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CHAPTER ONE

The Archiepiscopal Ministerial Age

Medieval Germans were themselves puzzled by the ministerials' peculiar status. An Alsatian monk, writing about 1160, pointed out that the familia of the bishop of Strasbourg was divided into three distinct strata: the ministerials or knightly stratum ("militaris directa"), who were so noble and warlike that they could be compared to the estate of the freeborn; the censuales or altar dependents, who paid dues; and those who owed both labor services and renders. Another passage supplied the ministerials with a Roman pedigree. After Julius Caesar had defeated the Gauls, he rewarded the Germans who had assisted him by granting their princes the rank of senators and by giving the lesser knights ("minores...milites") Roman citizenship. Before leaving for Rome, Caesar assembled the Germans and assigned the knights to the princes, but he urged them "to treat the knights not as slaves and servants but rather to receive their services as the knights' lords and defenders. Hence it is," the chronicler explained, "that German knights, unlike their counterparts in other nations, are called servants of the royal fisc and princely ministerials."¹ These passages, which were an attempt to explain not only the rise of the ministerials out of the familia but also the formation of the estate of princes (Reichsfürstenstand), reveal both the ministerials' pretensions to noble status and their anxiety about their marginal place in German society.²

¹. Chronicon Ebersheimense, ed. Ludwig Weiland, MGH SS 23 (Hanover, 1874), pp. 432–33.
Modern German scholars found it very difficult to believe that many of the most distinguished aristocratic families (for example, the only surviving lineage of former archiepiscopal ministerials, the Törrings, who had been counts since 1630) were of servile ancestry; and until the 1920s there were numerous and not very convincing attempts to prove the contrary. Although it is generally accepted today that the ministerials rose out of the ranks of the dependent population, many nobles did become ministerials in the twelfth century, and marriages between ministerials and nobles, particularly noblewomen, were common. This “improvement” in the ministerials’ bloodlines was a major factor in their eventual ennoblement. Aristocratic pride was not the sole reason for the scholarly reluctance to accept the ministerials’ servile origins, however. There is very little documentary evidence about the ministerials before their sudden appearance in the sources about 1100 as a fully formed institution, and scholars were thus able to let their imaginations run wild. Thanks to the survival of the Traditionsbücher, the Austro-Bavarian area is one of the few regions where it is possible to study, even dimly, the ministerials’ obscure beginnings. This chapter will therefore trace in broad terms the history of the Salzburg ministerials from servitude in the tenth century to nobility and oblivion in the fourteenth.

The medieval nobility of Salzburg was composed of three distinct, successive, but connected layers. The old free nobles—that is, individuals who were styled in the twelfth century as counts, nobles, or freemen—were the descendants of the Bavarian tribal nobility and the Carolingian imperial aristocracy who had settled in the area. By 1200 they had largely died out in the male line or had become ministerials themselves. The ancestors of the ministerials or at least their functional precursors, identified as servi, can first be detected in the second half of the tenth century and by 1050 formed an elevated group within the archiepiscopal familia. The Investiture Conflict was the decisive moment in the rise of the ministeriales, the term that became the standard designation for them in this period. By 1200 the

---


archiepiscopal ministerials had become the secular leaders of Salzburg society. Nothing illustrates their position better than their right, along with the cathedral canons, to elect the archbishop. The sources began to distinguish about 1180 between the greater or better ministerials, who had their own servile vassals or knights, and the lesser ministerials, who did not. By 1300 these lesser ministerials and the knightly retainers had formed a separate estate of knights (Ritterstand). Since by the fourteenth century there were too few lineages of greater ministerials to maintain their exclusive status, they coalesced with the knights, just as the surviving free nobles had become ministerials a century or two earlier. Although the designation of the Alsatian ministerials as knights reflected their rise out of the ranks of the servile population and their gradual ennoblement, the application of the words miles or Ritter to the ministerials in Salzburg signified that they could no longer maintain their superior position vis-à-vis their own men. This chapter concentrates on the ministerials, but it must inevitably also deal with the changing relationship between the nobles, ministerials, and knights.

Before the Investiture Conflict

It is possible to follow in the archiepiscopal codices of traditions that span the years 923 to 1060 the emergence of an elite group within the archiepiscopal familia, that is, among those individuals who were subject to the archbishop’s household lordship on account of their servile birth. These men, who were identified by terms that began to deemphasize their servile condition, gradually replaced the nobles as transactors and as the archbishops’ advisers.

The first signs of this process appear during the archiepiscopate of Frederick I (958–91). The consent clauses in four of the twenty-four transactions recorded in his collection state that Frederick had consulted with members of his household. For example, one notice declared that he had acted “with the advice of the entire clergy, the free vassals [militiae], and all of his household [familiaeque omnis].” Two entries offer a clue to the identity of the household members Frederick consulted. About 963 Diotrih, who was called a “servus” of Saints Peter and Rupert, exchanged his alod (proprietas) of three hides and twenty yokes with the archbishop for an equal amount of land that he and his posterity were to possess.

7. The word familia could sometimes be employed in the tenth and eleventh centuries for anyone who was subject to the lord’s authority, including the vassals and the clergy, but it referred more commonly to the nonfree, as the consent clause cited above indicates. On this point, see Philippe Dollinger, L’évolution des classes rurales en Baviere depuis la fin de l’époque carolingienne jusqu’au milieu du XIIIe siècle, Publications de la Faculté des lettres de l’Université de Strasbourg 112 (Paris, 1949), pp. 243–44.

8. SUB 1:180–81, no. 15. See also SUB 1:168–70, no. 2; 173–74, no. 8; 177–78, no. 13. On the meaning of miles and militia in this period in Salzburg, see Freed, “Nobles,” pp. 581–84.
in perpetuity.⁹ On 1 August 976, a “quidam familiae servus” named Wolfpreht and his wife gave the archbishop a hide and forty yokes and received in perpetuity whatever lands his father had previously held in benefice at an unidentifiable Saxinga, which Wolfpreht could dispose of freely.¹⁰

There are three striking aspects of these transactions. The first is that Archbishop Frederick even bothered to consult, let alone exchanged property, with a man labeled a serf. There is no evidence that Archbishop Odalbert (923–35), whose Traditionsbuch also survives, did; there mancipia, serfs without their own tenures, were merely objects to be traded. Second, these servi owned alods, and Wolfpreht held a benefice that had previously belonged to his father; that is, he already occupied a quasi-hereditary position. Finally, it is noteworthy that Wolfpreht exchanged property with Frederick in Regensburg on 1 August 976, just after Otto II had successfully besieged Duke Henry the Wrangler of Bavaria. This suggests that Wolfpreht may have been a warrior.

The members of the familia continued to advance during the archiepiscopalates of Frederick’s successors: Hartwig (991–1023), Thietmar (1025–41), and Baldwin (1041–60). First of all, there was a sharp decline in the number of nobles who exchanged property with the archbishops and a concomitant rise during the first half of the eleventh century in the number of transactors drawn from the familia. For example, forty-two noblemen, eleven noble clerics, twenty noblewomen, and two freemen, but no members of the household, engaged in the 102 transactions recorded in Archbishop Odalbert’s codex of traditions. In contrast, only two noblemen, one noble cleric, and one free man, but twenty-one lay members of the familia, seven clerical members of the household, and one female member of the familia appeared as transactors in the thirty-six entries in Thietmar’s collection. It is possible that for some unknown reason the scribes ceased to record the archbishops’ dealings with the nobility, but that seems unlikely. Second, members of the familia replaced the nobles and free vassals as the archbishops’ advisers and as witnesses in the eleventh-century collections, even when the transactor was a noble.

The growing importance of the lay members of the archiepiscopal household was reflected in designations that placed less emphasis on their servile status than servus did. Although servus itself and equivalent expressions like quidam servilis conditionis remained by far the most common terms, quidam de familia or ex familia sancti Ruodberti came into use under Archbishop Hartwig and quidam vir

⁹. SUB 1:173–74, no. 8. The Latin word mansus and the German word Hube, which was Latinized as huba or hoba and which I have translated as hide, were usually employed interchangeably in Bavaria. It was considered to be the amount of land necessary to support a peasant family. The arable portion of the hide was divided into yokes (jugera), in theory the amount of land that could be plowed by a team of oxen. See Dollinger, L’évolution, pp. 105–11.

¹⁰. SUB 1:183–84, no. 19. For further information, see Freed, “Formation,” pp. 80–84.
The archbishops turned to the familia for assistance for several reasons. The first was military. The Magyars posed a major threat during the first half of the tenth century. Although the threat subsided after Otto I defeated the Hungarians on the Lechfeld in 955, there were occasional Hungarian forays until the end of the century; and the archbishops, like other German bishops, were required to supply the crown with soldiers. Otto II's famous list of military contributions, the *Indiculus loricatorum* of 981, states that the archbishop's customary assessment was seventy cavalrymen with mailcoats (*loricati*), one of the largest contingents. The archbishops had originally relied on the nobility of the archdiocese, many of whom were their kinsmen, to satisfy their military needs, but there was a noticeable decline in the size of the archbishops' noble entourage as the large noble kindreds gradually divided into patrilineages. Although this restructuring of the nobility was occurring throughout Germany during the tenth and eleventh centuries, it posed a particular problem for the archbishops. Bavaria was in effect the royal domain in the eleventh century—for fifty-three years between 995 and 1096 the duke was either the king himself, his wife, or one of his children. Whereas the archbishops of the tenth century had been members of the Bavarian high nobility, the kings deliberately selected non-Bavarians as archbishops in the eleventh century. Such outsiders posed less of a threat to the king's control of Bavaria, but their lack of family ties within the duchy made them even more dependent on their servile retainers. On the eve of the Investiture Conflict the archbishops were thus surrounded by a group of trusted serfs on whom they relied for advice, military assistance, and other unspecified services and whom they had endowed with alods and benefices.

11. Ibid., pp. 84–90.
The Investiture Conflict

The Investiture Conflict, when the ministerials’ military talents were in great demand, was the decisive moment in the formation of the new estate, a hereditary rank in society whose members possessed special rights recognized by law or custom, with concomitant obligations. Ministerialis, which stressed the ministerials’ right to hold an office (ministerium) or, more broadly conceived, to perform honorable services, replaced servus as the standard designation for an individual who belonged to the new order. Unfortunately it is difficult to study this crucial period because Archbishops Gebhard (1060–88), Thiemo (1090–98, died in Anatolia in 1101), and Conrad I (1106–47), who were staunch supporters of the papacy, spent most of the years between 1077 and 1121 in exile. Consequently there is little documentary evidence for this period, though the custom of identifying ministerials with toponymic surnames, which began about 1100 and demonstrates that they were being perceived as property owners, makes it possible to start assigning individuals to distinct lineages. By using onomastic evidence and the history of individual properties, it can be shown that at least some of the ministerials were the descendants of the servi who had been mentioned earlier in the codices of traditions.

Ministerialis, which in late antiquity had referred to the imperial household slaves, was employed under the Carolingians for a great variety of state, court, and domestic officials regardless of their legal status. The men who were identified as ministerials during Odalbert’s archiepiscopate were nobles, but about 1000 Raban, an official of servile condition, was styled a “ministerialis vir.” In the mid-eleventh century the word still referred to an official rather than to a member of a particular estate. Thus Odalbert was called “quidam de familia sancti Ruodberti . . . ministerialis fratrum canoniconum,” that is, a member of the archiepiscopal household and an official of the cathedral canons. The first certain use of the word ministerialis for members of a distinct estate occurred in 1110, and in 1125 Count Manegold gave a serf (ancilla) to the cathedral canons on condition that “she enjoy the right and law of the ministerial dignity.” A cathedral canon was specifically identified in 1146 as belonging to the ordo ministerialium, that is, a member by birth of the estate of the ministerials. Ministerialis thus became in

18. See above, introduction at note 50.
20. SUB 1:207–8, no. 36. On Raban’s servile status, see SUB 1:213–14, no. 4; 262, no. 19. On the use of the term in the Codex Odalberti, see Freed, “Formation,” pp. 78–79.
23. SUB 1:609, no. 51a.
the first decades of the twelfth century the standard appellation for the men who belonged to the elite stratum within the archiepiscopal familia and reflected their new standing in society.

The scribes’ rewriting of the life of Archbishop Gebhard during the twelfth century shows that they equated the earlier *servitores* with the ministerials and illustrates the change in terminology. A passage in the older *Vita Gebehardi*, written sometime after 1088, described Archbishop Gebhard’s return to Salzburg in 1086 after an absence of nine years: “After this in the ninth year of his exile he was returned to his episcopal see by Count Engelbert, by certain other vassals [*militibus*] of his church, and also by many of his servile retainers [*servitoribus*].” The author of the *Annales Admuntenses*, who incorporated this passage into his own work sometime about 1140, made some significant changes. He wrote: “In the ninth year of his exile he was returned to his see by Count Engelbert, by his other vassals [*fidelibus*], and by the ministerials [*ministerialibus*] of the church.” In the second author’s view *milites* were *fideles*, and the *servitores* were the ministeriales.

It is far more difficult to prove that specific ministerials were the descendants of men who had been mentioned in the archiepiscopal *Traditionsbücher* before the Investiture Conflict, but the repetition of distinctive leading names (*Leitnamen*)—characteristic names associated with a particular lineage—and continuity in property holding suggest that they were. The example of the families who lived around the Wallersee also demonstrates how patrilineages, identified by surnames, formed among the archbishop’s servile retainers.

About 1077 Wezil (Wezil II), who was identified as a “servitor sancti Ruodberti,” arranged for Saint Peter’s to receive, after the death of his wife, whatever property and serfs he possessed at Geiselprechting, Upper Bavaria, as well as his mill at Tiefenbach on the Fischach, northeast of Salzburg (see map 6). He then gave the abbey under similar conditions his alods at Fenning, Gasbach, and Farmach, all in the general vicinity of the Wallersee, and at Grödig, south of Salzburg. This abbatial benefactor was almost certainly the Wezil who was listed among Archbishop Gebhard’s “ministeriales” in the *Traditionsbuch* of Admont.


26. There are considerable difficulties in using onomastic evidence and the inheritance of property to prove genealogical affiliations, but that this case concerns a restricted group of individuals and that the name Wezil was common only among the ministerials who lived around the Wallersee makes the identifications probable. On the problems of using such evidence, see Jackman, *Konradiner*, pp. 129–35.

27. SUB 1:284–85, no. 66.

(the usage is anachronistic). He may very well have been the son or kinsman of the Wezil (Wezil I) who had been identified earlier as a member of the archiepiscopal familia and who had exchanged in 1025/41 properties in the vicinity of Anger, Upper Bavaria, with Archbishop Thietmar.

Three lineages of archiepiscopal ministerials who lived around the Wallersee employed the name Wezil in the first decades of the twelfth century. The first were the Fennings, who lived in one of the places where Wezil II had given property to Saint Peter’s. When he took the habit in 1125/47, Wezil of Fenning gave Saint Peter’s his property in Fenning. The first witness was his brother Liutpolt, who granted the abbey his property in Fenning if he should die without an heir.

The second lineage that employed the name Wezil was the Hallwangs, who lived along the Fischach. Archbishop Conrad I confirmed in 1130 that Adalbert of Hallwang, surnamed Prenno, who had joined Saint Peter’s, and his brother Gottschalk had given the abbey their benefices in the following places: Ainring, Upper Bavaria, six kilometers east of Anger, where Wezil I had exchanged property with Archbishop Thietmar a century earlier; Hallwang; Tiefenbach, where Wezil II had given the abbey a mill; and Kühham, twelve kilometers west of Mühldorf. There is a single reference to Wezil of Hallwang who followed five known archiepiscopal ministerials as a witness in 1144.

The Dieberings, who lived just east of Hallwang, were the most important lineage to employ the name Wezil. Adalbero of Diebering served as the castellan of Hohenwerfen, the archbishop’s chief castle in the Pongau, from 1139 until he was mentioned for the last time in 1146. His son During held the castellany from 1147 until he was killed in 1163. There are only two certain references to a Wezil of Diebering, one in 1125/30, when he attested a document with Adalbero, and the other before 1139, when he was identified as an archiepiscopal ministerial; but the brothers Adalbero and Wezil who witnessed notices in 1090/95 and again in 1125 were almost certainly Adalbero and Wezil of Diebering.

29. SUB 2:174–75, no. 105a; 207–13, no. 140. The entries in the Traditionsbuch of Admont were edited in the twelfth century and may thus reflect later usage.
31. SUB 1:358–59, no. 202; 404, no. 284. Another pair of brothers, Isinbern and Manegold, who were also archiepiscopal ministerials, gave the abbey their property in Fenning. SUB 1:409–10, nos. 290a, 290b. It is not known how the two sets of brothers were related to one another.
32. SUB 2:298–99, no. 204. See also SUB 1:318–19, no. 140; 320, no. 144; 343, no. 178a; 597–98, no. 27; 2:217–19, no. 144d.
33. SUB 2:317, no. 217.
34. SUB 1:609–10, no. 51b; 2:277 ff., nos. 193, 215, 227, 244a.
36. SUB 1:309, no. 123; 591–92, no. 12; 2:308–9, no. 210a; 272–73, no. 187. Franz Valentin Zillner, “Salzburgische Geschlechterstudien: III, Die Werfener Burggrafen,” MSGS 21 (1881): 30, argued that Wezil of Diebering and Wezil of Hallwang were the same person because of the proximity of Hallwang to Diebering and because only the Dieberings could have held the Schrannensitz in Hallwang. I accepted Zillner’s argument in “Formation,” pp. 95–96, and this conclusion found its way into Dopsch’s Geschichte Salzburgs 1/1:372. I am less certain now because I can find no evidence that
It is not known how the Fennings, Hallwangs, and Dieberings were related to one another and to Wezil I and Wezil II, but it is hard to believe that neighboring lineages who employed the same leading name that was unique to them were not connected in some way to one another and to the individuals who had borne the same name and owned property in the same places. It is easy to lose one's path in such genealogical thickets, but the basic point is that the ministerial lineages of the twelfth century were not only the functional successors but also the descendants of the servi who had appeared in the archiepiscopal Traditionsbücher before the Investiture Conflict.

The High Middle Ages (1122–1246)

The ministerials and their clerical brothers were the archbishops' chief instruments in reasserting their authority after the Investiture Conflict and in creating their ecclesiastical principality. The best illustration of the ministerials' power is their almost unprecedented right to elect the archbishop. The ministerials prospered in the archbishops' service, but the restrictions on the ministerials' right to alienate their alods as well as their fiefs, like the requirement that they marry within the archiepiscopal familia, were a perpetual reminder of their servile status. The number of ministerial lineages was augmented by noble dynasties who entered the archiepiscopal ministerialage through marriage or other inducements and by the retainers of extinguished noble houses whose lordships the archbishops acquired. The ministerials' growing prestige is reflected by the honorifics, hitherto bestowed on nobles, with which the greater or better ministerials were graced unofficially after 1150; but the archbishops were considerably slower in honoring their retainers in this fashion. At the same time as the ministerials were filling the political and social vacuum created by the extinction of the free nobility, the lesser ministerials and the ministerials' own servile vassals, who were most commonly called knights, were forming a separate estate subordinate to the ministerials.

Archbishop Conrad's program for restoring order within the archdiocese after the Investiture Conflict had three components: construction of castles, promotion of the Augustinian canons, and reliance on the ministerials. He finished the castles of Hohensalzburg, Hohenwerfen, and Friesach, which Gebhard had begun before his exile in 1077, and built or acquired several others. Conrad reformed or founded eleven collegiate churches within the archdiocese, includ-

---

Hallwang was the site of a court in the twelfth century and because other ministerials, Adalbert and Gottschalk, were also associated with Hallwang.

ing the cathedral chapter, introduced the Augustinian rule in three archiepiscopal proprietary houses outside the archdiocese (Reichersberg, Weyarn, and Suben), and associated the exempt foundations of Berchtesgaden and Baumburg with his reform group.39

The ministerials formed the personal connecting link between the two other components of Archbishop Conrad’s program. They replaced nobles as the burgraves of the new castles. For example, in the 1130s Henry of Seekirchen became the first ministerial castellan of Hohensalzburg, an office previously held by noblemen.40 Although the castellany of Hohensalzburg remained an appointive office, the Pettau family served as the burgraves of Pettau from the 1130s until their extinction in the male line in 1438, when they were the second most powerful noble family in Styria.41 It is difficult to determine the social origins of the Augustinian canons in the twelfth century—renunciation of the world included anonymity, but seventeen of the thirty-eight twelfth-century canons it is possible to identify were archiepiscopal ministerials (the sources are skewed in favor of the nobility).42 The family ties between the canons and the ministerials are illustrated by the following example. Bishop Roman I of Gurk (1131–67), who served as Conrad’s coadjutor and whom the archbishop had designated as his successor, was the brother of Engelschalk, the burgrave of Friesach for most of the time between 1117 and 1147. The archbishop’s chief representatives in Carinthia were thus brothers.43 At the end of his archiepiscopate Conrad announced that an exchange of property he had made with the Benedictines of Formbach was void because he had failed to obtain the consent of the cathedral canons and ministerials.44 The ministerials and the canons were the foundation on which archiepiscopal authority rested during the High Middle Ages.

The best example of this situation is the cathedral canons’ and ministerials’ joint right to elect the archbishop. Starting with Conrad’s successor Eberhard I (1147–64), the clergy and ministerials elected all the archbishops, except Conrad III (1177–83), between 1147 and 1256.45 Even ardent reformers like Gerhoch of Reichersberg (1132–69) accepted the ministerials’ right to play a prominent part

43. Freed, “Ministers and the Church,” pp. 11–12.
in the election of the archbishop. For example, when Frederick Barbarossa accused Conrad II (1164–68), his uncle and a supporter of Pope Alexander III, of having taken possession of the archbishopric illegally, Duke Henry the Lion replied on Conrad’s behalf at the imperial diet on 14 February 1166, that Conrad “had acquired his diocese not by robbery but by the lawful and canonical election of the clergy, ministerials, and the entire people.” The electors had, in fact, made Conrad’s adherence to Alexander a condition of his election.46 There is no indication that Gerhoch, who recorded the duke’s alleged words, disapproved of the ministerials’ participation in Conrad’s election.

The translation of Conrad III from Mainz to Salzburg is the proverbial exception that proves the rule. Alexander III informed the cathedral canons, prelates, and ministerials that the bishops of Gurk and Passau and the other prelates of the church of Salzburg who had been present at the peace negotiations in Venice in 1177 had elected Archbishop Conrad of Mainz as the successor of Adalbert II, who had voluntarily resigned the archbishopric. The addressees were not to take it ill that those who had been present had proceeded to Conrad’s election without the clergy’s and ministerials’ advice, because the prelates had acted at the pope’s command.47 Alexander III thus tacitly recognized the ministerials’ electoral rights. At least by the thirteenth century, such participation by ministerials in an episcopal election would have been considered highly irregular in most of Germany.48

The career of Megingod II of Surberg exemplifies the position a ministerial could attain in the archbishop’s service during the second half of the twelfth century. Megingod was the son of Megingod I, who had served as the archiepiscopal butler at Henry V’s coronation in Rome in 1111, and was the second husband of Salzburg’s wealthiest ministerial heiress, Diemut of Högl. He first came to prominence in 1166/67 when, according to Gerhoch of Reichersberg, he was, probably as the burgrave of Hohensalzburg, the leader of the archbishop’s knights who bravely and courageously, though unsuccessfully, defended Salzburg after Frederick Barbarossa had outlawed Archbishop Conrad II and the clergy of Salzburg

for adhering to Alexander III. Megingod held the castellany until his death in 1193. Twenty-eight men were specifically identified as knightly vassals (milites) of Megingod, his older brother Sigiboto I, or Diemut; and another twenty-one men, who employed the same surnames as known Surberg retainers and appeared in the Surbergs' entourage, should probably also be included among their knights. While Archbishop Adalbert attended the Council of Verona in 1184, Megingod, along with his brother and the cathedral provost, administered the archdiocese. Megingod built himself a residence in the city of Salzburg on land that he leased for his lifetime from the cathedral canons in 1170. Megingod and Diemut must have maintained a substantial household, because there are references to their chamberlain and after Megingod's death to Diemut's private chaplain and seneschal. A man like Megingod, who was the lord of two castles (Surberg and Högl), was the burgrave of a major fortress, and could field a force of approximately fifty knights, would have been viewed as a nobleman in France.

It is not surprising, therefore, that scribes began to apply to ministerials honorifics hitherto bestowed upon the nobles. At first such terms generally appeared in unofficial documents such as Traditionsbuch entries to honor benefactors rather than in archiepiscopal charters; they were more likely to be employed for women than for men and for the dead rather than the living. Thus Diemut of Kirchhalling, who gave whatever she possessed in Kirchhalling to the cathedral canons, was called in 1122/47 "one of the nobler ministerials of Saint Rupert." (Note that noble was employed here as a comparative indicating Diemut's standing among the ministerials rather than as an indicator of her legal status.) Groups of prominent ministerial witnesses were described in the 1130s in two Traditionsbuch notices as honorable or illustrious ministerials. About 1160 Archbishop Eberhard I referred to Henry of Seekirchen as a "vir illustris," more than twenty years after the burgrave's death. Archbishop Adalbert II styled Megingod II of Surberg an honorable ministerial in 1170 and called his brother an illustrious ministerial in 1188 when Sigiboto founded the hospital of Saint John the Evangelist in the Ziller valley. The title dominus or lord was first granted to ministerials in the mid-twelfth century. Scribes were slower to apply nobilis to male ministerials.

51. Freed, "Diemut von Högl," pp. 606–15. It should be noted that men like Megingod were functionally, if not legally, the equals, for example, of the Burgundian castellans. Constance Britain Bouchard, Holy Entrepreneurs: Cistercians, Knights, and Economic Exchange in Twelfth-Century Burgundy (Ithaca N.Y., 1991), pp. 166–67, defined the castellans, the new nobility of the eleventh century, as men who owned a castle and "a good deal of land and authority and who had other men holding in fief from them."
52. SUB 1:620–21, no. 77.
53. SUB 2:229–30, no. 153; 236–37, no. 159.
54. SUB 2:436–37, no. 312. The entry is dated about 1155, but the reference to Diemut of Högl's deceased first husband places it between 1150/60 and 1164. Henry of Seekirchen died in 1139.
55. SUB 2:546–48, no. 397; 624–25, no. 460.
Once again, it was a deceased ministerial who was first honored in this fashion about 1180. Sigiboto I was the first living male ministerial to be called a “nobilis . . . ministerialis,” significantly enough in the entry in the Traditionsbuch that recorded his gift of the castle of Surberg to the cathedral chapter. It was not until 1218 that a ministerial, Burgrave Conrad of Hohensalzburg, was identified in this manner in an archiepiscopal charter. But it was only during the archiepiscopate of Frederick II of Walchen (1270–84), the first archbishop who was definitely himself a ministerial, that ministerials were styled simply as nobles. Not surprisingly, perhaps, the first ministerials to be honored in this way were his cousins the Goldeggs.

The gradual ennoblement of the ministerials filled the social vacuum that had been created by 1200 by the disappearance of the free nobility, the descendants of the Frankish imperial aristocracy and the Bavarian tribal nobility who had been identified as nobles in the witness lists of the twelfth century. The following example shows what happened to the nobility. In 1074 fifteen men who were identified as counts or nobles and eleven ministerials witnessed Archbishop Gebhard’s endowment of the monastery of Admont, but in 1195 Archbishop Adalbert II confirmed Admont’s possessions in the presence of twenty-six archiepiscopal ministerials but only two noblemen. By 1200 the ministerials had become the secular elite of the archdiocese.

The noble families either became ministerials themselves, usually because the last free scion married a ministerial woman, or died out in the male line. In the latter case, as will become clear later, their property could pass through an heiress to a ministerial lineage; or the archbishop himself could acquire their lordships and retainers, who in turn became archiepiscopal ministerials or knights. Interestingly enough, no documentary evidence describing the entrance of a noble family into the archiepiscopal ministerialage has survived (in contrast, documents about free men and women who became censuales or altar dependents are common). As a result, we can infer the mediatizations of such noble houses only from genealogical reconstructions.

57. Raitenhaslach, pp. 26–27, no. 29.
58. SUB 1:724–25, no. 292.
59. SUB 3:246–47, no. 728.
60. MC 5:55–56, no. 79. See Freed, “Nobles,” p. 604. Eberhard II referred to the Gurkfelds as nobles in 1246, at the very end of his archiepiscopate, when he granted them the status of archiepiscopal ministerials (SUB 3:639–40, no. 1095).
61. SUB 2:207–13, no. 140; 670–75, no. 497. No. 140 is a panchart drafted in the 1130s.
62. See chapter 3 at note 27 and chapter 5 at note 18.
63. I suspect that the letters Adalbero Iof Walchen, the last freeborn Walchen, received from Archbishop Eberhard II, which Adalbero’s grandsons were forced to surrender to the archbishop in 1307 (Regesten 2:95–96, no. 818), may have contained the terms of Adalbero’s entrance into the archiepiscopal ministerialage. The only document I have ever read that sounds like an attempted mediatization of a noble is a 1225 charter from Brixen in which the nobleman Hugo IV of Taufers surrendered his castles to the bishop of Brixen and received them back in fief. In return the bishop promised to defend and protect Hugo as if he were an episcopal ministerial (“Plane nos fide data promisimus quod
The Sims are an example of a noble family who became archiepiscopal ministerials through marriage in the twelfth century (see genealogy 1.1). Whereas Ulrich I of Sims was identified in the mid-twelfth century as a nobleman,64 his son Ulrich II was an archiepiscopal ministerial.65 Since the archiepiscopal ministerial Adalbero I of Berg was the only one of Ulrich II's kinsmen (parentes) who was identified by name after the latter's death,66 the best explanation for how the Sims became archiepiscopal ministerials is that Ulrich II's mother Liutkarda had been a Berg and he had received her legal status. Unlike their Styrian neighbors, the archbishops seem to have had little success in the twelfth century in obtaining the services of nobles in this way—the Sims were an insignificant family; but as will be discussed later, the two most important noble lineages in the Pinzgau, the Felbens and Walchens, became archiepiscopal ministerials through marriage in the first half of the thirteenth century.67

When a noble house died out without issue, the archbishop tried to obtain its lordship and retainers. For example, in 1223 Archbishop Eberhard II purchased the castle of Dornberg, northeast of Mühldorf, from Count Eberhard, the

---

64 MB 2:308, no. 85; CF, pp. 77–78, no. 114.
65 MB 2:329, no. 149. The editors dated the entry about 1150, but Ulrich I lived until at least 1155/58. Ulrich I and his son Ulrich II served as witnesses in 1155/64 (Traditionsbuch Neustift, pp. 59–60, no. 54; 72–73, no. 81). See also MB 2:345, no. 192.
67 Dopsch, Geschichte Salzburgs 1/1:393–96. See below, chapter 5 at note 27.
last representative of his dynasty, and stipulated that all members of the comital familia who belonged to knightly lineages would enjoy the status and privileges of archiepiscopal ministerials. Some of the count’s men were subsequently in the archbishop’s service and accompanied Eberhard II to Slovenia and Carinthia in the 1240s. The very last noble house in the principality itself, the counts of Plain, died out in 1260, and their fiefs escheated to the archbishop. The mediatization or extinction of the old nobility thus not only eliminated a major obstacle to the imposition of the archbishop’s territorial supremacy (Landeshoheit) but increased the size of the archiepiscopal retinue, a major instrument for enforcing the archbishop’s temporal authority.

Most families of former comital retainers who entered the archiepiscopal ministerial age in this manner remained insignificant and became a major component of the knightly estate that formed in the thirteenth century. The most notable exception is the Staufenecks, who had served as the burgraves of the main castle of the counts of Plain. The Staufenecks’ own castle, which was first mentioned in 1248, controlled a bridge over the Saalach across which salt from Bad Reichenhall was transported to the west. The Staufenecks refused to submit to the archbishop after the extinction of the Plains but were finally forced to acknowledge his authority, as will be explained later, by marrying within the archiepiscopal familia.

Surely it is not a mere coincidence that the first certain reference to an archiepiscopal ministerial as a noble in an archiepiscopal charter occurred eleven years after the death of the last Plain.

Still, the extent to which the ministerials replaced the nobles should not be overstated. After all, the reason the ministerials proved to be such a useful archi-

69. Among the individuals who witnessed the sale of Dornberg were Eberhard of Weng (near Dornberg?); Gottschalk Swalwe, who had been identified in Count Eberhard’s lifetime as Gottschalk swalve of Dornberg (Au, p. 132, no. 204); and Engelbert I of Sicking (northeast of Mühldorf). Ulrich I and Wernhard II of Sicking witnessed an archiepiscopal charter in Rann in 1241 (SUB 3: 515–16, no. 966); and Wernhard of Sicking, Henry of Dornberg (Gottschalk swalve had a son named Henry [Au, p. 132, no. 204]), and Eberhard of Weng were in Friesach in 1245 (SUB 3: 624–26, no. 1079).
70. Dopsch, Geschichte Salzburgs 1/1: 364; and Tyroller, Genealogie, pp. 115–28.
73. MC 5: 55–56, no. 79.
episcopal tool during the High Middle Ages was precisely that they were not free. The most obvious restriction on their liberty was the requirement to marry within the archiepiscopal familia, but both the kinds of property the ministerials possessed and their restricted right to alienate even alods are additional signs of their subordinate position.

To begin with, there is no indication that any lineage of archiepiscopal ministerials, except for the Gutrats, exercised any public jurisdiction or profited like the nobility from the administration of justice in the twelfth century. They relied instead on the income their property produced. A list of the holdings of Wolfram of Offenwang, who had been identified in the 1130s as one of the illustrious archiepiscopal ministerials and had conferred his entire estate on Saint Peter’s, offers a rare glimpse into the resources at the disposal of a relatively prominent ministerial in the mid-twelfth century. His estate consisted of many widely dispersed alods and benefices (“cum multis prediis et beneficiis”) in Upper Bavaria (see map 7): specifically, whatever Wolfram possessed in Offenwang itself (there is no evidence that he owned a castle), three manors (“curtis”), six hides, an alod, and tithes in one place. He held half a hide in fief from the count of Bad Reichenhall; he had been enfeoffed with the other benefices by the archbishop and had subenfeoffed some of the outlying properties, in one instance to the knight of a nobleman. These properties provided Wolfram with the means to fulfill the military and other obligations he owed the archbishop, but he was certainly not rich.

Admittedly, the material situation of the most powerful ministerial lineages improved considerably in the thirteenth century when they too acquired courts and advocacies. For example, the Gutrats, the wealthiest ministerial family in the principality in the thirteenth century, had been enfeoffed as early as 1163 by the archbishop with the district court (Landgericht) in the Pongau along with the

74. Herwig Ebner, Das Freie Eigen: Ein Beitrag zur Verfassungsgeschichte des Mittelalters, Aus Forschung und Kunst 2 (Klagenfurt, 1969), pp. 182–85, argued that in the Austro-Bavarian area ministerials generally acquired the right to exercise high or low justice on their alods without princely enfeoffment only after 1200. A word of caution is in order here because it is not known precisely when and how most ministerials obtained the district courts that were in their possession by the thirteenth century.

75. On his status, see SUB 2:236–37, no. 159. For additional information about the Offenwangs, see Reindel-Schedl, Laufen, pp. 377–78.

76. SUB 1:357–58, no. 201; 460–61, no. 380a. The list (no. 201) was compiled only after Conrad I’s death, but Conrad I referred to the donation in 1143 (SUB 2:315–16, no. 215). The translation of the word predium poses problems. Its general meaning was property, but it could clearly also mean alod, as it did in this instance when it was juxtaposed with beneficium. Indeed, the list itself used the word proprietas. Other examples are SUB 1:339–40, no. 171; 347–48, nos. 186a, 186b. Ebner, Das Freie Eigen, pp. 235–36, even asserted that in the twelfth century predium was the technical term for a ministerial’s alod; but since Ebner’s evidence comes from Cologne, I have decided to err on the conservative side and to translate predium as property unless the context indicates that alod is meant. For similar reasons, I have translated beneficium as benefice rather than as fief. Curtis or Hof, which I have translated as manor, referred specifically to the manor house, farm buildings, etc. in contrast to the demesne (terra salica, Sel). See Dollinger, L’ évolution, pp. 115–18.

77. Wolfram had at least one knight of his own (SUB 1:439–40, no. 346).
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MAP 7 The estate of Wolfram of Offenwang.
castellany of Hohenwerfen. After the valuable salt deposits in the Hallein area were rediscovered at the end of the century, the Plains subenfeoffed the Gutrats with the district courts in the Kuchltal, the stretch of the Salzach valley between the city of Salzburg and Pass Lueg thirty kilometers to the south (see map 4). They were the only laymen to own one of the nine salt pans in Hallein. In addition, the Gutrats also possessed a lordship in Lower Austria whose appurtenances included two castles, two market towns, three villages, and the patronage of six churches. A conservative estimate of the Gutrats’ annual income in 1304 at their extinction in the male line is £810 per annum. 78

The Gutrats’ material condition was probably closer to that of the Plains than to Wolfram of Offenwang’s or even the Surbers’ a century earlier, yet legally the Gutrats’ position was completely different from the Plains’. In what was the first step in the acquisition of the Gutrat inheritance by Archbishop Conrad IV (1291–1312), Otto II of Gutrat was compelled to acknowledge in 1296 that all of his alods in the archbishopric—people and property, towers and castles—were intrinsic alods (“inwärtsaigen”), that is, alods that could be alienated freely only within the archiepiscopal familia or to an archiepiscopal proprietary foundation. 79

Archbishop Eberhard II (1200–1246) had put it this way in 1241: “Alods [predia] or fiefs [feuda] of the church of Salzburg can never by ancient right be alienated to alien hands, but only to members of the familia of the church of Salzburg or to a monastery subject to Salzburg.” 80

Such restrictions on the ministerials’ right to alienate their property, along with the requirement that they marry within the archiepiscopal familia, were the most visible reminders of their servile status. The most spectacular instance when an archbishop enforced such a custom occurred in 1167. Mathilda, daughter of the archiepiscopal judge in Friesach and wife of the archiepiscopal chamberlain, had conferred on Admont, where her blind son had become a monk, nineteen hides and a house in Friesach. Archbishop Conrad II assembled his vassals, clerical and lay, and asked for a ruling on the following question: “If any serf [mancipium] of our church, who held an archiepiscopal office, purchased a property [predium] from the proceeds of the same office, whether that same serf was able to give or to bequeath the property so obtained without our hand or authority.” They ruled that “such persons were not permitted to bequeath, sell, or give properties of this type without . . . [the archbishop’s] consent.” Since Conrad II then conferred the

80. SUB 3:516–17, no. 967.
properties on Admont himself, it is clear that he was not objecting to the donation itself.  

A closer examination of the "serfs" involved in this case reveals the real reason Conrad II may have invoked the principle that such properties could not be alienated externally without the archbishop's permission (see genealogy 1.2). Mathilda's husband Bernhard II had succeeded his father as the chamberlain, the functional precursor, I believe, of the vidame of Friesach, the official who was charged after the 1180s with the administration of the archbishop's financial affairs in Carinthia.  

Her father, Adalbert I, served as the archiepiscopal judge of

81. MC 3:409, no. 1092; SUB 2:531–33, no. 384. The use of the word *mancipium*, which referred to the very lowest category of serfs—those who did not have their own tenures but were completely at their lords' disposal (*Hofknechte*)—was particularly derogatory. Several people have asked me whether as serfs the ministerials had to be manumitted before taking holy orders. I have found no evidence that this was the case in Salzburg.

Friesach from at least 1139 until 1167, and her brother Adalbert II may have been master of the archiepiscopal mint in Friesach. A second brother, Gotbert (d. by 1162), was in 1158 the provost of the secular canons of Maria Wörth. Her sister Chuniza was the wife of the judge Engelbert of Friesach, Gurk’s chief representative in the city. Their son Ruzo served in turn as the judge between 1166 and 1181. In short, Mathilda was the central figure among the group of individuals who held all the key administrative positions in Friesach, except the castellany, between the 1120s and 1160s. Her unauthorized donation thus provided Conrad II with a convenient pretext to reassert archiepiscopal authority in Friesach, which was threatened by the grip that a few interrelated ministerials had acquired on most of the key offices in the city.

Such constraints on the ministerials’ right to alienate their property, which were derived from their personal servitude, were an effective means of controlling them and a constant reminder that even the richest noble bondsmen like the Gutrats were not the equals of the old nobility. These restrictions gradually atrophied as the princes granted the ministerials the privilege to dispose of their property freely, in particular to churches that were under the protection of the prince as the suzerain of the principality, and as the process of territorialization transformed all the inhabitants of a specific territory into the subjects of a particular prince.

Even as the ministerials were replacing the nobles as the secular elite of the nascent principality, their servile retainers, called milites or knights in Salzburg, were beginning their own rise in a process that would in a curious fashion repeat the ministerials’ advance. The knights coalesced in the thirteenth century with the less important ministerial lineages and the retinues of the extinguished comital and noble dynasties to form the Ritterstand. About 1300 the remaining great ministerial lineages were themselves subsumed into the estate of knights, just as the last surviving noble families had entered the archiepiscopal ministerialage.

By the second half of the twelfth century a distinct hierarchy was emerging among the ministerials. Although there are several references to the greater

84. MC 1:162–65, no. 201; SUB 2:508–9, no. 362; 537–38, no. 388.
85. Mathilda’s father Adalbert I gave Viktring, where his son Hartwig was buried, four hides in Haidkirchen, southwest of Althofen (MC 3:303, no. 767). Hartwig in turn had given his alod in Edling, three kilometers south of Althofen, to his sister Chuniza, the wife of Engelbert of Friesach, and her children Gotpold I and Wolswind (SUB 1:675–76, no. 194). In 1162 the judge Engelbert and his son Gotpold witnessed Adalbert I’s donation on behalf of his deceased son, Provost Gotbert of Maria Saal (SUB 2:508–9, no. 362). Since Adalbert and Engelbert served as judges simultaneously, I have identified Engelbert as Gurk’s judge.
86. MC 3:409, no. 1092; 483, no. 1284. Ruzo was identified as the “nepos” or grandson of the judge Adalbert I (MC 1:162–65, no. 201) and as the “nepos” and “sororius,” that is, a sister’s son, of Adalbert II, master of the mint (SUB 2:508–9, no. 362; MC 1:160, no. 198). Ruzo, whose son was also named Gotpold (Gotpold II) (UB Steiermark 1:657, no. 681), and Ruzo’s brother William (SUB 2:531–33, no. 384) were thus two other sons of Adalbert I’s daughter Chuniza and of Engelbert.
(maiores) or better (meliores) ministerials, other ministerials were perceived as being in some sense inferior. For example, upon his return from Rome in 1111 Archbishop Conrad I allegedly uncovered a conspiracy led by Albwin, one of the less noble ministerials—that is, a ministerial of inferior rank. This report, written in the 1170s, may be anachronistic in its terminology and deliberately derogatory, but the Gömings, the only lineage of archiepiscopal ministerials who regularly employed the name Albwin in the twelfth century, were in fact classified by the thirteenth century as lesser ministerials and knights. The crucial distinction between the ministeriales maiores and their fellows, according to Heinz Dopsch, was that greater ministerials, like the Surbergs, had their own vassals or milites whereas the lesser ministerials, like the Gömings—who could be vassals of their former peers and were beginning by 1200 to be styled as milites themselves—did not. He estimated that there were never more than twenty lineages of greater archiepiscopal ministerials. This number was simply too small for them to maintain a separate existence, and it is one reason why they, unlike their peers in the duchies of Austria and Styria, failed to form a separate Herrenstand or estate of lords.

Although the basic meaning of miles as warrior remained the same from the tenth century to the fourteenth, the secondary connotations of the word changed as it was applied in succession to different groups: free vassals, the servile armed retainers of untitled noblemen and ministerials, and finally the greater ministerials themselves. As a result, a word that by the twelfth century had acquired a certain opprobrium because of its association with men who were legally serfs became synonymous with a noble in the principality by the fourteenth century.

On the rare occasions when it was used in the eleventh century miles referred to the free vassals, as can be seen in the juxtaposition of militia with familia in the consent clauses of the archiepiscopal Traditionsbücher or in the account of Archbishop Gebhard’s return to Salzburg in 1086 in the older vita. When Gebhard’s life was rewritten sometime after 1181, the chronicler could no longer conceive of milites as free vassals or even as the superiors of ministerials. He therefore wrote: “In the ninth year of his exile our said lord Gebhard was returned to his episcopal see by Count Engelbert, by certain other ministerials of the church, and by many knights [militibus].” The Admont monk turned the servitores of the older vita

89. Vita Chunradi, pp. 62, 69.
90. Dopsch, Geschichte Salzburgs 1/1:401; and John B. Freed, “Devotion to St James and Family Identity: The Thurns of Salzburg,” JMH 13 (1987): 208–10. The term lesser ministerials and knights was employed in the sources. The Wiesbachs were identified in 1262 in the Annales Sancti Rudberti, p. 796, as “quibusdam ministerialibus et militaribus minoribus dictis de Wispah.”
92. For a more detailed discussion, see Freed, “Nobles,” pp. 575–611.
93. See above at note 24.
94. Vita Gebehardi et successorum eius, p. 39. On the date of composition, see Lhotsky, Quellenkunde, p. 215. Although nobles and archiepiscopal ministerials were not identified in the twelfth
into ministeriales, but since by the late twelfth century miles was the standard designation for the ministerials’ own men, the hagiographer reversed the sequence of the free vassals (milites, fideles) and ministerials (servitores, ministeriales) he found in his older sources to accord with the social hierarchy of his own day.

Twelfth-century scribes, like the Admont monk, associated milites with servitude, albeit, like the ministerials before them, the elite group within the servile population. When, for example, Meginod II of Surberg and his wife Diemut in 1170 conditionally conferred on the cathedral chapter her ancestral castle of Högl with all its appurtenances, including all the serfs (proprii homines), they exempted the milites from the donation. The exemption shows that such knights were already considered different from their fellow serfs. Among Meginod’s men who were identified a year later “as knights and serfs” was Henry of Muckham, whose father Eckart had earlier been called an archiepiscopal ministerial. As Henry’s case indicates, lesser ministerials began to be styled as milites in the last decades of the twelfth century, presumably because like Henry of Muckham they had become vassals of the greater ministerials. The lesser ministerials and the armed servile retainers of the greater ministerials were thus gradually beginning to be united by their common position at the bottom of the Heerschildordnung, or military order of precedence, as vassals (milites) who did not have their own retainers.

The sources continued to stress the servile status of the knights well into the thirteenth century. For example, in 1230 Henry of Schnaitsee was called a servile knight (“miles proprius”) of the archiepiscopal ministerial Kuno III of Gutrat. The ranks of the knights were further augmented by the archbishop’s acquisition of the lands and men of extinct noble lineages, whose armed retainers were usually classified as knights rather than as ministerials. For instance, in 1211 Eberhard II obtained not only the castle of Haunsberg but also all of Gottschalk of Haunsberg’s “servile persons of military rank of either sex [hominibus suis propriis militariibus sexus videlicet utriusque].”

Some of these knights were decidedly poor, and their way of life must have been barely distinguishable from that of their peasant neighbors. The abbatial serf and knight Ulrich of Breitbrunn conferred on Saint Peter’s about 1250 his alod

---

95. SUB 2:546–48, no. 397.
97. The Heerschildordnung was a theoretical legal construct that prohibited a man from being enfeoffed by an inferior. For additional information, see Julius Ficker, Vom Heerschilde: Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Reichs- und Rechtsgeschichte (Innsbruck, 1862).
98. SUB 1:509, no. 473a.
99. SUB 3:149–50, no. 646.
of half a hide in Breitbrunn. His seven sons then gave Saint Peter’s the other half and received it back in fief. Half a hide divided among seven men, if that is all Ulrich possessed, hardly amounted to much. Other knights were men of more substance. The miles Werner of Lengfelden, a minor archiepiscopal ministerial and the master of the archiepiscopal kitchen, had built a church, Sankt Jakob am Turm, near his tower and had endowed it with a property he had purchased in the Tyrol. He gave both to Saint Peter’s in 1238. Urban milites were especially wealthy. For example, the knight Ortolf of Kai (a district in the city of Salzburg), who belonged to the archiepiscopal familia, owned vineyards and an orchard in Lower Austria and a house in Salzburg. Ortolf may very well have been a wine merchant.

The knights were thus a diverse group consisting of lesser ministerials, the vassals of the greater ministerials, and the armed retinues of extinct noble dynasties who had entered the archbishop’s service. An archiepiscopal charter of 1225 that referred to “the many other knights and burghers from the city and country” who had been present captured the diversified nature of the group and shows that the knights were beginning to be perceived as a distinct element in society. By the middle of the thirteenth century individuals could be identified as members of the knightly estate. Thus Conrad I of Kuchl was called in 1250 “Lord Conrad, the knight of Kuchl,” and another charter referred to “the knight Henry, whose surname is Zahn [Tooth].”

I know of only one prominent archiepiscopal ministerial, Eckart IV of Tann, who was identified as both an archiepiscopal ministerial and a knight in an archiepiscopal charter in the first half of the thirteenth century (1233) and who referred to himself as a knight (1243). Interestingly enough, Eckart was the only archiepiscopal ministerial from north of the Tauern who participated, according to Ulrich of Liechtenstein, in the Friesach tournament of 1224. Whether or not the tournament ever took place, Ulrich’s comment suggests that Eckart was famous for his chivalric exploits and that, like Ulrich, he may have been formally knighted. Eckart’s proud assertion of his knighthood thus probably referred to

100. SUB 1:507–8, no. 470.
102. SUB 1:747–48, no. 336; 3:200–202, no. 692. Reindel-Schidl, Laufen, pp. 386–87, placed Ortolf in Kay, Upper Bavaria, rather than in the Kaigasse or the district with that name in the city of Salzburg. I have linked him to Salzburg because he owned a house in the city.
107. Ibid., 1:15, stanza 39. Joachim Bunke, Courtly Culture: Literature and Society in the High Middle Ages, trans. Thomas Dunlap (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1991), p. 245, said that Ulrich was the first ministerial who is definitely known to have been girded with a sword.
his girding rather than his social rank, but the diffusion of chivalric culture in the archdiocese undoubtedly hastened the archiepiscopal ministerials’ eventual acceptance of the designation miles, hitherto a scorned term associated with their own servile warriors, as an acceptable appellation for themselves.

To summarize, the old free nobility either died out in the male line during the High Middle Ages or entered the archiepiscopal ministerialage. This was a necessary precondition for the creation of the ecclesiastical principality because it enabled Archbishop Eberhard II to obtain the nobility’s comital jurisdictions, lordships, and retinues. As the chief instrument in the archbishop’s assertion of his territorial supremacy, the ministerials prospered, as can be seen in the amount of wealth Wolfram of Offenwang possessed about 1150 and the Gutrats’ position at their extinction in 1304. At the same time the ministerials’ personal servitude, evinced in the restrictions on their right to alienate property outside the archiepiscopal familia, was an effective instrument to control them. In the long run, however, the greater ministerials’ growing power posed a threat to the archbishop’s temporal authority, and the late medieval archbishops met this challenge by, among other things, taking advantage of the ministerials’ personal servitude—Conrad IV’s acquisition of the Gutrat inheritance is a case in point—and by relying on the knights.

The Salzburg Interregnum and the Later Middle Ages (1247–1343)

Archiepiscopal authority weakened considerably in the quarter century after the death of Eberhard II in 1246 as the archdiocese became embroiled in the fight over the vacant Babenberg duchies of Austria and Styria. The ministerials utilized the situation to assert their independence. Archbishop Frederick II (1270–84) and his successors regained control by manipulating the ministerials’ political miscalculations and financial and familial misfortunes to their own advantage. Although some lineages died out in the male line and others were ruined politically and economically, other ministerials prospered in the archbishops’ service. In addition, the archbishops promoted the rise of knightly lineages. Unlike their counterparts in Austria and Styria, the greater ministerial lineages, considerably reduced in number and often in financial difficulty by 1300, were unable to maintain their separate position and gradually merged with their erstwhile servile vassals to form the Ritterstand, the only noble estate in the late medieval principality. In the end the knights too proved no match for the archbishops, and by 1500 Salzburg was a principality without a native nobility.

The extinction of the Babenbergs in 1246 and the collapse of the Hohenstaufen empire plunged southeastern Germany into chaos. The fate of the vacant duchies of Austria and Styria was a major issue confronting Germany during the interreg-
num, because King Ottokar II of Bohemia (1253–78), the most powerful prince in the empire, had seized the duchies. The issue was of particular interest in Salzburg, not only because Styria was under the archbishop’s spiritual jurisdiction but also because Archbishop-Elect Philip (1247–57) refused ordination in the hopes of succeeding his childless older brother Ulrich III (1256–69) as duke of Carinthia. Pope Alexander IV deposed Philip in 1257 and recognized Bishop Ulrich of Seckau (1244–68), whom the cathedral canons and ministerials had elected as archbishop the previous year. Philip, supported by his brother and his cousin Ottokar, refused to accept his deposition, while Ottokar’s opponents, most notably Duke Henry XIII of Lower Bavaria (1253–90), backed Ulrich. In the end Philip managed to lose both the archbishopric and the duchy, and Ulrich, hopelessly in debt, resigned in 1265. His successor Ladislaus (1265–70) did restore order temporarily, but he returned to his native Silesia in 1268 to act as regent for his nephew. The fate of central Europe was finally settled with Ottokar’s defeat by Rudolph of Habsburg in 1278 and the formal enfeoffment of Rudolph’s son Albrecht with Austria and Styria in 1282.

Frederick of Walchen, who as cathedral provost had already administered the archdiocese in Ladislaus’s absence, was one of Rudolph’s most ardent supporters. Frederick’s successors, Archbishops Rudolph (1284–90) and Conrad IV (1291–1312), quarreled with Duke Albrecht over their respective rights in the Enns valley, but after the restoration of peace in 1297 the principality was almost always in the Habsburg camp. The establishment of the Habsburgs in Austria and Styria, and subsequently in Carinthia (1335) and Tyrol (1363), left Salzburg as a buffer state between the Habsburgs and the Wittelsbachs in Bavaria. Their power and rivalry limited further territorial expansion by the archbishops but also ensured the principality’s survival until the nineteenth century.108

Frederick II’s accession was a turning point in the archbishopric’s affairs in other ways as well. Until 1270 all the archbishops, with the probable exception of the hapless Ulrich, had been nobles, and five archbishops between 1164 and 1270 had been the scions of princely dynasties.109 Frederick was the first

109. Ulrich is the only post–Investiture Conflict archbishop whose social origin is unknown. I suspect that Ulrich was in fact a Babenberg ministerial from Austria. Ulrich, who owed his appointment in 1244 as bishop of Seckau to Duke Frederick II of Austria (BUB 2:277–78, no. 425), began his career as the parish priest of Kirchberg (BUB 2:177–78, no. 336; 186–89, no. 344), which the editors of the second volume of the Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Babenberger in Österreich were able to place only in Lower Austria (BUB 2:383). They overlooked a possible clue to its location, however. In 1200 Duke Leopold VI confirmed for Zwettl the gift of five hides situated in Warnungs that the Cistercians had received from his ministerial Ulrich of Kirchberg (BUB 1:151–53, no. 116). Warnungs is twelve kilometers north of Zwettl and, more important, five kilometers east of Kirchberg am Walde, which was presumably the home of Duke Leopold’s ministerial. I have not been able to find any additional references to the earlier Ulrich or to establish the connection between him and the later archbishop, but I suspect that the latter was related in some way to the Babenberg ministerial.
archbishop who definitely was of ministerial ancestry and the only native Salzburger who occupied the see of Saint Rupert during the Middle Ages. Most of his successors belonged to ministerial or knightly lineages who lived in the Austro-Bavarian area.110

The late medieval archbishops, like their colleagues elsewhere in Germany, thus had a more parochial perspective than their noble predecessors with their supraregional family connections.111 Although the archbishops did become entangled in the Habsburg-Wittelsbach fight for the throne, from the vantage point of Salzburg this was a battle between neighbors. The outlook of Archbishop Conrad IV, the scion of two obscure Styrian knightly families,112 was inevitably very different from that of his Babenberg predecessor Conrad II, who, like his more famous brother Otto of Freising, was a grandson, nephew, half-brother, and uncle of emperors.

Starting with Frederick of Walchen, the late medieval archbishops concentrated their attention and considerable resources—the Avignon papacy ranked the archbishops second in wealth among the bishops of Christendom113—on consolidating their authority within the principality. In particular the archbishops curbed the greater ministerials, who had grown increasingly independent during the interregnum by obtaining the alods and fiefs of lineages like the Gutrats that failed to produce a male heir, by buying the lands and rights of impoverished families, and by crushing insubordinate dynasties. Frederick’s and his successors’ treatment of the Kalhams is the most spectacular example.

The brothers Kuno, Conrad VI, and Henry III of Kalham can most aptly be described as Raubritter (see genealogy 1.3). During the interregnum they had built a new castle east of their ancestral home (Altenkalham) from which they had terrorized the countryside. In 1269 Frederick of Walchen, who was then the cathedral provost, and several prominent archiepiscopal ministerials provided a bond of £400 to procure the release of their “friends” Kuno and Conrad of Kalham, who had been imprisoned by Archbishop Ladislaus.114 Once Frederick became


114. SUB 4:63–64, no. 65. For a more detailed account, see Heinz Dopsch, “Zur Geschichte der Burg Kalham,” MGSL 112–13 (1972–73): 265–76. Genealogy 1.3 is very tentative and should be used with caution. It is difficult to distinguish between the different Kalhams who employed the names Ulrich and Conrad simultaneously, and the kinship designations in the sources tend to confuse rather than to clarify the family relationships. On the identification of friends as kinsmen, see Otto Brunner, Land and Lordship: Structures of Governance in Medieval Austria, trans. Howard Kaminsky and James Van Horn Melton (Philadelphia, 1992), pp. 15–18. Brunner, p. 72, cited the case of the Kalhams.
GENEALOGY 1.3 Kalham-Wartenfels
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Unnamed? m.?
Unnamed? m.?
Henry Stempo of the Pongau
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before 1140
1184/89
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m.
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Ulrich II 1183/88-
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m.
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Conrad II 1220
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Henry II Knutzings
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Conrad III 1219/34-
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Conrad IV 1219/35-
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m.
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1233/34
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1. Margaret of Steinkirchen
Ortenburg Ministerial
1255-1259

2. Adelaide 1301

Jakob I of Thurm Knight

Oberndorf

Geute
1301-1307 m.

Conrad VII of Wartenfels 1307-1324
m.

André Sax d. 1326
archbishop, he was far less tolerant of his kinsmen’s misconduct. In a response to Ottokar II’s complaint that several archiepiscopal ministerials, including the Kalhams, had caused the king’s lands great injuries, Frederick pointed out that his own domains had suffered even greater losses but that he had been powerless to act because the evildoers had enjoyed the protection of Duke Henry XIII of Lower Bavaria. The archbishop-elect therefore proposed a joint operation against the troublemakers. The Kalhams’ actions, whatever their original motives may have been, had thus been linked to the larger dispute over the vacant Babenberg duchies. The archbishop succeeded in 1272 in separating the Kalhams from their most powerful ally, their maternal uncle Frederick I of Töring. The final blow came at the end of July and the beginning of August 1275, when Frederick besieged and destroyed the Kalhams’ new castle. Afterward the archbishop explained in a letter to his new ally, Rudolph of Habsburg, that after observing the correct legal procedures he had been forced to proceed against Conrad and Henry of Kalham, who had appealed to Ottokar for help, on account of their crimes, which had included pillaging, highway robbery, assaults, and rape. The Kalhams had managed once again to ally themselves with what soon proved to be the losing side in the struggle for Austria and Styria.

No document survives about the terms of the Kalhams’ submission to Frederick II. Some sort of formal reconciliation must have occurred, because in 1279 Conrad attended the archbishop in Vienna. The subsequent history of the family was one of steady decline. In the 1280s Conrad and Kuno pledged their shares of the land (Burgstall) where the castle of Altenkalham stood to their cousin Conrad V of Kalham-Wartenfels for what appear to be nominal amounts. This may have been an attempt to place the castle in the hands of the one member of the lineage who still enjoyed the archbishop’s favor. The third brother, Henry, when he was paroled in 1296 after imprisonment for some unspecified offense, likewise pledged various properties to his cousin and in 1299 surrendered to Archbishop Conrad IV his share of castle of Altenkalham and its Burgstall, the court at Kalham, and whatever else he possessed, alods or fiefs, from the church of Salzburg.

The Kalhams emerged from obscurity for the last time in 1326, when Conrad VIII laid claim to the fiefs that had belonged to his distant cousin Conrad VII of Kalham-Wartenfels and escheated to the church after the latter’s death. Arbiters awarded Conrad VIII—more by grace, they said, than by right—the disputed
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The downfall of the Kalhams, whose ancestry can be traced to the 1120s, was particularly dramatic and abrupt; but by 1300 at least five other lineages of greater archiepiscopal ministerials (Felbens, Goldeggs, Oberndorfs, Radecks, and Staufeneccks) were in varying degrees of financial difficulty. Since the archbishops took advantage of the ministerials' problems to obtain their castles, courts, and so on, the question is why these families were in so much trouble at the beginning of the fourteenth century. The most obvious explanation for the Kalhams’ financial difficulties after 1275 was their political miscalculations: they had allied with the archbishop’s opponents and lost.

Conversely, the archbishops were generous to those ministerials like the Kalhams’ cousin Conrad of Wartenfels, who were faithful retainers. He represented the archbishops, for example, on various boards of arbitration, including the commission that on 18 July 1275 (just before the archbishop began the siege of the Kalhams’ castle) fixed for centuries the border between Bavaria and Salzburg. Conrad was identified as a member of the council that governed Salzburg after the death of Archbishop Rudolph in 1290, the first time that institution was specifically mentioned; but the numerous documents Conrad witnessed in the 1270s and 1280s suggest that he had belonged all along to the archbishops’ inner circle of advisers. Conrad served in the 1290s as the Hofmeister, the official who presided at the archiepiscopal court that had jurisdiction over fiefs. He was suitably rewarded for his services. Archbishop Ulrich had granted Conrad permission in 1259 to build a new castle, and by 1267 he had adopted the name of his new residence, Wartenfels. Thus, although Archbishop Frederick destroyed the Kalhams’ adulterine castle, their cousin was permitted to build a new one. The connection between loyalty to the archbishop and the rise and fall of individual ministerials and specific lineages is plain.

Still, political mistakes were not the sole reason so many lineages of prominent
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archiepiscopal ministerials were suddenly in such financial difficulty after 1270. The question arises whether ministerials like the Kalhams allied with the archbishop’s enemies and resorted to highway robbery precisely because they were already in financial trouble.

Several factors besides insubordination may have been at work. One may have been a consequence of a change in family strategy. In the thirteenth century many lineages that had previously restricted the number of sons they permitted to marry adopted the new policy of allowing more than one son to wed. The drawback to this strategy was that the family’s patrimony was divided among too many heirs. The Kalhams may be a case in point. The generation of Conrad I in the mid-twelfth century had consisted of six brothers; yet as far as is known he was the only Kalham in his generation who had any surviving children. In contrast, two of his sons married and were the ancestors of separate lines. Kuno and his brothers may have taken to robbery precisely because they were forced to share the Kalham inheritance with their cousin Conrad of Wartenfels.

Second, the increasingly extravagant lifestyle that befitted their hard-won status as nobles may have ruined many ministerials. There is a bit of circumstantial evidence suggesting that by 1300 the nobles of southeastern Germany were living considerably beyond their means. The account books of the sons of Duke Meinhard I of Carinthia (1286–95) present a picture of ruinous extravagance. The brothers’ agents brought back from Venice on one of many shopping sprees, for instance, 42 bolts of baldachin, 10 gilded necklaces set with precious stones, 13 expensive belts, 141 pieces of cloth of different colors, 143 pieces of silk, furs, 123 pairs of gilded spurs, 120 swords, and an equal number of gilded bridles and reins. Similarly, after Archbishop Rudolph died in 1290, the archiepiscopal council was forced to pledge the tolls in the city of Salzburg for a year to pay a bill for 111 marks of silver that he owed a tailor. Princes who lived like this were presumably not surrounded by noble courtiers dressed in homespun loden.

Third, the incessant warfare that plagued the Austro-Bavarian area after the extinction of the Babenbergs may have contributed to the ministerials’ financial distress. The Annales Sancti Rudberti Salisburgenses is full of reports about the destructive effects of warfare. For example, in 1257 Archbishop-Elect Philip devastated the lands of the ministerials who had elected Ulrich to replace him; and Ottokar II seized and destroyed the possessions of the church of Salzburg in 1275 and allegedly caused an estimated 40,000 marks in damage. Georges Duby
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thought that the burning and pillaging of manor houses and their appurtenances was a major cause for the decline of the late medieval manorial economy. The ministerials’ estates may have been a particularly tempting target for the forces of a rival prince.

Finally, long-term climatic changes may have adversely affected agriculture within the principality, especially in the more mountainous sections, and thus undermined the economies of landowning ministerials. As anyone who has ever lived in Salzburg knows, it rains frequently under the best of conditions. The year 1281 stood out, however. According to the chronicler, there was unusually severe weather at Christmas 1280 and a massive amount of snow. Worse followed. To everyone’s astonishment, it snowed on 17 July in an area extending from Freising to the Lungau. It rained so much that summer that not even old people, the chronicler added, could remember such intemperate weather. The result was an unparalleled crop failure, and even prelates found oat bread dear. Like the rest of Europe, the principality suffered greatly from the famine that began as early as 1309 in southern Germany. The chronicler reported that more than 2,300 people were buried in one cemetery in Tittmoning between 11 November 1310 and 2 February 1311 because of a famine caused by the severe cold and the destructive effects of warfare. There was such a shortage of food in 1313 that a peck of wheat sold for 3 shillings and 2 pennies.

The question is whether the events of 1281 and the second decade of the fourteenth century were isolated occurrences or symptoms of a long-term deterioration in the climate. Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie pointed out that the first half of the fourteenth century, except for the second decade, was not especially wet. Grain production, which suffers most in northern Europe from too much moisture during the summers, would thus not have been adversely affected. The alpine glaciers advanced between 1215 and 1350, however, as a result of both longer winters and cooler summers that retarded glacial ablation. The somewhat colder weather may have had little effect on cereal yield in northern France, but harsher winters and cooler summers may have had more of an impact, Le Roy Ladurie argued, on alpine regions with shorter growing seasons. As an alpine principality, Salzburg and its landowners may have been especially hard hit.

It is difficult to determine which factor or combination of factors contributed to the downfall of a particular individual or late medieval lineage, but the fact

remains that after 1270 one prominent lineage after another was ruined politically, financially, or both.\(^{139}\) The elimination of the greater ministerials left the archbishops as the undisputed masters of the principality.

The knights, the group composed of the descendants of the lesser ministerials, the retainers of the extinguished comital and noble dynasties, and the greater ministerials’ own servile vassals took the ministerials’ place; but as archiepiscopal officials they were far more dependent on their lords’ grace than the ministerials had been. The Kuchls provide the most spectacular example of such upward social mobility. Conrad II of Kuchl, whose origins are obscure, was for forty years the trusted financial adviser of four archbishops. He was a member of the archiepiscopal council for at least twenty-five years; the vidame of Salzburg during the archbishops’ war with Duke Albrecht; the judge of the city of Salzburg in 1287, when Archbishop Rudolph granted the city its first municipal charter, and again from 1306 to 1312; and the captain of Salzburg, essentially the governor, during Archbishop-Elect Weichart’s absence in 1312. In the process Conrad amassed a fortune, and the Kuchls became the wealthiest family in the principality in the fourteenth century.\(^{140}\)

Although Archbishop Frederick III still distinguished in 1327 between “our church’s \[gottshaus\] ministerials, knights, and squires,”\(^ {141}\) no estate of lords or \textit{Herrenstand}, composed of the greater ministerial lineages, formed in late medieval Salzburg as it did in Austria and Styria. Instead the principality had only a single rather weak estate of nobles, the \textit{Ritterstand} or estate of knights.\(^ {142}\) The ministerials’ union with their former vassals was due in part to the spread of chivalric culture in the archdiocese, which in the late thirteenth century finally made \textit{miles} or \textit{Ritter} a socially acceptable designation for a prominent ministerial.\(^ {143}\) For example, although Conrad V of Wartenfels was generally called a ministerial, he was also styled a noble, a noble ministerial, and a knight.\(^ {144}\) Such terminological confusion is indicative of the breakdown after 1270 in the traditional divisions between nobles, ministerials, and knights. More important, by the middle of the
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fourteenth century there were simply too few ministerial lineages left in the principality to form a separate estate (only nine still survived in 1343, and by 1419 that number had been reduced to one). The archbishops had taken advantage of the ministerials' familial and financial difficulties and political mistakes to eliminate their erstwhile helpers, the last serious obstacle to the assertion of the archbishop's territorial supremacy. Knightly families like the Kuchls eventually met a similar fate, and by 1500 Salzburg was a principality without a native nobility.

This chapter has provided an overview of the history of the archiepiscopal ministerialage from the first appearance of an elite group among the serfs during the archiepiscopate of Frederick I in the second half of the tenth century until the political downfall, financial ruin, or biological extinction of most of their noble descendants by the middle of the fourteenth century. The Investiture Conflict, during which the ministerials' military skills had proved crucial, was the decisive period in the formation of the estate; and their participation in the election of every archbishop between 1147 and 1256 except Conrad III showed their new status. The extinction of the free nobility or the nobles' own entrance into the archiepiscopal ministerialage left the ministerials by 1200 as the secular elite of the principality. Paradoxically, the 1270 election of the archiepiscopal ministerial Frederick of Walchen, who first styled the ministerials as nobles, started them on the road to oblivion. Frederick and his successors utilized the ministerials' familial, financial, and political problems to eliminate the greater ministerials as a threat to archiepiscopal authority. In the end the ministerials met the same fate as the free nobles, in part because their personal servitude provided the archbishops with a legal device to control them.

This tension between the ministerials' social position and legal status, however, was only one of many sets of conflicting norms that shaped their lives: their obligation as serfs to marry within the archiepiscopal familia and the church's prohibition of consanguineous unions; maternal ascription and patrilocality; the ministerials' desire to ensure their lineages' continuity and the need to preserve the families' patrimony from division among too many heirs; male dominance and hypergamy; the ministerials' concern for their salvation and the inheritance rights of their heirs; the establishment of patrilineages and the continuing importance of cognatic and affinal ties; and the ministerials' own family strategies and the archbishops' political calculations. Since marriage was central to many of these conflicts, in the chapters that follow I will examine the ministerials' marital choices in order better to understand their peculiar status as noble bondsmen.
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