

Review Essay
Claves and Clavigeri: Medieval Source Repertories
in the Twenty-First Century

J.R. Webb

Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies

Clavis scriptorum Latinorum medii aevi: Auctores Galliae 735–987, ed. Marie-Hélène Jullien (and Françoise Perelman for vols. 1–2), *Corpus Christianorum continuatio mediævalis* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1994–)

Clavis scriptorum Latinorum medii aevi: Auctores Italiae (700–1000), ed. Benedetta Valtorta, *Edizione nazionale dei testi mediolatini 17 – Serie I, 10* (Florence: SISMEL, Edizione del Galuzzo, 2006)

Compendium auctorum Latinorum medii aevi (500–1500), ed. Michael Lapidge et al. (Florence: SISMEL, Edizione del Galuzzo, 2000–)

Die Geschichtsquellen des deutschen Mittelalters: www.repfont.badw.de (2006–)

The Narrative Sources from the Medieval Low Countries, ed. Jeroen Deploige: www.narrative-sources.be (2002–)

If each generation must write its own history, the same cannot be said of the heuristic tools that historians use to identify texts, authors, and relevant bibliography. Herein lie the positivistic vestiges of the scholarly endeavor, where much of the toil of earlier efforts to gather information on historical sources is not lost in subsequent undertakings. Source repertories are especially integral to the field of medieval studies, whose practitioners waded through centuries of scholarship and editions as they interpret that distant past. One might even observe that source repertories are a thing specific to ancient and medieval scholarship, since the quantity of sources following the advent of printing renders the textual corpus – barely manageable before 1500 – finally unmanageable. Because the bibliographer’s work is never finished, these repertories are in continual need of revision and updating. Authorial attribution is often a shaky business, newly discovered manuscripts of old works are continually being added, critical editions are increasing, and of course, secondary scholarship marches on at a greater pace than ever before.¹ And so, the early years of

¹ As Jacques Fontaine wrote in the preface to the French translation of the *Tusculum-Lexikon*, “L’arbre du savoir ne cesse de pousser; il pousse aussi de plus en plus vite,” then going on to speak of “la contagion de la productivité dans notre civilisation technicienne”! *Dictionnaire des auteurs grecs et latins de l’antiquité et du moyen âge*, trans. J.D. Berger and J. Billen (Turnhout, 1991), at p. v. Original German edn.: Wolfgang Buchwald, Armin Hohlweg, and Otto Prinz, *Tusculum-Lexikon griechischer und lateinischer Autoren des Altertums und des Mittelalters*, 3rd edn. (Munich, 1982). The entries on medieval Latin authors are the work of Otto Prinz. Fontaine’s sentiment is not a new one: see Eccles. 12:12.

this century have witnessed a new crop of medieval source repertoires, which are both more complete and in most cases more concentrated in space and time than those of the previous century. Their longevity as standard references in the years to come will depend on their adaptability to the new media through which knowledge and information are now conveyed.

The occasion for the following review essay presented itself with the appearance in 2010 of the most recent volume of the *Clavis scriptorum Latinorum medii aevi: Auctores Galliae 735–987* in the *Corpus Christianorum* series published by Brepols. Rather than limit this review to volume 3 of this collaborative reference work, or even to all hitherto published volumes of the series, it may be more useful at this time to take a broader view and give a general consideration of several projects currently underway which are intended to serve as reference guides to medieval writers and sources. I include in this review not only repertoires that have appeared in print, but also projects (e.g. from the Low Countries and Germany) that have chosen a digital format. Though there are positives and negatives in either format, the future clearly lies with the online repertoires. Indeed, there has rarely if ever been an endeavor in medieval studies more suited to online publication than these reference tools for written sources.



The effort to catalogue medieval authors and their works has a long history, stretching at least as far back as the sixteenth century.² A new phase of clarity and comprehensiveness came in the mid-nineteenth century with the publication of August Potthast's *Bibliotheca historica medii aevi* (1862, revised in 1896).³ From a large number of *Annales* to an even larger number of *vitae*, it was an impressive undertaking.⁴ The soundness of Potthast's approach in attempting to deal with all authors and texts of the Middle Ages is reflected by the fact that his work was never abandoned, but instead became the building block for later efforts. His separation of

² One of the earliest attempts is Johannes Trithemius's *Liber de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis* (Basel, 1494) (accessible at www.mgh-bibliothek.de/digilib/quellen.htm). For other early continental efforts, see R.C. van Caenegem et al., *Introduction aux sources de l'histoire médiévale*, rev. edn. (Turnhout, 1997), pp. 220–51. The national tradition in England goes back to the efforts of John Leland (+1552) and John Bale (+1563); a new edition and translation of the former has recently appeared: John Leland, *De viris illustribus*, ed. and trans. J. P. Carley (Toronto, 2010).

³ August Potthast, *Bibliotheca historica medii aevi: Wegweiser durch die Geschichtswerke des europäischen Mittelalters bis 1500*, rev. edn., 2 vols. (Berlin, 1896) (www.archive.org/details/bibliothecahist00pottgoog). Potthast was assisting at the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* in Berlin when he undertook the project. See H. Meisner's entry on Potthast in *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie* 53 (Leipzig, 1907), pp. 102–5 (www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd117716200.html).

⁴ Potthast's list of hagiographical literature would soon be surpassed by the Bollandists' own repertory published at the end of the same century: *Bibliotheca hagiographica Latina*, *Subsidia hagiographica* 6 (Brussels, 1898–1901), with a *Novum supplementum*, *Subsidia hagiographica* 70 (Brussels, 1986).

individual entries into manuscripts, editions, translations, and scholarship was by and large adopted by subsequent repertories. Of course in Potthast's time, information for each of these categories was available only for the most well known and studied texts. Often mentioned alongside Potthast is Ulysse Chevalier's *Répertoire des sources historiques du moyen âge*, though the aims of this work are a bit different. Chevalier compiled biographical information not just on authors but persons mentioned in narrative sources; therefore, the scope is even bigger, yet the thoroughness much diminished.⁵

Possibly because scholars wanted research tools that centered on their own national history (we are, after all, speaking about the early twentieth century), new repertories appeared, such as Molinier's six-volume collection treating the sources of medieval France.⁶ In these decades, attempts to treat medieval sources without reference to modern political geography were rare.⁷ From the 1930s, various contributions to the *Bulletin du Cange* contained simplified lists of authors, texts, and editions within modern national boundaries.⁸

The *Corpus Christianorum* project to provide critical editions for texts from early Christianity began in the middle of the twentieth century under the auspices of Eligius Dekkers. The series has been an undisputed success, and with its *Continuatio mediævalis* and other offshoots, has expanded well beyond the original plan. Dekkers's original vision was confined to the patristic age, ending with the Venerable Bede (+735). The first task of this new editorial project was to identify the sources and

⁵ Ulysse Chevalier, *Répertoire des sources historiques du moyen âge: Bio-bibliographie*, rev. edn., 2 vols. (Paris, 1905–1907; original edn., 1877–1886). Chevalier also compiled a repertory of place names: *Répertoire des sources historiques du moyen âge: Topo-bibliographie*, 2 vols. (Montbéliard, 1894–1903).

⁶ Auguste Molinier, *Les sources de l'histoire de France des origines aux guerres d'Italie (1494)*, 6 vols. (Paris, 1901–1906). I will signal here Molinier's interesting, though often overlooked, general introduction to the sources of medieval France in vol. 5 (Paris, 1904), pp. ii–clv (www.archive.org/details/lessourcesdelhis05moli).

⁷ Manitius's survey of medieval Latin literature stands out not only for its quality and longevity, but also for its broad geographical treatment: Max Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, 3 vols. (Munich, 1911–1931). The identically titled survey by Franz Brunhölzl, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, 2 vols. (Munich, 1975–1992), is also an excellent reference, though it has not superseded Manitius in every respect. The French translation of Brunhölzl's work, *Histoire de la littérature latine du moyen âge*, trans. H. Rochais, 2 vols. (Turnhout, 1990–1996), includes updated bibliographic notes by J.-P. Bouhout.

⁸ Vincenzo Ussani et al., "*Index Latinitatis Italicae mediæ aevi antiquioris*," *Archivum Latinitatis mediæ aevi* 6 (1931): 1–96. James Baxter et al., "An index of British and Irish Latin writers, 400–1520," *ALMA* 7 (1932): 110–219. Maurice Hélin, "*Index scriptorum operumque Latino-Belgicorum mediæ aevi*," *ALMA* 8 (1933): 77–163, with continuations in vol. 16 (1941): 65–75 and vol. 18 (1943/44): 31–3. Ferdinand Lot et al., "*Index scriptorum operumque Latino-Gallicorum mediæ aevi (500–1000)*," *ALMA* 14 (1939): 113–230, with continuations for eleventh-century works in vol. 16 (1941): 5–59 and various *addenda et corrigenda* from 1943–1950. Henri Baudet, "*Index scriptorum auctorumque Latino-Neerlandicorum mediæ aevi*," *ALMA* 24 (1954): 159–206.

authors of the period; the result was Dekkers's *Clavis patrum Latinorum*.⁹ This project provided – and still provides – much needed clarification on texts that so often formed the essential holdings of medieval libraries. It was also a major step forward in sorting out the massive problems of pseudonymity and spurious attribution that characterize much of the patristic tradition.¹⁰ The quality of Dekkers's *Clavis* helped inspire new national efforts, such as the much-needed repertory for Spanish authors by Manuel Díaz y Díaz at the end of the 1950s.¹¹ Dekkers's fellow Belgians at Louvain undertook a national source repertory in concert with their other large-scale efforts in medieval studies.¹²

Even though Potthast's repertory was too useful to abandon, it was in great need of correcting and updating, and so, an international group of scholars set about this large task. Beginning in 1962, the *Repertorium fontium historiae medii aevi* represented the most significant international effort to list the entirety of medieval narrative sources in one collection.¹³ This "New Potthast" (as it is frequently called) was more than a mere update of the original *Bibliotheca historica*. A typical volume will deal with several hundred to a thousand individual entries from Potthast, of which as many as half will be discarded for various reasons, but usually, a greater number of new texts will be added, bringing the total well above Potthast's original.¹⁴ That it took 40 years to complete should be a good indication of the massive effort involved as well as the range of the various contributing scholars and institutions. Clearly, by the time the eleventh and final volume was printed in 2007, the authors and sources beginning

⁹ First published in volume 3 of the newly established journal *Sacris erudiri* (1951), the *Clavis patrum Latinorum* was revised in 1961 and again in 1995; one must now consult this third edition.

¹⁰ A separate series: *Clavis patristica pseudepigraphorum medii aevi*, ed. J. Machielsen, 5 vols. (1990–2010) was eventually needed to clarify the many pseudonymous works.

¹¹ *Index scriptorum Latinorum medii aevi Hispanorum*, ed. M. C. Díaz y Díaz, 2 vols. (Salamanca, 1958–1959; Madrid, 1959). An extension of this repertory for the later Middle Ages appeared some decades later: *Hispanorum index scriptorum Latinorum medii posteriorisque aevi: Autores latinos peninsulares da época dos descobrimentos (1350–1560)*, ed. M. C. Díaz y Díaz et al. (Lisbon, 1993). See also p. 291 of this volume for a review of Jose Carlos Martin, with Carmen Cardelle de Hartmann and Jacques Ellassi, *Sources latines de L'Espagne tardo-antique et medievale (Ve – XIVe siecles*, which constitutes a continuation of Díaz y Díaz.

¹² *Index scriptorum operumque Latino-Belgicorum medii aevi: Nouveau répertoire des œuvres médiolatines belges*, ed. L. Genicot and P. Tombeur (Brussels, 1973–1979). Other initiatives begun at the same time were the Centre de traitement électronique des documents (CETEDOC): the first effort to use computers to analyze Latin texts, and the *Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental* (1972–). See Léopold Genicot, "Pour une organisation de la recherche en histoire médiévale," *Francia* 1 (1973): 692–98.

¹³ *Repertorium fontium historiae medii aevi*, 11 vols. (Rome, 1962–2008). Though under the auspices of the Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medioevo, the list of collaborators clearly shows the international scope of the project.

¹⁴ To take one example at random, *Repertorium fontium* 7 (Rome, 1997), treating L-M, began with 669 entries from Potthast, discarded 275 of them, but added 621 new ones, and thereby pushed the total up to 1015 (see p. xiii).

with A-B, published in 1967, were in need of updating. The problem with large-scale source repertories was evident: they had a limited shelf-life and needed regular maintenance in order to continue to be useful for scholars. That this was evident before the completion of the *Repertorium fontium* is shown by the appearance of more comprehensive repertories – again on a national basis – at the end of the twentieth century. Nationally oriented projects permitted more manageable samples of authors and texts and have produced some exemplary repertories, such as those of Carasso-Kok for the Netherlands and the Celtic-Latin compilation by Lapidge and Sharpe.¹⁵ Testing the bounds of a manageable sample undertaken by an individual is Sharpe’s own impressive handlist of authors from Great Britain and Ireland, which comes in just shy of 1000 pages, with almost 2300 named authors.¹⁶

These works were to outline future trends in what might be called the “re-nationalization” of medieval source repertories. The larger collaborative efforts of the *Repertorium fontium* (which was itself admittedly subdivided into national research groups) have ceded responsibility to specific research groups, most of which receive funding from their respective governments. This trend largely holds for the reference works considered in detail here. The French Institut de Recherche et d’Histoire des Textes (IRHT) produces the *Clavis scriptorum Latinorum medii aevi: Auctores Galliae 735–987* (CSLMA-Fr); a member of the Florence-based Società Internazionale per lo Studio del Medioevo Latino (SISMEL: which, in accordance with its name does have the most international membership of the organizations considered here) has published the *Clavis scriptorum Latinorum medii aevi: Auctores Italiae (700–1000)* (CSLMA-It); the *Narrative Sources from the Medieval Low Countries* (*Narrative Sources*) is a collaborative project among the Universities of Ghent, Leuven, Groningen, and now the Belgian Royal Commission of History; and the *Geschichtsquellen des deutschen Mittelalters* (*Geschichtsquellen*) operates out of the Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften. For better or worse, the nationalization of medieval source repertories shows how academic institutions are less susceptible to the general political and economic integration of countries in the European Union. The only repertory to maintain an international flavor and aim at comprehensiveness for the Latin Middle Ages is the *Compendium auctorum Latinorum medii aevi* (CALMA), which also operates under the auspices of SISMEL.

¹⁵ Marijke Carasso-Kok, *Repertorium van verhalende historische bronnen uit de middeleeuwen: Heiligenlevens, annalen, kronieken en andere in Nederland geschreven verhalende bronnen* (The Hague, 1981). Michael Lapidge and Richard Sharpe, *A bibliography of Celtic-Latin literature, 400–1200* (Dublin, 1985).

¹⁶ Richard Sharpe, *A handlist of the Latin writers of Great Britain and Ireland before 1540* (Turnhout, 1997), with a pamphlet of additions and corrections in 2001. I do not discuss Sharpe’s work in detail here, in part because of its appearance over a decade ago. It will undoubtedly serve as a long-lived reference, though my general comments about digitization and maintenance/correction can apply to this work as well. It has been favorably reviewed, e.g. by A. Grandsen in *English Historical Review* 114 (1999): 665–67 and by J. Ziolkowski in *Speculum* 74 (1999): 1121–22.

One of the problems with nationally oriented research projects, as any medievalist knows, is that the borders of modern nation-states do not correspond to the political or cultural borders of the medieval period. For the early Middle Ages, French and German scholars have both tended to view large chunks of the Carolingian empire as part of their own national heritage, and their interest in laying claim to the important and source-rich area of Lotharingia shows a faint parallel to the designs of tenth- and eleventh-century kings.¹⁷ For the repertories under consideration, this results in some redundancy, though admittedly not an inordinate amount of it.

The CSLMA-Fr was the first of these newer repertories to appear. Its first volume, treating authors A-E, appeared in 1994, a second volume devoted solely to Alcuin was published five years later, and its most recent issue (2010) covers F-H.¹⁸ Each volume comes with a separately bound table of abbreviations and indices, which, in volumes 2 and 3 include *addenda et corrigenda* for the previous volumes. Its editor, Marie-Hélène Jullien, assures users that a general cumulative index will appear when the project reaches its culmination.

The CSLMA-Fr represents the most comprehensive repertory of its kind to date. The biographical information for each author and background information for each text is often extensive. Incipits and explicits are included for identification purposes. References to earlier repertories, encyclopedias, standard histories of Latin literature, and general bibliography lead the entries on each author. The extensive lists of manuscripts in and of themselves justify the undertaking of the project. The secondary bibliography contains less of a francophone orientation than one might expect from a nationally based project and is, in general, quite up-to-date.

The most significant contribution of this *Clavis* is without question its manuscript lists, which aim to be exhaustive.¹⁹ There is even an effort to list the lost manuscripts of a given text, that is, those mentioned in medieval library catalogs, earlier works, or editions that have since been either destroyed or remain unidentified. Where applicable, manuscripts containing extracts or revisions of a given work appear in appendices. The lists for the exegetical works of Haimo of Auxerre are especially impressive, and this attention to manuscript detail is largely consistent throughout the series. While it is laudable that the contributors credit earlier studies on a text's manuscript diffusion, the separation of manuscripts taken from other studies and

¹⁷ The *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* has incorporated nearly all Frankish sources from the early Middle Ages, and some of the best editions of texts from the medieval duchy of Lotharingia (which included parts of Belgium and western France) can be found there as well; at the time of their composition the area fell under the purview of the German emperors.

¹⁸ That is, up to Hilduin of Saint-Denis. The entry for Florus of Lyon, however, was not ready in time for inclusion in the appropriate volume.

¹⁹ According to its editors: "Les listes des manuscrits constituent l'apport le plus original de la *Clavis*."

those added by researchers at the IRHT into different lists is a strange solution.²⁰ The attempted economy of space in the print form does not aid quick consultation of these lists, such as would have been the case if each manuscript received a new line of text. This is clear from a quick comparison with Burton Van Name Edwards's online manuscript list of Carolingian biblical commentaries.²¹

Fifteen years have passed between the first and third volumes and some changes between them are discernable. The closer attention to *spuria* and *dubia* is apparent in volume 3. While this may result from alphabetical chance, it could also reflect a greater sensitivity following a few overconfident attributions in the first volume.²² In some cases, however, the rehashing of attributions suggested (and refuted) centuries ago tends to draw attention away from the authors themselves. For example, the writings of Gerbert of Aurillac, though admittedly a tough case, could have been reduced somewhat by merely listing *spuria* without fuller descriptions. By listing so many works known for centuries to have been misattributed, it becomes hard for the reader to determine cases where debate still remains.²³ Another change in the most recent volume is the naming of the contributor responsible for each entry.

The Italian and French *claves* were planned as joint projects, and therefore both follow a similar approach with corresponding categories. Both take the eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries as their time frames. The CSLMA-It manages to fit all known Italian authors of this period, eighty-nine names in all, into a single volume. Further consistency is achieved through its single editor/compiler, Benedetta Valtorta. The Italian volume is slightly more economic with its introductions of authors, and does not discuss pseudonymous, spurious, or dubious attributions as extensively as the French *clavis*.²⁴

Valtorta has also saved space in the manuscript category. For texts with a larger diffusion, if an edition or specific study has provided a list of known manuscripts, the reader is directed there (though Valtorta does often give raw numbers of

²⁰ Rather, some sort of symbol to indicate those manuscripts newly discovered by the contributors would have allowed all manuscripts to be listed together.

²¹ Burton Van Name Edwards: *The transmission of Carolingian Bible commentaries in manuscripts and printed editions*: risd.digication.com/bvnedwards/Bibliography (last updated 9/2010). These manuscript lists draw from the first two volumes of the CSLMA-Fr, but have perhaps more than repaid the favor if they have helped establish the lists in volume 3. Edwards is currently preparing editions of Haimo's commentaries on Genesis, Deuteronomy, and the Song of Songs for the *Corpus Christianorum* series.

²² For example, the last entry in volume 1 (ERMO 6, pp. 376–77) follows the suggestion of K.F. Werner and names Ermoldus Nigellus as the author of the epic poem *Waltharius*, which is in no way certain.

²³ For instance, I suspect the final word on whether Gerbert was in fact the author of the *De utilitatibus astrolabii* (Gerb 15 *spur.*) has not been uttered; an indication of *opus dubium* would seem more appropriate here.

²⁴ The few cases of erroneous attribution that are discussed almost entirely involve those in which the rightful author is treated elsewhere in the *clavis*.

manuscripts). This approach often makes use of another SISMEL project which seeks to trace the manuscript diffusion of medieval Latin texts.²⁵ Moreover, Valtorta also defers to the online database of hagiographic codices, the *Bibliotheca hagiographica Latina manuscripta*.²⁶

Because the CSLMA model avoids anonymous works, some of the best narrative sources of early medieval Italy – such as the eighth- and ninth-century continuations of the *Liber pontificalis* – are left out.²⁷ The known Italian authors of this period were of course no slouches: Anastasius Bibliothecarius, Paul the Deacon, John the Deacon, etc. Valtorta even admits the eccentric Ratherius of Lobbes/Verona to the ranks of Italian authors, a welcome step, though one that would have greatly displeased the Veronese clergy of the tenth century. This is a useful and manageable repertory, successful as a single volume. Its longevity would be further assured by making it available (and updatable) online, for example, by incorporating it as part of the offerings of SISMEL's impressive *Mirabile* website.²⁸

The first of our repertories to proceed with an online format is the *Narrative Sources from the Medieval Low Countries* (www.narrative-sources.be). As early as 1996, the medieval history departments at Ghent and Leuven had published their source database (then confined to the area of modern Belgium) online. The current version includes sources from the whole of the medieval Low Countries – including those written anonymously – and reflects a significant improvement in its overall interface and design. The compilers of the database were fortunate to have earlier print repertories to draw from: e.g. for Belgium, the *Index scriptorum* from the 1970s, and for the Netherlands, the *Repertorium* of Carraso-Kok.²⁹

One can see immediately the strong positives of having a resource like this online. At the bottom of each entry its contributor(s) and time of last update are indicated. Each piece of information receives its own line, making easier and faster work of sorting through manuscripts, editions, and secondary bibliography. Unlike the other repertories, *Narrative Sources* has included separate categories for a text's "sources" and "influence," categories that could prove useful in discussions of textual popularity and impact.³⁰ Because these details are taken initially from the observations of a text's editors, who tend to be much more interested in sources than in influence, only a

²⁵ *La trasmissione dei testi latini del Medioevo/Medieval Latin texts and their transmission (TeTra)*, ed. P. Chiesa and L. Castaldi (Florence, 2004–). Three volumes have appeared thus far.

²⁶ Based on the published catalogues of the Bollandists and created under the direction of Guy Philippart: www.bhlms.fltr.ucl.ac.be.

²⁷ Though there is brief mention of the possible authorship of the biographies of popes Nicholas I and Hadrian II by Anastasius Bibliothecarius and John the Deacon, respectively: CSLMA-It, pp. 18 and 149.

²⁸ MIRABILE: Archivio digitale della cultura latina medievale: www.mirabileweb.it. See below, pp. 263 and 264 for more on this resource.

²⁹ See above, nn. 12 and 15.

³⁰ A category for "sources" was included in the *Index scriptorum operumque Latino-Belgicorum medii aevi*.

large-scale source repertory can begin to put these pieces together and attempt to register a given text's influence on subsequent writers. Most importantly, the database allows one to search specific chronological and geographical parameters, a feature that enables the researcher to explore a range of sources without having any one author or text already in mind.

It must be said that despite the fact that this repertory stands at the forefront for its ease of use and accessibility, its precision and completeness do not yet reach the high standards of the French and Italian *claves*. One problem is the lack of a general bibliography section for each author. Instead, all secondary works (both reference works and specific studies) are lumped together in the literature section for each text, which can lead to small gaps in coverage.³¹ Editions, often a panoply of them, are listed, but no judgement on which edition is best is signaled to the researcher.

The manuscript section of *Narrative Sources* shows both its great potential and current limitations. Though their manuscript lists are not nearly as comprehensive as those of the CSLMA-Fr, the manuscripts that are listed are interlinked. That is to say, by clicking on a specific manuscript of a given text, one is able to see whether any other texts in the database are contained in the same manuscript. Though this manuscript portion of *Narrative Sources* is still in its initial stages, once completed it will have the potential to do for the medieval sources of the Low Countries what the *Bibliotheca hagiographica Latina manuscripta* (BHLms) has done for hagiographic codices: allow the researcher to look for patterns of textual diffusion from the contents of manuscripts. When cumulative indices for the CSLMA-Fr appear, one may be able to do something similar with their manuscript index, though not with the same speed possible here.

The German commission that had contributed to the *Repertorium fontium* in previous decades has subsequently evolved to form and direct the project *Die Geschichtsquellen des deutschen Mittelalters* (www.repfont.badw.de). Its editors have also chosen an online format, but it is not yet in the form of an html-based database. Rather, the *Geschichtsquellen* is currently available in downloadable pdf files, which are periodically updated (the update is stamped on the bottom of each page).³² In format, the *Geschichtsquellen* is identical to the *Repertorium fontium*, though the language of the editorial material is changed from Latin to German. This project represents the least amount of labour lost between the "New Potthast" and the current manifestation. It has selected those sources for medieval Germany, that is, the German/Holy Roman empire, and updated the *Repertorium fontium* entries.

³¹ For example, a reference to the discussion of a particular author in reference works such as Manitius can appear in one entry but not in another text by the same author. The creation of a separate section of general literature/reference connected with the author would remedy this problem.

³² At the time of writing this review, entries for I/J and N-R had not yet been completed. Roman Deutinger has compiled a separate catalogue of *Konzilien und Synoden, 742–1002* (March 2008).

The excellence of German scholarship in research of this type is well known. The name of this particular project will immediately call to mind the important source inventories begun by Wattenbach in the nineteenth century and revised in the middle of the last century by greats such as Levison.³³ Another revised reference tool, the encyclopedia of German authors, is an essential resource whose entries are frequently cited in all of these newer repertoires.³⁴

The entries of the *Geschichtsquellen* are more succinct than those of the repertoires treated above, but this is not necessarily a bad thing. Manuscript lists are deferred to relevant editions or studies, and editions are listed in chronological order. The bibliography is selective, but the selections tend to represent strong contributions in the field; there is a discrimination here that can help the preliminary researcher. Where applicable, entries include the French *Clavis* code (e.g. ALC 45 for Alcuin's *Epistolae*) from the first two volumes of the CSLMA-Fr. Realizing the benefits of the digital format, the compilers have begun to place links in their files, most notably to entries in *Narrative Sources*, and for vernacular texts, the *Handschriftencensus* (handschriftencensus.de), an inventory of medieval German manuscripts.

The files currently available are not the final version of the *Geschichtsquellen*: there are future plans to make the *Geschichtsquellen* web-based and searchable, with information interlinked.³⁵ Perhaps this will include a manuscript database along lines similar to *Narrative Sources*. My suspicion is that when the *Geschichtsquellen* reaches this next phase, its combination of ease of access (especially its free access) with quality of information will make it a powerful reference in the field.³⁶

Finally we come to the *Compendium auctorum Latinorum medii aevi* (CALMA). The most ambitious repertoire in terms of time and space, it aims to treat all named Latin authors over the entire medieval millennium (500–1500). Meant to expedite the heuristic process by being a first stop for scholars in the identification of authors and texts, the CALMA points researchers to editions and the more substantial entries

³³ Especially good are the six volumes on the early Middle Ages: W. Wattenbach, W. Levison, and H. Löwe, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter: Vorzeit und Karolinger*, 6 vols. (Weimar, 1952–1990). See also W. Wattenbach, W. Holzmann, and F.-J. Schmale, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter: Die Zeit der Sachsen und Salier*, 3 vols. (Darmstadt, 1967–1971), and W. Wattenbach and F.-J. Schmale, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter: Die Zeit der Staufer* (Darmstadt, 1971). The structure of these reference works is a general narrative of the sources and not a deliberate repertoire or key.

³⁴ *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*, ed. K. Ruh et al., rev. edn., 14 vols. (Berlin, 1977–2008). This resource is not restricted to authors writing in the Germanic languages, but incorporates a large number (though still a selection) of Latin authors as well.

³⁵ Markus Wesche has stated that the new form of the *Geschichtsquellen* should appear in 2012: see hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/projekte/id=341.

³⁶ One thing that would be a significant advancement would be to link secondary sources to the excellent bibliographic database from the Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur at Mainz, the RI-OPAC (*Regesta imperii* online public access catalog): opac.regesta-imperii.de.

in other repertories. Exhaustive only in the amount of entries, not in the entries themselves, the CALMA is more than merely a repertory of repertories. Much of the essential information listed here will put researchers on solid ground without their necessarily having to consult the more detailed reference works. One thing that it is especially good for is establishing an author's known textual corpus.

This project began under the initiative of Claudio Leonardi and Michael Lapidge in an effort to make a repertory of writers out of the medieval author list that had been developing over the decades by the yearly bibliographic journal of medieval scholarship, *Medioevo latino* (1980–). Referred to as the in-house *lemmario*, the list itself was published as the *Bibliotheca scriptorum Latinorum medii recentiorisque aevi* (BISLAM) and now forms the skeleton which the CALMA will flesh out.³⁷ As of 2010 they had progressed as far as the letter “F”. When finished, the CALMA will likely prove to be the definitive first-stop repertory among the tomes of a library's reference section.

If the project was conceived of as an update of the *Tusculum-Lexikon*, that handy little book packed with information, then it has failed to maintain the same level of portability. But because of SISMELE's new online suite *Mirabile* (www.mirabileweb.it) – which provides digital access to *Medioevo latino*, the author list (BISLAM), as well as hitherto published entries in the CALMA – the bulky printed tomes (or individual fascicules) of the CALMA become less of an issue, at least for those institutions and individuals with subscriptions to the *Mirabile* website.³⁸ Additionally, the often heavily abbreviated references in the CALMA can be expanded with a click, without having to consult the *Elenchus abbreviationum* and its subsequent *addenda*. With the online format, not only can errors be easily corrected, but Leonardi's vision of having this resource continually updated will be possible. The close relationship of the CALMA to *Medioevo latino* will help ensure that the newest research is taken into account.³⁹

The CALMA is not the place to find exhaustive lists of manuscripts or secondary bibliography, but in a way, this makes it a more manageable resource. And because the *Mirabile* website has now integrated the CALMA with its other projects (which do deal with manuscripts and bibliography) into a single search,⁴⁰ many of these

³⁷ BISLAM: *Bibliotheca scriptorum Latinorum medii recentiorisque aevi/Repertory of Medieval and Renaissance Latin authors*, ed. R. Gamberini et al. (Florence, 2003). This version is an author-list with references to entries in *Medioevo latino*. However, the version of the BISLAM now available online at the *Mirabile* website lists their known works, and in some cases gives a preliminary list of manuscripts.

³⁸ A limited sample of materials is made available without a subscription.

³⁹ However, as the use of the CALMA as a resource increases, so increases the reach of the judgement of the collaborators at SISMELE as to which secondary scholarship is deemed “essential” for understanding a particular author or text.

⁴⁰ A search based on chronological parameters will generate selected authors from the BISLAM list, in a somewhat similar fashion to the possibilities at *Narrative Sources*.

limitations are remedied. The only significant gap in coverage would seem to be for secondary works written prior to the beginnings of *Medioevo latino* (ca. 1980) which are not mentioned in the CALMA. At this new frontier of digital reference tools, *Mirabile* has very quickly come to rival with *Brepolis* (brepolis.net) for its online research tools that are becoming more and more essential for the practice of medieval scholarship.



Authorship attributions, dating of texts, editions, manuscripts, and scholarship: these are the essential characteristics to be included in source repertories. The first – attributions of authorship and biographical details – may seem the most straightforward, but they are in fact the least. Distinguishing authentic from pseudonymous, spurious, and dubious works is no easy task, and in many cases there is simply not enough evidence to pronounce certainty. Determining a text's circumstances of composition and its date (either specific or relative) has occupied a great deal of scholarly energy. When repertories do give *termini* for a text's composition, the cases may not be as clear-cut as one definitive line would suggest. These brief details on a given text may be the most consuming task of the repertory compiler, since it requires not only the gathering of scholarship but also the digestion of it.

One thing that distinguishes some of the repertories treated above is whether they limit their treatment to all *known* medieval authors – either those who signed their compositions or to whom scholars have assigned authorship – or if they also incorporate the vast number of medieval texts whose authors are anonymous. Potthast had of course included anonymous texts, and the *Repertorium fontium* followed him, but of the newer repertories considered here, only those from the Low Countries and Germany contain anonymous works.

Next to authors, titles, and dates, the list of editions is the major *causa componendi* for these repertories. Where does one go to examine this source? And where will one find the most critical discussion and edition of its reconstructed text? From their beginnings, medieval source repertories have always made the listing of printed editions one of their primary tasks. It bears repeating that the repertory should indicate the best editions, and that in this matter and in many others, *novior non semper melior*.

We are still far away from the availability of all texts, even those in the more limited textual corpus from the early Middle Ages, in printed editions. It goes without saying that the listing of the earliest or most important manuscripts is crucial for unedited works – this need was envisaged already by Potthast, who worked at a time of much fewer editions. Thanks to a growing amount of scholarship on manuscript diffusion, as well as thorough manuscript lists in modern critical editions, we are

much closer to being able to make valuable observations about texts from the basis of their diffusion. Manuscript lists, whether incorporated full-scale into the repertory, as in the CSLMA-Fr, or otherwise summarized with reference to specific studies or editions, represent perhaps the clearest advancement of the most recent source repertories in comparison to their ancestors.

Finally, we come to the category with the highest variability: secondary scholarship. The question here is one of exhaustiveness versus discrimination. Should these repertories list every known work that touches on the primary source or author in question? Are those that include extensive bibliography aiming to do just that? If not already, then at some point soon – again thanks in part to new digital finding aids – being exhaustive will be an easier task than being selective. There are pros and cons to either approach. It is possible that if source repertories took over the task of listing every known secondary work on an author or text, we would see fewer scholars constructing cumbersome footnotes attempting to do the same thing. On the other hand, if these repertories are meant to reduce a scholar's investigative time, then the judgement of which works to include in the secondary bibliography becomes an important service. Regardless of whether an exhaustive or selective approach is attempted, it is clear that this is the section of the repertories with the shortest shelf-life and the one most in need of updating and maintenance. The digital format makes keeping these bibliographies up-to-date an achievable goal.



These five source repertories are not all trying to do the same thing, and therefore direct comparison between them is not entirely fair. The French and Italian *claves* aim at more detail for a more limited period and area.⁴¹ In that aim they are largely successful, though the limitations of a print-only format are already evident. Both were the most comprehensive and up-to-date resources of their kind at the time they were sent to press, but by their very nature, source repertories do not age well. The online repertories from the Low Countries and Germany treat named *and* anonymous authors writing in Latin *and* the vernacular throughout the Middle Ages within a specific geographical area. This is a much more ambitious effort and neither resource should be criticized for not having the same level of detail as the *claves*.⁴² The *Narrative Sources* database, excellent on the level of concept and design, will benefit from further development in the coming years. The *Geschichtsquellen*, useful now even as a not-yet-complete collection of files, will prove very useful in its next phase. The CALMA is the one resource to attempt to cover the entirety of medieval Latin

⁴¹ The CSLMA-It treats only 89 authors; the CSLMA-Fr has included ca. 165 authors so far.

⁴² *Narrative Sources* includes around 2200 entries (multiple texts by the same author are each given their own entry), and the *Geschichtsquellen* (where each work by the same author is included in a single entry) counts around 3000.

Christendom, though it does limit its range to known Latin writers.⁴³ Its ease of use in its online format will make a subscription to SISMEl's *Mirabile* website very attractive for institutions, especially once the CALMA is completed.

The bound book has its admirers, the digital file its detractors. Some will always want the feel of pages beneath their hands instead of a keyboard. It bears pointing out, however, that the books discussed here are not the kind one would tend to read while curled up next to the fire. They are reference guides, to be consulted as research requires. As such, they are more useful in digital form, for both quick consultation as well as maintenance and updating.⁴⁴

If one of the most significant advancements of these newer repertories is in the area of manuscripts, then source repertories will need to keep pace with the current digitization projects of medieval manuscript repositories. The time will soon come when a critical mass of high quality digital manuscript images made freely accessible online will change the field.⁴⁵ For example, if source repertories and digital manuscripts were interlinked, an unedited work might no longer be the obstacle it once was. The demonstration of palaeographical connections – i.e. texts copied in the same hand and codices from the same *scriptorium* – will be revolutionized when the manuscripts from various repositories can be consulted and compared instantaneously. Source repertories should begin to prepare for this eventuality.

Finally we come to the issue of cost. Some (perhaps many) believe that information placed online should be freely accessible. Well aware that publishers in the field of medieval studies need to generate revenues for their products, I am not insisting that everything be placed online and made free. The main point of this review essay is merely to state what seems obvious, that the placement of these source repertories online allows them to be easily updated and thus ends the otherwise inevitable need for a new *index* or *clavis scriptorum* every few decades. Having said that, it is true that two of the repertories considered here, the *Narrative Sources from the Medieval Low Countries* and the *Geschichtsquellen des deutschen Mittelalters*, do indeed offer their tools freely to the world. By way of comparison, prices for print versions of the other repertories are nothing short of prohibitive for most individuals and, in these tough economic times, they are unlikely to be high on the acquisitions

⁴³ The BISLAM list is currently at around 14000 names, which may well increase as the CALMA proceeds.

⁴⁴ An electronic edition of the *Clavis patrum Latinorum* is currently under consideration by Brepols.

⁴⁵ See e.g. Ezio Ornato, "Bibliotheca manuscripta universalis: Digitalizzazione e catalografia, un viaggio nel regno di Utopia?" *Gazette du livre médiéval* 48 (2006): 1–13, as well as the essays in *Kodikologie und Paläographie im digitalen Zeitalter*, 2 vols. (Norderstedt, 2009–2010). To mention only the most pioneering and exemplary, most are by now familiar with the digitization projects of St. Gall's Stiftsbibliothek: www.e-codices.unifr.ch/de/list/csg and Cologne's Dombibliothek: www.ceec.uni-koeln.de.

lists for many cash-strapped institutions.⁴⁶ These projects take significant amounts of time and energy; they seem far too important to be restricted to a handful of elite schools in Europe and North America.

⁴⁶ The most recent volume of the CSLMA-Fr costs €275; the CALMA costs €87 per fascicule (17 of which have appeared thus far).