

absorption in medieval women's embodiment, Barr considers another dimension—the embodiment of the text.

In contrast, Porete's *Mirror of Simple Souls*, unique among women's writings, feels utterly disembodied. Lacking a first-person authorial voice until its epilogue, it is no less devoid of visual and corporeal imagery. Barr argues ingeniously that the dialogue provides a mimetic experience of self-annihilation (the mystic's goal) through its "placelessness . . . the difficulty of locating a point of view with which to identify, the problematic position of the material book . . . and the sheer difficulty of the language" (193). Compelled to grapple with its labyrinthine complexity without intellectual footholds, the reader's Reason ideally dies (as her spokesman does in the text), assisting her Soul's liberation.

Oddly, Barr treats *A Revelation of Love* as *less* intimate than the *Mirror* because Julian of Norwich, like Thomas of Cantimpré, tries to control the reader's interpretation. "Love was his meaning," she writes, sharing her visions as well as their exegesis from a strong authorial position. But here Barr problematically confounds intimacy with postmodern indeterminacy. Although Julian's book is just as difficult as Marguerite's, non-specialist readers have overwhelmingly preferred it because of its engagingly intimate voice.

Did medieval readers prize difficulty? Manuscript evidence suggests that, then as now, some did while far more did not. But where we value close reading, they preferred deep reading, and to this Barr devotes a poignant conclusion. In a *cri de coeur* against mere information-gathering, she challenges modern readers to apply the same "full-bodied intention" (221) that once allowed medieval books to unlock their transformative potential.

BARBARA NEWMAN, Northwestern University

MARTHA BAYLESS, ed., *Fifteen Medieval Latin Parodies*. (Toronto Medieval Latin Texts 35.) Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies for the Centre for Medieval Studies, 2018. Paper. Pp. 119. \$17.95. ISBN: 978-0-8884-4485-1. doi:10.1086/713751

In 1996, Martha Bayless published her seminal study *Parody in the Middle Ages: The Latin Tradition*. The present book is not a revision or a reevaluation of her study of the Latin parodic texts that circulated in the Middle Ages, but rather a complement to it, in the form of a text edition. While *Parody in the Middle Ages* already contained an edition of eighteen texts, the author here expands this corpus with a new set of unedited independent versions, that differ, sometimes substantially, from versions that were previously edited by herself and by other scholars. This results in a new anthology of parodic prayers, gospels, sermons, and grammars, presented here in their fifteenth- and sixteenth-century avatars. Bayless underlines the importance of considering these later versions rather than trying to go back solely to the oldest versions that may have survived, in order to do justice to their late medieval context of circulation and adaptation. Invoking New Philology and the concept of "variance" defended by Bernard Cerquiglini (4), she rightly argues that, for such parodic texts that were constantly rewritten, there is no "best" version. Rather, we must consider each version for itself and as a manifestation of the long life of a text that lived on in a variety of manuscripts and contexts of composition.

For several texts, Bayless already edited another version in *Parody in the Middle Ages*, based on one or several manuscripts that differ from the ones used in *Fifteen Medieval Latin Parodies*. This is the case of the "Drinkers' Hymn and Prayer" (in *Fifteen Parodies*, 13–16) which is comparable to the "Missa potatorum" edited in *Parody* (338–45); of "A Money-Gospel" (*Fifteen Parodies*, 17–20; *Parody*, 321–31); of the two "Nonsense-Cento" (*Fifteen Parodies*, 41–52) edited as a series of mock sermons in *Parody* (363–98). Three more mock sermons are newly edited, for which another version was already provided in *Parody*: the short

and the long “Sermons of St. Nobody” (61–74 in *Fifteen Parodies*; 259–302 in *Parody*), and the “Sermon on St. One-Another” (*Fifteen Parodies*, 75–80), present in *Parody* under the title “Invicem” (311–20). Far from being repetitions, these new editions provide a very useful corpus for an in-depth comparison of these texts in their different manuscript versions, which makes of *Fifteen Parodies* a very useful tool for specialists.

Regrettably, the author does not elaborate on the reasons that led her to choose specifically some versions and manuscripts above others for *Fifteen Medieval Latin Parodies*. She indicates that the source manuscripts she chose are now predominantly located in German and Austrian libraries, and that they were called to her attention thanks to recent electronic databases that made them available (19–20). While this practical choice is indeed a great opportunity to give access to texts that were hitherto less accessible than digitized manuscripts in other repositories, it does not provide the reader with a clear guide to the constitution of the corpus. The individual introductions to each text, on the other hand, give a concise overview of the variants as kept in other manuscripts and already edited, as well as a description of each manuscript used for this edition. This description includes a very useful summary of the other texts kept in the same manuscript, which aids in understanding the textual context in which each parodic text has been kept. It is worth noting that an English translation of the texts is not provided in this volume. For readers less versed in medieval Latin, reading this anthology together with *Parody in the Middle Ages*, in which English translations are available, will give a better access to the comic essence of the texts and the details of their variants.

In her introduction, Bayless gives specific attention to the possible performance of the parodic Latin texts she edits. In her previous book, she had already mentioned the links between late medieval drama and these parodies to situate them in the carnival discourse, but her study remained focused on the expression of subversive humor in its textual forms. Here she looks into the possible performative dimension of these texts. She reiterates the common hypothesis of a Goliard milieu of production, but underlines that one should not be fooled by the self-depictions of the authors as “lowly and poverty-stricken wandering clerics” when in fact surviving evidence places them higher in the church hierarchy, and she argues convincingly that one should not assume these parodies were composed and used during the celebrations of the Feast of Fools (6). However, she does not elaborate on other contexts in which such texts could have been performed. Since the source manuscripts used here are mostly dating from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, it is in fact possible to reconstruct to some extent a context of performance for some of these texts. Although direct evidence of performances for Latin parodies in the late Middle Ages remains scarce, Bayless could have given more room in the introduction to the late medieval urban culture in which such texts were transmitted, as demonstrated by Jelle Koopmans and Paul Verhuyck in their study of the “St. Nobody” mock sermon in *Sermon joyeux et truanderie* (1987). Since *Fifteen Parodies* was published, new evidence has even emerged on this context of production for some manuscripts. Hanno Wijsman has very recently showed that Besançon, Municipal Library, MS 592, used as a source for two of the parodies edited by Bayless, was most likely produced in the Parisian university milieu, for the library of the duke of Burgundy (Wijsman, “Un manuscrit de Philippe le Bon et la Danse Macabré du cimetière des Saints-Innocents,” in *Les danses macabres dans l’Europe romane*, ed. Alina Zvonareva and Hanno Wijsman, special issue of *Le Moyen Âge* 127/1 [2021], forthcoming). Thus, there appears to be more diversity in the context of production and circulation of these late medieval manuscripts that still deserves to be further explored, rather than relying solely on the Goliard hypothesis.

The volume therefore offers texts that are worth reading for themselves, as well as references to sources that give ground to new research avenues worth exploring. *Fifteen Medieval Latin Parodies* constitutes not only an excellent textbook for lecturers, who can use this Latin corpus with their students to produce fresh translations, but also a good starting point for scholars who want to delve into complex textual and contextual material. One can only rejoice

that more of these parodies are now available thanks to this new edition, and that Bayless thus calls them again to the attention of philologists, literary specialists, and historians alike.

KATELL LAVÉANT, Utrecht University

LYN BLACKMORE, IAN BLAIR, SUE HIRST, and CHRISTOPHER SCULL, *The Prittlewell Princely Burial: Excavations at Priory Crescent, Southend-on-Sea, Essex, 2003*. London: Museum of London Archaeology, 2019. Pp. xxix, 514; many color and black-and-white figures and many tables. £35. ISBN: 978-1-9075-8650-7.
doi:10.1086/713411

The discovery and excavation of the “Prittlewell Prince” at Prittlewell Priory, Southend-on-Sea, Essex, in 2003–04 captured the imagination of academia and the public alike. The long-anticipated publication of the sixth-century early Anglo-Saxon burial chamber and its finds was well worth the wait, and the resulting report promises to become a mainstay of early medieval European archaeology.

The Prittlewell Princely Burial begins with a detailed history of the site location and its development through the long centuries. The report integrates antiquarian and early-twentieth-century excavations at the site, updating old records for modern archaeological standards of publication and combining into a cohesive narrative several hundred years of notes on finds in the local area and larger region of Essex. Archaeologists do not often get the chance to spend more than two hundred pages considering a single burial context, and this publication takes full advantage of the opportunity. The authors devote an entire chapter to the chamber grave, one to an analysis of the artifacts contained within, and one to the dating of its construction and use. It is also a rare treat to be able to read in great detail about such intense public engagement with the site.

One aspect where the report truly shines is the color photography. Lyn Blackmore, Ian Blair, Sue Hirst, Christopher Scull, and their collaborators have produced what is—with its plethora of colored photographs and intricate color-coded diagrams—a work of art in itself. This significantly improves readers’ engagement with the grave goods, in terms of understanding both their importance within the tableau and their manufacture. All items—from the famous gold crosses found near the location of the “Prince’s” head, to the glass beakers, lyre, hanging bowl, Roman spoon, and other prestige items, to the simple firesteel—are extensively discussed. Readers can compare photographs of the artifacts *in situ* with post-conservation images, as well as with computer-generated models of how the artifacts were constructed and what they might have looked like when they were new.

The authors give considerable attention to social, economic, political, and religious factors involved in the execution of the richly furnished chamber burial. Such an exhaustive analysis of seemingly every angle of this sixth-century burial is rare, even in today’s scholarship. The dating of the site follows the nomenclature laid out by John Hines and Alex Bayliss in 2013. This is helpful from the perspective of integrating such an important find into a longer material culture chronology, but admittedly somewhat maddening while reading for basic comprehension. *The Prittlewell Princely Burial* also includes several separate discussions of whether or not some of the finds indicate that the “Prince” or the people who buried him were Christian, or at least participated in the pageantry of this new religion at a time when elites in the area were converting to it. The historiography of the conversion of early Anglo-Saxon kingdoms to Christianity has long relied on textual sources. This volume (including an important contribution by Barbara Yorke) acknowledges that the duality of “Christian” and “pagan” obscures the spectrum of beliefs and practices inherent in the lives of sixth-century inhabitants of Britain. It offers for the artifacts interpretative frameworks that may have Christian connotations, but stops short of conclusively determining whether or not the