

VIATOR

MEDIEVAL AND RENAISSANCE STUDIES

Volume 25 (1994)

PUBLISHED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF
THE CENTER FOR MEDIEVAL AND RENAISSANCE STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS

BERKELEY, LOS ANGELES, LONDON 1994

94/1702

THE HISTORICAL IMPORTANCE OF GODFREY OF VITERBO

by Loren J. Weber

*Sad to say, but today there are few courtiers
who strive for heaven and think nothing of
worldly fame.*

—Hugo of Trimberg, *Renner*¹

I. INTRODUCTION: THE RECEPTION AND UNDERSTANDING OF GODFREY AND HIS WORKS

This study reconsiders the ways in which the scholarly literature has represented the Hohenstaufen chaplain and notary Godfrey of Viterbo (ca. 1125–after 1191) and his writings.² In recent articles, a number of scholars have—rightly, in my view—assessed Godfrey's historical writings favorably, but the present study challenges three related assumptions that are widespread among interested historians today: that Godfrey held a high position in the imperial chancery, that he enjoyed a close personal association with the Hohenstaufen rulers Frederick Barbarossa and Henry VI, and that his works served a political function at the imperial court. I shall contend that modern perceptions of Godfrey as a highly placed chancery official and as a "court historiographer"

The following abbreviations are used below: GF = *Gesta Friderici*; MGH DD = Monumenta Germaniae Historica, *Diplomata regum et imperatorum Germaniae*; SS = *Scriptores*; Archiv = *Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* (1820–1874); NA = *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* (1876–1935); MIOG = *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung* (1880–); DA = *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* (1937–).

¹*Der Renner von Hugo von Trimberg* vv. 661–664, ed. Gustav Ehrismann, 1 (Tübingen 1908) 27.

²For general information and bibliography on Godfrey of Viterbo see Wilhelm Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter 1: Vom Tode Kaiser Heinrichs V. bis zum Ende des Interregnum*, ed. Franz-Josef Schmale (Darmstadt 1976) 77–92; Karl Langosch in *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon* 3 (Berlin 1981) 173–182; Max Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters* 3 (Munich 1931; repr. 1973) 392–398; and *Repertorium fontium historiae mediæ aevi primum ab Augusto Potthast digestum* 5 (Rome 1984) 169–171. There is no complete critical edition of Godfrey's works; in 1872 Georg Waitz produced a partial edition (MGH SS 22.1-338), on which more below in the third section of this study. A complete text of one of the several recensions of the *Pantheon* was printed by Johannes Basilius Herold (Basel 1559) after a lost manuscript from Fulda, and reprinted several times by Johann Pistorius, *SS rerum Germanicarum* 2 (ed. 1, Frankfurt 1584; ed. 2, Frankfurt and Hanover 1613) 1–580 and (ed. 3, Regensburg 1726) 8–392, ed. Burchard Struve with variants from the manuscript Nuremberg, Stadtbibliothek Cent. II 100 (cf. the appendix below); the last five books of Pistorius's edition were reprinted by L. A. Muratori, *SS rerum Italicarum* 7 (Milan 1725) 347–520 and thence in PL 198.875-1044.

are fictions based on the chronicler's own self-promotional statements and on previous scholars' misinterpretations of the medieval transmission of his works. In fact, as we shall see, Godfrey's position in the chancery was respectable but modest, and the court appears to have ignored his works. This conclusion will shed new light on an enigma that has hitherto perplexed historians, namely, Godfrey's motives for reworking his *magnum opus*, the *Pantheon*, numerous times for various recipients.

Compared to those of his earlier contemporary Otto of Freising, Godfrey's works have received little attention in modern times. This situation seems to have been reversed throughout the later Middle Ages, however, when Godfrey's popularity and influence eclipsed Otto's, as a comparison of the manuscript transmissions of their universal chronicles—Otto's *Two Cities*³ and Godfrey's *Pantheon*—will confirm. At first glance this assertion might occasion surprise, since the extant manuscripts of Otto's chronicle number forty-six, and those of the *Pantheon* only forty-one.⁴ However, the chronology of the surviving manuscripts of the *Two Cities* indicates that interest in the work declined shortly after the author's death, and died out entirely in the mid-thirteenth century for some two hundred years before enjoying a renaissance in the second half of the fifteenth century:⁵ from the period about 1260 to about 1450 no known copy of the work remains.⁶ Manuscripts of Godfrey's *Pantheon* were, in contrast, produced consistently in substantial numbers throughout the later Middle Ages: fifteen of the manuscripts date from the thirteenth (or very late twelfth) century, thirteen from the fourteenth century, and twelve from the fifteenth century. What is more, the geographical distribution of *Pantheon* manuscripts in the Middle Ages was far greater than that of the *Two Cities*. Until the mid-fifteenth century, with two exceptions the copying of Otto's work was limited to Bavarian and Austrian monasteries, and even the later production stems almost exclusively from southern Germany and Austria,⁷ whereas manuscripts of the *Pantheon* were produced throughout most of

³Ed. Adolf Hofmeister, *Otonis episcopi Frisingensis Chronica sive Historia de duabus civitatibus*, ed. 2, MGH SS rer. Germ. (Hanover 1912); trans. Charles Christopher Mierow, *The Two Cities* (New York 1928).

⁴This latter figure includes the *editio princeps* by Herold (n. 2 above), and two manuscripts transferred from Leningrad to Warsaw in 1921 and destroyed in World War II: see the appendix. For the manuscripts of the *Two Cities* see Hofmeister (n. 3 above) xxiii–lxxxviii.

⁵Eleven of the extant manuscripts of the *Two Cities* were produced in Otto's own century, and some twenty-six (almost 60%) in the period 1450–1510, whereas only five of the extant copies of the chronicle originated in the first half of the thirteenth century: see Alphons Lhotsky, "Das Nachleben Ottos von Freising," in his *Aufsätze und Vorträge 1: Europäisches Mittelalter. Das Land Österreich* (Munich 1970) 29–48 at 33; Sigmund Benker, "Die älteren Drucke Ottos von Freising: Ein Beitrag zur Beschäftigung mit seinen Werken," *Otto von Freising: Gedenkgabe zu seinem 800. Todesjahr*, ed. Joseph A. Fischer (Freising 1958) 127–145 at 127; and, most recently, Brigitte Schürmann, *Die Rezeption der Werke Ottos von Freising im 15. und frühen 16. Jahrhundert*, *Historische Forschungen* 12 (Stuttgart 1986) 9–10. The latest of the thirteenth-century manuscripts (Hofmeister's C3), containing a continuation by Otto of St. Blasien, was probably prepared before 1261 (not counted here is one other thirteenth-century manuscript listed by Hofmeister [C5], which contains not Otto's chronicle per se, but rather the annals of Herman of Niederaltaich, who had interpolated much of the seventh book of the *Two Cities* into his own work). Not insignificantly, the same observation applies to Otto and Rahewin's *Gesta Friderici*, some two-thirds of the manuscripts of which likewise originated in the latter half of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries: see Schürmann 10.

⁶Hofmeister (n. 3 above) xxviii notes that the lost Viennese manuscript A 17, from which Johannes Cuspinian printed the *editio princeps* of 1514, could not have been produced before the fourteenth century according to certain variants; there is no reason to assume, however, as does Lhotsky (n. 5 above) 33, that this manuscript therefore actually derived from the fourteenth or first half of the fifteenth century.

⁷Schürmann (n. 5 above) 10 and n. 12; the localized nature of this transmission is attested to visually by the map in Bernard Guenée, *Histoire et culture historique dans l'Occident médiéval* (Paris 1980) 264.

western Europe, in such regions as Saxony and Alsace-Lorraine, northern and southern Italy, the Papal States, England, Aquitaine, Spain, and Poland.

Not only manuscript evidence indicates that the *Pantheon* was well known and influential in the later Middle Ages. While no comprehensive study exists on the work's *Nachleben*, even a random sampling of examples will demonstrate the breadth and profundity of Godfrey's effect on the later Middle Ages. Use of the *Pantheon* as an authority by later writers, especially in Germany and Italy,⁸ continued steadily throughout the later Middle Ages: Sicard of Cremona (d. 1215),⁹ Martin of Troppau (fl. 1261–1278),¹⁰ Alexander of Roes (fl. 1281),¹¹ Ptolemy of Lucca (ca. 1236–ca. 1326), Lupold of Bebenburg (ca. 1300–1363),¹² Gobelinus Persona (1358–1421), Hartmann Schedel (1440–1514),¹³ and Johannes Trithemius (1462–1516)¹⁴ are but a few significant examples.¹⁵ The *Pantheon*'s influence extended to some of the Middle Ages' most popular texts—notably the *Legenda aurea* of Jacobus de Voragine¹⁶—and included ver-

⁸Whether the *Pantheon* had a significant influence on writers outside of this region is not certain, but, in view of the work's broad transmission, I believe further study will establish that the work was used throughout Europe. Nicole Bériou has kindly brought to my attention one example of use of the *Pantheon* in France, that of Stephen of Bourbon, who composed his (unfinished) *Tractatus de diversis materiis praedicabilibus* ca. 1250–1261 in Lyon: see Stephen's prologue: "Collegi autem de diversis libris historicis, ut . . . de libro qui Pantheon dicitur Godefridi Parmensis (!), imperialis aule capellani, quem scripsit Gregorio VIII, de omnibus historiis gentium et regum et regnorum ab inicio mundi . . . usque ad annum Domini MCXLVI (!)": Albert Lecoy de la Marche, *Anecdotes historiques, légendes et apologues tirés du recueil inédit d'Etienne de Bourbon* (Paris 1877) 5–6. In comparison with Otto's *Two Cities*, it is significant that the list of authors using Otto's history offered by Hofmeister (n. 3 above) xcvi–cii and delineated in more detail by Schürmann (n. 5 above) 11–12 is limited largely to southern Germany and Austria, corresponding closely to the work's manuscript transmission; indeed, Hofmeister notes that the *Pantheon* acted until the fifteenth century as the primary vehicle for the transmission of large portions of Otto's chronicle that Godfrey had inserted into his work with relatively minor alterations.

⁹See Oswald Holder-Egger in his introduction to *Sicardi episcopi Cremonensis Cronica*, MGH SS 31.61.

¹⁰J. Schick, *Corpus Hamleticum: Hamlet in Sage und Dichtung, Kunst und Musik* 1.2: *Das Glückskind mit dem Todesbrief: Europäische Sagen des Mittelalters und ihr Verhältnis zum Orient* (Leipzig 1932) 138; and Karl Langosch in *Geschichte der Textüberlieferung der antiken und mittelalterlichen Literatur* 2, ed. H. Hunger et al. (Zürich 1964) 85 and 125.

¹¹*Die Schriften des Alexander von Roes*, ed. and trans. Herbert Grundmann and Hermann Heimpel, MGH Deutsches Mittelalter 4 (Weimar 1949) passim; and Michael Wilks, *The Problem of Sovereignty in the Later Middle Ages: The Papal Monarchy with Augustinus Triumphus and the Publicists* (Cambridge 1963) 80 and 193 n. 2.

¹²Frank L. Borchardt, *German Antiquity in Renaissance Myth* (Baltimore 1971) 275–276; and Wilks (n. 11 above) 193.

¹³Schick (n. 10 above) 173. Not coincidentally, Schedel purchased a manuscript of recension B of the *Pantheon* (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 43) in 1512.

¹⁴Note Trithemius's judgment of Godfrey in his *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*: "Vir in divinis scripturis studiosus et eruditus, et secularis literaturae non ignarus, ingenio praestans et clarus, metto exercitatus et prosa": Johannes Trithemius, *Opera historica* (Frankfurt 1601; repr. 1966) 280. Trithemius owned one of the preeminent witnesses to the text of the *Pantheon*'s recension E, the fifteenth-century manuscript Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek M. ch. f. 23.

¹⁵Further examples of later writers using Godfrey as a source are easily found. Schick (n. 10 above) 100–174 outlines Godfrey's influence on numerous later writers and collections based on the dispersion of a single text; see also Waitz's list at MGH SS 22.11 and (concerning Rolandino of Padua's use of the *Pantheon*) Bernhard Schmeidler, *Italienische Geschichtschreiber des XII. und XIII. Jahrhunderts. Ein Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte*, Leipziger historische Abhandlungen 11 (Leipzig 1909) 87.

¹⁶Johann Grässe, *Jacobi a Voragine Legenda aurea*, ed. 3 (1890; repr. Osnabrück 1965) 493, where Jacobus cites Godfrey as an authority. Jacobus copied other texts from Godfrey, often verbatim, without naming his source: see Schick (n. 10 above) 102–103 and 125–127.

ricular as well as Latin works.¹⁷ Excerpts from the *Pantheon* may even have been offered to students: when Hugo of Trimberg, *magister* and *rector scholarum* at the school of Saint Gangolf near Bamberg, composed his *Registrum multorum auctorum* around 1280 listing some eighty authors whose works belonged to the curriculum,¹⁸ he reported having seen many poetical texts in Godfrey's *Pantheon* that would have fitted well into his work, but that he passed over for brevity's sake.¹⁹ On a more serious note, it has also been asserted that the *Pantheon* was the favorite reading matter in the court of Louis the Bavarian (ca. 1281–1347), which in its struggle with the papacy often invoked the example of Godfrey's patron, Frederick Barbarossa.²⁰

Clearly, the *Pantheon* appealed to the mind of the later Middle Ages on a number of levels. Godfrey's fanciful and intricate mosaic of historical fact and legend, with its numerous anecdotes and moral fables—occasionally of Oriental flavor²¹ and often transmitted extensively in excerpted form as well²²—opened up his history to a broad

¹⁷See for instance Patricia A. McAllister, "Apocryphal Narrative Elements in the Genesis of the Middle Low German *Historienbibel* Helmstedt 611.1," in *Medieval Translators and Their Craft*, ed. Jeanette Beer, *Studies in Medieval Culture* 25 (Kalamazoo 1989) 81–92 at 82, on the *Pantheon* as a source for late medieval German *Historienbibeln*.

¹⁸Ed. Karl Langosch, *Das 'Registrum multorum auctorum' des Hugo von Trimberg*, *Germanische Studien* 235 (Berlin 1942). In general on Hugo and his works see Günther Schweikle in *Verfasserlexikon* 4 (1983) 268–282.

¹⁹Langosch (n. 18 above) 181 vv. 500–513:

In libro, qui dicitur Pantheon Gotfridi
Viterbiensis clerici, multa scripta vidi
metrica composita de gestis antiquorum
principum fidelium et incredulorum,
quorum quedam congrue possent adaptari
presenti particule; sed ne dilatari
per excerpta talia libellus videatur,
simul hec et alia stilus detestatur . . .
et ne sic fastidium per ydemptitatem
gignerem legentibus et prolixitatem.

²⁰Friedrich Heer, *Die Tragödie des heiligen Reiches* (Zürich 1952) 201.

²¹Cf. for instance the next note and, on Godfrey's use of an Eastern Christian work for the *Pantheon*'s astonishingly detailed life of Mohammed (unedited by Waitz: cf. MGH SS 22.280.34–38), Enrico Cerulli, *Il "Libro della scala" e la questione delle fonti Arabo-Spagnole della Divina Commedia*, *Studi e testi* 150 (1949) 417–427, and Norman Daniel, *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image* (Edinburgh 1960) 11–12, 230 and 310, who refers to the "excellent quality of information" Godfrey included in his work based on a "Syrian Apology."

²²The best-attested example—but by no means the only one—of a text from the *Pantheon* enjoying a significant independent transmission is that of his narrative concerning Judas (inc.: *Denariis triginta Deum vendidit Galileus*) based on an Eastern (Armenian?) tradition; for the text see Edélestand du Ménil, *Poésies populaires latines du moyen âge* (Paris 1847) 321–324, and for its sources and influence Paul Lehmann, "Judas Ischarioth in der lateinischen Legendenüberlieferung des Mittelalters," *Studi medievali* n.s. 2 (1929) 289–346; Leopold Kretzenbacher, "'Verkauft um dreissig Silberlinge': Apokryphen und Legenden um den Judasverrat," *Schweizerisches Archiv für Volkskunde* 57 (1961) 1–17; and Enrico Cerulli, "La regina Saba e la tradizione dei trenta denari in un testo Catalano del XV secolo," *Rendiconti della Accademia nazionale dei Lincei: Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* 23 (1968) 117–135. Hans Walther, *Initia carminum ac versuum medii aevi posterioris latinorum*, ed. 2 (Göttingen 1969) 213 no. 4248 lists nineteen manuscripts containing the text, which he mistakenly ascribed to Conrad of Scheyern; to Walther's list we can add here Erlangen, Universitätsbibliothek MS lat. 65 fol. 1 (s. XIII); Frankfurt am Main, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek MS Barth 129 fol. ii^r (s. XIV); Kornik (Poland), MS 1383 fol. 308r–v (s. XV); Leiden, Universiteitsbibliothek MS Voss. lat. Q. 70 fols. 114v–115v (s. XIII); London, British Library MS Titus D. III fol. 90r–v

public that might have found Otto's chronicle more imposing than understandable.²³ In the thirteenth century the work also proved itself a useful source of moral *exempla* for friars and preachers.²⁴ Equally important, the *Pantheon* may have played a consequential role in both the development of universal histories²⁵ and the still poorly-understood rise of a new encyclopedic tendency in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries,²⁶ functions which may ultimately account for much of the work's immediate and sustained success.

The end of the Middle Ages, however, signaled a decline in Godfrey's popularity and influence. The critical scholarship of the humanists failed to find the *Pantheon* either as authoritative or charming as had their medieval counterparts; that Godfrey was not likely to be mistaken for Virgil in the sixteenth century is demonstrated by the inscription of the theologian and poet Giano Vitale of Palermo (d. ca. 1560) in a fourteenth-century copy of the *Pantheon* which he presented—apparently with tongue firmly in cheek—to Cristoforo Spiriti of Viterbo, bishop of Cesena and later patriarch of Jerusalem:²⁷

Ad Christophorum Spiriti Viterbiensem Cesene Pontificem:

Authorem tibi do Viterbiensem,
aetatis hominem minus disertum.
Civem, Christophore, accipe elegantem,
qualem barbara tempora obtulerunt.
Et si quid fatuumque rancidumque
offendat sapidum tuum palatum,
aeque consule: non enim Marones
fiunt de Baviisque Maeviisque.²⁸

(date unknown); Munich, cgm 17401 fol. 8 (s. XIII) and cgm 28628a fol. 70r-v (s. XIV/XV); and Trebon (Czechoslovakia), Státní Archiv Cod. A 4 (Cat. no. 6) fols. 127-128 (s. XV).

²³See Anna-Dorothee von den Brincken, *Studien zur lateinischen Weltchronistik bis in das Zeitalter Ottos von Freising* (Düsseldorf 1957) 222, who compares Otto's fate in this regard to that of Augustine.

²⁴See Michael Chesnutt in *Enzyklopädie des Märchens* 4 (Berlin 1984) 593; cf. also the example of Stephen of Bourbon in n. 8 above. The subject of the *Pantheon* as *exempla*-literature has been handled briefly by Anneke Mulder-Bakker, "A Pantheon Full of Examples: The World Chronicle of Godfrey of Viterbo," in *Exemplum et similitudo: Alexander the Great and Other Heroes as Points of Reference in Medieval Literature*, ed. W. J. Aerts and M. Gosman (Groningen 1988) 85-98.

²⁵On the writing of universal history in the twelfth century see most recently Peter Classen, "Res gestae, Universal History, Apocalypse: Visions of Past and Future," in *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, ed. Robert L. Benson and Giles Constable (Cambridge, Mass. 1982) 387-417 at 398-403, who limits his analysis to Sigebert of Gembloux, Frutolf of Bamberg, and Otto of Freising.

²⁶On this subject in general see Charles Homer Haskins, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, Mass. 1927) 303-310; and Fritz Saxl, "Illustrated Mediaeval Encyclopaedias" (two articles), in *F. Saxl Lectures* (London 1957) 228-254. On the *Pantheon* as encyclopedia see also Peter von Moos, *Geschichte als Topik: Das rhetorische Exemplum von der Antike zur Neuzeit und die historiae im 'Policraticus' Johanns von Salisbury* (Hildesheim 1988) 566.

²⁷Concerning Giano Vitale (or Janus Vitalis) see Jöchers *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon* 4 (Leipzig 1751) 1651 and M. E. Cosenza, *Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary of the Italian Humanists* 4 (Boston 1962) 3702; on Spiriti see Konrad Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica medii aevi* 3 (Münster 1910) 159 and 226.

²⁸Viterbo, Biblioteca capitolare 1 fol. ii^v; a photograph of this inscription is reproduced by Domenico Mantovani, "Goffredo da Viterbo e il 'Pantheon' della Biblioteca capitolare," *Miscellanea di studi Viterbesi* (Viterbo 1962) 313-341 at 317. In 1426, before it came into the possession of Vitale, this manuscript appeared in the inventory of the library of the dukes of Milan (Elisabeth Pellegrin, *La bibliothèque des Visconti et des Sforza, ducs de Milan, au XVe siècle* [Paris 1955] 149 no. A 344), and after Spiriti's death it belonged

Yet not all interest in the *Pantheon* ended after the fifteenth century. In 1559 Basilius Herold produced the *editio princeps*, which was thereafter reprinted wholly or in part at least once in each of the subsequent three centuries.²⁹

Godfrey's reputation hit its nadir in the nineteenth century, when the goals and methods of historical research changed profoundly under the influence of "scientific" historiography. The critical analysis of sources and documents, pioneered by Barthold Georg Niebuhr and developed fully by Leopold von Ranke, was soon applied by the latter's students (and by their students in turn) to medieval history, with both positive and negative results: whereas Ranke's intellectual heirs performed inestimable services for medieval scholarship by scrutinizing archival and manuscript collections and by publishing myriad sources from the Middle Ages, in their relentless pursuit of the factual and concrete they often ignored or even maligned works that did not appeal to their positivist sense of historical importance.³⁰ Godfrey's *Pantheon* was one such work. Indeed, the *Pantheon* earned—precisely by virtue of its great popularity and extensive influence in the Middle Ages—a special contempt from scholars like Wilhelm Wattenbach, who maintained that the work was not only insignificant as a historical source but, worse, nevertheless important "because here the great abundance of fables entered scholarly historical writing for the first time and because in this way Godfrey exerted a very detrimental influence on the later chroniclers."³¹ And Paul Scheffer-Boichorst, likening Godfrey's works to a vast desert broken only here and there by the occasional oasis, flatly pronounced their author "devoid of political understanding," and moreover experienced agony on seeing "this verbose author" work up the whole of history on his "poetical chopping-block."³²

The nineteenth century's particular biases affected not only Godfrey's prestige, but, lamentably, the still-standard critical edition of his works as well. When the great nineteenth-century editor Georg Waitz published Godfrey's collected works in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica's* folio *Scriptores* series,³³ he followed contemporary convention in editing only those relatively short portions that appeared to him historically significant.³⁴ As a result, even today we know frustratingly little about the *Pan-*

to the theologian Latino Latini, who was born in Viterbo in 1513 and left his books to the library of that city on his death in 1593; the codex's presence in that city is therefore not indicative of a special connection to Godfrey, as might be thought, but rather to historical accident. For his generous permission to inspect this manuscript at the Biblioteca capitolare in Viterbo as well as his gracious reception in that city I am especially indebted to Monsignor Francesco Zarletti.

²⁹See n. 2 above.

³⁰For an indication that this tendency was particularly evident in the treatment of historical as opposed to poetic or philosophical works, see Johannes Spörl, "Das mittelalterliche Geschichtsdnken als Forschungsaufgabe," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 53 (1933) 281–303 at 283–284.

³¹W. Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter bis zur Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts*, ed. 6, 2 (Berlin 1893) 297.

³²P. Scheffer-Boichorst, in his review of Waitz's edition, *Historische Zeitschrift* 29 (1873) 441–452 at 441.

³³See n. 2 above.

³⁴Already in the first volume of the MGH's journal *Archiv* (1820) the need was voiced to publish only those portions of works that offered "gesichertes, originales Tatsachenmaterial," that is, provably factual material that did not rely on earlier sources; the philosophical and theological discourses that make works such as the *Pantheon* interesting as reflections of intellectual tastes were to be excluded, for, in the words of Johann Christoph Gatterer, "who will want to learn from the book of some monk what the biblical, Greek, and Roman authors can say better?" (*Archiv* 1.218, quoted by Spörl [n. 30 above] 284–285). As Spörl goes

theon's content in its final form, the various forms of its many recensions, its rhetorical structure, or the sources utilized by its author.³⁵

Our own century has seen the triumph of the principle that medieval historical works and their authors should properly be understood within a medieval context,³⁶ and in this spirit some attempt has been made to reevaluate the place of Godfrey's works in the intellectual world of the Middle Ages. While much of this effort has concentrated on what might be roughly described as literary aspects of Godfrey's writings,³⁷ scholars in the German-speaking world in particular have located the works' primary importance in their political function at the imperial court. This perspective owes much to Robert Holtzmann's assertion in 1922 of the existence of a politically oriented Hohenstaufen court historiography during the reign of Frederick Barbarossa:³⁸ although Holtzmann's theory suffered prompt criticism and his idea of a consciously propagated chancery *memoriale* has been discredited,³⁹ the notion that a group of historiographers

on to relate, however, the response to the proposed abridgment of texts, especially the intention to exclude the philosophical and theological excurses from the edition of Otto of Freising's chronicle, was far from unanimously positive; but while the entire text of Otto's *Two Cities* was ultimately published, Godfrey's *Pantheon* and other texts (for instance, Marianus Scotus's *Chronicon*, edited in MGH SS 5.481-562), appeared in the MGH only in highly abridged form. For the portions of the *Pantheon* not edited by Waitz—comprising the greater part of the work—reference can in some cases be made to Herold's *editio princeps* and its descendants (n. 2 above). Yet the shortcomings of this latter edition are many: in particular, it contains only one of the five known recensions of the work, and is based on a single manuscript. Obviously, all studies based on texts from this edition must contain the explicit or implicit caveat that other recensions of the work might offer significantly different texts.

³⁵The problem of Godfrey's sources for the first twenty of the *Pantheon's* thirty-three books has been handled by Friederike Boockmann in her dissertation, *Studien zum Pantheon des Gottfried von Viterbo* (Munich 1992). I thank Frau Dr. Boockmann for offering me access to the manuscript of her thesis prior to its publication.

³⁶On this development see Roger D. Ray, "Medieval Historiography through the Twelfth Century: Problems and Progress of Research," *Viator* 5 (1974) 33-59.

³⁷See, for example, in addition to Schick (n. 10 above) and the works listed in nn. 21 and 22 above, Lucienne Meyer, *Les légendes des matières de Rome, de France et de Bretagne dans le Panthéon de Godefroi de Viterbe* (Paris 1933); Mario Esposito, "An Apocryphal 'Book of Enoch and Elias' as a Possible Source of the 'Navigatio Sancti Brendani,'" *Celtica* 5 (1960) 192-206; Ingeborg Pape, "Gottfried von Viterbo und die Carmina Burana," *Philologus* 115 (1971) 191-195; and Hans Werner Seiffert, "Otto von Freising und Gottfried von Viterbo," *ibid.* 292-301. That Godfrey remains all but unknown in American scholarship may be indicated by the fact that the entry "Goffredo da Viterbo" in the recent *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* 5 (New York 1985) 572 deals not with the chronicler at all, but instead mistakenly ascribes his name to the (anonymous) "Lombard miniature painter responsible for the notable illustrations of the *Pantheon* made for Azzone Visconti of Milan in 1331" (now Paris BN lat. 4895).

³⁸Robert Holtzmann, "Das Carmen de Frederico I. imperatore aus Bergamo und die Anfänge einer staufischen Hofhistoriographie," *NA* 44 (1922) 252-313. Comparing numerous parallels in an anonymous *Carmen de gestis Frederici* from the early 1160s, Gunther's *Ligurinus* (1186/87), and Burchard of Ursberg's *Chronicon* (1229/30) with each other and with Otto and Rahewin's *Gesta Friderici*, Holtzmann posited that an official account of the decade 1152-1162 had been assembled in the imperial chancery under Rainald of Dassel's direction and distributed to various authors. According to Holtzmann, the circle of court historiographers, who were distinguished through their common use of official materials from the chancery and concentration on Barbarossa's person and reign, included Otto and Rahewin, Gunther, the author of the *Carmen*, John of Cremona (the author of a now-lost chronicle used by Burchard of Ursberg), and the author of yet another unknown work used by Gunther.

³⁹Already four years after Holtzmann's article, E. Ottmar responded with a sharp rebuttal ("Das Carmen de Friderico I. imperatore aus Bergamo und seine Beziehungen zu Otto-Rahewins *Gesta Friderici*, Gun-

in Barbarossa's court wrote with the intention of influencing "public opinion" has continued nevertheless in various forms to find its proponents,⁴⁰ and even today cannot be summarily dismissed.⁴¹ Especially important for our purposes is the fact that, whereas Holtzmann's article mentioned Godfrey only in passing, the historian from Viterbo has since come to be regarded as one of the principal examples of a Hohenstaufen "court historiographer."⁴² Thus Friedrich Heer was expressing widespread opinion of his time when he asserted in 1952 that the "leading personalities" of Hohenstaufen propaganda were well known to include not only Eberhard of Bamberg, Rainald of Dassel, and Otto of Freising, but also Godfrey of Viterbo; indeed, Heer went so far as to declare that Godfrey was necessarily to be appraised first and foremost in his role as a "Hohenstaufen political propagandist."⁴³ Heer's wording would likely strike most of today's scholars as overstated, but so far no one has challenged the implications of his assertion. On the contrary, in our own decade Odilo Engels has offered essentially the same idea by placing Godfrey at the "Mittelpunkt" of "a new phase in the establishment of the imperial authority by the Staufer" after the Treaty of Venice had confirmed the papal authority in Rome, a position Engels assigns to God-

thers *Ligurinus* und Burchard von Ursbergs Chronik," NA 46 [1926] 430-489), asserting that Holtzmann had both underestimated the discrepancies between the various works and overstated their points of similarity. While conceding the plausibility of aspects of Holtzmann's theory, Ottmar succeeded in demonstrating that a court historiography as conceived by Holtzmann was not provable. See also more recently Irene Schmale-Ott, *Carmen de gestis Frederici I. imperatoris in Lombardia*, MGH SS rer. Germ. (Hanover 1965) xxxiv-xl.

⁴⁰In 1937 Walter Stach dismissed Ottmar's article (n. 39 above) in a footnote as "nicht durchschlagend," and even wished to add to Holtzmann's circle of court historiographers the Archpoet, the authors of the *Legenda Karoli Magni* (1166) and *Ludus de Antichristo* (before ca. 1178/86), and Godfrey of Viterbo: see his "Politische Dichtung im Zeitalter Friedrichs I.: Der *Ligurinus* im Widerstreit mit Otto und Rahewin," *Neue Jahrbücher für deutsche Wissenschaft* 13 (1937) 385-410, repr. in *Mittelalterliche Dichtung*, ed. Karl Langosch, Wege der Forschung 149 (Darmstadt 1969) 430-466. Moreover, in 1944 Karl Langosch published an article in the newspaper *Geistige Arbeit* (Berlin, January 1944, 11. Jhg., Nr. 1-3) alluding to a politically oriented literary circle around Frederick Barbarossa of eight writers, which fundamentally corresponded to Stach's list, and thus included Godfrey of Viterbo; according to Langosch this group of writers was tied together not through the use of a chancery *memoriale* as in Holtzmann's conception, but rather by their common desire to celebrate Frederick and, more importantly, to influence their reading-public's opinion on a political level.

⁴¹See Timothy Reuter's synopsis of the issue in his "Past, Present and No Future in the Twelfth-Century Regnum Teutonicum," in *The Perception of the Past in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. Paul Magdalino (London 1992) 15-36 at 24-26. Peter Ganz ("Friedrich Barbarossa: Hof und Kultur," in *Friedrich Barbarossa: Handlungsspielräume und Wirkungsweisen des staufischen Kaisers*, ed. Alfred Kaverkamp, Vorträge und Forschungen 40 [Sigmaringen 1992] 623-650 at 634-635) rightly points out that, although the impulses for such a movement did not necessarily come from the court itself, a court historiography could still have existed in the sense that the court acted as a magnet that drew panegyric works from outsiders looking for rewards; although Ganz does not mention Godfrey in this connection, we shall see that this picture corresponds closely to his case.

⁴²See for instance Reuter (n. 41 above) 24-25, who lists a number of works, including those of Godfrey, that "qualify for inclusion in a list of Staufer court historiography." The present study does not challenge the idea of Godfrey as "court historiographer" in that the chronicler's works were clearly conceived in the political and intellectual world of the imperial court and stood within the tradition of historical writing under Frederick Barbarossa, as amply demonstrated for instance by Thomas Szabó, "Herrscherbild und Reichsgedanke: Eine Studie zur höfischen Geschichtsschreibung unter Friedrich Barbarossa," Ph.D. diss. (Freiburg i. Br. 1973); the following instead disputes the related assumptions that Godfrey's works were produced under the auspices of the court or were used there for political purposes.

⁴³Heer (n. 20 above) 201.

frey because the chronicler's writings "were suitable for providing the Hohenstaufen imperial dignity with a new basis of legitimation."⁴⁴

Even those scholars who do not stress the propagandistic function of Godfrey's works often still look for their importance primarily in the context of the political and intellectual world of the imperial court. To cite one recent example, Peter Johanek—stating that Godfrey "probably more than anyone else deserves the title of court historiographer"—has contended that the chronicler's writings served to bridge the cultural gap between the literate laity and clerics at court.⁴⁵ Since in his conception Godfrey's writings represented "historical encyclopedias" and "reservoirs of knowledge" which allowed Henry VI and his lay advisers to understand, appraise, and even employ the historical lines of argument used by court clerics, Johanek also ascribes an inherently political function to the chronicler's works. In addition, Johanek suggests that Godfrey's books may have served as informational collections for notaries and clerks at the court.

In his study Johanek makes explicit two assumptions that are part of the literature's collective perception of Godfrey's writings, but which are in fact unproven, namely, that the chronicler's works "came into being at the court, in the nearest vicinity of the emperor," and that they "circulated in the Hohenstaufen family, to whose members most of them were dedicated."⁴⁶ As these premises have done much to form the prevailing understanding of Godfrey and his works, they merit closer examination, and testing their validity will be the task of the following study.

II. GODFREY'S CAREER IN THE COURT

We courtiers are assuredly an infinite multitude, all striving to please one individual; and today we are one multitude, tomorrow we shall be a different one.

—Walter Map, *De nugis curialium*⁴⁷

The attribution to Godfrey of the label "court historiographer" assumes on the simplest level that he was a member of the court; and this he unquestionably was. Yet scholars treating Godfrey's works have more often than not gone considerably further in their conjectures about the chronicler's place in the court, assuming explicitly or implicitly that Godfrey belonged to a circle in the "nearest vicinity" of the Staufer, where he served his masters in a pedagogical role.⁴⁸ Indeed, the belief that Godfrey

⁴⁴Odilo Engels, "Gottfried von Viterbo und seine Sicht des staufischen Kaiserhauses," in *Aus Archiven und Bibliotheken: Festschrift für Raymond Kottje zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Hubert Mordek, Freiburger Beiträge zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte 3 (Frankfurt a. M. 1992) 327–345 at 334 and 340.

⁴⁵Peter Johanek, "Kultur und Bildung im Umkreis Friedrich Barbarossas," in Haverkamp (n. 41 above) 651–677 at 675–676.

⁴⁶Ibid. 676

⁴⁷Walter Map, *De nugis curialium (Courtiers' Trifles)* 1.1, ed. Montague Rhodes James (Oxford 1983) 2.

⁴⁸Note Johanek's statement (n. 45 above) 676: "[Gottfrieds] Werke entstanden bei Hof, in der engsten Umgebung des Kaisers, in der Absicht, Barbarossa und seinen Söhnen die Rudimente einer literarischen Bildung zu vermitteln"; Ernst Perels, *Der Erbreichsplan Heinrichs VI.* (Berlin 1927) 70, likewise places Godfrey in Henry's "engste Umgebung."

was probably one of Henry's own tutors has achieved almost universal acceptance.⁴⁹ Nor have such assumptions failed to influence scholars' opinions of Godfrey's abilities and his influence in the court: one historian has inferred, for instance, that the chronicler's closeness to the center of the Hohenstaufen empire afforded him a superior understanding of the "aims and motives of high politics,"⁵⁰ and others have argued that Godfrey impressed his historical philosophy upon the young Henry, with fateful political consequences.⁵¹ This conception of Godfrey's standing in the court and influence on the Staufer alone would seem to justify further study of his works. Unfortunately, however, the available historical and biographical data on Godfrey prove neither that he belonged to a circle of the court close to the Staufer, nor that he enjoyed a personal (or pedagogical) association with Frederick and Henry.

Most of what we know about Godfrey's life and career derives from autobiographical notices or allusions in his own works and from charters in which he is mentioned. These particulars, for the most part already known in Waitz's day, have formed the basis of virtually every account of Godfrey since and require only a brief review here. Later, however, we shall have to reexamine most of these details more carefully.

A notice in some manuscripts of the *Panttheon* dates Godfrey's birth to about 1125.⁵² Godfrey tells us that as a boy he was placed by the emperor Lothar III (1125–1137) in the cathedral school at Bamberg,⁵³ and that under Lothar's successor Conrad III (1137–1152) he assumed the position of chaplain and notary in the imperial court, which he held for forty years under Conrad and his successors, Frederick Bar-

⁴⁹Heinrich Ulmann, "Gotfrid von Viterbo: Beitrag zur Historiographie des Mittelalters," Ph.D. diss. (Göttingen 1863) 18; Theodor Toeche, *Kaiser Heinrich VI.*, Jahrbücher der deutschen Geschichte (Leipzig 1867) 28; Perels (n. 48 above) 69; Manitius (n. 2 above) 393; Stach (n. 40 above) 437; Heer (n. 20 above) 201; Werner Goetz, *Translatio imperii: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Geschichtsdenkens und der politischen Theorien im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit* (Tübingen 1958) 128; Arno Borst, *Der Turmbau von Babel: Geschichte der Meinungen über Ursprung und Vielfalt der Sprachen und Völker* 2.2 (Stuttgart 1959) 706; Odilo Engels, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Staufer im 12. Jahrhundert (I)," *DA* 27 (1971) 373–456, repr. in his *Stauferstudien: Beiträge zur Geschichte der Staufer im 12. Jahrhundert*, ed. Erich Meuthen and Stefan Weinfurter (Sigmaringen 1988) 32–115 at 111 and 114; Langosch (n. 2 above) 174; Siegfried Haider, "Zum Verhältnis von Kapellanat und Geschichtsschreibung im Mittelalter," in *Geschichtsschreibung und geistiges Leben im Mittelalter: Festschrift für Heinz Löwe zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Karl Hauck and Hubert Mordek (Vienna 1978) 102–138 at 116; and Friedrich Hausmann, "Gottfried von Viterbo: Kapellan und Notar, Magister, Geschichtsschreiber und Dichter," in *Haverkamp* (n. 41 above) 603–621 at 615. Only Waitz (MGH SS 22.2 n. 30) and Gerhard Bazken, "Zur Beurteilung Gottfrieds von Viterbo," in Hauck and Mordek (above) 373–396 at 379, dispute this belief.

⁵⁰Stach (n. 40 above) 437.

⁵¹Cf. Perels (n. 48 above) 68–69 and Engels (n. 49 above) 111–114.

⁵²Ernst Schulz, "Die Entstehungsgeschichte der Werke Gotfrids von Viterbo," *NA* 46 (1926) 86–131 at 114 first reproduced the relevant passage: "Summa omnium annorum ab Adam usque ad originem huius libri 6688, anno etatis magistri Gotfridi actoris huius libri 63, anno imperii Friderici 38, sedente papa Clemente [tertio] anno primo." Although the thirty-eighth year of Frederick's reign should correspond to A.D. 1190, the correct dating of this notice is the first full year of Clement III's papacy, or 1188: Schulz 130–131 shows that Godfrey's dating of Frederick's regnal year is consistently exaggerated by two years. Thus—assuming that Godfrey calculated his own age with greater accuracy than he did Frederick's regnal year—the chronicler was born in or about 1125.

⁵³MGH SS 22.259.14: "Eo tempore ego per Lotharium positus sum puer in scolis apud Babenberg." The phrase "eo tempore" must refer generally to Lothar's reign, as it is appended to the end of the chapter after Lothar's death; Waitz (MGH SS 22.1) assumes this event to have taken place in 1133, during Lothar's first expedition to Italy, when he spent several days in close proximity to Viterbo: see on this in more detail Wilhelm Gundlach, *Heldenlieder der deutschen Kaiserzeit 3: Barbarossa-Lieder* (Innsbruck 1899) 470 n. 4.

barossa (1152–1190) and Henry VI (1190–1197).⁵⁴ Godfrey boasts about his many responsibilities as a chaplain and notary in the court, which included saying mass and reading the hours, negotiating lawsuits, drafting letters, arranging new lodgings, providing stipends for himself and his people, and carrying out “very important” legations—twice to Sicily, three times to Provence, once to Spain, several times to France, and “forty times” from Germany to Rome.⁵⁵ Presumably it was in this last capacity, as a member of imperial legations, that Godfrey appeared as witness in March 1153 to the treaty of alliance—that is, the Treaty of Constance—between Barbarossa and Pope Eugene III,⁵⁶ and its renewal with Eugene’s successor Hadrian IV in January 1155.⁵⁷

Godfrey also accompanied Frederick on some of his travels.⁵⁸ He may have been in Frederick’s entourage at Dôle in late August 1162 for the abortive meeting between Barbarossa and the French king Louis VII at Saint-Jean-de-Losne on the Saône to solve the schism between Alexander III and the antipope Victor IV.⁵⁹ At any rate he unquestionably participated in Frederick’s fourth Italian expedition in 1167, for his relation of the ravaging of the imperial forces by a plague⁶⁰ in Rome’s August heat clearly derived from personal experience:⁶¹ at one point Godfrey even brings himself into the account, admonishing a dying comrade.⁶² In the wake of this calamity Godfrey joined the small retinue that accompanied Frederick and the empress Beatrix on their flight to Lombardy, and described Frederick’s narrow escape from the duplicity of the citizens of Susa.⁶³ And when on the next Italian expedition in 1174 Barbarossa ordered Susa’s destruction as vengeance for his earlier treatment in that city, Godfrey was charged “by order of the emperor [*iussu imperatoris*]” with protecting the house of the count from

⁵⁴MGH SS 22.281.18–20: “ego . . . domino rege Conrado III. in capellanum receptus, atque a domino Frederico imperatore primo per annos 40 sub nomine capellani et notarii honoratus, et a domino rege Henrico, filio Frederici, valde dilectus et veneratus”; cf. also MGH SS 22.255.45–48. The figure of forty years appears often enough in Godfrey’s works (note the use of the number three times alone in the prologue of the *Memoria seculorum* at MGH SS 22.104.10, 105.33, and 105.44) that we can be certain the author intends it not as an exact reference, but in the sense of “a great many.”

⁵⁵MGH SS 22.105.29–34. On Godfrey’s use of the number forty, see preceding note.

⁵⁶MGH DD 10.1.89 no. 52.

⁵⁷MGH DD 10.1.167 no. 98.

⁵⁸In his works (especially the *Gesta Friderici*) Godfrey occasionally implies his own participation in the events described by the use of the first person singular, or the first person plural to indicate himself and other members of the imperial party: see Ulmann (n. 49 above) 11–12 and n. 18 for a list of citations. In some of these cases, however, one cannot say with certainty that Godfrey’s use of “we” alludes to his own participation.

⁵⁹Note Godfrey’s use of the first person plural in several verses (later expunged) in the *Gesta Friderici* at MGH SS 22.320.48–49, which Ulmann (n. 49 above) mistakenly identified as a description of the emperor’s court at Besançon. Ulmann further suggested that Godfrey was present in 1162 at the siege and eventual destruction of Milan (see the description thereof at GF 454–456: MGH SS 22.317.47–49), yet Waitz disputes this (MGH SS 22.2 n. 14).

⁶⁰Otto Kestner, “Alpenpässe und römische Malaria in der mittelalterlichen Kaiserzeit,” *Historische Vierteljahrschrift* 30 (1935) 686–719 at 695–698 argues firmly for malaria as the responsible pestilence, but recently Peter Herde has reexamined the available sources and concluded that the short incubation period and sudden appearance of the disease indicate more likely an epidemic of dysentery among troops possibly already weakened by malaria: see Herde’s *Die Katastrophe vor Rom im August 1167: Eine historisch-epidemiologische Studie zum vierten Italienzug Friedrichs I. Barbarossa* (Stuttgart 1991).

⁶¹GF 625–714: MGH SS 22.321.37–323.27.

⁶²GF 700: MGH SS 22.323.13: “Tunc ego: ‘Dum vivis, cur, stulte, sepulcra requiris?’”

⁶³GF 763–810: MGH SS 22.324.29–325.27.

demolition.⁶⁴ He was conceivably also present at the meeting of church and empire in 1177 for the conclusion of the Peace of Venice.⁶⁵

In October 1169—between Barbarossa's flight from Susa and his destruction of the city—Frederick bestowed on Godfrey and his brother Werner and nephew Reimbart a building (designated as a *palatium*⁶⁶) in Viterbo as a hereditary imperial fief.⁶⁷ Godfrey also appears in two imperial privileges from January 1178 for Italian churches with which he was associated: on January 25 Frederick took the cathedral chapter of Lucca under his protection and confirmed its privileges "especially on account of the merit of our cherished chaplain Godfrey, canon of that church";⁶⁸ and on January 30 the emperor confirmed the rights and properties of the cathedral chapter of Pisa "chiefly through the intervention of the honorable Villanus, archpriest of that church, and our chaplain Godfrey of Viterbo, canon of the church at Pisa."⁶⁹ These documents establish that Godfrey held prebends at Lucca and Pisa, a fact to which the chronicler himself never refers, although he does mention that he was canon at Speyer, a city he refers to as "mater amanda mea."⁷⁰

As late as the summer of 1179 Godfrey continued to go on legations for Frederick, as a marginal note in one of his manuscripts tells us that in that year "the author Godfrey was captured while on legation for his lord, the emperor Frederick, by Conrad, the margrave of Montferrat, and after him Christian, the archbishop of Mainz [was also

⁶⁴GF 862–864: MGH SS 22.326.33–35: "Sola domus comitis stans integra cetera planxit; Rex pius hoc sancxit, domus incombusta remansit; Cuius tutor ego, qui mea metra lego" [in margin of Godfrey's autograph (see n. 73 below): "Gouifredus s(cilicet) iussu imperatoris"].

⁶⁵Cf. GF 1012: MGH SS 22.329.43: "Sors favet Illiricis, Venetis prestamus honorem," that is, the honor of being named for the location of the meeting. It has been suggested that Godfrey may even have played a special role in the Peace. At one point in the negotiations Frederick sent a delegation, including one *Gotifridus minor cancellarius*, to Alexander III with a secret proposal concerning the Matildan lands, according to Romuald of Salerno (MGH SS 19.448.10–30 and n. 29: the *Gotifridus alius cancellarius et protonotarius* at MGH SS 19.446.9–10 was not our Godfrey, but rather the later bishop of Würzburg). When Alexander hedged concerning Frederick's demands for secrecy, this Godfrey *minor cancellarius* became indignant and, according to Romuald, returned to the emperor. If the secret delegation's Godfrey should be Godfrey of Viterbo, then we would have viable evidence that the chronicler enjoyed Barbarossa's personal trust; there is, however, no evidence whatsoever to support this identification. Clearly Godfrey was a common name at this time—a survey of the index to Frederick's charters reveals in excess of fifty discrete individuals bearing this name—and I believe as a general principle that all identifications of the chronicler with miscellaneous Godfreys mentioned in documents, without explicit use of the cognomen *Viterbiensis* (which he seems always to have used in reference to himself), are to be treated with great caution, if not outright suspicion.

⁶⁶Although one might normally render this into English as "palace," the designation *palatium* can have been used in reference to buildings of much lesser opulence than that translation would convey: cf. for instance the semantic range of the modern Italian *palazzo*, which can refer to anything from a palace or mansion to a block of flats.

⁶⁷MGH DD 10.3.17–19 no. 555; see also Carlrichard Brühl, *Fodrum, gistum, servitium regis*, Kölner historische Abhandlungen 14.1 (Cologne 1968) 609.

⁶⁸MGH DD 10.3.265 no. 727: "specialiter ob merita dilecti capellani nostri Godefridi eiusdem ecclesiae canonici"; see also Baaken (n. 49 above) 378 and Scheffer-Boichorst (n. 32 above) 443–444. Godfrey's personal familiarity with the diocese of Lucca seems to be indicated by the gloss, apparently in the author's own hand, reproduced by Waitz at MGH SS 22.239.49–50 and 240.39–40.

⁶⁹MGH DD 10.3.267 no. 728: "precipue interventu honorabilis viri Villani eiusdem ecclesiae archipresbiteri ac dilecti capellani nostri Gotefridi Viterbiensis eiusdem Pisane ecclesie canonici."

⁷⁰In the *Denominatio regnorum imperio subiectorum*: on this text see n. 184 below. Hausmann (n. 49 above) 613–614 believes he has found an independent witness for Godfrey's canony at Speyer in a charter of 1163 (now in Munich) confirmed by Bishop Udalrich of Speyer and offering two Godfreys (*Godefridus*

captured]."⁷¹ If we can believe Godfrey's own account, he had already begun composing his works in the mid-1170s, before his capture by Conrad; and after his release he doubtless retired to Viterbo to devote himself to his literary pursuits. He appears only one time in the 1180s in a court document, a charter of Henry VI issued on 24 June 1186, during the king's siege of Orvieto near Viterbo,⁷² suggesting that Godfrey had made the short trip at this time from Viterbo to Henry's camp. The date of Godfrey's death is unknown, but a notice in his autograph⁷³ indicates that he lived until at least 1191.⁷⁴

decanus and *Godefridus prepositus*) in the witness list, the second of whom Hausmann argues to be Godfrey of Viterbo. Following from this, Hausmann has made a number of other identifications of the chronicler with persons mentioned in contemporary documents. He contends that Godfrey of Viterbo is identical with a *Godefridus prepositus de Frankenfort* who acted as witness to an imperial charter of 6 August 1167 (MGH DD 10.2.481 no. 534), and notes that this same provost Godfrey of Frankfurt is mentioned twelve times in and after 1151 in charters of the archbishop of Mainz, and later appears as chaplain and (between 1162 and 1171) as canon of Mainz, only to be referred to one more time in 1181 as provost. While given Hausmann's brief treatment it seems less than certain that all of these Godfreys from Frankfurt are even necessarily the same individual, Hausmann holds one and all to be Godfrey of Viterbo. Proceeding yet further along this line of argumentation, Hausmann then suggests that the *G. solo nomine prepositus in Franckenfort* who corresponded with Hildegard of Bingen (PL 197.218) will likely yet again have been our chronicler. As intriguing as these suggestions are for those interested in Godfrey of Viterbo's career, and although Hausmann will presumably elaborate his evidence later, I do not consider these identifications tenable by any means at this point, and reiterate here my caveat from n. 65 above concerning the conflation of miscellaneous Godfreys.

⁷¹MGH SS 22.271.43–45: "Nota, quia actor Gotifridus in legatione domini Friderici imperatoris captus fuit a Conrado marchione Montisfarrati et post eum Maguntinus archiepiscopus Christianus. Ubi si prima culpa fuisset punita, non esset altera subsecuta." Godfrey's description of Conrad in the *Gesta Friderici* leaves little doubt concerning his feelings about his captor's lineage (GF 883–885; MGH SS 22.327.7–9): "Montis farrati comites ad crimina nati, / Corde venenati, longeva fraude notati, / Cesaris agnati, tradere regna rati." Conrad captured Christian late in September of 1179 and held him captive for over a year: see especially Dieter Hägermann, "Beiträge zur Reichslegation Christians von Mainz in Italien," *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 49 (1969) 186–238 at 218–237. While Godfrey's abduction cannot be dated with equal certainty, Baaken (n. 49 above) 378 shows that it must have taken place in the previous summer. We do not know if Godfrey was captured alone or as part of a group, but the wording of his statement rules out Haverkamp's suggestion (n. 41 above) 35 n. 30 that Godfrey was captured together with Christian.

⁷²Complete text printed by Gerhard Baaken, "Ungedruckte Urkunden Heinrichs VI.," DA 31 (1975) 455–533 at 477–481; see also Johann Friedrich Böhmer and Gerhard Baaken, *Die Regesten des Kaiserreiches unter Heinrich VI.*, Regesta Imperii 4.3 (Cologne 1972) 10–11 no. 9.

⁷³MGH SS 22.136.25–27: "Incipit liber Pantheon Gotifredi Viterbiensis cappellani imperatoris Frederici et filii eius regis Henrici VI. Finitis autem est anno Domini 1191." On the partial autograph of Godfrey (Paris, BN lat. 4894: cf. the appendix below) see Georg Waitz in Archiv 11, 323–329 and MGH SS 22.13–14, and the discussion in section III below. Baaken (n. 49 above) 380, who used a microfilm of this manuscript, refers to the above remark as "eine eigenhändige Notiz des Autors"; Waitz, on the other hand, who originally determined the Paris manuscript to be Godfrey's autograph, does not suggest that this notice was written by the author himself, and to judge from his silence did not believe this to be the case. It is important to note in this connection that, since a later scribe (or scribes) continued to work with the autograph until long after Godfrey's death (cf. below at n. 172), these same persons may have been responsible for any number of other alterations or additions in the codex, so that care must be exercised in ascribing any given text therein to the chronicler himself. This observation applies equally to the statement found in two manuscripts of recension E that the work was finished in 1190 "in ecclesia Palaciana in Viterbio" (see n. 209 below), a notice that Baaken 377–378 explicitly asserts to derive from Godfrey himself: this is in fact unprovable.

⁷⁴In light of Godfrey's statement in the last recension of the *Pantheon* (around 1190: see n. 209 below) that he would write an account of the third crusade if he should live long enough (MGH SS 22.297.18:

As stated above, the foregoing account of Godfrey's life has been well known since the nineteenth century. In recent years, however, potential new information about Godfrey's career has come to light, which, though speculative, merits treatment here.

In 1978 Gerhard Baaken offered a striking comparison of the Treaty of Constance of March 1153 and the renewal thereof from January 1155, both of which list Godfrey as witness, to demonstrate that the scribe of the second document treated Godfrey's name in what may be described as a self-conscious manner. While the later document is essentially a direct copy of the original treaty with only minor alterations that reflect changes in the historical circumstances in the intervening two years,⁷⁵ a comparison of the witness lists of both charters reveals one conspicuous exception. The original witness list from 1153 reads:

Testes autem sunt . . . Arnoldus Coloniensis archiepiscopus, Hermannus Constantiensis episcopus, Anselmus Havelbergensis episcopus, Ardicio Cumanus episcopus, . . . Curien-
sis episcopus, Wibaldus Stabulensis abbas, Albertus Coloniensis decanus, magister Hen-
ricus notarius, *Gotefredus Viterbiensis capellanus regis*; ex laicis quoque Welpho dux,
marchio Hermannus de Baden, comes Ovlricus de Lenzburch, comes Wernerus de Lenz-
burch, Anselmus camerarius et ministerialis regni.⁷⁶

The corresponding list in the treaty of 1155 is (apart from orthographic and other trivial differences) identical to that given above, save that Godfrey's name has been left out by the scribe of the second document; Godfrey appears instead below as witness to an appendix, that is, to a new paragraph in which Barbarossa affirms that he will be bound to Hadrian, his successors, and the Roman church just as he was to Eugene:

sub presentia venerabilium legatorum vestrorum Cencii Portuensis episcopi et Bernardi
atque Octavianii presbiterorum cardinalium, principum vero nostrorum Arnoldi Coloni-
ensis archiepiscopi Italici regni archicancellarii, Chuonradi Patauiensis episcopi, Peregrini
Aquiliensis patriarche, Illini archiepiscopi Treuerensis, Ebrahardi Babenbergensis, Her-
manni Constantiensis, Ordolebi Basiliensis episcoporum, Wibaldi Corbeiensis, Marcuardi
Fuldensis abbatum, Adelberti prepositi Aquensis, *Gotifredi capellani nostri*. . . .

It is worth noting that other persons—Arnold of Cologne, Hermann of Constance, and Wibald of Stavelot/Corvey—appear in the list of witnesses to *both* the main body of the 1155 treaty and the appendix; *only* Godfrey's name has been handled in an irregular manner. Of course, the scribe of the treaty of 1155 may simply have omitted Godfrey's name from the first list of witnesses accidentally, but Baaken considers this conclusion improbable in a treaty of such importance. He concludes rather that a particularly close relationship must have existed between the scribe of the later document and Godfrey, which led the scribe to treat our chronicler's name differently from those

⁷⁵"Finem vero et eventum illorum bellorum adhuc si supervixero scribam"), the possibility exists that Godfrey died shortly after this; it seems to me, however, equally likely that Frederick's untimely demise in the river Saleph or any number of other factors could have discouraged the realization of this intention. Some scholars have maintained that Godfrey composed the *Gesta Heinrici VI* found in some manuscripts of the *Pantheon* (MGH SS 22.334–338), in which case the chronicler must have lived until about 1204: for a summary of this issue, Wattenbach-Schmale (n. 2 above) 90. The ascription of this text to Godfrey is still highly questionable, however, and requires a new, comprehensive treatment; but I believe that the theory offered below concerning Godfrey's literary activity would tend to argue against his authorship of this work.

⁷⁶See the commentary at MGH DD 10.1.165.14–16.

⁷⁷MGH DD 10.1.89 no. 52. On the important formula "Testes autem sunt," see below at nn. 110 and 111.

of the other figures.⁷⁷ Indeed, Baaken goes on to propose that Godfrey was himself the scribe of the second treaty, a theory about which more below.

Frederick's bestowal in 1169 of a *palatium* in Viterbo on Godfrey—designated here as *capellanus sacri palatii*—and Godfrey's brother Werner and nephew Reimbert has also been the subject of recent close study and speculation by diplomatic historians. The charter relates that the recipients have built the *palatium* at their own cost, which the emperor promises will be reimbursed *loco et tempore oportuno*; for this Frederick retains only the right of accommodation for himself and certain princely legates. The second half of the privilege goes much further than mere bestowal of a fief, however. It guarantees the recipients wide-ranging exemptions and privileges, including freedom from the authority of the consul or people of Viterbo, or any court other than the emperor's. According to one expert on the imperial chancery in the twelfth century, Friedrich Hausmann, this document is a remarkable text: the generosity of the privileges and exemptions outlined therein is so great, and the corresponding consideration on Godfrey's part so trifling, that Hausmann—who, it must be said, attempts in his study to portray Godfrey's position in the court in the most favorable light—has declared this charter "all in all an act of grace like none other known to me."⁷⁸ Not coincidentally, the diplomatic historian Walter Koch has also proposed on other grounds that this charter of Frederick Barbarossa is an *Empfängerdiktat*, that is, a privilege written by the recipient, specifically Godfrey of Viterbo himself.⁷⁹ This document may therefore tell us something about Godfrey's position in the chancery: such were the prerogatives of trusted notaries that they could draft privileges for the benefit of their own institutions or even for themselves.⁸⁰ That Godfrey wielded some influence in the chancery may be indicated as well by the fact that he was able successfully to solicit privileges for the churches of Pisa and Lucca where he held canonries.

In the 1950s Hausmann noted in his work on the chancery of Conrad III that, although Godfrey claimed to have worked as chaplain and notary already under that monarch, no evidence for the chronicler's activity there existed.⁸¹ Persuaded on the other hand of the likelihood of discovering more about Godfrey's activity in Frederick's chancery, Hausmann compared the chronicler's partial autograph in Paris with diplomatic materials from Barbarossa's reign, and announced in an unpublished lecture in 1969 that Godfrey could be identified with a chancery scribe from the early years of Frederick's reign heretofore known only as Arnold II C.⁸² This theory requires our close attention.

⁷⁷Baaken (n. 49 above) 376.

⁷⁸Hausmann (n. 49 above) 611.

⁷⁹Walter Koch, *Die Reichskanzlei in den Jahren 1167 bis 1174: Eine diplomatisch-paläographische Untersuchung*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse, Denkschriften 115.2 (Vienna 1973) 129; see also Baaken (n. 49 above) 377.

⁸⁰Hausmann (n. 49 above) 609.

⁸¹See Friedrich Hausmann, *Reichskanzlei und Hofkapelle unter Heinrich V. und Konrad III.*, Schriften der MGH 14 (Stuttgart 1956) 309. Godfrey's name does not appear in any of the charters of Conrad edited by Hausmann, *Die Urkunden der deutschen Könige und Kaiser 9: Die Urkunden Konrads III. und seines Sohnes Heinrich* (Vienna 1969).

⁸²Friedrich Hausmann's lecture, "Magister Gottfried von Viterbo, Dichter, Geschichtsschreiber und Kapellan Friedrich Barbarossas," is noted in *Bericht über den 10. österreichischen Historikertag in Graz*, Veröffentlichungen des Verbandes österreichischer Geschichtsvereine 18 (1970) 66. The most recent account by Hausmann of his theory appears in another, expanded lecture (n. 49 above), published unfortunately without footnotes.

In the early years of Barbarossa's reign the imperial chancery evidenced none of the attributes of a modern bureaucratic institution. It lacked a fixed headquarters, maintained no official register or records, and operated carelessly on a day-to-day basis rather than according to a strict organizational rule.⁸³ Moreover, the chancellor—more political adviser to the monarch than bureau chief—rarely wrote out charters himself or became personally involved in the daily workings of the chancery.⁸⁴ Various notaries, working almost completely without the supervision of higher authorities,⁸⁵ carried out these latter duties. Although notaries did not identify themselves by name in chancery documents, which generally record in the *recognitio* only the name of the respective chancellor or other competent authority,⁸⁶ each left nevertheless some individual—or idiosyncratic—mark on the documents he worked on, either in the script or in stylistic formulation, and in many cases both.⁸⁷ Through comparison of script and formulation in the extant charters (techniques known as *Schrift-* and *Diktatvergleich*),⁸⁸ diplomatic scholars involved in the editing of Frederick's charters at the Vienna branch of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* have identified many of Barbarossa's diplomas as the work of specific notaries. These scribes are known, however, only by their characteristic idiosyncracies and are rarely identifiable as historical personalities.⁸⁹ Each of these anonymous notaries has received a "name" corresponding to the chancellor under whom he worked and a letter of the alphabet according to the order of his appearance in the chancery (for instance, Rainald C or Christian E).⁹⁰

For the practitioners of *Schrift-* and *Diktatvergleich*, techniques that thrive on notarial idiosyncrasy, Arnold II C⁹¹ left invaluable clues about his identity. The first new notary to appear in the chancery after Barbarossa's accession,⁹² Arnold II C's style devi-

⁸³Heinrich Appelt, "Die Kanzlei Friedrich Barbarossas," in *Die Zeit der Staufer: Geschichte, Kunst, Kultur*, ed. Reiner Haussherr et al., Württembergisches Landesmuseum, Katalog der Ausstellung 5 (Stuttgart 1979) 17–34 at 17–18.

⁸⁴Heinrich Appelt et al., *Die Urkunden der deutschen Könige und Kaiser 10.5: Einleitung* (Hanover 1990) 16.

⁸⁵Ibid. 26; see also n. 106 below.

⁸⁶Appelt (n. 83 above) 20.

⁸⁷Very often the notary acted as both author and scribe, in other words, was responsible for both the formulation and the actual writing of the document; in many cases, however, the original no longer exists and the charter's scribe cannot always be determined with certainty.

⁸⁸Kurt Zeillinger, "Die Notare der Reichskanzlei in den ersten Jahren Friedrich Barbarossas," DA 22 (1966) 472–555 at 474–480 provides a brief but useful discussion of the methodology and limitations of the technique of *Diktatvergleich*.

⁸⁹See especially *ibid.*; Josef Riedmann, "Studien über die Reichskanzlei unter Friedrich Barbarossa in den Jahren 1156–1166," MIÖG 75 (1967) 322–402 and 76 (1968) 23–105; Rainer Maria Herkenrath, *Die Reichskanzlei in den Jahren 1174 bis 1180*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse, Denkschriften 130 (Vienna 1977); Koch (n. 79 above); and Walter Koch, *Die Schrift der Reichskanzlei im 12. Jahrhundert: Untersuchungen zur Diplomatie der Kaiserurkunde*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse, Denkschriften 134 (Vienna 1979).

⁹⁰Zeillinger (n. 88 above) 473–474. The findings of the extensive literature on the individual notaries and the privileges assigned to them are summarized by Appelt et al. (n. 84 above) 24–74.

⁹¹This scribe derives his designation from Arnold of Selehofen, who was the second of two Arnolds to act as chancellor under Conrad III (hence Arnold II), and continued in that position after Frederick's accession. The designations Arnold II A and Arnold II B (= Wibald of Corvey) have been given to scribes already working in the chancery before 1152.

⁹²Arnold II C's greatest activity in the chancery spans the year April 1152–April 1153 (some twenty-four documents), followed by a two-year lapse before he worked on another five diplomas between January and

ates significantly from typical chancery practice. His script shows many characteristics of the curial minuscule used in contemporary formal papal privileges, indicating earlier training or activity in the papal curia.⁹³ This might also explain Arnold II C's distinctly Italian orthography, which is especially pronounced in the writing of German names (such as *Ebrhardus* or *Werneherus*).⁹⁴ The particular form of *arenga* and (at least in one case) the *intitulatio* used by Arnold II C,⁹⁵ as well as his frequent use in imperial documents of the *cursus*,⁹⁶ which remained at the time of his activity in the imperial chancery an (at least ostensibly) secret device of the papal curia to help prevent forgeries,⁹⁷ further suggest that this notary had worked in the papal court. He seems to have had close contact with Roman aristocratic circles sympathetic to Barbarossa,⁹⁸ and, as he drew up a charter in 1159 for the benefit of Frederick's strong supporter, the cardinal Octavian (later the antipope Victor IV),⁹⁹ he may have been in the cardinal's retinue at that time. Intriguingly, the diplomatist Rainer Maria Herkenrath believes that Victor IV's own charter of February 1160 for the archbishopric of Hamburg-Bremen was composed by none other than Arnold II C.¹⁰⁰

The proposed identification of Arnold II C with Godfrey of Viterbo rests on three main types of evidence. First and foremost, Hausmann has maintained that paleographical comparison of the charters of Arnold II C with Godfrey's autograph reveals numerous scribal similarities, specifically in the formation of letters, the singular manner of the decoration of majuscules, and the use of abbreviations.¹⁰¹ While Hausmann has yet to publish the details of his argument, Kurt Zeillinger has offered in recent years a tentative *Schriftvergleich*, complete with reproductions of some relevant documents, between the hands of Arnold II C and Godfrey, a comparison that, in Zeillinger's opinion, allows the conclusion that both scripts derive from "one and the same hand."¹⁰² Some will surely question Zeillinger's comparison alone on the basis of the thirty-year interlude between Arnold II C's activity in the chancery (1152–1159) and

June 1155: see Appelt et al. (n. 84 above) 32 and 52. Kurt Zeillinger, "Das erste Roncagliose Lehenesgesetz Friedrich Barbarossas, das Scholarenprivileg (*Authentica Habita*) und Gottfried von Viterbo," *Römische historische Mitteilungen* 26 (1984) 191–217, also attributes the composition and script of the feudal constitution of 5 December 1154 and the law *Authentica Habita* of May 1155 to Arnold II C; this theory is advocated also by Hausmann (n. 49 above) 610–611, who attributes considerably more charters to Arnold II C (including several from 1163/64) than does Appelt's edition.

⁹³Appelt et al. (n. 84 above) 32. On Arnold II C's hand in detail see Koch (n. 89 above) 123–131.

⁹⁴See Zeillinger (n. 88 above) 528 for a list of these Italianisms.

⁹⁵Ibid. 528, and Ulrich Schmidt, *Königswahl und Thronfolge im 12. Jahrhundert* (Cologne 1987) 147.

⁹⁶Kurt Zeillinger, "Zwei Diplome Barbarossas für seine römischen Parteigänger (1159)," *DA* 20 (1964) 568–581 at 572.

⁹⁷Gudrun Lindholm, *Studien zum mittellateinischen Prosarhythmus: Seine Entwicklung und sein Abklingen in der Briefliteratur Italiens*, *Studia latina Stockholmiensia* 10 (Stockholm 1963) 13.

⁹⁸Zeillinger (n. 88 above) 575 and Appelt et al. (n. 84 above) 32.

⁹⁹MGH DD 10.2.83–84 no. 274.

¹⁰⁰See Baaken (n. 49 above) 384 and Hausmann (n. 49 above) 612. Unfortunately the charter, which notes that it was written "per manum Godfridi sancte Romane ecclesie notarii," exists only in a later copy; but it is notable that the document was written while Victor was visiting Frederick's court. While Hausmann offers some examples of stylistic correspondence between this document and those of Arnold II C, I nevertheless am not certain (as is Hausmann) that this reference represents "unmistakable" evidence for Godfrey's or Arnold II C's activity in the papal chancery.

¹⁰¹Hausmann (n. 49 above) 617.

¹⁰²Zeillinger (n. 92 above) 208–209.

Godfrey's work on the autograph (1185–1191); in this connection it must be said, however, that the highly-pronounced idiosyncracies of both Arnold II C's and Godfrey's scripts offset this difficulty to a great extent.

Zeillinger further notes that the compositions of both Arnold II C and Godfrey manifest characteristic Italian orthography in the writing of proper names and in the employment of the letter *h* (yielding forms like *istoriis*, *ebraicus*, *hobedit* or *rehedificatione*).¹⁰³ According to Hausmann, the orthographical similarities go even further than Zeillinger's examples would imply. Rainer Maria Herkenrath has recently shown that Arnold II C's work in the imperial chancery distinguishes itself from that of most of the other notaries through its carelessness: whereas the median number of errors per document for Frederick's notaries was about 4, Arnold II C made on average 12.2 errors in each diploma.¹⁰⁴ This figure is exceeded only by the average 16.7 errors of Arnold II D, who appears to have been a trainee of Arnold II C.¹⁰⁵ Herkenrath explains Arnold II D's poor showing as an indication that this notary suffered from dyslexia.¹⁰⁶ Following Herkenrath's lead, Hausmann points to manifold common errors in the writing of Arnold II C and Godfrey—confusion of certain vowels or consonants, doubled or missing syllables, false or omitted word-endings, and blundered forms such as *euguan gelium*—that in his opinion establish that both the notary Arnold II C and the historian Godfrey of Viterbo suffered from dyslexia.¹⁰⁷

Hausmann and Zeillinger augment their paleographical evidence with examples of similar style and expression in the writing of Arnold II C and Godfrey.¹⁰⁸ Clearly, if Arnold II C is to be identified with Godfrey of Viterbo, we can expect to find the notary's characteristic modes of expression and idiosyncracies of style repeated in the works of the historian; unfortunately, the lack of a complete edition of Godfrey's works with comprehensive index dictates that such comparisons must remain tentative. Nevertheless, Zeillinger has been able to provide some examples of stylistic similarity. In introducing the witnesses to his documents, Arnold II C never uses the common chancery formula "adhibitis (idoneis) testibus," preferring other formulations instead,¹⁰⁹ including in several examples: "Testes . . . sunt" (or "fuerunt") "hii";¹¹⁰ similar for-

¹⁰³Ibid. 211.

¹⁰⁴Rainer Maria Herkenrath, "Ein Legastheniker in der Kanzlei Barbarossas. Studien zum kaiserlichen Notar Arnold II. D (1152–1155)," *Archiv für Diplomatik* 33 (1987) 269–291 at 275.

¹⁰⁵See *ibid.* 271–274.

¹⁰⁶See *ibid.* 276–280, who provides a long and detailed list of Arnold II D's characteristic mistakes, including his tendencies to confuse similar letterforms and transpose or omit letters and syllables. Arnold II D seems to have spent much effort on amending his own mistakes, and according to Herkenrath seldom left an error uncorrected; this correction was clearly by the hand of the notary himself and not performed by a superior, as neither the chancellor nor even the head notary (or *protonotarius*) seems to have taken it upon himself to supervise the work of the notaries: cf. *ibid.* 280.

¹⁰⁷Hausmann (n. 49 above) 610. I am not thoroughly convinced, however, that many of the examples offered by Hausmann are not either common southern forms (*docma*, *menbrum*, *Lombardi*) or the results of mere scribal sloppiness which, considering the speed with which Godfrey produced and revised his works, does not seem particularly remarkable. Fuller treatment by Hausmann will, I expect, clarify this issue.

¹⁰⁸Hausmann (n. 49 above) 617–618 and Zeillinger (n. 92 above) 209–210. In most cases where the original of a diploma composed by Arnold II C exists, he has provided the script as well as the dictation, indicating that most or all of the documents written by the hand of Arnold II C were also composed by him.

¹⁰⁹Zeillinger (n. 88 above) 529; and *idem* (n. 92 above) 209.

¹¹⁰This formula found in MGH DD 10.1.29 no. 16, 10.1.36 no. 20, 10.1.95 no. 55, and 10.2.84 no. 274; cf. the similar formula in the list of witnesses to the Treaty of Constance (n. 76 above).

mulations appear in the prologues to Godfrey's works, such as "Testes autem et autores super vetus Testamentum, quos imitatur et sequimur, sunt hii,"¹¹¹ and "Actores autem cronicorum, quos imitatur, sunt hii."¹¹² In addition, the *appreciatio*: "feliciter amen," characteristic of Arnold II C's charters,¹¹³ finds parallels in at least two passages from Godfrey's works: "Opus autem huius libri scias me spacio 9 annorum agitasse et in decimo, Deo gratias, perfinisse; feliciter amen,"¹¹⁴ and "usque ad dominum imperatorem Fredericum primum et ad filium eius dominum regem Henricum sextum; feliciter amen."¹¹⁵

As the third component of the proposed identification of Arnold II C with Godfrey, striking circumstantial evidence can be offered. As seen above, the scribe of the Treaty of Constance between Barbarossa and Eugene III (1153) and of the later renewal thereof with Hadrian IV (1155) showed a particular consciousness of the presence of the treaties' witness Godfrey of Viterbo in both situations; not coincidentally, some scholars maintain that both documents were drafted by Arnold II C.¹¹⁶ The imperial charter of October 1169 bestowing the *palatium* in Viterbo on Godfrey as a fief, which has been adjudged an *Empfängerdiktat* drawn up by Godfrey himself,¹¹⁷ contains at least one phrase belonging to Arnold II C's characteristic vocabulary.¹¹⁸ Arnold II C appears to have worked in close cooperation with Frederick's antipope Victor IV,¹¹⁹ a man on whom Godfrey lavishes singular praise.¹²⁰ And Godfrey's own claim to have met diplomats from many lands in the papal as well as imperial courts¹²¹ suggests that he—like Arnold II C—may have worked in some official capacity in the papal curia.

One further point of comparison derives from Arnold II C's and Godfrey's common command of Roman law. Zeillinger argues not only for the identification of God-

¹¹¹MGH SS 22.95.5-7.

¹¹²MGH SS 22.103.40.

¹¹³MGH DD 10.1.95 no. 55, 10.1.176 no. 103, and 10.1.187 no. 110; see Zeillinger (n. 96 above) 577.

¹¹⁴MGH SS 22.105.48-49; see Zeillinger (n. 92 above) 209.

¹¹⁵MGH SS 22.134.10-11 and n. m. Godfrey's use of an *appreciatio* in this fashion seems to reflect at any rate his chancerial and/or curial training, which appears further in several other formulations in his works: Zeillinger (n. 92 above) 210.

¹¹⁶See for instance Zeillinger (n. 92 above) 211. Herkenrath (n. 104 above) 281-285, however, argues briefly but persuasively that Arnold II D rather than Arnold II C composed the Treaty of Constance. If true, this would eliminate one of Zeillinger's points of circumstantial evidence for the identification of Arnold II C with Godfrey, but does not otherwise damage his case. In fact, as Herkenrath himself argues (cf. n. 105 above), Arnold II C probably trained Arnold II D, and the latter closely imitated his teacher in the early period of his chancerial activity, which would therefore explain Arnold II D's peculiar consciousness of Godfrey's (= Arnold II C's) presence as a witness.

¹¹⁷See above at n. 79.

¹¹⁸The phrase *volumus esse cognitum*; see on this point Rainer Maria Herkenrath, "Regnum et Imperium in den Diplomen der ersten Regierungsjahre Friedrichs I.," in *Friedrich Barbarossa*, ed. Gunther Wolf, Wege der Forschung 390 (Darmstadt 1975) 323-359 at 339-340 n. 76.

¹¹⁹See above at nn. 99 and 100.

¹²⁰Cf. the description of Victor at GF 311-312: MGH SS 22.314.26-27: "Nobilis, almificus, speciosus, ad omnia planus, / Gemine Romanus, larga, pudica manus"; on Godfrey's other sympathetic remarks about Victor see also Zeillinger (n. 92 above) 212 n. 117.

¹²¹MGH SS 22.105.45-47: "Sepe enim Greci a Constantinopoli et Sarraceni a Babillonia et Persi a Perside et Armeni ab Armenia ad curiam imperialem et papalem venientes et magnas legationes ferentes me instruxerunt et sua scripta aliquando tradiderunt mihi." Godfrey's claim to have received materials from Eastern legates has received some support from literary historical analysis of certain texts from the *Pantheon*: cf. for instance nn. 21 and 22 above.

frey with Arnold II C, but for both as the composer of the feudal constitution of December 1154¹²² and the law *Habita*, issued by Barbarossa (probably in May 1155) at a meeting with the so-called "four doctors" of Bologna.¹²³ Both documents indicate an above-average knowledge of Roman law, indeed the latter displays in its wording "an unmistakable juristic virtuosity"¹²⁴ that has naturally led scholars to assume that the four doctors, the period's preeminent professors of Roman law, formulated *Habita* themselves.¹²⁵ Zeillinger's theory not surprisingly casts an interesting light on Godfrey's writings, which themselves demonstrate their author's erudition in this area. Thus—to provide a single illustrative example—in relation to the struggle between the emperor and the papacy, Godfrey firmly championed in the prologue of the *Pantheon* the idea that the monarch received his power directly from God, and therefore answered only to God for his actions,¹²⁶ apparently derived from the maxim found in Roman law that "the prince is not bound by the laws [*princeps legibus solutus est*]."¹²⁷ This idea already had considerable currency in Barbarossa's circle long before the writing of the *Pantheon*,¹²⁸ but Godfrey goes further than these earlier writers by maintaining that while the prince is not bound by the laws, nevertheless he should freely submit to them;¹²⁹ this affirmation of the prince's jurisdictional autonomy and simultaneous praise of his willingness to submit to the law finds a clear parallel in the *lex digna* of the Justinian Code.¹³⁰ Given his knowledge of Roman law—which Godfrey may have received at Bamberg (where we know two copies of the *Institutes* resided¹³¹) and in the imperial (and papal?) chancery—it is hardly surprising that he dedicated two chapters in his *Gesta Friderici* to the meeting at Roncaglia in November 1158 between Frederick Barbarossa and the four doctors. By making the professors tell Barbarossa: "As the living law, you can give, abrogate, and establish laws. . . . As the animate law, you do whatever you want,"¹³² Godfrey introduced the principle, derived from Roman law¹³³ and previously unknown in the Middle Ages, of the emperor as the *lex viva* or *lex animata*.¹³⁴

¹²²MGH DD 10.1.151–153 no. 91.

¹²³MGH DD 10.2.36–40 no. 243.

¹²⁴Robert L. Benson, "Political *Renovatio*: Two Models from Roman Antiquity," in Benson and Constable (n. 25 above) 339–386 at 363.

¹²⁵See Winfried Stelzer, "Zum Scholarenprivileg Friedrich Barbarossas (Authentica 'Habita')," DA 34 (1978) 123–165 at 153.

¹²⁶MGH SS 22.132.11–21.

¹²⁷Dig. 1.3.31.

¹²⁸Benson (n. 124 above) 365.

¹²⁹MGH SS 22.258.14–15: "Conditor est legis, neque debet lege teneri, / Sed sibi complacuit sub lege libenter haberi."

¹³⁰Thomas Szabó, "Römischrechtliche Einflüsse auf die Beziehung des Herrschers zum Recht. Eine Studie zu vier Autoren aus der Umgebung Friedrich Barbarossas," *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 53 (1973) 34–48 at 39; on the *lex digna* in the Middle Ages see also Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton 1957) 104–107.

¹³¹See Percy Ernst Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio: Studien und Texte zur Geschichte des römischen Erneuerungsgedankens vom Ende des karolingischen Reiches bis zum Investiturstreit*, Studien der Bibliothek Warburg 17.1 (Leipzig 1929) 277–278, and Heinrich Appelt, "Die Kaiseridee Friedrich Barbarossas," in Wolf (n. 118 above) 208–244 at 228.

¹³²MGH SS 22.316.27 and 29; see Benson (n. 124 above) 365, who gives the legal source of the doctors' statement as Nov. 105.2.4.

¹³³Benson (n. 124 above) 365.

¹³⁴Szabó (n. 130 above) 41 and 48.

It is also worth briefly noting that an important political device of the Hohenstaufen period, the reservation clause, first entered chancery usage in a charter of Arnold II C.¹³⁵ Since this formula is clearly derived from curial usage,¹³⁶ its appearance lends additional weight to the argument that Arnold II C (and therefore perhaps Godfrey) had worked in the papal court. Furthermore, if Arnold II C and Godfrey are identical, the inference that he may have introduced the reservation clause to the imperial chancery would seem conclusively to answer charges such as Paul Scheffer-Boichorst's, cited above, that Godfrey lacked political understanding. Such indications make the proposed identification of Godfrey with the notary Arnold II C a highly intriguing and suggestive possibility, but final conclusions on the theory will have to await Hausmann's own comprehensive treatment of the subject. While this theory therefore does not play a fundamental role in the following, its implications for our argument will naturally be given due attention.

We must now attempt to ascertain what the foregoing information about Godfrey's life and career tells us about his position at court relative to the Staufer. In fact, while it points clearly to the fact that Godfrey was a member of the court, there is little here to confirm that he belonged to the circle of the emperor's or king's *familiars*; and the little that does seem to point in this direction comes from Godfrey's own statements. That Godfrey worked in the court for many years (we need not take his phrase "forty years" literally) and accompanied Frederick on campaigns does not unequivocally place the chronicler in the emperor's close vicinity when we consider the vast size of the court, which with all of its servants may at times have comprised a thousand people or more,¹³⁷ and certainly often numbered at any rate in the hundreds. While Godfrey claims to have gone on numerous legations for Frederick, we have no reason to assume that he was personally commissioned by the emperor for these missions, or that he accompanied them in any capacity other than as a minor notary; it is perhaps not insignificant that, with the possible exception of the Treaty of Constance, we have no independent evidence for any of Godfrey's "very important" missions. And although it is certainly impressive in some sense that in 1153, while not yet thirty years old, Godfrey acted as witness to one of the most important political documents of Frederick's early reign, the Treaty of Constance,¹³⁸ nevertheless we do not know that the court chaplain actually took part in the negotiation of that treaty, nor, given the presence of experienced figures like Arnold of Cologne, Anselm of Havelberg, and Wibald of Stablo, is this particularly likely. Furthermore, Hausmann's identification of Godfrey with the notary Arnold II C—should it prove sound—would add a new dimension to our understanding of Godfrey's activity in the court, but nevertheless tells us noth-

¹³⁵MGH DD 10.1.36 no. 20; see also Heinrich Appelt, "Der Vorbehalt kaiserlicher Rechte in den Diplomen Friedrich Barbarossas," in Wolf (n. 118 above) 33–57 at 53.

¹³⁶On the clause in papal usage see Friedrich Thaner, "Über Entstehung und Bedeutung der Formel *salva sedis apostolicæ auctoritate* in den päpstlichen Privilegien," *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie der Wissenschaften*, phil.-hist. Klasse 71 (1872) 807–851; and Johannes Baptist Sägmüller, *Zur Geschichte der Entwicklung des päpstlichen Gesetzgebungsrechtes: Die Entstehung und Bedeutung der Formel 'salva sedis apostolicæ auctoritate' in den päpstlichen Privilegien um die Mitte des 12. Jahrhunderts*, ed. 2 (Rottenburg a. N. 1937).

¹³⁷Joachim Bumke, *Courtly Culture: Literature and Society in the High Middle Ages*, trans. Thomas Dunlap (Berkeley 1991) 53.

¹³⁸See on the Treaty Peter Rassow, *Honor imperii: Die neue Politik Friedrich Barbarossas, 1152–1159* (Munich 1940) 45–65, and Herbert Grundmann's review of Rassow's work in Wolf (n. 118 above) 26–32.

ing about Godfrey's position relative to the Stauffer: while he clearly worked in the imperial chancery for some time, and apparently wielded some influence there (that is to say, he "knew people"), given the *modus operandi* of that proto-institution, this fact alone does not confirm that Godfrey had a personal association with either Frederick or Henry.¹³⁹

We must at this point, therefore, inquire on what basis previous scholarship has suggested that Godfrey was Henry's teacher. As it turns out, the only tenable evidence for this is the manner in which Godfrey addresses Henry in his two works intended for that monarch, the *Speculum regum* and the *Memoria seculorum*.¹⁴⁰ The reader perusing these works cannot help but notice the author's self-assured and personal manner of addressing Henry, most especially in his lengthy prologue to the poetical portion of the *Memoria seculorum*.¹⁴¹ Although Godfrey begins this latter text respectfully enough—referring to himself as *servulus* and praising Henry's erudition—he thereupon assumes an unmistakably pedagogical tone. After listing the many subjects handled in the volume, Godfrey lets his intended benefactor know he has worked most of his life seeking out the requisite materials, and that "I have included [them] according to their right order in this little book, and with all my heart have written down for you, my lord, those things which should be read, and I have explained them so concisely that, having found this book, you may consider yourself to have found the histories themselves and the books of all others." Lest exalted language should cause Henry and his lay princes any confusion, Godfrey promises to avoid fancy words or ornate modes of expression, for he has not written for masters and philosophers, but has rather "intended and adapted these simple sentences for you, a layman who philosophizes in moderation, and other youths your age." This schoolmasterly attitude continues into the main body of the *Memoria seculorum*, where Godfrey ends his historical discussion with a long chapter admonishing Henry on proper rule, complete with the following blunt counsel:

If your majesty will not respect the rights and duties of prince and subjects, what right have you to call yourself a king? If you cannot be your own guide, still less shall you be mine. Alexander the Great's tutor instilled bad habits into his prince; the king learned this as a child, he regretted it as an adult. Alexander conquered Darius and also Babylon, but he could not overcome the instilled habits.¹⁴²

It was this passage in particular that led the nineteenth-century scholar Heinrich Ulmann to believe that Godfrey must have been Henry's own teacher, for (so he rea-

¹³⁹Note the statement by Appelt et al. (n. 84 above) 26: "Es sieht so aus, als hätte eine über die Zugehörigkeit zur Hofkapelle hinausreichende persönliche Bindung an den kaiserlichen Herrn nicht bestanden."

¹⁴⁰Hausmann (n. 49 above) 615 mentions that "in charters of the empress Beatrix a [certain] chaplain is referred to explicitly as the tutor of her sons and further as *magister* or *doctor*," which that scholar sees as additional evidence that Godfrey, who is referred to in imperial and royal documents as *magister*, acted as Henry's teacher. But Hausmann gives no evidence that these references from Beatrix's charters point specifically to Godfrey, who was only one of a considerable number of court chaplains enjoying the title *magister*: cf. for instance the chaplain and *magister* Daniel, who we know served as notary to Beatrix (MGH DD 10.4.284 no. 994, 10.4.492 and Appelt et al. [n. 84 above] 26), and who therefore seems to me perhaps a more likely candidate for Hausmann's identification than Godfrey.

¹⁴¹MGH SS 22.103.1–106.4

¹⁴²MGH SS 22.270.7–14; quoted from Mulder-Bakker (n. 24 above) 93.

soned) one could hardly expect that anyone else would dare to address the king so boldly.¹⁴³ But in truth Godfrey's manner of admonishing Henry proves nothing of the sort, for he assumes the same brazen tone with Frederick twice in the *Gesta Friderici*, in passages we shall see below.¹⁴⁴

More important, Godfrey unintentionally tells us himself that he was not Henry's teacher in a rather startling passage from the prologue of the *Memoria seculorum*, in which he ingeniously professes to apologize for the work's potential weaknesses by vaunting his tireless activity in the service of the court:

May my patient efforts and the excellence of the subjects treated, as well as the length of the work, find the more attention because I wrote this in the nooks of the imperial palace or on horseback on the road, under a tree or deep in the forest, whenever time permitted, during the sieges of castles, in the dangers of many a battle. I did not write this in the solitude of a monastery or in some other quiet place, but in the constant restlessness and confusion of events, in war and warlike conditions, in the noise of such a large court. As a chaplain I was occupied every day around the clock in the mass and all the hours, at table, in negotiations, in the drafting of letters, in the daily arrangement of new lodgings, in looking after the livelihood for myself and my people, in carrying out very important missions: twice to Sicily, three times to the Provence, once to Spain, several times to France, and forty times from Germany to Rome and back. More was demanded of me in every exertion and restlessness than from anyone else my age at the court. The more extensive and difficult all this is, the more miraculous it is that in such hustle and bustle, amidst such great noise and disquiet, I was able to create this work.¹⁴⁵

This passage is so exquisitely pretentious that it has been quoted verbatim or in essence in virtually every scholarly treatment of Godfrey, and has been used to intimate his importance in the court; but, the more closely one looks at the text, the more it suggests in fact precisely the opposite conclusion. It tells us first of all that Godfrey could hardly have been among Henry's teachers. Here he very explicitly offers the king a résumé of his activity, outlining in great detail his many minor administrative duties having to do with the day-to-day functioning of the court, and yet makes no mention whatsoever of having tutored Henry! Indeed, the very pretentiousness of Godfrey's account of his service suggests rather that his career in the court was—at least from the king's point of view—undistinguished, and that Godfrey knew this; had he assumed that he and his accomplishments were already well known to Henry, Godfrey would surely have seen little need to provide the king with such an explicit and elaborate account of himself. This passage is not, as one writer has theorized, a reflection of Godfrey's "downright healthy self-esteem."¹⁴⁶ It is, rather, a blatant solicitation of reward for his services.

This brings us to an issue that has rarely been treated in the literature, but which may prove of considerable importance for our understanding of Godfrey's place in the court. One way to assess how much value Frederick and Henry attached to Godfrey's services would be to evaluate the benefits the chronicler received for his efforts. We

¹⁴³Ulmann (n. 49 above) 18.

¹⁴⁴See his reproach to the emperor at GF 154–165: MGH SS 22.311.7–18 (cf. n. 152 below) and GF 511–516: MGH SS 22.319.9–14 (n. 202 below.).

¹⁴⁵MGH SS 22.105.24–36; quoted from Bumke (n. 137 above) 460–461.

¹⁴⁶Schmeidler (n. 15 above) 24.

know that Godfrey held prebends in Speyer, Pisa, and Lucca, which would likely have amounted to a not inconsiderable income.¹⁴⁷ Yet, as Hausmann has contended, a trusted notary and chaplain could often expect other, greater benefits: he "could eventually be elevated to bishop or archbishop, or within the chancery to chancellor or arch-chancellor."¹⁴⁸ And Peter Ganz, who rightly maintains that ambition and envy must have been common in the relatively small circle of the *capellani*, points out that a number of Godfrey's colleagues in the court chapel enjoyed just such benefits. Thus the chaplain Heribert became archbishop of Besançon in 1163, and was succeeded in that position by a court chaplain named Eberhard; and yet another chaplain, Rudolf, who was active at court in the 1170s, later became bishop of Strasbourg.¹⁴⁹ A man of Godfrey's considerable bureaucratic and political talents—whether these were real or only part of his self-appraisal—would probably consider himself well qualified for such positions, and likely think himself wronged, or at least neglected, in being passed over in favor of others.

And indeed, Godfrey in his writings gives us some reason to believe that he felt neglected by his masters. In the *Memoria seculorum* he makes sharp reference to the fact that Conrad of Montferrat suffered no punishment for his apprehension of Godfrey while the latter was acting as imperial legate: "If my confinement had been quickly avenged in the first place, you would not have been subjected to the injury of Christian's subsequent capture."¹⁵⁰ Godfrey's allegation, although couched in a general admonition to Henry that royal punishment must be swift to be effective,¹⁵¹ poorly conceals his resentment at the lack of imperial action in the face of his dilemma (and, incidentally, Frederick's apparent disinterest in his plight hardly suggests that the emperor considered Godfrey an indispensable member of the court!). Even more plaintive is the passage in the *Gesta Friderici* in which Godfrey, after relating that Rome once sent old and debilitated servants to Viterbo for rest and recuperation, suggests with carefully chosen words that older servants of the empire should be rewarded in a manner commensurate with their long and faithful service, for otherwise their lord

¹⁴⁷Cf. n. 226 below.

¹⁴⁸Hausmann (n. 49 above) 609.

¹⁴⁹See Ganz (n. 41 above) 627, who, however, misreads the diploma from Pisa (n. 69 above) and makes Godfrey archpriest as well as canon in that city. That Godfrey was bishop of Viterbo is ruled out already by the fact that the *Pantheon's* author—who was not otherwise inclined to modesty—always referred to himself as *capellanus* rather than the obviously more exalted *episcopus*. Nevertheless, in the eighteenth century Ferdinando Ughelli equated our chronicler mistakenly with a Gothifredus of the noble Italian Tignosi family who became bishop of Viterbo in 1184: see his *Italia sacra sive de episcopis Italiae* 1 ed. 2 (Venice 1717) 1407–1408: "Gothifredus Tincosus, nobilis Viterbiensis, electus episcopus anno 1184. Hic ille Gothifredus est, ex Coretino, qui universalem historiam . . . compilavit. Titulus est Pantheon . . . Fuit vir summae eloquentiae atque doctrinae, ac diu in Aula Imperatorum versatus, quorum beneficio Episcopatum obtinuit. Imperatorum Conradi III, Friderici I, Henricus VI a secretis diu fuit. Decessit in patria nonagenarius, anno reparatae salutis 1191." (On Godefridus Tignosi see Pius Bonifacius Gams, *Series episcoporum ecclesiae catholicae* [Regensburg 1873–1886; repr. Graz 1957] 737.) The fifteenth-century manuscript Gniezno, Archiwum Archidiecezjalne 5 also mistakenly refers to Godfrey once as bishop of Viterbo (cf. MGH SS 22.281.51 n. d), as does Zeillinger (n. 92 above) 213 and 216.

¹⁵⁰MGH SS 22.271.40–42: "Si mea vincla prius subito punita fuissent, / Nulla Maguntina tibi captio dampna dedisset; / Crimina non fieri regia pena facit." Cf. also Godfrey's epigrammatic assertion in n. 71 above: "Ubi si prima culpa fuisset punita, non esset altera subsequuta."

¹⁵¹On this point see Toeche (n. 49 above) 456.

brings dishonor on himself;¹⁵² since Godfrey must have intended the *Gesta Friderici* in particular for the ears of the emperor himself, one cannot help but wonder whom Godfrey expected Frederick to think of while this admonition linking Viterbo, retirement, and poverty was being read before the court.

But we have no reason to believe that Godfrey's written program of alternating self-promotion and reproach of his masters brought him any worldly rewards; as I shall contend in the next section of this study, the court seems to have ignored his works entirely. Before turning to the writings themselves, however, we must make some attempt at explaining why Godfrey's career may have hit a "glass ceiling." Although this is pure speculation, perhaps his origins held him back. Given his tendency to vaunt those aspects of his life and career that he felt would appeal to Henry and the court—an inclination that we have seen in some detail above—Godfrey's silence about his origins and family suggest that these were at best humble, or, conceivably, even somehow unfavorable. In this connection it is worth at least noting the possibility that he consciously avoided direct mention of his origins for fear that this would somehow prejudice the reception of his works and their author at the court. Thus whereas Godfrey must almost certainly have derived from Viterbo—he already boasts the cognomen *Viterbiensis* toward the beginning of his career in the imperial service when he acted as witness to the Treaty of Constance in 1153, and further refers to Viterbo once with the word *patria* while describing the land with warm familiarity¹⁵³—in his works

¹⁵²GF 154–165: MGH SS 22.311.7–18:

Longa per obsequia cum vita labore gravetur,
 Si senio premitur, si vulnere debilitetur,
 Hic [i.e. in Viterbo] habeat requiem sepe senile decus.
 Si preclara velit cesar sua gesta foveri,
 Hoc decus imperii decet omni lege teneri,
 Debeat ut senibus vita quieta geri.
 Non hec servorum fit gloria, set dominorum,
 Si defectorum stet salvus honor seniorum,
 Si nitet ipsorum veste platea, forum.
 Si miserum prestat famulum sibi diva potestas,
 Dedecus infestat dominum, cui servit egestas;
 Non sibi, set domino stat miser ille suo.

¹⁵³GF 145–150: MGH SS 22.310.41–311.3; cf. also MGH SS 22.267.10–15. Some scholars have argued that Godfrey derived from a German family, but the supporting arguments rest on rather tenuous evidence. In his *Gesta Friderici* Godfrey refers to the Germans as *gens mea* and *nostrī* (GF 999–1000: MGH SS 22.329.29–30), which does not, however, give dispositive proof for his being German, since these expressions occur in a passage concerning the battle of Legnano between the Germans and Lombards, and clearly represent a statement of Godfrey's partisanship rather than a conscious declaration of his nationality; he was, after all, a chaplain and notary in the German court! (This observation applies also to the similar example at GF 849: MGH SS 22.326.18: "Tota per Italiam gloria nostra perit.") Wattenbach (n. 31 above) 291 believed Godfrey to be a Saxon, since in the *Gesta* Godfrey praised the Saxons "above all others," and closed the poem with a glorification of the archbishop Wichmann of Magdeburg (GF 1171–1221: MGH SS 22.333.7–334.12); but as Ulmann (n. 49 above) 3 has already pointed out, in other passages Godfrey offered equally high praise of the Swabians (MGH SS 22.141.12–142.33), and, furthermore, Godfrey's wording suggests that his interest in Wichmann derived from something other than national identification: see Pape (n. 37 above) 192, who suggests that Godfrey's description of Wichmann indicates the author's personal acquaintance with the archbishop. Sheffer-Boichorst (n. 32 above) 443 contended that Godfrey must have come from a German family, since from a charter of 1169 we learn that Godfrey's brother and nephew respectively bore the Germanic names Werner and Reimbart (cf. above at n. 67), which Scheffer-Boichorst believes

he seems to go out of his way to stress his connections to Germany. Notably, all he tells us about his first thirty years concerns his schooling at Bamberg. Nor should it surprise us that he chose to refer especially to this fact. An education at Bamberg, which under the Salians had functioned as a premier instructional facility for future magnates of the *Reichskirche*,¹⁵⁴ offered the prospect of a distinguished career in the empire. Introducing his well-known poem of praise for Bamberg (in which he reports that only Latin was spoken in the walled clerical compound on the hill overlooking the city), Godfrey tells us that he learned the rudiments of the *ars gramatica* there;¹⁵⁵ this seems in fact to have been the extent of the curriculum at Bamberg, to judge from Meinhard of Bamberg's summary of the school's pedagogical goal: *dictet instanter, declinet iugiter*.¹⁵⁶ In light of both the wording of Godfrey's statement concerning his instruction at Bamberg and the twenty-year interval between the beginning of his education at Bamberg (presumably around 1133) and his first known activity in the imperial court, it is not unlikely that he continued his education elsewhere; the *Pantheon's* extensive opening disquisitions on theological and philosophical topics certainly suggest at any rate that he may have had some training in those subjects.¹⁵⁷

In fact, I would suggest the available evidence indicates that after leaving Bamberg Godfrey went on either to work or to continue his education (or both) in Italy. His own orthography, preserved for us in the partial autograph of his works in Paris, exhibits a mixed German and Italian character: strikingly, on the very same page¹⁵⁸ Godfrey can write *Guelfo* next to *Welfo* and *Welpo*, or *Guillelmus* beside *Willelmus*. Nor need one look long through the autograph to find Italianisms in Godfrey's own hand,

were rare in the region of Viterbo; but Hermann Schreibmüller ("Der staufische Geschichtschreiber Gottfried von Viterbo und seine Beziehungen zu Bamberg, Würzburg und besonders Speyer," *Zeitschrift für bayerische Landesgeschichte* 14 [1944] 248–281 at 249) denied any conclusive force in the Germanness of these names on the ground that in this period "die ganze Romania größtenteils das Gewand der altgermanischen Namen trägt." Gundlach's suggestion (n. 53 above) 469 n. 3 that a certain Werner who signed a charter from Viterbo dated 1158 as *Guzmeri Tediscu* might be Godfrey's father or brother is purely speculative.

¹⁵⁴Claudia Märtl, "Die Bamberger Schulen—ein Bildungszentrum des Salierreichs," in *Die Salier und das Reich 3: Gesellschaftlicher und ideengeschichtlicher Wandel im Reich der Salier*, ed. Stefan Weinfurter (Sigmaringen 1991) 327–345.

¹⁵⁵MGH SS 22.240.10: "ibi prima documenta gramatice artis didici."

¹⁵⁶Johannes Fried, "Die Bamberger Domschule und die Rezeption von Frühscholastik und Rechtswissenschaft in ihrem Umkreis bis zum Ende der Stauferzeit," in *Schulen und Studium im sozialen Wandel des hohen und späten Mittelalters*, ed. Johannes Fried (Sigmaringen 1986) 163–201 at 168. Although Meinhard was schoolmaster at Bamberg more than a half-century (ca. 1058–1071) before Godfrey's education there, his remarks still apply for the later period: Märtl (n. 154 above) 344–345 demonstrates that Bamberg remained in the twelfth century tenaciously conservative and that, in contrast to other cathedral schools in Germany such as Bernold's in Constance, "eine kritische Auseinandersetzung mit Texten scheint [in Bamberg] kaum stattgefunden zu haben." This statement may in turn be supported by Godfrey's contention that he learned (only?) the rudiments of grammar there; cf. also Godfrey's statement at MGH SS 22.240.26: "Documate gramatico clerus solet ille beari."

¹⁵⁷On the other hand, Godfrey's philosophical and theological discussions may well reflect not any formal training, but a general knowledge picked up during the forty years he claims to have collected books for his works (see MGH SS 22.105.43–45). An edition of this portion of the different recensions of the *Pantheon* would allow a definitive analysis of Godfrey's sources, how well he actually understood the material, and whether he was aware of contemporary philosophical and theological problems (as Otto apparently was).

¹⁵⁸These examples taken from fol. 153 of the autograph.

especially in the employment of the letter *b* and in the writing of German names.¹⁵⁹ Such orthographical habits are striking in an alumnus of Bamberg, and undoubtedly reflect some Italian influence on Godfrey during his formative learning years, as he certainly did not pick them up later while working in Barbarossa's chancery. One wonders what effect Godfrey's Italian origin—which extended to his orthography and, therefore, undoubtedly to his speech as well—might have had on his career in the imperial court.

At any rate it seems safe to say that if Godfrey had never written his historical works, we would have no reason to assume that the *Godefridus Viterbiensis* mentioned in a few scattered imperial charters belonged to the elite circle of Frederick's *familiares* or Henry's teachers. And there is equally little justification for placing Godfrey alongside the German noblemen Otto of Freising, Eberhard of Bamberg, and Rainald of Dassel as a major figure in the formation and propagation of Hohenstaufen political philosophy.

III. THE DEVELOPMENT OF GODFREY'S WORKS

nos nominis alti
Non sumus, egregios vix suscipit aula poetas.
 —Gunther, *Ligurinus*¹⁶⁰

While Waitz for practical reasons edited Godfrey's works under three rubrics—the *Speculum regum*, the *Memoria seculorum* and the *Pantheon*¹⁶¹—the introduction to his edition makes clear that this division represents merely a convenient simplification of an exceptionally complex and enigmatic manuscript tradition. Under the heading *Memoria seculorum* Waitz edited brief portions of two related but nevertheless distinct texts, which he designated as recensions A and B of the *Pantheon*; under the *Pantheon* rubric, by comparison, Waitz combined three later recensions of the work (designated C, D, and E) together with corresponding sections drawn from the earlier recensions A and B. In short, Waitz's *Pantheon* text is in reality a composite of five different versions of the work. To make matters worse, since Waitz's exclusive interest was in the historical significance of the texts and not in Godfrey's methods of revision, he provided almost no notes or commentary to help the reader understand the essential differences in content and form of the various recensions.¹⁶²

Some fifty years after Waitz's edition appeared, Ernst Schulz attempted to eluci-

¹⁵⁹A few random but typical examples found in portions of the autograph written by Godfrey are *Ector*, *Ebri*, *Ludoicus*, *bores*, *habundans*, *bostendit*, *exaustis*, *talamus* or (very often) *istoria*. Significantly, Godfrey furthermore always used the Romanized form—Gotifredus, Gotifridus—of his own (Germanic) name.

¹⁶⁰*Gunther der Dichter, Ligurinus* 10.619–620: ed. Erwin Assmann, MGH SS rer. Germ. 63 (Hanover 1987) 493.

¹⁶¹Edited by Waitz respectively at MGH SS 22.21–93, 94–106 and 107–307. Although Waitz edited the *Gesta Friderici* separately at MGH SS 22.307–334, this was not a discrete work, but was intended by Godfrey as the fifteenth chapter of the *Memoria seculorum*. On the *Gesta Heinrici VI* (MGH SS 22.334–338) see n. 74 above.

¹⁶²Already in 1899 Gundlach (n. 53 above) 479 n. 1 complained about Waitz's "kärge Angaben," a criticism repeated by Schulz (n. 52 above) 93.

date in some detail the genesis and development of the many forms of Godfrey's works. Placing particular emphasis on the large amount of material at the beginning of the *Pantheon* which Waitz had chosen to omit from his edition—a decision that according to Schulz had led the editor to “a series of false conclusions”—Schulz reviewed each stage of Godfrey's works in chronological succession to bring their evolution into somewhat sharper focus. His essay was not intended as an encyclopedic analysis of the works, but rather as “an attempt to elucidate their main features,” and ultimately to provide “the necessary prerequisite for an article to follow later that, based largely on unpublished materials, will treat Godfrey's personality, education, political stance, and curious method of revision [*Arbeitsweise*].”¹⁶³ This second, very ambitious article unfortunately never appeared.

The major shortcomings of Schulz's work for our purposes is that, while he clarified certain aspects of Godfrey's editing methods, he made no attempt to explain *why* Godfrey put his work through so many revisions. The following analysis will consider especially this issue of motive. We shall therefore examine only as much detail as necessary about the changing form and content of the many recensions of Godfrey's works, and concentrate rather on what light the relevant biographical and manuscript evidence sheds on the chronicler's motives for reworking his text repeatedly.

An examination of the author's partial autograph in Paris will clarify some important aspects of Godfrey's working methods. Waitz designated the text found in the autograph as recension B, since it represents essentially an intermediate stage of the *Memoria seculorum* (recension A) and the first edition of the *Pantheon* (recension C). That is, the original text of the autograph roughly preserves the *Memoria seculorum* as it stood in 1185: through deletion or modification of some texts and the addition of others in the margins Godfrey eventually converted the text into the *Pantheon*. The Paris autograph was Godfrey's personal working copy and not intended for a reading public. Considering it merely a working copy—and this observation will prove of critical importance—Godfrey made no concessions to consistency. Note for instance the following examples of the many contradictory dates and titles given for the work throughout the manuscript:

1) On fol. 1 the work is referred to as the *Liber memorialis* and the date of writing given is *M.C.LXXX.V*.¹⁶⁴

2) On fol. 28v the rubric originally gave the date of writing as *M.C.LXXX.V*. and the title of the work as *liber Memorie seculorum*; the name *Memorie seculorum* has been underlined, however, and *universalis* added above the line, changing the name of the work effectively to *Liber universalis*. The latter part of the rubric, which originally stated the work had been sent to Henry VI (*transmissus domino Henrico VI Romanorum imperatori*)¹⁶⁵, has been erased and replaced by a dedication to Pope Gregory VIII with the unlikely dating *M.C.LXXXIV*.¹⁶⁶ Since Gregory's pontificate

¹⁶³Schulz (n. 52 above) 86.

¹⁶⁴MGH SS 22.94.3.

¹⁶⁵MGH SS 22.103.4–5.

¹⁶⁶MGH SS 22.131.6–10: “Incipit liber *universalis* compositus a magistro Gottifredo Biterbiense *ad dominum Gregorium papam VIII anno Domini M.C.LXXXIV*” (italics indicate texts written over erasures). Despite this new rubric, the first part of the prologue addresses not the pope, but rather Henry VI in more or less the same form as had the corresponding text in the earlier *Memoria seculorum*; it has therefore been

lasted only from October to December of 1187, the dating in this latter rubric probably represents an erroneous rendering of "M.C.LXXXVII."¹⁶⁷

3) Fols. 29–30, which have been inserted into the codex to replace two excised leaves, contain a text that according to internal evidence was written in 1187 at the earliest, and probably even later. In the prologue on fol. 29 Godfrey states, "The name of this book is Godfrey's *Pantheon* [*Nomen autem libri est Panteon Gotifredi*]." ¹⁶⁸ Furthermore, in the upper right corner of fol. 29v a notice has been added that the work was finished in 1191.¹⁶⁹ While this latter remark has been squeezed into its position and was manifestly added after the writing of the page was completed, it is impossible to say how long thereafter.

4) The opening rubric on fol. 41 originally gave the title of the work as *Liber memorialis*; Godfrey has crossed out *memorialis* and written *universalis* above the line.

5) On fol. 154v a notice from 1186 concerning the marriage of Henry VI has been appended in distinctly different ink from that of the base text.¹⁷⁰

We can thus say with some confidence that Godfrey worked sporadically in this manuscript from the years 1185 to 1191; and that during this period the author experimented with the titles *Memoria seculorum* (1185), *Liber memorialis* (1185) and *Liber universalis* (1187) before deciding on *Pantheon* as the final title. The Paris autograph thus represents in essence one particular view of the evolution of the *Pantheon* over a period of six years.¹⁷¹

But the autograph concerns us not only for its retention of Godfrey's editorial tinkering: the ultimate fate of the codex deserves equal attention. We might expect that after Godfrey's death, his crude working copy with its multitude of cluttered marginalia and chaotic modifications would lie forgotten in some library or even be turned into a palimpsest. On the contrary, however, the manuscript continued to be used as though it were an "official" copy, that is, a presentation copy which the author himself put into circulation. Thus a later citizen of Viterbo has gone to the trouble of continuing the catalog of the popes in the Paris autograph down to 1227, commemorating

assumed in the literature that Godfrey intended recension B, or the *Liber universalis*, for both Henry and Gregory. This is certainly not the case, however. As we shall see below, by the time of Gregory's predecessor Urban III, Godfrey had already decided on the name of *Pantheon* for his work and published the text under that name; the assumption that under Urban III's successor Godfrey suddenly decided to change the name of the work back to *Liber universalis* and send it to both the king and Pope Gregory is untenable. Since this part of the Paris codex has clearly been worked over a number of times between 1185 and 1191, and indeed quite likely even later by persons other than Godfrey (cf. n. 73 above), it is almost impossible to determine at what time any given text was written, and by whom.

¹⁶⁷Waitz (MGH SS 22.131.10) mistakenly solved this dating as 1184, which of course does not agree with the naming of Gregory VIII as pope; Baaken (n. 49 above) 389 argued that this figure is simply a faulty rendering of the date 1187. Hausmann (n. 49 above) 607 considers this mistake additional evidence for Godfrey's dyslexia (whereby he assumes, of course, that Godfrey himself was the author of this notice).

¹⁶⁸MGH SS 22.133.7.

¹⁶⁹MGH SS 22.136.25–27: "Incipit liber Pantheon Gotifredi Viterbiensis cappellani imperatoris Frederici et filii eius regis Henrici sexti. Finitus autem est anno Domini M.C.XCI."

¹⁷⁰MGH SS 22.272.10–12: "Anno ab incarnatione Domini M.C.LXXXVI^{to}, inditione V^a, VI^{to} Kalendas Februarii, rex Henricus VI^{us} cum regina Constantia . . . nuptias gloriosas celebravit."

¹⁷¹I have used the wording "one particular view" here because I am convinced from my study of the development of the *Pantheon* that the Paris autograph was only one of several such working copies that Godfrey possessed and worked on concurrently; thus I do not wish to suggest that the entire development of the work is reflected in this one manuscript.

Honorius III's visit to Viterbo and his donation to the church there.¹⁷² What is more, in the mid-thirteenth century, long after Godfrey's death, another scribe made a painstaking copy of the autograph, a descendant of which is now preserved in Munich's Bayerische Staatsbibliothek;¹⁷³ this later copy naturally retains all of the inconsistent dating and variety of titles found at different points in the original autograph. In this way, a work that Godfrey never "published"—that is, never sent to the intended recipient but presumably left lying around his workshop—began to circulate generally after his death.

What significance will this determination have for our thesis? In short, since we can show that at least one of the surviving "works" of Godfrey—namely Waitz's recension B—descends not from a presentation copy, but rather from the author's own working exemplar—preserved for us in this case in the Paris autograph—perhaps some of Godfrey's other writings may have entered general circulation through this means. And indeed, I intend to show that both of Godfrey's earlier literary efforts with dedications for the court (that is, the *Speculum regum* and *Memoria seculorum*) owe their eventual dissemination to this phenomenon rather than to "publication" by the author.

The *Speculum regum*, which Schulz believed to have been published in 1183,¹⁷⁴ was Godfrey's earliest literary effort. As Godfrey explained in his dedication to Henry, the intent of the work was to trace through all of history the course of the *imperialis prosapia*, of which Henry represented the most recent constituent and culmination.¹⁷⁵ This exceptional genealogical inheritance came down from the first king Nimrod to his descendant Jupiter, first king of the Athenians (!), from whom derived not only the Greek, but also the Trojan kings.¹⁷⁶ After the defeat of the Trojans, however, this line of ancestry divided into two branches: from Anchises descended the kings and emperors of Rome, from Priam the kingdom of the Germans.¹⁷⁷ In Charlemagne both the German and Roman lineages were reunited: Charles's mother Bertha was the granddaughter of Heraclius, the Greek emperor and heir to the Roman *imperium* through Constantine, and his father Pepin was king of the Franks and descendant of the Trojans. As according to Godfrey Henry derived thence from Carolingian stock,¹⁷⁸

¹⁷²MGH SS 22.349.17–352.39.

¹⁷³CIm 43: see the appendix below.

¹⁷⁴Schulz (n. 52 above) 131. Waitz identified eight manuscripts of the *Speculum regum* falling into three classes distinguished by a prose commentary added to the second class and considerably augmented in the third class by later commentators. All three classes further contain numerous marginal glosses, some of which are common to all three; Schulz (90–91) has shown that these common marginalia descend from Godfrey himself and that they were later incorporated by the author into parts of the *Memoria seculorum* and *Pantheon*. In 1969 Hermann Amberg in his master's thesis, "Studien zur handschriftlichen Überlieferung der Werke Gottfrieds von Viterbo" (Würzburg 1969) 42–96, briefly described six manuscripts not used by Waitz.

¹⁷⁵MGH SS 22.21.26–28: "In hoc opere, quod Speculum regum appellatur, decet tuam eminentiam assidue speculari, in quo finem et principium imperii et gesta regum omnium potes imaginari"; see also Engels (n. 44 above) 336–340.

¹⁷⁶Wilhelm Berges, *Die Fürstenspiegel des hohen und späten Mittelalters*, Schriften der MGH 2 (Leipzig 1938) 104.

¹⁷⁷Cf. the *Speculum regum* vv. 684–686: MGH SS 22.62.4–6: "In duo dividimus Troiano semine prolem: / Una per Ytaliā sumpsit dyademata Rome, / Altera Theutonica regna beata fovet." Clearly to some extent Godfrey's *cognationis linea* in the earlier, less orderly period of antiquity is not centered so much on individual rulers as on peoples, or *Volkskörper*: see Engels (n. 44 above) 338.

¹⁷⁸Cf. the *Pantheon* at MGH SS 22.264.22–23: "Fridericus primus . . . natus ex clarissima prole nie Karulorum."

the Hohenstaufen king is thus effectively represented as the descendant of the Trojans, the possessor of the sovereign authority of Jupiter foretold by the Sibylline prophecies,¹⁷⁹ and the single legitimate heir of Charlemagne. In this way Godfrey's *Speculum regum* offered both an original interpretation of the "transfer of the empire" or *translatio imperii*,¹⁸⁰ and a new basis of legitimation for his intended benefactors.

It is not hard to see, therefore, why this work might have been of interest to the Staufer. It is almost certain, however, that the *Speculum regum* never circulated at the court. In the first place, internal evidence indicates that Godfrey never finished the work.¹⁸¹ It was one of his idiosyncratic practices to write the prologue to a given work detailing the intended contents before he had finished the work itself.¹⁸² Thus, although in the opening rubric to the prologue of the *Speculum regum* Godfrey promises that the book will continue "up to the present day [*in hodiernum diem*]," and will further include a *Gesta Friderici* and a chapter on the imperial insignia,¹⁸³ the text ends prematurely with a reference to the crowning of Charlemagne. Of course, one could argue that Godfrey, for whatever reason, may have sent the work to the court unfinished. Yet the manuscript transmission of the *Speculum regum* indicates that Godfrey's contemporaries—especially in Germany—quite simply knew nothing of the work. Admittedly, the earliest known manuscript—Paris, Bibliothèque nationale nouv. acq. lat. 299—dates from the beginning of the thirteenth century. But this codex, which was written in Italy, represents a special discovery because it contains not only the text of the *Speculum regum*, but excerpts from the *Pantheon* as well as an otherwise unknown minor work by Godfrey, the "Stipulation of the Realms Subject to the Empire," or *Denominatio regnorum imperio subiectorum*.¹⁸⁴ This last text, which stems beyond doubt from Godfrey's own hand,¹⁸⁵ describes a number of regions and cities of the Empire, and cannot belong to the *Speculum regum*;¹⁸⁶ its inclusion in this codex has therefore occasioned some confusion. But in my experience with the manu-

¹⁷⁹Godfrey seems to have reintroduced this latter idea into western European historiography: cf. Ernst Sackur, *Sibyllinische Texte und Forschungen: Pseudomethodius, Adso und die tiburtinische Sibylle* (Halle a. S. 1898) 126–133. On Godfrey's eschatology and related presentation of the Sibylline prophecies see also Martin Haesler, *Das Ende der Geschichte in der mittelalterlichen Weltchronistik* (Cologne 1980) 42–51.

¹⁸⁰For the use of this term in the historical writing of the Hohenstaufen period see esp. Goetz (n. 49 above) 104–137.

¹⁸¹This suggestion has already been cautiously made by Schmale (n. 2 above) 81.

¹⁸²Schulz (n. 52 above) 97 has mentioned this already in reference to the *Memoria seculorum*, where Godfrey in his prologue—which, significantly, he has written in the future rather than present or perfect tense—promises more content than the work itself actually offers. Thus whereas the prologue promises the first *Introductio* will treat the divine essence before Creation, the Trinity, the archetypal world, the angels, the firmament and stars, the elements, and the creation of Adam and his expulsion from the Garden of Eden, in actuality the text discusses only the divine essence and the Trinity; to this Schulz adds several further examples.

¹⁸³MGH SS 22.21.7–9 and 22.11. Furthermore, to the end of the prologue Godfrey has appended a catalog of rulers from Nimrod to Henry VI (carried down in most of the manuscripts to Frederick II: cf. MGH SS 22.24.53–54), which some scholars identify as a table of contents for the work. But this latter supposition is perhaps mistaken, as only the first few entries in the ruler list correspond to the actual chapters of the work: cf. Waitz's note at MGH SS 22.23.64 n. 89: "Non tam capitum indicem sed regum catalogum praebet auctor, qui paullo post prorsus a textu recedit."

¹⁸⁴Ed. Léopold Delisle, *Littérature latine et histoire du moyen âge*, Instructions adressées par le Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques (Paris 1890) 41–50; see also Schulz (n. 52 above) 128–130.

¹⁸⁵See Delisle (n. 184 above) 42–43 and Schreibmüller (n. 153 above) 271.

¹⁸⁶Schulz (n. 52 above) 128–129.

scripts of Godfrey's works I have found several other examples of minor texts that are genuine productions of the author, but which appear unexpectedly in contexts where they manifestly do not belong.¹⁸⁷ Evidently, Godfrey was an unmethodical writer and editor who wrote verses onto loose scraps of parchment when inspiration struck, and left these fragments lying around his workshop, where they were later (presumably after his death) bound helter-skelter together with other texts. Thus the erroneous inclusion of the *Denominatio* and miscellaneous verses of the *Pantheon* in the Paris manuscript provides one more indication that the *Speculum regum* derives from one (or more) of Godfrey's own exemplars from his workshop at Viterbo, rather than from a presentation copy sent to the court.

Two of the remaining thirteen manuscripts of the *Speculum regum* date from the end of the thirteenth century or the early fourteenth. One of these (Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland MS Adv. 18.4.10) comprises only the prologue and catalogs of emperors and popes, however, and the other contains not Godfrey's work as such, but the late thirteenth-century *Liber de temporibus et etatibus* by Albert Milioli of Reggio, who inserted much of the *Speculum regum* into his own work.¹⁸⁸ All of the remaining manuscripts of the *Speculum regum* were produced in the fifteenth century. There is thus no reason to believe that this work circulated anywhere—least of all in “court circles”—in the twelfth or early thirteenth centuries.

Godfrey's second literary effort, the *Memoria seculorum*—Waitz's recension A—was also intended for Henry, and likewise almost certainly never circulated in Germany during the Hohenstaufen period (or, for that matter, at any other time). To begin with, it is preserved only in two very closely related north Italian copies from the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries.¹⁸⁹ Furthermore, the extant copies manifestly descend not from a presentation copy, but rather from Godfrey's own working exemplar from the years 1183–1185.¹⁹⁰ Significantly, the two main parts of the work, written respectively in prose and verse, clearly originated at different times. Godfrey wrote the poetic portion between 1183 and 1185: many of the verses have been taken over freely from the *Speculum regum*, indicating that Godfrey began work on the *Memoria* in

¹⁸⁷See n. 197 below for one notable example.

¹⁸⁸Ed. Oswald Holder-Egger, MGH SS 31.336–668. On Albert's extensive copying of the *Speculum regum* see also Georg Waitz, “Über die angebliche Handschrift des Sicardus Cremonensis in Modena,” in *Nachrichten der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* (1871) 519–528 at 522.

¹⁸⁹François Avril and Marie-Thérèse Gousset have placed the production of the manuscript Paris, BN lat. 4896 in Genoa in the third quarter of the thirteenth century on the basis of the codex's copious decorations: see *Bibliothèque Nationale, Manuscrits enluminés d'origine Italienne 2: XIIIe siècle* (Paris 1984) 32. The other manuscript of this recension, Montpellier, Bibliothèque interuniversitaire (Section médecine) 222, pertains most probably to the beginning of the fourteenth century, and was produced in northern Italy, according to the illumination most likely in Genoa: I thank Daniel Le Blévec of the University of Montpellier for procuring color reproductions of this manuscript's illuminated pages, and Adelaide Bennett of the Index of Christian Art, Princeton, for her assistance in the dating and localization of the decorations.

¹⁹⁰The suggestion that this work represents only a *Werkstufe* has already been made by Schmale (n. 2 above) 83. Although the rubric to the prologue of the work's second part, the *Memoria seculorum*, states the book has been sent to the emperor (!) Henry VI (MGH SS 22.103.4–5: “transmissus domino Henrico VI Romanorum imperatori”), this is merely one more example of how Godfrey anticipated himself in his prologues. On an incidental note, Henry was crowned emperor only in 1191, after the death of his father, but Baaken (n. 49 above) 388 shows that Godfrey addressed Henry as *imperator* because he anticipated Henry's crowning, as did his contemporaries.

1183; the catalog included as part of the table of contents to the verses pronounces Frederick to be in the thirty-fourth year of his reign, which (accounting for Godfrey's consistently erroneous dating¹⁹¹) places the composition of this part of the *Memoria* in the year 1184; and the rubric to the dedication states the year of writing explicitly as 1185.¹⁹² After bringing the poetic portion to completion, however, Godfrey decided that the verses involved subjects too complicated to stand on their own without some type of introduction for the reader; for this reason he wrote simple prose summaries (dubbed *Introductiones* or *Isagogae*) of the material contained in the verses.¹⁹³ Godfrey seems to have written these *Introductiones* in 1185. This date appears in the rubric to the dedication to the first part of the work,¹⁹⁴ and the catalog included as part of the tenth *Introductio* states both that Frederick was at that time in the thirty-fifth year of his reign (corresponding in Godfrey's system to 1185), and that Lucius III, who died in November 1185, was pope.¹⁹⁵

The *Memoria seculorum* reveals numerous other internal inconsistencies similar to those we saw in Godfrey's autograph. The work is referred to in various places by a number of different titles: *Memoria seculorum*, *Liber memorialis*, and *Liber memoriarum*.¹⁹⁶ Furthermore, parts of the text appear in the wrong position (not unlike the *Denominatio* in the text of the Paris *Speculum regum*),¹⁹⁷ the tables of contents do not correspond well to the actual texts, and the *Gesta Friderici*, though promised in the index, does not appear. If this were not enough to indicate that this recension does not represent a publication authorized by Godfrey, the text's late and limited Italian transmission will stand as further evidence. There is no reason to believe that the *Memoria* circulated in Godfrey's day, and certainly not on German soil.

If the *Speculum regum* and recensions A and B were all thus laid aside unfinished

¹⁹¹See n. 52 above.

¹⁹²MGH SS 22.103.2.

¹⁹³MGH SS 22.97.43–45: "Ad hec tantarum et tam multiplicium rerum et temporum varietates considerantes, necessarium ac perutile per omnia fore conspeximus, ut quasdam breves isagogas, quibus lectores ad huius voluminis notitiam introducantur, prelibare curemus."

¹⁹⁴MGH SS 22.94.3.

¹⁹⁵MGH SS 22.100.50–51.

¹⁹⁶See Waitz at MGH SS 22.5. In the prose part of the work the title given is *Liber memorialis* with three exceptions, where the book is referred to as the *Liber memoriarum*; in the verse portion, on the other hand, the work is referred to invariably as the *Memoria seculorum*. Schulz (n. 52 above) 92 concluded that *Liber memorialis* was probably intended as the final title for the work, and that Godfrey forgot to go back and change the other appellations before he published the work; this assumes, of course, that Godfrey did publish the work, a conclusion that I contest in this study. Compare the example above of Godfrey's slightly later autograph, which contains not only all three of the above-mentioned titles, but in some places the name *Panttheon* as well.

¹⁹⁷One example must suffice here. In the *Memoria seculorum* a narrative concerning Enoch has been inserted after the thirteenth *Introductio* (cf. MGH SS 22.102.46–47), yet is not intended as the fourteenth: the prologue to the *Introductiones* promises only thirteen chapters and, moreover, as the *Introductiones* are arranged chronologically, this text cannot belong at this position. Nor does the last line in the Enoch text, "Scribere de Noe tempus et hora monet," make any sense in this context, as the dedication to the *Particulae* follows directly. In recension B (the Paris autograph) this text has been transferred to its appropriate chronological position in the second *Particula* just before the section on Noah: this is obviously the location for which the text was always intended. I surmise in this case that Godfrey originally composed the Enoch narrative on loose leaves which were later mistakenly bound into the archetype of recension A between the *Introductiones* and *Particulae*.

and remained unknown in Godfrey's day, the first recension of the *Pantheon* proper, which dates from 1187, fared far better. While much of the text of this version—which Waitz designated recension C—was carried over unchanged from the earlier *Memoria seculorum*, it displays a coherence and consistency lacking in the previous versions. Having finally settled on *Pantheon* as a title for his history, Godfrey has expunged every trace of the earlier competing titles (*Liber memoriarum* and so on); no texts appear out of context as with the *Denominatio* in the Paris *Speculum regum* or the Enoch narrative of the *Memoria seculorum*; ¹⁹⁸ the index does not promise texts that do not actually appear (like the chapter on the imperial insignia in the *Speculum regum* or the *Gesta Friderici* in the *Memoria seculorum*); and the *Memoria seculorum*'s separate prose and verse portions (the *Introductiones* and *Particulae*) have been painstakingly combined into a single text. The structural coherence of this version led Schulz to declare recension C a true edition of the *Pantheon*, that is, a “published” version of the work. ¹⁹⁹ And the immediate transmission of recension C supports Schulz's assertion: whereas the *Speculum regum* and *Memoria seculorum* had late, localized transmissions that indicate the archetype lay in obscurity for many years before being rediscovered and transmitted, we have three German manuscripts of recension C already from the twelfth century or from the first years of the thirteenth, which moreover demonstrably descend from two yet older lost copies. Clearly, in comparison with Godfrey's earlier “works,” the 1187 *Pantheon* was an immediate success.

This observation leads us to another, namely that recension C was dedicated, not to Henry or the imperial court, but rather to the pope. The significance of this distinction is particularly manifest when we consider that the pope Godfrey decided to make the recipient of his work was none other than Urban III, who—and this could not have been unknown to the *Pantheon*'s author—was one of Frederick's greatest personal foes! ²⁰⁰ As drastic as this change of intended recipient from the Stauffer rulership—whom our chronicler supposedly served in an important capacity for four decades—to the anti-German pope Urban III seems to us, Godfrey makes it look almost amusingly easy, at least in the opening dedication of the *Pantheon*, which is essentially a reproduction of the earlier dedication to Henry with minor revisions for the sake of Godfrey's new intended benefactor:

¹⁹⁸Cf. preceding note.

¹⁹⁹Schulz (n. 52 above) 112; Schulz at the same place states mistakenly, however, that the work was dedicated to both Henry VI and the pope.

²⁰⁰See for instance Wilhelm von Giesebrecht, *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit* 6 (Leipzig 1895) 115, who points out that Urban was “filled with a deep hatred of Frederick and the Germans,” by whom a number of the pope's relatives had been mutilated and banished after the destruction of Milan in 1162. The existence of an unpolished sketch of Godfrey presenting his book to Frederick and Urban in one very late thirteenth-century manuscript of recension C (Paris, BN lat. 4895A) led Waitz to suggest this manuscript might descend from a presentation copy for Frederick; everything speaks against this assumption, however. Textual comparison indicates that the Paris manuscript was copied directly from the mid-thirteenth century codex Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 21259, which contains no such dedication picture; Godfrey did not dedicate the *Pantheon* (or any other work) to Frederick; and not one other manuscript of any of Godfrey's works contains a dedication illumination. I would suggest rather that this illustration is most likely the later addition of one of the volume's owners, Johannes of Dirpheim or Dürbheim, chancellor of Albert I and bishop of Strasbourg after 1306, who also seems to have had the *Pantheon*'s catalog of popes and emperors updated to his own time in the Paris manuscript (cf. MGH SS 22.17), and may also be the author of the extensive fourteenth-century marginalia found throughout the codex.

Memoria seculorum:

Divo imperatori Romanorum et illustrissimo Henrico sexto . . . Dum Romani imperii culmen inspicio et eius eminentie considero dignitatem, illud ipse ante omnia necessarium esse intueor, ut, sicut potestate noscitur preminere principibus, ita magis omnibus virtutibus adornetur, tantaque sit eius disciplina regiminis, ut per eum omnia vitia corripi et status orbis debeat emendari.

Pantheon:

Summo et universali pape Urbano III . . . , Dum sacrosancte matris nostre Romane ecclesie culmen inspicio et eius eminentie considero maiestatem, illud ante omnia necessarium esse intueor, ut, sicut ipsa omnibus noscitur preesse principibus, ita omnes reges et principes et universe orbis ecclesie doctrina eius et regimine adornentur et ab ea, tamquam a fonte iustitie, totius sapientie regulis instruantur.

In the prologue to the *Pantheon* Godfrey expressed the wish that his work might receive papal approbation and be distributed thence to other churches, and that "not only clerics, but kings and princes should have this work by the authority of your sanctity."²⁰¹ Perhaps, since Godfrey failed to interest certain kings and princes in his work directly, he thought that the pope's imprimatur would help achieve this end for him; at any rate, for whatever reason, Godfrey's literary ambitions had become pan-European rather than centering exclusively on the German court.

This is indicated by the fact that the differences between the *Memoria seculorum* and the *Pantheon* ultimately go much deeper than the change of titles and systematic substitution of Urban's name for Henry's. Gone in the dedication of the later work are the explicit references to Godfrey as a member of the Hohenstaufen court; in the prologue to the *Pantheon* one looks in vain for the extended disquisition on Godfrey's tireless activity in the imperial court found in the *Memoria seculorum*. Even more noticeably, in the *Pantheon* the *Gesta Friderici* no longer appears at the end of the work as a separate book as in the *Memoria seculorum*, but has been incorporated as the last part of the seventeenth of recension C's twenty *Particulae*. On top of this, Godfrey has abridged the *Gesta* sharply, so that less than 200 of the original's 1221 lines remain. As a result, in the *Pantheon* Frederick loses his special significance in the sweep of history, and appears simply as the most recent German emperor. At the same time that he removed the emphasis on Frederick's deeds in the *Pantheon*, Godfrey also edited out the most passionate expressions of his own imperial partisanship. Thus, while in the *Pantheon* he retains a short chapter from the *Gesta* alluding to the animosity between Frederick and Milan, he omits the lengthy description of that city's destruction by Frederick. More importantly, Godfrey eliminated his own criticism of the emperor and German princes for treating the inhabitants too mildly by letting them settle in four nearby villages instead of banishing them to some distant place: when a once-captured fox manages to regain its lair, Godfrey had warned in the *Gesta Friderici*, he will in future protect himself in it that much more vigilantly.²⁰² Godfrey's opinions on this subject were naturally not likely to find much favor with his new benefactor

²⁰¹MGH SS 22.131.32–132.6: "Eapropter, reverentissime pater, hoc opusculum . . . ad honorem Dei et emendationem seu approbationem sancte Romane ecclesie, ante vestrum examen perferre disposui vestreque gratie presentare curavi, ut si, auctore Deo, per vos fuerit approbatum, ad alias ecclesias ulterius deriveretur, et non solum clerici, set reges et principes habeant opus hoc a vestre sanctitatis auctoritate."

²⁰²GF 511–516: MGH SS 22.319.9–14.

and the recipient of the *Pantheon*, Urban III, the archbishop of Milan, whose family had suffered gravely from the city's destruction!²⁰³

To be sure, Godfrey made no attempt to eliminate all vestiges of his imperial partisanship from the *Pantheon*. The glorious genealogy that Godfrey propounded for the Staufer in the *Speculum regum* remains intertwined throughout the *Pantheon*, and the author also retained among other things his admonition to Henry on right governance,²⁰⁴ his chapter on the meaning of the imperial insignia,²⁰⁵ and his eschatological disquisition on the Sibylline prophecy in which the Staufer figure as the line of the last emperor.²⁰⁶ Godfrey did not rewrite the *Pantheon* entirely from scratch, but he nevertheless subordinated the panegyric elements of the *Speculum regum* to vast amounts of other, newer material.²⁰⁷ That this change of emphasis was not unconscious on the author's part finds proof in his explication of the new title *Pantheon*, which indicates the encyclopedic—rather than panegyric—intent of the work: "This name seems quite suitable for this work, since in this book the Old and New Testaments, the Latin and the barbarian [Germanic?] histories, and prose and verse all harmonize peacefully with each other in one volume."²⁰⁸

Over the following several years Godfrey continued to work on his *Pantheon*, augmenting and refining the text according to its new encyclopedic orientation. The final version (Waitz's recension E) was, according to two of the manuscripts, finished in 1190, although this dating is in actuality somewhat problematic.²⁰⁹ This version begins with extensive theological disquisitions concerning the Trinity, the archetypal world, the angels and heavens and elements; thereafter follow lengthy *sententiae multorum philosophorum* on the human soul. Godfrey then narrates all of human history down to his own time, to which he appends a multitude of catalogs for the reader's reference. The last of the *Particulae*, which Godfrey has increased from recension C's twenty to thirty-three in the final version—presumably in allusion to the number of years of Christ's life²¹⁰—appropriately contains a long "Testimony of the Prophets concerning Jesus Christ in Defense of the Christian Faith [*Testimonia omnium prophetarum de Ihesu Christo ad defensionem fidei Christiane*]."²¹¹ The panegyric roots of Godfrey's

²⁰³See n. 200 above. Urban continued to oversee personally the diocese of Milan after his accession to the papal see: cf. Marcel Pacaut, *Frederick Barbarossa*, trans. A. J. Pomerans (New York 1970) 188.

²⁰⁴MGH SS 22.269.17–272.9.

²⁰⁵MGH SS 22.272.18–276.7.

²⁰⁶MGH SS 22.145.1–147.11; cf. n. 179 above.

²⁰⁷Furthermore, while the *Memoria seculorum* comprised separate prose and verse portions, in the text of the *Pantheon* Godfrey alternates between the two media; since the latter work thus lacks the prose *Introductiones*, which, as Baaken (n. 49 above) 388 has shown, served to recapitulate the *Speculum regum*'s glorious genealogy for the Hohenstaufen, Godfrey has de-emphasized this aspect of his work.

²⁰⁸MGH SS 22.133.7–12; on this text see also Ernst Robert Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, trans. Willard R. Trask (New York 1953) 517.

²⁰⁹The relevant text reads "Incipit liber hic Panteon . . . anno Domini millesimo centesimo decimo in ecclesia Palaciana in Viterbio perfectum et completum" (cf. MGH SS 22.107.43–44); Waitz solved the dating logically for 1190, but this is, after all, only an educated guess. Complicating the issue is the fact that this rubric appears in only two of the fourteen extant manuscripts of the recension (Nuremberg, Stadtbibliothek Cent. II 100, and Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek M. ch. fol. 23), both of which were produced in the late fifteenth century; in this case, however, the principle *recentiores, non deteriores* may properly be invoked, for I am convinced that these manuscripts descend ultimately, or even more or less directly, from a very old and well-written archetype.

²¹⁰See Curtius (n. 208 above) 505.

²¹¹MGH SS 22.128.50–130.15.

work are all but smothered under the weight of the new mass of material.²¹² Not insignificantly, this final version, which was markedly more extensive—that is to say, more encyclopedic—than the first edition of the *Pantheon*, was also, in terms of the total number of manuscripts²¹³ and their geographical dispersal, even more popular than recension C.

The success of the *Pantheon*, however, concerns us less here than the failure of the *Speculum regum* and *Memoria seculorum*. For, as the foregoing explication of the development of Godfrey's works has shown, the chronicler's original intention was to send his works to the court, and we must assume that it was the failure of this objective that drove Godfrey to rework his history for a broader audience. Why, then, did Godfrey's early works fall by the wayside?

It is possible—although not entirely certain—that Godfrey attempted to deliver one of his works to the court. As we saw, Godfrey seems never to have finished the *Speculum regum*, and it is therefore likely that some unknown event caused him simply to give up on the work. In the case of the *Memoria seculorum*, however, it is quite possible that Godfrey at some point had a presentation copy of the work (complete with the *Gesta Friderici*) made for Henry; we might even speculate that an attempt to deliver this book to its intended recipient was the purpose for Godfrey's trip in June 1186 to Henry's camp in Orvieto, where he appears as witness to a royal charter.²¹⁴ If this was the case, then we must conclude that Godfrey's work was rejected, or at least ignored, by the court. This conclusion might help to solve an interesting puzzle posed by Gerhard Baaken.²¹⁵ Henry's charter at Orvieto, the renewal of a privilege originally issued by his father for the monastery of Fonte Avellana in 1177,²¹⁶ is the only diploma from Henry in which Godfrey appears. As Baaken points out, in two later charters from Henry Godfrey's name fails to appear where we would otherwise expect it. Henry's renewal on 8 September 1186 of his father's privilege for Lucca, which we have already encountered above,²¹⁷ reproduced the original diploma verbatim with one exception: from the original *interventio* the phrase "et specialiter ob merita dilecti capellani nostri Godefridi eiusdem ecclesiae canonici" has been omitted.²¹⁸ Furthermore, Godfrey's name has disappeared from Henry's renewal on 21 October 1191 of Frederick's privilege for Pisa.²¹⁹ Since Godfrey is mentioned in the charter of June 1186, and not in that of September of the same year, it would appear that at some time during the summer of 1186 Godfrey distanced himself from Henry's court permanently. Baaken has cautiously suggested that this might indicate a disagreement between Godfrey and Henry that led the monarch (or at least his chancery) to have Godfrey's name deleted

²¹²Of course Waitz, by culling out for his edition precisely those portions of the *Pantheon* that refer to or deal with the Staufer, emphasized the panegyric origins of the work; I would suggest that in a complete edition of recension E these elements would be much less conspicuous.

²¹³While the number of extant manuscripts of recension C is roughly equal to that of recension E, comparative analysis of the witnesses and their provenances indicates that the recension C manuscripts descend from a smaller and more closely related stock than those of the later version, and moreover enjoyed a relatively sheltered existence in southern German monasteries; I am convinced that the actual number of manuscripts of recension E produced in the Middle Ages was considerably larger than that of the earlier version.

²¹⁴See above at n. 72.

²¹⁵Baaken (n. 49 above) 381.

²¹⁶MGH DD 10.3.179–181 no. 669.

²¹⁷See n. 68 above.

²¹⁸Baaken (n. 49 above) 380–381.

²¹⁹See n. 69 above.

from any later charters.²²⁰ This scenario strikes me as overly dramatic, however. I consider it more likely that Godfrey may have tried to deliver his *Memoria seculorum* to the court in 1186 in a final effort to curry Henry's favor, and, when his work received no interest there, determined to rework it and send it to the pope instead, which he did in the following year. Occupied as he was with this new project, the sexagenarian Godfrey likely retired at that time from court affairs altogether, resulting in his consequent disappearance from the court's bureaucratic consciousness and, hence, the subsequent chancery documents.

How can we explain the court's apparent disinterest in Godfrey's work? Here we can only speculate, but some possibilities do present themselves. As I have intimated in the preceding section of this study, Godfrey may well have been something of an outsider at the court, or at least not an insider enjoying a personal association with the king. It is worth noting in this connection Johanek's observation that Godfrey's early works address themselves directly to Henry.²²¹ This would normally seem to indicate Godfrey's privileged position: while Frederick's uncle Otto of Freising could think of addressing his work personally to the emperor, Rahewin knew enough to direct his finished product to somewhat lesser figures, namely, the chancellor and chief notary; Godfrey's contemporary Gunther, who was the teacher of at least one of Frederick's sons,²²² knew that he could not expect Frederick himself to read his *Ligurinus*, but expressed his hope that at least other educated readers would bring him and his work to the attention of the emperor;²²³ and Peter of Eboli likewise sent his *Liber ad honorem augusti*, for which we still possess what was probably the presentation copy, not to Henry himself, but to the imperial chancellor.²²⁴ But in light of the apparent failure of his works to receive an audience at court, the fact that Godfrey addresses himself directly to Henry, which under other circumstances might appear to intimate a close relationship between the chronicler and the king, may reveal instead Godfrey's unrealistic objectives for his literary efforts at the court.

This picture of Godfrey runs counter to that of the medieval patron-sponsor relationship offered by Joachim Bumke, who asserts that "in the Middle Ages there was no choice between commitment to a patron or artistic self-realization," and thus that "although we cannot always prove patronage, and even though we may assume that not every work was done on commission, it would be misleading to make a distinction between works that sprang from an inner vision of the artist and works that were done on request."²²⁵ Yet I believe that precisely this distinction applies in Godfrey's case. That Godfrey failed to finish the *Speculum regum* and *Memoria seculorum* admittedly does not prove that Henry never had any interest in them, and may indicate rather that the king simply chose to withdraw his patronage before they were fin-

²²⁰Baaken (n. 49 above) 381.

²²¹Johanek (n. 45 above) 675.

²²²Assmann (n. 160 above) 89-90.

²²³See Ganz (n. 41 above) 636. Gunther explicitly hoped to be rewarded for his composition, and (presumably as an incentive for the emperor) even promised to resume his activity after a short pause and compose a work on Frederick's deeds up to the present (*Ligurinus* 10.60f-613). But there is no indication that such a sequel was ever written, and it appears that Gunther's bid for the patronage of the court was ignored; that the *Ligurinus* itself survived the Middle Ages tenuously in only one manuscript further suggests that Gunther's work failed to arouse significant interest at the court.

²²⁴Bumke (n. 137 above) 466.

²²⁵*Ibid.* 458.

ished.²²⁶ But to make this latter assumption would likely do the *Pantheon's* author an injustice. Godfrey's tireless revision and amplification of his work suggests that, quite apart from his evident hopes of worldly fame and fortune, he was indeed ultimately driven by some artistic inner vision that the court's disinterest did not long frustrate. This represents perhaps the fundamental difference between the literary careers of Godfrey and his contemporary Gunther: while both seem to have expected their works to win them favor at the court, the failure of this endeavor signaled the abrupt end of Gunther's literary career,²²⁷ but in many respects the true beginning of Godfrey's.

If, as I have argued here, we must in light of the available historical evidence abandon the prevailing conceptions of Godfrey as a leading figure in the imperial chancery, as an important spokesman for Hohenstaufen ideology, and as a key member of the circle around Frederick Barbarossa and Henry VI, we have as compensation gained a more complex and credible narrative. This involves a courtier who built a respectable, and even prosperous, career in one of medieval Europe's great courts, but at the same time likely wished for yet greater honors than those accorded him; and an intellectual figure who, undeterred by the failure of his early literary efforts to attract an audience at the court, painstakingly revised his works a number of times until he fulfilled his ambition of producing a popular and influential compendium of moral and historical knowledge. In the final result, I believe that the conception and production of the *Pantheon* serves as a fine illustration of Beryl Smalley's contention that "we owe a lot of historical writing to frustrated ambition."²²⁸

School of Historical Studies
Institute for Advanced Study
Princeton, New Jersey 08540, U.S.A.

²²⁶As suggested above, Godfrey's three known prebends at Pisa, Lucca, and Speyer will likely have afforded him a considerable income, a conclusion supported by his ability to work and rework his books at leisure—the parchment alone must have been worth a small fortune—and to employ a number of secretaries to help him (as evidenced by the various hands in his partial autograph). Godfrey may quite simply not have needed Henry's direct patronage to write, even if he seems to have expected that his literary efforts would bring him substantial rewards from the king upon their completion.

²²⁷See n. 223 above.

²²⁸B. Smalley, *Historians in the Middle Ages* (London 1974) 180.

The present article has benefited immeasurably from the careful reading and invaluable critiques of a number of friends and colleagues, most particularly Robert L. Benson (UCLA), Giles Constable (Institute for Advanced Study), and Timothy Reuter (University of Southampton). Richard H. Rouse (UCLA) provided generous assistance with (among other things) the dating and localization of many of the manuscripts listed in the appendix. The information above regarding the manuscript transmission of the *Pantheon* is based on a separate study performed in 1989–1992 at the Monumenta Germaniae Historica in Munich and at various European libraries with the support of the German Academic Exchange Service, and published in my dissertation, "Godfrey of Viterbo's *Pantheon*: Origin, Evolution, and Later Transmission," Ph.D. diss. (UCLA 1993); I am deeply indebted to the president of the MGH, Horst Fuhrmann, and to all of the institute's library staff and *Mitarbeiter*, in particular Claudia Märkl, for scholarly support and fellowship during the course of my studies. In this same period Friedrich Hausmann (Graz) offered generously of his knowledge as well as providing me with some otherwise unobtainable copies of documents. Finally, I should like also to offer my thanks to Nicole Bériou (Sorbonne) for her help and encouragement.

<i>Manuscript</i>	<i>No. of fols.</i>	<i>Place of origin</i>	<i>Waitz's siglum</i>
<i>Speculum regum</i> (Waitz's class 3): Seitenstetten, Stiftsbibliothek Nr. 298 fols. 2-58 Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek lat. 3496 fols. 217-267v	— —	s. Germany/Austria, s. XV s. Germany/Austria, s. XV	3 ^b 3 ^a
Interpolation of <i>Speculum regum</i> by Albert Milioli of Reggio: Modena, Biblioteca Estense cod. α.M.1.7	—	Italy, s. XIII ^{2/2}	—
<i>Memoria seculorum</i> (Waitz's recension A): Montpellier, Bibliothèque interuniversitaire (Section médecine) MS 222 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale lat. 4896	230 107	n. Italy (Genoa?), s. XIVin. Genoa (Italy), s. XIII ^{3/4}	A2 A1
<i>Memoria seculorum-Liber universalis-Pantheon</i> (Waitz's recension B): Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 43 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale lat. 4894	121 164	Italy, s. XIIImed. (after 1227) Viterbo (Italy), 1185-91 (additions to 1227)	B2 B1
<i>Pantheon</i> (Waitz's recension C): Bern, Burgerbibliothek Bongarsiana lat. 260 fols. 79-103v [exc.] Frankfurt a. M., Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek MS Barth 89 fols. 107-193v [fr.] Metz, Bibliothèque Médiathèque lat. 521 fols. 2-58 [exc.] Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 9503 fols. 31-230v Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 9681 fols. 9-44, 47-62v [exc.]	— — — — —	w. Germany (Metz?), s. XIV ^{1/2} w. Germany, s. XIII ^{1/4} prob. Metz, s. XIIIex./XIVin. Lower Bavaria, s. XV Lower Bavaria, s. XIV	C3' C1 C8* C6 C7*

<i>Manuscript</i>	<i>No. of fols.</i>	<i>Place of origin</i>	<i>Waitz's siglum</i>
Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 9711 fols. 232-287v	—	Lower Bavaria, s. XV	C7
Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 21259 fols. 57-228v	—	s. Germany (prob. Bavaria), s. XIIImed.	C3
Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 22237	174	Lower Bavaria, s. XIIex. (after 1198)/XIII ^{1/4}	C4
Oxford, Bodleian Library Laud. misc. 721 fols. 1-331	—	Eibersbach (w. Germany), 1454	C9
Paris, Bibliothèque nationale lat. 4895A	162	Germany (Bavaria?), s. XIV ^{1/4}	C8
Tarazona, Archivo de la Catedral MS 99	343	Aragon, s. XIV ^{2/2}	—
Trier, Bibliothek des bischöflichen Priesterseminars MS 42	156	w. Germany, s. XIIex./XIIIin.	—
Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek lat. 372 [fr.]	16	s. Germany/Austria, s. XIII ^{2/2}	C3*
Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek lat. 380	225	s. Germany/Austria, s. XIVin.	C5
Johann Pistorius, SS rerum Germanicarum 2 (ed. 3 Burchard Struve: Regensburg 1726) pp. 8-392	—	[provenance Fulda]	C2
<i>Pantleon</i> (Waitz's recension D):			
Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek F. 93 fols. 1-368v	—	Germany (prob. Saxony), s. XV	D5
Innsbruck, Universitätsbibliothek lat. 1086	262	s. Germany/Austria, s. XV	D6
Leiden, Universiteitsbibliothek B. P. L. 15	182	Italy (?), s. XIII ^{1/2}	D1
London, British Library Royal 14 C.xi	182	England, s. XIIIex./XIV ^{1/2}	D7
Prague, Universitní knihovna I. C. 24 fols. 206v-314 [exc.]	—	Saxony/Bohemia, s. XIVex./XVin.	—
Prague, Universitní knihovna III. C. 14	199	prob. Bohemia, s. XIVex.	D4
Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Vat. lat. 2037	182	Italy (prob. Papal States), s. XIIIex./XIVin.	D2
Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Ottobon. lat. 484	123	England, s. XIV ^{1/3}	—
Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Pal. lat. 1813	365	s. Germany/Austria, s. XV	—
Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek lat. 3406	266	s. Germany/Austria, s. XV	D3
Vienna, Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv MS B 238 fols. 67-191	—	s. Germany/Austria, s. XIVex.	—

<i>Manuscript</i>	<i>No. of fols.</i>	<i>Place of origin</i>	<i>Waitz's siglum</i>
<i>Pantheon</i> (Waitz's recension E):			
Bordeaux, Bibliothèque municipale lat. 726	85	Aquitaine/England, ca. 1230-60	—
Gnieszno, Archiwum Archidiecezjalne MS 5	342	Constance (Germany), 1416	E9
Laon, Bibliothèque municipale lat. 402	217	Aquitaine/England, ca. 1230-60	E6
Madrid, Real Monasterio de San Lorenzo del Escorial M. III. 8 fols. 31-71v [exc.]	—	Spain, s. XIII ^{2/2}	—
Nuremberg, Stadtbibliothek Cent. II, 100	270	Germany, s. XV ^{2/2}	E2
Paris, Bibliothèque nationale lat. 4895	180	Milan (Italy), 1331	E8
Paris, Bibliothèque nationale lat. 5003	215	s. Italy, s. XIII ^{1/4}	E3
Paris, Bibliothèque nationale lat. 17547	175	Italy, s. XIII ^{2/2}	E7
Salzburg, St. Peter's Archabbey a. IX. 2	136	Italy, s. XIII ^{1/2}	E5
Sandomierz (Poland), Archiwum Kapitulne lat. 114	190	Cracow (Poland), 1335	—
Venice, Biblioteca Marciana Cl. 10 No. 48/3172	141	Italy, s. XIIIex./XIVin.	E4
Viterbo, Biblioteca Capitolare No. 1	287	Italy, s. XIV ^{1/2}	—
Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek M. ch. f. 23	239	Germany, s. XV ^{2/2}	E1
Destroyed in Second World War:			
Warsaw, Biblioteka Narodowa lat. F. I. 74 fols. 84ff. [exc.]	—	Germany/Poland, s. XIII (?)	D4*
Warsaw, Biblioteka Narodowa lat. F. IV. 65	255	Poland, 1419	—