

## NEO-LATIN NEWS

**Vol. 63, Nos. 3 & 4. 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.**

◆ *Platonis Gorgias Leonardo Aretino interprete*. Ed. by Matteo Venier. Edizione nazionale delle traduzioni dei testi greci in età umanistica e rinascimentale, 7. Florence: SISMEL, Edizioni del galluzzo, 2011. VIII + 422 pp. On November 1, 1409, Leonardo Bruni sent to Niccolò Niccoli a manuscript containing his Latin translation of Plato's *Gorgias*, along with a brief letter encouraging his friend to have the work copied and disseminated. The appearance of this translation was important for two reasons. First, as is generally known, the mastery of Plato's oeuvre had effectively disappeared in the west during the preceding centuries. When Bruni made his translation, émigrés from the east were beginning to reintroduce instruction in Greek to the west, but even into the next century, many a humanist professed a greater knowledge of Greek than he actually had. The key to the recovery of Greek literature was to have it translated, not into the vernacular, but into Latin, the language used by educated people throughout Renaissance Europe. Bruni's translation therefore filled the need of the moment and was eagerly taken up by such well-known intellectuals as Poggio Bracciolini, Leon Battista Alberti, and Matteo Palmieri, then eventually by Marsilio Ficino as well, whose translations of Plato's works became canonical in the Renaissance. The forty-five pages of section 1 of Venier's introduction survey this material.

The second reason this work is important is that, as Paul Botley has shown in *Latin Translation in the Renaissance* (Cambridge, 2004), Bruni stood at the center of an important controversy over how Greek literature should be translated. An older tradition focused on word-for-word, literal translation, but Bruni argued that since the ancients were masters of rhetoric, a good translation of a Greek text should capture the sense rather than the exact words in a polished Latin that should match the elegance of the original. Accordingly his translation of the *Gorgias* was into a recognizably Ciceronian Latin. As section 2 of Venier's introduction shows, however, the result does not constitute an unequivocal success, with the occasional lapses being due in part to efforts to impose an alien style onto Plato's Greek, but also in part to the lack of adequate lexical resources at this time. At any rate, Venier's discussion, which goes on for some fifty pages, examines this important issue in detail, in subsections on isosyllable, isocolon, and isorhythm; reminiscences of the *auctores*; syntactical divergences from the original; rhetorical figures; clauses and *numerosa oratio*; literalism; grammatical, syntactical, and lexical particularities; shortening of the original and other infidelities, both purported and real; the philological propriety of the translation; and unclear, approximate, and erroneous translations.

The success of Bruni's translation led to forty manuscript witnesses, an unusually large number, which Venier patiently sorts into classes, from which he constructs the requisite stemmata. This task consumes another hundred plus pages, at which point we finally reach the edition itself, which is accompanied by three critical apparatuses. Appendices on the philological apparatus, marginalia in several manuscript witnesses, and Calicles' speech; a bibliography; and indices of words and expressions, of parallel passages, of manuscripts and early printed editions, and of names and places add eighty more pages.

The result of all this is what can only be called a monument of erudition, a critical edition that can serve as a model for how this sort of work should be done, for those who have the time, patience, and skill to invest in it. I am especially pleased to note that this edition is part of a series that is devoted to humanist translations of Greek texts, a subject whose importance is becoming increasingly apparent as the volumes in the series appear. More information can be found

at the series website: <http://www-3.unipv.it/entg/pubblicazioni.html>. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Ficino in Spain*. By Susan Byrne. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 2015. xiv + 364 pp. \$70. At first glance, the title alone of this book may appear provocative: what kind of influence could Marsilio Ficino have had in Spain? Spain, as we all know, was different, isolated and inward looking; if it even had a Renaissance, it did so apart from the rest of Europe, and on its own terms. Burckhardt largely ignored Spain when he described the Renaissance elsewhere, and the longstanding romanticizing view from within insisted that Spain produced its own intellectuals. When the two worlds intersected, the received opinion is that what happened to Erasmus was typical and that the ideals of the European Renaissance were sacrificed on the altar of Spanish orthodoxy. Within this picture, there is little place for someone like Marsilio Ficino, whose fascination with Plato and Neoplatonism led him to a heterodoxy that sometimes pushed the limits even in Renaissance Florence.

Byrne's argument, quite simply, is that the "persistent idea that Ficino was not a factor in Spanish thought and letters is, frankly, an obsolete anachronism" (216). By the fifteenth century, Ficino's writings and translations were already circulating in Spain. The Catholic monarchs Ferdinand and Isabel welcomed Ficino and his Neoplatonism, and students and scholars at the universities of Salamanca and Alcalá de Henares embraced Ficinian studies over the next centuries. Library catalogues at the early colleges there contain many entries on Ficino, and annotations in the accompanying volumes show that the books were being read. Charles V's chroniclers, along with those who explored the new world, made direct references to Ficino, and Philip II read Ficino's translations as part of his education and kept the only surviving fifteenth-century manuscript of a Castilian translation of the *Pimander* in his personal library. Spanish historical, political, theological, philosophical, medical, legal, and creative writers absorbed Ficino's ideas, such that important authors like Miguel de Cervantes, Lope de Vega, Bartolomé de las Casas, and Garcilaso de la Vega adapted material from his works. The Jesuits founded their order on the model of Plato's ideal republic, praised Ficino himself, and put his books into

the libraries of their schools, which introduced Ficino to generations of Spanish nobles. As Byrne concludes, “Ficino’s intellectual, philosophical, and literary impact on Spanish authors was immediate, deep, and long-lasting” (218), an argument that she supports by reference to Ficino’s place in Spanish libraries, his appearance as an authority in sixteenth-century Spanish letters, his role as a filter for the study of Hermes Trismegistus and of Plato, and the persistence both of Hermetic-Neoplatonic imagery and of political-economic Platonism.

This is an interesting example of the kind of book that can result when someone takes a commonly received scholarly opinion and tests it against the actual data. All of us view the world through our various heuristic filters, some of which we construct ourselves and some of which we inherit from our teachers, but as this book shows, these filters can keep us from seeing important facts that are literally right in front of us. Once we set aside the idea that Ficino could not have had much of an impact in Renaissance Spain because our ideas about the Renaissance in Spain do not have a place for him, then we can see what there is to see. And if that forces us to revise one of our heuristic filters, then so be it. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Worlds of Learning: The Library and World Chronicle of the Nuremberg Physician Hartmann Schedel (1440-1514)*. Edited by Bettina Wagner. Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Ausstellungskataloge, 89. Munich: Allitera Verlag and the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 2015. 22.90 Euros. One of the genres that is often overlooked by scholars of Neo-Latin is the library exhibition catalogue. This is a pity, because many of these catalogues contain important information that cannot be found elsewhere, presented by people with excellent scholarly credentials who are accustomed to looking at the research material we use from different perspectives and to asking questions that scholars with a professorial appointment might not think to ask. A good example of this point is the catalogue that accompanied the exhibition “Welten des Wissens. Die Bibliothek und Weltchronik des Nürnberger Arztes Hartmann Schedel (1440-1515),” held from 19 November 2014 to 1 March 2015 at the Bavarian State Library in Munich.

Schedel is best known for his involvement in the so-called Nuremberg Chronicle, one of the masterpieces of early printing. The largest

printing project of the incunabular (pre-1501) period, the chronicle contains over 1,800 illustrations, produced in a print run of more than 2,000 copies in the shop of Anton Koberger. The book is well known to historians of early printing, since some 1,700 copies survive and documentary evidence gives us a good deal of information about how it was produced. The catalogue gives us the basic information about the book, since its Latin text was crafted by Schedel, who followed the medieval model of dividing human history into seven eras but used Greek and Roman sources along with the works of humanist scholars like Flavio Biondo and Eneo Silvio Piccolomini. This is not really a book about the chronicle, however, but about its author and his life, as revealed by his books. Schedel's book collection, much of which survives intact in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, is the largest private library to have come down to us from an intellectual who lived and worked at the time when Italian humanism sunk its roots into German culture. The 370 manuscripts and 460 early printed books allow us to trace the intellectual development of a man who was born into a family with long ties to Nuremberg but was educated first in Leipzig, then in Padua, where he took a degree in medicine. While studying there, Schedel was bitten by the humanist bug and spent his free time copying classical texts, searching for and transcribing inscriptions, and gaining a basic knowledge of Greek. After graduation, he took up a series of positions as official town physician, ending up eventually in Nuremberg, where he remained for the rest of his life. He continued his humanist activity, collecting books, working on the chronicle, and achieving significant professional success until he passed away at the age of seventy-four.

Schedel's library demonstrates why it is important for someone studying Renaissance Latin to work with the books and manuscripts from this period, along with modern editions. Schedel lived at the time when printing transformed the intellectual life of Europe, and he benefited richly from this transformation, amassing a library whose size and breadth would have been beyond the reach even of a wealthy, successful physician in the preceding century. Many of his books preserve his notes, which allow us to see what he was reading for and how he processed what he read. His handwriting changed during the course of his lifetime, from a Gothic script to a humanistic one,

reflecting the evolution of his thought. Unlike many men of his day, he preserved ephemera like booksellers' catalogues and correspondence about books that show us how one went about building a library at this time. And in the indices he created for his books, we can see how Schedel struggled to organize the flood of knowledge unleashed by the information revolution that resulted from print. Indeed, once it is placed into this context, the Nuremberg Chronicle takes on new meaning as a sort of universal history that reflects the concerns not so much of its medieval models, but of its early Renaissance readers, who needed a framework into which they could put their expanding historical, geographical, and cultural knowledge.

This is a valuable book, sound in its scholarship, beautifully illustrated, and clearly organized. It can serve as a model for the kind of exhibition catalogue on which scholarship in Neo-Latin should rest. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Vie de saint Jérôme*. By Desiderius Erasmus. Trans. and ed. by André Godin, Latin text ed. by Alexandre Vanautgaerden. *Notulae Erasimianae*, 9. Turnhout: Brepols, and Geneva: Bibliothèque de Genève, 2013. 298 pp. *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami*. Ordinis noni, tomus uirtus. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2013. xiv + 678 pp. The two great Erasmus editions of our time (the Amsterdam *Opera omnia* [=ASD, 1969-] and Toronto Collected Works in English [=CWE, 1974-]) were launched amid festivities for the quincentenary of the author's birth, in a spirit of Northern Atlantic, Cold War religious ecumenism and classical-humanist revival. The Erasmus they set forth in their early volumes was essentially the forty-something whom learned coteries acclaimed as he rode up the Rhine valley to Basel in the summer of 1514, producer of the *Adagia*, *Moria*, *Copia* and other Literary and Educational Writings (as CWE calls them) in a fashionable idiom. Now, five decades later, both ASD and CWE are deep in the later sections of the *Erasmi lucubrationes*: edition and paraphrases of the New Testament, translations and editions of the Church Fathers, and—most extensive of all—the theological controversies in which Erasmus was continuously engaged from 1517 until his death in 1536. The witty humanist who, if he had kept on his way to Rome in late 1514, might by now have an honorary niche

in the Villa I Tatti Renaissance Library, has yielded his place to the embattled theologian of the *Lutherzeit*. The volumes under review help to contextualize that evolution.

In 1982, André Godin's monograph *Érasme lecteur d'Origène* set a new mark for study of the humanist's working relationships with his patristic precursors. A year later, at the Ninth International Conference on Patristic Studies in Oxford, Godin turned to Erasmus's biography of Jerome, the *Hieronymi Stridonensis vita*, composed originally for the 1516 Basel (Froben) edition of the *Divi Hieronymi opera*. While no single work of scholarship on Erasmus's reading and use of Jerome has yet matched Godin's model for Origen, important new research by Eugene Rice, Lisa Jardine, Jacques Chomarat, Benedetto Clausi, Hilmar Pabel, and others has opened the field up in interesting ways. This handy new edition of the *Hieronymi vita* offers an excellent vantage point for assessing what was at stake for Erasmus in the relationship. It contains a fine introductory essay ('Un chef-d'oeuvre polyvalent'), translation and notes by Godin, a facing reprint of the Latin text as edited in 1933 by Wallace K. Ferguson, and a substantial bibliography (which, however, lacks several items cited in the introduction). It is not clear from the "Note sur l'édition" when the *Hieronymi vita* first appeared as a self-contained publication in a small format, rather than among the preliminaries of a folio or quarto edition of Jerome's epistolary and exegetical writings. In any case, the elegant design of the present octavo in the *Notulae Erasmi* series—conceived and curated by the Director of the Bibliothèque de Genève, Alexandre Vanautgaerden, himself the author of a major study of *Érasme typographe*—gives this *Life* a more Aldine allure than even Froben aimed at, but one not at odds with Erasmus's original styling of the subject. As Godin notes (14), the project of an edition of Jerome's letters was also part of Erasmus's *self-styling* as a humanist from as early as we can reliably track it. The idea seems to have occurred to him while he struggled to decipher the scribe- and compositor-mangled orthography of Jerome's Greek tags, for the *début* volume of his *Adagia* (Paris, 1500). At that point in Erasmus's career, and for some time afterward, Jerome was mainly attractive to him as an approved Christian model of classical erudition and eloquence. It was an enhanced version of that Jerome, familiar already to several generations of Italian humanists and

their readers, that he meant to publish in Basel—or, if disappointed there, in Rome—in late 1514 or early 1515.

*Dis aliter visum.* Erasmus duly published his Jerome with Froben in Basel, but only after a considerable delay while he and his *équipe* saw to other business. On leaving England in the summer of 1514, he had also had in mind to publish a set of critical notes on the standard Latin text (traditionally credited to Jerome) of the New Testament, in the manner of Valla. Upon his arrival in Basel, in circumstances that we can now only partly reconstruct, this relatively modest project was overtaken by the more ambitious one of publishing a full Greek text of the New Testament, facing (revised) Latin translation, and accompanying textual and exegetical notes. Such would be the *Novum instrumentum*, published in February 1516, the *editio princeps* of the New Testament and the first work in which Erasmus—who was known to have obtained his doctorate in theology on the fly—ventured more than a few steps into the territory of professional theologians. Already in drafting the preliminaries of the Jerome edition, which include the *Hieronymi vita*, the editor took his precautions. “Let only heretics have Jerome for an object of horror and hatred, since they were the only ones that he always treated as the most bitter enemies!” The polemical last line of the biography is insightfully glossed by Godin as “fully coherent with the function of lightning-conductor for the *Novum Instrumentum* that Erasmus [now] assigned to his edition of the *Hieronymi Opera*” as a whole (250). We do not know exactly when a biography of the saint became part of Erasmus’s plan for his edition of Jerome; it may have been an afterthought. It seems certain, however, that the *Hieronymi vita* reflected a momentous and partly involuntary restyling of Erasmus’s own life as a publishing author.

In the texts presented by Edwin Rabbie in the fifth volume of the ninth *ordo* of his *opera omnia* (the section devoted to theological controversy), Erasmus is fully embodied in the combative role scripted for Jerome as his *alter ego* in the *Hieronymi vita*. These works issued by Froben in Basel between 1526 and 1529 show him reacting—in a variety of publishing formats, at different scales of argument, and at considerable length overall—to the censures made on his Latin *Paraphrases* of the Gospel of St. Luke (1522) by Noël Bédac, syndic of the Paris Faculty of Theology. Erasmus’s *Paraphrases* of the Epistles,

Gospels, and Acts were an immediate sequel to the 1516 *Novum instrumentum*. Beginning with Romans in 1517 and accompanying the progress of his New Testament through its second (1519) and third (1522) editions, they were an extension of the thought experiment on paper that began when he took Valla's hint to consider how the word of God in Scripture ought to sound—indeed, ought now to be *made* to sound—in Latin. In Ann Moss's resonant phrase, they were an outworking of “the Latin language turn” in Renaissance epistemology. Research such as Moss's and Erika Rummel's has narrowed the gap between humanist and scholastic positions of the day, without diminishing the scandal that a steady application of such Neo-Latinism to the core texts of Christianity was bound to represent for Bédá and others of his guild. If one had any doubt of the gravity or inevitability of the conflict, a glance at the correspondence between Erasmus and Bédá—which both saw fit to reproduce in self-justification—would dispel it. Here were two men who had known for a while that they were likely sooner or later to clash publicly. Now that the time had come, their lines and poses were too well studied to create much drama. In Bédá's eyes, Erasmus and his kind were men presuming to expound sacred mysteries on the strength of a training in “humanity” and languages alone, *humanistae theologizantes cum Luthero* (here 221, note to ll. 196–97 of Erasmus's *Supputationes errorum in censuris Natalis Bedae*). For Erasmus, Bédá's incomprehension was only slightly less culpable than that of the unnamed Spanish Franciscan who took his advocacy of a *vera germanaque theologia* for a claim that only Germans could do real theology (226). Erasmus was irritated that Bédá had not gone to the trouble of looking at his edition of the New Testament and suspected, not improbably, that he was alarmed by the strong sales of the *Paraphrases* and the prospect of a French translation of the work (268). Bédá sends Erasmus back to read Bishop Augustine; Erasmus takes his stand with the presbyter Jerome and recalls how the latter had been harried by Augustine, his inferior in biblical science. And so on. It is easy to understand why Rabbie, in a brief introduction to the volume, quotes Augustin Renaudet's verdict on the correspondence between Erasmus and Bédá (“longue et inutile”) and extends it to their interactions in other genres. Yet it would be a serious error of historical perspective to downplay the importance of this slugging-

match. The *humanista theologizans* behind the unscintillating pages of *divinationes, supputationes* and *notatiunculae contra Bedam* now edited to a standard rarely matched for other modern Latin authors is one whose measure is being taken anew by scholarship of our time. (Mark Vessey, University of British Columbia)

◆ *Contra vitam monasticam epistula: Andrea Alciato's Letter Against Monastic Life*. By Andrea Alciati. Ed. and trans. by Denis Drysdall. Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia, 36. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2014. 144 pp. \$74. Andrea Alciato (1492-1550) was a lawyer and humanist in Milan who is best known as a legal scholar and as the author of his *Emblematum libellus* (first authorized edition 1534), the first of the emblem books that became popular in the sixteenth century. His work against monasticism was written in 1517 or 1518, though not published until 1695. The original manuscript has been lost, but a manuscript copy dated 1553 forms the basis of the present edition. Variations between this manuscript and the first printed edition are noted in the apparatus. Interestingly, the 1553 manuscript can be viewed online at the University of Utrecht library website, and the website is given in the introduction. While this edition does not give much biographical information on Alciato, he can be found in Bietenholz *et al.*, *Contemporaries of Erasmus* (vol.1).

Alciato's letter against the monastic life is a series of arguments attempting to persuade his friend Bernardus Mattius to leave the monastery. Mattius, who is only known from this work, is a lawyer who, upon reaching forty years of age, suddenly left his career and his support of his mother and brothers, and joined a Franciscan monastery in Pavia. Since the age of forty has such significance in religious conversions from Augustine on (Petrarch notably), it is possible that Mattius is a literary invention.

Alciato's main argument against monasticism is that the life of someone in the world, successfully facing temptations and struggles, is spiritually better and more meritorious than the life of one shut up in a monastery, free from such temptations and struggles. He says, "when anyone can live continently and honestly, free of these observances of yours, and move without stumbling through the thickets and thorns of this world, he acquires far greater grace with God than those associates

of yours who stay shut up in cloisters. For who does not believe that a poor man, burdened with many children, providing food from day to day with his own hands for them, for himself, and for his family, but mindful nevertheless of God, is far more acceptable in heaven than are those who have no other care than praying and fasting?" (92).

Likewise, he argues that monasticism is not in the Bible or the earliest church and, in its current form, is contrary to the intentions of its founders. He says that the apostles and those "in primitiva ecclesia" were not monks, nor do monks imitate their lives. Unlike current monks, the early church heroes worked hard, were thrifty, and were witnesses and martyrs for the faith. With good intentions Francis began the Franciscans, urging humility and a life in imitation of the gospels. However, his followers built monasteries, became divisive, and changed the order. In a notable contrast, Alciato sets forth the Jewish Essenes as an ideal community for poverty, worship, and morals.

Another recurring argument Alciato makes is that before Mattius gave up civil law for the monastery, he had helped his family and friends, and had wealth to give. Now that he has entered the monastery and has taken up a life of poverty, he has nothing to give, and his mother and brothers will become impoverished. He says, "Everywhere in the gospels Christ preaches alms-giving as preparing the surest way to heaven.... You lack this blessing, thinking alms-giving is of no importance, but rather take what would be due to others" (64). Despite the objection from monks that they preach and pray for others, this is not as good as actually helping them.

Drysdall refers to Alciato's main argument about the spiritual superiority of the life of the layperson as Stoic. Alciato does say that both Christians and pagans uphold perseverance in the world as better than separation and cites Zeno in support of this: "The man who has a really strong mind is one who, just when there is the greatest difficulty in living rightly, shows himself at that time to be vigorous, unbroken, unconquerable" (98). While this is Stoic, taking into account the date of the work, it actually sounds Protestant, or at least Erasmian. This would explain why Alciato asks Mattius not to share this letter with anyone and became concerned that it would be published. According to his 1520 letter, the work by that time had reached Erasmus by way of Francesco Calvo, a bookseller and publisher in Pavia and Rome.

Alciato was extremely anxious to get this work on monasticism back from Erasmus, even threatening Calvo, Erasmus, and Froben with a lawsuit, saying that he would be linked with Luther if the work became public knowledge. This is an interesting concern, since Luther had not yet written against monasticism, which he does in 1521. Like Luther, Alciato argues that monasticism is unbiblical, but he does not make the other argument Luther does, namely that monasticism is an attempt to get to heaven by works rather than by the true path, which is by faith alone.

Drysdall's edition is very well done, and the translation is excellent and very readable. The value of the work lies in the clear influence of Erasmus. Alciato refers by name to Erasmus's 1516 New Testament, the *Instrumentum novum* (101), and it is the source of Alciato's biblical quotations. There are also about thirty references to and quotes from Erasmus's *Adagia*. Likewise, Erasmus's letters to Alciato are in his *Correspondence*, and Alciato is cited by Erasmus in the *Adagia*. This edition shows the concerns of an Italian Catholic at the time of the start of Protestantism, and the arguments are similar to those that engulfed greater figures such as Erasmus and Luther in controversies. Apparently Erasmus never returned the work to Alciato, who eventually gave up trying to get it back. Erasmus in a 1531 letter tells Alciato that he had burned it. (Bruce McNair, Campbell College)

◆ *Entre la Renaissance et les Lumières, le 'Theophrastus redivivus' (1659)*. Ed. by Nicole Gengoux. Paris: Champion, 2014. The world of *Theophrastus* studies is rather a small one, a fact which this collection of essays both acknowledges and takes full advantage of: eight of the fourteen critics cited in the bibliography have been included amongst the ten contributors to this volume. This relative exclusivity is primarily a consequence of the fortunes of the text itself, published only in 1981 and still not fully translated from the original Latin (accordingly, Latin quotations in the essays are not generally translated either, although detailed French abstracts precede the two contributions—one in English, and one in Spanish—that are not in French). However, other factors are also in play: Pierre-François Moreau's foreword freely attacks the rigidity of the philosophical canon and of the discipline's tendency to marginalise clandestine or libertine texts.

The proofreading of the volume has not been faultless, but the collected essays have been well and generously edited, with connections between articles gently highlighted and some occasionally quite robust responses to individual contributors' approaches allowed to remain in place. Nicole Gengoux's initial presentation gives a very clear account of the text, neatly summarising its principal arguments, its reception history, and the primary critical debates that recur in the essays that follow, such as the text's atheist or naturalist position, its concern with the past or with the future, and its effect upon potential readers. In a pairing of essays on natural morality, Jean-Pierre Cavallé analyses the *Theophrastus's* advocacy of freedom, equality, and community, and hence of a return away from private ownership (be it of land or of sexual partners) to a state of nature, while John Christian Laursen re-evaluates the *Theophrastus's* cynicism, a philosophy which resembles the appeal for a return to nature in its rejection of civilisation's customs and laws. In a second section on nature, politics, and religion, the atheism of the *Theophrastus* is compared firstly to euhemerism, as Lorenzo Bianchi studies the text's rational analysis of the origins and imposition of religions, and secondly to pantheism, as Miguel Benitez assesses the atheist author's respect for the reasonableness of deifying elements of nature that are beneficial to all rather than inventing gods. In a third pairing of essays, Gianni Paganini underlines the radicalism of the text's Aristotelianism, employed to atheist ends, while Marcelino Rodríguez Donís studies the text's reliance on animal intelligence and natural reason to demonstrate that the gods do not exist, that the soul is mortal, and that the powerful have always manipulated religious beliefs to suit their own purposes. In the penultimate essay, Nicole Gengoux suggests that the resemblances between the *Theophrastus* and Spinoza—in their naturalism, their approach to Epicurus, and their presentation of dynamism in nature—are indicative of a shared thought process even though the evidence clearly suggests that Spinoza did not know of the *Theophrastus*.

The *Theophrastus* does not emerge from the close scrutiny of such a high proportion of its critics unscathed. Héléne Bah-Ostrowiecki highlights the methodological flaws in its polemical position, as it argues with its opponents on their own terms: the text fights the dualism between the natural and the supernatural by positing nature

as a single entity, only to destroy that unity by contrasting natural reason with flawed, human reason. Paganini highlights the text's surprising ability to question traditional conceptions of religion and the universe in spite of its preference for ancient philosophies over the modern theories of Copernicus or Descartes, while Donís situates the *Theophrastus* in the context of sources to which its author remains curiously oblivious: Pliny or Ficino would have supported his arguments concerning animal intelligence; Gassendi would have corrected his misrepresentation of Epicurus. Most of the contributors (Bianchi, Benitez, Paganini, Donís) refer to the anonymous author's frequently selective, occasionally patchy, and at times downright misinformed reading of his sources and his willingness to skew the philosophical positions of the authorities he cites to suit his atheist ends. Yet while his reading may have been faulty, at least he read: in contrast, Olivier Bloch's short, concluding essay demonstrates through analogy with the lost works of Aristotle that there is no evidence of anyone having actually read the *Theophrastus* before the twentieth century, let alone having been influenced by its ideas—although he goes on to add that this neglect does not in fact really matter. It is nevertheless a neglect that the contributors to this volume certainly try to make up for now. (Emma Herdman, University of St Andrews)

◆ *Fasti Austriae 1736: Ein naulateinisches Gedicht in fünfzehn europäischen Sprachen*. Ed. by Franz Römer, Herbert Bannert, Elisabeth Klecker, and Christian Gastgeber. *Singularia Vindobonensia*, 5. Vienna: Praesens Verlag, 2015. 200 pp. It is customary for those who attend the congresses of the International Association for Neo-Latin Studies to receive a book, in Latin, that sheds light on the Neo-Latin culture of the city in which the congress is being held. The nature of this volume is not publicized in advance, which always adds to the anticipation of the congress participants: what unexpected treasure will the congress organizers come up with this time? I do not think that anyone would have anticipated the contribution that Franz Römer, the second vice president and conference organizer, and his colleagues produced, but they did a remarkable job of finding something that represents the extraordinarily rich culture of Vienna, the host city for the sixteenth triennial congress in August of 2016.

The volume in question is an edition of Joseph Koller's *Fasti Austriae, in singulos anni menses, cum metro, tum prosa, compendio digesta* ... (Vienna, 1736). The book, as one might guess, is a recasting of Ovid's *Fasti*, prepared to accompany an academic ceremony at the Jesuit university in Vienna in 1736. Koller (1703-1766) drew his inspiration from Ovid's calendar poem, but he incorporated Christian holidays and events that were important to Austria's Habsburg rulers into a series of short poems, one for each month. Each poem is accompanied by a translation into one of the languages spoken by people under Habsburg rule at the time, which serves both as a reminder of the cultural diversity of the Austrian empire in the eighteenth century and as a testament to the scholarly network of the editors, who found a qualified editor for each section. Each poem is also accompanied by an illustration of activities appropriate to the month by the Viennese engravers Josef (1683-1740) and Andreas (1700-1740) Schmu(t)zer. The result is a fascinating document, one that records an interesting moment in Viennese history while at the same time reinforcing one of the themes of the congress, which was 'Contextus Neolatini: Neo-Latin in Local, Trans-regional, and Worldwide Contexts.'

This book, and the congress with which it was associated, offers concrete testimony to the vitality of Neo-Latin studies in Austria today. In 2011, a special Ludwig Boltzmann Institute for Neo-Latin Studies, one of only two such groups in the humanities, was founded in Innsbruck. The scholars at this institute, which quickly became one of the European centers for Neo-Latin studies, recently published *Tyrolis Latina: Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur in Tirol* (Vienna and Cologne, 2012), a monumental, 1,325-page history of Latin culture in this region from its beginnings to the present day. Two other major projects, one studying Benedictine theater in Salzburg and the other, the reception of antiquity at the Jesuit university in Graz, show that Neo-Latin is being pursued elsewhere as well. And in Vienna, it is worth noting that the university has proved unusually receptive to Neo-Latin, with the classics department being renamed to include Neo-Latin in 2000, the venerable journal *Wiener Studien* being relabeled "Zeitschrift für Klassische Philologie, Patristik, und lateinische Tradition," and the series *Singularia Vindobonensia* being founded to make the Neo-Latin literature of early modern Austria,

with a focus on Vienna, accessible. Much good work has come from Viennese scholars on the eighteenth century, which is often rather neglected in Neo-Latin studies in favor of the earlier periods; to that work, this volume can now be added. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Neo-Latin World*. Edited by Philip Ford, Jan Bloemendal, and Charles Fantazzi. The Renaissance Society of America Texts and Studies Series, 3. 2 vols. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2014. xlv + xviii + 1,246 pp. The publication last year of *Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Neo-Latin World*, edited by Philip Ford (who sadly died before publication), Jan Bloemendal, and Charles Fantazzi, was a welcome landmark for anyone involved in Neo-Latin studies. Research in this field has been constantly hampered by a shortage of reference material: until this new encyclopedia, the only existing reference work in English was Jozef IJsewijn's invaluable *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies*, published originally in 1977, and revised and reprinted in two parts (the first in 1990; the second, with Dirk Sacré, in 1998). But the *Companion*, for all its undoubted scope and authority, is essentially the work of an individual, remains on a relatively small scale (for a handbook to such a large and varied field), and is already outdated. Most importantly, it is markedly hard to get hold of.

*Brill's Encyclopaedia* is a second major work, also in two volumes, although the two parts are conceived quite differently from IJsewijn's pair. Volume I, the *Macropaedia*, consists of sixty-six substantial chapters, of between four and twenty-five double-columned pages, arranged in twelve sections (plus some handsome colour illustrations at the end); Volume II, the *Micropaedia*, is a slimmer work of 324 pages—including separate indices of names and place names—and contains 145 shorter entries (of mostly one to four pages) on topics, individuals, and specific works. Erasmus, for instance, has four separate entries in the *Micropaedia*: "Education—Erasmus," "Erasmus (*The Adagia*)," "Erasmus (*Praise of Folly*)," and "Erasmus (*Theology*)." The full table of contents to both parts is printed at the front of each volume, but the index appears only at the end of volume 2. I note this as a potential hazard for future scholars and students who may end up finding and purchasing only the first volume on the second-hand market.

Aside from sheer scale, the most significant difference from IJsewijn's *Handbook* is that the Brill *Encyclopaedia* is a work of multiple authorship, and even of multiple editorship, with three editors, representing scholarly traditions in the UK, the Netherlands, and the USA, respectively, supervising the contributions of an impressive eighty scholars from around the world. Nevertheless, there has been some attempt to create clarity for the user of the encyclopedia by (in most cases) commissioning the author of a given *Macropaedia* article to write related entries in the *Micropaedia*: so Monique Mund-Dopchie, for instance, has contributed Chapter 60, "Cosmography and Exploration," to the *Macropaedia*, as well as four related entries to the *Micropaedia* (on "Borrowings from Ancient Geography," "Latin Translations of Place Names," "Latin Travel Journals and Guidebooks," and "Latin Vocabulary for New World Phenomena"). This is by and large a strength of the work: major and more minor entries are cross-referenced and complement each other, and it helps to avoid much repetition between the volumes. It is also an effective use of expertise, especially in the most highly specialized areas, although sometimes I felt that the choice of *Micropaedia* entries had been guided perhaps too much by the suggestions of related *Macropaedia* authors. Any future editions, or updates to the digital edition, could perhaps expand the *Micropaedia* in particular.

There are only occasional instances where contributions seem wrongly allocated: Dirk Sacre's fascinating *Micropaedia* essay on "Inscriptions," for instance, is disproportionately long, while I thought the two excellent entries on "Occasional Poetry: Theory" (by Susanna de Beer) and "Occasional Poetry: Practice" (by Ingrid A. R. De Smet) in the *Micropaedia* underserve a mode of poetic production that forms such a large part of the extant Neo-Latin record and that could usefully have been discussed in the *Macropaedia*. My sense is that the *Macropaedia* may prove more durable than its companion volume, but I enjoyed and learnt from both enormously, and the sheer range of the *Micropaedia* gives an exciting impression of the variety and vitality of the field.

The choice of essays and entries, as well as the decisions about divisions between *Macro-* and *Micropaedia*, represents an assessment of the field as a whole and sets out for graduate students and junior

scholars a sense of the principal areas of research. This impression operates both positively and negatively: the recent strength and sophistication of scholarship on Renaissance and early-modern print culture is reflected in an excellent and very varied seven chapters in Part II of the *Macropaedia*: “Latin and Printing,” plus an additional eight directly relevant entries in the *Micropaedia* (on “Print and Pedagogy” and on seven separate “Printing Centres”). Similarly, lively recent work on the relationship between Latin and the vernacular is reflected in a dedicated section in the *Macropaedia* (albeit of only two chapters), plus two further related *Micropaedia* entries. One of these is on “Latin Translations from the Vernacular in Early Modern Science,” and the *Encyclopaedia* reflects the greatly increased interest in Neo-Latin within intellectual culture as a whole, devoting dedicated sections of the *Macropaedia* to Latin and the Arts, Latin and Philosophy, Latin and the Sciences, Latin and the Church, and Latin and Law (Parts V-IX respectively). A sign of the increasing maturity of the discipline is the inclusion of one *Macropaedia* article (“History of Neo-Latin Studies,” by Demmy Verbeke, comprising its own Section XII) and three *Micropaedia* entries devoted to the history of the discipline and its scholarly pioneers.

In terms of Neo-Latin literature, the *Encyclopaedia* appears to resist both the creation of a literary canon of particular authors and works, and perhaps even the centrality of literature to the discipline at all: the editors themselves note in their preface that in terms of proportions, their volume is much less centrally concerned with literature than IJsewijn’s *Companion*, and the selection of entries in the *Micropaedia* in particular seems to suggest an attempt to avoid canon-creation by relatively sparing use of single-author entries. Of the twenty-three authors who do receive a named entry, many—such as Calvin, Descartes, Erasmus, Gassendi, Spinoza, Valla, and Vives—are not principally, or not only, considered literary authors. Of entries dedicated to single texts, of which there are very few, only Erasmus’s *Praise of Folly* is generally treated as a literary work.

Another possible instance of tacit agenda-setting can be found in the relative paucity of material focusing on classical imitation: aside from a brief *Macropaedia* chapter on the topic (“Neo-Latin Literary Genres and the Classical Tradition,” by Jan Bloemendal) and

the introductions to many of the chapters on individual genres, the treatment of this—traditionally central—aspect of Neo-Latin studies is confined to a rather eclectic set of *Micropaedia* entries, including: “Borrowings from Ancient Geography” (Monique Mund-Dopchie), “The Greek Anthology” (Harry Stevenson), “Lucretius—Editions and Commentaries” (Jill Kraye), “Neo-Latin Supplements to Classical Latin Works” (Craig Kallendorf), “Pliny (on Art)” (Maia Wellington Gahtan), “Seneca’s Philosophical Works—Editions and Commentaries” (Jill Kraye, but no corresponding entry on the drama), “Terence as a School Text: Commentaries” (Jan Bloemendal), and “Virgilianism” (Craig Kallendorf). Readers interested in the influence of such major authors as Horace, Ovid, and Cicero who wrote across multiple genres—as well as those considered more minor today who were widely imitated in the Renaissance, such as Martial and Statius—have to consult the index alongside obviously relevant generic chapters. I do not consider this a weakness of the project as a whole, since it encourages us to approach Neo-Latin works on their own terms and in a broader intellectual context, but it amounts to an interpretation of the field and it certainly makes some aspects of classical reception (such as that of Lucretius, very well represented throughout the *Encyclopaedia*) more prominent than others (such as that of Statius’s *Sylvae* or Senecan tragedy).

Inevitably, every reader will find different strengths or weaknesses depending on their own interests and areas of expertise. As mentioned above, the choice of individual authors for *Micropaedia* entries is fairly limited, and sometimes seems uneven: Bembo, for instance, receives an entry of his own, but neither Pontano nor Sannazaro do (characteristically, there is instead a relevant entry for “Humanist Centres—Naples,” although the Bembo entry does not refer us to it). On the whole, both discussion and choice of entries reflects a particular interest in northern European Latinity—not after all unreasonable in a Brill publication—alongside fascinating work, once again reflecting recent scholarship, on Neo-Latin writing in Eastern Europe, the Ottoman Empire, and the ‘New World.’ After nearly a year of regular use, only a few topics seem to me to be to be truly underserved—for example, the rich Neo-Latin writings of seventeenth-century Britain (my own area of specialization) has largely fallen between the gaps of

two *Micropaedia* entries (both by David A. Porter), one on the “long sixteenth century” and one on “later centuries,” but which really begins seriously in the eighteenth. This is reflected in the index, in which neither George Herbert nor Andrew Marvell appears (though Marvell is in fact mentioned briefly on 869), and John Owen—an epigrammatist read enthusiastically across Europe—receives only two passing mentions. (I also found a few errors in the index, though this is hardly surprising in so large a project.)

But these are minor cavils. *Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Neo-Latin World* is a splendid resource and will be of enormous benefit to everyone working in this field, as well as—perhaps even more so—to many students and scholars of the Renaissance and early modern period who do not consider themselves Neo-Latinists. Immediately upon publication it has become the inevitable starting-point for any fresh project, and an essential purchase for research libraries. Which leads me to my only serious complaint: at just under \$500 (just under 400 euros, somewhat over £300) it is prohibitively expensive, and many scholars who would wish to own it will instead have to wait hopefully for their libraries to acquire it. (Victoria Moul, King's College, London)

◆ *After Civic Humanism: Learning and Politics in Renaissance Italy*. Edited by Nicholas Scott Baker and Brian Jeffrey Maxson. Publications of the Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, Essays and Studies, 35. Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2015. 297 pp. \$34.95. It is not often that a direct line can be traced between a series of Neo-Latin texts and an idea that has endured through to modern times, affecting profoundly the broader development of western culture, but that is what has happened with the concept of civic humanism. The term has its origins in the work of Hans Baron, an émigré German scholar whose *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance* (Princeton, 1955, revised edition 1966) is regularly cited as one of the most influential books in its field from the twentieth century. In this book Baron argued that the crisis caused by the invasion of Giangaleazzo Visconti caused the disparate elements of Florentine intellectual life to fuse into a civic activism that was rooted in the reception of republican texts from ancient Greece and Rome. In the half century since its appearance, *The Crisis* has been challenged

on a number of fronts, especially for the dating of key Neo-Latin texts by Leonardo Bruni and others on which the details of its argument rest, but the ideal of a commitment to the active political life under the influence of classical models has endured into the writings of the so-called 'Cambridge school,' in which historians like John G. A. Pocock and Quentin Skinner have posited an 'Atlantic Republican Tradition' that flowed through seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England into the American revolution.

*After Civic Humanism* collects a number of essays that begin with Baron's concept and examine where scholarship has gone since the fifties. After an introduction by the editors that lays out the issues, Oren Margolis argues that Jacob Burckhardt's classic *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy* offers a roadmap for a renewed focus on the practical political nature of many humanist texts, and Christopher Celenza ties humanist discussions about the mutability of language to the intellectual chain forged by Pocock and Skinner. Two essays by Alexander Lee and Lorenza Tromboni on the fourteenth century push from Baron's focus on Latin texts that deal with republicanism to suggest that Albertino Mussato's defense of Paduan liberty unfolded within an imperial paradigm and that the vernacular translation of Marsilio of Padua's *Defensor pacis* had a greater influence on Florentine intellectual life than has previously been recognized. Four essays on the fifteenth century nuance Baron's original treatment of this period: Brian Jeffrey Maxson shows how ritual and magic derived from their original context provide an important overlay to the republican ideals expressed in the humanist orations that were delivered when a Florentine mercenary captain took command of his troops, Elizabeth McCahill shows how humanists in Rome explored a variety of political issues, Gary Ianziti traces the spread of the politicized history written by Leonardo Bruni to Pier Candido Decembrio and other humanists working in Milan, and Jenifer Cavalli explores how female consorts used humanist learning to expand and solidify their political power. The last four essays extend into the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. John Gagné shows how the Milanese and French negotiated competing political languages during the French invasion, Nicholas Scott Baker examines how writing history became a political act for the exiled Florentine republican Jacopo Nardi, Mark Jurdjevic argues

that the *Florentine Histories* reveal a continuing republican sentiment in the enigmatic Machiavelli, and Edward Muir shows how Paolo Sarpi's secular treatment of civic humanist themes extends beyond the well-known works studied by William Bouwsma to the lesser-known material as well.

The theme that emerges from these essays is that the connection between humanism and politics in Renaissance Italy is multifaceted and nuanced. Baron's civic paradigm retains its heuristic value, but as one of several modes that explain the interaction between learning and politics in Italy between 1300 and 1650. This is in line with the general scholarly movement of the last half century, which eschews single-model explanations in favor of a more supple analysis that emphasizes diversity and complexity. Within this context Baron's model emerges in a diminished form, but it remains alive and well, unlike many other fifty-year-old scholarly paradigms. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Reading Lucretius in the Renaissance*. By Ada Palmer. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014. 416 pp. \$39.95. *Reading Lucretius in the Renaissance* is the latest in a recent outpouring of scholarly contributions to the reception of Lucretius in early modern Europe. Following in the wake of Gerard Paul Passannante's *The Lucretian Renaissance* (2011), Stephen Greenblatt's *The Swerve* (2011), Alison Brown's *The Return of Lucretius to Renaissance Florence* (2010), and Valentina Prosperi's *Di soavi licor gli orli del vaso* (2004), Ada Palmer takes a hitherto untried tack, approaching the topic through a deft combination of the history of the book and reading, the reception of the classical tradition, and the history of ideas writ large. The main question she sets out to answer is how a work as full of strange, radical, heterodox ideas as *De rerum natura* managed to survive—indeed to flourish—in the Renaissance, especially considering that, in the seventeenth century and beyond, it was bound to have such a revolutionary impact on modern science, religion, and philosophy. Palmer's ingenious method for solving this inveterate mystery is to trace the way *DNR* was read, and thus how it was understood, from its rediscovery by Poggio Bracciolini in 1417 until the later sixteenth century, when the poem was devoured by one of its most profound

readers ever, Michel de Montaigne. What she concludes is nothing short of extraordinary: Lucretius survived the first precarious sesquicentury of his second life not because of his ideas but in spite of them, that is by being magnificently misunderstood—and in the most harmless way possible.

Palmer gains access to how Renaissance readers understood Lucretius via a meticulous investigation of the marks they left in extant manuscripts, incunables, and other early print editions. She directs her vigilant eye to marginalia, which indicate which parts of the text interested readers most and what they thought about them, as well as to paratexts like biographies, letters *ad lectorem*, and commentaries, which reflect the views of reader-editors and which guided other readers' perceptions of the text and its author. A painstaking collation of these reader responses shows that the portions of *DNR* that modern readers find so interesting, the parts that could fuel skepticism, deism, and atheism (which Palmer refers to heuristically as Lucretius's "proto-atheist arguments" [23-32]), were largely ignored until the second half of the sixteenth-century—not, Palmer convincingly argues, because they were seen as particularly dangerous or wrong-headed but because they were not considered interesting at all.

Instead, for over a century most readers of *DNR*—and there were conspicuously many—approached it, as they approached ancient sources in general, primarily as a corrupt text in need of emendation, as a lesson in unfamiliar vocabulary, as a stylistic model, and as a treasury of moral *sententiae* and of notabilia about the ancient world. This overwhelmingly linguistic, erudite, and moral reading agenda "acted as a filter that dominated the reading experience and thereby limited the capacity of atomism, and other unorthodox scientific theories, to circulate in Renaissance Europe even as the texts that contained them circulated broadly" (6). In a nutshell, the danger inherent in *DNR* was hidden in plain sight, effectively non-existent because it was not noticed. Only a few incisive minds, most notable among them Machiavelli, cared much about atomism or tried to grasp it. And therefore, a conveyer of odious ideas was diffused and even promoted by individuals who would have been horrified if only they had been more aware of its content.

This all changed in the decades after 1550, as a reliable text became readily available, as lexical issues were exhaustively pretreated in vast commentaries, and as general reader interest shifted from moral to natural philosophy, in line with the emergence of skepticism and material science as major intellectual concerns. Furthermore, Lucretius's ideas finally attracted interest because they were capable at last of being comprehended by a broader audience, thanks to the massive effort humanists had previously devoted to emending and explaining the text. Now many readers could and did engage seriously with Lucretius's atomism, his scientific arguments, and his proto-atheist ideas. "A new type of reading is occurring in the later sixteenth century, one that values content over form. Earlier readers came to Lucretius to restore this great ancient poet; later readers came to use him" (231).

One of Palmer's more thought-provoking conclusions is that this trajectory is indicative of a broader trend in the *fortuna* of classical sources: "Recovered texts enjoyed two waves of Renaissance reception, one in which they reached a limited audience of skilled philologists, the majority of whom spent nine-tenths of their energy on repair and one-tenth on digesting the ideas, and a second in which the poem's content penetrated far more broadly, and more easily" (236). What was ultimately the upshot for Lucretius's ideas? In Palmer's view, although the poet's notorious rejection of Providence and the immortal soul can in fact be linked to the development of atheism, "his materialism and the mitigated skepticism (as opposed to Pyrrhonism) of his weak empiricism would prove much more important to the development of modern thought" (238-39). The true intellectual heirs of Lucretius are not closet atheism but Montaigne's moderate skepticism, Gassendi's Christian atomism, Bayle's theism, and the notion of provisional belief that underlies the scientific method. This kind of *longue durée* intellectual history is Palmer's strongest suit.

Not every aspect of this study is as sweet as a structure made up exclusively of smooth-surfaced atoms. Palmer occasionally plays on the boundary of bibliographic excess, indulging in overwhelming lists, slightly wishful quantification, and overzealous codicological description. Consequently, important observations can get lost in the glut of information, and I found it difficult to keep the various manuscript traditions and printed editions straight in my mind. Yet the reader

would be wise to follow Palmer on the *semita herbescens*, as she almost always draws important conclusions from her arduous investigations. Indeed, what makes this book so valuable, so exemplary, is that it uses the micro-tools of book history to answer broader, more significant questions. Thus by painstakingly reconstructing the varying attention Renaissance readers paid to Lucretius's most dangerous ideas, Palmer makes a major and novel contribution to the history of science and the vexed issue of unbelief in an age of faith and persecution.

One question that was never answered to my satisfaction, however, is to what extent Lucretius's first Renaissance readers would have been able to understand the complex content of books two and three of *DNR*, which are the main sources for his atomism and other heterodox ideas, and which tend to befuddle even the modern reader abetted by translations, commentaries, and centuries of scholarship. What did Poggio Bracciolini or Niccolò Niccoli, or the other early Quattrocento humanists among whom the still-garbled manuscript circulated, think this poem was supposed to be about? Did they have the resources—cultural, intellectual, lexical—to make sense of it? At one point Palmer asserts that “understanding Lucretius's atomist system was certainly possible in 1417,” but she does not satisfactorily substantiate this rather important claim. I cannot help but wonder whether books two and three received so little attention in the manuscript tradition simply because they were undecipherable to most if not all early readers.

This having been said, *Reading Lucretius in the Renaissance* remains a smart, innovative methodological model and a first-rate contribution to research on Lucretius, humanism, and the transformative reception of the classical tradition. No less important, perhaps, it is graced by a rare stylistic elegance; it is a testament, in Lucretian terms, to the power of eloquence to honey-coat the edifying wormwood of erudite scholarship. (Patrick Baker, Humboldt University, Berlin)

◆ *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum. Medieval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries.* Greti Dinkova-Bruun, Editor in Chief; James Hankins and Robert A. Kaster, Associate Editors. Vol. 10. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2014. 403 pp. \$95. The series founded in 1964 by Paul

Oskar Kristeller has reached the tenth volume, so enriching a tool long since indispensable for the scholars of the classical tradition in the West during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. The volume is dedicated to the memory of Virginia Brown, Editor in Chief of the series from 1992 until her untimely death in 2009. The volume deals with four Greek authors (Pindar, Aelianus Tacticus, Musaeus, and Agathias) and a Latin one, Aulus Gellius. As usual, each entry is introduced by an outline of the *fortuna* of the author, from antiquity to the present day. In the chapters that follow, the translations and the commentaries of the individual works are then usually examined in chronological order.

The long entry on the poet Pindar is by Francesco Tissoni (1-125), who published, in 2009, a book on Pindar's reception in Theodore Gaza's school in Ferrara. In the *fortuna* Tissoni debates the value of the ancient biographies of Pindar and outlines the reception of this author in Hellenistic, Latin, and Byzantine literatures. Known only by name in the West during the Middle Ages, Pindar was rediscovered by the humanists: the surviving *Epinicia* was circulating in Italy in the first decades of the fifteenth century (manuscripts of Pindar were available to Guarinus of Verona, John Aurispa, and Franciscus Filelfus). Tissoni lists seventeen translations (from Gaza to Aemilius Portus) and nine commentaries (from that of Gaza on the *Olympians* to the excerpts published by David Kochhaffe in 1596). A section is reserved for the fragments, edited and translated in 1560 by Henri Estienne.

The *Tactica theoria* by Aelianus Tacticus is a military handbook dedicated to the Emperor Trajan; the author was a Greek supposedly living in Rome. The features of the treatise and its ancient reception are outlined by Silvia Fiaschi (127-63). The work was brought from Byzantium to Italy by the humanist John Aurispa. The same Aurispa translated it into Latin, dedicating this and other translations of military works to the King of Naples, Alfonso of Aragon (although the translation is lost). Aelianus was then translated by Theodore Gaza (1455-56, at the court of Naples), Francesco Robortello (1552, together with the *editio princeps* of the Greek text), and Sixtus Arcerius (1613). Fiaschi also gives a list of the editions from 1494 (translation of Gaza) to 1670.

The third Greek author treated in the book is Musaeus, a poet who lived in the second half of the fifth century. The reception of his work is examined by Paolo Eleuteri (165-238), who published, in 1982 (with E. Livrea), the Teubner edition of this poet's work, the 343-line hexameter *epyllion* on Hero and Leander. The poem was well known in the Byzantine Middle Ages and was readily accepted by humanistic culture, thanks to the popularity of the tale of Hero and Leander, told by Ovid and other Latin authors. Twenty-seven Greek manuscripts were produced in this period, from an original perhaps owned by Cardinal Bessarion. The first printed edition of the Greek text was published in Florence in 1494. The first Latin translation was that in hexameters written by Aldus Manutius and published by him in 1498. The other printed translations examined by Eleuteri are those of Guillaume de la Mare (1511), Andreas Papius (1575), Fabius Paolinus (1587), Eilhardus Lubinus (1595), and Florens Christianus (1608). Other Latin translations of Musaeus remained unpublished (or were published in recent times), by Benedictus Jovius (brother of the historian Paolo), Iohannes Baptista Montanus, Kaspar Schütz, William Gager, and William Croft. The first commentary on Musaeus was published in 1514 by Jean Vitel. Notes on Musaeus were also written by the already-mentioned Andrea Papius and William Croft (unpublished). Eleuteri gives a very accurate bibliography of the editions of Musaeus's work, along with information about the vernacular translations and adaptations up to *ca.* 1750.

Agathias was a poet and historian who lived in the sixth century. The chapter on this author is by Réka Forrai (239-72). Agathias's ninety-nine epigrams were included in the *Greek Anthology* collected by Constantine Cephalas in the tenth century. The anthology ended up in two separate collections, the *Anthologia Planudea* put together in 1299 by Maximus Planudes, and the *Anthologia Palatina* published only in the nineteenth century. Forrai records the first editions of the *Planudea* and gives a list of twenty-nine translators of one or more epigrams. The most popular of the Agathian poems is the epigram X.69 on death, of which there remain ten different Latin translations.

As an historian Agathias wrote a continuation of the *Wars* by Procopius, covering in five books the events of the years 552-559. A Latin translation of the *History* was made in 1481 by Christophorus Persona

(the Prior of Santa Balbina in Rome) and published in 1516. Commentaries on Agathias were published by Adriaen de Jonghe (1556), Bonaventura de Smet (1594), and Johannes Löwenklau (1576). The first edition of the Greek text was printed in Leiden in 1594, with a new Latin translation made by Bonaventura de Smet.

The chapter on Aulus Gellius is by Leofranc Holford-Strevens (273-329), who has written several studies and essays on this author. In the *fortuna* he gives a detailed history of Gellius's textual transmission and reception from antiquity to the present time. The chapter includes a list of the editions of the *Noctes Atticae* from the *editio princeps* (1469) up to 1998. The first translation into vernacular Italian is that by Bartolomeo da San Concordio (1601); Holford-Strevens gives a survey of the translations in several languages until 2009, and of the commentaries from the fifteenth century up to 2012.

The volume also contains corrections and additions to several previous entries in the series. Lucretius, published in vol. 2 (1971) by W. B. Fleischman, is updated by Ada Palmer (331-56). The entry on Dionysius Periegetes (by G. B. Parks and F. E. Cranz, vol. 3, 1976) is updated by Didier Marcotte (357-73), and the one on Sallust by Patricia J. Osmond and Robert W. Ulery, Jr. (375-91), which was published in vol. 8 (2003), is brought up to date here by the same authors.

The volume includes indices of manuscripts and translators and commentators (393-401), the preface by G. Dinkova-Bruun (ix-xiv), the general bibliography of the series (xxiii-xxxiv), and the preface by Kristeller to volume 1 (xv-xxii), whose statements about the aims and methods of the project still remain relevant today. The cover of the volume, illuminated by decorative initials from a manuscript of Agathias, one of the authors dealt with in this book, is very attractive. (Fabio Stok, University of Rome II)

◆ *Neo-Latin and the Humanities. Essays in Honour of Charles E. Fantazzi.* Edited by Luc Deitz, Timothy Kircher, and Jonathan Reid. *Essays and Studies*, 32. Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2014. 289 pp. \$34.95. In February, 2011 a symposium on "Neo-Latin and the Humanities" was given at East Carolina University in honour of Professor Charles Fantazzi; most of the contributions to this book originated there. Fantazzi's work on

Neo-Latin in general and Jean Luis Vives in particular is mirrored in the book and makes it more focused than such collections usually are.

Of special interest is the chapter by James Hankins on “Charles Fantazzi and the Study of Neo-Latin Literature,” because with his survey of the research in Neo-Latin from the sixteenth century to the present, Hankins offers both an introduction to the subject and a proposal of how to characterise its various phases. Thus the essay is a brilliant contribution to the ongoing debate over the ways and means of Neo-Latin research, even though it concentrates almost exclusively on editorial work. A pleasant aspect is Hankins’s enthusiasm: “Neo-Latin philology is in the best condition it has ever been in” (41, a conclusion not shared by all contributors, though; see 270).

In “The Rolls of the Dead and the Intellectual Revival of the Twelfth Century in Francia and Italy,” Ronald G. Witt analyses the French death rolls as reflections of the clerical community that produced them, whereas their absence in the *regnum* south of the Alps reveals a more fragmented clergy there. Timothy Kircher’s “Wrestling with Ulysses: Humanist Translations of Homeric Epic around 1440” is a brilliant study of the early humanists’ theory and practice of translation, exemplified by the competition between Lorenzo Valla, Leonardo Bruni, and Leon Battista Alberti.

With “*Colligite fragmenta: A Neglected Tumulus for Joannes Ludovicus Vives (1492-1540)*,” Jeanine De Landtsheer and Marcus De Schepper bring Professor Fantazzi a very special gift: a manuscript in Berlin containing fifteen funerary poems for Vives, of which seven have not been published before. Vives is also the protagonist in Paul F. Grendler’s “The Attitudes of the Jesuits toward Juan Luis Vives.” Most of the founding Jesuits shared their Spanish background and Parisian education with Vives. We are told a vivid story of how the humanist and Ignatius Loyola met in Bruges in 1529. At the time, they were both not quite forty years of age, but differed in social position: Vives was a successful scholar and teacher, Loyola a penniless student. Grendler moves on to the complicated attitudes the Jesuits in general had to Vives’ work. They disliked his scorn of scholastic philosophy, his criticism of sinful clergy, and especially his commentary on Augustine’s *De civitate Dei*, but could not do without his *Colloquia* in their teaching.

Luc Deitz's "Francesco Patrizi da Cherso on the Nature of Poetry" describes the controversy this scholar had with Aristotle in his unfinished *Della poetica* (volume 1, published 1586) over the philosopher's assertion that Empedocles and Homer were connected only by metre, and that Empedocles was a scientist, not a poet. Deitz's learned discussion brings us right into the middle of one of the most central topics in Renaissance aesthetic theory.

James M. Estes' "The Englishing of Erasmus: The Genesis and Progress of the Correspondence Volumes of the *Collected Works of Erasmus*" and James K. Farge's "Scholasticism, Humanism and the Origins of the Collège de France" tell the histories of these enterprises.

Dustin Mengelkoch's "*Euphonia and Energeia: Jan Bernaerts and Statius's Thebaid*" is a subtle, close reading of Bernaerts's paratexts to his Statius edition, concentrating on how attentive to these almost mystical principles he was in his interaction with Statius's text. By means of examples, Mengelkoch reveals Bernaerts's high ambitions as an editor-critic, participating "in the humanistic enterprise of spreading virtue through education" (228).

In "A Humanist in the New World: Francisco Cervantes de Salazar (c. 1518-75)," Enrique González González gives the biography of an adherent of Vives who composed a commentary to his *Colloquia*. A charming presentation of a trilingual Irish patron is given by Keith Sidwell in "*Laus Butleri: Praising the 10<sup>th</sup> Earl of Ormond in Irish, English, and Latin.*" The volume also contains an introduction, a select bibliography of Fantazzi's works, an eloquent praise of him, and an index. (Minna Skafté Jensen, University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Emerita)

◆ *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Monasteriensis: Proceedings of the Fifteenth International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies (Münster 2012)*. General editors, Astrid Steiner-Weber and Karl A. E. Enenkel. Acta Conventus Neo-Latini, 15. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2015. This, the latest volume of refereed proceedings from the triennial congress of the International Association for Neo-Latin Studies, contains a selection from among the papers delivered at the Münster meeting in 2012. After the conference program and Minna Skafté Jensen's presidential address, the five plenary papers appear: "La diffusione della stampa e la

nascita della filologia,” by Concetta Bianca; “Démonstrations d’amitié et d’humanisme: *alba*, adages et emblèmes chez les petits-enfants d’Érasme,” by Hélène Cazes; “Poems on the Threshold: Neo-Latin *carmina liminaria*,” by Harm-Jan van Dam; “Paradoxie und Ironie in Johann Valentin Andreaes *Christianopolis* (1619),” by Reinhold F. Gleis; and “La *Bibliotheca Mexicana* de Juan José de Eguia y Eguren, obra unificadora de la cultura mexicana,” by Carolina Ponce Hernández.

Next come forty-four regular communications delivered by attendees at the congress: “Les *Poemata* de Johannes Fabricius Montanus: un *Enchiridion vatis Christiani?*” by David Amherdt; “Les implications politiques d’Otto Vaenius dans les Pays-Bas,” by Nathalie de Brézé; “L’*Aegidius* di Giovanni Pontano: l’approdo religioso di un uomo politico,” by Anna Gioia Cantore; “Huellas del Petrarca Latino en la Corona de Aragón entre 1470 y 1520: el caso del Petrarca moral y religioso,” by Alejandro Coroleu; “Lexicographie latine et religion autochtone in Nouvelle-France: à propos de la *Radicum montanarum silva* (1766-1772) du P. Jean-Baptiste de la Brosse,” by Jean-François Cottier; “Philosophy of Friendship in Agricola’s Letters,” by Judith Deitch; “Anna Maria van Schurmann: The Arts of Argumentation and Self-Portraiture,” by Patricia Demers; “The Intercalary Scenes in Joannes Burmeister’s *Aulularia* (1629),” by Michael Fontaine; “Appended Epitaphs,” by Maia Wellington Gahtan; “Religion, the Cosmos, and Counter-Reformation Latin: Athanasius Kircher’s *Itinerarium exstaticum* (1656),” by Jacqueline Glomski; “¿Agostino Netti, *alter ego* de Agostino Vespucci? Cultura humanística y política en la Florencia de inicios del s. XVI,” by Gerard González Germain; “Apuntamientos para un estudio de la difusión de Pico en la España renacentista,” by Felipe González Vega; “Dousa, Johnston, and the Ambivalent Epigram,” by Roger P. H. Green; “*Carmen unisonum*: un manuel d’éthique en vers, composé à l’aube de la réforme catholique en Hongrie,” by László Havas; “Hans Buchler of Gladbach’s *The-saurus conscribendarum epistolarum*: Humanist Epistolary Rhetoric Distilled for Posterity,” by Judith Rice Henderson; “Elizabeth Jane Weston and Her Place in the *Respublica litterarum*,” by Brenda M. Hosington; “La *Bestiarum schola* di Pompeo Sarnelli fra educazione religiosa e cultura politica,” by Antonio Iurilli; “Konstantindramen als habsburgische Festdramen: Solimanis ‘Constantinus victor’ (Prag

1627) und Avancinis 'Pietas victrix' (Wien 1659)," by Angelika Kemper; "Hieronymus Hirnhaim's *De typho generis humani* (1676) and Scepticism about Human Learning," by Sari Kivistö; "Josias Simmlers *De Alpīs commentarius*," by Martin Korenjak; "Clausal Relations and Aristotelian Ontology in Erasmus' *Novum Testamentum*," by John C. Leeds; "*Prolusio academica* und *Programma*; Zwei akademische Textsorten im Vergleich," by Anna Maria Leisgang-Bruckmüller; "Lecturas en los estudios de Latinidad en España: el alcance de la obra de Baptista Mantuano como libro de texto," by Mariano Madrid Castro; "Engelbertus Kaempfer in *Amoenitatibus Exoticis* (1712) quam veras genuinasque cum prioribus Neolatinis Persicarum rerum descriptionibus comparatas obtulerit *Relationes de aulae Persiae statu hodierno*," by Karl August Neuhausen; "Nero as an *exemplum* for James I of England," by Howard R. Norland; "Mythologie und Politik im neulateinischen Epos," by Christian Peters; "International Protestantism and Commemorative Anthologies on the End of the First Anglo-Dutch War," by Lee Piepho; "Sprache und Stil des 'Schweigsamen Historikers' als Anreiz für neulateinische Deutungen," by Franz Römer; "Lumanista senese Francesco Patrizi e la lezione etico-politica degli antichi: il trattato *De institutione reipublicae* (ante 1471)," by Giovanni Rossi; "Jean Dorat poète sacré, d'après un poème inédit," by François Rouget; "*Liberator Germaniae*: Ulrich von Huttens Dialog mit Karl V. im Spiegel seiner politischen Korrespondenz der Jahre 1520-21," by Barbara Sasse Tateo; "*Utra serviet alteri, an Roma Carthagini an Romae Carthago?* Wissenschaft und Religion, Literatur und Politik in Joseph du Baudorys *De novis systematum inventoribus quid sentiendum oratio*," by Sonja M. Schreiner; "Der Astronom Andalò di Negro als Quelle Boccaccios: Die Miniatur des Planatengottes Saturn in Andalos 'Introductorius ad judicia astrologiae' im Prunkcodex Fonds Latin 7272 der Bibliothèque nationale in Paris," by Peter R. Schwertsik; "La realtà 'infernale' nel 'Charon' di Giovanni Pontano," by Margherita Sciancalepore; "Religion and Politics in the Works of Marin Barleti," by Minna Skaftø Jensen; "Sebastian Barradas et la peinture biblique au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle," by Matthieu Somon; "Paul Schede Melissus und der Kronborg-Brunnen," by Nikolaus Thurn; "Politik und Geschichte, Frömmigkeit und literarische Bildung bei Rudolf von Langen (1438-1519): Zum Humanismus in Münster in der zweiten Hälfte des 15.

Jahrhunderts,” by Ulrich Töns; “El *Nucleus historiae ecclesiasticae* (Amsterdam, 1669) de Christoph Sand e los escritos en latín de Isaac Newton sobre historia de la Iglesia (ca. 1680): algunos indicios textuales de su conexión,” by Pablo Toribio Pérez; “Latin Inscriptions by Justus Lipsius in *Alba amicorum*,” by Gilbert Tournoy; “Dialogo alla soglie del paradiso: i modelli dell’*Eremita* di Galateo e la sua fortuna nell’Europa della riforma,” by Sebastiano Valerio; “Los *Apophthegmata* de *Conradus Lycosthenes*: historia editorial,” by Juan J. Valverde Abril; “Thomas Lansius’ *Consultatio de principatu inter provincias Europae* im frühneuzeitlichen Sprach- und Stilunterricht,” by Kristi Viiding; “*Tempus fugit—versiones manent*: D F G Project *Saarbrücker Übersetzungsbibliographie—Latein*,” by Anne Weber; and “*Quinquaginta Rationes*—Fifty Reasons: From an *Opusculum polemicum Tyrnaviense* to a Standard Catholic Book in America,” by Svorad Zavarský. The volume closes with an index of names.

For over forty years now, the proceedings of the IANLS congresses have served as invaluable resources for what is being done in the field of Neo-Latin studies. This one, handsomely produced by Brill, the new publisher, joins its predecessors, even as work begins on the volume from the Vienna congress that just took place. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)