

Kapitelsäle als eine Gruppe aufgeführt werden, die besonders in England in gotischer Zeit gerne als nahezu freistehende Polygone gebaut wurden. Schließlich bleibt noch eine ganze Anzahl von „Nebenkirchen ohne klar bestimmbare Funktion“, denen der letzte Abschnitt dieses Hauptteils gewidmet ist.

Der kurze Schlußabschnitt, der auf 18 Druckseiten die Verbreitung der Zentralbauten behandelt, trägt inhaltlich wenig Neues bei, sondern hat die Aufgabe, den Überblick zu schaffen, der beim Abhandeln der Funktionen nicht gewonnen werden konnte. Die Bauten werden hier in regionaler Ordnung und innerhalb der Regionen chronologisch aufgeführt.

Untermann hat zahlreiche Beispiele von Zentralbauten verschiedenster Art zusammengetragen und sich sicher um Vollständigkeit bemüht, die freilich nie lückenlos zu erreichen ist. So wäre es also wenig sinnvoll, hier den einen oder anderen Bau nachzutragen, der in dem Buch nicht genannt wird. Man sollte wohl eher darauf hinweisen, wie oft man Bauten, die einem bei der Lektüre in den Sinn kommen, im Register wirklich findet und wie selten man dabei ins Leere stößt.

Die zahlreichen Abbildungen geben dem Text die nötige Anschaulichkeit. Die Pläne sind dabei durch die Vereinheitlichung der Maßstäbe vergleichbar gemacht. Allerdings machten es die erheblichen Größenunterschiede der Objekte unmöglich, mit einem Maßstab auszukommen. So ist die Mehrzahl der Grundrisse und Schnitte 1:500 wiedergegeben, größere Bauten oder Baugruppen aber 1:1000. Das mag in Art und Format der Publikation zwingend begründet sein, und doch bleibt der wechselnde Maßstab ein Mangel. Jeder Benutzer des Buches wird mit Erstaunen den Größenunterschied zwischen den Kapellen in Würzburg und Altötting (S. 177) registrieren, aber er wird darauf hereinfallen, daß die Kirchgrundrisse von Deutz und Nymwegen (S. 130/31) etwa gleich groß erscheinen. Die Maßstabsangabe in der Bildunterschrift gibt zwar an, daß Deutz in halber Größe abgebildet und also im Vergleich doppelt so groß (d. h. mit vierfacher Fläche) zu denken ist, doch gegen die Evidenz kommen solche Überlegungen einfach nicht an. Ein Versehen beim Druck verrät, daß es doch anders gegangen wäre: Die Pläne des Karners von Deutsch-Altenburg (S. 223) sind nicht, wie angegeben, 1:500 abgebildet, sondern wesentlich kleiner, vermutlich 1:1000. Sie erscheinen zwar wirklich sehr klein, sind aber noch eindeutig lesbar.

In seiner Bestandsaufnahme hat Untermann ein sehr umfangreiches und erstaunlich vielfältiges Material gesammelt, das er geordnet vorlegt und kritisch würdigt. Dabei ist er gezwungen, aufzählend zu referieren und viele Einzelheiten zu diskutieren. Ein durchgehender und sich aufbauender Gedankengang, der den Leser mitziehen könnte, läßt sich damit nicht entwickeln. Da das Material zwar Gruppierungen, aber keine durchgehende Strukturierung aufweist, fügt es sich nicht zu einer ihm innewohnenden Ordnung. Die Gliederung, die verschiedenartige, oft sich überschneidende Gesichtspunkte berücksichtigt, ist nicht zwingend. Sie hätte auch ganz anders aussehen können, ohne daß sie deshalb einleuchtender geworden wäre.

Damit soll nicht auf Mängel der Bearbeitung hingewiesen werden, sondern auf die Besonderheit des Themas. Mit seinem Buch erreicht der Autor ein Ziel, das er vermutlich nicht angestrebt hat: Er weist nach, daß im Mittelalter zwar zahlreiche Zentralbauten errichtet wurden, daß es aber den Zentralbau im Mittelalter, von dem der Buchtitel spricht, eigentlich gar nicht gibt.

Für jeden, der sich mit diesem vielfältigen Themenkreis beschäftigt, sollte das zugleich gehaltvolle und ernüchternde Buch von Untermann Pflichtlektüre sein.

*Darmstadt*

*Walter Haas*

Studi Gregoriani per la storia della „libertas ecclesiae“, XIII. LAS, Rom 1989. 433 S.

This volume of Studi Gregoriani consists of sixteen Relazioni, prefaced by an opening address by A. M. Stickler and supplemented by C. Violante's Discorso di chiusura, which were given at the Congress held at Salerno in 1985, La Riforma Gregoriana e l'Europa, in commemoration of the nine hundredth anniversary of Pope Gregory VII's death there in exilio; a volume of Comunicazioni will follow.

Cardinal Stickler's address focused the work of the Congress sharply upon the



personality and work of Gregory, while reminding it of the vast canvas upon which they must be depicted. Centuries of interaction between ecclesiastical and civil government, and the cumulative and interacting legacies of Roman, Germanic, and feudal institutions, had resulted in a state of affairs in which spiritual offices were all too often controlled by their material environment: *officium sequitur beneficium*. Of the deep malaise that followed, simony, clerical marriage and concubinage, and lay investiture were the tangible evidence. Gregory's experiences as pope up to Canossa brought him gradually to the realization, most apparent in his slowly crystallizing hostility to lay investiture, that the reform of the church must be pursued at the highest and most demanding level. Only thus could the centuries-long tide be turned to establish the principle that *beneficium sequitur officium*. The greatness of Gregory lay in the clear perception which he eventually reached after his experiences with Henry IV of Germany in the winter of 1075-6 that this was so. Stickler in effect offers the challenge of a Gregory who indeed exhibited the „Einzigkeit“ and „Unersetzlichkeit“ of Burckhardt's „große Mann“, as „ein solcher, ohne welchen die Welt uns unvollständig schiene, weil bestimmte große Leistungen nur durch ihn innerhalb seiner Zeit und Umgebung möglich waren und sonst undenkbar sind; er ist wesentlich verflochten in den großen Hauptstrom der Ursachen und Wirkungen“.

The challenge was well taken up in the two areas that were chosen for consideration by the Relatori: the concept of a Gregorian Reform as centring upon the personality and actions of Gregory, and the impact of the Reform upon the regions of Europe, considered not so much in terms of their international development as of Gregory's impingement upon them. Certainly the concept of a Gregorian Reform is ripe for reconsideration at the end of a century in which Augustin Fliche disseminated and perhaps coined the phrase with an emphasis upon settled programmes and principles, whereas Ovidio Capitani has more recently posed the question, „Esiste un'età Gregoriana?“ The present volume offers no easy or unanimous answer, but reveals some of the further questions that must be explored. An important question is that of the respects in which reforming aspirations differed. W. Goetz makes the valuable point that ecclesiastical reform and Gregorian reform were far from being interchangeable terms. Archbishop Liemar of Bremen, the Lombard bishops opposed to Gregory, and Guibert of Ravenna were for the most part according to their lights reformers who were concerned to combat simony and clerical marriage or concubinage. But they represented a traditionalist, rather than a revolutionary, force. Gregory's reform was more than a matter of purification; it involved the juridical and administrative re-ordering of the whole church. Gregory's own concept of the Roman primacy and of the papal office led him to make obedience a key demand, and to present a stone of stumbling to many bishops. There can be no question of the Gregorian reform's having begun in 1046; it began in 1073. Equally, it ended in 1085. In one of the few contributions that overrun this date by exploring the *Libelli de Lite*, O. Capitani makes it clear from the work of Manegold of Lautenbach and others how quickly those who explored the nature and interaction of papal and royal authority complemented an appeal to Gregory's letters by an appeal of their own to history. The parameters of discussion quickly changed.

The phrase „Gregorian Reform“ is not left unquestioned. In writing of it as applied to the German lands, H. Zimmermann warns against the danger of importing later meanings. The verb *reformare* appears seldom in Gregory's letters, and a caution is issued against any such monocausal explanation of the age of Gregory VII as the phrase appears to embody. Given the three-cornered character of the German struggle of pope, king, and princes, the caution is salutary and it is likely to be heeded. Yet in this, as in most of the more stimulating of the contributions to this volume, Gregory's *Einzigkeit* almost inevitably emerges. By way of Hirsau, Zimmermann gives a central place to Gregory's letter of 1080 about the reform of All Saints' at Schaffhausen (Reg. 7.24), in which Gregory's zeal to eliminate every trace of temporal authority brought him to condemn and nullify even a privilege of his immediate predecessor, Alexander II.

Some of the most memorable contributions focus sharply upon Gregory himself. M. Maccarrone makes a searching exploration of the Petrine foundations of Gregory's understanding of the papal primacy. He rightly has no place for the facile conception



of a Petrusmystik as opposed to a profound and personal commitment to the Apostle's service. He explains, with a wealth of examples and pertinent comment, the long traditions in canonical and other sources upon which Gregory drew. There is a depiction of the Petrine outlook which Gregory inherited not only from reform popes since Leo IX but also from their tenth-century predecessors. Maccarrone makes the attractive suggestion that Hildebrand may have had his earliest education at Rome in a schola cantorum attached to St Peter's before he moved to the Lateran palace. If St Peter's and the Lateran were the places of his early education, a similar duality found expression at the end of his life in his last encyclical from Salerno (Epp. vag. 54), in which he proclaimed St Peter and the Roman church to be the father and the mother of all Christians. In this dual inspiration, Maccarrone sees the uniqueness of Gregory and the heart of his conception of the papal primacy. The case for his historical Unersetzlichkeit must, perhaps, rest upon his having been thereby impelled to explore the prerogatives of the apostolic see and of the pope, not only in idea but also in action, with an unexampled zeal and thoroughness.

Not that he can be called a jurist; in the history of canon law, popes like Alexander II and Urban II contributed much more of importance than he. Moreover, he was anything but a systematic thinker. Maccarrone makes the arresting observation that, for all his Petrine motivation, Gregory referred to St Peter in only one of the twenty-seven clauses of the *Dictatus papae*, when, in clause 23, a canonically elected pope is undoubtedly made holy by the Apostle's merits. And upon this as upon other topics, Gregory's second letter to Bishop Hermann of Metz (Reg. 8.21) showed much greater maturity of statement. H. Fuhrmann argues similarly in a seminal paper on Gregory and canon law, with particular reference to the *Dictatus papae*. This was not, as G. B. Borino argued in an influential article, the index to a canonical collection that was never compiled; it was Gregory's own attempt to explore the lines of his papal authority. But why, then, did he say so little about its Petrine springs? Perhaps it is necessary to look at the temporary pattern of circumstances in Germany during the winter of 1074-5. Perhaps, too, his Unersetzlichkeit is to be sought in the very fact that he was not a jurist, and that he stimulated the exploration of the prerogatives of the apostolic see not only by what he himself thought but also by the way in which by his words and deeds he impelled others to think, in particular his papal successors and their canonist supporters.

So far as Gregory VII's own contribution is concerned, the Reform that takes his name did not take the form of his reconstructing or greatly advancing the structure and workings of the Roman church itself. C. G. Fürst shows that he made no direct contribution to the eleventh-century transformation of the cardinalate from being a liturgical institution of the local Roman church to being of international and governmental significance. This underlines the paradox that, while almost all of the cardinal-bishops of his pontificate were his loyal, active, and unshaken supporters, he gave no countenance to Peter Damiani's vision of them as the spiritual senators of the Roman church. Only once did the phrase *cardinales episcopi* appear in his letters, and then the scribe was quick to interline between the words an apparently disjunctive *et* (Reg. 1.16). R. Somerville reviews the councils, at least eleven in number, that Gregory held, usually in Rome but in 1084 perforce in Salerno. He shows how much is still to be learnt about them, and well brings out their significantly mixed character, as both theatres for him to transmit the directions of the Holy Spirit through himself as vicar of St Peter to the assembled audience, and as forums for collective decisions to be taken in matters both great and small. It is particularly welcome, in view of the true importance of the subject, that R. Elze should ponder Gregory VII's concern for the Roman liturgy, for no student of the medieval papacy should neglect the liturgical round which formed the regular business of the Roman church and clergy. Elze's reminder that there survive forty-six manuscripts of Bernold of St Blasien's *Micrologus* underlines the value of this source; historically it is the foundation of Gregory's reputation as a liturgical reformer. The detailed reforms that Bernold mentioned were trifles – and yet they were not. For Gregory, liturgical harmony was part of the consonance with the Roman church that was the mark of a catholic (*Dictatus papae* 26); the limitations of what was actually done may belie its inner significance. G. Picasso discusses Gregory's concern to impose canonical discipline



upon monks and clergy, and notices his concern to impose an appropriate discipline upon different orders. He suggests that the young Hildebrand may have lived as a clericus canonicus with his early patron John Gratian at St John in portam Latinam, and maintains the likelihood that he was a monk at Cluny.

Whatever may be made of Gregory's career, there can be no doubt of the many facets that it presented. Insight into what manner of man he was is facilitated by the account by G. Fornaciari and F. Mallegni of an anthropological, palaeopathological, and palaeonutritional examination in 1984 of his extensive skeletal remains. Anthropologically, the myth of Jewish ancestry seems to have been dispelled; his characteristics suit an Alpine-Mediterranean, but not a Lombard, background. He was, indeed, small in stature – in the prime of life some 163 cm. tall and at the time of his death only some 157 cm. But he was always well nourished and strong, with the appearance of being a horseman. Anything but sedentary, his frame had been subject to physical stresses. A pathological examination of his vertebrae disclosed a condition which must have been painful and sometimes necessitating rest; it, rather than nervous causes, may account for his occasional invalidity. Perhaps most important, his age at death appears to have been between sixty-five and seventy-five, and probably about seventy. If he was born c. 1015, he was some thirty years of age before any events in his life which can be firmly dated. He assumed the major offices of his career as a man of appropriate age and experience: he was into his forties when he became archdeacon at Rome, and some fifty-eight years of age when he became pope. The medical dating offers ample space for the development of his ecclesiastical career, including a monastic period before his exile with Pope Gregory VI. The sense of space adds force to Violante's observation that there remains a pressing need for a full and balanced account of his spiritual development.

A bridge from the subject of the Gregorian reform to that of Gregory and the regions of Europe is provided by R. Schieffer's overview of his relations with the kings of Europe. These relations are also the concern of a number of regional studies. Schieffer notices how comprehensively Gregory addressed in his letters the kings of his time. The letters, many of which bear the marks of his own dictation, show a similarity of outlook. Paying special attention to Philip I of France and Henry IV of Germany, Schieffer rightly observes in the period from Worms to Canossa a turning-point not only in Gregory's attitude to Henry but also to kings in general. There was a levelling of the political landscape after which letters were addressed „to all defenders of the Christian faith“ and „to all defenders of the Christian religion“. But perhaps a valid point is pressed rather far. If kings were obedient or could be regarded as so, like William I of England, Gregory continued to single them out for high regard and praise, even though he could strike different notes when writing to and about them (compare Reg. 9.37 with Epp. vag. 531). But Schieffer's insistence on the pivotal nature of the period of Worms and Canossa fits well the perspective upon Gregory that Stickler presents in his opening lecture. Perhaps the most important conclusion to be drawn from this volume is how profoundly Gregory's mind developed under the pressure of events during his years as pope. Few sentences in his letters deserve deeper pondering than a wholly disregarded observation in a letter of January 1075, and so of the time of the *Dictatus papae* and of the supposed Investiture Decree. Writing to, of all people, Bishop Hugh of Die who had been pressing ecclesiastical liberty too hard upon his diocese he declared: *nemo repente fit summus et alta edificia paulatim edificantur* (Reg. 2.43). Gregory was echoing the wisdom of Pope Gregory I (Reg. 5.58, 9.218), and he curiously anticipated words of someone as far from him in time, place, and mind as Oliver Cromwell: No man goes so far as he who knows not whither he is going. There is a point beyond which these words would not fit Gregory. Yet it is a mark of his greatness that he, too, guided his age in the paths that it might follow, but did so in response to the gradual unfolding of events in conscious understanding that it is thus that events must be controlled.

Alongside Zimmerman's discussion of the Gregorian Reform in the German-speaking lands, its impact upon Henry IV's kingdoms is further considered by G. Fornasari in relation to the *Regnum Italiae*. His concentration upon the Patrenes, Piacenza, the Matildine world, and Aquileia points the value of local and regional histories. One would, however, have welcomed such an overall treatment as might



have been afforded by a critique of E. Müller-Mertens's thesis in his book on the *Regnum teutonicum*, a concept to which Gregory's contribution is not here assessed. Gregory's dealings with France are well covered by J. Gaudemet in a careful analysis of the large proportion of Gregory's letters, both registered and not, which has to do with French affairs, often local and particular. Three main topics are chosen: Gregory's concern by many means to secure respect for the hierarchy and to facilitate the exercise of its powers; his resolve to settle conflicts and promote concord; and his curbing of lay excesses, especially those of King Philip I. For all his attention to France, Gregory showed restraint in the sense that he intervened only when it was necessary for him to do so. Gaudemet applauds his firmness of tone and care for justice: „Ce scrupule de toujours respecter la justice est peut-être le trait majeur de cette personnalité“.

Except, perhaps, for the eastern lands of Europe, its peripheral areas are comprehensively covered. Exceeding the general restriction of period, A. García y García outlines a reform in the Iberian kingdoms which was „moderada“ from 1049 to 1073, „rígida“ from 1073 to 1085, and „conciliatoria“ from 1088 to 1123. The present reviewer attempts a Gleichschaltung of the Gregorian Reform in the Anglo-Norman lands and in the Scandinavian kingdoms; it is, perhaps, surprising that, although Gregory pursued similar policies towards the kings of England and Denmark whose friendship he needed, he never seemed aware of their hostility to each other or of an interest to curb it. N. Cilento opens his survey of the Norman and Lombard lands in South Italy and of relations with Byzantium by referring to a similar apparent indifference to relationships between lay princes when he both maintained to the end his own link with Prince Gisulf of Salerno and also sought the alliance of Robert Guiscard who seized Salerno from Gisulf in 1077. Gregory's dealings with the peripheral states of Christendom were partly governed by his need to counterbalance the recalcitrant rulers of its heartlands, the Capetians and the Salians. But his concern for such distant places as Ireland and Iceland establishes the universality of his pastoral and religious perspectives, as well.

In summary, it would not be wise to claim that the *Relazioni* at Salerno by themselves establish Gregory's Burckhardian greatness; they represented many standpoints and backgrounds, and it must always be asked how Gregory might appear if the accidents of survival had also preserved Registers of popes like Alexander II and Urban II. However, Gregory emerges as a man of great stature, and as one of the figures of both papal and European history about whom the question of greatness must necessarily be posed. No such figure stands more in need of a historical synthesis which will replace that made between the two World Wars by Augustine Fliche, which established Gregory's greatness for Fliche's day. For it can be said with certainty that the question of his greatness is one that needs to be posed and answered by each generation of medieval historians.

Oxford

H. E. J. Cowdrey

Thomas Frenz: *Die Kanzlei der Päpste der Hochrenaissance (1471–1527)*. (Bibliothek des Deutschen Historischen Instituts in Rom, Bd. 63), X und 562 S., Max Niemeyer Verlag, Tübingen 1986.

Bekanntlich ist die römische Kurie im mittelalterlichen Europa mit dem Auf- und Ausbau einer (sich schon ziemlich bald reich ausfaltenden) Administration und der schriftlichen Ausfertigung von Verwaltungsentscheidungen vorangegangen und hat als Vorbild für die Entstehung von Verwaltungen und Behörden an den Königs- und Fürstenhöfen des Abendlandes gedient. Nicht von ungefähr ist auch die moderne Disziplin der Diplomatik als Hilfswissenschaft der Geschichte vor allem an den Papsturkunden entwickelt worden. Dabei standen verständlicherweise die Anfänge der Entwicklung im Mittelpunkt der Aufmerksamkeit der Forschung, d. h. die Jahrhunderte des Mittelalters. Es macht eine der Leistungen des hier anzuzeigenden Bandes aus, daß Verf. den damit angedeuteten zeitlichen Rahmen sprengt, indem er sich der „Hochrenaissance“ zuwendet (eine Bezeichnung im Titel, die aus Gründen der Anschaulichkeit gewählt ist: S. 39, Anm. 1). Freilich betritt er nicht nur chronologisch Neuland: