

NEO-LATIN NEWS

Vol. 61, Nos. 1 & 2. Jointly with SCN. NLN is the official publication of the American Association for Neo-Latin Studies. Edited by Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University; Western European Editor: Gilbert Tournoy, Leuven; Eastern European Editors: Jerzy Axer, Barbara Milewska-Wazbinska, and Katarzyna Tomaszuk, Centre for Studies in the Classical Tradition in Poland and East-Central Europe, University of Warsaw. Founding Editors: James R. Naiden, Southern Oregon University, and J. Max Patrick, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and Graduate School, New York University.

◆ *Petrarch and St. Augustine: Classical Scholarship, Christian Theology and the Origins of the Renaissance in Italy*. By Alexander Lee. Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, 210. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012. x + 382 pp. \$177. Petrarch's *opera* is extensive, that of Augustine is extraordinarily vast, and the literature on both is vaster still. To bridge them successfully is a significant undertaking. Over the past fifty years, scholars have attempted this task, from classic studies by Charles Trinkaus (often discussed here) to more recent ones such as C. Quillen's *Rereading the Renaissance: Petrarch, Augustine and the Language of Humanism* (1995) and M. Gill's *Augustine in the Italian Renaissance: Art and Philosophy from Petrarch to Michelangelo* (2005). In a new study, Alexander Lee argues that "Petrarch's thought on moral questions was derived principally from the writings of St. Augustine" (24). Lee contends that Petrarch, rather than being philosophically inconsistent as is often suggested, was especially influenced by Augustine's early works, most notably the *Soliloquies* and the *De vera religione*, which provided him with an interpretive method for incorporating classical literature and philosophy into Christian moral theology.

Lee examines the relationship between Augustine and Petrarch by way of different themes: Petrarch's approach to literary imitation; the place of Augustine in the *Secretum* regarding reason, will, and the *meditatio mortis*; Augustine's influence regarding the themes of the vir-

tuous life and friendship as found in Petrarch's *De otio religioso*, *De vita solitaria*, and the *De remediis utriusque fortune*; and finally the connection between Augustine's *De doctrina Christiana* and Petrarch's conception of eloquence and moral philosophy.

Ronald Witt, in his important *In the Footsteps of the Ancients: The Origins of Humanism from Lovato to Bruni* (2003), argues that Petrarch reoriented a pre-existing movement of imitating ancient style by giving it a religious purpose, thus uniting classicism and Christianity, and was inspired by Augustine in this effort. Lee's study advances this argument by showing that it was Augustine's early works which provided Petrarch with a systematic framework for moral philosophy, giving him a consistency generally considered lacking. As Augustine in his early writings reconciled Christianity and classical thought, Petrarch, in knowing and following these writings, did the same. That is, Petrarch was first an Augustinian in his fundamental principles and then read classical works through the lens of the early Augustine, enabling him both to imitate classical style and incorporate those sources according to his purpose. While this may lead one to consider Petrarch occasionally inconsistent in his use of the ancients, at times Stoic, at other times Peripatetic, nonetheless, Lee argues, understanding his foremost adherence to Augustine reveals that his approach to classical literature was inherently consistent.

For example, Lee's study of Petrarch's *De otio religioso* shows that whereas classical and Christian authors tended to approach the topic of *otium* from the point of contrasting the active and contemplative lives, Petrarch understood *otium* in an interior sense of seeking the apprehension of truth and turning from obstacles and desires opposed to this. This is the perspective found in Augustine's *De vera religione* and distinguished Petrarch from other Renaissance humanists such as Salutati, who approached the topic more traditionally. In regard to Petrarch's *Secretum*, Lee argues that rather than confusing Stoic and Augustinian thought, Petrarch's familiarity with Augustine's *De vera religione* and *Soliloquies* allowed him to advance "the view that virtue could be attained through the rational pursuit of self-knowledge and the re-orientation of the self towards God by means of cognition" (96). In this, he was fundamentally different from Salutati and Valla, who held to the primacy of the will over the intellect. While both

positions are found in the works of Augustine, Petrarch adheres to Augustine's early theological writings, whereas Salutati and Valla are more in line with his later writings which questioned the power of the intellect and gave priority to the will.

In his final chapter, Lee examines the connection in Petrarch's writings between eloquence and moral philosophy. The "eloquence and wisdom" theme has often been taken as representative of humanism in general, and Petrarch has been considered as either inconsistent in his approach or generally supporting eloquence over moral philosophy. Lee argues that once one recognizes the fundamental importance of Augustine's *De doctrina Christiana* to Petrarch and the way this work adapts "a Ciceronian rhetorical theory to a Christian purpose" (290), one discovers that Petrarch is neither inconsistent nor places eloquence above moral philosophy. For Lee, Petrarch began with Augustine and adopts those parts of classical authors and thinkers which were consistent with Augustine, rather than beginning with classical sources and validating them with Augustine. His use of the early Augustine as the lens for reading classical works reveals a consistency interpreters of Petrarch have missed. Petrarch is thus an "Augustinian humanist" (353).

Lee's work is thoughtful, and his distinction between the works of Augustine followed by Petrarch and those followed by Salutati and Valla is insightful. By choosing a thematic approach, he illustrates the Augustinian influence on Petrarch effectively. He adjusts Ronald Witt's description of Petrarch's place in the development of humanism as someone who gave a previously classically oriented movement a new Christian direction, by explaining how this new direction was a particular kind of Augustinianism not always followed by later humanists. Why they did not adhere to Petrarch's kind of Augustinianism is not made clear. If humanists such as Salutati followed the later works of Augustine due to different principles already fixed in their mind, then there must have been even more fundamental influences than Augustine.

While it is true that Petrarch can be considered an "Augustinian humanist," as Lee refers to him, so can most other humanists to one degree or another. One is hard pressed to find a humanist who opposed Augustine. Besides humanists, thinkers as disparate as Aquinas,

Scotus, Ockham, Erasmus, Luther, and Descartes are all followers of Augustine. Augustine's writings are so voluminous, with some themes accentuated at times, other themes at different times, and his reputation so great in Western history, that he served as The Authority as no other western thinker has. For Lee, the determinative question is, which works of Augustine did they follow? This book is a valuable contribution to our understanding of Petrarch and his place in Renaissance humanism. (Bruce McNair, Campbell University)

◆ *Érasme typographe: humanisme et imprimerie au début du XVI siècle.* By Alexandre Vanautgaerden. Preface by Jean-François Gilmont. Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance, 503. Brussels: Académie royale de Belgique, and Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2012. XIV + 632 pp. Every so often, one comes across a book that could only have been written by one person. This is one of those books. The author, Alexandre Vanautgaerden, recently named director of the Bibliothèque de Genève, served for fifteen years before that as curator of the Erasmus House in Anderlecht, outside Brussels. Here he had a chance to pursue his interest in the early printed editions of Erasmus, which had occupied him for his doctoral thesis, allowing him to revise the thesis into the book being reviewed here.

Erasmus is one of those authors for whom one wonders if anything really new can be said, but Vanautgaerden has shown that it is indeed still possible to do so. The goal of the book is to show how one of the most important authors of the Renaissance used the new print medium to control not only how his books were presented, but also how they would be read. Vanautgaerden rightly offers priority to the *editiones principes*, with the intention “se baser sur une enquête matérielle pour établir le lien entre le contenu des ouvrages, les idées nouvelles et la forme des livres. Pour le dire en latin, écrire une biographie d'Érasme, non *ex Erasmo*, mais *ex Erasmi libris*” (4). In other words, print is viewed not as a neutral medium, but one which is bound inexorably to the ideas expressed in it and which must be taken into account in the interpretation of these ideas.

For his earliest publications, Erasmus lacked the stature and influence to control how his material was presented. Like other humanists at the beginning of the fifteenth century, he saw the book as an object

with which to seek patronage, but his printer, Thierry Martens, was not able to get him where he wanted to go as his ambitions grew. He found a new printer, Josse Bade in Paris, who was able to produce for him a superior product, but as his ambitions continued to rise, he went to Venice to work with the best, Aldus Manutius. Here he found what he was looking for, a press with adequate financing, a group of correctors who could help him in his work, connections to important libraries, and a director with a distinguished presence in the world of letters. He stayed with Aldus for ten months in 1508 and learned from him how to write in the print shop, rather than in scholarly seclusion. And he was able to see clearly that a printed book could be organized so that its exterior form (its *mise en page*) reflected its interior make-up (the ideas it carried), by controlling the title page, the setting of the text, prefatory material, indices, etc. The years 1514-1516 proved especially formative: here, in working with the printer Johann Froben, Erasmus came to understand that printing could be seen and used as a form of rhetoric, serving as a type of delivery (the fifth and final part of rhetoric) that helped take the reader where the author wanted him or her to go. This became especially important in his polemical works, where he reprised his technique of writing in the print shop to get his views into print in record time.

As one would guess from its sheer size, an enormous amount of work has gone into this book, which rests on the sort of detailed analysis of primary source material that one would hope to find accompanying the bold thesis Vanautgaerden has proposed. Erasmus's edition of Tertullian, for example, is studied at length because Vanautgaerden was able to find the material he needed to see how the editors and printers worked: the medieval manuscript annotated by the editor, the markings that guided the imposition of type, and the final printed product. What was observed here was compared to the *Life of St. Jerome*, where Erasmus's manuscript has survived, with the notes for the printer intact. This shows how Erasmus marked up the text to underline its rhetorical structure, in such a way that it accords well with our modern notions of paragraphing.

One of the most surprising conclusions in this book is the direct result of Vanautgaerden's careful attention to the relevant primary source material. Aldus Manutius was Erasmus's ideal printer, but

he only stayed with him for a few months, and when he returned to northern Europe, Erasmus never succeeded in finding Aldus's equal. So what he could not find, he invented. We have a mental picture of Thierry Martens and Johann Froben as humanist printers like Aldus, but this is in good part a picture that Erasmus created, working on prefaces for them, writing letters in Latin which they signed and sent out but could not read, and so forth. Martens and Froben are therefore revealed as printers first and humanists second, with it now being clear that the Latin works circulating under their names were not written by them.

As one would hope for a work on this topic, *Erasme typographe* is nicely produced and generously illustrated with literally dozens of illustrations. In addition to five hundred pages of text, the book also contains a list of the *editiones principes* of Erasmus's works, a secondary bibliography that covers fifty double-columned pages, a handy list of key typographical terms in French with their equivalents in five other languages, and three separate indices. By the time the reader has finished, he or she has little choice but to accept Vanautgaerden's conclusion: "Si l'humaniste est parvenu à s'imposer comme une des figures majeures dans l'Europe du premier tiers du XVI^e siècle, c'est parce qu'il a su dominer aussi le médium de l'imprimerie. La supériorité d'Érasme sur son temps n'est pas qu'intellectuelle, elle est également technique" (495). (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Controversies*. By Desiderius Erasmus. Edited, translated, and annotated by Clarence H. Miller. Introduction by Clarence H. Miller and James K. Farge. *Collected Works of Erasmus*, 82. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 2012. xxxvii + 361 pp. *Controversies* presents Erasmus's final arguments in a battle with the theologians of the University of Paris, especially with their elected leader, Noël Bédá, that had lasted a decade. Bédá and Erasmus were arguing over both content and form—should the text of the Latin Vulgate Bible be maintained? Should the scholastic method continue to be used for the study, teaching, and interpretation of Christian doctrine?—but the conflict over method was the fundamental one. Erasmus argued for a humanistic approach that used philological criticism on the Bible and preferred the works of the early church Fathers

to those of the medieval theologians. Bédá defended the scholastic method, which used systematic dialectic to explore God's revelation to humanity and stressed the obligation to pass on to future generations a tradition of dogma, moral teaching, and popular devotions.

Erasmus's relationship with the University of Paris was a long one. In 1495 he went there to study theology, although he never took a degree. His work was well known there and problems went back a decade from the publication of the work being reviewed here. The theology faculty refused Erasmus permission to publish his *Paraphrase on Luke* in Paris, after which he began an extensive correspondence with Bédá that reveals a great deal about Bédá's deep-seated antipathy to humanist method and Erasmus's defence of that approach. Both men tried, but the gulf between them was too deep and there was never a meeting of the minds; in fact, their exchange passed from private (more or less) letters to published polemic, culminating in 1531 with the *Determinatio facultatis theologiae*, a short book containing the Paris faculty's formal censures of 175 propositions drawn from various works of Erasmus. Erasmus replied the next year with his *Declarationes ad censuras Lutetiae vulgatas sub nomine facultatis theologiae Parisiensis*. A young Dominican friend, Ambrosius Pelargus, offered suggestions to Erasmus on revising the *Declarationes*, many of which he accepted. It is this revised, second version that is translated and annotated in the present volume.

Even the editors are forced to admit that “[r]eading the *Declarationes* is hardly an exhilarating or even very satisfying experience” (xxxii), noting that other of Erasmus's polemical writings are clearer or more theologically substantive. Nevertheless this treatise is valuable as a record of what Erasmus and Bédá were arguing about, organized clearly and free of the personal spite that mars much humanist invective. The *Declarationes* is also valuable for the insight it sheds into the methodological divide between humanism and scholasticism, which was one of the key intellectual issues of the day.

The Collected Works of Erasmus is by now a well-established operation, and this volume follows the structure and conventions of the series. The translation reads well, the notes are adequate for a first reading of the text, and there are two good indices, one general, the other of scriptural citations. All in all, the volume meets the expectations of those who are familiar with the series—and that is no small

achievement. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Jérôme Fracastor, La Syphilis ou le Mal Français. Syphilis sive Morbus Gallicus.* Edited and translated by Jacqueline Vons, with Concetta Pennuto, Danielle Gourevitch, and Jacques Chevallier. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2011. civ + 168 pp. 37 euros. Between 1869 and 2009, i.e., for 140 years, no complete French translation of Fracastoro's poem *Syphilis sive Morbus Gallicus* has been published, but then within two years two new editions with introduction, translation, and notes have appeared: one in 2009 by Christine Dussin as vol. 152 of the series "Textes de la Renaissance" (Paris: Éditions Classiques Garnier, 209 pp., 32 euros) and the present one by four scholars, each of whom is responsible for separate sections. The lion's share falls under the responsibility of J. Vons, Associate Professor of Classics and the History of Medicine in Tours, who wrote the second part ("La genèse de la *Syphilis*," pp. xlvi-li) of chapter II ("Le médecin et son poème: la *Syphilis* de Fracastor") and chapters III ("Un poème des temps modernes," pp. liii-lxxvii) and IV ("La fortune du texte," pp. lxxix-xcì) of the introduction, the facing translation (2-84), and the notes (87-118); she also contributed three of the four "Annexes" (I: Glossary of medical terms, pp. 121-25, II: Three Letters of Pietro Bembo to Fracastoro, pp. 127-31, III: Scaliger's remarks on the *Syphilis* in book VI of his *Poetics*, pp. 133-38) and compiled the bibliography (143-66). C. Pennuto, Maître de Conférences in Latin and the History of Medicine also in Tours, wrote the first part ("Éléments biographiques," pp. xxxix-xlvi) of chapter II and chapter V ("La tradition éditoriale et la présente édition," pp. xciii-ci) of the introduction and is responsible for the Latin text, whereas D. Gourevitch, historian of medicine at the École pratique des hautes études, contributed chapter I ("La syphilis, une maladie aux noms multiples," pp. xv-xxxvii) of the introduction, and the dermatologist J. Chevallier, Annexe IV (139-42), a brief assessment of the work of "Alfred Fournier, syphiligraphie, latiniste et directeur de la «Collection choisie des anciens syphiligraphes»," who published the last French translation of the *Syphilis* in 1869.

The four authors are especially interested in the importance of Fracastoro's poem for the history of medicine and the venereal diseases. The introduction mainly deals with these points, whereas the

literary aspects and the poetic evaluation of the text are of secondary importance. Accordingly meager is what Vons has to say in chapter III on the heroic and didactic aspects of the poem and on the presentation of the discoveries and the New World. Nowhere does she discuss the relation of the *Syphilis* to classical Latin poetry (except for a few references to Lucretius); nowhere does she explain the structural models of the *Georgics* and, in the third book, of the *Aeneid* and the Argonautic tradition; nowhere does she direct the reader's attention to Fracastoro's skilful manipulations of his main models and the way in which he seems to avoid and nevertheless includes the true causes of infection; and nowhere does she situate the third book within the literary history of the poems on the discovery of the New World, because she has not taken pains at all to make herself familiar with the relevant literature in languages other than French: for instance, she does not know (and does not quote in the bibliography) W. Ludwig, "Neulateinische Lehrgedichte und Vergils *Georgica*," in *From Wolfram and Petrarch to Goethe and Grass. Studies [...] L. Forster* (Baden-Baden, 1982), 151-80 (repr. in *id.*, *Litterae Neolatinae. Schriften zur neulateinischen Literatur* (Munich, 1989), 100-27); H. Hofmann, *Studi Umanistici Piceni* 6 (1986): 175-81 and 7 (1987): 169-74; C. Goddard, *Studi Umanistici Piceni* 16 (1993): 185-92; R. Monreal, *Studi Umanistici Piceni* 23 (2003): 179-89; J. E. Ziolkowski, in *Altro Polo*, ed. A. Reynolds (Sydney, 1984), 57-73; F. Cairns, *Hum. Lov.* 43 (1994): 246-61; R. Frank, *IJCT* 9 (2004): 524-34; on *Syphilis* and the poems on the discovery of the New World and Fracastoro's sources: G. Gliozzi, *Adamo e il nuovo mondo* (Florence, 1976) (also in French translation [!]: *Adam et le Nouveau Monde* (Lecques, 2000)); H. Hofmann, in *The Classical Traditions and the Americas*, ed. W. Haase-M. Reinhold (Berlin and New York, 1994), 420-656 (esp. 427-29); G. Eatough, *Selections from Peter Martyr (Repertorium Columbianum V, Turnhout, 1998)*, who provides a new text of *Dec.* I and III 4 with translation and detailed commentary (Vons does not quote the 1966 facsimile reprint of the edition (Alcala de Henares 1530) but only that by B. Gauvain (Paris, 2003), with French translation, not indicating that it contains, as Eatough's *Selections*, only *Dec.* I and III 4). Her text of Scaliger's *Poetics* in App. III is taken from the first edition (Lyons, 1561) and not from the critical edition in 6 vols. (Stuttgart, 1994-2011) with German translation and commentary by M. Fuhrmann, L. Deitz,

and G. Vogt-Spira (the bibliographical entry on p. 162 is wrong and incomplete and shows that she has never seen that edition), and in her discussion of Scaliger's admiration of Fracastoro's poem (lxxix ff.) she neither refers to nor profits from W. Ludwig, "Julius Caesar Scaligers Kanon neulateinischer Dichter," *Antike & Abendland* 25 (1979): 20-40 (repr. in *id.*, *Litterae Neolatinae*, 220-41) nor I. Reineke, *Julius Caesar Scaligers Kritik der neulateinischen Dichter* (Munich, 1988). The bibliography is a mess, lacunose and abounding in incorrect citations (Scaliger wrote an *Oratio pro M. Tullius* [sic!] *Cicerone contra Des. Erasmus* [p. 162 and lxxix n.1], cf. Gourevitch speaking of Grünpeck's treatise "la *pestilentiali* [sic!] *scorra*" [p. xxxiii]), and in some sections there is neither an alphabetical nor a chronological order.

For the text, C. Pennuto claims to present the "première édition critique française du poème" (ci), based on the first four printed editions (Verona, 1530; Rome, 1531; Paris, 1531; Basel, 1536), of which Rome, 1531, obviously prepared under Fracastoro's supervision, is the best: it corrects the misprints and omissions of the *editio princeps* and adds a list of its own misprints. But instead of printing an emended text of Rome, 1531, Pennuto quotes in the *apparatus criticus* all the printing errors of the four editions that are so obvious that one asks why the reader is being bothered with those *quisquilia*. On the other hand (I only give some examples from book I), she makes new mistakes, misreading *f-* as the long *s-* (1,260 *sors* instead of the correct *fors*), writing *pulluerant* (1,341) instead of *poll-*, and prints *perditus* (1,271), *genus* (1,272), and *Tum* (1,360) whereas the Cominiana (1718, ²1739) and the modern editions have the better readings *protinus*, *pecus*, and *Ut*, but she does not say—something that would be more important than the *apparatus* with the mere typographical errors—when and where these readings have appeared for the first time. Also her punctuation, which basically follows that of Rome, 1531, "a été quelquefois modernisée avec la plus grande prudence" (ci): not always for the better, as is shown by 1,171, *uerum etiam Sol ipse nouum, quis credere possit, curret iter* (better:—*quis credere possit?*—) or 1,273-76, where she prints (defying her own translation):

*A stabulis latus ad pabula pastor
ducebat, tum forte alta securus in umbra
dum caneret tenuique gregem mulceret auena.*

Ecce aliquam tussis subito irrequieta tenebat.

A better syntactical structure and understanding is gained by punctuating as the editions since the Cominiana have done:

*A stabulis lætas ad pabula pastor
ducebat: tum forte, alta securus in umbra
dum caneret tenuique gregem mulceret auena,
ecce aliquam tussis subito irrequieta tenebat.*

Finally, the 240 notes (87-118), numbered consecutively in the translation and not according to books and lines, which makes finding information quickly difficult, are of very mixed quality and often refer only to the notes in Dussin's 2009 edition or in Eatough's 1984 commentary instead of providing information on what Dussin and Eatough have written there. On the other hand Vons does not comment on many important aspects, especially in the stories of the *iuvenis Cenomanum* and *Ilceus* and in book III, so that the reader does not get any help toward a better understanding of the poem and has to consult Eatough's commentary, where he or she gets much better information and explanations than in the book under review.

The summary, therefore, cannot be positive: the four authors did not provide a satisfying text, omitted discussions of many important aspects and features of the poem, and did not succeed in explaining it to a modern readership on the basis of the results of the research of the last decades. They could easily have found that literature in the annual "Instrumentum Bibliographicum" of *Humanistica Lovaniensia*, but were obviously not able to read German (there is no single trace of the reception of a learned contribution in German) and consulted studies in languages other than French only sporadically. The result is that it would have been better not to have published the book in this form. Did too many cooks spoil the broth? (Heinz Hofmann, University of Tübingen)

◆ *Epistulae*. By Stephanus Brodericus. Edited by Petrus Kasza. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Medii Recentisque Aevorum. Budapest: Argumentum Kiadó - Magyar Országos Levéltár, 2012. The Bibliotheca Scriptorum Medii Recentisque Aevorum was founded by László Juhász in 1930. Before it was suspended in 1946, it had run to no less than 36 volumes. It took the Institute for Literature of the Hungarian Acade-

my of Sciences until 1976 to resume publication and start with a “series nova.” In 1985 Lázló Szörényi became general editor, assisted from 1988 onwards by Klára Pajorin. One of the major ongoing projects is the publication of the complete correspondence of the Hungarian humanist and diplomat Andreas Dudith (1533-1589). No less interesting is the publication of the letters written by or addressed to that other Hungarian bishop and diplomat István Brodarics, or Brodericus (*ca.* 1480-1539). Soon after he had crowned his studies in Italy with a doctorate in canon law at the University of Padua, he served as a diplomat in Poland as well as in Italy. Having been appointed Royal Chancellor in 1526, he accompanied King Louis II on his campaign against the Turks. He escaped from the disaster at Mohács, and a few months later he gave an eyewitness account of that famous battle in his *De conflictu Hungarorum cum Solymano Turcarum imperatorem ad Mohacs historia verissima* (ed. by Peter Kulcsár in the BSMRA, s.n. 6, 1985).

The edition under review contains 349 letters in total, of which no less than 254 are written by Brodericus himself. They are mostly of a diplomatic nature and addressed to kings and princes (Sigismund I, King of Poland; Ferdinand, Archduke of Austria; Francis I, King of France; Louis II, King of Hungary; Mary, Queen of Hungary; Pope Clement VII). Other correspondents include leading humanists such as Pietro Bembo, Andreas Cricius, Aldus Manutius, and Erasmus.

The text of the letters is based on both manuscripts and printed editions; hence it would have been nice if the editor had provided us with a complete list of these sources. At the beginning (5-17) the editor has given a chronological list of all the letters, but it would surely have been interesting to have also an alphabetical list of all the writers or addressees of letters, and/or a system in the index of names that allows the reader to see immediately how many letters were written by or addressed to that person. The Latin texts are carefully edited and are accompanied by copious and pertinent annotations. Only a few typos or other errors have crept in (e.g., p. 110, l. 23: *ceasarem* instead of *caesarem*; p. 111, l. 42: *De rebus Barensis* instead of *Barensibus*), so that one can conclude that this volume, elegantly bound in a readable format, has been prepared according to the highest standards. For the introduction and commentary, however, it would have been a good idea to have had the English idiom checked by a native speaker. A

final remark: the manuscript of the epitaph for Brodericus composed by Nicolaus Olahus, which on p. 605 is reported to be lost, is currently preserved at the University Library of Budapest, H. 46, fol. 23. (Gilbert Tournoy, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven)

◆ *Theriobulia*. By Johannes Dubravius. Edited, translated, and annotated by Alexander Loose. *Spolia Berolinensia*, 32. 2 vols. Hildesheim, Zurich, and New York: Weidmannsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 2011. Alexander Loose's edition of Johannes Dubravius's *Theriobulia* is a welcome addition to the growing body of Neo-Latin literature in circulation. The *Theriobulia* is a fascinating, somewhat unusual Neo-Latin mirror of princes, written by the Bohemian humanist Johannes Dubravius in 1518 for the then twelve-year old Louis II, king of Hungary and Bohemia. In it, various animals advise their king, the lion, how to lead his life and how to govern. A vernacular poem of his fellow-countryman Smil Flaschka of Pardubitz, entitled *Nová Rada*, was Dubravius's most important model. However, in his Neo-Latin animal parliament, Dubravius also incorporated many references to numerous classical and humanistic texts.

Alexander Loose's work, derived from his doctoral dissertation, comprises an edition, based on four available printed texts, with a facing German prose translation. The introduction contains an overview of the sources used, a survey of the structure of the work, and an analysis of the metrical and prosodic features. The commentary offers a detailed source analysis, explains the animal symbolic, and places the work in its historical context. The appendix, finally, contains the edition and translation of the prefaces to the first four editions of the work and a German translation of the Old Bohemian model text *Nová Rada*.

Loose's introduction provides information about the author, the historical context, and literary sources and models. A considerable part of the introduction is devoted to a discussion of the vernacular model *Nová Rada* (convincingly identified as the vernacular model referred to by Dubravius himself as *libellus patrio sermone scriptus*), in which tetrapods and birds instruct their king, the lion, in matters of life and government. Although this discussion illuminates a significant background to Dubravius's animal parliament, one wonders a little

at the need for a lengthy explanation of the title *Nová Rada*, when, as Loose himself later comments, it is doubtful whether Dubravius understood what exactly was new (*nová*) about his vernacular example. The structure of the introduction could also have been made more reader friendly by adding a short summary of the *Theriobulia*, which would be helpful before reading the section on models and sources. The section on ancient Greek and Latin sources would benefit from a short paragraph explaining the relevance of texts, passages, and sentences of ancient authors used by Dubravius.

In general, however, the author must be praised for his critical introduction to the *Theriobulia*. Loose highlights how Dubravius combined elements from his vernacular model with classical and Neo-Latin influences. He convincingly argues that Dubravius used the fourfold division, structured by the cardinal virtues, of Martianus Capella's *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii* (to which Dubravius had previously published a commentary) as an outline for his *Theriobulia*. Its four main parts are devoted to *prudentia*, *iustitia*, *temperantia*, and *fortitudo*. Further, Loose's discussion of the most important sources for the main themes of the animals' speeches and the characterisation of the individual animals offers a valuable background to the work. Finally, Loose deserves praise for his conscientious analysis of the metre of the work.

Loose's translation gives an accessible prose rendition of the Latin. Copious notes in the commentary illustrate the wealth of classical and contemporary allusions and references.

The next edition of Dubravius's work would benefit from a more in-depth discussion of the relationship of the *Theriobulia* to Medieval Latin animal literature, such as fables and animal epics. For example, it would be interesting to learn how Dubravius's work compares to the thirteenth-century *Speculum sapientiae*, a Latin collection of fables which was translated into English, German, and Czech. Similarly to Dubravius's work, it was structured according to four virtues: *prudentia*, *magnanimitas*, *iustitia*, and *modestia*. A second Medieval Latin work, the tenth-century animal epic *Ecbasis cuius captivi per tropologiam*, contains an animal parliament at the court of a lion king that may offer interesting comparative material. The present author believes that a discussion of this medieval tradition would add an interesting nuance to the already

impressive analysis of the *Theriobulía* given by Loose. (Nienke Tjoelker, Ludwig Boltzmann Institut für Neulateinische Studien, Innsbruck)

◆ *Obras completas*, vol. 15. Por Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda. *Sobre el destino y el libre albedrío*. Introducción filológica, edición crítica, traducción y notas de J. J. Sánchez Gázquez; *Demócrates*. Introducción filológica y edición crítica de J. Solana Pujalte - Introducción filológica, traducción y notas de I. J. García Pinilla; *Teófilo*. Introducción filológica, edición crítica, traducción y notas de J. M. Núñez González; Estudio histórico de S. Rus Rufino. Excmo. Ayuntamiento de Pozoblanco, 2010. Este volumen decimoquinto de las obras del insigne humanista pozoalbense nos ofrece el texto original, traducido, anotado y comentado de tres tratados dialogados, a cargo de cuatro filólogos latinos de acreditada solvencia de las universidades de Almería, Córdoba, Castilla-La Mancha y Oviedo, precedidas de un amplio estudio histórico. Concluye con un índice onomástico de los tres tratados y otro de fuentes del primero de ellos a cargo de T. López Muñoz, y con el índice general. El volumen supera de ese modo las setecientas páginas, con una doble numeración: una en números árabes para la edición que se repite en la traducción, y otra en números romanos para el estudio e introducciones, bibliografías e índices, además de algunas páginas dedicadas a resúmenes sin numerar.

El estudio histórico general trata sobre la recepción de Aristóteles en el siglo XVI a través del tomismo, aplicada de forma particular a Sepúlveda y más concretamente a las principales cuestiones antropológicas planteadas en estas tres obras, que son situadas en el contexto del cisma religioso europeo, de la conquista del Nuevo Mundo, y de la labor de la Inquisición en España: el dilema entre la libertad y la predestinación unido al valor las obras frente a la fe para la salvación del hombre, la posibilidad de una guerra moralmente justa, y la legalidad de emitir falsos testimonios en un juicio. La expresión y la puntuación están poco cuidadas, y las erratas y lapsus delatan una falta de revisión impropias de la colección. Por señalar alguna: “para ilustra” (XI), en una frase que debería ir precedida de pausa fuerte tras la referencia a la nota a pie de página; “expuesta Tomás” (XXXVI); “permanecen en ocultos” (LIV).

Las ediciones críticas cumplen con los criterios filológicos exigibles, están bien traducidas, y sus introducciones incluyen la obligada descripción de las ediciones previas (y manuscritos en el caso del *Demócrates*) y de los criterios seguidos en la edición. Sin embargo han sido realizadas y reunidas sin que apenas se perciba alguna coordinación entre los distintos autores o a través del consejo editorial de la Colección. Ello se refleja, entre otras cuestiones, en la falta de un criterio uniforme para las introducciones, que no siempre incluyen el comentario de las fuentes, de los criterios seguidos en la traducción, del contenido o del estilo del tratado; en la presentación de los resúmenes sinópticos que figuraban en anteriores ediciones; en las alternancias de u/v para la /u/ consonántica en latín, y de abreviaturas y siglas como cf./cfr. y THLL./ThLL, o en añadir o no coma tras los títulos de artículos y de capítulos de libro en la bibliografía. Son raras las erratas tanto en las ediciones (“diculpa” en p. 55), como en las traducciones (“eiusquue” en p. 196).

En algunos casos falla la correspondencia entre el texto latino y la traducción, como en las dos primeras páginas del cap. VI del *Demófilo*. Por lo demás, la calidad material del volumen sigue siendo tan excelente como en anteriores volúmenes, tanto la encuadernación, tapas y papel, como la impresión. Incluye asimismo ilustraciones de varias ediciones de cada uno de los tratados.

El libro resultará de gran interés para todo aquel interesado en la historia del pensamiento filosófico en la Europa del siglo XVI, pues, gracias a la edición y traducción de estos tres tratados, contamos con un texto latino más fiable, y accesible en traducciones fiables, y los distintos estudios introductorios y anotaciones proporcionan además una valiosa información adicional. (Joaquín Pascual Barea, Universidad de Cádiz)

◆ *Declamationes Sullanae*, pt. 2: *Introductory Material, Declamationes III, IV, and V*. By Juan Luis Vives. Edited by Edward V. George, with notes to Declamation IV by Edward V. George and Anna L. E. Hinkle. *Selected Works of Juan Luis Vives*, 9. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012. \$146 / 105 euros. A German proverb says: “Gut Ding will Weile haben” (“It takes time to do things properly”). More than twenty years ago, in 1989, Edward George published the first two of

Vives' *Declamationes Sullanae*, with a helpful introduction. Beyond a few elements from this original introduction repeated here, George does particular service in pointing, in the second part of his introduction, entitled "Influential Antecedents," to three sources: Quintilian, Erasmus's *Institutio principis Christiani*, and earlier editions of Sallust. However, it is not entirely clear to me why this second part, dealing with Vives' "calculated attention to three sources in particular," could not form a unity with the fourth one, entitled "Vives and the Sources," in which Vives' impressive knowledge of ancient sources is briefly illustrated. One small remark here: on p. 5, n. 15, George quotes a passage from the 1513 edition of Sallust's *Opera*, in which he reads: *Moris autem erat ut iuvenes sese exercuerunt* ...; normally one expects to read *exercerent*, and that is indeed the reading provided by other editions, such as Venice, 1513 and 1514, or Lyons, 1514, which can be found on the internet.

The edition of the Latin text here is mainly based on the first Antwerp edition (1520) and the revision by Vives (Basel, 1538) on the one hand, and on two later editions of Vives' *Opera omnia*: Basel, 1555 and Valencia, 1782-1790. The editor has even occasionally used a recent Spanish edition of 1940, which obviously depends directly on the Valencia edition—as can easily be deduced from printing errors such as *eundem erat* for *eundum erat* (64/18) in both editions—and does not contribute one single better reading. Unlike the previous volume in the series (see my review—badly mangled by modern technology—in *NLN* 2008), the Latin text here is most carefully edited, the *apparatus criticus* is pertinent, and the commentary is always to the point.

Of course a few typographical and other errors have slipped through. Thus the editor most of the time follows, or at least mentions, the corrections proposed by the printer of the 1538 volume in his *apparatus criticus* (e.g., p. 34/1); however, he fails to do so on p. 36/19-20, where the verb *amittere* is required at the end of the sentence: ... *decimationes, quibus malebant complures milites puniri quam militandi morem et disciplinam, qua et steterat haec res publica et futura erat sempiterna*. The printer had pointed out this omission in his list of corrections: *quamquam verbum Amittere ab ipso Autore deletum videbatur, cum prius loco eius quid est Puniri, esset positum* ("although the word *Amittere* was apparently deleted by the author himself, whilst it was originally placed

where *Puniri* now stands”).

Another minor point relating to the translation and the commentary: on pp. 154-55, n. 55 explains the sentence *Iuppiter, et tu eam vocem securus accepisti; quaenam igitur te movent?* In this note the editor seems to doubt that it is to be considered an apostrophe to Jupiter. In my view, since there is not only *tu* in the first part, but also the singular in the adjective *securus* and in the verb *accepisti*, and again *te* in the second part of the sentence, a slip on the part of Vives is out of the question. Thus, instead of translating “Jupiter! And you listened to him ...,” it might be more appropriate to translate: “You too, Jupiter, listened to him ...” (“too” meaning together with the senators who had remained silent). On p. 199 the editor translates *At libentius extra Romam agit Sulla quam Romae* in the following manner: “But then Sulla orders exile beyond Rome more willingly than exile at Rome.” Is the meaning not simply: “But Sulla prefers to live outside Rome to living at Rome”?

A most interesting feature which caught my attention is the fact that the editor systematically adapted the future active participle in the future active infinitive to its subject (34/21, p. 96/12, p. 114/7, p. 160/9, p. 262/17), in some cases following **V**. Since all previous editions (**HWB**) always present that form as invariably ending in *-um*, one is inclined to accept that young Vives was convinced that the future active infinitive, exactly as its passive counterpart does, remained indeclinable. And this brings us to another question: in the first volume of the *Selected Works of Vives* (ix-x), the editorial principles for the entire series were established. These included the adaptation of the orthography to the system of the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*. But how far should this adaptation go in matters grammatical? If solecisms, such as the erroneous use of *suis* instead of *eius*, are not corrected (see for instance George’s edition of the *Pompeius fugiens* in *SWV* 1, p. 126 and p. 128), should the editor not limit himself to drawing the attention of the reader to this anomaly in the use of the future active infinitive but leaving it uncorrected?

Nevertheless, all in all, this critical edition, along with the translation and commentary, is carried out according to the most exacting standards. It is rounded off with a double index, one of persons and another of classical and Neo-Latin sources, each of them covering

both parts of the *Declamationes Sullanae*, the current one and the one published back in 1989. A superb piece of work! (Gilbert Tournoy, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven)

◆ *The Kaleidoscopic Scholarship of Hadrianus Junius (1511-1575): Northern Humanism at the Dawn of the Dutch Golden Age*. Edited by Dirk van Miert. Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, 199. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2011. xii + 319 pp. 99 euros. Hadrianus Junius (1511-1575), or Adriaen the Jonghe, is one of those unjustly forgotten humanists of the early modern Netherlands. Born in the Dutch city of Hoorn, he was active in the period between the death of Erasmus in 1536 and the foundation of the University of Leiden in 1575. Praised in his own time as 'the second Erasmus', he was neglected by research until Chris Heesakkers drew attention to him in his inaugural lecture *Tussen Erasmus en Leiden: Hadrianus Junius en zijn betekenis voor de ontwikkeling van het Humanisme in Holland in de zestiende eeuw*, in this volume presented in an English translation as *From Erasmus to Leiden: Hadrianus Junius and His Significance for the Development of Humanism in Holland in the Sixteenth Century*. Rightly, this 'grand old man' of Junius scholarship receives pride of place in this volume, which is opened by its editor, Dirk van Miert, with an Introduction on Junius and Northern Dutch Humanism. He locates Junius between other early humanists such as the schoolmasters Alexander Hegius, Petrius Tiara, and Gulielmus Gnapheus (spelled "Gnapaeus" in this book).

Junius was a versatile man, a physician, classical scholar, translator, lexicographer, antiquarian, historiographer, emblemist, school rector, and Latin poet as well—a man with a real 'kaleidoscopic scholarship.' Not all of his subjects are treated in this book. His historiographical works are treated by Coen Maas ("Hadrianus Junius' *Batavia* and the Formation of a Historiographical Canon in Holland"), who gives Junius's history of the Low Countries its place in earlier and later historiography, and by Nico de Glas ("Context, Conception and Content of Hadrianus Junius' *Batavia*"), who by closely reading the text shows its genesis, actual content, and probable aim.

The classical scholar Junius is treated by the editor himself ("Hadrianus Junius' *Animadversa* and His Methods of Scholarship"). The *Animadversa* was a genre of philological (often textual) notes

to several classical authors. Van Miert shows how Junius made his *Animadversa*, and he also shows that some of his conjectures and emendations have survived the ages and are now in the *apparatus critici* of modern editions, while others (deservedly or not) have fallen into oblivion. Chris Heesakkers investigates “Junius’ Two Editions of Martial’s *Epigrammata*” and draws out the problems concerning these two editions, which are often confused. In these editions, Junius turns out to be a scholar with only a scant philological method.

The lexicographer—of course this lexicography is related to classical scholarship—is treated by Toon Van Hal (“A Man of Eight Hearts: Hadrianus Junius and Sixteenth-Century Plurilinguism”). Van Hal discusses the multilingual dictionary *Nomenclator*, opening the way toward further research on Junius’s lexicographic scholarship.

Junius was an important emblemist as well, as is shown by Ari Wesseling (“Devices, Proverbs, Emblems: Hadrianus Junius’ *Emblemata* in the Light of Erasmus’ *Adagia*”) and Karl Enekel (“Emblematic Authorization—*Lusus emblematum*: The Function of Junius’ Emblem Commentary and Early Commentaries on Alciato’s *Emblematum libellus*”). Enekel analyzes the functions of Junius’s ‘self-commentary’: Junius added a substantial commentary attached to his own emblems, to elucidate their idiosyncratic inventiveness and to establish a norm for the images, even if the woodcutters or printers would make a mess of them.

Although the image of Junius presented is not complete—the physician, translator, school rector, and Latin poet are more or less neglected, and the editor has chosen not to give a biographical overview of Junius’s life—this volume by Van Miert has added to our knowledge of early humanism in the Netherlands in general and of this humanist in particular. Junius had a vast knowledge—kaleidoscopic indeed—and he was innovative and influential on several subjects, almost as much as Erasmus had been in other respects. (Jan Bloemendal, Huygens Institute for the History of the Netherlands, The Hague)

◆ *Obras completas*, vol. 6: *Escritos varios*. Por Pedro de Valencia. Jesús María Nieto Ibáñez, coordinador. León: Universidad / Instituto de Humanismo y Tradición Clásica, 2012. 661 p. Comienza el presente volumen con una Presentación de Jesús Paniagua Pérez y

un Prólogo de Luis Gómez Canseco, seguidos de una Introducción y unos Criterios de Edición para textos en castellano (los aplicados a textos latinos se recogen en las páginas que preceden al escrito *De tuenda valetudine*). Se cierra con un Índice de nombres propios.

Doce son los escritos de Pedro de Valencia publicados en este libro, de distinta temática y extensión. Y diez los autores que han realizado las diversas ediciones y los estudios. De ahí las diferencias existentes en el tratamiento de los mismos, en la amplitud de los estudios introductorios y en su organización, en una “falta de uniformidad” que se aclara convenientemente en la Introducción (21). Los varios intereses y ocupaciones del humanista extremeño y su valía quedan reflejados en estas obras de tema médico, técnico, pedagógico, político y literario, aderezadas con abundantes referencias a fuentes antiguas, medievales y contemporáneas.

De esos doce escritos, tres están redactados en latín: *De tuenda valetudine*, régimen de salud, con introducción por Eduardo Álvarez del Palacio, y edición y traducción por Antonio María Martín Rodríguez; *De hebraeorum coro*, sobre esta medida de peso, a cargo de Raúl Manchón Gómez; y los *Humanae rationis παραλογισμάτων illustriora exempla*, conjunto de errores de filósofos, por Avelina Carrera de la Red.

Las restantes obras de Pedro de Valencia aquí editadas están escritas en castellano. Son las *Advertencias para la crianza de los príncipes, cuando pequeños, contra el abuso de procurarlos callar con espantos*, con estudio introductorio y edición de Jesús María Nieto Ibáñez, que se ha encargado también de la *Descripción de la justicia en ocasión de querer Arias Montano comentar las leyes del Reino* y del *Parecer sobre una cátedra en Salamanca*, junto con la edición de la *Dedicatoria a la Reina doña Margarita de su libro intitulado De las enfermedades de los niños*, con introducción de Raúl López López. Nieto Ibáñez se ha ocupado además de revisar y adaptar a las normas de la colección las ediciones de Abdón Moreno García de la *Descripción de la pintura de las virtudes* (introducción de Dolores Campos Sánchez-Bordona), y de los *Ejemplos de príncipes, preladados y otros varones ilustres, que dejaron oficios y dignidades y se retiraron*, de los que ha hecho igualmente la introducción. Se completa el volumen con las *Cartas a Góngora en censura de sus poesías*, editado por Manuel María Pérez López con introducción del mismo y de Juan Matas Caballero; la *Carta e informe de Pedro de Valencia sobre los escritos del padre Alonso*

Sánchez y el doctor Jerónimo Hurtado, a cargo de María Isabel Viforcós Marinas; y el escrito *Sobre la Guerra de Flandes de Jerónimo Conestaggio*, por Raúl López López.

En el libro se hubiera podido buscar más uniformidad y evitar repeticiones de referencias bibliográficas y otras reiteraciones como la que afecta al resumen de contenidos del *De tuenda valetudine*. Hay también erratas en las citas de las notas, en la puntuación y la ortografía del castellano, y en algunos títulos de obras latinas, como “*Cantroversiarum Medicarum et Philosophicarum libri decena*” (31).

Dos observaciones relativas al léxico y la literatura de la medicina latina: la primera, sobre el escrito *De tuenda valetudine*, donde se traduce *Cibo ... iam concocto* (56) como “el alimento ... ya guisado,” cuando el término *concocto*, tecnicismo médico de corte celsiano y pliniano, hace referencia a la cocción del alimento en el estómago. La segunda, sobre el autor denominado Celio utilizado como fuente en los *Ejemplos de príncipes ...*, que no es, como se indica en la introducción correspondiente, Celio Aureliano, escritor médico del siglo V, sino Celio Rodigino, autor de las célebres *Antiquae Lectiones* (Venecia, 1516), donde efectivamente se localiza el ejemplo de san Antonio Anacoreta recogido por Valencia (libro 10, cap. 4).

En cualquier caso, es este un interesante volumen que da a conocer unos escritos sin duda provechosos para filólogos e historiadores. (María-Teresa Santamaría Hernández, Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha)

◆ *Discourses of Power: Ideology and Politics in Neo-Latin Literature*. Edited by Karl Enenkel, Marc Laureys, and Christoph Pieper. *Noctes Neolatinae / Neo-Latin Texts and Studies*, 17. Hildesheim, Zurich, and New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 2012. xxxvi + 338 pp. As Anthony Grafton and Lisa Jardine reminded us twenty-five years ago in *From Humanism to the Humanities: Education and the Liberal Arts in Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Europe* (Cambridge, Mass., 1986), a humanist education prepared the student for a particular career, one that focused around government service. From Petrarch onward, humanists served in both secular and church chancelleries, and as diplomats, courtiers, and church officials. The link between humanism and power produced a mass of texts with political and ideological

content, generally in Latin, since this was the language of power in the early modern period. With this connection in mind, the three scholars who edited this volume organized a conference on 'Ideological Discourses in Neo-Latin Literature,' held at Leiden University from the 26th to the 28th of November, 2009, with support from Leiden and Bonn Universities and from the Dutch government. The papers presented here were originally delivered at the conference and revised for publication.

The volume contains the following essays: Karl Enenkel, "Introduction"; Marc Laureys, "Bibliography"; Anita Traninger, "Arenas of Anger: The Uses of Declamation in Early Modern Political Discourse"; Christoph Pieper, "Die vielen Facetten des Sigismondo Malatesta in der ideologischen Poesie des Hofes in Rimini"; Karl Enenkel, "The Politics of Antiquarianism: Neo-Latin Treatises on Cultural History as Ideology and Propaganda"; Han Lamers, "The Imperial Diadem of Greece: Giovanni Gemisto's Strategical Representation of 'Graecia' (1516)"; Thomas Haye, "Der Türkendiskurs im anonymen *Dialogus de capta Rhodo* (1523)"; Roswitha Simons, "Umsturz, Irreligiosität, Kulturzerstörung, Diskursverschränkung in der Reformationspolemik des Johannes Atrocianus"; Marc Laureys, "Van Rossum *ad portas*: Girolamo Faletti's Evocation of the Guelders Wars in His *De bello Sicambrico*"; Ronald W. Truman, "Ideological Discourses in Sixteenth-Century Spanish Treatises on Government"; Diana Stanciu, "Sovereignty and the Censure of Aristotle in Jean Bodin's *Methodus ad facilem historiarum cognitionem*"; Coen Maas, "Was Janus Dousa a Tacitist? Rhetorical and Conceptual Approaches to the Reception of Classical Historiography and Its Political Significance"; Robert Seidel, "Aliena sequens regna, deserui mea': Antipfälzische Polemik im Medium lateinischer Centonendichtung"; Beate Hintzen, "Der Fürst im Nachruf: Zu Aktualisierung und Instrumentalisierung antiker und zeitgenössischer ideologischer Muster in den Nekrologen des Martin Opitz"; and Robert von Friedeburg, "Wars with Books: From Which Point Onward Should We Employ the Term 'Ideology' with Respect to Our Sources?" Floris Verhaart has also supplied a useful *index nominum*, which closes the volume.

As one would hope, a number of very interesting topics are touched on in these essays: the use of ancient sources to solidify

an ideological position in political discourse (Pieper and Maas), the capacity of emerging fields like book history to help clarify how the meanings of words like ideology evolve over time (von Friedeburg), the relative rolls of Latin and the vernacular in humanist political discourse (Seidel), the importance of the idea of a crusade against Turkey as it appears in both little-known (Haye) and well-known (Enenkel) sources, the role of propaganda (Laureys and Lamers), and the need to be alert for an evolution of thought in the writings of the same theorist (Stanciu, in reference to Jean Bodin). The classic weakness in a collection like this is coverage: conference organizers can encourage their participants to do certain things, but in the end they have to take the papers that are offered, which seldom provide a continuous narrative about their subject. In fairness a great deal of ground is covered here, from the fifteenth to the seventeenth centuries, in Italy, Germany, France, England, Spain, and the Netherlands, in genres ranging from epic, cento, dialogue, and historiography to elegy, declamation, and theoretical tracts. Enenkel's introduction is also useful as an effort to provide commentary on topics that are not developed at length in the essays—civic humanism, the role of Plato and Aristotle in early modern political discourse, and Machiavellianism, *inter alia*. In the end it is not fair to approach a volume like this as if it were a companion to early modern political thought; if it is evaluated for what it is—a collection of essays on an important topic in Neo-Latin studies—it succeeds admirably. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *De laudibus Monasterii Westphaliae metropolis*. By Oleg Nikitinski. Società di studi politici, Biblioteca di cultura europea, 3. Naples: La scuola di Pitagora editrice, 2012. 247 pp. As those who attend the congresses of the International Association for Neo-Latin Studies know, a delightful tradition has evolved at the organization's triennial congresses in which the head of the local organizing committee offers a keepsake to the participants. The keepsake is a book that in some way evokes the Neo-Latin culture of the city hosting the congress. For the 2003 meeting in Bonn, Beate Czaplá, Marc Laureys, and Karl August Neuhausen produced *Bonna solum felix . . . : Bonn in der lateinischen Literatur der Neuzeit* (Cologne, 2003); *Companion to the History*

of *the Neo-Latin Studies in Hungary*, edited by István Bartók (Budapest, 2005), appeared in conjunction with the 2006 congress in Budapest; and the organizers of the 2009 meeting in Uppsala provided facsimile editions entitled *Nova literaria Maris Baltici & Septentrionis* and *Three Dissertations under the Presidency of Anders Celsius* (Uppsala, 2009). The book under review here was given to the participants of the 2012 IANLS congress in Münster.

This volume works a little differently from its predecessors. The congress organizer, Karl Enekel, who holds the chair in Medieval and Neo-Latin Philology at the University of Münster, went to one of his Seminar associates, Dr. Oleg Nikitinski, and asked him to prepare a book that would survey the Latin culture of the area in the language in which that culture developed. *De laudibus Monasterii Westphaliae metropolis* does just this, drawing from the writings of the principal Westphalian humanists of the fifteenth through the seventeenth centuries: Rodolphus Langius, Hermannus Buschius, Joannes Murrnellius, and Ferdinandus de Furstenberg. These men are not exactly household names, even in the community of Neo-Latinists, but as Nikitinski shows, they maintained relationships with many of the most important figures in European culture, including Rudolf Agricola, Gian Lorenzo Bernini, Desiderius Erasmus, Marsilio Ficino, Aldus Manutius, Politian, Lorenzo Valla, and countless others. The book also contains information about the Schola Paulina, one of the oldest in Europe, which will interest historians of humanist education. Also included are autobiographies of Ferdinandus de Furstenberg and Bernardus de Mallinckrodt and observations about their stays in Westphalia by Justus Lipsius, Pope Alexander VII, and Queen Christina of Sweden.

After reading this volume, the reader is unlikely to conclude that Münster is in danger of eclipsing Rome or Leiden as a center of Neo-Latin culture. But it quickly becomes clear that the area has for centuries offered intellectual delights that equal its culinary ones, perhaps not so refined as those of Paris but solid and substantial, well worth sampling and lingering over. The book itself reinforces those delights, on several levels. It is nicely produced, with well-chosen photographs and facsimiles of manuscripts and early printed books. Nikitinski's prose is another delight, fluent and graceful, well able to carry forward

its argument yet by no means somber and serious: see, for example, the sections headed “Visio Caroli Enenkelii,” “De birotis,” and “De tabernis vinariis et cauponis.” I do not know what the organizers of the Vienna congress in 2015 have in mind for those who will attend that meeting, but I do not envy them the task of following in the footsteps of this volume. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Dialectical Disputations*. By Lorenzo Valla. Edited and translated by Brian P. Copenhaver and Lodi Nauta. 2 vols. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 49-50. 1 + 397 pp., 591 pp. *Commentaries on Plato*, vol. 2: *Parmenides*. By Marsilio Ficino. Edited and translated by Maude Vanhaelen. 2 vols. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 51-52. lxii + 286 pp., 408 pp. *Dialogues*, vol. 1: *Charon and Antonius*. By Giovanni Gioviano Pontano. Edited and translated by Julia Haig Gaisser. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 53. xxvii + 403 pp. *Poems*. By Michael Marullus. Translated by Charles Fantazzi. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 54. xx + 475 pp. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 2012. \$29.95. The six volume reviewed here represent the 2012 harvest for the I Tatti Renaissance Library, now clearly established as the preeminent series for the publication of texts and translations in Neo-Latin studies.

The *Dialectical Disputations* is an excellent example of Lorenzo Valla (ca. 1406-1457) in action. Only the boldest, most original thinker could expose as a forgery a document that was vital to the papacy’s place in the temporal power structure or erect a new Christian morality on, of all things, Epicurean foundations, but if Valla could do these things, why not attack Aristotle and the entire scholastic intellectual structure that dominated university life in his day? The problem as he saw it was that professional philosophers had strayed from the proper standard, which was a clear understanding of the classics as a repository of common usage in speaking and common sense in thinking. Everything one needs to know is freely available in the classical texts, but by neglecting and misinterpreting the ancient documents, especially Aristotle, the scholastics have created bizarre neologisms and habitual deviations from classical norms of speech that impede understanding, leading instead to abstruse formalisms and meaningless abstractions. What matters is not whether an argument follows some abstract

rule, but whether it works, and for it to work, the speaker or writer must have control over the full range of rhetorical tools. Dialectic is important, but only when properly practiced and subordinated to oratory. As set forth in the *Dialectical Disputations*, Valla's method did not have much of a direct influence in his lifetime—he was asking too much, too fast, in his call for reform—but his eclecticism and pragmatism have resonated richly within the history of philosophy over the succeeding centuries.

The *Parmenides* in many ways has proved to be the most controversial of Plato's dialogues, since it seems to attack a crucial part of Plato's philosophy, the theory of the Ideas, and then explores a series of relationships between unity and multiplicity without offering a clear conclusion about what the exploration means. Proclus and the Neoplatonists argued that the dialogue was essentially a religious text, offering an initiation into the highest principles of the universe hidden beneath its apparent contradictions. At the end of the fifteenth century, Marsilio Ficino (1433-1499) published another commentary to the *Parmenides*, one that is deeply indebted to Proclus but not enslaved to it. Ficino's commentary incorporated the *Parmenides* into his belief that a series of divinely inspired theologians transmitted an "ancient theology" from Persia, Egypt, and Greece into Christianity, with Plato sitting at the center of this tradition and Aristotle being excluded from it, a position that put him at odds with Pico della Mirandola, among others. As Vanhaelen points out in her introduction, Ficino's debt to the medieval scholastics was greater than he would want to admit, but he did stay firmly within the Neoplatonic tradition, stressing the similarities rather than the differences between Proclus and Plotinus, looking for agreement rather than contradiction between the *Parmenides* and the *Sophist*, and attempting to reconcile the content of Plato's *Parmenides* with Parmenides' *Poem*. Modern scholarship handles these points differently, but that in no way diminishes Ficino's importance within the history of philosophy.

The other two volumes under review here move from philosophy to literature. The *Dialogues*, by Giovanni Pontano (1429-1503), are among the most important Neo-Latin representatives of this genre. They are deeply embedded within the humanist culture of Quattrocento Naples, especially the gatherings generally described (anach-

ronistically) as the Accademia Napoletana or Accademia Pontaniana. *Charon* is set in the underworld of classical mythology and scrutinizes the problems and follies of humanity, with a focus on fifteenth-century Italy. *Antonius* is a Menippean satire named for the recently deceased Antonio Beccadelli; in it his friends revisit favorite topics that they had enjoyed discussing with him. Each discussion is precipitated by a crisis (an impending war in Italy, Beccadelli's death), but the crisis merely provides a context for a free-flowing conversation within the Neapolitan sodality. The dialogues are set out of doors, which allows a freedom of movement reinforced by the arrival of outsiders who are not members of the group. The conversation ranges freely but comes "back again and again to certain themes, presenting them from different points of view and with different emphasis, like musical variations played in different keys and at different volumes" (xvi). Religion, poetry, and language are among these recurring themes, with the latter being particularly important as the interlocutors labor over definitions, offer puns, pounce on solecisms, and play with etymologies. This is the preeminent humanist literary game, with *variatio* being the principal desideratum.

One of the regular participants in these Neapolitan gatherings was the Greek émigré Michael Marullus (*ca.* 1453/4-1500), who shared with Pontano an interest in the poetry of Lucretius. Marullus was an accomplished poet, with the volume under review here offering a text and translation of his verse corpus. First there is a collection of 199 epigrams, which is noteworthy for both the variety of meters used in it and the range of themes found there, extending from love poems and funeral laments to a series of invectives directed in particular against Poliziano, whom Marullus hated. The other major work presented here is Marullus's *Hymns to Nature*, which belongs to a genre of theogonic poetry that begins with Hesiod and the Homeric Hymns and extends through Cleanthes, Callimachus, and Proclus. In these poems Marullus descends systematically through the various hierarchies of being, presenting a universe in which Lucretius is as present as Plato and the Neoplatonists. Marullus is occasionally obscure, but the strictures of Julius Caesar Scaliger are too harsh: we have here a poet who is well worth reading, whom Ronsard imitated and who appears later still in George Eliot's *Romola*.

As is customary in this series, each volume contains a working Latin text accompanied by a readable English translation, an introduction, brief textual notes, a substantive body of content notes adequate to allow an initial reading of the text, and a basic bibliography. This year's group offers a nice mix of literary and philosophical works, including several basic texts in the Neo-Latin corpus. As usual, I am eager to see what next year will bring. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)