

Marek Thue Kretschmer: *Rewriting Roman History in the Middle Ages: the “Historia Romana” and the Manuscript Bamberg, Hist. 3.* Mittellateinische Studien und Texte vol. 36. Leiden 2007: E. J. Brill. X, 426 pp.

REVIEWED BY ESPEN KARLSEN

The book under review is the published version of a doctoral dissertation in Latin philology defended at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU) at Trondheim in 2006, written under the supervision of professors Lars Boje Mortensen (until 2007 at the University of Bergen, presently at the University of Southern Denmark, Odense) and Gunhild Vidén (until 2006 at NTNU, presently at the University of Göteborg).¹

Kretschmer (in the following K.) studies, as the title of his book indicates, historiographical works in a Bamberg manuscript probably produced at Halberstadt around the year 1000, in the following referred to as *B*. At the centre of Kretschmer's interest is a paraphrase of Paul the Deacon's (*Paulus Diaconus*) *Historia Romana* (in the following *HR*). The original work was a frequently read text on ancient Roman history in the Middle Ages. The paraphrase is here edited for the first time.

B contains the *Epitome de Caesaribus* (“Abbreviated Account of the Caesars”), the *Excidium Troie* (“The Fall of Troy”), the *Romana* (“Roman History”) and *Getica* (“Gothic History”) of Jordanes, *Liber Historiae Francorum* (“The Book on the History of the Franks”), Bede's *Ecclesiastica Historia gentis Anglorum* (“A History of the Church of the English People”) as well as his *Chronica de sex aetatibus mundi* (“Chronicle of the Six Ages of the World”), and the *Historia Romana* (“Roman History”) and the *Historia Langobardorum* (“A History of the Lombards”) by Paul the Deacon (720/30–c. 799). In addition, there are some texts concerning Alexander the Great, e.g., the *Vita Alexandri Magni* (“The Life of Alexander the Great”, composed c. 950) of Leo Archipresbyter of Naples (also known as Leo Neapolitanus) which was edited by Pfister (1913). *B* is the oldest manuscript to contain this text. All together the texts in *B* constitute a universal history (K. p. 3).

¹ I will refer not only to the revised version under review (2007), but also to the original dissertation submitted in 2005 and defended in 2006 (Kretschmer 2005), as additional examples not included in the version under review are cited in full in the 2005 dissertation.

K.'s book has received due praise in international journals (Le Saux 2008; Limbach 2008; Menegaldo 2009; Führer 2009; Foote 2009). The present review will deal more than the earlier ones with philological and linguistic matters.

The aim of the book as formulated on p. 1 "is to offer a series of contextualisations of *B*, with special regard to its paraphrased version of the *Historia Romana*" of Paul the Deacon. K. emphasises that not only is the combination of texts in the *codex* remarkable, but the texts appear to have been paraphrased and rewritten in a peculiar Latin marked by vernacularisms. Already the title of the book, *Rewriting Roman History*, implies that K. sees the rewriting as a rather conscious task.

The composition of the *Historia Romana* started in the fourth century with Eutropius whose frequently copied handbook of Roman history comprises some seventy pages in a modern printed edition. In the late eighth century the text of Eutropius was expanded by Paul the Deacon (in the printed edition by Crivellucci 1914 the *Historia Romana* comprises 266 pages including critical apparatus). The manuscript *B* contains a paraphrased and abbreviated version of the *Historia Romana* of Paul the Deacon (†799). In the following the abbreviation *HR* refers to the *Historia Romana* of Paul the Deacon, whereas *HRB* refers to the paraphrased version in *B*. This latter version is published by K. (pp. 68–166) in the book under review. The version in *B* is not the original paraphrase (see below).

In the introduction (pp. 1–16) K. discusses the rôle of the paraphrase within medieval historiography, and he emphasises that the idea of the text as a fixed unity has hindered the investigation of different versions and rewriting. K. has chosen to study a single manuscript. On pp. 4–5 he introduces two examples of studies on single manuscripts and versions.²

In Chapter 2 K. presents a classification and preliminary survey of manuscripts containing abbreviations and/or paraphrases of Eutropius, Paul the Deacon's *Historia Romana*, Landolfus Sagax etc., thus adopting a wider focus than just the manuscript *B*. Kretschmer's survey includes twenty-five manuscripts containing abbreviations and/or paraphrases of these texts. The lemmata indicate *inter alia* date and place of origin, as well as references to catalogues, descriptions and contents, including infor-

² He cites from McKitterick's conclusion in her study on the *Liber Pontificalis* (1994), which he sees as a path for future medieval Latin historiography: "What the extant manuscripts do indicate is, firstly, that not one historical text, Roman, Christian or early medieval can be regarded as an unchanging entity. Secondly, all historical writings could be transformed to serve a particular author's or compiler's specific purpose in relation to whatever audience, or audiences, that author or compiler had in mind. Only by detailed examination of the manuscripts concerned can we begin to gain some notion of what those audiences might have been' (K. p. 4).

mation on which texts are copied together in which manuscripts, where and when they are copied and where they are found today. Several of these texts are sometimes copied together.

In Chapter 3, K. discusses the relationship of *B* to other manuscripts of the same paraphrase of the *HR*. The *HRB* is one of four textual witnesses of the same paraphrase of which the original is lost. He discusses the relationship between the textual witnesses which is summarised in a *stemma*, i. e., a diagram of the relationship between the different manuscripts (p. 54). One of the manuscripts (*O*, Southern England?, from the middle of the thirteenth century) is copied from a manuscript written at Salisbury (*S*) and its readings are therefore not included in the list of variant readings in the appendix. The manuscript *U* is copied in Italy in the fourteenth century. (I will return to these manuscripts below.) K. cautiously suggests that the original paraphrase might have been written at Naples in the second half of the tenth century, as a rarely copied Life of Alexander by Leo Archipresbyter of Naples is included (see below for more information on why this connects the *HRB* paraphrase to Naples). *B* and *U* is characterised by a colloquial language, whereas *S* and *O* are more polished. They share some of the other content also with *B*.

Chapter 3 serves as an introduction to different versions of the *Historia Romana* and gives an impression of the textual multiplicity mentioned in the introduction. By including this he secures that the book will remain an important tool of reference.

Even though K. does not discuss the script of *B*, manuscript scholars will undoubtedly miss a reproduction of at least one leaf of the manuscript. (The reproduction on the front cover of his book is for some reason taken from another Bamberg manuscript.) A picture would, at least to the manuscript scholar, have contributed to the contextualizing of *B*.²

The edition of the *HRB* (Chapter 4) is a central part of K.'s book, providing the basis for the study of the paraphrase. It is a single manuscript edition. He has avoided orthographical standardisations. The edition is diplomatic, but not in a strict sense of the word, as this would mean a careful reproduction of the exemplar with italicised expansions of the abbreviations in the manuscript.

The present review contains several terms that may seem repellently technical to readers with no knowledge of Latin grammar. I have given up translating all Latin expressions despite the fact that the *Notes for contributors* at the back of this volume of *Collegium Medievale* require the authors to do so. Taking into consideration the

² I consulted Hartmut Hoffmann's study of tenth and eleventh century Bamberg manuscripts to find pictures (Hoffmann 1995, plates 178 a–b and 179). The text is copied in a Continental Caroline minuscule, as was to be expected of a *codex* of this date and place.

technical nature of the central discussion in the book under review, the inclusion of definitions of linguistic terms would make the present review exceed the limitations of the present journal. Instead, I have tried to present the conclusions in a more accessible form.

In Chapter 5, “The language of the texts contained in *B*” (pp. 167–231), K. turns to the topic indicated by the title of the book, i.e., the paraphrased texts proper and their linguistic form.³ The purpose of this is threefold. It may a) determine which texts in *B* form a unity, b) it may help to reject or confirm an Italian origin, and c) give new evidence on the study of transition from Latin to *volgare*, a term that appears to refer to spoken Romance or Italian in this volume (K. p. 167). The Latin in *B*, similar to the tenth century Salerno chronicle (*Chronicon Salernitanum*, in the following C.S.), K. argues, seems to constitute another witness of literary language in the process of transition from the Latin to *il volgare*, to a more spoken or colloquial syntax.⁴ (K. 168–170). Complex, hypotactic⁵ periods are turned into shorter paratactic sentences (pp. 168–170). True as it is, this is no sufficient argument alone for an Italian origin, as parataxis⁶ is common in many medieval Latin texts from different linguistic areas of Europe.⁷ The Life of Alexander by Leo, full as it is of vernacularisms, appears not to be rewritten, possibly because it was close to the language of the redactor and he considered it unnecessary (K. 230–231). The presence of this rarely copied version is a stronger argument for an Italian origin than K.’s linguistic ones.

K. has chosen to study a single manuscript copied at Halberstadt, probably written by someone speaking a Germanic language, as a source of linguistic change from Latin to Romance. Why not reconstruct the *HR* original paraphrase as far as possible on the basis of *B*, *S* and *U*, the three important manuscripts (see above)? Such an eclectic text would probably furnish a more valuable source for the transition from Latin to Romance, as the original paraphrase may have been compiled in Italy. K. has done the preparations for such an edition, so it would probably not take that much effort to complete it.

K. focuses on nine different syntactic changes (K. p. 171), i.e.,

³ K. excludes those texts of *B* that are proven to contain faithful copies of the original texts.

⁴ This might have been explained further. In my view the Latin of the *HRB* is more polished and standardised than that of the C.S.

⁵ From *hypotaxis*, the subordination of one clause to another.

⁶ The placing of clauses or phrases one after another, without words to indicate coordination or subordination.

⁷ This also goes for most of the nine syntactic categories listed below.

- 1) the replacement of the classical accusative and infinitive construction (henceforth the a.c.i., cf., e.g., Norwegian “jeg så ham komme”) with conjunctive clauses (“jeg så at han kom”),
- 2) substitution of direct speech with indirect speech,
- 3) the finite use of the present participle,
- 4) the replacement of the present participle with the ablative of the gerund,
- 5) the use of *coepisse/incipere* (“to begin”) + infinitive for past-tense finite verb forms,
- 6) the use of a modal verb (*debere*) + infinitive as a periphrasis of the future tense,
- 7) use of *facere* (“to see to it that”) + infinitive,
- 8) use of *unus* as indefinite article,
- 9) use of prepositional phrase instead of case.

In addition there is a tenth category of replacements in the vocabulary. Most of these groups are typical features of many late Latin texts (i.e., Latin texts from the period c. 200–600 A.D.) as well as many medieval Latin texts.

The thirteen texts to be discussed are listed on p. 172, including five texts relating to Alexander the Great. K. aims at finding to what extent the thirteen texts share syntactic structures and vocabulary. In the remaining part of the chapter K. has supplied lists of examples from the primary texts and from the paraphrases according to the ten groups just mentioned.

We are offered meticulous divisions of the material into the groups listed above. Selected passages are cited in full both in the primary version and in the paraphrase. These different groups are not discussed or defined more closely, although a closer enquiry in many cases would enhance our understanding. There is also a lack of interpretation of the cited instances within each group. One might get the impression that K. perceives these categories and their rôle within the Latin language, both the primary Latin versions and the more “Romance” paraphrased version, as more straightforward and crystal clear than they in fact are.

I will now comment upon some of Kretschmer’s nine linguistic features.

Category 6, i.e., the use of a modal verb (*debere*) + infinitive as a periphrasis of the future tense. In particular *debere* (“ought”, “should”) + infinitive replace the classical periphrasis consisting of a future participle (ending on *-urus*; e.g., *futurus*, *venturus* = “about to come”) with an inflected form of the verb “to be” (*esse*). This combination denotes posterior action. The existence of this use of *debere* + infinitive to denote future has been disputed, *inter alia* by Pinkster who was not convinced of

its existence in the Latin language.⁸ However, K. is fortunate enough to have a control group in the texts on which the paraphrase is based to confirm the interpretation (e.g., in Paul the Deacon's original *Historia Romana*), but unfortunately fails to emphasize this important result. In this context it is worthy of notice that the *-urus esse* periphrasis has left no traces in the Romance languages,⁹ and its use is in many texts restricted to rather few future participles, e.g., in the *Regula Benedicti*.¹⁰

The importance of considering the replacement of *-urus esse* is particularly clear in the citation on p. 189 in the paraphrase of *HR*. Three expressions with *-urus esse* in a row is replaced with modal verb periphrases with *velle* ("to want", "wish for") and *debere* ("ought", "should").¹¹ The evidence is even stronger considering the paraphrase of *Historia Langobardorum* in *B* (p. 204 with additional examples in Kretschmer 2005, 383–384). I will here focus on the excerpts from the paraphrased *Historia Langobardorum* in particular taking into consideration Kretschmer's additional examples in the original dissertation (2005, 383–384).¹² He lists altogether fourteen instances. In eight of them the combination *-urus esse* in the original *Historia Langobardorum* is replaced with an expression involving a modal verb + infinitive in the paraphrase.

K. refrains from pointing out that the use of modal verb periphrases could be linked with the avoidance of the *-urus esse* among late Latin and medieval authors.¹³ Hanetseder (1994, 181) took *-urus esse* as a point of departure and calls attention to other ways of expressing future in *Epistula Alexandri* in *B* (they are periphrastic expressions replacing the future participle, by means of finite verb in the subjunctive

⁸ Pinkster has criticized this idea which is not uncommon among classical philologists (1989, 311–313), and found no sign whatsoever of future tense auxiliary use in the material investigated by him from early to Late Latin.

⁹ There are very few forms that have survived into the Romance languages, most notably the adjectival *venturo* (Italian) and the term *futuro* itself (Harris & Vincent 1988, 48).

¹⁰ By way of comparison, this is true also of the *Revelaciones* of St. Bridget of Sweden, where *-urus*-forms are uncommon and in part formulaic (see my excursus on the active periphrastic conjugation and the future infinitive active in the *Revelaciones* 1–7 in Karlsen 2001, 163–169).

¹¹ Hanetseder (1994, 185) adds *posse* ("to be able to") and *habere* ("to have")+ infinitive as periphrases of the future in *B*.

¹² The instance of *venire deberet* from the paraphrased *HL* V, 39 seems final to me, as does it in the primary version of Paul the Deacon.

¹³ Hanetseder (1994, 181–186) takes the replacement of *-urus esse* as a point of departure and discusses the different replacements.

in a subordinate clause, and the preposition *ad* + gerundive). Then it appears that the modal verb periphrasis of the future is but one of several ways used in the rewriting of the texts in *B* to express non-final posterior action (futurity).¹⁴

A discussion of the different expressions of non-final posterior action would probably have led to interesting new results.¹⁵ In the examples cited by Hanetseder there are other changes in the text due to different ways of replacing the *–urus* (*esse*) expression, e.g., *Nullumque ab his dolum aut scelus resurrecturum sperabam*, is rendered *Ego autem non cogitabam de eis, ut aliquam fraudem mihi facerent* (Pfister 1910, 34). In the latter instance the a.c.i. with future infinitive (*resurrecturum*) is rendered by a conjunctive clause with a subjunctive in the imperfect tense.¹⁶ Thus it coincides with the first of K.'s categories (the replacement of the classical accusative and infinitive construction with conjunctive clauses). There may be more factors present in the same textual examples, e.g., the a.c.i. is rendered by a conjunctive clause and the *–urus esse* form in the a.c.i. is rendered by some other mode of expression with reference to the future.

Group 3, the use of the present participle in place of a finite verb, could need further clarification. It is hard to see that this phenomenon was typical of spoken language.

Among Late Latin authors there was in the words of Hofmann & Szantyr ([1965] 1972, 389), an immense use of participles, typical of learned language, and this immense use included some new usages unknown in standard classical Latin, i.e., the language of Cicero, Caesar and Livy. Probably K. would in principle adhere to the definition of Eklund (1970, 119): "The phrase 'p(resent) p(articiples)' instead of a finite form refers to cases in which a p.p. has a position such, that it seems to serve as a finite form and can be replaced – without any other changes being made in the sentence – by a finite form". To such instances K. adds instances of the *nominativus absolutus*,¹⁷ although it "cannot formally count as finite, the relative high frequency of

¹⁴ I have discussed different ways of expressing non-final posterior action in subordinate clauses in the *Revelaciones*, Books 1–7, of St. Bridget (1303–73) (Karlsen 2001, 136–167), including all relevant instances in past-tense and present-tense contexts. The discussion also includes an excursus on all instances of the active periphrastic conjugation and the future infinitive active in *Revelaciones* 1–7. The use of the future participle with or without *esse* is in this text strongly characterized by formula, and rather few participle forms are frequent.

¹⁵ Hanetseder (1994) has made some valuable observations concerning one of the texts in *B*, i.e., the paraphrase of *Epistola Alexandri ad Aristotelem*.

¹⁶ This so-called "prospective" subjunctive is studied by Fridh (1971) and by Karlsen (2001, 150–158).

¹⁷ An absolute construction in Latin consists of a noun and participle or adjective in an inflected case, usually the ablative, but in postclassical Latin also the nominative and accusative occurs. An absolute construction may function as a sentence adverb.

the construction suggests that the present participle is perceived as an equivalent to a finite verb rather than an anacoluthon" (K. p. 171, footnote 14). The *nominativus absolutus* no doubt occurs, but it does not belong to the category "finite use of the present participle". Eklund (1970, 204) concluded that "it is very questionable if there was ever any deliberate use of p.p. instead of finite verb forms in the Latin language". J. N. Adams went even further and argued that this phenomenon did not exist.¹⁸ I am surprised that there is no discussion of these problems in K.'s study, and he finds no support in his references to Eklund (1970, 119–205) and to Stotz (1998, 236–238) (K. p. 171, footnote 14). On the pages referred to in Eklund (1970), Eklund sharply criticised the idea that the present participle performed the functions of a finite verb.

Of the ten instances (two in the same sentence) of "finite" uses of the present participle in the *HRB* there are seven instances of the nominative absolute. Moreover, nine of the participles are derived from verbs of movement, six of them are forms of the same participle *veniens* ("coming"). The different verbs found in the paraphrased text are in these cases replaced by *veniens/venientes* alone.¹⁹ It appears that we have to do with a simplifying formulaic pattern, central in the technique of paraphrasing in the *HRB*.²⁰

K. would have stood on safer ground if he had collected all instances of finite verbs being turned into participles, either in absolute constructions, or as conjunct participles. It is quite possible that he then would have thrown light upon one essen-

¹⁸ Adams (1976, 60–61); see further Pitkäranta (1978, 78–85) on Victor Vitensis (fifth century). For earlier scholarship, see the survey in the standard reference work by Hofmann & Szantyr ([1965] 1972, 389).

¹⁹ *HRB* 16, 15: *Veniens itaque Belisarius in Siciliam, cum aliquantum tempus ibi moraretur, rex Gothorum Theodatus mortuus est*; *HRB* 13, 1: *Eraclianus quoque comes Africe cum tribus milibus ac septingentis nauibus ex Africa Romam ueniens, Marinus comes occurrit ei et exterruit eum atque fugere fecit*; *HRB* 14, 11–12: *et inde uenientes per Vincenciam, Veronam, Pergamum et Brixiam, quesunt Venecię ciuitates, ac et per alias uenientes ciuitates, nemo eis resistebat*; *HRB* 15, 1: *Tercio uero anno regni eius Gugo rex ueniens occurrit ei Ricimer patricius et pugnavit cum eo non longe a Pergamo ciuitate et occidit illum*.

²⁰ The element of formula in the use of the p.p. is strong also in *Chronicon Salernitanum*, in which instances as, e.g., C.S. 10 (Westerbergh 1956, 13) *Quod dum Arichis audiens, nimis exterruit*, occur formulaically (*dum* modifies the participle alone; for the use of *dum*, cf. Tertullian, *De carne Christi* 6.1 *habuerit carnem dum omnino non natam*. Cf. also the use of *quia* in Tertullian, *De virginibus velandis* 10, 4 *quomodo non magis uiris aliquid tale deus . . . subscripsisset, vel quia familiariori scilicet imagini suae, vel quia plus laboranti*). An instance of *dum* modifying an absolute construction is found in C.S. 72 (Westerbergh 1956, 70) *dum nescientibus* (abl. pl.) Langobardi (nom. pl.; see Westerbergh 1956, 274) *ipsa decipula, forti animo super eos irruerunt*. See further Karlsen (forthcoming 2013) on the present participle modified by *dum*, *ut*, and *quia*.

tial element in the paraphrase, relating it to the statement of Hofmann & Szantyr ([1965] 1972, 389) on the immense use of participles among Late Latin authors. This fits well inside the framework of late Latin language, but it is not a feature in the development from Latin to Romance.

K. has included lists over the most common replacements in the vocabulary (in the *HRB* on p. 192–194. I will add an observation on the vocabulary that K. does not mention as this is important in the transition from Latin to Romance. The avoidance of *ire* (“to go”) as a verb of movement is certainly conspicuous (cf. Väänänen 1981, 75). The frequency of *pergere* as a synonym, often in the perfect tense (*perrexit/perrexerunt*), is particularly striking in the *HRB*. The problem with lists is what to include and exclude, and there may be other important replacements worthy of mention.

K. concludes that the different texts in *B* are rewritten to become homogeneous (the more contemporary texts, however, appear to have few alterations). The texts under investigation (with some reservation for the shorter ones) all appear to have been rewritten with the exception of Leo Archipresbyter of Naples who was contemporary with the redactor of the original paraphrase and may have been part of the same milieu (K. pp. 230–231). The rewriting of Leo was thus probably unnecessary (p. 231).

The linguistic factors discussed by K. were since long established in many Latin texts already in late antiquity.²¹ For instance, the first known example of a conjunctive clause in the place of an infinitive construction as an object of a verb of saying is found in a continuation of Caesar’s book on the civil war from c. 40 B.C.²² The rewriting no doubt brings the *HR* closer to spoken language, but is it not possible that the rewriting was done for a Latin audience with another educational background than Paul the Deacon’s readers? The orthography in *B* is not radically influenced by spoken Romance, nor is the grammar, which is not unusual for many medieval texts. Another example of rewriting from a different linguistic area rings to mind: The extremely classicising and demanding Danish history of Saxo Grammaticus (c. 1200) was later rewritten in a less demanding and less learned form of literary Latin in the *Compendium Saxonis* (“An Abridgment of Saxo”) (Knudsen 2012).

K. discusses at length in chapter 6 important matters as ideological, literary and moral factors, as well as Roman history and medieval historical theories and the chronicle as world history. He outlines the history of apologetic world history and

²¹ See among others, Adams (1976) on the sixth century chronicle of *Anonymus Valesianus* II; Blatt (1930) on the early medieval translation into Latin of *Acta Andreae et Matthiae apud anthropofagos*, Pitkäranta (1978) on Victor Vitensis, and Löfstedt’s classic study of the fourth- or fifth-century *Itinerarium Egeriae* (1911), to name a few narrative texts.

integration of Roman history into the Christian world chronicle back to St. Jerome (347–420). Further he examines the case of the *HRB* paraphrase, whether it is part of a world chronicle or of an anthology of national histories (K. p. 236–245, including a list of omissions in *B*). K. also discusses the Christian interpretation (*Interpretatio Christiana*) of history and mentions systematic omissions in the paraphrase, e.g., of apotheoses, different examples of simplification, the possible suppression of triumphs (were triumphs deemed unsuitable to the readers?) etc. He concludes that the *HRB* appears to form part of a world chronicle and presents a Christian reading of Roman history. The chapter contains large collections of material, similar to chapter 5.

Taken in its own terms, this book cannot be considered an unqualified success. It only succeeds in answering some of its stated research questions mentioned in the beginning of this review. a) He determines which texts in *B* form a unity, b) his discussion of the syntactical categories does not help to reject or confirm an Italian origin: They do not link the *HRB* to Italy exclusively, since they occur in many texts in the European Middle Ages (cf. K. p. 321), but there are indications in the vocabulary, and c) he does in my view not give much new results on the study of the transition from Latin to *volgare* (K. p. 167). In this last case the basic problem is that the linguistic material would need clearer, well-defined categories and more sophisticated interpretation. Chapters 5 and 6 (pp. 167–319) consist largely of a collection of material divided into groups. The approach in Chapter 5 is old-fashioned. By treating the groups in watertight compartments without interpretation, the complex nature of linguistic variation is reduced to a too simplistic picture, and these strict compartments may have prevented K. from discovering important connections. Important and relevant research on the Latin language from the last thirty years is not taken into consideration,²³ and he fails to make a point of his own important result regarding the modal verb periphrases of the future tense.

In other aspects the book under review is impressive and the result of hard work. The main conclusions appear sound and correct. After having acquainted myself with the book and the many examples of paraphrasing, I am in no doubt that K. is right in stating that we have to do with a systematic paraphrase of the *Historia Romana* into a different linguistic form.

The book will remain important for years to come *inter alia* for the following rea-

²² *Bellum Hispaniense* ("The War in Spain") 36, 1. On the phenomenon in ancient (classical and late) Latin, see Hofmann & Szantyr (1972, 576–579).

²³ The language of *B* is strongly characterised by traits found in late Latin texts. I am surprised that there are no references to Hofmann & Szantyr (1972), which is still the standard work of reference in this field.

sons:

- 1) It offers the first classification and preliminary survey of extant manuscripts containing versions of the *HR*.
- 2) K. studies the textual history of the *HRB* version which is also transmitted in three more manuscripts and then supplies a stemma of the four manuscripts containing this paraphrase, thereby laying the foundation for an eclectic edition of the paraphrase and lists textual variants from the two other important manuscripts containing the paraphrase that prove to be important (K. pp. 323–393).
- 3) K. provides an excellent critical edition of *HRB*, a text previously unprinted, thereby securing its place in the study of historiographical tradition in the Middle Ages.
- 4) K. shows that the systematically rewritten texts in *B* may be meant to form a world history and throws light on ideological implications of the paraphrase and literary techniques.

Bibliography

- Adams, J. N. 1976. *The Text and Language of a Vulgar Latin Chronicle (Anonymus Valesianus II)*. Institute of Classical Studies Bulletin Supplement No. 36. London: University of London.
- Blatt, Franz. 1930. *Die lateinischen Bearbeitungen der Acta Andreae et Matthiae apud anthropophagos. Mit sprachlichem Kommentar herausgegeben von F. B. Gießen & København: Töpelmann/Levin & Munksgaard.*
- Crivellucci, Amedeo (ed.). 1914. *Pauli Diaconi Historia Romana*. Fonti per la storia d'Italia 51. Roma: Tipografia del senato.
- Duval, Fr. 2008. [Review of] "Marek Thue Kretschmer, *Rewriting Roman History in the Middle Ages. The Historia Romana and the Manuscript Bamberg, Hist. 3.*" *Scriptorium* 62, p. 63.
- Eklund, Sten. 1970. *The Present Participle in Latin*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Foote, David. 2009. [Review of] "Marek Thue Kretschmer, *Rewriting Roman History in the Middle Ages. The Historia Romana and the Manuscript Bamberg, Hist. 3.*" *Speculum* 83, 1017–1019.
- Fridh, Åke. 1971. *Der sogenannte prospektive Konjunktiv im Lateinischen*. Acta Regiae societatis scientiarum et litterarum Gothoburgensis. Humaniora 5. Göteborg: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Führer, Julian. 2009. [Review of] "Marek Thue Kretschmer, *Rewriting Roman His-*

- tory in the Middle Ages. The Historia Romana and the Manuscript Bamberg, Hist. 3.*" *Mittelateinisches Jahrbuch* 44: 1, 167–169
- Hanetseder, Eva. 1994. "Der angebliche Brief Alexanders über die Wunder Indiens. Eine sprachliche Untersuchung der Fassung in der Bamberger Handschrift." *Archivum Latinitatis medii aevi* 167–200. Bruxelles: Droz.
- Hofmann, Johann Baptist & Anton Szantyr. 1972. *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft II.2.2. 1965. Corr. repr. 1972. München: C. H. Beck.
- Karlsen, Espen. 2001. *The Accusativus Cum Infinitivo and Quod Clauses in the Revelaciones of St. Bridget of Sweden*. Lateinische Sprache und Literatur des Mittelalters 33. Bern: Peter Lang.
- . Forthcoming 2013. "The Present Participle Modified by *dum*, *ut* and *quia*." *Actes du 13e Colloque international de Linguistique latine, 4-9 avril 2005, F.U.S.L (Bruxelles)*, eds. Dominique Longrée, C. Bodelot et M. Lenoble, (Bibliothèque d'Études Classiques). Louvain-Paris: Peeters.
- Knudsen, Anders Leegaard. 2012. "Compendium Saxonis & Chronica Jutensis." *Medieval Nordic Literature in Latin: A Website of Authors and Anonymous Works c. 1100–1530*, eds. Stephan Borgehammar, Karsten Friis-Jensen, Lars Boje Mortensen & Åslaug Ommundsen. https://wikihost.uib.no/medieval/index.php/Medieval_Nordic_Literature_in_Latin
- Kretschmer, Marek Thue. 2005. *Rewriting Roman History in the Middle Ages: the "Historia Romana" and the Manuscript Bamberg, Hist. 3*. Doktoravhandling ved NTNU Bind nr: 2005: 239. Trondheim: Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Faculty of Arts, Department of History and Classical Studies.
- Limbach, Eric H. 2008. "Marek Thue Kretschmer, *Rewriting Roman History in the Middle Ages. The Historia Romana and the Manuscript Bamberg, Hist. 3*." H-HRE, H-Net Reviews. March, 2008. URL: <http://www.h-net.org/reviews/showrev.php?id=14281>
- Löfstedt, Einar. 1911. *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae*. Uppsala & Leipzig: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Menegaldo, Silvere. 2007. "Marek Thue Kretschmer, *Rewriting Roman History in the Middle Ages. The Historia Romana and the Manuscript Bamberg, Hist. 3*". *Cahiers de recherches médiévales et humanistes* [En ligne], 2007, mis en ligne le 18 février 2009, consulté le 04 janvier 2013. URL: <http://crm.revues.org/11471>.
- Pfister, Friedrich (ed.). 1913. *Der Alexanderroman des Archipresbyters Leo*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung.
- Pinkster, Harm. 1989. "Some Methodological Remarks on Research on Future Tense

- Auxiliaries in Latin.” In G. Calboli (ed.), *Subordination and Other Topics in Latin* 311–326. Studies in Language Companion Series 17. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Pitkäranta, Reijo. 1978. *Studien zum Latein des Victor Vitensis*. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.
- Le Saux, F. 2008. “Marek Thue Kretschmer, *Rewriting Roman History in the Middle Ages. The Historia Romana and the Manuscript Bamberg, Hist. 3*”. *Medium Aevum* 77, 120–121.
- Väänänen, Veikko. 1981. *Introduction au latin vulgaire*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Espen Karlsen, fil. dr. in Latin. He is responsible for the collection of incunabula in the National Library of Norway, Oslo. Address: Nasjonalbiblioteket, Postboks 2674 Solli, N-0203 Oslo; e-mail espen.karlsen@nb.no or eskarl@online.no.
