt, 76, 191
 Lyon, 244–45, 293, 330–31

 M(a)egingaud of Trier, 36
 Magdeburg, 7, 8, 55, 59, 252–53, 268
Magic Flute (Mozart), xv–xvi
 Magnus, 172–73, 175
 Mainz. *See also* Bardo of Mainz
 archbishopric of, 7, 56–57, 252–53, 255–63
 archchancellorship of, 255–56
 archchaplain of, 255
 cathedral of, 122, 262
 Gandersheim and, 89–94
 Manegold, Count, 83
 Manegold I of Donauworth, 142, 198, 199,
 201–2
 Manfred of Turin. *See* Olderich-Manfred II
 marches, 206–7, 209–10
 margraviates. *See also* duchies; *individual*
 margraves
 governance by, 5, 6–7

 in Italian kingdom, generally, 8, 127–28,
 182, 188–89
 justice, role of in, 188–89
 social class of, 180
 Matilda (daughter of Boleslaw I), 128, 222,
 223, 311, 312
 Matilda (daughter of Conrad II)
 birth of, 37, 38, 79, 370n. 49
 burial of, 159
 death of, 38, 370n. 49
 engagement of, 38, 240, 242–43, 370n. 54
 Matilda (daughter of Louis IV), 32
 Matilda (daughter of Otto II), 91–92, 265,
 327
 Matilda (sister of Burchard of Worms),
 276–77
 Matilda (sister of Sophie of Gandersheim),
 327
 Matilda of Canossa, 127
 Matilda of Nonnenmunster, 276–7, 279
 Matilda of Swabia
 accord with, 50, 75
 birth of, 31, 35
 burial of, 21
 children of, 37
 Ekkehard IV and, 55
 endowment of 1034 and, 21
 marriage of, 23, 24, 32, 36, 363n. 59
 Mieszko II and, 214
 opposes Conrad II, 72, 73
 at royal progress, 66
 Matthew, Apostle, 158
 Maurice, Saint, 144
 Maximilian I, 367n. 2
 Meginhard/Meinhard of Würzburg, 90–91,
 280
 Meinwerk of Paderborn
 as bishop, 284–86
 at coronation of Conrad II, 385n. 61
 death of, 284
 Dietmar and, 183
 diplomas for, 161, 324
 enfcoffment of, 191
 Gandersheim and, 90–91
 Grado and, 107–8
 interregnum and, 43
 Meissen, 210
 memorial books. *See* books of life
 merchants, 339–40. *See also* economy
 Merovingians, 15, 18, 44, 251
 Merseburg, 59
 metropolitans. *See* archbishoprics
 Metz, 274–75
 Mieszko I, 210, 215, 224

- Mieszko II
 Cnut the Great and, 208–9
 death of, 220
 Lotharingia and, 73–74
 marriage of, 208, 214
 opposes Conrad II, 213–20, 235–36, 326–27
 in prayer confraternity, 211
- Milan
 battles in, 120–22, 124–27, 130–31
 opposition to Conrad II in, 120–32, 293, 330–31
 Ravenna, dispute with, 102–3, 105–6
- military, 110–11, 129, 173–74, 178, 206–7, 209–10. *See also* vassalage
- milites*. *See* vassalage
- Minden, 8, 291
- ministerialage, 168, 171–75, 332
- monasticism
 Bardo of Mainz and, 262–63
 at Benedictbeuern, 302–3
 Branthog of Halberstadt and, 288
 at Breme, 309–10
 at Echternach, 303–4
 Godehard of Hildesheim and, 282
 governance, role of in, 7
 at Hersfeld, 297–99
 at Limburg an der Haardt, 306, 307
 at Lorsch, 310
 at Montecassino, 299, 315
 at Niederalteich, 297–99
 Pilgrim of Cologne and, 264–65
 policies toward, xviii, 294–97, 314–17
 at Saint Gall, 306–7
 at Saint-Ghislain, 304–6
 at Saint Maximin, 307
 at Saint Trond, 315–16
 taxes and, 262–63
 at Tegernsee, 299–303
 Warmann of Constance and, 287
- Montecassino, 101, 133, 135–36, 297, 299, 315
- Moosburg, 114, 291, 295, 334
- Moravia
 Bohemia and, 217, 219
 Bretislav, Prince, and, 225
 extent of, 3, 206
 foreign policy on, 223–24
 Hungary and, 224, 226–27
 Poland and, 225
- Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus, xv–xvi
- Münster, 8
- Murten, 239–240
- Muttenz, 75, 116, 238
- names, 15–17, 27, 322–23
- nationalism, 208
- Naumburg, 164, 210, 215–16, 339
- Nibelungen Not*, 71–72
- Niederalteich, 230, 282, 297–99
- Niedermünster, 61
- Nijmegen, 58, 119–20, 122, 274, 326
- Nonantola, 97, 132
- Norbert of Stavelot, 306–7
- Norital, 80, 111–12
- Northern Tier, 206, 207–8, 209–23
- Novara, 64
- Obermünster, 61, 165–66, 191
- Oda, 211
- Odilo of Breme, 309–10
- Odilo of Cluny
 at coronation of Conrad II, 43, 104, 151–52
 at coronation of Henry II, 151–52
 crown melted down by, 144
 diplomas issued to, 54, 104
 at election of Conrad II, 43
 Lyon and, 245
 Payerne and, 239
 peace negotiations by, 99, 102
- Odo II
 accord with, 83, 274
 Burgundy kingdom and, 238–44
 hereditary claim of, 65
 opposes Conrad II, 74–75, 131–32, 326–27
 Robert II and, 9
- Olderick-Manfred II, 96, 98, 127
- Öhringen, 19, 88, 201, 283
- omens, 344
- On the Calculation of Dates* (Bede), 273
- Orba, 99, 286
- Ordulf, 185
- Orso/Ursus of Grado, 106, 108
- Osnabrück, 8
- Ostarrîchi, 61
- Ostpolitik*, 204–5, 208–9, 235–37
- Otbertini family, 123, 127
- Otloh of Saint Emmeram, 302
- Otto (forgiven at coronation), 49, 50
- Otto of Carinthia
 battles of, 23, 50
 burial of, 16–17
 children of, 18
 death of, 21–22, 24
 dukedom of, 26
 dynasty of, 18, 20, 23
 honor of, 50
 name of, 16
 succession by seemingly likely, 23
- Otto of Freising, 15, 16, 17, 44, 231
- Otto of Hammerstein
 battles of, 23

- inheritance of, 193
 marriage of, 36, 46, 88, 259, 263
- Otto Orseolo, 106, 109, 199, 209, 229
- Otto (son of Boleslaw Chrobry), 218–19
- Otto of Schweinfurt, 128, 222, 223, 312–13
- Otto of Worms. *See* Otto of Carinthia
- Otto William, Count of Burgundy, 75, 242
- Otto I
 ancestor of Conrad II, 18, 30
 crowns of, 149, 150, 151
 Hungary and, 224, 227, 391n. 23
 physical attributes of, 21–22
 reign of, 8–9, 251, 325
 Worms dynasty and, 17
- Otto II
 coronation of, 149, 151
 crowns of, 149, 150, 151, 152
 death of, 224
 Italian kingdom and, 134
 lineage of, 29–30
 monasticism and, 299–300
 Virgin Mary and, 158
- Otto III
 Boleslaw Chrobry and, 210
 death of, 23, 29, 197, 256
 engagement of, 197, 200
 Ezzo and, 327
 Henry of Bavaria and, 224
 Italian kingdom and, 134
 lineage of, 29
 military and, 174
 Poland and, 9, 208, 210
 reign of, 1, 204
 Venice and, 228–29
 Werner of Strasbourg and, 197
- Ottonians, 207
- Pabo, 175
- Paderborn, 59, 99–100, 284–86, 285. *See also*
 Meinwerk of Paderborn
- Pandolph of Benevento, 134
- Pandolph IV, 101, 134, 135, 136
- Pandolph VI, 136
- papacy, 8, 26, 102–3, 153, 331–32, 392n. 34.
See also individual popes
- Parma, 52, 100, 132, 268
- Passau, 8, 227
- Paul the Deacon, 178
- Pavia, 43, 63–64, 98–99, 104, 123–24
- Payerne, 54, 239
- Peter II of Venice, 229
- Peter (nephew of Stephen I), 229
- Peter Damian, 308
- Peter, Saint, 149, 332
- Peter of Como, 256
- Peter of Piacenza, 124, 131–32, 293
- Philip, King, 147
- Piacenza, 99, 122, 126, 292–93
- Piast family, 209, 235, 236
- pilgrimages
 advice on route for, 234
 embassy to Constantinople and, 198–99,
 200, 202, 203, 229, 230
- Pilgrim of Cologne
 as archbishop, 263–65
 at Augsburg court diet of 1036, 119
 battles of, 135
 Carinthia and, 86
 chancellorship of, 119, 260–61, 264
 at coronation of Gisela, 46, 48, 56, 57,
 258, 263–64, 331
 at coronation of Henry III, 141, 264
 death of, 264
 at election of Conrad II, 44–45
 at Frankfurt, synod of, 264
 Italian kingdom and, 95, 104–5, 135
 monasticism and, 264–65
 Prutz and, 115
 at royal progress, 57, 59
 supports Conrad II, 74, 182–83, 257
- Pilgrim (count), 345
- plague, 137
- Poland
 battles with, 217–19, 230, 235–36, 322
 Bohemia and, 219, 224–25, 226, 235
 Christianity and, 9
 Cnut the Great and, 212
 extent of, 3
 Henry II and, 210–12, 217, 236
 Henry III and, 220
 Lotharingia and, 73–74
 Moravia and, 225
 opposition to Conrad II in, 212–20, 230,
 235–36, 322, 326–27
 Otto III and, 9, 208, 210
 Saxony and, 210–11, 214–15, 217–18,
 218–19, 236
 Scandinavia and, 208–9
- politics. *See also* justice
 Conrad II, acumen of, xviii–xix, 51,
 57–58, 57–58, 62, 67, 87, 96, 100, 328
 duchies and, 182, 187
 Gisela, acumen of, xviii, xix, 38, 51, 62, 328
 of Henry II, 321–22
 of Henry III, 328
 military weakness compensated by, 236,
 240
 policies toward, generally, 321–22,
 328–40
 sayings for, 63, 152, 324–28

- Poppo of Aquileia, 110
 accord with, 132, 191
 Adalbero of Eppenstein and, 84–85,
 333–34, 335
 Aribert of Milan and, 123, 124, 292
 battles of, 135
 as bishop, 8, 292–93
 and Conrad II, 76, 105, 289, 290, 330
 death of, 108
 diplomas for, 85
 Grado and, 106–9, 229–30, 311–12
 in Italian kingdom, 135
 military tax and, 110–11
 Venice and, 292–93
 Poppo (count), 335
 Poppo of Stavelot-Malmédy
 as abbot, 74, 240, 250, 295, 296–97,
 306–7, 314–15, 315–16
 death of, 297
 peace negotiations by, 296
 Pilgrim of Cologne and, 264
 Siegfried of Gorze and, 35, 47
 Strasbourg bishopric and, 272
 as student, 294, 296
 Wazo of Liège and, 259–60
 Poppo of Trier
 as archbishop, 36, 268
 Bruno of Toul and, 116, 286
 at coronation of Conrad II, 104, 183, 268
 dispute with, 75
 at election of Conrad II, 178–79, 183, 268
 Ernest II and, 73, 77, 78, 183, 268
 pilgrimage of, 200
 supports Conrad II, 74
 prayer confraternities, 165–66, 211, 258, 277,
 279–80, 295
 Premyslid family, 210, 235, 236
 property. *See also* economy; enfeoffment
 enfeoffment of, 10–11
 royal fisc, 189–93
 in Salzburg, 270
 widow's portion, 84, 115, 189–90, 191,
 269, 344
 Prutz, 115–16
 Quedlinburg, 33, 59
 Raffold of Schönberg, 175
 Rainald I, 242
 Rainer, Margrave, 102
 Rainulf, 136
 Ranke, Leopold von, 204
 Ranshafen, 180
 Ratmund of Niederaltich, 299
 Ravenna, 99–101, 102–3, 105–6, 126
 Regensburg, 8, 59, 61, 114–16, 165–66,
 283–84
 Reginard of Liège, 244, 310, 315–16
 Reginbald II of Speyer, 278–80, 294, 307
 Reginger of Speyer, 161, 279
regna, 1, 4–5, 8, 67, 179–80
 Reichenau, 66–67, 72
 religion. *See* Christianity; church
 Remigius the Confessor, Saint (bishop of
 Rheims), 17
 revenge, 71–72, 100
 Rheims, 252
 Richard of Fulda, 260, 262
 Richard of Metz, 18
 Richard of Saint-Vanne at Verdun, 294–96,
 298
 Richer of Montecassino, 136, 299, 316
 Richeza of Poland, 172, 208, 214, 220, 222,
 265
 Robert I (duke), 238, 242
 Robert II (king), 9, 64, 74, 96, 104, 242,
 296
 Rodulfus Glaber, 35–36, 47, 51, 308
 Rollo/Robert, 137
 Roman Italy, 1, 4, 102–6, 341–42. *See also*
 Italian kingdom
 Romanus III Argyrus, 144, 201
 Rome, 1, 102, 103, 105, 109, 132, 341–342
 Rotho/Rudolph of Paderborn, 133, 263, 286,
 297, 298
 royal chaplains, 52, 53
 royal charters. *See* diplomas
 royal court, 51–52. *See also* household
 royal fisc, 189–93
 royal progress, 56–67, 72, 90, 183, 257–58,
 262. *See also* itinerancy
 Rudolph of Rheinfelden, 17, 325
 Rudolph I of Hapsburg, 159, 164
 Rudolph III of Burgundy
 accord with, 80, 116
 at coronation of Conrad II, 102, 103, 104
 death of, 219, 238, 242
 Ernest II and, 80
 negotiations with, 64–66, 75
 Rule of St. Benedict, 262, 288, 298, 302, 303,
 316
Ruodlieb, 156, 168–69, 171, 240–41
 Rus/Russia, 211, 214, 218, 236
 Säben/Sabiona, 8, 112, 404n. 45
 Saint Castulus monastery, 334–35
 Saint Gall monastery, 54–55, 59, 60, 83, 116,
 166, 306–7
 Saint-Ghislain monastery, 297, 304–6
 Saint Maurice d'Againe, 144, 244

- Saint Maximin monastery, 295, 297, 307
 Saint Trond monastery, 315–16
 Saint Zaccaria, 111
 Salerno, 109, 133–34, 135
 Salian dynasty
 castle of, 23, 364n. 60
 Conrad II in, 15–17, 21–22, 76
 in election of Conrad II, 44
 foundation of, 18, 141–43
 names in, 322–23
 Salzburg, 7, 8, 115, 191, 252–53, 268–70
 San Zeno, 110, 197, 335
 Sardinia, 4
 Saxons/Saxony
 accord with, 50–51, 212
 battles of, 220–23
 Burchard of Halberstadt and, 288–89
 dukedom of, 179, 180, 181–82, 183–86
 in election of Conrad II, 43, 183–84, 212
 Gottschalk and, 185, 216
 governance of, 5
 Henry II and, 184, 211–12
 justice in, 185–86, 338–39
 language in, 5
 Poland and, 210–11, 214–15, 217–19, 236
 royal progress in, 58–59, 90
 Slavs and, 184–85, 220–23, 235
 sayings, 63, 152, 324–28
 Scandinavia, 103–4, 208–9
 scepters, 166
Schatzwurf, 61
 Schieffer, Rudolf, 7
 scholarship, xviii, xix–xx, 280
Scholasticus (Walter of Speyer), 279
 Schramm, Percy Ernst, xvi
 Schwarzach, 161, 295
 seal, imperial, 141–42, 143, 342
 Seligenstadt, 92
 Seliger, 238
servitores, 171–75
 Severus of Prague, 261, 283
 ship metaphor, 63, 152, 324
 Sicily, 4, 134
 Siegfried of Gorze, 35, 47
 Siegfried II of Stade, 59, 176
 Sigibert of Minden, 59, 61, 291
 simony, 308–11
 slavery, 176
 Slavs/Scлавinia, 206
 accord with, 212
 battles with, 220–23, 322, 332
 Christianity and, 8–9
 East Frankish-German kingdom and, 204–209
 in election of Conrad II, 43, 212
 Liutizi, 210–12, 215, 217–23, 235, 236
 opposition to Conrad II by, 220–23, 236, 322
 at royal progress, 59
 Saxony and, 184–85, 220–23, 220–23, 235
 taxes for, 312–13
 social class. *See also* feudalism
 of *capitanei*, 171
 of counts, 180
 duchies and, 176–82, 189
 enfeoffment and, 169–70, 172–73, 174–75
 law codes and, 174–76
 lower stratum in, 168
 of margraves, 180
 middle stratum in, 168–76
 ministerialage, 168, 171–75, 332
 overview of, 11–12, 327–28
 of *servitores*, 171–75
 upper stratum in, 176–89
 of *vassalores*, 171, 172, 188
 vassalage, 10, 120–22, 128–30, 168–74
 Solomon, King, 148, 149, 150–51, 152
 Solothurn, 239, 245
 Sophia (daughter of Frederick II of Upper Lotharingia), 37, 76
 Sophie (daughter of Ezzo), 91–93
 Sophie of Gandersheim
 Adelheid of Quedlinburg and, 184, 345
 Aribo of Mainz and, 259, 327
 Gandersheim dispute and, 89, 90, 91–92, 94
 Godehard of Hildesheim and, 283
 at royal progress, 58, 184
 speeches, 43, 328
 Speyer
 bishopric of, 20, 279–80
 cathedral of, 19, 56, 281, 307
 dynastic appellations and, 360n. 7
 region, 27
 tomb at, 159–64, 346–47
Stammesbildung und Verfassung (Wenskus), xx
 Stephen I
 accord with, 231–35, 236–37
 Bavaria and, 218
 Bohemia and, 218
 Bulgaria and, 198–99
 Christianity and, 51
 coronation of, 227
 Henry III and, 85–86, 219
 marriage of, 227
 pilgrimage route and, 198–99, 202
 Venice and, 51, 109, 209, 229–30
 Stephen IX. *See* Frederick of Lotharingia
 Strasbourg, 271–73
 Styria, 62, 84, 87, 106

- Swabia
 accord with, 116
 castle of, 27
 dukedom of, 142–43, 179, 180–82, 186, 187
 Gisela and, 81
 governance of, 5
 Henry III and, 81
 language in, 6
 opposes Conrad II, 67, 76–84
 royal progress in, 62–64
- Swein Estridson, 192
 Swein Forkbeard, 103
 Switzerland, 245
 synods, 197, 259, 264, 311–13, 337–38
- Tassilo III, 10
 taxes
 justice regarding, 333–34, 335
 for military, 110–11, 129
 monasticism and, 262–63
 from Prutz, 115–16
 for Slavs, 312–13
- Tegernsee, 127, 299–303
 Tellenbach, Gerd, xiii–xiv
 Theodora, 142, 197, 200
 Theodoric the Great, 63
 Theophanu, 29–30, 48, 134, 141, 158, 200, 208
 Thietmar, Count, 192
 Thietmar (margrave), 217
 Thietmar of Merseburg, 34, 35, 36–37, 77, 208
 Thietmar II of Salzburg, 104, 115, 269–70, 303
 Tittenkofen, 334–35
 tonaries, 264
 Toul, 3, 241, 286
 transpersonal kingship
 of Conrad II, generally, 62, 63–64,
 65–66, 67, 115
 history of, 77
 insignia and, 143, 152
 sayings on, 324–25
 travel, 198–200, 234
 Trento, 3, 6, 33, 84, 111–13, 137, 252
 Tribur, 312–13
 Trier, 7–8, 252–53, 268. *See also* Poppo of Trier
 Trillmich, Werner, xvii
 Troia, 101, 133, 136, 138, 237
 True/Holy Cross, 144–45, 164, 201, 237, 345
 Tymme/Thietmar, 283
- Udalrich of Bohemia
 accord with, 219, 326
 Burchard III of Lyon and, 244, 245
 dukedom of, 177–78, 225–26
 election of Conrad II and, 178
 Udalrich of Basle, 309
- Udalrich (chancellor), 53
 Udo of Katlenburg, 191
 Ulm, 81
Unibos, 169
 Unwan of Hamburg-Bremen
 as archbishop, 266–67
 at coronation of Conrad II, 105
 Gerbrand, Bishop, and, 104
 peace negotiations by, 212, 213, 235
 at royal progress, 59
 Urold of Echternach, 303–4
 Uto, 216
 Utrecht, 8, 345–46
- valvasores*, 120–22, 128, 171, 172, 188, 321–22
 Variendus, Count, 427n. 85
 vassalage, 10, 120–22, 128–30, 168–74. *See also*
 military
 veneration of the crucifix, 164–65
- Venice
 Henry II and, 229
 Henry III and, 293
 Hungary and, 199, 209, 228–30, 236–37,
 332
 Otto III and, 228–29
 Poppo of Aquileia and, 106–9, 229–30,
 292–93, 311–12
 travel and, 198, 200
 Vercelli, 96, 98, 293
 Verden, 7, 176
 Verona, 3, 110
 Vescovera, 99
 Vienna, 230–31
 vinedressers, parable of, 304, 305
 Virgin Mary, 162, 165
 on coin, 142, 165
 importance of to Conrad II, 46, 56, 142,
 158–59, 239
 royal veneration of, 158
Vita Burchardi, 19, 276, 287–88
Vita Waltharii manu fortis (Ekkehard I), 256
 Vogelweide, Walter von der, 147
 Voltelini, Hans von, 231
- Waiblingen, 16, 17, 27
 Waimar of Salerno, 134, 136–137
 Walpert, 111
 Walter of Speyer, 159, 269, 279, 338
 Warin (nobleman), 83
 Warmann of Constance, 73, 83, 278, 287, 316
 warrior class, 11–12
 Wazo of Liège, 54, 259–60
 Weinfurter, Stefan, xix–xx
 Weissenburg, monastery of (Alsace), 26–27,
 297

- Weissenburg, monastery of (Bavaria), 83, 191, 304, 397n. 30
- Welf II, 75, 77, 80–81, 112–13, 127, 301
- Wenskus, Reinhard, xx
- Werben, 220, 221, 231
- Werden, 259, 263, 298
- Werla, 43, 180, 184, 288
- Werner (count of Speyer), 20
- Werner (knight), 52, 62, 169
- Werner of Kyburg, 75, 77, 82, 83, 116, 193
- Werner of Strasbourg
 - Basle and, 309
 - as bishop, 271–72
 - at coronation of Conrad II, 197
 - death of, 200, 230, 271
 - embassy to Constantinople and, 197–203
 - Gandersheim and, 92, 93
 - Gisela and, 202–3
 - importance of, 197–98
 - in royal chapel, 197
 - in royal court, 52
- West Francia, 2, 8, 152
- Western (Roman) Empire, 4, 8, 341
- Westphalia, 35, 58–59
- Wezellin-Werigand, 111, 427n. 85
- Wido, 126
- Wigger of Gandersheim, 312
- Wigger of Verden, 59
- William (count), 330
- William of Friesach, 61–62, 85, 88, 232, 330
- William (Italian nobleman), 99
- William of Mainz, 151
- William I of Strasbourg, 18, 271–72, 313, 343
- William V of Aquitaine, 64, 74, 96, 97, 98, 383n. 8
- Willigis of Mainz, 51, 89–90, 93, 224, 256
- Wipo
 - on Adalbero of Eppenstein, 86
 - on ancestry, 17–18
 - on Burgundy kingdom, 240, 340
 - on the church, 250–51
 - on Conrad the Younger, 25–26, 74–75, 76
 - on coronation, 48–49, 102, 239, 340
 - on dukes, 177
 - on education, 22
 - on election, 42–45, 212
 - on embassies, 199–200, 202–3
 - on Ernest II, 81, 82
 - on funeral, 347
 - on Gisela, 32, 37–38
 - on Henry II, 40
 - on Hungary, 231–32
 - on interregnum, 274
 - on Italian kingdom, 96–97, 98, 101–2
 - on Liutizi, 220–21, 222
 - on Mieszko II, 219
 - on *Ostpolitik*, 208
 - on politics, 321, 324–25, 325–26, 328
 - on reign, 391n. 1
 - on royal progress, 62–63, 65–66
 - on Saxony, 184
 - on simony, 309
 - on social class, 169, 170, 172, 178, 180
 - on succession, 41
 - on Udalrich, 226
- witticism, xvi, 324–28
- Wolfgang of Regensburg, 22
- Wolfram (“leading name”), 27–28
- Wolfram (son of Conrad II), 28, 37
- Wolfram of Speyer, 28
- women, 276–77, 279
- Worms
 - bishopric of, 91, 258, 275–78, 280, 300, 317
 - cathedral of, 21, 29
 - dukedom of, 17, 180
 - dynasty of, 16–17, 21, 22, 23, 44, 76, 88
 - Gisela and, 258
 - law code for, 174, 175, 176, 276
 - prayer confraternity at, 165
- Wunstorf, 291
- Würzburg, 62, 75, 280–82, 300, 317
- Yaromir, 22
- Yaroslav, 214
- Zeitz, 164, 210, 215–16
- Zeizolf (“leading name”), 27
- Zoë, 142, 200
- Zorn, Frederick, 28
- Zurich, 240
- Zwentibald, 224