deserves thanks for making it available. One looks forward to the edition of Book II (which is also to contain a much-needed index for both volumes).

GREGORY HAYS, *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*

JAN ZIOLKOWSKI, ed. *Nigel of Canterbury, The Passion of St. Lawrence.* Leiden and New York: E.J. Brill, 1994. Pp. xii, 323.

Jan Ziolkowski's edition of the unedited works of Nigel of Canterbury, sometimes known as Nigel de Longchamps or Nigel Wireker, is a worthy addition to Brill's outstanding—and handsome—series "Mittellateinische Studien und Texte." In this volume are editions and translations of and notes to Nigel's *Passion of St. Lawrence*, epigrams (largely first editions), and selected comments, including unpublished poems, from a Cambridge manuscript which once belonged to Nigel. Ziolkowski's edition rounds out our picture of the author of the famous *Speculum stultorum*, and his not inconsiderable verse output can now be read *in toto*. (Ziolkowski began this project when he edited Nigel's *Miracula Sancte Dei genetricis uirginis Marie, uersifice* [Toronto, 1986]). Now it will not, I trust, be ascribed to lack of sympathy for either poet or project if I aver that, in my view, Nigel does not belong to the first rank of Medieval Latin poets. But leaving that impertinent bit of aesthetic criticism aside, Nigel—who was an accomplished master of the quantitative hexameter as formed and rhymed in the high Middle Ages as well as an energetic exponent of verse hagiography replete with striking descriptions and rhetoric—can tell us a great deal about poetic ambitions and tastes of Anglo-Norman Latinity in the final years of the twelfth century.

It is this milieu that Ziolkowski approaches in chapter two ("Nigel and Canterbury," pp. 6–42), the longest section of his prudent introduction. There he offers a sketch of the intellectual or at least scholastic currents in and around Canterbury in the second half of the twelfth and in the early thirteenth centuries both before and after the murder of Thomas (1170). This world of letters boasted the likes of John of Salisbury, Gerald of Wales, Joseph of Exeter, and Peter of Blois. Here Ziolkowski's primary interest is historical, even church-political, rather than literary. In particular, Ziolkowski evokes the memory of Thomas as the rallying point and inspiration for the politics and much of the writing of the monks of Christ Church: "Becket...came to symbolize opposition to the intrusion of temporal power in ecclesiastic affairs: he had forfeited his life in order to guarantee the immunity of the clergy" (p. 20). But, as Ziolkowski describes it, Christ Church was a monastic cathedral, and the archbishop was expected to direct both a monastery and a major church (not to mention the archdiocese). Estrangement, even conflict, was not unknown by the end of the twelfth century.

Not with a heavy hand, but with a light touch, Ziolkowski sets this and other conflicts between secular officials (or those more oriented towards the secular powers) as points of comparison between the situation in which Nigel and his

brothers found themselves and the more dramatic historical conflict between Laurence and Romans described in the major poem in his edition. "To Nigel, the greed of the Roman emperor and his prefect could have prefigured the greed of the English kings and the archbishops of Canterbury, just as the suffering of Laurence to protect the treasure of the Church could have anticipated the suffering of the Canterbury monks to keep their treasure and rights from the grasp of the kings and archbishops" (p. 42).

But Nigel and his world were beset by subtler and more long-lasting trends and tensions. Already in Nigel's day,

> monks had lost their ascendancy in the worlds of learning and ecclesiastic administration. Increasingly, clerks secured the positions that... earlier ... had been ... monks[']. W]hen he produced the *Passio Sancti Laurenti martiris*, Nigel, whether or not he had been a clerk in his younger days, belonged to a monastery [near] an archiepiscopal court which was filled with clerks, and could not have failed to see the transformation underway. (p. 31)

Ziolkowski uncovers a tension between Nigel's own studious inclinations and the battles he fits in his literary endeavours, a tension that was obviously productive:

> Under different circumstances, Nigel's writings might have matched more closely the strongly theological flavor of the books he owned, but the challenges facing Christ Church were not conducive to an intellectual life of disengaged contemplation. Nigel's involvement in the struggles of Christ Church may have... pulled him away from the Bible and theology toward satire and moral philosophy, and it may even have conditioned his work as a poet. (p. 38)

Given such insights, it is a shame Ziolkowski does not venture to speak more about the poem's audience and its expectations on a variety of levels. I suspect that the editor felt that speculative analysis should yield to the editions, translations and notes that fill this already sizeable volume.

As editor, Ziolkowski addresses the manuscript sources of the texts. Chapter three (pp. 43–51) describes the most important manuscript for the transmission of Nigel's works, London, British Library, MS Cotton Vespasian D. xix, which contains the epigrams (fols. 2r–4v), the *Miracula s. Marie* (fols. 5r–24v), and *Passio s. Laurentii* (fols. 28r–45r), and the *Vita s. Pauli primi hermitae* (fols. 45v–51r [roughly one-third the length of the *Passio* and available in editions published in 1931 and 1960]). Reviewing the evidence, Ziolkowski concludes (somewhat inconclusively) that although Nigel was himself "probably somehow involved in the production of this manuscript" (p. 45), the number of hands identifiable (as many as nine) at the very least complicates Mozley's earlier claim that the manuscript is Nigel's

autograph; Nigel's role as penman seems represented by hand one (in textura) and some of the (cursive) corrections.

Chapter 4 (pp. 52–247) is the core of the entire volume and is a virtual book itself, including an introduction to the historical background of Laurence (d. 10 August 258) and Nigel's prose source or sources and poetic precursors. The poem (2348 rhymed hexameters [caudati, some leonine]) follows, Latin facing English, then notes and two appendices. Without the benefit of autoscopy, this reviewer cannot speak to the accuracy of the edition or reports of manuscript readings, but is prepared to trust the editor whose attention to detail appears scrupulous throughout. Punctuation is sensible, though, i.a., "etiam" in v. 956 would probably be better taken with "uocata" (i.e. "even when called") and I would set a comma after "puto" (v.1859). Indeed, the entire book is impressively well produced: I am reduced to noting the awkward hyphenation of "homo-eoptoton" (p. 67).

The translation is literal, as befits a facing translation. How literal? For instance, "super celos" (v. 1443) is rendered "on top of heaven." (The same phrase is rendered more elegantly as "in heaven above" in v. 2265.) By an oversight, on p. 95 the English of v. 405 is missing (it would run something like "The martyr is honoured, through whom God works these [wonders].")

I wish Ziolkowski had devoted more space to analysis of Nigel's stylistic practices in this poem, for as editor of the bulk of Nigel's verse, he is in possession of unparalleled knowledge. (The "Index of Repeated and Stock Hexameter Phrases," pp. 303–314, is a valuable tool.) As it is, his comments setting Nigel's style in the context of other Anglo-Norman poetry are suggestive. For example, it is interesting to see Nigel's rhyming compared to the virtuosity of his fellow Canterburyian, Reginald (pp. 67–68). As is obvious, these verses are products of the schools and contemporary metrical handbooks. Though Ziolkowski sends users of his edition to the standard sources (Meyer, Klopsch), readers with a special interest in medieval understanding of quantitative metrics might profit from Jürgen Leonhardt, *Dimensio syllabarum. Studien zur lateinischen Prosodie- und Verslehre von der Spätantike bis zur frühen Renaissance* [Göttingen, 1989]). One area where it might be indeed interesting to gather statistics is enjambment both within and between the rhymed couplets. The latter (as after vv. 90, 138, 218, 432, 1114, 1246, 1620, 1884, 1916) is notably rare, but one would want to know how Nigel's practice of enjambment compares to those of his contemporaries. The way the writing of verse was taught as well as a taste for reading (and writing) elegiac couplets doubtless contributed to the tendency rarely to extend thought beyond the (rhymed) couplets. A stretch like vv. 1383–86 is thus quite striking. To readers raised on the verse paragraphs of Vergil (and Milton), these enjambed lines seem to sound a grander register, yet Nigel and his audience would likely have found the fact that all four lines rhyme in *-is* to be still more impressive.

In noting "parallels," the bane of any commentator, Ziolkowski, while correctly abjuring the "classical fallacy," also rightly notes classical parallels, since what we call classics were among the *auctores* Nigel would have read from his student days. But some omissions, and some inclusions, are odd. For example, at v.

57, *si quis in hoc populo*, the echo of Ovid, *Ars amatoria* 1.1 ("si quis in hoc artem populo non nouit amandi") is deafening, but goes unremarked by Ziolkowski. (More subtle—but one cannot merely count words—are Boethian tones in vv. 2035, "qui solus cuncta gubernas," 2199, and 2204; cf. esp. the great hymn "O qui perpetua mundum ratione gubernas" of *De consolatione philosophiae* 3.9.) When, however, we come to the description of "ira" as "furor immedicabilis herbis" in v. 834, Ziolkowski cites as a parallel Silius Italicus 1.147, who writes "immedicabilis ira." The general wisdom is, or at least I believe has been, that until its fifteenth-century rediscovery, the *Punica* lay preserved, and largely unread, in one manuscript in the region of Lake Constance. Does Ziolkowski want us to believe Nigel read Silius, or got this from him by some other means so that this is a significant parallel? Moreover, to my ears, "immedicabilis herbis" is more likely a recasting of a memorable phrase of Ovid's Oenone, "Me miseram, quod amor non est medicabilis herbis" (*Heroides* 5.149). Not only were the *Heroides* standard reading, but the phrase was a favourite: though later than Nigel, Vincent of Beauvais includes "amor non est medicabilis herbis" in his florilegium. (Indeed, one of the marginal poems Ziolkowski presents later in the volume is in fact a couplet from the *Heroides* [4.75–76], one, moreover, Ziolkowski quite properly notes is found in medieval florilegia [pp. 289–90]). That the word is used of "ira" (though not directly) as in Silius Italicus is, then, a coincidence. Ziolkowski includes it, one fears, because Lewis and Short has it s.v. *immedicabilis*. But that is not how the reading and writing mind of Nigel worked, and as here, now and then Ziolkowski's notes border on the desultory.

It is of course impossible to annotate fully. The notes are often helpful, giving bibliography on, e.g., monastic sign language (p. 212, on vv. 653–58), but are necessarily limited on more mainstream issues (e.g., on the standard arguments against idols, Ziolkowski cites no other Christian apologist than Augustine's *City of God* 1.1 [p. 214, on vv. 748–72]). There are very few comments on longer stretches. For example, if one were to analyze Decius's speech in vv. 1497–1552, one might have wanted to comment on both stylistic features (five couplets begin "Si deus est" [once "esse"]; three others "si deus atque caro," all of which is picked up in Laurence's long response), and some of the arguments, which, in their particular focus on the incarnation, speak more to contemporary debates about transubstantiation and Corpus Christi than to pagan Roman concerns. Laurence's martyrdom itself, and especially his offer to the Romans to eat of his roasted body, also resonate with communion. This is but one of numerous places where one would very much have appreciated expansive remarks.

Chapter 5 (pp. 248–81) is devoted to fifteen epigrams, the majority of which were previously unedited, in the main manuscript described above. (Fifteen, because Ziolkowski, following manuscript notations, divides 4 and 7 in the standard numbering.) These are well crafted but minor efforts, occasional even if their moral positions would be widely applicable. Ziolkowski finds that Nigel shares little with eleventh- and twelfth-century poets such as Marbod, Baudri, or Hildebert, and claims that he is not writing in imitation of classical epigrams, though his own notes (p. 269) to Epigram 1, vv. 7–8, with references to Horace, Ovid, and Martial, seem to

belie his assertion. What Ziolkowski may mean is that when Nigel, unlike a Martial, attacks sinful persons (e.g., the proud), he names no names, real or feigned. Other poems record praises of, i.a., St. Catherine and Thomas Becket.

Chapter 6 (pp. 282–302) presents the "Marginal Poems of Cambridge, Trinity College, MS. B.15.5. (342)." This manuscript of Peter Comestor's *Historia scholastica* seems to have belonged to Nigel. His are both the glosses and several poems, datable to 1194 on the basis of one note (see p. 283). Ziolkowski discusses and prints a selection of some of the more interesting of these glosses, most of which purvey standard definitions of scholarly/pedagogical interest (e.g., rhetorical terms). The poems—several not in Walther's *Initia*—are various: some are likely Nigel's own compositions, others are merely inscribed in the manner of a commonplace book (cf. the *Heroides* couplet noted above); several mnemonics have obvious pedagogical value. Ziolkowski does not print some of the longer bits if they are published elsewhere (e.g., extensive excerpts from Peter of Riga's *Floridus aspectus*). He gives more than the verse only, including as bonuses several of the more interesting glosses (e.g., an exegesis of Noah's ark [pp. 287–88]). As there is also an ark poem (p. 288), located, as Ziolkowski notes, beneath Peter's own remarks on the ark, this takes us, at least imaginatively, into the poet's workshop. There is material—tralatitious to be sure, but Ziolkowski's remarks on sources and analogues themselves adumbrate a fuller picture of the intellectual currents and milieux in which Nigel worked—on, among other things, the nine muses and the "abuses" of the world as well as of the monastery (twelve each). Between muses and abuses, then, we have an appropriately rhyming summary of a large part of Nigel's musings. At least in the verse, we might say, he runs the gamut from alpha to mu. Not the "compleat" poet, then, but thanks to Ziolkowski's solid work, now at least completely available for study, and for that we thank the editor and the publisher.

RALPH HEXTER, University of California, Berkeley