

The Historical Work of Burchard of Ursberg, IV: Burchard as Historian*)

The historian Burchard begins his work, the Ursberg *Chronicon* (hereafter *UC*), by commenting on its written sources. Although most of the early part of his text is copied directly from the universal chronicle of Frutolf of Michelsberg and Ekkehard of Aura, he omits that source's early passages concerning the period between Creation and the foundation of the Assyrian kingdom¹). Burchard replaces the borrowed chronicle's introduction in direct response to its text. In the first sentences of his work, he explains why he omits much of the Old Testament history which his model work had incorporated:

De regnis et regibus et gestis temporum multi scripserunt varia hec descriptione prosequentes. Nam Moyses ab Adam usque ad Noe et a Noe usque ad Abraham duarum etatum tempora secundum successiones generationum in populo Dei describit, nullam usquam de regnis aut regibus faciens mentionem, tum quia reges forte non erant, tum quia non de regibus scribere intendebat, sed mirabilia et leges Dei, que gessit in populo suo, enarrare studebat. Huius itaque et aliorum sacre historie scriptorum tractatus merito preferunt, qui a Deo inspirati magnalia Dei mirifice inter homines eloquuntur²).

* This is the fourth in a series of articles beginning in the first 1982 fascicle of this journal.

¹) The immediately prior article in this series has discussed Burchard's use of this and other earlier chronicles: «The Historical Work of Burchard of Ursberg, III: The Historian and His Sources», *Analecta Praemonstratensia* LIX, 19-42. All references to Burchard's text will be to the Monumentist edition: Burchard of Ursberg, *Chronicon*, ed. O. Holder-Egger and B. von Simson, 2nd ed., *Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum in Usum Scholarum* (Hanover, 1916). Although Holder-Egger and Simson do not reproduce the text of Frutolf-Ekkehard in Burchard's version, they here indicate where the Premonstratensian's copy begins: p. 3. Cf. [Frutolf of Michelsberg and] Ekkehard of Aura, *Chronica*, ed. G. Waitz, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores* 6 (Hanover, 1844), pp. 33-35. Reference is made here and subsequently to the MGH edition, cited as Frutolf-Ekkehard, because it includes the early derivative sections of the twelfth-century chronicle and because its critical apparatus represents the first edition of the Ursberg *Chronicon*; see Frutolf-Ekkehard, p. 15. The more recent AQ edition, however, offers a definition of Frutolf's contribution superseding earlier criticism: F.-J. Schmale, intro. to Frutolf of Michelsberg and Ekkehard of Aura, *Chronica necnon anonymi chronica imperatorum*, ed. and trans. Schmale and I. Schmale-Ott, *Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters* 15 (Darmstadt, 1972), pp. 1-39.

²) *UC*, p. 1.

Although the Premonstratensian author never names Frutolf or Ekkehard directly, he is aware that they in turn based their work on Jerome's translation of Eusebius' chronicle. Burchard mentions that he will reproduce Eusebius' parallel columns of dates in the succession of earthly kingdoms:

Ceterum, licet hec, que in lege et prophetis et psalmis scripta sunt, ad corroborandam fidem sufficere possint, multi tamen adiecerunt, hec, que a sanctis dicta sunt, principaliter prosequendo, ex libris eciam gentilium de regnorum et regum successionibus aliqua satis eleganter interserendo. Ex his Orosius et Eusebius et alii quam plures libros annales ediderunt. Ex quibus prefatus Eusebius collationes temporum facere conatus est, singulos annos in numeris disponens in singulis lineis et columnis. A principio disponens quatuor principatus ... per singulos annos disponit. ... Hec ideo dictus Eusebius sic disponit, ut ostendat, quotus annus cuiuslibet regni sive regis quotus sit ad quemlibet annum alterius regni sive alterius regis³).

On the other hand, as he stresses in his work's first sentence, his attention will be more exclusive than Eusebius' had been; he will write only «de regnis et regibus et gestis temporum», not about the biblical antecedents to those developments.

Burchard thus leaves out from his chronicle of man's early history Eusebius' careful calculations of how many years intervened between the major events of Old Testament history and which pagan gods were contemporaries of which Hebrew prophets⁴). The Ursberg chronicler justifies his omission with two arguments: that the copy available to him of Eusebius' pre-Flood chronology is corrupt, and that these early dates are not in any case of much interest. Eusebius' later timetables, which Burchard indeed reproduces through Frutolf-Ekkehard's redaction, are more valuable. From them, the Premonstratensian asserts, a «prudens lector» may discern the chronology of kingdoms which existed contemporaneously and what was the order of their succession. The Ursberg historian is eager to get on with his central task, the record of secular empires. He concludes his brief introduction to the text of Frutolf and Ekkehard with a reference to the work of the twelfth-century scholastic commentator on biblical history, Peter Comestor. He then launches

³) UC, pp. 1-2.

⁴) Cf. Frutolf-Ekkehard, p. 33, n. 6; p. 34. Schmale emphasizes that Frutolf did not slavishly copy Jerome, but collated many sources for the period before Ninus: p. 9.

directly into his version of the borrowed chronicle. That copyist's task engages him for many pages, some two hundred leaves in the principal manuscript⁵).

Anni, hystoria: GENRE IN THE URSBERG Chronicon

The prior article in this series has shown that Burchard was almost entirely uncritical of the work of his most important source, Frutolf-Ekkehard, as a repository for historical fact. Historically, he accepted his predecessors' work with few questions; historiographically, as is already evident in his prefatory comments, he adopted an explicitly distinctive posture. His replacement of the borrowed text's early passages emphasizes the secular focus of his work. This is moreover not his only criticism of the work of Frutolf and Ekkehard. After his nearly exact repetition of its entries from the Assyrian king Ninus to the German emperor Henry V, he resumes indirect commentary on his model history's characteristics.

Burchard's discussion of genre

At the conclusion of his copy of Frutolf-Ekkehard, Burchard offers a second introduction. It forms a boundary between his virtually exclusive dependence on that source and the remainder of his chronicle, a compilation of sources from the mid-twelfth century followed by an original account of the late 1100's and early 1200's. This recommencement, like Burchard's first beginning in preface to Frutolf-Ekkehard, describes the historian's task. In the course of a plea for the work's favorable reception, it addresses the theme of the history of kingdoms:

Multis dum sua facta vel dicta placent, aliena displicent; rectius autem erat, ut nobismet displicentes aliis placere velimus, ipsique nobis placeant. Quia vero omnis etas in malum prona est facilisque descensus Averni, rectum contempnitur et quod vitiosum est frequentatur. Ideoque tam scriptores singularum rerum quam etiam interpretes linguarum sive expositores librorum contra emulos et detractores et invidos in principiis operum suorum volentes aliqua describere plurima commentati sunt. Ceterum, ut rudes et imperiti, nostre loquae simplicitatem de medio usu loquendi procedentem et nullius dulcedinis sive eloquentie stilum redolentem credimus ab emulis potius irridendum quam livido dente huic detrahendum.

⁵) UC, pp. 2-3. See the prior article in this series, «Burchard III», 21 ff., for discussion of the manuscript of Frutolf-Ekkehard used by the Premonstratensian historian.

Sane super his fiat voluntas Dei expleta. Nos vero, sicut fuerit voluntas in celo, de nostro proposito explebimus gesta regum maximeque Romani imperii, sicut cepimus et de diversis regnis prioribus ad id perduximus⁶⁾.

Burchard's direct address here to the problems of historical language and presentation will be seen to be of interest in subsequent discussion of rhetorical tools employed in sections of his chronicle contemporary with his own experience. For the moment, though, the point about historiographical method which he now amplifies is most significant:

In superioribus vero gesta quatuor imperatorum, videlicet Cuonradi, Hainrici III. et Hainrici IIII. et Hainrici V. [i.e. as related by Frutolf-Ekkehard] sub stilo hystoriographo non sunt conglutinata, sed potius gesta temporum sub singulis annis sunt descripta, ideoque series hystorie de ipsis imperatoribus difficiliter contextitur. Recapitulando igitur de eisdem imperatoribus quedam retexemus, ut series et narratio nostra melius stilo simplici procedat⁷⁾.

Burchard has found Frutolf-Ekkehard's annalistic record of the reigns of the Salian emperors wanting, for all its rich detail. He compensates for its inadequacy by recapitulating their careers, recording the inscriptions on their graves and focusing finally on the politically sensitive issue of attempted papal deposition of Henry IV and Henry V⁸⁾.

More interesting than his specific emphasis on papal-imperial conflict — although in this too he responded critically to his source⁹⁾ — from the point of view of Burchard's historiographical technique is his exposition of *stilus hystoriographicus*. The Premonstrantensian author here justifies his highly idiosyncratic narrative method, the mixture of raw annalistic lists of events with more graceful synthetic accounts. That method has never been carefully explored, although it has been frequently remarked by modern students of medieval historiography¹⁰⁾. Its author's expla-

⁶⁾ UC, p. 3.

⁷⁾ UC, pp. 3-4.

⁸⁾ UC, pp. 4-7.

⁹⁾ E.g. Burchard says of Henry V's conflict with the church that he acted *viriliter*: UC, p. 7. Ekkehard's final assessment of Henry had been less laudatory: Frutolf-Ekkehard, p. 265: «Hic, ut prescriptum est, primo sub specie religionis patrem excommunicatum imperio privavit; confirmatus in honoribus mores mutavit; sed post iniurias apostolicæ sedi illatas semper se ipso inferior fuit, iusticiis regni non multum invigilavit ...».

¹⁰⁾ See «The Historical Work of Burchard of Ursberg, I: The Ursberg *Chronicon* Text», AP LVIII, 97-98.

nation for the technique is, therefore, crucial to appreciation of his historiographical accomplishment. Annals alone, Burchard says, are inadequate to present the flow of historical events. *Series hystorie*, the pattern of *hystoria*, is lost when events are presented year by year; weaving them together, the historian can invest them with intelligibility. The fabric of history is a living metaphor in *UC*: *contextitur, retexemus*.

Burchard's terminology for the theory of historiography seems at first ambiguous and complicated, and it will require close examination. It is on the other hand apparent from the general shape of his extant work, even without exhaustive analysis of his usages, that the Ursberg author intended to provide each of the kings in the latter section of his work with a woven image. He was able to provide such a picture for only a few. *UC* commemorates Lothar of Supplinburg, whose description follows immediately from Burchard's second theoretical exordium, with *gesta* and *anni*, while it treats Conrad of Hohenstaufen with *historia* and *anni*; *Historia Welforum*, apparently a late intrusion, now provides much of the discussion in their *gesta* and *hystoria* respectively. Henry VI's reign is marked with *anni* alone, and Otto IV's and Frederick II's are both subsumed under the title «Anni Ottonis». Only Frederick Barbarossa and Philip of Swabia receive both synthetic and annalistic treatments largely from Burchard's own hand, and Frederick's *hystoria* embraces only the first part of his reign.

The following table represents an expansion of the table of contents for *UC* offered in the first article in this series. The historian's own major rubrics point out the generic distinctions among his respective treatments of Welf and Hohenstaufen monarchs. Parenthetical remarks show the scope of analytical discussions and note where the intrusion of material from the twelfth-century Welf family history, *Historia Welforum*, is so substantial as to obscure the Premonstatensian chronicler's original contribution¹¹). On the right, pagination in the SSRG edition points out the extent of the various sections in the text:

Introduction to Frutolf-Ekkehard	1-3
Frutolf-Ekkehard redaction — Flood to A.D. 1125 . . .	[elided]
Second introduction and review of Frutolf-Ekkehard . . .	3-7
«Gesta Lotharii» (general comments on the reign and the monarch's family connections, fleshed out with <i>HW</i> intrusions)	7-16

¹¹) See «The Historical Work of Burchard of Ursberg, II: The Ursberg *Chronicon* and the *Historia Welforum* Tradition, *AP* LVIII, 225-251.

«Anni Lotharii» — 1125-1137	16-17
«Hystoria Cuonradi regis» (focus on Welf-Staufer conflict, almost completely made up of <i>HW</i> material)	17-20
«Anni Cuonradi» — 1138-1152	21-22
«Hystoria Friderici imperatoris» (discussion of Frederick's first ten years only, brief <i>HW</i> intrusion)	22-45
«Anni Friderici» — 1152-1190	45-70
«Anni Hainrici sexti» — 1190-1197	70-75
«Gesta Philippi» (treatment of entire reign)	75-94
«Anni Philippi» — 1198-1208	94-96
«Anni Ottonis» — 1208 ff., including Frederick II to 1230	96-127

Even a cursory examination of this descriptive table shows, in light of the scholarly consensus that Burchard had little time to work on his chronicle in the form in which it survives, that his portrayal of the brief reign of Philip is the best surviving example of the type of double history-annals he wished to produce. Borrowing from earlier accounts is unimportant here. Memory supplanted record, and Burchard's loyalty to the Swabian house was urgently summoned to illumine a closed story. «Gesta Philippi» is the most stylistically ambitious section of Burchard's work except for his two introductions and the truncated «Hystoria Friderici». «Anni Philippi», in strong contrast, is a lean and disconnected string of annals in matter-of-fact language.

Comparison of Burchard's treatment of Philip's with his accounts of other reigns suggests that the provost worked from a draft in which his sources and recollections were originally set out annalistically. For some kings he returned to compose *gesta* or *hystoria* concentrating on important themes, and left the annal framework stripped of its former detail as a chronological appendix to the biographical narrative. For other kings, he did not effect such revision, and while they have no *gesta* or *hystoria* their annals remain well-detailed. Thus Henry VI's annals extend for more than five pages in the Monumentist edition and Philip's for only two, although the eventful reign of the latter was longer than his brother's.

Burchard's record of Barbarossa as it appears in the surviving *UC* text perhaps represents an intermediate stage in this revision process. «Hystoria Friderici» has several subordinate rubrics leading up to its account of the destruction of Milan in 1162. All these sections maintain a lofty style and a continuous narrative, just as does «Gesta Philippi». Burchard's analytical narrative, however, breaks off there, and annals revert to the beginning of Frederick's reign. They are like «Anni

Philippi» terse entries of deaths, successions, and astronomical and meteorological events up until the destruction of Milan. There they suddenly expand to continue the detailed narrative dropped at the premature conclusion of Frederick's *hystoria*, although without its embellishment or strict concentration on the imperial-Lombard conflict. Burchard seems to have stopped halfway through his synthetic work on Barbarossa, leaving the concluding annalistic section as a rough draft containing those undifferentiated raw materials from which he had expected to fashion separate synthetic and annalistic sections.

Why the Ursberg provost should have chosen to divide his historical composition between two genres is at first unclear. Frutolf-Ekkehard had provided a model for the inclusion of interpretive materials under subordinate rubrics; the earlier chronicle had occasionally broken into its succession of annals with topical digressions labelled *hystorie*, as for instance «Hystoria Gothorum» after the battle of Adrianople¹²). Such *hystorie* were however not, like Burchard's, coherent historical essays drawn from annals. While the Premonstratensian may thus have been encouraged by the presence of Frutolf-Ekkehard's *hystorie* among annals, his pairing of the two historiographical genres was an important innovation, unique to him at least in the confidence with which he used it and the carefully reasoned apology with which he provided it. In its development the Premonstratensian historian made critical response to long rhetorical and historiographical tradition defining the two forms¹³).

¹²) Frutolf-Ekkehard, pp. 119-121. Other historians employed analogous but dissimilar techniques. Bede's concluding chronological summary, for instance, shows no closer relationship to Burchard's method than does Frutolf-Ekkehard's technique: *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, ed. B. Colgrave and R.A.B. Mynors (Oxford, 1969), 5.34. The English historian's annals are much more skeletal than Burchard's, especially in comparison to the length of his synthetic account.

¹³) Underlying this discussion is H. Beumann's principle that use of *topoi* does not necessarily indicate the ossification of conventions, rather sometimes provides a basis for critical discussion: «Topos und Gedankengefüge bei Einhard», *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 33 (1951), 337-350, rpt. *Ideengeschichtliche Studien zu Einhard und anderen Geschichtsschreibern des früheren Mittelalters* (Darmstadt, 1962), pp. 1-14. See also R.D. Ray, «Medieval Historiography through the Twelfth Century: Problems and Progress of Research», *Viator* 5 (1974), 53-55. Ray mentions that many medieval historians mixed genres, and suggests that this technique may have been the natural product of the monastic milieu, which encouraged choppy, diverse methods of presentation. None of the historians whom he cites, however, specifically addresses the problem of mixed genres: p. 41.

Genre and historicity: the rhetorical tradition

As R.D. Ray has pointed out, medieval historians' manipulation and discussion of genre can be deceptive, since definitions shifted continually and even those writers who attempted exactitude in labeling their work often included apparently incongruous elements¹⁴). Nevertheless, the ancient effort to gather historical literature under rhetorical standards remained an important normative force in medieval historiography, describing historical forms and establishing guidelines for their respective contents. Cicero's presentation in *De oratore* of the development of history as a collateral art of rhetoric and his discussion of historical writing in *De inventione* formed points of departure for subsequent commentary; the communication and interpretation by Isidore of a classical consensus on the relationship between rhetoric and history and on the definition of historical genres likewise became a touchstone for medieval perceptions of the varieties of history and the nature of historical truth¹⁵).

In Cicero's dialogue *De oratore*, the speaker Antonius had pointed out that history was originally only the bare year-by-year record of events: «Erat enim historia nihil aliud nisi annalium confectio ...». Over time, historians had learned to borrow the orator's tools and to become less *narratores*, more *exornatores*. Antonius asserted, however, that historical composition had laws peculiar to it and unlike the standards of oratory: «Nam quis nescit, primam esse historiae legem, ne quid falsi dicere audeat?»¹⁶) In *De inventione*, Cicero raised the implications for historiography of an issue upon which his Antonius only touched, the

¹⁴) Ray, pp. 35-41.

¹⁵) To trace the development of basic historiographical concepts from Republican Rome to Hohenstaufen Germany is far outside the scope of this study. For a survey of the sources and scholarship, see O. Engels, «Gliederungskriterien im Mittelalter», in *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, ed. O. Brunner et al., II (Stuttgart, 1975), 614-616. Cf. B. Croce, *History: Its Theory and Practice*, trans. D. Ainslie (New York, 1960), pp. 200-220; L. Arbusow, *Colores rhetorici: Eine Auswahl rhetorischer Figuren und Gemeinplätze als Hilfsmittel für akademische Übungen an mittelalterlichen Texten* (Göttingen, 1948), pp. 95-97; H. Grundmann, *Geschichtsschreibung im Mittelalter* (Göttingen, 1965), pp. 7-51; G. Melville, «System und Diachronie: Untersuchungen zur Theoretischen Grundlegung geschichtsschreibischer Praxis im Mittelalter», *Historische Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft* 95 (1975), pp. 46-47. For use of genre descriptions as titles, see P. Lehmann, «Mittelalterliche Büchertitel», in *Erforschung des Mittelalters* V (Stuttgart, 1962), pp. 63-69.

¹⁶) M.T. Cicero, *De oratore*, tr. E.W. Sutton, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), 2.12.52-2.15.62.

tension between accomplished action and its rhetorical exposition. The historian was obliged to tell truth because history was fact as well as representation: «Historia est gesta res, ab aetatis nostrae memoria remota ...»¹⁷).

So Isidore, echoing Cicero, emphasized the importance of historical veracity: «Nam historiae sunt res verae, quae factae sunt»¹⁸). Much later, Burchard's principal source, the universal chronicle of Frutolf and Ekkehard, showed acute awareness of the problem of historical truth in historiographical presentation; Frutolf chose to transfer the burden of choice among divergent accounts to his reader. Concerning Alexander the Great, the Michelsberg historian thus inserted, «prudens lector eligat, quid sibi de hiis maxime placeat» and «veritatem ipsarum rerum iudicio legentium relinquimus»¹⁹). Here Frutolf accepted the mutation of Cicero's «prima lex» into the historian's obligation to report equally witnesses of varying reliability²⁰).

Frutolf, however, responded specifically to Cicero's and Isidore's injunctions that history represent truth. He referred repeatedly to «dissonantia hystoriarum»; he was especially troubled by difficulty in determining the chronological relationship between biblical figures and secular monarchs:

His igitur in locis de regum temporumque serie scriptores hystoriarum videntur dissentire. Ea quippe quae de Ezra et Neemia scribuntur, Iosephus sub rege Xerse, filio Darii, refert facta fuisse, si tamen codex in quo sic habetur mendosus non est, ut magis ex scriptorum neglegentia, quam ex hystoriorum hoc evenerit sententia²¹).

¹⁷) M.T. Cicero, *De inventione*, tr. H.M. Hubbell, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass., 1949), 1.19.27.

¹⁸) Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiarum sive originum libri XX*, ed. W.M. Lindsay, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1911), 1.44. Cf. J. Fontaine, *Isidore de Seville et la culture classique dans l'Espagne visigothique* (Paris, 1959), I, 180-185; A. Borst, «Das Bild der Geschichte in der Enzyklopädie Isidors von Sevilla», *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 22 (1966), 1-62.

¹⁹) Frutolf-Ekkehard, pp. 69, 70. See Schulz's commentary on Frutolf's frequent disclaimers of direct responsibility: *Die Lehre von der historischen Methode bei den Geschichtsschreibern des Mittelalters (VI-XIII Jahrhundert)*, Abhandlungen zur mittleren und neueren Geschichte 13 (Berlin, 1909), pp. 45-47.

²⁰) Ray has asserted that indiscriminate presentation of varying accounts was Bede's «vera lex historiae»: «Bede's *Vera Lex Historiae*», *Speculum* 55 (1980), 1-21; see also Ray, «Historiography», pp. 43-44.

²¹) Frutolf-Ekkehard, p. 58; cf. pp. 46, 48-49.

Burchard, following Frutolf's direct approach to the problem of truth among historical sources, acknowledged scribal error in the proemium to his copy of the older chronicle: «... quia prefata scriptura vicio scriptorum omnino est corrupta»²²). His second introduction, following that copy and describing the synthetic treatment of history as more satisfying than Frutolf-Ekkehard's annalistic form, reveals clear familiarity with the classical tradition on truth, embellishment, and rearrangement in the writing of history.

As Burchard already explained in his first introduction, Eusebius' work had been chronologically focused, a conservative interpretation of the historian's role as the correct ordering of past events: «... ut ostendat, quotus annus cuiuslibet regni sive regis quotus sit ad quemlibet annum alterius regni sive alterius regis»²³). Burchard's annals for the twelfth and thirteenth centuries indicate a continuing interest in chronology, but the Premonstratensian's purpose as stated in the second preface extends beyond establishing a sequence of action; he wishes to present kings' deeds, «gesta regum maximeque Romani imperii»²⁴). Indeed, for Burchard *gesta* and *hystoria* are virtually interchangeable terms. Some of his synthetic accounts of reigns are labelled *gesta*, others *hystoria*, although no characteristic of style or organisation differentiates them. To Burchard as to Cicero, then, «Historia est gesta res». But clearly, again to Burchard as to Cicero, *hystoria* is also the written record of *gesta*, and the historian's role lies in the connection between the two usages.

Much later, in the twentieth century, the philosopher of history B. Croce was to see this distinction as critical for historiography from ancient times forward: the understanding of annals as «quod factum, quoque anno gestum sit» and history — Croce meant non-annalistic historical synthesis — as «quo consilio, quaque ratione gesta sit»²⁵). How generally such a distinction may have been applied in the Middle Ages is a difficult question. In Burchard's work, at least, such a dichotomy is explicit. Further, the Premonstratensian historian has cast out Isidore's old distinction between *hystoria* as eyewitness account and

²²) UC, p. 2.

²³) UC, p. 2.

²⁴) UC, p. 3.

²⁵) Croce, p. 186.

anni as the record of past events. He has adopted in its place a definition of *historia* as the interpretive reconstruction of events²⁶).

Otto of Freising, the twelfth-century Cistercian historian of German empire, had directly denied that an explanatory objective was part of the historian's task. «Quae omnia utrum licite aut secus acta sint, dicere presentis non est operis. Res enim gestas scribere, non rerum gestarum rationem reddere proposuimus»²⁷). Burchard's political tendentiousness was far less subtle than Otto's; many events attracted his blatantly judgmental commentary. His portentous invocation of Vergil, «facilisque descensus»²⁸), is a preemptive defense against attacks on his idiosyncratic historical editorializing, which he well realized might be received as inappropriate. Lament over or celebration of events was not the only tool by which a historian might shape his representation of events, however. The choice of detail from overlapping sources and the manner in which details were strung together were also important; in these aspects of his technique Burchard's chronicle is less unique and more nearly in the mainstream of rhetorically conditioned medieval historiography.

Content and presentation: the rhetorical tradition

When Burchard set out through *stilus historiographus* to refashion the raw material of the detailed and informative *anni* which he first collected, he had ready at hand the tools of classical rhetoric. History was, after all, a sub-species of rhetorical *narratio*, that aspect of oratory which communicated the sequence of events that made up the situation under

²⁶) Isidore, 2.44: «Annales sunt res singulorum annorum. Quaecunque enim digna memoria domi militiaeque, mari ac terra, per annos in commentariis acta sunt, ab anniversis gestis annales nominaverunt. Historia autem multorum annorum vel temporum est; cujus diligentia annui commentarii in libris delati sunt. Inter historiam autem et annales hoc interest, quod historia est eorum temporum quae vidimus, annales vero sunt eorum annorum quos aetas nostra non novit». Otto of Freising offers the same definition, though he does not abide by it: *Gesta Friderici seu rectius chronica*, ed. F.-J. Schmale, trans. A. Schmidt, AQ 17 (Berlin, 1965), c. 41: «Nam antiquorum mos fuisse traditur, ut illi qui res ipsas prout gestae fuerunt sensibus perceperant earundem scriptores existerent. Unde et hystoria ab hysteron, quod in Greco 'videre' sonat, appellari consuevit».

²⁷) Otto of Freising, *Chronica sive historia de duabus civitatibus*, ed. A. Hofmeister, trans. A. Schmidt, AQ 16, (Berlin, 1960), 6.23. See also *Chronica* 2. prol.: «Nemo autem a nobis sententias aut moralitates expectet». Schulz points out, «Und diesem Grundsatz bleibt er auch in seinem späteren Geschichtswerk treu»: p. 64. This is not to say that Otto was not capable of tendentiousness; see e.g. *Chronica* 3. prol.

²⁸) UC, p. 3.

discussion. Precisely what handbooks of rhetoric or *artes dictaminis* the historian Burchard had studied are impossible to determine, but that a religious of his experience and erudition was imbued with rhetorical learning in his early training in the trivium is certain. To describe the extent of rhetorical influence on Burchard's work would be effectively to describe the difference between his annals and his biographical histories, an investigation which — undertaken with attention to all distinguishable details — would demand space and time far out of proportion to the importance of its conclusions. Ray has suggested, however, that the rich efflorescence of historiography in the twelfth century and its withering in the thirteenth were both directly related to the level of interest in rhetoric. The exhibition of rhetorical sophistication in so late an author as Burchard therefore demands some attention²⁹).

Cicero's central directive on narrative in *De inventione*, «ut brevis, ut aperta, ut probabilis sit»³⁰), echoed down the rhetorical handbooks of his successors³¹), providing a general stylistic standard for historical prose. So Burchard, in turning abruptly from his «Hystoria Friderici» narrative, appealed directly to *brevitas* as a rhetorical virtue: «Hec de bellis imperatoris ... sufficiat ..., ut pateat, quam virilem et animosum se exhibuerit in aliis bellis ... breviter explicabimus. Cuncta siquidem plene describere opus faceret immensum»³²). Rhetoric, however, gave the work of the narrator-historian suggestions for content as well as for form. Martianus Capella pointed out, for instance, that narrative had six parts: «... narrationis etiam elementa sunt sex: persona, causa, locus,

²⁹) R.D. Ray, in «Rhetoric in Twelfth-Century Historiography: A Round Table», Session 113, Fourteenth International Congress on Medieval Studies, Kalamazoo, Mich., 5 May 1979. On the general importance of rhetoric to medieval historiography, cf. Schulz, pp. 96-98; Melville, p. 55. For the relationship of history to the liberal arts in general, see H. Wolter, «Geschichtliche Bildung in Rahmen der Artes Liberales», in *Artes Liberales*, ed. J. Koch, Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 5 (Leiden, 1959), pp. 60-80.

³⁰) Cicero, *De inventione* 1.20.28.

³¹) E.g. M.F. Quintilianus, *Institutiones oratoriae libri duodecim*, ed. M. Winterbottom (Oxford, 1970), 4.2.31: «Eam [i.e. narration] plerique scriptores maximeque qui sunt ab Isocrate volunt esse lucidam brevem veri similem». The following discussion of rhetorical theory and its historiographical influence is based on H. Lausberg's *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik: Eine Grundlegung der literaturwissenschaft*, 2nd ed. (Munich, 1973), c. 289-290. See also F. Quadtbauer, *Die antike Theorie der Genera dicendi im lateinischen Mittelalter*, Sitzungsberichte der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, der philosophisch-historischen Klasse 241 (Vienna, 1962), II, 7-17.

³²) UC, pp. 44-45.

tempus, materia, res»³³). Rhetorical exploration and definition of *narratio* even gave some grounds for the composition of tendentious history. Although for Cicero himself «*historia est gesta res*» and «*narratio est rerum gestarum aut ut gestarum expositio*»³⁴), Quintilian made an important modification acknowledging that narrative, like the orator's task as a whole, extended beyond *delectare* and *docere* to *movere* and *persuadere*: «*Narratio est rei factae aut ut factae utilis ad persuadendum expositio ...*»³⁵).

Again, to trace the specific ways in which the Ursberg historian's work reveals the influence of these concepts would be of little interest. Their general compatibility with the author's techniques and critical persona is however of considerable interest because it reveals that he indeed responded to a complex tradition of rhetorical criteria for historical writing. He did so broadly, without minute and self-conscious casting of individual sections of his work along rhetorical guidelines, because his rhetorical background was an integral part of his intellectual point of view and of his facility for assimilating and evaluating information. Cicero had said that history was true, *vera*, but that *narratio* was *probabilis*, not true but plausible. Any narrator must bridge the gap between truth and its image with verisimilitude, conviction, and clarity. The historian, whose material was factual, had special awareness of this obligation. The distance of historical reality from historiographical presentation, the multiplicity of historical facts: these were the conjoined difficulties of the historian's task. What details should the chronicler record and how should he offer them? As Hugh of S. Victor stated succinctly, «*gesta ... temporum infinita pene sunt*»³⁶). Hugh's own system for choosing important topics, to focus on person, place, and time, was neat; Otto of Freising's response to the task was even more basic. He wrote to Rainald of Dassel about the historian's task:

Scitis enim, quod omnis doctrina in duobus consistit, in fuga et electione ... grammatica ... ipsa est, quae secundum suam disciplinam docet eligere ea quae conveniunt proposito, et fugere, quae impediunt propositum Sic et cronographorum facultas habet,

³³) Cited by Lausberg, c. 289.

³⁴) Cicero, *De inventione* 1.19.27.

³⁵) Quintilian, 4.2.31.

³⁶) Hugh of St. Victor, «Hugo of St. Victor *De tribus maximis circumstantiis gestorum*», ed. W.M. Green, *Speculum* 18 (1943), 491.

quae purgando fugiat, quae instruendo eligat; fugit enim mendacia, eligit veritatem³⁷⁾).

Burchard's purpose was immediately simpler than Otto's — not the record of two great Augustinian cities, but «gesta regum», the deeds of German kings. Still, the Ursberg historian was faced, especially for contemporary events, with culling from an abundance of historical documentary, and oral material, and his manner of communicating what he did choose was again responsive to authoritative rhetorical theory. The Vienna Scholia on Horace's *Ars poetica* made clear definition of two kinds of narrative technique; such definition was surely known to Burchard:

Omnis ordo aut naturalis aut artificialis est. Naturalis ordo est, si quis narret rem ordine, quo gesta est; artificialis ordo est, si quis non incipit a principio rei gestae, sed a medio, ut Vergilius in Aeneide quaedam in futuro dicenda anticipat, et quaedam in praesenti dicenda ... differt³⁸⁾.

Here, reference had been made specifically to poetry and Burchard, surprisingly emphatically since works of epic poets such as Lucan were typically labelled as historical³⁹⁾, carefully dissociated himself at least from elegiac poets over the Christian debacle at Damietta:

Faciant super hoc rumore planctum et lamentationem et deplorationem hi, qui sciunt verba multiplicare et conquestiones de rebus miserabilibus facere et animos hominum ad deplorandum et compatiendum suis eligis versibus inclinare. Nos vero ad texendum et retexendum rerum gestarum hystoriam properabimus⁴⁰⁾.

The method according to which Burchard «wove» history was, however, not entirely chronological; he shared his rhetorically informed pattern of presentation with the poets whom he lambasted.

³⁷⁾ Otto, *Chronica*, pp. 6-8. See Engels, p. 620. Burchard's Premonstratensian contemporary, Robert of Auxerre, responded closely to Hugh's observation in his chronicle's opening sentence; Robert's statement — more obviously than any similar statement in *UC* — rings of the rhetorical handbook: *Chronicon*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGH SS 26 (Hanover, 1882), p. 226: «Cum infinita sint temporum gesta gestorumque digestores quam plurimi, nec possint ab omnibus omnia vel haberi vel legi: non inutile duximus ex infinitis pauca colligere et in unum coartare compendium, quae legenti magis vel oblectamentum pariant vel profectum».

³⁸⁾ Cited by Quadlbauer, pp. 32-33.

³⁹⁾ See Wolter, pp. 66-67.

⁴⁰⁾ *UC*, p. 120.

In M. Schulz's view, the single most important historiographical product of the rhetorically generative twelfth-century milieu was the new usage of *ordo artificialis* alongside natural chronological arrangement. In the thirteenth century, as she asserts, this rhetorically grounded reassessment of historical writing broke down; an anti-annalistic attitude continued to prevail — so strongly that she suggests it was responsible for the eclipse of the annalistic form in mid-century — but now it was differently motivated. Schulz chooses Burchard of Ursberg as typical of the new thirteenth-century attitude toward historiography, citing his criticism of Frutolf-Ekkehard's Salian annals, «ideoque series hystorie de ipsis imperatoribus difficilius contextitur», and his alternative proposition to present them «sub stilo hystoriographo» as evidence for a strictly biographical emphasis⁴¹). Schulz is surely right that Burchard does not in his *gesta* or *hystorie* substantially reorder time, but it is unclear why his narrow use of rhetorical rearrangement for biographical purposes makes it less a use of *ordo artificialis*⁴²).

«Texere et retexere», «series rerum gestarum» — the thread of the history of kings which Burchard wove was indeed chronological, at least in part, but the pattern which his intervention generated was not consequently so. At the beginning of the twelfth century Conrad of Hirsau had defined the two varieties of *ordo* in historiographically intelligible terms, with specific reference to the *series* often mentioned by Burchard: «Naturalem noveris ordinem, cum liber iuxta rei gestae seriem incipitur, artificialem, ubi librorum principiis ordo debitus non tenetur, sicut Vergilius in Eneide»⁴³). For Conrad, the *Aeneid* remained

⁴¹) Schulz, pp. 105-107. On p. 106, about Burchard: «Im Gegensatz zu dieser [i.e. annals], in der der Leser sich die Regierungshandlungen der einzelnen Herrscher erst wieder herausuchen und zusammenstellen muss, um von ihnen ein Bild zu gewinnen, will er ihm vielmehr diese Arbeit abnehmen und selbst schon die Taten der Herrscher in Zusammenhang schildern».

⁴²) Croce's opinion was more closely in accord with the one advanced here. Without mentioning Burchard directly, he nevertheless uses exactly the Premonstratensian's words to point out the presence of *ordo artificialis* in twelfth- and thirteenth-century historiography: p. 219: «The form of the chronicles, too, becomes less accidental and arid, the better among the chroniclers here and there seeking a different 'order' — that is to say, really, a better understanding — and we find (particularly from the thirteenth century onward) the *ordo artificialis* or internal opposed to the *ordo naturalis* or external chronological order. There are also to be found those who distinguish between the *sub singulis annis describere* and the *sub stilo historico conglutinare* — that is to say, the grouping together according to things described». Cf. *UC*, p. 4: «... sub stilo hystoriographo non sunt conglutinata, sed potius gesta temporum sub singulis annis sunt descripta ...».

⁴³) Cited by Quadlbauer, pp. 60-61.

the locus classicus of artificial order, as it had been for the Vienna scholiast, but he defined it as incompatible with the natural order of «series rerum gestarum».

Series and *ordo* had long been important *topoi* in Christian historiography. Isidore himself had said, «Chronica Graece dicitur quae Latine temporum series appellatur, qualem apud Graecos Eusebius Caesariensis episcopus edidit, et Hieronymus presbyter in Latinam linguam convertit»⁴⁴). Gregory of Tours set out «prosequentes ordinem temporum»⁴⁵); Otto of Freising was at the same task more than five centuries later, using the weaving metaphor which the Ursberg provost later adopted: «... bellorum ac rerum nutantium seriem teximus»⁴⁶). Ekkehard, Burchard's most immediate model, likewise considered *series* an important historical consideration. Praising an Irish historian named David, Ekkehard said, «Hic ... totam huius expeditionis seriem ... digessit»⁴⁷). Among all these authors — Gregory of Tours, Otto of Freising, Ekkehard of Aura — the natural order of events so described was explicitly chronological.

The historical genre most narrowly appropriate to chronological *ordo naturalis* was annalistic, however, and annals were precisely the form which Burchard rejected in his theoretical second introduction. *Series* was not for him strictly chronological and the order which it explored was not entirely sequential. In Burchard's context *series* might then be interpreted both as the pattern (sense) of history and as the thread (sequence) of events. If his predecessors' *anni* were unsatisfying for Burchard as chronicler, then it follows that he found his own technique of combining *historia* and *anni* more satisfying. The review of Salian reigns initiating the independently compiled section of Burchard's chronicle offers an example of that technique's application. Burchard indeed begins with a chronological survey, the description of the Speyer tombs, but that review is highly unusual in that its emotional affect is greater than its specific information. The central point of the Salian recapitulation is not the exact ordering of kings, but examination of the anti-papal activity of the last two members of the dynasty. Theme, not

⁴⁴) Isidore, 5.28.

⁴⁵) Gregory of Tours, *Historiarum libri decem*, ed. and trans. R. Bucher, AQ 1 (Berlin, 1956), 2. prol.

⁴⁶) Otto, *Chronica* 2.32. Cf., e.g., Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum*, ed. G. Waitz, SSRG (Hanover, 1878, rpt. 1930), 1.26: «... ad nostrae seriem revertamur historiae».

⁴⁷) Frutolf-Ekkehard, p. 243.

chronology, is Burchard's focus. As in any historical discussion, chronological *ordo naturalis* remains a backdrop, but here the rhetorically sophisticated *ordo artificialis* of argument drawing together incidents from different historical periods assumes the forefront. The deposition of Saul is presented as directly relevant to Henry IV's excommunication. Biblical typology was of course an exegetical tool familiar to Burchard and his contemporaries from their theological experience, but this circumstance does not lessen its historiographical interest.

Burchard's highly connotative usage of *series* as a historiographical description represents a broadening and deepening of the narrowly chronological usage of Ekkehard. Otto of Freising had retained the old usage, but his world chronicle was hardly a simple chronology. Burchard was, however, not alone in his new interpretation of the term. Robert of Auxerre, another preeminent thirteenth-century Premonstratensian historian, had prefaced his chronicle with a proliferation of historical-theoretical terms and metaphors. Robert mixed four images for history, thread, flowers, music, and water: «seriem ... texere»; «descriptiunculam ... effloratam»; «dissonantia numerorum»; «neque ... fonti dissimilem rivulam e fonte manentem»⁴⁸). To what extent some or all of these metaphors were dead for Robert is beside the point. His repetition of them and his accumulation of etymologically related words, like Burchard's repetition of his own consistently favorite weaving metaphor, implies that they were not; in any case they still represent a self-conscious effort to describe the following work⁴⁹). It is evident that they do not describe a strictly chronological emphasis. Robert did not, like Burchard, criticize *anni* as defective, so his repeated reference to weaving and *series* alongside other historical metaphors is not as strongly thematic as his fellow canon's. Still, correspondence between his and Burchard's images for historical synthesis strengthens the impression that the latter indeed meant to search for more than biographical coherence in *hystoria*⁵⁰). Burchard did not know Robert's work, but the parallelism between the two Premonstratensians' preoccupations with pattern in history suggests

⁴⁸) Robert, p. 227.

⁴⁹) Cf., e.g., G. Melville's study of the *flores* metaphor: «Zur 'Flores-Metaphorik' in der mittelalterlichen Geschichtsschreibung: Ausdruck eines Formungsprinzips», *Historisches Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft* 90 (1970), 65-70.

⁵⁰) See N. Backmund's discussion of Robert: *Die mittelalterlichen Geschichtsschreiber des Prämonstratenserordens*, Bibliotheca Analectorum Praemonstratensium 10 (Averbode, 1972), esp. pp. 265-267.

that the reform orders, which had produced the greatest of twelfth-century German historians, Otto of Freising, maintained a vital, synthetic historiographical tradition into the thirteenth century.

N. Partner has recently attempted to describe the «apparent shapelessness» of medieval historiography as the natural product of a contemporary aesthetic⁵¹). Building on E. Auerbach's definition of medieval Latin style as paratactic, that is differing from classical and modern modes of expression in its characteristic use of additive and temporal rather than causal and subordinating conjunctions⁵²), she has seen medieval historical perception as analogous to historiographical style:

The dominant literary conventions of the age, the taste for abrupt, paratactic composition, for episodic, compound narratives, had to make the conception of an orderly, linking theme of providential history as foreign to nonfiction as the well-made plot was to contemporary fiction⁵³).

Here Partner refers narrowly to the development of Christian theological principles along historical lines and she perhaps overstates her case; the complex Ciceronian period is not the only possible vehicle for complexly logical thought, nor is the episodic narrative necessarily devoid of thematic unity. *Series* as pattern elucidated through rhetorical *ordo artificialis* and allusive interplay with literary models may be the more starkly apparent in the absence of hypotactic connectives. Continual identification of a causative force or a direction of historical development way imply logical hypotaxis through grammatical parataxis. Burchard, reacting against Frutolf-Ekkehard, set out specifically to define pattern in history; he asserted his dissatisfaction with the disconnected presentation which Partner has found typical. Determination of the degree of his success in avoiding it will depend on closer analysis not of his theoretical discussion, but of his practical accomplishment.

STYLE AND PATTERN IN BURCHARD'S INTERPRETATION OF EVENTS

In his chronicle's second introduction, Burchard acknowledges that

⁵¹) Cf. N.F. Partner, *Serious Entertainments: The Writing of History in Twelfth-Century England* (Chicago, 1977), p. 194; W.J. Brandt, *The Shape of Medieval History: Studies in Modes of Perception* (New Haven, 1966), esp. pp. 65-76.

⁵²) See E. Auerbach, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*, trans. W.R. Trask (Princeton, 1968), pp. 70-75, 99-101, 166 ff.

⁵³) Partner, p. 222.

some readers will be displeased by his work, adverting to himself as «rudes et imperiti»⁵⁴). His disclaimer of stylistic sophistication is a commonplace⁵⁵); his description of his own as the middle style, «de medio usu loquendi», nevertheless indicates his responsiveness to formal rhetorical standards. The language of Burchard's chronicle, at least in its more polished sections, is less simple than his introduction suggests. And although he occasionally makes use of the logical terminology of the schools, unornamented scholastic exposition was not an important influence on the language of his work.

Homiletic

As Burchard's editor O. von Simson noticed, parts of the historian's work are written more in the style of homily than of history⁵⁶). For instance in «Gesta Philippi», the only complete royal biography extending from the subject's accession to his death without the appearance of substantial derivative passages, frequent allusion to the sublime material of the Vulgate effectively raises the narrative from the middle to the high style⁵⁷). The biographical essay on Philip is divided among three rubrics: «Gesta Philippi», «De bellis Philippi», «Determinatio cause». «De bellis» and «Determinatio» are, however, not structural departures but minor transitions serving to mark stages in a continuous account. In introducing the second rubric, for instance, the author qualifies his purpose: «Hec hactenus de exortu scismatis in regno dicta sufficient. Nunc de bellis propter hec gestis dicamus»⁵⁸).

«Gesta Philippi» indeed reveals the influence of scholastic dialectic, as its final rubric «Determinatio cause» implies. Burchard's exposure to the universities is evident elsewhere in *UC*, for instance in his biographical notices of Gratian and Irnerius and in his record of Bernard's assault on Abelard⁵⁹). Only in Philip's biography does it assume obvious significance.

⁵⁴) *UC*, p. 3.

⁵⁵) Auerbach, p. 93; the locus classicus is Gregory of Tours' «non oratores sed piscatores». See Ray, for whom simple historical language becomes «that holy rusticity friendly to moral truth»: «Historiography», p. 50. Here Ray follows Otto of Freising, *Chronica* 1. prol.: «... sic semper veritatis amica sancta sit rusticitas». Burchard's own important source, Frutolf-Ekkehard, had provided a similar comment: p. 243: «... stilo tam facili, qui pene nichil a communi loquela differat ...».

⁵⁶) Simson, intro. to *UC*, p. xxix.

⁵⁷) See Simson's apparatus for biblical references: *UC*, pp. 76-88.

⁵⁸) *UC*, p. 82.

⁵⁹) *UC*, pp. 15-16. See also Burchard's attention to Peter of Benevento: p. 77.

ance for the development of the narrative. The conflict which is resolved, in Burchard's presentation, by regicide is one which he perceives to have begun when Innocent III wrongfully excommunicated Philip. Although subsequent events are not subordinated by the Ursberg author to strictly logical arrangement but are developed in the style of a sermon, the dialectical pattern is clear. Philip's ascendancy seems at first secure because God sees to it that the Germans do not abandon their true masters, «nativos dominos»⁶⁰). The pope plots against Philip's coronation and the princes grow restless. Burchard packs the narrative with scriptural tags in the aftermath of Philip's succession: «Tunc ceperunt multiplicari mala in terris»⁶¹).

In his exposition of these *mala*, the Ursberg provost offers a portrait of general overturning of right order:

Orte siquidem sunt in hominibus simultates, doli, perfidie, traditiones, ut se invicem tradant in mortem et interitum, rapine, depredationes, depopulationes, terrarum vastationes, incendia, seditiones et bella et rapine sive in stratis sive in latrocinis iustificate sunt, ut omnis homo iam sit periurus et predictis facinoribus implicatus, ut vix excusari possit, quin sit in his sicut populus sic et sacerdos. Tribulatio magna prohibuit et hoc, ut nec quis de villa sua posset procedere secure saltem in proximam villam⁶²).

The emotive climax of Burchard's lament for internal German violence is built on Vulgate references to the perversion of royal unction:

Exaltatum est cornu iniquitatis, de quo multi delibuti sunt. Quo contra Dominus loquitur per prophetam: 'Dixi iniquis: nolite inique agere, et delinquentibus: nolite exaltare cornu'. Hoc cornu impletum est iam adulterino ungento, non eo, de quo scriptum est in lege: Non facies tibi unguentum alterius compositionis; oleum quoque peccatoris, de quo iustus precatur, ut non impinguet caput suum. Iam procul est cornu, de cuius oleo unctus est David in regem. Quid igitur fiet in membris, nisi quod et in capitibus? Quid recipiat barba, nisi quod habet caput? Sic derivantur tam mala quam bona. O Deus, aspice, quia sicut unguentum est in capite, tale descendit in barbam, et utinam in barbam tantum ad reprobos, descendit etiam in barbam Aaron. Nam qui in monte fortitudinis fundamentum posuerant, utpote claustrales et vitas quascumque religiosas agere se fecte demonstrantes, alienatis sunt a vulva sancte

⁶⁰) UC, p. 76.

⁶¹) UC, p. 80.

⁶²) UC, p. 80.

matris ecclesie, qua concepti sanctum baptisma perceperunt. Erraverunt ab utero, quo monitis salutaribus calefieri debuerunt et nutrir, nunc tantum locuti sunt falsa⁶³).

Burchard clearly does not mean that Philip, in his presentation a troubled but worthy king, should not have been anointed, rather that proper unction had gone awry. Otto's rival election ensues and the Ursberg author returns with an excoriation of Rome parallel to the passage about Philip's unction in its vitriolic employment of biblical allusion:

Gaude, mater nostra Roma, quoniam aperiuntur kataracte thesaurorum in terra, ut ad to confluant rivi et aggeres nummorum in magna copia. Letare super iniquitate filiorum hominum, quoniam in recompensationem tantorum malorum datur tibi precium. Iocundare super adiutrice tua Discordia, quia erupit de puteo infernalis abyssi, ut accumulentur tibi multa pecuniarum premia. Habes quod semper sitisti, decanta canticum, quia per malitiam hominum, non per tuam religionem orbem vicisti⁶⁴).

The remaining rubrics of «Gesta Philippi» fall away from the sermonizing tone of these few passages; the subsequent text simply describes the playing out of forces whose generation has already been decried. The final assessment of Philip in «Determinatio cause», however, plainly recalls the logical rubric: «... constet ex predictis, quod potenter regnaturus fuisset sicut et alii de parentela eiusdem, si non impedisset mors»⁶⁵). The Ursberg chronicler rationalizes the success of forces against which he has sermonized by logically positing the removal of an unhappy and inescapable condition.

The homiletical style and dialectical presentation of «Gesta Philippi» do not by themselves provide coherent organization for Burchard's study of Philip's reign. To an extent, «Gesta Philippi» is structurally paratactic in Partner's sense of the term. The life begins with Philip in Italy when his elder brother dies. The narrative switches from Italian and German rebellion against the Hohenstaufen heir to Innocent's anti-imperial agitation with only temporal conjunction: «Innocentius siquidem papa

⁶³) UC, pp. 80-81.

⁶⁴) UC, p. 82. The same passage is interesting for the author's political and ecclesiological points of view. It must be assumed to be Burchard's own so long as there is no better evidence that it may not have been included in some UC versions than its absence from C. Heyd's 1539 translation: see «Burchard I», p. 109.

⁶⁵) UC, p. 91.

III. tunc ...»⁶⁶) When the text reverts to description of baronial sedition, it acknowledges that the focus of intervening material has been digressive: «His interpositis de oppositione sedis apostolice, ut regium genus deperiret, redeamus ad describendum labores, quos iniquissimorum principum machinatione sustinuit in Alamannia»⁶⁷). So the story of Philip's travails continues episodically until his death, strung along with *tunc, et, sed* rather than arranged in a careful hierarchy of causally related incidents.

Although Burchard's narrative is therefore grammatically paratactic and although it moves along more or less chronologically, chopply, from crisis to crisis, it is not necessarily thematically disjointed. Every incident or complex of incidents presented in the entire text is intimately related to Philip's struggle to maintain his crown and is told precisely from the point of view of this effort except for one, the several paragraphs beginning «Ea tempestate surrexit in Francia ...» and describing Crusader activities leading up to the Latin conquest of Constantinople in 1204. The passage concludes, marking digression, «Sed nunc redeamus ad propositum»⁶⁸). Even this brief excursus, however, is linked to the mainstream of the Philip-narrative by the author's notice that the blinded Byzantine king was the German consort's father, and that her brother first sought refuge in the Staufer court, then returned home and was subsequently killed⁶⁹).

Thus in «Gesta Philippi» not only have the exegetical and typological techniques of the sermon been used to inform historical presentation, but also rhetorical invention has rigorously confined the elements of the exposition to a narrowly defined field of interest. The linkage of the repeatedly summoned image of Philip as analogue to biblical heroes with energetic concentration on his career renders the text internally consistent, fast-moving, and preeminently intelligible. The paratactic style, despite its poverty of causal connectives and subordinating structures, has concluded by advancing an explicit and persuasive causal argument: Philip, embattled by wicked princes, overcame his adversaries because of his own righteousness. He was finally defeated, but the historian does not therefore abandon his description of the reign's course as providential:

⁶⁶) UC, p. 77.

⁶⁷) UC, p. 79.

⁶⁸) UC, pp. 86-88.

⁶⁹) UC, p. 87.

Fuit autem occisus X. kal. Iulii, hac sola causa, quia, cum desponsasset unam de filiabus suis prefato sceleroso [i.e. to Otto of Wittelsbach], idem quendam liberum familiarem ducis Bawarie perfide interfecit, de qua perfidia coram principibus notatus fuit, et ideo rex filiam suam sibi tradere denegavit⁷⁰).

«Hac sola causa»: Philip's murder is senseless. Burchard takes it at face value. The victorious king's death does not dismay the historian by overturning the results of Philip's slow triumph; its senselessness does not mean that the historical process leading to Philip's ascendancy was itself senseless. The immediate reason for the king's destruction is the same moral rectitude and justice which had brought his defeat of Otto. That its final effect is unlooked-for does not inspire Burchard to lament the mysteriousness of historical events⁷¹).

Historical causation: the individual level

In «Gesta Philippi», Burchard says of Otto IV that he was both proud and stupid, and that these were characteristics which allowed him to become embroiled in the contest for German Empire: «... miseruntque nuntios suos ... in Angliam, ut inde advocarent et adducerent Ottonem, pro eo quod superbus et stultus, sed fortis videbatur ...»⁷²). The theme of pride is not elsewhere important in the Ursberg chronicler's account of Philip's reign; there is little room for the discussion of human motivation and its consequences alongside the historian's portrait of divine and diabolical inspiration at war in German empire. In the stories of both Fredericks, however, personal characteristics beyond generalized virtue like Philip's or vice like his assassin's assume significance in triggering the succession of events. Pride is most important among them.

The most recent article in this series, in its comparison of *UC*'s use of the lost work of John of Cremona with its use of other extant sources, has suggested that Burchard's borrowing from that account of Barbarossa's Italian activities was limited. Stylistic criteria, which have heretofore been used to support John's responsibility for most of «Hystoria Friderici», will here be seen to suggest rather that he made

⁷⁰) *UC*, p. 90.

⁷¹) The emphasis placed here on the coherence of Burchard's portrait of Philip reveals the *UC* invective against him as an even less probable contribution of the original author: *UC*, pp. 91-94. See «Burchard I», pp. 126-128.

⁷²) *UC*, p. 81.

little contribution to *UC*. Vulgate allusions in Burchard's biographical treatment of Frederick are frequently and incongruously intertwined with the theme of «imperator Mavortius», to whose epic deeds are attached frequent superlatives: *confidentissimus*, *solertissimus*⁷³). Overt allusions to Vergil and intrusions of snatches of hexameter lines⁷⁴) implied to Simson that Burchard was through much of «*Hystoria Friderici*» heavily dependent on John, and that the Cremonese account must have been in verse⁷⁵). The Ursberg provost, however, was himself capable of creating epic tone, adverting almost at the same moment to the *Aeneid* and to Scripture for the purpose of exciting his reader's close attention and impressing the gravity of his point.

In *UC*'s second introduction, where the author attempts to turn aside potential criticism, classical and Scriptural allusions are combined into a single sentence: «*Quia vero omnis etas in malum prona est facilisque descensus Averni, rectum contempnitur et quod vitiosum est frequenter*»⁷⁶). Such a combination of allusions was hardly extraordinary. The Premonstratensian historian and his Cremonese source for «*Hystoria Friderici*» may have used the device independently or the Ursberg author may even have been so favorably impressed by its effect in John's text that he adopted it himself. The appearance of a similar blending of epic and biblical tags in that part of *UC* which Burchard indisputably wrote, however, implies that he might not have followed the Cremonese work as closely in «*Hystoria Friderici*» as has been assumed. The sudden break, «*Transitus*», and the shift to annals after the destruction of Milan in A.D. 1162⁷⁷), may require no more explanation than the fact of Frederick's Lombard retrenchment; Barbarossa's involvement in Italy after that point was hardly worthy of epic treatment. Nor was Philip of Swabia's career amenable to Vergilian allusion. For all Burchard's wishful thinking, Philip was a spectacular failure, in whose reign all Barbarossa's careful aggrandizement of Staufer alods and Henry VI's dynastic machinations were obliterated. The homiletical style appropriate for Philip's reign and, as well, for Frederick I's is present throughout both, but John of Cremona's work ended long before the

⁷³) *UC*, esp. pp. 28-32.

⁷⁴) E.g. «... *Italicas appetiit oras* ...»: *UC*, p. 27.

⁷⁵) Simson, p. XXIX-XXXIII.

⁷⁶) *UC*, p. 3.

⁷⁷) *UC*, pp. 44-45.

reign of Barbarossa's younger son, and Burchard cannot have drawn his later biography from it.

The Ursberg historian's portrayal of Barbarossa's early reign must then be substantially his own. Source material is subjected to his own rhetorical manipulation and the strong thematic concentration which emerges is either his originally or so thoroughly transformed and adopted by him that it intrudes in «Gesta Philippi» and, it will be seen, in «Anni Ottonis». The theme of pride first emerges in «Hystori Friderici» in the description of Frederick's Milanese opponents: «Mediolanenses enim superbi rebelles consueverunt esse imperatoribus exortis de Suevia; illis vero, qui de Saxonia erant, devotius assistebant ...». Burchard's observation that the Milanese favored Saxon over Swabian emperors is apt but this is not a line of reasoning which he immediately pursues. He returns quickly with «Cum sint etenim superbissimi ...»⁷⁸). The people of Asti are subjected by Frederick after Roncaglia as «gentem ... superbam»⁷⁹) and Cremonese allies of Milan begin to act «superbe»⁸⁰). The theme of pride recurs even more emphatically with Burchard's rubric «de scismate suborto». A Vulgate quotation is portentously advanced:

Sane Deus, qui per os psalmiste declamavit contra excommunicationem pape per pecuniam corrupti, declaravit illud propheticum esse verum: 'Maledicent illi, et tu benedices; qui insurgunt in me, confundantur, servus autem tuus letabitur'.

Burchard distinguishes the parts of the Psalm text and explains their historical fulfillment even more overtly in the manner of a scholastic preacher than he did in explaining the relevance of biblical quotations on unction in his life of Philip of Swabia:

Cuius versus tres articuli in hoc negocio evidentissime sunt adimpleti. Primum namque articulum de maledictione seu benedictione Dei ipsi Deo relinquamus, ceterum ex duobus consequentibus constabit primum non ex Deo, sed ex dyabolo processisse⁸¹).

In subsequent paragraphs and subsequent rubrics, the relevance of the images of rebellion against and acquiescence to divine will is repeatedly asserted. When the Milanese rebel for the third time they have tried their

⁷⁸) UC, p. 26.

⁷⁹) UC, p. 32.

⁸⁰) UC, p. 37.

⁸¹) UC, p. 39. Cf. Psalm 108.28.

luck too far: «'ante ruinam exaltabitur cor'»⁸²). Frederick appears explicitly as the *servus* of the biblical quotation beginning «Maledicent illi ...». When he is on the point of capture at the hands of the resurgent Milanese, he is saved by God: «Tandem Deus ex alto prospectans, ut servum suum liberaret, eo tempore pluviam densissimam et tempestuosam de nubibus emisit, ut nullus alium discernere posset aut cognoscere». Similarly, on the point of their city's destruction, the Milanese appear as the victims of the righteous wrath of God: «... ut superbos Deus everteret ...»⁸³).

The theme of pride is likewise evident in «Anni Ottonis» despite their semi-annalistic form, which indicates that Burchard failed to return to the overlapping reigns of the Welf and his Staufer successor to distill a synthetic account. The opening entry, recounting Otto's accession, looks forward to and accounts for his deposition: «... regnavit annis IIII et a regno pellitur, quod propter ipsius superbiam precipue contigisse creditur»⁸⁴); the same trait of personality which had led Otto to seek empire and brought Milan's downfall led to the emperor's death. Burchard's assessment of Otto is so uniformly hostile that he attributes even his apparently positive accomplishments to arrogant motives. Otto harries criminals «potius indignans super eos per superbiam quam amans iustitiam», and moves against ecclesiastical landholdings «simulans zelum iustitie, cum potius ageret superbe»⁸⁵). Gregory IX, the successor of Otto IV as the focus of anti-Staufer activity in the empire, is similarly described by the Ursberg historian: «Hic tamquam superbus primo anno pontificatus sui cepit excommunicare Fridericum ...»⁸⁶).

The frequently enunciated New Testament principle that God humbles the proud and raises up the meek was a familiar *topos* in medieval historiography⁸⁷). Burchard's use of it, as least in reference to Gregory IX as arrogant, probably derived immediately from a documentary source, Frederick II's encyclical on his excommunication of December 1227. The Premonstratensian historian summarizes this letter describing a long series of alleged abuses of the child king's trust by his papal guardians. Burchard's description of the emperor as here «retexens

⁸²) UC, p. 41. Cf. Prov. 16.18.

⁸³) UC, p. 42.

⁸⁴) UC, p. 96.

⁸⁵) UC, p. 97.

⁸⁶) UC, p. 122.

⁸⁷) Otto of Freising employed it: e.g. *Gesta* 2.14: «De situ et superbia Mediolani».

omnem progressum vite sue et conversationem» acknowledges its similarity to his own work by assigning to it the metaphor of weaving⁸⁸). Frederick had asserted that God cast down the arrogant Otto to raise him up because he was humble:

Item qualiter Dominus mirabiliter preter humanam conscientiam ipsum in multis periculis conservavit et demum ad imperium sibi debitum preter humanum sensum reduxit, deiciendo Ottonem superbum et exaltando humilem⁸⁹).

A final emergence in Burchard's chronicle of the historical effect of pride as preached by Frederick, though less overt, regards agents of Gregory IX in Apulia. They alleged that the emperor had died in the Holy Land, and attempted to exterminate his returning Crusaders: «Sed Deus misericors aliter providit et homines suo servitio deditos ad laudem et gloriam nominis sui clementissime conservavit»⁹⁰). Humble servants of God, in Burchard's unfinished account of Frederick II's reign, are sheltered by divine providence exactly as they were in his polished but

⁸⁸) UC, p. 122. See Beumann, pp. 340-341: *conversatio* as a topos in royal biography had been introduced by Einhard. The term was familiar in monastic literature from the Benedictine Rule: Benedict of Monte Cassino, *Regula*, ed. R. Hanslik, *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum* 75 (Vienna, 1960), c. 58.

⁸⁹) UC, p. 123. Frederick's own text had reemphasized Otto's arrogance at several points: «... dictus nobilis consanguineus noster [i.e. Otto] ... per superbiam cuncta despiciens ... nequiter conspiravit ... tunc dormiens in puppe Dominus discipulorum clamoribus excitatus per nos derelictum, quem mirabiliter preter humanam conscientiam conservarat, deiciendo superbum et humilem exaltando, quasi ventis precepit, ut tranquillitas fieret Novit enim Altissimus, quod preter humanum sensum ... personam nostram exposuimus, et ... per ministerium nostrum sic superbum potentia divina deiecit ...»: *Encyclica de excommunicatione sua*, in MGH Legum sectio IV: Constitutiones et acta publica imperatorum et regum 2 (Hanover, 1896), pp. 149-150. The Vulgate text to which Frederick alluded, Luke 14.11, had appeared at the beginning of the seventh chapter of the Benedictine Rule as the basis for his discussion of the twelve steps of humility: «Clamat nobis divina scriptura, fratres, dicens: 'Omnis qui se exaltat humiliabitur, et qui se humiliat exaltabitur'. Cum haec ergo dicit, ostendit nobis omnem exaltationem genus esse superbiae». It was thus a central text for the development of monastic historical sensibility, although a survey of patristic and monastic commentary on the Luke verse and the associated parables of the wedding guests and the great supper shows no coherent line of development for the theme of pride as an element in historical causation. Cf. Jerome, *Expositio quatuor evangeliorum*, Patrologia Latina, ed. J.P. Migne, 30 (Paris, 1846), col. 574; Augustine, *Sermones*, PL 38 (Paris, 1845), cols. 643-648; Gregory, *Homiliae*, PL 76 (Paris, 1849), cols. 1267-1270; Bede, *In Lucae evangelium expositio*, PL 92 (Paris, 1850), cols. 511-515; Anselm of Canterbury, *Homiliae et exhortationes*, PL 158 (Paris, 1853), cols. 652-655. See Otto of Freising, e.g. *Chronica* 3. prol.: «Audiat in potestate iudicis esse, quem velit humiliare et quem velit exaltare».

⁹⁰) UC, p. 126.

truncated biography of Barbarossa. Frederick's historian takes as his theme an important element is his subject's political propaganda. He extends it back to the career of the second Staufer king as well as forward to his work's premature conclusion.

Historical development: the universal level

God's justice then, in Burchard's presentation, intervenes directly to influence the fate of the individual monarch in the secular world. Pride and humility are the dialectical reagents of an interventive providence. Burchard makes no attempt, however, to raise the theme of pride to a higher level as a causal force for the changing of relationships among peoples or toward the Church. Kings, popes, and the Milanese were the direct agents in their own motivation; in their personalities lay the immediate causes of their own catastrophes. Concerning that wider pattern connected these discrete historical processes, the Ursberg historian is silent.

The theory of four world-kingdoms concluding in Roman Empire applied by Jerome to Eusebius' work⁹¹) was of course, familiar to Burchard from his redaction of Frutolf-Ekkehard; his introduction to that copy elucidates the concept of multiple kingdoms. Such a system shed little light on the wide expanse of history since Roman ascendancy, however. Nor — at least in Burchard's rendering — did it offer clarification of the relationship of contemporary time either to long-term secular or to cosmic developments. Augustine's program of six ages of sacred history likewise had the defect of little relevance to the pattern of twelfth- and thirteenth-century events, and Burchard set this too aside after a cursory acknowledgment⁹²). Sacred history, the Ursberg historian declares, is not his business.

The eschatological pattern of historical development developed from an Augustinian basis in the chronicle of Otto of Freising was known to the provost, but he failed to borrow it, perhaps for the same reason that it pertained to sacred history or ecclesiastical history rather than to the history of kingdoms. For a medieval historian to have avoided any such

⁹¹) J.W. Swain, «The Theory of the Four Monarchies: Opposition History under the Roman Empire», *Classical Philology* 35 (1940), pp. 19-20: the use of this model left the Medes dangling awkwardly. For an accessible overview of which historians to the mid-twelfth century used which world-era, see A.-D. van den Brincken: *Studien zur lateinischen Weltchronistik bis in das Zeitalter Ottos von Freising* (Düsseldorf, 1957), pl. 5.

⁹²) UC, pp. 1-2.

rigid construction of historical development was hardly unusual; Burchard's chronicle carried a wide variety of information, and all was supported by a common chronological framework. To impute to his work a sense of periodization or definition of historical forces which the author did not make explicit would be to overburden that framework⁹³). Schulz has suggested that the underlying motivation for the writing of profane history in the thirteenth century was the desire for information useful in dealing with the contemporary world⁹⁴). The Ursberg historian's work indeed revealed practically how the situation of Frederick II on his return from the Holy Land had developed and even, in its extraordinary political tendentiousness, made suggestions for the future conduct of papal-imperial business.

Nevertheless two great European developments outside the history of secular kingdoms — even outside the related sequence of papal-imperial conflicts, though their description still surely lay within the field of useful information — briefly distracted the provost Burchard from his central royal interest and there, it seems, stimulated him to brief examination of universal historical development. The Crusades and the appearance of new monastic orders were phenomena relatively new to Burchard's time. Christian expeditions to the Holy Land were activities in which German kings indeed participated, but neither in his own comments nor in his adoption of Crusader sources does Burchard emphasize royal involvement. Incidents in the Holy Land which excited his most active interest were the capture and loss of Damietta, at which Frederick II was not

⁹³) See A. Funkenstein's cautionary remark: «Periodization and Self-Understanding in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Times», in *Medieval Historiography*, ed. P.M. Clogan, *Medievalia et humanistica*, new ser. 5 (Denton, Texas, 1974), p. 16: «... for all the instances in which the middle ages approached our search for contents, it never reached the methodical consciousness of placing such a search in the first order of priorities; nor could it develop throughout immanent interpretations of historical relations, for it could not really overcome its view of history as governed by transcendent structures and of historical facts as given rather than made».

The preface to Robert of Auxerre's chronicle, in many ways analogous to Burchard's, gives a vivid impression of the medieval historian as all but overwhelmed by the heterogeneous nature of facts, the obscurity of causes, and the vagueness of his own objectives in approaching his task: p. 227: «Hic nempe describitur, qualiter ab initio usque nunc mundus fluxerit vel florens provecibus vel pressuris attritus, qualiter res mutatae, translata regna, regnorum gloriae ad nichilum devolute; quomodo denique post adventum Christi christianitas creverit, corruerit impietas, pietas triumpharit. Liqueat sane, quia ex tali taliumque inspectu et despectu presentium et respectu oritur futurorum. Praeterea scriptum est: *Memento dierum antiquorum, cogita generationes singulas*». Cf. Deut. 32.7.

⁹⁴) Schulz, p. 83.

present. The events at Damietta lay at once without and within Burchard's perceptions of historical intelligibility as expressed, for instance in the ephemeral success of Philip of Swabia.

Burchard was not an eyewitness to the Damietta disaster; he acknowledges a written source⁹⁵). Still, his account is unique among contemporary sources in the vehemence of its condemnation of Christian actions. Shortly before the capture of the city, Al-Kamil treated for peace; Burchard judges that the Christian commanders were wrong to reject his offer, accusing them of *superbia*:

Quam compositionem legatus sedis apostolice, qui aderat, et Templarii et alii rectores exercitus pro sua superbia admittere recusabant. Ideo contigit, ut ad modicum letificati gaudium, quod stulte de prospero successu acceperunt, infeliciter perderent.

Under a night attack the city succumbed, but the historian is hardly glad:

Factaque est intra civitatem cedes maxima Sarracenorum, tam virorum quam mulierum quam parvulorum, ita ut esset miserabile spectaculum etiam ipsis christianis rectis corde et flexis humana compassione⁹⁶).

When events finally overturned the Christian success, Burchard assesses:

Sicque factum est, ut exercitus christianus, qui prius in superbia et in abusione elatus, absque Deo in suis viribus confidens, fiduciam habet inanem, confunderetur, et tam Damiata quam Terra Sancta adhuc perdita inveniretur.

Here arrogance reappears as a destructive historical force in much the same fashion as it had in Otto IV's career. But, more interestingly, it reveals moral ambiguity in the great contemporary outward movement of Christianity, the Crusades. While divine intervention responds to moral characteristics even above the individual level, Burchard acknowledges, the Christian community is not linearly ascendant because it sometimes reveals itself as defective even in comparison to heathens: «... Soldanus tamquam pius et bonus ...»⁹⁷).

The internal state of Christendom presented the Premonstratensian

⁹⁵) UC, p. 117: «Referam unum, quod legi in scriptis cuiusdam eas pugnas prolixius describentis».

⁹⁶) UC, p. 119.

⁹⁷) UC, p. 120.

historian with a similarly complex problem in terms of historical intelligibility. His own order had, like Otto of Freising's Cistercians, see itself as a return to the life of the earliest church, *vita apostolica*. Burchard's monastic affiliation perhaps excited his special interest in the appearance and historical origins of the mendicants. L. Little has recently described the Ursberg provost's as the «most comprehensive view extant of the friars' organic development», commending him for «broad historical vision» despite his chronological proximity to papal approval of the Preachers and Minorites. Little points out that Burchard's account is generally quite accurate, even if a few details are skewed⁹⁸). The exactitude of the Premonstratensian's record is here of less interest than his presentation of the relationship of new orders to the wider pattern of history. Concerning the mendicants, Burchard steps out of his narrow commitment to the history of kingdoms even more obviously than he did in describing the Crusades for a lengthy discussion of a complex of events of paramount historical significance. The Dominicans and Franciscans, he says, are symptoms of a new age:

Eo tempore mundo iam senescente exorte sunt due religiones in ecclesia, cuius ut aquile renovatur iuventus, que etiam a sede apostolica sunt confirmate, videlicet Minorum fratrum et Predicatorum⁹⁹).

As neither Little nor students of Burchard's historical method have heretofore noticed, the Premonstratensian historian's usage of Psalm 102's «Revovabitur ut aquilae iuventus» to apply to stages in the history of the church was not original. Another Premonstratensian, Anselm of Havelberg, had in the mid-twelfth century used the eagle as an image of the movement of the church through progressive levels of development:

Lex Christiana doctrinis et scriptis instauratur, fides quae vocatur catholica in universo mundo annuntiatur; et sancta Ecclesia pertransiens per diversos status sibi invicem paulatim succedentes, usque in hodiernum diem, sicut iuventus aquilae renovatur et semper renovabitur, salvo semper sanctae Trinitatis fidei fundamento, praeter quod nemo aliud deinceps ponere potest, quamvis in

⁹⁸) L.K. Little, *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy in Medieval Europe* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1978), pp. 167-168; p. 252, n. 90.

⁹⁹) UC, p. 107. Cf. Otto of Freising, *Chronica* 6.36: «Tanta mutatione, tamquam a perfectione ad defectum vergente tempore ...».

superaedificatione diversa plerumque diversarum religionum structura crescat in templum sanctum Domino¹⁰⁰).

The bishop of Havelberg's attempt, in the first book of his *Dialogi*, to connect the seven seals of the Apocalypse to the unfolding of ecclesiastical history has attracted much attention since J. Spörl's and W. Kamlah's basic studies in 1935¹⁰¹). An emerging consensus is that while Anselm's progressivist thought was rooted in the *Glossa ordinaria* of the Laon school and had been to a degree anticipated in the work of Honorius of Autun and Rupert of Deutz, it represented the first clearly articulated attempt to define stages of historical development both since Christ and into the future¹⁰²).

Anselm was, like his contemporary Otto of Freising, a member of a contemplative order who nevertheless spent most of his mature years embroiled in administrative and political affairs. As a friend of St. Norbert and bishop of Havelberg from A.D. 1129 to 1155, he was a protagonist in the Premonstratensian effort to convert the Slavs. Anselm was also counsellor to the emperors Lothar, Conrad, and Barbarossa. For Lothar he undertook negotiations with the Byzantine government, and it was during his stay in Constantinople that he made the contacts among Eastern theologians which were eventually to form the basis of his *Dialogi*; the dialogues were finally composed for the Cistercian pope

¹⁰⁰) Anselm of Havelberg, *Dialogues*, Livre I: *Renouveau dans l'Eglise*, trans. G. Salet, Sources chrétiennes 98 (Paris, 1966), 1149 A-B. Salet repeats PL column numbers (*Dialogi*, PL 188 (Paris, 1855), cols. 1139-1248), so they rather than his pagination are cited here.

¹⁰¹) J. Spörl, *Grundformen der hochmittelalterlichen Geschichtsanschauung: Studien zum Weltbild der Geschichtsschreiber des 12. Jahrhunderts* (Munich, 1935), pp. 20-31; W. Kamlah, *Apokalypse und Geschichtstheologie: Die mittelalterliche Auslegung der Apokalypse vor Joachim von Fiore*, Historische Studien 285 (Berlin, 1935, rpt. Vaduz, 1965), pp. 64-70. See also J.W. Braun's model study of Anselm's textual tradition: «Studien zur Überlieferung der Werke Anselms von Havelberg I», *DA* 28 (1972), 133-209. On Anselm's wider significance, see H. Grundmann, *Studien über Joachim von Floris*, Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance 32 (Leipzig, 1927), pp. 92-95; A. Funkenstein, *Heilsplan und natürliche Entwicklung: Formen der Gegenwartsbestimmung im Geschichtsdenken des hohen Mittelalters* (Munich, 1965), pp. 60-67; W. Berges, «Anselm von Havelberg in der Geistesgeschichte des 12. Jahrhunderts», *Jahrbuch für die Geschichte Mittel- und Ostdeutschlands* 5 (1956), pp. 50-57; G. Serverino, «La discussione degli 'Ordines' di Anselmo di Havelberg», *Bulletino dell' istituto storico italiano per il medio evo e Archivio Muratoriano* 78 (1967), 75-122.

¹⁰²) Cf., e.g., Salet's translation; W. Edyvean, *Anselm of Havelberg and the Theology of History* (Rome, 1972). On Honorius, see Edyvean, p. 62; on Rupert, see Spörl, p. 19; on general twelfth-century development of German historical symbolism, see Grundmann, pp. 73-74.

Eugenius III as an aid to the understanding of Eastern doctrine and as a guidebook for coping with the Byzantines. Anselm performed another Eastern mission in 1154. He then returned to Italy and died during the siege of Milan in 1158 as exarch of the archdiocese of Ravenna. The conjunction of his monastic life as a member of a reform order defensive about its newness and his rich personal experiences gave rise to a startlingly original interpretation of the pattern of history and diverse trends in Christian thought¹⁰³).

In Anselm's *Dialogi*, the seven seals were shown to be analogous respectively to «status ecclesie» from Christ's advent: the age of the apostles, the age of persecution, the age of heretics, the age of hypocrites (the contemporary *status*), the age of consolation, the age of Antichrist, and the final age of beatitude. Each of these ages was characterized by conflict. In the present age, for instance, monastic orders combatted hypocrisy¹⁰⁴). The salient feature of this developmental plan is the importance which it accords monasticism as a historical force¹⁰⁵). But Anselm further allowed that this monastic improvement on Christian life in secular time was only one of many instances of divine intervention:

... et ita de gentibus Judaeos, de Judaeis autem Christianos fecit, et paulatim subtrahendo, et transponendo, et dispensando, quasi furtim ab idolorum cultura ad legem, a lege autem, quae quidem ad perfectum non duxit, ad perfectionem Evangelii paedagogice et medicinaliter deduxit, et tandem subtracta omni dispensatione, omnem perfectionem Christianae legis edocuit¹⁰⁶).

God had already begun and would continue always to shape the church as a teacher and a physician: «paedagogice et medicinaliter».

Anselm opened his discussion of monastic orders with the defensive question, «Quare tot novitates in Ecclesia Dei fiunt?»¹⁰⁷) His conclu-

¹⁰³) Cf. Spörl, pp. 22-24; Edyvean, pp. VII-VIII. Anselm was in eclipse in Conrad's later reign: Salet, pp. 9-10.

¹⁰⁴) Kamlah's diagrammatic presentation is especially lucid: pp. 67-68. As Edyvean emphasizes, Anselm in fact used six-age and four-age systems alongside the seven ages of the apocalyptic seals; since the seven ages dealt only with the last age in other systems, the schemes could overlap: pp. 13-15.

¹⁰⁵) See esp. Anselm, cols. 1154-1157. Cf. Spörl, p. 27: «Das Mönchtum wird hier, vielleicht so klassisch wie nirgends mehr in der Literatur des Mittelalters, als geschichtsbildender Faktor dargestellt».

¹⁰⁶) Anselm, col. 1147.

¹⁰⁷) Anselm, col. 1141.

sion, again using the metaphor of the eagle later appropriated by Burchard, was that *novitates* were both good and necessary:

Et fit mira Dei dispensatione, quod a generatione in generationem succrescente semper nova religione, renovatur ut aquilae juvenus Ecclesiae, quo et sublimius in contemplatione volare queat, et subtilius quasi irreverberatis oculis radios veri solis contueri valeat¹⁰⁸).

The exact relationship of Anselm's theological understanding of history to the ideas of his predecessors and successors especially concerned with broad developmental trends, in particular its relationship to Hugh of St. Victor's Trinitarian schema and to Joachim's apocalyptic vision, which rapidly eclipsed Anselm's in influence, is indeed of independent interest. For the purposes of this study, however, it suffices to say that the Premonstratensian bishop developed an interpretation of pattern in ecclesiastical and doctrinal history which he never applied to secular events; Anselm's seven seals concerned only the church. Nevertheless it would clearly have been possible for someone more interested in the succession of kings and empires than was Anselm to connect his developmental theory to a universal chronicle, even to use it to place contemporary events in clearer context.

Burchard of Ursberg's description of the origins of the mendicant orders leaves no doubt that he knew the work of the important theologian of history of his own order. He clearly understood the specific implications of Anselm's work for the importance of monastic developments. Burchard's use of the «ut aquile juvenus» image brings the bishop of Havelberg's theory up to date. The provost, writing nearly three-quarters of a century after Anselm's death, recognized that intervening events were also intelligible in the developmental scheme; the Franciscans and Dominicans of the thirteenth century were directly analogous to the Cistercians and Premonstratensians of the twelfth.

The most significant characteristic of Burchard's use of Anselm's thought, however, is its confinement to the single topic of the mendicants, a context eminently compatible with the earlier theologian's own narrow usage of the progressive principle and with his own strongly monastic emphasis. Elsewhere in the Ursberg history there is no overt display of either Anselm's or any other twelfth-century developmental or progressive theology of history. That Burchard shows no familiarity with Joachimism is perhaps worthy of note. As his mendicants passage and

¹⁰⁸) Anselm, col. 1157.

many other notices in his chronicle together prove, the Premonstratensian was actively interested in and attuned to intellectual currents in Italy in the first decade and a half of the thirteenth century, up to his apparently permanent residence at Ursberg as prelate. M. Bloomfield has asserted that Joachim was known even north of the Alps «as far back as 1217»¹⁰⁹); Burchard must have known of him from the Fourth Lateran condemnation of his theological idiosyncracies if not from the abbot of Fiore's theatrical encounters with famous personages¹¹⁰). Indeed, the generally positive tenor of imperial-Joachimite relations¹¹¹) might have made Joachim's theology of history seem especially appropriate to Burchard's reference. It apparently did not. Burchard is unlikely to have been ignorant of Joachim, so he probably considered Joachimite chiliasm of no utility in the historical work at hand.

Burchard's digression on the mendicants occurs in his relatively unpolished, undigested «Anni Ottonis» immediately after the inclusion of papal encyclicals enjoining Crusade enlistment and convoking the Fourth Lateran Council¹¹²). The great European effort to recover the Holy Land had, in his entry for 1211, temporarily distracted Burchard's interest from «gesta regum» to the papacy's other activities. Anselm of Havelberg's image of the self-regenerating eagle had no correspondence to the historian's own conception of the pattern of secular events. Nor did the millenarian speculation, rife in the thirteenth century, in which Joachim's disciples quickly became the leaders. Burchard's great contemporary, Frederick II, had not yet been cast as Antichrist at his writing. The provost copied the apocalyptic «Verba sibille» at the beginning of his chronicle¹¹³), but he apparently did so only in imitation of the Frutolf-Ekkehard codex which belonged to the Benedictine abbey of Zwiefalten, not because he saw it as of direct relevance to his own work. Burchard's history, then, is in its underlying principles as in its content generally without historical-theological overtones. Just as it conspicuously omits records of miracles and portents, it avoids supernatural explanation for secular trends on the widest scale. God's hand is

¹⁰⁹) M. Bloomfield and M.E. Reeves, «The Penetration of Joachimism into Northern Europe», *Speculum* 29 (1954), 289; cf. M.E. Reeves, *The Influence of Prophecy in The Later Middle Ages: A Study in Joachimism* (Oxford, 1969), pp. 39-40.

¹¹⁰) B. McGinn, *Visions of the End: Apocalyptic Traditions in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1979), pp. 126-127; Reeves, pp. 4-15.

¹¹¹) Reeves, p. 11.

¹¹²) UC, pp. 101 ff.

¹¹³) See «Burchard I», p. 111.

at work in history; providential justice responds to specific moral situations without unqualifiedly supporting a western Christian cause. But while the history of the *saeculum* may, as Burchard could have learned from Otto of Freising, be unfolding toward the apocalypse, neither the character nor the degree of its movement toward that end is under discussion in the Premonstratensian's historical work. *Gesta regum, series historie* — the interplay of events responds to a complex of forces.

Burchard then knew contemporary theologies of history, but none of them lent structure to his work as it had to his predecessor Otto's. Linear development was nevertheless important to his vision of history on the secular rather than the cosmic level. Historical progress, not meta-historical progress, is apparent in the provost's work and in this he shows himself the heir of twelfth-century optimism rather than the participant in the German anarchy and disillusionment of the early thirteenth century. In his apparent confidence in reascendant monarchy the Premonstratensian is much more closely akin to the sanguine Otto of Freising of *Gesta Friderici* than to the apocalyptic Otto, whose *Chronica* prophesied the end of the two Augustinian cities.¹¹⁴) To what degree political progressivism informed the structure of *UC* is here of interest. Empire and, more specifically, Hohenstaufen dynastic fortunes have obvious vicissitudes in the course of Burchard's independent work, as it follows his copy of Frutolf-Ekkehard. There can be no question, though, that the last pages recounting Frederick II's triumphal return from the Holy Land are not upbeat; the historian expected continued improvement in the emperor's circumstances and in Germany's¹¹⁵).

Burchard had turned from his synthetic account of the first Frederick with the destruction of Milan. It was an appropriate place for him to set aside his pen; like the murder of Philip of Swabia, it was a *determinatio*, although from the historian's point of view it was a resolution far more favorable and less permanent. The conflict between empire and papacy, in which the contumacy of the Milanese and German princes was bound

¹¹⁴) K. Morrison has recently attempted to find closer correspondance between Otto's two great works: «Otto of Freising's Quest for the Hermeneutic Circle», *Speculum* 55 (1980), 207-236. The difference in their respective outlooks remains striking, as P. Munz has emphasized: *Frederick Barbarossa: A Study in Medieval Politics* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1969), p. 140.

¹¹⁵) Spörl has pointed out how central the reception of Roman law and the idea of descent from classical Rome were for Staufer imperial progressivism: «Das Alte und das Neue im Mittelalter: Studien zum Problem des mittelalterlichen Fortschrittsbewusstseins», *HJB* 50 (1930), pp. 310-315.

up, seemed as clearly to contemporaries to be the great issue of their times as it has to later historians. Burchard emphasized its preeminence at two still more important junctures in his history. The last sentences of his summary of the Salians stress the end of the controversy over investitures: «Tandem, sicut in superioribus annotatum est, hec discordia anno dominice incarnationis M^oCXXII^o. determinata est ...»¹¹⁶). The final sentences of the entire *UC* likewise address papal-imperial rapprochement:

Quibus advenientibus, imperatore manente apud Capuam, tractatum est de pace et concordia inter imperium et sacerdotium et regnum Sicilie et absolutione imperatoris, multis aliis quoque mediantibus, tam de curia Romana quam etiam Italia et Alamannia. Sane hec compositio, cum non posset perfici eo anno, dilata est usque in annum sequentem¹¹⁷).

The Ursberg historian seems to have wished to continue his work to include events of the following year, but when he set it aside anticipating peace, he had already marked both the beginning and the conclusion of his continuation of Frutolf-Ekkehard with mileposts in the struggle between Roman church and German empire.

The outstanding feature, then, of the provost Burchard's historical work is that it is precisely that — historical. It subjects a broad variety of evidence to exacting and clearly definable if incompletely exercised historiographical standards, in which a degree of rhetorical sophistication atypical of the thirteenth century is implicit. The same chronicle, despite the model of several historical-theological works which the author surely knew and the general conspicuousness of theological concepts in further twelfth-century works with which he was probably also familiar, construes the universal pattern of events with recourse to divine plan. Except for the moral status of individuals or specific groups of individuals, sometimes seen as historically determinative in its arousal of divine justice, it portrays secular trends as distinct from cosmic trends even though it emphasizes church-state tension as the single most important factor in *series hystorie*, and even though that tension lent itself easily to interpretation along Augustinian or apocalyptic lines.

The Colorado College
Colorado Springs
Colorado 80903, U.S.A.

Carol L. NEEL

¹¹⁶) *UC*, p. 7.

¹¹⁷) *UC*, pp. 126-127.