



Københavns Universitet



**[Review of] Bernhard Hollick, Anonymi Epternacensis Glossae in logicam: Studie mit kritischer Edition der Texte. (Rarissima Mediaevalia 5.) Munster: Aschendorff, 2015.**

Hansen, Heine

*Published in:*  
Speculum

*Publication date:*  
2018

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Hansen, H. (2018). [Review of] Bernhard Hollick, Anonymi Epternacensis Glossae in logicam: Studie mit kritischer Edition der Texte. (Rarissima Mediaevalia 5.) Munster: Aschendorff, 2015. *Speculum*, 93, 857-858.

become regular once replaced by their continental counterparts (lxxxviii). She thus believes that the play was composed by a native of Poitou (xcvi) where some rhymes usually attributed to an Anglo-Norman author were acceptable (xc). In my edition, I also defended the continental origin of the play and thus find Hasenohr's analysis very credible.

In his lengthy essay (xcviii–cxxxii), Bordier recontextualizes the *Jeu d'Adam* in the history of medieval theater. He offers an interesting overview of the development of dramatic activities in the clerical milieu. The gist of his argument is that young clerics, in particular students in schools attached to large secular churches, played an important role in ecclesiastical dramas, in particular during the Christmas season. In his opinion, the *Jeu d'Adam* hails from a large secular church, probably a cathedral, and was likely performed during the end-of-the-year clerical festivities. I subscribe to these ideas and my only criticism concerns two issues. First, Bordier does not make a distinction between dramatic rituals proper, included in the liturgy as revealed by the manuscripts that transmitted them, and compositions from the same ecclesiastical milieu but whose links to liturgy are tenuous. I believe this distinction to be necessary as the function of these compositions was different. For instance, the *Jeu d'Adam* is an ecclesiastical drama but it was certainly not included in a liturgical service. Second, Bordier does not offer a pedagogical rationale for the young clerics' participation in such compositions. Here it is important to insist that the majority of these students were future clerics undergoing professional training. Participation in plays allowed them to put into practice—especially in large non-liturgical compositions like the Beauvais *Ludus Danielis* or the *Jeu d'Adam*—various skills needed for their vocation, such as the ability to memorize, recite, sing, move with confidence, and so forth.

Given Hasenohr's qualifications as a philologist, the edition is beyond reproach. On a side note, Hasenohr breaks, albeit timidly, with the non-interventionist approach prevalent in France since Joseph Bédier. Considering that the author hailed from France, she replaced the Anglo-Norman forms with their continental equivalent to correct some irregular lines. The notes offer new and valuable interpretations, for example of the meaning of *figura* or *platea*. The errata are scarce but take note that the reference on p. lxxv to a nowhere-to-be-found note j in the critical apparatus concerns note k.

This dense little volume is packed with information and will contribute much to our knowledge of the *Jeu d'Adam*.

CHRISTOPHE CHAGUINIAN, University of North Texas

BERNHARD HOLLICK, *Anonymi Epternacensis Glossae in logicam: Studie mit kritischer Edition der Texte*. (Rarissima Mediaevalia 5.) Münster: Aschendorff, 2015. Pp. 506. €66. ISBN: 978-3-402-10435-4. doi:10.1086/698112

This volume contains a study and critical edition of an anonymous set of Latin glosses on parts of Priscian's *Institutiones grammaticae* (GL 2.1–53; 3.107–22), on all of Porphyry's *Isagoge*, and on most of Aristotle's *Categories* (chs. 1–13). The glosses are found in a single manuscript, Luxembourg, Bibliothèque nationale MS 9, which once belonged to the abbey of Echternach and seems to date from the early twelfth century.

The glossator apparently studied under a magister Thietboldus, who is described as being “of eternal memory” (*eternę memorię*) and whose interpretations are mentioned once in the glosses on Priscian and four times in the glosses on the *Categories*. Two other medieval interpreters are also mentioned: Lanfrancus (three times) and Wichmundus (once), both in the glosses on Priscian. These latter two are perhaps to be identified as the later archbishop of Canterbury and his student Guitmund, later bishop of Aversa. Magister Thietboldus may then,

*Speculum* 93/3 (July 2018)

as Hollick suggests (72), be Theobald of Étampes, who studied under Lanfranc at Caen and later taught there himself before arriving in Oxford towards the end of the eleventh century. This is speculative, as Hollick is also careful to point out, but if correct, then the glosses must postdate 1123, when Theobald is known to have still been alive.

Although the glosses are thus seemingly of some historical interest, they are, from a philosophical perspective, rather elementary. The glossator is not concerned to discuss the philosophical issues raised by the authoritative texts, but simply to expound the texts by giving a paraphrastic analysis of their argumentative structure by means of a curious blend of Apuleian and Boethian syllogistics with a bit of topical theory thrown into the mix. It is a rather striking procedure that, as Hollick correctly notes (17), is quite similar to that applied in a set of roughly contemporary glosses on the *Isagoge* and the *Categories* in a manuscript now in Cambridge (Fitzwilliam Museum, MS McClean 165, fols. 82r–116v; partial edition by H. Hansen, “Anonymus Fitzwilliamensis on *Categories* 7,” *CIMAGL* 83 [2014]: 342–78). As Hollick also notes (20), however, the glosses are certainly not among the outstanding philosophical works of the Middle Ages. Still, he tries hard to pick some philosophical meat off their expository bones and as part of this endeavor argues, for example, that the author was committed to the so-called *collectio* theory of universals (245–47).

The study takes up 303 pages, which is longer than the rather meager philosophical contents of the glosses merit. This seems mainly to be due to the fact that the book was originally a dissertation and thus there is much elementary material—such as a fifteen-page *Forschungsbericht* (21–35) and a twenty-three-page history of syllogistic and topical theory from antiquity to the early Middle Ages (93–115)—that will be well known to the specialist audience for whom the glosses are likely to be of interest. Such material could well have been edited out prior to publication.

The edition itself takes up 126 pages. Editing a text on the basis of a single manuscript is never easy, but Hollick manages to produce a mostly legible text that inspires general confidence in his ability to read the manuscript correctly. I have not had access to the manuscript, but checking against the neatly written folio (21v) reproduced on page 338, I found only one error: Hollick reads *per* (339.10), where the expected and correct reading is clearly *pro*.

There are, however, other places where the printed reading cannot be correct. Thus, for example, *differentia* (349.12) should be *differentiæ*; *generalissimam* (350.31–32) should be *generalissimum*; *animal* (389.28) should be *aliquis*; *permutatur* (420.21) should be *per mutationem* (the comma before *per* should be deleted); *convenienter* (412.16) should be *circumscriptis*; *in* (416.1) should be *invicem*; and *propter* (395.4, 421.23) should be *propositionem*. Such errors need not be due to Hollick’s reading of the manuscript. They may well be found there, but in that case they should be emended (even by an editor who, like Hollick [308], prudently wishes to practice restraint in this regard).

A similar consideration extends to the dittographies that are sometimes printed. Thus, *Si risibile . . . indiuiduis* (347.16–18) is an erroneous repetition of the immediately preceding lines and should be deleted. Another clear example is *non differunt secundum genus. Sed non differunt secundum rationale animal. Proba: Si sunt idem secundum rationale animal* (367.15–16).

Conversely, minor additions are sometimes required. Thus, for example, *sunt aliquid* (425.5) should be *sunt <ad> aliquid*, and *non omnes habentes* (429.2–3) should probably be *non omnes <non> habentes* (I suspect that at 428.34 *non omnes habentes* is an error for *omnes non habentes*).

As far as orthography is concerned, Hollick explicitly (308–9) tries to keep as close to the manuscript as possible. Apparently this extends to sometimes writing a word and its prefix separately—thus, for example, *in diffinitarum* (406.2) and *de nominatiuum* (411.5).

By contrast, paragraphing and punctuation are seemingly to a large extent Hollick’s own (310). They are mostly reasonably intelligible, but there are occasions where the result is a

*Speculum* 93/3 (July 2018)

garbled text. For example, 342.6–10 should not be spread over three paragraphs, but simply read: *Quæ assumptio distributa ponitur in libro sic: GENUS ENIM DICITUR ET ALIQUORUM COLLECTIO (Isag. 6.1–2), id est significat aliquorum collectionem, et DICITUR ALITER GENUS (Isag. 6.8) et ALITER RURSUS DICITUR GENUS (Isag. 6.21). Argumentum a repugnanti.* Sometimes punctuation is missing. Thus, for example, *Vtrum singulę . . . (321.21) should be Vtrum. Singulę . . . ; Vtrum omnia . . . (389.8) should be Vtrum. Omnia . . . ; and ita probat omnis . . . (396.23) should be ita probat: Omnis . . .* At other times, it gets put in the wrong place. Thus, for example, *Si non dicitur visus, cęcitatis visus non . . . (430.11–12) should read Si non dicitur visus cęcitatis visus, non . . .* Similarly, *de homine, in eo quod quale differentia . . . (365.20) should read de homine in eo quod quale, differentia . . .* On occasion, it is of the wrong kind. Thus, for example, *ARISTOTELES, utrum . . . (354.1) should be ARISTOTELES. Utrum . . . ; passiones. Ostendit . . . (420.31) should be passiones, ostendit . . .*

There is no such thing as a perfect edition, and these glosses are a rather difficult text to edit. Despite suggestions for improvement such as the above, Hollick has done a pretty good job, and nothing I've said here detracts from the fact that his *editio princeps* is a valuable contribution to the understanding of a period in the history of medieval philosophy that we still know relatively little about. It will be a useful resource in the further exploration of the field.

HEINE HANSEN, University of Copenhagen

BRIAN MÖLLER JENSEN, ed., *Lectionarium Placentinum Temporale: Edition of a Twelfth Century Lectionary for the Divine Office*, vol. 1: *Pars hiemalis*, vol. 2: *Pars aestiva*. (Millennio Medievale 108; Testi 26.) Florence: SISMEL Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2016. Pp. xlvii, 478, xii, 407; 16 color plates. €155. ISBN: 978-88-8450-709-9. doi:10.1086/698537

Jensen presents a modified diplomatic edition of a single liturgical source, composed of two volumes, Piacenza, Biblioteca Capitolare, MSS 61 (Pia 61) and 60 (Pia 60), which contain the temporal cycle of a twelfth-century cathedral office lectionary from Piacenza. The lectionary, called by the editor the “Ribaldus-collection” after the local canon who paid for its making, comprises one hundred forty-four feasts, with as many gospel incipits and around 340 texts. The introduction to the first volume offers a brief history of the development of liturgical books, specifically the *lectionarium*, and the editorial tradition of medieval lectionaries, with the *raison d'être* for the present work. Jensen argues that the Piacenza lectionary is a result of the post-Gregorian revision of the Piacentinian liturgical customs, which, in turn, affected office lectionaries. In his introduction, he also provides a codicological report and a description of their peculiarities in the temporal cycle. By way of illustration, he offers a reconstruction of Matins for the Epiphany, situating the lessons with the other liturgical pieces (invitatory, verses, hymns, antiphons, psalms, responsories, and versicles). Finally, he describes the principles upon which his edition is based. A description follows of the three *apparatus*: an *apparatus biblicus*, an *apparatus fontium*, which identifies twice as many authors as named in the rubrics of the codices, and an *apparatus criticus* noting medieval and modern editorial interventions. Eight color plates from Pia 61 are provided (fols. 29v, 85v, 92r, 119r, 181r, 277r, 332r, and 354r). The remainder of the first volume contains the edition of the *pars hiemalis*, from *Dominica I de Adventu* to *In Sabbato Sancto* (fols. 1r–363v).

The second volume begins with eight color plates from Pia 60 (fols. 8r, 33r, 33v, 55v, 151v, 193r, 249r, and 282v). There follows the edition of Pia 60, *pars aestiva*, from *Dominica sancte Pasche* to *Sermo Beati Augustini de Eucharistia ad neophytos* (fols. 1r–285v). The volume concludes with an inventory of the feasts of the *temporale* with rubric titles and lemmata, a bibliography, indices of Gospel incipits in liturgical order, and an index of authors (eleven cited in the rubrics, twenty-two in the *apparatus fontium*).

*Speculum* 93/3 (July 2018)