Olivier Delsaux’s study represents an ambitious, copiously notated, and lengthy foray into the speculative realm of late-medieval writers’ authorial involvement in the production of manuscripts. As the subtitle suggests, the author views the manuscripts of Christine de Pizan as his primary test case, and more specifically, the set corpus recently treated in Gilbert Ouy, Christine Reno, and Inès Villela-Petit, *Album Christine de Pizan* (2012). Building on the paleographic work of Ouy and Reno, who contend that twenty of fifty-four original manuscripts of Christine’s works are autograph copies, Delsaux endeavors to place Christine’s presumed manuscript activities in a larger late-medieval context that might mutually inform her practices and those of contemporaries. Delsaux’s study does not therefore provide new codicological information as much as it synthesizes the detailed research of others (including the author’s previous and forthcoming publications) with the goal of presenting a context and a methodology for studying the authorial involvement in the material production of late-medieval manuscripts. The study opens with the contention that, while numerous studies have explored individual examples of autograph manuscripts, there has been no scientific consensus reached in terms of the methodology and aesthetics of this practice. As a first step in remedying this issue, Delsaux provides an extensive glossary of terms that break down the two key themes of his work, the author and the manuscript. Of greatest interest is his proposal that alongside the term “manuscrit autographe,” concerning a manuscript transcribed by the author, we must consider the concept of “manufacture autographe,” a manuscript that, while transcribed by someone else, was nonetheless overseen by the author. He further breaks down manuscript categories to speak of three material stages that can be distinguished: “manuscrit de composition, d’édition, ou de publication” (22). These three types of autograph works are subsequently defined as an author’s personal copy of a work, an exemplum provided to scribes for the production of subsequent copies, and a copy produced for an audience. The three main chapters of this study address individually these three stages. Whereas the first chapter depends heavily on literary, predominantly fictionalized, accounts of writing and the second chapter, consisting of a meager 21 pages, openly acknowledges the lack of evidence available for study of this stage (221), chapter 3, at 325 pages, is a book in itself and merits a careful reading. Among the many questions explored in this section are whether it mattered to readers that they had an autographed copy in hand, whether there is an advantage of having the author involved in manuscript production, and what factors inspired authors to participate in the manuscript production process. Delsaux surmises that there were several extraneous reasons that influenced the way authors dealt with the production of their manuscripts, but absent from this list is a valorization of the autograph manuscript that reflects modern sensibilities. Among the causes he evokes, we find financial concerns, time constraints, distrust of scribes, the absence of an authorized copy to hand over to a scribe, or aesthetic considerations regarding calligraphy, layout, or punctuation as central concerns that might have inspired late-medieval writers, especially Christine, to participate in the manual labor of book production. An important portion of chapter 3 concerns the types of passive and active scribal interventions found in Christine’s corpus and the perceived respect her scribes had for the author’s text. Building on a detailed analysis of textual alterations found in manuscript copies of Christine’s work, both changes attributed to fellow scribes and to the author herself, Delsaux speculates that Christine’s intense involvement with the transcription of her works, her supervision of the manuscript process from beginning to end, and her practice of working with the same scribes all contributed to
an uncommon degree of respect for the author's work and the quality of the final product. One of the most important contributions of this study may very well be its primary role in canonizing the previous scholarship of Ouy and Reno, which is approached in this work as representing solid ground. The author is to be admired for his mastery of an extremely large bibliography and his efforts to synthesize this vast corpus. It may very well be one of the best introductions to the rich and varied codicological research being done in the French tradition. Readers may be surprised by the sweeping speculations about authorial intentionality and audience preferences derived from previous codicological research, but it may very well be this type of intellectual musing that will lead to fresh approaches to a material corpus that is increasingly available to scholars in digital form and that begs for more scholarly attention.

Deborah McGrady, University of Virginia

doi:10.1017/S0038713414002723

The subject of Eva De Visscher’s accomplished study is Herbert of Bosham, *magister* of theology in Paris, sometime secretary to Thomas Becket, and a scholar generally recognized as the most proficient Christian Hebraist of the twelfth century. De Visscher’s focus is Herbert’s *Psalterium cum commento*: the manuscript remains unedited, and this study is the first to work from a transcription of the entire text. As such, *Reading the Rabbis* is an important work, which offers considerable riches both for specialists in Hebrew-Latin translation and biblical exegesis, and for those with a more general interest in Christian Hebraism.

It is telling, perhaps, that along with more recent scholars of Christian Hebraism, including Deborah Goodwin and Gilbert Dahan, De Visscher engages with the still-authoritative work of Beryl Smalley, demonstrating just how influential Smalley’s body of work remains, even sixty years since the publication of *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*. De Visscher chases a number of hares set running by Smalley, and, through a series of careful and attentive readings, makes thoughtful qualifications and sensible corrections to earlier scholarly readings of Herbert.

The chief aim of De Visscher’s work is to move discussion of Herbert of Bosham’s exegetical writings beyond generalities and to describe, in detail, his scholarly methods. She seeks to define what exactly Herbert knew; what he read; how he read it; and—most crucially of all—who was helping him in his studies. Advancing beyond the incontrovertible fact Herbert knew at least some Hebrew, De Visscher attempts to quantify that knowledge in terms of vocabulary, grammar, textual criticism, and his method of translation. In doing so, she addresses the text of the *Psalterium* in exhaustive exegetical detail.

To a large extent, De Visscher succeeds in her stated aim, illuminating and considerably fleshing out Herbert’s use of, and perspectives on, Jerome and Rashi, the twin pillars of his exegetical work. This is coupled with a detailed discussion of Herbert's strategies for translation, revealing his methodology as a Hebraist. Herbert chose to translate Hebrew *lexica* as literally as possible, translating Hebrew roots with their Latin equivalents; and maintaining consistency by each time translating a noun for a noun, a verb for a verb. In addressing Herbert’s strategy as a translator, De Visscher also unpacks the broader purpose of the *Psalterium* itself: this was not a straightforward introduction to Hebraic
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