

Francia. Forschungen zur westeuropäischen Geschichte

Herausgegeben vom Deutschen Historischen Institut Paris

(Institut historique allemand)

Band 32/1 (2005)

DOI: 10.11588/fr.2005.1.61655

Rechtshinweis

Bitte beachten Sie, dass das Digitalisat urheberrechtlich geschützt ist. Erlaubt ist aber das Lesen, das Ausdrucken des Textes, das Herunterladen, das Speichern der Daten auf einem eigenen Datenträger soweit die vorgenannten Handlungen ausschließlich zu privaten und nicht-kommerziellen Zwecken erfolgen. Eine darüber hinausgehende unerlaubte Verwendung, Reproduktion oder Weitergabe einzelner Inhalte oder Bilder können sowohl zivil- als auch strafrechtlich verfolgt werden.

kratie; F. MENANT, Italien der Kommunen; J.-M. MARTIN, Süditalien; R. DURAND, Portugal; C. LALIENA, Aragon; M.-A. NIELEN, Outremer), in denen zum Teil versucht wird, dem Leitthema gemäß Namengebung und Familienstrukturen miteinander in Verbindung zu bringen.

Drei Vorträge liegen außerhalb des hochmittelalterlichen Zeithorizonts. R. LE JAN steuert einen wichtigen und überzeugenden Beitrag zu »Personal Names and the Transformation of Kinship in Early Medieval Society (Sixth to Tenth Centuries)« bei, während P. BECK die bäuerliche Personennamengebung im spätmittelalterlichen Frankreich untersucht und J. MORSEL interessante und weiterführende Beobachtungen über die Unterschiede (und Gemeinsamkeiten) bei der Bezeichnung spätmittelalterlicher adliger fränkischer Damen auf Siegeln sowie in Urkunden mitteilt und interpretiert.

Der methodologische, vor allem aber statistische Voraussetzungen und Gegebenheiten reflektierende Beitrag »Methodological Problems in a Quantitative Approach to Changes in Naming« von P. CHAREILLE rundet einen Sammelband ab, der einen eindrucksvollen Einblick in die wertvolle Forschungsarbeit der Gruppe GMAM liefert, der aber zugleich zeigt, daß die mediävistisch ausgerichtete historische Namenforschung noch zahlreiche ungelöste Aufgaben vor sich hat, die wohl nur durch größere interdisziplinär arbeitende und international zusammengesetzte Forschergruppen bewältigt werden können.

Jörg JARNUT, Paderborn

Eduard HLAWITSCHKA, Konradiner-Genealogie, unstatthafte Verwandtenehen und spätottonisch-frühsalische Thronbesetzungspraxis. Ein Rückblick auf 25 Jahre Forschungsdisput, Hannover (Hahnsche Buchhandlung) 2003, XX–220 p. (Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Studien und Texte, 32).

The title reflects the author's conception of a dispute that began in 1978 regarding legal principles affecting royal succession in Germany from the tenth century to the later middle ages. The author's belief is that new conceptions of the family structure of the Konradiner are incorrect, that the law of canonical consanguinity disproves them, and that consequently there can be no implications for his own nebulous theory, where inheritance is a secondary issue in royal candidacy. The stated hierarchy of issues – first Konradiner genealogy, then prohibited marriage, and finally succession custom – has some significance, since the central purpose of the book is to sway the reader towards dismissing the legal foundation of heritability in royal succession. Had the legal and constitutional matter been placed in the forefront as appropriate, the reader would think twice before rejecting it. Some readers will be persuaded by the author's single-minded attack on an already fairly expansive body of research, yet the book contains some fatal flaws that should lead the attentive reader to embrace those new standpoints.

The book is constructed in ten chapters which introduce and summarize the dispute and provide discussion of each stage according to the author's perception. However, it is important to note that five of the ten chapters – constituting almost 80% of the text – focus specifically on the author's principal opponents: Armin Wolf's name occurs in the titles of three of these chapters, while the current reviewer is mentioned in the titles of four. The ostensive objectivity in the book's construction is therefore a dissimulation. Other chapter titles name scholars who have made minor contributions (e.g. Christian Settapani and Jean-Pierre Poly, who merit a five-page chapter), as well as persons who rank as genealogists rather than historians (e.g. Josef Heinzelmann and Walter Greiner). It is evidently part of the author's polemical technique that trained and experienced historians should be seen to participate in a discussion where uninvolved scholars and outright amateurs freely contribute. Since the author rejects historians and genealogists equally, presumably he is under no cloud of keep-

ing company with amateurs. The effect of this technique is to bury the legal and constitutional matter, especially since it does not appear to impact the less-than-rigorous methods of the genealogists. To cite a common German scholarly metaphor, real issues are consigned *ad acta* – through an artificial procedure designed to suppress rather than to appraise.

Unfortunately for the author this technique has not provided him with enough material to argue coherently against his adversaries; hence he has found it necessary to emend the historical record on more than one occasion. The outstanding example is where he questions the current reviewer's determination to equate the tenth-century counts of Ufgau and Ortenau with those of Rheingau. Despite numerous and various reasons for making this equation, the author asserts the impossibility of identity in light of evidence that Count Konrad of Rheingau emerges in the source record alongside a separate Count Konrad of Ufgau-Ortenau. Here he stresses an imperial diploma of 994, where Duke Konrad of Swabia, who is count of Rheingau, appears as intervenient in a transaction involving properties in the Ufgau-Ortenau county held by a Konrad. Supposedly the reviewer was unaware of this important evidence when reaching central but erroneous conclusions. The author considers that in 1997 the reviewer reworked the genealogical reconstruction in order to derive special advantage from what was, in the final analysis, a major error (see p. 156–157). This is far from the case. Already in the first presentation of the revised Konradiner reconstruction in 1990 the reviewer proposed that as the Swabian duke's second son Count Konrad of Ufgau-Ortenau might have received his county as early as 987 (see Jackman, »The Konradiner«, p. 119–120). It is the author who is negligent, therefore, in failing to mention that possibility – a convenient failure, since he would have found it necessary to indicate that Duke Konrad of Swabia eventually abdicated not simply a county but the duchy of Alsace to his eldest son Hermann – a clear sign that abdications of public office from father to son were relatively frequent. We can treat different Konrads as father and son, and the equation of the Ufgau-Ortenau succession with the Rheingau succession remains highly likely – or technically reliable, as I argued in »The Konradiner« – despite the author's smoke screen.

On these points, the author departs from the accepted standard of historical scholarship – leaving a strong impression of hidden non-historical or political agenda. Despite outward appearances, however, it is possible that the author's suppression of the heritability issue springs less from a political motivation than from a failure to understand, or perhaps assimilate, the legal and constitutional matter that is being proposed. Much of his argumentation is circular – since for the most part he is simply challenging evidence that his combatants have long since placed in a more suitable light: there is little opportunity to advance his side of the debate without circular reasoning. These tendencies come to the fore in his discussion of the inheritance of Udo of Rheingau who, following Regino's Continuator, »with the king's permission divided his fiefs and jurisdictions like an inheritance among sons« (*quasi hereditatem inter filios divisit*). The author makes every effort to sanitize this passage of any vestige of meaning that might be opposed to his own outlook. He supposes that the passage must apply only to sons of Udo, thus documenting that Udo had sons, because otherwise Udo's brother Hermann alone would have inherited, and there would have been no need for the word »divisit«. The fallacy here is that obviously Udo's fiefs and jurisdictions did not all arrive from the father! The author also upholds the traditional interpretation that the king's permission was rigorously required for Udo to pass the fiefs and jurisdictions to his sons. If that is so – and one can hardly disagree – why should the Continuator have bothered with such a commonplace? The new outlook on this passage is that the fiefs and jurisdictions were diversified beyond the immediate family according to Udo's desire, an act that would surely have required extraordinary royal permission, and for which the Continuator's private-law simile »quasi hereditatem inter filios« is perfectly apt. But if we follow the author, the Continuator's recourse to simile is not permissible; moreover, variant gram-

matical usages are to be identified and applied without explanation of context in order to serve the author's purpose and no other (see p. 48–52). Once in command of the facts, the reader can only imagine that the author defends the traditional interpretation through some failure to grasp constitutional issues proposed by his combatants. These issues may require deeper clarification. Rome not having been built in a day, however, ideas must be permitted to stand both on their own merit and through the logical support that historical discussion provides. Certainly, the reader could rightly conclude that the new legal and constitutional material does not conform to general positions long upheld by the author. The book contains no discussion of that interesting circumstance, but offers a »Wohlan denn« for new investigations that are needed to supplant those it supposedly disproves.

Some further polemical techniques merit some comment. First, the author often develops argumentation in such a way that a *coup de grace* can be delivered, so that the opposing argumentation collapses like »a house of cards«. Obviously this procedure will help to convince unsuspecting readers, who may also view the author's ability to ridicule an opponent as proof of the fragility of opposing views. Unfortunately for the author, the *coup de grace* is frequently illusory. When discussing of Margrave Burkhard of the Bavarian Ostmark, for example, he draws a too hasty conclusion about property law (see p. 100–101). If Burkhard passed Bavarian property to the church of Augsburg according to Bavarian law, it does not certify that Burkhard himself was a Bavarian, for his wife is known to have been a ducal Bavarian and the property likely emanated from her. Here as elsewhere the author does not permit a realm of possibility, but limits the admissible to whatever is favorable to his own standpoint. Another technique is appeal to the authority of other historians without developing a context, as if some scholars were »approved«, and others merely risible. This is evident in his appeal to Patrick Corbet's study of marriage law in Germany in the central middle ages (see p. 92–93). For obvious reasons he wishes to draw this definitive work into his ranks of the 'approved' – despite the inconvenience that Corbet explicitly confirms the reviewer's outlook regarding an occasional sharpening of canonical marriage prohibitions for political purposes during the period. Unhappily for the author's purposes, canonical prohibitions were not applied consistently. Conversely, the reviewer's own notion that customary marriage law was more important than canon law has no attraction for the author. Juristic evidence supports this notion, but the author refrains from mentioning or discussing it. Finally, the author has a technique of explaining opposing ideas in terms of his opponents' inferable lack of knowledge or ability. There is evidence that Konrad of Swabia died relatively young: Thietmar of Merseburg describes him and certain other nobles as *morte momentanea depressi*. The author suggests that the reviewer misread the word »momentanea« to mean »prematurely«, whereas its actual meaning is »suddenly« (see p. 105). The inattentive reader will assume that the lack of knowledge to which the author alludes is further evidence of incorrect conclusions. Of course, the word »suddenly« in the context of several deaths clearly implies »prematurely«, so an attentive reader might actually notice the author's misrepresentation.

In a few places, thus where the inheritance of Reichenhall and the descent of the counts of Diessen from Otto the Great are considered (p. 38–44, 191–203), the book presents genuinely new material, even if the discussion remains slanted. Yet for the most part we are dealing either with a regurgitation of arguments that already languish in a damaging light, or with turgid discussion devised to combat evidence that has served in the interim to consolidate new outlooks. The discussions of newer material lack any observable reference to variables emerging in the twenty-five years of controversy (e.g. undoubted proliferation in the possibilities for interpreting paths of inheritance, whether public, private or onomastic). Essentially the book is an attempt to shout down the opposition, drawing on techniques such as revisionism, smoke screen, convenient omission, circular reasoning, ridicule, appeal to authority, and misrepresentation – not to mention the invective tone that is developed

and maintained throughout the book, despite the author's explicit repudiation of invective (see p. 203). In recapitulation of a long-standing and presumably unalterable position, the book makes its own unique contribution to the study of royal succession – but one can hardly speak in terms of a seminal contribution.

Donald C. JACKMAN, Pennsylvania

Carsten WOLL, *Die Königinnen des hochmittelalterlichen Frankreich (987–1237/38)*, Stuttgart (Steiner) 2002, 321 p. (Historische Forschungen, 24).

Il est naturel et même souhaitable que des chercheurs, étrangers à la France, s'intéressent à des sujets de toute sorte concernant celle-ci et nombreuses sont les personnes de toute nationalité qui, souvent avec talent, se sont occupées de sources françaises, comme d'ailleurs des Français ont depuis longtemps œuvré avec succès hors de leurs frontières.

M. Carsten Woll, jeune chercheur allemand, a donc eu la bonne idée de préparer une thèse, sous la direction du professeur Kurt-Ulrich Jäschke, publiée maintenant, consacrée aux reines des XI^e, XII^e et du premier tiers du XIII^e siècle, qui témoigne sans conteste d'un travail intense. Cela présente le mérite essentiel de faire connaître à un large public allemand des personnages méconnus souvent même d'historiens français.

Mais, pourtant, cette recherche – donc en principe tout à fait louable – laisse le lecteur averti sur sa faim. Les limites chronologiques choisies, elles-mêmes, font problème. En effet, si le *terminus ad quem* (1237/1238) se justifie parfaitement, car il correspond à la mort d'Ingeburge, femme de Philippe Auguste, la date de 987 ne correspond à rien de précis pour la personne même d'Adélaïde, car celle-ci fut mariée à Hugues Capet bien avant cette date, à savoir vers 970.

C. Woll connaît assez bien la bibliographie ... allemande, mais ignore nombre de titres français, tant généraux, que relatifs à telle ou telle reine. En effet, pour les premiers, sont omis notamment les ouvrages d'A. Brachet, *Pathologie mentale des rois de France. Louis XI et ses ascendants. Une vie humaine étudiée à travers six siècles d'hérédité (852–1483)*, Paris 1903, de F. Olivier-Martin, *Études sur les régences. I: Les régences et la majorité des rois sous les Capétiens directs et les premiers Valois (1060–1375)*, Paris 1931, de F. Barry, *La reine de France*, Paris 1964, de R. A. Jackson, *Ordines coronationis Franciae. Texts and ordines for the coronation of Frankish and French kings and queens in the Middle Ages*, Philadelphia (Pa.) 1995–2000, 2 vol., ou encore la contribution de R.-H. Bautier, *Sacres et couronnements sous les Carolingiens et les premiers Capétiens. Recherches sur la genèse du sacre royal français (Annuaire-bulletin de la Société de l'histoire de France, 1987–1988 [1989], p. 7–56)*.

Pour chacune des reines, manquent de même de nombreuses références; citons:

- pour Berthe de Bourgogne, femme de Robert le Pieux, l'article d'E. Santinelli, *La veuve du prince au tournant de l'an mil: l'exemple de Berthe de Bourgogne*, dans: *Femmes et pouvoirs des femmes à Byzance et en Occident (VI^e–XI^e s.) ...*, éd. S. Lebecq, A. Dierkens, R. Le Jan, J.-M. Sansterre, Villeneuve d'Ascq 1999, p. 75–89;
- pour Anne de Kiev, A. Caix de Saint-Aymour, *Anne de Russie, reine de France et comtesse de Valois au XI^e siècle*, 2^e éd., Paris 1896; M. Hellmann, *Die Heiratspolitik Jaroslavs des Weisen*, dans: *Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte* 8 (1962) p. 7–25; R. Hallu, *Anne de Kiev, reine de France*, Rome 1973, ou encore toute la littérature relative à sa souscription en caractères cyrilliques, notamment l'article de C. Couderc, *Une signature autographe d'Anne de Russie, femme de Henri I^{er}, roi de France*, dans: *La Russie géographique, ethnographique etc.*, Paris 1892, p. 473–475, planche;
- pour Aliénor d'Aquitaine, les articles d'E.-R. Labande, *Pour une histoire véridique d'Aliénor d'Aquitaine*, dans: *Bulletin de la Société des antiquaires de l'Ouest*, 4^e série,