

EVPHROSYNE

EVPHROSYNE

VOLUME 49

Director

Maria Cristina Pimentel

Editorial Board

Aires A. Nascimento (Universidade de Lisboa)

Ana Maria Lóio (Universidade de Lisboa)

Ana María Tarrío (Universidade de Lisboa)

Arnaldo do Espírito Santo (Universidade de Lisboa)

Bernardo Mota (Universidade de Lisboa)

Carmen Codoñer (Universidad de Salamanca)

Emílio Suárez de la Torre (Universitat Pompeu Fabra)

José Manuel Díaz de Bustamante (Universidad de Santiago de Compostela)

José Pedro Serra (Universidade de Lisboa)

Manuel Alexandre Júnior (Universidade de Lisboa)

Paolo Chiesa (Università degli Studi di Milano)

Paolo Fedeli (Università degli Studi di Bari 'Aldo Moro')

Rodrigo Furtado (Universidade de Lisboa)

Thomas Earle (University of Oxford)

Vanda Anastácio (Universidade de Lisboa)

Victoria Emma Pagán (University of Florida)

Support Staff

Ana Matafome

Ana Carolina Caeiro

CENTRO DE ESTUDOS CLÁSSICOS
FACULDADE DE LETRAS DA UNIVERSIDADE DE LISBOA

EVPHROSYNE

JOURNAL FOR CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

NEW SERIES – VOLUME 49

BREPOLS

MMXXI

FCT Fundação
para a Ciência
e a Tecnologia

*This work is financed with national funds through FCT
(Foundation for Science and Technology), through the project
UIDB/00019/2020.*

This is an open access publication made available under a
cc by-nc 4.0
International License: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0>.

© 2022, Brepols Publishers n.v., Turnhout, Belgium.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be
reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any
form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying,
recording, or otherwise without the prior permission of the
publisher.

D/2022/0095/168
ISBN 978-2-503-59276-3
DOI 10.1484/J.EUPHR.5.128792

ISSN 0870-0133
eISSN 2736-3082

Printed in the EU on acid-free paper.

Editing Hispanic Passionaries

Passionarium Hispanicum saeculi X, cura et studio
Valeriano Yarza Urquiola, Turnhout, Brepols, 2020
(*Corpus Christianorum Series Latina*, 171). 1005 pp.
ISBN 978-2-503-58876-6

Passionarium Hispanicum saeculi XI, cura et studio
Valeriano Yarza Urquiola, Turnhout, Brepols, 2020
(*Corpus Christianorum Series Latina*, 171A). 542 pp.
ISBN 978-2-503-59108-7

In 1953, Àngel Fàbrega Grau published the first volume of his *Pasionario Hispánico*. The second came two years later. The book originated from his PhD thesis, which was awarded the Premio Francisco Franco (Letras) of 1950. His purpose was to make available the text of what he called “the *pasionario hispánico*” and to study its evolution from its beginnings to the eleventh century. At the time, it was a groundbreaking edition, comprising a transcription of an outstanding mid-tenth-century passionary of San Pedro de Cardeña, Burgos (today London, add. 25600), and a pioneering study of the manuscripts, the origins and history of each text, and the cult of the saints contained in the tenth- and the eleventh-century manuscripts considered. For the first time, most of the *passiones* circulating in northern Spain in the tenth century were available, accompanied by an illuminating study. For the meaning and scope of Fàbrega Grau’s achievement at the time, see Fernand Peloux, *Le légendier de Moissac* (2018, pp. 133-140).

Soon, however, the limitations of Fàbrega Grau’s work became clear. Baudouin de Gaiffier wrote a couple of articles discussing a few controversial points (*Analecta Bollandiana*, 72, 1954, 134-166 and 378-396), and Guy Philippart later noted in 1977 that the great effort required to produce the edition was unfortunately in inverse proportion to the little benefit it offered (*Les Légendiers latins et autres manuscrits hagiographiques*, p. 130). The conceptual framework of the edition was controversial. As Fàbrega Grau explained in his Introduction (pp. 12-15), his purpose was to publish “el *pasionario de la liturgia hispana*”, the *pasionario hispánico*. *Pasionario* – in the

P. F. Alberto • Centro de Estudos Clássicos da Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Lisboa, palberto@campus.ul.pt

This is an open access article made available under a [CC BY-NC 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

Euphrosyne, 49 (2021), pp. 383-396

© BREPOLIS PUBLISHERS

DOI 10.1484/J.EUPHR.5.128815

Hispanic hagiographical-liturgical context, he stressed – he defined as “un libro esencialmente litúrgico [...] destinado a contener las Actas o Pasiones de mártires que se leían en la ocurrencia de su aniversario dentro del Oficio nocturno, o alguna vez dentro de la misa, dispuestas [...] por orden cronológico de su conmemoración anual dentro del calendario litúrgico” (p. 12). And so we have the text of London, add. 25600. *Hispánico* stands for all the passions contained in the selected manuscripts independently of the provenance of the martyrs or their cult. From these perspectives, some questions arose. Did one single uniform passionary (that is to say, one single collection) ever exist, uniformly used throughout the Iberian Peninsula in the tenth century? Is add. 25600 the “Hispanic passionary”? Does it fully represent all other exemplars of that time in Spain? What about the other tenth-century passionary from the same region (Paris nal 2180 and a few sections of Madrid 494), which contains all the texts in add. 25600, plus eleven more? Why use other contemporary Hispanic passionaries in the *apparatus criticus* only when the texts are Hispanic? Many other questions could be asked.

Pilar Riesco Chueca’s *Pasionario Hispánico* was published in 1995. This was also an important achievement. Her approach was very different from that of Fàbrega Grau. The book contains twenty-five *passiones*, exclusively of Hispanic martyrs and saints, not the whole liturgical year, as in Fàbrega Grau. Also, it is a critical edition. To establish the text, Riesco Chueca used all the Hispanic manuscripts available. Her Introduction comprises a brief description of these manuscripts and a detailed study of the linguistic features of the corpus. Naturally, Riesco Chueca’s approach was not free from criticism either – why use only Hispanic manuscripts, when some of the texts have an earlier manuscript transmission? And how meaningful is a global linguistic study of a corpus consisting of pieces produced in various periods and environments, transmitted over centuries? However, Riesco Chueca’s edition is fairly reliable and a clear improvement on Fàbrega Grau’s as far as concerns the common texts.

A few months ago, Brepols published the impressive *Passionarium Hispanicum* by Valeriano Yarza Urquiola in the *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina*. Yarza Urquiola had previously published other texts of considerable length in the same series, such as the works of Ildefonsus of Toledo (CCSL 114A). It is presented as “estudio y edición crítica de los relatos hagiográficos, de autor anónimo, de mártires cristianos de diferentes países agrupados en la colección llamada *Pasionario Hispánico*, formada en la Hispania de los siglos X y XI en los monasterios, principalmente, de Cardeña y Silos”. I must say that it is an admirable endeavour for both the magnitude of the textual corpus and the complexity of the questions it raises. This edition certainly involved a considerable amount of work and dedication, and deserves to be examined carefully. My comments on the following pages, mostly focusing on conceptual and methodological approaches, aim to offer a key to reading Yarza Urquiola’s edition, and to contribute to a better understanding of the problems raised by these remarkable hagiographical assemblages of texts.

The Introduction to the text runs to 350 pages. First, Yarza Urquiola defines the term *pasionario hispánico* and the purpose of his edition (pp. 6-7). This is an important point, as we have seen. He explicitly accepts Fàbrega Grau’s designation,

since, as he says, it embraces the Roman, Visigothic, and Mozarabic periods, and also because it includes the *passiones* of all martyrs and saints found in the tenth- and eleventh-century manuscripts “sea cual sea el país de origen de los mártires”. Yarza Urquiola used all the extant Hispanic passionaries of the tenth and eleventh centuries, and three from the thirteenth (not only one, as in Fàbrega Grau). But the same questions remain. What is the editor reconstructing? Is it a “pasionario hispánico” or *the* “pasionário hispánico”? How can we prove that the text of the present edition was the hagiographical collection used throughout the Iberian area, if we only have (a few) manuscripts from one particular territory, to the south of Burgos and the surrounding regions? Perhaps it would be more accurate simply to say that the corpus of *passiones* in the present edition represents the territory of the Kingdom of León, namely the county of Castile and nearby regions, and to name it accordingly. *Hispánico* is rather misleading to the average reader.

Chapter 3 is entitled “Historia del *Passionarium Hispanicum*” (pp. 11-13). It consists of two and a half pages with considerations on the manuscripts used in the edition. Certainly, this is a deliberate choice, and perhaps understandable in such a huge work (1547 pages!). But it is a pity that we are not given the editor’s view on many interesting issues related to the history of the hagiographical corpus he has edited. A good starting point for this study could have been the remarkable synthesis by Guy Philippart in Monique Gouillet’s *Le légendier de Turin* (2014, pp. 7-74), which outlines the evolution of this sort of hagiographical collection from the earliest period to the ninth century, and elaborates on the role that an early Hispanic passionary may have played in the historical evolution of the passionaries. In fact, an Hispanic passionary must have circulated in eighth-century Burgundy, evidence of which can be seen in the *Anonymous of Lyons* (already noted by Henri Quentin in *Les martyrologes historiques*, 1908, p. 144; see Fernand Peloux, “Lyon au temps d’Agobard, réceptacle hispanique et laboratoire hagiographique”, in *Lyon dans l’Europe carolingienne*, 2019, pp. 79-86). Yarza Urquiola’s ideas about its potential relation to a passionary which circulated a couple of centuries later in the Aquitaine region, which was perhaps one of the models of the legendary of Saint-Pierre de Moissac (Paris lat. 5304 + lat. 17002), as François Dolbeau remarked (“Naissance des homéliers et des passionnaires”, 2008, p. 31; Fernand Peloux, *Le légendier de Moissac*, 2018, pp. 140-146), would be very welcome.

In the following 300 or so pages, Yarza Urquiola presents very briefly an approach to each of the texts in the present edition, with a summary of the contents. The editor divided the corpus into two chapters (4 and 5): “*Pasionario Hispánico del s. X*” and “*Pasionario Hispánico del s. XI*”. This had already been Fàbrega Grau’s choice, whose criterion had been the following: every text found in a passionary of the tenth century (in Fàbrega’s case, only in add. 25600) belongs to the tenth-century group; all remaining texts found in the passionaries of the eleventh century, and not in those of the tenth (in the strict sense given by Fàbrega Grau), are considered to belong to the eleventh-century group. Obviously, this approach is problematic. We are dealing with a small body of manuscripts. If a *passio* or *vita* in one of the few eleventh-century manuscripts is not in either of the two tenth-century manuscripts (London, add.

25600 and Paris nal 2180 plus a few sections of Madrid 494), this does not necessarily mean that it did not exist in Spain in the tenth century, and specifically in the Leonese kingdom. I give one practical example. The *Vita Castissimae* (BHL 1640) is a version of the *Vita Euphrosynae* (BHL 2722) (Baudouin de Gaiffier, “Le doublets en hagiographie latine”, *Analecta Bollandiana*, 96, 1978, 264; already in Hippolyte Delehaye, *Les légendes hagiographiques*, 1906², p. 116). This redaction originated from Burgundy: the earliest witness is the famous Montpellier, Bibliothèque Interuniversitaire, Bibliothèque universitaire Historique de Médecine, H 55, a passionary produced, according to Martin Heinzemann, for a female monastic community in Troyes (“Ein karolingisches Legendar vom Beginn des 9. Jahrhunderts”, 2016, pp. 218-219). Yarza Urquiola considers it to belong to the *passiones* of the eleventh century. But the best Hispanic witnesses of it are two tenth-century manuscripts (El Escorial a-II-9; Paris nal 2178). This textual version is precisely the version that we find in El Escorial b-I-4, s. XI *in.*, and Toledo 44-11, s. XIII. Of course, we could say that the text existed in the tenth century (in legendaries), but only *entered* the “pasionario hispánico” in the eleventh century. I do not see the relevance of such a subtle, and impractical, distinction. The fact is that the text existed and circulated in the region of Burgos in the tenth century, and it is the very same version that we find in the eleventh-century passionaries. In any case, some words of explanation should have been given to the reader.

The exposition in chapters 4 and 5 is arranged by the saints’ origin: Spain, Rome, Italy, Gaul, Germany, Africa, the East. (Incidentally, it is quite challenging to find the section concerning a particular martyr: the short sections are divided by region, not in accordance with the initial numbering of the texts on pages 14-15 and 146-148; also a hagiographical index would be helpful). This had already been Fàbrega Grau’s approach, and similar arrangements have been used by many other scholars. It is an acceptable solution, and in many contexts is the best option. But in a corpus of this nature, I dare suggest a different way. What does the region of the saint’s origin, that is to say, the place of their martyrdom, mean to the users of these passionaries? Was it a distinctive category in the minds of the people? On the other hand, in many cases, the location of the martyrdom has nothing to do with the origins of the cult (i.e., the centre from which a particular cult irradiated). For instance, Saint Adrian and Saint Natalia are classified in the “Eastern group”. True, they were martyred in Nicomedia and venerated in Byzantium. But the cult arrived in Visigothic Spain from Rome, not long after it flourished in the time of Pope Honorius I, as occurred across Western Christendom. The same could be said for Saint Juliana and many others. My alternative suggestion would be to adopt the medieval approach, that is, the sort of arrangement recognised by every Christian in their daily use of collections of this kind: *per anni circulum*. The saints of January, the saints of February...

The introduction of each text is extremely brief, and mainly corresponds to a summary of its content. This is quite disappointing. One would expect to find more information about the history of the cult and the history of the text of each particular saint, and an updated bibliography. Many illuminating studies have been produced since Fàbrega Grau’s study, namely on cults irradiating from Italy, Gaul, Germany,

and the East. For a number of texts we now have reliable critical editions which could have been consulted in the preparation of the present work, or at least indicated to the reader who wishes to go deeper into the study of these texts. I refrain from giving examples, so many occur to me at this moment.

Many points inspire interesting discussions. One example. How can we be sure that in early medieval Spain the feast day of Castissima was 15 September, that is, the day of Euphrosyne? None of the four manuscripts used by Yarza Urquiola indicates the day. In both El Escorial b-I-4 and Toledo 44-11, the *Life* is the last piece, with no indication of the day. No tenth- or eleventh-century Hispanic calendar mentions the feast, and no other evidence exists. The *BHL* prudently omitted the date. A word of explanation could elucidate the matter for the reader.

In Chapter 6, Yarza Urquiola deals with a few texts contained in Tui, Archivo Capitular e Histórico Diocesano, MS 1, that are absent from the manuscripts in the preceding chapters. These are: *Inuentio sancti Stephani* (fols. 216v-218v), *Passio Speusippi, Eleusippi et Meleusippi* (fols. 128v-132v), *Passio Marii et Marthae* (fols. 145r-147v), *Passio Ignatii Antiochensis* (fols. 164r-167v), and *Passio Blasii* (fols. 167v-170r). The manuscript dates to the late twelfth century. Now, in a study of the legendary of Alcobaça, François Dolbeau explained that the contents of the manuscript in Tui correspond to two parts of different provenance (“Le légendier d’Alcobaça”, *Analecta Bollandiana*, 1984, pp. 272-274). The first part, fols. 19r-175r (presently, fol. 19 is the first), corresponds to the first tome of a legendary compiled in Clairvaux sometime before c. 1170, possibly in the second quarter of the twelfth century, covering the calendar from 25 December to 6 February. Together with Alcobaça and the lost legendary of Longpont (see F. Dolbeau, “Notes sur la genèse et sur la diffusion du *Liber de natalitiis*”, *RHT*, 1976), they all descend from the same ancestor. Therefore, at least four of the five texts have nothing to do with the tenth and eleventh-century passionaries studied in the present edition, all of them predating the introduction of the Gregorian reform. This being the case, they cannot be seen as pieces of the “pasionario hispánico” in the sense meant by Fàbrega Grau and Yarza Urquiola, since they could only have been imported into Spain after the second quarter of the twelfth century. Also, the first text, the *Inuentio sancti Stephani*, is absent from all other passionaries of the present edition: how can we say that it belonged to the tenth- and eleventh-century hagiographical collection called “pasionario hispánico”, if it is absent from all witnesses? In fact, these five texts should not have been included at all. The explanation for such a puzzling case comes on p. 334: the editor admits that he only examined the five texts mentioned above, nothing more. This also explains the vague and inaccurate considerations on pp. 331-332.

In Chapter 7 (“La tradición manuscrita del *Passionarium Hispanicum*”), Yarza Urquiola presents the manuscripts and the relationships between them. The descriptions of each witness are extremely synthetic. The sequence of notes on each manuscript is arranged alphabetically by the name of the city where the manuscript is kept today. This does not match the initial list on p. 291 (the manuscripts are listed *per siglum*), and no explanation is given to the reader. An index of manuscripts would also be very useful to find the section on a particular manuscript.

For some manuscripts, we would expect to have some discussion about the date, origins, and history. For instance, I was very curious about the copyists of London add. 25600, Manchester, John Rylands Library, lat. 89, and Madrid BRAH 76: is it really the same Endura in all of them? Díaz y Díaz had suggested that it is indeed, but I wonder whether further studies have confirmed this possibility. The origin of Paris nal 2180 deserves attention. Yarza Urquiola says: “su procedencia de otro lugar, que se identifica sin muchas dudas con Silos”. Who is “sin muchas dudas” on this point? How can he be sure that Paris nal 2180 was produced in the *scriptorium* of Silos in the tenth century? Díaz y Díaz was very prudent about its origins, and indicated only the “región occidental de Castilla” (*Códices Visigóticos*, 1983, pp. 348-349); Miguel Vivancos, an expert on the *scriptorium* of Silos – his work should absolutely have been included in the bibliography – states: “de origen desconocido son también los manuscritos BNP N.a.l. 239 y N.a.l. 2180, aunque este último puede ponerse en contacto con región palentina” (*Glosas y notas marginales*, 1996, p. 67). In his description of the manuscript, Vivancos is silent about its origins (pp. 291-294). We only know that in 992 it was offered to San Pelayo de Cerrato, as François Dolbeau found (“Anciens possesseurs”, *RHT*, 1979, 233); in the thirteenth century it was in Silos, as demonstrated by Catalogue B (Ann Boylan, “The Library at Santo Domingo de Silos and Its Catalogue...”, *Revue Mabillon*, 1992). A discussion of these elements, with the relevant bibliography, would be an important contribution.

The description of the contents of the manuscripts is very useful. Yarza Urquiola chose to describe the *membra disiecta* of the original manuscript separately (Paris nal 2179 + Madrid 494, Part II; Paris nal 2178 + Madrid 822, Part I). In Tui, Archivo Capitular e Histórico Diocesano, MS 1, the description is misleading. As said previously, we have two distinct sections. The first (fols. 19r-175r) corresponds to the first tome of a legendary from Clairvaux. Its model was common to the contemporary passionary of Alcoçaba (Lisbon, BNP, Alc. CCLXXXIV [418] is another copy of the first tome), not considered (and rightly so) in the present edition. In the case of London add. 25600, he lists the contents continuously, which gives the reader the false impression that it is a uniform collection. Actually, as Yarza Urquiola explains, the last three texts have nothing to do with the rest of the manuscript. They are in an eleventh-century quaternion attached to the passionary of Cardena after the composition of El Escorial b-I-4.

In Chapter B of Chapter 7, Yarza Urquiola presents the contents of a number of manuscripts not used in the edition. One such is Lisbon, Torre do Tombo, Mosteiro de Santa Maria de Lorvão, B 16 (this is the updated shelf mark). It was a good option not to use this manuscript in the present edition, but for a reason not told by the editor. The passionary contains many texts coincident with the tenth- and eleventh-century witnesses of the “pasionario hispánico”, and many others that are clearly unrelated. Referring to the work of Aires Nascimento (“Um novo testemunho do Passionario Hispânico: um código lorvanense da primeira metade do século XII”, in *Sub luce florentis calami: homenaje a Manuel C. Díaz y Díaz*, 2002), the editor characterises the manuscript as follows: “se puede asegurar que el código, en lo que hace a las Pasiones, excepto las tres citadas [i.e., those of Matthew, Marc and Antoninus of Pamiers], depende enteramente de los códigos LP, s. X, y S, s. XI” (p. 321). This

statement is clearly wrong. For instance, the *Passio Vincentii* in the Lorvão passionary is an interpolated version. It has some affinities with the model of *L* (London add. 25600), but at the same time exhibits many traces of later models. One example is the name of the old woman who finds Vincent's body on the shore, studied by Victor Saxer ("La version brève BHL 8638 de la Passion de S. Vincent", *Hispania Sacra*, 1991 = *Saint Vincent, diacre et martyr*, 2002), among many others. And the collation proves beyond any reasonable doubt that the text in the Lorvão passionary is *not* a copy of *L*. Incidentally, it should be said that only *L* matters in this case: *P* (Paris nal 2180) suffered the loss of a number of folios between fol. 129 and fol. 130, and so the *Passio Fructuosi, Auguri et Eulogii* and the *Passio Vincentii* (21 and 22 January) are missing (...!), while *S* (Paris nal 2179) is a *codex descriptus* of *L*.

After the description of the manuscripts comes a section entitled "*Stemma codicum*". It covers eight pages. Here, Yarza Urquiola offers a study of the relations between the witnesses used in the edition. Interestingly, and in spite of the title, there is no diagram of what we usually call a *stemma codicum*, neither do we have the history of the evolution of this particular group of manuscripts. He divides the manuscripts into several groups: (1) *A* (El Escorial a-II-9), *R* (Madrid BRAH 13) and *V* (Paris nal 2178), which are not passionaries, as Yarza Urquiola underlines; (2) *L* and *P*; (3) *M* (Madrid 494); (4) *D* (Paris nal 239), *E* (El Escorial b-I-4), *S* (Paris nal 2179) and *B* (Madrid 822, Part II); (5) the subgroup *E S B*; (6) *C* (Madrid 1547) and *T* (Toledo 44-11), both from the thirteenth-century; and (7) *G* (Tui 1). This division is puzzling. What is the purpose? In a critical edition, we expect the manuscripts to be grouped by textual affinities, that is, by common errors which configurate families descending from a (usually lost) exemplar. And we expect to have sound evidence, namely lists of exclusive variants and errors of all kinds which demonstrate the affinities between copies and families or classes. This would be most useful in the present case.

Let us consider *L+E* (that is, *L* and its eleventh-century addition *E*) and *S*. If we fully collate the manuscripts, we see that, for most of the common texts, if not for all, *S* is modelled on *L+E*. This fact was already pointed out by Fàbrega Grau (vol. 2, p. 6), but Yarza Urquiola seems to ignore it. *B* is also a *descriptus* of *L+E* or *S*. On p. 330, he says: "los códices *ESB* presentan un texto casi idéntico, pareciendo ser *ES* copia uno del otro, especialmente *S* de *E*. Pero lecturas privativas en ambos ejemplares descartan esta opción". Which readings? And why is no evidence presented? One would expect to be given a number of variants which might prove that *S* is not a copy of *E* (or *L*), as the editor says. But nothing is provided to support this conclusion. Actually, the complete collation of the texts common to *L+E* and *S* proves that there is not a single reading in *S*, beyond any reasonable doubt, that is better than the readings in *L+E* that could not be a simple emendation. The variants of *L* in the *apparatus criticus*, which would seem to show that *S* does not descend from *L*, are usually just misprints. A few examples (I give my comments in brackets): (*Passio Eugeniae*) p. 491, 352 unam me] una me *P*, unam *L* (also *S*); (*Passio Iuliani et Basilissae*) p. 550, 472 pendebant] pendebat *L* (also *S*); p. 555, 620 enim] om. *L* (wrong, the word is in *L*); p. 575, 1230 pedum] peduum *L* (also *S*); p. 576, 1273 lactineus] lactine *L*, lacteus *T* (no, *L* has *lactineus*); (*Passio XL martyres*) p. 577, 13 indigemus] indignemus *L* (also *S*); (*Passio Sebastiani*) p. 606, 712 eorum] deorum *L* (also *S*); (*Passio Eulaliae Barcinonensis*)

p. 710, 99 despexit] respexit *L* (also *S*); (*Passio Emetherii et Celedonii*) p. 734, 129 locum] *om. L* (also *S*); (*Passio Theodosiae*) p. 747, 357 et] ut *L* (also *S*); (*Passio Petri et Pauli*) p. 802, 143 eas] *om. L* (also *S*); p. 818, 59 hominem] hominis *L* (*hominis* is an emendation: the original reading was *hominem*, like *S*); (*Passio Iulianae*) p. 1187, 221 mihi] mi *S*, me *E* (*S* has *me*).

In sum, in such a huge corpus as that common to *L+E* and *S*, I cannot find a single convincing reading proving that *S* descends from a model in a higher stemmatic position than *L+E*. They share the same absurd errors, the same additions and omissions found nowhere else, even the orthography is often identical. A few examples with *E* among many others: (*Passio Policarpi*) p. 1069, 121 neue] neuee *E S* (the last *e* was erased in *E*); (*Passio Acacii*), p. 1096, 12 aeuum] eum *E S*; p. 1097, 44 aesculapio] excolapio *E S*; p. 1097, 44-45 adulterae Nemesi] adulter enemis *E S*; (*Passio Chrysogoni*) p. 1108, 255 excissum] eiscissum *E*, eiscisum *S*. We even find the same indication for liturgical use: in the *Passio Adriani*, *L* offers a famous indication in red ink (fol. 193v); this indication was transposed to *S*, where it was also written in red (fol. 180r). The marginal note in the *Passio Iuliani et Basilissae* in *L* (fol. 87v), was copied into the margin of *S* (fol. 53v). In the *Passio Sebastiani*, *S* has the indication *ad missam*, also in red ink, which the copyist had found in *L* (fols. 77r and 114v, respectively). A possible interpretation is the following: in the time of abbot Domingo (1041-1073), the abbey of Saint Sebastian of Silos used the best exemplar in the region, the passionary of San Pedro de Cardena written by Endura (*L*), supplemented with *E*, as one of its models.

As for the relationship between *E*, *S* and *P*, Yarza Urquiola says: “*ES* incorporan los diez (nueve *S*) relatos del s. X no sirviéndose del código silense *P*, sino de un mismo texto inspirado y elaborado sin duda a partir de *P*, pero poseedor de multitud de pasajes y lecturas diferentes” (p. 329). It is obvious that they do not descend from *P*. But how does the editor know that their model was “inspired and composed undoubtedly from *P*”? Some evidence should be given to support this conclusion. The (rare) example given by Yarza Urquiola some lines later (*Passio Thomae*), quoting a passage omitted in *P*, but not in *ES*, indicates precisely the opposite: that *ES* cannot descend directly or indirectly from *P*, but from a common model, unless the editor considers that the model of *ES* is a contaminated exemplar; if so, he should say so and prove it with relevant evidence. A preliminary collation suggests that *P* was not the model of the extant eleventh-century passionaries.

Further inquiries into *T* and *C* would be most useful and could lead to similar results: that, for many texts, *T* depends on *E* and/or *S* and related copies. Yarza Urquiola seems to agree with this possibility as concerns *T*: “para los mismos relatos que contienen del s. XI, los manuscritos *CT* se sirvieron de la versión que presentan los códigos *ES*, pero casi nunca copiándola literalmente, sino haciendo abundantísimas correcciones y cambios al texto” (p. 331). Actually, the copyists of *CT* not only used the versions in *ES*, but possibly they used *ES* themselves. *C* appears to be modelled on *T* or on a common model.

The short section mentioning editorial procedures should be clearer. For instance, a word of explanation about the purpose of incorporating *codices descripti* into the *apparatus criticus* would be most useful. Incidentally, some aspects of the *apparatus criticus* are unusual and misleading. In general, *in ras.* stands for *in rasura*, that is, it

indicates that the words were written over others which had been erased. But, on p. 627, 1377-1386 (*Passio Sebastiani*), all indications *in ras.* mean something else. These words are not written over an erasure, they are simply missing, because the outside edge of the leaf (fol. 126 of *L* in this case) was torn off to extract the decorated initial of the *passio* on the verso. The same occurs on p. 854, 42-46 (*Passio Iustae et Rufinae*; *L*, fol. 212r); p. 871-872, 254-256 (*Passio Bartholomaei*; *S*, fol. 234r); p. 873, 14-17 (*Passio Cucufatis*; *S*, p. 234v); p. 952, 308-339 (*Passio Euphemiae*; *L*, fol. 243). Also two folios in *S*, between fols. 149 and 150, are lost, corresponding to the text of the *Passio Theodosiae* from p. 739, 121, *nobilissimi* to pp. 744, 270 *cum diabolo*. This must be indicated in the *traditio textus* (which explicitly states that the text is in *S*, which is not true) or in the *apparatus criticus*; otherwise the reader will infer that the variants and errors in *L* in this portion of the text correspond to good readings in *S*.

Finally, the bibliography. Yarza Urquiola chose to present a very synthetic bibliography. This option is perfectly understandable and often commendable. But many other studies by reputed scholars would be useful for a full understanding of so many texts. The examples of missing items are so many that I shall only mention one: the remarkable production of François Dolbeau, one of most brilliant scholars working on hagiography, is not represented by a single work! Dolbeau's work would be most beneficial for insights into theoretical approaches and important details. I have already mentioned a few works above. I add three more examples: in "Faire l'expertise de manuscrits ou de collections hagiographiques" (in *Ingenio Facilis. Per Giovanni Orlandi*, 2017) Dolbeau gives important methodological guidelines (completely ignored in the present edition); in "Les prologues de légendiers latins" (in *Les prologues médiévaux*, 2000) he studies the fascinating prologue of London add. 25600; in "Notes sur l'organisation interne des légendiers latins" (in *Hagiographie, cultures et sociétés*, 1981) he offers a general approach to the organisation of hagiographical collections.

*

Now, we arrive at the core of the work: the text. It is impressive: 1164 pages of Latin text with a tiny *apparatus criticus* at the bottom of the page. As the editor states explicitly on p. 13, this is a critical edition. The textual body consists of "todos los relatos que se contienen en los ejemplares que constituyen la tradición manuscrita del *Pasionario Hispánico*" (p. 334). Therefore, the aim is to reconstruct the earliest stage of the texts copied in this corpus of tenth- and eleventh-century Hispanic passionaries, based on the extant manuscript witnesses and the rules of textual criticism. Most of the texts have an early and large manuscript transmission, but the purpose of the present edition is only to establish the earliest stage of the particular branch which circulated in Spain in the passionaries of the tenth and eleventh century.

If the purpose is to reconstruct the redaction that is at the origin of a particular branch within a larger, and earlier, textual transmission, the task of the editor is, in general, easy. Whenever our copies disagree, it is easy to check which reading corresponds to the upper level and which reading is a variant or an error.

I will give an example. In the *Passio Adriani et comitum*, when the narrator says how many companions Adrian had in the dungeon, *L* and its *codices descripti* *S* and *B* have *triginta tres*, while *P* and also *T* have *uiginti tres* (p. 777, 200; *T* is missing in

the *apparatus criticus*). Yarza Urquiola had to choose a reading and he chose *triginta tres*. Based on the present edition, therefore, any reader will presume that *triginta tres* was the text in the earliest stage of the “pasionario hispánico”, and that *P* and *T* exhibit an error. This is wrong. The correct number is *uiginti tres*. Actually, the *Passio Adriani* is an excellent case study. It is a Latin translation of a Greek *martyrion* made in Rome in the seventh century. Fortunately, we have the Greek text which served as the model for the translator and, even better, it has a fairly sound manuscript transmission. Fortunately, it is a translation *ad uerbum*. And, also fortunately, the Latin text has a very rich manuscript transmission, with the earliest copies dating to the late eighth century. Now, the version of the text which circulated in northern Spain belongs to a family of copies whose earliest extant witness is traceable to Burgundy: Montpellier, Bibliothèque Interuniversitaire, Bibliothèque universitaire Historique de Médecine, H 156, of the early tenth century, perhaps from Langres (*Ml*). The same version was copied in the abbey of Moissac, Septimania, in the late tenth or the early eleventh century (*Mo*). All Greek and Latin witnesses (and in particular *Ml Mo*) show that the martyrs were twenty-three in number. Also, the Carolingian martyrologies and all sorts of evidence present the number twenty-three. In sum, the reading in the earliest stage of the “pasionario hispánico” was *uiginti tres* as preserved in *P*. *L* introduced an error.

Many other examples could be given. For instance, on p. 781, 315, Yarza Urquiola’s text reads *in nudibus manibus*, which is in *P*, while *L S T* have *in nudis animalibus*. The Greek and Latin manuscripts (and particularly the other witnesses of this same family, *Ml* and *Mo*) prove that the correct reading is *in nudis animalibus*, corresponding to the original ἐπὶ ἀστροφῶτων ζώων. (Incidentally, *L* has the correct reading *in nudis manibus* in the margin. This could be interesting to the reader: I would include it in the *apparatus criticus*). On p. 785, 445, the *apparatus* states “maxime bene natorum (natarum *T*) add. *P T*”. Actually, this phrase must have been in the lost exemplar from which all the Hispanic passionaries derive (with *natarum*, obviously), as shown by the Greek and the Latin textual transmission: the earliest stage of the text is *multitudo feminarum maxime bene natarum*. It is *L* and its *descriptus* that altered the text. On p. 787, 512, there is a wrong choice and a wrong *apparatus*. The editor’s text has *distillabat*, but *P T* have *stillabat*, which is the right word, as demonstrated by the textual transmission, namely *Ml Mo*; nothing is said on this in the *apparatus criticus*. On p. 787, 522, the editor’s text has *in igne* following *L*, against *P T*’s *in fornace ignis*. The reading in the ancestor of this family was *in fornacem ignis*. *P* preserves the right phrase. Many other cases could be mentioned. On p. 771, 7, *festinans* in *L* and its *descripti* is a variant of *festinus*, which is the earlier reading, as found in *P T* (the *apparatus criticus* is inaccurate). On p. 776, 156, *magno gaudio* is a variation uniquely found in *L*: *P T* and the whole textual transmission has only *gaudio*. On p. 789, 572, *misericors es, Domine* in *P T* is the right reading; *miserere, Domine, quia misericors es* is a variation of *L*. One last observation: in the *apparatus criticus* of p. 781, 309-311, *omnes laudis titulos et gloriosos martyrum – intimabo uestris* is said to be a sentence omitted in *P T*. This is not true. The sentence is an additional note for liturgical use in *L* and its *descriptus S* (*B* has lost the folios after p. 780, 276), written in red ink: it

does not belong to the text, and therefore there is no omission. If we collated more texts of the present edition, we could find many more examples.

Let us now examine a case in which we do not have the Greek model. The *Passio Christinae* (BHL 1748-1757h) has a relevant manuscript tradition and two main classes of manuscripts can be identified. The earliest witnesses of the first class are: Brussels, Bollandistes, 14, s. IX *med.*, northern Francia; Roma Farf. 29, s. IX², Santa Maria di Farfa; Vat. lat. 5771, s. IX², northern Italy, owned by San Colombano di Bobbio; Paris lat. 3851A, Part I (fols. 17-56), s. X, Saint-Martial de Limoges; and, finally, the above-mentioned legendary of Moissac (Paris lat. 17002), which is particularly important in this case because it contains the very same version that we find in the Hispanic manuscripts. These are the tenth-century *P*, the early eleventh-century supplement *E* and its *descriptus* *S*, and the thirteenth-century *T* and *C*. The earliest copies of the other class are: Torino DV.3, s. VIII *ex-IX in.*, perhaps Soissons; Zürich C 101, s. IX-X, Reichenau / St Gallen; Bruxelles 7984 (3191), s. IX-X, owned by Saint-Pierre of Wissenbourg; and Hamburg, Theol. 1727, s. X-XI, Kloster Berge (Magdeburg). The *passio* is also a translation of a Greek *martyrion*. Unfortunately, as noted, the model is lost: we have only a small portion in a papyrus, but it is enough to confirm the distribution of the Latin witnesses in the two main classes and to establish which witnesses are closer to the original text. Finally, there are some studies and editions of the *passio* not mentioned in Yarza Urquiola's edition, namely Christopher Tuplin's in *Traditio* (1980) and Marieke Van Acker in Gouillet's *Le légendier de Turin* (2014).

The editor rightly takes *P* as his main witness. Actually, *E* and its *descriptus* *S* – *S* offers the very same errors of *E* (for instance, the absurd p. 896, 382 *tormenta ostendere ostende*), the same omissions, the same layout – present a version contaminated with an exemplar belonging to a different class of manuscripts. *E* does not derive from *P*. The errors in *P* are usually small details, often of a grammatical nature or due to a misunderstanding of what was written in the model. In most cases, it is easy to restore the earliest readings, either with the help of the other Hispanic copies or by simple emendation. But in a few cases we need to look at the whole textual transmission of the *passio*. The failure to consider the whole manuscript transmission led Yarza Urquiola to decide to intervene and to propose baseless emendations. I give two examples.

The first is on p. 879, 16. Yarza Urquiola's text reads *accipiens tus ad offerendum in mensa idolorum*. In the *apparatus criticus* we have: “tus] scripsi, tura ES, toracem PCT”. If we had no other manuscripts, this emendation would be plausible. But the *Passio Christinae* has a large manuscript transmission (certainly more than one hundred and fifty copies) and a reasonable number of important ninth-century exemplars, as said and listed above. The correct reading is *storacem*, as shown by all earlier copies, that is, στύραξ, the aromatic gum. The exemplar which circulated in northern Spain most certainly had the corrupt *toracem* found in *PCT*. That *toracem* was the reading in the exemplar which arrived in Spain is demonstrated by the Moissac legendary (*Mo*), which still preserves *storacem*. Since *toracem* was incomprehensible, *E* altered the word to a more understandable *tura*, later transposed to *S*.

The other example is on p. 892, 287-289. Here we read the following: *iudex iratus iussit afferi canistrum aereum et succendi subtus ualde et submitti picem, resinam et oleum et miserunt eam in canistrum. Milites uero stabant quattuor et coagitabant canistrum ...*

The *apparatus criticus* has: “287 canistrum] *scripsi*, canem *PCT*, coccauum *ES* [...] 288 canistrum] *scripsi*, canem *PCT*, caccuum *S*, caccabum *E* [...] 289 canistrum] *scripsi*, canem *PCT*, caccuum *ES*”. Actually, *PCT* offer the correct word in the three cases: there is no need to emend *canem*. This is the word in all early copies of both main families (except the Farfa passionary, which transformed it into the more intelligible *uas*, and the Moissac legendary, which gives the usual *cacabum*, that is, *caccabus*, κάκκαβος). *Canem* may correspond to κάνεον / κανοῦν presumably in the original text, that is, the bronze basket in which Christina is to be tortured. Even without the original Greek text, we can retrieve a few original readings, if we consider the whole Latin transmission.

An interesting case study for our purposes is the *Vita Castissimae* (*BHL* 1640), mentioned above, whose text illustrates a different problem of the methodological approach in the present edition. The *Life* is copied in: El Escorial a-II-9, Part C (fols. 59-132), dated to 954 (= *A*), and Paris nal 2178 (+ Madrid 822, Part I), from the second half of the tenth century (= *V*), both written in the region of Burgos; in *E*, the early eleventh-century supplement to *L* produced in Burgos; and in the thirteenth-century *T*, most likely from Toledo. These four copies represent a particular branch of *BHL* 2722, in which “Euphrosyne” was transformed into the Latin equivalent “Castissima”. The *Vita* has a fairly good textual transmission. It circulated in the Carolingian centres and Mozarabic Spain, at least, from the late eighth century onwards. The earliest copies are the above-mentioned Montpellier H 55, the remarkable early ninth-century passionary produced for a female audience possibly in Troyes; Munich, Clm 14798, Part II (fols. 71-92), from the second half of the ninth century, owned by St Emmeram; El Escorial, I-III-13, a mid-ninth-century codex produced perhaps in Catalonia, containing an collection of monastic and ascetic works (its *Vita Castissimae* has a peculiar configuration: Chapters 1-4 come from *BHL* 2722, and the rest of the text from *BHL* 2723); finally, La Seu d’Urgell, Arxiu Diocesà i Capitular, 604, Part III (fols. 153-237), most likely produced in Córdoba for a female monastery in the second quarter of the tenth century (M. C. Díaz y Díaz, *Manuscritos visigóticos del sur de la Península*, 1995).

As said above, Yarza Urquiola considers the text to belong to the group of the “*pasionario hispánico* del siglo XI”; but the text circulated in the tenth century in the same network of monasteries as the passionaries considered here – not to mention at Córdoba (recall Urgell 604, which Yarza Urquiola ignores). In most cases, the earliest copies (*AV*) have a better text than the later copies, that is, they are closer to the upper levels of the textual transmission of *BHL* 2722 and 1640. This makes sense.

Now, *AET* share the same text, with, as usual, many textual variants. Occasionally the differences are substantial. On p. 1335, 38-43, Yarza Urquiola’s text reads as follows:

Alia igitur die egressus pater monasterii, uocans ad se puellam, coepit eam blando aedificare sermone, intimans ei pudicitiam et castitatem sollerter obseruare elemosynarumque iugi largitione pauperes sustentare et super omnia timorem Dei saepe in corde retinere. Puella uero haec uerba placido uultu, intenta aure, humili mente suscipiebat.

In the *apparatus criticus* we have:

38/43 alia – suscipiebat] et alia die castigabat eam (illam V) ipse uir sanctus pro castitate et elemosina et timore dei et satis complacebat ei AV.

The text in *BHL* 2772, according to the *consensus* of the manuscripts, is more or less the following:

Et in crastino die castigabat illam ipse uir sanctissimus pro castitate et elemosyna et timore Dei et satis placuit animae suae.

Any user of a critical edition will interpret this to mean that the text offered in the present edition is the earliest stage of the text as reconstructed from the available witnesses, and that what is recorded in the *apparatus criticus* is the variants or errors of *A V*, which were introduced in the course of the textual transmission. This is simply not true. The correct text, that is, the text of the exemplar which arrived in northern Spain in the tenth century and from which all the Hispanic manuscripts descend, is that found in *A V*, as seen above. I could mention dozens of cases in which Yarza Urquiola incorrectly chose the readings of *E T* against those in *A V*. Unquestionably, *A V* represent the earliest stage of the text within the group of Hispanic manuscripts chosen by the editor. And if his purpose was to make a critical edition only of the text of the eleventh-century “pasionario hispánico”, he should not have used *A V*. At the very least, some clarification should be given to prevent the reader from believing (wrongly) that *A V* contain deviations from an earlier stage of the text, when the reality is precisely the opposite.

Many other texts present the same problems of approach. I will give one final example. In the *Passio Felicis Nolani* (*L P S T*), p. 902, 70-71, Yarza Urquiola’s text reads: *tunc beatus Felix dixit: “Dignum est ut consulam”*. The *apparatus criticus* has “70/71 tunc – consulam] *om. LPS*”. The sentence in the text is clearly an addition by the copyist of the thirteenth-century *T*. This is obvious from the critical edition of this very Hispanic version produced by Rosa Manfredonia and Edoardo d’Angelo (*La Passione di Felice martire, vescovo di Nola* [*BHL* 2869], 2013), not mentioned by Yarza Urquiola, who obviously also used Paris lat. 17002 (p. 64, 35; compare with the Nola version, p. 44, 35). Incidentally, in a very few cases, the editor consulted other editions indeed. For instance, in the *apparatus criticus* of the *Passio Dionysii*, he occasionally mentions the text of *PL* 106 (1864), that is, a reprint of Surius’ *De probatis sanctorum historiis* of 1574, a text based on unidentified manuscripts and stylistically polished by its humanist editor. What is the point of using Surius’ text in the *apparatus criticus* of a modern critical edition? Actually, we have at our disposal Michael Lapidge’s recent edition, with an infinitely better, and philologically sound, text (*Hilduin of Saint-Denis: The “Passio S. Dionysii” in Prose and Verse*, 2017).

The editor also intervenes with corrections to the text of the lost ancestor of the “pasionario hispánico” when there is no need for it. For instance, on p. 602, 615; 619 (*Passio Sebastiani*), all the codices have *Marcellini*, so why alter it to *Marcelliani*? Of course, this is the name in the earlier transmission of the text. But if all Hispanic witnesses agree, this means that the ancestor of *L P* and related copies had *Marcellini*. Similarly, in the *Passio Christophori*, if all the witnesses to the “pasionario hispánico” have *Italiae*, why change it to *Alexandriae* on pp. 852, 465? This is the correct word, but

the common ancestor of the Hispanic manuscripts most likely had *Italiae*, and this was the reading circulating in the “*pasionario hispánico*”. As Yarza Urquiola claims, he is editing the text of the “*pasionario hispánico*”.

In sum, when we are producing a critical edition of a particular branch of the manuscript transmission of a certain text, that is, when we are restoring the text of the lost ancestor of a particular family of manuscripts, it is most important to consider the history and the evolution of the whole manuscript transmission. When all the witnesses we are dealing with agree, there is no problem. When they disagree, our work begins. Sometimes, good sense and a good knowledge of Latin (or Greek) is enough to restore the text of the lost ancestor. Other times, the choice of the variants, right or wrong, is almost irrelevant. But many times, we face differences which require the use of other tools and methods. Then, we must use all the available evidence. If some of the descendants of a common lost exemplar have A, others B, and the upper level from which the lost exemplar descends has A, it is logical to presume that A is the inherited feature, and that B is the deviation. If we do not follow this principle, the most basic principle of textual criticism, the choice between different readings becomes arbitrary, no matter how talented one may be. The result is not what the lost ancestor of that particular family actually had, but what we think is suitable to be there. We already have, alas!, enough occasions to test our capacity as a Latinist, when no help is provided by the available manuscripts.

A final word. It is a pity that this edition lacks a hagiographical index and an index of manuscripts, as noted above. These are indispensable tools, especially in a paper book, to permit the full use of an edition with this sort of content.

*

As I have tried to show, this edition brings up interesting discussions on methodological approaches and conceptual paths in editing and studying hagiographical texts. It is a fascinating world, which requires a variety of skills, namely when we aim at producing a critical edition. The fields of philology and late antique and medieval history should be explored intensely. And the most important thing is that we must use all the evidence and methods at our disposal.

I
COMMENTATIONES

The Dodwell Vase: Agamemnon and Thersander in between epic cycles – MARTIM AIRES HORTA	7
Sobre el término ἄθλον y la contracción de /a+/e/ en los dialectos dorios – IVÁN ANDRÉS-ALBA	47
Los ὄροι de Beocia que delimitan tierra sagrada del dios Dioniso – MACARENA CALDERÓN SÁNCHEZ	65
Preguntas indirectas ecoicas en griego clásico – SANDRA RODRÍGUEZ PIEDRABUENA	77
Las primeras figuras de Cristo en el mundo romano: entre el culto pagano y el cristiano. Algunas evidencias textuales – M. ^a AMPARO MATEO DONET	101
Luce, lusso e poesia nelle <i>Silvae</i> di Stazio – ALESSIA BONADEO	119
La construcción de identidades desde la Europa del Renacimiento – MARCO ANTONIO CORONEL RAMOS	135
El epistolario del humanista Cristóbal Escobar: una muestra de mecenazgo en la Sicilia española – JUAN FRANCISCO REYES MONTERO	153
Luís da Silveira y la ficción sentimental <i>Naseo e Amperadonia</i> – ANA MARÍA S. TARRÍO	187
Poesía natalicia y elogio al soberano. Un genetlífico desconocido de Miguel Venegas S.I. – JUAN CARLOS JIMÉNEZ DEL CASTILLO	205
Preceptos y fuentes clásicas de la construcción épica en un inédito de Francisco Botelho de Moraes e Vasconcelos – CHRISTIAN JUAN PORCAR BATALLER	221

- Autores clásicos latinos en los “Epigramas Profanos” de Juan de Iriarte –
FRANCISCO SALAS SALGADO 239
- The China Jesuits and Canon Law in defense of a possible baptism of the
Qing Emperor, against Domingos De Navarrete, OP (Macau, 1684) –
NOËL GOLVERS 261
- Novedades sobre los fondos griegos de la Biblioteca Nacional de España:
manuscritos e impresos griegos y encuadernaciones bizantinas – TERESA
MARTÍNEZ MANZANO 279

II
STVDIA BREVIORA

- Three Notes on DRN III – ARCHIBALD ALLEN 305
- Il motivo dell’eco nella poesia di Cornelio Gallo? – PAOLA GAGLIARDI 311
- El uso del adjetivo ἀλιτήριος en el *Bellum Judaicum* de Flavio Josefo –
FRANCISCO BALLESTA ALCEGA 325
- De Septem Mirabilibus Mundi* en el ms. 220 de Charleville-Mézières:
estudio, edición crítica y traducción – SONIA MADRID MEDRANO 335
- Matar Saudades* de Fernando Lopes (1988): Permanência do mito
odisseico no cinema português – NUNO SIMÕES RODRIGUES 347

III
DISPVTATIONES

- Un nuovo commento a Lucrezio, DRN V 1105-1349. Nicoletta Bruno,
L’origine della violenza e della paura, Verlag Traugott Bautz, 2021
(*Studia Classica et Mediaevalia*, 29). 527 pp. ISBN 978-3-95948-487-9 –
MARIANTONIETTA PALADINI 361
- Dying in Perugia: A proposal for Prop. 1.21-22 – JEAN-YVES MALEUVRE 367
- Acta Martyrum Scillitanorum. A Literary Commentary*. Vincent Hunink,
Turnhout, Brepols Publishers, 2021. 138 pp. ISBN 978-2-503-59095-0 –
PAULO RAMOS 379

- Editing Hispanic Passionaries. *Passionarium Hispanicum saeculi X*, cura et studio Valeriano Yarza Urquiola, Turnhout, Brepols, 2020 (*Corpus Christianorum Series Latina*, 171). 1005 pp. ISBN 978-2-503-58876-6 – *Passionarium Hispanicum saeculi XI*, cura et studio Valeriano Yarza Urquiola, Turnhout, Brepols, 2020 (*Corpus Christianorum Series Latina*, 171A). 542 pp. ISBN 978-2-503-59108-7 – P. F. ALBERTO 383

IV
LIBRI RECENSITI

a) Edições de Texto. Comentários. Traduções. Estudos Linguísticos

- MARINA CORAY, MARTHA KRIETER-SPIRO, EDZARD VISSER, *Homer's Iliad: The Basel Commentary. Book IV*. Translated by Benjamin W. Millis and Sara Strack, edited by S. Douglas Olson – RUI CARLOS FONSECA 399
- VIRGÍLIO, *Geórgicas III*. Organização de Matheus Trevizam, traduções de António Feliciano de Castilho e Matheus Trevizam – GABRIEL A. F. SILVA 401
- PLUTARCO, *Sobre comer carne*. Tradução do grego, introdução e comentário de Joaquim Pinheiro – BERNARDO MOTA 402
- MERCÈ PUIG RODRÍGUEZ-ESCALONA (ed.), *Projeccions de la lexicografia llatina medieval a Catalunya* – CARLOS PRIETO ESPINOSA 404
- MICHAEL WINTERBOTTOM, *Style and Scholarship: Latin Prose from Gildas to Raffaele Regio. Selected Papers*. Praef. Michael Lapidge, cur. Roberto Gamberini – ELENA BERTI 406
- GREGORIO RODRÍGUEZ HERRERA (ed.), *Florilegios latinos y sociedad* – GABRIEL A. F. SILVA 408
- JOSÉ CARLOS MARTÍN-IGLESIAS, PABLO C. DÍAZ, MARGARITA VALLEJO GIRVÉS, *La Hispania tardoantigua y visigoda en las fuentes epistolares. Antología y comentario* – P. F. ALBERTO 410
- RUTH MIGUEL FRANCO, JOSÉ CARLOS MARTÍN-IGLESIAS (edd.), *Braulionis Caesaraugustani epistulae et Isidori Hispalensis Epistulae ad Braulionem. Braulionis Caesaraugustani confessio uel professio Iudaeorum ciuitatis Toletanae* – RODRIGO FURTADO 411
- JUAN GIL FERNÁNDEZ (ed.), *Scriptores Muzarabici saeculi VIII-XI* – RODRIGO FURTADO 415

- FRÉDÉRIC DUVAL (ed.), *La traduction à casus du Code de Justinien. Édition critique du livre II* – MÁRIO DE GOUVEIA 418
- MELPOMENI VOGIATZI, *Byzantine commentaries on Aristotle's "Rhetoric"* – RUI MIGUEL DUARTE 420
- LINDA YURETICH (trans.), *The Chronicle of Constantine Manasses. Translated with commentary and introduction* – RUI CARLOS FONSECA 423
- GALVANO FIAMMA, *Chronica pontificum Mediolanensium. Edizione critica, traduzione e commento a cura di Federica Favero* – P. F. ALBERTO 427
- PEDRO DE VALENCIA, *Epistolario*. Jesús M.^a Nieto Ibáñez, Inmaculada Delgado Jara, M.^a Isabel Viforcós Marinas (coordinadores) – SANTIAGO LOPEZ MOREDA 428
- CHARLES RIDOUX (ed.), *Paul Meyer. Gaston Paris. Correspondance. Avec la collaboration d'Ursula Bähler et d'Alain Corbellari* – VANDA ANASTÁCIO 431
- b) Literatura. Cultura. História**
- DAVID BOUVIER, VÉRONIQUE DASEN (edd.), *Héraclite: le temps est un enfant qui joue* – ANTÓNIO DE CASTRO CAEIRO 433
- ANDRÉ HURST, *Dans l'atelier de Pindare* – MÁRIO DE GOUVEIA 436
- RAFAEL J. GALLÉ CEJUDO, MANUEL SÁNCHEZ ORTIZ DE LANDALUCE (edd.), *Studia Hellenistica Gaditana II: De Calímaco a Nono de Panópolis. Estudios de crítica textual y exégesis literaria* – JOSÉ M.^a CANDÓN ROMERO 438
- JUAN SIGNES CODOÑER, *Breve guía de la literatura griega desde Hesíodo hasta Pletón* – MÁRIO DE GOUVEIA 441
- CHRISTOPH PIEPER, BRAM VAN DER VELDEN (edd.), *Reading Cicero's final years. Reception of the post-caesarian works up to the sixteenth century with two epilogues* – LUÍS MANUEL GASPAS CERQUEIRA 445
- BÉNÉDICTE DELIGNON, NADINE LE MEUR, OLIVIER THÉVENAZ (edd.), *La poésie lyrique dans la cité antique: Les Odes d'Horace au miroir de la lyrique grecque archaïque* – PEDRO BRAGA FALCÃO 447
- M. COURRÉNT, *Vitruvius auctor. L'œuvre littéraire de Vitruve et sa réception dans la littérature* – P. F. ALBERTO 452

- S. AMENDOLA, G. PACE, P. VOLPE CACCIATORE (edd.), *Immagini letterarie e iconografia nelle opere di Plutarco* – NUNO SIMÕES RODRIGUES 453
- S. NOVELLI, M. GIUSEPPETTI (edd.), *Spazi e contesti teatrali. Antico e moderno* – VALENTINA CARUSO 454
- GEORGIA SERMAMOGLOU-SOULMAIDI, EVAN ROBERT KEELING (edd.), *Wisdom, Love, and Friendship in Ancient Greek Philosophy: Essays in honor of Daniel Devereux* – ANA RITA FIGUEIRA 462
- HUNTER H. GARDNER, *Pestilence and the Body Politic in Latin Literature* – BERNARDO MOTA 465
- JESÚS M.^a NIETO IBAÑEZ, *Historia Antigua del Cristianismo. Desde los Orígenes al Concilio de Calcedonia* – PAULO RAMOS 467
- WOLFRAM HÖRANDNER, ANDREAS RHOBY, NIKOS ZAGKLAS (edd.), *A Companion to Byzantine Poetry* – RUI CARLOS FONSECA 468
- LEONORA NEVILLE, *Guide to Byzantine historical writing* – MÁRIO DE GOUVEIA 472
- JUAN JOSÉ POMER MONFERRER, JORDI REDONDO (edd.), *Pietat, prodigi i mitificació a la tradició literària occidental* – NEREIDA VILLAGRA 475
- M. ALGANZA ROLDÁN, P. PAPADOPOULOU (edd.), *La mitología griega en la tradición literaria: de la Antigüedad a la Grecia contemporánea* – NUNO SIMÕES RODRIGUES 477
- ANNA MARIA MESTURINI, Ψεῦδος: I “colori” della finzione – JOANA MATOS FRIAS 478
- INGRID A. R. DE SMET, PAUL WHITE (edd.), *Sodalitas litteratorum. Études à la mémoire de / Studies in memory of Philip Ford* – ANA MARÍA TARRÍO 480
- YANN POTIN, *Trésor, écrits, pouvoirs: Archives et bibliothèques d’État en France à la fin du Moyen Âge* – CARLOS GUARDADO DA SILVA 482
- R. ANTHONY LODGE (ed.), *Les comptes des consuls de Montferrand (1378-1385)* – COVADONGA VALDALISO-CASANOVA 485
- OLIVIER CANTEAUT (ed.), *Le discret langage du pouvoir. Les mentions de chancellerie du Moyen Âge au XVII^e siècle* – BERNARDO DE SÁ-NOGUEIRA 485

ARNAUD FOSSIER, JOHANN PETITJEAN, CLÉMENCE REVEST (edd.), *Écritures Grises. Les instruments de travail des administrations (XVI^e-XVII^e siècle)* – LUÍS CORUJO 487

JEANNE-MARIE JANDEAUX, *Le Roi et le déshonneur des familles: les lettres de cachet pour affaires de famille en Franche-Comté au XVIII^e siècle* – JORGE REVEZ 492

OLIVIER PONCET, KATIA WEIDENFELD (edd.), *Déclarez vos revenus! Histoire et imaginaire d'un instrument fiscal (XVIII^e-XXI^e siècle)* – JORGE REVEZ 495

c) Transmissão Textual. Codicologia. Instrumenta

P. F. ALBERTO, P. CHIESA, M. GOULLET (edd.), *Understanding Hagiography. Studies in the Textual Transmission of Early Medieval Saints' Lives* – FERNAND PELOUX 498

M. ANTÒNIA FORNÉS PALLICER (ed.), *Paleògrafs i editors: mètodes, objectius i experiències* – CARLOS PRIETO ESPINOSA 500

Liste des archivistes paléographes – CARLOS GUARDADO DA SILVA 502

HELDER CARITA, JOSÉ MANUEL GARCIA (ed.), *A imagem de Lisboa: O Tejo e as leis zenonianas da vista do mar* – CARLOS GUARDADO DA SILVA 504

Positions des thèses: Soutenues par les élèves de la promotion de 2018;
Positions des thèses: Soutenues par les élèves de la promotion de 2019;
Positions des thèses: Soutenues par les élèves de la promotion de 2020 –
 CARLOS GUARDADO DA SILVA 508