

de Fournival's "*Bestiaire d'amour*" and a Woman's "*Response*," and my 2007 article on a Lombard manuscript of the *Bestiaire d'amour*, Pierpont Morgan Library, 459.

As for the anonymous *Response* whose authorship (male or female?) remains a vexed question, Bianciotto prefers to explain it through existing literary convention, positing even a young "clerc" as a possible author and finding my stance of belief in a real woman's voice "étroitement féministe" (p. 88). But the *Response* cannot be fitted into any conventional mold. Its startling prologue begins with a heterodox version of Genesis 2 describing the creation of two women (cf. the Lilith legend), Adam's murder of the first, his lust for the second, Eve, who was made from his own flesh. From this the author concludes that woman is the "nobler creation" and the ultimate responsibility for original sin was Adam's. Bianciotto provides one disappointing footnote on this: "Selon Segre, p. XXV, seule référence érudite que l'on puisse relever dans la *Response*, ce passage semble faire allusion à la légende talmudique des deux femmes d'Adam . . . curieusement transformée ici . . ." (p. 281). Given the uniqueness of the prologue and of the *Response* as a whole, this is scant recognition of its author's unconventional approach. The authorship question may never be resolved, but more attention must be paid to its departures from known sources. Various possibilities are discussed in chapter 5 of my *Beasts of Love*.

Included in the new "édition bilingue" is a rendering of the medieval text into modern French. This has the usual advantages and disadvantages, making the text accessible to readers who have no familiarity with the medieval language, but sometimes masking nuances, whether stylistic or substantive. Bianciotto has worked to avoid *faux amis*: he notes problematic words and syntax, and his glossary is useful. Sometimes, however, his translative choices reflect modern preferences at the expense of the original. For example, Richard's prologue begins significantly with the Aristotelian "Toutes gens desirrent par nature a savoir," then celebrates that important theme of "savoir" with an elaborate display of *annominatio* upon "savoir." The various forms ("savoir," "estre seüe," "sache," "ont seü," etc.) syntactically symbolize the interaction of present with past to construct a shared cultural heritage. Judging perhaps that *annominatio* does not appeal to modern taste, Bianciotto chooses to convert "savoir" to "acquérir la science," "sache aucune chose" to "possède la science d'une chose particulière," "ne set mie" to "ne connaît pas," and so on.

An equally regrettable loss occurs in the *Response* when Bianciotto chooses to omit some of the phrases by which the woman personally addresses Richard. At the first "biaus sire, chiers maistres" Bianciotto explains, "L'auteur de la *Response*, en manière d'humilité affectée sans doute ironique, abuse d'adjectifs à valeur affective redondants qui n'ont pas toujours été restitués dans la traduction" (p. 279). By second-guessing the woman's intentions and prejudging her phrases "redundant," Bianciotto manipulates an important feature of the original, destroying both the tone and the evidence, and making it impossible to identify specific contexts that elicit such "ironic" phrases.

Despite all, however, Bianciotto has done medievalists a real service by bringing two important works to the fore again in a convenient format.

JEANETTE BEER, St. Hilda's College, Oxford

DANIEL RICO CAMPS, *Las voces del románico: Arte y epigrafía en San Quirce de Burgos*. (Imago, 2; Seminario de Arte Medieval, 5.) Murcia: Nausicaä, 2008. Paper. Pp. 126 plus 1 separate black-and-white figure; 31 black-and-white figures. €18.
doi:10.1017/S003871341000196X

The Castilian church of San Quirce lies between the cathedral town of Burgos, on the pilgrimage road to Santiago, and the renowned monastery and Romanesque cloister of Santo Domingo de Silos. Now in private hands, the mid-twelfth-century Romanesque church can

be visited just one day a month, and it is largely ignored by travelers who flock to more welcoming monuments nearby. In this study Daniel Rico Camps analyzes the Romanesque corbels, metopes, and accompanying inscriptions of the cornice over the west portal of the collegiate church, and he thrusts this unlikely site to the center of contemporary discussions of the Romanesque. The eleven corbels narrate scenes from Genesis, from the Creation and Fall of Adam and Eve through the Expulsion from Paradise and the story of Cain and Abel. The ten metopes depict profane and vulgar images: defecating figures, cocks, men battling, and a couple with enlarged genitals engaged in sexual play.

Earlier writers, disdainful of the vulgar subjects and vernacular texts, were quick to dismiss the assemblage as a disordered array of carvings described disparagingly as “popular” art. Rico, however, rehabilitates this cycle in masterly fashion, adroitly using the images and inscriptions to explore key polarities within Romanesque art: the sacred and the profane, the serious and the ludic, Latin and the vernacular, writing and orality, learned and popular culture. With a carefully articulated formal grammar and visual rhetoric, these opposing elements are brought together in ways that expose the hybridity and paradoxical nature of Romanesque art. Rico’s own sensitive and enlightening “reading” takes into account the portal’s liminal role and its relationship to the building’s interior decoration; the meaningful differentiation of corbels and metopes; the centrality or marginal placement of figures; the blending of narrative sequences, symbolic images, and different visual pathways; and the deployment of visual and textual parallels, symmetries, and figures of speech involving compositions, gestures, and inscriptions. For any student of the Romanesque or of twelfth-century culture, Rico provides a methodological exercise of rare discernment and sophistication.

Rico begins with Joaquin Yarza’s summation of the cycle as a commentary on the consequences of the Fall of Adam and Eve: the entry of sin into a world aptly characterized by framing images of defecating men, inscribed “MALA CAGO” and “IO CACO.” That, however, is just the starting point for a tour de force of exegesis in which Rico’s densely packed but elegantly expressed rumination reverberates through intriguing digressions, erudite footnotes, and theoretical reflection, weaving together threads of insightful commentary with a symphonic texture reminiscent of the best work of Meyer Schapiro or Serafin Moralejo on Romanesque art. This broad-ranging investigation is not an effort to discover the irretrievable historical details behind the confection of these sculptures or to trace their artistic pedigree. Rico does emphasize the centrality of the theology of original sin and its effects, specifically as expounded in Romans 5 and 7 and elaborated in Augustine’s writings, but his study spirals outwards into an extended meditation on the ramifications of the story of the Creation and Fall of man, the sin of Cain, and their continuing repercussions and re-enactment in a fallen world.

Rico concludes by turning to the performance of the images and texts, re-creating a dynamic process of collective and interactive interpretation, demanded by the ambiguities and multiple meanings embedded in the ensemble. He underscores the capacity of Romanesque art to integrate different cultural and social groups, employ a range of expressive modes, and confer a paradoxical centrality on subjects later relegated to the margins of Gothic art. For the author, this capacity helps define a crucial period—the twelfth century—in the evolution of the medieval church’s place in society and the relationship between the sacred and secular spheres.

At the heart of Rico’s analysis is an exploration of the inscriptions “MALA CAGO” and “IO CACO”; the dramatic juxtaposition of the defecating figures with Adam and Eve and God’s cursing of Cain; and the “IO” provocatively inscribed by the oversized penis of the man in the lovemaking couple exhibited in a central metope. Like Jean-Claude Bonne and Kirk Ambrose, Rico stresses the integration of texts and images and the role of inscriptions in the visual poetics of Romanesque art. He considers the analogies between linguistic registers and visual compositions and the complementary role of figures of speech in verbal and

visual expressions. These deceptively simple and direct phrases prompt a thoroughgoing investigation of the mixing of Latin and vernacular forms, the performativity of first-person texts, and the punning allusions to scriptural and liturgical verses, and even mythological figures. With this, Rico effortlessly traverses a wide cultural landscape, discussing, for example, notions of rusticity, analogies between grammatical and moral rectitude, and the performance of penance. Within this short study, he skillfully draws comparisons with a range of works: the wall paintings of San Clemente in Rome, the Bayeux Tapestry, the Romanesque portal of the Catalan church of Santa Maria de Covet, the pavement mosaics and portals of Italian Romanesque churches, the *Jeu d'Adam*, the *Libro de buen amor*, vernacular glosses and commentaries on Latin texts, the marginal illustrations of Gothic manuscripts, and a variety of proverbs, satirical verses, and scholastic exercises.

Though centered on a little-known Romanesque monument, Rico's book is a brilliant, profound, and richly evocative exploration of medieval attitudes and ideas and of their expression in words and images. Thoroughly engaged with contemporary scholarship across disciplines, his work will interest a wide circle of medievalists and students of culture, well beyond specialists in Romanesque art, for its insights into the relationships between texts and images, the interactions of Latin and vernacular culture, and the complex dialogue between the sacred and the profane in medieval art and culture.

JAMES D'EMILIO, University of South Florida, Tampa

ELS ROSE, *Ritual Memory: The Apocryphal Acts and Liturgical Commemoration in the Early Medieval West (c. 500–1215)*. (Mittellateinische Studien und Texte, 40.) Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009. Pp. xiii, 334. €121.
doi:10.1017/S0038713410001971

The narrow focus of this study should not mislead potential readers into thinking that the impact of the book is similarly narrow. *Ritual Memory* will be of interest to liturgists, of course, but also to anyone who studies hagiography, the apocrypha, or even Christian Scripture. The author traces the uses in Western liturgies of the apocryphal acts of the apostles Bartholomew, Philip, James, Matthew, Simon, and Jude up until the twelfth century. In doing so, however, Rose raises interesting questions concerning the relationship between the apocrypha and hagiography. What exactly is the difference? Are not both concerned with the miraculous lives of the renowned Christians, albeit some are characters from Scripture? If there is no difference (an assertion Rose leaves unstated), then, more controversially, can one draw a clear distinction between canonical Scripture and hagiography (a question left unasked)? Rose suggests as well that the apocryphal lives of the apostles likely survived because of their use in the liturgy and, through that use, came to rival canonical Scripture as a source for Christian imagination.

Rose takes as her test cases six of the less well known or "minor" apostles whose feasts were celebrated in the early-medieval period. The description of the liturgies consulted makes an excellent introduction to medieval liturgy in general. In a few short pages she clarifies the difference between Gelasian and Gregorian liturgies, between antiphons and responsorials. Rose also introduces and dates the lists, martyrologies, hymns, and apocryphal acts that make up the bulk of the narrative sources about the apostles.

The first chapter offers an extended overview of modern and medieval discussions of the apocrypha and their relationship to both canonical Scripture and hagiography. Modern scholars tend to question the strict separation between apocrypha and hagiography. Early church writers were mostly concerned to protect readers from the heretical tendencies found in the apocrypha while medieval scholars more often accepted at least parts of the apocrypha as authentic witnesses to the early tradition of the church.