

## NEO-LATIN NEWS

**Vol. 50, Nos. 1 & 2. Jointly with SCN. Subscriptions: \$15.00 (\$20.00 international) for one year; \$28.00 (\$37.00) for two years; \$40.00 (\$52.00) for three years. Checks or money orders are payable to *Seventeenth-Century News*, 4227 TAMU, College Station, Texas 77843-4227. 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-Ważbińska, 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.

*The Latin Odes of Jean Dorat.* Trans. by David Slavitt. Washington: Orchises, 2000. 94 pp. \$20. David Slavitt is well known as a translator of the classics, especially of classical drama by Seneca, Aristophanes, Aeschylus, and Euripides, and as a poet and novelist. Given that classicists tend to ignore Latinity as late as that of the Renaissance, it is a pleasant surprise to discover that Slavitt has turned his attention to *The Latin Odes of Jean Dorat*, the verse of a French humanist, scholar, and poet. Dorat's relative obscurity outside of Neo-Latin studies (itself considered a very arcane field in the United States) is aggravated by the fact that little of his work has survived. While we have doubtless lost much of the poetry that he wrote, a great deal of his production probably consisted of lessons delivered orally as a teacher: after all, Dorat was the French royal reader in Greek and the preceptor of several of the French Pléiade poets. What does remain of Dorat's work lives

on mainly through these poets who mention him in their poetry and in the sparse liminary or circumstantial verse that Dorat wrote for his former pupil and important patrons.

Slavitt's translation of Dorat's Latin odes coincides with a renaissance of interest in this sixteenth-century humanist: the first international conference on Jean Dorat was recently held in Limoges, Dorat's birthplace, and Philip Ford has just published the precious notes taken by one of Dorat's students during his commentary on book ten of the *Odyssey* (reviewed by Jeff Persels in *NLN* 49.3-4 (2001), pp. 373-75). One would expect the purpose of a translation such as Slavitt's to be the widening of the audience for Neo-Latin poetry, and therein lies a problem: for whom is this book of translations intended? Although Slavitt notes that Dorat's poems are very contemporary and political, he provides only the barest of introductions, no more than an enumeration of the different members of the Valois monarchy; even worse, the poems themselves are not accompanied by any sort of explanatory notes. It is strange to see Slavitt acknowledge the important historical basis for Dorat's poetry, yet to declare (on what basis, one might ask?) that he represents an ideal alternative of politeness, elegance, charm, and learning in a barbaric age "much like our own," ignoring, apparently, that Dorat was steadfastly and cruelly on the side of the Catholics during the Religious Wars. Indeed, Dorat is notorious for having rejoiced after the death of the rhetorician Petrus Ramus during the Saint Bartholomew's Day massacre. The basic problem is that those who could derive benefit from reading a translation of poems by a Renaissance humanist without any scholarly apparatus are precisely those who would not need to pick up this book. Indeed, it seems unlikely that a general reader could identify Henri de Mesmes, to whom Dorat addresses a horoscope in the first Ode (he was a statesman and humanist whose godfather was the future Henry II), or Phillippe Hurault de Cheverny in Ode 35 (Duke of Orleans, chancellor of the future Henry III, who became *conseiller d'Etat*). Even worse, except for the fact that there are gaps in the numbering, the reader is not even made aware that Slavitt is presenting a selection of odes (the title

certainly makes no reference to this). One wonders why Slavitt has omitted odes that otherwise present considerable generic and thematic interest, such as Ode 7, on the death of Gelonis, the wife of the Neo-Latin poet Macrinus, himself famous for writing conjugal erotic poetry, or Ode 24, to Camille de Morel, the extraordinary gifted humanist daughter of Jean de Morel, a patron of the Pléiade poets.

Lastly, and most disappointing, the readers to whom this volume is presumably destined cannot rely on its translation for accuracy. Even a cursory comparison of Slavitt's English translation with Demerson's and the original Latin text reveals that Slavitt often takes severe, unjustified liberties with the original. A few lines from Henri de Mesmes's horoscope (Ode 1), for which Slavitt gives the original Latin, should suffice to demonstrate Slavitt's translating style. For example, one only has to read a few strophes before one encounters gratuitous embellishments, such as where the cries of the newborn child, evoked as *salutat / Aethereas lachrimosus angor* ("a teary cry greets the air"), are rendered as "those tears the child sheds in advance of the blows / it must receive from a life on earth." This theme is apparently dear to Slavitt, because immediately afterward, as the *vates* wonders whether he has erred in making this augury a mere reflection of his wishes, Slavitt interjects "Do I dare dream for my daughter a better fate than most of us face?" which is nowhere in the original text. Perhaps even more importantly, the whole entrance of the poet as the father and husband is delayed because of Slavitt's choices. The child's cry which reaches the poet's own ears and announces him a father (*vagitus aureis cum pepulit meas / Iam patris*) becomes clumsily a "cry announcing itself to a world that knows as any father does," while the triple appearance of that I along its self-affirmation as fatherly witness and as paterfamilias whose household is being increased (*aucta*) is simply not rendered with the necessary force (vv. 21-24). Slavitt's rendition is a start, but we need modern translations of Renaissance texts that offer better and more carefully conceived access than this. (Marc Bizer, University of Texas)

*Bibliografía sobre Luis Vives.* By Francisco Calero and Daniel Sala. Colección Serrano Morales. Valencia: Ajuntament de Valencia, 1999. 348 pp. This indispensable tool for scholars of Juan Luis Vives (1492-1540), the ethnically Jewish, Roman Catholic expatriate Spaniard, brings unannotated bibliography on this humanist to a new level. No predecessor, including Bonilla, Empaytaz, or Noreña, has remotely approximated so exhaustive a project as this feast of citations undertakes. The 2196 main entries, ranging back into the sixteenth century, are divided among thirty-four thematic sections, followed by a twenty-three-part breakdown of Vives's works. (Inexplicably, as far as I can tell, the standard eight-volume Valencia *Opera omnia* of 1782-90 is not listed, despite repeated citations of Gregorio Mayans y Siscar's *Vita Vivis* from that compilation.) An appendix of references to Vives in the Valencian press and an essential index of authors complete the book.

Many items make repeat appearances, as demanded by the thematic categories. Topics include Vives's psychology, anthropology, educational theory and practice, dialectic, ethics, juridical thought, ideas on war and peace, rhetoric, etc., and his relationship with four major contemporaries (Erasmus, Luther, More, and Ignatius of Loyola). The multi-part arrangement exposes at a glance instances of the sparse scholarly attention given to some of Vives's works. The *Commentary on Augustine's City of God* (Section XLI) draws only eleven entries apart from the work of Estellés González and Pérez i Durà, whose labor-intensive new edition is now in progress. The *De conscribendis epistolis*, finally given a critical edition in 1989, shows seven entries. The lengthy and important *De anima et vita* shows only thirteen. These numbers are striking even in view of Calero and Sala's decision not to count cases where a work of Vives's is treated as part of a larger scholarly study.

The impression of comprehensiveness strikes the reader immediately. I venture to assert that any scholar of Vives will discover useful things that he or she did not know exist. You find everything from unpublished works (## 110, 112, etc.) to large bibliographies or reference works in which Vives merely occurs

(e.g., Nicolás Antonio's eighteenth-century *Bibliotheca Hispana*, Palau y Dulcet's twenty-eight-volume *Manual del librero hispano-americano*, and the Toronto *Contemporaries of Erasmus*). The editors justifiably note that the line has to be drawn somewhere; thus they do not attempt to cover the political, pedagogical, and biographical background for Vives's time. Nor do they pretend to rival compilations of source editions like González, Albiñana, and Gutiérrez's magnificent *Vives: edicions princeps* of 1992, or even Adolfo Bonilla y San Martín's sketchier century-old chronological bibliography, which unlike the present work embraces translations categorically.

On the other hand, some caution is required in using the volume. Things are not always easy to find. Confusion will visit the reader who overlooks the editors' unobtrusive note (p. 21, n. 3) that when collections are cited by abbreviation, the complete bibliographical addresses for these abbreviations are to be found in thematic section II, 'Obras colectivas.' Charles Fantazzi's 1979 critical, annotated edition of the *In pseudodialecticos* is missing from Section XXXVIII (*Adversus pseudodialecticos*), where one would go first to look for it, but may be found in Section IV ('Edad media. Universidades. Filosofía medieval'). Inconsistently, Rita Guerlac's edition of the same work appears in both places. This is one of a number of instances where the book will be friendlier to the user familiar with Vives than to the scholar making acquaintance with this formidable humanist for the first time. Similarly there is not always a logical or necessary home for important translations. Thus Riber's commonly used Spanish-version *Obras completas* appears as entries #79 and #599, but can most reliably be found (as is the case with other items) by tracing backward from the entry 'Riber' in the Index. This means that someone would need to know of that edition in advance in order to be sure of finding it. The important 1610 English translation of the *City of God* commentary, still the only English version of that major work, is not cited.

The editors' ironclad and understandable determination to avoid comment sometimes works against the book's usefulness even on its own terms. The scope of many items far outstrips the study of Vives. While one appreciates being apprised that these

works deal with the humanist, they are cited without any indication at all of where or to what extent Vives is treated. Thus, for example, the value of entry #157 (complete citation: “Gassendi, Petrus: *Opera omnia in sex tomos divisa*. Florentiae: 1727”), or #175 (“*Historiae de rebus Hispaniae. Libri XXX* by Juan de Mariana, 1605”) is not readily apparent. Such instances are frequent. The style of citation sometimes masks the accurate title of a work (cf. ## 113, 132). Misprints occur, but none that I have found fatal to understanding. “Briesemeister” is misspelled; entry #70 is published by Edwin Mellen Press.

In sum, this bibliography is a groundbreaking new vehicle for which scholars will be grateful, and one which will benefit from further refinement when the time for an update arrives. Physically the book is elegant and soundly bound. Layout is lavish to a fault; a later edition could diminish the page space reserved for each entry with no loss in quality. The editors generously invite readers to communicate regarding errors and deficiencies. (Edward V. George, Texas Tech University)

*The Adages of Erasmus*. Selected by William Barker. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 2001. li + 405 pp. \$80 cloth, \$29.95 paper. *Friends Hold All Things in Common: Tradition, Intellectual Property, and the Adages of Erasmus*. By Kathy Eden. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001. ix + 194 pp. \$35. Five hundred years after it was first published, Erasmus's *Adages* remains a remarkable book. In spite of an occasional slip, it reveals an astounding grasp of all extant classical literature on the part of one gifted, voracious reader. The *Adages* is a reference work, to be sure—one which has still not really been superseded—but it also preserves the distinctive voice of its author, becoming a work of literature as well. It remained a best seller for generations, partly because it was a good read in its own right, but partly because it proved an invaluable resource in an age when mastering Latin style was the ticket to professional success. First published in 1500, it was followed by major revisions in 1508 (the Aldine edition), 1515 (the Froben edition), and 1533, then by epito-

mes and expansions that adapted it to the needs of new readers through the eighteenth century, when European education began to turn away from the rhetorical approach to the classics that had dominated the schools since the Renaissance.

The proverb, defined by Erasmus as “a saying in popular use, remarkable for some shrewd and novel turn” (Barker, p. 5), was opened up in the *Adages* by being resituated within its ancient literary culture, thereby becoming a thought-provoking linguistic phenomenon that looked simultaneously back toward the past culture whose wisdom it encapsulated and forward into the new culture that was emerging in imitation of Greece and Rome. The unusual metaphorical force of the proverb offered both delight and instruction: *festivitas* to adorn the *genus familiare* favored by Erasmus and *auctoritas* to make an argument persuasive. Proverbs could also be transferred directly into commonplace books, where they were organized under headings like *temeritas* and *pietas*, at which point they stood ready to flesh out new writings in new contexts. Erasmus’s *Adages*, in other words, stood as a filter between antiquity and those who gazed back on it from an ever-increasing distance.

Barker’s anthology presents English translations of 119 of Erasmus’s 4151 proverbs, taken from the relevant volumes of the Collected Works of Erasmus. The selection focuses on widely circulated proverbs, especially those that are also found in English. All the famous adages are here—*amicorum communia omnia*, *festina lente*, *Herculei labores*, *dulce bellum inexpertis*, etc.—along with a generous selection of less famous, but no less interesting, ones, making this a good introduction to the *Adages* for those who wish to sample the riches of Erasmian *copia*. It is worth remembering, however, that when volumes 30, 35, and 36, with the last of the *Adages*, an index, and introductory matter, join volumes 31 to 34, which have already been published, the Collected Works of Erasmus will offer these same selections situated within the collection as a whole, making this volume a questionable purchase for major research libraries and for specialists whose needs go beyond introductory anthologies.

Eden's study of the *Adages* develops an elegant argument about the work and its significance that is so deceptively simple that its originality threatens to become obscured by the modesty with which it is presented. The *Adages* serve as a way to preserve and make accessible the classical tradition, but *tradio*, as Eden points out, is a term derived from Roman law, where it refers to the most regular means for transferring the ownership of property. The early Christians used the figures of the *spoliatio Aegyptorum* and the *mulier captiva* to appropriate the classical tradition as a hostile property transfer between enemies, but Erasmus reconfigures this relationship, substituting for the appropriated property of enemies the shared property of friends. In his opening adage, *amicorum communia omnia*, Erasmus bases this approach in Pythagoras, the originator of pagan communalism as well as of the saying itself, and Plato, Pythagoras's most persuasive disciple, both of whose teachings are in obvious agreement with those of Christ. Eden develops her argument through close readings of Erasmus's sources, showing how the famous proverbs initiating each group of a thousand (*chilias*) reinforce the relationships among friendship, property, and the literary tradition and structure the collection as a whole. Eden also suggests that the new technology of printing, which disseminates Erasmus's work as the common intellectual property of all who care about the classical past, also poses a threat to the free transferral of that property, for it was in Venice at the turn of the sixteenth century—where Aldus Manutius published the second major edition of the *Adages* in 1508—that laws regarding intellectual property began evolving toward the copyright system of today, which offers certain advantages to the author but impedes the free flow of ideas at the same time.

This last point begins to emerge at the end of Eden's book, but it is not developed as thoroughly as it should have been. Erasmus certainly held to the ideals expressed in *amicorum communia omnia*, but he also had a keen awareness of scholarly publishing as a source of income that he fully intended to exploit. In *festina lente*, he notes that his publisher and collaborator Aldus "has acquired as much gold as he has reputation, and richly deserves both" (Barker,



p. 149). And he expected no less for himself. The *editio princeps* begins with a dedication to Lord Mountjoy and ends with a poem on the virtue of the English king Henry VII and a letter to the young prince Henry, thus placing it emphatically within the network of English patronage. And as Jean Hoyoux showed more than fifty years ago (“Les moyens d’existence d’Erasmus,” *Bibliothèque d’Humanisme et Renaissance* 5 (1944): 42-43), both of these strategies were designed to maximize the profits that were potentially available through the new technology. In other words, as Lisa Jardine has explained at length (*Erasmus, Man of Letters* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993)), Erasmus quickly mastered the ways in which he could use the new army of printers, editors, and proof readers to promote himself and advance his career. This Erasmus exists in uneasy tension alongside the Erasmus of older scholarship, the great master of the disinterested pursuit of knowledge. Eden’s balance tilts rather more toward the latter than I would have liked, but *Friends Hold All Things in Common* remains an important book that will help us appreciate the complexities of the adages collected and translated in Barker’s anthology. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

*Controversies: Hyperaspistes 2*. Ed. by Charles Trinkaus, trans. by Clarence H. Miller, and annotated by Clarence H. Miller and Charles Trinkaus. *The Collected Works of Erasmus*, 77. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: The University of Toronto Press, 2000. xiv + pp. 333-812. \$125. Book 2 of *Hyperaspistes* (1527) is the fullest expression of Erasmus’s disagreement with Luther and is closely linked to the works translated in CWE 76: Article 36 of Luther’s *Assertio omnium articulorum per bullam Leonis X novissimam damnatorum / An Assertion of All the Articles of Martin Luther Which Were Quite Recently Condemned by a Bull of Leo X, Article 36*, which stimulated *De libero arbitrio diatribe sive collatio / A Discussion of Free Will* (1524), which in turn stimulated Luther’s *The Enslaved Will* (not in CWE), to which *Hyperaspistes liber unus / A Warrior Shielding a Discussion of Free Will against The Enslaved Will by Martin Luther, Book One* (1526), then *Hyperaspistes liber secundus*, respond.

The section of *Hyperaspistes* in this volume is twice the length of Book 1, but is nevertheless difficult if not impossible to understand without the material in the preceding volume.

Book 2 of *Hyperaspistes* sets out Erasmus's earlier argument, Luther's response in *The Enslaved Will*, and Erasmus's further response, developed at great length here. The mass of detail, coupled with the complexity of multiple, intertwined arguments, can make for difficult reading, but for those with the patience to unravel it all, the depth and range of Erasmus's theological vision come into focus. Erasmus attributes almost everything in justification to grace, with a minimum concession to free will, and models his position on Augustine in a deliberate effort to appropriate to his own position the churchman whom Luther most admired. He therefore attempted to draw together the grace that acts on a person and the person willing through assent, delineating a place for both divine and human participation in the conversion of a soul and drawing together Augustine's insistence on the omnipotence of God with the late scholastic argument that God grants a person a role in his or her own salvation. Erasmus's position rests on his own particular way of reading Scripture, which "should be interpreted according to the character of those who are being addressed," since "Scripture sometimes addresses one group, sometimes the other" (1536E), and which allowed for reconciliation by opening a way to see the other side of an argument. Within ten years, however, Erasmus was dead, followed ten years later by Luther; by then the religious wars were beginning, and Erasmus, the great advocate of concord and civil discourse, was condemned by both sides and is remembered for his failure to achieve the reconciliation he sought.

Though published separately, volumes 76 and 77 comprise an integral unit, as evidenced by the continuous pagination that links them together. The reader who wants to straighten out the nuances of grace and free will in the works of the two greatest theologians of the Renaissance thus has gracious plenty to work with here. Regular readers of this journal will be aware that CWE has become the standard English translation of Erasmus's works,

and given the importance of the material contained here, anyone with any real interest in the subject will have to turn to this translation. As always, the quality of the scholarship is high, as is the price, but in the end the former justifies the latter. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

*Giovanni della Casa's Poem Book, Joannis Casae carminum liber, Florence 1564.* Ed., trans., and commentary by John Van Sickle. Tempe, Arizona: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1999. xi + 156 pp. \$20. Like his fourteenth-century countryman Petrarch, Giovanni della Casa (1503-1556) is better known for his Italian sonnets than for his Latin verse. A Florentine by birth, della Casa was an important member of the humanist circle in Rome in the first half of the sixteenth century, and his Latin verse, published, like his Italian verse, posthumously, charts his involvement with that circle. John Van Sickle has edited, translated, and commented on the poems that make up the posthumous volume—the *Carminum liber*—published in Florence in 1564. Van Sickle's introduction considers not only the literary aspects of della Casa's Latin poetry but also traces how the poetry reflects his association with important figures of the Cinquecento world (Pope Paul II and his grandsons Alessandro and Ottavio Farnese, the Venetian Bishop Gian Matteo Giberti, Cardinal Reginald Pole) as well as his fellow humanist poets (Marc Antonio Flaminio, Pietro Bembo, Francesco Maria Molza, Lodovico Becadelli, Francesco Berni), along with friends and relatives in Florence like Pier Vettori and Carlo Gualteruzzi, who eventually saw his poetry into print. Van Sickle has made use of the contemporary letters of della Casa to friends and associates along with their letters to him, as well as letters which concern della Casa's activities, a selection of which he prints in Appendix II in Italian (without translations). Most of these letters concern, he indicates, literary activity involving the *Carminum liber*.

Van Sickle reprints and translates only the poetry of the *editio princeps* of 1564. Other Latin poetry attributed to della Casa, such as that reprinted in Toscano's *Carmina illustrium poetarum Italorum* (Paris, 1576), in Gherus's *Delitiae CC. Italorum poetarum*

(Frankfurt, 1612), and in the two eighteenth-century collections of Latin verse by Italian poets, printed in Florence and Bergamo, in 1719 and 1753 respectively—*Carmina illustrium Itatorum* and *Carmina quinque illustrium poetarum*—he neither directly mentions nor discusses. Yet surely he must know of the existence of these reprints, since they include all the poetry of the 1564 volume as well as additional poems.

Hence there are only sixteen poems in this collection; the final three short poems, moreover, are often printed as one. Horace is the primary literary influence, though echoes of Catullus, Propertius, Callimachus, and Euripides can be found. Poem nr. 4 in fact is adapted from Hippolytus' denunciation of women, Latinized virtually word for word. However, della Casa can most often be found, like Horace, giving advice to his friends, deploring the vulgarity of the mob, inveighing against Fortuna, castigating ambition, advising retreat from the city, and praising those who also serve the Muses. The collection is essentially a set of familiar poems to friends and patrons, written in meters that range from elegiacs (which, as Van Sickle notes, Horace never used) to the favorite Horatian meters—hexameters, As-clepiads, Alcaics—and even an excursion into Catullan hendecasyllables. The book served della Casa as much for experiments in Latin meters as for addresses to associates. In true Neo-Latin style, it is marked as much for improvisation on classical themes as for imitation of Latin and Greek poets. Van Sickle's translations are serviceable and as rewarding to readers who can enjoy the facing Latin as to those who must come to della Casa only in translation. His commentary and notes, together with his introduction, are helpful in placing that poetry in the context of the poetics and politics of the Renaissance in Italy. (Stella P. Revard, Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville)

*Een netwerk aan de basis van de Leidse universiteit: Het album amicorum van Janus Douza.* Ed., trans., and commentary by Chris L. Heesakkers. 2 vols. Leiden: Universiteitsbibliotheek Leiden / Uitgeverij Jongbloed, 2000. 143 ff, [xiv] + 558 pp. Distributed through the Leiden University Library. The volumes under re-

view here present a remarkable manuscript, Leiden Universiteitsbibliotheek BPL 1406, the 'friendship album' of Janus Dousa (1545-1604). Trustee, then librarian of the newly founded University of Leiden, diplomat and man of letters, Dousa stood at the center of literary and political life in late sixteenth-century Holland. Beginning in his student days and continuing through his active involvement with the university, Dousa kept an *album amicorum*, in which he invited his friends to write something of interest to him. Given Dousa's prominence as a writer, educator, and statesman, this album clearly merits the time and attention that have been lavished on it here.

Preparing such an album appears to have become fashionable just a short time before in Germany, so that Dousa's in fact is one of the earliest of the versions prepared by Dutch students. He did not abandon the project until the press of serious, non-university business at the end of his life forced him to, so that from 1563 to 1597, 135 of his contemporaries from all over Europe commemorated their friendship with him in texts of various length, usually in Latin and sometimes illustrated with their family coats of arms. The album looks today very much as it did in the sixteenth century, making the decision to publish a facsimile a sensible one.

Even a cursory examination of the album reveals its fundamentally literary character. The inscriptions return over and over again to Dousa's *candor* and *eruditio*, and to his abilities as a poet. He published several books of Latin verse, a historical study of the Netherlands, and commentaries on Sallust, Horace, Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, Petronius, and Plautus, so it would stand to reason that he would seek out contact with those of like interests. Thus poets and scholars appear again and again in the pages of the album, and since Dousa moved in high circles, the key figures—Lucas Fruterius, Gulielmus Altarius, Daniel Rogers, Hadrianus Junius, Victor Giselinus, Justus Lipsius, Jan van Hout, Bonaventura Vulcanius, Paulus Melissus, Janus Gruterus, and Joseph Justus Scaliger—were well known in his day and, in many cases, still are now.

What is worth dwelling on here, I believe, is the potential that works like this offer for the study of Neo-Latin literature. Dousa's literary abilities seem to have inspired his friends, who honored him in the most appropriate way they could: with poems. This makes the album, as Heesakkers notes, "a paradigm of Latin—and in small measure also of Dutch—literary activity at the young Dutch university" (p. 43). Thus we find in this album, as in others, original poetry that is well worth studying in and of itself, along with the concrete evidence about who knew whom that literary history should rest on. To be sure, this evidence is not easy to use, for when an album remains unpublished, one has to struggle through not just one sixteenth century hand, but dozens. In this case Heesakkers has presented the manuscript for us to appreciate in facsimile, but also done an enormous amount of work in transcribing this material, providing a translation into Dutch, and clarifying the relationship between each writer and Dousa. This album, and others like it, clearly merit further study, and the editor and his university are to be commended for making this material accessible to today's community of Neo-Latin scholars. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

*Giordano Bruno 1548-1600: mostra storico documentaria*, Roma, Biblioteca Casanatense, 7 giugno-30 settembre 2000. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 2000. cxliv + 234 pp., 12 color plates. Lit. 75,000. To honor the four-hundredth anniversary of the death of Giordano Bruno, the Comitato Scientifico e Organizzativo arranged for an exhibition of materials relating to his life and times at the Biblioteca Casanatense in Rome. Given that Bruno was not just a philosopher in the strictest sense, but a thinker whose ideas and actions have maintained a certain notoriety among the educated public, the goal of the exhibition was to use primary sources—archival documents, first editions of Bruno's works, contemporary illustrations of the places in which he lived, and so forth—to produce a full, scientifically accurate picture of the man and the ideas from which he constructed his world. Judging from the catalogue that accompanied the exhibition, the organizers succeeded splendidly.

The catalogue begins with an introduction that contains a basic narrative of Bruno's life and works, an iconographical survey that includes twenty-three pictures of Bruno, a selection of documents recording the major events of his life, a section on the surviving manuscripts of his works, a bibliography of secondary works cited in the catalogue, and a chronology of key dates. The catalogue proper is organized chronologically, in nineteen sections whose titles give an idea of their respective emphases: 'Da Nola a Napoli,' 'La prima formazione filosofica di Bruno: aristotelismo e platonismo,' 'I "maestri",' 'La scintilla dell'*Ars memoriae* e dell'*Ars lulliana*,' 'Bruno nel convento di San Domenico Maggiore,' 'Per una riforma morale e religiosa: scelta di testi in volgare,' 'I trattati d'amore e alcuni autori prediletti di Bruno,' 'Il "cavaliere errante" dalla fuga da Roma all'espatrio,' 'Nella cittadella di Calvino,' 'L'insegnamento a Tolosa e il giudizio su Francisco Sanchez,' 'Nella Parigi di Enrico III,' 'L'esperienza inglese,' 'Il secondo soggiorno parigino,' 'L'arrivo in Germania,' 'Da Praga a Francoforte,' 'Il rientro in Italia,' 'La fase veneta del processo,' 'La fase romana del processo,' and 'Inquisizione e indice: la proibizione delle opere di Bruno.' The book concludes with a general bibliography.

This exhibition and the catalogue that accompanies it exemplify the best work of this kind in the Italian scholarly community of today. Months of labor have clearly gone into researching and selecting the items to be displayed, arranging for their collection in Rome, and preparing a permanent record of what is known about this material at the time of the exhibition. The result is a research tool that will serve as a point of reference for the next generation of Bruno scholarship, presented in a form that is both easy to use and elegant—the twelve color plates are accompanied by a generous selection of black-and-white illustrations, and as is always the case with Olschki books, type face and page layout combine in a presentation that meets the highest publishing standards. If you have any serious interest in Bruno at all, you will want to have this catalogue readily to hand. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

*Die lateinische Poetik des Marco Girolamo Vida und ihre Rezeption bei Julius Caesar Scaliger.* By Susanne Rolfes. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 149. Munich and Leipzig: K. G. Saur, 2001. 304 pp. 88 EUR. This study begins from the observation that in spite of its initial success, Marco Girolamo Vida's *De arte poetica* (1527) was overshadowed by the *Poetices libri septem* of Julius Caesar Scaliger (1561), which is widely viewed as the first complete and systematic Renaissance poetics, a precursor of modern literary history and the most important foundation of classical aesthetics. Rolfes' project is to revisit this apparently simple relationship and to restore to Vida's treatise the praise she feels it deserves.

A cursory reading of Vida's poetics shows that it was designed to help a practicing poet make a perfect epic, using Virgil's *Aeneid* as a model. Rolfes argues, however, that we should not overemphasize the pedagogical intent of the work. Instead, favorite themes like the Prometheus myth, the music of the spheres, and the Muses guide the reader toward "eine 'epische Kulturgeschichte'" which helps explain the rise and fall of great cultures. Divine inspiration and literary imitation are certainly treated, but again, the discussion goes from literature per se to its social and political ramifications—that is, Vida believed in the power of language, but he also believed in the reciprocal relationship between epic poetry and cultural and political power. Italy was being threatened from within by squabbling city states and from without by the Turks; Vida's solution was to promote the writing of a good epic poem, which would unite his countrymen politically at the same time as it raised the literary culture upon which Italy's strength depended.

Scaliger positioned himself in Vida's footsteps, intending not only to go beyond what he had done, but to move in a different direction: he retained Vida's interest in literary development, but not in its social or political corollaries. Thus themes like inspiration and imitation, along with the theory of epic and the traditional comparison between Homer and Virgil, are treated in Scaliger's poetics, but as elements of an objective, properly literary history. Thus Scaliger indeed expanded and in some ways excelled Vida, but in other ways they remained different enough to defy



comparison. Consequently Vida's poetics should be appreciated on its own terms, as a document that is worth reading for its critical, aesthetic, and intellectual dimensions and for what it can tell us about the values of the age in which it was written. Like many lightly revised German dissertations, Rolfes' study retains a good deal of historical and biographical background which does not really advance the argument, and it occasionally suffers from a somewhat pedantic, overly thorough presentation, such that in the end one wonders (at least in passing) if the whole business would not have been better as an article than a book. But unlike some dissertations, this one rests on a good idea and comes to an interesting, clearly stated conclusion which strikes me as right on the money. The direction Scaliger took, of course, is the direction that literary studies, particularly among classicists, continued to follow until very recently, and it is perhaps ironic that a dissertation which remains virtually untouched by the literary theory of our day pleads for the appreciation of a poetics that recognizes the very interconnection between literature and politics that drives so much contemporary theory. In other words, the book is certainly worth reading, both on its own terms and for what it might suggest in other areas as well. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

*Mars et les Muses dans L'Apologie pour Hérodote d'Henri Estienne.* By Bénédicte Boudou. Geneva: Droz, 2000. 684 pp. CHF 145.40, EUR 97.41. The *Apologie pour Hérodote* is one of the most fascinating works of the French Renaissance. Published in 1566, it follows the shorter, Latin *Apologia pro Herodoto*, which Henri II Estienne wrote as an introductory essay to his 1566 edition of Lorenzo Valla's Latin translation of Herodotus's *History*. The chief interest of the *Apologie* lies in its outstanding literary value in many areas. It is a great collection of stories, close in ribaldry and satirical spirit to Rabelais or Boccaccio; it is also a critique of the Roman Catholic Church and so belongs to the history of ideas and religious apologetics. And it is a masterpiece of French prose. As its

title proclaims, it is a defense of Herodotus and of the Greek historian's claims to veracity, and so a fitting witness to the revival of Greek letters in Europe.

Had Henri Estienne simply produced a translation of his Latin text, the interpretation of the *Apologia* would be far more straightforward. Instead, the French *Apologie* has a polemical and critical thrust that goes well beyond the purpose of defending Herodotus. Is, then, the *Apologie* a satire? No, says the author of this lengthy study: that is a reductionist reading, although the work is certainly satirical. Is the *Apologie* a work of religious apologetics? Again, no: "La richesse, la profondeur et la diversité des réflexions d'Henri Estienne dans *L'Apologie pour Hérodote* attestent que son livre est bien autre chose qu'un brûlot protestant" (p. 503). But just what is this "autre chose"?

Boudou seeks to provide answers to this question in her lengthy study. Her documentation is extensive, her scholarship wide ranging. At the same time, her book reveals a lack of focus even as it creates, through its close, attentive readings, an interest in Henri Estienne, that most prolific and individual of authors. A bonus of this study is that it provides, as an appendix, the complete text of the Latin *Apologia pro Herodoto*, with a French translation *en regard*. Boudou is concerned, however, with the French *Apologie* almost exclusively.

The title of her book calls attention to two characteristics of Henri Estienne's work: a polemical, or martial, one and a more literary one delighting in words and poetry. Boudou's main thesis is that the *Apologie pour Hérodote* is best analyzed as two forms of discourse—the polemical and the literary—of which "Mars" and the "Muses" are metonymies. She takes this dichotomy from Henri Estienne's own works, in which he seeks to demonstrate that literature ought not be foreign to those whose duty is the protection of France: Henri Estienne "aspire à voir Mars, dégoûté de combattre, se réconcilier avec les Muses" (p. 17). Chagrined that the polemical aspects of the *Apologie* have overshadowed the more literary aspect, Boudou seeks to restore the balance and analyze the poetical, playful, literary aspects of the work.

The critical essay is divided into three parts: ‘Histoire de l’Apologie pour Hérodote,’ ‘Mars dans l’Apologie pour Hérodote,’ and ‘L’Apologie pour Hérodote sous le signe des Muses.’ The first part, in two chapters, studies Henri Etienne’s background and the “genesis” of the *Apologie*; the second part, also in two chapters, focuses on “Mars”, i.e., on a discussion of “argumentation” and “satire”; under the third part, “Muses”, we find three chapters on, respectively, the role and meaning of the numerous “histoires,” on the importance of “critique”—giving to this word the meaning that it has in Jean Jehasse’s *La Renaissance de la critique*—, then on the *Apologie* as a “method” for the reading of history.

My chief concern lies in the usefulness of this Mars-Muse antithesis. One often finds discussions of polemical technique not under “Mars,” but under “Muses,” and vice versa. Take comedy, for example: is comedy polemical? Yes: in chapter 4 we find a section and sub-section on “le rire satirique.” But comedy is also playful and literary, as we find in reading the analysis of the “contes pour rire” in chapter 5, which is placed “sous le signe des Muses.” And can comedy somehow be both? The answer is yes, as we find in reading part 4.3 of this same chapter 5. Likewise: why separate the presumably “martial” rhetoric of exempla studied in III.3.3 from the “musing” exemplum studied in V.4.2? That Henri Estienne’s writing can be defined as having essentially a “martial” and a “musing” spirit is certainly true. But the reader of this study may begin to wonder: just how useful is this dichotomy Mars / Muses as an analytical distinction? Does this division do justice to the nature of the *Apologie*?

Similar questions can be raised in regard to the author’s introduction of other themes into her analysis. Eager, and justifiably so, to claim for the *Apologie* a more ambitious character than that of mere satire or polemic, she claims that the *Apologie* is a “recherche de la vérité,” an “enquête,” a “critique,” “une véritable réflexion sur la manière de lire et d’écrire l’histoire,” etc. These terms show that the author is seeking to underscore the intellectual depth and originality of the *Apologie*. Yet how and why are “recherche,” “enquête,” etc. related to Mars or the Muses? The

author does succeed in demonstrating this depth and originality, but it is through a method that the author herself qualifies as “pédestre.” The book is in fact a series of close readings of various argumentative and literary techniques in the *Apologie*, along with useful discussions of important influences, such as Sextus Empiricus, and various intellectual relationships, such as Estienne’s with Calvin. In these aspects of her work, the author succeeds quite well. She alerts the reader on the first page that her study is going to follow the text closely. With such an approach, most readers, I believe, will have no quarrel: a pedestrian, modest approach is one that can do much to bring an author home to the reader. And it is within these close readings of the text that the book ultimately succeeds in its basic aim. Again and again, in close, careful readings, the author analyzes the essential aspects of style and argument in the *Apologie*. We arrive at a great appreciation for Henri Estienne’s literary abilities, his individuality as a writer even as he embraces religious apologetic. Yet the overall thesis seems to dissolve and disappear when we get to this level of close reading. The why and how of moving from topic to topic was not always apparent to this reader as he read the three parts, seven chapters, twenty-six sub-parts, and sixty-four sub-sub-parts.

More discussion of some basic points might have given this study more focus. What, for example, is the “real” title of Henri Estienne’s work? The original title is *Introduction au Traité de la conformité des merveilles anciennes avec les modernes ou Traité préparatif à l’Apologie pour Hérodote*. In her introduction, Boudou shows great interest in this original title and criticizes those editions which fail to respect it: she chides the 1735 editor of the *Apologie* for “relegating the original title to a sub-title” (p. 11). She criticizes Paul Ristelhuber, the editor who gave the first complete text of the French *Apologie*, for calling Henri Estienne’s work *Apologie pour Hérodote* and for committing the further sin of putting in the sub-title *Satire du XVI siècle*. But if this original title is so important, then why was it discussed so briefly in *Mars et les Muses*? And why does the author almost always use the word *Apologie* to refer to the French text? To focus on the original title, to discuss its

complexities and implications—it is a real conundrum—would allow for more analysis of an essential feature of the *Apologie*, namely Henri Estienne’s concern with belief and truth, and this in turn might have allowed for clearer connections between the various analyses of Estienne’s rhetoric, or for more complete justification of her often repeated statements that the *Apologie* is a “recherche de la vérité,” “enquête,” “méthode,” “une réflexion épistémologique,” etc.

Still regarding the title: Boudou states that it is with the 1735 edition that “Pour la première fois, le livre prend le titre d’Apologie pour Hérodote” (p. 11, n. 26). How then does this square with Ristelhuber’s claim that Estienne adopted the ordinary title *Apologie pour Hérodote* “dans le cours de l’impression,” in other words, in 1566 (*Apologie pour Hérodote* (Geneva: Slatkine, 1970), 1: xlv)? Moreover, I feel that our author is a bit unfair to Ristelhuber. Yes, it is true that he does not mention the original title of Henri Estienne’s work “dès la première page” (p. 12), but he does provide the complete original title twice: once, after his *Note de l’éditeur*; the second time, before Henri Estienne’s *Préface de la première partie*.

More discussion of some of her major claims would also have given this study more focus. For example, the author makes at the end of her study the very interesting remark that Henri Estienne adopts a “démarche mimétique” (p. 504) in his *Apologie*, that he is imitating Herodotus’s own example. Why not have made more of this relationship? The Greek word *historia* means, literally, “enquête,” and throughout her study, Boudou uses a French translation of Herodotus’s *History* that translates the title of his work literally: *Enquête*. Since she wishes to demonstrate that the *Apologie* is a “recherche de la vérité,” “enquête,” etc., why wait until the end to point out this “démarche mimétique” (on p. 351, she raises in a single sentence the possibility of “mimétisme”)? Likewise, if the “apport majeur d’Estienne à la réflexion sur l’histoire” is to emphasize the “distance qui sépare les historiens anciens du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle,” then how does that square with Henri Estienne’s desire to demonstrate “conformité” between “merveilles”?

In a study of this length, errors will of course slip through. On p. 364, the Latin quotation reads *Si non caste, tam caute*, it should read *tamen caute*. The following sentence, as it appears in the text, is misleading: “Dès 1561, il écrit ainsi, à l'exemple de Xénophon, un *Discours sur le Devoir de joindre Mars aux Muses*” (p. 17): Xenophon never wrote such a treatise. In fact, although there is a footnote to Jean Jehasse, *op. cit.*, p. 134, the author seems to be quoting Jean Jehasse, *op. cit.*, p. 97, who is referring to Estienne's edition of Xenophon. On p. 53, in discussing some references that Henri Estienne makes to Petrarch, she refers to the poet's Italian sonnets; one should include too Petrarch's Latin polemic *Sine nomine*, which Henri Estienne appears to be quoting directly.

Given the length of this work, the reader might have welcomed an index that listed those pages where the author analyzes so well Estienne's rhetorical and argumentative techniques—*hyperbole, métaphore, enthymème, synecdoque*, etc. (although I remain a bit puzzled by the definition given to the enthymeme). Likewise, a complete and precise bibliographical listing of the French editions of the *Apologie*—none are listed in the bibliography—would have been of no small help to the reader in tracing more easily the evolution of the title from its original form to the current *Apologie pour Hérodote*.

This study appends the Latin text of the *Apologia pro Herodoto* and a French translation. Boudou also includes the prefatory letter to Camerarius and a letter to the reader, and so provides a more complete text than does the previous edition of the *Apologia*, by Johannes Kramer (Meisenheim am Glan: Verlag Anton Hain, 1980, with a German translation). However, she omits two Latin epigrams by Henri Estienne that appear after the title page and before the letter to Camerarius. (I am grateful to the Division of Rare and Special Collections of Cornell University for sending me photocopies of portions of the Latin text.) There are errors in the Latin and Greek which need to be corrected. On p. 514, we read *Mars et les Muses tuum apaibaion munusculum*, but Henri Estienne printed *tuum amoibaion munusculum*. On p. 516, we read *ego tamen numquam ad subeundum castigationis onus magis imperatus fuissem*, but

the original text as printed reads *magis imparatus fuissem*. On p. 520, we read *quaedam tua poëmatia*, translated as “ces poèmes de toi.” I believe however that Estienne printed *quaedam tua ponêmátia*, the diminutive of “works.” *Sed quid plura?* The responsibility for providing a complete list of *errata* and *corrigenda* lies with those who chose to edit and publish this valuable text.

Discrete mention is made that “une réédition de *l'Apologie pour Hérodote* [est] en préparation” (p. 21, n. 1). We are not told by whom, but I assume that it will be done by the author. It would be most useful for scholars if this new edition of the French *Apologie* included the Latin *Apologia*, with the translation of the latter. Readers would then be able to read for themselves these two fascinating texts and compare them more easily. (Why the Latin *Apologia* should be appended to *Mars et les Muses* is left unclear.)

The author has a real sympathy for Henri Estienne and illuminates the individuality of his style and thought. She has demonstrated that this masterpiece of French prose repays close study. Her command of scholarship is impressive: she is well poised to produce further studies on Renaissance literature, and in this study she has established a good basis for her future work. Many pages of Boudou's study will be referred to by specialists of the Renaissance, and her work will certainly create further interest in this writer. Saint-Exupéry wrote that to encourage men to build ships, you need to give them the love of the sea: Boudou has certainly succeeded in creating an affection for Henri II Estienne, and her work will encourage further studies of his vast output. (John A. Gallucci, Colgate University)

*Disputatio nova contra mulieres / A New Argument against Women*. Ed., trans., and commentary by Clive Hart. Mellen Critical Editions and Translations, 1. Lewiston, Queenston, Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press, 1998. \$89.95. It is always encouraging to see a press launch a series of critical editions and translations with the avowed intent of making significant but neglected texts available. The Edwin Mellen Press is therefore to be congratulated on its decision to start such a series and, given present scholarly interest

in Renaissance texts about women, is to be praised for starting with the *Disputatio nova contra mulieres*, of 1595, edited and translated for the first time into English by Clive Hart. However, that said, the press might give some thought to the format they have presumably chosen for the series. In this first volume, it leaves much to be desired.

The work is divided into six chapters. The first presents a rather spotty survey of the 'querelle des femmes' from the Middle Ages to the nineteenth century, the second a history of the publication and reception of the *Disputatio nova*. Hart takes as his starting point the full paradoxical title of the work, *Disputatio nova contra mulieres, qua probatur eas homines non esse*, translated as "A new argument against women, in which it is demonstrated that they are not human beings," and in this first chapter addresses the long-debated question of whether women have souls. Starting with Aristotle, he skips rather erratically over a series of little-known texts by some unfamiliar authors, mentioning in passing "the development of neoplatonism in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries" and Lodovico Domenichi's 1549 *La nobiltà delle donne* (without an accent). He stops to discuss a 1566 play by Lewis Wager, whom he familiarly calls "Lewis," and goes on to mention a Nashe pamphlet, a Donne "Problem," Marston's *The Dutch Courtesan*, Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, one of Samuel Butler's "Miscellaneous Thoughts," and a series of rather obscure writings ending with a French work of 1834 today largely forgotten. The choice is nothing if not eclectic. The section ends by mentioning "the energetic refutations of Gedik, Sister Arcangela, and others." Although this is his first reference to these people, we are told nothing about them, even in a footnote, until pages 28 and 32, respectively. Chapter 2 opens with a discussion of the disputed authorship of the *Disputatio nova* and a description of the work. It is an anonymous small tract of fifty-one paragraphs whose tone swings from solemn to facetious but whose thesis is resolutely anti-feminist: women are not human. The work, Hart says, is most notably characterized by "intentional and skilful misuse of sources." The chapter ends with a discussion of works connected in various ways to the



*Disputatio nova*, from Simon Gedik's refutation, published several months after the *Disputatio nova* in 1595, to adaptations and translations, and even works that Hart claims *seem* to refer to it (the italics are mine), like Ben Jonson's *Masque of beautie* and, more surprisingly, Dostoyevsky's *Crime and Punishment*.

There now follow the English translation of the Latin text (Chapter 3), what is called a "commentary, with identification of allusions and sources" (Chapter 4), a translation of a French anonymous essay of 1744 entitled *Essai sur l'ame des femmes* (Chapter 5), and then, finally, the Latin text with bibliographical introduction and textual notes (Chapter 6). The inappropriateness and sheer clumsiness of this format beggar belief. Firstly, in an edition of this nature, especially a "critical edition" as this claims to be, the original is the 'authoritative' text and should be placed first, or in a format with facing-page translations, on the left. Here it is placed last. Secondly, the annotations (what Hart calls "commentary") often pertain to expressions and allusions occurring in the Latin text. The reader is therefore obliged to keep the book open at three separate places: the translation, the annotations, and the original. Thirdly, and worst of all to my mind, the translation and its original are separated by a nine-and-a-half-page English translation of an anonymous essay entitled *Essai sur l'ame des femmes*, which Anne Gabriel Meusnier de Querlan appended to his 1744 French translation of the *Disputatio nova*. Although the essay begins by mentioning the *Disputatio nova* and quotes once briefly from it, its author says it is not a response to the earlier treatise. One might add that it has no particular merit of its own. Its relevance in this volume therefore has to be questioned. Rather than giving us the *Essai*, Hart should have provided a Latin text and an English translation (or even just a translation) of Simon Gedik's response, *Defensio sexus mulieribus*, a far more interesting and influential text, reprinted very many times both with the *Disputatio nova* and as an independent tract. It was still being quoted in the eighteenth century, as witness the *Essai*, and is the subject of many of Hart's annotations.

More can be said about the unfortunate format of Hart's book. No line numbers are given for either translations or the Latin text. Words or expressions commented on are in italics and within a single bracket in the annotations but are sometimes difficult to find in the text and translation given the absence of line numbers. No numbers or asterisks are used in the Latin text or translation to refer to the textual notes and annotations. The reader is therefore unaware—unless keeping a thumb in the annotations chapter—of which words or passages have elicited Hart's comments. Finally, as a result of the format, facts are often repeated. For example, comments on textual points in Chapter 4 reappear in the textual notes in Chapter 6.

There remains the question of Hart's editorial and translation skills, about which one can fortunately be more positive. His text of the Latin original is based on both manuscripts and printed editions, and he gives most substantive variants in his notes, although he considers the variants in the 1595 "reset" text, not entirely correctly, I think, not substantive enough to warrant inclusion. The text is carefully and cautiously edited, and the textual notes are accurate. The annotations, or "commentary," are pertinent and useful. The translation of both the Latin text and the French *Essai* is, Hart says, "literal." This makes for overall semantic accuracy, although neither rendering is completely free of minor mistranslations. It also makes for occasional awkward phrases. On the whole, however, Hart's translation renders the style of the *Disputatio* faithfully, changing neither tone nor register.

In conclusion, Edwin Mellen Press and Clive Hart have done scholars interested in the history of the 'querelle des femmes' a service by providing the text and translation of a treatise that has been rather neglected up to now. It is a pity that they decided to give us the *Essai sur l'ame des femmes* instead of the more important *Defensio sexus mulieribus*, still awaiting a modern edition and a translation. It is an even greater pity that they chose such an awkward format. It is to be hoped that they will improve on this in their future volumes. (Brenda Hosington, Université de Montréal)

*The Oxford Francis Bacon XIII: The Instauration magna: Last Writings.* Ed. and trans. by Graham Rees. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000. xcvi + 363 pp. \$135. The traditional story of Francis Bacon's death is that he wanted to find out whether stuffing a dead chicken with snow would preserve it, and that the chill he caught when gathering snow for this experiment killed him. This sounds apocryphal, but it is certainly *ben trovato*. Since around 1607, Bacon had been working intermittently on the enormous, unfinishable *Instauration magna*, a project which called not only for grand philosophical engagement with questions about life, the universe, and everything, but also for the accumulation of a very great many experimental data. Seven of the last writings which he meant for the *Instauration* are gathered here in a new edition and translation by Graham Rees: two versions of the *Historia densi et rari*, which is in effect a discussion of the way in which matter is distributed in the universe; the *Abecearium nouum naturae*, which outlines eighty areas of inquiry into the physical world; the *Historia et inquisitio de animato et inanimato*, the *Inquisitio de magnete*, and the *Topica inquisitionis de luce et lumine*, all of which appear to be sketches for a part of the *Instauration* in which Bacon would show how specific inquiries might be conducted; and the *Prodromi siue anticipationes philosophiae secundae*, which was written as an introduction to the penultimate part of the great work. These texts show a recurring interest in the processes at either end of human and animal life, vivification and putrefaction: their author would have been just the man to jump out of his coach on one of the last snowy days of winter and try an experiment in keeping flesh from decay.

The volume in which these texts are collected is part of the Oxford Francis Bacon, *OFB*, a brainchild of Graham Rees and Lisa Jardine. This project will publish all of Bacon's original writings in fifteen volumes, of which this is the fourth to appear: the Latin *Philosophical Studies ca. 1611-ca. 1619* came out in 1996 (reviewed by Lee Piepho in *Neo-Latin News* 45.1-2 (1997), pp. 32-33), and was followed in 2000 by two volumes in English, the *Advancement of Learning* and the *Essayes*, the latter being a reissue of an edition first published in 1985. Four volumes of Bacon's

correspondence are also to be published, under the general editorship of Alan Stewart. Since the edition of Spedding, Ellis, and Heath (1857-61), *SEH*, has served readers of Bacon so well, it is reasonable to ask whether a new edition is worth undertaking—and, indeed, whether it is worth paying for at an average price of \$135 per volume. Answering this pair of questions makes it possible to see some of the distinctive virtues of *OFB* as a whole, and of this volume in particular.

First, the Bacon canon has changed. Of the seven texts presented in this volume, three are new: an early version of the *Historia densi et rari*, the *Abececlarium* (which had previously been known from a fragment of an earlier version than the one presented here), and the *Historia et inquisitio de animato et inanimato*. These are all printed from a manuscript compiled by Pierre Dupuy, for whom they were copied from originals given to or stolen by a member of the Dupuy circle, Philippe Fortin de la Hoguette. These new texts are matched by a number of others elsewhere in *OFB*, and the edition of the correspondence will add more than 200 letters to the 700 printed by Spedding in the *Letters and Life* (1861-1874) which complemented *SEH*. These discoveries thus make new material available; for instance, seeing how Bacon reworked the Dupuy manuscript text of the *Historia densi et rari* is very instructive. Second, the texts presented in *SEH* were not edited to acceptable modern standards. Rees remarks with restraint that the textual notes to the earlier edition of the *Topica inquisitionis de luce et lumine* “show Victorian editorial practices in an interesting if melancholy light” (p. lxxxiii), and even when the *SEH* text is not seriously defective, its treatment of important matters such as capitalization contrasts sharply with the meticulous fidelity of *OFB*. Third, *SEH*'s translations from Latin are not only written in rather laborious prose, but treat technical terms anachronistically (cf., e.g., Rees's “Loadstone is not dissolved in aqua regia” and *SEH*'s “A magnet is not dissolved in nitro-muriatic acid” for *Magnes non solvitur in Aqua Regis*), and are sometimes very misleading (cf. Rees's “put into a crucible, yet not heated to the point where it gives off flame” and *SEH*'s “put into a crucible, yet without any flame” for *in*

*Crucibulo positus, citra tamen quam ut flammam immittat*). Text and translation are on facing pages in *OFB* and, inconveniently, in different volumes in *SEH*. Fourth, *OFB* is furnished with excellent introductions, which are equally attentive to intellectual content and context and to textual history, and with endnotes which are richly learned and often most attractively written: see, for instance, the discussion of *motus pilorum ex cauda equina* at pages 328-29. *SEH*'s editorial matter is, of course, obsolete. Neo-Latinists will be undismayed to find that some material, for instance the important distinction between *lux* and *lumen* (pp. 333-34), is explained in the *OFB* endnotes solely by quoting Latin discussions of the subject which are not translated. Fifth, *SEH* broke the works of Bacon up thematically and relegated the occasional works to the *Letters and Life*, whereas *OFB* treats the whole corpus together and (except that works from the *Instauratio* are presented in a single sequence) chronologically. Taken together, these five areas of improvement transform the experience of reading Bacon.

In conclusion, this volume is not only a superb piece of work in itself, but also part of a project of the highest importance for all Neo-Latinists and for all historians of early modern thought or of early modern England, one which is being carried out to the highest imaginable standards. (John Considine, University of Alberta)

*La France des humanistes: Hellénistes I.* By Jean-François Maillard, Judith Kecskeméti, Catherine Magnien, and Monique Portalier. Europa Humanistica. Turnhout: Brepols, 1999. LII + 598 pp. 450 FF, 65 EUR. This book, in the form of a dictionary, inventory of editions, and transcription of prefatory material, focuses on a group of French humanists whose books contain the prefaces which illuminate the two great preoccupations of Renaissance scholarship: the return to sources and the transmission of texts. Printing turned out to be the most effective means of preserving and transmitting the texts of antiquity, and the material reprinted here presents a step-by-step record of that work, from the discovery of manuscripts to the printing practices that favored the birth of

modern principles of philology and textual criticism. At the heart of this story is Guillaume Budé, whose work with the Collège des lecteurs royaux inspired the other humanists treated here: Germain de Brie, Pierre Danès, Jacques Louis de'Estrebay, Agostino Giustiniani, Gentien Hervet, Jean Mercier, Jacques Merlin, Philippe Montanus, Joachim Périon, Guillaume Petit, and Godefroy Tilmann. For them, classical Greek was the key that unlocked the parallels between secular and patristic, then between Greek and Latin culture, which provided in turn models for the renewal of the vernacular. After the invention of printing, the enthusiasm for pursuing manuscripts was matched by the determination to get the text into print, to recreate the original and to make it available as widely as possible. The focus here on the role of printing, in turn, nuances the traditional version of this story. The roles of those who underwrote the costs of publication, who merited the label *humanissimi* often applied to them, and of the young students for whom the books were written, the *iuvenes* and *studiosi* who appear on the title pages of the day, come to center stage, as do those of the correctors, who found themselves curiously situated between the worlds of the artisan and the scholar. The relationship between printer and scholar in turn emerges in all its many complexities: each needed the other; but the latter often found himself simultaneously praising the former for the work of cultural dissemination and excoriating him for inadvertently corrupting the text in an effort to cut costs and accelerate production.

Each of the dozen entries stands in effect as a monograph, consisting of a brief biography and a bibliography of basic reference works, followed by a list of the authors which each humanist worked on, a chronological inventory of editions with extracts from prefatory materials, and an indication of further works that remain unpublished. In addition to an index of classical authors and a general index, there are two other indices that are especially useful: one of the authors and recipients of the dedications and prefaces whose works are reprinted here, and the other of the printers and booksellers who disseminated this material. This allows the reader to use the book in two ways, either by tracing the ap-

pearance and disappearance of various individuals through the work of one scholar, or by tracing the impact of a patron across the work of many scholars and editors.

Since Latin was the international language of scholarship in the Renaissance, the documents reprinted here function as the primary sources in a key period of the history of classical scholarship. They further our understanding of the classical authors whose works they accompany, but as letters they also stand on their own as literary texts. The editors of this volume have invested a good deal of time in collecting this material, but the result is well worth the effort: not only have they made easily accessible a corpus whose *membra disiecta* are scattered throughout the libraries of Europe, but they have also provided the primary sources with which the old story of textual recovery and transmission can be retold in terms of the emerging discipline of book history. This collection, in short, belongs on the shelf of every serious student of Neo-Latin literature and the history of classical scholarship. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

Florence Vuilleumier Laurens. *La Raison des figures symboliques à la Renaissance et à l'Âge Classique: études sur les fondements philosophiques, théologiques et rhétoriques de l'image*. Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance, 340. Geneva: Droz, 2000. 538 pp. 145.40 CHF, 97.41 EUR. This weighty volume represents the slightly modified Sorbonne doctoral thesis defended by VL in 1996, in which the author studies the theoretical bases of the association of word and image from the fifteenth through the seventeenth centuries, with particular focus on the hermeneutic procedure called into play by the "mysteriously meant." It is a dense and intensely learned work which general readers might find somewhat daunting, but which specialists will find well worth their time. It more than justifies its author's claim to chart "les phases du long débat entre iconophilie et iconoclastic," with particular focus on the shift from medieval allegory to humanistic symbolism. VL tracks the all-important emergence of metaphorical discourse as a rhetoric granting ever more legitimacy to readerly interpretation as a counterweight to

authorial intention. If Horace was right to assert *ut pictura poesis*, then VL shows that, in the material she is concerned with, there might well be a case to argue that *ut pictura omnia scripta*. She succeeds fully in her intention to present the portrait of “un XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle se découvrant . . . comme un grand ‘Âge symbolique,’ le dernier peut-être, puisque condamné bientôt à se dissoudre sous le soleil des Lumières” (p. 14).

The book consists of some 300 plus pages of critical analysis, divided into four sections; some forty pages of bibliography; and over 150 pages of transcribed Latin treatises on the properties and functions of symbolic images and the hermeneutic they engage. This organization, reinforced as it is by the extensive bibliography and a ten-page Index Nominum, makes of the volume an important “instrument de travail,” although one that lends itself more to consultation by readers with specific inquiries in mind than by neophytes in the field. As a whole, it tends to wear its doctoral robes a trifle ostentatiously—between one-third and one-half of many of its pages are made up of dense footnote text, for example—but there can be no doubt that VL has established a thorough and ground-breaking catalogue of the important treatises in the field, and her constant recourse to primary sources, always discussed both analytically and in their historical context, makes of her book an invaluable reference tool.

Part One, ‘Le retour de Pythagore,’ charts the humanist rehabilitation of Pythagorean notions of form and harmony through the writings of Alberti and Ficino. Fruitful attention is then paid to the way in which such texts as the *Pythagorae fragmenta* of 1603 (indeed, the whole tradition of *praecepta mystica* and symbolic discourse) were scrutinized in the seventeenth century under the mutual tensions of philology and philosophy. Part Two, ‘Le nouveau monde symbolique,’ relates such inquiries to the Erasmian and post-Erasmian world, in which Christian wisdom becomes anchored in ‘classical’ adages, and the linkages of Stoic precepts and Senecan style engage a thinker like Vives in sustained reflection on the nature of figurative thinking and writing. Part Three, ‘Les enfants de Denys,’ then traces the influence of Denis the



Areopagite throughout the field of “symbolic theology.” VL’s inquiries into the notion that Christian truth possibly lends itself more readily to figurative representation than to explicit verbal declaration prove to be especially engaging here: see for example her study of the Dutch Jesuit Maximilian van der Sandt, who undertook to explicate both the profane and the sacred *arcana* of antiquity as a “delectable form of learning” (*amoena erudita*) for the benefit not only of the literary writers, but also of the “Christian philologists” of his day (p. 189). Part Four, ‘La rhétorique des formes symboliques,’ then develops the “veil or mirror?” formulation of the hermeneutic challenge posed by enigmatic writing, with detailed explication of works by Jacob Masen, Emanuele Tesauro, and Claude-François Ménéstrier. Consideration of the latter’s desire “de pénétrer dans la philosophie des et d’en rechercher les principes” (p. 297) leads to a far-reaching conclusion: in post-Cartesian France, where the canons of style assert “that which is not clear is not French” (a dictum school children are taught to this day!), enigmatic and symbolic writings fall from favor. On the brink of the Enlightenment, “la clareté française” arrests the hegemony of the symbolic until such time as it is reinstated in philosophy by eighteenth-century German reflection on the sublime, and thereby in literature by Romanticism.

VL invokes more than once the work of one of her mentors, Marc Fumaroli, and in particular his 1994 study, *L’École du silence: le sentiment des images au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle*. Her volume, in its synthesis of the theoretical relationships between verbal and visual rhetoric (between *logos* and *symbolon*), constitutes an impressive development of Fumaroli’s essential studies of the late Renaissance’s understanding of the artistic process (*poiesis*). Her explorations in the fields of emblematica, the mystical, and the cabbalistic further the work of scholars such as Frances Yates and D. P. Walker. Erudite and replete with documentation, this volume is a major contribution to our notions of taste and sensibility, as well as of the nature of hermeneutic, during one of the most formative periods of our intellectual and artistic history. (Kenneth Lloyd-Jones, Trinity College, Hartford)

Giovanni Boccaccio. *Famous Women*. Ed. and trans. by Virginia Brown. I Tatti Renaissance Library, 1. xxvi + 530 pp. Marsilio Ficino. *Platonic Theology*, vol. 1: Books 1-4. Trans. by Michael J. B. Allen, with John Warden; Latin text ed. by James Hankins, with William Bowen. I Tatti Renaissance Library, 2. xxviii + 342 pp. Leonardo Bruni. *History of the Florentine People*, vol. 1: Books 1-4. Ed. and trans. by James Hankins. I Tatti Renaissance Library, 3. xxiv + 520 pp. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001. \$29.95 per volume, cloth. The three volumes under review here launch a new series, the I Tatti Renaissance Library, which is designed to make available to a broad readership the major Latin texts of the Italian Renaissance along with an English translation. Given the nature of the series, some words about the project in general are in order before we turn to the three books that are currently available in it.

The I Tatti Renaissance Library was conceived as a sort of extension of the Loeb Classical Library, acknowledging that Latin remained a vibrant literary and intellectual force after antiquity and providing an outlet for the publication of key texts from a time when the language and values of the classical world got a new lease on life. That is, the series presents itself at the level of *haute vulgarisation*, not rarified scholarship, and it deserves to be evaluated in these terms. Each volume contains a "reliable Latin text," as the series publicity puts it, and that is indeed a fair assessment. There are no claims that these are critical editions based on extensive philological work with a full *apparatus criticus*, but each volume contains 'Notes to the Text' that often reflect considerable effort: in the Ficino volume, for example, Hankins began with the only modern edition, that of Marcel, but recollated the major independent witnesses, and in his Bruni volume the working text he presents takes an important initial step toward eventually producing a critical edition that recognizes the various stages through which the work went as Bruni revised it. An English translation, reasonably close to the Latin but clearly pitched toward readability, appears on facing pages. Each volume also contains a short

introduction by the editor, brief notes to the translation (often dominated by, but certainly not restricted to, identification of sources), a brief bibliography, and an index of names and places. The first three volumes suggest that the series can indeed be used as its originators intended, as reliable texts for the educated general reader, for advanced undergraduate and graduate courses, and for the growing number of scholars who need access to this material but who are not professional Latinists by training.

The general editor, James Hankins, has introduced the project with three volumes that show clearly the potential scope and appeal of the series. Virginia Brown's edition of *De mulieribus claris* is the first English translation based on the autograph text, and brings to a much wider audience than Zaccaria's 1967 Latin text the first biographical collection devoted exclusively to women. The 106 figures described here, almost exclusively from the classical world, were renowned for the great deeds they performed, whether good or bad, and reflect the conviction of humanists like Boccaccio that women as well as men required models of virtue and eloquence to move effectively through the world. Ficino's *Theologia Platonica* is the most important product of the Renaissance revival of Plato, part of an effort to synthesize Platonism with Christianity that would exercise wide influence on the art, thought, and culture of the period. It is translated into English for the first time in this series, as is Bruni's *Historiarum Florentini populi libri*. This latter book is generally considered the first modern work of history, an account of Florence's attempts to maintain her liberty against foreign powers and to expand her rule over the surrounding areas of Tuscany. These three works influenced later authors ranging from Chaucer to Spenser, and suggest that major works of biography, history, and philosophy of broad general interest can indeed be extracted from the thousands of Neo-Latin works written in the Renaissance.

Each of these volumes is done to consistently high standards, clearly and accurately printed in a readable format at an attractive price. The intention is to issue two or three volumes a year, and this is a goal that any Neo-Latinist cannot help but ap-

plaud. One wonders whether all the ‘hype’ that has accompanied the launch of the series is really necessary—publicity claims that this is “the only series that makes available to a broad readership the major literary, historical, philosophical, and scientific works of the Italian Renaissance written in Latin” are hardly accurate, as any regular reader of this journal knows—but if that’s what got the entire first printing (of several thousand copies) of the first two volumes sold out in a matter of months, perhaps in an increasingly Latinless age, the end justifies the means. In any event, I congratulate the authors, the series editor, and the press for their success, and I look forward to seeing the next installment in the project. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)