

UC Davis

UC Davis Previously Published Works

Title

Review of *Book of Gomorrah: An Eleventh-Century Treatise against Clerical Homosexual Practices* by P. Damian and P. J. Payer

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0xr255bw>

Journal

Speculum, 59(3)

Author

Hexter, Ralph Jay

Publication Date

1984-07-01

Peer reviewed

Medieval Academy of America

Book of Gomorrah: An Eleventh-Century Treatise against Clerical Homosexual Practices by Peter Damian; Pierre J. Payer

Review by: Ralph J. Hexter

Speculum, Vol. 59, No. 3 (Jul., 1984), pp. 642-645

Published by: [Medieval Academy of America](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2846316>

Accessed: 13/11/2013 14:49

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Medieval Academy of America is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Speculum*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

to "Du lignage au roy navarroys." The other manuscripts (with one exception), as well as the medieval German translations, indicate that "de Norvoye" should be retained. Roach explains that she made the change because "navarroys" conforms to her genealogical research on the Lusignans.

The chief importance of Couldrette's *Mélusine*, as Roach points out, lies in its widespread diffusion and the great interest it evoked during the late Middle Ages. The reasons behind the creation of such a work, however, are far more complex than Roach postulates: a desire by Couldrette's patron to see his family's history abstractly portrayed in a *conte de fée* explaining why the Lusignans lost their kingdoms in Jerusalem and Armenia and why their direct line in France came to an end. Louis Stouff has very logically and plausibly argued that Jean d'Arras and Couldrette wrote their respective versions of the *Mélusine* because of the political motives of rival patrons who were on opposite sides in the Hundred Years War. They were vying for authority over Lusignan and were attempting to reinforce their territorial claims by establishing lineage from the Lusignans whose direct line had died out in the early fourteenth century. By avoiding any comparison of the poetic version of the *Mélusine* with Jean d'Arras's prose version and by failing to discuss the reasons behind the creation of both works, Roach has presented Couldrette's poem out of context. By devoting a major portion of her introduction to tracing links between the *Mélusine*'s fictional characters and remote historical figures, she has focused on a relatively minor aspect of the *Mélusine* and has ignored a vast spectrum of historical forces shaping life and literature in France in the late fourteenth century.

MATTHEW W. MORRIS

Oxford College of Emory University

PETER DAMIAN, *Book of Gomorrah: An Eleventh-Century Treatise against Clerical Homosexual Practices*, trans. Pierre J. Payer. Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1982. Paper. Pp. xi, 108. \$7.50. Distributed in the U.S. by Humanities Press, Atlantic Highlands, N.J.

ABOUT 1049 St. Peter Damian, throughout his life a passionate but reasonable opponent of simony and clerical marriage, was moved to send Pope Leo IX a tract condemning homosexual practices among clerics. In a preface and twenty-six chapters Damian categorized and condemned a variety of sexual acts (including masturbation) in no uncertain terms. Leo, in his response, noted the frankness of his speech. Damian's zeal was not directed at homosexuality per se; rather, his concern was the church. He maintained the impractical and apparently unpopular position that no one guilty of the sexual misconduct outlined in the *Liber Gomorrhianus* should be admitted to the clergy or, if a cleric, should remain in his position. He inveighed against the mutual confession of priests engaging in such practices and above all against the penitentials, which were inconsistent and, in his view, too lax. He urged his fallen brethren to repent and reform themselves, not that they might thereby remain in their positions but to save their souls. At the conclusion he felt compelled to justify the entire enterprise, which some might regard as meddling on his part, asking how he could possibly have remained silent "when the divine voice issues a terrible threat through the mouth of the prophet and says, 'If you see your brother doing evil and you do not correct him I will require his blood from your hand'" (p. 87; cp. Ezek. 3.18, 20).

Leo, while praising Peter's zeal, declined to endorse his extreme position; with the celebrated words "nos humanius agentes" the pope echoed not only Damian's "humaniores" (c. 2, PL 145:162A; cp. Payer, p. 18) but, more significantly, a phrase found in the second diocesan statute of Theodulf of Orléans: "ut humanius loquamur" (c. 42; PL 105:215B).

The *Liber Gomorrhianus* had little impact either in Damian's lifetime or in the centuries which followed. Despite the bowdlerized form in which it was first printed by Constantine Gaetani in 1610 and often reprinted (most accessibly in the *Patrologia Latina* [145:161–90]), scholars have been (or have pretended to be) too modest to discuss the work in detail. That "[n]o decent person could undertake a translation of Peter's *Liber Gomorrhianus*"¹ appears to have been the universal opinion of the scholarly world until recently, for the translation reviewed here is the first of the entire work to appear in any modern language.

Given the difficulties of the text and the lack of any prior translation or commentary to which he could refer, Payer has done a good job. The translation is readable, largely reliable (as far as the text allowed; see below), and on the whole conveys a sense of Damian's grandiloquence. The splendors and occasional absurdities of Peter's fulminations have not been dimmed, nor has Payer blocked Peter's most splendidly mixed metaphors: "Surely this impious piety does not cut off the wound but adds fuel to the fire" (p. 30; c. 2, PL col.162A) and "Indeed, whomever this most atrocious beast once seizes upon with bloodthirsty jaws, it restrains with its bonds from every form of good work and immediately unleashes him down the steep descent of the most evil depravity" (p. 65; c. 16, PL col. 176D).

The value of the translation is vitiated by the text on which it was based. At the conclusion of his introduction Payer candidly remarks, "It was my original intention to compare this edition with the earliest manuscript . . . but I was unsuccessful in my attempt to obtain a microfilm"; he refers readers to the series of articles on the manuscript tradition of Damian's works by Kurt Reindel (p. 23 and n. 68). It was unfortunate that Payer could not have carried out his plan or have contacted Professor Reindel (Regensburg) as I had occasion to do while working on the *Liber Gomorrhianus*. A collation of the Gaetani text with the critical one Reindel and his associate Prof. Owen Blum have prepared and which they were kind enough to send me revealed not only that the Gaetani text was filled with errors but that it had been bowdlerized. I do not wish to anticipate the findings of Reindel and Blum or to speculate about when, where, and by whom the changes were made. Merely as examples of the euphemizing tendency of the alterations I note that there has been a massive — if not quite complete — suppression of "sodomita" and related words (with "carnalis homo" or "carnales homines" replacing "sodomita" or "sodomite" respectively in cc. 8 [PL col. 168A], 10 [col. 169D], 14 [bis: cols. 174A, 175A], 19 [col. 180B]; "carnalis vitii" replacing "sodomie" and "nefandae turpitudinis" "sodomitice turpitudinis" [both in c. 22, col. 184B]) as well as an attempt to eliminate or rephrase direct references to anal intercourse (e.g., in c. 13 "qui in terga fornicantur" is twice replaced by "qui consummato actu contra naturam delinquent [col. 173A; ". . . peccant" at col. 173B]; "in posteria" and "in terga" are removed [they ought to

¹ Henry Daniel-Rops, *The Church in the Dark Ages*, trans. Audrey Butler (London and New York, 1959), p. 583; the original reads "il n'est honnête Français qui permette de traduire son *Liber Gomorrhianus*" (*L'église des temps barbares* [Paris, 1950], p. 704).

appear in cols. 173B and 175A respectively; even more spectacular excisions were made in cc. 1, 2, 15, and 22]).

Other, less tendentious shortcomings of the Patrologia text made Payer's task as a translator exceedingly difficult, and there are, unfortunately, a number of mistranslations for which the text can not be blamed: "inde vilis capella humiliter beat" (c. 11; PL col. 171B) is not "there he humbly blesses the head of the evildoer" (p. 53; the following sentence in English is also way off track); "contrita est" (Jer. 14.7 in c. 17, PL col. 177C) is not "is contrite" (p. 67); "animos a crimine sumens" (col. 178B) is less likely to mean "acquiring souls through crime" (ibid.) than "becoming bold . . ."; and, given the imagery throughout the passage, "ad uncum poenitentiae" (c. 24, PL col. 187B) should be translated "to the anchor" rather than "to the scalpel of penance" (p. 85). Since the translation is intended for readers of English, why not make "Aprutium" "Abruzzi" (p. 33) and "being made the plunder of Allophyllis" (p. 82; "praeda factus Allophyllis," PL col. 185A) ". . . of foreigners" or even "of Philistines" (cp. the headnote to Ps. 56 [55.1 Vulgate])?

Damian's citations of the Bible, as Payer notes several times, frequently diverge from the Vulgate, which in turn diverges not infrequently from other Bible translations. However helpful modern versions of the Bible prove to the translator, he ought not force the citations to conform to some external standard. Damian follows the Vulgate in his citation of Lam. 4.5 (c. 17, PL col. 177D) and has "croceis" ("saffron") where English versions (as did the Septuagint) follow the Hebrew ("scarlet") more strictly, reading "purple." It is not the translator's business to correct the Latin tradition or Damian and write "purple" (p. 67). Damian's quotation (c. 18, PL col. 179C; cp. p. 70, n. 89) of 2 Sam. 3.29 with "Gomorian" (PL "Gomorrhianum") for the Vulgate "fluxum seminis" (which he also knows and discusses) is intriguing. This may well derive, either directly or via a gloss, from the Septuagint's "γοβορρής." The transformation of the Greek into "Gomorian" is almost inevitable when one considers that in a Greek minuscule hand "μ" and "ν" would be easily confused, at least by a less-practiced eye, and that by the eleventh century the "ν" would already have been pronounced "ι."

The English text is remarkably well proofread; my only query is whether Payer means "the earthy" or "the earthly Jerusalem" (p. 64). The references in the footnotes, however, are far from reliable. I by no means checked them all, but I note the following *corrigenda*: p. 8, n. 19: "PL 97, 143A" should read "PL 97, 816A"; 8, n. 21: "PL 97, 813A" should read "PL 97, 845A"; 20, n. 58: "PL 144, 170A" should read "PL 144, 270A"; 38, n. 21: "Sodona"; 67, n. 83: "*Metamorphoses* 4.474" should read "*Metamorphoses* 6.474"; 75, n. 99: "Isidore . . . , Book 6.4" should read ". . . Book 9.6.4"; p. 104: "*San Peir*" should read "*San Pier*"; finally, p. 53, n. 58, and p. 102: Jerome's *Commentariorum in Matheum Libri IV* is in volume 77 of the Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, not in volume 7 (it is, however, volume 7 of *Pars I [Opera Exegetica]* of Jerome's works within CCSL, which probably explains the error).

Payer has prefaced his translation of the *Liber Gomorrhianus* with a short introduction (pp. 3–23) of which the best part is a concise review of the conciliar and, for the Carolingian period, legal strictures against homosexual behavior. In the introduction and in the notes Payer shows himself at home with the penitential literature. Other parts of the introduction are less satisfactory: at the outset he seems at pains to establish the relevance of debate about homosexuality ("Homosexuality is a problem which North American society has not been successful in resolving" [p. 3]) and of the *Liber Gomorrhianus* in particular — "a characteristic Western approach to homosexual-

ity" (p. 5). At the same time he frequently stresses the "unique" features of the document; Payer wishes to sell the work even at the risk of inconsistency. While the translation is aimed at 'contemporary readers . . . the majority of [whom] do not read Latin" (pp. 5–6; cp. p. 23), students and general readers without a strong background in church history are likely to be seriously misled when, for example, Payer asserts that "in . . . the tenth century and the first half of the eleventh . . . the rules against clerical marriage seemed everywhere to be disregarded" (p. 11). The "Bibliography" (pp. 101–4) is in fact a list of books cited or used.

Payer has produced a volume which, despite its shortcomings, teachers of medieval social and ecclesiastic history will be happy to be able to assign students, which scholars should be grateful to have as a gloss and commentary on the original (in the sense that a translation is the fullest commentary), and which will immeasurably aid any subsequent translator of the improved text.

RALPH J. HEXTER
Yale University

JOHN EDWARDS, *Christian Córdoba: The City and Its Region in the Late Middle Ages*. (Cambridge Iberian and Latin American Studies.) Cambridge, Eng., and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982. Pp. xv, 240; 2 maps, 3 tables. \$47.50.

THIS IS the latest work in the Cambridge Iberian and Latin American Studies series, a collection which has already given medievalists Evelyn Procter's *Curia and Cortes in León and Castile*. The present work surveys the political, social, and economic history of the former Muslim capital of Córdoba from its Christian conquest in 1236 until the death of King Ferdinand in 1516. Edwards examines the history of the city with particular attention to its urban structure, its taxation system, its economic position in the context of its region, its politically ambitious nobility, and its religious turmoil in the later Middle Ages. This is no easy task given the uneven nature of the source material. The coverage of the period before 1350 is accordingly the most superficial part of the book; the concentration of the study is focused upon the later fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, where Edwards's archives are the richest and his secondary reading the most extensive. The themes are best developed and the thesis most clearly elaborated in the chapters on the years from 1400 to 1516.

The work opens with a useful introduction to the region's geography. The historical survey then begins with the conquest of Córdoba, which is rather lamely recounted as Fernando III's "afterthought." No reader of Julio González's *Fernando III*, Derek Lomax's *Reconquest*, or the *Crónica latina* will find this an apt description of the siege of the city. In his discussion of the 1241 *fuero* of the city it is clear that Edwards has not utilized the recent works of González and García Gallo on that charter. In examining the partitioning of Córdoba in the wake of its capture, the author consults only the older study of Seville's *repartimiento* by González, passing over the published editions of the redivision of Lorca, Murcia, and the nearly contemporary enterprise at Valencia. He overlooks the extended study by Carmela Pescador in his discussion of the urban knightly class. Indeed, none of these works appear in Edwards's bibliography, and the secondary research for the earlier period seems a bit thin. Thereafter, matters improve and the fruit of Edwards's municipal and ecclesiastical archival research in Córdoba matures impressively. His delineation of the organization of the