

The Historical Work of Burchard of Ursberg, I: The Ursberg 'Chronicon' Text^{*)}

The early thirteenth-century chronicle of the Premonstratensian canon Burchard, provost of the Swabian convent of Ursberg, is an important source for the later reign of Frederick Barbarossa (A.D. 1152-1190) and more especially for the reigns of his successors Henry VI (1190-1197), Philip of Swabia (1198-1208), Otto IV (1198-1218), and Frederick II (1212-1250). From the time of Henry VI on, the author was recording events which he remembered. While the early part of his work incorporates the universal chronicle of Frutolf-Ekkehard from the Flood to the death of the last Salian, Henry V (1106-1125), and his accounts of the reigns of Lothar of Supplinburg (1125-1137), Conrad III (1138-1152), and the early years of Barbarossa are substantially derived from earlier extant sources, that latter part holds an important place among a relatively few contemporary histories. After the brief efflorescence of historical literature devoted to Barbarossa's first decade as emperor, among which the royally sanctioned biography of Otto of Freising and his continuator Rahewin figures prominently, there is a sudden poverty of contemporary accounts. The only other history from southern Germany as informative as Burchard's on the remaining decades of Barbarossa's life and on the reigns of his sons and Otto IV is Otto of St. Blasien's continuation of the chronicle of Otto of Freising. The St. Blasien historian's work reaches only to A.D. 1209 and for the next twenty years, up to the last entries for the summer of 1230, Burchard's text is uniquely important¹⁾.

*) The following represents the first in a series of articles based on a doctoral dissertation of the same title submitted at Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, in 1981. The author owes special thanks for guidance in its preparation to her graduate chairman, Professor James J. John. She likewise acknowledges the assistance and encouragement of: Professor Dr. Laetitia Boehm, Universität München; Dr. Norbert Backmund, O. Praem., Abtei Windberg; and the manuscript and reference librarians of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek.

¹⁾ Cf. F. GÜTERBOCK, 'Über Otto von St. Blasien, Burchard von Ursberg, und eine unbekannte Welfenquelle mit Ausblick auf die Chiavennafrage', in *Kritische Beiträge zur Geschichte des Mittelalters: Festschrift für Robert Holtzmann* (Berlin, 1933), p. 191; E. KANTOROWICZ, *Frederick the Second, 1194-1250*, trans. E. O. Lorimer (London, 1931; rpt. New York, 1942), p. xxvi; J.W. THOMPSON, *A History of Historical Writing* (New York,

The chronicle of the Ursberg author holds interest, however, for reasons other than the historical information which it records. Burchard's lively Stauffer partisanship, his vehement anti-papalism, and his wide-ranging commentary on turmoil inside Germany and in the church, as well as his selfconscious directness of expression and swift-moving narrative of crucial incidents, enhance his account. Burchard's style is nevertheless inelegant and his work's structure is inconsistent, with some sections of the text showing signs of careful recasting and others of raw drafting; neither style nor structure has provided a focus for scholarly attention to the Ursberg *Chronicon* (hereafter *UC*). Nineteenth- and early twentieth-century work growing from two editions of Burchard's history for *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, the 1874 folio edition by O. Abel and L. Weiland and the 1916 octavo edition by O. Holder-Egger and B. von Simson²), centered on the identification of Burchard's sources and on relationships among his sources, his own account, and other accounts derived from the same or related sources. More recently N. Backmund, in his survey of medieval Premonstratensian historians, investigated Burchard in the context of the historiography of his own order. The former line of inquiry proved more fruitful; Backmund found little in Burchard's chronicle to be symptomatic of its origin from a Premonstratensian house³).

The textual research and source identification performed by the Monumentists and their successors make possible the formulation of questions in the interpretation of *UC* which nevertheless remain unsolved. Burchard's perceptions of history and the role of the historian, evident in those parts of his work which have been shown to be original and in his treatment of the work of other historians, of documentary, and of oral evidence have received little attention. His importance for the history of historiography is nevertheless considerable, since as

1942), I, 198; T.C. VAN CLEVE, *The Emperor Frederick II of Hohenstaufen: Immutator Mundi* (Oxford, 1972), pp. 543-544; N. BACKMUND, *Die mittelalterlichen Geschichtsschreiber des Prämonstratenserordens*, Bibliotheca Analectorum Praemonstratensium 10 (Averbode, 1972), pp. 8, 26.

²) [BURCHARD OF URSBERG], *Burchardi et Cuonradi Urspergensium chronicon*, ed. O. ABEL and L. WEILAND, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores* 23 (Hanover, 1874), 333-383; BURCHARD OF URSBERG, *Chronicon*, ed. O. HOLDER-EGGER and B. VON SIMSON, 2nd ed., *Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum in Usus Scholarum* (Hanover, 1916). Subsequent references to Burchard's text will be to the SSRG edition unless otherwise noted.

³) BACKMUND, *Geschichtsschreiber*, p. 26.

many critics have noted in passing he is conspicuous among medieval historians in his explicit discussion of the aims of historical writing in general and of his personal objectives in the writing of *UC*⁴). These objectives led Burchard into an inventive method. While many medieval historians worked in more than one historical genre — Otto of Freising, for instance, wrote a universal chronicle and a royal biography — Burchard jumbled genres in his sole surviving work. His chronicle reproduces an annalistic universal history, but Burchard added a theoretical preface to that earlier chronicle and included some synthetic historical and biographical passages in addition to annalistic divisions in the sections which he wrote or compiled himself, from the reign of Lothar onward. *UC*'s independent sections are labeled by genre: 'Gesta', 'Anni', 'Hystoria'. The following table illustrates the order in which these major textual divisions appear, with theoretical and synthetic sections marked with an asterisk; all but the first three divisions are clearly rubricated in the sole complete manuscript:

- * Introduction
Frutolf-Ekkehard redaction (Flood to A.D. 1125)
- * Second introduction and review of Frutolf-Ekkehard
- * 'Gesta Lotharii'
'Anni Lotharii'
- * 'Hystoria Cuonradi regis'
'Anni Cuonradi'
- * 'Hystoria Friderici imperatoris'
'Anni Friderici'
'Interpositio de civitate Augusta'
'Anni Hainrici sexti'
- * 'Gesta Philippi'
'Anni Philippi'
'Anni Ottonis' (including Frederick II to A.D. 1230)

The mixed mode of presentation summarized here then seems to merit investigation alongside the political tendentiousness of Burchard's work and its relation to earlier and contemporary sources. Despite increasing attention to medieval theory of historiography and theology of history, however, the historical method of the Premonstratensian provost has not yet been exhaustively studied⁵).

⁴) E.g. BACKMUND, *Geschichtsschreiber*, pp. 12-13.

⁵) See J. SPÖRL's seminal article: 'Das mittelalterliche Geschichtsdenken als Forschungsaufgabe', *Historisches Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft* 53 (1933), 281-303. See also R.D. Ray's review of subsequent literature: 'Medieval Historiography through the Twelfth Century: Problems and Progress of Research', *Viator* 5 (1974), 33-59.

Although, as Backmund's recent essay confirmed, the 1916 *Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum* edition of *UC* begun by Holder-Egger and concluded by Simson has heretofore been regarded as definitive⁶), the textual tradition of Burchard's work is extremely weak and the history of modern scholarship shows a trail of error and misapprehension on issues as basic as the chronicle's attribution. Early editions of the work listed an unnamed 'abbas Urspergensis' as author. A 1569 Basel edition named Conrad of Liechtenau, Burchard's successor as provost of Ursberg, as the historian⁷). In 1764, M. Khuen first showed from autobiographical notices in *UC* that Burchard must have written at least its 'Hystoria Friderici' and the immediately succeeding sections⁸). Ursberg records showed that Conrad succeeded him in 1226, however, and the assumption clung that Conrad must have continued the work from at least that date to its conclusion in 1230. Thus the first MGH edition identified Burchard as the primary author and Conrad of Liechtenau as his continuator.

Burchard's survival past 1226 and his authorship of *UC*'s account of events after that date were proved only in G. Gronau's 1890 dissertation, chiefly on the basis of the stylistic compatibility if the text's late notices with its early sections⁹). Gronau's discovery overturned the work of some redoubtable nineteenth-century students of sources for medieval German history. G. Waitz's conclusions on Frutolf-Ekkehard were qualified;¹⁰) W. von Giesebrecht's lengthy researches into stylistic symptoms of where the Ursberg continuator might have taken up Burchard's work were shown to be worthless. While these interpretations, based upon the plausible but false assumption that the provost-historian died when his administrative successor took office, now hold little interest, the reasons for the initial association of *UC* with Conrad remain relevant. Giesebrecht and his contemporaries may have been so

⁶) BACKMUND, *Geschichtsschreiber*, pp. 32-33.

⁷) [BURCHARD OF URSBERG], *Conradi a Liechtenaw abbatis Urspergensis chronicum absolutissimum a Nino Assyriorum rege usque ad tempora Friderici II* (Basel, 1569).

⁸) M. KHUEN, *Dissertatio historica de Burchardo abbate Urspergensi historiae de Friderico I. imperatore eiusque parentela auctore*, MS. bound with Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Inc. 251m, *passim*.

⁹) G. GRONAU, *Die Ursperger Chronik und ihr Verfasser*, Diss. Berlin 1890, *passim*.

¹⁰) G. WAITZ, *Commentationis de chronici Urspergensi prima parte, eius auctore, fontibus et apud posteros auctoritate specimen*, Diss. Berlin 1836; W. VON GIESEBRECHT, 'Kritische Bemerkungen zur Ursperger Chronik', *Sitzungsberichte der königlichen bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, der philosophisch-, philologischen und historischen Klasse* (1881), I, esp. pp. 223-227.

completely deceived because there was some truth in their misinformation. General acceptance of Gronau's thesis, however, has led subsequent students of Burchard's history to consider the attribution to Conrad as a long, unhappy caesura in the progress of research into the text, rather than as a key to its history.

INCOMPLETION IN THE EXTANT TEXT

The first published mention of Conrad as *UC*'s author in K. Brusch's *Monasteriorum Germaniae praecipuorum*¹¹), on which the attribution of the 1569 printing in turn was based, had derived from an unpublished history of Ursberg's provosts and abbots written in 1524 by the canon Johannes Weissung: *Catalogus necnon epitome omnium rerum gestarum singulorum prelatorum Urspergensium*. Since Weissung's notice of *UC* describes the relationships of Burchard, Conrad, and a monastery fire of the 1220's, careful scrutiny of his text is essential for reconstructing the history of the earlier work's attribution:

Quemadmodum fragmenta ab vi ignis relictia Burchardus composuit, sic Conradus natus ex nobili genere de liechtnaw, prepositus electus, cuius stemma ante duos annos finivit Diemar ultimus, multivaria sua erudicione ac mira sanctimonia, sapienciam cum eloquencia coniunxit, et puerilibus eciam adultis doctissimisque ingeniis, tantam cronicam composuit, quod non minimam partem si mihi centum lingue oraque centum essent, sicut olim poete desiderare, queam exprimere¹²).

Weissung asserted that the provost who succeeded Burchard composed a great history of the fragments which the earlier prelate had already collected from the remains of a disastrous fire, and that the same Conrad was the collateral ancestor of a prominent local family which had only recently died out. The effusiveness with which Weissung mentioned Conrad is conspicuous, and the following passage suggests why. The Ursberg history was eventually published, Weissung said, with the support of a prominent local ecclesiastic:

¹¹) K. BRUSCH, *Chronologia monasteriorum Germaniae praecipuorum* (Sulzbach, 1682), rpt. of *Monasteriorum Germaniae praecipuorum* (Ingolstadt, 1551), pp. 603-604.

¹²) J. WEISSUNG, *Catalogus necnon epitome omnium rerum gestarum singulorum prelatorum Urspergensium*, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 27213-4. Reference is made here to the Clm 27213 version: fol. 18v. Punctuation is modernized in this and subsequent quotations from manuscript sources.

Ac maxime impulsu archiepiscopi augustensis diocesis Heinrici de liechtnaw utriusque iuris doctoris, firmissime credo cor reverendissimi episcopi predixisse de suo genere scriptorem fuisse, cum tam ardenti animo eam curavit per artem impressoriam ad posteros venire, fuit profecto.... Proinde certissimus scriptor [i.e. Conrad], non nomen suum uti authoris in superscriptionem posuit, quemadmodum iam multi iactantuli faciunt, ne sitabundus in vita laudis videretur esse, proximos successores existimavit calculum eius tamquam candidissimum ad posteros proicere. Ideo intitulata sine certo auctore in extrema usque secula fuisset, nisi reverendus Tomas Mang abbas vir antiquitatis studiosissimus, calculum sive doctissimum ingenium posteris enucliasset¹³).

Weissung was indebted for the observation that a Liechtenauer had been *UC*'s author to his abbot, Thomas Mang; the late bishop of Augsburg, Henry of Liechtenau, had according to Weissung sensed the correct attribution which the modesty of his distinguished ancestor had concealed.

The success of the first printing of a history book which had lain virtually unused since the thirteenth century had, by Weissung's time, stimulated speculative inquiry into its authorship; the personal interest of the bishop in whose see were located both the monastery where the text originated and the city where it went to press may have indicated the direction which that investigation took. Because Conrad of Liechtenau had indeed been provost when *UC* closed, the tradition on its authorship which Weissung perpetuated did not seem dubious. Weissung was, however, oblivious to *UC*'s internal evidence for Burchard's authorship, and his garbled description of events in the Ursberg community in Burchard and Conrad's time eventually generated much confusion. His attempt to prove, independently of Mang's assertion, that Conrad had authored *UC* by comparing the text's note at A.D. 1215, 'Eodem anno electus fui et translatus in Ursperc', with his own catalog of Ursberg prelates showed circuitous logic, faulty calculation, and limited familiarity with the chronicle itself¹⁴). Reattribution of the complete *UC* to

¹³) WEISSUNG, fol. 19r.

¹⁴) Cf. *UC*, p. 112; WEISSUNG, fol. 19v; 'Postremo ut cerciorem queam te reddere ipsum Conradum auctorem fuisse, et non ex arena viderer funiculum facere, ipsemet pene in calce sui operis, ubi scribit de synodo Constantiniana et multis aliis se indicat, fuit enim anno ab incarnatione verbi 1215 electus et translatus in Ursberg. Et fundacio prima coenobii urspergensis facta est anno post incarnationem verbi 1125. Facile nunc te docebit catalogus quis fuit'. The catalog in fact shows that it was Burchard, not Conrad.

Burchard has left Weissung's information concerning its authorship and composition in discredit¹⁵). Nevertheless, those aspects of Weissung's statement which cannot be immediately cast out on *UC*'s internal evidence, his association of a destructive fire with the composition of *UC* and his contention that a late version was substantially adulterated, still demand attention. If tendentious reference to Conrad is completely cancelled, the implication is still apparent in Weissung's account that *UC* in its existing form represents a hasty assemblage of pieces of a history, perhaps of the scraps of a library. If examination of the text were to confirm that it was composed quickly and perhaps left incomplete, and if aspects of Burchard's surviving text or its manuscripts were shown to be symptomatic of a later author's intervention, then Weissung's testimony might assume added importance.

The possibility that *UC*'s present form represents only a preliminary effort toward the author's original plan is supported by a scholarly consensus that the provost had little time to work on his chronicle¹⁶). That the prelate had long had such a project in mind is attested by the extent of his collection of inscriptions and of his consultation of sources outside his own monastery. Attempts to determine when various sections of *UC* were originally composed have nevertheless proved inconclusive, since such clues as hindsight comments might or might not have been inserted in the course of revision and recopying¹⁷). The only reliable evidence for the degree of incompleteness of Burchard's work is thus the extent to which it fails to accomplish the general historiographical objectives set forth by the author, if those goals can be successfully deduced from his prefatory discussions.

Some degree of haste and roughness in composition is immediately apparent. The chronicle's final sentence leaves an important issue, the lifting of Frederick II's first excommunication, tantalizingly unresolved, as if the author left his work suddenly with the intention of returning to complete the account, but never did: 'Sane hec compositio, cum non posset perfici eo anno, dilata est in annum sequentum'¹⁸). The final

¹⁵) E.g. BACKMUND, *Geschichtsschreiber*, pp. 10-11.

¹⁶) E.g. O. ABEL, 'Die Ursperger Chronik', *Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 11 (1858), 90; T. LINDNER, 'Zum Chronicon Urspergense', *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 16 (1891), 125; BACKMUND, *Geschichtsschreiber*, p. 12.

¹⁷) E.g. GIESEBRECHT, esp. pp. 226-227; Lindner, pp. 119-125.

¹⁸) *UC*, p. 127.

attention by the original author to any part of the extant *UC* text was probably given at about the same time as the premature conclusion was written, in mid-1230, as Lindner observed¹⁹). Internal evidence suggests when work on the surviving version began. Details remain missing on distant events such as the exact lengths of the twelfth-century papacies of Lucius III and Urban III; surviving manuscripts leave space for the addition of notations on months and days, and so evidently did Burchard's²⁰). Simson asserted and Backmund concurred that the provost began the long historical project which he then left imperfect only shortly before 1230 — probably in 1229 but certainly after the fire during his own prelaty to which Weissung again alluded²¹). Stronger support for this contention than any specific evidence of truncation or omission within the text is the failure, indicated in the tabular summary of *UC*'s contents above, to fulfill apparent intent to alternate annalistic sections with synthetic essays on recent reigns.

Burchard's historical work, then, must be approached with the understanding that it is not precisely what the author meant to shape, but a draft version. Whether it represents a first effort to construct a history from Noah to contemporary times or a later attempt to reconstruct such a work after its loss by fire must remain problematic, since stylistic and structural discontinuities support both interpretations. But in either case — whether *UC* is damaged or merely unfinished — the accuracy of the text established in the SSRG edition on the basis of a few corrupt and closely-related fifteenth-century sources will be an important consideration in defining the author's historiographical significance. Judgment of the faithfulness with which the text as handed down by copyists on the eve of the Reformation communicates the medieval provost's interpretation of historical events and attitude toward the writing of history must precede discussion of his relationship to the twelfth-century models from which he worked and the thirteenth-century contemporaries among whom he lived. In the background of this investigation must remain the qualification that, while a coherent picture of the Premonstratensian's methods and objectives may emerge, it cannot be definitive. Sources on Burchard's life are scanty; only one faulty composition survives from his pen. The *UC* text stands virtually alone as suggestive but uncorroborated

¹⁹) LINDNER, p. 122.

²⁰) *UC*, pp. 58-59.

²¹) SIMSON, intro. to *UC*, pp. x-xi; BACKMUND, *Geschichtsschreiber*, p. 12.

evidence for its author's life as a scholar, imperial partisan, and provost of a small monastic foundation battered in conflict between the imperial cousins of southern Germany, the Welf and Stauffer houses.

THE HISTORY OF THE SURVIVING VERSION

Burchard's autograph of the Ursberg *Chronicon* or any copy which may have been made in the author's lifetime has long since disappeared. No manuscript of his work reached Munich from the Ursberg library upon the dissolution of the house in 1803; one of several late fires which destroyed the monastery between the thirteenth and the nineteenth centuries may have resulted in the loss of the copy belonging to the historian's own house. How long the earliest version remained at Ursberg, even whether it was first preserved there, is therefore difficult to establish. Evidence for the manuscript tradition of Burchard's history extends back little further than the preparation of the *editio princeps* in 1515. Indeed, surviving manuscripts can illuminate the work's transmission up to the sixteenth century only when examined in the context of the earliest printed redactions²²).

Early Editions

Part of Burchard's work was printed before 1500. Copies of an incunable text entitled *Hystoria Friderici imperatoris magni, huius nominis primi ducis Suevorum et parentele sue* are extremely rare, as the Augsburg bibliographer Placidius Braun noted already in the eighteenth century²³). The forty-four-folio printed *Hystoria Friderici* contains

²²) Simson surveys manuscripts and editions; pp. XXXI-XXXVIII. The purpose of further discussion here is to reassess the accuracy of the Ursberg text's transmission, enucleating problems which Simson overlooked or found insignificant, and to correct his few misapprehensions rather than to review and add detail to his generally accurate presentation. Further summaries of manuscript and printed material are: ABEL; GIESEBRECHT; BACKMUND, *Geschichtsschreiber*, pp. 27-33; *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter vom Tode Kaiser Heinrichs V. bis zum Ende des Interregnum*, ed. W. Wattenbach, rev. F.-J. Schmale, I (Darmstadt, 1976), 115. All emphasize the weakness of the tradition.

²³) G.W.F. PANZER, *Annales typographici ab anno MDI ad annum MDXXXVI...Opera Georgii Wolfgangii Panzer...* (Nuremberg, 1798-1803), Augsburg no. 84; L.F.T. HAIN, *Repertorium bibliographicum* (Stuttgart, 1826-1838), no. 8718; *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* (Leipzig, 1925 ff.), no. 5737. Cf. KHUEN, c. 1; C.W. SCHUMACHER, *Beyträge zur deutschen Reichshistorie* (Eisenach, 1770), pp. 64 ff.; P.I. BRAUN, *Notitia historico-literaria de libris ab artis typographicae inventione usque ad annum 1479 impressis*

Burchard's text from A.D. 1152 up to 1230 from his rubric 'Hystoria Friderici imperatoris', but it adds some extraneous matter. At the beginning of the book appears an excursus on Staufer genealogy which jumbles material from *UC*'s account of reigns before Barbarossa's with other sources for the same period and emphasizes the relationship between the dynasty and the Benedictine abbey of Lorch²⁴). The incunable's text is without question based on the full Ursberg history; *UC* is not an expansion of the shorter compilation. *Hystoria Friderici*'s Staufer prologomena seem to have been written in the diocese of Augsburg, possibly at Lorch itself, well after Burchard set aside his history. The only firm *post quem* for their composition indicated by the prefatory additions in the incunable, as P. Brezzi has pointed out in describing a Vatican manuscript based upon it, is the mid-thirteenth century, when relics which those additions mention were translated to the monastery of St. Fides at Sélestat²⁵). Since none of several manuscripts carrying the same text as the printed *Hystoria Friderici* can be dated earlier than its publication and all appear to be copied directly from it, the truncated Ursberg history with Lorch preface was probably assembled specifically for the incunable's production, which a variety of indirect evidence suggests took place in 1472 at the Augsburg abbey of Sts. Ulrich and Afra²⁶). The incunable is of little importance for

(Augsburg, 1788), p. 46; *Literatur in Bayerisch Schwaben von der althochdeutschen Zeit bis zur Gegenwart*, ed. H. PORNACHER *et al.*, Beiträge zur Landeskunde von Schwaben (Weissenhorn, 1979), no. 42b.

²⁴) [BURCHARD OF URSBERG], *Hystoria Friderici imperatoris magni, huius nominis primi ducis Suevorum et parentele sue* (Augsburg, 1472), fols. [2r-10v]. O. ABEL and L. WEILAND edited the incunable where it differs from *UC* for the Monumenta: *Hystoria Friderici imperatoris magni huius nominis primi, ducis Suevorum et parentele sue*, MGH SS 23 (Hanover, 1874), pp. 384-385. See also ABEL, pp. 112-114.

²⁵) ABEL, p. 114. Cf., e.g., *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen* I, 275 and n. 26; P. BREZZI, 'Un manoscritto vaticano dell' *Historia Friderici* già attribuita a Burcardo d'Ursberg', *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 34 (1954), esp. p. 291.

²⁶) The *Hystoria Friderici* manuscript which Brezzi described was dated by the scribe to St. Valentine's Day 1500: Cod. Vat. lat. 9522, fol. 39r; Brezzi, p. 292. The Vatican copy (fols. 1a-39) has been rebound from another large book (old foliation beginning with fol. 252) as the first among tangentially related and roughly contemporary texts. Among its contents, beginning on fol. 67r, is a life of St. Ulrich. The presence of this work points toward a close connection among *UC*, the incunable *Hystoria Friderici*, and Augsburg, where the monastery of Sts. Ulrich and Afra lay.

On the incunable's date, see *Lit. in Bay. Schwab.*, no. 42b. Cf. C. WEHMER, 'Augsburger Schreiber aus der Frühzeit des Buchdrucks', *Beiträge zur Inkunabelkunde*, new ser. 1 (1935), *passim*; WEHMER, 'Ne Italo cedere videamur: Augsburger Buchdrucker und Schreiber um 1500', in *Augusta 955-1955: Forschungen und Studien zur Kultur und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*

reconstructing Burchard's original, since comparison of its partial text with the first printed version of the full *UC* reveals that the latter derives from the same branch of the tradition and represents a common manuscript ancestor more accurately.

Chronicon Abbatis Urspergensis a Nino rege Assyriorum magno usque ad Fridericum II. Romanorum imperatorem — *UC* in substantially the form which modern scholarship assigns to it, the universal chronicle of Frutolf and Ekkehard with Burchard's addenda to 1229 — was printed by Johann Miller at Augsburg in 1515 under an exclusive privilege of the emperor Maximilian. The text of the imperial document, included at the front of the printed volume, reveals that the emperor's counsellor Conrad Peutinger had given a manuscript copy of the Ursberg history to Miller for the purpose of publication. An editorial preface following the privilege shows, however, that neither Peutinger himself nor Miller emended the text, but the Augsburg humanist Joannes Foeniseca or Johann Mader, who asserted that he collated 'unicum...mendosum...exemplar' with some of the chronicle's sources: 'conferentes tamen illud cum reliquis tum chronographis tum historicis, redintegravimus'²⁷).

Several later sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century redactions were increasingly remote from the Ursberg original, since they were grounded in turn on the *editio princeps*. In 1537, Crato Mylius (Kraft Müller) published *UC* with late accretions. Müller's history, printed at Strasbourg, was entitled *Chronicum Abbatis Urspergensis, a Nino...usque ad Fridericum II...*, much like the text of his Augsburg predecessor Miller. But in the Strasbourg edition *Paraleipomena rerum memorabilium, a Friderico II. usque ad Carolum V. Augustum* were added. Müller's book thus brought Burchard's universal and German history up to the present day, with a history of the Holy Roman Empire from the last Staufer and encomia on humanist and Reformation personalities such as Erasmus.

Augsburgs, ed. H. RINN (Augsburg, 1955), pp. 150 ff.; J. HEMMERLE, in *Die Benediktinerklöster in Bayern, Germania Benedictina* 2 (Augsburg, 1970), p. 46. An eighteenth-century edition reproduced the incunable text. See G.A. CHRISTMANN, intro. to [BURCHARD OF URSBERG], *Historia Friderici imperatoris magni hujus nominis primi ducis Suevorum et parentelae suae* (Ulm, 1790), p. 111.

²⁷) [BURCHARD OF URSBERG], *Chronicon abbatis Urspergensis a Nino rege Assyriorum magno usque ad Fridericum II. Romanorum imperatorem*, ed. J. Foeniseca (Augsburg, 1515), title p., verso. The 1515 edition is unfoliated. Subsequent references to its text are to the handwritten column numbers of the New York Public Library copy (Spencer Ger. 1515), cited as *UC* 1515.

The printer Müller's prefatory note to the paralipomena on the Ursberg history described the preparation of the 1537 edition, but neither the volume's front matter nor its historical texts mention the name of the editor of this new *UC* version. Müller refers to the use of handwritten copies of the Ursberg author's sources as well as of two more complete manuscripts for the improvement of readings in the *editio princeps*: one manuscript chronicle was contributed by the bishop of Worms, the other by the Strasbourg humanist Caspar Heyd²⁸). Both manuscripts were labeled as Eusebius' chronicle but, Müller asserts, they were in fact 'ipsissimus Urspergensis'. How far their texts extended is unclear. They may not have been Burchard's work at all but that of his major source authors, Frutolf and Ekkehard. The printer says of the scholar who collated these manuscripts with the prior edition only that he was 'quendam studiosum historiarum'. The *Paraleipomena* text likewise mentions only 'studiosus quidam historiarum'²⁹), as do the volume's general title-page and the subtitle of the late addenda.

Subsequent criticism has concluded that Heyd himself — the source of the collated manuscript — revised the Ursberg text in 1537 from the 1515 edition, added marginal comments, and composed the *Paraleipomena*, thus establishing the expanded form in which Burchard's work was printed throughout the next century³⁰). In the absence of overt acknowledgment of Heyd's work on the 1537 version, with its repeated oblique references to 'studiosus historiarum', this attribution rests on his plain testimony of responsibility for the German *UC* translation, including even more extraneous material, which emerged two years later from the same press, Kraft Müller's in Strasbourg: '*Ein auszerlesne Chronick von anfang der welt bis auff das iar nach Christi unsers eynigen Heylands gepurt M.D.XXXIX... Durch Caspar Hedio Doctor auss dem Latin ins Teutsch gebracht, zuosamen tragen, und beschriben*'³¹).

Why Heyd's name should have been left entirely out of the 1537 chronicle's editorial credits if indeed he were responsible for emendations and additions is not immediately obvious, especially since the same

²⁸) This and subsequent references to this edition are as *UC* 1537. See its p. 343 for discussion of source manuscripts.

²⁹) *UC* 1537, p. 505.

³⁰) E.g. BRAUN, *Notitia...typographicae*, II, 93.

³¹) Subsequent references to this translation are as *UC* 1539. The translation is paginated only in the second and later sections. References in unpaginated sections are to subtitles.

impression identified him as the contributor of a relevant manuscript. The dedication of Heyd's 1539 translation nevertheless says explicitly that he had established the recent Latin version³²). Müller had written in the 1537 edition that it would reveal how Germany had suffered at the hands of the pope, lamenting 'O servitatem Germanico et principe pectore indignissimam'³³). The editorial presentation of the Latin *UC-Paraleipomena* was indeed tendentious, as its printer implied; the thirteenth-century author's anti-papal stance was consistently emphasized³⁴). Perhaps Heyd went unmentioned because such polemical treatment seemed to require concealment. A vernacular work was potentially more inflammatory, though, and two years later Heyd himself was less than subtle about the tendentious purposes of *Ein auszerlesne Chronick*: 'Dise histori wirt von eynem Teutschen zuo Latin beschribenn, so klaeglich, das mans on weynen kaum lesen mag, wie tyrannisch der Papst mit dem lieben Kaiser gehandelt hab'³⁵).

Heyd's and Müller's 1537 printed edition was then — whatever its editor's reasons for obscuring his identity — a revised and expanded version, colored by intervening religious controversy, of Mader's and Miller's redaction. It follows logically that Heyd's 1539 German chronicle, again printed by Müller, was a translated and further expanded version of their 1537 effort. Müller's reprints of both Latin and vernacular chronicles involved no manuscript collation; 1569 Basel and 1609 Strasbourg printings only repeated the contents of the Latin edition of 1537, the 1609 edition appending the unrelated annals of Regino and Lambert and both repeating Heyd's polemical marginal notes though never directly identifying him³⁶). Given Heyd's participation in both Strasbourg chronicle publications of the late 1530's and his immediate successors' ignorance of or inattention to the possibility that further manuscript materials were available, it would indeed be surprising if he had not used his own *UC-Paraleipomena* edition for his German translation. Comparison, however, of the contents of the first three full *UC* printings, excluding the incunable *Hystoria Friderici* — the Latin versions of 1515 and 1537 and the German version of 1539 — reveals

³²) *UC* 1539, 'Vorrede'.

³³) *UC* 1537, p. 345.

³⁴) See, for instance, marginalia in *UC* 1537, pp. 236-237, 321.

³⁵) *UC* 1539, p. 398 (marginal).

³⁶) Like Simson (p. xxxvii), *Repertorium Fontium* errs in listing Müller's 1566 printing as the first German edition of the complete *UC* text: *Repertorium fontium historiae medii aevi*, II (Rome, 1967), 609.

some possibility that Heyd did not use a printed book as he prepared Burchard's chronicle for vernacular presentation. As modern students of the historical work of Burchard of Ursberg have uniformly failed to note, the German chronicle omits some passages present in both the Latin editions.

Heyd's 1537 edition had already modified *UC* even within the chronological limits of Burchard's text proper as printed in the *editio princeps*. The editor had inserted a life of Alexander the Great where the Augsburg edition — following the manuscript on which it was based — had promised information on the Macedonian conqueror but failed to produce it. Heyd found what the Burchard copy and, in turn, Mader had omitted in another Frutolf-Ekkehard manuscript, but judged it unscholarly and introduced in its stead a different biography of Alexander³⁷). The 1539 Heyd translation included his alternative material on Alexander. More interestingly, it completely omitted three passages represented in both 1515 and 1537 editions, passages distinguished in *UC* by their emphatically tendentious content. The translation left out two paragraphs bearing narrowly on the Premonstratensian convent of Ursberg: one, the polemic against Philip of Swabia for his mortgaging of monastic foundations to secular advocates; the other, the record of Ursberg's release from mortgage in 1226³⁸). A third passage is likewise absent from the 1539 translation: 'Gaude, mater nostra Roma...', the bitterest denunciation of the papacy in the *UC* text³⁹).

Heyd might possibly have left specific mention of Ursberg's thirteenth-century difficulties out of his big vernacular history book because it was of only parochial interest. Why he might have chosen to omit the ringing antipapal diatribe is less easily imaginable, since this passage would have served his poorly-veiled tendentious purposes well. If the manuscript which Heyd contributed for the 1537 edition indeed included Burchard's independent work, not just Frutolf's and Ekkehard's, then Heyd might

³⁷) *UC* 1537, p. 13. Cf. 'Excerptum de Alexandro Magno' in [FRUTOLF OF MICHELSBERG and] EKKEHARD OF AURA, *Chronicon*, ed. G. WAITZ, MGH SS 6 (Hanover, 1844), pp. 62 ff.

³⁸) The first omitted Ursberg passage embraces the last lines before 'Anni Philippi', from 'Occasio autem huius rei...': cf. *UC*, pp. 93-94; *UC* 1515, cols. 495-496; *UC* 1537, p. 325; *UC* 1539, p. 534. The second comprises the entry for 1226 from 'Eodem anno ecclesia...' up to 'Eodem anno Agnes...': cf. *UC*, pp. 121-122; *UC* 1515, col. 515; *UC* 1537, p. 337; *UC* 1539, p. 543.

³⁹) The omission extends from 'Gaude...' up to the following rubric, 'De bellis Philippi': *UC*, p. 82; *UC* 1515, col. 490[a]; *UC* 1537, p. 321; *UC* 1539, p. 529.

perhaps have used it for his translation, especially if he began the German version before the 1537 edition went to press. The Heyd manuscript may then have omitted the three passages which his printed translation leaves out and which are linked by their special pleading for the economic welfare of the southwest German church. The discrepancies between his German and Latin *UC* texts, which suggest that a variant version omitting some of the material in the 1515 edition commissioned by Peutinger still existed in the sixteenth century, demand attention in the context of other evidence for the transmission of the Ursberg history.

Manuscripts

The Reformation and Counter-Reformation raised lively argument over the accuracy of the early editions of Burchard's work. The Strasbourg version was Indexed, but ecclesiastical authors at first pointed out that it was the Heyd paralipomena — not the chronicle text proper — which were offensive. Confusion nevertheless soon arose between Heyd's editorial comments and additions and the chronicle itself. The propagandizing interest of commentators, which had first led to the addition of polemical notes and a pro-Protestant continuation, muddled understanding of Burchard's intentions and or the way in which his text had been handed down⁴⁰). Clarification of its history requires consideration of the few extant handwritten copies.

1. Codex latinus monacensis 4351

The Munich *UC* codex, Clm 4351, contains Burchard's work, a few other short works which his original already appended, and still more works related to his text but appended by later copyists⁴¹). It is bound in jumbled order and its parts were copied at different times over the course of nearly thirty years. The following table lists contents and indicates roughly when parts were copied. Groupings bearing parts of Burchard's text are marked with an asterisk. The manuscript's foliation, which omits

⁴⁰) Counter-Reformation leadership denounced Burchard: e.g. R.F.R. BELLARMINE, *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis* (Cologne, 1613), p. 352.

⁴¹) See BAYERISCHE STAATSBIBLIOTHEK, MUNICH, *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum bibliothecae regiae monacensis*, 2nd ed. (Munich, 1892 ff.), no. 4351. The catalogue description identifies the principal contents of the codex as Ekkehard's chronicle. See also *Lit. in Bay. Schwab.*, no. 42a.

uncopied leaves, is preserved but the uncopied leaves are indicated in brackets and lettered from the last preceding numbered leaf⁴²). Marginal notes are included only where they are important for dating the copy. In their absence, loose dates based on the appearance of the script and corroborated by a consensus in published descriptions are indicated; three major folio groupings are distinguished paleographically and codicologically:

- 1) Fols. 1r-[95av]: copied carefully by several barely distinguishable calligraphic hands around A.D. 1470.
 *Fols. 1r-95r — second section of *UC* (beginning at Frutolf-Ekkehard's history of the Goths.)⁴³
 Fols. 95v-[95av] — blank.
- 2) Fols. 96r-[201cv]: copied by hands extremely similar to those of fols. 1 ff.
 *Fols. 96r-201r — third section of *UC* (beginning at Frutolf-Ekkehard's annals of Henry I)⁴⁴. At the entry for 1152, fol. 164v, there is a note in Peutingger's bold, distinctive hand: 'Fuit annus salutis MCLiii ex othone et Guntherio. Peutingger'.
 Fols. 201v-[201cv] — blank.
- 3) Fols. 202r-[263av]: copied carelessly by several recurring hands, none of them calligraphic, one neat, some almost illegible, around A.D. 1500.
 Fols. 202r-203r — 'Verba Sibille'⁴⁵.
 Fols. 203r-206r — 'Tractatus de locis et statu terre Iherosolimitane'⁴⁶.
 *Fols. 206v-257r — first section of *UC* (beginning at Burchard's introduction)⁴⁷).

⁴²) Only the two bifolia of coarse paper which form paste-downs at the front and back of the codex are omitted from the foliation.

⁴³) EKKEHARD, pp. 119 ff. Reference is made here to the MGH edition rather than to the more recent AQ edition, which distinguishes Frutolf's contribution (*Frutolfi et Ekkehardi chronica necnon anonymi chronica imperatorum*, ed. and trans. F.-J. SCHMALE and I. SCHMALE-OTT, *Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte Mittelalters* 15 (Darmstadt, 1972)), because the former represents *UC* 1515 in its critical apparatus and includes even those parts of Frutolf and Ekkehard's work in turn derived from earlier sources. See Waitz's introduction to Ekkehard, p. 15.

⁴⁴) EKKEHARD, pp. 180 ff.

⁴⁵) See *Sibyllinorum verborum interpretatio*, Patrologia Latina 90, ed. J.P. Migne (Paris, 1850), cols. 1181-1186.

⁴⁶) See *Tractatus de locis et statu sanctae terrae ierosolimitane*, ed. G.M. THOMAS, *SB bayer. Akad.* (1865), II, 141-171.

⁴⁷) *UC*, pp. 1-3.

- Fol. 257v — blank.
- Fols. 258r-263r — miscellany of texts of local interest for Augsburg.
- Fols. 258r-260r — 'De Guelfis sive Guelfonibus'. At the beginning, in Peutinger's hand, 'Chuonradus Peutinger edidit atque emisit'.
- Fols. 260v-261v — genealogical tables and notes associated with 'De Guelfis'.
- Fol. 262r-v — 'De Civitate Augustensi', derived from but not identical to *UC*'s rubric 'Interpositio de civitate Augusta'⁴⁸). At the end in the text hand, not Peutinger's, 'Collegimus ex cronica abbatis Auspergensis anno MCCCCLXXXVI, quando serenissimus rex Romanorum apud nos Augustenses ageret'.
- Fol. 263r — 'Verba Ottonis Frisingensis Episcopi de Civitate Augusta'⁴⁹).
- Fols. 263v-[263av] — blank, except for unrelated markings.

Leaves in group 1) are bound in eight regular quires of six bifolia each; those in 2) are bound in nine regular quires, again of six bifolia each except for the intrusion of a single leaf misplaced into the last gathering⁵⁰). The paper throughout both of the first two groups of quires is extremely similar or identical; the same watermark is observable on uncopied leaves in both sections⁵¹). Outside leaves of both 1) and 2) show dirt and wear. Contemporary quire marks, letters, begin with fol. 96, continue through the rest of section 2) and then, beginning with *k* and still sequential, through section 1). While similarity of paper and script show that 1) and 2) were copied as part of the same effort and are now bound in logical order, the second group of leaves carrying Burchard's narrative to its conclusion was thus probably copied before the preceding group. 1) and 2) form rough thirds of the complete *UC* text, indeed of Clm 4351. It seems likely that their scribes intended to reproduce an entire chronicle exemplar, not just its latter sections, and that they worked backwards for reasons of convenience or interest; a third group

⁴⁸) *UC*, pp. 50-52.

⁴⁹) See OTTO OF FREISING, *Chronica sive historia de duabus civitatibus*, ed. A. HOFMEISTER, trans. A. SCHMIDT, AQ 16 (Berlin, 1960), 3.3; 6.20.

⁵⁰) Fol [201b] probably should be placed after the following blank leaf, fol. [201c].

⁵¹) The watermark of the paper of Clm 4351's fols. 1-[201c], except for fol. [201b], resembles the top of a champagne bottle with cork and wrapper. C.M. BRIQUET offers nothing similar: *Les Filigranes: Dictionnaire historique des marques du papier dès leur apparition vers vers 1282 jusqu'en 1600*, ed. A. STEVENSON, 4 vols. (Amsterdam, 1968).

of quires carrying the beginning of the work were never completed or — bound separately like 1) and 2) — were lost from the rest of the copy.

Previous descriptions of Clm 4351 have uniformly, following Giesebrecht, considered that fols. 258 to the end of the codex constituted a fourth section of the copy, not part of the third section beginning at fol. 202. Close examination of paper, quiring, and binding nevertheless confirms the impression offered by the script that the last folios are closely related to those immediately preceding. Despite the fact that the final pages of Clm 4351 bear non-*UC* material, they were copied at about the same time as the beginning of Burchard's work and, as well, 'Verba Sibille' and 'Tractatus', the two short works which preface *UC* in the present arrangement and which Burchard's autograph probably already included. Fols. 202 and following do not, like the first two sections of Clm 4351, consist entirely of regular quires. They include three quires of six bifolia, two of five bifolia, and one — the last — of four. None of these irregular gatherings has a quire mark. Their paper, watermarked with the design of a crown, is the same throughout⁵²). No relationship is apparent except in the first quire, copied all in one neat hand, between the recurring scribes of the last section of Clm 4351 and the gatherings which they copied; a single scribe did not always copy an entire quire. While all the extraneous end matter on Augsburg is copied in the same hand, not elsewhere represented, this is not unusual since the hand of fols. 202-212 likewise makes only this contribution.

More importantly, although all of the end matter in Clm 4351 not attributable to Burchard but representing a miscellany of texts of local interest for Augsburg appears in the last gathering of four bifolia, on its fols. 258r-263r, the first leaf of the same quire (fol. 257) bears *UC* text continuing directly from the immediately preceding quire. Though the outside leaves of this gathering in Clm 4351 show wear and dirt and were evidently not bound immediately with the rest of the *UC* text, they were nevertheless copied as part of the same effort which, in the rest of section 3), completed an earlier partial copy of Burchard's work. The same quire used to conclude the first section of the *UC* copy was used for notices about Augsburg and the Welfen not originally recorded by Burchard. Because this extraneous end matter in Clm 4351 does not, as Giesebrecht's division of the codex into sections implied, represent a separate quire filled at another time, the possibility arises that all the

⁵²) Cf. BRIQUET, nos. 4895, 4925, both of the last years of the fifteenth or first decade of the sixteenth century.

contents of the sole complete manuscript codex of Burchard's history were contained in one exemplar.

The evidence of Clm 4351 itself, then — paleographical, codicological, and textual — is that shortly before A.D. 1500 an effort was made to complete the partial *UC* copy represented by two existing groups of quires, fols. 1-[95a] and 96-[201c]. These two sections had already been copied some thirty years before, although the exact date cannot be determined. Conrad Peutinger, as the marginal notes in his hand in both earlier and later sections of Clm 4351 affirm, commissioned and supervised the contributions of several scribes toward reproduction of a complete Ursberg text. Arabic numerals marking the respective beginnings of sections in Peutinger's new — the third — section of Clm 4351 enhance the impression that he assembled old and new copies to recreate an organic whole. A contemporary hand marked 'Verba Sibille' with 2, 'Tractatus' with 3, and Burchard's incipit 'De regnis et regibus...' with 4. It is difficult to imagine a reference point other than an exemplar for these ordinal numerals. There is no 1, but 'De Guelfis sive Guelfonibus', the first text of the extraneous Augsburg miscellany, is without a number; perhaps the scribe of these last folios only neglected to indicate that they came first in his exemplar, or that they were meant to come first in a new codex for which the one to which he contributed was the model. The presence of Peutinger's 'edidit atque emisit' at the head of 'De Guelfis' suggests that he, at least, expected this essay to appear at the beginning of a new manuscript volume.

The *editio princeps* of *UC*, it has been seen, states that Mader edited the text from a copy provided by Peutinger. Clm 4351 was without doubt used by him. The edition omits fols. 202r-206r and fols. 258r-263r, but the rest of the copy is repeated in correct chronological order. A series of marginal paragraph marks and associated notes on fols. 120r-157v are the source of added capitular divisions in the printed text. A black, opaque smudge on fol. 263r suggests printer's ink. The copy evidently went to Johann Miller's Augsburg press unbound. Though the present binding and cover are nearly contemporary, marginal notes — sometimes Peutinger's own and sometimes the printer's — are partially trimmed off. Binding and trimming thus seem to have been completed shortly after printing and the binder, confused by the presence of extraneous texts and by the different hands and quiring systems of the copy's parts, bungled his job⁵³).

⁵³) The watermark of the two paste-downs at the front and back of Clm 4351 is a crude,

Although textually the incunable *Hystoria Friderici* is extremely closely related to the A.D. 1515 *editio princeps*, there is no reason to believe that they were both made from the same manuscript which Peutinger later owned. Marginal marks in Clm 4351 refer to the incunable, but they seem to result from its collation with the printed book rather than to its initial use for the incunable text's preparation⁵⁴). The printed *Hystoria Friderici* text takes up Burchard's narrative in the middle of the second group of Clm 4351's gatherings — the first group which was copied — so that it seems unlikely that the manuscript was assembled around A.D. 1470 specifically for the incunable's publication. On the other hand, Peutinger seems to have eventually given or left his copy to his Benedictine friends at Sts. Ulrich and Afra in Augsburg, whence it came to Munich⁵⁵), and where the incunable had earlier been printed. One of his team of scribes, on concluding his work, referred to the same city: 'aput nos Augustenses'. The surge of attention to Burchard's text in the 1470's and the years immediately following — the copying of the first two sections of Clm 4351, the publication of the incunable *Hystoria Friderici*, and the preparation beginning at the latest in 1496 of a complete manuscript — all centers on Augsburg, and it is therefore extremely likely that both the partial text acquired by Peutinger and its exemplar both belonged to the library of the monastery of Sts. Ulrich and Afra. It is likely, too, that the exemplar to which he directed his team of assistants for the beginning of the *UC* text was the same as their predecessors had used three decades before for the copy which they were now completing. The *Hystoria Friderici* redactor who added Lorch materials to Burchard's account of Barbarossa's and his descendants' reigns probably based his work on the same exemplar, and his autograph — which does not survive — was used soon after its completion as the basis of the incunable version.

eyeless ox-head. Cf. BRIQUET 15251, 15253. It closely resembles a group of late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century watermarks from Swabia and is thus thoroughly compatible with binding in Augsburg immediately after the 1515 printing. Notes in two different hands closely contemporary to the last text section on fol. 95r, 'Sequentia habetis versis binis foliis' and 'non est defectus', seem to refer to the present binding.

⁵⁴) Cf. SIMSON, pp. xxxiv-xxxv; he did not exclude the possibility that the incunable was made from Clm 4351.

⁵⁵) Cf. *Cat. mon.*; P.I. BRAUN, *Notitia historico-literaria de codicibus manuscriptis in bibliotheca liberi ac imperialis monasterii ordinis S. Benedicti ad SS. Udalricum et Afram Augustae extantibus*, II (Augsburg, 1792), 91.

2. Conrad Peutinger and the Rediscovery of the Ursberg Chronicon

The account offered by the sixteenth-century Ursberg historian Johannes Weissung contradicts the evidence of surviving manuscripts and editions on the provenance of the manuscript on which the *editio princeps* was based:

Fuit [i.e. Conrad] enim homo varie lectionis idemque doctissimus. Excussit sicut in cronica sua liquet videre pene omne genus scriptorum, et precipue antiquarum historiarum, quibus certissima fides est data. Quam diu in cartha pargamentacea a doctissimo preposito (cum enim ars impressoria eo tempore non inventa erat) conscriptam, Conradus Peutinger utriusque iuris doctor excellentissimus, in nostro cenobio invenit, ab hinc novem annis elapsis, porro auguste ad veterum fidem exactissime castigavit, non absque labore. Cum unicum exemplar saltem superfuit, privilegio Maximiliani Romanorum imperatoris per Joannem Miller in urbe Vindelicorum calcographum impressa est anno 1515 decimo Kalendas novembris...⁵⁶⁾.

Weissung was writing in 1524 and Clm 4351 reveals clearly that it was neither rediscovered nine years before nor emended by Peutinger, as the Ursberg canon alleged. As Giesebrecht immediately noticed, Weissung knew very little about the manuscript basis of UC's 1515 edition or about Peutinger's attention to it. He was familiar with the *editio princeps* and he made the logical assumptions that Burchard's — and his own — monastery was the place where it had been discovered and that publication had quickly followed discovery. Giesebrecht allowed that his 'third' section of Peutinger's manuscript, fols. 202-257 of Clm 4351, might have been copied in 1515, but closer inspection of quiring has shown this to be impossible, since the last of these leaves is the first in a quire elsewhere carrying the date 1496⁵⁷⁾.

Weissung's guess that Peutinger had found Burchard's chronicle in the Ursberg library was wrong, but not ill-considered. The humanist had indeed given careful attention to the Premonstratensian house and its history as well as to regional history. Peutinger's career and historical interests leading to the printing of Burchard's work were curiously parallel to the early Ursberg author's. From A.D. 1497 when he was thirty-two years old until 1534 when he retired to private life as the

⁵⁶⁾ WEISSUNG, fols. 18v-19r.

⁵⁷⁾ GIESEBRECHT, pp. 208-209.

city became Lutheran, Conrad Peutinger was Augsburg's official historian⁵⁸). As a counsellor of Maximilian I, acquaintance of Thomas More, and correspondent of Erasmus, he was among the most politically influential of northern Christian humanists. He encouraged the emperor's interest in the history of the Holy Roman Empire and satisfied it with relevant editions. The first major source for the Hohenstaufen period published by Peutinger was *Ligurius*; it appeared in 1507 from the Augsburg press of Erhard Oeglin as a direct boost to Maximilian's current Italian projects⁵⁹). Peutinger's editorial preface to *Ligurius* described his method and motivation in searching out the sources of the German nation's past. He said that the text was one recently turned up by himself and Conrad Celtis on a systematic search for unknown works in the library of the convent of Ebersberg; he was communicating it '...ne incliti Caesaris nostri Friderici primi labores et egregia facinora oblivioni traderentur'⁶⁰).

Peutinger's interest in *UC* was, of course, similarly motivated but the humanist shared a fascination with Burchard which he did not share with the author of *Ligurius*-epigraphy. The provost had delighted in collecting and recording inscriptions and so did Peutinger. In 1505 the Augsburger published *Romanae vetustatis fragmenta in Augusta Vindelicorum et eius diocesi*, a seven-folio list of inscriptions in large lapidary capital type cut specifically for the occasion by the Augsburg printer Erhard Ratdolt⁶¹). Mader, the eventual editor of *UC*, participated in his colleague's epigraphical enthusiasm, as the two couplets addressed by him to Peutinger on the slim book's dedicatory page attest. The coincidence among Burchard's, Peutinger's, and Mader's respective absorptions with epigraphy is so striking that it at first seems suspicious. Peutinger cannot be singled out as a late contributor to *UC*'s epigraphical quotations, though, since none of them corresponds to the inscriptions in his published or in his copy-book⁶²).

⁵⁸) On Peutinger's career, see E. KÖNIG, *Peutingerstudien*, Studien und Darstellungen aus dem Gebiete der Geschichte 9, pts. 1-2 (Freiburg i. B., 1914); R. PFEIFFER, 'Conrad Peutinger und die humanistische Welt', in *Augusta 955-1955*, pp. 179-186. H. LUTZ, *Conrad Peutinger; Beiträge zu einer politischen Biographie*, Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Stadt Augsburg 9 (Augsburg, 1958).

⁵⁹) *Lit. in Bay. Schwab.*, no. 125; PFEIFFER, p. 183.

⁶⁰) [GUNTHER OF PARISIS], *Ligurius de gestis imperialis caesaris Friderici primi Augusti*, ed. C. PEUTINGER (Augsburg, 1507), intro.

⁶¹) *Lit. in Bay. Schwab.*, no. 123.

⁶²) See *Inscriptiones Baivarum Romanae*, ed. F. VOLLMER, 'Abhandlungen der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, der philosophisch-philologischen und historischen

Peutinger's plans for the reclamation and exposition of medieval historical works were ambitious and, although he accomplished a great deal, he projected more than he finally achieved. The Augsburg humanist hoped to produce the first edition of Otto of Freising's *Gesta Friderici*, but Cuspinian preempted his efforts at Strasbourg in 1515⁶³). Peutinger's most important original work, a *Kaiserbuch* recounting imperial history from Augustus to Maximilian, on which he labored to the end of his life and for which *UC* was an important source, was never completed and never published⁶⁴). Given the printing of *Ligurinus* already in 1507, Peutinger's favorable assessment of Burchard's work, and the apparent copying of the *UC* manuscript which he owned before 1500, it is at first puzzling that the Augsburg historian should have waited more than fifteen years from his rediscovery of *UC* to obtain an imperial privilege and to arrange its publication. In 1515, Peutinger's own editions of Jordanes and Paul the Deacon⁶⁵) appeared from the same Augsburg press, Johann Miller's, which in that year printed the Ursberg work which he gave over to Mader's editorial care. Perhaps Peutinger was surprised by the appearance of Cuspinian's edition of Otto and responded by sending his own historical discoveries hastily to press — so hastily that he did not have time to make his own emendations in *UC*, though that text was especially important for his own Swabian interests, and instead entrusted it to another Augsburg humanist.

Whether Peutinger made careful use of Burchard's work in the period between his acquisition of a manuscript and its publication is difficult to determine. Marginal notes in his own hand were made before his copy was sent to the printer in 1515, but the Staufer genealogical essay appended to his 1507 *Ligurinus* edition fails to show the influence of that copy's late genealogical tables⁶⁶). Peutinger was intimately familiar with sources for medieval events in the region of his native city. Among his notebooks preserved at Stuttgart, in a volume copied before and bound in 1506, are included excerpts from one of *UC*'s important sources,

Klasse', suppl. (Munich, 1915), pp. 33 ff. As Vollmer's text points out, Peutinger and other members of his circle were in the habit of bringing ancient inscriptions home and using them as decoration for house and garden.

⁶³) LUTZ, p. 43.

⁶⁴) PFEIFFER, pp. 185-186; *Lit. in Bay. Schwab.*, no. 122.

⁶⁵) *Lit. in Bay. Schwab.*, no. 124.

⁶⁶) Cf. 'De Ortu, genere, et posteris imperatoris Caesaris Friderici Primi ...', in *Ligurinus* (unfoliated), quire *m*; Clm 4351, fol. 261v.

Historia Welforum; ⁶⁷⁾ another of Peutinger's copybooks includes notes on charters of the Premonstratensian monastery of Ursberg ⁶⁸⁾. The humanist historian's discovery of a *UC* exemplar at Ursberg itself must then have seemed the more certain to Weissung, the abbey historian writing in the 1520's, since he was surely aware that the humanist editor had visited his house several years before and had rummaged in the library.

Weissung's misunderstanding of the provenance of Peutinger's *UC* manuscript still leaves open the possibility that some copy of Burchard's work — not the one assembled by Peutinger's team — remained at the abbey at least until his time. The sixteenth-century canon never directly mentioned a manuscript of Burchard's work as still in the Ursberg library, but his assertion that only one copy existed at the time of printing may only have reflected confusion between Peutinger's *UC* codex and Ursberg's. Weissung's acquaintance with Burchard's text was only superficial; he made no pretense of intimate familiarity with it and he did not claim to have collated the edition of 1515 with any manuscript. Just as Caspar Heyd may have known a *UC* version which left out sections represented in Clm 4351, so might Johannes Weissung. Assessment of the significance of this possibility, however, awaits consideration of another extant handwritten copy.

3. The Partial Petronell Manuscript of the Ursberg Chronicon

The existence of the *Hystoria Friderici* incunable shows that the prohibitive length of the entire *UC* text and the greater inherent interest of its accounts of Hohenstaufen reigns had, by the later fifteenth century, led to the appearance of at least one partial copy. Another copy, roughly contemporary and similarly truncated, implies that the circumstances of its preparation were parallel. The copy identified in previous literature as MS. 3 in the Schlossarchiv of the counts of Traun in Petronell, Austria ⁶⁹⁾, takes up the *UC* text as does the incunable with the reign of

⁶⁷⁾ Stuttgart cod. hist. fol. 247, fols. 108r-109v; cf. W. VON HEYD, *Die historischen Handschriften der königlichen öffentlichen Bibliothek zu Stuttgart*, I: *Handschriften in Folio* (Stuttgart, 1889). E. König pointed out that Peutinger knew the important Altomünster manuscript of the Welf family chronicle, which only reemerged in the twentieth century: intro. to *Historia Welforum*, ed. and trans. E. KÖNIG, *Schwäbische Chroniken der Stauferzeit* I (Stuttgart, 1938), p. XIII, n. 9.

⁶⁸⁾ Stuttgart cod. hist. fol. 243, fol. 65r-v.

⁶⁹⁾ The Petronell copy is now in the private possession of Otto Abensperg-Traun,

Frederick Barbarossa. Unlike the edition of 1472, though, it adds no front matter detailing the relationship of the Staufer dukes to Lorch.

The script of the Petronell *Historia Friderici* text, which begins at Burchard's identical rubric⁷⁰) and continues to the end of his work, is of the mid-fifteenth century;⁷¹) this partial witness to *UC*'s tradition thus has stemmatic significance independent of Clm 4351. The text, however, is so full of errors and conjectural emendations and is so closely related to Clm 4351 that it was judged to be of little value by Holder-Egger and Simson in their preparation of the SSRG version, the first critical edition for which it was used⁷²). The copy shows no significant variation in content from Peutinger's more complete manuscript — no substantive omissions or additions, only frequent misreadings among a few better readings. The Petronell manuscript is nevertheless important in showing that Peutinger's team of assistants made only a few extremely minor changes in the *UC* copy which they compiled — at least where their text overlapped the text of the Petronell manuscript⁷³). The manuscript from which the incunable *Hystoria Friderici* with its Lorch preface was immediately derived must have been a complete *UC*; otherwise the author cannot have made the hodgepodge selection of material appearing in Burchard's work before the rubric 'Hystoria Friderici' which he inserted among Lorch notices. The Petronell *Hystoria Friderici* manuscript bears no direct evidence that its exemplar was more complete than itself, but there is no reason to assume that its model too did not begin with Ninus and continue to the reign of Frederick II. The presence at Augsburg in about A.D. 1470 of the exemplar of both Clm 4351 and the manuscript from which the incunable *Hystoria Friderici* was printed has already been suggested; a location in the same diocese for the

though his family's castle is now the home of the Donaumuseum of the Niederösterreichisches Landesmuseum and most of the books of the pre-War Schlossarchiv belong to the Niederösterreichisches Landesarchiv, Vienna. Herr Abensperg-Traun kindly furnished a microfilm copy for the purposes of this study.

⁷⁰) *UC*, p. 22.

⁷¹) This paleographical observation is, again, based on the appearance of the manuscript and confirmed by the consensus of published descriptions. Cf. H. SIMONSFELD, 'Ueber eine Handschrift des Chronicon Urspergense', *Neues Archiv* 7 (1881), 213; GIESEBRECHT, pp. 214-215; SIMSON, pp. xxxiii-xxxiv.

⁷²) Simonsfeld, who first described the Petronell copy, was misled by its many peculiar readings to believe that it was not closely related to Clm 4351: pp. 213-215.

⁷³) Of the few *UC* passages included in Clm 4351 but absent in the Petronell copy, all were probably marginal notes in the exemplar. None eliminates the possibility that the Munich and Petronell manuscripts had a common exemplar.

exemplar of the Petronell copy is generally supported by the evidence of the latter codex.

The back cover of the Petronell manuscript bears the date A.D. 1507 and records the ownership of the Gundelfingen family. Genealogical notes relating to that house on the front cover and fol. 89 extend to A.D. 1512⁷⁴). H. Simonsfeld's description offered no indication of how the house of Gundelfingen might have acquired such a rare history book; it noted that a few members of the family had been canons or canonesses but none had been Premonstratensians and that the weight of Gundelfingen influence was in the see of Constance, rather than in Augsburg⁷⁵). A deed-book from the diocese of Augsburg — indeed from Ursberg itself — nevertheless confirms that the noble family had connections there. In 1384, the abbot Albert of Ursberg copied the undated record of a gift from one 'Diemo de Gundelfingen'⁷⁶. The locally prominent house might then have maintained into the fifteenth century a sufficiently strong relationship with the diocese to have acquired a decorated book of local history based on a manuscript at one of its monastic foundations. Where exactly that exemplar was found is impossible to determine from the Petronell manuscript; it was quite possibly at Ursberg, possibly too at Augsburg. It was, like Clm 4351's exemplar and the manuscript basis of the *Hystoria Friderici* incunable, already far removed from Burchard's original, and it belonged to the same branch of the tradition as the incunable text. Petronell and Munich copies share many misreadings and errors of prolepsis; Giesebrecht's suggestion that the two had a common exemplar has gone unchallenged. Though Giesebrecht supposed that the hypothetical common exemplar of both was no older than the fourteenth century⁷⁷), it may plausibly have been copied even later, shortly before its three extant descendants — the Petronell, incunable, and Munich texts — were produced.

⁷⁴) Notes in a still later hand show that in the seventeenth or eighteenth century the book was acquired by the counts of Wolkenstein. Simonsfeld noticed that the same hand which left the Gundelfingen genealogical notes made frequent emendations in the text; his conclusion (p. 213) 'dass diese Hand eine wiederum verschiedene Handschrift der Chronik benutzt hat' was unfounded, since the reader may have made his corrections from the 1515 edition. See also SIMSON, pp. XXXIII-XXXIV.

⁷⁵) SIMONSFELD, pp. 213-215.

⁷⁶) F.L. BAUMANN, Aus dem Registrum foundationis Urspergensis, *Württembergische Vierteljahrshefte für Landesgeschichte* 4 (1881), 204-207.

⁷⁷) GIESEBRECHT, p. 218.

Lost Witnesses

Whether or not the Augsburg exemplar came to Sts. Ulrich and Afra from Ursberg, Burchard's own monastery, is problematic. The dissociation of Burchard's name from the *UC* text perhaps implies that the tradition had continued for some time outside the house where the author apparently spent the last years of his life; elsewhere, 'abbas Urspergensis', the attribution offered by Clm 4351⁷⁸⁾ and the *editio princeps*, might have been satisfying than an unknown provost's name; the copy which Weissung seems to have known, though, need not have been closely related to the Augsburg exemplar and it also omitted the historian's name, since he too could attempt to identify the author only through circuitous logic. But even if the missing Augsburg copy had only come to the episcopal city shortly before its text was shortened and altered for the incunable *Hystoria Friderici*, it certainly remained there until after the first edition was prepared.

Mader's reference to 'unicum...mendosum...exemplar' for the redaction which he completed at Peutinger's behest was inexact. In at least one instance, he repaired an omission in Peutinger's copy by collation with some other witness to the Ursberg text⁷⁹⁾. He might have corrected his principal witness' text against the Petronell copy or the Augsburg exemplar; each carried the better reading where the scribe of Clm 4351 made an error of prolepsis. That Mader and Peutinger should have been unaware of a partial printing of Burchard's work made in their own city in 1472 is *prima facie* improbable, but, as Giesebrecht observed, it may have seemed unnecessary to mention partial witnesses useful for the establishment of the text⁸⁰⁾. Many conjectural emendations in Mader's version correspond to those made by the scribe of the Petronell copy, but because the latter was already by 1515 in the possession of the Gundelfingen family, and because it shows no signs of use by a printer, none of those emendations proves direct dependence⁸¹⁾. Mader did not make emendations directly in Peutinger's copy, now Clm 4351; type may have been set from another lost copy in his own hand, or from

⁷⁸⁾ Clm 4351, fol. 96r (upper marginal note at the beginning of *UC*, in a different hand from the text's but apparently contemporary with the copy's assembly shortly after A.D. 1500): 'chronica abbatis auspergensis'.

⁷⁹⁾ *UC*, p. 113: 'et tunc liberabitur'.

⁸⁰⁾ GIESEBRECHT, pp. 216-217.

⁸¹⁾ GIESEBRECHT thought that Clm 4351 had been collated with the Petronell copy: p. 216.

the Peutinger copy with attention to Mader's separate notes. The 'unicum...mendosum...exemplar' described by the editor may then not have been the manuscript now labeled Clm 4351 or a transcription annotated by him, but the Augsburg exemplar itself. Because Mader knew that the utilitarian copy assembled by Peutinger and all other evidence for the *UC* text, including the incunable, which may have been available to him were equally derived from an older manuscript which he also knew, then in mentioning a sole corrupt exemplar he may have meant — perfectly honestly — the parent manuscript.

The Augsburg exemplar postulated here disappeared from Sts. Ulrich and Afra before Braun catalogued its manuscript library in 1791, probably long before since it received no mention, however oblique, after the appearance of *UC*'s first edition. It would at any rate have been of relatively little value in reconstructing Burchard's text since one immediate descendant, Clm 4351, reproduces it in its entirety and two closely related witnesses, the Petronell manuscript and the incunable *Hystoria Friderici*, present a basis for correcting Clm 4351's readings in its more interesting latter sections. These two derivative manuscripts and this derivative incunable, along with the *editio princeps* — all of independent textual significance because their exemplar has disappeared and all represented in the critical apparatus of the SSRG edition, but among which Clm 4351 is of overwhelming importance — thus only illuminate one branch of *UC*'s manuscript tradition. No representatives of other branches, if indeed there were other branches, survives⁸²).

A manuscript of Burchard's work — not the codex which became Clm 4351, since the latter bears no evidence that it traveled from Augsburg to Ursberg and back to Augsburg between the time Peutinger and Mader finished with it and Braun's notice of its presence at Sts. Ulrich and Afra's — was still at Ursberg at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Its presence there a hundred years after Weissung wrote tends to confirm that his insistence that Peutinger used a copy at the Premonstratensian monastery was based on his knowledge that a copy existed there. On June 9, 1627, two Premonstratensian canons of St. Michael's at Antwerp, Prosper Moriconi and Matthaeus de Beir, stopped at Ursberg on their

⁸²) See BRAUN, *Notitia...manuscriptis*. G.H. Pertz erroneously identified a manuscript in the British Museum as Burchard's work: 'Berichte ueber einige in den Jahren 1826 bis 1837 fuer die Monumenta unternommene Reisen', *Archiv* 7 (1839), 80; 'Bemerkungen ueber einzelne Handschriften und Urkunden', *Archiv* 7 (1839), 633. Abel recognized that Harleian 3668 was not a *UC* copy: p. 83.

return home from the translation of relics of St. Norbert in Prague. The record of their travels⁸³) indicates that they did not stay there very long, because already on June 15 they had passed through Roggenburg and arrived at Roth. Nevertheless, Moriconi and de Beir had time to inspect the Ursberg library and note what they found there:

Superest in eodem coenobio etiamnum ipsum Conradi Lichtenavii Urspergensis Chronici autographum, quod a mendis illis quamplurimis immune est, quibus illud postmodum sublestae fidei homines resperserunt: quod pro Urspergensis coenobii honore, ac ejusdem Conradi viri omnino egregii immortalis memoria, ac pro communi Reipublicae litterariae bono, optandum foret ex fide ipsius autographi aliquando in lucem prodire...⁸⁴).

This copy apparently does not survive⁸⁵).

Backmund has suggested that Moriconi and de Beir were mistaken about the age of the historical manuscript which they observed, and that it was only a late copy expurgated of anti-papal remarks⁸⁶). Such an interpretation leans heavily on an interpretation of the two canons' reference to late redactors of *UC*, 'sublestae fidei homines', as Protestantizing or at least anti-Roman. They may have meant only that recent scribes or editors had been unfaithful to the text. No Counter-Reformation version of Burchard's work can have been older than the first Reformation edition, Heyd's in, 1537. Moriconi and de Beir may have been paleographically unsophisticated but they were no strangers to manuscript libraries; for them to have mistaken a relatively recent copy for the autograph of a thirteenth-century author would have been extremely naive. Consternation within the Order of Prémontré over laudatory Protestant commentary on the work of a medieval Premonstratensian historian may well have been great, but strong Counter-Reformation reaction was only against late editorial additions beside which the original author's pro-imperial statements seemed pale. Even though the attitude of the visitors at Ursberg toward the history written there may have been defensive, it was thus likely to have been

⁸³) The canons' journal is reproduced in *Acta Sanctorum* from contemporary publications in Prague and Antwerp: AASS Junii I (Antwerp, 1695), 895c ff.

⁸⁴) AASS Junii I, 902a.

⁸⁵) A. LOHMÜLLER, 'Die Bibliothek des Prämonstratenser Reichsstiftes Ursberg, 1125 bis 1803', *Jahrbuch des Vereins für Augsburger Bistumsgeschichte* 10 (1976), 294.

⁸⁶) BACKMUND, *Geschichtsschreiber*, p. 28; *Deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexicon*, ed. W. STAMMLER, 2nd ed. K. RUH, I (Berlin, 1977), cols. 1120-1121.

relatively uncritical toward Burchard's own text. Weissung and Mang had both struggled proudly to identify the thirteenth-century Ursberg chronicler the more closely with their house; they had no wish to disown him. The *UC* copy seen by travelers from Antwerp of course excluded Heyd's paralipomena because it long antedated his intervention. That manuscript may or may not have been as old as they believed, but it must have been older than the Protestant revolt and probably was older than any surviving witness to Burchard's text.

THE STATE OF THE URSBERG *CHRONICON* TEXT

The Ursberg copy of the provost's chronicle noted by de Beir and Moriconi in 1627 must have perished in the abbey fire of 1632, when the Swedes burned the library and other buildings⁸⁷). Much later G. Lienhardt, the eighteenth-century student of Premonstratensian authors, saw a manuscript in which the Belgian canons' contemporary, Frederick Rommel of Roggenburg, claimed that he too marked an old *UC* copy at Ursberg in 1630;⁸⁸) thereafter it was evidently gone. No other lost copies — none other than the Augsburg exemplar, the Ursberg copy known to Weissung, Spengler, Moriconi and de Beir, and the manuscript possibly known to Heyd — may be even tentatively identified. There is no doubt that the complex of surviving witnesses including Clm 4351, the *editio princeps*, the Petronell copy, and the incunable accurately reflects the *UC* text as represented in the Augsburg exemplar; while four brief notices in Clm 4351 are omitted in the Petronell and the printed *Hystoria Friderici* versions, all were either marginal notes in the manuscript of Sts. Ulrich and Afra or references to the order and contents of the Munich copy and — probably — its exemplar's codex which would have been inappropriate in shortened versions⁸⁹). There is, on the other hand, serious

⁸⁷) N. BACKMUND, *Die Chorherrenorden und ihre Stifte in Bayern* (Passau, 1966), p. 205; BACKMUND, *Geschichtsschreiber*, pp. 27 ff. Abel thought that the Ursberg copy — he believed the autograph — was lost in 1525 in the *Bauernkrieg* fire: p. 77. His misinterpretation has been variously corrected: e.g. R. LANG, 'Kloster Ursberg. Bibliothek, Handschriften, Buecher', *Analecta Praemonstratensia* 28 (1952), 47; LOHMÜLLER, p. 283; BACKMUND, *Geschichtsschreiber*, p. 28.

⁸⁸) G. LIENHARDT, *Spiritus Literarius Norbertinus* (Augsburg, 1771), p. 364.

⁸⁹) Two are notices of narrowly Premonstratensian interest, the former remaining marginal in Clm 4351 (fol. 148v) and the latter (fol. 162r) a problematic reference to Otto of Freising which may be wildly erroneous: *UC*, p. 3; 'M^oC^oXX^o felix ordo...Norpertum

question whether the Augsburg exemplar accurately reflected the contents of Burchard's autograph book. Heyd perhaps had grounds in the manuscript he acquired from the Augustinian canons at Strasbourg for omitting a few extraordinarily tendentious paragraphs in his 1539 translation. Seventeenth-century observers noticed that an old Ursberg copy unknown to the Augsburg humanists — overlooked by Peutinger in his researches at the abbey or perhaps considered defective by him precisely because it omitted passages present in the Augsburg exemplar — was substantially different from the printed editions.

Two passages in *UC* have consistently been marked by students of Burchard's work as of questionable authenticity for purely textual reasons, despite their appearance in all descendants of the Augsburg exemplar. In one, the Ursberg account turns abruptly from eulogy of Philip of Swabia as a worthy, unlucky scion of righteous and heroic emperors to condemnation of the same king. It has nothing but praise for Barbarossa's son in describing the events of his reign or in summarizing his personality upon his death. Then, though, the narrative launches a measured criticism of Philip:

Hic cum non haberet pecunias, quibus salaria sive solda preberet militibus, primus cepit destrahere predia, que pater suus Fridericus imperator late adquisierat in Alamannia, ita ut cuilibet baroni sive ministeriali villas seu predia rusticana vel ecclesias sibi contiguas obligaret. Sicque factum est, ut nichil sibi remaneret preter inane nomen domini terre et civitates seu villas, in quibus fora habentur, et pauca castella terre⁹⁰).

nomine'; *UC*, p. 21; 'Eodem anno fundata...Premonstratensis ordinis'. Two more are, respectively, a reference to the end of Frutolf-Ekkehard's contribution and a reference to *Tractatus de locis* as bound in the first quaternion of the volume: *UC*, p. 3: 'Hucusque scriptoris...pars reliqua'; *UC*, p. 64: 'Hec require...quaterno libri'.

The two Premonstratensian notices are almost surely late additions. The notice that Frutolf-Ekkehard's work has come to an end was probably Burchard's own, since it carries his characteristic mention of a source *scriptor* and reveals knowledge which Burchard clearly had but which was definitively recovered only in the nineteenth century — that the beginning of *UC* was borrowed from an earlier chronicle. Finally, the reference to a geographical tract at the beginning of the volume was probably also included by Burchard, since his own text shows use of *Tractatus*' historical section and his manuscript codex is likely to have contained its essay on locations in the Holy Land. Cf. Simson's critical notes and introduction, pp. xxxii-xxxiii.

Simson's early attempt to explain the note on Otto of Freising, which the copyist of Clm 4351 himself obviously did not understand, as a garbled reference to the Cistercian historian's early canonry at Klosterneuburg is plausible, though he apparently abandoned it in his later *UC* edition: B. VON SIMSON, 'Zu Wipo, den Annales Altahenses, dem Chronicon Urspergense', *Neues Archiv* 14 (1889), 609.

⁹⁰) *UC*, pp. 91-92.

The statement that Philip's military needs led to his financial embarrassment, substantially true⁹¹), is still intelligible in the context of 'Gesta Philippi's' account of destructive conflict among German princes. The sentences immediately following reach a different and incongruous level of anti-Staufer vehemence:

Ea tempestate idem Philippus ecclesiam Urspergensensem obligavit titulo pignoris nobili viro Bertholdo de Nifen et filio eius Hainrico, quam postea prepositus, qui tunc fuit, et fratres de potestate eorundem tyrannorum liberaverunt, cum tantam cepissent ibidem exercere tyrannidem, ut nequaquam posset ecclesia conventualis existere. Pro liberatione vero solverunt CC marcas argenti. Hic modus obligationis et solutionis ecclesiarum, maxime Cisterciensis et Premonstratensis ordinis, hactenus inusitatus fuit et libertatibus privilegiorum ipsorum valde contrarius, cum constet, quod priores imperatores nullum tale ius sibi vendicabant in ecclesiis predictorum ordinum.

UC then initiates a long and complicated explanation of why Ursberg was mortgaged:

Occasio autem huius rei dicitur fuisse et narratur, quod olim presidente Grimone preposito in ecclesia Urspergensi, regnante Cuonrado rege et sibi succedente nepote suo imperatore Friderico, propter reverentiam et auctoritatem prefati Grimonis ipsi imperatores nichil huiusmodi iuris presumpserunt sibi vindicare, preterquam illud, quod pertinet ad dominium totius terre, ut sub protectione sua eas susciperent et privilegiis suis munirent et fideliter defenderent. Contigit autem, quod mortuo predicto Grimone canonici Urspergenses elegerunt sibi in rectorem quendam de fratribus suis, hominem nullius intelligentie aut valentie et adeo hebetis eloquentie, ut nec verbum de ore ipsius nisi cum difficultate posset intelligi. Cumque talis prelatis coram inclite recordationis imperatore Friderico comparuisset, ipse cum tota curia sua sprexit eundem odioque sui nobili viro Degenhardo de Hellinstein, procuratori suo per omnia regalia predia Suevie, iniunxit, quatenus personaliter accederet ad ecclesiam Urspergensensem et de voluntate fratrum in prediis ipsorum extra abbatiam et grangias statutis apponeret annum, quod sibi pro advocatia et defensione solveretur, ut videlicet quilibet mansus rusticanorum prediorum solveret maltare unum avene, ut officiales sui equis ipsorum ex hoc haberent annonam et ipsa ecclesia sine preiudicio omnis gravaminis imperialem haberet defensionem.

⁹¹) See C. FREY, *Die Schicksale des königlichen Gutes in Deutschland unter den letzten Stauern seit König Philip* (Berlin, 1881: rpt. Aalen, 1966), p. 23.

The text returns to the connection between Ursberg's and Philip's difficulties:

Hinc nacta occasione, cum prefati tyranni de Nifen tantillam pensionem ab imperatoribus petere viderentur, ipsam ecclesiam omnino subegerunt et destruere studuerunt. Ceterum Deus ultionum dominus in primum huius sceleris auctorem, prefatum videlicet Philippum, vindictam exercuit, ut sub gladio tyranni caderet, qui primus ecclesias in potestatem tyrannorum contradidit⁹²).

Christmann first noted in 1790 that the invective against Philip from 'Ea tempestate...' was inappropriate to *UC*'s otherwise uniformly laudatory attitude toward Philip. Since then only Gronau, arguing principally on stylistic grounds, has held firmly that the entire passage is Burchard's own. Others, following Abel's observation that the diatribe carries an anachronistic reference to Ursberg as *abbatia*, although it was not elevated to the status of abbey until the mid-fourteenth century⁹³), have disputed only the extent of interpolation⁹⁴). Gronau's uniform on the stylistic unity of Burchard's work here drove him into clear error. As he noted — against his own argument — the *UC* diatribe against Philip is indeed well-informed on events in the thirteenth-century monastery, but it contains no information which could not have been learned much later from the mortgage contract preserved at Ursberg⁹⁵). Burchard himself would surely have been able to name the 'prepositus, qui tunc fuit', the prelate Walter who directed the monastery only fifteen years before his own arrival at Ursberg.

As Gronau again noted, yet another *UC* passage concerning the release of Ursberg from its mortgage into secular advocacy in 1226 is closely related and similarly based on the relevant charter⁹⁶). It is, like the invective against Philip, unusual in the *UC* context in its complaint about the misfortunes of the author's Premonstratensian house. The historian Burchard was the contemporary of the events of 1226 at Ursberg; as chronicler, he regularly spoke of himself in the first person.

⁹²) *UC*, pp. 92-94.

⁹³) N. BACKMUND, *Monasticon Praemonstratense* (Straubing, 1949-1956), I, 86; *Chorherrenorden*, p. 205.

⁹⁴) CHRISTMANN, in [BURCHARD], p. 129; GRONAU, pp. 23-32. Cf. ABEL, pp. 107-108; GIESEBRECHT, pp. 219-223; SIMSON, p. xxx; *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen* I, 118, n. 57. Backmund's judgment that Burchard would never have referred to himself as *abbas* must be regarded as definitive, though he allows the possibility that a late copyist might have substituted *abbatia* for *praepositura*: *Geschichtsschreiber*, p. 25 and n. 148.

⁹⁵) GRONAU, p. 19.

⁹⁶) GRONAU, pp. 20-21.

Here alone, though, the *UC* text makes imprecise third-person reference to 'B. prepositus':

Eodem anno ecclesia Urspergensis pro CC marcis, quas B. prepositus pro liberatione ecclesie persolvit, ab Alberto de Niunburc redimitur et fidem Hainrici regis datam in manu bone memorie Hainrici de Zuplingen, tunc episcopi Ahistetensis, accepit. Insuper privilegia regis eiusdem, quod nunquam pro qualibet necessitate eadem ecclesia a defensione imperii alienaretur⁹⁷).

Gronau should, with other scholars, have set aside both this lament over Ursberg's difficulties and the critique of Philip's policy as late intrusions.

Heyd's German translation of 1539 offers evidence against the authenticity of the Philip and the Ursberg passages. It omits the discussion of Philip, from 'Occasio huius rei...' to the end, as well as the entire note on Ursberg's financial loss of A.D. 1226. Though the Strasbourg *Chronick* also omits 'Gaude, mater nostra Roma...', a passage more compatible with Burchard's political attitudes and not so obviously arising from preoccupation with parochial concerns, its neglect of two anomalous paragraphs on Ursberg tends to confirm that were late additions, not the work of the text's principal author, the provost Burchard. The chronicle manuscript which the two Antwerp canons Moriconi and de Beir saw at Ursberg in 1627, like Heyd's, may have omitted at least these three conspicuously tendentious passages since, as their remarks based on cursory inspection suggest, it is likely to have belonged to a branch of the text's tradition different from that represented by the lost Augsburg exemplar and its surviving witnesses. A vague memory that the great chronicle composed at Ursberg was assembled from the remains of a disastrous fire endured at the abbey until Weissung's time. This tradition was at least partially accurate; a late hand, though not necessarily a thirteenth-century hand, intervened to lament related misfortunes. How much more widely the same hand may have interfered is not immediately obvious. The SSRG edition completed by Holder-Egger and Simson makes definitive recension of surviving corrupt witnesses, but it fails to explore thoroughly the extent of late additions common to existing copies. A more exact reconstruction of Burchard's work requires closer analysis of his chronicle's style and content than has yet been attempted.

The Colorado College.

Carol L. NEEL.

⁹⁷) *UC*, pp. 121-122.