The Medieval Academy of America

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS JOURNALS

Review
Reviewed Work(s): Gesta regum Anglorum: The History of the English Kings, 1 by William of Malmesbury, R. A. B. Mynors, R. M. Thomson and M. Winterbottom; Gesta regum Anglorum: The History of the English Kings, 2: General Introduction and Commentary by William of Malmesbury, R. M. Thomson and M. Winterbottom
Review by: Bruce R. O'Brien
Source: *Speculum*, Vol. 76, No. 3 (Jul., 2001), pp. 815-818
Published by: The University of Chicago Press on behalf of the Medieval Academy of America
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2903963
Accessed: 21-04-2018 03:34 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at http://about.jstor.org/terms

JSTOR

Medieval Academy of America, The University of Chicago Press are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Speculum*

This content downloaded from 199.111.91.13 on Sat, 21 Apr 2018 03:34:56 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

cultures. *Art and Crusade* is a *livre à thèse,* very much in the style of Robert Branner's *Saint Louis and the Court Style in Gothic Architecture* (1965); and although it may have some of the same capacity for stimulating debate, discussion, and further research, it also has some of the same defects. Far richer and more provocative is the analysis of the court production of art and architecture that we find, for example, in Paul Binski's *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets* (1995) with its subtle incorporation of ideas derived from the essays of Giesey, Hobsbawm, Cannadine, and Elias to frame the issues of courts and court cultures in new and far more challenging terms. Aside from the basic and essential question of whether the Arsenal Bible was really produced for St. Louis, in attributing the conceptual frame of large artistic projects to the king himself, Weiss ignores the potential for a far more interesting possibility: that Louis, who surrounded himself with Dominican and Franciscan preachers and teachers, reached out to the intellectual environment of Paris, the greatest school of the Middle Ages, and that it may have been precisely the fortuitous constellation of royal authority and intellectual environment that underlay some of the unique aspects of the royal programs of Paris during his reign.

CAROLINE BRUZELIUS, Duke University

WILLIAM OF MALMESBURY, *Gesta regum Anglorum: The History of the English Kings,* 1, ed. and trans. R. A. B. Mynors (†), completed by R. M. Thomson and M. Winterbottom. (Oxford Medieval Texts.) Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1998. Pp. xxxii, 879; diagrams. $180.

———, *Gesta regum Anglorum: The History of the English Kings,* 2: *General Introduction and Commentary,* by R. M. Thomson with M. Winterbottom. (Oxford Medieval Texts.) Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1999. Pp. xlvii, 496; 1 diagram. $115.

"It was therefore my design, in part moved by love of my country and in part encouraged by influential friends, to mend the broken chain of our history, and give a Roman polish to the rough annals of our native speech" (1 prol. 4). So William of Malmesbury, the most important historian of English affairs since Bede, explained his project, a history of the deeds of English kings from their arrival in Britain to his own time under Henry I (1100–1135). This work, his finest historical book, was edited by William Stubbs in 1887–89 and sensitively translated by John Sharpe (1815), with revisions by Joseph Stevenson (1854). Stubbs confessed that his work was preliminary and that a new edition would be needed, a need now met by R. A. B. Mynors, who began the work in the 1950s, and R. M. Thomson and M. Winterbottom, who took over from Mynors in the 1980s, with Winterbottom principally responsible for the text, Thomson for the commentary, and both for the translation.

The most striking changes from Stubbs's text are the discovery that Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale 294 bis (Tt), which Stubbs knew of, but had not seen, was a witness to an older first edition, with its own unique dedicatory epistles, and the inversion of Stubbs's second and third editions, B and C. Stubbs printed C, even though he worried that it might not be William's final edition. This new edition prints the agreement of C and B with some, but not all, of the additions unique to either or both confined to an appendix. Reconstruction of archetypes is impressive and persuasive (though Bk for Mynors's preferred Bq in the reconstruction of B needs a justification greater than "convenience"), and readers can resurrect any edition with confidence from what is printed here. Where I checked in important witnesses to A, C, and B (Al, Ce, and Bc^1), the readings are accurate. Emendations

This content downloaded from 199.111.91.13 on Sat, 21 Apr 2018 03:34:56 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

and interventions are gentle and wise and produce a more sensible text that is a pleasure to work with.

The editors' story of the progression of editions differs from Stubbs's account. The *Gesta regum,* they argue, survives in at least four versions, witnessed by almost forty manuscripts. It was begun with the encouragement of Queen Mathilda (d. 1118); and a copy (T), William's first edition, was made "probably around 1126" (2:xxii), drawn from his working draft (W^1) and presented to her daughter, Empress Mathilda. The working draft (W^1) by then must have been quite messy, and so William "or another" made a copy of it (W^2), which became the new working draft. At some point in its long existence, this draft produced a child (A), disadvantaged (but identified) by errors that had crept into W^2 when it was copied from W^1. The editors are inconsistent on A's date, especially confusing given their date for T; in one place A was "substantially completed by 1125" (2:6), while in another, its possible archetype (Al) was written "after 1125 or perhaps early 1126" (2:xxiv). We do not know what prompted the production of A—it lacks dedicatory epistles, though the editors suspect it once carried the same ones found in later versions. Sometime then, or perhaps later, William or another produced a "mysterious branch" of A: Aa. In several places it reads as if it must be William's work; yet while Aa corrects what Stubbs called "the most unfortunate blunder" in any of William's works—the equation of Pope John XV with Gerbert of Aurillac—the blunder remains in all later editions of the *Gesta regum,* a paradox that leaves the editors puzzled (but see 2:xxi, n. 13). William worked over W^2 into the 1130s to update parts of it, soften its criticisms of certain great persons, and amend the style. It must again have become a confusingly crowded text, and so once more a fair copy (W^3) was made of the draft. W^3, erratically revised and in places uncorrected (e.g., 2.154.3; see 2:xxvi), then became the parent of two further editions, C and B. William produced C around 1135 (2:6) from W^3 with the addition of a good deal of Glastonbury material, most of which does not show up in the later edition, B. What convinced William to remove material he had added to C was his composition in the meantime of *De antiquitate Glastonie ecclesie,* which absorbed most of this material. C, in fact, may have been created specially for the Glastonbury community. B was William's final product; proof is slight but nevertheless present in three places (2:xxix), the last of which, where a church standing in T, A, and C has been destroyed in B (2.138B.1), is most persuasive.

The editors do not give us B, but a hybrid of all four editions that never existed in a single text at any one time. They claim that it was "impracticable to use the B version as our base text" because of "the many errors that point to a further copying between the final state of W^3 and the emergence of the archetype of the B manuscripts" (2:xxxiii); a glance at the apparatus confirms B's problems, but perhaps not their remedy. They print in the apparatus readings that justify B, marking those they feel are authentically William's, and relegate to an appendix additions to B (and C) not found in A or T. It is not clear to me for all of B's problems why they could not have printed it (with its additions), using C (and A and T) judiciously to correct those "many errors." Pooling all versions to create the best text possible, they have given us a *Gesta regum* better than William was capable of producing. The editors express a hope that William would have approved. That he would I have no doubt, but I think William's strengths and weaknesses have to be preserved for us to understand his accomplishment. A historian who allowed a sloppy text—senseless in places—to endure through over ten years of revisions is someone resembling, but not the same as, the author of the text of this edition.

Surprisingly, the editors omit from both the text and their discussion of the text the rubrics that fill many of the manuscripts. Stubbs followed Ce and printed its rubrics. This new edition includes only the briefest rubrics at the head of each book (e.g., "Liber Primus" and "Prologus in libro primo"). The manuscripts bear differing testimony. Al, Ce, and Bc^1 have longer and more widespread rubrication, marking internal divisions of the text. Bc^1,

This content downloaded from 199.111.91.13 on Sat, 21 Apr 2018 03:34:56 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

one of the two principal manuscripts used here to reconstruct B, lacks some of the few printed rubrics but marks out with rubrics the accounts of, first, the kingdom of Wessex (at fol. 4) and then Northumbria, Mercia, and East Anglia. Some of these rubrics Bc^1 shares with Al and Ce. That the editors have left the rubrics out may have been the right thing to do—the rubrics may not be William's—but the editors should have told us why.

The translation has its base in the Sharpe-Stevenson translation of the nineteenth century, and there are strong echoes throughout. Mynors finished his translation in the 1980s, and both Thomson and Winterbottom reworked it in 1995–96 (1:v–vi). They distinguish their goal from Mynors's: While "Mynors believed strongly that a translation should be elegant even at the cost of literalness," their goal was to cleave to the Latin. In practice, however, their translation leans more toward elegance than literalness, and so brings the strengths and weaknesses of its type. In places it captures William's erudition, his vision, as well as his anachronisms. In other places it diminishes the clarity of his metaphors, overrides his reasoned word choice, and, at times, mistranslates. The resonance of metaphor has been diluted where William enclosed his description of Dunstan, Æthelwold, and Oswald with images of light and darkness, *lumen* and *tenebrae* (2.149.1.6). The translation hides the return of the exact metaphor by changing *Angliam* 'England' into "the English sky," cleared by the "three-fold light"; hence "the dense clouds [for *tenebrae*] of wickedness disappeared" (1:243). In terminology, readers will want to know, for example, whether William equates people with kingdom, and so a closer fidelity to William's decisions on whether the English king ruled a people (*Angli*) or a place (*Anglia*) would have been better (e.g., 2.148.2). *Angli* as "English*men*" is perhaps also unwise (2.148.1). William uses *virago* for Hild at 1.30.5, who no one would disagree was indeed a virgin; for Eadgyth, wife of the Confessor, he chooses only *perpetua integritas* 'perpetual purity' rather than the translation's "perpetual virginity." As we admit degrees of virginity in olive oil, so also, perhaps, does Malmesbury in his holy women. In another place William's list of rulers forced to attend Edgar's court and row him on the river Dees includes *reges* of the Scots, Cumbrians, and the Welsh, as well as Mascusius the *archipirata* (2.148.2), which is something other than "the pirate king," since William avoided *rex*. Some of the translation misses its source. Some might question translating William's characterization of the closeness of Northumbria and Kent, "nichil esset uel in potestatibus diuersum uel in moribus barbarum," as "there was no divergence in their government, no barbarian discord in their way of life" (1.48.2); I see no "discord," but only the sense of foreignness here. William's *barbaria* is indeed a slippery place, not having any people or customs as its fixed abode and often instead implying a relative relationship between peoples or kingdoms (cf. 1.49.4). Lastly, William in a famous passage claims that he can vouch for only the events of his own time; but let the reader know (the editors translate him as saying) "that I guarantee the truth of nothing in past time except the sequence of events; the credit of my narrative must rest with my authorities" (1 prol. 7). But the Latin sends a stronger disclaimer: William guarantees the truth of "nichil de retro actis preter coherentiam annorum," "nothing of things done formerly except the sequence [lit. linking together] of the years." *Caveat lector* indeed, from William himself!

The commentary takes up the bulk of volume 2 and is mostly the work of Thomson. Malmesbury's breadth posed for him a daunting task that had defeated challengers; Mynors confessed in 1987 that his commentary, which he had been accumulating since the 1950s, "looks like an extinct volcano in use as the town tip" (2:v). R. W. Southern, originally responsible for the commentary, thought that a team of scholars would be needed to adequately perform the task. Thomson did in fact consult freely, and the results are often impressive. He has made fair choices on what to cover. So he felt no need to give any guidance on the strange tale of ravenous mice, no matter how *veracissimus* William's informant (3.290); but on the *volumen vetustum* William used in his second narrative of

This content downloaded from 199.111.91.13 on Sat, 21 Apr 2018 03:34:56 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms

King Æthelstan's life (2.132), Thomson provides abundant coverage on the issues and the controversialists to consult. In any given chapter Thomson offers most, but not all, we would want. In chapter 180 of book 2, for example, a long and important account from Cnut's invasion to the aftermath of Edmund Ironside's death, possible lemmata are many, and Thomson has addressed the majority of them: everything from the Londoners' habit of acclaiming kings (180.4) to echoes of Virgil in William's analysis of Edmund's half-victory over Cnut at Brentford (180.7). One omission, however, is felt. We should have been able to learn something about "a certain Uhtred, an earl across the Humber" (180.2), an ally of Edmund Ironside and a significant power in the north, first earl of the house of Bamburgh (covered in a number of works of the early 1990s by Christopher Morris, M. K. Lawson, and Simon Keynes).

Typesetting errors are amazingly few for almost fifteen hundred pages. Only two are worth noting: at 1:149 read "lost" for "losmbbbbt," and at 2:xviii read "c. 126," not "c. 124," for the site of ACB's revision of a passage in T.

William hoped that "Posterity, I trust, when love and envy are no more, if it cannot praise my style, at least will pay a tribute to my industry" (1 prol. 8). My criticisms aside, this new edition is a worthy testament to the industry of both a twelfth-century author and his twentieth-century editors.

Bruce R. O'Brien, Mary Washington College

Jürgen Wolf, *Die sächsische Weltchronik im Spiegel ihrer Handschriften: Überlieferung, Textentwicklung, Rezeption.* (Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften, 75.) Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1997. Pp. xv, 495 plus 60-page appendix; 12 maps, 11 tables, and 3 diagrams. DM 118.

The influence of the vernacular, prose *Saxon World Chronicle* (*SW*) on both Latin and German historiography in medieval Germany cannot be overestimated for almost all history writers referred to it as the standard or cited directly from it in the period from c. 1230 to 1450 (pp. 2, 197). This Marburg dissertation (1995) written under Roderich Schmidt, long the authority on Saxon history and law, is extremely welcome. Wolf presents a chronological reassessment of *SW* manuscripts from the earliest annalistic text to 1450 and traces the history of the entire textual transmission and reception along with the fate of each manuscript and a few printed versions up to the twentieth century. Then using this information, the author characterizes each version and each manuscript within its own social-historical context. Hence the first half of the book contains a carefully researched, detailed catalog of the fifty-nine known *SW* manuscripts, thus superseding H. Herkommer's 1972 catalog. The second half evaluates the evidence for the transmission of the multiple variants according to date, location, author, ownership, patron's social milieu, and reception.

Wolf's results corroborate the accepted division into three manuscript traditions: A (annalistic form), B (expanded to include events contemporary with the writer), and C (heavily elaborated form). He demonstrates that each group was produced in its own political and social context and that each manuscript carries predominantly the expectations of a specific audience or patronage group. The A versions were most popular in southern German cities and monasteries but also with the Teutonic Knights; B was dominant in northern German cities among burghers, and C at the courts (i.e., of the Welfs) in Saxony and Thuringia, where copyists tended to represent dynastic interests by including lengthy genealogies. Wolf also demonstrates how the centers of interest shifted over time. His tables and maps summarize a great amount of detail and provide a valuable overview of his findings for the A, B, and C versions for each century.

This content downloaded from 199.111.91.13 on Sat, 21 Apr 2018 03:34:56 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms