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Medieval Rome is fascinating, intoxicating, compelling. Its uniqueness resides, *inter alia*, in its double nature of both ‘place’ and ‘idea’: a place and an idea that escape any clear-cut attempt at definition, especially since their perception and reception change remarkably over the chronological span under consideration (500–1400). As a physical place, medieval Rome is a city, indeed is the City: seat of the papacy and foremost pilgrimage centre of Latin Christendom. Nevertheless, in the very early period covered by this book, it could be seen as extending as far as the Mediterranean basin and Gaul, the area that once belonged to the Roman empire.

Rome is also an ‘idea’, a ‘mental’ place, and as such encapsulates worlds: the world of the ancient Empire, with the immense cultural capital of its literary tradition and physical legacy, and the glorious world of the martyrs and the triumph of Christian faith. These worlds, and especially the qualities and values associated with them – chief amongst these *auctoritas*, *gravitas*, splendour, and magnificence – could hardly be said to have been separate in the medieval mind, but instead were fused to form a highly charged and multifaceted concept of *romanitas*, which could be assimilated, appropriated, and adapted to serve different aims and aspirations.

This volume originates from a conference that I organized in Cambridge in July 2008, at the core of which was the aim of addressing medieval Rome in its double dimension of ‘place’ and ‘idea’. Participants focused on either what one might call a ‘horizontal’ line of enquiry – transmission across space – or a ‘vertical’ one – transmission across time – and, in most cases, combined both by addressing the ever-shifting relationship between Rome ‘as a physical place’ and Rome ‘as a mental place’.

The main aim was to explore the theme of cultural transmission between Rome and its neighbours (Byzantium, Southern and Northern Italy, England, and France) and/or from the past to the present within Rome itself (from ancient or Early Christian Rome to ‘medieval’ Rome).
The foci of our enquiry were cultural transmission and the exchange of ideas, with cultural transmission seen as a broader process, whose outcomes become visible over a period of time, and the second as a more ‘immediate’ and more episodic, but equally fertile and fruitful, phenomenon.1 Indeed, transmission from and to medieval Rome or within Rome itself from the past to the present was always an adaptation, transformation, and reinterpretation, in other words a form of translation.

The conference was conceived as a multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary project, bringing together international scholars across a wide range of disciplines, with the aim of addressing the notion of ‘culture’ in its broadest sense and all its various aspects, including the legacy of Antiquity and the Classical Tradition, religious and political thought, liturgy and music, literature and language, art, archaeology, architecture and numismatics. The idea was to articulate the quest across a number of case studies and wide time/place axes, and to offer a range of methodological approaches and interpretations. The original title, ‘Ex Changes’, was a word-play referring to two major aims of the conference: one was to explore the reciprocity and mutual enrichment that derive from the exchange of ideas and the processes of reception, assimilation, and transformation that secure and bring about cultural changes; the other was to offer speakers, colleagues, and students in the audience an opportunity to engage each other, and their specialties, in a productive ‘exchange’ of ideas on the role of Rome in the transmission of culture throughout the Middle Ages.

Research on how cultural exchanges worked as catalysts for change in their turn called for the exploration of how these processes of exchange contributed both to shape the medieval City itself and to construct the medieval idea of Rome, thereby expanding the notion of medieval Rome as the product of such interactions.

1 Over the past decades, there has been an increasing interest in the study of cultural transmission and translation. The literature is extensive. See notably, S. Budick and W. Iser (eds.), The Translatability of Cultures. Figurations of the Space Between (Stanford, 1996); H. Ziegler (ed.), The Translatability of Cultures. Proceedings of the Fifth Stuttgart Seminar in Cultural Studies (Stuttgart and Weimar, 1998); L. H. Hollengreen (ed.), Translatio or the Transmission of Culture in the Middle Ages and Renaissance. Modes and Messages (Turnhout, 2008); and, with a focus on artistic exchange, S. J. Campbell and S. J. Milner (eds.), Artistic Exchange and Cultural Translation in the Italian Renaissance City (Cambridge, 2004). For a revision of issues associated with the concept of travel in the medieval period, including cultural migration (but with a focus on England), see P. Horden (ed.), Freedom of Movement in the Middle Ages, Harlaxton Medieval Studies 15 (Donington, 2007). The Thirty-Second International Congress in the History of Art, held in Melbourne in 2008, was also devoted to the theme of cultural intersections: J. Anderson (ed.), Crossing Cultures. Conflict, Migration, and Convergence (Melbourne, 2009).
Rome across time and space, c. 500–1400

While the title of the book has changed slightly to echo the principal emphases emerging from the conference itself, these aims form the foundations of this volume, where the ongoing dialogue between the different contributors (encouraged in the form of e-mail exchanges more than a year before the Cambridge meeting and still going on at the time I am writing) creates dialectic and fertile intersections across the papers, all variously concerned with such topics as the ‘imitation’, translation, and recreation of Rome, the mechanisms that initiate and facilitate exchanges, the processes by which meaning is re-written in the present from the materials of the past, the responses to cultural change and innovations (including emulation, misunderstanding, and resistance), and the re-transmission of ideas.

As a natural consequence of the degree to which the original papers themselves complemented each other, the book is designed in six thematic sections, in which short essays contribute to the discussion from the vantage point of the author’s special expertise, but also engage with the arguments of the other members of each section. Since the section themes are markers of emphasis rather than strict compartmentalizations, each research question resonates and finds further answers throughout the various sections.

Medieval Rome is a hotspot of scholarly attention. There have been many other books devoted to medieval Rome published in recent years, most notably those produced in relation to the year 2000. Without the ambition of being inclusive, I should at least mention the exhibition catalogues from that year as well as the Settimane di Studi del Centro Italiano di Studi sull’Alto Medioevo for 2000 and 2001, on the themes Roma nell’alto Medioevo and Roma fra Oriente e Occidente respectively. There is also the publication of the proceedings of the international conference Arredi di culto e disposizioni liturgiche a Roma da Costantino a Sisto IV, on the important issue of the relationship between church furnishing and liturgical use of architectural space in Rome, edited by Sible de Blaauw. In addition there is the volume edited by Julia Smith,
Early Medieval Rome and the Christian West, which divided its attention between aspects of early medieval Rome and particular links between papal Rome, England, and Francia in the early Middle Ages. There have also been volumes of studies devoted to the material culture of Rome, such as that edited by Herman Geertman, *Atti del colloquio internazionale ‘Il Liber pontificalis e la storia materiale’* and those on *Roma dall’antichità al Medioevo*, sponsored by the Soprintendenza Archeologica di Roma, and books dedicated to various aspects of Early Christian Rome, such as *Das Bild der Stadt Rom in Frühmittelalter* by Franz Alto Bauer, and *Religion, Dynasty and Patronage in Early Christian Rome, 300–900*, which focused on aristocratic patronage. On the later period, *Roma e la riforma gregoriana. Tradizioni e innovazioni artistiche (XI–XII secolo)*, co-edited by Serena Romano and Jillian Enckell Julliard, deals with the artistic production in Rome associated with the Gregorian reform. Finally, *Roma Felix. Formation and Reflections of Medieval Rome*, edited by Éamonn Ó Carragáin and Carol Neuman de Vegvar, groups papers given at recent International Congresses around the themes ‘articulating the city’ and ‘reading the city’, the first dealing with communities, congregations, and cults; the second with envisaging and interpreting medieval Rome.

Two important ongoing projects are also worth a mention: Maria Andaloro and Serena Romano’s catalogue of the medieval paintings of Rome, and Peter Cornelius Claussen’s *Corpus* of the Roman churches, 1050–1300, centred on architecture and liturgical furnishing.
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All these books are excellent and offer significant insights into individual aspects of the medieval city. In addition, the conference proceedings Roma antica nel Medioevo. Mito, rappresentazioni, sopravvivenze nella ‘Respublica Christiana’ dei secoli IX–XIII offers a number of case studies on the survival of ancient Rome in the Middle Ages.⁹

What distinguishes Rome Across Time and Space is three-fold. First, there is its chronological and geographical range and the consequent dialogue between scholars across conventional periods and national boundaries. Secondly, there is the interdisciplinary interaction between art and architectural historians, archaeologists, liturgical and musical scholars, historians, literary scholars, linguists, and numismatists. Most important of all, however, are the general themes of cultural transmission and exchange coupled with the specific theme of the appropriation, assimilation, and transformation of both the idea and the history of Rome. Furthermore, there is the overarching theme of Rome ‘as a place’ and ‘as an idea’, which runs through the chapters within each section and across the sections.

The volume opens with a section devoted to the transmission of classical and patristic texts, and its implication in the wider context of medieval constructions and perceptions of the history of Rome. The unifying theme here is that of Christianizing Rome, via a translation of ideas from secular or pagan to Christian contexts.

The transmission of classical histories of Rome has more often been considered from the point of view of textual transmission than in terms of the role played in shaping medieval histories of Rome. Rosamond McKitterick adopts the latter approach to discuss one of the most important texts for the history of medieval Rome, the Liber pontificalis. By exploring the historical and historiographical context of the first (sixth-century) redaction of the Life of the Pontiffs, McKitterick identifies the historiographical genre of serial biography rather than the early martyr narratives and martyrlogies as the principal model for the extraordinary format of the Liber pontificalis. She therefore argues that its distinctiveness in relation to other contemporary histories is that it offered an alternative reading of the Roman past. As Christian, and Christianized, Roman history the Liber pontificalis not only generated many new associations and emulators, but itself played a major role in re-orienting perceptions of

Rome and its past, and present, and indeed in shaping the history of the papacy in subsequent years.

The Christianization of the Roman past is also an underlying theme in the chapter of Maurizio Campanelli, who adopts a philological approach to examine the images of Rome offered by medieval ‘descriptions’ of the city. As opposed to traditional ‘evolutionary’ interpretations of these texts, aiming at identifying increasing signs of ‘proto-humanism’ and Renaissance mentality, this perspective has the advantage of offering a reading from within the texts, exploring the image of Rome that they present on their own terms and unveiling the mechanics of the construction of the medieval idea of Rome, each author using monuments and books in very different ways and measure.

The Rome of the Mirabilia – as Campanelli shows – is a Rome without inhabitants, populated only by hundreds of monuments. It is not a living city, but a ‘history’ book. The city, in its physicality, is the source of its own story. At the opposite pole from the Rome ‘without uncertainties’ of the Mirabilia, where everything can be identified and reconstructed, is Master Gregory’s Rome, a supernatural space which can neither be fully described nor entirely explained. While the Mirabilia and Master Gregory started from monuments to reconstruct historical events – the books providing only additional details – the process was reversed in the fourteenth century, when the point of departure became the books themselves. The Rome of Giovanni Cavallini is a Rome where places become symbols, and names play a crucial role as a fundamental guarantee of historical continuity. The continuum between past and present can only be uncovered by recovering the original names and reconstructing their evolution. Names, Campanelli shows, were therefore a philological concern which became a historiographical tool: the thread which tied together monuments and histories, but also ancient Rome and contemporary Rome.

To appreciate the relevance of textual transmission for the construction of the idea of Rome in the Middle Ages, it is necessary to explore – with Michael Reeve – the extent to which medieval Rome was a repository of ancient texts. The emperor Augustus and Pope Nicholas V each planned a library for Rome on the Alexandrian model, but information is scarce from the period in between on the holdings and use of public or private libraries in the city. Furthermore, though the few extant late-antique manuscripts of Latin texts have tended to be associated with Rome, the debate about their origins has recently been reopened. Reeve provides an important contribution to this debate by reviewing the evidence for the survival and use at Rome, in both Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages, of classical and patristic texts.
By focusing on liturgical forms, texts, and practices in Carolingian Francia, Anglo-Saxon England and the Atlantic Islands of Britain and Ireland, the contributors to the second section consider the translation of the Roman liturgy north of the Alps. It was *romanitas* (which in the ecclesiastical realm means the richness and authority of the Roman tradition, of its basilicas, of its ceremonies, of its liturgical norms and practices) that made Rome the centre par excellence in which to learn about Christian liturgy. However, such an overwhelming richness and complexity determined a need for selection: it was impossible, and also unnecessary, for any northern ecclesiastical visitor or reformer to assimilate all this richness, still less to replicate it at home. What they did was to select structures and forms (as in the case of the Divine Office discussed by Billett), customs and rituals (as exemplified by the Ruthwell Cross, examined by Ó Carragáin), feasts and liturgical practices (as in the case of the Frankish liturgy, explored by Hen), and to translate these into a more comprehensible language, which could fit local conditions and changing circumstances.

In dealing with liturgy as a crucial aspect of cultural translation and exchange, this section addresses a number of questions including what it meant to speak of ‘Roman’ liturgy outside Rome, the sources and extent of the translation of ‘Roman’ liturgical forms and texts, their reception alongside non-Roman traditions, and the ways in which ‘peripheral’ churches’ perception of their Roman liturgical heritage changed across time.

Ó Carragáin explores the ‘paradox’ that the ‘peripheries’ produced some of the most sophisticated and original syntheses of Christian thought and liturgy. To make their own what the ‘centre’ had to teach, early insular clerics had to grasp what was essential and central in Christian tradition, and translate this into non-Latin languages and non-Roman visual cultures. In addition to the Codex Amiatinus and the Lindisfarne Gospels, a powerful translation of the essentials of the Roman liturgy is seen by Ó Carragáin in the Ruthwell Cross, a unique ‘imaginative construct, at once visual and verbal, which brings together sculpture, iconography and poetic chant, in Latin and English, in Roman script and runes’.

The very claim made by the Anglo-Saxon authors that the English Church had learned its liturgy from Rome is discussed by Jesse Billett, who examines how the English attitudes to the *romanitas* of their Office liturgy evolved over time. In the period of closest liturgical contact with Rome, the English Office liturgy was characterized by openness and eclecticism: non-Roman texts and chants, and even structurally relevant non-Roman elements, were accommodated within a Roman liturgical framework. What mattered was not to use only Roman texts or Roman...
music, but to praise God in harmony with the catholic Church throughout the world, which was best done more Romano. But as the so-called Roman Office came into wider and wider use on the Continent through the Carolingian liturgical programmes of the eighth and ninth centuries, attention shifted away from the basic structural elements of the Office that made it characteristically Roman. Instead, incidental elements that had always been open to eclecticism (chants, readings, prayers) were retrospectively endowed with ‘Roman authority’ as a way to preserve English liturgical peculiarities in the face of powerful Continental influences, particularly at the Conquest. Billett therefore concludes that the later Anglo-Saxon attitude to the Divine Office as a local manifestation of Roman tradition to be jealously guarded was an exact inversion of earlier English views of participation in the Roman Office as a means of experiencing unity with the wider Church.

Finally, Yitzhak Hen revises the traditional interpretation of the Romanization of the Frankish liturgy in the late eighth and early ninth centuries. He shows that, despite the prevailing notion of unity that characterizes contemporary sources, no general Romanization of the entire Frankish rite was ever desired, and that the liturgical reforms promulgated by Pippin III and Charlemagne were limited to the introduction of a few Roman books and practices, realized only through a slow process of criticism and experiment. The Frankish kings’ interest in reforming the liturgy, Hen argues, was mainly aimed at ensuring that the Frankish bishops and priests celebrate the liturgy ‘properly’. The concern with correctio on the one hand, and the preoccupation with authority on the other, gave rise to what Hen calls a ‘rhetoric of reform’ aimed at associating the Frankish Kings with Rome, ‘the very city of cities, the mighty head of the whole world’ (Gregory of Tours), a symbol of authority, orthodoxy, and unity. This association played a vital role in shaping Carolingian political ideology and religious identity.

The third section examines architectural inspiration and sculptural models within and without Rome. It addresses questions such as the extent to which Rome – as both a ‘place’ and an ‘idea’ – was a source of inspiration in the architectural and sculptural fields, the nature of such an inspiration (was it formal, or functional, or both, or did it vary over time and across space?), the role played by concepts of continuity and discontinuity in transmission processes, and the factors that determined the changes in the perception of Rome’s physical legacy, across space and time.

Judson Emerick discusses the role of Early Christian architecture as a source of inspiration for Carolingian church building, by taking as a focus of analysis the relationship between the abbey church of Saint-Denis,
Rome across time and space, c. 500–1400

built by Abbot Fulrad, King Pippin and Charlemagne, and its architectural model, Old St Peter’s. This involves a revision of how perceptions of Constantine’s architectural patronage changed over time. St Peter’s,Emerick argues, was not seen as a ‘Constantinian’ basilica by the patrons of Saint-Denis, but as a ‘papal’ basilica: it was a basilica that had been transformed over the centuries, and especially by the eighth-century popes, not only into Rome’s foremost centre for the worship of the saints, but also as a stage to display the popes as religious leaders, precipitating new associations and meanings. The eighth-century Frankish leaders who built at Saint-Denis focused mainly on this contemporary papal monument, imitating not only its form, but also its function.

Sible de Blaauw argues for a priority of form in the reception of the Early Christian architecture of Rome within the city itself in the period between the mid eleventh and the early fourteenth centuries. He identifies two types of approaches towards the Early Christian architectural heritage of Rome: a ‘conservative’ one, exemplified by Old St Peter’s and S. Paolo fuori le mura, where special care was taken to preserve the original form unaltered, and an ‘interventionist’ approach, a more invasive type of intervention, exemplified by S. Lorenzo fuori le mura and the Lateran basilica. The insertion of the transept in the latter was the most significant instance, in this period, of a transformation of ancient churches into transept basilicas as part of a strategy of making them appear even more ‘Early Christian’ than they had been originally. Ultimately, both approaches were driven by the very same aim of emphasizing continuity. This could be achieved either by simple preservation or by physical alterations that changed the perception of the ancient basilicas, enhancing their resemblance to St Peter’s and S. Paolo fuori le mura, and making them all conform better to an ‘idealized’ prototype – the perfect exemplum of Early Christian architecture in Rome – which in its turn could be used as the most appropriate model for new contemporary buildings.

The ‘reinterpretation’ of the physical legacy of Rome via later architectural interventions for the sake of a ‘forged’ continuity is yet another aspect of that construction of an idea of Rome within Rome itself through an adaptation and transformation of the past that finds a textual parallel in the descriptions and ‘histories’ of Rome discussed by McKitterick and Campanelli.

John Mitchell starts from Rome to retrace the narrative of the history of art and architecture in eleventh-century Italy, reversing the traditional narrative that starts from Montecassino and its reforming abbot, Desiderius. Desiderius is usually credited with the predominant role in what amounts to an artistic and cultural revolution, involving the introduction of a new pattern of ecclesiastical architecture, a new exploitation
of the arts of sculpture, painting and mosaic, and a new engagement
with the visual traditions of the Early Christian Church in papal Rome.
Mitchell's essay looks past the dominating figure of Desiderius to Rome
and other centres in Italy. Rather than seeing Desiderius as a lone heroic
initiator of a new direction in art and architecture, Mitchell situates the
reformation of Montecassino within the flow of developments in Italy
and Europe. The story of this new visual language that drew afresh on
examples from Classical Antiquity therefore started in Rome, moved
down to the Benedictine monastery of S. Vincenzo al Volturno, some
200 km south-east of Rome, and only finished at Montecassino, a day’s
trek to the west; and the wider stage was the opening horizons of the con-
temporary world, across the Alps into northern Europe and across the
Mediterranean East to Byzantium.

The investigation of transmission via sculptural and architectural
models finds its most appropriate conclusion in a discussion of columns.
Monolithic cylindrical columns are explicitly ‘Roman’: they are one of
the most enduring emblems of Rome and the classical tradition. One
might say that they are also the ‘supports’ and ‘frame’ of this volume, as
they appear in nearly all the papers, as the most characteristic feature of
the Roman basilica (Kinney), as the visual emblem of one of the most
prominent Roman families (Binski), as an influential source of artistic
inspiration (Bourdua), and as the symbol of one of the most important
Roman *rioni* (Campanelli), to cite only some examples. Dale Kinney’s
paper confronts Rome and *romanitas* through the explication of the two
medieval ‘discourses’ of columns: the exegetical one, rooted in a few key
passages in the Latin Bible, and the secular one rooted in classical prose
and panegyric and the material practice of building. Neither was autono-
mous and both were an integral part of larger discourses (the exegesis
of *Ecclesia*, the rhetoric of marble ornament, etc.), yet their autonomous
discussion is illuminating on the contribution of Rome – as both a place
and an idea – to medieval building practice and exegetical imagination.

It is impossible, in the space of this introduction, to evoke all the con-
nections across the thematic sections of this book, but it is worth men-
tioning that what the discourse of columns tells us about Charlemagne
(Kinney) is very consonant with what the ‘rhetoric of architecture’
(Emerick) and the ‘rhetoric of reform’ in liturgy (Hen) say about the
Carolingian king.

Next comes a section that revolves around the theme of cultural exchange
as a ‘true’ exchange, underlining in particular the two-way nature of the
process and highlighting how Rome both ‘exported’ and ‘imported’, both
‘taught’ and ‘learnt’ (from its own past, and its neighbours, and from its
own past as it had been re-elaborated by its neighbours), thus playing a