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clearly defined acts of solidarity that the respective parties expected from each other, including nonmilitary forms of assistance such as mediation and arbitration. At the same time, the contractual partners began to explicitly determine the person or territory they regarded as enemy (inclusive definition) or excluded from the group of potential or actual adversaries (exclusive definition). The loyalty proviso (Treworbehalt) usually referred to certain persons to whom one of the parties was already socially or politically bound, that is, to allies, seigneurs, vassals, and relatives. In order to strengthen friendship alliances, two kinds of strategies were available, an internal and an external one: first, the confirmation of the contract by an oath or by the denomination of a bailor; second, the accumulation of additional social bonds like marriage and adoption. The fourth chapter finally offers a little study in itself since it focuses on appointed mediators and arbitrators rather than the actual contractual partners and the quality of their alliance.

Garnier's study is guided by two important premises that need to be discussed in more detail. First, she convincingly emphasizes the crucial role of writing (Schriftlichkeit). The significant spread of literacy in the thirteenth century facilitated the differentiation of political friendship contracts. While oral contracts tended to be more general in content, written contracts allowed for the precise and steady determination of the relevant persons, territories, obligations, and techniques of conflict resolution. Beyond their permanence and differentiation, however, written contracts have far-reaching effects resulting from the rhetorical structure of the text. Garnier is not at all interested in the tropes and figures of speech employed by written contracts, although they also have a high political impact. Rhetorical means such as metaphors (e.g., anima una et cor unum) and antithesis (e.g., amicus amicus inimicus inimicus) provide more than adornment—they structure ways of thinking; they evoke imaginative notions supporting the idea of friendship and solidarity. Second, Garnier argues that friendship in the Middle Ages—like ancient Roman amicitia—was based on mutual profit rather than mutual affection. This presumption fails to account for the highly affective language typical of a significant number of friendship contracts. The prospect of mutual profit alone cannot sufficiently explain a language that suggests intimate personal bonds.

A comprehensive bibliography and a detailed index conclude a highly instructive and inspiring book that deserves to be read and discussed by scholars of every academic discipline interested in friendship as a phenomenon of medieval culture.

ANDREAS KRASS, Universität Konstanz


Paolo Gatti's monograph very usefully augments our understanding of two glossaries transmitted in Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS A 91, which preserves material from multiple sources, amplified by marginal annotations. The manuscript is datable to the ninth century, and following Marco Mostert's admittedly weak attribution, Gatti asserts that it may have originated at Fleury. He adds, however, that Bernhard Bischoff suggested "Francia orientale" on the basis of the hand found in the first folio. The text has four parts, first identified by Hermann Hagen in 1875: a brief Greek-Latin glossary; two fragments of glossaries, edited by Gatti; and the beginning of the "Absida" glossary. Gatti describes prior editions and studies of the manuscript and its sources, especially those by Gustav Loew (1876) and Georg Goetz (1923). He expends considerable effort in detailing the sources of the glosses in a fine and convenient summary. Finally, Gatti concludes that, partly because one source was the Liber glossarum (produced at Corbie under Abbot Adalhard, ca. 780–826),
the Bern compilation was likely produced between the end of the ninth century and the end of the tenth.

Gatti’s text is good. He authoritatively conveys the Greek terms underlying corrupt Latin transcriptions, and when he is stymied, his interventions are mostly judicious. He notes orthographic peculiarities of representative pronunciation, such as 1.173 Sicofantâ (Sicofanta) and 1.129 Astera (astra). A few infelicities occasionally appear, such as 1.133 Philo xenia for Philoxenia, alongside the hypercorrection (2.70) fîli(ûs) for fili, which corresponds to the genitival lemma pignoris. Sometimes the reconstructed gloss does not seem to fit the context, such as 2.17 Contubernium: (con)vî(c)tus. Gatti seems not to have grasped 1.145 †Crisippus: index, where the lemma transliterates the Greek name Chryssippus. Whether the Stoic rhetorician is intended I cannot say, but “judge” might describe the function of anyone with this name. Another obscurity can be resolved in 1.4 †Ancimenâ: figura and 1.147 †antimena: figura. While Gatti proposes antinomia or antonomasia, enthymema is undoubtedly intended. A perfectly useful Modern English term, enthymeme denotes “a rhetorical argument” (OED), in other words, a rhetorical figura. The reading †Scileus: milius at 2.134 is rather more obscure, but scileus disguises Scillaeus, “pertaining to Scylla,” whom we know to have been turned into a seabird of some sort, a milius or “kite” according to the gloss. As Gatti observes, saltria in 1.164 Saltria: milier, dicta a saltando is in error for psaltria, “luteist, literally psaltery player,” but he might have added that psaltria was confused with saltatrix, “belly dancer.” Gloss 1.230 Sedesto: fice consencio looks like Sed esto: ecce consentio, and like the preceding dignor te: illare [sic] dicimus might have been lifted from a dialogue such as those found in the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana. Finally, I am inclined to keep 1.197 Lutaeum: splendidum rather than emend lutaeum to lucens. The orthography is reasonable: luteum can mean “golden,” “yellow” or “glowing,” and splendidum is an acceptable contextual rendering. A few other similar problems of interpretation crop up now and again, but Gatti does contribute many ingenious, and obviously correct, emendations.

Gatti has provided generous cross-references to other glossaries in an extensive and intelligent apparatus fontium. He has drawn parallels from innumerable sources, without suggesting, however, any single path of dissemination. Making sense of the relationships in the sources would challenge anyone interested in the transmission of learning in the period. At least one rarity occurs first in the works of Aldhelm of Malmesbury (d. 709): the interjection puppup (1.40) derives from the acrostic preface to his Carmen de virginitate, whence Hrabanus Maurus found it useful in his own acrostic De laudibus sanctae crucis. Ultimately, tracing the sources in the Bern glossaries may not be too taxing. Alphabeticization reveals that Gatti’s second glossary has at least two components, a section of glossae collectae combined with one in partial a-order for the letters R, S, T, and U. The glossae collectae almost certainly occur in batches, one of which is 2.100–107: 100 Sulfultus: instructus, munitus; 101 Inmensum: magnum; 102 Formidandum: timendum; 103 Tiro: iuvenis indoctus; 104 Lintrus: parva navis; 105 Naufragium: periculum; 106 Sollertia: industria, acumen; and 107 Tandum: aliquando. One could hypothesize a source in which a novice (tiro), aided by (sulfultus) God, overcame immense (inmensum) and frightening (timendum) rocks in his skiff (linter), averting shipwreck (naufragium) by his wits (sollertia) and at last (tandum) reaching the shore. Searching the Patrologia Latina database for these collocations could disclose a source.

Although a generalist would find it imposing, this little book has much to offer the specialist. For those interested in medieval Latin philology, Gatti’s book should be indispensable: the first glossary in particular transmits memorably obscure words—like auxesin and tuccetae—and even a few hapax legomena.

SCOTT GWARA, University of South Carolina