
Review

Reviewed Work(s): Relics, Apocalypse, and the Deceits of History: Ademar of Chabannes, 989- 1034. by Richard Landes

Review by: R. I. Moore

Source: *Speculum*, Vol. 72, No. 3 (Jul., 1997), pp. 850-852

Published by: The University of Chicago Press on behalf of the Medieval Academy of America

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3040807>

Accessed: 14-05-2019 07:47 UTC

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.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Medieval Academy of America, The University of Chicago Press are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Speculum*

dedication poem provides only a broad indication of date, and Mutherich's preference for a date not too far from 830 must be taken loosely. The Ebbo Gospels is the only surviving manuscript of the group bearing evidence of place of origin, at Hautvillers, but even that is problematic, for no other illuminated manuscript has a demonstrably early Hautvillers origin or provenance. Indeed, when the nonilluminated manuscripts from Reims were surveyed by Frederick Carey in what still remains the fundamental essay on Reims book production (in Leslie Webber Jones, ed., *Classical and Mediaeval Studies in Honor of Edward Kennard Rand* [New York, 1938; repr. 1968], pp. 41–60), he found that of seventy-five Reims manuscripts dating before the end of Hincmar's episcopacy, the Ebbo Gospels is the only one associated with Hautvillers. How then can we imagine an active scriptorium at Hautvillers, able to produce a masterpiece like the Ebbo Gospels, much less the Utrecht Psalter, which is often associated with Hautvillers because of its evident, albeit highly problematic, relationship to the Ebbo Gospels? Students of Carolingian illumination can look forward to the appearance of the second part of this fundamental treatment of the manuscripts from Reims, which will certainly advance our ability to address such questions, as this first part most effectively does.

LAWRENCE NEES, University of Delaware

RICHARD LANDES, *Relics, Apocalypse, and the Deceits of History: Ademar of Chabannes, 989–1034*. (Harvard Historical Studies, 117.) Cambridge, Mass., and London: Harvard University Press, 1995. Pp. xii, 404; black-and-white frontispiece, 14 black-and-white figures and diagrams. \$55.

Richard Landes's contribution to the growing awareness in recent years both of the immense wealth of unexploited material represented by the eleventh-century manuscripts of Saint-Martial, Limoges, including hundreds of autograph folios of Ademar of Chabannes, and of the difficulties of using it has made this an eagerly awaited book. It will not disappoint. Landes's views on Ademar's personal and intellectual development as they are reflected in the autographs, and on the nature and significance of apocalyptic excitement associated with the expectation of the millennium, already widely discussed, are now set out in full. Many will find no less absorbing, and perhaps judge no less important, his rich and circumstantial account of the contexts in which Ademar lived and worked. His family, most probably a cadet line of the *vicomtes* of Limoges, enjoyed extensive ecclesiastical connections in the region and worked hard at improving them, to the extent that Ademar's father succeeded to the patrimony because two elder brothers had entered Saint-Martial, where they became respectively deacon and cantor, while the placing of Ademar himself at Saint-Cybard, Angoulême, Landes suggests persuasively, was calculated to extend the network and its influence to a new and politically exploitable county. It was the beginning of a career that illustrates very graphically why the delicate spirits of the next generation failed to satisfy their aspirations in the great Benedictine houses, for though Ademar's life was one of hard work and passionate devotion, it offered little opportunity for contemplation and was anything but remote from the world. On the contrary, these cloisters represented the interface between court, office, and public opinion, which we are enabled to observe in detail through three singularly eventful decades. To that end Landes has taken skillful advantage of the very rich materials of which Ademar's own voluminous writings form the centerpiece, bringing to bear on them both wide learning and close and perceptive reading, unafraid to speculate where speculation can alert us to possibilities that the sources do not make clear or explicit, but always scrupulous and precise in doing so.

The result, since we are dealing chiefly neither with charter or other record evidence, on the one hand, nor with conventional hagiography, on the other, is not only a satisfying and

absorbing account in its own right but one that offers a refreshing contrast and complement to other studies of monastic communities in these decades. The central role accorded to the dynamics and vicissitudes of the peace movement in Aquitaine is not unexpected, but Landes's analysis of the development of the cult of St. Martial in the context of rivalry between the ducal house and the *vicomtes* of Limoges, the growth of the bourg, and the rebuilding of the basilica is an important and original demonstration of the manipulation of the relic cult to contain (rather than to arouse) popular excitement and of the social tensions generated by the transformation (whether the result of a "mutation" or not) that became so visible in these decades. New political insights include a fresh examination of the events surrounding the death of Count William of Angoulême in April 1028 amid accusations of witchcraft maybe designed to provide cover for poisoning by the Gascon wife of his son and heir.

At the core of the work, and central to the numerous revisions and rereadings that it proposes across a wide range of issues, is the composition of Ademar's best-known work, the *Chronicon* or *Historia*. In Landes's view, the version edited by Jules Chavanon (Landes's β) was a second, and considerably expanded, version, composed in the months after July 1027, of an earlier, unfinished recension (α), which Léopold Delisle identified as an autograph and which Landes dates to 1025 or early 1026. A third version, Landes's γ , was written at Limoges between spring 1028 and summer 1029 and survives only in some autograph fragments and a late-twelfth-century version of the *Historia* by a copyist whose considerable additions to the beta text have hitherto been regarded as interpolations. Close comparison of the contents of the three recensions not only establishes the relationship between them but charts the personal and intellectual development of the historian in graphic and sometimes startling detail. Alpha, probably composed during the 1020s, is the fruit of long apprenticeship and reflection in the scriptorium at Saint-Cybard, whose organization and everyday operation are graphically reconstructed. It shows a good education and wide reading, including a sophisticated interest in chronology, but is parochial in its outlook and sparing and somewhat hesitant in its treatment of the dramatic events of Ademar's own lifetime. They, by contrast, are the focus of attention in the revisions, though the expansion and embellishment of earlier material (as in the attribution of the deaths of Otto III and Louis V to poisoning: see above) often betray the author's current preoccupations and anxieties. Of these we are offered a minute and often dramatic reconstruction, which may be briefly summarized as traversing a rapid course from heightened and disappointed ambition, accompanied by the greater knowledge of the world and intensified political awareness that followed the return of the count of Angoulême from the Holy Land in 1027, Ademar's move to Saint-Martial in the spring of 1028 and his passionate immersion in the campaign to have Martial acknowledged as an apostle, to the humiliation and descent into madness after he, and Martial with him, was publicly exposed as a fraud by Benedict of Chiusa in August 1029.

It is hard to think of another figure of the period, or near it, of whom such an intimate portrait could be attempted. The detail is inevitably debatable—how closely the firmness of Ademar's grip on his quill corresponded to that on reality is an interesting paleographical issue in itself—but the attempt is extremely rewarding. Through these successive and very differently tinted lenses Ademar's changing vision of the extraordinary times in which he lived, revealed as much in what he did not choose to tell at different times as what he did, provides Landes with the basis of a far broader and more challenging account of Aquitaine, and by extension the west, in this "millennial generation" than it would be possible to engage in a short review. Its keynote is anxiety, and in particular anxiety in court and cloister at the specter of popular unrest. Even those who are most skeptical of the general currency of apocalyptic expectations, or of the extent to which they should be read as accounting for disturbance rather than reflecting it, will be impressed by the evidence pre-

sented here that, whatever we may think about it, the monks of Saint-Cybard were very worried indeed. Even those most doubtful that heresy was as yet a reality among the populace rather than a bogey evoked by the defenders of “imperial” monasticism against the voices of apostolic simplicity will be grateful for the vividness with which popular religious feeling is displayed in so many aspects, notably in respect of church building, to which we have given too little thought. Landes’s prolonged and perceptive immersion in one of the most extraordinary chroniclers of this or any time has provided material to sustain our present fascination with the beginning of this millennium well into the next.

R. I. MOORE, University of Newcastle upon Tyne

MICHAEL LAPIDGE, ed., *Archbishop Theodore: Commemorative Studies on His Life and Influence*. (Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England, 11.) Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1995. Pp. xiii, 343; maps and figures. \$59.95.

As a commemoration of the thirteen-hundredth anniversary of the death of Theodore of Tarsus in 690, Michael Lapidge and some Cambridge colleagues convoked a small gathering of scholars to present papers on many aspects of the work and context of this astonishing seventh-century (arch)bishop of Canterbury. The printed versions of those twelve papers, reinforced by two further invited contributions, amount to far more than the “Commemorative Studies” of the subtitle; rather, the resulting volume is one of the most substantial contributions to early-medieval history of at least the past decade.

The order in which the papers appear mirrors in effect the pattern of Theodore’s life and activity. The first three move from a consideration of the Syriac background to that of contemporary Greek culture and to seventh-century Rome. With, so to speak, the Channel crossed (Theodore came to England in 669), the next papers take up theological controversy, canon law matters, the penitential literature ascribed to Theodore, and hagiographical and didactic works possibly also by him. Finally, liturgical, biblical, poetic, and linguistic aspects are passed under review.

All fifteen of the papers (including Lapidge’s stage-setting survey of Theodore’s career as a whole) deserve detailed mention, but only a handful can be noticed here. Among Theodore’s lesser but fascinating achievements was—according to Carmela Viricillo Franklin—the introduction into England of the cult of the Persian convert Anastasius. This is striking because Anastasius (whose original name was Magundat) was a somewhat older contemporary of Theodore’s. That the Latin into which the Greek *acta* of this martyr were translated was very faulty was lamented by Bede; Franklin offers an ingenious, and quite convincing, hypothesis that the author of the faulty Latin is none other than Theodore, for whom Latin was a third language (after Syriac and Greek). She suggests further that Bede, despite the strong praise he heaps on Theodore, actually knew surprisingly little about the details of the archbishop’s life and accomplishment; if so, his candor about the quality of the Latin is merely ironic rather than disingenuous.

Another facet of Theodore’s interaction with the Latin world is studied in Martin Brett’s treatment of him in relation to “the Latin canon law.” Although the definite article in the paper’s title might be thought to imply something more codified than can have been the case, it is clear that Theodore brought certain equipment and a certain attitude to the meetings at Hertford (673) and “Hatfield” (680): occasions so celebrated through the combination of Theodore’s presidency and Bede’s (secondhand) report that they commonly rank as the first councils of the English church. Brett shows deftly how uncertain our sense of the level of knowledgeability about the canon law at those meetings must be, hints that Theodore used what sources he had with surprising freedom, and reminds us refreshingly