

2005

Review of *Women Writing Latin, from Roman Antiquity to Early Modern Europe*, edited by Laurie J. Churchill, Phyllis R. Brown, and Jane E. Jeffrey

Catherine Conybeare
Bryn Mawr College, cconybea@brynmawr.edu

[Let us know how access to this document benefits you.](#)

Follow this and additional works at: http://repository.brynmawr.edu/classics_pubs

 Part of the [Classics Commons](#)

Custom Citation

Conybeare, Catherine. Review of *Women Writing Latin, from Roman Antiquity to Early Modern Europe*, edited by Laurie J. Churchill, Phyllis R. Brown, and Jane E. Jeffrey. *Speculum* 80 (2005): 540-542.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College. http://repository.brynmawr.edu/classics_pubs/20

For more information, please contact repository@brynmawr.edu.

Savoy, instead of the princes (surely an unhappy translation from Livingston's English preface).

Matching line by line, Chênerie retains a good 98 percent of Livingston's text, cleaning it up by emending some punctuation, adding roman numerals for numbers instead of writing them out, removing the *ç* from forms like *cou*, correcting some capitalized and lower-case words, sorting the variants, and weighing in with new interpretations at the several points in the text where the combined efforts of all editors and reviewers still leave enigmatic or unhappy lines (1324–27, for example)—and while they may not be conclusive, they add to the possibility of solutions. To these minor textual corrections, she adds a new apparatus that gives an updated review of the variants in the complex layers of Foerster and Müller's redactions and includes the input of Livingston and the five reviewers of his text. All this summarizes the possible conjectures regarding *Gliglois*, but as circumstances have lent the romance a more virtual existence than most, it is hard to say if we are any closer to the lost original than before—at best we have some more educated guesswork and a more grammatically regulated version. Beyond that, Chênerie adds a useful glossary, a list of proper names (although in a poem remarkably devoid of intertextual allusions, Tristan is missed in the listing of the few there are), plus lively notes that expand on Livingston's earlier commentary. In the introduction she provides a short résumé of the text and updates the language analysis, expanding more fully on morphology, phonetics, and versification. She further provides a new "étude littéraire," which once again covers some traditional ground but takes stock of existing criticism and goes on to examine *Gliglois* in what Chênerie sees as its relationship to the *conte populaire*.

Unusually, reviewing this romance entails dealing much more with the modern editorial process than the work itself: this is really a revised, updated, and expanded edition that incorporates a genealogy stretching back to the late nineteenth century. Chênerie has previously published a translation of the work (*La légende arthurienne et le graal* [Paris, 1989], pp. 711–47), and with the Old French now more accessible, it will perhaps excite the increased critical interest it deserves.

CAROLINE JEWERS, University of Kansas

Laurie J. Churchill, Phyllis R. Brown, and Jane E. Jeffrey, eds., *Women Writing Latin, from Roman Antiquity to Early Modern Europe*, 1: *Women Writing Latin in Roman Antiquity, Late Antiquity, and the Early Christian Era*; 2: *Medieval Women Writing Latin*; 3: *Early Modern Women Writing Latin*. (Women Writers of the World.) New York and London: Routledge, 2002. 1: pp. x, 186. 2: pp. x, 323. 3: pp. x, 298. \$125 (each vol.).

The editors of these three volumes, collecting multiple traces of "women writing Latin," have taken on an ambitious task. Their brief introduction gives some sense of how ambitious. They are seeking to complicate the image of Latin as "the language of patriarchal power"—to show that it was "a language of women as well as of men" (1:1). They wish to give "a more complicated understanding of the relationship between Latin literacy and the development of the European vernaculars" (1:2). They have made a point of including "nonliterary" texts, on the sympathetic grounds that gender bias has led to their being defined as irrelevant or subordinate; and, in their quest for women's writing, they have been prompted to remold rigid notions of authorship—to include embedded texts, for example, or texts produced in collaboration with male scribes (1:3). As one works through the volumes, the significance of all this is underplayed, but it is potentially incendiary. The cumulative implications are immense. Notions of canonicity and of what counts as worthy of examination are called into question. Notions about women's education are expanded

and nuanced (see the excellent observation about Elisabeth of Schönau learning Latin by immersion: 2:201). Disciplinary divisions are shaken up (look at the energetic reading of Hrotsvit as a playwright by someone who has actually directed her work). While it is never made explicit, a class-based approach here is just as important as selection by gender. The conscientious recovery of diverse women's voices is equally a project of recovering the voices of the underclass.

To each "woman writing Latin" represented in these volumes, her present redactor gives an introduction (which varies hugely in length, detail, and degree of engagement with the issues raised in the introduction), excerpts from her work in both Latin and English translation, and a bibliography (again, varying greatly in scope). The editors explain that English translations have been included "in order not to perpetuate the exclusivity of Latin literacy," which is laudable; unfortunately, the exclusivity of Anglo-American academic practice is all too often perpetuated in the vast preponderance of English-language scholarship in most of the bibliographies.

The volume of most interest to readers of this journal will be volume 2, which covers the Middle Ages from Radegund to St. Bride of Sweden; the latter part of volume 1, early Christian material from Perpetua to Egeria, will also be of interest. The rest covers Roman antiquity and Renaissance and early-modern writers. What are the principles according to which the texts have been selected? Why are they sometimes works already well known and widely available (Perpetua is a case in point) and sometimes truly novel projects of recovery? We never learn. The editors merely note that they did "not include all the Latin writings of women or even all the most important women" (1:2). They themselves allude to the exclusion of Dhuoda and Gertrude of Helfta. The dedication of the volumes gives us no clue, either: they are for "all young women currently studying Latin." These young women are, it seems, interested in women's writing for its own sake, not for anything more specific or clearly focused.

I have now used excerpts from these volumes in two seminars, at both undergraduate and graduate levels; both, as it happens, were peopled exclusively by young women, who were much intrigued by the collection. There is nothing else out there quite like it, and, used with care, it is an important teaching tool.

The material that went over best in class is also, to my mind, the most important contribution of these volumes: the anonymous texts, the inclusion of which should be warmly applauded. The little plea from a schoolgirl to her teacher Mistress Felhin (from ninth-century Saxony); the women's contributions to the twelfth-century mortuary roll from Caen; and the wills and documents of dedication from a Catalan convent, Sant Pere de les Puelles: all these are fascinating texts, beautifully presented by their modern-day redactors (Steven A. Stofferahn, Daniel Sheerin, and Linda McMillin respectively). To them should be added the graffiti from Pompeii (Elizabeth Woeckner) and the epigraphic material, though this last is less well presented. These texts, of course, speak directly to the issues raised in the introduction about which writings are worthy of inclusion, who is doing the writing, and how they go about it: my students were quick to see their significance. For all the arguments about the importance of the "nonliterary," however, it is disappointing to see such material drop out entirely when we reach the Renaissance volume (despite the Renaissance rage for epigraphy, for example). This yields, in the end, the conservative implication that we should only attend to nonliterary Latin sources when we cannot muster sufficient "literary" ones.

Ironically, the two medieval women whose claims to write truly "literary" Latin are least in dispute are ill served in this collection. To represent Heloise through the *Problemata*, rather than the well-worn letters, was an inspiration, but the treatment does not do her justice. An introduction chiefly concerned with her Latinity is full of inadequate or erroneous observations about syntax and style; the Latin itself, in both text and notes, contains

frequent typesetting errors and is several times mistranslated. As for Hildegard, the treatment of the Latin is fine, but the summary of her life suffers from an unnuanced antipatriarchal triumphalism, which does scant justice to her historical situation: the complications of working simultaneously within and against a dominant tradition are lost. (In this context, would that the coercive semantics of Herrad of Hohenbourg's glosses had been explored. As it is, they are smoothed over by being "incorporated" into the English [2:253].) The overall introduction to the volumes gestures toward subaltern narratives and strategies, which form a most pertinent interpretative matrix for this material (1:6–7); but we never hear of them again.

These are volumes of extraordinary range and diversity, and this diversity is their strength; but a firmer editorial hand was needed for readers to profit more fully from it. There is almost no sense of dialogue between the entries, which is odd in volumes that had their genesis in two NEH seminars. (A simple example: in the discussion of Angela Nogarola there is a comment on the "interesting choice" of the cento form. Why is there no reference here to the entry on Proba?) The introduction covers fewer than eight pages, a troubling proportion of them in others' words (which are not always of obvious relevance); the identical introduction is reproduced in each of the three volumes. This means that there is no historical overview: no sense of how conditions for literate women might have changed over time, of how they might be getting their educations, or of how their conditions might relate to other historical trends. (For example, in the Renaissance volume we have a regular pattern of very learned, very young women being promoted and put on display and—depressingly—an equally regular pattern of their careers being summarily terminated in their late twenties; but this passes without comment.) The Latin texts, their translations, and comments on their Latinity are sometimes very poor, and for this the editors must bear ultimate responsibility. One small but significant example occurs when an Asclepiadic metrical schema is transcribed from a sixteenth-century printed edition (3:112). Suor Laurentia Strozzi, the writer under discussion, was clearly mistress of this quantitative classical meter: she uses it beautifully, including observing the hard caesura in the middle of the line. But either her original typesetter or her modern interpreter has made nonsense of the schema by joining long syllable markings into single lines of varying length; if the former is responsible, it passes without comment.

Ultimately, reading through these volumes was a frustrating enterprise. The collection is important, and there are some exceptional entries; but the volumes, taken as a whole, could be so much better. I hope there is a second edition; and I hope that, at that stage, extensive editorial correction will take place. (I would also strongly recommend including a map of Europe, showing the provenances of the writers, who are not usually situated geographically other than with place-names.) Otherwise, *Women Writing Latin* will merely reinforce the traditional impression of women's writings as secondary and negligible.

CATHERINE CONYBEARE, Bryn Mawr College

SANDRINE CLAUDE, *Le château de Gréoux-les-Bains (Alpes-de-Haute-Provence): Une résidence seigneuriale du moyen âge à l'époque moderne*. (Documents d'Archéologie Française, 80.) Paris: Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, 2000. Paper. Pp. 187; 151 black-and-white figures and 2 tables.

Long left to practitioners of local history, the medieval fortified sites of southeastern Provence have begun to attract the attention of a growing number of specialists, as evidenced, for instance, in recent numbers of the journal *L'archéologie du Midi médiévale*. Another example of this shift of interest is provided by Sandrine Claude's study of the château of Gréoux-les-Bains, which also provides a good illustration of the methodological approach