

and a must-read for anyone interested in the history of spirituality and in the history of textual transmission.

XAVIER BIRON-OUELLET, Université du Québec à Montréal

ELISABET GÖRANSSON, GUNILLA IVERSEN, BARBARA CROSTINI, BRIAN M. JENSEN, ERIKA KIHLMAN, EVA ODELMAN, and DENIS SEARBY, eds., *The Arts of Editing Medieval Greek and Latin: A Casebook*. (Studies and Texts 203.) Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2016. Pp. xix, 452; many color and black-and-white figures, and 12 tables. \$70. ISBN: 978-0-88844-203-1.

Table of contents available online at <http://www.pims.ca/publications/new-and-recent-titles/publication/the-arts-of-editing-medieval-greek-and-latin-a-casebook>
doi:10.1086/706434

The *Ars edendi* research program, active at the University of Stockholm for several years, has produced a remarkable collection of essays relating to textual criticism in medieval Greek and Latin texts. After the publication of four books of *Lectures* by eminent scholars, focusing on both methodological and practical issues (*Studia Latina* Stockholmiensia 56, 58, 59, 62 [2011–16]), this new casebook collects papers written mainly, but not only, by members of the program. As Gunilla Iversen states in the preface, the aim of the book is not “to present one general editorial solution, but to investigate and elaborate different methods to be used in each case” (xi); namely, according to the texts’ specific features and transmission issues, and to the editions’ specific purposes and targets. Ultimately, it is a very practical way to discuss methods—and a very effective one.

Two out of nineteen chapters of the book are not entitled to be considered case studies: the final synthesis by Elisabet Göransson, which recaps and connects the previous papers, highlighting common problems and strategies; and the paper by Caroline Macé, which considers how the editorial guidelines of scientific series might influence (or even constrain) the work of critical editors, not only in the exterior layout but also in the deeper understanding of texts. (A very original and provocative insider’s perspective: Macé had been working for years as secretary of the editorial board of *Corpus Christianorum—Series Graeca*).

The other seventeen chapters are almost equally split between Greek and Latin examples; here is a (necessarily) short summary of the topics. Alexander Andrée deals with the wide and chaotic tradition of the so-called *Glossa ordinaria* on the Gospel of John, suggesting the need for a *codex potior*, selected via the charting of every structural difference in the manuscripts (mainly, the presence/absence of single glosses). He defines this method as “an expanded single-manuscript edition” (18). Theodora Antonopoulou provides a report on her ongoing edition of the Greek *Passio* of Clement of Ancyra, preserved in eighteen manuscripts (many of which are partial or defective). She detects some genetic groups and underlines the significance of rewritings in the textual transmission. Alessandra Bucossi examines the *Sacred Arsenal*, a Byzantine anthology of patristic authorities used for theological discussions; she provides a double *apparatus criticus*, recording the variants both of the *Sacred Arsenal*’s manuscripts and of selected manuscripts of its sources, and discusses the best editorial strategy in cases of convergence or divergence of such variants. Barbara Crostini projects a digital edition of Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Vat. gr. 752 (a *catena* to the Psalter, featuring prominently the commentary of Hesychios); the text will be organized in a double grid, pointing to Hesychios’s text and to the *catena* itself. Eric Cullhed deals with a work preserved in authorial manuscripts, Eustathios’s *Parekbolai* on the *Odyssey*. He suggests some ways to highlight the different compositional stages and discusses different strategies for the

rendering of orthography and punctuation (e.g., betraying the author versus making the text hard to understand for modern readers). Greti Dinkova-Bruun studies Peter Riga's versification of the Gospel, which is preserved in several different versions, from the original authorial forms (progressively implemented by Peter Riga himself) to derivative ones. She proposes a multistage edition, where such variations can be highlighted. Claes Gejrot, who is currently working on the edition of the *Diplomatarium Suecanum*, discusses the evolution in the publishing of documentary sources, pointing out how their juridical value and fruition should imply a major fidelity to the source. Andrew Hicks investigates the best method for editing the post-Remigian commentaries to Martianus Capella's *De nuptiis*, which are not reducible to any textual unity. After some methodological remarks, he opts for a synoptic edition, albeit aware of its limits. Gunilla Iversen, the scholar most experienced in editing tropes, reviews and discusses the different methodological strategies concerning this literary genre, characterized by a significant local variance. She examines the "static" approach of Bannister-Blume, the "element edition" of the *Corpus troporum*, the music editions, and the edition of a trope as whole unit. The latter solution appears to be the most effective, when accompanied by tables referring to the local variants. Brian M. Jensen, editor of the *Lectionarium Placentinum*, defines his product as a "modified diplomatic edition," based on the fidelity to the (only) manuscript, with some corrective actions in terms of punctuating, spelling, and occasionally emending blatant scribal mistakes. Erika Kihlman deals with sequence commentaries, an unstable kind of text. She aims to publish a "representative text," that is, an edition based on a *codex potior*, chosen with consideration of the relationships among manuscripts and accompanied by a partial selection of variants from other witnesses. Eva Odelman proposes what she calls a "semi-critical edition" of the *Sermones moralissimi de tempore* by Nicolaus de Aquaviva: such edition is based on a single witness (in this case, an incunable) with the cross-checking of three other manuscripts, contributing to some moderate emendations. The (apparently odd) choice of the incunable as main witness is due to the wide dissemination of its text. Sinéad O'Sullivan provides a method for a global edition of the Carolingian glosses to Martianus Capella's *De nuptiis*, which involves the grouping of the single glosses according to some defined typologies of comments. Filippomaria Pontani proposes a complete edition of the *scholia* to the *Odyssey*: for each *scholium* are declared genesis, time, author, manuscripts, and indirect tradition, allowing both a diachronic survey on the whole corpus and a textual improvement of the single glosses. Denis Searby projects a digital edition of gnomological texts circulating in collections (*Dicts and Sayings of Philosophers*). Although the narrative tends to change in every version, the name of the supposed author tends nevertheless to persist, providing hints for detecting genetic relationships. Christine Thomsen Thörnqvist proposes a reconstructive edition of medieval commentaries to the Aristotelian *Logic*, accompanied by a wide *apparatus criticus*, useful both for recovering the authorial versions and for surveying their subsequent textual traditions. Staffan Wahlgren studies the *Semeioseis gnomikai* by Theodorus Metochites, a text with a narrow tradition, very close to the author. He discusses the relationships between the two witnesses, as they are recognizable through little corrections in the manuscripts.

The point of the book is the pragmatic approach. As Göransson remarks in her synthesis, there is no question of *new philology* or *old philology* (although some papers seem eager to acknowledge their debt to the *new*, perhaps as evidence of their up-to-date status): this alleged opposition is overcome by the facts. Authors suggest practical solutions for their issues, without dogmatism; a reader can obviously dissent with the suggested strategies, but in each case editorial problems are presented in a most clear and correct way. Sometimes, this pragmatic approach leads to the formulation of a renewed language for textual criticism; for example, terms such as *representative text* or *semicritical edition* are presented as new categories or strategies for editing medieval works. Such efforts might produce the false impression of new methodological results; however, as a matter of fact, the methods are not new, but

they are applied with better refinement. What seems more relevant is the awareness, often declared throughout the book, that any edition is a compromise, and that the best edition should provide the best level of such compromise. In fact, a “scientific” edition (as I would like to call it, avoiding the more engaging yet less clear term, *critical*) attempts to reproduce a text and at the same time its history, interrupting in one moment, or in a few moments, a process we are necessarily able to know only partially.

Overall the sequence of papers in the book is impressive. Most authors deal with significant projects on topics not yet researched, providing a vital image of textual criticism, further enhanced by the previous four collections of *Lectures* published in the framework of the Stockholm program—not at all an obsolete matter; on the contrary, a very attractive one, especially for early career scholars, as many of the contributors are. A marginal remark is the (comparatively) little space devoted to digital editions in the collected papers. Some authors do indeed deal with them, but none deals with them *only*. Several articles consider digital editions as an effective solution when a three-dimensional perspective proves useful—for example, when a multiple representation of the text in variable structures is requested. However, the authors generally discuss their textual criticism issues as unrelated to such resources; they seem to be aware that new technologies cannot do without the methodological results of traditional criticism. Perhaps, as Macé—a very experienced scholar in digital humanities—says, it is not time for it yet.

PAOLO CHIESA, University of Milan

HUW GRANGE, *Saints and Monsters in Medieval French and Occitan Literature: Sublime and Abject Bodies*. (Research Monographs in French Studies 53.) Cambridge, UK: Legenda, 2017. Pp. 128. £75. ISBN: 978-1-781884-89-8.
doi:10.1086/705956

Huw Grange’s *Saints and Monsters in Medieval French and Occitan Literature* is a densely argued study of the discontinuities through which various late medieval saints’ lives keep one kind of “extraordinary” body (a holy one) distinct from another (e.g., a dragon’s), as well as from the more ordinary bodies of pagans and heretics and, sometimes, Frenchmen (2).

Grange’s first chapter, “St. Margaret of Antioch and Her Sublime/Abject Bodies,” wrangles dozens of medieval accounts—in French, Occitan, and Latin—of the life and martyrdom of Margaret of Antioch, famous for slaying a dragon and, in her cultic afterlife, for protecting pregnant women in their moment of delivery. Margaret provides Grange with an ample, indeed overflowing, repertoire through which to question the resilience of the martyr’s body, the gender implications of defeating a devil, and the extent to which hagiographical texts may function as contact relics. Along the way, the author engages with a series of critical theorists who lend him the terms “sublime” and “abject,” which themselves represent two ways of articulating the limit of what Grange has called “bodily integrity” (8). Grange wants us, above all, to appreciate the multiple ways in which Margaret’s body interacts with other bodies, not least the bodies of those manuscripts through which she comes into contact with us.

His second chapter, “St. George of Cappadocia (and his Dragon): Strangers and Communities,” devotes itself to “considering how texts promote collective identity” (40). Grange is concerned with how George’s story encompasses an account of Christian persecution under a pagan tyrant, the liberation of a pagan city and its princess from a predatory dragon, and a posthumous appearance during the First Crusade. “By telling us which strangers are like us and which ones are anything but, the saint makes ‘us,’” Grange observes, as he teases out the differences between texts in which pagans are assimilated into a Christian community and texts in which pagan otherness is strictly unassimilable (45).