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This dissertation proposes a new model for examining the political strategies of noble families during the central Middle Ages. It uses the German noble house of Andechs as a case study to argue that the analysis of family relationships is critical to understanding how noblemen and noblewomen exercised their lordship and expanded their power. The kinship networks active within the Andechs family are shown to be the principal reason why this noble house became during the twelfth century one of the most influential families in the German empire. Part I’s introductory chapters assert that recent scholarly approaches to the medieval nobility in general (Chapter One) and the house of Andechs in particular (Chapter Two) are inadequate for explaining the roles kinship played in medieval politics. The chapters in Part II demonstrate how two of the most popular source bases used by historians of the nobility, property donations (Chapter Three) and memorial records (Chapter Four), are unreliable as evidence for kinship networks because they reveal more about the interests of the religious communities who wrote the texts than they reveal about the families who are named in the documents. Part
III proposes a series of new directions in the study of medieval noble houses. First, the family relationships of the secular lords who belonged to the Andechs lineage are analyzed to explain how these interactions affected decisions concerning succession (Chapter Five). The roles Andechs churchmen played inside their family’s networks of cooperation and support are then considered (Chapter Six). Lastly, despite a problematic source base, Andechs women’s family relationships are explored to determine their potential significance for the noble house’s politics (Chapter Seven). This study concludes in Part IV (Chapter Eight) by arguing that the political success of the house of Andechs in the twelfth century can only be appreciated by reconstructing the kin networks on which family members relied as they sought to expand their positions in the empire. Through the examination of a single noble house, this dissertation seeks to demonstrate how the analysis of family relationships can provide new perspectives on medieval politics and noble society.
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PART I

INTRODUCTION
CHAPTER ONE

HISTORIANS AND THE MEDIEVAL NOBILITY

The fourteenth-century Schlackenwerther Codex, commissioned by the Polish Duke Ludwig I of Liegnitz and Brieg (ca. 1311-1398), consists of various works relating to one of the duke’s most famous ancestors.¹ Duchess Hedwig of Silesia (ca. 1174-1243) had been canonized by Pope Clement IV in 1267, and during the later Middle Ages she emerged as one of the patron saints of Duke Ludwig I’s Piast dynasty. The 1353 manuscript, which is also known as the Hedwig Codex, includes two accounts of her life and her miracles, a copy of the papal bull for her canonization, a prayer for the saint, and other texts. It contains numerous images as well, and one of the best-known is a picture depicting Hedwig and the family of her birth, members of the German noble house of Andechs.² At the center of the image are her parents, Duke Berthold III of Merania and his wife Agnes. Seated to their left are their four sons, Hedwig’s brothers, who were all prominent secular and ecclesiastical lords in central Europe. To the right of Duke Berthold III and Agnes are three of their daughters, including Hedwig, as well as one of their granddaughters, Saint Elizabeth of Thuringia. Beneath all of these figures, at

² Ibid., fol. 10v.
the bottom of the picture, is Hedwig’s youngest sister, who was an abbess at a small German convent.

There are various details in the image that suggest a loving family scene. Hedwig’s parents are holding hands in the center of the picture. To their right, Saint Elisabeth of Thuringia is extending her hand to her mother, Queen Gertrude of Hungary. On the opposite side of the image, one of Hedwig’s brothers has a hand clasping the arm of another of her brothers. Despite these features, this picture from the 1353 Schlackenwerther Codex cannot properly be labeled a “family portrait” in the modern sense, for it does not depict Hedwig and her birth family at any one moment in time. Hedwig’s parents had both died before their granddaughter Elizabeth was born, making this impressive scene of a large family gathering an historical impossibility. The image can best be described as a pictorial representation of a family tree. Like a modern genealogist, the artist has ignored the issue of chronology in order to show in a single illustration several prominent but noncontemporary members of different generations from the noble house of Andechs. As a result, historians cannot draw any conclusions about the interactions of these eleven relatives from their appearance together in the picture.

This dissertation is about the family relationships and personal contacts between relatives that are so often overlooked when medieval families are presented as timeless, static schemata rather than associations of interacting, contemporary individuals. It is about how, during the twelfth century, the house of Andechs rose to become one of the

---

most powerful noble families in the German empire because of the networks of cooperation and support that brought members of the family together at different times in varying contexts. And lastly, it is about redrawing, or perhaps simply erasing, the borders that modern historians have created to distinguish social history from political history when discussing the medieval nobility; as will be argued here, only by removing any distinctions between these two fields can scholars properly understand the lives and careers of twelfth-century noblemen and noblewomen. Thus, while on one level this dissertation is a case study of the relationships within a single noble house, it is also an attempt to offer a significantly different method for studying the medieval nobility.

I. The study of the medieval nobility from the Middle Ages to the present

Timothy Reuter observed in 1979 that “[t]he nobility has been one of the main concerns of medieval historians since the second world war.”4 While this statement is certainly accurate, it suggests that an interest in the medieval nobility is relatively new, dating only to the period after 1945. In truth, however, the nobility has been one of the primary themes in work on the Middle Ages for centuries. Indeed, if one chooses to define a historian as anyone who studies and writes history—rather than as someone professionally trained in the modern, scholarly field of history—the study of the medieval nobility can be said to have begun already during the Middle Ages. Literary works focusing on the exploits of a particular line of dukes or counts began to appear in the tenth century, and by the twelfth century such texts had developed into an immensely

---

popular genre of literature among the elites of western Europe.⁵ Although by modern standards much of the information given in these works earns the label of “legendary” instead of “historical,” the medieval audiences for these texts would have disagreed with this assessment. In a society in which historical “truth” meant something quite different than what it means today, there is no reason to believe that the nobles of the tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries seriously questioned the authenticity of the stories they were hearing about their illustrious ancestors.⁶

Texts of this nature continued to flourish into the early Modern Period because the ruling dynasties of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries maintained an active interest in their medieval forebears. In Germany, for example, many of the leading princely families of the post-medieval period, including the Wittelsbachs of Bavaria and the Wettins of Saxony, had already emerged as prominent dynasties prior to the year 1200. As a result, the later members of these noble houses often commissioned works of literature to glorify the memory of their earliest ancestors. The first history of the house of Andechs, published in the year 1729, was dedicated to one of the Hohenzollern margraves of Brandenburg because the Hohenzollerns had inherited properties in central Germany from the house of Andechs following the extinction of the male Andechs line in 1248.⁷


⁶ For an analysis of the writing of this genealogical literature in the central Middle Ages, see Leah Shopkow’s introduction to Lambert of Ardres, The History of the Counts of Guines and Lords of Ardres, trans. Leah Shopkow (Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), 4-8.

⁷ Johann D. Koeler, De Ducibus Meraniae ex Comitibus de Andechs Ortis (Aldorf, 1729). Burgrave Frederick of Nuremberg, a member of the Hohenzollern family, married a sister of the last count of Andechs and thus acquired a claim to part of the Andechs inheritance.
The French Revolution and the subsequent decline of the *ancien régime* did not completely put an end to the production of such works in Europe. Towns and monasteries founded by nobles during the Middle Ages continued to show an interest in the histories of their founding dynasties long after these medieval families had been otherwise forgotten. Many of these texts are remarkably similar to the equivalent sources from the Middle Ages, freely mixing historical and legendary elements to emphasize the greatness of a particular noble house.\textsuperscript{8} Despite the enduring popularity of this antiquarian type of work into the twentieth century, the genre is no longer considered to be as reputable as it once was; for by the second half of the nineteenth century, the professional study of history in the universities of Europe and the United States had begun to change dramatically how the medieval nobility was researched and understood.

If Reuter’s statement about the study of the nobility since the Second World War is thus misleading in the sense that the nobility has long been a subject of study, it is an accurate assessment of the historiography from another perspective. The academic historians of the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries often considered the medieval nobility to be a tool for answering broader questions rather than a worthy subject of research in its own right. From the perspective of the legal, institutional and constitutional questions that dominated the decades on either side of the year 1900, the nobility was already in the Middle Ages a clearly-defined class or estate with specific administrative functions to perform in the medieval “state”. Thus, William Stubbs and

\footnote{8 Several excellent examples of this type of literature written about the house of Andechs come from the monastery at Andechs, which was founded two centuries after the family’s extinction but which claims to have the family’s collection of relics. See Joseph Silberhorn, *Ursprung, Abstammung und Aussterben der Hochgeborenen Grafen von Andechs: Ein Auszug aus der Chronik vom heiligen Berge Andechs* (Berg Andechs, 1840); P. Magnus Sattler, O.S.B., *Chronik von Andechs* (Donauwörth: by the author, 1877); and Willibald Mathäser, *Andechser Chronik* (Munich: Süddeutscher Verlag, 1979).}
Frederic Maitland in their studies of the constitutional history of England were quick to identify the barons who orchestrated King John’s signing of the Magna Carta (1215) as central to the evolution of parliament and the English nation because they emerged as the voice of the people.\(^9\) The Frenchman Paul Guilhiermoz, in his 1902 *Essai sur l’origine de la noblesse en France au moyen âge*, studied the French nobility within the context of feudalism and maintained that the laws of fiefs and vassals created fixed relationships between the king and his nobles.\(^10\) And in Germany, Georg Waitz’s monumental *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte* argued that the German nobility remained largely unchanged from the time of Tacitus onwards; the members of the noble estate served as the king’s administrators until the collapse of the Carolingian “state” transferred public power from the king into the nobles’ hands—an event that explained for Waitz why Germany failed to emerge from the Middle Ages as a centralized nation-state.\(^11\)

Karl Lamprecht was one of the first historians to challenge directly this political model that dominated the historiography of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. He proposed studying history within a much broader context, one which recognized the importance of social and economic factors and which was willing to draw

---


ideas from the social sciences. Lamprecht’s theories did not find a receptive audience within German academia, however. His chief rival, Georg von Below, accused him of dilettantism and argued for the maintenance of the status quo within the historical discipline. Thus, following Waitz, von Below continued to view the territorial sovereignty of the German nobility as the residue of the public authority once vested in the imperial office; he ignored Lamprecht’s claims that there was a total collapse of public power after the Carolingian period and that the eventual emergence of the “state” was an outgrowth of later, private forms of noble authority. As Roger Chickering explains in his biography of Lamprecht, “If the one position implied the priority of political history—the proposition that the state was the principal agent of historical development—the other implied the historical primacy of society over politics.”

This Methodenstreit (Methodological Debate) dominated the German historiography around the year 1900, and in the often acrimonious contest between these opposing viewpoints, von Below and his supporters were eventually victorious. Verfassungsgeschichte—the study of the nature and the institutions of the German “state” from earliest times until the modern period—remained the dominant framework for research into the nobility during the first half of the twentieth century. By the 1920s the

---


13 For the specific charge of dilettantism, see Georg v. Below, “Kulturgeschichte und kulturgeschichtlicher Unterricht,” Historische Zeitschrift 106 (1911): 96-105. Von Below offers here a fascinating critique of the concept of interdisciplinary studies, one which has certain resonances even within twenty-first-century academia.

14 Chickering, 148-149.
fields of social and economic history had virtually disappeared in Germany.  

Meanwhile, throughout the inter-war period, German medievalists continued to analyze how the nobles of the central Middle Ages acquired the types of “state”-based powers which had, in earlier centuries, been in the sole possession of the king.  This is not to suggest the field was a static one.  Otto Freiherr von Dungern, for example, critiqued older models by emphasizing the importance of studying individual noble families rather than the nobility as a whole. Nevertheless, politics remained the central focus of his research and the research of many other German historians.

While methodologies that embraced a broad range of social and economic theories thus failed to gain a foothold in Germany in the early twentieth century, France emerged during the 1920s as fertile ground for such ideas. A group of French scholars, including Lucien Febvre, began to react sharply against the traditional study of “great men,” the origins of institutions, and the state. Heavily influenced by the social sciences, these earliest members of the historical movement known today as the Annales School turned away from the old model of narrative, political history and embraced an interdisciplinary approach to history, one which sought to understand the diversity of the

---


16 Representative articles by many of the most important German scholars of this period, including Theodor Mayer and Heinrich Mitteis, can be found in English translation in *Medieval Germany 911-1250: Essays by German Historians*, vol. 2, trans. Geoffrey Barraclough (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1938; reprint, AMS, 1979).

human experience. Psychology, sociology, geography and anthropology all became acceptable tools of the historian.\textsuperscript{18}

As World War II approached, the French and German traditions of history writing had markedly diverged; the Austrian Otto Brunner’s 1939 \textit{Land und Herrschaft} was one of the only medieval works of this period to draw inspiration from both national historiographies.\textsuperscript{19} Despite their differences, historians in France and Germany continued to recognize the centrality of the nobility for the study of the Middle Ages. For this reason, it is not surprising that a pair of scholars, one from each country, produced almost simultaneously some of the most important research on the medieval nobility to appear in the last century.\textsuperscript{20} These historians were the Frenchman Marc Bloch (1886-1944) and the German Gerd Tellenbach (1903-1999).\textsuperscript{21} Like so many of the works from earlier decades to discuss the nobility, Bloch’s \textit{La Société féodale} (1939-40) and Tellenbach’s \textit{Königtum und Stämme in der Werdezeit des Deutschen Reiches} (1939) were not principally studies of the nobility.\textsuperscript{22} Bloch was exploring numerous aspects of the society of post-

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{18} For the history of the Annales School as well as an explanation of what these scholars were reacting against, see Peter Burke, \textit{The French Historical Revolution: The Annales School, 1929-89} (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990).
\item \textsuperscript{20} As Thomas Bisson has recently explained, “on the eve of the Second World War, two scholars of consummate talents set forth ideas about social elites in the Middle Ages that have influenced historical discussions ever since.” See his “Nobility and Family in Medieval France: A Review Essay,” \textit{French Historical Studies} 16 (1990): 597.
\item \textsuperscript{21} For a biography of Bloch, see Burke, 12-27. For Tellenbach’s biography, see Hagen Keller, “Das Werk Gerd Tellenbachs in der Geschichtswissenschaft unseres Jahrhunderts,” \textit{Frühmittelalterliche Studien} 28 (1994): 374-397.
\end{itemize}
Carolingian Europe, and Tellenbach was considering the political relationship between the kingdom and the individual principalities within post-Carolingian Germany. Elements of their work, including Bloch’s discussions of the noble “class” and Tellenbach’s interest in the collapse of Carolingian power, were deeply embedded in older historiographical traditions. Nevertheless, they injected new life into questions surrounding the nobility, and their ideas led the next generation of historians to focus on the noblemen and noblewomen of the Middle Ages much more intensively than earlier scholars had ever done. It is in this context that Reuter’s observation about the nobility being one of the focuses of medieval historical research since the Second World War is to be understood.

What made the work of both Bloch and Tellenbach especially significant was their use of new methodologies that began the process of moving the study of the nobility toward the field of social history. Bloch, a founding member of the Annales School, analyzed the medieval nobility through a variety of prisms, looking not only at feudal relationships and the noble estate but also noble kindreds and the everyday life of nobles. As Peter Burke explains, *Feudal Society* “deals with feudal society as a whole: with what we might now call ‘the culture of feudalism.’” Meanwhile in Germany, Tellenbach and his students at the University of Freiburg—who would become known collectively as the “Freiburg School”—devised an approach labeled *Personenforschung*.

---

23 A point made by Bisson in his “Nobility and Family in Medieval France,” 597. John Freed has argued that Tellenbach’s choice of topics—the origins of the first German Reich—was heavily influenced by the political environment in Germany at the time he was writing. See Freed’s “Reflections on the Medieval German Nobility,” *American Historical Review* 91 (1986): 554-560.

24 For kinship, see Bloch, 1:123-142; for daily life, see 2:293-311.

25 Burke, 24.
(best translated into English as “prosopography”) in order to create a more accurate picture of the genealogical structure of the imperial nobility. Their focus on naming patterns shifted the emphasis in early medieval politics from institutions toward noble kinship groups. Karl Leyser has offered an excellent summary of the historiographical transformation:

The older school assumed—with some exceptions—the state and a volume of government without asking very precise questions of how it worked from day to day. It was in its abstractions a shadow-history of institutions that did not really exist. In the orientation of much German scholarship during the past twenty years all these generic assumptions have disappeared. Prosopography has taken the place of legal axioms. Early medieval society in East Francia became simply large family groups, closely inter-related and contesting for places and honours close to their kings or their own more powerful kinsmen in the church. The Carolingian rulers maintained their Reich by their links with a small number of noble clans whom they had established in all parts of their huge empire.

In short, social networks had become the key to understanding Carolingian power.

Although Tellenbach was one of the central figures in the development of the methodology called Personenforschung, it was his student Karl Schmid (1923-1993) whose work in this field significantly transformed modern perceptions of the medieval nobility. Schmid’s earliest research focused on the early and central Middle Ages and

---


27 In Germany, this field is closely connected to one type of source, the libri memoriales, or memorial books, which were produced in various monastic communities during the ninth and tenth centuries. Tellenbach and his student Karl Schmid were both interested in using these sources and edited the liber memorialis from Remiremont. For more on the historiography surrounding the memorial books, see note 41 below.


the leading families of the Alemannia/Swabia region surrounding Freiburg. In two articles from the late 1950s, Schmid observed that when modern scholars have attempted to create genealogical tables for the prominent noble families of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, they have had great difficulties extending those family trees back into the Carolingian period. According to Schmid, the reason for this lay in a change during the eleventh century in how nobles organized and imagined their families. Under the Carolingian rulers of the ninth century, the constantly changing situation at court meant that few noblemen were able to hold onto offices and other rights long enough to pass them on to their sons; in other words, only a small number of families were able to organize themselves as lineages—families structured around the direct descent of property and rights in the male line. The majority of families in this period were organized much less rigidly. Kinship groups formed, transformed and reformed to serve specific political purposes. Labeled Sippen (sips) by modern scholars, these groups could

---

30 Schmid’s dissertation, which deserves more attention than it has received, concerns a single Swabian nobleman and was published as Graf Rudolf von Pfullendorf und Kaiser Friedrich I. (Freiburg: Universitäts Buchhandlung, 1954).


32 Here, I am using “lineage” as a translation of the German “Geschlecht” as it is used by Schmid. Jack Goody, in his The development of the family and marriage in Europe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 227-232 discusses the numerous ways in which the terms “lineage” and its French equivalent “lignage” have been defined in anthropological and historical writing. Here, I understand “lineage” to mean a narrow line of descent in the male line—rather than a series of branches all connected to one another through a male ancestor. Technically speaking, this type of lineage can also be called a “patrilineage” because descent in the male line is emphasized, but I will try to avoid overly technical anthropological terminology whenever possible in this dissertation.
be composed of both agnatic (paternal) and cognatic (maternal) kin. The basis for the structure of these kinship groups was not inheritance but rather the patronage opportunities that arose whenever one of their members attained a prominent position within the Carolingian empire. These sips have generally left behind few traces in the surviving sources because of their short-term nature. However, Schmid and the other early members of the “Freiburg School” argued that the collections of relatives listed together in the monastic *libri memoriales* (memorial books) provide the best evidence for the existence of many of these kin groups.

Beginning in the early eleventh century, according to Schmid, the structure of noble families changed. One of the key reasons for this change was an increased stability in the control of property; families were beginning to maintain their hold on rights and properties for longer periods of time. Noblemen therefore started to build castles which could serve as relatively permanent centers of their power and authority. Increasingly, nobles used the names of their castles as a way of identifying themselves, and well-known noble families like the Habsburgs and the Wittelsbachs owe their names to this process. Because these castles were family seats which could be handed down from generation to generation, the line of noblemen who controlled a family’s castles gradually began to imagine themselves as part of a lineage which had endured over an extended length of time. Often, a nobleman founded a monastery near one of his new castles, and this religious foundation typically became the burial site for the members of the lineage.

---


34 For Schmid’s earliest comments on the *libri memoriales*, see his “Zur Problematik von Familie,” 198-204. For more on these sources, see note 41 below.
as well as the place where the lineage’s memory was preserved. Only when lineal structures had thus crystallized did noble dynasties and houses come into existence, emerging as the clearly-definable entities that modern historians are able to study and analyze over the course of several generations.\textsuperscript{35}

To support his argument about the development of lineages during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, Schmid used contemporary genealogical literature and images. For Schmid, this evidence opened a window into noble self-consciousness and how members of a noble family constructed their own kinship group.\textsuperscript{36} The twelfth-century histories of the Welfs, one of the foremost noble houses of the German kingdom, all emphasized the lineal structure of the family, focusing on those ancestors who were part of the direct line of descent. Similarly, the one image of the dynasty that bears some resemblance to a modern family tree places the members of the lineage in the middle and has side branches only for the most famous family members outside the main succession.\textsuperscript{37} Because genealogical literature and imagery of this nature was virtually non-existent in earlier

\textsuperscript{35} I have chosen to follow Schmid’s distinction between the terms “Familie” (family), “Sippe” (sip), and “Geschlecht” (lineage) on the one hand, and “Haus” (house) and “Dynastie” (dynasty) on the other. Schmid identifies the first set of terms as all being basic units of family organization, while the second set of terms are historically-constructed family units. In other words, people only began to imagine that noble society was divided into distinct houses and dynasties after families had begun to organize themselves as narrow lineages rather than more extended sips. This is, in a sentence, the argument of his complex and complicated “Zur Problematik von Familie, Sippe und Geschlecht, Haus und Dynastie beim mittelalterlichen Adel.”


centuries, these sources demonstrate—according to Schmid—how the lineage had
replaced the sip and become the dominant family structure by the central Middle Ages.  

The argument for a change in family structure between the ninth and twelfth
centuries has been labeled the “Schmid thesis” by more recent generations of historians.
Numerous scholars—the majority working in England and the United States—have
critiqued aspects of this theory on a variety of grounds. Some have contended that there
is evidence for lineages already in the Carolingian period. Others have argued that the
*libri memoriales*, Schmid’s key sources for the existence of sips prior to the year 1000,
cannot be used to analyze family structure. And the “Schmid thesis” has also been

---

38 For a further example of Schmid’s interpretation of genealogical images, see his posthumously published “Geschlechterbewusstsein am Beispiel ausgewählter karolingischer (Bild-)Stemmata aus dem hohen Mittelalter,” in Georges Duby: *L’écriture de l’Histoire*, eds. Claudie Duhamel and Amado and Guy Lobrichon (Brussels: De Boeck Université, 1996), 141-159.

39 It is important to note that, in general, I have little to say about the British historiography on the medieval nobility in this chapter. The English-trained German émigré Karl Leyser and his students are some of the only scholars in England who have directly engaged in debates about the continental nobility (more specifically, the non-Norman continental nobility). Most British historians view the post-1066 nobility as so fundamentally different from the continental nobility as to require entirely different approaches in order to study it. This point is made clearly in J.C. Holt, “Feudal Society and the Family in Early Medieval England: III. Patronage and Politics,” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 5th Series, vol. 34 (1984): 1-25.


criticized on the grounds that the castle-based naming patterns of the eleventh century were much more complex than Schmid claimed they were.\footnote{Bouchard, “The Structure of a Twelfth-Century French Family: The Lords of Seignelay,” \textit{Viator} 10 (1979): 44-45 and her \textit{Those of My Blood}, 158-161; Freed, \textit{The Counts of Falkenstein: Noble Self-Consciousness in Twelfth-Century Germany} (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1984), 52-57; and Wilhelm Störmer, “Adel und Ministerialität im Spiegel der bayerischen Namengebung (bis zum 13. Jahrhundert),” \textit{Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters} 33 (1977): 84-152. As I have already noted above, some criticisms of Schmid appear to me to be unfounded, and the issue of naming patterns is another example of this situation. Critics of his theory of castle-names argue that these names are not evidence for family identity in the eleventh century when they first appear. Schmid, however, makes a similar point in his “Zur Problematik von Familie, Sippe und Geschlecht,” 218, claiming that these names became tied to family identity only through a lengthy process.}

In Germany, criticisms of Schmid’s theories about the emergence of lineages have generally not been as pointed.\footnote{American and British historians have tended to view the “Schmid thesis” as a broad theory for understanding family structure throughout Europe, but most German historians recognize Schmid’s work as the product of \textit{Landesgeschichte}, or regional history. Thus, the majority of Germans who study family structure simply point out—without directly criticizing the specifics of Schmid’s arguments—that Schmid’s work on Swabia does not always apply to other regions of Germany. See, for example, Karl Bosl, “Adel, Bistum, Kloster Bayerns im Investiturstreit,” in \textit{Festschrift für Hermann Heimpel}, vol. 2, eds. Die Mitarbeiter des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1972), 1121-1146 and Friedrich Prinz, “Bayerns Adel im Hochmittelalter,” \textit{Zeitschrift für bayerische Landesgeschichte} [hereafter ZBLG] 30 (1967): 53-117. The most concise summary of German historians’ views of Schmid’s theory is in Werner Hechberger, \textit{Staufer und Welfen 1125-1190: Zur Verwendung von Theorien in der Geschichtswissenschaft} (Cologne: Böhlau, 1996), 108-109: “Wie jede Theorie hat also Schmids Entwicklungsmodell bestimmte räumliche, sachliche und zeitliche Grenzen, so daß der Hinweis auf Ausnahmen das Modell allenfalls modifizieren, nicht aber widerlegen kann.”} It is his later work on genealogical literature and imagery that has attracted the interest and scrutiny of German historians in recent years. Many are no longer convinced that these sources provide an ideal window into what medieval nobles thought their families looked like. A debate between two of Schmid’s students, Gerd Althoff and Otto Gerhard Oexle, has focused on whether or not these texts, the majority of which were produced at monasteries or other religious communities, reveal noble self-consciousness or rather the religious house’s view of a particular noble family.\footnote{Gerd Althoff, “Anlässe zur schriftlichen Fixierung adligen Selbstverständnisses,” \textit{Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins} 134 (1986): 34-46 and “Geschichtsbewußtsein durch Memorialüberlieferung,” in \textit{Hochmittelalterliches Geschichtsbewußtsein im Spiegel}, 34} Other scholars have begun to stress that many of the genealogical images that
survive from the Middle Ages were intended for very specific purposes, such as to depict all of the owners of a particular office or territory, and therefore reflect only certain aspects of a noble family’s identity.\textsuperscript{45}

Despite these various criticisms of Schmid’s arguments and of his sources, the theory that the lineage became the dominant family structure in the period after the year 1000 remains an integral part of the secondary literature on the medieval nobility. One of the most important reasons for the survival of the “Schmid thesis” is that, since the 1960s, the theory has had another supporter whose influence on the post-1945 historiography has been far greater than Schmid’s outside Germany. The Frenchman Georges Duby (1919-1996), whose immense body of work includes studies on numerous aspects of medieval society, discussed the issue of family structure in his analysis of the French nobility. In his 1953 thèse, \textit{La société aux XIe et XIIe siècles dans la région mâconnaise}, he noted that the period between 980 and 1030 saw dramatic changes in the ruling elite of the Mâconnais region. As the old foundations of Carolingian comital authority crumbled, a group of castellans rose to prominence, each one exercising power over a relatively small area of the Mâconnais. In the early eleventh century, partible

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

inheritance was common within these castellan families, but by 1100 the principle of indivisibility had begun to predominate. Duby also noted that surnames became more common after 1050 and that, over the course of the eleventh century, the property rights of wives diminished.⁴⁶

In his thèse, Duby did not tie all of this evidence together into a broader theory about family structure. At the time of the publication of Duby’s work in 1953, Bloch’s *La Société féodale* was the book that was most profoundly impacting French historiography. Thus, much of what appears in Duby’s study of the Mâconnais is a response to Bloch’s arguments about the feudal nobility and the origins of the noble class.⁴⁷ As Duby has stated on numerous occasions, it was only after he had read Schmid’s work that he concluded that his evidence from the Mâconnais fit very well the thesis about a change in family structure and about the emergence of lineages over the course of the eleventh century.⁴⁸

During the 1970s and early 1980s, Duby expanded considerably upon his and Schmid’s original arguments. Once Duby merged the concept of noble family structure with the *Annales* school traditions in which he had been trained, family structure became an element of much broader issues in the history of medieval Europe. Thus, the period


⁴⁷ This is a point made recently by Frederic Cheyette, “Georges Duby’s *Mâconnais* after fifty years: reading it then and now,” *Journal of Medieval History* 28 (2002): 291-317.

⁴⁸ For Duby’s acknowledged debt to Schmid, see his *The Chivalrous Society*, 101-102. In 1974, Karl Schmid and several other German historians attended a conference in Paris organized by Georges Duby and Jacques Le Goff. This is one of the few times when there were direct contacts between French and German historians working on the issue of family structure. Such collaboration has become less common in recent years. The proceedings of the 1974 conference have been published as *Famille et parenté dans l’occident médiéval*, eds. Georges Duby and Jacques Le Goff (Rome: École française de Rome, 1977).
around the year 1000 emerged as a crucial moment for the nobility according to Duby and many of his students; this was the period when public power collapsed and families from the lesser nobility began to form lineages, passing from one generation to the next private authority over relatively small territories. The tendency for families to structure themselves as lineages also became for Duby the key to understanding why the rights of noblewomen steadily decreased during the central Middle Ages. And because one feature of the lineage was a tendency to emphasize primogeniture over partible inheritance, Duby further argued for the existence of a group in society known as *iuvenes*, landless sons with few options who helped to make the crusades and tournaments popular.

Duby’s arguments about the social ramifications of the emergence of lineages led him to focus extensively on an issue he viewed as central to noble society: marriage. In his 1981 *Le chevalier, le femme et le prêtre*, he traced the development of the conflicting theories that the Church and the nobility had concerning marriage. Noblemen wanted to be able to change wives whenever the political winds shifted and to marry cousins as a

---


way to maintain control of family property, but the Church increasingly emphasized the indissolubility of the marital bond and supported strict laws against incestuous marriages. Furthermore, while the Church favored marriage for anyone who had not taken religious vows, the heads of noble families intentionally limited the number of sons and daughters who could marry. Younger sons could only marry if they found heiresses who could support them. According to Duby, the Church and the nobility eventually reached a compromise concerning their views on marriage during the course of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries; this compromise laid the foundation for many future developments in the history of marriage.

While Schmid’s later work focused on the issue of noble self-consciousness, Duby thus used the concept of family structure to discuss a broad range of themes affecting the noble society of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Like Schmid, Duby did use genealogical literature as the basis for some of the aspects of his arguments. But the most important body of sources for Duby’s theories was the collection of charters preserved at the monastery of Cluny. Written records of property donations to the monastery, these charters are filled with the names of noblemen and noblewomen who wanted to receive spiritual benefits from their close ties to Cluny. Duby had relied

---

53 For further examples of aspects of French society that Duby analyzed through the prism of the emergence of lineages, see many of the articles published in his *Love and Marriage in the Middle Ages*. Duby’s focus on issues like love and marriage, women, and rebellious youths is one of the reasons why his work has been so much more popular with a general audience than the work of Karl Schmid. This is also one of the reasons why so much more of Duby’s work has been translated into English.

54 See especially *The Knight, the Lady and the Priest*, 227-284. One of the pieces of genealogical literature that Duby used for many of his arguments has recently been translated into English: Lambert of Ardres, *The History of the Counts of Guines and Lords of Ardres*.

55 A detailed discussion of this body of sources can be found in Barbara H. Rosenwein, *To Be the Neighbor of Saint Peter: The Social Meaning of Cluny’s Property*, 909-1049 (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1989).
heavily on these charters in his 1953 thèse, and he continued to use this early research to support many of his later arguments. In Germany, charters have rarely been central to debates about family structure, perhaps because they had not played a significant role in the development of the “Schmid thesis.” On the other hand, French and American scholarship on family structure, which has grown increasingly distinct from the German historiography in recent decades, has followed Duby’s approach closely.

Frederic Cheyette has recently explained the significance of Duby’s work with charters for the current literature on the medieval nobility:

Duby understood a necessary corollary of making sense out of the cartularies: if you wanted the names in the documents to be more than mere names, more than tokens, if you hoped to imagine them as individuals and understand the relations among them, above all if you wished to comprehend the social and physical environments within which those people lived their lives, you had to work on a small geographical scale. Thus, as the influence of Duby’s thesis grew and eventually came to dominate French medieval social history and the work of those elsewhere who came under its spell, the region became the favoured framework and the cartulary or charter collection the most familiar type of source.

Evidence to support Cheyette’s observation is not difficult to find; the regional monograph based upon charter material has become one of the dominant models to shape

---

56 See especially *The Chivalrous Society*, 59-80, where he returns to the subject of his thèse and reinterprets his evidence.

57 This is a point that has, to the best of my knowledge, not been made in the recent literature on family structure. But it helps to explain why a wide gulf now separates most German work on the nobility from the main historiographical trends in the field. Schmid’s research on noble self-consciousness has led German historians to focus much more of their attention on genealogical literature and images rather than charters. For discussions of French, American and German approaches to the medieval nobility, see Bisson, “Nobility and Family in Medieval France” and John B. Freed, “Medieval German Social History: Generalizations and Particularism,” *Central European History* 25 (1992): 1-26. Freed’s *Noble Bondsmen: Ministerial Marriages in the Archdiocese of Salzburg, 1100-1343* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1995) is one of the few recent works that has combined German and Franco-American traditions.

58 Cheyette, “Georges Duby’s Mâconnais after fifty years,” 297.
research into the medieval nobility in America and much of Europe since the 1960s.\(^5^9\) Many recent works concerning individual noble and royal dynasties also have relied on similar types of sources and have focused on the same kinds of questions as these regional studies.\(^6^0\)

What has emerged in the last several decades from this extraordinary accumulation of research is a far more complex understanding of noble family structures than was originally argued by Karl Schmid and Georges Duby a half-century ago. Many of their arguments about the changes of the eleventh century—including the construction of castles, the use of *cognomina*, and the emergence of lineages—continue to form the

---


foundation for how historians construct the nobility of the central Middle Ages.\textsuperscript{61} However, scholars have increasingly begun to recognize that the rules governing the organization of noble families were not as strict as Duby and Schmid believed. Duby’s work has come under especially intense criticism in recent years for presenting a much too orderly model of noble society.\textsuperscript{62} In most regions of Europe, the lineage did not become such a dominant structure that it replaced completely all other ways of organizing families.\textsuperscript{63} Primogeniture was not a legal requirement but rather one of many possible options for arranging the descent of property. Evidence abounds for the important roles played in a family’s succession and inheritance by younger sons—and by women, whose significant contributions to the success of noble families have only recently begun to be appreciated.\textsuperscript{64}

Increasingly, studies of the medieval nobility have therefore argued that the older theories on family structure are an over-simplification of a complicated reality. The lineage was not a rigid social construct that forced nobles to conform to certain rules of


\textsuperscript{63} This is a point which has been made most strongly in recent years by Constance B. Bouchard. See especially her book \textit{Those of My Blood}. Others who have made similar arguments include Livingstone, “Kith and Kin: Kinship and Family Structure of the Nobility of Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century Blois-Chartres,” \textit{French Historical Studies} 20 (1997), 419-458 and Evergates, “The Feudal Imaginary of Georges Duby,” 648-650.

behavior. It was instead a cultural category, a way that nobles could imagine and organize their families if such a model proved to be useful or necessary at a particular moment. Stephen White, whose *Custom, Kinship, and Gifts to Saints* has been one of the most influential works in promoting this new view toward family structure, chose to use the anthropological concept of “practical kinship” to explain the importance of analyzing which relatives actually engaged in social activities together. In the last decade, historians have also employed the idea of “fluid family structure” to express the similar notion that the composition of a family could vary depending on the situation. Thus, in her research on southern Italy, Joanna Drell has argued that “[t]he inclusion of certain family members in family activities or their exclusion from these, the descriptions of relationships, and even the targeted recollection of family ancestry, all demonstrate the flexibility with which kinship could be manipulated according to circumstance.”

The concepts of “practical kinship” and “fluid family structure” unquestionably offer a better foundation for analyzing noble families than the earlier theories developed by Schmid and Duby. Rather than attempting to impose an inflexible model on all the noble kinship groups of the central Middle Ages, critics of these older arguments have employed the newer approaches to present a much fuller and deeper understanding of

---

65 Stephen White, *Custom, Kinship, and Gifts to Saints: The Laudatio Parentum in Western France, 1050-1150* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 127. The science of anthropology has had significant influence on the study of noble families since the 1950s. Indeed, the whole debate about family structure has its origins in the structural anthropology of the first half of the twentieth century. More recently, it is the work of post-structuralists in the field, most notably Pierre Bourdieu, that has helped to shape arguments about “practical kinship” and the malleability of kinship structures. See, for example, Bourdieu, *The Logic of Practice*, trans. Richard Nice (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990).

66 Constance Bouchard, Joanna Drell and Amy Livingstone are just three of the historians who have made use of this general concept.

67 Drell, 170.
how families were organized. Wives, daughters, younger sons and other relatives have all emerged as important members of their families after being ignored by historians for decades. In the last two centuries, the image of medieval European noble houses has therefore undergone a dramatic transformation. From being viewed as legal, juridical units shaped by the forces of feudalism and constitutionalism, these families have gradually come into focus as culturally-constructed social groups whose complexity defies easy definition or universally-applicable structural model.

What has not changed dramatically since the Second World War, however, is the basic paradigm. Schmid’s work on lineages and noble self-consciousness and Duby’s research into the social significance of family structures have continued to be the driving forces behind today’s research into noble families. Even those scholars who have most vehemently argued against some of the older theories nevertheless ask many of the same questions Schmid and Duby asked and use the same types of evidence to support their positions. The reason for this tendency is the continuing focus by historians in Europe and the United States on many of those issues that have interested medievalists for generations: namely the nature of noble power, the relationship between rulers and their nobilities, and the role of nobles in the growth of the medieval “state.” In other words, neither “fluid family structure” nor “practical kinship” is a concept that has been consistently used to understand medieval social and political history in radically different ways; instead, both ideas have most often been employed to disprove earlier arguments rather than to prove newer theories about the nobility.  

68 I do not intend this to be a harsh criticism of current research on noble families. Many works published in the last several years have helped to refine significantly how historians understand the roles played by the nobility in medieval society. By asking older questions from the newer perspective that kinship structures could be flexible, historians have shattered many long-standing myths concerning noble
Despite this general trend, a small number of scholars have begun to shift some of their attention away from the Schmid-Duby paradigm. These rare exceptions are illuminating because they suggest some of the fresh directions in which the study of the medieval nobility can possibly be taken. Gerd Althoff has, for example, used the concept of “practical kinship” to argue that kinship bonds must be placed in the broader context of other social bonds in order to be understood. Althoff has focused much of his research on the medieval notion of amicitia, friendship, which appears in many peace conventions and treaties between rulers during the early Middle Ages. Far from being a subjective concept, amicitia in this sense carried with it the expectation of certain kinds of behavior. In the ninth century, the agreements between feuding members of the Carolingian dynasty also began to include the term amicitia. This is evidence for the fact that ties of kinship, by themselves, were not sufficient to regulate relationships; a concept of ritualized friendship had to be included to help insure peace between warring brothers or cousins. By refusing to view families as rigid social constructs, Althoff has been able

---


to explain some of the ways in which kinship connections were and were not effective bonds within medieval society.\textsuperscript{71}

More recently, Frederic Cheyette has used modern views toward noblewomen, which recognize their potentially significant political roles, to take a fresh look at troubadour poetry.\textsuperscript{72} In these poems, noblewomen are often portrayed in positions of power, controlling castles and receiving oaths of fidelity from vassals. It is these women who are typically the object of the poet’s desire, but many scholars have considered this whole situation a literary construct because of the presumed political weakness of noblewomen during the central Middle Ages. However, because the lineage was not as dominant as historians once assumed and noblewomen could indeed hold powerful positions, Cheyette has argued convincingly that there was a social reality underlying the themes which appear in troubadour love poetry. “Fluid family structure” has therefore served as part of the groundwork of Cheyette’s position, enabling him to reconsider much broader questions about medieval culture and society.

This dissertation will take a position similar to that of Althoff and Cheyette, namely that the notions of “fluid family structure” and “practical kinship” have been sufficiently well-demonstrated that they can now serve as the foundation for newer, more dynamic arguments. A quarter-century ago, Elizabeth Brown, in a now-famous article which appeared in the \textit{American Historical Review}, stated that the time had finally come to declare the “tyrant feudalism…once and for all deposed and its influence over students

\textsuperscript{71} Barbara Rosenwein is an American scholar who has taken an approach similar to Althoff’s. See especially her “The Family Politics of Berengar I, King of Italy (888-924),” \textit{Speculum} 71 (1996): 247-289.

\textsuperscript{72} Cheyette, \textit{Ermengard of Narbonne} and “Women, Poets, and Politics in Occitania,” in \textit{Aristocratic Women in Medieval France}, 138-177.
of the Middle Ages finally ended.”

The concept of family structure that Schmid and Duby have made a central part of social history admittedly has not had the pervasive influence that feudalism had over generations of medieval historians. Nevertheless, like feudalism, it has created a rigid framework for analysis and has shaped the majority of questions that historians have asked about medieval noble families. The time has come, therefore, to approach these families from new directions in an effort to illuminate aspects of medieval political and social history that were largely neglected while the model of family structure dominated the historiography.

Developing a fresh set of questions that will, in the course of a few hundred pages, dramatically transform prevailing theories about the medieval nobility is perhaps an overly ambitious goal for this dissertation. Therefore, I will focus here on a single facet of noble families, one which has often been ignored in the debates about family structure—but one which can provide important insights into the role of kinship bonds in medieval politics and society. Efforts to prove or disprove the significance of the lineage as an organizing principle for noble families have tended to overlook the personal relationships between relatives because the lineage is fundamentally diachronic rather than synchronic in nature. In other words, research related to the issue of family structure is concerned with extended periods of time, often several generations of the same noble family; shorter intervals of a few years or a decade are typically not emphasized in this type of research because lineal kinship structures are not as evident in such limited time periods. As a result, the personal interactions between people related by blood or marriage have not received very much attention in recent scholarship.

---

By studying narrower chronological periods and analyzing the evidence for family relationships, I will argue in this dissertation that the personal contacts between relatives can explain noblemen and noblewomen’s political strategies better than concepts of family structure can. Decisions relating to marriage alliances, inheritance practices and the exercise of territorial lordship all become clearer through the careful investigation of kin interactions. The differing contexts in which members of a kinship group appeared together—and the differing motivations for these personal contacts—reveal the networks of cooperation and support that were often critical to the survival and success of noble houses during the central Middle Ages.

II. Plan of the dissertation

This dissertation will concentrate on a single noble kinship group, the house of Andechs, as a case study for exploring questions about intra-familial relationships during the central Middle Ages. As the aforementioned image of Saint Hedwig of Silesia and her Andechs relatives in the Schlackenwerther Codex reveals, numerous members of this family acquired prominent secular and ecclesiastical lordships in central Europe over the course of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. I have therefore chosen the Andechs family as the focus of my research because the political success of the noble house has resulted in the survival of a rich source base for many Andechs men and women. A broad range of contemporary documents from the period 1100-1204 makes it possible to analyze the interactions between the relatives within the noble house. As will be shown, the networks of cooperation and support that connected kin inside the Andechs family were central to the rise of this noble house to the upper echelons of the nobility of the German empire.
German history and German historical traditions have not been at the forefront of modern approaches to the study of the Middle Ages since the early twentieth century. In recent decades, French and American scholars interested in family structure and influenced by Duby’s arguments have rarely made German noble lineages the focus of their research. Indeed, there are very few works concerning the imperial nobility written in any language other than German. The house of Andechs is therefore virtually unknown west of the Rhine River or on the opposite shores of the Atlantic. For this reason, Chapter Two provides an overview of the history and the historiography of the family.

In Part II of the dissertation, the focus shifts to the question of whether or not Andechs family relationships can be analyzed using the same methodologies and types of sources that have served as the foundation for the study of noble family structures during the last half-century. Monastic charters, a critical body of evidence for French and American scholars since the publication of Duby’s work on the Mâconnais, are examined in Chapter Three in order to determine if the groups of Andechs relatives who appear

---

74 For the lack of interest in medieval German history outside Germany in recent years, see Gerd Althoff, Johannes Fried, and Patrick J. Geary, “Introduction,” in Medieval Concepts of the Past, 1-9; Patrick J. Geary, Medieval Germany in America (Washington, D.C.: German Historical Institute, 1996) and Freed, “Medieval German Social History: Generalizations and Particularism.” Geary in his Medieval Germany in America estimated that, in 1995, there were no more than a half-dozen historians in the United States publishing works about medieval Germany.

75 One exception among American historians is John B. Freed. See especially his The Counts of Falkenstein. Among the French, Michel Parisse’s work on the Lorraine region has led him to explore several families along the French-German border. See his Noblesse et chevalerie en Lorraine médiévale.

76 The British scholarship on medieval German history spearheaded by Karl Leyser, Timothy Reuter and Benjamin Arnold has been one of the few historiographical traditions to show a consistently strong interest in the history of the German nobility outside German-speaking lands. See, for example, Leyser’s Rule and Conflict in an Early Medieval Society: Ottonian Saxony (Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1979) and Arnold’s Princes and Territories in Medieval Germany (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).
together in these sources reveal more about the interests of the family or of the religious communities that wrote and preserved the texts. Chapter Four has as its focal point the twelfth- and thirteenth-century archival materials that survive from Diessen, the most important monastery for the Andechses. Modern German studies of noble self-consciousness rely heavily on necrologies, family histories and other evidence from religious communities that had strong ties to a noble house; analysis of the Diessen sources offers the opportunity to explore the extent to which the monastery’s image of the house of Andechs can be used to understand how the Andechses constructed their own networks of cooperation and support.

Part III suggests a series of possible new directions for research into noble families. By dividing the house of Andechs into three distinct subgroups, the chapters in this section aim to demonstrate how different sets of relatives interacted with one another over the course of the twelfth century. Chapter Five argues that succession and inheritance inside a lineage are best understood by analyzing the surviving sources that reveal contacts between a father and his sons. The family relationships of those members of the house of Andechs who entered the Church are the focus of Chapter Six, for ecclesiastical lords remained much more actively involved in their noble house’s affairs than most historians recognize. Lastly, Chapter Seven attempts to integrate Andechs noblewomen into the family by considering the potential roles women could play in political networks as mothers, wives, sisters and daughters.

In the closing part of the dissertation, entitled “Synthesis,” the complete Andechs kinship network, which was divided into various subgroups in Part III, is reconstituted. The aim of Chapter Eight is to explain, by progressing chronologically through the
twelfth century, how family relationships affected the political strategies of Andechs
noblemen and noblewomen. Through this approach, the advantages of analyzing kin
interactions become clear, for new perspectives emerge on such issues as succession, the
exercise of territorial lordship and the arranging of marriage alliances. Finally, in the
Conclusions, the broader implications of this case study are considered; after identifying
the ways in which the house of Andechs can serve as a model for examining other noble
families, this dissertation ends by suggesting fresh directions in noble studies for the
twenty-first century.
CHAPTER TWO

THE HOUSE OF ANDECHS IN THE CENTRAL MIDDLE AGES:
HISTORY & HISTORIOGRAPHY

Today, a noble lineage from the central Middle Ages is not the principal reason why the place-name Andechs is known in Germany. Approximately one million tourists visit this township southwest of Munich each year because the Benedictine monastery there—which was founded in the fifteenth century more than two hundred years after the noble house became extinct—includes a brewery that many consider one of the best in Bavaria. Even the monks concede that the thousands of people who make pilgrimages to Andechs each weekend and holiday do not always do so for religious reasons. As the monastery’s prior noted in a 1998 publication, “Monastery and beer: no one can think about one without the other.”

Not surprisingly, the memory of the noble house of

---

1 Throughout this dissertation, I will use the term “house of Andechs” to refer to the family that is the subject of this study. In the modern literature, scholars have used a variety of hyphenated names to identify the noble house because of the many different lordships controlled by the lineage. “House of Andechs-Diessen” and “the Andechs-Meranier” are two other popular names for the family. But for the sake of convenience and simplicity, I will only employ “house of Andechs”—though I recognize that the name is not an ideal one because the title “count of Andechs” was not the only title used by the family’s secular lords between 1100 and 1204. For the family members whom I include in this noble house, see Figure I. As I have noted in Chapter One, it is not always easy to define who belonged to any given noble family in the Middle Ages, so the depiction of the house of Andechs in Figure I is meant to be a convenience to my readers rather than a rigid representation of this family.

2 P. Anselm Bilgri, O.S.B., Peter K. Kohler and Birgit Adam, Geheimnisse der Klosterbrauerei (Augsburg: Sankt Ulrich Verlag, 1998), 15. The figure of one million visitors per year is taken from the same page as well.
Andechs has fared poorly competing against this powerful combination of God and alcohol. Nevertheless, as this chapter will show, there are numerous reasons why the Andechses are an excellent family to use as a case study for answering broader questions about the importance of kin relationships in medieval European noble society.

I. A brief history of the house of Andechs

In 1993, an exhibition held at the monastery of Andechs sought to ignite the German public’s interest in the medieval family that had first made Andechs historically significant by constructing a castle there around the year 1100. Visitors had the opportunity to view a variety of original twelfth- and thirteenth-century documents, wax seals, coins and other artifacts connected to the noble house. In conjunction with the exhibition, the organizers published a catalogue richly illustrated with maps and photographs.³ Alois Schütz, a professor at the University of Munich, contributed to this work, writing a detailed article on the Andechs family’s history.⁴ The Minister-President of Bavaria, Edmund Stoiber, included a brief Preface. He summarized succinctly the reasons for the exhibition:

One expects from a good historical exhibition that it will raise awareness among the broader public of generally unknown events from the past. The political weight that the Bavarian lineage of the Andechs-Meranier was able to bring to bear in the struggle against other dynasties for power and influence has been obscured in many ways by the suggestive effect of those powers who were ultimately more successful….Nevertheless, we are thankful today for the spiritual and political web that it [the house of Andechs] constructed—and into which it


was woven. The mobilization of such historical networks will make it easier for us and for our neighbors to build a Europe that will be fair to the diversity and to the unique natures of its members.5

There is perhaps a trace of a politician’s hyperbole in these remarks. Nevertheless, Stoiber correctly observes that the lack of interest the modern world has shown in the house of Andechs must not lead people to overlook the significance of this family during the central Middle Ages.

From roughly 1100 to 1250, the Andechses were one of the most important noble houses in the southeastern regions of the German empire.6 Sources from the duchy of Bavaria first begin to mention a previously unknown Count Berthold during the opening years of the twelfth century.7 Berthold is most often identified in these texts by the cognomen “de Andechs,” which had not been applied to any prominent Bavarian nobleman prior to that time.8 As a result, historians have labeled this Count Berthold I of

5 Herzöge und Heilige, 5.

6 I will use the term “German empire” in this dissertation to refer to what would, in later centuries, be called the Holy Roman Empire. Unfortunately, there is no twelfth-century term that properly defines the German polity in a way that modern people find useful. While many historians simply refer to the region as “Germany” or the “kingdom of Germany”, I am reluctant to do so in this dissertation. As will be discussed below, the house of Andechs possessed lordships in regions that today belong not only to Germany but also to Italy, France, Austria, Slovenia and Croatia. Thus, my use of the term “German empire” is intended to capture the geographical extent of the entire polity that was, at least in theory, controlled by the German kings/emperors of the twelfth century.


8 The only earlier reference to Andechs of which I am aware is an “Otwin de Anadehsa” in the witness list of Tr. Tegernsee, 63-65, no. 82 from around the year 1068. Otwin was likely a ministerial of the monastery of Tegernsee, or perhaps a minor nobleman (unrelated to the later house of Andechs).
Andechs (ca. 1100-1151) as the founder of a new, self-consciously distinct lineage similar to the ones Karl Schmid has analyzed in the duchy of Swabia. With Berthold, therefore, the history of the house of Andechs can be said to begin.

This is not to suggest that Count Berthold I was the first member of his kinship group to be an influential noble; he undoubtedly came from a family that was already well-established in the south of the German empire before 1100. Nevertheless, beginning in the 1120s, Berthold I emerged as a powerful ruler in his own right. He laid the foundation for the future success of his lineage by marrying well, fathering numerous children, and establishing strong ties with many other secular and ecclesiastical lords in and around Bavaria. His son and successor Count Berthold II of Andechs (1151-1188) continued to strengthen the noble house’s political position within the empire. Throughout Berthold II’s career, he was a loyal supporter of Emperor Frederick I Barbarossa (1152-1190). The count’s close connection to the German ruler even helped

---

9 For Schmid’s arguments about lineages, see Chapter One. The house of Andechs was one of many noble houses to develop in Bavaria around the year 1100: see Friedrich Prinz, “Bayerns Adel im Hochmittelalter,” ZBLG 30 (1967): 53-117. Despite the fact that this Berthold was the first member of the kinship group named after the castle of Andechs, historians traditionally designate him Berthold II because he had an eleventh-century ancestor named Berthold (see Appendix One). I have chosen to name him Berthold I for the sake of convenience, though I recognize this may cause some confusion for my readers who are familiar with the German literature on the Andechses.

10 The count’s ancestry is discussed in Appendix One.

11 The overview of the house of Andechs provided in the following few pages is intended only to be a brief introduction to the family. I will go into more detail about the family’s history and historiography throughout the remainder of this chapter. Moreover, I will indicate in the footnotes which issues will be discussed in later chapters.

12 Berthold II witnessed almost fifty charters of Frederick I between 1152 and 1188. A list of many of his appearances is provided in Alheydis Plassmann, Die Struktur des Hofes unter Friedrich I. Barbarossa nach den deutschen Zeugen seiner Urkunden (Hanover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1998), 77-79.
him to obtain the title of margrave of Istria in 1173. While the title does not appear to have brought him significant properties on the Istrian peninsula in modern Croatia, it did elevate Berthold II above the status of the average count. Seven years later in 1180, Margrave Berthold’s son Berthold III was named duke of Merania after a region of the Adriatic coast south of the march of Istria. Again, the title did not provide the lineage with a new center of lordship; the duchy was essentially a titular one, since the Byzantine emperors and the kings of Hungary also claimed ownership of this region of Dalmatia. But with this enfeoffment, the noble house became one of the few families to have a member who belonged to the newly-crystallizing Reichsfürstenstand, or estate of imperial princes.

Duke Berthold III of Merania (1188-1204) was one of the leading nobles in the empire during the later twelfth century and was a key figure in the German contingent

---

13 Berthold II is first identified as Marchio Istriae in a charter of the patriarch of Aquileia dated 5 January 1174. See the Urkundenbuch des Herzogthums Steiermark [hereafter UB Steiermark], ed. J. v. Zahn (Graz: Verlag des Historischen Vereins für Steiermark, 1875), 1:525-526, no. 554. The previous margrave of Istria, Engelbert III of Spanheim, is known to have died in 1173. Berthold II’s acquisition of the title is connected to his support of Barbarossa as well as the fact that his mother was an heiress to an earlier margrave of Istria (see Chapter Seven).

14 Berthold II is not named in a single source from Istria during his career. For more on the history of the region, see Heinrich Schmidinger, Patriarch und Landesherr: Die weltliche Herrschaft der Patriarchen von Aquileja bis zum Ende der Stauffer (Graz and Cologne: Verlag Hermann Böhlau Nachf., 1954), 67-73.

15 The term Merania has caused much confusion over the centuries. Many academics and non-academics have assumed that the term refers to the town of Meran in northern Italy just west of Bolzano/Bozen. This is, however, not the case. For the literature that has demonstrated convincingly Merania’s location on the Adriatic coast, see note 74 below.

16 Throughout the later twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, the royal and imperial chanceries consistently used the title dux Meraniae for Berthold III and his successors. However, in a charter of Berthold III drawn up on 9 January 1181, Berthold III appears with the title dux Dalmacie. See Monumenta Boica [hereafter MB], ed. Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften (Munich, 1765), 4:139-140, no. 10. Berthold III seems to have preferred this title “duke of Dalmatia” until the late 1190s, when he began to appear in all sources with the title “duke of Merania.”

17 For more on the title of duke of Merania in the context of imperial politics, see note 37 below.
that took part in the Third Crusade.\textsuperscript{18} He also played an active role in imperial politics during the period of crisis following the death of Emperor Henry VI in 1197.\textsuperscript{19}

Throughout his career, Berthold III continued his father’s and grandfather’s efforts to increase the influence of the house of Andechs. His third-born son Ekbert was elected bishop of Bamberg in 1203. He married one of his daughters to King Philip II Augustus of France and another to the future King Andreas II of Hungary. A third daughter married the Polish duke Henry of Silesia. Because of Berthold III’s numerous successes, historians have often viewed the decade and a half preceding his death as the pinnacle of his lineage’s power.\textsuperscript{20}

Another reason why modern scholars have looked back on the duke’s later years as the golden age of the house of Andechs is that the family entered a period of crisis soon after his career ended. When he died in 1204, his two oldest sons Otto († 1234) and Henry († 1228) divided the patrimony, with Otto becoming duke of Merania and Henry margrave of Istria. Four years later, the house of Andechs achieved one of its greatest successes and suffered one of its worst setbacks on the same day. On 21 June 1208, Duke Otto I of Merania married Beatrice, the heiress to the county-palatine of Burgundy and a granddaughter of Emperor Frederick I. One of the people present in Bamberg for

---

\textsuperscript{18} The sources detailing Berthold III’s involvement in the crusade are very good. See especially the \textit{Historia de Expeditione Friderici Imperatoris (Der sogenannte Ansbert)}, in \textit{Quellen zur Geschichte des Kreuzzuges Kaiser Friedrichs I.}, ed. A. Chroust, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum [hereafter MGH SSrG], New Series, vol. 5 (Berlin, 1928; reprint, 1964), 1-115 and \textit{Chronicon Magni Presbiteri}, ed. Wilhelm Wattenbach, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores [hereafter MGH SS], vol. 17 (Hanover, 1861), 509-516.

\textsuperscript{19} Duke Berthold III was a loyal supporter of King Philip of Swabia throughout the early years of Philip’s clashes with King Otto IV of Brunswick. He is named as one of Philip’s key allies in several of the diplomatic exchanges between Pope Innocent III and the rival kings. See, for example, \textit{Regestum Innocentii III papae super negotio Romani imperii}, ed. Friedrich Kempf, Miscellanea Historiae Pontificiae, vol. 12 (Rome: Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1947), 33-38, no. 14; 54-59, no. 20; 162-166, no. 61; and 253-255, no. 98.

the wedding ceremony was Barbarossa’s son King Philip of Swabia—a clear indication of the significance of this marriage for imperial politics. But only a few hours after Otto and Beatrice were married, Philip was assassinated. Margrave Henry of Istria and his younger brother Bishop Ekbert of Bamberg were both implicated in the murder and fled to Hungary, where their sister was queen. As a result of the murder, Henry had the title of margrave of Istria stripped and lost many of his lands in the empire.  

This political crisis, which significantly reduced the territorial strength of the house of Andechs, was followed by a dynastic crisis, for Duke Otto I of Merania and his brother Margrave Henry of Istria both had trouble producing heirs. Henry died childless in 1228. Otto had five daughters before his wife Beatrice finally provided him with a son in the mid-1220s after more than fifteen years of marriage. When Duke Otto I died in 1234, this son Otto II was still a minor, leading to a further deterioration of the family’s power in the empire. The young Duke Otto II of Merania made the situation worse a few years later; upon reaching the age of majority in the late 1230s, he began an ill-advised war against the duke of Bavaria. Throughout the early and mid-1240s, Otto II steadily lost ground in the conflict. In 1246, the castle of Andechs was captured and destroyed. Only two years later in 1248, Duke Otto II of Merania died without any children. When his paternal uncle Patriarch Berthold of Aquileia, the youngest son of Duke Berthold III

---


22 An account of the war has been preserved in the *Annales Scheftlarienses Maiores*, ed. Philip Jaffé, MGH SS 17, 341-343.
of Merania, died in 1251, the house of Andechs became extinct in the male line (see Figure 2.1).

![Diagram of the Andechs lineage]

This noble lineage disappeared in the mid-thirteenth century with surprising suddenness. Despite the events of 1208, the house of Andechs had maintained a vibrant and extensive kinship network during the 1210s and 1220s. As late as 1231/1232, Duke Otto I of Merania and his brothers Bishop Ekbert of Bamberg and Patriarch Berthold of Aquileia were three of the leading lords in the empire.\(^2\) The noble house had been

\(^2\) All three were present together at the court of Emperor Frederick II in Italy for approximately six months between December of 1231 and May of 1232. Duke Otto I and Patriarch Berthold also were prominent figures in the negotiations surrounding the treaty of San Germano in 1230. See *Die Aktenstücke*
accustomed to similar situations throughout much of its existence, for the heads of the lineage had consistently fathered an abundance of male and female children. Every generation of the family born during the twelfth century included at least six men and women who survived to adulthood and who played important roles in regional, imperial, and sometimes even European politics. After 1251, however, no direct male descendant of Count Berthold I of Andechs remained alive.\textsuperscript{24}

\textbf{II. Historiographical considerations}

Between the year 1100 and the extinction of the house of Andechs in the mid-thirteenth century, the members of this family included three dukes, two margraves, three bishops, a patriarch, four abbesses, and numerous women who married counts, dukes and kings. The Andechses were unquestionably one of the most prominent families in the German empire during this period. Nevertheless, even among historians, the house of Andechs remains relatively unknown and understudied. The only member of the family to receive significant attention from a broad range of scholars is Duke Berthold III of Merania’s daughter Duchess Hedwig of Silesia, who was canonized in 1267, and it is her sanctity rather than her family connections that has attracted the most interest.\textsuperscript{25} Indeed,


\textsuperscript{24} For the surprising number of extinctions of south German noble houses during the first half of the thirteenth century, see John B. Freed, \textit{The Counts of Falkenstein: Noble Self-Consciousness in Twelfth-Century Germany} (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1984), 62-67.

while the exhibition held at the monastery of Andechs in 1993 was intended to inform the
general public about this powerful family, it also unintentionally highlighted the dearth of
academic research that has been devoted to the noble house as a whole. The article by
Alois Schütz published in the exhibition’s catalogue book is the lengthiest and most
detailed history of the Andechs to appear since the 1800s.26

The majority of general histories of the family date from the late eighteenth and
eyearly nineteenth centuries.27 Edmund Oefele’s 1877 Geschichte der Grafen von Andechs
remains the most important work on the family more than a century and a quarter after its
publication.28 In a 1956 article, Karl Hartmann lamented that no recent historian had
focused on the family, yet Hartmann had no intention of being that historian; the stated
goal of his article was to inspire someone else to write a history of the house of
Andechs.29 His call to arms has gone largely unheard. A decade after his article
appeared, Karl Bosl wrote a broad overview of the family’s international connections, but
this thirty-page article only scratches the surface of the Andechses’ extensive European

26 The only true monograph concerning the history of the house of Andechs published in the
twentieth century is Georg Herlitz, Geschichte der Herzöge von Meran aus dem Hause Andechs (Halle:
Julius Herwitz, 1909). Even it is only ninety-four pages in length and discusses only the three dukes of
Merania from the lineage.

27 See, for example, Joseph von Hormayr, Versuch einer pragmatischen Geschichte der Grafen
von Andechs nachherigen Herzoge von Meran (Innsbruck, 1797); Johann Adolph von Schultes,
Diplomatische Beyträge zur Geschichte der Grafen von Andechs und nachherigen Herzöge von Meran,
Histor. Abhandlungen der kgl. bayr. Akademie der Wissenschaften, vol. 4 (Munich, 1818); and Paul
Oesterreicher, “Beiträge zur Geschichte der Grafen von Andechs, nachmaligen Herzoge von Meran,” Die

28 Edmund Freiherr von Oefele, Geschichte der Grafen von Andechs (Innsbruck: Verlag der
Wagner’schen Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1877). This work will hereafter be cited as Oefele.

political interests and networks. Even Alois Schütz’s 1993 article is more a narrative history than a careful study of the house of Andechs’s significance for the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. In short, no one has attempted to immerse himself or herself in the intricate details of the family’s history since Oefele in 1877.

Academic disinterest in the house of Andechs has manifested itself in additional ways. For example, recent general histories of the empire in the central Middle Ages have focused more on other twelfth- and thirteenth-century noble dynasties like the Welfs, Babenbergs and Wittelsbachs—though the Andechs were arguably just as significant. German dissertations have been published during the last decade on such contemporary lineages as the Wettins, Brunonids and Zähringens, yet the most recent doctoral dissertation written about the Andechses was completed at Vienna in 1965—and remains unpublished. Furthermore, works concerning such important topics in the historiography as the concept of noble self-consciousness and the emergence of territorial


31 See, for example, Alfred Haverkamp, Medieval Germany 1056-1273, trans. Helga Braun and Richard Mortimer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988); Horst Fuhrmann, Germany in the High Middle Ages c. 1050-1200, trans. Timothy Reuter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986); and Benjamin Arnold, Medieval Germany, 500-1300: A Political Interpretation (Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1997).

32 Stefan Pätzold, Die frühen Wettiner. Adelsfamilie und Hausüberlieferung bis 1221 (Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 1997).


34 Ulrich Parlow, Die Zähringer: Kommentierte Quellendokumentationen zu einem südwestdeutschen Herzogsgeschlecht des hohen Mittelalters (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1999).

lordships have dedicated relatively little attention to the family. The scholarly debate surrounding the origins of the Reichsfürstenstand is one of the few places in the literature where the house of Andechs is regularly discussed; Berthold II’s acquisition of the march of Istria in 1173 and Berthold III’s acquisition of the duchy of Merania in 1180 have been viewed by many historians as key pieces of evidence for Emperor Frederick I’s establishment of the estate of imperial princes.

Why has the family, despite its prominence during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, remained outside the mainstream of imperial history? The extinction of the noble house in 1248 is one factor. Viewed from a broad perspective, the Andechses survived as a lineage for only five generations during the central Middle Ages, and this relatively brief stay on the historical stage has diminished the family’s reputation over the centuries. Contemporary noble houses like the Wittelsbachs, Welfs and Habsburgs have been the focus of significantly more scholarly attention because they continued to be prominent families into the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. However, this point is not sufficient to explain fully historians’ lack of interest in the Andechses. Other

---

36 For a detailed consideration of the literature on noble self-consciousness, see Chapter Four. Studies of territorial lordship that have surprisingly little to say about the house of Andechs include Benjamin Arnold, Princes and Territories in Medieval Germany (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991) and Ernst Klebel, “Vom Herzogtum zum Territorium,” in Aus Verfassungs- und Landesgeschichte. Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstag von Theodor Mayer (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1954; reprint, 1973), 1:205-222.

relatively short-lived lineages from the south of the empire that became extinct in the thirteenth century, most notably the Zähringen dukes in Swabia and the Babenberg margraves/dukes of Austria, have been the subject of numerous books and articles in recent years. Thus, it appears that deeper historical and historiographical issues lie at the heart of the family’s obscurity.

I would argue that the principal reason why the house of Andechs remains understudied is that the family was a victim of its own success. Throughout the twelfth century, the Andechs expanded their power and influence across a broad swath of central Europe. When Duke Berthold III of Merania died in 1204, he left behind an impressive patrimony to be divided among his sons. He possessed extensive properties and rights in numerous regions of the German empire, including Franconia in the vicinity of the Main River valley; eastern and western sections of the duchy of Bavaria; Tyrol both north and south of the Brenner pass; and Carniola in the northern Balkans. Furthermore, as duke of Merania and margrave of Istria, he had titular authority over portions of the eastern Adriatic coast. The regions where Duke Berthold III controlled lordships are divided today among five nations: Germany, Austria, Italy, Slovenia and Croatia (see Figure 2.2). When his son Duke Otto I of Merania married the heiress to the county-palatine of Burgundy in 1208, the noble house even extended its territorial holdings into what is now France.

Figure 2.2. Map of modern Europe showing regions of Andechs lordship, ca. 1200
Such a geographically diverse collection of lordships has created difficulties for how modern historians have researched and discussed the family. John Freed has noted in a recent article that “particularism” is one of the defining features of the field of medieval social history inside Germany.\(^3\) Broad studies of society and culture across the entire medieval empire are rare, while narrower works based on smaller geographical areas are more common. For this reason, Landesgeschichte, or regional history, is the framework in which most research into noble families has been conducted. Regional journals—such as the Zeitschrift für bayerische Landesgeschichte, Zeitschrift für Geschichte des Oberrheins and Archiv für Geschichte von Oberfranken—are where many studies of the nobility can be found. Not surprisingly, the articles in these journals rarely look beyond the regional level in their analysis of history. If historians do study the nobility in a context other than Landesgeschichte, they typically turn in the opposite direction from trans-regionalism toward even more extreme types of local history. Heimatsforschung, or research into one’s own home, is a popular historiographical approach within Germany that often focuses on the role a noble family played in the history of a single town or district.\(^4\)

The dominance of the German traditions of Landesgeschichte and Heimatsforschung has meant that the majority of medieval noble families are often viewed as local and regional—rather than imperial—entities. In the case of the house of

---


Andechs, this creates problems because the family’s lordships crossed various territorial boundaries inside Germany. More importantly, many of their lordships also crossed modern linguistic, ethnic and national borders. Since the beginning of the academic discipline of history in the nineteenth century, nationalism has been a powerful force in shaping how the Middle Ages has been studied in Europe. Historians have typically researched the history of their own countries—despite the fact that their countries may not have even existed in the Middle Ages. This strong sense of nationalism has further helped to create a fragmented historiography of the Andechs family. No one group of historians—inside or outside Germany—has shown an interest in writing a comprehensive history of the house of Andechs because the family belongs to no one nation or state. Scholars have instead generally focused on the house’s involvement in their own country or their own particular region of expertise. As a result, the modern scholarship on the Andechs does not present one overarching macro-history of the house of Andechs but many different micro-histories. Andechs historiography can only be understood by surveying the literature region by region.

III. The territorial lordships of the house of Andechs to 1204

The castle and county of Andechs—as well as many of the other properties and rights controlled by the Andechs lineage in the twelfth century—lay in what many people

---

41 It is in this way that the house of Andechs is different from similar noble houses like the house of Zähringen. The Zähringens are clearly viewed as being central to the study of Swabian history in the twelfth century. As a result, historians at the University of Freiburg have focused on this family since the early 1900s. The Andechs, however, have no one place that is recognized as the noble house’s true homeland. Though Bavaria comes closest to fulfilling this function for many historians, the Wittelsbachs are the great Bavarian dynasty of the central Middle Ages in the opinion of most people.

today know as Old Bavaria (*Altbayern*). The term refers to the region that has always been part of Bavaria, from the early Middle Ages to the present.\(^\text{43}\) Even now, the people of this area are proud of the unique culture of Old Bavaria and of the traditionally influential position their land has enjoyed in central European history. As a result, Bavarian *Landesgeschichte* has been an especially vibrant field since the nineteenth century. Because Bavarian scholars recognize the house of Andechs as a native noble lineage, whose roots in the region extend back before Count Berthold I into the tenth and eleventh centuries, the noble house is considered an appropriate subject of study in Bavarian historiographical traditions. The literature on the family’s involvement in this region’s history is therefore rich.

Bavarian scholars have shown interest in a broad range of different issues concerning the noble house. Various historians have, for example, attempted to connect the twelfth-century Andechses genealogically back to an array of pre-1100 leaders of the Bavarian nobility.\(^\text{44}\) Prominent members of the family whose careers have in some way

\(^{43}\) Between Bavaria’s first appearance in the sources in the sixth century and the Napoleonic wars of the early nineteenth century, the borders of the Bavarian principality underwent numerous transformations. During the central Middle Ages, much of what is now the country of Austria was separated from the duchy of Bavaria in a series of territorial divisions. Several centuries later, as a result of the *Reichsdeputations-hauptschluss* of 1803, Bavaria gained new territories to which it had never had a prior claim; Franconia (including the dioceses of Würzburg, Bamberg and Eichstätt) and sections of Swabia (including the western portions of the diocese of Augsburg) were grafted on to Bavaria, becoming part of first the kingdom of Bavaria and, after 1918, of the German state of the same name. These new regions, which had developed their own distinctive identities during the medieval and early modern periods, have remained culturally separate from the rest of Bavaria in many ways. For this reason, *Altbayern* is a term that is often used to distinguish between the older and the newer parts of Bavaria.

brought glory to Bavaria have been popular subjects of books and articles as well. But the most intense research on the family has concerned the lineage’s territorial lordships within Old Bavaria. The **Altbayern** section of the *Historischer Atlas von Bayern* as well as numerous other works provide detailed information about the family’s Bavarian rights and territories. What has emerged from this body of literature is a clear understanding of the extent of Andechs power inside Bavaria.

One of the keys to the noble house’s position throughout the twelfth century was the comital authority it possessed in Upper Bavaria (**Oberbayern**), in the region around the castle of Andechs (See Figure 2.3). Between the Lech River in the west and the Starnberger Lake in the east, Count Berthold I of Andechs and his successors controlled an extensive network of ministerials and allodial properties. With the foundation and endowment of a new house of Augustinian canons at Diessen on Ammer Lake in the mid-1110s, Berthold I provided for his family a burial site and religious center to

---


46 The *Historischer Atlas von Bayern* also includes series on Franconia and Swabia, but the section on **Altbayern** is by far the most complete. Doctoral candidates at the University of Munich have been writing dissertations on various regions of *Altbayern* and then having those dissertations published as part of the *Historischer Atlas* for the last several decades.

Figure 2.3. Upper Bavaria in the 12th Century

complement the lineage’s military base at Andechs.\textsuperscript{48} One of the Andechses’ most important rights in Upper Bavaria was their possession of the office of advocate for the monastery of Benediktbeuern.\textsuperscript{49} As the secular authority on Benediktbeuern’s properties,


Berthold I and his heirs were able to increase significantly their power and influence in the southeastern regions of the German empire.\(^{50}\)

In 1157, Count Berthold II of Andechs acquired the lordships of his distant relative Count Henry of Wolfratshausen, who died childless that year. The county of Wolfratshausen was located just to the east of the county of Andechs and extended from the Starnberger Lake in the west across the Isar River in the east.\(^{51}\) Besides bringing the house of Andechs more properties and ministerials in Upper Bavaria, this inheritance also gave the lineage possession of the castle of Wolfratshausen, one of the most impregnable castles in the whole duchy.\(^{52}\) Just as significantly, Count Berthold II also obtained from Count Henry the advocacy for the imperial monastery of Tegernsee; along with Benediktbeuern, this religious community was one of the wealthiest in Bavaria.\(^{53}\) Berthold II expanded his position in the duchy even further only a year later in 1158, when Count Ekbert III of Neuburg from the noble house of Vornbach died childless while in Italy with Emperor Frederick I. One of the principal inheritors of Ekbert’s lands

---


\(^{52}\) For the difficulty the duke of Bavaria had taking this castle during the war of the late 1230s and early 1240s, see the *Annales Scheffilarienses Maiores*, 341-343 and Egon Boshof, “Bayern und Österreich in der Schlussphase der Herrschaft Friedrichs II,” ZBLG 63 (2000): 439.

and rights was the count of Andechs, who through this inheritance acquired important interests in Lower Bavaria (*Niederbayern*), the eastern portions of the duchy (See Figure 2.4). Berthold II inherited two counties that straddled the Inn River just to the south of Passau. The county and castle of Neuburg lay on the western side of the Inn, and the county of Viechtenstein was located just across the river in what is today Austria. As Ekbert’s heir, Berthold also became advocate for the monastery of Vornbach. By 1160, Count Berthold II had thus emerged as one of the foremost noblemen in Bavaria; the only serious rivals to his power in the duchy were the dukes themselves.

The Bavarian historians who have provided such a detailed depiction of the role played by the house of Andechs inside Bavaria have rarely looked beyond the confines of *Altbayern* in their studies of the family’s politics and lordship. Indeed, during the last century and a half, the modern border between Bavaria and Austria has developed into a remarkably rigid dividing line for scholars conducting research on the noble house. When Count Berthold II of Andechs inherited the lands and rights of Count Henry of Wolfratshausen in 1157, he acquired significant properties in northern Tyrol in the Inn River valley. Two decades later in 1180, Berthold II and his son Berthold III founded the town of Innsbruck as a new focal point of these northern Tyrolean lands. Bavarian historians have had little to say about any of this; it is historians working and publishing

---


in Austria who have most extensively researched Andechs interests in Tyrol. Similarly, the properties Berthold II inherited from Count Ekbert III of Neuburg in modern Austria have not received as much attention from Bavarian scholars as the properties Ekbert left to Berthold II in Old Bavaria. Even those territories in Austria—especially in the duchy

---


57 See especially Holzfurtner, Die Grafschaft der Andechser. He discusses every one of the house of Andechs’s comital lordships inside Bavaria extensively but dedicates only one paragraph to the county of Viechentstein just across the Inn River in Austria (279).
of Carinthia—that were controlled by the house of Andechs since the beginning of Count Berthold I’s career around 1100 have not attracted the interest of Bavarian historians. Instead, it has been Austrian scholars who have offered the most detailed studies of these properties. This has made the history of the Andechses’ Austrian lordships appear in many ways to be separate from the history of the family’s lordships in *Altbayern*.\textsuperscript{58}

The effects that regional and national historiographical traditions have had on the fragmentation of Andechs history become even clearer when the family’s involvement in Franconia is considered. More than five hundred years after the extinction of the Andechs lineage, in 1803, Franconia was ceded to Bavaria during the reorganization of the Holy Roman Empire.\textsuperscript{59} Today the region is the northernmost part of the German federal state of Bavaria. However, because Franconia was not traditionally attached to Bavaria—and is therefore not part of *Altbayern*—the historiography of the region has remained largely isolated from the historiography of the rest of Bavaria. As a result, throughout the nineteenth and much of the twentieth centuries, few works were published that analyzed the role played by the house of Andechs in both regions. Alois Schütz’s 1993 article for the Andechs exhibition book was one of the first articles to dedicate significant attention to the history of the house of Andechs in Bavaria and Franconia. Only in 1998, when an exhibition on the Andechses was held in the Franconian town of Bamberg, did the family’s involvement in Franconian history begin to be more fully

\textsuperscript{58} For example, although Count Berthold I of Andechs unquestionably inherited territories at Moosburg in Carinthia and in the Möll River valley from his eleventh-century ancestors, it is two Austrian scholars who have demonstrated the broader significance of these property holdings. See Heinz Dopsch and Therese Meyer, “Von Bayern nach Friau: Zur Herkunft der Grafen von Görz und ihren Anfängen in Kärnten und Friau, Krain und Istrien,” ZBLG 65 (2002): 300-301. In general, Austrian scholars have understood better than Bavarian ones the important genealogical connections the house of Andechs had to families whose lordships lay in what is today Austria.

\textsuperscript{59} See note 43 above.
integrated into the family’s broader history. The catalogue published in conjunction with the exhibition includes articles by numerous scholars who sought to explore a range of different aspects of the family’s history—both inside and outside Franconia.\textsuperscript{60} Prior to the Bamberg exhibition, Bavarian historians had virtually ignored the Franconian aspects of Andechs history, while historians working in Franconia had mainly focused only on the family’s involvement in their own region.

Scholars interested in the Franconian affairs of the house of Andechs have, like Bavarian scholars, generally focused on issues of territorial lordship. Count Berthold I of Andechs received in the early twelfth century as part of his inheritance various allods in Upper Franconia (\textit{Oberfranken}) within the diocese of Bamberg (See Figure 2.5).\textsuperscript{61} During the early years of his career, the count seems to have shown little interest in these Franconian lands and rights. Then, in 1135, Berthold I appeared for the first time in a source from this region; he is identified in the witness list of a charter of Bishop Otto I of Bamberg (1102-1139) as “count of Plassenburg,” a title he took from a castle near the town of Kulmbach.\textsuperscript{62} This castle was the earliest center of Andechs power in Franconia and was located within one of the family’s most important blocs of allodial properties in the region. However, Plassenburg was not the seat of a comital lordship, and there is no evidence to suggest Count Berthold I possessed any comital rights in Franconia during

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}

\item For the origins of these property rights, see Appendix One.

\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
In this period, the house of Andechs was therefore not as significant a force in Franconian politics as it was in Bavarian politics.

The relatively weak foundation for Andechs lordship in Upper Franconia quickly grew stronger, however. Soon after the year 1135, Count Berthold I’s eldest son Poppo

---

was married to Kunizza, the heiress to the Franconian Count Reginboto of Giech. The castle of Giech, which lay just to the east of the town of Bamberg, as well as the castle of Lichtenfels on the Main River, were the key properties that Kunizza brought Poppo from her father’s inheritance. This marriage thus dramatically improved the territorial position of the house of Andechs in Upper Franconia. But the sudden increase in the power and influence of the Andechses in the region made the bishops of Bamberg uncomfortable. While the family’s territorial possessions around Plassenburg were not a threat to the bishops, the same could not be said for the lands acquired through Kunizza; Giech and Lichtenfels guarded two routes that led from the town of Bamberg to many of the bishopric’s other properties in Upper Franconia. As a result, Bishop Egilbert of Bamberg (1139-1146) arranged for the dissolution of the marriage in 1142, and conflict soon erupted between the house of Andechs and the church of Bamberg.\(^6\)

An 1143 treaty between Count Poppo and Bishop Egilbert brought an end to the initial phase of the dispute. Following Poppo’s death in 1148 on the Second Crusade, his younger brother Count Berthold II of Andechs completed a new treaty with Bishop Eberhard II of Bamberg (1146-1170) in 1149.\(^5\) A period of stability ensued in which the house of Andechs firmly established control over its ministerials, rights and properties in the region.\(^6\) Then, in 1177, Count Berthold II’s only surviving brother Otto was elected

\(^6\) For a much more detailed discussion of the marriage of Poppo and Kunizza, its dissolution, and its significance, see Chapter Five.

\(^5\) Schütz, “Die Andechs-Meranier in Franken,” 14-19. Also see Chapter Five.

bishop of Bamberg. During the first half of the thirteenth century, he was followed on
the episcopal throne by two more Andechs churchmen, Ekbert (1203-1237) and Poppo
(1237-1242). By gaining control of the bishopric, the house of Andechs was able to
become the dominant force in the politics of Upper Franconia. Not until the final years
of Duke Otto II of Merania’s life would the conflict between the house of Andechs and
the church of Bamberg resume.

While the origins of Andechs territorial lordship have been the focus of much of
the work on the family done by Franconian historians, research has also centered on a
range of other issues concerning the noble house’s role in the region’s history. Scholars
have, for example, discussed Andechs involvement in settling the easternmost parts of
Franconia and in founding towns (especially Kulmbach and Bayreuth) and endowing
monasteries (including Langheim and Banz) in the region. Other research has centered
on the three bishops of Bamberg from the house of Andechs, especially Bishop Ekbert,
under whom the cathedral at Bamberg was rebuilt. Because Duke Otto II of Merania,

---

67 See especially Ansgar Frenken, “Hausmachtpolitik und Bischofsstuhl. Die Andechs-Meranier
als oberfränkische Territorialherren und Bischofe von Bamberg,” ZBLG 63 (2000): 711-786; Otto Meyer,
Oberfranken im Hochmittelalter. Politik—Kultur—Gesellschaft (Bayreuth: Oberfranken-Stiftung, 1973;
reprint, 1987), 135-169; and Erich Freiherr von Guttenberg, Grundzüge der Territorienbildung am

Franken, Reihe 1, Heft 30 (Munich: Kommission für bayerische Landesgeschichte, 1999); Günter Dippold,
“Die Städtegründungen der Andechs-Meranier in Franken,” in Die Andechs-Meranier in Franken, 183-195;
Franz Machilek, “Die Zisterze Langheim als fränkisches Hauskloster der Andechs-Meranier,” in Die
Andechs-Meranier in Franken, 161-176; Siegfried Pokorny, “Bayreuth: Landwirtschaftliche Rodesiedlung
oder geplante Marktsiedlung,” in 800 Jahre Sprache in Bayreuth, eds. Rüdiger Harnisch and Doris Wagner
(Bayreuth: Rabenstein, 1994), 35-58; Erwin Herrmann, “Zur Siedlungsgeschichte des Kulmbacher
des Hauses Andechs-Meranien am Obermain, ed. Jakob Lehmann (Lichtenfels, 1963), 17-23; and Martin
Kuhn, “Um die meranische Klostervogtei Banz,” in Zur Geschichte des Hauses Andechs-Meranien am
Obermain, 49-52.

69 Klaus van Eickels, “Die Andechs-Meranier und das Bistum Bamberg,” in Die Andechs-
Meranier in Franken, 145-156; Caroline Göldel, “Otto von Andechs, Stiftspropst von Aachen, Bischof von
Bamberg, und das Tafelgüterverzeichnis,” in Die Andechs-Meranier in Franken, 75-79; Karl Müssel,
the last secular lord in the Andechs lineage, died in 1248 at the Franconian castle of Niesten, Franconian historians have shown more interest in this duke than scholars from Altbayern have; during the nineteenth century, a debate raged for a time in the Franconian scholarship over whether or not Duke Otto II had been murdered by one of his own ministerials. Thus, Franconian historians have in most cases studied completely different aspects of the house of Andechs than Bavarian scholars have. Two distinct versions of the noble family’s history therefore exist in the modern German literature.

Overlooked by both Bavarian and Franconian historians because of their regional emphases are the lordships controlled by the house of Andechs in Carniola (Krain). At some point in the early 1100s, Count Berthold I of Andechs married Sophia, a daughter and heiress of Margrave Poppo of Istria. She brought with her into the marriage extensive properties in and around the Sava River valley in Carniola, in what is today Slovenia (See Figure 2.6). During the mid-1140s, Count Berthold I appeared in a source from this region for the first time as “count of Stein.”


This document is also registered in the Tiroler Urkundenbuch [hereafter Tiroler UB], ed. Franz Huter (Innsbruck: Landesmuseum Ferdinandeum, 1937), 1:89-90, no. 212. For most scholars, the problem with this text has long been whether it refers to Stein in Carniola, which would make this Count Berthold I of Andechs, or to Stein in Carinthia in the Jauntal, which would make this Count Berthold of Tirol. Both explanations are plausible since both castles lay close to the monastery of Viktring. Most recent historians, including the editor of the Tiroler UB, have supported the position that the text refers to Berthold of Tirol. Franz Schumi, who printed a summary of this text in the Urkunden- und Regestenbuch des Herzogtums Krain [hereafter UB Krain], ed. Franz Schumi (Ljubljana, 1882), 1:96, no. 93, has made the strongest argument for Count Berthold I of Andechs. His arguments have largely been ignored by later scholars, though they are the most plausible arguments I have found. Schumi claims that the other witnesses, based on the locations by which they were identified, were more than likely Andechs ministerials. Indeed, Minkendorf (Münkendorf, now Mekinje) is only a short distance north of Carniolan Stein (Kamnik). And a “de nazzenvuzzen” appears as a witness in a later tradition notice involving the house of Andechs: see the Urkundenbuch des Landes ob der Enns [hereafter UBLE], ed. Verwaltungs-Ausschuss des Museum Francisco Carolinum zu Linz (Vienna: K. K. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1852), 1:673, no. 157.
Kamnik, became one of the political centers for the house of Andechs in Carniola during the later twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. Windischgraz, modern Slovenj Gradec, emerged as another focal point of the family’s lordship in this southeastern corner of the empire in the same period. Following the assassination of King Philip of Swabia in 1208, Margrave Henry of Istria spent much of his time in Carniola. The family remained active there even after Henry’s childless death, for it was his brother Patriarch Berthold of Aquileia who replaced him as the leading lord in the region.

Despite the obvious significance of Carniola for the Andechs, German historians have had little to say about the family’s involvement in the region. Some of the only German-language works to discuss the Carniolan lordships of the house of Andechs date from the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries—before the creation of Yugoslavia, while Carniola was still a part of the Austrian-Hungarian Empire. Since the declaration of Slovenian independence in 1991, a national historiography has begun to develop that has recognized the importance of the house of Andechs for the country’s history. An exhibition on the family was held at a museum in Slovenj Gradec in 2001. Only one year earlier, a symposium on the Andechs was held at Kamnik, with both Slovenian and German scholars in attendance. The publication of the conference proceedings in both languages in 2001 suggests that the Carniolan lordships of the house of Andechs are

---

finally beginning to be incorporated into the broader history of the family’s rights and territories.\textsuperscript{73}

Thus, throughout most of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, scholars did not attempt to write comprehensive histories of the house of Andechs. Instead, a series of distinct historiographical traditions have formed around the Andechses. The only issues that have attracted the interest of scholars from more than one region or country are those that have had the greatest impact on the noble house’s reputation, especially its acquisition of the duchy of Merania\textsuperscript{74} and its involvement in the assassination of King Philip of Swabia.\textsuperscript{75} In general, however, \textit{Landesgeschichte} and nationalist agendas have created a fragmented history of this family that played such a significant role politically throughout the southeast of the empire between approximately 1100 and 1250.

\textsuperscript{73} \textit{Grofje Andeško-Meranski: Prispevki k zgodovini Evrope v visokem srednjem veku / Die Andechs-Meranier: Beiträge zur Geschichte Europas im Hochmittelalter}, eds. Andreja Eržen and Toni Aigner (Kamnik, 2001). The articles include the most detailed work on Andechs properties and ministerials in Carniola of which I am aware. Another important work for the house of Andechs written by a Slovenian historian is Peter Štih, \textit{Studien zur Geschichte der Grafen von Görz: Die Ministerialen und Milites der Grafen von Görz in Istrien und Krain}, Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung [hereafter MIÖG], Ergänzungsband 32 (Vienna and Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1996).


IV. The house of Andechs as a case study for analyzing family relationships

None of the aforementioned criticisms of the historiography is intended to suggest that the regional literature on the house of Andechs has no value. This dissertation will rely heavily on earlier research concerning the family because it provides many important foundational details about the Andechses; the questions being explored here would be impossible to ask if other historians had not already analyzed many of the key issues in this noble house’s history. Nevertheless, much of the work on the house of Andechs has failed to recognize that the family can also be used to study broader historical issues. As a large, trans-regional kin group with diverse political interests in both the secular and ecclesiastical spheres, the Andechses are an excellent family to use to analyze intra-familial relationships. In order for the members of the kinship group to control lordships across such a broad geographical area, it was essential for them to utilize a range of different social networks. Because the house of Andechs included an abundance of men and women in every generation (except the last one), many members of the family were able to play important roles in the noble house’s strategies throughout the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. As a result, the analysis of family relationships is critical to understanding the success the Andechses achieved.

For a study of kinship networks, the diverse territorial interests of the house of Andechs are a great benefit, for the members of this family appear in a broad array of primary sources from throughout the southern parts of the German empire. The Episcopal

---

76 Ministerials and vassals were, for example, two sets of people whom the lords in the lineage employed effectively in order to help them rule. A dissertation could easily be written about these social networks alone. For a recent work that focuses on the involvement of ministerials in a noble house’s politics, see Claus-Peter Hasse, Die welfischen Hofämter und die welfische Ministerialität in Sachsen. Studien zur Sozialgeschichte des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts (Husum: Matthiesen Verlag, 1995). See also Gerd Althoff, Verwandte, Freunde und Getreue: Zum politischen Stellenwert der Gruppenbindungen im früheren Mittelalter (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1990).
chanceries at Bamberg, Augsburg, Freising, Passau, Brixen, and Gurk—as well as the chanceries of the archbishops of Salzburg and patriarchs of Aquileia—all produced charters and/or tradition notices that reveal the activities and interactions of various Andechses. Evidence for the family can also be found in the sources from more than two dozen monasteries, convents and houses of canons from Banz on the Main River in Franconia to Stična (Sittich) in Carniola more than three hundred miles to the southeast. Furthermore, royal and imperial charters of every German ruler from Lothar III (1125-1137) to Frederick II (1212-1250) name members of the house of Andechs who were secular and ecclesiastical lords. Other types of sources—including private charters, chronicles and annals, letters, necrologies, literary works, and images—all can be used to study family relationships inside the kin group as well.

Because of the strong traditions of text editing in Germany and Austria, many of these records have been published, or at least registered, during the last century and a half in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* and various regional collections. With the original documents today scattered throughout numerous archives in several different countries, these editions make it easier for the historian to build a comprehensive trans-regional and trans-national picture of the house of Andechs. But the majority of scholars who have written about the house of Andechs have continued to rely for their primary source material on Oefele’s 1877 *Geschichte der Grafen von Andechs*, which includes a register of sources for the secular lords in the noble house. As an archivist at Munich,

---

77 I will discuss many of these sources in more detail throughout the dissertation (especially in Chapters Three and Four). For a general overview of many of these source collections, see John B. Freed, *Noble Bondsmen: Ministerial Marriages in the Archdiocese of Salzburg, 1100-1343* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1995), 17-22.

78 Oefele, 107-219.
however, Oefele did not have access to all the documents that refer to members of the family. Furthermore, his belief that women and ecclesiastical lords did not truly belong to the noble house led him to ignore valuable evidence for intra-familial relationships. By utilizing the more recent text editions and the original documents when necessary, this dissertation will be able to offer the first complete picture of the house of Andechs’s strategies as the family sought to control diverse lordships scattered throughout the southeast of the empire.

This dissertation will focus on Andechs family relationships from the start of Count Berthold I’s career around 1100 until the death of Duke Berthold III of Merania in 1204. The marriage of Duke Otto I of Merania to the heiress of the county-palatine of Burgundy in 1208 and the assassination of King Philip of Swabia in the hours immediately following the wedding opened a new phase in the history of the house of Andechs; the lordships that the family gained and lost as a result of the events of that day dramatically altered the noble house’s strategies. The death of Duke Berthold III in 1204 is therefore a convenient dividing line to use when studying the family. Sufficient evidence survives from the century before he died to analyze the key family relationships and to recreate the main networks of cooperation and support that shaped the politics of the Andechs kinship group during this period.

---

79 See, for example, p. 163, note 1, where Oefele thanks the abbot of a Tyrolean monastery for describing for him the seal on a document of Duke Berthold III of Merania. Oefele is especially bad at registering the Carniolan documents that involve the members of the Andechs lineage.

80 Ibid., Vorwort: “Nonne, Mönch und Infulträger des Mittelalters sind aus ihrer Familie kaum weniger vollständig getreten, als die verehelichten Töchter.”

81 I intend to analyze the period after 1204 in the book that will develop from this research.
PART II

THE PROBLEM OF SOURCES:

RELIGIOUS HOUSES AND THE EVIDENCE FOR FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS
CHAPTER THREE

COUNT BERTHOLD SPEAKS:

FAMILY INTERESTS, MONASTIC CLAIMS & THE DONATION OF PROPERTY

During the twelfth century, the house of Andechs possessed properties and rights scattered across Bavaria, Franconia, Tyrol and Carniola. Because of these diverse territorial interests, Count Berthold I of Andechs, his sons and his grandsons made donations to numerous different religious houses throughout the southeast of the German empire between the years 1100 and 1204. For much of this period, when a nobleman from the house of Andechs made a donation to a monastery or other religious community, one of the members of that religious house recorded the property grant in writing. There is no evidence to suggest that either Count Berthold I or his son Margrave Berthold II of Istria had his own chancery during his career. Only in the 1190s, under Duke Berthold III of Merania, did a scribe from the duke’s own household begin to draw up documents in Berthold III’s name.¹

The absence of an Andechs chancery for most of the twelfth century is one aspect of a broader trend in the southeast of the German empire. Private, sealed charters were not commonly used in this region prior to the last quarter of the century and did not

¹ The earliest appearance of a “Heinricus notarius,” who would be named in a series of Andechs charters from the period around 1200, is in Duke Berthold III’s charter for Reichersberg dated 2 June 1194. See UBLE, 2:451-452, no. 308.
replace other forms for preserving property agreements until after 1200.\textsuperscript{2} Especially in
the duchy of Bavaria and its environs, the group of sources where most property
donations have survived are the so-called books of traditions, or \textit{Traditionsbücher}.\textsuperscript{3}
Beginning in the ninth century, the members of a religious community typically made
brief, summary records of the gifts of property to their house on loose scraps of
parchment. However, because it was impractical to save dozens or even hundreds of
individual parchment pieces, communities in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries started
to enter copies of these tradition notices into codices.\textsuperscript{4} Many of these books of traditions
have been preserved, and they provide invaluable information about the patronage
networks surrounding the religious communities in the southeast of the empire.\textsuperscript{5}

\textsuperscript{2} For more on this point, see Wilhelm Ewald, \textit{Siegelkunde} (Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 1969), 39 and

\textsuperscript{3} This is a modern term, not a medieval one. Patrick J. Geary in his \textit{Phantoms of Remembrance}
(Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994) and John B. Freed in his \textit{Noble Bondsmen: Ministerial
both use the German term \textit{Traditionsbücher} when discussing these works. I have chosen to use the English
term “books of traditions” to avoid complicating this dissertation with too many non-English words and
phrases.

\textsuperscript{4} For more on tradition notices and books of traditions, see Johanek, 131-162 and Christine Sauer,
\textit{Fundatio und Memoria. Stifter und Klostergründer im Bild 1100 bis 1350} (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck &
Ruprecht, 1993), 34-42. Though now outdated, one of the most detailed discussions of these sources
remains Oswald Redlich, “Üeber bairische Traditionsbücher und Traditionen,” MIÖG 5 (1884): 1-82. Also
see John B. Freed’s forthcoming “Bavarian Wine and Woolless Sheep: The \textit{Urbar} of Count Sigiboto IV of
Falkenstein (1126-ca. 1198)” \textit{Viator} 35, where Freed discusses the recent historiography concerning the
books of traditions.

\textsuperscript{5} For more on the books of traditions as sources for social history, see John B. Freed, “German
Source Collections: The Archdiocese of Salzburg as a Case Study,” in \textit{Medieval Women and the Sources of
Many of the Bavarian books of traditions have been edited by Professor Peter Acht and his students at the
University of Munich. The editions are part of the series \textit{Quellen und Erörterungen zur bayerischen
Geschichte (Neue Folge)}. For a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of these modern editions, see
Heide Dienst, \textit{Regionalgeschichte und Gesellschaft im Hochmittelalter am Beispiel Österreichs} (Vienna
and Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 1990) 119-125 and John B. Freed’s forthcoming “The Creation of the \textit{Codex
Falkensteinensis} (1166): Self-Representation and Reality.”
This chapter will consider what kinds of evidence for the house of Andechs can be extracted from the donations of property that family members made to monasteries, convents and houses of canons during the twelfth century. Grants preserved at more than a dozen religious communities in the south of the German empire identify as donors various sets of Andechs kin, including parents and children, husbands and wives, and siblings. Because the analysis of the kinship groups named in property donations has been central to arguments about noble family structures throughout the last half-century, the value of these sources for the study of family relationships must be considered.

Important to this dissertation is the question of whether or not the collections of relatives listed in these documents reveal anything about the networks of cooperation and support inside the noble house. In other words, do the property grants provide evidence for close intra-familial bonds, or were there extra-familial factors shaping the composition and representation of the kin groups who appear in these sources?

I. Property donations and the structure of the house of Andechs

Recent historians have argued that tradition notices served a complex combination of legal, historical and sacral functions for a medieval religious community.\(^6\) Nevertheless, despite their multifaceted purpose, the majority of these records of property grants are remarkably spare in the details they provide. For example, the earliest source to name any of the nuclear family members of Count Berthold I of Andechs is a tradition notice from the house of Augustinian canons at Diessen in Upper Bavaria. Preserved in a codex compiled at Diessen during the early thirteenth century, it reads simply:

\(^6\) Geary, 86; Sauer, 36-37; Dienst, 106-107; and Johanek, 145.
Let it be known to people in the present and the future that Count Berthold of Diessen,\(^7\) in the presence of his wife Sophia and his sons Poppo and Berthold, granted to St. George [the church at Diessen] the woman Heilrada, daughter of Hiltibold of Hofstetten and Imiza of Finning, and her children. [This grant was made] on the condition that she, her children and their descendants may possess their ministerial rights in perpetuity, unless they later lose these rights through marriage. The names of her children are Wigolt, Sigimar, Diebolt, Judith, Gisela and Hereburc. Witnesses: the priest Gotbolt, Meingoz of Utingin, Dietmar of Diessen, Liutwin of Birchanger, and Engeldeus of Saint George.\(^8\)

Several pieces of information that modern historians would like to have are missing from this tradition notice. The most obvious is a date.\(^9\) There is also no explanation of why Count Berthold I of Andechs was giving to the house of canons this particular woman and her children. Heilrada was clearly a ministerial—a person of unfree status from the count’s *familia*—but the document does not explain as much about her background as scholars might wish.\(^10\)

The paucity of details in many of the tradition notices indicates that the religious community receiving a gift recorded in writing only the aspects of the grant it thought to be most important. Fortunately for the modern study of the medieval nobility, the names of any of the donor’s kin who were involved in the grant were considered significant

\(^7\) Count Berthold I’s title in this tradition notice, “comes de Diissen,” reflects his ancestors’ use of the castle at Diissen as the seat of their lordship in Upper Bavaria. For more on this point, see Chapter Four.

\(^8\) Tr. Diessen, 4-5, no. 2: “Notum tam futuris quam presentibus sit, quod Bertolfus comes de Diezin presente uxoré sua Sophia filiisque Poppone et Bertolfo tradidit Heilradam, filiam Hiltiboldi de Houestetin et Imize de Vinningin, et filios filiisque suas sancto Georio ea videlicet condicione, ut ius habeant ministerialium suorum ipsa et filii filiique eius et posteritas eorum imperpetuum, nisi coniugio interveniente postea iusticiam suam amittant. Nomina filiorum filiarumque eius hæc sunt: Wigolt, Sigimar, Diebolt, Iuditha, Gisela, Hereburc. Testes: Gotebolt sacerdos; Meingoz de Utingin, Dietmarus de Tizen, Liutwin de Birchirnanc, Eingildieo de sancto Georio.”

\(^9\) See Appendix Three, no. 1 for a discussion of when this donation might have occurred.

pieces of information to preserve. Stephen White and other recent historians have generally used the term *laudatio parentum* “to refer to the act by which a person’s relatives (*parentes*) gave their approval (*laudatio*) to his or her conveyances of landed property.”¹¹ Why property donations typically included in some way a group of the grantor’s relatives has been the subject of debate in the current literature. The donor’s family and the monastic community both could have their own reasons for wanting some of the grantor’s relatives to approve the gift.¹² But regardless of the precise motivations behind the involvement of consenting kin groups in most property donations, the collections of relatives named in these documents offer some of the richest surviving evidence for how noble families were organized during the central Middle Ages.

Research conducted in recent decades has shown that a broad range of a donor’s kin could appear in the charters and tradition notices that record property agreements. In some cases, siblings, uncles, nephews and even cousins are named in these documents as consenters or witnesses. In other cases, only members of the nuclear family—the donor’s spouse and children—are involved in the agreements. Because of these findings, historians studying family structure and inheritance patterns have argued convincingly that different noble families were structured differently and that, even within a single

---

¹¹ Stephen D. White, *Custom, Kinship, and Gifts to Saints* (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 1. As White explains, modern historians use the phrase *laudatio parentum* as a broad term for a wide range of scribal terminology for the involvement of relatives in a donor’s grant. It would be interesting to know, however, whether the variations in scribal terminology refer to different types of property donations made by kin. For this reason, I have generally avoided using the term *laudatio parentum* in this dissertation.

¹² For more on this issue, see White, 130-176 and Barbara H. Rosenwein, *To Be the Neighbor of Saint Peter* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1989), 49-77. I will have more to say on this subject throughout this chapter.
family, the structure could change every few years or from generation to generation. It is mainly to reflect the variations in the kin groups named in the property grants that many scholars have begun to employ the concepts of “fluid family structure” and “practical kinship.”

From the perspective of these current arguments about family structure, there is nothing unusual or surprising about the groups of Andechs kin who appear together in the family’s property agreements with religious communities. The sources name a variety of different relatives and thus reveal the flexibility of the kinship structures that shaped the house of Andechs. For the period between 1100 and 1204, thirty-four property agreements (grants, exchanges, quitclaims and confirmations) made by members of the noble house survive as tradition notices or sealed charters. The majority identify at least one of the donor’s kinsmen and/or kinswomen as being involved as a co-grantor, a consenter, or a witness. Of the thirty-four documents, twelve—or approximately one-

---

13 See Chapter One for noble family structure.


15 For these thirty-four documents, see Appendix Two. This appendix also contains a list of property grants that are only known because of references to them in later documents. I have not included these grants in my discussion because the majority of the documents do not indicate whether any kin were involved in the agreements.

16 I have chosen not to distinguish between kin named in the body of a text and those named as witnesses, nor have I chosen to draw a sharp distinction between different types of property agreements. White in his *Custom, Kinship, and Gifts to Saints* offers an exhaustive discussion of both issues. In the end, he chooses to treat a broad range of texts (including simple donations as well as quitclaims) in his discussion of the laudatio parentum without viewing them as entirely different in nature (see pp. 253-254, note 8). He states about the witness/consenter dichotomy, “Relatives who witnessed a gift should probably be distinguished from relatives who approved it or joined in it, because the former may have participated in the transaction less actively than the latter. This distinction, however, remains problematic” (p. 266, note 54). Because this dissertation concerns family relationships rather than the exact meaning of medieval property agreements, I believe I can be somewhat less precise on these issues than White.
third—name one or more of the donor’s sons.\textsuperscript{17} Six of the texts mention the donor’s brother,\textsuperscript{18} while a wife appears alongside her husband on four occasions as a consenter.\textsuperscript{19} Only a single charter indicates that a donor’s father was present for one of his son’s property arrangements.\textsuperscript{20} More distant relatives, specifically a paternal uncle and a cousin, each appear once in the surviving texts.\textsuperscript{21} Thirteen of the charters and tradition notices fail to mention any of the donor’s kin.\textsuperscript{22}

The predominance of sons as consenters or witnesses in Andechs property agreements suggests an emphasis within the noble house on direct descent in the male line during the twelfth century. As many of the documents that can be dated with relative accuracy indicate, in those periods when the donor had sons who had reached the age of majority, the only relatives to be involved in the donor’s grants were those sons. In contrast, the four appearances of the donor’s wife all occurred at times when the couple had no sons who had reached adulthood. Strengthening the impression that the father-son descent group was most important, the one mention of a distantly-related cousin in an

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{17} Appendix Two, nos. 3-4, 8, 18-20, 25-27, 31, and 33-34.
  \item \textsuperscript{18} Appendix Two, nos. 8-10, 15, 28, and 30.
  \item \textsuperscript{19} Appendix Two, nos. 3, 15-16, and 29. See also no. 40. As Freed explains in his “German Source Collections,” 86, women could not act as witnesses; they were limited to the roles of consenter and co-grantor in property agreements.
  \item \textsuperscript{20} Appendix Two, no. 8. Even this was more a peace treaty between the house of Andechs and the bishopric of Bamberg than a traditional property agreement between a group of nobles and a religious community.
  \item \textsuperscript{21} Appendix Two, nos. 1 and 11.
  \item \textsuperscript{22} Appendix Two, nos. 2, 5-7, 12-14, 17, 21-24, and 32.
\end{itemize}
Andechs property donation took place in 1149, before the ruling count, Berthold II, had married or had any legitimate children.\textsuperscript{23} None of this means, however, that the grants, exchanges and confirmations reveal a rigid lineage structure based on primogeniture similar to what Georges Duby argued was the norm in twelfth-century noble families.\textsuperscript{24} Count Berthold I’s second son, Berthold II, was named alongside his older brother Poppo twice in their father’s donations of property, and it was Berthold II—rather than Poppo’s minor son Henry—who acquired the bulk of the patrimony following Poppo’s death on the Second Crusade. Henry was placed in a monastery while still young and disappeared from the sources for the family.\textsuperscript{25} Only in the following generation, when Berthold III succeeded his father Berthold II, did the main inheritance pass smoothly to the eldest son. In contrast, upon Berthold III’s death in 1204, his two oldest sons Otto and Henry—both of whom had witnessed grants during their father’s lifetime—divided the family’s titles and lordships between them. Every generation therefore experienced a different process of succession and inheritance.\textsuperscript{26}

Further complicating any attempt to define the structure of the house of Andechs rigidly is the appearance of various churchmen in the property agreements. Of the five men in the family who had ecclesiastical careers during the twelfth century, only one—the aforementioned Henry—was a monk; the others were canons who were able to

\textsuperscript{23} See Chapter Five for a detailed discussion of Berthold II and his sons.

\textsuperscript{24} For Duby’s arguments, see Chapter One.

\textsuperscript{25} This episode will be analyzed in much greater detail in Chapters Five and Six.

\textsuperscript{26} For more on succession within the house of Andechs, see Chapter Five.
inherit pieces of their family’s property.\textsuperscript{27} Thus, Berthold I and his paternal uncle Conrad of Jasberg made a joint grant to the monastery of Weihenstephan at some point between the years 1102 and 1114.\textsuperscript{28} In 1182, Bishop Otto II of Bamberg donated to the house of canons at Diessen various lands “through the hand of his brother Margrave Berthold.”\textsuperscript{29} Six years later, following Berthold II’s death, his sons Duke Berthold III and the cathedral canon Poppo jointly gave properties to the Franconian monastery of Michelfeld.\textsuperscript{30} In each generation, almost every male in the house of Andechs therefore had some kind of claim to the inheritance, which helps to explain why sons and brothers appear in the property agreements more than all other types of relatives combined.

Noblewomen who married or were born into the house of Andechs are noticeably absent from the various grants, exchanges and confirmations involving their male kin.\textsuperscript{31} The only women to appear occasionally in the documents are the donors’ wives, but they disappear from the texts once their eldest sons reached adulthood; these wives are not even named as widows, for every twelfth-century Andechs lord outlived his first spouse. Other historians’ research has clearly demonstrated that, in other noble families, wives, mothers, sisters and daughters often played a role in property agreements.\textsuperscript{32} However, in

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item For canons’ property rights, see Constance B. Bouchard, \textit{Sword, Miter, and Cloister. Nobility and the Church in Burgundy, 980-1198} (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1987), 59-60.
\item Appendix Two, no. 1.
\item Appendix Two, no. 28. Otto was also involved in a property agreement in the early 1150s as a young cleric. See Appendix Two, no. 15.
\item Appendix Two, no. 30.
\item The women in the house of Andechs will be discussed in much greater detail in Chapter Seven.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
the case of the house of Andechs during the twelfth century, there is only one charter that
suggests a woman in the family had a legitimate claim to any Andechs properties.\textsuperscript{33} No
source from the twelfth century gives information about the dowries of Andechs women,
and only one document indicates that a father gave an entrance gift when he had a
daughter placed in a convent.\textsuperscript{34} Why Andechs women were not actively involved in
property agreements is unclear. One possible explanation is the numerous men who were
born into the family throughout the period from 1100 to 1204; there was never a time
during the twelfth century when the property rights of women were central to the
inheritance strategies within the noble house. Regardless of the reason, the evidence for
women’s roles strengthens the argument that family structure was fluid, since their lack
of involvement in the Andechs sources does not conform to what scholars have found in
the texts for other families.

An analysis of the charters and tradition notices that preserve the property
agreements of the house of Andechs thus reveals a kinship group that, from the
perspective of family structure, cannot be easily labeled. Although the property rights of
men were clearly emphasized over the rights of women, the noble house was not
structured as a rigid lineage. Almost all of the men in the family had claims to parts of
the patrimony, and even the most important titles and lordships were not inherited based
on strict rules of primogeniture. On the other hand, the family was not a completely

\textsuperscript{33} UB Krain, 2:5-6, no. 7. In this agreement between Duke Berthold III and the patriarch of
Aquileia, it is reported that a sister (unnamed) of the duke may have had a claim to some of the properties
the duke was offering to the patriarch as collateral for a loan. See Chapter Seven for further analysis of this
text. Count Berthold I’s wife Sophia made a grant to Diessen of Carniolan properties she had brought with
her into her marriage, but the earliest reference to this grant is in a thirteenth-century necrology (Appendix
Two, no. 38).

\textsuperscript{34} Appendix Two, no. 36. For another possible reference to an entrance gift, see the next section
of this chapter.
amorphous kinship group either, since in any given period of time a fairly small number of relatives were involved in the family’s property agreements with religious communities. In short, the concept of “fluid family structure” can be applied effectively to the house of Andechs for two reasons: first, because it does not conform to any rigid model about the organization of noble families in general and second, because even within the house, the structure changed noticeably from generation to generation.

The most important question for this chapter is whether these conclusions about family structure reveal anything about family relationships. The kin groups named in the tradition notices and charters where property donations are preserved demonstrate that inheritance rights and customs were flexible and that the house of Andechs was organized differently at different times during the twelfth century. But do these groups of relatives also provide evidence for the networks of cooperation and support which operated inside the family? Did these collections of kin who came together for property agreements function as groups in other situations and contexts? Or were the religious communities who wrote the charters and tradition notices the ones who insisted that a particular set of relatives be present?

Most historians who study noble family structures acknowledge the potential problems posed by the fact that the overwhelming majority of their sources were produced by the religious communities receiving the nobility’s gifts of property. In general, however, scholars have argued that, if read carefully, the charters and tradition notices can nevertheless reveal something about the noble families making the grants.35 Regardless of who decided which of the donor’s relatives were to be involved in a

donation, the documents provide insight into how medieval society understood noble families to be organized. Kin would not have appeared in these sources if the donor and/or the religious community saw no reason to include them in the agreement, and every grant that includes the *laudatio parentum* therefore offers evidence about family structures during the central Middle Ages.

In order to study family relationships, however, the historian needs to consider whether or not the members of the religious house who received a gift influenced in any way the composition of the noble kin group consenting to the donation. If they did, the collections of relatives named in the sources would reflect the religious house’s interests rather than the interests of the family members who were involved in making the gift. This would mean that the consenting kin groups are not necessarily evidence for the networks of cooperation and support inside a noble house. The possible explanations for why a particular set of relatives appears in a property grant therefore must be considered carefully in order to determine whether the donor or the religious community was shaping the way in which the kinship group was being represented.

II. *“O dulcis Deoque dilecta filia”*

Because most of the charters and tradition notices provide so little context for the gifts of property they record, it can be very difficult to draw from these sources any conclusions about why certain kin were present for a donation. Even grants made for the spiritual well-being of the donor and his relatives do not indicate that all the kin named in the document had the identical religious motivations for participating in the gift.\(^{36}\) As a

\(^{36}\) A point White emphasizes on numerous occasions in his *Custom, Kinship, and Gifts to Saints*. See, for example, p. 129.
result, this consideration of property agreements will begin by analyzing a grant that has been preserved in a different kind of source. The *Vita Mechtildis*, written about Mechthild of Diessen, abbess of Edelstetten (†1160), includes a description of a donation made to the religious community at Diessen. The story of this gift is potentially one of the best surviving pieces of evidence for the relationship between two members of the house of Andechs. In a lengthy passage, the *Vita* recounts a conversation that Mechthild had with her father, Count Berthold I of Andechs. Their conversation concerns a piece of property that the count was giving to the house of canons at Diessen, where at the time his daughter was a canoness. Because the historical accuracy of information contained in hagiographical texts has long been questioned by scholars, historians of the house of Andechs have almost universally ignored this story. But the account of this property donation, because of the details it includes, can provide important insight into the question of how property grants can and cannot be used as evidence for intra-familial relationships.

Mechthild was the daughter of Count Berthold I of Andechs and his first wife, Sophia of Istria. She was probably born around 1120, and only a few years later her father placed her in the community of canonesses at Diessen while she was still a young girl. As is the case for most noblewomen who entered convents during the Middle Ages, there are virtually no contemporary sources that provide any information about Mechthild’s career. A papal bull from either 1153 or 1154 reports that—when she was

---

37 Modern works about Mechthild are few in number and typically emphasize the hagiographical rather than the historical evidence for her life. See, for example, Paul Bayerschmidt, *Mechtild von Dießen. Eine deutsche Heilige des frühen Mittelalters* (Munich: Dreifaltigkeits-Verlag, 1936) and Hans Pörnbacher, *Mechtild von Dień und Andechs. Äbtissin von Edelstetten* (Weißenhorn, Bavaria: Anton H. Konrad Verlag, 1992).
around thirty years of age—she was called to become abbess of Edelstetten in Swabia but was reluctant to accept the position. Only the *Vita Mechtildis*, written almost a half-century after her death, reveals that she eventually did agree to take the office of abbess; following only a brief stay in Edelstetten, however, she returned to Diessen. Her death is recorded in a thirteenth-century necrology from Diessen as having occurred on 31 May 1160.

According to the *Vita Mechtildis*, Mechthild decided upon returning to Diessen from Edelstetten that she wanted to do something that would help provide for the canons and canonesses who belonged to the religious community there. Thus,

> turning to her parents, her father Berthold and her mother Sophia, the blessed Mechthild said in a calm voice before everyone, ‘O father, remember that you sent me as a young girl into this church. Here, with the grace of the Holy Spirit guiding me, I made such progress that, even though I was unworthy, I could not avoid the title of mistress. After that, as you know, I flourished until recently in Edelstetten with the title of abbess….Now, my father, if you had betrothed me to a mortal man, you would have given to him a part of your property as my dowry, would you not? And thereafter, he would have considered himself to be more than just a son-in-law; he would have assumed himself to be an heir to all your property, would he not? But in truth, because the King of Kings and Lord of Lords Jesus Christ chose me, your daughter, to be his wife, you resolved never to give any marriage gifts to my sweet Husband—your Creator, Redeemer and Savior—for me and for your soul. Consequently, my pious father, know that the church at Diessen, founded by you and other of my kin, in which God preordained that my worldly bedchamber would be, is located in a woody, fruitless place which is full of water. Therefore, most beloved father, give to my immortal Husband—not from what is yours but from what is his—that which he chose for himself at the creation of the world. I say, I beseech, give as a marriage gift to me and thus justly and fitly to my Husband who is making the request, a tenth

---

38 Tr. Diessen, 105-106, no. 3.


40 *Necrologium Diessense* [hereafter Nec. Diess.], MGH, Necrologia Germaniae, vol. 1, ed. Franz Ludwig Baumann (Berlin: Weidmann, 1888), 19 (31 May). As Baumann rightly observes, the year of death was added by a later hand than that which had entered the date. Unfortunately, there is no other source that can confirm she died in 1160. For more on the Diessen necrologies, see Chapter Four.
decima] of the revenue from the property that you are recognized as possessing in the region near the Isar river, within the limits of Oberding."41

Her father, having understood the petition of his beloved daughter, consulted with his relatives. Joyfully and affectionately fulfilling the petition, he then said, ‘O daughter, compared to every other kin connection, yours is the most dear to me. Because of my love for you, I confer to this church of St. Mary in Diessen a tenth of the revenue from my property in the region near the Isar river, within the limits of Oberding. And with everyone present bearing witness, I make this gift upon the altar of St. Mary the Virgin Mother of Jesus Christ.’ The blessed Mechthild, the bride of Christ, responded in a voice full of happiness, ‘O my father, now I rejoice with you, because you have satisfied my petition in every way.’…[Then] her father added, ‘O sweet daughter, beloved to God, I ask that you pray to God with me: if any of my descendants should attempt to hinder access to the gift I am now giving—may this not happen—let him suffer a most worthy punishment, and at the Last Judgment let him be tormented perpetually with Cain.’ When this prayer was finished, a voice was heard in the sky of holy spirits answering and shouting with the sweetest voice, ‘Amen.’42

---

41 The term *decima* here does not appear to mean the church tithe. For the difficulties in understanding the use of the term in this passage, see Die Älteste Besitzliste und das Urbar des Stiftes Diessen von 1362/63 und die Register zu Traditionen, Urkunden und Urbar, ed. Waldemar Schlögl, in Quellen und Erörterungen zur bayerischen Geschichte, Neue Folge, vol. 22, pt. 2 (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1970), 91, no. 4.

42 Vita Mechtildis, 445-446, ch. 21: “convertens se ad parentes B. Mathildis, patrem suum Bertholdum, et matrem suam Sophiam, coram omnibus leni voce sic alloquitur: O pater, memor esto, quod me juvenculam destinasti in hanc Ecclesiam, in qua sancti Spiritus me gubernante gratia: ita profeci, quod, quamvis indigna, tamen magisterii nomen effugere non potui. Deinde in Oetilinsteten, sicut ipse nosti, nomine Abbatiae usque nunc florui….Nunc, pater mi, si me desponsasses viro mortali, nonne illi partem substanciæ tuæ nomine dotis mecum tribuisses, et isdem deinceps non solum pro genero, immo pro herede totius tuæ substantiæ se gessisset? Verum quia Rex Regum et Dominus Dominantium Jesus Christus me filiam tuam sibi elegit sponsam, tu numquam tam dulci Sponso mecum, Creatori, Redemptori, ac Salvatori tuo, pro me, et pro anima tua, aliqua sponsalia dare deliberasti. Cognosce igitur, pater pie, quod ecclesia Dyezzen, a te et prosapia mea fundata, in qua thalamus materialis mihi est a Deo præordinatus, sita est in loco nemoroso, aquoso, et infructuoso. Da ergo, pater carissime, Sponso meo immortalis, non de tuis, sed de suis, quæ sibi in prima totius mundi elegit constitutione; da, inquam, quæso, mihi, et tam justæ et congruae petenti Sponso, nomine sponsalium, decimam substantiæ tuae, quam habere dignosceris circa Isaram, in confinio Diengen. Pater vero ejusdem sponsæ Christi praecedulis filiæ suæ intellecta petitione, communicato parentum suorum consilio, gaudenter et affectuose ipsi adimplens petitionem, dixit: O filia, mihi præ omni cognatione tua dilectissima, decimam totius substantiæ meæ circa Isaram in confinio Diengen, ob amorem tui, huic ecclesie sanctæ Marie in Dyezzen confero, et sub testimonio omnium circumstantium, super hoc altare sanctæ Marie Matris et Virginis Jesu Christi delego. Ad quod sponsæ Christi B. Mathildis dixit voce gratulabunda: O pater mi, jam congaudeo tibi, quia meæ per omnia satisfecisti petitioni….Post hac subjuxit pater ejus, dicens: O dulcis Deoque dilecta filia, mecum, precor, ora Deum, si quisquam, quod absit, meorum posterorum donum jam per me datum impedire attentaverit, ut isdem hic condigna poena puniatur, et in extremo judicio cum Cain perpetuo crucietur. Hac finita precæ, audita est vox in aëre sanctorum spirituum respondentium, et cum dulcissima voce clamantium, Amen.”
This account of the personal interactions between Count Berthold I of Andechs and his daughter Mechthild is a remarkable piece of evidence for family relationships within a twelfth-century noble house. Modern historians have generally argued that noblewomen who were placed into religious communities as young girls became isolated from their families. Here, however, is an example of a canoness having direct contact with her father—and even holding an extensive conversation with him on his visit to her religious community. Such detailed descriptions of the relations between any of the members of a nuclear family are rare for the central Middle Ages; no other text concerning the house of Andechs rivals the Vita Mechtildis in the richness of its imagery. But how reliable is this account in the Vita of a property grant as a source for analyzing Andechs family relationships?

Throughout much of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, saints’ lives were ignored by most scholars, who believed these texts provided little if any accurate historical information. The goal of those who wrote hagiographical texts was never to produce true biographies in the modern sense of the term. Rather, the authors of saints’ lives were attempting to depict their subjects as ideal examples of Christian virtue and sanctity. As a result, there are common themes and stories, repeated throughout many of the vitae, that are intended to downplay the individuality of the holy person and instead highlight how he or she fit the general model of the saint. Only in more recent years

---

43 For modern perceptions of medieval noblewomen, see Chapters One and Seven.


have modern historians begun to exploit hagiographical sources with regularity, but the texts have typically been used as evidence for studying the cultures that produced them—not as evidence for the people about whom they were written.\textsuperscript{46}

In the case of the \textit{Vita Mechtildis}, the majority of the text contains virtually nothing that could be considered biographical. Hagiographical topoi—including the dramatic story of Mechthild’s encounter with a demon—and Biblical allusions are the dominant elements of the work.\textsuperscript{47} The author of the \textit{Vita}, Engelhard of Langheim (†1210?), admitted in three letters he wrote concerning the text that he knew very little about Mechthild and had gathered most of his information from conversations he had had about the canoness.\textsuperscript{48} A few of Mechthild’s relatives appear to have asked Engelhard to author the \textit{Vita} because he was well-known in southern Germany for several miracle collections he had compiled.\textsuperscript{49} However, there is no indication that the \textit{Vita} was ever intended to serve as evidence at an official inquiry into Mechthild’s canonization in Rome, and the dearth of original information Engelhard provides (even by the standards of hagiography) suggests that he may not have dedicated a great deal of time or effort to

\textsuperscript{46} Elliott, 65.

\textsuperscript{47} For the story of the demon, see \textit{Vita Mechtildis}, 451-452, ch. 18. Other hagiographical topoi, including descriptions of Mechthild’s virtues—like her obedience, abstinence and distaste of lying—can be found on pp. 445-446, chs. 2-6.

\textsuperscript{48} Engelhard’s letters to the provost of Diessen and to an unnamed countess related to Mechthild immediately precede the \textit{Vita} in the \textit{Acta Sanctorum}, 444. The third letter, to the abbot of Ebrach, is in Joseph Schwarzer, “Vitae und Miracula aus Kloster Ebrach,” \textit{Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde} 6 (1881): 523-524. In the letter to the unnamed countess, Engelhard indicates that he had had an hour-long conversation with her about Mechthild.

Copies of the *Vita* never circulated very widely. Nor did Mechthild’s cult enjoy broad appeal outside Upper Bavaria and those other regions where the house of Andechs was influential.

The relatively generic and indistinctive nature of most of the *Vita Mechtildis* stands in stark contrast to the chapter about the meeting between Mechthild and her father. The story concerning the tenth of the revenues from Oberding is much more detailed than any other portion of the work. In the opening chapter of the *Vita*, for example, when Engelhard discusses Mechthild’s family background, she is simply, “descended from imperial blood,” “from the blood of the house of Diessen,” and “daughter of the prince of the land.” Not until the story about the property donation to the canons at Diessen are her parents identified by name as Count Berthold and his wife Sophia. Lacking many of the hagiographical topoi that characterize the rest of the *Vita*, the story about Mechthild and her father may well have been written by someone other than Engelhard of Langheim; at the very least, Engelhard had a much better source for this event than he did for the rest of Mechthild’s life.

The anomalous nature of the passage concerning Count Berthold I and his daughter raises the question of why this episode was included in the *Vita* at all.

---

50 Ibid., col. 554. Oppel argues that Engelhard must have been commissioned to write the work.

51 For the surviving manuscripts of the *Vita*, see *Die älteste Besitzliste und das Urbar des Stiftes Diessen*, 90, no. 4.

52 *Vita Mechtildis*, 445, ch. 1: “de sanguine Imperiali duxit originem;” “de Dyezzen sanguinem;” and “Principis terræ filia.” The reference to her imperial blood likely refers to the distant kinship connection she and her siblings had to Emperor Frederick I Barbarossa through her mother Sophia of Istria (see Chapter Seven). The “de Dyezzen sanguinem” refers to the fact that some of Mechthild’s paternal ancestors are named in sources as counts “of Diessen” (see Chapter Four).

53 I am not aware of any scholar who has written a detailed analysis of the text of the *Vita* and of the manuscripts in which it survives; such a study would be necessary in order to be able to draw better conclusions about the production of the work.
According to the text, the conversation between Mechthild and her father revolves around a part of the count’s assets that he had decided to grant to the Diessen religious community at his daughter’s request. Thus, the canons and canonesses at Diessen are the chief beneficiaries in the story and the ones with the most to gain. Although there is no evidence from other sections of the *Vita* that Engelhard of Langheim used Diessen sources to write his work, the religious house’s own interests are clear in the discussion of the Oberding revenues. As a result, the motivations underlying the inclusion of this story in the *Vita Mechtildis* are likely to be found at Diessen.

In this context, it is interesting to note that on 17 March 1248 Duke Otto II of Bavaria (1231-1253) had a charter drawn up for the Diessen house of canons. He granted to the religious community the right of protection over the church at Unterbrunn in western Bavaria. According to the charter, one of the reasons why the duke of Bavaria had decided to make this gift was “in recompense for the tenth of the revenues at Oberding, which my illustrious father Duke Louis of Bavaria and I took away from the house of canons a long time ago.” This charter therefore suggests that the conversation between Count Berthold I and Mechthild was inserted in the *Vita Mechtildis* because of a territorial dispute which had arisen at some point in the early thirteenth century. Engelhard included the episode in an attempt to strengthen the Diessen religious

---

54 Tr. Diessen, 149-150, no. 26.

55 Ibid., 150: “…in recompensationem decime in Diengen, que multis retroactis temporibus a nobis et ab illustri patre nostro Lvdeewico, duce Bawarie, eidem ecclesie est subtracta.”

56 The seizure of the tenth by the Wittelsbach dukes of Bavaria may have been connected to the assassination of King Philip of Swabia in 1208. Members of the house of Andechs were implicated in the murder, and Duke Louis I of Bavaria (1183-1231) seized the family’s rights and properties in Upper Bavaria. The canons apparently suffered various injustices at the hands of the duke. See Tr. Diessen, 43-44, no. 32.
community’s legal claims to a tenth of the revenues at Oberding at a time when that source of income had been lost to the Wittelsbach dukes of Bavaria.

But had Count Berthold I of Andechs actually given part of his revenues at Oberding to the house of canons at the request of his daughter Mechthild? The clear political and economic reasons behind the appearance of the story in the Vita inevitably raise suspicions about the entire account. The book of traditions from Diessen, which was compiled during the first decade of the thirteenth century, includes tradition notices for three gifts made to the community by Count Berthold I. However, none of these refers to the Oberding revenues, nor do the entries for Mechthild and Berthold I in the Diessen necrologies, where property grants were also occasionally recorded. The Vita is therefore the only surviving source to mention this gift.

Making the story of the Oberding revenues even more problematic is the question of when this donation might have occurred. One of the only pieces of contemporary evidence that survives from Mechthild’s career is a papal bull issued by Pope Anastasius IV in which he asks Mechthild to accept the position of abbess of Edelstetten. This bull offers the one relatively fixed date for Mechthild’s career which is known, since Anastasius was pope only from 8 July 1153 until 3 December 1154. The Vita explicitly states that Mechthild made the request to her father for a tenth of his Oberding revenues after she had returned to Diessen from Edelstetten, presumably placing their conversation in the later 1150s. Count Berthold I of Andechs had already died in 1151, however, and

---

57 These three grants by Count Berthold I are Tr. Diessen, 4-5, no. 2; 6-8, no. 4; and 16-17, no. 11.

58 For the necrologies, see Michael Borgolte, “Stiftergedenken in Kloster Dießen. Ein Beitrag zur Kritik bayerischer Traditionsbücher,” Frühmittelalterliche Studien 24 (1990): 235-289. For more on the codex that contains the Diessen tradition notices and necrologies, see Chapter Four.

59 Tr. Diessen, 105-106, no. 3.
his son Berthold II—Mechthild’s brother—was the count of Andechs when Mechthild arrived back at Diessen.

Either the timing of the donation or the identity of the donor as reported in the Vita Mechtildis is therefore incorrect. Unfortunately, there are no details provided in the story that can offer a definitive solution to this problem. The altar dedicated to the Virgin Mary, which the Count Berthold mentions in his speech in the Vita, was dedicated on 7 October 1150—after Berthold I had ceased to be politically active and only a few months before he died. While this suggests that Berthold II may have been the donor, the repeated references to the Count Berthold in the account as the father of Mechthild imply that the grant was indeed made by Count Berthold I rather than Mechthild’s brother. Strengthening the latter argument to some extent is the appearance in the Vita of Mechthild’s mother, Sophia of Istria: when Mechthild first asks her father for the tenth of his revenues at Oberding, her mother is reportedly present.

Sophia’s involvement does, however, raise more questions about the timing of the grant than it answers. Modern historians are in general agreement that Sophia died in the late 1120s or early 1130s. This would mean that Count Berthold I’s donation of the

---

60 Edmund Oefele, who first produced a register of sources for the counts of Andechs, chose to assume that the Vita was correct in placing the request to the period after Mechthild’s return to Diessen; he therefore identified Berthold II as the one who made the grant (see Oefele, 133, no. 159b). More recently, Waldemar Schlögl has argued that the timing of the grant as reported in the Vita must be false; according to him, during the Middle Ages, who made a donation to a religious house was much more significant than when the donation was made, meaning that the identification of the donor as Mechthild’s father is probably the accurate piece of evidence in the story (see Die älteste Besitzliste und das Urbar des Stiftes Diessen, 90, no. 4).

61 Tr. Diessen, 93-94, no. 87. For more on Berthold I’s final years, see Chapter Five.

62 Historians’ educated guesses for when she might have died include 1126: Johannes Kist, “Die Nachfahren des Grafen Berthold I. von Andechs,” Jahrbuch für fränkische Landesforschung 27 (1967): 42; the late 1120s: Kamillo Trotter, “Das Haus der Grafen von Andechs,” in Genealogisches Handbuch zur bairisch-österreichischen Geschichte, ed. Otto von Dungern (Graz: Verlag Leuschner & Lubensky, 1931), 21, no. 35; and ca. 1132: Peter Štih, “Krain in der Zeit der Grafen von Andechs,” in Grafe Andeško-
Oberding revenues occurred while Mechthild was a young child. The *Vita Mechtildis* explicitly states in one of Mechthild’s speeches that Berthold had not given Diessen a gift when he placed his daughter in the religious community. But if Sophia was present when her husband made the gift, it must have been given around the time Mechthild became a canoness, not three decades later after Mechthild had returned from Edelstetten. Of course, if the donation did occur around the year 1130, Mechthild would have been too young to have had the conversations that the *Vita* describes.  

A careful analysis of the *Vita Mechtildis* and its context thus suggests that the relationship between Mechthild and her father Count Berthold I of Andechs, as it is described in this work, has no historical foundation. That the two of them had a lengthy conversation together as adults in the presence of Mechthild’s mother Sophia is not possible. But this does not mean that the entire story should be dismissed as mere hagiographical invention. Elements of the account—most notably the intervention of heavenly voices at the end of the story—are certainly typical of saints’ lives. However, the reasons why the contacts between Mechthild and her father are discussed at length in the *Vita* have less to do with hagiographical topoi than with the Diessen religious community’s territorial and political interests.

---

63 The opening decades of the twelfth century were a period when religious reformers were increasingly labeling entrance gifts as a form of simony. One of the most famous of these reformers, Gerhoh of Reichersberg (1093-1169), was a canon in Bavaria who insisted that entrance gifts must be voluntary. See Joseph H. Lynch, *Simoniacl Entry into Religious Life from 1000 to 1260* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1976), 90-93. Given this context, it is quite likely that the *Vita* is correct in stating that Count Berthold I had not given a formal entrance gift to the religious community at Diessen when Mechthild became a canoness.

64 The *Vita* states that she was five when she was first given to Diessen. She was likely born in the late 1110s or early 1120s, only a few years before her mother died.
At its core, the story about Count Berthold I’s grant to the religious house at Diessen is an attempt by the canons to make as strong a claim as possible to a tenth of the revenues at Oberding. A member of the house of Andechs may have actually given the canons this income at some point during the twelfth century, but by the early 1200s the religious community must not have had a legal record of the donation. As a result, the canons manufactured an elaborate story and had it inserted into the *Vita Mechtildis*. They made the grant appear as ancient as possible by connecting it to Count Berthold I of Andechs, who had founded their community. By mentioning the count’s wife, the canons suggested that Sophia of Istria—whom the community also recognized as a co-founder of the religious house—had given her consent to this donation. Berthold also “consulted with his relatives” in the midst of the episode, adding further legitimacy to the grant. Moreover, Mechthild’s supposed involvement in the donation connected the entire incident to a member of the house of Andechs who, by the early thirteenth century, was a popular local cult figure in Upper Bavaria. In short, the Diessen canons had created a very prominent group of close kin to act as the legal grantors of the Oberding revenues. That the donation could not possibly have occurred in the way it is described in the *Vita* did not concern the religious community. The canons were willing to manufacture a depiction of Andechs family relationships that would improve their religious house’s claims to a vital source of income.

The *Vita Mechtildis* is admittedly an unusual source in which to find the record of a property donation. Nevertheless, the lengthy description of events surrounding Count Berthold I of Andechs was not lost on the religious community at Diessen. They were willing to craft a story that would strengthen their claim to the Oberding revenues. The canons were adept at creating a narrative that connected them to a member of the house of Andechs, enhancing the legitimacy of their claim. The *Vita Mechtildis* is a testament to the canons’ ingenuity and determination in the face of limited evidence.
Berthold I’s gift to Diessen, as reported in the *Vita*, provides much more of a context for this property donation than historians have for the overwhelming majority of grants to religious communities during the central Middle Ages. While the conversation involving the count and Mechthild may illuminate very little about the relationship between father and daughter, it does demonstrate better than more official documents how much influence the members of a religious house could have in how donations were recorded and remembered. What an analysis of the *Vita Mechtildis* makes clear is that the Diessen canons were the ones who wanted and needed to have Count Berthold I, his wife Sophia, their daughter Mechthild, and various other unnamed relatives together in one place as a way of strengthening the canons’ claims to a tenth of the revenues at Oberding. The author of the *Vita* therefore constructed a story that provided what he considered to be a plausible depiction of how a consenting kin group functioned.

This conclusion raises important questions about how the charters and tradition notices that record property transactions can be used to study family relationships. The grant of the Oberding revenues—despite the fact that it is contained in a hagiographical source—is discussed in the formulaic language characteristic of these more official sources. Count Berthold I of Andechs essentially speaks aloud a tradition notice. He announces that he is making “‘the gift upon the altar of St. Mary the Virgin Mother of Jesus Christ’” and “‘with everyone present bearing witness.’” The count then levels a threat against any of his descendants who might “‘attempt to hinder access to the gift I am now giving.’” As has been shown, all of these words were put into Berthold’s mouth in the *Vita Mechtildis* in order to assist the canons at Diessen; nothing about

---

67 Similar language appears in many tradition notices and charters from twelfth-and thirteenth-century Bavaria.
Andechs family relationships can be drawn from his speech. Given this situation, the archival documents where property donations were normally recorded need to be analyzed carefully to determine the extent to which consenting kin groups were shaped by the religious communities who produced these documents.

III. The monastery of Admont & Andechs family relationships

The majority of studies of the medieval nobility written in recent decades have relied on the archival sources from a small number of prominent religious communities within a particular region. Although much valuable research on noble family structures has been produced as a result of this approach, historians have generally not taken into account the possibility that the sources from different monasteries or different religious orders within different regions might reveal different consenting kin groups—even within the same noble family. The recent emphasis on the evidence from a limited number of monastic houses has therefore potentially created over-simplified explanations for the composition of these groups of relatives. However, by focusing on a single noble family rather than a single region, it is possible to view the sources for property donations from a decidedly different perspective. The consenting kin groups who are named in grants to different monasteries can be compared and contrasted in order to determine whether the patterns suggest the influence of the donor and his family or of the religious communities receiving the gifts.

---

68 Regional studies have typically focused on local nobilities and families that may only appear in the sources from one or two monasteries. It is precisely the fact that property donations can reveal something about these lesser noble families that has made the documents so popular in recent years. However, I would argue that it is important to look at more powerful noble families with trans-regional interests if the grants of the lower nobility are to be better understood. For more on this point, see Chapter One.
One of the religious houses to which members of the house of Andechs made several donations during the twelfth century was the Benedictine monastery of Admont in the march of Styria. Contacts between the religious community and the noble family were especially numerous in the period between approximately 1135 and 1165, when almost a dozen different sources connect various Andechs family members to Admont for one reason or another. The surviving Admont records of property donations from these years are particularly valuable because of the range of Andechs kin who were involved in gifts to the monastery. Since the counts of Andechs made property agreements with several other religious communities during the same period, the sources produced at Admont also can be analyzed effectively in order to consider the extent to which the monastery’s role in producing the documents has distorted the perception of Andechs family relationships.

The monastery of Admont was founded in 1074 by Archbishop Gebhard of Salzburg (1060-1088). Situated in the Enns river valley in the march of Styria, the religious house lay near the Pyhrn mountain pass along one of the main routes through the eastern Alps. During the Investiture Controversy, the pro-papal Admont had been devastated on various occasions by supporters of the emperors. But beginning in the 1120s, the monastery’s power and influence began to grow rapidly. The Hirsau reform took hold within the religious house, and a short time later a community of nuns was added. By the middle of the twelfth century, Admont was one of the most successful
religious houses within the archdiocese of Salzburg, and it attracted noble patrons from throughout the southeast of the German empire.\(^6\)

Count Berthold I of Andechs had already established contacts with the monastery of Admont by the end of the 1130s. Shortly before the year 1139, he placed his only daughter from his second marriage, Kunigunde, in the convent there. At the time of her entrance into the community, the count made a gift of extensive properties in Carinthia to the religious house.\(^7\) Around the same time, Berthold I also granted to Admont a saltworks in Bad Reichenhall near Salzburg, which he had acquired by hereditary right when his paternal uncle, the canon Conrad of Jasberg, had died.\(^8\) Unfortunately, both of these property donations are known only from brief references in later sources, meaning there are no indications as to whether some of Berthold I’s relatives might have been involved with the grants in any way.

The evidence is better for the gift made to Admont by Count Berthold I’s eldest son Poppo on the eve of the Second Crusade in 1147. According to the surviving tradition notice, Poppo agreed to give the monastery twelve *mansi* as well as the serfs who worked those properties if he did not return from the Holy Land. He made the grant “for the salvation of his soul, the souls of all his ancestors, and the soul of his son Henry, whom he had offered to the monastery for the religious profession.”\(^9\) Because Poppo

---


\(^7\) Appendix Two, no. 36.

\(^8\) Appendix Two, no. 37.

\(^9\) MHDC, 3:330-331, no. 847: “…pro remedio anime sue et omnium parentum suorum et pro filio suo Heinrico quem in eodem cenobio monastice professioni obtulerat.” This is Appendix Two, no. 9 and Appendix Three, no. 19.
would not be able to finalize the donation if he died, his younger brother Berthold II was entrusted with the task of completing the agreement after the crusade. But following Poppo’s death at Constantinople in 1148, Berthold II decided not to give all twelve *mans* to Admont. Instead, “unmindful of the fraternal petition of piety and faith,” he granted to the monastery only five of the *mans* as well as two fords for crossing the Drava river. Berthold II made this donation through “his kinsman” Duke Henry V of Carinthia.

Early in the 1150s, Berthold II and Admont concluded another property arrangement, and this one also involved a lengthy, complex process. The count of Andechs and the monastery agreed to an exchange of rights and territories; in return for granting to Admont a saltworks in Bad Reichenhall near Salzburg, Count Berthold II received properties in the valleys of the Inn and Enns rivers as well as wine and money. This agreement between Berthold II and Admont was reached in Regensburg at the royal court in either 1151 or 1152. None of the count’s close relatives was present at the time. However, Berthold II promised that, within two years, his wife as well as his younger brother, the cleric Otto, would confirm the property exchange. Both agreed to the arrangement before the two years had passed. In a charter of Archbishop Eberhard I of Salzburg (1147-1164), it is reported that Berthold II and his brother Otto traveled to

---

73 Ibid.: “…fraterne petici(o)nis pietatis et fidei immemor…” This reference to the grant was added to the end of the tradition notice where Poppo’s grant is recorded. For the tradition notice where Berthold II’s grant is preserved, see the following footnote.

74 Ibid., 339, no. 872. Duke Henry is referred to as “cognatus suus.” He belonged to the noble house of Spanheim and appears to have been a second cousin of Count Berthold II; Count Engelbert I of Spanheim († 1096) was the great-grandfather of both of them.

75 Appendix Two, no. 15. There are two versions of this text. UB Steiermark, 1:329-330, no. 342, which was preserved at Admont, states that the agreement took place at the court of King Conrad III. However, another version of the exchange, *Salzburger Urkundenbuch* [hereafter SUB], eds. Abbot Willibald Hauthaler and Franz Martin (Salzburg, 1916), 2:423-426, no. 304, reports that the initial agreement took place at the court of King Frederick I.
the Carinthian town of Villach in 1153 to attest before various prominent witnesses that the exchange had indeed occurred in the appropriate manner.\(^7^6\)

A few years later, Count Berthold II of Andechs made a final donation to Admont.\(^7^7\) This agreement was more straightforward than his previous two property arrangements with the religious community. At some point between 1157 and 1165, he was present at the monastery to give the community various lands and serfs. According to the tradition notice, the grant was completed in the presence of the abbot and was made by both the count and his wife Hedwig. They gave the gift “out of their love for their relatives in the monastery and for the salvation of their souls and the souls of their ancestors.”\(^7^8\) The witnesses included several of the count’s ministerials from throughout his territories.

Each of the gifts of property offered by members of the house of Andechs to the monastery of Admont between the years 1147 and 1165 thus involved a different set of relatives. How are these kin groups who are named in the various property agreements to be interpreted? From the perspective of traditional approaches to the study of family structure, the groups appear to be the product of a period of relative uncertainty within the house of Andechs. In the years immediately preceding the Second Crusade, Berthold II was unquestionably next in the line of inheritance after his older brother Poppo, which is why he was expected to confirm Poppo’s gift following his brother’s death in 1148. When Berthold II returned from the crusade, however, the question of who would

\(^{76}\) SUB, 2:423-426, no. 304.

\(^{77}\) Appendix Two, no. 16.

\(^{78}\) Ibid.: “…ab amorem uidelicet eorum quos in eodem monasterio habent, propinquorum et pro remedio anime sue omniumque parentum suorum.”
succeed him must have been unclear; he had no legitimate children of his own because he had yet to marry. This may help to explain why one of his distant kinsman, Duke Henry of Carinthia, was involved in his own first grant to Admont. When Berthold II next made a property arrangement with the monastery in the early 1150s, his wife and brother were expected to give their consent because the succession was still in doubt. Then, following the birth of his son Berthold III around 1154, a phase of increased stability ensued; Berthold II’s final grant to Admont, which occurred while his son was still a minor, involved only his wife because the inheritance was secure in the direct male line.

Turning to the issue of family relationships, it is tempting to understand all of this to mean that, in the years immediately following the Second Crusade, Count Berthold II of Andechs wanted to build strong relationships with as many relatives as possible. Without an adult son to insure the smooth descent of the patrimony, he needed to rely on his brother and especially his wife to provide him with a network of support. Berthold II even turned to a distant kinsman, Duke Henry of Carinthia, for one of his property donations; this was the only occasion during the whole of the twelfth century that such a distant relative became involved in one of the Andechs counts’ grants. Because of the uncertainty of the time, Berthold II therefore emphasized certain kinship bonds that he otherwise might have largely neglected if the succession had been more secure.

While this is one plausible interpretation of the Admont texts, when these donations are analyzed alongside Count Berthold II’s property arrangements with other religious communities, an entirely different perspective emerges. In 1143, his older brother Poppo had reached an agreement with the bishopric of Bamberg concerning the inheritance of Poppo’s former wife Kunizza, the only daughter of Count Reginboto of
Poppo agreed to give the bishopric two castles near Bamberg which he claimed through his marriage to Kunizza, and in exchange Bishop Egilbert granted to Poppo, his son Henry and Berthold II partial use of the fortifications during their lifetimes. Both Count Berthold I and Berthold II witnessed this charter. Six years later, after returning from crusade, Berthold II confirmed the earlier agreement with Bamberg except for one modification: his own eldest son was to have partial use of the castles during his lifetime as well. Significantly, none of Berthold II’s living relatives was named as a witness or consenter to this new accord—which occurred in the same year that the count’s distant kinsman Duke Henry of Carinthia was involved in his gift to Admont.

Early in his career, Count Berthold II of Andechs also made a pair of property arrangements with the western Bavarian monastery of Benediktbeuern. The tradition notices where these two arrangements are recorded have been dated to the 1150s or 1160s by modern scholars. According to the first of these texts, Berthold II agreed to an exchange of properties with the monastery. The same document also states that the count received additional properties from Benediktbeuern as part of the agreement—but only for the duration of his lifetime. In the second tradition notice, the count granted the religious house a piece of forest and, in return, received a parcel of land near his castle of Andechs. While he gave the forest to Benediktbeuern in perpetuity “in his desire for

79 Appendix Two, no. 8.

80 Appendix Two, no. 12. Berthold II almost certainly did not have a son yet in 1149 at the time of this agreement (see Chapter Five).

81 Appendix Two, nos. 13 and 14.

82 Appendix Two, no. 13.

83 Appendix Two, no. 14.
eternal life as well as for the salvation of the souls of his dead ancestors,” the property he obtained in exchange was to revert to Benediktbeuern upon his death. Neither of these tradition notices names any of his relatives as consenters or witnesses to the agreements, despite the fact they occurred in the same period as the count’s grants to Admont.

At some point between the years 1158 and 1173, Berthold II gave a gift to another Bavarian monastery as well. He granted a serf along with a small amount of money to the religious community at Vornbach south of Passau. As was the case in his property agreements with Benediktbeuern, the tradition notice where this donation to Vornbach has been preserved mentions none of Berthold II’s kin. The evidence from the two Bavarian monasteries as well as the church of Bamberg therefore suggests that Berthold II did not usually appear in conjunction with other members of his family in property arrangements during the mid-twelfth century. As a result, the argument that uncertainties surrounding the inheritance inside the house of Andechs can explain the kin groups named in the Admont texts no longer seems to be tenable. Indeed, the counts’ grants to Admont between the late 1140s and the 1160s appear to be quite anomalous when viewed within the context of the counts’ property agreements with other religious communities.

How are the kin groups in the noble house’s donations to Admont to be explained if similar collections of relatives were not involved in the family’s other property agreements from the same period? The answer becomes clear when the focus is shifted away from the house of Andechs to the monastery of Admont. A survey of the religious

---

84 Ibid.: “…eternę vitę desiderio animarumque parentum suorum defunctorum remedio…”

85 Appendix Two, no. 17.
community’s other tradition notices from the mid-twelfth century reveals that extensive consenting kin groups were common in many of the donations to the monastery.

For example, on the eve of the Second Crusade, Count Conrad of Peilstein made a gift of various properties to Admont for the sake of his soul as well as in return for some money to help fund his trip. His wife and three of his sons are named in the tradition notice as co-grantors. Approximately a decade later, around the year 1160, Count Engelbert of Görz (Gorizia) gave a piece of land to Admont. The name heading the witness list is Otto of Lenginbach, who is identified as his nephew, “his sister’s son.” The same tradition notice also reports that “Later, the son of the aforesaid count, the young count Meinhard, renounced his claim” to the property his father had granted. And in a third donation to Admont from around the year 1170, Count Liutold III of Plain granted a vineyard to the monastery “with his wife Uta and their children.” At the end of the tradition notice, it states that one of Liutold III’s sons later confirmed this gift “in the town of Enns because he had not been present for the original donation, which had been made in the castle of Plain.”

These three donations to Admont, all from the same period as the grants made by members of the house of Andechs to the monastery, indicate that the tradition notices from this religious community include especially elaborate formulae for the involvement

86 UB Steiermark 1:278, no. 265.
87 Ibid., 402, no. 416: “Testes sunt Otto de Lenginbach filius sororius eiusdem comitis,…”
88 Ibid.: “Postmodum filius predicti comitis, puer Meinhardus comes eundem mansum abdicavit.”
89 Ibid., 487-488, no. 521: “…cum uxore sua Uta et filiis…”
90 Ibid.: “Hanc traditionem predicte uinee renouauit filius eius…in oppido Ense quia priori traditioni que in castro Plain (facta) fuerat, ipse non interfuerat.”
of a donor’s kin in property agreements. Compared to other religious houses with which the counts of Andechs had dealings, Admont appears to have had particularly rigid policies about procuring the consent of relatives whenever a gift was made to the monastery. The only record of an Andechs donation that states that family members who were not present for the agreement needed to give their consent at a later date was drawn up at Admont.\textsuperscript{91} While the document is therefore unusual from the perspective of Andechs property arrangements, it is quite standard when viewed in the context of other Admont tradition notices. Considering that none of Count Berthold II’s kin was named in his grants to the monasteries of Benediktbeuern and Vornbach, the kin groups who appear in the counts’ donations to Admont therefore must be approached very cautiously. The evidence certainly suggests that these collections of relatives named in family members’ grants to Admont reflect the monastery’s customs and interests more than the concerns of the house of Andechs.

It is interesting to note that Count Berthold II of Andechs had very close ties to those religious houses with which he reached property agreements that did not involve any of his kin. He was the lay advocate for both Benediktbeuern and Vornbach, and he possessed comital authority within the region that included most of the diocese of Bamberg.\textsuperscript{92} In contrast, the house of Andechs did not have especially strong connections to Admont. As the grants from the counts of Peilstein, Görz (Gorizia) and Plain demonstrate, there were many comital houses in the southeast of the empire that gave properties to this influential monastery. Admont’s numerous high-ranking patrons may

---

\textsuperscript{91} Appendix Two, no. 15.

\textsuperscript{92} See Chapter Two.
explain why grants to the religious community typically involved several kin. The monastery was receiving substantial amounts of property spread over a broad geographical region, and Admont may have considered especially large consenting kin groups necessary because the monastery could not possibly keep track of who had legitimate claims to each of the territories it was receiving. Thus, different religious communities potentially had different opinions about who needed to give consent to gifts. As a result, reading anything about family relationships from these property arrangements becomes very problematic.

The dangers of relying too heavily on the charters and tradition notices that record grants to study noble families is apparent in an analysis of the evidence for contacts between Count Berthold II of Andechs and his wife Hedwig. The property exchange involving the count and the monastery of Admont during 1152-1153 is the earliest surviving reference to Berthold II’s spouse. Hedwig appeared again in the sources a few years later when she made the grant of lands and serfs to Admont alongside her husband. Only one other contemporary text names Hedwig. In 1161, the abbot of Benediktbeuern drew up a charter to conclude a property dispute. He declared that he and his monks were relinquishing all their claims to the disputed piece of land. According to the charter, the abbot made this decision “at the request of Count Berthold, our advocate, and with the intervention of his wife Hedwig.”

---

93 Admont was clearly unusual for having so many prominent donors. Most southern German monasteries were patronized by only one or two families from the upper nobility. See Ludwig Holzfurtner, “Schenker und Schenkergruppen im hohen Mittelalter. Sozialgeschichtliche Studien an Hand bayerischer Traditionsbücher,” ZBLG 54 (1991): 316-317.

94 Appendix Two, no. 16.

95 UB Steiermark, 1:430, no. 464: “Itaque ex peticione domni Berhtoldi comitis, aduocati scilicet nostri et interuentu uxorivs eius Hadewige,...”
Hedwig’s appearance in this text merits attention because none of the other women who married into the house of Andechs is named in any similar context. It is therefore tempting to interpret this document as evidence that Hedwig played a more active role in the family’s political affairs than other Andechs wives did. However, the property dispute at the center of the abbot’s charter concerns his monastery of Benediktbeuern and the monastery of Admont. This means that every appearance of Hedwig in the contemporary sources involved Admont in some way. Given that, as has been shown, Hedwig’s inclusion in her husband’s grants to Admont reflects more on the monastery than the house of Andechs, her intervention in the Benediktbeuern-Admont dispute must be viewed with caution. Does her involvement reveal her close relationship with Count Berthold II during his career, or does Hedwig’s appearance in this charter instead provide evidence for her relationship with the community of religious at Admont? Without any sources from outside the Admont sphere of influence to help answer this question, the monastery’s role in shaping the image of Hedwig’s position within the house of Andechs cannot be ignored.

IV. Conclusions

During the last several decades, the charters and other archival documents where medieval property grants, exchanges and confirmations are preserved have been vital sources for debates about noble kinship groups. The aim of this chapter has been to consider whether or not the records of these transactions can be used in the study of family relationships to the same extent as they have been used to analyze family

96 It is interesting to note that Hedwig also appears in an Admont necrology. See Oefele, 22-23.
structures. As has been shown, the tradition notices from the southeast of the German empire reveal how flexible property rights and inheritance patterns were for the house of Andechs in the twelfth century. But the story of the Oberding revenues in the *Vita Mechtildis* and the evidence from the counts’ grants to Admont suggest that it was the religious community’s views toward property rights and inheritance, not the family’s, that typically shaped the composition of these groups. The collections of relatives named in the documents therefore cannot on their own provide any direct evidence for networks of cooperation and support inside a noble house. Corroborating evidence from a much broader range of sources must be sought in order to determine if the group of kin named in any given property donation can be used to understand intra-familial relationships.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE FOUNDERS OF DIESEN:

LIUTOLD’S CODEX & THE CONSTRUCTION OF FAMILY IDENTITY

The first decade of the thirteenth century was a tumultuous period in the history of the western Bavarian lands of the house of Andechs. On 12 August 1204, Duke Berthold III of Merania died. His second son Henry, who succeeded him as margrave of Istria, inherited the county of Andechs as well as other rights and properties in Upper Bavaria. From the beginning, however, Henry seems to have been more interested in the other lordships he had acquired, namely those in Carniola.¹ There is evidence to suggest that the Wittelsbach duke Louis I of Bavaria (1183-1231) sought to exploit this situation by launching raids into Henry’s Bavarian lands.² Then, at the wedding of Henry’s brother Duke Otto I of Merania to the heiress of the county-palatine of Burgundy on 21 June 1208, King Philip of Swabia was assassinated. The margrave of Istria was implicated in the plot and fled the empire to Hungary, where his sister Gertrude was queen. At a gathering of the German royal court later in the same year, Henry was formally stripped

¹ During the years immediately following Duke Berthold III’s death in 1204, Margrave Henry of Istria is named in significantly more sources from Carniola than Upper Bavaria. He definitively appears on only one occasion prior to 1210 in a document from a western Bavarian religious house: Tr. Weihenstephan, 288-289, no. 350.

of the march of Istria and his other imperial fiefs by King Otto of Brunswick.\(^3\) Using Henry’s crime as a pretext, Duke Louis I invaded his Bavarian lands again. By the spring of 1210, the county of Andechs—the ancestral home of the house of Andechs since the beginning of the twelfth century—was lost to the family, and a “judge and administrator of the province” was appointed by Louis to govern the region.\(^4\)

In the midst of the turmoil in Upper Bavaria between 1204 and 1210, an Augustinian canon from the religious community at Diessen in the county of Andechs compiled a codex.\(^5\) Moments of crisis often spurred the members of a religious house to preserve as many of the key documents concerning their institution as possible. The canon, named Liutold, included in his book two necrologies, the Augustinian rule for canons, copies of tradition notices and important charters, as well as liturgical texts.\(^6\) For the medieval community of canons at Diessen, this codex could serve a variety of spiritual and economic purposes. On the one hand, the necrologies indicated which saints, past members of the religious house, and prominent patrons were to be prayed for on a particular day; the canons could therefore use the necrologies alongside the other liturgical texts in the codex for the performance of the divine office. On the other hand, the necrologies also noted which pieces of property had been given by specific donors,

\(^3\) For a more detailed discussion of these events, see Chapter Two.

\(^4\) Tr. Diessen, 43-44, no. 32: “iudex et procurator provincie.” The house of Andechs would eventually recover its Bavarian lands in 1227-1228.

\(^5\) Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 1018.

\(^6\) For a more detailed description of the manuscript, see below.
meaning that the necrologies could be combined with the tradition notices to form a list of the community’s property holdings.\footnote{Because of the different purposes this codex served, modern German historians have used different terms to categorize the manuscript. Some scholars have labeled it a \textit{Traditionsbuch}. See, for example, Michael Borgolte, “Stiftergedenken in Kloster Diéßen. Ein Beitrag zur Kritik bayerischer Traditionsbücher,” \textit{Frühmittelalterliche Studien} 24 (1990): 235-289; Waldemar Schlögl in Tr. Diessen; and Hans Arbinger, \textit{Das Diéßener Traditionsbuch} (Munich: Buchdruckerei J. Gotteswinter, 1941). Others have called it a \textit{Kapiteloffiziumsbuch}. See, for example, Bernd Schneidmüller, “Die Andechs-Meranier—Rang und Erinnerung im hohen Mittelalter,” in \textit{Die Andechs-Meranier in Franken: Europäisches Fürstentum im Hochmittelalter} (Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 1998), 55-68 and Christine Sauer, \textit{Fundatio und Memoria. Stifter und Klostergründer im Bild 1100 bis 1350} (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993).}

For modern historians, Liutold’s Codex has been valuable for another reason: no other work provides more evidence for the genealogy of the house of Andechs before 1204 than this manuscript. Liutold’s interest in the Andechs family can be traced to the fact that the community of Augustinian canons at Diessen had been founded by Count Berthold I of Andechs and members of his extended kinship group around the year 1114. Throughout the twelfth century, the Diessen canons enjoyed the patronage of the family, and the community’s chapter hall and church served as burial sites for Count Berthold I and many of his descendants and other relatives until 1204.\footnote{After 1204, other religious communities—most notably the Franconian monastery of Langheim—became more important for the members of the house of Andechs. Diessen remained an important religious community for the family but lost much of its significance as a burial site and focal point of the family’s patronage strategies.} As a result, Diessen became one of the most important places for the preservation of the memory of the noble house. German scholars have therefore labeled the community of canons a \textit{Hauskloster}, a “house monastery,” because of its close relationship with the Andechses.\footnote{The concept of the \textit{Hauskloster} was central to Karl Schmid’s earliest arguments about the emergence of patrilineages. See his “Zur Problematik von Familie, Sippe und Geschlecht, Haus und Dynastie beim mittelalterlichen Adel,” \textit{Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberreins} 105 (1957): 1-62 [reprinted in Karl Schmid, \textit{Gebetsgedenken und adliges Selbstverständnis im Mittelalter} (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1983), 183-244]. More recently, Wilhelm Störmer has provided a general discussion of “house monasteries” in his analysis of Wittelsbach monasteries: “Die Hausklöster der Wittelsbacher,” in \textit{Die Zeit der frühen Herzöge: Von Otto I. zu Ludwieg dem Bayern}, ed. Hubert Glaser (Munich: Hirmer Verlag, 1980), 139. For the position that Diessen was the \textit{Hauskloster} of the counts of Andechs, see for example Alois}
compiled his codex during the crisis of the early thirteenth century, one of his goals was to insure that the memory of Diessen’s founders and patrons would not be forgotten. The necrologies are filled with the names of members of the extended Andechs kinship group, and the tradition notices mainly concern properties given by many of those same relatives. There is even a drawing in the manuscript that depicts some of the members of the kinship group.

Liutold’s Codex thus includes an extraordinary collection of evidence for the house of Andechs. The goal of this chapter will be to analyze the depiction of the Andechses and their extended kinship group as presented in the manuscript. German scholars have consistently relied on this codex from the early thirteenth century to write the history of the house of Andechs in the twelfth century—without seriously considering the possibility that Liutold’s views toward the founders and patrons of his religious community only reflect the Diessen canons’ own interests. Contemporary, twelfth-century sources must be studied alongside the memorial evidence from Liutold’s Codex in order to determine if the Andechs kinship group portrayed in the book accurately represents the intra-familial networks operating within the noble house prior to the year 1204.

I. Genealogy, memory and identity: the Welfs and German historiography

While the French and American historiography on the medieval nobility since the Second World War has typically focused on the collections of charters that survive from

prominent western European monasteries in order to write regional studies of the nobility, German scholarship has tended to concentrate on the extant texts written at smaller, family-controlled “house monasteries” like Diessen to discuss the histories of individual noble houses. More than any other body of sources, these works intended to preserve a family’s memory have shaped how German historians during the last half-century have explored the changing perceptions of noble kinship groups over the course of the central and later Middle Ages. The genealogical evidence from these texts has been especially important for questions about the ways in which medieval authors constructed the membership of noble houses.

In the historiography of the last fifty years, questions about the identity and group-consciousness of German noble families have mainly focused on a single kinship group, the Welfs. The history of this noble house during the early twelfth century was dominated by the brothers Duke Henry the Proud of Bavaria and Saxony († 1139) and Duke Welf VI of Spoleto († 1191) and then, beginning in the 1140s, by Welf VI and Henry the Proud’s son, Duke Henry the Lion of Bavaria and Saxony († 1195). For the authors of the eighteenth-century *Origines Guelficae*—who were mainly interested in the career of Henry the Lion—Welf VI was viewed as a key ally and supporter of Henry the Lion. According to the *Origines*, the reason for the cooperation between uncle and nephew was connected to a strong sense of Welf family unity that envisioned all the

---

10 For some of the strengths and weaknesses of the tendency of Germans to focus on much narrower topics than the French, see John Freed, “Medieval German Social History: Generalizations and Particularism,” *Central European History* 25 (1992): 1-26.
members of this noble house working together toward common Welf goals. In short, the Welfs were not just a family—they were a cohesive political party.\textsuperscript{11}

Throughout much of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, studies of the political history of the German empire between approximately 1125 and 1250 were dominated by the perceived conflict between the Welfs and their chief rivals, the Staufens, who included many of the kings and emperors during this period. These two families were generally thought to have been involved in a generations-long struggle which began with the disputed royal election that followed the death of Emperor Henry V in 1125.\textsuperscript{12} Central to this argument was the observation by the twelfth-century chronicler Otto of Freising that “[t]hese families…were frequently envious of each other and often disturbed the peace of the state.”\textsuperscript{13} Otto’s comment helped to make the dynastic history of the Welfs and the Staufens central to much broader questions in modern Verfassungsgeschichte about the history of the German nation.\textsuperscript{14} Generations of German scholars understood the Staufens and the Welfs as distinct, competing power blocs whose

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{13} Otto of Freising, \textit{The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa}, trans. Charles Christopher Mierow (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994), 116, II.i.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{14} For more on German Verfassungsgeschichte, see Chapter One.
\end{flushright}
family strategies significantly impacted the history of the empire even into the modern period.15

Beginning with Karl Schmid’s 1968 article “Welfisches Selbstverständnis,” the Welf began to be studied from a new perspective.16 Using the rich collection of family histories, genealogies and pictorial representations of the Welfs produced during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, Schmid considers questions about the relationship between Welf history and Welf historiography in the central Middle Ages. He argues that, although modern historians could trace the Welfs back into the Carolingian period, the concept of a Welf house was not constructed until the twelfth century. Furthermore, the understanding of the Welf house could vary in different places at different times. In the later twelfth century, for example, the memorial sources being produced in the territories of Duke Welf VI along the Swabia-Bavaria border reflected a different family consciousness than the similar sources written in his nephew Henry the Lion’s Saxon lands during the same period. With this article, Schmid thus raises important questions about how noble families need to be understood as mental phenomena—products of time and space—rather than merely biological structures.17

15 For more on nineteenth- and twentieth-century perceptions of the Staufens and the Welfs, see Bernd Schneidmüller, Die Welfen: Herrschaft und Erinnerung (Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 2000), 288-300 and Hechberger, 21-32.


One of Schmid’s students, Otto Gerhard Oexle, has expanded significantly upon his teacher’s arguments. Using the Welf sources, Oexle focuses on the issue of “liturgical memory” and the ways in which the memorial texts written at a Hauskloster can be analyzed to explore family identity.¹⁸ For Oexle, these sources can reveal how noblemen used memory to legitimize their lordship; by emphasizing certain ancestors and ignoring others, the authors of these works created a family history that was useful for the contemporary members of a noble house. Gerd Althoff, another student of Karl Schmid, has countered many of Oexle’s assertions, arguing that the sources produced at “house monasteries” often reflect only the religious communities’ interests and not the views of noble families.¹⁹ For Althoff, the causa scribendi has become the key issue in determining the value of monastic texts as evidence for family identity. The reasons why these sources were written when they were written must be considered carefully according to him because the motives behind their production often concerned the monastic authors more than the noble families discussed in the texts.

Althoff’s criticisms have led many scholars to take a much more cautious approach to memorial sources than was taken by earlier historians in the field.


Nevertheless, there remains a general consensus that the texts written by monastic authors can provide valuable insight into the group-consciousness of the Welfs. Bernd Schneidmüller’s careful reading of the necrologies and other works produced at the Saxon monasteries controlled by Henry the Lion and his heirs demonstrates how closely memory and family identity were connected to regional lordships. For Schneidmüller, these texts reveal that, in Saxony, Henry the Lion’s genealogical connections to other Saxon nobles—including Emperor Lothar III (1125-1137)—were more important than the kinship bonds Henry and his children had to their southern German relatives like Duke Welf VI. Each time that the political situation of individual Welf noblemen changed significantly, monastic authors sought to construct the family’s history in a way that would support and legitimize the new realities of family power. As a result, over the course of the later twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the Welfs increasingly came to be understood in Saxony as a Saxon family—despite the fact that the Welfs established their lordship in Swabia and Bavaria two centuries before they first arrived in Saxony.

Thus, the research conducted by Schmid, Oexle, Althoff, Schneidmüller and other German historians between the late 1960s and the mid-1990s has gradually transformed perceptions of the Welf family. All of their work helped to lay the foundation for Werner Hechberger’s 1996 book *Staufer und Welfen 1125-1190*, which seeks to offer a new interpretation of the supposed conflict between the two great families. Because the Welfs are no longer viewed as an unchanging, monolithic family, Hechberger chooses to

---


21 For this point, also see Schneidmüller’s recent book: *Die Welfen: Herrschaft und Erinnerung*.

22 See note 11 above.
reconsider the career of Duke Welf VI from the perspective of recent arguments. According to Hechberger, the different visions of the Welf family presented in the Saxon and the Swabian-Bavarian sources reflected a genuine split between Welf VI and his nephew Henry the Lion; there was no mutual feeling of “Welfness” that compelled these two noblemen to cooperate with one another during their careers. Indeed, Welf VI had no qualms about allying himself with the Staufen Emperor Frederick I Barbarossa because, like Henry the Lion, Frederick was one of Welf VI’s nephews. Hechberger’s work has therefore shown how the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century perceptions of the Welfs and the Staufens were much too rigid because “Welf” and “Staufen” identities were not understood in the Middle Ages as powerful definers of group consciousness.

No other families from the German empire during the central Middle Ages have received as much scholarly attention as the Welfs and the Staufens. The historiography relating to the Welfs has been especially rich in recent decades because, as many historians have noted, there are significantly more sources for Welf identity and group consciousness than for any other noble house in the empire. Nevertheless, some scholars have attempted with varying degrees of success to analyze how the members of other families sought to construct their identity. One of the most valuable recent

---

23 Emperor Frederick I’s mother Judith was the sister of Welf VI and Henry the Proud (Henry the Lion’s father).

24 Hechberger’s book is especially valuable for understanding the Welf family because Hechberger discusses at length how the Welf-Staufen theory grew in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries to overshadow what the medieval sources for the Welf and the Staufen actually say.


additions to the historiography on family identity has been Stefan Pätzold’s study of the Wettins, who were a prominent noble family in eastern Saxony.27

In 1156, Margrave Conrad of Wettin divided his properties and rights among all five of his sons, creating several different branches within the noble house. Two texts written during the early thirteenth century, the *Genealogia Wettinensis* and the *Chronicon Montis Sereni*, provide evidence for how contemporary monastic authors in Saxony imagined and understood the complex kinship group that emerged from this territorial division.28 Like Hechberger in his work on the Welfs and the Stauffens, Pätzold compares and contrasts these memorial sources for the Wettins with other types of evidence for the family, including private charters and seals.29 Pätzold then argues that the *Genealogia* and the *Chronicon*, both of which traced the histories of all of Margrave Conrad’s descendants, emphasized in many ways the common group identity of all the different branches of the noble house. In contrast, while some other sources support the position that members of the various family branches did occasionally have contacts with one another, most of the surviving evidence indicates that, with each passing generation, the different lines increasingly perceived themselves as distinct families.30 The construction of Wettin identity in the later twelfth and early thirteenth centuries was therefore


28 Ibid., 271-347.

29 Ibid., 339-347. Though Pätzold only discusses these other types of sources briefly, the fact that he discusses them at all is significant because so many other studies of noble group consciousness have focused solely on memorial sources produced at monasteries.

30 Ibid.
complicated, and the Genealogia and the Chronicon were each able to express only certain aspects of how this noble house was understood and remembered.

Beginning with the debates surrounding the Welfs and the Staufens and continuing more recently with discussions about other noble families in the empire like the Wettins, the German historiography has thus made family identity a central theme in the study of the nobility. Scholars have increasingly argued that many of the older, traditional views about noble families which originated in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries are more problematic than previously assumed. The key to this new research and this rethinking of noble group consciousness has been careful consideration of what the memorial sources written at “house monasteries” can and cannot reveal about noble houses. While these texts often provide historians with the best surviving evidence for how noble families were imagined and understood, the works of Hechberger and Pätzold have shown the importance of comparing the evidence from these works with other types of surviving sources.

No historian has analyzed how modern perceptions of the house of Andechs relate to the depictions of the noble house in the memorial sources and in contemporary, twelfth-century texts. Nevertheless, recent works on the house of Andechs consistently emphasize some kinship bonds while virtually ignoring others. The reasons for these decisions are rarely explained. For a study of Andechs family relationships, however, it is critical to determine which relationships scholars have assumed to be important for the family and which relationships can be supported by evidence from the central Middle

---

31 The only historian to discuss the group consciousness of the house of Andechs is Bernd Schneidmüller in a brief article on the subject: “Die Andechs-Meranier—Rang und Erinnerung im hohen Mittelalter,” in Die Andechs-Meranier in Franken, 55-68.
Ages. This approach requires careful analysis of the source that has—both consciously and unconsciously—had the most significant influence on how historians of the last two centuries have written the history of the house of Andechs: the codex compiled by the Diessen canon Liutold.

II. Liutold’s Codex and Andechs family identity

One of the ways in which the Welfs were virtually unique in twelfth-century Germany was that many of their memorial sources appear to have been commissioned by members of the family and were possibly even written at the courts of Welf lords rather than in religious houses. But Liutold’s Codex—like the majority of surviving memorial sources—was produced by a religious community for its own use. As the position of the house of Andechs in Upper Bavaria rapidly deteriorated in the years between 1204 and 1210, the Augustinian canons at Diessen sought to preserve the most important texts for their religious house in a single place. A local crisis that threatened the canons, rather than the interests of Margrave Henry of Istria or any other contemporary members of the house of Andechs, was the causa scribendi underlying Liutold’s work. However, because Diessen was the “house monastery” for the Andechs family and the burial site for many members of this kinship group during the twelfth century, the manuscript provides detailed evidence about how the canons at Diessen wanted to remember the

---

32 One of the only other German pieces of literary evidence for noble self-consciousness that was clearly produced under the direct influence of a nobleman was the Codex Falkensteinensis. For this source, see Freed, The Counts of Falkenstein and his forthcoming “The Creation of the Codex Falkensteinensis (1166): Self-Representation and Reality.”

33 Borgolte, “Stiftergedenken in Kloster Dießen,” 246-247. Borgolte has connected the compilation of the codex specifically to the events of 1208, namely King Philip of Swabia’s assassination and its aftermath. I am more inclined to believe that the crisis in Upper Bavaria began earlier, almost immediately after Duke Berthold III of Merania’s death in 1204. For other discussions of the date of the codex’s compilation, see Oefele, 3-6 and Tr. Diessen, 19*.
founders and patrons of their community. The issue here is how the depiction of the noble house that Liutold preserved in his codex has enhanced or rather distorted modern perceptions of Andechs family relationships.

Before turning to this question, it is first necessary to take a closer look at the codex itself. Waldemar Schlögl, in his edition of the Diessen tradition notices and charters, has provided a detailed codicological description of the manuscript, which is today housed at the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich.\textsuperscript{34} The opening nineteen folios of the manuscript are occupied by the first of two necrologies (Necrology A).\textsuperscript{35} For a single monastic codex to include more than one necrology is unusual, and various scholars have speculated about the reasons behind the existence of the two texts. Michael Borgolte has recently argued that Necrology A, which contains far fewer names than the second one (Necrology B), was intended to preserve the days of death of only the most important figures for whom the Diessen canons were to pray. He supports his position by pointing out that only Necrology A records the feast days for saints. Furthermore, the names of the canons and canonesses from the Diessen community are all preserved in this necrology but not Necrology B.\textsuperscript{36}

A copy of the Augustinian rule for canons follows the first necrology.\textsuperscript{37} After the rule, the next major section of the codex—almost the entire fourth quire—is comprised of

\textsuperscript{34} Tr. Diessen, 9*-41*.

\textsuperscript{35} Borgolte, “Stiftergedenken in Kloster Dießen,” 254-289 contains an edition of the two necrologies that separates the names in the first necrology from the names in the second one. The MGH edition—abbreviated Nec. Diess. in this dissertation—lists all the names from both necrologies together. Borgolte’s edition only includes the names entered by Liutold, while the MGH edition contains later additions as well.


\textsuperscript{37} Clm 1018, ff. 20r-24r.
several folios that were left blank by Liutold. Schlögl has suggested that Liutold might have intended to include a narrative history of his religious community on these pages, but this is only speculation. Later scribes took advantage of the blank folios to record numerous tradition notices, most dating from the thirteenth century. After this unused quire, Liutold copied into the codex a series of papal bulls and other important ecclesiastical documents relating to the house of canons. Following these texts is the main collection of approximately twenty-five tradition notices compiled by Liutold. Because the two necrologies mention numerous grants to the house of canons that do not appear in this collection of tradition notices, Liutold almost certainly chose only specific grants that he wanted to preserve here as complete texts. The organization of the tradition notices is therefore central to any analysis of Liutold’s memorial strategies in compiling his codex.

Necrology B, which includes approximately three times more names than Necrology A, follows the tradition notices. Borgolte has argued that both necrologies in the manuscript are based on an earlier calendar from Diessen. According to him, this would explain why Necrology A has fewer and more select names while Necrology B seems to include a much broader range of names from throughout the later eleventh and

38 Ibid., ff. 24v-32v

39 Tr. Diessen, 17*-18*.

40 Clm 1018, ff. 33r-35r.

41 Ibid., ff. 35r-39r. How many tradition notices there are in this section depends to some extent on how the historian chooses to count them. I will refer to this section as containing twenty-four different tradition notices.

42 Ibid., ff. 39v-52v.
the twelfth centuries. However, because a seemingly random collection of people is listed in both necrologies without any indication why, neither Borgolte’s nor anyone else’s theory about the organization of the necrologies has been able to explain every name which appears in the two calendars. But the argument that Necrology B is a general list of the dead while Necrology A is a more carefully-chosen list is likely correct.

A set of liturgical texts to be used during the mass for the dead fills the last few folios of the codex written by Liutold. Then, at some point later in the thirteenth century, another quire was added to the manuscript. Rather than including texts that date from the period after Liutold’s initial compilation, however, these folios mainly contain twelfth-century copies of many of the same tradition notices found in the portion of the codex written by Liutold. This final quire is thus comprised of surviving pieces from earlier attempts to preserve Diessen’s tradition notices. Because the wording used by Liutold in his versions of the traditions differs in some places from the language of these earlier copies, Schlögl has suggested that Liutold still had the original tradition notices available when he was producing the manuscript. This argument is further

44 Sauer, 54-55 offers what is, in my opinion, a flawed argument about the people who appear twice in the necrologies. She believes there are very definite reasons why some people appear twice, but the evidence does not support her claims.
45 Clm 1018, ff. 52v-54v: “Lectiones in agenda mortuorum.”
46 Ibid., ff. 55-61.
47 Tr. Diessen, 18*-22*.
48 Ibid, 28*-29*.
supported by the fact that Liutold organized the tradition notices in an entirely different order than the way they are listed in the final quire.

As this brief overview shows, a variety of factors have made this codex difficult to interpret, and significant research still needs to be done before historians can understand the manuscript fully.⁴⁹ One reason why the codex has not been easy to decipher completely is that Liutold’s work clearly represents only a single moment in the memorial tradition of the house of canons at Diessen. The earlier copies of tradition notices contained in the final quire and Borgolte’s belief in the existence of an earlier necrology both suggest that the religious community had already begun shaping its past during the twelfth century. Furthermore, the entries made throughout the later Middle Ages in both necrologies and the thirteenth-century tradition notices added on the blank folios after the Augustinian rule are evidence that the process of remembering and preserving continued after Liutold’s death.⁵⁰

Liutold himself appears to have included only a single piece of original material in the codex: a half-page picture which he placed within the collection of tradition notices.⁵¹ Despite the fact that Liutold was more of a compiler than an author in the modern sense, the texts he chose to include and the way he organized them provide evidence for how the canons at Diessen shaped their memory of the house of Andechs at

---

⁴⁹ The most recent discussion of the codex can be found in Alois Schütz, “Die Grafen von Dießen und Andechs, Herzöge von Meranien,” in Königliche Tochterstämme, Königswähler und Kurfürsten, ed. Armin Wolf (Frankfurt: Vittorio Klostermann, 2002), 274-287. Schütz states on several occasions in this article that he will have more to say about the codex in a forthcoming publication, but I am unaware of any book or article on this subject that has appeared in the last two years.

⁵⁰ For some of the later texts written at Diessen that mention members of the house of Andechs, see the various sources compiled as Notae Diessenses, ed. Philip Jaffé, MGH SS 17 (Hanover, 1861), 323-327.

⁵¹ For the analysis of this image, see below.
the beginning of the thirteenth century. Because the two necrologies served different
memorial purposes, as Borgolte has argued, Liutold’s decisions about which family
members to enter in each of the necrologies can reveal much about his understanding of
the kinship group as a whole. Similarly, his arrangement of the tradition notices offers
clues about which grants made by members of the Andechs family he considered to be
most important for his religious community. This information can then be used to
analyze how he chose to memorialize both individuals and groups within the house of
Andechs.

The first point that must be emphasized is that the term *domus Andechsae*, or any
similar broad familial designation, does not appear anywhere in the codex. There is no
indication that Liutold or the scribes who had earlier written his sources understood the
Andechs family as a noble “house” or “dynasty” as the concepts are used today.
Furthermore, although cognomina taken from important castles were one of the most
common naming techniques in the central Middle Ages, designations such as *de Andechs*
are surprisingly rare in the codex. Of all the noblemen and noblewomen listed in the
necrologies who are known to have had some kind of genealogical connection to the
counts of Andechs, only one-quarter appear with a cognomen. None of the bishops and
abbesses who were born into the house of Andechs is identified in the necrologies by a

---

52 The earliest example of such a general designation for the house of Andechs that I have been
able to find is the term “Gens Andechysia” used by the sixteenth-century Bavarian court historian
Aventinus. See Johannes Turmair genannt Aventinus, *Annales Ducum Boiariae*, ed. Sigmund Riezler, in

53 Borgolte, “Stiftergedenken in Kloster Dießen,” 265 (4 Apr.): “Gisila cometissa de Berge”; 268
(2 May): “Hainricus comes de Wolfratehusin”; 270 (17 May): “Reginboto comes de Gieh”; 277 (5 Aug.):
“Echebertus comes de Butene”; 288 (14 Dec.): “Berhtoldus marchio de Andehs.”
family name. The statistics are even more striking in the tradition notices Liutold copied into his codex. On only four occasions in the twenty-four tradition notices are any members of the extended Andechs kinship group identified by cognomina.

All of this means that the codex includes an abundance of counts and countesses—Bertholds, Ottos, Sophias, Giselas, etc.—whom Liutold and earlier Diessen scribes did not identify beyond their first names. For modern historians, determining the exact identities of all the nobles who appear in the manuscript has proven difficult because of the lack of specific information about each one. Based on the necrologies, it appears that the Diessen canons’ knowledge and memory of the Andechs extended kinship group stretched back as far as the second half of the eleventh century. And when Liutold compiled the codex in the early thirteenth century, the memory of these men and women must have still been vibrant enough that further genealogical details were unnecessary. The canons knew who all of these nobles were by their days of death, the properties they had given to the religious community, and the places where they were buried. That they were all members of a single extended kinship group was implicit to the canons. The question, therefore, is who belonged to this kinship group that the canons knew so well?

The answer is closely tied to the canons’ understanding of the earliest years of their religious community’s existence. In the section of the codex that contains the

54 This is certainly not unusual in the twelfth century. Churchmen did not begin to employ family names in their titles until the later Middle Ages. Nevertheless, it is worth noting here in order to present a clear depiction of the necrological evidence.


56 For more on the ancestry of the house of Andechs in the eleventh century, see Appendix One.
copies of tradition notices and other important documents made by Liutold, the first text that Liutold chose to record was a papal bull dated 6 February 1132. On that day, Pope Innocent II placed the house of Augustinian canons at Diessen under the protection of the Holy See. That such a pivotal document for the religious community was given an especially prominent position in the codex is certainly not surprising. Though there are other texts in the manuscript that date from earlier than 1132, the bull of protection was clearly seen as central to the house’s establishment.

According to this bull, the community of canons at Diessen had been offered to the Papacy for Rome’s protection “by Counts Berthold and Otto, their wives Sophia and Lauritta, and their children.” Modern historians have identified these four nobles as Count Berthold I of Andechs and his wife Sophia and Count Otto I of Wolfratshausen and his wife Lauritta. This Count Otto and his lineage took their cognomen from the castle of Wolfratshausen, which was located near the confluence of the Loisach and Isar rivers, just to the east of the county of Andechs. During the first half of the twelfth century, the house of Wolfratshausen was one the most influential families in Upper

---

57 Tr. Diessen, 102-105, no. 2.

58 Borgolte, “Stiftergedenken in Kloster Dießen,” 243-244. The recent editions of Bavarian books of traditions have arranged all the texts in chronological order rather than keeping them in the order in which they appear in the manuscripts. This can lead historians to overlook the significance of why the compilers arranged texts the way they did. For more on this point, see Heide Dienst, *Regionalgeschichte und Gesellschaft im Hochmittelalter am Beispiel Österreichs* (Vienna and Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 1990), 119-125 as well as my discussion of this issue in Chapter Three.

59 Tr. Diessen, 103, no. 2: “…a Bertulfo et Ottone comitibus et Sophia ac Lauretia eorum uxoribus et filiis…”

60 The wives are what help to make the identifications possible because the Diessen tradition notices mention Sophia and Lauritta on other occasions. German historians typically designate this count of Wolfratshausen as Otto III because two earlier members of his kinship group were also named Otto. However, because he is the first one to use the cognomen “of Wolfratshausen,” I have chosen to designate him Otto I for the sake of convenience.
Bavaria. Its success was short-lived, however. The lineage became extinct in the male line in 1157 (see Figure 4.1), and much of the Wolfratshausen inheritance passed to Count Berthold II of Andechs. 61

![Genealogical Diagram]

Figure 4.1. The house of Wolfratshausen

Historians have long recognized that there was a biological connection between the houses of Andechs and Wolfratshausen. 62 However, the precise genealogical relationship between the first count of Andechs and the first count of Wolfratshausen has been the subject of debate. Recreating an accurate family tree of their kinship group during the eleventh and early twelfth centuries has proven to be extremely difficult. 63

---

61 For more on this point, see Chapter Two.

62 In the Middle Ages, this genealogical connection seems to have been recognized but not discussed in any significant way. The earliest work of which I am aware that refers to the houses of Andechs and Wolfratshausen as separate lines of the same family is Wiguleus Hund, Bayrisch Stammen-Buch, vol. 1 (Ingolstadt, 1585; reprint, Neustadt an der Aisch, 1999), 20ff.

63 See Appendix One.
The only nobleman whom recent scholars have confidently identified as an ancestor in the direct male line of both Count Berthold I and Count Otto I is a Count Frederick of Haching, who is first named in a royal charter dated 30 June 1003. A century thus separated the counts of Andechs and Wolfratshausen from their closest known common ancestor.

Regardless of the precise genealogical relationship between Count Berthold I and Count Otto I, their appearance together in the papal bull meant that they became closely connected to each other in the Diessen canons’ memorial strategies. Their importance to the religious community is reflected in the fact that Liutold identified each of them in Necrology A as “founder of this place.” Berthold’s wife Sophia, who is listed in Necrology B, has the same title. Otto’s wife Lauritta, who for unknown reasons appears in both necrologies, is labeled “founder of this place” in each of the texts. Liutold clearly wanted to emphasize the special role these four nobles had played in the early years of the Diessen house of canons.

Careful analysis of the necrologies suggests that Liutold and earlier scribes made no attempt to distinguish between members of the house of Wolfratshausen and members of the house of Andechs. Although by modern standards Count Berthold I and Count

---

64 *Die Urkunden Heinrichs II. und Arduins*, eds. Harry Bresslau and Paul Kehr, MGH Diplomata regum et imperatorum Germania, vol. 3 (Hanover: 1900-1903) [hereafter MGH D Heinrich II], 65-66, no. 54. Frederick is discussed in Appendix One of this dissertation.


66 Ibid., 279 (6 Sept.): “Sophia comitissa obiit, fundatrix huius loci.”

67 Ibid. (31 Aug.): “Lauritta comitissa, fundatrix loci huius, obiit” in Necrology A and “Lauritta comitissa obiit, fundatrix huius loci” in Necrology B. It is unclear to me why Lauritta is named in both necrologies. The explanation given in Sauer, 55, does not seem plausible (see note 44 above).
Otto I could be said to have founded two separate lineages because of their adoption of different cognomina, the Diessen religious community viewed both branches as one extended kinship group—the founding family of the house of canons. That Liutold’s understanding of the houses of Andechs and Wolfratshausen was related to his view of Berthold I and Otto I as co-founders of his community can be seen in his decisions about which of their kin to place in each necrology in his codex. As a general rule, Berthold’s and Otto’s children, as well as those of their siblings who were patrons of Diessen, all appear in Necrology A, which was reserved for the most important people in the community’s history. Meanwhile, those siblings who did not support Diessen, as well as most members of the generation that preceded Berthold’s and Otto’s generation, are listed in Necrology B. The key break in the kinship group’s history, at least in Liutold’s opinion, therefore had much more to do with the foundation of the Diessen house of canons than the establishment of the houses of Andechs and Wolfratshausen as distinct lineages.

The organization of the tradition notices similarly reveals how both branches of the family were considered by the Diessen canons to belong to a single extended kinship group. Twenty-one of the twenty-four texts Liutold included in his main collection of tradition notices name at least one member of this kinship group, yet the order of the

\[68\] Count Berthold I’s daughter Gisela is named in both necrologies (8 April) for reasons that are not apparent to me. Also difficult to explain is why Count Berthold I’s wife Sophia only appears in Necrology B, especially since she granted a significant amount of property in Carniola to the canons: see Nec. Diess., 25 (6 Sept.).

\[69\] There are two notable exceptions to this generalization. Count Otto I’s father and Count Berthold I’s paternal uncle Conrad both appear in the first necrology. It appears that both of these men were involved in the earliest years of the Diessen religious community. For more on them, see Appendix One.
documents does not emphasize one branch of the family over the other (See Figure 4.2).

The only person whose importance for the religious community is clearly emphasized is Count Henry of Wolfratshausen. The first tradition notice Liutold copied into the codex concerns the grants this last count of Wolfratshausen made on his deathbed in 1157. Because of the numerous properties and rights the childless Henry gave to Diessen when he died, it is not surprising that Liutold would recognize him as a key patron by beginning with one of his tradition notices. Six of the next eight notices in the manuscript name Count Henry of Wolfratshausen as well, leaving little doubt that he was a central figure in the canons’ memorial strategies.

With the exception of this opening group of Count Henry’s traditions, there is no clear pattern that can explain the organization of the notices Liutold recorded in the codex. Texts involving members of the house of Andechs are intermixed with the few remaining tradition notices that involve members of the house of Wolfratshausen. The three traditions that do not mention any members of Diessen’s founding family have not been separated from the other notices in any way. Furthermore, the documents are not arranged in any kind of chronological order, not even by the careers of particular counts from either branch of the family. In short, most of the tradition notices appear to have been copied into the codex in a random manner, strengthening the impression that

70 Borgolte, “Stiftergedenken in Kloster Dießen,” 244 and Schlögl in Tr Diessen, 23*-24* both argue that the Wolfratshausen line is emphasized over the Andechs line. As Figure 4.2 shows, however, there is enough intermingling of texts from both families that this argument is not completely convincing.

71 Tr. Diessen, 28-31, no. 21.

72 Ibid., 18, no. 13; 19-20, no. 14; and 33-34, no. 23. These three tradition notices all record grants to Diessen by priests.

73 Nor do they appear to be arranged geographically based on the locations of the properties being granted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLM 1018 FOLIO</th>
<th>TR. DIESSEN #</th>
<th>DATE OF TRADITION NOTICE</th>
<th>MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF WOLFRATSHAUSEN</th>
<th>MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF ANDECHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35r-36r</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>Count Henry</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36r</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(1150-1157)</td>
<td>Count Henry</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36r</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(1150-1157)</td>
<td>Count Henry</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36r</td>
<td>8a</td>
<td>(1137-1147)</td>
<td>Bishop Henry</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36r</td>
<td>8b</td>
<td>(1150-1155)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36r</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(1140-1145)</td>
<td>Count Henry</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36v-37r</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(1140)</td>
<td>Count Henry</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37r</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(1133-1148)</td>
<td>Count Henry</td>
<td>Count Berthold I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37r</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(1158-1173)</td>
<td>Count Henry</td>
<td>Count Berthold I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37r</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1123-1127)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Count Berthold I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37r-37v</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1123-1127)</td>
<td>Count Otto I</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37v</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(1173-1182)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Margrave Berthold II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37v</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(1158-1182)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37v</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(1150-1158)</td>
<td>Count Henry</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37v</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(1173-1182)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Margrave Berthold II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37v-38r</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(1137-1147)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Count Berthold I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38r</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(1137-1147)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Count Berthold I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38r</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(1137-1147)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Counts Berthold I, Berthold II &amp; Poppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38r-38v</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1122-1123)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Count Berthold I, Countess Sophia &amp; Sons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38v</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(1137-1148)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38v</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(1137-1148)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38v</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(1123-1127)</td>
<td>Counts Henry &amp; Otto II / Countess Lauritta</td>
<td>Counts Berthold I &amp; Poppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38v-39r</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1114-1123)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Count Berthold I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39r</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(1123-1148)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Count Berthold I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39r</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(1182)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Bishop Otto II &amp; Margrave Berthold II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2. Members of the houses of Andechs & Wolfratshausen named in the Diessen tradition notices compiled by Liutold
everyone in the houses of Andechs and Wolfratshausen was viewed by Liutold as belonging to one collective group of founders and patrons.\textsuperscript{74}

One of the best pieces of evidence for Liutold’s understanding of Andechs identity is the drawing that he included within the collection of tradition notices.\textsuperscript{75} At the center of the image is the Virgin Mary enthroned as the Queen of Heaven (\textit{Regina Celi}) with Jesus seated on her lap. Mary, to whom the new church at Diessen had been dedicated in 1150, is extending her hand to receive a ring from a kneeling figure identified in the picture as Count Henry of Wolfratshausen. Below the count is a bust of his uncle, Bishop Henry I of Regensburg. On the opposite side of Mary and Jesus are another pair of figures, these two members of the Andechs branch of the extended kinship group. Kneeling and offering a book to the Holy Mother is Bishop Otto II of Bamberg, the youngest son of Count Berthold I of Andechs. The bishop’s older brother, Margrave Berthold II of Istria, is depicted in a bust underneath him.

Count Henry’s pivotal role in the endowment of the house of canons is emphasized again in the drawing. The Virgin Mary and the Christ child are turned toward him, and Mary is accepting from Henry a ring. As Michael Borgolte and Christine Sauer have both pointed out in their interpretations of the image, the ring was a typical medieval symbol representing the legal transfer of property.\textsuperscript{76} Thus, Liutold is indicating that, more than any other donations to his community, it was the grants made by Count Henry of Wolfratshausen that were most significant for the economic foundation of the

\textsuperscript{74} The key decision in the organization of the texts came when Liutold decided to include almost exclusively tradition notices involving the Andechs-Wolfratshausen extended kinship groups in his codex.

\textsuperscript{75} Clm 1018, f. 36v.

\textsuperscript{76} Borgolte, “Stiftergedenken in Kloster Dießen,” 244, note 53 and Sauer, 46-47.
house of canons. Liutold underscored this point even further through his decision on where to place the drawing; beneath it on the same page is a copy of a tradition notice in which Henry grants “his principal manor in Diessen” to the religious community.

Within the drawing, the patron in the second most prominent position is Bishop Otto II of Bamberg. He is offering to Mary and Jesus a book. Though not as powerful a symbol as the ring being given by Count Henry, the book likely represents Otto’s importance for the spiritual life of the canons. He was present for the consecration of the new church at Diessen in 1182. On this occasion, he also gave to the community among other things a chalice and various liturgical vestments. The tradition notice recording these grants by the bishop is the last notice Liutold included in his main collection of property donations, perhaps because of its late date or perhaps because Liutold considered this final position a significant one. Regardless, the location of the tradition notice, much more distant in the codex from the image than the notices recording Count Henry’s gifts, indicates that Otto was not quite the patron the last count of Wolfratshausen was thought to be.

77 Because of the numerous properties Count Henry granted to Diessen after it became clear that he would not have any children, the canons clearly saw Henry as central to their religious community’s success. A fifteenth-century source from Diessen describes him as, “Hainricus comes de Wolfratshausen obiit, qui locum hunc de cineribus sew de paupertate maxima sublimando extulit, multis hominibus et prediis honestissimis ditavit, sepultus in nostro capitolo.” See Notae Diessenses, 329.

78 Tr. Diessen, 11, no. 7: “…suam principalem curiam in Diezen.” For the meaning of curia in this context, see John B. Freed’s forthcoming “Bavarian Wine and Woolless Sheep: The Urbar of Count Sigiboto IV of Falkenstein (1126-ca. 1198),” Viator 35.

79 Sauer, 48.

80 Tr. Diessen, 95, no. 89.

81 Ibid., 36-38, no. 27. For the argument that the last position in the collection of tradition notices was an important one, see Borgolte, “Stiftergedenken in Kloster Dießen,” 244.
The busts of Bishop Henry I of Regensburg and Margrave Berthold II of Istria in the lower corners of the image have proven to be more difficult to interpret. Although no record of a grant by Berthold II is included in the tradition notices, Bishop Otto II did make a gift of property to the religious community “through the hand of his brother Margrave Berthold.”82 Meanwhile, the two tradition notices immediately preceding the image in the codex involve a pair of grants made by Bishop Henry I—though there is nothing especially noteworthy about the bishop’s donations.83 Sauer has suggested that the margrave and the bishop are included in the picture to act as consenters to Count Henry’s and Bishop Otto’s grants and that the whole scene is therefore a symbolic, “pictorial tradition notice” intended to show in one place four central figures from the religious community’s founding family.84 While this is one plausible explanation, it leaves unanswered the question why Bishop Henry and Margrave Berthold were chosen rather than other prominent members from the houses of Andechs and Wolfratshausen.85

A more thorough analysis of all of Liutold’s Codex is necessary if the many intricacies of the picture are to be better understood. However, the main point for this study is that the drawing presents the extended Andechs-Wolfratshausen kinship group much like the necrologies and the tradition notices do. There is no attempt to draw a clear distinction between the two noble houses. This is not to say that Liutold was unaware of the division; he clearly labels his favorite patron, Count Henry, as comes de

82 Ibid.: “per manum fratris sui Berhtoldi marchionis.”

83 Ibid., 12-13, nos. 8a and 8b.

84 Sauer, 62

85 Why, for instance, were none of the founders of Diessen portrayed in the drawing? Or Duke Berthold III of Merania, who died only a few years before Liutold compiled his codex?
Wolfratshausen, while Margrave Berthold II is given the cognomen de Andehs.\textsuperscript{86}

Nevertheless, the overall impression of the picture is that the four figures around Mary and Jesus belong to a single family of founders rather than two different lineages. Recent scholars have conformed to this view in their discussions of the Andechs and Wolfratshausen lineages’ relationships with Diessen: Borgolte, in his study of Liutold’s Codex, writes of a \textit{Gründersippe} (founders’ sip) and Sauer of a \textit{Gründerfamilie} (founders’ family).\textsuperscript{87}

Liutold’s understanding of the two noble houses as one extended founding family persisted at the Diessen community of canons after the completion of his codex. In two genealogies written at Diessen, one in the mid-thirteenth century and the other in the fourteenth century, the Andechs and Wolfratshausen lines of the family are listed together.\textsuperscript{88} This is especially clear in the earlier of the genealogies; fifty members of the two houses (including a few legendary members) are all named collectively in one long paragraph. Thus, Andechs family identity, as it was constructed by the Diessen canons, was closely connected to the noble house’s involvement in the foundation of the canons’ religious community. As a result, already in the thirteenth century at Diessen, the memory of the house of Andechs had been merged with the memory of the house of Wolfratshausen.

\textsuperscript{86} Liutold uses the same cognomina for both men in Necrology A.

\textsuperscript{87} Borgolte, “Stiftergedenken in Kloster Dießen,” 246 and Sauer, 48.

\textsuperscript{88} Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 5515, f. 128r. The two genealogies are printed in \textit{Notae Diessenses}, 328. For analysis of the texts, see Bernd Schneidmüller, “Die Gründer des Stifts Dießen: Mittelalterliche Genealogien der Andechs-Meranier,” in \textit{Die Andechs-Meranier in Franken}, 266-267.
How the Augustinian canons at Diessen perceived and understood the group consciousness of the Andechs family would likely be little more than an interesting footnote in the noble house’s history if Liutold’s Codex and other Diessen sources had not had such a significant influence on historians of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The overwhelming majority of scholars who have written about the house of Andechs have consistently included discussions of the house of Wolfratshausen as part of the family’s history. Edmund Oefele’s 1877 book has played an important role in shaping this approach to the study of the entire extended kinship group; though entitled *Geschichte der Grafen von Andechs* (*History of the Counts of Andechs*), Oefele discusses all the members of the house of Wolfratshausen at length.\(^8\) It is not unusual to find the counts of Wolfratshausen referred to as “Andechses” in a variety of other works as well.\(^9\) Even studies of the history of the house of Andechs in Franconia—a region where the house of Wolfratshausen had no territorial claims—discuss the members of the Wolfratshausen line.\(^10\)

For a study of family relationships, Liutold’s Codex and the later Diessen sources are significant because they have created an understanding of Andechs family identity that implies close contacts between the houses of Andechs and Wolfratshausen. This has led many historians to make assumptions about the kinship bonds which existed between

\(^8\) The register of sources at the end of Oefele does not distinguish between members of the two branches of the family. Instead, Oefele bases the order of texts on the generations within both lineages.


members of the two branches of the family. For example, Bishop Henry I of Regensburg from the house of Wolfratshausen has been viewed as a key figure in the politics of both families. Numerous arguments about the interests and strategies of the Andechs family have, moreover, been made by drawing evidence from the activities of members of both noble houses. In short, the Andechs and Wolfratshausen lineages have been understood in the modern scholarship to belong to a single network of cooperation and support throughout the first half of the twelfth century.

The strength of this vision of the Andechs-Wolfratshausen kinship group can be seen most clearly in recent discussions of another branch of the same extended family: the noble house of Wasserburg. Genealogical research conducted during the twentieth century has demonstrated convincingly that the counts of Wasserburg, whose lordship lay in the Inn river valley in eastern Bavaria, were more closely related in the male line to the counts of Andechs than the counts of Wolfratshausen were. But this does not mean that in recent years scholars have integrated the history of the house of Wasserburg into the Andechs-Wolfratshausen kinship group’s history. One could argue that the reason for this is related to the fact that, unlike the house of Andechs, the house of Wasserburg did not inherit any of the house of Wolfratshausen’s lands and rights in 1157. However, the

---

92 Frenken, 724-725.

93 See, for example, Schütz, “Das Geschlecht der Andechs-Meranier im europäischen Hochmittelalter,” 59-60, where he cites family members from both lines in his argument about the close Andechs relationship with the monastery of Admont.


95 There is only one text that suggests that the house of Wasserburg had any property rights in western Bavaria. See Tr. Diessen, 114-115, no. 9.
Diessen canons’ clear emphasis on the Andechs-Wolfratshausen connection has also helped to marginalize the Wasserburg line, suggesting that this noble house never had a shared group consciousness with the other two houses.96

But is this perception of the Andechs-Wolfratshausen kinship group solely the product of the thirteenth-century Diessen sources? Have the memorial interests of Liutold and the other canons distorted historians’ understanding of the noble family’s group consciousness? Or is there evidence from the twelfth century that presents a comparable view of the family relationships binding together members of the houses of Andechs and Wolfratshausen? To answer these questions, the texts compiled by Liutold between the years 1204 and 1210 must be analyzed within the context of events that occurred in Bavaria in the decades prior to the house of Wolfratshausen’s extinction in 1157.

III. The houses of Andechs and Wolfratshausen before 1157

At the heart of Liutold’s depiction of the extended Andechs-Wolfratshausen kinship group was his interest in memorializing the founders of his religious community and their descendants. However, none of the sources Liutold included in his codex suggest any possible motives behind why Count Berthold I of Andechs and Count Otto I of Wolfratshausen chose to establish and endow a house of canons at Diessen during the early decades of the twelfth century. A general spirit of religious renewal at the time is certainly one factor; as Stefan Weinfurter has observed, “The one hundred years between

96 The only member of the Wasserburg line to appear in Liutold’s necrologies is a Count Dietrich from the early twelfth century, who may or may not have been Count Berthold I of Andechs’s brother. See Borgolte, “Stiftergedenken in Kloster Dießen,” 272. Also see Appendix One.
1050 and 1150 can be regarded as the grand period of monastic foundations in Bavaria.\textsuperscript{97} Furthermore, because many of the leading families within the duchy were founding religious communities in this period, these “house monasteries” were becoming recognized symbols of noble power.\textsuperscript{98} But why did the two distant relatives Berthold and Otto found a house of canons jointly at Diessen—rather than endowing two separate religious communities in different places?

During the closing decades of the eleventh century and the opening years of the twelfth century, significant changes were occurring in the structure and nature of lordship in western Bavaria. Ludwig Holzfurtner has argued that this period witnessed the end of the old Carolingian system of counties. The counts who are named in sources dating from the first half of the eleventh century still based their comital authority on their duties and rights as local representatives of royal power, and the borders of their counties basically conformed to the earlier Carolingian borders. By around 1100, however, a series of new counties had emerged, most of them with entirely different borders than the older counties. The counts of these new lordships based their authority only partly on earlier types of comital rights; more important for their power were the control of church advocacies and the possession of extensive allodial properties.\textsuperscript{99} Both the counties of Andechs and Wolfratshausen were a product of these developments.\textsuperscript{100}


Thus, in the years before Count Berthold I of Andechs and Count Otto I of Wolfratshausen were named together in the papal bull of 1132 for the Diessen canons, the two nobles were in possession of similarlyconstructed, neighboring lordships in Upper Bavaria (See Figure 4.3). Drawing a clear geographical line of separation between the counts’ territories and rights is impossible, however. Earlier generations of their kinship group had been in possession of allods scattered throughout the entire region that would after 1100 be divided into the counties of Andechs and Wolfratshausen. The inheritance of these allodial properties had not occurred in a very orderly fashion during the eleventh century, for the rules governing the descent of allods were not as strict as the rules concerning feudal holdings like comital rights.\textsuperscript{101} As a result, Count Berthold I did not inherit all of the family’s allodial lands and rights within his county of Andechs, nor was Count Otto I in possession of all the allods in the county of Wolfratshausen.\textsuperscript{102}

It is in this context that the foundation of the house of canons at Diessen is to be understood because, while Diessen lay within the county of Andechs, members of the house of Wolfratshausen owned numerous properties in and around the site. Indeed, between approximately 1070 and 1120, Diessen emerged as the most important power center for many of the ancestors of both lineages. Contemporary sources from this period


\textsuperscript{100} For more details, see Chapter Two.

\textsuperscript{101} Benjamin Arnold, \textit{Princes and territories in medieval Germany} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 143-144.

\textsuperscript{102} For Andechs allods in the county of Wolfratshausen, see Tr. Diessen, 6-8, no. 4. For Wolfratshausen allods in the county of Andechs, see ibid., 28-31, no. 21. Holzfurtner has done more extensive work on this subject. See his \textit{Die Grafschaft der Andechser} and \textit{Das Landgericht Wolfratshausen}, Historischer Atlas von Bayern, Teil Altbayern, vol. 13 (Munich: Kommission für bayerische Landesgeschichte, 1993).
Figure 4.3. Upper Bavaria, highlighting the central regions of the counties of Andechs (left) and Wolfratshausen (right)
identify a Count Arnold, Count Otto, Count Gebhard, and Count Leopold with the
cognomen de Diessen.\textsuperscript{103} The necrologies in Liutold’s Codex suggest that even more
family members from the years around 1100 also had interests at Diessen; a Count
Dietrich is described in the second necrology as “our count,” and Count Berthold I’s
uncle Conrad is labeled a Diessen canon in the first necrology.\textsuperscript{104} Only with the
construction of the castle of Andechs, and later the castle of Wolfratshausen, did Diessen
cease to be the key site in Upper Bavaria for the kinship group’s power and authority.\textsuperscript{105}

During the later eleventh and early twelfth centuries, as many of the extended
families of the preceding period began to divide into separate lineages, old centers of
family power and influence like Diessen often became the sites for new religious
communities.\textsuperscript{106} This was one way to settle the complex inheritance questions that arose
as more and more kin, who were increasingly more distantly related, all came to acquire
pieces of property in the same place. One of the best-recorded examples of this situation
concerns the monastery of Scheyern, which lay to the northeast of Diessen. Abbot
Conrad of Scheyern, who wrote a history of his monastery during the early thirteenth
century, explained that, shortly before the castle of Scheyern was converted into a
religious house around 1120, “it was not occupied by one or two lords, but by many in

\textsuperscript{103} See Appendix One for more on these nobles.

\textsuperscript{104} For Dietrich’s entry, see Borgolte, “Stiftergedenken in Kloster Dießen,” 272 (1 June):
“Dheodericus comes nostras [sic].” The canon Conrad’s entry is problematic because it is not entirely
legible. Borgolte, 270 (16 May) lists it as “Chonradus canonicus, huius loci quondam possessor.” Schütz,
“Die Grafen von Dießen,” 269, note 153 points out that other words are lost.

\textsuperscript{105} Holzfurtner, \textit{Die Grafschaft der Andechser}, 369 and Schütz, “Die Grafen von Dießen,” 226-
227.

\textsuperscript{106} Prinz, 112-113.
Members of the extended kinship group that included the noble houses of Wittelsbach, Valley, and Dachau all had partial ownership of the castle until they decided to found a religious community there. Though no similar narrative history survives for Diessen, a comparable situation likely lay behind the establishment of the house of Augustinian canons there by the extended Andechs-Wolfratshausen kinship group.

Count Berthold I appears to have been involved with the arrival of the first group of canons at Diessen in or around the year 1114. They originally settled at the church of St. George, and the only two tradition notices from this earliest period that survive in Liutold’s Codex both name the count of Andechs. By the mid-1120s, the community had moved a short distance away to the church of St. Stephen because, as the 1132 papal bull explains, “this place appeared more suitable for both the preservation of the religious life as well as for the needs of the brothers.” It was after the transfer to St. Stephen that Count Otto I of Wolfratshausen became involved in the canons’ affairs, perhaps because this church was jointly held by both Otto and Count Berthold I of Andechs. The church of St. Stephen certainly seems to have been more important for the entire kinship group than the church of St. George was. The three members of the kinship group buried

---


108 Ibid. See also Störmer, “Die Hauskläster der Wittelsbacher.”

109 Tr. Diessen, 3-5, nos. 1 and 2.

110 Ibid., 103, no. 2: “…locus ipse tam ad conservandam religionem quam etiam fratrum usibus aptior visus est.”

111 Ibid., 5-6, no. 3, is the first appearance of Count Otto I of Wolfratshausen in the Diessen tradition notices. It is unclear whether the church of St. Stephen was in some way connected to the castle at Diessen (the castle’s chapel?), but it seems likely, especially because St. Stephen was located on a piece of high ground.
at Diessen before family members began to be interred in the canons’ chapter hall were all buried in the church of St. Stephen.112

Because of how significant the change in location was for the long-term survival of the community of canons, the four people most directly involved in this move were the ones whom Liutold and later canons chose to remember as the founders of their religious house. However, while the Diessen canons memorialized Count Berthold I and his wife Sophia alongside Count Otto I and his wife Lauritta, the territorial motivations behind the foundation of the religious community do not necessarily imply that there was a close relationship between the count of Andechs and the count of Wolfratshausen. Indeed, by establishing the house of canons, the two noblemen were potentially severing any last type of connection there was between them rather than attempting to reinforce their distant kinship bond. Diessen was no longer to be a territorial or political center for these branches of the kinship group, only a spiritual center.113

A careful consideration of the tradition notices recording grants to the house of Augustinian canons at Diessen confirms that the foundation of the religious community was an isolated incident of cooperation between the noble houses of Andechs and Wolfratshausen. As was argued in the last chapter, the reasons why members of the same kinship group were named together in property donations are not always easy to determine. The religious community may have had its own expectations regarding who

---

112 Borgolte, “Stiftergedenken in Kloster Dießen,” 260 (19 Feb.): “Liupoldus comes obiit, sepultus in meridiana absida ecclesie S. Stephani prothomartiris”; 262 (7 March): “Chuniza cometissa obiit, sepulta in media basilica S. Stephani”; and 267 (24 April): “Otto comes senior et maior domus obiit. Sepultus in meridiana absida ecclesie S. Stephani.” Leopold and Otto were both closely related to the Wolfratshausen line, while Kunizza was more closely related to the Andechs line. For more on these family members, see Appendix One.

113 For another example from Bavaria of the branches of a noble sip sharing claims to an ancestral piece of property but otherwise having no close connections to one another, see Freed, The Counts of Falkenstein, 36-40.
had to consent to the grant, and these expectations could supercede the donor’s wishes about who should be present for the gift. Nevertheless, the groups of noble relatives listed in these grants do provide evidence about who—in the opinion of the religious community or the kinship group—may have had claims to the piece of property being donated. The Diessen tradition notices are therefore valuable sources for, at the very least, the possible legal bonds that might have connected the houses of Andechs and Wolfratshausen to one another.

However, of the twenty tradition notices that date from the period prior to the death of the last count of Wolfratshausen 1157, members of the houses of Andechs and Wolfratshausen are named alongside one another in only two. Sometime during the late 1120s or early 1130s, a ministerial from Tyrol made a grant “through the hands of his lord Otto [Count Otto II of Wolfratshausen] and of Henry [Count Henry of Wolfratshausen] and of his lady Lauritta [Otto and Henry’s mother] into the hands of the advocate Count Berthold [I of Andechs] and of his son Poppo.” A few years later, another Wolfratshausen ministerial and his wife gave property to Diessen with the consent of Count Henry, “in the presence of Berthold, count and advocate of this place.” Among the twenty tradition notices, there are various other grants by Andechs and Wolfratshausen ministerials, but only these two involve members of both noble houses. It is therefore difficult to draw any clear conclusions about why this pair of

---

114 See Figure 4.2 above. A third tradition notice which names both Count Henry of Wolfratshausen and Count Berthold I of Andechs (Tr. Diessen, 31-32, no. 22) was drawn up after Henry’s death; Henry’s name appears in the text because one of his former ministerials was making a grant for his soul with Count Berthold I’s consent.

115 Tr. Diessen, 8-9, no. 5: “…per manus domini sui Ottonis et Henrici et domine sue Lauritten in manus advocati comitis Bertolfi et filii sui Popponis…”

116 Ibid., 17, no. 12: “…presente comite Bertolfo et eiusdem loci advocato.”
grants brought relatives from the two branches of the kinship group together. But one piece of evidence strongly suggests that their distant blood connection was not a factor; these are the only two tradition notices from the twelfth century to identify a count of Andechs as Diessen’s advocate. Count Berthold I’s official relationship with the canons—not his bond of kinship with the house of Wolfratshausen—is thus emphasized in these texts.

Significantly, none of the gifts made to Diessen by the noblemen and noblewomen who belonged to either the Andechs or Wolfratshausen line names relatives from the other branch of the extended kinship group. Count Berthold I of Andechs donated property to the house of canons on three separate occasions, and one of these grants even included properties located within the county of Wolfrathausen. ¹¹⁷ No one from the house of Wolfratshausen was involved in the tradition notices, however. Count Henry of Wolfratshausen and his uncle Bishop Henry I of Regensburg both made gifts to Diessen as well; in each case, no member of either noble house is named as consenting to the grant. ¹¹⁸ A tradition notice from the early 1140s concerning Count Henry’s gift of properties within Diessen itself reads simply, “Let it be known to all those in the future and the present that Count Henry granted to St. Stephen his principal manor in Diessen for the sake of his soul and the souls of his ancestors.” ¹¹⁹ Despite the fact that this grant

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 4-5, no. 2; 6-8, no. 4; and 16-17, no. 11.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 9-13, nos. 6-8; 21-23, no. 16; 25-26, no. 18; and 28-31, no. 21. Schlögl includes under tradition no. 6 a second donation (6b), this one by Henry’s mother Lauritta. The witness lists are the same.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 11, no. 7: “Notum sit tam futuris quam presentibus, quod comes Heinricus suam principalem curiam in Diezen tradidit sancto Stephano prothomartyri pro requie anime sue necnon parentum suorum.”
clearly involved a significant site at the heart of the kinship group’s former stronghold of Diessen, the witness list includes none of the count’s relatives.

The Diessen tradition notices thus indicate that the property rights of the houses of Andechs and Wolfratshausen were distinct from one another during the second quarter of the twelfth century. This strengthens the impression that, once Berthold I and Otto I had cooperated to establish the house of canons in the family’s church of St. Stephen, their branches of their extended kinship group were no longer bound together by overlapping inheritance claims. Diessen therefore ceased to be a place that united the political and territorial interests of both lineages. As the surviving sources for the two noble houses produced outside of Diessen reveal, contacts between members of the Andechs and Wolfratshausen lines became rare in the years following the foundation of the Diessen religious community.

The counts of Wolfratshausen’s lordships in Tyrol and the comital rights of the counts of Andechs in Franconia and Carniola meant that the members of the two noble houses had important political interests outside of Upper Bavaria. This helped to create separate spheres of influence for the two noble houses in the decades before 1157. Even in western Bavaria, however, where they possessed neighboring counties, the evidence for contacts between the two family branches is sparse. Count Berthold I of Andechs and his three sons were heavily involved in the affairs of the monastery of Benediktbeuern because they were its advocates. Meanwhile, one of the richest source bases for the

---

120 For the house of Wolfratshausen’s Tyrolean rights and properties, see Schütz, “Das Geschlecht der Andechs-Meranier im europäischen Hochmittelalter,” 44-59. Also see Chapter Two.

121 See numerous tradition notices in F. L. von Baumann, “Das Benediktbeurer Traditionsbuch,” Archivalische Zeitschrift, Neue Folge 20 (1914): 1-82 [hereafter Baumann]. Also see Chapter Five, where the family’s involvement with Benediktbeuern during the 1130s and 1140s is discussed in more detail.
counts of Wolfratshausen is the body of texts from Tegernsee, where the members of
the Wolfratshausen lineage had been advocates since 1121. But the counts of
Wolfratshausen do not appear in Benediktbeuern sources, nor are the counts of Andechs
named in Tegernsee sources prior to 1157. Furthermore, the counts of Wolfratshausen
had close contacts with the monastery of Weihenstephan in Freising, but after the year
1114, none of the counts of Andechs is named in a Weihenstephan text until the mid-
1160s. The houses of Wolfratshausen and Andechs were thus members of very
different patronage networks in Upper Bavaria.

Further strengthening the impression that the two lineages had few contacts
during the twelfth century is the history of the conflict between the house of
Wolfratshausen and the duke of Bavaria, which is described in the Historia Welforum.
Duke Henry the Proud of Bavaria strongly opposed the election of the Wolfratshausen
family’s Henry to the bishopric of Regensburg in 1132. The duke attempted to have the
election declared uncanonical but without success. He then gathered an army in early

---

122 See the numerous tradition notices in Tr. Tegernsee dating from the 1120s.

123 Ministerials of Count Henry are named on three occasions in Benediktbeuern traditions, but he
is not recorded as having been present for any of them. See Baumann, 25, no. 50; 30-31, no. 62; and 32-33,
no. 68. A member of the house of Andechs does not appear in a Tegernsee tradition notice until after
Count Berthold II of Andechs succeeded Count Henry of Wolfratshausen as advocate in 1157.

124 For members of the house of Wolfratshausen and Weihenstephan, see Tr. Weihenstephan, 136,
no. 165; 137-138, no. 168; 163, no. 204; and 180-181, no. 222. Count Berthold I of Andechs appears in a
Weihenstephan tradition notice which has been dated to 1102-1114 (57-59, no. 70). The next appearance
of a member of the house of Andechs in a Weihenstephan tradition notice dates to 1162-1172 (209, no.
256).

125 Count Henry of Wolfratshausen does appear together once in western Bavaria with Count
Berthold I’s sons Poppo and Berthold II, but in a tradition notice of Duke Welf VI. See Die Traditionen
der des Stiftes Polling [hereafter Tr. Polling], ed. Friedrich Helmer, Quellen und Erörterungen zur bayerischen

126 Historia Welforum, ed. Erich König, Schwäbische Chroniken der Stauferzeit, vol. 1 (Stuttgart
and Berlin: W. Kohlhammer, 1938), 32-37, ch. 19 and 40-43, ch. 22. For a brief summary of the Welf-
1133 and devastated the region around Regensburg, though he was unable to take the town itself. A short time later, when Duke Henry the Proud was traveling in western Bavaria, he was attacked by Count Otto II of Wolfratshausen, who was seeking vengeance for the duke’s actions against his uncle Bishop Henry I. The duke barely escaped with his life, but he soon returned to the count’s lands with his army. He succeeded in capturing the castle of Amras in the Inn valley in northern Tyrol and later besieged the castle of Wolfratshausen. A pitched battle between the opposing forces appeared inevitable, until Count-Palatine Otto of Wittelsbach was able to arrange a peace.

Whether Count Berthold I of Andechs or his sons assisted their Wolfratshausen kin in this war is unclear. Bishop Henry I of Regensburg is reported to have called together “his relatives and his friends” (cognatos et amicos suos) to support him. The only nobleman who is identified by name in the Historia Welforum as an ally of the bishop and his nephew is the Babenberg Margrave Leopold of Austria, whom other sources do indicate had a kinship connection with the house of Wolfratshausen. But no member of the house of Andechs is specifically named as fighting alongside the bishop of Regensburg against the duke. No source even places one of the counts of Andechs in the general vicinity of Bishop Henry I and Count Otto II of Wolfratshausen around the year 1133. Between 1135 and 1139, virtually all of the evidence for Count Berthold I of Andechs and his eldest son Poppo is from Franconia to the north of

127 Historia Welforum, 40, ch. 22.


129 The papal bull for Diessen dated 6 February 1132 is clearly based on an earlier request for a bull of protection. The members of the houses of Andechs and Wolfratshausen named in the bull had likely decided several years earlier to seek papal protection. See Tr. Diessen, 63*-64*.
Indeed, there is no surviving document that definitively places any member of the house of Andechs anywhere in Bavaria between June of 1130 and July of 1140.

To draw conclusions based on the fact that people do not appear together in contemporary texts is dangerous; arguments made from silence are inevitably problematic. However, as will be demonstrated in subsequent chapters, the twelfth-century evidence for many of the family relationships involving members of the house of Andechs is abundant. In that context, the lack of evidence for contacts between the relatives from the Andechs and Wolfratshausen lines is more significant than it might appear at first glance. The genealogical connection between the two noble houses was not an especially close one, and there is no reason to assume strong relationships binding the members of the separate branches together. But this is precisely the assumption that many modern historians have made because the vision of Andechs-Wolfratshausen group consciousness that appears in Liutold’s Codex has had such a significant influence on the scholarship of the last two centuries. For the Diessen canons, a single incident of cooperation—namely the founding of their religious community—became a central and pivotal moment in their history. As a result, when Liutold and other canons began to preserve the memory of their founders, the houses of Andechs and Wolfratshausen became more tightly bound to one another in later tradition and legend than they ever had been in actuality during the first half of the twelfth century.

---

130 For more on this point, see Chapter Five.
IV. Conclusions

The house of Wolfratshausen was one of the many comital lineages of the central Middle Ages that disappeared abruptly after only a few short decades of success, unable to produce enough male heirs to endure for more than a couple of generations.\textsuperscript{131} The succession of Count Berthold II of Andechs to Count Henry of Wolfratshausen’s inheritance in 1157 appears to have occurred smoothly, and no one seriously challenged the claims of the house of Andechs to the house of Wolfratshausen’s lands and rights. After 1157, neither Count Berthold II nor any of his heirs made a consistent effort to preserve the memory of the Wolfratshausen line. During the early 1170s, Duke Berthold III of Merania did name his second son Henry, perhaps after Count Henry of Wolfratshausen; however, his decision to name his third son Ekbert after Count Ekbert III of Neuburg († 1158) suggests that the duke was more interested in emphasizing his father’s acquisition of key lordships than in remembering particular kin relationships.\textsuperscript{132} The house of Wolfratshausen almost certainly would have been forgotten by the early thirteenth century if not for Liutold and the other canons at Diessen.

As this chapter has shown, the memorial strategies of medieval religious communities have significantly influenced how modern historians reconstruct the group consciousness and identity of noble families. Because members of these kinship groups did not write their own genealogies and family histories, the depictions of noble houses in the monastic sources have been viewed as the best evidence for understanding how elite families were understood and imagined in the Middle Ages. But this analysis of the

\textsuperscript{131} For the issue of dynastic extinction, especially in Bavaria, see Freed, The Counts of Falkenstein, 63-67.

\textsuperscript{132} For Count Ekbert, see Chapter Two.
Andechs-Wolfratshausen kinship group has clearly shown that a religious community could shape the memory of a noble family to suit its own needs, creating an image of a kinship group that does not necessarily reflect the interests of any members of that family. The texts produced at a “house monastery”—like the property donations discussed in the previous chapter—therefore cannot be used as evidence for the kin networks of cooperation and support that noblemen and noblewomen relied upon for their own political strategies. If family relationships are to be understood properly, older methodologies and assumptions concerning the structure and identity of noble kinship groups need to be replaced by newer approaches.
PART III

TOWARD A NEW METHODOLOGY:

STUDIES IN ANDECHS FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS
The counts of Andechs who ruled between the years 1100 and 1204 all successfully fulfilled one of their most important functions as the heads of a noble lineage: fathering legitimate children. Every generation of the house of Andechs born during the twelfth century included seven or eight members who reached adulthood.\(^1\) What is even more significant than the number of children is the order in which they were born, for in each generation the count’s first wife provided her husband with at least one son early in their marriage. As a result, the survival of the Andechs lineage in the male line was secure throughout much of the period under consideration here. Minority rule and female succession—two situations that could easily lead to crisis and uncertainty within a noble house—never seriously threatened the stability of the house of Andechs during the twelfth century.

---

\(^1\) The family tree provided in Figure I shows all of the people whom I consider to have been members of the house of Andechs. It is interesting to note that many of the women born into the house of Andechs who later married into other families were just as fecund as the Andechs men (many of these women will be discussed in Chapter Seven). A complete list of all the descendants of Count Berthold I of Andechs in both the male and female lines can be found in Johannes Kist, “Die Nachfahren des Grafen Berthold I. von Andechs,” *Jahrbuch für fränkische Landesforschung* 27 (1967): 41-240.
Thus, adult men rather than women and young children were the family members who played the key roles in shaping Andechs succession strategies. All of the sons born to the counts of Andechs during the early years of their fathers’ first marriages reached their teenage years while their fathers were still active in imperial politics. Indeed, the eldest son of each of the twelfth-century counts had been appearing in sources for at least a decade prior to his father’s death. Adult heirs who were fully prepared to become the heads of the family and to succeed to their noble house’s lordships—but who could not until their father had died or retired—were therefore a prominent feature within the lineage. For this reason, it is essential to view the interactions between the counts and their sons as central to the study of succession in the house of Andechs during the twelfth century. As I will argue in this chapter, the analysis of father-son relationships can illuminate the strategies employed by members of the lineage as they sought to insure the smooth transfer of power and authority from one generation to the next within the family.

I. Noble “youths” in the central Middle Ages

Many historians interested in medieval family structures have considered it both a blessing and a curse for a noble house to have numerous adult males alive at any one moment. Because kinship played a central role in the circulation of territories and rights within the nobility of the central Middle Ages, there needed to be heirs available who could insure that key lordships and properties would remain in the family after the ruling head of the lineage had died. However, fathers and sons, uncles and nephews, and brothers often could not agree on how to divide the inheritance and to share power peacefully, meaning that intra-familial disputes could quickly arise. As J. C. Holt
explains, “[r]ight at the heart of the family, in its control over the descent of the
patrimony from which the family derived its name, its historical traditions and its heraldic
devices, relations were potentially explosive.”

The scholar who has been most influential in shaping modern perceptions of the
relationships between noble fathers and their adult sons is Georges Duby. In a 1964
article, he argued that the development of the lineage as the defining structure of noble
houses after the year 1000 was a central reason for many inter-generational tensions. Duby contends that those sons of a nobleman who did not enter the Church as young
boys all passed through a period in their lives during which they were bachelors and
“youths” (*iuvenes*): “[I]n the warrior world,…the man of arms is no longer held to be a
‘youth’ once he has become the head of a household, established, rooted, and the founder
of a family. ‘Youth’ can thus be defined as that part of a man’s life between the
ceremony of knighting and fatherhood.” According to Duby, this phase in a nobleman’s
life was often quite long, beginning between the ages of sixteen and twenty-two and
potentially lasting two or three decades. An eldest son typically was not allowed to
marry until his father had died or was ready to retire since he could not become the head
of the household while his father was still politically active. Younger sons were often not

---


4 Duby, “In Northwestern France,” 199.
permitted by their father to marry at all unless they could find heiresses. Limiting the right of younger sons to marry was an effective way for a noble lineage to insure that its patrimony would not become fragmented—though this strategy often meant younger sons became perpetual bachelors.⁵

“Youth” was thus a period of great instability and uncertainty. During this stage of a nobleman’s life, he was fully prepared to assume a position of authority in his lineage, but he could not. Because his ambitions and his desire to rule could undermine his father’s position, he often departed from his father’s household in order to gain a level of independence and freedom of action.⁶ However, according to Duby, this strategy of distancing “youths” from the ruling members of their lineage was not always effective in easing tensions within the house. Drawing on evidence from one of his favorite medieval texts, the Historia comitum Ghisnensium of Lambert of Ardres, Duby offers a vivid description of what he believes to have been a common occurrence:

Propriety demanded that wealthy fathers and those careful of their family’s glory provide the eldest son with what was necessary to lead a group of wandering “youth” for a year or two after knighting. At the end of those wander-years we find the “youth” back at his father’s house. He is bored. He finds the place stuffy. His tour has given him a taste of economic independence and free spending; now deprived of it, he strongly feels its absence. He casts an envious eye on the revenues that belong to him…Tensions rise against the father’s powers. The history of the greatest lineages is full of such disputes; sometimes they provoke the son’s new departure, this time an aggressive one. The “young” eldest son, surrounded by his younger companions, opens battle with the old lord.⁷

---

⁵ Ibid., 201-204.

⁶ Ibid., 204-206. Duby believes that these wandering “youths” were the model for the knights errant whose lifestyle has been immortalized in the courtly love literature and the chansons de geste of the central Middle Ages. Groups of these “youths” played central roles in the crusading movement and in the popularization of knightly tournaments as well. Each knight hoped that his valor on the tournament field would attract the attention of a lord who had an unmarried heiress to give to the worthiest suitor.

For Duby, the ultimate goal of any nobleman was to marry and establish his own household, and a “youth” inevitably grew jealous and impatient if his father would not relinquish to him power and authority at what he thought was the appropriate time.

Historians of the central Middle Ages have found Duby’s concept of “youth” effective for explaining many of the disputes that arose among the adult members of royal and noble houses. For example, Henry the Younger’s rebellion against his father King Henry II of England (1154-1189) in 1173-1174 has been interpreted by one scholar in terms of the “youths”/lords dichotomy: “The generation gap of 1173 and 1174 found young, aggressive aspirants eager to seize power…but shut out by their elders.” In an article on parent-child relationships in France, Jane Beitscher discusses a noble son from the Limousin who decided he could wait no longer to succeed his father. Viscount Archambald III of Comborn “was in his forties when he finally exploded in mad jealousy, striking against his father who was at least sixty years old. Although middle-aged by our standards, Archambald had never escaped from paternal economic and psychological domination.” For Beitscher, an eldest son who lacked independence and

---

8 As noted above, Duby’s idea of the noble “youth” was closely connected to his views about the emergence of the patrilineage after the year 1000. However, some scholars have also applied the concept to the early Middle Ages. See, for example, Christoph Dette, “Kinder und Jugendliche in der Adelsgesellschaft des frühen Mittelalters,” Archiv für Kulturgeschichte 76 (1994): 1-34 and Régine Le Jan-Hennebicque, “Apprentissages militaires, rites de passage et remises d’armes au Haut Moyen Age,” in Éducation, apprentissages, initiation au Moyen Age: actes du premier colloque international de Montpellier (Montpellier: Centre de Recherche Interdisciplinaire sur la Société et l’Imaginaire au Moyen Age, 1993), 211-232. These articles clearly demonstrate the wide-ranging influence of Duby’s arguments for subsequent literature on the medieval nobility.


10 Jane K. Beitscher, “‘As the twig is bent…’: children and their parents in an aristocratic society,” Journal of Medieval History 2 (1976): 186.
was anxious for his father to die “was a ‘child-adult’ whose hybrid identity began early and ended late in life.”¹¹ More recently, W. M. Aird has analyzed the disputes between King William I of England (1066-1087) and his eldest son Robert Curthose.¹² According to Aird, William’s refusal to allow Robert to establish an independent household stood in direct opposition to “Robert’s desire to receive the public recognition and affirmation of his fully gendered adult self.”¹³ Aird concludes that “[w]here one man sought to prevent another from fully expressing his masculine identity and attaining manhood, it should not be surprising that conflict was the result.”¹⁴

Despite this emphasis by Duby and many other historians on the tensions that existed between “youths” and their fathers, inter-generational hostility was not inevitable within noble society.¹⁵ Bernard Bachrach has demonstrated, for example, that the counts of Anjou had during the early years of their dynasty “an Angevin family tradition of harmony and cooperation.”¹⁶ Violent clashes between fathers and sons were the exception rather than the norm within this comital house. Andrew Lewis has argued that the Capetians as well as many of the leading noble families of France practiced

---

¹¹ Ibid., 185.


¹³ Ibid., 48.

¹⁴ Ibid., 55.

¹⁵ Various aspects of Duby’s theories about marriage and noble family structures have received criticism during the last four decades (See Chapter One). In general, however, Duby’s arguments about “youths” have been very well-received. Even David Herlihy, who has criticized Duby’s family models on several points, accepts the notion of “youth.” See his Medieval Households (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1985), 120-121 and “The Generation in Medieval History,” Viator 5 (1974): 360.

“anticipatory association” as one strategy to avoid potential conflicts; the eldest son, and occasionally younger sons as well, received a title and at least a part of their inheritance during their father’s lifetime as a way of promoting familial order. Most significantly, Theodore Evergates has pointed out that a central feature of Duby’s model of family conflicts—namely the landless, penniless “youth”—was not as prevalent as Duby believed. Primogeniture was relatively uncommon, meaning younger sons who remained in the secular world were not always forced into leading the life of a restless knight errant for decades. In short, despite the very real potential for conflict, many noble houses found ways to minimize the chances that violence would erupt inside the family between the members of the older and younger generations. Rather than relying on any general model for the study of relationships within the house of Andechs, the historian must therefore look closely at the contemporary evidence in order to determine how Andechs fathers and sons related to one another.

Fortunately, a variety of sources make such an approach possible. Although property donations have been some of the most popular documents to use in the study of noble parents and their children, these are not the only types of texts from the 1100s that provide information about members of the house of Andechs. A broad range of evidence is available to explore father-son interactions for each of the twelfth-century generations of the Andechs lineage. Key pieces of evidence can be culled from such diverse works as chronicles, necrologies, and even the charters of the German kings and

---


19 For the use of property donations by historians who analyze noble families, see Chapter Three.
emperors. Of the ten sons known to have been born into the house of Andechs between 1100 and 1204, only one fails to appear in any source during his father’s lifetime.20
Indeed, all three sons of Count Berthold I of Andechs, both sons of Margrave Berthold II of Istria, and three of the four sons of Duke Berthold III of Merania are named on several occasions in contemporary documents. As a result, evidence is available from which to draw many significant conclusions about Andechs family relationships and the lineage’s succession strategies.

II. Succession and the south German nobility

Today in the United States, there is no consensus concerning the moment at which a young person crosses the threshold from childhood to adulthood. Different rights and responsibilities come at different ages, including one’s sixteenth, eighteenth and twenty-first birthdays. According to the Constitution, political adulthood arrives even later in life; members of the House of Representatives must be twenty-five years of age, Senators thirty, and the President thirty-five. Complicating the issue further, not all legal definitions of adulthood are as rigid as they may appear at first glance. Law courts, for example, can determine on a case-by-case basis whether teenagers under the age of eighteen ought to be tried as juveniles or adults. A complex combination of legal, political, social and personal factors thus play a role in making childhood and adulthood ambiguous concepts in modern America.

Medieval Europe presents a similarly complicated picture for the historian interested in analyzing the types of roles young men were able to play in noble society.

20 This is Berthold, the fourth son of Duke Berthold III of Merania and the future patriarch of Aquileia.
Authors from this period offer several different answers to the question of when children began to acquire adult rights and responsibilities.\textsuperscript{21} Gratian, in his \textit{Decretum}, argued that children from the age of seven were capable of giving their meaningful consent to their marriage.\textsuperscript{22} In contrast, early medieval law codes generally considered the end of the twelfth year as the time when a young man reached the age of consent.\textsuperscript{23} Isidore of Seville claimed that the age of fourteen was the dividing line between the stages of life known as \textit{pueritia} and \textit{adolescentia}.\textsuperscript{24} Andreas Capellanus in his study of courtly love also suggested fourteen was an important age, but he added that “before his eighteenth year a man cannot be a true lover” because he is not yet sufficiently mature.\textsuperscript{25}

Two issues make the analysis of the transition from childhood to adulthood in the medieval period even more difficult. The first is the lack of strong centralized governments in most regions of Europe during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries which were capable (or desirous) of mandating specific ages for when young men were recognized as adults. Decisions about how children were to be educated and when they were to be given certain rights and responsibilities lay with individual families, especially

\textsuperscript{21} The best recent review of the evidence for medieval attitudes toward the transition from childhood to adulthood is Thilo Offergeld, \textit{Reges pueri: Das Königtm Minderjähriger im frühen Mittelalter} (Hanover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 2001), 10-34.


the heads of households. This explains why, as previously noted, the knighting ceremony for a young nobleman could take place at any point between the ages of approximately sixteen and twenty-two. The anonymous author of the early thirteenth-century *Prose Lancelot* tells the story of a king who is reluctant to have his son knighted because he fears for his life if the boy becomes an adult. While this piece of anecdotal evidence comes from the realm of literature, it nevertheless hints at the very real control fathers could have over aspects of their sons’ lives during this period.

The second issue that complicates the study of medieval children and adults is the lack of information concerning the precise ages of nobles when they appear in the sources. As James Schultz has observed in his analysis of childhood in Middle High German literature, medieval writers were “remarkably casual about numbers—often omitting them, sometimes treating them inconsistently.” Years of birth are almost never preserved in the sources, and for most noblemen, there are few clues from which to estimate their possible ages. Archival records from the southeast of the German empire rarely identify young men by such helpful terms as *puer* or *adolescens*, which would at least give a general sense of how old they were. Furthermore, because twelfth-century

---


29 See Orme, 43-50 for a discussion of birthdays in the Middle Ages.

30 Andrew W. Lewis, “Anticipatory Association of the Heir in Early Capetian France,” *American Historical Review* 83 (1978): 919-920 observes that the range of scribal practices in existence during the central Middle Ages means that there was no consistency in how sons were described during their father’s lifetime. John B. Freed, *Noble Bondsmen: Ministerial Marriages in the Archdiocese of Salzburg, 1100-1343* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1995), 97 cites an example of a ministerial from the archdiocese of Salzburg being labeled a *puer* in a twelfth-century source, but such descriptive terminology
German nobles did not commonly hold elaborate, well-documented dubbing ceremonies or similar knightly initiations for their sons, there are virtually no records for the ages at which particular noble boys were girded with their swords. One of the few well-known examples of such an occasion was held at a gathering of the imperial court in Mainz in 1184, when Emperor Frederick I knighted his two oldest sons; they were sixteen and eighteen at the time. The only reason that such specific ages can be established for the young men is that they were the sons of the emperor.

Thus, when Ilse Balajthy in her study of the counts of Andechs suggests that Berthold III began to play an active role in his family’s politics from the age of sixteen, she is basing her position on general theories of medieval adulthood rather than direct evidence for his age. Berthold III’s exact year of birth is impossible to determine—as are the years of birth for the other Andechs sons born in the twelfth century. All that the surviving sources allow the historian to do is make reasonable estimates about how old these noblemen were when they began to be named in documents. In general, it appears that Andechs sons are referred to in texts as young children only rarely. Count Berthold I’s two eldest sons, Poppo and Berthold II, were mentioned in a Diessen tradition notice is not as common as historians would like. I know of no source related to the house of Andechs that refers to any sons by such terminology; they are typically identified only by kinship terms like *filius*.

---

31 Joachim Bumke, *The Concept of Knighthood in the Middle Ages*, trans. W. T. H. Jackson and Erika Jackson (New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1982), 87. As Bumke notes, initiation ceremonies were purely social events which only some nobles chose to organize.


from before the year 1123 but did not begin to make regular appearances in the sources until the mid-1130s; this tradition notice from Diessen, which also mentions their mother Sophia, may be the only example of Andechs sons being named before they had reached their teenage years.\textsuperscript{34} In other generations of the noble house, such broad spans of time between sources that make references to particular sons cannot be found. Once Berthold II’s and Berthold III’s children began to be named, they continued to appear in documents from subsequent years with remarkable consistency.\textsuperscript{35} This suggests that most Andechs sons were already old enough to have adult rights and responsibilities when they made their first appearances in the surviving sources.

These observations correspond well to the conclusions historians have drawn for the members of some of the other leading noble families from the south of the German empire.\textsuperscript{36} For example, the young duke Frederick of Swabia, the future Emperor Frederick I, was approximately sixteen years of age when he first appeared in a charter alongside his father and around twenty when he started to be named more consistently in the sources.\textsuperscript{37} Welf VII, the only son of Duke Welf VI of Spoleto († 1191), was listed with his father in a document only once as a minor and was approximately twenty in the

\textsuperscript{34} Tr. Diessen, 3-4, no. 2. This tradition notice is also analyzed in Chapter Three. For a discussion of the possible years of birth of Sophia’s sons, see Appendix Three, no. 1.

\textsuperscript{35} All of these Andechs sons will be discussed in much more detail in the following sections of this chapter.

\textsuperscript{36} I have drawn the following examples only from those cases in which noble fathers did not die until their eldest sons were already old enough to inherit. Sons whose fathers died while they were still minors often began to appear in sources at much earlier ages. See Freed, \textit{Noble Bondsmen}, 96-97.

\textsuperscript{37} Ferdinand Opll, \textit{Friedrich Barbarossa} (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1990), 29. O pll argues that Barbarossa was more than likely born in December of 1122. Marcel Pacaut suggests he was born in 1125 or 1126. See his \textit{Frederick Barbarossa}, trans. A. J. Pomerans (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1970), 46.
early 1160s when a series of sources makes reference to him. Furthermore, the eldest son of Duke Henry the Lion of Bavaria and Saxony, who was also named Henry, first appeared alongside his father in a charter from the year 1174, only a year or two after his birth. He is not named in another source until 1186, and it is only in 1191, when he was eighteen or nineteen years of age, that the young Henry started to appear in a broad range of texts. Thus, it is likely that sons born into the house of Andechs were in their late teens when they first became actively involved in their family’s affairs.

More significant than the age at which Andechs sons are first named in sources is what they are shown doing in these documents. The evidence reveals that, once they began to appear in the surviving texts with regularity, these young men were playing numerous different roles in their families. Count Berthold I’s eldest son Poppo witnessed a charter of Emperor Lothar III on 22 September 1137—without his father. Poppo also acted as advocate of the monastery of Benediktbeuern during his father’s lifetime. In the next generation, Margrave Berthold II’s eldest son Berthold III worked both with his

38 Karin Feldmann, “Herzog Welf VI. und sein Sohn: Das Ende des süddeutschen Welfenhauses” (Ph.D. diss., University of Tübingen, 1971), 53 and note 77 in “Anmerkungen zu II.”


40 Ibid., 174-176, no. 118.


42 Die Urkunden Lothars III. und der Kaiserin Richenza, eds. Emil von Ottenthal and Hans Hirsch, MGH Diplomata regum et imperatorum Germania, vol. 8 (Hanover: 1927) [hereafter MGH D Lothar III], 190-193, no. 119. Please note that much of the evidence cited in this paragraph will be discussed in more detail in later sections of this chapter.

43 Baumann, 17-18, no. 29. Significantly, Poppo was already appearing with the title comes in this and other early sources. What is unclear is if he had already been given one of his father’s comital lordships or if the title was a common one for adult heirs. The latter seems more likely, but this is an issue that requires more research.
father and by himself throughout all of the Andechs lordships from Franconia to Carniola. After being named duke of Merania in 1180, he began to seal his own charters.\textsuperscript{44} He also attended the court of Emperor Frederick I’s son King Henry VI in Italy in 1186 without his father.\textsuperscript{45} Berthold III’s own sons did not appear independently from their father very often in the surviving sources, but they are named alongside him in a variety of contexts. The eldest son Otto was with his father at Worms in December 1195 to take the Cross.\textsuperscript{46} Furthermore, both he and his brother Henry accompanied their father to northeastern Italy and Carniola in 1202, where they appeared as witnesses to a peace treaty alongside numerous prominent imperial lords.\textsuperscript{47}

An examination of the evidence for other noble sons in the south of the empire again reveals that the counts of Andechs were not unusual in the roles they assigned to their heirs. During the mid-1140s, Frederick Barbarossa began while in his early twenties to lead his own military expeditions independently from his father.\textsuperscript{48} Poppo IV, son of the Franconian Count Gotebold I of Henneberg († 1144), had already started to act as advocate for the monastery of Lorsch four years before his father’s death.\textsuperscript{49}

\textsuperscript{44} The earliest example is from 1181: see MB, 4:139-140, no. 10.

\textsuperscript{45} See, for example, \textit{Regesten Imperii}, vol. 4, pt. 3: Die Regesten des Kaiserrechtes unter Heinrich VI, 1165 (1190)-1197, ed. Johann Friedrich Böhmer; newly edited by Gerhard Baaken (Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1972), 9-10, nos. 6-7.

\textsuperscript{46} \textit{Annales Marbacenses qui dicuntur (Cronica Hohenburgensis cum continuatione et additamentis Neoburgensibus)}, ed. Hermann Bloch, MGH SSrG 9 (Hanover, 1907), 66-67.

\textsuperscript{47} MHDC, vol. 4, pt. 1, 1-3, no. 1524.

\textsuperscript{48} Oppl, 29-30. For Frederick’s campaigns during his father’s lifetime, see Otto of Freising, \textit{The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa}, trans. Charles Christopher Mierow (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994), 59-60, I.xxvi.

IV, son of Duke Conrad of Zähringen († 1152), was named alongside his father in a letter written by King Roger II of Sicily in 1148-49, in which the king asked a group of leading German noblemen to support Duke Welf VI against the German King Conrad III.\textsuperscript{50} Otto of Wittelsbach († 1183), the future duke of Bavaria, witnessed a charter of King Conrad III with his younger brother Frederick—but without their father—on 13 February 1147, almost ten years before their father died.\textsuperscript{51}

All of this suggests that, throughout the twelfth century, it was common practice within the noble houses of southern Germany to practice some form of what Andrew Lewis has called “anticipatory association.”\textsuperscript{52} Sons who were “youths” obtained from their fathers a portion of the family’s rights and properties. The young men were also permitted to act independently from their fathers to a certain extent. In his work on the Capetians and the French nobility, Lewis has suggested a variety of reasons for this familial strategy:

In noble society the anticipatory association of the heir might have any of several possible functions, only one of which was the reinforcement of a weak hereditary title. It was sometimes a means of transmitting the father’s entire inheritance to his eldest son to the exclusion of the cadets. In other cases, when the family had several holdings, it was used in conjunction with a partition of the estate or the assignment of apanages as one element in a more complicated successional plan. Occasionally, it provided a coadjutor to an ailing, elderly father. Yet again, it could mark a recognition or an endowment of a prospective heir who had come of

\textsuperscript{50} Ulrich Parlow, \textit{Die Zähringer: Kommentierte Quellendokumentationen zu einem südwestdeutschen Herzogsgeschlecht des hohen Mittelalters} (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1999), 210-211, no. 319.


\textsuperscript{52} See note 17 above.
age; in cases of this sort, the association was sometimes linked to the marriage of the heir and the assignment of a dower to his wife.\textsuperscript{53}

Thus, “anticipatory association” rather than Duby’s model of the frustrated and bored noble “youth” offers the best framework for understanding how Andechs fathers and sons interacted with one another.\textsuperscript{54}

As Lewis has observed, however, each example of “anticipatory association” is unique in nature.\textsuperscript{55} Numerous factors could play a role in a father’s decision to involve one or more of his sons in his rule during his lifetime. In the case of the house of Andechs, there is not a universal model that effectively explains how and why Berthold I, Berthold II and Berthold III associated their heirs in their lordship. The interactions between each of these fathers and his adult sons reveal that the three lords did not have the same succession strategy as their goal when they chose to practice a form of “anticipatory association.” As a result, each generation of the house of Andechs must be analyzed separately to understand the importance of father-son relationships for the descent of power and authority within the lineage.

\textsuperscript{53} Lewis, “Anticipatory Association of the Heir,” 915-916.

\textsuperscript{54} It must be noted that “anticipatory association” and Duby’s concept of the restless noble “youth” are not mutually exclusive. King Henry II of England had numerous problems with his sons, despite the fact that he involved each of them in aspects of his lordship during his lifetime. Nevertheless, Lewis takes a much more nuanced approach to the study of fathers and sons than Duby does; Lewis recognizes a much broader range of possible relationships between lords and their heirs. For this reason, I consider Lewis’s arguments a better foundation for studying fathers and sons than Duby’s arguments.

\textsuperscript{55} Lewis, “Anticipatory Association of the Heir,” 908 and 920.
III. Count Berthold I of Andechs and his sons

Approximately three decades separate the first appearance in the sources of Count Berthold I’s oldest sons Poppo and Berthold II in the early 1120s from Berthold I’s own death in 1151. As noted above, both Poppo and Berthold II were likely still minors when they were named in a Diessen tradition notice with their parents around 1120. During the next several years, they continued to remain close to Count Berthold I, simply witnessing or consenting to his property arrangements in Bavaria. Beginning in the mid-1130s, however, the count permitted these two sons to broaden their horizons. In 1135, Poppo appeared in Upper Franconia alongside Berthold I and other Franconian nobles in the witness list of Bishop Otto I of Bamberg’s charter for the religious community at Vessra. Two years later in September 1137, Poppo and his younger brother Berthold II were south of Rome at Aquino as Emperor Lothar III returned from his Sicilian campaign. In subsequent years, Poppo became a regular visitor to the court of King Conrad III—with and without his father. Berthold II, meanwhile, was the only member of the lineage to witness a charter of Duke Leopold of Bavaria for the monastery of Prüfening drawn up in the summer of 1140.

56 A complete list of all the surviving documents which name Poppo can be found in Appendix Three. For the difficulties in drawing conclusions about family relationships from monastic property agreements, see Chapter Three.


58 MGH D Lothar III, 194-202, no. 120.

59 See, for example, MGH D Konrad III, 18-19, no. 10 (1138); 75-77, no. 45 (1140); and 114-115, no. 65 (1142).

60 UB Babenberger, 1:17-19, no. 13.
Other sources from the years after 1135 reveal that Count Berthold I of Andechs permitted his two oldest sons to play significant roles in the management of the family’s properties and rights. Berthold I’s last definitive appearance as advocate of Benediktbeuern was in a charter of Emperor Lothar III dated 1 January 1136; over the course of the following decade, Poppo and Berthold II were both named in Benediktbeuern tradition notices with the title of advocate. Furthermore, a Diessen tradition notice from the period between 1137 and 1147 refers to a property donation made by “a ministerial of Counts Poppo and Berthold [II].” This suggests that the count had already given his two oldest sons their own entourage to support and legitimize their authority. A variety of sources thus indicates that Count Berthold I of Andechs—more than a decade before his death—had chosen to involve Poppo and Berthold II in numerous aspects of his politics and lordship.

The most important decision Berthold I made in the period after 1135 was not simply to associate Poppo and Berthold II in his rule; it was to marry his eldest son Poppo to Kunizza, the daughter and heiress of the Franconian count Reginboto of Giech. Though “anticipatory association” of heirs was, as noted above, relatively common in southern Germany in the twelfth century, sons marrying during their fathers’ lifetimes seems to have been rare. The tendency was for an eldest son to marry only after he had

61 MGH D Lothar III, 118-120, no. 77.

62 Baumann, 17-18, no. 29 and 20, no. 34 (see especially note 5, pp. 20-21).

63 Tr. Diessen, 13-14, no. 9: “ministerialis comitum Popponis et Bertholfi.” Because Count Berthold I gave the name of Berthold to his second son, it is sometimes difficult to determine whether sources from the late 1130s and the 1140s are referring to Berthold I or Berthold II. Schlögl, the editor of the Diessen tradition notices, has argued that this text refers to Berthold II because the name Berthold follows Poppo’s name; if this were Berthold I, one would expect that he would be named in the notice before his son Poppo. The argument seems to be a valid one and also helps to explain the identity of the Berthold named in other sources from this period.
become the head of his lineage. However, because Kunizza was an heiress, Count Berthold I of Andechs had the opportunity to bring into his lineage’s control the strategically significant Upper Franconian lands and rights that she would bring with her into her marriage. At a time when Berthold was still active politically, he did not hesitate to use his eldest son to cement the crucial merger of the noble houses of Andechs and Giech.

Like so many of the other women who married an Andechs lord during the twelfth century, Kunizza provided her husband with a male heir during the first few years of their marriage. A short time later in 1142, however, Bishop Egilbert of Bamberg succeeded in having the union dissolved. The legal justification for this move is uncertain, but the bishop was clearly anxious to weaken the rapidly expanding power of the Andechses in Upper Franconia. The surviving evidence suggests that Kunizza supported the bishop’s actions, for in a charter from the same year she declared her desire to grant her inheritance—including the strategic castles at Giech and Lichtenfels—to the church of Bamberg. As a result, the house of Andechs suddenly found its newly-acquired position as the leading noble lineage in Upper Franconia under serious threat. But because Poppo and his ministerials were the ones in control of Giech and Lichtenfels in 1142 when the marriage was dissolved, the bishop was in no position to take control of the castles peacefully. War soon erupted.

---

64 Freed, Noble Bondsmen, 96-97 and Duby, “In Northwestern France,” 201. For another south German exception to this rule, see Jordan, 196, where the marriage of Henry the Lion’s eldest son Henry is discussed.

65 Staatsarchiv Bamberg, BU 223. The phrase here for the dissolution of the marriage is “publice separata.” For additional evidence concerning the end of the union, see Oefele, 21-22, no. 20.

66 Alois Schütz, “Die Andechs-Meranier in Franken und ihre Rolle in der europäischen Politik des Mittelalters,” in Die Andechs-Meranier in Franken (Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 1998), 14-16 and
A treaty between Poppo and Bishop Egilbert drawn up in the late spring or early summer of 1143 ended the conflict. Kunizza, whose inheritance lay at the center of the dispute, had died at some point in the months leading up to the peace accord, leaving the house of Andechs and the church of Bamberg to decide the fate of her lands. Poppo agreed to turn over to the bishop the castles of Giech and Lichtenfels as well as the rest of Count Reginboto’s former rights and properties. In return, the bishop granted half the castle of Lichtenfels and the main section of the castle of Giech “to Poppo and to his son and to his brother Berthold [II]” for their use during their lifetimes. Once the three of them had died, full control and ownership of both castles would revert to the church of Bamberg. The agreement was witnessed by Count Berthold I of Andechs.

That Poppo’s minor son and his younger brother Berthold II are both named in the treaty suggests that a clear line of succession did not yet exist within the Andechs lineage in 1143. Indeed, the situation inside the noble house during this period was complex. Count Berthold I of Andechs was still alive and politically active. His two oldest sons, who were in their twenties, had already been involved in managing the family’s lordships


67 This is generally referred to in the modern literature as the “First Treaty of Giechburg”: Paul Oesterreicher, Denkwürdigkeiten der fränkischen Geschichte, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf das Fürstbischofum Bamberg, vol. 3 (Bamberg, 1832), 87-88, no. 7.

68 Ibid.: “Bopponi. filioque et fratri suo Perhtolfo.”

69 Schütz, 16 suggests that Poppo and Berthold II had already agreed to a division of the inheritance by this date, but there is no direct evidence to support this claim. While Count Berthold I probably intended to divide the patrimony between them, the surviving sources do not reveal any clear plan for how this was to happen.
for more than half a decade.\textsuperscript{70} The third son, Otto, had already reached the age of majority and begun to be involved in the family’s affairs as well. Twice in the 1140s he witnessed property donations to Benediktbeuern by Bavarian notables, and in the earlier of these tradition notices he was the only member of the house of Andechs who was present.\textsuperscript{71} Furthermore, Poppo had added a third generation to the lineage with his own son, who was the only member of the family to possess a legitimate blood claim to Kunizza of Giech’s valuable inheritance. The treaty between Poppo and Bishop Egilbert thus occurred at a moment when a variety of possible succession strategies were available to Count Berthold I of Andechs and the rest of his lineage (see Figure 5.1).

\begin{figure}
\centering
\begin{tikzpicture}[level distance=2.5cm, sibling distance=3cm, level 1/.style={sibling distance=5cm}, level 2/.style={sibling distance=3cm}]
  \node (Berthold) {Count Berthold I (d. 1151)}
    child {node (Poppo) {Poppo (d. 1148)}}
    child {node (BertholdII) {Berthold II (d. 1188)}}
    child {node (Otto) {Otto (d. 1196)}}
  child {node (Henry) {Henry (d. after 1177)}};
\end{tikzpicture}
\caption{Male members of the Andechs lineage alive in the 1140s}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{70} As noted above, Poppo and Berthold II had both already appeared in a source prior to the year 1123 (see note 34), meaning they were each at least twenty in 1143. For more on their ages, see Appendix Three, no. 1.

\textsuperscript{71} Baumann, 18, no. 30, and 25, no. 50. There is no indication in either of these texts that he had already been placed in the Church in this period.
A series of events during subsequent years streamlined the descent of the noble house’s power and lordship. At some point between mid-1143 and mid-1147, Poppo placed his only son in the monastery of Admont.\textsuperscript{72} That Count Berthold I of Andechs’s eldest son would choose for his own eldest son a religious career is noteworthy, for this decision does not fit neatly into the model of the noble lineage popular among modern historians. One possible explanation for Poppo’s actions is that Henry was mentally or physically handicapped and therefore unfit to succeed.\textsuperscript{73} In 1166, however, Henry became abbot of Millstatt in Carinthia, and five years later he was a serious candidate for the position of abbot of Admont. As a result, it seems unlikely that he was too mentally or physically impaired to have played a role in Andechs politics and lordship—had he remained outside the Church.\textsuperscript{74} Was Berthold II’s strong position within the noble house

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item The earliest source to report this dates from 1147: MHDC, 3:330-331, no. 847. This is also the first source to indicate that the boy was named Henry. He was likely not given this name until after he was designated for the monastic life since it is an unusual name in both the houses of Andechs and Giech.

\item Monasteries are known to have been a “dumping ground” for such members of noble families. See Timothy Reuter, “Nobles and Others: The Social and Cultural Expression of Power Relations in the Middle Ages,” in Nobles and Nobility in Medieval Europe, ed. Anne J. Duggan (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2000), 90. However, since Henry was later elected abbot of Millstatt, it seems unlikely. For his career, see Wilhelm Deuer, “Abt Heinrich aus dem Geschlecht der Grafen von Andechs-Giech (1166-nach 1177) und seine Bedeutung für das Kloster Millstatt,” in Studien zur Geschichte von Millstatt und Kärnten: Vorträge der Millstätter Symposien 1981-1995, ed. Franz Nikolasch (Klagenfurt: Verlag des Geschichtsvereines für Kärnten, 1997), 319-340.

\item The only source that offers any information about Henry’s abilities concerns his candidacy for the position of abbot of Admont: Vita Gebehardi et successorum eius, ed. W. Wattenbach, MGH SS 11 (Hanover, 1854), 47-48: “Post haec piæ recordationis Admuntensis abbas Liutoldus septimo regiminis sui anno, postquam utiliter, sed admodum laboriose, in vinea Domini desudavit, anno Domini incarnationis 1171, 3. Nonas Septembris Domino vocante diem clausit extremum....Post cuius decessum in eligendo patrem fratres aliquandiu dissidentes, quidam domnum Isinricum prenominatum abbatem Biburgensem, quidam domnum Heinricum abbatem Millstatensem, Popponis comitis filium, et a puero similiter in Admuntensi educatum coenobio, coeperunt expetere in patrem et dominum. Obtinuit tamen pars quae domnum Heinricum elegerat, et altera pars huic coepit assentire. Electus ergo domnus Heinricus venire ad nos penitus abnuit, licet multis et episcoporum et principum litteris pro hoc esset sollicitatus, tum quieti suae consules, tum priorem vocationem sui et electionem in locum Millstatensem obtendens, insufficientiam quoque suam ad regimen nostri monasterii sepemerno proponens. Rursus igitur dum in electione patris vota eligentium scinderetur, et ob hoc dissensionum scandalis tota confunderetur Jerusalem, tandem utcumque concordia facta, Rudolfo quidam prior Sancti Lamberti est electus, cum item domnus Isinricus a pluribus religiosis eligeretur, et tamen ab alii ne illa electio effectum haberet impediretur.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
therefore the reason behind the young Henry’s removal from the line of succession?

Berthold II—who like Henry had a claim to Kunizza’s inheritance because of his inclusion in the 1143 treaty with the bishop of Bamberg—may well have seen his nephew as a serious threat to his own standing within the noble house.

Regardless of the answer to this question, Henry’s entry into Admont as a child signaled the end of his ties to the family of his birth. A potential source of successional conflict within the noble house had thus been eliminated. Significantly, by 1147 Count Berthold I of Andechs also seems to have ceased playing any prominent role in the lineage’s affairs. Berthold’s necrological entry in Liutold’s Codex from the Diessen house of canons reads, “Count Berthold, founder of this place, afterwards a lay brother of our community, died.”

Though he may have joined the house of canons only shortly before his death in 1151, he was likely already in his sixties at the start of the 1140s, making an earlier retirement very possible. Furthermore, a series of sources from early 1147 naming Poppo and Berthold II—including one that identifies them as “Counts Poppo and Berthold of Andechs”—suggests that the two brothers were the dominant figures in the lineage by this time.

---


76 For the likelihood that Berthold I had already been born by 1080, see Appendix One.

77 For the quotation, see Tr. Freising, 2:367-369, no. 1537; “Poppo et Berhtolt comites de Andehs.” Other texts from early 1147 include Tr. Polling, 14-21, no. 7; MGH D Konrad III, 302-304, no. 167; and ibid., 311-312, no. 172. For the argument that these documents all refer to Berthold II rather than Berthold I, see note 63 above.
Poppo and Berthold II both accompanied Conrad III on the Second Crusade when the king departed for the Holy Land in June of 1147. Two years later in the spring of 1149 when the remnants of the army were again on imperial soil, Berthold II was without his brother; Poppo had died at Constantinople the preceding winter. Upon his return, one of Berthold II’s first actions was to force the new bishop of Bamberg, Eberhard, into renegotiating the 1143 treaty. The bishop agreed to extend the earlier accord so that Berthold II’s first-born son would also have use during his own lifetime of the aforementioned pieces of Kunizza’s inheritance. Though Berthold II did not yet have a son at the time of this new treaty, he was clearly preparing for the future and for a newly-emerging succession plan. In 1151, Count Berthold I died, and by 1153, Otto had embarked upon his career in the Church. Berthold II had become the sole ruler of the Andechs lordships, and his own eldest son was to be his unquestioned heir.

It is impossible to guess what would have happened if Poppo had returned from the Second Crusade with his brother. Would there have been a permanent division of the patrimony, or would one of the two been forced into perpetual bachelorhood to avoid the possibility of fragmentation? For modern historians with the benefit of hindsight, Poppo’s death certainly appears to have occurred at a convenient time since such difficult questions never needed to be answered. As the events of the mid-1140s reveal, however, the house of Andechs had already been able to manage successfully an array of potential problems surrounding the succession. With five males from three generations of the lineage alive and in the secular world in 1143, the members of the lineage found a way to avoid intra-familial conflict through a series of well-timed decisions. The placement of

---

78 This is generally referred to in the modern literature as the “Second Treaty of Giechburg”: Oesterreicher, Denkwürdigkeiten, 3:88-91, no. 8.
Poppo’s son Henry in a monastery, Berthold I’s retirement, and Otto’s entry into the Church all helped to streamline the succession without jeopardizing the health of the lineage; Berthold II was well-qualified to become its sole head. The succession was thus a decade-long process rather than an issue that only became important when Count Berthold I died. Furthermore, because of this preparation, an unexpected event such as Poppo’s death on the Second Crusade did not lead to a crisis. The members of the house of Andechs had controlled the entire succession process effectively in order to insure a smooth transition of power from one generation to the next.

IV. Margrave Berthold II of Istria and his sons

As the 1150s began, Count Berthold II of Andechs—who was childless and approximately thirty years of age—was the only male member of his lineage who was not in the Church. The previous decade’s uncertainty over the succession, caused by an abundance of men active in the noble house’s secular affairs, had suddenly been replaced by uncertainty resulting from a shortage of viable heirs. Moreover, because Berthold II was a second son and did not clearly emerge as the principal successor to his father until after the Second Crusade, there is no reason to believe he had married prior to the year 1149. The earliest reference to his first wife, Hedwig, dates from 1152, and a charter from 1153 suggests that the couple was still childless the following year. Their only

---

79 For the marriages of younger sons, see Duby, “In Northwestern France,” 202-203.

80 SUB, 2:423-427, no. 304. In a passage of this charter (of Archbishop Eberhard I of Salzburg) that refers to Count Berthold I of Andechs, it states, “…quod comes Perhtoldus de Anedechsen pater illius Perhtoldi qui nunc superset….” Because infants were not always counted as family members as a result of the high mortality rates for young children, it is also possible that Berthold III had been born shortly before this charter was written.
son, Berthold III, was therefore probably born in 1154 or 1155. Count Berthold II did not have another male child until he remarried at some point during the mid- or late 1160s.\textsuperscript{81}

Following the course that Count Berthold I of Andechs had charted in the previous generation, Berthold II chose to associate his eldest son in his affairs from a relatively young age. Already in the late 1160s and early 1170s, Berthold III began to be named alongside his father in a small number of sources, though none of the evidence suggests he was more than a passive participant in events during this period.\textsuperscript{82} Soon thereafter, however, Berthold III began to act independently from Berthold II. On 1 May 1172, Duke Welf VI had a charter drawn up recording a grant to the monastery of St. Ulrich and Afra in Augsburg; one of the witnesses to the donation was “Berthold junior, count of Andechs.”\textsuperscript{83} In or around the same year, the Andechs ministerial Henry Schneck made a donation to the Bavarian monastery of Schäftlarn “with the permission and through the hand of his junior lord, count Berthold.”\textsuperscript{84} Berthold III was approximately eighteen years of age at the time these documents were written. While father and son would be named together in numerous charters and tradition notices until Margrave Berthold II’s death in 1188, Berthold II and Berthold III also began after 1172 to operate separately from one another with increasing frequency.

\textsuperscript{81} For Berthold II’s second marriage, see Chapter Seven.

\textsuperscript{82} See, for example, \textit{Die Traditionen, Urkunden und Urbare des Klosters Asbach} [hereafter Tr. Asbach], ed. Johann Geier, Quellen und Erörterungen zur bayerischen Geschichte, Neue Folge, vol. 23 (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1969), 42-43, no. 55 and UBLE, 1:673, no. 157 and 739-740, no. 403. The first two of these tradition notices both involve property agreements between monasteries and Count Berthold II, making Berthold III’s presence unsurprising. See Chapter Three.

\textsuperscript{83} MB, 22:185-186, no. 10: “Bertholdus Comes junior de Anedechse.”

One aspect of Berthold III’s newly-developing independence during the early 1170s was his marriage to Agnes of Rochlitz from the Saxon noble house of Wettin. Unlike Kunizza of Giech, she was not an heiress and did not bring with her into the marriage any properties of strategic importance for the Andechses. That Berthold II had arranged such a union for his eldest son while the young man was only around twenty years of age is a clear indication that the count/margrave was willing to give his heir significant responsibilities during his own lifetime. Indeed, Berthold II appears to have granted to Berthold III the family’s counties in Lower Bavaria in order that the new couple could establish its own household. When Agnes began providing her husband with sons during the mid-1170s, they were not placed in a monastery as the young Henry had been in the previous generation. Berthold III’s three oldest sons were all still living in the secular world in the early 1190s, and two of them would inherit the patrimony after Berthold III died in 1204.

Where was Berthold II’s son from his second marriage, Poppo (II), while Berthold III was marrying and having children? Poppo (II) does not appear in a source until 1185, when he is identified as a cathedral canon and as provost of the church of St.

---

85 For more on this marriage, see Chapter Seven.

86 I am unaware of any historian of the house of Andechs who has previously considered this possibility. However, there is enough evidence to suggest this was the case. The only surviving record of a property donation by Berthold III and his wife was made to the monastery of Vornbach: see UBLE, 1:676, no. 168. The earliest known sealed charter of the duke also concerns Vornbach: see MB, 4:139-140, no. 10. Throughout the remainder of his career, Berthold III spent a significant amount of time in Lower Bavaria.

87 For more on Berthold III and his sons, see below.

88 I have designated this Poppo as Poppo (II) here in order to avoid having my readers confuse him with Berthold I’s son Poppo. Because Poppo (II) entered the Church and the other Poppo predeceased his father, neither has traditionally been designated by a Roman numeral in the modern literature.
Jacob in Bamberg. Of the ten male members of the house of Andechs to be named in the surviving twelfth-century charters and tradition notices, he is the only one who makes his first appearance as a member of the Church. This is especially noteworthy because he was a second rather than a third or fourth-born son. As has already been shown, Count Berthold I permitted his second son Berthold II to play a prominent role in the family’s secular affairs during his own lifetime; furthermore, Berthold III clearly intended from the beginning that his second son Henry would inherit part of the patrimony, as will be discussed below. There is, however, no evidence to suggest that Poppo (II) was ever seriously considered as a potential successor to his father.

Margrave Berthold II thus employed a very different succession strategy from the one his own father had devised during the 1130s and 1140s. In both cases, the eldest son was involved in the family’s politics and lordship from a young age and was permitted to marry during his father’s lifetime. But the similarities end there. Count Berthold I and Margrave Berthold II did not envision the same career path for their second sons. Nor did they have comparable plans for how their firstborn grandsons were to be raised since Berthold I saw his placed in a monastery while Berthold II allowed his to remain an integral member of the lineage. To understand why the margrave of Istria chose to arrange the succession in a different manner than his father had, it is necessary to focus more narrowly on the situation inside the house of Andechs during the 1170s.

One of the key factors in Berthold II’s decision to eliminate his second son from the direct line of descent was that Poppo (II) had been born to a different mother than Berthold III. The biological fact that Berthold III and Poppo (II) were only half-brothers

---

is insufficient for explaining their father’s succession strategy, however. What is most important is that their births to different mothers resulted in a significant disparity in age between them. Because of this gap, when Berthold III began to appear in sources independently from his father in and around the year 1172, Poppo (II) was not yet ten years old. This means that Poppo (II) was in his early teens at the oldest—and therefore still too young to play an active role in his father’s affairs—when his brother Berthold III started to have children in the mid-1170s. By the early 1180s, Berthold III and Agnes of Rochlitz had four sons, leaving little doubt that at least one would survive and be able to succeed to the Andechs lordships (see Figure 5.2). Thus, it appears that Poppo (II) was squeezed out of the line of succession because, by the time he reached adulthood, he already had several nephews who had insured the long-term survival of the lineage.

When a position in the cathedral chapter at Bamberg became available as a result of the death of the provost of St. Jacob in 1185, Poppo (II) was moved into a Church career. Despite the decision by Berthold II to place his second son in the Church, the margrave nevertheless gave to Poppo (II) a significant inheritance. As a canon and a member of a cathedral chapter, Poppo (II) was permitted to own property, and the other members of the house of Andechs who became canons all acquired pieces of the

---

90 Since Hedwig is named alongside her husband in a source from 1161, it is unlikely that Berthold II had remarried and had another child until 1163 at the earliest. See Chapter Three for a more detailed discussion of the surviving references to Hedwig.

91 Most historians have argued that the fourth son of Duke Berthold III and Agnes, another Berthold, was born in 1182. See, for example, Kamillo Trotter, “Das Haus der Grafen von Andechs,” in Genealogisches Handbuch zur bairisch-österreichischen Geschichte, ed. Otto von Dungern (Graz: Verlag Leuschner & Lubensky, 1931), 26, no. 67. The foundation for this argument is that Berthold ceased to be archbishop-elect of Kalocsa and became archbishop in 1212, suggesting he became thirty—the minimum age to hold an episcopal see—in that year.
In Poppo (II)’s case, however, his part of the inheritance appears to have been especially large; several sources survive that show him acting as an heir to his father rather than as a canon. For example, following the death of Margrave Berthold II in 1188, the brothers Berthold III and Poppo (II) made a joint property donation to the monastery of Michelfeld southeast of Bamberg. Then, in the 1192 confirmation of an earlier agreement regarding the marriages of Andechs and Bamberg ministerials, Duke Berthold III of Merania and Poppo (II) are both identified as being heirs to Margrave Berthold II and thus parties to the agreement. Four decades later in 1231, Poppo (II) made a donation from his own inheritance “for the salvation of my soul and the soul of

92 For canons’ property rights, see Constance B. Bouchard, *Sword, Miter, and Cloister: Nobility and the Church in Burgundy, 980-1198* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1987), 59-60. Also see Chapter Three.


my father, who because of paternal affection made me a trusted heir to his patrimony.”

Thus, while Poppo (II) was unable to succeed to any of the Andechs lordships, his father insured that he nonetheless acquired a significant portion of the family’s allodial estates.

Margrave Berthold II’s motives in making Poppo (II) one of his heirs are difficult to ascertain. He could just as easily have placed the young man in a monastery, effectively severing Poppo (II)’s right to any of the family’s properties; this is what had been done with the child Henry in the mid-1140s. In general, however, the second sons of south German nobles tended to remain in the secular world, and it is therefore possible that Berthold II was reluctant to sever all ties to Poppo (II). Such a suggestion is, of course, only speculation. What can be stated more confidently is that, until Poppo (II) died in 1245, he remained closely involved in the affairs of the house of Andechs while holding a variety of offices within the church of Bamberg. By giving Poppo (II) a significant portion of the patrimony, Margrave Berthold II succeeded in keeping his second son connected to the other members of the lineage, despite removing him from the line of succession. Meanwhile, Duke Berthold III was able to inherit Berthold II’s lordships and to pass them on to his sons without having to face the possibility his younger brother would make any counterclaims. As in the previous generation, a series of well-timed decisions over the span of more than a decade thus enabled the ruling count of Andechs to insure a peaceful succession after he died.

---

95 The most recent printed edition of this charter can be found in: Erwin Herrmann, “Zur Stadtentwicklung in Nordbayern,” AGO 53 (1973): 76: “…ob remedium anime mee necnon et patris mei, qui me paterno affectu dilectum heredem sui fecit patrimonii.”

96 To cite only a few examples of other noble houses in which second sons typically succeeded to a piece of the patrimony in the twelfth century: the Wittelsbachs, Welfs, Staufen, and Hennebergs. One of the few prominent lineages that did tend to put second sons in the Church was the Zähringens.
V. Duke Berthold III of Merania and his sons

In May of 1189, only six months after the death of his father Margrave Berthold II, Duke Berthold III of Merania embarked on the Third Crusade. He would not be named in another source from north of the Alps until June of 1192. Whom he placed in charge of administering the Andechs lordships while he was away for these three years is unclear. His uncle Bishop Otto II of Bamberg and his younger brother Poppo (II) both may have been involved in some way. There is no evidence to suggest that any of his sons played a direct role in managing the family’s rights and properties during this period, perhaps because they were still too young. By the mid-1190s, however, his three eldest sons had all begun to appear in the surviving sources. Only the youngest of Berthold III’s four male children fails to be named in any document from the final decade of the duke’s life (see Figure 5.3).

![Figure 5.3. Male members of the Andechs lineage alive in the early 1200s](image)

---

97 Poppo (II)’s involvement can perhaps be inferred from the fact that the agreement concerning Andechs-Bamberg ministerial marriages dates from the months immediately after Duke Berthold III returned from the crusade. This may be one reason why Poppo (II) is such a prominent figure in this charter. See note 94 above.
Ekbert, the third son, followed a similar career path to that of the other third son born into the house of Andechs in the twelfth century: Count Berthold I’s son Otto, who was still bishop of Bamberg in the mid-1190s. Like his great-uncle Otto, Ekbert was named in a tradition notice from a Bavarian monastery while still living in the secular world; he appears in the witness list of a quitclaim involving Schäftlarn shortly before he became a cathedral canon at Bamberg. As was the case with Otto two generations earlier, it is difficult to determine if Ekbert was being held in reserve to insure a stable succession or if his father wanted him to have a basic knowledge of the family’s lordships before he entered upon his Church career. Regardless, Ekbert would go on to become bishop of Bamberg and would maintain close ties to the secular members of the noble house, just as Otto did throughout his career.

Duke Berthold III’s two oldest sons both made their first appearances in the surviving sources in 1194-1195, when they were approaching twenty years of age. Henry, the second son, was named alongside his father when the duke of Merania renewed the privileges that Margrave Berthold II had granted to the monastery of Raitenhaslach, which lay in Lower Bavaria south of the Andechs county of Vornbach. Leading the witness list to the same document were “Duke Berthold and his son Henry.” Berthold III’s eldest son Otto I was present at Worms with his father on 6

---

98 Tr. Schäftlarn, 320-322, no. 321.


100 See note 91 above for the argument that the fourth son Berthold was born in 1182. This means the three oldest sons of Duke Berthold III must have been born between approximately 1173 and 1181.

December 1195 to take the Cross. The death in Italy of Emperor Henry VI on 28 September 1197 on the eve of the crusade led many, including the two Andechses, to abandon the expedition. One month later on 31 October as Berthold III and Otto I made their way back north, the duke reached an agreement with the bishop of Gurk concerning ministerial marriages, and his son Otto I consented to the arrangement.

There is little noteworthy about these early appearances of Otto I and Henry. The two charters in which they are named place them alongside their father as witnesses and consenters—much as sons in previous generations had initially been named alongside their fathers. However, unlike other generations, these first references to the young men are not a prelude to a period of greater independence during their father’s lifetime. Neither Otto I nor Henry appears in another source until 1202, and in that year, they were once again accompanying Berthold III. On 5 February 1202 all three were in Görz (Gorizia) northeast of Aquileia for a peace agreement between the count of Görz and the patriarch. Duke Berthold III played a direct role in arranging the peace, while Otto I and Henry both acted as witnesses. The same month, the duke of Merania received a loan from the patriarch of Aquileia, and his two sons were named with him in the charter that outlined how the loan was to be repaid and which properties were to be collateral. Otto I and Henry do not appear in another source until after the death of Duke Berthold III in 1204.

---

102 See note 46 above.
103 MHDC, 1:271-273, no. 369.
104 See note 47 above.
105 UB Krain, 2:5-6, no. 7.
The father-son relationships of the late 1190s and early 1200s were thus quite different from the relationships of the previous two generations. There is no evidence to suggest that Duke Berthold III of Merania permitted either of his heirs to act independently from him before he died. Furthermore, while Count Berthold I and Margrave Berthold II both arranged marriages for their eldest sons, neither Otto I nor Henry married until after 1204. Berthold III did not give either of his two heirs the freedom of action that he had had during the 1170s and 1180s—prior to the death of his own father. What were the possible reasons for Berthold III not following the strategies employed by earlier generations of the house of Andechs?

One of the most important factors to consider is the relatively young age of Duke Berthold III of Merania when his oldest sons first appeared in documents in 1194-1195; he was approximately forty years of age. His early marriage and the numerous children his wife Agnes bore early in their union meant that the generation gap between Berthold III and his sons was an especially narrow one. When the duke died in 1204, Otto I and Henry were both approaching thirty years of age, yet their father was only around fifty—and was still deeply involved in regional and imperial politics. In contrast, Count Berthold I and Margrave Berthold II were both already at least fifty years old when they first permitted their eldest sons to act independently from them in the late 1130s and early 1170s respectively. Duke Berthold III of Merania may not have been

---

willing to relinquish any authority to his heirs because he remained until his final days capable of managing his lineage’s affairs alone.

Thus, Berthold III’s relatively young age in the decade prior to his death means that he was not confronted with the kinds of decisions his father and grandfather had made during their careers. The only aspect of the succession that had clearly been decided during the late 1190s and early 1200s was that the third son Ekbert—and presumably the fourth son as well—was not to play a role in the inheritance of the Andechs lordships. Otto I and Henry were to be the principal heirs. However, nothing from Berthold III’s lifetime suggests how the family’s rights and properties were to be divided between them. The duke of Merania’s early death means that the plan for the succession was much less clear in 1204 than it had been in 1151 and 1188 when Berthold I and Berthold II had died.

This view of events at the close of the twelfth century overlooks one important issue: the ages of the duke’s sons Otto I and Henry during this period. Evidence from the preceding generations strongly suggests that heirs had begun to act independently from their fathers by the age of twenty. Otto I and Henry were both older than that in 1200, yet they continued to appear only in documents that also name Berthold III. Sources for how this state of affairs might have affected the duke’s heirs is lacking. There is no indication of any intra-familial strife prior to 1204. It is interesting to note, however, that the half-decade following Berthold III’s death saw the position of the house of Andechs in the empire decline significantly. Were Otto I and Henry unprepared to succeed in 1204, since they had yet to have the opportunity to rule with any independence before their father died? Some sources do suggest that Henry had problems in Upper Bavaria
soon after he acquired the Andechs lands in this region, but few broad conclusions can be
drawn from the evidence. Nevertheless, Duke Berthold III’s death clearly came at a
time when the situation within the noble house was not entirely stable. Although Otto I
and Henry were old enough to inherit, they were not as accustomed to power and
authority as other Andechs lords had been in previous generations upon succeeding to the
family’s rights and properties.

VI. Conclusions

At first glance, the analysis of the succession strategies employed within the
house of Andechs during the twelfth century does not easily lend itself to broad
conclusions. While there are some similarities among the three generations of the
lineage, a single coherent plan did not dictate how Berthold I, Berthold II and Berthold
III chose to manage the descent of the patrimony. Factors such as the number of sons
each lord had and the size of the generation gap separating a lord from his heirs led to
important differences. “Anticipatory association,” an approach to succession that was
being used by many of the south German noble houses, offers one of the few unifying
principles spanning all three generations of the Andechses—though Berthold III did not
give to his sons as much freedom as his father and grandfather had given to their own

107 A set of annals from the monastery of Tegernsee provides the earliest piece of evidence for
trouble. Under the year 1204, the annals report: “After Duke Berthold of Merania died on 12 August,
Count Otto of Valley began a grievous war against the duke’s son Margrave Henry with the approval of
Duke Louis of Bavaria.” Printed in the MGH as Annales Wernheri Aliorumque Tegernseenses, ed. Georg
Waitz, MGH SS 24 (Hanover, 1879), p. 58: “Obeunte duce Perhtoldo Meranie 2. Idus Augusti, Otto comes
de Valeie movet contra filium eius Hainricum marchionem guerram gravem favore Ludiwici ducis
Bawarie; unde huic monasterio maxima desolatio per ignem et rapinam accessit.” This same event is dated
to 1206 in the Chronicon Monasterii Tegerseensis [Chronica Dominorum Abbatum hujus Venerabilis
Monasterii S. Quirini Martyris Tegerseensis], in Thesaurus Anecdotorum Novissimus, vol. 3, ed.
Bernhard Pez (Augsburg: 1721), cols. 523-524. Most historians have argued that this attack is better dated
to the period after King Philip of Swabia’s assassination in 1208; however, I see no reason to question the
dating of the event to earlier in the career of Margrave Henry.
sons. Clearly, each of the ruling heads of the lineage made his own decisions based on the contemporary situation, and the family’s succession strategies can only be understood if they are analyzed in this relatively narrow context.

One general observation that emerges from this study of Andechs succession is that intra-familial strife was not as common in the medieval nobility as many historians have believed. During the twelfth century, there were often three, four, or even five adult men active in the house of Andechs, yet there is no evidence for disputes developing between any of them. Georges Duby and other scholars who have claimed that tension was a centerpiece of the father-son dynamic in the twelfth century have thus failed to place their arguments within a broader context. There is certainly evidence that indicates conflict was one possible result of a nobleman’s succession strategies. However, the structure of the lineage did not inevitably generate tension within every noble house, meaning different perspectives on family relationships need to be considered.

In his work on fifteenth-century Venice, Stanley Chojnacki has argued that noble sons passed through a period of political apprenticeship in their late teens and their twenties before the Venetian government recognized them as full adults. Apprenticeship did not insure these young men would not cause trouble, but it did enable Venice to put some restraints on these youths and to teach them how to behave properly. Though models from a Renaissance Italian city-state cannot be transferred unchanged to Germany three centuries earlier, the notion of apprenticeship is a compelling one. Noble fathers in the southeast of the German empire during the twelfth century gradually gave their sons more and more power, training them for the day when they succeeded to the family’s

---

lordships. This approach gave fathers the opportunity to educate sons in the benefits of cooperation and compromise. Cross-generational conflict could still develop, but this period when a father worked together with his sons gave families the opportunity to promote stability and to curb intra-familial tensions. Although more research on the subject needs to be done, the concept of apprenticeship may prove to be an effective one for understanding father-son relationships in the central Middle Ages.

While such an argument may raise doubts about the ubiquity of the violence-prone “youth” in twelfth-century noble society, it does not challenge Duby’s basic position that the phase he labels “youth” was a critical one in the career of a nobleman. As this chapter has shown, one of the keys to understanding succession is to focus on the period in which adult sons coexisted with their father. By analyzing where and when these sons appeared in sources and what types of responsibilities they were given by their fathers, family relationships emerge as a driving force in a lineage’s succession strategies. Lords and their heirs did not have to be antagonistic toward one another. Fathers and their adult sons could also form networks of cooperation and support that helped to strengthen a noble house and to insure the smooth transfer of power and authority from one generation to the next.
Half of the sons born into the house of Andechs during the twelfth century never succeeded to one of the family’s many lordships. Instead, these children entered the Church while young and began preparing for ecclesiastical careers. As members of one of the leading noble families in the German empire, none of the five Andechs churchmen disappeared into obscurity after joining a monastery or cathedral chapter. All rose to prominent positions in the Church over the course of their lives. One was elected abbot of the monastery of Millstatt in Carinthia; three became bishops of Bamberg during the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries; and the fifth spent the final thirty-three years of his life as patriarch of Aquileia. The house of Andechs thus produced a series of ecclesiastical lords whose power and influence in the empire rivaled that of the counts, margraves and dukes from the family.

---

1 The quotation is taken from a charter of Bishop Otto II of Bamberg, who was the uncle of Duke Berthold III of Merania: MB, 25:108, no. 6. The terminology used in the charter will be discussed in more detail below.

2 Henry, the son of Count Poppo, was abbot of Millstatt from 1166 until his death in the early 1180s.

3 Bishop Otto II (1177-1196), Bishop Ekbert (1203-1237), and Bishop-Elect Poppo (1237-1242).

4 Berthold, archbishop of Kalocsa (1207-1218) and patriarch of Aquileia (1218-1251).
The Andechs noblemen who made the decision to place sons in the Church were behaving like typical lords of the central Middle Ages, for the majority of twelfth-century noble houses sent some of their members into religious communities. Nevertheless, detailed studies of the contacts between family members inside and outside the Church remain rare. As Constance Bouchard has observed,

Most of the documents that survive from the eleventh and twelfth centuries are a record of the interactions of churches with the local nobility. And yet, somewhat surprisingly, the relation of nobles with the church is a relatively neglected scholarly topic, especially for the twelfth century. The documents have been used primarily to give either a history of the church or a history of the nobility, as though the two were separate entities.5

In this chapter, I will investigate the evidence for the family relationships of those members of the house of Andechs who entered the Church. By analyzing where, when and why these ecclesiastical lords came into contact with their relatives, the Andechses can be understood as more than just a noble lineage of fathers and sons. The roles that churchmen played in the family are central to reconstructing the networks of cooperation and support that made the house of Andechs successful during the twelfth century.

I. Medieval Churchmen as Kinsmen: Historiographical Considerations

Ecclesiastical prince, saint, administrator, diplomat, literary patron, courtier, warrior: these are only a few of the terms to appear in recent years in the titles of works

---

concerning medieval bishops, either individually or collectively.⁶ They reflect the extraordinary range of rights, responsibilities and expectations that surrounded these prominent members of the Church hierarchy during the central Middle Ages. As spiritual leaders, important landholders, and political power brokers, each bishop was at the center of a diverse network of social bonds that stretched from his cathedral chapter and his diocese to the royal court to the Papacy in Rome. The abbots of the wealthiest monasteries in medieval Europe were often powerful figures as well, with interests that extended beyond the realm of religious concerns to regional politics and economics.⁷ In short, prelates played many different roles in the society of the central Middle Ages, and it is therefore possible to analyze their complex careers from a variety of perspectives. Here, only one issue will be considered: how significant were family relationships for ecclesiastical lords as they sought to manage the numerous rights and responsibilities attached to their offices?

In studies concerning the bishops and abbots of the German empire, this is not a question that historians have frequently asked. Two other issues have instead dominated the historiography relating to imperial prelates of the tenth through thirteenth centuries: the “imperial church system” and the foundations of territorial lordship. Theories

---


⁷ Because only one member of the house of Andechs was placed in a monastery instead of a cathedral chapter, I will discuss bishops more than abbots in this general overview.
surrounding the concept of the “imperial church system,” or Reichskirchensystem, have attracted significant scholarly interest because they concern the roles prelates played as government officials and administrators in the German empire. While the precise nature of the relationships between imperial churchmen and the German kings and emperors continues to be debated, historians are in general agreement that the notion of the imperial church is central to understanding how the rulers of the empire maintained power. Thus, recent studies of the imperial court under Lothar III, Frederick Barbarossa and Henry VI have clearly demonstrated that many bishops were important counselors and advisors to these emperors. At the regional level, the foundation of much of the research into imperial prelates has concerned their rights and responsibilities as territorial lords. Because the German rulers of the central Middle Ages often granted extensive properties to the bishoprics, many of these ecclesiastical lordships developed into prominent regional powers.


Wolfgang Petke, Kanzlei, Kapelle und königliche Kurie unter Lothar III. (1125-1137) (Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1985); Alheydis Plassmann, Die Struktur des Hofes unter Friedrich I. Barbarossa nach den deutschen Zeugen seiner Urkunden (Hanover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1998); and Ingeborg Seltmann, Heinrich VI. Herrschaftspraxis und Umgebung (Erlangen: Verlag Palm & Enke, 1983).

The archbishops of Cologne and bishops of Würzburg, for example, both claimed ducal authority within their own dioceses and were able to dominate local politics. See Manfred Groten, “Köln und das Reich: Zum Verhältnis von Kirche und Stadt zu den staufischen Herrschern 1151-1198,” in Stauferreich im Wandel, ed. Stefan Weinfurter (Stuttgart: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 2002), 237-252 and Stuart Jenks, “Die Anfänge des Würzburger Territorialstaates in der späteren Stauferzeit 1198-1254,” Jahrbuch
numerous parts of the empire, conflicts between bishops and nobles were common as neighboring secular and ecclesiastical lords vied to be the leading figures in local politics.¹¹ The territorial dimensions of episcopal power have therefore been a popular subject of research among modern historians because bishops were of such importance in shaping the political map of the German empire.

Church-Empire relations and territorial lordship are certainly not the only contexts in which imperial bishops and abbots have been analyzed.¹² Nevertheless, the German prelates’ roles as imperial princes and regional lords have remained dominant themes in the historiography because these are aspects of ecclesiastical power that enable scholars to answer many broader questions concerning Landesgeschichte and the history of imperial power and authority. How have questions about bishops’ and abbots’ families and kinship connections factored into these studies of imperial churchmen? Historians who have analyzed ecclesiastical careers in Germany as well as in other regions of medieval Europe have tended to discuss the kin relationships of prelates within a relatively narrow range of contexts. The most common references to families involve the

¹¹ For a detailed study of one of these conflicts, see Benjamin Arnold, Count and Bishop in Medieval Germany (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991).

¹² For other approaches to the study of these ecclesiastical lords, see for example Paul Pixton, The German Episcopacy and the Implementation of the Fourth Lateran Council (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995); John Van Engen, Rupert of Deutz (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983); and Lawrence G. Duggan, Bishop and Chapter: The Governance of the Bishopric of Speyer to 1552 (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1978). It is not by accident that these examples I have given of books discussing other aspects of imperial churchmen’s careers are all written by non-Germans. Both consciously and unconsciously, Verfassungsgeschichte and Landesgeschichte continue to shape much of the German literature in the field, meaning it is predominantly scholars working outside Germany who have approached the German prelates from innovative directions.
origins of churchmen. Many scholars mention a bishop’s or abbot’s relatives at the beginning of their works as basic background information before turning to what they consider to be more important issues in the prelate’s career.13 Other historians have been interested in the somewhat broader topic of whether the bishops of a particular diocese or kingdom were typically members of the upper nobility or whether they came from further down the social ladder.14 Closely-connected to this matter of churchmen’s origins in the literature has been the issue of how much influence family members might have had in the selection of one of their kinsmen to a high-ranking position in the Church. Kings and nobles have often been viewed as either subtle or heavy-handed power brokers who sought to manipulate episcopal and abbatial elections to insure that their own relatives obtained important ecclesiastical offices.15

Thus, the family connections of bishops and abbots have generally been considered significant for understanding how and why churchmen acquired their


ecclesiastical offices, while the roles a prelate’s family members might have played in
other aspects of his career have been largely neglected. The effect of this approach has
been to marginalize the place of kinship in churchmen’s lives. Edmund Oefele, in his
1877 study of the house of Andechs, offered an especially blunt explanation for why he
would not be discussing Andechs churchmen in his work: “The medieval nun, monk and
prelate were no less fully expelled from their family than married-off daughters.”
While most recent historians have not been quite as forceful as Oefele in expressing such
a position, this attitude continues in more subtle ways to pervade much of the literature
on medieval churchmen; there is a strong sense that once a man or a woman had begun a
career in the Church, his or her birth family became significantly less important. This is
more assumption than self-evident fact, however, and it is therefore necessary to examine
carefully the evidence for contacts between Andechs ecclesiastical lords and the other
members of their noble house.

II. Andechs Churchmen in the Twelfth Century

The first male member of the house of Andechs to be placed in the Church during
the twelfth century was Henry, the child of Count Poppo and Kunizza of Giech.
Significantly, Henry was the only son in the family to become a monk rather than a
canon; he entered the monastery of Admont in the mid-1140s while he was still a young
boy. As was discussed in the previous chapter, the potential difficulties Henry posed

16 Oefele, Vorwort.

17 MHDC, 3:330-331, no. 847. Bouchard in her Sword, Miter, and Cloister, 50-51 has noted that
noble families in Burgundy typically intended all their sons entering the Church to become either canons or
monks; they did not place some boys in cathedral chapters and others in monasteries. Viewed from this
for the Andechs succession may have played a decisive role in the decision by his family to remove him completely from secular society while he was still a child. No extant source written after the year 1147 names him alongside any of his relatives from the house of Andechs.\textsuperscript{18} There is also no evidence that family relationships influenced his election in 1166 as abbot of Millstatt—despite the fact that this monastery in Carinthia was located near Andechs rights and properties in the southeast of the empire.\textsuperscript{19} Henry is the only male in the house of Andechs who seems to have had most if not all ties to the family of his birth severed after entering the Church.

Only a few years after Henry became a monk at Admont, his paternal uncle Otto, the third son of Count Berthold I of Andechs, began his own ecclesiastical career. From his first appearances in the surviving sources, it is clear that Otto would play a much more prominent role in his family’s affairs than Henry. Twice during the early and mid-1140s, while he was still living in the world, Otto witnessed property donations to the monastery of Benediktbeuern by local Bavarian notables.\textsuperscript{20} He was first identified in a perspective, Henry’s entry into a monastery is clearly noteworthy. Why did he not become a member of a cathedral chapter like his other relatives who later joined the Church?

\textsuperscript{18} Around the year 1160, Count Berthold II of Andechs and his wife Hedwig made a donation to Admont “ab amorem [sic] uidelicet eorum quos in eodem monasterio habent propinquorum” (See UB Steiermark, 1:396-397, no. 407). Henry was presumably one of the family members to which the text refers, but little about his relationship with his family can be inferred from this.

\textsuperscript{19} The only contemporary record of his election that survives states simply, “Domnus Heinricus abbas Milstat elitigit.” See Continuatio Admuntensis, ed. W. Wattenbach, MGH SS 9 (Hanover, 1851), 583. For the one piece of evidence that may suggest that some of his relatives maintained an interest in his career, see Chapter Five, note 74. For more on Henry’s life, see Wilhelm Deuer, “Abt Heinrich aus dem Geschlecht der Grafen von Andechs-Giech (1166-nach 1177) und seine Bedeutung für das Kloster Millstatt,” in Studien zur Geschichte von Millstatt und Kärnten: Vorträge der Millstätter Symposien 1981-1995, ed. Franz Nikolasch (Klagenfurt: Verlag des Geschichtsvereines für Kärnten, 1997), 319-340.

\textsuperscript{20} Baumann, 18, no. 30 and 25, no. 50. Caroline Göldel, “Otto von Andechs, Stiftsprost von Aachen, Bischof von Bamberg, und das Tafelgüterverzeichnis,” in Die Andechs-Meranier in Franken (Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 1998), 75 claims that Otto was already a royal chaplain under Conrad III in 1141, but her evidence for this is unconvincing. Klaus van Eickels, “Die Andechs-Meranier und das Bistum Bamberg,” in Die Andechs-Meranier in Franken, 147 argues for Otto already having chosen a
document as a *clericus* in the year 1152, but even this reference to him involved Andechs family business; his appearance was in connection with a grant that his brother Count Berthold II of Andechs was making to the monastery of Admont.\textsuperscript{21} The following year, in order to confirm that donation, Otto traveled with Berthold II to the town of Villach in Carinthia for a gathering of regional magnates.\textsuperscript{22} For the next forty-three years until his death in 1196, Otto would continue to be named alongside various relatives in a broad range of sources, and any study of Andechs family relationships in the second half of the twelfth century must therefore take into account Otto’s role in the noble house.

Where Otto received his spiritual education is unclear, though his family’s connections to Franconia make the cathedral school at Bamberg a reasonable possibility.\textsuperscript{23} Further strengthening this hypothesis, most scholars believe that one of the first offices Otto held within the Church was as cathedral canon and provost of St. Stephen’s in Bamberg; the “Otto prepositus sancti Stephani” who was a witness in Bishop Eberhard II of Bamberg’s 1164 charter for the monastery of Asbach is generally thought to be the Andechs Otto.\textsuperscript{24} During the mid-1160s, Otto was also named for the career in the Church by 1143 because he is not named in the “First Giechburg Treaty” between the house of Andechs and the bishopric of Bamberg. However, considering the efforts by the bishops of Bamberg in both the 1143 and 1149 versions of this treaty to limit the number of family members who could claim the disputed territories, Otto’s absence from the texts should not be over-interpreted. For more on these treaties, see Chapter Five.

\textsuperscript{21} UB Steiermark, 1:329-330, no. 342, where the text is dated 1151. Oefele, 126, no. 116 dates the document to 1152.

\textsuperscript{22} SUB, 2:423-426, no. 304.


\textsuperscript{24} Tr. Asbach, 87-89, no. 4. “Perchtoldus comes de Andechese” also witnessed this confirmation of the monastery’s rights. Van Eickels, 146; Oefele, 23; and Erich Freiherr von Guttenberg, *Das Bistum Bamberg*, pt. 1 (Berlin and Leipzig, 1937), 156 all argue that Otto was also a cathedral canon in Augsburg early in his career. Müsself, 11 argues against this position, claiming there is no evidence for Otto having a
first time in an imperial charter as provost of St. Mary’s in Aachen. This church was the
site of German royal coronations, and the office of provost was typically reserved for
members of the king’s own family or for other strong supporters of his rule. As further
evidence of the close ties between the Andechses and Emperor Frederick I in these years,
Otto was elected bishop of Brixen in 1165. Both Otto’s brother Count Berthold II and
Barbarossa likely played roles in his election, for the two lords had clear reasons for
wanting Otto in this ecclesiastical post. The house of Andechs gained a connection to a
bishopric where it had territorial interests, while Frederick acquired an ally in a key
Alpine see in the midst of his dispute with Pope Alexander III. Otto served as bishop-elect of Brixen until 1170 but was never consecrated as a
result of the opposition of the cathedral canons and the archbishop of Salzburg to his
connection to the church of Augsburg. Both arguments are discussed in Ansgar Frenken,
“Hausmachtpolitik und Bischofsstuhl. Die Andechs-Meranier als oberfränkische Territorialherren und

25 Müssel, 11-12; van Eickels, 146; and Göldel, 75. Significantly, Otto is identified in one
imperial charter from the year 1166 as “our cousin Otto provost of Aachen.” See Die Urkunden Friedrichs
[hereafter MGH D Friedrich I], 2:429-430, no. 501: “nepos noster Otto prepositus Aquensis.” There was
indeed a distant kin relationship between Barbarossa and the members of the house of Andechs. Otto and
Frederick shared a common great-grandmother, making them second cousins. Otto’s maternal grandfather
Poppo of Istria and Frederick’s maternal grandmother Wulfhild were both children of a Sophia of Hungary.
However, despite the many contacts Emperor Frederick I had with Otto’s brother Count Berthold II of
Andechs, no source refers to a kinship connection between the ruler and the count/margrave. For more on
Staufen-Andechs ties, see Alois Schütz, “Die Grafen von Dießen und Andechs, Herzöge von Meranien,” in
Königliche Tochterstämme, Königswähler und Kurfürsten, ed. Armin Wolf (Frankfurt: Vittorio
Klostermann, 2002), 277, note 189 and 282, note 209.

26 Sancti Rudberti Salisburgensis Annales Breves, MGH SS 9, 758 (under the year 1164 because
his predecessor Bishop Hartmann died in December of that year).

27 Müssel, 12-13; van Eickels, 146; Alois Schütz, “Das Geschlecht der Andechs-Meranier im
europäischen Hochmittelalter,” in Herzöge und Heilige: Das Geschlecht der Andechs-Meranier im
europäischen Hochmittelalter, eds. Josef Kirmeyer and Evamaria Brockhoff (Munich: Verlag Friedrich
Pustet, 1993), 63-64; and for Andechs interests in the region, Martin Bitschnau, “Gries-Morit,” in Tiroler
Burgenbuch, ed. Oswald Trapp, vol. 8, Raum Bozen (Bozen: Verlagsanstalt Athesia, 1989), 207-256. The
importance of the Alps for imperial politics is discussed in Heinrich Büttnner, “Die Alpenpolitik
Friedrich Barbarossas bis zum Jahre 1164/65,” in Grundfragen der alemannischen Geschichte, Vorträge
Following the end of his short stay in the Alpine see, he disappears from the surviving sources for only a brief period before being identified again in an imperial charter as provost at Aachen on 24 March 1174. Later that same year, Otto was named for the first time in a document as cathedral provost of Bamberg. The office was an especially important one within the church because its holder was second only to the bishop within the diocese. It was significant for another reason as well: at Bamberg, as in many other bishoprics during the later twelfth century, the cathedral provost was generally considered the leading candidate to succeed the bishop. Otto did not have to wait long to see if this trend would hold true in his case. On 12 June 1177, only three years after Otto became cathedral provost, Bishop Hermann II of Bamberg died. Otto’s election by the cathedral chapter followed during the summer or autumn months of the same year. He would lead the diocesan church as Bishop Otto II of Bamberg until his death in 1196.

Frenken, 726; Müssel, 12-13; and Schütz, “Das Geschlecht der Andechs-Meranier im europäischen Hochmittelalter,” 63-64.

MGH D Friedrich I, 3:103-104, no. 614. He appears with the same title again on 23 May: ibid., 3:113-114, no. 621. Otto had presumably held this position throughout his time as bishop-elect of Brixen. See Pixton, 95-100 for the plurality of office-holding among high-ranking churchmen in the empire.


Guttenberg, Das Bistum Bamberg, 157. He was consecrated by Pope Alexander III on 18 March 1179. It is difficult to determine if Berthold II might have played a role in manipulating the election in Otto’s favor. According to UB Krain, 1:150-151, no. 173a, Margrave Berthold II was in Carniola on 6 July 1177. Furthermore, a letter written to the abbot of Tegernsee by the provost of Raitenbuch in late August or early September 1177 suggests Berthold had recently met with the patriarch of Aquileia in or near Venice: Die Tegernseer Briefsammlung des 12. Jahrhunderts, ed. Helmut Plechl, MGH, Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit, vol. 8 (Hanover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 2002), 254-255, no. 224. All of this suggests Berthold II was involved in the negotiations surrounding the Peace of Venice in late July. Bishop Hermann II was also involved in these negotiations prior to his death, and it is therefore possible members
There is little doubt that Otto’s status as a scion of the noble house of Andechs played a central role in his dramatic rise through the Church hierarchy. His brother Berthold II’s influence throughout the southeast of the empire and his family’s strong connections to Emperor Frederick I both insured that Otto would not toil in obscurity in a minor benefice for his entire life. His eventual election as bishop of Bamberg is therefore not surprising. As noted above, however, it is not sufficient to discuss only Otto’s origins when analyzing the significance of kinship ties for his career. His contacts with his relatives after he obtained his various offices, especially his post as bishop of Bamberg, must be studied as well.

Bishop Otto II’s family relationships involving his relatives in the Church are an excellent place to begin. As the first high-ranking ecclesiastical lord in his noble house, he quickly emerged after 1177 as an important patron for those of his kin who had already begun, or soon were to begin, church careers. By 1180, his nephew Henry—one of the sons of Otto’s sister Gisela and her husband Count Diepold II of Berg—had replaced Otto himself in the office of cathedral provost. Since the house of Berg was a Swabian comital family with no earlier connections to Upper Franconia, Bishop Otto II’s role in securing Henry that position is evident. Henry would continue to act as cathedral provost until his election as bishop of Würzburg in 1191, meaning the two highest offices in the church of Bamberg were controlled by an Andechs uncle and one of his nephews throughout the 1180s.

Only a few years after Henry joined the cathedral chapter, another of Bishop Otto II’s nephews also became a canon at Bamberg. As has been discussed in Chapter Five, the second son of Margrave Berthold II of Istria, Poppo, obtained the post of provost of St. Jacob’s in 1185. This was the start of a long career in the church of Bamberg, one that would eventually span more than a half-century and would culminate in 1237 with Poppo’s election as bishop.\(^3\) During the episcopacy of his uncle Otto, he quickly rose to a prominent position within the cathedral chapter; he added a second title to that of provost of St. Jacob’s when in 1195 he acquired the office of provost of St. Stephen’s.\(^3\) By then, yet another member of the house of Andechs had joined the cathedral chapter as well. Duke Berthold III of Merania’s son Ekbert, Bishop Otto II’s great-nephew, appeared in 1192 and again in 1195 as the provost of St. Maria and St. Gangolf’s in Theuerstadt.\(^3\) By the time Otto died in 1196, he had thus arranged to have three of his relatives placed in the church of Bamberg, laying the foundation for continuing Andechs influence within the see throughout the first half of the thirteenth century.\(^3\)

\(^3\) See Guttenberg, 171-173 for a brief outline of his career.

\(^3\) MB, 24:40-42, no. 17: “Boppo prepositus sancti stephani. et sancti Jacobi.” The office of provost of St. Stephen’s is the same position his uncle Otto had held within the cathedral chapter around 1164.


\(^3\) With Poppo and Ekbert possessing between them in the 1190s the offices of provost of St. Jacob’s, St. Stephen’s, and St. Maria and St. Gangolf’s in Theuerstadt (across the Regnitz River from the cathedral), the house of Andechs controlled all three collegiate churches (Kanonikerstifte) affiliated with the cathedral chapter of Bamberg. For more on these churches, see Bernd Schneidmüller, “Die einzigartig geliebte Stadt—Heinrich II. und Bamberg,” in Kaiser Heinrich II. 1002-1024, eds. Josef Kirmeier, Bernd Schneidmüller, Stefan Weinfurter and Evamarie Brockhoff (Augsburg: Haus der Bayerischen Geschichte, 2002), 47-48.
In the years immediately following 1196, two members of the cathedral chapter who were unrelated to the house of Andechs were elected as bishops of Bamberg: Timo (1196-1202) and Conrad (1202-1203). Both held the position of cathedral provost prior to their elections. The canon who replaced Conrad in that office in 1202 was the Andechs Ekbert, who then followed Conrad as bishop in 1203. Why Ekbert rather than his uncle Poppo obtained the posts of cathedral provost and bishop in the early 1200s is unclear. It has been suggested that, because Poppo’s five years as bishop-elect from 1237 to 1242 were tainted with scandal and corruption, there may have been members of the cathedral chapter who from the beginning of his career questioned his ability to govern the bishopric effectively. Regardless, Poppo did become cathedral provost soon after Ekbert’s election as bishop—almost certainly with Ekbert’s assistance—and would hold that position throughout his nephew’s episcopacy.

During the same period when Ekbert became bishop and Poppo cathedral provost, another member of the house of Andechs joined the cathedral chapter at Bamberg. Ekbert’s younger brother Berthold was a canon there for a short time before being elected archbishop of Kalocsa in Hungary. This means that, between 1177 and the early 1200s, Guttenberg, 160 and 163.

Ibid., 164.

Van Eickels, 146-147. Because he squandered the bishopric’s property during his brief time as bishop-elect between 1237 and 1242, Bamberg sources have generally been unkind toward Poppo. One fourteenth-century list of the Bamberg bishops and their burial sites states, “Boppo episcopus 15. electus, qui sedem episcopalem occupavit, plura bona ecclesie alienavit, tandem depositus fuit propter symoniacam pravitatem; cuius sepultura cum fidelibus nostris prelatis non scribitur.” See Notae Sepulcrales Babenbergenses, ed. Philip Jaffé, MGH SS 17 (Hanover, 1861), 641.

Frenken, 728.

Ibid. and Van Eickels, 146 both claim that Berthold was chosen as cathedral provost of Bamberg in 1203 and that Poppo only obtained that post after Berthold became archbishop-elect of Kalocsa. I know of no evidence to support fully this position. Looshorn, 596 states Berthold may have been provost of St.
four members of the house of Andechs and one additional member of their extended
kinship group all held positions within the church of Bamberg (see Figure 6.1). Such a
concentration of noble relatives in a single religious community was not unusual during
the central Middle Ages, and various historians have observed comparable situations in
other parts of Europe. Constance Bouchard, in her work on Burgundy, has for example
concluded, “The result of promotion of ecclesiastical relatives was that virtual dynasties
were established in many Burgundian churches, where a series of uncles and nephews
held office in the same or neighboring churches.”4 This concept of ecclesiastical
dynasties is useful for explaining why the study of kinship bonds is central to
understanding the careers of many nobles even after they entered the Church. It was
familial patronage strategies that often determined which offices these churchmen would
hold and which prebends they would receive during their lifetimes.

But was there more to these family contacts inside the Church than patron-client
networks? In other words, is it possible to see kin relationships at work in other aspects
of the careers of those Andechs churchmen who held positions together in the diocesan
church at Bamberg? Historians have in general been quite vague about the potential
value and significance of having multiple family members holding offices in the same
religious community. As both Bouchard and Lawrence Duggan have observed, no noble
family was able to place enough of its members in a diocesan church to dominate the

Stephen’s but admits this is only a possibility. The earliest sources of which I am aware that name
Berthold are two letters of Pope Innocent III that designate him simply as “Praeposito” and “Babenburgensi
(Buda, 1829-30), 28 and 50.

4 Bouchard, Sword, Miter, and Cloister, 80. For similar statements, see Fanning, 41; Duggan, 21-
22; and Karl-Heinz Spieß, Familie und Verwandtschaft im deutschen Hochadel des Spätmittelalters: 13. bis
Furthermore, certain trends in twelfth-century ecclesiastical history—such as the increasing independence of many cathedral chapters vis-à-vis their bishops—make it difficult to determine what mutual interests a bishop and his relatives who were canons might have had. In the case of the church of Bamberg, the weakening of the ideal of the *vita communis* among the members of the cathedral chapter in the late 1100s helped to isolate the canons from both the bishop and one another as they began living in separate residences around Bamberg. Within this environment, clear examples of cooperative actions are not readily apparent.

Further complicating this issue is the nature of the surviving sources from the church of Bamberg during this period. Most of the documents that name more than one

---

44 Bouchard, *Sword, Miter, and Cloister*, 80 and Duggan, 23.


ecclesiastical member of the house of Andechs are Bishop Otto II of Bamberg’s charters, in which his relatives in the cathedral chapter appear in the witness lists alongside their other colleagues in the church. Thus, Otto’s 1195 charter granting a piece of church property to the monastery of Ensdorf was witnessed by “Cathedral Provost Timo, Deacon Egilhard, Cantor Eberhard, Sexton Conrad, Cellarer Conrad, Henry of Muchelen, Gottfried of Werde, Provost Poppo of Saint Stephen’s and Saint Jacob’s, Provost Ekbert of Theuerstadt, Master Gundolf,…”47 There is nothing to suggest here that the kin connections between Otto and the provosts Poppo and Ekbert were of any significance. In one of the bishop’s charters from 1183, this one concerning his confirmation of a grant of church property to a small religious community in Bamberg, his nephew Henry is described in the witness list as “our relative Henry, the cathedral provost.”48 While the comment is certainly noteworthy, drawing any broader conclusions from it about Otto and Henry’s relationship is problematic without additional evidence. Because the Andechs kin in their roles as church officials could be expected to appear together whenever there was important church business to discuss, references to contacts between them in episcopal charters are difficult to interpret from the perspective of family networks of cooperation and support.

Ultimately, the occasional piece of anecdotal evidence is all that survives to suggest the roles family relationships could play in internal church affairs. When the cathedral provost Henry was elected bishop of Würzburg in 1191, it appears that he sold

47 MB, 24:41, no. 17. For a similar example, see MB, 25:109-111, no. 8.

or gave his residence in the town of Bamberg to his cousin Poppo, and this house then remained in the possession of Andechs family members throughout the first half of the thirteenth century.⁴⁹ A somewhat stronger piece of evidence for cooperation dates from the year 1203, when Bishop-elect Ekbert and his uncle Poppo traveled together to Poland to help in the foundation of a convent by Ekbert’s sister Hedwig, who was duchess of Silesia.⁵⁰ Since there is no indication that other members of the cathedral chapter accompanied the pair, this event provides a rare glimpse into the ways in which kin networks and ecclesiastical networks could overlap.

The sources thus make it difficult to draw detailed conclusions about how the various Andechs relatives inside the church of Bamberg interacted with one another. While Bishop Otto II of Bamberg’s role in obtaining ecclesiastical offices for his nephews is clear, the surviving evidence for how he worked together with these family members after they entered the cathedral chapter is lacking. The only conclusion that can be made with confidence is that the Andechs kinship network present within the Bamberg cathedral chapter during Otto’s episcopacy gave this bishop a much stronger position than he would have had without such a network in place. Fortunately for this work, the twelfth-century sources for the networks of cooperation and support involving Andechs churchmen and their relatives who controlled the family’s lay lordships are significantly richer and more varied.

---

⁴⁹ Reitzenstein, 71.

⁵⁰ Schlesisches Urkundenbuch, ed. Heinrich Appelt, vol. 1 (Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1963), 54-58, no. 83. I will have more to say about this text in Chapter Seven.
III. Bishop Otto II and the Secular Lords in the House of Andechs

Throughout the twelfth century, the secular lords in the house of Andechs interacted regularly with many of the bishops in the southeast of the empire. Count Berthold I of Andechs was described as “my miles” in a charter of Bishop Erlung of Würzburg from the year 1113 because the count had earlier acquired a benefice from the bishop. Fifty years later in 1163, his son Count Berthold II of Andechs appeared as “our dear fidelis” in a charter of Patriarch Ulrich II of Aquileia. Bishop Albert of Freising granted to Berthold II and his son Duke Berthold III of Merania in 1182 the advocacy for all of the bishop’s properties in the Alpine dioceses of Brixen, Trent, and Chur. On 31 October 1197, Berthold III agreed to a treaty with Bishop Ekkehard of Gurk concerning the marriages of their ministerials. These are only a few examples of the numerous contacts Andechs lords had with regional prelates as a result of overlapping territorial interests. It is therefore important to place Otto’s years in Brixen and Bamberg in the proper context. How did his interactions with his secular relatives differ from these lay lords’ dealings with other prelates during the twelfth century? The answer lies in the


52 UB Krain, 1:120, no. 128: “dilecto fidelis nostro.” Berthold II presumably held property in Carniola in fief from Ulrich since Carniola lay within the patriarchate of Aquileia. The same patriarch refers to Berthold II as “fidelis nostri Bertholdi marchionis Hystriea” in 1177: Ibid., 1:150, no. 173a.

53 Codex Diplomaticus Austriaco-Frisingensis, ed. J. Zahn, Fontes rerum Austriacarum, pt. II, vol. 31 (Vienna, 1870), 3:118-119, no. 119. The reason for this generous grant by the bishop of Freising may be tied to the fact that, in 1180 following Henry the Lion’s fall, Berthold II had helped Albert secure from Emperor Frederick I confirmation of certain rights which Henry had previously stripped from the bishop. See MGH D Friedrich I, 3:366-368, no. 798.

54 MHDC, 1:271-273, no. 369.
frequency of their contacts and in the numerous different ways Otto helped to shape Andechs political strategies.

Otto’s brief time as bishop-elect of Brixen in the late 1160s provided the house of Andechs with its earliest evidence for the potential value of having ecclesiastical-secular kinship networks operating inside the family, for it was during these years that the strength of Otto’s relationship with his older brother Berthold II first became manifest. The siblings had already been named together in a source from the 1140s, when they both witnessed a Benediktbeuern tradition notice.\(^5\) They saw each other again in 1153 and 1164, further suggesting the two were not strangers during the early years of their careers.\(^5\) However, the contacts between them greatly intensified after Otto’s election as bishop of Brixen in 1165. During the subsequent five years, Otto used his office to expand considerably Berthold II’s position in Tyrol. With Otto’s assistance, Berthold acquired the advocacies for the church of Brixen and for Neustift, a nearby house of Augustinian canons.\(^5\) Acting as advocate of Brixen, Berthold II then witnessed a pair of grants to the church which were made into the hands of the bishop-elect.\(^5\) Otto also gave to his brother as fiefs two counties that the bishops of Brixen possessed, namely in the

\(^5\) Baumann, 25, no. 50: “comes Berhtoldus, advocatus noster, et Otto frater eius.”

\(^5\) SUB, 2:423-426, no. 304 and Tr. Asbach, 87-89, no. 4.


\(^5\) Die Traditionsbücher des Hochstifts Brixen vom 10. bis in das 14. Jahrhundert, ed. Oswald Redlich, Acta Tirolensia, vol. 1 (Innsbruck, 1886; reprint, Aalen: Scientia Verlag, 1973), 174, nos. 496a and 496b. Both of these notices include in the witness list a Berthold “advocatus” as well as “item Perchtold comes.” Oefele, 161, suggests that this second Berthold is Berthold II’s son Berthold III. I am more inclined to believe this is Count Berthold of Tyrol, who appears in various sources from the Brixen region in this period. Berthold III was likely still too young to appear only with the title of “comes” in the later 1160s.
Puster valley to the east of Brixen and in a section of the Inn River valley north of the Brenner Pass.\(^5^9\)

Otto’s generosity was made possible by the extinction of the noble house of Gries-Morit in 1166. The last member of this lineage, a Count Arnold, had held the aforementioned advocacies and counties from the bishopric, and his death enabled Bishop-elect Otto to grant these numerous offices to his own brother.\(^6^0\) These were not the first rights Berthold II had acquired in Tyrol, however. He had previously inherited properties in the region following the death of his distant relative Count Henry of Wolfratshausen in 1158, but he seems to have shown little interest in the region until Otto’s election.\(^6^1\) Only after 1165 did Berthold II become a frequent visitor to Tyrol and enter into regular contact with the bishops of Brixen.\(^6^2\) His establishment of a market at Innsbruck in 1180 demonstrates how his brother’s episcopacy helped to transform Tyrol


\(^{6^0}\) Bitschnau, 212-213. He believes that the houses of Andechs and Gries-Morit were distantly-related and that Barbarossa arranged Otto’s election as bishop of Brixen to insure that the family would continue to hold power in the region. He bases this argument to a great extent on the fact that Arnold, a common name in the house of Gries-Morit, was also the name of the father of Count Berthold I of Andechs (See Appendix One). While a distant kin relationship is possible, it is not essential to explaining Otto’s election. Since Otto was probably already provost of St. Mary’s in Aachen in 1165 and thus one of the most trusted churchmen in Frederick’s inner circle, he was likely near the front of the line to obtain any strategically significant bishopric in the empire, especially one in the Alps in the general vicinity of Andechs power centers.

\(^{6^1}\) For the house of Wolfratshausen’s possessions in Tyrol, see Schütz, “Das Geschlecht der Andechs-Meranier,” 44.

\(^{6^2}\) For evidence of Berthold II’s activities in Tyrol after 1170, see for example Redlich, 176, no. 501; 178, no. 507; and 179-180, no. 508.
into a region at the center of Berthold II’s and later Berthold III’s long-term political strategies.\(^63\)

The impressive number of rights that Otto obtained for Berthold II in only five years as bishop-elect of Brixen clearly indicates his willingness to use his position in the Church to strengthen the house of Andechs’s territorial power. As a result, his election as bishop of Bamberg in the late summer of 1177 was in many ways even more significant than his election as bishop of Brixen because of his family’s pre-existing interests in Upper Franconia. During the first three-quarters of the twelfth century, the house of Andechs had already had more consistent contacts with the bishops of Bamberg than with any other line of ecclesiastical lords. Upper Franconia, more than any other region where the house of Andechs possessed lordships, had witnessed the almost complete entanglement of the family’s interests with those of the local bishops—long before any member of the family had joined the church of Bamberg.

As was discussed in Chapter Five, the marriage of Count Berthold I’s son Poppo to the heiress Kunizza of Giech in the late 1130s brought Andechs power and influence to within sight of the town of Bamberg itself; the castle of Giech stood fewer than ten miles from the diocesan seat, on the opposite side of the Regnitz River valley. The 1143 treaty between the church and the noble house drawn up after Kunizza’s death stated that the bishops and the Andechses were to share use of both Giech and the nearby castle of Lichtenfels, thus binding the church and the family even more closely to one another.\(^64\)


\(^64\) Paul Oesterreicher, Denkwürdigkeiten der fränkischen Geschichte, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf das Fürstbisthum Bamberg, vol. 3 (Bamberg, 1832), 87-88, no. 7. At Giech, the house of Andechs had use of the castle while the bishops had use of the “Munitionem Giecheburch ante castrum sitam.” At
In or around 1143, Poppo also acquired the comital rights in the Radenzgau, the borders of which essentially followed the borders of the diocese of Bamberg. Following Poppo’s death, Count Berthold II inherited these comital rights, further helping to stabilize the noble house’s position in Upper Franconia. By the 1150s, Bishop Eberhard II of Bamberg (1146-1170) seems to have recognized that the house of Andechs was in the region to stay, and a period of relative peace between church and noble family ensued. There is even evidence that Berthold II and Eberhard II made a joint grant of property to the convent of St. Mary and Theodore in Bamberg at some point between 1157 and 1170.

While there were thus contacts between the house of Andechs and the church of Bamberg before 1177, Otto’s election inaugurated a period of much more intensive interactions. Between 1177 and the death of the bishop’s brother Berthold II in 1188, the margrave of Istria was named in the witness lists of ten of the bishop’s charters and tradition notices for various religious communities in the southeast of the German empire. In eight of the ten, Berthold II is the only prominent noble to appear in the Lichtenfels, each side had use of “medietatem castri,” though precisely how this worked in practice is not explained. For more on the treaty, see Chapters Two and Five.


66 This grant of “quoddam nouale in confinio Weikendorf et predii ad Lancheim pertinentis situm” is preserved in an 1174 charter of Bishop Herman II of Bamberg. The most recent edition of the charter is in Erwin Herrmann, “Die erste Nennung eines Kulmbacher Priesters (1174) in einer Bamberger Urkunde,” Geschichte am Obermain 15 (1985/86): 49-50. Herrmann incorrectly claims on p. 47 that this charter is not in Oefele’s register of sources for the house of Andechs; it is p. 124, no. 109a (listed under the years 1146-72). The property named in the grant was presumably part of a benefice Berthold II held from the bishopric.

67 Appendix Four includes a list of the most important sources that provide evidence for contacts between Bishop Otto II of Bamberg and the two contemporary secular lords in the house of Andechs, namely his brother Margrave Berthold II of Istria and his nephew Duke Berthold III of Merania. The ten charters of the bishop that Berthold II witnessed are Appendix Four, nos. 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 16, 19, and 22.
witness list, and in a ninth the one additional high-ranking secular lord to be listed is his son Berthold III.68 Similarly, Berthold III witnessed a total of twelve of his uncle’s charters and tradition notices, and he was the only noble of comital-rank or higher to be named in nine of those.69 All of this suggests that between 1177 and 1196 the margrave and the duke were often present for the types of Bamberg church business that would normally only have been witnessed by church officials and ministerials—and perhaps members of the lesser regional nobility.70

In the four decades prior to Otto’s election, secular lords from the house of Andechs had witnessed a total of three charters drawn up by the bishops of Bamberg for religious communities in the empire.71 Even the relatively dry evidence found in witness lists thus indicates that there were unusually strong ties between the church of Bamberg

Because not all of Otto’s charters are dated, it is impossible to be certain how many of the total surviving number were written before Berthold II’s death in 1188. However, I estimate that the margrave witnessed approximately twenty-five percent of Otto’s charters from 1177-1188. A list of the bishop’s charters can be found in Hans-Ulrich Ziegler, “Das Urkundenwesen der Bischöfe von Bamberg von 1007 bis 1139. Mit einem Ausblick auf das Ende des 12. Jahrhunderts,” Archiv für Diplomatik, Schriftgeschichte, Siegel- und Wappenkunde 28 (1982): 182-184.

68 Appendix Four, no. 7 also includes Berthold III in the witness list. The only one of the bishop’s charters witnessed by Berthold II that was also witnessed by several other prominent imperial lords was no. 13, which was drawn up at a session of the imperial court in Nuremberg in 1183.

69 The twelve are Appendix Four, nos. 3, 4, 7, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 27, 28, and 30. The three to name other high-ranking lords are nos. 7 (which his father also witnessed), 13 (discussed in the preceding footnote), and 20.

70 Secular witnesses of comital rank or higher are virtually non-existent in Bishop Otto’s charters. This is especially noteworthy considering that a variety of comital families possessed advocacies for Bamberg properties, including the counts of Abenberg for the church and market of Bamberg and for various monasteries in Upper Franconia as well as the counts of Sulzbach and the counts of Bogen for Bamberg-owned religious communities in Lower Bavaria. For discussions of how to interpret the witness lists of charters from the German empire, see Petke, 106-108; Plassmann, 9-14; and especially Karl-Heinz Spieß, “Königshof und Fürstenhof. Der Adel und die Mainzer Erzbischöfe im 12. Jahrhundert,” in Deus Qui Mutat Tempora: Menschen und Institutionen im Wandel des Mittelalters, eds. Ernst-Dieter Hehl, Hubertus Seibert, and Franz Staab (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1987), 203-234.

and the house of Andechs after 1177. Indeed, numerous historians, especially those
interested in Franconian *Landesgeschichte*, have studied the career of Bishop Otto II of
Bamberg from the perspective of Andechs territorial lordship within the diocese. 72 Most
recently, Ansgar Frenken’s detailed article on the subject has clearly demonstrated how
thoroughly the family came to dominate Upper Franconian politics in this period. 73

Bishop Otto II granted to the secular lords in his family the advocacies for various lands
in the region; 74 limited the powers of other noble families who possessed Bamberg rights
and properties; 75 and looked the other way when his secular relatives acquired lands to
which the bishopric had legitimate claims. 76 Thus, while Otto did not allow the bishopric
to be stripped of all its territories by his Andechs family members, he also did not make

72 Otto Meyer has described the period from 1137 until 1248 as the “Andechs century” in
Franconia and identified the years of Otto’s episcopacy and of his great-nephew Ekbert’s episcopacy
(1203-1237) as the height of the family’s power and influence in the region. See his *Oberfranken im
Hochmittelalter. Politik—Kultur—Gesellschaft* (Bayreuth, 1973; reprint, 1987), 137. For other discussions
of Otto that have emphasized his familial ties, see Müssel; van Eickels; and Erich Freiherr von Guttenberg,
*Grundzüge der Territorienbildung am Obermain*, Neujahrslätter, ed. Gesellschaft für Fränkische
Geschichte, vol. 16 (Würzburg, 1925), 74ff.

73 As Frenken explains, “Es ist unverkennbar, dass das Hochstift im letzten Drittel des 12.
Jahrhunderts massiv unter den Einfluss der benachbarten Andechser Fürsten geraten war” (729).

74 Ibid., 733-734. This point is discussed in more detail below.

75 Ibid., 734-735. Other comital families, most notably the house of Abenberg, controlled many of
the most important advocacies in Upper Franconia. In 1189, however, Count Frederick II of Abenberg
mortgaged various advocacies back to the church of Bamberg to help pay for his involvement in the Third
Crusade (Appendix Four, no. 24). The bishops of Bamberg refused to grant these advocacies to anyone
else, insuring that the house of Andechs would be the most powerful noble family in Upper Franconia after
1189. For more on these events, see Wilhelm Störmer, “Grundzüge des Adels im hochmittelalterlichen
Franken,” in *Herrschaft, Kirche, Kultur: Beiträge zur Geschichte des Mittelalters. Festschrift für Friedrich

76 Frenken, 737. Duke Berthold III’s acquisition of the castle of Niesten in the early 1190s,
following the extinction of the lesser noble family who owned it, was likely the result of support from his
uncle. Although this castle northeast of Bamberg had been owned by the bishopric of Bamberg in the early
twelfth century, Bishop Otto II apparently made no effort to push his own claims and instead let it pass to
his nephew. See also Andreas Dück, “Die Meranier auf Burg Niesta und in Weismain,” in *Zur Geschichte
des Hauses Andechs-Meranien am Obermain: Festschrift zur Feier der Namensverleihung "Meranier-
any attempt to stop those relatives from becoming the leading nobles in Upper Franconia by his death in 1196.

The bishop’s familial strategies in Upper Franconia are most evident in a pair of his charters concerning the Cistercian monastery of Langheim near Lichtenfels. When King Henry II established the bishopric of Bamberg in 1007, most of eastern Franconia was a heavily-forested, sparsely-settled wilderness; what little population there was in the region was mainly Slavic and pagan. One of the responsibilities of the new bishopric, therefore, was to bring these lands and people more fully into the Roman Church’s and the German empire’s spheres of influence. During the twelfth century, efforts to missionize, to clear forests, and to colonize were led by several Franconian monasteries which had been founded or reformed in the opening decades of the century. The community of Cistercians at Langheim quickly became involved in this work after the establishment of its house in the 1130s. The Andechs count Poppo and his wife Kunizza of Giech gave the monastery various properties around the year 1140 to help support it, but in general the members of the house of Andechs had few contacts with Langheim—until the episcopacy of Bishop Otto II of Bamberg.

---


79 For Poppo and the early days of the monastery, see Dippold, “Non verus et proprius monasterii fundator,” as well as Franz Machilek, “Langheim als Hauskloster der Andechs-Meranier,” in Klosterlangheim, Arbeitsheft 65, Bayerisches Landesamt für Denkmalpflege (Munich, 1994), 26. Between the early 1140s and 1177, the only other surviving record of contacts between the house of Andechs and Langheim dates from 1152, when Count Berthold II was, along with the bishop of Würzburg, part of an exchange of properties with the monastery: MB, 37:68-70, no. 97.
During the decade following his election in 1177, Otto successfully worked to bring Langheim into the Andechs sphere of influence. In an 1187 charter drawn up at Bamberg, the bishop placed a series of properties he was granting to the monastery “into the hands of our nephew Duke Berthold of Merania in order that he may hold, guard and defend them for the monastery of Langheim.”

On another occasion between 1180 and 1188, the bishop of Bamberg made a second donation to Langheim and again designated the duke as the protector of the lands he was giving. Because the house of Andechs possessed properties of its own in eastern Franconia, the newly-formed bond with Langheim helped to make the family the leading power in the clearing and settlement of the regions near the border with Bohemia. So strong did the ties between the noble house and the Cistercian monastery become that Langheim even emerged as a second Andechs house monastery (Hauskloster) alongside Diessen during the opening decades of the thirteenth century.

From the perspective of family relationships, these two charters of Bishop Otto II for Langheim are significant for another reason. Although Margrave Berthold II of Istria

---

80 The complete text of this charter is, to the best of my knowledge, unpublished. The original is Staatsarchiv Bamberg, BU 376: “…in manus Bertholdi ducis merani nepotis nostri ut teneat et tuetur atque defendat ea lancheimensi ecclesie.” Berthold III was to receive for performing this function “duas muta seu modios avene,” an amount that Geldner calls “symbolisch” (pp. 56-57). Because the Cistercians were opposed to having noble advocates for their monasteries, the term *advocatus* is not used in this charter. However, the early modern copy-book of Langheim charters does identify Berthold III as being the advocate for the lands. See Das Copialbuch der Cistercienser-Abtei Langheim [I. Beilage], ed. Caspar Anton Schweiter, BHVB 22 (1859): 28-29. For more on the issue of Cistercians and advocates, see Frenken, 741-742, especially note 126, and more generally Giles Constable, *The Reformation of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 253-254.

81 Historische Schriften und Sammlungen ungedruckter Urkunden, zur Erläuterung der deutschen Geschichte und Geographie des mittleren Zeitalters, ed. Johann Adolph von Schultes, vol. 1 (Hildburghausen, 1798), 74-75, no. 2. Berthold III was to receive in this case “unam mutam seu modium avene per annos singulos.”

was still alive and politically active at the time of both charters—in fact he witnessed
both of them—his son Duke Berthold III of Merania was the one given the task of
protecting the lands the bishop was granting to the monastery. This suggests a conscious
familial strategy to involve Berthold III rather than Berthold II more actively in
Langheim’s affairs. Considering that the margrave must have already been in his sixties
during the 1180s, there were obvious advantages to placing the duke of Merania at the
center of these grants. Why should Bishop Otto II have worked to build his brother’s
power in Upper Franconia when helping his nephew offered the prospect of having a
more enduring impact?\textsuperscript{83}

Such a strategy may also indicate that Margrave Berthold II wanted to insure a
strong relationship between his son the duke and his brother the bishop. It was clearly in
the best interest of the house of Andechs that Berthold III and Otto maintain a close bond
with one another after Berthold II’s death. Evidence for frequent contacts between the
pair does survive for the period after 1188, and some of the documents from this period
even suggest there was an especially good relationship between them. In an exchange
that occurred in the year 1195 between the church of Bamberg and the Franconian
monastery of Banz, Otto granted the properties the bishopric received from Banz “to our
beloved nephew Duke Berthold of Merania in benefice.”\textsuperscript{84} Another of the bishop’s

\textsuperscript{83} Although Frenken’s recent article is the best work on Andechs strategies in Franconia to date,
Frenken takes a very impersonal approach to the study of the interactions between the secular lords and the
bishops of Bamberg in the house of Andechs. He fails to recognize the very different relationships that the
bishops had with different secular relatives.

\textsuperscript{84} Paul Oesterreicher, \textit{Geschichte der Herrschaft Banz}, vol. 2: \textit{Urkunden} (Bamberg, 1833), l-lii,
no. 31: “dilecto fratrueli nostro Bertholdo duci meranie in beneficiu.” Whether or not the house of
Andechs was already in possession of the advocacy for Banz at the time of the agreement has been debated
by historians. See, for example, Martin Kuhn, “Um die meranische Klostervogtei Banz,” in \textit{Zur Geschichte
(Staffelstein, 1991), 40-41. Frenken, 717 implies that the advocacy passed to
charters from this period also refers to Berthold III as “our beloved nephew.” While the scribes who wrote these charters may have been the ones who decided to insert the adjective *dilectus* into the texts, the repeated use of the term may also be an indication of the strength of the bond between uncle and nephew during these years. Their contacts with one another in the late 1170s and early 1180s—while Margrave Berthold II was still alive—had helped to lay the foundation for their close relationship in these later years.

The surviving sources concerning territorial lordship in Upper Franconia thus provide much valuable evidence for how prominent a role Bishop Otto II of Bamberg played within the house of Andechs between 1177 and 1196. These are not, however, the only records that reveal the closeness of his relationships with Margrave Berthold II and Duke Berthold III. Indeed, one of the bishop’s earliest charters offers a clear indication of the much broader implications that Otto’s office was to have for this kinship network. As bishop-elect of Bamberg, Otto spent January of 1178 at the imperial court in Italy. Soon thereafter, when he was returning north of the Alps, he stopped at Wolfsberg in the duchy of Carinthia—where the bishops of Bamberg had a castle. There, on 29 March 1178, he drew up a charter to settle a dispute between an episcopal ministerial and the nearby monastery of St. Paul in the Lavant Valley. The lead witness to the document was Margrave Berthold II.  

That Otto’s first contact with his brother after becoming bishop of Bamberg occurred in Carinthia is significant. Like many of the other bishoprics in southern

---


86 MHDC, 3:470-471, no. 1242. This is Appendix Four, no. 2.
Germany, the church of Bamberg did not own properties and rights only within its own diocese. In the years following the establishment of the see of Bamberg in 1007, King/Emperor Henry II and his immediate successors had made a series of grants that extended the political power of Bamberg well beyond the borders of Upper Franconia. By the end of the eleventh century, the bishopric was one of the leading landholders in the Alpine regions of the southeast of the empire, and the bishops controlled key mountain passes leading into northeastern Italy. The church’s most important rights and territories outside Franconia lay within the duchy of Carinthia and were clustered around two major centers: in the east, the castle of Wolfsberg in the Lavant River valley and, in the west, the town of Villach, where there had been a bridge across the Drava River since the ninth century. Various eleventh-century rulers had also granted the bishopric a series of estates in the dioceses of Regensburg and Passau, as well as in the archdiocese of Salzburg, in order to facilitate episcopal control of these distant properties. An extensive network of Bamberg territories thus extended through the southeast of the German empire.


A small number of sources revealing interactions between the bishops of Bamberg and the counts of Andechs in these lands outside Upper Franconia survive from the period before Otto’s election as bishop. In a royal charter dated 3 February 1154, which was drawn up at Bamberg, King Frederick I designated Count Berthold II of Andechs as the middleman in the transfer of the Lower Bavarian monastery of Niederaltaich into the hands of Bishop Eberhard II. According to Otto of Freising, the count of Andechs and the bishop of Bamberg traveled together only a year later from Venice through the southeast of the empire after leaving the imperial court in Italy. Furthermore, when Eberhard II confirmed the foundation and the territorial possessions of the Benedictine monastery of Asbach in Lower Bavaria in 1164, the list of lay witnesses for the charter was led by Count Berthold II. As is the case with the Franconian evidence, however, the volume of sources indicating regular contacts between the secular lords in the house of Andechs and the bishops of Bamberg in these regions outside the diocese increased significantly only after Otto’s election in 1177.

The bishopric of Bamberg’s extensive rights and properties in Carinthia—a region that bordered Carniola, where the house of Andechs had exercised lordship since the first half of the twelfth century—have gone virtually unnoticed in the modern scholarship concerning the family. But as the appearance of Otto and Berthold II at Wolfsberg in

---

89 MGH D Friedrich I, 1:116-117, no. 70.

90 Otto von Freising and Rahewin, Gesta Friderici I. Imperatoris, ed. Georg Waitz, MGH SSrG 46 (Hanover and Leipzig, 1912), 145, II.38.

91 Tr. Asbach, 87-89, no. 4.

92 Schütz in his two lengthy articles on the family in Herzöge und Heilige and in Die Andechs-Meranier in Franken fails to mention the importance of the Carinthia-Carniola border region for the house of Andechs. Johannes Mötsch, “Das Ende der Andechs-Meranier—Streit ums Erbe,” in Die Andechs-Meranier in Franken, 129 implies that Carinthia was a place where the bishops of Bamberg—but not the
1178 reveals, the brothers were well aware of the potential significance of these properties. Indeed, the bishop helped the margrave strengthen their family’s position in Carinthia very early in his episcopacy. In a charter from 1180, Bishop Otto II exchanged lands with the Bamberg-owned monastery of Arnoldstein, which lay in the Gail River valley and guarded roads into both Italy and Carniola; in return for granting the monastery various lands near Arnoldstein, the bishopric received among other territories “the mountain that in the vernacular is called Krainegg,” which lies to the southeast of Arnoldstein near the Würzen Pass into Carniola. Included in the witness list of this document is “Margrave Berthold, advocate.” The title almost certainly refers to the advocacy for the monastery of Arnoldstein, though it may also indicate that Berthold II was to hold the advocacy for some of the lands being exchanged. Regardless, with this advocacy and Bishop Otto II’s control of Krainegg, the house of Andechs extended its influence north of the Karawanken mountain range into one of the key regions that provided access to the family’s Carniolan lordships.

The territorial interests of Bishop Otto II of Bamberg and of the secular lords in the house of Andechs thus overlapped across a broad swath of the southeast of the empire.

---

93 MHDC, 3:479, no. 1271: “montem qui vulgo Creineke vocatur.”

94 Ibid.: “Berhtoldus marchio advocatus.”

95 Margrave Engelbert of Istria had held the advocacy for Arnoldstein until his death in 1173. In a charter from 1174, it is then reported that the Bamberg ministerial Colo of Ras had obtained the advocacy (MHDC, 3:439-440, no. 1177), but Colo is named in the witness list of the 1180 charter without the title. The only detailed discussion of the Arnoldstein advocacy in the secondary literature of which I am aware is Ernst Klebel, “Die Grafen von Görz als Landesherren in Oberkärnten,” Carinthia I 125 (1935): 68-70.
outside the borders of the diocese of Bamberg. Evidence revealing the importance of this entire region for the Otto-Berthold II-Berthold III kinship network can be found in the abundant sources that indicate these family members regularly traveled with one another between Upper Franconia and the Carinthia-Carniola borderlands. The journey from the Bamberg region to the area around Wolfsberg and Villach—a distance of approximately three hundred miles—typically led southeast across Upper Franconia and then through the Bavarian Upper-Palatinate to Regensburg on the Danube River. From there, the route followed the Danube downstream past Passau into the lands east of the Inn River and west of the lower Enns River. This region, the frontier between the duchies of Bavaria and Austria during the later twelfth century, provided access to a series of north-south passes through the mountains of the march of Styria and the duchy of Carinthia; these passes brought travelers first to the central Enns River valley, then to the upper Mur River valley, and finally to the central Drava River valley near the Carniolan border.

96 Another of the bishop’s charters helps to make this point. On or shortly before 7 June 1192, Bishop Otto II and his two nephews Duke Berthold III of Merania and Provost Poppo of St. Jacob’s confirmed an earlier agreement between Margrave Berthold II and the bishopric concerning marriages between ministerials of the church of Bamberg and of the house of Andechs. Much of the text, which details how the children of these ministerial marriages were to be divided between the bishopric and the noble house, is typical of this kind of charter. What is noteworthy, however, is that the document clearly states that the terms of the agreement were to apply to ministerial marriages “in Franconia, Bavaria and Carinthia.” See Tr. Diessen, 109-112, no. 6 (p. 111 for “in Franconia, Bauwaria et Carinthia”). This charter is undated; however, on 7 June 1192 Emperor Henry VI confirmed the agreement. See MHDC, 3:533-534, no. 1394; it has been registered more recently as Regesta Imperii, vol. 4, pt. 3: Die Regesten des Kaiserreiches unter Heinrich VI, 1165 (1190)-1197, ed. Johann Friedrich Böhmer; newly edited by Gerhard Baaken (Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1972), 92, no. 223. The original agreement between Berthold II and the bishopric has not survived. For the issue of Poppo’s involvement in this agreement, see Chapter Five. The best discussion of these types of agreements and ministerial marriages more generally is John B. Freed, Noble Bondsmen. Ministerial Marriages in the Archdiocese of Salzburg, 1100-1343 (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1995).

As Figure 6.2 shows, sources name Bishop Otto II alongside Margrave Berthold II and Duke Berthold III in numerous places along this route. The figure also illustrates how the secular lords in the house of Andechs often witnessed the bishop’s charters for religious communities located in many of these same regions between Upper Franconia and Carniola. Travel between the various centers of the family’s and the church’s lordship was thus an essential component of Otto’s relationships with his brother and his nephew—as was the establishment of close ties between the Andechses and the many religious houses that lay between those power bases. Consider, for example, Bishop Otto II’s 1180 charter for Osterhofen, a Premonstratensian community in Lower Bavaria located on the Danube between Regensburg and Passau. The religious house was owned by the bishopric of Bamberg, but the appearances by both Berthold II and Berthold III in the witness list are nevertheless noteworthy because the charter concerns internal Bamberg church business. Making the situation even more striking, the agreement between the bishop and the house of canons occurred on Bamberg-owned properties along Atter Lake east of Salzburg. For the three Andechs relatives to be together there suggests they were journeying as a group either to or from the Carinthia-Carniola-Italy borderlands and using Bamberg lands and rights to facilitate that journey.

---

98 Appendix Four, no. 7: *Die Urkunden und das älteste Urbar des Stiftes Osterhofen*, ed. Johann Gruber, Quellen und Erörterungen zur bayerischen Geschichte, Neue Folge, vol. 33 (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1985), 26-27, no. 13. “Perchtoldus marchio de Andehsen et filius eius Perchtoldus marchio” are the only nobles of comital-rank or higher named in the witness list.

99 The witness list of this charter includes besides Berthold II and Berthold III “ministeriales eorundem: Godfridus et Ortungus de Andehsen.” For Andechs ministerials to be witnesses to a charter concerning an exchange between the bishop and the religious community at Osterhofen further suggests an unusual gathering at Atter Lake. For Alpine travel in this period, see Josef Riedmann, “Verkehrsweg, Verkehrsmittel,” in *Kommunikation und Mobilität im Mittelalter*, eds. Siegfried de Rachewiltz and Josef Riedmann (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1995), 61-75.
Figure 6.2. Bishop Otto II of Bamberg’s most important contacts with Margrave Berthold II of Istria and Duke Berthold III of Merania, 1177-1196
One of the strongest indications of how important travel in these regions was for the secular-ecclesiastical kinship networks operating inside the house of Andechs in the later twelfth century can be found at the Pyhrn Pass, the first mountain pass that travelers crossed when journeying south to Carinthia from the Inn-Danube-Enns region. In the year 1190, Bishop Otto II of Bamberg founded a hospice in the Garsten valley near the top of the pass on allodial lands owned by his church.100 Included in the properties with which he initially endowed this institution were “ten mansi located in the same valley, which our relative the duke of Merania was holding from us in fief and which [we gave] at the petition of that duke.”101 When Duke Berthold III or one of his ancestors in the house of Andechs had first received these properties in fief from the bishopric is unclear. Regardless, Berthold III’s decision to give them to the hospice at Pyhrn reflects his desire to be connected to a new foundation that lay on one of the key routes between his various lordships. Because the hospice was located a significant distance from any centers of the house of Andechs’s power, it has received virtually no attention from modern scholars of the family.102 But the fact that the only institution jointly endowed by Bishop Otto II and one of the secular lords in his family was on the northern edge of the Alps along the route between Franconia and Carinthia is clear evidence of how vital a role this region played in Andechs territorial strategies and family relationships.

---

100 See especially UBLE, 3:263-265, no. 279 and Bernardi Cremifanensis Historiae, ed. Georg Waitz, MGH SS 25 (Hanover, 1880), 665.

101 UBLE, 2:423, no. 289: “…decem mansos, quos consanguineus noster dux meranensis a nobis habebat in feudo, ad peticionem ipsius ducis sitos in eadem ualle,…”

102 Schütz, “Das Geschlecht der Andechs-Meranier,” 67 mentions the foundation in one brief sentence. Frenken makes no mention of it.
A rich body of sources from many different parts of the southeast of the German empire thus reveals that Bishop Otto II of Bamberg used his position to support his relatives Margrave Berthold II and Duke Berthold III in a variety of ways. By strengthening his family’s lordship in Upper Franconia, extending Andechs influence north of Carniola into Carinthia, and involving the margrave and the duke in episcopal affairs in other regions as well, Otto emerged as an integral member of the house of Andechs in the closing decades of the twelfth century. Why and how the margrave and the duke acquired an array of important rights and territories in this period can only be explained by their close relationship with the bishop. Indeed, Berthold II and Berthold III’s strategies in the southeast of the empire are impossible to understand unless their ecclesiastical relative Otto is placed near the center of Andechs history in the final quarter of the twelfth century.

IV. A Note on Bishop Diepold of Passau and the House of Andechs

Although the career of Bishop Otto II of Bamberg unquestionably provides the best twelfth-century evidence for the roles a churchman could play in the house of Andechs, the prelacy of Bishop Diepold of Passau (1172-1190) is worth considering briefly because it reinforces several of the aforementioned conclusions. Diepold was the son of Count Diepold II of Berg and Gisela, a daughter of Count Berthold I of Andechs. Margrave Berthold II of Istria and Bishop Otto II of Bamberg were therefore Diepold’s maternal uncles, and Duke Berthold III of Merania was his first cousin. Like his brother Henry, the cathedral provost of Bamberg and bishop of Würzburg discussed

---

103 Eberl, 38.
above, Diepold clearly owed his position in the Church to his Andechs relatives rather than the house of Berg, which had no known political and territorial interests in Lower Bavaria and the diocese of Passau.\textsuperscript{104}

The house of Andechs had been an important landholder in the region around Passau since 1158, when Berthold II inherited numerous properties and rights from Count Ekbert III of Neuburg.\textsuperscript{105} However, with the exception of Berthold II’s involvement in a small number of tradition notices from the monastery of Vornbach, for which he was the advocate, there is little evidence for Andechs interests in the diocese of Passau until after Diepold’s election in 1172.\textsuperscript{106} The margrave of Istria then became much more actively involved in Vornbach’s affairs.\textsuperscript{107} Moreover, at some point between 1173 and 1188, both Margrave Berthold II and Bishop Diepold settled a property dispute involving the Passau cathedral canons and a pair of local notables.\textsuperscript{108} During a stay at Passau in 1179, Berthold

\textsuperscript{104} Frenken, 730, note 82. A chronicle from the monastery of Reichersberg near Passau, written in the late 1100s, states under the year 1172 that Diepold was “sororius comitis Pertholdi” [Count Berthold II] without making any mention of Diepold’s connection to the house of Berg: \textit{Chronicon Magni Presbiteri}, ed. Wilhelm Wattenbach, MGH SS 17 (Hanover, 1861), 497.

\textsuperscript{105} See Chapter Two.

\textsuperscript{106} For Berthold II’s earliest contacts with Vornbach, see UBLE, 1:673, no. 157; 739-740, no. 403; and 741, no. 411. None can be dated to a narrower period than 1158-1173 (1173 is the year Berthold II started to be titled in sources \textit{marchio} rather than \textit{comes}). For the Vornbach tradition notices, see Eva Chrambach, \textit{Die Traditionen des Klosters Formbach} (Altendorf: Dieter Gräbner, 1983 and 1987).

\textsuperscript{107} UBLE, 1:674, no. 161; 676, nos. 166-167; 678-679, no. 175; 679, no. 178; 680, no. 179; 681, no. 184; 747-748, no. 436. Considering that the periods 1158-1173 and 1173-1188 are the same number of years in length, the many more references to Berthold II in Vornbach tradition notices from 1173 onwards strongly suggest he was more active in the region during this later period.

\textsuperscript{108} MB, 29, pt. 2:266-267. See also \textit{Die Regesten der Bischöfe von Passau}, vol. 1, ed. Egon Boshof (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1992), 283, no. 926. Oefele, 59 includes the church of Passau among the advocacies in Lower Bavaria controlled by the house of Andechs, and Berthold II may well have been present for this dispute settlement because of that office. It is, however, unclear to me how the family acquired this advocacy, which does not appear to have been in the possession of Count Ekbert III of Neuburg before 1158: see Richard Loibl, \textit{Der Herrschaftsraum der Grafen von Vornbach und Ihrer Nachfolger: Studien zur Herrschaftsgeschichte Ostbayerns im Hohen Mittelalter}, Historischer Atlas von Bayern, Teil Altbayern, series II, vol. 5 (Munich: Kommission für Bayerische Landesgeschichte, 1997), 136.
II also witnessed a charter of Bishop Diepold in which the bishop granted church properties to the cathedral chapter; the only other high-ranking witness to the agreement was Diepold’s brother, Count Ulrich of Berg.\textsuperscript{109}

While Berthold II thus seems to have been much more active in the region around Passau after Diepold was elected, Berthold III was the Andechs lord who developed an especially strong relationship with the bishop. Even before he was named duke of Merania in 1180, Berthold III made a donation to the monastery of Vornbach and acted as the middleman in a property agreement concerning St. Nicholas’s, the house of Augustinian canons at Passau.\textsuperscript{110} From the beginning of his career, therefore, Berthold III showed significant interest in the Andechs lands in Lower Bavaria around Passau.

Bishop Diepold’s involvement in his cousin’s affairs first became evident only a short time after Berthold III became duke. On 9 January 1181, Berthold III drew up his earliest surviving charter while at his family’s castle of Neuburg south of Passau; he granted to the monastery of Vornbach a set of tithes he held in fief from Diepold, and it was with the approval and consent of the bishop that Berthold III affixed his seal to the document.\textsuperscript{111}

Over the course of the next decade, Duke Berthold III and Bishop Diepold were named together in a variety of charters and tradition notices. The duke witnessed one of the bishop’s donations to St. Nicholas’s;\textsuperscript{112} intervened alongside Diepold in a

\textsuperscript{109} MB, 28, pt. 1:121-122, no. 19. Ulrich’s appearance in the charter is noteworthy since he was quite a distance from the Swabian homeland of his family.

\textsuperscript{110} The donation to Vornbach is UBLE, 1:676, no. 168. The other tradition notice is ibid., 1:578-579, no. 192.

\textsuperscript{111} MB, 4:139-140, no. 10.

\textsuperscript{112} UBLE, 1:584-585, no. 214.
noblewoman’s dispute with the same house of canons;\footnote{Ibid., 1:596, no. 246.} and was present in his capacity as advocate of Vornbach in an exchange between that monastery and the bishop.\footnote{Ibid., 2:411-413, no. 281. See also \textit{Die Regesten der Bischöfe von Passau}, 281-282, no. 923.} In the early months of 1189, as both men prepared to depart alongside Emperor Frederick I on the Third Crusade, Duke Berthold III witnessed three more of Diepold’s charters, a pair for the monastery of Vornbach and another for the cathedral chapter at Passau.\footnote{MB, 4:143-145, nos. 13-14 (see also \textit{Die Regesten der Bischöfe von Passau}, 286, no. 937, and 291, no. 956) and SUB, 1:692-694, no. 703 (see also \textit{Die Regesten der Bischöfe von Passau}, 287-288, no. 941).} The duke was named in the witness lists of two of these documents alongside an impressive collection of his relatives, including his uncle Bishop Otto II of Bamberg and several of his other cousins from the house of Berg: cathedral provost Henry of Bamberg, Bishop Otto II of Freising (1184-1220), Count Ulrich of Berg, and Count Berthold of Berg.\footnote{MB, 4:144-145, no. 14 names Count Berthold of Berg but not Ulrich; SUB, 1:692-694, no. 703 names Count Ulrich of Berg, but not Berthold. There is nothing in either of these documents that would suggest why virtually all of the high-ranking witnesses belong to the Andechs-Berg kinship group. Both charters concern Passau church business.} From the perspective of Andechs kinship networks, an even more significant family gathering had occurred a few months earlier on 5 October 1188 at Plattling between Regensburg and Passau. There, Bishop Diepold of Passau acted as the mediator in the settlement of a dispute between his uncle Bishop Otto II of Bamberg and the abbot of the monastery of Seitenstätten. Leading the witness list to Diepold’s charter confirming the settlement were Margrave Berthold II of Istria and Duke Berthold III of Merania.\footnote{\textit{Urkundenbuch des Benedictiner-Stiftes Seitenstetten}, ed. P. Isidor Raab, Fontes rerum Austriacarum, Abt. II, vol. 33 (Vienna, 1870), 24-25, no. 16. See also \textit{Die Regesten der Bischöfe von Passau}, 282, no. 924. This charter highlights the difficulty in reading too much about family relationships}
both reveal how much more important the Danube River valley around Passau became for the house of Andechs after the elections of Otto in Bamberg and Diepold in Passau. These two bishops played a significant role in shifting the attention of both Margrave Berthold II and Duke Berthold III toward regions where the secular lords in the house of Andechs had not previously exercised their lordship with such intensity. To overlook Diepold’s contacts with his relatives in the house of Andechs is to misunderstand the political and territorial interests of Berthold II and Berthold III in the late 1170s and 1180s.

V. Conclusions

Not all twelfth-century imperial bishops had such close, consistent contacts with their secular relatives as did Bishop Otto II of Bamberg and Bishop Diepold of Passau. Indeed, two of Diepold’s brothers from the house of Berg rarely appeared in sources alongside the lay lords in the house of Andechs during their episcopacies. Bishop Henry of Würzburg (1191-1197) and Bishop Otto II of Freising (1184-1220) both seem to have done little to support Margrave Berthold II of Istria and Duke Berthold III of Merania, despite the fact that the house of Andechs had strong connections to both of their bishoprics. Another Berg brother, Mangold, was abbot of Tegernsee during the last decade of Duke Berthold III’s life, but evidence for contacts between the cousins is sparse although Berthold was advocate for Tegernsee.\footnote{For Henry, Otto, and Mangold, see Eberl, 38-39.} Overlapping political and

\footnote{For Henry, Otto, and Mangold, see Eberl, 38-39.}
territorial interests were clearly not the sole reason why Bishop Otto II and Bishop Diepold became such integral members of their secular relatives’ kinship networks after their elections.

In the case of Otto, his contacts with his brother Berthold II extending back to the 1140s suggest that he had from his early years a strong connection to his family’s interests, a connection that he never lost. According to a text preserved in the Diessen book of traditions, on 12 October 1182 Bishop Otto II helped to consecrate the new church at the house of canons as well as a series of altars inside the church.\textsuperscript{119} During this stay at Diessen, he also made a pair of grants to the house of Augustinian canons. One of these donations, which he gave “through the hand of his brother Margrave Berthold,” included a chalice and clerical vestments as well as various lands and rights in Upper Bavaria.\textsuperscript{120} While the text of the tradition notice indicates that Otto had bought some of these Bavarian territories which he was giving to Diessen, it also states that he held some of the other lands and rights, including a church, through hereditary right.\textsuperscript{121} This is the only surviving source to reveal Otto had inherited a piece of his father’s patrimony and provides evidence for the bonds that continued to connect him to his family three decades after he first appeared in a document as \textit{clericus}. Moreover, his presence at Diessen to consecrate the church and several altars indicates that he maintained ties to a religious community that his parents had established while he had been a young boy. Both Otto and his older brother Berthold II had grown up at a time when Upper Bavaria was the

\textsuperscript{119} Tr. Diessen, 95, no. 89.

\textsuperscript{120} Ibid., 36-38, no. 27b: “per manum fratris sui Berhtoldi marchionis.”

\textsuperscript{121} Ibid.: “hereditario iure.” This is almost certainly the reason why his brother Berthold II was involved in the grant. For customs concerning the alienation of pieces of a family’s patrimony, see above, Chapter Three.
center of the house of Andechs’s political power, and their appearance together in the region in 1182 offers additional insight into why Otto maintained such strong ties with his Andechs relatives.

In Diepold’s case, it is possible that his extraordinarily close involvement with the house of Andechs can be explained by a role as Berthold III’s mentor or teacher. The duke’s strong interest in the family’s Lower Bavarian lands during Diepold’s episcopacy is striking; at no other time between 1158 and the loss of those lands in 1208 did any of the secular lords in the house of Andechs pay so much attention to the region around Passau. Furthermore, although Diepold and Berthold III were first cousins, Diepold was likely at least a decade older than Berthold, making him the ideal age in the 1170s and early 1180s to act as counselor to the young lord. That their relationship was based on more than just territorial interests in Lower Bavaria can be seen most clearly in the evidence for their involvement in the Third Crusade. The chronicle accounts of the German contingent’s journey through eastern Europe and Asia Minor reveal that the cousins cooperated closely with one another on the march. Diepold, who died in the Holy Land in November 1190, even appears in Necrology A of the Diessen book of traditions, further evidence of how thoroughly he was integrated into the Andechs sphere of influence during his prelacy.

---

122 Since Diepold was elected in 1172, his year of birth can likely be placed in the early 1140s. Gisela and her husband Count Diepold II of Berg married in the mid-1130s, and the future Bishop Diepold of Passau was their fourth child, further supporting the idea he was born shortly after 1140. See Eberl, 35.

123 *Chronicon Magni Presbiteri*, 513 (the *Chronicon* includes the Passau canon Tageno’s account of the crusade) and *Historia de Expeditione Friderici Imperatoris* (*Der sogenannte Ansbert*), in Quellen zur Geschichte des Kreuzzuges Kaiser Friedrichs I, ed. A. Chroust, MGH SSrG, New Series 5 (Berlin, 1928; reprint, 1964), 45 and 56.

Thus, Bishop Otto II of Bamberg and Bishop Diepold of Passau both demonstrate
the importance of analyzing the careers of medieval ecclesiastical lords from the
perspective of kinship. Family connections could play vital roles throughout prelates’
lives, not just in their early years when they were first embarking upon careers in the
Church. Moreover, historians who study noble kinship groups cannot ignore the
potentially central positions churchmen could hold within their families. As has been
shown, the activities of Margrave Berthold II of Istria and Duke Berthold III of Merania
during the closing decades of the twelfth century are impossible to understand unless the
activities of the prelates in their family are analyzed as well. The networks of
cooperation and support that operated at the center of a noble house often relied on the
relationships of ecclesiastical kin to shape their political and territorial strategies, and as a
result, historians must recognize prelates as potentially vital members of their families
during the central Middle Ages.
CHAPTER SEVEN

WIVES AND MOTHERS, SISTERS AND DAUGHTERS:
WOMEN AND THEIR ROLES IN NOBLE KINSHIP NETWORKS

One of the most wicked villainesses in Hungarian opera is the character of Queen Gertrude of Hungary in Ferenc Erkel’s *Bánk Bán*, which premiered in Budapest in 1861 and is often referred to today as the national opera of Hungary. The historical Gertrude was the daughter of the Andechs Duke Berthold III of Merania and the husband of King Andreas II of Hungary (1205-1235); she was assassinated by members of the Hungarian nobility in 1213. Although contemporary accounts of her death make no mention of the specific motives behind her assassination, the opera offers a colorful version of the events surrounding her killing.¹ At the center of the story is a Hungarian nobleman, the provincial governor Bánk. While Bánk is traveling away from court, the queen’s brother attempts to seduce his wife—with the approval of the queen. The resulting intrigues eventually lead Bánk to join a conspiracy against the queen, whom he assassinates. For the Hungarian audience of the nineteenth century, the political overtones of the opera would have been obvious. In a period when many Hungarians desired independence

¹ Contemporary and near-contemporary accounts of the assassination include *Annales Mellicenses: Continuatio Lambacensis*, ed. W. Wattenbach, MGH SS 9 (Hanover, 1851), 558; *Continuatio Admuntensis*, 592 (where the suggested motive is “in odium Teutonicorum”); *Annales Sancti Rudberti Salisburgenses*, ed. W. Wattenbach, MGH SS 9, 780; and Alberich of Troisfontaines, *Chronica*, ed. Paulus Scheffer-Boichorst, MGH SS 23 (Hanover, 1874), 898.
from their Habsburg rulers, *Bánk Bán* presented its audience with the medieval story of a
heroic Hungarian nobleman killing a foreign-born queen.²

Although no source from the first half of the thirteenth century corroborates the
plot of the opera, there are late medieval accounts of Gertrude’s assassination that clearly
influenced the version of events presented in *Bánk Bán*. An especially vivid telling of the
story around which the opera would later be structured is contained in a fourteenth-
century manuscript from the former Andechs house monastery at Diessen in Upper
Bavaria:

The wedding of [Gertrude’s] daughter Saint Elizabeth and Landgrave Louis [IV]
of Thuringia was celebrated in Hungary at the city of Buda. Patriarch Berthold of
Aquileia, the brother of the queen, was present for this marriage and saw there a
Hungarian countess of great beauty, whom he beset and overcame, though she
was unwilling. This countess of course complained to her husband about the
injury inflicted upon her, but the patriarch derided her claims against him and
retired to his own lands. A short time later, the aforesaid count had a perverse
suspicion that the queen was a co-conspirator in the wickedness which had
befallen his wife and that she gave her consent to it. And so, at a moment suitable
to the count, he paid for and gathered certain nefarious men, who during the night
entered the queen’s chamber and hanged her, choking her to death.³

There is no reason to believe this version of events. Since Gertrude’s daughter Elizabeth
was born in 1207, she could not possibly have celebrated her wedding before her


³ *Notae Diessenses*, ed. Philip Jaffé, MGH SS 17 (Hanover, 1861), 331: “Sciendum est, quod in desponsatione sancte Elizabeth filie sue et Ludovici langravii Thuringie, que copulatio nuptiarum celebrabatur Ungarie in civitate Ovena, quibus nuptiis intererat Berchtoldus patriarcha Aquilegiensis, frater prescripte regine, qui videns comitissam quandam Ungaricam valde formosam, quam circumvenit et invitam oppressit. Ilsa vero comitissa hoc malum sibi ingestum conquesta fuit marito suo. Ipse vero patriarcha illam querimoniam vilipendit et ad propria remeavit. Temporibus quoque paucis elapsis, predictus comes suspicionem sinistram habuit, quod regina conscia fuerit et consensum prebuerit huius mali, quod uxori sue acciderat, et tempore sibi congruo convenit quosdam maleficos pro pecunia, qui nocturno tempore intraverunt cameram regine et ipsam strangulantes suspenderunt.”
mother’s death in 1213.\footnote{Erika Dinkler-von Schubert, “Elisabeth von Thüringen,” Theologische Realenzyklopädie, vol. 9 (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1982), 513. Elizabeth’s marriage is generally dated to 1221.} Moreover, the late medieval sources cannot even agree on which of Gertrude’s brothers was involved in this affair; some texts indicate the culprit was not Berthold but Bishop Ekbert of Bamberg.\footnote{See, for example, John of Viktring, Liber Certarum Historiarum, ed. Fedor Schneider, MGH SSrG 36, pt. 1 (Hanover and Leipzig, 1909), 128 and Henry of Mügeln, Chronicon, ed. Eugenius Travnik, in Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum. Tempore Ducum Regumque Stirpis Arpadianae Gestarum, ed. Emericus Szentpétery, vol. 2 (Budapest, 1938), 205-206.}

The disagreement over the identity of Gertrude’s lascivious brother is one of the most interesting features of this legend, for the surviving sources from the early thirteenth century reveal that \textit{three} of the queen’s male siblings were at the Hungarian court in the years before her assassination. She had helped to engineer Berthold’s election to the Hungarian archbishopric of Kalocsa in 1206, and he continued to hold this post—as well as various others in Hungary—until he became patriarch of Aquileia in 1218.\footnote{Pio Paschini, “Bertoldo di Merania patriarcha d’Aquileia (1218-1251),” Memorie storiche forogiuliesi 15 (1919): 4-6.}

Meanwhile, Ekbert and Margrave Henry of Istria had fled to Hungary following the assassination of King Philip of Swabia at Bamberg in 1208 because they were both implicated in the murder plot.\footnote{Bernd Ulrich Hucker, “Der Königsmord von 1208—Privatrache oder Staatsstreich?,” in Die Andechs-Meranier in Franken: Europäisches Fürstentum im Hochmittelalter (Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 1998), 111-127.} Evidence of the impressive contingent of Andechs family members at the Hungarian court during this period can be found in a 1209 charter of King Andreas II which names all four siblings together.\footnote{Codex Diplomaticus Hungariae Ecclesiasticus ac Civilis, ed. Georg Fejér, vol. 3, pt. 1 (Buda, 1829), 76-78.} Thus, the story of the queen and her brother popularized by \textit{Bánsk Bán} does have one historical pillar for its foundation; in the
years around 1210, Gertrude and the Hungarian royal court were the focal point of an important support network operating inside the house of Andechs.

Queen Gertrude’s involvement in her siblings’ affairs highlights a critical aspect of her kinship group’s history. Despite the emphasis in the last two chapters on the male children in the family, the number of daughters born into the house of Andechs between 1100 and 1204 actually surpassed the number of sons, with each generation of the family including several women for whom at least some evidence survives. In total, there are a dozen known female scions of the Andechs family who lived during the twelfth century, and if the six wives who married into the noble house are counted with them, women comprise a clear majority within the kin group. As a result, a study of Andechs family relationships that only analyzes the interactions between the male members of the noble house presents an incomplete picture of how this family functioned. It is also necessary to consider the roles women played as wives, mothers, sisters and daughters in the networks of cooperation and support that shaped the Andechs family’s political and territorial strategies during the central Middle Ages.

Unfortunately, analyzing the kin relationships of the Andechs women is significantly more difficult than analyzing the relationships of the Andechs men. Unlike their male counterparts in the noble house, the majority of the family’s female members have received virtually no attention in the modern literature relating to Andechs history. Most recent books and articles list their names in family trees but are otherwise silent about their careers. The lack of detailed research on the women in the house of Andechs means many of the most basic questions about them remain unanswered. Much of this

---

9 All of these women are included in the family tree that is Figure I.
chapter will therefore be dedicated to determining what the surviving medieval sources permit historians to conclude about Andechs women. As will be shown, examining the evidence for female family members offers the opportunity to explore some of the potential difficulties that confront scholars interested in studying noble kinship networks of cooperation and support.

I. Sources for the Noblewomen in the House of Andechs

On 6 February 1202, Duke Berthold III of Merania and his two oldest sons Otto and Henry were at Udine in northeastern Italy in the residence of Patriarch Pilgrim II of Aquileia (1194-1204). There, an imperial notary drew up a charter recording a £1,000 loan that the patriarch agreed to give to the duke. As collateral, Berthold III and his two sons offered a series of properties in Carniola. However, according to the charter, “because there was an inheritance dispute between the duke and his sister concerning a quarter part of those possessions,” Berthold III and his sons also agreed to provide other properties instead should the sister’s claims prove to be legitimate. This text thus offers historians valuable insight into female inheritance rights inside the house of Andechs. But considering that the duke of Merania had four sisters—all of whom were possibly still alive in 1202—and that the loan agreement is the one surviving reference to the sibling disagreement, this document raises many more questions than it answers.

---

10 UB Krain, 2:5-6, no. 7: “mille marcas Frisachensium.” The reason why Duke Berthold III needed to be loaned money early in the year 1202 is unclear.

11 Ibid., 5: “…quia pro quarta parte illarum possessionum inter ipsum ducem et sororem ipsius hereditaria est questio,…”

12 These four women will be discussed in more detail below.
What makes the charter even more frustrating is that it is the only contemporary source from the period 1100 to 1204 to make any mention of a woman born into the house of Andechs having claims on a portion of her natal family’s lands. As has been discussed in Chapter Three, thirty-four agreements (grants, exchanges, quitclaims and confirmations) involving the noble house’s properties survive as tradition notices or sealed charters, yet none refers to a sister or daughter in the noble house as a donor or as a participant in the laudatio parentum. Moreover, no marriage contracts survive for any of the Andechs women who were married off during this period. Even contemporary references in chronicles or archival sources to the dowries they brought with them into their marriages do not exist.

This almost complete lack of evidence for the inheritance rights of the female children in the house of Andechs is noteworthy, especially considering that property ownership has been central to recent scholarly discussions about the importance of women inside noble houses. More than four decades ago in 1962, David Herlihy argued that “the woman comes to play an extraordinary role in the management of family property in the early Middle Ages [701-1200], and social customs as well as economic life were influenced by her prominence.” During the last quarter century, numerous historians have supported Herlihy’s claim and have demonstrated convincingly in their studies of regional nobilities that noblewomen throughout western and central Europe

---

13 These texts are all discussed at length in Chapter Three. A list of the thirty-four documents is also provided in Appendix Two.

exercised a broad range of rights over property.\textsuperscript{15} Using a variety of archival materials, including charters, wills and testamentary bequests, these scholars have shown that noblewomen, in their roles as sisters and daughters, were often named in documents recording exchanges, quitclaims and sales by their parents and siblings. Amy Livingstone has observed, for example, “In a sample of charters from the Chartrain, 35 percent refer to daughters, primarily as consenters to their parents’ gifts and sales of property and to the resolutions of disputes.”\textsuperscript{16}

Because regional studies of noble families’ property-holding patterns have been more popular in French and American historiography than in the German tradition of \textit{Landesgeschichte}, there are few works concerning the imperial nobility that offer possible explanations for why Andechs women were absent from the noble house’s property agreements.\textsuperscript{17} Not surprisingly, one of the only recent scholars who has considered the issue of female property rights within the German empire of the central


\textsuperscript{16} Livingstone, 50. Also see the statistics provided in Gold, 135-139.

\textsuperscript{17} Herlihy’s above-quoted article on women and property, which he wrote before Georges Duby’s model of the regional study became popular, includes an analysis of sources from Germany, Italy, Spain, northern France and southern France. His general findings suggest that German women’s property rights were similar to women’s rights in other regions of Europe during the twelfth century (see especially p. 108). Other historians have not confirmed his research, however. One of the few German works to discuss women’s property rights inside the empire unfortunately focuses on the later Middle Ages: Karl-Heinz Spieß, \textit{Familie und Verwandtschaft im deutschen Hochadel des Spätmittelalters: 13. bis Anfang des 16. Jahrhunderts} (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1993).
Middle Ages is an American. John Freed, in his work on ministerials in the archdiocese of Salzburg, has studied the family strategies of more than one hundred fifty lineages; as he observes, “The right of women to inherit property was accepted without question, as the numerous heiresses demonstrate, but it was usually considered subsidiary to a brother’s claim.”\(^\text{18}\) This statement suggests that the abundance of sons born into the house of Andechs during the twelfth century was a key reason why daughters born into the family do not appear in the sources as consenters or co-grantors. Because at least one male heir was born during the early years of each Andechs lord’s first marriage, there was no period between 1100 and 1204 when a female family member was in line to be a principal inheritor. As a result, the parties to Andechs property agreements might have viewed the involvement of daughters and sisters as unnecessary.\(^\text{19}\)

The paucity of references to Andechs women in such documents has broad ramifications extending well beyond the issues of inheritance and property rights. Social historians mine these sources for a wealth of information concerning the medieval nobility.\(^\text{20}\) Indeed, charters and tradition notices from monasteries and churches with strong patronage ties to the Andechses are critical to scholars’ knowledge of the male members of the family. The three sons of Count Berthold I of Andechs, Count Poppo’s son Henry, Margrave Berthold II’s two sons, and three of the four sons of Duke Berthold III of Merania all appear in such archival materials while children or young men. These


\(^{19}\) See Chapter Three for a more detailed discussion of why certain family members do and do not appear in the family’s property agreements with religious communities.

\(^{20}\) See Chapter One for an overview of how social historians use charters.
texts are therefore invaluable when attempting to reconstruct the history and genealogy of the patrilineage from contemporary sources. Many of the arguments presented in Chapters Five and Six could not have been made without the foundational evidence for Andechs sons and brothers contained in the family’s property transactions with religious communities in the southeast of the German empire. Thus, given that Andechs daughters and sisters are so rarely mentioned in this important source base, how much information actually survives from the central Middle Ages for these women?

To answer this question, it is necessary to analyze a broad range of texts, for even the most basic aspects of genealogical research—such as determining the number of female Andechses and their names—are complicated by the nature of the surviving evidence. Consider, for example, the daughters of Count Berthold I of Andechs. Contemporary sources from the middle decades of the twelfth century, when they would have been adults, provide virtually no information about who these women were. Archival documents from the noble house’s patronage circles enable historians to identify only one of the female members of this generation; a tradition notice from the late 1130s reports that the count placed “his daughter Kunigunde” in the convent at Admont and donated property to the religious community as her entrance gift. This is, however, the only reference to Kunigunde in the surviving twelfth-century sources. Moreover, in order to determine if Count Berthold I had any other daughters, documents from the early and mid-1100s must be set aside and later evidence analyzed.

21 As noted in Chapter Three, property transactions are not sufficient by themselves to analyze family relationships, but they are useful when used in conjunction with other types of documents.

22 Since Count Berthold I’s sons were all born during the 1110s and 1120s (see Chapter Five), his daughters were presumably all born during this same general period as well.

23 SUB, 2:274, no. 188: “filiam suam Chunigunt.”
A chronicler who began writing in the late 1160s at the monastery of Reichersberg south of Passau produced the earliest text to reveal the existence of a second daughter of Count Berthold I of Andechs. Two passages in the chronicle concern the elections of the brothers Henry and Diepold—both members of the noble house of Berg—as bishops of Passau in 1169 and 1172 respectively. Each of these prelates is described as a “sister’s son,” or nephew, of Count Berthold II of Andechs. However, the sister is not identified in the text. It is not until the early thirteenth century that another Bavarian chronicle, in its discussion of the 1184 election of Henry and Diepold’s brother Otto as bishop of Freising, explains that the Andechs noblewoman who was the mother of all these ecclesiastical lords was named Gisela. The identity of another of Count Berthold I’s daughters also becomes evident for the first time in a source written around the year 1200. The *Vita Mechtildis* of Engelhard of Langheim refers to Abbess Mechthild of Edelstetten as the child of Berthold and his wife Sophia. The only twelfth-century text to name her, a papal letter from 1153-1154, mentions nothing about Mechthild’s family background; it is only with the help of the *Vita* and historical hindsight that the Mechthild in this letter can be identified as belonging to the house of Andechs.

---


27 Tr. Diessen, 105-106, no. 3.
One must move even deeper into the thirteenth century to find evidence that Mechthild had another sister who also entered the Church: Abbess Euphemia of Altomünster. Her name first appears in Necrology A of Liutold’s Codex, written around 1210 at Diessen, as “Abbess Euphemia of Altomünster, sister of our community, [who] died in the year 1180.”\(^\text{28}\) However, it was not until the mid-1200s that a Diessen scribe added to her entry in the necrology any information about her family background: “daughter of our founder Count Berthold [I].”\(^\text{29}\) The one piece of corroborating evidence for Euphemia’s identity is, unfortunately, also found in a Diessen source: the genealogy of the house of Andechs written by one of the canons around 1250.\(^\text{30}\) In this list of Andechs family members, Euphemia is named alongside her sisters Gisela and Mechthild and her brothers Poppo, Berthold II and Otto.\(^\text{31}\) Kunigunde—the only one of the four daughters of Count Berthold I of Andechs who can be identified as a member of the house of Andechs from a text dating to her own lifetime—is not included in this source.

Kunigunde’s absence from the mid-thirteenth-century Diessen genealogy clearly indicates that the list of names is not an ideal text to use for the reconstruction of the Andechs family tree. Nevertheless, turning to the next generation of the noble house, the genealogy is the earliest source to provide direct evidence concerning the identities of


\(^{29}\) Nec. Diess., 20 (18 June): “filia fundatoris nostri Berhtoldi comitis.”

\(^{30}\) Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 5515, f. 128r. The printed edition of this genealogy (*Notae Diessenses*, 328) has mistakenly omitted several of Count Berthold I’s children. However, a photograph of the manuscript page can be found in *Die Andechs-Meranier in Franken*, 65.

three of Margrave Berthold II of Istria’s daughters. It lists them alongside Berthold II’s sons as “Margravine Mechthild of Vohburg, Countess Kunigunde of Eberstein, [and] Countess Sophia of Henneberg.”

No text from the late twelfth or early thirteenth century can confirm these names and titles. The aforementioned reference to an unnamed sister of Duke Berthold III of Merania in the 1202 loan agreement is one of the two earliest appearances of a daughter of the margrave in the extant sources. The other is a letter Berthold II wrote to the abbot of Tegernsee during the late 1170s or early 1180s in which he refers to “our daughter, whom we betrothed a long time ago to the son of Duke Ompud.”

So poor are the sources, however, that it is impossible to determine whether this betrothed daughter was one of the women listed in the Diessen genealogy—or even if her proposed union ever occurred.

The best corroborating evidence for the identities of these three daughters of Margrave Berthold II can be found in various charters from the early and mid-1200s in which members of the houses of Vohburg, Eberstein and Henneberg are named as relatives of Andechs family members. In a charter of the margrave’s grandson Duke Otto I of Merania, for example, Count Poppo VII († 1244?) from the house of Henneberg and

---


34 Oefele, 29, no. 34, identifies this woman as an unnamed fourth daughter of Margrave Berthold II and his first wife. Kamillo Trotter, “Das Haus der Grafen von Andechs,” in Genealogisches Handbuch zur bairisch-östereichischen Geschichte, ed. Otto von Dungern (Graz: Verlag Leuschner and Lubensky, 1931), 25, no. 58 and Johannes Kist, “Die Nachfahren des Grafen Berthold I. von Andechs,” Jahrbuch für fränkische Landesforschung 27 (1967): 43 both follow Oefele in their own reconstructions of the family’s genealogy. However, because no source, including the various late medieval texts about the Andechses written at Diessen, mentions the existence of another lay daughter besides Mechthild, Kunigunde and Sophia, I am inclined to believe instead that this was an early betrothal or marriage of one of these three women.
Margrave Diepold VI of Vohburg († 1225) are both designated as “our relatives.” With the help of the Diessen genealogy, it is possible to identify these two noblemen as the sons of Margrave Berthold II’s daughters Sophia and Mechthild respectively. However, other Diessen sources from the later Middle Ages describe Mechthild as being countess of Görz (Gorizia) as well, and members of this noble house from the southeast of the empire are also labeled as the kin of Andechs lords in charters from the thirteenth century. This suggests Mechthild was married twice, but without contemporary sources for either of her marriages, the details of both remain the subject of scholarly debate.

While texts from their own lifetimes are thus essentially silent about these three daughters of Margrave Berthold II, the identity of the margrave’s fourth daughter can be found in a contemporary source. The Genealogia Wettinensis, written between 1211 and 1217, mentions the Andechs lord Berthold II because this second wife, Liutgard, was a...

---

35 Paul Oesterreicher, Geschichte der Herrschaft Banz, vol. 2: Urkunden (Bamberg, 1833), liv-lv, no. 33: “…consanguineorum nostrorum.” Oesterreicher dates this charter to “ca. 1216” and Oefele to May of 1218 (p. 180, no. 510b). Otto is identified as “dux Meranie” in the charter itself, and his seal also lists only that title. Because he consistently used the title “count-palatine of Burgundy” as well as “duke of Merania” following his marriage in June of 1208, this charter was almost certainly written before that date.

36 The marriage of Sophia to Count Poppo VI of Henneberg is well-established in the modern literature. See, for example, Heinrich Wagner, “Entwurf einer Genealogie der Grafen von Henneberg,” Jahrbuch des Hennebergisch-Fränkischen Geschichtsvereins 11 (1996): 51-52. Mechthild’s marriage into the house of Vohburg is more problematic because historians disagree over the reconstruction of that family’s genealogy. See Oefele, 29-30, no. 35; Dungern, 52-53; and Michael Doeberl, Regesten und Urkunden zur Geschichte der Dipoldinger Markgrafen auf dem Nordgau (Munich, 1893).

37 Mechthild is “Machthildem cometissam Coricie” in the fourteenth-century Andechs genealogy from Diessen printed in Notae Diessenses, 328. Evidence for a kin connection between the two noble houses can be found in a 1234 charter of Patriarch Berthold of Aquileia, in which Count Meinhard III of Görz is referred to as “dilectum nepotem et fidelem nostrum.” See MHDC, 4:222-223, no. 2094.

member of the extended Wettin kinship group. Their marriage is therefore discussed in this genealogical text, and the names of their two children are provided as well: “Cathedral Provost Poppo of Bamberg and Abbess Bertha of Gerbstedt.” This information about Bertha is invaluable since, like Kunigunde in the previous generation, she does not appear in any of the sources for the Andechses written at Diessen during the thirteenth century.

Without a pair of genealogical texts, namely the *Genealogia Wettinensis* and the Diessen list of Andechses from the mid-thirteenth century, all four of Margrave Berthold II of Istria’s daughters would thus be unknown to modern historians. Fortunately, a much broader range of sources—including many contemporary ones—is available to help identify who Duke Berthold III of Merania’s daughters were. The most problematic reference to one of these women is the earliest one. The *Historia de Expeditione Friderici Imperatoris*, a chronicle of the Third Crusade, reports that with the approval of Emperor Frederick I, Duke Berthold III agreed in the summer of 1189 to give an unnamed daughter to Toljen, the nephew of the ruler of Serbia, Stefan Nemanja. As with the betrothal of Berthold II’s daughter to Duke Ompud in the previous generation,

---

39 *Genealogia Wettinensis*, ed. E. Ehrenfeuchter, MGH SS 23 (Hanover, 1874), 226-230. See Chapter Four for a detailed discussion of this source. Berthold II’s second wife Liutgard will be discussed in more detail below.

40 Ibid., 228: “Popponem Bavenbergensem prepositum et Bertam Gerbestadensem abbatissam.”

however, the results of these initial negotiations are unknown—as is the identity of the woman involved in the proposed marriage.\textsuperscript{42}

Sources from the period around 1200 do provide definitive evidence concerning the marriages of two of the duke’s daughters. A monastic chronicle from the southeast of the empire reports under the year 1203 that Andreas, the brother of King Emery of Hungary (1196-1204), had as his wife a “daughter of Duke Berthold of Merania.”\textsuperscript{43} This is the aforementioned Gertrude, and after Andreas became king in 1205, she appears as his queen in several texts from her lifetime.\textsuperscript{44} Gertrude’s sister Agnes is also referred to as a daughter of Duke Berthold III in the contemporary sources that discuss her marriage. Agnes’s husband was King Philip II Augustus of France (1179-1223), who took her as his wife in 1196 following his uncanonical repudiation of Ingeborg of Denmark. The scandalous nature of Philip’s marital strategies and his clash with Pope Innocent III over his two wives insured that the events surrounding Agnes’s marriage were discussed in numerous chronicles of the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{45}

\textsuperscript{42} Oefele, 34, no. 42; Trotter, 26, no. 68; and Kist, 44 all argue that this woman is an otherwise unknown daughter of Duke Berthold III who appears in no other source. I am more inclined to believe this was an early betrothal and possibly marriage of one of the daughters of Berthold III for whom other evidence does survive.

\textsuperscript{43} Continuatio Admuntensis, 590.

\textsuperscript{44} See, for example, Codex Diplomaticus Hungariae, vol. 3, pt. 1, 29-31 and 149-150. It is interesting to note that the earliest texts I have been able to find that give her name actually date from 1214, the year after her assassination. See Codex Diplomaticus Hungariae, vol. 3, pt. 1, 151-152.

The marriage of Agnes and Philip led one chronicler, Alberic of Troisfontaines, to insert a detailed genealogy of her family into his text.\textsuperscript{46} Writing in the 1230s near Châlons-sur-Marne between Paris and the German empire, Alberic accurately identifies Agnes’s four brothers as “Duke Otto of Merania, Margrave Henry of Istria, Bishop Engelbert [Ekbert] of Bamberg, and Berthold, an archbishop of Kalocsa in Hungary, who was patriarch of Aquileia after Wolfger of Passau.”\textsuperscript{47} Agnes is listed as one of four sisters, but only one of these female siblings is given a name in the text: “Gertrude was the wife of King Andreas of Hungary.”\textsuperscript{48} The other two are identified simply as “an abbess” and “a duchess in Poland, whom Duke Henry of Breslau had [as his wife].”\textsuperscript{49} The aforementioned \textit{Genealogia Wettinensis} of the 1210s makes no mention of Duke Berthold III of Merania having a daughter who was an abbess; however, like Alberic’s chronicle, the \textit{Genealogia} does refer to an unnamed daughter of the duke who was married to “Henry duke of Silesia in Poland.”\textsuperscript{50}

Contemporary archival documents make it possible to confirm the identities of both of these Andechs women whose names are not supplied by either Alberic or the \textit{Genealogia}. Several charters written at the court of Duke Henry I of Silesia in the early

\textsuperscript{46} Alberich of Troisfontaines, 872-873. Alberic identifies Agnes by the name Maria throughout his account of Philip’s marriage to her.

\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., 873: “…ducem videlicet Meranie Ottonem et Henricum Histrie marchionem, episcopum de Bavenbergis Engelbertum et unum archiepiscopum Colohensem in Hungaria Bertoldum, qui fuit patriarcha Aquileie post Wolferum Pataviensem.” While Alberic does name Agnes’s four brothers correctly, he does mistakenly identify their father as “duci Ottoni Meranie” instead of Berthold [III].

\textsuperscript{48} Ibid.: “Gertrudis uxor Andree Regis Hungarie.”

\textsuperscript{49} Ibid.: “una…abbatissa” and “ducissa in Polonia, quam habuit Henricus dux Vrescelavie.”

\textsuperscript{50} \textit{Genealogia}, 230: “Heinrico duci Slesie in Polonia.”
thirteenth century indicate that his wife was named Hedwig. One of her own charters even survives. Because this Duchess Hedwig, who died in 1243, was canonized in 1267, numerous late medieval sources discuss in great detail her connections to the house of Andechs. There are, however, no sources written during her lifetime in either Andechs or Silesian patronage circles that make direct reference to her blood ties with any of her Andechs relatives. Fortunately, the same is not the case for the unnamed abbess mentioned by Alberic of Troisfontaines. She is identified as a member of the Andechs family in a 1215 charter of Bishop Ekbert of Bamberg, in which she is named as the bishop’s sister Mechthild, abbess-elect of Kitzingen. Alongside her brothers and sisters, she also appears in the Diessen genealogy of the mid-thirteenth century in the list of Duke Berthold III’s children. There, the four female siblings are described as “Queen Gertrude of Hungary, Queen Agnes of France, Abbess Mechthild of Kitzingen, and Duchess Hedwig of Silesia.” Thus, although it is necessary to draw on evidence from a broad range of sources to identify them as Andechses, the women from the last generation of the house of Andechs born during the twelfth century are nevertheless the


53 See the discussion in Chapter One of the image in the Schackenwerther Codex.


only ones for whom relatively good contemporary and near-contemporary documentation survives.

As previously noted, Andechs sons and brothers are prominent figures in the archival materials of the 1100s. Imperial and episcopal charters, monastic tradition notices, chronicles and an array of other texts provide a solid foundation for the study of the men in the noble house. As a result, the entire male side of the twelfth-century Andechs genealogy can be reconstructed accurately without needing to rely on any sources written after 1210. In contrast, only half of the women born into the house of Andechs during the twelfth century are identifiable through documents written prior to that same year. Compared to their male relatives, Andechs daughters and sisters were simply not very involved in the types of activities that medieval scribes were interested in recording. Studying the roles these women played in kinship networks of cooperation and support is therefore difficult. Before considering the ramifications of this situation for the analysis of female family relationships inside the noble house, it is necessary to consider briefly what modern historians know about the Andechs wives.

How does the evidence for the noblewomen who married into the house of Andechs during the 1100s compare to the evidence for their daughters? A survey of the sources indicates that wives are included more often than other Andechs women in the

---

56 Indeed, all of them can be identified by name in sources written prior to the year 1200 with the exception of Duke Berthold III’s fourth son Berthold, who became archbishop of Kalocsa and patriarch of Aquileia. He is not named in a source until after becoming archbishop-elect of Kalocsa in 1206.

surviving charters and tradition notices concerning the noble house’s territorial interests.\textsuperscript{58} Count Berthold I’s wife Sophia, Count Poppo’s wife Kunizza, Margrave Berthold II’s wife Hedwig, and Duke Berthold III’s wife Agnes all appear as either co-grantors or consenters in property donations made by their husbands.\textsuperscript{59} Furthermore, although the names of virtually all Andechs daughters are only knowable because of texts written decades after their deaths, the names of these four wives can be found in documents from their own lifetimes.\textsuperscript{60} Contemporary sources for the noblewomen who married into the noble house are therefore significantly better than similar sources for most of the women who were born as Andechses.

When analyzed outside the context of Andechs daughters and sisters, however, Andechs wives do not appear to have been such prominent figures within the noble house. Although four of their names are known, the surviving twelfth-century sources provide minimal additional information about these women. Even determining their own parentage is a surprisingly difficult task, especially considering the prominence of the house of Andechs during the 1100s. Count Poppo’s wife Kunizza, because of the conflict that erupted surrounding her inheritance, is the only one whose origins are mentioned in contemporary archival documents. A charter of Bishop Egilbert of Bamberg from 1142 identifies her as “Kunizza, daughter of Count Reginboto,” and an 1149 charter of Bishop

\textsuperscript{58} See Chapter Three and Appendix Two for such a survey.

\textsuperscript{59} Appendix Two, nos. 3 (Sophia); 16 (Hedwig); 29 (Agnes); and 40 (Kunizza).

\textsuperscript{60} Ibid.
Eberhard of Bamberg makes her familial connection even clearer by naming her “the lady Kunizza, daughter of Count Reginboto of Giech.”

In general, however, sources from Andechs patronage circles provide no evidence concerning the background of the women who married into the family. Count Berthold I’s wife Sophia has, for example, been identified by modern historians as one of two daughters of Margrave Poppo of Istria († 1098/1101) from the noble house of Weimar-Orlamünde. She and her sister inherited their father’s extensive properties in the southeast of the empire, most notably in Carinthia and Carniola, and Sophia thus brought with her into her marriage lands and rights that helped to make possible the early expansion of Andechs territorial power. But no text written in Andechs circles during the twelfth or thirteenth century identifies Sophia beyond her birth-name. The earliest text to make a direct reference to her marriage and to her familial background is the Historia Welforum, written around the year 1170 at the court of Duke Welf VI of Spoleto. As this work explains, Margrave Poppo “married off his two daughters, one to Berthold count of Andechs and the other to Albert count of Bogen.”

---

61 Staatsarchiv Bamberg, BU 223: “Chuniza comitis Reginbodonis filia” and Paul Oesterreicher, Denkwürdigkeiten der fränkischen Geschichte, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf das Fürstbisthum Bamberg, vol. 3 (Bamberg, 1832), 88-91, no. 8: “dominam Cvnizam filiam comitis Regenbotonis de Giecheburc.”


63 Historia Welforum, ed. Erich König, Schwäbische Chroniken der Stauferzeit, vol. 1 (Stuttgart and Berlin: W. Kohlhammer, 1934), 24, ch. 15: “…Poponem marchionem, qui duas filias suas unam Berhtoldo comiti de Andehse, aliam Alberto comiti de Bogen copulavit.” The Historia reports that a woman from the Hungarian royal family, whose daughter from her second marriage would marry into the
Another genealogical source written under the influence of a different noble house, the aforementioned *Genealogia Wettinensis*, provides the best surviving evidence from the central Middle Ages for the identities of two other Andechs wives. The *Genealogia* reports that Count Dedo of Rochlitz († 1190), son of Margrave Conrad of Wettin († 1157), had “a daughter Agnes, who married the duke of Merania.” A second Wettin genealogy from the early 1200s confirms Agnes’s identity, but no document written under Andechs influence discuss her parentage; she is simply “his wife Agnes” in the one tradition notice that names her alongside Duke Berthold III. Even this brief reference, however, is more corroborating evidence than survives for the other Andechs wife named in the *Genealogia*. According to the text, the fifth daughter of Margrave Conrad of Wettin, “Adela was married to King Sven of Denmark. The king had by her a daughter Liutgard, who married Margrave Berthold of [Istria].” No other source confirms the existence of this marriage, though Alberic of Troisfontaines does make a confused reference to an Andechs lord having a mother “from the line of Danish kings.”

---

64 *Genealogia Wettinensis*, 229: “… filiam Agnetem, que nupsit duci de Meran.”

65 *Genealogiae Comitum et Marchionum Saec. XII. et XIII*, ed. Georg Waitz, MGH SS 24, 78. This genealogy does not identify Agnes by name but rather as Dedo’s daughter, “quam duxit dux Perchtoldus de Meran.” Alberich of Troisfontaines, 873, mistakenly calls her “Aaliz” and her husband “duci Ottoni Meranie.”

66 UBLE, 1:676, no. 168: “uxore sua Agnes.” This text is also Appendix Two, no. 29. Liutold’s entry for her in Necrology A of his Diessen codex reads simply, “Anno ab incarnatione Domini Millesimo CLXXXXV Agnes ducissa obiit.” See Borgolte, 264 (25 March). The Diessen genealogy of the mid-1200s names her “Agnes ducissa.” See *Notae Diessenses*, 328.

67 *Genealogia Wettinensis*, 228: “… Adela copulatur regi Danorum Suenoni, qui genuit ex ea Lucardem, quam duxit Bertoldus marchio de Bavaria [sic].”

68 Alberich of Troisfontaines, 873: “de regibus Dacie.” Alberic gives no name for the woman and identifies her as “mater…ducis Ottonis Meranie.” For more on Liutgard, see Oefele, 23.
Historians of the house of Andechs thus must rely on evidence from the houses of Welf and Wettin to establish the identities of three Andechs wives: Sophia of Istria, Liutgard of Denmark and Agnes of Rochlitz. However, because sources like the Historia Welforum and Genealogia Wettinensis do not survive in significant numbers from the twelfth and early thirteenth century, every noblewoman who married into the house of Andechs cannot be found in texts from this genre. The identity of Margrave Berthold II of Istria’s first wife, for example, remains a mystery. She appears alongside her husband in an Admont tradition notice as “his wife Hedwig,” but virtually nothing else about her is known. Historians speculate that she was a member of the house of Wittelsbach.

There is, however, no evidence to connect her directly to that family.

Modern arguments concerning the identity of Count Berthold I of Andechs’s second wife are based on even less information, for she is not described as his spouse in any document from the twelfth or thirteenth century. Nevertheless, many scholars posit the existence of a second marriage by the count in order to explain how his son Berthold II inherited the Lower Bavarian comital lordships of Count Ekbert III of Neuburg in 1158. Contemporary sources reveal that the childless Ekbert III had a sister Kunigunde.

Because Count Berthold I is known to have had a daughter by the same name, historians

---

69 UB Steiermark, 1:397, no. 407: “uxoris eius Hadewige.” This is Appendix Two, no. 16. She is again simply “uxoris eius Hadewige” in another charter involving Admont: ibid., 1:430, no. 464.

70 Most historians believe she was a member of the Dachau branch of the house of Wittelsbach. From the early 1150s, the counts of Dachau held the title of duke of Merania, and Berthold III may therefore have acquired that title in 1180 in part because of his mother’s family connections. See Toni Aigner, “Das Herzogtum Meranien—Geschichte, Bedeutung, Lokalisierung,” in Grofje Andeško-Meranski, 40-43; Oefele, 22; and Trotter, 23. For opposing viewpoints, see Joseph Gottschalk, St. Hedwig, Herzogin von Schlesien (Cologne and Graz: Böhlau Verlag, 1964), 31 and Franz Tyroller, Die ältere Genealogie der Andechser, Beilage zum Jahresbericht des Wittelsbacher Gymnasiums München für das Schuljahr 1951/52, 41 (where her father is named as Count-Palatine Otto of Wittelsbach). For the more recent argument that Hedwig may have been a member of the house of Vornbach, see note 104 below.

71 UBLE, 1:643, no. 56; 659, no. 111; and 720, no. 315.
have identified Kunigunde of Neuburg as the otherwise unknown second wife of the
count of Andechs, whom he must have married sometime in the 1130s following the
death of Sophia of Istria. This hypothesis is certainly plausible, and it has gained
general acceptance among modern scholars. Regardless, the fact that no extant source
from the central Middle Ages provides evidence that this marriage took place makes
problematic any arguments about the union.

Careful analysis of the surviving information concerning Andechs wives thus
reveals that contemporary sources provide few more details about these women than
about their daughters. Considering that the recent emphasis in the historiography on the
property rights of female children and siblings has also stressed the property rights of
wives, the paucity of evidence relating to the women who married into the house of
Andechs is noteworthy. One reason for their apparent lack of significant roles in the
family’s territorial affairs is the success most of these wives had bearing sons. As noted
in Chapter Three, these women were only present in their husbands’ property transactions
in the first few years of their marriages, prior to their eldest sons attaining adulthood;
after that, they disappear from the charters and tradition notices. Many historians have
argued in the past decade that widowhood was the stage in a woman’s life when she
potentially had the most influence and power because she was free from both her father’s

---

72 Oefeke, 17-18; Trotter, 21; Tyroller, 154; Kist, 42; Alois Schütz, “Das Geschlecht der Andechs-
Meranier im europäischen Hochmittelalter,” in Herzöge und Heilige. Das Geschlecht der Andechs-
Meranier im europäischen Hochmittelalter, eds. Josef Kirmeier and Evamaria Brockhoff (Munich: Verlag
Friedrich Pustet, 1993), 63; and Richard Loibl, Der Herrschaftsraum der Grafen von Vornbach und Ihrer
Nachfolger: Studien zur Herrschaftsgeschichte Ostbayerns im Hohen Mittelalter, Historischer Atlas von
Bayern, Teil Altbayern, series II, vol. 5 (Munich: Kommission für Bayerische Landesgeschichte, 1997), 54-
55 and 142.

73 For nobleswomen’s rights as wives, see Jennifer Ward, Women in Medieval Europe, 1200-1500
(London: Longman, 2002), 116-120; Gold, 125-127; Drell, 76-89; and Theodore Evergates, “Aristocratic
Women in the County of Champagne,” in Aristocratic Women in Medieval France, 90-97.
and husband’s control.  Unfortunately, this observation does not assist the scholar studying the house of Andechs in the twelfth century. Count Poppo and Duke Berthold III were widowers when they died, and Margrave Berthold II was divorced.  It is likely that Count Berthold I left behind his second wife Kunigunde as a widow, but as has been discussed previously, nothing is known about their marriage or how it ended.

Heiresses have also been identified by historians as potentially powerful women in noble society since they controlled property.  Both Count Berthold I of Andechs and his son Count Poppo married heiresses who brought important lordships with them into their marriages. However, Count Berthold I’s wife Sophia of Istria does not appear in any contemporary sources in a position independent from that of her husband. It was not until the mid-thirteenth century that a Diessen scribe noted in Necrology B of Liutold’s Codex that “she gave to us [the Diessen canons] many estates on St. Stephen’s Mountain in Carniola and two manors there.” This is the only surviving piece of evidence that she maintained at least partial control over the lands she had inherited from her father. Count Poppo’s wife Kunizza appears to have been a much more powerful and independent figure; she clearly played a central role in gaining a divorce from her husband and in transferring her inheritance to the bishopric of Bamberg. Nevertheless, the limited

---

74 For widows, see Livingstone, 68-71; Gold, 130-133; Drell, 103-106; and Carol Lansing, The Florentine Magnates (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), 132-141.

75 For Margrave Berthold II’s divorce, see below.


77 Nec. Diess., 25 (6 Sept.): “dedit nobis predia multa in Monte s. Stephani in Carneola et 2 curias ibidem.”
number of sources for her actions along with her death soon after divorcing Poppo make it difficult to draw any strong conclusions about her position as an heiress.\footnote{The only evidence for her potential independence is provided in a pair of Bamberg episcopal charters from 1142-1143: Staatsarchiv Bamberg, BU 223 and Oesterreicher, \textit{Denkwürdigkeiten der fränkischen Geschichte}, 3:87-88, no. 7. For more on Kunizza, see Chapter Five.}

Andechs wives, like the women born into the noble house, are thus family members for whom limited reliable evidence is extant. While documents from their lifetimes enable historians to know the names of four of the six noblewomen who married Andechs lords before the year 1200, additional information about the majority of these wives is not as easy to find. Indeed, despite the wealth of recent research emphasizing the power and influence women could possess as wives, mothers, sisters and daughters, Andechs women are in general absent from the sources concerning the noble house. Karl Bosl, in his 1967 article on the “international connections” of the house of Andechs, used the women who were by birth or marriage members of the family to argue for the pan-European contacts of the noble house in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries.\footnote{Karl Bosl, “Europäischer Adel im 12./13. Jahrhundert: Die internationalen Verflechtungen des bayerischen Hochadelsgeschlechtes der Andechs-Meranier.” \textit{ZBLG} 30 (1967): 20-52. For a similar approach to the history of the house of Andechs, see also Gottschalk, 24-73.}

This genealogical approach to Andechs women is possible because sources like the Diessen necrologies and the \textit{Genealogia Wettinensis} enable historians to reconstruct the family tree of the extended Andechs kin group.\footnote{In Chapter Eight, I will suggest possible reasons for why the lords in the house of Andechs arranged particular marriage alliances for themselves and their children, creating in the process the extensive kinship network in which Bosl was so interested. However, because contemporary sources provide no direct evidence for the motivations behind the majority of these marriages, I will refrain from discussing the topic in this chapter.} For a study of the family relationships inside the noble house, however, such evidence is insufficient because the genealogical connections between relatives do not translate directly into an understanding of how
networks of cooperation and support operated within the kin group. To determine the roles Andechs women played inside these networks, it is therefore necessary to consider the extent to which the surviving sources permit the analysis of their interactions with other members of the noble house.

II. Women and Family Relationships in the House of Andechs

In 1217, Bishop Ekbert of Bamberg made a grant to the monastery of St. Michaelsberg in Bamberg and requested that masses be said for his father Duke Berthold III and his sister Gertrude, the queen of Hungary later immortalized in the opera Bánk Bán. Ekbert’s brothers Margrave Henry of Istria and Duke Otto I of Merania, who were preparing to depart on the Fifth Crusade with Gertrude’s widower King Andreas II of Hungary, both witnessed Ekbert’s charter. That the bishop and his two siblings chose to remember their assassinated sister in such a manner is a clear indication of Gertrude’s enduring ties to the family of her birth. As noted at the beginning of this chapter, she had as queen helped to arrange the election of her brother Berthold as archbishop of Kalocsa and had also provided safe haven for Ekbert and Henry when they were implicated in King Philip of Swabia’s death in 1208. The evidence for Gertrude’s relationships with her Andechs relatives thus demonstrates effectively the central role she played in the noble house’s kinship networks during the opening years of the thirteenth century.

---


82 It is especially interesting to note that Ekbert’s sister Agnes of France, who had also died prior to 1217, is not mentioned in the charter.
How exceptional a figure was Gertrude in Andechs history? Two chronicles from the early 1200s suggest she was atypical for the women born into the family. The first, written at the monastery of Admont in Styria, reports under the year 1203 that Gertrude’s husband Andreas had been captured by his brother King Emery during a dispute over the Hungarian throne; it goes on to explain that “his wife, the daughter of Duke Berthold of Merania, was stripped of all her possessions, and [Emery] permitted her to return to her homeland.” The following year, after Emery died, Andreas was freed and “recalled his wife with great honor.” Gertrude thus had the opportunity after several years of marriage to spend time back in Germany becoming reacquainted with her relatives—a chance most noblewomen did not have after they married. Since her father Duke Berthold III of Merania likely died while she was there, she would have witnessed the transfer of power within the house of Andechs to the next generation. Her extended, unexpected stay in Germany may therefore have laid the foundation for her close relationships with her brothers in subsequent years.

The second chronicle, written at the cathedral chapter in Cologne, includes under the year 1210 a lengthy story about King Andreas II of Hungary. According to the

---

83 *Continuatio Admuntensis*, 590: “…uxorem vero eius filiam Perhtoldi ducis Meranie omnibus bonis destitutam, ad terram et patriam suam remeare permisit.”

84 Ibid.: “…uxorem suam…cum Gloria magna revocavit.”

85 Bernd Ulrich Hucker argues, rightly I believe, that Andreas and Gertrude were probably married in or around the year 1197. See his “Der Königsmord von 1208,” 119-120.

86 Duke Berthold III of Merania died on 12 August 1204, King Emery of Hungary on 30 November of the same year. If the *Continuatio Admuntensis* is correct in dating Gertrude’s departure from Hungary to 1203, she would have spent at least eleven months in Germany. For more on these events, see Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *Hungary in the Thirteenth Century* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), 29-32, where Gertrude is identified as the instigator of the dispute between Andreas and Emery.

87 *Cronica Regia Coloniensis* (*Annales Maximi Colonienses*), ed. Georg Waitz. MGH SSrG 18 (Hanover, 1880). For its authorship, see Andrea Sommerlechner, *Stupor Mundi? Kaiser Friedrich II. und*
chronicle, “Because the king of the Hungarians was unable to capture a certain stronghold with his own troops, he employed—by the advice of his wife, who was German by birth—an army consisting of Germans who were staying in his land. He then subjugated to himself the aforesaid stronghold in a short time without the great risk of a full-scale war.” The phrase “consilio uxoris sue” offers clear evidence that Gertrude was well-known as far west as the Rhine River region as a powerful figure at the Hungarian court. Indeed, the Cologne chronicle goes on to explain how she helped thwart an assassination attempt on her husband the same year. That a contemporary source written outside Andechs and Hungarian circles assigns Gertrude such a prominent role in events inside Hungary suggests she was a woman with an especially strong personality. Her own assassination in 1213 further supports this claim, for the Hungarian nobility obviously recognized her as the wielder of significant—and undue—influence within the kingdom.

Kimberly A. LoPrete, in a recent article on King William I of England’s daughter Countess Adela of Blois, warns against “the anachronism involved in categorizing powerful female lords as exceptional women and as honorary men alike.” As she explains, most historians have assumed that medieval women “were always deemed

die mittelalterliche Geschichtsschreibung (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1999), 570.

88 Cronica Regia Coloniensis, 186: “Rex Ungariorum cum per suos munitionem quandam expugnare non posset, consilio uxoris sue, que ex Theuthonica gente oriunda fuit, ex his qui in terra eius morabantur Theutonicis sumens exercitum, iam dictam munitionem sine magno belli periculo in brevi sibi subiugavit.”

89 Ibid., 186-187.

inferior and incompetent compared to all men” and that the occasional politically-active woman was an anomaly to be “excluded from the general history of women.”  Recently, however, LoPrete and other scholars have demonstrated convincingly that noblewomen regularly exercised powers of lordship in the central Middle Ages and that contemporary writers did not view such women as unusual. Queen Gertrude’s active involvement in Hungarian court politics and in Andechs networks of cooperation and support is therefore not surprising when viewed from the broad perspective of female authority and influence during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. What is surprising, however, is the wealth of extant documentation concerning her involvement in such affairs. The evidence for the family relationships of other Andechs women is much more anecdotal in nature, making it difficult to assess how central most female Andechses were to the family’s networks of cooperation and support.

Gertrude’s sister Hedwig, for example, can be shown to have had direct contacts with any of her Andechs relatives on only a single occasion during her half-century career as duchess of Silesia. In January of 1203 just outside Breslau, her husband Duke Henry I of Silesia had a charter drawn up concerning his endowment of the newly-founded Cistercian convent at Trebnitz. Although Hedwig is not named in the document, the text does report that Bishop-elect Ekbert of Bamberg and his uncle, the cathedral provost Poppo, were present. Contemporary sources provide no explanation for why

---

91 Ibid., 91-92. LoPrete is especially critical of Georges Duby’s theories about powerful medieval women.

92 For examples of such research, see ibid., 92, note 6 as well as Cheyette, Ermengard of Narbonne and the articles in Evergates, ed., Aristocratic Women in Medieval France.

93 Schlesisches Urkundenbuch, 1:54-58, no. 83: “…Bambergensi electo domino Ekberto et patruo suo preposito Poppone tunc mecum gratia visitationis existentibus.”
the two Andechs churchmen were visiting Silesia at the time. However, the *Legenda maior de beata Hedwigi*, written around the year 1300, states that the Cistercian nuns who first populated Trebnitz all came from a convent within the diocese of Bamberg; furthermore, the first abbess had been Hedwig’s teacher as a child.\(^4\) Ekbert and Poppo therefore appear to have traveled to Silesia with the nuns in order to assist in the foundation and endowment of the new convent. In the process, they must have met with their relative Hedwig, whom they had presumably not seen since her marriage around 1190.\(^5\)

After 1203, there is no evidence Hedwig had contact with her brother Ekbert, her uncle Poppo, or any of her other Andechs kin before she died in 1243.\(^6\) Nevertheless, the transfer of nuns from Upper Franconia to Silesia is a clear indication that Hedwig maintained some ties to the family of her birth—at least during the early part of her career. A similar conclusion is, unfortunately, impossible to draw for any other Andechs woman born during the twelfth century besides Hedwig and her sister Gertrude. Reinhard Seitz has argued that Countess Gisela of Berg, daughter of Count Berthold I of Andechs, played a role in inviting her sister Mechthild to become abbess of the Swabian convent of Edelstetten in the mid-1150s, but this is only speculation.\(^7\) Alison Beach has

---


\(^5\) Gottschalk, 168 and 180-182.

\(^6\) For speculation about additional (undocumented) contacts between Hedwig and her Andechs relatives, see ibid., 182-193.

\(^7\) Reinhard W. Seitz, “Zur Person der Gisela, ‘Gräfin von Schwabegg’, ‘Stifterin des Frauenklosters Edelstetten,’” *Archivalische Zeitschrift* 80 (1997): 360-373. Seitz’s argument seems to me a plausible one, especially because Mechthild’s move from the Bavarian Diessen to the Swabian Edelstetten is difficult to explain without a factor like family influence. The fact that several of Gisela’s sons had contacts with their Andechs cousins during the later twelfth century is further evidence that the countess of
recently noted that one of the letters in a twelfth-century collection of correspondence from the convent at Admont was written in the 1160s or 1170s by one of the nuns to congratulate a newly-elected bishop of Brixen;\(^9\) it is possible the author was the Andechs nun Kunigunde of Admont and that she was writing to her half-brother Bishop-elect Otto of Brixen in 1165, but this is again purely speculation. Detailed, reliable sources from the period 1100-1204 that refer to direct contacts between Andechs women and their relatives simply do not survive in significant numbers.

As a result, the foundation of any attempt to understand the roles women played in the house of Andechs’s kinship networks cannot be the charters, tradition notices, and other archival materials that have been central to most of this dissertation. Different types of evidence most be sought. However, the discussion of sources at the beginning of this chapter has clearly shown that there is no group of texts that offers unfettered access into the lives of Andechs women. In most cases, all that is known with certainty about these female family members is their names. Historians working in the modern field of prosopography have, fortunately, recognized the potential of analyzing names. As Patrick Geary has noted, “Medieval naming followed complex patterns but never ‘rules’—decisions about how to designate children involved complicated strategies which, with patience and skill, can be partially recovered and thus provide insights into otherwise impenetrable areas of medieval social values.”\(^9\)

Constance Bouchard has also Berg may have maintained ties to the family of her birth (see Chapter Six). For the difficulty in interpreting the other surviving evidence for Abbess Mechthild’s family relationships, see Chapter Three.


recently argued, “[S]ince a girl of the upper nobility was generally given the name of an older relative, someone known personally by her parents, the particular name was chosen deliberately to identify her with the family group in general and with a successful or important woman specifically.” Analyzing names inside the house of Andechs thus offers the opportunity to integrate women at least partially into the family’s kinship networks.

The majority of names given to Andechs women during the twelfth century conform to the general patterns historians have found among other noble families of the central Middle Ages. Count Berthold I, Margrave Berthold II and Duke Berthold III all named one daughter—almost certainly the eldest in each case—after their mothers. Furthermore, each of these lords named one of his daughters Mechthild. Although it is unclear how this name first came into the house of Andechs, the repetition of the name in three consecutive generations is not unusual because younger daughters were often given the names of their father’s close female kin. Also unsurprising is that neither Count Berthold I nor Margrave Berthold II chose to give a daughter the name of his first wife, for wives were often considered outsiders by their husbands, only becoming integrated into the family under their sons. In the case of the heiress Sophia of Istria, it is her

The various articles in this book provide an excellent introduction to the current state of research into medieval naming patterns.


101 Berthold I’s daughter Gisela was the only one of his four daughters to marry, which strongly suggests she was the eldest. Berthold III’s daughter Hedwig appears to have been the first of his daughters to marry (around 1190), likely making her the eldest. It is more difficult to determine if Berthold II’s daughter Sophia was the eldest because so little is known about the marriages of her and her sisters.


103 Ibid., 120.
husband’s decision to name their eldest son after her father Margrave Poppo of Istria that reveals how significant her familial origins were for the house of Andechs. Count Berthold I did name a daughter after his second wife Kunigunde, but the girl was born late in his life and appears to have been destined for a convent from birth. More noteworthy is Duke Berthold III’s decision to give one of his daughters the name of his wife Agnes of Rochlitz, especially since this daughter was likely his second-born female child; the potential significance of Berthold III’s choice will be explored further below.

Four other Andechs daughters’ names are even more unconventional than that of Duke Berthold III’s daughter Agnes, and it is those names that do not follow expected patterns that can potentially reveal the most about the family’s kinship networks. Consider, for example, Margrave Berthold II’s decision to name one of his daughters Kunigunde. The two other women in the family with that name were Berthold II’s half-sister and his stepmother. Since his half-sister was placed in the convent at Admont while still a child, the more likely person after whom his daughter was named was his stepmother. But why did Berthold II name a daughter after a woman to whom he had no real kinship connection? Richard Loibl has suggested that Kunigunde of Vornbach was actively involved in securing her lineage’s inheritance for her stepson Berthold II, for he was not the only possible heir to Count Ekbert III of Neuburg. The margrave’s decision to name a daughter after her would certainly support this hypothesis; Berthold II

104 Loibl, 142 and 275-276. Recently, Alois Schütz has argued in favor of the position that Kunigunde of Vornbach had nothing to do with Count Berthold II’s acquisition of the Neuburg inheritance; he believes Berthold II’s wife Hedwig was actually the heiress of Count Ekbert III. See his “Die Grafen von Dießen und Andechs, Herzöge von Meranien,” in Königliche Töchterstäemme, Königswähler und Kurfürsten, ed. Armin Wolf (Frankfurt: Vittorio Klostermann, 2002), 276. I am, however, skeptical of this argument, for Kunigunde of Vornbach appears in contemporary sources as being actively involved in her family’s territorial interests (see note 71 above), while there is no direct evidence for Hedwig even being from this noble family.
may have been seeking to memorialize the woman who had personally helped him to expand his noble house’s power into Lower Bavaria. His daughter’s name may therefore offer a glimpse into an important family relationship.

There are three Andechs women with names that no other twelfth-century members of the noble house possessed. The first, Count Berthold I’s daughter Euphemia who became abbess of Altomünster, may have been named after one of her father’s sisters or other relatives, but the sources for Berthold I’s generation are not good enough to draw any clear conclusions. The remaining two Andechs daughters with unique names are Margrave Berthold II’s daughter Bertha by his second wife Liutgard of Denmark and Duke Berthold III’s daughter Gertrude. Neither woman was named after any known paternal relative, her mother, or even her maternal grandmother. Why were these daughters given the names Bertha and Gertrude? The answer to this question provides invaluable evidence concerning the roles women could play in kinship networks within the house of Andechs.

As noted earlier in this chapter, the only surviving source to refer to the marriage between Margrave Berthold II and Liutgard of Denmark is the Genealogia Wettinensis. This is also the only text to identify their children as Poppo and Bertha. The passage in the Genealogia where all of these members of the house of Andechs are discussed is therefore worth considering in full. It is part of the section of the genealogy concerning

---

105 Schütz, “Das Geschlecht der Andechs-Meranier,” 63 argues that Berthold II’s close relationship with Emperor Frederick I was likely the crucial factor in his receiving this inheritance. However, while imperial connections must have played a role, Schütz fails to account in this article for Berthold II’s unusual decision to name his daughter after his stepmother.

106 See Appendix One for Berthold I’s generation and that of his parents.

107 Liutgard of Denmark’s mother was named Adela and was from the house of Wettin, as will be discussed further below. The mother of Duke Berthold III’s wife Agnes was Matilda of Heinsberg.
the children of Conrad of Wettin († 1157), who was margrave of Meissen. According to
the *Genealogia*, Conrad “had six daughters…; the fifth, Adela, was married to King Sven
of Denmark. The king had by her a daughter Liutgard, who married Margrave Berthold
of [Istria]. After they [Berthold and Liutgard] had begotten Cathedral Provost Poppo of
Bamberg and Abbess Bertha of Gerbstedt, they were separated with the consent of the
bishops on account of the disgrace of adultery.”

The *Genealogia’s* frustratingly short mention of the dissolution of Berthold II’s
marriage to Liutgard raises more questions than it answers. Nevertheless, this evidence
that the marriage ended unexpectedly is significant. Because Berthold II and Liutgard’s
son was given the Andechs name Poppo, he was likely the first child of this union, born
before any charges of adultery had been leveled. In contrast, that their daughter was not
named after a relative from the house of Andechs suggests that Margrave Berthold II
never recognized her as a full member of his family. Berthold II may not have even been
involved in naming her. She may have been born after the dissolution of their marriage,
and there may have been questions about the identity of the girl’s father that led the
margrave to disown her entirely.

Bertha’s later career as abbess of Gerbstedt provides further insight into her
earliest years. The Benedictine convent at Gerbstedt, which lay near the Elbe River south
of Magdeburg, had close connections to the house of Wettin—the birth family of

---

108 *Genealogia Wettinensis*, 228: “Filias quoque genuit sex…; quinta Adela copulatur regi
Danorum Suenoni, qui genuit ex ea Lucardem, quam duxit Bertoldus marchio de Bavaria [sic]; qui cum
genuissent Popponem Bavenergensem prepositum et Bertam Gerbestadensem abbatissam, consensus
episcoporum propter notam adulterii separantur.”
Bertha’s maternal grandmother.\textsuperscript{109} According to the Genealogia Wettinensis in its discussion of Conrad of Wettin’s six daughters, the margrave of Meissen “made three of them nuns at Gerbstedt: Abbesses Oda and Bertha of Gerbstedt and Abbess Agnes of Quedlinburg.”\textsuperscript{110} Thus, Berthold II’s daughter Bertha had a maternal great-aunt who had her name and preceded her as abbess of Gerbstedt.\textsuperscript{111} It is unlikely that this is a coincidence. While the precise reasons are unclear, Liutgard of Denmark’s maternal relatives incorporated her daughter by Berthold II into their own noble house. Indeed, the Wettin Margrave Henry of Meissen († 1288) even referred to this Bertha in a 1238 charter as “our dearest relative Abbess Bertha of Gerbstedt.”\textsuperscript{112} Though completely isolated from the house of Andechs, Berthold II’s daughter Bertha nevertheless had a successful career because she was able to acquire a Wettin identity through her maternal grandmother.

Bertha was not the only woman born into the house of Andechs who was given a Wettin name. As previously noted, Duke Berthold III of Merania named his second daughter after his wife Agnes of Rochlitz. Like Liutgard of Denmark, Agnes of Rochlitz was a granddaughter of Conrad of Wettin; her father Count Dedo of Rochlitz was one of Conrad’s six sons. The late 1160s and the 1170s—the period when Liutgard of Denmark


\textsuperscript{110} Genealogia Wettinensis, 228: “…quarum tres Gerberstat monachas fecit, Odam et Bertam abbatissam Gerbestadensem, Agnetam Quidelingenburgensem abbatissam.”

\textsuperscript{111} Max Gerstenberg, Untersuchungen über das ehemalige Kloster Gerbstedt (Halle, 1911), 36-37 and 60-61 argues that the Bertha who was Conrad of Wettin’s daughter likely died around the year 1195 and that the Bertha who was Berthold II’s daughter was abbess from the early 1200s until ca. 1249. See also Fritz Buttenberg, “Das Kloster zu Gerbstedt,” Zeitschrift des Harz-Vereins für Geschichte und Altertumskunde 52 (1919): 1-30.

and Agnes of Rochlitz married into the house of Andechs and when their daughters Bertha and Agnes were born—thus saw numerous contacts between the Andechses and the Wettins. It is therefore not surprising that the name Gertrude, which Duke Berthold III gave to his third daughter, is a name that can also be found among noblewomen from the house of Wettin.

The *Genealogia Wettinensis*, in its list of Conrad of Wettin’s daughters, identifies the first three of these women as the aforementioned Abbesses Oda, Bertha and Agnes. The fifth in the list is Adela, Liutgard of Denmark’s mother. Between the trio of abbesses and their sister Adela in the *Genealogia* is another of Conrad’s daughters:

“Gertrude, the fourth, married the count-palatine of the Rhine. After her husband died, she made Christ her heir and built a church in honor of St. Theodore in Bamberg. There, she joined with nuns servile to God and ended her life in this holy profession.”

The foundation of this new Bamberg religious community, whose nuns followed the Cistercian rule, has generally been dated to 1157. Bishop Eberhard II of Bamberg (1146-1170) supported the convent, as did his successor Bishop Herman II (1170-1177). In a charter of Bishop Hermann II dated to 1174, for example, he confirmed a series of earlier donations to St. Theodore. Included among these was a grant Bishop Eberhard II

---

113 *Genealogia Wettinensis*, 228: “…quarta nupsit palatino Reni Gerdrudis, que viro defuncto Christum heredem faciens, ecclesiam in honore beati Theodori Bavenberg construxit ibique monialibus Deo famulantibus se socians, in sancta conversacione vitam finivit.” For the difficulties involved in identifying her husband, see Pätzold, 286.

made in conjunction with Margrave Berthold II of Istria. The house of Andechs thus had ties to Gertrude’s convent from its earliest years.

Beginning in the episcopacy of Bishop Otto II of Bamberg, St. Theodore became a focal point for the house of Andechs’s patronage strategies. Although this convent was not a house monastery as historians have traditionally understood and defined that term, several family members had strong ties to the convent in the later twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. A total of eleven charters from Bishop Otto II survive for St. Theodore. Bishop Eckbert of Bamberg had various connections to this religious community as well. Duke Berthold III’s daughter Hedwig used nuns from St. Theodore to help found the monastery of Trebnitz in Silesia. Mechthild, Hedwig’s sister, was a nun at St. Theodore before becoming abbess of Kitzingen. Queen Gertrude of Hungary made a grant to the convent shortly before her death. Duke Otto I of Merania, the brother of these three women, donated property to St. Theodore as well. In a span of approximately a half-century, seven members of the house of Andechs, including five of the eight children of Duke Berthold III, can be connected to this small convent in Bamberg. Given this context, it seems likely that St. Theodore’s founder, Gertrude of Wettin, factored into Duke Berthold III’s decision to name his third


116 Zink, 92.

117 Ibid.

118 Gottschalk, 180-181.

119 Arnold, 23.

120 Zink, 301-302, no. 19.

121 Ibid., 310-312, no. 25.
daughter Gertrude; she is the only woman with the name Gertrude who can be tied to the house of Andechs.

There are few surviving sources that reveal strong connections between the male members of the houses of Andechs and Wettin. Although Count Dedo of Rochlitz was a frequent visitor to the court of Emperor Frederick I after he inherited his lordships from his father in 1156, he does not appear in the witness list of an imperial charter with Margrave Berthold II of Istria, another regular at court, until 1179—several years after their children Agnes and Berthold III had already married. The only noteworthy appearance of Dedo and Berthold II in an extant text dates to 1185, when they both witnessed a donation to the monastery of Seitenstätten by Archbishop Wichmann of Magdeburg, to whom they were both distantly related. Duke Berthold III can be found alongside his father-in-law on only two occasions, in the witness lists of a pair of imperial charters from 1180 and 1187.

Thus, a study of the houses of Andechs and Wettin that focuses exclusively on the male members of the lineages reveals minimal evidence for contacts. By placing women at the center of the analysis of Andechs-Wettin connections, however, a strong kinship network clearly emerges. As Figure 7.1 indicates, Wettin names became commonplace among Andechs women in the later twelfth century; the house of Andechs did not borrow

---

122 MGH D Friedrich I, 3:348-350, no. 787. This charter is a forgery but is based on an authentic original. According to the editors of Frederick’s charters, the witness list is reliable.


names from any other noble house with such frequency. But naming patterns are not the only reason why women are important for reconstructing Andechs-Wettin contacts. The foundation of the convent of St. Theodore in Bamberg by Gertrude of Wettin was critical to this kinship network as well because the religious community became central to Andechs patronage strategies. The connections numerous Andechs women had to the convent of St. Theodore reveal that there was a complex set of female relationships operating within the noble house—but largely outside the gaze of the surviving sources. Genealogical evidence and scattered references in a few documents are unfortunately all

---

125 For an analysis of why the house of Wettin was of such interest to the house of Andechs, see Chapter Eight.
III. Conclusions

Since the 1960s, historians have increasingly recognized that twelfth-century noblewomen had more rights to family property than earlier generations of scholars once believed. Only in the last decade, however, have historians begun to appreciate fully the potential significance of these women in the exercising of political power and territorial lordship in western and central Europe. Kimberly LoPrete’s work on Countess Adela of Blois and Frederic Cheyette’s monumental study of Viscountess Ermengard of Narbonne have demonstrated that influential noblewomen were not as uncommon as once thought; the famous Eleanor of Aquitaine is no longer considered to be unique, the one woman in twelfth-century Europe capable of operating effectively in the male-dominated political arena. 126 Among the members of the house of Andechs, Queen Gertrude of Hungary stands out as another of these powerful women, for her role in events inside Hungary during the early 1200s is impossible to ignore.

In general, however, the women who married or were born into the house of Andechs during the twelfth century do not appear to have been prominent figures in the noble house’s kinship networks of cooperation and support. The majority of Andechs women are almost completely absent from contemporary documents, and modern historians are fortunate just to know many of their names. How can the lack of evidence for the female Andechses be explained, given recent arguments about the authority and

influence of medieval noblewomen? The answer lies in the dense network of men who surrounded the Andechs women. Because the lords in the house of Andechs were long-lived and fathered numerous male heirs—and because the majority of these lords’ daughters provided their own husbands with an abundance of male heirs—Andechs women were rarely in a position to wield power directly in their roles as wives, mothers, sisters, or daughters. Throughout the twelfth century, there were consistently adult men available to inherit the bulk of the family’s property, to succeed to lordships and to make political decisions. As a result, the types of sources that survive from the central Middle Ages reveal virtually nothing about the women in the house of Andechs.

This study of female family relationships thus raises broader questions about the current emphasis in the historiography on powerful noblewomen. Recent scholars have convincingly shown that there is rich evidence for women possessing property rights and political influence. But how much of a noblewoman’s power was based on weakness within her noble house’s male kinship networks of cooperation and support? In other words, did the typical medieval noblewoman have any independent foundation for her authority within her father’s or husband’s family, or did the absence of male relatives provide her with her only real opportunity to wield power? The lack of sources for most Andechs women clearly suggests that historians must approach issues of female lordship and authority cautiously. While women undoubtedly had important roles to play inside their kinship groups, the analysis of Andechs family relationships reveals that more research needs to be done if those roles are to be properly understood.
PART IV

SYNTHESIS
CHAPTER EIGHT

THE RISE OF THE HOUSE OF ANDECHS: FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS AND IMPERIAL POLITICS IN THE TWELFTH CENTURY

What roles did intra-familial relationships play in shaping the history of the house of Andechs between the years 1100 and 1204? Because each of the last three chapters has concentrated on a different piece of the Andechs family, this dissertation has thus far been able to answer this question in only a fragmentary manner. Chapter Five analyzed the careers of the secular lords at the heart of the lineage and explained how family relationships affected decisions concerning succession. The importance of Andechs churchmen for the noble house’s kinship networks of cooperation and support was the focus of Chapter Six. Lastly, in Chapter Seven, those women who were Andechses by birth or marriage took center stage; despite a problematic source base, their interactions with the other members of their kin group were explored. These various segments of the family must now be reunited in order to consider the ways in which the noblemen and noblewomen of the house of Andechs functioned as a single kinship network during the twelfth century.

The aim of this chapter is to explain by progressing chronologically through the period 1100 to 1204 how family relationships affected the political strategies of the members of the house of Andechs. As will be shown, decisions relating to marriage
alliances, inheritance practices and the exercise of territorial lordship all become clearer when viewed from the perspective of kin interactions. This is not to suggest that family relationships are the only factor that influenced the noble house’s politics during the twelfth century; however, networks of cooperation and support operating inside the kinship group shaped family members’ strategies to a much greater extent than scholars have generally realized.¹ Only by reconstructing these networks can historians begin to understand how the house of Andechs rose to the upper echelons of the imperial nobility by the early 1200s.

I. ca. 1100 – ca. 1120

The first nobleman to appear in an extant source with the cognomen “de Andechs” is the Berthold who has been labeled Count Berthold I of Andechs throughout this dissertation.² Because he is the earliest known member of his extended kinship group to title himself after the castle, Berthold has generally been identified by historians as the lord who built this fortification overlooking the waters of Ammer Lake in Upper Bavaria.³ As noted in Chapter One, Karl Schmid and numerous other historians have

¹ Throughout this chapter, I will also consider some of the other factors that affected the noble house’s strategies, including most notably the development of the Andechs ministerialage and the Königsnähe of the family’s secular and ecclesiastical lords. Nevertheless, intra-familial relationships will be the focus of this chapter because no historian has attempted to understand in a coherent manner how these relationships impacted the history of the noble house.

² Tr. Tegernsee, 103, no. 132 (1092-1113) identifies him in the witness list as “Perhtolt de Anedehse.”

since the 1950s attached special significance to the construction of castles during the eleventh and early twelfth centuries; according to these scholars, many German nobles who built new centers of lordship for themselves and their descendants in these years were key figures in the transformation of the sips of the early medieval period into the lineages of the central Middle Ages. With the advantage of hindsight, modern historians can recognize Count Berthold I of Andechs as one of these lords, for he was the founder of a new line of counts that would survive five generations until 1248.4

None of this means, however, that one can presuppose the existence of the house of Andechs during the opening years of the twelfth century. Three of the five earliest references to Count Berthold I in the extant sources name him alongside members of his extended kinship group who had no territorial interests at or around Andechs.5 In the witness list of a Tegernsee tradition notice dated to between the years 1092 and 1113, his name is followed immediately by that of Leopold of Diessen, one of his (second?) cousins from the branch of the kinship group that would later become the house of Wolfratshausen.6 A text concerning Berthold’s earliest reported connection to the monks at Benediktbeuern includes him in the witness list alongside Count Otto of Diessen and

---

4 The beginning of Berthold’s career can be seen as marking a sharp break in the history of his kinship group. As noted in Appendix One, the Count Arnold who was almost certainly Berthold’s father used the cognomen “of Diessen”—like most of Berthold’s known eleventh-century ancestors. Berthold’s establishment of Andechs as the new center of his Bavarian lordship therefore signals the start of his break from earlier family traditions. It is for this reason that he can be labeled the founder of a new lineage.

5 The region between Ammer Lake and Starnberger Lake, where the castle of Andechs was located, was not a traditional center of power for Count Berthold I’s ancestors. This region only became important for Berthold’s lordship in Upper Bavaria after he acquired the Benediktbeuern advocacy, for Benediktbeuern was one of the major landholders in the area between the lakes. See Chapter Two and Holzfurtner, 155-160.

6 Tr. Tegernsee, 103, no. 132. This reference to Leopold is also discussed in Appendix One.
Amras, Leopold’s father. Furthermore, the count of Andechs made one of his first known property grants, a donation between 1102 and 1114 to the monastery of Weihenstephan, jointly with his paternal uncle, the churchman Conrad of Jasberg. In short, Count Berthold I of Andechs belonged to a diffuse kinship network in the early 1100s. During no other twenty-year span of the twelfth century is it possible to find a similar concentration of sources that connects an Andechs lord to several distant relatives. Moreover, there is no evidence to suggest Berthold perceived himself as the founder of a new, self-consciously distinct noble house at the start of his career.

As has been discussed in Chapter Four, one reason for Berthold’s ties to such a broad range of relatives in the years around 1100 was the complex inheritance situation within his extended kin group. Overlapping territorial interests in Upper Bavaria, especially in and around Diessen, brought these noblemen into frequent contact with one another. The castle of Diessen had even served as the shared residence for several of Count Berthold I’s relations during the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries. The construction of the castle of Andechs must therefore be recognized as only an initial step in Berthold’s efforts to establish an independent power base for himself and his heirs. The maintenance of pre-existing kinship networks remained essential to his success as he began to rule as count.


8 Tr. Weihenstephan, 57-59, no. 70. See Appendix One for more on this text.

9 Thus, although modern historians can, for the sake of convenience, label him the first member of a new lineage, it is better to understand Count Berthold I of Andechs’s kin relations in the early twelfth century as being based more on the models of the extended kinship group and the sip than on the model of the noble house. See Chapter One for more on these kinship structures.
A second reason why Count Berthold I of Andechs continued to have contacts with distant relatives during the early 1100s is equally significant; the new lord had not yet constructed around himself his own kin network of cooperation and support. There is no evidence to suggest that Berthold had any relatives residing with him at Andechs at the start of his career. He therefore remained dependent on the family relationships he had inherited from his father. This situation only began to change with his marriage to Sophia of Istria, which likely occurred between the years 1105 and 1115, but even this union did not immediately transform Count Berthold I into the head of a new noble house. None of his children by Sophia could have reached adulthood before 1120, meaning they were of limited political and strategic value to him during his early career.\(^{10}\) Moreover, because Sophia was an heiress, she did not bring with her into their marriage a group of close male relatives to whom her husband could turn for support.\(^{11}\) Count Berthold I thus remained closely bound to the extended kin group of his paternal ancestors throughout the opening two decades of the twelfth century.

The analysis of family relationships sheds valuable light on the earliest period of Andechs history. From the perspective of territorial lordship, the first twenty years of Berthold I’s career as count of Andechs were of central importance because he established his authority across a broad expanse of Upper Bavaria during this period. He combined the inheritance he had received from his father with newly-gained rights,

\(^{10}\) For the marriage of Sopia and Berthold I and the possible years of birth of their children, see Appendix Three, no. 1.

\(^{11}\) This is a point that is not frequently emphasized in discussions about the value of heiresses on the marriage market. In the case of Sophia, historians generally focus on two issues. The first is the Carniolan lands she brought with her into the marriage. The second is the fact that many of the genealogical connections the Andechses had to leading imperial families, including the Staufens, ran through Sophia. These genealogical connections involved Sophia’s ancestors and distant kin, however; Sophia’s only close relative alive at the time of her marriage was her sister Hedwig.
including most notably the advocacy for Benediktbeuern, to build a stable comital lordship. By 1120, he had already begun to construct a network of ministerials across his lands to help in the administration of his properties and rights. His endowment of the first community of canons at Diessen around 1114 is an indication that, like many of his contemporaries among the imperial nobility, he had become a patron of the religious reform movement as well. Nevertheless, despite his numerous lordly activities, the lack of a strong network of close kin meant the count’s power base was not completely secure during his early career. Between 1100 and 1120, Berthold was a young nobleman attempting to consolidate his authority and influence while relying on the occasional support of distant relatives; only with hindsight can his actions during these years be recognized as laying the foundation for the rise of one of the most prominent imperial noble houses of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

II. ca. 1120 – 1135

Previous narrative histories of the Andechses have focused relatively little attention on the fifteen years between approximately 1120 and 1135. Sources for Count Berthold I of Andechs’s politics and lordship during this period do not reveal any significant modifications to his strategies from the preceding decades. He continued to focus much of his attention on strengthening his position in Upper Bavaria. The majority of references to Berthold in the documents from this period can be found in Diessen


13 Oefe, 227-228, no. 3 (1116) is the earliest surviving document to include explicitly in its witness list “ministeriales Bertolfi comitis.” It lists six of his ministerials “et alii quam plures.”

14 For Count Berthold I and the early years of the Diessen house of canons, see Chapter Four.
When viewed through the lens of family relationships, however, these fifteen years emerge as a critical phase in the career of the first count of Andechs. In 1120, Berthold belonged to an extended kin group that had been shaped entirely by the inheritance and succession patterns of the later eleventh century; in 1135, the kinship network of cooperation and support surrounding the count included none of these distant relatives with whom he had previously maintained close contacts. The emergence of a completely new network—what modern historians refer to as the noble house of Andechs—was the result of three decisive changes that occurred inside Berthold’s kin group during the 1120s and early 1130s.

First, a series of deaths within the count of Andechs’s extended family weakened the kinship network that had been active during Berthold’s early career. The paternal uncle with whom Count Berthold I had made a joint grant to Weihenstephan, the canon Conrad of Jasberg, died in this period. Several family properties he had controlled during his lifetime, including a saltworks in Bad Reichenhall, passed by inheritance to Berthold. Evidence for the death of another of the count’s relatives survives in a Diessen tradition notice; at some point between 1123 and 1127, the count of Andechs made a donation to the house of canons for the soul of an unnamed brother—almost certainly the last of Berthold’s male siblings to die. Furthermore, in 1121 or 1122,

---

15 See Tr. Diessen, 4-5, no. 2; 6-8, no. 4; 8-9, no. 5; 16-17, no. 11; and 102-105, no. 2.

16 For the saltworks, see UB Steiermark 1:329-330, no. 342. This document was not written until the early 1150s but indicates that there had been a dispute over this saltworks for twenty years—since Berthold had first granted it to the monastery of Admont following his uncle’s death. This would suggest Conrad died in either the late 1120s or early 1130s. For more on Conrad, see Schütz, “Die Grafen von Dießen und Andechs,” 267-269.

17 Tr. Diessen, 6-8, no. 4. Schlögl believes this brother was Dietrich, whose descendants took the cognomen “of Wasserburg” (7). Berthold’s other two known brothers, Gebhard and Otto, disappeared from the sources around the year 1100 and did not found their own lineages. See Appendix One.
Count Otto of Diessen and Amras died. His death may have been the most significant for the count of Andechs, for Otto’s designation in Necrology A of Liutold’s Codex as “maior domus” suggests he had been the leading figure in Berthold’s extended kinship group during the early 1100s.\(^{18}\) Count Otto’s death, as well as the deaths of Count Berthold I’s uncle and brother, meant that the old networks of cooperation and support to which Berthold had belonged prior to the 1120s were disappearing.

The second critical change that occurred in the period between approximately 1120 and 1135 involved Count Berthold I of Andechs’s decision to sever his territorial connections to Count Otto of Diessen and Amras’s descendants in the Wolfratshausen branch of the kin group. As has been discussed in Chapter Four, Berthold and his wife Sophia as well as Count Otto I of Wolfratshausen and his wife Lauritta played a direct role in the transfer of the Diessen community of canons to the church of St. Stephen in the mid-1120s. The purpose of this joint action appears to have been the neutralization of their competing claims to properties at Diessen; the endowment of the religious community meant Berthold and Otto no longer had overlapping rights in the place that had been in the later eleventh century the center of their kin group’s lordship in Upper Bavaria. Following the grant in 1132 of papal protection for the Diessen house of canons, contacts between the Andechses and the Wolfratshausens virtually ceased.\(^{19}\)

\(^{18}\) Michael Borgolte, “Stiftergedenken in Kloster Dießen. Ein Beitrag zur Kritik bayerischer Traditionsbücher,” *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 24 (1990): 267 (24 April): “Otto comes senior et maior domus obiit.” Schütz, “Die Grafen von Dießen und Andechs,” 267, note 149 suggests that Otto held an especially prominent position within his kinship group before he died. Since Otto had been appearing in sources for more than a half-century prior to his death, he was unquestionably an elder statesman within the kinship group (see Appendix One).

\(^{19}\) This papal document is Tr. Diessen, 102-105, no. 2. It is discussed at length in Chapter Four.
Count Berthold I of Andechs was able to distance himself from his Wolfratshausen relatives because of the third key change affecting his kinship network during the period 1120 to 1135: the emergence of the next generation of his own family. By the late 1120s and early 1130s, Berthold’s six children by his wife Sophia of Istria had survived infancy and their first few years, when so many medieval children succumbed to disease. ²⁰ The count’s two eldest sons, Poppo and Berthold II, had already begun to appear in sources alongside their father. ²¹ A pair of Berthold I’s daughters had been placed in religious communities, laying the foundation for the extension of the Andechs kinship network into the ecclesiastical sphere. As further evidence of the growing importance of the count’s nuclear family during this period, he arranged the first marriage of one of his children in or shortly before 1135. His oldest daughter Gisela was married to Count Diepold II of Berg. ²² This alliance with a Swabian noble family whose lands lay to the west of the county of Andechs suggests Berthold was seeking to build a new network of cooperation and support around his Upper Bavarian lands—one that did not rely upon his distant paternal kin.

Thus, through a combination of natural events and Berthold’s own actions, the kinship group surrounding the first count of Andechs underwent a dramatic transformation in the fifteen years between 1120 and 1135. The network of relatives with whom Count Berthold I had contacts at the start of this period bore no resemblance to the kin network of which he was a member one and a half decades later. Central to this

²⁰ See Appendix Three, no. 1 for the possible years of birth for Berthold’s children by Sophia.
²¹ See especially Tr. Diessen, 4-5, no. 2 and 8-9, no. 5.
²² See Chapters Six and Seven for this marriage.
transformation was the increasing tendency for Berthold to be named in the surviving sources alongside members of his nuclear family instead of members of his extended kinship group. As a result of this development, the period between 1120 and 1135 marks the appearance of the house of Andechs as a new political force in the southeast of the German empire. Count Berthold I finally emerged during these years as the head of his own family—a family initially based at the Upper Bavarian castle of Andechs.²³

III. 1135 – 1148

In the year 1135, Count Berthold I of Andechs appeared for the first time in a document from Upper Franconia when he witnessed Bishop Otto I of Bamberg’s charter for the monastery of Vessra.²⁴ Historians of the house of Andechs have generally been interested in this text because Berthold is identified in the witness list by the cognomen “de Plassenberch.”²⁵ Located on lands in eastern Franconia the count had inherited from his mother, the Schweinfurt heiress Gisela, this castle has been described by modern scholars as the earliest center of Andechs lordship in Upper Franconia.²⁶ The bishop of

²³ I have consciously avoided using the term “lineage” here because the house of Andechs was still essentially a nuclear family in this period rather than a kinship group that included several generations based around a line of lords stretching back into the past.

²⁴ Staatsarchiv Bamberg, BU 192. For a summary of the charter, see Das Urkundenbuch des Abtes Andreas im Kloster Michelsberg bei Bamberg, ed. C.A. Schweitzer, BHVB 16 (1853): 14-15. Count Berthold I’s only earlier reported contact with Franconia dates from around 1110, when he was named in a charter of the Lower Franconian bishop of Würzburg: MB, 37:35-37, no. 75.

²⁵ Staatsarchiv Bamberg, BU 192: “Bertholdus comes de Plassenberch.” The title “comes de Andechs” remained the most common title for Count Berthold in the sources after 1135, but “de Plassenberch” was used occasionally in Upper Franconian texts.

Bamberg’s charter thus provides the first direct evidence that Count Berthold I had begun in the mid-1130s to involve himself in Franconian affairs and to exert his authority over the territories he controlled in the region.

Berthold’s appearance with the cognomen “de Plassenberch” is not the only reason this document is significant, however. Immediately following the count in the witness list is “his son Poppo.” This means that Count Berthold I of Andechs’s earliest known connection to events in Upper Franconia did not occur until his firstborn son was old enough to accompany him on the journey north from Bavaria. Only two years later in 1137, Berthold and Poppo were named together in another of Bishop Otto I’s charters, and Poppo received from the bishop the advocacy over a group of properties in Franconia—evidence the young nobleman had already reached adulthood. Thus, the timing of Count Berthold I of Andechs’s earliest appearance in Upper Franconia was clearly influenced by his family relationships; he did not begin to pursue aggressively the expansion of his territorial lordship into this region until his son Poppo was capable of playing an active role in his strategies.

The references to Poppo in Bishop Otto I of Bamberg’s 1135 and 1137 charters provide important evidence for the start of a new phase in the history of the house of Andechs. From the mid-1130s until Poppo’s death on the Second Crusade in 1148, there was a strong kinship network functioning at the heart of the noble house which brought a new level of stability to the Andechs family. While Count Berthold I and his eldest son

---

27 Staatsarchiv Bamberg, BU 192: “Poppo filius eius.”

28 Poppo was quite possibly already in his early twenties by 1135. See Appendix Three, no. 1.

29 P. Aemiliani Ussermann, Episcopatus Bambergensis sub S. Sede Apostolica Chronologice ac Diplomatice Illustratus (St. Blasien, 1802), 84-85, no. 90.
Poppo were the most active members of this network, they were not the only Andechses who participated in family strategies in these years. By 1140, the count’s second son Berthold II had already been present at the imperial court and the Bavarian ducal court—without his father. Furthermore, during the early and mid-1140s, Berthold I’s youngest son Otto appeared for the first time in the surviving sources when he witnessed a pair of Benediktbeuern tradition notices. Four adult male members of the noble house were thus involved in Andechs politics and lordship during the thirteen years between 1135 and 1148.

Count Berthold I of Andechs’s decision around 1135 to begin actively asserting his authority in Upper Franconia was only the first step in his new strategy for expanding the position of his noble house within the German empire. During the late 1130s, he married his eldest son to the heiress Kunizza of Giech and thus established Poppo as one of the most influential noblemen in the region around Bamberg. Bishop Egilbert of Bamberg’s dissolution of Poppo and Kunizza’s marriage in 1142 failed to weaken the noble house’s position in Franconia significantly. Indeed, the involvement of Poppo, his brother Berthold II and their father Count Berthold I in the 1143 treaty with the bishop provides clear evidence for how strong the Andechs network of cooperation and support was during these years. By the start of the Second Crusade, the new bishop Eberhard II (1146-1170) had accepted Poppo’s comital authority within the diocese of

30 MGH D Lothar III, 194-202, no. 120 (22 Sept. 1137) and UB Babenberger, 1:17-19, no. 13 (9 July 1140).

31 Baumann, 18, no. 30 and 25, no. 50.

32 See Chapters Two and Five.

33 Paul Oesterreicher, Denkwürdigkeiten der fränkischen Geschichte, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf das Fürstbischofamt Bamberg, vol. 3 (Bamberg, 1832), 87-88, no. 7.
Bamberg, and the house of Andechs was firmly entrenched in Upper Franconia. The arrival of a new generation on the political scene was therefore central to the emergence of the family’s power in a region that Count Berthold I had virtually ignored during the first thirty-five years of his career.

The period between 1135 and 1148 also witnessed the expansion of Andechs lordship into Carniola. Like Upper Franconia, this was a region where Count Berthold I had possessed rights and properties since the opening years of the twelfth century. However, the first appearance in a surviving source of a “Count Berthold of Stein”—who took his cognomen from the noble house’s castle in the modern Slovenian town of Kamnik—dates from the mid-1140s. This suggests Count Berthold I of Andechs again waited for his sons to reach adulthood before he sought to exercise directly his house’s lordship in a region outside the duchy of Bavaria. Indeed, the nature of the Andechs kinship network during the 1140s was such that the precise identity of “Count Berthold of Stein” is impossible to determine; both Berthold I and his son Berthold II were actively involved in the family’s political and territorial affairs in this period. As a result, either one could have acted as the family’s representative at Kamnik. The strength of the relationships among the Andechs men who were alive in the years between 1135 and

---

34 Count Berthold I’s claims in Carniola were acquired through his wife, the heiress Sophia of Istria. See Chapter Two for more on this point.

35 MHDC, 3:304, no. 770: “comes Bertoldus de Stein.” For a detailed analysis of this text, see Chapter Two, note 71.

36 There was already a network of ministerials in place on the family’s Carniolan lands by the mid-1140s, meaning the Andechs lordship in Carniola was not necessarily being neglected prior to this time. See Peter Štih, “Krain in der Zeit der Grafen von Andechs,” in Grofje Andeško-Meranski: Prispevki k zgodovini Evrope v visokem srednjem veku / Die Andechs-Meranier: Beiträge zur Geschichte Europas im Hochmittelalter, eds. Andreja Eržen and Toni Aigner (Kamnik: Kulturverein Kamnik, 2001), 13-14.
1148 enabled the different members of the noble house to pursue their family’s interests in Upper Bavaria, Upper Franconia and Carniola simultaneously.

Territorial lordship was not the only aspect of Andechs political power that Count Berthold I and his sons successfully expanded during this period. Between 1100 and 1135, Count Berthold I was named on only a single occasion in the witness list of a royal/imperial charter, prompting Alois Schütz in a recent article to argue for the Königsferne (distance from the king) of the Andechses during the early twelfth century. Beginning in 1135, however, there was a dramatic increase in the frequency of visits by Andechs men to the courts of Lothar III and Conrad III. Berthold I and his oldest son were often present on those occasions when the ruler was in Regensburg, Bamberg or Nuremberg between 1135 and 1148. More significantly, Poppo and his younger brother Berthold II accompanied Emperor Lothar III on his Italian expedition in 1137, and Count Berthold I traveled well beyond his usual sphere of influence in order to attend King Conrad III’s court at Frankfurt in 1140. Poppo and Berthold II’s witnessing of a series of Conrad III’s charters from 1147 further reveals that these two lords became central figures in the German contingent’s preparations for the Second Crusade. Thus, the dramatic transition from the Königsferne of the early twelfth century to the Königsnähe

---

37 Schütz, “Die Grafen von Dießen und Andechs,” 266-274. The one appearance of Count Berthold I in the witness list of a royal charter between 1100 and 1135 dates from the year 1130: MGH D Lothar III, 42-43, no. 27.

38 See, for example, MGH D Konrad III, 18-19, no 10; 114-121, nos. 65-68; 189-192, no. 106; and 272-274, no. 149.

39 MGH D Lothar III, 194-202, no. 120 (Aquino 1137) and MGH D Konrad III, 73-74, no. 44 (Frankfurt 1140).

40 MGH D Konrad III, 302-304, no. 167; 311-312, no. 172; and 349-353, nos. 192-193.
(nearness to the king) of the period 1135 to 1148 is additional evidence for the vibrancy of the Andechs kin network that emerged during these years.

Count Berthold I of Andechs showed virtually no interest in Upper Franconia, Carniola and the royal/imperial court during the first three and a half decades of his career. His strategy began to change noticeably in 1135, however. Over the next thirteen years, the Andechses embarked upon a period of rapid expansion; they ceased to be simply an Upper Bavarian comital family and emerged as one of the leading noble houses in the German empire. As has been argued here, the active participation of four adult men in Andechs politics and lordship was the most important reason for the family’s success during these years. The strong network of cooperation and support that bound together Count Berthold I and his sons between 1135 and 1148 was central to the Andechses’ ability to extend their influence in multiple directions simultaneously. This period therefore offers the first clear evidence from Andechs history for how family relationships were able to shape the political and territorial strategies of a noble house during the central Middle Ages.

IV. 1149 – 1164

When Berthold II of Andechs returned from the Second Crusade in 1149, he was not accompanied by his older brother Poppo, who had died at Constantinople in December of the previous year. As has been discussed in Chapter Five, it is impossible to know how the succession would have transpired had Poppo survived the journey home from the Holy Land. While the youngest of Count Berthold I’s sons, Otto, may have been intended for the Church from an early age despite his involvement in secular affairs
during the 1140s, it seems likely there would have been some kind of division of the Andechs lordships between at least Poppo and Berthold II. Regardless, Poppo’s death marked the beginning of a period of transition for the kinship network operating at the center of the noble house. Count Berthold I of Andechs died in 1151, and by 1153 at the latest Otto had started his career as a churchman.\textsuperscript{41} The set of family relationships that had been central to the success of the house of Andechs between 1135 and 1148 had ceased to exist.

The first evidence for the new kinship dynamic confronting Count Berthold II of Andechs dates from 1149 or shortly thereafter. According to a text written at the monastery of Admont, Berthold II granted to the religious community a set of properties which he had initially placed “into the trusteeship of his relative Duke Henry [V] of Carinthia.”\textsuperscript{42} This duke was only distantly related to the count of Andechs, and there are no other surviving sources that indicate there were close contacts between them.\textsuperscript{43} Indeed, the Admont document where the donation is preserved states that Duke Henry V was so slow turning over Berthold II’s gift to the monastery that he had to be “courteously and lawfully admonished by the brothers” in the presence of the archbishop of Salzburg before he finally completed the transaction.\textsuperscript{44} That the duke did not feel compelled to follow precisely the count’s wishes suggests the bond between Henry and Berthold II was not a very strong one. In the period around 1150, however, Count

\textsuperscript{41} See Chapter Five.
\textsuperscript{42} MHDC, 3:339, no. 872: “…in manum et fidem cognati sui Heinrici ducis de Karinthia.”
\textsuperscript{43} See Chapter Three for further discussion of Duke Henry V’s appearance in this text.
\textsuperscript{44} MHDC, 3:339, no. 872: “…a fratribus admonitus beneigne and legitme…”
Berthold II of Andechs did not have a multitude of other relatives on whom he could have relied.

From the perspective of family relationships, Berthold II’s situation did not improve significantly over the course of the fifteen years between 1149 and 1164. He had contact on at least one occasion with his younger brother during the mid-1150s, but Otto was just beginning his Church career in this period and had not yet obtained an important office through which he could support Berthold II’s politics and lordship. Furthermore, while the count’s marriage to his first wife Hedwig likely occurred soon after his return from the Second Crusade, there is no evidence to suggest any of their children had reached the age of majority by 1164. The distantly-related Duke Henry V of Carinthia, the cleric Otto and Hedwig, whose family origins are unknown, were thus the only adult relatives with whom Berthold II had any close contacts in this fifteen-year period. Even these family relationships are difficult to analyze as evidence for the Andechs kinship network of the years from 1149 to 1164. As noted in Chapter Three, all of the surviving sources for the count’s relationships with these three family members concern Berthold II’s ties to the monastery of Admont. The political and territorial interests of this religious community therefore obscure the true nature of the kinship bonds connecting the count to his relatives in these years.

Given that Count Berthold II of Andechs could not rely on a strong kinship network to support him between the years 1149 and 1164, what kinds of political

---

45 See Chapters Three and Six.
46 See Chapters Five and Seven.
47 Although there was a distant kinship bond between Count Berthold II and Emperor Frederick I, I have not included the emperor in this list because the sources for his interactions with the count do not use the language of kinship.
strategies did he choose to pursue in this period? A survey of the extant documents to name the count during these years suggests he sought to consolidate his position in the empire by building relationships with a series of secular and ecclesiastical lords whose political and territorial interests overlapped with his own. For example, Count Berthold II became a frequent visitor in the late 1150s and early 1160s to the court of Duke Henry the Lion of Bavaria. By the mid-1150s, the count had also begun to appear regularly alongside Bishop Eberhard II of Bamberg—despite the troubles between the bishopric and the house of Andechs in the previous decade. Berthold II twice acted as the middleman in Bamberg property agreements in 1154, and he traveled together with Eberhard II from the imperial court in Italy back to Germany in the summer of 1155. By developing close ties to the patriarchs of Aquileia and the bishops of Würzburg between the years 1149 and 1164, the count further helped to stabilize his authority in both Carniola and Franconia. Throughout his lordships, therefore, Berthold II worked to create new social networks to fill the void created by his depleted kinship group.

48 Die Urkunden Heinrichs des Löwen, ed. Karl Jordan, MGH, Die deutschen Geschichtsquellen des Mittelalters (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1957), 51-53, no. 37; 78-79, no. 54; and Tr. Polling, 43-45, no. 20. It is certainly not surprising for a Bavarian count to be present at the Bavarian ducal court. However, prior to the mid-1150s, there are very few sources that suggest members of the house of Andechs were regular visitors to the courts of any of Henry the Lion’s predecessors.

49 The two property agreements are UBLE, 2:270-272, no. 181 and MGH D Friedrich I, 1:116-117, no. 70. For Berthold and Eberhard’s journey together from Italy, see Otto of Freising, The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa, trans. Charles Christopher Mierow (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994), 155, II.xxxviii.

50 For his connections to the patriarchs of Aquileia, see especially MHDC, 3:349-351, no. 900 and UB Krain, 1:120-121, no. 128 (where Berthold is referred to as “dilecto fidei nostro” in an Aquileia charter). For his connections to the bishops of Würzburg, see especially, MB, 37:68-70, no. 97 and P. Aemiliani Ussermann, Episcopatus Wirceburgensis sub Metropoli Moguntina Chronologice et Diplomatice Illustratus (St. Blasien, 1794), 45-46, no. 47. Count Berthold I of Andechs had been named in a Würzburg charter once in the year 1113, but that is the only previous evidence for close Andechs connections to either the bishops of Würzburg or the patriarchs of Aquileia.
The most prominent lord with whom Count Berthold II of Andechs often had contact in these years was Emperor Frederick I Barbarossa. Schütz has recently suggested that the count owed his influence at the Staufen court to Bishop Eberhard II of Bamberg, himself an ardent supporter of the emperor.\(^5\) As Karl Schmid has convincingly argued, however, the house of Andechs had already established ties with Frederick in the months leading up to the Second Crusade, while Frederick was still duke of Swabia.\(^5\) The crusade itself then provided another opportunity for Berthold II to strengthen his relationship with the future emperor.\(^5\) The count of Andechs’s presence alongside Frederick at a gathering of Franconian notables on 20 February 1152—five days after King Conrad III’s death—also suggests Berthold II played an active role in promoting Frederick’s election as Conrad’s successor.\(^5\) That the count would support Frederick’s claim to the kingship is not surprising. At a time when Berthold II did not have a strong kinship network on which he could rely, having someone on the throne whom he had known personally for several years could bring him valuable support as he sought to maintain his power and influence within the empire.

During the first dozen years of Frederick’s reign, Count Berthold II of Andechs emerged as one of the German ruler’s staunchest allies among the nobility. He witnessed


\(^{54}\) MB, 37:68-70, no. 97.
more than twenty-five of Frederick I’s charters between the years 1152 and 1164.\textsuperscript{55} Many of the count’s visits to the royal/imperial court occurred while Barbarossa was in the vicinity of Andechs lordships—when Frederick was holding court at Bamberg, Regensburg or Würzburg. However, Berthold II was also present with his ruler at Quedlinburg, Goslar, Worms, Speyer and Strassburg in regions of the German empire where the house of Andechs had no political or territorial interests—evidence that Berthold II belonged to Barbarossa’s inner circle.\textsuperscript{56} The count of Andechs’s participation in Frederick’s first and second Italian campaigns further strengthened his ties to the emperor.\textsuperscript{57} Significantly, the consistent support Berthold II gave to Barbarossa during these years did not go unrewarded; Frederick I named him margrave of Istria in 1173, and the emperor may have also backed Berthold’s claims to the Wolfratshausen and Neuburg inheritances in 1157 and 1158 respectively.\textsuperscript{58}

The period from 1149 to 1164 provides valuable insight into the importance of family relationships for the twelfth-century house of Andechs. The lack of a strong kinship network did not greatly weaken Count Berthold II of Andechs’s position in the empire during these years. By establishing close relationships with Emperor Frederick I and with various secular and ecclesiastical lords in those regions where he had territorial interests, Berthold was able to build new social networks of cooperation and support

\textsuperscript{55} See the charters in MGH D Friedrich I., vols. 1 and 2.

\textsuperscript{56} For the argument that the appearances of nobles in imperial witness lists are more significant when those nobles were with the emperor outside the regions where they possessed lordships, see Alheydis Plassmann, \textit{Die Struktur des Hofes unter Friedrich I. Barbarossa nach den deutschen Zeugen seiner Urkunden} (Hanover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1998).


\textsuperscript{58} See Chapter Two for Berthold II’s inheritance of these properties and rights.
around himself. Increasingly, he also relied on his network of ministerials to assist him in the administration of his rights and properties.\textsuperscript{59} Nevertheless, the nature of the count’s activities in this period suggests these types of networks did not offer him the same opportunities as did networks based on family relationships. There is no evidence that Count Berthold II of Andechs made a serious effort to extend his lordship in new directions during these years in a manner similar to what his noble house had done between 1135 and 1148. Indeed, despite gaining new rights and properties in Lower Bavaria and Tyrol through the Wolfratshausen and Neuburg inheritances, Berthold II did not attempt to spread his influence into either of these regions prior to 1164.\textsuperscript{60} The social networks the count of Andechs constructed in the fifteen years between 1149 and 1164 were designed to fortify and stabilize his political position in the empire—not to expand it.

\textbf{V. 1165 – 1177}

The election of Count Berthold II of Andechs’s younger brother Otto as bishop of Brixen in early 1165 opened a new phase in the history of the noble house. After an interruption that had lasted a decade and a half, there was once again more than one member of the family in a position to play an active role in Andechs politics and lordship.


\textsuperscript{60} The only piece of the Wolfratshausen and Neuburg inheritances that Berthold II showed an immediate interest in was the advocacy for the monastery of Tegernsee in Upper Bavaria. See \textit{Die Tegernseer Briefsammlung des 12. Jahrhunderts}, ed. Helmut Plechl, MGH, Die Briefe der Deutschen Kaiserzeit, vol. 8 (Hanover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 2002), 27-28, no. 18 and 240-241, no. 211.
The impact of this change was immediate. Otto was bishop-elect of Brixen for only five years, yet during this period Tyrol emerged as a new center of lordship for his noble house.\textsuperscript{61} By helping his brother Berthold II to acquire the advocacies for the church of Brixen and for Neustift, the nearby house of Augustinian canons, Otto gave the Andechses their first chance to experience directly the potential of a combined secular-ecclesiastical kinship network.\textsuperscript{62} His election as bishop of Bamberg in 1177 would create even better opportunities for his noble house to exploit such relationships.

Because of the opposition of the cathedral canons and the archbishop of Salzburg to his election, Otto was removed from the see of Brixen in 1170, having never been consecrated as bishop. He then disappeared from the sources for his family until he was elected bishop of Bamberg. In the interim, however, the Andechs kinship network continued to experience a new period of growth. Count Berthold II’s son Berthold III reached adulthood in or around the year 1170, and the future duke of Merania was first named independently from his father in a source in 1172.\textsuperscript{63} As has been argued in Chapter Five, Berthold III quickly became a prominent figure within the house of Andechs. Significantly, the two regions where he appeared most frequently alongside his father before 1177 were Lower Bavaria and Tyrol.\textsuperscript{64} This suggests that Berthold II

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{61} It is interesting to note that Count Berthold II did not participate in Emperor Frederick I’s Italian campaign of 1166-1167, which included many of the most prominent secular and ecclesiastical lords in Germany. Berthold II’s absence from such an important campaign was quite possibly connected to his family’s new interests in Tyrol.
  \item \textsuperscript{62} For more on this point, see Chapter Six.
  \item \textsuperscript{63} MB, 22:185-186, no. 10 (1 May 1172).
  \item \textsuperscript{64} For Lower Bavaria, see UBLE, 1:739-740, no. 403; ibid., 2:344, no. 235; and Tr. Asbach, 42-43, no. 55. For Tyrol, see Das Traditionsbuch des Augustiner-Chorherrenstiftes Neustift bei Brixen, ed. Hans Wagner, Fontes rerum Austriacarum, Abt. II, vol. 76 (Vienna, 1954), 43-46, no. 10 and 87-88, no. 109.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
followed the same familial strategy his own father Berthold I had utilized in the late 1130s, focusing much of his attention on newly-gained lordships once he had an adult son to support him in his efforts.

Like the period from 1135 to 1148, the years between 1165 and 1177 also provide important evidence that the leaders of the house of Andechs were willing to employ aggressive tactics to extend their lordship when there were multiple family members in positions of power. Poppo’s refusal in 1142-1143 to turn over to the bishop of Bamberg the properties of his ex-wife Kunizza led to a brief war in Upper Franconia. Thirty years later, Berthold II sought to expand his power in Carniola at the expense of another churchman. A charter of Patriarch Ulrich II of Aquileia dated 5 January 1174 reports that the margrave of Istria—this is Berthold II’s first appearance in an extant source with this title—was threatening the archdeacon who claimed ownership of the church of St. Pancras in Slovenj Gradec.\textsuperscript{65} Though the house of Andechs had been in possession of rights and properties around Slovenj Gradec since the beginning of the twelfth century, this is the earliest document to show an Andechs lord attempting to strengthen the family’s lordship in the region. The timing of Berthold II’s forceful efforts to acquire the church’s wealth is therefore significant. He only began to push his authority in Carniola further eastwards from Kamnik toward Slovenj Gradec and the frontier of the empire after his son Berthold III was in a position to assist him in the administration of his other lands.\textsuperscript{66}

\textsuperscript{65} UB Steiermark, 1:525-526, no. 554.

\textsuperscript{66} For more on Slovenj Gradec in this period, see Marko Košan, “Windischgrätz/Slovenj Gradec zu Zeiten der Grafen von Andechs,” in Grofje Andesko-Meranski, 89-90.
The analysis of Andechs territorial lordship in the years between 1165 and 1177 thus offers additional examples of the importance of family relationships for the noble house’s success. But this period also provides a much broader understanding of the roles played by kinship networks in Andechs political strategies. In 1170 and again in 1172, Count Berthold II successfully installed two of his nephews from the house of Berg as bishops of Passau; the first marriage Count Berthold I of Andechs had arranged for one of his children, that of his daughter Gisela to Count Diepold II of Berg, had begun to strengthen the family’s power base. As a result, the group of men who had legitimate claims to the Andechs inheritance were no longer the only figures actively involved in the noble house’s kinship network. Indeed, the period from 1165 to 1177 also witnessed a significant increase in female involvement in the Andechses’ political relationships.

Count Berthold I of Andechs had chosen to marry off only one of his daughters, the aforementioned Gisela. He placed the remaining three into convents, which is one of the principal reasons why women were almost completely absent from the Andechs kinship networks of the early and mid-twelfth century. In contrast, Count Berthold II arranged marriages for all three of his daughters by his first wife Hedwig, and the earliest of these unions likely occurred during the late 1160s and early 1170s. His daughter Sophia was married to Count Poppo VI of Henneberg, who belonged to one of the

---

67 See Chapters Six and Seven for the Berg-Passau connection.

68 See Chapter Seven.

69 Like Berthold III, the earliest any of his sisters could have been born was the early 1150s. However, it is more likely that the youngest two, and perhaps all three, were born in the late 1150s or early 1160s. See Chapters Five and Seven for the marriage of Hedwig and Berthold II.
leading noble houses in Lower Franconia. At least one of the marriages of Berthold II’s daughter Mechthild also may have occurred in this period; she was married to a margrave of Vohburg, whose key lordships lay in the region around Lower Bavaria, and to Count Engelbert of Görz (Gorizia), who controlled lands on the border between Carniola and Italy. As noted above, Count Berthold I married off Gisela to the count of Berg in order to establish a close relationship with a nobleman whose territories lay close to Berthold’s Upper Bavarian lands. A similar strategy appears to have influenced Berthold II’s marriage arrangements for his daughters after 1165. However, rather than attempting to expand the Andechs kinship network in Upper Bavaria, Berthold II sought to build kin connections in other regions which were central to his power: Franconia, Lower Bavaria and Carniola.

A pair of additional marriages from the years between 1165 and 1177 reveal that the house of Andechs also began to look in new directions during this period. When Berthold II married Liutgard of Denmark and Berthold III married Agnes of Rochlitz, the family showed for the first time that its interests were no longer confined to the southeast of the German empire. As has been discussed in Chapter Seven, the presence in Bamberg since the late 1150s of Gertrude of Wettin, who was related to both of these Andechs wives, almost certainly laid the foundation for the two unions. Nevertheless,

---


71 For Mechthild’s marriages, see Chapter Seven.

72 The proposed marriage of one of Berthold II’s daughters to the Hungarian duke Ompud may have also been arranged in this period (see Chapter Seven); this betrothal can also be seen as strengthening Berthold II’s position in the Carniola region. More difficult to explain is the marriage of Berthold II’s daughter Kunigunde to Eberhard of Eberstein. There is no obvious reason why the count of Andechs would have married a daughter to a nobleman of non-comital status whose center of lordship was near Baden-Baden in the Rhine River region.
neither marriage would have occurred if Berthold II and Berthold III had not seen advantages in building closer ties to the house of Wettin. While the Andechses did not gain territorially from their connections to the Wettins, they did bind themselves to a kinship network that already belonged to the upper echelons of the imperial nobility.\textsuperscript{73} The introduction of Wettin names into the house of Andechs and Andechs patronage of the convent of St. Theodore in Bamberg, which had been founded by Gertrude of Wettin, demonstrate the value the Andechses attached to their Wettin contacts from the late 1160s onwards.

The Andechs kinship network of the years between 1165 and 1177 included the most complex web of relationships that had yet encircled the noble house. Otto’s brief career as bishop-elect of Brixen, Berthold III’s attainment of adulthood, the elections of the Berg brothers as bishops of Passau, and a series of marriages of Andechs men and women meant that the family network surrounding Count/Margrave Berthold II in this period bore no resemblance to the skeletal network he had had supporting him between 1149 and 1164. This new set of family relationships translated directly into the expansion of the house of Andechs’s power and influence within the German empire. From southern Tyrol to Lower Bavaria to eastern Carniola, Berthold II exercised his territorial lordship more actively than he had earlier in his career. Moreover, marriage alliances brought him additional contacts in several regions where he possessed comital authority and further helped him—and his oldest son—to become players on the stage of imperial politics. As was argued for the period 1135 to 1148, the years between 1165 and

\textsuperscript{73} Stefan Pätzold, \textit{Die frühen Wettiner. Adelsfamilie und Hausüberlieferung bis 1221} (Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 1997). Since Sophia of Istria and Kunizza of Giech were heiresses and the family origins of Berthold II’s wife Hedwig are unknown, these two marriages appear to have been the earliest unions to connect the house of Andechs to such a powerful kinship network.
1177 provide clear evidence for the ways in which family relationships impacted the strategies of the house of Andechs.

**VI. 1177 – 1188**

Among historians of the medieval German empire, the middle months of the year 1177 are best known for the complex negotiations between Emperor Frederick I and Pope Alexander III that culminated in late July in the Peace of Venice and the end of the papal schism. For the house of Andechs, however, the summer of 1177 was significant for another reason. On 12 June, Bishop Hermann II of Bamberg died while in northern Italy with Barbarossa. The cathedral provost at the time was Margrave Berthold II of Istria’s younger brother Otto, whose high office within the church of Bamberg and close connections to the emperor ensured he would receive serious consideration as Hermann’s successor. He was formally elected bishop by the cathedral canons during the late summer or autumn; after a seven-year wait, he was once again a prominent ecclesiastical lord in a position to assist his Andechs relatives.\(^{74}\)

Margrave Berthold II of Istria and his son Berthold III quickly learned the value of having a close family member as bishop of Bamberg. From the beginning of Otto’s episcopacy, he funneled toward his brother and nephew key rights in Upper Franconia and along the Carinthia-Carniola border. Indeed, whereas his position as bishop-elect of Brixen had enabled Otto to expand his family’s influence only within Tyrol, the office of bishop of Bamberg gave him much greater power because the bishopric controlled such

\(^{74}\) See Chapter Six for Otto’s position as cathedral provost and his election as bishop.
an extensive collection of properties spread across the southeast of the empire. Otto’s 1177 election was therefore a critical moment in the history of the Andechses because Bamberg territorial and political interests overlapped so frequently with his noble house’s strategic interests.

Otto was not the only member of the house of Andechs who obtained an influential new position during the period between 1177 and 1188. Three years after Otto was elected bishop, in 1180, Emperor Frederick I enfeoffed Berthold III with the duchy of Merania. Although this lordship was essentially titular in nature, it nevertheless elevated Berthold III into the uppermost echelon of the imperial nobility: the Reichsfürstenstand, or estate of imperial princes. Since the new duke of Merania was already married with several children, his acquisition of this fief further established him as an independent actor within his noble house. He was no longer simply his father’s son. The scribe who wrote one imperial charter during the 1180s even entered his name in the witness list before Berthold II’s name, evidence for his increased autonomy vis-à-vis his father. As a result of Berthold III’s enfeoffment with the duchy, the house of Andechs had three high-ranking lords—two secular and one ecclesiastical—at the center of its network of support until the margrave of Istria’s death in December of 1188. Such an impressive collection of close kin had never previously existed within the family.

Around the periphery of this core group of Andechs kin was a series of other relatives who further strengthened the noble house’s position during the period.

---

75 See Chapter Six.

76 See Chapter Two.

77 MGH D Friedrich I, 4:228-230, no. 956. For the potential significance of the order of names in the witness lists of imperial charters, see Plassmann, 12-13. Berthold III is possibly named first in this charter because Berthold II was not considered a member of the Reichsfürstenstand; regardless of the reason, the fact that he does not immediately follow his father in the list is noteworthy.
1177/1180 to 1188. Within two or three years of Otto’s election as bishop of Bamberg, he had installed his nephew Henry of Berg as cathedral provost. In 1185, another of Otto’s nephews, Margrave Berthold II of Istria’s son Poppo by his second wife Liutgard, also joined the chapter, as provost of St. Jacob’s. 78 These additions to the Andechs kinship network in Upper Franconia further helped to establish this region as the new centerpiece of Andechs territorial lordship. Though it is impossible to pinpoint a precise moment when the county of Andechs ceased to be central to the construction of the noble house’s identity, by the late 1170s the number of sources that definitively place family members in Upper Bavaria is significantly smaller than the number placing them in Upper Franconia. Extant documents from the years between 1177/1180 and 1188 strongly suggest that Upper Bavaria and the house of Augustinian canons at Diessen were no longer as significant for Andechs self-consciousness as Upper Franconia and the Cistercian monastery of Langheim. 79 The vibrancy of the noble house’s family relationships within the diocese of Bamberg was almost certainly a key factor in this change; nowhere else did the Andechses have such an impressive collection of relatives in control of the highest secular and ecclesiastical offices.

The one region to experience a similar intensification of Andechs lordship during this period was Lower Bavaria, where another kin connection became the cornerstone of the noble house’s strategies. Bishop Diepold of Passau, like cathedral provost Henry of

78 See Chapter Six for these two family members.

79 At some point between 1173 and 1188, Margrave Berthold II gave to the Diessen house of canons properties he owned in Diessen and received in return properties in Carniola which Sophia of Istria had previously given the community (see Nec. Diess., 25). This is additional evidence that the house of Andechs was distancing itself from its Upper Bavarian interests. It appears that the administration of the county of Andechs was almost completely in the hands of ministerials by around 1175, which further helps to explain why the members of the noble house gradually lost their Upper Bavarian identity.
Bamberg, was a member of the house of Berg and a son of Gisela of Andechs. Though elected bishop in 1172, he does not definitively appear in a source alongside any of his Andechs relatives until 1179. Over the course of the next decade, Diepold quickly emerged as a central figure in the Andechs kinship network, joining his maternal uncle Bishop Otto II of Bamberg as a powerful ecclesiastical lord willing to use his office to support his relatives. Significantly, much of the evidence for his contacts with the house of Andechs involves Duke Berthold III of Merania. Alois Schütz, supporting the view of most Andechs historians, has recently argued that Berthold III did not acquire any of the patrimony until after his father’s death. But the duke’s 1181 charter for the monastery of Vornbach, in which he granted to the religious community a fief he held from Bishop Diepold, seems to indicate that he was the one exercising Andechs lordship in Lower Bavaria. At the very least, Margrave Berthold II permitted his son to play the lead role in protecting the noble house’s interests in the lower Inn River valley. The presence of a strong Andechs ally in Lower Bavaria, namely Berthold III’s first cousin Bishop Diepold of Passau, was likely a key reason why this was the region where the duke most frequently acted independently from his father.

It is difficult to overestimate how lofty the house of Andechs’s status in the German empire must have been during the late 1170s and 1180s. Even the periods from 1135 to 1148 and from 1165 to 1177 had not witnessed as high a concentration of family

---


81 This evidence is discussed at length in Chapter Six.


83 MB, 4:139-140, no. 10. This is the earliest surviving charter drawn up in Duke Berthold III’s name.
members in prominent positions as these years did. In Upper Franconia and Lower Bavaria, the multiple Andechs lords who controlled powerful offices were able to dominate these regions’ secular and ecclesiastical networks of politics and patronage like never before. Outside these regions, Berthold II and Berthold III continued their lineage’s tradition of administering lordships through close cooperation. Bishop Albert of Freising’s 1182 grant to the margrave and duke of the advocacy for all of his bishopry’s properties in the Alpine dioceses of Brixen, Trent, and Chur was a clear acknowledgment of the Andechs father and son’s supremacy in and around Tyrol during this period.

No document written between 1177 and 1188 reveals more about the strength of the noble house’s kinship network of cooperation and support in these years than a papal letter dated 3 March 1187. As noted above, Margrave Berthold II began in the early 1170s to assert his authority in the region around Slovenj Gradec, showing special interest in the wealthy church of St. Pancras. Although the margrave does not appear to have had any legitimate claim to the church, he and his son Berthold III were in possession of St. Pancras’s by 1187. Their seizure of the church prompted Pope Urban II to write to the patriarch of Aquileia: “we order that you advise and persuade the margrave and his son with all diligence that they peacefully abandon the church…[and] restore the seized profits without delay.” If Berthold II and Berthold III failed to meet the pope’s

84 Codex Diplomaticus Austriaco-Frisingensis, vol. 3, ed. J. Zahn, Fontes rerum Austriacarum, part II, vol. 31 (Vienna, 1870), 118-119, no. 119. The reason for this generous grant by the bishop of Freising may be tied to the fact that, in 1180 following Henry the Lion’s fall, Berthold II had helped Albert secure from Emperor Frederick I confirmation of certain rights which Henry had previously stripped from the bishop. See MGH D Friedrich I., 3:366-368, no. 798.

85 Codice Diplomatico Istriano, ed. Pietro Kandler, vol. 1 (Trieste, 1862; reprint, 1986), 332, no. 175: “…mandamus quatenus predictum marchionem et ejus filium omni diligentia moneas et inducas ut prefatam ecclesiam…pacifice dimittentes, perceptos fructus sine dilatione restituant…”
demands within thirty days, the patriarch was to punish them by ecclesiastical censure and to forbid the priests of St. Pancras from celebrating the divine office for them.

Pope Urban II’s letter is significant for a study of Andechs family relationships because it reveals how much confidence the noble house had in its position during the years between 1177/1180 and 1188. Slovenj Gradec was the southeasternmost point of Andechs lordship within the German empire. That both Margrave Berthold II of Istria and Duke Berthold III of Merania would pursue the family’s interests in this region forcefully enough to prompt papal intervention is therefore noteworthy. Viewed from the perspective of kinship networks of cooperation and support, however, the aggressive tactics of the two Andechs lords are understandable. Their relatives Bishop Otto II of Bamberg and Bishop Diepold of Passau could protect the noble house’s position in Franconia and Bavaria while they were on the frontiers of the German empire.

Furthermore, Berthold III already had in 1187 four sons by his wife Agnes, meaning the long-term survival of the Andechs lineage was secure. The strong web of family relationships surrounding margrave and duke in the late 1180s thus enabled father and son to risk the illegitimate extension of their power into a region that was peripheral to their main centers of lordship.

VII. 1189 – 1204

Duke Berthold III of Merania encountered during the late 1180s and early 1190s a situation similar to the one that had confronted his father Count Berthold II of Andechs in the late 1140s and early 1150s, when the house of Andechs had undergone its first dramatic transformation. Berthold II’s death in December of 1188 was followed only a
short time later by the death of Bishop Diepold of Passau on 3 November 1190 during the Third Crusade. 86 Two lords from the Andechs kinship network who had been critical to the success of the noble house in the preceding period were therefore gone. Berthold III, who had been appearing in sources since the early 1170s and had been enfeoffed with the duchy of Merania in 1180, was certainly well-prepared to assume an even more prominent position within the house of Andechs following the loss of his father and cousin. But like Berthold II four decades earlier after the deaths of Count Berthold I and Poppo, Berthold III no longer had the support of a pair of key relatives on whom he had relied heavily while younger.

Because Margrave Berthold II of Istria died only a short time before the German contingent departed on the Third Crusade in May of 1189, it is difficult to gauge Berthold III’s immediate response to his father’s death. The duke and his half-brother provost Poppo, at the request of Bishop Otto II of Bamberg, made a joint grant to the monastery of Michelfeld for the soul of their father shortly after he died. 87 But Berthold III then departed for the Holy Land, not to return to the empire until late 1191 or early 1192. 88 No sources for the state of affairs within the Andechs lordships survive from the period when he was crusading. 89

86 Borgolte, 284 (Diepold) and 288 (Berthold II).

87 A record of the grant has been preserved in one of Bishop Otto II’s charters: MB, 25:105-108, no. 6.

88 The first piece of evidence for the duke’s return to Europe is a charter dated 17 June 1191; at the time, Berthold III was in Naples with Emperor Henry VI. See Regesta Imperii, vol. 4, pt. 3: Die Regesten des Kaisereiches unter Heinrich VI. 1165 (1190)-1197, ed. Johann Friedrich Böhmer; newly edited by Gerhard Baaken (Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1972), 69-70, no. 162.

89 As noted in Chapter Five, there is no evidence for how the Andechs lands were administered while the duke was gone. However, that Berthold III was concerned about the situation in his territories is quite possibly reflected in his early return from the crusade; he was one of the first German noblemen to
Three events from the year 1192 provide the earliest evidence for how the Andechs kinship network was reacting to the losses of Margrave Berthold II and Bishop Diepold. First, Duke Berthold III, his half-brother Poppo, and their uncle Bishop Otto II of Bamberg confirmed the agreement Berthold II and the church of Bamberg had previously made concerning the marriages of Andechs and Bamberg ministerials. Since the treaty included ministerials from Franconia, Bavaria and Carinthia, its reissue highlights the extensive, enduring connections between bishopric and noble house—connections that were largely unaffected by the margrave’s death. As further evidence of this secular-ecclesiastical bond, the second key event of 1192 was the first appearance in a surviving source of Duke Berthold III’s son Ekbert as a member of the Bamberg cathedral chapter. Until Bishop Otto II’s death in 1196, three generations of Andechses would be represented in the diocesan church.

The third significant event from the year 1192 to reveal how the Andechs kinship network was and was not changing in this period occurred in October. Duke Berthold III of Merania joined with Duke Leopold V of Austria to attack the brothers who were counts of Ortenburg and whose lands lay just to the west of the Andechs lordships around Passau on the Inn River. No evidence for Berthold III’s involvement in any Lower Bavarian military dispute survives from the period before 1190, yet within two years of

leave for home after having reached the Holy Land. See Chronicon Magni Presbiteri, ed. Wilhelm Wattenbach, MGH SS 17 (Hanover, 1861), 517.

90 Tr. Diessen, 109-112, no. 6.


92 See Chapter Six for more on these years.

93 Chronicon Magni Presbiteri, 519.
Bishop Diepold of Passau’s death, the duke had become embroiled in a regional conflict. The loss of the secular-ecclesiastical kin network centered at Passau appears to have weakened Berthold III’s position in Lower Bavaria and may have prompted him to begin building a new alliance with his neighbor to the east, the duke of Austria.\footnote{Only one earlier source suggests any direct contacts between the Andechses and the Babenberg dukes of Austria. Duke Berthold III and Bishop Otto II both witnessed one of Duke Leopold’s charters while at the imperial court in Regensburg on 23 February 1187 (UB Babenberger, 1:91-92, no. 67). The 1192 alliance against the counts of Ortenburg is the first evidence for strong ties between the noble houses, and early in the next century, a marriage alliance would further strengthen the bond between them.}

Expansion in Upper Franconia, contraction in Lower Bavaria: the early 1190s demonstrate clearly how the changes to a kinship network that were caused by the natural cycle of births and deaths could affect a noble house’s political strategies. The events of 1192, however, provide only a glimpse into how Andechs family relationships were being reconfigured in the years between 1188 and Berthold III’s death in 1204. As Ekbert’s entry into the Bamberg cathedral chapter indicates, he and his two older brothers Otto and Henry had already reached adulthood by this date and were therefore in a position to begin to play a more active role within the noble house. In 1194, Henry was named for the first time alongside his father when he consented to the duke’s privilege for the monastery of Raitenhaslach in Lower Bavaria.\footnote{\textit{Die Urkunden des Klosters Raitenhaslach 1034-1350}, ed. Edgar Krausen, Quellen und Erörterungen zur bayerischen Geschichte, Neue Folge, vol. 17, pt. 1 (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1959), 42, no. 44.} On 6 December of the following year, the eldest son Otto was with Berthold III at the imperial court in Worms to take the Cross.\footnote{\textit{Annales Marbacenses qui dicuntur (Cronica Hohenburgensis cum continuatione et additamentis Neoburgensibus)}, ed. Hermann Bloch, MGH SSrG 9 (Hanover, 1907), 66-67.}
This new generation was stepping onto the political stage just as the last member of an older generation was leaving it. Bishop Otto II of Bamberg died on 2 May 1196. Though in his seventies, the bishop remained active until his final days, witnessing an imperial charter alongside Duke Berthold III while at Würzburg less than a month before he died. But despite the significant influence the house of Andechs held within the church of Bamberg at the time of his death, Poppo and Ekbert were both too young to be elected to succeed him. Neither of the next two Bamberg bishops, Timo (1196-1201) and Conrad (1202-1203), had any blood connections to the Andechses. The impact of this situation on the Andechs kinship network operating in Upper Franconia is striking. Between mid-1196 and Ekbert’s election as bishop in 1203, there are no sources that provide any evidence about the family’s activities in the region. Without Bishop Otto II of Bamberg there, Upper Franconia ceased to be a centerpiece of the noble house’s political and territorial strategies for the first time in almost two decades.

Where did Duke Berthold III of Merania focus his attention once he had become the senior member of the house of Andechs and its undisputed head? Three months after Bishop Otto II’s death, on 7 August 1196, the duke was with several other imperial princes near Merseburg, well to the north of his lordships, “for the affairs of the empire.” This reference to Berthold III marks the beginning of a period of increased

---

97 Borgolte, 268.


100 *Regesta Diplomatica Necnon Epistolaria Historiae Thuringiae*, vol. 2, ed. Otto Dobenecker (Stuttgart, 1900; reprint, Sändig Reprint Verlag, 1983), 202, no. 1057: “pro negociis imperii.” The text is listed here under the year 1197, but the gathering of imperial lords took place in 1196 (see Oefele, 172, no. 428).
participation by the duke in the highest levels of European politics. As noted in Chapter Seven, he married one of his daughters to King Philip II Augustus of France and another to the Hungarian prince Andreas during the late 1190s. Furthermore, following Emperor Henry VI’s death in 1197, the duke emerged as a strong supporter of King Philip of Swabia—and thus became entangled in the papal-imperial conflicts that erupted over Philip and Otto of Brunswick’s competing claims to the throne. In December 1203, Berthold III was one of seven German nobles to receive a letter from Pope Innocent III in which he was asked to abandon King Philip’s side. The other nobles included the dukes of Saxony, Zähringen, Bavaria and Austria, a clear indication that Berthold III had become one the most prominent lords in the German empire by the early thirteenth century.

Despite Berthold III’s power and influence during the last few years of his life, the period when he stood alone as the leader of his noble house was—unpredictably—quite quiet from the perspective of family relationships. The election of his son Ekbert as bishop of Bamberg in 1203 was one of the only events that significantly strengthened the Andechs kinship network of cooperation and support during these years. Berthold III’s daughter Agnes, who married King Philip II of France, died in 1201 after only five years

---

101 As Schütz rightly observes in his “Die Grafen von Dießen und Andechs,” 282, Berthold III is named between 1188 and 1204 only rarely in sources concerning the administration of his rights and properties. By this period, the Andechs ministerialage appears to have assumed virtually all responsibilities involving everyday administration of the Andechs lordships.


103 See Chapter Six.
of marriage—having never been crowned queen.104 At the time of the duke’s own death in 1204, his daughter Gertrude was back in Germany, having fled Hungary following the imprisonment of her husband.105 Adding to the insignificance of the kinship network around 1200, Berthold III, as noted in Chapter Five, does not appear to have involved his two eldest sons in his affairs very frequently. Between 1198 and 1204, Otto and Henry were named on only two occasions in extant sources. One of these was their father’s 1202 agreement with the patriarch of Aquileia concerning a loan the churchman was giving the duke.106 Few other twelfth-century documents concerning the house of Andechs present a comparable image of a family gathering prompted by weakness rather than by strength.

The fifteen years separating the deaths of Margrave Berthold II of Istria and his son Duke Berthold III of Merania are unquestionably the most difficult period in twelfth-century Andechs history to interpret from the perspective of family relationships. As a leader of the Third Crusade, a strong supporter of Emperor Henry VI, and a principal figure in the royal succession controversy of the late 1190s and early 1200s, Berthold III represents the pinnacle of Andechs power. His position within the German empire in his final years is especially impressive when one considers how his grandfather Count Berthold I had begun his own career a century earlier. Nevertheless, the sources from the years between 1188 and 1204 suggest that Berthold III was not as interested as his father and grandfather had been in using family relationships to support his position. Especially


105 See Chapter Seven.

106 UB Krain, 2:5-6, no. 7. This document is discussed at length in Chapter Seven.
after Bishop Otto II of Bamberg’s death in 1196, the duke of Merania was a surprisingly solitary figure, sending his daughters outside the empire to marry and rarely cooperating closely with his adult sons.

The results of this strategy were mixed. As has been mentioned in Chapter One, the image of the house of Andechs in the fourteenth-century Schlackenwerther Codex reveals that Duke Berthold III of Merania was recognized long after his death as a great lord and as the head of a prominent pan-European family. However, the Andechs kinship network that came to power when he died in August 1204 had minimal experience exercising authority and lordship; Ekbert, bishop of Bamberg since early 1203, was the longest-tenured holder of a prominent office within the close kinship group. An entirely new set of family relationships therefore needed to develop inside the house of Andechs if there were to be in the thirteenth century kinship networks of cooperation and support as effective as those that had been in place throughout much of the twelfth century.

VIII. Conclusions

A margrave of Istria, a duke of Merania, a bishop of Bamberg, an abbess of Edelstetten, a duchess of Silesia, a queen of Hungary: even the briefest of glances at an Andechs family tree like the one presented in Figure I reveals that the noble house included an extraordinary collection of prominent men and women during the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. However, despite this dissertation’s focus on the links between individual members of the noble house, the goal of this work has not been to study Andechs genealogy. Indeed, to depict the Andechses in the form of a simple, schematic family tree—the preferred tool of the modern genealogist—is to obscure the real meaning
of kinship connections for the house of Andechs. By ignoring the issue of chronology and by presenting together noncontemporary members of the family who never knew one another, personal contacts and interactions are lost; the lines connecting relatives in a family tree represent only bonds of blood, not functioning social networks. But as this chapter has shown, family relationships are central to understanding how the house of Andechs emerged between the years 1100 and 1204 as one of the leading noble houses within the German empire.

To a certain extent, the chronological divisions presented here are artificial ones. Numerous other years could have been chosen just as easily to be dividing lines. Nevertheless, by carving Andechs history into a series of ten- to twenty-year periods, a central argument of this dissertation becomes clear. Whenever a member of the house of Andechs reached adulthood, married, acquired a new office, or died, the noble house’s kinship networks underwent a transformation. New opportunities and new challenges arose. Relationships that had previously been insignificant became critical to how Andechs lords were able to exercise their authority and lordship. That the noble house successfully reinvented itself every few years, creating fresh networks of cooperation and support when necessary, is one of the principal reasons why the Andechses attained such a powerful position within the imperial nobility.

Family relationships obviously cannot explain all aspects of Andechs history in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. The territorial foundations of the noble house’s lordship, the development of the Andechs ministerialage, and close connections to the courts of the Staufen kings and emperors all played roles in the family’s rise to prominence. Nevertheless, to separate the political history of the Andechses from the
history of the family’s kinship networks is to obscure many of the factors driving the house of Andechs’s success. Upper Franconia, Carniola and the Staufen court became focal points of the family’s power and authority only in the late 1130s and 1140s because Count Berthold I of Andechs had during these years three adult sons with whom he could share responsibilities. Similarly, the wealth of sources dating to the 1170s and 1180s that concern the noble house’s interests in Upper Franconia and Lower Bavaria can only be interpreted properly if the strength of the Margrave Berthold II of Istria—Duke Berthold III of Merania—Bishop Otto II of Bamberg—Bishop Diepold of Passau kinship network is understood. For the house of Andechs, close family relationships were invaluable political bonds, powerful connections capable of shaping and reshaping the course of the noble house’s strategies for periods of a few years or decades. The careful analysis of kinship networks of cooperation and support is therefore essential to reconstructing Andechs history between the years 1100 and 1204.
CONCLUSIONS

THE MEDIEVAL NOBLE FAMILY IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

The case study has been a cornerstone of research conducted within the field of family history since the 1960s, when the “new social historians” first identified the family as a valuable object of study. Analyzing individual families is today considered one of the most effective methods for exploring the intricacies of kinship as a historical phenomenon. Nevertheless, studies that employ this approach are often easy targets for critics who charge that the particular family being discussed is too atypical to be compared to other families or that the conclusions being drawn about the family are too myopic to be useful to other historians. Such criticisms are well-founded when the authors of microhistories fail to contextualize their research. Because the analysis of no one family can provide the ideal model for understanding all the families from a given region and time period, it is essential that historians studying individual kinship groups

---

1 For the early years of the field of family history, see Tamara K. Hareven, “The History of the Family as an Interdisciplinary Field,” *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 2 (1971): 399-414 (especially 412 for the value of case studies).

consider how to utilize their findings for the examination of broader issues within the field of family history.

Viewed from this perspective, reconstructing the general narrative of Andechs history between the years 1100 and 1204 has been only an ancillary component of this dissertation. The house of Andechs’s extraordinary ascension into the upper echelons of the imperial nobility over the course of the twelfth century was not representative of a broader trend during the central Middle Ages. Very few noble houses in Europe achieved the political success and exercised the trans-regional influence that the Andechses did. As a result, this project’s most important contributions to family history are not to be found in its conclusions about the house of Andechs. Much more significant than the specific family that has been the subject of this case study are the questions that have been asked and the methodologies that have been employed in order to analyze that family.

Thus, the central argument of this dissertation has been that the examination of family relationships provides one of the most effective strategies for understanding the roles kinship bonds played within medieval noble society. Exploring the connections and interactions among all the members of a family has only recently emerged as a popular approach in the field of family history. Nevertheless, this research model is already prompting scholars to challenge old theories and to take the study of historical families in new directions. Linda Pollock, for example, argues in her 1998 article on the Barrett-Lennard family in seventeenth-century England,

The volatile dynamics of the Barrett-Lennard family, preserved in copious family papers and legal documents, enable us to perceive the inner workings of family relationships among the gentry and also appreciate the complexities and subtlety involved in implementing power. An examination of some of the salient features
of this family, particularly the interaction among siblings, will help us to understand power in action rather than in concept and will lead to a rethinking of patriarchy.³

Similarly, Lorri Glover states in her year 2000 book about relationships within the Lucas family of eighteenth-century South Carolina,

The values expressed and the behaviors exhibited by siblings and kin provide new insights into the creation of class, the power of patriarchy, the subordination of women, and the pervasiveness of deference. By looking at early American life experiences through this prism, one sees that sibling and kin ties played at least as great a role as wealth in constructing class identity; that siblings created relationships that ignored and even challenged the dictates of patriarchy; that sisters operated as partners in most family matters; and that women and men cultivated an ethos of cooperation in their kin networks and their class. This broader definition of family, then, offers a deeper understanding not only of eighteenth-century family values but also of the impact of those values on early American society.⁴

Various other recent works, including most notably Ann Crabb’s study of the family solidarity of the Strozzis within Renaissance Florence, further demonstrate the growing importance of relatives’ personal interactions for the field of family history.⁵

That historians working in such diverse fields as medieval Germany, Renaissance Italy, early modern England and colonial South Carolina have all begun to make family relationships the focus of their research during the past decade is not a coincidence. The growing dissatisfaction of many medieval scholars with the model of the noble lineage is only one manifestation of the broader collapse of family structure as an accepted


framework for studying kinship.\textsuperscript{6} Since the late 1980s, historians have increasingly argued that historical families were too fluid and too flexible in their organization to be labeled with rigid terms like “patrilineage,” “extended household,” or “nuclear family.”\textsuperscript{7} In the wake of this change, questions about the differences between premodern and modern family structures and about the emergence of the “conjugal household” as the dominant family model have faded from the literature.\textsuperscript{8} Teofilo Ruiz, in a recent review of a work concerning peasant families in Spain during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, writes that the book “harkens back to the by-now classic quantitative studies of European life, one of the great \textit{annaliste} contributions to late twentieth-century historiography.”\textsuperscript{9} That a regional study of family structures—such works were the cornerstone of family history from the 1960s to the early 1980s—can be described today as somewhat old-fashioned is clear evidence that most scholars no longer consider structuralist approaches to be effective in recreating family life.

The rejection of rigid definitions of family and kinship has led to a general decline in the volume of research being conducted on individual families. For many historians, the notion that the family has for centuries been a fluid, flexible unit which its members could shape and reshape depending on the situation has made unnecessary case studies designed to examine the nature of the family in a particular region during a narrow period

\textsuperscript{6} See Chapter One for more on this point.


\textsuperscript{9} Teofilo Ruiz, review of \textit{La société paysanne en Nouvelle-Castille: Famille, mariage et transmission des biens à Pozuelo de Aravaca (1580-1640)}, by Marie-Catherine Barbazza, \textit{American Historical Review} 108 (2003): 584.
Increasingly, these scholars have turned their attention to aspects of family life that were impacted more significantly than family structure by processes of historical change. Childhood, youth, gender, education and old age are only a few of the topics in the field of social history that have exploded in popularity during recent years. As the 1999 *Journal of Family History* issue dedicated to fatherhood\(^1\) and the 2002 article collection entitled *The Premodern Teenager*\(^2\) show, historians today frequently analyze parents and children as well as husbands and wives through social categories that do not require an emphasis on the family unit as a whole.

Despite this growing trend, the case study has not disappeared completely from the field of family history. For some scholars, arguments about the fluidity and flexibility of kinship groups have made it possible to introduce a new level of complexity and sophistication into the analysis of individual families. Rather than de-emphasizing family in their research, these historians have produced in recent years some of the most comprehensive examinations of historical families yet written. As the above quotations taken from Pollock and Glover both demonstrate, the key to much of this new work on individual families has been a reconsideration of the role patriarchy played in past societies. Earlier case studies based on the model of family structure consistently made the male head of the household the focal point of their definition of family as well as the lens through which the entire family was viewed. However, the recent rejection of

---

\(^{10}\) Ruggles, 127-128.

\(^{11}\) *Journal of Family History* 24, no. 3 (1999).

structuralist models has enabled historians to posit that patriarchy was not as dominant a feature of the pre-modern family as once thought.13

One of the most significant consequences of this new position has been the realization that women, younger sons and distant relatives actively participated in numerous aspects of family life. Historians who have analyzed the intra-familial relationships and interactions of these family members have increasingly argued that many types of kinship networks—which were not centered around the male head of the household—remain understudied and underappreciated. The bonds between brothers and sisters, for example, have only recently emerged as a key component of family history. As Glover observes in the conclusion of her work on colonial South Carolina, “the intragenerational world of siblings and kin was so much the center of gentry life that one simply cannot understand their society without accepting their definition of family.”14 This statement is clear evidence that scholars are currently undertaking a dramatic reconceptualization of the meaning of family. The goal of this dissertation, when viewed from the perspective of this recent work in the field of family history, is to demonstrate how the emerging study of intra-familial relationships provides valuable new insights into the noble houses of the central Middle Ages.

Although there are important parallels between this project and other recent case studies of individual families, the methodologies used to study networks of relationships within post-medieval families cannot be applied straightforwardly to the twelfth-century nobility. The journals, diaries, family archives and personal letter collections employed

---


14 Glover, 147.
by scholars of later periods simply do not exist for the noble houses of the central Middle Ages. As a result, the nature of the surviving sources requires medieval historians to approach family relationships from different directions than other historians. In this dissertation, three closely-related strategies have formed the foundation for analyzing the intra-familial interactions of the Andechses. Combined, these strategies offer one possible blueprint for how medievalists can begin to replace the current models for researching the medieval nobility — models that, despite their discussions of fluidity and flexibility, continue to have their roots embedded in earlier, structuralist approaches to family history.

The first strategy has been to employ as broad a source base as possible. Since the 1960s, historians studying the medieval nobility have tended to rely on especially well-preserved monastic archives — such as Cluny’s — for their evidence on family life. Both Chapters Three and Four have demonstrated, however, that the surviving charters and tradition notices from any one religious community can present an image of a noble house that is significantly different than the image that emerges from other source collections. Only those relationships that are observable in documents from multiple, disparate textual communities can therefore provide strong evidence for the nature of intra-familial networks. For example, the references to Count Berthold I of Andechs’s two oldest sons Poppo and Berthold II as consenters and witnesses for property donations to the Andechses’ own house monastery at Diessen in Upper Bavaria are not especially noteworthy. It is these heirs’ appearances during their father’s lifetime in the charters of the Bamberg bishops, the Bavarian dukes and the German kings and emperors that offer

\[15 \text{ See Chapter One.}\]
historians a much deeper appreciation of the broad range of rights and responsibilities the two young men were given between approximately 1135 and 1148. In short, determining which family relationships manifested themselves in a variety of different contexts over an extended period of time is an essential step in identifying the most significant networks of cooperation and support within a noble house.

The importance of utilizing a broad range of sources in the study of noble families leads to the second strategy that has been critical to this dissertation: emphasizing evidence that places relatives together outside a family’s traditional centers of power. To limit research on noble houses to only those sources that show how family members behaved in the areas where their lineage’s lordships were—as the Annales-style regional studies do—is to risk presenting an incomplete picture of family relationships. Gatherings at the courts of kings and emperors, diplomatic missions and crusades all provided relatives with opportunities to spend time together and to strengthen their ties to one another. In the case of the house of Andechs, the kinship network centered on the Hungarian royal court around the year 1210 offers one of the clearest examples from Andechs history for how valuable family relationships could be in medieval politics. However, Queen Gertrude of Hungary’s efforts to assist and support three of her brothers are not mentioned in any sources written in the southeast of the German empire, where the secular lords in the house of Andechs possessed all of their rights and territories. Only Hungarian sources reveal the significance of Gertrude’s sibling relationships for the family of her birth. Thus, because of the pan-European nature of noble society during the
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16 See Chapter Five.
17 See Chapter Seven.
twelfth century, family history is best written by following family members wherever they traveled—not by placing artificial geographical constraints on their activities.

The third strategy that has shaped this project’s approach to the house of Andechs is closely related to the other two strategies. By using a diverse source base and by looking beyond regional centers of lordship, this dissertation has clearly demonstrated that historians must recognize the control of property as only one of the many issues that affected intra-familial relationships during the central Middle Ages. Structuralist models for understanding the medieval nobility have traditionally focused their definitions of family around succession and inheritance; thus, the lineage is fundamentally a concept designed to explain only how the patrimony passed from one generation to the next within a family. Even those critiques of the lineage-based model of noble houses that argue women played important roles within these families generally use as their foundation the evidence for female property rights. While an emphasis on family relationships does not necessarily diminish the significance of inheritance and succession for the medieval nobility, it does reveal that other aspects of family life could be the motivating factors behind the formation of certain kinship networks of cooperation and support.

For example, there is no evidence to suggest the bonds connecting the houses of Andechs and Wettin during the 1170s were based on either family’s territorial interests; the influx of Wettin names among the female Andechses in this period appears to have
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18 See Chapter One.

19 See Chapter Seven.
been the result of newly-formed spiritual networks. Similarly, the strong relationships among Andechs uncles and nephews inside the Bamberg cathedral chapter during the 1180s and 1190s were the result of ecclesiastical patronage networks, not mutual interests in the Andechs patrimony. Nevertheless, to ignore these familial interactions is to present an incomplete view of the significance of kinship bonds for the members of the house of Andechs. Even within the Andechs lineage, fathers were able to involve their heirs in their affairs during their own lifetimes by sending these young men on missions to the imperial court and by giving them military responsibilities. Such tactics gave adult sons power and influence—despite the fact that they could not yet succeed to the patrimony. Thus, control of property was clearly not the only factor that shaped family relationships. Modern perceptions of both inter- and intra-generational kinship bonds are greatly enhanced by considering other reasons why the members of a noble house interacted with one another.

The image of the house of Andechs that emerges from the application of these three strategies reveals that the networks of cooperation and support operating within a medieval family were frequently much more complex than historians have previously realized. Sibling bonds, the interactions between secular and ecclesiastical kin and women’s ties to their relatives are all aspects of noble family life that attain new levels of significance once older models for researching the medieval nobility are de-emphasized. The study of intra-familial relationships therefore raises new questions and suggests new
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20 See Chapter Seven.

21 See Chapter Six.

22 See Chapter Five.
directions for the field of medieval family history. David Herlihy once argued, “To penetrate the emotional world of the medieval household is a supremely difficult task.” However, as this dissertation has shown, careful analysis of kin interactions offers historians the opportunity to explore numerous aspects of internal family dynamics about which the surviving sources seem, at first glance, to be silent.

Consider, for example, the Andechs brothers Berthold II and Otto. They appeared together in at least one source from every decade beginning in the 1140s and ending in the 1180s. Overlapping territorial and political interests undoubtedly were one factor in their many contacts. Nevertheless, the sheer volume of documents to name them together—when they were making grants, witnessing each other’s agreements, traveling, or attending the court of Emperor Frederick I—suggests that their connection to one another was unusually strong; neither had such frequent interactions with any secular or ecclesiastical lord outside the family. Similarly, Duke Berthold III of Merania’s numerous contacts with Bishop Diepold of Passau are remarkably well-documented. The one period when Lower Bavaria was central to Andechs politics and lordship was the period when the careers of these first cousins overlapped. Because Berthold III did not have such close connections to Diepold’s brothers Bishop Henry of Würzburg (1191-1197) and Bishop Otto II of Freising (1182-1220), the duke’s relationship with the bishop of Passau is unique. These two cases from the house of Andechs thus suggest that it is


24 See Chapters Six and Eight.

25 See Chapters Six and Eight.
possible to find evidence for emotional attachments and intra-familial affection in the
twelfth-century sources.

Analyzing family relationships in order to recreate what Barbara Rosenwein has
called the “emotional communities” that existed inside medieval noble houses has
ramifications that extend well beyond the field of family history. 26 Because all of the
members of a noble house—men and women, secular and ecclesiastical—belonged to
the political elite of medieval Europe, affective relationships could play a significant role
in shaping how these figures chose to exercise power and lordship. Indeed, determining
the ways in which emotional attachments between family members influenced their
political strategies has the potential to transform how historians study medieval politics.
Charles T. Wood observed in a 1989 review of recent books concerning the political
history of the Middle Ages that the field was experiencing a revival: “however, it is not
the political history of old. Rather, it is a history less interested in the origins of the
national state than in the role of the family.” 27 No longer able to rely on feudalism,
constitutionalism or a similar, oversimplified structural model to explain the political
processes of the central Middle Ages, historians have increasingly argued that kinship
networks are the key to understanding political power.

As recent scholarship in the field of family history has shown, however,
imagining the medieval nobility as a set of discrete lineages is an ineffective means of
recreating these networks. This case study demonstrates how intensive analysis of all the
close family relationships within a noble house leads to a clearer understanding of the

26 Barbara H. Rosenwein, “Worrying about Emotions in History,” American Historical Review

394.
political strategies that individual family members employed. Kinship networks of cooperation and support were a critical factor in the rise of the house of Andechs into the upper echelons of the imperial nobility, and there is unquestionably much more that the study of family relationships can illuminate about medieval politics and society. By taking a holistic approach to medieval noble houses and by recognizing the importance of both the synchronic and diachronic elements of family life, noble families emerge as groups of interacting individuals whose joint decisions and actions directly impacted how successful their houses were within the complex world of the medieval nobility.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX ONE

THE ANCESTORS OF THE HOUSE OF ANDECHS

Who were the parents of Count Berthold I of Andechs? When one considers that the count was already in possession of extensive rights and properties from the start of his career—and that he was able to marry a wealthy, high-ranking heiress early in the twelfth century—the question should be an easy one to answer. Berthold was clearly born into a noble family that had been prominent in the southeast of the German empire before he became count. Nevertheless, despite numerous attempts by historians to determine the eleventh-century ancestors of the twelfth-century house of Andechs, no clear consensus has emerged.¹ What little evidence survives for Count Berthold I’s familial background is vague and inconsistent, making it difficult to recreate his ancestry in any definitive manner. Because no new documents have surfaced in recent years to help solve the

---

puzzle, my intention here is not to add yet another theory about the Andechs genealogy to the already abundant literature on the subject. I will instead offer an overview of the primary and secondary sources in order to provide scholars with a better understanding of the current state of the debate concerning the ancestors of the house of Andechs.\(^2\)

I. The earliest genealogical evidence for Count Berthold I’s ancestors

Before turning to the genealogical reconstructions of modern historians, it is important to consider what specific information about Count Berthold I’s relatives can be gleaned from contemporary and near-contemporary sources. Unfortunately, the documents from Count Berthold I’s own lifetime provide very little direct evidence for his kinship connections. A tradition notice recording a grant by the count to the Diessen canons in the mid-1120s reports that Berthold made the donation “*pro requie anime fratis sui et omnium propinquorum suorum.*”\(^3\) This is the only contemporary text to reveal that Berthold had a brother; and unfortunately, this sibling is not even named in the source.\(^4\) Another tradition notice, this one from the monastery of Weihenstephan in Freising, records a grant made in the early twelfth century by “*Perhtoldus comes et eius patruus Chonradus de Iagobesperg.*”\(^5\) A Tegernsee tradition notice from between the

\(^2\) Schütz, “Die Grafen von Dießen und Andechs,” has taken a similar approach to the problem of the Andechs genealogy. I will therefore refer to his work frequently in this Appendix. However, Schütz often makes assumptions about the Andechs genealogy that, while plausible, cannot be confirmed by the medieval sources. The goal of this Appendix is to remain as close to the sources as possible.

\(^3\) Tr. Diessen, 6-8, no. 4.

\(^4\) Oefele, 114, no. 38, mistakenly claims that a Benediktbeuern tradition notice naming a “comes Bertholdus…et Otto frater eius” refers to Count Berthold I. However, it is clear that this text is referring to Count Berthold II and his younger brother Otto. See Baumann, 4.

\(^5\) Tr. Weihenstephan, 57-59, no. 70.
years 1092 and 1113 identifies this same Conrad as “clericus de Javbesperc.” And a charter from the mid-twelfth century, drawn up shortly after the deaths of both Conrad and Berthold I, describes Conrad as Berthold’s paternal uncle and as “clericus de Dyecen.”

Excluding Berthold I’s own wives and children, this Conrad is the only person specifically identified by name as a relative of Count Berthold I of Andechs in the twelfth-century sources. Based on the pre-1200 evidence, Berthold’s family tree therefore looks like this:

```
?    Conrad clericus

Count Berthold I    ?

House of Andechs
```

Figure A.1. Count Berthold I’s family tree according to twelfth-century sources

---

6 Tr. Tegernsee, 93-94, no. 120. Jasberg, to the east of Wolfratshausen, appears to have been the site of a religious community, though I have been unable to find any details about it. This tradition notice also describes Conrad as “germanus Perhtoldi comitis de Andehse senioris.” Because Conrad was the patruus of the Berthold whom I have labeled here as Count Berthold I of Andechs, the term germanus in the notice suggests that the father of Count Berthold I must have been another Count Berthold of Andechs. I am aware of only one modern historian, however, who has used this document to draw that conclusion (see Tyroller, 27, no. 51 as well as the family tree he provides at the end). Why has the text not been used more often as evidence for the identity of Count Berthold I’s father? Peter Acht, the editor of the Tegernsee tradition notices, has observed that, although the original grant dates to the years 1092 to 1113, the only surviving copy of the tradition notice was written in the second half of the twelfth century. Thus, if it was written during the career of Count Berthold II of Andechs (1151-1188), it is plausible to think the scribe was using the term senior to refer to Berthold I. This would not explain the term germanus, however. The text therefore seems to merit more attention from scholars than it has received—especially because it is one of only a few twelfth-century documents to provide any information about Count Berthold I’s genealogical relationships. But as will be shown below, later evidence suggests that a Count Arnold was Berthold I’s father, and this appears to be the more likely possibility. For another argument about why the text should read patruus rather than germanus, see Schütz, “Die Grafen von Dießen und Andechs,” 267-268, note 152.

7 SUB, 2:424, no. 304. This text would seem to suggest that Conrad may have played a role in the foundation of the Diessen house of canons. Thirteenth- and fourteenth-century sources from Diessen also suggest this possibility, but more research needs to be done on the issue.
Fortunately for historians, the thirteenth century provides more evidence for Berthold’s kin connections—though the substantial temporal divide between these later sources and the period around 1100 raises important questions about the veracity of these texts.

Liutold, the Diessen canon who between 1204 and 1210 compiled the codex that includes many of the key early texts for his religious community, showed very little interest in supplying genealogical details about the patrons of his house of canons. The numerous noblemen and noblewomen named in the codex’s two necrologies are identified by their names and their titles and occasionally by where they were buried. However, Liutold used no genealogical descriptors like *pater, filius,* and *uxor* to indicate how all of these nobles were related to one another. It is not even clear from his notations which ones were members of the house of Andechs. Liutold’s necrological entries are therefore not very useful when attempting to recreate Count Berthold I’s ancestry.

At some point after Liutold completed his codex, however, one or more thirteenth-century canons from Diessen made a series of notations within the necrologies, providing additional information about many of the nobles Liutold had listed. These

---

8 Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 1018. See Chapter Four for further discussion of this codex.


10 For more on this point, see Chapter Four.

11 These are included in the MGH edition of the necrology abbreviated throughout this dissertation as Nec. Diess. The entries are so short that it is very difficult to determine whether they are the work of one scribe or more than one scribe. A thorough analysis of the codex would be necessary to draw any conclusions. For additional comments on these notations, see Schütz, “Die Grafen von Dießen und Andechs,” 298.
scribes noted such details as when the nobles died and to whom they were related. For example, Liutold’s entry for Count Berthold I’s daughter Mechthild reads simply “Mathildis abbatissa de Otilinesstetin bone memorie obiit.” But a later hand has added “anno 1160, sepulta ante altare s. Iohannis Baptiste, filia Berhtoldi fundatoris nostri.” This same group of scribes also provides historians with the clearest depiction of Count Berthold I’s family background to date. Their notations indicate that the count had three brothers named Dietrich, Gebhard and Otto; two uncles named Frederick and Conrad; and parents named Arnold and Gisela.

Where did these scribes acquire their information? As Michael Borgolte has argued, Liutold must have been working from an earlier document when he initially compiled his two necrologies. It is therefore possible that the later scribes copied from this earlier necrology pieces of information Liutold had chosen not to include in his codex. There may also have been another twelfth-century manuscript that Liutold had not used but that his successors had found and incorporated into the necrologies. Oral traditions inside the house of canons are another plausible source for the information. Because there is no definitive answer to the question, the evidence provided by these scribes must be considered carefully in order to determine how much of it can be corroborated by other documents.

12 Borgolte, 271 (31 May).
14 Ibid., 10 (Frederick: 24 Jan.); 11 (Arnold: 8 Feb.); 12 (Gisela: 22 Feb.); 18 (Conrad: 16 May); 19 (Dietrich: 1 June); 27 (Gebhard: 3 Oct.); and 29 (Otto: 3 Nov.). For the family tree according to these notations, see Figure A.3 below. For further discussion of these necrological entries, see Schütz, “Die Grafen von Dießen und Andechs.”
15 Borgolte, 249-250.
Significantly, the genealogical details concerning the twelfth-century descendants of Count Berthold I of Andechs all can be shown to be accurate. One of the thirteenth-century scribes records, for example, that Bishop Otto II of Bamberg was “filius Berhtoldi fundatoris nostri,” and there is ample evidence from non-Diessen sources to support this statement.\(^{16}\) Similarly, Margrave Berthold II is accurately described as “filius Berhtoldi comitis, fundatoris nostre ecclesie.”\(^{17}\) And as noted above, Count Berthold I’s daughter Abbess Mechthild is correctly identified as “filia Berhtoldi fundatoris nostri.”\(^{18}\) Thus, the evidence from the twelfth century suggests that historians can rely on these thirteenth-century genealogical notations.

Much of the information in the necrologies concerning the family relationships inside the house of Wolfratshausen also can be demonstrated to be accurate.\(^{19}\) If a family tree of this noble house were constructed using only the evidence from these thirteenth-century Diessen scribal notations, the result would be the following:

---


\(^{17}\) Nec. Diess., 31 (14 Dec.).

\(^{18}\) Ibid., 19 (31 May). For additional evidence that Abbess Mechthild was the daughter of Count Berthold I and his first wife Sophia, see Chapter Three.

\(^{19}\) For the house of Wolfratshausen, see Chapter Four.
There is no supporting evidence of which I am aware that can prove—or disprove—Count Otto senior married a woman named Justicia and that they had a son named Leopold. But all the other genealogical relationships in this family tree can be confirmed by a variety of sources from the twelfth century, again suggesting that these thirteenth-century notations are reliable.

The corroborating evidence from the twelfth-century noble houses of Andechs and Wolfratshausen thus indicates that historians should consider seriously the necrological notations concerning the members of Count Berthold I’s generation and the

---

20 The dates indicate the day under which each person is listed in the necrologies (American style of dating). The preceding letters indicate whether the entry can be found in Necrology A or Necrology B of Liutold’s Codex (see Chapter Four).

21 Tr. Tegernsee, 103, no. 132 names a “Liutpolt de Dieze” as a witness. Because the cognomen “de Diessen” was a common one in the Andechs-Wolfratshausen kin group during the period around 1100, this is probably the same Leopold listed in the Diessen necrology. However, there is no evidence to identify him as the son of Otto and Justicia.

22 For these genealogical relationships, see Schütz, “Das Geschlecht der Andechs-Meranier,” 53-59. It is important to note that the years of death recorded in some of these thirteenth-century notations for the house of Wolfratshausen appear to be incorrect.
preceding one. Based on the information these entries provide, the following schema of Berthold’s family can be constructed:

![Family Tree Diagram]

Figure A.3. Count Berthold I’s family tree according to the Diessen necrologies

Earlier sources do confirm two elements of this family tree. The above-mentioned Diessen tradition notice dating to the mid-1120s reveals that Berthold I did indeed have at least one brother. And, as has already been shown, twelfth-century documents do clearly identify a canon Conrad as Berthold I’s paternal uncle.

Another text produced at Diessen during the thirteenth century offers a similar depiction of the generations of Count Berthold I and of his father. Around the year 1250, a list of the members of the houses of Andechs and Wolfratshausen was written on a piece of parchment which is preserved today as part of a later codex. The text includes
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23 The dates indicate the day under which each person is listed in the necrologies (American style of dating). The preceding letters indicate whether the entry can be found in Necrology A or Necrology B of Liutold’s Codex (see Chapter Four).

24 Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 5515. For more on this manuscript, see Chapter Four and Schütz, “Die Grafen von Dießen und Andechs,” 298. A photograph of this page can be found in Die Andechs-Meranier in Franken: Europäisches Fürstentum im Hochmittelalter (Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 1998), 65.
the following entries: “…De Andehns. Chunradus canonicus. Fridericus comes. Tvta canonica. Arnoldus comes. Gisila cometissa. Otto comes. Gebehardus comes. Dietricus comes. Berhtoldus comes…” This list corresponds closely to the entries in the necrologies. The only difference is the inclusion of “Tvta canonica” in a position that would suggest she was Berthold I’s aunt, either by blood or through a marriage to his uncle Frederick. Liutold did enter the name of a canoness Tuta in Necrology B of his codex, but there is no genealogical information recorded about her by a later hand. It is certainly plausible that she could have been an aunt of Count Berthold I of Andechs. Regardless, this list combined with the entries in the necrologies indicate that the thirteenth-century canons of Diessen had a clear, consistent position regarding whom they believed Count Berthold I’s close relatives were.

The list of family members written at Diessen around the year 1250 begins with the three names “Razo comes. Fridericus comes roche. Kunizza cometissa.” Because they precede the phrase “De Andehns” as well as the list of Wolfratshausen family members, these three figures appear to be the earliest ancestors of the two lineages who were known by the Diessen canons in the mid-thirteenth century. But Liutold listed neither a Count Rasso nor a Count Frederick Roche in either of his necrologies. He did, however, include in Necrology B under 7 March “Chuniza cometissa obiit, sepulta in

---

25 Clm 5515, f. 128r. The list has been printed as part of Notae Diessenses, ed. Philip Jaffé, MGH SS 17 (Hanover, 1861), 328. However, this printed list is inaccurate because the editor accidentally skipped an entire line in the manuscript, the line that includes Count Berthold I of Andechs, his brothers, his wife, and two of his children.

26 Borgolte, 270 (24 May).

27 Clm 5515, f. 128r.
media basilica S. Stephani.” The location of her tomb at Diessen suggests this Kunizza lived in the late eleventh or early twelfth century; the only other two people reported to have been buried in St. Stephen’s lived during this period, while later members of the Andechs and Wolfratshausen lineages were buried in the chapter hall. Who was Countess Kunizza? One of the thirteenth-century scribes who made notations in the necrologies added next to her name “uxor Friderici comitis Rochen.” While interesting, this detail does not explain her kin relationship to Count Berthold I, since Count Frederick Roche’s genealogical connection to Berthold is not stated anywhere in the twelfth- or thirteenth-century sources. Similarly, a thirteenth-century hand has added to Necrology A under 19 June, “Raze com[es] ob[iit], qui cenobium in Werde construxit.” This is likely the same Count Rasso who opens the genealogical list from around 1250, but there is nothing to suggest how he was related to Count Berthold I of Andechs.

The evidence from Diessen in the thirteenth century thus reveals that during this period the memory of the Andechs lineage only extended back to the late eleventh century and the generation of Count Berthold I’s father. Beyond that, the canons had a vague sense that certain other nobles belonged to the kinship group but did not know precisely how they were related to the Andechses. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, it was generally believed at Diessen that Count Rasso was the father of Count Frederick Roche, but the late medieval Diessen canons made no attempt to link the two

---

28 Borgolte, 262. For more on this Kunizza, see Schütz, “Die Grafen von Dießen und Andechs,” 243, especially note 63.

29 See Chapter Four.


31 Ibid., 20.
men to the rest of the Andechs genealogy. As a result, the family tree presented in Figure A.3 is the best that can be constructed from the medieval references to Count Berthold I’s kin connections. In order to create a more detailed genealogy, it is therefore necessary to turn to the research of modern historians.

II. Reconstructions of the Andechs kinship group in the 19th and 20th centuries

The thirteenth-century sources from Diessen provide scholars with an abundance of names and a few genealogical connections—but virtually no details about who any of these people were. As a result, modern historians have had to search the documents from the later eleventh and early twelfth centuries to determine if there were any counts with names like Frederick, Arnold and Dietrich who could plausibly have been the relatives of Count Berthold I of Andechs named in the Diessen sources. At the center of this kind of research have been three methodologies: the study of personal names, the analysis of cognomina, and the examination of patterns of property-holding. The combination of these approaches has enabled scholars to suggest plausible genealogies for the eleventh-century ancestors of Count Berthold I of Andechs.

Cognomina have been especially important to the study of the Andechs family tree. Count Berthold I was the first member of his kinship group to appear with the cognomen “de Andechs,” and throughout his career he is identified in most sources by this name. However, in one tradition notice from the early 1120s, he is labeled “Bertolfus

---

32 See especially Notae Diessenses, 329.

33 For more on cognomina, see Chapter One.
comes de Diezin.” Significantly, the cognomen “de Diessen” was a common one in sources dating to the period from approximately 1040 until 1120; several nobles were identified by that place-name during these years. For many modern historians, the cognomen evidence indicates that these noblemen all belonged to the same extended kinship group. Strengthening that position, many of the nobles who appear in sources as being “de Diessen” have the same personal names as the nobles who are listed in the thirteenth-century Diessen necrologies.

Thus, the “Gebehart comes de Diezzen” who is named in an Augsburg tradition notice from the late 1090s has been equated with the Count Gebhard whom the later Diessen sources identify as a brother of Count Berthold I of Andechs.35 Similarly, historians have labeled the “Liutpolt de Dieze” in the witness list of a Tegernsee tradition notice dated to between the years 1092 and 1113 as the same Leopold who belonged to the house of Wolfratshausen.36 And most importantly for this dissertation, there is also an “Arnolt comes de Diezan” named in sources from the 1070s-1090s, and recent historians are in general agreement that this must be the Count Arnold identified as Count Berthold I’s father in the Diessen necrologies.37

---

34 Tr. Diessen, 4-5, no. 2.
35 Oefele, 225-227, no. 2. See for example ibid., 112; Trotter, 21; Holzfurtner, 387 and 389; Schütz, “Das Geschlecht der Andechs-Meranier im europäischen Hochmittelalter,” 48; and Die Andechs-Meranier in Franken, 386.
36 Tr. Tegernsee, 103, no. 132. See for example Oefele, 117; Trotter, 20 and Tyroller’s family tree.
37 For references to Arnold in the primary sources, see Tr. Freising, 2:319, no. 1469 and ibid., 485, no. 1664a. Historians who argue this is Berthold I’s father include Holzfurtner, 387; Schütz, “Das Geschlecht der Andechs-Meranier im europäischen Hochmittelalter,” 48; Trotter, 20; and most recently Schütz, “Die Grafen von Dießen und Andechs,” 258-266.
Using the evidence for patterns of property ownership in the duchy of Bavaria, scholars have concluded that this Count Arnold of Diessen was the same person as the contemporary Hallgraf Arnold, who was in possession of comital rights in the salt-producing regions around Bad Reichenhall southwest of Salzburg. This Arnold also controlled extensive properties in the Inn River valley in central Bavaria. These rights and territories were inherited by Berthold I’s brothers—first Dietrich and then Gebhard—and formed the foundation for the twelfth-century county of Wasserburg. The impressive list of Arnold’s possessions in various regions of Bavaria clearly indicates that he was a prominent nobleman in the southeast of the German empire. This helps to explain why Count Berthold I was already a key figure in Bavaria from the beginning of his career. Though he only inherited a piece of his father’s patrimony, his father’s power and influence helped to lay the foundation for his own success.

Before turning to the question of Count Arnold of Diessen’s kinship connections, the identity of his wife—Count Berthold I’s mother—needs to be considered. The earliest reference to her is in the Diessen necrologies of the thirteenth century, where it is

---

38 For the Hallgrafschaft, see Holzfurtner, 248-249. Though these comital rights were held in fief, it also appears that the family had allodial properties near Bad Reichenhall. This is suggested by the fact that Count Berthold I was in possession of “una salina” in the region later in his career (SUB, 2:423-426, no. 304).


40 Martin Bitschnau has argued that, on top of the properties and rights Arnold possessed around Diessen and on the Inn River, he was also in possession of comital rights in southern Tyrol near Brixen, south of the Brenner Pass. These rights, according to Bitschnau, passed to another (a fifth?) son of Arnold, Arnold II. See his “Gries-Morit,” in *Tiroler Burgenbuch*, ed. Oswald Trapp, vol. 8, Raum Bozen (Bozen: Verlagsanstalt Athesia, 1989), 207-256.
learned that her name was Gisela. Not until the fourteenth century does a source survive that claims this Gisela was a daughter and heiress of Margrave Otto of Schweinfurt (†1057), the most prominent landholder in Franconia in the mid-eleventh century. But the twelfth-century *Annalista Saxo* reports that Margrave Otto’s daughter Gisela married a Count Wichmann of Seeburg. While it is certainly possible that Gisela could have been married twice, the evidence to support the position that this Gisela was Count Berthold I’s mother is nevertheless not very compelling. However, historians have generally argued for the kinship connection because it is the most plausible way to explain how Count Berthold I of Andechs was by 1135 already in possession of significant territories in Upper Franconia—territories that had been controlled by the margraves of Schweinfurt throughout the first half of the eleventh century.

If Gisela of Schweinfurt was Berthold I’s mother and Count Arnold of Diessen his father, what does this suggest about the early years of Berthold’s life? The first count of Andechs is named in several sources from the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries,


42 *Annalista Saxo*, ed. G. Waitz, MGH SS 6 (Hanover, 1844), 680.


but modern editors have been unable to provide very specific dates for any of these
documents. For example, his earliest appearance in a Tegernsee tradition notice, as
“Perhtolt de Anedehse,” could have occurred at any point between 1092 and 1113.\textsuperscript{45} The
other surviving evidence for Count Berthold I during the first part of his career is equally
hard to interpret. His first known contact with the monastery of Benediktbeuern occurred
between 1098 and 1116;\textsuperscript{46} with the monastery of Weihenstephan between 1102 and
1114;\textsuperscript{47} and with the church of Freising between 1104 and 1122.\textsuperscript{48} A charter of Bishop
Erlung of Würzburg (1106-1121) reporting ties between the bishop and the count in the
period 1106-1113 provides the narrowest range of years of any of these early references
to Berthold I.\textsuperscript{49}

While the first sources for Count Berthold I are therefore problematic, the
evidence for other members of his family suggests that the beginning of his career can
best be placed around 1100, perhaps even a few years earlier. His father, Count Arnold
of Diessen, is last named in a source between the years 1091 and 1098.\textsuperscript{50} One of his
brothers, Gebhard, makes his only appearance in the surviving, contemporary sources

\textsuperscript{45} Tr. Tegernsee, 103, no. 132. Oefeire, 112, no. 33b argues that this tradition notice must have
been written before 1102, but the more recent editor of the Tegernsee tradition notices, Peter Acht, makes a
plausible argument against this more narrow dating of the text.

Edmund Oefeire, \textit{Oebayerisches Archiv für vaterländische Geschichte} 32 (1872-73): 10-12. See also
Oefeire, 112, no. 33a.

\textsuperscript{47} Tr. Weihenstephan, 57-59, no. 70. See also Oefeire, 112, nos. 32-33.

\textsuperscript{48} Tr. Freising, 2:347, no. 1506. See also Oefeire, 117, no. 60c.

\textsuperscript{49} MB, 37:35-37, no. 75.

\textsuperscript{50} Tr. Freising, 2:485, no. 1664a.
between approximately 1096 and 1102. Furthermore, various historians have suggested that Gebhard was already married in this period since his widow and son are named in a document only a few years later. Another of Berthold I’s brothers, Dietrich, appears twice in sources from the late 1080s and early 1090s. Thus, the transition of power from the generation of Count Arnold of Diessen to that of Arnold’s sons appears to have occurred in the decade before 1100.

How old was Count Berthold I during this period? A precise date for his birth is impossible to determine, but various clues indicate that he was more than likely already an adult when he succeeded his father. First, Arnold had been count of Diessen since before 1073 and had therefore had a lengthy career prior to his own death in the 1090s. Second, Berthold’s mother Gisela was born between the years 1036 and 1057, meaning she was likely already having children by 1070. Lastly, the appearances of Berthold I’s brothers Gebhard and Dietrich in sources from the late 1080s and 1090s strengthen the impression that their generation was old enough to take control of the family’s lands by

---

51 Oefele, 225-226, no. 2. See also Franz Tyroller, *Die ältere Genealogie*, 27, no. 53 and Trotter, 21, no. 34.


53 Trotter, 22, no. 37; Tyroller, *Die ältere Genealogie*, 27, nos. 48 and 50; and Tyroller, *Genealogie des altbayerischen Adels*, 155, no. 34. There is some skepticism among recent historians concerning the actual identity of the Dietrich named in these texts, but I see no reason to doubt this is Berthold I’s brother. See Burkard, 73, note 85.

54 Arnold’s earliest known appearance in the sources is in Tr. Freising, 2:319-320, no. 1469, which has been dated to the early 1070s. Schütz, “Die Grafen von Dießen und Andechs,” 263-264 believes that Arnold was married twice and that Gisela was his second wife. Arnold was certainly politically active long enough to have had two wives. On the other hand, considering there is no definitive evidence to confirm he married at all, the claim that he married twice is perhaps a tenuous one.

55 Gisela’s father Margrave Otto of Schweinfurt married in 1036 and died in 1057. Otto would have already been quite old in 1057, meaning Gisela was probably born at some point in the 1040s.
1100. It thus seems plausible to place Berthold I’s birth sometime between the years 1070 and 1080.56

Returning to Count Arnold of Diessen and his ancestry, no medieval source offers any direct evidence concerning the identity of his own father, Count Berthold I’s paternal grandfather. Since Arnold’s career is generally thought to have extended from approximately 1070 until approximately 1095,57 historians have sought his father in the sources dating to the mid-eleventh century and have arrived at a pair of possible conclusions. Two brothers, Berthold (I) and Otto (I), appear with the cognomen “de Diessen” during this period.58 Most scholars have stated that there is no way to be certain which was Arnold’s father.59 But if, as I have argued above, a reconstruction of the family based on the thirteenth-century Diessen sources is reliable, there is one piece of evidence that points to Otto (I) being Arnold’s father. At some point between 1073 and 1077, a Count Otto and his son Count Frederick took part in a grant to the monastery of St. Blasien in Swabia.60 The Count Frederick whom Liutold lists under 24 January in Necrology B of his codex was, according to Liutold, “sepultus ad S. Blasium in Nigra

56 Schütz, “Die Grafen von Dießen und Andechs,” 264 argues that Arnold and Gisela were married in the late 1070s or early 1080s. Later, pp. 266-267, he suggests Count Berthold I of Andechs may have still been a minor at the time of his father’s death in the late 1090s. I would argue that this is unlikely. Schütz fails to take into account Gisela’s age. If she was born in the 1040s, it seems more plausible to place Berthold I’s birth in the 1070s or around 1080.

57 Holzfurtner, 387 and Trotter, 20.

58 Oefele, 108-109, no. 10 and 109, no. 13. For more on these brothers, see Schütz, “Das Geschlecht der Andechs-Meranier,” 41-44.

59 See especially Holzfurtner, 387. Schütz, “Das Geschlecht der Andechs-Meranier,” 45-48 makes no attempt to argue one way or another.

60 Ulrich Parlow, Die Zähringer: Kommentierte Quellendokumentationen zu einem südwestdeutschen Herzogsgeschlecht des hohen Mittelalters (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1999), 81-83, no. 82. Parlow believes these two counts are “von Dießen” (81). Schütz, “Die Grafen von Dießen und Andechs,” 235 agrees.
This is the same Frederick whom a later hand has identified in the necrology as Count Berthold I of Andechs’s paternal uncle. If the Frederick of the 1073-1077 grant is indeed this Frederick buried at St. Blasien, Count Otto (I) of Diessen would have also been the father of Count Arnold (Frederick’s brother) and thus the grandfather of Count Berthold I of Andechs.

Significantly, this argument offers a solution to the mystery of the kin relationship between Count Berthold I of Andechs and Count Otto I of Wolfratshausen, co-founders of the house of Augustinian canons at Diessen. Count Otto of Diessen and Amras, who also appears in sources from the later eleventh century with the cognomina “de Thanning,” is identified in a Freising tradition notice as the son of Count Berthold (I) of Diessen, Count Otto (I) of Diessen’s brother. This Count Otto of Diessen and Amras was the father of Count Otto I of Wolfratshausen. To find a common ancestor in the male line of the first counts of Andechs and Wolfratshausen, one must therefore go back another generation to the father of Counts Otto (I) and Berthold (I) of Diessen. As will be discussed below, most historians have identified Count Frederick of Haching as their father. In this reconstruction of the family’s genealogy, Count Berthold I of Andechs and Count Otto I of Wolfratshausen would therefore have been second cousins:

61 Borgolte, 257.
62 See note 14 above.
63 See Chapter Four.
64 For the reference to Otto as Berthold’s son, see Tr. Freising, 2:315-316, no. 1464. The career of this Count Otto of Thanning/Diessen/Amras has been discussed most recently in Schütz, “Die Grafen von Dießen und Andechs,” 252-254 and Holzfurtner, 387-388.
65 See below for Count Frederick of Haching.
Figure A.4. The ancestors of the houses of Andechs and Wolfratshausen

Several pieces of evidence indicate that Counts Berthold (I) and Otto (I) of Diessen were most likely the sons of a Count Frederick of Haching. This Frederick first appears in a royal charter of King Henry II dated 30 June 1003, where he is identified as Frederick, “qui iudicat in Hachingun in pago Sundergouue.”66 This is a region that would later form part of the county of Wolfratshausen. Sources from the opening decades of the eleventh century reveal that he was a leading nobleman in the vicinity of the Isar River valley, and he may also have been in possession of those comital rights on

66 MGH D Heinrich II, 65-66, no. 54.
the Inn River that would later become the foundation for the county of Wasserburg. Thus, territorial factors play a role in identifying Frederick as an ancestor of the houses of Andechs, Wasserburg and Wolfratshausen. There are also references in Bavarian sources from around the year 1025 to both a Berthold and an Otto being the sons of a Count Frederick, and this is another reason why historians have identified Count Frederick of Haching as the father of Counts Berthold and Otto of Diessen. That the names of Frederick’s two sons are personal names that would later appear in the Andechs and Wolfratshausen lineages further strengthens the position that the count of Haching was an ancestor of the two noble houses.

With Frederick, Count Berthold I of Andechs’s ancestry can thus be extended in the direct male line back to the year 1000. There is, however, an additional kinship connection that must be explained, for Count Frederick of Haching never appears in a source with the cognomen “de Diessen.” The first reference to Diessen is in a Freising tradition notice dated to between the years 1039 and 1053, in which a “comes Razo de Diezen” is named. The next two nobles to appear with the title of count of Diessen are the abovementioned Berthold and Otto, the sons of Count Frederick of Haching. How did the brothers come into possession of Diessen? The answer remains unclear, though a connection to Rasso through a female line seems most likely. Already in the thirteenth

---


68 For the reference to a “Perahtolt filius Fridirici comitis,” see MGH D Heinrich II, 694-696, no. 2 (this is a charter of Henry II’s widow Kunigunde). For the reference to an “Otto filius Friderici,” see Oefele, 109, no. 12.

69 Tr. Freising, 2:456, no. 1612a.

70 Recent discussions of Rasso include Schütz, “Die Grafen von Dießen und Andechs,” 232-233, especially note 22 and Holzfurtner, 143-152. See also Holzfurtner, “Ebersberg—Dießen—Scheyern: Zur
century, the Diessen canons no longer had any clear sense of Rasso’s relationship to the Andechses either; a “Razo comes” leads the list of family members written around 1250, yet as noted above there is no indication in the Diessen religious community’s sources how he was related to anyone else in that list.\textsuperscript{71}

Modern historians’ inability to draw a clear genealogical connection between Count Rasso and Count Berthold I of Andechs is especially frustrating because Rasso’s rights and properties in Upper Bavaria were critical to the formation of the county of Andechs. While the houses of Wolfratshausen and Wasserburg appear to have had lordships based predominantly on territories that had been in the possession of Count Frederick of Haching, the house of Andechs owed much of its position to the mysterious Count Rasso of Diessen. Because so little is known about this Rasso, it is difficult to draw definitive conclusions about the foundations of Andechs power in Upper Bavaria. All that is clear is that Diessen itself must have been a center of military and political importance, since it was during the second half of the eleventh century that Diessen emerged as the place after which many of Count Berthold I’s ancestors were named.

As this reconstruction of Count Berthold I’s ancestry reveals, the first count of Andechs was born into a kinship group that had been powerful in Bavaria for a century. His great-grandfather Count Frederick of Haching already held comital rights in the duchy of Bavaria and made appearances in royal charters during the early 1000s. There

\textsuperscript{71} Over the course of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the Diessen canons and then the monks at the late medieval monastery at Andechs produced an elaborate legend surrounding Rasso. See Tyroller, 17-19 and especially Eduard Hlawitscha, “Die geschichtlichen Einträge im Andechser Missale,” in Eduard Hlawitscha and Ermengard Hlawitscha-Roth, \textit{Andechser Anfänge: Beiträge zur frühen Geschichte des Klosters Andechs} (St. Ottilien: Eos Verlag, 2000), 47-97.
seems little doubt that the family’s influence extended back into the tenth century as well, though evidence for Count Frederick’s ancestors is difficult to find. The probable connection between members of the kinship group and the monastery of St. Blasien during the 1070s has led a few historians to speculate that Berthold I’s ancestors were also related to the Ottonians—through Kuno of Öhningen, who has been the focus of numerous historical studies. If these speculations are correct, the house of Andechs was from its beginning already one of the leading lineages in southern Germany. A comprehensive reconsideration of all the sources for the possible ancestors of the Andechses would probably help to answer many of the most difficult questions about the nature of the kinship group, but this brief overview is sufficient for the purposes of this dissertation.

72 Holzfurtner, Die Grafschaft der Andechser, 377-391.

APPENDIX TWO

SOURCES FOR ANDECHS PROPERTY AGREEMENTS

The two figures in this appendix provide a list of the known property agreements made between members of the house of Andechs and various religious communities during the years from 1100 to 1204. Figure A.5 lists those agreements for which the complete texts survive—either as originals or copies. These documents provide the best evidence for the groups of kin who were involved in property agreements. Figure A.6 lists those agreements that are known today only because later documents make reference to them. There can be no way to know with certainty which kin might have been involved in this latter group of agreements because the surviving versions do not include the original witness lists and typically only name the main donor.

Each figure includes six columns. The first gives the number that I have assigned to each of the texts and that I use in the footnotes in Chapter Three for the sake of convenience. The second identifies the member of the house of Andechs who was the chief figure in negotiating the property agreement. The third gives the date of the agreement, or at least the approximate date offered by the document’s modern editors. The fourth names the religious community that was involved in the agreement. The fifth column is entitled *Laudatio parentum*, a term which refers to the approval given by the donor’s kin to a property agreement; this column therefore lists those kin who are named
in the agreement as co-donors, as consenters or as witnesses. The sixth column identifies the type of property agreement. Most of the terms in this column are self-explanatory; the distinction between a “donation” and a “grant for souls” is that the latter specifically states that the gift was made for the salvation of someone’s soul.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>MAIN DONOR</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>RECIPIENT</th>
<th>L. PARENTUM</th>
<th>GRANT TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Berthold I</td>
<td>1102-1114</td>
<td>Weihenstephan</td>
<td>Uncle (Joint)</td>
<td>Donation¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Berthold I</td>
<td>1104-1122</td>
<td>Freising</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Donation²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Berthold I</td>
<td>ca. 1120</td>
<td>Diessen</td>
<td>Wife &amp; 2 Sons</td>
<td>Donation³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Berthold I</td>
<td>1123-1148</td>
<td>Ensdorf</td>
<td>2 Sons</td>
<td>Donation⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Berthold I</td>
<td>1123-1148</td>
<td>Diessen</td>
<td>None?</td>
<td>Grant for Souls⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Berthold I</td>
<td>ca. 1125</td>
<td>Diessen</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Grant for Souls⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Berthold I</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Ebersberg</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Donation⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Poppo</td>
<td>1143</td>
<td>Bamberg</td>
<td>Father/Son/Brother</td>
<td>Settlement⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Poppo</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>Admont</td>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>Grant for Souls⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Poppo</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>Bamberg</td>
<td>Brother (Joint)</td>
<td>Lien¹⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Berthold II</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>Admont</td>
<td>Cousin</td>
<td>Grant for Souls¹¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Berthold II</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>Bamberg</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Confirmation¹²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure A.5. Charters and Tradition Notices

¹ Tr. Weihenstephan, 57-58, no. 70. His uncle ("patruus") was Conrad of Jasberg, who was a churchman. Conrad is discussed in more detail in Chapter Eight and Appendix One.

² Tr. Freising, 2:347, no. 1506.

³ Tr. Diessen, 4-5, no. 2.

⁴ *Sammlung historischer Schriften und Urkunden*, ed. Freiherr Max von Freyberg, vol. 2 (Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1829), 199, no. 42.

⁵ Tr. Diessen, 16-17, no. 11. The gift was made "per manus Conradi." This Conrad could be his uncle Conrad of Jasberg, but there is no evidence to support or reject this possibility. See note no. 1 above.

⁶ Ibid., 6-8, no. 4.

⁷ Oefele, Register, no. 60.

⁸ Paul Oesterreicher, *Denkwürdigkeiten der fränkischen Geschichte, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf das Fürstbisthum Bamberg*, vol. 3 (Bamberg, 1832), 87-91, nos. 7 and 8. These texts concern the property agreement that was part of the negotiations between the house of Andechs and the bishopric of Bamberg. See Chapter Five.

⁹ MHDC, 3:330-331, no. 847.

¹⁰ Oefele, 232-233, no. 6. This document concerns a loan the brothers were receiving for the Second Crusade. They consented to give specific properties to the bishopric of Bamberg as collateral if they failed to repay the loan.

¹¹ MHDC, 3:339, no. 872. The grant was made "in manum et fidem cognati sui Heinrici ducis de Karinthia." The duke was related only distantly to the count (see Chapter Three).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>MAIN DONOR</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>RECIPIENT</th>
<th>L. PARENTUM</th>
<th>GRANT TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Berthold II</td>
<td>1151-1168</td>
<td>Benediktbeuern</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Exchange&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Berthold II</td>
<td>1151-1173</td>
<td>Benediktbeuern</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Grant for Souls&lt;sup&gt;14&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Berthold II</td>
<td>1152-1153</td>
<td>Admont</td>
<td>Wife &amp; Brother</td>
<td>Exchange&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Berthold II</td>
<td>1157-1165</td>
<td>Admont</td>
<td>Wife (Joint)</td>
<td>Grant for Souls&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Berthold II</td>
<td>1158-1173</td>
<td>Vornbach</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Grant for Souls&lt;sup&gt;17&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Berthold II</td>
<td>1170-1173</td>
<td>Asbach</td>
<td>Son (Joint)</td>
<td>Quitclaim&lt;sup&gt;18&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Berthold II</td>
<td>1173-1175</td>
<td>Reichersberg</td>
<td>Son (Joint)</td>
<td>Grant for Souls&lt;sup&gt;19&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Berthold II</td>
<td>1173-1175</td>
<td>Schäftlarn</td>
<td>Son</td>
<td>Donation&lt;sup&gt;20&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Berthold II</td>
<td>1173-1175</td>
<td>Schäftlarn</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Grant for Souls&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Berthold II</td>
<td>1173-1188</td>
<td>Benediktbeuern</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Grant for Souls&lt;sup&gt;22&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Berthold II</td>
<td>1173-1188</td>
<td>Vornbach</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Donation&lt;sup&gt;23&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Berthold II</td>
<td>1173-1188</td>
<td>Vornbach</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Donation&lt;sup&gt;24&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Berthold II</td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>Wilten</td>
<td>Son (Joint)</td>
<td>Exchange&lt;sup&gt;25&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Berthold II</td>
<td>1180-1188</td>
<td>Benediktbeuern</td>
<td>Son (Joint)</td>
<td>Grant for Souls&lt;sup&gt;26&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Berthold II</td>
<td>1183-1188</td>
<td>Benediktbeuern</td>
<td>Son</td>
<td>Quitclaim&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure A.5 continued

<sup>13</sup> Baumann, 18-19, no. 31.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., 28-29, no. 56.

<sup>15</sup> UB Steiermark, 1:329-330, no. 342 and SUB, 2:423-426, no. 304.

<sup>16</sup> UB Steiermark, 1:396-397, no. 407.

<sup>17</sup> UBLE, 1:741, no. 411.

<sup>18</sup> Tr. Asbach, 42-43, no. 55.

<sup>19</sup> UBLE, 2:344, no. 235.

<sup>20</sup> Tr. Schäftlarn, 198-199, no. 200.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., 201, no. 203.

<sup>22</sup> Baumann, 44-45, no. 101.

<sup>23</sup> UBLE, 1:676, no. 166.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., 1:747-748, no. 436.


<sup>26</sup> Baumann, 48, no. 108.

<sup>27</sup> Oefele, 237-238, no. 10.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>MAIN DONOR</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>RECIPIENT</th>
<th>L. PARENTUM</th>
<th>GRANT TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Otto</td>
<td>1182</td>
<td>Diessen</td>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>Donation²⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Berthold III</td>
<td>1173-1180</td>
<td>Vornbach</td>
<td>Wife (Joint)</td>
<td>Donation²⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Berthold III</td>
<td>1188</td>
<td>Michelfeld</td>
<td>Brother (Joint)</td>
<td>Donation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Berthold III</td>
<td>1188-1204</td>
<td>Wilten</td>
<td>Sons</td>
<td>Confirmation³¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Berthold III</td>
<td>1194</td>
<td>Reichersberg</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Confirmation³²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Berthold III</td>
<td>1194</td>
<td>Raitenhaslach</td>
<td>Son (Joint)</td>
<td>Grant for Souls³³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Berthold III</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>Sons</td>
<td>Lien³⁴</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure A.5 continued

²⁸ Tr. Diessen, 37-38, no. 27. This is the only grant Bishop Otto II made of family properties.
²⁹ UBLE, 1:676, no. 168.
³⁰ MB, 25:105-108, no. 6. The gift was made “pro remedio animae patris sui.”
³¹ Ertl, 70-72, no. 3.
³² UBLE, 2:451-452, no. 308.
³³ Die Urkunden des Klosters Raitenhaslach 1034-1350, ed. Edgar Krausen, Quellen und Erörterungen zur bayerischen Geschichte, Neue Folge, vol. 17, pt. 1 (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1959), 42, no. 44. This is a confirmation of an earlier grant by Berthold III’s father.
³⁴ UB Krain, 2:5-6, no. 7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>MAIN DONOR</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>RECIPIENT</th>
<th>L. PARENTUM</th>
<th>GRANT TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Berthold I</td>
<td>1106-1113</td>
<td>Würzburg</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Exchange&lt;sup&gt;35&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Berthold I</td>
<td>ca. 1135</td>
<td>Admont</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Entrance Gift&lt;sup&gt;36&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Berthold I</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Admont</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Donation&lt;sup&gt;37&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Sophia</td>
<td>ca. 1130</td>
<td>Diessen</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Donation&lt;sup&gt;38&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Poppo</td>
<td>ca. 1137</td>
<td>Bamberg</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Exchange&lt;sup&gt;39&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Poppo</td>
<td>ca. 1137</td>
<td>Langheim</td>
<td>Wife (Joint)</td>
<td>Grant for Souls&lt;sup&gt;40&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Berthold II</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>Würzburg</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Exchange&lt;sup&gt;41&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Berthold II</td>
<td>1173-1188</td>
<td>Diessen</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Exchange&lt;sup&gt;42&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Berthold II</td>
<td>1173-1188</td>
<td>Seitz</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Grant for Souls&lt;sup&gt;43&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Berthold III</td>
<td>1188-1204</td>
<td>Viktring</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Confirmation&lt;sup&gt;44&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Berthold III</td>
<td>1188-1204</td>
<td>Seitz</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Confirmation&lt;sup&gt;45&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Berthold III</td>
<td>1203-1204</td>
<td>Langheim</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Donation&lt;sup&gt;46&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure A.6. Other Sources for Property Agreements

<sup>35</sup> The grant is reported in one of the bishop’s charters (1113): MB, 37:35-37, no. 75.

<sup>36</sup> SUB, 2:274, no. 188. This grant was made when Count Berthold I placed his daughter Kunigunde in the convent at Admont, but it only survives in a later document.

<sup>37</sup> The grant is reported in a later document: UB Steiermark, 1:329-330, no. 342.

<sup>38</sup> Nec. Diess., 25 (6 Sept.). Liutold was not the one to record this grant in his codex. A canon writing later in the thirteenth century added to Sophia of Istriá’s necrological entry that she had granted a series of properties in Carniola to the Diesen religious community and that the canons had later given these properties to Margrave Berthold II of Istriá in return for properties in Diessen.

<sup>39</sup> The grant appears in a later source: Oesterreicher, Denkwürdigkeiten, 4:18-20, no. 2.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid. It is unclear whether or not this is the grant referred to in a later charter of Bishop Otto II of Bamberg from around 1180 (Oefele, 235-237, no. 9). If it is not, then Poppo and his wife Kunizza actually made two grants to Langheim. For more on this, see Oefele, Register, nos. 97 and 98a.

<sup>41</sup> This grant is reported in a later document: MB, 37:68-70, no. 97.

<sup>42</sup> Nec. Diess., 25 (6 Sept.). See note 38 above.

<sup>43</sup> UB Steiermark, 1:706-707, no. 718. The record of this grant only survives in a later forgery.

<sup>44</sup> UB Krain, 1:108-112, no. 113.

<sup>45</sup> UB Steiermark, 1:706-707, no. 718. This is a later forgery.

<sup>46</sup> Oefele, 240-241, no. 13. This grant only survives in a later document.
APPENDIX THREE

UPDATED REGISTER OF SOURCES FOR
COUNT POPPO OF ANDECHS († 1148)

This is a preliminary register of those sources that name Count Poppo and that have been published in full, or registered in new editions, since the appearance of Edmund Oefele’s *Geschichte der Grafen von Andechs* in 1877. For those texts that only exist in printed form in editions that pre-date Oefele’s work, I have chosen to list only the Register number in Oefele since he provides all the necessary bibliographic material. I have focused on Poppo here because he is often overlooked in studies of the house of Andechs—mainly because he predeceased his father. However, it is my hope that this appendix may, at a later date, serve as the foundation for a more extensive collection of Andechs sources. Such collections are invaluable for understanding the history of noble houses, and an updated source collection for the Andechses would be a great benefit to historians.¹

¹ Two recent source collections for noble families that demonstrate the value of such works for the study of the medieval nobility are Ulrich Parlow, *Die Zähringer: Kommentierte Quellendokumentationen zu einem südwestdeutschen Herzogsgeschlecht des hohen Mittelalters* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1999) and Martin Aurell, *Actes de la famille Porcelet d’Arles (972-1320)* (Paris: C.T.H.S., 2001).
Count Berthold I gives his ministerial Heilrada and her children to the house of canons at Diessen in the presence of his wife Sophia and sons Poppo and Berthold II.

“Notum tam futuris quam presentibus sit, quod Bertolfus comes de Diezin presente uxore sua Sophia filiisque Poppone et Bertolfo tradidit Heilradam, filiam Hiltiboldi de Houestetin et Imize de Vinningin, et filios filiasque suas sancto Georio…”

Schlögl, the editor of the Diessen tradition notices, provides a terminus post quem of 24 April 1122 for this donation. He argues that Berthold I would only have used the title of “comes de Diessen” after the death of his distant Wolfratshausen relative Count Otto of Diessen-Amras on 24 April 1122. There is evidence from earlier decades to suggest, however, that more than one member of the kinship group could use the cognomen “de Diessen” during the same period (see Appendix One). Furthermore, because Berthold I undoubtedly held lands and rights at Diessen prior to this date, it is certainly possible the grant could have occurred before 1122. I therefore argue that the tradition notice could have been drawn up at any point between ca. 1114—the foundation date of the Diessen house of canons—and ca. 1123—the period when the house of canons moved from St. George to St. Stephen.

Narrowing the date of the tradition notice any further is difficult. Franziska Jungmann-Stadler, in a study of Sophia’s sister Hedwig, has suggested that both women were born during the 1090s. They could not have been born later than 1102 because their father Margrave Poppo of Istria died in 1098/1101. As prominent heiresses, the two were almost certainly both married soon after they reached the minimum marriageable age of twelve. This would mean that Sophia’s union with Count Berthold I likely occurred between approximately 1105 and (at the latest) 1115. Jungmann-Stadler believes that Hedwig married in 1108 or 1109 and had her first child in either 1109 or 1110. If the births of Sophia’s two oldest sons Poppo and Berthold II are similarly dated to the period around 1110, this Diessen tradition notice could plausibly be dated to the late 1110s or early 1120s. Placing the document within this timeframe would explain how Poppo and Berthold II were old enough to be involved in the property donation but were still considered minors (Sophia’s involvement indicates they were not yet recognized as adults).

---


3 Alois Schütz, “Die Grafen von Dießen und Andechs, Herzöge von Meranien,” in Königliche Tochterstämme, Königs wähler und Kurfürsten, ed. Armin Wolf (Frankfurt: Vittorio Klostermann, 2002), 271, note 165 suggests Sophia and Berthold I were married between 1110 and 1120. The latter year is too late because five of their children—Poppo, Berthold II, Gisela, Mechthild and Otto—all were almost certainly born by 1125.

4 Ibid., 248-249.
Ulrich of Amras, a ministerial of the counts of Wolfratshausen, makes a grant to the house of canons at Diessen into the hands of the advocate Count Berthold I and his son Poppo.

“Notum sit omnibus tam presentibus quam futuris, quod Odalricus de Humeras tradidit… in manus advocati comitis Bertolfi et filii sui Popponis…”

“Et huic rei astipulantur: comes Poppo,…”

Complete Text: Tr. Diessen, 8-9, no. 5.
OEFELE, 159, NO. 334.

This tradition notice is very difficult to date with any accuracy because it is unclear which members of the house of Wolfratshausen are named in the document. Schlögl argues for a dating range of ca. 1123 – 28 May 1127. His terminus ante quem is based on the assumption that the Otto who appears in the notice is Count Otto I of Wolfratshausen, who probably died on 28 May 1127. Schlögl believes that the phrase “per manus domini suiOttonis et Henrici et domine sue Lauritten” in the text must refer to Count Otto I and his brother Henry, the future bishop of Regensburg. This is the subject of debate, however. Schlögl was working under the assumption that, in the next generation, Count Henry of Wolfratshausen was the first-born son and Count Otto II of Wolfratshausen the second-born son; the order of names in this tradition notice would therefore only make sense if it were referring to the members of the previous generation. But Johann Weissensteiner has demonstrated convincingly that Count Otto II of Wolfratshausen was born before Count Henry of Wolfratshausen, meaning the order of names in the text works equally well for both generations. The reference to Count Otto I’s wife Lauritta does not help to solve the mystery, since she continues to appear in documents until the 1140s.

Thus, the Otto and Henry in the tradition notice could be from either generation of the house of Wolfratshausen. This means the text must be assigned to a broad temporal range. The reference in the text to St. Stephen provides a terminus post quem of ca. 1123. A date for the text anytime in the next decade is possible. In 1133, Count Otto II of Wolfratshausen was imprisoned as a result of his conflict with the duke of Bavaria. He was not released again until 1136, shortly before he died. Either 1133 or 1136 is therefore the terminus ante quem.

---

26 May 1129/30 @ Stohka

FORGERY

Count Berthold I and his son Poppo are witnesses in a charter of King Lothar III for the monastery of Mallersdorf.

“...Berhtoldus comes et filius eius Poppo,...”

Complete Text: MGH D Lothar III, 27-30, no. 20. OEFLE, 113, NO. 35D.


The editors of the MGH edition of Lothar III’s charters, Ottenthal and Hirsch, were somewhat skeptical about the authenticity of this charter. However, the most interesting question for these scholars was whether the charter was drawn up in 1129 at Stöckey near Erfurt or in 1130 at Stocka in Bavaria. It is the editors of the 1994 edition of the Regesta Imperii for Lothar III who have declared most emphatically that the charter is a forgery from sometime during the mid- or late 1130s. Unfortunately, it is not clear if the forger was working from an earlier authentic charter, one from which the witness list might have been taken.

6 February 1132 @ Cluny

Count Berthold I, his wife Sophia, and their children are named in Pope Innocent II’s bull of protection for the house of Augustinian canons at Diessen as grantors of the religious house to the Holy See.

“...ecclesiam beati Stephani a Bertulfo et Ottone comitibus et Sophia ac Lauretia eorum uxoribus et filiis per manum illustris viri Tehinhardi beato Petro oblatam,...”


The “filiis” referred to in the document must have included Poppo since he had already appeared in a Diessen tradition notice prior to the year 1123. The text of the bull makes it clear that Count Berthold I and the others had sought papal protection for Diessen at some earlier date and that 6 February 1132 marked the end of a lengthy process. For more on this point, see Die Älteste Besitzliste und das Urbar des Stiftes Diessen von 1362/63 und die Register zu Traditionen, Urkunden und Urbar, ed. Waldemar Schlögl, in Quellen und Erörterungen zur bayerischen Geschichte, Neue Folge, vol. 22, pt. 2 (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1970), 90, no. 3.
1135

Oefele, 113-114, no. 37: Count Berthold I of Andechs (“de Plassenberch”) and his son Poppo are named as witnesses in a charter of Bishop Otto I of Bamberg.

3 October 1136 @ Coreggio Verde

Count Poppo is named as a witness in a charter of Emperor Lothar III while taking part in an Italian expedition.

“…comitum…Bopponis”

OEFLE, 121, NO. 92.

The obvious question concerning this charter is whether the “Count Poppo” in the witness list is in fact the Poppo from the house of Andechs. A definitive answer would require a careful investigation of the sources from Lothar III’s reign in order to determine if there is another Count Poppo who is a more likely candidate.

25 May 1137

Oefele, 114 and 121, nos. 37c and 92a: Poppo is granted by Bishop Otto I of Bamberg the advocacy over certain properties owned by the religious community of St. Getreu am Michelsberg.

22 September 1137 @ Aquino

Count Poppo is named as a witness in a charter of Emperor Lothar III while participating in an Italian expedition.

“…comes Poppo”

Complete Text: MGH D Lothar III, 190-193, no. 119.
OFEFELE, 121, NO. 93.

Because a Count Poppo who is identified with the cognomen “of Andechs” is named in another imperial charter from the same date (no. 7 below), there seems to be little reason to doubt that this Count Poppo is the one from the house of Andechs.
22 September 1137 @ Aquino

**Count Poppo and his younger brother Berthold II are witnesses for a charter of Emperor Lothar III while in Italy.**

“…comitum etiam Bobo de Anedesse, Be[rtu]lfus [frater] eius”

**Complete Text:** MGH D Lothar III, 194-202, no. 120.
OEFELE, 121, NO. 94.

(1137/38-June 1147)

**In a tradition notice from the house of canons at Diessen, Berthold von Hausen is identified as a ministerial of Counts Poppo and Berthold II. His grant to the canons was made with the consent of his lords.**

“Bertolfus de Husen, ministerialis comitum Popponis et Bertholfi,…unacum matre sua Adelburga, et consensu dominorum suorum…”

**Complete Text:** Tr. Diessen, 13-15, no. 9.
OEFELE, 123-124, NO. 107A.

Schlögl, the editor of the Diessen tradition notices, argues that the Berthold named in the text is Poppo’s younger brother Berthold II because his name follows that of Poppo; if this were Poppo’s father Count Berthold I, the name Berthold would presumably preceede that of Poppo.

The grant by Berthold von Hausen was made at the request of his brother Liutold, “who was killed in the county of his lord, Count Berthold.” This Berthold must be Count Berthold I. There is no evidence to suggest that Berthold II was in control of any of the family’s counties—indisputably from both his father and older brother—prior to the Second Crusade. It is an indication of how complex the situation was inside the Andechs lineage during the late 1130s and 1140s that these three men were all named in the same document. See Chapter Five for more on this point.

22/23 May 1138 @ Bamberg

**Count Poppo witnesses a royal charter of King Conrad III.**

“Poppo comes de Anedesse”

**Complete Text:** MGH D Konrad III, 18-19, no. 10.
OEFELE, 121, NO. 95.
July 1139
Oefele, 114, no. 40: Count Berthold I and his son Poppo are named as witnesses to a gift made to the monastery of Michelsberg in Bamberg.

(before 1139)
Oefele, 121, nos. 96 and 97: Count Poppo and his wife Kunizza are involved in a pair of property agreements involving the bishop of Bamberg and the monastery of Langheim.

(ca. 1139-1143)
Count Poppo and his brother Count Berthold II are named as witnesses in a tradition notice recording a nobleman’s grant to the monastery of Benediktbeuern. Poppo is identified as the monastery’s advocate.

“…sub his testibus: Poppo comes, advocatus noster, Berhtoldus comes, frater ipsius,…”

Complete Text: Baumann, 17-18, no. 29.
OEFLE, 122, NO. 102B.

Baumann’s arguments concerning the date for this text can be found on pp. 3-4 of his edition of the tradition notices. For further discussion of this text and its significance, see Chapter Five.

(ca. 1139-1143)
The youngest son of Count Berthold I, Otto, is named as a witness in a tradition notice recording a nobleman’s grant to the monastery of Benediktbeuern. He is identified as the brother of Poppo, the monastery’s advocate, and of Berthold II.

“…sub his testibus: Otto frater advocationi nostri Popponis et B[erhtoldi],….”

Complete Text: Baumann, 18, no. 30.
NOT IN OEFLE.

Baumann’s arguments concerning the date for this text can be found on pp. 3-4 of his edition of the tradition notices. For further discussion of this text and its significance, see Chapter Five.
1 May 1140 @ Frankfurt

Count Poppo is named as a witness in a charter of King Conrad III.

“Poppo comes de Anedesse”

Complete Text: MGH D Konrad III, 75-77, no. 45.
OEFELE, 121, NO. 98.

The editors of the MGH edition of Conrad III’s charters have identified this text as a forgery. However, the forgery was clearly based on an original document, and the editors therefore believe the date and the witness list are authentic.

15 November 1140 @ Weinsberg

Count Poppo witnesses a charter of King Conrad III during the siege of Weinsberg.

“Poppo comes”

Complete Text: MGH D Konrad III, 87-88, no. 52.
NOT IN OEFELE.

It is unclear why Oefele does not include this text in his Register. He may have thought that this Count Poppo was not the Poppo from the house of Andechs. However, since Poppo of Andechs was with Conrad III at Frankfurt in May and his brother was with Conrad’s ally Duke Leopold of Bavaria in July, it is likely this Count Poppo is the Andechs lord. The house of Andechs seems to have played an important role in Conrad III’s war against Duke Welf VI.

(1141-1142)

Oefele, 121, no. 98a: Count Poppo and his wife Kunizza make a donation to the monastery of Langheim.

20 January 1142 @ Regensburg

Count Berthold I and his son Count Poppo are both named as witnesses in a royal charter of King Conrad III.

“Perhtoldus comes de Andehse, Poppo comes filius eius”

OEFELE, 115, NO. 43.
Late May 1142 @ Nuremberg  #15

Count Poppo is named as a witness at the royal court for a judicial decision concerning the monastery of Wessobrunn.

“Poppo comes de Andechs”

OEFLE, 121, NO. 98B.

1142-1143

Oefele, 121-122, nos. 99 and 99a: Count Poppo’s marriage to Kunizza is dissolved. As a result, conflict breaks out between Poppo and the church of Bamberg.

(May-June) 1143

Oefele, 122, nos. 100 and 101: The peace agreement between Count Poppo and Bishop Egilbert of Bamberg.

(June) 1143 @ Fulda  #16

Count Poppo witnesses a charter of King Conrad III.

“Boppo de Anadesse”

Complete Text: MGH D Konrad III, 156-157, no. 88.
OEFLE, 122, NO. 102.

For the argument that this text should be dated to June at Fulda rather than August at Ulm, as Oefele believed, see the MGH edition.

(December 1146-May 1147)  #17

In a tradition notice recording a grant by Duke Welf VI to the house of canons at Polling, the duke’s grant is made through the hand of Count Poppo. Berthold I(II) is named as a witness in the document.

“…factum est per manum Poponis comitis de Anedehse et per manum Hartmanni de Tutenhusen, in cuius manum scilicet Poponis comitis delegavit dominus Welf eidem ecclesie tradendum et Popo comes in manum Hartmanni in fide eidem ecclesie delegandum. Huius tradicionis testes sunt hii:…Berhtolt comes de Anedehse…”

Complete Text: Tr. Polling, 14-21, no. 7.
OEFLE, 123, NO. 104B.
Oefele believed that the Count Berthold named in the witness list was Berthold II. This is the most plausible argument, as I have argued in Chapter Five.

30 January 1147 @ Fulda

“Bobbo comes et frater eius Bertholdus”


It is possible that this text refers to the brothers Poppo IV and Berthold I, who were both burgraves of Würzburg from the house of Henneberg. This may be why Oefele does not include this charter in his Register. However, because the Andechs brothers Poppo and Berthold II appear so frequently in documents during the months leading up to the Second Crusade, I am inclined to believe this text refers to them, not the Hennebergs.

(January-June 1147)

On the eve of the Second Crusade, Count Poppo makes a grant to the monastery of Admont for his soul, the souls of his ancestors, and the soul of his son Henry. If Poppo should die on the crusade, his brother Berthold II will complete the agreement.

“Notum sit omni posteritati, qualiter Poppo comes de Gieche iturus in expeditionem Ierosolimitanam que sub Chounrado III. rege facta est, pactus est cenobio Admuntensi, si de hoc itineri non reverteretur, XII mansus apud Schowenburc cum mancipiis ad eosdem mansus pertinentibus pro remedio anime sue et omnium parentum suorum et pro filio suo Heinrico quem in eodem cenobio monastice professioni obtulerat, et hanc pactionem fratri suo Perchtoldo comiti comissit, ut, si ipse, ut predictum est, in hac via remaneret, ille vice ipsius eosdem mansos cum mancipiis cenobio traderet pro anima sua.”


OEFELE, 123, NO. 105.

13 February 1147 @ Regensburg

“Poppo et frater suus Bertoldus comites”
Because “Poppo et Berhtolt comites de Andehs” are named in the following text, which is from the same approximate period, it seems certain that the Poppo and Berthold named in this charter are the brothers from the house of Andechs.

(February) 1147 @ Regensburg

*While attending the royal court, Count Poppo and his brother Berthold II witness an agreement between the bishop of Freising and the abbess of Niedernburg in Passau.*

“Poppo et Berhtolt comites de Andehs”

OEFELE, 122-123, NO. 104.

(May) 1147 @ Stetten

*Count Poppo is named as a witness to a grant made by Duke Welf VI to the monastery of Wessobrunn.*

“comes Poppo de Lèche”

OEFELE, 123, NO. 104A.

Poppo’s title of “count of Lèche” is probably a southern Bavarian scribe incorrectly spelling the Franconian castle of “Giech.” For this point, see Die Traditionen des Klosters Wessobrunn, 46.

(before 27 May 1147)

*Count Berthold I and his sons Poppo and Berthold II are named as witnesses in a grant by Adalbert of Mammendorf to the monastery of Wessobrunn.*

“Testes: Perchtoldus comes de Andechs et duo filii eius Poppo et Pertholdus et alii multi.”

Complete Text: Die Traditionen des Klosters Wessobrunn, 41-42, no. 27.
OEFELE, 115, NO. 52.

Reinhard Höppl, the editor of the Wessobrunn traditions, dates this text to ca. 1142-1147 based on some of the other tradition notices around it in the book of traditions. There is nothing in the text itself that indicates a possible date. However, the fact that neither Poppo nor Berthold II appears with any title suggests to me an earlier date,
perhaps as early as the late 1120s. It is unusual to find Poppo mentioned without the title
*comes* after his marriage to Kunissa of Giech.

**BEFORE 27 MAY 1147**

Oeßele, 115, no. 51: *Count Berthold I makes a grant to the monastery of Ensdorf, and his sons Poppo and Berthold II are witnesses.*

**4 JUNE 1147**

*Poppo and his brother Berthold II are named as witnesses in a royal charter of King Conrad III.*

“Poppo comes et frater eius Bertholdus”

*Complete Text: MGH D Konrad III, 349-351, no. 193.*
*Oeßele, 123, no. 106.*

Because this charter was drawn up after the crusading army had begun its march through the southeast of the empire, this must be Poppo and Berthold II of Andechs, who are known to have participated in the crusade.

**16 JUNE 1147**

*Poppo and his brother Berthold II appear as witnesses for a royal charter of King Conrad III.*

“Popo comes et Bertholdus frater eius”

*Complete Text: MGH D Konrad III, 351-353, no. 193.*
*Oeßele, 123, no. 107.*

Because this charter was drawn up after the crusading army had begun its march through the southeast of the empire, this must be Poppo and Berthold II of Andechs, who are known to have participated in the crusade.

**11 DECEMBER (1148) @ CONSTANTINOPLE**

*Poppo dies*  
The only sources for his death are a pair of thirteenth-century notations made in both Necrology A and Necrology B of the Diessen canon Liutold’s Codex: see Nec. Diess., 31: “*Poppo com. ob., sepultus Constantinopolis, filius Berhtoldi comitis, fundatoris nostri.*” The phrase “*sepultus Constantinopolis*” is only found in Necrology A.
APPENDIX FOUR

SOURCES FOR BISHOP OTTO II OF BAMBERG’S CONTACTS
WITH THE SECULAR LORDS IN THE HOUSE OF ANDECHS, 1177-1196

The documents included in this appendix are predominantly those of Bishop Otto II of Bamberg’s charters that name Margrave Berthold II of Istria and/or Duke Berthold III of Merania. Unfortunately, there is no modern study of the Bamberg episcopal charters that offers in one place printed editions of all these texts. Hans-Ulrich Ziegler in 1982 provided in an article on the twelfth-century bishops a list of all of Otto II’s known charters, but it does not contain information on the most recent editions for each of the documents.¹ I have attempted here to indicate where the newest, full-text edition of each source can be located; however, this is—with Appendices Two and Three—part of an ongoing project to update Edmund Oefele’s 1877 register of Andechs sources, and I do not claim to be finished with this work. As a result, there may be more recent editions of some of these texts than the editions I have provided in the footnotes.

I have also included in this appendix a small number of other charters and tradition notices that provide useful evidence for contacts between Otto and the secular lords in the House of Ancehs.

lords in his family. I have not, however, included any imperial charters. Although Bishop Otto II appears with Berthold II and Berthold III in the witness lists of many of Emperor Frederick I and Henry VI’s charters, it is difficult to conclude that there were close familial contacts during large court gatherings. But one exception to this general observation is worth noting here. A series of imperial charters from the autumn of 1184 strongly suggests that Berthold II and Otto journeyed together to and from Frederick I’s court in Italy in that year. The bishop of Bamberg first witnessed an imperial charter from this period at Milan on 22 September 1184; only a week later on 29 September, Margrave Berthold II was named in the witness list of a charter drawn up at Pavia. Since these are the two earliest surviving imperial charters from this Italian expedition, the brothers quite possibly accompanied Barbarossa across the Alps. Over the course of the next two months, the siblings appeared together as witnesses in seven of Frederick I’s charters as the imperial court made its way across northern Italy. The brothers were then named separately in the witness lists of two different charters drawn up at Treviso north of Venice on 24 November. Neither witnessed another charter from this Italian expedition. It seems likely, therefore, that from Treviso the pair crossed the Alps together into either Carinthia or Tyrol in late November or early December.

2 MGH D Friedrich I, 4:102-105, nos. 866-867.
3 Ibid., 4:105-107, no. 868; 117-118, no. 877; 119-120, no. 879; 121-125, no. 881; and 127-132, nos. 883-885.
4 Ibid., 4:133, no. 886 (Otto) and 134-135, no. 887 (Berthold II).
5 For a discussion of this expedition, see Ferdinand Opll, Friedrich Barbarossa (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1990), 142ff. The emperor spent Christmas of 1184 in Brescia.
6 Landgrave Louis III of Thuringia and Burgrave Henry of Regensburg may have left the imperial court around the same time. Imperial charters are in general an underused resource in the study of imperial noble families and the imperial nobility more broadly. While a single reference to a secular or
Thus, the list of documents provided below is not intended to be a comprehensive list of all sources that might be used as evidence for Otto’s contacts with Berthold II and Berthold III. It does, however, contain the best evidence for these interactions. I have listed the documents in chronological order. If the charter or tradition notice includes information on where the business discussed in the document was conducted, I include the location. In the subsequent two columns, I then name the lord in whose name the document was drawn up and the recipient of the text. The final column states which members of the house of Andechs are named in the charter or tradition notice. The letter W indicates that person was a witness to the agreement. If a lord from the family appears in the document in some other context, I explain his involvement in more detail in the footnote.

---

ecclesiastical lord in the witness list of any given charter cannot reveal much, patterns such as the one I have discussed here are potentially very useful.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Andechses Named</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1177-1188</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Otto II</td>
<td>Prüfening</td>
<td>W: Berthold II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.29.1178</td>
<td>Wolfsberg</td>
<td>Otto II</td>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td>W: Berthold II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.24.1178</td>
<td>Gleink</td>
<td>Otto II</td>
<td>Gleink</td>
<td>W: Berthold III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1178-1180</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Otto II</td>
<td>Langheim</td>
<td>W: Berthold III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Otto II</td>
<td>Arnoldstein</td>
<td>W: Berthold II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>Langheim</td>
<td>Otto II</td>
<td>Langheim</td>
<td>W: Berthold II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>Atter Lake</td>
<td>Otto II</td>
<td>Osterhofen</td>
<td>Ws: Berthold II &amp; III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1180-1188</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Otto II</td>
<td>Langheim</td>
<td>Bert. III &amp; W: Bert. II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.12.1182</td>
<td>Diessen</td>
<td>Otto II</td>
<td>Diessen</td>
<td>Berthold II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure A.7. Charters and Tradition Notices that name Bishop Otto II of Bamberg with Margrave Berthold II of Istria and / or Duke Berthold III of Merania

---

7 Hans Hirsch, “Die Urkundenfälschungen des Klosters Prüfening,” MIÖG 29 (1908): 62-63. Despite the title of the article, this particular tradition notice is not a forgery.

8 MHDC, 3:470-471, no. 1242.

9 UBLE, 2:353-354, no. 245. The surviving copies of this charter and of nos. 14 and 15 below were all written around the year 1200. The question therefore is whether they are copies of authentic charters that were lost in the 1192 fire at Gleink or simple forgeries. While the scribe may well have altered some of the titles of people in order to update them (for example naming Berthold III as duke though he was not yet duke in 1178), I am inclined to believe the charters’ contents are authentic. See Robert Steiner, *Die Entwicklung der bayerischen Bischofssiegel von der Frühzeit bis zum Einsetzen des Spitzovalen Throneyp*, Quellen und Erörterungen zur bayerischen Geschichte, Neue Folge, vol. 40, pt. 1 (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1998), 193-195.

10 Oefele, 235-237, no. 9.

11 MHDC, 3:479, no. 1271.


15 Tr. Diessen, 36-38, no. 27. Otto’s grant to Diessen is made through the hand of his brother Berthold II.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Andechses Named</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.29.1182</td>
<td>Aufhofen</td>
<td>See note</td>
<td>Neustift</td>
<td>Otto II &amp; Berthold II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1182</td>
<td>Bamberg</td>
<td>Otto II</td>
<td>Langheim</td>
<td>Berthold II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>(1182)</td>
<td>Amberg</td>
<td>See note</td>
<td>See note</td>
<td>Ws: Otto II &amp; Bert. III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.1183</td>
<td>Nuremberg</td>
<td>Otto II</td>
<td>Aldersbach</td>
<td>Ws: Berthold II &amp; III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.12.1183</td>
<td>Lorch</td>
<td>Otto II</td>
<td>Gleink</td>
<td>W: Berthold III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.12.1183</td>
<td>Lorch</td>
<td>Otto II</td>
<td>Gleink</td>
<td>W: Berthold III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1183</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Otto II</td>
<td>St. Getreu</td>
<td>W: Berthold II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Otto II</td>
<td>Michelfeld</td>
<td>W: Berthold III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Otto II</td>
<td>Cathedral</td>
<td>W: Berthold III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Otto II</td>
<td>St. Getreu</td>
<td>W: Berthold II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>(1186)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Otto II</td>
<td>Prüfening</td>
<td>W: Berthold III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure A.7 continued


17 Joseph von Hormayr, *Sämtliche Werke*, vol. 3 (Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1822), 427-428, no. 4. Berthold II is named in the text as a party to this exchange involving the bishops of Würzburg and Bamberg and the monastery of Langheim.

18 *Codex Falkensteinensis: Die Rechtsaufzeichnungen der Grafen von Falkenstein*, ed. Elisabeth Noichl, Quellen und Erörterungen zur bayerischen Geschichte, Neue Folge, vol. 29 (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1978), 135-136, no. 157. This text concerns the transfer of Judith of Neuburg-Falkenstein’s share of her family’s patrimony to her paternal uncle Sigiboto IV.

19 MB, 5:359-360, no. 6. This charter was drawn up during a session of the imperial court. See also MGH D Friedrich I, 4:50-51, no. 840.

20 UBLE, 2:382-384, no. 262. See note 9 above.

21 Ibid., 2:385-387, no. 263. See note 9 above.


23 P. Aemilius Ussermann, *Episcopatus Bambergensis sub S. Sede Apostolica Chronologice ac Diplomatice Illustratus* (St. Blasien, 1802), 126, no. 141.

24 Staatsarchiv Bamberg, BU 365.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Andechs Named</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>(1186)</td>
<td>Regensburg</td>
<td>See note</td>
<td>Prüfening</td>
<td>Ws: Otto II &amp; Bert. II²⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>Bamberg</td>
<td>Otto II</td>
<td>Langheim</td>
<td>Bert. III &amp; W: Bert. II²⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.10.1188</td>
<td>Plattling</td>
<td>See note</td>
<td>See note</td>
<td>Otto II &amp; Ws: Bert. II &amp; III²⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>See note</td>
<td>Cathedral</td>
<td>Otto II &amp; W: Berthold III³⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>(1190)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Otto II</td>
<td>Pyhrn</td>
<td>Berthold III³¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>(6.7.1192)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Otto II</td>
<td>See note</td>
<td>Poppo &amp; Berthold III³²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1194-1196</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Otto II</td>
<td>Michelsberg</td>
<td>W: Berthold III³³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.17.1195</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Otto II</td>
<td>Ensdorf</td>
<td>W: Berthold III³⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>Michelfeld</td>
<td>Otto II</td>
<td>Banz</td>
<td>Berthold III³⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Otto II</td>
<td>Michelfeld</td>
<td>W: Berthold III³⁶</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure A.7 continued

---

²⁷ Ibid., 182-183, no. 230. This is a tradition notice recording a grant by Duke Louis I of Bavaria and his paternal uncle Count-Palatine Otto VI of Wittelsbach.

²⁸ Staatsarchiv Bamberg, BU 376. Summary: *Das Copialbuch der Cistercienser-Abtei Langheim [I. Beilage]*, 28-29. Berthold III is named in the text as defender of the lands being granted to Langheim.


³⁰ Paul Oesterreicher, *Geschichte der Herrschaft Banz*, vol. 2 (Bamberg, 1833), 48-50, no. 30. This is a charter of Count Frederick of Abenberg drawn up on the eve of the Third Crusade. He mortgaged various Bamberg fiefs to Bishop Otto II to fund his journey.

³¹ *UBLE*, 2:423, no. 289. Berthold III is named in the charter because he returned to the bishopric lands he held in fief so that Bishop Otto II could give those lands to Pyhrn.

³² Tr. Diessen, 109-112, no. 6. This is an agreement between the house of Andechs and the church of Bamberg concerning ministerial marriages.

³³ Staatsarchiv Bamberg, BU 373. Summary: *Das Urkundenbuch des Abtes Andreas im Kloster Michelsberg bei Bamberg*, 52.

³⁴ MB, 24:40-42, no. 17.

³⁵ Oesterreicher, *Geschichte der Herrschaft Banz*, 2:50-52, no. 31. Berthold III received a benefice from Bishop Otto II as part of the exchange recorded here.

³⁶ Hormayr, 436-437, no. 10.
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