Bryn Mawr College
Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College

History of Art Faculty Research and Scholarship | History of Art

2021

Rewriting the renouveau

Dale Kinney
Bryn Mawr College, dkinney@brynmawr.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.brynmawr.edu/hart_pubs

Part of the History of Art, Architecture, and Archaeology Commons

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Citation

Kinney, D. 2021. "Rewriting the renouveau," in *Urban Developments in Late Antique and Medieval Rome. Revising the Narrative of Renewal*, ed. Gregor Kalas and Ann van Dijk. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press: 237-278.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College.
https://repository.brynmawr.edu/hart_pubs/126

For more information, please contact repository@brynmawr.edu.

Rewriting the *Renouveau*

Dale Kinney

Abstract: The art and architecture of eleventh-century Rome are predominantly discussed within the framework of an 'early Christian renewal' (*renouveau paléochrétien*) closely tied to the Gregorian Reform. Articulated fifty years ago in accordance with the prevailing top-down model of history, the framework is incompatible with more recent historical approaches that emphasize agency from below. This essay argues for a more distributed model of agency in the making of eleventh-century art. A case study of Santa Maria in Trastevere, reformed in 1065, calls into question the model of a Reform art directed by cardinals. A comparison with cinematic *auteur* theory questions the concept of a Reformist 'directed art' from another perspective.

In one of the most influential contributions to the study of medieval Roman art of the past century, Hélène Toubert made the case that Roman wall paintings and mosaics of the later eleventh and twelfth centuries constituted a *renouveau paléochrétien* inspired by Montecassino and the institutional Reform associated with Pope Gregory VII (1073-1085).[1] Her argument was endorsed by Richard Krautheimer in his equally influential monograph of 1980, in a chapter titled 'The New Rebirth of Rome.'[2] Krautheimer's purview was broader than Toubert's, encompassing architecture, marble ornament, and salvaged antiquities in addition to painting, and he posited a wider context, integrating the revival of early Christian forms and motifs into an overall revival of antiquity. According to Krautheimer, the revival arose from a 'matrix' of Petrine, Constantinian, and imperial traditions, 'pregnant with political implications.'[3] Krautheimer's emphasis on politically charged *renovatio* was echoed by Peter Cornelius Claussen, who refined the approach by distinguishing three phases: a phase of repair and consolidation (*restauratio*) before 1100, heavily dependent on Montecassino; a wave of renewal (*renovatio*) under Pope Paschal II (1099-1118), which achieved the fullest material expression of the Gregorian Reform; and a triumphal phase (*renovatio triumphans*) after the conclusion of the Investiture Controversy in 1122, in which Constantinian and Petrine models were emulated to signal the quasi-imperial stature of the popes.[4] Claussen argued that the turn to the past was fueled less by the fragments of Roman antiquity visible everywhere in the medieval city than by

an ideal image of ancient splendour. In the medieval imaginary, ancient Rome was an 'aesthetic utopia' marked by shiny, colourful surfaces of marble and gold.[5]

Among scholars of the mural arts, Toubert's appeal to the Reform continues to be the guiding thread.[6] Frescoes uncovered in the 1970s-1980s in the nave of Santa Maria Immacolata in Ceri, 30 km from Rome, have been consistently identified with the Reform by leading scholars, despite an argument that they could not have been painted until after 1160.[7] Stefano Riccioni's monograph on the apse mosaic of San Clemente confirmed Toubert's line of interpretation, albeit with a new approach.[8] His subsequent analysis of the mosaic in Santa Maria in Trastevere (1141-1143) found it to be 'the apex of Gregorian art'.[9] The volume of the corpus of medieval Roman painting covering the later eleventh and twelfth centuries, edited by Serena Romano, is called *Riforma e tradizione*. A conference at the University of Lausanne in 2004 resulted in the volume *Roma e la Riforma gregoriana*, also edited by Serena Romano, with articles mainly on wall painting but also on manuscript illumination, sculpture, liturgy, and even 'A Gregorian Reform Theory of Art'.[10] Like Claussen, Romano refined the correlation of Reform and *renouveau*, though in a different way. She associated the Reform with painting before the reign of Paschal II, especially the extraordinarily inventive and influential murals in the lower church of San Clemente, and the *renouveau* with painting and the revival of mosaic in the first half of the twelfth century.[11] She further distinguished two aspects of the *renouveau*: the ideological expression of the renewal of the Roman Church beginning with Paschal II, and a refined antiquarianism associated with Popes Callixtus II (1119-1124) and the family of Pietro Pierleone (Anacletus II, 1130-1138).[12]

Against the tide of this overwhelmingly positive reception, a few notable skeptics and dissenters have stood out. Carlo Bertelli (1982) challenged Toubert's argument for the seminal

role of Montecassino, insisting that the eleventh-century 'rinascita' of Roman painting was 'autochthonous', even if 'the younger school' of Montecassino contributed 'technical perfection' and 'formal elaboration'.[13] Returning to the subject some years later, Bertelli (1994) termed the 'San Clemente style' a 'rediscovery' rather than a renewal, arguing that its practitioners found their greatest inspiration in the ornamental repertoire of late antique *opus sectile* revetment.[14] He described a 'turn' in the use of ancient models under Callixtus II, when Roman antiquity took on a political cast, and a 'new orientation' under Pope Innocent II (1130-1143), whose apse mosaic in Santa Maria in Trastevere, in his view, does not show the conservative retrospection of the Reformers.[15] Francesco Gandolfo (1989) likewise questioned the role of Montecassino, as well as the attribution of ideological content to painters' use of antique motifs. Though he allowed some Cassinese influence on wall painters' iconography and figure types, Gandolfo maintained that the frames painted around the scenes, where the antique elements touted as evidence of a *renouveau* are largely confined, are not expressions of a revival but the continuation of tendencies in Roman painting going back to the tenth century.[16] Proposing a distinction between painters of ornament (*quadraturisti*) and painters of scenes (*figuristi*), he argued that the work of the former reflected contemporary taste rather than ideology.

Ursula Nilgen (2006) questioned Toubert's model of authorship, according to which signal examples of the Reform/*renouveau* – frescoes in the lower church of San Clemente and the apse mosaic of the upper church – were effectively the work of highly educated clerics who directed the artists who made them and, in the case of the frescoes, the lay donors who paid for them.[17] She also observed that, depending on the date of the frescoes, they could just as well reflect the Reformist ideals of the anti-Gregorian party as those of the Gregorian cardinal to whom they were credited by Toubert. Valentino Pace (2007) took a stronger stance, arguing that

it must have been the donors of the San Clemente murals, Beno de Rapiza and his wife Maria Macellaria, who chose the subjects to be depicted, because the frescoes were their personal ex voto.[18] Pace concurred with Gandolfo that in Rome, artistic antiquarianism was a 'workshop practice' not to be confused with the programmatic expression of clerical beliefs.[19] On a different plane, Xavier Barral i Altet (2010) objected to the tendency to extend Toubert's notion of a Reform-inspired *renouveau paléochrétien* to the whole of Europe. Noting that the scope and import of the Reform are still being debated by historians, he cautioned against conflating it, as Toubert implicitly did, with the historiographic conceit of the 'renaissance of the twelfth century', which was coined with regard to literature.[20] He advocated a collective 'pause for reflection'.[21]

Whether or not one agrees with her critics, it must be admitted that the historical framework of Toubert's argument is obsolete. Like Krautheimer and other scholars of her era, she held a top-down model of history in which events and changes are driven by political and intellectual leaders. In the case of the 'Gregorian' Reform, the model assumes the causal role of 'Great Popes,' in the words of Maureen Miller, who effected change through personal charisma, obscuring the 'practical, ground-level methods of organizing collective action, extracting and mobilizing resources, communicating ideas, and exerting pressure' that today's historians find more productive of historical explanation.[22] Similarly, Chris Wickham observed that the history of Rome has been dominated by a 'papal grand narrative' that casts the city and its inhabitants as 'simply an Other': at best witnesses, and often obstacles, to the self-realization of the papacy, which is the story.[23] Wickham's own recent history, focused not on the popes but on 'the society of the city, and the overarching economic structures that made it work', produces an interpretive context quite unlike the one assumed by Toubert.[24] His Rome is populated by citizens of diverse

socio-economic stature, including a 'medium elite' comprising land-holders and artisans working in more than 100 trades: leather-workers, metal-workers, wood-workers, shoemakers, locksmiths, food preparers, providers of animals, doctors, money-changers, etc.[25] These relatively well-off laypeople had considerably more cultural agency than Toubert's model permits. They participated in the Reform independently from the ecclesiastical factions emphasized by art historians; pious Romans like Beno and Maria were inspired to contribute to the betterment of their churches by an 'ideal of post-apostolic sanctity' rather than by political allegiances.[26]

The important book by Tommaso di Carpegna Falconieri on the medieval Roman clergy (2002) is equally disruptive of the top-down paradigm.[27] In contrast to the common but oversimplified view of the clergy as a social unit whose views and behavior mirrored the pope's, di Carpegna Falconieri detailed the emergence of a split between clerics who served the pope and the 'urban clergy' who ministered to the congregations of titular basilicas like San Clemente. He showed that the cardinal-presbyters assigned to the 28 *tituli* ceased to perform liturgical and administrative duties in those churches in the second half of the eleventh century, as they were progressively absorbed into the papal administration.[28] Busy at the Lateran or sent out of Rome as legates, cardinals left their title-churches in the charge of archpriests, who controlled their ministry and finances with little oversight.[29] These priests and lesser clergy formed a loosely political block that sometimes took the side of the so-called anti-popes, notably in the case of Wibert of Ravenna (1084-1100), who ruled Rome as Pope Clement III in the time of Gregory VII (d. 1085), Victor III (d. 1087), Urban II (d. 1099), and Paschal II.[30] Urban priests resisted the efforts of Reform popes to change their lifestyle by requiring them to renounce marriage and private property. Di Carpegna Falconieri traced these efforts to a 'pre-Reform' moment in the

first half of the eleventh century, when communities of independent priests began to be replaced by secular canons living according to the *Institutio canonicorum Aquisgranensis* promulgated in 816.[31] In 1059 this rule was proclaimed to be too lax, and Popes Alexander II and Gregory VII tried to impose the stricter rule of canons regular, who lived like monks. According to di Carpegna Falconieri, they had little lasting success, and most of the urban clergy of Rome continued to observe the Rule of Aachen at the turn of the twelfth century.[32] Under the Aachen Rule they did give up marriage but continued to possess property.

Di Carpegna Falconieri's picture of a cardinalate disengaged from its local title-churches and potentially at odds with the urban clergy presents an obvious challenge to Toubert's scenario for the paintings in San Clemente. Pursuing a line of interpretation suggested by Pace and di Carpegna Falconieri, Lila Yawn (2012) demonstrated that the San Clemente murals could easily have had a pro-Clementine rather than a Gregorian intention, reasoning that it is impossible to determine which faction controlled the church in the decade 1084-1093, and the rhetoric on both sides is so similar that it could have been written by 'monozygotic twins'.[33] Although she cautioned that 'attempting to discern the politics of the putative designers of an undocumented painting cycle on the basis of the cycle's iconography impresses me as […] a game of historiographically induced preconceptions, self-projection, and cognitive chance', Yawn in fact made a convincing circumstantial case that not only the murals, but the entire lower church of San Clemente were so strongly attached to the memory of the homonymous anti-pope that Cardinal Anastasius, who took San Clemente as his title church in or before 1102, was obliged to demolish and bury it under the church that exists today.[34]

It is not my purpose in this article to denigrate the work of Hélène Toubert. She was an outstanding scholar who almost single-handedly pushed the study of Roman art in the eleventh

and twelfth centuries into a new and remarkably productive era. Nearly fifty years out, many of her discoveries, insights, and conclusions are still valid. Like all of us, however, she was a product of her time, as was her approach to art history. She largely adhered to Erwin Panofsky's method of iconography, which – although resistance to it was beginning to build up – was still 'state-of-the-art' when she wrote in the 1970s.[35] Panofsky's method fits well with the top-down understanding of history, because it assumes a hierarchical mode of communication in which the artist instills meaning in a visual object, and the viewer is obliged to decipher it. The 'correct' meaning is the one the artist intended the viewer to see.[36] Today, when many historians are less interested in the intentions of leading individuals than in the horizontal nexus of forces that fosters social and cultural movement from below, new art historical models are in order. With due respect for all it has done for us, it is time to rewrite the narrative of the *renouveau*. To the piecemeal process of rewriting that is already underway, I will here offer two suggestions for new chapters. One follows the line of scholars like Claussen and Romano, who have attempted to clarify the precise relation between clerical Reform and the production of art. The second treats the problem of authorship.

Art and the Gregorian Reform: a Case Study

For scholars of architecture, the touchstone of the Reform/*renouveau* has been the church of St. Benedict at Montecassino, magnificently rebuilt by Abbot Desiderius in the 1060s. Decorated by artists imported from Constantinople, the basilica embodied a self-proclaimed revival of art forms (notably bronze casting and wall and pavement mosaic) forgotten by *magistra Latinitas*, and its elevation with a continuous transept (as reconstructed by Kenneth John Conant) was thought to recreate the Constantinian elevation of St. Peter's basilica in Rome.[37] Krautheimer

maintained that Desiderius's revivalist project inspired the transept basilicas that represent the *renovatio* in Rome itself, San Crisogono and Santa Maria in Trastevere.[38] For historians of monumental art the touchstone is San Clemente, where both the lower-church murals and the upper-church apse mosaic are thought to have been inspired by Montecassino as well, with an infusion of decorative motifs from the local storehouse of antiquities. Manuscript illumination, though not neglected, has not been fully integrated into the narrative of Reform/*renouveau* based on the monumental arts, even though one genre in particular – the Giant (or 'Atlantic') Bibles – was wholly bound up with the Reform. In this section, I will argue that the lessons of recent scholarship on the Giant Bibles are useful for reconsidering the relation between art-making and the Reform. My case is based on the example of Santa Maria in Trastevere, where the Reform is clearly documented in 1065, eighty years before the making of the transept basilica and apse mosaic held by some to be its material expression. The eleventh-century artworks made for the basilica do not sit comfortably within the prevailing master narrative, but they do show characteristics of the piecemeal production of the Giant Bibles.

For much of the twentieth century, the 'monstrous' Bibles (up to .6 m tall, .4 m. wide, and weighing up to 25 kg) were considered the quintessential example of Reform-driven art.[39] Thought to have been planned and promoted by Pope Gregory VII and produced in a single scriptorium at the Lateran, the Bibles were meant to disseminate an authoritative new edition of the Bible, attributed by some to the pope's friend Peter Damian (d. 1072).[40] More recent research has shown that this model is far too simple. It is true that the Bibles conform to a standard type: written in double columns in a deliberately deracinated Caroline minuscule, unlike the *romanesca* prevalent in contemporary Roman scriptoria, and decorated with initials in a distinctive style dubbed 'geometric' by E. B. Garrison. Figural illuminations recall early

Christian exemplars like the fifth-century frescoes in St. Paul's basilica, as well as Carolingian intermediaries like the oversized Bible presented to Pope John VIII by Emperor Charles the Bald in 875, and later given to St. Paul's by Gregory VII.[41] Despite these generic resemblances, however, careful study of eleventh-century Bibles has shown that they do not contain a single edition of the Bible text, nor can they be traced to a single scriptorium. It has not been possible to identify an antigraph of the text nor to establish stemmata of the illustrations.[42] Guy Lobrichon posited only a guiding impulse to produce a Bible suited to liturgical use, while the text underwent three phases of editing between 1050 and 1100.[43] Paleographers have observed that variations in the order of the Biblical books correspond to a mode of production in which multiple scribes – as many as 15 in one case – worked on a single Bible simultaneously.[44] This observation has led to differing interpretations. On the one hand, Noemi Larocca attributed six early Bibles to a single, strictly regimented scriptorium designed for the serial production of a 'specific edition', without taking account of Lobrichon's three editorial phases, all of which are represented in her sample.[45] At another extreme, Lila Yawn envisaged 'fluid assemblies' of independent scribes coordinated by 'literate middlemen' and brought together in various locales as commissions for the Bibles arose.[46] Lobrichon similarly invoked 'project managers' (*maîtres d'œuvre*) and *commanditaires* in connection with individual books, as well as 'heads of workshops' (*maîtres des ateliers*), 'leaders of the Reform' who were responsible for the dissemination of the books, and 'inventors' (*concepteurs*) who conceived the Giant Bible in the abstract.[47]

With scholarship on the Giant Bibles still in flux, the lessons to be drawn from it were nicely summed up by Emma Condello in 2005. The intention to make a new edition of the Bible emerged around mid-century, but for various reasons, including the fact that the books went into

production immediately, their hasty distribution, and the rapid unfolding of the Reform itself, the edition was never definitively completed.[48] The appearance of the books – the choice of the script, the sobriety of the decoration and the deliberate lack of luxury – was in keeping with their purpose to provide a readable and authoritative text for the Reform ideal of the communal reading of Scripture. The Bibles were not imposed by Rome as models but 'offered themselves spontaneously for imitation' by virtue of their 'intrinsic value'.[49] The classicizing appearance of the script is a side effect of the primary intention, which was to appear traditional and universal.[50]

The only artifacts that can be securely connected to the reform of Santa Maria in Trastevere are also books. Although far more modest than the Giant Bibles, they were similarly intended to facilitate Reform ideals of community through the provision of texts. Like the Bibles, they were made strictly for clerics. They were not commissioned by the reigning pope or titular cardinal but were most likely made by the canons for their own use. Features of their execution suggest some commonalities with the mode of production of the Giant Bibles.

The book that signals the reform of the community of Santa Maria in Trastevere is now in the British Library (Add. 14801). It contains a version of the Hieronymian Martyrology (fols. 5-44) and the *Institutio canonicorum Aquisgranensis* (fols. 45-205).[51] Although the history of the manuscript before its purchase from a London bookdealer in 1844 is unknown, there is ample evidence that it was made for Santa Maria in Trastevere. Entries in the martyrology mention that church specifically, and the notice of the feast of Pope Callixtus I (217-223), who was venerated as the basilica's first founder, is especially elaborate.[52] The martyrology is dated by the entries for 25 March, which begins 'In Jerusalem our Lord Jesus Christ was crucified', and 27 March, the Resurrection.[53] The only years in the eleventh century when Easter fell on 27 March were

1065 and 1076.[54] The entry for 22 May – a Sunday in both years – records the dedication of Santa Maria in Trastevere 'by the hand of Pope Alexander, with four bishops, two cardinals, and the entire *schola* of the Lateran'.[55] Since Alexander II died in 1073, the dedication probably occurred in 1065, and the book was produced the same year. It was written in a 'very typical' Roman minuscule (*minuscola romanesca*) by a single scribe.[56] Many hands added notes in the margins of the martyrology between 1091 and the fifteenth century, indicating that the book remained in use at Santa Maria in Trastevere for hundreds of years.[57] It probably was taken away or sold sometime before the eighteenth century, since the learned students of Santa Maria's history of that era, Pietro Moretti (fl. 1730-1750) and Pier Luigi Galletti (d. 1790), seem not to have known it.[58]

In addition to the presence of the Aachen Rule for canons, Add. 14801 has other hallmarks of the Reform. The martyrology (calendar) conforms to Pierre Jounel's observation that Roman calendars of the second half of the eleventh century contain many more popes than the early Christian original, a development that he attributed to Pope Gregory VII, possibly even before he was pope.[59] The SMiT calendar contains nearly every pope from Peter to Innocent I (401-417), as well as selected fifth-, sixth-, and seventh-century popes, one eighth-century pope (Gregory II, 715-731), and one contemporary pope (Gregory VI, 1045-1046).[60] The text of the Carolingian Rule exhibits alterations mandated by the Lateran synods of Nicholas II in 1059 and Alexander II in 1063.[61] The obvious implication is that the manuscript was written in conjunction with the reform of the basilica's clergy, which concluded with the consecration by Pope Alexander II. Almost immediately, the pope appointed as titular cardinal the distinguished Reformer Giovanni Minuto (1066-1073).[62]

If its few decorated initials give Add. 14801 'a certain solemnity' (Fig. 1), it is plain compared to the other eleventh-century survivor of the chapter's library, a Gospel book also now in the British Library (Add. 6156).[63] Its miniatures were published in 1985 by Jonathan Alexander, who observed that the compendium of Gospel lections at the beginning, which includes readings for stations 'ad sanctam Mariam transtiberim' on the second Thursday of Lent and the Sunday after the feast of Pope Callixtus I (14 October), indicates that the book was made for that church.[64] Although she was unable to study the manuscript closely, on the basis of photographs Paola Supino Martini opined that its 'calligraphic' Roman minuscule is very similar to that of Add. 14801, which she believed could have been made at Santa Maria in Trastevere.[65] Alexander judged that the Evangelist portraits are compatible with a date in the late eleventh or very early twelfth century.[66] He noted that the portraits are 'in essentials identical': all four seated in profile to the right with a lectern rising between their knees.[67] He attributed the images to two artists: one who drew Matthew (Fig. 2), Mark, and Luke; and a second, 'clearly problematic' artist responsible for John (Fig. 3). He struggled to find clear parallels for the style of either artist, finally concluding that they 'are likely to have used … an 11th-century Gospels as a model and perhaps one from north France or Flanders.'[68]

In addition to the possible (mis)use of an unfamiliar model, the peculiarities of the illuminations in the SMiT Gospels might be explained by a mode of production in line with Lila Yawn's account of the making of the Giant Bibles. As mentioned above, she proposed that many of the Bibles were produced by 'ad hoc scribal teams' organized by 'master scribes or middlemen', some of whom also did painting.[69] The scribes were not trained as painters and their work often betrays the lack of a painter's expertise. The signs of a scribe-painter include irregular outlines of painted initials, asymmetries in shapes, and pigments that spill over borders

to invade adjoining fields.[70] All of these traits are conspicuous in the initial I that accompanies the portrait of John in the SMiT Gospels, and they also occur in the L on the page with the more accomplished St. Matthew. A scenario that would explain these features is this: the manuscript was written at Santa Maria in Trastevere by a canon-*scriptor* who created the illuminated initials and left spaces for the addition of the portraits. A painter was engaged to make the portraits but left after drawing only three. The scribe then tried his own hand at the fourth, and he or another inexperienced painter added the colors.

A similar process was followed, with better results, in a Gospel Book now in the Biblioteca Malatestiana in Cesena, produced in Rome and dated 1104 by an inscription.[71] The book was written in Roman minuscule leaving space for decorated initials, which were then added by the scribe.[72] A painter was brought in to make a full-page presentation scene (Fig. 4). His skillful monochromatic drawing shows lay donors, male and female, standing on either side of Christ enthroned and accompanied by St. John the Baptist and a deacon saint, perhaps the titular saints of the church or monastery for which the book was made. [73] Another layman, who may be the scribe or the *maître d'oeuvre*, kneels proffering the book at Christ's feet.[74] The miniature is especially interesting because of the close resemblance of the donors to the figures of Beno and Maria in San Clemente, noted by Garrison and recently elaborated by Gaia Elisabetta Unfer Verre (Fig. 5).[75] The Cesena manuscript illustrates not only the combination of scribe-painters and what might be called professionals, but also the possibility that professional painters worked across media and at large and small scale. The manuscript also demonstrates that 'medium elite' laypeople might finance a fine book.

The reform of Santa Maria in Trastevere evidently did not entail rebuilding, as archaeological research under the pavement of the present basilica revealed that the lower wall of

the original fourth-century apse was still standing when Pope Innocent II leveled the site to make his own church in 1141.[76] There may have been significant repairs, however, in line with Claussen's posited phase of *restauratio* in the decades before 1100. The original basilica would have been 700 years old around 1050. Parts of it had fallen in already in the ninth century, and Popes Leo IV (847-855) and Benedict III (855-858) had to shore up the apse.[77] The Carolingian repairs may themselves have needed restoration in the eleventh century. In addition, if the 'pretty dwellings' of the monastery erected by Pope Gregory IV (827-844) 'by the side of the basilica' were still usable, they would have been renovated for the canons.[78]

A marble doorframe now in the wall of the north aisle may have been part of the basilica's *restauratio*. The present door was made in the sixteenth century, reusing three blocks carved with medieval reliefs (Fig. 6). Two more blocks were discovered by Alessandro Zuccari in 1991 in the remains of a different door in the façade of the nearby oratory of Maria Santissima Addolorata, also on the north side of the church.[79] The five extant blocks comprise left and right jambs decorated with inhabited vine scrolls, and a lintel on which a more stylized vine creates regular roundels framing floral motifs and, in the center, two bust images of angels flanking an orant female in queenly regalia, presumably the Virgin Mary (Figs. 7-8). The monolithic jambs were carved on the lateral faces of ancient fluted Corinthian pilasters, which were turned into the wall in reuse (Fig. 9). The size of the door originally framed by the extant pieces would have been at least 2.74 m. wide by 3.76 m. high.[80] Zuccari supposed that the fragments found in the entrance to the oratory of the Addolorata were in situ, and that the oratory was originally constructed in the twelfth century by Pope Innocent II.[81] It cannot be ruled out, however, that the jambs found in 1991 were already in secondary use in the oratory and had been moved there from somewhere else, possibly the pre-twelfth-century church.

The reused blocks are not easily datable by style. Gioia Bertelli, the first to study them closely, proposed a tenth-century date for the lintel but a late eleventh- or twelfth-century date for the jambs, where she found a 'totally different flavor'.[82] Other scholars believe the lintel and jambs are contemporary, dating them anywhere from the late tenth to the mid-twelfth century.[83] Most recently Karin Einaudi, who examined the blocks after they were cleaned and restored in 1995, affirmed that they are homogeneous, albeit by different hands. She favors a date in the second half of the eleventh century, possibly at the time of the consecration by Pope Alexander II.[84]

The portal fragments can be compared to a group of similar reliefs that includes the dismantled doorframe of Sant'Apollinare now in the Vatican Grottoes, pieces of a doorframe reused as a frieze in the prothyron of the entrance to Santa Pudenziana, and fragments of a doorframe reused as a step in San Giovanni a Porta Latina, as well as the so-called 'porta speciosa' of the monastery church of Grottaferrata.[85] These marble frames are decorated with clipeate images and inhabited rinceaux that suggest antique models like the spoliate pilasters reused in the chapel of Pope John VII (705-707) in St. Peter's.[86] The reliefs differ in style and quality, and none is precisely dated. Corrado Fratini argued from the epigraphy of their inscriptions that the blocks from Sant'Apollinare and the frieze at Santa Pudenziana (Fig. 10) are contemporary with the frescoes in the lower church of San Clemente. He dated them to the pontificate of Gregory VII and proposed that their inscriptions and iconography reflect the 'first phase' of the Reform.[87] The carving of the frame at Santa Maria in Trastevere is less accomplished than these examples. In style it is more like the 'gradino' in San Giovanni a Porta Latina; typologically, it resembles the 'porta speciosa' at Grottaferrata, made just after 1100

according to Valentino Pace.[88] Both doorframes are often compared to the inhabited rinceaux on the main door of Salerno cathedral, which was consecrated in 1084.[89]

Although not standardized like the Giant Bibles, the numerous new doorframes may also have been an effect of the Reform. The church door is a highly charged point of passage. As St. Augustine told the newly baptized: 'There are two doors: the door of paradise and the door of the church; through the door of the church we enter the door of paradise'.[90] The door is Christ (John 10:7-9: 'I am the door: by me if any man enter in he shall be saved').[91] An inscription in the upper fillet of the frieze over the door at Santa Pudenziana reiterates this traditional symbolism: 'O You! who wish to come to life's repose / Look! an entrance is open if you have sincerely turned back / He who is the way, the guide, the door-keeper summons / Promising joys and forgiving all faults'.[92] The hailing of a passerby is ironic, since the inscription is too small to be read from the ground; but it expresses the intention of the portal to attract attention. This door especially welcomed those who had 'turned back' from sin. Calling out to reformed Christians, a new doorframe might also have signaled the presence of a spiritually renewed church within.

Like the Giant Bibles, the doorframes follow a common idea but are diverse in execution. Despite their generic similarity in the evocation of classical ornamental motifs, especially the inhabited vine scroll, the reliefs are diverse stylistically and in techniques of carving. The many variations suggest the lack of an established practice of figural sculpture in Rome in the mid-eleventh century.[93] When a demand for such sculpture arose, it was met by enterprising local craftsmen, perhaps inspired by the outsider, 'John of Venice', who signed the portal of Santa Maria in Cosmedin before the Reform was underway.[94] Stefano Riccioni called these works a dialectical 'series of events', which despite their diversity, led to a single result, the renewal of 'visual language'. He described these artistic events as mirroring the dialectical unfolding of the

Reform itself, 'which was not the result of a pre-established project and had no single root'.[95] Riccioni's description may be generally true, but in the specific case of sculpture it seems that the dialectic did not achieve its final synthesis. As noted by Claussen, the demand for figural sculpture abruptly ceased after around 1100, when the distinctive aniconic work of the Roman *marmorarii* (the so-called Cosmati) took hold. Claussen wondered if we should call this brief burst of figural sculpture 'Ghibertine', since much of it occurred in the decades when Wibert (Clement III) was dominant in Rome.[96]

To sum up, this case study of Santa Maria in Trastevere is a reminder that the Reform slogan *ecclesiae primitivae forma* (the model of the original church), often invoked by art historians in connection with the *renouveau paléochrétien*, was first and foremost a way of life. It denoted the *vita communis* described in the Acts of the Apostles, in which possessions were held in common and 'as many as were owners of lands or houses sold them and brought the price of the things they sold and laid it down before the feet of the apostles'.[97] The first priority of popes from Leo IX (1049-1054) onward was to ensure that the clergy adhered to this communal apostolic model, made more austere by the added requirements of celibacy and the rejection of any cleric whose office had been bought. Presumably the canons of Santa Maria in Trastevere met the last two criteria, while being permitted to retain ownership of private assets by adopting the Rule of Aachen.

Moral reform was not without a material aspect. Catchwords like *restaurare*, *instaurare*, *innovare*, *renovare*, *reparare* were used in a double sense, and according to various authors of the era, the renewal of the communal lifestyle should be accompanied by the repair or *renovatio* of church buildings.[98] In central Italy, as noted above, the great exemplar of material *renovatio* was the abbey church at Montecassino. In Rome, no such spectacular rebuilding is known to

have occurred before the twelfth century.[99] Desiderius himself, as titular cardinal of Santa Cecilia in Trastevere, made or renewed six relic altars in and around his *titulus* between 1060, the year after his appointment, and 1080, when Pope Gregory VII dedicated the altar of the *confessio*.[100] He also encouraged new forms of liturgical chant, as discussed in this volume by Luisa Nardini. Yet the setting for these liturgical innovations, the Carolingian basilica, remained intact. Reasons for the absence of large-scale architectural renovations in Rome include the clerical resistance documented by di Carpegna Falconieri; the disruptions of the lengthy schism caused, according to his critics, by Pope Gregory VII; and the sheer immensity of the task.[101] Even had a pope been able to reform its clerical community (as no eleventh-century pope managed to do), rebuilding the gargantuan Constantinian cathedral was out of the question.[102] It was renovated only at the end of the thirteenth century by Pope Nicholas IV (1288-1292).[103] The same was true of St. Peter's, which was still tottering in the fifteenth century, and St. Paul's, which survived with sporadic repairs into the nineteenth century. The great signature churches of Rome remained decrepit throughout the Gregorian/Ghibertine era for want of the material and technical resources needed to overhaul them.[104] It was not until the twelfth century that popes undertook the restoration of even mid-scale early Christian basilicas like San Clemente and Santa Maria in Trastevere, and then largely through intermediaries in the curia. These renovations took place in a changed environment, with evidence of centralized planning and oversight lacking in the century before.[105]

St. Paul's basilica did receive a marvelous new bronze door in 1070, manufactured in Constantinople at the expense of a member of the same wealthy Amalfitan family that sponsored a similar embellishment at Montecassino (Fig. 11).[106] It was a bright spot in the towering façade of the vast fourth-century basilica, but just a spot: a symbolic gesture, like the new doorframes,

altars, and paintings that marked the reform of lesser churches. Even the ostentatious renovation of Santa Cecilia, marked by high-profile altar dedications by bishops, cardinal bishops, and the pope, was piecemeal.[107] In addition to the new altars, it included a beautiful new opus sectile pavement in the external Cappella del Bagno, a remnant of the early Christian insula thought to have been St. Cecilia's abode; the gift of a Giant Bible, one of the finest eleventh-century examples of the type; and the large-scale in-house production of liturgical books.[108] The renovation of Santa Cecilia may have been meant to be exemplary, but it was probably atypical. Giant Bibles were exported far and wide as symbols of the Reform, but they were almost never gifted to city churches.[109] The case of Santa Maria in Trastevere, where the eleventh-century Reform produced artistic 'events' of relatively modest scale and quality, seems to have been more representative.

Artist, auteur

Her initial analysis of the wall paintings and mosaics constituting the *renouveau paléochrétien* led Toubert to conclude that they embody hidden meanings beyond the ken of contemporary artists. They reflect 'the knowledge of a scholar' – of necessity a cleric – who was the 'author of the program' that the artists carried out.[110] Endorsing her position, Ernst Kitzinger argued the primacy of the patron as a point of method:

> a patron may not only prescribe the subject content of a work of art but may also choose the artists who are to be employed, the medium they are to use, and the models they are to follow. His choices and initiatives may, and often do, reflect broader ideas … and they may affect not merely subject matter and iconography, but specifically artistic qualities, including style. In this way, "history", through the agency of the patron, may affect the

> very core of the art historical process, as was indeed the case … in the ambient of the Reform Papacy…[111]

Toubert later revised her formulation to take account of the role of donors like Beno and Maria. This led to a triangular model for the creation of the art 'willed' by Reform popes and clerics, 'a play of connections among painters, patrons and lay donors'.[112] The relationship of patrons and donors was clarified by replacing 'patron' with *commanditaire*, from *commander*, 'to order'.[113] Expressing a distinction elided in the English 'patron', *commanditaire* (like the Italian *committente*) denotes a director of the artist's work, who may or may not also pay for it.[114] In the case of the San Clemente frescoes the donors financed the work and determined the saints to be honored and possibly also the scenes to be depicted. The *commanditaire* made sure that their choices were appropriate, and then told the artists what to do: what models to follow, what significant details to include. The choices of the *commanditaire* revealed the general artistic and ideological orientation of the Reform clergy, and sometimes his personal preferences as well.[115]

Although the parallel was doubtless unintended, in its own context Toubert's model of authorship recalls the cinematic *auteur* theory widely discussed in France in the 1950s and 1960s. In its founding statement by François Truffaut, *auteur* theory advocated a *cinéma des auteurs* – that is, films conceived by directors who wrote their own screenplays – over the predominant French genre of films adapted from literary works by scriptwriters.[116] Unlike scriptwriters, who saw the essence of the film in the plot and for whom directors were merely 'framers' (*metteurs en scène*), *auteurs* understood the unique, extra-literary potential of their medium. Truffaut's polemic was controversial. The critic André Bazin noted that it aligned film with arts like literature and painting, in which there is an equivalence between 'author' and 'work'. He questioned whether this model is appropriate to filmmaking, an enterprise with so

many participants and variables that identifying a single author might not be possible.[117] In fact, the *auteur* was a discursive construct that subsumed the work of other agents – actors, cinematographers, scriptwriters, etc. – under a single name.[118] Auteurism had its heyday in the 1960s.[119] In the U.S., the critic Andrew Sarris advocated it as a 'critical device' that focused attention on certain criteria of value: technical competence, personality, and 'interior meaning' ('extrapolated from the tension between a director's personality and his material').[120] Directors embraced it as a means of asserting their individuality in an increasingly corporatized environment.[121]

Many aspects of *auteur* theory, including its capitalist context, its emphasis on the expression of subjective individuality, and the conflation of the *auteur* with the Modernist conception of the self-expressive artist, are manifestly irrelevant to the middle ages. Yet there are also fundamental similarities with Toubert's model of the clerical author or *commanditaire*, notably the premise of the author's control over all aspects of the project, the subordination of other contributors to the singular vision of the author, and the function of the author for the modern interpreter as a 'critical device'. The device of the learned author enabled Toubert to apply the Panofskyan method of iconographic analysis, which assumes the unified intention of an artist or patron. Without this device, the interpreter confronts the possibility of multiple intentions that do not coalesce into a program. Toubert acknowledged this alternative ('it is … possible that our mosaicist … copied the motifs contained in his models without a precise iconographic intention'), but she rejected it in favor of the 'thought' of a single planner, for whom every detail of the composition had a specific symbolic meaning that contributed to the unified concept of the whole.[122]

Today's scholars tend to accord greater agency to artists and donors. Serena Romano, in particular, elevated the status of the painters at San Clemente to a point of near-equality with the author of the 'program', ascribing their many pictorial innovations to the 'sole mind' of the lead painter, 'an artist in the deepest and most complex sense of the word', whose work exhibits imagination, inventiveness, emotional expression, and a capacity for narrative that 'almost comes out of the blue'.[123] Romano positioned the lay donors as *committenti* and described them as the 'go-between' (*tramite*) who mediated the intention and ecclesiastical knowledge embedded in the program and 'the occasion of staging it.'[124] The 'intention' was that of the titular cardinal, who is thus – as for Toubert – in the role of *commanditaire*. Valentino Pace, on the other hand, claimed more agency for the donors, arguing that they, as devotees of St. Clement and grateful for his protection of their little son (*puerulus Clemens*), dictated the subjects of the paintings and conceived them as representations of their own devotion ('as if it were exclusive to them'), even if their choices were subject to the guidance of a 'spiritual counselor' who may have asked them to undertake the project and suggested the scenes to be depicted.[125] This last provision retains the role of the *commanditaire*, albeit in diminished form. Pace's emphasis on the piety of the donors was echoed robustly by Wickham, who claimed that analysts of the frescoes 'have almost universally gone wrong' in attributing the guiding hand to the cardinal-priest Rainerio (later Pope Paschal II) – or any cardinal.[126] Contextualizing the commission in the manifestations of lay piety seen elsewhere in Italy at the time, Wickham argued for a habit of lay patronage that would not have needed the guidance or organization of a cleric; 'which is to say, lay piety and church politics operate on wholly different levels, and we must avoid linking them at all tightly'.[127] Kirstin Noreen had previously stressed the initiative and potential independence of lay donors in painting the walls of the extramural church of Sant'Urbano alla Caffarella.[128]

Historically, there is considerably more evidence for lay patronage of churches in eleventh-century Rome than there is for the involvement of cardinals. Some of this evidence, like 'donor' portraits, is direct, and some is circumstantial. I counted 70 Roman churches whose names first appear in documents of the tenth and eleventh centuries, many of which bear the names of families, individuals, and artisanal groups or *scolae*.[129] These churches presumably were built, maintained, and decorated by their lay founders, so laypeople in the eleventh century were accustomed to playing decisive roles in the material life of their churches. The same would have been less true of cardinals. Donors who aspired to undertake embellishments of a titular basilica must have had to obtain permission from the officiating clergy, but as demonstrated by di Carpegna Falconieri, this would likely have meant dealing with an archpriest, not a cardinal. The archpriest and the community of canons had charge of the material and financial aspects of their churches. Cardinals like Atto of San Marco, discussed by William North in his important contribution to this volume, oversaw the canons' liturgical practice and instructed them, but on purely practical grounds it is implausible that they oversaw artistic decoration. Only a very useless cardinal would have had the time to stand around his title church supervising painters or mosaicists. The canons, on the other hand, were there every day. As intermediaries between the hyperliterate members of the curia and the people, canons could have served as the 'spiritual counselors' posited by Valentino Pace.

Instead of the triangular *auteur* model, with the *commanditaire* at the apex directing the program to be carried out by donors and artists, we might imagine something like a knot, in which the intentions of donors, artists, and clergy are entwined. A project originates in the desire of one or more parties – of the canons to beautify their church, of the donors to display their devotion, of the artists to exercise their skills – and evolves to satisfy all of them as well as

possible. The product is refined through repeated conversations and exchanges of expertise, as all parties can meet on-site repeatedly. In such a model, the program of a work is not imposed beforehand from above but *comes about* in a dynamic manner as the project unfolds. Such a collaborative 'coming about' is most possible when – as in the case of the San Clemente frescoes – the social hierarchy of the participants is relatively flat. Donors and painters were both of Wickham's medium elite artisanal class, and the canons, though of the clerical elite, had a pastoral mission that fostered familiarity with their lay parishioners. Collaborative production – like any negotiation – may have entailed struggles for the direction of the project. Intentions may have clashed, or they may have been perfectly complementary. The cardinal may have intervened if he noticed problematic deviations from standard iconography. Procedures and outcomes are more variable and much less predictable than the *auteur* model allows. In my view, the collaborative model is better suited to the interpretation of much medieval art, especially monumental art, but not always. In Rome it does not even carry over to the twelfth century, when the papal administration seems to have deliberately discouraged lay participation in church building and decoration, and Toubert's notion of a 'directed art' is more appropriate.[130]

Conclusion

In closing I want first to reiterate that this essay was not conceived, nor is it intended to be read as a disparagement of the scholarship of Hélène Toubert. On the contrary, it is a call to all art historians to rise to her standard of self-consciousness and clarity about art historical method and its assumptions, even as we reevaluate those assumptions in light of the latest scholarship of our own day. With Barral i Altet, I suggest a 'pause' in what has become a reflexive recourse to

Toubert's assumptions about cause and effect, in which Reform was a cause and art works largely an effect.

I have suggested that in the case of Santa Maria in Trastevere, the artistic effects of the reform of a clerical community were much more modest than the brilliant and imposing basilica constructed for the distant successors of those clerics 75 years later. The eleventh-century artifacts that can be associated with the reform comprise two books and possibly one marble doorframe. The books were produced in-house by scribes with the participation of a traveling painter. The doorframe is generically related to several other such marble portals made around the same time by a motley group of artisans. Though only one example, the case of Santa Maria in Trastevere tends to confirm Claussen's conception of the eleventh century in Rome as a distinct era of artistic production and art historical research.[131]

I have also proposed a new model of authorship, in which laypeople and lesser clergy have an agency not accorded them in the top-down model centered on popes and cardinals. Well suited to the standardized, didactic, and glamorous marble ornament and mosaics of the twelfth century, the top-down model does not do justice to the lively and artistically uneven art of the eleventh. I would suggest that it is precisely the participation of lay donors and 'undirected' artists that makes eleventh-century artwork distinctive. In accord with Wickham's emphasis on lay piety as a driving force, we might say that Reform ideals articulated by popes, antipopes, and the curia permeated the religious culture of the city and – like the text and apparatus of the Giant Bibles – 'offered themselves for imitation' to lesser clergy and laypeople. It was the enthusiasm of the latter that drove a demand for material expression that local craftsmen were not immediately prepared to satisfy. The ensuing scramble prompted developments in expertise that in the case of figural sculpture never reached fruition. The eleventh-century chapter of Roman art

history was left incomplete. The exception is wall painting, whether because painters had more opportunities to exercise their craft, or because the geniuses of San Clemente truly 'came out of the blue'.[132]

Not discussed here is a feature of the Reform that has dominated the attention of art historians in the wake of Toubert, namely the political struggle with secular rulers over the right to appoint bishops and archbishops and to invest them with the insignia of their office. Highlighted by contemporary chroniclers, this aspect of the Reform was of great significance to the papacy, and art historians have tended to assimilate art-making to the 'papal grand narrative' by assuming that instances of *renouveau* in painting, sculpture, and architecture encode political claims and messages related to papal politics. Francesco Gandolfo has been a somewhat lonely critic of this tendency, objecting that there is absolutely no independent evidence that eleventh-century popes had a 'politics of art'.[133]

> A methodological hypothesis that sees a necessary, indissoluble connection between manifestations of Roman artistic classicism in the eleventh-twelfth centuries and the reformed Church cannot be generally applied. The enthusiastic adherence to such a line of interpretation, set out a few decades ago and immediately perceived as a kind of liberating panacea, in the sense that an art of the Reform … can finally be sought, case by case, in programs of decoration and their historical and cultural motivations… should subside.[134]

Gandolfo was careful to note that the reflexive recourse to ideological explanations was not a fault of Hélène Toubert, who was more careful, but of her followers.[135] He advocates a more complex and 'slippery' model of interpretation, which takes the return to antique and early Christian art forms as a matter of taste and fidelity to the artistic tradition of Rome. Similarly,

Serena Romano described the *renouveau paléochrétien* in painting as a 'conscious *ripescaggio*' of appropriate models from the past.[136] A synonym of another untranslatable Italian word, *riproporre* ('to repropose'), *ripescare* also connotes fishing. Intentionally or not, Romano's description evokes the image of artists and patrons fishing in the vast sea of the Roman artistic heritage, reeling in ingredients for their own *chefs d'oeuvre*. *Ripescaggio* is a much less tidy interpretive model than that of the predictable ideological program. For that very reason, it seems to me that it may be closer to the reality of art-making, especially, but not only, in eleventh-century Rome.

Rewriting the *renouveau*: Bibliography

Primary sources

British Library, Add. MS 6156, Gospels from Santa Maria in Trastevere, 11th cen.

British Library, Add. MS 14801, S. Hieronymi Martyrologium etc. from Santa Maria in Trastevere, 11th-15th cens.

Augustine of Hippo, Sermo CLIX, De Pascha I, PL[2] 39, cols. 2058-2059.

Le Liber pontificalis. Texte, introduction et commentaire, ed. by Louis Duchesne and Cyrille Vogel, 3 vols. (Paris: Ernest Thorin, 1888-1892; Paris: E. de Boccard, 1957; repr. Paris: E. de Boccard, 1981).

The Vulgate Bible, vol. 6, *The New Testament. Douay-Rheims Translation*, ed. by Angela M. Kinney (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013).

Secondary sources

Jonathan Alexander, 'A Manuscript of the Gospels from Santa Maria in Trastevere, Rome', in *Studien zur mittelalterlichen Kunst 800-1250. Festschrift für Florentine Mütherich zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. by Katharina Bierbrauer, Peter K. Klein, and Willibald Sauerländer (Munich: Prestel-Verlag, 1985), 193-206.

Claudia Angelelli, *La Basilica titolare di S. Pudenziana. Nuove ricerche* (Vatican City: Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana, 2010).

Larry M. Ayres, ‘Bemerkungen zu den frühen italienischen Riesenbibeln’, in *Canossa 1077: Erschütterung der Welt. Geschichte, Kunst und Kultur am Aufgang der Romanik*, vol. 1, *Essays*, ed. by Christoph Stiegemann and Matthias Wemhoff (Munich: Hirmer Verlag, 2006), 325-332.

Larry M. Ayres, ‘Le Bibbie atlantiche. Dalla Riforma alla diffusione in Europa’, in *Le Bibbie Atlantiche: il libro delle Scritture tra monumentalità e rappresentazione*, ed. by Marilena Maniaci and Giulia Orofino (Milan: Centro Tibaldi, 2000), 27-37.

Antonella Ballardini and Paola Pogliani, ‘A reconstruction of the oratory of John VII (705-7)’, in *Old Saint Peter’s, Rome*, ed. by Rosamund McKitterick, John Osborne, Carol M. Richardson, and Joanna Story (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 190-213.

Joan Barclay Lloyd, ‘The Medieval Church of S. Maria in Portico in Rome’, *Römische Quartalschrift*, 76 (1981), 95-106.

Joan Barclay Lloyd, *The Medieval Church and Canonry of S. Clemente in Rome* (Rome: San Clemente, 1989).

Xavier Barral i Altet, ‘Arte medievale e Riforma Gregoriana. Riflessioni su un problema storiografico’, *Hortus artium medievalium*, 16 (2010), 73-82.

André Bazin, ‘De la politique des auteurs’, *Cahiers du Cinéma*, 12, 70 (1957), 2-11.

Carlo Bertelli, ‘San Benedetto e le arti in Roma: pittura’, in *Atti del 7º Congresso Internazionale di Studi sull’Alto Medioevo. Norcia-Subiaco-Cassino-Montecassino, 29 settembre–5 ottobre 1980*, 2 vols. (Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull’Alto Medioevo, 1982), 271-302.

Gioia Bertelli, ‘Precisazioni su un architrave in S. Maria in Trastevere’, *Bollettino d’arte*, s. 5, 61 (1976), 72-74.

Le Bibbie Atlantiche: il libro delle Scritture tra monumentalità e rappresentazione, ed. by Marilena Maniaci and Giulia Orofino (Milan: Centro Tibaldi, 2000).

Herbert Bloch, *Monte Cassino in the Middle Ages*, 3 vols. (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1986).

Antonio Cadei, ‘S. Maria Immacolata di Ceri e i suoi affreschi medievali’, *Storia dell’arte*, 44 (1982), 13-29.

Nicola Camerlenghi, *St. Paul’s outside the Walls. A Roman Basilica, from Antiquity to the Modern Era* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018).

Catalogue of Additions to the Manuscripts in the British Museum in the Years MDCCCXLI-MDCCCXLV (London: British Museum, 1845; repr. Norwich: Jarrold & Sons, n.d.).

Tommaso di Carpegna Falconieri, *Il clero di Roma nel medioevo. Istituzioni e politica cittadina (secoli VIII-XIII)* (Rome: Viella, 2002).

Tommaso di Carpegna Falconieri, 'Giovanni Minuto', in *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* (Istituto Treccani, 2001). http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/giovanni-minuto_(Dizionario-Biografico) accessed 06/15/2018.

Margherita Maria Cecchelli, 'Incorniciature medioevali di porte di chiese romane', *Palladio*, 13 (1963), 21-26.

Peter Cornelius Claussen, 'L'altare di Santa Maria in Cappella a Trastevere. Un'opera del'XI secolo quasi sconosciuta o ignorata', in *Il potere dell'arte nel medievo. Studi in onore di Mario D'Onofrio*, ed. by Manuela Gianandrea, Francesco Gangemi, and Carlo Costantini (Rome: Campisano Editore, 2014), 53-64.

Peter Cornelius Claussen, *Die Kirchen der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter 1050-1300*, vol. 1, *A-F* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2002).

Peter Cornelius Claussen, *Die Kirchen der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter 1050-1300*, vol. 3, *G-L. S. Giacomo alla Lungara bis S. Lucia della Tinta* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2010).

Peter Cornelius Claussen, 'Magistra Latinitas – Opus Romanum. Aspekte kirchlicher Reform in der Sakralarchitektur und liturgischen Ausstattung in Rom', in *Canossa 1077: Erschütterung der Welt. Geschichte, Kunst und Kultur am Aufgang der Romanik*, vol. 1, *Essays*, ed. by Christoph Stiegemann and Matthias Wemhoff (Munich: Hirmer Verlag, 2006), 297-308.

Peter Cornelius Claussen, 'Marmo e splendore. Architettura, arredi liturgici, *spoliae*', in *Arte e iconografia a Roma dal tardoantico alla fine del medioevo*, ed. by Maria Andaloro and Serena Romano (Milan: Jaca Book, 2002), 150-174.

Peter Cornelius Claussen, 'Un nuovo campo della storia dell'arte. Il secolo XI a Roma', in *Roma e la Riforma gregoriana. Tradizioni e innovazioni artistiche (XI-XII secolo)*, ed. by Serena Romano and Julie Enckell Julliard (Rome: Viella, 2007), 61-84.

Peter Cornelius Claussen, 'Renovatio Romae. Erneuerungsphasen römischer Architektur im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert', in *Rom im hohen Mittelalter. Studien zu den Romvorstellungen und zur Rompolitik vom 10. bis zum 12. Jahrhundert Reinhard Elze zur Vollendung seines siebzigsten Lebensjahres gewidmet*, ed. by Bernhard Schimmelpfennig and Ludwig Schmugge (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1992), 87-125.

Peter Cornelius Claussen, 'Scultura e splendori del marmo a Roma nell'età della riforma ecclesiastica nell'XI e XII secolo', in *Matilde e il tesoro dei Canossa tra castelli, monasteri e città*, ed. by Arturo Calzona (Milan: SilvanaEditoriale, 2008), 201-215.

Peter Cornelius Claussen with Darko Senekovic, *Die Kirchen der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter 1050-1300*, vol. 2, *S. Giovanni in Laterano* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2008).

Stefano Coccia, with Anna Giulia Fabiani, Francesco Prezioso, and Francesco Scoppola, 'Santa Maria in Trastevere: nuovi elementi sulla basilica paleocristiana e altomedievale', *Mededelingen van het Nederlands Instituut te Rome*, 59 (2000), 161-174.

Stefano Coccia, Federico Guidobaldi, and Francesco Scoppola, 'Titulus Iulii (Santa Maria in Trastevere): nuove osservazioni sulle fasi più antiche', in *Scavi e scoperte recenti nelle chiese di Roma. Atti della giornata tematica dei Seminari di Archeologia Cristiana (Roma – 13 marzo 2008)*, ed. by Hugo Brandenburg and Federico Guidobaldi (Vatican City: Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana, 2012), 33-61.

Kenneth John Conant, *Carolingian and Romanesque Architecture 800 to 1200* (rev. ed. 1978, repr. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1990).

Emma Condello, 'La Bibbia al tempo della Riforma Gregoriana: Le Bibbie Atlantiche', in *Forma e modelli della tradizione manoscritta della Bibbia*, ed. by Paolo Cherubini (Vatican City: Scuola Vaticana di Paleografia, Diplomatica e Archivistica, 2005), 347-372.

Karin Einaudi, 'S. Maria in Trastevere', in *Corpus della scultura altomedioevale*, 7, *La diocesi di Roma: la VII Regione Ecclesiastica, Transtiberim*, in press.

Corrado Fratini, 'Considerazioni e ipotesi sulla "Cornice di Sant'Apollinare" nelle Grotte Vaticane', in *San Pietro. Arte a Storia nella Basilica Vaticana*, ed. by Giuseppe Rocchi Coopmans de Yoldi (Bergamo: Edizioni Bolis, 1996), 51-68.

Francesco Gandolfo, 'La pittura romana tra XI e XII secolo e l'Antico', in *Roma, centro ideale della cultura dell'Antico nei secoli XV e XVI. Da Martino V al Sacco di Roma 1417-1527*, ed. by Silvia Danesi Squarzina (Milan: Electa, 1989), 21-32.

Francesco Gandolfo, 'I programmi decorativi nei protiri di Niccolò', in *Nicholaus e l'arte del suo tempo* (Ferrara: Gabriele Corbo Editore, 1985), vol. 2, 515-559.

Francesco Gandolfo, 'I puteali di S. Bartolomeo all'Isola e di Grottaferrata', in *Roma e la Riforma gregoriana. Tradizioni e innovazioni artistiche (XI-XII secolo)*, ed. by Serena Romano and Julie Enckell Julliard (Rome: Viella, 2007), 165-184.

Francesco Gandolfo, 'Il ritratto nobiliare di committenza nel medioevo romano', in *La Nobiltà romana nel medioevo*, ed. by Sandro Carocci (Rome: École Française de Rome, 2006), 279-290.

Francesco Gandolfo, 'L'XI secolo: da Silvestro II (999-1003) ad Urbano II (1088-1099)', in *La committenza artistica dei papi a Roma nel Medioevo*, ed. by Mario D'Onofrio (Rome: Viella, 2016), 255-273.

Dorothy F. Glass, *Romanesque Sculpture in Campania. Patrons, Programs, and Style* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991).

Caroline J. Goodson, 'Material Memory: Rebuilding the basilica of S. Cecilia in Trastevere, Rome', *Early Medieval Europe*, 15/1 (2007), 2-34.

Ute Götz, *Die Bildprogramme der Kirchentüren des 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts* (Diss. Tübingen, 1971).

Federico Guidobaldi, 'Un estesissimo intervento urbanistico nella Roma dell'inizio del XII secolo e la parziale perdita della "memoria topografica" della città antica', *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome – Moyen Âge*, 126, 2 (2014), 2-47.

A Handbook of Dates for Students of British History, ed. by C. R. Cheney (1945); rev. ed. by Michael Jones (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

Pierre Jounel, 'Le Sanctoral romain du 8e au 12e siècles', *La Maison-Dieu*, 52 (1957), 60-88.

Herbert L. Kessler, 'L'antica basilica di San Pietro come fonte e ispirazione per la decorazione delle chiese medievali', in *Fragmenta picta. Affreschi e mosaici staccati del Medioevo romano*, ed. by Maria Andaloro, Alessandra Ghidoli, Antonio Iacobini, Serena Romano, and Alessandro Tomei (Rome: Àrgos Edizioni, 1989), 45-64.

Dale Kinney, 'Patronage of art and architecture', in *Pope Innocent II (1130-1143). The world vs the city*, ed. by John Doran and Damian J. Smith (London: Routledge, 2016), 352-388.

Dale Kinney, 'Romanità a Roma: le basiliche del XII secolo fra tradizioni e innovazioni', in *La Cattedrale cosmatesca di Civita Castellana. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi (Civita Castellana, 18-19 settembre 2010)*, ed. by Luca Creti (Rome: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, 2012), 53-75.

Dale Kinney, 'Rome in the Twelfth Century: *Urbs fracta* and *renovatio*', *Gesta*, 45/2 (2006), 199-220.

Dale Kinney, 'Spolia', in *St. Peter's in the Vatican*, ed. by William Tronzo (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 16-47.

Ernst Kitzinger, 'The Gregorian Reform and the Visual Arts: a Problem of Method', in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, s. 5, 22 (1972), 87-102.

Konzilien und Synoden 742-1002 des Frankenreichs, des Deutschen Reichs und Reichsitaliens, ed. by Roman Deutinger, Version März 2008. http://www.repfont.badw.de/Concilia742.pdf, accessed 06/06/2018.

Richard Krautheimer, *Rome. Profile of a City, 312-1308* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980, repr. 2000).

Noemi Larocca, ‘Linee di una ricerca paleografica sulle “Bibbie Atlantiche” più antiche’, in *Les Bibles Atlantiques. Le manuscrit biblique à l’époque de la Réform de l’Église du XIe siècle*, ed. by Nadia Togni (Florence: Sismel/Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2016), 21-37.

Guy Lobrichon, ‘Le succès ambigu des Bibles “Atlantiques”: Triomphes et résistances dans l’Ouest européen, XIe-XIIe siècles’, in *Les Bibles Atlantiques. Le manuscrit biblique à l’époque de la Réform de l’Église du XIe siècle*, ed. by Nadia Togni (Florence: Sismel/Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2016), 231-265.

Silvia Maddalo, ‘I santi Giorgio e Silvestro e l’ideologia politica della Riforma nel ciclo pittorico dell’Immacolata di Ceri’, in *Le Plaisir de l’art du Moyen Âge. Commande, production et réception de l’oeuvre d’art. Mélanges en hommage à Xavier Barral i Altet* (Paris: Éditions A. et J. Picard, 2012), 678-685.

Marilena Maniaci and Giulia Orofino, ‘Dieci anni di studi sulle Bibbie atlantiche a Cassino’, in *Les Bibles Atlantiques. Le manuscrit biblique à l’époque de la Réform de l’Église du XIe siècle*, ed. by Nadia Togni (Florence: Sismel/Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2016), 5-19.

Marilena Maniaci and Giulia Orofino, ‘L’officina delle *Bibbie* atlantiche: artigiani, scribi, miniatori. Problemi ancora aperti’, in *Come nasce un manoscritto miniato: scriptoria, tecniche, modelli e materiali*, ed. by Francesca Flores d’Arcais and Fabrizio Crivello (Modena: Franco Cosimo Panini, 2010), 197-212.

Guglielmo Matthiae, *Le porte bronzee byzantine in Italia* (Rome: Officina Edizioni, 1971).

Jeff Menne, ‘The Cinema of Defection: Auteur Theory and Institutional Life’, *Representations*, 114/1 (2011), 36-64.

Giovanni Miccoli, ‘Ecclesiae primitivae forma’, *Studi medievali*, 1 (1960), 470-498.

Maureen C. Miller, ‘The Crisis in the Investiture Crisis Narrative’, *History Compass*, 7/6 (2009), 1570-1580.

Daniela Mondini, Carola Jäggi, and Peter Cornelius Claussen, *Die Kirchen der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter 1050–1300*, vol. 4, *M–O* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2020).

Daniela Mondini, Carola Jäggi, and Peter Cornelius Claussen, *Die Kirchen der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter 1050–1300*, vol. 5 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, forthcoming 2021).

Renzo U. Montini, *Santa Pudenziana*, Le Chiese di Roma illustrate, 50 (Rome: Marietti, 1959).

Laura Moscati, *Alle origini del comune romano: economia, società, istituzioni* (Rome: B. Carrucci, 1980).

Necrologi e libri affini della provincia romana, vol. 1, *Necrologi della città di Roma*, ed. by Pietro Egidi (Rome: Forzani e C. Tipografi del Senato, 1908).

Ursula Nilgen, 'Die Bildkünste Süditaliens und Roms im Zeitalter der Kirchenreform', in *Canossa 1077: Erschütterung der Welt. Geschichte, Kunst und Kultur am Aufgang der Romanik*, vol. 1, *Essays*, ed. by Christoph Stiegemann and Matthias Wemhoff (Munich: Hirmer Verlag, 2006), 309-323.

Kirstin Noreen, 'Lay Patronage and the Creation of Papal Sanctity during the Gregorian Reform: The Case of Sant'Urbano alla Caffarella, Rome', *Gesta*, 40/1 (2001), 39-59.

Glenn Olsen, 'The Idea of the *Ecclesia primitiva* in the Writings of the Twelfth-Century Canonists', *Traditio*, 25 (1969), 61-86.

Giulia Orofino, 'La decorazione delle Bibbie atlantiche tra Lazio e Toscana nella prima metà del XII secolo', in *Roma e la Riforma gregoriana. Tradizioni e innovazioni artistiche (XI-XII secolo)*, ed. by Serena Romano and Julie Enckell Julliard (Rome: Viella, 2007), 357-379.

Giulia Orofino, 'Pittura e miniatura nell'Italia centro-meridionale al tempo della Riforma gregoriana', in *Les fonts de la pintura romànica*, ed. by Milagros Guardia and Carles Mancho (Barcelona: Universitat de Barcelona, 2008), 161-175.

Luciano Osbat, 'Il santuario della Madonna di Ceri', in *I santuari e la devozione mariana nell'alto Lazio*, ed. by Luciano Osbat (Rome: Vecchiarelli Editore, 2006), 32-59.

Valentino Pace, 'L'arte di Bisanzio al servizio della Chiesa di Roma: La porta di bronzo di San Paolo fuori le mura', in *Studien zur byzantinischen Kunstgeschichte. Festschrift für Horst Hallensleben zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. by Birgitt Borkopp, Barbara Schellewald, and Lioba Theis (Amsterdam: Verlag Adolf M. Hakkert, 1995), repr. in *Arte a Roma nel Medioevo. Committenza, ideologia e cultura figurativa in monumenti e libri* (Naples: Liguori Editore, 2000), 87-103.

Valentino Pace, 'Campania XI secolo. Tradizione e innovazioni in una terra normanna', in *Romanico Padano, Romanico europeo* (Parma: Università degli Studi di Parma, Istituto di storia dell'arte, Centro di Studi Medioevali, 1982), 225-256.

Valentino Pace, 'La Cattedrale di Salerno. Committenza programma e valenze ideologiche di un monumento di fine XI secolo nell'Italia meridionale', in *Desiderio di Montecassino e l'arte della riforma gregoriana*, ed. by Faustino Avagliano (Montecassino: Pubblicazioni cassinesi, 1997), 189-230.

Valentino Pace, 'La chiesa abbaziale di Grottaferrata e la sua decorazione nel medioevo', *Bollettino della Badia greca di Grottaferrata*, 41 (1987), 47-87; repr. in *Arte a Roma nel Medioevo. Committenza, ideologia e cultura figurativa in monumenti e libri* (Naples: Liguori Editore, 2000), 416-497.

Valentino Pace, '"Nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est": sulla scultura del medioevo a Roma', in *Studien zur Geschichte der europäischen Skulptur im 12./13. Jahrhundert*, ed. by Herbert Beck and Kerstin Hengevoss-Dürkop, 2 vols. (Frankfurt am Main: Henrich, 1994), repr. in *Arte a Roma nel Medioevo. Committenza, ideologia e cultura figurativa in monumenti e libri* (Naples: Liguori Editore, 2000), 21-68.

Valentino Pace, 'La Riforma e i suoi programmi figurativi: il caso romano, fra realtà e mito storiografico', in *Roma e la Riforma gregoriana. Tradizioni e innovazioni artistiche (XI-XII secolo)*, ed. by Serena Romano and Julie Enckell Julliard (Rome: Viella, 2007), 49-59.

Erwin Panofsky, *Studies in Iconology. Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1939; repr. New York: Harper & Row, 1972).

Enrico Parlato and Serena Romano, *Roma e Lazio. Il romanico* (Milan: Jaca Book, 2001).

La pittura in Italia. L'altomedioevo, ed. by Carlo Bertelli (Milan: Electa, 1994).

Roland Recht, Martin Warnke, Georges Didi-Huberman, Maurizio Ghelardi, and Dieter Wuttke, *Relire Panofsky: cycle de conférences organisé au Musée du Louvre du 19 novembre au 17 décembre 2001* (Paris: Musée du Louvre, 2008).

Stefano Riccioni, 'La décoration monumentale à Rome aux XIe et XIIe siècles: révisions chronologiques, stylistiques et thématiques', *Perspective*, 2 (2010), 319-360.

Stefano Riccioni, *Il mosaico absidale di S. Clemente a Roma.* Exemplum *della Chiesa riformata* (Spoleto: Fondazione Centro Italiano di Studi dell'Alto Medioevo, 2006).

Stefano Riccioni, 'From Shadow to Light. Inscriptions in Liminal Spaces of Roman Sacred Architecture (11th-12th Century)', in *Sacred Scripture / Sacred Space. The Interlacing of Real Places and Conceptual Spaces in Medieval Art and Architecture*, ed. by Tobias Frese, Wilfried E. Keil, and Kristina Krüger (Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2019), 217-244.

Stefano Riccioni, 'The Word in the Image: an Epiconographic Analysis of the Mosaics of the Reform in Rome', *Acta ad Archaeologiam et Artium Historiam pertinentia*, n.s. 10, 24 (2011), 85-137.

Riforma e tradizione 1050-1198, ed. by Serena Romano, La pittura medievale a Roma 312-1431, Corpus, vol. 4 (Milan: Jaca Book, 2006).

I. S. Robinson, 'Reform and the Church, 1073-1122', in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. 4, *c 1024–c 1198 Part I*, ed. by David Luscombe and Jonathan Riley-Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 268-334.

Roma e la Riforma gregoriana. Tradizioni e innovazioni artistiche (XI-XII secolo), ed. by Serena Romano and Julie Enckell Julliard (Rome: Viella, 2007).

Serena Romano, 'I pittori romani e la tradizione', in *Arte e iconografia a Roma dal tardoantico alla fine del medioevo*, ed. by Maria Andaloro and Serena Romano (Milan: Jaca Book, 2002), 103-138.

Eugenio Russo, 'Integrazioni al "Corpus", VII, 3 della scultura altomedievale di Roma: S. Giovanni a Porta Latina e S. Giovanni in Laterano', *Rivista di Archeologia Cristiana*, 56 (1980), 95-102.

Andrew Sarris, 'Notes on the Auteur Theory in 1962', *Film Culture*, 27 (1962-1963), 1-8.

Orietta Sartori, 'Possibili valenze storico-ideologiche di un rilievo medievale romano. Il 'gradino' di San Giovanni a Porta Latina', *Studi romani*, 47, 3-4 (1999), 289-310.

Albert Sbragia, 'Fellini and the Auteurists', *Italica*, 92/3 (2015), 660-679.

La II regione ecclesiastica, ed. by Alessandra Melucco Vaccaro, Corpus della scultura altomedievale, vol. 7, pt. 3 (Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 1974).

Silvia Silvestro, 'L'incorniciatura della "Porta Speciosa" della chiesa abbaziale di Grottaferrata', *Bollettino della Badia greca di Grottaferrata*, n.s. 48 (1994), 115-140.

Paola Supino Martini, 'Aspetti della cultura grafica a Roma fra Gregorio Magno e Gregorio VII', in *Roma nell'alto medioevo*. Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'alto Medioevo, 48 (2001), repr. in *Scritti 'romani'. Scrittura, libri e cultura a Roma in età medievale*, ed. by Giuliana Ancidei, Emma Condello, Marco Cursi, Maria Edvige Malavolta, Luisa Miglio, Maddalena Signorini, and Carlo Tedeschi (Rome: Viella, 2012), 213-250.

Paola Supino Martini, *Roma e l'area grafica romanesca (secoli X-XII)* (Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 1987).
Hélène Toubert, 'Iconographie et histoire de la spiritualité médiévale', *Revue d'histoire de la spiritualité*, 50 (1974), 265-284; repr. in *Un art dirigé. Réforme grégorienne et iconographie* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1990), 19-36.

Hélène Toubert, 'Introduction. Réforme grégorienne et iconographie', in *Un art dirigé. Réforme grégorienne et iconographie* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1990), 7-15.

Hélène Toubert, 'Peinture murale romane. Les découvertes des dix dernières années. Fresques nouvelles, vieux problèmes, nouvelles questions', *Arte medievale* 3 (1987), 127-160.

Hélène Toubert, 'Le renouveau paléochrétien à Rome au début du XIIe siècle', *Cahiers archéologiques*, 20 (1970), 99-154, repr. in *Un art dirigé. Réforme grégorienne et iconographie* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1990), 239-310.

Hélène Toubert, ‘Rome et le Mont-Cassin: Nouvelles remarques sur les fresques de l’église inférieure de Saint-Clément de Rome’, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 30 (1976) 3-33, repr. in *Un art dirigé. Réforme grégorienne et iconographie* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1990), 193-238.

François Truffaut, ‘Une certaine tendance du cinéma français’, *Cahiers du cinéma*, 6, 31 (1954), 15-29.

Gaia Elisabetta Unfer Verre, ‘Decorazione e illustrazione del codice’, in *L’Evangeliario di Papa Chiaramonti. Storia di un codice del secolo XII*, ed. by Paola Errani and Marco Palma (Cesena: Editrice Stilgraf, 2012), 47-64.

Gaia Elisabetta Unfer Verre, ‘Problemi di miniatura romana nell’età della Riforma: L’Evangeliario Piana 3.210 di Cesena’, in *Il Codice miniato in Europa. Libri per la chiesa, per la città, per la corte*, ed. by Giordana Mariani Canova and Alessandra Perriccioli Saggese (Padua: Il Poligrafo Casa Editrice, 2014), 93-103.

Chris Wickham, *Medieval Rome. Stability and Crisis of a City, 900-1150* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).

Joseph Wilpert, *Die römischen Mosaiken und Malereien der kirchlichen Bauten vom IV. bis XIII. Jahrhundert*, 4 vols. (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1917).

Lila Yawn, ‘Clement’s New Clothes. The Destruction of Old S. Clemente in Rome, the Eleventh-Century Frescoes, and the Cult of (Anti)Pope Clement III’, *Reti Medievali Rivista*, 13.1 (2012), 175-208. http://rivista.retimedievali.it, accessed 06/06/2018.

Lila Yawn, ‘Haste, Cost, and Scribes as Painters in Italian Giant Church Books of the Mid and Later Eleventh Century’, *Rivista di Storia della Miniatura*, 17 (2013), 43-58.

Lila Yawn, ‘Scribe-Painters and Clustered Commissions: Eleventh-Century Italian Giant Bibles and the Bamberg Moralia in Iob’, in *Comment le Livre s’est fait livre. La fabrication des manuscrits bibliques (IVe–XVe siècle): bilan, résultats, perspectives de recherche. Actes du colloque international organisé à l’Université de Namur du 23 au 25 mai 2012* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2015), 87-109.

Giuseppa Z. Zanichelli, ‘La funzione del disegno nei codici italiani fra XI e XII secolo’, in *Come nasce un manoscritto miniato: scriptoria, tecniche, modelli e materiali*, ed. by Francesca Flores d’Arcais and Fabrizio Crivello (Modena: Franco Cosimo Panini, 2010), 115-126.

Nino M. Zchomelidse, *Santa Maria Immacolata in Ceri. Pittura sacra al tempo della Riforma Gregoriana / Sakrale Malerei im Zeitalter der Gregorianischen Reform* (Rome: Archivio Guido Izzi, 1996).

Alessandro Zuccari, ‘Dalla “Theotokos” alla “Sponsa Christi”. Il portale laterale di Santa Maria in Trastevere e l’icona della Clemenza’, in *Il potere dell’arte nel medievo. Studi in onore di*

Mario D'Onofrio, ed. by Manuela Gianandrea, Francesco Gangemi, and Carlo Costantini (Rome: Campisano Editore, 2014), 131-151.

Rewriting the *renouveau*: Illustrations

Fig. 1 Martyrology of Santa Maria in Trastevere, fol. 51. London, British Library, Add MS 14801 (photo: © The British Library Board).

Fig. 2 Gospel Book of Santa Maria in Trastevere, fol. 24: Portrait of St. Matthew. London, British Library, Add. MS 6156 (photo: © The British Library Board).

Fig. 3 Gospel Book of Santa Maria in Trastevere, fol. 130: Portrait of St. John. London, British Library, Add. MS 6156 (photo: © The British Library Board).

Fig. 4 Cesena Evangeliary, fol. 1v: Dedication image. Cesena, Biblioteca Malatestiana, MS Piana 3.210 (photo: Biblioteca comunale Malatestiana).

Fig. 5 The Miracle at Chersonese and portraits of Beno de Rapiza and Maria Macellaria. Rome, San Clemente, lower church (photo: after Wilpert, *Die römischen Mosaiken*, vol. 4, pl. 241).

Fig. 6 North door of Santa Maria in Trastevere with 11th-century jambs and lintel (composite photo: Darko Senekovic).

Fig. 7 North door of Santa Maria in Trastevere, right jamb (photo: Almuth Klein).

Fig. 8 North door of Santa Maria in Trastevere, lintel (photo: author).

Fig. 9 North door of Santa Maria in Trastevere, right jamb (photo: Almuth Klein).

Fig. 10 Main door lintel, Santa Pudenziana (photo: author).

Fig. 11 Bronze door, San Paolo fuori le mura (photo: Robert Glass).

[1] Toubert, 'Le renouveau paléochrétien'. See Romano, in *Riforma e tradizione*, 163; Barral i Altet, 'Arte medievale e Riforma'.
[2] Krautheimer, *Rome*, 161-202 and 352 ('my mainstay throughout this chapter has been Toubert's brilliant paper').
[3] Krautheimer, *Rome*, 191.
[4] Claussen, 'Renovatio Romae'; Claussen, 'Marmo e splendore'.
[5] Claussen, 'Marmo e splendore', 151-153, 169-170.
[6] For a multi-faceted account of the historiography up to 2010, see Riccioni, 'La décoration'.
[7] Bertelli, 'San Benedetto', 301; Zchomelidse, *Santa Maria Immacolata*; Kessler, 'L'antica basilica', 55; Osbat, 'Il santuario', 34-37; Riccioni, 'La décoration', 346-347. For the late date see Cadei, 'S. Maria Immacolata', 26-29 ('settimo o ottavo decennio del millecento'); provisionally followed by Toubert, 'Peinture murale', 130-132 ('vers 1170-1180'). Maddalo, 'I santi Giorgio e Silvestro', proposed a mid-twelfth century date and an association with a 'second phase' of the Reform.
[8] Riccioni, *Il mosaico absidale*.
[9] Riccioni, "The Word in the Image", 88.
[10] *Roma e la Riforma gregoriana.*
[11] Romano, in *Riforma e tradizione*, 15-35; 163-182.
[12] Romano, in *Riforma e tradizione*, 163-164; 174-178.
[13] Bertelli, 'San Benedetto'; quotations on 283, 302.
[14] *La pittura in Italia*, 227-232.
[15] *La pittura in Italia*, 233-235.
[16] Gandolfo, "La pittura romana", 21-26.
[17] Toubert, 'Le renouveau paléochrétien', 300, 305; eadem, 'Rome et le Mont-Cassin', 236-237; Nilgen, 'Die Bildkünste Süditaliens', 320.
[18] Pace, 'La Riforma,' 55-56.
[19] Pace, 'La Riforma,' 51, 59.
[20] Barral i Altet, 'Arte medievale e Riforma,' 79.
[21] Barral i Altet, 'Arte medievale e Riforma,' 80.
[22] Miller, 'The Crisis,' 1574.
[23] Wickham, *Medieval Rome*, 13-15.
[24] Wickham, *Medieval Rome*, 20.
[25] Wickham, *Medieval Rome*, 140-142. See also Moscati, *Alle origini*, whose book is an important precedent to Wickham's, and Bertelli, 'San Benedetto', 289..
[26] Wickham, *Medieval Rome*, 354.
[27] di Carpegna Falconieri, *Il clero di Roma.*
[28] di Carpegna Falconieri, *Il clero di Roma*, 109-127.
[29] di Carpegna Falconieri, *Il clero di Roma*, 167-172.
[30] di Carpegna Falconieri, *Il clero di Roma*, 170.
[31] di Carpegna Falconieri, *Il clero di Roma*, 178-188; *Konzilien und Synoden 742-1002*, 5-6.
[32] di Carpegna Falconieri, *Il clero di Roma*, 187-188; see also the excellent account by Barclay Lloyd, *The Medieval Church and Canonry*, 203-225.
[33] Yawn, 'Clement's New Clothes', 185, 193; endorsed by Wickham, *Medieval Rome*, 356-357. Although her style-based dating of the murals before 1084 precludes the pro-Clementine reading, Romano acknowledged its possibility: *Riforma e tradizione*, 129-130.

[34] Yawn, 'Clement's New Clothes', quotation on p. 196. For Anastasius: Barclay Lloyd, *The Medieval Church and Canonry*, 60-65.
[35] Toubert, 'Iconographie et histoire'. On the resistance see Recht, Warnke et al., *Relire Panofsky*.
[36] Panofsky, *Studies in Iconology*, 6-7.
[37] Conant, *Carolingian and Romanesque*, 362-364; Bloch, *Montecassino*, 1:40-71, 88-93. See the revisionist assessments by Claussen, 'Scultura', 208-209 and Gandolfo, 'L'XI secolo', 265-267.
[38] Kinney, 'Rome', 200-208.
[39] On the size: Condello, 'La Bibbia', 349; Lobrichon, 'Le succès ambigu', 237-238.
[40] For the traditional view see Supino Martini, 'Aspetti', 232; Ayres, 'Bemerkungen', 325, Orofino, 'La decorazione', 357-359; eadem, 'Pittura e miniatura', 161-162; Riccioni, 'La décoration', 325-326. Ayres, 'Le Bibbie', posited a single 'export scriptorium' that spawned Giant Bibles and other books made elsewhere in Italy and in Europe.
[41] Condello, 'La Bibbia', 352-357.
[42] Condello, 'La Bibbia', 359; Maniaci and Orofino, 'Dieci anni di studi', 9.
[43] Lobrichon, 'Le succès ambigu', 244-251.
[44] Maniaci, in Maniaci and Orofino, 'L'officina delle *Bibbie*', 203; Larocca, 'Linee di una ricerca', 26-27.
[45] Larocca, 'Linee di una ricerca', 31-32.
[46] Yawn, 'Haste, Cost'; eadem, 'Scribe-Painters'.
[47] Lobrichon, 'Le succès ambigu', 244, 245, 251.
[48] Condello, 'La Bibbia', 358-359.
[49] Condello, 'La Bibbia', 360, quoting Supino Martini.
[50] Condello, 'La Bibbia', 363-364.
[51] *Catalogue of Additions*, List of Additions 1844, 7-8; *Necrologi*, 85-87.
[52] British Library, Add MS 14801, fol. 15 (*Rome depositio iulii pape … positu ad SCA MARIA trans tiberi*); fol. 36v (*Nat sci calixti pp qui in p sequutione alexandri imperatoris diutius fame cruciatus* etc.).
[53] British Library, Add MS 14801, fol. 14 (*hierosolima. dns nr ihc xpc crucifixus e[st]*; *hierosolima. Resurrectio dni nri ihu xpi*). The importance of these passages was first pointed out to me by the late Thomas Waldman.
[54] *Handbook of Dates*, 166. My thanks to Brenda Bolton for expert advice on dates.
[55] British Library, Add MS 14801, fols. 19v-20 (*Dedicatio basilice SCE MARIE transtyberim per manum alexander pontificis et cum epi IIII. cardinalis II. scole lateranensis omibus*). This notice was mistakenly published as a marginal addition by Egidi, who attributed it to Alexander III (1159-1181): *Necrologi*, 94. It has been partially abraded and crossed out, probably after the consecrated building was replaced by Pope Innocent II.
[56] Supino Martini, *Roma e l'area grafica romanesca*, 118.
[57] *Necrologi*, 88-103.
[58] *Necrologi*, 86.
[59] Jounel, 'Le Sanctoral', 80-81.
[60] For Gregory VI: British Library, Add MS 14801, fol. 43v (*Dep. sci gregorii epi*). Despite the wording, the entry is on the date of the pope's abdication, 20 Dec., not his death.
[61] Supino Martini, *Roma e l'area grafica romanesca*, 118.
[62] di Carpegna Falconieri, 'Giovanni Minuto'.
[63] Initials of Add. 14801: Supino Martini, *Roma e l'area grafica romanesca*, 118.

[64] British Library, Add. MS 6156, fol. 8v-9 (Luke 16:19-31) and fol. 15 (Matt. 18:23-35); Alexander, 'A Manuscript', 193.
[65] Supino Martini, *Roma e l'area grafica romanesca*, 119 n. 39.
[66] Alexander, 'A Manuscript', 201, 203.
[67] Alexander, 'A Manuscript', 203.
[68] Alexander, 'A Manuscript', 203.
[69] Yawn, 'Haste, Cost', 44-46.
[70] Yawn, 'Haste, Cost', 43.
[71] Cesena, Biblioteca Malatestiana, Piana 3.210, fol. 1v (*Anno dominice incarnationis millesimo C°IV°*); Unfer Verre, 'Problemi', 94.
[72] Unfer Verre, 'Decorazione', 48-51.
[73] Zanichelli ('La funzione del disegno', 122) and Unfer Verre ('Decorazione', 51) agree that the artist never intended to add color to the drawing. I am grateful to Dott.ssa Unfer Verre for kindly providing a copy of the invaluable 2012 monograph on the Cesena manuscript, and to Dott.sa Paola Errani for supplying the image shown in Fig. 4.
[74] Unfer Verre, 'Decorazione', 56-57; *eadem*, 'Problemi', 95. On the contrary, Gandolfo identified the standing figures as devotees and the kneeling one as the 'vero committente' ('Il ritratto', 282-283).
[75] Wilpert, *Die römischen Mosaiken*, vol. 4, pl. 241; Unfer Verre, 'Decorazione', 54-56; *eadem*, 'Problemi', 95-102.
[76] Coccia et al., 'Santa Maria in Trastevere'; Coccia et al., 'Titulus Iulii'.
[77] *Liber pontificalis*, II, 78 (*per circuitum locis longo senio erat praerupta*); 120 (*absidam, quae pre nimia vetustate ruitura manebat, … restauravit*); 147 (*absidam maiorem …, que in ruinis posita, noviter atque fundamentis faciens, ad meliorem erexit statum*).
[78] *Liber pontificalis*, II, 78 (*iuxta latus praenominate basilicae monasterium a fundamentis statuit et novis fabricis decoravit ... modo, Deo dispensante, pulchra sunt habitacula monachorum*).
[79] Zuccari, 'Dalla "Theotokos"'. These blocks were excavated and removed to a corridor off the sacristy.
[80] Zuccari, 'Dalla "Theotokos"', 136.
[81] Zuccari, 'Dalla "Theotokos"', 141-146.
[82] Bertelli, 'Precisazioni', 72.
[83] Cecchelli, 'Incorniciature', 25 (1130-1143); Russo, "Integrazioni', 96 n. 3 (mid-12th century); Sartori, 'Possibili valenze', 292 (before 1080); Claussen, *Die Kirchen der Stadt Rom*, 3, 184 (10th-early 11th cen.); Zuccari, 'Dalla "Theotokos"', 144 (1130-1143); Parlato and Romano, *Roma e Lazio*, 74-75 (uncertain).
[84] Einaudi, 'S. Maria in Trastevere'.
[85] Cecchelli, 'Incorniciature', 23-25; Gandolfo, 'I programmi', 529-535; Claussen, 'Renovatio Romae', 90-91; Sartori, 'Possibili valenze', 290-292. The portal of Santo Stefano degli Abessini may also belong to this group, but some date it significantly later (Pace, 'Nihil innovetur', 44 n. 29; Parlato and Romano, *Roma e Lazio*, 147), while the frame of the central door of S. Maria in Cosmedin, previously considered part of the group, has been convincingly dated to the late tenth or early eleventh century by Michael Schmitz (in Mondini, Jäggi, Claussen, *Die Kirchen der Stadt Rom*, 4, 178-193). For Grottaferrata: Pace, 'La chiesa abbaziale', 422-425; Silvestro, 'L'incorniciatura' (contra Sartori, 'Possibili valenze', 301, proposing a date around 1024).

[86] Sartori, 'Possibili valenze', 309. For the spolia: Kinney, 'Spolia', 30-31; Ballardini and Pogliani, 'A reconstruction', 193-196.
[87] Fratini, 'Considerazioni e ipotesi', 57-64; endorsed by Claussen, *Die Kirchen der Stadt Rom*, 1, 104; idem, 'Un nuovo campo', 62; idem, 'Scultura', 209-211; Riccioni, 'From Shadow to Light', 227-228. For other opinions see Angelelli, *La Basilica*, 166; she also notes that the frieze was 'strongly reworked if not in large part remade' during a restoration in 1870.
[88] Pace, 'La chiesa abbaziale', 425, followed by Silvestro, 'L'incorniciatura', 119. For a full discussion of the style and date of the door frame, see Kinney, 'S. Maria in Trastevere'.
[89] Pace, 'Campania XI secolo', 227-229; Glass, *Romanesque Sculpture*, 22; Pace, 'La Cattedrale', 211-224.
[90] Augustine, Sermo CLIX, De Pascha I, 3, PL^2 39, col. 2059: *Duae enim sunt portae, porta paradisi et porta ecclesiae: per portam ecclesiae intramus in portam paradisi*; cited by Götz, *Bildprogramme*, 18.
[91] *The Vulgate*, 538-539; Götz, *Bildprogramme*, 11. Add Quintavalle in Potere dell'arte on door symbolism
[92] Montini, *Santa Pudenziana*, 36 (AD REQVIEM VITAE CVPIS O TV QVOQVE VENIRE/EN PATET INGRESSVS FVERIS SI RITE REVERSVS/ADVOCAT IPSE QVIDEM VIA DUX ET JANITOR IDEM/GAVDIA PROMITTENS ET CRIMINA QVAEQVE REMITTENS); less reliably Fratini, 'Considerazioni e ipotesi', 59; cf. Angelelli, *La Basilica*, 166 n. 44. Her transcription seems to contain a typo (*advovat*). Riccioni ('From Shadow to Light', 226) emended the last line to CRIMINAQVE QVI REMITTENS, claiming it as an example of metaplasm. I am grateful to Éamonn Ó Carragáin for his learned help in construing the second line, where RITE is usually taken literally to refer to ritual.
[93] Pace, 'Nihil innovetur', 23.
[94] IOANNES DE VENETIA ME FECIT; *La II regione ecclesiastica*, 163-165; Pace, 'Nihil innovetur', 24-27; Schmitz, in Mondini, Jäggi, Claussen, *Die Kirchen der Stadt Rom*, 4, 182. Documentary evidence suggests a relative scarcity of marble carvers in the city: Wickham, *Medieval Rome*, 144.
[95] Riccioni, 'From Shadow to Light', 231-232.
[96] Claussen, 'Un nuovo campo', 63; idem, 'Scultura', 209-213. Claussen, 'L'altare', posits one properly 'Gregorian' work of the period in the altar of Santa Maria in Cappella.
[97] Acts 4:32-35 (*nec quisquam eorum quae possidebat aliquid suum esse dicebat, sed erant illis omnia communia … Quotquot enim possessores agrorum aut domorum erant vendentes adferebant pretia eorum quae vendebant et ponebant ante pedes apostolorum*); *The Vulgate*, 632-635. Olsen, 'The Idea', 65-66. Miccoli, 'Ecclesiae primitivae forma', traces the changing manifestations of the concept from ca. 1080 onward.
[98] Robinson, 'Reform', 268-270.
[99] New churches showing the influence of Montecassino were built in the eleventh century, but they were small: Barclay Lloyd, 'The Medieval Church'; Claussen, *Die Kirchen der Stadt Rom*, 1, 177-178; idem, 'Un nuovo campo', 61-62.
[100] Claussen, 'Renovatio Romae', 91-93; idem, *Die Kirchen der Stadt Rom*, 1, 227-229; idem, 'Scultura', 209; Goodson, 'Material Memory', 12-13, 31-32; Gandolfo, 'L'XI secolo', 265.
[101] For the criticisms of Gregory VII see Robinson, 'Reform', 278-283.
[102] Robinson, 'Reform', 280 (regular canons were finally established at the cathedral in 1121).
[103] Claussen and Senekovic, *Die Kirchen der Stadt Rom*, 2.
[104] For the problem of roof beams alone, see Kinney, 'Patronage', 359-362.

[105] Kinney, 'Romanità a Roma', 53-56; Guidobaldi, 'Un estesissimo intervento'.
[106] Götz, *Bildprogramme*, 202-211; Matthiae, *Le porte bronzee*, 73-82, pls. 16-48; Pace, 'L'arte di Bisanzio'; Camerlenghi, *St. Paul's*, 146-147. I am grateful to Nicola Camerlenghi for sharing the photo reproduced in Fig. 11, and to Robert Glass for allowing me to reproduce it.
[107] Claussen, *Die Kirchen der Stadt Rom*, 1, 227-228; Goodson, 'Material Memory', 31-32.
[108] Cappella del Bagno: Claussen, *Die Kirchen der Stadt Rom*, 1, 242-246; Goodson, 'Material Memory', 28-33. Bible: Larry Ayres, in *Le Bibble atlantiche*, 126-131. Books made in-house: Supino Martini, *Roma e l'area grafica romanesca*, 113-117.
[109] Condello, 'La Bibbia', 368.
[110] Toubert, 'Le renouveau paléochrétien', 268, 306.
[111] Kitzinger, 'The Gregorian Reform', 100-101.
[112] Toubert, 'Introduction', 12; eadem, 'Peinture murale', 158-160.
[113] Toubert, 'Introduction', 10. Thanks to my colleague Grace Armstrong for clarifying the meaning of *commanditaire*, on the basis of her own study of Marie de Champagne and Chrétien de Troyes: 'the difference … between "patron" and "commanditaire" is that the former protects/finances/often lodges the artist whereas the latter … asks him to execute certain orders'.
[114] I am grateful to Valentino Pace for illustrating the distinction between *committente* and donor (*mecenato*): 'per l'edificio di [Frank Lloyd] Wright il Guggenheim è il committente. All'interno ci sono opere donate dai mecenati'.
[115] Toubert, 'Introduction', 10.
[116] Truffaut, 'Une certaine tendance', 25-28. I am grateful to Homay King for a cogent orientation to *auteur* theory.
[117] Bazin, 'De la politique'; Sarris, 'Notes', 1-5; Sbragia, 'Fellini', 663.
[118] Menne, 'The Cinema', 41.
[119] Menne, 'The Cinema', 36-37, 41.
[120] Sarris, 'Notes', 6-7.
[121] Menne, 'The Cinema', 36-37.
[122] Toubert, 'Le renouveau paléochrétien', 289.
[123] Romano, in *Riforma e tradizione*, 29.
[124] Romano, in *Riforma e tradizione*, 27.
[125] Pace, 'La Riforma', 55-56.
[126] Wickham, *Medieval Rome*, 356.
[127] Wickham, *Medieval Rome*, 357.
[128] Noreen, 'Lay Patronage', 50-54.
[129] Kinney, 'Rome,' 212-213; eadem, 'Romanità a Roma', 70-72. On the *scolae*: Wickham, *Medieval Rome*, 152-154.
[130] Kinney, 'Rome', 213-215.
[131] Claussen, 'Un nuovo campo'; Claussen, 'Scultura'.
[132] Although I have discussed only the murals in San Clemente, the quantity of surviving 11th-century wall paintings in Rome is substantial; see *Riforma e tradizione* and Riccioni, 'La décoration', 330-340.
[133] Gandolfo, 'L'XI secolo', 266-269.
[134] Gandolfo, 'I puteali', 173-174.
[135] Gandolfo, 'I puteali', 173 n. 24.
[136] Romano, 'I pittori romani', 119.