The Wittelsbach Court in Munich: 
History and Authority in the Visual Arts (1460-1508)

May 2009

© Andreas Dahlem 2009
Abstract

The culture at the ducal court of Sigmund and Albrecht IV of Bavaria-Munich was characterised by a coexistence of traditional as well as novel concepts and interests, which were expressed in the dukes’ artistic, architectural and literary patronage. Apart from examining the orthodox means of aristocratic self-aggrandizement like jousting, clothes, decorative arts and precious, exotic objects, this thesis discusses ‘innovative’ tendencies like the forward-looking application of retrospective motifs, historicising styles as well as the dukes’ genealogy, the ducal government’s imprint on the territory and the aesthetic qualities of the landscape.

The study of a selection of buildings and works of art with the methodologies of the stylistic analysis, iconology and social history emphasises the conceptual relations between the ducal court’s various cultural products, which were conceived as ensembles and complemented each other. The elucidation of their meanings to contemporaries and the patrons’ intentions is substantiated with statements in contemporary written sources like travel reports, chronicles and the ducal court’s literary commissions.

The principal chapters explore three thematic strands that are idiosyncratic for the culture at the court of Sigmund and Albrecht IV between 1460 and 1508, because they were consistently realised in several buildings and works of art. The first chapter provides an overview of the history of Munich, the Duchy of Bavaria and the Wittelsbach dynasty. The second chapter explores the princely self-conception at the threshold of the Late Middle Ages and the Early Modern Era by considering the application of clothes, decorative arts, knightly skills, exotic animals, and monuments of the patrons’ erudition as means of social communication and differentiation. The third chapter considers the dukes’ awareness as well as ‘manipulation’ of their genealogy and history as a forward-looking means for legitimating and realising their political objectives. It also examines the symbolism and origins of historicising motifs in art and architecture like the Church of Our Lady’s bulbous domes that acted as markers of the ducal sepulchre. The fourth chapter scrutinizes the impact of the dukes’ government and artistic as well as architectural patronage on their territory. It also considers emergence of poly-focal panoramic views from the interiors of castle and palaces into the surrounding countryside by examining the origins of this phenomenon and the perception of the landscape’s aesthetic qualities.
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Introduction and methodology

The councillor, historian, humanist and physician Hartmann Schedel of Nuremberg included a townscape of Munich in his Liber Chronicarum or rather Nuremberg Chronicle (1493), an illustrated world history with woodcuts of twenty-nine towns in Europe and the Near East. (Plate 7) These townscapes depict the spiritual centres of Christendom (Jerusalem and Rome), the great trading centres (Constantinople, Florence and Venice), major German cathedral cities and pilgrimage sites (i.e. Bamberg, Cologne, Eichstätt, Magdeburg, Passau, Regensburg, Strasbourg and Würzburg), imperial free towns (i.e. Augsburg, Nuremberg and Ulm), the important princely and imperial residences (i.e. Krakow, Prague and Vienna).

It is intriguing that Schedel added Munich rather than Landshut to his selection of eminent European towns by commissioning a townscape of Munich from Michael Wolgemut. Neither one of the two Bavarian towns are important ‘pan-European’ trading centres, major pilgrimage sites or diocesan towns. Nevertheless, the Dukes of Bavaria-Landshut’s principal seat would have been the more obvious choice in view of the evaluations of historiographers in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.¹ In their judgement, the Dukes of Bavaria-Munich were overshadowed by the renown and wealth of their relatives in Landshut. To this day, Bavarian historians like Andreas Kraus, Wilhelm Störmer and Walter Ziegler regard the Dukes of Bavaria-Landshut as the most eminent Bavarian branch of the Wittelsbach dynasty in the second half of the fifteenth century.² The marriage of Duke George of Bavaria-Landshut with the Polish Princess Jadwiga Jagiellon and the lavish wedding festivities in 1475 were understood as manifestations of the authority, political influence and reputation of the Dukes of Bavaria-Landshut.³ Conversely, it was believed that Albrecht III of Bavaria-Munich did not bequeath a duchy of outstanding character and worth to his sons in 1460.⁴ The modest court of Sigmund, Albrecht IV, Christoph and Wolfgang, consisting of 164

¹ For an example of this view refer to Walter Ziegler, 'Europäische Verbindungen der Landshuter Herzöge im 14. und 15. Jahrhundert', in Franz Niehoff (ed.), Vor Leinberger. Landshuter Skulptur im Zeitalter der Reichen Herzöge (1; Landshut: Museen der Stadt Landshut, 2001), 27-50. p. 27-31
⁴ Kraus, 'Sammlung der Kräfte und Aufschwung (1450-1508)'. p. 291
persons and 121 horses in 1464, was regarded as substantiation of this interpretation. The struggles of Sigmund, Albrecht IV and Christoph for participation in the ducal government were conceived as detrimental to the attainment of political distinction inside their territories as well as in the Holy Roman Empire. From this perspective, Albrecht IV only emerged as an adroit, considerable statesman toward the end of the fifteenth century, which is, for example, reflected in his marriage with Kunigunde of Austria.

Hartmann Schedel could not anticipate the tide of history that brought the reunification of the Duchy of Bavaria under the hegemony of the Dukes of Bavaria-Munich in 1505. Yet Schedel must have considered Munich as more significant than Landshut or any of the Bavarian dukes’ other seats (i.e. Ingolstadt and Straubing), and relevant to his chronicle’s narrative, because he only commissioned a woodcut of Munich.

This raises the question whether Schedel’s choice reflects a fifteenth-century conception of Munich that differs from the historiographic portrayal of the Wittelsbach dynasty’s two branches in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. What aspects of Munich and the dukes of Bavaria-Munich attracted Schedel’s attention? What distinguished Munich from the other Bavarian ducal seats in the late fifteenth century so that it was of interest to Schedel and the audience of his chronicle? To answer these questions this thesis examines three aspects that are most characteristic of the culture at the ducal court in Munich in the second half of the fifteenth century and the early sixteenth century.

The thesis’s structure and subject matter

The scope of material, which is relevant to a study of the culture and outlook at the ducal court in Munich, prompted the thesis’s thematic approach that covers architecture, murals, altarpieces, genealogies, travel reports, etc. Thereby it is intended to counteract the modern tendency to separate individual media into distinct categories, even though they were conceived as ensembles. Examples were selected to illustrate key concepts and themes that are characteristic of the culture at the ducal court in Munich between 1460 and 1508. The commissions of Sigmund (reg. 1460-1467) and Albrecht IV (reg. 1465-1508) of Bavaria-Munich are understood as means of visual communication that conveyed the conception of their reign, their public image, and political agenda. The dukes’ strategies are classified into three categories.

Firstly, the Dukes of Bavaria-Munich pursued more traditional strategies of princely magnificence that are reflected in splendid clothes, chivalry, ‘zoological’ gardens, the size of their entourages, and the life as well as the culture at the ducal court in Munich. These schemes were complemented by novel means of self-aggrandizement. These strategies reflect the dukes’ diverging concepts of their identities, which they intended

---

6 Störmer, 'Die wittelsbachischen Landesteilungen im Spätmittelalter (1255-1505)'. p. 21
to convey to their subjects and the audiences of their commissions. Erudition became a desirable characteristic of aristocrats from the middle of the fifteenth century. For example, Duke Sigmund presented himself as a learned prince with his memorial plaque’s Latin elegy outside the Church of Our Lady’s south-eastern portal that complemented the chivalric pursuits of Albrecht IV and Christoph of Bavaria-Munich. This period also witnessed a shift from the exclusively religious interest in the Holy Land to a curiosity in foreign cultures and lands with their strange inhabitants. For instance, the ducal treasurer Matthäus Prätzl referred to the recommendations of Aristotle’s *Nichomachean Ethics* as motivation for collecting travel reports and as explanation for his thirst of knowledge.\(^7\)

Secondly, this inquisitiveness was accompanied by an ‘archaeological’ interest in history. Sigmund and Albrecht IV commissioned works of art and chronicles that illustrated and reworked their genealogy to substantiate their claim to power as well as their forward-looking political agenda. They revived past styles and employed historicising motifs that evoked bygone periods. The sources for the knowledge of historic models and the patrons’ intentions for evoking ancient times are discussed in this context. The origins and symbolism of the Church of Our Lady’s bulbous domes are of particular interest as they are a landmark feature of Munich’s townscape and almost a singular architectural element at the time of their creation. The bulbous domes and their symbolism might derive from the architectural disposition of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. Therefore, they act as markers of the ducal tomb and reflect the combination of the contemporary interest in (biblical) history and foreign places. Their relation to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre’s architectural disposition raises questions about the availability and dissemination of knowledge of the holy site’s architecture in late medieval and early modern Munich respectively.

Thirdly, the development of the Duchy of Bavaria into a territorial entity (Territorialstaat) and the expansion of the Bavarian dukes’ authority beyond the borders of their princely seat is manifested in the creation of administrative structures and their artistic as well as architectural patronage in the countryside around Munich. Armorial bearings, memorial plaques, palaces, churches and religious foundations indicate the visual as well as conceptual demarcation of the dukes’ realm and authority. Changes in perception of space and the landscape are examined in this context as palace interiors were visually related to their exteriors, and buildings functioned as characteristic landmarks that communicated with beholders beyond the town walls.

---

\(^7\) Mentioned and transcribed in Randall Herz, *Die ’Reise ins Gelobte Land’ Hans Tuchers des Älteren (1479-1480). Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung und kritischen Edition eines spätmittelalterlichen Reiseberichts* (Wissensliteratur im Mittelalter, 38; Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 2002). p. 258
Methodology

Focus on primary sources

Primary sources like Ulrich Füetrer’s *Buch der Abenteuer* (*Book of Adventures*, 1473-1484/87) and *Bairische Chronik* (1478-1481), Veit Arnpeck’s *Chronica Baioarorum* (1494-95) as well as the travel report (1492) of the Venetian diplomat Andrea de Franceschi were transcribed in the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries. These books present valuable resources, because they provide effortless access to these fifteenth-century accounts. Nevertheless, Helmuth Stahleder criticised the late nineteenth-century and especially the twentieth-century historiographic publications on Munich for having shifted their focus from the study and interpretation of sources to the reiteration as well as the discussion of previous scholarship. The veracity of ‘facts’ and analyses was taken for granted without evaluating their truth. Thereby, according to Stahleder, mistakes were passed on from one generation of historians to the next. This perception prompted his compilation of primary sources (almost exclusively records of Munich’s town council) on the medieval and early modern history of Munich, which he published in *Chronik der Stadt München. Herzogs- und Bürgerstadt. Die Jahre 1157-1505*.

The printed copies of Arnpeck and Füetrer’s chronicles lack interpretations of the transcribed material. Conversely, the transcriptions in Stahleder’s *Chronik der Stadt München* are often accompanied by contextual information or brief explanations. Nevertheless, these very short interpretations do not critically relate the transcribed sources with concepts in recent historical studies, which would provide a comprehensive, rigorous evaluation of this period and its characteristic developments.

Arnpeck and Füetrer’s chronicles as well as literary works have not yet been employed for the interpretation of buildings and works of art from a contemporary’s perspective. These written primary sources are intended as substantiations of this thesis’s iconological interpretations of art and architecture, because they provide information on

---


9 Stahleder, *Chronik der Stadt München. Die Jahre 1157-1505*, p. 4

the perception of art and architecture by the audience for whom they were designed. In
the instance of Füetrer’s works, they demonstrate how patrons like Albrecht IV intended
beholders of these works of art and buildings to interpret them. This approach should
minimise the risk that the twenty-first-century observers’ assumptions, unknown by the
fifteenth-century audience, creators and patrons, are retrospectively projected onto the
buildings and works of art. The application of these primary sources should also permit
the re-evaluation of the clichéd characterisations of Sigmund, Albrecht IV and
Christoph of Bavaria-Munich. Albrecht IV is generally regarded as a modern type of
ruler whose education as well as rationality distinguishes him from the idle, art-loving,
hedonistic Sigmund, and the chivalric, daring, impulsive Christoph.11

An appraisal of the primary sources

Duke Sigmund’s testament (29th November 1485, Hausurkunde 809, Geheimes
Hausarchiv, Munich), the ledgers (1467, 1491 and 1495) of the ducal treasurer Matthäus
Prätzl (Cgm 2222, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich; and Fürstensachen 287a,
Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Munich), the inventories of 1509 and 1513 that were
transcribed by Otto Hartig,12 and the Hofordnung of 1464 and 1508 (Fürstensachen 252,
Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Munich; and Hofhaushaltsakten Nr. 5, Geheimes
Hausarchiv, Munich), which were means to regulate and organise princely courts,
provide the most objective insight into life at the ducal court in Munich. They list the
members of the ducal court, payments for repairs, building work and the objects—
mostly for daily use like candles, writing utensils, medicine, glasses, wine and
chessmen, but also a manger for Christmas13—that were acquired and owned by the
dukes of Bavaria-Munich in the second half of the fifteenth century and the early
sixteenth century. However, Sigmund’s testament and the inventories are also
subjective records. The persons who compiled it discriminated certain items in their
selections. These lists document those items that were regarded ‘valuable’ or worthy.
They reflect the attitude of the dukes and their courtiers. They provide a glimpse of
some aspects of court life, but they do not provide a complete impression of it.

Korrespondenz-Akt Nr. 574 of the Geheimes Hausarchiv in Munich contains the
correspondence of Sigmund, Albrecht IV, Christoph and Wolfgang regarding their

11 Sigmund von Riezler, ‘Christoph, Herzog von Baiern’, in Historische Commission bei der Königlichen
Akademie der Wissenschaften (ed.), Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie (4; Leipzig: Duncker &
in Historische Commission bei der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften (ed.), Allgemeine
IV., der Weise, Herzog von Bayern’, in Historische Commission bei der Königlichen Akademie der
Wissenschaften (ed.), Neue deutsche Biographie (1; Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1953), 157-158. p.
157; Kraus, ‘Sammlung der Kräfte und Aufschwung (1450-1508)’. p. 291-292; Maren Gottschalk,
‘Geschichtsschreibung im Umkreis Friedrichs I. des Siegreichen von der Pfalz und Albrechts IV. des

Erasmus Grassers (1518) und Jan Polacks (1519), 4 vols. (1; Munich: Verlag Georg D.W. Callwey,
1926). p. 78 & 81-82

13 Matthäus Prätzl, ‘Fürstensachen 287a’, (Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv Munich, 1491). fol. 2r, 2v, 3v,
4v, 5v, 6v, 8r, 9v & 14r.
dispute about participation in the ducal government, and copies of the treatises that stipulated the positions and roles of each duke. These documents range from 1465 to 1472. They are complemented by Hausurkunde 655 (contract between Sigmund and Albrecht IV regarding the transfer of the government business from Sigmund to Albrecht IV in 1466), Hausurkunde 665 (Duke Sigmund’s abdication in 1467), Hausurkunde 807 (the assignment of Duke Sigmund’s share of inheritance of the Duchy of Bavaria-Munich to Duke Albrecht IV in 1477) and Hausurkunde 870 of 1494 (the official version of Hausurkunde 807 that was issued in the presence of high-ranking court officials and a priest) in the Geheimes Hausarchiv, Munich. These documents reflect the persistent struggle among the brothers for participation and a leading role in the ducal government. For example, Duke Christoph’s abandonment of his claim of involvement in the ducal government for the duration of five years and Sigmund’s negotiations between Albrecht IV and Christoph, whom he criticized for his hostile conduct against his older brother, as recorded in documents of 1470 in the Korrespondenz-Akten Nr. 574 illustrate the efforts of appeasing the fraternal opponents and asserting Albrecht IV’s monocratic rule.

Korrespondenz-Akte Nr. ad 574 (Geheimes Hausarchiv in Munich) comprises copies of the letters sent to Archduchess Eleanor of Austria, the daughter of King James I of Scotland, from Sigmund (1466), Christoph (1469) and Anna of Brunswick (1471). The letters do not contain any information on the senders’ artistic, architectural and literary patronage, which concretely substantiate an exchange between the Habsburg courts in Austria and the Wittelsbach court in Munich. Nevertheless, it is a definite proof for the contact between the Habsburgs and the Wittelsbachs. The dukes of Bavaria-Munich maintained very close relations with Archduke Sigmund of Austria in Innsbruck and the imperial court in Vienna. Eleanor of Tyrol had stayed at the court of King Charles VII of France before marrying Sigmund of Tyrol. She might have passed knowledge of the customs and fashions at the French royal court onto the dukes of Bavaria-Munich. The Habsburg courts in addition to the sisters and wives of the Bavarian dukes who either stemmed from Italian princely houses (i.e. Elisabeth Visconti) or married Italian aristocrats (i.e. Margaret of Bavaria-Munich) might have conveyed information on the culture at the northern Italian courts. (Plate 53)

Sigmund signed Grünwald Castle over to Albrecht IV with Hausurkunde 681 of 1485 (Geheimes Hausarchiv, Munich). This document stipulates that the mass, founded by Sigmund in the castle’s chapel, is excluded from this transfer of ownership. It highlights the duke’s conception of his Christian faith and the importance of these ecclesiastical foundations for the salvation of Christians in the late fifteenth century.

The records of Munich’s town council as transcribed by Helmuth Stahleder are primary sources that provide an objective impression of civic life in the Middle Ages and the early modern era. They reflect a wide range of events and concerns from official visits by foreign monarchs, serious political and diplomatic affairs to mundane aspects of civic life. These records evidently reflect the town council’s judgement and interests, which is reflected

---

in Hans Rosenbusch’s retrospective assessment of Emperor Louis the Bavarian’s reign in the Salbuch\textsuperscript{15} of 1444 or his relief about Agnes Bernauer’s execution in a note of 22\textsuperscript{nd} October 1435.\textsuperscript{16} The records only document official visitors of Munich who received a present from the town council, customarily wine. For example, the Venetian diplomats, among them Andrea de Franceschi, who stayed in Munich from 16\textsuperscript{th} to 18\textsuperscript{th} August 1492 are not mentioned in the records.\textsuperscript{17} The diplomats did not receive an audience with Duke Albrecht IV of Munich.\textsuperscript{18} They must have been considered as normal visitors rather than official representatives of Venice. Therefore and in addition to a later clearance of documents, the town council records only reflect a partial impression of Munich’s cultural life and exchanges with other regions. For instance, they do not document the stay of journeymen in the workshops of Munich’s artists and craftsmen. They only record relations with architects, masons, painters, sculptors and other craftsmen when they were related to civic projects that were funded by the town council. Namely, mayor Bartlme Schrenck entertained the civic master mason Lukas Rottaler and master carpenter Ulrich of Munich on 25\textsuperscript{th} and 28\textsuperscript{th} May 1491 with regard to terminations of the Church of Our Lady’s towers.\textsuperscript{19}

Veit Arnpeck’s \textit{Chronica Baioarorum} (1494-1495) and Ulrich Füetrer’s \textit{Bairische Chronik} (1478-1481) chronicle the history of Bavaria up until their contemporary times. Thereby they offer a concurrent perspective on events, the dukes of Bavaria-Munich and their government in the second half of the fifteenth century. Ulrich Füetrer’s \textit{Buch der Abenteuer} (1473-1484/87) indirectly conveys information on the ducal court in Munich and the conception of the public persona of his patron. According to Bernd Bastert, the description of an invincible knight in Persibein (6, 1-7) of the \textit{Buch der Abenteuer} was intended as a metaphor for Albrecht IV.\textsuperscript{20} Likewise, Arnpeck and Füetrer’s patrons and environment influenced the objective of their chronicles. Yet these chronicles and their authors’ knowledge of contemporary events and oral traditions as well as primary sources that may have been lost today provide valuable descriptions of historic persons and events when one considers the context within which they were created, and assess them accordingly.

Veit Arnpeck also wrote the chronicle of the bishops of Freising (\textit{Liber de gestis episcoporum Frisingensium}, finished in 1495).\textsuperscript{21} He was a cleric with beneficiaries in the bishopric of Freising (documented at the Church of St Andrew in 1491) and Landshut, where he was affiliated with the Church of St Martin according to records of

\textsuperscript{15} A list of properties and earnings.
\textsuperscript{16} Stahleder, \textit{Chronik der Stadt München. Die Jahre 1157-1505}. p. 289 & 312
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid. p. 453
\textsuperscript{18} Simonsfeld, ‘Venetianischer Reisebericht’. p. 258
\textsuperscript{20} Bernd Bastert, \textit{Der Münchner Hof und Fuetrers "Buch der Abenteuer". Literarische Kontinuität im Spätmittelalter}, ed. Wolfgang Harms (Mikrokosmos. Beiträge zur Literaturwissenschaft und Bedeutungsforschung, 33; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1993). p. 120
1468, 1487 and 1492. Both, the bishop of Freising and the dukes of Bavaria-Landshut were by and large opponents of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich and competed with them for hegemony in this region. Thus they might have supported Arnpeck’s counter-propaganda that undermined Füetrer’s conception of a single, uninterrupted line of Bavarian history and disputed the Wittelsbachs’ alleged kinship with the Carolingians.

Ulrich Füetrer is documented in Munich from 1453. Maren Gottschalk stated that Püterich von Reichertshausen probably introduced Füetrer to members of the ducal court in the early 1460s. If he was the creator of the genealogical mural in the Alte Hof, his contacts with the court must have been established before 1465, which means that the ducal court initially appreciated his skills as painter rather than as author according to Bernd Bastert. The first documented connection with the ducal court dates from 1467, when ‘Ulrich Maller’ was paid by the ducal treasury for entertaining several ladies of Archduke Sigmund of Austria’s entourage probably at his studio. This was a common part of the programme for high-ranking guests during official visits. Füetrer’s association with the ducal court is reflected in the acquisition of a house in close proximity to the Alte Hof and the Neuveste where he lived from 1482. Bernd Bastert observed that Füeter appears to have been involved in the creation of the heraldic decoration of the town hall’s new dance hall building in 1478, which glorified the Wittelsbachs’ reign and descent, as he was well versed in heraldry and genealogy. This close relationship with the court of Albrecht IV is reflected in the Buch der Abenteuer and the Bairische Chronik that praise Füetrer’s patron and exalt the renown of the House of Bavaria. In particular, Füetrer presented Albrecht IV as the legitimate heir of Louis the Bavarian and thus his eminent descendent who should assume the leading role within the Wittelsbach dynasty.

The plaques of Sigmund and Albrecht IV outside the south-eastern portal of the Church of Our Lady, in St Wolfgang in Pipping and the Kesselberg Pass road represent the conception of the dukes’ public persona, which they wanted to convey to their subjects. They present the dukes within an ecclesiastical setting, which is characteristic for the ducal patronage of this period. Most of the works of art, buildings and objects, commissioned by the ducal court, were designed for an ecclesiastical context. Wolfgang Braunfels observed that the audience of these artistic and architectural commissions in Munich were only versed to decode programmatic messages, when they were presented in an ecclesiastical framework. Thus the dukes employed these means to effectively communicate their political agenda.

22 Liebhart, ‘Arnpeck, Veit’.  
23 Bastert, Der Münchner Hof und Fuetrers ‘Buch der Abenteuer’. p. 140  
24 Gottschalk, ‘Geschichtsschreibung’. p. 87  
25 Bastert, Der Münchner Hof und Fuetrers ‘Buch der Abenteuer’. p. 142  
26 Ibid. p. 142  
29 Bastert, Der Münchner Hof und Fuetrers ‘Buch der Abenteuer’. p. 140-141  
Andrea de Franceschi travelled as part of a Venetian delegation of diplomats through Northern Italy, Southern Germany and Eastern Switzerland to offer Emperor Frederick III and his son King Maximilian I congratulations on restoring peace in Bavaria. The Venetian diplomats’ journey lasted from the beginning of June till the end of September 1492. The delegation comprised Giorgio Contarini, Count of Zasso, Polo Pisani, the secretary Giorgio de Fredericis and his coadjutor Andrea de Franceschi. Andrea de Franceschi was twenty years of age at this stage and had worked in the doge’s chancellery for several years. He assumed the office of great chancellor in 1529. The Venetian diplomats have a reputation as very good and meticulous observers, whose diligent reports were intended for the internal use in the doge’s chancellery. They were not intended for the public dissemination. They served the acquisition of factual information for the Venetian government. As such they did not have to serve the conveyance of a prestigious public image and therefore can be regarded as highly objective, precise observations.31

Hans von Waltheym (c. 1422-1479), a citizen of Halle an der Saale, described his pilgrimage and journey of 1474 through the Holy Roman Empire, Switzerland and France in a late-fifteenth-century manuscript. On 17th February 1474, Waltheym left Halle to travel via Erfurt, Nuremberg and Landshut to St Wolfgang im Salzkammergut. From there, he travelled to Saint Maximin in France where he arrived on 22nd April 1474. On his return journey, he stayed three weeks in the spa at Baden. His return to Halle was delayed because of outbreaks of the bubonic plague in Southern Germany and Alsace. He arrived in his hometown on 15th March 1475.32 Waltheym’s report is an example of the increasing number of descriptions, published by aristocrats, noblemen and patricians in the second half of the fifteenth century to document their pilgrimages. On the one hand, they were intended as means of self-promotion. Accounts of receptions at eminent courts might present the authors favourably. These reports demonstrated the authors as faithful Christians and should secure their salvation. On the other hand, they were conceived as practical travel guides that should enable their readers to replicate the trips. As such they contain precise descriptions of the places and sights along the route. Of course, these observations reflect the authors’ personal experiences and perspectives, which were conditioned by their culture and environment. For example, Klaus Voigt observed that Franceschi had discerned some of the characteristics of the Gothic architectural disposition of Ulm Minster and Strasbourg Cathedral, whereas Andrea Gatari could not grasp them in this detailed description of the minster in Basle. Though Franceschi did not identify specific aspects of the Gothic architecture like Enea Silvio Piccolomini and Petrus Ranzanus who praised certain characteristics of the Gothic hall churches in the regions along the Danube.33 It cannot be evaluated whether Franceschi did not possess the knowledge and language to describe the architecture of Ulm Minster, or this aspect was not relevant for his report

31 Simonsfeld, 'Venetianischer Reisebericht', p. 241-243
and thus he omitted it. Nevertheless, it demonstrates that each account was influenced by its author’s knowledge, experiences, objective and cultural background.

Hans von Mergenthal visited Munich on 24th and 25th March 1476 as a member of the entourage of Duke Albrecht of Saxony. Albrecht’s brother Ernst was married to Elisabeth, the sister of Sigmund and Albrecht of Bavaria-Munich. The retinue comprised circa one hundred persons, who had left Dresden on 5th March 1476 to travel to the Holy Land. Hans von Mergenthal documented this journey in his account, which was published in 1586. This report shows the aspects of court life that were highly regarded by aristocrats and were essential aspects of the princes’ demonstration of magnificence in the late Middle Ages and the early modern era. It describes the formalities of entertainment and hospitality at princely courts. The author certainly wanted to reciprocate with praising his hosts for their amicability. Therefore it might be regarded as a somewhat formulaic description of court life. Nevertheless, it provides an insight into the mentalities of princes and customs at princely courts in the second half of the fifteenth century.

Hans Seyboldt, the scribe of the Seligenthal abbey outside Landshut, and Hansen Eringer, a secretary of Margrave Albrecht of Brandenburg, documented the magnificent festivities of the wedding of Duke George of Bavaria-Landshut with Jadwiga Jagiellon of Poland in 1475. Thoman Jud, the master of the Hofmark of Bruckberg, commissioned Seyboldt to write his account of the marriage, which was completed in 1482. It is now part of the manuscript collection Cgm 331 in the Bavarian National Library in Munich. Eringer’s work reflects an eyewitness’s impression of the events, which might have been written for Margrave Albrecht’s wife Anna or Duke Louis IX of Bavaria-Landshut’s wife Amalie according to Sebastian Hiereth. Eringer’s contemporary account impressively documents the princes’ magnificent, colourful attire, the reception of the bride, the marriage ceremony in the St Martin and the nice speeches during the handing over of the bride’s presents. In contrast, Seyboldt’s report lacks some of the immediacy of Eringer’s description as it was written seven years after the marriage. Seyboldt, on the other hand, had insight into the ducal archives and conveyed the masterly organisation of the festivities’ logistics. Therefore, both accounts complement each other and together create a rich, manifold impression of the persons who attended the wedding, the ceremonies and events.

---

34 Stahleder, Chronik der Stadt München. Herzogs- und Bürgerstadt. p. 456-457
35 A Hofmark is a manor or minor regional centre that is particular to the administration and jurisdiction of the Duchy of Bavaria.
37 Ibid. p. 9
Stylistic analysis coupled with iconology and social history

The last three decades witnessed lively foundational research activities on the art and architecture in Munich as well as the territories of the Wittelsbach dukes in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. These publications focus almost exclusively on questions of attribution and the documentation of the buildings’ construction or the output of the artists’ workshops. Other books like the exhibition catalogues of the Diözesanmuseum in Freising on the Gothic period in Munich as well as Jan Polack’s workshop refine stylistic attributions and provide new insights into the production of these works of art. However, they did not elaborate on iconological considerations and the patrons’ intentions, which are reflected in the buildings as well as works of art, and are part of a social communication process.

Bernhard Schütz propagated formal analyses of architecture as a central means of architectural history for gaining more information on the genesis of buildings. He doubted that this type of examination would result in an over-accentuation of the architectural disposition (a positivistic formalism) but that they complement or rather substantiate the findings of other forms of historical research. For example, this methodology reveals the patrons’ intentions and buildings’ symbolism by decoding the architectural vocabulary and its emblematic connotations. The separation of the analysis of architectural forms from iconology was criticised by Hermann Bauer and recently Ulrich Fürst. On the one hand, architectural historians focus on the facts of buildings’ construction, questions of attribution, enquiries into the origins of motifs and stylistic evaluations. On the other hand, studies of architectural iconology concentrate on decipherable signs and symbols without paying much regard to the architectural form.


40 Bernhard Schütz, Die kirchliche Barockarchitektur in Bayern und Oberschwaben 1580-1780 (Munich: Hirmer, 2000). p. 7-10. Schütz’s methodology was also discussed by Ulrich Fürst in Ulrich Fürst, Die lebendige und sichtbare Histori. Programmatische Themen in der Sakralarchitektur des Barock (Fischer von Erlach, Hildebrandt, Santini), eds Frank Büttner and Hans Ramisch (Studien zur Christlichen Kunst, 4; Regensburg: Schnell & Steiner, 2002). p. 10

Renate Wagner-Rieger and Peter Morsbach remarked that this artificial separation of architectural form and symbolic meaning, as described by Fürst, in particular with regard to Late Gothic architecture. Wagner-Rieger criticised scholars for mainly being concerned with stylistic evaluations without relating the development of a style to actual historic and artistic circumstances. According to Wagner-Rieger and Morsbach, an approach, which contemplates, for instance, the buildings’ decorations, furnishings, liturgy and piety, would reveal new avenues for interpretations, because it regards buildings and works of art as manifestations of programmatic statements.

Recent art historical research aimed to link the distinct stylistic evolution of an era with contemporary trends that are situated outside the realm of art production like political and social developments, functional requirements and gender-specific interests. Thereby, it designated these extra-artistic trends as the impetus that shaped the specific development of a style. This methodology appears appropriate for the examination of the princely patronage’s artistic and architectural products, because the ‘authorship’ of concepts can be attributed to aristocratic patrons who desired to express their political objectives with their commissions.

For example, Martin Warnke summarised this methodological strand by writing that artistic products are the result of a specific culture, which is shaped by the characteristics of a specific geographic, historic and linguistic region. The disposition of the building or rather work of art is explained by its context, the conditions that determined its creation as well as the environment for which it was created and where it conveyed its meaning.

42 Fürst, Die lebendige und sichtbare Histori. p. 9
46 Ibid. p. 10
The conception of buildings and works of art as ensembles

Marina Belozerskaya’s study of the Burgundian arts (Rethinking the Renaissance. Burgundian Arts across Europe) and her subsequent publication Luxury Arts of the Renaissance shifted the focus from the popular triga (architecture, painting and sculpture) of art historical scholarship to what is regarded as decorative arts by including tapestries and embroidery, manuscripts, music, metalwork like jewellery and armours, carvings in precious and semiprecious stone as well as opulent ephemera like sugar sculptures. Belozerskaya scrutinised all arts including those that are referred to as minor or decorative arts, which then were much in demand and highly respected by patrons. With this approach, she intended to counteract the tendency of removing works of art from their original context as well as understanding them as independent pieces whose value derives exclusively from their innate qualities. However, tapestries and armours, for example, existed as part of ensembles and they were prominent means for the ostentatious display of their patrons’ aristocratic status through their symbolic messages.

From this perspective, the isolation of subject areas is perceived as restrictive. This approach prevents a comprehensive understanding of the court culture in its entirety. At the end of the Middle Ages and the beginning of the early modern era, princes resorted to various media to display their ‘absolutist’ claims to power and the authority over their territories. Architecture, the visual arts, gardens, even the development of a region as well as processions, pageants, liturgy, music and other practices of courts (i.e. hunting and tournaments) functioned together to visualize and promote the policies, objectives and assertions of aristocratic patrons. Albeit, each media might address a distinct audience, there exists an overarching central idea—particularly when commissioned by a single patron—that relates all media with each other. A study of these princely Gesamtkunstwerke not only recognises their conception as ensembles; it validates the discrete interpretations of the individual media when these findings concur. Thereby, they consolidate the understanding of the culture at the ducal court in Munich between 1460 and 1508.

The virtues of an approach, which refers to findings from research areas outside the customary scope of the art historical discourse, is exemplified by Paul Crossley’s study of the hall choir of the Church of St Laurence in Nuremberg. With this strategy, Crossley was able to reveal connections among the works of art as well as between the works of art and the architecture of the hall choir of St Laurence, even though they were commissioned by individual patrons or groups of patrons like guilds who came from different backgrounds and had distinct motivations. These linkages are even more

48 Belozerskaya, Luxury Arts of the Renaissance. p. 4
pronounced in the patronage of an aristocrat or a princely court, because the individual objects were envisaged as complementing each other (i.e. in the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace the painted embellishments of the facades are echoed by the motifs of the stained glass panes and the decorations of keystones and consoles as well as the character of the altarpieces) and their symbolism conveyed to a large extent the patrons’ political objectives. For example, findings from the literary commissions of the Dukes of Bavaria-Munich support the conclusion of the analysis of art and architecture, because the same notions prompted the commission of these objects. Together they create a richer impression and substantiate the plausibility of the examination’s result.

**Innovative aspects of the patronage of the Dukes of Bavaria-Munich**

Critical overviews of the Gothic and early modern periods either failed to notice projects of the ducal court like the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace or only briefly mentioned them. For instance, Paul Frankl, who considered the cultural and social aspects that shaped a style’s development and impacted on commissions, mentioned the ‘otherwise unimportant’ Chapel of Blutenburg Palace as an example for the harmony of architecture, decorations and furnishings that were created at the same time and obey ‘the same Kunstwollen’ by responding to the demands, placed on each media in this orchestrated, emblematic presentation of various bearers of meaning. Frankl appreciated the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace for its quality as an ensemble that is preserved almost unaltered in its original late fifteenth-century state. It still comprises most of the late fifteenth-century architectural embellishments and original works of art like Jan Polack’s altarpieces as well as the wooden sculptural cycle of an unknown master. Yet Frankl’s evaluation of the ‘otherwise unimportant’ palace chapel ignores important concepts that were innovative within the body of fifteenth-century ducal commissions. Likewise, other studies on the artistic and architectural commissions of the Dukes of Bavaria-Munich in the second half of the fifteenth century overlooked or did not mention the novel conceptions that are manifested in them.

---

Reflections on the terms ‘court art’ or ‘court culture’

This thesis examines the culture of the ducal court in Munich in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. However, it is difficult to define a distinct ‘court art’ or ‘court culture’ since the culture, taste and lifestyle of the Dukes of Bavaria-Munich as well as the patricians and to some extent the middle class converged. Artists like Ulrich Füetrer, Erasmus Grasser, Hans Haldner and Jan Polack as well as master masons like Jörg von Halspach worked for the Dukes of Bavaria-Munich, the church, the guilds and patricians in Munich and its vicinity. Sometimes patricians, aristocrats and the Dukes of Bavaria-Munich shared the same interests (i.e. the cult of Emperor Louis the Bavarian).

The Bavarian dukes’ dynastic relations and the implications for their cultural patronage

The Wittelsbachs extended their dynastic connections—which had been mainly established with houses in the eastern regions of the Holy Roman Empire (i.e. Duke Louis I had married Ludmilla of Bohemia in 1204, Henry XIII of Lower Bavaria had wedded Elisabeth of Hungary in 1244 and his brother Louis II of Upper Bavaria had married Anna of Silesia-Glogau in 1260)—westward and southward during the reign of Louis the Bavaria whose second wife is Margaret of Holland. This conjugal bond associated the Duchy of Bavaria with territories in the northwest of the Empire like the County of Holland and the County of Hainaut. The Wittelsbachs relations with France were the result of Duke Frederick of Bavaria-Landshut’s participation in battles against the towns of Flanders in 1383. They led to the weddings of Isabeau de Bavière and Louis VII of Bavaria-Ingolstadt with members of the French royal family.51 These connections were complemented by the Bavarian dukes’ marriages with Italian aristocrats that stemmed from the conjugal bond of Louis V of Upper Bavaria and Margaret of Gorizia-Tyrol in 1342, because the territories that the Wittelsbachs had gained through this marriage now bordered Italian principalities like those of the Visconti. Stephen III of Bavaria-Ingolstadt wedded Thaddea Visconti in 1364, Ernst of Bavaria-Munich married Elisabeth Visconti in 1396, and Albrecht IV’s sister Margaret of Bavaria-Munich was married to Frederick I of Gonzaga in 1463. The Habsburgs’ assumption to the highest office of the Holy Roman Empire under Albrecht II and Frederick III shifted the focus of the Bavarian dukes’ dynastic politics, which are reflected in their conjugal bonds. Elisabeth of Bavaria-Munich married Ernst I of Saxony in 1460, Albrecht IV of Bavaria-Munich wedded Kunigunde of Austria in 1487, Louis IX of Bavaria-Landsbut married Amalie of Saxony in 1452, and Margaret of Bavaria-Landsbut was married to Philip of the Palatinate in 1474. These conjugal bonds with dynasties whose territories border the Duchy of Bavaria were echoed by the dukes’ political agenda, which concentrated on the consolidation and expansion of their

This objective is reflected in Albrecht III of Bavaria-Munich’s refusal of the Bohemian throne in 1440 and Albrecht IV’s attempts to incorporate territories in Swabia, Tyrol as well as Further Austria into the Duchy of Bavaria, and the capture of the Imperial Free Town Regensburg in 1486.\(^{52}\) Hans von Mergenthal’s travel report that records the stay of Albrecht of Saxony’s entourage in Munich on 24\(^{th}\) and 25\(^{th}\) March 1476 indicates contacts with the dukes of Saxony.\(^{53}\) The letters of Sigmund of Bavaria-Munich, Christoph of Bavaria-Munich and Anna of Brunswick (Korrespondenz-Akte Nr. ad 574, Geheimes Hausarchiv, Munich), Sigmund’s stay at the imperial court in Vienna during his youth,\(^{54}\) and Albrecht IV of Bavaria-Munich’s wedding with Kunigunde of Austria manifest relations with the Habsburg dynasty. The dukes of Bavaria-Munich might have met Philip the Good on his journey of 1454 through the Duchy of Bavaria en route to the imperial diet (Reichstag) in Regensburg. Duke Louis IX of Bavaria-Landshut received the Burgundian duke in Lauingen an der Donau and accompanied him to Regensburg. Philip the Good visited Louis IX’s principal seat of Landshut on his return trip, where he stayed from 22\(^{nd}\) May until 1\(^{st}\) June 1454. A clerk of the ducal secretary Jehan Scoenhove described it in the letter to members of the court in Dijon.\(^{55}\)

These marriages and visits indicate dynastic connections and possible interactions between the Wittelsbach dukes and other princes, but they do not disclose the extent and aspects of cultural exchanges, which are reflected in written statements, presents like works of art and the migration of artists (i.e. Hans from Zeeland who settled in Straubing during the reign of the dukes of Bavaria-Straubing)\(^{56}\). Walter Ziegler stated that the erection of a ducal sepulchre in the Chapel of St Afra in the Cistercian Abbey of Seligenthal outside Landshut in circa 1330 is an exponent of the tradition of European dynasties to establish tombs in Cistercian abbeys (i.e. the Babenberg dukes’ sepulchre in Heiligkreuz near Vienna and the Bohemian kings’ tomb in Königssaal (Zbraslav) near Prague).\(^{57}\) However, he does not provide any concrete evidence that these sepulchres in Heiligkreuz and Königssaal were models for the Bavarian dukes other than that it followed a general pattern of patronage. Correspondingly, he observed that the churches of the northern Backsteingotik must have been a paragon for Hans Krumenauer, Hans von Burghausen and Hans Stethaimer, who built the Late Gothic brick hall churches in Bavaria (i.e. St Martin and Heiliggeistspitalkirche in Landshut, St Nicholas in Neuötting and St Jacob in Wasserburg am Inn). Ziegler continues to assert

\(^{52}\) Ibid. p. 40-41  
\(^{53}\) Stahleder, Chronik der Stadt München. Herzogs- und Bürgerstadt. p. 456-457  
\(^{54}\) Arnpeck, Sämtliche Chroniken. p. 673; Werner Bös, Gotik in Oberbayern (Munich: Süddeutscher Verlag, 1992). p. 46  
\(^{56}\) Dorit-Maria Krenn, 'Der Norden: Hennegau, Holland, Seeland und Friesland', in Dorit-Maria Krenn and Joachim Wild (eds.), "fürste in der ferne". Das Herzogtum Niederbayern-Straubing-Holland 1353-1425 (Hefte zur Bayerischen Geschichte und Kultur, 28; Augsburg: Bayerisches Staatsministerium für Wissenschaft, Forschung und Kunst & Haus der Bayerischen Geschichte, 2003), 8-17. p. 14  
\(^{57}\) Ziegler, 'Europäische Verbindungen der Landshuter Herzöge im 14. und 15. Jahrhundert'. p. 47
that even though the actual connection of the northern and southern brick Gothic architecture has not been decoded, it must have existed without a doubt.\textsuperscript{58} These examples show that it is difficult to trace the relationship of the Bavarian dukes’ architectural and artistic patronage to contemporary trends and models throughout Europe when only some circumstantial evidence may be available, but concrete indications are missing.

\textsuperscript{58} Ibid. p. 47/49
Historical and political context

The foundation of Munich

On 8th September 1156 Emperor Frederick Barbarossa (reg. 1152-1190) granted Duke Henry the Lion (reg. 1156-1180) the Duchy of Bavaria in fief. In 1157/78, shortly after his designation as Duke of Bavaria, Henry demonstrated his authority against Bishop Otto I of Freising (c. 1112-1158) by ordering the destruction of the mint and the toll bridge across the River Isar at Föhring, a market between Munich and Freising that was situated in the bishop of Freising’s territories. (Plate 1) Consequently the salt transports from Reichenhall via Wasserburg am Inn to Augsburg, Swabia and Switzerland were diverted along an existing eleventh-century trading route through Munich, because Henry intended to profit from the lucrative transit taxation. This aim is also reflected in his foundation of a castle and market in Landsberg am Lech that was located on the salt trade’s subsequent westbound route.

In 1158 Frederick Barbarossa settled the dispute between Henry the Lion and Bishop Otto I of Freising regarding the shipping route and the bishop’s loss of income at the Reichstag of Augsburg. The accord of 14th June 1158—wrongly referred to as the Arbitration of Augsburg (Augsburger Schied)—‘legalized’ Henry’s act retrospectively. This legal document, highlighting that both parties approved of this agreement, settled market rights, taxation, the allocation of tax revenues (each party received a proportional share) and rights of coinage. This agreement is generally understood as the ‘foundation certificate’ of Munich, because it is the first written document to mention the town’s name ‘Munichen’ and it promoted the development of this small monastic settlement into a thriving trading community.

---


63 Consult Bauer, Geschichte Münchens. p. 16-23 for an elaboration on the difficult legal basis of the Episcopal market and mint at Freising, which had never been authorized with an imperial edict. Bauer suspected local support (i.e. from the Wittelsbach dynasty, church advocates and the Counts Palatine) behind Henry the Lion’s act. Also refer to Stahleder, Chronik der Stadt München. Die Jahre 1157-1505. p. 6-7; Nöhbauer, München. p. 8
The rise of the Wittelsbach dynasty

The Wittelsbach dynasty descended from the Counts of Scheyern who resided in their ancestral seat at Scheyern. (Plate 1) Otto of Scheyern is their first documented ancestor. The Traditionsbuch of the cathedral chapter in Freising records ‘comes Otto de Skyren’ as its principal church governor from the middle of the eleventh century until circa 1078. His grandson Otto was the first to bear the title Count of Wittelsbach. The designation appeared for the first time in documents on 13th July 1116 and derives from Wittelsbach Castle near Aichach, his dynasty’s new principal seat. (Plate 1)

At this stage the Wittelsbach counts were a local power that was to extend its authority and influence in the course of the twelfth century. The rise of the dynasty is closely linked to their relationship with Frederick Barbarossa and reflected in their choice of heraldic animal. In 1166, the Wittelsbach counts incorporated an eagle, the symbol of the Empire, into their coat-of-arms. The eagle represented the office of the Count Palatine of Bavaria, which they had assumed in the 1110s and not later than 25th June 1120. On 16th September 1180, Frederick Barbarossa installed Count Otto V of Wittelsbach on the ducal throne of the imperial fief of Bavaria (Duke Otto I of Bavaria) as successor to Henry the Lion, who had become an authority of almost equal standing to the king in the Holy Roman Empire and presented in itself a threat to the emperor’s power.

The Wittelsbachs’ ascent to power continued in 1214 when Duke Louis I of Bavaria (reg. 1183-1231) was enfeoffed with the Palatinate of the Rhine on behalf of his son Duke Otto II of Bavaria (reg. 1231-1253) who was engaged to Agnes of the Palatinate at the age of six. As Counts Palatine of the Rhine the Wittelsbachs entered the top ranks of the Holy Roman Empire’s aristocracy. Their newly acquired title comprised important offices and influential powers. The office-holding Count Palatine acted as judge over the king and imperial governor (Reichsvikariat, deputy of the king in times of a vacant throne or when the king resided in Italy). The Wittelsbachs also became administrators of the royal estates in their territories on grounds of their office. They were also made prince electors with the conferment of the Palatine of the Rhine.

---


65 Fried, 'Die Herkunft der Wittelsbacher'. p. 31


68 Ziegler, 'Wittelsbach'. p. 219
Henceforth the Bavarian dukes, even those who did not rule the Palatinate of the Rhine, bore the title Count Palatine of the Rhine at the beginning of their form of address and the title Duke of Bavaria was relegated to the second place. In the instance of the reigning Counts Palatine of the Rhine their title demonstrated their significant role in the Holy Roman Empire and their direct political relationship with the emperors. In the case of those Bavarian dukes, who were not the governing Counts Palatine of the Rhine, the title reflected the affiliation of their ancestors and relatives with the Holy Roman Emperor.69

The identification with these offices and the renown that derived from them is also reflected in the Wittelsbachs’ coat-of-arms and repeated name change. In 1229 the Palatinate of the Rhine’s golden lion with a red crown appeared for the first time on their heraldic shield.70 The Wittelsbachs also eschewed those parts of their title, which associated them with their ancestral seat in Wittelsbach.71 Only eighteenth-century historiography revived Wittelsbach as a term that is synonymous with the House of Bavaria.72 These high offices had become more important for the dynasty’s self-consciousness than the identification with their local roots in Western Bavaria.

From the thirteenth century the extensive estates of the Dukes of Bavaria continuously developed into a territorial entity as the result of their military success (i.e. the battle with the Dukes of Andechs-Meranien) and ‘inheritances’ (Heimfallrecht73).74 These territories formed the heartland of the House of Bavaria. Later territorial acquisitions like the Palatinate of the Rhine, Brandenburg and Holland except for Tyrol were not incorporated or closely affiliated with this heartland.75
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The emergence of Munich as ducal seat

From 1180, the Wittelsbachs mainly governed their duchy from Regensburg. After Emperor Fredrick II’s designation of Regensburg as Imperial Free Town in 1245 and the peaceful territorial partition of the Duchy of Bavaria in 1255 the Wittelsbachs’ lost their hold of Regensburg. From circa 1230 Landshut, where Louis I of Bavaria (reg. 1183-1231) had founded a castle and a market in 1204, emerged as centre of the ducal government. Munich only began to emerge as a favoured principal ducal seat after the duchy’s first territorial partition in 1255, when Henry XIII (reg. 1253-1290) established Landshut as centre of Lower Bavaria and Louis II (reg. 1253-1294) selected the Alte Hof in Munich as principal residence in Upper Bavaria. (Plate 12 and Plate 13) The choice of Munich may have been promoted by its economic significance as salt trading market and because of it as a source of loans.

The view that Munich became the principal seat of the ducal court after 1255 is supported by the ducal building campaigns at the Alte Hof. They were initiated in the second half of the thirteenth century and probably added new structures on an existing fortified residence that dated from the reign of Henry the Lion. For example, the erection of the Zerwirkgewölbe was recorded in 1264. It housed the butcher’s shop and meat storage, important facilities for a permanent court. The Alte Hof’s new function as residence of the Upper Bavarian duke was highlighted by the politically momentous wedding of Elisabeth (the daughter of Otto II, sister of Louis II and widow of King Conrad IV of Germany) with the aspiring Count Meinhard II of Gorizia-Tyrol in 1259. The move of the Franciscan friary from the Anger on Munich’s south side to a site north of the Alte Hof in 1284 (Plate 16) is another indication of the establishment of the Upper Bavarian dukes’ court at the Alte Hof. Louis II’s efforts to expand and accumulate court life and activities at the Alte Hof were continued by his son Duke Rudolf I (reg. 1294-1319), which is reflected in the construction of the eastern part of the Burgstock (the Alte Hof’s southern wing) around 1300. (Plate 18)
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The ducal foundation of the Romanesque Church of Our Lady

The town’s extension under Louis II (completed circa 1300) and the ducal foundation of the Church of Our Lady are additional manifestations of the Wittelsbachs’ presence in Munich and the growth of the town’s population, which necessitated the erection of a second parish church. Hitherto only the Church of St Peter’s, dating from the twelfth century, had served Munich’s burghers as parish church. On 24th November 1271, Bishop Conrad II of Freising established the Church of Our Lady, located to the northwest of the main market square (Schrannenplatz), as the centre of Munich’s second parish. On 29th March 1273 Pope Gregory IX confirmed the Church of Our Lady as Munich’s second parish church. The clerics of the new parish ministered to the worshippers of the town’s northern half, where the ducal residence was located. The border between the two parishes was the main street that stretched across the town from east to west.

The first Church of Our Lady was probably erected on the site of a storehouse belonging to the Bishop of Freising whose foundations were discovered during excavations in the course of the building’s reconstruction after the Second World War. These excavations also revealed that the first building was an imposing three-aisled basilica rather than a modest chapel as suggested by Bishop Conrad II of Freising who referred to it as Lady Chapel in the foundation document. In fact this so-called Lady Chapel was much larger than the Church of St Peter’s and therefore can be understood as one of the first architectural manifestations of the Wittelsbach dukes that was intended to display their newly gained authority over the town.

This Romanesque church occupied approximately two thirds of the Late Gothic building’s area that replace it in the second half of the fifteenth century. It was a large three-aisled basilica with ad quadratum alternating supports that ended with a choir, flanked by two apses in the east and featured a twin-towered west front. A single-pitch roof, supported by four freestanding pillars, covered the area between the two towers and sheltered the main portal. The tall nave, illuminated through clerestory windows, probably featured groin vaults. A rood screen that partitioned off the choir from the
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nave must have been incorporated circa 1310. The choir was elevated above the nave’s
circle level. It extended over three bays and terminated in a $\frac{5}{8}$th polygon.\textsuperscript{92} It cannot be
determined with certainty whether this choir was a later addition to the Romanesque
building (possibly around 1310) or whether it was part of the original design, because
excavations have not revealed any traces of an earlier structure.\textsuperscript{93} Conversely previous
foundations may have been incorporated into subsequent construction campaigns. The
choir featured two annexes on its north-eastern side: the hexagonal Chapel of St
Michael as well as the sacristy, located between the Chapel of St Michael and the apse
of the northern side aisle.\textsuperscript{94} In its entirety the layout of the Romanesque Church of Our
Lady reflected the characteristic architectural disposition of contemporary Southern
Bavarian churches.\textsuperscript{95}

This architectural statement of the Wittelsbach dukes prompted a reaction on behalf
of the civic patrons of St Peter who consequently funded the construction of a new
Romanesque basilica. The new Church of St Peter was consecrated in 1294. The
western twin tower and particularly the longitudinal choir with its polygonal buttressed
east end reflect the impact of the Gothic.\textsuperscript{96}

The reign of Emperor Louis the Bavarian

Duke Louis IV (reg. 1294-1347), the son of Louis II of Upper Bavaria and Mechthild of
Habsburg, became known as Emperor Louis the Bavarian during his disputes with the
papacy, because Pope John XXII referred to Louis with this denigrating name in
response to Louis’s challenge of his authority. (Plate 40 and Plate 71)

The early years of Louis’s life were characterised by the struggle with his older
brother Rudolf I (reg. 1294-1317) for participation in the ducal government as co-
regent.\textsuperscript{97} Initially Rudolf successfully resisted the demand of the underage brother.
Eventually Louis could push through his request, which resulted in the partition of their
territories in 1310.\textsuperscript{98} The territorial division was revoked in 1313 without ceasing the
fraternal struggles.\textsuperscript{99}

After the deaths of Stephen I (reg. 1290-1310) and Otto III of Lower Bavaria (reg.
1290-1312) Louis the Bavarian gained tutelage of his underage sons Henry XIV, Otto
IV and Henry XV. Louis’s opponents offered Frederick I of Austria the tutelage of the
underage Lower Bavarian princes. This proposal provided Fredrick with the chance to
realise his long cherished plans to expand his territories at the expense of the Bavarian
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dukes by incorporating certain Lower Bavarian regions into his lands. In a rare act of cooperation Louis and Rudolf defeated Frederick in the battle of Gammelsdorf near Moosburg on 9th November 1313. (Plate 1)

In 1314, following the death of Emperor Henry VII († 1313), the Luxembourg party among the prince electors nominated Louis as Henry VII’s successor and rival candidate to Frederick I of Austria. Louis won the election on 20th October 1314. Rudolf sensed a chance to challenge his younger brother by supporting Frederick, since Frederick contested Louis’s election and had himself appointed as German king outside the law. Yet Louis the Bavarian was crowned German king in Aachen on 25th November 1314.

The beginning of Louis’s reign as German king was dominated by constant struggles with Frederick until he defeated his opponent in the Battle of Mühldorf and Ampfing in September 1322 with support from Munich’s burghers. The exceptionally brave efforts of the Baker’s Guild changed the outcome of the battle in Louis’s favour. Louis granted the Baker’s Guild the use of the imperial eagle in their armorial bearing as an expression of his gratitude.

Louis’s Italian campaign between 1327 and 1330 was the result of his dispute with Pope John XXII in Avignon. On 31st May 1327, Louis was crowned King of Italy in Milan and representatives of the Roman populace installed him as Holy Roman Emperor in St Peter’s on 17th January 1328. In 1330 Louis fulfilled a pledge that he had made in Rome by founding a Benedictine abbey in Ettal. Ettal was situated at the periphery of Louis’s heartland and along the primary trading route between Augsburg and Italy. The pious foundation is understood as an outpost to establish Louis’s authority in this remote region that was a former Welf territory, bordered the Habsburgs’ lands and enabled Louis to control an important trade route.

Louis the Bavarian expanded his territories through marriages and inheritances. In 1323 he enfeoffed his son Louis V with the Mark Brandenburg after the extinction of the House of Ascania. The end of the Lower Bavarian dukes’ line in 1340 allowed Louis the Bavarian to reunite the Duchy of Bavaria. In 1341 Tyrolean aristocrats drove out their regent John Henry of Bohemia, a member of the House of Luxembourg. Consequently Louis the Bavarian annulled the marriage of John Henry with Margaret of Gorizia-Tyrol and forced Margaret into matrimony with his son Louis V. He gained the Earldom of Hainaut, Holland, Zeeland and Friesland in 1345 through his marriage with Margaret of Holland. (Plate 3) These territorial acquisitions caused tensions with
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Charles IV of Luxembourg who was elected as rival king on 11th July 1346. While preparing to go into war against Charles IV Louis died during a court hunt at Puch near Fürstenfeld on 11th October 1347. (Plate 1)

Louis the Bavarian’s political impact on late medieval Munich

Hans Rosenbusch, the scribe of Munich’s town council, praised the Wittelsbach emperor and his patronage of Munich in the Salbuch of 1444. He stated that ‘under the reign of Emperor Louis the Bavarian Munich flourished most of all and he expanded it with the new town, because he was particularly fond of this town’. Rosenbusch recollected an era of important developments regarding the administration and constitution of Munich as well as the involvement of its burghers in the civic government. Louis the Bavarian continued not only his father’s architectural, economic and political policies (i.e. the extension of the town wall to incorporate the new town was completed in 1337 with the Isartor) that promoted Munich’s development into a thriving community, he became one of the town’s outstanding patrons.

Rudolf I and Louis aimed to secure financial and military support from Munich’s citizens by granting them privileges during their reciprocal struggles for power. For example, Louis intended to win over the burghers, who were divided into two parties, with his trade policies after his election as German king. In 1315 he granted Munich’s burghers and especially the merchants as well as their goods protection and safe-conduct throughout the Holy Roman Empire. In 1319 Louis waived the Ungeld (an import tax on various goods that had to be paid to the reigning duke of Bavaria). Louis’s victory over his brother apparently promoted the formation of the outer council (Äußerer Rat) and the ‘gemain’, which had emerged in the thirteenth century and were eventually officially recognised. Burghers were not ‘subjects’ of the inner council anymore and could partake in government. This political development counteracted the oligarchy of the old-established patrician families who were members of the inner council. In 1324 the town received the imperial colours as a symbol of Munich’s elevated status in view of being Louis’s imperial seat. In 1330 and 1342 Louis strengthened the town’s government by passing the enforcement of trade and building laws over to the civic authorities, but it has to be expected that the formulation of these building and trade laws as well as their enforcement by civic authorities was executed.
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according to the emperor’s intentions. The book of civic laws (Stadtrechtsbuch) was completed and confirmed by Louis in collaboration with Munich’s council and citizenry by 1340.

Generally, it was understood that the municipal development under Louis the Bavarian was characterised by the continuous expansion of civic independence from ducal powers and the emergence of an urban community with an independent culture, constitutional as well as administrative bodies. The numerous privileges which Louis the Bavarian granted Munich’s citizens were believed to have extended civic liberties in Munich to such a degree that they were hardly dissimilar from those in an Imperial Free Town in the middle of the fourteenth century. Hence Werner Bös referred to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as the era of Munich’s burghers. However Louis’s awards of civic privileges were based on a pragmatic standpoint. They were the most economic form of unavoidable political concessions as well as clever means to support Munich’s community. The Bavarian dukes benefited from a prosperous development in their capital town on the condition that these political adjustments did not conflict with or restrict the ducal government and fostered a flourishing economic as well as social life. This state of affairs is reflected in the oath of the councillors and the civic judge, pledging to put the ducal interest before that of the civic government and Munich’s burghers. This oath was not at all a formality. It demonstrates that the dukes were concerned about protecting their power. Even though the independence and authority of the civic government increased in this period, it cannot be compared with the state of civic liberties in the fifteenth century, which were often employed to evaluate the state of Munich’s administration and government in the fourteenth century.

The zenith of Munich’s civic autonomy from ducal powers within the town’s boundaries was reached circa 1500. At this stage the dukes’ rights were limited to the burghers’ Erbhuldigung at the beginning of the reign, the annual affirmation and the inner council’s oath of allegiance. In addition the council paid the dukes an annual civic tax of 600 pounds of Pfennig. Citizens were compelled to serve the dukes with military services to a limited extent. Civic judges received the power of capital punishment from the dukes, which they exercised in their name. On the other hand, councillors had the town’s budget and assets at their disposal without being controlled by a higher authority. They could set taxes as well as levies for the town’s guard and armament at their own discretion. The council was responsible for the town’s defence, the construction and maintenance of fortifications, for equipping their citizens with arms and armour, for the inspection of civic contingents, for providing the guards of the town
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gates as well as for policing Munich. They also had the authority of closing the gates. Munich’s burghers had the right of feud and maintaining alliances. This is reflected in the vivid diplomatic relations that were established by the civic government in their own interest.125

In contrast the position of Munich’s citizens and civic government under Louis the Bavarian’s reign was not as autonomous and consolidated as in the fifteenth century. The town council was not allowed to form alliances with towns and rulers outside the Duchy of Bavaria. It could only take action regarding domestic policies as members of the Landschaft or Landstände126 (i.e. establishing peace or mediating in times of conflict that resulted from the territorial partitions). The council’s right of objection or protest against ducal policies could only be exercised against unreasonable demands of the regent and again only within the legislative structures of the Landschaft. According to the annual oath of allegiance, the common prosperity of the urban community was subordinated to the dukes’ interest. The Bavarian dukes also continued to benefit from the financial and military resources of the commune, which they employed to redeem their debts or defend their residence as well as political interests for which Munich had to provide civic contingents. The dukes were not willing to make too many concessions to Munich’s citizens and thereby promoting the development of civic autonomy from ducal rule. Hence the Bavarian dukes retained all important rights: the high court (Hochgericht, Blutgericht or Blutbann) that could inflict capital punishment, military sovereignty and the ratification of laws as well as newly elected councillors.127

The cult of Louis the Bavarian and his office as Holy Roman emperor

When Louis the Bavarian died at Puch near Fürstenfeld on 11th October 1347 (Plate 1), the burghers of Munich brought his corpse to Munich to bury him alongside his first wife in the Church of Our Lady’s choir.128 This act of civic affection for the first Wittelsbach emperor was rooted in the good relationship with their lord. Louis’s role as emperor had bestowed his residence with imperial grandeur. The imperial regalia—comprising the imperial crown, the imperial sceptre and orb, the imperial sword, the coronation vestments, the dalmatic with sixty-eight eagle medallions, a stole, the Holy Lance, the Imperial Cross, and relics like particles of the True Cross—were kept in the
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Alte Hof’s palace chapel. They attracted pilgrims and bestowed an imperial aura on Munich so that its burghers hesitated to hand them over to Louis’s heirs after his death. The emperor’s heirs could only present Charles IV with the regalia in 1350.

**Munich after Louis the Bavarian’s death**

After Louis the Bavarian’s death the eminence and splendour of the former imperial seat quickly faded in the second half of the fourteenth century. This development was encouraged by the territorial partitions of the Duchy of Bavaria between Louis’s six sons. (Plate 4) Munich’s economy was declining, a trend that was promoted by the military campaigns of the dukes in the Alsace, in Tyrol, against Venice and the Imperial Free Towns in Swabia that required a rigorous fiscal policy on behalf of the regents. Social tensions, stemming from the political and social discrimination of the growing middle classes in most major towns of the Holy Roman Empire, further increased the discontent of Munich’s burghers. An open conflict arose between the old-established patrician families and the civic middle class in 1377. The members of the middle-class reproached the patricians for collaborating with the Bavarian dukes against them. The so-called Agreement of 1377 that was approved by the Bavarian dukes induced a commission, consisting of twenty-eight members (fourteen members of the inner and outer councils which were made up of wealth merchants, bankers and patricians as well as fourteen members of the Gemain), to draw up principles for civic government practice and for permitting the participation of Munich’s middle class in the civic authorities.

Economic conditions triggered another violent conflict between the dukes, patricians and Munich’s citizens in 1384. In the course of this bloody dispute the burghers captured and beheaded Johann Impler, a prominent patrician and ducal advisor. Meanwhile John II, Stephen III and Frederick of Bavaria, who had withdrawn to Dachau, asked the League of Princes (Fürstenbund) for support to subjugate the burghers of Munich. Eventually the town surrendered and one hundred of the most eminent burghers had to ask the dukes in Dachau for mercy. The citizens had to pay 6,000 guilders in atonement for their rebellion. They also had to agree to the dukes’ plan to construct the fortified, moated Neuveste. (Plate 54) The new castle could be defended against attacks from within as well as from outside the town. It incorporated parts of the town wall and featured a gate on its northern side. This means of escape allowed the dukes to leave the town and castle directly. Thus it prevented possible confrontations.
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The ‘neue veste’ is mentioned in records for the first time on 7th March 1389 probably before its completion.\textsuperscript{134} The class struggle among Munich’s citizens and the disputes with the dukes re-emerged between 1397 and 1403, because the civic authority remained under the control of the inner and outer councils. However all of Munich’s burghers had to pay taxes which were higher than in other Southern German towns and regions.\textsuperscript{135}

The territorial partitions of the Duchy of Bavaria (1255-1505)

The period between 1255 and 1505 was characterised by several divisions of the Duchy of Bavaria and subsequent reunifications. These partitions resulted in the duchy’s territorial fragmentation and the demise of the Wittelsbach dynasty’s allodium.

The partition of 1255: the creation of Lower and Upper Bavaria

The first partition occurred in 1255 under Louis II of Bavaria (reg. 1253-1294) and Henry XIII of Bavaria (reg. 1253-1290) who were the Wittelsbach dynasty’s fourth generation to inherit the duchy in 1253. Initially Louis II and Henry XIII jointly reigned the duchy, but in 1255 Louis II and Henry XIII decided to partition their inherited lands. Imperial laws prohibited the division of territories granted as imperial fiefs. Therefore the Bavarian dukes restricted this partition to a Mutung (a statement of intent), which maintained the enfeoffment of the Wittelsbach dynasty and the constitutional unity of the Duchy but enabled the cleaving of usufruct.\textsuperscript{136} Louis II received Upper Bavaria with München and the indivisible Palatinate\textsuperscript{137} that was central to the Holy Roman Empire’s jurisdiction. His brother Henry XIII was given Lower Bavaria with Landshut.\textsuperscript{138} The creation of the territories of Upper and Lower Bavaria set a precedent that provided the basic principle for future partitions of the Duchy of Bavaria (i.e. in 1349, 1353, 1376 and 1392).\textsuperscript{139} (Plate 4)
The genesis of the four Bavarian duchies after Louis the Bavarian’s death

Louis the Bavarian expanded his dynasty’s territories through marriages, inheritances and adroit political tactics. He also reunited the Duchies of Lower and Upper Bavaria after the Lower Bavarian line became extinct in 1340.¹⁴⁰ The unity of the Wittelsbach dynasty’s core territories did not last long, because Louis’s sons divided their inherited lands in the course of the second half of the fourteenth century into four duchies: Bavaria-Straubing, Bavaria-Ingolstadt, Bavaria-Landshut and Bavaria-Munich.

The Duchy of Bavaria-Straubing

The Treaty of Landsberg (1349) conferred Upper Bavaria with Tyrol and the Mark Brandenburg on Louis V, his stepbrothers Louis VI and Otto V. Stephen II, his stepbrothers William I and Albrecht I were given Lower Bavaria as well as the earldoms of Holland-Hainaut-Zeeland-Friesland.

Stephen II, William I and Albrecht I divided their inherited lands with the Treaty of Regensburg of 3rd June 1353. Stephen II received Bavaria-Landshut, comprising the south-western area of Lower Bavaria with Landshut as ducal residence. (Plate 4) William I and Albrecht I were given the north-western half of Lower Bavaria with Straubing as their ducal seat. The earldoms of Holland-Hainaut-Zeeland-Friesland were excluded from the partition of 1353, because Margaret of Holland had established William I as her successor and reigning deputy of Hainaut-Holland-Zeeland-Friesland in September 1346. (Plate 3) At this stage William I resided in his earldom and he agreed with Albrecht I on a de facto division of their reign over Lower Bavaria-Straubing-Holland but they did not partition their territories de jure. William I ruled Hainaut-Holland-Zeeland-Friesland, whereas Albrecht I resided in Straubing and governed the Duchy of Lower Bavaria-Straubing.

In 1356, Albrecht I initiated the erection of a new castle with a chapel, which was dedicated to Saints Sigismund and George in 1373. The choice of St Sigismund, whose relics were transferred to Freising Cathedral as well as Prague Cathedral in 1354, as the chapel’s patron saint was prompted by the affection of Albrecht I and his wife Margaret of Liegnitz-Brieg for this particular saint as stated in a document of 1374. According to this document, Albrecht I and Margaret appointed the Order of the Carmelites with the pastoral duties in the chapel and established a memorial mass for their ancestors’ salvation.¹⁴¹

By 1358, Albrecht I moved his court into the Earldom of Hainaut-Holland-Zeeland-Friesland, because William I had suffered a stroke on a journey to England in 1357 and had become incapable of acting on his own account. Albrecht I was attracted by Hainaut’s wealth and the increasing economic strength of towns in Holland and Zeeland. This financial and economic potency coupled with the earldom’s location at the periphery of the Holy Roman Empire provided more political freedom than the Duchy of Lower Bavaria-Straubing, which was situated close to the Emperor Charles IV’s sphere of influence.

The reign of the dukes of Bavaria-Straubing-Holland was a rather peaceful era for their subjects in Lower Bavaria in comparison with the upheavals and struggles in the other Bavarian duchies or the earldom of Hainaut-Holland-Zeeland-Friesland.142

The territorial partition of 1392 and the conflicts of the Wittelsbach dynasty’s four lines

The most decisive and momentous territorial partition occurred in 1392. It led to the creation of four dynastic lines: Upper-Bavaria-Munich, Upper Bavaria-Ingolstadt, Lower Bavaria-Landshut and Lower Bavaria-Straubing-Holland. (Plate 4)

Duke Frederick of Bavaria-Landshut (reg. 1375-1393) died only one year after the territorial division of 1392 and left a seven-year-old son. This triggered the quarrel between Duke Stephen III of Bavaria-Ingolstadt (reg. 1375-1413) and Duke John II of Bavaria-Munich (reg. 1375-1397) for the tutelage of Duke Henry XVI of Bavaria-Landshut (reg. 1393-1450). Eventually, Stephen III and John II agreed to jointly execute tutelage and government but after the death of John II of Bavaria-Munich in 1397 the hidden conflict between the lines escalated. Stephen III of Bavaria-Ingolstadt denied his nephews Ernst (reg. 1397-1438) and William III of Bavaria-Munich (reg. 1397-1435) their role in government. In 1398 each party started to build up arms in preparation for war. The Landschaft’s arbitration of 11th November 1402 decreed that the territorial
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partition had to be restored according to the agreement (Hausvertrag) of 1392 and that each line of the dynasty could only rule their respective territories. When Duke Louis VII of Bavaria-Ingolstadt (reg. 1413-1443) became the sole ruler of the Duchy of Bavaria-Ingolstadt in 1413, new conflicts arose that characterised the political conduct of the next three decades. Louis VII believed that his line had been put at a disadvantage in the partition of 1392 and therefore demanded land from Henry XVI of Bavaria-Landshut. Ernst and William III of Bavaria-Munich, Henry XVI of Bavaria-Landshut and Count Palatine Johann von Pfalz-Neumarkt founded the Parakeet Society (Sittichgesellschaft), a precautionary alliance against Louis VII, on 17th April 1414 for four years. Louis III Elector Palatine of the Rhine and Burgrave Frederick VI of Nuremberg (from 1415 also Prince Elector Frederick I of Brandenburg) joined this alliance in 1415 during the Council of Constance. Now it became known as the League of Constance and its duration was extended until the death of Louis VII.

In 1417, Louis VII claimed areas in the Mark Brandenburg from Frederick I of Brandenburg but was referred to Duke Henry XVI of Bavaria-Landshut with his demands. Subsequently Louis VII and Henry XVI became deadly enemies. The situation escalated with the occupation of Neuburg an der Donau by Louis VII on 4th February 1421 as it triggered war between Louis VII, Henry XVI as well as Ernst and William III. In the course of this military conflict Louis VII attacked Munich with his troops, because he believed that he could easily take the town since some of Munich’s burghers sympathised with him. Ernst and William III as well as the latter’s son Albrecht III (reg. 1438-1460) were able to repulse the attackers. They pursued their enemy with support from thirty-seven civic guilds as well as several aristocrats and confronted Louis VII between the hamlets of Alling, Puchheim and Hoflach. On 19th September 1422, the Dukes of Bavaria-Munich, the peasants and citizens of Munich as well as allied aristocrats defeated the armed forces of Louis VII in a skirmish without much bloodshed. The victors brought the defeated enemies (allegedly 400 men) to Munich where they faced a lenient verdict. They only had to swear an oath, proclaiming that they would never rise up against the Dukes of Bavaria-Munich.

Peace only lasted until the death of John III of Bavaria-Straubing. He was the last male member of his line and died childless in 1425. Louis VII tried to claim John III’s Bavarian territories contrary to the dynastic agreement of 1392. This agreement stipulated that John III’s Bavarian lands must be divided between the three remaining lines. Louis VII requested the entire territory of the Duchy of Bavaria-Straubing, because he argued that his ancestors had been put at a disadvantage in the partition of 1392 and he was entitled to the inheritance of John III as compensation.
Sigismund’s arbitration of Pressburg on 26th April 1429, intending to prevent another military conflict, stipulated that the Duchy of Bavaria-Straubing must be divided between John III’s four immediate heirs. A few years earlier the politically moderate Ernst I and William III had put forward this proposal to establish peaceful, conciliatory relations with their relatives in Ingolstadt and Landshut. The four parts of the Duchy of Bavaria-Straubing were allocated to the four heirs by drawing lots and recorded in the ‘Tailzedl’ of 9th July 1429. William III and Ernst I jointly reigned their inherited territories from their court in Munich. Straubing became a secondary residence for the Dukes of Bavaria-Munich where Albrecht III of Bavaria-Munich acted as deputy of his father Ernst I. However Henry XVI now claimed that he had been treated unfavourably with regard to the distribution of the territories of Bavaria-Straubing and a concealed conflict prevailed between him and Louis VII.

Louis VII continued to cause strife in the late 1430s. He favoured his illegitimate son Wieland von Freyberg over his unpopular, deformed legitimate heir Louis VIII the Hunchback (reg. 1443-1445). The conciliatory politics of Louis VIII clashed with the political ambitions of his father. For example, Louis VIII was involved in the preparation of the Bavarian Peace in 1438, which would have created more stable, amicable relations between the Wittelsbach lines. This tense relationship between father and son coupled with their different political agendas resulted in bitter conflict. On 27th January 1439, Louis VIII declared war on his father and with the support of Albrecht III of Bavaria-Munich he besieged the heavily fortified town of Neuburg an der Donau where Louis VII sought refuge. Several attempts to storm Neuburg failed. In 1443 Duke Henry XVI of Bavaria-Landshut took command of the siege troops and new attacks on Neuburg commenced from 7th May 1443. Eventually Margrave Albrecht Achilles of Brandenburg and Louis VIII could conquer Neuburg with their troops and capture Louis VII who was imprisoned by his son. From 1445, the year Louis VIII died, Henry XVI detained Louis VII in the mighty castle above Burghausen until his demise in 1447.

Henry XVI of Bavaria-Landshut disregarded the dynastic agreements of 1392 by incorporating all of Louis VII’s lands into the Duchy of Bavaria-Landshut. The Holy Roman Emperor, who relied on Henry XVI’s political and financial support, did not reprimand this illegal action. Christian Dittmar stated that only the peaceful stance of Albrecht III of Bavaria-Munich prevented another conflict between the two remaining Bavarian lines of the Wittelsbach dynasty. It seems that he had become level-headed as a result of the conflicts with his father who had ordered the execution of Albrecht III’s wife Agnes Bernauer.
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The morganatic marriage of Duke Albrecht III of Bavaria-Munich and Agnes Bernauer

Very little is known about Agnes Bernauer and her relationship with Duke Albrecht III of Bavaria-Munich. Since the publication of Sigmund von Riezler’s *Geschichte Baierns*, it was traditionally assumed that Albrecht III met Agnes Bernauer, the beautiful daughter of a village quack, after the carnival tournament of 17th February 1428 in a bath in Augsburg. However a woman called ‘Pernawerin’ was mentioned in a list of the servants at the court of Duke Albrecht III around 1424, which is transcribed in Helmuth Stahleder’s *Chronik der Stadt München*. Stahleder asserted that Bernauer would have been spelled as Pernauer in Middle High German. It is more probable that Albrecht III and Agnes met at his court where a relationship could have developed gradually. Yet it cannot be completely clarified whether Albrecht III met Agnes in Augsburg at an earlier stage and then asked her to join his court, or whether she already was one of his servants before he fell in love with her.

In 1431 or 1432 Albrecht III married Agnes secretly since she was not a wife of equal social standing. From 1433 Albrecht III was governor in Straubing. His high-handed reign, his feuds with the knightly aristocracy, his cruel persecution of Straubing’s Jewish community, and his lavish lifestyle in addition to his marriage with the proletarian Agnes Bernauer incurred his father’s displeasure. The morganatic marriage of Ernst’s only son severely jeopardised the continued existence of the Bavaria-Munich line, because children procreated by this legal matrimony, which was insoluble according to canon law, would not be allowed to take over the reign from Albrecht III upon his death. This situation would have provoked war between the ‘illegitimate’ heirs of Albrecht III and members of the other Wittelsbach lines who would have claimed the Duchy of Bavaria-Munich based on this problematic legal situation.

This morganatic marriage was also met with disapproval from a wide range of people like Munich’s patricians, the estates and most of the Upper Bavarian aristocrats as well as Beatrix of Bavaria-Munich. A record of 8th July 1432 not only reveals that Albrecht III and Agnes must have been married by this time, but that Agnes’s presumptuous behaviour angered the ducal family as well as the townsfolk of Munich. According to this statement, the plebeian Agnes Bernauer resided in the Alte Hof like a legitimate duchess and presumed to issue orders over Munich citizens (in this instance a man called Münchauser who fled into the Alte Hof to seek asylum angered Agnes by

---
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intruding into what she perceived was her court). Albrecht III’s sister Beatrix repeatedly travelled to Munich (i.e. 10th August 1432 and 13th December 1434) to encourage her brother to divorce Agnes Bernauer. According to Hans Rosenbusch’s entry of 10th August 1432 in the civic records, Duchess Beatrix’s stay in Munich is related to her brother’s relationship with Agnes Bernauer, which seriously angered her and led to an argument with him.

At a secret meeting Duke Ernst of Bavaria-Munich, princes and masters discussed the elimination of Agnes Bernauer that was supported by Henry XVI of Bavaria-Landshut. Therefore Henry XVI invited Albrecht III to his hunting party. Meanwhile Agnes Bernauer was captured, adjudicated in Straubing Castle and sentenced to death on account of practising magic, committing high treason as well as exercising detrimental effects on the duchy. On 12th October 1435 she was executed by drowning in the Danube. Albrecht III buried her in the cloister of the Church of the Carmelites (Heilig-Geist-Kirche) in Straubing. On 22nd October 1435 a delighted Hans Rosenbusch noted in the town council’s records that Duke Ernst’s messenger delivered news of Agnes Bernauer demise and was lavishly rewarded.

Initially Duke Ernst’s plan to secure his line’s continued existence did not succeed, because the deeply hurt widower Albrecht III threatened his father with war as reprisal for the murder of Agnes Bernauer. The fierce hostility between father and son brought the duchy to the brink of ruin. Munich’s citizens were so concerned about this situation that on 10th December 1435 the town council paid the priests of the Heiliggeistspital 72 pfennig for mass and prayer services held in the hospital’s church to plead for a quick, favourable resolution of the dispute. On 7th/8th and 13th April 1436 the council paid the nuns of several Seelhäuser (communities of Beguines) in Munich for praying 32,000 Ave Marias after Albrecht III rose up against his father.

In this situation Johann von Indersdorf (1382-1470), Albrecht III’s father confessor and from 1442 provost of the canonic college at Indersdorf, tried to reconcile father and son by mediating between them with his so-called Fürstenlehren (Lessons for princes). (Plate 1) The Fürstenlehren describe those Old Testament kings who were rigorously punished for their rebellion against divine order. The examples, selected by Johann von Indersdorf, clearly related to the conflict between Ernst and Albrecht III. For example, God rigorously disciplined Saul for his disobedience and Salomon for his...
indecent relations with women as well as for violating divine laws. The story of Salomon’s son Rehabeam who was rejected by the majority of his subjects, because he did not want to listen to his wise old advisors, could be understood as an analogy to the high-handed morganatic marriage of Albrecht III against his father’s will and to the displeasure of most of the Upper Bavarian aristocrats as well as patricians. It cannot be verified whether the Fürstenlehren and Johann von Indersdorf’s persuasive powers made Albrecht III see reason. However Albrecht III quickly became reconciled with his father who had commissioned a chapel to commemorate Agnes Bernauer on the cemetery of St Peter in Straubing.

Already in November 1436 Albrecht III married Duchess Anna of Brunswick (Braunschweig-Grubenhagen). This conjugal bond, befitting Albrecht III’s social rank, evidently settled the dispute between father and son. A note in the records of Munich’s town council echoes the popular support of the wedding on behalf of its burghers. Hans Rosenbusch wrote: ‘we are delighted that we have not been presented with another Agnes Bernauer’.

The establishment of amicable relations between the two remaining lines in the second half of the fifteenth century as reaction to the territorial partitions’ negative repercussions

The period from the middle of the fourteenth century and especially after the territorial partition of 1392 until the middle of the fifteenth century was characterised by severe inner-dynastic feuds and struggles for power. It resulted in rather instable political conditions that hindered a continuous, successful development of the Bavarian duchies. These conflicts consumed a large amount of the Bavarian dukes’ financial means, leaving them without the necessary assets to expand their allodium and become an eminent force in the Holy Roman Empire like the ‘parvenu’ Habsburg dynasty.

Walter Ziegler pointed out that territorial partitions were not regarded as negative, disadvantageous actions in the Middle Ages. The concept of dividing territories between heirs only became condemned in the modern age and especially in the nineteenth century. To some extent it was the norm to split the inheritances. Territorial partitions did not prevent small territories like Albertine Austria and Ernestine Saxony emerging as powerful authorities in the Holy Roman Empire during
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the fifteenth century whereas the large, undivided Mark Brandenburg remained politically insignificant.  

 Nevertheless the territorial partitions and especially that of 1392 resulted in the loss and fragmentation of the Wittelsbach dynasty’s extensive territories. (Plate 4) These inner-dynastic struggles for power and the desire for territorial expansions at the expense of the other lines resulted in the divergent political objectives of the four, later three and eventually two lines of the Wittelsbach dynasty. This constellation weakened the allodium of the Wittelsbach dynasty and reduced the dukes’ ability to strengthen their position in the political framework of the Holy Roman Empire. 

 Based on the conception that the Wittelsbach dynasty’s political insignificance in the Holy Roman Empire emanated from the constant discord between the dynasty’s lines, Duke Louis IX of Bavaria-Landshut (reg. 1450-1479) sought to develop a more amicable, cooperative relationship with his relatives in Munich after taking over the reign in 1450. (Plate 5 and Plate 6) Louis IX arranged the compensation of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich for his father’s ruthless appropriation of the Duchy of Bavaria-Ingolstadt with the treaty of Erding (Erdinger Vertrag) on 16th December 1450. The reign of Louis IX and his son George (reg. 1479-1503) as well as that of Albrecht III, his sons John IV, Sigmund and Albrecht IV of Bavaria-Munich was an era, characterised by peaceful inner-dynastic policies. (Plate 49-Plate 52)

 The era’s only two considerable disputes were Louis IX’s military conflict with Margrave Albrecht Achilles from 1460 until 1463 (Markgrafenkrieg), which was settled with the Peace of Prague on 22nd August 1463, and Albrecht IV’s struggles with the Habsburgs. The conjugal bond of Albrecht IV and Kunigunde of Austria, the daughter of Emperor Frederick II, against her father’s will, prompted Albrecht IV’s disputes with the House of Habsburg. Albrecht IV also pursued aggressive territorial expansion policies that focused on areas like Tyrol and Further Austria (parts of Swabia, Alsace and Vorarlberg). These campaigns clashed with the policies of the House of Habsburg since the Habsburgs had shifted their emphasis to Austria after their expulsion from their heartland by the Swiss Confederation in 1415. Eventually the dispute between Albrecht IV and Emperor Frederick III was settled in the Peace of Augsburg (1492) that forced Albrecht IV to return his territorial acquisitions in Swabia to the Habsburgs. 
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The reign of Sigmund and Albrecht IV of Bavaria-Munich (1460-1508)

John IV, the eldest son of Duke Albrecht III and his wife Anna of Brunswick, was born in Munich on 4th October 1437. (Plate 42 and Plate 49) Their second son Sigmund was born in Straubing on 26th July 1439. (Plate 42 and Plate 50) Sigmund was the first Wittelsbach duke with this forename yet. He was very probably named after one of the patron saints of the Chapel of Saints Sigismund and Georg in the palace at Straubing. On 29th February 1460 Albrecht III died at the age of fifty-nine and was buried in the church of the Benedictine abbey in Andechs which he had founded in 1455 rather than in the Church of Our Lady like his ancestors since Louis the Bavarian. The proximity to the miraculous treasure of relics (Andechser Heiltumsfund), discovered in Andechs in 1388, was more important to Albrecht III, who intended to establish a new dynastic tomb there, than the continuation of his dynasty’s traditions.181

In 1460, John IV and Sigmund assumed the government of the Duchy of Bavaria-Munich. They had already assisted their father with government duties prior to his death. The records of Munich’s town council, dated 9th April 1458, 9th September 1458 and 10th March 1459, mention their active involvement in finding a solution with regard to the disputes about the salt shipping route through Munich with other Southern German towns. For this reason John IV together with the patricians Peter Schluder and Hans Bart travelled to Heidelberg. Duke Sigmund negotiated in Augsburg, at the imperial court and in Regensburg.182 Hence the transition of the ducal reign from the father to his two sons occurred smoothly. The brief joint government of John IV and Sigmund lasted only until John IV’s death of the bubonic plague on 18th November 1463. John was buried in Andechs like his father.183 The joint reign of John IV and Sigmund was peaceful and uneventful compared to the past political turmoil.

The sixteen-year-old Albrecht IV, the third son of Albrecht III and Anna of Brunswick, demanded participation in the government after the demise of John IV. Sigmund was able to repel the request of Albrecht IV until 1465 when his younger brother came of age and with the help of the Estates could force his brother into granting him a joint position in the ducal reign. In due course Albrecht IV reproached Sigmund for his lavish lifestyle, negligent administration and for signing over parts of their territory to wealthy aristocrats. Sigmund retired from his active role in the ducal government on 3rd September 1467 and passed the authority over to Albrecht IV, because he was tired of his brother’s remonstrations and the government duties.184 This
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is reflected in his explanation for his abdication which stated: ‘as a consequence of individualism [Blödigkeit des Leibes] I do not like to take great efforts and work but I am more inclined to live a leisurely life without worries, and therefore I intend to hand over the ducal authority to someone who looks after the country and its people better and more diligently.’ Nevertheless Sigmund retained the ecclesiastical fiefs, the right of patronage and allocation of ecclesiastical sinecure. He received the castles and palaces in Dachau, Nannhofen, Menzing (Blutenburg Palace), Starnberg as well as Grünwald as residences, the income from several ducal estates (i.e. Laufzorn) and a princely allowance. (Plate 2, Plate 88, Plate 89, Plate 90 and Plate 118)

Although Sigmund’s abdication could be regarded as a belittling event into which Albrecht IV pressured him, it probably was not a particular negative experience in Sigmund’s life after all. For example, Karl Heller Reichsedler von Hellersperg examined Sigmund’s abdication in detail. His extensive study of the available legal documents and primary sources led him to conclude that Sigmund continued to fulfil several administrative and government duties (i.e. ‘Landesherrliche Gerichtshoheit’ in the Dachau district) after his abdication. Sigmund mentioned ‘Blödigkeit des Leibes’ as one of the reasons for his abdication in Hausurkunde 665. Andreas Tönnesmann explained the contemporary meaning of ‘Blödigkeit’ with regard to Emperor Rudolph II ‘Gemüthsblödigkeit’ (melancholy). According to Tönnesmann, ‘Gemüthsblödigkeit’ should be understood as the intention to free oneself from the restriction of one’s dynasty and one’s political life. Therefore Sigmund’s ‘retirement’ and Rudolph II’s move from Vienna to Prague in 1583 as well as his decreasing political activity from circa 1600 might have been motivated by similar aims. Moreover it has to be remembered that even though his financial resources were limited, he received a princely allowance, the most prestigious ducal castles, palaces and hunting grounds. Sigmund was able to pursue his interests after his abdication without having to struggle with his younger brother about his government style. Instead he could focus all of his efforts on his artistic, architectural and religious patronage. This interpretation of Sigmund’s life after his retirement is echoed by Ulrich Füetrer’s description, which highlights some of Sigmund’s pursuits and inclination for a lavish lifestyle as Füetrer wrote that
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Sigmund was a lenient, well-mannered, talkative, entertaining and tall person whose company people enjoyed; he liked beautiful women; mass was important to him, he had his own priests and singers who wore red fur gowns; they were appropriate for the status of a prince and they had been confirmed by a letter of indulgence from the pope and had to sing the prayers of the canonical hours for Sigmund on a daily basis; he had more than one small church built, which he had embellished lavishly, and he donated much money every year.190

A similar appraisal of Sigmund and the hedonistic but pious court life at Blutenburg Palace was presented by Veit Arnpeck in his chronicle of Bavaria:

He was a lenient ruler. He fed everyone who asked him for a meal, and provided everyone with letters of prayers. He enjoyed the company of beautiful women and lived with white doves, peacocks, pigs, birds and all kinds of exotic small animals; he liked listening to songs and music played on string instruments; he always engaged good cantors and singers. He was not married but had three children, two boys and a girl with Margaret Pfätendorfer. He was the empress’s loyal servant. He loved Menzing191 very much and had the churches there decorated lavishly and beautifully.192

Sigmund’s limited financial resources nevertheless allowed him to commission some of the finest fifteenth-century works of art and buildings in Munich like the frescoes and altarpieces in St Wolfgang in Pipping as well as the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace which became his favoured residence. (Plate 88, Plate 89, Plate 90, Plate 97, Plate 103-Plate 106, Plate 109, and Plate 116)


191 Blutenburg Palace is located in the Hofmark Menzing.

192 ‘Er was ain milter herr. er gab yedermann geren fördrung und bettbrief. im was wol mit schönen frauen und weissen tauben, pfaben, swein und vöglen und allen selczamen tieren, auch mit singen und saytenspiel. er hett albeg gut cantores und singer bei im. er sezet sich gen Dachaw und darnach gen Menzing und Nähhofen. Grüenwald gab er seinem bruder herzog Albrechten [IV], als pald er sich heiratet. er hett kain elich weib [aber von der margarete Pfättendorferin zwei buben und ein mädel]. er was auch der kaiserin diener gewesen. Menzing liebet er vast, pauet das wol und machet di kirchen da gar köstlich und schön.’ – From Arnpeck, Sämtliche Chroniken. p. 673; Bös, Gotik in Oberbayern. p. 46.
Albrecht IV’s ambitious politics and struggles with his brothers for participation in government

Albrecht IV had foresightedly reached an agreement with his younger brothers in 1465, which he believed would secure his position as sole regent of the Duchy of Bavaria. Even though Albrecht IV compensated his younger brothers with estates in the vicinity of Munich (i.e. Greifenberg Palace and Königswiesen Estate) for refraining from their demands of an active role in ducal government, he was not able to appease Christoph and Wolfgang for long. (Plate 1) It would take Albrecht IV more than twenty years to repulse his younger brothers’ requests.

The territorial expansion of the Duchy of Bavaria-Munich under Albrecht IV’s reign threatened the Habsburg’s allodium. (Plate 5-Plate 6) Hence Frederick III supported the foundation of the Swabian Confederation and mobilized them against Albrecht IV. Albrecht IV levied the ‘Reisgeld’ (a tax to finance professional, military troops) in 1488 since he expected to go into war against the Swabian Confederation. For the first time a Bavarian duke did not intend to ask the Estates for military support. This disregard of their local authority prompted the aristocrats and knights in the Upper Palatinate to found the Löwler Bund and join the Swabian Confederation.

Christoph was very popular with the landed gentry and joined their uprisings against Albrecht IV because he hoped to achieve his ambitions of gaining an active role in the ducal government. In 1466 Christoph was involved with the Böckler Bund (also known as Alliance of the Unicorn) and in 1488 he became a member of the Löwler Bund. The Löwler Bund comprised of the same members as the Böckler Bund (aristocrats and knights mainly from the Upper Palatinate) who tried to resist infringement of their local authority by Albrecht IV.

Although Albrecht IV subjugated a few members of the Löwler Bund, eventually he had to admit defeat against the superiority of the Swabian Confederation. The Peace of Augsburg (1492) settled the conflict. Albrecht IV only retained the Abensberg territory, which he had gained during his campaigns and lost his claims on Regensburg as well as Tyrol. However the treaty did not settle the disputes between the ducal brothers. Only the peace agreement at the diet of 1493 and Christoph’s death on the island of Rhodes in the same year on the return journey from his pilgrimage to Jerusalem ceased these fraternal quarrels.
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The upsurge of ducal authority

The ducal infringement of local authorities in the second half of the fifteenth century was also felt in Munich. Established patrician families either became extinct or moved permanently to their country estates as they strove for social advancement (i.e. aristocratic titles) or a position at the ducal court. These changes in the social fabric of Munich enabled the Dukes of Bavaria-Munich to expand their authority over Munich.

In December 1467 Sigmund personally freed an aristocrat called Bernrieder or Pernrieder from the Schergenstube, the prison in the town hall, and brought the prisoner into the ducal jail, the appropriate detention place for an aristocrat. This disregard of civic jurisdiction is an early indication of the shift in the relationship of dukes and civic authorities.

In December 1479 Duke Albrecht IV intervened in the election of Munich’s inner council by refusing to confirm Balthasar Pötschner as elected member of the inner council and replacing Pötschner with Heinrich Bart. This indifference to the civic independence did not disadvantage Pötschner. On the contrary it was in the interest of Albrecht IV and Pötschner, because the latter became the ducal councillor shortly afterwards and received the ducal permission to establish Munich’s first paper mill in 1490. The duke intervened these elections again in 1499 and 1515.

Albrecht IV also introduced monastic reforms in the Duchy of Bavaria-Munich in the 1480s. In 1481 he instituted more observant, stricter rules for the Augustinian order against the burghers’ will. This measure must have caused such great opposition that Munich’s town council had to increase the policing of streets.

Instances like these intensified over the next decades. Munich’s burghers had to get used to humiliations like the apology of all members of the inner council and the exile of mayor Bartlme Schrenck who had to leave the town for several month in 1482, because he had imprisoned a knight in the civic Schergenstube rather than in the town hall’s tower.
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Munich’s flourishing cultural development under Sigmund and Albrecht IV of Bavaria-Munich

The peaceful joint government of Ernst and William III of Bavaria-Munich, their political agenda, social and religious commitment in the first four decades of the fifteenth century that was continued by Ernst’s descendants, as well as the coalition of dukes and patricians throughout the fifteenth century promoted a thriving community that attracted craftsmen, artists as well as masons like Gabriel Angler, Gabriel Mälesskircher, Hans and Matthäus Haldner, Jörg von Halspach, Erasmus Grasser and Jan Polack.205 One of the first examples of this burgeoning cultural development in Munich was Gabriel Angler’s high altarpiece (1434-1437) for the Romanesque Church of Our Lady, which was commissioned by Munich’s town council. It was highly esteemed and transferred into the Late Gothic building after the choir’s completion.206

The most important period for the cultural development in Munich in the Middle Ages and the early modern era occurred under the reign of Sigmund and Albrecht IV of Bavaria-Munich. This period witnessed the construction of the Late Gothic Church of Our Lady, the renovation and extension of the town hall as well as the Alte Hof. The dukes commissioned works of art for the parish churches as well as the churches of monasteries and convents. They initiated building work at their suburban castles and palaces in Dachau, Grünwald and Menzing. They promoted the construction of churches in the vicinity of Munich like St Wolfgang in Pipping and supported their decoration with foundations as well as works of art as, for instance, in St Martin in Untermenzing and the church in Aufkirchen.

The construction of the Late Gothic Church of Our Lady

In the fifteenth century, Munich remained one of the last major towns and ducal residences in the duchies of Bavaria to receive a new, prestigious hall church in the contemporary Late Gothic style.207 Many large Bavarian towns had erected new parish churches around the turn of the fourteenth to the fifteenth century.208 Work on St Martin in Landshut commenced around 1390 with the erection of a new choir and was continued by Hans von Burghausen with the construction of the nave.209 More than a century later the church of St Martin was finished with the completion of its tower around 1500.210 Work on St Nicholas in Neuötting began in 1410.211
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of Bavaria-Ingolstadt initiated the construction of the Church of Our Lady in Ingolstadt. The Dukes of Bavaria-Landshut who had annexed Louis VII’s territory after his death in 1447 completed it.\footnote{Siegfried Hofmann and Johannes Meyer, \textit{Das Münster zur Schönen Unserer Lieben Frau in Ingolstadt} (4th edn.; Ingolstadt: Münsterpfarramt Ingolstadt, 1997). p. 3-4; Bös, \textit{Gotik in Oberbayern}. p. 14} Other Bavarian towns such as Amberg, Burghausen, Dingolfing and Straubing also featured newly built Late Gothic hall churches. The increased self-esteem of Munich’s citizens and the ducal court as well as the town’s status as the main residence of the Dukes of Bavaria-Munich demanded for a new, imposing hall church in the contemporary Late Gothic style, providing an appropriate ecclesiastical site for the self-aggrandizement of the dukes and burghers.\footnote{Volker Liedke, ‘Der Kirchenmeister Jörg von Halspach, der Erbauer der Münchner Frauenkirche’, \textit{Ars Bavaria}. 82 (1999), 39-77. p. 42; Pfister, ‘Città Nobelissima’. p. 20-21} The construction of a new Church of Our Lady, one of the largest Late Gothic hall churches in Bavaria,\footnote{Bös, \textit{Gotik in Oberbayern}. p. 33; Nöhbauer, \textit{München}. p. 18} was the most important building project in fifteenth-century Munich.

The maintenance and repairs of the Romanesque building became exceedingly expensive in the fifteenth century.\footnote{Altmann, ‘Die spätgotische Bauphase der Frauenkirche’. p. 1} This situation is reflected in two documents. The anniversary foundation of 1426 stipulated that surpluses had to be employed for the building’s upkeep.\footnote{Ibid. p. 1; Stahleder, \textit{Chronik der Stadt München. Die Jahre 1157-1505}. p. 309} On 24\textsuperscript{th} April 1443 Alexander de Masowia, Legate of the Holy See de latere in Germany, Hungary and Poland, granted the parish of the Church of Our Lady the use of the money collected from indulgence sales in 1443 for the renovation and conservation of the Romanesque building.\footnote{Pfister, ‘Città Nobelissima’. p. 20-21}

The replacement of the Romanesque church with a new structure must have been considered in the 1450s, because Abbot Kasper Ayndorffer (1401-1461) of the Benedictine abbey in Tegernsee, who had presented the rosary bell to the Church of Our Lady in 1452, recommended Hans Haldner for the position of master mason in his letter of 20\textsuperscript{th} October 1458 to the mayor and town council of Munich.\footnote{Altmann, ‘Die spätgotische Bauphase der Frauenkirche’. p. 1, Liedke, ‘Der Kirchenmeister Jörg von Halspach’. p. 42; Stahleder, \textit{Chronik der Stadt München. Die Jahre 1157-1505}. p. 354} Haldner had worked at the abbey in Tegernsee where he was involved in the construction of the cloister and the chapter house.\footnote{Altmann, ‘Die spätgotische Bauphase der Frauenkirche’. p. 1} In the late 1460s—circa 1468 according to Hans Ramisch—Albrecht IV commissioned Haldner to sculpt Louis the Bavarian’s Tumba for the choir of the Church of Our Lady, where it was situated between the Altar of the Holy Cross and the high altar.\footnote{Hans Ramisch, ‘Die spätgotische Tumba für Kaiser Ludwig den Bayern aus dem Jahre 1468, ein Werk des Münchner Bildhauers Hans Haldner’, in Susanne Böning-Weis, Karlheinz Hemmeter, and York Langenstein (eds.), \textit{Monumental. Festschrift für Michael Petzet zum 65. Geburtstag am 12. April 1998} (Arbeitshefte des Bayerischen Landesamt für Denkmalpflege, 100; München: Lipp, 1998), 548-563. p. 549, 552 & 557; Altmann, ‘Die spätgotische Bauphase der Frauenkirche’. p. 1; Bös, \textit{Gotik in Oberbayern}. p. 40} The clay portrait head of Jörg von Halspach (c. 1470) has also been attributed to Haldner’s workshop.\footnote{Ramisch, ‘Die spätgotische Tumba für Kaiser Ludwig den Bayern’. p. 557} Nevertheless Jörg von Halspach had been chosen as master mason for this enormous construction project by the time when Sigmund laid the foundation stone on 9\textsuperscript{th} February 1468, because on 20\textsuperscript{th} March 1468
Halspach was appointed as civic mason of Munich.\textsuperscript{222} The choice of Halspach, who was not a burgher of Munich, and against Haldner, a resident of Munich, probably stemmed from four reasons. Firstly, Haldner’s patron Kasper Ayndorffer had died in 1461.\textsuperscript{223} Secondly, the project’s scale and the use of bricks required a master mason with experience in these regards.\textsuperscript{224} Thirdly, Duke Albrecht IV commissioned Haldner to create Louis the Bavarian’s prominent tomb and the tasks of the Church of Our Lady’s master mason would have interfered with the timely completion of this work of art. Fourthly and most importantly, Jörg von Halspach’s appointment as master mason of the Church of Our Lady was most probably the result of his relationship with the Wittelsbach dukes.

Jörg von Halspach, also referred to as Jörg von Polling in several legal documents of Munich’s town council, had worked at the Augustinian canony in Polling and for the Benedictine abbey in Ettal before being summoned to Munich.\textsuperscript{225} William III and Albrecht III maintained good relations with the Augustinian canony in Indersdorf since Abbot Johannes Rothuet (1382-1470) was their father confessor.\textsuperscript{226} At least Sigmund continued to maintain this relationship with the Augustinians of Indersdorf. This is reflected by Paul Sewer’s handwritten manuscript copy of Hans Tucher’s pilgrimage report for Sigmund (Cgm 24, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich). Moreover it can be assumed that Louis the Bavarian’s progenies continued to maintain good relations with the Benedictine abbey in Ettal, as it was the emperor’s foundation. Jörg von Halspach might have been introduced to the Dukes of Bavaria-Munich through these ecclesiastical institutions.

As early as 1461 there is proof for the good relations of John IV and Sigmund of Bavaria-Munich with Jörg von Halspach. In a letter of 20\textsuperscript{th} March 1461 the two dukes instructed their warden Hans Tuchsenhauser to refund rents paid by Jörg von Halspach for an estate in the Landsberg district that Halspach leased from the dukes. Halspach had worked for the dukes and, in their view, Halspach’s efforts equated his paid rent.\textsuperscript{227}
The preparations for the erection of the Late Gothic Church of Our Lady required Munich’s town council to seek formal permission from the Dukes of Bavaria-Munich and the bishop of Freising as Munich belonged to his diocese. In December 1467 Hans Hundertpfund and Andre Sänfl travelled to Freising to ask for Bishop Johann IV Tulbeck’s approval, in particular for the demolition of the old church building and the Chapel of St Michael on the choir’s north-eastern side. Duke Sigmund also supported the building project. In addition to his consent he asked Albrecht IV to authorize this project. In a letter of 12th January 1468 Albrecht IV approved the destruction of St Michael’s Chapel and a house on the cemetery, which was associated with Louis the Bavarian’s foundation of the imperial mass. The demolition of St Michael’s Chapel was required for the placement of a pole in centre of the new choir from which the layout of the new church building was transferred onto the ground with threads that were attached to this post.

On 5th February 1468, Ernst Pütrich, the Church of Our Lady’s priest made the first three cuts of the spade for the excavations that were required for the building’s foundation. On 9th February 1468, between two and three o’clock in the afternoon Duke Sigmund laid the foundation stone. This event is remembered on two commemorative plaques outside the dukes’ portal and in the records of Munich’s town council. (Plate 64 and Plate 65) The account of the council’s scribe states that the new building was necessitated by the increase of Munich’s population as the Romanesque Church of Our Lady became too small. The ceremony of the laying of the foundation stone, accompanied by the ringing of bells, occurred in the presence of Ernst Pütrich, the church’s provosts Martin Katzmair of the inner council and Andre Sänfl of the outer council as well as numerous burghers. It is astonishing that high-ranking ecclesiastic dignitaries (i.e. the bishop of Freising) were not present during this
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ceremony according to the town clerk’s description and the codex of the monastery in Scheyern.233

In April 1470 Jörg von Halspach was sent to Augsburg and Ulm to inspect the local ecclesiastical building projects, to consult his colleagues, and to gain inspiration for his design of the Late Gothic Church of Our Lady.234 This trip with regard to the examination of several buildings is documented in the town council’s records, because Jörg von Halspach and a civic mercenary were paid for their expenses before 8th April 1470.235

Entries in the council’s records indicate that building work in the first half of the 1470s concentrated on the choir and the west end with its two towers.236 Initially construction work did not affect the Romanesque church, because the new building rose around the old structure that remained fully functional as attested by the memorial services of the Battle of Hoflach and Alling in September 1470 and September 1472.237

In 1472, an entry in the register of the goldsmiths’ guild recorded the completion of the old building’s demolition and the erection of new chapels as well as altars like the Altar of St Anne.238 In 1473 the walls of the ambulatory and the nave’s northern wall almost rose to their full height; the west front was completed up to the level of the gallery and first floor level respectively.239 By January 1475 the façade of the west front with its two towers reached the level of the window above the main portal, because Barbara Astaler (née Bart) signed a contract with the church’s provosts Martin Katzmair and Andre Sänfltl to pay for the costs of a new stained glass window, reusing parts of the Romanesque building’s stained glass windows.240

On 9th October 1473 master mason Matthäus Roritzer of Eichstätt, the son of Konrad Roritzer, received a payment for his visit and consultation.241 In 1474 the town’s treasury recorded payments and catering costs for the following eminent master masons who travelled to Munich to confer with Jörg von Halspach on the construction of the Late Gothic Church of Our Lady and specifically the vaulting of the choir: Moritz Ensinger of Ulm, Konrad Roritzer of Regensburg, Friedrich Spys (Spies) of Ingolstadt and Michael Sallinger of Pfarrkirchen who had been taught by Stephan Krumenauer.242
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The parish council of the Church of Our Lady sold various items like tallow and mortgage loans on properties (Ewiggelder) to the town council for 520 pounds of Pfennig on 18th March 1475. The sale was necessary to finance the erection of the roof truss above the choir. On 26th December 1475, the town treasury paid sixty-three pounds of Pfennig for thirty-six small and large wooden rafts that were delivered in this year to supply building material for the choir’s roof truss. Between March 1477 and July 1478 the remaining wooden truss was assembled to completely cover the nave, choir and ambulatory. However the vaults were not finished at this stage, because the roof was required as weather protection. The dating of the roof’s completion to 1478 is also supported by payments to an unknown metalworker on 30th January 1478, to the smith Hans Zuckseysen the Elder on 15th March 1478, to carpenters on 31st May 1478 and to various craftsmen in February 1479 for the creation as well as erection of a star, surmounted by a cross and flanked by a crescent on the east end of the church’s roof.

The costs of the acquisition of plots for the Late Gothic building, which occupies a much larger area than the previous Romanesque church, as well as the expense of financing the construction work burdened the monetary resources of the parish council, the town council and guilds in the late 1470s. Hence new sources of income had to be exploited. On 31st January 1477, Ulrich Asenhamer, the personal cook of Albrecht IV, provided the provosts with a loan of 122 Rhenish guilders, which should be regarded as a donation, if the money was not repaid before his death. On 2nd February 1477 Sigmund and Albrecht IV granted their permission to the sale of the Seydlmühle, situated near the Wurzertor. (Plate 13) Hans Hörl, the chaplain of the imperial altar or rather altar of the Holy Cross, as well as the parish council intended to sell the mill to the town council to fund the foundations at the imperial altar. In turn the priests and provosts of the Church of Our Lady sold their house in the Fingergasse to Sigmund and Albrecht IV for use as prebend of the imperial altar.

One of the most important and lucrative sources of income was the sale of indulgences from 1480 until 1482. Albrecht IV obtained the authorisation of Pope Sixtus IV (1471-1484)—the papal bull was delivered in a festive ceremony by the suffragan bishops of Augsburg and Brixen on 11th March 1480 on the central market square—that worshippers and pilgrims to the Church of Our Lady who would confess, attend a Holy Communion and place the amount of money, one required for living expenses per week, into a guarded chest in front of the imperial altar or rather altar of the Holy Cross would receive indulgences from 1480 until 1482. Two thirds of these donations were intended to finance the church’s construction and one third to support
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the battle against the Ottoman Empire.250 65,000 pilgrims visited the Church of Our Lady in 1480 and donated 9,376 Rhenish guilders. This sum was spent to a large degree on paying the fee for the issuance of the papal bull, printing the letters of indulgences, presenting those who delivered the bull with presents, paying the eight priests who spread the news of the indulgence opportunity in Munich throughout the duchy, and the entertainment of up to 270 father confessors as well as the preachers. Hence a remission from paying contributions to support the battle against the Ottoman Empire was obtained.251 The granting of indulgences attracted altogether approximately 120,000 pilgrims who donated more than 15,000 guilders that were mainly employed for financing the construction of the vaults.252 After the final account on 7th October 1482 permission to commence with the vaulting was conceded.253

The procurement of these financial resources highlights the involvement of the Dukes of Bavaria-Munich and their interest in the swift completion of the Late Gothic Church of Our Lady. Unlike other construction projects of these dimensions like St Martin in Landshut, Ulm Minster and the tower of St Bartholomew in Frankfurt am Main, the Church of Our Lady was completed within two decades without any changes to the original plans. Only the two bulbous domes were placed onto the west front’s twin towers in 1525. The uniformity of the Church of Our Lady’s design with its restrained architectural vocabulary and the brisk progression of construction work must be attributed to the determination of the coalition of dukes and burghers—under the aegis of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich—to create a prestigious ecclesiastical centre for their town and a symbol of ducal authority.254

Around 1487 Albrecht IV received a bell from the town council of Regensburg as present for the Church of Our Lady. Therefore the construction of the bell towers was finished or they were nearing completion.255 According to the tombstone of master mason Jörg von Halspach († 6th October 1488), the construction work must have been completed before his death, because the inscription stated that he had laid the first, the middle and the last brick and stone respectively. Lukas Rottaler, Jörg von Halspach’s assistant, succeeded him as master mason.256 The towers’ tambour storeys with the watchmen’s rooms were completed at the latest by May 1492 since Ulrich the Carpenter was paid on 13th May 1492 for installing the guns’ foundations. The tambour storeys are also depicted in Michael Wolgemut’s townscape as published by Hartmann Schedel in his Liber Chronicarum in 1493. (Plate 7)

251 Altmann, 'Die spätgotische Bauphase der Frauenkirche'. p. 12
252 Ibid. p. 12-13; Bös, Gotik in Oberbayern. p. 35
253 Altmann, 'Die spätgotische Bauphase der Frauenkirche'. p. 13
255 Altmann, 'Die spätgotische Bauphase der Frauenkirche'. p. 14
The bull of 11th April 1492, issued by Pope Innocent VIII, permitted Albrecht IV to establish a collegiate foundation at the Church of Our Lady. According to Christl Karnehm, this collegiate foundation was intended from the inception of construction work, because the choir’s scale made allowances for the requirements of the canons. (Plate 70) In order to finance the promotion of this former parish church without straining the court treasury, Albrecht IV affiliated the wealthy monasteries of Ilmmünster and Schliersee with the Church of Our Lady. (Plate 1) In 1495 the relics of St Arsatius and fourteen canons from Ilmmünster as well as Schliersee were brought to Munich. Dr Johannes Neuhauser, the ducal chancellor and Albrecht IV’s half-brother, became the first provost of this newly established ‘court monastery’. The ducal court did not only benefit from the improvement of the church’s status but the canons of the collegiate foundation also provided erudite clergymen who were engaged in the ducal administration.

Traditionally it was believed that the Church of Our Lady was consecrated on 14th April 1494, based on a clergymen’s handwritten note in a calendar. However this date is most probably incorrect and refers more appropriately to the consecration of the Church of St Salvator, the cemetery church of Our Lady’s parish on the northern perimeter of the town, where construction work commenced in 1493. Besides the Church of Our Lady’s consecration was celebrated on the second Sunday after Michaelmas until the nineteenth century and not on 14th April. An earlier consecration date is more plausible since the high altar of the Church of Our Lady was already consecrated in 1473 and major building work was completed by 1488.
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The end of the era of Sigmund and Albrecht IV of Bavaria-Munich: the Landshut War of Inheritance and the Primogeniture Degree

On 1st February 1501, Sigmund died at the age of sixty-one in Blutenburg Palace. He was buried in the tomb of the Wittelsbach dynasty in the Church of Our Lady on 3rd February 1501 as desired and declared in his epigraph on the memorial plaque outside the dukes’ portal.262 (Plate 65)

Duke George of Bavaria-Landshut passed away on 30th November 1503 in the Neues Schloss in Ingolstadt at the age of forty-eight. (Plate 52) George established his eldest daughter Elisabeth as his heiress in his testament of 19th September 1496, which was drawn up under the influence of Prince Elector Philipp of the Rhine. Elisabeth had married Rupert of the Palatinate in 1499, the son of George’s sister Margaret and Prince Elector Philipp. His decision violated the dynastic agreements of 1392, the Treaty of Erding of 1450 and the Holy Roman Empire’s legislation. According to these statutes, Albrecht IV was the rightful heir of the Duchy of Bavaria-Landshut.263

George’s decision to bequeath the Duchy of Bavaria-Landshut to Elisabeth and Rupert was an intolerable insult to Albrecht IV since he had appointed George on 7th July 1485 as his heir in the instance that he died without male successors. Albrecht IV aimed to strengthen the Wittelsbach dynasty and the Duchy of Bavaria by eventually reuniting the remaining two parts by stating that ‘the dignity, honour and reputation of the commendable House and Principality of Bavaria should be advanced for which nothing better and providential could be envisaged than that the same Principality of Bavaria would come under the authority and reign of only one prince’.264 Hence Sigmund had already passed his share of the Duchy of Bavaria-Munich to his brother Albrecht IV in 1477 (Hausurkunde 807).265 He confirmed this decision with a more formal document in 1494 (Hausurkunde 810) that was written in the presence of Balthasar Hundertpfund, the priest of the Church of Our Lady.266

266 Sigmund von Bayern-München, 'Hausurkunde 810', (Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv Munich - Geheimes Hausarchiv, 1494).
George’s decision to appoint his daughter and her husband as his heirs would have strengthened the standing of the Counts Palatine of the Rhine in the Holy Roman Empire and would have provided them with additional power in this region. Consequently, the balance of power in the Bavarian territories would have shifted to the disadvantage of the Dukes of Bavaria-Munich. King Maximilian I also opposed an increase of the Counts Palatine of the Rhine’s powers, because their territorial expansion policies in the 1480s had jeopardised the Habsburg dynasty’s allodium.267

George installed Rupert as governor just before his death. He also entrusted Rupert with the castles in Landshut and Burghausen and ordered the Estates to pay tribute to their new ‘regent’. The transfer of Burghausen Castle, housing the treasury with the wealth of the dukes of Bavaria-Landshut, was of great importance, because George had increased the ducal treasure with regard to the prospective, inevitable military conflict.268

Initially, Albrecht IV, Rupert and King Maximilian I aimed to find a peaceful solution to the difficult legal situation. The Duchy of Bavaria-Landshut not only comprised territories that were imperial fiefs but also consisted of ducal estates that could be lawfully claimed by Elisabeth and Rupert. However Maximilian I envisaged a fragmentation of the Bavarian duchies to undermine the Bavarian dukes’ authority. Hence Maximilian I played off Albrecht IV against Rupert by proposing the creation of a principality from those Bavarian territories north of the Danube for Rupert. Albrecht IV and Rupert refused the king’s proposal. Consequently Rupert’s party occupied Landshut and Burghausen on 17th April 1504 to end the king’s delaying tactics and create a fait accompli. For this reason the king’s judgement of 23rd April 1504 awarded the whole Duchy of Bavaria-Landshut to Albrecht IV and Wolfgang of Bavaria-Munich, excluding those territories that interested King Maximilian I who based his claims on the fact that the dynastic agreements of 1392 and 1450 had not been confirmed by his predecessors on the imperial throne. This judgement made a military conflict unavoidable and Albrecht IV as well as Wolfgang declared war on the Palatine Electorate on 29th April 1504.269

Maximilian I initiated a firm offensive with the coalition troops in the Palatinate of the Rhine to force Rupert to declare peace. Prince Elector Philipp agreed to a six-month armistice on 10th September 1504 after his son had died on 20th August 1504.

The situation was different in the Duchy of Bavaria-Landshut. The troops of Albrecht IV (circa 2,000 mounted knights, temporarily up to 12,000 foot soldiers and 1,600 carts) took towns in the duchy’s western parts and Rupert’s soldiers (about 2,000 mounted knights and 8,000 foot soldiers) captured towns in the eastern regions. Both parties avoided direct confrontation as a result of the balance of power and intended to win this war by attrition of the enemy. This tactic caused abhorrent destruction in Lower and Upper Bavaria as well as in the Upper Palatinate.

Maximilian I and his troops entered the Bavarian war theatre in September 1504 and won the only battle of this war on 12th September 1504. It took place at Wenzenbach, north of Regensburg, by annihilating those Bohemian troops that had caused the
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devastation in the Upper Palatinate. Three days after Maximilian I’s victory at Wenzenbach, Elisabeth died and bequeathed her claim of the Duchy of Bavaria-Landshut to her two underage sons Ottheinrich and Philipp. Thus the Landshut War of Inheritance could have ended. Only Maximilian I prolonged it to capture those areas of the Duchy of Bavaria (i.e. Kufstein and Tyrol), which he had planned to incorporate into his territories. (Plate 5 and Plate 6) The king’s military action in Tyrol enabled Prince Elector Philipp and his two grandchildren to strengthen their position. Besides Albrecht IV was not willing to make concessions to Prince Elector Philipp and his two grandchildren. The pillage of so-called ‘Kehrab’ along the rivers Isar, Inn and Salzach caused even more atrocious devastation but also broke any remaining resistance. Finally armistice was agreed on 31st January and 1st February 1505 respectively. It came into effect on 13th April 1505.270

The arbitration at the imperial diet in Cologne (Kölner Spruch) of 30th July 1505 decreed the creation of the Duchy of Pfalz-Neuburg for Ottheinrich and Philipp. The Duchy of Bavaria-Landshut was reunited with the Duchy of Bavaria-Munich, which now comprised most of the Wittelsbach dynasty’s heartland. This reunification also ended the development of Lower Bavaria into a distinct ‘state’. Maximilian I not only profited from his participation in the war because of his territorial gains, he became highly regarded for his victories and the humiliation of the Counts Palatine of the Rhine.271

Albrecht IV realised his intentions of 1485 and took precautionary measures with the Primogeniture Decree of 8th July 1506 to prevent future partitions for territorial partitions had caused military conflicts in the first half of the fifteenth century and were also responsible for this recent war on Bavarian territory. Wolfgang of Bavaria-Munich gave his consent to the Primogeniture Decree that was ratified by the Estates. According to the Primogeniture Decree, the Duchy of Bavaria was indivisible in the future; only the reigning Bavarian duke’s first-born son inherited the ducal title and the duchy; any later-born sons were to be subjects of their eldest brother, they could only hold the title of counts and were allocated an annual allowance of 4,000 guilders from their majority.272

On 18th March 1508 Duke Albrecht IV of Bavaria-Munich died at the age of sixty. He was buried in the Church of Our Lady. The altars of the choir were covered with black clothes and decorated with large white crosses and a ducal coat-of-arms for his funeral. Albrecht IV’s burial was attended by numerous aristocrats and as many as 2,500 persons and 1,809 horses were fed.273
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The facets of princely self-aggrandizement

Magnificence: clothes and the decorative arts as means of communication and social differentiation

Aside from art and architecture the late medieval and early modern aristocrats highly esteemed tapestries, embroidery and precious cloths, manuscripts, music, metalwork like armour and gold work, pageants, tournaments, banquets, marriage festivities and court hunts as well as ephemeral objects like food sculptures (i.e. Albrecht IV of Bavaria-Munich’s funerary effigy was made of pastry and eaten during his the funeral banquet). Marina Belozerskaya and Stephan Hoppe have stated that at first sight it is difficult for a twenty-first-century beholder to grasp the importance of such utilitarian objects, because they do not have the same visual presence and accessibility as more imperishable monuments of princely grandeur like buildings, paintings, sculptures or medallions, and they often only left a lasting impression in written descriptions or ledgers. The temporary and utilitarian nature of many of these objects and events or rather their classification as minor or decorative arts induced scholars to neglect research on these areas in comparison with art historical examinations of court art and architecture. However they were highly respected by patrons and contemporary beholders as prominent means for the ostentatious display of the aristocrats’ status.

Grand retinues as expression of the aristocrat’s status

When gathering for political councils and festivities like the marriage of Duke George of Bavaria-Landshut with Princess Jadwiga Jagiellon of Poland (1457-1502) in 1475 aristocrats tried to make a grand entry and impress their peers with sumptuous clothes, precious jewellery and large entourages. The descriptions of Hans Seyboldt, a scribe of the Seligenthal abbey outside Landshut, and Hansen Eringer, a secretary of Margrave Albrecht of Brandenburg, create a vivid impression of the magnificent marriage celebrations in Landshut that served as a stage for demonstrating one’s rank by addressing a large audience. These reports disseminated information on the aristocrats’
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efforts to display and advance their status to a wider audience who were not physically present at these princely gatherings.276

According to the reports of Hans Seyboldt and Hansen Eringer, transcribed by Sebastian Hiereth, Margrave Albrecht of Brandenburg and his son made an impressive entry into Landshut. Their retinue of approximately 225 to 250 persons and 1,370 horses included numerous aristocrats and knights, falconers, trumpeters, pipers, timpanists and heralds. In comparison the entourage of Emperor Frederick III and his son King Maximilian appears rather modest. It was only composed of circa 110 to 130 aristocrats, a chaplain, scribes, tailors, shoemakers, doctors, barbers, hairdressers, hunters, chefs, trumpeters and pipers as well as 567 horses. Yet the retinue of Frederick III and Maximilian was still one of the largest among the princely guests of the marriage festivities. The suite of Jadwiga Jagiellon who arrived in Landshut in a horse-drawn carriage, decorated with four gilded lions, which presented the coat-of-arms of the Kingdom of Poland, and those of Count Palatine Philip of the Rhine (1448-1508), Albrecht IV, Christoph and Wolfgang of Bavaria-Munich together consisted of only 600 to 800 persons and horses. Yet the retinues of the aforementioned aristocrats were dwarfed by their hosts’ flamboyant display of authority and splendour. Louis IX and George of Bavaria-Landshut presented their proverbial wealth and power with a vast entourage of more than 350 or 400 persons and 3,000 or so horses.277

The aristocrats’ attire: manifestations of status, affiliation and social differentiation

The aristocrats’ affluence and status was also reflected in their attire. The bride and groom were at the centre of the attention as the marriage ceremony and festivities in Landshut presented them with an ideal occasion for conveying their eminence to a large audience of aristocrats. Hence no expenses were spared to clothe the bride and groom in lavish attire. Duke George wore a valuable, tight-fitting, short jacket (doublet) with slits in the colours of his court (brown, grey and white) for the arrival of his bride Princess Jadwiga Jagiellon on the meadow outside Landshut.278 George’s garb was decorated

276 For a general elaboration on the importance of the aristocrats’ display of their rank and the dissemination of this information with descriptions of princely gatherings like the Landshut Wedding of 1475 refer to Astrid von Schlachta, 'Festberichte', in Werner Paravicini, Jan Hirschbiegel, and Jörg Wettlaufer (eds.), Höfe und Residenzen im spätmittelalterlichen Reich. Bilder und Begriffe (Residenzforschung, 15.II - Teilband 1 - Begriffe; Ostfildern: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 2005), 543-546. p. 543-544; Harriet Rudolph, 'Entrée', in Werner Paravicini, Jan Hirschbiegel, and Jörg Wettlaufer (eds.), Höfe und Residenzen im spätmittelalterlichen Reich. Bilder und Begriffe (Residenzforschung, 15.II - Teilband 1 - Begriffe; Ostfildern: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 2005), 318-323. p. 318-321
277 Transcribed in Hiereth, Herzog Georges Hochzeit zu Landshut im Jahre 1475. p. 76-83 & 91
278 The colours of the ‘official’ costume of the court of the dukes of Bavaria-Landshut was brown, grey and white at the time of the wedding of George of Bavaria-Landshut with Jadwiga Jagiellon. Mentioned in ibid. p. 36. An illustration of Duke George’s summer costume was reproduced in Franz Niehoff (ed.), Vor Leinberger. Landshuter Skulptur im Zeitalter der Reichen Herzöge 2 vols. (1; Landshut: Museen der Stadt Landshut, 2001). p. 20 & 93. This sketch of 1486 documents red, yellow, green, white and black as colours of George’s attire.
with pearls and precious stones like rubies and sapphires.279 The lavish embroidery of the left sleeve showed a banner made of pearls that stated ‘in honour she loves me’. The embroidery also depicted a lady sitting under an oak tree and keeping a lion on her leash, which are symbols of love according to the custom of Brabant.280 George’s hat, featuring his court’s characteristic colours, was decorated with a band of pearls and numerous precious stones whose value was estimated at fifty thousand guilders281 but some travelling merchants determined its value at one hundred thousand guilders, while other observers claimed that scarcely any other prince in the German lands owned such an expensive band of pearls and precious stones.282 A plume of white heron feathers was attached to George’s hat with a clasp that was valued at six thousand guilders. His horse wore saddlery that was decorated with pearls like those of his pages.283

The dress and jewellery of Duke George’s bride Jadwiga Jagiellon was likewise very impressive. On the wedding day she wore an exquisite robe, made of red satin, with long, wide sleeves, which were embroidered with beautiful, expensive pearls. A delicate veil covered her head. She wore a valuable crown, decorated with precious stones. Jadwiga also put on an expensive necklace, embellished with gemstones and a precious clasp.284

The wardrobe of Duke George and Princess Jadwiga was not an unusual attire for high-ranking aristocrats like Philip the Good of Burgundy. The Nuremberg patrician Gabriel Tetzel, a travel companion of Leo of Rozmital, who visited Philip the Good’s court in 1465, described similar exquisite clothes and jewellery. Tetzel was shown the duke’s treasure, which he estimated as greater than that of the Venetians for ‘it is said that nowhere in the world were such costly treasures [...]. I have indicated the principal objects so far as I was able to see them. Item, twelve tunics, none worth less than 40,000 crowns. Item, the hat which [Philip the Good] wears, worth 60,000 crowns. [...] Item, an ostrich feather on his hat, 50,000.’285 In comparison to Philip the Good’s hat or the ostrich feather Tetzel listed a crucifix, carved from the wood of the Holy Cross and decorated with gems, pearls and gold and featuring figures of the crucified Christ, the Virgin Mary and St John that was worth 40,000 crowns. Another golden cross

280 ‘Der linke Ärmel war mit Perlen bestickt. Es waren sehr große zu einem Reim gefügt, der also lautete: “In Ehren liebet sie mir.” Und es war eine Frau dargestellt, nach brabantischer Sitte unter einer Eiche sitzend; die hatte einen Löwen an einem Seil in der Hand.’ – From Ibid. p. 93
281 ‘Der Hut in seiner Hoffarbe war mit einem erlesenen Kranz von großen Perlen und vielen Edelsteinen geziert. Deren Wert wurde auf fünfzigtausend Gulden geschätzt.’ – From Ibid. p. 52
282 Transcribed in Ibid. p. 62 & 99
283 ‘Darauf befand sich auch ein Busch weißer Reiherdern mit einem kostbaren, daran befestigten Häfl im Worte von sechstausend Gulden. Das Pferd, auf dem er saß, hatte ein Sattelzeug aus Perlen wie die Pferde seiner Pagen.’ – From Ibid. p. 52
containing one of the nails with which Christ was crucified was worth 60,000 crowns. Thus fashion items and luxury goods, made of precious materials and incorporating exotic objects like ostrich feathers, were at least as highly priced as sacral art.\footnote{Ibid. p. 16 & 27-28}

On the one hand, an aristocrat’s attire was an obvious means to display and celebrate political alliances. For example, Duke George displayed his kinship with other aristocrats by supplying them with garments that featured his court’s characteristic colours.\footnote{Hiereth, \textit{Herzog Georgs Hochzeit zu Landshut im Jahre 1475}. p. 109} Likewise Albrecht IV, Christoph and Wolfgang of Bavaria-Munich wore clothes of the same colour.\footnote{Ibid. p. 109} On the other hand, it was a characteristic means to distinguish oneself from one’s peers as well as members of other social classes; thereby expressing one’s social standing. As part of the non-verbal communication process clothes served as means to create and demonstrate social as well as political order.\footnote{Kirsten O. Frieling, ‘Kleidung’, in Werner Paravicini, Jan Hirschbiegel, and Jörg Wettlaufer (eds.), \textit{Höfe und Residenzen im spätmittelalterlichen Reich. Bilder und Begriffe (Residenzforschung, 15.II - Teilband 1 - Begriffe; Ostfildern: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 2005)}, 323-325. p. 323}

This notion is also reflected in the accounts of Seyboldt and Eringer. They noted for example, the extravagant garments and jewellery of Emperor Frederick III, which contrasted with the truly lavish attire of Duke George and Princess Jadwiga. The emperor wore a gown, fashioned from red and gold cloths, with a large collar that was decorated entirely with pearls, diamonds, sapphires, emeralds, amethysts, rubies and many other gemstones.\footnote{Hiereth, \textit{Herzog Georgs Hochzeit zu Landshut im Jahre 1475}. p. 93} Frederick III also bore a valuable cross around his neck, which was embellished with precious stones.\footnote{Ibid. p. 99} The descriptions of Seyboldt and Eringer emphasise the sumptuousness of the emperor’s attire that distinguished him from the unquestionably ornate clothes of Duke George, Jadwiga Jagiellon and their peers like his son King Maximilian or Count Palatine Philip of the Rhine.\footnote{Ibid. p. 90} The attire of Frederick III also reflects his personal obsession with collecting jewels, gold and silver work.\footnote{Alphons Lhotsky, ‘Friedrich III.’, in Historische Kommission bei der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (ed.), \textit{Neue Deutsche Biographie} (5; Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1961), 484-487. p. 486}

This social differentiation also existed among brothers. For instance, Albrecht IV, Christoph and Wolfgang of Bavaria-Munich wore brown silk doublets with pearl-embroidered sleeves and caps, decorated with pearls that must have been similar to the cap with which Duke Sigmund is depicted on the exterior panel of the high altarpiece’s right wing in Blutenburg Palace Chapel (painted by Jan Polack in 1491/92) or the cap that Duke Albrecht IV wears on the donor portrait on the exterior panel of the left wing of the former high altarpiece of the Franciscans’ Church of St Anthony (created by Jan Polack’s workshop, 1491/92).\footnote{Hiereth, \textit{Herzog Georgs Hochzeit zu Landshut im Jahre 1475}. p. 100-101} However the hierarchy between the brothers becomes evident in the description of their garments, which they wore at the dance. According to the contemporary observers, Albrecht IV was dressed\footnote{Ibid. p. 90}
in a short brown doublet with very large pearls attached to one of the sleeves. Christoph and Wolfgang wore the same clothes, but the pearls on the sleeves of their jackets were smaller. Albrecht IV, the ruling duke, employed the embellishments of his clothes to set himself apart from his younger brothers who did not have an active role in the ducal government.

**Entertainment at the ducal court in Munich**

In the *Liber Chronicarum* (1493) Hartmann Schedel described the Alte Hof in Munich as ‘a beautifully, well embellished palace with a very spacious princely court and living quarters with many exquisite as well as wonderful chambers, rooms and vaults’. (Plate 9) The traditional ducal residence with its very large courtyard as well as beautiful apartments impressed contemporary visitors and provided a representative stage for the court festivities and the receptions of aristocrats like Duke Albrecht of Saxony who visited Munich on his journey to the Holy Land in 1476. Albrecht IV of Bavaria-Munich entertained Albrecht of Saxony and his retinue of circa one hundred persons, including Duke William of Saxony and Prince Sigmund of Anhalt, in his residence on 24th and 25th March 1476 as documented by Hans von Mergenthal whose report of Albrecht of Saxony’s journey to Jerusalem was published in 1586.

On Laetare Sunday my gracious lord rode to Munich; Duke Albrecht [IV] of Munich, the ruling prince, rode a quarter mile to meet my gracious lord [who] was kindly received and led to the palace [of Albrecht IV who] had arranged everything. There was no other prince of Bavaria present. On the Monday of the Annunciation of the Virgin Mary my gracious lord intended to depart but Duke Albrecht [IV] insisted that he should stay and honoured my gracious lord with minstrels, namely good singers, with good organists, lute players, harpists and pipers, all of the very best. He also has a beautiful, small church at his palace, very well equipped with cantors and organists […]. Therefore the town of Munich has to be praised above all other towns.'

---


296 ‘Alda ist yetzo ein schöns wolgezierts schloss und ein fast weyter fürstlicher hoff und behawßung mit vil hübschen und wunderwirdigen gemachen, camern und gewelben.’ Refer to Plate 9

Music always was an essential element of court culture in the Middle Ages and the early modern era that ranged from the important role of the trumpeter in prestigious, formal rituals (especially at the electoral courts), the unison or polyphonic arrangement of ecclesiastical music for mass to the general musical entertainment of the members of the court and their guests. Music was an indispensable feature of court festivities, where the musica alta (trumpeters and drummers) and the musica bassa (flautists, string and lute players) entertained the lord, his courtiers and guests.  

According to Mergenthal’s description, Albrecht IV of Bavaria-Munich entertained his guests with excellent minstrels like singers, organists, musicians who played lute, harp and wind instruments (probably shawms) in the Alte Hof in Munich. (Plate 15) There were very good cantors and organists at the Chapel of St Laurence. Albrecht IV continued the tradition of his father to employ outstanding musicians like Conrad Paumann. The renowned organist was summoned to Albrecht III’s court and worked for the duke and his sons until his death in 1473.  

The English singers Conret Symth and Peter Skeydell of the royal ensemble were said to have left England in 1483 for a new employment as minstrels of the Duke of Bavaria. Unfortunately this statement and their arrival in Bavaria cannot be verified as their presence in Munich or Landshut has not been documented. It is also not known whether they would have worked at the court of George, Sigmund or Albrecht IV.  

The presence of musicians at the ducal court for the entertainment of the dukes, their families, courtiers and guests is documented in Matthäus Zasinger’s engraving The Court Ball. (Plate 15) It depicts a scene of the life at the ducal court in Munich. There are pipers, timpanists and drummers on the galleries on either side of the hall. Thus the print provides an impression of the entertainment that might have been experienced by Albrecht of Saxony and his retinue.  

Music was an important aspect of the entertainment and religious life at the ducal court in Munich, because Veit Arnpeck described the singers, cantors, musicians and organists who entertained Duke Sigmund, his entourage as well as guests, and who were required for the daily mass in his account of Sigmund’s splendid court at Blutenburg Palace. The ducal court’s vocal ensemble must have performed during Albrecht IV’s funeral service in 1508 since they were documented as part of the ducal household.  

These court musicians also travelled with their lord as part of an appropriate, magnificent retinue. For instance, the Bavarian dukes’ minstrels were recorded in the ledgers of the Habsburg court in Innsbruck. From this point of view, the ducal court
of Munich did not differ from other princely courts. For instance, in 1473 Charles the Bold held a magnificent banquet in Trier to impress Emperor Frederick III and convey his political agenda. For every one of the thirty-three courses that were served, ten trumpeters, three pipers and two trombonists entered the hall in front of the servants with the meals. After the banquet first an ensemble of two trumpeters, four pipers and two trombonists performed music. Then musicians entertained the princes with quieter instruments: three lute players were followed by three violinists. In this regard the court of Charles the Bold, who employed various ensembles that comprised almost forty musicians as recorded in court ordinance of 1469 and Oliviers de la Marche’s description of 1474, certainly provided a model for other princes in the Holy Roman Empire who competed with each other for prestige by employing means like court musicians for demonstrating their magnificence. Nevertheless only very few princes maintained a musical ensemble permanently. Documents and descriptions very seldom provide the evidence that musicians were a constant part of princely courts. Thus the courts in Brandenburg and Munich are exceptional examples. In the 1450s the dukes in Munich supported a stable of three soft minstrels (lutenists or rather violinists) that provided the court’s musical entertainment, for instance, during meals. Albrecht III’s sons obviously continued their father’s cultivation of music as attested by the descriptions of Mergenthal and Arnpeck as well as Matthäus Zasinger’s Court Ball. It is not documented whether the courts of the Burgundian dukes, Emperor Frederick III or the King of Bohemia (Ladislaus the Posthumous and George of Podiebrad), where Albrecht III of Bavaria-Munich stayed during his youth and whose crown was offered him in 1440, provide a model for the Bavarian dukes from the middle of the fifteenth century. Yet it can be assumed that they were aware of the patronage at other courts throughout the Holy Roman Empire, especially at the Habsburg’s courts in Wiener Neustadt and Innsbruck. At the latest they witnessed the other princes’ musical ensembles during the wedding festivities of Duke George of Bavaria-Landshut and Jadwiga Jagiellon in 1475, where Margrave Albrecht of Brandenburg’s retinue included trumpeters, pipers and timpanists, and Emperor Frederick III was accompanied by trumpeters and pipers.

305 Berger, 'Musik[er]'. p. 199
307 Berger, 'Musik[er]'. p. 199
310 Hiereth, Herzog Georgs Hochzeit zu Landshut im Jahre 1475. p. 76-83 & 91
The interest in the exotic

The strange beasts and the ‘zoological garden’ at the ducal court in Munich

Veit Arnpeck, in his description of Duke Sigmund’s court, referred to another characteristic facet of princely splendour in the second half of the fifteenth century: the interest in the exotic. According to Arnpeck, Sigmund enjoyed the company of beautiful women as well as white doves, peacocks, birds and other exotic, strange creatures.311 Sigmund’s peacocks might have provided inspiration for Jan Polack as he incorporated peacock feathers into the wings of the angels who are depicted on the central panel of the high altarpiece in Blutenburg Palace Chapel. (Plate 106) The plume of the helmet’s crest of Kunigunde of Austria’s coat-of-arms on the exterior panel of the right wing of the former high altarpiece of the Franciscans’ Church of St Antonius in Munich, created by Jan Polack, also features peacock feathers. (Plate 133)

Arnpeck’s account of the court life at Blutenburg Palace and the examples of the foreign peacock feathers on Jan Polack’s altarpieces demonstrate the Bavarian dukes’ penchant for these exotic embellishments and desired to convey the refinement of the life at their court. Peacocks and their feathers must have been considered as precious and exquisite as the ostrich feather, which Gabriel Tetzel saw in the treasury of Philip the Good.

Exotic animals like lions and monkeys existed at the ducal court since the thirteenth century. The ducal administrator Johann von Kammerberg recorded expenses for the repairs of the windowpanes, which had been broken by the court monkeys in 1359 and 1364.312 The custom of keeping lions at the Alte Hof began under Duke Louis II of Bavaria (reg. 1253-1294) who tended the first African lion.313 In December 1473 an entry in the town council’s records refers to the lions and their cage at the Alte Hof where the heraldic animals of Bavaria were kept, because two lions had escaped and four messengers (Fronboten) were paid to inform Munich’s burghers of this incident.314 The description of Munich in Hartmann Schedel’s Liber Chronicarum (1493) also mentions the lions, kept at the ducal court, as it ends with a remark about a lioness and its many cubs.315 (Plate 9) The Venetian diplomat Andrea de Franceschi also saw these lions during his visit in 1492 as he mentioned them in his description of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich’s splendid palace: ‘Adjacent to the gate of the Alte Hof there are three lions in two dungeons—a beautiful showpiece. In addition there are two lions in the courtyard, which are much larger than the caged ones. These lions freely roam among the people, they can be stroked by everybody and are completely tame; however one of them, the larger one, has been castrated and does not have claws anymore but the other

311 ‘Im was wol mit schönen frauen und weissen tauben , pfafen, swein und vöglen und allen selczamen tierlen’. – Arnpeck, Sämtliche Chroniken. p. 673
312 Burmeister, Die baugeschichtliche Entwicklung des Alten Hofes in München. p. 47
313 Behringer, Rundgang durch das mittelalterliche München. p. 94
315 ‘In diser statt hat ein leobin vil iunger leoblin gewelft’. Refer to Plate 9
one is intact."³¹⁶ Obviously these lions provided an interesting and entertaining sight for beholders who watched the courtyard from rooms in the Burgstock and Zwingerstock or from the gallery and passageway on the courtyard-side of the Church of St Laurence. (Plate 18) In the second half of the fifteenth century the duke’s zoological collection may have been extended as Matthäus Prätzl, Albrecht IV’s treasurer, recorded expenses for the care of lions and lynxes in 1491. A ‘zämmacher’³¹⁷ received four schillings and twenty-two pfennig for assisting the master of the lions with the lions and lynxes.³¹⁸ Duke Albrecht V continued this tradition of keeping exotic animals at the ducal court as noted by Georg Braun and Franz Hogenberg in their description of Munich in ‘Civitates orbis terrarum’ (1572). They saw tigers, bears, lynxes and twelve lions at the Alte Hof during their visit.³¹⁹

Lions and other wild creatures were kept at the palaces of eminent aristocrats for their entertainment. An account of the palace and gardens at Lochau near Torgau by Hans Herzheimer who visited the grounds on 10th January 1519 shows that wild animals were allowed to roam freely around the courtyard to provide distractions for Elector Frederick the Wise of Saxony as Herzheimer wrote: ‘when the Elector is in residence and is desirous of some pleasure, the inner gate of the inner palace is opened. Then these deer and wild creatures run to a trough to eat and are not shy in any way’.³²⁰ It was not mentioned by any contemporary beholder like Franceschi that the duke, duchess, their courtiers and guests observed the lions from the apartments in the Burgstock and Zwingerstock. (Plate 18) Yet it can be assumed that they were not only kept because they were the heraldic animals of the dukes of Bavaria but also presented a pleasant sight.

³¹⁶ ‘Der Herzog aber wohnt gesondert für sich mitten in der Stadt und hält, wie gesagt, sehr glänzend Hof. Neben dem Thor des (alten) Hofes sind in zwei Verliesen drei Löwen—ein schönes Schaustück. Ferner befinden sich im Hofe zwei Löwen, die viel größer sind als die eingeschlossenen. Dieselben spazieren unter den Leuten umher, lassen sich von jedermann anrühren und sind ganz zahm; allerdings ist der eine von ihnen, der größere, kastriert und hat keine Krallen mehr, der andere aber ist unversehrt.’ – As transcribed in Simonsfeld, ‘Venetianischer Reisebericht’. p. 257. – In December 1473 an entry in the town council’s chronicle recorded the lions and their cage at the Alte Hof, where the Bavarian dukes’ heraldic animals were kept, because two lions had escaped and four messengers (Fronboten) were paid to inform citizens in Munich of this incident (‘das sy von hawß zu hawß gesagt haben von der zwayr leben wegen, die man zu hof verloren het’). – Transcribed in Stahleder, Chronik der Stadt München. Herzogs- und Bürgerstadt. p. 447 and also mentioned by Hartig, Münchner Künstler und Kunstsachen (Vol. 1). p. 51. – In 1491 Duke Albrecht IV’s treasurer Matthäus Prätzl recorded expenses for the care of lions and lynxes. A ‘zämmacher’ (likely a person, who was responsible for the taming of wild animals) received four schillings and twenty-two pfennig for assisting the master of the lions. (‘4 ß [Schilling] 22 [Pfennig] ausgeben dem zämmacher umb ettliche arbeit, so er dem lebmaister [Löwenmeister], dem jungen und alten leben [Löwen], auch dem luxen [Luchs] gemacht hat, zaltt in der woche vor vor ![1] Pfingsten.’) From Hartig, Münchner Künstler und Kunstsachen (Vol. 1). p. 65. – Hartmann Schedel ended his description of Munich with a reference to the lions in the Alte Hof. According to Schedel a lioness gave birth to many lions (‘In diser statt hat ein leobin vil iunger leoblin gewelt’).

³¹⁷ The person responsible for the taming of wild animals.


³²⁰ Hoppe, 'Anatomy of an Early "Villa"'. p. 131
Similar exotic animals were kept in court ‘zoos’ throughout Europe. For instance, Gabriel Tetzel described Philip the Good’s zoological garden as a place of ‘vast proportions with many fountains and lakes, in which one found all manner of birds and animals which seemed strange to us’. At the castle of René I of Anjou at Angers Tetzel and other members of Leo of Rozmital’s retinue were shown another one of these gardens, where a specially appointed keeper—one of them was killed in 1454—looked after lions, leopards, ostriches and goats which in fact were the long-eared sheep with horns that contemporary travellers to the Near East frequently described in their accounts. These exotic animals intrigued Gabriel Tetzel for he wrote: ‘the King takes great pleasure in birds and rare beasts. We saw an incredible number, also goats from heathen parts with ears more than three spans long. We saw two great lions, two leopards, two ostriches and many other strange beasts.322

The strange and exotic creatures in these princely gardens evoked wonder. The acquisition of these animals and the maintenance of ‘zoological gardens’ could only be afforded by the wealthiest patrons. The dukes of Bavaria-Munich were competing with other princes. They employed these animals to display their magnificence, which was also echoed by the accounts of Arnpeck and Schedel. The lions were also appropriate beasts for the Bavarian court since they were also the Bavarian dukes’ heraldic animals as depicted by Jan Polack on the exterior wing of the former high altarpiece of the Franciscans’ Church of St Antonius in Munich that shows Albrecht IV of Bavaria-Munich. (Plate 132) On the other hand, these zoological gardens can be understood as a ‘proto-scientific’ introduction to the natural world for they were more than mere extensions of the interior or leisure grounds. These gardens with their panoply of at times exotic flowers, herbs, birds and other strange animals reflect a curiosity in the natural world.

Curiositas: pilgrimages and travels to foreign places

The aristocrats’ interest in precious objects and exotic animals from distant places is but one manifestation of a general tendency in the late fifteenth century, which has been labelled as curiositas.323 Already in 1395 the French nobleman Ogier d’Anglure wrote down an account of the pyramids, elephants, giraffes and crocodiles that he saw in Cairo and other parts of Egypt.324 In his journal Albrecht Dürer described the admirable

321 Letts (ed.), The Travels of Leo of Rozmital. p. 27-28
322 Ibid. p. 68-69. For another description of the zoological gardens at the residences of René I of Anjou refer to Marie-Thérèse Haudebourg, Vom Glück des Gartens. Gartenparadiese im Mittelalter (Ostfildern: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 2004). p. 127 & 142. According to Haudebourg, there were also elephants and camels kept in his zoos.
objects from Mexico, the new land of gold, that he was shown in the palace of Margaret of Austria in Mechelen in 1520. He wrote enthusiastically about these exotic objects: ‘all the days of my life I have seen nothing that rejoiced my heart so much as these things, for I saw amongst them wonderful works of art, and I marvelled at the subtle **Ingenia** of men in foreign lands. Indeed I cannot express all that I thought there’.325

The outlook of the elites in the fifteenth century was international and religious motivations for voyages to the Holy Land were replaced by curiositas, the interest to travel to experience these fascinating places, and explore unfamiliar people, animals as well as landscapes.326 This attitude informed Georg von Ehingen’s decision to make a detour on his journey to the Holy Land (1456) to visit the site near Beirut where St George allegedly had slain the dragon.327 The well-travelled aristocrat described this journey in his autobiography **Reisen nach der Ritterschaft** (late fifteenth century) that is a summary of Georg von Ehingen’s chivalric deeds. Hence this visit was not only motivated by Georg’s worship for his patron saint, he also wanted to experience the site where the model of the European aristocracy performed the quintessential chivalric deed. Curiositas and the demonstration of knightly virtues must have also motivated Duke William III of Saxony to harpoon a dolphin from aboard the ship that took him to the Holy Land in 1461.328 Less piety than curiosity drove Daniel van der Merwede and Friedrich von Kreisbach to travel from the Holy Land onto India where they visited the alleged tomb of the Apostle Thomas. Their journey resembles Sir John Mandeville’s itinerary. Mandeville documented his voyage to the Holy Land and his legendary expedition into the Far East in a manuscript, which became one of the most widely disseminated literary works of the Middle Ages.329 For instance, the collection of travel reports, compiled by the ducal treasurer Matthäus Prätzl in Munich, contained a copy of Mandeville’s report.330

---


326 Heidlore Böcker, 'Reise', in Werner Paravicini, Jan Hirschbiegel, and Jörg Wettlaufer (eds.), *Höfe und Residenzen im spätmittelalterlichen Reich. Bilder und Begriffe* (Residenzforschung, 15.II - Teilband 1 - Begriffe; Ostfildern: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 2005), 133-139. p. 137


328 Böcker, 'Reise', p. 137


330 Randall Herz listed all the travel reports, contained in Prätzl’s collection. Refer to Herz, *Die 'Reise ins Gelobte Land'* , p. 257
Accounts of pilgrimages and travel reports like Hans Tucher’s *Die Reise ins Gelobte Land* (1482) became a popular literary genre in the second half of the fifteenth century. Tucher’s publication became an instant success in the 1480s that was only matched by Bernhard von Breydenbach’s ‘Peregrinatio in terram sanctam’ (1486). For example, the Augustinian canon Paul Sewer of Indersdorf produced a hand-written copy of Tucher’s report for Duke Sigmund of Bavaria-Munich in 1489 (Cgm 24, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich). According to Johann Kamann, the success of *Die Reise ins Gelobte Land* was a result of its topicality, because Tucher was an attentive, diligent observer who precisely studied and described the natural world, its peculiarities, the strange people and cultures that he encountered.

These publications not only aided devotion and religious meditation, they provided a glimpse of these distant lands with their strange people, customs, architecture and creatures. This tendency is exemplified by those pilgrimage reports that shifted their focus away from descriptions of the acts of worship at the pilgrimage sites and instead contained longer, more detailed descriptions of the places, people and events that the authors experienced on their journeys. For instance, Hans Tucher measured the dimensions of the burial chamber in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and paced out the Stations of the Cross, which he supplemented with a map of the stations of Christ’s journey to Mount Calvary. In 1458 an artist accompanied the English cleric John Tiptoff to the Holy Land to satisfy his audience’s interest in these exotic locations.

Likewise the German cleric Bernhard von Breydenbach asked Erhard Reuwich of Utrecht to join him on his voyage to Jerusalem in 1483/84 to document the sacred sites, towns, countries and their peoples as well as the fauna and flora. Likewise Lucas Cranach, from 1505 Frederick the Wise’s court painter in Wittenberg, and the painter Johann Cuntz travelled with the Elector of Saxony to the Holy Land in 1493. Werner Paravicini considered Tiptoff’s notion of hiring an artist for the visual documentation of his journey as comparable to the studies of the natural scientists from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries. This evaluation is especially true with regard to Erhard Reuwich who accompanied Bernhard von Breydenbach in 1483/84. Reuwich’s sketches, which he produced in situ for creating the woodcut illustrations of Breydenbach’s text in ‘Peregrinatio in terram sanctum’ (1486) upon his return, are very detailed and naturalistic. (Plate 74 and Plate 75) Artists and printmakers appreciated
the authentically, graphically rendered scenes for their directness and immediacy in conveying information. Hence the illustrations of Hartmann Schedel’s Liber Chronicarum (1493) were modelled on Reuwich’s depictions. Reuwich’s woodcuts were not only appreciated by his contemporaries, the Italian painter Carpaccio modelled buildings like the Dome of the Rock and the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in The Sermon of Saint Stephen from his cycle of the life of Saint Stephen (1511-1520) on the architecture in Reuwich’s large View of Jerusalem and the Holy Land as observed by David Marshall.

Aristocrats like Duke Frederick of Austria (1436, later Emperor Frederick III), Duke Christoph of Bavaria-Munich (1493)—a member of the retinue of Frederick the Wise—as well as Count Palatine Ottheinrich of the Rhine (1521) aimed to achieve knightly honour (honor, gloria) with their travel reports.

‘Pilgrimages’ to Jerusalem were very popular with aristocrats like Christoph of Bavaria-Munich and patricians such as Hans Tucher in the fifteenth century. Their experiences abroad (the journeys are comparable to educational holidays), the efforts of a journey to these distant lands with the sacred Christian sites and the physical absence from courts were further important aspects of these travels from which aristocrats derived prestige, honour and magnificence. The dubbing at the Holy Sepulchre conferred great honour on the recipients. For instance, Albert the Fair of Hohenzollern who visited Jerusalem circa 1340 considered that the dubbing at the Tomb of Christ crowned his knightly rank. Hence their accounts served as means for edification, entertainment and the creation of prestige. This notion must have motivated Christoph of Bavaria-Munich to write a guidebook for princely pilgrims to the Holy Land after the return from his pilgrimage in 1493. Hans Schneider (c. 1450 – c. 1513/14) was employed by Christoph as a bard of medieval lyric poetry from 1488 until 1493 and accompanied his lord on this pilgrimage. The journey was documented in the so-called Pilgrimsbuch that used to be stored in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich but has been lost. It is not known whether Schneider made his own notes or used Christoph’s records and completed Christoph’s project respectively. The latter assumption appears plausible as Schneider dedicated his book to his late patron.

---

340 Schneider, ‘Einleitung’. p. 5-6
343 John Richards, ‘Sir Oliver de Ingham (d. 1344) and the foundation of the Trinitarian priory at Ingham, Norfolk’, Church Monuments, XXI (2006), 34-57. p. 39; Böcker, ‘Reise’. p. 137; Paravicini, ‘Von der Heidenfahrt zur Kavalierstour’. p. 92 & 99-111
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The ideal aristocrat: chivalrous and erudite

Princes like Duke Louis IX of Bavaria-Landshut and Elector Frederick III the Wise of Saxony founded academic institutions like the universities in Ingolstadt (1473) and Wittenberg (1502).\(^{347}\) In the fifteenth century erudition became a desirable quality of princes and a status symbol of the aristocracy.\(^{348}\) In due course, an academic education was not limited to those aristocrats who were intended to pursue an ecclesiastic career, and their peers did not frown upon learned aristocrats. On the contrary, the princely government in the late Middle Ages and the early modern era put more emphasis on the written documentation of administration business and consisted of secular as well as ecclesiastic councilors and chancellors that required princes to receive an education preparing them for their duties.\(^{349}\) In the fifteenth century the first princes began to attend universities. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries knightly academies (‘Ritterakademien’) provided a welcome alternative to universities for they combined an academic curriculum with an introduction to court culture and the skills that were required by their rank like etiquette, dancing, fencing and riding. Aside from courts, knightly academies and universities became loci for social interaction where kinships could be established. Nevertheless princes also learned practical skills at universities (i.e. mostly a knowledge of the law) that were required for governing and overseeing their courts’ administrations.\(^{350}\)

Duke Albrecht III of Bavaria-Munich, who received part of his education at the court in Prague, intended to extend his sons’ knowledge beyond an exclusively chivalrous upbringing. For this reason Ulrich Greimold was employed as teacher for the princes by the ducal court in Munich from 1452. Greimold was a theologian who was closely affiliated with the abbey at Tegernsee and had been educated at the University of Vienna. He taught all five sons of Albrecht III basic reading, writing and arithmetic skills. They were introduced to the fundamentals of Latin grammar and language. Two of Greimold’s collections of manuscripts, still preserved in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich (Clm 19651 and Cgm 739), provide an insight into the princes’ curriculum. The manuscripts in the Clm 19651 collection were employed to practise Latin with the princes. It contains texts like the Cato (‘Distichs of Cato’ or rather ‘Catonis Disticha’). An anonymous author of the third or fourth century AD who
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\(^{347}\) For an illustration of the founder’s charter of the university at Ingolstadt refer to Niehoff (ed.), Vor Leinberger. p. 19


was named Dionysius Cato wrote this popular medieval schoolbook for studies of Latin. The Distichs of Cato contained a collection of Latin proverbs on morality and wisdom. The princes also practised the Cisiojanus—twenty-four hexametrical verses with a syllable for each fixed holiday in the year—to memorize the most important feasts and religious holidays. Clm 19651 also contains excerpts of Giles of Rome’s ‘Liber de regimine principum’, Johannes Damascenus’s ‘Barlaam et Josephat’ and the Pseudo-Catonic Disticha. The focus of Greimold’s other collection of manuscripts (Cgm 739) was placed on mathematic-astronomic texts and computus mnemonics. For example, it contained German language instructions of arithmetic, which put emphasis on fractions.\textsuperscript{351}

The princes’ education was not exceptional for highborn members of the aristocracy in the second half of the fifteenth century. Their relatives the electors of the Palatinate put great attention on the erudition of their male progenies. They employed humanists like Conrad Celtis and Johannes Reuchlin as teachers who instructed the princes in Latin and Greek. In the sixteenth century some of the prospective electors of the Palatinate attended the university in Heidelberg.\textsuperscript{352} Likewise, the humanist Johannes Aventinus (Johannes Turmair von Abensberg, 1477-1534), a well-known scholar and historian at the court of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich taught Louis X and Ernst of Bavaria, the sons of Albrecht IV. Duke Ernst (1500-1560) made educational journeys to Italy, France and Saxony. In 1515 he was matriculated at the university in Ingolstadt.\textsuperscript{353}

All of Albrecht III’s sons received the same education at the court in Munich. Yet they have not been regarded as equally learned. Christoph has been characterised as a courageous, impulsive knight who gained honour in tournaments and on battlefields, whereas Albrecht IV has been portrayed as a well-educated, almost Machiavellian ruler who attended the universities in Pavia, Perugia and Siena.\textsuperscript{354} This conception is reflected in Albrecht IV’s epithet ‘the Wise’ but it has not been completely appropriate.

Even in recent scholarly publications education and chivalry are regarded as a dichotomy. This conception was expressed in Maren Gottschalk’s interpretation of Dr Peter Paumgartner’s characterisations of Albrecht IV and his brother Christoph, which are found in Paumgartner’s addendum to Ulrich Füetrer’s chronicle of Bavaria.\textsuperscript{355} Paumgartner described Albrecht IV as an upright lord with a beautiful countenance,
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build and personality who was highly regarded by his subjects for his great reason, fair nature and conscientious execution of government. He was a diligent ruler who had to face much opposition from peers like his brother Christoph and the Alliance of the Unicorn (Böckler Bund) as implied by Paumgartner. Veit Arnpeck accentuated this characterisation of Albrecht IV as an erudite and intelligent ruler. He described the duke as a well-educated, prudent and wise prince who was knowledgeable of Latin and Italian.

Historians like Maren Gottschalk and Andreas Kraus construed the portrayals of Albrecht IV by Paumgartner and Arnpeck as indication for the genesis of a novel type of ruler (‘neuer Fürstentyp’) who was brought up to become a scholar and had a knowledge of jurisprudence. In their opinions, Albrecht IV’s decisions were guided by reason and he did not have a penchant for chivalrous pastimes. This attitude designates Albrecht IV as an example of the early modern sovereign.

Füetrer’s characterisation of Duke Christoph presented an opposite to this platitudinous conception of Albrecht IV and his government, because Füetrer described Christoph as an affable, gregarious, well-mannered, lenient and bold knight who excelled in combat, jousting and wrestling. Since Füetrer’s portrayal of Christoph mentioned his success in tournaments and on the battlefield, Christoph was understood to symbolize the outdated, waning and retrospective chivalric spirit; whereas Albrecht IV epitomises the new, enlightened ruler who represented the future with his intellectual superiority. In these scholars’ understanding the two brothers personified two differing types of aristocrats as well as two incompatible attitudes and lifestyles.

However it should be remembered that Christoph intended to write a guidebook for princely pilgrims to the Holy Land after the return from his pilgrimage in 1493. When taking this facet of Duke Christoph’s abilities and personality into account, it becomes apparent that he was not only a skilled and renowned knight but he had received an education which enabled him to pursue such a project. It also demonstrates that he was aware of the potential of pilgrimage reports for furthering his reputation.
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356 ‘This Duke Albrecht [IV] was from his countenance, body, build and personality a very beautiful and upright lord and highly regarded by the people and with great reason, a fair nature and a serious ruler, but his whole life a diligent man, who had to face opposition of which a entire book could be written.’ – ‘Dyser Hertzog Albrecht [IV] war von angesicht, leib, gestalt und persona in gar hübscher und ghrader herr und von den leutten berüembt und zuvor hocher vernunft, ains recht thainden wesen und ain ernstlicher herrscher, aber sein leben lang ain müesäliger mensch, dem vil widerbärigkeit zuestuend, davon ain ganz puech zu schreiben wär.’ – Füetrer, Bayerische Chronik. p. 222

357 ‘Albrechten [IV], Herzog in Obern- und Niderenbairn, wolgelert der lateinischen und wälschen sprach, weis und fürsichtig.’ – Arnpeck, Sämtliche Chroniken. p. 673

358 Gottschalk, Geschichtsschreibung. p. 206; Kraus, Sammlung der Kräfte und Aufschwung (1450-1508). p. 292

359 ‘Then Duke Christoph had the audacity to wage war on Duke Albrecht [IV], as he was an eager, bold prince, who had an upright build and he was very adroit, pleasant, well-mannered, lenient, gregarious on every occasion; [he spent his time] with wrestling, jumping, jousting, [horse] racing and due to his chivalry he skilfully [fought] at the vanguard on the battlefield and was praised so that his story was known.’ – ‘Da understuend sich hertzog Cristoff mit hertzog Albrechten zu kriejen, wan es ain Turstiger, kecker fürst, von leib ghrad und aller glegenheit gantz wol geschiht, holdsalig, wol erpiettend, seiner handt milt, gsellig, mit ringen, springen, Stechen, reuen und im veld ritterlich gestatten vor andern kündet, geschiht und gepreist was, als das seine geschiht weisen.’ – Füetrer, Bayerische Chronik. p. 223

Albrecht IV’s chivalry as expression of his authority

Tournaments continued to be a popular aspect of court festivities in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. It presented good opportunities for aristocrats to demonstrate their prowess. Several jousts were held in Landshut as part of the wedding celebrations of Duke George of Bavaria-Landshut and Jadwiga Jagiellon. Albrecht IV and his brother Christoph partook in the jousts. The contemporary observers noted that Christoph was a particularly daring knight who dislodged a Polish nobleman with his lance in a swift attack.361

Even though historians like Gottschalk and Kraus portrayed Albrecht IV as disinclined to the chivalric lifestyle and the pastimes of knights, several tournaments were held in Munich during his reign, as recorded in the ledgers of Munich’s town council. The expenses for the preparation of Munich’s market square for tourneys (i.e. covering the cobblestones with moss and brushwood refuse, as well as the erection of barriers) and the entertainment of guests demonstrate that tournaments were regularly organised in Munich. For instance, guests from Augsburg and Ulm attended the tournament in January 1467.362 Pipers provided music for the dances and entertainment. One of the two tourneys, which took place in 1470, was organised by the ducal court as documented in the records of the town council.363 Further tournaments were held in March 1476, February 1477, June 1478, February 1482, February 1485, in September 1485 (attended by Duke George of Bavaria-Landshut and Otto II von Neumarkt), in September 1492, November 1494, February 1499 and March 1500 (King Maximilian participated in this tourney).364

These tilts were supported by the ducal court as Ulrich Füetrer received payments in 1486 and 1487 from the ducal court for eighty-nine heraldic shields to be used at tournaments in Munich.365 The tourney of 1470, attended by Louis IX and George of Bavaria-Landshut as well as Count Palatine Otto von Neumarkt,366 was also organised by Albrecht IV’s court. Another example for the ducal court’s involvement in tournaments is the carnival tourney of 1500. On 3rd March 1500 King Maximilian I rode from Augsburg, where he stayed for an imperial diet, to Munich in order to participate in the jousting that took place in the Alte Hof according to the records of Munich’s town council.367

362 Records transcribed in Stahleder, Chronik der Stadt München. Herzogs- und Bürgerstadt. p. 408
363 Records transcribed in Ibid. p. 429
365 Hartig, Münchner Künstler und Kunstsachen (Vol. 1). p. 14
366 Stahleder, Chronik der Stadt München. Herzogs- und Bürgerstadt. p. 429
Albrecht IV used events like the wedding of George of Bavaria-Landshut with Jadwiga Jagiellon to demonstrate his skills as dextrous knight. Not only Duke Christoph excelled in the jousts of the wedding festivities at Landshut, because Hans Seyboldt and Hansen Eringer recounted that Albrecht IV had remained horse-mounted in the joust against Frederick of Brandenburg, which certainly was not common when compared with the two observers’ descriptions of the other jousts.  

Albrecht IV’s chivalry was also expressed in works of art. He commissioned Matthäus Zasinger with the visual documentation of the culture at his court. Zasinger’s two engravings (dated 1500) depict courtiers in a hall of the Alte Hof with Albrecht IV and his wife Kunigunde of Austria seated in a bay window as well as a tourney staged on Munich’s market square where Albrecht IV and Kunigunde observed from a balcony in the centre of the print. (Plate 14) Zasinger’s Tourney possibly represents a combination of reality (i.e. the fountain on the right side of the market square is documented since 1467) and an idealised townscape. It is documented that members of the ducal court watched tourneys from the town hall. For example, records of 24th February 1454 and 7th December 1454 mention that Duchess Anna of Brunswick, the wife of Albrecht III of Bavaria-Munich, and her entourage observed tournaments from the councillors’ drinking room (Ratstrinkstube) of the town hall. It can be assumed that Albrecht IV and Kunigunde continued this custom. Hence the depiction of Albrecht IV and Kunigunde on the balcony of the house in the middle of the scene probably has a realistic background.

The spectators’ interest in tournaments might have been one of the reasons for the construction of the oriel on the courtyard façade of the Alte Hof’s Burgstock. It provided an ideal platform, awarding beholders with views across the courtyard where the tournament of 1500 took place. (Plate 18 and Plate 22)

Zasinger’s prints were intended to convey a specific public conception of Albrecht IV’s court by presenting aspects of its activities. Then engravings that could be reproduced in great numbers were ideally suited to this purpose since they could be presented to relatives, diplomats, noble guests and peers. These ‘propagandist’ endeavours of Albrecht IV should be considered with regard to the strategies of Maximilian I who employ chivalry as means of self-aggrandizement, which found expression in the Theuerdank and Weißkunig. Maximilian I commissioned these works from 1505 to celebrate his life and flaunt his chivalrous virtues. Albrecht IV also desired to present himself as a virtuous knight who mastered the skills and manners that were required of a prince and ruler in the late Middle Ages and early modern era. Hence Ulrich Füetrer wrote the Buch der Abenteuer (Book of Adventures; Cgm 1, Bayerische
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Staatsbibliothek, Munich) for his lord between 1473 and 1484/87. It belongs to the category of late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century literature that was termed ‘Ritterrenaissance’ (chivalric renaissance), because these works referred to the high medieval Arthurian and Grail’s novels.

In contrast to Füetrer’s *Buch der Abenteuer*, the literature created in the sphere of the court of Maximilian I (i.e. the *Weißkunig, Theuerdank* and *Freydal*) only indirectly refers to the ideologies of their high medieval paragons. Yet Füetrer’s *Buch der Abenteuer* by presenting an ideal courtly value system and chivalric role models glorifies its patron in a manner that is comparable to the *Weißkunig, Theuerdank* and especially the *Freydal* that describe the life and festivities at the court of Maximilian I. For example, Füetrer implicitly praised Albrecht IV with the metaphor of the invincible knight in the Persibein. In this narrative a prince faces serious opposition but survived every fight without being wounded. This passage might have been intended as an allusion to the contemporary political circumstances as Albrecht IV was involved into disputes and military conflicts with opponents like the Alliance of the Unicorn (Böckler Bund). The *Buch der Abenteuer* like Füetrer’s *Bairische Chronik*, which created a continuous line of Bavarian rulers from the founding father Bavarus to Füetrer’s present, bases the legitimation of Albrecht IV’s government on his descent. At once the *Buch der Abenteuer* commemorates Albrecht IV’s real and legendary ancestors. Thus, in Bettina Wagner’s view, it had a similar purpose (‘gedächtnus’) as the works commissioned by Emperor Maximilian I who probably received a copy of the *Buch der Abenteuer* from his brother-in-law and competitor, which is now kept in the Austrian National Library in Vienna (Cod. 3037-38).

Evidently, Albrecht IV constructed his public image as a chivalrous, unflinching, well-mannered knight and ruler, which is reflected in the depiction of the duke on the wing of the high altarpiece of the Franciscans’ Church of St Antonius. Jan Polack showed Albrecht IV wearing armour. Albrecht IV’s success in tournaments presented an intelligible message to his adversaries like the Alliance of the Unicorn (Böckler Bund). This awareness of the potency of emblems that conveyed a public persona is also reflected in the actions with which Albrecht IV responded to the vilification campaigns of his opponents. For example, Geowolf von Degenberg disparagingly referred to Albrecht IV as ‘scolar et scriptor’. Consequently the angry duke instigated the destruction of Geowolf’s castles in November 1468 and January
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Thereby he deprived his foe of the most prestigious identity-creating emblem of the knightly aristocracy.

The significance of these attributes for the public persona of princes in the late Middle Ages and the early modern era is also reflected in the iconography of the *Triumphal Arch* (dated 1515), conceived by Albrecht Dürer for Emperor Maximilian I. (Plate 141) The scenes on the towers that flank the triumphal arch commend Emperor Maximilian I—as aside from his triumphs on the battlefield and his political marriage bonds—as hunter, jouster, master of the artillery, prospective crusader and pious Christian. They are the exemplary ideals that were expected of contemporary rulers. These qualities could be demonstrated at court hunts and tournaments. The foundation of orders of knights like the Order of St Hieronymus in Meissen by the electors of Saxony (1450) and the Order of St George by Emperor Frederick III (1469) reflects the importance of chivalry as a central aspect of social interaction. Correspondingly, Albrecht IV established the Company of St George at the altar of St Anne in the Church of Our Lady in Munich (1496). This reading is substantiated by Marina Belozerskaya’s study *Rethinking the Renaissance* (2002), observing that ‘chivalry remained vital to political and military organization throughout Europe. The presence of countless chivalric romances in courtly libraries, the subject matter of tapestries and fresco cycles decorating European palaces, and the tournaments staged at numerous courts, including Italian ones, make clear that classical humanism was not the exclusive preoccupation or priority of aristocratic circles’. Nevertheless, the concept of chivalry, which had been considered as outdated and backward-looking in view of Johan Huizinga’s refuted interpretation, did not conflict with erudition in Albrecht IV’s lifetime as attested by the emergence of knightly academies. In fact, Albrecht IV’s education was not unusual of a prince in the second half of the fifteenth century.
Duke Sigmund of Bavaria-Munch: a new, erudite type of aristocrat?

Sigmund’s participation in tournaments is not documented unlike that of Albrecht IV and Christoph. Although Sigmund was an avid hunter and records mention his participation in crossbow shooting competitions (i.e. in 17th May 1467), he did not have a penchant for this aspect of the aristocratic lifestyle. According to Sigmund’s testament of 1485, he apparently did not own armour and jousting equipment as it only lists carts, horses, bridles, hunting equipment, nets and dogs, which he intended to bequeath to his brother Albrecht IV. Neither Albrecht IV nor Sigmund’s sons or younger brothers received jousting equipment as specified in this testament, because he might not have possessed such an outfit at this time.

This disinclination toward participation in tournaments is probably reflected in Sigmund’s portrait on the exterior panel of Jan Polack’s high altarpiece (1491/92) in Blutenburg Palace Chapel. (Plate 105) Unlike Albrecht IV who is shown wearing armour on Jan Polack’s high altarpiece for the Church of St Antonius (c. 1491/92, Plate 132), Sigmund does not wear armour on the high altarpiece of Blutenburg Palace Chapel that was created concurrently.

In comparison with Albrecht IV and Christoph, Sigmund apparently had a different notion of his public perception and therefore pursued divergent strategies, which was made possible by his retirement as ruling duke and passing the authority over the Duchy of Bavaria-Munich on to Albrecht IV. Subsequently Sigmund became know for his artistic, architectural and religious patronage. The slight differentiation of the public personae of the reigning duke and some of his brother—in this instance Albrecht IV and Sigmund—is echoed by the education and roles of Albrecht IV’s sons. Master Johannes Müller was responsible for William IV’s schooling till the age of fifteen. His education focussed on those qualities that were expected of the prospective ruler of the Duchy of Bavaria. Therefore he received mostly a chivalric education and participated in thirty-one tourneys between 1510 and 1518, which he had documented by the painter Ostendorfer who created a book with depictions of the tournament. His younger brothers received their tuition from the humanist Johannes Aventinus, who taught Louis X until 1511 and Ernst till 1517. The different accents of the education of William IV, Louis X and Ernst have two reasons. On the one hand, Louis X and Ernst were designated for ecclesiastic careers. Louis X accomplished a participation in ducal government, although he obeyed to William IV’s authority and supported his political
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agenda. Ernst became the administrator of the Passau diocese in 1518. He held this position till 1540. On the other hand, Louis X and Ernst—like Duke Sigmund—were not actively involved in ducal government. Whereas William IV—like Albrecht IV—acted as reigning dukes and thus had to publicly represent the government of the Duchy of Bavaria. The dukes’ different roles required divergent public personae. They enabled Sigmund and Louis X to pursue less established and popular strategies in their artistic and architectural patronage. For example, Louis X modelled his urban palace in Landshut on the Palazzo del Tè in Mantua. Its Italian wing is the first Renaissance palace on German soil. Likewise, Sigmund commissioned the following works of art that did not necessarily accommodate prevailing local conventions.

The commemoration plaques outside the dukes’ portal of the Church of Our Lady

Sigmund left an impressive monument, attesting to his piety, cultural patronage and learning. To this day one of the two red marble plaques outside the dukes’ portal, which functioned as the Church of Our Lady’s main portal in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, honours Duke Sigmund’s auspices of the new Late Gothic building’s construction. (Plate 63) Hans Haldner’s workshop probably created these plaques that commemorate the laying of the foundation stone and the beginning of the building work. (Plate 64 and Plate 65)

The inscription on the smaller one of the two plates, measuring 1.35 by 0.85 metres and situated on the left-hand side of the portal, is written in minuscule and provides the date of the construction’s inception: ‘Anno Domini MCCCC, in the LXVIII year [1468] construction commenced on the eighth day after the holiday of Our Lady on Candlemas [9th February]’.
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391 Epigraphs are powerful means for communicating information to present and prospective audiences in a public sphere. For a summary of this topic refer to Detlev Kraack, ‘Inschriften’, in Werner Paravicini, Jan Hirschbiegel, and Jörg Wettlaufer (eds.), Höfe und Residenzen im spätmittelalterlichen Reich. Bilder und Begriffe (Residenzforschung, 15.II - Teilband 1 - Begriffe; Ostfildern: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 2005), 294-296. p. 294-295
392 The dukes’ portal, today commonly referred to as the brides’ portal (Brautportal), was used by the Dukes of Bavaria-Munich for their ceremonial entries into the Church of Our Lady. They also encouraged the custom that priests received the bride and groom at this portal. There the couples had to confirm their intention to enter into matrimony and their wedding rings were consecrated before they were led into the church for the mass. For example Duke William V escorted his bride Renata of Lorraine through this portal into the church for their marriage ceremony, which was documented by Nikolaus Solis with watercolours (1568). Refer to Morsak, Zur Rechts- und Sakralkultur Bayerischer Pfalzkapellen und Hofkirchen. p. 144
395 ‘An° dñi m cccc vñ / Im lxviii iar ist d’ / paw angefangen / acht tag nach vns/er lieben frauen / tag zw liechtmess’.
The larger plaque (2.25 by 1.31 metres), located on the right-hand side of the dukes’ portal, was created after February 1468 and probably before the consecration of the church. (Plate 65) Most probable it was made to celebrate the completion of the dukes’ portal in the 1470s. The pictorial relief occupies the upper third of the marble plate. It depicts Duke Sigmund between the coat-of-arms of the Bavarian dukes and the enthroned Virgin Mary. Sigmund kneels in front of the Virgin in prayer. The duke’s Miserere (‘Virgin Mother of Christ show compassion with me’) is inscribed on a banner above the duke’s head. Unconventionally Sigmund rather than the Virgin Mary, the subject of his adoration and the Church of Our Lady’s patron saint, is prominently placed in the centre of the composition. This conception clearly reflects that Sigmund perceived his patronage as more important than the act of dedicating the building to the Virgin. This exceptional notion becomes particularly apparent when compared with the donor relief from the Chapel of St Laurence in the Alte Hof (c. 1324) and the memorial plaque (1492), which commemorates the completion of the Kesselberg Pass roadwork between Walchensee and Kochelsee.

The composition of the relief from St Laurence places the Virgin Mary with the Christ Child in the centre between Margaret of Holland and Louis the Bavarian. (Plate 30) Margaret presents the church building to the Virgin Mary and Christ Child while the emperor kneels on the right side in prayer. The memorial plaque of the Kesselberg Pass features a similar composition. (Plate 123) It was commissioned by Duke Albrecht IV and was displayed on a rock face along the pass. The pictorial scene which occupies approximately the top third of the red marble plate shows the crucified Christ flanked by Albrecht IV and his wife Kunigunde of Austria as well as their respective coats-of-arms. This plaque is a commission of the ducal court that is near contemporary with Sigmund’s plaque outside the dukes’ portal. Nevertheless the pictorial scene of the Kesselberg plaque employs a more conventional and probably more ‘appropriate’ composition than the relief outside the dukes’ portal of the Church of Our Lady.

In contrast to the memorial plaque from the Kesselberg Pass that incorporates a German inscription, Sigmund’s plaque outside the dukes’ portal features a Latin epigraph below the pictorial relief. The plaque’s Latin elegy was written either by Sigmund, a court poet like Hans Schneider, one of the schoolmasters of Munich’s Latin
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396 Altmann, 'Die spätgotische Bauphase der Frauenkirche'. p. 2
397 Peter Pfister, 'Blick in die Geschichte', in Peter Pfister and Hans Ramisch (eds.), Der Dom zu Unserer Lieben Frau in München. Geschichte - Beschreibung (4th edn.; Munich: Erich Wewel Verlag, 1994), 11-50. p. 26-27; Altmann, 'Die spätgotische Bauphase der Frauenkirche'. p. 16; Stahleder, Chronik der Stadt München. Die Jahre 1157-1505. p. 445-446. Traditionally 14th April 1494 has been held as the day of the consecration of the Church of Our Lady. However Altmann and Stahleder doubted the correctness of this date and the accuracy of the source from which it had been derived. According to Stahleder the date stemmed from a handwritten note in a calendar that belonged to a cleric. Altmann and Stahleder believed that 14th April 1494 would have been a very late date for the consecration of the church, as the high altar was apparently consecrated by 1473. This evaluation is further supported by an examination of the history of the construction of the Church of Our Lady. In Altmann’s view the fact that the consecration of the Church of Our Lady was traditionally celebrated on the second Sunday after Michaelmas until the nineteenth century, supported his interpretation.
398 ‘Virgo parens cristi tu miserere mei’.
399 Bauer, Geschichte Münchens. p. 43. Also mentioned by Bastert, Der Münchner Hof und Fueterers 'Buch der Abenteuer'. p. 135 as an example of the close ties between ducal court and patricians, because Heinrich Bart built the Kesselberg pass by order of Duke Albrecht IV. It is only one of the several joint entrepreneurial endeavours of dukes and patricians.
schools or his half-brother Dr Johannes Neuhauser.\footnote{Dr Johannes Neuhauser is the illegitimate son of Duke Albrecht III and a female member of the Ligsalz family (an eminent patrician dynasty in Munich). In 1460 Neuhauser was born on a ducal estate in Neuhausen. He was a member of the chapter of Regensburg Cathedral. Under Duke Albrecht IV Neuhauser became a councillor at the ducal court and the provost of the collegiate foundation (Kollegiatstift) at the Church of Our Lady, which Albrecht IV had established in 1492. Neuhauser exerted decisive influence on the ducal policies and eventually became the ducal chancellor, the highest office at the court in Munich. After the death of Albrecht IV in 1508 Neuhauser was one of the guardians of Duke William IV and remained the leading head of ducal government at least until 1512. He died on 26th January 1516. A memorial plaque in the Church of Our Lady, now located outside the former sacristy, features a Latin text. Refer to Pfister, ‘Blick in die Geschichte’. p. 30-31} This early humanist \footnote{Wilfried Stroh, 'Lateinstadt München', <http://www.klassphil.uni-muenchen.de/~stroh/lateinstadtmuenchen.pdf>, accessed 24 March 2006. p. 3-5} elegy in Distichen verses\footnote{German, plural. Latin: distichon. A pair of verses consisting of one hexameter verse and one pentameter verse.} occupies two thirds of the marble plate’s surface. Therefore it was intended as a very prominent element of the plaque and because of its size was meant to be perceived as such by beholders.

The inscription on Sigmund’s plaque praises the Bavarian duke and titular Count Palatine of the Rhine for his involvement in the construction of the new Late Gothic Church of Our Lady.\footnote{‘Clam fortuna ruit fragili pede tempus et hora | Nostraq’ sunt semper facta dolenda nimis | Ecce Sigismúdus princeps serenissim’ orbis | Bawarie Reni duxq’ comesq’ diu | Huic animi pietas virtus prudentia summa | Alma deo comples votaq’ digna pie | Virginis excelse templü dum construui cernit | Saxum fert primü letus honore Dei | Cristo dum libeat domus hec sibi cógrua busto est | Cui corpus confert ossaq’ cücta fauet | Spiritus astra colat volitans ad littora pacis | Lumíe sic divo vita perennis erit | Anno milleno quadringent’ sexaq’ geno | Octauo dom[mi] sicq’ nono febro | Epigramma illustissimi principis et d’d’ | Sigisudí anno etat’ sue 29. Smd.’ – ‘The frail fortune escapes unnoticed, time and hours pass by. Our deeds are always transient. Behold Sigmund, the serene ruler of the land | for a long time duke of Bavaria and of [Palatinate of] the Rhine. | In his heart the virtue of kindness, courage and wisdom. | For his kind Lord, he courteously and piously fulfils his vows | erects a church of the highest splendour for the Virgin | he lays the first stone for the glorification of the Lord. | God willing, this church will be an appropriate tomb | where his body and all of his the bones will rest in peace. | The soul lives in stars (heaven), hastening to the shores of peace. | In this divine light his life shall be eternal. | In the year of the Lord one thousand four hundred sixty eight [1468] | on the 9th February | epigram of the illustrious Prince and Master | Sigmund in the twenty-ninth year of his life.’ — Recently Wilfried Stroh initiated a debate about the translation of ‘dum construui cernit’ and thus Sigmund’s conception of his involvement in the building project. He interpreted this passage’s meaning as follows: Duke Sigmund noticed that the erection of a new building had been decided. This means, Sigmund did not initiate this building project. For more information on Wilfried Stroh’s discussion of this early Humanist epigram refer to a copy of his lecture of 17th November 2005: Stroh, 'Lateinstadt München', p. 4} It highlights that Sigmund laid the foundation stone on 9th February 1468 and pledged several donations as well as ecclesiastical foundations. Thereby the epigraph recognizes Sigmund as the building’s patron and glosses over the role of the parish as well as Munich’s burghers who had to bear the majority of the project’s costs. The inscription also demonstrates that Sigmund intended the new building as his burial site unlike his father Albrecht III and older brother John IV whose corpses were laid to rest in the Benedictine Abbey church at Andechs. Hence the new Late Gothic building again functioned as the tomb of the Wittelsbach dynasty as which it had been intended by Louis the Bavarian.

An examination of Sigmund’s plaque outside the dukes’ portal of the Church of Our Lady has to consider at least two forerunners that possibly served as models. On the one hand, the donor relief from the nave of the Alte Hof’s Chapel of St Laurence (c. 1324)
must have inspired Sigmund. (Plate 30) On the other hand, he might have drawn inspiration from the plaques commissioned by Louis VII of Bavaria-Ingolstadt. (Plate 124)

The donor relief of the Chapel of St Laurence is part of the few surviving sculptural decorations of St Laurence that are now exhibited in the Bayerisches Nationalmuseum in Munich. The imperial eagle on one of the keystones, the coat-of-arms of the Bavarian dukes, carried by two angles and originally located over the portal of St Laurence, and the relief commemorate Louis the Bavarian and his second wife Margaret of Holland as patrons of this construction project. (Plate 29, Plate 30 and Plate 31) Only the year is inscribed on this relief. It indicates either the date of the foundation of Louis and Margaret or the inception of the building work.404

Novel ideas were introduced to Munich from the court of Duke Louis VII of Bavaria-Ingolstadt. Louis VII was an arbiter for the fashions and taste of the royal court in France where he had stayed from 1391 until 1393 as well as between 1402 and 1415. There Louis VII absorbed the customs, the culture, the architectural and artistic taste of the French royal court, which he imitated in his architectural and artistic projects in Ingolstadt. For this reason, his court in Ingolstadt provided a paradigm for the dukes of the other Bavarian territories.405

The assumed eminence of Louis VII found expression in a series of plaques whose inscriptions celebrate him as the French Queen’s brother (‘künigin von Frannkchreich prueder’) and acknowledge him as an avid sponsor of various building projects.406 (Plate 124) Sculptors in Ingolstadt ‘mass-produced’ these plaques between 1431 and 1438. They were prominently displayed in Ingolstadt, Rain am Lech, Wasserburg am Inn, Kufstein, Aichach and Lauingen. The plaques do not feature an effigy of Louis VII.407 He is represented as the patron of these plaques by the Bavarian dukes’ coat-of-arms, the references in the epigraph, his emblems, the raven and seated lady of the legend of St Oswald as well as the sun that illustrates his association with the French Order of the Chevaliers du Soleil. Louis VII received his Chevaliers du soleil d’or circa 1390 from King Charles VI of France, who had married his sister Isabeau de Bavière on 17th July 1385 and whom he served at the French royal court from 1391 to 1393 as well as from 1402 until 1415.408

Duke Sigmund merged the intelligible pictorial language of Louis the Bavarian’s relief with the combination of representational symbols and text of Louis VII’s plaque.
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404 Lermer, ‘Stifterrelief aus der Lorenzkapelle im Alten Hof zu München’. p. 57
406 Ziegler, 'Bayern'. p. 758
The pictorial scene addresses a wider audience as beholders who were versed in heraldry and Christian iconography could decipher its message. Louis Morsak observed that in the fifteenth century most subjects were familiar with the Bavarian dukes’ coat-of-arms as a symbol of the sovereignty of the Wittelsbach dukes over the Duchy of Bavaria. In this context the Bavarian dukes’ coat-of-arms with its helm, wreath, crest, mantling and lions as supporters of the shield represents state-related, dynastic aspects. The remaining pictorial programme (i.e. mottos, the adoration of a saint, etc.) refers to a court-related, personal programme. The information conveyed in the text sections of Louis VII and Sigmund’s plaques are only accessible to those beholders who are literate. In the second half of the fifteenth century a fair amount of craftsmen and merchants in addition to patricians, aristocrats and the clergy could read German. Therefore Louis VII chose a German text for his plaques. Likewise Albrecht IV had a German inscription carved on the memorial plaque (1492) at the Kesselberg Pass. From this perspective, the Latin epigraph on Sigmund’s plaque, only addressing a specific educated audience, presents a diversion from the contemporary German inscriptions that were aimed at a larger audience. In this case, the selection of the German vernacular was the obvious choice, because, according to Detlev Kraack, epigraphs tend to comply with the established conventions of their time to address the greatest possible audience in this social communication process.

Firstly, the beholders of Sigmund’s plaque were required to read Latin to comprehend its message. However hardly any citizen of Munich could read and write Latin in the second half of the fifteenth century. Even the members of the town council required the service of Heinrich Grüniger, one of the schoolmasters of the Latin school, for the translation of documents and letters from Latin into German and vice versa. Grüniger also travelled on behalf of the town council to the Italian universities in Bologna, Padua and Pavia for legal consultation as he could speak, read and write Latin and Italian.

By the second half of the fifteenth century, the ability to communicate in Latin had become a token for the erudition of a prince. For example, Veit Arnpeck characterised Duke Albrecht IV as an educated, prudent and wise prince who was knowledgeable of Latin and Italian. Contemporary observers like Andrea de Franceschi appreciatively noted that Emperor Frederick III was knowledgeable of Latin. In contrast Franceschi described the Archbishop of Salzburg as uneducated and unable to communicate in Latin, whereas his suffragan bishop Georg Altdorfer of Chiemsee was well educated and spoke Latin very eloquently in Franceschi’s view.

Sigmund’s choice of a Latin text is even more exceptional when considered in relation to other near contemporary monuments associated with the ducal court (i.e. the Tumba of Louis the Bavarian and the tomb of Duke Louis X of Bavaria in the abbey.
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church at Seligenthal outside Landshut) and the so-called ‘Ritterrenaissance’ of the late fifteenth century, which produced German language literature.

The two inscriptions, surrounding the top plate of Louis the Bavarian’s Tumba in the Church of Our Lady’s choir (c. 1468) feature German texts that state that Louis the Bavarian and other Bavarian dukes like John II, Ernst, William III, Adolf and Albrecht III of Bavaria-Munich were buried there, and that Albrecht IV commissioned the tomb. Even though only a small number of people—the clergy, members of the court and their guests—had access to the choir and saw the tomb it incorporates German texts rather than Latin. (Plate 71) It can be assumed that most of these beholders would have had at least a basic grasp of Latin and thus could read a Latin epitaph.

Louis X was educated by the humanist Johannes Aventinus and was associated with humanists as well as scholars like Dietrich von Plieneningen, Johann Albrecht Widmannstetter as well as the astronomer and mathematician Peter Apian. Yet he chose a German text for the inscription on his Tumba, which was created by Thomas Hering of Eichstätt (circa 1545). Compared with the epigraph on Sigmund’s plaque, for which the sculptor employed a Gothic font, the epitaph of the tomb of Louis X was written in antique-style Roman square capitals that are characteristic of sixteenth-century humanist monuments and were employed by Albrecht Dürer in his prints as well as paintings.

In comparison with these two funerary monuments the tombstone of Dr Johannes Neuhauser († 1516) in the Church of Our Lady, commissioned in the early sixteenth century, features a Latin inscription. Hence the author as well as the audience of the poem on Sigmund’s plaque could also be related to the clergy of the Church of Our Lady’s collegiate foundation (Kollegiatstift). The conjecture of associating this Latin

416 Behringer, Rundgang durch das mittelalterliche München. p. 68
418 The inscription on the tomb of Louis X reads ‘BEGRÖBNVS | DERER AVS DEN DURCHLEICHTIGSTEN CHVRHAVS BAIRN VERSTORBENER ALHIER | BEIGESEZTER DURCHLEICHTIGSTEN PERSONEN. R.I.P.’. The plaque with the inscription on the western side panel of the tomb was created circa 1649 to replace the damaged panel that was destroyed in 1634 by Swedish soldiers. The original inscription read ‘Under disem Stain ligt begraben der durchleicht. hochgeboren Furst und Herr Ludwig Pfalzgraf bey Rhein Herzog in obern vnd nieder bayrn. Starb da man zelt MD 45 den 22 Tag Aprilis. Gott sey der Seel gnedig vnd barmherzig.’ It can be assumed that the text of the original inscription was written in Roman square capitals like the text below Hans Wertinger’s portrait of Duke Louis X (dated 1516, Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, Munich). For more information on the tomb refer to Max Tewes, ‘Grabmahl Herzog Ludwig Ws.’, in Franz Niehoff (ed.), Um Leinberger. Schüler und Zeitgenossen (2nd edn.; Landshut: Museen der Stadt Landshut, 2007), 326-327. p. 326 and Hofmann, ‘Residenz - Grablege - Herrschaftskirche.’ p. 232.
419 The Roman square capitals (Capitalis), inspired by antique Roman epigraphs, became a popular font in the Renaissance. Albrecht Dürer employed it for inscriptions on the portraits of Emperor Maximilian I (1519), Prince Elector Frederick III the Wise of Saxony (1524) and Erasmus of Rotterdam (1526). Dürer’s Triumphal Arch of 1515 features a Gothic font in contrast to its allusion to antique motifs. His Great Triumphal Car (1518) incorporates a Gothic font and the Capitalis. Refer to Kraack, ‘Inschriften’. p. 295 and to Klaus Albrecht Schröder and Maria Luise Sternath (eds.), Albrecht Dürer (Ostfildern-Ruit: Hatje Cantz Verlag, 2003). p. 448-453, 464-475 & 525-529.
poem with ecclesiastic connotations and educated clergymen might be plausible since it presented a counterpoint to the courts’ promotion of the German vernacular in contemporary literature. The medieval minne culture was revived at the ducal court in Munich with Ulrich Füetrer’s works. The *Buch der Abenteuer*, an example of the so-called chivalric renaissance (Ritterrenaissance), was written in German and could also be read by the ladies of the court. According to Heiner Borggrefe, the early humanists did not agree with this development, because they vehemently rejected the vernacular in literature.420

Secondly, beholders of Sigmund’s plaque outside the Church of Our Lady’s dukes’ portal also had to have a good understanding of poetry and had to be aware of the early humanist ethos. In Wilfried Stroh’s view, this late fifteenth-century elegy can be regarded as early humanist, because it demonstrates an awareness of antique literary motifs. The introduction of this poem (‘Clam fortuna ruit fragili pede tempus et hora’) makes reference to the antique motif of the decline of fortune and transition to misfortune that is, for instance, mentioned in Seneca’s *Hercules*.421 Another indication for the elegy’s early humanist ethos is the inept use of the participium ‘complens’ instead of the verbum finitum ‘complet’.422

Wilfried Stroh suggested that the elegy’s early humanist character relates it to the civic Latin school (also referred to as school of poetry), which had been founded by Munich’s town council. In contrast to the ‘German’ schools (‘deutschen’ Pfarrschulen) of Munich’s two parishes the Latin school or rather Poetenschule represented a new type of educational institution. It was a grammar school, haute école or gymnasium illustre where students were taught the curriculum that they required for admission into universities. Schoolmasters like Sigmund Eisenhofer who taught in Munich’s Latin school from 1486 were educated at universities like that in Ingolstadt, founded by Duke Louis IX of Bavaria-Landshut in 1473. Their title ‘schoolmasters of poetry’ or ‘poetae’ indicates a humanist claim. They conceived their work as being based on humanism. Exponents of the novel Renaissance education referred to themselves as ‘poetae’. German scholars later adopted this notion, which originated in Italy. For this reason Sigmund’s elegy could be one of the earliest works of a poet in Munich who regarded himself as a humanist.423

This demonstration of erudition on behalf of Duke Sigmund as well as his advocacy of poetry were probably results of his studies of Giles of Rome’s ‘Liber de regimine principum’ as well as Sigmund’s possible familiarity with Enea Silvio Piccolomini’s postulations on rhetoric and poetry.

The ‘Liber de regimine principum’ was the most successful ‘mirror of princes’ in the Middle Ages. Thomas Aquinas’s *Sententia libri Politicorum*, De regno as well as *Summa Theologiae* influenced it. Moreover, it referred to Aristotle’s *Nichomachean Ethics*, *Politics* as well as *Rhetoric*. In the three books of the ‘Liber de regimine
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principum’, structured along the lines of ethica, oeconomic and politica, Giles of Rome elaborated on the virtuous ruler’s characteristics. The first book covers the individual conduct of the ruler (in this instance his pupil King Philip IV of France), the nature of his true happiness, the choice as well as the acquisition of virtues and so on.

Enea Silvio Piccolomini, one of the first Italian humanists who lived north of the Alps for an extended period, vehemently propagated his notions of a virtuous aristocrat during his stay at a few German courts. In the 1440s, shortly after his arrival in the Holy Roman Empire, Piccolomini’s humanist views on education clashed with the culture that he encountered north of the Alps. He criticised the German aristocracy’s alleged lack of education and especially their missing patronage of poetic literature, which constituted one of the aspects of the studia humanitatis that was revered by Piccolomini. In the course of his stay Piccolomini began to re-evaluate his initial view based on his experience of the intellectual life north of the Alps. He became aware that the aristocrats and scholars whom he met at the German courts were receptive to his advice as well as criticism and they were willing to learn in order to expand their knowledge. He began to highly regard the works of German scholars like Otto von Freising and Albertus Magnus. Piccolomini was also in contact with some of the brightest minds in late medieval Germany like Nikolaus von Kues (who was also an acquaintance of Albrecht IV of Bavaria-Munich),424 Gregor Heimburg, Johannes Lysura and Thomas Ebendorfer.

As a consequence of the acquaintance with these literati as well as his profound knowledge of past and present German literature Piccolomini became determined to resurrect the Germans’ cultural heritage. From his interpretation of history he believed that the Germans could resume the cultural achievements of their ancestors when princely patrons throughout the Holy Roman Empire promoted poetry and rhetoric.425 Therefore he wrote in a letter to Heimburg who worked at the courts in Prague and Tyrol: ‘I am delighted to witness the revival of rhetoric in Germany. Hopefully there are soon more literati in this part of the world for many Germans once used to be educated and versed in writing aesthetically pleasing works.’426 In Piccolomini’s view, it was the responsibility of aristocrats as well as princely patrons to support the contemporary literary developments to repeat the great literary achievements of German history and to rise to a new cultural zenith.

By presenting a Latin poem, which, in Wilfried Stroh’s view, reflects a knowledge of antique literary motifs, Duke Sigmund might have intended to follow Giles of Rome’s prescriptions of a virtuous ruler’s characteristics and complied with Piccolomini’s advice. The works of Giles of Rome were part of the duke’s curriculum. However it is not known whether members of the ducal court in Munich were aware of Piccolomini’s ideas. Sigmund might have come into contact with Piccolomini’s postulations at the

425 Voigt, Italienische Berichte. p. 95-98; Volker Honemann, 'Medien', in Werner Paravicini, Jan Hirschbiegel, and Jörg Wettlawer (eds.), Höfe und Residenzen im spätmittelalterlichen Reich. Bilder und Begriffe (Residenzforschung, 15.II - Teilband I - Begriffe; Ostfildern: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 2005), 537-541. p. 539
court in Vienna where he had spent his youth. Veit Arnpeck described Sigmund’s stay at the court of Empress Eleanor of Portugal in Wiener Neustadt in his chronicle of Bavaria. According to Arnpeck, Sigmund used to be the empress’s chamberlain.427 Eleanor married Emperor Frederick III in 1452. Thus Sigmund could have lived at her court between 1452 and 1460 as part of his education and preparation for his role in ducal government.

The audience of the ducal court’s works of art

Frank Fürbeth stated in his monograph on Johannes Hartlieb (c. 1400-1468), the advisor and personal physician of Albrecht III and Sigmund, that he could not identify any evidence for the familiarity of members of the ducal court in Munich with the humanist ethos in Hartlieb’s time.428 This indifference towards early humanism in Munich contrasted with the intellectual pursuits at the imperial court in Vienna around 1450 or in imperial free towns like Augsburg and Nuremberg where courtiers and patricians were interested in this novel intellectual development. Based on Fürbeth’s evaluation of the literature, written and read by members of the ducal court in Munich, Bernd Bastert concluded that members, associated with Albrecht IV’s court, preferred traditional literary models like medieval lyric poetry and a late medieval version of the ‘classic’ high medieval minnesong. The audience at the ducal court—even the few university educated aristocrats as well as patricians—were seemingly indifferent to ‘modern’ literary genres that were inspired by humanist ideas.429

The literature and especially the works of art, created in the sphere of Albrecht IV’s court, did not only address courtiers, aristocrats and patricians who were closely associated with the court. They were also aimed at Munich’s burghers, the gentry and rural aristocracy. In the fifteenth century the Bavarian nobility lived in the countryside. It consisted of the gentry (Landleute) and the aristocrats (Landherren or rather Turnieradel). Their lifestyle had changed very little during the Middle Ages and at the beginning of the early modern era. This is reflected in Johannes Aventinus’s description of the rural noblemen. According to Aventinus, aristocrats preferred to lead a traditional aristocratic-chivalrous lifestyle (i.e. hunting and tilting) on their own castles and estates rather than to live at the ducal court in Munich.430 Especially the aristocrats of Lower Bavaria and the Upper Palatinate who had formed the Alliance of the Unicorn (Böckler Bund) and the Löwler Bund to fight against Albrecht IV in order to repel his expansion of authority showed a resistance to serving the Bavarian dukes and adopting novel

427 ‘Er was auch der kaiserin diener gewesen’ – From Arnpeck, Sämtliche Chroniken. p. 673. Sigmund’s stay at the imperial court was also mentioned by Burger, Die Schloßkapelle zu Blutenburg bei München. p. 254
429 Bastert, Der Münchner Hof und Fuetrers 'Buch der Abenteuer'. p. 80
430 ‘Der adl wont auf dem land ausserhalb der stet, vertreibt sein zeit mit hetzen paissen jagen; reiten nit zu hof dan wer diest und sold hat.’ From Ibid. p. 132
tendencies of the aristocratic lifestyle which emerged in urban centres throughout the Holy Roman Empire and Europe.\textsuperscript{431}

The divergence in values and lifestyles between gentry, rural aristocracy and the urban elites in Munich is emphasised by the records of the town scribe Hans Rosenbusch. He described the absence of proper manners in those noblemen who attended a banquet in Munich in 1433. According to Rosenbusch, the noblemen fell upon the food and ate like swine with both hands, which bothered some patricians so much, that they asked them, if they were not ashamed of their behaviour.\textsuperscript{432} Rosenbusch’s observation reflects the different stages of the ‘process of human development’\textsuperscript{433} as represented by the members of the different social ranks. It can be assumed that the values of the gentry and the rural aristocracy changed very little from 1433 to the early sixteenth century, because they continued to pursue similar pastimes in 1514 as they did a century ago. For instance, the knight Jörg Trenbeck described the diversions of participants in the Landtag\textsuperscript{434} of 1514 in a letter to his father Deggenhart Pfaffinger: ‘the whole day we had racing and jousting in our mind and had to perform a dance of joy in the open town, meanwhile someone had to walk around with a kettledrum to indicate that one was tilting’.\textsuperscript{435} Therefore tournaments continued to be an important leisure pursuit and a means of self-aggrandizement for the gentry and the rural aristocracy.

Bernd Bastert identified the audience of Albrecht IV’s ‘propaganda’, expressed in his artistic and literary commissions, as a group consisting of courtiers, rural noblemen and urban patricians. Even though this audience was made up of persons from different social strata with divergent values, their interests overlapped in several areas. By and large most members of Albrecht IV’s audience had a similar level of education. They favoured literary works like Ulrich Füetrer’s \textit{Buch der Abenteuer} (1473-1484/87). Only few members of Albrecht IV’s court and administration had received a university education. For example, Albrecht IV only had nine councillors between 1481 and 1500 who had graduated from universities. His chancellor Dr Johannes Neuhauser was exceptionally well educated in comparison to other courtiers.\textsuperscript{436} By contrast far better educated courtiers with academic and early humanist interests like Enea Silvio Piccolomini lived at the imperial courts in Vienna and Innsbruck than at the ducal court in Munich. Hence Holy Roman Emperors like Frederick III and Maximilian I had to commission different kinds of works of art and literature than Albrecht IV.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{431} Ibid. p. 115-116 & 131-132
\item \textsuperscript{432} ‘Da vielen die edelleut darein und frassens als die saw mit paiden fewsten. Da redten ettlich burger gnug darzu, ob sie sich sein [= dessen] mit schameten.’ From Stahleder, \textit{Chronik der Stadt München. Die Jahre 1157-1505}. p. 280-281. Also refer to Bastert, \textit{Der Münchner Hof und Fuetrers 'Buch der Abenteuer'}. p. 136
\item \textsuperscript{433} The term ‘Prozeß der Zivilisation’ was coined by Norbert Elias in his analysis of table manners.
\item \textsuperscript{434} Meeting of the body of representatives of various classes in medieval provincial politics.
\item \textsuperscript{436} Bastert, \textit{Der Münchner Hof und Fuetrers 'Buch der Abenteuer'}. p. 137-138
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Sigmund could employ different strategies and realise other notions as his brother Albrecht IV, since he had abdicated from his role as reigning duke in 1467. Sigmund was able to create a different public persona because of his ‘retirement’ than Albrecht IV who had to legitimate and convey his authority to all of his Bavarian subjects. The audience, addressed by Albrecht IV, was broader and more divergent than that of Sigmund’s projects. Albrecht IV had to convey his authority to rural noblemen like the members of the Alliance of the Unicorn and the Löwler Bund as well as to the courtiers, patricians of Munich and the guests of the ducal court in Munich. Nevertheless Sigmund even introduced original, innovative concepts during his short reign as head of the Duchy of Bavaria-Munich. For example, he commissioned the genealogical mural that decorated a hall in the Alte Hof’s Zwingerstock or the oriel on the Burgstock’s façade. This evaluation of Sigmund’s patronage is also echoed in Wilhelm Störmer’s characterisation of Sigmund as more intelligent and imaginative than his younger brother Albrecht IV.437

The past, the present and the future: forward-looking retrospection

The continuation of dynastic traditions was a central aspect of court culture in the late Middle Ages and the early modern era. Princes presented themselves as part of their dynasties’ lineages. They extended their descent to mythical historic periods to legitimate their authority and government. Princes displayed their descent to illustrate their place in their dynasties’ history and leave a lasting impression for posterity. Various media conveyed the messages of this culture of commemoration. They ranged from heraldic displays, genealogical tables to dynastic sepulchres and the ‘conservation’ or rather revival of historic places. Birgit Franke and Barbara Welzel stated that cultural studies research has often neglected to examine objects and works of art as expressions of this culture of commemoration, because the novel creations and innovations of a period have been of greater interest to scholars than the deliberate application of inherited notions and objects; even though the continued use, remodelling and repeated proclamation of traditions was an important aspect of court culture, which was closely linked to the creation of new objects, ideas and policies. Hence Franke and Welzel conclude that only a study—considering the amalgamation of historic locations, bequeathed objects and strategies with innovations and novel creations—creates a richer, more balanced impression of this era.

The culture of remembrance at the ducal court in Munich

The Church of Our Lady

The epigraph on Duke Sigmund’s plaque is a monument of his erudition, piety and patronage for which he wanted to be remembered by future generations of churchgoers and visitors. It indicates the ecclesiastical foundations and donations like the Heilsspiegelfenster (1480), gilded altar furniture, vestments, the splendid Missal for the altar of the Virgin Mary and St Ursula, the precious relics of St Ursula, and a cultus foundation at the St Bartholomew altar (1480) that Sigmund promised to present to the church. The inscription also attests to the continued use of the Late Gothic Church of
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439 Ibid. p. 59
440 A Heilsspiegel or Speculum Humanae Salvationis was a popular medieval contemplation book.
Our Lady as the site of the Wittelsbach dynasty’s sepulchre. Shortly after the inception of the Late Gothic building’s construction and well in advance of the church’s consecration Sigmund continued the maintenance of the dynastic tomb that had been established by Louis the Bavarian by gathering the mortal remains of his ancestors and relatives in a crypt underneath the choir.442 Thereby he ‘centralised’ the commemoration of the Wittelsbach’s progenitors in the Church of Our Lady’s choir.

Ulrich Füetrer incorporated allusions to real, contemporary events in the Buch der Abenteuer to attain a similar conceptual connection between Albrecht IV and the Church of Our Lady. For example, Füetrer modified the episode that describes Merlin counselling Uterpendragon on the erection of an appropriate tomb for his late brother who fell in battle.

Merlin spoke […]: ‘I will teach you how to live like a king: first you should build a church in honour of the Virgin Mary at your brother’s burial place.’ The king said: ‘Of course.’ Forthwith the construction of a magnificent minster commenced.443

Instead of the monuments made of monolithic stones, which Uterpendragon usually erects near Salisbury for his late brother in most versions of this story, Merlin recommends Uterpendragon in Füetrer’s Buch der Abenteuer to build a church dedicated to the Virgin Mary as a regal means for the commemoration of the dead.444 With this alteration of the narrative Füetrer and his patron Albrecht IV wanted to allude to the function of the Church of Our Lady as the Wittelsbach dynasty’s sepulchre and implicitly praise this construction project as a dignified accomplishment of Füetrer’s patron.

Albrecht IV also commissioned several works of art for the Late Gothic Church of Our Lady and established religious foundations to demonstrate his connection with this esteemed ecclesiastical building. He presented the Herzogenfenster (1485), Louis the...
Bavarian’s Tumba (c. 1468), the Salve Bell (1490), and he established a benefice at the altar of St Anne (1481), a Salve Regina foundation (1490) and the Company of St George at the altar of St Anne (1496).445

From circa 1473 the dynastic crypt was marked by Louis the Bavarian’s Tumba in the centre of the choir between the Altar of the Holy Cross and the high altar.446 (Plate 71) Initially Albrecht IV had to obtain the papacy’s retrospective recognition of Louis the Bavarian’s burial in the Church of Our Lady. The second papal bull of 7th February 1480, related to the collection of indulgences to finance the Late Gothic building’s construction, contained the approval of the excommunicated emperor’s funeral on behalf of the Apostolic Sec.447

In September 1490 Albrecht IV presented the Church of Our Lady with a Salve Regina foundation that included a bell for one of the towers and a chandelier, hung above the Tumba of Louis the Bavarian.448 Payments for the decoration of the chandelier with one large and three small heraldic shields were recorded in the ledgers of ducal treasurer Matthäus Prätzl in 1490.449 The chandelier is depicted in one of Nikolaus Solis’s watercolours, which document scenes from the marriage of Duke William V of Bavaria and Renata of Lorraine in 1568. (Plate 70) The chandelier featured a sculpture of the Virgin with Christ Child between two rings with candles; above it two angels carry a quadripartite shield that is surmounted by the imperial crown. The coats-of-arms on the shield are indecipherable but it can be assumed that it featured Louis the Bavarian’s armorial bearing since it also displayed the emperor’s crown. Thus the chandelier, whose candles were lit during the ecclesiastical ceremony prescribed by the foundation charter, is iconologically related to the tomb below it and—in addition to the Tumba—it is another visual marker of the Wittelsbach dynasty’s sepulchre.

Albrecht IV’s foundation charter constituted that the Salve Bell had to be tolled on the eve of every holiday of the Virgin Mary, on every Saturday and every day during lent for all time. According to the foundation charter, the ringing of the bell had to be followed by

a paternoster and an Ave Maria that have to be prayed for the souls of our donor and all of his ancestors, the princes and princesses of Bavaria. This also applies to all of our


446 According to Hans Ramisch the high altarpiece of the Church of Our Lady had been transferred into the choir of the new Late Gothic by 1473. Therefore he conjured that the Tumba of Louis the Bavarian had been installed by this time since it was the visual expression of the Wittelsbach dynasty’s presence in the church. Refer to Ramisch, 'Die spätgotische Tumba für Kaiser Ludwig den Bayern'. p. 549

447 Morsak, Zur Rechts- und Sakralkultur Bayerischer Pfalzkapellen und Hofkirchen. p. 147; Stahleder, 'Konsoldierung und Ausbau der bürgerlichen Stadt'. p. 139-140

448 Karnehm, Die Münchner Frauenkirche. p. 59

449 Matthäus Prätzl’s entry was transcribed by Otto Hartig in Hartig, Münchner Künstler und Kunstsachen (Vol. I). p. 65.
descendents, the princes and princesses of Bavaria who will be buried here after their
demise; the priest of the Church of Our Lady with his two fellows and the chaplain also
have to pray two paternoster and an Ave Maria at the imperial altar [or rather Altar of
the Holy Cross] in commemoration of Emperor Louis the Bavarian and at the Altar of
St Anne; on every Saturday after the [singing of a] Salve [Regina] they should proceed
to the tomb of our ancestors, the princes of Bavaria, and ourselves in the choir of the
Church of Our Lady to say a Miserere there.450

Albrecht IV’s Salve Regina foundation was a statement of his dynasty’s presence in the
church. The charter specifically mentioned Louis the Bavarian because the foundation
was related to his Tumba. Thereby Albrecht IV related himself to his outstanding
progenitor and demonstrated his descent. The foundation also ensured the retrospective
commemoration of Albrecht IV’s other ancestors, who had been buried in the tomb
under the choir, or whose mortal remains had recently been transferred into the ducal
sepulchre because of Sigmund’s order. Moreover it intended to ascertain the prospective
remembrance of all of those members of the Wittelsbach dynasty, including Albrecht IV
and Sigmund, who were to find their final resting-place there.

These donations created a dignified locus for the Wittelsbach dynasty’s sepulchre and
were intended to secure the dukes’ posthumous commemoration. Some of these works
of art and ecclesiastical foundations like the Heilsspiegelfenster, the Herzogenfenster as
well as the prayer of the Salve Regina foundation made specific reference to their
patrons and the dukes’ ancestors. The Herzogenfenster shows Albrecht IV with his
ancestors in adoration of the Virgin Mary who is depicted as the Virgin of the
Protecting Mantle (Schutzmantelmadonna). (Plate 72) Likewise the Heilsspiegelfenster
incorporates references to Sigmund as well as to his relatives and ancestors. For
instance, angels hold the coats-of-arms of Adolf I of Jülich-Berg, the husband of
Sigmund’s aunt Elisabeth of Bavaria (1406-1468). These donations emphasised
Sigmund and Albrecht IV’s descent and illustrious kinship, because as observed by
Nicola Coldstream ‘medieval society functioned by precedent and reference to tradition,
and it could not divorce itself from the past since the past justified the present: we see it
in rulers who tended more to base their claims to succession on inheritance rather than
conquest.’451
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450 ‘unnser alls Stiffters und aller unnserer vorfahren fürsten und fürstynn von Beyrn sele, die in bemellter
kirchen begraben liegen, gedacht, und ein gemeins bete mit einem pater noster und Ave Maria
gefromot und gebeten werden. Desgleichs sol es hernach nachmals aller unnserer nachkomen fürsten
und Fürstynn von Bairn sele halben, die nach irm abgeen allda begraben, auch also gehalten werden;
es sollen auch der pfarrer, sein zwen Gesellen und der Capplan, auf weylenndt keyser Ludwigs
loblicher gedechnuss Zwayen und Sannd Annen Alttern, alle sambstag nach dem salve, zu unnserer
vorfarn fürsten von Bairn und unnserer begrebnuss, in dem chor derselben kirchen geen, und daselbs
ein miserere sprechen.’ – Moeglin, ’Das Bild Ludwigs des Bayern in der deutschen
Geschichtsschreibung des Spätmittelalters (ca. 1370-ca. 1500)’. p. 251-252

451 Nicola Coldstream, Medieval Architecture (Oxford History of Art; Oxford: Oxford University Press,
2002). p. 177
Models for the ducal sepulchre in the Church of Our Lady

Sepulchres were the most important monuments for the dynastic cult of commemoration in the Holy Roman Empire from the eleventh to the seventeenth century. These tombs of high-ranking, mostly aristocratic individuals or princely families were erected in purpose-built sepulchral chapels or they were prominently place in existing churches. A group of clerics often attended to these medieval sepulchres by praying for the salvation of the deceased. At least by the fifteenth century the sepulchres of princely dynasties in the churches of their residences replaced the sepulchres that had been established in the princes’ rural monastic foundations. This development was encouraged by the Reformation and most importantly by the identity-creating presence of a dynastic sepulchre that housed the ancestors’ mortal remains. Thus it acted as a demonstration of their illustrious descent.452

Louis VII of Bavaria-Ingolstadt established the Church of Our Lady in Ingolstadt, where the foundation stone of the new building had been laid in 1425, as the location of his house’s tomb in a document of 8th July 1429.453 The document stipulated that Louis VII, his father Stephen III, his second wife Catherine of Alençon and her two sons as well as his first wife Anna of Bourbon should be buried there. This aim should be achieved by transferring Anna of Bourbon’s heart from Kaisheim and the corpses of Stephen III from Niederschönenfeld, Catherine of Alençon and her two sons from Paris to Ingolstadt, and in the instance that Louis VII died elsewhere his remains should be brought to Ingolstadt to bury him with his family. In 1429, 1434, 1438 and 1441 Louis VII established various foundations that should secure his posthumous salvation as well as that of his family and ancestors with the reading of masses as well as the saying of prayers.454 Similar motivations instigated the foundation of a brotherhood of chaplains, psalterists, prebendaries and one thousand paupers.455 They had to pray in support of his reign, for Louis VII, his family, his ancestors and the whole duchy. Louis VII commissioned Hans Multscher to create a gravestone for the church’s choir to mark the location of the ducal sepulchre.456 (Plate 125) The monument was never executed but a limestone model that Multscher created in 1430 and which is now exhibited in the Bayerisches Nationalmuseum in Munich documents its probable design. According to Siegfried Hofmann, the kneeling knight should not be understood as a portrait of Louis VII because the ducal orders stated that this man together with the duke’s armorial bearing and emblems (i.e. solar disc and raven of St Oswald) was intended as an indirect representation of Louis VII who was excommunicated at the time of this commission.457

---

452 Heck, 'Grablegen'. p. 273-274  
453 Hofmann, 'Residenz - Grablege - Herrschaftskirche'. p. 246  
454 Ibid. p. 247  
455 Ibid. p. 247/249  
457 Hofmann, 'Residenz - Grablege - Herrschaftskirche'. p. 247
Sigmund and Albrecht IV of Bavaria-Munich must have certainly known Louis VII’s foundations in Ingolstadt, which continued to exist after his death in captivity. His aim to ‘centralise’ the commemoration of his ancestors and family could have provided a model for the collection of the mortal remains of Sigmund’s ancestors and relatives in a crypt underneath the choir of the Church of Our Lady.\(^{458}\) However it was not uncommon for princes in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries to rebury relatives, if they considered it appropriate of their status to commission new, more magnificent sepulchres.\(^{459}\)

Albrecht IV is only mentioned as the patron of the monument in the inscriptions on the scroll that frames the top slab. However he had a different objective because of the sepulchre’s history and the entombment of Louis the Bavarian in Munich. In contrast to Ingolstadt the ducal sepulchre in Munich was established under Louis the Bavarian and the Wittelsbachs, who had been buried there, represented a longer dynastic history in the late fifteenth century. Albrecht IV wanted to represent the history of his house and especially his prominent ancestor Emperor Louis the Bavarian, whose corpse rested in the Church of Our Lady, with the Tumba’s subject matter. Therefore the scenes of Haldner’s top plate are unmistakably related to the Bavaria-Munich line.

Frederick III attained the creation of the diocese of Vienna during his journey to Rome in 1468. The Church of St Stephan was elevated to a cathedral in 1469 and the collegiate foundation of Rudolph IV (1365) became the cathedral chapter.\(^{460}\) From 1467 Nicolaus Gerhaert worked in the service of Frederick III who commissioned this influential late fifteenth-century sculpture to create his cenotaph. Two payments by the emperor for the tomb are recorded in 1468. Gerhaert worked on this project until his death in 1473. By this time only the tomb slab might have been created under Gerhaert’s supervision. The monument was only finished after Frederick III’s death and eventually erected in the southern side aisle’s east end of St Stephan’s Cathedral in 1513.\(^{461}\) The effigy on the top plate depicts the emperor capped and gowned with the coronation regalia. Various armorial bearings represent his foundations (Order of St George in Wiener Neustadt), status (imperial eagle), house (Habsburg) and lands (i.e. Austria, Lombardy and Styria). The reliefs on the side panels illustrate Frederick III’s ecclesiastical foundations (i.e. the Franciscan Friary of St Leonard near Graz).\(^{462}\)

Emperor Frederick III’s contemporary commission of a sepulchral monument and foundations could have encouraged Albrecht IV to instigate a collegiate foundation and to appoint Hans Haldner with the creation of Louis the Bavarian’s Tumba. However

\(^{458}\) Morsak, Zur Rechts- und Sakralkultur Bayerischer Pfalzkapellen und Hofkirchen. p. 160; Moeglin, ‘Das Bild Ludwigs des Bayern in der deutschen Geschichtsschreibung des Spätmittelalters (ca. 1370-ca. 1500)’. p. 252


\(^{462}\) Gruber, Die Domkirche Sankt Stephan zu Wien. p. 56-57
Nicolaus Gerhaert produced the monument concurrently with Haldner who could not emulate a finished work. This coupled with the different history and programmatic intentions of the patrons explains the distinct design of Louis the Bavarian’s Tumba in the Church of Our Lady. Nevertheless Albrecht IV would have certainly known about Frederick III’s patronage and the tomb that Gerhaert created for the emperor. Moreover the Benedictine Abbey in Tegernsee, whose members maintained close relations with the ducal court in Munich, had studied in Vienna and through their connection with the university were informed about the latest developments in the town as well as at the imperial court. Johannes Grünwalder, the illegitimate son of John II of Bavaria-Munich, the great-grandfather of Albrecht IV, had also studied in Vienna. Although Johannes Grünwalder died in 1452, his stay in Vienna demonstrates that the ducal court and persons who were closely associated with it had a connection with Vienna. This group of persons was a further means for the ducal court in Munich to gain information on the contemporary commissions of the imperial court in Vienna. Besides, Sigmund stayed at the imperial court in Vienna and Wiener Neustadt during his youth according to Veit Arnpeck. From 1487, the connection between the ducal court and the imperial court intensified as a result of Kunigunde of Austria’s marriage to Albrecht IV.

The Chapel of Blutenburg Palace

The genealogical programme of Blutenburg Palace Chapel’s exterior

The Chapel of Blutenburg Palace is another ecclesiastic monument, where Sigmund commemorated his ancestors, illustrated past and present dynastic bonds, and thus displayed his house’s great distinction. The chapel’s southern and northern facades are decorated with armorial bearings to illustrate Sigmund’s descent and the relations of his house with other dynasties.

The painted tracery frieze on the northern façade incorporates a heraldic shield with the combined coat-of-arms of the Bavarian dukes and the Counts Palatine of the Rhine, which is flanked by the coats-of-arms of the Dukes of Brunswick and the House of Habsburg. The armorial bearing of the Duchy of Brunswick refers to Anna of Brunswick, the mother of Sigmund and Albrecht IV. The Habsburg’s coat-of-arms represents the marriage of Albrecht IV with Kunigunde of Austria, the daughter of Emperor Frederick III and sister of King, later Emperor Maximilian I.

The southern façade is decorated with a series of heraldic shields that illustrate the matrimonial alliances of the ancestors of Sigmund and Albrecht IV.

---
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The coats-of-arms in the painted tracery frieze represent (from left to right) the conjugal bonds of Catherine of Gorizia and Duke John II (Sigmund and Albrecht IV’s great-grandfather who became the first ruler of the Duchy of Bavaria-Munich after the partition of 1392), Elisabeth Visconti and Duke Ernst (the grandfather of Sigmund and Albrecht IV), Anna of Brunswick and Duke Albrecht III (the father of Sigmund and Albrecht IV), Kunigunde of Austria and Albrecht IV, Margaret of Cleves and Duke William III (the brother of Duke Ernst and the great-uncle of Sigmund as well as Albrecht IV). (Plate 53)

In addition to the presentation of the matrimonial alliances of Sigmund and Albrecht IV’s progenitors, the programme of the chapel’s southern façade features a conspicuous imperial theme. Louis the Bavarian’s imperial coat-of-arms is prominently placed in the centre of the painted tracery frieze between the other armorial escutcheons. Unlike the other coats-of-arms, which are incorporated into the grouped trefoil motifs, the imperial eagle of Louis the Bavarian is elevated from the painted tracery frieze by placing it on a blue rectangle with a red border. Another depiction of the imperial eagle is situated above the chapel’s portal. (Plate 98) Heraldic shields with the standing lion (the heraldic animal of the Counts Palatine of the Rhine) and the white-and-blue lozenge pattern of the Bavarian dukes flank the imperial coat-of-arms.

The imperial subject matter of the southern façade’s embellishment is expanded by the depiction of the Gnadenstuhl above the portal and the armorial bearing with the imperial eagle. (Plate 98) The scene of the enthroned lord holding his dead son and flanked by two angels illustrates the patroncium of the chapel, which is dedicated to the Holy Trinity. The Gnadenstuhl alludes to the doctrine of divine right that provided the basis for the sovereignty of the Bavarian dukes. This form of worshipping God was often an aspect of princely self-aggrandizement. Johan Huizinga, for instance, described this phenomenon as the humanization of the Trinity. To illustrate this thesis Huizinga referred to Jean Molinet’s comparison of Emperor Frederick III with God the Father: like God who sent his son to earth the Emperor had sent Maximilian I into the Low Countries for his wedding with Mary of Burgundy and to become governor of this territory. From this point of view, it is an appropriate subject matter for an aristocratic court chapel, especially for a place where Emperor Louis the Bavarian is celebrated as an outstanding progenitor of Duke Sigmund.

The princely and imperial themes of the southern façade’s mural cycle are subtly substantiated by the depictions of St Onuphrius and the Magi in the band of murals below the chapel’s windows that also show Adam and Eve, the Holy Family (Heilige Sippe), St Florian and the coat-of-arms of the Bavarian dukes. (Plate 99, Plate 100, 108)


\[468\] Burger, Die Schloßkapelle zu Blutenburg bei München. p. 148 & 252

\[469\] Unfortunately only the murals, depicting Adam and Eve as well as St Onuphrius, have been copied onto the surface of the protective cases that cover the fragile fresco-secco mixed media murals. Refer to Achim Hubel, 'Schloßkapelle von Blutenburg', in Norbert Lieb and Heinz Jürgen Sauermost (eds.), Münchens Kirchen (Munich: Süddeutscher Verlag, 1973), 77-86. p. 78; Wolfgang Meyer, 'Zur
According to legend, St Onuphrius was an oriental prince who became a hermit and whose relics were allegedly brought to Munich by Duke Henry the Lion. More importantly the depiction of the Magi underlines the façade’s imperial subject matter and conceptually relates it to the Chapel of St Laurence in the Alte Hof and thus to Sigmund as well as Albrecht IV’s progenitor Louis the Bavarian. Louis had commissioned a sculptural cycle for St Laurence that included sculptures of the Three Kings. Two of the surviving figures of the Magi are now exhibited in the Bayerisches Nationalmuseum in Munich. (Plate 32)

Robert Suckale believed that the Magi are artistic expressions of the programmatic intentions, which were pursued by Louis the Bavarian with this sculptural cycle. According to Suckale, the Three Kings’ adoration of the Christ Child was the most important of all regal events in the New Testament. Every German king had to visit the shrine of the Three Kings in Cologne Cathedral after the coronation in Aachen. The coronation ceremony incorporated parts of the Ordinary of the Three Kings liturgy (Drei-Königs-Liturgie). The Grace of God legitimated the German king’s rule. On the other hand, Jesus Christ was regarded as the king of all kings. For this reason, the Magi were a popular subject matter with princely patrons who were sometimes depicted as members of one of the kings’ retinues in adoration of the Christ Child. This regal theme certainly befitted Louis the Bavarian’s court chapel where the imperial regalia and relics were displayed during his emperorship. Likewise it is an appropriate topos for a chapel where the Wittelsbach dynasty, its illustrious ancestors, its kinships and the eminent progenitor Louis the Bavarian are celebrated as part of Sigmund’s scheme of legitimation and self-aggrandizement.

The Chapel of Blutenburg Palace as evocation of the St Laurence Chapel in the Alte Hof

The chapel’s architectural disposition and location on the palace’s northern perimeter substantiate the impression that Sigmund’s building project was intended to emulate the Alte Hof in Munich. In the late fifteenth century, Blutenburg Palace was divided into a faubourg (Vorburg) and a main castle (Hauptburg) unlike the Alte Hof where all four wings were located around a courtyard. (Plate 91) Nevertheless the new chapel was incorporated into the faubourg’s northern wing similar to the Alte Hof where the Chapel of St Laurence formed part of the Lorenzistock, the wing on the courtyard’s northern side. Although the choir and nave of St Laurence did not form an entity that was covered with a single roof like the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace, both chapels featured buttresses that terminated well below the roof trusses and they are prominent elements.
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472 This notion was mentioned by Lothar Altmann and Susanne Burger. Refer to Altmann, 'Das Bildprogramm der Schloßkapelle zu Blutenburg'. p. 177; Burger, *Die Schloßkapelle zu Blutenburg bei München.* p. 327
which structure their exteriors. (Plate 27, Plate 95 and Plate 97) Moreover the walls of both ecclesiastical structures are penetrated with large windows that feature copings.

The interiors of St Laurence and the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace convey a similar impression: the nave and choir are visually demarcated as separate spaces. (Plate 28, Plate 103 and Plate 104) This visual separation of the two ‘rooms’ is obviously more pronounced in St Laurence than in the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace, because the choir of St Laurence was attached to the nave as a separate architectural unit. (Plate 27, Plate 95 and Plate 97) Even though the choir of the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace forms part of the building, a prominent transverse arch and the side altars visually separate the threshold of nave and choir. (Plate 103 and Plate 104) The transverse arch and side altars with their altarpieces and crestings provide a frame for the high altarpiece when viewed from the balcony in the chapel’s west end that echoes the view from the gallery in St Laurence. Another similarity between the two palace chapels are the shafts which rise from consoles above the beholder’s level to become the ribs of the cross vaults in St Laurence and the net vaults in the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace. Based on this analysis of the two buildings’ architectural dispositions, it appears very plausible that Sigmund’s chapel at Blutenburg Palace alluded to the Chapel of St Laurence. The duke and his retinue must have discerned the stylistic similarities of these two buildings and the consequential symbolic implications.

The genealogical programme of the interior of the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace

The armorial bearings on the chapel’s facades prepare beholders for the extended heraldic and genealogical programme of its interior. (Plate 103 and Plate 104) The chapel’s windows incorporate stained glass panes with heraldic shields and scenes of Christ’s Passion. Achim Hubel described the series of armorial escutcheons as a genealogical cycle, because these coats-of-arms make reference to an even wider range of Sigmund’s ancestors and relatives than those of the exterior’s heraldic programme.

The coats-of-arms of the Duchy of Brunswick, the County of Cleves, Habsburg-Austria, the County of Gorizia, the House of Visconti, Bavaria and the Palatinate, which are shown on the exterior and exclusively represent the matrimonial alliances of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich, are complemented by the armorial bearings of Holland, Zeeland, Friesland, the Kingdom of (Naples and) Sicily, Duchy of Jülich-Berg-Ravensberg, Hungary, House of Bourbon and the imperial coats-of-arms of the Wittelsbachs and Habsburgs.

The coats-of-arms of Holland, Zeeland and Friesland refer to the territories that Louis the Bavarian obtained for his dynasty through his second marriage with Margaret of Holland and which were inherited by those of his sons who became known as the dukes of Bavaria-Straubing. The alliance of the Wittelsbach dynasty and the House of Aragon, based on the wedding of Duke Stephen II of Lower-Bavaria and his first wife Elisabeth of Sicily in 1328, is represented with the armorial bearing of the Kingdom

---

473 Hubel, ‘Schlößkapelle von Blutenburg’. p. 84
474 Elisabeth is the daughter of King Frederick III of Sicily.
of (Naples and) Sicily. The coat-of-arms of the Duchy of Jülich-Berg-Ravensberg illustrates the marriage of Elisabeth⁴⁷⁵ (c. 1406-1468) with Duke Adolf II of Berg or that of Catherine of Bavaria-Straubing⁴⁷⁶ (1360-1402) with William III of Jülich-Guelders. The Hungarian heraldic shield either represents the marriage of Margaret of Bavaria⁴⁷⁷ with Prince Stephan⁴⁷⁸ or it refers to Otto III of Lower Bavaria who was crowned King of Hungary in 1305. The armorial bearing of the House of Bourbon commemorates the marriage of Isabeau de Bavière⁴⁷⁹ with King Charles VI of France. The coats-of-arms of Emperor Louis the Bavarian and Emperor Frederick III (until 1493) or rather Maximilian I who became German king in 1486 and is related to the dukes of Bavaria-Munich through his sister Kunigunde of Austria who married Albrecht IV in 1487 are also represented in the windows’ heraldic scheme. (Plate 53)

This extended heraldic programme of the window panes is echoed by the armorial escutcheons on the sacrament house, consoles and keystones as well as those above the sacristy’s door in the choir’s east end.⁴⁸⁰ (Plate 103 and Plate 104) The interior of the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace is conspicuously dominated by heraldic motifs. In this context, the lozenge pattern of the net vaults must have been intended to evoke associations with the coat-of-arms of the Bavarian dukes, especially since the white-and-blue lozenge pattern features prominently on the two poles of God’s throne.⁴⁸¹ (Plate 93) Susanne Burger provided another example for the symbolic domination of the interior by the lozenge motif. She observed that each one of the three altars and Duke Sigmund’s location on the balcony in the chapel’s west end mark the four corners of a lozenge. She also remarked that the lozenge motif formed the basis of the compositions of the biblical scenes on the inner panels of the high altarpiece’s wings, showing the Baptism of Christ and the Coronation of the Virgin Mary.⁴⁸² (Plate 106)

According to Burger, heraldic concepts also underlie the colour scheme and design of the three altarpieces.⁴⁸³ (Plate 103-Plate 106) The juxtaposition of metallic surfaces with coloured areas (i.e. gold and vibrant red in the Annunciation and the Gnadenstuhl, gold and white in the Baptism of Christ) abides by the rules of heraldry, stating that metal tinctures must never be placed on metals and colours must never be placed on coloured tinctures (rules of tinctures). Therefore a metal tincture borders on coloured tinctures. In Burger’s view, this heraldic colour scheme was appropriately chosen to emphasise the armorial character of the high altarpiece’s design. When closed the two
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⁴⁷⁵ Elisabeth is the daughter of Duke Ernst of Bavaria-Munich.
⁴⁷⁶ Catherine is the daughter of Albrecht I, Duke of Lower Bavaria and Count of Holland, Hainaut and Zeeland.
⁴⁷⁷ Margaret is the daughter of Louis the Bavarian and Margaret of Holland.
⁴⁷⁸ Stephan is the son of King Charles I of Hungary.
⁴⁷⁹ Isabeau is the sister of Louis VII of Bavaria-Ingolstadt.
⁴⁸⁰ The armorial bearings on the consoles (and possibly on the keystones) were apparently added at a later stage and thus cannot be incontestably attributed to the patronage of Duke Sigmund of Bavaria-Munich. Refer to Wolfgang Meyer, ‘Zur farbigen Fassung des Inneren der Kapelle von Schloß Blutenburg’, in Johannes Erichsen (ed.), Blutenburg. Beiträge zur Geschichte von Schloß und Hofmark Menzing (Munich: Haus der Bayerischen Geschichte, 1985), 169-171. p. 171
⁴⁸¹ This observation is analogous to the interpretation of the figuration of the vault of the Fugger Chapel in St Anna, Augsburg. There the shapes, created by ribs, allude to the lilies of the Fugger’s coat-of-arms. Refer to Burger, Die Schloßkapelle zu Blutenburg bei München. p. 249
⁴⁸² Ibid. p. 254
⁴⁸³ Ibid. p. 254-255
exterior panels of the wings evoke the impression of a heraldic shield. Instead of trying to obscure the vertical division between the two wings by choosing a composition that spans across both panels or by employing painted illusionism, the partition of the two panels is emphasised in this instance, because the two panels are presented as separate ‘spaces’. For instance, the precious cloths, hanging over the walls in the background, are differentiated from one another in each panel. Thus the two panels act like the two fields of an escutcheon, separating the space of St Sigismund as well as the combined coat-of-arms of the Duchy of Bavaria and the Palatinate of the Rhine from that of St Bartholomew and Duke Sigmund.

**St Bartholomew as a symbol of the commemoration of Louis the Bavarian**

Only the armorial bearings on one of the keystones and one of the stained glass panes make a reference to Louis the Bavarian inside the chapel, but other aspects of the chapel’s decoration symbolically allude to Duke Sigmund’s eminent ancestor. For example, Susanne Burger interpreted the depiction of St Sigismund and St Bartholomew along with the chapel’s donor on the outer panels of the high altarpiece’s wings as a subtle statement by Duke Sigmund on his forced abdication from government in 1467. (Plate 105) In Burger’s view, St Sigismund and St Bartholomew are deliberately juxtaposed on the altarpiece’s wings. St Sigismund was the epitome of knighthood in the late Middle Ages, a period that was characterised by a nostalgic retrospective view on the heyday of chivalry. According to Burger’s elucidation, Sigmund wanted to be perceived like his admirable patron saint, but in reality Sigmund must have felt more like the martyr St Bartholomew. Burger conceptually equated St Bartholomew’s decapitation on an allegorical level with Sigmund’s abdication and the feeling of ostracism as a result of his forced departure from active participation in government.

Burger’s thesis is an interesting interpretation of the high altarpiece’s symbolism. One cannot make a certain statement about Sigmund’s personal feelings about his abdication. The surviving primary sources and the relevant secondary literature convey the impression that Sigmund’s retirement did not stop the duke from pursuing his interests and that it rather complied with his inclinations. Already in the late eighteenth century Karl Heller Reichsessedler von Hellersperg showed that Sigmund’s complete retirement from all duties in the ducal government is a myth of historiography, because Sigmund had retained jurisdictional duties after his retirement and continued to sign documents as well as treatises along with Albrecht IV.

---

484 Ibid. p. 243
485 Ibid. p. 242-244
From this point of view, it appears fruitful to focus on the other symbolic facets of St Bartholomew that are related to Emperor Louis the Bavarian. Duke Sigmund must have had a particular affection for this saint, because he established a cultus foundation at the altar of St Bartholomew in the Late Gothic Church of Our Lady and commissioned a stained glass window with depictions of St Bartholomew as well as St Wolfgang for the Late Gothic Church of Our Lady. Sigmund is also depicted alongside St Bartholomew on the high altarpiece of St Wolfgang in Pipping (c. 1480) and St Bartholomew presents Sigmund on a fragment from an altarpiece (c. 1480/90). The altarpiece’s fragment was originally displayed in the church of the Benedictine Abbey at Andechs and may have been a means of commemorating Sigmund’s father and older brother who were buried there. 488

According to Robert Suckale, Emperor Louis the Bavarian established St Bartholomew as the patron saint of the Holy Roman Empire and thus as a sacred representative of the Empire, because the Empire’s previous patron saints (i.e. St Michael, St Laurence and St Maurice) had become associated with dioceses or other institutions (i.e. St Laurence with Merseburg and St Maurice with Magdeburg). Charlemagne could not be adopted as the Empire’s patron saint for he was not recognised as a saint in all parts of the Empire in the late Middle Ages. Therefore Louis the Bavarian chose St Bartholomew. The fact that Emperor Henry VII, whom Louis the Bavarian took as a model, died on the holiday of St Bartholomew (24th August 1313) and that his tomb in the Cathedral of Pisa was associated with an altar dedicated to St Bartholomew might have promoted this decision. Moreover from 1315 the elections of the Holy Roman emperors were held exclusively in St Bartholomew’s in Frankfurt am Main. 489

From this perspective, the depictions of St Bartholomew and St Sigismund on the exterior panels of the high altarpiece’s wings are appropriate, as they anticipate the central panel’s princely and imperial character that is evoked by its subject matter (God in majesty with his dead son). According to Richard Bauer, Christ’s Passion, which is a central theme of the chapel’s decoration, reflects the dukes of Bavaria-Munich’s humble inclination to again assume the burden of the highest office in the Holy Roman Empire and thus become Christ’s successors in agony, because divine order constituted that the Holy Roman Emperor as most important protecting power of Christianity is an essential part of the whole order of salvation. 490

---


490 Bauer, 'Anmerkungen zum heraldischen Programm'. p. 60
The interpretation of the decoration’s imperial subject matter substantiates Burger’s reading of the three altarpieces in the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace as heraldic shields that are related to each other like the troika of coats-of-arms on the exterior frame of the chapel’s portal. Unlike in St Wolfgang in Pipping, where Sigmund commissioned an altarpiece with a central shrine with sculptures of St Wolfgang and two deacons (c. 1480/85), the duke chose altarpieces with painted and gilded surfaces for his chapel in Blutenburg Palace. According to Burger, the side altarpieces stand for the armorial bearings of Bavaria and the Palatinate; the high altarpiece represents the imperial coat-of-arms in this troika of heraldic shields.

St Bartholomew is also related to the commemoration of the ancestors of the Wittelsbach dynasty as attested by a document of 24th April 1320, which was issued by Duke Henry XIV, Duke Otto IV and Duke Henry XV of Lower Bavaria. They decreed the merger of the annual commemoration ceremonies for their progenitors that were dispersed throughout the year into a single Lower Bavarian Holiday of Princes (Fürstentag) on the feast day of St Bartholomew. This edict is another indication that demonstrates the Wittelsbach dukes’ affinity for St Bartholomew since they regarded this saint’s day as the suitable date for the commemoration of their predecessors. Thus it appears logical for Duke Sigmund to incorporate a depiction of St Bartholomew into the artistic programme of the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace and the altarpiece’s fragment from the Benedictine Abbey in Andechs.

In the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace Duke Sigmund amalgamated the commemoration of his progenitors with heraldic embellishments that are characteristic in a throne or knight’s hall. Sigmund might have emulated the notions, which had been realised in the Chapel of St George above the entrance vestibule, commissioned by Emperor Frederick III in the castle of Wiener Neustadt from the 1450s. The chapel was a consecrated ecclesiastical space that functioned as the refectory of the order of St George that had been founded by Frederick III. Sigmund was probably familiar with this building as he spent some time of his youth at the imperial court.

---

492 Burger, *Die Schloßkapelle zu Blutenburg bei München*. p. 248
493 Hofmann, 'Residenz - Grablege - Herrschaftskirche'. p. 226
495 Arnpeck, *Sämtliche Chroniken*. p. 673
The Church of St Wolfgang in Pipping

The elevations of the choir of St Wolfgang in Pipping (Plate 109), situated in close proximity of Blutenburg Palace along the Würm River and the medieval pilgrimage routes from Augsburg as well as Landsberg am Lech to St Wolfgang im Salzkammergut,\(^{496}\) feature a painted tracery frieze below the roof line with the following coats-of-arms: (beginning with the heraldic programme on the choir’s southern exterior wall and ending with the coats-of-arms on the northern side) a troika with the heraldic shields of the Duchy of Brunswick, the Palatine of the Rhine and the House of Visconti (Plate 110); the County of Hainaut, the Duchy of Bavaria, the County of Cleves (Plate 111); the imperial eagle of Emperor Frederick III,\(^ {497}\) the heraldic shield of the Duchy of Bavaria, the imperial eagle of Emperor Louis the Bavarian (Plate 112); the combined coat-of-arms of the Dukes of Bavaria and the Counts Palatine of the Rhine, the armorial bearing of the House of Habsburg (Plate 113); the coats-of-arms of Friesland, Zeeland and Holland (Plate 114). (Plate 53)

The heraldic scheme on the exterior of St Wolfgang’s choir presents a programmatic message that is comparable to that of the armorial bearings on the facades of Blutenburg Palace Chapel. The territorial gains (i.e. Friesland, Holland and Zeeland) during Louis the Bavarian’s reign as a result of his marriage with Margaret of Holland are only illustrated on the northern side of St Wolfgang’s choir and not on the exterior of Blutenburg Palace Chapel. (Plate 3) The heraldic scheme of St Wolfgang’s choir only alludes to these matrimonial alliances by incorporating the coats-of-arms of aristocratic houses with which the Dukes of Bavaria-Munich were related. The kinships are not as intelligibly presented as on the exterior of the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace where the coat-of-arms of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich are grouped with those of their respective wives. Sigmund also expressly demonstrated his connection with the imperial court of Frederick III with the inclusion of the emperor’s armorial bearing on St Wolfgang’s elevation. On the one hand, pilgrims to St Wolfgang im Salzkammergut, which belonged to the Duchy of Bavaria until 1506, travelled in the direction of the Habsburg’s territories. Hence the coats-of-arms appropriately symbolised the ‘alliance’ between the two aristocratic houses to those travellers. On the other hand, Sigmund had stayed at the imperial court of Frederick III.

---


\(^{497}\) Sigmund’s affinity for Emperor Frederick III and his stay at the imperial court in Vienna during his youth are reflected in Sigmund’s choice of his clothes’ colours: black, red and white. These are the colours of Emperor Frederick III and the Habsburg dynasty. Moreover Sigmund sought support from the imperial court in Vienna during the struggles with Albrecht IV, when his younger brother demanded his participation in government. In 1474 Sigmund also received relics of St Ursula from Frederick III for the Church of Our Lady. Refer to Arnpeck, Sämtliche Chroniken. p. 673; Burger, Die Schloßkapelle zu Blutenburg bei München. p. 7; Stahleder, Chronik der Stadt München. Herzogs- und Bürgerstadt. p. 442-443
The Alte Hof

In the 1460s Duke Sigmund had initiated building work in the Alte Hof. The extension of the Burgstock included the erection of a new roof frame (1463), the exteriors’ evocative, imposing decoration, and the embellishment of the interiors of the Burgstock and the Zwingerstock. (Plate 18) The Burgstock’s facades were decorated with heraldic programmes and the elegant Late Gothic oriel, which was probably built in conjunction with the new roof frame. These painted heraldic decorative schemes of the Burgstock’s exterior were visible until the early twentieth century. 498 However the evaluation of their authenticity and the accuracy of their reconstruction are problematic because of the extensive undocumented renovation and construction work in the five centuries after their creation. The dismantling of the top half of the Burgstock’s gate tower in 1813 and the demolition of the palace chapel of St Laurence in 1816 were two of the most severe incisions into the ensemble’s fabric.

Bombing during the Second World War did not damage the Burgstock unlike some of the Alte Hof’s other wings. Nevertheless renovation work was carried out from 1964 till 1968 to accommodate the Inland Revenue’s offices. This construction project comprised the reconstruction of the gate tower according to the wooden model of Munich, built by Jakob Sandtner in 1570 for Duke Albrecht V of Bavaria and now in the Bayerisches Nationalmuseum in Munich. (Plate 16) The artists Kleemann and Braun discovered the façade’s original decoration and restored it. Their findings and subsequent restoration work also remained undocumented. 499 Hence it cannot be appraised to what extent the current heraldic programme reflects the original scheme as envisaged by its patron Duke Sigmund in the 1460s. However the armorial bearings on the exterior of the Burgstock express similar concepts as the schemes found at the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace and St Wolfgang in Pipping, two later examples of Sigmund’s patronage. For this reason it may be assumed that most of the coats-of-arms on the exterior of the Burgstock’s gate tower and the oriel echo Sigmund’s original heraldic scheme and that they were reconstructed based on the traces of the facades’ fifteenth-century embellishments that were discovered during the renovation work.

The town-centre-facing side of the Burgstock’s gate tower displays the same heraldic shields as the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace, the Church of St Wolfgang in Pipping and the gatehouse of Grünwald Castle: the combined coat-of-arms of the Dukes of Bavaria


and the Counts Palatine of the Rhine, the armorial escutcheons of the Duchy of Brunswick, the House of Visconti and the County of Gorizia. (Plate 19 and Plate 20) These coats-of-arms mark the Alte Hof as the residence of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich and they illustrate the recent conjugal bonds of the male members of the Bavaria-Munich line with other prominent aristocratic houses. (Plate 53)

The gate tower’s courtyard façade displays the imperial eagle of Louis the Bavarian and the coats-of-arms of the Counts of Habsburg, the Palatinate and Bohemia. (Plate 21, Plate 22 and Plate 24) These heraldic shields most probably refer to the matrimonial alliances of female members of the Bavaria-Munich line with these aristocratic dynasties: Sigmund’s aunt Beatrix married John of the Palatinate and Duke Ernst’s sister Sophie wedded King Wenceslaus of Bohemia. (Plate 53) The coat-of-arms of the Habsburg counts in combination with the imperial eagle to its left-hand side most probably refers to the marriage of Louis II of Upper Bavaria and Mechthild of Habsburg, the daughter of King Rudolph I that produced Louis the Bavarian.

The heraldic programme of the oriel on the Burgstock’s courtyard façade echoes the concepts of the gate tower’s scheme. (Plate 24) The armorial bearings in the lower row represent the conjugal bonds of the Bavaria-Munich line’s male members with other prestigious aristocratic families: Albrecht III and Anna of Brunswick, Ernst and Elisabeth Visconti, John II and Catherine of Gorizia-Tyrol, William III and Margaret of Cleves, Albrecht IV and Kunigunde of Austria. (Plate 25, Plate 26 and Plate 53) The dukes of Bavaria-Munich are represented by the combined coat-of-arms of the Duchy of Bavaria and the Palatinate. The heraldic shield that combines the coats-of-arms of the Duchy of Bavaria, the Palatinate, Austria and Styria500 was either added after the marriage of Albrecht IV with Kunigunde in 1487 or during the renovation work in the 1960s to commemorate this liaison.

The armorial escutcheons in the upper row praise the reign of Louis the Bavarian and the territorial gains during his government. (Plate 25 and Plate 26) The Habsburg’s coat-of-arms is shown below Louis the Bavarian’s imperial eagle and possibly refers to Mechthild of Habsburg. (Plate 53) The heraldic shield of Tyrol which accompanies the imperial eagle and the Habsburg’s armorial bearing recalls the marriage of Louis V with Margaret of Tyrol in 1342 and their subsequent enfeoffment with the County of Tyrol. The combined coat-of-arms of the Dukes of Bavaria, Counts Palatine of the Rhine and the Counts of Tyrol on the oriel’s eastern side also remembers Louis the Bavarian’s shrewd politics that attained the incorporation of the County of Tyrol into the territories of the Bavarian dukes. After the extinction of the Ascanian dynasty Louis the Bavarian enfeoffed his son Louis V with the Mark Brandenburg which is reflected in the combined coat-of-arms of the Duchy of Bavaria, the Palatinate and the Margraviate of Brandenburg. The upper row also includes the combined coat-of-arms of the Dukes of Bavaria and the Counts Palatine of the Rhine as well as the heraldic shield of the Free State of Bavaria (from 1950). At least the armorial bearing of the Free State of Bavaria is an addition of the post-Second World War renovation works.

500 In 1282 King Rudolph I enfeoffed his sons Albrecht I and Rudolf II with Styria, which was subsequently incorporated into the Habsburg dynasty’s territories. Therefore Emperor Frederick III was also Duke of Styria as displayed by the coat-of-arms on his tomb slab in St Stephen’s Cathedral in Vienna.
The heraldic schemes of the Burgstock’s exterior specifically represent the ancestors and dynastic connections of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich. The Alte Hof was visually demarcated as the residence of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich with these armorial escutcheons that at once commemorated the progenitors of Sigmund and Albrecht IV and thus legitimated their sovereignty. The heraldic programme of the Burgstock’s courtyard façade was appropriately extended with coats-of-arms that explicitly referred to Emperor Louis the Bavarian and his politics, because the Alte Hof had been his residence and the Burgstock’s oriel faced the Chapel of St Laurence where the imperial regalia had been kept from 1324 until 1350. This aspect of the heraldic programme was substantiated by the white, light yellow and dark grey lozenge pattern as the colour scheme of this extensive embellishment of the Burgstock’s facades alludes to the imperial colours that were also employed as decoration of the town walls.

**The genealogical scheme of Grünwald Castle’s gatehouse**

Grünwald Castle is located south of Munich and overlooks the River Isar from its position at the top of a steep slope. (Plate 2, Plate 118-Plate 121) It belonged to the Counts of Andechs-Meranien until the Wittelsbach dukes gained it by 1248. At the beginning of the fourteenth century the castle was renovated and extended to serve the dukes as hunting lodge. This function is also reflected in the designation as ‘iadhilling’. Concurrently it was renamed from Derblfing into Grünwald probably to reflect its new function and its location in a forest that was abundant with game. In 1405 the castle’s chapel, dedicated to St George and St Catherina is documented for the first time.

In 1486 as part of the renovation work at Grünwald Castle, initiated by Duke Albrecht IV to create a suitable bucolic retreat and hunting lodge for his future wife Kunigunde of Austria, Ulrich Füetrer decorated the crowstep gable of the gatehouse with a hierarchical presentation of coats-of-arms. (Plate 120) The armorial bearings display a programme that corresponds with the heraldic schemes of the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace, St Wolfgang in Pipping and the Alte Hof’s Burgstock as it illustrates the kinship of the Dukes of Bavaria with other European aristocratic houses. (Plate 53)

The combined coat-of-arms of the Dukes of Bavaria and the Counts Palatine of the Rhine, displayed at the gable’s apex, boldly placed Albrecht IV as well as his dynasty at the zenith of this scheme. (Plate 120) Below it the House of Habsburg’s heraldic shield represents Kunigunde of Austria. It is flanked by the coat-of-arms of the Portuguese House of Braganza that refers to Eleanor of Portugal, the wife of Emperor Frederick III and mother of Kunigunde of Austria. The armorial bearings of the Duchy of Bavaria-Munich were inscribed on the facade of the Alte Hof, the residence of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich.

---

501 As indicated by the payments recorded by the civic treasury that are transcribed in Stahleder, *Chronik der Stadt München. Die Jahre 1157-1505*. p. 236. In 1324 Louis the Bavarian had granted Munich’s citizens and town council the right to use the imperial colours in their civic coat-of-arms. Refer to Bös, *Gotik in Oberbayern*. p. 28; Nöhbauer, *München*. p. 13


Brunswick, the House of Visconti, the County of Hainaut, the County of Gorizia, the Kingdom of (Naples and) Sicily, the Duchy of Cleves, the Kingdom of Poland and the Duchy of Jülich-Berg represent the wives of the ancestors of Albrecht IV. (Plate 53)

The heraldic scheme on the crowstep gable of Grünwald Castle’s gatehouse must have provided a glimpse of the armorial programme that awaited the ducal family, courtiers and visitors in the halls of the Dürnitzstock, the western wing of Grünwald Castle where the living quarters of the duke and duchess were located. (Plate 118) This wing of the castle is now lost. It was gradually demolished from the end of the seventeenth century to prevent an uncontrolled collapse of the ruinous buildings. The slope on which Grünwald Castle is located was constantly eroded during floods of the River Isar. The diminishing stability of the western wings’ foundations triggered the destruction of the buildings with the ducal apartments.

The heraldic embellishment of the halls in the Dürnitzstock is documented in the ledgers of the ducal treasurer Matthäus Prätzl (Cgm 2222, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich). According to Prätzl’s records of 1486 and 1487, Ulrich Füetrer and master Heinrich decorated the rooms with murals. Heinrich embellished the room adjacent to the kitchen, the blue parlour (blau Stube) as well as the entrance hall (Fletz), situated between the blue parlour and the large hall that faced toward the River Isar. Füetrer painted two sundials and a stove, decorated two rooms, created six coats-of-arms with shields and crests, eighty-nine armorial bearings of the knights who participated in tournaments, and eight history paintings. Füetrer’s works of art and armorial bearings may be imagined as a heraldic or genealogical programme for a knight’s hall. The coats-of-arms may have complemented the history paintings by decorating a large room in a frieze-like manner as in the gate tower of the ducal palace in Straubing. This tower was a former fortificatory tower of the town wall that was incorporated into the palace during its construction. A painted frieze with coats-of-arms and fleuronné-like ornaments was discovered during renovation work in a room of the gate tower in 1985/1995. This Late Gothic mural (c. 1420) shows a series of armorial bearings like the imperial eagle and the coat-of-arms of the County of Hainaut. The dukes of Bavaria-Munich were certainly familiar with Straubing Palace and its decoration, because William III and Ernst I of Bavaria-Munich had received parts of the Duchy of

504 Anna of Brunswick, the mother of Albrecht IV and daughter of Duke Erik I of Brunswick, married Duke Albrecht III of Bavaria-Munich in 1437.
505 Duke Ernst of Bavaria-Munich (the grandfather of Albrecht IV) wedded Elisabeth Visconti in 1396.
506 The coat-of-arms of the County of Hainaut stands for the marriage of Emperor Louis the Bavarian with Margaret of Holland in 1324, which bestowed the Wittelsbach dynasty with the territories of Hainaut, Holland, Zeeland and Friesland.
508 Duke Stephen II of Lower-Bavaria wedded Elisabeth of Sicily in 1328.
509 Duke William III of Bavaria-Munich married Margaret of Cleves (c. 1416-1444) in 1433.
510 Duke Louis VI of Upper-Bavaria wedded the Polish princess Kunigunde, the daughter of King Casimir III of Poland, in 1352.
511 Elisabeth (c. 1406-1468), the daughter of Duke Ernst of Bavaria-Munich and aunt of Albrecht IV, married Duke Adolf of Jülich-Berg (c. 1360-1437) in 1430.
513 The payments are transcribed in Ibid. p. 14. They were also mentioned by Hartig, Münchner Künstler und Kunstsachen (Vol. 1). p. 16-17.
514 Krenn, "Städte und Märkte "des lands in nidern Bairn". p. 32
Bavaria-Straubing after the death of John III of Bavaria-Straubing in 1425. Straubing became a secondary residence of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich and Albrecht III of Bavaria-Munich acted as deputy of his father there.\textsuperscript{515} Nevertheless in the Alte Hof, the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace, St Wolfgang in Pipping and Grünwald Castle the armorial bearings were applied to interiors as well as exteriors.

**The structuring principle of the exteriors’ and interiors’ genealogical decorations**

This examination of the exterior’s heraldic schemes of the Alte Hof’s Burgstock, the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace, St Wolfgang in Pipping and the gatehouse of Grünwald Castle as well as the interior of the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace indicates that with the exception of the gatehouse of Grünwald Castle, commissioned by Albrecht IV rather than Sigmund, the selection of the armorial bearings for their respective locations was structured by an underlying principle. The coats-of-arms employed for the exteriors’ decoration refer specifically to the Dukes of Bavaria, their titular designation as Counts Palatine of the Rhine, Louis the Bavarian and the matrimonial alliances of male members of the Bavarian-Munich line with princesses of other aristocratic houses. The armorial scheme of the gable of Grünwald Castle’s gatehouse does not feature an explicit reference to Louis the Bavarian and it includes references to the conjugal bonds of the members of the other lines of the Wittelsbach dynasty (i.e. Duke Stephen II of Lower-Bavaria).

The heraldic programme of the interior of the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace was extended to incorporate a wider range of relatives and ancestors who were not limited to members of the Bavaria-Munich line (i.e. Duke Stephen II of Lower-Bavaria and Isabeau de Bavière). Likewise the hall with the genealogical murals in the Alte Hof’s Zwingerstock and probably the great hall in Grünwald Castle, decorated with eight history paintings as well as armorial escutcheons, made reference to a broader range of progenitors and kinship. In comparison with the heraldic programmes of the Alte Hof’s Burgstock, the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace and to some extent of Grünwald Castle the interiors’ decorative schemes were conceptually more complex. They do not exclusively refer to the Wittelsbach dynasty’s Bavaria-Munich line and they presented the house as a united dynasty. The armorial programmes’ location and audiences prompted the programmatic contents’ distinction of the exteriors and interiors. The exteriors’ heraldic programmes addressed a broader range of beholders and had to identify the buildings as residences or commissions of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich. Thus they had to be specific and intelligible in conveying their programmatic meaning, whereas the interiors’ schemes could present a complex genealogical and political concept because their beholders were more knowledgeable of the history of the Wittelsbach dynasty and the political agenda of Sigmund as well as Albrecht IV.

\textsuperscript{515} Krenn, 'Ein Herzogtum erlischt'. p. 37-38; Wild, 'Ausblick'. p. 39; Ziegler, 'Bayern'. p. 757
The significance of armorial bearings in fifteenth-century society

In the Middle Ages and the early modern era coats-of-arms were emblematic representations of individuals and groups. They acted as a ‘code social’ by displaying the individual’s role within a family or a group and in turn the family or group’s rank within society. In principle any judicable person could hold a coat-of-arms in the Middle Ages and the early modern era, but it was primarily a means of the aristocracy to display their status. The emergence of heraldry from the middle of the twelfth century was related to the consolidation of stable territories as the basis of the princely reign and establishment of the princely residences. Objects and spaces were tagged with coats-of-arms. Thereby armorial bearings acted as markers of the rulers’ sphere of power.

Birgit Franke and Barbara Welzel observed that through their ubiquity heraldic and semi-heraldic symbols acted like an accompanying ‘soundtrack’ that enriched the self-aggrandizement of aristocrats and their dynasties.

Sven Luken observed in his study of Albrecht Dürer’s Triumphal Arch (dated 1515) for Emperor Maximilian I that gate towers decorated with coats-of-arms were common in the Habsburgs’ lands in the second half of the fifteenth century. For example, the wall of armorial bearings (1453) on the exterior of the Chapel of St George in the castle of Wiener Neustadt displayed 107 heraldic shields around a sculptural depiction of Frederick III, who commissioned this façade decoration, on the courtyard-side of the western gate. Another tower with armorial bearings was located in the Upper Austrian town of Vöcklabruck. It was built in 1502 and featured a painted portrait of Maximilian I and coats-of-arms that represented his domains. The tower with escutcheons at the imperial palace (Hofburg) in Innsbruck was completed by 1499 and demolished during an eighteenth-century construction campaign. Salomon Kleiner’s etching (1750) documents the tower’s disposition, whose armorial decoration was designed by Maximilian I’s court painter Jörg Kölderer, who was allowed to include his portrait in a central place. The fifty-four coats-of-arms were arranged in six rows. Escutcheons of Maximilian I and his wife Bianca Maria Sforza, illustrating their matrimonial alliance, surmounted the rows of armorial bearings to demonstrate the emperor’s supremacy over his domains.

---


518 Franke and Welzel, 'Paläste und Zelte voller Kunst. Zur Hofkultur Karls des Kühnen'. p. 53

519 Ibid. p. 456-457. For a reproduction of Salomon Kleiner’s etching of the imperial palace’s tower in Innsbruck refer to Lüken, 'Kaiser Maximilian I. und seine Ehrenpforte'. p. 456

520 Ibid. p. 456-457.
Coats-of-arms as means of displaying dynastic relations, genealogies and territorial possessions also formed part of the iconography of princes’ formal entries (‘Joyeuse Entrées\(^521\)) in the Netherlands. According to Sven Lüken, houses, towers and temporary portals\(^522\) of honour were decorated with escutcheons for the arrival and entry of princes like Emperor Maximilian I (1477, 1486 and 1508) and Princess Juana of Castile in Brussels (1496).\(^523\)

The genealogical writings and murals commissioned by the Wittelsbach dukes

The conception of the Wittelsbach dynasty as a united, single house had emerged in genealogical chronicles and was translated into visual propaganda with the genealogical mural in the Alte Hof’s Zwingerstock. It allowed Sigmund and Albrecht IV of Bavaria-Munich to resort to members of other lines for their legitimation.

The genealogical chronicles of the Dukes of Bavaria

Jean-Marie Moeglin suggested that the legitimation of the princely reign in the Middle Ages was based on three notions. Firstly, the dynastic strategy glorifies a dynasty’s ancestral past by referring to real and legendary ancestors to construct a reputable, noble lineage. Secondly, the ‘national’ concept highlights the uninterrupted princely authority over a territory that is perceived as an autonomous entity. Thirdly, the ‘genealogical’ strategy establishes a succession of rulers, related by blood, from the territory’s foundation to the contemporary generation of princes who commissioned these historiographic works. Thereby, a dynasty’s genealogy is at once linked with a territory and with a continuous bloodline of rulers who governed it. The ‘genealogical’ strategy is at once dynastic and national as the territory is identified with the dynasty and vice versa.\(^524\)

The first genealogy was created at the Benedictine abbey in Scheyern for the Wittelsbach dukes. (Plate 1) The castle at Scheyern used to be the principal seat of the Wittelsbach dynasty until the late eleventh century when they moved their court to the castle in Wittelsbach near Aichach. (Plate 1) Subsequently Otto V established a Benedictine abbey in Scheyern that is dedicated to the Holy Cross and the Assumption of the Virgin Mary. He was buried there as Duke Otto I of Bavaria in 1183. The abbey
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\(^521\) For a definition of these formal entries and their occasions refer to Rudolph, ‘Entrée’. p. 319


\(^523\) Ibid. p. 477-479


The Scheyern genealogy aimed to obscure the true origins of the Wittelsbachs and glorified them by relating the Bavarian dukes to the Carolingians. However this endeavour was not as successful as intended, because Otto von Freising’s history, providing a different view on the Wittelsbach’s origin and ascent, was more widely disseminated.\footnote{Spiegel, 'Review of Jean-Marie Moeglin, *Les ancêtres du prince: Propagande politique et naissance d’une histoire nationale en Bavière au moyen âge (1180-1500)*'. p. 196}

After 1250 the failed dynastic approach of the Bavarian dukes’ historiographic commission resulted in a conceptual shift. The new strategy—the creation of a national history—coincided with the gradual development of the territorial form of the duchy of Bavaria (‘Territorialstaat’). It emphasised the permanence of the Duchy of Bavaria. These histories claimed that Bavarians had been expelled from their homeland by the Goths and returned under the leadership of Theodon I in 508. Since the time of this ‘homecoming’ the duchy was continuously reigned by a series of Bavarian princes. Their government reflected the unity and the independence of the territory and the Bavarian people. Even though these histories were anti-imperial in sentiment, they did not necessarily glorify the Wittelsbach dynasty, as they were only the last rulers in a long line of Bavarian dukes. Nevertheless these histories were advantageous to the Wittelsbach dynasty. The Wittelsbach dukes did not necessarily contribute to the glorious ancient past of their territory but they continued their predecessors’ traditions and built on their achievements.\footnote{Ibid. p. 196}

This ‘nationalist’ strand of Bavarian historiography was doomed by the inheritance struggles of the Wittelsbach dukes in the early fourteenth century. Already by 1255 the duchy had been divided into two separate branches under Duke Louis II and Duke Henry XIII. Almost a century later Emperor Louis the Bavarian reunited the Upper and Lower Bavarian branches of the duchy in 1340. However this unification only lasted until 1353 when the Duchy of Bavaria-Straubing-Holland (1353-1425) was created. In 1392 the duchy’s last large partition occurred: Duke Stephen II received the Duchy of Bavaria-Ingolstadt (1392-1447) by drawing lots, the Duchy of Bayern-Landshut was given to Duke Frederick and Duke John II was to reign over the Duchy of Bavaria-Munich.\footnote{Ibid. p. 196-197}

Duke Louis IV’s election as Holy Roman Emperor in 1314 shifted the historiographers’ focus again. The contested election and struggles with his rival candidate Frederick I of Austria forced Louis the Bavarian to find means to legitimize his authority and imperial status. Therefore ‘national’ concerns were of lesser importance to chroniclers under Louis the Bavarian’s patronage.
In the second half of the fourteenth century the Wittelsbach dukes had to realise that their aspirations of becoming the Empire’s imperial dynasty did not materialise. In the decades after Louis the Bavarian’s death the emperor remained a controversial and problematic figure for his dynasty’s legitimation because of the emperor’s dispute with the papacy, his excommunication and the ‘damnatio memoriae’ that has never been annulled by the papacy.  

Initially Louis the Bavarian and his legacy were forgotten in Bavaria. However Bavarian monasteries like Ettal, founded by Louis the Bavarian in 1330, maintained a liturgical memoria of their founder. Thereby they contributed substantially to the fifteenth-century revival of this important ancestor of the Wittelsbach dukes who became one of the central figures of territorial and dynastic historiography in the fifteenth century.

On the one hand, Louis the Bavarian represented a glorious figure in the Wittelsbach dynasty’s history. His struggle with the papacy and his subsequent excommunication could not gloss over his political success as Holy Roman Emperor, including the extension of his dynasty’s authority through advantageous marriages and territorial gains, as well as on the battlefield. (Plate 3) On the other hand, he reunited the divided Duchy of Bavaria in 1340 and thus became the progenitor of all four of the dynasty’s lines after the partitions in the second half of the fourteenth century. The heads of these four lines aimed to gain the hegemony among the Bavarian duchies and intended to eventually reunite them like Louis the Bavarian had done. Hence they had the greatest interest in claiming his heritage.

The fifteenth century became the golden age of Bavarian historiography with authors like Andreas von Regensburg, Hans Ebran von Wildenberg, Ulrich Füetrer and Veit Arnpeck. Except for Arnpeck’s *Chronica Baioarorum* (1494-1495) the writings of the other fifteenth-century historiographers revived notions of the Scheyern works, which had not been promulgated after the mid-thirteenth century. The dynastic strategies of the Scheyern chronicles were employed to explain and reconstruct the lineage of the fifteenth-century Wittelsbach dukes. It was believed that they were related to various important dynasties like the Carolingians and the Salier. In these chronicles the Wittelsbach dukes could also look upon an illustrious family history that was traced back to the very first Bavarian dukes: Bavarus and Norix. The history of the Duchy of Bavaria became synonymous with the history of the Wittelsbach dynasty and vice versa. The dynasty and duchy became conceptually inseparable.

---

529 Ibid. p. 197; Moeglin, ‘Das Bild Ludwigs des Bayern in der deutschen Geschichtsschreibung des Spätmittelalters (ca. 1370-ca. 1500)’. p. 240-241


531 Moeglin, ‘Das Bild Ludwigs des Bayern in der deutschen Geschichtsschreibung des Spätmittelalters (ca. 1370-ca. 1500)’. p. 240

Andreas von Regensburg’s *Chronica de principibus terrae Bavarorum*

Andreas von Regensburg wrote the *Chronica de principibus terrae Bavarorum* (Chronicle of the Bavarian Princes, 1425-1428) for his patron Duke Louis VII of Bavaria-Ingolstadt to substantiate Louis VII’s claim of the territories of the childless dukes of Bavaria-Straubing that were based on his descent from Louis the Bavarian. Andreas von Regensburg shrewdly sourced information and historic episodes from earlier chronicles like *De ducibus Bavariae* and *Fundationes monasteriorum Bavariae* as well as the Table of Scheyern. This genealogical list was created in the last quarter of the fourteenth century and seems to have been displayed in the cloister of the Scheyern monastery in the fifteenth century. This table aimed to confirm the dynastic connections between the Carolingians and the Wittelsbachs. Thereby it established a kinship between the Wittelsbach dynasty and these eminent ancestors, in particular Charlemagne. 533

Rather than structuring the narrative in a chronological order, Andreas von Regensburg arranged it according to a logical plan that eschewed unnecessary details and facts. This allowed him to pronounce certain historic events or persons like Duke Otto I of Bavaria and Louis the Bavarian.

For Andreas von Regensburg the appointment of Otto I as the first Wittelsbach duke of Bavaria in 1180 was not the installation of a new dynasty on the ducal throne but he conceived it as the duchy’s return to the heirs of Charlemagne. (Plate 37, Plate 40 and Plate 48) This notion is comparable with the thirteenth-century concept of the Bavarian people’s return to their homeland. In the instance of Andreas von Regensburg’s history the homecoming was linked to the Wittelsbach dynasty.

Andreas von Regensburg also emphasised Louis the Bavarian as a central figure among the ancestors of the Wittelsbach dukes. He portrayed the emperor as an exemplary, successful, magnanimous prince and as an important member of the Wittelsbach dynasty by focussing attention on the most characteristic episodes of Louis the Bavarian’s life. For example, Andreas highlighted Louis’s generosity toward Rudolf’s sons. According to Andreas’s chronicle, Louis forgave his nephews for their father’s disloyalty by enfeoffing them with the Palatinate and the Upper Palatinate. Andreas von Regensburg interpreted this historic episode in a manner that was appropriate for his patron’s political agenda. 534 In the view of Louis the Bavarian and more so in the interpretation of this event by Andreas or rather Louis VII, the unity of the Wittelsbach dynasty’s complete territorial possessions was not as important as the integrity of the Bavarian heartland (Lower and Upper Bavaria), which had been reunited in 1340. Therefore Louis the Bavarian became the progenitor of all fifteenth-century
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533 Ibid. p. 197; Moeglin, ‘Das Bild Ludwigs des Bayern in der deutschen Geschichtsschreibung des Spätmittelalters (ca. 1370-ca. 1500)’. p. 244 & 250
Bavarian dukes whereas Rudolf was presented as the forefather of the Counts Palatine of the Rhine.

Hans Ebran von Wildenberg’s *Chronik von den Fürsten aus Baiern*

Hans Ebran von Wildenberg wrote his *Chronik von den Fürsten aus Baiern* (Chronicle of the Dukes of Bavaria, 1479) for Duke Louis IX the Rich of Bavaria-Landshut and based it on Andreas von Regensburg as well as Twinger von Königshofen. He structured the ducal succession according to dynasties (‘stamen’) and added information on those periods (i.e. the time from the duchy’s origins to its occupation by the Romans) that were not covered by Andreas von Regensburg. However, Hans Ebran von Wildenberg did not make any effort to relate the Wittelsbachs to dynasties more distant than the Carolingians as he followed Andreas von Regensburg conception of associating the Wittelsbach dynasty only to the Carolingians. By doing so the Wittelsbachs were presented as the legitimate rulers of Bavaria, which had been founded by Charlemagne. After the death of Arnulf the Evil they experienced an era of ‘wandering in the desert’ that ended with the succession of Otto of Wittelsbach to the Bavarian ducal throne in 1180.\(^{535}\) (Plate 37, Plate 39 and Plate 40)

Hans Ebran von Wildenberg also created a very favourable image of Louis the Bavarian. He was regarded as the glorious representative of the magnificent dynasty of the dukes of Bavaria.\(^{536}\) Unlike Andreas von Regensburg and Twinger von Königshofen this overall very flattering characterisation of Louis the Bavarian ends with a less pleasing description of the emperor’s death in 1347 by mentioning his excommunication: ‘One day Emperor Louis, after reigning for thirty-two years, rode to Untersdorf for hunting. There he fell and died abruptly [without having been able to] confess and to do penance and whilst being excommunicated; that happened in the year 1347 after the incarnation of Christ. And he was brought to Munich where he was buried in the parish Church of Our Lady and left six sons.’\(^{537}\)

Hans Ebran von Wildenberg’s portrayal of Louis the Bavarian must have been intended to deliberately differ from earlier historiographic characterisations, which portray the Wittelsbach emperor as the progenitor of all of the Wittelsbach dynasty’s lines, and those commissioned by the dukes of Bavaria-Munich, because the relatives in Munich became strong competitors for the dukes of Bavaria-Landshut in the second half of the fifteenth century. Unlike the dukes in Landshut who based their legitimaton

---


536 Moeglin, 'Das Bild Ludwigs des Bayern in der deutschen Geschichtsschreibung des Spätmittelalters (ca. 1370-ca. 1500)’. p. 245

537 ‘Keiser Ludbig, do er gehescrhet hett 32 jar, reit er eins tags aus zw Understorf und wolt jagen. Do viel er hin und starb eines jähen tods an peicht und pues und im pann; das geschah nach der menscherwurdung Cristi 1347 jar. Und er ward gefüert gin Münichen und daselben begraven in unser frawen pfarkirchn und lies sechs sün’. – Transcribed in Ibid. p. 245-246
on their direct ancestors whose tomb is located in the convent in Seligenthal, the dukes of Bavaria-Munich founded their authority and the legitimation of their reign as Bavarian dukes upon their glorious ancestor Emperor Louis the Bavarian. He was buried in the Church of Our Lady in Munich, which was rebuilt from 1468 in the Late Gothic style to create a contemporary, venerable ‘shrine’ for the dynastic tomb. The dukes of Bavaria-Landshut must have anxiously observed this ambitious and successful building project.

Building work on the Church of St Martin in Landshut commenced circa 1385. The generous present of a house opposite the sacristy for master mason Hans von Burghausen in 1406 from Duke Henry the Rich of Bavaria-Landshut manifested the ducal involvement in this project. The dukes gained complete control over the building project after the citizens’ revolt of 1410 but the completion of the church with its tall single tower required almost one century. In contrast the Church of Our Lady was finished almost entirely within two decades as a result of the commitment of dukes, citizens, town council and the clever plan of master mason Jörg von Halspach. More importantly only ten years after the laying of the foundation stone, at the time when Hans Ebran wrote his chronicle, the roof truss was placed onto the Church of Our Lady. The swift progress of the building work in Munich must have caused distress in Landshut. Hans Ebran von Wildenberg’s chronicle evidently tried to diminish the genealogical importance of Louis the Bavarian for the fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Bavarian dukes to counter the propaganda and political agenda of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich.

Ulrich Füetrer’s *Bairische Chronik*

Duke Albrecht IV of Bavaria-Munich commissioned Ulrich Füetrer to write the *Bairische Chronik* (1478-1481) concurrently with Hans Ebran von Wildenberg’s historiographic project for Louis IX of Bavaria-Landshut. The *Bairische Chronik* covers the vast history of Bavaria, beginning in circa 60 BC with the reign of the Roman Emperor Pompeius and ending in 1481. Two sequels cover the history of the Duchy of Bavaria and the Wittelsbach dynasty up to 1502 and 1511.
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538 Princess Ludmilla of Bohemia (c. 1170-1240), the first wife of Louis I and the widow of Count Adalbert III of Bogen, founded the Cistercian Abbey in Seligenthal outside Landshut’s town walls in 1232. Shortly after the foundation the work on the Chapel of St Afra must have commenced, because initially Ludmilla was buried there. Her remains were transferred into the church’s choir when the abbey church was completed in 1259. After the partition of the Duchy of Bavaria in 1255 the St Afra Chapel became the location of the tomb of the Dukes of Lower Bavaria and later that of the Bavaria-Landshut line. The dynastic tomb in the Cistercian Abbey at Seligenthal is the oldest sepulchre of the Wittelsbach dynasty situated adjacent to one of their ducal seats. – Refer to Hofmann, ‘Residenz - Grabele - Herrschaftskirche’. p. 224 & 226; Ziegler, ‘Bayern’. p. 753-754.
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Ulrich Füetrer and Albrecht IV respectively pursued three objectives with this historiographic project. Firstly, the *Bairische Chronik* presents a continuous series of rulers. The bloodline of Albrecht IV reaches back to the origins of the Duchy of Bavaria when it received its identity. Secondly, Louis the Bavarian and his emperorship are glorified. Undignified aspects of his reign like his excommunication are glossed over. Thirdly, the *Bairische Chronik* promotes the unity of the Duchy of Bavaria as well as the Wittelsbach dynasty. Albrecht IV is characterised as the only true heir of Louis the Bavarian and thus the sole pretender to the ducal throne of a united duchy.

The genesis of the Duchy of Bavaria is related to the expulsion of Prince Bavarus and his people from their homeland in Füetrer’s version of the history of Bavaria. The occupation of Armenia by the Romans under Pompeius’s rule forced the courageous, magnanimous Bavarus and his people to leave their country. Bavarus and his subjects esteemed their inherited independence. They choose to migrate to ‘Bavaria’ rather than to become subservient subjects of the Romans. There, Bavarus united his people with the native tribe of Norix. (Plate 35 and Plate 44) Bavarus brought peace and law to his new homeland. His sense of justice (i.e. he protected the poor from injustice) helped Bavarus to win the trust of his new subjects. After Norix’s death Bavarus ruled over ‘Bavaria’ alone and conferred his name upon this territory. He also incorporated ‘Osterfrancken, Kerlingen, Burgund, Oesterreich,isterreich und Merhern’ (East Francia, Carinthia (?), Burgundy, Austria, Istria, Merania) into his lands.543

Bavarus’s successors Boemundus und Ingraminon were praised in the *Sächsische Weltchronik* (Saxon World Chronicle) and in Füetrer’s *Bairische Chronik* for their support of Julius Caesar’s march on Rome. (Plate 35) Julius Caesar expressed his gratitude for the Bavarians’ aid with the treasures that he gifted his ‘German’ allies. In Füetrer’s view, the Bavarian princes and people benefited from the alliance with the Roman ruler, because their manners and customs were refined at an early stage in the country’s history.544

Füetrer’s version of the beginning of the history of the Duchy of Bavaria emphasises the importance of Bavarus, a brave and free prince who provided the territory and its people with an identity by bestowing it with his name. On the other hand, Füetrer connected Bavaria’s early history with that of the ancient Roman Empire. By doing so the history of Bavaria became intertwined with world history, the Bavarians were characterised as a civilised people, and thereby Füetrer increased the acclaim of the Duchy of Bavaria as well as the Wittelsbach dynasty.545

The subsequent history as presented in the *Bairische Chronik* differed from the ‘narratives’ of Andreas von Regensburg and Hans Ebran von Wildenberg. Ulrich Füetrer associated the Wittelsbach dukes not only with the Carolingians; he also related them to a broader range of more remote dynasties and princes.546 Füetrer already

---

543 Gottschalk, ‘Geschichtsschreibung’. p. 92
544 Ibid. p. 92, 100-101
545 Ibid. p. 92-93
touched on this notion in the *Buch der Abenteuer* (1473-1484/87) where he wrote about Albrecht IV’s descent that ‘the fruit takes after the trunk’: [547] [he is] highly dignified because of his lineage and blood, Armenia, Rome, the Frankish Empire, the Greeks and Hungary, from this pond of blood emerged his ancestors and had their origins there. In Füetrer’s view, the dukes of Bavaria-Munich could for this reason look upon a long, illustrious lineage of ancestors that reached back to the duchy’s origins and incorporated several dynasties, but in the end formed a single bloodline (‘linea sanguinis’ from Bavarus via Louis the Bavarian to Albrecht IV and his heir William IV).

The conception of a continuous succession of related rulers on the ducal throne found also expression in a central notion of the *Bairische Chronik* that regarded the dynasty’s branches as mere ramifications of its central line. This reasoning of Füetrer’s genealogical narrative amalgamated all of the Bavarian dukes, beginning with Bavarus and leading up to the Wittelsbach dukes of the late fifteenth century, with the genealogy of the Wittelsbach dynasty, which he described as the ‘edlen stams von Bayem’ ([the noble house of Bavaria]). This conception of the history of the House of Bavaria contrasts with that of Andreas von Regensburg and Hans Ebran von Wildenberg who highlighted Otto of Wittelsbach’s rise to the ducal throne in 1180. They perceived Otto’s enfeoffment with the Duchy of Bavaria as a rupture in the ducal succession, whereas Füetrer presented it as the duchy’s transition from one branch of the ducal house to another one. According to Füetrer’s reasoning, the Wittelsbach dukes did not derive the legitimation of their sovereignty from imperial investiture but their authority was based on their ancestry and their bloodline. [549]

Füetrer eschewed a chronological presentation in favour of an effective, ‘literary’ structure of his chronicle, which allowed him to present only a selection of the most famous and memorable ancestors of the Wittelsbach dynasty. By doing so Füetrer solved the problem of legitimation with his genealogical argumentation. The Wittelsbach dynasty not only descended from the most eminent dynasties and was related to emperors, more importantly the dynasty produced a Holy Roman Emperor. [550]

The eminence and central role of Louis the Bavarian that had already been stressed in Andreas von Regensburg’s *Chronica de principibus terrae Bavarorum* was further accentuated in Füetrer’s *Bairische Chronik*. His carefully structured narrative covers Louis the Bavarian’s struggle with Frederick I of Austria for the imperial throne, the
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547 ‘Stamen’ means trunk when translated literally. In this instance ‘stamen’ refers to the founder of the dynasty. However as it is a poetic text, trunk with its genealogical connotation is the appropriate translation.


dispute with the papacy, Louis’s relationships with his Lower Bavarian cousins as well as his brother Rudolf and the emperor’s death.

Füetrer’s description of Louis’s rift with the pope and his coronation in Rome emphasises the support that Louis received from the Roman citizens and more importantly from the cardinals. Thereby Füetrer aimed to retrospectively legitimate Louis’s coronation in Rome and refute his excommunication.

Even though Füetrer adopted the notion of Andreas von Regensburg for his account of the conflict between Louis and Rudolf, he bestowed the opponents with more contrasting characters by setting off Louis’s magnanimity with the bitterness of Rudolf who intended to force his younger brother to resign by all means.

The *Bairische Chronik* also highlights Louis the Bavarian’s efforts to diligently rebuild the unity of his dynasty, which had been severely divided by conflicts. With the duchy’s reunification Louis the Bavarian had become the progenitor of all four Bavarian lines of the Wittelsbach dynasty that emerged after the partitions in the second half of the fourteenth century. Füetrer’s characterisation of Louis the Bavarian appropriately ends with an eulogy, praising the emperor as an advocate of peace in the Holy Roman Empire as Füetrer wrote: ‘the emperor’s reign was beneficial for the Empire. He was peaceful and prevented military disputes in the Empire. […] May God show compassion for his soul and have mercy on him. Amen.’

Füetrer intended to diminish the fact that Louis the Bavarian had died in excommunication by commending the emperor’s deeds, as they would atone for those aspects of Louis’s life that might be regarded by a contemporary audience as ignominious. Therefore Füetrer’s portrayal of the Wittelsbach emperor decidedly differs from Hans Ebran von Wildenberg’s account.

Veit von Ebersberg’s *Chronicon Bavarorum* (1504-1506), written for Albrecht IV during the Landshut War of Inheritance, echoes the importance of Louis the Bavarian as crucial progenitor for the legitimation of the authority and political claims of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich. Veit von Ebersberg boldly presented Albrecht IV as the only legitimate heir of Louis the Bavarian. Therefore Albrecht IV could not only present his line as the custodians of the emperor’s tomb in the Church of Our Lady, for which he commissioned Hans Haldner to create a red marble Tumba, Albrecht IV manifested that only he and his progenies could continue Louis the Bavarian’s legacy based on their blood.

The literary rather than chronological approach of the *Bairische Chronik* enabled Füetrer and his patron to accentuate certain themes like the unity of the Duchy of Bavaria. Already the description of the amalgamation of the peoples of Bavarus and Norix at the very beginning of the duchy’s history demonstrates this conceptual scheme,
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551 *Aller erst kam der kaiser ain wenig zu rue, und er merte wol das reich. Er was fridsam und verstörte alle krieg des reichs […] Gott sei seiner sel parmhartzig und genedig; amen’. – Moeglin, ‘Das Bild Ludwigs des Bayern in der deutschen Geschichtsschreibung des Spätmittelalters (ca. 1370-ca. 1500)’. p. 249 & 251

which is reflected in the concurrent political agenda of Albrecht IV.\textsuperscript{553} (Plate 35 and Plate 44)

An agreement of 1480 between Albrecht IV, Sigmund and Georg of Bavaria-Landshut aimed at restoring the duchy’s unity. As neither Sigmund nor Albrecht IV were married and had natural children at this stage they concurred with George that their lands would be reunited with George’s territories in the instance that they would not produce legitimate male heirs before their deaths. However it was not a mutual agreement since George placed his line’s interests before those of the duchy and the dynasty as a whole by dismissing the time-honoured dynastic policies and treatises (Hausverträge) by installing his son-in-law Ruprecht of the Palatinate as his successor shortly before his death. Albrecht IV must have perceived George’s decision as an insult, because George did not reciprocate the agreement of 1480 in favour of the Wittelsbach dynasty’s prospective advantage.\textsuperscript{554}

Veit Arnpeck’s \textit{Chronica Baioarorum}

The specific intentions that shaped the distinct historiographic approach of Füetrer’s chronicle are further emphasised when comparing his work with Veit Arnpeck’s near contemporary Latin \textit{Chronica Baioarorum} (1494-1495). Veit Arnpeck’s contrasting historiographic model, based on Otto von Freising’s writings, aimed to undermine Füetrer’s conception of a single, uninterrupted line of Bavarian history. Arnpeck also disputed the Wittelsbachs’ kinship with the Carolingians. Thus Arnpeck subverted the central notion of Bavarian dynastic and national history. In contrast Arnpeck traced a continuous succession of Bavarian rulers from 508 to the second half of the fifteenth-century who were of Bavarian extraction but not necessarily related. Thus he established Bavaria as a geographical region, which existed independently from its rulers and passed on from one dynasty to another without the requirement of their kinship by blood.\textsuperscript{555} This conception crippled Füetrer’s intention to merge the dynastic as well as national strategies in his genealogical approach and thereby connecting the Wittelsbach dynasty with their territory and vice versa in an inseparable relationship.

Arnpeck was a cleric with beneficiaries in the bishopric of Freising (documented at the Church of St Andrew in 1491) and the author of the chronicle of the bishops of Freising (\textit{Liber de gestis episcoporum Frisingensium}, finished in 1495).\textsuperscript{556} His writings reflect the constant struggle between the bishops of Freising and the Bavarian dukes. Since the time of Duke Henry the Lion, disputes between the bishops and the dukes of Bavaria existed. They continued after the installation of Otto I of Wittelsbach on the ducal

\textsuperscript{553} Störmer, 'Hof und Hofordnung in Bayern-München'. p. 369-371
\textsuperscript{554} Gottschalk, 'Geschichtsschreibung'. p. 102 & 105; Graf, 'Kunigunde'. p. 58; Spiegel, 'Review of Jean-Marie Moeglin, Les ancêtres du prince: Propagande politique et naissance d'une histoire nationale en Bavière au moyen âge (1180-1500)'. p. 198; Kraus, 'Sammlung der Kräfte und Aufschwung (1450-1508)'. p. 292-293; Moeglin, 'Das Bild Ludwigs des Bayern in der deutschen Geschichtsschreibung des Spätmittelalters (ca. 1370-ca. 1500)'. p. 253
\textsuperscript{555} Spiegel, 'Review of Jean-Marie Moeglin, Les ancêtres du prince: Propagande politique et naissance d'une histoire nationale en Bavière au moyen âge (1180-1500)'. p. 198
\textsuperscript{556} Ibid. p. 198; Liebhart, 'Arnpeck, Veit'.
throne of Bavaria. Especially in the late fifteenth century the bishops must have feared the political agenda of Albrecht IV of Bavaria-Munich for he aimed to turn the Church of Our Lady into the centre of a diocese. This objective might have been inspired by Emperor Frederick III’s success in establishing Vienna as diocese in 1468, but the Wittelsbachs did not succeed until the nineteenth century. However in 1495 Albrecht IV accomplished the incorporation of the monks and relics of the monasteries in Ilmmünster and Schliersee into the chapter of the Church of Our Lady, which was elevated to a collegiate church. These ducal interferences into the authority and realm of the bishop of Freising must have triggered the counter-propaganda of Arnpeck’s *Chronica Baioarorum*.

On the other hand, Arnpeck is also documented in Landshut in 1468, 1487 and 1492 where he worked at the Church of St Martin. Hence the argument of his *Chronica Baioarorum* might have been supported by Duke George of Bavaria-Landshut who certainly was not a supporter of Albrecht IV’s idea to reunite the Duchy of Bavaria under the hegemony of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich.

Even though Arnpeck’s argument and chronicle evaluated the history of the Duchy of Bavaria more ‘objectively’ and presented it in a more systematic manner, it was a comparatively unsuccessful effort that was thwarted by the instant success of Füetrer’s *Bairische Chronik* between 1480 and 1510. In fact Füetrer’s chronicle became the greatest, most well known fifteenth-century history of Bavaria, because he had distilled the historiographic sources of his *Bairische Chronik* into a powerful, successful narrative that reflected the political intentions of his patron Albrecht IV of Bavaria-Munich.

These chronicles of the Duchy of Bavaria and the Wittelsbach dynasty were not exceptional endeavours in the late Middle Ages and the early modern era. By the end of the Middle Ages genealogical writings in narrative or tabular form to glorify legendary and real ancestors were written in many principalities throughout Europe. The most prominent contemporary example is Jacques de Guise’s *Chroniques de Hainaut* (c. 1278) that had been translated by Jean Wauquelin for Philip the Good and contains an illumination, which was attributed to Rogier van der Weyden. The Bavarian dukes may have heard of Philip the Good’s project, as the magnificent Burgundian court was a topic of interest for princes across Europe. Nevertheless the Bavarian chronicles did not contain any sophisticated illuminations like Rogier van der Weyden’s frontispiece in the *Chroniques de Hainaut* that depicts Philip the Good receiving the translated chronicle (1448). For example, the *Buch der Abenteuer* contains only the armorial bearings of
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Bavaria and Austria to illustrate the alliance of the two dynasties that stemmed from the marriage of Albrecht IV of Bavaria-Munich and Kunigunde of Austria. This absence of a larger amount of illustrations is apparently characteristic of medieval chronicles in the Holy Roman Empire according to Nigel Morgan.\textsuperscript{561} It might also be promoted by the lack of specialised scribes and illuminators in Munich. The Bavarian dukes had to refer to workshops in monasteries like Tegernsee and Indersdorf or in Imperial Free Towns like Augsburg and Nuremberg. Nevertheless these Bavarian chronicles contained a unique Bavarian narrative and conception of dynastic as well as ‘national’ history, which is also reflected in the subject matter of the genealogical cycle from the Alte Hof in Munich.

The genealogical mural of the Alte Hof and its manuscript copies

At least one room in the Alte Hof featured murals. The fragments of this large genealogical cycle, showing only fourteen of the original sixty-one figures, were discovered on 5\textsuperscript{th} August 1850 during renovation work in the Zwingerstock (the Alte Hof’s southern wing) where they remained until 1893 when they were transferred into the Bayerisches Nationalmuseum in Munich.\textsuperscript{562} (Plate 33) The fragments in the Bayerisches Nationalmuseum depict fourteen members of the Arnulfing, Carolingian and Agilolfing dynasties who were claimed to be ancestors of the Bavarian dukes in the fifteenth century. The complete series of sixty-one legendary and real ancestors as well as relatives of the Bavarian dukes in its original conception is documented on two manuscript scrolls (c. 1470/80) in the Cabinet des Estamps of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris (Lugt 28). (Plate 35-Plate 42)

Likewise at least one room in the Neuveste was embellished with murals in 1485 by Master Jan, most probable Jan Polack, as recorded in those documents transcribed by Otto Hartig.\textsuperscript{563} (Plate 54 and Plate 55) The room must have belonged to the prospective apartments of Kunigunde of Austria whom Albrecht IV married in 1487. For this reason, Albrecht IV commissioned Ulrich Füetrer and Master Heinrich in 1486 and 1487 to decorate the halls in Grünwald Castle’s Dürnitzstock, the living quarters of the duke and duchess, with armorial bearings and murals that showed eight historic scenes.\textsuperscript{564}

\textsuperscript{561} Morgan, 'Chronicles and histories, manuscript',


\textsuperscript{564} The payments are transcribed in Wild, \textit{Prähistorische Staatssammlung.} p. 14. They were also mentioned by Hartig, \textit{Münchner Künstler und Kunstsachen (Vol. 1).} p. 16-17.
The Alte Hof’s genealogical mural

The mural must have been commissioned by Sigmund of Bavaria-Munich in the first half of the 1460s, because John IV and Sigmund are the last princes in this chronological series of full-length portraits. (Plate 42) The verses below the portraits of John IV and Sigmund indicate that the genealogical cycle was painted after John IV’s death of the bubonic plague on 18th November 1463 as the inscription refers to him as ‘Herczog Johannsz Pfalczgraw bey Rhein vnd Herczog in Baimn’; whereas Sigmund is addressed as ‘der genedig Herr Herczog Sigmund Pfalczgraff bey Rhein vndn Herczog in Bayrn’. ‘Genediger Herr’ as form of address was only employed when referring to the presently ruling duke. Had the genealogical mural been created after 1465, it would have included a depiction of Albrecht IV who joined the government on 10th September 1465. Based on this evaluation the murals must have been created after the death of John IV in 1463 and before Albrecht IV joined the ducal government in 1465.

The genealogical cycle with its dimensions of approximately twenty-three by two metres most probable decorated the walls of a corridor (according to Enno Burmeister) or a large heated chamber (according to Siegfried Hofmann) that formed part of the suite of official rooms in the Alter Hof’s Zwingerstock. (Plate 34) It was situated in a frieze-like manner below the ceiling of a four metre tall space so that its composition was not interrupted by the openings of windows or doors. If Burmeister’s conjecture is correct (his argument appears more plausible than that of Hofmann), the genealogical mural decorated a reception room or anteroom of the great hall. This corridor might have been comparable to the ‘Kapellengang’ in the urban Palace, built for Duke Louis X of Bavaria in Landshut. (Plate 136) The corridor outside the palace chapel which faces the courtyard and is situated on the first floor of the southern side of the Stadtresidenz’s Italian wing features illusionistic, painted mural niches between the

567 Burmeister, Die baugeschichtliche Entwicklung des Alten Hofes in München. p. 56
568 Unfortunately the original location of the murals has not been documented when they were discovered in 1850. Subsequent references did not necessarily require an exact description of their location as they were fixed and their transfer into the Bayerisches Nationalmuseum in 1893 could not have been anticipated. After the murals’ relocation into the Bayerisches Nationalmuseum the previous descriptions of their original site emerged as vague and contradictory. Hence most recently Hofmann and Burmeister attempted to reconstruct the murals’ original location. Hofmann assumed that the layout of the Zwingerstock’s interior echoed that of other contemporary palaces like the Neues Schloss in Ingolstadt. Based on this premise he argued that the mural could not have decorated a special hall dedicated to the commemoration of the dukes’ ancestors as suggested by Heinrich Konrad Föringer and Norbert Lieb. Hence Hofmann believed that the murals decorated one of the heated rooms in the duke’s official apartments. On the other hand Burmeister plausibly deduced from an examination of the Zwingerstock’s layout that the murals probably decorated a reception room or anteroom of the great hall. Burmeister based his examination on a plan of the Zwingerstock of 1895 that documented the layout of the building two years after the murals’ relocation and forty-five years after their discovery. Based on the size of the fragment in the Bayerisches Nationalmuseum Burmeister interpolates the dimensions of the mural that depicted all of the princes as documented by the manuscripts of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. This information together with an evaluation of the rooms and halls in the Zwingerstock enabled Burmeister to identify the most probable original site of the mural which currently functions as toilet.
windows as well as landscape scenes on the wall across from the windows. Portraits of Louis X’s ancestors are placed in these niches.569

The mural from the Alte Hof is the first known example of the commemoration of ancestors with portraits in a secular space in the Duchy of Bavaria-Munich.570 The Bavarian dukes had commemorated their ancestors in the table of Scheyern. More recently the Dukes of Bavaria-Munich had commissioned a mural in the votive chapel at Hoflach, west of Munich, to remember their victory in the battle against Louis VII of Bavaria-Ingolstadt in 1422 and pay tribute to the their supporters. (Plate 137) The chapel, dedicated to the Virgin Mary and St George, was erected circa 1430 and Gabriel Angler decorated the interior’s northern wall with a scene, showing Ernst, William III and Albrecht III of Bavaria-Munich with St George, aristocrats, and the spearmen as well as bowmen of Munich knelling in front of the Virgin and Christ Child with St Anne and the Holy Family. Most of the figures are identified by their coats-of-arms.571 Even though the dukes’ objective in commissioning this mural was not the memorialisation of their ancestors but their deed, to honour their supports and to reflect their gratitude for the divine protection, it must have been regarded as a pictorial commemoration of a high point of the dynastic and civic history, because an annual memorial service was held either in the Church of Our Lady or St Peter’s in the second half of the fifteenth century and the first half of the sixteenth century.572 Yet this mural is situated in an ecclesiastical context rather than a secular building.

The dukes of Bavaria-Straubing had decorated a room in a tower of their palace in Straubing with a painted frieze (c. 1420) that contains a series of armorial bearings like the imperial coat-of-arms of Louis the Bavarian.573 However this heraldic embellishment does not incorporate portrays of the dukes’ ancestors. Even though Albrecht IV commissioned a similar armorial decoration for a hall in Grünwald Castle in 1486/87, the commemoration of progenitors continued to occur mainly in ecclesiastical contexts like the Church of Our Lady, St Wolfgang in Pipping and the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace.

The manuscript copies of the genealogical mural

The mural of the Alte Hof inspired several manuscript copies that must have been presented to peers in order to promote the high esteem and visionary political agenda of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich.574 Two manuscript scrolls with tempera illustrations (c.

569 For a photograph of the corridor refer to Iris Lauterbach, Klaus Endemann, and Christoph Luitpold Frommel (eds.), Die Landshuter Stadtresidenz. Architektur und Ausstattung (Veröffentlichungen des Zentralinstituts für Kunstgeschichte, 14; Munich: Zentralinstitut für Kunstgeschichte, 1998). p. 60.
571 Bös, Gotik in Oberbayern. p. 79-81
572 Stahleder, Chronik der Stadt München. Die Jahre 1157-1505. p. 243
573 For a photograph, showing a detailed view of the heraldic decoration of the room in the tower of the ducal palace in Straubing, refer to Krenn, 'Städtte und Märkte "des lands in nidern Bairn"'. p. 32.
574 Ute Verstegen discussed the common practice among the European aristocracy to exchange portrays of the reigning princes and their ancestors. Refer to Ute Verstegen, 'Ahnengalerien und Stammbäume', in Anne Schunicht-Rawe and Vera Lüpkes (eds.), Handbuch der Renaissance (Cologne: DuMont Literatur und Kunst Verlag, 2002), 120-121. p. 121.
1470/80) in the Cabinet des Estamps of the Bibliothèque Nationale Paris show all sixty-one princes, dukes, kings and emperors. (Plate 35-Plate 42) The Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich holds three genealogical manuscripts with illuminations: a late fifteenth-century manuscript (Cgm 8533), a sixteenth-century book (Cgm 2822) and another sixteenth-century leather-bound manuscript (Cgm 1604). A sixteenth-century illuminated manuscript is stored in the Geheimes Hausarchiv in Munich (Handschrift 367).\(^{575}\) (Plate 43-Plate 52) Handschrift 367 must have originally been bound as a book, which is suggested by the relationship of the coats-of-arms on the verso side of the previous sheet with the figures on the recto side of the subsequent sheet. (Plate 43-Plate 44 and Plate 47-Plate 48) This sixteenth-century copy must have been based on a source that was created circa 1478/79, because unlike the Bibliothèque Nationale’s manuscript it includes Duke Georg of Bavaria-Landshut (Plate 52) who assumed government of the Duchy of Lower Bavaria after the death of his father Duke Louis IX of Bavaria-Landshut on 18\(^{th}\) January 1479. Moreover Count Palatine Albrecht of Mosbach and Neumarkt (1440-1506) is referred to as Dean of Strasbourg Cathedral. (Plate 49) On 12\(^{th}\) November 1478 Albrecht became Bishop of Strasbourg. Hence it can be assumed that the source of Handschrift 367 predated Albrecht’s appointment as bishop or was created shortly afterwards when this information was not yet readily available to its author. Handschrift 367 also includes depictions of Sigmund’s brothers Albrecht IV, Christoph and Wolfgang of Bavaria-Munich. (Plate 50 and Plate 51)

The reconstruction of the mural’s complete programme based on its manuscript copies

The quality of the illuminations of the Bibliothèque Nationale’s manuscripts may not match that of the mural. However they demonstrate that the fragments in the Bayerisches Nationalmuseum have been assembled incorrectly. (Plate 33, Plate 36-Plate 38) The mural’s fragments show the fourteen kings and emperors in the following order (from left to right): Otharius, Tassilo III, Emperor Louis the Pious, Carloman (‘Karolomanus’), Emperor Arnulf, King Otto of Hungary, Emperor Otto I the Great, Theodo, Arnulf von Metz, Angisus, Pippin the Great, Charlemagne, Karl Martell and Carloman (‘Karolomanus’). Whereas the correct chronological order in the manuscripts lists (from left to right) Theodo, Arnulf von Metz, Angisus, Pippin the Great, Charlemagne, Karl Martell, Carloman (‘Karolomanus’), Otharius, Tassilo II, Emperor Louis the Pious, Carloman (‘Karolo Manus’), Emperor Arnulf, King Otto of Hungary and Emperor Otto I the Great. Thus the left half of the mural was mistakenly exchanged with the right half and vice versa. (Plate 33, Plate 36-Plate 38)

The original programme of the mural as documented in the illuminated manuscript of the Bibliothèque Nationale Paris begins with the legendary ancestors of the Wittelsbach dukes: the alliance of Bavarius and Norix that marked the genesis of the Duchy of Bavaria. (Plate 35) Then it shows representatives (mostly kings and emperors) of eminent dynasties like the Agilolfings, Arnulfings, Carolingians, Ottonians, Luitpoldings, Saliens and Welfs. (Plate 35-Plate 39) Henry the Lion, the founder of

\(^{575}\) Anonymous, ‘Handschrift 367’, (Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv Munich - Geheimes Hausarchiv, 16th century).
Munich, is depicted next to Duke Otto I of Bavaria who represents the commencement of the Wittelsbachs’ reign in the Duchy of Bavaria. (Plate 40) Representatives of the Palatine line of the Wittelsbach dynasty like King Ruprecht of the Palatinate and his grandson Christoph, the future king of Denmark, are also included in this genealogical cycle. (Plate 41) The enthroned Emperor Louis the Bavarian, shown with the imperial cloak (Pluviale), crown, the imperial sceptre and orb, is prominently placed in the centre of the second manuscript scroll. (Plate 40) His eminence among the Wittelsbachs’ ancestors even surpasses that of Charlemagne. (Plate 37) Louis the Bavarian is the only prince who is seated on a throne. His central position on the second manuscript scroll must be an indication that the prominent placement of his portrait considered the setting of the genealogical mural. Louis the Bavarian’s descendents who represent the various branches of the Wittelsbach dynasty (Straubing, Ingolstadt, Landshut and Munich) are the last figures in this series. (Plate 40-Plate 42)

The princes in the mural’s fragments and in the manuscripts of the Bibliothèque Nationale are mostly shown in full frontal portrait view. Only those ancestors who were believed to have had a deplorable character or represent unacceptable personalities turn their back on the beholders. For example, it was assumed that Charles Martel, the illegitimate son of Pippin of Herstal, had been taken to hell by the devil. 576 (Plate 37) The figures are presented either as individuals, pairs or groups of three. They are dressed in historicising and contemporary costumes. The figures of the mural’s fragments are standing on a tiled floor with pointed quatrefoil patterned tiles and in front of a blue backdrop. (Plate 33) In contrast the space depicted in the manuscript illuminations is much simpler. The floor as well as the background in the manuscript are plain and kept in the colour of the paper. Nevertheless the manuscript illuminations still convey a sense of three-dimensionality and spatial recession. The ancestors and princes are generally identified by a set of two coats-of-arms (except for those ancestors representing the legendary and early beginnings of the dynasty who are only shown with one armorial bearing; the pair’s other shield was left blank), which are hanging on cords. This illusionistic motif creates another spatial layer. Verses below the coats-of-arms characterise each person and provide additional information.

The Bibliothèque Nationale’s manuscript, the Handschrift 367 and the genealogical mural of the Alte Hof indicate that Duke Sigmund had a novel conception of the Wittelsbach dynasty and its future that differed from those of his relatives and progenitors. For the first time a series of ancestors is presented in a secular context in the Duchy of Bavaria. Previously genealogical cycles were displayed in ecclesiastical contexts like the monastery of Scheyern and the Cistercian Abbey at Seligenthal outside Landshut.

In addition to the members of the Bavaria-Munich branch and their ancestors the genealogical cycles that originated at the court in Munich incorporate depictions of the

576 ‘Charles Martel who was said to have been a very wicked antagonist, a despicable “Panckhart” and brute, who was a king of the Frankish Empire; the devil took him with body and soul to hell for [giving him] great agony.’ – ‘Karolus Marcelus | der hiesz Ain arger | böser widerspriesz | Ain schnöder Panckhart | vnd wietreich Der | war ain Khinig in | Franckhreich Der | teufel in zw grosser | quell mit leib vnd | seel fuer in die hell’. – Charles Martel’s characterisation is also transcribed in Hofmann, ‘Die bayerischen Herzöge im Bild’. p. 284 and also mentioned on p. 263.
past and present dukes of Bavaria-Ingolstadt, Bavaria-Landshut and Bavaria-Straubing
as well as the representatives of the Palatine branch and King Otto of Hungary.577 These
relatives and ‘more distant’ ancestors were employed to emphasise the high esteem of
the Wittelsbach dynasty and the dukes of Bavaria-Munich. Hence the verse, which
describes Duke Louis VII of Bavaria-Ingolstadt, is surprisingly commendatory, even
though he stirred up the Bavarian War of 1420-1422.578 (Plate 41) Nevertheless the
eulogistic verse describes him as ‘the magnanimous and high-born Duke Louis, the
chosen and undaunted Count Palatine of the Rhine, Duke of Bavaria [and] Count of
Mortain [in France]’.579 Thereby alluding to Louis VII’s relationship to the French royal
court.

By depicting members of all branches of the Wittelsbach dynasty the genealogical
mural and the manuscripts stress the House of Bavaria’s unity. The conception of the
unity of the Wittelsbach dynasty and the Duchy of Bavaria is stipulated by the myth of
the foundation of Bavaria. The verses, describing the alliance of Bavarian and Norix at
the conceptual beginning of this genealogical cycle, praise the foresighted wisdom of
these two princes since they united their people and bestowed them as well as their
territory with an identity by naming it after Bavarian: ‘Bavarus, the first duke of the
Duchy of Bavaria who gave his name to his land, came from Armenia. Norix, the other
duke, had his main residence in Regensburg. At first the two disagreed but then they
swore fraternity […] and created a united territory with one coat-of-arms and one name
as if they descended from the same tribe’.580 (Plate 35) A similar eulogy, suggesting that
Bavarus bestowed the country with an identity and established a line of Bavarian princes,
is found in Handschrift 367. It states that Bavarus ‘came from Armenia to us, the
noble lineage with a dignified name, the high-born princes of Bavaria, the first was
called Bavarus who named the country after himself [and] from him [stems] this
princely house’.581 (Plate 44)

In contrast, the verses of Duke Stephen III of Bavaria-Ingolstadt, Duke Frederick of
Bavaria-Landshut and Duke John II of Bavaria-Munich emphasise that they ended the
Ingolstadt’.582 ‘This was Duke Frederick the Good of Bavaria who resided in
Landshut’.583 ‘Duke John [II] of Bavaria resided in Munich. They were brothers. The

577 Ibid. p. 265; Bastert, *Der Münchner Hof und Fuetrers 'Buch der Abenteuer'.* p. 194
578 Dittmar, ‘Kriegerische Auseinandersetzungen bis 1505 als Folge der Landesteilung’. p. 60-64
579 ‘Der grosmuetig vnd hochgeborn Herczog Ludwig der auserkhorn vnd vnue rzagt Pfalczgraw bey
Rhein Herczog in Bayern Graff zu Matein’. Duke Louis VII of Bavaria-Ingolstadt received the
earldom through his marriage with Anna of Bourbon. Also refer to Siegfried Hofmann, ‘Die
580 ‘Der Erst Herczog der hie obstat von dem Bayrlanndt den namen hat. Herczog Bauarus was sein nam
von Armenia er her kham. Der annder Herczog Norix hier der Nar(k)haw nach im nennen lies era cu
zw seiner Haubtstat Regenspurg aufgebouen hat. Diese zwen des erst vnainig wurenn Bruederschaft
sy zusammen schwurenn Ir berichtigung gemacht wart Das sy furbasz An widerbart Sollenn sein aines
wappens vnd nams Alls ob sy werenn ains stams.’ – Also transcribed in Hofmann,‘Die
581 ‘Aus Armenia unns her entspros, das edl geslächt des namen gros, die Edlnfürsten aus Bayrnlanndt,
der erst Herczog was genant, der dies lanndt nant nach seine namen, seyd von in ist hie der fürstlich
582 ‘Herczog Steffan von Bayrn was das der mit Hausz zw Inglatstat sasz.’ – Also transcribed in Hofmann,
‘Die bayerischen Herzöge im Bild’. p. 286
583 ‘Disz was Herczog | Frydrich der guet | von Bayrn, der da | sasz zw Landshut.’ – Also transcribed in
Ibid. p. 286
three divided the unified Duchy of Bavaria between themselves.\textsuperscript{584} (Plate 41) These verses are a critical evaluation from a mid-fifteenth century viewpoint, because they highlight that the three dukes partitioned the duchy even though they were brothers.

These genealogical cycles illustrate the Wittelsbach dynasty’s kinship with the Carolingians, Agilolfings, Arnulfings, Ottonians, Luitpoldings, Salians and Welfs. Although the ancestral tables cover the period from Norix and Bavarus up to the late fifteenth century with depictions of John IV and Sigmund or rather John IV, Sigmund, Albrecht IV, Christoph and Wolfgang of Bavaria-Munich as well as George of Bavaria-Landshut in the instance of Handschrift 367, they do not present a continuous bloodline like Ulrich Füetrer in his \textit{Bairische Chronik} or Veit von Ebersberg’s genealogical table that incorporate all progenitors. Nevertheless the Wittelsbach dukes are shown as part of a lineage of kings and emperors. Bavaria is portrayed as a royal realm early on in its history for the Bavarian dukes were at the same time kings and emperors. This notion encourages the deduction that the Wittelsbach dukes are related to these ‘Bavarian’ kings and emperors at least through their office if not by blood.

By relating the Wittelsbach dukes to illustrious royal and imperial dynasties as well as focusing attention on Louis the Bavarian, prominently depicted on the imperial throne, the genealogical mural’s ‘narrative’ succeeds in legitimating the dynasty’s authority and emphasising its worthiness for furnishing the office of the Holy Roman Emperor. The Wittelsbach dynasty is presented as a ‘casa imperiale’ based on their kinship and the fact that one of their members already held the office of the Holy Roman Emperor. According to Peter Moraw, Sigmund’s conception—that was subsequently adopted by Albrecht IV—of his house as a ‘casa imperiale’ and intention to regain the imperial title for his dynasty was not unrealistic, because the Wittelsbach dynasty in Bavaria and the Palatinate was the noblest but most powerless house among the three largest dynasties in the Holy Roman Empire that competed for the imperial throne in the Late Middle Ages.\textsuperscript{585}

There is evidence, suggesting that Duke Albrecht IV might have intended to reclaim the electorship for the dukes of Bavaria-Munich, because the Treaty of Pavia (1329) asserted the alternation of the electorship between the Wittelsbach dynasty’s Bavarian and Palatinate branches. The attainment of the electorate would have certainly strengthened the political influence of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich in the Holy Roman Empire and it would have improved their chance on regaining the imperial title.

To substantiate the dukes of Bavaria-Munich’s intention to increase their authority in the Holy Roman Empire and its political institutions the genealogical cycle includes ancestors like the Ottonian emperors Otto I the Great, Otto II and Otto III who were dukes of Bavaria, Saxony as well as Brunswick, and Welfs such as Henry the Lion who was Duke of Bavaria and Saxony. These ancestors were intended to demonstrate the long-standing alliances between Bavaria, Brunswick and Saxony, which were revived

\textsuperscript{584} ‘Herczog Hannsz von | Bayrn was das der zw München sasz | disz war Brüeder | von den dreyen des | Bayrn landt geteil | wardt von Ein.’ – Also transcribed in Ibid. p. 286

\textsuperscript{585} ‘Unter den drei Großdynastien des dt. SpätMA, die um die Krone rangen, waren die Wittelsbacher in Bayern und der Kurpfalz die schwächsten, jedoch die ursprünglich vornehmsten.’ Refer to Peter Moraw, ‘Ruprecht von der Pfalz’, in Werner Paravicini, Jan Hirschbiegel, and Jörg Wettlaufer (eds.), \textit{Höfe und Residenzen im spätmittelalterlichen Reich. Teilband I: Dynastien und Höfe} (1; Ostfildern: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 2003), 319-324. p. 319
through the recent marriages of Albrecht III of Bavaria-Munich with Anna of Brunswick and Elisabeth of Bavaria-Munich with Ernst I of Saxony.\[^{586}\] The kinship with Saxony was especially important since the Saxon princes were electors. The emphasis of this affinity certainly underlined the dukes of Bavaria-Munich’s objective to win back the electorship.

The prominent and very flattering presentation of Louis the Bavarian was intended to counter the problematic issues, stemming from the Wittelsbach emperor’s dispute with the papacy and his excommunication. These matters must have caused concern to Sigmund of Bavaria-Munich. Duke Sigmund and Munich’s burghers wanted to replace the Romanesque Church of Our Lady with a contemporary Late Gothic building that housed Louis’s tomb. Therefore Sigmund explored means to vindicate his prominent ancestor, for example, with his ‘state propaganda’. Sigmund’s promotion praised Louis the Bavarian and transformed his emperorship into a ‘cult’ that is legitimated ‘dei gratia’ rather than by the pope.\[^{587}\] This notion found expression in the verse under the portrait of Louis the Bavarian on the manuscript scroll of the Bibliotheque Nationale, which describes ‘Emperor Louis [as] the Champion, Duke of Bavaria the Chosen one, founder of the Ettal abbey, crowned king in Rome by the grace of God’.\[^{588}\] (Plate 40)

The characterisation of Louis the Bavarian refers to the legend of the Ettal abbey’s foundation in 1330. (Plate 79 and Plate 80) It was believed that a ‘grey monk’ appeared to the emperor in a miraculous vision during his Italian campaign in 1428. In return for the success and financial support that Louis received for his campaign, the emperor had to pledge the foundation of an abbey with a church that could house the marble Madonna that Louis received from the ‘grey monk’.\[^{589}\]

In the fifteenth century, Louis the Bavarian’s vision was understood as divine intervention, offsetting his excommunication and supporting the legitimacy of his coronation in Rome.\[^{590}\] On the one hand, it provided the justification for his successors to protect and promote the memory of Louis the Bavarian. This scheme to rehabilitate Louis scored a success in the posthumous recognition of the emperor by Pope Sixtus IV in the second papal bull that related to the Church of Our Lady and was issued on 7th February 1480. This papal bull was obtained by Albrecht IV and retrospectively confirmed the lawfulness of Louis the Bavarian’s burial in the Church of Our Lady.\[^{591}\] Thus it finally ended the emperor’s problematic relationship with the church. On the other hand, this conception of Louis the Bavarian enabled the dukes of Bavaria-Munich to employ this particular ancestor in support of their own political objectives in the second half of the fifteenth century. The legitimacy of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich’s

---

\[^{586}\] Hofmann, 'Die bayerischen Herzöge im Bild'. p. 266-267; Bastert, Der Münchner Hof und Fuetrers 'Buch der Abenteuer'. p. 120-121


\[^{589}\] Ibid. p. 268; Suckale, Die Hofkunst Kaiser Ludwigs des Bayern. p. 39-40

\[^{590}\] Hofmann, 'Die bayerischen Herzöge im Bild'. p. 268

\[^{591}\] Morsak, Zur Rechts- und Sakralkultur Bayerischer Pfalzkapellen und Hofkirchen. p. 147
sovereignty stemmed from the grace of God as well as their bloodline. Therefore Siegfried Hofmann stated that, from this point of view, the ecclesiastical acknowledgment of Louis the Bavarian and the Wittelsbach dynasty were understood as additional beneficial accolades but they were not essential to the legitimation of their authority.\(^{592}\)

**Appraisal of the genealogical mural**

The Christian motif of the Tree of Jesse, depicting the biblical progenitor as the base of Christ’s genealogical tree, inspired the creation of family trees in the Middle Ages, which decorated manuscripts, walls, tapestries and stained glass windows.\(^{593}\) The horizontal gallery of kings, which were a prominent feature of the west fronts of French Gothic cathedrals, provided a formalistic and conceptual model for these medieval genealogical cycles.\(^{594}\) A sculptural cycle of the Bavarian dukes’ ancestors existed in the Chapel of St Afra at the Cistercian Abbey of Seligenthal outside Landshut, which had been founded by Duke Louis I of Bavaria’s wife Ludmilla in 1332. According to Siegfried Hofmann, a Tumba was erected in the Chapel of St Afra between circa 1320 and 1337 to visibly mark the dynastic sepulchre there. Its side panels were decorated with a row of twenty-six sculptures, which mostly depict those members of the Lower Bavarian line and their relatives who had been buried in Seligenthal.\(^{595}\) Even though it is a sculptural cycle it may have provided a model for Sigmund’s ancestral mural. However, this genealogical cycle was commissioned for an ecclesiastical context.

From the fourteenth century, for example, Countess Mahaut of Artois, King Edward II of England and Holy Roman Emperor Charles IV commissioned wall paintings with subject matters related to their dynasties’ histories that were situated in secular contexts. Countess Mahaut decorated the interiors of her castle at Conflans with scenes of her father’s crusading exploits in 1320. Edward II had a pictorial life of his father Edward I painted in his Palace of Westminster in 1324. Charles IV adorned the interior of Karlštejn Castle with a genealogical cycle (after 1355) that has been destroyed.\(^{596}\) King Philip IV of France commissioned a sculptural programme for the great hall of his palace in Paris (erected between 1301 and 1313), which comprised over-life-size figures of real and legendary ancestors, beginning with the fictitious progenitor Pharamond and ending with the king’s recent predecessors. This display of the king’s descent legitimated his reign. Comparably Jean de Berry commissioned a series of portrait sculptures for the fireplace in the newly constructed great hall (1382-1388) of his palace at Poitiers. They depict the duke, his wife Jeanne de Boulogne, his nephew King Charles VI and Charles IV’s wife Isabeau de Bavière.\(^{597}\) King Matthias Corvinus

---

592 Hofmann, 'Die bayerischen Herzöge im Bild'. p. 268
593 Verstegen, 'Ahnengalerien und Stammbäume'. p. 121
594 Ibid. p. 121
595 Hofmann, 'Residenz - Grablege - Herrschaftskirche'. p. 224, 226 & 230
extended the Golden House of Hunedoara Castle in the third quarter of the fifteenth century. The upper level of the two-storey arcade that faced the courtyard was probably decorated with the legendary genealogy of John Hunyadi, the king’s father. Margaret of Austria, as listed in an inventory of her possessions under the heading ‘Les paintures estans dans la librairye de Madame’, had a large collection of portraits on display in the library of her palace in Mechelen, which also contained a veritable genealogical gallery that hung around the chimney’s mantel. A mural, depicting the counts of Holland including the Wittelsbach dukes who held this title in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, was painted in the Carmelite convent of Haarlem in the early fifteenth century. The commission of this genealogical cycle was related to the ducal court, because the dukes of Bavaria-Straubing maintained close relations to the convent through William the Confessor who was the confessor of Duke Albrecht I and his family as well as an instructor at the Carmelite convent. The portraits were copied in the late fifteenth century. These panels are now displayed in the Gravenzaal of the town hall in Haarlem. Jean Wilson suggested that these ancestral portraits might have been understood as a supplement of the genealogical manuscripts and chronicles that presented the histories of dynasties and their territories. Furthermore, painted or sculptural cycles of prominent persons, so-called uomini illustri or uomini famosi, decorated the halls and ballrooms of palazzi south of the Alps from the fourteenth century. Biblical, antique and legendary uomini famosi as well as notable persons of civic and dynastic histories decorated the main halls and loggias of palaces and villas in Italy. For example, Andrea del Castagno’s mural of uomini famosi (c. 1448/49) from the Villa Carducci at Legnaia is now exhibited in the Uffizi in Florence. Valerano del Vasto had the Sala Baronale of his Castello della Manta decorated with a mural of uomini famosi (c. 1420) that include Julius Caesar and Charlemagne. (Plate 144) Italian models like these mural cycles might have provided paradigms for Duke Sigmund’s genealogy. Though Sigmund’s familiarity with Italian art is not known.

The genealogical mural from the Alte Hof and its manuscript reproductions are in conceptually comparable to the mural in Karlštejn Castle near Prague with regard to the display of the patrons’ distinguished descents. Charles IV commissioned a genealogy of the House of Luxembourg in the Emperor’s Hall on the second floor. It was begun circa 1356 and destroyed before 1597. Approximately sixty seated and standing full-length
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figures represented a diverse series of ancestors, ranging from renowned characters of the Old Testament like Noah, ancient Roman mythology like Jupiter to the Capetians, the houses of Brabant and Bohemia. It included depictions of Charlemagne and Charles IV. Watercolour copies in the National Gallery in Prague (Sign. AA 2015) and the Austrian National Library in Vienna (cod. 8330) document the lost mural. They were created for Emperor Maximilian II between 1569 and 1575. The watercolours in the Austrian National Library are the more accurate copies. Folios 6r to 59r depict fifty-six real and legendary ancestors of Charles IV. Thus they reflect his personal and dynastic aspirations. This prominent genealogical cycle, which certainly provided an influential model in Central Europe, was apparently executed by artists whose style was influenced by French court paintings. Sigmund’s father Albrecht III received his education at the royal court in Bohemia and thus must have been familiar with this genealogical cycle.

The dukes of Bavaria-Munich may have been aware of the genealogical cycles of King Philip IV of France and Jean de Berry. They could have gained knowledge of these ancestral portrait galleries through Louis VII of Bavaria-Ingolstadt and his sister Isabeau de Bavière. They might have had knowledge of the portrait gallery in the Carmelite convent in Haarlem, because they had inherited some of the dukes of Bavaria-Straubing’s territories including Straubing. They might have also heard of Margaret of Austria’s ancestral portrait gallery through Maximilian I or Kunigunde of Austria, even though Margaret’s commission did not function as a model as the murals in the Alte Hof had already been completed a few decades earlier.

These ancestral cycles and especially Charles IV’s genealogy might have provided paragons for Sigmund’s commission. Unlike the Luxembourg dynasty the Wittelsbach dukes did not refer to legendary ancestors of the ancient Greek mythology like the Trojans or Old Testament characters like Noah. Instead the Wittelsbach dukes created a very specific and individual descent that differed from other generic contemporary genealogies. They established the unique and characteristic legendary progenitor Bavarus as the founding father of their ancestry. (Plate 35 and Plate 44) This notion enabled them to closely associate their dynasty with their territory and vice versa. As a result of the amalgamation of dynastic and national historiographic approaches the Duchy of Bavaria became inconceivable without the Wittelsbach dynasty. Their ancestor Bavarus bestowed the duchy and its people with an identity. The mural’s underlying scheme also champions the unity of the duchy and dynasty by praising the wise decisions of Bavarus, Norix and Louis the Bavarian.

608 Simpson, ’Wurmser of Strasbourg, Nicholas’.
611 From the late sixteenth century the Wittelsbach dukes included figures from Greek mythology like Hercules into their genealogy (i.e. the genealogical series in Dachau Palace). Refer to Verstegen, ’Ahnengalerien und Stammbäume’, p. 120-121.
Duke Sigmund’s strategies—the presentation and ‘manipulation’ of his dynasty’s past—are characterised by an obvious retrospective bias. Yet Sigmund employed his ancestors’ accomplishments and failures in support of his present and future objectives as the mural addressed contemporary and prospective audiences. Hence Sigmund’s outlook was focused on the prospects of his dynasty. This notion has to be considered with regard to the conception of the past in the late Middle Ages. Medieval society, especially members of its upper ranks, decisively organised their lives according to their understanding of history. The past was regarded as relating to and impacting on the present. History as well as historic precedents explained the present, and it was believed that they indirectly predeter m定了 the course of contemporary as well as future developments. Thus the past was understood as a vehicle of change. It could explain present circumstances and justify future actions. Since history was conceived as providing guidelines for prospective undertakings aristocrats felt that a knowledge of the past provided practical benefits for their political skills. Hence northern nobles, as Scot McKendrick put it, ‘sought to understand the present and their position in it by reference to the past’. The virtues, vices, achievements and inadequacies of the Wittelsbachs’ progenitors provided guidelines for the conduct and actions of the present and future Bavarian dukes. From this perspective, Sigmund’s ‘propaganda’ at once expressed retrospective and forward-looking tendencies, because his political objectives were grounded on legendary and real historic precedents as well as his ancestors. Sigmund established guidelines for his dynasty’s future political agenda by accentuating specific beneficial and detrimental episodes from the history of the duchy as well as the Wittelsbach dynasty like the reunification under Louis the Bavarian or the territorial partitions and fraternal feuds.

The genealogical mural and manuscript copies at once demonstrate the glory of the Wittelsbach dynasty through the achievements of their progenitors and the kinship with other eminent, illustrious dynasties as well as the legitimacy of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich’s rule and their political objectives. Sigmund established a prestigious, ‘magnificent’ court culture that communicated his dynasty’s esteem very intelligible to beholders through his artistic commissions (i.e. the armorial bearings of the Burgstock’s facades and oriel as well as the genealogy in the Zwingerstock). His younger brother Albrecht IV subsequently adopted this strategy after Sigmund retired from his active role in ducal government in 1467.
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The Tumba of Louis the Bavarian in the Late Gothic Church of Our Lady

Pope Sixtus praised the Church of Our Lady as an appropriate locus for the last remains of the ‘imperatoris Romanorum Ludovici’ and several Bavarian dukes. (Plate 70 and Plate 71) The Apostolic See retrospectively acknowledged the excommunicated emperor’s burial in the Church of Our Lady with the papal bull of 7th February 1480.\textsuperscript{615} This was a triumph for Albrecht IV who had commissioned Hans Haldner to create the magnificent red marble Tumba in circa 1468. (Plate 61 and Plate 62) According to Massimo Troiano’s account of the wedding of William V with Renata of Lorraine, the cenotaph originally incorporated coats-of-arms and panels on its sides with scenes of important events in Louis the Bavarian’s life like his victory in the Battle of Mühlhofen over Frederick I of Austria.\textsuperscript{616} The top half of the red marble covering slab shows the enthroned emperor in half-relief. (Plate 71) He sits on the imperial throne with the imperial regalia and is flanked by two angels. The portrayal of Louis the Bavarian is stylised. The features that were typically associated with the emperor as official representative of the Holy Roman Empire are emphasised. Models for this imperial portrait of Louis the Bavarian were fifteenth-century Holy Roman emperors like Frederick III as well as contemporary conceptions of the emperorship (i.e. a lion-like and Herculean emperor respectively).\textsuperscript{617}

The pedestal of Louis the Bavarian’s throne is decorated with three coats-of-arms, featuring his imperial eagle in the centre, the standing lion of the Counts Palatine of the Rhine on the left side and the lozenge pattern of the Dukes of Bavaria on the right side.

The lower half of the marble plate depicts the reconciliation of Duke Ernst of Bavaria-Munich with his only son Albrecht III. This event in the Duchy of Bavaria-Munich’s recent history was as important to Albrecht IV as Louis the Bavarian’s role as Holy Roman emperor because Albrecht III’s morganatic marriage with Agnes Bernauer jeopardised the continued existence of the Bavaria-Munich line.

Two sculpted scrolls with inscriptions frame the Tumba’s covering slab. They identify Albrecht IV as the patron of this work of art and only list those members of the Wittelsbach dynasty’s Bavaria-Munich branch who had been buried in the Church of Our Lady (i.e. Louis the Bavarian).\textsuperscript{618} (Plate 71) Those members of the Wittelsbach dynasty whose last remains were also placed into this dynastic tomb but who do not belong to the Bavaria-Munich line were omitted from these inscriptions.

The Tumba’s programme manifestly places the dukes of Bavaria-Munich under the auspices of Louis the Bavarian, which is the result of the two-storey composition and
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each scene’s disposition. The emperor’s portrait feels as if it hails from a heavenly sphere, because the drapery carried by the two angels symbolised heaven since antiquity\textsuperscript{619} and the throne seems to hover over Louis’s progenies who are placed in a mundane space. Hence Louis the Bavarian was presented as the ‘omni-present’, celestial overlord of the Wittelsbach dynasty. According to Hans Ramisch, this two-storey composition was infrequently employed in circa 1470, although Master E.S.’s popular engraving \textit{The Large Virgin of Einsiedeln} (1466) disseminated this format.\textsuperscript{620} However Ramisch did not elaborate on the relation of \textit{The Large Virgin of Einsiedeln} and the top plate of Louis the Bavarian’s Tumba. The divine, heavenly figures like the Trinity of Father, Son and Holy Ghost stand on a balcony that is surmounted by a canopy. The Virgin and Christ Child with St Benedict and an angel stand on an altar in the vaulted space that is framed by a round arch. This level represents the terrestrial realm. This interpretation is substantiated by the two pilgrims who kneel in prayer in front of the altar. This differentiation of heavenly and terrestrial spheres might have been translated into Haldner’s composition of the Tumba’s top plate.

The subject matter of the Tumba’s top plate also displays the self-expression of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich as the custodians of his tomb. Their eminent progenitor and his politics were understood to serve as paragons for the reign of the dukes in the late fifteenth century and future members of the Bavaria-Munich branch. The inner-dynastic disputes were regarded as ineptitude that prevented the Bavarian dukes from achieving similar political accomplishments as Louis the Bavarian. Rather than competing with the Habsburgs for the imperial throne, the Wittelsbach lines or rather father and son were involved in feuds. The Habsburg dynasty had only recently claimed the title \textit{Rex Romanorum} and the imperial crown when it had passed from the Luxembourgs—who had held the title since 1346—to Frederick III of Habsburg in 1438.\textsuperscript{621} Thus in the second half of the fifteenth century the Habsburgs could not substantiate their claim to the imperial throne through a long line of Habsburg emperors. In Richard Bauer’s view, this situation presented an apparent chance for the Bavarian dukes to reclaim the title for their house.\textsuperscript{622}

\textsuperscript{619} Ramisch, ‘Die spätgotische Tumba für Kaiser Ludwig den Bayern’. p. 550
\textsuperscript{620} Ibid. p. 550
\textsuperscript{621} Coldstream, \textit{Medieval Architecture}. p. 18
\textsuperscript{622} Bauer, ‘München als Landeshauptstadt’. p. 121
The success of the forward-looking retrospection of Sigmund’s and Albrecht IV’s political programme

The heraldic programmes of the facades of the Alte Hof’s Burgstock, the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace and to some extent of Grünwald Castle’s gatehouse exclusively refer to members of the Bavaria-Munich line. Whereas the coats-of-arms in the windows of the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace and the genealogical mural from the Alte Hof’s Zwingerstock also allude to other branches of the Wittelsbach dynasty as well as to a wider network of aristocratic relations throughout Europe.

The exteriors’ embellishments denote the buildings as the residences or the foundations of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich, whereas the interiors’ artistic schemes indicate the programmatic intentions of the political agenda of Sigmund and Albrecht IV. The broader public was certainly familiar with the coats-of-arms of the Bavarian dukes, Counts Palatine of the Rhine, Emperor Louis the Bavarian and to some extent with those of the wives of the Bavarian dukes. Hence these armorial bearings allowed a wide range of beholders to identify the buildings with the Bavaria-Munich branch of the Wittelsbach dynasty and their rulers.

On the one hand, the more complex programmes of the heraldic cycles and the genealogical murals addressed a more specific audience who were knowledgeable of the history of the Duchy of Bavaria and the Wittelsbach dynasty. These works of art were aimed at peers and beholders who were associated with the ducal court in Munich and thus were possibly familiar with Ulrich Füetrer’s *Buch der Abenteuer* and *Bairische Chronik*. This audience comprised mainly of courtiers, the Bavarian aristocracy, the upper ranks of the clergy and the patricians of Munich as well as high-ranking visitors. These persons were either involved in the Landschaft (or Landstände, the representative body of the estates in medieval politics), the civic government of Munich or were themselves princes or rulers. This audience had the greatest potential of impinging the success of the political agenda of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich. In Kilian Heck’s opinion, genealogy was an essential means of maintaining social order in pre-modern and early modern Europe.623 This customary medium allowed Sigmund and Albrecht IV to display their descent, to indicate and to substantiate their political objectives, and to maintain or improve their rank in the political hierarchy of the Holy Roman Empire. On the other hand, the agenda, which was conveyed by the interiors’ heraldic and ancestral cycles, should be conceived as educational measures. In Bettina Wagner’s view, Ulrich Füetrer’s *Buch der Abenteuer* and the *Bairische Chronik* legitimated the ducal reign by presenting a continuous series of Bavarian rulers.624 This concept of genealogical succession is also the underlying principle of the Alte Hof’s genealogical mural. According to Wagner, Füetrer’s works—and therefore the genealogical mural—

624 Wagner, ‘Ulrich Füetrer, Buch der Abenteuer’, p. 42
provided paragons for Albrecht IV’s sons and introduced them to their father’s—and uncle’s—political objectives and conception of the Bavarian dukes’ future.

In the 1480s, Albrecht IV could not suspect that the Duchy of Bavaria would be reunited approximately two decades later after the Landshut War of Inheritance (1504/05) and the imperial arbitration of Cologne (30th July 1505). Nevertheless this event and its outcome enabled Albrecht IV to strengthen his territorial sovereignty. Consequently, the issuing of the Primogeniture Decree of 8th July 1506 is a consistent measure in Albrecht IV’s scheme that stipulated his descendants’ succession and thus assure the duchy’s prospective unity. He understood that only a large, undivided territory and an intact dynasty could secure the dukes of Bavaria’s future position in the political framework of the Holy Roman Empire and to improve it. Although primogeniture decrees were not particularly common at the transition from the fifteenth to the sixteenth century, it was a measure taken by other aristocratic houses: for example, the dukes of Württemberg’s Treaty of Münsing (1482) and the ‘Väterliche Ordnung’ (1499) of the Albertine line of the Wettin dynasty in Saxony.

The primogeniture was a necessary prerequisite for the electorate, which Albrecht IV must have striven to gain for his house, because Emperor Charles IV’s Golden Bull of 1356 stipulated the indivisibility of electorates and the principle of primogeniture. Nevertheless the system of primogeniture was not readily accepted at this stage. Louis X challenged it when he reached his majority in 1514 and his mother Kunigunde supported his claim for participation in the government. This dispute was resolved and subsequently only the oldest son took over the reign from his father. The acknowledgement of Albrecht IV’s primogeniture degree on behalf of William IV and Louis X is found in a document of 12th June 1523. Their younger brother Ernst had demanded his participation in the ducal government at a meeting in Landshut on 9th May 1523, because he was not satisfied with role as Episcopal administrator in Passau. William IV and Louis X wrote on 12th June 1523 in response to Ernst demands: ‘maybe it is our destiny [which is bestowed upon us] by the Lord that we Princes of Bavaria have to quarrel with each other, even when the whole world leaves us in peace. No sooner that we had begun to gather the ruins as a result of the our almighty Lord’s benefaction than the insistent claim of our dear [brother] threatened to cause new ruin.’

Albrecht IV’s and Sigmund’s political agenda, expressed in the heraldic decoration of their residences and the works of art that they commissioned, must have been
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internalized by their successors, because William IV based his claims for the imperial throne on his descent. In his opinion, the Wittelsbach dynasty was part of the Carolingian and Agilolfing dynasties. From this point of view, the Wittelsbach dynasty was much older and nobler than the House of Habsburg, which produced the Holy Roman Emperors in the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

The persistence of the genealogical strategies of Sigmund and Albrecht IV is also reflected in the names of William IV’s children. For example, William IV and Jakobäa of Baden named their first son after Theodo, one of the princes depicted in the genealogical murals of the Alte Hof. (Plate 36 and Plate 45) The mural very probably depicts Duke Theodo, a member of the Agilolfing dynasty who ruled over the Duchy of Bavaria from circa 670/680 until 717. Theodo was one of the first eminent Bavarian dukes. He was a patron of Christian missionaries like St Emmeram and St Korbinian. Theodo also initiated the structured development of the duchy, for instance, with the extensive rewriting of the Bavarian laws. The characterisation in Handschrift 367 describes Theodo as a noble, virtues prince who accomplished great deeds with his courage. (Plate 45) This example shows that Theodo and other legendary ancestors of the Wittelsbach dynasty were revered in the sixteenth century.

Stylistic retrospection in Grünwald Castle and the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace: historicist evocations of the past

The historicising guise of Grünwald Castle as a symbol of a time-honoured dynasty

Albrecht IV aspired to being regarded as a chivalrous, unflinching knight and ruler by his subjects. For example, Geowolf of Degenberg vilified Albrecht IV as ‘scolar et scriptor’ and thereby challenged the duke’s chivalry. Albrecht IV responded to this insult with the destruction of Geowolf’s castles in November 1468 and January 1469. In addition to Albrecht IV’s participation in jousts, tourneys, shooting matches and court hunting the retrospectively styled architecture of Grünwald Castle, evoking ‘romantic’ visions of the aristocracy’s golden age and coinciding with the ‘chivalric renaissance’
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in literature at the ducal court in Munich, emphasised Albrecht IV’s chivalry and authority.

The ‘medieval’ character of Grünwald Castle’s architecture was accentuated during the construction and renovation campaigns of Sigmund and especially Albrecht IV who intended to envelope the hunting and leisure palace into the ‘romantic’ guise of a ‘classic’ knight’s castle.634 (Plate 118, Plate 119 and Plate 121) These construction projects preserved the medieval castle’s rectangular layout with its four corner towers. The living quarters (Dürnitzstock or Palas), the towers with battlements and especially the tall tower, the gatehouse with machicolation, crowstep gable and drawbridge as well as the curtain walls with battlements, loopholes and wall walks were perceived as the appropriate symbolic references for demonstrating the aristocratic status and chivalric lifestyle of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich in the second half of the fifteenth century.

The tall castle keeps or donjons, the characteristic symbolic elements of the aristocratic castles in the Hohenstaufen era of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, gained popularity as a token for the dignified patrons’ affiliation with the aristocracy of the Holy Roman Empire (Reichsaristokratie) and the elevated social standing in the late Middle Ages.635 As noted by Matthias Müller, the towers of medieval castles were preserved and incorporated into late medieval and early modern palaces because of their symbolic qualities. They represented rights of possession and the status of the palaces’ inhabitants. They were also symbols for the commemoration of the dynasties’ history and renown.636 Sven Lüken, who stated that towers are symbols of mundane glory and important emblems of the aristocratic status, substantiated Müller’s interpretation of the towers’ iconography.637 Hence medieval castle keeps or donjons remained conspicuous elements of many castles and palaces that were extended or rebuilt in the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. They were, for instance, integrated into the Corps de Logis of Weikersheim Palace or the early modern architectural disposition of Aschaffenburg Palace where the medieval keep conceptually clashed with the regular, symmetrical layout. The massive round tower in the inner courtyard of Würzburg Castle on the Marienberg was preserved during later renovation campaigns and remained a dominant feature of the early modern castle-palace. The silhouette of Grünwald Castle is still dominated by the towers and was even more so before the necessary demolition of the castle’s western wing. (Plate 118, Plate 119 and Plate 121) These symbols of the
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dynasty’s venerability aptly complement the genealogical decoration of the gatehouse’s crowstep gable. (Plate 120)

At the time of Otto of Wittelsbach’s installation as Duke of Bavaria by Emperor Frederick Barbarossa, Grünwald Castle belonged to the powerful Counts of Andechs who struggled with the Wittelsbachs for the hegemony in the Duchy of Bavaria. By 1248 the Wittelsbachs had established their authority and gained Grünwald Castle with the extinction of the Counts of Andechs. Ergo in the late fifteenth century Grünwald Castle might have been understood as a potent emblem for the consolidation of the Wittelsbach dynasty’s power over the Duchy of Bavaria. Albrecht IV may have intended to emphasise this programmatic quality with the historicising quality of his construction campaign because he aimed to expand his power throughout the territorial state and subjugate his opponents who had gathered in the Alliance of the Unicorn and the Löwler Bund. From this viewpoint the castle may have been understood as a token for the time-honoured Wittelsbach dynasty and the permanence of the Bavarian dukes’ reign.

Otto Meitinger’s findings on the building work (1468-1499) at the Neuveste in Munich support the interpretation that the late fifteenth-century architectural disposition and detailing of Grünwald Castle were motivated by symbolic considerations rather than defensive capabilities. From the beginning, the moated castle on Munich’s periphery was planned as a fortification, providing protection for the ducal court against attacks from outside as well as inside the town. These aspects of the Neuveste’s architecture were enhanced during Albrecht IV’s reign. (Plate 54 and Plate 55) The fortification was improved and extended in the second half of the fifteenth century with curtain walls and towers to account for the development of new, more powerful firearms. For example, the loopholes of the southern bastion were designed for firearms in contrast to the embrasures of the artillery tower (Geschützturm). Conversely, the curtain walls with their battlements and loopholes as well as the gatehouse’s machicolation of Grünwald Castle only had a pseudo-military function. Their symbolic quality surpassed the practical benefits of defending the castle. Michael Weithmann stated that it was a common phenomenon in the late medieval and early modern age to embellish castles and palaces like those in Grünwald and Menzing (Blutenburg Palace) with emblematic medieval military features such as battlements, embrasures, moats and fortified towers. They were status symbols that represented the independence (Edelmannsfreiheit) or rather sovereignty of the aristocracy and from the late fifteenth century increasingly that of the patriciate.

Nicola Coldstream observed this phenomenon with regard to the architectural disposition and decoration of Herstmonceux Castle in England with its moat, the crenellated façade, corner towers and towered gatehouse with the French-inspired machicolations. In Coldstream’s opinion, these nostalgic elements, often employed by the nouveaux riches who could not refer to the ancestral connotations, which are evoked by these tokens, symbolised a heroic past and bestowed dignity on their patrons. In contrast Sigmund and Albrecht IV of Bavaria-Munich combined a political message
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with the historicism of their commissions that is, for instance, expressed with the column on the northern façade of Grünwald Castle’s gatehouse. (Plate 122)

The column with its leaf capital, placed between the two windows on the gatehouse’s northern side, attracts attention because of its distinct character within the oeuvre of buildings, commissioned by the ducal court in the late fifteenth century and early sixteenth century. The only stylistically comparable columns are depicted on contemporary altarpieces and in paintings.

In the first half of the fifteenth century a historicising architectural style had emerged in the works of painters like Jan van Eyck, Rogier van der Weyden, Lukas Moser, Konrad Witz, Hans Memling, Stefan Lochner and Hans Pleydenwurff.641 For instance, Stefan Lochner set the scene, depicted in his Presentation in the Temple of 1445 (now in Lisbon), in a late Romanesque building. As observed by Klaus Graf and Stephan Hoppe, the middle column, which supports the altar’s mensa, can be exactly dated based on its leaf capital, diamond-patterned shaft, and the decoration between plinth and basis.642 The round arch that frames the scene and the round arched window without tracery in the background accentuate the late Romanesque character of the architecture. However Lochner did not reproduce Romanesque architecture faithfully. Stephan Hoppe noted that the composite capitals and bases’ leaf motifs of the columns, supporting the arch that frames the scene, are possibly Lochner’s inventions, evoking a historicising style, which refers to the Romanesque period. It was intended to indicate that the depicted scene was spatially and temporarily separated from the present of the fifteenth-century beholders.

Likewise Nicola Coldstream and Martin Warnke observed that the architectural projects, commissioned by Emperor Frederick III, incorporated historicising motifs, which stylistically refer to indigenous medieval traditions.643 From 1453 Peter von Puscia built an entrance vestibule at the imperial castle in Wiener Neustadt. The Chapel of St George is situated on the first floor. The choir’s exterior features a wall with more than one hundred real and imaginary armorial bearings, a statue of the Virgin Mary and a portrait sculpture of Frederick III. This notion of a time-honoured, dignified ancestry was echoed with the historicist architecture of the chapel’s interior with its retrospective architectural detailing like sexpartite vaults and tracery that evoke the style of the buildings designed by the Parlers.

The column of the northern window of Grünwald Castle’s gatehouse evidently was not based on models, found in the contemporary construction projects of the Dukes of


642 Graf, 'Stil als Erinnerung'. p. 19; Hoppe, 'Architekturstil und Zeitbewusstsein'. p. 60-61

643 Warnke, Geschichte der deutschen Kunst. Band 2. p. 18; Coldstream, Medieval Architecture. p. 177-178
Bavaria-Munich like the Alte Hof, the Late Gothic Church of Our Lady, Blutenburg Palace Chapel and St Wolfgang in Pipping; nor was it replicated in any of these ducal architectural commissions. It may have been derived from actual Romanesque buildings like the first Church of Our Lady, from depictions of Romanesque architecture in paintings and prints, or from the historicising style of painters working in the Low Countries and the Rhineland.

Jan Polack depicted very similar columns and capitals in the altarpieces that he produced for Albrecht IV (the high altarpiece of St Antonius, the church of the Franciscans’ friary in Munich, c. 1491/92) or which were created in the sphere of the ducal court (i.e. the new high altarpiece for the Church of St Peter, c. 1485/90).\(^\text{644}\) (Plate 122, Plate 130 and Plate 134) The panel of the former high altarpiece from the Church of St Antonius that shows Christ crowned with thorns features a column, supporting a round arched window and the arch of the room’s entry, which is reminiscent of the column between the northern windows of Grünwald Castle’s gatehouse. (Plate 122 and Plate 130) The decorative leaves of the capitals, the torus between basis and shaft as well as the other torus between shaft and capital are almost identical on both columns. The panel from the high altarpiece of the Church of St Peter, depicting St Peter healing a lame man, features similar columns. (Plate 134) The shafts and capitals of the columns which support the vaults of the main and side aisles of the synagogue or church behind St Peter are nearly indistinguishable from the columns on the panel from the high altarpiece of St Antonius and the northern façade of Grünwald Castle’ gatehouse.

In the instance of the panel showing St Peter healing a lame man, the historic connotations of the building’s architectural style are emphasised by the incorporation of two sculptures, depicting Adam and Eve, in the niches of the two piers of the three-partite entrance. (Plate 134) Adam and Eve represent an episode from the Old Testament. Therefore a depiction of Adam and Eve was incorporated by the Master of the Marriage of the Virgin on a stained glass window of the central-plan, ciborium-like building that represented the temple in Jerusalem in his painting of *The Marriage of the Virgin* (c. 1440, formerly attributed to Robert Campin).\(^\text{645}\) Erwin Panofsky and recently Stephan Hoppe discussed the conceptual and stylistic juxtaposition of the entrance portal of the yet to be completed Gothic building which represents the southern portal of the transept of Notre-Dame du Sablons (Notre-Dame des Victoires) in Brussels\(^\text{646}\) with the Romanesque architecture of the original building (i.e. the torsion and zigzag band motifs of the columns) that was to be replaced by the new structure. In Hoppe’s view,

\(^\text{644}\) Even though the patron of the new high altarpiece of St Peter’s are not documented, Peter Steiner believed, the commission was prompted by Duke Albrecht IV to celebrate his victory against the bishop of Freising in gaining the right of patronage and allocation of ecclesiastical sinecures (Patronatsrecht) at St Peter. Refer to Peter B. Steiner, ‘Jan Polack - Werk, Werkstatt und Publikum’, in Peter B. Steiner and Claus Grimm (eds.), Jan Polack. Von der Zeichnung zum Bild: Malerei und Maltechnik in München um 1500 (Munich & Freising: Diözesanmuseum Freising, 2004), 15-26. p. 19 & 22.

\(^\text{645}\) Erwin Panofsky attributed the *Marriage of the Virgin* to Robert Campin. Recent scholarship credited a painter in the circle around Rogier van der Weyden as its author and identified it as a copy of Robert Campin’s lost *Legend of St Joseph* (circa 1420/25).

\(^\text{646}\) The church of Notre-Dame du Sablons (Notre-Dame des Victoires) in Brussels was begun after 1400, but remained unfinished until the early twentieth century. The incomplete ecclesiastic structure looked similar to the Gothic building depicted by the Master of the Virgin’s Marriage.
the two contrasting architectural styles visualise the typology of the Old Testament and the New Testament.

Similar columns and leaf capitals to those of Grünwald Castle’s gatehouse and Jan Polack’s architectural settings are shown in the Flagellation of Christ (c. 1450/55), one of seven panels from the Passion Cycle by the Master of the Karlsruhe Passion (Hans Hirtz ?) and a Nativity (c. 1494) that might have been created by Ludwig Schongauer.647 Jan Polack or members of his workshop might have been introduced to these historicising motifs in the Rhineland or the Low Countries.

The historicising columns are coherently combined with round arches in the Flagellation of Christ and the Nativity as well as Jan Polack’s altarpieces. By contrast the columns of Grünwald Castle’s gatehouse support pointed arches. (Plate 122) In view of Stephan Hoppe’s interpretation of the juxtaposition of Gothic and non-Gothic forms in the Late Middle Ages and the early modern era as proto-theoretical discourse on the semiotics and iconography of architectural decorations as well as style—a notion that is conceptually substantiated by Ethan Matt Kavaler’s findings on the combination of geometric and vegetal forms in the vaults of the chapels in the Church of Our Lady in Ingolstadt—it is tempting to conjecture that Albrecht IV and his master mason deliberately juxtaposed the column’s historicising style with the Late Gothic pointed arches, especially for Jan Polack’s panels, the most probable sources of this architectural detailing, show a combination of these retrospectively styled columns with round arches.648

The principle of comparison through contrast (kontrastierender Vergleich) emphasised the characteristic qualities of the differing oeuvres and objects. This notion informed the organisation of sixteenth-century art collections and was an aspect of the contemporary reception of the rhetoric of antiquity. In Hoppe’s interpretation, it might explain the amalgamation of Late Gothic and historicising architectural detailing in sixteenth-century palaces like Count Palatine Ottheinrich’s residence in Neuburg an der Donau (the Saalbau features a Gothic rib vault, a Renaissance stucco coffered vault and a Romanesque-like groin vault) or the juxtaposition of the German and Italian wings of Duke Louis X’s Stadtresidenz in Landshut.649

In the instance of Grünwald Castle’s gatehouse, the unusual combination of historicising column that supports round arches in the contemporary paintings with pointed arches draws attention on both architectural elements and thereby might have been intended to accentuate the building’s historic character. In fact it can be interpreted as Albrecht IV’s statement: he did not conceal the historic disposition of the castle with the construction and renovation work of 1486/87.

The combination of the retrospectively styled column with the pointed arches is not the only example for an exceptional combination of architectural features, created in the

647 For reproductions of these paintings refer to Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe and Badisches Landesmuseum Karlsruhe (eds.), Spätmittelalter am Oberrhein. Maler und Werkstätten 1450-1525 (Stuttgart: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 2001). p. 34 & 98
649 Hoppe, 'Romanik als Antike und die baulichen Folgen'. p. 130-131
late fifteenth century in the sphere of the ducal court. A similar juxtaposition of retrospective Late Gothic architectural detailing with ‘Romanesque’ architectural elements is presented in the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace where the pointed arches of the windows and the transverse arch contrast with the round arches on the predella of the high altarpiece. (Plate 103, Plate 104 and Plate 107) The painted decoration of the chapel’s ribs also contrasts with the tectonics of marble around the ribs’ intersections with the floral ornaments on the ribs’ shafts. Another example is the near contemporary decision against the traditional Late Gothic pyramidal spires and for the alternative historicising terminations of the Church of Our Lady’s towers.

In this context the juxtaposition of the retrospectively styled column and Late Gothic pointed arches does not appear unusual. Füetrer’s Bayerische Chronik and Buch der Abenteuer as well as the buildings’ genealogical decorations indicate that there existed an interest in history and the Wittelsbach dynasty’s past in particular. Nevertheless, there is no definite evidence for a proto-theoretical discourse on the development of a style through history comparable to Stephan Hoppe’s observations on The Marriage of the Virgin (c. 1440) and Lukas Moser’s Magdalene Altar (1432) in Tiefenbronn.650

These examples demonstrate that artists, architects, patrons and beholders were able to distinguish distinct styles like the Romanesque and the Gothic. They were also aware of the connotations attached to each one of the styles. Hence it appears plausible that Duke Albrecht IV employed this motif to evoke certain notions that were associated with the emperorship of the Holy Roman Empire in the late fifteenth century. Even though the windows feature pointed arches, the column’s capital might have been intended to allude to the columns of the chapel of the imperial castle in Nuremberg, the twelfth-century imperial palace in Gelnhausen, the thirteenth-century imperial palaces in Goslar and Wimpfen for they exhibit similarities with these historic models.651 The stylistic reference to buildings, associated with the Holy Roman Emperor, was appropriate for this building project for two reasons. Firstly, Grünwald Castle was intended as Morgengabe652 for Kunigunde of Austria, the daughter of Emperor Frederick III whose architectural commissions incorporated historicising elements. Secondly, the self-aggrandizement of Sigmund and Albrecht IV aimed at demonstrating their dynasty’s appropriateness for the Holy Roman Emperor’s office. Albrecht IV’s political agitation was directed at regaining the imperial throne for the Wittelsbach dynasty. For example, Albrecht IV achieved that Archduke Sigismund of Tyrol recommended him as possible successor on the imperial throne to Frederick III.653

---

650 Hoppe, ‘Architekturstil und Zeitbewusstsein’. p. 61-62 & 64-65
651 For illustrations refer to Jürgen Kaiser, Mittelalter in Deutschland (Stuttgart: Konrad Theiss Verlag, 2006). p. 13, 15 & 17.
652 Morgengabe describes the gift given to a bride by her husband after the wedding night.
653 Graf, ‘Kunigunde’. p. 53-57
Historicising architecture and works of art in the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace

The architectural disposition of the exterior of the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace with its painted tracery frieze below the roof reflects a conceptual affinity with the churches of Hans von Burghausen in Landshut and those conceived by his followers (i.e. Stephan Krumenauer) in Lower Bavaria rather than with the Church of Our Lady in Munich.\(^654\) (Plate 97) This conceptual relationship and allusion to an established formula are also echoed by the chapel’s interior. (Plate 103 and Plate 104) The lozenge pattern of the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace is reminiscent of the vaulting patterns of St Martin in Landshut (especially the vaults’ pattern of the nave’s main aisle which dates from the first half of the fifteenth century but was determined by the pattern of the choir’s vaults that had been built in the last quarter of the fourteenth century). The vaults of Blutenburg Palace Chapel differed from contemporary developments like the vaults realised in the Late Gothic Church of Our Lady in Munich, the ornamental and organic vaulting patterns devised by Arnold von Westfalen for the ecclesiastical as well as secular building projects of the Saxon electors or those created by master masons in Swabia, in the regions along the Danube and in the Habsburg dynasty’s Alpine territories.\(^655\)

This observation corresponds with Otto-Ernst Wolf’s findings on the progression of the forms of vaulting patterns of ecclesiastical construction projects in Upper Bavaria in the fifteenth century.\(^656\) He observed a revival of past vaulting patterns in the rural churches of Upper Bavaria, built in the second half of the fifteenth century. No sooner had the creation of new decorative vaulting patterns climaxed around 1475 than master masons and patrons resorted to simpler, plainer designs again. They favoured earlier vaulting patterns like the continuous lozenge pattern and the visual delineation of bays with ridge ribs. This development was initiated with the construction of St Wolfgang in Pipping and continued in the design of the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace with the lozenge patterned net vaults as well as the main star shape generated by the ribs of the choir’s vaults.

\(^{654}\) The painted blind tracery frieze with the heraldic shields on the southern and northern facades of Blutenburg Palace Chapel seems to float above the buttresses, and it is related to the sculpted blind tracery frieze that was placed like a band into the Church of Our Lady’s roof where it echoes the boundary between the nave’s as well as ambulatory’s chapels and the nave’s aisles, the choir as well as the ambulatory. (Plate 60 and Plate 97) According to Hans Ramisch, this blind tracery frieze evolved from the lattice parapet located above the eaves. As such it crowns the fourteenth-century choir of for instance the Heiligkreuzkirche in Schwäbisch Gmünd, St Martin in Colmar and St Sebald in Nuremberg. In Ramisch’s view this architectural element subsequently transformed into the painted tracery friezes that were applied to the exteriors below the eaves of Hans von Burghausen’s churches in Landshut. Refer to Ramisch, ‘Das Bauwerk’. p. 74 & Hubel, ‘Schloßkapelle von Blutenburg’. p. 77


\(^{656}\) Wolf, ‘Die Blutenburger Schloßkapelle’. p. 163
The retrospective quality of the vaults of Blutenburg Palace Chapel is supported by the subject matter of its works of art, which probably refer in particular to the era of Louis the Bavarian. According to Achim Hubel, the subject matter of the ‘Man of Sorrows’ (Schmerzensmann) emerged at the beginning of the fourteenth century. Its creation coincided with the reign of Louis the Bavarian who, in Hans Ramisch’s view, commissioned a sandstone sculpture (c. 1325) of the ‘Man of Sorrows’ for the tomb of the Wittelsbach dynasty in the Church of Our Lady where the emperor had buried his first wife Beatrix von Schlesien-Glogau in 1322. Based on stylistic evidence Robert Suckale argued against Ramisch’s dating by stating that the ‘Man of Sorrows’, now displayed on the northern pier at the threshold of nave and choir, was created by the workshops of the ducal or rather imperial court in Munich shortly after the death of Louis the Bavarian. Nevertheless the ‘Man of Sorrows’ in the Church of Our Lady is more or less associated with the era of Louis the Bavarian and was related to the tomb of the Wittelsbach dynasty.

It is particularly striking that the ‘Man of Sorrows’ or rather the Gnadenstuhl were chosen as the subject matter for the central panel of the high altarpiece in the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace. (Plate 106) Considering the chapel’s strong imperial theme, it appears more appropriate to present a regal, triumphant Christ with the celebration of Christ’s resurrection or with a depiction of Christ as King of Heaven. Rather than showing the King of Heaven as part of the Coronation of the Virgin, depicted on the right wing’s inner panel, it would have been a suitable subject matter for the high altarpiece’s central panel.

Along with the incorporation of a fourteenth-century sculpture, a depiction of the Virgin Mary with Christ Child, into the cresting of the high altarpiece it can be imagined that the subject matter of the Gnadenstuhl and the ‘Man of Sorrows’ respectively were deliberately chosen by Duke Sigmund of Bavaria-Munich for their retrospective qualities that referred to the era of Louis the Bavarian. (Plate 106) Moreover the Trinitarian Gnadenstuhl on the high altarpiece in the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace was deliberately modelled on the Master of Flémalle’s The Holy Trinity (c. 1410), which further accentuates the retrospective qualities of this work of art. These allusions were especially fitting for a chapel whose decorative scheme celebrates Sigmund’s genealogy and emphasises Louis the Bavarian’s role as Holy Roman emperor. This conjecture is substantiated by the style of Jan Polack’s altarpieces, the floral or rather vegetal imagery, covering some of the walls, and the panel of the Andechser Heiltumsschatz, commissioned by Duke Sigmund for the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace in 1497.

657 Hubel, ‘Schloßkapelle von Blutenburg’. p. 83
659 Suckale, Die Hofkunst Kaiser Ludwigs des Bayern. p. 147 & 195
660 Hubel, ‘Schloßkapelle von Blutenburg’. p. 84
661 Steiner and Grimm (eds.), Jan Polack. p. 149
The style of Jan Polack’s altarpieces

Achim Hubel observed that Jan Polack stylistically differentiated the divine figure of God the Father from the human body of Christ on the central panel of the high altarpiece. 662 (Plate 106) The volume of the cloak’s billowing cloths envelops the body of God the Father. Only his head and hands emerge from the robe. They are the only discernible, naturalistic body parts of this figure. This old-fashioned, elaborately conceived robed figure, as described by Hubel, contrasts with the carefully, naturalistically treatment of Christ’s body. Thus the billowing robe of God the Father becomes a surface on which the corpse of Christ is presented. Jan Polack modelled Christ’s body in great detail to reveal muscles and bones. Polack employed light and shadow to convincingly convey the illusion of the corpse’s three-dimensionality.

This juxtaposition of two concepts of reality is echoed by the scenic landscape of Christ’s baptism, flanking the central panel of the high altarpiece on the left wing that is set off with the two-dimensionality of the ornamentation of the gilded panel. (Plate 106) A meandering river recedes into the distant landscape with its rolling hills behind Christ, St John the Baptist and an angel to suddenly clash with the panel’s gilded surface. Instead of a naturalistic rendering of a sky, which would complement the landscape scene, the gilded surface emphasises the two contrasting styles and two conceptual realities of this altarpiece.

Branchwork and historicising architectural motifs as tokens of biblical and historic times

The notion of demarcating the divine sphere from the terrestrial realm of the mortal humans with stylistic means is supported by the connotations of the architecture that is depicted on the high altarpiece’s predella. (Plate 107) A round arch, created by a combination of pastiglia and engraving of the gilded surface, frames each one of the four evangelists. 663 Branches that grow out of holes in the ledge situated in front of the evangelists form the round arches. The arches’ semicircular shape is set off with the ogee arch of the high altarpiece’ casing and the heavenward soaring cresting. (Plate 103, Plate 104 and Plate 106)

662 Hubel, 'Schloßkapelle von Blutenburg'. p. 81
663 The architectural shapes and decorative ornaments were modelled by applying liquid chalk onto the wooden panel’s gesso ground. Refer to Inga Pelludat, 'Verzierungstechniken auf den Altarretabeln in der Blutenburg', in Peter B. Steiner and Claus Grimm (eds.), Jan Polack. Von der Zeichnung zum Bild. Malerei und Maltechnik in München um 1500 (Munich & Freising: Diözesanmuseum Freising, 2004), 95-106. p. 98. Ethan Matt Kavaler mentioned a similar framing of the saints in the small reliquary altar of Bernhard Adelmann von Adelmannsfelden which had been created by Jörg Seld in 1492—concurrently with Jan Polack’s three altarpieces in the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace, made in 1491 according to the date on the southern side altarpiece—for the parish church of Eichstätt. A row of high medieval saints (inter alia Walburga, Willibald, Boniface and Charlemagne) are presented under an arcade of round arches, supported by diminutive Romanesque capitals. These historic figures apparently demanded this retrospective style and Seld also employed the Romanesque style for its sacred status. Refer to Kavaler, 'Nature and the Chapel Vaults at Ingolstadt'. p. 248.
In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries round arches were stylistic motifs for denoting ancient architecture and sites that are associated with the origins of Christianity. According to Paul Crossley and Hubertus Günther, branchwork emerged for the first time in architecture on a cross vault (1471) in the Willibaldschor of Eichstätt Cathedral. It was not part of a representational architectural element or an organic vaulting pattern, but it was applied to a geometric vaulting figuration, which had a very long tradition in European ecclesiastical architecture at this stage. The coalescence of the established geometric cross vault with the novel organic vegetal motif was understood as evidence for a differentiation of styles and proto-theoretical statement on the styles’ characteristic symbolism.

Crossley associated the emergence of the branchwork with the humanist interests of Wilhelm von Reichenau, the erudite bishop of Eichstätt, who intended it as demonstration of the Germans’ history, architectural traditions and a riposte to the challenge of the theoretical basis of the Italian Renaissance’s revival of indigenous past architectural motifs. For example, Tacitus stated in his Germania that the virtue of the ancient Germans was their unspoiled, simple civilisation of bucolic hunters, peasants and warriors, which contrasted with the Romans’ refined, decadent society. He sympathetically proclaimed that the ancient German tribes did not have any temples but worshipped in woods and groves. This statement was substantiated by Vitruvius’s assumption that architecture had its roots in arboreal dwellings made by binding trees together in the forest. These notions, recovered by German humanists from ancient documents, provided relevant precedents for praising the distinct character of German history and transformed vegetal ornaments from a decorative feature into a potent visual expression of the proto-theoretical discourse on the roots of the German architecture in the fifteenth century.

This interpretation was substantiated by Hanns Hubach and Ethan Matt Kavaler’s findings. Hubach was able to show that branchwork as incorporated in Hans Seyfer’s reliefs (1488) in the cloister of Worms Cathedral were understood in the early humanist sphere of the Palatine elector’s court as a quasi-antique decorative element. Kavaler demonstrated with his structuralist analysis of the side chapel’s vaults in the Church of Our Lady in Ingolstadt that the juxtaposition of geometric and vegetal forms as well as

---

665 Crossley, 'The Return to the Forest'. p. 72-73
666 Günther, 'Die deutsche Spätgotik und die Wende vom Mittelalter zur Neuzeit'. p. 66; Crossley, 'The Return to the Forest'. p. 74; Kavaler, 'Nature and the Chapel Vaults at Ingolstadt'. p. 238
the temporal layers indicated by them created a conceptual dichotomy in which the branchwork represents a raw, incomplete and early stage of the Creation.668

As shown by Hubertus Günther and Stephan Hoppe, the recollection of indigenous high medieval traditions and the emergence of theoretical treatises on architecture prompted, for instance, the revival of round arches that began to replace pointed arches in ecclesiastical architecture north of the Alps at the end of the fifteenth century.669 These non-Gothic architectural motifs refer to the indigenous Romanesque style, but Stephan Hoppe recently deduced that in certain instances round arches on their own and in combination with branchwork denote biblical times and were associated with the holy sites, which are connected with the origins of Christianity. He showed that the disposition and style of the architecture in Jan van Eyck’s *The Madonna with Canon van der Paele* (1436) and Albert van Ouwater’s *The Rising of Lazarus* (c. 1450), which is modelled on van Eyck’s painting, allude to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre’s rotunda that van Eyck may have studied on an undocumented pilgrimage to the Holy Land in 1426.670 Both scenes are set in a rotunda that is encompassed by an ambulatory with round arches, which are supported by columns with Romanesque-like leaf capitals, closely resembling the columns and capitals in the rotunda and of the southern portal of the Holy Sepulchre. Moreover Albrecht Dürer’s *The Presentation in the Temple* (c. 1503/05) from a woodcut series, showing scenes of the Virgin’s life, is set in a barrel vaulted space in the Temple of Jerusalem, which features a round arched portal. The portal is surmounted by branchwork.671 Therefore branchwork and Romanesque-like architectural elements, on the one hand, referred to historic times in general, ranging from antiquity to the High Middle Ages. On the other hand, they alluded to biblical times and the buildings that were associated with the holy sites.

The branchwork on the high altarpiece’s predella in the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace form round arches with twigs that are bound together. (Plate 107) This motif may allude to Vitruvius’s notion on the ancient beginnings of architecture. The dukes of Bavaria-Munich may have been introduced to Wilhelm von Reichenau’s early humanist scheme of creating a theoretical basis for the indigenous Late Gothic architecture during one of the bishop’s visits to Munich. Three of his stays (in July 1466, July 1471 and July 1475) are documented in the records of Munich’s town council.672 Wilhelm also maintained good, even close relation with the ducal court in Munich and especially with Albrecht
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668 Kavaler, ‘Nature and the Chapel Vaults at Ingolstadt’. p. 631 & 639
670 Stephan Hoppe kindly provide me with a pre-publication copy of his article ‘Die Antike des Jan van Eyck. Architektonische Fiktion und Empirie im Umkreis des burgundischen Hofs um 1435’ that will be published in the forthcoming book *Persistenz und Rezeption – Weitverwendung, Wiederverwendung und Neuinterpretation antiker Werke im Mittelalter*, edited by Dietrich Boschung und Susanne Wittekind.
671 This argument along with illustrations of the architectural elements is presented in Hoppe, ‘Architekturstil als Bedeutungsträger’. and ‘Die Antike des Jan van Eyck. Architektonische Fiktion und Empirie im Umkreis des burgundischen Hofs um 1435’ that will be published in the forthcoming book *Persistenz und Rezeption – Weitverwendung, Wiederverwendung und Neuinterpretation antiker Werke im Mittelalter*, edited by Dietrich Boschung und Susanne Wittekind. I kindly received a pre-publication copies of both articles.
IV whose courtship of Kunigunde of Austria he supported with his negotiations at the Habsburg court in Innsbruck in June and July 1486.  

In this context the round arches, formed by branchwork, are likely to have been understood by fifteenth-century beholders as demonstrations of an ancient era. As such they provide an appropriate framework for the presentation of biblical figures like the four Evangelists. If contemporary observers read this motif in this manner, it must have decreased the immediacy of this work of art for it did not transport the four Evangelists into the beholders’ present. At once, the removal of the four Evangelists from the present time and their placement into another, temporarily distant period provided the scene with a different meaning that must have bestowed it with more authenticity. This was a suitable strategy for a palace chapel where educated worshippers like Duke Sigmund employed these works of art for contemplation.

The floral or rather vegetal imagery and the round arches complement the Blutenburg Palace Chapel’s architectural detailing and works of art that allude to the time-honoured past of the Wittelsbach dynasty with the evocation of a bygone era. In the fifteenth century beholders were certainly familiar with round arches and their symbolism through the first Church of Our Lady.

The painting of the Andechser Heiltumsschatz for the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace

In 1497 Duke Sigmund commissioned a painting of the Heiltumsschatz (the treasure of relics) of Andechs, a collection of 111 relics including three bleeding hosts, head relics and particles of the True Cross, for the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace. (Plate 108) It was originally displayed inside the chapel where it is documented as late as 1840. Today it is exhibited in the Bayerisches Nationalmuseum in Munich.

The three bleeding hosts are depicted prominently in the centre of the painting. Various other relics that are shown in reliquaries and are accompanied by German captions surround them. According to the inscription, which accompanies the bones and skulls in the lowest row, it was believed that these relics were still hidden in Andechs. The painting’s pious patron is depicted in prayer on the left side of these relics and Abbot Johann Schattenbach of the Benedictine Abbey at Andechs kneels on the right side. The two parchment pieces that were attached to the left and the right of the two figures list all of the indulgences one would gain for the veneration of the Andechs relics.

According to legend, Saint Rasso brought the relics of the ‘Andechser Heiltumsschatz’ from the Holy Land to Andechs where they were displayed in the castle chapel of the Counts of Andechs. Around 1248 when the castle passed from the Counts of Andechs to

---

674 The depiction of Nuremberg on the Krell altarpiece in St Lorenz, Nuremberg is but one example for biblical events that were set in the contemporary, local environment of patrons and beholders. For an illustration refer to Coldstream, *Medieval Architecture*. p. 151.
675 The painting is dated next to the portrait of Duke Sigmund of Bavaria-Munich.
the Wittelsbachs the treasure of relics was buried at a secret location. The numerous precious relics were recovered not until 1388. On 6th December 1389 the treasure of relics was relocated from Andechs to St Laurence in the Alte Hof with a ceremonial act, because the Bavarian dukes intended to replace the ‘lost’ imperial regalia and relics which had been a popular destination for pilgrims but had to be given to Charles IV in 1350. The relic treasure from Andechs provided a new sacred site for pilgrims. From 1390/92 Pope Boniface IX and various bishops like Johann von Mosburg (Bishop of Regensburg between 1384 and 1409) granted letters of indulgences to those pilgrims who travelled to Munich for the Andechser Heiltumsschatz. While the relics were kept in the ducal residence in Munich, they were brought to Andechs for the holiday of the consecration of the abbey church around Michaelmas, for example, in 1396 and 1403, before they were permanently returned to the site of their discovery in 1413 or at the latest in 1420.

In 1455 Albrecht III of Bavaria-Munich established a Benedictine abbey at Andechs where a small monastic settlement of Benedictine monks had already existed prior to this ducal foundation. Eventually Albrecht III chose the abbey church as his burial place where he planned to establish a new tomb for his heirs and the members of his dynasty. Thereby Albrecht III relinquished the tradition of the Bavarian dukes’ burial in the dynastic tomb in the choir of the Church of Our Lady in Munich. He must have regarded the proximity of the Andechser Heiltumsschatz as more important than the continuation of dynastic traditions because of the relics’ sacredness that was thought to secure one’s salvation.

Duke Sigmund could relate to the Andechser Heiltumsschatz for two reasons. Firstly, his father and brother were buried in the abbey church at Andechs. Secondly, in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries the relic treasure of Andechs was regarded as substitute for the ‘lost’ imperial regalia that were associated with the reign of Louis the Bavarian as Holy Roman Emperor. Thus the painting of the Andechser Heiltumsschatz commemorates his father as well as his brother and it is probable that it also indirectly alluded to Louis the Bavarian’s role as Holy Roman Emperor in the context of the decoration of the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace. The presence of particles from the True Cross in the Andechser Heiltumsschatz suited the chapel’s central theme, which referred to Christ’s Passion and thus, according to Richard Bauer, subtly presented the dukes of Bavaria-Munich’s inclination to assume to the Holy Roman Emperor’s throne.

The Andechser Heiltumsschatz and its retrospective connotations have to be considered with regard to Klaus Graf’s observations on antiquarianism in the late Middle Ages and the early modern era. In Graf’s view, the search for relics anticipated the
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680 Ibid. p. 164, 185 & 206
682 Bauer, 'Anmerkungen zum heraldischen Programm'. p. 60
archaeological research and the collections of exotic as well as mysterious objects in cabinets of curiosities. The painting of the Andechser Heiltumsschatz receives a different meaning in a historicising or rather retrospective context like the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace. The chapel’s decoration and architecture refer to the genealogy of Sigmund’s dynasty or historic periods by employing retrospective styles. They signify an awareness and conception of the temporal distance of these events and periods from the present time. Ergo the relics are not only valued for their sacredness, patrons and beholders also appreciated their historic qualities.

The widespread fascination with antiquities—whether they stemmed from antiquity, Byzantium, exotic locations or the indigenous medieval period—at the end of the fifteenth century and the beginning of the sixteenth century is reflected in the varied references to past periods and stylistic evocations of historic epochs in the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace, which are employed to accentuate the Wittelsbach dynasty’s esteemed genealogy.

The historicism and symbolism of the Late Gothic Church of Our Lady

The references of the Church of Our Lady’s architecture to the Romanesque

The light and airy interior of the Late Gothic building is dominated by the massive, octagonal piers that contrast considerably with the thin, almost dematerialised piers of contemporary ecclesiastical structures like the Church of St Martin in Landshut or those buildings that were inspired by the designs of Hans von Burghausen and his followers. (Plate 66) When viewed from the west end, the unadorned piers of the Church of Our Lady create a ‘virtual’ or rather illusionistic wall along the nave’s main aisle toward the choir and east end.

The original Church of Our Lady has to be imagined as a three-aisled longitudinal pier basilica with alternating supports, a polygonal choir and a twin-towered west front. The tall nave, illuminated through clerestory windows, featured groin vaults and ad quadratum alternating supports. Two polygonal apses, the eastern terminations of the side aisles, flanked the choir. At arcade level the massive piers of the Romanesque structure and the clerestory guided the worshippers gaze toward the choir.

Hans Ramisch noted that Halspach’s design subtly combined the multi-directional visual and spatial thrust of the vaults with the longitudinal focus at the beholders’ level. Although the vaults’ dynamic patterns, for example, direct the viewers’ gazes from the northern side aisle to the main aisle, the partition arches visually demarcate the main aisle from the side aisles. This spatial ambivalence amalgamates the characteristics
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685 Ramisch, 'Das Bauwerk'. p. 68; Lieb, 'Münchens Kirchen'. p. 9
686 Ramisch, 'Das Bauwerk'. p. 68
687 Ibid. p. 76
of hall churches and basilicas in the architectural disposition of the Late Gothic Church of Our Lady. The spatial qualities, associated with a Romanesque basilica, must have been intended as an adroit allusion to the Romanesque building.

This retrospective quality of Jörg von Halsbach’s design is accentuated by the conception of the Late Gothic building as Staffelhalle or rather pseudo-basilica. At first sight, beholders will identify the Church of Our Lady as a hall church with its tall walls, supporting the vast roof as well as lacking a clerestory, and the large windows of the chapels between the engaged piers that illuminate the nave. The vaults of the main and side aisles as well as the chapels between the engaged piers appear to be level at the first glimpse. However a cross-section of the building reveals that the vaults of the main aisle are located above those of the side aisles. The vaults of the side aisles are situated above those of the chapels between the engaged piers. The descending height of the vaults of the main and side aisles as well as the chapels represents a subtle variation of the hall church concept on behalf of Jörg von Halspach. The vaults’ descending height must have been intended as an understated tribute to the Romanesque basilica in the context of the complete conception of the Late Gothic church. This appropriate reference to the Romanesque Church of Our Lady might not have been regarded as unusual in the age of the hall churches, as the basilica remained a choice for ecclesiastical construction projects in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as attested by Ulm Minster and the Minster in Überlingen, which were initially designed as hall churches and during their construction converted into basilicas.

The retrospective quality of Jörg von Halspach’s design is not only reflected in the interior’s spatial and architectural disposition. Peter Kurmann noted that the form of the main aisle’s star vaults and their catenation into a row of linked vaults is reminiscent of the vaulting patterns and disposition employed in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in the north-eastern parts of the Holy Roman Empire (i.e. former Cistercians’ Church in Pelplin and the cathedral in Frauenberg). Questions regarding the relationship of the Bavarian brick hall churches with exponents of the brick Gothic (Backsteingotik) in north-eastern Germany, Poland and the Baltic countries were raised in the past. Walter Ziegler pronounced that the north-eastern brick Gothic undoubtedly must have inspired the Bavarian brick hall churches. Any concrete evidence that vouches for an exchange of Jörg von Halspach with his colleagues in the north-eastern regions of the Holy Roman Empire does not exist. Nevertheless, Kurmann’s findings and Ziegler’s conjecture suggest that this vaulting pattern was introduced from the north-eastern brick Gothic into Munich.
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One can only speculate about the reasons for the choice of a vaulting pattern that was characteristic for the thirteenth- and fourteenth-century brick Gothic churches of the northeast. The patrons of the Church of Our Lady might have intended to reflect the time-honoured history of Munich, which had been founded by Henry the Lion. Several brick Gothic churches were located in the territories of the Welf dynasty and the Mark Brandenburg. Furthermore Louis the Bavarian’s first wife Beatrix von Schlesien-Glogau hailed from the Duchy of Glogau in Silesia, a region that also featured several notable brick Gothic churches.

Concurrently with the commemoration of Louis the Bavarian there existed a keen interest in the history of Munich. For instance, town scribe Hans Rosenbusch praised Munich’s history in the Salbuch of 1444. St Onuphrius, whose relics were brought to Munich by Henry the Lion, became a popularly venerated saint in the second half of the fifteenth century. This cult of St Onuphrius is reflected in the forenames of Munich’s burghers and in works of art. In the late fifteenth century, Onuphrius became a popular name for the male offspring of Munich’s burghers and aristocrats (i.e. Onofferus Freyberg zu Hohenaschau). Onuphrius was also the patron saint of the private chapel in the house of the Pötschner family. Sigmund Gotzkircher commissioned depictions of the saint for his house in the 1460s. A mural of St Onuphrius embellished the facade of a house adjacent to the central market square and the courtyard façade of the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace also featured a depiction of the saint.

This selection of examples demonstrates the existing awareness of civic and dynastic history in Munich and the ducal court which may have provided the impetus for choosing the ‘old-fashioned’ star vaults for the Late Gothic building’s main aisle as a dignifying motif to exemplify the history of the Church of Our Lady.

The star vaults remained a solitary creation, although older, simpler vaulting patterns were revived in the design of the rural churches that were built concurrently with the Church of Our Lady. According to Peter Kurmann, this historicising vaulting pattern was scarcely copied in subsequent building projects in the Duchy of Bavaria. Only the star net rib vaults (Sternnetzrippengewölbe) of the chapel in Straubing Palace, built after 1564, might have been inspired by the main aisle’s vaults in the Church of Our Lady. The possible adoption of this motif for a sixteenth-century building project by the Bavarian dukes in their residence in Straubing could be an indication for the awareness of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich of this retrospective vaulting pattern’s symbolism.

The historicising aspect of the vaults of the Church of Our Lady is accentuated by their ‘domed’ shape that was described by Peter Kurmann but without discerning the possible retrospective qualities of the vaults’ disposition. According to Kurmann, the strong concavity of the vaults’ domed shape in the main aisle is exaggerated by the central star pattern, which is created by the combination of six lozenges. The diagonal ribs can be perceived either as exaggerated pointed arches or round arches depending on the beholders’ viewpoints as a result of the vaults’ concavity and the ribs’ equal strength.
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The ribs of the side aisles’ vaults produce similar equivocal arch shapes and thereby juxtapose pointed and round forms.

In Hans Ramisch’s opinion, the Late Gothic Church of Our Lady’s twin towered west front represents an evocation of the Romanesque building, because it was the first hall church that incorporated two towers into its architectural structure. In contrast, the two towers of the Church of Our Lady in Ingolstadt were placed in front of the western façade. Heinz Jürgen Sauermost described the twin towered west front of the Church of Our Lady in Munich as an outmoded architectural design in the second half of the fifteenth century on the grounds of its retrospective allusion to the previous Romanesque building or to Regensburg Cathedral.

However, Sauermost’s evaluation does not take into account that other contemporary ecclesiastical construction projects like Burkhard Engelberg’s design for the Church of Saints Ulrich and Afra in Augsburg or Hans Hieber’s model for a new building of the pilgrimage church Schöne Maria in Regensburg featured a west front with two towers. Recently, Heinz Jürgen Sauermost observed that the Late Gothic Church of Our Lady’s west front was not modelled on or rather a replication of the ‘classic’ eleventh-, twelfth- and thirteenth-century twin towered west fronts, because the two towers are at once perceived as a matching pair but do not form a homogenous entity with the west front’s other architectural parts. The towers are visually related by their symmetrical architectural disposition and embellishments like lesenes and mouldings. However these architectural decorations also distinguish the towers from the nave because the towers’ mouldings do not match the nave’s mouldings. The entrance portal’s porch with the single pitch roof appears to create a visual fissure between the two towers and thus counteracts their symmetry.

The juxtaposition of retrospective or rather historicising motifs with contemporary architectural elements is also reflected in the sculptural decoration of the Church of Our Lady. The sculptures adorning the west portal (a Virgin Mary with Christ Child and
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Resurrected Christ) date from the 1330/40s and were created under Emperor Louis the Bavarian’s patronage who presented them to the church after his return from Rome.\textsuperscript{701} The dukes’ portal features a Virgin Mary with Christ Child, a Resurrected Christ and an Annunciation group (the Virgin Mary and Gabriel) that were created in the 1430s.\textsuperscript{702} (Plate 63) They were originally commissioned to decorate the portals of the previous Romanesque church and were reused for the embellishment of the respective portals of the Late Gothic building. Correspondingly many of the altarpieces and works of art like Gabriel Angler’s polyptych for the high altar (1434/37)\textsuperscript{703} and the Ecce Homo (1320/25)\textsuperscript{704} were transferred from the Romanesque church into the Late Gothic building. These altarpieces were connected with foundations that secured their patrons’ salvation and therefore had to be incorporated into the new building. Conversely, the portals’ sculptural programmes were not part of such ecclesiastical foundations and could have been easily replaced with contemporary sculptural cycles.

Previously the choice for the Late Gothic Church of Our Lady’s plain, simple architectural vocabulary was explained with the patrons’ desire to complete the construction project in a short timeframe and before exceeding their funds. Therefore patrons seemed to have been willing to eschew some of the lavishness of other contemporary projects. This objective does not explain the reuse of the sculptural decoration of the portals. It cannot be imagined that patrons like Duke Sigmund, who commissioned the Heilsspiegelfenster for the Church of Our Lady, could not afford to pay for a new sculptural programme for the dukes’ portal, where he erected a memorial plaque. Hence he evidently did not desire a context for his memorial plaque that comprised contemporary, stylistically ‘modern’ sculptures, since the marble plate is located adjacent to the original sculptural programme from the 1430s with depictions of the Virgin Mary with Christ Child, a Resurrected Christ and an Annunciation group. The sculptural programme was only enriched with the little figures on the portal’s jamb during the construction of the Late Gothic church building.

It appears that these historic works of art, especially those created under Louis the Bavarian’s patronage, were treasured and the patrons of the Late Gothic building did not want to replace them for their dignified, time-honoured symbolism as well as considerations of religious devotion. Even so the reuse of these sculptures was very probably also motivated by the concept of the juxtaposition of ‘old’ and ‘new’ that was expressed elsewhere in the architectural disposition of the Church of Our Lady. Particularly the contrast of old sculptures and architectural motifs with the latest contemporary concepts emphasises the historic or rather retrospective qualities of these features.

Hans Ramisch described the hexagonal console pedestal of Louis the Bavarian’s throne, which separates the upper half of the top plate’s relief from the scene in the lower half, as a historicising motif. In Ramisch’s view, this motif was employed to emphasise the authenticity and time-honoured quality of the depiction of Emperor Louis
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the Bavarian.\textsuperscript{705} Thereby the emperor is presented as a historic figure and the console pedestal visually separates two past temporal layers. It constitutes a stylistic differentiation of two periods that are approximately a century apart.

The revival of past architectural motifs and the adoption of motifs from the Church of Our Lady not only occurred in the chapel of Straubing Palace where the star vault of the Church of Our Lady was replicated. The juxtaposition of various styles and temporal layers was also employed in the architecture of the Jesuits’ Church of St Mariä Himmelfahrt in Cologne (1618-1678), commissioned by arch-bishop Ferdinand of Bavaria (1577-1650), the son of Duke William V of Bavaria and Renata of Lorraine, as a monument of Bavarian piety (‘monumentum Bavaricae pietatis’) and the counterreformation. The early Baroque west front incorporates a window with a pointed arch and tracery (not a rose window), which can be stylistically related to the windows of the west fronts of Cologne Cathedral as well as the Church of Our Lady, and two towers whose architectural disposition and detailing revive the Romanesque style. Norbert Nussbaum observed that the application of the window’s Gothic forms only derives its symbolic potency from its juxtaposition with the Romanesque motifs, because it was not exceptional to combine Gothic elements with Renaissance and early Baroque motifs in the post-Gothic style.\textsuperscript{706} Likewise, the retrospective or rather historicising aspects of the twin-towered west front, the star vaults and the reductive, monumental design of the Church of Our Lady derive their symbolic connotations from their juxtaposition with contemporary as well as innovative elements like the systematic order of Jörg von Halspach’s design which expresses a new rationality. The evocation of a historic style and period like the Romanesque might have been understood as a dignifying concept that was appropriate for a building with a ‘time-honoured’ history or which, in Heinz Jürgen Sauermann’s view, competed with Regensburg Cathedral in the ancient capital of the Duchy of Bavaria that was recaptured by Albrecht IV of Bavaria-Munich in 1486 but lost again in 1492.\textsuperscript{707}

**The bulbous domes of the Church of Our Lady as historicising motifs**

Even though the bulbous domes were only placed onto the towers in 1525 and therefore are regarded as a Renaissance motif,\textsuperscript{708} there are indications that this type of termination, representing a diversion from common Late Gothic spire tower terminations, was already envisaged in the late fifteenth century. (Plate 60) The towers’ tambour storeys were finished before 1492, because the records of Munich’s town council (12\textsuperscript{th} and 13\textsuperscript{th} May 1492, 24\textsuperscript{th} June 1492) document that guns (so-called
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‘Schlangen’) were installed in the tambour storeys’ rooms by Albrecht IV’s gunsmith in May 1492. A year later, the tambour storeys, still without terminations, were depicted in the townscape of Munich, published in Hartmann Schedel’s *Liber Chronicarum* (1493). (Plate 7)

In Sauermost’s reading the architectural disposition of the low tambour storeys with its sixteen small round-arched windows brings the moderate upward thrust of the towers’ architecture to a halt. (Plate 58 and Plate 60) The thresholds of the octagonal storeys, housing the bells, and the tambour storeys are marked by a tracery frieze, which is surmounted by a prominently structured cornice. This architectural detailing together with the segmental arches of the tambour storeys’ windows evidently would have conflicted with spires. The tambour storeys were placed like arched friezes on the towers and represent the perfect connecting pieces for the transition from the towers to the bulbous domes. Therefore Heinz Jürgen Sauermost and Lothar Altmann, who reiterated Sauermost’s argument, believed that the architectural disposition of the tambour storeys indicates that Jörg von Halspach and his patrons eschewed traditional tower terminations like spires from their plan and contemplated alternatives.

This conjecture is supported by a wooden model, which was produced by the carpenter Wibolt to visualise the proposed terminations for the twin towers of the Church of Our Lady. He received a payment for his work on 26th April 1489. Evidently the termination type of Wibolt’s lost model either did not please his clients or could not be realised, because work on the towers stagnated and representatives of Munich’s town council as well as master masons consulted their colleagues in Landshut to find a solution. For example, on 25th and 28th May 1491 mayor Bartlmke Schrenck entertained masons from Landshut and Munich, namely the civic master mason Lukas Rottaler and master carpenter Ulrich of Munich, who met regarding the towers. At the end of the fifteenth century the lodge in Landshut prepared the completion of the construction of the tower of St Martin. The civic authorities and masons in Munich sought information for the completion of the towers of the Church of Our Lady. For this reason Munich’s town council also paid for the journey of the civic master mason Lukas Rottaler and civic junior carpenter Heinrich Wesch to Landshut in July 1500 where the two craftsmen inspected the roof truss and tower of St Martin. The ‘traditional’, common spire of St Martin did not present the desired solution for the termination of the towers of the Church of Our Lady at the beginning of the sixteenth century, because it
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was not realised in Munich and it took more than three decades until the towers were crowned with the bulbous domes in 1525. (Plate 10 and Plate 11)

A shortage of funds cannot explain the delay in realising the bulbous domes, because the dukes of Bavaria-Munich financed and completed other projects in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries that were at least as expensive. For this reason, Heinz-Jürgen Sauermost suggested that a design like the bulbous domes might have been controversial with a broader audience in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. Sauermost believed that only the journeys of councillor Mathes Kirchmair with the craftsmen Konrad Rainer and Master Wolfgang from Munich to Augsburg in second half of 1524 might have provided the breakthrough for this motif, because the bulbous domes of the Church of Our Lady’s towers were completed one year after the delegation’s trip to Augsburg.

In Sauermost’s view, the motif of the bulbous domes was only related with Renaissance domed tower terminations through their shape. He suggested that the thirteenth-century lanterns of San Marco in Venice, which in turn derived from eastern sources, more probably inspired the bulbous domes of the Church of Our Lady. The east was commonly represented in fifteenth-century paintings by buildings with domed terminations, because in the first half of the fifteenth century an alternative, non-Gothic architectural style, modelled on local Romanesque buildings and foreign architectural oeuvres that were associated with Christian antiquity, had emerged in the works of Netherlandish painters like Jan van Eyck and Rogier van der Weyden. Subsequently, German painters like Lukas Moser, Konrad Witz, Hans Memling, Stefan Lochner and Hans Pleydenwurff adopted this historicising architectural vocabulary.

According to Heinz-Jürgen Sauermost and Norbert Nussbaum, the notion that the distinct Central and Northern European conception of antiquity prevailed in Munich is supported by the depictions of domed tower terminations in Hans Schöpfer the Elder’s Judgement of Verginia by Appius Claudius of 1535 in the Alte Pinakothek in Munich. (Plate 83) The buildings in Schöpfer’s painting mostly feature onion domes, but the tower on the right-hand side of the bridge in the distance is crowned with a bulbous dome. (Plate 84) In contrast, Albrecht Altdorfer employed ‘traditional’ pyramidal spires as tower terminations for a twin towered church alongside pointed cupolas for the distant buildings in the Battle of Alexander and Darius at Issus (1429), which was commissioned by Duke William IV of Bavaria and created almost concurrently with Hans Schöpfer the Elder’s painting. (Plate 142 and Plate 143) Hence the bulbous or
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rather onion domes had not been unreservedly established as tokens of antiquity in the German ‘Renaissance’, as Altdorfer was otherwise very heedful in conveying a ‘Renaissance’ impression in his Battle of Alexander and Darius at Issus.

Sauermost (and Nussbaum) did not notice that already from the mid-1480s Jan Polack had employed the non-Gothic, historicising motifs, derived from Netherlandish paintings, for depictions of biblical and historic events. Thereby they were distinguished from the present time that was represented by the contemporary Late Gothic style. For example, Jan Polack depicted domed terminations on the panels (i.e. Christ’s Entombment, The Betrayal and Crucifixion) of the high altarpiece (1491/92) of the Franciscans’ Church of St Antonius in Munich, which had been commissioned by Albrecht IV of Bavaria-Munich. (Plate 129 and Plate 131)

The relation of the Church of Our Lady’s bulbous domes and the architecture of the holy sites in Jerusalem

Sauermost noted that domed terminations were known in Munich at the latest by the fourth quarter of the fifteenth century, because they were depicted in Erhard Reuwich’s woodcut illustrations for Bernhard von Breydenbach’s popular ‘Peregrinatio in terram sanctam’ (1486), the first illustrated travel book in Europe, which was published on 11th February 1486 in Latin and was subsequently translated into German, Dutch, French and Spanish.721 Therefore Sauermost came to the conclusion that the tambour storeys of the towers were not part of Jörg von Halspach’s original plan, but this alteration of the plan in the late 1480s was required to accommodate the guns in the watchmen’s rooms and contemplated domed terminations.722 (Plate 74) Yet Sauermost did not provide any proof for his conjecture. He did not demonstrate whether Breydenbach’s pilgrimage report was known in Munich and how the bulbous domes as emblematic evocations of Solomon’s Temple related to the symbolism of the Church of Our Lady, other than referring to the generic relationship of Christian churches to Solomon’s Temple, which was understood as the customary model of all church buildings, and the description of the Virgin Mary as ‘Templum Salomonis’ in the non-contemporary court church in the ducal palace that replaced the Neuveste from the sixteenth century.723

Although the Dome of the Rock was identified as ‘Templum Salomonis’ in Erhard Reuwich’s aerial view of Jerusalem and the Holy Land, the townscape of Jerusalem in Konrad Grünemberg’s pilgrimage report Pilgerfahrt ins Heilige Land (1486) as well as the woodcuts of Jerusalem in Hartmann Schedel’s Liber Chronicarum (1493), pilgrims to Jerusalem and Christians throughout the Middle Ages were aware that the Muslim Temple or rather the Dome of the Rock did not represent the original Jewish Temple.724 (Plate 74, Plate 75 and Plate 76) According to Denys Pringle, John of Würzburg’s description of the Temple, written in circa 1165, demonstrates an awareness of the
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building’s complicated history of construction and reconstruction as well as a consciousness that the contemporary building did not correspond to the original structure where Christ’s presentation occurred.\textsuperscript{725} This conception and the fact that the Dome of the Rock was occupied by Muslims in the late fifteenth century, impeding the access of Christians to the building, is reflected in Hans Tucher the Elder’s pilgrimage report \textit{Die Reise ins Gelobte Land} (1479-1480). Tucher described the Islamic crescent of the building, which, in his view, was the common embellishment of Muslim ‘church towers’.\textsuperscript{726} Likewise, the fifteenth-century illuminated manuscript, now in the British Library London, created for King René of Provence, shows several buildings including the Temple that are crowned with bulbous domes.\textsuperscript{727} The Temple’s pink walls are adorned with what appear to be jewels. It features green windows and roofs, all of which are decorated with golden ornaments and capped by the most elaborate bulbous domes. The bulbous dome with the Islamic Crescent clearly indicates the Muslim occupation of Jerusalem.

The \textbf{perception of the Holy Sepulchre in the fifteenth century}

Compared with the Temple, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre was of far greater importance to pilgrims and Christians in the Middle Ages, especially in the late fifteenth century. For example, Nicola Coldstream described this phenomenon by summarising that the cross and Christ’s crucifixion were central to Christian faith and the strongest visual as well as literary images in the experience of Christendom in the Middle Ages.\textsuperscript{728} The destination of pilgrims in the fifteenth century was specifically the site of Christ’s crucifixion, death on the cross, burial and resurrection. Entries in the record of Munich’s town council show that the Holy Sepulchre was the goal of the pilgrims’ journeys in the second half of the fifteenth century. For instance, the town council’s documents described the transit of Duke William III of Saxony and his entourage on 7\textsuperscript{th} April 1461 who travelled through Munich on their pilgrimage to Jerusalem. The scribe noted explicitly that William III intended to travel across the sea to the Holy Sepulchre.\textsuperscript{729} Rather than identifying the Holy Land or Jerusalem as the destination of William III’s pilgrimage, he mentioned the Holy Sepulchre and thereby highlighted its central importance in comparison to any sacred site in the Holy Land.

The central role of the Church of the Holy Cross in Christian devotion is demonstrated by Erhard Reuwich’s panoramic woodcut of Jerusalem and the Holy Land for Bernhard von Breydenbach’s pilgrimage report. (Plate 74) The Church of the Holy Sepulchre is the only site in Reuwich’s depiction that was marked with three crosses.
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These crosses informed pilgrims that they would receive triple indulgences by visiting this historic religious site. In comparison the Temple, though featured prominently in the centre of Reuwich’s woodcut, does not feature any of these indulgence crosses, which were important to late medieval pilgrims.

The Christian pilgrim’s focus on the Church of the Holy Sepulchre is demonstrated by the popularity of the dubbing at the tomb of Christ in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. It was a chivalrous deed to travel to Jerusalem and visit the Holy Sepulchre where the knighthood of the Order of the Holy Sepulchre was conferred upon aristocratic and patrician pilgrims. The dubbing over the tomb of Christ had been established around 1330 and became an important aspect of the pilgrimages of aristocrats as well as patricians, because, on the one hand, it demonstrated the aristocrats’ chivalrousness and, on the other hand, conferred dignity on patricians without subordinating themselves to aristocratic lords.730

Numerous architectural monuments that were erected as imitations of the Holy Sepulchre from the fifth until the seventeenth century accentuate the crucial role of Christ’s tomb in Christian piety in the Middle Ages and early modern era.731 For instance, a tomb of Christ was built in the Basilica of Aquileia in the tenth century.732 One of the earliest reproductions of the Holy Sepulchre in Germany is located in the Church of the Capuchins (Kapuzinerkirche) in Eichstätt.733 The monument dates from circa 1160 and was commissioned by Walbrun, dean of Eichstätt Cathedral, under the effect of the second crusade (1148/49) for the former so-called Schottenkirche, the Irish Benedictine abbey Church of the Holy Cross.734 The replica of the Holy Sepulchre was the centre of the church, which was designed as a two-storey space with a gallery analogous to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. Another early example of a tomb of Christ is located in Konstanz Cathedral. According to Nicola Coldstream, it dates from the mid-thirteenth century,735 whereas Johannes Tripps stated that it was built around 1280.736 In 1459 Jörg Ketzel, who had travelled to the Holy Land in 1453, commissioned a Chapel of the Holy Sepulchre. This copy of the tomb of Christ is now located in the courtyard of the Heiliggeistspital in Nuremberg.737 The interior of the chapel features a memorial slab that was claimed to have the dimensions of Christ’s tomb in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem.738 Similar reproductions of the tomb of Christ were commissioned by the councillor Georg Emmerich in Görlitz (from 1481), Elector Frederick III the Wise of Saxony near Torgau (Kreuzkapelle or rather
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Schöne Kirche, 1493/94), Count Johann Ludwig of Nassau-Saarbrücken in Weilburg an der Lahn (1505), as well as Georg and Barbara Regel in the Church of St Anna in Augsburg (1506). The Jerusalem church (Jerusalemkerk) in Bruges, Belgium is another example for the desire of Christians to transport Christ’s tomb to their hometowns with evocations of the Holy Sepulchre. Members of the Adornes, a Genoese family of merchants who had settled in Bruges commissioned the construction of a Holy Sepulchre church that was built of brick between 1427 and the 1450s to house the family’s burial chapel.

Hans Tucher’s pilgrimage report reflects this fascination of fifteenth-century beholders with the architecture of the Holy Sepulchre, as he measured the dimensions of the burial chamber of the Holy Sepulchre. Tucher compared his measurements to Jörg Ketzel’s Tomb of Christ at the Heiliggeistspital in Nuremberg and came to the conclusion that Ketzel tried to reproduce the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem with his architectural commission but that it does not equal the original in Jerusalem. This statement shows that beholders and patrons of these architectural evocations of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem became more interested in the authenticity of their commissions.

Pilgrimage reports like Hans Tucher’s Reise ins Gelobte Land were not the only sources for patrons to convey their ideas to artists and masons who may not have visited the Holy Sepulchre themselves. The illustrated publications of Bernhard von Breydenbach and Konrad Grünemberg contain woodcut plates that convey visual information on the sacred sites and buildings in Jerusalem. They depict the Church of the Holy Sepulchre with domed terminations. (Plate 74 and Plate 76) Breydenbach’s ‘Peregrinatio in terram sanctam’ also contains a plate of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre that shows its domed cupola as well as the slightly pointed domed termination of its bell tower. (Plate 75) In contrast, the Temple in Jerusalem was depicted with a swelling onion dome in Breydenbach’s ‘Peregrinatio in terram sanctam’ and Hartmann Schedel’s Liber Chronicarum, which was described by Robert Bork as an inaccurate reproduction of the architecture of the Dome of the Rock.

Not only artists like Jan van Eyck or Jan Polack employed these bulbous domes for the depictions of the biblical scenes’ architecture. Bulbous domes were also reproduced in architecture. The Jerusalem Church in Bruges features an octagonal bell tower with a bulbous dome. A swelling dome also caps the shrine in the Church of St Anne in Augsburg. (Plate 73) Robert Bork stated that these types of tower terminations enjoyed widespread popularity in the sixteenth century. Furthermore, sixteenth-century depictions of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem like the pilgrimage souvenirs made of mother-of-pearl, bought by wealthy pilgrims such as Count-Palatine
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Ottheinrich, show the building with a swelling, slightly pointed dome that is reminiscent of the bulbous domes of the Church of Our Lady in Munich. (Plate 77)

The Church of Our Lady as evocation of the Holy Sepulchre?

These observations raise three questions. Were members of the ducal court familiar with the architecture of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, which would have allowed them to choose a termination like the bulbous domes for the towers of the Church of Our Lady in the fourth quarter of the fifteenth century? How did they know the architectural disposition of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre? How does the symbolism of a motif like the bulbous domes, referring to the architecture of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, relate to the Church of Our Lady?

The Wittelsbachs’ foundations of the Benedictine abbeys at Scheyern and Ettal must have provided the most important conceptual models for the cult of the Holy Cross, Jesus Christ and the Virgin Mary at the Church of Our Lady. The abbey church in Scheyern housed the Wittelsbachs’ first dynastic tomb and the Holy Cross relics. It was dedicated to the Holy Cross and the Assumption of the Virgin Mary. Louis the Bavarian founded the Benedictine abbey in Ettal after his return from Rome. (Plate 79 and Plate 80) He laid the church’s foundation stone in 1330. The church was dedicated to the Virgin Mary like so many of the Bavarian dukes’ ecclesiastical foundations. Louis also summoned twenty friars to Ettal, and established a knightly collegiate foundation (Ritterstift) with twelve knights and a master. The knights did not have to observe celibacy and they maintained a hospital for injured chevaliers.744

The original abbey church at Ettal was designed as a centralised structure with a twelve-sided polygonal layout. (Plate 79 and Plate 80) The structure’s core was surrounded by a two-storey ambulatory. The knights gathered in the polygon’s centre during mass, while their wives sat on the ambulatory gallery. The centralised structure was extended with an eastern, basilica-like choir for the Benedictine friars.745

Robert Suckale stated that the architecture of the abbey church in Ettal was intended to symbolise the Pantheon, which Louis the Bavarian had seen during his stay in Rome in 1428.746 However, Fritz Wochnik suggested that the church’s architectural disposition was conceived as a reference to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre because especially its choir in the east was reminiscent of the ambulatory choir that was added to the Holy Sepulchre in the twelfth century.747 Wochnik’s conjecture appears more plausible as it is substantiated by the Benedictine abbey church’s architectural disposition and the knightly collegiate foundation.

The Benedictine abbey church’s architecture as depicted on the map of 1513 (Plate 79), Philipp Apian’s drawing (Plate 81) or in Michael Wening’s engraving of 1701 (Plate 80) echoes the architectural disposition of the Holy Sepulchre monument in
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Constance Cathedral (c. 1260) and San Sepolcro in Aquileia Cathedral (second quarter of the tenth century) with their conical roofs. Louis the Bavarian could have known it since his nephew Markward von Randegg was patriarch of Aquileia. Munich’s burghers and the dukes of Bavaria-Munich might have also heard of it, since Cardinal Alexander, the Patriarch of Aquileia who visited Munich in 1443, granted them the collection of money through the sale of indulgences for the maintenance of the Church of Our Lady. According to Richard Krautheimer, the Rotunda of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem features twenty supports of which eight are piers and twelve are columns. Either one of these numbers was chosen for the building’s architectural disposition, which were modelled on the Holy Sepulchre, because of their symbolism as maintained by medieval numerology. Ettal’s patrons selected twelve as the number of the church’s polygonal layout. It is also reflected in the twelve knights that lived in the knightly collegiate foundation. The twelve Apostles might have also inspired the number of knights. The abbey church at Ettal also appears strikingly similar to the Benedictines’ Church of the Holy Cross in Eichstätt as documented in a watercolour (1537) from Count Palatine Ottheinrich’s travel album that depicts the townscape of Eichstätt. The Church of the Holy Sepulchre is shown on the very right-hand side of the watercolour. It was a two-storey centralised structure that adhered to the basilical system (‘basilikales System’) with a cylinder that must have incorporated an ambulatory, a tambour and a lantern. Numerous windows, lesenes and a frieze of round arches structured the elevation. Tucher the Elder confirmed in his pilgrimage report *Die Reise ins Gelobte Land* that the Holy Sepulchre monument in the Church of the Holy Cross outside Eichstätt resembled the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. The churches in Eichstätt and Ettal were part of Benedictine abbeys and therefore Louis the Bavarian as well as the Benedictines in Ettal must have known the church in Eichstätt. Moreover, the building in the background of a crucifixion that is presented in the shrine of the Holy Cross altarpiece (c. 1484/90) in the pilgrimage church of St Wolfgang near Haag. (Plate 82) The centralised structure’s architecture in the Holy Cross altarpiece was meant to provide the temporal context for the crucifixion scene by evoking biblical times. The building’s style was associated with the Temple and thus the Holy Sepulchre’s architecture may have been imagined correspondingly. A similar building is also shown on the main panel of the Renaissance epitaph of the
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canon Philipp Dobereiner (dated 1576) in the Church of Our Lady in Munich. The epitaph’s theme focuses on Christ’s Passion and climaxes in the crucifix that literally surmounts the epitaph and Ecce Homo. The main panel depicts Christ outside Jerusalem’s town wall as he carries the cross toward Golgotha. In the background a centralised, two-storey building with an ambulatory on the ground floor stands on Christ’s right side. Hence in the fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth centuries patrons, artists and worshippers must have identified buildings like the abbey church in Ettal with the architecture of the Holy Land during Christ’s lifetime on the grounds of their architectural disposition.

The allusion of the abbey church’s architectural disposition to the Holy Sepulchre is substantiated by the knightly collegiate foundation. It may have been intended to emulate similar institutions like the Knighthood of the Holy Sepulchre or the Order of St John (of Jerusalem), which were associated with the Holy Sepulchre and Christian pilgrims. For example, the Knights of St John cared for pilgrims like Duke Christoph of Bavaria-Munich who died in their hospital on the Island of Rhodes. These emblematic references to the Holy Sepulchre and the dedication to the Virgin Mary were certainly appropriate for a church that Louis the Bavarian had chosen as his desired burial place since it emulated the dual cult of the abbey church in Scheyern.

Sigmund of Bavaria-Munich certainly knew of the ‘authenticity’ of the replica of the Holy Sepulchre in Eichstätt, because the canon Paul Sewer of the Augustinian canonry in Indersdorf and brother of the ducal treasurer Martin Sewer created an elaborate, hand-written copy (Cgm 24, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich) of Hans Tucher’s pilgrimage report Die Reise ins Gelobte Land for Sigmund in 1489. He might have even seen the monument in Eichstätt himself or learned about it from Bishop William of Reichenau with whom the ducal court in Munich maintained close relations. Sigmund was very probably familiar with the symbolism of the abbey church in Ettal, because Emperor Louis the Bavarian is praised specifically for this foundation in the genealogical mural of the Alte Hof. Therefore Sigmund was aware of Louis the Bavarian’s foundation and might have even known Louis’s emblematic intentions that underlay the establishment of the knightly collegiate foundation alongside the Benedictine abbey.
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From this perspective, a symbolism that referred to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and Christ’s crucifixion was appropriate for the Church of Our Lady, which housed the tomb of the Wittelsbach dynasty. Louis the Bavarian established several foundations in the Church of Our Lady to further increase the prestige of his dynasty’s tomb. He founded the so-called Kaiseraltar (imperial altar) after the death of Beatrix von Schlesien-Glogau and possibly to commemorate his coronation in Rome. The altar is dedicated to the Virgin Mary, the Holy Cross and St Beatrix. The Kaiseraltar is more commonly referred to as the altar of the Holy Cross (Kreuzaltar), which highlights the importance of the Passion relics and symbols that were venerated there. The Kreuzaltar was the altar for the congregation until its demolition in 1604. (Plate 68 and Plate 69) It was liturgically not the most important religious site in the Church of Our Lady, but it was prominently placed at the threshold of nave and choir. Thereby the altar of the Holy Cross provided a conspicuous focal point for worshippers who approached it from the west end along the nave’s main aisle. It was also located in close proximity to the Wittelsbachs’ cenotaph in the centre of the choir. In 1339 Louis donated a sanctuary lamp and appointed a chaplain ‘for the altar in front of our tomb in the choir of the Church of Our Lady in Munich’. The chaplain had to say a silent mass on a daily basis and each Friday he had to hold a requiem for the emperor’s late wife and ancestors. The proximity of the Holy Cross relics and the dynastic tomb in the abbey church at Scheyern that was also dedicated to the Virgin Mary must have provided a paragon for Louis’s foundation.

Frederick, John II and Stephen III continued the tradition of commemorating the ancestors of the Wittelsbach dukes at the altar of the Holy Cross. They confirmed the eternal mass (Ewige Messe) that had been founded by Catherine of Gorizia-Tyrol, the wife of John II, and was to be held on every Sunday as well as every holiday between the first and last ringing of bells of the High Mass.

The next generation of Bavarian dukes also paid tribute to their ancestors at the altar of the Holy Cross since Ernst and William III established a mass for their mother Catherine of Gorizia-Tyrol there in 1403. Thereby the dukes not only continued the tradition of the House of Bavaria but also that of their mother. These foundations not only commemorated the progenitors of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich on the anniversaries of their deaths, on holidays or once a week, but the charters of some of these foundation stipulated that mass had to be said every day.

Christ’s death on the cross was the subject of other ducal commissions at the end of the fifteenth century. In 1488, Sigmund of Bavaria-Munich established a Tenebrae foundation in the Church of Our Lady. It paid tribute to Christ’s death on the cross with
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the singing of the ‘Tenebrae facta sunt’ on Fridays. Sigmund also commissioned the so-called Erbauungsbüchlein ‘St Anshelmi Fragen an Maria’ in 1494. It contains a dialogue between the Virgin Mary and Bishop St Anshelmus on Christ’s Passion. The Erbauungsbüchlein (book for one’s contemplation and edification) is entertaining and reads effortlessly. It illustrates the Virgin’s feelings for her son and her pain of witnessing his execution. The book also acted as a Christian talisman as stated on folios 95, 96 and 97. Each text section is succeeded by two illuminations that illustrate and summarise the topics of the preceding text. The illuminations depict the key episodes of Christ’s Passion like the Last Supper, Jesus washes the feet of the disciples, the Agony in the Garden of Gethsemane, the Betrayal, the Trials of Jesus (three plates plus a depiction of Judas’s suicide), the Flagellation, the Crowning with Thorns, Pilatus washes his hands, Jesus stripped of his clothes, Jesus is nailed to the Cross, Christ’s crucifixion, Roman soldiers gambling for his clothes, the Decent from the Cross, Pietà and Christ’s Entombment. Interestingly enough the book ends with Christ’s entombment and not his resurrection. It focuses on Christ’s suffering like the subject matter of the high altarpiece’s central panel in the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace. In 1497, Sigmund commissioned a panel, depicting the Andechs treasure of relics (Andechser Heiltumsschatz) for the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace, which comprised particles of the True Cross. (Plate 108)

These examples further accentuate that the dukes of Bavaria-Munich were concerned with Christ’s death on the cross at the end of the fifteenth century. The interest to observe the holy sites in Jerusalem in reality must have prompted Duke Christoph’s pilgrimage to the Holy Land in 1493. He may have travelled there to inspect the Holy Sepulchre and gain first hand information on its architecture for realising tower terminations that symbolically allude to the church marking the site of Christ’s death.

The dual cult of the Virgin Mary and Christ’s death on the Cross is also symbolised by the cross with crescent and star that was placed onto the roof of the Church of Our Lady’s east end in 1478/79. Obviously the cross is a reference to Jesus Christ and specifically his death on the cross. The sun and stars are also symbols for Christ. However, in this instance they also refer to the Virgin Mary, the church’s patron saint, because the Virgin is associated with the sun, moon and stars in the Book of Revelations (12,1). This passage was translated by artists into the subject matter of the Virgin on the Crescent (Mondsichelmadonna).
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The bulbous domes as reference to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and symbols of the cult of the commemoration of ancestors

In the context of the symbolism and dedication of the altars as well as foundations in the Church of Our Lady, the bulbous domes must have been understood as another emblem that refers to Christ’s death on the cross and thus an appropriate, dignifying architectural motif for the church that houses the dukes of Bavaria-Munich’s sepulchre.

Peter Kurmann stated that the choice for a twin-towered façade for the Late Gothic Church of Our Lady in Munich might have been inspired by the Church of Our Lady in Ingolstadt, because in both instances this architectural feature was understood as a marker of the Bavarian dukes’ dynastic tombs. However, Kurmann could not substantiate his conjecture and did not identify other symbolic elements of the west front’s architecture like the bulbous domes.

Bulbous and onion domes surmounted the towers of late fifteenth-century and early sixteenth-century buildings and monuments that are related to the commemoration of ancestors. For instance, the Jerusalemkerk, which was built for the Adornes family in Bruges to house their tomb (1427-1450s), features a bulbous, even apple-shaped dome at the top of its central tower. This tower termination motif appropriately refers to the architecture of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem and at once marks the church as the site of the Adornes family’s tomb. Thereby it entwined the worshipping of Christ with the remembrance of the Adornes family’s ancestors with the intention to also preserve the memory of the building’s patrons. In 1519, King Sigismund I had a burial chapel for himself and his wife built on the south side of cathedral on the Wawel in Kraków. The Italian architect Bartolomeo Berrecci designed this classical domed cube that is decorated on the inside and outside with antique ornaments and structured by classical orders. The cube is surmounted by an octagonal tambour and copper-clad dome with lantern. Thus the Italianate style of Berrecci’s design is supported by the choice of materials. The Sigismund Chapel of Kraków Cathedral is also capped with a dome, probably to mark it as burial place.

Emperor Maximilian commissioned Albrecht Dürer’s **Triumphal Arch** (dated 1515) to combine the fundamental objectives of his genealogical and literary projects into a single work of art. A hemispherical dome surmounts the Triumphal Arch’s central, heraldic tower. The towers that flank the arch on either side are capped with domes that resemble the bulbous domes of the Church of Our Lady. The Triumphal Arch’s central tower incorporates the portal of honour and authority (‘Portenn der Eeren unnd der Macht’). A family tree displays the genealogy of the Habsburgs and the six rows of armorial bearings are the heraldic representation of their territories. Lüken noted that towers were symbols of worldly glory in Maximilian’s time since they were emblems of the aristocratic status and prestige in palace.
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architecture. This aspect of the *Triumphal Arch* is certainly modelled on existing buildings that were decorated with coats-of-arms like the heraldic wall (c. 1453) on the exterior of the palace chapel of St George in Wiener Neustadt or the heraldic tower of the Hofburg in Innsbruck that was completed in 1499. Matthias Müller asserted that towers were symbols for the commemoration of dynasties’ history and renown. Thus towers were firmly associated with the glorification of the patron’s genealogy, authority and status. They legitimated the ruler’s claim to power by remembering the patron’s ancestors. Therefore he based his authority on his descent and his progenitors’ achievements.

Sven Lüken suggested that the *Triumphal Arch*’s domes were inspired by Venetian Early Renaissance churches like Santa Maria dei Miracoli, which was built by Pietro Lombardo from 1481 and consecrated in 1489, because it features a hemispherical dome with a domed lantern above the choir and a campanile with a domed termination that is reminiscent of the *Triumphal Arch*’s side towers. However, the *Triumphal Arch* incorporates scenes that relate to Christ’s Passion like the recovery of the Holy Tunic of Trier. Not only were towers associated with ancestral commemoration, but also Christ’s death on the cross and thus the architecture of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. Richard Krautheimer observed that early Christians closely associated burial and resurrection with baptism. Therefore the architecture of baptisteries and mausoleums in some instances was modelled on the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. A pattern that continued throughout the Middle Ages, particularly in Northern Italy and even north of the Alps. Michael Schmidt determined that Eichstätt’s burghers had chosen the Church of the Holy Cross as the site of their tombs because of their belief of the Holy Sepulchre monument’s effect on their salvation. Similar motivations must have guided Georg and Barbara Regel to erect a replica of the Holy Sepulchre in the Church of St Anna in Augsburg (1506) as their tomb. (Plate 73) Likewise, the ducal court in Munich linked Louis the Bavarian’s Tumba, the sepulchre under the choir and foundations, related to the ancestral commemoration, with the altar of the Holy Cross in the Church of Our Lady in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Other members of the Wittelsbach dynasty, who were buried elsewhere, also desired an association of their tomb with relics of the Holy Cross. For instance, Johannes Grünwalder, the illegitimate son of John II of Bavaria-Munich, the great-grandfather of Sigmund and Albrecht IV, originally placed his epitaph in front of the altar of the Holy Cross in Freising Cathedral. From this perspective, it appears plausible that the domes of Maximilian I’s *Triumphal Arch* and the tower terminations of the Church of Our Lady were symbols of ancestral commemoration. In the instance of the Church of Our Lady, knowledgeable contemporary beholders would have recognised the bulbous domes as markers of a shrine and the ducal sepulchre respectively.
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The connection between the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and Gothic churches in Germany was unquestionably made by contemporaries in the second half of the fifteenth century as attested by the letter of 6th August 1479 that Hans Tucher sent his brother Endres Tucher from Jerusalem. Hans Tucher described his arrival in Palestine, the visits to the room of the last supper on Mount Zion and the Holy Sepulchre. It also contains the comparison of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem with the Church of St Sebald in Nuremberg, which was later incorporated into his published pilgrimage report. Hans Tucher also relates the Holy Sepulchre to the Church of the Holy Cross in Die Reise ins Gelobte Land.

The bulbous domes were certainly not intended as evocations of a Heavenly Jerusalem as suggested by Hans Ramisch and Lothar Altmann. Medieval beholders were aware of the sacred sites’ architectural histories and in the late fifteenth century they were more interested in the biblical events’ real locations rather than modelling churches on imaginary concepts like the Heavenly Jerusalem. It appears plausible that the bulbous domes were derived from the architectural disposition of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre as represented in illustrated publications like Bernhard von Breydenbach’s popular ‘Peregrinatio in terram sanctam’, Konrad Grünemberg’s Pilgerfahrt ins Heilige Land and Hartmann Schedel’s Liber Chronicarum. (Plate 74, Plate 75 and Plate 76) This conjecture is supported by the striking resemblance of the architectural disposition of the Church of Our Lady’s towers and the woodcut illustration of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Breydenbach’s ‘Peregrinatio in terram sanctam’. (Plate 76) The depiction shows the square outside the main entrance on the southern side. The part of the building with the portal features a biforium above the entrance and is surmounted by a tambour and hemispherical dome with the remains of a lantern. The cylindrical tambour features windows that are grouped in pairs. A frieze encircles the tambour above the windows and marks the threshold of tambour and dome. Although the dome appears to be built of stones, the architectural disposition of all of its individual parts is very similar to the tambour storeys and bulbous domes of the Church of Our Lady’s twin towers. The tambour storeys feature pairs of windows on each side of the octagons. Friezes, which are surmounted by the bulbous domes, encircle the octagonal tambour. It is tempting to suggest the woodcut in Breydenbach’s pilgrimage report as the blueprint for the terminations of the Church of Our Lady’s towers, especially since it was widely disseminated in Europe at the time of the completion of the church building’s construction.
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The ducal court’s sources for a knowledge of the sacred sites’ architecture in Jerusalem

This elaboration did not yet provide any suggestions with regard to the origins of the bulbous domes and how the dukes of Bavaria-Munich might have acquired knowledge of the architecture of the sacred sites in Jerusalem in the fifteenth century.

In 1489, the canon Paul Sewer of the Augustinian canonry in Indersdorf and brother of the ducal treasurer Martin Sewer created an elaborate, hand-written copy (Cgm 24, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich) of Hans Tucher the Elder’s pilgrimage report *Die Reise ins Gelobte Land* for Duke Sigmund of Bavaria-Munich.785 Sewer’s codex does not contain any illustrations of sacred sites in Jerusalem. Nevertheless, Sigmund gained an impression of the sacred sites’ architectural disposition from Tucher’s detailed accounts, which, for example, mention architectural detailing like ‘kriechischen werck’ that referred to the Temple’s Greek-style decoration.786

Matthäus Prätzl was Albrecht IV’s treasurer since 1486. He began to compile a collection of pilgrimage reports from 1488. This anthology of seven travel reports was completed in circa 1491. It is now kept in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich (Codex L 1603) but only contains five of the original seven books, which were listed by Prätzl in the table of contents: 1. ‘Marco Polo’, 2. ‘Sankt Brandans Meerfahrt’, 3. Jean de Mandeville’s Travels, 4. Pseudo-Odorico de Pordenone [Ulrich Friaul], 5. Hans Schiltberger’s ‘Reisebuch’, 6. Hans Tucher the Elder’s ‘Die Reise ins Gelobte Land’, and 7. Bruder Peter’s ‘Meerfahrt’. A subsequent owner removed the reports by Tucher and Bruder Peter from the collection at a later stage; they are now lost.787 Besides, Prätzl commissioned an artistic and precious world map for his collection788 that aided the reader to locate the places described in the reports. Unfortunately, the map is lost too.

According to Prätzl’s table of contents, Bernhard von Breydenbach’s pilgrimage report, which was published concurrently, was not included in his collection. However, German-language versions of Bernhard von Breydenbach’s ‘Peregrinatio in terram sanctam’ in addition to Hans Tucher’s pilgrimage report were kept in at least two monastic libraries in Munich and its vicinity. These copies are now stored in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich and form part of the library’s collection of six German-language copies of Breydenbach’s book.

The Benedictine Abbey at Tegernsee acquired a copy in 1487.789 It has to be remembered that Kasper Ayndorffer, the abbot of this Benedictine friary, recommended Hans Haldner to Munich’s town council in his letter of 20th October 1458 as master mason for the imminent building project of the Late Gothic Church of Our Lady. This
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785 'Volendet und geschriben ist dises Puchlin · dem durchleuchticht hochgeboren fursten vnd herren · herren Sigmunden · Pfaltzgraebe je Rhein · Herzog Jn obern vnd midern Beyren · von mir Paulsen Sewer profesß und korpruder zu vndensdorff · Mertin Sewers Pruder · Etwo seiner furstlichen genaden kamerer vnd getreßer diener [brother of Martin Sewer, the duke’s treasurer] · Nach Cristi vnsers lieben herren geburt Tausent vierhundert · vnd Jn dem Neßn vnd achtzigisten Jare [1489] meinem gnadigen herren’. – Transcribed in Herz, *Die 'Reise ins Gelobte Land'*; p. 83 & 86
786 Ibid. p. 417
787 Ibid. p. 114 , 257-258 & footnote 532
788 ‘ain vast kunstige auch kostliche Mappa’. – Transcribed in Ibid. p. 258
789 Bayerische Staatsbibliothek et al., *Inkunabelkatalog* (2; Wiesbaden: Dr Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1991). p. 2
letter clearly is an indication for the interest of the Benedictines of Tegernsee in this construction project. Hitherto no further evidence like letters are known to support the conjecture that the Benedictine friars, based on their knowledge of Breydenbach’s report and Reuwich’s architectural illustrations, may have played a role in the decision for the historicising shape of the bulbous domes of the Church of Our Lady.

Another copy of Breydenbach’s illustrated pilgrimage report originally belonged to St Christopher’s Franciscan community of the Pütrich sisters. This ‘convent’, Seelhaus or Regelhaus was located in the former Schwabinger Gasse, on the corner of the present day Residenzstrasse and Perusastrasse at the Max-Josephs-Platz, where it stood until the secularization of 1803. Duchess Kunigunde took great interest in its prosperity. She intervened her husband’s plans to dissolve the Regelhaus of St Christopher in the early 1480s. Kunigunde’s involvement in the nunnery culminates in her entry into the convent shortly after her husband’s death on 16th March 1508.

If members of the ducal court in Munich did not possess a copy of Breydenbach’s pilgrimage report, they could have seen it either in the Benedictine abbey in Tegernsee or more probable at the convent of the Franciscan nuns in Munich. Therefore, they must have been familiar with Reuwich’s illustrations that depicted architectural detailing of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre like the tambour and hemispherical dome above the main entrance portal.

From the late-1480s, this historicising architectural motif also emerged in Jan Polack’s works. For instance, buildings in The Betrayal and Christ’s Entombment from the high altarpiece (1491/92) of the Franciscans’ Church of St Antonius in Munich, commissioned by Albrecht IV, are surmounted with bulbous domes. Thus there existed several sources from which Sigmund and Albrecht IV could have gathered knowledge of the architecture of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre that may have had an impact on the genesis of the bulbous domes of the Church of Our Lady.

790 Ibid. p. 2
791 Graf, 'Kunigunde', p. 166
792 Ibid. p. 168
793 Ibid. p. 148, 167-169
794 Ibid. p. 170ff
The impact of the government, the artistic and architectural patronage of the Dukes of Bavaria-Munich on their territory

The impact of the Wittelsbach dynasty on the fabric of Munich in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries

Since the foundation of Munich by Duke Henry the Lion its rulers shaped the town’s urban fabric. This is, for example, reflected in the layout of the town. (Plate 12 and Plate 13) The division of Munich into quarters was essential for the organisation of its administration and the town’s defence. It was ‘planned’ around the central market square that functioned as the intersection of two roads. Traffic along the salt trading route, which had prompted the foundation of Munich by Henry the Lion, approached Munich from the east, crossed the bridge across the River Isar and passed through the town in westward direction. (Plate 12 and Plate 13) The second important route traversed Munich from the south in northern direction. From circa 1260, it was established as a transit route under Duke Louis II who along with his successors converted Munich into an important place of transhipment for the long-distance trade. The salt trading was supplemented with the turnover of goods from the Alpine regions and the Franconian-Bohemian markets that were forwarded to their destination markets from the Wittelsbach dynasty’s territories in Tyrol and the Nordgau (the western part of the Upper Palatinate covering the regions Neumarkt, Lauterhofen, Altdorf and Hersbruck). Salt was brought from the East to Munich, wine and metals arrived in the town from the South, and cloths were shipped from the North. These two arterial streets met on the western side of the large market square that formed the centre of a spacious ‘planned’ town, especially after the extension of Munich’s boundary with the construction of a second town wall in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries under Louis II and Louis the Bavarian. (Plate 12 and Plate 13)

The presence of the ducal court in Munich, especially the measures initiated by Louis II and Louis the Bavarian, promoted the town’s development. For example, they attracted craftsmen and merchants. This resulted in the growth of the town’s population and its expansion. Already by the middle of the thirteenth century the incorporation of a part of the ‘Tal’—the area between the Taltor and the bridge across the River Isar—enlarged the town. Now the Isartor (first documented in 1318) marked the town’s eastern confines.798 (Plate 13)

By the end of the reign of Duke Louis II (1253-1294) the town had grown beyond its original perimeter, reflected by the first town wall. Conversely, a second wall was erected to protect those burghers who lived outside the old wall. Louis the Bavarian accelerated construction work on the new fortification as a result of his military conflicts with Frederick I of Austria. The new town wall was apparently finished with the completion of the Isartor, the eastern town gate near the bridge across the River Isar, in 1337. Nevertheless, construction work continued until the fifteenth century when the enclosure was completed. The area within the town’s fortification increased from seventeen to ninety hectares. The structured layout of the old town was transferred onto the expanded area.799

The erection of Munich’s imposing fortification that comprised two walls as documented in Michael Wolgemut’s townscape (Plate 7 and Plate 9) in Hartmann Schedel’s Liber Chronicarum (1493) was not only motivated by the threat of attacks for Hiram Kümper observed that the Munich emulated the fortifications of the powerful imperial free town Nuremberg. The efforts of the town walls’ construction together with the procurement and adaptation of Johann Glöckner’s Nürnberger Kriegsmonographie in 1442, which is an elaboration on defence engineering, armories and military technology, demonstrates that Munich should be regarded as the guardian of the Holy Roman Empire’s safety on par with the imperial free towns. This notion is supported by the objectives that are described in Munich’s version of the Nürnberger Kriegsmonographie.800

Hartmann Schedel noted Emperor Louis the Bavarian’s role in the town’s expansion and the erection of a second town wall in his description of Munich. Schedel wrote that Louis who also beautified it with buildings enlarged Munich. The town grew significantly during the reign of Louis the Bavarian, because he had a new town wall erected to incorporate the area and many of the buildings like the Alte Hof (‘alt schloss’) and the Franciscans’ Friary (‘parfußer closter’), which were located outside the old town wall, into the perimeter of Munich.801 Even though Schedel overemphasised Louis the Bavarian’s role in enlarging Munich and boosting its

800 Kümper, ‘Reichsstädtische Allüren im spätmittelalterlichen München’. p. 74-76
801 Extract from the description of Munich above the depiction of Munich in Hartmann Schedel’s Liber Chronicarum (1493): ‘yedoch ist sie von dem […] kaiser Ludwigen erweitert und mit gepewen geziret worden. […] zu den zeiten hertzog Ludwigs zu bayern und des romischen kaisers hat diese statt mercklich und gross zugenommen dan derselb kaiser hat die vorstatt und vil andere gepew mit mawn eingefangen. vnd das alt schloss mit der parfußer closter.’ Refer to Plate 9.
development, for the emperor only consistently continued a process that had been initiated by his predecessors like Louis II. Yet the description in the *Liber Chronicarum* highlights the impact of the Wittelsbach dynasty on its ducal seat by praising the measures of Louis the Bavarian (i.e. the town’s beautification).

**Munich as ducal seat**

An examination of the dukes’ impact on Munich’s townscape first of all raises questions regarding the definition of a princely residence. What are the characteristics that distinguish a town with a princely seat from other urban centres? Do these features apply to Munich in the late Middle Ages and early modern period?

The late Middle Ages witnessed changes in the conception of the princely government. Between the thirteenth century and the fifteenth century the princely households began to evolve from travelling courts into a form of government with stationary administrations that were based at the principal princely palaces. Rather than accompanying their rulers, the administration (i.e. chancellery, treasury, scribes, archive, etc.) was centred at these main princely residences. These palaces along with the towns within which they were situated became the centres or rather ‘capitals’ of the princely territories. According to Klaus Neitmann, these main princely seats were typically denoted by an impressive urban palace, a local archive, a dynastic tomb, magnificent buildings and works of art that served prestigious as well as administrative purposes, the foundation or rather patronage of monasteries and convents as well as a close interconnection of court and town, which was exemplified, for instance, by privileges, awarded to the civic government and the burghers by their lord.

**The Alte Hof**

The Alte Hof and from the late fourteenth century the Neuveste were the obvious manifestations of the ducal court’s presence in Munich. It is assumed that a fortified residence or a castle existed at the Alte Hof’s present location by the time of Munich’s foundation or at the latest by 1180 when the town and the duchy passed on to the Wittelsbach dynasty. The findings of recent archaeological excavations in the 1990s, which unearthed traces of a building on the site of the Alte Hof, dating from the twelfth century, underpinned this conjecture. This residence was continuously extended and became the preferred seat of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich. By the fifteenth century, two ducal residences existed in Munich. The Alte Hof, the older one, was the prestigious residence.

---

802 Bauer, *München als Landeshauptstadt*. p. 116
803 Bastert, *Der Münchner Hof und Fuetrers 'Buch der Abenteuer'*. p. 122
804 Klaus Neitmann, "Was ist eine Residenz? Methodische Überlegungen zur Erforschung der spätmittelalterlichen Residenzbildung", in Peter Johanek (ed.), *Vorträge und Forschungen zur Residenzfrage* (Residenzforschung; Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1990), 11-43. p. 21-24 & 41; Bastert, *Der Münchner Hof und Fuetrers 'Buch der Abenteuer'*. p. 123
residence of the dukes, the centre of court life and ducal administration until the sixteenth century. The Neuveste, a moated, fortified castle, was built from 1385 in the north-eastern corner of the enlarged town after violent conflicts between the dukes and the burghers of Munich. It provided shelter and in the fifteenth century was the residence of the duchesses and their courtiers.\(^{806}\) (Plate 11, Plate 54 and Plate 55)

The reign of Louis the Bavarian was the second important period for the architectural development of the Alte Hof. The Burgstock (the southern wing) and the Zwingerstock (the western wing) were extended under Louis the Bavarian’s reign.\(^{807}\) He also continued the building work on the Lorenzistock (the wing north of the courtyard) that had commenced under his predecessors. Louis initiated or continued the construction of the palace chapel, located in the Lorenzistock, and dedicated it to St Laurence, the early Roman patron saint of Munich.\(^{808}\) (Plate 27) He certainly added the choir to the nave and is responsible for the interior’s decoration.\(^{809}\)

A relief, dated 1324, shows a praying Emperor Louis the Bavarian and his second wife Margaret of Holland, whom he married in February 1324, kneeling in front of the Virgin Mary with Christ Child.\(^{810}\) (Plate 30) Margaret of Holland presents the Virgin and Christ Child with a model of the Palace Chapel of St Laurence, which the infant Jesus accepts and blesses. This gesture is understood as an indication that Louis the Bavarian added the choir and renovated or completed the chapel’s interior.\(^{811}\) On 20\(^{th}\) February 1321, the German king established the position of a court chaplain, which was vested with rights comparable to those of the parishes of St Peter and St Mary (Church of Our Lady), to secure his dynasty’s salvation and in memory of his late brother Rudolf I as well as his ancestors. By 1324 at the latest, building work must have been completed, since the Chapel of St Laurence was the prestigious location where the imperial regalia and relics were kept and displayed.\(^{812}\)

The architectural disposition of St Laurence with its ashlar exterior and sculptural façade decoration eschewed local traditions and introduced the High Gothic style. (Plate 27) Louis the Bavarian was clearly aware of the latest architectural and artistic developments in South-western Germany and intended to realise them in Munich to create a prestigious, ‘modern’ residence.\(^{813}\) The single aisle nave was covered by cross vaults and a stellar vault at its eastern side where a triumphal arch visually separated it from the choir with its \(^{5/6}\)-polygonal layout. (Plate 28) In contrast to monastic architecture, the nave and sanctuary were designed to create a closer unity. This visual


\(^{807}\) Burmeister, Die baugeschichtliche Entwicklung des Alten Hofes in München. p. 26

\(^{808}\) Lieb, 'Münchens Kirchen'. p. 11; Burmeister, Die baugeschichtliche Entwicklung des Alten Hofes in München. p. 26

\(^{809}\) Burmeister, Die baugeschichtliche Entwicklung des Alten Hofes in München. p. 26 & 29

\(^{810}\) Lermer, 'Stifterrelief aus der Lorenzkapelle im Alten Hof zu München'. p. 57

\(^{811}\) Burmeister, Die baugeschichtliche Entwicklung des Alten Hofes in München. p. 32


\(^{813}\) Lieb, 'Münchens Kirchen'. p. 11-12
integration of nave and choir was emphasised when looking from the balcony at the nave’s western end, which was reserved for the emperor, members of the ducal family and high-rank courtiers.814

Two keystones, one showing an imperial eagle and the other the coat-of-arms of the Counts of Hainaut (Margaret of Holland was the daughter of Count William III of Hainaut and Holland), three standing figures and two reliefs survived the destruction of the chapel in 1816. (Plate 29, Plate 31 and Plate 32) The keystones and sculptures probably embellished the choir as depicted in Wilhelm Rehlen’s drawing that documents the interior of St Laurence before its demolition. (Plate 28) The three standing figures in the Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, which were dated by Norbert Lieb to about 1325/30, formed part of a sculptural cycle comprising five figures that were placed between the windows of the palace chapel’s choir.815 (Plate 32) They represent two kings and a saint with missing attributes, most probable St Joseph.816 The missing two figures very probably depicted the third king and the Virgin Mary with Christ Child. Thus the sculptural cycle in the Chapel of St Laurence’s choir represented the Holy Family and the Magi.817 The relief of Louis the Bavarian, Margaret of Holland and the Virgin with Christ Child was located on the southern wall of the nave.818 (Plate 30) The second relief was situated above the southern entrance portal of the chapel. (Plate 29) It shows two angels holding the coat-of-arms with the lions of the Palatinate of the Rhine and the white-and-blue lozenge pattern of Bavaria. The heraldic shield clearly attested to Louis the Bavarian’s patronage and marked the building as the possession of the Wittelsbach dynasty. These symbols become particularly meaningful in the context of the exhibition of the imperial regalia and relics in the palace chapel. Thus Emperor Louis glorified himself and at once visualised the symbolic proximity of throne and altar. In Wilhelm Störmer’s opinion, this notion is comparable to the intentions pursued by the French kings with the construction of the Sainte-Chapelle in Paris.819

Munich’s parish churches

Munich’s two parish churches were further sites of Louis the Bavarian’s patronage. He intended to furnish the parish of St Peter’s with quasi-Episcopal rights during his dispute with the Curia in Rome.820 He might have recognised the potential of the Church of Our Lady, which contrasted with the confined space and location of the Alte Hof’s palace chapel, as a central site for his dynasty’s commemoration and foundations since he transformed the choir of the Romanesque church into his dynasty’s sepulchre. This strategy conformed to the development of centralised dynastic foundations and

814 Ibid. p. 12
815 Burmeister, Die baugeschichtliche Entwicklung des Alten Hofes in München. p. 31
816 In contrast Robert Suckale identified the three sculptures from the Chapel of St Laurence in the Bayerisches Nationalmuseum as the Magi. Refer to Suckale, Die Hofkunst Kaiser Ludwigs des Bayern. p. 24-25
817 A subject matter that is also depicted in a mural on the southern façade of Blutenburg Palace’s chapel.
818 Burmeister, Die baugeschichtliche Entwicklung des Alten Hofes in München. p. 32
819 Störmer, ‘Die wittelsbachischen Landesteilungen im Spätmittelalter (1255-1505)’. p. 18
tombs in the thirteenth century. At once, it contrasted with the common tendency of the fourteenth century to establish dynastic tombs in rural monasteries and convents like the Cistercian abbey at Fürstenfeld, which had been founded by Louis II in expiation of the unwarranted execution of his wife Mary of Brabant whom he had accused of adultery, and where Louis II was buried. (Plate 1) According to Kilian Heck, it had only become more common to establish dynastic tombs in urban churches in close proximity to the urban princely palaces by the fifteenth century.

Robert Suckale believed that the Romanesque building of the Church of Our Lady was at least renovated during Louis the Bavarian’s reign. Nevertheless there are indications, suggesting that the Church of Our Lady’s choir might have been replaced with a new structure to provide an appropriate setting for the dynastic tomb. Norbert Lieb asserted that building work on the Church of Our Lady’s choir commenced in the first decade of the fourteenth century under Louis the Bavarian’s reign, because he had a representative tomb installed in the centre of the choir between 1303 and 1307. During this construction campaign the choir was extended eastward as well as into the nave from which it was partitioned off with a rood-screen-like latitudinal wall. The choir featured cross vaults with sculptural keystones and ribs, springing from semicircular responds. The ducal foundations that were established in the choir and its vicinity related to the dynastic sepulchre. Thereby the choir had been transformed into the House of Bavaria’s oratory and the parish church into its prestigious ‘court church’. The burial of Louis the Bavarian and his first wife Beatrix von Schlesien-Glogau in the choir set a precedent for Louis descendants. For example, Louis V of Bavaria, Stephen II of Bavaria, John II of Bavaria-Munich, Ernst of Bavaria-Munich, William III of Bavaria-Munich, Sigmund of Bavaria-Munich and Albrecht IV of Bavaria-Munich were buried there. This custom continued well into the sixteenth century.

The impact of the ducal court on Munich’s townscape and the differentiation of social spheres

Emperor Louis the Bavarian’s court provided impulses for Munich’s progression. It attracted aristocrats, a small group of intellectuals who were based at the Franciscans’ friary, foreign envoys and traders. The exhibition of the imperial regalia and relics in the Chapel of St Laurence created streams of pilgrims. This influx of visitors and relics in the Chapel of St Laurence created streams of pilgrims. This influx of visitors and the
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attention that Munich received as locus of the imperial regalia as well as ‘centre’ of the Holy Roman Empire must have promoted Louis’s decision to improve the townscape of Munich to create a suitable backdrop for his court’s festivities and ceremonies.831

Louis issued several building regulations during his reign to transform Munich into an impressive ducal residence. For example, the act of 4th May 1315 decreed that wooden market stalls and huts had to be removed from Munich’s central market square. It was declared as ‘gefreit’ or rather ‘Freiung’, meaning that neither the king, his descendants nor anybody else were allowed to erect any buildings or structures on the market square. According to the act’s wording, the square was intended to become beautiful, pleasant and adequate for masters, burghers, guests as well as everybody who had to do business or spend time there.832 Thus it provided an appropriate framework for the ceremonies and festivities like tournaments, which were frequently held there during Louis’s reign (i.e. 1338 and 1345). References to tournaments on the market square also occur repeatedly in the town council’s records, which attest to the success of Louis the Bavarian’s measures. For example, on 20th January 1454, aristocrats like Duke Henry XVI the Rich of Bavaria-Landshut and Count Palatine Otto I of Morsbach participated in a tourney there.833 Another tournament took place on 9th March 1476.834 Records of 18th February 1477, 835 2nd January 1485836 and 30th January 1485837 documented the preparations for the carnival tournaments.

The entries of 22nd April/31st May 1481, 29th January 1486 and 20th August 1486 in the ledgers of the treasury of Munich’s town council document that the Rechtshaus or rather Brothaus and the Gollikirche on the main market square were demolished.838 The Rechtshaus, which had been mentioned for the first time in 1293 and was located near the town hall, was a building with at least two floors.839 It contained prison cells and bakers sold bread on the ground floor. The notices from the town council or amendments to laws were posted there.840 The Gollikirche must have been a small
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835 ‘Zum stechen und rennen zum faschangk’. – Ibid. p. 461
837 Ibid. p. 386
838 Ibid. p. 364, 396 & 398
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chapel on the market square. Once these buildings had been removed, their sites were paved with cobblestones.841

These measures were intended to create the impressive rectangular open square that is depicted in Master MZ or rather Matthäus Zasinger's engraving of a tourney on the market square, dating from 1500 as inscribed on the right building of the central row of houses. (Plate 14) This continued maintenance of the townscape and its development ensured that Munich’s central square remained a suitable locus for the ceremonies, festivities and processions of the ducal court, the town council, guilds and the two parish churches which is exemplified by Zasinger’s print. His engraving shows horsemen jousting, talking and wrestling as well as mounted pipers and drummers on a square. Observers watch the tourney from the windows of the adjacent buildings. Duke Albrecht IV of Bavaria-Munich and his wife Kunigunde of Austria were depicted by Zasinger on the balcony in the centre of the engraving from which they overlooked the spectacle on Munich’s central market square. The persons watching the tourney from the windows of the house to the right of the balcony are most probable members of the court or patricians and members of the town council. The exalted position underlined the position of the beholders in the social hierarchy. Rather than mingling with the burghers and common people, the dukes of Bavaria-Munich, their courtiers, the aristocrats, noblemen and patricians watched these events from the windows and balconies of the buildings adjacent to the market square like the town hall.

In fact Zasinger’s engraving was certainly inspired by real events, because it was documented by the chronicler of Munich’s town council that members of the ducal court watched tournaments, other festivities and ceremonies from the windows of the town hall. For example, on 20th January 1454, Duchess Anna of Brunswick, the wife of Albrecht III of Bavaria-Munich, and her entourage observed a tournament from the drinking chamber of the councillors (Ratstrinkstube) on the corner of the market square and Dienerstrasse.842

The concept of expressing one’s social standing in the hierarchy of the late medieval and early modern society through one’s physical location was continued in the sixteenth-century architectural projects of the Bavarian ducal court. According to Hans Lange, the galleries and the piano nobile as articulated on the Italian wing’s façade of Duke Louis X’s urban palace in Landshut were intended to visualise the social distinction of the duke and the members of his court from the public outside the palace.843 The Isarturm allowed Louis X to watch the activity and business at the Ländtor as well as the barges and boats on the River Isar from an elevated position without the need of exposing himself to the everyday life. The exalted vantage point also symbolically represented his status. (Plate 135)

842 The presence of Duchess Anna of Brunswick and her entourage in the Ratstrinkstube was documented, because the town council had to pay for repairs of the stoves, which were apparently damaged during the rather lively feasting that accompanied the tournament. The entry of 24th February 1454 in the town council’s records as transcribed by Helmuth Stahleder states the civic treasury paid the stove-fitter Jakob 65 Pfennig for his work to repair the damaged stoves: Die Stadtammer zahlt dem Hafner Jakob 65 Pfennige ‘von öfen zu machen auf der trinckstuben, die dy hertzogin het zeprochen zu dem rennen. Suntag Mathie 1454’. – Ibid. p. 333
843 Lange, ‘Gasse, Gang und Galerie’ p. 158-160
The success of Louis the Bavarian’s measures is demonstrated by the record of 5th September 1479 in the files of Munich’s town council. According to this entry, the treasurers and civic master masons inspected the streets and squares, especially the market square, for proscribed superstructures that subsequently had to be dismantled or demolished. This shows that the town council was vigilant in enforcing Louis’ building regulations to maintain a prestigious townscape. Contemporaries like Hartmann Schedel and Andrea de Franceschi noted the results of these efforts.

Schedel wrote in the Liber Chronicarum that ‘Munich, the town of the upper German lands, situated along the River Isar, is very prominent among the princely residences in the German lands and the most well-known in Bavaria. Even though this town is regarded as a recent foundation, it surpasses other towns with its fine ordinary and exceptional buildings; because there are very beautiful dwellings, vast streets and delightfully decorated churches.’ Schedel’s description was echoed by Andrea de Franceschi who stated in his travel report that ‘Munich is a very distinguished town without a bishop […]. There are many trades and craftsmen of all kinds. The town features magnificent streets, all of them paved with cobblestones and wide with fountains in the middle.

The layout of Munich’s medieval town centre reflects a specific characteristic of Southern German medieval towns as was observed by Norbert Nussbaum: whereas churches flanked the market squares in northern and central German towns and thereby marked the centres of the towns, ‘in southern Germany […] a block of houses usually separates the church from the market square, creating a separate site for ecclesiastical activities. This constellation clearly indicates that the late medieval town understood its communal function as being both economic and spiritual.’ In Munich, the Church of Our Lady and the Church of St Peter are both separated from the central market square by their respective location and rows of houses. This medieval constellation of the town’s layout is documented in Jakob Sandtner’s wooden model of Munich (1570) and it is still discernible today. (Plate 12) Obviously this structuring of Munich’s townscape is not unique to the main residence of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich as it can be observed in other South German towns like Augsburg and Landshut. Nuremberg and Würzburg differ in this respect: the Church of Our Lady flanked the Hauptmarkt in Nuremberg and the Marienkapelle was built on Würzburg’s market square. However,
Munich’s layout reflects a conscious choice on behalf of the Bavarian dukes and possibly the town council that is not based on Munich’s topography but on a conceptual rationale. The dukes as well as the members of the town council understood the respective communal functions of the churches and the market square, because the spiritual sphere was topographically and visibly distinguished from the economic realm. This conceptual separation of the spiritual and the economic domains is emphasised by the fact that the churches in Munich were not used for council as well as guild meetings and as archive for official civic documents unlike in other places where ecclesiastical buildings served these purposes. The town hall of Munich with its meeting rooms, archive, dance hall and prison cells fulfilled these functions.

Programmatic ‘innovations’ in the patronage of Sigmund and Albrecht IV of Bavaria-Munich

Unlike Ernst and William III of Bavaria-Munich whose reign was beneficial for Munich’s development but who mostly resided in the castles outside Munich (i.e. Dachau, Starnberg and Grünwald), their successor Albrecht III concentrated his government in Munich. 848 Ernst, William III and Albrecht III did not very actively display their government with architectural and artistic commissions in Munich like their ancestor Louis the Bavarian. Albrecht III even intended to establish a new dynastic tomb at the monastery in Andechs where he was buried on 1st March 1460. 849 This situation changed considerably during the reign of Sigmund and Albrecht IV.

Innovations in architecture initially occurred in urban building projects like the Church of Our Lady and the Alte Hof. In particular Sigmund launched pioneering projects that incorporated novel concepts. In the 1460s, he initiated construction work at the Alte Hof to create a splendid court. Sigmund renovated and extended the southern wing (Burgstock). (Plate 22 and Plate 24) Its roof truss and gate tower were erected during his reign. He commissioned the genealogical murals in the western wing (Zwingerstock). An elegant Late Gothic oriel was attached to the courtyard-side of the southern wing. 850 The facades of the southern wing and the gate tower were embellished with heraldic schemes, and a lozenge pattern, alluding to the imperial colours as well as the lozenge pattern of the dukes of Bavaria’s coat-of-arms. These heraldic decorations of the Burgstock’s exterior are generally regarded as Sigmund’s commissions, because they relate to the heraldic embellishments of the exteriors of St Wolfgang in Pipping and the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace. 851

848 Störmer, 'Hof und Hofordnung in Bayern-München'. p. 364; Ziegler, 'Bayern'. p. 762
851 Burmeister, Die baugeschichtliche Entwicklung des Alten Hofes in München. p. 47-48 & 116-117
The Late Gothic oriel of the Alte Hof’s Burgstock

The Late Gothic oriel on the courtyard-side of the Alte Hof’s Burgstock with its heraldic decoration complemented the combined coat-of-arms of the Duchy of Bavaria and the Palatinate of the Rhine that had been installed above the portal of the Chapel of St Laurence by Louis the Bavarian almost one and a half centuries previously. (Plate 24) In addition to the white-and-blue lozenge pattern, the coats-of-arms on the oriel’s exterior made reference to the immediate ancestors and relatives of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich. Thereby it undeniably functioned as an obvious symbol for the dukes, who resided at the Alte Hof, and legitimated their government based on their ancestry and relations.

From this point of view, the Burgstock’s oriel served as a means to signal the ruler’s presence similar to the Goldenes Dachl in Innsbruck (1494-1496) that was commissioned by King Maximilian probably to commemorate his marriage with Bianca Maria Sforza.852 (Plate 139) This oriel was attached to the façade of the royal treasury, flanking the large town square and ideally situated along the busy trading route from Augsburg to Italy, where this means of propaganda received its greatest exposure. The magnificently decorated oriel also served as platform from which members of the royal court watched festivities, processions and tournaments.853 As such it provided a stage for the king, queen and their courtiers to present themselves to their people and attend events with them. The reliefs depict Maximilian, Bianca Maria Sforza, his chancellor, a court jester, Moorish dancers and coats-of-arms that represented the king and his government during his physical absence. Maximilian strived to define his territory and emblematically convey his authority to his subjects as well as travellers through his lands. Martin Warnke observed that with this project the king caught up with other princes in the German lands, because it had become an essential feature of princely self-promotion.854

Even though the Burgstock’s oriel faced the Alte Hof’s courtyard and thus was not situated in a public space as the Goldenes Dachl, which probably received more attention from the burghers of Innsbruck and travellers on the trading route, it was conceived with a similar purpose in mind. The Burgstock’s oriel with its armorial bearings certainly conveyed similar emblematic messages to its beholders as the Goldenes Dachl.

The conception of the Burgstock as an emblem of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich and their government appears to be supported by a legend, which became associated with the Burgstock’s oriel or rather ‘Monkey’s Oriel’ (Affenerker) as it is more commonly known. According to this myth, a monkey, kept at the court for entertainment and as a precious exotic object, seized the infant Louis the Bavarian from his cradle. The monkey climbed with the baby onto the oriel’s spire, which did not exist then. The courtiers who spotted the monkey with the baby were terrified, as they feared Louis would be accidentally injured or killed. To their delight the monkey quickly returned the future emperor to his cradle. Wolfgang Behringer believed that the legend might

852 Warnke, Geschichte der deutschen Kunst. Band 2, p. 20
853 Ibid. p. 21
854 Ibid. p. 22
have been inspired by a depiction of a monkey on the exterior of the Chapel of St Laurence.\textsuperscript{855} It was also suggested that a sculpture of a monkey surmounted the Chapel of St Laurence in remembrance of the legendary event.\textsuperscript{856} Monkeys existed at the ducal court during Louis’s lifetime, because the ducal administrator Johann von Kammerberg recorded expenses for the repairs of the windowpanes, which had been broken by the court monkeys in 1359 and 1364.\textsuperscript{857}

This legend might have emerged in the late fifteenth century, because Duke Sigmund is said to have been highly imaginative.\textsuperscript{858} He certainly created an impressive visual cult around his ancestry and celebrated in particular Louis the Bavarian. From this point of view, the conjecture that this legend could have originated in Duke Sigmund’s sphere might be plausible. It can be imagined that this story was intended to further the distinction of the ducal court in Munich and Sigmund’s commissions. The legend undeniably complemented the heraldic decoration of the Burgstock’s oriel, which inter alia referred to Louis the Bavarian and his politics as Holy Roman emperor that bestowed the Wittelsbachs with territorial gains.

The Church of Our Lady as locus of the Wittelsbach dynasty’s glorification

The erection of the new Late Gothic building of the Church of Our Lady was one of the most ambitious and important construction projects of Munich’sburghers and the dukes of Bavaria-Munich in their main residence in the late Middle Ages and early modern period. (Plate 60) The costs for the church’s construction were borne by the town council and the parish. Donations of burghers and pilgrims increased their financial means. The dukes of Bavaria-Munich were obviously interested in a swift completion of the construction project. Therefore Duke Albrecht IV supported it by obtaining the authorisation from Pope Sixtus IV for the sale of indulgences between 1480 and 1482, which generated funds for the vaulting of the church.\textsuperscript{859}

The construction of the Late Gothic Church of Our Lady provided the dukes of Bavaria-Munich with various opportunities to demonstrate their patronage either by commissioning works of art or by renewing the ecclesiastical foundations of their ancestors and establishing new ones. Duke Sigmund donated several works of art and ecclesiastical objects for this building like gilded altar furniture, vestments, relics and a missal.\textsuperscript{860} Duke Albrecht IV induced the construction of a gallery for the organ in 1490.
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It is very probable that the duke also gifted the organ (finished by 1491 according to the inscription) because the court paid for its maintenance.861

Further manifestations of the dukes’ presence

In addition to displaying the ducal court’s presence with the obvious (Alte Hof and Neuveste) and less evident (Church of Our Lady) monuments, the dukes gifted works of art to monasteries and convents in their main residence. For example, Albrecht IV and his wife Kunigunde of Austria commissioned Jan Polack to create the high altarpiece for St Antonius (c. 1491/92), the church of the Franciscans’ Friary in Munich, which was the ‘court friary’ (Hauskloster) of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich and as such situated between the Alte Hof and the Neuveste.862 (Plate 13 and Plate 16) The ducal donors are depicted on the outer panels that show scenes from Christ’s Passion (the Flagellation and the Road to Calvary) when the first pair of wings was opened. (Plate 132 and Plate 133) The new high altarpiece might have been commissioned to commemorate the bicentenary of the Church of St Antonius’s consecration. In 1284, Duke Rudolf, the older brother of Louis the Bavarian, had transferred the Franciscans’ Friary from the Anger into the immediate neighbourhood of the Alte Hof where it remained until the nineteenth century. A very generous donation from the patrician family Sendlinger allowed the construction of St Antonius, which was consecrated in 1294.863

In circa 1485/90 the Church of St Peter received a new high altarpiece that was produced by Jan Polack’s workshop. The process of its creation and its patrons are not documented.864 (Plate 134) Claus Grimm and Peter Steiner believed that this commission was prompted by Albrecht IV to celebrate his victory against the bishop of Freising in gaining the right of patronage and allocation of ecclesiastical sinecures at St Peter. According to records of Munich’s town council, which registered the expense for a present on 18th December 1485, Dr Johannes Neuhauser, the half-brother of Albrecht IV, had been installed as dean at the Church of St Peter.865 In Steiner’s opinion, not only the dean’s relationship to the ducal court but also the imposing new high altarpiece were intended to display the ducal patronage and the benefits that the church as well as parish would gain from it.

861 Karnehm, *Die Münchner Frauenkirche*. p. 24-25
863 For the date of the consecration of St Antonius refer to Störmer, 'Die oberbayerischen Residenzen'. p. 7
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Buildings and works of art as symbolic focal points

The interior of the Church of Our Lady and the Wittelsbachs’ dynastic tomb

The ducal patronage focused in particular on the choir of the Church of Our Lady. The ambulatory chapel with the Altar of St Anne is only one example. Already in 1437, Ernst and Albrecht III had founded a mass (Ewigmesse) for Elisabeth of Milan, Ernst’s wife and Albrecht III’s mother, at the Altar of St Anne in the Romanesque Church of Our Lady.\(^\text{866}\) After its transfer into the Late Gothic building Albrecht IV founded a mass there in 1473.\(^\text{867}\) His foundation was complemented by Sigmund’s benefice at the Altar of St Anne of 1481.\(^\text{868}\) In 1496, Albrecht IV established the Company of St George and affiliated it with the side chapel of St Anne.\(^\text{869}\) Sigmund and Albrecht IV also commissioned the Heilspiegelfenster (1480) and Herzogenfenster (1485) for the ambulatory chapels. (Plate 72) Hans Haldner produced the red marble Tumba of Louis the Bavarian that was placed into the choir’s centre between the Holy Cross Altar and the high altar. (Plate 70) This project coincided with the interdiction of other sepulchres in the Church of Our Lady by Pope Sixtus IV in March 1480 as requested by Albrecht IV.\(^\text{870}\) Even though the records state that excavations for the erection of tombs and the burying of corpses inside the Church of Our Lady threatened the stability of the building, it appears that the ducal request for this papal order was prompted by the intention to establish a focal point with Louis the Bavarian’s cenotaph inside the church.

The Church of Our Lady’s layout emphasised this impression because it was conceived as a Wegkirche, enabling worshippers to embark on an imaginary pilgrimage along the nave’s main aisle. The massive, unadorned piers guided ‘pilgrims’ along an imaginary Via Dolorosa from the west to the east towards the Altar of the Holy Cross. (Plate 68 and Plate 69) The piers not only focussed the worshippers’ gazes onto the Altar of the Holy Cross, they also concentrated the beholders’ attention on the choir with the sepulchre of the Wittelsbach dynasty. (Plate 70)

This notion is accentuated by Albrecht IV’s Salve Regina foundation of 1490. A chandelier with armorial bearings and imperial crown above Louis the Bavarian’s Tumba was lit during this ecclesiastical ceremony. (Plate 70) The chandelier and the flag with the combined armorial bearings of Bavaria and the Palatinate of the Rhine, which was attached to one of the choir’s southern piers, were visible from distant viewpoints, especially when approaching the choir along the nave’s main aisle, allowing worshippers to set out on a ‘pilgrimage’ to the Holy Cross Altar as well as the Wittelsbachs’ sepulchre. These heraldic and semi-heraldic symbols that were associated with the emperor and the dukes of Bavaria-Munich functioned as markers of their sphere of authority as observed by Birgit Franke and Barbara Wenzel with regard to the
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manuscript of Rudolf von Ems’s *Alexander* that contains a dedication illumination, showing the handing over of the manuscript’s presentation copy to Charles the Bold,\(^\text{871}\) or by Susie Nash regarding the heraldic display in Rogier van der Weyden’s *Philip the Good receiving Jean Wauquelin’s translation of the ‘Chroniques de Hainaut’* (1448), the *Chroniques de Hainaut*’s frontispiece, for the assertion of territorial rights.\(^\text{872}\)

The success of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich’s commissions and foundations is reflected in Hartmann Schedel’s description of Munich in the *Liber Chronicarum* (1493). Schedel almost promoted Louis the Bavarian’s Tumba in the Church of Our Lady’s choir as a destination for visitors and pilgrims by noting that ‘Emperor Louis [the Bavarian] is buried in front of the high altar in the parish Church of Our Lady. There, one can see his imperial throne and his regalia.’\(^\text{873}\)

The interpretation of the architectural disposition of the Church of Our Lady as guiding the beholders’ sight and the chandelier as well as the heraldic flag as focal points is substantiated by works of art like Jan Polack’s three altarpieces for the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace, which were conceived to have a visual impact especially on distant beholders like Duke Sigmund who sat on the balcony in the western end of the chapel. (Plate 103 and Plate 104) Achim Hubel observed that the two side altarpieces together with the high altarpiece form a wall of images (Bildwand) when the high altarpiece’s wings are opened.\(^\text{874}\) The altarpieces and the chapel’s interior are organised according to subject matters. The northern half is devoted to Jesus Christ and the southern half is dedicated to the Virgin Mary. The enthroned God the Father holding his dead son (Gnadenstuhl) denoted subject of the two spheres’ centre. The altarpieces’ colour schemes emphasise this spatial organisation. For this reason, Jan Polack or rather his patron Duke Sigmund chose a painting for the high altarpiece’s central panel instead of a shrine with sculptures.\(^\text{875}\) Instead of creating the illusion of a three-dimensional space within which the figures are situated, Polack employed a more ‘traditional’ approach to create a flatter space. The impression of a surface created by the figures and objects, which are depicted in a convincing volumetric manner, is emphasised by the gilded background. The panel’s composition together with the gilded background create a glowing surface. It was intended to be seen as a whole and conveyed an other-worldly, divine impression,\(^\text{876}\) because the figures are depicted in a manner that allows beholders to grasp them either as part of the complete wall of images or as individual details rather than distinct figures when seen from a closer proximity.\(^\text{877}\)

\(^\text{872}\) Nash, *Northern Renaissance Art*. p. 80-81
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\(^\text{877}\) Hubel, ‘Schloßkapelle von Blutenburg’. p. 83
Church towers as characteristic, recognizable landmarks

The descriptive woodcut of Munich in Hartmann Schedel’s *Liber Chronicarum* of 1493—the first known depiction of Munich’s skyline—shows the townscape of Munich as seen from the Gasteig, an elevated area east of the town. (Plate 7) At the end of the fifteenth century, travellers and merchants approaching Munich from the east along the salt trading route had a similar view. They saw the large roof and tall, monumental twin towers of the Church of Our Lady in the centre of the town. The unfinished towers, still lacking their bulbous domes, are rising out of the dense texture of buildings, towers, roofs and gables. The Church of Our Lady is flanked by the towers of St Peter’s with its two pyramidal spires, the Heiliggeistspitalkirche, the town hall and the gate tower of the Alte Hof’s Burgstock. Two walls that together with the seven gates and 118 towers formed a mighty fortification encircle Munich.878 The Isartor, the eastern entrance to the town, is shown in the middle of the townscape with the bridge across the River Isar. The trading route that crossed the river was the town’s lifeline. The salt, which had to be moved through Munich according to a golden bull issued by Louis the Bavarian in 1332,879 guaranteed the prosperity of its burghers and the dukes of Bavaria-Munich. Approximately four decades later, Hans Sebald Beham created another townscape of Munich (1530, printed by Niklas Meldemann) that underlines the accuracy of the illustration in the *Liber Chronicarum* and shows the Church of Our Lady with its bulbous domes that were placed onto the towers in 1525. (Plate 10 and Plate 11)

The two townscapes of Munich clearly indicate the ‘demand’ for conspicuous landmarks. The skylines of the other twenty-eight towns, which are depicted in Schedel’s chronicle, also feature characteristic buildings like castles and churches, enabling readers to identify the places. Even in instances like the skylines of Augsburg, Cologne, Constance, Erfurt, Lübeck, Magdeburg and Regensburg that appear generic in their treatment these landmarks ease the towns’ recognition. In other instances like Strasbourg and Vienna the characteristic towers of the cathedrals provide landmarks that are easily recognisable and enable readers to identify these towns without reference to the accompanying descriptions. The castles of Nuremberg (the seat of the Hohenzollern burgraves) and Würzburg (the residence of the prince-bishop who was then believed to be the ‘Duke of Franconia’)880 are the distinguishing attributes of these townscapes.

Some of the townscapes (i.e. the view of Munich or Strasbourg) work particularly well on the ground of their distinctive church towers. Others like the skyline of Regensburg, which shows the unfinished west end with its two tower stumps, cannot be as readily identified as they lack conspicuous landmarks like singular towers, spires or castles. This observation is supported by the layout of some of the woodcuts that emphasises the function of buildings and especially towers as landmarks or rather trademarks of the towns as well as their patrons. For instance, the tower of Strasbourg Cathedral penetrates the space of the accompanying text. This transgression of invisible

878 Bös, *Gotik in Oberbayern*. p. 27
879 All salt transports between Landshut and the Alps had to cross the River Isar in Munich, where the salt had to be put in temporary storage. Refer to Ibid. p. 28-29.
boundaries between the space of the illustration and the text draws attention onto the
tower itself, which was regarded as one of the wonders of the world in the sixteenth
century. In fact, the conception of towers as prestigious, trademark-like landmarks is
even reflected in their architectural disposition. For example, the tower of Ulm Minster
appears as if it was conceived as an independent entity, because the architectural
disposition of the tower’s exterior does not merge into a uniform appearance with the
nave’s exterior.

The erection of increasingly elaborate church towers with characteristic terminations
became one of the priorities of the ecclesiastical architectural patronage of urban
communities in the late Middle Ages. The tower and spire of the Münster in Freiburg
im Breisgau set a precedent, which other patrons aspired to duplicate. The high-rising,
richly decorated towers of Ulm Minster and St Martin in Landshut demonstrate the
patrons’ inclination to devote an enormous amount of labour and money to the
realisation of such challenging projects, which competed with other construction
campaigns throughout the Holy Roman Empire. This ‘nationwide’, even pan-European
competition is reflected in Veit Arnpeck’s contemporary description of the Church of St
Martin in Landshut that praised the height of the then still unfinished tower, for
Arnpeck stated that it will eclipse the height of all other towers in the German lands
upon its completion. Andrea de Franceschi’s account of the Church of Our Lady
echoes Arnpeck’s observation. The Venetian diplomat praised the lightness of the
church’s interior, its dimensions (170 by 54 Venetian feet) and the great height of its
two towers above everything else. (Plate 66)

The towers of Munich’s churches as carriers of secular, civic and religious meaning

Aside from the practical aspects of housing bells and providing a platform for the
towns’ watchmen, Robert Bork and Martin Warnke identified the concept of visibility
as the primary purpose for patrons to bear the burden of the huge expense of building
the great Gothic church towers and their heavenwards-striving spires. These towers
with their often singular terminations functioned as carriers of secular and civic
meaning, religious symbolism as well as conveyors of a sense of community or rather as
objects of communal identification.

Bork highlighted that the religious meaning of spires as shrine markers was strongly
influenced by the competition of masons with sculptors, joiners, goldsmiths and other
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Munich, civic guards observed the town and surrounding countryside from the rooms in twin towers’
tambour storeys to report fires and approaching enemy troops. According to entries in Munich’s town
chronicle on 12th May 1492 and between 13th May and 24th June 1492, guns were also installed there. Refer to Stahleder,
creators of micro-architectural designs like the canopies of reliquaries in the Late Gothic period. Thus, the medieval public, which was well versed in decoding religious symbolism, interpreted towers and their spires as markers of shrines even without an awareness of their iconography’s ancient history.886

The symbolic function of spires or other forms of tower terminations as markers of shrines is underlined by the findings in the previous chapter on the historicism of the architecture of the Church of Our Lady. It was suggested that the bulbous domes are evocations or rather references to the architecture of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. Hence the bulbous domes were appropriately adopted for the Church of Our Lady in Munich for both churches function as tombs.

Contemporary readers of Schedel’s Liber Chronicarum would have been aware of the connotations that emanate from a twin towered west front like that of the Church of Our Lady. (Plate 7) In addition to the religious and historicist symbolism, a west end with two towers was a bold statement. The cost of its erection could match or exceed the construction expenses of the rest of the church building. Especially in instances like Landshut, Ulm and Vienna where the buildings’ architecture was plainer and simpler the expenditure for erecting a tall tower with a spire could swiftly eclipse the construction costs of a Late Gothic nave and choir. Only the most affluent, aspiring patrons and groups of donors respectively could afford ambitious projects that incorporated a west end with two towers. Hence twin towered facades were only planned for the eminent religious urban establishments or those ecclesiastical structures which were intended to be perceived as such by their audiences in urban communities and beyond.887 In some instances, these taxing projects exhausted the resources of their patrons or were abandoned as a result of changes in the patrons’ agenda. For example, only one of the two towers of Strasbourg Cathedral was completed in the fifteenth century. The towers of the churches and cathedrals in Cologne, Regensburg and Ulm were not finished until the nineteenth century when a nationalist enthusiasm for the Gothic emerged, which was then identified as the indigenous German architectural style.888

In comparison with the single tower of St Peter or any of the other churches depicted in the townscape of Munich, created by Michael Wolgemut and Hans Sebald Beham, (Plate 7 and Plate 11) the decision of master mason Jörg von Halspach and his patrons to build a twin towered west end, which is a diversion from the contemporarily popular west fronts with single towers and elaborate tracery spires as built, for example, in Freiburg im Breisgau, Landshut and Ulm, becomes even more pronounced. By erecting two towers instead of a single tower, which was a common design at this time, Jörg von Halspach employed a conservative motif that was the standard in High Gothic designs like Regensburg Cathedral or even Romanesque cathedrals like Bamberg where two towers flank both the east and west end.

886 Bork, Great Spires. p. 20-21
887 Ibid. p. 2 & 10
Medieval and early modern beholders were aware that these towers, which dominated the townscapes, conspicuously promoted their patrons who had commissioned their erection. Thus towers functioned as signs of worldly authority. The patrons’ power and their ability to win over supporters for these ambitious, expensive undertakings are reflected in the projects’ successful completion. Projects, reflecting only the interests of a small group of clergymen or aristocrats, were often abandoned before completion as result of the lacking popular support. Whereas construction campaigns of a more communal character were more often finished owing to a continuous flow of financial means through donations. 889

The towers of Ulm Minster and St Bartholomew in Frankfurt am Main highlight that urban communities were not always able to realise their ambitious plans. The tower of Ulm Minster was conceived by Ulrich von Ensingen and built from 1392 but construction work ceased at the end of the fifteenth century when the western tower had just reached the level of the gallery below the storey where the bells would have hung. The tower and spire of Ulm Minster were finished from 1885 until 1890. Similarly, the erection of the tower of St Bartholomew in Frankfurt am Main, which had been designed by Madern Gerthener, occurred in stages between 1415 and 1513. The tower’s domed termination received its lantern according to Gerthener’s plans only between 1869 and 1880. In contrast, the towers of the Church of Our Lady and that of St Martin in Landshut were finished in the Late Gothic period. 890 Especially the swift completion of the Late Gothic building of the Church of Our Lady in Munich was a triumph for its patrons. It demonstrates the power of the alliance of the dukes, town council, patricians and guilds under the leadership of the aspiring, assertive dukes of Bavaria-Munich. The dukes could exploit the legacy of their ancestor Louis the Bavarian who was held in high esteem by Munich’s burghers to garner their subjects’ support. Certainly the notion to create an appropriate burial place for the emperor generated civic support for this building project.

In Martin Warnke’s view, the success and ‘failure’ respectively of the four tower projects in Landshut, Munich, Frankfurt and Ulm is an indication for the changing political tide at the time. The power had shifted from civic governments, comprising an alliance of patricians, craftsmen and merchants, to the princely courts. The successful realisation of the projects in Landshut and Munich reflects the establishment of the princely territorial sovereignty (fürstliche Territorialherrschaft), which became the dominant form of government in the early modern era. 891

The Late Gothic building of the Church of Our Lady in Munich with its twin towers exemplifies that the burghers could identify with the scheme, it provided them with pride and it served the development of a communal identity. This notion is illustrated by their distinct appearances, which were captured in the townscapes of the Liber Chronicarum or Hans Sebald Beham’s view of Munich’s skyline. The significance of the church building and its two towers for the communal identity of Munich’s burghers is further emphasised by an entry in the parish register where the Church of Our Lady is

889 Bork, Great Spires. p. 5
891 Ibid. p. 43
compared to a hen that spreads its wings over its chicks and thus acts as their protector.  

Robert Bork’s argument about the attention, labour and money, which were invested into the design and realisation of great towers as well as spires, in addition to the information, conveyed by the townscapes by Michael Wolgemut and Hans Sebald Beham, highlights that the emblematic qualities of towers were appreciated and recognised by contemporaries. It is not the interpretation of twenty-first century beholders that project these attributes on them.

The grand Late Gothic building of the Church of Our Lady with its two tall towers dominated the town’s skyline in the late Middle Ages and the early modern era. The prints and Jakob Sandtner’s sixteenth-century model of Munich show that the Church of Our Lady dwarfed the low-rise buildings that surrounded it in fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. (Plate 57) It provided a conspicuous focal point for the urban environment and the surrounding countryside. Even today, one cannot fail to notice the twin towers, as they still stand out from the twenty-first century skyline with its high-rise architecture. For example, beholders can glimpse the towers of the Church of Our Lady with their height of almost one hundred metres from various vantage points throughout Munich’s city centre.

The towers remained symbolic landmarks with which the Wittelsbachs and Munich’s burgilers continued to identify as attested by a sixteenth-century depiction of Munich in the Münchner Stadtmuseum (Plate 8), the portrait (c. 1672) of the young, horse-mounted Maximilian II Emanuel (1662-1726) in Schleißheim Palace (Neues Schloss Schleißheim) with the twin-towered Church of Our Lady in the distant background (Plate 87), and Antonio Zanchi’s draft design (1673) of the painting for the high altar of the Church of St Kajetan, which commemorates its foundation by Elector Ferdinand Maria of Bavaria (1636-1679) and his wife Henriette Adelaide of Savoy (1636-1676). (Plate 85)

The townscape in the Stadtmuseum of Munich appears almost distorted in order to emphasise the Church of Our Lady’s prominence in Munich’s skyline. (Plate 8) According to Dr Thomas Weidner of the Münchner Stadtmuseum, this watercolour is a copy of a painting that was part of a cycle of St Benno’s life in the Chapel of St Benno in the Church of Our Lady. The location and context of the original painting, reproduced in this watercolour depiction, certainly explain the prominence that was awarded to the Church of Our Lady in this townscape. Nevertheless, it is another example for those depictions of Munich within which the Late Gothic building of the

892 Ibid. p. 37-38
893 According to Hans Nöhbauer this townscape of Munich dates from the sixteenth century. Refer to Nöhbauer, München. p. 20. However the information, provided by Dr Thomas Weidner of the Münchner Stadtmuseum, it is a watercolour copy of a painting (Inv. Nr. Z(B1)84 of the Münchner Stadtmuseum, 17 by 27 cm, signed “H.S.”) that formed part of a cycle of St Benno’s life in the Chapel of St Benno in the Church of Our Lady. Today it is not located there anymore, but it was mentioned in Anton Mayer’s guidebook of the Church of Our Lady (Anton Mayer, Der Begleiter durch und um Unser Lieben Frauen Dom- und Pfarrkirche zu München, 1875, p. 101). Mayer described a depiction of Munich, dating from the late seventeenth century.
Church of Our Lady received a central position and thus highlights its emblematic, trademark-like qualities.

Zanchi’s painting shows Ferdinand Maria and Henriette Adelaide in the centre of the composition. (Plate 85) Their children surround them. In the foreground two servants carry a model of the Church of St Kajetan, which Ferdinand Maria and Henriette Adelaide commissioned to fulfil a vow related to the long-awaited birth of their heir Maximilian II Emanuel (more commonly known as Max Emanuel). The twin towers of the Church of Our Lady with their distinctive bulbous domes rise in the background above the crowd of bystanders on the left side of the painting. In this instance, they not only function as a symbol for the Wittelsbach dynasty’s eminence and renowned genealogy but they act as a trademark of their main residence. The twin towers create a visual link between the first dynastic tomb in Munich,\(^894\) where most members of the ducal family were buried in the fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and the Church of St Kajetan that became to house the Prince’s Tomb where Ferdinand Maria, Henriette Adelaide, Max Emanuel and other members of the Wittelsbach dynasty chose to be buried from the seventeenth century.

**The Church of Our Lady as ‘Großform’: addressing an exterior audience**

The exterior of an ecclesiastical building like the Church of Our Lady in Munich was obviously meant to address an audience in the urban community and beyond it. These considerations certainly influenced the design of the Church of Our Lady with its austere exterior and twin towered west front. The Late Gothic building is an enormous hall church, rising from the surrounding houses, the vast roof well above the gables of all other buildings in Munich. Its architecture was clearly intended to make a spectacular impression when seen from far afield.\(^895\) The characteristic twin towers and the large roof were planned as a spectacular sight for travellers approaching Munich from any direction, even for those coming from the elevated area to the east of the River Isar, the so-called Gasteig that acted as the vantage point for the townscapes of Michael Wolgemut and Hans Sebald Beham. (Plate 7, Plate 10 and Plate 11)

In comparison with the facades of Regensburg Cathedral, the Münster in Freiburg im Breisgau, Strasbourg Cathedral or Cologne Cathedral, the overall architectural vocabulary of the exterior of the Church of Our Lady is restrained. Even the brick facades of St Martin in Landshut, the Church of Our Lady in Ingolstadt and the Church of St Jacob in Straubing appear more elaborately decorated than those of the Church of Our Lady. Although the towers’ walls with their lesenes and mouldings seem more ornate than the nave’s exterior, they are far plainer than the facades of St Martin, St Jacob and the Church of Our Lady in Ingolstadt where architectural decorations like lesenes, mouldings and buttresses are more pronounced. In comparison with St Martin, St Jacob and the Church of Our Lady in Ingolstadt, the decorative elements fade into the

\(^894\) The Jesuit Church of St Michael (laying of the foundation stone in 1583; consecration on 6th July 1597) also acted as tomb for members of the Wittelsbach dynasty. For example Duke William V of Bavaria, who initiated and funded the construction, was buried there.

\(^895\) Lieb, ‘Münchens Kirchen’. p. 18
monumental overall appearance of the Church of Our Lady in Munich. The building’s exterior conveys an impression of a uniform and integrated whole, which was achieved by understating the guise of all individual parts.

The patrons of the Church of Our Lady and master mason Jörg von Halspach chose to emphasise the monumental form of the building rather than to create an intricately detailed sculptural exterior. Thus the building’s architectural disposition is overwhelming and awe-inspiring when seen from a closer proximity. For distant beholders it provides a conspicuous, grand form whether they look at it from the north or south, the west or east. This is not to say that ecclesiastical structures with a richly decorated exterior like Cologne Cathedral did not make a visual impact on faraway viewers. The silhouette of Cologne Cathedral still to this day provides a characteristic focal point in the city’s skyline. However, the patrons and master mason Jörg von Halspach must have understood that they could achieve their two objectives by reducing the adornment of the facades of the Church of Our Lady. Their decision decreased the construction costs and accelerated the advancement of building work while still maintaining a silhouette that overtly addressed nearby and faraway beholders. The latter notion was not only applied to the design of the Late Gothic building of the Church of Our Lady. It is also found in other contemporary artistic and architectural commissions in Munich.

The concept of communicating information to distant viewers is closely associated with a characteristic of the palace architecture of the late Middle Ages and the early modern era that was discussed in recent publications on this topic. Cord Meckseper suggested that princely state palaces (landesherrliche Residenzen) were designed in order to make a formal, visual impact on their beholders. Their exteriors were meant to address a public audience. In this respect they did not differ from contemporary developments in other architectural fields.896 Meckseper’s remark is supported by Stephan Hoppe who observed that from the second half of the fifteenth century princes perceived the need to distinguish their residences from the mass of castles, which were associated with the nobility in general, in order to express their altered conception of the princely rule and to visualise the recently evolved state government, centred at the princely courts.897 The Italian Renaissance symbolism was not yet available north of the Alps or could not be employed, as the majority of beholders who were addressed by these architectural projects were not yet versed in decoding the Italian Renaissance semiotics. Hence distinct Northern architectural innovations like lucarnes emerged in the architectural projects of the Electors of Saxony around 1470, which were adopted by other aristocratic patrons.

G. Ulrich Großmann initially discerned the so-called ‘Großform’ in fifteenth-century palace architecture.898 The term ‘Großform’ describes those architectural elements and parts of the buildings that address a public audience and convey their symbolic

897 Hoppe, ‘Wie wird die Burg zum Schloss?’. p. 97-98
messages across a great distance with their massive, simplified silhouettes, which can be easily recognised from far afield. This term was initially applied to innovations in late medieval and early modern architecture like lucarnes that are inter alia regarded as indications for the conceptual transition from ‘castle’ to ‘palace’. This process began to occur in the German lands in the second half of the fifteenth century.

According to Großmann, for example, lucarnes qualify as ‘Großform’ because they are not only decorative elements but also communicate information. Contemporary beholders were aware of their symbolism, which stemmed from their origins. In the late fourteenth century, battlements emerged as symbols for the claim of authority of the castles’ inhabitants. From the mid-fifteenth century, the form of battlements was increasingly abstracted as they developed into lucarnes. The battlements’ transformation into lucarnes and their origins are illustrated by a depiction of the Marienburg in Würzburg in a painting of the martyrdom of St Kilian (c. 1490). The stringent sequence of lucarnes echoes the form of the battlements on the enclosure’s walls of Würzburg Castle. Therefore, lucarnes became the civilian equivalent of the traditional symbol of sovereignty that had its origins in military and defence architecture. Even though this transformation eventually obscured their original practical function, their symbolic connotations—a token of authority and supremacy—was not lost.

The prominent display of conspicuous, distinctive symbolic motifs was promoted by the political topography of the Holy Roman Empire in the fifteenth century. In the thirteenth century, the Holy Roman Empire unlike other regions of Western Europe lacked a single power in the form of a central government or princely court that fostered the development of an early modern state. In the late Middle Ages the Empire’s political topography was characterised by fragmentation that encouraged competition between the numerous small principalities, imperial free towns and other territories. This condition mostly described the political topography until 1806.

Kilian Heck suggested that this complex abundance of states, territories and powers of differing sizes as well as political character was the reason for rulers and governing bodies to perceive the need to distinguish themselves and their territories from one another with apparent means and strategies. This notion gained even greater importance when these political bodies and their territories were entwined in matrimonial alliances, dynastic relationships, knighthoods or leagues of towns and counties. In this context, the meaning of coats-of-arms changed. Whereas a coat-of-arms initially represented a collective of relatives who were related by cognatic bonds, it developed into a token of the agnatic structured dynasty. This shift in the meaning of coats-of-arms was the prerequisite for their transformation from symbols that

899 For a plate of Würzburg Castle as depicted in the martyrdom of St Kilian (Martin-von-Wagner-Museum, Würzburg) refer to Hoppe, 'Wie wird die Burg zum Schloss?'. p. 105.
901 Heck, Genealogie als Argument. p. 81
represented a dynasty and their members into emblems of a space, a specific area, a state or a territory, which occurred from the middle of the thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{902}

The architectural disposition of the Church of Our Lady obviously cannot be compared with lucarnes and other architectural elements or building parts of late medieval and early modern palaces that qualify as ‘Großformen’ and conveyed distinct symbolic connotations, associated with the secular architecture of princely courts. Yet the underlying notion of this architectural feature is analogous to the overall impression of the exterior of the Church of Our Lady. (Plate 58, Plate 59 and Plate 60) Lucarnes are much larger in comparison with the size of battlements and they were placed at the roof level of palaces—the most prominent location—so that they could be unmistakably recognised by faraway viewers. Similarly, master mason Jörg von Halspach and his patrons chose a simplified architectural vocabulary to create a monumental silhouette for the Late Gothic building of the Church of Our Lady. Instead of an intricately detailed sculptural exterior, which can only be appreciated from a closer proximity, the austere, restrained decoration of the facades, the large roof and tall twin towers of the Church of Our Lady make an impact on distant beholders who discern a massive brick building that emerges from the dense texture of houses.

The concept of the ‘Großform’ as manifested in other architectural projects in Munich

The intention of the Church of Our Lady’s patrons to create a ‘Großform’, which also addresses an audience outside the confines of the town walls, is supported by other projects that were commissioned in Munich in the fifteenth century. For example, the civic treasury paid a painter named Ott eight pounds and sixty Pfennig on 28\textsuperscript{th} October 1419 for his work and it registered a payment of nine shillings and twelve Pfennig for the paint, required by master Ott for decorating the town wall, enclosure and twenty-four towers with a black and red-brown lozenge pattern that alluded to the imperial black and gold colours of the civic coat-of-arms.\textsuperscript{903} In 1324, Louis the Bavarian had granted the citizens and town council of Munich the use of the imperial colours as part of the civic coat-of-arms.\textsuperscript{904} The civic government perceived the need for commissioning a trademark-like decoration of the town’s fortification, which was one of the first architectural features that beholders saw when approaching Munich. The town walls’ lozenge pattern pre-empted the light yellow and dark grey lozenge pattern of the facades of the Alte Hof’s Burgstock, which were decorated with this heraldic motif in the second half of the fifteenth century, and the white-and-blue lozenge pattern on some of the surfaces of the oriel’s exterior. (Plate 19 and Plate 24)

\textsuperscript{902} Ibid. p. 81-82
\textsuperscript{904} Bös, \textit{Gotik in Oberbayern}. p. 28; Nöhbauer, \textit{München}. p. 13
The white-and-blue lozenge pattern, which originally had been the coat-of-arms of the Counts of Bogen and passed on to the Wittelsbach dynasty together with the extinct counts’ estates in 1242, is found as a trademark decoration on the two poles of God’s throne on the winged high altarpiece’s central panel in the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace. It is complemented by the pattern of the chapel’s vaults that also alludes to the Bavarian dukes’ coat-of-arms. (Plate 106) There is a sixteenth-century stucco version of this lozenge pattern on the ceiling of the Landshuter Stadtresidenz’s northern staircase or in the apse’s calotte on the loggia’s northern side, which is comparable to the lozenge pattern created by the vault’s ribs in the nave of the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace. The colours of the Bavarian dukes’ coat-of-arms continued to be used in a hallmark-like manner by future generations as attested by the tapestries that accompanied the heraldic decorations of the south-western wing’s ballroom in Dachau Palace and were commissioned by Duke Albrecht V of Bavaria (1528-1579) in the 1560s. Their design was dominated by white and blue.

These heraldic colours of the Duchy of Bavaria inspired the roof decoration of the town hall’s tower, which had to be repaired after being struck by lightning in 1460. When reconstruction work was finished in 1462, the town council of Munich bought 14,900 glazed roofing tiles: 10,000 white and blue tiles as well as 4,900 red, green and yellow tiles. However, only the white and blue tiles were used for covering the tower’s truss. With its white and blue tiles the tower became another symbolic landmark of Munich. The characteristic and well-known heraldic colours of the Duchy of Bavaria were appropriately chosen for the town hall of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich’s main seat where the Erbhuldigungen (the homage by the Estates) and Landtage (the conventions of diets) were held until the mid-sixteenth century.

The civic officials’ vestments further illustrate the trademark-like quality of these colours, which promoted a communal identity and conveyed information to holders. In 1452 and 1457, the town council’s treasurer noted the purchase of white and blue cloths. According to Roswitha von Bary, white-blue and green-white predominated as colour combinations of the civic officials’ vestments. In addition, she stated the civic pipers wore a silver breastplate with the white-and-blue lozenge pattern of the Duchy of Bavaria’s coat-of-arms instead of a more civic oriented heraldic motif like the black-and-gold or rather red-and-brown lozenge pattern of the town walls. This shift in the colour scheme of civic commissions and vestments from the middle of the fifteenth...
century could be related to an increase of the Dukes of Bavaria-Munich’s authority over their main residence. More probable it is the result of the identification of Munich’s burghers and civic government with the Duchy of Bavaria. Instead of displaying the imperial colours, the burghers and civic government apparently preferred to identify with the Duchy of Bavaria and therefore indirectly with the Wittelsbach dynasty. This shift most probably occurred because Munich had become the main residence of the Duchy of Bavaria-Munich. The characteristic lozenge pattern allowed the differentiation of Munich from other towns and territories in the Holy Roman Empire. The imperial coat-of-arms, which was also employed by imperial free towns, did not provide such a unique identity.

The simplification of the coat-of-arms into a lozenge pattern with trademark-like qualities—the encapsulation of concepts into potent symbols—is as innovative as the decision of master mason Jörg von Halspach and the patrons of the Church of Our Lady to create a Late Gothic building with an austere exterior whose sculptural and ornamental decoration was subordinated to the uniform, grand and monumental appearance of the whole structure. Through this process of simplification they were transformed into powerful emblems that should be regarded as Großform and conveyed their symbolic connotations even more cogently. The lozenge pattern is easily discerned and has a great visual impact on distant beholders. In contrast, the series of coats-of-arms on the facades of the Alte Hof’s Burgstock, St Wolfgang in Pipping and the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace function in a similar manner to trademarks in conveying information, but these heraldic schemes are visually too complex to have the powerful impact of symbols like the lozenge pattern or the silhouette of a building.

The relationship of interior and exterior spaces: the poly-focal panoramic prospects

In the late Middle Ages and the early modern era prestigious buildings like the Alte Hof were not only related to their environment with the hallmark-like decoration of their facades or the Burgstock’s oriel that manifested the duke’s presence to an outside audience and thus demarcated it as his main residence. The interior spaces were connected with the exterior through innovative features like bay windows and oriels, providing the aristocrats with elevated vantage points, reflecting their social rank and awarding them with poly-focal or rather three-sided panoramic views of courtyards, gardens and the surrounding countryside. This interest in the natural world is echoed by the subject matter of contemporary paintings and prints. For instance, painters had replaced the gilded surfaces with countryside and landscape scenes as backdrops. People as well as animals and plants were depicted naturalistically. The late medieval and early modern audiences of these works of art must have delighted in the naturalism of these depictions. These novel architectural elements together with contemporary artistic developments demonstrate that exteriors had become subjects, which were
worthy of being observed from these outlooks. This phenomenon might be described as the aestheticisation of nature.

The genesis and symbolism of poly-focal panoramic outlooks from interiors across courtyards, gardens, towns and countryside

As maintained by orthodox observers, the emergence of the palace as a modern phenomenon is associated with the adoption of the Italian Renaissance and entirely broke with its roots in medieval castle design in the mid-sixteenth century. According to Stephan Hoppe’s article ‘Wie wird die Burg zum Schloss? Architektonische Innovationen um 1470’, this stance overlooks the intensive efforts for visualising the recently evolved state government, centred at the princely courts, with new architectural means.  

Although the early modern palace construction projects referred to medieval traditions of stately architecture, they at once deviated from their models by introducing innovations. Hoppe observed that the new types of princely residences in the Holy Roman Empire began to markedly contrast with the architecture of castles that were associated with the nobility in general. They demonstrate a conscious dismissal of the semiotics of medieval castles by transforming the features of castles, which served military, defensive purposes, into architectural elements with an entirely symbolic function. The poly-focal or rather three-sided panoramic views (fächerartiger Überschaublick), which was identified by Stephan Hoppe as one of the indications for the transformation of the castle with its defensive architectural disposition to the prestigious early modern palace, is an architectural feature with origins in military, defensive architecture, but was transformed into a symbol of the early modern ruler’s omnipotent authority over his territory.

Fortified towers, parapet walks and bastions were designed for providing the widest possible view to identify potential attackers as early as possible and to target them without being hindered by blind spots. These panoramic outlooks were transferred from their defensive purpose into the civilian spheres of palace architecture. Thereby the military vision for observing an area was conceptually transformed into the

912 Hoppe, 'Wie wird die Burg zum Schloss?'. p. 97
913 Ibid. p. 95
915 Hoppe, 'Wie wird die Burg zum Schloss?'. p. 105
appreciative prospect of rulers who prized the aesthetic qualities of this vision and understood it as dignifying motif that symbolically expressed their omnipotence.\textsuperscript{916} This development occurred in the second half of the fourteenth century when the French royal house introduced a new architectural vocabulary with the renovation of the Louvre in Paris and the palaces in the countryside. New living quarters were added to the thirteenth-century castles. They featured numerous large windows that illuminated the rooms with natural light and provided visual links between interiors and exteriors. Former parapet walks were converted into covered walkways for civilian purposes that were prized for the views into gardens and the palaces’ surroundings.\textsuperscript{917} The architectural patronage of Charles V is notable in this regard. In 1365, he commissioned a new stair tower, located in front of the Louvre’s Corps de Logis, whose architecture allowed the beholders in the courtyard to observe the movements of the royal family. For example, it provided the stage for the royal families passage to the palace chapel.\textsuperscript{918} Concurrently, the appreciation of views across courtyards and into gardens developed at the French royal court. This concept was realised at the royal palace at Vincennes and the Louvre where Charles V had a garden laid out adjacent to the Corps de Logis to enhance the ‘aesthetic’ qualities of prospects from inside the building.\textsuperscript{919} Marie-Thérèse Haudebourg observed that an illumination in Book of Hours of Jean de Berry depicts small pavilions in the garden of the Louvre. These pleasure houses and architectural follies were situated on mounds. From their elevated location, they provided panoramic views of the garden and across the garden’s wall. According to Haudebourg, the garden of the Louvre featured four mounds with pavilions.\textsuperscript{920}

These architecturally framed views from elevated positions became a popular and prestigious aspect of the rulers’ apartments in the princely state palaces of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (i.e. Meissen, Torgau, Wittenberg, Neuburg an der Donau and Heidelberg).\textsuperscript{921} The poly-focal panoramic outlook was a common feature of the dining rooms of high-ranking aristocrats north of the Alps. The rulers could overlook their lands from these so-called Herrentafelstuben through several windows that provided prospects in three directions. Thereby the interiors of these palaces were symbolically and conceptually connected with their exteriors and the rulers’ territories respectively.\textsuperscript{922} The aristocrats were emblematically presented as omnipotent rulers of their domains. In the sixteenth century, the symbolism of these poly-focal panoramic architectural outlooks was extended to incorporate references to Roman antiquity. For example, the architectural orchestration of the three-sided panoramic prospects from chambers in the Albrechtsburg in Meissen and the palace in Neuburg an der Donau was noted to resemble the outlook from the dining room of the Villa Laurentium as described by Pliny the Younger.\textsuperscript{923} Pliny praised the dining room’s layout for it provided vistas in three directions across the sea. These added symbolic connotations
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increased the prestige of this architectural feature and its patron as it provided an emblematic stage for the ruler’s self-aggrandizement.

Count Palatine Ottheinrich, a grandchild of Duke George of Bavaria-Landshut, might have disseminated the Renaissance and humanist connotations of the poly-focal panoramic prospect to the Bavarian dukes, because his diaries (kept until 1534) document visits to Munich. Subsequently, Duke Louis X had the so-called Isar tower erected in 1542 (‘M·D·X L I I’ inscribed over the southern portal of the Isar tower’s ‘observation room’), (Plate 135) and his older brother William IV transformed the Neuveste from a medieval castle with the erection of the Rundstubenbau (round hall building, built in the 1530s) as well as other buildings into a prestigious Renaissance palace. (Plate 55 and Plate 56) Louis X was certainly also inspired by the experiences that he gathered on his journey of 1536 to Italy and especially to Mantua where he saw the Palazzo del Tè. He tried to emulate the perspectives from interiors into exteriors, which he had encountered in the Palazzo del Tè, in an urban environment with the walkway to the Isar tower’s observation room, providing cursory glimpses of the town and River Isar, and the Isar tower’s lookout itself. The Rundstubenbau of the Neuveste in Munich provided views across the magnificent leisure and rose garden, situated on the eastern side of the palace. (Plate 56) This garden with a Tempietto in the centre was realised from 1518. The two-storey pavilion featured bronze sculptures and water features in the open ground floor hall. The room on the first floor was decorated with a cycle of paintings, incorporating Albrecht Altdorfer’s Battle of Alexander and Darius at Issus (1529), and providing prospects across the garden into the surrounding country. (Plate 142) The upper storey and domed roof of the ‘Lusthaus’ or pleasure house is depicted in Hans Sebald Beham’s townscape of Munich (1530). (Plate 11)

Poly-focal prospects in the building projects of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich

Comparable views to those presented after Charles V’s renovation of the Corps de Logis at the Louvre were possible from rooms in the Alte Hof and the Neuveste in Munich. The models of the ducal construction projects in the second half of the fifteenth century cannot be identified. It is not known whether Louis VII of Bavaria-Ingolstadt or his sister Isabeau de Bavière who was married to the French King Charles VI introduced the dukes of the Wittelsbach dynasty’s other branches to these architectural features. Louis VII stayed at the French royal court and knew the Louvre in Paris. He probably visited the other royal palaces in the French countryside. He must have been
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925 Refer to plate 134 in Lauterbach, Endemann, and Frommel (eds.), Die Landshuter Stadtresidenz. p. 148. The dating of the Isar tower’s construction to the early 1540s was also mentioned by Lange, 'Gasse, Gang und Galerie'. p. 158.
926 William IV’s construction campaign was completed by 1540 with the consecration of the Chapel of St George. Refer to Meitinger, Die baugeschichtliche Entwicklung der Neuveste. p. 32. Also mentioned in Loibl, Wittelsbacher Jagdschlösser um München'. p. 19-20.
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929 Smith, The Northern Renaissance. p. 319
familiar with the panoramic prospects across courtyards, gardens and into the urban environment as well as the countryside.

At the ducal residences in Munich, these exalted vantage points served as places from which members of the ducal court watched tournaments, festivities, processions or the lions that roamed freely around the Alte Hof’s courtyard and were mentioned in Andrea de Franceschi’s travel diary of 1492. The duke, duchess and their entourage must have watched tournaments from the Alte Hof’s windows like Anna of Brunswick and her entourage who had observed jousts from the councillors’ drinking chamber in the town hall on 24th February 1454 and 7th December 1454. According to Fridolin Solleder, a joust was held in the Alte Hof during the visit of Duke Albrecht the Bold of Saxony (1443-1500) in April 1467. Bernd Bastert believed that Solleder had misinterpreted the original note since the dimensions of the Alte Hof were not suited to staging jousts and tournaments and accommodating spectators. However, the courtyard of the Alte Hof, described by Hartmann Schedel in his Liber Chronicarum (1493) as a very spacious princely palace, measures approximately forty by forty meters. (Plate 9) Mounted knights could have entered the courtyard through the gates on the northern and southern sides and clashed in its centre. Viewers could have watched the joust from either side of the track as well as from the windows and oriel like the beholders of the tournament on Munich’s market square that is depicted in Matthäus Zasinger’s engraving. (Plate 14) The records of Munich’s town council, noting that a joust in honour of Emperor Maximilian’s visit to Munich on 3rd March 1500 was held in the Alte Hof, substantiate Solleder’s reading of the original quote. Maximilian travelled from Augsburg to Munich during a Reichstag. By day, knights, aristocrats and the emperor himself tilted and combated in the Alte Hof. In the evening, the town council organised a dance and banquet for Maximilian in the ballroom of the town hall, which had been built by Jörg von Halspach from 1470 and was decorated with Erasmus Grasser’s Moorish Dancers as well as Ulrich Füetrer’s heraldic shields.

The function of the oriel on the courtyard-side of the Alte Hof’s Burgstock as a spectacular and symbolic outlook for the duke, duchess and their entourage was documented by Matthäus Zasinger’s Court Ball (dated 1500 in the bay window above Duke Albrecht IV). (Plate 15) This print shows Duke Albrecht IV and his wife Kunigunde of Austria seated in a bay window where they play cards. In the foreground, members of the ducal court are engaged in conversations. The attire of the duke, the duchess and some of the courtiers appear to be made of luxurious fabrics and feature elaborate embroideries. Drummers, pipers, timpanists, trumpeters and a court jester, who is identified by his fool’s cap with the donkey ears, stand on the two galleries on

\[930\] Stahleder, Chronik der Stadt München. Die Jahre 1157-1505. p. 333 & 337
\[932\] Bastert, Der Münchner Hof und Fuetrers ’Buch der Abenteuer’. p. 16
\[933\] ‘Alda ist yetzo […] ein fast weyer fürsticher hoff’.
either side of the room. The small lion on the right-hand side possibly represented the tame lions that were kept at the ducal residence. The room is decorated with few furnishings, but they are exquisitely decorated with expensive woodcarving. A goblet, probably made of silver and gold, stands on the table between Albrecht IV and Kunigunde.

Traditionally, it was believed that this print depicts a court dance. However, the actions and gestures of the courtiers, who either sit or walk around the room, suggest that it is a ‘normal’ gathering of the duke, duchess and courtiers. If the engraving would depict a festivity like a dance, it can be assumed that Albrecht IV and Kunigunde would participate. Instead, they are uninvolved and do not pay any attention to the courtiers around them. From this point of view, the engraving’s emblematic meaning was intended to convey information about the refined culture of the ducal court in Munich.

The townscape that can be glimpsed through the windows substantiates this interpretation. Zasinger chose an imaginary townscape with streets that converged toward various vanishing areas as the backdrop of this scene. Rather than employing only one vanishing point as prescribed by the rules of linear perspective, the Court Ball features three major vanishing areas and presents a wide vista. (Plate 15) The fictional townscape makes reference to the aristocrats’ contemporary visual taste and celebrates Zasinger’s patron, because in the second half of the fifteenth century panoramic polyfocal views from palaces across courtyards, gardens, towns and into the landscape had become en vogue and reflected the aristocrats’ conception of their government. This so-called ‘Herrscherblick’ (the ruler’s prospect across his territory) evoked the symbolic conception of the far-sighted omnipotent lord and conceptually related the interior and the palace in general with the exterior.

The reading of Zasinger’s Court Ball as documentation of the sophisticated life at the ducal court in Munich becomes even more persuasive, when considering that the artist and his patron emphasised the poly-focal panoramic views, which had become the de rigueur architectural element of the eminent princely palaces in the German lands by 1500, and that Zasinger’s Court Ball very probably formed part of an ensemble of prints. The Court Ball and the Tournament must have complemented each other. (Plate 14 and Plate 15) They conveyed an impression of the cultivated life at the ducal court in Munich. The reproduction of these engravings was simple and fairly inexpensive compared with the creation of other media. Hence it can be imagined that they were employed in a comparable fashion to the portrait medals of Isabella and Leonello d’Este. Isabella and Leonello presented them to relatives, high-ranking guests and diplomats as a means of constructing and disseminating their reputation as learned, illustrious aristocrats as well as to establish bonds with dignitaries throughout Europe.

From this perspective, the engravings functioned as a novel propaganda medium that illustrated some prestigious aspects of the life at the ducal court in Munich. In addition to more traditional pursuits like the tourney on Munich’s market square, the

935 Bastert, Der Münchner Hof und Fuetrers ’Buch der Abenteuer’. p. 126
representation of the ruler’s prospect across his immediate realm of power, in this instance an idealised townscape that possibly was intended to represent his main ducal seat, is of particular importance. This innovative symbolic concept was realised with architectural features like bay windows or oriels in palaces that were intended to be at the vanguard of aristocratic culture. Thereby panoramic poly-focal views emphasised the eminent status of the building and its patron.

Panoramic outlooks from elevated vantage points were also appreciated for their aesthetic qualities, as they provided beholders with views across gardens and into the surrounding countryside. This notion is illustrated by the panel of Jan Polack’s winged altarpiece from the former Benedictine abbey of Weihenstephan, which shows the *Death of Saint Corbinian with a view of Freising in the distance* (1489). (Plate 126) The dying saint and four of his disciples are situated in a loggia, offering a scenic view across the River Isar and of Freising in the distant background. The town is flanked by the Benedictine abbey of Weihenstephan on the left-hand hill and the cathedral precinct on the right-hand hill where St Corbinian worked as bishop.

Corresponding vistas across gardens and into the country were possible from rooms in the ducal palaces as well as castles in Munich and its vicinity. Although the Alte Hof was located close to the town centre by the second half of fifteenth century as a result of the town’s expansion in previous centuries, prospects into the distant countryside were still possible. The depiction of Munich in the *Liber Chronicarum* (1493), the townscape by Hans Sebald Beham (1530), and especially Jakob Sandtner’s wooden model (1570) show that the low-rise buildings on the eastern side of the Alte Hof between the duke’s palace and the town wall did not hinder views from an elevated outlook like the Burgstock’s oriel and the Zwingerstock’s row of large segmental arch windows.937 (Plate 7, Plate 10, Plate 11, and Plate 16) Therefore members of the ducal court must have been able to look toward the wooded eastern shore of the River Isar. They might have even been able to observe the traffic on the bridge that was located between the Gasteig and the Isartor.

The Neuveste was located on the periphery of Munich. Hence the duchess, her courtiers and visitors could look unhindered across the River Isar into the densely wooded vicinity of Munich, which was abundant with game. According to inventory lists of 1513 and 1518, cited by Otto Hartig, a tree garden and a pond with a boat existed outside the Neuveste by the late fifteenth century. (Plate 55) They provided another noteworthy focal point for beholders.938 In the sixteenth century, William IV transformed this tree garden into a splendid pleasure and rose garden with a pavilion.

Duke Sigmund had initiated the creation of gardens at Grünwald Castle and Dachau Castle. Around 1470, Sigmund established a walled deer park on the slope and the bank between Grünwald Castle and the River Isar. He also kept exotic animals in the castle’s...
After creating the deer park and menagerie at Grünwald Castle, Sigmund initiated similar projects at Dachau Castle, because documents of 1478, 1498 and 1500 mention three gardens.\textsuperscript{940} (Plate 1)

In the fourteenth century, Dachau Castle had fallen into disrepair. When it burned down again, Duke William III and Duke Ernst chose a new site on the plateau from which they could overlook the trading road from Salzburg via Munich to Augsburg, the River Amper and the vast plain around Munich. The new castle was erected from 1403 and construction work was completed under Duke Ernst in 1435.\textsuperscript{941}

From this exalted position beholders could look toward Munich and on clear days they could even see the Alpine chain. Philipp Hainhofer praised this breathtaking panorama in 1611.\textsuperscript{942} The exceptionally large windows of the hall in the south-western wing of the Renaissance palace, built for William IV and Albrecht V between 1546 and 1577 to replace Dachau Castle, and the garden, laid out in 1572, demonstrate exemplarily the aristocrats’ penchant for scenic panoramic views from elevated vantage points in the early modern era.\textsuperscript{943}

Since the Renaissance palace replaced the late medieval castle, there is not any other evidence than the late fifteenth-century documents, which may substantiate the thesis that the aesthetic qualities of the panoramic views from the plateau above Dachau may have prompted the dukes to choose this site in the early fifteenth century. Initially, the location may have been favoured for the protection offered by the steep slope on one side of the castle, which hindered attackers to assail the castle from this direction. The elevated position allowed watchmen to spot distant enemies long before they reached the castle.

This situation could have changed with the laying out of gardens around Dachau Castle. A court garden was already mentioned in 1419.\textsuperscript{944} It appears that Duke Sigmund established orchards adjacent to Dachau Castle, as documents of 1478 and 1498 mention a ‘Pomgarten […] im öllent’ as well as a ‘Pomgarten am Kühberg’. Another garden on the Kühberg, owned by Duke Sigmund, was recorded in 1500.\textsuperscript{945} Nevertheless, there is not any evidence to substantiate the conjecture that the scenic


\textsuperscript{940} This information, which will be published in a forthcoming book on the gardens of Dachau Palace, was kindly provided by Manfred Stephan of the Bayerische Verwaltung der staatlichen Schlösser, Gärten und Seen.

\textsuperscript{941} Weithmann, \textit{Inventar der Burgen Oberbayerns}. p. 114; Weithmann, \textit{Burgen und Schlösser in Bayern}. p. 99

\textsuperscript{942} Verstegen, ‘München’. p. 209

\textsuperscript{943} Ibid. p. 208-209

\textsuperscript{944} Hanns Czollner, a burgher of Dachau, bought a meadow adjacent to the court garden of Dachau Castle in 1419: ‘gelegen zu Dachaw oberhalb der prugk auf der Amber am Hofgarten’. – This information was kindly provided by Manfred Stephan of the Bayerische Verwaltung der staatlichen Schlösser, Gärten und Seen.

\textsuperscript{945} The information regarding these documents and the late medieval gardens around Dachau Castle were kindly provided by Manfred Stephan of the Bayerische Verwaltung der staatlichen Schlösser, Gärten und Seen.
prospects from the plateau around Dachau Castle might have promoted the creation of these gardens. The only clues for the dukes of Bavaria-Munich’s predilection for panoramic views from exalted outlooks are Zasinger’s Court Ball and Polack’s Death of Saint Corbinian. (Plate 15 and Plate 126) However Jan Polack’s panel was produced for the monastery of Weihenstephan. Hence it cannot be related directly to the ducal court but it shows that this taste was not prized exclusively by princely patrons.

The most compelling evidence for the dukes of Bavaria-Munich’s appreciation of these panoramic prospects from elevated viewpoints is found in Ulrich Füetrer’s Buch der Abenteuer, written for Albrecht IV between 1473 and 1484/87. Flordimar, the protagonist of the story with the same name, arrives in a strange land where he saves the queen from the threat of the heathens. Subsequently, they fall for each other. Toward the end of the story, Flordimar and the queen’s maid stand on a hill from which they overlook the queen’s territory and main residence.

One day they arrive on a hill and see a marvellous land. […] There is a large and magnificent town not far from them. The maid speaks: ‘Behold, here, this town and territory belong to my lady.’ 946

Later Flordimar arrives at the queen’s palace where he overlooks a beautifully laid out garden outside the building whilst waiting for his audience.

Flordimar is lead to the castle […] where Master Flordimar has to wait [and sees] […] a wonderfully designed and planted garden. […] The Tschachtelur is delighted to welcome Flordimar [and they] […] walk into the beautiful garden. 947

These two quotes from Füetrer’s Buch der Abenteuer can be understood to echo the contemporary penchant for scenic views into gardens, deer parks, forests and the surrounding countryside. They highlight that this kind of vision was not only appreciated by members of the ducal court in Munich in the second half of the fifteenth century. Authors like Ulrich Füetrer, artists like Matthäus Zasinger and their patrons found it noteworthy to describe and illustrate these scenic prospects from elevated vantage points across gardens and their territories. Hence it appears very probably that these panoramic views from exalted places were cherished for their emblematic as well as their aesthetic qualities.

The origins of the aristocrats’ preference for panoramic prospects as exemplified by Jan Polack’s Death of Saint Corbinian, Matthäus Zasinger’s Court Ball and the descriptions of Ulrich Füetrer in his Flordimar, might be explained by the dukes’ commissions at


Grünwald Castle, one of their favourite rural retreats and hunting seats in the late fifteenth century.

Grünwald Castle stands above the valley of the River Isar. The duke and duchess’s apartments were located in the western wing for their protection. The western wing rose above the steep slope, which dramatically reduced the risk of attacks from this direction. Nevertheless, the duke and duchess could overlook the castle’s garden, the deer park on the riverbank, and the valley of the River Isar. Therefore they must have had similar prospects to that depicted in Jan Polack’s *Death of Saint Corbinian* and described by Hans Herzheimer.

From this perspective, it appears plausible that the location of the ducal apartments might have encouraged Duke Sigmund to establish a deer park and zoological garden below Grünwald Castle’s western wing rather than in any other place in the vicinity of the castle. It also seems plausible that the extensive renovations of the windows under Duke Albrecht IV were motivated by the aim to create larger windows so that the duke and Kunigunde of Austria as well as their entourages could enjoy the prospect into the garden, deer park and the valley of the River Isar. This construction campaign might be comparable to the garden that the French King Charles V had laid out outside the Corps de Logis at the Louvre.

After Albrecht IV had exchanged hunting grounds and the Schleißheim estate with Sigmund for Grünwald Castle in 1485, he initiated considerable building work in January 1486 to transform Grünwald Castle into an appropriate Morgengabe for his prospective wife whom he married on 2nd April 1487 in Innsbruck. (Plate 118) The construction project, documented by the ducal treasurer Matthäus Prätzl, was mostly completed by April 1487. As part of the building work, the glazier Hans Winhart crafted 1,237 new windowpanes and recycled 1,066 of the old panes. He also created nineteen panes with stained glass depictions of armorial bearings that must have been incorporated into the windows in a similar manner as in the windows of the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace. (Plate 103 and Plate 104)

Although the large number of panes indicates that the windows featured bull’s-eye glass panes, it does not contradict the conjecture that Albrecht IV intended to create brighter rooms with scenic view. The illumination of the great hall through ‘larger’, translucent windows must have been regarded as necessary for beholders to appreciate its decoration with murals, showing eight historic scenes. These murals were created by Ulrich Füetrer and complemented the heraldic adornment of the hall with its ninety-eight armorial bearings, six coats-of-arms with escutcheons and helmets as well as the nineteen armorial bearings of the stained glass panes. Obviously these new windows also provided scenic prospects from the apartments of Albrecht IV and Kunigunde. This presumption might be substantiated by the fact that Albrecht IV ordered the renovation
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948 Sigmund von Bayern-München, 'Hausurkunde 681'.
950 Ibid. p. 14
951 ‘Ulrich Füetrer malt sechs Wappen mit Schild und Helm in Feldung, dann 89 Wappen der Turnierer und für die große Stube 8 Historien.’ – As listed in Ibid. p. 14
of Sigmund’s zoological garden or deer park. Furthermore, the orchard was fenced in and Gothart von Tölz built an aviary.\textsuperscript{952}

Hans Herzheimer mentioned in his account of the palace and gardens at Lochau that one could overlook the gardens through the large windows of a round pleasure house as well as another pleasure house, probably the ‘new Lochau’.\textsuperscript{953} Certainly, the expensive glazing of these buildings was intended to enable scenic prospects across the surrounding gardens and park. According to Heiko Lass, the ability to observe a deer park and the hunting from castles, palaces, lodges and shooting boxes was an essential feature of these buildings.\textsuperscript{954}

The perception of forests and the natural world in general changed in the course of the Middle Ages. One of the factors for this development were the measures that had to be taken to counteract the dwindling of woodlands in the Holy Roman Empire. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the vast German forests declined as a result of the use of wood as building material, firewood, for the production of wooden commodities and the clearing of woodlands to gain land for agriculture. From the fourteenth century, towns like Nuremberg and Erfurt introduced systematic forestry to remedy the woods’ dwindling size. In the fifteenth century, the Bavarian dukes became interested in the economic potential of forests. The intention to generate income and use woodlands for their leisure pursuits encouraged the dukes of Bavaria-Munich to issue the instructions and regulations of 1470, 1476,\textsuperscript{955} 1482, 1491, 1493\textsuperscript{956} and 1512 which obliged their highly regarded foresters and game wardens to preserve these natural resources and to use them sparingly.\textsuperscript{957} Now woods were cultivated and maintained for their economic value, as a locus for the court’s leisure pursuits (‘for hunting and for other amusements’)\textsuperscript{958} as well as to conserve the game population, which had become increasingly difficult to stalk, because the deer had retreated into the remaining thickets.

This altered attitude toward forests is reflected in the changed characterisation of woodlands in contemporary literature. Originally, the motif of the inhospitable, unspoilt, wild and foreboding forest represented a threatening realm that contrasted with the civilised, cultivated natural world as symbolised by gardens in high medieval literature.\textsuperscript{959} Whereas the works of fifteenth-century authors like Ulrich Füetrer reflect the human impact through forestry that transformed woods from wild, inhospitable places into civilised, orderly loci. For example, the protagonist of Füetrer’s Flordimar overlooks an impressive land and a flourishing town from his exalted position on a hill. The ‘woods [or rather trees] stand uniformly, as if they were planted by the hand of a

\textsuperscript{952} Ibid. p. 13
\textsuperscript{953} Hoppe, ‘Anatomy of an Early "Villa"’. p. 133-134
\textsuperscript{954} Heiko Laß, 'Jagdschlösser', in Werner Paravicini, Jan Hirschbiegel, and Jörg Wettlauffer (eds.), Höfe und Residenzen im spätmittelalterlichen Reich. Bilder und Begriffe (Residenzforschung, 15.II - Teilband 1 - Begriffe; Ostfildern: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 2005), 336-342. p. 338
\textsuperscript{955} Regulations to protect the forests.
\textsuperscript{956} Order against poachers.
\textsuperscript{957} Loibl, 'Wittelsbacher Jagdschlösser um München'. p. 10; Bastert, Der Münchner Hof und Fuetrer's ‘Buch der Abenteuer’. p. 201-203; Schaelow, 'Grünwald - Seehof'. p. 685; Störmer, 'Die oberbayerischen Residenzen'. p. 17
\textsuperscript{958} ‘ze iaid und zv andrer churtzweil’ – Quoted in Schaelow, 'Grünwald - Seehof'. p. 683
\textsuperscript{959} Haudebourg, Vom Glück des Gartens. p. 104; Bastert, Der Münchner Hof und Fuetrer's 'Buch der Abenteuer'. p. 202
wise master [or lord].

Hence nature and the countryside had become another realm where rulers could illustrate their authority. Füetrer would not have made this allusion to this contemporary development or rather phenomenon of the recent past, had the systematic cultivation of forests not occurred in the fifteenth century in the Duchy of Bavaria since his audience could not interpret this reference.

The Bavarian dukes paid attention to the conservation of their forests because of their passion for hunting. For example, large woodlands that were abundant with game surrounded Grünwald Castle. (Plate 2) It was the seat of the Upper Bavarian Jägermeister (venator, master hunter) from 1319 till 1490. In the second half of the fifteenth century, the castle became one of the favourite rural retreats of the ducal court. The duke, duchess and their courtiers not only withdrew to Grünwald Castle to escape the plagues that raged in Munich, they cherished it as starting point for the numerous hunting expeditions of the ducal court. These court hunts attracted numerous spectators from Munich. For example, the town council paid coachmen to drive the ladies from Munich to the hunting grounds in 1461, 1463, 1464 and 1469 to attend the ducal court’s hunting parties.

It seems that not only the spectators of court hunts may have watched these spectacle from an exalted position like the western wing’s apartments in Grünwald Castle or the pleasure houses at Lochau. The dukes also slaughtered animals from elevated platforms as described by Hans von Waltheym. He was shown a hunting house, built into the River Isar, during his visit of Landshut in 1474.

Duke Louis IX the Rich had the most amazing hunting lodge, which I have ever seen, built into the river near the town of Landshut. From it one hunts the deer that are driven out of the forest [into the water] underneath the hunting house, where they are slaughtered.

The hunting that took place from this platform or rather hunting lodge has to be imagined like the stag stalking, depicted by Lucas Cranach the Elder in the *Hunt in Honour of Charles V at Torgau Castle* (1544) from what almost appears like a bird’s
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962 The ducal court retreated to Grünwald Castle for instance in 1439 (p. 304-305), 1482 (p. 371) and 1495 (p. 453) to escape the bubonic plague as mentioned in the documents of Munich’s town council. In 1495 Duke Louis X of Bavaria was born there, as the pregnant Kunigunde of Austria had left the ducal residence in Munich to avoid an infection. Transcribed in Stahleder, *Chronik der Stadt München. Die Jahre 1157-1505*. p. 304-305, 371 & 453. Also refer to Störmer, 'Die oberbayerischen Residenzen'. p. 17.
eye view. However, in Landshut the hunters were situated in an elevated position from which they could overlook a larger area. Thus they had better views across the Isar and the riverbanks. These elevated shooting boxes also provided protection for the aristocrats and the spectators.

This interpretation is supported by Hans Herzheimer’s description of the palace, gardens and walled deer park at Lochau, which were created by Elector Frederick the Wise of Saxony by remodelling an older hunting seat in the early sixteenth century. In his account, Herzheimer mentioned that the stalking of deer and heron hunts, taking place in a pond near a round pleasure house for Frederick the Wise’s amusement, could be observed from the round building that provided excellent prospects of the spectacle for the elector’s guests, young ladies and women.

His Electoral Majesty then orders a hunt in the earlier mentioned beautiful forest adjoining this pond. And the deer are chased into the pond where the invited guests, young ladies and women, poor and rich, amuse themselves nearby. In the round pleasure house, where they can play cards, eat and drink, sing, play instruments and make merry. They chase the wild creatures into the pond and then shoot them as they desire […]. On this same pond, when the Elector wishes some amusement, a heron hunt is arranged. It can be watched as one chooses gazing out from the round pleasure [house]..

Through this visual experience aristocrats became accustomed to panoramic views from exalted viewpoints into gardens and the surrounding countryside. The aesthetic quality of this prospect, which according to Waldheym and Herzheimer’s reports was prized by aristocrats in the late medieval and early modern periods, is reflected in paintings like Jan Polack’s *Death of Saint Corbinian*, Lucas Cranach the Elder’s *Hunt in Honour of Charles V at Torgau Castle* and to some degree Matthäus Zasinger’s *Court Ball*. (Plate 15 and Plate 126)

Hunting had become an important social and cultural aspect of the aristocratic lifestyle, which is also supported by suggestion of the humanist Conrad Celtis. From the 1490s, he praised the combination of the pleasurable facets of a bucolic lifestyle with hunting, the traditional reason and pretext for aristocrats to spend time in the country. Therefore it appears plausible that the strategies, developed to make the princes’ hunting pursuits more pleasurable and enable beholders to observe these spectacles, affected the visual culture and taste of princely patrons in the fifteenth century. This reason provided another pretext for the introduction of these novel concepts that had been realised elsewhere into the architecture of buildings and gardens in the Duchy of Bavaria-Munich. Princes and their courtiers would have wanted to

965 For a general elaboration on hunting preserves and their use by aristocrats in the Middle Ages and the late medieval period refer to Werner Rösener, 'Wildpark', in Werner Paravicini, Jan Hirschbiegel, and Jörg Wettlaufer (eds.), Höfe und Residenzen im spätmittelalterlichen Reich. Bilder und Begriffe (Residenzforschung, 15.II - Teilband I - Begriffe; Ostfildern: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 2005), 333-336. esp. p. 333-335.
966 Hoppe, 'Anatomy of an Early "Villa"'. p. 129-130
967 Ibid. p. 133-134
968 Ibid. p. 136
enjoy similar prospects to those that they were used to from their hunting jaunts in their palaces and gardens.

From this perspective, Albrecht IV’s renovation of the western wing’s apartments in Grünwald Castle for Kunigunde of Austria were certainly appropriate, because his wife must have been familiar with the practices of court hunts as she had lived at the court of Archduke Sigismund of Tyrol in Innsbruck from 1485 until 1487 when she married Albrecht IV. The area around Innsbruck was particularly popular with the Habsburgs for hunting. Therefore Archduke Sigismund and Emperor Maximilian renovated several castles or erected new rural seats and hunting lodges to provide suitable residences for their hunting parties.

These evidences suggest that the origins of the aristocrats’ taste for prospects from an exalted vantage point into the garden below and then the commanding view from the garden into the surrounding countryside are certainly situated to some extent in the sphere of the late medieval and early modern aristocracy’s popular pastime: hunting. Therefore the roots of the poly-focal panoramic view as a pleasurable prospect cannot be exclusively linked to the architectural relationship of military outlooks with oriel and bay windows as suggested by Stephan Hoppe. The symbolism of poly-focal panoramic prospects changed in the course of time and between locations. The ‘rediscovery’ of antiquity in the Renaissance added novel connotations to it. In the sixteenth century, the symbolism of these poly-focal panoramic architectural outlooks was extended to incorporate references to Roman antiquity. For example, Count Palatine Ottheinrich initiated building projects in Neuburg an der Donau in the 1520s that were inspired by his knowledge of the Franco-Flemish court culture and especially the Renaissance palace architecture south of the Alps. Hence the architectural orchestration of the three-sided panoramic prospects from rooms in the palace in Neuburg an der Donau was conceived to resemble the views from the dining room of the Villa Laurentium described by Pliny the Younger. Princes aimed to emulate the lifestyle, magnificence and self-aggrandizement of Roman Caesars to increase their prestige. In addition to the poly-focal prospect’s connotations of the omnipotence of their government as symbolised by this omnidirectional vision and the visual as well as conceptual connection of rulers with their territory, these panoramic views are appreciated for their origins in antique Roman palace architecture.

The imprint of the ducal government on the countryside

From the 1470s, Sigmund’s patronage focussed on his palaces and estates in the vicinity of Munich (i.e. Blutenburg Palace and the estates in Menzing, the castles as well as palaces in Dachau, Grünwald, Nannhofen and Starnberg). (Plate 2, Plate 88, Plate 89 and Plate 90) Thereby he continued the traditions of his father and grandfather who built, renovated or extended these ducal residences. Though Sigmund pursued new
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969 Graf, 'Kunigunde'. p. 41-45
970 Laß, 'Jagdschlösser'. p. 338
971 Hoppe, 'Antike als Maßstab'. p. 211
strategies in displaying the Wittelsbach dukes’ authority over their territory by realising and developing the concepts, which had been expressed in his commissions at the Alte Hof, in his construction projects at Blutenburg Palace and the Church of St Wolfgang in Pipping. The exteriors of the chapel and gate tower of Blutenburg Palace and the choir of St Wolfgang were decorated with heraldic schemes that illustrate his patronage, the kinship of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich to other aristocratic houses, and the eminent ancestors of Sigmund. (Plate 94, Plate 95 and Plate 97)

Two contemporary beholders noted Sigmund’s patronage of these ‘suburban’ construction projects. The chronicler Veit Arnpeck wrote about Sigmund in the late fifteenth century that ‘he liked Menzing very much, built it fittingly and made the churches there very exquisite and beautiful.’ Ulrich Füetrer stated in his Bairische Chronik that Sigmund ‘built more than one church and embellished them in a manner appropriate for a prince’. These two quotes refer to Blutenburg Palace and the chapels in the countryside around Munich, which Sigmund built and decorated after his abdication. (Plate 2) Blutenburg Palace became Sigmund’s main residence and was transformed into one of the most magnificent late medieval palaces in the vicinity of Munich. (Plate 88, Plate 89 and Plate 90) The pious duke laid the foundation stone of St Wolfgang in Pipping on 5th May 1478. (Plate 109) Pipping is situated along the pilgrimage route from Augsburg to St Wolfgang im Salzkammergut and in close proximity to Blutenburg Palace where the construction of a second chapel commenced in 1488. (Plate 97) Füetrer’s statement also alludes to the Church of St Martin in Untermenzing, built from 1492, and the church in Aufkirchen, which was built from 1499 under Sigmund’s patronage and that is dedicated to the Assumption of the Virgin Mary.

Initially, the patronage of Albrecht IV focussed on Munich where his government and administration were centred. After Sigmund had signed over Grünwald Castle to Albrecht IV on 12th December 1485, he initiated a prestigious construction project there. (Plate 2, Plate 118, Plate 119 and Plate 121) It comprised among other things the erection of a new gatehouse and the decoration of the duke and duchess’s chambers with murals to create an appropriate and comfortable hunting lodge, where the court
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972 Blutenburg Palace was situated in the Hofmark Menzing.
973 Arnpeck probably referred to the Duke Sigmund’s construction campaigns at Blutenburg Palace.
974 ‘Menzing liebet er vast, pauet das wol und machet di kirchen da gar köstlich und schö’n.’ – Transcribed in Arnpeck, Sämtliche Chroniken. p. 673
975 Herzog Sigmund ‘pauet mer dann ain kirchen klain, zieret die vast wol [very well] und fürstlich’. This quote was taken from the transcript of Ulrich Füetrer’s Chronicle of Bavaria (1478-81): Füetrer, Bayerische Chronik. p. 261-262
976 Störmer, ‘Die oberbayerischen Residenzen’. p. 18
977 Altmann, Kirchen entlang der Würm. p. 43
978 Altmann, ‘St. Wolfgang in Pipping, eine Pilgerkirche?’. p. 304
could spend leisure time. Work began in January 1486 and was finished in October 1487.981

All of these buildings reflect the patronage and intentions of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich, but it is particularly apparent in St Wolfgang in Pipping, the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace and Grünwald Castle. The surviving heraldic programmes on the facades of these three buildings make specific reference to the matrimonial alliances of Sigmund and Albrecht IV’s ancestors as well as to the recent marriage of Albrecht IV and Kunigunde of Austria. (Plate 96, Plate 98 and Plate 120) These coats-of-arms almost exclusively refer to members of the Wittelsbach dynasty’s Bavaria-Munich branch. The heraldic scheme of the exterior of the choir of St Wolfgang was particularly effective in conveying its meaning to a wide audience, because it was situated along the pilgrimage route to St Wolfgang im Salzkammergut. (Plate 110-Plate 114) It addressed local beholders as well as a public from outside the Duchy of Bavaria-Munich.

The Church of St Wolfgang with its lavishly decorated interior, especially its choir, and comparatively large nave appears to be inappropriately situated in the small hamlet of Pipping, which only comprised of a small community. For instance, records of 1832 mention four houses and twenty-three villagers.982 Hence it obviously was intended as a statement on behalf of Duke Sigmund who did not fail to further emphasise his patronage with a memorial plaque that is similar to the plaque outside the bride’s portal of the Church of Our Lady. The plaque above the northern portal, documented by a copy of 1848,983 (Plate 117) praises the pious duke’s act by stating:

His Serene Highness Duke Sigmund of Bavaria and Count Palatine of the Rhine demonstrated his [reputation] as donor and his aid with the Church of St Wolfgang in honour of the Lord. [Construction did] not take long. [It was completed] within a year. He laid the first stone with his hand in the year of which there were fourteen hundred and seventy-eight on the holiday of St Eric before Whitsun [5th May 1478]. […] Then in the eightieth year on the Sunday before the Assumption of the Virgin Mary [13th August 1480] the temple was consecrated to honour the Lord, because [we] will be protected from the eternal wrath of God through [the deed] of the Master and lenient, honourable prince. Amen.984

The notion of demarcating the dukes’ territory with armorial bearings, memorial plaques, portraits, foundations and buildings is further substantiated by the commissions of the Bavarian dukes after the reunification of the duchy in 1505. In the first half of the

982 Altmann, 'St. Wolfgang in Pipping, eine Pilgerkirche?'. p. 302
983 Ibid. p. 302
984 Der durchleüchtig hochgenannt | Sigmund Hertzog In Bayrnlanndt | Dar zu pfalldntzgraf bey Rein | Sein stifft und hilffe groß thuet schein | An dissem gotzhaus santz Wolfgang | Gott zu lob Er pawet nit lang | In Jares zil vom grund aus cund | Den ersten stain mit seiner heund | Leget In unsers herrn Jarn | Do der viertzenhundert warn | Acht und sybentzig auch geacht | Vp pfingsten am Erichtag volbracht | Den anfang mit veis fur war | Darnach Im Achtzigisten Jar | Am sunntag vor der hymelfart | Marie der Junckfrauen zart | Den tempel In Gottes ern | Weyhen lyeß da durch dem hnr | Und milten fursten hochgepotn | Got abwend seyren ewigen zorn Amen.
1510s, the Bavarian dukes commissioned Hans Leinberger to produce a new high altarpiece for the parish church of St Kastulus in Moosburg (finished in 1514). The exterior panel of the predella’s left wing, painted by Hans Wertinger, shows Dukes Wolfgang, William IV and Louis X as the altarpiece’s donors. The wing’s panel is flanked by the magnificent combined coats-of-arms of Bavaria and the Palatinate of the Rhine on the left-hand side. Moosburg had belonged to the Duchy of Bavaria-Landshut before the Landshut War of Inheritance. It constituted a new domain of the Dukes of Bavaria-Munich’s territory and they intended to convey their reign to their ‘new’ subjects with this visual demonstration of authority. Similar considerations must have prompted the ducal commission of a stained glass window (1511) for the Heiliggeistspitalkirche in Landshut, which shows the armorial bearing of the Dukes of Bavaria and Counts Palatine of the Rhine.

These heraldic strategies for conveying the dukes’ presence and authority were complemented by the symbolic architectural disposition of Blutenburg Palace, which stylistically refers to the Alte Hof. The addition of an outer courtyard with the chapel on its northern perimeter might have been intended to emulate the Alte Hof’s layout with the Chapel of St Laurence on the courtyard’s northern side. (Plate 91) Emperor Louis the Bavarian’s coat-of-arms and the imperial theme of the exterior as well as interior’s decoration supports this reading. Susanne Burger believed that Duke Sigmund could have had similar views from the Palas onto the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace to those awarded by the oriel of the Alte Hof’s Burgstock onto the Chapel of St Laurence. In her view, Sigmund tried to replicate this familiar prospect in his main residence.

Burger even suggested that the original fifteenth- and sixteenth-century silhouette of Blutenburg Palace, when seen from a distance, is comparable to the skyline of Munich as depicted in the contemporary townscape of Hartmann Schedel’s Liber Chronicarum (1493). (Plate 88 and Plate 89) Even though the silhouette of Blutenburg Palace lacks monuments like the Church of Our Lady and St Peter’s with their trademark towers, Burger assumed that the emphasis of the secular parts in Blutenburg Palace’s silhouette was intentional. She saw her conjecture confirmed by the location of Blutenburg Palace along the River Würm, which, in her view, replicated the locality of Munich, situated along the River Isar. (Plate 2) From this perspective, Burger concluded that Blutenburg Palace represented an ideal town for it was free of the annoyances of urban communities. Here, Sigmund could govern without any opposition, enjoy his aristocratic lifestyle, and demonstrate his status, magnificence as well as authority.

For this reason, Lothar Altmann believed that the heraldic scheme of the exterior of the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace reflected Sigmund’s desire to create an ‘ideal world’ after his abdication by living off his ancestors’ fame. This would have meant that
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Sigmund created an alternative realm, which juxtaposed with the sphere of his brother. Albrecht IV tried to establish his authority in Munich with his urban residence, whereas Sigmund owned the best and most prestigious ‘suburban’ and rural castles, palaces as well as hunting grounds. There, he created an alternative sphere of Wittelsbach ‘rule’ where he represented his dynasty lavishly through his extensive patronage of the arts and architecture as well as liturgy. However, Karl Heller Reichsdler von Hellersperg demonstrated that Sigmund continued to participate in the ducal government. His involvement is underrated in contemporary research. Furthermore, Sigmund at once glorified himself and augmented the Wittelsbach dynasty’s reputation with the buildings. They became monuments of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich’s government, representing them throughout their territory. From this viewpoint, Sigmund’s building campaigns in the Hofmark Menzing and that of Albrecht IV in Grünwald complemented one another.

The extension of the framework for the demonstration of the princely government with inscriptions, plaques, armorial bearings, buildings, works of art and foundations to the entire town of Munich, its vicinity and the whole territory of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich coincided with a conceptual approach in late fifteenth-century historiography that intended to conceptually associate the Wittelsbach dynasty with their territory, the Duchy of Bavaria, and vice versa. Jean-Marie Moeglin referred to this intention as the ‘genealogical’ strategy, which established a succession of rulers from the territory’s foundation to the contemporary generation of princes—the patrons of these historiographic works—who are related by blood. Thereby the dynasty’s genealogy was at once linked to their territory and to a continuous bloodline of Bavarian rulers.

The attributes of the aristocratic status and claim to power changed significantly in the Duchy of Bavaria from the middle of the fifteenth century. The aristocrats’ rank and sovereignty were based more and more on territorial possessions rather than personal qualities. The notion of property as a criterion of the aristocratic status is reflected in an administrative phenomenon of the late fifteenth century. Alongside the minor jurisdiction over a Hofmark (a manor or minor regional centre) and an appropriate chivalric lifestyle, members of the nobility had to own estates. This requirement is manifested in the Landtafeln of circa 1465, 1485 and 1490. (Plate 1 and Plate 2) These property registers list the Upper and Lower Bavarian noblemen and their estates.

Sigmund and Albrecht IV pursued a dual strategy to legitimize their status as rulers of the Duchy of Bavaria-Munich. They present their distinguished genealogy and kinship to other eminent aristocratic houses. At the same time, they demarcate their territory with castles, palaces and churches, which are decorated with distinct armorial bearings. These heraldic devices assign the territory unmistakably to the dukes of Bavaria-Munich.

---
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The underlying intentions of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich’s strategies regarding the demarcation of their territory and the illustration of their authority are highlighted by the findings of Kilian Heck’s study *Genealogie als Argument. Der Beitrag dynastischer Wappen zur politischen Raumbildung der Neuzeit*. Heck examined coats-of-arms as genealogical symbols and their function in providing a social group with an identity or for defining a territory. He described this process as the construction of reality through the symbolic connotations of these armorial bearings. Initially from the late twelfth century, armorial bearings served as means of identification in tournaments and battles. Their original function gradually diminished, as they increasingly became visual representations of dynasties. This development is reflected in the decreasing size of heraldic shields.

From the fifteenth century, an aristocratic house’s identity was not exclusively linked to its ancestors, it also stemmed from geographic entities. In the Late Middle Ages, aristocratic houses in the Holy Roman Empire intended to noticeably demarcate their territories by differentiating them from the territories of other dynasties with the application of characteristic armorial bearings and heraldic programmes on buildings in their princely seats and peripheral locations. Therefore, coats-of-arms not only represented a dynasty and its members, they stood for the dynasty’s territories. This notion explains the reason for the emergence of heraldic programmes and armorial bearings in peripheral locations, on buildings like town gates and, in the instance of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich’s patronage, the ‘suburban’ churches as well as palaces like St Wolfgang in Pipping, Blutenburg Palace and Grünwald Castle. Heck stated that analogous to Jurij M. Lotman’s concept of the ‘semio-sphere’ in literary studies, coats-of-arms and heraldic schemes were intended to introduce order into an unstructured, peripheral space by serving as impressive visual representations of a dynasty and by expressing its authority over a territory.

The requirement to demonstrate the ducal authority in rural or peripheral spheres was particularly important, because in the fifteenth century the majority of aristocrats and noblemen in the Duchy of Bavaria lived in the countryside rather than in the princely seats. This social topography of the Duchy of Bavaria was described by Johannes Aventinus who stated that the Bavarian ‘aristocrats lived in the country outside the towns, [they] spent their time with hunting and stalking; they did not ride to the court except for those who worked for and were paid by the court’. In addition to the landed aristocracy, Munich’s patricians acquired estates in the vicinity of Munich. By 1469, almost all of the established patrician families except for the Rudolf owned estates in the country around Munich. Successful merchants like the Barth, Gollier, Pötschner, Ridler, Schrenck, Sendlinger and Tulbeck joined the landed class with the acquisition of rural Hofmarken and thus obtained a status that is comparable to that of
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the gentry or aristocrats. Thereby these patricians fulfilled a condition that allowed them to serve in the ducal administration.\textsuperscript{999}

Sigmund and Albrecht IV’s strategies of manifesting their sovereignty in their territory could only be realised by rulers and aristocrats who had the actual power to do so. For example, the ducal order of the preservation of forests and game only became possible when the authority of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich enabled their enforcement and execution.\textsuperscript{1000} Hence these decrees and the ducal patronage in the country around Munich accompanied the increasing consolidation of the territorial sovereignty of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich in the second half of the fifteenth century. According to Hans Lange, next to the Electorate of Saxony, the Duchy of Bavaria was the most consolidated and developed early modern territorial state in the Holy Roman Empire in the late fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{1001}

This strengthening of the central ducal government is reflected in the administrative structures that created a ‘cultural landscape’, for instance, in the region south-west of Munich along the River Würm. (Plate 1 and Plate 2) The Hofmarken were planned from the beginning as country estates or local centres of the ducal administration as well as regional courts of justice.\textsuperscript{1002} The Wittelsbach dukes established the centralised regional administration for the development of these regions and the execution as well as enforcement of their government on a local level. The judges of these regions were paid by the court and thus acted according to the dukes of Bavaria-Munich’s intentions.\textsuperscript{1003}

The dukes of Bavaria-Munich encouraged the creation of these Hofmarken and the erection of palaces from the fifteenth century to develop this part of their territory into more suitable regions for leisure pursuits like hunting parties and boat trips. Hence most of the estates along the River Würm and around the Würmsee (now Starnberger See) belonged to members of the ducal household or their court officials. (Plate 1 and Plate 2) For instance, Albrecht IV conferred the Königswiesen Estate near Gauting and the forests of Weyerbuchet, Holzen as well as Schachen on loan to Hans Weiler and in 1502 to Erhard Perfaller for Perfaller’s son Benedikt. In 1507, Duke Wolfgang, the younger brother of Sigmund and Albrecht IV, acquired it to build a hunting lodge or palace there.\textsuperscript{1004} From the 1480s or 1490s, Albrecht IV, Kunigunde of Austria and the court began to temporarily reside in Starnberg Palace for a couple of weeks each year. Albrecht IV carried out his government business from this interim residence. Albrecht IV, Sigmund and Wolfgang used Starnberg palace as a starting point for hunting and pilgrimages to Andechs where their father and older brother were buried. Sources also indicate that the boats of the ducal court lay at anchor in the lake and that there were several boathouses near the castle. They were used for the hunting of birds like herons.\textsuperscript{1005} The ducal court may have spent the ‘summer holidays’ in this palace that
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overlooked the Würmsee and provided scenic prospects of the Alpine chain in the distance. Duke William IV continued this tradition by spending most of the summer with his court in Starnberg.

The Würmsee and the area around Blutenburg Palace continue to be used for the leisure pursuits of the court of the dukes and later electors of Bavaria in subsequent decades and centuries. Blutenburg Palace served the ducal court as a hunting lodge and pleasure palace in the sixteenth century. Elector Maximilian I occasionally used it as his summer residence.\textsuperscript{1006}

\textsuperscript{1006} Störmer, 'Die oberbayerischen Residenzen'. p. 18
Conclusion

The dynastic and cultural policies of Sigmund and Albrecht IV aimed at elevating the status of the Wittelsbach dynasty in the aristocratic hierarchy of the Holy Roman Empire. They accentuated the cult of their prominent forefather Louis the Bavarian and strove for the recovery of the Holy Roman Emperor’s office for the House of Bavaria. Sigmund and Albrecht IV’s political agenda was complemented and substantiated by their artistic, architectural and literary commissions, their lifestyle and court culture.

In the second half of the fifteenth century, the Dukes of Bavaria-Munich staged their princely splendour with means like large entourages, splendid garments, jewellery, banquets, court festivities, tournaments, music, exotic animals, ‘zoological collections’, and genealogical murals. For example, Sigmund commissioned a deer park and menagerie at Grünwald Castle, which must have provided interesting showpieces for beholders from the ducal apartments. Only the wealthiest patrons could afford this lifestyle. It distinguished them from the aristocrats, noblemen and patricians in their territory.

The religious motivation of the aristocrats’ interest in foreign places like the sites of biblical events was supplemented by a genuine curiosity in strange cultures and lands. Erudition became a priced quality of princes from the middle of the fifteenth century. Duke Sigmund presented himself as a learned patron with the memorial plaque’s Latin elegy outside the dukes’ portal of the Church of Our Lady and portraits. He enjoyed hunting but it seems that he did not like to participate in jousts. Duke Albrecht IV had to resort to additional means like jousting to demonstrate his authority to his subjects for aristocrats, noblemen and patricians highly regarded these skills. Events like the wedding of Duke George of Bavaria-Landshut with Jadwiga Jagiellon of Poland provided a platform for conveying these skills that were expected for a ruler to a broad public. Additionally, Albrecht IV employed other media to disseminate this aspect of his court culture. He commissioned Matthäus Zasinger to produce an engraving of a tourney on Munich’s market square; Ulrich Füetner wrote the *Buch der Abenteuer* for Albrecht IV; and Grünwald Castle’s historicising architectural disposition alludes to a golden age of chivalry.

Sigmund introduced ‘novel’ artistic and architectural developments to the culture of the ducal court in Munich. He might have encountered some of them like the wall of armorial bearings on the exterior of the palace chapel of St George in Wiener Neustadt at the imperial court of Frederick III in Vienna during his youth. He was the first Bavarian duke to display the dukes of Bavaria-Munich’s descent in a public, secular sphere and on a grand scale by commemorating his ancestors and the dynasty’s kinship with the genealogical decorations of the Alte Hof’s interiors and exteriors, the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace as well as the Church of St Wolfgang in Pipping. This notion was adopted by Albrecht IV and translated into a potent, individual genealogical narrative with Ulrich Füetner’s *Bairische Chronik*. The venerable history of Munich and the
Wittelsbach dynasty was expressed with the historicising architecture of the Church of Our Lady that housed the ducal sepulchre where Emperor Louis the Bavarian and other members of the Wittelsbach dynasty had been buried. The interest in the Wittelsbach dynasty’s genealogy and in the history of the Duchy of Bavaria was not a nostalgic longing for a past golden age. It was a means to legitimate and achieve present as well as future political objectives.

The Church of Our Lady’s bulbous domes, which must have been envisaged circa 1490, not only marked the church as a site of the Holy Cross relics by making an appropriate reference to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre’s architecture; they also denoted the building as shrine of the Wittelsbachs’ dynastic sepulchre. The legitimation of the dukes’ authority by basing it on historic precedents cannot completely explain the interest in historicising, ‘exotic’ motifs. A curiosity in foreign and strange objects is another aspect that encouraged the adoption of these historicising motifs in architecture and works of art, especially when they were derived from the sacred sites in the Near East. For example, the foreword of Matthäus Prätzl’s collection of pilgrimage reports is inspired by Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics* (*Ethica ad Nicomachum*), which was part of Sigmund and Albrecht IV’s education. The preface states that man has an inherent curiosity for new and foreign things, because information on the strange has a positive effect on man. These tidings make man lively, dispel his severity and heighten his love of life. All of the wondrous, marvellous things in water and on land, the foreign countries and people that were described by the authors of the travel accounts in Prätzl’s collection are testimonials of the Lord’s magnificence and omnipotence. Prätzl’s statement illustrates the inquisitiveness of members of the ducal court in Munich in the second half of the fifteenth century. It complements the political symbolism and indicates that members of the ducal court, aristocrats as well as patricians were bonded by a specific shared knowledge and common values. These common values and shared history of the dukes of Bavaria-Munich and the burghers of their princely seat provided a communal identity. For instance, in the second half of the fifteenth century, most people in Munich were still familiar with the Romanesque Church of Our Lady’s architecture. Thus they were able to interpret the historicising symbolism of the Late Gothic building’s architectural detailing and disposition. This is but one example since the dukes deployed diverse sources, ranging from Christian antiquity to the Romanesque and Gothic, for the symbolism of their artistic and architectural patronage.

The prominent display of conspicuous, characteristic emblematic motifs like the lozenge pattern—and to a lesser extent the creation of a distinct skyline with trademark-like buildings—was promoted by the fragmented political topography of the Holy Roman Empire in the fifteenth century that encouraged competition between the numerous small principalities, imperial free towns and other territories. This condition encouraged rulers and governing bodies to develop strategies to distinguish themselves and their territories from one another. This notion coincided with the conceptual convergence of the Wittelsbach dynasty and the Duchy of Bavaria, the development of an early modern territorial state as well as the expansion of the dukes’ authority throughout their territory with artistic and architectural manifestations of their presence.
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1007 Mentioned and transcribed in Herz, *Die 'Reise ins Gelobte Land'* , p. 258
The perception of the country and the landscape outside the ducal palaces, expressed through the concept of the ruler’s omnipotent vision with poly-focal panoramic views in architecture, paintings and the graphic arts, was a symbol for the sovereign’s ‘absolute’ claim to power. The aristocrats were physically and visually removed from the level of their subjects with these exalted vantage points. The taste for panoramic views from elevated positions was also prompted by aesthetic considerations and in the Duchy of Bavaria may have been related to the hunting houses built for the dukes’ hunting pursuits.

Sigmund and Albrecht IV expressed ‘novel’ concepts in their artistic and architectural patronage. They introduced some of these notions into the Duchy of Bavaria where they had not realised in this form before. The ducal projects were not at the vanguard of new developments of princely patronage. Concepts like the architectural staging of viewpoints had emerged in the sphere of the Royal court in Paris in the second half of the fourteenth century and was developed by the Saxonian electors in projects like the extension of the Albrechtsburg in Meissen. More importantly, the dukes understood to translate these concepts into characteristic schemes that related specifically to their political agenda and distinguished them from other comparable projects (i.e. genealogical decorations and dynastic sepulchres). In addition to the successful communication of their discrete objectives, they had to consider the experiences and knowledge of the audience that they addressed to effectively convey their intentions and programmatic statements. For example, the heraldic schemes on the exteriors of the Alte Hof’s Burgstock and the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace convey a less complex programme than the stained glass windows’ armorial bearings in Blutenburg Palace Chapel as well as the genealogical mural in the Alte Hof’s Zwingerstock. This demonstrates an awareness of the different audiences that the Dukes of Bavaria-Munich wished to address.

The Wittelsbach dynasty’s history, Sigmund and Albrecht’s descent, artistic and architectural patronage as well as aristocratic lifestyle impressed peers like Andrea de Franceschi and Hans von Mergenthal. The accounts of Veit Arnpeck, Ulrich Füetrer and Hartmann Schedel praise the dukes, their court and Munich. Especially the inclusion of a description of Munich in Schedel’s Liber Chronicarum indicates the success of their ‘propaganda’, which focussed on the promotion of the cult of Emperor Louis the Bavarian. It was the ingenious feat of Sigmund and Albrecht IV, who exploited the reputation of their most prominent progenitor and his burial in the Church of Our Lady’s choir, which placed them at an advantage over the other branches of the Wittelsbach dynasty. The description of Munich in Schedel’s Liber Chronicarum specifically mentions it and presents it almost like a pilgrimage site. These accounts disseminated their ‘propaganda’ and a commendatory impression of the Dukes of Bavaria-Munich as well as their princely seat.

Sigmund and Albrecht IV not only based their authority on historic precedent, they learned from the past, which provided the objectives of their political agenda. Thereby they crafted the foundation for the reunification and rise of the Duchy of Bavaria in the sixteenth century, which they could not anticipate in the fifteenth century. However, the Dukes of Bavaria-Munich benefitted from their ‘propagandist’ groundwork, genealogical legitimation and dynastic relations with the Habsburgs during Emperor
Maximilian I’s arbitration at the imperial diet in Cologne (Kölner Spruch) of 30th July 1505 that resulted in the reunification of Upper and Lower Bavaria.

The success of Sigmund and Albrecht IV’s political agenda and the artistic and architectural means to display it is reflected in the continuation of these strategies by Albrecht IV’s descendants. In a document of 12th June 1523, William IV and Louis X acknowledged Albrecht IV’s primogeniture degree that was meant to prevent future partitions of the duchy and strengthen his dynasty’s position in the Holy Roman Empire with the territorial unity. William IV, like Albrecht IV and Sigmund, believed that his dynasty should assume the imperial throne for the Wittelsbach dynasty, stemming from the Carolingian and Agilolfing dynasties, because it was much older and nobler than the House of Habsburg, which produced the Holy Roman Emperors in the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. He had also internalized the genealogical strategies of his progenitors. William IV and Jakobäa of Baden named their first son Theodo after the legendary ancestor of the Wittelsbachs who is depicted in the genealogical murals of the Alte Hof. Moreover, Louis X commissioned murals for the Kapellengang of his urban palace in Landshut, which depict a selection of his ancestors.

The Isar tower of Louis X’s urban residence, the Rundstubenbau and the pavilion in the court garden, both built during William IV’s renovation and expansion campaigns of the Neuenste, as well as the exceptional large windows of the south-western wing’s hall in Dachau Castle, built for William IV and Albrecht V provided poly-focal perspectives into the surrounding environment. These views became a typical feature of the princely state palaces from the late fifteenth century for their emblematic quality. This architectural element had been realised by Sigmund in the Alte Hof and is documented in Matthäus Zasinger’s Court Ball, produced for Albrecht IV. Louis X and William IV continued to appreciate these outlooks for their symbolic and aesthetic qualities.

Louis X and William IV continued their progenitors’ notion of demarcating their territories, especially the regions that they had gained through the Kölner Spruch, with armorial bearings, memorial plaques, portraits, foundations and buildings. For example, the predella of Hans Wertinger’s altarpiece for St Kastulus in Moosburg depicts Dukes Wolfgang, William IV and Louis X as the altarpiece’s donors and features the combined coats-of-arms of Bavaria and the Palatinate of the Rhine. Likewise, the stained glass window (1511) for the Heiliggeistspitalkirche in Landshut incorporates the armorial bearing of the Dukes of Bavaria and Counts Palatine of the Rhine.

The white-and-blue lozenge pattern continued to be applied in a trademark-like manner like on the two poles of God’s throne on the winged high altarpiece’s central panel and the pattern of the vaults in the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace as well as the exterior of the Alte Hof’s Burgstock. For instance, the northern staircase’s ceiling in Louis X’s urban palace in Landshut features a sixteenth-century stucco version of this lozenge pattern. The white and blue colour scheme of the tapestries that accompanied the heraldic decorations of the south-western wing’s ballroom in Dachau Palace were commissioned by Albrecht V in the 1560s and alluded to the colours of the Bavarian dukes’ coat-of-arms.

---
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**Plate 1** Philipp Apian, *Bairische Landtaffen* (collage of plate 13, 14, 17, 18), woodcuts by Jost Amman, 1568 (Source: Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München (Shelfmark: Hbks F 15 b))

This plate has been removed as a consequence of copyright restrictions.

**Plate 2** Detail from Philipp Apian, *Bairische Landtaffen* (collage of plate 13, 14, 17, 18), woodcuts by Jost Amman, 1568 (Source: Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München (Shelfmark: Hbks F 15 b))
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**Plate 3** The territorial possessions of the Habsburg, Luxemburg and Wittelsbach dynasties between 1273 and 1378 (Source: http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bild:HRR_14Jh.jpg, last accessed: 2nd March 2007)
Plate 4 The territories of the Duchies of Bavaria-Munich, Bavaria-Landshut, Bavaria-Ingolstadt and Bavaria-Straubing after the territorial partition of 1392 (Source: information DVD of the exhibition 'Von Kaisers Gnaden. 500 Jahre Pfalz-Neuburg', Haus der Bayerischen Geschichte, Augsburg, 2005)

Plate 5 The territories of the Duchies of Bavaria-Landshut, Bavaria-Munich and Bavaria-Ingolstadt, aristocrats, imperial free towns, the Habsburg dynasty and ecclesiastic rulers in Bavaria around 1450 (Source: ZIEGLER, WALTER, 'Europäische Verbindungen der Landshuter Herzöge im 14. und 15. Jahrhundert', in Franz Niehoff (ed.), Vor Leinberger. Landshuter Skulptur im Zeitalter der Reichen Herzöge (1; Landshut: Museen der Stadt Landshut, 2001), 27-50, p. 29)
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Plate 6: The territories of the Duchies of Bavaria-Munich and Bavaria-Landshut as well as those of the Counts Palatine of the Rhine before the Landshut War of Inheritance
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Plate 7  Woodcut of Munich from Hartmann Schedel’s Liber Chronicarum (1493) (Source: BÖS, WERNER, Gotik in Oberbayern (Munich: Süddeutscher Verlag, 1992), p. 28)

This depiction of Munich was probably created by Michael Wolgemut who had lived in Munich before moving to Nuremberg. It shows from left to right: the Church of St Jacob am Anger, St Peter’s, the town hall’s tower, the Church of Our Lady with its incomplete towers, the Alte Hof with the Burgstock’s imposing gate tower, the church of the Franciscans’ friary adjacent to the ducal residence, and the Neuveste, the moated ducal castle at the fringes of the town. The Isartor is depicted in the centre of this scene as part of Munich’s impressive fortifications with its two ring walls and more than one hundred towers.
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Plate 8  A sixteenth-century depiction of Munich in the Stadtmuseum of Munich (Source: NOHBAUER, HANS F., München (2nd edn.; Munich: Hirmer, 2003), p. 20)

According to the information, provided by Dr Thomas Weidner of the Münchner Stadtmuseum, it is a watercolour copy of a painting (Inv. Nr. Z(B1)84 of the Münchner Stadtmuseum, 17 by 27 cm, signed ‘H.S.’) that formed part of a cycle of St Benno’s life in the Chapel of St Benno in the Church of Our Lady.
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Plate 10  Hans Sebald Beham, *Die Firstlich Statt München*, woodcut, printed by Nikolaus Meldemann (1530)  
(Source: Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München (Shelfmark: Mapp. XI, 439))

Plate 11  Detail from Hans Sebald Beham, *Die Firstlich Statt München* (Townscape of Munich with the Arrival and Entry of Emperor Charles V), woodcut, printed by Nikolaus Meldemann (1530) (Source: Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München (Shelfmark: Mapp. XI, 439))


This plate has been removed as a consequence of copyright restrictions.


This plate has been removed as a consequence of copyright restrictions.

Plate 16  Detailed view of Jakob Sandtner’s Wooden architectural model of Munich (1570) with the Alte Hof (Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, Munich)

Plate 17  The Alte Hof in Munich as seen from the tower of the Church of St Peter’s
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Plate 18   Layout of the Alte Hof (Source: BURMEISTER, ENNO, Die baugeschichtliche Entwicklung des Alten Hofes in München (Munich: Buchendorfer Verlag, 1999), p. 11)
Plate 19  The gate tower of the Burgstock from the south, Alter Hof, Munich
Plate 20  The coats-of-arms on the south side of the Burgstock’s gate tower, Alter Hof, Munich

Plate 21  The coats-of-arms on the courtyard side of the Burgstock’s gate tower, Alter Hof, Munich
Plate 22 Burgstock, Zwingerstock and the courtyard of the Alte Hof, Munich
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Plate 23 C. A. Lebschée, The courtyard and southern wing (Burgstock) of the Alte Hof, sepia watercolour (1869/70) (Source: NÖHBAUER, HANS F., München (2nd edn.; Munich: Hirmer, 2003), p. 15)
The Burgstock’s courtyard façade, Alter Hof, Munich
Plate 25  The coats-of-arms on the Burgstock’s oriel, Alter Hof, Munich
Plate 26  The coats-of-arms on the Burgstock’s oriel, Alter Hof, Munich

Plate 28  Wilhelm Rehlen, *Interior of the Chapel of St Laurence at the Alte Hof*, watercolour drawing (1816) (Source: BURMEISTER, ENNO, *Die baugeschichtliche Entwicklung des Alten Hofes in München* (Munich: Buchendorfer Verlag, 1999), p. 27)
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Plate 29  Relief from the Chapel of St Laurence showing two angels with the combined coat-of-arms of the Dukes of Bavaria and the Counts Palatine of the Rhine (c. 1324), sandstone with traces of the original polychromy. (Original location: above the main portal of the Chapel of St Laurence in the Alte Hof, Munich; current location: Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, Munich)

Plate 30  Margaret of Holland and Emperor Louis the Bavarian present the Chapel of St Laurence to the Virgin Mary and Christ Child (c. 1324), sandstone with traces of the original polychromy. (Original location: Alte Hof, Munich; Current location: Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, Munich)
Plate 31  Keystones with the coat-of-arms of the Counts of Hainaut (left side) and the imperial eagle (right side) from the Chapel of St Laurence (c. 1324), sandstone. (Original location: Alte Hof, Munich; Current location: Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, Munich)

Plate 32  Three saints from choir of the Chapel of St Laurence: a saint with missing attributes (probably St Joseph) and two of the Three Kings (Balthasar and Melchior) (c. 1324), sandstone. (Original location: Alte Hof, Munich; Current location: Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, Munich)
Plate 33  Fragment of the genealogical mural from a hall in the Alte Hof's Zwingerstock, Munich (c. 1363-1365). (Current location: Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, Munich)

The first photograph shows the fragment as it is exhibited in the Bayerisches Nationalmuseum today. The photo below it, recreates the correct chronological order of the real and legendary ancestors of the Wittelsbach dukes as they were originally shown in the Alte Hof.
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Plate 34  Footprint of the Alte Hof and detailed view of the south-western corner of Zwingerstock and Burgstock (Source: BURMEISTER, ENNO, Die baugeschichtliche Entwicklung des Alten Hofes in München (Munich: Buchendorfer Verlag, 1999), p. 53 & 137)
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From left to right: Reconciliation of Dukes Bavarus and Norix at the inception of the Bavarian dukes’ ‘reign’ in the Bavarian lands; the three brothers Boamundus, Ingraminus and Adelgerus.
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From left to right: Agilolfings: Duke Theodo (Duke Theodo of Bavaria ?, before 665-c. 716), King Garibald (possibly Duke Garibald I of Bavaria, 540-591), King Tassilo I of Bavaria (560-610), ‘Theodo the Pious’ (possibly the son of Duke Tassilo III of Bavaria, who became a monk); Arnulfings: Bishop Arnulf of Metz (582-640) as the progenitor of Charlemagne and the Bavarian princes, Angisus (probably Ansegisel (c. 602 -679), the son of Bishop Arnulf of Metz), and ‘Grossus Pipinus’ (possibly Pippin II or Pippin of Herstal (635/40-714), son of Ansegisel and father of Charles Martel).
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From left to right: Carolingians: Charlemagne (742-/47-814) as the central figure of the genealogical cycle’s first part; Charles Martel (686-741) is associated with Charlemagne here; Carloman (probably either the son of Charles Martel or the brother of Charlemagne); Otharius (described as the founder of the Benedictine Abbey Tegernsee); Agilolfings: Tassilo III (748-787); Carolingians: Emperor Louis I the Pious (814-840, son of Charlemagne); Carloman, King of Bavaria (830-880).
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From left to right: Carolingians: Emperor Arnulf or rather Arnulf of Carinthia (850-899, son of King Carloman of Bavaria); Otto, King of Hungary and Duke of Bavaria (Duke Otto III of Bavaria ?, 1261-1312); Ottonians: Emperor Otto I the Great (912-973), Emperor Otto II (955-983, son of Emperor Otto I), Emperor Otto III (980-1002, son of Emperor Otto II), Emperor Henry II the Holy (972-1024, son of Duke Henry II the Quarrelsome of Bavaria); Duke Ernst (?).
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From left to right: Carolingians: Emperor Lothar I (795-855), Pippin I, King of Aquitaine (823-864), Louis II the German (804-876); Luitpolding dynasty: Arnulf (the Evil), Duke of Bavaria (reg. 907-937); Salians: King Conrad II (possibly Duke Conrad II of Bavaria (1052-1055), the son of Emperor Henry III), Emperor Henry III (1017-1056), Emperor Henry IV (1050-1106, Henry VIII as Duke of Bavaria), Emperor Henry V (1086-1125).
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Plate 40  Manuscript copy of the genealogical mural in a hall of the Alte Hof’s Zwingerstock (c. 1470/80), watercolour on paper, Cabinet des Estamps, Bibliothèque National Paris (Source: BÄUMLER, SUZANNE, BROCKHOFF, EVAMARIA, and HENKER, MICHAEL (eds.), Von Kaisers Gnaden. 500 Jahre Pfalz-Neuburg (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 2005), p. 57)
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Plate 41  Manuscript copy of the genealogical mural in a hall of the Alte Hof’s Zwingerstock (c. 1470/80),
watercolour on paper, Cabinet des Estamps, Bibliothèque National Paris (Source: BÄUMLER, SUZANNE,
BROCKHOFF, EVAMARIA, and HENKER, MICHAEL (eds.), Von Kaisers Gnaden. 500 Jahre Pfalz-Neuburg
(Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 2005), p. 58)

From left to right: Duke William I of Bavaria-Straubing (1330-1389); Duke Louis VI
the Roman (1328-1365); Otto der Kühne (Duke Otto V of Bavaria, 1346-1379); King
Christopher III of Denmark (Christoph von Neumarkt, 1416-1448); King Rupert
(Ruprecht III, Count Palatine of the Rhine, 1352-1410); Duke Stephen III of Bavaria-
Ingolstadt (1337-1413); Duke Frederick of Bavaria-Landshut (1339-1393); Duke John
II of Bavaria-Munich (1341-1397); Duke Louis VII of Bavaria-Ingolstadt (1365-1447).
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Plate 42  Manuscript copy of the genealogical mural in a hall of the Alte Hof’s Zwingerstock (c. 1470/80),
watercolour on paper, Cabinet des Estamps, Bibliothèque National Paris (Source: BÄUMLER, SUZANNE,
BROCKHOFF, EVAMARIA, and HENKER, MICHAEL (eds.), Von Kaisers Gnaden. 500 Jahre Pfalz-Neuburg
(Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 2005), p. 59)

From left to right: Duke Ernst of Bavaria-Munich (1373-1438); Duke William III of
Bavaria-Munich (1375-1435); Duke Henry (possibly Henry II, Duke of Bavaria, Count
Palatine of the Rhine and Duke of Austria, or Duke Henry XV of Bavaria); Duke
Albrecht III of Bavaria-Munich (1401-1460); Duke Louis VIII the Hunchback of
Bavaria-Ingolstadt (1403-1445); Duke Henry XVI the Rich of Bavaria-Landshut (1386-
1450); Duke Louis IX the Rich of Bavaria-Landshut (1417-1479); Duke John IV of
Bavaria-Munich (1437-1463); Duke Sigmund of Bavaria-Munich (1439-1501).
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Plate 43  Coats-of-arms, watercolour on paper (16th century), Folio I verso, HS 367, Abteilung III, Geheimes Hausarchiv, Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Munich
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Plate 44  Reconciliation of Bavarus and Norix, watercolour on paper (16th century), Folio I recto, HS 367, Abteilung III, Geheimes Hausarchiv, Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Munich
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Plate 45  Garibaldus and Theodo, watercolour on paper (16th century), Folio IV recto, HS 367, Abteilung III, Geheimes Hausarchiv, Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Munich
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Plate 46  Duke Otillo (probably Duke Odilo of Bavaria, died 748, father of Tassilo III), watercolour on paper (16th century), Folio 9 recto, HS 367, Abteilung III, Geheimes Hausarchiv, Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Munich
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Plate 47  Coats-of-arms, watercolour on paper (16th century), Folio 17 verso, HS 367, Abteilung III, Geheimes Hausarchiv, Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Munich
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Plate 48  Charlemagne and King Louis, watercolour on paper (16th century), Folio 18 recto, HS 367, Abteilung III, Geheimes Hausarchiv, Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Munich
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Plate 49  Albrecht von Pfalz-Mosbach (Bishop of Strasbourg, 1440-1506) and Duke John IV of Bavaria-Munich, watercolour on paper (16th century), Folio 38 recto, HS 367, Abteilung III, Geheimes Hausarchiv, Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Munich
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Plate 50  Duke Sigmund of Bavaria-Munich and Duke Albrecht IV of Bavaria-Munich (1447-1508), watercolour on paper (16th century), Folio 39 recto, HS 367, Abteilung III, Geheimes Hausarchiv, Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Munich
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Plate 51 Duke Christoph of Bavaria-Munich (1449-1493) and Duke Wolfgang of Bavaria-Munich (1451-1514), watercolour on paper (16th century), Folio 40 recto, HS 367, Abteilung III, Geheimes Hausarchiv, Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Munich
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Plate 52 Duke George the Rich of Bavaria-Landshut (1455-1503), watercolour on paper (16th century), Folio 41 recto, HS 367, Abteilung III, Geheimes Hausarchiv, Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Munich

This plate has been removed as a consequence of copyright restrictions.
## Genealogical table of the House of Wittelsbach

### Plate 53

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reign</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>County/Province</th>
<th>Reign Dates</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Otto I, Duke of Bavaria</strong>&lt;br&gt;(1007–1039)</td>
<td>Otto</td>
<td>Hermann</td>
<td>Ariane</td>
<td>Bavaria</td>
<td>1007–1039</td>
<td>(b. 1000, d. 1039)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elisabeth</strong>&lt;br&gt;(1036–1047)</td>
<td>Bruno</td>
<td>Hermann</td>
<td>Ariane</td>
<td>Bavaria</td>
<td>1036–1047</td>
<td>(b. 1031, d. 1047)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Louis II, Duke of Upper Bavaria</strong>&lt;br&gt;(1052–1089)</td>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>Bruno</td>
<td>Elisabeth</td>
<td>Bavaria</td>
<td>1052–1089</td>
<td>(b. 1040, d. 1089)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Henry XI, Duke of Lower Bavaria</strong>&lt;br&gt;(1069–1089)</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Bruno</td>
<td>Elisabeth</td>
<td>Bavaria</td>
<td>1069–1089</td>
<td>(b. 1045, d. 1089)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elisabeth</strong>&lt;br&gt;(1089–1097)</td>
<td>Bruno</td>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>Elisabeth</td>
<td>Bavaria</td>
<td>1089–1097</td>
<td>(b. 1084, d. 1097)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Louis III, Duke of Bavaria</strong>&lt;br&gt;(1097–1125)</td>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Elisabeth</td>
<td>Bavaria</td>
<td>1097–1125</td>
<td>(b. 1092, d. 1125)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Henry XII, Duke of Lower Bavaria</strong>&lt;br&gt;(1105–1125)</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>Elisabeth</td>
<td>Bavaria</td>
<td>1105–1125</td>
<td>(b. 1100, d. 1125)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elisabeth</strong>&lt;br&gt;(1125–1141)</td>
<td>Bruno</td>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>Elisabeth</td>
<td>Bavaria</td>
<td>1125–1141</td>
<td>(b. 1121, d. 1141)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Footnotes:
- *[Note]*: Additional notes regarding the reigns and family relationships.
- *[Date]*: Exact dates of reigns and events.
- *[Source]*: Primary sources for historical data.

---

For a more detailed genealogical chart, refer to the original document.
Plate 54 Reconstruction of the Neuveste’s architectural disposition circa 1460 (Source: MEITINGER, OTTO, Die baugeschichtliche Entwicklung der Neuveste. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Münchner Residenz (Oberbayerisches Archiv, 92; Munich: Verlag des Historischen Vereins von Oberbayern, 1970), p. 69)

Plate 55 Reconstruction of the Neuveste’s architectural disposition circa 1500 (Source: MEITINGER, OTTO, Die baugeschichtliche Entwicklung der Neuveste. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Münchner Residenz (Oberbayerisches Archiv, 92; Munich: Verlag des Historischen Vereins von Oberbayern, 1970), p. 73)

Plate 56 Reconstruction of the Neuveste’s architectural disposition circa 1540 (Source: MEITINGER, OTTO, Die baugeschichtliche Entwicklung der Neuveste. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Münchner Residenz (Oberbayerisches Archiv, 92; Munich: Verlag des Historischen Vereins von Oberbayern, 1970), p. 77)
Plate 57  Detailed view of Jakob Sandtner’s *Wooden architectural model of Munich* (1570) with the Church of Our Lady (Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, Munich)


This plate has been removed as a consequence of copyright restrictions.
Plate 59  The west front of the Church of Our Lady, Munich
Plate 60  The Church of Our Lady in Munich as seen from the tower of the Church of St Peter’s

Plate 61  Detailed view of the Church of Our Lady’s south-eastern façade showing the transition from nave to ambulatory
Plate 62  The Church of Our Lady’s east end with the ambulatory
Plate 64  Commemoration plaque of the laying of the foundation stone, flanking the Dukes’ Portal on the western side, The Church of Our Lady, Munich
Commemoration plaque of Duke Sigmund of Bavaria-Munich, flanking the Dukes' Portal on the eastern side, The Church of Our Lady, Munich

Plate 65
The Altar of the Holy Cross (Kreuzaltar) was the most prominent altar in the Church of Our Lady. It stood at the threshold of the choir and blocked the worshippers’ view of the choir and high altar, when looking along the nave from west toward the church’s eastern end. The flag, attached to one of the piers and seen on the right-hand side of the Kreuzaltar, marked the site of the Wittelsbach dynasty’s tomb.
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The etching shows the bride and groom as well as the guests in front of the Holy Cross altar at the threshold to the Church of Our Lady’s choir. Through the gate on the right-hand side of the Holy Cross altar the tomb of Emperor Louis the Bavarian, which was created by Hans Haldner for Duke Albrecht IV in 1480/90, is visible in front of the high altar.
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The Church of Our Lady’s choir was lavishly decorated with expensive cloths for the wedding of Duke William V with Renata of Lorraine. The tomb of Louis the Bavarian in the choir’s centre is covered with orange cloths. Above it hangs the chandelier, commissioned by Duke Albrecht IV, with a sculpture of the Virgin Mary and Christ Child as well as the angels, that are carrying the imperial crown and the Bavarian dukes’ coat-of-arms. The flag with the coat-of-arms of the Bavarian dukes on the right side of the choir is another marker of the emperor’s tomb and, thus, the dynasty’s burial site.
Plate 71  Cast of the top plate of Louis the Bavarian’s tomb in the Church of Our Lady, Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, Munich
Plate 73  Holy Sepulchre monument (1506), Church of St Anne, Augsburg
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Plate 74  Detail from the townscape of Jerusalem from Bernhard von Breydenbach’s ‘Peregrinatio in terram sanctam’, woodcut by Erhard Reuwich (1486), p. v1b/v2a, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich (Source: http://mdz.bib-bvb.de/digbib/inkunabeln/inkill/@ebtraster;cs=default;ts=default;pt=16348;lang=de?filename=b_911_4_21.jpg;window=new, last accessed: 2nd March 2007)

Plate 75  The Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, from Bernhard von Breydenbach’s ‘Peregrinatio in terram sanctam’, woodcut by Erhard Reuwich (1486), p. i7a, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich (Source: http://mdz10.bib-bvb.de/~db/0002/bsb00026461/images/150/bsb00026461_00062.jpg; last accessed: 2nd March 2007)

Plate 76  Townscape of Jerusalem from Konrad Grünemberg’s pilgrimage report Pilgerfahrt ins Heilige Land (1486), manuscript copy, ink on paper. (Source: BÄUMLER, SUZANNE, BROCKHOFF, EVAMARIA, and HENKER, MICHAEL (eds.), Von Kaisers Gnaden. 500 Jahre Pfalz-Neuburg (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 2005), p. 171)
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Plate 78   View of Eichstätt in Count Palatine Ottheinrich’s travel album (1537), watercolour, Universitätsbibliothek Würzburg, shelfmark: Delin VI, 3
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Plate 79   Map of Ettal Abbey and its surroundings (1513), ink on paper, Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Munich
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Plate 81  Ettal Abbey from Philipp Apian’s estate (1554-c. 1585), Cgm 5379(3, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich
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Plate 82  Shrine of the former Holy Cross altar, Catholic Pilgrimage Church of St Wolfgang near Haag (c. 1484/90) (Source: Niehoff, Franz (ed.), Vor Leinberger. Landshuter Skulptur im Zeitalter der Reichen Herzöge 2 vols. (1; Landshut: Museen der Stadt Landshut, 2001), p. 96)
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Plate 83  Hans Schöpfer the Elder (c. 1505-1569), Susanna in the Bath and the Stoning of the Elders (1537), Alte Pinakothek, Munich, © Blauel/Gnamm - Artothek
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Plate 84  Detail of Plate 83
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Plate 85 Antonio Zanchi, Design for a painting to commemorate the foundation of the Theatinerkirche in Munich by Elector Ferdinand Maria and his wife Henriette Adelaide in grateful recognition of the birth of the heir apparent Max Emanuel (1673), Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlung, © Blauel/Gnamm – Artothek
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Plate 86 Room No. 30 with a wooden model of Schleißheim Palace (1725), a portrait of Electoral Princess Maria Antonia of Bavaria with Elector Joseph Ferdinand (18th century), and a equestrian portrait of Elector Maximilian II Emanuel (c. 1672), Neues Schloss Schleißheim (Source: DG013322, Bayerische Verwaltung der staatlichen Schlösser, Gärten und Seen, Munich)
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Plate 87 Detail of Plate 86 showing the equestrian portrait of Elector Maximilian II Emanuel (c. 1672)
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Plate 89 Drawing of Blutenburg Palace based on Hans Thonauer the Elder’s fresco in the Antiquarium of the Residenz in Munich (Source: MUSEUMS-PÄDAGOGISCHES ZENTRUM, VOGT, MANFRED, and HILLE, CARMEN (eds.), Blutenburg. Ein Rundgang auf dem Schloß der Wittelsbacher und in Münchner Museen (Munich: Museums-Pädagogisches Zentrum, 1985), p. 20)

Plate 90 Blutenburg Palace from the south-east
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Plate 94  The gate tower’s courtyard side with the coats-of-arms of Brunswick and Bavaria-Palatinate, Blutenburg Palace, Munich
Plate 95  The Chapel of Blutenburg Palace from the north

Plate 96  Detail of the painted tracery frieze on the northern façade of the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace with the coats-of-arms of the Duchy of Brunswick, the Dukes of Bavaria and Counts Palatine of the Rhine, and the House of Habsburg, Austria (from left to right)
Plate 97  The southern façade of the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace, Munich

Plate 98  The coats-of-arms in the painted tracery frieze of the southern façade of the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace illustrate the marriage bonds of Duke Sigmund’s past and present relatives with other aristocratic houses.
Plate 99  Southern portal of the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace with reproductions of the original murals showing Adam and Eve as well as St Onuphrius
Plate 100  Southern portal of the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace with murals of Adam and Eve as well as St Onuphrius, condition prior to renovation work (Bayerische Verwaltung der staatlichen Schlösser, Gärten und Seen, Munich)

Plate 101  The Magi, mural on the southern façade of the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace (Source: Bayerische Verwaltung der staatlichen Schlösser, Gärten und Seen, Munich)

Plate 102  The Holy Family, mural on the southern façade of the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace (Source: Bayerische Verwaltung der staatlichen Schlösser, Gärten und Seen, Munich)
Plate 103  The interior of the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace, Munich
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Plate 104  The interior of the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace, Munich (Source: DG012494, Bayerische Verwaltung der staatlichen Schlösser, Gärten und Seen, Munich)
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Plate 105  Jan Polack’s workshop, St Sigismund and St Bartholomew with Duke Sigmund of Bavaria-Munich, exterior panels of the high altarpiece’s wings in the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace (1491/92) (Source: DG012496, Bayerische Verwaltung der staatlichen Schlösser, Gärten und Seen, Munich)
Plate 106  Jan Polack’s workshop, *The Baptism of Christ, Gnadenstuhl, The Coronation of the Virgin, the four Evangelists (predella)*, high altarpiece of the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace with opened wings (1491/92)
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Plate 107  Predella of Jan Polack’s high altarpiece in the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace, Munich (Source: DG012499, Bayerische Verwaltung der staatlichen Schlösser, Gärten und Seen, Munich)

Plate 108  Painting of the Andechser Heiltumsschatz (1497) for the Chapel of Blutenburg Palace, Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, Munich
Plate 109  The Church of St Wolfgang in Pipping
Plate 110  Painted tracery frieze on the south side of the choir’s façade, Church of St Wolfgang in Pipping

Plate 111  Painted tracery frieze on the south-east side of the choir’s façade, Church of St Wolfgang in Pipping

Plate 112  Painted tracery frieze on the east side of the choir’s façade, Church of St Wolfgang in Pipping
Plate 113  Painted tracery frieze on the north-east side of the choir’s façade, Church of St Wolfgang in Pipping

Plate 114  Painted tracery frieze on the north side of the choir’s façade, Church of St Wolfgang in Pipping
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Plate 115  Footprint of St Wolfgang in Pipping with a plan of the figuration of the choir’s vaults (Source: ERICHSEN, JOHANNES (ed.), Blutenburg. Beiträge zur Geschichte von Schloß und Hofmark Menzing (Munich: Haus der Bayerischen Geschichte, 1985), p. 159)
Plate 116  The high altarpiece in the Church of St Wolfgang in Pipping (Source: STEINER, PETER B. (ed.), Münchner Gotik im Freisinger Diözesanmuseum (Regensburg: Schnell & Steiner, 1999), p. 48)


Plate 118  Jost Amman, *Grünwald Castle*, woodcut (c. 1563), part of Philipp Apian’s estate, Cgm 5379(3, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich)
Plate 119  Grünwald Castle from the east
Plate 120  The gatehouse of Grünwald Castle from the east
Plate 121  Grünwald Castle from the north-east
Plate 122  The window on the northern side of the gatehouse of Grünwald Castle
Plate 123  Commemoration plaque for the completion of the Kesselberg Pass roadwork in 1492, red marble, Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, Munich
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Plate 125  Hans Multscher, Model for the tomb of Duke Louis VII of Bavaria-Ingenstadt (1430), limestone, Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, Munich
This plate has been removed as a consequence of copyright restrictions.

Plate 126  Workshop of Jan Polack, *Death of St Corbinian with a view of Freising in the distance*, wing of an altarpiece from the former Benedictine monastery Weihenstephan (1489), Alte Pinakothek, Munich, © Blauel/Gnam – Artothek

Plate 127  Workshop of Jan Polack, Central panel and the wings’ interior panels of the former high altarpiece of the Church of St Antonius (c. 1491/92), Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, Munich

Plate 128  Workshop of Jan Polack, Central panel’s reverse side and the wings’ exterior panels, former high altarpiece of the Church of St Antonius (c. 1491/92), Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, Munich
Plate 129  Workshop of Jan Polack, *The Betrayal*, panel from the former high altarpiece of the Church of St Antonius (c. 1491/92), Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, Munich
Plate 130  Workshop of Jan Polack, *Christ crowned with thorns*, panel from the former high altarpiece of the Church of St Antonius (c. 1491/92), Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, Munich
Plate 131  Workshop of Jan Polack, Christ’s Entombment, panel from the former high altarpiece of the Church of St Antonius (c. 1491/92), Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, Munich
Plate 132  Workshop of Jan Polack, Duke Albrecht IV of Bavaria-Munich and the combined coat-of-arms of the Dukes of Bavaria and Counts Palatine of the Rhine, detail from the left interior panel of the first set of wings of the former high altarpiece of the Church of St Antonius (c. 1491/92), Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, Munich

Plate 133  Workshop of Jan Polack, Kunigunde of Austria with the coat-of-arms of the Habsburg dynasty, detail from the right interior panel of the first set of wings of the former high altarpiece of the Church of St Antonius (c. 1491/92), Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, Munich
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Plate 134 Workshop of Jan Polack, Healing of the Lame Man, panel from the former high altarpiece of St Peter’s (c. 1485/90), Katholische Pfarrkirchenstiftung St. Peter, München (Source: STEINER, PETER B. and GRIMM, CLAUS (eds.), Jan Polack. Von der Zeichnung zum Bild. Malerei und Maltechnik in München um 1500 (Munich & Freising: Diözesanmuseum Freising, 2004), p. 199)

Plate 135 The Isar Tower of the Landshuter Stadtresidenz from the west
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Plate 136 The Kapellengang with depictions of Louis X of Bavaria’s ancestors, Landshuter Stadtresidenz (Source: LAUTERBACH, IRIS, ENDEMANN, KLAUS, and FROMMEL, CHRISTOPH LUITPOLD (eds.), Die Landshuter Stadtresidenz. Architektur und Ausstattung (Veröffentlichungen des Zentralinstituts für Kunstgeschichte, 14; Munich: Zentralinstitut für Kunstgeschichte, 1998), p. 60)
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Plate 137  Gabriel Angler, Dukes Ernst, William III and Albrecht III, aristocrats, noblemen and Munich’s burgher worship the Virgin Mary with Christ Child in gratitude for the victory in the battle of Alling (c. 1430), Chapel of St Mary and George, Hoflach (Source: Bös, Werner, Gotik in Oberbayern (Munich: Süddeutscher Verlag, 1992), p. 80-81)
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Plate 138  Hans Wertinger, Predella with the donors’ portraits of the high altarpiece (c. 1515/1516), Church of St Kastulus, Moosburg (Source: Niehoff, Franz (ed.), Um Leinberger. Schüler und Zeitgenossen (2nd edn., Landshut: Museen der Stadt Landshut, 2007), p. 28)
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Plate 143  Detail of Plate 142
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Plate 144  *Uomini Famosi* (c. 1420), Sala Baronale, Castello della Manta (Source: ROHLMANN, MICHAEL, 'Botticellis "Primavera". Zu Anlass, Adressat und Funktion von mythologischen Gemälden im Florentiner Quattrocento', Artibus et Historiae, 17/33 (1996), 97-132. p. 107)