
Almatourism

Journal of Tourism, Culture and Territorial Development

Pilgrimages of Princes in the 15th Century – Two Holy Land journeys of German Princes via Rome. A Distinction to the Lower Nobility Class Journeys

Behrendt, A.*
Viator Mundi Association (Germany)

ABSTRACT

Throughout that work the differences and similarities of princely and non-princely, but noble, pilgrimages in the German-speaking part of the late medieval times should be outlined with the aid of two concrete examples. The main focus will be on the distinction of princely pilgrimages to pilgrimages of the lower nobility class. In this connection especially the fact is important that a more precise distinction between the two groups of persons rarely takes place in the widely-used German-speaking literature and both groups are used equivalent. To illustrate a more precise distinction throughout the analysis with the two chosen princely pilgrimages there will be used direct quotes at suitable text passages to enable a singularization of the similarities as well as the differences to the pilgrimages of the lower nobility class. Concrete examples constitute the pilgrimages of the dukes Eberhard I. of Württemberg and Bogislaw X. of Pomerania. As the analysis progresses there will be highlighted that princely pilgrimages differ in the intention, the effort of planning as well as the enactment in comparison to non-princely pilgrimages. For future scientific investigations with late medieval pilgrimages to Jerusalem and Rome therefore it will be necessary to defer to a concrete distinction between princely pilgrimages and non-princely, but noble, pilgrimages.

Keywords: Noble Pilgrimage; Princely Pilgrimage; Lower Nobility; German Area; 15th Century

*E-mail address: viator-mundi@gmx.de

Introduction

The preoccupation with historical pilgrimages has come increasingly into focus since some years. Aside from semi-professional, modern travel descriptions and guide books it is possible to find a growing tendency of a revitalization and exploration of older forgotten pilgrim ways and destinations. The focus of this scientific analysis will lay on the examination of noble pilgrimages from German states during the 15th century. The main point of the work should be the differences between lower nobility class pilgrimages and pilgrimages of princes.

The German terminus “Adelsreise”¹ is in common used for the late medieval pilgrimages of princes and the lower nobility class in the German-speaking sphere (as cited in Spieß, 2005, p. 33). The groundbreaking article “Von der Heidenfahrt zur Kavaliertour” by Werner Paravicini names the “Adelsreise” in the same breath with the “Fürstenreise”² (as cited in Paravicini, 1993, p. 91f). Following the definition of Adelsreise by Paravicini, the historian Detlev Kraack extends the nobility term in his dissertation PhD thesis “Monumentale Zeugnisse der spätmittelalterlichen Adelsreise” (Kraack, 1997).

This term includes in the definition of Kraack and Paravicini all people from the princes to the patrician and is based on the chivalric ideals and courted manners which adopted the emerged differences between the noble classes during the late medieval time (as cited in Paravicini, 1994, p. 32).

Similarities between the different pilgrimages of princes and members of the lower nobility class are especially detectable at Holy Land journeys to Jerusalem.

The act of being knighted in the Church of the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem (as cited in Cramer, 1941, p. 20-22) and the hanging of the escutcheon in several places at the isle of Rhodes are identical (as cited in Kraack, 1997, p. 86f, 431f.). Nevertheless this conformity should not be seen as an equalization of pilgrimages of princes and the low nobility class. The comparison of different travelogues from princes and members of the lower nobility class show that especially the experience of the pilgrimages out of the perspective of a prince is something totally different. This aspect of view is getting more and more attention in modern research.

Cordula Nolte managed to outline that there are crucial differences of princely travel attempts in comparison with other pilgrimages by the example of the Holy Land journeys³.

Based on the high organizational effort which is combined with a princely pilgrimage, it is possible to delimit members of the lower nobility class and of the princely class. Toward that there is one exception: the “Grafenstand” (the class of counts). Based on a high amount of administrative and judicial warrants plus the effort of the enactment of sovereignty during the late medieval, it is possible to associate some of the Grafen as members of the princely class even if the class of counts is situated between the imperial princess class and the class of barons which is, in the Holy Roman Empire of German Nations, a lower nobility class (as cited in Köbler, 1995, p. 168).

Having the princely pilgrimages into focus it is necessary to fade the lower nobility class pilgrimages into the background. For additional facts and interested readers the publications of Detlev Kraack and Werner Paravicini are recommended.

The special feature of pilgrimages of princes to the Holy Land and Rome include the long travel period and the immense effort of such a princely journey. Rome, as the city of the pope, was alongside Jerusalem the most attractive travel destination of princes from the German states. Beside the religious aspects of the pilgrimage the princes used the possibility to get a personal contact to the pope. From that contact the princes fondly hoped to get more privileges and prestige (as cited in Schmutge, 1995, p. 97f. and Thurnhoffer, 1921, p. 54 – 58).

To outline the specific characteristics of princely pilgrimages in this analysis, it is necessary to look at an example of princely pilgrimage. For this investigation it will be adduced the pilgrimages of the count Eberhard I of Württemberg (1468) and the duke Bogislaw X of Pomerania (1496-1498) within a case study.

1. The case study of duke Eberhard I

Eberhard I, son of the count Ludwig I of Württemberg-Urach, succeeded his father with an age of nine years in 1459 as a count. Besides the funding of the University of Tübingen in the year 1477 he managed the reunion of the regions Württemberg-Urach and Württemberg-Stuttgart through the contract of Münsingen in 1482. This reunion was an important step for the promotion of Württemberg from an earldom to a dukedom in the year 1495. The heritable title of a duke followed after his pilgrimage (as cited in Uhlan, 1985, p. 98). Whether Eberhard I of Württemberg could count as a duke during his pilgrimage even if he was not promoted at the time to a duke is questionable. A possible answer is the following: Based on the expense of his pilgrimage and on the enactment he could be count as a prince. The historian Karl-Heinz Spieß for example count him as a “[...] Fürstengenosse [...]”⁴ (Spieß, 2005, p. 50).



Figure 1: Coloured pen drawing of Eberhard I., Ulm 1493.

The pilgrimage to the Holy Land is nevertheless important for the reign of Eberhard I.. His epithet “im Bart” (in beard) leads back to a local legend which claims that he got this name because of a vow during his knightly accolade at the Holy Sepulchre of Jerusalem (as cited in Faix, 1990, p. 11).

Also his personal motto “Attempo” and the combination of that motto with a palm tree (as cited in Mertens, 1999, p. 160) as his personal symbol is more or less attributed to his pilgrimage by common local historians of Württemberg (as cited in Gamer-Wallert, 2003, p. 20).

The arrangements of Eberhard I. in advance of his journey are very well documented and show which characteristics are considered for a princely pilgrimage:

Besides a set of regulations which should become effective in the case of Eberhard’s I. death, he regulated by regiment orders the government of his country during his absence (as cited in Faix, 1990, p. 11). The beginning of this regiment orders stipulates that:

„Nach dem sich min gnediger herr grave Eberhart ein zit usser land tun will und yetzo wegfertig ist, hat er geordent, sine sachen, land und lut ußzurichten, Hansen von Bubenhofen, hern Jergen von Ehingen und Wolffen von Neuhusen mit zugebung Hansen truchsessen von Bichishusen und Hansen Harscher und den gewalt gegeben, alle täglich zufallend sachen ußzurichten.“⁵ (Faix/Reichert, 1998, p. 202)

A detailed reconstruction of the pilgrimage by several sources is possible. There exists a manuscript copy in the library of the University of Tübingen. It is not the original source but “[...] an excerpt which was made by the Hellenist and Latin scholar Martin Crusis on the 12th and 13th May 1587.” (Faix/Reichert, 1998, p. 7). This copy is the only source which is nearby fully retained. A printed version of this copy and other parts from other copyists plus reports of the companions of the pilgrimage of Eberhard I may be found in the monograph “Eberhard im Bart und die Wallfahrt nach Jerusalem im späten Mittelalter“ which was written by Gerhard Faix and Folker Reichert.

Closer examination reveals that there are clear differences between princely pilgrimages and the ones of the lower nobility and middle-class. The transcribed pilgrim report is not original from the pen of Eberhard I. himself, but from his personal physician Dr. Johannes Münsiger who got the order to write down the report (as cited in Zitter, 2001, p. 52). An additional characteristic of princely journey reports is the narrative character of the reports. This narrative character is also viewable in the report of the pilgrimage of Eberhard I That special type of narration implies the description of heroic and good deeds of the prince which was intended for the public and served the enactment of the own rulership of Eberhard I.

Another unique selling point of princely pilgrimages is the amount of accompanying persons. In the case of Eberhard I, 40 people went with him on the pilgrimage to the Holy Land; among them were two chaplains, one personal physician, two valets, three trumpeters, two cooks, two shooters and over 20 noble men.

“Peregrinatio illustris Wirtembergici comitis domini Eberhardi barbati in terram sanctam 1468. Cum Eberhardo comite Wirtembergensi et Mompelgardenso profecti in

terram sanctam 40 viri, inter quos 25 nobiles, omnes facti equites.”⁶ (Münsinger, as cited in Faix/Reichert, 1998, p. 142)

On closer examination of this quote it is possible to recognise two other characteristics of pilgrimages: The mention of the knightly accolade on the Holy Sepulcher of Jerusalem and the naming of the own name of the prince. A knightly accolade on the Holy Sepulcher of Jerusalem is not a characteristic which is reserved for princely pilgrimages. It is a common characteristic of all pilgrimages of members from the lower and upper nobility class.

One of the companions of Eberhard I. was the knight Anselm von Eyb. This man wrote down the experiences of the pilgrimage by his own in a second pilgrimage report. A comparison of the experiences of Anselm von Eyb with the report of Eberhard I is, unfortunately, not possible because von Eyb concentrated his report to the description of the cities of Jaffa, Ramla and Jerusalem.

A concrete speciality of the report of the pilgrimage of Eberhard I – in comparison to other princely pilgrimages reports – are the used languages of the report. While the description of the journey is written down in a combination of Latin and Early Modern High German, the beginning and the end includes some parts in Greek. Based on the copying of the original text by Crusius it is not clear whether the Greek passages are from the original text of Münsinger or from the copy of Crusius. The kind of the choice of words fits more Martin Crusius as the author because in the Latin translation of the Greek passage of the beginning of the report, there is a passage written in the third person about Münsinger:

„Ἐχ χειρογράφον βίβλον τού δευτέρου μήχουζ περί ἀποδημιάζ εἰζ τόν ζωοπάροχον τοῦ χυρίου Χριστοῦ τάφον. Descripsit manu sua (ut videtur) Ioannes Minsinger (medicinae doctor) a Frundeck iuratus medicus Ulme ab Ulmeis concessus ad iter ad sacrum sepulchrum.”⁷ (Münsinger, as cited in Faix/Reichert, 1998, p. 143)

Remarkable of the report of Eberhard I is the short travel time which he needed for his pilgrimage to Jerusalem and Rome. The start of the journey was the 10th May 1468. From Urach the way led him over Kempten, Bolzano, Trento to Venice. In Venice the travel party of Eberhard I. stayed overnight at the “[...] teutschen haus [...]”⁸ (Münsinger, as cited in Faix/Reichert, 1998, p. 145), a hostel which was specialised on German travellers. This hostel is not the same as the Fondaco dei Tedeschi near the Rialto Bridge where only German merchants were allowed to stay overnight. (Röricht, 1900, p. 9) In Venice the travel party shipped in to travel on the 04th June to Jaffa. The usage of the sea route is not a characteristic for the distinction of lower nobility and princely pilgrimages but it appears that princely pilgrims paid often the expenses for their fellow travellers in Venice.

During the sea voyage of Eberhard I the author of the report mentioned especially the cities of Parenzo (today Porec), Ragusa (today Dubrovnik) and the isle of Crete and Rhodes. After a journey of four weeks, Eberhard I reached the port city of Jaffa on the 28th June. From here he and his travel party took the way over Ramala to Jerusalem. In the pilgrim report there are mentioned different day trips in the local area, for example

to Bethlehem, to the river Jordan and to Bethany (as cited in Münsinger, in Faix/Reichert, 1998, p. 158). A knightly accolade of Eberhard I. at the Holy Sepulchre of Jerusalem is not directly mentioned, but the pilgrimage report of Anselm von Eyb described this ritual which befits the social status of the noble men of the travel party and Eberhard I. From Jerusalem over Jaffa the group around Eberhard I travelled back on the 19th July by ship. At this way back the group visited the memorial of the apostle St. Paul on the isle of Cyprus. From there Eberhard I. travelled to Otranto over Rhodes, Crete and Corfu some days later. The travel party separated during their stay on Corfu. Most of them travelled to Venice but Eberhard I and the count Kraft von Hohenlohe, they met each other on Corfu, travelled over Otranto and Neaples to Rome.

In Rome Eberhard I was able to get an audience in the Vatican. His stay in Rome was short and did not get mentioned so much by Münsinger. Nevertheless it can be assumed that the contacts to the Curia of Rome played an important role for the decision of going on this pilgrimage (as cited in Seidenfuß, 2003, p. 299). Following the way of the modern Via Francigena, Eberhard I travelled over Viterbo, Sutri, Montefiascone, Bolsena and Siena to the city of Florence. From Florence he took the way back home on the 20th October over Venice and Rottenburg.



Figure 2: Travelled pilgrimage route with im. journey. portant stations of Eberhard's I

2. The case study of duke Bogislaw X

The second princely pilgrimage of this work will be the one of duke Bogislaw X of Pomerania. During the history of the dukedom of Pomerania, he was the only one who went on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land (as cited in Bethe, 1996, p.33).

Bogislaw X. was born as the son of duke Erich II. of Pomerania-Wolgast and Sophia of Trans-Pomerania in the year 1454. The sources about his education and his first years are inaccurate.



Figure 2: Copy of a drawing of Bogislaw X of Pomerania, Anklam 1523.

After the death of his father he assumed the government business in 1474 and after the death of his uncle Wartislaw X. he was able to rule as the absolute ruler of Pomerania from 1478 on (as cited in Böcker, 1995, p. 383ff.). The following years he had some military conflicts with the electorate of Brandenburg with the result that Bogislaw X lost the conflict. Electoral prince Albrecht Achilles of Brandenburg gave Bogislaw X the dukedom of Pomerania as a fief back. Some years later it was possible that the electorate of Brandenburg renounced the feudality over Pomerania (as cited in Bethe, 1996, p. 33).

About the pilgrimage of Bogislaw X exists different reports from members of his travel group. These are: the report of Hans Schürpff, the one of Johannes von Kitscher (which was brought to the city Greifswald by Bogislaw X after the return of the pilgrimage), the one of Christian Kalen and the one of Martin Dalmer (as cited in Konow, 2003, p. 24f.).

To examine the pilgrimage of Bogislaw X the report of the ducal writer Martin Dalmer will be the source of choice. The report of Dalmer has the title "Beschreibung Herzog Bugslaffen des 10. Peregrination nach dem Heyligen Lande. In welcher, wie in einem Diaro, alle des H. B. Acten und Reisen von einem orth zuhm andern fleissig verzeichnet sein" (Dalmer, 1835, p. 318). The report is written in the form of a diary and was

printed the first time in 1835. Since that year different historians followed up with the descriptions of the report which was not, in contrast to other reports, a contract work of Bogislaw X himself. The intention which Dalmer followed was to give an objective overview about the journey without palliations (as cited in Konow, 2001, p. 49). There exist two different versions of the report Dalmer's: On the one hand there is the "Löpersche Handschrift" which was printed together with the chronicles of Pomerania by Thomas Kantzow in 1835. On the other hand there is the hand written copy of Vienna which was attached without a title in the published essay by Karl-Otto Know in the Baltic Studies in 2001 (Konow, 2001). Both versions diverge in some points.

For the examination of the pilgrimage of Bogislaw X the hand written copy of Vienna will be the basis. A speciality of the hand written copy is the use of Low German language and the detailed description of a sea fight between the Turks and the Venetian galley which transported Bogislaw X and his travel group to the Holy Land. The untypical detailed description makes the pilgrimage report of Bogislaw X to something special under the princely pilgrimage literature. According to the description the patron of the ship was given to the Turks by Bogislaw X to save the travel group. Based on the unchivalrous description of this it is possible to express that Bogislaw X was not the purchaser of that report. The description of the naval battle starts with the naming of the superior number of the Turks:

„Am Freitage Conversionis Pauli anno 1497, als m.g.H. gesigeltt ist von Modin nach Candiean und bey 100 Meil Wegs von Modin gekommen, haben sie unter des Turcken Lande, wol 10 Weke Sehs von ihnenn, 9 Sigell erhaben sehenn.“⁹ (Dalmer, in: Konow, 2011, p. 65)

The translation shows that the Turks attacked the galley of Bogislaw X with nine ships. During the battle the pilgrims at the galley defended themselves against the Turks but at the end the superior number of the Turks was too hard to defend. As the reaction to the nearby defeat, Bogislaw X ensured personally that the patron of the ship was given in the hands of the Turks. Martin Dalmer mentioned, after he described how the crew and the travel group at the galley fought against the Turks, the handover of the Patron by Bogislaw X to the Turks:

„Darnach habenn die Turckenn den Patronn von ihnen habenn wollen. Den hatt m.g.H. unten aus der Galleiden geolett und den Turken uberantwortett. Die fhureten ihn zu ihrem Hauptmann auf das grosse Schif, da er bey ihnen bey 2 Stunden gewesen ist. Da haben die Turcken von ihme begerdtt, er sollte ihnen alle seinen Bilger ubergebenn, so wollten sie den Venedigernn Fride besten und ihn sampt den Galleien faren lassen. Das hatt der Patron nicht thuen wolenn, sondern gesagtt, es were ihm nicht von seinen Herrn, den Venedigernn, befolenn, den sie hetten den Bilgernn Geleidtte gegebenn. Was sie ihme nun daruber thuen woltenn, muste er mit leidenn.“¹⁰ (Dalmer, in: Konow, 2011, p. 65f.)

The translation of that passage shows clearly that the pilgrims around Bogislaw X got the promise of the Venetians for a free passage. A promise of free and safety passage is

an only common characteristic of princely pilgrimages. The patron of this sea travel himself who went on the sailing trip because of an order of Venice, referred to that assurance in front of the Turks.

That uncommon and unchivalrous behaviour is not mentioned in other reports of that journey besides Dalmer and an Italian fellow passenger which wrote about that issue in their reports. After the sea battle Bogislaw X was able to continue his journey. He visited Jaffa, Jerusalem and Bethlehem. At the way back to the city of Stettin he visited Rome. There he was invited to an audience with pope Alexander VI. Martin Dalmer describes that invitation of the pope as follows: “Am Montagk ist m.g.H. gefoddertt, zu dem Babst [sic!] zu kommen. [...] Und da hat S.F.G. dem Bapst obedientia gethonn. Die anderen haben dem Bapst alle die Fusse gekusset.”¹¹ ((Dalmer, in: Konow, 2011, p. 71). After the pope had invited Bogislaw X to the audience Bogislaw and other noble men followed the invitation to the papal residence where they gave him the honour he deserved. Another speciality of the pilgrimage of Bogislaw X is that he brought two scholars with him from the Italian travel stage to Pomerania. They were brought to the University of Greifswald. To name them: the German lawyer Johannes von Kitscher who did his doctorate at the University of Bologna and the Italian lawyer Peter of Ravenna. During the journey back to Pomerania they were brought into service of the dukedom. A mention of Peter of Ravenna can be found in Martin Dalmer’s report: „Ahn Sonnabentt Catharinae hatt m.g.H. einem Doctori Petro de Rauenna 100 Ducaten geben, damitt er sich ausrichtenn und mith nach dem Lande zu Pommern reittenn sollte.”¹² (Dalmer, in: Konow, 2011, p. 70).



Figure 3: Travelled pilgrimage route with important stations of Bogislaw’s X journey.

Overall the pilgrimage of Bogislaw X is one of the longest princely pilgrimages in the German-speaking area – temporal and geographical seen. The pilgrimage led him from Stettin over Angermünde to Berlin, Wittenberg, Leipzig and Naumburg. From Naumburg the travel group went to Nürnberg, Speyer, Worms, Innsbruck and Bolzano. Over Padua Bogislaw X reached Venice on the 4th June 1497 where he took a ship to the Holy Land. Parenzo, Ragusa, Corfu, Crete and Cyprus were the Mediterranean stations on his way to Jaffa where the travel group paid for their secure travel to Jerusalem. In Jerusalem Bogislaw X visited different sanctuaries and decided to travel back on the 2nd September 1497. The way back over Jaffa, Cyprus, Rhodes and Venice brought him back to the Italian mainland. From Venice he travelled over Ferrara, Ravenna and Spoleto to Rome. He arrived there around the 14th December 1497. After different visits with the local high nobility and pastorate class he took the way back over the modern Via Francigena: Viterbo, Acquapendente, Siena and Florence were the main mentioned stations on that trip back. From there he went over Bolzano and the Via Romea to Jena. Over Wittenberg and Berlin he and his travel group finally reached Stettin on the 12th April 1498 and ended there the pilgrimage to the Holy Land.

3. The concrete differences between princely and lower nobility pilgrimages

In the following systemic part the concrete differences between princely and lower nobility pilgrimages will be outlined.

Pilgrimages to Jerusalem and Rome by princes represent only a small section of princely travel habits. Nevertheless it is possible and important to outline the divergences of princely, lower nobility and middle-class pilgrimages: With an outlining it is possible to develop a more detailed picture of the late medieval social and the mental-historical research. Pilgrimages in a princely view were, especially in the outer appearance, a possibility to show and enact their own rights and powers. Based on that, it was necessary for the princes to prepare the pilgrimages in a complex and protracted way. This protracted and complex preparation is a main characteristic of princely pilgrimages which makes the biggest difference between lower nobility and princely pilgrimages to Jerusalem and Rome. It was possible for the princes to mix the intentions of a pilgrimage with a representative journey. Princely pilgrimages are often made in times where representation pressure raised by coronation ceremonies, Imperial Diets or new diplomatic possibilities out of the own territory (as cited in Spalatin, 1851, p. 27).

To face travel preparations is informative for the singularization of differences between princely and lower nobility pilgrimages. Members of the lower nobility class had fewer problems to travel, especially in the view of the grade of organization. When princes went on pilgrimages they had to entrust the ruling role of governmental business into the hands of a trusted representative (as cited in Friedel, 1859, p. 196). If the pilgrim was an electoral prince he had to respect imperial ramifications additionally. Electoral princes had to choose wisely the councillors which were allowed to hold the Great Seal of the prince till his return. Based on the dangerousness of a long pilgrimage it was

important to implement ingenious mechanisms to counteract possible rumours and to prove the correctness of this. In relation to the rule appointments it was necessary to manage succession issues and a testation before the travel began.

Another part of the travel preparations are the provisioning of service, armour and kitchen carts. To ensure the transport of the prince it was important to organize the means of transport in advance. Tableware, clothes and weapons for the prince and his travel group had also been organized in advance of the travel (as cited in Hundt, in Röhricht/Meissner, 1883, p. 51). Another unique selling point of princely pilgrimage is the military protection of the princely company. Additional to the personal protection the princes were relied to the escort through transit countries. Before the journey the escort in the regions was ordered and before the arrival in bigger cities, messengers were sent to announce the arrival (as cited in Cohn, 1965, p. 23). The number of the entourage – as described for the pilgrimage of Eberhard I. – is the main characteristic of a princely pilgrimage. The immense logistical outlay was not able to be hold by members of the lower nobility class. While lower noble men, for example the knight Arnold von Harff (as cited in Brall-Tuchel/Reichert, 2007), were able to travel without an entourage, princes only had the chance to go on a pilgrimage to Rome and Jerusalem with a big amount of people. The average of German princely pilgrimages entourages laid about 50 people (Münsinger, as cited in Faix/Reichert, 1998, p. 142 and Paravicini, 1994). The groups were made up of kitchen staff, barbers, father confessors, scribes, forerunners, heralds, trumpeter and members of the lower nobility class. The prince was always in the main focus of this hierarchically arranged group (as cited in Spieß, 2005, p. 43).

Additional to the accompanying travel society there was a big difference between princely and lower nobility pilgrimages: the representation of the travelling prince and the treatment of the travelling pilgrim by other princes were typical for princely pilgrimages. Bogislaw X. for example was welcomed in Heidelberg after a 700 kilometres journey by his princely peers (as cited in Spieß, 2005, p. 46). An augmentation of the princely prestige during a pilgrimage was also possible while victorious participations on battles. The sea battle of Bogislaw X. spread around really fast in the Italian population and was one point on the way of a growing hero veneration of Bogislaw X., even though the behaviour of giving away the patron of his ship in such a fast way was not much honourable. The invitation of the pope to an honourable welcome in the city of Poggibonsi where the people of the city welcomed Bogislaw X. with shouts of celebration and congratulations (as cited in Dalmer, in: Konow, 2011, p. 301 – 303 and Muller, 1879, p. 223f.) was a direct reaction to the supposed victorious sea battle. The encounters during a pilgrimage played an important role for the princes because the contacts to princely peers offered social benefits and the possibility to improve or spread the own political situation. Travel routes were always chosen during pilgrimages after political aspects during the late medieval times and were also changed if there was a positive possibility of new diplomatic chances. One example for this is the Jerusalem journey of Duke Albrecht of Saxony who travelled in 1476 to meet with thirteen princes for political negotiations (as cited in Mergenthal, 1586). Other examples of the political importance of princely pilgrimages and the characteristic as a unique selling point are found among the

outgoing 15th century. Electoral prince Ernst of Saxony started a pilgrimage to Rome in 1480, but this journey changed the intention really fast to a political travel because one of his sons was elected by the pope for the position as the archbishop of Magdeburg (as cited in Thurnhoffer, 1921, p. 2f.). The design of the memory of a pilgrimage is the last expression of the princely status and another special characteristic of princely pilgrimages which cannot be found in the memories of lower nobility class pilgrimages. The composition of the pilgrimage report by itself had a special structure and should glorify the prince himself (as cited in Mergenthal, 1586, p. 1 and Reichert, 1998, p. 139).

Conclusions

Aside from the glorification in written form there was also a special substantive culture of memory.

Based on the costs of brought along objects, it is clear that princely pilgrimages are totally different to lower nobility pilgrimages. Next to glassware from Murano, expensive jewelry, candelabra made out of corals and exotic animals found their way based on pilgrimages to the royal courts of German states¹³. Like mentioned before, it was common that foreign scholars were brought from pilgrimages to the universities of princes. More important than that was only the princely memorandums which could not get bought: An awarded sword from the pope, the papal rose or jewellery which was given from kings was shown to the public for means of representation.

It therefore appears that princely pilgrimages are fundamentally different to pilgrimages of the lower nobility and middle-class in intention, organisation and reception. Despite to the religious motivation of the prince the representative character is predominant because it was possible to outline the own power, right and wealth in the own and foreign countries. The demonstration of this leads to the augmentation of the honour of the prince. A planned display of the memorabilia and the writing down of the travel memories let the honour of the prince increase over his own lifetime.

Based on all the points it is necessary to mention the different characteristics of princely and lower nobility pilgrimages for the future research discussion to enable a more precise distinction.

References

Babel, R. and Paravicini, W. (ed.) (2005). *Grand Tour. Adlige Reisen und europäische Kultur vom 14. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert*. Ostfildern.

Bethe, H. (1996). *Die Greifen. Pommersche Herzöge 12. bis 17. Jahrhundert. Katalog zur Ausstellung 3. März bis 5. Mai 1996*. Kiel.

Böcker, H. (1995). *Bogislaw X., Herzog von Pommern (1454-1523)*. In: Deutsche Fürsten des Mittelalters. n.p..

Böhmer, W. (ed.) (1835). *Thomas Kantzow's Chronik von Pommern in Niederdeutscher Mundart. Sammt einer Auswahl aus den übrigen ungedruckten Schriften desselben*. Stettin.

Brall-Tuchel, H. and Reichert, F. (2007). *Rom. Jerusalem. Santiago. Das Pilgertagebuch des Ritters Arnold von Harff (1496 – 1498)* (pp. 383-408). Köln.

Cohn, H. J. (1965). *The Government of the Rhine Palatinate in the Fifteenth Century*. Oxford.

Cramer, V. and Meinertz, G. (ed.) (1941). *Das Heilige Land in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart*, Vol. 3. Köln.

Cramer, V. (1941). *Das Rittertum vom Heiligen Grabe im 14. Und 15. Jahrhundert*. In: *Das Heilige Land in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart, Bd. 3, hg. von Valmar Cramer/Gustav Meinertz*. Köln.

Dalmer, M. (1835). *Beschreibung Herzog Bugslaffen des 10. Peregrination nach dem Heyligen Lande. In welcher, wie in einem Diaro, alle des H. B. Acten und Reisen von einem orth zuhm andern fleissig verzeichnet sein*. (pp. 300-326) In: Wilhelm Böhmer (ed.): *Thomas Kantzow's Chronik von Pommern in Niederdeutscher Mundart. Sammt einer Auswahl aus den übrigen ungedruckten Schriften desselben*. Stettin.

Dalmer, M. (2001). *Beschreibung Herzog Bugslaffen des 10. Peregrination nach dem Heyligen Lande. In welcher, wie in einem Diaro, alle des H. B. Acten und Reisen von einem orth zuhm andern fleissig verzeichnet sein*. (pp. 61 – 76) In: Karl-Otto Konow: *Martin Dalmer und seine Beschreibung der Fahrt Herzog Bogislaws X. in das Heilige Land*. In: *Baltische Studien. N.F. Vol. 87*, n.p..

Erfen, I. and Spieß, K.-H. (ed.) (1997). *Fremdheit und Reisen im Mittelalter*. n.p..

Ermisch, H. (ed.) (1883). *Neues Archiv für Sächsische Geschichte und Altertumskunde, vol. 4*. Dresden.

Ermisch, H. (ed.) (1921). *Neues Archiv für Sächsische Geschichte und Altertumskunde*, vol. 42. Dresden.

Faix, G. (1990). *Eberhard im Bart. Der erste Herzog von Württemberg*. Stuttgart.

Faix, G. and Reichert, F. (1998). *Eberhard im Bart und die Wallfahrt nach Jerusalem im späten Mittelalter*. Stuttgart.

Gamer-Wallert, I. (2003). *Graf Eberhards Palme. Das Logo der Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen*. Tübingen.

Gesellschaft für pommersche Geschichte und Altertumskunde (1879). *Baltische Studien*. No. 29, n.p..

Ernst Moritz Arndt Universität Greifswald (ed.) (2001). *Baltische Studien. Pommersche Jahrbücher für Landesgeschichte. Neue Folge*. Vol. 87. Kiel.

Hundt, H. (1883). *Rechnungstagebuch (1493 - 1494)*, hg. von Reinhold Röhrich/Heinrich Meissner. (pp. 37 – 100) In: *Archiv für sächsische Geschichte und Alterthumskunde* 4. Dresden.

Köbler, G. (1995). *Deutsches Etymologisches Rechtswörterbuch*. Tübingen.

Konow, K.-O. (2003). *Beiträge zur Geschichte Herzog Bogislaws X. von Pommern um die Wende vom 15. zum 16. Jahrhundert*. Siegen.

Konow, K.-O. (2001). *Martin Dalmer und seine Beschreibung der Fahrt Herzog Bogislaws X. in das Heilige Land*. (pp. 46-79). In: *Baltische Studien Ser. NF*, vol. 87 (2001). N.p.

Kosegarten, J. G. (1857). *Geschichte der Universität Greifswald mit urkundlichen Beilagen*. Greifswald.

Kraack, D. (1997). *Monumentale Zeugnisse der spätmittelalterlichen Adesreise. Inschriften und Graffiti des 14. – 16. Jahrhunderts*. *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil. – Hist. Klasse*, 3. Folge. Göttingen .

Lorenz, S. (1999). *Attempo – oder wie stiftet man eine Universität*. n.p..

Mergenthal, H. v. (1586). *Gründliche und warhafftige Beschreibung der löblichen und ritterlichen Reise und Herrschaft in das heilige Land ... des Herren Albrechten Hertzogen zu Sachsen...*, hg. von Hieronymus Wellen. Leipzig.

Mertens, D. (1999). *Eberhard im Bart als Stifter der Universität Tübingen. In: Attempo – oder wie stiftet man eine Universität.* (pp. 157-173) n.p..

Mueller, J. (1879). *Venetianische Actenstücke zur Geschichte von Herzog Bogislavs X. Reise in den Orient im Jahre 1497.* (pp. 167 – 298). In: Baltische Studien. Nr. 29. N.p..

Münsinger, J. (1998). *Peregrinatio illustris Wirtembergici comitis domini Eberhardi barbati in terram sanctam 1468.* (pp. 137 – 172). In: Gerhard Faix./ Frank Reichert, Eberhard im Bart und die Wallfahrt nach Jerusalem im späten Mittelalter. Stuttgart.

Nolte, C. (1997). *Erlebnis und Erinnerung. Fürstliche Pilgerfahrten nach Jerusalem im 15. Jahrhundert.* (pp. 65 – 92) In: Fremdheit und Reisen im Mittelalter, hg. Von Irene Erfen/Karl-Heinz Spieß. Stuttgart.

Paravicini, W. (1994). *Europäische Reiseberichte des späten Mittelalters. Eine analytische Bibliographie. Herausgegeben von Werner Paravicini. Teil 1. Deutsche Reiseberichte bearbeitet von Christian Halm.* In: Kieler Werkstücke. Reihe D. Beiträge zur europäischen Geschichte des späten Mittelalters. Vol. 5. Frankfurt a.M.

Paravicini, W. (ed.) (1994). *Kieler Werkstücke. Reihe D. Beiträge zur europäischen Geschichte des späten Mittelalters.* Vol. 5. Frankfurt a.M.

Paravicini, W. (1994). *Die ritterlich-höfische Kultur des Mittelalters.* München.

Rachewiltz, S. d. and Riedemann, J. (ed.) (1995). *Kommunikation und Mobilität im Mittelalter. Begegnungen zwischen dem Süden und der Mitte Europas (11.- 14. Jahrhundert).* Sigmaringen.

Riedel, A. F. (ed.) (1859). *Codex diplomaticus Brandenburgensis.* Vol. III, 2, Berlin.

Röricht, R. (1900). *Deutsche Pilgerreisen nach dem Heiligen Lande.* Innsbruck.

Schmugge, L. (1995). *Deutsche Pilger in Italien. In: Kommunikation und Mobilität im Mittelalter. Begegnungen zwischen dem Süden und der Mitte Europas (11.- 14. Jahrhundert).* (pp. 97 – 113). Edited by Siegfried de Rachewiltz/ Josef Riedemann. Sigmaringen.

Schöntag, W. (1999). *St. Peter zum Einsiedel im Schönbuch. Eine Stiftung des Grafen Eberhard im Bart.* (pp. 91-104) In: Der Schönbuch. Mensch und Wald. N.p..

Seidenfuß, M. (2003). *Von der ‚realen‘ in die mentale Heimat. Die Wallfahrt Eberhards im Bart zu den Heiligen Stätten (1468).* (pp. 295-346) In: Mittelalter zwischen Politik und Kultur. Kulturwissenschaftliche Erweiterung. Neuried.

Seidenfuß, M. and Hasberg, W. (ed.) (2003). *Zwischen Politik und Kultur. Perspektiven einer kulturwissenschaftlichen Erweiterung der Mittelalter-Didaktik.* Neuried.

Spalatin, G. (1851). *Friedrichs des Weisen Leben und Zeitgeschichte*. hg. von Christian Gotthold Neudecker/ Ludweig Preller. Jena.

Spieß, K.- H. (2005). *Reisen deutscher Fürsten und Grafen im Spätmittelalter*. (pp. 33 – 51). In: Rainer Babel / Werner Paravicini (Hrsg.), *Grand Tour. Adlige Reisen und europäische Kultur vom 14. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert*. Ostfildern.

Thurnhoffer, F. (1921). *Die Romreise des Kurfürsten Ernst von Sachsen im Jahr 1480*.(pp. 1 – 63) In: *Neues Archiv für Sächsische Geschichte und Altertumskunde* 42. n.p..

Uhlan, R. (ed.) (1985). *900 Jahre Haus Württemberg*. (3rd ed., pp. 101). Stuttgart.

Unknown author (1998). *Ordnung wie all sach im land außgerichtet und geregirt werden sollen in abwesen und verreisten graf Eberharts des eltern*. (pp. 202 – 203) In: Gerhard Faix./ Frabk Reichert, *Eberhard im Bart und die Wallfahrt nach Jerusalem im späten Mittelalter*. Stuttgart.

Zitter, M. (2001). *Die Leibärzte der württembergischen Grafen im 15. Jahrhundert (1397-1496). Zur Medizin an den Höfen von Eberhard dem Mildem bis zu Eberhard im Bart*. Leinfelden-Echterdingen.

¹ transl.: travel of the nobility

² transl.: travel of princes

³ Acc to C. Nolte, *Erlebnis und Erinnerung. Fürstliche Pilgerfahrten nach Jerusalem im 15. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart 1997), 89: „Dazu gehört die Überlegung, inwiefern sich fürstliche Reisen von den Fahrten anderer Pilger unterschieden. Was die von großem Aufwand geprägte äußere Gestaltung der Reise sowie ihre Organisation als Hof- plus Pilgerreise angeht, so läßt sich im Einklang mit früheren Forschungsarbeiten ein deutlicher Unterschied zu anderen Pilgerfahren feststellen.“

⁴ transl.: prince companion

⁵ Own translation: “After my gracious Lord count Eberhard had been planning to go on a journey for some time and after he had been ready for this travel, he decreed all governmental issues about his people and country. Hans von Bubenhofen, Jörg von Ehingen and Wolf von Neuhusen will, with the support of Hans Truchsess von Bichishusen and Hans Harscher, get the authority to organise all governmental affairs.”

⁶ Own translation: „The pilgrimage of the elegant count of Württemberg, Eberhard im Bart, to the Holy Land 1468. With Eberhard, the count of Württemberg and Mömpelgard, forty men joined the travel to the Holy Land. Under this forty there were twenty-five noble men which were knighted.”

⁷ Own translation: „Described by own hand like it looks like from Johannes Münsinger auf Frundeck, doctor of medicine, sworn in doctor in Ulm, got permission for the journey to the Holy Sepulcher of Jerusalem by the people of Ulm.“

⁸ transl.: German house

⁹ Own translation: “On Friday the 25th Januar 1497, when my gracious Lord sailed from Modon to Candia and 100 miles from Modon, they had seen in the near of the land of the Turks around 10 ways away from them 9 sails.“

¹⁰ Own translation: “Then the Turks wanted to have handed the patron over. My gracious lord went down to the lower deck of the galley and entrusted him to the Turks. They brought him to their captain

on the big ship. There he had to stay two hours. The Turks wanted him to hand over all pilgrims, in return they would grant the Venetians peace and would let the galley drive on. The patron denied the offer and told them that he cannot do this because of the promise his Lord, the Venetians, gave the pilgrims. They promised the pilgrims a free passage. All what the Turks want to do with the pilgrims they have to do with the patron.”

¹¹ Own translation: “On Monday my gracious lord was invited to visit the pope. [...] And therefore his Highness graces had done this favour. All the others had kissed the feet of the pope.”

¹² Own translation: “At St. Catherines day my gracious lord paid the doctor Peter of Ravenna 100 ducats so that he could equip himself for the journey to Pomerania.”

¹³ Acc to H. Hundt, (as quote. 30), 52, 59-61: Hundt mentioned antic bronze work, turkish carpets, sparrowhawks, greek pigeons, foreign money and the skin of lions.