

ATTR 2021

## Compilation, Canonization, and Authority

Bergen / Barony Rosendal, September 20 – 24

### Abstracts

*Sören Koch (UiB) / Adelyn Wilson (University of Aberdeen)*

#### ***Compilation – a topic for interdisciplinary research?***

The purpose of this first session is to explore the concept of compilation, the methods involved in compilation, and to understand how compilation relates to concepts of authority and authorship. The format of the session will be a workshop event, with a combination of small group discussion among seminar participants and interactive discussions led by Professors Koch and Wilson.

This workshop session will begin with the opportunity for participants to share in small groups their pre-seminar understanding and experience with compilation, and to reflect on what that understanding means in the context of some set texts which will be provided in advance. This first part of the workshop will be an excellent opportunity to begin to get to know the other participants, and to set a baseline for your understanding of compilation against which you can reflect your learning through the programme.

The second part of the session will be an interactive discussion with Professors Koch and Wilson, in which they will discuss their own research on compilations among legal texts. Together Professors Koch and Wilson and the participants will probe several questions about compilation, examining concepts in connection to specific textual examples. What is the nature of compilation? Can there be a universal concept of compilation? How were compilations made? To what extent does compilation differ from original authorship? What are the motivations for compiling? How does compilation interact with concepts of authority? In exploring these questions, Professors Koch and Wilson will introduce the seminar participants to several compilations with which they have worked across three different genres of legal texts from Norway and Scotland from the early-modern period. A key theme of the discussion will be the extent to which these questions might be answered differently across the disciplines.

Required reading:

Koch, Sören, “Legal compilation in early modern Denmark and Norway – recycling the law”, in Kjell Åke Modéer (ed.), *Legal History: Reflecting the Past and the Present*, Olin Foundation ISBN 9789186645151 (2021), p. 198-229.

Recommended reading:

Hirschi, C. (2013). " Compiler into Genius. The Transformation of Dictionary Writers in Eighteenth-Century France and England". In *Scholars in Action*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004243910\\_007](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004243910_007)  
<https://www.alexandria.unisg.ch/214682/1/Hirschi%2C%20Compiler%20into%20Genius.pdf>

Terje Stordalen (UiO)

### **Compilation, Complexification, Canonization: Canonical Ecologies**

Compilations can be made for many different purposes, and they may be used in very diverse ways. One phenomenon common to compilations of authoritative texts, rules, or standards seems to be the build-up of a certain complexity through the compilation process – both in terms of possible intertextual exchange, and in terms of texts and rules becoming applicable to ever-changing (often expanding) spheres of life. The many strategies that canonical communities may apply to deal with growing complexities can be subsumed under the twofold policy of limitation and simultaneous flexibility. The limitation comes in terms of formal canonization, delimitation of authoritative materials, petrification of texts, etc. A certain flexibility, on the other hand, comes for instance in the forms of authorized commentary, socially controlled reception, or the management of social remembering (and forgetting) of the authoritative base. The continued authority of a compilation is produced in a complex interplay between text, commentary, institutions, social memory, social habits. This presentation charts some central elements and moments of such “canonical ecologies” by way of following one biblical text — the Book of Proverbs – through some of its moments in production, compilation, and reception.

Required reading:

Økland, J. and T. Stordalen. 2014. “Canon, Canonicity, Canonization,” in J. O’Brian (ed.), *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Bible and Gender Studies*, Vol 1. p. 17-25 (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Recommended reading:

Stordalen, T. 2021. “The Production of Authority in Levantine Scriptural Ecologies: An Example of Accumulative Cultural Production,” in T. Stordalen and Ø.S. LaBianca (eds.) *Levantine Entanglements: Cultural Productions, Long-Term Changes and Globalizations in the Eastern Mediterranean*, p. 322-72 (London: Equinox).

Jens Eike Schnall (UiB)

### **Compilatio and Ordinatio in Medieval Encyclopedic Manuscripts**

The manuscript culture of the Middle Ages developed and refined the art of (re)organizing and systematizing knowledge in large, at times monumental, works. Among the best known examples are encyclopedic works such as the *Didascalicon de studio legendi* by Hugo of St. Victor, *De proprietatibus rerum* by Bartholomaeus Anglicus, *De natura rerum* by Thomas of Cantimpré and the *Speculum maius* by Vincent of Beauvais. In this session, we will deal with the concepts and techniques of *compilatio* and *ordinatio* and their application within medieval encyclopedic texts and texts which contain sections of encyclopedic character. Our examples will be taken from both Latin and Old Norse works, as for the latter mainly the Norwegian *King’s Mirror* and Icelandic law manuscripts containing the *Jónsbók*. Special attention will be given to structural models which provide schemes for the compilation of large works and

which, at the same time, can be linked to the medieval art of memory. We will thus e.g. get a glimpse of the medieval roots of modern tree diagrams, medieval pedagogy, and see what makes a text on phlebotomy appear in legal manuscripts.

Required reading:

N. Hathaway (1989) "*Compilatio*": *From Plagiarism to Compiling*  
(Los Angeles: University of California Press)

*Jørn Øyrehagen Sunde and Brage Hatløy*  
(UiO and UiB)

### ***Compilation in the Code of the Norwegian Realm of 1274***

One can think of legislation as a coin with two opposite sides, since law is an instrument both for stability and for change in society. Stability is a precondition for predictability, and hence for social order and economic growth. But law is also a political tool for governance, and hence an instrument for change.

Balancing stability and change may become a pressing issue during times when larger pieces of legislation are in the works, such as is the case in the writing of a code of law. When a large part of the entire body of law is in flux, the whole stability and ability for society to change is at stake.

A valuable and useful tool in the process of making new law is to reuse already existing law by editing, rearranging, rewriting, and supplementing it, and this can take the form of a compilation process. There is no universal formula on how to conduct the process because the balancing has to be done with regards to the existing instability in society, which again is decisive for the degree of changes possible to achieve.

The Code of the Norwegian Realm of 1274 was made by compiling older law that was edited, rearranged, rewritten and supplemented. It is hence a most suitable object of study to understand the art of compilation when making a code of law. At the same time, a study of the Code of 1274 gives insight in European and Norwegian medieval politics and society from a legal point of view, in an era of codification of law in Europe.

Required reading:

Korpiola, M. 2018. "High and Late Medieval Scandinavia: Codified Vernacular Law and Learned Legal Influences." In: Pihlajamäki H et al. (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of European Legal History*, pp. 378-404. (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Recommended reading:

Hatløy, N. 2019. "Komparativ mellomalderrett: Eit døme på rettshistorisk komparativ metode." In: Jørn Øyrehagen Sunde (red.) *Fordom og forvetning – Ei handbok i rettshistorisk metode*, p. 123-142. (Oslo: Akademisk Publiserings)

Mathias Schmoeckel  
(University of Bonn)

***The History of Expropriation and Its Relation to 1 Samuel 8***

The *sedes materiae* for expropriation for centuries was 1 Sam 8: The Prophet reminds the Jews, who wanted to have a king, what kings usually do: they take away the boys for their army and the money for their wars. The interpretation displays clearly how the Christian authors of the last millennium thought of kings and the legitimacy of expropriation.

Recommended reading:

Reynolds, S. 2010: “Before eminent domain: toward a history of expropriation of land for the common good.” (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press)

This book is available at the University of Oslos digital library

[https://bibsyst-almaprmo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=BIBSYS\\_ILS71519847470002201&context=L&vid=UIO&lang=no\\_NO&search\\_scope=default\\_scope&adaptor=Local%20Search%20Engine&isFrbr=true&tab=default\\_tab&query=any,contains,Susan%20Reynolds,%20Before%20Eminent%20Domain&offset=0](https://bibsyst-almaprmo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=BIBSYS_ILS71519847470002201&context=L&vid=UIO&lang=no_NO&search_scope=default_scope&adaptor=Local%20Search%20Engine&isFrbr=true&tab=default_tab&query=any,contains,Susan%20Reynolds,%20Before%20Eminent%20Domain&offset=0) <[https://bibsyst-almaprmo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=BIBSYS\\_ILS71519847470002201&context=L&vid=UIO&lang=no\\_NO&search\\_scope=default\\_scope&adaptor=Local Search Engine&isFrbr=true&tab=default\\_tab&query=any,contains,Susan Reynolds, Before Eminent Domain&offset=0](https://bibsyst-almaprmo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=BIBSYS_ILS71519847470002201&context=L&vid=UIO&lang=no_NO&search_scope=default_scope&adaptor=Local Search Engine&isFrbr=true&tab=default_tab&query=any,contains,Susan Reynolds, Before Eminent Domain&offset=0)>

Eirik Hovden (UiB)

***Compilation, canonization, and codification in the Islamic legal tradition***

Islamic scholars have over the centuries developed a vast and rich scholarly textual tradition where legal theory (jurisprudence, *fiqh*) is a core discipline. Large parts of these developments have taken place in cosmopolitan scholarly networks outside direct control of a central state. Compilation has been a way of managing the diversity of sources and potential legal rules that arose over the centuries, something the legal anthropologist Brinkley Messick have called “the library” (2018). Some of these library texts were canonized by various “communities of interpretation”, the most famous of which are the four Sunni legal “schools” (*madhhabs*), although many other existed and exists. In the process of managing “library-texts”, explicit and implicit criteria for inclusion were made. Efforts of reducing a potential destructive plurality and incoherence early on led to codification, even if such codes were primarily meant for scholarly and didactic purposes and thus functionally different from later, modern Islam-inspired legislation. “Compilations”, “Canons” and “Codes” are terms or concepts that some see as foreign to the Islamic tradition and thus of limited use. I argue that these terms, separately or in juxtaposition, are highly useful as hermeneutical tools that open for comparative endeavours and theoretical that generate new questions and perspectives, drawing our attention to agency, social settings and historical contexts.

Required reading:

Brinkley Messick, Shari’a Scrips (2018), introduction, pages 20-30

Recommended reading:

Brinkley Messick, Shari'a Scrips (2018), introduction, pages 1-20

Marion Katz, The Age of Development and Continuity, 12th-15th Centuries EC, in The Oxford Handbook of Islamic law, Ed. A. Emon and R. Ahmed (2018)

*Tone Irene Brekke (UiO)*

***From Canonized to Canonizing Women in British Romanticism: Anthologies and Lists of Excellent Women Writers as Feminist Praxis?***

The late eighteenth century is frequently referred to as a period in which our modern notion of the literary emerges. One phenomenon that accompanies the changes in the literary marketplace in this period, is the growing interest in literary anthologies. Although they frequently contained references to religious texts, some of these explicitly present themselves as secular, literary canons. Not surprisingly, these “lists” do for the most part exclude women writers. The cultural and ideological work invested in these canons, such as their contribution to the formation of a national and male, middle-class identity has been pointed out by many critics. What has not received much critical attention is, however, the anthologies and canons launched by women writers of the eighteenth-century.

This presentation points to some of the canonizing efforts in the translations, selections of texts, authors, and lists of “excellent women” in Mary Wollstonecraft’s anthology, *The Female Reader* (1789), Mary Robinson’s pamphlet *A Letter to the Women of England* (1799), Anna Letitia Barbauld’s *The British Novelists* (1810) and Mary Hays’ *Female Biography, or, Memoirs of Illustrious and Celebrated Women* (1807). That British women writers in the second half of the eighteenth century, such as Hays, Wollstonecraft, Robinson and Barbauld developed and financed their careers as poets and authors of fictions and pamphlet by working as reviewers and translators is well known. Less debated, however, is their role as cultural “transmitters” in the development of the emerging English literary canon. A central point of this presentation will be to reevaluate the understanding of cultural authorship and its gendered hierarchies. Instead of viewing women’s roles as translators, editors and reviewers as a secondary activity limited to passively reproducing and transmitting texts, perhaps we need to reevaluate and widen the discussion of canonic processes to include such cultural work?

Required reading:

Wollstonecraft, Mary. Selections from *The Female Reader* (1789): “Preface, “Select Desultory Thoughts addressed to Females, and “Book IV Devotional Pieces, and Reflections on Religious Subjects.” pp. iii-xx, 1-16, 354-394.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. Selections from *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (1792): “Chap. 1: The rights and involved duties of mankind considered” and “Chap 2: The prevailing opinion of a sexual character discussed” New Haven and Yale: Yale University Press, 2014. pp. 37-44, 45-63.

Recommended reading:

Barbauld, Anna Letitia. “An Address to the Deity” *Poems* (1773). p 41-44.

Taylor, Barbara: “Feminism and Enlightened Religious Discourses” in *Women, Gender and Enlightenment* (Sarah Knott and Barbara Taylor, eds.) New York: Palgrave, 2005. p 410-15.

Taylor, Barbara: "For the love of God" in Mary Wollstonecraft and the Feminist Imagination. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. p. 95-142.

Bermingham, Ann and John Brewer (eds). "Part II: Engendering the Literary Canon" in *The Consumption of Culture 1600-1800. Image, Object, Text*. Oxford and New York: Routledge 1995/2005. 121-193.

*Kelsie Rodenbiker (University of Glasgow)*

***The Catholic Epistles as a (Para)Canonical Compilation***

The ancient process of forming an authoritative canon of Christian scriptures was not an inevitable plod toward a teleological end resulting in the now-familiar New Testament, and the Catholic Epistle collection – James, 1 and 2 Peter, 1, 2, and 3 John, and Jude – played a fraught role in this process. Key antecedents prepared the ground for a sevenfold Catholic collection, including the Muratorian fragment, the early manuscript tradition, and ancient references to 'catholic' epistles. But there was an ancient concern over the perceived pseudonymity of the majority of the collection—as exhibited, for example, by Eusebius, who both provides the first unambiguous designation of a sevenfold collection of Catholic Epistles and relegates the majority of the collection to a grouping of *antilegomena* (debated texts). The concern over pseudonymity and the accompanying hesitation to include all seven Catholic letters among the New Testament place the collection in a liminal space between texts that were widely accepted early on, like the four now-canonical Gospels or Paul's letter to the Romans, and texts that fell outside the supposed boundary of an authoritative New Testament, like the *Gospel of Mary* or the *Protevangelium of James*. Still, while the suspicion of pseudonymity is at the centre of the debate over the Catholic Epistles' role in the New Testament, their attribution to key apostles is also a major factor in their continued use and eventual inclusion. We will first discuss the tethers between attribution, compilation, and canonicity, using the Catholic Epistles as a case study, before exploring the implications of their canonical liminality on the broader notions of scriptural authority and the integrity of a scriptural canonical boundary.

Required reading:

Mroczek, Eva. 2016. "The Sweetest Voice: The Poetics of Attribution." In idem: *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity*, 51–85. (Oxford: Oxford University Press) See esp. the introduction and section on "Characters in Search of Stories: Authority, Pseudonymity, and Poetics."

Recommended reading:

Najman, Hindy (2012) "The Vitality of Scripture Within and Beyond the 'Canon.'" *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 43: 497-518.

Nienhuis, David R. and Robert W. Wall (2013) "The Shaping of a Canonical Collection" In idem: *Reading the Epistles of James, Peter, John and Jude as Scripture: The Shaping and Shape of a Canonical Collection*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013, 17–39.