

CECILIA AMBROSINI – FEDERICO DE DOMINICIS – MARIA GALLI (edd.), FRANCESCO SANTI (presentazione), ROSSANA GUGLIELMETTI (introduzione), *Osculetur me. Tre commentari anonimi al Cantico dei Cantici* (Opere perdute e anonime 3), SISMELE-Edizioni del Galluzzo, Firenze 2022, pp. XV-340, € 68, ISBN 978-88-9290-172-8.

This book presents the Latin texts of three anonymous commentaries on the Canticle of Canticles, which were defended as master's theses (*lauree magistrali*) under the supervision of Rossana Guglielmetti at Milan University (p. xiv). All three editions were published online (ecodicibus.sismelfirenze.it) and then revised for the print edition, which is also available as an open-access PDF document on the publisher's website (sismel.it).

The volume begins with a foreword by Francesco Santi (pp. vii-x), in which he reflects on various types of anonymity and the importance of the Bible in the Middle Ages. Guglielmetti provides an introduction (pp. xi-xv). Before her synthetic contextualization of the three works, she makes a twofold case for saving such anonymous commentaries from oblivion: 1) They are the «invisible rings» that join the known authors (p. xi), and 2) they fill out the panorama of medieval exegesis, for which a whole intellectual class took responsibility (p. xii).

Readers owe a debt of gratitude to the book's three editors, whose labors have brought to light texts hitherto available only in manuscript. Despite the limitations that I will detail below, the fact remains that this publication advances our knowledge of various fields of study by rendering these texts accessible to anyone who reads Latin. I will treat them in order, using parenthetical references to indicate the page and line numbers (page, line) at which a word, phrase, or longer block of text begins.

The biblical references for all three works have been filed under the letter B, for *Bibbia*, in the general index (pp. 337-340). The lack of a separate biblical index for these Canticle commentaries betrays the limited sensitivity to biblical citations that pervades the whole book. Abbreviations, likewise, are an issue for all three works, since none of them presents a truly complete list of sigla just before the Latin texts, nor is there any definition of general abbreviations.

Maria Galli produces her critical edition (pp. 1-79) on the basis of the two known manuscripts of an anonymous commentary, which she cautiously dates to the final decades of the eighth century or the very early ninth: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France (BNF), lat. 15679, and Arras, Bibliothèque Municipale 235, also numbered as 1079 (p. 3). Although Galli does not provide information about the online availability of these, they can be found within the BNF's Catalogue Collectif de France (ccfr.bnf.fr). The Arras manuscript has suffered major damage, and the Paris one lacks many folios, but the two of them complement one another to provide a remarkably complete edition. Sporadic underlining, to indicate where only one manuscript is legible, marks most of the work and renders the edition less pleasant to read. Nevertheless, Galli has done well to choose this method rather than overburdening the apparatus (p. 12; see pp. 40-79).

The anonymous author, editor rather, has drawn heavily from two direct sources: Origen's commentary on the Canticle according to Rufinus's Latin translation, which he epitomizes until it ends at Cant 2,15, and Justus of Urgell's commentary on the Canticle, which he reproduces quite faithfully from Cant 2,16 on. Critical editions of these two sources provide the principal basis for correcting scribal errors (p. 7).

Galli has used small capital type for citations of the Canticle, both the lemmata and their shorter reprises. Direct biblical citations have usually been identified (except Gal 2,9 at 47,123), but biblical allusions have been passed over. Galli has shown competence in the correction of many scribal errors. Nevertheless, the quantity of remaining errors of various sorts undermines confidence in the text presented. The edition does not always correspond to the manuscript images available online: *sit* for *fit* (71,135); *meus* for *meum* (72,1); *populum* for *populus* (74,59); *Iesus* for *Iesu* (76,105). Galli often corrects *iuxta Rufinum* or *iuxta Iustum*, but many more readings should have been emended in this manner: *<>um* (25,316); *propitiatorum* (26,330); *pro ergo* (33,90); *ornare* (52,104); *vires* (52,116); *temporalia* (54,5); *confessarum* (57,86); *contemta* (58,127); *operare* (60,200); *addens* (62,249); *resurrectionem* (63,20); *ritos* (65,93); *tranquillitate* (66,125); *sollicitudinem* (66,125); *omnes* (66,129); *chorus* (67,1); *habuisse* (69,72); *furentia* (75,95). There are spelling errors: *diicit* (34,121, for *dicit*); *caritae* (49,28, for *caritate*); *emiciuntur* (53,162, for *emittuntur*); *crediderun* (71,133, for *crediderunt*); *timt* (73,15, for *timet*). There are about a dozen instances in which there is no space between words, a couple of errant letter 'U's, inconsistent italics, and an inconsistent editorial approach to orthography.

De Dominicis's edition of a twelfth-century commentary, perhaps composed in the Neapolitan Monastery of Sts. Severino and Sossio, occupies half of the book (pp. 81-248). The Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio Emanuele III in Naples holds the *codex unicus* of the work, shelved as ex-Vind. Lat. 15, which shares some readings with an eleventh-century Bible of the same monastery (pp. 86s).

The principal source for the Neapolitan commentary is another anonymous commentary, from the eleventh or twelfth century, for which a critical edition is available (pp. 87s). The source commentary draws from a broad range of Latin Canticle commentaries: Rufinus's translation of Origen, Justus of Urgell, Gregory the Great, Alcuin, and Haimo of Auxerre (p. 89). To these, the Neapolitan adds many others, citing Gregory the Great by name but employing Venerable Bede, Williram of Ebersberg and others without naming them (pp. 87s). Underlining in De Dominicis's edition helpfully indicates additions to and reworkings of its principal source.

The Neapolitan commentary's redactor frequently reworks the older commentary, for example, by expanding its dichotomy between the things of this world and those of heaven. Likewise, he insists on the Holy Spirit's sevenfold grace, adds remarks about the devil, and polemicizes against profane learning.

De Dominicis makes many competent interventions to make the corrupt manuscript more readable (e.g., *aeriis* [202,290]; *tenera* [234,339]; *in ea* [238,483]). One would like to see emendations of *argentums* (118,352); *er* (126,48); *innocui* (128,107, for *innotuit*); *cornonaberis* (159,241); *es* (159,243, for

est); *pulchram* (165,415, for *pulchra*); *ab renuntiatione* (167,493, for *abrenuntiationis*), *ecclesia catholicam* (193,693). The reader will quickly recognize words run together that should have a space between them, of which I counted nineteen instances. Since the edition does not indicate its source's folios, it will be difficult to compare it to the original.

The edition's biggest problem is its biblical citations. At one point, De Dominicis appropriately marks four citations in a single paragraph (112,135) but only indicates the biblical reference for the last of the four, omitting Eph 2,7, Ps 33,2, and Job 2,10. Unfortunately, these are not isolated instances. There are also direct citations that are not even marked with quotation marks (e.g., John 1,12 [127,64]; 1 John 5,16 [159,238]; Ps 1,2 [191,631]), many clear biblical allusions that go unnoticed (e.g., Ezek 23,3 [*Vetus Latina*, 120,418]; Acts 8,26-40 and Acts 10,2 [143,21]; Ps 83,8 [201,259]; Eph 2,20 [237,433]; Ps 75,2 [238,485]; 1 Cor 15,28 [239,505]; Luke 20,36 [239,509]), and one that should cite Rom 9,15 instead of that verse's biblical source, Exod 33,19 (178,240). Sometimes the verse's interpretation is in quotation marks along with the biblical text (246,716), a problem that is especially prevalent for Canticle citations, which are in italics rather than quotation marks (e.g., 141,526; 149,201; 150,254; 152,6; 176,175). The use of italics, in fact, is quite inconsistent overall.

Cecilia Ambrosini has edited a twelfth-century commentary from a *codex unicus* of the same century, held in Paris by the Institut de Recherche et d'histoire des Textes (IRHT) under shelf mark CP406 ms 31 (pp. 249-335). The commentary relies heavily on Carolingian interpreter Haimo of Auxerre and, of the three printed editions of his Canticle commentary, most closely matches the edition published within the works of St. Thomas Aquinas in Parma, v. 14, in 1863 (*Haimo T* in the apparatus; pp. 253s). Besides Haimo, the commentary borrows especially from Anselm of Laon, as well as Gregory of Elvira, Justus of Urgell, and others. Ambrosini provides a helpful overview of these sources by chapter and line (pp. 268s) but does not include them in the apparatus, forcing one constantly to flip back to the overview to ascertain while lines have been drawn from Haimo, Anselm, and the others.

For Cant 1, the edition has a main column for the text drawn from what must have originally been a glossed Bible's *glossa marginalis*, and a right-hand column in smaller type for glosses that originated as a Bible's *glossa interlinearis* (pp. 256-259). The interlinear gloss quickly tapers off and is lacking from Cant 2 on. Ambrosini presents the lemmata in small capital type and uses italics for any biblical citations in the commentary. Unfortunately, the lack of verse numbers makes it difficult to navigate the text.

Some interesting additions to Haimo's commentary include the claim that there is no literal sense for Cant 8,1a (*Quis michi det te fratrem meum suggerentem ubera matris mee?*), and reflections on the contemplative versus the active life (332,137; 334,213).

The critical apparatus shows that Ambrosini has made many competent textual interventions (e.g., 274,11; 288,148; 298,56; 299,76). Virtually every page has emendations *iuxta Haimonem T*, but there are plenty more to carry out: *boc* (312,178, *hec*); *porticum templum* (323,73, *porticu templi*); *potum* (323,84,

potus); *inde* (324,123, *unde*); *mundum* (325,145, *mun*do); *respondes* (328,32, *respondebis*); *ista* (330,79, *isti*); *pertulimus* (330,90, *pertulerim*, even though the apparatus claims that it was corrected); *et* (330,97, *ut*). *Hyroo* (282,241) should be changed to *hyroo*. The cases of many words have been corrected, but many still need intervention, such as: *percepturam* (297,23); *plenus* (299,67); *timore* (312,158); *ignorantiam* (329,68). The apparatus sometimes reads *conieci* or *supplevi* (good interventions, e.g., at 287,109; 301,123; 329,50), but these have no brackets or other marking in the text.

The biblical citations and allusions have been identified only very sporadically. Some missed citations in Cant 1–3 include: 1 Cor 13,8 (283,284); 1 John 4,19 (284,33); Cant 2,9 (287,105.107). In the case of the Cant 2,9 citation, the lack of its delimitation hinders the fluid reading of the text. Missed allusions in Cant 1–3 include: 1 John 4,19 (277,99); Gen 25,13 and 1 Chr 1,29 (277,117); Acts 8,1 (278,139); Ruth 4,13 and 4,17 (282,239); Phil 1,23 (285,45); Gen 27,28 (285,57); Gal 4,28 (285,60); Eph 4,5 (290,189); 1 Cor 13,12 (290,193); 1 Tim 2,5 (294,124); 1 Cor 9,27 (295,150); 2 Tim 1,10 (296,186). The Psalms have been cited according to the Hebrew numbering (except at 301,120), even though the text conforms to the Gallican Psalter. A verse from the Simon Magus pericope, Act 8,10, is cited for a reference to Philip and the eunuch, and Cornelius (291,27). In short, the edition needs major intervention in the identification and delimitation of biblical passages.

The orthographical principles enumerated in the introduction (p. 266) have been employed only sporadically. There is alternation between *-ti-* and *-ci-* when these are followed by a vowel (e.g., 273,57 and 279,160; 287,123 and 314,226; 293,72 and 294,101; 306,276 and 310,99). Double consonants should follow the classical norm (266), but one finds *repperimus* for the present tense (292,42) and *reperi* for the past (312,171). *Inmaculata* (308,54) fluctuates with *immaculata* (308,59) and *hinnuli* (300,87) with *hinuli* (322,48); besides *admonetur* (329,58) one finds *ammonentis* (287,116). The manuscript's *sugentem* (327,11) has been altered to *suggentem*, but its *consumatum* (327,193) has not been emended to *consummatum*.

There are a couple of stray periods (288,156; 294,123), a missing one (326,158), and words run together without a space (290,197).

Galli, De Dominicis, and Ambrosini have enriched our knowledge of medieval Canticle commentaries and their transmission. The publication of three Latin texts has laid the groundwork for studies on their content and, it is to be hoped, will serve as a stimulus for bringing more manuscripts to light. Overall, the book's three works have been edited sufficiently well to be useful, with a great deal of caution.

Kevin Zilverberg
 University of St. Thomas
 2115 Summit Avenue
 St. Paul, Minnesota 55105
 United States of America
 kjzilverberg@stthomas.edu