

the fields it is entangled with. That is the work of scholars to come, and Dickason's book will be a gold mine of resources for such future projects.

Laura Hellsten, Åbo Akademi

EKKEHART IV, *St. Galler Klostergeschichten (Casus Sancti Galli)*, ed. HANS F. HAEFELE and ERNST TREMP, with the assistance of FRANZISKA SCHNOOR. (Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptorum 82.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2020. Pp. xiv, 688; black-and-white figures. €98. ISBN: 978-3-4471-1178-2.  
doi:10.1086/725640

EKKEHARD IV, *Fortune and Misfortune at Saint Gall*, trans. EMILY ALBU and NATALIA LOZOVSKY. (Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library 68.) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2021. Pp. vii, 503. \$35. ISBN: 978-0-6742-5146-5.  
doi:10.1086/725640

Few medieval authors make it as easy for historians to crawl inside their minds as Ekkehard IV of St. Gall (c. 980–c. 1057). First of all, the great number of historiographical, hagiographical, and liturgical texts he composed allow us to reconstruct important aspects of monastic self-understanding in the turbulent eleventh century. In addition, this Ekkehard, one among many Ekkehards whose name was tied to the famous monastery, lets us zoom in on his thought processes and his writing methods due to the many glosses he left throughout the sizeable library of St. Gall. Ekkehard, in other words, is more than a mere producer of texts to those willing to delve deeply into his legacy. He gets as close as possible to becoming an actual person—which is, all things considered, quite a rarity in medieval historiography. However, tempting as it may be to get swept up in the life and thoughts of this author, it is precisely this “personality” that makes it so important to not simply take his texts for granted, but to study them as closely as possible. The two works under review here, both translations and commentaries of one of Ekkehard's most famous works, will allow future generations of researchers to continue these studies. At the same time, they also show that Ekkehard's textual persona should not be taken for granted: he is as much a product of our interpretation as he is the result of the way he presented himself. In fact, the simple idea that there are as many Ekkehards as there are *readers* of Ekkehard may already be observed by the fact that both publications have opted for a different spelling of the name of their protagonist.

Nevertheless, both publications fill an important niche in the field. Ekkehard's *Casus Sancti Galli* is an important and interesting narrative (and great for teaching!). Both the MGH edition by Hans F. Haefele, Ernst Tresp, and Franziska Schnoor and the Dumbarton Oaks translation by Emily Albu and Natalia Lozovsky (itself based on the aforementioned MGH edition) make this text and its author accessible to a new generation of scholars. The edition and facing translations are up to the usual standards we have come to expect from these series; the few emendations to the edition that could be considered have been listed in other reviews focusing specifically on the MGH version, such as Peter Orth in *Francia Recensio* (2020) or Stephan Waldhoff for *Sehepunkte* (2021). It is the translations that take the spotlight, however, and the way both bring the idiosyncrasies of the narrative to the fore. Each on their own will certainly push research on the monastery of St. Gall in new and exciting directions. When the two are taken together, however, that research will become that much deeper and more engaging.

The version by Albu and Lozovsky starts with a brief but serviceable introduction (vii–xxviii) in which the biography of both text and author are clarified. The translators explain the context within which the text came into being, pointing out that Ekkehard IV was particularly keen on maintaining monastic tradition in the face of what he saw as unnecessary innovations and interference from the outside. They dwell on the choices made when translating the title

of the work and use this as a jumping-off point to explain the main themes highlighted by the author—the tension between regularity and discipline on the one hand, and “reform” on the other. The brevity of the introduction leads to some necessary shortcuts, however, including the choice to state that the work “carefully preserved the memory” (ix) of the events that made the community what it was. This, in my opinion, underplays the role of Ekkehard as a masterful manipulator of said memories—which, in turn, is one of the avenues of future research that may be taken with this very translation in hand. The contributions that came out of the recently finished Humanities in the European Research Area (HERA) project “After Empire: Using and Not Using the Past in the Carolingian World, c. 900–1050,” especially the 2022 monograph by Sarah Greer, *Commemorating Power in Early Medieval Saxony* on the preservation and manipulation of memory at Quedlinburg and Gandersheim, demonstrate the enduring potential of such an approach.

The MGH edition, started by Haeefele but finished under the supervision of Treppe, has a longer introduction. It includes not only a critical examination of the manuscript tradition, but also an exposition of the highly interesting historiography and *Nachleben* of the narrative and its place in modern German national consciousness—also an interesting jumping-off point for further research. Treppe highlights many interesting aspects of the work and its author, including the way he built upon his predecessor Ratpert’s historiographical narrative not only chronologically but also thematically. Like their English counterparts, Treppe and his associates also dwell on the title and how it shows Ekkehard’s concern for the “fortune and misfortune” in St. Gall, as well as his preoccupation with maintaining tradition in the face of new initiatives from outside the cloister. Aside from the fact that the comments are more extensive, the MGH edition engages with the manuscripts more comprehensively—an engagement which itself reveals a plethora of interesting insights into the narrative. Rubrics and neumes have been variously used to organize the text; a sixteenth-century copy shows that it was intended to be glossed and commented upon; the language is continuously updated to fit with the customs at the time; and so on. Linguistic observations also concern the translation, of course. Treppe is clear about the debt he owes to Haeefele’s work in this regard—even going so far as to criticize their mutual predecessor Gerold Meyer von Knonau for his “overly critical and prejudiced tone” (p. 89: “überkritische und voreingenommene Ton”) and contrasting it with Haeefele’s more elegant rendition of the text (the widely accepted chapter division introduced by Meyer von Knonau is maintained, however; even this new edition is subject to established traditions after all). Interestingly, Treppe is most overtly critical of the historiographical traditions of the past two centuries: he takes several shots at the overly positivistic attitudes of previous scholars who decided this text was not worth their while due to the narrative choices made. While the introduction could go further in providing an alternative reading, it is this critical stance, coupled with the many times the introduction points out possible avenues for further research, that is paradoxically both in the spirit of Ekkehard’s highly personal writing style, and completely against the conservative mentality he represented.

While both translations are expertly made, it is important to remember that each of them is in the end an interpretation in itself. This review could never hope to fit a full critical comparison between the two, but some quick observations may help make the point that there is a different Ekkehard for every reader. Only rarely do the translations contradict each other, such as in chapter 85 where we read about a baby that *Pater illum tandem nutricis sinu adductum*—which could either be “Eventually, his father took him from a wetnurse’s breast,” or “Dann führte man es der Brust einer Amme zu” [Then it was brought to the breast of a wetnurse]. It is unclear where this difference comes from. It could be a matter of interpretation—the sequence of events makes the English translation more apparently “logical”—but that would require the reader to read *adductus* as a corruption of *abductus*—a common enough copying error, but nonetheless one that does not seem to be reflected in the extant manuscripts. Whichever reading you prefer, the subtle differences strewn throughout both

versions are, in many ways, more indicative of the usefulness of reading both translations side-by-side. The concept of *disciplina*, for instance, is variously translated as “Zucht” [cultivation] or “Lehrmethoden” [teaching methods] in the German version, whereas the English version tends to opt for “rules” or simply “discipline.” At two points in the text, mention is made of a *praemonachus* (chaps. 6 and 10), a *dis legomenon* which the German leaves as-is, but which is rendered in English as “future monk.” Chapter 38 tells of a *temptator ille et irrisor*, who is either a “Versucher und Spotter” [tempter and mocker] or a “devilish mocker.” In chapter 66, we read about a *coronatus*, who may either be a “Gekrönter” [crowned person] or a “tonsured monk”; in chapter 92 the word *foris* is either the succinct “auswärts” [outside] or the very explicit “outside the community”; and in chapter 119 the monks are, with a masterful dad joke, described as *Galli pulli*, which becomes either the young “Küken [chicks] des Gallus” or the more mature “Saint Gall’s chickens.” In each case, there is no obvious wrong choice, but they are choices nonetheless.

These differences show the personality of Ekkehard as much as the translators’. They reflect Ekkehard’s “keen appreciation for the power of words” (Albu and Lozovsky, p. xxi), but they should also serve as a reminder that any subsequent scholar working on the *Casus Sancti Galli* should take both interpretations into account—and will be invited to add their own reading. It is in the re-reading and re-interpreting of such narratives, after all, that we find the human element in our texts.

RUTGER KRAMER, Universiteit Utrecht

MATEUSZ FAFINSKI, *Roman Infrastructure in Early Medieval Britain: The Adaptations of the Past in Text and Stone*. (The Early Medieval North Atlantic.) Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2021. Pp. 239; black-and-white figures. €99. ISBN: 978-9-4637-2753-2. doi:10.1086/725566

Mateusz Fafinski examines the transition from Roman to early medieval Britain through the lens of Roman infrastructure, both material and symbolic. In this stimulating study of the late-fourth to mid-eighth centuries, Fafinski urges greater nuance than traditional arguments for either “continuity” or “discontinuity” of Roman spaces and practices. Instead, Fafinski looks “for the strategies of adaptation and activation of what was left by the Romans,” including roads, urban spaces, forts, and ruins, underscoring the range of approaches to *Romanitas* and its highly regionalized nature (16). Throughout, Fafinski highlights parallels to continental reuses of Roman material in Britain and regions that (re)constructed ideas of Rome in their own idiosyncratic ways. This study brings together legal and historical documents with archaeology and the landscape itself to demonstrate the multiplicity of strategies for wielding the past as a tool of legitimization and power in Britain.

In chapter 1, “Frameworks: From Historiography to the Principal Terms,” Fafinski defines major concepts in his study—e.g., “Infrastructure,” “Continuity,” “Re-Use”—and briefly discusses scholarship relevant to each. With “City” included here, but road-related infrastructure saved for the following chapter, readers get only a partial snapshot of the principal terminology. Chapter 1 nevertheless clearly lays out the theoretical framework applied in subsequent chapters, including an emphasis on “distinction” (both temporal and spatial) and “re-use,” which “is never neutral as an activity” (33). Chapter 2, “Movements: Charters and Roman Transport Infrastructure,” examines the references to Roman roads and bridges in English and Welsh charters (centered on southern English charters and the *Book of Llandalf*). References in boundary clauses can simply indicate demarcation, but they also have symbolic value, as those involved in such charters “noticed the remnants of the Roman past around them and chose to use it, re-use it and record that process in their charters, documents and chronicles” (47). Fafinski also points out different regional strategies, namely “adaptation” in the west and

*Speculum* 98/3 (July 2023)