Medieval Academy of America

Anonymi professoris epistulae by Athanasios Markopoulos
Review by: Alexander Alexakis
Speculum, Vol. 78, No. 3 (Jul., 2003), pp. 952-954
Published by: Medieval Academy of America
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/20060851
Accessed: 15/05/2012 05:46

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

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.

Medieval Academy of America is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Speculum.*

STOR®
http://www.jstor.org

more fantastic interpretations provided for the iconography (interpretations that want to find an esoteric wisdom guarded by the counts and their Cathar subjects). The analysis would have been enriched, nevertheless, had Macé compared the seals of the counts with seals of their contemporary Occitan lords. The seals (indeed the rule) of Count Alfonse (the Capetian prince who inherited the county of Toulouse via marriage to Raymond VII's daughter, Jeanne) could also have been introduced for comparison. A similar, though less common, concern is that Macé occasionally builds arguments without reference to sources. A section on the growing consciousness of ancestry among the Raymondine counts, for example, goes some way before a brief passage (described as "brillante") is taken from the troubadour Peire Cardenal.

The uneven acceptance of the value of the sources is a graver concern, for it sometimes provides a distorted view of the counts, even when a more balanced perspective might be available. Macé often discounts authors who challenged his counts, especially clerics who supported the Albigensian Crusade against Raymond VI, while he accepts at face value descriptions from supporters, especially troubadours. One example of many: Peter des Vaux-de-Cernay is dismissed as providing a portrait of Raymond VI within "un context quelque peu burlesque," whereas in the same paragraph the anonymous Occitan continuator of the *Chanson de la croisade albigeois* is credited for illustrating (again) "brillamment" Raymond's early responses to the crusaders (p. 171). The political loyalties of the two authors are not questioned, even though the vision of the *Chanson* challenges Macé's own conclusions.

Macé's book is built upon his doctoral work at the University of Toulouse and has remained, I think, somewhat too close to its subjects. Even as the work endeavors to contextualize the wavering powers of the counts of Toulouse, Macé gives the counts every benefit of the doubt. A veritable apologia is presented to explain the presence of known heretics and their sympathizers in the entourage of Raymond VI. Raymond, Macé continues, was a good Christian, unfairly punished by Gregorian reformers generally and Pope Innocent III specifically. Macé's judgment of Raymond VI's affiliation is surely correct, yet Innocent's challenges were based on Raymond's tolerance of—not participation in—Cathar activities. Initially, indeed, the pope wanted Raymond to impose greater authority over the region to stem the growth of Catharism. Thus Raymond had plenty of warning about the mounting pressures against him before the launch of the Albigensian Crusade in 1209, but he still failed to establish the control that he wanted, and in fact that the pope wanted him to have. To be fair, Macé concludes his study with a recognition that although the crusade and the Treaty of Paris (1229) ending it destroyed any hope that Raymond's son, Raymond VII, would rule the whole, the treaty gave him the opportunity to rule better the part that remained in his possession (Toulouse).

These points are more challenges to, than complaints about, the book. Macé has done a good job of outlining the dynastic and religious dynamics at play in Occitania before the Albigensian Crusade. He has also drawn from as broad a source base as probably can be had for the "dynastie Raymondine" to present the social, marital, religious, and iconographic environment within which the counts of Toulouse and Saint-Gilles sought to exercise their powers—and in which others sought to check their powers.

CHRISTOPHER GARDNER, University of Nebraska, Omaha

ATHANASIOS MARKOPOULOS, ed., *Anonymi professoris epistulae.* (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 37; Series Berolinensis.) Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2000. Pp. ix, 74*, 168; 2 black-and-white plates.

Byzantine epistolography is a rather well tended field, and most of the existing Byzantine *epistoliers* have been edited and studied by such preeminent Byzantinists as J. Darrouzès,

C. Mango, A.-M. Talbot, G. Fatouros, and many others. Very few collections still remain unedited or understudied. One of the most significant among them is that of the anonymous professor that dates back to the tenth century.

Despite its great significance, evidenced by the fact that scholars such as P. Lemerle, C. Mango, and P. Speck used the letters for their own research, consulting either the only manuscript that preserves them (London, British Library, Add. 36749) or the partial editions by R. Browning, B. Laourdas, and Browning-Laourdas, no complete edition was available up to now. Therefore the publication of these 122 letters is a much-anticipated addition to the corpus of Byzantine epistolography.

As is obvious from the title of the book, the letters were penned by an anonymous professor, whom internal evidence places in Constantinople during the first half of the tenth century, his possible life span covering the period 870–ca. 945. This professor lived during one of the most active periods in Byzantine intellectual life, but he is not one of those bright writers who signed, for example, the historiographical works of the period of Constantine Porphyrogenitus or any of the literary products of that period. At best, he might have educated some of those authors. If not, he certainly taught many of the young (and spoiled) scions of noble families who eventually manned the administrative machine of Byzantium. Still, the letters themselves, despite their extremely difficult and convoluted vocabulary and syntax, bear witness not only to the condition of tenth-century secondary education in Constantinople (and in the Byzantine Empire, wherever available) but also to a number of interesting aspects of Byzantine daily and social life. From the names and titles of his addressees, it seems that the anonymous author was well connected: five of his letters are addressed to the patriarch of Constantinople and numerous others to metropolitans, bishops, monks, or officials of the state and courtiers. Many touch upon the minutiae of his profession and constitute a valuable source for the secondary curriculum and for what it was like being a teacher or a student at that time: the anonymous professor had to address the complaints of parents who did not approve of his pedagogic methods; beg for his salary, which was not regularly paid, if paid at all; ward off the attempts of other teachers to steal his students; and defend himself from the slandering campaign of an enemy, which led to considerable loss of students to another teacher. Besides this, the letters allow one to deduce the nature of the secondary curriculum in the Byzantine schools (it basically consisted of teaching grammar, poetry, and rhetoric). The letters also help us make some valid hypotheses concerning the methods of instruction and the internal organization of schools. All these details should suffice to give an idea of the significance of the letters themselves.

The present edition follows the standard format of similar projects. The introduction reviews the information we have about the author of the letters and his work and provides a technical discussion of the unique manuscript that preserves the corpus of the letters, complemented by a review of the existing editions and translations of the letters and a few words about the principles of the edition. The major part of the introduction includes summaries (at times lengthy) of the letters. The critical edition is supplemented by indexes "nominum propriorum," "verborum ad res Byzantinas spectantium," "Graecitatis," "verborum memorabilium," "locorum" and a list of the addressees of the letters.

Concerning the letters proper, it is my opinion that they can easily be placed among the most difficult Byzantine texts that have survived. The anonymous author seems to have consciously strived to obfuscate his thought by using a combination of rare words, long sentences, and convoluted syntax. His predilection for figures of speech such as hyperbaton, litotes, and metaphor, instead of clarifying, makes the deciphering of his ideas more difficult. Modern scholars have evaluated the anonymous professor as a cantankerous character whose dysfunctional personality is reflected in his writing style. The letters do not give anyone the impression of a welcoming "discussion with an absent friend" but simply showcase the author's narcissistic predilection for listening to his own voice. The editor has tackled the extreme difficulties of the Greek text (intensified by the fact that there is only one manuscript) with great competence, and the result is one of the major feats of modern Byzantine philology and textual criticism. That said, I have also to stress the fact that the difficulties presented by the Greek text are such that some of the editorial choices made by Markopoulos may remain points of debate in the years to come. In that connection I take the opportunity to stress here that it is my strong conviction—the result of my work on critical editions of Byzantine texts—that a full translation of every edited text is necessary, I dare say mandatory, in order to test and verify all editorial choices in a critical edition. Beyond its general application, this suggestion is also an indication of the need for a translation of this particular work into some modern language. Concomitant to this is my further suggestion that prestigious publishers such as Walter de Gruyter and the Corpus Christianorum (Latin and Greek) series abandon their current policy of publishing critical editions only, without translations.

To turn back to the book under review, I feel compelled to add my own contribution to a minor point: On pages 30*–31* Markopoulos discusses the suggestion of J. Koder concerning the meaning of the words οἰκουμενικὴ συμφορὰ (universal disaster), found in Letter 26, line 18. Markopoulos, following Browning, has identified this as a reference to the Byzantine defeat by the Bulgarians at Anchialos in 917. Koder, on the other hand, suggested that these words might refer to a climatic event. Koder's suggestion is further supported by a passage from the homily *In sanctos Petrum et Heliam* of John Chrysostom (PG 50:730, lines 30–37). Therein Chrysostom employs the same words to describe the drought brought about in Israel by the prophet Elijah (3 Kings 17). Therefore the possibility that these words allude to the severe winter of 927/28 is strong, and Markopoulos gives it due consideration at the end of his *Nachtrag* (p. 31*).

The present edition of the letters of the anonymous professor is a worthy addition to the great series Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae and fills a long-existing need for their publication in the best possible way.

ALEXANDER ALEXAKIS, Richard Stockton College of New Jersey

MICHAEL MATZKE, *Daibert von Pisa: Zwischen Pisa, Papst und erstem Kreuzzug.* (Vorträge und Forschungen, Sonderband 44.) Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke, 1998. Paper. Pp. 255; 2 maps.

The career of Daibert, bishop (1088) and archbishop (1092) of Pisa and first Latin patriarch of Jerusalem (1099), is one of the most controversial in the history of the medieval church. Historians of Italy have generally made positive evaluations of his role in the development of the city of Pisa and of the reform papacy, while tending to lose interest in him after his departure from Italy in the aftermath of the First Crusade. By contrast, Daibert is usually regarded by historians of the crusades and the Latin East as a deus ex machina whose political ambitions and opportunism threatened to destroy the fragile security of the nascent Latin kingdom of Jerusalem; to such views, his deposition from the patriarchate in 1102 at the instigation of Baldwin I of Jerusalem—an unreconstructed pre-Gregorian king if ever there was one—was a justified end to a policy of ill-judged theocratic aggrandizement. There has long been a great need for a full-length critical investigation that would do justice to Daibert's career as a whole, and this has now been met with the publication of an excellent study by Michael Matzke, which is solidly grounded in the sources and historiography of both eleventh-century Tuscany and the beginnings of the crusading movement. Daibert's periods as (arch)bishop of Pisa and patriarch of Jerusalem are treated in around one hundred pages each, while a central section of around fifty pages deals with the First Crusade and the Pisan expedition of 1098/99 and includes two excursuses on the