

along gender lines, with women assuming care for the sick and men taking on the ministerial and administrative duties. Religion was also central to life in the hospital, and Davis describes the sermons given by the brothers and the use of relics in healing. By consulting archaeological records detailing physical remains, Davis is able to postulate who might have sought care in the hospital and what kinds of care they might have needed. For, just as providers tended to the body, they were equally concerned with care for the soul, as they saw the two as intertwined. The book's epilogue draws parallels in the correlation between times of commercial prosperity and charity in the medieval and the modern world.

Through Davis's meticulous and omnivorous use of sources—archaeology, charters, material culture, and theology—and command of the secondary literature, this book provides a comprehensive and illuminating account of the rise of hospitals. The argument that the commercial and charitable revolutions were symbiotic is well made and persuasive. The book furnishes a solid understanding of life in these charitable houses and the lives of those working, living, and recuperating there, as well as how a commercial economy would galvanize believers to seek redemption through good works and penance. A particular strength of the analysis is the attention given to the prominent role of women as patrons, administrators, and workers within the hospital. Through the examination of how and why people supported hospitals in Champagne, Davis succeeds in marrying theological ideas to actual practice. The book offers a new interpretation of the commercial revolution, not as a catalyst for suspicion and persecution but as a catalyst for charity. It also makes clear that hospitals in Champagne were at the center of thirteenth-century society, touching rich and poor, urban and rural. This volume offers a model for further examination of the “hospital movement” in other times and places.

The Medieval Economy of Salvation makes an original and important contribution to the scholarship by connecting economic growth to the enactment of charity. It offers an in-depth analysis of the many facets of the hospital that furthers knowledge about these charitable institutions. The book advances a more positive view of medieval social relations by showing that the turn toward commerce did not mean that neighbors turned away from those in need.

AMY LIVINGSTONE, Ball State University

ANSELME DAVRIL, ANNIE DUFOUR, and GILLETTE LABORY, eds. and trans., *Les miracles de Saint Benoît: Miracula sancti Benedicti*. (Sources d'histoire médiévale 45.) Paris: CNRS Éditions, 2019. Pp. 648; 1 map. €90. ISBN: 978-2-2711-2970-3.
doi:10.1086/716317

In 2004, Dom Anselme Davril presented to the Paris Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes the manuscript of an edition he had prepared of the *Historia translationis* of Saint Benedict from Monte Cassino to Fleury (Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire) and the nine books of the *Miracula Sancti Benedicti* that were written at Fleury between 865 and c. 1120 by six authors. The first of them was Adrevald, responsible for book 1 (dealing with the period up to 865), and next came, in succession, Adelarius, who added chapters 40–41 to book 1 (one of which seems datable to 869), Aimo (books 2–3, continuing the work of Adrevald and Adelarius until just after 1004), Andrew (books 4–7, dealing with c. 994–1044), Rodulfus Tortarius (book 8, covering c. 1031/60–1114), and Hugh of Fleury (book 9, dealing with 1114–19). Dom Davril died in 2010, and did not see the edition published. Indeed, the work done on the edition by Annie Dufour and Gillette Labory was considerable. The editors had to deal with the complex transmission of the individual books of the collection and the *Historia translationis*, written by an author they call Pseudo-Adrevald. (Although the author had been usually identified with Adrevald, there are such stylistic differences between the *Historia translationis* and the first book of the *Miracula* that their authors cannot be identical.)

Speculum 96/4 (October 2021)

In the end they chose eleven manuscripts that originate from Fleury or from one of its dependencies, and fourteen non-Fleury manuscripts. This proved to be a sensible decision, which had already been made by Dom Davril, even if it meant discarding sixty-eight of the eighty-three extant manuscripts of the *Historia translationis* that are mentioned in the *Clavis scriptorum latinorum medii aevi*, vol. 1 (1994), 39. We now have a reliable edition of the text as it occurs in a number of manuscripts that were important to their makers and users, with an annotated translation that serves the needs of modern medieval historians. Similar choices were made for the books of the *Miracula*, each of whose authors had a different reception. Indeed, not a single manuscript exists that contains the whole corpus of the *Historia translationis* and the nine books of the *Miracula*. And yet each author sees himself as the continuator of his predecessor, and Adrevald, the author of book 1, uses in turn the *Historia translationis*.

It is possible to read the texts one after the other, as part of the single corpus their authors intended to contribute to. It is also possible to read them individually, as they were intended to be read by some of the scribes responsible for the extant manuscripts, most of which only contain one or at most a few of the texts making up the corpus. This is also suggested by the differences in approach and style of the authors. The *Historia translationis* of Pseudo-Adrevald became highly influential in the development of the genre of the “translation of relics,” providing subsequent authors with a crystallized set of items that might be borrowed and elaborated on in their own *translationes*. The authors of the *Miracula* also could not be confused with one another. Adrevald, Aimo, Andrew, and Hugh were historians; Rodulfus Tortarius thought of himself first and foremost as a poet. Among the historians, there is a marked tendency of writing about the historical background against which the miracles of Saint Benedict took place. Sometimes they need to remind themselves of the subject of the *Miracula*. Adrevald likes to show off his Latin. Aimo sometimes explicitly prefers written over oral evidence, even if the oral evidence is provided by members of his own community (3.4, 244–49). These Fleury authors also wrote other works, some of which have been edited and translated in the same series as the publication under review: the *Life* of Abbot Gauzlinus of Fleury by Andrew was edited by Robert-Henri Bautier and Gillette Labory (1965), and the *Life* of Abbo of Fleury by Aimo was edited by the same scholars with the addition of Davril and Lin Donnat in a volume entitled *L'Abbaye de Fleury en l'an mil* (2004), where other texts produced at Fleury have also found a place. *Les Miracles de Saint-Benoît* is the fourth volume devoted to the (mainly historiographical) production of the Fleury scriptorium (the *Life* of King Robert the Pious of France, by Helgaud, came out in 1965, by the same editors who brought out the *Life* of Abbot Gauzlinus). Hugh of Fleury was also a well-known historian outside the orbit of Saint Benedict.

This edition, with its accompanying translation, is more than welcome. It comes with a helpful introduction on the authors and their work, useful descriptions of the manuscripts that have been retained for the edition, indices of names and words, and a bibliography. No attempt has been made, however, to list all works in which the *Historia Translationis* and the *Miracula Sancti Benedicti* have been used extensively. There is hardly anything mentioned in languages other than French. Thus, we find Dominique Barthélemy's *Chevaliers et miracles: La violence et le sacré dans la société féodale* (2004), but not Thomas Head's *Hagiography and the Cult of the Saints: The Diocese of Orléans, 800–1200* (1990) or Patrick Geary's *Furta sacra: Thefts of Relics in the Central Middle Ages* (1978). Nor is there a thematic index. The index of (Latin) words has to serve as a substitute. Similarly, a list of the sources used by the Fleury authors would have been useful. But these are minor quibbles. We have to be grateful for this reliable edition and translation, which will no doubt lead to more scholars being enchanted by these offerings of Fleury historiography.

MARCO MOSTERT, Utrecht University