

UC Davis

UC Davis Previously Published Works

Title

Review Article: Medieval Latin: An Introduction and Bibliographical Guide by F.A.C. Mantello and A.G. Rigg

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/86q2z433>

Author

Hexter, Ralph Jay

Publication Date

2000

Peer reviewed

Review Article

by Ralph Hexter

Medieval Latin. An Introduction and Bibliographical Guide. Edited by F.A.C. Mantello and A.G. Rigg. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1996. Pp. xiv, 774.

The present volume represents a remarkable achievement and should be welcomed heartily by all students and teachers of Medieval Latin. Little of Martin McGuire's pathbreaking original *Introduction to Medieval Latin Studies: A Syllabus and Bibliographical Guide* (1964) or its revision by Hermigild Dressler (1977) remains except the identity of the press (Catholic University of America). Yet thanks in part to the generations of students and teachers who availed themselves of these somewhat homey concoctions, teaching and research in Medieval Latin are thriving in North America as perhaps never before, and the present volume pays a handsome tribute to McGuire and Dressler by rethinking the purpose of such a *vade mecum* at the turn of the millennium and giving us a greatly expanded and very professional handbook sans "syllabus"—how could there be *one* syllabus in any event?—based on the collaboration of a range of experts who as a group testify to the very health of Medieval Latin studies to which I just referred. The first section of the Introduction (A), "Medieval Latin, Past and Present" (A.AA—the work is divided into and cross-referenced by such alphabetic sections and subsections), concludes with recognition that while the world of Medieval Latin studies is international and polyglot and attained prestige as a university discipline at the end of the last century in Ludwig Traube's Munich, a North American blossoming of the field is clearly underway. Whether this is a real *translatio studii* or whether the decline perceived in some quarters in Munich is only relative (or attributable to other pressures on the German university system today), it might be interesting to interrogate why this is happening and what it means for medieval studies in North America. Does it reflect a serious revision of our culture's fixation on "humanism" and the elision of the medieval period, especially Medieval Latin, which dates from the "Renaissance humanists" themselves? Are students of Latin finally coming to their senses and realizing that there are

hundreds of post-classical texts that need basic studies and editions? Of course, introductory handbooks are hardly the place for a sociology of knowledge which might read the growth in scholarly bibliography as due as much to professional demands to lengthen *curricula vitarum* as to “enthusiasm” (p. 5) or which, eschewing such cynicism, might attempt to consider how the growth of Medieval Latin fits with the so-called New Philology. (For one unsatisfactory reference, see my remarks on DD, below.) Is it a parallel development or a reaction, or some of both? One would be entirely content to allow Mantello and Rigg the untrammelled chest-beating that goes with the genre of such inward-looking field surveys if they or anyone could point to serious treatments of these questions elsewhere.

What is the “Medieval Latin” to which users of the book are introduced? The editors strike the note in the first paragraph of their introduction (A.AA), where they describe Medieval Latin as “a living language common to the whole of Western Christendom and transcending local linguistic variations” (p. 3). Without taking exception to the general value, even accuracy of such a definition, I must say that the word “Christendom” can hardly help but sound anachronistic, if not for medieval Europe—I say “if not,” yet that might be an open question—then certainly to those of us teaching in non-sectarian institutions. Even in the introduction to a handbook published by the Catholic University of America Press one might have expected the terms of so basic a definition to be subjected to more critical analysis (as it is, to be sure, by some of the contributors). While one could readily see how the language of debates between Jews and Christians (see p. 678) penned by the latter surely belong to Christendom, what of any Latin that might have come from the mouths or the hands of the former? Plausibly also, by the argument that the terms of their “defence” were dictated by Christian accusers. But what about translations? Sections HA and HC are devoted to translations from Hebrew and Arabic, respectively (see below), but the issue emerges more broadly. Are the classical gods and heroes preserved in Medieval Latin now, *pace* Augustine, citizens of Christendom? Or when the astrological lore from a range of non-Christian sources, as described in EE, was translated into Latin, did these texts and their vocabulary become a part of “Christendom,” and if so in what sense? One might well have asked if “Christendom” was (or is) essential or accidental—to use vocabulary popular in certain circles in medieval Latinity—to the existence and development of “Medieval Latin.” Either way, it might have made for an interesting discussion at this juncture, especially since the volume at several points opens onto border phenomena (for example, “Jewish chirographs of loans” [p. 204] in addition to sections HA and HC mentioned above), and in another context, comparison of the

Greek East suggests that it was not just Christianity itself in the West that mandated the spread of Latin. It was much more the prestige of Rome (even in its Christian form) and the Roman military (p. 72). (In a later section [GA] and more limited context, Jan Ziolkowski offers perhaps the strongest formulation in support of the thesis, but wisely in terms of a Christendom grasped as an operational reality: “the Church alone afforded the institutional continuity that enabled Latin texts, classical as well as medieval, to survive to our day,” p. 518.)

Policing another conceptual boundary, the editors assert that Medieval (as opposed to Vulgar) Latin is “the direct descendant of the literary, learned Latin of the classical period” (p. 3). This formulation is at once bold and well-balanced. See further my remarks on CC, below.

AB (pp. 6–9) summarizes the “Background, Aims and Structure of the Present Guide.” It was aimed at graduate students, but will be of use to all. The parallel anthology originally to be developed (p. 7) was at the date of publication not likely to appear (p. 9); instead, texts may appear on the Web. AC reports on the volume’s “Organization” (p. 10) and AD (pp. 11–20) on the “Abbreviations.”

* * *

There is not much one can say in a review about part B, a conspectus of “General Reference and Research Tools” (pp. 21–67). It certainly can help the instructor of an introductory course on Medieval Latin, since one is likely to have strong feelings and comments about some series, but can leave the responsibility across the board to the collaborative work of the team. But a teacher is still called on to rank and rate—what these authors could hardly do (for diplomatic if for no other reason)—and give a few of one’s own tricks in navigating the vast ocean of Medieval Latin studies. For example, when it comes to *L’Année philologique* mentioned as item BA1¹ on p. 22, I always tell students to look out for the subsections on “Humanistes et commentateurs.” I missed a reference to the journal *Scriptorium*, which I find very helpful. Teachers and students will find themselves wanting to add to the crossreferencing. For example, apropos of BC 35 (Cosenza), I will certainly recommend students to consult BD21 (= DBI) wherever possible.

¹I might pass on a tip I developed, perforce, since I was having trouble distinguishing between “I” and “1” in the compact references to bibliographical items: the first two characters are *always* letters, the number starts only with the third character. (Graduate student eyes can probably still make out the difference; I can only with extreme concentration.)

Given the wealth of information, some does not appear where one might expect it. While Mastandrea and Tessarola's *De fine versus* appears on p. 35 as BB50, O. Schumann's *Lateinisches Hexameterlexicon* shows up at CE 13 on p. 110. Likewise, Hans Walther's *Initia carminum* and Schaller-Könsgen appear among hymn repertories (GJ13 and GJ 11, respectively [pp. 604 and 603]), yet probably need to be pointed out to students for their value as finding-sources for poetry of all sorts. (Indeed, Walther's indices can help one do certain searches this volume does not enable, for example, a thematic search on, say, Troy.) The bibliographies are admirably up-to-date, and inclusion of "Computer Resources" (BE, pp. 50–54) will help keep the conscientious student current. (As far as the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* is concerned, users will want to note that as of 1996 a third edition, edited by Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth, appeared, replacing the second edition of 1970 cited as BD 110.) Bravo, by the way, for section BE, which lacks only a general caveat concerning the problematics of the quality of texts available in some of the sources.

* * *

"Part Two" comprises sections C, a survey of "Medieval Latin Philology" (pp. 71–136), and D, E, and F, which together cover "Varieties of Medieval Latin" (see below). C's introduction (CA; pp 71–78) is by A.G. Rigg, one of the volume's editors. Echoing the introduction to the entire volume, Rigg insists that the "development [of Vulgar Latin] properly belongs to the study of Romance Philology" (p. 71). Perhaps its *development* does, but one could conceive of studying Latin(s) in the Middle Ages along with Vulgar Latin and need not insist so strongly on the exclusively literary tradition of Medieval Latin. There seems to be some *Fachangst* here. The boundaries are permeable in many texts as not a few of his own points indicate (see p. 75). CB, CC, and CE are likewise Rigg's contributions, the first on "Orthography and Punctuation" (pp. 79–82), the second on "Morphology and Syntax" (pp. 83–92), the third on "Metrics" (pp. 106–10). These are elegantly concise treatments appropriate for such an encyclopedic volume. CE in particular is a masterpiece of brevity. CC offers Rigg the greatest challenge; here brevity risks suggesting that the bounds between standard and non-standard were clearer than at times and places they were. Rigg is of course right that medieval scholars were themselves engaged in grammatical conservatism. "Any deviations from the learned patterns were seen as errors, as, for example, in a report of a Latin examination conducted by Odo Rigaldus (d. 1275), archbishop of Rouen," Rigg writes (p. 83). Yet

such standardizers were not active in every context, and the slippery issue of culture and education is left pretty much unexamined.

Rigg does not sweep deviations from classical norms under the rug. He sees deviant forms as “genuine, if ephemeral (and erroneous), linguistic phenomena. They are not, however, systemic: they do not enter a general morphology of Medieval Latin” (p. 84). But could there be a “system” of radical deviance? It might have been helpful to consider that some systems permit more or less variation, and indeed, a system may seem indifferent to variation on one level (orthography, say) yet not equally free on another. This does not have to do with anything like the “nature” of Medieval Latin, which does not, of course, exist for us apart from the speech acts known to us, one way or another, via texts. (See Rigg, p. 90: no “single language... existed.”) Much of the language as it appears to us has to do with the circulation of texts. Some writers (and readers) were local, others less so. Ultimately, Rigg finds that “the only successful enterprises in the description of Medieval Latin grammar are studies of the usage of specific authors or in limited collections of documents or texts from a particular period or region” (p. 91), and this judgement is reflected in the modest set of studies he lists in his bibliography (pp. 91–92). I might at this juncture note that in general, I prefer the bibliographies that are more copiously annotated to those that are mere lists. It is also helpful when (as in CD or CF) authors reference their paragraphs to items from their bibliographies.

Richard Sharpe reports on “Vocabulary, Word Formation, and Lexicography” in CD (pp. 93–105), a rich and informative contribution. He notes “the readiness of Medieval Latin to admit new words or to readmit words fallen from use, to change the meaning of words, and to form new words from Latin building blocks” (p. 93). It is interesting to observe that except for the “readmit” part, the same could be said of Plautus. This section has the value of being explicitly pedagogical; for example, its final paragraph (p. 102) is highly instructive, and not just for graduate students.

Up to this point C suggests that the volume slants subtly towards British Medieval Latin. This may well reflect the needs and interests of graduate students using a book in English. Terence O. Tunberg, in his contribution on “Prose Styles and *Cursus*” (CF, pp. 111–21), offers a healthy corrective, drawing more evenly across a wide range beyond the channel, and indeed most of the chapters cover at least the standard western continental areas (especially France, Germany and Italy). What is also gratifying about this piece, of learned encyclopedia quality, is the absolute lack of English supremacy in the bibliography; German and French titles are very present, Italian and Spanish somewhat less so. This helpfully underscores the demands I (“we” as a profession, I believe, I could still say) make of our

graduate students, but it will be a nice ally to have in those persuasive advising sessions when they ask us why they need to pass the various examinations in modern foreign languages we require of them. Likewise, the book should be slapped (with a resounding thud) on the desks of our university librarians and accessionists to demonstrate three important points: 1) to do our work, and teach our students, our libraries need to acquire books in foreign languages; 2) we cannot do without certain series and collections; 3) even older materials are still essential, so don't cart them off (much less—gasp—"deacquisition" them) without consulting us! By the way, those graduate students may need to be told that the Middle Ages took the *ad Herennium* (mentioned on p. 114) to be one of Cicero's works.

As M.W. Herren notes, "'Latin and the Vernacular Languages' [CG, pp. 122–29] is a large and diverse topic without many signposts," but the editors and author were brave enough to propose and take it on, respectively, and the reader is the happy beneficiary. The material adduced from glossaries and colloquies (among other sources) is very illuminating, but as important as any detail is Herren's insight that in the Middle Ages, "Latin was more akin to an acquired second language than to either a 'living language' or a 'dead language.' The closest modern parallel would perhaps be English as it is learned worldwide today outside English-speaking countries" (p. 124).

Terence Tunberg provides an authoritative account of "Humanist Latin" (CH, pp. 130–36). In rapid succession he explains why he prefers this term to "Neo-Latin" to describe the phenomenon he is discussing, that the Latin prose of the Prehumanists marks their Latin as, well, pre-Humanist, that emulation of Cicero was not the only route, and that tics of various sort in the emulation of classical models could produce Latin which in its details and in its overall effect was anything but classical. Most important (especially given the context in which this item appears), Tunberg emphasizes that "medieval grammars and lexica remained in use for most of the Renaissance" and, further, that "Humanist Latin retains many features of medieval syntax" (p. 132). As he points out, the tools for studying Humanist and Neo-Latin are even less available than those for studying Medieval Latin ("Neo-Latin lexicography... is still in its infancy" *ibid.*). As a final point, I would emphasize that students of Latinity in the Humanist period need also realize that Latin texts that are "medieval" in style and content are still being copied, read and written, even if they were not admired by the loudest subset of the cultural elite. It is a grave error to conceive of "Humanist Latin" as simply replacing "Medieval Latin." This would be to mistake development in one area (however significant) for a change across the board.

* * *

Sections DEF together include 38 chapters under the rubric of “Varieties of Medieval Latinity” (pp. 137–504), in other words, where the emphasis is at least as much on the medium as the message, but implicitly as well, how the message impacts the medium. D has no overarching label, but runs from “Christian and Biblical Latin” through administration, law and music to commerce and everyday life (pp. 137–314, the second largest block in the book). E (pp. 342–426) covers science, from mathematics to magic, and F (pp. 427–504) technology and crafts.

“Christian and Biblical Latin” (DA, pp. 137–56), includes Sheerin’s well-balanced introduction (with abundant citations in Latin) to the intriguing if problematic field represented by the phrase “Christian Latin.” Sheerin’s exposition of this now somewhat hoary quarrel is more than justifiable as a way of giving graduate students a sense of the history of the scholarship on the debate. Sheerin is bold enough to take a stand: “Christian Latin is no illusion. The issue is how best to describe and account for it. What is needed is a new approach or set of approaches founded upon the best in contemporary linguistic theory...” (p. 150). DB, on “The Liturgy” (pp. 157–82) and again by Sheerin, is also aimed at both informing and orienting students; indeed, it can serve as a handy reference tool in itself. It is also refreshing that Sheerin can say of an old reference work (DB52) that it is “dated ... but still useful; replacement needed” (p. 177).

In DC, “Ecclesiastical and University Administration” (pp. 183–194), Norman Zacour addresses the Latin of these institutions. Particularly nice is the contrast he draws between the unadorned prose of a “cardinal, scribbling a quick note to the vice-chancellor” and the formal petitions and responses, bristling with formulae. This is a suggestive essay—how could one give any kind of complete treatment?—with a modest bibliography all the more valuable for its focus. Its more detailed companion piece, of encyclopedic scope and quality, is DD, “Secular Administration” by Brigitte Bedos-Rezak (195–229). This could serve as an entire seminar in administrative history (or “medieval socioadministrative processes,” as she terms it, p. 223), for in describing the available sources, she perforce describes much more than Latin usage. I’m not at all sure what Medieval Latin etymologizing of various terms (say *curiales*) says, despite Bedos-Rezak’s assertion, about “contemporary conceptions of administrative processes and of their implications” (p. 205; the next paragraph is much clearer), and reference to the “New Philology” seems strained (p. 219). But this is a serious and helpful contribution. Do I seem self-indulgent if I pause to remark on the pleasures of discoveries? Even as I knew the link between Persian *shah*

("king") and ML *scaccum* ("game of chess"), I didn't know the rest of the story: "the [chess-]board... was also used for counting money and hence gave the word *scaccarium*, the source of the word *Exchequer*" (p. 222).

DE, by Richard Sharpe, is devoted to "Charters, Deeds, and Diplomats" (pp. 230–40). His pedagogic strategy is to print a few samples and perform at least an initial analysis, and he concludes his brief bibliography by suggesting where one could go to continue such exercises. John Gilchrist and Kenneth Pennington face the challenging topics "Canon Law" and "Roman and Secular Law," respectively (DF, pp. 241–53, and DG, pp. 254–66). Each explicates the occult mysteries of making reference to the various sections and subsections of the relevant legal sources, according to both medieval and modern conventions. Any student willing to persevere will no doubt come to appreciate the droll understatement that apparently goes with the territory of the medieval "paperchase": "In interpreting decretist texts it is risky to assume that similar terms have similar meanings for different authors" (Gilchrist, p. 248) and "the reader should not assume that the meanings of words did not change between the eighth and twelfth centuries" (Pennington, p. 258). Terrifying examples are given. It may be that my own ignorance of these fields makes these seem like much more challenging chapters, or it may in fact be the case that there is no easy way into the fields. Forewarned, the student is forearmed.

DH, by Stephen F. Brown, is dedicated to "Theology and Philosophy" (pp. 267–87). The opening portion is closely related to Sheerin's essay on "Christian and Biblical Latin" (DA), but then quickly moves into new territory, for example, the history of the term "theologia." His strategy is not to present theology here and philosophy there, but to trace some of their interactions across the centuries via the impress of that, at times, tense dialogue on the development of words and meanings. The leitmotif of *verba cadentia*—medieval schoolmasters might well have cited Horace—continues: for example, on p. 281, in a particularly fine paragraph Brown describes how "the language of many classroom teachers gradually became more "Aristotelianized" as they began to give new Aristotelian interpretations to words already existing in a technical vocabulary predominantly set by St. Augustine."

Not quite so balanced as I might have wished is "Grammar" by Vivien A. Law (DI, pp. 288–95). Since, as Law says, "Medieval grammatical terminology has received very little scholarly attention, except for that of the speculative movement of the thirteenth century and its immediate forerunners," she has chosen to redress the balance in her essay, letting the bibliography serve as a guide "to the copious literature on the terminology of the later period" (p. 289). This is understandable, but the s(c)hrift given to

the *modistae* is so brief, that few reading the essay's final paragraph (293–94) will have much of an idea of what it was all about.

In “Music” (DJ, pp. 296–306), Nancy Phillips is disarmingly frank: “... *tonus* identifies a melodic formula or other melodic structure that was differently understood by each writer, or—more likely—was poorly understood by all” (p. 298). It is naturally quite a challenge to comprehend the terminology of music without going through a course in music, or at least reading a serious introduction to medieval music. Perhaps the only people who will consult this chapter will have already done such reading, but I would not have objected had Phillips included in her bibliography—quite responsibly focussed on the issue of terminology—or elsewhere a suggestion or two for such an introduction (though they can of course be accessed indirectly, via the general bibliographies and other reference works to which she refers us). This may be one of the places the division between D-F, on the one hand, and GH, on the other, in other words, between medium and content, might profitably have been relaxed a bit.

John H. Pryor's comments on notaries (p. 308) in DK “Commerce” (pp. 307–14) make a nice contrast with sections DD and DE. Notaries functioning in commercial contexts, at least in some settings, didn't always pay attention to grammatical niceties the way bureaucrats in the great central chanceries did; nevertheless, “Notaries really did know the law in most cases and were aware of the importance of what they wrote” (p. 310) and “The omission of a standard word from a regular formula... is invariably significant” (p. 311). The paragraph on business Latin derived from Greek, Arabic, and other vernaculars, is quite fascinating (p. 309).

“Latin in Everyday Life” by Richard Sharpe (DL, pp. 315–41) constitutes one of the more extensive essays in this section. The third sentence begins, “It [Latin] was still spoken by such men...” (p. 315). Leaving aside the fact that Sharpe has not referred to any persons, just “educated classes,” I wonder if Sharpe means to emphasize the male gender of such persons or whether he is one of the very few writing academic prose today to consider “men” “unmarked.” “Churchmen” in the next sentence suggests it is the former—or perhaps Sharpe simply has no interest in contrasting the practice of Latin across the gender divide. He launches the subsection “Latin in Schools” with the seemingly unproblematic clause, “When a boy begins to learn Latin...” (p. 316), but of course the gendered term begs interrogation. What happens when a girl—a Dhuoda, a Hrotswitha—began to learn Latin? Was the only issue for a boy whether he should start “with a theological treatise” (*ibid.*)? Was the learning of Latin itself part of the process of masculinizing some medieval persons, as Walter J. Ong suggested famously, albeit with a different vocabulary, for the

Renaissance?² How can even an introduction to the field of Medieval Latin not ask these questions?

“Latin in Everyday Life” would certainly be the place to observe gender difference in language usage, a well-recognized linguistic phenomenon and long an area of linguistic study. How it might work in a language with the peculiar socio-linguistic profile of Medieval Latin would prove a very interesting topic. (Consider the question in terms of Herren’s suggestive parallel, noted above: in countries where English is not spoken broadly, or is a second rather than first language, are those who learn “international English” men and women in equal parts?) Sharpe does provide material that might bear on the above questions. On pp. 316–17 he describes a sort of exoticization of the vocabulary of women’s work (virtually entirely fantastic, and by men); on pp. 319–20 he cites a report of the testimony of one Jocastra as witness to a putative miracle, but he offers no commentary on her Latin (mediated as it is here by a third-person narrator).

As Sharpe notes, legal records provide a special, potentially privileged subset of documents. “Legal records and accounts... are the two richest sources for seeing ordinary life reflected in Latin texts written by participants in the activities they deal with” (p. 321). The examples of objects and their names, often borrowed from vernaculars, are quite fascinating. “Records... can provide us with little episodes that reveal how people lived, and they can also show us the details usually lacking in ordinary narrative texts. They take us very close to the day-to-day realities of medieval life, the physical objects, how they were used, kept, and valued” (p. 323). Yes, but do Latin texts show us these realities more, or better, than vernaculars? Certainly interesting is the fact that “instruments that had caused a person’s death... became ‘deodands,’ their value... paid to the crown” (p. 324); it was for this reason that many objects were listed. The lesson drawn, however—that “None of these words was latinized for the occasion; all... formed part of the clerk’s working vocabulary. He was not disturbed by their mixture of Latin, Old French, and English derivations” (p. 325)—seems limited, indeed. In sum, what this section seems to contribute primarily is a glimpse into local and household records/record-keeping (in the British Isles, for that matter). This is the first article in the collection I found truly disappointing.

²“Latin Language Study as a Renaissance Puberty Rite,” orig. 1959, repr. in Ong, *Rhetoric, Romance and Technology: Studies in the Interaction of Expression and Culture* (Ithaca, 1977), pp. 113–41. For a recent critique, see Alan Stewart, *Close Readers: Humanism and Sodomy in Early Modern England* (Princeton, 1977), pp. 100–102.

Even though the articles in section E on science, starting with the “Introduction” by Faith Wallis (EA, pp. 342–47), are brief (approximately five pages each; a maximum of six seems to have been enforced), it would be unfair—and incorrect—to ignore the serious contributions of these many authors.

Barnabas Hughes is frank with would-be students of “Mathematics and Geometry” (EB, pp. 348–54): “The student of Medieval Latin mathematics needs five tools in addition to a working knowledge of Latin. First is a good grasp of arithmetic, algebra, geometry, and trigonometry, without which much of what the medieval authors wrote will be lost to the reader” (p. 348). If that doesn’t stop them right there, Hughes can help with the rest, recommending numbers two (an overview), three and four (pencil and paper), and providing the fifth, “an introduction to the various kinds of specialized Latin terms” (ibid.). I, at least, would have appreciated a bit more immediate help with the examples he cites, since, like some readers, I might like to read his introduction even before I refresh my high school and college math.

Edith Dudley Sylla begins “Physics” (EC, pp. 355–62) by noting that “for the Middle Ages ‘physics’ meant first of all the book of that name by Aristotle along with the commentaries on it” (p. 355), but her helpful article moves well beyond that narrow tradition even as it shows that Aristotelian concepts and terminology recur in almost every context. Medieval Latin realizes its potential here—appreciated by its students, reviled by others—when, for example, it makes of “ubi” an indeclinable noun, “motion in place,” or coins “aeviternitas” to signify the world’s (as opposed to God’s) eternity (p. 358).

As Edward Grant explains in “Astronomy, Cosmology, and Cosmography” (ED, pp. 363–68), “it was the influx of Greco-Arabic science... in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries that established cosmology or cosmography as a major component of natural philosophy in the Latin curriculum and introduced astronomy as a science” (p. 363). Although the “terms were usually interchangeable” (ibid.), Grant focusses on “astronomy” as the science of celestial bodies proper, their locations, sizes and motions, while “Astrology” is covered by Charles Burnett (EE, pp. 369–82). Astrological lore was received into Medieval Latin in two stages, first, what was inherited directly “from classical and late antiquity in... the early medieval period,” then what came when Arabic sources, themselves reflecting Greek, Persian, Indian, and native Islamic teaching, were translated into Latin (p. 369). This makes for fascinating if exotic reading; Burnett even contrasts the styles of several translators of Latin treatises (pp. 376–77).

Near the beginning of “Chronology and Systems of Dating” (EF, pp. 383–87), Faith Wallis observes that “[a]s an evolving and ‘popular’ science, *computus* is rich in jargon. Like the computer argot of today, most of its terms are appropriations of words with more general primary meanings.” (383). Wallis makes the field quite attractive, not only for its own sake, but with such *aperçus* as the fact that “heavy concentration of words for ‘column,’... ‘row,’... ‘space’... makes *computus* literature an unexpectedly rich source of information about medieval modes of conveying both visual perception and abstract thought” (p. 384). “Cartography and Its Written Sources” by P.D.A. Harvey (EG, pp. 388–93) is helpful in all standard ways as well as in suggesting areas in which further work is needed.

Throughout “Zoology and Physiology” (EH, pp. 395–400), James J. Scanlan emphasizes the importance of Aristotle for “medieval biosciences.” (Given the importance of the Physiologus tradition, mentioned in the article, perhaps the bibliography might have included some references to it.) The ps. Aristotelian *De plantis* (a.k.a. *de vegetabilibus*, in fact a work of Nicolaus of Damascus) stands behind much of “Botany,” as R. James Long explains in EI (pp. 401–5). Long also treats of the “herbalist tradition,” though, as he explains, it was not considered a science on the same footing as the tradition with “Aristotelian” roots. EJ, “Geology” by John M. Riddle (pp. 406–10), is quite fascinating, including reference to the widely, and wildly popular lapidaries. EK, “Chemistry and Alchemy” by Michela Pereira (pp. 411–15), mostly concerns the latter of those terms, since “We cannot speak of ‘chemistry’ when approaching the alchemical writings of the Middle Ages because... today’s chemistry does not derive *directly* from any classical or medieval discipline” (p. 411). This has its interest for medieval language, for “the language of alchemy is a product of the Middle Ages (*ibid.*). The use of metaphor was part of the intentional esotericism of alchemy.

Peter Murray Jones points out that “Medicine” (EL, pp. 416–21) “was both science and art—a learned discipline and a means of maintaining or restoring health” (p. 416), and thus had a concomitantly rich and broad language. Just as Aristotle, pseudo or real, was the point of departure for other sciences, here the progenitors were Galen and Hippocrates, though often through Arabic works which were in no sense mere translations. Direct translations from the Greek became available in significant numbers in the twelfth century. Not surprisingly, in so brief an introduction, Jones is unable to exemplify medical language in any detail, but the bibliography, helpfully subdivided, and especially “Studies (b) The Language of Latin Medical Literature” (p. 420) should provide further access. “Magic” is the contribution of Richard Kieckhefer (EM, pp. 422–26), himself author of an influential book on the subject and thus an example of the quality and

appropriateness of the contributors. The importance of the Elder Pliny's *Natural History*, which has been highlighted elsewhere in several subdivisions of section E (for example, p. 402), emerges here yet again, although Augustine and Isidore, as becomes clear, offer many more specifics. New to me is the "Picatrix" (p. 423), but then, I'm no student of the history of magic.

In "Technology and Crafts: Introduction" (FA, pp. 427–30), Bert Hall sets the stage for all the contributions in F, where "the dichotomy between words and actions is especially stark," and those who described and those who practiced the crafts were rarely the same people. And he offers some striking examples. The article by Elspeth Whitney immediately following, "Artes Mechanicae" (FB, pp. 431–35), takes up the category of, and nomenclature for, "mechanical arts" and addresses the issue of their standing among the other arts. That they were not always and everywhere very far below the liberal arts is a distinctly medieval contribution. But it is one thing to write lists, and another to write treatises, for, as Joseph F. O'Connor observes at the beginning of "Architecture" (FC, pp. 436–42), "there are no technical treatises on architecture between Vitruvius... and... Alberti..." (p. 436). The wave of building projects from the eleventh century on left in its wake many architectural terms and descriptions. O'Connor's survey of terms for buildings and building parts runs back to the basilicas of early Christianity. The bibliography is particularly generous.

In "Weights and Measures," Ronard Edward Zupko (FD, pp. 443–46) takes most of his examples from medieval England, as promised (p. 443), but *exempli gratia*: "the principles apply to all the regions of Europe that had experienced Roman occupation." Though the bibliography he provides is broader, I would feel better if it did not still maintain so consistent a bias towards England. E. Malcolm Parkinson, in "Weapons and Warfare" (FE, pp. 447–51), sketches out an area Parkinson himself dubs "martial Latin" (447), a felicitous formulation. In somewhat less than four pages of text Parkinson gives selected examples of the interaction of evolving military technology, cultural contact, and linguistic developments of all sorts, pointing students to specialized treatments for more information on these and similar terms.

In the first paragraph of "Ships and Seafaring" (FF, pp. 452–58), John H. Pryor makes the significant observation that "the literary sources [for maritime vocabulary] must be used with reservation because their authors were frequently landsmen who often did not need or wish to be precise" (p. 452). The terminology reflects the fact that "in the Western Mediterranean the ninth and subsequent centuries were a period of linguistic synthesis, when the older Greco-Roman terminology began to be influenced by the

emerging vernaculars and by Arabic and Byzantine demotic Greek. As the volume of maritime traffic increased and international contacts became more frequent and sustained, particularly after the First Crusade, older terms acquired new meanings and new Latin words were formed" (p. 453). History of language involves—in a certain sense *is*—social history, at least a branch thereof. The bibliography, running to seventy-eight items, is particularly extensive, though, as I have noted, some of the volume's shorter bibliographies are more helpful when richly annotated; this one is not while that of the next section, FG, is.

The typology laid out by John Langdon at the start of "Agriculture, Animal Husbandry, and Forestry" (FG, pp. 459–64), would apply equally well to a good number of these specialized vocabularies. The vocabulary "dealing with farming and forestry... consisted of (a) Classical Latin [henceforth "CL"] words that continued in regular usage...; (b) CL words subject to semantic change...; (c) CL words whose forms were changed...; (d) latinized words of vernacular origin..." (p. 459). And there were combinations of the above, too. "Generally speaking, the more quickly a... practice changed, the more complex the terminology that arose around it" (p. 460) is a valuable observation of wide applicability. The genre or type of text recording the usage, moreover, would affect the speed with which terminological innovation is picked up. Given the variation in usage of terms referring to measurements between countries and even regions, "caution must be used when applying these terms to such statistical exercises as yield measurements" [ibid.]. While there are the intriguing titbits you might consider dropping into awkward interstices in the chitchat at your next dinner party—such as the ultimate derivation of "forest" from "foris" (p. 461)—I would recommend this article to students as one that exemplifies the types and complexity of variation Medieval Latin technical vocabulary so often entails.

FH, "Manuscript Production" by R.H. Rouse (pp.465–67), is a masterpiece of brevity, but though no one can fault Professor Rouse for focussing strictly on the physical substrate, the manuscript, and its production, he or the editors might have realized that somewhere in the volume attention should have been paid to the vocabulary of writing. If not elsewhere, then why not here? I am thinking not only of the mechanics of forming the words by hand, but other elements of manuscript production that challenge modern editors (see Ziolkowski on pp. 514–15). What, for example, is a *subscriptio*? What does *edidit* mean? What *recensuit*? That no universally applicable answers can be given to the latter two questions does not mean it would not have been worthwhile to hear a master such as Professor Rouse offer guidance.

In her article on “Panel and Wall Painting, Mosaics, Metalwork, and Other Decorative Arts” (FI, pp. 468–73), Caecilia Davis-Weyer opens a window on a fascinating if truly little-known world. The *Mappae Clavicula* is the Latin version of a Greek collection of recipes originally for “gold, gold amalgams, and chrysography” (p. 468) but expanded by the end of the eighth century to include dyes and other materials. Along with high medieval Latin collections that discuss colours and other decorative arts, these texts offer a wealth of information and specialized vocabulary, much of it derived from Greek, some from Arabic and vernaculars. The bibliography that accompanies this brief introduction into a technical field is copiously annotated. John H. Munro opens his contribution on “Textiles” (FJ, pp. 474–84) by observing that despite the facts that textile manufacturing was “the predominant industry of medieval Europe” and the word itself derives from Latin *textilis*, much of the evidence for advances in weaving technological and other particulars, including the far-reaching sociological effects of technological changes, are “found in vernacular texts” (p. 474). Munro’s discussion makes me wish that my education in Classics included practical instruction in weaving—my ideal curriculum would include sailing as well—even as it reminds us that some of the roots of our more modern “industrial revolution” lay in the Middle Ages, including one stage of the process that was at least sometimes mechanically rather than manually powered (p. 476). The enormous work of dying and carding was very labour-intensive, and just reading these few pages reminds us of the value invested in each piece of clothing until this very century and the rise of mass-manufactured and -marketed apparel *prêt à porter*. A very full bibliography makes up for Munro’s decision to concentrate exposition on the production of “woolens” at the expense of other types of cloth, for example, silk and linen.

“Medieval mining consisted of local operations performed by people who would not necessarily have been literate and did not know Latin,” observes Pamela O. Long in her somewhat choppy contribution on “Mining and Ore Processing” (FK, pp. 485–91, at p. 486). While a good bit of lore and traditional vocabulary were transmitted from classical world through authors such as Theophrastus, Pliny, and Strabo, medieval authors, like Albertus Magnus, wrote primarily on stones rather than mining procedure and Georg Agricola had to coin many neologisms for his sixteenth-century treatises on the practical procedures of mining and processing ore (among others, *De re metallica libri xii*).

“Minting and Money,” by Alan M. Stahl (FL, pp. 492–96), begins with the observation that for all the importance of money and coinage, “the *De moneta* of Nicholas Oresme, a fourteenth-century French scholastic

theologian and royal advisor, is virtually the only contemporary treatise on the subject” and “it is concerned almost entirely with the political and fiscal aspects of minting” (p. 492), not on the technology of actually manufacturing money. In both this and the preceding entry we learn about the composition of various alloys, and here that our “carat” derives via *caratum* from the Arabic (p. 493). Stahl’s account reminds us that while money was portable and enabled trade, it also reflected local realities and peculiarities. Stahl chose to devise a very spare bibliography, not including a single book by Carlo M. Cipolla on the history of money. I should have thought at least a few of Cipolla’s books on the history of technology, many translated into English, would have graced several of the bibliographies in this section.

John Muendel makes the observation, of potential interest for sociolinguists, that in the nomenclature of “Mills and Milling” (FM, pp. 497–504), “[f]rom the late twelfth century, the vernacular came to be used in preference to Latin to describe milling apparatus” (p. 497). It was also the late twelfth century that saw the first wind- (as opposed to water-) mills (p. 499). One cannot help but be as fascinated by the apparatuses themselves, and I was intrigued to learn of the value of the “medieval floating mill,” used throughout Europe though invented by Belisarius after the Goths had disrupted the Roman water supply (p. 498). It is a reminder that mills of all sorts, whether for grinding grain or performing other functions, were precursors of the large-scale industrial plants that by the nineteenth and twentieth centuries dominate so much of our landscape. It is ironic perhaps, considering the mill’s descendants, that in the nineteenth century and in some places earlier the mill “on the floss” was such a locus of nostalgia and romance (“Die schöne Müllerin” and all that), though Blake knew to call them “Satanic.” Though it would be far beyond the scope of a chapter in this book, and certainly far beyond a lexicographical analysis, it is just this sort of sober account that provokes a cultural-historical analysis of mills and millers, which would have, of course, its medieval section: think, obviously, of Chaucer’s Miller, the tale he tells, and the answering tale told by the Reeve about the miller, the miller’s wife and daughter, and the two travelling clerks. Just when did jokes start to be told about millers’ daughters?

* * *

In contrast to Part Two, which has its first focus on Medieval Latin as language, the medium, Part Three, “Varieties of Medieval Latin Literature” (pp. 505–734), attempts to survey content. G, the book’s largest single section (pp. 505–712), begins with two period-based essays, but the balance

of its twenty-three chapters is dedicated to surveys by category (genre is not quite the right word for some of these), from epic to sermons and travel literature and on to encyclopedias and florilegia. H (pp. 713–34) comprises four chapters on medieval translations.

As Jan Ziolkowski suggests by the title of his major contribution, “Towards a History of Medieval Latin Literature” (GA, pp. 505–36), writing a literary history of Medieval Latin is a work in progress. The potential body of material is vast, but not only for that reason is it hard to survey: there is, tellingly, no accepted “canon.” Moreover, it runs over whatever “edges” might be proposed for it in countless messy ways. His is a large essay, serving almost as a second introduction to the whole volume. While focussed on literature, Ziolkowski, too, has his say on the “language question.” I very much agree with Ziolkowski’s suggestion that “the best way to conceive of Latin in the Middle Ages may be as a *father* [as opposed to mother] *tongue*. This description conveys Latin’s special quality as a language spoken by no one as a mother tongue” (p. 506; original emphasis).³ Given the division of the volume into language- and literature-oriented contributions, it at first appears odd that Ziolkowski would begin with so lengthy a disquisition on matters of language, the relation of which to the literary-historical framework begs articulation. I was also initially somewhat put off by his laboured parsing of the terms “Medieval,” “Latin,” and “Literature.” Then I reminded myself that this tried and true pedagogic tool was not inappropriate for the audience; the volume is, after all, an “introduction,” even if it often speaks in less overtly introductory tones. However, my appreciation for Ziolkowski’s achievement, and his strategy, increased on subsequent readings, and I ultimately came to appreciate that his approach sheds light not only on literary history but on the contour and shape of our discipline, its history, and perhaps its future. It is in this context the “language question” has a firm place.

One of the first literary-historical issues he takes up is the canonical periodization of Latin (p. 509), commenting on the volume’s own determinedly broad definition of Medieval Latin, itself calculated “to

³The degree of my agreement may be gauged by the fact that in the concluding paragraph of an essay Ziolkowski was kind enough to cite two paragraphs earlier in another connection, I wrote, “Bieler’s claim that medieval Latin is the ‘mother tongue of the West’ is arresting because the ‘invention of medieval Latin’ depended on the very fact that Latin was no longer the mother tongue of any individual. If medieval Latin could become the ‘mother tongue of the West’ only after this disjoining, after the infant had been snatched from its mother and sent to the school of its father, this paradox only underlines the artificiality, the exclusivity of *Latinitas*” (“*Latinitas in the Middle Ages: Horizons and Perspectives*,” *Helios* 14 (1987) 69–92, at p. 86. It would be interesting to trace the history of this conceit.

facilitate tracing the trajectory of literature in genres written between 200 and 1500.” “Newcomers to the field,” whom he explicitly sets out to address (*ibid.*), should, however, also be informed that the very canonical periodization Ziolkowski rehearses is the product of a long development, much of it Humanist and later, and that few if any Medieval Latin authors as they looked back upon the *auctores* conceptualized Terence, say, as representing an “Old or Archaic Latin” in contradistinction to Vergil’s “golden Latin.” Ziolkowski does record a sequence of period definitions of “Medieval Latin” from Gröber on (pp. 510–11). Ziolkowski is particularly interesting in his critique of the choice of ending termini. One might well address as a problem of its own the “late medieval”; certainly, in addition to the reasons he adduces, I would cite the explosion of extant texts, which reaches such proportions that the percentage effectively accessible actually drops off. (Consider the end-date of *PL*’s coverage, noted by Ziolkowski [p. 514] as “about 1216.” Ziolkowski himself emphasizes that “the tally of unidentified texts still in manuscript remains high, especially for the period after 1200” [p. 515].) I certainly agree with Ziolkowski’s insight that “Overemphasis upon renaissances or renaissances creates the misimpression that the Middle Ages were no more than an alternation between barbarism and classicizing renewals that gradually paved the way for the one true renewal, the Renaissance” (p. 511).

When it comes to integrating both historical and geographical dimensions, Ziolkowski goes beyond the “wonderful paradox that the dismemberment of the Roman Empire did not see the collapse of the imperial language” (pp. 512–13) to articulate a very pregnant insight: Medieval Latin “can be viewed as having come into its own through decentralization, after Rome and the western sector of its empire fragmented” (p. 513). Salutary as well is the observation that “whether we conceive of Medieval Latin as postnational..., prenatal..., international, or supranational, we must not misconstrue it as national language and literature, for it was nothing of the sort” (p. 514).

As I read the essay, Ziolkowski advances to the heart of his topic when he raises the issue of canon, or canons, and “anticanon” (p. 515). By detailing the historical fact that so often Medieval Latin texts were recovered, published, and prized in the context of national literary histories, he clearly implies that some future project of Medieval Latin literary history must find a way to sublimate and transcend these multiple deforming centres. It is one of Ziolkowski’s great strengths that he helps readers appreciate that the very perspectives from which scholars have viewed the vast Medieval Latin literary corpus have led to radically different “sortings” of the material, each valuable yet each “untrue” in some significant way. The vernacular or

national-historical is but the first distorting “lens” he passes before our eyes. There follow the “Christian” (pp. 517–18) and the Classical (pp. 518–20). Each distorts, yet each is attractive precisely because it affords a view that is at least a partial truth. And Ziolkowski gives these various devils their due even as he emphasizes the limitations of each perspective. Some of his suggestions cannot be fully developed within the scope of even an extended introduction. “Interesting and even enlightening lists,” he writes, “could be drawn up of Latin texts that stand in a special relation to a particular personage in the Bible” (p. 518). Jonah is the example Ziolkowski gives; it is clearly “interesting” and I can imagine why it would be “enlightening,” but I wish Ziolkowski had had time to give us the value of his insights here.

I take personally to heart his caveat against over-emphasizing the classical tradition: “Special attention to such clusters of Medieval Latin texts is appropriate, so long as it does not lead to the reductive outlook that Medieval Latin literature was nothing more than the projection of Classical and Late Latin literature into the Middle Ages” (p. 519). The examples he passes quickly before our eyes are well chosen. It is inevitable that details run the risk of being smudged at so high a level of generalization. Hidden, for instance, behind the literally true statement that “Terence was a favorite, whereas Plautus endured near total disregard” (*ibid.*), is the interesting story of the bifurcation of the Plautine canon into two sets of plays (in different manuscript traditions—a common story of medieval reception), one, indeed, not discovered until the fifteenth century, the other known and appreciated earlier.

Ziolkowski does suggest some other criteria, for example, “to establish one [canon or method] reflecting medieval rather than modern tastes” (p. 520). He is right to reject the use of school reading lists or manuscript counts. His grounds for so doing are interesting: “compilations of this sort [textbooks] have never coincided fully with the best or most outstanding compositions of any given age” (p. 521). For him, this becomes yet another distorting lens. With a wise sense that absolute rigour is neither possible nor called for, Ziolkowski suggests the attractive idea of “informed connoisseurship” (*ibid.*). This seems not at all unlike the “melding/ melting of horizons” another medievalist-cum-literary-historian proposed—H.R. Jauss—even if he is not invoked directly at this juncture. (Jauss appears in Ziolkowski’s bibliography for his work on genres: GA 87, p. 535.)

Before he passes on to review the issue of generic distinctions and style—the “Select Bibliography” accompanying the essays (pp. 531–36) is helpfully divided into subsections corresponding to the topics covered, and in the same order—Ziolkowski makes an arresting observation on modern prejudice against works not written in one’s mother tongue” that deserves

much meditation (p. 522). In the concluding sections, he emphasizes the positive elements in the medieval literary system, the way authors crafted a poetics through rhetoric and the degree to which they were buoyed up, not oppressed by the classical past of their linguistic medium. It is important that we appreciate—in every sense of the term—“the self-confidence of the Middle Ages” (p. 524; see p. 525). Ziolkowski notes the medieval origins, and sense, of “modernity” (pp. 525–26).

Since I have in this review elsewhere castigated the failure of others to consider gender in certain contexts, let me assure you that Ziolkowski does (p. 526), underscoring the importance of “Medieval Latin literature... in studies of gender and sexuality” (p. 526). He also touches on social class and status, of both authors and audiences, as well as the very system of writing and text circulation. At the conclusion of this rich essay, Ziolkowski gives a name to his recommended (and as I see it, Jaussian) mode of analysis: “a philologically grounded eclecticism” (p. 530). Even as he emphasizes the philological work (including editing) yet to be done, he is bold enough to call—and rightly—for “synthesizers” and “judicious populariz[ers]” (p. 531). I say “bravo.”

Quite wisely, a separate section is devoted to “The Latin Literature of Late Antiquity” (GB, pp. 537–46), which tends to fall out of many overviews of the literary history of either the classical or medieval periods. Not medieval itself, least of all in terms of its language, many of its texts, however, are fundamental for medieval literature, though Michael Roberts wastes no words musing on classificatory problems. Indeed, of Fortunatus he repeats the tag that he was the “last poet of antiquity and the first of the Middle Ages” (p. 541) without further commentary (unless it is implicit in his mention of what Fortunatus transmitted to the Carolingians) or interrogation of the categories. Naturally one longs for more detail than can be provided in so narrow a compass even by Michael Roberts’ economic yet thorough survey. For example, describing Prudentius’s *Psychomachia*, he writes, “the multiple interpretative levels of the poem depend on the hermeneutic codes of contemporary exegesis” (p. 540). Fortunately, the section concludes with a particularly good bibliography. (The bibliography of this and virtually all the remaining sections in G helpfully include a section on primary sources.)

There follow a series of sections that focus each on a particular genre. Pride of place goes to “Epic,” surveyed by Jan M. Ziolkowki (GC, pp. 547–55). Given what contributors had to eschew in order to keep these sections within set limits, it is a shame that editors didn’t more strongly encourage cross-reference rather than repetition (for example, of Biblical epics, in this and the preceding article). That only led to more drastic

compression, so that some paragraphs in Ziolkowski's account are perforce little more than catalogues, though complete ones, I grant. Ziolkowski can only suggest his or readers' potential interest in a particular work by slowing the catalogue ever so slightly (for example, for the *Waltharius* or *Ruodlieb*). Still, one could hardly tell from the three sentences devoted to Walter of Châtillon's *Alexandreis*, not even the statement that the "poem swiftly won a niche in the schools from which it was not soon dislodged" (p. 551), that this is a truly great poem, one that can stand beside many better known epics from other ages and one eminently worth reading today. Ziolkowski concludes by asserting the importance of Medieval Latin epics, conjuring with the names of Dante and Chaucer; the impress of Prudentius and the genealogy of *Troilus* are obvious, but I would have been interested in having this influence analyzed in more detail.

If Jill Mann's "Beast Epic and Fable" (GD, pp. 556–67), though even briefer at but three pages of prose exposition, is nonetheless more successful, it may be because the topic permits a tighter and more coherent focus. Mann begins with the various traditions of fable collections and reworkings and then shifts to beast epic proper. She is not afraid to offer vivid descriptions and evaluations: "The *Ysengrimus* is among the most witty and inventive productions of the Latin Middle Ages, and its powerful influence on the later vernacular Reynard cycles is now generally acknowledged ..." (p. 557).

A.G. Rigg, the author of *A History of Anglo-Latin Literature, 1066–1422* (Cambridge, 1992), a book I very much admire, shows himself master of the literary chronicle *in parvo* in "Satire" (GE, pp. 562–68). It is interesting to have a category that involves prose and verse, but then again, there is that *tertium quid*, the prosimetrum as well, long associated with (Menippean) satire. Rigg does not seem to think this formal detail worth mentioning, categorizing, for example, Alain of Lille's *De planctu naturae* merely as an allegory (p. 563).⁴ It is not clear whether Rigg would consider parody a subset of satire or an adjacent category. I am disturbed by only one point in Rigg's essay, namely, its antepenultimate paragraph. To exemplify the general statement that "All satire, whether justified or not, is essentially a literary activity, written as much for the pleasure of writing, however

⁴Perhaps arriving too late to be noticed, but worth passing along as general bibliography, is Bernhard Pabst, *Prosimetrum: Tradition und Wandel einer Literaturform zwischen Spätantike und Spätmittelalter*, Ordo 4 (Cologne, 1994). Peter Dronke's slighter lectures on the same theme, *Verse with Prose from Petronius to Dante: the Art and Scope of the Mixed Form*, likewise dating from 1994, also do not appear to be referenced in Mantello-Rigg. (Not as a criticism of Rigg, since its appearance coincided with the publication of the volume itself, but as a paste in for the bibliography in GE, readers may wish to note Martha Bayless, *Parody in the Middle Ages: The Latin Tradition* [Ann Arbor, 1996]).

perverse, as for any intention to reform" (p. 565), he cites "antifeminist and antimatrimonial satire." There is no question that literary traditions involve topoi, but this is not to say that said literature is to be evacuated of all meaning, nor that the topoi and their popularity themselves cannot be analyzed. It is interesting to see what type of literature Rigg is here trying to empty of signification by this argument. Is this a whitewash? I don't think students will (or should) stand for such simple answers. The misogynist tradition needs to be addressed more candidly, and fully, and I am quite confident that our historical-literary sensibilities are up to the task. (To this end the bibliography might well have included some of the surveys of medieval antifeminism.) Rigg then devotes a very brief section to the definitionally exiguous forms of "Proverbs and Epigrams" (GF, pp. 569–73), some of which are gathered into collections but which are more often scattered and often—literally—marginal.

Stephen K. Wright begins his section on "Drama" (GG, p. 574–81) with warnings about the vastness of the bibliography and the interdisciplinary challenges facing anyone who would deal with this much richer and problematic field. More than virtually any other contributor, Wright engages in his account with the historiography of various controversies in the history of medieval drama. This is undeniably helpful for the uninitiated, yet it may unduly privilege the question of genesis (or rebirth) and development over other possible conceptual starting points for an open-minded investigation of the genre. Only in the last paragraph (p. 578) does Wright discuss secular drama, and then only "the attempts of medieval educators and intellectuals to imitate Roman comedies." While the "elegiac comedies" have precious little to do with drama (as Wright acknowledges), they at least get mentioned. Absent is any reference to Albertino Mussato's impressive Seneca-inspired tragedy *Ecerinis*. Although Mussato (1261–1329) is counted among the so-called "Paduan prehumanists," this certainly falls within the temporal bounds of the volume.⁵

The task of defining "Exempla" and treating *exemplum* both as a species of rhetorical argument and as a genre (of sorts) is rendered fascinating and illuminating by Nigel F. Palmer (GH, pp. 582–88). The difference between "homiletic" and "rhetorical exempla" is subtle (p. 583), and other forms that approach (but are distinctly different from) the

⁵The text of *Ecerinis*, edited by L. Padrin, can be found in a volume of the Humanistische Bibliothek, Reihe 2, Texte, Bd. 17, published by W. Fink (Munich, 1975). For the larger context of reception (a topic not terribly well represented in Mantello-Rigg, although it is important not to over-emphasize "classical heritage" [so Ziolkowski, too, pp. 519–20]), see Eckard Lefevre, ed., *Der Einfluss Senecas auf das europäische Drama* (Darmstadt, 1978).

exemplum are the novella and anecdote. Palmer is equally penetrating when commenting on exempla collections, worth citing at more than usual length:

when the exemplum is seen in the context of a collection, the unidirectional thrust towards a particular lesson is counteracted by the wealth of diverse (and potentially contradictory) doctrine contained in the whole. This polarity, which is always possible, but only rarely demonstrably intended, asserts itself as a principle in collections with a narrative framework,... for example, in the *Historia septem sapientum*, where the tales are set within an outer story and arranged in contradictory pairs... Such works implicitly question the idea that an exemplum can form a compelling basis for a particular course of action: and so the literary form turns, playfully, against itself. (pp. 584–85)

Christopher J. McDonough faces the difficulty of his topic, “Lyric” (GI; pp. 589–96) right at the start: “In English the meaning of the term *lyric* is not precise, and it is currently used to describe any short poem.” In contrast to other modern assumptions, “Medieval Latin lyric... relied heavily on the rhetorical tradition that derived from antiquity, and from it the poet fashioned its many commonplaces into new syntheses to express feelings and ideas” (p. 589). McDonough deftly weaves the many threads that contribute to the variegated texture of lyric into a loose net that captures but does not unduly constrain the object of study. He manages to give an analysis that is at once synchronic and diachronic. For example, of the *Cambridge Songs* he observes, “One of the obstacles that endangered the survival of the love lyric is apparent in the same miscellany. Three pieces survive only in fragments, the consequence, presumably, of their subject matter” (p. 591), introducing students to the issues of collections and survival. He also gives a sense of the “edges” of his domain without hardening generic categories into sclerosis: “With verse of this type [i.e., Hugh Primas’ mockery of ecclesiastics] the threshold of political invective was reached, a genre that was to open new vistas for the Latin lyric of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, with its criticism of the venality and corruption of the Church” (p. 592). This essay, with its elegance and suggestiveness grounded in a scholarly mastery lightly presented in the text while abundantly evidenced in the accompanying bibliography, fully achieves my highest expectations for a contribution to a collaborative guide such as Mantello-Rigg’s.

At the outset of “Hymns” (GJ, pp. 597–606) Daniel Sheerin undertandably, but somewhat more mechanically, bows to the “restrictions

of space and the need for a generic focus” to declare that of the possible universe of hymnic literature, “hymns will be understood here generally as chanted liturgical poetry in extended, stanzaic compositions” (p. 598). He rightly points out the continuity of medieval hymns with “the hymnodic legacy from Christian antiquity,” a period that for him apparently reaches at least into the seventh century (*ibid.*). Whatever temporal limits one sets, the concept of “Christian antiquity” is an interesting one and might have interesting applicability in contexts other than hymnody and liturgy. It is almost impossible to give an account of the development of a sung and chanted genre without engaging the history of medieval music, and yet the readership of this volume can hardly be expected to be students of musicology as well; Sheerin solves the dilemma by referring to these issues but keeping them at arm’s length. The concluding section (“Intertextuality, Transfers, Transformation”) will give students much to think about.

The next two entries on “Biography” and “Hagiography” are explicitly set up as companion pieces. As Walter Berschin, author of the first (GK, pp. 607–17; note that Berschin originally wrote his piece in German and Siegfried A. Schulz has effected the English translation) puts it, “in the Middle Ages the overlap shared by biography and hagiography was greater than is today commonly assumed. In this guide... the two are treated as distinct if related categories, reflecting the modern tendency to treat them separately despite their considerable overlap” (p. 607). Certainly “the full range of biographical writing in the Middle Ages” is enormous if Berschin’s estimate that “there may be about ten thousand such texts [including hagiography] from the period c. 200–1500 A.D.” (p. 607). Berschin surveys the field from third- and fourth-century martyr acts to lives of monks, bishops, and “serial biographies of the sixth century,” and then on through periods best defined by region and/or dynasty (for example, Ottonian Biography). This admirably full account—Berschin takes the time to attend in some detail, for example, to Jerome’s importance, from multiple perspectives, for the tradition (p. 608)—is given a satisfying conclusion in its final section, “The Fourteenth Century and Beginning of the *Aetas Plutarchiana*” (pp. 615–16) just as, as Berschin reports, Sir Thomas More ends his own life with an act of literary imitation. Other valuable literary historical *aperçus* are scattered along the way. Oddly enough, one rarely gets a sense of the human interest in these lives, or what made them “biographies” rather “history,” another difficult distinction Berschin strives to draw. (I wonder about the aptness of Berschin’s somewhat gratuitous likening of the *Vita S. Radegundis* to Goethe’s life of Winckelmann; yes, both elide their subject’s death, but the two died in rather different

circumstances and Goethe might well have thought the circumstances rather than “any mention of death” itself “too unpleasant” [p. 610].)

Against this backdrop, David Townsend, author of the pendant piece on “Hagiography” (GL, pp. 618–28), gives a more nuanced literary, even socio-cultural account of this particular tradition of Medieval Latin biography, highlighting not only its *topoi* but its own subcategories (for example, *passio*, *translatio narrative*), so that one in no way regrets that Townsend mentions a few of the same texts Berschin had. Likewise, his comments on *opera geminata* (p. 621) appreciably augment the more limited observation of Michael Roberts about the establishment of the genre (p. 541). Townsend’s purview and mode of analysis style stand out as particularly imaginative and sophisticated in the context of the volume. He shows that study of Medieval Latinity can be illuminated by awareness of what is excluded: “As social pluralism in an increasingly urban culture was countered by more extensive phenomena of social repression, hagiography also upon occasion became a tool of propaganda against marginalized groups. Such deployments of the genre include the legends of child ‘martyrs’ like William of Norwich and Little St. Hugh of Lincoln, . . . whose *vitae* were an effective means of exacerbating anti-Jewish sentiment” (p. 623). Such an insight reminds one that one could construct entries about Medieval Latin (as Mantello and Rigg, not surprisingly but still tellingly, chose not to) that would have focussed on anti-Semitic (or less anachronistically, and with Townsend, anti-Jewish), antifeminist or misogynistic literature, anti-Muslim literature, and anti-sodomitical literature. At the very least, it can be hoped that remarks like Townsend’s will inspire some students to use the information in this volume to rethink and reorganize the study of Medieval Latin literature. I appreciate also the fact that his bibliography is annotated throughout.

“Rhetoric” is of course not strictly a genre, and in the section of this name (GM, pp. 629–38), noted historian of rhetoric James J. Murphy gives a précis of the Latin tradition from the ancients through the medieval *artes dictaminis*, *versificandi* and *praedicandi*. Among Murphy’s interesting observations is this one: despite the fact that “Jesus Christ had given the Church an evangelizing . . . mission of spreading his message to all humanity,” “the Christian Church took nearly twelve centuries to develop a rhetorical form unique to its preaching mission” (p. 634). Murphy’s pages on *ars praedicandi* (pp. 634–36) are particularly illuminating.

In “Historiography” (GN, pp. 639–49), Roger Ray restricts coverage “to Latin prose narratives that claim or seem to treat real events of primarily nonsaintly experience over some stretch of time” (p. 639), pointing out that medieval authors would have understood a much broader spectrum to fall

under *historia*. Ray does not let us forget this other sense, however, productively noting that “the cloister was the great institutional sponsor of historical writing and reading. At the heart of its daily liturgical piety was a highly charged *historia*, the story of salvation...” (p. 639). Ray highlights other facets of institutional history that leave their impress on the quantity, distribution, and character of historical writings. Rather than attempt to list even a portion of the hundreds of texts in this genre, Ray has shaped his contribution as a real essay, adducing historians and histories in support of his theses and arguments. His explication of *veritas* is telling: “The prevailing assumption was that historians were authorized by genre to reinvent *veritas* in light of worthy new applications. The example of the Gospels would have made it heresy to think anything else” (p. 642). The following is an observation of even broader applicability: “It might seem that the classical and Christian resources of medieval historiography jostled uneasily alongside each other. Once one comes to terms, however, with the basically rhetorical nature of this literature, it becomes clear that the classical subsumed the biblical” (*ibid.*). Ray also has the good sense to know when explanations simply must remain somewhat vague: “In general the twelfth century was the great age of medieval historiography, partly because there were fascinating questions and developments, partly because some of the best writers of the time tried their hand at it” (p. 645). And, as he had already noted in the context of the popularity of Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*, the twelfth century was also a time “when fine rhetorical prose was newly admired” (p. 644). The bibliography is catholic and has helpful annotations throughout (some amusing, like his blurb on Dudo of St. Quentin: “Vikings/Normans walk and talk like Romans” [p. 646]).

As Julian Haseldine rightly notes at the opening of “Epistolography” (GO, pp. 650–58), “in the Middle Ages the letter was far more than simply a vehicle for the transmission of information.... It could be a political proclamation, a treatise, a bond of patronage or friendship, an administrative document, a gift, and a work of art in its own right” (p. 650). Haseldine does not omit to mention the means by which letters were produced and conveyed (generally scribes and messengers), authenticated and culled when collections were made.

Beverly Mayne Kienzle and David L. d’Avray divide the topic of “Sermons” (GP, pp. 659–69) between them, the former covering “Sermons before 1200” (pp. 659–62), the latter “Sermons after 1200” (pp. 662–65). Conceptually this discussion follows on GM, “Rhetoric,” which concluded, as I noted, with a valuable discussion of the *ars praedicandi*, although Kienzle makes a link with the section immediately preceding her own when she notes that “sermons were frequently exchanged like letters” (p. 659). It

emerges that homilies and sermons were simpler in the earlier period than in the later, when “the bulk of the surviving sermons by friars were models that would be turned by the preacher from Latin into the vernacular if the congregation were predominantly lay” (p. 662) and, moreover, a new mode of structuring sermons was adopted. d’Avray’s half is further enlivened by his quoting several examples from sermons. Given that the circulation of model sermons—“the medieval system of mass communication through preaching”—was already functioning well before the introduction of printing, d’Avray’s final point makes sense: “the history of preaching... cuts across the antithesis between manuscripts and printing, as well as the antithesis between oral and written culture” (p. 665).

More traditional generic divisions might well have overlooked “Pastoralia: The Popular Literature of the Care of Souls,” treated here by Joseph Goering (GQ, pp. 670–76). Although “as a literary genre, *pastoralia* is somewhat amorphous” (p. 670), it comprises important and widespread types of texts, including penitentials, *summae*, *specula*, and *distinctiones*. Given the intended audience, which “had little formal education” and perhaps no advanced experience of Latin, “ornate styles and complex periodic sentences are eschewed in favor of the language of ordinary speech” (p. 671). Alphabetized lists and graphically presented *distinctiones* are among the tools adopted to make these texts useful above all else. Describing in such detail all that came under the twelve pastoral themes listed by Richard of Wetheringsett might not have been the most efficient use of much of two pages (pp. 673–74).

Section G is rounded out by accounts of six further textual conglomerates. As Peter Binkley makes clear at the beginning of “Debates and Dialogues” (GR, pp. 677–81), the debate as a genre has origins not only in ancient philosophical texts but in poetry and “magisterial” dialogues. Boethius’s *De consolazione philosophiae* was the most important but not the only model for the medieval centuries. (Since Goering makes mention of the *Ecloga Theoduli*, he might have included in the bibliography R.P.H. Green, “The Genesis of a Medieval Textbook: The Models and Sources of the *Ecloga Theoduli*,” *Viator* 13 [1982] 49–106.) “Travel Literature” by Jean Richard (GS, pp.682–87; translated from the original French by George E. Gingras), embraces accounts of pilgrimages and guides, primarily to the Holy Land but also to Compostela and Rome, as well as reports of those who struck out in even more exotic directions.

Peter Dinzelbacher notes near the beginning of “Vision Literature” (GT, pp.688–93; translated from the original German by Siegfried A. Schulz), that “while records of visions have rarely come down to us from Greek antiquity (Plato, *Republic* 614b–621d), and none whatsoever from Roman times, they

constituted a frequent topic of Jewish apocryphal literature in the form of apocalypses” (p. 688). This is a valuable literary-historical observation, yet in focussing so narrowly (if consistently) on “autobiographical reports of experiences, or... biographies based on the progonists’ own statements” and dismissing in two sentences “falsified texts” and “fictitious visions and dreams,” (p. 688) it seems that Dinzelbacher might have unintentionally obscured filiations that, while strictly extra-generic from his point of view, are nonetheless interesting and important. For example, though *in situ* no mere vision, the sixth book of the *Aeneid* will have contributed no little to the landscape of visions at least in their literary manifestations. However well or ill they sort with the genre as here defined, both the *Somnium Scipionis* and Boethius’s *De consolazione philosophiae* might have deserved mention, and likewise Perpetua herself. I do not mean to carp or second-guess the difficult choices any encyclopedist must make; in his bibliography Dinkelbacher himself warns that the list of “Individual Authors and Texts” is “very selective” while providing a particularly generous helping of “Studies.”

The next section, by Thomas H. Bestul on “Devotional and Mystical Literature” (GU, pp. 694–701), covers adjacent territory, overlapping in the case of some of the personal meditations Bestul mentions, although treatises on the “nature and theory of contemplation” or “general manuals of spiritual guidance” are clearly quite different; while there are notable verse examples, prose predominates. Bestul’s account, while economical, is rich and thought-provoking, suggesting links between the popularity of writings devoted to or arising from personal devotion and developments in areas as diverse as “affective piety,” literacy and the demand for manuscripts in and out of monasteries (p. 695). While Dhuoda’s *Liber manualis* makes its single appearance in the volume here (*ibid.*), it is adduced as an example of “lay piety” “promot[ed]” in the Caroligian period. This makes sense in the context of GU, but the very logic of genre-oriented summaries reduces the likelihood that unsuspecting readers would gain any sense of its interest from a social-historical perspective or of the remarkable voice that speaks from it. The topic of false attributions, which surfaces here in the cases of influential works circulating at times under the name of Augustine, Bernard, or Bridget of Sweden, is one that might have deserved its own treatment, perhaps under a section labeled “Pseudonymous literature.”⁶

⁶A reference might have sufficed if there were some systematic work to which one could be sent that updated Paul Lehmann’s *Pseudo-antike Literatur des Mittelalters* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1927) and, more importantly, covered non-“antique” authors as well; a good start,

Gregory G. Guzman gives a merely perfunctory survey of “Encyclopedias” (GV, pp. 702–7). Though his great encyclopedic work is lost to us, Varro deserves mention before, even primacy over, Pliny. Varro was a real force to be reckoned with into Late Antiquity (or “Christian Antiquity,” to use Sheerin’s term); Jerome (who gets no mention in this section) knew at least the titles of nearly forty of his works, Augustine honours him in *De civitate dei*, and it was really his *Disciplinae* in nine books that laid the groundwork for what the Middle Ages (by dropping medicine and architecture) made the *septem artes*. This section is yet another place where Macrobius might have appeared; that for all the influence of his works he is mentioned nowhere in the entire anthology is disappointing. (Then again, Servius is not mentioned anywhere either.) These might be judgement calls, but I do fault Guzman for not including in his bibliography (so very rich in material on Vincent of Beauvais) some example of recent work on encyclopedias as systems of knowledge, for example, Umberto Eco, “Dictionary vs. Encyclopedia,” ch. 2 of Eco’s *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language* (Bloomington, 1984), pp. 46–86, an account not without reference to Medieval Latin texts. (No surprise, that, considering that Eco’s doctoral dissertation was on Aquinas’s aesthetics.) It is particularly disappointing, however, that Guzman, given that the title of his own major focus is the *Speculum maius*, omits reference to Herbert Grabes, *The Mutable Glass: Mirror-imagery in Titles and Texts of the Middle Ages and the English Renaissance* (Cambridge and New York, 1982).

The section concludes with A.G. Rigg’s expert compact presentation on “Anthologies and Florilegia” (GW, pp. 708–12). Teachers and students would be well advised to consider the particular authentic medieval horizon a given compilation or collection represents, even to consider (as Rigg suggests [p. 710] apropos of Oxford Bodley Add. A.44) basing a Medieval Latin course on the contents of such an anthology. In the bibliography Rigg does well to include M.B. Parke’s important article on the “...Concepts of *Ordinatio* and *Compilatio*.” He sends readers to a series of his own articles for fuller bibliographies on these collections. This is efficient but somewhat reduces the value of the account here. Graduate students might well want to know that while it is true enough, as Rigg says, that the *Carmina burana* manuscript (Munich clm 4660) is “named for the monastery of Benedikt-beuern in Bavaria (p. 710), other scholars make rather startlingly different claims for its provenance. See, for instance, Georg Steer, “‘Carmina Burana’

if oriented more towards the earlier centuries, is Wolfgang Speyer, *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum; ein Versuch ihrer Deutung* (Munich, 1971).

in Sudtirolo. Zur Herkunft des clm 4660," *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum* 112.1 (1983).

The final section (H, pp. 713–33) consists of surveys of four translation complexes. "Medieval Translations: Latin and Hebrew" by Charles H. Manekin (HA, pp. 713–17) touches on not only the relatively few translations from Hebrew into Latin but the even rarer cases of Latin translated into Hebrew. The localization of knowledge and limited opportunities for the circulation of texts are apparent from the case of Peter of Spain's *Tractatus*, translated no fewer than four times into Hebrew "in Provence, Spain, and Crete" (p. 715). The situation with the Hebrew Bible was rather different, but Manekin's treatment of "Christian Hebraism in the Middle Ages" is short (pp. 715–16), since, as he notes, "the great period of Christian Hebraism would not come until the end of the Renaissance and the Reformation" (p. 716).

When Roman authors thought about translation, they thought about translating Greek texts almost exclusively; hence the section on "Medieval Translations: Latin and Greek" (HB, pp. 718–22) opens with a brief overview of Roman ideas on translation that were handed down through the Latin Middle Ages. Because this ground has often been traversed, Bernice M. Kaczynski's survey here—of a potentially enormous field—is highly compressed. The "Select Bibliography" (pp. 720–22) is compensatorily extensive, and particularly rich in titles in multiple languages.

Given the distribution of the "Medieval Translations: Latin and Arabic" addressed in HC (pp. 723–27), Deborah L. Black could focus her review on little more than a century of translation activity, and her account is accordingly more detailed and satisfying. She is able to give some sense of the "Methods and Character of the Translation" (pp. 724–26). If there was any reference to translation activity from Latin into Arabic in this section, I missed it.

The final chapter in the volume, "Medieval Translations: Latin and the Vernacular Languages" by Jeanette M.A. Beer (HD, pp. 728–33), is perforce rather slight given the potential vastness of the field. The greater part of the essay is devoted to translations from Latin into a vernacular, but Beer also gives a good sampling of the "major works that were translated into Latin from a preceding vernacular version" (p. 731). Perhaps only the fame of the authors involved would have inspired me to add to her list Petrarch's latinization of Boccaccio, *Decameron* X.10.

I could of course not check all the many thousands of references, but only a very few trivial problems came to my attention.⁷ It is clear that the contributors and editors did everything in their power to make this a reliable as well as stimulating *vade nobiscum* into the fields of Medieval Latin. And in that they have succeeded marvelously.

RALPH HEXTER, University of California, Berkeley

⁷In the bibliography on p. 134, "Capelletto" should be "Cappelletto"; on p. 154, "lateinishcer" should be "lateinischer"; on p. 214, "comonly" should be "commonly"; on p. 683, "Hold" should be "Holy"; and in the index, on p. 769, *Repertorium fontium* should be listed as BC85, not BC84. It was almost inevitable that some doublets in the bibliography would go undetected: DB44 = CF42, GF8 = GB59, and GF19 = GB17.