

NEO-LATIN NEWS

Vol. 63, Nos. 1 & 2. Jointly with SCN. NLN is the official publication of the American Association for Neo-Latin Studies. Edited by Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University; Western European Editor: Gilbert Tournoy, Leuven; Eastern European Editors: Jerzy Axer, Barbara Milewska-Wazbinska, and Katarzyna Tomaszuk, Centre for Studies in the Classical Tradition in Poland and East-Central Europe, University of Warsaw. Founding Editors: James R. Naiden, Southern Oregon University, and J. Max Patrick, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and Graduate School, New York University.

◆ *Poets and Princes. The Panegyric Poetry of Johannes Michael Nagonius.* By Paul Gwynne. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2012. XXIV + 552 pp. + 12 illustrations. 150 euros. In his *Ars poetica*, Horace advises young scholars not to rush into publishing their literary writings, but instead, to keep their works set aside for at least nine years for further revision and improvement. Paul Gwynne took Horace's advice doubly to heart, as almost two decades have passed since his doctoral dissertation, 'The Life and Works of Johannes Michael Nagonius, *poeta laureatus*, ca. 1450–ca.1510.' The result is the first comprehensive study on Johannes Michael Nagonius (Giovanni Michele Nagonio), a fifteenth-century Italian itinerant poet who is hardly even known, much less read, by Neo-Latinists today. During his extensive travelling across Europe, likely as a member of a papal embassy, Nagonius wrote panegyrics in Latin verses for an impressive array of European princes and Italian *signori*, including the Holy Roman Emperor Maximilian I (r. 1486–1519), the king of France Louis XII (r. 1498–1515), and the Doge Leonardo Loredan (r. 1501–1521).

In Gwynne's own words, the book "presents the first full-length study of Nagonius's life and detailed critique of his work" (3). While discussing Nagonius's Latin poetry, Gwynne engages the reader in a larger historical perspective, setting the presentation of Nagonius's

manuscripts against the backdrop of contemporary historical events. The analysis of the personal and political fortunes of the individual dedicatees, the rivalry between courts and countries, and the shifting in negotiations and alliances for the control of the Italian peninsula offer a unique insight into the culture of the Renaissance courts across Europe. The major strength of this book is the masterful combination of the historical and literary approaches, which reveals the importance of Nagonius's poetry within its political, historical, and social context.

Poets and Princes is divided into three parts. Part I, "Johannes Michael Nagonius, *civis Romanus et poeta laureatus*," presents biographical information about the poet, which is admittedly scanty and mainly gleaned from his oeuvre. Part II, "The Panegyric Works of Nagonius," is certainly the most engaging and fascinating of the three. It discusses the Renaissance tradition of Latin panegyric poetry and introduces Nagonius's manuscripts chronologically, following the poet during his travels in the most splendid courts of Europe. Thus the poet's career is followed from the time he was an orator at the papal court to when he became a recognized itinerant poet of the highest order. Part III is a selection of the most significant passages from a large number of Nagonius's manuscripts, which are made available for the first time with an English translation and commentary. This part is particularly interesting for scholars of the reception of the classical tradition, as it sheds light on the poet's direct classical sources, such as Vergil, Statius, Silius Italicus, and others. In addition, Part III presents a catalogue of manuscripts and printed books by Nagonius, consisting of an impressive number of sources that have been scrupulously checked by Gwynne over the past two decades and completely justify his Horatian attitude. Finally, the book is enriched by several figures, maps, and plates.

What makes *Poets and Princes* stand out is Gwynne's extensive and exhaustive research, and the exquisite organization of the material, which is analyzed for its literary value and presented through an historical perspective. This valuable book is excellent in conception and execution, and reflects and augments current scholarly interest in individual poets. More importantly, Gwynne offers an unusually sympathetic approach to the Renaissance Latin panegyric, in particular to Nagonius's poetry. As a literary genre, the panegyric does not appeal to

modern readers because of its artificiality and lack of originality, and the obscurity of the convoluted Latin. Nonetheless, Gwynne revives the figure of Nagonius as a poet within his intellectual, social, cultural, and political context, making this book interesting for scholars of Renaissance literature, culture, and history, as well as scholars of the classical tradition. (Lilia Campana, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Marsilio Ficino: Index rerum*. By Christoph Kugelmeier, Peter Riemer, and Clemens Zintzen. Indices zur lateinischen Literatur der Renaissance, 3,2. Hildesheim, Zürich, and New York: Olms, 2014. XXII + 186 pp. The volume under review here is the second part of a project that began in 2003 with the publication of an *index nominum* and *index geographicus* to the works of Marsilio Ficino. Along with the two indices, the first volume contained a bibliography, a survey of the contents of Ficino's *Opera omnia* (Basel, 1576), a list of modern editions that have been indexed, and an overview of authors, addressees, places, and dates from Ficino's correspondence. The second volume contains an *index rerum*, a subject index that offers access to Ficino's philosophical work, especially to his all-important *Theologia Platonica*.

This index does exactly what it was designed to do: offer clear, easy access by topic to Ficino's thought. The entries are arranged alphabetically and coded in a way that is easy to understand. A series of simple symbols differentiates headings and subheadings through four successive levels, with another set of symbols showing whether two headings or subheadings are equivalent, opposites, or related in some less structured way. Each reference contains one or more sigla, matched to editions of Ficino's works in a table at the beginning of the volume, along with relevant page numbers. What results are entries like "Gotteserkenntnis—↔ Quelle T² 131" that do not exactly make for exciting reading, but given that this is a work of scholarly reference rather than a novel, that does not really matter. The system is mastered quickly, and from that point on, the researcher is ready to get to work.

While I am sure that the ten-year gap between the appearance of the two volumes is due in part to the usual delays in large academic projects (other commitments that sidetrack an author, gaps in funding, etc.), I am also sure that the principal culprit was the enormous

amount of work that went into preparing this index. Ficino was prolific, which generated hundreds of pages to go through, and his thought and style are not always perfectly straightforward, which complicates the indexer's task considerably. That makes this volume all the more of an achievement. The only point I wonder about was the decision to index German terms, not Latin ones. The relevant texts are in Latin, and it seems to me that German terms force the reader to imagine which Latin words are being indexed when Latin entries would remove any doubt. But this is a manageable problem, at least for anyone who reads Ficino in Latin and controls German well.

In 2015, one can dream of the day when all of Ficino's texts will be available in machine readable form, which will render indices like this unnecessary. But until we reach that point, scholars will either have to rely on projects like this or skim hundreds of pages of Latin themselves in search of the passages that interest them. I know which option I prefer. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *De obitu Iohannis Stoeffler Iustingani mathematici Tubingensis elegia (Augsburg 1531). Ein Gedicht auf den Tod des Tübinger Astronomen Johannes Stöffler (1452–1531).* By Theodor Reysmann. Edited and translated with commentary by Dirk Kottke. Spudasmata, 156. Hildesheim, Zürich, and New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 2013. 125 pp. 29.80 euros. In 2011 Tübingen celebrated the five hundredth anniversary of its town hall's astronomical clock, and Dieter Kottke decided to write a book that he proudly announces as an edition and translation of, and commentary on, an elegiac poem on the death of the constructor, the astronomer Johannes Stöffler (1452–1531). The poem was written by Theodor Reysmann (ca. 1503–1543/44), who was honored as poet laureate by Ferdinand I. In 1530 the plague forced Stöffler and Reysmann to leave for Blaubeuren, where Stöffler died as an old man

Kottke starts with a rather short overview concerning Reysmann's fame and the different editions of *De obitu Iohannis Stoeffler Iustingani mathematici Tubingensis elegia*. At this point the reader may have certain problems with Kottke's presentation of the dedication because text and translation are not printed, as usual, on facing pages but follow each other *en bloc* and sequentially. Luckily enough Kottke changes his method when he presents the main text, consisting of 178 elegiac

distichs full of allusions, topical inventory, and historical references, a rather difficult text that needs a fundamental commentary written by a specialist in the relevant fields. A good translation should be another special service in the case of a text like this, whose existence has only been known for a very short time and which has never been edited before. It is Kottke's lasting contribution to scholarship that he has made this poetic obituary accessible for everyone by editing it. Unfortunately he does not seem to be the right pioneer for the rest. His translation was probably inspired by the one published in part in 2011 in the *Tübinger Blätter*, which seems to have been only something called an *Arbeitsübersetzung* that was definitely not *pumice expoliturum*. Often it does not really help the reader, due to the fact that the translator is not always able to find a suitable (and single) solution: a huge list of explanations in brackets is really odd. Kottke even uses explanatory words as *wörtlich* or alternative translations, marked with *oder*. Furthermore the translation of *ad patrios lares* by using the phrase *an den heimischen Herd* suggests feelings like 'home sweet home,' which is not intended by Reysmann. In another passage Kottke seems to undergo a severe battle with the necessary understanding, inserting (*wer?*) when he cannot identify a certain person. Once he even calls his translation—marked with (???)—a *Notbehelf*. Telling his readers who Zoilus was in the translation, not in the commentary, is strange, while the commentary itself is—as a whole—a mixture of the most different elements: e.g., Kottke discusses grammatical platitudes but also offers useful information about calculating with the fingers; he mentions parallels to older texts but sometimes forgets their interpretation. More than once the author does not find the right focus or—much worse—does not ask the questions that need to be asked. Anyway, it must have been a lot of work to collect all these details, and Kottke deserves credit for having done so, but the reader would have been thankful for some categories and for some kind of system. Furthermore there are typographical errors and quite unusual expressions, e.g., when Kottke writes (23): *Im textkritischen Apparat sind die Jahreszahlen 1531 und 1534 als Referenz angegeben; ist keine Jahreszahl angegeben, liegt eine Konjektur bzw. Korrektur zu beiden Ausgaben vor; siehe dazu auch die betr. Anmerkungen im Kommentar*. He also clumsily mentions *angebaute Felder*, and Stöffler himself is buried by a funeral (*mit einer Leichenfeier bestat-*

ten). Kottke spells *Bakkalareat*, and consequently writes *Bakkalar*; his statements on the *Appendix Vergiliana* and Ausonius lack professional insight. The bibliography is an unusual mixture of primary sources and secondary literature, but as a very useful appendix Kottke gives a complete list of Reysmann's poetical oeuvre.

In a nutshell the title is promising and the author's plan is fruitful, but the book does not fulfil the reader's hopes. The topic deserves some deeper insight and less haste at the end, or at least some rearrangement. In other words: It is regrettable that the publication which is innovative *per se* did not receive some change of emphasis before becoming a volume of the renowned Spudasmata series. (Sonja Schreiner, University of Vienna)

◆ *Des Apophthegmes à la Polyantbée: Érasme et le genre des dits mémorables*. By Louis Lobbes. 3 vols. Textes littéraires de la Renaissance, 12. Paris: Éditions Champion, 2013. 2000 pp. 295 euros. *Opera omnia IV-4: Apophthegmatum libri I-IV*. By Desiderius Erasmus. Edited by Tineke L. ter Meer. London and Boston: Brill, 2010. viii + 399 pp. \$142.00. The *Apophthegmata*, a collection of shrewd and witty sayings made by particular ancient men and women, and gathered from the classic texts, appeared late in Erasmus's career. The first edition (*Apophthegmatum ... dictorum libri sex*) came from the press of Hieronymus Froben in 1531. It was dedicated to the young William of Cleves (1516–1592) and was meant to instruct him, and other noblemen like him, in the wise speech of leadership, using *exempla* from antiquity. An expanded edition (now eight books) appeared a year later. A final and corrected text (*Apophthegmatum libri octo ... denuo vigilanter ab ipso recogniti autore*) was published in 1535 (Erasmus died the following year). The collection was immensely popular, going through dozens of editions into the seventeenth century. The first translation was in German, prepared by Heinrich von Eppendorff, an enemy who suppressed Erasmus's name on the title page, and as early as 1549 the work had also been translated into French, English, Spanish, and Italian. When Thomas Nashe, in his *Anatomie of Absurditie* (1588), describes the way that Agesilaus of Sparta refused the food and drink in the country of "Thasius" (or Thasos), he probably picked the story up from the widely circulated *Apophthegmata*, not directly from Plutarch.

The two books under review are both scholarly editions of this text. The work of Dr. ter Meer is an annotated text of Books I through IV, the first of two volumes in the authoritative ASD edition of the Erasmus *Opera omnia* (ASD is an abbreviated name for Amsterdam, where the project started). The study by Dr. Lobbes (a substantial *Habilitation à diriger des recherches* directed by Jean Céard) is made up of a volume of introduction and source notes for each apophthegm, followed by two volumes that print the 1535 Latin text opposite two French translations of 1539 and 1553. To these two might now be joined volumes 37 and 38 of the Collected Works of Erasmus, a translation of the *Apophthegmata* by Drs. Betty Knott and Elaine Fantham that has appeared at the time of writing (September 2014) from the University of Toronto Press.

Despite its considerable humour and many flashes of insight, along with the always engaging presence of Erasmus throughout the text, the once widely circulated *Apophthegmata* is not that well known today. Essentially a book of political wisdom for young William and his fellow peers, it is a remarkable treasure-house of 3,085 quotations or observations by or about many ancient notables, taken and often significantly modified from Plutarch, Diogenes Laertius, Xenophon, Athenaeus, and many other writers. Plutarch's *Apophthegmata Laconica* and *Dicta regum et imperatorum* in *Moralia* were the initial inspiration, but Erasmus shook apart Plutarch and a large body of other sources to reform them into a new whole. There are eight books with sayings from Spartans, Socrates, Aristippus, Diogenes the Cynic, other great men of war and politics (Cicero and Demosthenes tacked in at the end of IV), and "miscellaneous persons," such as Roman historical figures gathered from Suetonius, Livy, Valerius Maximus, and the *Historia Augusta*. Books VII and VIII, "the after dinner sweets" (as Erasmus puts it), were added in the second edition. Book VII has philosophers as its theme and is based largely on Diogenes Laertius; Book VIII turns to sophists (moving "from horses to asses," says Erasmus).

A typical short entry comes from Plutarch's account of Agesilaus: [30] in ASD: *Rursus alii cuidam percontanti, quam ob causam Sparta non cingeretur moenibus, ostendit ciues armatos. 'Hi' inquires 'sunt Spartanae ciuitatis moenia,' significans republicas nullo munimento tutiores esse quam*

virtute ciuium. [The ASD note gives the marginal gloss as ‘Fortiter’ and the source as *Apophth. Laconica*, Agesilaus 29.]

1.30 in CWE: When another person asked him [Agesilaus] why the city of Sparta had no walls, he pointed to the armed citizens and said, ‘These are the walls of the Spartan state.’ This indicates that the safest defence of a country is the courage of its citizens. [The note in CWE indicates the note as ‘resolute’ and the source as Plutarch, *Moralia*, 210E.]

Most of the entries follow this style, and the overall effect is engaging—a brief scene is set, someone says one thing, and the principal speaker responds with wit and wisdom; usually right after, a commentary follows, a couple of lines to a dozen, providing the briefest of moral context or application. Erasmus has no qualms about rewriting his sources. For this, and for using a Latin translation of Diogenes, he was extravagantly attacked by the scholar Francesco Robortello, who apparently did not grasp the approach. Yet, because of his rewriting, this book of such miscellaneous speakers is nicely pulled together in the same manner as the *Adagia*, with less digression and detailed scholarly commentary.

Most of the entries in the *Apophthegmata* are gathered under the names of particular speakers, and this approach emphasizes the context of the speaker’s character as much as the particular wit of the saying (or, sometimes, wordless gesture). There is, then, a proposed model of leadership and moral thought demonstrated through the gathering together of these individual spoken styles. But there is another way of reading the book, an approach Erasmus had already discussed near the end of book 2 of his *De copia* and enacted in his expanded *Adagia*, and that was to identify the content or quality of the quotation in a system of topical classification. Thus, in the *Apophthegmata*, most of the entries have a marginal annotation (“*fortiter*” in our example) summarizing the content in a word or two. These marginal notes are all indexed by Erasmus at the end of the work, in essence turning the collection into a kind of commonplace book, very much in the tradition that Ann Moss describes in her *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought* (Oxford, 1996). Many later sixteenth-century editions go further and resort the Erasman

collections under the topical headings, and the *Apophthegmata* was no exception. The varied approaches are discussed by Ann Blair in her *Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age* (New Haven, 2010).

Because there are so few textual witnesses, the editor's job in preparing a text like this is fairly straightforward. Dr. ter Meer uses the 1535 edition (C) as her base text and provides variants with 1531 (A) and 1532 (B); historical variants from the Basel *Opera omnia* (1540) and the long-standard LB edition (1703-6) are also given. Her commentary on the sources is more complex, because of the variety and textual tradition of the texts Erasmus was known to have followed. Her introduction provides an excellent summary for the context of the *Apophthegmata*.

The edition prepared by Dr. Lobbes is a different project. Like Dr. ter Meer, he provides 1535 for his Latin text (mistakenly, I feel, presenting the marginal topical summaries as titles), noting some of the major changes from 1531 and 1532 (but not against LB), and against this he sets the 1539 translation by l'Esleu (or Antoine) Macault, dedicated to François I^{er} and continued by "E. des Pl." (believed to be Étienne des Planches) in 1553. His edition, then, tells what happened when the text was absorbed into another language. Dr. Lobbes also provides an account of the sources in his first volume. His substantial introduction lays out the immediate context and structure of Erasmus's text, but he then goes on to see how the work is re-enacted in a French context, including comments on Montaigne and the absorption of Erasmus's text into later works such as Domenico Nani Mirabelli's *Polyanthea* (originally published in 1503, this anthology was later expanded by the addition of new material from Erasmus and other collections; Ann Blair has a thorough census of editions on her Harvard web site). Along the way, one thing I found particularly valuable was Dr. Lobbes's account of the way certain classical words (money, clothing, etc.) had been translated into French. I believe this edition should encourage analysis of the way the *Apophthegmata* (as a leading compilation of ancient wisdom) was absorbed into the French literary tradition.

The numbering is an issue for the modern reader. If you are looking up the last quotation given in Book IV, 1535 treats this as number "23" in a sequence devoted to Demosthenes, ASD calls this "1301,"

Lobbes calls it “IV, 382,” and CWE “4.373.” What happened? The quotations were numbered in the early editions using two inconsistent systems (through-numbering for some books, elsewhere a series of sequences devoted to individuals like Demosthenes). ASD has noted the inconsistent numbering inside each book but then consistently through-numbers the entire collection. Lobbes and CWE have consistently through-numbered each book, but Lobbes occasionally splits some of the entries (e.g., 1.162 becomes 1.162 and 1.163), and the split entries account for his totals. The different approaches are not easy to reconcile.

That small issue aside, anyone who has worked on a scholarly edition will know how much detailed and thoughtful effort, as well as attention to the higher criticism, has gone into these two editions. One must express gratitude to these two editors for what they have done, to Dr. Lobbes for having more securely tied the *Apophthegmata* to the vernacular tradition and to Dr. ter Meer for having given us the first volume of what will be the standard scholarly edition of this important work. (William Barker, University of King’s College and Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia)

◆ *Salmon Macrins Gedichtsammlungen von 1538 bis 1546. Edition mit Wortindex.* Edited by Marie-Françoise Schumann. Hamburger Beiträge zur neulateinischen Philologie, 9. Berlin and Münster: LIT, 2013. XX + 507 pp. The book under review is the fourth volume in the series Hamburger Beiträge zur neulateinischen Philologie that focuses on the French Neo-Latin poet Salmon Macrin and the third in which Marie-Françoise Schumann presents an edition of his highly influential poetry collections. In 2011 she edited Macrin’s collections published between 1528 and 1534; in 2012, the poems published in 1537. With the present volume, Schumann provides us with the first modern edition of three poetry collections (Latin text only) printed between 1538 and 1546: a collection of *Septem Psalmi* and *Paeanium libri quatuor* (1538), *Hymnorum selectorum libri tres* (1540), and *Odorum libri tres* (1546).

As in the previous volumes of 2011 and 2012, the editor gives a very short introduction (5 pages); several paragraphs on the author and the edition have been taken over verbatim from the previous

volumes. The three poetry collections fill 272 pages and are followed by an extensive word index (227 pages). In the *Septem Psalmi* of 1538, Macrin presents the seven penitential psalms in Aeolic verse. The fifty-seven *Paeans* show a pious character; the poet addresses the Virgin Mary, Christ, the Holy Spirit, and even God himself, but also friends, noblemen such as cardinal Jean du Bellay, and Macrin's wife Gelonis (1,16; 1,17). Besides sacred themes, Macrin treats contemporary events as well: e.g., in Paean 3,8, where he laments the outbreak of the plague in his hometown, Loudun.

The *Hymnorum selectorum libri tres* are dedicated to another cardinal, Jean de Lorraine. Several of the eighty hymns are addressed to influential noblemen (e.g., Charles de Valois (1.8), son of King Francis I^{er}) or to the king himself (1,29). In this poetry collection, Macrin treats sacred themes almost exclusively, especially the Passion of Christ and the Virgin Mary. With Hymn 2,12, he explains why Christian justice outrivals the ideas of all philosophical schools. Imitation and emulation of Horace are implicit in all of Macrin's poetry; in several cases he even makes it explicit in the title of his hymns (1,4; 3,4). In the appendix to book 3 of the *Hymns* we find two poems of contemporaries addressed to Macrin (A1; A4). The third poetry collection, the *Odorum libri tres* of 1546, begins with a preface to King Francis I^{er}. With his sixty Odes, Macrin returns to a more secular poetry; they address patrons and friends and discuss secular subjects such as love and marriage (1,16; 3,11) and contemporary events, e.g. the French victory at Carignano against the combined forces of the Holy Roman Empire and Spain (1,14).

As in the previous volumes, Schumann's edition of Salmon Macrin's poetry collections from 1538 to 1546 offers a vast amount of material for further research on this greatly neglected French poet, but, as in the other volumes, the reader might miss a substantial introduction, a commentary, or notes to the text explaining the historical, religious, and literary background. (Johanna Luggin, Ludwig Boltzmann Institut für neulateinische Studien, Innsbruck, Austria)

◆ *Sämtliche Werke*, vol. 3: *Dramen*, pt. 3: *Kommentar zu Priscianus vapulans und Iulius redivivus*. By Nicodemus Frischlin. Edited by Christoph Jungck und Lothar Mundt. Stuttgart and Bad Cannstatt:

Frommann-Holzboog, 2014. 253 pages. More than ten years after publishing their edition of Frischlin's best known plays *Priscianus vapulans* and *Iulius redivivus*, Christoph Jungck and Lothar Mundt have now submitted the commentaries on the two comedies which reviewers had strongly called for. The results of their work, released as volume III,3 of the Historisch-kritische Frischlin-Gesamtausgabe, confirm that these demands were justified: through the lens of the commentary, Frischlin's satire is significantly clarified.

Absolutely indispensable for future studies on Frischlin's dramatic oeuvre is Jungck's commentary on *Priscianus vapulans*. Given the fact that satirical texts even from the more recent history of literature always require background information for a sufficient understanding, the lack of a commentary in this case was a real problem. Thanks to Jungck the play with its evident satirical orientation is now much more accessible to researchers, but also to a broader readership more generally. The satire on the use of Medieval Latin—by far the most important aspect of the play—is particularly well explicated by the author, who offers an extensive, well-researched analysis of the sources Frischlin used to unmask the linguistic habits in sixteenth-century academia. The passages of the main sources which Frischlin simply transferred into verses—sections from Chrysostomus Javelli's commentary on Aristotle's *Physics* in Act 1, from Bernardus de Gordonio's *Lilium medicinae* and Valescus de Taranta's *Philonius* in Act 2, from Ioannes Nevizanus's *Sylva nuptialis* and Jean Barbier's *Aureum viatorium utriusque iuris* in Act 3, and from Felix Hemmerlin's *De plebanis* in Act 4—are mostly cited in their entirety. The most valuable advantage of the book is the analysis of the 'corrupted' vocabulary which the characters make use of. Jungck sought to identify all lexical elements belonging to Medieval Latin and to explain their partly obscure derivation.

Compared to the substantial commentary, the introduction is short, even excessively so. The author restricts himself to a brief contextualization of the play within Frischlin's oeuvre, some scattered comments on the secondary literature, a chapter on metrics, and a chapter on the 1578 performance. Interpretive approaches are not given in any depth, which is regrettable, because reflections concerning the direction of the impact of the satire would have been useful additions to the philological commentary. A statement discussing to

what extent the linguistic satire implies criticism of the contemporary situation in Frischlin's own university, Tübingen (as Price and Leonhardt argue), could have been expected at the very least. Debatable is Jungck's conclusion that *Priscianus vapulans* is a comedy displaying *irgendwo und irgendwann* (12) despite the time designation in verse 1510. Also if the dating (February 1517) is already contained in the source, a commentator cannot simply ignore this information in Frischlin's text.

Iulius redivivus is per se easier to approach for modern readers. However, for this play a commentary is still helpful, especially when it is as user-friendly as the one Mundt has produced. His work neatly balances philological comments—the sources identified are mainly from antiquity (Caesar, Tacitus)—and *realia*. Particularly detailed information is given on the humanists quoted by Eobanus Hessus in the third act. Short descriptions of content and characters at the beginning of each scene provide welcome support for the reader.

The introduction is somewhat more extensive than the one Jungck offered for *Priscianus vapulans*. In the first part Mundt offers an informative overview of the genesis of the work, including the printing of paratextual documents such as Frischlin's own description of the play. In a second chapter the author deals with the history of the subject.

Unfortunately, the two commentaries hardly ever make reference to each other. In light of the approximate concurrency of the two plays, it would be surprising if we did not find multiple examples of links between them. Also references to other works of Frischlin are scarce. Nevertheless, a final judgement on the book can only be positive. Scholarly focus on Frischlin's comic plays will for a long time be based on Jungck and Mundt's well-researched volume. Hopefully the book will also promote the use of these two plays as classroom texts. (Simon Wirthensohn, Ludwig Boltzmann Institut für neulateinische Studien, Innsbruck, Austria)

◆ *La citadelle de la vertu ou La véritable tranquillité de l'âme / Arx virtutis sive De vera animi tranquillitate* (1627). By Jean van Havre (Joannes Havraeus). Edited and translated by Stéphane Mercier. *Supplementa humanistica Lovaniensia*, 37. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2014. 224 pp. 65 euros. Contained in this book is

an edition of three satires written by the Flemish poet Jean van Havre (1551–1625). Van Havre, who was lord of Walle, in the region of Lokeren near Ghent, lived and studied in Italy and France for more than a decade, after which he returned home and rose to prominence in Ghent, where he became an alderman. Toward the end of his life he began planning a work on the duties of the good alderman, for which he composed a preface in verse. He lost interest in the larger work but continued with the preface, expanding it and tripling it in size. This poem, which became the *Arx virtutis*, was ready for publication at van Havre's death in 1625, at which point his friends took over and saw it into print in 1627.

The work has a somewhat complicated publication history. The shorter version was published in Ghent in 1621. The longer version, which had swollen to more than nine hundred verses and was divided into three books, was finished when van Havre died and was seen through the Plantin-Moretus press in Antwerp by Gaspard Gevaerts. The volume under review presents both versions, first the 1627 version, then the first one as an appendix. Mercier adds a brief introduction as well along with notes to the principal text. The notes do a good job of identifying sources, which reveal the poet's mastery of a body of classical sources in which Stoicism occupies a privileged place and Latin prevails over Greek. Seneca, Publilius Syrus, Horace, Ovid, Virgil, Claudian, and Juvenal are cited often, with Martial and Persius appearing less often and contemporary authors like Erasmus and Palingenius also present. It is to Mercier's credit that he does more than simply cite parallel passages, adding some commentary and references to events from van Havre's time as well. Dirk Sacré has provided a second appendix, "Elf onuitgegeven brieven van Iohannes Havraeus aan Casperius Gevartius (1621–1623) en een brief van Nicolaus Burgundius over Havraeus." These unpublished letters provide considerable insight into the material circumstances of the publication of van Havre's satires.

This edition in itself offers little, if anything, for the reviewer to complain about. The text is faithfully reproduced from the early printed editions, the translation makes it accessible to the reader whose Latin is wobbly to nonexistent, and the accompanying apparatus places the *Arx virtutis* into both the culture in which it was produced

and the tradition of Latin satire from antiquity to the Renaissance. My only hesitation goes back to the conception of the project itself, which serves to bring back to life a figure whom Mercier freely admits had passed into virtual oblivion (17). This is always a worthy goal in Neo-Latin studies, but in point of fact the number of readers who are passionately interested in van Havre is unlikely to be large, and one wonders whether their interests would have been served almost as well by consulting the exact same text as it appears in the 1627 edition, which is not a particularly rare book and is also available both online as part of the massive digitalization project at the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich and on microfilm from the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel. One could argue, though, that this is more a decision for the financial arm of the Leuven University Press to make, and that we should applaud the republication of another Neo-Latin work in a well prepared modern edition. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Musica incantans*. By Robert South. Edited and translated, with commentary, by Dennis Miedek. *Hamburger Beiträge zur neulateinischen Philologie*, 10. Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2013. IX + 112 pp. In 2006, after having conducted his first New Year's Concert with the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra, Mariss Jansons told the world that music as the language of our hearts and of our souls should become even more important in our lives. Robert South (1634–1716) wanted to express (nearly) the same sentiment through his marvelous Neo-Latin poem *Musica incantans* (Oxford, 1655), which was famous in his day and later but is almost forgotten now, since the text was never edited or translated. Dennis Miedek successfully changed this regrettable situation by editing, translating into German, and commenting on the 358 hexameters in his master's thesis. A supervised paper as part of the rather new but quite renowned series *Hamburger Beiträge zur neulateinischen Philologie* has to be considered as a very special case indeed: The curriculum of Osnabrück University made it possible by offering a specialization in the field of Neo-Latin Studies to exceptionally talented and learned young people. That is what Stephan Heilen tells us in his introduction about the promising young scholar whose first book seems to be the successful product of a rather ambitious

project: the publication of a very interesting and substantial text.

Musica incantans sive poema exprimens musicae vires iuvenem in insaniam adigentis et musici inde periculum is an ingenious mixture of genres. A young man gets angry after having eagerly listened to the beautiful (and fatally dangerous) music he explicitly begged for. Finally he kills himself by jumping into the sea. The musician gets accused of murder, defends himself in the manner of an *orator*, and is—luckily enough—allowed to leave as a free man. Different layers are artificially interwoven: mythological elements and protagonists and speeches in the courtroom, romantic scenes and the detailed description of symptoms of madness. In the very end music rules everything—the musician is another, better Orpheus.

Working with his sources and the (many) different manuscripts and printed editions, Miedek shows profound knowledge. Nowadays, this is rather atypical for a standardized master's thesis. Miedek draws a precise stemma and clearly shows that the text was revised between 1655 and 1667. Unfortunately, when talking about some printer's errors, he does not comment on this topic in much depth. Miedek does begin to unpack South's learned style, which is full of allusions, but in some cases he does not mention the obligatory parallel texts, nor does he interpret the vast number of *loci communes* or give enough details about them.

It was definitely the right decision to print the more recent text of 1667 because it is the last version approved by the author himself and gives insight into the process of publication and interpretation, since it carries some different readings and emendations. Miedek's translation is quite good but is sometimes a bit colloquial or unnecessarily complicated, as when it is used as an *additamentum* to help the reader on his way to a deeper understanding of the text. In some cases Miedek remains too much on the surface, e.g., when he does not inform us about the (Neo-)Latin motif of talking with hundreds of tongues. It seems to be normal that not all the information given in the commentary shows the same depth of thought; sometimes there is too much paraphrase or the exact citation is missing. When Miedek comments on the rape of Philomela, the use of *virgo* has no sarcastic meaning—cf. the Ajax-simile, which is not witty. Generally speaking, what Miedek calls “wit” is not that, but there are at least

parodic elements in the text. Finally, it is always a problem to resort to metrics as a desperate solution to a problem, and Dryden's work on satire is not secondary literature, but an important primary source in the history of classical scholarship.

It is a pity that there are some misprints and misspellings, but they do not really diminish the book's importance; furthermore it should be *ovidisch* and not *ovidianisch*, which makes a difference in the diachronic understanding of Ovid's own work and its influence in later ages. When Miedek mentions *furor poeticus* he should have mentioned Marsilio Ficino as well, and a note on the *septem artes* would also have been useful. There are some repetitions, but this is true for many, not to say most, books. To conclude: Miedek's 'premiere' is impressive, the work he had to do was enormous, and the result is more than promising. Let us wait eagerly for his second book. (Sonja Schreiner, University of Vienna)

◆ *Dynamics of Neo-Latin and the Vernacular: Language and Poetics, Translation and Transfer*. Edited by Tom Deneire. Medieval and Renaissance Authors and Texts, 11. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2014. X + 327 pp. \$149. One of the great ironies of cultural history is that the elevation of Latin to the undisputed lingua franca in Renaissance Europe took place at the same time that all of Europe experienced an increasing appreciation for the vernacular languages. This phenomenon has generally been interpreted within a binary scheme, with the elitist Neo-Latin culture on the one hand set in opposition to a popular or bourgeois culture on the other. A group of Dutch scholars, however, has spent the last decade exploring this issue as a more complex and dynamic matter of cultural poetics, to use Stephen Greenblatt's terminology. Beginning in 2004 Jan Bloemendal received a large grant from the Dutch Organization of Scientific Research (NW) to study the bilingual theater culture of the Netherlands during the Renaissance, which was followed by a second grant in 2009 that studied how several Dutch poets who wrote in both Latin and the vernacular were received in Germany. The project was expanded in its later stages to include the dynamics of Neo-Latin and the vernacular more generally, which led to the book under review.

The volume opens with a methodological intervention by Jan Bloemendal that essentially constitutes a response to ten questions that had originally been posed by Nikolaus Thurn in *Neulatein und Volkssprachen* (Munich, 2012). This is followed by the first of two sections, entitled “Language and Poetics,” that explores the question of cultural exchange on a micro-level. The volume editor begins the section with a study of Dutch occasional poetry from the years 1635 to 1640 that shows how dangerous it is to try to construct larger generalizations from the interaction between Neo-Latin and the vernacular poetic repertoires in this specific area. Using the eleven volumes of Pieter Bor’s *History of the Dutch Revolt and the War against Spain* (1595–1634), Harm-Jan van Dam explores the co-existence of both Latin and vernacular liminal poems in an important Dutch book of the Renaissance. Johanna Svennson in turn studies the division of labor between Latin and Danish in the speech community formed by the clergy in the province of Scania in the late seventeenth century. Ümmü Yüksel’s paper discusses two poems written by Martin Opitz in praise of Daniel Heinsius, which allows us to see how the figure of Heinsius can serve as both a representative of Latin learning and a symbol of Dutch literary and political nationalism. Eva van Hooijdonk extends this approach to the collection of Latin epigrams on Prince Maurice of Nassau that Hugo Grotius composed around 1600 to accompany a series of engravings depicting various Dutch successes in the revolt against the Spanish. The Maurice epigrams end up becoming an interesting way to mediate the transition from the German newsprint context in which the engravings originated to a self-consciously nationalistic context of Dutch vernacular poetry.

The second section, “Translation and Transfer,” explores the process of cultural dynamics on the macro-level, with a focus on translation and cultural or knowledge transfer. Annet den Haan explores why Giannozzo Manetti believed that a translation into the vernacular can never be a good translation, while Beate Hintzen looks at a series of poems connected to Martin Opitz to bring out the role of Greek within the contact between Latin and vernacular literature, and Guillaume van Gemert follows a treatise of Hugo Grotius from its beginnings as a work of self-apology in a Dutch context through a Latin translation in which the theological content stood front and

center to a series of German translations, one of which made its way into the hands of a Swedish general. Ingrid De Smet in turn shows how Jacques Auguste de Thou was forced to rely at least in part on the vernacular jargon of sixteenth-century falconers in his efforts to write on the subject in Latin. Bettina Noak returns to a theological focus with a study of paratexts as a means of knowledge transfer in an early modern encounter with Hinduism written in Dutch, while David Kromhout studies the changes in the discourse of the early seventeenth-century Leiden humanists by focusing on three bilingual Dutch poets, Daniel Heinsius, Jacob Cats, and Hugo Grotius. Ingrid Rowland closes out this section with a fascinating study of the interplay between Latin and vernacular in Vitruvius's sixteenth-century readers. The concluding chapter, again by the volume editor, brings together the dynamic model of bilingual interaction to shed light on allied issues like *imitatio / aemulatio*, translation studies, and transfer studies in the Renaissance. The volume also contains a selected bibliography of relevant secondary works.

Unlike a good number of books containing essays by various scholars, this one has a strong methodological and thematic unity that makes the whole more than the sum of its parts. It is worth noting that Philip Ford's important book *The Judgment of Palaemon: The Contest between Neo-Latin and Vernacular Poetry in Renaissance France* appeared recently in this same series, to which we owe a considerable debt for advancing discussion on a topic of growing interest in Neo-Latin studies. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Poésie latine à haute voix (1500–1700)*. Edited by L. Isebaert and A. Smeesters. Brepols: Turnhout, 2013. 238 pp. This collection of eight articles in three languages (English, French and Italian) brings together the proceedings of an international meeting held in Louvain in 2009 on recited Latin poetry, and more specifically on voice-directed poetry. This is original because Latin sung poetry, which was also used in reading, recitation, and of course theater, is often left aside. In a clear introduction, the authors note that, if the pronunciation of Latin (6) has already been the subject of studies in the tradition of Justus Lipsius, for example, work on the various types of "voice directing" is in its early stages, and indeed we must pay tribute to the book for

this.

The first part (11–101) includes three studies, one on secular Paris colleges and two on the Jesuit colleges. The use of the Latin language in the various pedagogies has been known for a long time, but the authors properly linger on elocution, whereas most studies concern *actio*. Matthew Ferrand takes the example of Ravius Textor and shows the extreme originality of the literary construction of his *Dialogi* and *Epigrammata*, which are exercises in declamation, but also phonetics and recitation that would be called performance today (32). Together with pronunciation, such training is the basis of the seventeenth-century manuals of the Jesuits, and, as Gregory Ems reminds us (53–65), it is primarily a practice that leads to the theater. If Dirk Sacré and Tim Denecker claim not to be at the heart of the subject of the book when they talk about Joannes Lucas, a Parisian Jesuit from the seventeenth century, we take this statement for a *captatio benevolentiae* because the article shows us how he has his place between Father Cressolles and Father Caussin, well-known Jesuit scholars to whom numerous essays have already been dedicated. Lucas has, for example, extremely modern ideas about the relationship between language and behavior (99) that obviously go through the learning of *actio* in oratory.

The following two studies (111–31 and 133–49) emphasize what the authors call the “Roman model,” real or fictional. The model is real when Stefano Benedetti evokes the show given at the Capitol Theatre by Leo X in Rome in September 1513 to mark the honorary citizenship granted to Giuliano and Lorenzo de’ Medici. These shows were meant to return to the ancient theater and even saw a staging of Plautus’s *Poenulus*. It is true that the author tells us in great detail how these shows, musical interludes, and the various tables were conducted, but it is hard to see how this study fits the subject of the book, that is, the issue and the forms of poetry read aloud. However the second study shows how, in the story of a fictional event (a poetic competition that would have taken place in the villa of Leo X), the Roman model of “good spoken Latin,” of purity and of elegance that includes gestures, will be diffused, starting with the people, staged as a spectator (138).

The third part, which includes studies on Latin sung poetry, involves musicologists and transports us through all the Latin European

territories of the modern era, i.e., Italy, rather unsurprisingly, but also France and Bavaria. Christophe Georis presents the works of the poet Aquilino Coppini, who wrote Latin poetry exclusively intended to be sung, especially in mystical experiences. Defining an original method of confrontation between the Latin text and the Italian hypotext of some motets, the author shows how the Latin language, undereroticized if compared to the more explicit Italian language, is the vector of the mystical approach, leading as it does to ecstasy and thereby announcing the baroque era (184). The article on the songs of Pierre Perrin, a French musician of the seventeenth century, fills a bibliographical void for this author whose music and lyrics have indeed been well studied, but by French scholars only. By focusing on Perrin's production in Latin, the author shows us how there was an awareness of the musicality of the Latin language even in the seventeenth century, which also allowed the importation of the Roman practice as a model and the highlighting of the genius of French music as it was about to impose itself (203). Bavaria is the focus of the last article in this book, with a case study of the musical theater of the Jesuit Franz Lang, who was active in Munich between 1695 and 1707. This clarifies how Latin brings musicality into use as a religious language, even if using Latin can be synonymous with excluding a significant part of the audience. The last three studies are extremely important in the book because on the one hand they show that Latin is a language that has been used in all areas of art and science for a long time, and on the other hand they inform us about the technical modalities of pronunciation, the phrasing and interpretation of this language, and the effects it could produce.

Every article is followed by a full bibliography, which eliminates tedious searches in a general bibliography on a variety of topics. The book ends with a section by the editors that demonstrates that studying spoken Latin in the modern era is an example of interdisciplinarity, and we must thank the authors for this challenge. (Florence Bistagne, Université d'Avignon—Institut universitaire de France)

◆ *Neo-Latin Commentaries and the Management of Knowledge in the Late Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period (1400–1700)*. Edited by Karl Enenkel and Henk Nellen. Supplementa Humanistica

Lovaniensia, 33. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2013. xiv + 526 pp. A few commentaries, such as Servius's on Virgil, have achieved escape velocity and been published separately from the texts that prompted them in the first place. But most commentaries are parasites: well-intentioned, symbiotic, but parasites all the same. Texts can usually survive without commentaries, but the reverse is unusual. If commentaries are parasites, what is scholarship on commentaries? "Big fleas have little fleas, / Upon their backs to bite 'em, / And little fleas have lesser fleas, / And so, *ad infinitum*." Or so it once seemed, before scholars like Gérard Genette, Anthony Grafton, and Glenn Most showed the usefulness of these parasites, not just to their host texts, whose prestige they upholster, but to literary history and the history of education. Renaissance poetry, where it had classical models, was influenced by bad interpretations as well as good ones, and there is no better record of how classical authors were taught in school than obsolete, error-ridden, parasitical commentaries.

This new collection of commentary scholarship originated at a 2010 conference of mostly transalpine scholars, but all of the papers have been filled out and polished since then. They have also been indexed: a labor that may have been cheerless in the performance, but will surely extend the usefulness of this volume, not only forward in time (to answer questions we cannot anticipate), but also to scholars whose main concern is not commentary per se. There is not space here to summarize all thirteen essays (a task which the editors have already performed on 70–76). Instead, I wish to consider the collection as a whole. What does it add, and where does it leave us?

In answer to the second question, what is the *status quaestionis*, the long introduction by editors Karl Enenkel and Henk Nellen is probably the clearest overview of Renaissance commentary—the variety of its methods, typography, organization, and contents—that anyone has written so far or is likely to write in the near future. One big conclusion, which accumulates over several papers, is that commentary did not develop during this period, so much as sway or list. Features that seem new in later commentaries can usually be exemplified in the earliest commentaries as well (even if they aren't typical there), and later commentaries still perform the same functions as older commentaries: correcting errors in transmission, glossing unfamiliar

vocabulary, guiding students through knotty syntax.

A second conclusion is that commentary's scope was larger than we usually imagine. Biblical and literary texts are the most familiar objects of commentary, but there were also commentaries on scientific and legal texts, such as Pliny and Justinian, as well as modern texts, such as Antonio Beccadelli's *De dictis et factis Alphonsi regis Aragonum* (1455). We think of commentaries as keeping old texts accessible, but (as these papers demonstrate) commentaries were also a site for ongoing debates in theology and a matrix for accommodating new discoveries in science. Hence the second part of the collection's title, *Neo-Latin Commentaries and the Management of Knowledge*.

On page 4, the editors lament that previous scholarship on commentaries has been "unsystematic and has therefore not led to the development of any theories regarding the practice of commentary (comparable to the theories which the debate on textual editing has yielded in abundance)." This new volume does little to change that; apart from Valéry Berlincourt's essay on digressions in Caspar von Barth, there is little theorizing. A few essays, such as Susanna de Beer's on Pliny and Bernard Stolte's on legal humanism, carve a wider path, but most are case studies. There is even one essay, by Volkhard Wels, about a lecturer, Daniel Heinsius, who refused to write commentaries, on the grounds that commentary is a grubby activity, incompatible with poetic feeling. But "exceptions are important, too" (215), as Craig Kallendorf shows in his essay on Virgil commentary and marginalia. Theories choke on exceptions, but taxonomies thrive. This collection amounts to a taxonomy of commentaries and may actually prove more useful than a theory would have been. (David Scott Wilson-Okamura, East Carolina University)

◆ *Neo-Latin Philology: Old Traditions, New Approaches*. Edited by Marc van der Poel. Proceedings of a Conference Held at the Radboud University, Nijmegen, 26–27 October 2010. *Supplementa humanistica Lovaniensia*, 35. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2014. 208 pp. 59.50 euros. As the headnote indicates, this collection of essays originated in a conference held in Nijmegen on the methodology of Neo-Latin philology. More specifically, the participants gathered to reflect on how the growing interest in the materiality of literature

might affect their work in medieval and Renaissance Latin and Italian literature. The question they asked themselves was, how might the material presentation of a text, in either manuscript or print, affect the interpretation of that text?

The first two answers to this question are theoretical: Haijo Westra notes that interest in the material aspects of medieval codices has restored a measure of objectivity and verifiability to a field that had been destabilized by a focus on the social construction of texts, while H. Wayne Storey concentrates on the copyist and the fascicle to show how changes in the production and construction of manuscripts leads to “contexts of interpretation” (40). The seven papers that follow are devoted to one author or work. Christoph Pieper draws on the so-called new historicism to show how Basinio of Parma used textual corrections, markings, and Greek quotations to fashion himself as author, in negotiation with those who he hoped would read his *Hesperis*. Marianne Pade follows Niccolò Perotti’s *Cornu copiae* from the manuscript presentation copy through a series of early editions to demonstrate that the way in which the text was set out helped effect a change in its status, from a commentary on Martial to a lexicographical handbook. David Rijser in turn studies a manuscript (Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 2742) that contains a commentary on Horace’s *Ars poetica*, to show that the significance and value of the commentary can only be appreciated when the manuscript that carries it is placed in its proper social and intellectual context. Werner J. C. M. Gelderbom uses the poetry of Johannes Secundus as his test case, which demonstrates that Secundus revised his poetry before sending it to the printer to soften its tone, because he understood that print was a public medium that required conformity to public moral standards and greater attention to the relationship of the parts to the whole. Marc van der Poel’s essay on the *Emblemata Horatiana* uses a series of printed editions to track how this illustrated commonplace book moved farther and farther away from its Horatian origins into a modern Christian context. Tom Deneire in turn studies a rare play by Johann Lausemberg, *Pompeius Magnus*, to define what he calls an “intertextual materiality” (172), in which the development of Lausemberg’s poetic and stylistic anachronism is traced to his use of the commonplace books, antiquarian volumes, and philological

dictionaries of his day. Finally Nienke Tjoelker turns to John Lynch's *Alithinologia* to show how material philology places the work in its social context, from which new conclusions can be drawn about both Lynch's career and about reading and writing more generally by Irish exiles in the seventeenth century.

The methodological concerns explored in this book go back to a famous collection of essays in medieval studies that was published in the 1990 volume of the journal *Speculum*. These essays launched the so-called new philology, which deprivileged authorship, original context, and the authentic version of a text in favor of studying the various forms a work may acquire through its medium, the role that people other than the author play in constructing texts, and the various meanings a text is given by successive communities of readers. The authors of these essays agree that material presentation, in manuscript or print, contributes to interpretation, but they argue that the author comes to the fore more clearly in the Renaissance than in the Middle Ages and that the printing press allows for a more stable presentation of both author and text than the codex. In other words, they accept the focus on materiality from the new philology but not the French poststructuralist theory on which it was originally based. This position will not appeal to every reader of these essays, but everyone can, and should, use this collection as a way to think about how the material form in which a text is encountered affects its meaning. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)