

rauf hin, dass Urkunden eine größere soziale Akzeptanz fanden. Allerdings lassen Quellenbelege erahnen, dass trotzdem mündlich abgeschlossene Rechtshandlungen immer noch üblich waren.

Für nicht-polnische Leserinnen und Leser ist eine ausführliche deutschsprachige Zusammenfassung beigelegt. Wünschenswert wäre vielleicht gewesen, zahlreichere Tabellen zu verwenden. Insbesondere wären Tabellen hilfreich gewesen, um die Ergebnisse der Analyse des Formulars und des Kanzleipersonals zusammenzufassen, wie es in solchen Untersuchungen oft gemacht wird. Dies hätte die Benutzung des Buches für diejenigen, die nach Belegen für einzelne Urkunden suchen, erleichtert. Forschungsliteratur, die sich nicht direkt mit Pommerellen befasst, wurde von der Autorin nur vereinzelt berücksichtigt; eine eingehendere Einarbeitung hätte die generelle historische Einbettung jedoch gestärkt. Abgesehen davon ist kaum zu übersehen, dass Agnieszka Gut damit einen sehr wichtigen Beitrag zur Diplomatie Ostmitteleuropas geliefert hat. Diese Monographie wird noch lange die Grundlage jeder Beschäftigung mit den Quellen dieser wichtigen Region bilden – und außer Urkunden gibt es bekanntlich für Pommerellen bis zu den 1340er Jahren kaum Quellen. So ausführlich, detailreich und sorgfältig ist die Analyse, dass sie kaum zu ersetzen sein wird. Diese Monographie ist aber sehr viel mehr als nur eine Untersuchung von Formular und Kanzleipersonal. Agnieszka Gut ist es zusätzlich gelungen, eine faszinierende Gesamtdarstellung der Entstehung und Entwicklung pragmatischer Schriftlichkeit in einer Region zu liefern, die sich an der Peripherie Polens befand und sich auf ganz andere Weise entwickelte als die meisten anderen Regionen Mitteleuropas. Als solches wird diese Studie auch für diejenigen, die sich mit dem historischen Phänomen der Verbreitung von Schriftlichkeit im mittelalterlichen Europa befassen, von großem Interesse sein.

St. John's, Neufundland und Labrador

Sébastien Rossignol

Paul BERTRAND, *Les Écritures ordinaires. Sociologie d'un temps de révolution documentaire (1250–1350)*. (Histoire ancienne et médiévale 138.) Publications de la Sorbonne, Paris 2015. 440 S. ISBN 978-2-85944-920-9.

The explosive growth in the uses of script for purposes of daily life in the so-called „long thirteenth century“ has intrigued students of medieval literacy for a long time already. The Belgian historian Paul Bertrand, who has spoken many times in discussions on the subject, has proposed a synthesis (introduced by Michael Clanchy himself) to analyse in detail various features of this period that were decisive for the development of literacy in the medieval West. It is by now well known that the thirteenth century saw a growth in the number of records produced and preserved, accompanied by a multiplication of their genres, standardisation within the individual genres, and a „democratisation“ of the range of their users. The author puts this general scholarly opinion to the test, investigating uses of the written word in the area of modern north-eastern France and Belgium (i. e. the counties of Artois, Hainaut, Flanders, Namur and the episcopal principality of Liège). This territory offers a rich variety and massive amounts of sources produced in princely, episcopal, and urban scribal offices. The author rightly decided that the written culture of clergymen and laymen should be studied together. In nine vividly written and well-illustrated chapters, the reader is led through the jungle of the texts to the people who created and used them.

The book has its own conceptual setting, to a large extent inspired by French and English anthropology and ethnology, as well as by an „Italian style“ sociology of written culture. Its understanding of literacy follows Brian Street's idea of the „literacy event“. The main key concept chosen is that of „ordinary“ or „common“ records (*écritures ordinaires*); this terminology is in fact synonymous with the well-known designations of „pragmatic literacy“ and „pragmatische Schriftlichkeit“. However, Bertrand decided to disregard almost completely the scho-

larly discourse on this phenomenon developed over the last decades in medieval scholarship (with one notable exception: the seminal monograph of Michael Clanchy). As synonyms of „ordinary records“ appear such terms as „written culture“, „culture of writing“ and the rather vague „archival records“ (les écrits d'archives).

The introductory chapter (not numbered) puts a question that is fundamental for the whole monograph: what was the essence of the „documentary revolution“ of the thirteenth century? The preliminary answer, tested and confirmed in the following three chapters, emphasises that two parallel phenomena were essential: the production of bulk administrative records that were kept only for a short time, and the refinement of preservation strategies and techniques. Intertextuality (the production of *vidimus*-charters and *pancartae*, the creation of cartularies, confirming and copying diplomas) can also be used for keeping records. It was as important as the organisation of treasuries of charters and archives, easily searchable thanks to ever more perfected systems of indices and lists of contents.

Equally important in the daily use of script is the all-embracing desire to rationalise the form and contents of the records and to improve the speed of their visual perception. This could be achieved by imposing order and „organising“ written texts on their material supports. The author shows convincingly that codicological analysis (the study of justification and lineation, of the relationship between blocks or columns of text and the „white“ on the page, of the use of colours) can be successfully applied to the analysis of records from the domain of pragmatic literacy (chapter 4).

As one might expect, Latin script also underwent considerable change in the critical thirteenth century. The analysis of graphical culture (chapter 5) goes far beyond the limits of documentary palaeography, embracing also the phenomenon of graphical codes of different origins, but the central issue of this chapter is the author's opinion that cursive script did not exist (p. 229). Instead he speaks about „cursivité“, that is a series of graphical marks and habits which would make script more or less cursive. (By the way, this opinion did not prevent him from talking about „cursive script“ later on in the book.) Bertrand points out the most important marks of this „ordinary“ (ordinaire) „cursive“ script of the period, that is the depersonalisation, uniformity, and neutralisation which makes it so difficult for historians to distinguish individual hands. The most interesting part of this chapter is an in-depth analysis of the technical inventions by the scribes to increase the speed of writing. This resulted in a new (?) attitude towards the written word (now seen as an everyday tool), and in an unheard-of proliferation of written records. Its main consequence was the ever-growing web of interconnected records (discussed in chapter 6). This phenomenon is skilfully analysed using the example of the cross-referential network of administrative documents concerning annuities. Increasing numbers of registers of rents, revenues, spontaneously organised cartularies, etc. constituted the nucleus of everyday administrative work generally, with the scribes creating the registers having to resolve the purely practical issues of their textual organisation.

These networks of records were produced by both secular and ecclesiastical institutions, and by individuals. Exceptionally rewarding is the analysis of the personal collections of records of people who were professionally involved in institutional administration. The parallel analysis of the private and official archives kept by Thierry de Heriçon (at the turn of the thirteenth and fourteenth century subsequently clerk of the French royal chancery, servant of the counts of Artois, and finally bishop of Arras) lets the author build a bridge between the records themselves and their creators and users. The people „behind the records“ are the main subject of chapter 7, clearly meant as a wide-ranging panorama of the various forms of participation in written culture by the professionals of literacy, semi-literates, etc. The attention focusses first of all on clerks and on the people whom Jacques Verger called „les gens de savoir“. Without referring to Verger's research, the author follows in his footsteps by showing the contribution to pragmatic literacy made by the lower echelons in the administration. For

them, writing was the most efficient instrument of their work, but nothing more than that. Bertrand does not succeed to answer convincingly the most important question concerning their professional formation, that is: where they learnt to write the „ordinary“, speedy, strongly cursive script, so typical for ephemeral administrative records?

In the final chapter an attempt is made to list the four principal functions of writing in the long thirteenth century. This list is slightly confusing, as the author decided to treat „communication“ and „communication with an authority“ as two separate functions of the written word. The function of „memorising“ is also distinguished, even if the commemorative role of certain types of charters (such as *pancartae*) is discussed squarely in reference to the communicative value of writing. The most cryptic is the last function, that of „facilitating analysis of the real as well as abstract phenomena of the world, and of control and inspiration for human actions“ (sic; p. 372). The simple and convincing conclusion that thirteenth-century writing was broadly used as the instrument in daily administration, economy, the practice of law, and pastoral care, has resulted in unnecessary divagations on „bricolage intellectuel“, and much repetition of what has already been said in the earlier chapters.

Undoubtedly, we are dealing with an ambitious book, meant to give a personal answer to some general questions that continue to reappear in discussions of medieval literacy, and to go beyond worn-out conceptual frames and typologies (see, e. g. pp. 29sq., 80sq., 243sq.). In many places we can hear the author's loud voice saying „I did it my way“. He certainly did, but were all his choices justified? Most curiously, having elaborated his own set of concepts, he came to the same conclusions as scholars investigating features of pragmatic literacy in the „Münster“ way: an explosive proliferation of records, growth of their cross-referential webs, the appearance of „consultation literacy“, and the birth of a complex group of professionals of the written word. All these developments have been noted in the scholarly literature. It is excellent to get a well-argued confirmation that they also occurred in the southern Netherlands and in northeastern France. One has to say, however, that the book suffers from a lack of balance between zooming in and zooming out: the author's ambition to write an „essay autant que synthèse“ causes the splendid source materials from the area under investigation, masterly analysed, to somehow disappear in an ocean of general remarks. Only some corpora of sources get a clear voice, and they are discussed several times (e. g. the taxation records of the counts of Flanders, preserved in Lille, and the personal dossier of Thierry de Hericon).

Generally speaking, in this book there is both too much and too little. On the one hand, the descriptions of some generally known phenomena take up much unnecessary space; on the other hand, some surprising lacunae appear. When discussing the growth of „consultation literacy“, for instance, the author talks about all possible aspects of the new intellectual tools without connecting them with the new textual culture of the university (pp. 108sq.). Even more worrying is that many of the general observations about features of medieval written culture can be disputed one by one, because they are built on intuition or on misreading the scholarly literature (e. g. the author's understanding of the works by Peter Rück on the performative function of charters on pp. 150 and 161, to mention only one issue).

The effort to sketch a comparative perspective for the main area of investigation deserves approval, although here, too, some of the author's choices might be challenged. Taking Clanchy's diagnosis of the development of literacy in thirteenth-century England as the norm for the whole medieval West is risky. At the same time, comparing the growth of urban administrative literacy in northeastern France and the Belgian territories with the south of France can give only limited profit. There might have been more interesting results if the proto-bureaucratic scribal offices in the cities of the area under investigation would have been compared with the area of towns organised according to the so-called „German law“, the very neighbours to the east, i. e. the German lands and East Central Europe. A series of recent publications has

brought to light similarities between these municipal „writing machines“, resulting most probably from a similar organisation of urban institutions (first among which was the dominant college of aldermen). Sometimes the author's choices are hard to understand. Why does the popularity of the habit of copying charters into liturgical books need to be justified by the randomly chosen example of Ethiopia?

Despite these misgivings, this is a very rich and interesting book, which may serve also as a stimulus to meditate on the nature of the study of medieval literacy: on how we do our work, which concepts we choose, how we draw our methodological schemes. Contrary to the author, however, who archly admits that he has been poaching in many disciplines (mostly in the so-called „auxiliary“ sciences of history), I am convinced that the investigation of medieval literacy surely ought to be more than the simple mathematical addition of data provided by various disciplines.

Utrecht

Anna Adamska

Archivi e archivisti in Italia tra medioevo ed età moderna, hg. von Filippo DE VIVO–Andrea GUIDI–Alessandro SILVESTRI. (I libri di Viella 203.) Viella, Roma 2015. 395 S. ISBN 978-88-6728-457-3.

Die 101 italienischen Staatsarchive verwahren etwa 1,6 Mill. Laufmeter Archivgut, das wohl mit zu den bedeutendsten weltweit zu zählen ist. Trotzdem halten sich die Bemühungen der politisch Verantwortlichen um Zuwendung der für eine sachgerechte Konservierung und einen zeitgemäßen Zugang notwendigen Sachmittel und Personal sehr in Grenzen.

Bei dieser prekären Ausgangslage kann der hier anzuzeigende Band auch als Versuch gewertet werden, das Bewusstsein für Archive als wesentlichen Bestandteil der nationalen und europäischen Kultur zu schärfen und sie nicht nur als Ort, sondern auch als Objekt der Forschung zu etablieren. Verantwortlich dafür zeichnet eine Gruppe von Forscherinnen und Forschern, die im Rahmen des am Londoner Birkbeck College angesiedelten ERC-Projekts „ARCHIVES – A comparative history of archives in late medieval and early modern Italy“ in sozial- und kulturgeschichtlichem Zugriff die Mechanismen und Orte untersuchen, die die Entstehung von Archiven ermöglichten, ferner das Verhältnis der Archive zu den aktenproduzierenden Behörden, die Biographien des Archivpersonals, von diesem angewandte Methoden und Ordnungskriterien sowie die daraus hervorgegangenen Findmittel, materielle Aspekte der Konservierung, den nicht-institutionellen Gebrauch der Archive sowie ihre Nutzung durch die Geschichtsschreibung, lange bevor sie im 19. Jahrhundert zu Anstalten der Forschung wurden (S. 10). Methodisch wichtig ist aber auch der Vergleich der komplexen archivischen Realitäten in den verschiedenen Staaten und Kommunen Italiens zwischen dem 15. und dem 18. Jahrhundert. Schließlich ist der Sammelband auch interdisziplinär angelegt, an der Schnittstelle von Behörden- und Verwaltungsgeschichte, Geschichte der Schriftkultur und Schriflichkeit, Archivgeschichte sowie Informations- und Kommunikationsgeschichte.

Der dabei verwendete Archivbegriff ist freilich ein ziemlich weitläufiger. Erklärbar ist dieses Manko auch damit, dass die italienische Archivwissenschaft im Gegensatz zur deutschsprachigen grundsätzlich die Nützlichkeit eines klar umrissenen Archivbegriffs nicht anerkennt; nur selten wird z. B. zwischen Registratur (archivio corrente) und Archiv (archivio storico) unterschieden. Weiters haben in den meisten der hier untersuchten Fälle die Archive auch noch nicht ihre institutionelle Unabhängigkeit von der Kanzlei erhalten, weshalb es auch sinnvoller ist, von Bediensteten mit teils archivarischen Funktionen als von professionellem Archivpersonal zu sprechen.

Der Band ist in drei Themenblöcke gegliedert (I. Figure e strategie collettive, II. Archivi e potere, III. Archivi e cultura), denen eine ausführliche theoriegesättigte Einleitung der Herausgeber vorangestellt (S. 9–39) und ein 2007 in „Archival Science“ erschienener, für die