

## NEO-LATIN NEWS

Vol. 66, 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.

◆ *'Moribus antiquis sibi me fecere poetam': Albertino Mussato nel VII centenario dell'incoronazione poetica (Padova 1315-2015)*. Edited by Rino Modonutti and Enrico Zucchi. mediEVI, 15. Florence: SI-SMEL / Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2017. xx + 287 pp. 46 euros. As we all know, for centuries the story that Francesco Petrarca told about himself and the origins of humanism prevailed: the study of antiquity had remained dormant through the centuries of the Dark Ages, but serious interest in and understanding of ancient Greece and Rome returned almost instantaneously in the fourteenth century, thanks to Petrarca. Occasional discussions of figures like Lovato dei Lovati (1240/41-1309) took place within the context of Paduan prehumanism, but since the publication of Ronald Witt's *In the Footsteps of the Ancients: The Origins of Humanism from Lovato to Bruni* (Leiden, 2000), it has become clear that Petrarca actually represents the third generation, not the first, of Italian Renaissance humanists. To be sure, the new movement caught fire with Petrarca and he deserves credit for rocketing it forward to new scholarly and creative heights, but humanism did not spring forth fully formed from his head like Athena from Zeus.

A key figure in this revisionist history is Albertino Mussato (1261-1329), who was the principal second-generation humanist. On December 3, 1315, in an effort to revive what was understood as an

ancient ceremony, Mussato was crowned with laurel, ivy, and myrtle in Padua in recognition of what he had achieved in two works: the *Ecerinis*, a Senecan tragedy whose protagonist, Ezzelino III da Romano, ruled Padua from 1237 to 1256; and *De gestis Henrici septimi Cesaris*, which recounts the Italian journey of emperor Henry VII that ended in his death in 1313. Seven hundred years later a conference was held in Padua in order to examine how Mussato's work was understood at that point. The essays in this volume come from that conference. They have been organized in three sections. The first, "L'incoronazione poetica del 1315," contains three contributions: Gabriella Albanese, "'Poeta et historicus': La laurea di Mussato e Dante"; Giorgio Ronconi, "Echi dell'incoronazione poetica di Alberto Mussato in Dante e Giovanni del Virgilio"; and Giovanna M. Gianola, "L'epistola II e il 'De gestis Henrici VII Cesaris'." Section 2, "Albertino Mussato e le sue opere," offers four essays: Luca Lombardo, "L'edizione critica delle 'Epistole' metriche di Albertino Mussato: il testo, i temi, le fonti (con un'appendice 'dantesca')"; Marino Zabbia, "Note autobiografiche nelle opere di Albertino Mussato"; Rino Modonutti, "Le orazioni nelle 'Storie' di Albertino Mussato"; and Bianca Facchini, "Albertino Mussato: ultime riflessioni sulla poesia." The final section, which contains seven papers on "Il genere tragico, Seneca ed Ezzelino," examines Mussato's best-known work, the *Ecerinis*, and its reception from several different perspectives: Claudia Villa, "Bartolomeo da San Concordio, Trevet, Mussato, Dante (*Inf.* XXXIII). Appunti per le vicende di Seneca tragico nel primo Trecento"; Piermario Vescovo, "'Alta tragedia': Dante, Mussato, Trevet"; Attilio Grisafi, "Forme e temi della tragedia umanistica"; Stefano Giazzon, "'Ezzelino' (1739): sulla prima traduzione italiana della tragedia di Albertino Mussato"; Enrico Zucchi, "La fortuna dell' 'Ecerinis' e la figura di Ezzelino nella tragedia del Settecento"; Stefano Verdino, "Tra gli Ezzelini dell'Ottocento"; and Luca Morlino, "'Per svegliar Mussato'. Le traduzioni italiane dell' 'Ecerinide', Manlio Torquato Dazzi e Ezra Pound."

I must say that when I began work in this area some forty years ago, I knew who Mussato was but I could never have imagined an entire collection of essays devoted to him and his works. Thanks in good part to Witt's prize-winning book, a new understanding of the origins of humanism has emerged, which has helped to restore Mussato to the

position of cultural prominence that he deserves. This conference and its proceedings stand as a fitting record of this development. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Plato's Persona: Marsilio Ficino, Renaissance Humanism, and Platonic Traditions*. By Denis J.-J. Robichaud. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018. 344 pp. \$79.95. Anyone who knows anything about Renaissance humanism knows that Marsilio Ficino published the first complete Latin translation of Plato's dialogues, wrote a huge tome that tried to reorient theology by aligning it with the Platonic tradition, and played a central role in the Platonic Academy of Renaissance Florence. Yet there are significant obstacles to studying Ficino. Like anyone who wrote in Latin, he threatens to overwhelm the modern scholar who by definition is not as comfortable in the language as the Renaissance intelligentsia was, and the language problem is complicated by the fact that Ficino was a scholar of Greek as well. A good amount of material survives that can allow us to reconstruct his work habits, but here the language problem is exacerbated by the need to read drafts and comments in crabbed hands on manuscripts that resist scrutiny even when they are studied in person, much less in reproduction. In Ficino's case, simply the amount that he wrote has discouraged all but the most intrepid scholars from wading into a flood of material that threatens to overwhelm the investigator. In *Plato's Persona*, Robichaud takes his place alongside Chastel, Kristeller, and Allen as one of the new generation's leading Ficino specialists.

He does this by attempting something that has not been done before, "writing a single volume analyzing Ficino's hermeneutics for understanding the Platonic corpus as a whole" (341). To do this, Robichaud focuses on the role of personae, arguing that Ficino fashions a humanist rhetorical persona for himself as a Platonic philosopher and interprets the dialogues by extracting and analyzing the three voices—Socratic, Pythagorean, and Platonic—through which Plato speaks in his dialogues. While modern scholars have often used a developmental approach, with the idea that Plato's ideas evolved over time, Ficino sought to interpret Plato's dialogues as a coherent corpus. Later scholars like Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834) proposed that the authentic Plato can only be recovered from within his writings, but

Ficino went in a different direction by placing Plato into a tradition and reading him in relation to Iamblichus, Proclus, Plotinus, Porphyry, Hermias, and Pseudo-Dionysius. By working in this way, Robichaud is able to demonstrate that Iamblichus's *De secta Pythagorica* played a greater role in Ficino's thought than had previously been understood. He is also able to nuance Ficino's relationship to Augustine in an important way. As Robichaud notes, "Augustine's attitude marginalizes Platonism as a whole even as he makes his study of the 'books of the Platonists' the crucial propaedeutic for his conversion to Christianity" (21). Yet while Augustine sought to appropriate from Plato what was compatible with Christianity and discard the rest, Ficino did not see the birth of Christ as a fundamental break in history between pagan philosophy and Christian revelation, but instead placed Christianity among the other philosophical schools that postulate the existence of God and the human soul.

*Plato's Persona* is a work of serious scholarship that gives us a Ficino for our time. For one thing, it challenges the humanist claims of a clean break with the barbarism of the Middle Ages by demonstrating that Ficino's work demonstrates a continuity with medieval thought, especially with such authorities as Boethius, Aquinas, and Pseudo-Dionysius. We are coming to understand now that he is not alone in this. Robichaud also helps us understand that our own interpretation of Plato does not exist in a timeless vacuum, but takes its place at the end of a chain of previous interpretations that begins in late antiquity, extends through the Renaissance, and ends with us. This approach adds a new urgency to the role of history within the discipline of philosophy and parallels the growth of reception studies in the more literary-oriented part of the classical tradition. Finally I would like to commend Robichaud for writing a book that is refreshingly clear and easy to follow. Ficino's writings are dense, and they seem to have attracted modern scholars who do not always succeed in offering a clear 'through line' as they unpack an admittedly challenging source. Robichaud has avoided this problem nicely, which makes it unusually easy and pleasant to recommend this book to anyone with a serious interest in Renaissance Platonism. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Erasmus and Calvin on the Foolishness of God: Reason and Emotion in Christian Philosophy*. By Kirk Essary. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017. xx + 278 pp. \$80.00. In the early decades of the Reformation, Erasmus was often the elephant in the room. An accomplished biblical scholar well prior to the Reformation, he published the Greek New Testament with a new and controversial Latin translation, followed that with provocative annotations and biblical paraphrases, and prepared numerous patristic editions. The sometime friend of many reformers, he was just as often an adversary. An advocate for a reformist Catholicism, he never joined the Protestant cause—yet, long after his death, the legacy of Erasmus would haunt the work and texts of reformers all across Europe, John Calvin not least of all.

In a revision of his 2014 dissertation at Florida State University, Kirk Essary attempts to probe Erasmus' convoluted legacy for Protestant biblical scholarship as well as the larger question of how the philosophy of biblical and humanist scholarship in the sixteenth century departed from prevailing scholastic models. Essary's study is constructed cogently, even cleverly. Obviously an exhaustive comparison of the writings of Erasmus and Calvin would be unworkable. Essary rather situates his project within the limits of two intersecting lines of inquiry: the exegesis of the Pauline motif of "God's foolishness" in Erasmus and Calvin, as expounded largely in the opening chapters of 1 Corinthians; and their appropriation of this same theme as part of a larger "Christian philosophy" that discloses their "approaches to Christian preaching" as well as their "conceptions of religious knowing and feeling" (xv). The topic of folly provides especially effective access to Erasmus, whose well-known *Praise of Folly* was but one of his many writings that took up this theme.

Accordingly, several chapters trace various aspects of the foolishness of God and of the gospel message through 1 Corinthians, addressing implications for religious epistemology, for eloquence and rhetoric, and for rhetorical and theological accommodation. Two further chapters examine, in turn, the implications of Paul's seeming dismissal of philosophy in Colossians 2:8, and the legitimate place of emotions in Christian knowing and living—an arguably anti-Stoic emphasis embraced by both Erasmus and Calvin. The latter topic retains the book's exegetical focus by examining the reception history of Jesus'

fear in Gethsemane and the emotions he allegedly expressed earlier, at the raising of Lazarus. Erasmus and Calvin occupy center stage throughout, but Essary attends also to figures who may well have been influences or conversation partners along the way, including Philip Melanchthon, Heinrich Bullinger, and Konrad Pellican. (Here one may wonder if Pellican is not a rather barren candidate, insofar as his commentaries on the epistles are routinely a pastiche derived from Erasmus, Bullinger, Chrysostom, and others, which would appear to diminish the evidentiary value of Pellican “repeating” Erasmus.)

The argument through most chapters consists largely of a serial comparison of biblical passages and regularly interacts with others who have explored or contested how to read the Reformation’s humanist roots. Essary’s prose, however, is not always an easy read, given his penchant for parenthetical constructions and vague reference, and the views and arguments of his modern interlocutors are occasionally dismissed or demeaned too cursorily. Still, such flaws notwithstanding, Essary appropriately corrects many caricatured comparisons of Erasmus and Calvin—such as “the oft-repeated theme in Protestant historiography” that Erasmus was “merely a moral theologian” (123)—and does so with more than ample evidence. Indeed, one of the highlights of the book is the way Erasmus’ own theology and piety shine forth with impressive fervor and substance. Another highlight emerges from Essary truly having given his sources the “close reading” that he promised, such that Calvin’s tacit indebtedness to Erasmus for matters of both form and substance is identified over and over again—in instances sufficiently numerous that this reviewer would have appreciated an appendix to tabulate and categorize Calvin’s dependencies. Nonetheless, Essary’s book ought to change the way many have read Erasmus, as well as the way many have insufficiently gauged Calvin’s literary relationship to Erasmus. (John L. Thompson, Fuller Theological Seminary)

◆ *Paraphrase on Luke 1-10*. By Desiderius Erasmus. Translated and annotated by Jane E. Phillips, preface by Robert D. Sider. *Collected Works of Erasmus*, 47. Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 2016. xix + 316 pp. \$170. *The Correspondence of Erasmus: Letters 2357-2471*. By Desiderius Erasmus. Annotated by

James M. Estes, translated by Charles Fantazzi. *Collected Works of Erasmus*, 17. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 2016. xviii + 392 pp. \$180. *Opera omnia: recognita et adnotatione critica instructa notisque illustrata*. By Desiderius Erasmus. Ordo IV, volume 7: *Declamatiuncula*. Edited by Terence Tunberg. *Isocratis ad Nicoclem regem de institutione principis*. Edited by Lucia Gualdo Rosa. *Epistola consolatoria in adversis*. Edited by Edwin Rabbie. *Oratio de pace et discordia, Oratio funebris*. Edited by Marc van der Poel. *Xenophontis rhetoris Hieron sive tyrannus*. Edited by Jeroen De Keyser. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2017. 250 pp. \$149.

These three volumes advance two of the most ambitious, long-standing, and comprehensive international publishing initiatives of our times, one based in Amsterdam and the other in Toronto. In the best spirit of a new *respublica litteraria*, scholars from many national, linguistic, and disciplinary backgrounds have brought us closer to a critical edition of Desiderius Erasmus' (ca. 1469-1536) *Opera omnia*, known as ASD, and to annotated English translations of his complete works (*Collected Works of Erasmus*, or CWE). The spirit of cooperation towards a common goal is evident, not just in the variety of names appearing on title pages, but also in the broad network of scholars mentioned in acknowledgements and notes.

Jane Phillips' translation and annotation of the first half of Erasmus' *Paraphrase on Luke*, first published in 1523 as part of the humanist's effort to adapt New Testament texts for the sixteenth-century reader, brings to completion the series of CWE volumes dedicated to his *Paraphrases*. It precedes by one year the critical edition of the Latin text, published in December 2017 in the ASD series, and succeeds by more than ten years the publication of its companion volume in CWE. This is Phillips' third contribution to that series, and as in previous instances she renders Erasmus' Latin in clear, readable prose that takes into account his ability to interweave varied modes of expression. Her rich annotations make Erasmus' paraphrase, itself an accommodation of a different sort, accessible to modern scholars. As outlined in her translator's note, Phillips is especially attentive to four types of annotations: notes that show how Erasmus applied his knowledge of classical literature and Scripture to enliven the text; notes that situate Erasmus' Biblical interpretation within an exegeti-

cal tradition; references to Erasmus' other writings, particularly his *Annotations*; and notes explaining which parts of the text were subject to criticism by contemporaries, what those criticisms were, and how Erasmus responded to them. Perhaps because the ASD critical edition of this work was not yet available, Phillips also provides abundant commentary on Erasmus' Latin word usage. This reader appreciated the decision to employ footnotes instead of endnotes, a format that greatly facilitates use of the work for scholarly purposes, even if the notes sometimes tend to overwhelm by their sheer volume the paraphrase itself.

In line with a practice begun in earlier volumes of the series, the *Paraphrase on Luke 1-10* contains an "Index of Greek and Latin Words Cited" that allows readers to zero in on how Erasmus uses key terms in his hermeneutical vocabulary, such as *fides* or *sermo*. This index is considerably fuller than some of those accompanying other volumes of the series, but other indices that certain scholars might have found useful are absent. For example, there is no index of classical or patristic and medieval references as in some of the other *Paraphrases*. The reader may be surprised to discover that neither Robert Sider (General Editor of all New Testament scholarship in the CWE), nor Philipps in her translator's note, covers some of the typical topics one might expect in prefatory material, such as the genesis of the *Paraphrase on Luke* or the particular features that distinguish it from other *Paraphrases* in the series. Readers are, however, invited to consult Sider's excellent introduction to the whole series of *Paraphrases* that appears in volume 42 of the CWE, and of course now one also has access to the ASD edition. Sider does offer a brief but interesting retrospective on how the project has evolved since its inception and reflects on what a monumental achievement it is to have produced annotated English translations of all of Erasmus' *Paraphrases*. Indeed!

If Erasmus trumpets the victorious march and rapid spreading of the Gospels in his dedicatory epistle to the *Paraphrase on Luke*, the letters collected in CWE 17, which cover the period from August 1530 to March 1531, sound a more somber tone overall. With the Empire on the verge of religious war, the threat of a Turkish invasion on the rise, and renewed disputes with old adversaries, the humanist is faced with the fragmentation of Christendom and continued accusations



from both reformers and conservatives. Although he prudently did not attend in person, Erasmus offers us valuable insight into the happenings at the 1530 Diet of Augsburg, organized by Charles V in an attempt to achieve religious reconciliation within the Empire, and its ultimate failure. The volume's translator, Charles Fantazzi, gives us a lively version of Erasmus' prose, one that captures in turn his moments of despair or defensiveness, the *festivitas* of his epistolary exchanges with like-minded humanists, and the reverence with which he writes about early religious texts. The task of annotating this sequence of letters was made more complex by the fact that, for the first time in the CWE correspondence series, the source text was not seen to press by P. S. Allen, who edited an authoritative critical edition of Erasmus' letters in the early twentieth century (*Opus epistolarum*, 1906-1958), but by his widow, H. M. Allen, and their longtime collaborator H. W. Garrod. As a consequence, James Estes and the various specialists on whom he relied for assistance were more active in augmenting or correcting the notes found in the source volumes. The product of their work is an apparatus that effectively highlights a wide array of literary, historical, and polemical aspects of the letters. Estes proves especially adept at identifying and clarifying the way in which Erasmus, and often his correspondents, deploy adages and other classical references to enliven their epistles and strengthen their intellectual bonds. Preceding each letter there is a brief note that specifies from which manuscript it is drawn and where it was initially published. When addressees have not yet figured in previous volumes in the series, Estes adds biographical information, and when appropriate he engages in a more detailed discussion of an epistle's contents.

Representing the forty-ninth volume to have been published in the collection, ASD IV-7 contains critical editions of six short works belonging to the fourth "ordo" of Erasmus' *opera*, the one which relates to moral instruction. As is invariably the case with the ASD, the volume is of the highest quality, and the editorial board has assembled an impressive team of scholars. Each work is preceded by an introduction detailing the editorial history of the text and the context for its composition. In many cases these introductions also contribute insightful analyses on topics ranging from Erasmus' use of Latin and his skill as a translator to the role of marginalia. Meticulously researched

footnotes complete the critical apparatus for each text.

Terence Tunberg oversees the edition of the *Declamatiuncula* (1518), developing in his introduction a brief but stimulating discussion of how this short work provides a good case study of the ways in which humanist authors might approach a Christian theme. Tunberg shows that even the author of the *Ciceronianus*, agreeing with Lorenzo Valla's recommendation to prefer syntax and word-choice from Latin authors active during the first century BC to the second century AD, frequently employed pagan religious terms to express Christian ideas and concepts, although he was not dogmatic in doing so.

Lucia Gualdo Rosa's edition of *Isocratis ad Nicoclem regem de institutione principis* (1516) contains in its introduction a stimulating discussion of the marginalia that accompanied early editions of Erasmus' translation, but which were excluded from the 1540 and 1703-1706 versions of his *Opera omnia*. Gualdo Rosa argues for their value, whether or not they were written by Erasmus himself, and includes them in her footnotes. Also worth noting are Gualdo Rosa's introductory comments on Erasmus' qualities as a translator. She concludes that Erasmus' version is an independent creation rather than a mere reworking of a previous translation. This, according to Gualdo Rosa, shows how seriously he took the work of Isocrates, despite his ambivalent attitude towards the ancient Sophists. Less original, argues Jeroen De Keyser, is Erasmus' 1530 Latin rendering of Xenophon's *Hieron* (1530). In his introduction to Erasmus' last known translation of a Greek pagan work, De Keyser demonstrates, in fact, the degree to which the author emulates Leonardo Bruni's 1403 translation.

The shortest work in the volume is the *Epistola consolatoria in adversis* (1528), which Edwin Rabbie edits and annotates. Occupying roughly half the volume, on the other hand, are the texts and critical apparatuses of the *Oratio de pace et discordia* and the *Oratio funebris in funere Bertae Goudanae viduae probissimae* (both first published in 1706, but likely composed in the late 1480s), edited by Marc van der Poel. His introduction to the orations provides important information on the probable dating and circumstances of their composition, and includes useful outlines of their structure. His most remarkable contribution, however, is an eighty-page appendix in which he offers a thorough and copious examination of the so-called 'manuscript of

Scriverius' (*Scri*), our only source for the two orations. Van der Poel covers in masterful detail both the history of the manuscript and its treatment at the hands of copyists, printers, and scholars over the more than four centuries following its creation. His conclusions are relevant, not just to readers wishing to explore the two orations published here, but also to those interested more generally in Erasmian paleography.

Together, the three volumes reviewed here contain material of great interest to scholars from numerous disciplines, including rhetoric, theology, history, Neo-Latin studies, Renaissance studies, Reformation studies, translation studies, and early modern paleography. (Robert Kilpatrick, University of West Georgia)

◆ *The Stoic Origins of Erasmus' Philosophy of Christ*. By Ross Dealy. Erasmus Studies. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017. 424 pages. \$90. For some time now it has been commonly held that Erasmus' thought should be approached from the viewpoint of rhetoric rather than philosophy. Contrary to that position, emeritus professor Ross Dealy upholds that *philosophia Christi* takes its origin in late classical stoicism and attempts to demonstrate the philosophical consistency underlying Erasmus' works. His inquiry draws on a thorough and convincing reading of the *Disputatiuncula de taedio, pavore, tristitia Jesu* (1499-1501) (*A Short Treatise Concerning the Distress, Alarm, and Sorrow of Jesus*) and the more famous *Enchiridion militis Christiani* (1503). Stressing that these two books should be read together, as two important stages of Erasmus' early thinking, Dealy uses those two treatises to highlight all the possible evidence of a stoic background to his thought, drawing from Cicero, Epictetus, Gellius, and Panaetius.

Part one illustrates what the early humanists thought of stoicism. From Petrarch to Machiavelli we are told that they failed to grasp the core of real stoicism, which lies in what Dealy coins a "both/and" rather than "either/or" mindset. They believed that stoicism was about *apatheia* achieved through reason, leading to a mastery over the "passions," and they thus concluded that the wise man was impervious to desire or suffering. On his part Erasmus would have understood that the wise man felt fear and other passions like any other mortal, but that those would not overwhelm him. Dealy uses

Erasmus' interpretation of the story of the stoic in the typhoon found in the *Attic Nights* as evidence of his proper understanding of stoicism. At odds with Gellius, Erasmus asserted that the stoic was struck by fear as any other person would be, for his affliction was nothing but a natural reaction to the circumstances he found himself in. Wisdom is thus set apart from what is thought to be a spontaneous response. (Note that Erasmus called those late stoics over whose works he built his own view of stoicism *mei stoici*.)

Part two is an attempt to resettle the debate over Erasmus' youth. Dealy's demonstration at that point is driven by psychological concerns over the reasons why Erasmus would have had recourse to stoicism at that period of his life. Erasmus uses as evidence his own experience of monastic life. His alleged physical inability to fast as well as his mental inability to follow one rule demonstrates his point against monastic life. By the time he left the orders, this experience having shattered his ideal of *vita contemplativa*, Erasmus would have found in stoicism a theory of different constitutions and tempers that led him to believe that *monachatus non est pietas* unless one has the right temper for it. It simply appeared to him afterward that this was not the case for him.

Parts three and four examine key concepts of stoicism and the arguments Erasmus might have drawn from them. It discusses at length the distinction in late stoicism between *katekon* and *katorthoma*—efficient action and right action—over which Erasmus' ethics are built. Common people and wise men alike undertake efficient action, but what makes them right actions is that the wise men knowingly conform themselves to universal harmony by doing so. For Christians that would imply that morality can only be judged from the inside: the appearances of piety, like ostentatious prayers or fasts, are mere appearances, useless as such unless the mind is pious. At the same time, stoic *oikeiosis* would also prove useful to Erasmus in his demonstration against the commonly believed wise man's *apatheia*. Natural instinct cannot be denied, and it is absurd to think of the wise man as insensitive to natural urges such as hunger or fear of death. Moreover, by acknowledging the human nature of Christ, Erasmus claims that Jesus did undergo fear of death at Gethsemane, and not just the "propassion" of it—a sudden outburst of fear—as the dominant Catholic dogma after Saint Jerome maintained. Erasmus made this demonstration

the pivotal point of his line of argumentation against Colet. Christ overcame fear of death, showing more courage than if he had not felt it, while his real suffering makes him closer to mankind. Thus Christ fully deserves to be an object of love for Christians, while the exalted martyrs are worthy of “mere” admiration.

Part five looks back to late antiquity and medieval Christology to give a fair account of the *status quaestionis* on Christ’s suffering at Gethsemane. This overview will prove useful to every scholar who is not familiar with the theological thought of Hilary of Poitiers, Bonaventure, or Alexander of Hales. The next part deals with the intellectual context of the *De taedio Christi* and shows that there was enormous interest in the Passion by the time of Erasmus’ debate with Colet. Stressing the originality of Erasmus’ thought, Dealy shows that most contemporary authors thought of Jesus Christ as a “super martyr” facing death with *alacritas* (eagerness)—the exact opposite of fear. This part duly complements part four’s demonstration.

In part seven, Dealy opposes André Godin’s thesis expressed in his seminal work *Érasme, lecteur d’Origène*. According to Godin, Erasmus would not merely actualize Origen’s trichotomic anthropology, but would have bent it in a stoic way. In the thought of Origen and his followers, the soul, *anima*, is torn between spirit and flesh, and in every choice it has to cling to one or the other. Hence *adiaphora* (the indifferent things) form the matter over which spirit and flesh contend in order to rule over the soul. On the other hand, Erasmus, following “his stoics,” would have thought of the *adiaphora* in such a way that satisfying natural urges does not always imply a moral issue. There can be indifferent things for Christians as long as the way they are handled is worthy of a Christian. Though this position asserts the consistency of Erasmus’ thinking, note that Dealy here has less factual proofs to display than the evidence Godin has drawn from Erasmus’ letters to support his views.

While everyone acknowledges the importance of the *Enchiridion militis Christiani* in Erasmus’ works, Dealy successfully shows that the lesser known *De taedio Christi* involves philosophical issues of Christology that are fundamental to the spiritual warfare handbook he would compose two years later. Even if the debate is still open about whether the stoics or Origen had a deeper influence over Erasmus,

the debt of those two books to late stoicism has been overlooked for too long. Thus *The Stoic Origins of Erasmus' Philosophy of Christ*, a stimulating and bold intellectual venture, undoubtedly broadens the scope of inquiry for every Erasmus' scholar. (Jean-Nicolas Mailloux, Université de Paris 3–Sorbonne Nouvelle, EA 174–Formes et idées de la Renaissance aux Lumières)

◆ *De obsidione Scodrensi. Über die Belagerung von Skutari*. By Marinus Barletius. Edited, translated, and with an introduction and notes by Stefan Zathammer. Die neulateinische Bibliothek: Artes Renascentes, Series Germanica, 2. Wien: Verlag Holzhausen, 2017. 320 pp. 45 euros. The second volume in the series Die neulateinische Bibliothek: Artes Renascentes, Series Germanica, following the edition of Petrarch's *Africa* by Daniela Mairhofer, is Stefan Zathammer's edition of *De obsidione Scodrensi*, an account of the siege of Shkodër, written by Marinus Barletius, an Albanian humanist and eyewitness to the event.

Shkodër (also Shkodra, Latin *Scodra*, Italian *Scutari*, German *Skutari*) is one of the biggest and also oldest cities in the modern Republic of Albania, situated in its northern region. The area has been inhabited since antiquity, first by the Thracians and later by the Illyrians, and it was conquered by the Romans in 168 BC. In the Middle Ages, periods of Byzantine, Slavic, Venetian, and Ottoman rule followed. Shkodër was held by the Turks until 1913, when it became a part of modern Albania. Although Shkodër had already been under the control of the Ottoman Turks from 1392 to 1396, the centuries-long Turkish rule effectively began with the very event described by Barletius: the siege of 1478–1479, which ended the Serenissima's control of the area.

The author of *De obsidione Scodrensi*, the priest and humanist Marinus Barletius, was born around 1460 in Shkodër but emigrated to Venice after the city he helped defend was captured by the Turks. His other works are a biography of George Castriota *alias* Skanderbeg, *Historia de vita et gestis Scanderbegi, Epirotarum principis*, and the *Compendium*, a collection of *vitae* of popes and emperors. *De obsidione Scodrensi* is divided into three books, the first being, as Zathammer notes, a kind of archaeology (38), including a history of the Turkish people and descriptions of Macedonia, Epirus, and the Shkodër region.

In books II and III Barletius relates the siege of his hometown in detail, counting every stone and flammable projectile directed at the city, and praises the faith and courage shown by the besieged in the face of adversity. Descriptions of life inside the city walls are particularly memorable: bells were rung to alarm the citizens and warn them of danger, but, as Barletius gravely notes, [*c*]ampanis numquam otium dabatur (2.15.4), and the inhabitants were reduced to living like rabbits in caves they had to dig themselves (2.15.5); equally disturbing is the description of malnourishment and famine (3.5.2-7). Orations by Christians and Muslims are inserted into the narrative at dramatic points, illustrating the piety and valour of the former, and the vanity and bloodthirstiness of the latter. Barletius' black-and-white portrayal of the barbaric, perfidious Turks and morally superior Christians is hardly surprising, especially when compared to other humanist representations of the Turks, discussed in the introductory part of this book. Zathammer provides a concise and well-balanced introduction that helps the reader understand the historical background, especially the geopolitical importance of today's Albania for both Venice and the Ottoman Turks. Furthermore Zathammer tells the story of Albanian humanism, mentioning other important figures like Paul Angelus, Johannes Gasulus, Nikolaus Leonicensus Thomaeus, and Marinus Becichemus, and presents the reader with what is known of the life and literary works of Marinus Barletius. Barletius the émigré is also set into the context of Italian humanism. Zathammer establishes the *terminus post quem* for *De obsidione Scodrensi*, lists Barletius' sources other than autopsy (local oral tradition, classical historians, and contemporary sources), identifies his classical role models (Sallust, Livy, and Vegetius among others) and the use of topoi like the aforementioned orations, and finally assesses his trustworthiness. The text is based on the *editio princeps* of Barletius (Venice, 1504) and accompanied by a critical apparatus and a facing German translation that is faithful and easy to follow.

This edition will certainly be of interest to historians and neo-Latin scholars, especially those studying the rich corpus of *Antiturbica* writings. It is also an important contribution to the study of a humanist tradition that is less well known, but, as demonstrated by Zathammer's highly commendable work, quite intriguing and deserving of more

attention. (Petra Šoštarić, University of Zagreb)

◆ *De iustitia / Über die Gerechtigkeit*. Francisco de Vitoria. Teil 2, herausgegeben, eingeleitet und ins Deutsche übersetzt von Joachim Stüben, mit einer Einleitung von Tilman Reppen. Politische Philosophie und Rechtstheorie des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit, Reihe, I: Texte, 4. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 2017. CX + 355 S. 188 euros. Die vorliegende Publikation aus der Reihe „Politische Philosophie und Rechtstheorie des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit“ (PPR, Abt. I (Texte)), deren wichtiges Anliegen es ist, zentrale Quellentexte der politischen Theorie des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit in der jeweiligen Originalsprache mit einer modernen deutschen Übersetzung zu edieren, um sie einem breiteren Publikum zugänglich zu machen, ist der zweite von insgesamt drei Bänden, die den Vorlesungskommentar Francisco de Vitorias (1483-1546) zu Ausschnitten des *Iustitia*-Traktates aus der *Summa Theologiae* des Thomas von Aquin erschließen, und umfasst quaest. 62, art. 1-2, welche die Restitution behandelt.

Der Band zerfällt in insgesamt fünf Teile: I. allgemeine Einführung von Tilman Reppen (XVII-LVIII); II. Vorbemerkungen des Übersetzers Joachim Stüben (LIX-CIX); III./IV. lateinischer Text mit deutscher Übersetzung gemäß den stark differierenden Versionen, die die erhaltenen Textzeugen (Salamanca, *Biblioteca Universitaria*, ms. 43; Rom, *Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana*, cod. Ottobon. lat. 1015) jeweils bieten (2-169; 170-256); V. Appendix mit Verzeichnissen, Anmerkungen und Registern (259-355).

Zu I.: Die allgemeine Einleitung ist als sehr gelungen zu bezeichnen. Tilman Reppen versteht es, einen umfassenden und verständlichen Überblick über Form, Inhalt und Hintergrund des Textes zu geben. Seine Überlegungen umfassen u.a. kurze Bemerkungen zur Überlieferung und zum literarischem Genus des Kommentars, die Einordnung von Vitorias Denken in die philosophisch-theologische Tradition (Abelard, Anselm, Thomas), aber auch eine Bewertung von dessen Eigenständigkeit und Originalität, sowie eine sehr ausführliche Darstellung der zentralen Gedankengänge und Grundbegriffe des Textes, die Vitorias Position bezüglich der Restitutionslehre deutlich werden lässt: Es handelt sich um eine rechtsphilosophische, jedoch



vornehmlich moraltheologische Auffassung der Restitution, die Vitoria aus der Perspektive des Schädigers als Wiederherstellung eines früheren Zustandes durch Rückgabe oder Ersatzleistung versteht und als heilsrelevant charakterisiert.

Zu II.: Stübens gelungene Einleitung beleuchtet detailliert die Entstehungsbedingungen und den Kontext von Vitorias Vorlesungskommentar, dessen Überlieferungssituation (keine autorisierte Version, lediglich mehr oder weniger zuverlässige, schwer entzifferbare Abschriften von Schülern), sowie die Verdienste und Mängel der bisherigen einschlägigen Edition von Beltrán de Heredia (Salamanca, 1934) und erläutert schließlich sein eigenes editorisches und translatorisches Vorgehen, methodische und inhaltliche Probleme bei der Deutung Vitorias und Irrtümer sowie Fehlentwicklungen bei dessen Rezeption in der modernen Sekundärliteratur. Einziger Kritikpunkt sind gelegentliche Überschneidungen zwischen Repgens und Stübens Einleitungen. Aus meiner Sicht wäre es deutlich ökonomischer und übersichtlicher gewesen, eine gemeinsame, zusammenhängende Einleitung zu verfassen. Zudem vermisst der Leser eine kurze Analyse der Unterschiede der insbesondere im Umfang stark variierenden Fassungen der beiden Handschriften und deren Implikationen für die Interpretation des Textes.

Zu III./IV.: Der lateinische Text der beiden Versionen des Vorlesungskommentars folgt weitgehend der von de Heredia besorgten Edition, wobei jedoch viele typographische, orthographische und syntaktische Fehler beseitigt und eine nicht unerhebliche Anzahl von Konjekturen vorgeschlagen werden, die den lateinischen Text signifikant verbessern. Eine Liste von Konjekturen, Änderungen und Abweichungen zu der Edition von de Heredia befindet sich im Anhang (265-267). Indes wäre es m.E. weitaus leserfreundlicher gewesen, an Stelle einer separaten, recht unübersichtlichen Liste, einen kleinen kritischen Apparat direkt unter dem lateinischen Text zu drucken.

Zudem wird nicht immer deutlich, ob die identifizierten Fehler in der jeweiligen Handschrift zu finden sind oder auf ein Missgeschick von de Heredia zurückgehen, etwa in folgendem Eintrag: S.170, Z.18 de K (=Konjektur) ] de de BH 3 (=Heredia) – wenn der Fehler nicht auf die Handschrift zurückgeht, ist der Anspruch auf eine Konjektur unberechtigt, wenn er dagegen tatsächlich auf die Handschrift zu-

rückzuführen ist, sollte, um Missverständnisse zu vermeiden, deutlich gemacht werden, etwa durch Hinzusetzung des Zusatzes *ms.*, dass der Textzeuge diesen Fehler enthielt und de Heredia ihn abdruckte, ohne zu konjizieren. In einigen Fällen findet sich ein solcher Zusatz, der eine falsche Transkription de Heredias berichtigt (z.B. S.186, Z.15 BH3 hinter *transfere* setzt hinzu [*ms. transferri*]), aber mir ist unklar geblieben, ob Stüben eine systematische Neukollation der Handschriften durchführte, oder lediglich einige problematische Stellen überprüfte, und ich vermute, dass die Beseitigung von Irrtümern de Heredias, wie im oben angeführten Fall, manchmal zu Unrecht als Konjektur bezeichnet wird. Eine Einsichtnahme in die Handschriften, die mir nicht möglich war, könnte hier Klarheit schaffen.

Überhaupt zeigt die textkritische Notationsweise Stübens einige kleinere Schwächen: die ungewöhnliche Benutzung des Großbuchstaben K zur Bezeichnung einer Konjektur, die Einführung einer rein orthographischen Variante als Konjektur (S.8, Z. 16, 18: *Nu<m>quid* (statt *Nunquid*)), die eigenwillige Benutzung des Symbols <> sowohl für Konjekturen als auch Athesesen (S.176, Z.8: <> *merito quaeritur*; [Lemma: S.176, Z.8 BH3 hinter *omnium* fügt hinzu <et> – hier gilt: wenn *et* überliefert ist, muss es durch Angabe von [et] im Text getilgt werden, wenn es lediglich eine fehlerhafte Konjektur (?) von de Heredia ist, darf sie nicht im Text selbst erscheinen!).

Die deutsche Übersetzung dagegen ist als rundum gelungen zu bezeichnen: sie ist flüssig lesbar, lebendig, stets genau und erfüllt somit die translatorische Maxime „So wörtlich wie möglich, so frei wie nötig“ auf vorbildliche Weise. Die in der Appendix enthaltenen Anmerkungen zu erklärungsbedürftigen Passagen sind hilfreich und die Auflösungen der Quellen und Anspielungen Vitorias sind von erstaunlicher Fülle und demonstrieren eindrucksvoll Stübens Fachwissen, dessen Texterschließung weit über de Heredias Ausgabe hinausgeht.

Insgesamt ist die Qualität der Publikation, abgesehen von den oben genannten Schwächen, als sehr erfreulich zu bewerten. Die durchgehende Verwendung von Kurzformen bei der Zitation und die Kursivierung lateinischer Zitate in den Einleitungen und im Anhang hätten jedoch zur Entschlackung der Fußnoten und zu einem größeren Lesefluss beitragen können. Der Leinen-Einband ist qualitativ

hochwertig, das Layout und die Textgestaltung vorbildlich, der Text erfreulich frei von Tippfehlern (nur ein einziger auf S.VI: Ausgleich).

Der vorliegende Band wird sich – neben den anderen, bereits in dieser Reihe erschienenen Bänden zu Vitorias Werken – für die weitere Erschließung seines Denkens zweifellos als nützlich erweisen und einen wertvollen Beitrag dazu leisten, dass seine Werke einer größeren Anzahl von Forschern zugänglich und bekannt gemacht werden. Einem jeden, der sich näher mit der Thomas-Kommentierung dieses einflussreichen Denkers und seiner Restitutionslehre auseinandersetzen möchte, sei diese Publikation daher wärmstens empfohlen! (Jannik Reiners, University of Cambridge)

◆ *Nundinarum Francofordiensium encomium / Eloge de la foire de Francfort / Ein Lob auf die Frankfurter Messe / Encomium of the Frankfurt Fair.* By Henri Estienne. Else Kammerer, editorial coordination; Anne-Hélène Klinger-Dollé, Claudia Wiener, Maria Anna Oberlinner, and Paul White, translators. Texte courant, 5. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2017. CVI + 130 pp. The author of this work, Henri II Estienne (1531-1598), was simultaneously a critic, a philosopher, a printer, a humanist, a voracious reader, a manuscript hunter, and an author. He fell in love with classical Greek as a child, which led him to complete and publish the *Thesaurus linguae Graecae*, a monumental dictionary that is still worth consulting today. The *Thesaurus*, however, was expensive and the market for it was limited, so that publishing it left Estienne in precarious circumstances financially. His *Encomium of the Frankfurt Fair* was published partly in an effort to get on to the market something that would sell, but partly as a way to express genuine admiration for a major commercial event that geopolitical circumstances and financial innovations had made into a vibrant, exciting semiannual event. Books were not the only thing for sale in Frankfurt, but the printer-bookseller Christian Egenolff and the publisher Sigmund Feyerabend had made the city into a major publishing center and the Fair attracted authors as well as publishers from all over the continent. As a result, every All Saints' Day and Easter, Frankfurt became a new Athens, a place where the Muses and the printing arts combined to provide a tangible center to the Neo-Latin culture of the Renaissance. This is what Estienne's *Encomium* praises.

This is not the first edition of the *Encomium*, nor is it the first translation into a modern language: as soon as it was published, its early readers took it as a praise of internationalism and of peaceful exchange, both commercial and literary, so that it has been republished several times after the wars that have wracked Europe over the last hundred and fifty years. This is an unusually appealing edition, however. Everything, even the introduction, appears in French, German, and English, and the inclusion of a Latin text as well means that the book is accessible to most readers through one of these languages and can be used in teaching as well as research, on both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The role of the fair in literary and publishing history comes through clearly, but it is presented in a light and playful spirit that recognizes that the Fair was also a place of drunkenness and public disorder, which adds a different kind of interest to the work. The book is generously illustrated, with a nice little bibliography of primary and secondary sources. All in all an interesting diversion that shows a side that is seldom seen of the scholar-printer who produced the justly famous *Thesaurus* and adds a material underpinning to the field of Neo-Latin studies. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *El Principado de Córdoba*. Martín de Roa. Edición, traducción e introducción de Jorge Grau Jiménez. Córdoba: UCO Press, 2016. 310 pp. La introducción contiene una sucinta biografía del autor (Córdoba, ca. 1560 - Montilla, 1637), señalando sus estudios en Osuna, su ingreso en la Compañía de Jesús, y algunas amistades como Ambrosio de Morales, Luis de Góngora, y Bernardo José de Aldrete. Sigue un catálogo de sus obras latinas (epigramas, comentarios bíblicos, sobre acentuación, sobre los cumpleaños y otras costumbres antiguas, sobre los santos de Córdoba ...) y castellanas (IX-XXV). El comentario de las obras sobre el principado se centra en las polémicas que mantuvo con Rodrigo Caro, cuyas *Antigüedades y principado de la ilustrísima ciudad de Sevilla* incluían el parecer de Roa sobre la misma, así como en la repercusión que tuvo un siglo después. La tercera parte recoge los criterios de edición (LXV-LXXVIII), la censura y licencias de ambas obras, las abreviaturas y la bibliografía (LXXIX-XCVI). La edición del texto latino, acompañada de aparato de fuentes, ocupa 23 páginas, y otras tantas la traducción enfrentada. Sigue en 103 páginas

el tratado castellano *Antiguo principado de Córdoba en la España Ulterior o Andaluz* (Córdoba, 1636); un glosario de personas y lugares mencionados; un índice de autores y obras citados de forma abreviada, y otros de fuentes, de nombres y el general.

Roa fue una autoridad en asuntos de Antigüedad, y entre otros méritos supo reconocer que las ruinas de Medina Azahara eran de época islámica, interpretando correctamente la denominación de Córdoba la Vieja que tenía entonces. También rechazó la nómina de Hércules y reyes legendarios que habrían fundado ciudades en Hispania, ya procedieran de falsificaciones recientes o de la Antigüedad. Aclarando que el historiador Juan de Mariana le reconoció personalmente que, cuando llamaba a Sevilla capital de la Bética, se refería a la Andalucía de su tiempo, defendió justamente el principado de Córdoba en la Bética romana, aunque trató de extenderlo sin razón más allá del siglo IV, e incluso al reino visigodo y a todo el periodo islámico. Tampoco tiene razón cuando atribuye las *Etymologiae* a un obispo de Córdoba llamado Isidoro; cuando hace cordobeses a los mártires San Lorenzo –enfrentándose al cronista aragonés Juan Francisco Andrés de Uztárroz–, y a Olimpias, Parmenio, Elimena y Crisotelo si la Iglesia lo consintiera, o a los autores árabes Avicena y Abenzoar entre otros. Pues el amor a su patria entorpecía su buen juicio y vasta erudición, lo que entonces como ahora llevó a destacados historiadores a manipular la verdad en defensa de la gloria y los intereses de su nación o lugar de nacimiento.

Ello explica la influencia en su obra de las falsificaciones de Román de la Higuera y de los moriscos Alonso del Castillo y Miguel de Luna, a quien trató personalmente. Resulta interesante su conversación con Román en Toledo en 1611 camino de Roma sobre la ciudad de *Baetis* mencionada por Estrabón (*Geog.* 3.2.1) y que Hübner con buen criterio interpretó como un lapsus por *Italica*: Román acabó identificándola con Utrera en uno de los fragmentos que atribuyó a Dextro, garantizándose así el apoyo de Caro, natural de Utrera, para la defensa de su falsificación.

En la traducción del tratado latino (Lyon, 1617) solo cabe disentir en algunos detalles, como el título *De Cordubae in Hispania Betica principatu liber unus* (“El principado de Córdoba en la Hispania Bética, libro único”), en vez de “Libro sobre el principado ...,” o la dedicatoria *ad S.P.Q. Cordubensem* (“al Cabildo y pueblo cordobés”), en lugar

de “al Cabildo y pueblo de Córdoba”; *admodum* por ‘aún’ en lugar de ‘muy’ (pp. 17 y 19), o *unus Asdrubal* como “un Asdrúbal” en vez de “solo Asdrúbal” (21). Las anotaciones a la traducción son útiles y abundantes, aunque se echan en falta aclaraciones al sentido del epíteto *Patricia* de *Corduba* (9) o a las derivaciones de topónimos en 119.

El libro está cuidadosamente revisado, por lo que apenas he detectado leves erratas, como el espacio que falta en XIII en Anisson, 1667; verdadadero en LIII por verdadero; el punto final que falta en la nota 205, o la tilde que falta en “no sé con que fundamento” (65). Deberían ir en mayúscula inicial algunos nombres propios y sintagmas como nuevo mundo referido al continente americano (29), molino perdido y puerta de los sacos (47).

Grau nos ofrece en suma el fruto de estas investigaciones de Roa en una espléndida edición, valorando adecuadamente sus aportaciones y carencias en el contexto cultural y religioso de su tiempo, y con los instrumentos necesarios para uso y provecho del lector. (Joaquín Pascual-Barea, Universidad de Cádiz)

◆ *La paideia degli umanisti: un antologia di scritti*. By Lucia Gualdo Rosa. Opuscula collecta, 17. Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 2017. x + 356 pp. 70 euros. The author of the essays in this collection, Lucia Gualdo Rosa, needs no introduction to those who work in Italian humanism. As she notes in a poignant preface, “Un album di fotografie,” the process of contemplating a lifetime’s work after you have passed your eightieth birthday is rather like turning over the pages of an album of photographs—a pleasure that our younger readers, whose pictures are all archived on their phones, will probably never have. But if the process is pleasurable for the author, it is equally pleasurable for the reader when the photographs were taken by someone like this.

*La paideia degli umanisti* contains an opening essay, “Lucia e i ‘suoi’ manoscritti vaticani,” by Marco Buonocore, and eighteen essays by Gualdo Rosa: “Le lettere di dedica delle traduzioni dal Greco nel ‘400. Appunti per un’analisi stilistica”; “Le traduzioni dal greco nella prima metà del ‘400. Alle radici del classicismo europeo”; “Chi ha paura della filologia classica? In margine ad un recente articolo di Riccardo Fubini”; “Préhumanisme et humanisme en Italie: aspects et

problèmes”; “La fortuna—e la sfortuna—di Seneca nel Rinascimento europeo e il contributo alla ricerca della verità dell’umanesimo romano da Lorenzo Falla a Marc-Antoine Muret”; “Bruni Leonardo (1370-1444)”; “Una nuova lettera del Bruni sulla sua traduzione della *Politica* di Aristotele”; “Due nuove lettere bruniane e il ritrovamento del ‘materiale Bertalot’”; “Leonardo Bruni, l’*Oratio in hypocritas* e i suoi difficili rapporti con Ambrogio Traversari”; “La struttura dell’epistolario bruniano e il suo significato politico”; “Le lettere familiari di Leonardo Bruni: alcuni esempi della loro diffusione in Italia nel primo Quattrocento”; “Leonardo Bruni e le sue ‘vite parallele’ di Dante e del Petrarca”; “L’umanesimo civile di Leonardo Bruni: revisionismo ‘made in USA’”; “A proposito degli epigrammi latini del Sannazaro”; “Un prezioso testimone della Grande Cronaca di Guillaume de Nangis nella collezione del Parrasio: da Giovanni Conversini a Gasparino Barzizza”; “L’Académie pontanienne et l’élaboration d’une poétique du classicisme”; “L’Accademia Pontaniana e la sua ideologia in alcuni componimenti giovanili del Sannazaro”; and “Un decennio avventuroso nella biografia del Parrasio (1509-1519): alcune precisazioni e qualche interrogativo.”

The essays reprinted here, selected from more than a hundred items in Gualdo Rosa’s bibliography, extend back some thirty-five years. Not all essays merit reprinting, but these do: their author is well known for her careful, meticulous efforts to answer questions that are worth asking, and while some of the essays originally appeared in journals like *Rinascimento* and *Lettere italiane* that are fairly easy to find, the majority were initially published in conference proceedings, Festschriften, and smaller journals that can be difficult to locate even in Italy, much less abroad. It is also worth noting that this volume is much better produced than many collections of republished essays. The articles are grouped logically into three sections, on the recovery of antiquity and various aspects of humanism, on Leonardo Bruni, and on humanism in southern Italy, especially Naples. The original publications have been reproduced here, which avoids citation problems but makes for an annoying read when various fonts and letter sizes are juxtaposed. The book is also paginated throughout, however, and concludes with a glorious twenty-six-page index, which is not always present in Italian essay collections.

All in all, a worthy monument to a great scholar. May she continue to prosper—and publish! (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *The Invention of Rome: Biondo Flavio's Roma Triumphans and Its Worlds*. Edited by Frances Muecke and Maurizio Campanelli. Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance, 576. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2017. 292 pp. This essay collection began as a Discovery Project funded by the Australian Research Council and started to take shape at conference held at the British School of Rome in 2014. The goal of the project was to increase the understanding of and appreciation for the last of Biondo Flavio's major works, *Roma triumphans*. *Roma triumphans* is an encyclopedic work that inaugurated a new discipline, which we might call 'antiquarianism,' that aimed at the virtual reconstruction of the ancient world by using all the tools at the scholar's disposal (philology, history, archaeology, etc.) to furnish models for the construction of a new world based on a proper understanding of the old one. As the only comprehensive treatment of the Roman world written in the fifteenth century, it was well known and often consulted in its own day, but the lack of a modern edition and translations, coupled by a lack of appreciation for its nature as a compilation of citations, summaries, and paraphrases of ancient Roman sources, has led to its being undervalued today. This is beginning to change, however. The first volume of the edition and translation in the I Tatti Renaissance Library appeared in 2016, and critical editions of all of Biondo's works will eventually appear through the Edizione Nazionale delle Opere di Flavio Biondo. The essays in this volume contribute to the revival of interest in a key work of Italian Renaissance humanism by showcasing a variety of possible approaches to *Roma triumphans*.

The essays in Part I are devoted to context, genre, and purpose. Anne Raffarin and Angelo Mazzocco compare the epilogues of *Roma instaurata* and *Roma triumphans*, with the former scholar stressing the importance of the ancient Roman triumph for Biondo's presentation of the triumph of a restored Christian Rome and the latter emphasizing the differences between the two epilogues. Frances Muecke considers the nature and composition of *Roma triumphans*, concluding that it should be situated within the genre of the compilation. Part II explores some of the main topics of *Roma triumphans*: religion, government, the



army, and private life. Frances Muecke discusses the inherent ambiguity in Biondo's attitude toward the religion of pagan Rome, observing that as a Christian, he could hardly endorse everything he saw there, but he found Roman religion superior to other pagan religions and noted that "survivals" color the Roman religious life of his day. James Hankins offers an exciting argument that *Roma triumphans* is not just an ideologically neutral source book, but offers instead a reading of the dynamics of Roman government that sees its strengths not in a specific constitutional form but in the adherence of its leaders to public and private virtue. Giuseppe Marcellino offers a solution to one of *Roma triumphans*'s puzzles, about why the digression on writers and literary production is set into a discussion on slavery and manumission in ancient Rome; his conclusion is that it was intended to contribute to a discussion of the "free man," made so by the study of the liberal arts. Ida Gilda Mastroianni focuses on Biondo's treatment of the central importance of discipline as an explanation for Roman military success, while the last two essays in this section discuss the buildings of ancient Rome. Maurizio Campanelli argues that for Biondo, the unimpressive physical remains of ancient Rome cannot lead to an appreciation of its past magnificence, but that we must rely on literary sources for this, while Peter Fane-Saunders examines Biondo's responses to three characteristic structures from Roman architecture, the tower-shaped pyre, the villa, and the mansion. Part III contains four essays. Maria Agata Pincelli focuses on the manuscripts of *Roma triumphans* and concludes that it was indeed published as Biondo claimed, as a finished work in multiple copies produced under the author's supervision. Paul Gwynne documents the reception of *Roma triumphans* in the generations after its publication; Anne Raffatin focuses her study of the same topic on one later reader, Andrea Fulvio; and William Stenhouse explores the survival of this treatise in the sixteenth century, when scholarship on Roman topography and institutions took new paths but scholars in these areas continued to draw from *Roma triumphans*.

Essay collections that are born in conferences do not always move definitively past their origins, but this one does: the essays average twenty-five large pages in length and are richly documented and well argued. As such, they perform in an excellent way one of the core functions of scholarship in Neo-Latin studies: exhuming lost works

and demonstrating their importance. My congratulations to the editors and authors for a job well done. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Renaissance Encyclopaedism: Studies in Curiosity and Ambition*. Edited by W. Scott Blanchard and Andrea Severi. Publications of the Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, Essays and Studies, 41. Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2018. 467 pp. As the editors of this essay collection note in their "Introduction," there is an irony that drives scholarship on Renaissance encyclopaedism: "... the Renaissance, in contrast to the middle ages, was in fact a period that did not produce many works that we could call 'encyclopaedias,' yet it was nevertheless a seminal period in the development of an encyclopaedic approach to knowledge that would later become one of the most central concepts of modern scholarship, one that still informs the humanistic disciplines in both Europe and the Americas: the ideal of a total, interdisciplinary knowledge that nineteenth-century German classicists would term *Altertumswissenschaft*, that is, scholarly inquiry fully informed by historical context, philological precision, and critical (or skeptical) habits of mind" (15). The roots of Renaissance encyclopaedism go back to the Hellenistic *enkyklios paideia*, a general educational program that was described fully by Quintilian and seems to have been revived in the teaching of Vittorino da Feltre. The humanist version of all this has often been located in the Florentine circle surrounding Poliziano in the late 1480s and early 1490s, but this volume suggests that the origins of Renaissance encyclopaedism rest instead in Rome, in the circles around Pomponio Leto and Cardinal Bessarion, which pushes things back into the 1450s. In time, however, the emphasis shifted from an educational program per se to a physical object like Pliny's *Natural History* that would contain the information necessary to understand and appreciate ancient literature. This transformation drew from three sources: a Pythagorean / Platonic one that stressed the harmony and organic nature of knowledge; an Aristotelian one that had remained strong in the Middle Ages and focuses on the sheer quantity of information; and an impetus that is in the spirit of Quintilian or Aulus Gellius but is really *sui generis*, the philological miscellany that is sometimes called an incipient dictionary, sometimes a commentary, and sometimes an

encyclopaedia (an example is Perotti's *Cornu copiae*).

The essays that explore these issues are grouped into three sections. "Roman Contexts" contains three essays: "'Talking about Everything Is a Nearly Infinite Task': Encyclopaedism and Specialization in Lorenzo Valla's *Elegantiae linguae Latinae*," by Clementina Marsico; "The Learned Encyclopaedism of Giovanni Tortelli," by Paola Tomè; and "*Roma instaurata, Italia illustrata, Roma triumphans*: Flavio Biondo's Encyclopaedic Project for a Dictionary of Antiquities," by Anna Raffarin. In "Encyclopaedism in Bologna," we find "Encyclopaedism and Philology in Humanistic Bologna," by Loredana Chines; "'Since They Know and Profess the Entire Encyclopaedia': New and Old Encyclopaedism in Codro Urceo's Satirical *Sermo Primus*," by Andrea Severi; "A New Beginning: Poliziano's *Panepistemon*," by Annarita Angelini; and "Poliziano between Philology and Poetry," by W. Scott Blanchard. "Encyclopaedism in the Sixteenth Century and in Northern Europe" offers the following: "Virtù and the Physician: Giorgio Valla's *De expetendis et fugiendis rebus opus*," by Dustin Mengelkoch; "When the Proverb Collection Became an Encyclopaedia: Erasmus of Rotterdam and Arsenius Apostolis," by Lorenzo M. Ciolfi; "Erasmus' *Adagia*: A Cultural Encyclopaedia," by David Marsh; and "Producing Knowledge: Guillaume Budé's Encyclopaedic Horizon," by Luigi-Alberto Sanchi.

I have to admit that I often approach the collection of essays by diverse hands with a certain amount of trepidation, in fear that I will find short, unrevised conference papers, or papers that often have only a tangential relationship to the expressed theme, or *saggi* that for various reasons would not survive a rigorous refereeing on their own at a top journal. I am pleased to report that there is nothing to fear here. The essays average almost forty pages in length, and each of them provides a substantive piece of the puzzle that constitutes Renaissance encyclopaedism. What I particularly like here is the introduction, which goes beyond summarizing the contents of the essays to become a mini-history of the genre that offers a new interpretation of its genesis and development. In short, *Renaissance Encyclopaedism* is a great read. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)