

TWO ANTHOLOGIES OF MEDIEVAL LATIN

In the last few years teachers of Medieval Latin in the USA and England have got one new anthology and another completely revised one to use as textbooks. To facilitate their choice I shall give an account of both books' merits and faults.

*
* *

Keith Sidwell, *Reading Medieval Latin* (Cambridge University Press 1995), XVIII + 398 pp. This is an ambitious textbook with texts arranged chronologically and according to contents and provenance. The contents are as follows : I. The foundations of Christian Latin : 1 Education ; 2 Liturgy and Divine Office ; 3 The Bible ; 4 The Church Fathers ; 5 The new Christian genres. II. Early medieval Latin : 6 Hiberno-Latin ; 7 Anglo-Latin ; 8 Continental Latin ; 9 The Carolingian Renaissance ; 10 The Ottonian Renaissance. III. From the end of the Ottonian Renaissance (1002) to the Concordat of Worms (1122) : 11 The Norman Conquest ; 12 The 'investiture contest' ; 13 The First Crusade ; 14 Philosophy and theology ; 15 Poetry. IV. The twelfth-century Renaissance : 16 The schools and the scholastic method ; 17 The religious life ; 18 Theology and philosophy ; 19 Historical writing ; 20 Court literature.

Every chapter and every section has an introduction, and the texts are accompanied by extensive notes. At the end of the book there are brief chapters on grammar and orthography, followed by a vocabulary. Unfortunately, many notes show that the editor is no specialist of Medieval Latin philology.

P. 87 in a letter by St Columbanus : *...de loco deserti, quem pro domino meo Iesu Christo de trans mare expetivi*. Sidwell p. 88 : " *de*

trans mare 'from over the sea'. The double preposition is not Latin, but it is found in Old Irish, Columbanus' native language. Here, unusually, he has allowed a vernacular structure to influence his Latin". This is wrong: the combination of two prepositions occurs early and frequently in Latin texts from different parts of the Empire (see J. B. Hofmann & A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax*, München 1965, p. 282 f.); some of these combinations survive in the Romance languages, e.g. Ital. *da* < *de ab*, French *dès* < *de ex*.

P. 89 in *Vita St Columbae* by Adomnan: *Ad cuius cum accessisset ripam, alios ex aculis aspicit misellum humantes homunculum*. Sidwell: "*alios*: tr. 'some' (but it may mean 'others', i.e. besides the dead man)". Here, on the other hand, we may actually have a Hiberno-Latin feature: *alius* in the sense of *quidam* occurs not infrequently in texts written by Irishmen, the reason being that Irish *araile* means both 'another' and 'a certain one', see my book *Der hibernolateinische Grammatiker Malsachanus* (Uppsala 1965) p. 117 and also *Studia Hibernica* 19 (1979), p. 163.

P. 120 in a text by Gregory of Tours: *Et a maioribus quidem cum rixa et scandalo auferebat, a minoribus autem violenter diripiebat*. Sidwell: "*maioribus*: 'from the great' (dat. of disadvantage with *auferebat*...)". Does the commentator really mean that the preposition *a* takes the dative?

P. 123 *Vipera serps iaculus basiliscus emorrois aspis / faucibus horrificis sibila torsit iners* (Venantius Fortunatus). Sidwell p. 124 "*serps = serpens*". That is linguistically possible, cf. parallel forms like *stipis*: *stips*, *nubes*: *nubs* and *Glotta* 54 (1976), p. 127, J. André in *Grammaire et histoire de la grammaire. Hommage à J. Stefanini* (1988) p. 28. However, nobody seems to have noticed that Venantius here is dependent on Lucan 9,700 ff.¹, where all the names of the different snakes occur (except *vipera*), and Lucan has l. 723 *seps*. One manuscript of Ven. Fort. also has *seps* (see Leo's edition of *carm.* 8,3,195 p. 187); in his index p. 417 Leo writes: "*serps* i.q. *seps*". It is possible that *seps* should be upgraded to the text of Ven. Fort., and it certainly has played a role in the formation of the monosyllabic *serps* instead of *serpe(n)s*.²

1. Roger White has drawn my attention to this.

2. Cf. for our passage also S. BLOMGREN, *Studia Fortunatiana* 2 (Uppsala 1934) p. 57.

P. 129 ...*ut...quo venerit, ea via repetare studeat* (Jonas of Bobbio). Sidwell p. 130: "...*quo venerit, ea via* (i.e. *eam viam*) *repetare* (= *repetere*)... '...that a man... should seek again that road whence he had come' ". The change of *repetere* to *repetare* has to be explained. Probably we have a contamination between *repetere* and *repedare* 'go back' from *pes*; see *Arctos* 8 (1974), 81, and, concerning the survival of *repedare* in the Romance languages, Y. Malkiel, *Studies in the Reconstruction of Hispano-Latin Word Families* (Berkeley 1954) p. 1 ff. With *repedare* the abl. *ea via* is acceptable.

P. 146 Concerning the expression *in somnis* in a poem from the beginning of the 9th century, Sidwell refers to Verg. *Aen.* 2,270. *In somnis* is, however, the usual expression for 'in a dream' throughout all Latinity; see E. Löfstedt, *Syntactica* 1 (Lund 1942) p. 55 ff.

P. 247 in a poem from *Carmina Cantabrigensia: turbe virorum / ac mulierum*. As Sidwell points out, the metre is 5p + 5p; consequently one has to put the accent on the penultima of *mulierum*; the shift of accent in this word is, in fact, proven by the Romance languages, e.g. Spanish *mujer*. This should have been mentioned in the commentary.

*
* *

K. P. Harrington, *Medieval Latin*. Second edition, revised by J. Pucci. With a Grammatical Introduction by Alison Goddard Elliott (Chicago 1997), XXII + 679 pp. Harrington's *Medieval Latin* was first published in 1925, and has been reprinted many times. Although it is full of misprints and many notes are false or misleading, it has been widely used as a textbook in Medieval Latin in the USA. A revised edition was long overdue.

This is a thorough revision: all Neo-Latin texts included by Harrington have been omitted, and also several Medieval ones. It is regrettable that the numerous short stories in the original textbook (by Iacobus of Voragine and Iohannes Monachus, the selections from *Historia septem sapientum* and *Gesta Romanorum*, etc.) were omitted: they were so easy that students could translate them at sight — a good training and a useful encouragement. The anthology proper is divided into five parts: I. 350-450 The Formation of Late Latin; II. 450-750 The Rise of Late Latin; III. 750-900 From Late to

Medieval Latin ; IV. 900-1100 The Rise of Medieval Latin ; V. 1100-1350 Varieties of Medieval Latin. Each part has an introductory essay, and every text has an extensive headnote. Every text is also accompanied by numerous footnotes, in which unclassical spellings, forms, words and expressions are explained.

The essays and headnotes show that Pucci's *forte* is literary analysis. The footnotes bear witness to the fact that his knowledge of the Latin, particularly Medieval Latin language, is amazingly defective. Harrington's notes were haphazard, now and then outright false. But Pucci has made matters worse : innumerable trivia are explained, although no explanation was called for (e.g. *nunquam* = CL *numquam*, *adsumpsit* = CL *assumpsit*, etc. ; why not discuss the recomposition once and for all in the introduction ?), while really difficult passages are left without commentary. Harrington's misleading notes have been kept, and many more false ones have been added. To substantiate this harsh judgement, I furnish a list of additions and corrections.

P. 54. Grandgent's *An introduction to Vulgar Latin* from 1907 is cited as the standard work on Vulgar Latin, not V. Väänänen's *Introduction au latin vulgaire* (third edition 1981). Only the latter is to be used now.

P. 74. It is now generally assumed that Egeria comes from Spain. To the bibliography about her add V. Väänänen, *Le journal-épître d'Egérie* (Helsinki 1987). — Pucci cites H. Petré's edition in the *Sources Chrétiennes* 21 from 1948 ; rather P. Maraval's edition in the same series 296 from 1982.

P. 76,10 f. *Haec ergo vallis ipsa est, in cuius capite ille locus est, ubi sanctus Moyses...iterum locutus est ei Deus* (Egeria). Pucci notes : " *ille*, functions here as the definite article, as often in LL/ML. " No, *ille* has its original deictic force and looks forward to *ubi* : 'that place in which'. — The pending nominative *sanctus Moyses*, which is picked up by *ei*, should have been commented upon.

P. 76,12 f. *Et quoniam nobis ita erat iter, ut prius montem Dei ascenderemus, qui hinc paret, quia unde veniebamus melior ascensus erat...* (Egeria). This is difficult to translate, but no note is added ; it is not even mentioned that *quia* is not in the MS, but has been added by some editors. In my opinion Prinz' text is better : *...quia hac parte, unde...*

P. 81,5 ff. *Ille eos sedulo commonere nihil esse religionis in stipite ; Deum potius, cui serviret ipse, sequerentur ; arborem illam excidi oportere, quia esset daemonei dedicata* (Sulpicius Severus). According to Pucci's notes both *commonere* and *oportere* are historical infinitives. *Oportere* is rather an infinitive in indirect discourse. — 13 ff. *cum unam in partem pinus illa esset acclinis, ut non esset dubium quam in partem succisa corrueret, eo loci vinculus statuitur* (sc. *sanctus Martinus*) (Sulpicius Severus). Pucci : “*ut...corrueret* : result clause ”. No, *ut non esset dubium* is a result clause, *quam...corrueret* is an indirect question. — Pucci : “*eo* : adverb modifying *vinculus* = ‘there’. *loci* : dependent on *vinculus* = ‘bound at the spot’ ”. No, *loci* is a partitive genitive, dependent on *eo*.

P. 86,5 *Tibi, quod intristi, exedendum est* (Ausonius). Pucci has not seen that this is a literal quotation from Ter. *Phorm.* 318.³

P. 89,5 f. *quodcumque meum scieris, amabis* (Ausonius). Pucci : “*scieris* : future passive indicative of *scire* ”. No, it is future perfect.

P. 104 ff. There should have been comments on the metres of Prudentius.

P. 105,29 *carnis post obitum* (Prudentius). Pucci : “*obitum* : perfect passive participle of *obire*, here used as a substantive... ”. No it is of course the abstract noun *obitus* (4th decl.). Pucci's note about *obitum* is repeated p. 130,3 (concerning *Post quorum obitum*).

P. 130,4 f. *ut ante expeditionis quam parabat par foret* (Jordanes). Pucci : “*expeditionis* : genitive of specification with *par*. ” The form *expeditionis* is rather used instead of *expeditioni* ; there are many examples of the omission or false addition of final -s in Jordanes. — 12 Pucci : “*in concussione* = CL *in concussionem*, an example of apocope ”. The term apocope should only be used concerning the disappearance of a final syllable, not of a final consonant. — 14 f. *huc atque illuc circumferens oculos, ut elati potentia ipso quoque motu corporis appareret*. Pucci : “*elati* : i.e. *spiritus* ”. This note is taken over from Harrington. It is completely misleading : how could a word like *spiritus* be omitted ? *Elati* is a substantivized past participle and should be translated ‘of the proud man’. One might ask how Harrington came up with the strange idea of an omitted *spiritus* ; presumably he found it in the English translation by

3. Carol Lanham has found this quotation for me.

Ch. Mierow (Princeton 1915) which he (and Pucci) mentions ; there we read ; “ the power of his proud spirit ”. – 18 *rarus barba* (sc. *Attila erat*). Pucci : “ *barba* : masculine here (but feminine in CL) ”. Oh no, *rarus* goes with *Attila*, and *barba* is abl. of specification.

P. 131,1 ff. *Attila vero nancta occasione...movit procinctum* (Jordanes). The expression *nancta occasione* should have been commented upon. The Classical construction would have been *nanctus occasionem* ; Jordanes uses the past participle of the deponent *nan-ciscor* in passive sense.

P. 132, 4 f. (concerning storks which are leaving a city) *rebus presciis consuetudinem mutat ventura formido* (Jordanes). Pucci has not found this worthy of any commentary, although it is one of the more difficult passages in the book. First, *ventura formido* does not mean ‘coming fear’ but ‘fear of things to come’ (just as *id gaudium* does not only mean ‘that joy’ but also ‘joy because of that’). Is *rebus presciis* a dative with *rebus* referring to the storks ? Then the sentence means : ‘Fear of things to come changes the habit of foreseeing creatures’. But the use of *res* for *animal* is rare. Or is *presciis* used with passive sense : ‘because of things which are foreseen’ ?

P. 134,1 ff. *Qui (scil. Attila)...puellam...sibi in matrimonio...socians eiusque in nuptiis hilaritate nimia resolutus...iaceret* (two MSS *iacebat* ; Jordanes). Pucci writes that *socians* and *resolutus* are nom. abs. They are just participles going with the subject of *iaceret*.

P. 152,1 ff. *Ista etenim atque et his similia iugiter intuens dici pro commemoratione praeteritorum, ut notitiam adtingerint venientium, etsi incultu effatu, nequivi tamen obtegere...* (Gregory of Tours). Pucci : “ *dici* = CL *scripsi* ”. How could anybody, however ignorant and barbarous, write *dici* and mean *scripsi* (or *dixi*) ? *Dici* is pres. inf. pass. governed by *intuens* : ‘when I noticed that these and similar things were being said’ ; there should be a comma after *dici*, and the predicate in the main clause is *nequivi*. — Pucci notes that *incultu* is written instead of *inculto* ; it could be added that the *-u* is caused by the *-u* of *effatu* (assimilation of endings). — 5 f. *presertim his illicitus stimulis, quod a nostris fari plerumque miratus sum, quia...* Pucci : “ *miratus sum* : governs indirect statement with *quod*, but here with normal CL construction...subject accusative (*plerumque*) and infinitive (*fari*) ”. No, *plerumque* is an adverb ‘often’, *quod* explains *his stimulis* and is picked up by *quia* ; hence : ‘particularily encouraged by these stim-

ulating words which to my amazement are often said by our people, namely that...’.

P. 153,2 and 154,6. The spellings *nepus* instead of *nepos* and *sacerdus* instead of *sacerdos* are of course also caused by analogy of the masculines of the second decl. ; cf. the fem. *sacerda*.

P. 156,18 ff. *Tunc regina arcessire clam sanctum Remedium...iubet, depraecans, ut regi verbum salutis insinuaret. Quem sacerdos arcessitum secretius coepit ei insinuare, ut Deum verum...crederit* (Gregory of Tours). Who ordered whom ? As the *Quem*-clause reads, it seems that the king was ordered by the bishop to come. That is impossible. I have suggested that *sacerdos* should be deleted as a gloss, explaining *quem* : *Acta Classica* 21 (1978) p. 159 ; the sentence is then to be translated : ‘after the bishop had been ordered to come, he began to teach the king...’ Pucci has no comment.

P. 157,17 *De exercito vero eius baptizati sunt amplius tria milia* (Gregory of Tours). The *constructio ad sensum tria milia* with the nom. plur. masc. *baptizati sunt* would have deserved a commentary. Cf. P. 241,10 ff. *decem milia hominum...sublatos transtulit*.

P. 203,4 f. *Cumque haec Narsis audisset, haec breviter retulit verba : Si male feci cum Romanis, male inveniam* (Paul the Deacon). Pucci says nothing, although the expression *male* (instead of *malum*) *inveniam* is strange. Probably *male invenire* has been influenced by *male(-)facere*. Other examples of *male inveniam* (but not the one in Paul the Deacon) and a commentary in J. Herman’s paper ‘Sur un exemple de la langue parlée à Rome au VI^e siècle’ in *Latin vulgaire — latin tardif* II (Tübingen 1990) p. 145 ff. — 16 f. *aliarumque rerum species... mittit* ‘he sent other kinds of things’. For the enallage (which Pucci leaves without commentary) see E. Löfstedt, *Syntactica* 2 (Lund 1933) p. 109 ff.

P. 205,12 f. *Sublatumque aurum, pauperibus adhuc habundantius quam consueverat largitur* (Paul the Deacon). Pucci : “ *sublatumque aurum* : nominative absolute construction”. It is just the direct object of *largitur* (the comma after *aurum* should be deleted).

P. 207,6 f. *de eius manu, sicut nobis postea factura est, vini poculum sumere praeoptamus* (Paul the Deacon). This strange construction, which Pucci does not discuss, is a mixture of : 1. *De eius manu vini poculum sumere praeoptamus, sicut postea facturi sumus* ; 2. *Praeoptamus, ut de sua manu nobis vini poculum det, sicut nobis postea factura est*.

P. 240,6 ff. *Suberant et causae quae cotidie pacem conturbare poterant, termini videlicet nostri et illorum pene ubique in plano contigui, praeter pauca loca in quibus vel silvae maiores vel montium iuga interiecta utrorumque agros certo limite disterminant, in quibus caedes et rapinae et incendia vicissim fieri non cessabant* (Einhard). It should be pointed out that *in quibus* (before *caedes*) refers back to *termini contigui*.

P. 242,17 f. *...filiae, quarum agmen extremum ex satellitum numero ad hoc ordinati tuebantur* (Einhard). Pucci: “*ex satellitum numero*: i.e. ‘by a number of attendants’”. Incomprehensible! The subject of *tuebantur* is understood: *viri* or *milities*, namely *ex satellitum numero* ‘from the crowd of attendants’; *ordinati* goes with this subject.

P. 244,22 f. *quicquid ea die cuiuslibet officii agendum aut cuiquam ministrorum iniungendum erat expediebat* (Einhard). Pucci: “*cuiquam...iniungendum erat*: passive periphrastic construction with dative of agency = ‘or whatever was to be attended to by whomever of this ministers’”. No, *iniungere* means ‘to order’: ‘...or (whatever) had to be ordered to any of his ministers’.

P. 246,5 f. *marmora... Roma atque Ravenna devehenda curavit* (Einhard). Pucci: “*curavit*: lit. ‘he took care that Rome and Ravenna were plundered’; *devehenda* is probably too strong...” Why translate *devehere* with ‘plunder’, when it just means ‘transport’? — 9 f. *...ut omnia quae in ea gerebantur cum quam maxima fierent honestate*. Pucci: “*cum...honestate*: = CL *maxima cum honestate*: Einhard conflates the idiom *quam maxime* and the form he seems to mean, *cum maxima honestate*.” All this just goes to show the commentator’s ignorance: the use of *quam* to strengthen an adjective in the superlative is Classical: ‘with as much decency as possible’.

P. 272. There is much to add to the bibliography about Dhuoda, e.g. an Italian translation by G. Zanoletti appeared in Milano 1982; a new edition was made by Myra Ellen Bowers, The Catholic University of America, Phil. Diss. 1977;⁴ textual criticism and language were discussed by H. Antony, *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 16

4. Cf. now also the edition and translation by M. Thiébaux in Cambridge Medieval Classics 8, Cambridge 1998.

(1961) p. 288 ff. and *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 37 (1981) p. 774 ff., B. Löfstedt, *Arctos* 15 (1981) p. 67 ff.

P. 571,64 Pucci : “ *Iovi* : from *Iovis, is* ”. Didn’t we learn in school that the normal Classical nominative is *Iuppiter* ?

I break off ; there is no reason to assume that the pages I have not gone through are any better.

Mr. Pucci had high ambitions for his revision of Harrington⁵. In the preface p. XVIII he writes, i.a. : “ The introduction and head-notes have been written to function as overviews of a crucial epoch in the Western literary tradition for too long ignored, downplayed, or disparaged... I hope this revision communicates a new sense of the urgency of the moment, suggesting anew that the time has come to work on the Latin materials of many centuries... ”. It seems he is completely unaware of all the work which has been done on Late and Medieval Latin language and literature in the last 100 years (as codified e.g. in Stotz’ linguistic handbooks, Hofmann & Szantyr’s syntax and Manitius’ and Brunhölzl’s literary histories). Had he known this, his notes would probably have been more helpful. As it now is, the revised version of Harrington’s textbook is not better than the original one. Is this the best an Ivy League professor⁶ can accomplish ?

*
* *

Although Sidwell’s notes also contain some errors, his anthology is decidedly to be preferred to the one by Harrington & Pucci.

UCLA

Bengt LÖFSTEDT

5. He is politically correct, announcing proudly (p. XVII) : “ I have more than doubled the selections by women writers ”.

6. Professor Pucci has an endowed chair in Classics and Medieval Studies at Brown University.