NEO-LATIN NEWS

Vol. 57, Nos. 3 & 4. Jointly with SCN. NLN is the official publication of the American Association for Neo-Latin Studies. Edited by Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University; Western European Editor: Gilbert Tournoy, Leuven; Eastern European Editors: Jerzy Axer, Barbara Milewska-Wazbinska, and Katarzyna Tomaszuk, Centre for Studies in the Classical Tradition in Poland and East-Central Europe, University of Warsaw. Founding Editors: James R. Naiden, Southern Oregon University, and J. Max Patrick, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and Graduate School, New York University.

♦ Res seniles, Libri V-VIII. By Francesco Petrarca. Edited by Silvia Rizzo, with the collaboration of Monica Berté. Edizione nazionale delle opere di Francesco Petrarca, 2. Florence: Casa Editrice Le Lettere, 2009. 373 pp. 35€. This edition of the letters written by Petrarch in his old age is part of the Edizione nazionale delle opere di Francesco Petrarca. The project began a century ago, with the intention of producing definitive texts of Petrarch’s works. Over the first several decades, little progress was made, with Festa’s edition of the Africa in 1926 being followed by Rossi and Bosco’s Familiares in 1933-1942, Billanovich’s Rerum memorandarum libri in 1945, and Martellotti’s De viris illustribus in 1964. Work was taken up again and reorganized at the end of the twentieth century, in conjunction with the celebration of the seventh centenary of Petrarch’s birth in 2004. The reorganized effort has already made considerable progress, with the following volumes currently available:


Upon completion, CD-ROMs will be produced. The entire project is described at http://www.franciscus.unifi.it/Commissione/Tut-toPetrarca.htm.

The volume under review here is the second installment of the Seniles. In line with the series norms, there is no commentary, but there is an apparatus containing authorial variants and some discussion of textual issues along with a second apparatus focused on intertextual references. The Latin text, which is based on the critical edition of E. Nota et al. (4 vols., Paris, 2002-2006) but with some variations, is accompanied by a good Italian translation which is useful in clarifying Petrarch’s sometimes-puzzling Latin. Any library with a serious interest in Neo-Latin studies should have a standing order for this series, which will be the preferred edition for this vitally important corpus for the foreseeable future. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

Bellunesi e feltrini tra Umanesimo e Rinascimento: filologia, erudizione e biblioteche. Atti del Convegno di Belluno, 4 aprile 2003. Edited by Paolo Pellegrini. Medioevo e Umanesimo, 113. Rome and Padua: Editrice Antenore, 2008. xx + 322 pp. 35€. The eleven essays in this volume of conference proceedings are devoted to Renaissance humanists who had connections to the Italian cities of Belluno and Feltre. An introduction by Rino Avesani lays out the plan of the volume, in which it becomes clear that one group of essays is devoted to Pierio Valeriano, a second to other humanists of lesser importance from Belluno, and a smaller, final group to humanists from nearby Feltre. Kenneth Gouwens opens the volume with a nice paper, “L’Umanesimo al tempo di Pierio Valeriano: la cultura locale, la fama, e la Respublica litterarum nella prima metà del Cinquecento,” which places Belluno’s favorite son, Valeriano, into the broader context of Italian humanism, especially in his relations with Paolo Giovio and Iacopo Sadoleto. In
“Pierio Valeriano’s De litteratorum infelicitate: A Literary Work Revised by History,” Julia Haig Gaisser provides a penetrating analysis of the structure of this work, noting that its long view of philosophical and religious truth pulls against the immediate and collective pain of individual suffering wrapped around the key year 1529. Maria Agata Pincelli, in “Un profilo dell’interpres nel Rinascimento: l’orazione in ingressu di Pierio Valeriano,” reports on Valeriano’s inaugural oration at the Studium Urbis, where his discussion of Catullus explored how Quintilian’s concept of the grammaticus, master of every field of knowledge, might be applicable in his own day. Marco Perale in turn explores a curious fact in the publication history of Valeriano’s Hieroglyphica, that it was first printed in Basel and was not published in Italy until half a century later; the answer given in “1556: Pierio Valeriano, Paolo IV e la doppia edizione degli Hieroglyphica” is that a number of people associated with the work had reformist tendencies, leading to an initial publication in a non-Catholic city.

The second group of essays focuses on ‘minor humanists’ from Belluno, individuals who are well worth studying but never attained the stature of Valeriano. Tiziana Pesenti, for example, uses her essay, “Andrea Alpago: ‘gran traduttore’ di Gerardo da Cremona o nuovo traduttore del Canone di Avicenna?”, to evaluate a translation of a key work in the medical canon made by a doctor from Belluno who spent two decades in Damascus. Matteo Venier turns his attention to the Breves institutiones of Giovanni Persicini, noting in “La grammatica latina di Giovanni Persicini” that this work deserves more dissemination than it received, given that it imposed a clear order on Latin grammar and illustrated its points with appropriate examples from classical authors. Persicini’s grammar was probably studied by Giangiacomo Sammartini, whose library was discussed by Roberto Spada in “L’«Inventario di libri di messer Zaniacopo Sammartino». Alcune note biografiche su Giovanni Persicini”; F. Malaguzzi’s “Sull’abito di una raccolta bellunese del Cinquecento: la biblioteca Piloni” represents a similar study, this time focused on the books of the counts Piloni, now dispersed but well known to bibliophiles and art historians. In “Pontico Virunio, Guarino e le grammatica greca del Crisolora,” Christian Förstel notes that Pontico, a little-known author today, rewrote the history of Italian humanism, subjecting Byzantine grammar to
a deeper philological criticism from which more modern grammar manuals emerged and attributing to Guarino a number of points which earlier humanist historiography had assigned to Chrysoloras.

The last two essays focus on humanists from Feltre. An especially interesting study is the one presented by Niccolò Zorzi, who rescues the learned Tommaso Zanetelli from oblivion through careful archival work and study of the manuscripts he copied in “Un feltrino nel circolo di Ermolao Barbaro: il notaio Tommaso Zanetelli, alias Didymus Zenoteles, copista di codici greci (c. 1450-1514).” Finally Alessandro Scarsella explores the relationship between a humanist from Feltre and the vexed question of the authorship of the Hypnerotomachia Poliphili in “Giambattista Scita e l’autore dell’Hypnerotomachia: lo status quaestionis.” Unlike some Italian conference proceedings, this one is nicely furnished with three indices, of names and places, of manuscripts, printed books, and archival documents, and of plates. All in all, this is a most useful volume, offering some fine new work on an important first-rank humanist and some excellent studies of lesser figures associated with him. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

De Troie à Ithaque: Réception des épopées homériques à la Renaissance. By Philip Ford. Travaux d’Humanisme et Renaissance, 436. Geneva: Droz, 2007. x + 411 pp. At the end of this rich study, the author poses an interesting question: given that Homer’s presence was very strong in France, from the end of the fifteenth to the beginning of the seventeenth centuries, when did it become meaningful to talk about a French Homer? And what characterised the reception of Homer in France compared to that of other European countries? To answer these questions Philip Ford draws on his analyses of Homer’s fortune in printed sixteenth-century editions (comprising the original Greek, translations and commentaries) and on the character and fortune of the various translations published in France during the same period, focusing on the political readings of the two poems, not least that of Guillaume Budé, on the role of Jean Dorat and the Pléiade in introducing Homer to a more general public, and on the connection between the humanists’ religious beliefs and their exegesis of Homer. The vast number of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century prints on which
the study is based affirms both the breadth and the depth of Homer’s influence in Renaissance Europe.

Though the focus of the book is on Renaissance, and especially sixteenth-century, France, Ford synthesizes a much wider material, both geographically and chronologically. He sets out to trace the reception of Homer from the mid-fourteenth century (25 ff.) when, thanks to Petrarch, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* became available to a Latin readership in the translations of Leontius Pilatus, after the events of the Trojan War and of Odysseus’ return to Ithaca had been known in Western Europe only in Latin or vernacular reworkings for much of the Middle Ages. In the first part of the book (15-91) he examines publications that somehow concern Homer as a European phenomenon and analyses the various Greek editions, Latin translations, and commentaries produced throughout the Latin West. On the basis of these analyses, he chronicles the first reactions to the Homeric epics and the gradual familiarisation with them that took place, thanks initially to Greek and Italian scholars, and later on to Northern European humanists such as Melanchthon. A central element throughout the chapter is the interpretation of the Homeric poems, which was often influenced by confessional divides.

The second part of the book (91-320) is dedicated to the reception of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in France. Whereas the first part of the book covered the reception of Homer until 1540, the second part studies two periods, the ‘Golden Age of Homer’ in the years 1541-1570 and the ‘twilight of the Homeric gods’ in the years 1571-1600. Here Ford discusses the literary reception of Homeric epic in France and examines the way writers and artists had been formed by their education in their views on and use of Homer. Special attention is given to humanists such as Guillaume Budé (167-79) and Jean Dorat (211-28) who inspired successive generations of writers and were deeply influenced by the two Homeric poems. A separate chapter discusses Julius Caesar Scaliger’s reshaping of attitudes to Homer (275-311). Of great value and interest is the detailed bibliography of Homeric texts printed before 1600 that completes the study (321-77).

To his question about the character of a French Homer, Ford can conclude that it was a complex phenomenon, reflecting the mentality of the period. The early French students of Greek had been helped
and influenced by Italian and German scholars, but Homer was quickly assimilated into French culture, not least thanks to the two most important Hellenists of the period, Budé and Dorat. Their Homer came to play a central role in sixteenth-century French culture and influenced to a considerable degree our conception of the French Renaissance.

A survey such as the one offered by Ford always runs the risk of becoming a compilation of bibliographical entries. The author has to a large degree avoided that danger by the happy ploy of using two widely studied passages, that of the amorous encounter between Zeus and Hera at Mt. Ida (*Il.* 14.341-56) and that of the Cave of the Nymphs (*Od.* 13.92-112), to describe translations and commentaries. This is just one example of how he manages to organize and present his subject matter to the reader. In spite of the vast material comprised in the study, the present reviewer noticed very few slips or omissions: on p. 1 n. 2 one gets the impression that Lorenzo Valla translated the entire *Iliad* into Latin, when in fact he only translated the first sixteen books, as Ford rightly states on p. 26. Though the Latin translation of Leontius Pilatus is mentioned several times, we hear nothing about his copious annotations of the two poems which were used by Boccaccio, for instance, for his *Genealogie deorum gentilium*, for the *Esposizioni sopra la Comedia* and for the *De montibus*, a dictionary of the names of mountains, rivers, woods, etc. Leontius’s annotations have survived in a number of manuscripts and were used by later commentators such as Constantinus Lascaris. In the paragraph on Leontius’s translations on p. 25, Ford mentions that the manuscript copies prepared for Petrarch have been preserved in the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris. Though he refers to an article of Renata Fabbri for the translations preserved only in manuscript, it might have been relevant at this point to mention that Leontius’s translations are actually preserved in a considerable number of manuscripts, the latest of 1527. The book has an index of names; I believe many readers would also have found an *Index locorum* useful.

However, these minor points in no way detract from the very considerable value of the book that will remain the standard study of Homer’s reception in the Renaissance France for many years to come. (Marianne Pade, University of Aarhus, Denmark)
L’Orthographia di Gasparino Barzizza, vol. 1: Catalogo dei manoscritti. By Giliola Barbero. Percorsi dei classici, 12. Messina: Centro Interdipartimentale de Studi Umanistici, 2008. 252 pp. 60€. The book under review here is one of a number of recent publications devoted to Gasparino Barzizza (1360-ca. 1430), one of the most important of the early Italian humanist teachers. Director of a series of schools in Pavia, Padua, Ferrara, and Milan, he numbered among his pupils such luminaries as Vittorino da Feltre, Leon Battista Alberti, and Antonio Beccadelli (called ‘Il Panormita’). His Tractatus de compositione and Orthographia were conceived as guidance in how to write a correct, elegant Latin, while his Epistolae offered models for how this should be done. Barzizza was well known in his own day—his Epistolae, in fact, was the first book to have been printed in France (1470)—but to a certain extent, he has been eclipsed by his students and by other teachers like Guarino da Verona, who have attracted somewhat more scholarly attention in modern times than he has. This, however, is changing. R G. G. Mercer prepared an extensive study in 1979 (The Teaching of Gasparino Barzizza, with Special Reference to His Place in Paduan Humanism (London: Modern Humanities Research Association), while a scholar of the stature of Lucia Gualdo Rosa had recently edited a collection of valuable essays on Barzizza’s work (Gasparino Barzizza e la rinascita degli studi classici: fra continuità e rinnovamento (Naples: Istituto universitario orientale, 1999)). The book under review here, which began as a thesis for the dottorato di ricerca under the indefatigable Vincenzo Fera, marks the latest contribution to this renaissance.

It presents itself as a catalogue of the manuscripts of Barzizza’s Orthographia, but it is more than that. Barbero provides a detailed codicological description of all sixty-nine extant manuscripts of the work, most of which are datable to the second and third quarter of the fifteenth century and locatable to the Veneto and Lombardy, where Barzizza lived and taught. Most are written not in the prestige humanist bookhand, but in a more rapid hand that combines Gothic with humanistic elements. The catalogue is beautifully done, with each manuscript receiving a full analysis according to modern codicological standards. Barbero’s project is designed to provide the foundation on which a critical edition can be erected, but her careful
work suggests that this job will not be easy. Over a hundred years ago, Sabbadini noted that the textual tradition of the Orthographia seemed to be confused, and Barbero has confirmed his worst fears, concluding that there are not just two states of the text, as had once been thought, but that the work is found in a number of different redactions, some of which probably record authorial revisions but others of which do not. Barzizza’s approach to orthography, in which he focused on spelling changes as a word evolved from Latin to the vernacular, invited revision as knowledge about historical linguistics grew, and the manuscript tradition confirms that these revisions took place regularly, as first Barzizza, then his readers emended their texts to take new information into account.

This book appears in a series published through the Interdepartmental Center for Humanistic Studies at the University of Messina, a series that includes inter alia the proceedings of two well-known conferences, one on marginalia held in 1998 and the other on the classics and the humanist university held in 2001, along with other works on humanist grammar and rhetoric. This series in turn is one of six sponsored by the Center, which also publishes a journal of interest to readers of NLN, Studi medievali e umanistici. Further information is available at their website: [http://ww2.unime.it/cisu/](http://ww2.unime.it/cisu/) (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

♦  Building the Kingdom: Giannozzo Manetti on the Material and Spiritual Edifice. Edited by Christine Smith and Joseph F. O’Connor. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 317; Arizona Studies in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, 20. Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2007. xviii + 518 pp. $69. In Building the Kingdom, two accomplished scholars examine Giannozzo Manetti’s De secularibus et pontificalibus pompis (a description of the consecration of Florence Cathedral in 1436) and book two of Manetti’s Life of Nicholas V. They have prepared a critical edition and translation whose insightful commentary and attentive annotation offer an exceptionally complete view of the texts within their cultural and historical contexts. Christine Smith brought to the project a capacity for marrying the close study of Renaissance architectural theory with the creative analysis of both buildings and cities, already evidenced in
her important and provocative book, *Architecture in the Culture of Early Humanism: Ethics, Aesthetics, and Eloquence: 1400-1479* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992). Joseph F. O’Connor, a scholar of Greek and Latin literature, contributes a philologist’s intimate knowledge of language, adding a subtlety to the reading that only a deep understanding of classical sources, Renaissance humanism and Manetti’s biography and oeuvre can produce. The resulting book makes a unique contribution to both architectural history and intellectual history.

The Renaissance saw the publication of several architectural treatises that aimed to codify architectural decorum. Manetti’s texts offer a rare view of how a non-architect perceived Renaissance architecture and urbanism in relation to patrons and functions, but also in relation to his own, idiosyncratic interests. Consequently, ekphrasis and critique are not instrumentalized; rather, they are contextualized in such a way that they address political and intellectual ends outside of architecture.

Manetti’s description of the Florence cathedral consecration is based on his firsthand knowledge of the event, which took place on March 25, 1436. He wrote it at the request of Agnolo Acciauoli, Manetti’s brother-in-law and himself a learned Florentine who had also attended the celebration. From an architectural perspective, *De pompis* does not reveal much about the building that the reader does not already know. Manetti praises the form, scale and material of the *duomo,* preferring to comment upon rational and empirical qualities like measurements rather than to delve into a more abstract aesthetic critique. Manetti sees in the building an anthropomorphic order and thereby reiterates one of the most common tropes of his day in relation to religious architecture (discussed in detail in Chapters 2 and 9). The theme, which, Smith and O’Connor convincingly argue, is both formal and literary, reappeared later in Manetti’s *Life of Nicholas V.* The emphasis, however, is not on the architecture, which is treated almost as a stage set, but rather on the spectacle—the ritual’s ephemeral aspects, such as the liturgy and the music. The translation, critical commentary and analysis of *De pompis* builds for the reader a framework for understanding Manetti’s rhetorical approach, as well as the literary sources and political priorities that informed his views.

The book’s focus is Manetti’s chapter on Pope Nicholas V’s achievements. A scholar of Hebrew, Greek and Latin, Manetti was
at the center of a Florentine intellectual circle during Pope Eugenius IV’s stay in the city, when he came to the attention of Tommaso Parentucelli, the future Pope Nicholas V, Eugenius’s successor. In 1451, Nicholas appointed Manetti to the position of papal secretary; Manetti lived in Rome from 1453 to 1455, the last two years of his patron’s pontificate. The Life, written after the pontiff’s death, is Manetti’s effort to defend Nicholas’s ambitious building campaigns in relation to desires to represent the Church Triumphant through architecture and urban projects. The reader comes to understand how a humanist with little interest in architecture experienced and perceived his built surroundings, and this in itself makes the text a valuable source. But architectural historians will be especially interested in Smith and O’Connor’s excursus of Manetti’s particular usage of architectural terminology (Chapter 5). An example is his use of the word ‘area’ for an urban space that is smaller than what is typically referred to as a ‘piazza.’ Here, space is not objectified, nor is it simply the by-product of surrounding buildings. Manetti’s understanding of space is placed in precise relationship to his understanding of other conditions, like ‘place,’ ‘perspective,’ and ‘figure,’ all of which affect one another in the built realm. As such, space is not a void, but the result of an accumulative circumstance, perceptible and knowable but not defined in the way that solid objects are. This discussion of nuanced ways of understanding space is instructive to today’s architects, historians, and theorists, who too often bandy about the term ‘space’ in an imprecise and unself-conscious manner, in reference to voids of varied and often-amorphous characteristics.

This book’s great contribution is its engagement with the intersection of humanist culture and the built environment of fifteenth-century Italy, particularly Rome. It offers new perspectives on Nicholas V’s building campaigns, the most ambitious of any Quattrocento pope. In this, it complements the studies of Carroll William Westfall (In This Most Perfect Paradise: Alberti, Nicholas V, and the Invention of Conscious Urban Planning in Rome, 1447-55 (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1974)) and Charles Burroughs (From Signs to Design: Environmental Process and Reform in Renaissance Rome (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1990)), both of whom used very different historiographical and theoretical approaches to analyze some of the same
monuments. The book will be an outstanding resource for specialists, particularly scholars of Renaissance architecture. Although the careful reader appreciates having these two Manetti texts in the same volume, the *Life of Nicholas V* could probably have stood alone. The lack of an index frustrates the reader’s efforts to focus consistently on particular themes that recur throughout the book, but it seems churlish to complain of it, given the depth and breadth the authors bring to the project, evidenced not only in the text, but also in the ample and helpful notes. (Saundra Weddle, Drury University)

Il problema del libero arbitrio nel pensiero di Pietro Pomponazzi: la dottrina etica del *De fato*: spunti di critica filosofica e teologica nel Cinquecento. By Rita Ramberti. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 2007. xxiii + 325 pp. In this work Rita Ramberti attempts to make sense of the *De fato*, a complex work of the famed Renaissance Italian Aristotelian, Pietro Pomponazzi (1462-1525), who held major professorships in philosophy, first at Padua and then at Bologna. While scholars have long debated Pomponazzi’s corpus, not until recently has *De fato* been the subject of intense scrutiny and discussion. Ramberti’s book adds not only to the understanding of Pomponazzi’s text, but also of its influence in the first half of the Cinquecento.

Ramberti begins by discussing Pomponazzi scholarship and providing a sketch of previous Renaissance texts on free will and several of his earlier works, in which the influences of Aristotelianism and Stoicism are evident. Central to Pomponazzi’s thought is the paradox of asserting both human free will and a natural world governed by eternal laws. While in earlier texts Pomponazzi argued that the immortality of the soul cannot be determined rationally and that events which appeared to be miracles or divine intervention were truly caused by nature (and in a world governed by immutable laws no human liberty is possible), in *De fato* he fully embraces Christianity, with the purpose of locating human free will within Christian theology. This, too, is problematic, since God’s foreknowledge—part of divine omnipotence—removes human free will. In order to extricate himself from this problem, Ramberti argues that Pomponazzi sets forth a theoretical innovation: God’s self-limitation. Pomponazzi proclaims that God limits his foreknowledge so that his divine decrees
correspond with the exact moment when human will is exercised. Divine self-limitation, therefore, allows for the existence of human free will. With *De fato* Pomponazzi has placed human freedom within the Christian tradition, and faith has become rationally defensible.

Further, Ramberti also references the exercise of human free will and its goal of attaining virtue by overcoming the human disposition. Human virtue can be realized if man willingly forms and maintains the social body. Man collectively seeks the common good, which is the ultimate end. The virtuous and moral life is distinctively human, and the exercise of such a life leads to happiness in the human world, which is perfectible according to the rules God has given.

The third and final chapter of Ramberti’s work is perhaps the most interesting. In it, Ramberti examines reactions to and the influence of Pomponazzi’s work. Supporters defended his claims of orthodoxy, while detractors labeled him a heretic and ally of Luther. In the period in question—from the 1520’s to the actual publication of *De fato* in 1567 (forty-seven years after its composition)—Ramberti’s most engaging discussion, among several, is that of Pomponazzi’s work in the anti-Luther and anti-Erasmus polemic. Employing the examples of Celio Calcagnini, Juan Gines de Sepulveda, and Ambrogio Fiandino, Ramberti fascinatingly describes how *De fato* is absorbed by both sides in the battle over free will. The treatment of fate and free will in the natural philosophy of Girolamo Cardano and Simone Porzio is also worth a careful reading.

Ramberti’s work is a fine example of scholarship, well-researched and well-argued. It is the most comprehensive discussion of *De fato* to date. While one may cite minor squabbles with the text, such as whether Pomponazzi can be depicted as a wholly obedient Christian, the book is a welcome addition to Pomponazzi studies as well as philosophical and theological thought in the Cinquecento. (Jeffrey A. Glodzik, State University of New York at Fredonia)

♦ *Paraphrase on Matthew*. By Desiderius Erasmus. Edited by Robert Sider. Translated and Annotated by Dean Simpson. Collected Works of Erasmus, 45. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 2008. xvi + 449 pp. It is hard to believe that the Collected Works of Erasmus series is more than half finished—the
book under review here is the fifty-second of the ninety projected volumes. Indeed, it is now hard to imagine Erasmus studies without the CWE. The *Paraphrase on Matthew* is simply the latest entry in this indispensable enterprise.

Erasmus wrote his paraphrase on Matthew after he had finished paraphrasing the epistles. He first declined the request to undertake the project, then changed his mind and, he says, finished it in only a month, having it published a few months later by Froben, then three more times in his lifetime. The finished project shows that his initial doubts were not well founded, for the Gospel text benefits in some ways from Erasmus’s character exposition, insinuation of motive, and externalization of psychological forces, along with the ways in which he makes the action vivid. Several themes run through the paraphrase. First is the representation of Jesus as a master teacher: he adapts himself to the developing abilities of his students, the disciples, quizzing them and rebuking them as appropriate. Second, we see Erasmus’s profound concern for the religious welfare of society and the individual. And finally, we see a focus on the Gospel as an alternative to the threats posed by Satan and the corrupt religious establishment. Access to these key themes is enhanced by carefully constructed annotation. Here we see changes that occur through the publishing history of the book, along with notes on sources, especially parallel passages from the other Gospels and the key patristic sources: Origen, the *Homilies on Matthew* by Chrysostom, and the *Commentary on Matthew* by Jerome. Finally, the notes position the *Paraphrase on Matthew* within the controversies its publication aroused. The book was attacked by Noël Béda, then defended in Erasmus’s *Elenchus, Divinationes ad notata Bedae*, and *Supputatio calunniarum Natalis Bedae*, ultimately to no avail, since the Faculty of Theology in Paris condemned the *Paraphrases* in 1527. Erasmus responded with his *Declarationes ad censuras Lutetiae vulgatus*, but the work was attacked again at a meeting of Spanish monks, to whom Erasmus wrote his *Apologia adversus monachos*. The notes give an indication of what was at stake in these controversies.

The *Paraphrase on Matthew* was Erasmus’s first chance to set out a full portrait of the life of Jesus as he understood it. As such, it merits a read by anyone interested in the theological aspects of Neo-Latin studies. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)
Beatus Rhenanus. *Rerum Germanicarum libri tres*. Edited by Felix Mundt. Frühe Neuzeit, 127. Tübingen: Walter de Gruyter, 2008. XIV + 674 pp. 147.66€. Mundt (hereafter M.) provides us here with an excellent and much-needed new edition of this very important work of Beatus Rhenanus. M.’s book will certainly foster and enhance further research not only about Beatus Rhenanus’s life and works, but also in this particularly interesting field at the crossroads between geographical and historical studies in early modern times.

As regards the table of contents of this book, which is the revised version of M.’s 2007 dissertation, the editor’s report on his edition of Beatus Rhenanus’s three books on German affairs (1-9) is followed by a Latin edition and German translation of Sturm’s life of Beatus Rhenanus (12-27), Sapidus’s encomium for Beatus Rhenanus (26 f.), and Beatus Rhenanus’s dedicatory letter to king Ferdinand (28-33), as well as Beatus Rhenanus’s three books themselves (34-421). Interpretive studies on Beatus Rhenanus and his work make up the next section on pages 425-615. A bibliography (617-38) and four indices (641-74: index of names of persons, index of names of places and peoples, index of *verba notabilia vel a Rhenano explicata*, and *index locorum*) conclude M.’s book.

M. bases his edition on the 1551 printing of the work and diligently explains the value of the other four editions of the *Rerum Germanicarum libri tres* (1531, 1610, 1670, and 1693) for his new edition. A. F. W. Sommer (Vienna: Im Selbstverlag, 2006) just published a reprint of the 1531 edition. This reprint, however, in turn demonstrates the need for M.’s scientific edition. Needless to say, also nowadays the internet provides us with an enormous number of digital versions of old (and new) books that increases on a daily basis. Rhenanus’s books are among them. But this fact actually increases further the necessity of thorough philological work. And M.’s edition is a very good example of what this kind of work can mean for future research on authors from the Renaissance period.

M.’s translation is true to the original text and reads very well at the same time. As is the case with every translation, of course, there are certain stylistic questions—for example in regard to word order or similar issues—that might have been answered differently.
by a different translator. But I did not observe anything that would detract from the value of M.’s translation. The only general question I would like to point our attention to is whether one needs to treat the occasional Greek passages in Rhenanus’s text differently from the Latin, i.e., whether we should translate these Greek passages into, e.g., English or French. This kind of procedure would make it clear to the reader that what he reads is in fact a Latin translation derived from a text rendered in a different language. The fact that Rhenanus himself found it necessary to quote these texts in their original Greek and then translated these passages into Latin would lend itself to a very interesting further study on Rhenanus’s language skills. Maybe we could even find out something about Rhenanus’s use of translations. Mutatis mutandis, the same is true, of course, in regard to other languages or texts from earlier periods of the German language that found their way into Rhenanus’s work.

M.’s studies on Rhenanus’s work are groundbreaking in the truest sense of the word, because, as M. himself concedes (426), these studies are just one step towards a detailed line-by-line commentary on the Rerum Germanicarum libri. There is a great need for much more research in this field, before anyone could dare to tackle this Herculean labor of analyzing in minute detail Rhenanus’s sources, aims, and influence. Having said that, we need to thank M. for the vast amount of work and analysis which he provides us here. M.’s studies and remarks deal with more general questions about Beatus Rhenanus’s life and the context and influence of the Rerum Germanicarum libri first. He then follows the structure of the edition and does a marvelous job of placing a wealth of information at the reader’s disposal without ever losing sight of the reader’s needs in terms of brevity, clarity, and perspicuity. Undoubtedly, M.’s work will serve as a solid and firm foundation for much interesting research to come.

In addition, M. nicely demonstrates just how many more challenges are waiting for researchers in the field of Neo-Latin studies. For example, there are some authors among Beatus Rhenanus’s sources that are read less often today and mostly known to specialists in their fields only. In the Renaissance there was in fact a market for these works, and the shape of this market was still developing as Gerstenberg, for example, has pointed out (see A. Gerstenberg,
Thomaso Porcacchis L’Isole piu famose del mondo. Zur Text- und Wortgeschichte der Geographie im Cinquecento (mit Teiedition) Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie, 326 (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 2004), pp. 2 f. and 263). And this market was not restricted to Latin, but expanded rapidly into the vernacular languages. The genres, modes of discourse, and textual structures for certain branches of scientific knowledge were diversified. M.’s study will help us to determine more exactly the shape, size, and conditions of this developing market for publications because Rhenanus’s choices indicate the kind of audience he was targeting. Also Rhenanus himself, of course, needs to be seen as a part of this audience. In this regard, M.’s analysis of efforts by other Renaissance authors to produce literature of roughly the same kind as Rhenanus (490-532) is also highly relevant here.

In general, M. is clearly right in declaring that a serious look at Rhenanus’s studies will make even more obvious how interconnected different periods of time are in regard to their knowledge (426 f.), even if this knowledge should be specialist knowledge. M.’s book enables us to study further Beatus Rhenanus’s role within the context of the development of these branches of science like geography or historiography. Thanks to M., we can and must do this now on a more informed basis than before. (Wolfgang Polleichter, Ruhr-Universität Bochum)

Der Jedermann im 16. Jahrhundert. Die Hecastus-Dramen von Georgius Macropedius und Hans Sachs. By Raphael Dammer and Benedikt Jeßing. Quellen und Forschungen zur Literatur- und Kulturgeschichte, 42 (276). Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2007. 321 pp. 98€ / $137. The tradition of the Everyman in literature, dating from the late Middle Ages up to Philip Roth’s 2006 novel, is an important theme that has lost neither its impact nor its fascination. Its roots are the well-known English moral play Everyman (late fifteenth century) and the equivalent Dutch Elkerlijc (ca. 1475), whose interdependence still remains to be clarified. In sixteenth-century Germany, Georgius Macropedius’s Latin rendering of the material, Hecastus (1539), provided the basis for Hans Sachs’s adaptation in early modern German, the Comedi von dem reichen sterbenden menschen / Der Hecastus genannt (1549). Both works fall within the period of the Reformation movement and
present us with the interesting situation that Macropedius (1487-1558, from s’Hertogenbosch in Brabant) happened to belong to a Catholic fraternity, whereas Sachs (1449-1576, from Nuremberg) was an enthusiastic spokesman for Protestantism. Thus, to compare Macropedius and Sachs in one edition is a great idea of enormous benefit for both scholars and students.

Dammer and Jeßing’s introduction (1-29) offers a concise and comprehensive overview that provides the reader with the literary background of the Everyman, the context and development of Reformation drama as well as the authors’ biographies, literary activities, and religious orientation. The influences of English and French moral plays from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, Prudentius’s *Psychomachia* (ca. 400), and the Latin context of Plautinian and Terentian *palliata* are traced and evaluated, which culminated in their instrumental use within the religious debates during and after the Reformation. After Macropedius’s drama had been published, he was heavily criticised and accused of propagating Protestant heresy, so that he had to rework his text and stress the Catholic view: in case of sudden death, he argues, not only good deeds, but faith alone can save one’s soul, too. Yet, as Dammer and Jeßing stress, the theological ambivalence persists in the revised version (cf. p. 29), which probably appealed to Sachs when he decided to translate the play into German.

The main part of the book contains the edition of the two plays (31-315). Since both earlier editions (Macropedius by Bolte 1927, Sachs by Keller and Goetze 1870-1908) are problematic and in terms of textual criticism of little use (cf. p. 31), the presentation of Macropedius’s Latin text next to Sachs’s German rendering presents us with an excellent new edition of high scholarly value, allowing for the indispensable comparison of the two plays. Macropedius’s first version is followed by an appendix of his later interpolations and changes (184-93), which makes it easy to compare the two. The translation of the Latin (194-263) is especially useful for non-Latinists and makes the edition attractive for scholars and students of (Early High) German, too. Apart from its practical use, it is a joy to read: the two authors indeed follow their principle of translating as close to the original as possible, yet as freely as necessary (cf. p. 33), whereby the chorus is retained in poetry and thus gives an impression of how
the original might have worked. The commentary, which rounds off the edition (264-315), is not too capacious, yet comprehensive and a useful accompaniment to the texts: individuals, names, allusions, and words are explained, as are grammatical issues, metre and melody, or strange expressions. Maybe an *apparatus fontium* would also have been helpful as regards sources and allusions to (Latin) passages or biblical quotations, but this is obviously a difficult undertaking, which the authors decided against (cf. p. 26). It is very beneficial that Dammer and Jeßing generally note divergences and differences from Macropedius in the commentary on Sachs, thereby providing the first steps in the direction of further comparative studies. Finally, a list of helpful resources, a bibliography of secondary literature, and a register facilitate the use of the book.

All in all, the two plays speak for themselves as an impressive example of how Neo-Latin and the vernacular, humanist and popular ideals, and Catholicism and Reformation interacted and were indebted to each other in the sixteenth century. This is a perfect basis for scholars of both Neo-Latin and German to explore further a fascinating genre and its interrelated history. (Eva von Contzen, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany)

♦  *Obras Completas III: Academica.* By Pedro de Valencia. Edited, translated, and annotated by Juan Francisco Domínguez Domínguez. León: Universidad de León, 2006. *Obras Completas X: Traducciones.* By Pedro de Valencia. Coordinated by Jesús Mª Nieto Ibáñez. León: Universidad de León, Instituto de humanismo y tradición clásica, 2008. Pedro de Valencia (1555-1620), theologian and classical scholar, whose papers were confiscated by the Inquisition in 1618, developed a close friendship with Arias Montano, with whom he collaborated *inter alia* in the cataloguing of the library of the Escorial. *Obras* Volume III includes a preliminary study, bibliography, and extensive discussion of the textual tradition with twenty title-page photos. The bilingual (Latin / Spanish) text includes studies dealing with Arcesilas, Pyrrho, Stoicism, Carneades and the New Academy, the Cyrenaics, and Epicurus. *Obras* Volume X contains Latin translations of Theophrastus’s *De igne*, part of Thucydides Book 1, and Saint Epiphanius of Cyprus’s *De lapidibus*. Translations into Spanish include Dio of Prusa, *On Retirement*;
Lysias’s oration *On the Death of Eratosthenes*, a discourse of Epictetus on those who seek a life of quiet; and a fourteen-page “Discourse on the Matter of War and the State, Composed of Sentiments and Words (sentencias y palabras) from Demosthenes.” (Edward V. George, Texas Tech University (Emeritus))

-The Early Latin Poetry of Sylvester Phrygius*. Edited, with introduction, translation and commentary by Peter Sjökvist. Studia Latina Upsaliensia, 31. Uppsala: Uppsala University Library, 2007. 408 pp. Since the publication of Hans Helander’s editions of Emanuel Swedenborg’s texts (1985, 1988, 1995), the series Studia Latina Upsaliensia has presented several editions of Swedish Neo-Latin literature, many of them being doctoral theses. Peter Sjökvist’s solid work on the early poetry of the theologian Sylvestor Johannes Phrygius (1572-1628) is a welcome addition to the series. Phrygius is considered one of the foremost representatives of early Swedish Neo-Latin poetry; his texts have drawn some scholarly attention, but the present work is the first large-scale study on him. It focuses on three major portions of Phrygius’s early Latin poetry, which were probably written between the years 1597-1602, when he was mostly studying at several universities in Northern Germany (Rostock, Hannover, Jena, Wittenberg). With these poems Phrygius became one of those who introduced the literary fashions of continental humanism to Sweden. The significance of the German impact on Swedish Neo-Latin literature can hardly be underestimated: several generations of Swedish authors, Phrygius included, were educated in German universities, and their works were anchored in German academic literary culture. After the Lutheran Reformation had been carried out in Sweden in the 1520s and 1530s, education at the University of Uppsala (founded in 1477) was largely suspended for several decades, and students had to leave for abroad to pursue academic studies, Protestant German universities ranking as the most popular destination. These same German universities were also frequented by Swedish students after the reopening of the University of Uppsala in 1593.

The three poems chosen for this edition, *Ecloga prima*, *Threnologia dramatica* (a poem from the *Agon Regius* print) and *Centuria prima*, represent different literary genres. However, the author states in the in-
roduction of the work that they constitute their own easily discernible group in Phrygius’s literary production, which is in its entirety listed and categorized at the end of the work. Although the author does not *expressis verbis* explain in what way the poems form a group of their own, he presumably refers not only to the date of their composition but also and quite specifically to the political and social contexts of these poems that interestingly mirror the vicissitudes of this turbulent period in Swedish history. Historical background is indeed essential for the understanding of the present poems and their function. The writer manages to give a survey that is to the point but does not oversimplify the complex situation. The period from the death of King Gustavus Vasa in 1560 until Charles IX was crowned the King of Sweden in 1607 was marked by confusion about the succession to the throne, by strained relations with Poland as well as by tensions between the Catholic Counter-Reformation and Lutheranism and between the king and the nobility. A young man and writer in search of a respectable career and powerful patrons had to explore his opportunities in largely unpredictable circumstances. As for Phrygius, he counted on Duke John, son of John III (1568-1592), for his rise to power, but, to Phrygius’s disappointment, the Duke renounced all claims to power in 1604 in favour of his uncle (Charles IX).

When defining his methodological approach, the writer brings forward many important aspects which concern Neo-Latin poetry in general. A special emphasis is put on the importance of the synchronic perspective in interpreting Neo-Latin texts. The recent emergence of databases of Neo-Latin literature provides a useful tool for this kind of research. The author has particularly availed himself of the database *Camena—Corpus Automatum Multiplex Electorum Neolatinitatis Auctorum*, which contains poetry composed in Germany in the sixteenth century. In regard to Swedish Neo-Latin poetry prior to Phrygius, the writer has been able to read it all through due to the relatively small number of relevant works, such as those by Henricus Mollerus, Laurentius Petri Gothus, and Ericus Jacobi Skinnerus. This of course offers an excellent opportunity to examine the initial history of Neo-Latin poetry in Sweden as a whole.

The date of composition, the literary genre, and the contemporary circumstances of the poems are discussed in the chapter which serves
as an introduction to the poems; in the commentary section, the writer gets back to several questions with further details. *Ecloga prima*, printed in 1599 in Hamburg, was written on the death of Birgitta, daughter to Bishop Petrus Benedicti, Phrygius’s patron and future father-in-law. Because he is not known to have published other eclogues, the title of the poem invites a question why Phrygius used the word ‘*prima*.’ The poem contains pastoral elements, and its indebtedness to Virgil’s first eclogue might have been one of the reasons to entitle it as “the first eclogue.” It is also suggested that Phrygius intended to point out that it was the first time that the eclogue genre was used in Swedish literature, and this is true. The poem consists of a dialogue between two interlocutors whose names are not Greek, as they usually were in pastorals, nor do they appear in Latinized form. The original Swedish names (Ebbe and Tore) and the completely Swedish setting of the poem can be seen as Phrygius’s desire to adapt the eclogue to Swedish conditions. Moreover, the poem combines autobiographical features (one of the interlocutors can be identified as Phrygius himself) with the conventional topics of funeral poems.

*Threnologia dramatica* is a funeral poem, or a lament, in honour of King John III of Sweden, who died in 1592. Phrygius wrote the poem almost ten years after the King’s death, and it was not published until 1620, in the *Agon Regius* print. The poem is divided into four dramas (or acts). In the first drama, the author converses with Pallas; this is obviously influenced by Georg Sabinus’s poem *Ad Ioannem Bogum, Regis Polonie aulicium. Elegia XII* (1568?). Duke John, who was the closest legitimate heir to the throne at the time of the composition of the poem, is the principal character and besides the author, the only real character in the drama, if we disregard his late parents, who appear briefly. Since Duke John died in 1618, before the printing of the poem, Phrygius inserted into the drama a brief dialogue between the late queen and king, lamenting in heaven over their son’s untimely death. The adjective ‘dramatic’ in the title primarily refers to the dialogue form, which we met already in Phrygius’s *Ecloga prima* and which was popular in contemporary funeral and wedding poetry in general. These texts were not intended to be staged, but if they were ever publicly read or recited aloud, they were naturally only a step away from a dramatic performance.
Centuria prima, printed in 1602 in Rostock and dedicated to a young Swedish nobleman, consists of 100 (in fact, of 99) captioned hortatory and admonishing distichs, which were supposed to form the first part of a larger work. The writer suggests that Phrygius would initially have planned to dedicate it to Duke John, hoping to be able to publish emblems proper by adorning the distichs with pictures using the Duke’s financial support. When it became obvious to everyone that Duke John would not ascend the throne, the dedicatee would have had to be changed and Centuria prima became a simple print of ‘bare emblems’ (emblemata nuda), with headings (inscriptio) and distichs (subscriptio) but without pictures. The writer justifies this interpretation by the content of the emblems as well as by some issues external to the text. Various aspects of governing are dealt with in many emblems or paraenetic distichs, as Phrygius calls them, but the writer rightly notes that advice to rulers constituted the essence of many emblematic collections, which were inspired by mirrors of princes. The majority of the emblems are not arranged in any systematic way; only ‘precautionary’ emblems (distichs number 83-90) seem to form an entity.

The texts are largely edited according to the principles that have been established earlier in the series, basically meaning that the original form of the text has been kept as far as it does not confuse the understanding; that is why punctuation has been altered to conform to modern standards. The commentary aims at establishing Phrygius’s literary models and sources by finding and identifying allusions and intertexts as well as relevant thematic and linguistic parallels and echoes from ancient and Neo-Latin literature. The commentary is very detailed and meticulously documented throughout. Several times the writer is able to revise ideas stated in earlier research and offer fresh and convincing interpretations concerning, for example, such things as Phrygius’s relationship with the royal family, dating, and dedicatory questions regarding the poems. The comprehensive analysis involves consistently taking the political, religious, and social contexts into consideration, which often opens intriguing aspects of the poems. One of the most interesting features in the poems examined is Phrygius’s self-expression, not only in respect to his career-building but also in respect to the history of Swedish literature. Phrygius wrote for himself a part in Eloga prima and Threnologia dramatica, complain-
Although the main arguments and points are well emphasized and repeatedly brought up in the introduction and commentary, it is a pity that the work does not include a conclusion. Owing to the great number of details and the vast reference material presented, a reader would have appreciated hearing in what way the writer thinks Phrygius’s literary models and sources profited him as a writer. Since Phrygius has a special position in the history of Swedish Neo-Latin literature, it would also have been particularly interesting to learn something about his possible impact on future writers. (Raija Sarasti-Wilenius, University of Helsinki)

♦ **Scholarly Knowledge: Textbooks in Early Modern Europe.** Edited by Emidio Campi, Simone De Angelis, Anja-Silvia Goeing, and Anthony T. Grafton. Travaux d’Humanisme et Renaissance, 447. Geneva: Droz, 2008. The papers in this volume were collected from a conference held in Zurich at the end of 2005, whose goal was to “to gather experts from all disciplines to discuss European Renaissance textbooks used in academia, their content and their making” (9). The obvious paradigm for a paper at this conference was to select one or two textbooks and to focus on them, working back to classroom practice and out to larger issues and concerns. This is what most of the participants did. In “Melanchthon’s Textbooks of Dialectic and Rhetoric as Complementary Parts of a Theory of Argumentation,” for example, Volkhard Wels contrasts the simplified, practice-oriented approach to argumentation in Melanchthon to the medieval textbooks whose goal was a full exploration of the subtleties of the subject. Daniel Tröhler uses “The Knowledge of Science and the Knowledge of the Classroom: Using the Heidelberg Catechism (1563) to Examine Overlooked Connections” to explore how the catechism can teach basic information with clarity, while Barbara Mahlmann-Bauer in turn shows in “Catholic and Protestant Textbooks in Elementary Latin Conversation: Manuals of Religious Combat or Guide to Avoiding Conflict?” that Latin dialogues could teach both conversational skills and a measure of tolerance through the development of varying positions. Emidio Campi discusses Peter Martyr’s classroom practice as
exegete and theologian in “Peter Martyr Vermigli as a Teacher at the Schola Tigurina.” In “Heinrich Bullinger (1504-1575) and the Ancient Languages” Peter Stotz shows how humanist textbooks could offer not only linguistic skills but also a hermeneutic for unpacking texts. Anja-Silvia Goeing returns to language teaching in “Establishing Modes of Learning: Old and New Hebrew Grammars in the Sixteenth Century,” arguing that Theodor Bibliander’s new comparative approach to grammar teaching exemplifies a new system of knowledge that arose from the classroom. By contrast, in “Teaching Physics in Louvain and Bologna: Frans Titelmans and Ulisse Aldrovandi,” David A. Lines shows that the kinds of physics textbooks used in the Renaissance classroom suggest that teachers were looking not for new perspectives or discoveries, but for an established body of knowledge in a comprehensible form. In “Teaching Stoic Moral Philosophy: Kaspar Schoppe’s Elementa philosophiae Stoicae moralis (1606),” Jill Kraye suggests similarly that Schoppe’s work fails (especially in comparison to Lipsius) if judged as original scholarship, but succeeds quite well as a call for pedagogical reform, providing the orderly, methodical summary of Stoicism required for that purpose. Simone De Angelis lays out the twists and turns on the pedagogical road in “From Text to the Body: Commentaries on De anima, Anatomical Practice and Authority around 1600,” demonstrating that the commentary tradition on this one key Aristotelian text sometimes stimulated new discoveries like William Harvey’s observation that blood circulated, while at the same time guiding Johannes Kepler to abandon the text entirely and turn his optical research elsewhere. Nancy G. Siraisi captures nicely in “Medicina Practica: Girolamo Mercuriale as Teacher and Textbook Author” the irony of what happens when published lecture notes convey what went on the author’s classroom but never in turn get assigned as a textbook by anyone else, while in “Jakob Ruf’s Trostbüchlein and De conceptu (Zurich 1554): A Textbook for Midwives and Physicians,” Hildegard Elisabeth Keller and Hubert Steinke show that textbooks can function outside the male clerical environment of the Renaissance university.

Each of the papers mentioned thus far provides something of interest and value. As Urs B. Leu notes in “Textbooks and Their Uses—An Insight into the Teaching of Geography in Sixteenth-
Century Zurich,” however, information about teaching can also be derived from student sources, and in the handful of papers from this conference that take this approach, things get really interesting. The richest contribution is Ann Blair’s “Student Manuscripts and the Textbook,” which provides the clearest account I have ever seen of how students prepared their own textbooks by taking down the lectures of their masters. Dictation, it seems, was more common than we might have imagined, surviving as marginal notes in printed texts or as free-standing manuscripts. Reportationes were sometimes prepared by teams and were often revised from the messy scribblings made in class to fair copies. Anyone who has followed the early printed history of classical authors has noticed the small fascicles obviously set up for student note-taking that were published in several German and Dutch cities between ca. 1490 and 1520; Jürgen Leonhardt presents some preliminary finds from a large research project devoted to these books in “Classics as Textbooks: A Study of the Humanist Lectures on Cicero at the University of Leipzig, ca. 1515.” The books themselves allow us to trace the fitful progress of humanism in the Renaissance university, while the handwritten lecture notes they contain add the work of teachers who published little to the picture we have of Renaissance scholarship that is based in printed books. A book in press at the moment, The Classics in the Medieval and Renaissance Classroom, ed. J. F. Ruys, J. Ward, and M. Heyworth (Turnhout, Brepols), will pursue some of these points further.

In a stimulating introduction, “Textbooks and the Disciplines,” Anthony T. Grafton suggests how problematic the study of Renaissance textbooks can become. For one thing it is difficult to say for sure what a textbook is: many works that were never written as textbooks, like Castiglione’s Il cortegiano, were used in that way, while other books whose titles clearly suggest that they were written as textbooks were never, so far as we know, adopted in any class. Erasmus in turn insisted upon wide reading in the classics, then produced books like De copia and the Adages that eliminated the need for precisely this sort of pedagogical breadth. Jürgen Oeklers’s afterward, “Elementary Textbooks in the Eighteenth Century and Their Theory of the Learning Child,” is equally provocative, focusing on a problem that is so obvious that it is often overlooked: what is the concept of childhood that governs
the production of a given textbook? In the end, then, this essay collection does what any such volume ought to do: it answers some questions that are worth asking, and leaves the reader with others to pursue. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)


Those who have followed the fortunes of The I Tatti Renaissance Library since its relatively recent inception have noticed by now that the pace of publication has picked up: the 2008 harvest, under review here, totals six volumes. Somewhat arbitrarily, perhaps, these six books can be divided into two very different projects: three that are part of multi-volume presentations of long works, and three that serve as collections of smaller works into composite volumes.

Of the first group, Robert W. Ulery’s volume is the second of three that cover the history of Venice from 1487 to 1513. An official history of the city, the *History of Venice* covers both internal politics and external affairs, especially conflicts with the other European states and with the Turks in the East. The author, Pietro Bembo (1470-1547), a Venetian nobleman and cardinal, was a celebrated stylist in Latin and Italian (versions of the history exist in both languages), fostering Ciceronianism in the former and the Tuscan dialect in the latter. The current volume covers the years 1499 to 1509. The other two volumes in this group initiate the series of which they are a part. Bartolomeo Platina (1421-1481), the author of the *Lives of the Popes,*
lived a life that took an unusual number of unexpected turns, including a stint as a mercenary and two different periods of torture in Castel Sant’Angelo mixed in with study under Vittorino da Feltre and John Argyropoulos, membership in Pomponio Leto’s Roman Academy, and positions as papal abbreviator and prefect of the Vatican Library. The *Lives of the Popes*, a major work of humanist historiography, is worthy of its flamboyant author. In some senses an apology for the Papacy, the book firmly anchors the birth of the church in pagan Rome, where its early saints are regularly compared to the corrupt clergy of Platina’s day, to the disadvantage of the latter, especially Paul II, the pope who had imprisoned and tortured Platina. The book was very popular, going through twenty-five printings before the mid-seventeenth century and being translated into the major western European languages, yet it ended up on the index and was finally republished in censored form. The third volume in this group is a different sort of animal. In principle a revision of texts published over twenty-five years ago, this book offers several works of great importance in the history of western thought whose textual status and reception are unusually complex. Their author, Marsilio Ficino (1433-1499), is justly famous as the man whose Latin translations of the dialogues of Plato in 1484 played a major role in the Renaissance revival of that author. The *Phaedrus*, with its discussion of such key themes as love and rhetoric and its use of famous metaphors like the chariot of the soul, is one of the most important of Plato’s dialogues, providing an additional justification for republication (along with the fact that the original has long been out of print). Since the 1496 edition in which it appeared in this form, “the *Phaedrus* commentary” has meant the documents printed here: a general title, an argument divided into three chapters from the 1484 edition, a postscript for these three chapters, eight new chapters, a postscript, a new title, and fifty-three *summae* of varying lengths. In this form, as Allen put it, the *Phaedrus* commentary “remained in cartoon” (xxxv), a sketch for a tapestry that was never fully woven. Added to this volume is Ficino’s introduction to the *Ion*, a dialogue on poetic inspiration whose popularity was also great.

The other three volumes under review represent in some sense a collection of smaller works. Cristoforo Landino (1424-1498) is perhaps better known for his Platonizing commentaries on Virgil
and Dante (he was Ficino’s teacher), but he also wrote the *Xandra*, a collection of Latin poetry that has attracted significant scholarly interest of late (see Christoph Pieper, *Elegos redolere Vergiliosque sapere: Cristoforo Landinos ‘Xandra’ zwischen Liebe und Gesellschaft* (Hildesheim: Olms, 2008)). These three books of Latin poems focus primarily on his love, Alessandra, but they also chronicle his life, friendships, interest, and growing political awareness from his late adolescence to his middle thirties. Chatfield’s volume also contains an earlier redaction of Book 1 and some miscellaneous poems by Landino. Bartolomeo Scala (1430-1497) lived and worked in these same circles, competing unsuccessfully with Landino for a chair at the university but attaining greater success in politics, rising through a series of offices to become first chancellor of Florence. His writings reflect this environment, drawing on manuscripts in Cosimo de’ Medici’s library like Lucretius’s *De rerum natura* and on the Platonic material that Ficino was working on. His fables and dialogue on law were known and admired, but his most important work was his *Defense against the Detractors of Florence*, which plays a part in the development of modern republican theory. The final volume contains writings on religion by Nicolas of Cusa (1401-1464), who is best known for his *The Catholic Concordance*, which is not presented here. His shorter works include pieces connected with the Council of Basel, a series of works in which he emerged as a champion of the pope, a group of more metaphysical speculations on matters of faith and doctrine, and several final calls for reform. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)