

Portugal, 7 Deutschland und Skandinavien). Auch die zahlreichen Preisangaben sind, wie Williman in der Einleitung hervorhebt, statistisch schwer zu verwenden, da sie sich auf Handschriften in ganz unterschiedlichem Zustand und auf nicht näher bekannte Marktverhältnisse beziehen. So schwanken beispielsweise die Preise der Dekretalen Gregors IX. bei 19 in Italien angebotenen Exemplaren zwischen 1 und 125 Florentinischen Gulden.

Der abgeschlossene Bd. I läßt nur mehr erahnen, welche Mühe die Erschließung der in den Inventaren genannten Titel gefordert haben muß. Der Bearbeiter mittelalterlicher Bibliothekskataloge kennt das Problem: anonym angeführte Werke, unvollständige oder entstellte Titelangaben (hier allerdings in vielen Fällen durch ein Incipit und Explicit näher gekennzeichnet). Um so wertvoller sind die ausführlichen und präzisen Register von Marie-Henriette Jullien de Pommerol (vor allem: Personen- und Ortsnamenregister, Autoren- und Werkregister, Incipit-Tafel). Unentbehrlich zur Benutzung des Werkes, besitzen sie überdies einen großen Eigenwert. So ist etwa das Personenregister ein wahres „Who's who?“ italienischer Prälatenkreise im 14. Jh. Autoren- und Werkregister, sowie die Incipit-Tafel sind willkommene Hilfsmittel für jeden, der sich mit mittellateinischer Literatur, vor allem mit liturgischen und juristischen Schriften befaßt.

Bei dem Lesen des Buches stellt man sich immer wieder die Frage, wo denn die vielen genannten, teils sehr wertvollen Handschriften hingekommen sind. Doch angesichts der Tatsache, daß die weitaus größte Zahl der im Auftrag der Apostolischen Kammer beschlagnahmten Bücher sofort verkauft wurden, kann ihr heutiger Aufbewahrungsort nur mehr in einigen wenigen Fällen nachgewiesen werden (z. B. Nr. 327.5; 368.4). Da manche Büchergruppen, und selbst einzelne Handschriften, in verschiedenen, zeitlich getrennten Listen auftauchen, läßt sich zumindest ihr Schicksal durch das 14. Jh. verfolgen, etwa der Weg jener bedeutenden Bestände, welche schließlich vom Collegium Gregorianum aufgenommen wurden. In dieser Frage erweisen sich die von Williman gebotenen Querverweise als ein weiterer Vorzug einer in vieler Hinsicht vorbildlichen Quellenedition.

Echternach

Jean Schroeder

Gerd Kampers: *Personengeschichtliche Studien zum Westgotenreich in Spanien. Spanische Forschungen der Gönnergesellschaft, Zweite Reihe, 17. Band. Begründet von Heinrich Finke, Wilhelm Neuss, Georg Schreiber, fortgeführt von Johannes Vincke, in Verbindung mit Quintin Aldea, Theo Berchem, Hans Flasche, Hans Juretschke und José Vives herausgegeben von Odilo Engels. 1979, VIII und 224 Seiten, Leinen 68,- DM, Verlag Aschendorff Münster.*

Two general observations on the subject of what we call, somewhat clumsily, prosopography are called for at the outset. First, we need constantly to remind ourselves that the final goal of this nice blend of science and art is comprehension, not compilation. Those medievalists who are acknowledged masters of the craft – one thinks of such as Tellenbach and Werner, Gênicot and Duby, Schmid and Stroheker – owe their eminence not to their ability in seeking out and setting down the names and personal details of those individuals who make up the group on which their gaze is fixed but to their skill in interpreting the evidence which the labour of compilation provides and in applying the insights they gain and the conclusions they draw to the history of the period under scrutiny. Compilation is a necessary preliminary, true, but it is never more than a means to an end, that end being understanding; in itself, a register of persons and details about them is as valueless, historically speaking, as a list of dates. I make this point with some emphasis since it seems to me that recent years have seen a growing tendency, which should be resisted, to view the production of such a register as the prime function of the prosopographer, to reduce the business of writing prosopography to the business of writing a prosopography. The second point, though in a sense connected, is in a more significant one discrete. I simply cannot accept that completeness of prosopographical listing is so self-evidently meritorious a target as

seems nowadays generally to be assumed. The German Historical Institute at Paris has both reflected and furthered this modern attitude in its aim, pursued over the last decade and more, of compiling 'a register of all persons mentioned in European texts between A.D. 200 and 1200, regardless of status or origin' (George Beech, 'Prosopography' in (ed.) James M. Powell, *Medieval studies: an introduction* (Syracuse University Press, 1976), p. 174). I cannot for the life of me see the justification in historical terms for such an enterprise (which is not to say that I cannot understand the psychological urge which inspires it, an urge not dissimilar from that impelling any dedicated collector: cf. the comments on compilers in earlier ages in Lawrence Stone, *The past and the present* (London, 1981), p. 48). At least as regards the early Middle Ages, to list the names of all known figures from the lower reaches of society, together with the few stark scraps of personal information which, save in a very small number of cases, are all that is recorded about them, is simply to indulge in the heaping-up of data for their own sake and thus to be guilty of the most sterile form of antiquarianism. Such misguided effort is the sort of activity which gets History a bad name.

Gerd Kampers does not share my views. As to the first point, he is categorical (p. 3): 'Prosopographisches Arbeiten bedeutet . . . nichts anderes als das Sammeln von auf Personen bezogenen Detailinformationen.' So much for the prosopographer as an analyst, an interpreter, a judge – a historian! As to the second, his conviction of the value of completeness is apparent from both the intended and the actual form of his book – for it is necessary to distinguish these two. Originally, Kamper's aim was to produce a comprehensive prosopographical listing of the known personages of the Visigothic kingdom in Spain between 507 and 711, and the bulk of the material, if not all, had already been gathered when, in 1974, there came what must have been a shattering blow: the publication of Luis A. García Moreno's *Prosopografía del reino visigodo de Toledo*. The work now under review is the result of Kampers's understandable determination to save something from the wreck of his earlier designs. It falls into two parts, the first containing prosopographical data not to be found in García Moreno, the second providing a makeweight interpretative essay. With regard to the first section, Kampers rightly (if with a trace of forgivable tartness) points out that García Moreno's book is considerably more limited in scope than its title would suggest; his own material does not overlap with that of the *Prosopografía* but extends the limits of our coverage socially, geographically and chronologically in that he deals with all groupings, lay and cleric (not just with bishops and the upper echelons of lay society, as does García Moreno), includes persons from the Byzantine- and Sueve-held territories and begins with 507 rather than 568. He also has the satisfaction of listing a few lay dignitaries overlooked by García Moreno. In all, his register runs to over 600 names, approximately the same number as appears in the *Prosopografía*. The two lists, to which Kampers provides a convenient composite index, together furnish an almost complete directory of personages known to have lived in the Iberian peninsula between 507 and 711. (I say 'almost complete' since kings and their families, together with persons of Jewish and Greek name, are for the most part omitted. The Sueve kings and their relatives are to be found in D. Claude, 'Prosopographie des spanischen Suebenreiches', *Francia vi* (1978), pp. 677–76).

Two points need to be made about Kampers's register. First, while I accept that the listings of lay dignitaries and bishops have value (though I am less sure than the author appears to be that the epithet *honestus* can be taken to indicate membership of the *Oberschicht*, at least as I understand this term; Kampers offers no definition and, as is his wont, provides no support for his viewpoint) and while I am prepared to admit that those of abbots, monks, nuns and members of the secular clergy *may* have value (though I am not sanguine), I am quite unable to see how any case can be made for the usefulness of including the names of all known figures who do not fall (or are presumed, in the absence of positive evidence to the contrary, not to fall) into the above groups. There are some 250 of these; spread

over two centuries and all regions, they are self-evidently worthless for any sort of statistical purpose, even if it were possible – as it is not – to provide more than the sparsest information to accompany the names. Second, it goes without saying that if nevertheless the provision of such a listing of the apparent also-rans of Visigothic society is held to be a useful exercise, an essential requirement of the finished product is that the data it contains be both accurate and as full as possible. I confess that in view of the extreme bareness of the entries, the great bulk of which do not extend to two full lines of print, I almost did not bother to check their reliability; error seemed too remote a possibility to be contemplated. Check I eventually did, however, only to find mistakes and inadequacies so legion that I soon gave up in dismay. Out of 40 entries (two blocks of 20) based on J. Vives, *Inscripciones cristianas de la España romana y visigoda*, 2nd edition (Barcelona, 1969) which I checked, a mere 16 proved to be without fault of any description. (And one of these, no. 593, failed to acknowledge its source, I may add: cf. no. 453 for another example, where, again, the source is in fact Vives.) In many cases part of a date – year, month or day, whether established or doubtful – is omitted (9 instances) or wrong (7). In others, the age to which the subject lived is not given (1) or is given wrongly (5), incompletely (1) or with greater precision than is justified (1). The hapless Istorna (no. 506) not only has his life-span cut short to the tune of 20 years but is made to expire on the wrong day too; and Julius (no. 508) suffers a similar indignity with regard to both date of, and age at, death. In some cases question-marks hanging over certain points of information (the year of a death, the provenance of an inscription, the era of another) are jettisoned. Two entries fail to mention that their subjects were married, and on one occasion the form of a name is changed without explanation from that given in the Vives text. When Kampers omits information, it seems often to be because Vives himself has omitted it from his comments, though it is available in the Latin texts themselves; the reverse is clearly the case in no. 508, where Kampers blindly follows Vives's error (which Vives corrects on his p. 175) in the rendering of a date in the Latin text, and again in no. 595. The curious matter of the two inscriptions to Leontius in Vives, one from Mairena (no. 152: no. 514 in Kampers), the other from the nearby Alcolea del Río (no. 542: no. 515 in Kampers), but both giving 22 September 576 as the date of Leontius's death and about 50 years as his life-span, is not even commented upon; perhaps Kampers did not notice the coincidence of terms, for in no. 514 he omits both the day and the month of Leontius's death (following Vives), while in no. 515 he has 22 October. In view of the brevity of the inscriptions and the simplicity of the task of rendering accurately and in concise German the very basic personal details they furnish, I admit to stupefaction that so many offences, of commission and omission both, should have been perpetrated. I make no bones about it: I should certainly expect any conscientious and halfway competent office clerk with the necessary linguistic skills to have performed a very great deal better. Apart from examining another 15 Vives entries, randomly selected, of which 5 were found to have deficiencies, I made no further check of the directory material. Nevertheless, certain other errors, of varying degrees of heinousness, forced themselves upon my attention: the confusion of Florentius and Fulgentius in no. 24; the saga of Emanuel, who appears as such on p. 9 (no. 14), metamorphoses into 'Emmanuel' (a name already borne by no. 17) on p. 165 and does not figure at all in the index; the omission of the abbreviation 'm' from the list on p. 204; the labelling of Teudisclus as 'bishop' in the index when the relevant entry is at pains to point out that he remained a monk; the failure to provide note reference numbers in no. 39. In short, whatever value the directory which Kampers provides may be deemed to have in principle is vitiated in practice by the simple fact that it cannot be relied upon as an accurate or full compilation of the available information.

Is the second part of the book possessed of a merit which might compensate in some measure for the defects of the first? Regrettably, no. This section did not figure in Kampers's original plan, its inclusion being due to the fact that the length

of his register of persons was so severely curtailed by the publication of García Moreno's work, and it is difficult indeed to believe that his heart was in it. Ostensibly devoted to an evaluation and interpretation of the data presented in the first section, it in fact deals with the bishops alone, at any length, and with the bishops as a whole, not just those listed earlier. The investigation is almost wholly concerned with the ethnic composition of the episcopate and with the significance of this for the question of Germanic settlement. Kampers's method is to list the bishops, see by see within each province (a map would have been *very* useful), to identify those among them bearing Germanic names and to establish what proportion of the whole these represented, overall as well as for each province and see, in the periods 507–711 and 589–711. Armed with this information and with the conviction that bishops of Germanic name were also of Germanic race, he then addresses himself to the question of settlement, first summarising the findings of archaeologists and toponymists and then identifying five blocks of territory, four in the peninsula and one in Septimania, which in his view are shown by the evidence of further lists of sees and bishops which he produces (and which add nothing, save some more percentages, to the data given in the earlier ones) to have been centres of Germanic population. Basic to his judgement is the belief that there exists a correlation between the proportion of Germanic bishops in a see and the degree of Germanisation in the locality, the first being the higher as the second is the greater.

The correctness of Kampers's conclusion with regard to one of his five areas, the Castilian Meseta, long since identified by archaeologists as the prime Visigothic settlement-zone, and the probability of its correctness with regard to another, the north-west, Visigothic settlement in which is now asserted by some toponymists, with good reason, to have taken place well before the fall of the kingdom, are no thanks to his argumentation, which is quite lamentable. Indeed, at the most crucial points there are no arguments at all, merely the blandest of unsupported assertions. A quite basic question which Kampers signally fails to tackle is this: granted that names from the early years of Hispano-Roman contact with the Germans may usually be taken as reliable pointers to race, does this still hold good in the seventh century? Kampers assumes that it does, but assumption is not good enough. What of changing name-fashions? What of the effect of mixed marriages, legal since Leovigild's day? What, indeed, of the problems of establishing whether a name is Latin or Germanic (or something else again) at all? Kampers, who relies almost wholly upon Piel-Kremer for the identification of Germanic names, does not look at any of these matters. Cases of the adoption of what he calls Latin-Christian names by Goths are known and discussed, yet he denies the adoption of late Roman ones, again without argument. But can Julianus (cf. p. 162 and pp. 171–2) be categorised so neatly as one of the first and not one of the second? Why should it be said that Fructuosus was ‚kaum‘ the original name of the famous Visigothic monk? The sort of detailed argumentation necessary to allay fears that Kampers leaps to conclusions in his linking of names and racial identities is simply not forthcoming. It is difficult to set much store by the thinking which can produce, apparently in all seriousness, such a statement as this: ‚Da Renatus . . . in der Bischofsliste von Coimbra zwischen zwei Germanen steht, könnte er germanischer Abstammung gewesen sein‘ (p. 164: for ‚two Germans‘ read ‚two bishops of Germanic name‘). Consider also the following, which is Kampers's sole gesture in the direction of an answer to the question of possible name-borrowing. Stating that among the names of seventh-century laymen in the *Oberschicht* only 26% are Latin (more correctly, ‚non-Germanic‘: see his p. 129) but that among the bishops of the period 589–711 Latin names amount to 69.1%, he continues:

In Anbetracht der Tatsache, daß man im Episkopat mehr Romanen, unter den weltlichen Großen mehr Germanen voraussetzen darf, ist der Schluß erlaubt (*sic!*), daß die Namen zugleich aussagekräftig für die nationale resp. gentilizische Zugehörigkeit ihrer Träger sind. Im Gegensatz zum fränkischen Gallien hat es also (*sic!*)

im gotisch-suevischen Spanien eine germanische Namenmode bis zum Beginn des 8. Jahrhunderts anscheinend (*sic!*) nicht gegeben. Goten und Sueven haben ihrerseits kaum (*sic!*) spätrömische Personennamen, wohl aber in einigen Fällen nachweislich lateinisch-christliche Namen angenommen (pp. 160–1).

Even if we grant the legitimacy of regarding names as badges of ethnic identity, how crass is the assumption – for, again, argument is lacking – that the higher the percentage of German bishops in a see, the more substantial the local German population! Are we to suppose that bishops were appointed in accordance with some Visigothic Hundred-Year-Plus-Plan which graded sees according to the size of their German populations and ensured that by the end of the period just the right mix of Romans and Germans had taken office in each see relative to every other?! Some such absurdity has to be envisaged if such a relationship as Kampers proposes between the distribution of population and the distribution of bishops is held to exist. (It would be to take the whole thing too seriously to point out that there are in any case numerous distorting gaps in the extant episcopal lists.) In reality, as a moment's reflection will show, to maintain that a see where (say) two out of four bishops in a given period were German was less Germanised than one where (say) three out of five were German is simply laughable: all depends on the chosen perimeters, and one need only consider how different the conclusion would be if the period were shortened by a number of years, giving (say) two out of two for the first see and one out of three for the second! Extraordinarily enough however, Kampers does not in fact even work with a given period; the percentage figures for German bishops which he extracts from his lists (themselves marked by gross error, as a glance at the entry for *Pax* on p. 180 and the wild contradictions in the statements made concerning *Dumio* on pp. 179–81 will reveal) are misleadingly maximised and rendered incomparable one with another by his unscientific practice of beginning the episcopal count in any see with the first German bishop recorded there, the date of the appearance varying, naturally, from see to see. Is it even justifiable to assume the presence of a German bishop to be a pointer to the existence of a local German settlement? I can see not the slightest reason to think so. The whole thrust of the seventh century, as I have remarked elsewhere, was away from racial separateness, towards greater unity. There can be no question of some principle of ecclesiastical government which maintained that heavily Germanised areas were to have German bishops; other considerations apart, we may note that, as Kampers's own data show, every see save one, *Segontia*, is known to have had at least one bishop bearing a Roman name appointed after 589. The most we can say is that it will often have been the practice, understandable enough given the strength of localism, to appoint local men and that in areas where there was a substantial German population these are likely in the nature of things sometimes to have been Germans. But appointments were determined by numerous other factors, and it is simply naïve to believe that a see must have been heavily Germanised because a high proportion of Germans figured among its bishops.

One does not have to look hard to find further faults in Kampers's book: the spurious weight attached to percentages when the numbers involved are so small as to have no statistical significance whatsoever (one recalls Thoma Carlyle's remark: 'A judicious man looks at statistics not to get knowledge but to save himself from having ignorance foisted on him'); the lack of any index save that to his and García Moreno's prosopographical listings; the misuse of 'Jahrhundertwende' to mean 'Jahrhundertmitte' – and so on. But enough is enough. There are some useful things in the book, no doubt, but they are submerged by the swamping sea of defects. Overall, this must be deemed a wretched production indeed, ill prepared, ill thought through and marked by a shoddiness, a lack of care for the most basic scholarly practices and procedures, which, I have to say, I have never previously encountered in a published work of German scholarship. *O tempora! O mores!*

Lancaster

P. D. King