

Citation style

Coulson, Frank T.: Rezension über: Marjorie Curry Woods, Weeping for Dido. The Classics in the Medieval Classroom, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019, in: *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch*, 55 (2020), 2, S. 360-362, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36191/mjb/2020-55-2-19>, heruntergeladen über Website



copyright

This article may be downloaded and/or used within the private copying exemption. Any further use without permission of the rights owner shall be subject to legal licences (§§ 44a-63a UrhG / German Copyright Act).

ist für überliefertes *actores/actoribus* zwingend *auctores/auctoribus* zu konjizieren, l. 29 *usi* für *ubi*, falls hier nicht bloße Tippfehler vorliegen. Als störend habe ich empfunden, dass zwei wichtige und im Hauptteil immer wieder herangezogene Texte über Annotationssymbole, nämlich Kapitel 1, 21 von Isidors *Etymologiae* (*De notis sententiarum*) sowie die Einleitung zu Cassiodors Psalmenkommentar, nicht in den Editionsteil aufgenommen wurden.

An Tippfehlern ist mir aufgefallen 91 »Liber Arts«, 115 »textaul«, 203 »antiambda«; 240, nr. 13, l. 6 ›volunataate‹; 292 ›20‹ statt ›2°‹ (zweimal bei Erfurter Handschriften). In der Tabelle S. 224 wird unter 3ad) auf das Stichwort ›snake‹ verwiesen, aber im Register fehlt der entsprechende Eintrag (220). Der kritische Apparat auf S. 238 erscheint am rechten Rand abgeschnitten.

Die geäußerte Detailkritik soll nicht den Blick auf die Qualität von St.s Buch als Ganzes verstellen. Es gründet auf jahrelangem, genauem Studium eines beachtlichen Korpus an Handschriften, bietet eine Fülle an wertvollen Informationen und stellt einen willkommenen Überblick über ein in seiner Gesamtheit bisher zu wenig beachtetes Phänomen antiker und frühmittelalterlicher Textkultur dar. Somit wird es sowohl als Nachschlage- und Referenzwerk von Nutzen sein als auch – so darf man hoffen – Anstoß geben zu weiteren Forschungen auf unterschiedlichen Themengebieten, welche mit der Handschriftenannotation in Verbindung stehen.

Lukas J. Dorfbauer

Marjorie Curry Woods, *Weeping for Dido: The Classics in the Medieval Classroom* (E. H. Gombrich lecture series), Princeton 2019 (Princeton University Press), XXI + 176 S.

In her splendid new monograph, ›Weeping for Dido‹, Marjorie Curry Woods again demonstrates that she is one of the leading scholars in the field of medieval Latin commentaries on classical texts. The book is engagingly written, well-researched and thoroughly documented, and free of unnecessary verbiage and jargon. All the Latin has been scrupulously translated into English, rendering the book accessible to a much wider audience. As a scholar who has engaged with the primary evidence, I would like to stress in the opening to this review that W. is a supremely competent palaeographer, showing mastery over a wide range of quite difficult hands and scripts (from Gothic textualis to crabbed, virtually illegible cursive). I checked her transcriptions against the plates provided and could find only one transcription error, a very high rate of accuracy. Lurking behind the 152 pages of mellifluous prose is no doubt a trove of binders holding transcriptions of otherwise unexamined manuscripts and representing thousands of hours of work in libraries. ›Weeping for Dido‹ brings to the fore a rich collection of texts on canonical classical authors (Vir-

gil and Statius), as well as a less well-known text of the late antique period (the *Ilias latina*). It will undoubtedly become the volume of choice for all those seeking a high level of manuscript scholarship coupled with sophisticated literary criticism.

The book is divided into three chapters. Chapters One and Two examine Latin school commentaries from the High Middle Ages on Virgil's *Aeneid*, Statius's *Achilleid* and the *Ilias latina*. In chapter Three, W. investigates how the glosses on the *Aeneid* and the *Ilias latina* may reflect performative aspects of the poems within the medieval classroom, particularly as boys took on the persona of Dido or of Achilles disguised as a girl. The chapter concludes with a brief analysis of poems in the *Carmina Burana* that treat Dido. W.'s discussion of the CB texts is all the more welcome given the recent appearance of the *Dumbarton Oaks Library* volume on the collection, edited and translated by John Trail. The three individual chapters are neatly and tightly interconnected, as all texts engage with such questions as sexuality, gender and the female voice.

In chapter One, W. details commentaries written on Book 4 of the *Aeneid*. The discussion is quite far-ranging, referencing manuscripts from the eleventh to the fifteenth century from France, Italy and Germany. Berlin, SBB-PK, Hamilton 678, a thirteenth-century manuscript of Italian origin with glosses added in a later fifteenth-century hand, is singled out for more detailed analysis.

Chapter Two looks at the school tradition on Statius's *Achilleid* and the *Ilias latina* (an abbreviation in Latin of Homer's *Iliad* attributed to Publius Baebius Italicus). Both texts gained immense popularity during the Middle Ages and were widely read and commented upon. W.'s treatment of the school tradition on the *Ilias latina* is, to my knowledge, a first and thus all the more welcome.

Chapter Three revisits and expands upon the commentary texts presented in chapters One and Two. It begins with a discussion of a poem by Marbod of Rennes in which an anonymous boy adopts the persona of a young woman who performs a lament for her dead lover and segues into a broader discussion of boys performing women. Herein, W. moves from a more concrete, objective analysis of the commentaries to develop more speculative arguments about gender and sexuality and how they relate to more performative aspects of the poetry. Her discussion encompasses texts on rhetorical theory, medieval Latin comedies, and poetic collections of the twelfth century. No doubt, this chapter will be of most interest to the more general reader and scholar interested in theoretical questions.

Princeton University Press is to be praised for the engaging and pleasing appearance of the printed volume. One of the difficulties for those of us who work on commentaries in manuscript is the *mise-en-page*. While the relationship of the commentary text to primary text may be perfectly clear in the man-

uscript copy, it often proves to be much more difficult to reproduce that readability in a modern edition. W. and the copy-editor at Princeton have worked hard (and successfully) to steer the modern reader through the manuscript layout. Further, W. has insisted on giving primacy to the Latin commentary text in English translation, relegating the Latin text to a footnote at the bottom of the page. I can see the advantages to such a layout, particularly since the audience for this volume will undoubtedly include scholars of vernacular languages and pedagogy.

Are there any quibbles one might make about such a well-produced and engaging little volume? Only perhaps that sometimes the reader might have liked a little more detail about specific commentaries, as for example in chapter One on Virgil commentaries where more extensive discussion is in the main limited to the commentary found in Berlin, SBB-PK, Hamilton 678.

In sum, this is a fine book. All those interested in classical reception should hasten to read it. The volume wears its vast erudition lightly, and the author is to be praised for her commitment to engage an audience of diverse backgrounds. It is just the sort of book I wish I had written.

Frank T. Coulson