

1989

Review of *Magister Gregorius, The Marvels of Rome*, translated with commentary by John Osborne

Dale Kinney

Bryn Mawr College, dkinney@brynmawr.edu

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

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

 Part of the [History of Art, Architecture, and Archaeology Commons](#)

Custom Citation

Kinney, Dale. Review of *Magister Gregorius, The Marvels of Rome*, translated with commentary by John Osborne. *Speculum* 64, no. 4 (1989): 959-961.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College. http://repository.brynmawr.edu/hart_pubs/29

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

quoted by the author herself, p. 93). Indeed, one of the most problematic aspects of Teicher's Hebrew article was his insistence on Christian influences on Jewish "theology," which certainly cannot be entirely denied, but not with regard to his claims for its influence on the supposed "literal" interpretation of the Bible, etc. This appears to have led Goldfeld (who acknowledges a general indebtedness to Teicher in the introduction) to the conclusion, repeatedly stated but never proven, that this supposed Christian influence was behind the writing of the "Treatise."

On the other hand, if one wishes to consider the real possibility of an influence of Christian ideas, it is essential to examine the manuscript of the treatise on resurrection of Judah Ibn Zabara, which suggests precisely this — something Goldfeld failed to do. Indeed, when it comes to comparison, there is at least one important Muslim work, Ibn Kammunah's "Treatise on the Immortality of the Soul," which not only has been edited but has even been translated (*Ignace Goldziher Memorial Volume*, 2:83–99). This, also, the author has not done. Nor has she even begun to consider all of the numerous citations and discussions of the "Treatise" in Jewish medieval writing, but rather has limited her examination to a tiny fraction of these, exactly the ones already discussed by Teicher.

The essentially sound conclusions (which in essence are those of Teicher) are not helped by exaggerated speculation, as for instance in dealing with the various letters of Maimonides. Thus, not all of the letter to his pupil is a forgery, and to indicate that it is robs scholars of a very valuable tool in the study not only of Maimonides' life but of his thought. The same is true of the letter to Joseph Ibn Jābir (the correct form of the name), and certainly with that to Ḥasdai (not "Ḥisdai") ha-Levy, where the last paragraph on resurrection is an interpolation but the rest of the text is probably authentic.

The book concludes with a translation of a lengthy text on resurrection which the author, again following Teicher, argues was interpolated into the text of a commentary of Meir Abulafia (the Hebrew text, readily available, has also been reprinted by the author).

This book is certainly valuable as a much-needed revival of the important conclusions of Teicher, shamelessly ignored by scholars in light of Sonne's objections. It is unfortunate, however, that it is not complete even in this respect, nor does it contribute anything new. It is weakest on historical aspects of the problem, such as the Maimonidean controversy and the burning of the "Guide" at Montpellier (where basic bibliography has been ignored). There remains yet to be undertaken a thorough investigation of the question of the "Treatise," incorporating Teicher's conclusions and moving beyond them, as well as a detailed and correct analysis of the entire Maimonidean controversy. Perhaps this book will stimulate interest once again in these issues, and if so it will have served a very useful purpose. Certainly it cannot be ignored in any future work on Maimonides, and perhaps it will even encourage some to read Teicher's own articles.

NORMAN ROTH, University of Wisconsin, Madison

MAGISTER GREGORIUS, *The Marvels of Rome*, trans., with commentary, John Osborne. (Mediaeval Sources in Translation, 31.) Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1987. Paper. Pp. viii, 114. \$7.50. Distributed outside North America by E. J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands.

John Osborne has done a service in making generally accessible an unusual and appealing medieval Latin text. Master Gregory, known only from this 4,500-word

travelogue, was a visitor to Rome at the end of the twelfth or early thirteenth century. His *Narracio* is cited in most accounts of the so-called renaissance of the twelfth century among the testaments to a reawakened sensibility to the monuments of ancient Rome. Art historians include his descriptions in the *fortuna critica* of such notable ancient statues as the bronze equestrian portrait of Marcus Aurelius and the Spinario. His confession that in examining the plaque inscribed with the first-century C.E. *Lex de imperio* "plura legi, set pauca intellexi" is a familiar testimony of the supposed medieval inability to decipher ancient capital scripts. In short, this is an author reasonably well known through selected passages repeated out of context. Osborne's translation and commentary invite an assessment of the text as a whole, and possibly a reassessment of the popular excerpts in its light.

The economical introduction (pp. 1–15) reviews the data of manuscript transmission and editions, describes the text, characterizes the author, and considers the evidence for his identity. Osborne comes close to endorsing Josiah Russell's proposal of 1936, that the author was the same "magister Gregorius" named as chancellor of the papal legate to England, Otto of Tonengo, in a document of 1238; but he concludes that the evidence is inconclusive. He deduces Master Gregory's personality primarily by means of contrasting the *Narracio* to the *Mirabilia urbis Romae*, an enumeration of Roman antiquities composed a century before Master Gregory's, in 1140–43. Osborne's characterization lacks the esprit of the indelible paragraph by Richard Krautheimer (*Rome: Profile of a City, 312–1308*, pp. 189–90) in which Master Gregory appears as an engagingly dotty English amateur, but it is essentially similar. On both accounts Master Gregory was an enthusiast, distinguished by an eccentric eagerness for physical knowledge of the monuments and by the transparency of his effusive reminiscences and descriptions.

The translation is accurate and readable, and I find it superior to its only predecessor, by George B. Parks, which now seems stilted and confusing (*The English Traveler to Italy*, 1:254–68). Osborne opted for a simple, colloquial style: compare Gregory, cap. 19, "Set cui contigit universa palacia . . . sermone prosequi?" with Park, "But of what avail to mention all the palaces? . . ." and Osborne, "But who really cares whether I describe at length all the palaces? . . ." Tone, vocabulary, and straightforward syntax are suited to the modern reader and will be a real advantage for those of us who want to use this text in undergraduate teaching. How truthfully it captures Master Gregory is debatable. The *Narracio* is not ornate, but it is self-conscious and contrived, and in places pedantic.

The meat of Osborne's scholarly contribution is in the commentary (pp. 37–99), in which earlier philological and topographical annotations (notably by G. McN. Rushforth, M. R. James, and R. Valentini and G. Zucchetti) are synthesized and augmented by new connections made by Osborne himself. The chief goal of the commentary seems to be to identify and to provide the most up-to-date scholarly account of every ancient building and statue mentioned by Master Gregory. In these terms it is a laudable success. Osborne is a careful and thorough researcher, and readers can count on factual and bibliographic reliability in this section.

This publication makes it possible for all medievalists to evaluate a text previously familiar mostly to those with a special interest in medieval antiquarianism and the historical topography of the city of Rome. Interpretations of it, including Osborne's, have been determined by these specialized perspectives, from which the text is most useful, and therefore most readily perceived, as the unmediated voice of the author. Indeed the tendency has been to treat the text as if it were the author and, conversely, to treat the author as if he, like his *Narracio*, were unique. The nature of the text as a literary artifact, the probable literary formation of its author, and the literary

community to which he might have belonged have received concomitantly little consideration. With a wider readership, one can hope that these omissions will be made up. A passage in need of literary elucidation is the famous description of the marble Venus in chapter 12. This is the locus classicus for Master Gregory's antiquarian personality, supposedly revealing his crypto-aesthetic sensibility, his residual superstition, and his unaffected self-expression. But it is also based on a topos of ancient art criticism: the perfection of the artist's mimetic craft that obliterates the boundary between art and nature. And it has a suspicious resemblance to pseudo-Lucian's description of the Cnidian Aphrodite (probably the same statue type seen by Master Gregory in a replica), in *Amores* 13. This being a Greek text, it is not likely that Master Gregory had read it. But what did he read? On that front, there may still be much to do.

DALE KINNEY, Bryn Mawr College

MAGISTER GUILLELMUS ALTISSIORENSIS, *Summa aurea: Introduction générale*, ed. Jean Ribaillier (†). (Spicilegium Bonaventurianum, 20.) Paris: CNRS; Grottaferrata (Rome): Collegium S. Bonaventurae ad Claras Aquas, 1987. Paper. Pp. viii, 331.

This introduction to the critical edition of William of Auxerre's *Golden Summa* marks the completion of a very fine multivolume work (see *Speculum* 59 [1984], 154–56; 63 [1988], 674–75). These prologomena are presented in five parts: William's life and works (pp. 3–24); the structure of the *Summa aurea* (pp. 27–33); the manuscripts of the *Summa* (pp. 37–180); critical introductions to each of the four books (pp. 183–312); and finally a table of concordance between the critical edition and the two editions dating from 1500, by Regnault and Pigouchet (pp. 315–27).

Most of this introductory material was written by Jean Ribaillier himself before his death in 1974. His disciples have added a section at the end of part 1 on the various abbreviations of the *Summa aurea*. Other copies of the *Summa* have been discovered by scholars since Ribaillier completed his survey, and a critical introduction to book 4 has been added by F. Hudry in collaboration with Fr. J.-G. Bugerol, O.F.M.

Compared with many another medieval personage, a relative abundance of biographical data has survived regarding William: he was archdeacon of Beauvais; he made two trips to Rome; he was appointed to examine the works of Aristotle as to the propriety of using them for the curriculum at the University of Paris; and the date of his death has been fixed with reasonable certitude: November 3, 1231. The only other surviving work which can certainly be attributed to William is his *Summa de officiis ecclesiasticis*, which has survived in 19 manuscripts.

While the structure of the *Summa aurea*, in broad outline and in some details, resembles Peter Lombard's *Sentences*, William's work is not a commentary on Lombard, but rather the result of his lectures in theology at Paris. Ribaillier's judgment is confirmed by telling arguments. At the end of this section (part 2), some indication is given of the enormity of the task which Ribaillier had to face: the text of the *Summa* filled some three hundred manuscript folios and has survived in some 130 codices, many of which are incomplete and some of which present a shorter or differently redacted text.

The greater part (part 3) of this introduction is dedicated to the listing and detailed description of the manuscripts. After the description of each manuscript, it is generally noted whether the manuscript is complete or incomplete; indications are given as to the quality of the text presented; and the other manuscripts which share the same text tradition are listed.