Angelo Poliziano. *Lamia: Text, Translation, and Introductory Studies*. Ed. by Christopher S. Celenza. Brill’s Studies in Intellectual History, 189; Brill’s Texts and Sources in Intellectual History, 7. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010. xiv + 272 pp. The text at the center of this book is a praelectio, or preliminary oration, delivered in the fall of 1492 to open a course on Aristotle’s *Prior Analytics* being taught at the Florentine university by Angelo Poliziano. The decision to teach Aristotle was a controversial one: no one challenged Poliziano’s ability to handle the Greek, but his background was in literature and he held the chair in rhetoric and poetics, not philosophy. The *Prior Analytics*, focused on the use of syllogisms, struck some of his contemporaries as an especially inflammatory choice, and as is always the case, the backbiting soon reached his ears. To Poliziano, a member of the late fifteenth-century Florentine intellectual community who gossiped about him as he sought to expand his teaching portfolio was a sorcerer or enchantress who sucked the blood of her victims—a *lamia*, in Latin. To these enemies, Poliziano devotes his attention here.

The actual argument is framed between two apologies, an introductory one by the lamias and a conclusion by the wise owl. In between, in deference to the subject of his upcoming lecture course, Poliziano proposes and defends a syllogism, first outlining what an ideal philosopher looks like, then allowing that it might be worth-
while to be such a person, then asking why one should not claim to be a philosopher. Ironically, however, Poliziano’s actual conclusion is just the opposite, that he is not a philosopher, just an interpreter. The real question revolves around what it means to be a philosopher in the first place. The root meaning of the word, of course, is ‘lover of wisdom,’ and Poliziano is actually asking whether those who were teaching Aristotle in the Florentine university were really questioning, looking for new evidence, and asking themselves ‘why?’ By framing the argument within fables, he is challenging his readers to search for wisdom in untraditional ways, and by proceeding as he did, he placed himself within the tradition of Socratic irony. In the end, Poliziano argues that the only way actually to attain wisdom is through philology, because only the philologist could examine all the evidence, be unimprisoned by disciplinary shackles, and pass dispassionate judgement on life’s problems. In the end his way did not prevail, but it did dominate discussion in many circles through the eighteenth century.

The book we have here offers an admirable model of how to take a text like this and bring it back to life. The late Ari Wesseling produced an exemplary text in 1986, which forms the basis for this edition, but Celenza made minor changes in punctuation and orthography in the name of uniformity, readability, and consistency. He has also provided a fluent translation, the first into English, that conveys the meaning, tone, and style of the Latin without sacrificing readability. Poliziano assumed a lot of knowledge on the part of his readers, so Celenza provides the necessary notes, often based on Wesseling’s work but with the source freely acknowledged.

As a guide to a first reading and a stimulus to further reflection, there are four lengthy essays preceding the text. The first, “Poliziano’s Lamia in Context,” by Celenza, provides historical background and a fairly detailed analysis of the points covered in the work. Francesco Caruso’s “On the Shoulders of Grammatica: John of Salisbury’s Metalogicon and Poliziano’s Lamia” reminds us that pre-modern intellectual discourse usually had traceable roots, in this case in parallels between the Lamia and the works of John of Salisbury and Petrarch. In “The
Role of the Philosopher in Late Quattrocento Florence: Poliziano’s *Lamia* and the Legacy of the Pico-Barbaro Epistolary Controversy,” Igor Candido traces another set of roots that go back to a discussion in the middle 1480s among Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, Ernolao Barbaro, and Poliziano. Denis J.-J. Robichaud uses his “Angelo Poliziano’s *Lamia*: Neoplatonic Commentaries and the Plotinian Dichotomy between the Philologist and the Philosopher” to show that the history of the philology—philosophy controversy is important as well: Neoplatonists from Proclus to Ficino allowed the philosopher to engage in philological commentary, but forbade the philologist to comment on philosophical texts. This, Poliziano argues, is backwards from the way things should be.

The book closes with a full bibliography and a brief, but adequate, index. In short, this is ‘must reading’ for anyone interested in the development of humanism in late fifteenth-century Florence, along with historians of philosophy and education. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

♦  *De officio legati, De immunitate legatorum, De legationibus Ioannis Langiachi Episcopi Lemovicensis.* By Etienne Dolet. Ed. and trans. by David Amherdt. Geneva: Droz, 2010. In 1541, the scholar-turned-printer Etienne Dolet published at his own presses in Lyon a relatively short work composed of three parts: *De officio legati, De immunitate legatorum,* and *De legationibus Ioannis Langiachi Episcopi Lemovicensis.* The entire work is dedicated to Jean de Langeac, bishop of Limoges, for whom Dolet had worked as secretary when Langeac was French ambassador to Venice at the end of the 1520s. In *De officio legati,* Dolet describes the external characteristics (e.g., age, class) an ambassador requires before detailing the function of the ambassador and the qualities needed to be successful. According to Dolet, the ambassador’s role essentially lies in the fulfillment of the orders (*mandata,* as Dolet prefers, *quas instructiones vulgo vocant,* 66) received from a king. In the fulfillment of these, Dolet interestingly sanctions the use of spies and what might be called tactical generosity in order to win the favour of others. In *De immunitate legatorum,* Dolet uses a range of classical sources to elucidate the concept of diplomatic immunity in antiquity. The work concludes with *De legationibus,* a
309-line poem in hexameters which recounts the diplomatic career of Langeac in laudatory terms. Dolet claims to have composed this poem shortly after the end of his time as Langeac’s secretary, evoking its *juvenilis ille calor lasciviensque stylus* (46).

Turning to the introduction that prefaces the edition and translation of this work, Amherdt usefully provides structured synopses of each of the three sections of the publication. In a number of cases, these reveal the coherency of Dolet’s thought, just as they generally help the reader to navigate the text. Discussions of each part of the publication are also provided. In relation to *De officio legati*, Amherdt appears to assume that this work represents Dolet’s attempt to answer perennial questions regarding ambassadors; on the back cover of the work, he suggests that Dolet’s work will interest those who wish to grasp the Renaissance understanding of the ambassador. As a consequence, he discusses the relationship between Dolet’s text and other treatises, both humanistic and scholastic, on the subject, as well as the extent to which it is contradictory to recommend apparently morally dubious tactics while simultaneously asserting that the ambassador needs to be moral. Such considerations should, however, have been secondary to a discussion of the possibility that Dolet’s comments were shaped by the desire to correct errors made by ambassadors and by those who choose ambassadors. Interesting in this regard is the fact that Dolet’s account of the diplomatic career of Langeac in *De legationibus* makes no reference to a number of tactics Dolet suggests in the *De officio*. The treatment that Amherdt offers of *De immunitate*, though brief, is much more successful. Specifically, he reveals how this text, which is essentially a series of direct citations of ancient works, could be read as a paean to ancient virtue. The discussion of *De legationibus* is again, however, somewhat disappointing. Amherdt does provide a useful précis of Langeac’s career, which interestingly makes clear that Dolet omits to mention certain diplomatic missions. The only real analysis, however, consists of the observation that the poem is mediocre. This view problematically implies that Dolet was working to a set of exclusively aesthetic criteria and ignores how the poem is presumably intended primarily as a monument designed to ensure the immortality of Langeac’s name. (Dolet defends this as a central function of poetry; see his *Carmina (1538)*, ed. by C. Langlois-Pézeret (Geneva,
2009), 258-63). Indeed, it might also have been interesting to explore the notion that the opening two sections of the work were part of a broader epideictic strategy that culminates in Dolet’s laudatory poem.

Overall, if the introduction would have benefited from being more detailed in a few areas, Amherdt nonetheless does a great service both by making available this complex text with an accurate translation and detailed notes, and by providing a generally stimulating introduction. The volume is thus a welcome addition to the increasing number of editions of works by Dolet that have come into print in recent years. It will also be of great benefit to those interested in diplomatic and political culture in the Renaissance, though not necessarily in the transparent way that one might initially assume. (Harry Stevenson, Cambridge University)

♦ The Correspondence of Erasmus, Letters 1802-1925, March 1527 - December 1527. By Desiderius Erasmus. Annotated by James K. Farge, trans. by Charles Fantazzi. Collected Works of Erasmus, 13. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 2010. xx + 574 pp. This volume offers the first translations into English of the first 124 letters in vol. 7 of P. S. Allen’s Opus epistolarum Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami, along with five additional letters whose existence and history have been recovered since Allen’s edition was published. All of these letters were written during a nine-month period at the end of 1527, when Erasmus was in residence in Basel; more than half do not appear in his Opus epistolarum (Basel, 1529).

The overriding issue in the letters translated here is Erasmus’s continued frustration with his critics. It was his great misfortune to have ended up under attack by both conservative Catholic theologians and religious reformers. By this time he has finally broken with Luther, but that failed to silence his Catholic critics; indeed the crisis in Spain came to a head during this period. Epistle 1814, from Juan de Vergara, contains information about the inquisition into his orthodoxy that convened on 27 June 1527; its sudden termination marked only a temporary victory. This overshadowed to an extent the controversy with Erasmus’s French critics, but these problems continued as well, leading to a formal condemnation of 112 propositions drawn from Erasmus’s works at the end of the year. These problems made Erasmus
more dependent than ever on his powerful protectors, and a number of letters in this volume involve correspondence with people like Emperor Charles V and his ministers, William Warham (the Archbishop of Canterbury), and the Polish nobleman Jan (II) Łaski, who did him the great favor of purchasing his library, then leaving it to his use as long as he lived. Other letters exchanged with prominent humanists like Guillaume Budé and Juan Luis Vives bring out aspects of Erasmus’s cultural program, in which he insisted on the importance of studying the humanities to increase both knowledge and piety. The letters translated here also allow us to follow the progress of the scholarly projects Erasmus was working on during this period, like the collected works of Augustine and Ambrose. Now and again more personal elements emerge, as when Erasmus complains about his health (Epistles 1808-9); it is also worth noting that the complaints about money that were frequent in his earlier correspondence are largely gone here, due no doubt to Łaski’s purchase of his library.

This is in many ways a typical CWE volume, in which an elegantly polished translation is presented along with thorough notes that allow an appreciative first reading of the text. Given the size of the larger project, volumes like this one, which appears at about the two-thirds point in the projected twenty-two volumes of letters, are in danger of getting passed over. That would be a real shame. The two authors have obviously spent a good deal of time and effort on this project, and it deserves praise both as part of one of the great scholarly enterprises of our time and for the fine work of scholarship it is by itself. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

♦ Bonaventura Vulcanius. Works and Networks: Bruges 1538 - Leiden 1614. Ed. by Hélène Cazes. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010. xiv + 490 pp. In the fall of 2010, the Leiden University Library and the Scaliger Institute organized an exhibition entitled “Facebook in the Sixteenth Century? The Humanist and Networker Bonaventura Vulcanius.” De Smet (to go by his original Flemish name) was a genuine networker, who instead of modern tools like Facebook, started two Alba amicorum, filled with messages of friendship on the meaning of scholarship and humanism, which he consciously used as a tool for public relations. Born in Bruges in 1538, the son of a dis-
ciple of Erasmus, Vulcanius was a humanist without borders: he lived and worked in Spain and Germany, and was secretary of Philips van Marnix van Sint-Aldegonde. In 1581 he was appointed as Professor in Latin and Greek at Leiden University, a chair he would hold until his death in 1610. Vulcanius edited and translated rare texts, composed dictionaries, sent laudatory poems, and compiled the first chapters of a history of Germanic languages—and according to a famous remark by Scaliger, “had no religion but dice and cards.” He was also secretary to the Senate of the university, and his books and manuscripts are still one of the great collections of the Leiden University Library. Along with the exhibition catalogue, Hélène Cazes has edited this large and interesting collection of papers on this versatile philologist, including the first edition of many unpublished works and documents.

In her introduction, Cazes stresses the paradox that, although the scholar Vulcanius supervised his own initial biography and left behind a considerable number of documents and testimonies, a cloud of mystery still lingers around his name, his activities, and his beliefs. She finds an explanation for the paradox in the part played by Vulcanius himself in the composition of his legend, and in the nature of his scholarship and writing: devoting most of his life to editions and translations, Vulcanius defined his writing as that of an epigone. This volume does not seek to resolve the paradox, but rather “aims to restore the aura of discretion and silence in which Vulcanius wrapped his private life and opinions … gathering different perspectives, without excluding any of them, and propos[ing] various takes on the same question,” constituting thereby “an imaginary biography” (2-3).

In the opening paper, “Looking for Vulcanius: Plethora and Lacunae. The Many Lives of Bonaventura Vulcanius 1614-2010” (5-43, containing many sources in the ten appendices), Cazes herself explores the various biographies of the humanist, starting from Vulcanius’s own epitaph, a tetrastichon that as a “retrospective portrait and a prospective eulogy” illustrates how he wanted to picture himself as a Leiden professor and nothing else. In a first section, “Legacies and Portraits,” Harm-Jan van Dam’s “‘The honour of letters’: Bonaventura Vulcanius, Scholar and Poet” (47-48) provides us with a very perspicacious overview of Vulcanius’s work as a philological editor (interestingly, he seemed to have preferred editing only authors of
whom he possessed one or more manuscripts—hence the publication of quite a few obscure authors) and allows the reader to see how Vulcanius’s own poetical works are particularly informative about the poetical practice and principles of an international scholar, dedicated networker, and well-established professor—although prudence is always called for when it comes to the use of his poetry as a source of historical information. Van Dam then focuses on an analysis of Codex Vulcanius 103 (of the Leiden University Library, the home of most of the texts discussed in the present volume) and concludes with a convenient overview of works published by Vulcanius. In the second paper, Chris L. Heesakkers (edition and notes) and Wilhelmina G. Heesakkers-Kamerbeek (translation) present “Petrus Cunaeus, Oratio in obitum B. Vulcanii habita Lugd. Batav. in acad. MDCCXIV” (69-101), the funeral oration that was held in 1614 upon Vulcanius’s demise, and that, in contrast with the common practice at Leiden University, was not published immediately afterwards (it was printed only in 1725). The next paper, “The Portraits of Bonaventura Vulcanius” (103-19) by Kasper van Ommen, discusses the first portraits of Vulcanius and supplies a succinct, nicely illustrated catalogue of all known portraits. While the policy of quoting original sources and/or translations of such sources in the main text or the footnotes is apparently deliberately inconsistent throughout the volume, the choice not to translate two quotes printed in old Dutch (106-7) might still be deemed awkward by an international audience. In his “Remarques sur les catalogues de vente aux enchères de la bibliothèque de Vulcanius” (121-44), Paul J. Smith surveys Vulcanius’s ‘untypical’ library, based on the catalogues of the two auctions of his collection. Vulcanius indeed had already sold part of his library during his lifetime, as he was losing his sight and in need of money. Interestingly, Smith in his listings of Vulcianius’s books adds an asterisk to the ones containing autograph annotations by their previous owner, a detail that will most probably be very useful for future research on Vulcanius.

The second section, “Routes of Exile and Convictions,” opens with “Vulcanius et le réformateur Théodore de Bèze,” by Elly Ledegang-Keegstra (148-65), who describes how Vulcanius beginning in 1574 spent thirteen months in Geneva, where he found his admired colleague Beza, with whom he shared an interest in Christian authors.
From that year on, Vulcanius seemed to be moving towards Protestantism, his firmly Catholic background notwithstanding, as is explained in Hugues Daussy’s “L’insertion de Bonaventure Vulcanius dans le réseau international protestant” (167-83). If any explanation for his alleged conversion can be found, it seems to be (scholarly) opportunism rather than anything else. At the very least, there was no question of a sincere conversion to Calvinism, not even when the very moderate (if not agnostic) Vulcanius moved to Geneva. After Kees Meerhoff’s discussion of “Bonaventure Vulcanius et Heidelberg, citadelle fragile du monde réformé” (185-214), mainly dedicated to the role of played by the *Album amicorum* in a world of Dutch exiles, Anton van der Lem in his “Bonaventura Vulcanius, forgeron de la Révolte” (215-22) examines Vulcanius’s possible role in the Dutch Revolt.

In the next section, “Homes: Looking Back,” Karel Bostoen in “Two Bruges Humanists: Vulcanius and Castelius. Good Friends or Mere Acquaintances?” (225-43) first takes us back to Vulcanius’s intriguing relationship with fellow-humanist Joannes Castelius, who also originated from Bruges. Vulcanius veteran Alfons Dewitte in his “Vulcanius, Marnix van St. Aldegonde, and the Spirit of Bruges: Remonstrant Protestantism?” (245-60) explores the circumstances of the complicated history of the publication of the *Psalms of David* by Gillis van den Rade in 1580. The next section, “Homes: Professor in Leiden” begins with “Bonaventura Vulcanius, Janus Dousa and the 'Pleias Dousica’” (263-86). Chris Heesakkers outlines how the rapid development of Leiden University at the end of the sixteenth century was mainly due to the success of the Arts Faculty, with its bright stars Lipsius and Scaliger. He tells the history of Vulcanius’s warm and lasting friendship with the whole Dousa family and his successful lobbying for a professorship in Classics at Leiden. In “Between Col leagues: Bonaventura Vulcanius and Justus Lipsius” (287-334), the most sizable contribution to the collection, Jeanine De Landtsheer provides us with a very well-documented survey of the relationship between the two humanists, when for a whole decade long they were both living in Leiden, and also when Lipsius after his departure hardly showed any interest in his former colleague, while Vulcanius himself, especially in his correspondence with the Antwerp humanists Ortelius and Sweertius, often mentioned Lipsius, whose publications—so we
can deduce from the auction catalogues—were almost all present in his library. Vulcanius furthermore seems to have been a keen reader of Lipsius’s letters. From her careful analysis, De Landtsheer concludes that the contacts between the two humanists may have been rather superficial and that despite their mutual esteem, they did not really get along very well.

The last section of the book, “Pioneering Philology: Greeks and Getes,” contains six mostly concise but nonetheless very stimulating contributions about Vulcanius’s scholarly activities. In “Vulcanius as Editor: The Greek Texts” (337-50), Thomas M. Conley surveys the Greek texts edited and published by Vulcanius. A striking aspect is the number of first editions, especially of authors from the fifth to the seventh centuries. Most editions were based on a single manuscript from Vulcanius’s library, to which he supplied numerous emendations. Yet his editions survived the test of time, and many of his conjectures are still honored by modern editors. In “Scholarly Stresses and Strains: The Difficult Dealings of Bonaventura Vulcanius and Henricus Stephanus over Their Edition of Arrian’s De expeditione Alexandri Magni historiarum libri VIII” (351-59), Gilbert Tournoy details Vulcanius’s strained relationship with the famous but no less greedy Estienne, who talked him into a new edition and translation of Arrian. As Tournoy notes, “Vulcanius felt bitterly disappointed: Stephanus not only had not paid him properly but beyond that fobbed him off with only 15 copies of the edition” (356), reminding readers that even in the sixteenth century, libido scienti alone was rarely enough to sustain humanistic practice. In “Scaliger, Vulcanius, Hoeschelius and the Pursuit of Early Byzantine History” (361-86), Dirk van Miert brightly analyzes the interest shown by Vulcanius (and Scaliger) for the history of the late Roman and early Byzantine empires. Their interest was fueled not only by the debate about the early history of Christianity, but also by the search for a historical identity within rising nation-states—and by the ongoing excitement of humanists over the discovery of new texts. The main interest of the aging (and ailing) Vulcanius was Procopius’s History. “Vulcanius and His Network of Language Lovers. De literis et lingua Getarum sive Gothorum” (1597) by Toon Van Hal (387-401) shows how the polyglot Vulcanius’s composite opusculum about the Goths’ language—aimed at demonstrating the linguistic relation-
ship between Gothic, German, Frisian and Dutch—was stuffed with specimens that he acquired from his academic friends: Scaliger in the first place, but also Cornelius Gualtherus, Georgius Cassander, Paulus Merula, Raphelengius, and finally Marnix van Sint-Aldegonde. Van Hal thereby effectively illustrates the importance of Vulcanius’s network with very specific examples. In his second contribution to this collection, “On the Attribution of the 1595 Leiden Edition of Pauli Warnefridi De gestis Langobardorum to Friedrich Lindenbrog” (403-10), Thomas M. Conley proves convincingly that Vulcanius was the editor of the 1595 edition by Raphelengius, which has previously been ascribed to Friedrich Lindenbrog. Kees Dekker, finally, in his “The Runes in Bonaventura Vulcanius De literis & lingua Getarum sive Gothorum (1597): Provenance and Origins” (411-49) takes us back to the treatise already discussed by Van Hal. While most scholars consider the seventeenth-century Danish antiquarian Ole Worm the pioneer of runic studies, a considerable part of his collection of runes is actually borrowed from Vulcanius’s 1597 treatise. He must have had access to at least two transcripts of Gothic texts. Dekker compares Vulcanius manuscript BPL 1886 with the runic items and comments on his De literis, analyzing the runes and references to the origins of the inscriptions. Dekker illustrates how Vulcanius’s interest in the Gothic past connected him with his Scandinavian colleagues: his ground-breaking comparative setting of Germanic languages provides at the same time a unique insight into the history of early runic studies and allows for the reconstruction of a network of northern humanists in search of their distant past.

As indicated by Cazes in her Conclusion, the man who was the ‘last of humanists’ cannot easily be pinned down. This wide-ranging collection of papers therefore proves a successful approach: by touching upon numerous aspects of Vulcanius’s life and works, we get a better view of the multifaceted personality and activity of this formidably industrious humanist.

Despite its attractive appearances and solid content, upon closer examination this valuable collection is flawed by an intolerable proliferation of typographical errors, missing as well as superfluous spaces, inconsistent and wrong spellings of proper names, and inaccurate word divisions. Even unfinished sentences as well as repetitions of
sequences of words are unpleasantly common—and so are (in a few contributions) some amusing cases of Dunglish. I will not indulge in a pedantic listing of the scores of errors that caught my eye, nor try to single out the most striking examples in each of these categories, as such an undertaking would unjustly put the blame on the contributors from whose papers I would be quoting. Yet one cannot but wonder whether Brill had just fired its editorial staff at the time of the production of this volume, or was duly about to, upon taking even the haviest look at the embarrassing result of their performance. (Jeroen De Keyser, Catholic University Leuven)

♦ La Columbeida. By Julius Caesar Stella. Introduction, critical edition, annotated translation, and indices by Javier Sánchez Quirós. Palmyrenus, Colleción de textos y studios humanísticos, Serie textos. Alcañiz and Madrid: Instituto de studios humanísticos, 2010. CXVIII + 216 pp. Among the many surviving texts written on the encounter between the ‘old’ world and the ‘new’ are five neo-Latin poems whose subject in one way or another is Columbus and his voyages: Lorenzo Gambara, De navigatione Christophori Columbi libri IV (1581); Giulio Cesare Stella, Columbeidos libri priores duo (1585); Vincentius Placcius, Atlantis reiecta sive De navigatione prima Christophori Columbi in Americam (1659); Ubertino Carrara, Columbus. Carmen epicum (1715); and Johann Christian Alois Mickl, Plus ultra (ca. 1730). None of these poems was ever on the best-seller list—Mickl’s, in fact, lay in manuscript for decades after it was composed—but all of them are worth reading today, for they tell us a good deal about the neo-Latin culture through which Europe viewed the ‘discovery’ of America.

The best known, and most studied, of these poems is Stella’s. The Columbeis tells the story of Columbus’s first voyage. The poem begins as Satan, disguised as an officer named Ascanius in Columbus’s fleet, incites a mutiny to keep the admiral from bringing Christianity to the new world. God sends an angel to warn Columbus, who rallies his troops; in fact their journey is almost over, and they soon touch land first in Cuba, then in Española, where Book 1 ends in the middle of an incomplete catalogue of heroes. The action resumes when Rumor stirs up the natives. They are calmed by their leader, Narilus, who then consults his oracle and receives a long prophecy foretelling the
coming of the Jesuits and the rule of Philip II. Satan then causes an Indian princess named Anacaona to fall in love with Columbus, who is forced to stay briefly in Española to repair his fleet. When the ships are ready, Columbus sails off and Anacaona faints away. Stella planned two more books, but the work as we have it ends here.

Sánchez Quirós gives us an edition of the text with notes, a translation into Spanish, and an extensive introduction. The introduction provides everything one needs for a first reading of the poem: an overview of the life and works of the author; an introduction to the poem that discusses its title, its relation to other Jesuit literature, its content and structure, and a brief look at Latin poetry about the ‘discovery’; sections on the *Columbeis* as an imitation of the *Aeneid* and on the Christianization of pagan poetry in the Renaissance; a survey of epic devices utilized by Stella and the poem’s metrical features; and, finally, an explanation of the criteria by which the text was prepared and a thorough bibliography. The poem itself follows, with Latin text on the left-hand pages and Spanish translation on the right, accompanied by two apparatuses (one of sources, the other of textual variants) keyed to the Latin and notes keyed to the Spanish.

It is worth mentioning that the preparation of this critical edition represents an unusual amount of effort on the part of Sánchez Quirós, one that took almost twenty years from the time when this project was initially presented as a doctoral dissertation. Initially the textual history does not appear to be such a problem, since there are only four important manuscripts and four early printed editions to work with. As Heinz Hofmann has shown, however, the 1589 Rome version is really a second edition, extensively reworked from the 1585 London *editio princeps* in accordance with several very precise goals. The year after Sánchez Quirós’s doctoral dissertation was presented, Hofmann published an edition of the poem with a translation into Dutch (Groningen, 1993) that was based on the London edition. This was a perfectly defensible decision, but a quick check of resources like WorldCat confirms that Hofmann’s edition is unfortunately very difficult to find, with (for example) no recorded copies in North America, which justifies Sánchez Quirós’s decision to continue working on the poem. He has chosen to base his text on the 1589 revision, as a representative of the author’s final intentions, but to show in his apparatus
how that differs from other versions, including the initial London text. The result should stand as the definitive text of the poem.

Sánchez Quirós’s book, however, should stimulate rather than close down discussion of the poem, for much can still be said about the *Columbeis* as a vehicle by which the ‘new’ world entered the consciousness of the ‘old.’ That it did so through the filter of the *Aeneid* is also worth further reflection. Hofmann sees Stella’s poem as a rewriting of the so-called optimistic, or triumphal, *Aeneid*, while I see it as one that is unusually sensitive to the darker musings and other voices of Virgil’s poem; the jury is still very much out on this issue. It is abundantly clear, however, that the poem stands as an excellent example of how later Latin creates and maintains an international republic of letters: initially published in London, Lyon, and Rome with manuscripts now to be found in Italian libraries, the poem today has attracted attention from a German editor who was working in the Netherlands when he prepared his edition, two Americans (Nancy Llewellyn, who wrote an unpublished 2006 UCLA doctoral dissertation on it, and myself), and a Spanish editor. We can only hope that more such work follows. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

♦ *The Latin Poems.* By Archibald Pitcairne. Ed. and trans. by John and Winifred MacQueen. Bibliotheca Latinitatis Novae / Neo-Latin Texts and Translations. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, and Tempe: ACMRS, 2009. xvi + 484 pp. Archibald Pitcairne was a noteworthy figure in late Stuart Scotland. He was a founding member of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh and briefly professor of medicine at Leiden (where students apparently found his Scottish pronunciation of Latin difficult to follow); he made original contributions to mathematics; his conviviality was remembered for more than a century after his death in 1713; he wrote anti-Presbyterian satires in English verse and Latin prose. He was also a Latin poet of real distinction.

In 1671, when Pitcairne and his friend Robert Lindsay were young men, excited by the accounts of the afterlife which they had been reading in Plato, Ficino, and Henry More, they agreed that whichever of them died first should return to visit the other and tell him about his experiences after death. Four or five years later, Lindsay appeared to Pitcairne in a dream, saying “Archie perhaps you heard I’m dead.”
Pitcairne had not yet heard the news, but Lindsay had indeed died that day and told him that “they have buried my body in the Gray-Friars, I am tho alive and in a place the pleasures of which cannot be express in Scots Greek or Latin.” In his Latin poetry, the themes of the dead, the underworld, and revenants come back again and again: in that respect, the apparition of Robert Lindsay is an exemplary moment in his imaginative life.

As a friend and husband, he lamented the death of individuals close to him; as a Jacobite, he associated the return of the exiled Stuarts with the return of the dead from the underworld; as a drinking man, he celebrated the Stygian depths of the taverns in the cellars of old Edinburgh; as a physician, life and death were his stock in trade. As a neo-Latin poet, of course, he was in the ambiguous business of celebrating the immortality of a dead language. In a review of David Money’s The English Horace, James Binns summarizes Money’s sense of “the subversive, subtle, ironic opportunities which the Latin language offered those of the Jacobite persuasion,” and this is well and elegantly said, but one might also say that writing a neo-Latin poem is always an act of restoration. Since restoration was precisely what mattered most in the Jacobite imagination, Jacobitism had a profounder affinity with neo-Latin than with a living language like Scots or English, and neo-Latin was the natural medium for Pitcairne’s many Jacobite verses.

There was a “design of collecting” Pitcairne’s poems “and printing them altogether” just after his death, but this came to nothing, and they are collected here for the first time by John and Winifred MacQueen, in an edition with facing-page English prose translations, a historical and critical introduction, an ample commentary, and indexes. The MacQueens count 124 surviving poems, though in some cases it is difficult to decide whether two texts are drafts of the same poem or different but related works. They group them into nine thematic sections; many of the poems are difficult to date, and some of the reworkings took place at substantial intervals, so a chronological ordering would have been impractical. First come a group of Jacobite poems, those gathered in Pitcairne’s printed Poemata selecta of 1709. These are followed by a group of longer satirical and philosophical poems, then by groups on his first and second wives and his daughters, on medical figures, and on other friends and opponents. A second group of largely
Jacobite poems with a British focus is separated from a third with a European focus by a set on the calendar and church year: Pitcairne particularly liked to reflect on the dates of the birthdays of members of the House of Stuart. A couple of translations from English and Scots into Latin are followed by three *dubia*.

Although more thought might have been given to the relationships of the textual witnesses (we are told, for instance, that “We prefer printed to ms sources,” but we are not told why), the poems are clearly enough presented. Textual variants are sometimes placed in the commentary rather than the apparatus; the apparatus itself is oddly presented in full at the beginning of each poem rather than being distributed page by page. Little fault can be found with the translations, though at a couple of points the translation of one version of a poem which Pitcairne reworked is paired with the text of a different version. The commentary goes a long way towards explaining poems which even contemporaries found difficult and allusive (keys to some of them circulated in manuscript). The editors deal frankly with two characteristic kinds of problems. On the one hand, Pitcairne’s allegories are sometimes highly obscure. If, for instance, the *populum potenti Dite creatum* of one of the calendrical poems is the people of Britain, can *Dis* here stand for James VI and I, in whose person the crowns of England and Scotland were united? Perhaps, but the identification is far from obvious, and the editors cannot be blamed for admitting that “we do not fully understand the significance of this phrase.” On the other hand, Pitcairne’s topical allusions are sometimes likewise obscure. Perhaps, to take an example on which some light can possibly be shed, the *Normannus* who was being revered by Pitcairne’s enemies in late 1713 and *Qui Lutheri semper, Qui nunc Solennia Papae Sacra facit, si quid credis Amice mihi* was the Lutheran Georg Ludwig of Hannover, soon to become heir-apparent to the British throne—but in that case, why on earth was Pitcairne accusing him of Popery when Georg Ludwig’s hopes of succession depended entirely on his Protestantism? Again, the editors can hardly be blamed for saying simply that they have not identified this figure.

Overall, then, the edition is a great success. It presents an important and previously uncollected body of poetry, prepared to high scholarly standards. The book is attractively produced, and the price
is not unreasonable. It is hard to imagine that John and Winifred MacQueen’s work will be superseded in the foreseeable future. (John Considine, University of Alberta)

♦ *Anthea sive fabula “Eamus ad ipsum.”* By Henricus Sienkiewicz. Trans. by Petrus Angelinius, ed. by Theodericus Sacré. Pluteus Neolatinus, 1. Brussels: Melissa, 2010. This book recently published in Brussels as the first volume of a new series entitled “Pluteus Neolatinus” is highly recommended. The series is devoted to the Latin works written in the late modern period (from 1750). The book reviewed here depicts two admirers of antiquity from the second half of the nineteenth century. One of them was a great Polish writer, Nobel Prize laureate Henryk Sienkiewicz; the second one was an Italian clergyman linked to the papal court, Petrus Angelinius (Pietro Angelini).

The fact that the Polish original story *Let Us Follow Him* by Sienkiewicz was published in 1893 in three newspapers and that it was read in Krakow by the author himself confirms that the topic connected with the beginnings of Christianity was popular in the second half of the nineteenth century. It can be added that the first stage adaptation of this story was soon issued (in 1895).

The edition published by Dirk Sacré in a beautiful editorial and graphic design contains a text of *Anthea*, which is a Latin version of Sienkiewicz’s story with a scholarly commentary. The translation was the work of Petrus Angelinius (1847-1911). The book contains an interesting introduction where we can find information about Angelinius and Sienkiewicz and a history of the Latin editions of the text. Two appendices are also included. The first contains a Latin letter by Sienkiewicz and the text of his speech delivered in Krakow on the occasion of his jubilee. The editor also added the Latin text of the paraphrase of the Sienkiewicz novel *Quo Vadis* made by a Hungarian teacher Adalbertus Denczer. The second appendix contains Latin religious poems (*Carmina*) by Angelinius and his eulogy in honour of King Leopold II of Belgium (*Oratio in funere Leopoldi II Belgarum Regis*).

For those who are interested in the Latin text of *Anthea*, which, I should add, is not a completely faithful translation of Sienkiewicz’s story, this scholarly modern edition will be satisfactory. The previous
four editions of this text (in 1898, 1902, 1912 and 1935) are already completely forgotten and are difficult to access, and also not free from faults. The decision of the modern editor to choose the last version, which appeared during Angelinius’s life and which he himself revised as the basis for the critical edition, was correct. Dirk Sacré proves that it was the Latin text which was dedicated to Pope Leo XIII. It was also consecrated by this Pope (23). Then the editor mentions a poetic paraphrase of the story written by the Latin poet Franciscus Sofia Alessio (1873-1943).

Dirk Sacré decided to use philological methods which are applied in the editions of modern Latin texts. The edition contains the critical apparatus and similia. The confrontation of Angelinius’s Anthea with the texts of classical authors and Scripture allows access not only to the workshop of the translator of the text, but also to Sienkiewicz’s creative processes. The rich historical and factual commentary contained in Adnotationes deserves high praise. It was necessary to investigate many sources, which allows the editor to rectify some lingering errors and to give some more information about the meaning and function of Anthea.

The new edition of the Latin text of Anthea allows the reader to familiarise himself or herself with the forgotten story by the author of Quo Vadis and with its excellent Latin version. It also shows how the Latin text was received in the second half of the nineteenth century. The book can therefore become a valuable aid for teachers of Latin, because its literary content (which investigates such things as the purpose of life and the choice of a way of life) is certainly interesting even today for young people. (Barbara Milewska-Ważbińska, Warsaw University)

volume that followed constitute a sort of extended dialogue with one of the most influential books of this generation in neo-Latin studies, Françoise Waquet’s *Latin or the Empire of a Sign from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Centuries*, trans. John Howe (London, 2001; first published in French in 1998 and reviewed in *NLN* shortly after the English translation appeared). Waquet’s book traced the role of Latin in early modern and modern culture, but like every other important book, it raised as many questions as it answered. Waquet inquired as to what Latin meant in the West and provided a good many interesting answers to this question, but that leads one to wonder what place Latin played in other cultures as Europe came into contact with Asia and the Americas. Waquet also outlined how Latin served as an instrument of oppression, of women and children and of non-Europeans and the lower classes. As the authors of these essays show, however, “Latin and its meanings were regularly contested, negotiated, locally appropriated, and sometimes cunningly subverted in the early modern period. There are, in short, plenty of other stories to be told about Latin since the Renaissance, stories which both complement and, in some instances, challenge Waquet’s compelling epic” (7). These other stories involve the relationship between humanist Latin and both medieval Latin and the modern vernaculars; European representations of, and encounters with, the East through Latin; Latin writings by and about women in the early modern period; and Latin in the ‘New’ Worlds, from the Americas to Australia.

Yasmin Haskell’s “Distant Empires, Buried Signs: In Search of New Worlds of Latin in the Early Modern Period (Introduction)” lays out the goals and scope of the volume in an eloquent, concise chapter. In “Other Latins, Other Cultures,” Ann Moss argues that the triumph of humanist Latin represents a change in mentality as well as medium of expression: someone like Montaigne shows how contact among the various linguistic options open to him allowed him to imagine the world from the perspective of the ‘other.’ Siobhan O’Rourke and Alison Holcroft’s “Latin and the Vernacular: The Silence at the Beginning of Bruni’s *Dialogi ad Petrum Histrum*” offers an important new reading of a text that has been much discussed lately, arguing that the main character is Salutati, not Niccoli, with the key point being an anxiety about the position of Latin eloquence in relation to a threat from the
John Considine explores the early modern roots of the metaphor behind the concept of a ‘dead’ language in “De ortu et occasu linguae latinæ: The Latin Language and the Origins of the Concept of Language Death,” while in “Translation and Re-Translation: Boileau’s Art poétique Latinized” Christopher Allen studies a phenomenon that is more common than many people realize, the vernacular work translated into Latin in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Juanita Ruys explores the early modern reception of Heloise as a Latinist in “From Virile Eloquence to Hysteria: Reading the Latinity of Heloise in the Early Modern Period,” suggesting that writing in Latin served in the end to accentuate the otherness of a female author. Andrew Laird challenges Waquet’s conclusion that Latin had little success in the Americas in the generations after the Encounter in “Latin in Cuauhtémoc’s Shadow: Humanism and the Politics of Language in Mexico after the Conquest,” while the next three papers shift the inquiry to slavery as seen through a Latin lens. Alexandra Mariano focuses on José Basílio de Gama’s Brasilienses aurifodinae, in which the African slave is constructed as ‘other’ and ultimately dehumanized through the author’s mixture of Latin literary pretension and scientific discourse. We might not be totally surprised that in John Gilmore’s “Sub herili venditur hasta: An Early Eighteenth-Century Justification of the Slave Trade by a Colonial Poet,” John Maynard uses Latin verse to defend slavery, but it is shocking indeed to see the same argument coming from a former black African slave in Grant Parker’s “Can the Subaltern Speak Latin? The Case of Capitein.” In “Latin Terms and Periphrases for Native Americans in the Jesuit Relations,” John Gallucci traces the historical development of the term and concept of the savage, while in “History and Poetry in Philippus Meyerus’s Literary Portrayals of the Prophet Mohammed and the Ottoman Rulers (1594),” Marc Laureys shows how a humanist writer from Artois uses a negative version of the viri illustres genre to paint the Turks as barbarians.

This volume is important for several reasons. The most basic one is as a series of microhistories, case studies that each merit reading and reflection on the new information being provided. From a broader perspective, these essays extend and qualify the conclusions of Waquet’s book, which has proved sufficiently influential to merit this kind of work. Finally, the material presented here is an important challenge to
those who claim that the classics at best have nothing to say to the issues of class, gender, and ideology that dominate scholarly discourse at the beginning of the twenty-first century, or at worst stand as the enemy to enlightened, progressive thought. As these essays show, “Latin, even humanist Latin, is just a language after all, and a language is only as good or bad, as oppressive or liberating, as its users and communities of users” (14-15). As long as we have multiple communities, we will have multiple perspectives, and it is that very multiplicity that makes the study of Latin so interesting and unpredictable. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

♦ Book on Music. By Florentius de Faxolis. Ed. and trans. by Bonnie J. Blackburn and Leofranc Holford-Strevens. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 43. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2010. xxiv + 340 pp. Sacred Painting. Museum. By Federico Borromeo. Ed. and trans. by Kenneth S. Rothwell, Jr., with introduction and notes by Pamela M. Jones. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 44. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2010. xxxvi + 298 pp. These two volumes, the latest to be published in the I Tatti Renaissance Library series, show that Renaissance Latin extended its reach well beyond the belles lettres usually conjured up by the term. Both writers had good humanistic educations, and both used their knowledge of classical texts to claim an authority and prestige for music and the visual arts that was designed to incorporate these disciplines into the humanistic realm.

Fiorenzo Fasoli is not well known today; indeed, as his editors freely acknowledge, there are references to such a figure in archival documents but his identity is still a matter of scholarly dispute. He wrote his treatise on music for the Milanese Cardinal Ascanio Maria Sforza, who was an accomplished musician himself, with the single surviving manuscript, illuminated by the great Attavante degli Attavanti and written by one of the most famous Quattrocento calligraphers, Alessandro da Verrazzano, being worthy of presentation to the brother of Lodovico the Moor. The treatise is in three books, with the first moving from a general praise of music to the fundamentals of sound, pitch, and mode, the second dealing with intervals, counterpoint, and composition, and the last with notation, mensuration, and proportions.
Sources include not only music theorists but also classical authors, church fathers, and medieval authors. The presentation is somewhat jumbled, suggesting that Fasoli was not accustomed to teaching, but the treatise is valuable as a window into musical theory and practice from a humanist perspective.

Federico Borromeo, on the other hand, is well known, as the Cardinal Archbishop of Milan at the beginning of the seventeenth century, the founder of the Biblioteca Ambrosiana, and the cousin of Carlo Borromeo. *Sacred Painting* and *Museum* demonstrate his wide-ranging concern with the visual arts, with the former focusing on how the power of sacred art could be harnessed to save souls and the latter functioning more as a work of connoisseurship. Borromeo wrote after the Council of Trent urged that bishops use art to teach and inspire their dioceses, and he is acutely aware that provocative nudes and manneristic contortions, for example, could distract the viewer and lead her away from God, while pious art could teach the articles of faith and guide the viewer toward the divine. *Museum* has a more intimate feel than *Sacred Painting*, serving in effect as a walking tour of Borromeo’s own collection and discussing it in terms of the major artistic currents of his day. Borromeo had very specific likes and dislikes: he did not care for works composed in the *maniera* style but did like naturalism; he knew Vasari, but insisted that the *colorito* tradition of Lombard and Venetian artists was just as satisfying as the Tuscan *disegno* approach. Here again, however, Borromeo remained true to his overriding principles, arguing that landscapes and still lifes like those of Bruegel should be appreciated as representations of God’s creation that could lead us back to the Creator.

Both volumes presented some unusual challenges to their editors. Fasoli’s text, unlike other ITRL volumes, comes with staves and musical notation, while the edition of Borromeo’s treatises includes black and white reproductions of ten paintings whose presence facilitates an understanding of the text. Each book has the textual notes and commentary that the series format calls for, along with a fluid English translation that gives the general reader his best shot at the sometimes technical material in Fasoli’s work. Again, two home runs for The I Tatti Renaissance Library. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)
Medien und Sprachen humanistischer Geschichtsschreibung. Ed. by Johannes Helmrath, Albert Schirrmieister, and Stefan Schlelein. Transformationen der Antike, 11. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2009. VI + 287 pp. The essays in the volume under review here had their beginnings in a conference held in November, 2006 at the Deutsches Historisches Museum in Berlin. The conference was devoted to the role of classical culture in the histories written by humanists. This subject was explored on two levels: how historiography served to stimulate a new national self-consciousness in the countries of Europe (example: Polydore Vergil), and how historiography affected discourse on the regional level (example: Erasmus Stella).

like Livy and the *Historia Augusta*. The contributions of Schlelein, Wallisch, and Völkel turn more toward linguistic questions as they examine the consequences, on several levels, of choosing a language in which to write. Schirrmeister focuses on regional history writing in relation to classical reference texts, while Hirschi concludes the volume by offering a broader perspective. Unlike many volumes originating in conferences, this one contains substantial essays (averaging thirty pages in length) that are of uniformly high quality and interest.

This book is one of several to have emerged thus far from a large group project in the classical tradition, Collaborative Research Center 644: Transformations of Antiquity. This center unites eleven disciplines from the social sciences and humanities at the Humboldt University of Berlin as well as one each at the Free University of Berlin and the Max Planck Institute for the History of Science. Around sixty scholars, representing five faculties altogether, work in sixteen projects designed to map the interdisciplinary contexts in which the productive appropriations and transformations of the ancient sciences and arts emerge into the system of sciences and the cultural self-construction that defines the European societies. Special effort is being made to break down disciplinary boundaries and to look at questions of larger social significance. Further information can be found on the project website: [http://www.sfb-antike.de/index.php?id=248&L=6](http://www.sfb-antike.de/index.php?id=248&L=6). (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)