* l i b e r t a s 1. charte d'affranchissement... 2. congé... 3. statut privilégié d'une église...
4. privilège... 5. franchise, exemption... 6. privilège urbain... 7. territoire soumis au droit
urbain... 8. souche noble... 9. générosité... 10. franchise, candeur...

Soit dix sens, mais pas »liberté« parmi eux. Plus on apprécie la richesse et l'intérêt du livre
magistralement dirigé par Johannes Fried, plus on se demande s'il n'aurait pas été préférable de
lui choisir un autre titre.

Alain GUERREAU, Paris

Rom im hohen Mittelalter. Studien zu den Romvorstellungen und zur Rompolitik vom 10. bis
zum 12. Jahrhundert. Reinhard Elze zur Vollendung seines siebzigsten Lebensjahres gewid-
met, herausgegeben von Bernhard SCHIMMELPFENNIG und Ludwig SCHMUGGE, Sigmaringen
(Thorbecke) 1992, XI–186 p.

Throughout the Middle Ages, ancient Rome enjoyed a rich and manifold reception.
Different strands can be distinguished, although they overlap each other, of course, in many
ways. The erudite or scholarly reception of Rome consists mainly of antiquarian studies of the
topography and antiquities of Rome on the one hand, and textual criticism and commentaries
on classical Latin authors on the other hand. The aesthetic or art-historical reception of Rome
is evidenced by classical elements in medieval art. The imitations of and borrowings from
classical Latin authors, as well as the long tradition of Roman legends and popular lore,
constitute the literary reception of Rome. The role of ancient Rome and Roman history in
medieval politics and political thought may be called the political or historical reception of
Rome.

Therefore, Rome remained omnipresent in medieval culture, and the medieval concept of
Rome was determined to an important extent by the classical legacy. Throughout the Middle
Ages attempts were made to revive this classical tradition in order to achieve a *renovatio
Romae*. The *Nachleben* of Rome has been investigated in a few large-scale studies, which have
become »classics« in their own right. Arturo Graf (Roma nella memoria e nelle immaginazioni
del Medio Evo, 1882, 1923[2] [= 1987]) surveyed a great variety of medieval legends and stories
dealing with Rome and its political and literary protagonists. Fedor Schneider (Rom und
Romgedanke im Mittelalter, 1926 [= 1959]) traced the changing concept of Rome throughout
the Middle Ages, and showed its various cultural and intellectual expressions. Percy Ernst
Schramm (Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio. Studien und Texte zur Geschichte des römischen
Erneuerungsgedankens vom Ende des karolingischen Reiches bis zum Investiturstreit, 1929;
Volume 1: 1957[2] [with addenda] [= 1984, 1992]; Volume 2: reprinted with a few changes in:
Kaiser, Könige und Päpste, Volumes 3 [1969] and 4,1 [1970]) studied the political and cultural-
intellectual ideal of the *renovatio Romae* aspired to by the Western and Eastern Empires, the
papacy, and the Romans.

The dates of publication and subsequent reprints of these works bear witness to their lasting
success. Nevertheless, they all have their limitations and flaws which have not passed
unnoticed by later scholars. Graf produced an impressive *Materialsammlung*, but fell short of
providing an historical-critical analysis of the documentation he collected. Schneider's treat-
ment of his topic remained rather »impressionistic« (Herbert Bloch) and even somewhat
idiosyncratic; for instance, his anti-religious bias and the influence of Oswald Spengler's
terminology (Pseudomorphose, Statik, Dynamik, etc.) should be taken into account. No one
today should consult Schramm's study, easily the most influential of the three, without
adducing a crucial paper by Herbert Bloch (Der Autor der »Graphia aureae urbis Romae«,
1984). In this article Bloch demonstrated that the *Graphia* was a compilation forged by the
12th-century librarian of Montecassino, Peter the Deacon. This revelation enervated many of
Schramm's theses, since he had dated the *Graphia* to about 1030 and had considered the

treatise an essential source for the *renovatio Romae* of Otto III, the central figure of his work. Incidentally, the 1992 reprint of ›Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio‹ without any reference to the corrections worked out by Bloch or indeed any accompanying discussion prompted quite a critical article *(Unrenoviert)* from a reviewer in the ›Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung‹ of November 17, 1992.

Bloch's study of the *Graphia* and its scholarly context outlined above constitute the starting-point of ›Rom im hohen Mittelalter‹, a collection of papers delivered at a conference in September 1987, and presented as a Festschrift to Reinhard Elze, long-time Director of the German Historical Institute in Rome. In the introduction, Bernhard Schimmelpfennig explains that the aim of this volume is to assess the evolution and change of the concept of Rome and its *renovatio* from the 10th to the 12th century on a wider and more nuanced basis than in the studies of Graf, Schneider, Schramm, and Bloch. One fundamental correction of the older scholarship, already established by Bloch and further elaborated in this volume, is evident in the mere subtitle of ›Rom im hohen Mittelalter‹, and refers to the chronological framework of the topic. Graf and Schneider were not very concerned about periodization; Schramm, however, focused explicitly on the 9th, 10th, and 11th centuries. All three, therefore, ignored the importance of the 12th century, which enjoyed a notable »new fascination with ancient Rome« (see Bloch's paper in: Renaissance and renewal in the twelfth century, 1982). Particularly in Schramm's case, this error led to a number of misguided ideas. Admittedly, scholars only began to understand fully the renaissance of the 12th century at the time (Haskins's book appeared in 1927), but Schramm did not adjust in later editions of ›Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio‹ his chronological orientation to these new insights.

The essays included in ›Rom im hohen Mittelalter‹ are divided into four groups: *Die Kaiser* (one contribution by Hermann FILLITZ), *Die Päpste* (contributions by Werner MALECZEK, Uta-Renate BLUMENTHAL, Horst FUHRMANN, Bernhard SCHIMMELPFENNIG), *Die Stadt* (contributions by Ingrid BAUMGÄRTNER, Hans Martin SCHALLER, Peter Cornelius CLAUSSEN), and *Rom von außen gesehen* (contributions by Rudolf SCHIEFFER, Friedrich WOLFZETTEL, Paul Gerhard SCHMIDT). By distinguishing different milieus the editors want to elucidate the various forms and expressions of the *renovatio Romae*, the complexity of which was not fully grasped in previous scholarship. In his concluding paper, Ludwig SCHMUGGE discusses all the articles in a presentation structured according to the three traditional protagonists of the medieval concept of Rome, namely the papacy, the empire, and the citizens of Rome. Rather than summarizing the papers in a similar fashion here, I would like to sketch their main lines of thought according to a few pairs of opposite concepts which may evince the many aspects involved in the idea of Rome during the High Middle Ages.

Probably the most important opposition emerging from the studies in ›Rom im hohen Mittelalter‹ is the tension between the universal and local dimensions of the concept of Rome, for which the pivotal period is the pontificate of Innocentius III. In the course of the centuries the bishop of Rome gradually acquired a status of primacy and universality in the Church, but the Church of Rome was not equated with the universal Church until the Investiture controversy. From Innocentius III onwards, this equation was universally accepted, so that the Church of Rome was not necessarily and exclusively associated anymore with the city of Rome (Fuhrmann). Canonists, such as Deusdedit, who tried to defend the prerogatives of the local Roman clergy and distinguished carefully between the *Romana ecclesia* and the pope, represented only a minority (Blumenthal). A similar development can be traced in the Roman ceremonial liturgy, which celebrated the pope as *Liturge in der Stadt, Fürsorger für die Stadt und Herr über die Stadt*, but gradually lost its close bonds with the city of Rome. The ceremonial *ordines* of the 12th century, possibly dating back to earlier times than commonly thought, were sometimes not even properly understood by its 12th-century audience (Schimmelpfennig). Toward the end of the 12th century the city of Rome lost its importance as a source of inspiration for the imperial insignia as well (Fillitz). Finally, the universality and

exemplarity of Rome appeared also in the literary reception of Rome, as, for instance, in the Old French novel (Wolfzettel).

Another opposition exists between the revival of Rome *(Romerneuerung)* and the domination of Rome *(Rombeherrschung)*. Ingrid Baumgärtner already brought attention to this issue in an important paper on the Roman Comune to which her contribution in this volume can be considered a sequel. The Comune strove for *Romerneuerung* by reviving the ancient senate, but followed a different strategy to achieve *Rombeherrschung*; it appropriated namely the administrative apparatus of the papal Curia, and looked to the Empire for ideological inspiration (Baumgärtner). For the Church of Rome, on the other hand, *Rombeherrschung* became ever more difficult to accomplish, as it assumed ever more universal dimensions. The long absences from Rome made it difficult to counter the offensive of the local nobility and the Comune in their effort to control the city. In the High Middle Ages, the Roman church did not develop a specific concept of Rome, and was not concerned about an ideological *Romerneuerung*; it merely confirmed its status as leader of the *ecclesia universalis* (Maleczek).

A distinction should be made, too, between the reception of Antiquity and contemporary tendencies. Reception of antiquity was a factor in the ideological concerns of the leaders of the Comune, but its importance in their political strategy should not be overrated. In its attempt to dominate Rome, the Comune followed a *Realpolitik* in which reception of antiquity was dictated by pragmatic considerations (Baumgärtner). A survey of the government insignia of the Comune may illustrate its selective use of ancient models (Schaller). The imperial insignia, especially those from the 12th century, are more elaborate, and make a more sophisticated use of ancient motives (Fillitz). They are to be situated in a larger art-historical context, just as the *renovatio* in Roman churches during the 11th and 12th centuries (Claussen).

A further opposition is that between the material and the ideological expressions of the *renovatio Romae*. Claussen's paper discusses the renewal of the Roman churches in the High Middle Ages in both its art-historical and political contexts.

Finally, the views on Rome from the inside should be compared to those from the outside. The concept of Rome expressed by foreigners may be quite vague due to lack of knowledge, as in German historians during the High Middle Ages, with the possible exception of Otto of Freising (Schieffer); sometimes it shows similarities with the idea of Rome put forth by the popes and the canonists, as in the Old French novel (Wolfzettel); finally, it can be utterly negative and critical, as in the case of John of Garland (Schmidt).

This brief summary shows that ›Rom im hohen Mittelalter‹ does indeed provide a wider-ranging outlook on the *renovatio Romae* than previous scholarship. The editors live up to their promise of presenting a more nuanced and complex picture of the concept of Rome than had been achieved before. It is particularly noteworthy that the discussion is not centered anymore on the aspirations and ideals of specific persons or groups, but rather on tangible events and policies. The views on the *renovatio Romae* have long been dominated by the clash of interests between the emperor, the pope, and the citizens of Rome, and the topic has almost always been interpreted and discussed along those lines. Some famous contemporary accounts may have influenced this approach; Otto of Freising's report of the encounter between Frederick Barbarossa and the envoys of the Roman Comune comes to mind (*Gesta Friderici*, 2,29–30). However, even if ›Rom im hohen Mittelalter‹ is still structured in these terms, the traditional heroes have retreated into the background, and the focus has shifted to the historical and political realities that shaped the scene in which the protagonists operated.

Some elements or themes may perhaps not have received all the attention they deserve, but then again, one should keep in mind that ›Rom im hohen Mittelalter‹ is a collection of essays, not an exhaustive monograph. Most papers of ›Rom im hohen Mittelalter‹ deal with the

political, juridical, and historical elements of the concept of Rome, i. e. those *Romvorstellun-gen* that are relevant for a specific *Rompolitik*, which is, of course, the perspective suggested by the subtitle of the volume. The two art-historical contributions (Fillitz and Claussen) also pay much attention to the political dimension of their topic. Claussen even explicitly calls for a study of the political implications of the medieval antiquarian descriptions of Rome (p. 122). The erudite and literary modes of reception of Rome as such are given rather short shrift. The antiquarianism evidenced, for instance, by the *Mirabilia urbis Romae* and the *Graphia aureae urbis Romae* plays only an inconspicuous role, and is nowhere discussed at length. Neverthe-less, it should be noted that Schimmelpfennig has further argued his theory positing a pre-12th-century date for the *Mirabilia* (p. 49–51); this earlier date is met with approval by Baumgärtner (p. 77), and merits further investigation, even if the traditional date is still endorsed in this volume by Claussen (p. 122). The literary *Romvorstellungen* are treated exclusively in the section *Rom von außen gesehen*. Schmidt is the only one to remind us that in the Middle Ages there also existed a negative idea of Rome, which Benzinger (Invectiva in Romam, 1968) has drawn our attention to.

As Ludwig Schmugge admits in his conclusion (p. 178), the most problematic component of the topic remains the Emperor, about whose concept of Rome or reception of Antiquity not much new information appears. The section *Die Kaiser* is indeed filled by only one article, although Schmugge reports on two additional papers, delivered by Benson and Elze at the 1987 conference but not included in ›Rom im hohen Mittelalter‹. This reduced focus on the Emperor in the context of *renovatio Romae*, along with the inclusion of the 12th century in the treatment of the topic, marks the most notable difference in approach from Schramm's study. Otto III dominated the scene in ›Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio‹; he is merely a marginal figure in ›Rom im hohen Mittelalter‹.

This evolution perhaps also accounts for the more critical approach of the ideal of *renovatio* itself. It may be symptomatic that the term *renovatio* does not occur in the title of this new volume, although ›Rom im hohen Mittelalter‹ is to a large extent inspired by the work of Schramm. The term *renovatio* is more closely associated with specific developments and tendencies (e. g. Claussen: phases of architectural renewal in 11th- and 12th-century Rome; Baumgärtner: political renewal attempted by the Comune; Fillitz: revival of ancient forms of imperial headgear), and is not used as a general cultural-historical notion. Schramm, on the other hand, still started his book with a theoretical discussion of the concept of *renovatio*, following the tradition of Konrad Burdach and Paul Piur, and then singled out the »Roman« variant as the object of his study.

The book is edited with care. Typographical errors are few: on p. 2 (and on the dust jacket) read »Graf«, not »Graff«; on p. 139 »1165«, not »1065«; on p. 173 »religieuse«, not »réligieuse«; on p. 175 »Bertram«, not »Betram«. ›Rom im hohen Mittelalter‹ considerably advances our knowledge of the political, religious, and cultural-intellectual components of the concept of Rome in the High Middle Ages, and provides an indispensable complement to the scholarly work of Graf, Schneider, Schramm, and Bloch.

Marc LAUREYS, Leuven

Heinrich FICHTENAU, Ketzer und Professoren. Häresie und Vernunftglaube im Hochmittelal-ter, München (Beck) 1992, 351 p.

Ce livre de Heinrich Fichtenau, avant sa retraite professeur d'histoire médiévale à Vienne, est plein d'idées, bien écrit, et basé sur une familiarité exceptionnelle avec les sources. Il est le fruit d'une vie entière de réflexion. En un mot le livre est excellent. Il est à espérer qu'un éditeur français ou anglais trouve le courage de le traduire et de le faire connaître à un large public, plus large que celui des médiévistes, et des médiévistes qui maîtrisent l'allemand.