

## NEO-LATIN NEWS

Vol. 62, 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.

◆ *Hofkritik im Licht humanistischer Lebens- und Bildungsideale. De miseric curialium* (1444), *Über das Elend der Hofleute*. By Enea Silvio Piccolomini. *Equitis Germani aula dialogus* (1518), *Aula, eines deutschen Ritters Dialog über den Hof*. By Ulrich von Hutten. Edited and translated by Klaus Schreiner and Ernst Wenzel. Mittellateinische Studien und Texte, 44. Leiden: Brill, 2012. 241 pp. \$144. The scope of this dual-language (Latin-German) edition of two works from the early modern period is valuable for the ease of comparison of original to translation and for the insights the texts provide into the socio-logical, literary, humanistic, and educational ideals of a time when the court, secular or ecclesiastical, defined standards of behavior for a particular class. Underlying both works is Lucan's warning that he who wishes to lead a righteous or virtuous life should avoid the court. The controversial nature of Lucan's words finds full expression in these works and others, and the excellent bibliography of secondary studies of critiques of court manners and this way of life preceding and following the early modern period shows that the controversy extended well into the eighteenth century.

The moral dilemma posed by court life was acute for university graduates who found themselves faced with the advancement potential offered by the court and the threat of damnation implicit in its many

vices. The challenge to lead a life in the *imitatio Christi* tradition lay not only in the display of wealth in court life but also in the mainly secular ends served by court activities. The critiques of both Enea Silvio and Hutten, emphasizing their literary intentions in using fictions and satire, seem to ignore the fact that their criticisms are drawn from personal experiences. Recognizing the potential for misinterpretation, however, both men sought to deflect any notion that their criticisms were directed at the men they served, Prince Elector / Cardinal Albrecht v. Brandenburg and Emperor Friedrich III, rather than at the nature of court life itself.

Enea Silvio's letter to Johannes v. Eych offers a catalog of the virtues and vices from which one might choose a way of life, stressing the importance of choice and suggesting that only a fool would choose life at court. Hutten's approach is didactic, using the dialogue form to cloak the seriousness of his intent in a light-hearted, inoffensive exchange between friends. Castus and Misaulis, the voices of innocence and experience, embody the choices suggested by Enea Silvio and the warning implicit in Lucan's words. Hutten's dialog is a conversational mirror with a caution for those who had not yet made the choice of life at court and with an implied self-criticism that he had himself become part of a life he was advising others to avoid.

The publication history of Enea Silvio's essay in Latin copies and German translations lends credence to its designation as one of the most influential of all texts on the subject of court criticism and to its role as a model for future writers. Its audience, members of the nobility, bureaucrats, and monks, was more diverse than Hutten's readers. Noted for the excellence of his Latin style, Hutten recognized the limitations of writing exclusively in Latin late in his career and began to translate his works into German to expand his range of influence. Nevertheless, handbooks of German literature always mention the *Epistolae obscurorum virorum* when discussing Hutten's literary legacy but never the *Aula* dialogue.

Enea Silvio's critique must be viewed against the background of his later service to the Church as Pope Pius II. Hutten's diverse life reflected his commitments to the nobility to which he belonged, to humanistic scholarship and study, to joining professional skills and private interests in service to public responsibilities, and to life in a

society, however corrupt, in which he could achieve fame and success for himself and respect for his social class. The fact that he died in seclusion, separated from friends and family, suffering from syphilis, underlines the gap between ideals and realities in his life. (Richard Ernest Walker, University of Maryland College Park)

♦ *Expostulatio*. By Ulrich von Hutten. Edited by Monique Samuel-Scheyder. *La traduction allemande parue à Strasbourg en 1523*. Edited and translated by Alexandre Vanautgaerden with the 1523 text included. Turnhout: Brepols, 2012. 349 pp. 55 euros. This edition of Hutten's last work, *Expostulatio* (1523), is essentially four small books in one. The first, a 122-page biography of Ulrich von Hutten in French including material on Luther and Erasmus, is described as filling a gap in French scholarship on Hutten. It is a detailed treatment with marginal references to relevant sections in Hutten's works, and it touches briefly but adequately on the important stages and central personalities in Hutten's life. Compiled by the principal editor, Monique Samuel-Scheyder, it is an impressive effort and should be a welcome resource for readers of French with an interest in Hutten. The second text, an edition of Hutten's Latin original edited by Alexandre Vanautgaerden, an appendix placed in the middle of the book, seems out of place, and lacking any editorial apparatus it is not clear what its role is except, as stated, to provide a comparison text for the German translation completed in the same year (1523). Despite its description as an edition, no information is given as regards why an edition was needed, what the editor's objectives were, or how it relates to the original. The remaining texts, a German version of the *Expostulatio* with a French translation, were combined into a facing-page edition, prefaced by an introduction with disappointingly brief comments on the German translation. Given the variety of texts, it seems that an excellent opportunity was missed to examine the Latin, German, and French versions of the same text to provide insightful comparisons of the act of translating and the impact on expression and content in the three languages.

This edition is a reformulation of an original project to present Hutten's complaint against Erasmus for what he saw as a personal rebuff when he attempted unsuccessfully to arrange a visit in Basel,

together with Erasmus's response, *Spongia*, which unfortunately was not published until after Hutten's death. The delay in completing this project was due to the existing publication of an English treatment of the same materials. This new approach, providing French readers with Hutten's original Latin text and a French translation of a German version, has difficulties which, to the editor's credit, are mentioned in the introduction to the translation section.

Using the German translation of the *Expostulatio* to gain insight into Hutten's reception in Germany is problematic. Hutten succumbed to syphilis in 1523; the state of his health in this period and his virtual isolation in exile on Ufenau island in Lake Zürich made it highly unlikely that he could have had any role in the preparation and publication of the German translation. The German manuscript used here bore no translator's name, no printer's name, and no place of publication, which could reflect a fear of legal punishment for authors and publishers of pro-Luther works at a time when he had been condemned within the Empire. The editor might have commented on the transformation of Hutten's personal complaint into an apologetic vehicle in support of Martin Luther. There are other uncertainties linked to the German text: Who edited it? Under what conditions was it published? And by whom? The one certainty is that the German text is stylistically and for practical reasons not the work of Hutten. The objective of using Hutten's Latin original for comparison is also problematic, given that we know so little about the dissemination of the text, who its actual readers were, or how they responded to it. The decision to include the Latin text is also curious since a comparison to the German translation based on either style or content is essentially left up to the reader. Samuel-Scheyder's brief comments on Latin-German stylistic differences show how useful such comparisons could be for modern readers, but the remarks are limited in scope. Considering the anonymity of Hutten's translators and the role that editorial changes can have, e.g., the extended title of the German *Expostulatio* is not part of Hutten's original but was added by a pro-Lutheran editor, it seems that a detailed examination of both texts is needed to make judgments about Hutten's reception among his contemporaries. Hutten began to translate some of his works into German in 1519, for the sake of a broader readership,

and with greater diligence in late 1520, a few years prior to his death. This is not enough time, nor is there sufficient critical information to make definitive judgments about those who read him in German or about their responses to his German writings. Understandably, no such conclusions are offered here.

The organization of the texts could have been improved by placing the Latin and German versions on facing pages, since the text sections are numbered; the sections of the French translation are unnumbered. The perceptiveness and analytical strength of Samuel-Scheyder's comments about the German translation suggest that a broader engagement with the text could have been valuable. Identifying features related to the haste of preparation, detailing the translator's efforts to reproduce Hutten's elliptical Latin style in vernacular German, and noting the frequent use of redundant synonyms to express disapproval or to intensify points of criticism are all mentioned as potential lines of inquiry, but with far too few examples; this approach could have analyzed translation techniques as regards language and content and could have resulted in a more insightful study. Hutten's works deserve further study, but to approach him through a German translation of uncertain provenance may not bring him the credit he is due. The value of this study lies in the comprehensive biographical section in French; it deserved more supportive material than the two editions and the French translation provide. (Richard Ernest Walker, University of Maryland College Park)

◆ *Érasme de Rotterdam, réponses à la 'Responsio paraenetica' et aux annotations marginales d'Alberto Pio de Carpi*. Edited and translated by Marie Theunissen-Faider. 2 vols. Turnhout: Brepols and the Musée de la Maison d'Érasme, 2011. 441 + 384 pp. Anyone endeavoring to produce a critical edition of Erasmus's conflict with Alberto Pio, Prince of Carpi, faces special challenges, because of the way the adversaries structured their quarrel. The major documents consist not only of open letters and pamphlets (one of which underwent substantial revision over time), but also of extensive marginal notes by Pio to which Erasmus responded at length. Pio himself died in the midst of the exchange (8 January 1531), just after having completed a major work against Erasmus that would be published in March of that year,

the *Tres et viginti libri*. The fact that his antagonist was dead did not deter Erasmus from further rebuttals; in fact, he was so unyielding in his critique that one of Pio's friends, Agostino Steuco, chided him publicly, while another, Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda, wrote a counter-rebuttal.

Who was Alberto Pio of Carpi? He was nephew to Pico della Mirandola, a student under Aldo Manuzio, a prince who had been forced from his patrimony by a relative, and a renowned diplomat as well as a humanist, theologian, and philosopher. Erasmus saw him as having joined together to attack him with the papal nuncio Girolamo Aleandro, and indeed the two were inclined to believe that Erasmus's ideas, if not directly responsible for Luther's attack on the Roman church, were at best sympathetic to it. The clash began indirectly, with the two antagonists circling one another at a distance over a period of several years before a definitive shot was fired. Erasmus, hearing from friends that Pio was hostile to him, eventually wrote a letter in October 1525 defending his loyalty to the Catholic faith and demonstrating the sincerity of his stance against Luther. Pio replied at length with the *Responsio paraenetica*, which he first sent to Erasmus privately in 1526 and eventually published, over Erasmus's protests, in January, 1529. Pio's copy of the original manuscript had been destroyed by fire during the 1527 Sack of Rome, and so the work had to be reconstructed from a rough draft in Paris. Erasmus quickly composed his *Responsio ad epistolam paraeneticam* (to which Pio later attached his annotations and included it in the *Tres et viginti libri*), rushing it into print in order for it to be ready for the Frankfurt book fair in the spring.

The dispute has been well documented in recent years, with a critical edition in English of Erasmus's documents in volume 84 of the Collected Works of Erasmus (Toronto, 2005). Pio's side of the debate has appeared in a critical edition and Italian translation by Fabio Forner (Florence, 2002). Theunissen-Faider's contribution, besides providing French translations of Erasmus's side of the quarrel, includes a critical edition of the Latin text of the *Responsio ad epistolam paraeneticam*, the *Apologia adversas Rhapsiodias Alberti Pii* (Erasmus's defense against Pio's annotations), and an appendix including Erasmus's 1525 letter to Pio, Pio's *Praefatio* to his marginal notes to Erasmus's *Responsio*, and the Parisian printer Bade's preface to Pio's *Responsio paraenetica*.

All of these texts are presented with the Latin on pages facing the French translation, substantial notes, and for the *Responsio ad epistolam paraeneticam*, Pio's complete annotations in the margins surrounding Erasmus's text on the page. These appear in Latin, with the French translation directly underneath. Thus a reader may gain a sense of Pio's mind at work as he moves through Erasmus's text, and then proceed to Erasmus's counterarguments.

Volume 1 contains the texts, while Volume 2 consists of the notes. While ordinarily such an arrangement might be clumsy to work with, in this case the arrangement makes sense, given the focus on the exchange between Erasmus and Pio. There is also a fine introduction to the material by the editor. This debate is important to the understanding of the divisions in the world of humanism during the period of the Reformation, and this edition is a splendid resource for scholars of the early sixteenth century. (Laurel Carrington, St. Olaf College)

◆ *Christias*. By Marcus Hieronymus Vida. Edited, with introduction and commentary, by Eva von Contzen, Reinhold F. Glei, Wolfgang Polleichtner, and Michael Schulze Roberg. 2 vols. Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium, 91-92. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 2013. 498 + 450 pp. 104 euros. Not every Neo-Latin poem deserves a modern edition, with critical text, introduction, and 450-page commentary, but this one does. Commissioned in 1518 by Pope Leo X, this poem was produced as a grand epic on the life of Christ that would unite faith and learning in opposition to the newly emergent Lutheran heresy. The *editio princeps* was published in Cremona in 1535. The *Christias* was an immediate success, with thirty-six more editions appearing all over Europe by 1600 and with John Milton numbered among its admirers in the next century. Why such a poem would have been so popular may not be apparent at first glance today, but a little reflection—at least with the benefit of hindsight—gives its success a certain air of inevitability. The literary theory of the day taught that epic poetry was designed to praise the virtues of its hero. All sorts of individuals, from the historical heroes of classical antiquity to contemporary rulers, possessed suitably praiseworthy virtue, but logically, the most appropriate subject for an epic poem—the one possessing the greatest virtue—would be Jesus. Vida was not the first poet to attempt an epic like this: in the fifteenth century Girolamo

delle Valli wrote a *Gesuide* and Ilarione da Varone a *Crisias*. But Vida was a much better poet, and the choice of Latin as the language of composition meant that his *Christias* could be read and appreciated by anyone in his day with a basic classical education.

This edition is not the first to have been produced in modern times: thirty-five years ago Gertrude C. Drake and Clarence A. Forbes produced a text with English translation (*Marco Girolamo Vida's The Christiad* (Carbondale, 1978)), followed five years ago by James Gardner's I Tatti volume (*Marco Girolamo Vida, Christiad*, The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 39 (Cambridge, MA and London, 2009)). Both of these volumes contain a serviceable text along with an English translation, with the latter adding enough light annotation to facilitate a first reading of the poem. For some purposes, these earlier editions will continue to suffice, but the volumes under review raise the game to a considerably higher level. The first volume begins with a fifty-nine page introduction that presents the poem within the context of the considerable scholarship on it that has appeared with the last several decades. A brief overview of Vida's life, work, and impact is followed by a study of his development as an epic poet, an analysis of the structure and narrative technique of the *Christias*, a discussion of the characters in the poem, a special treatment of the epic similes that includes a chart, and a survey of how various aspects of early modern culture make their appearance in the poem. The introduction concludes with discussions of the publishing history of the *Christias* and the principles upon which the present critical edition was established. The bulk of the first volume covers the text of the poem, some six thousand verses spread over six books that focus on Jesus's passion, death, and resurrection but include an account of his earlier life and ministry that is incorporated into the events being narrated. The *apparatus criticus* is accompanied by a second apparatus that lists parallels to classical texts; this is especially interesting because it shows Vida writing not only through his expected Virgilian model but also fashioning enough echoes of *De rerum natura* to make the *Christias* a sort of anti-Lucretius. The Latin text is accompanied by a translation that was prepared independently of the last German version, which dates back to 1811. The crowning achievement here, however, is the second volume, which is devoted to the commentary.

The text is broken into sections, with each section introduced by a paragraph, then unpacked line-by-line, in a discussion that covers language and content with a special eye on Biblical parallels and narratological principles. The edition also contains several indices and an extensive bibliography.

In the end, this poem is unlikely to arouse the enthusiasm today that it did in its own time, given that Latin is no longer the common property of educated people and that the religious subject of the poem no longer sits at the center of postmodern culture. However as long as we care about our past, we will have to continue to work to understand why a poem like the *Christias* achieved a popularity that no longer seems self-evident to us. And as we do so, we should express our appreciation to this editorial team, which has provided a worthy edition for us to study. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *L'insegnamento delle discipline*. By Juan Luis Vives. Introduction, translation, and commentary by Valerio del Nero. Immagini della ragione, 13. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 2011. xlvi + 260 pp. 24 euros. In 1531 Vives published the massive *De disciplinis libri xx* (here *DD*), embracing a systematic criticism of education titled *De causis corruptarum atrium*; an equally systematic plan for overhaul, *De tradendis disciplinis* (*DTD*); and a series of short treatises headed *De artibus*. Del Nero translates only the *DTD* here. He bases his translation on the 1531 *editio princeps* and helpfully marks the page breaks of both the 1531 and the 1780's Mayans edition. The eight-page bibliography is a rich update.

Del Nero sees in the entire *DD* complex “an ambitious and methodical plan which situates the author at the center of a network of relations with some of the top humanists of the time ... and makes of the *De disciplinis* a particularly vital intersection in the milieu of the truly rich culture of cinquecento Europe” (vi). The *De disciplinis* expounds Vives's humanistic answer to late scholastic habits of learning. Del Nero calls it Vives's *capolavoro*, rising out of his earlier activity in Paris, Louvain, Bruges, and England and presaging later writings of linguistic (the *De ratione dicendi*) or ethical-epistemological (*De anima et vita*) depth (x). To engage the formidable *DD* del Nero recommends a twofold approach: “historicizing” Vives's position in

the classical, medieval, and humanistic continuum; and intertextual reading which confers coherence on his own entire intellectual oeuvre” (xii-xiii). Vives, says del Nero, “cracks open any cultural model that purports to be oriented toward a principle of philological, theological, or scientific authority” (xxiv). At the same time, censorship of the reading list comports with the demands of the envisioned *respublica Christiana* (xxv).

Samples of the translation show that the *DTD* is rendered (in the opinion of this non-native speaker) into lively, readable, reliable, and sometimes expansive Italian. An example of the latter quality: At *DTD* 2.8 Vives recommends Gellius with caution (124). Vives: “legendus est quidem, sed ita, ut te rem levem scias inspicere.” Foster Watson’s English, from *Vives: On Education, A Translation of the De tradendis disciplinis of Juan Luis Vives*, translated by Foster Watson (Cambridge, 1913): “He may be read, but with a consciousness of the slightness of his value.” Del Nero: “Sicuramente è un autore che deve essere letto, ma in modo tal che tu sia consapevole di avere tra le mani uno strumento di non eccelsa funzionalità.” Compression of the original gives way to visual impact and circumlocution.

The generous annotation rouses envy that Latinless English speakers are not served by an English translation with similarly valuable ancillary equipment. Foster Watson’s sketchily annotated version is still the only available English translation of the *DTD*. Among the minor flaws in del Nero, however, one finds unpredictable omissions in the notes: Athenaeus, Petrus Crinitus, and Peter Textor get identified, but not Raphael of Volterra, Sulpicius Verulanus, Johannes Despauterius, or Isidore of Seville.

Assuming that the principal target audience is Latinless readers of Italian, it is puzzling that the edition offers neither an analytical table of contents nor an index, nor informative running heads, and even declines to set off chapter or subsection headings in bold introductory easy-to-spot type. Watson’s English translation would have served as a model for all these features. A reader not already familiar with the *DTD* will need to exercise diligence in seeking to pinpoint Vives’s views on a given topic in del Nero’s translation.

In sum, this book is a valuable, if not always easy to use, updated guide to the *DTD*, as well as a positioning of the entire *DD* in the

contexts of Vives's output as a whole and the developing northern humanist enterprise of his time. (Edward V. George, Texas Tech University, Emeritus)

◆ *The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*. Edited by Paul Botley and Dirk van Miert. Supervisory editing by Anthony Grafton, Henk Jan de Jonge, and Jill Kraye. *Travaux d'humanisme et Renaissance*, 507. Vol. 1, *April 1561 to December 1586*; vol. 2, *January 1587 to December 1596*; vol. 3, *January 1597 to June 1601*; vol. 4, *July 1601 to March 1603*; vol. 5, *April 1603 to April 1605*; vol. 6, *May 1605 to December 1606*; vol. 7, *January 1607 to February 1609*; vol. 8, *Appendices, Biographical Register, and Index*. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2012. 5000 pp. Hardback, \$528; PDF, \$396; Hardback + PDF, \$633.60. Poet, textual critic, scholar of chronology, and fierce defender of his family genealogy, Joseph Justus Scaliger (1540-1609) was one of the great Neo-Latinists of his day. This volume contains a modern critical edition of every letter written by Scaliger or sent to him, along with the basic scholarly apparatus necessary to understand and appreciate each item.

Roughly two-thirds of the letters are in Latin, with almost all the remainder in French; clear principles dictated the choice of language, which in itself constitutes an interesting area of study opened up by this collection. For the most part Scaliger did not write his letters with an eye on publication, which distinguishes him from many of his humanist colleagues and makes for an unusually interesting, and revealing, collection. Among his correspondents are many of the great names of the day: Tycho Brahe and Johannes Kepler, Denis Lambin and Justus Lipsius, Isaac Casaubon and Daniel Heinsius, along with Jacques-Auguste de Thou. Some of the letters are intimate and personal, ranging from an account of a recent illness to a note accompanying the gift of some bottles of wine. Rather more of them offer us the chance to eavesdrop on a great scholar at work, abusing his enemies and praising scholarly accomplishment, introducing young scholars on their way to a new position, following important editions through the press, and cultivating friendships in the republic of letters. A total of 627 letters survive in autograph manuscripts, with three-quarters of these being to and from Casaubon, de Thou, Lipsius,

Claude Dupuy and his sons, and Pierre Pithou. Ten manuscripts at the British Library, the Bibliothèque nationale de France, the Hamburg Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, and Det Kongelige Bibliothek in Copenhagen are described in detail in the introduction, along with important printed editions of 1610, 1612, 1615–1662, 1624, 1627, 1628, 1638, 1656, 1709, 1727, and 1879. Some two hundred letters, one eighth of the total, are published here for the first time.

Each letter is introduced by a headnote that contains up to eight types of information: title, a list of the sources, details of extant replies, a discussion of the date, an analysis of the sources used to construct the text, details of any surviving address, miscellaneous observations, and a synopsis of the contents in English. Beneath the headnote is the text itself, the textual apparatus, and the footnotes. In addition to the labors necessary simply to produce a text, a great deal of work has been expended in some unexpected areas: the notes are often extensive, and the vagaries of early modern chronology have required some intricate maneuvering to solidify the proper date for each letter—a point that Scaliger himself would have appreciated. The bibliography, indices, and appendices are also most useful indeed.

One hates to use trite expressions in a review like ‘monument of scholarship’ and ‘timeless work of erudition, not to be redone,’ but sometimes these expressions are what the project calls for. Work began in 2004, which means that the two editors have invested a substantial part of their scholarly careers in editing these letters. Given the amount of material—the 5,000 pages referenced above is not a misprint—it is a tribute to the industry and learning of the editors that the project was completed this quickly. The edition has been prepared in accordance with the highest standards throughout. It is also worth noting, in deference to the web of connections that bound Scaliger to his correspondents within the world of letters, that this modern work of humanist scholarship is similarly anchored in the *res publica litterarum* and reflects some extraordinary generosity on the part of several individuals. The project began when Anthony Grafton decided to use the Balzan Prize that he had been awarded to support this edition. He established the Scaliger Project at the Warburg Institute in London, where Jill Krays gave generously of her time and expertise to oversee the project. Henk Jan de Jonge read and

commented on the entire edition before it was published, and another Dutch scholar, Ineke Sluiter, provided funds from her Spinoza Prize to help with expenses. Institutions like Princeton University and the Mellon Foundation stepped up as well. As the Acknowledgements at the beginning of the first volume indicate, many individual scholars have also helped, as have the custodians of manuscripts and rare books from around the world. Scaliger, I think, is smiling at us now, from wherever he is. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Icon Animorum or The Mirror of Minds.* By John Barclay. Translation by Thomas May. Edited by Mark Riley. *Bibliotheca Latinitatis novae*, 8. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2013. 380 pp. 75 euros. John Barclay (1582-1621) is better known in Neo-Latin circles for his *Argenis*, the best-selling novel of its century, than he is for the text presented here. Nonetheless the *Icon animorum* is worth our attention today as well. Barclay begins from the idea that human beings vary and that their character and behavior depend on their state of life, the century in which they live, the nation in which they are born, their innate character, and the influences of the environment in which they are raised. Barclay's goal in his *Icon* is to identify these differences and to explain some of their causes. He concludes that every age and nation has a certain genius, an essential character, that directs an individual's development and creates a variety of character types. Chapter one focuses on the four-step aging process that every person undergoes, in a discussion that draws on ancient sources like Aristotle and Horace, but with a focus on childhood that is distinctive to Barclay's analysis. The second major section covers the national characters of France, Britain, Germany, Italy, Spain, eastern and northern Europe, and Turks and Jews, drawing on various ethnographic treatises, travel writers, and intelligencers and diplomatic agents. The third section, chapters 10 through 16, discusses the influence on personality of innate traits, environment, and several key professions. Theophrastus is a major source here, along with contemporary writers on characters like Joseph Hall and Sir Thomas Overbury, although Barclay's treatment tends to be more serious than theirs, with an eye on moral improvement rather than mere entertainment. The result is a series of *icones*, or images, verbal portraits of English belligerence,

Spanish pride, and German excess, types that remain recognizable today.

Barclay wrote a Latin that was appropriate for this material, utilitarian rather than artistic and therefore easily readable by the cosmopolitan audience at whom the work was directed. In 1631, seventeen years after the *editio princeps*, an English translation by Thomas May appeared. May was a skilled writer, perhaps best known for his translation of Lucan, and he rendered the *Icon* in a style that was typical of early seventeenth-century English prose, rather like the loose style of Seneca. His translation, which added adjectives and metaphors, made explicit what was only suggested in the Latin, and updated and modernized everything, is reprinted here along with Barclay's Latin text. The edition is based on the first London / Paris edition of 1614, as an effort to reproduce Barclay's original intent, but with punctuation, paragraphing, and orthography modernized.

One could, I suppose, quibble about a couple of things here: the introduction presents a digression on Barclay's novels that is not really appropriate to a discussion of the *Icon*, and the decision to try to recapture Barclay's original intentions while simultaneously modernizing his text may strike some readers as a bit curious. But I would discourage too much quibbling. This is a nicely produced edition of an interesting text, supplemented by an English translation that has considerable literary merit in its own right. The series in which the *Icon* appears, *Bibliotheca Latinitatis novae*, is not producing volumes at nearly the rate of, say, The I Tatti Renaissance Library, but I wish we could see more books from them. There are many worthwhile Neo-Latin texts in need of editing! (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Isaac Vossius (1616-1689) between Science and Scholarship.* Edited by Eric Jorink and Dirk van Miert. Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, 214. Leiden: Brill, 2012. xiii + 352 pp. 133 euros. Eight chapters by eminent scholars of humanism and Dutch science, alongside two excellent bibliographical studies, as well as a learned editorial introduction and epilogue all attempt to make sense of Isaac Vossius's multifaceted career. What these scholars seek to do is place Vossius—a difficult task given that Vossius maintained no fixed means

of employment, was sustained alternatively by the Dutch, French, Swedish, and English heads of state, and published on everything from chronology, the Septuagint, the Sybilline oracles, the arts and sciences of the Chinese, geography and the nature of light to the winds and tides.

The editors Jorink and van Miert self-deprecatingly make light of all this attention devoted to Vossius, modestly noting that “Vossius gives us an intriguing insight into seventeenth-century erudition” (5). While several authors compare Vossius to the much-studied Jesuit Athanasius Kircher, Vossius is unlikely to spawn a similar scholarly industry, lacking as he does Kircher’s charismatic *Kunst und Wunderkammer* collections and iconographic charm offensives. Nevertheless, one contributor, Fokko Jan Dijksterhuis, argues more ambitiously (and quite convincingly) that for “a proper understanding of the scientific revolution, the work of presumably marginal thinkers like Vossius” should also be taken into account (185). Nigh all the contributors seek to explore, as the subtitle of the collection suggests, the relationship between humanism and the new forms of scientific scholarship that Vossius illustrates.

Notably, however, those explorations offer varying answers. Dirk van Miert points out that Vossius’s cutting-edge intellectual forebears, the French scholars Casaubon, Scaliger, and Saumaise, shaped his libertine scholarship more than did his own pious and pedestrian biological father, Gerardus Joannes Vossius. Vossius’s radical views included a rejection of the authority of the Hebrew Masoretic text in preference for Chinese sources and his own rational conjectures, although such a conjectural method, as Anthony Grafton shows, was in use for centuries and by seemingly conservative figures such as Vossius senior himself. Eric Jorink traces a shift in Vossius’s interests from philology to “New Science” (123). Karel Davids likewise notes a shift in audience for Vossius’s geographic works from the Republic of Letters to heads of state, who had rather more practical uses in mind for Vossius’s scholarship (198–99). So what, in the end, was the relationship between science and scholarship for Vossius? Were philological techniques themselves already radical, in both empirical and conjectural ways, such that Vossius required no shift in technique or outlook? Did not his forebears already treat the realm of nature

and mathematics amid their myriad works, as in Saumaise's *Plinianae exercitationes* or Scaliger's efforts to square the circle? Or did Vossius move over the course of his career, from philology to natural philosophy, and finally back to the safer waters of history?

The editors Jorink and van Miert concede in their epilogue that "finally, we are left with perhaps more questions than when we started our inquiries" (317). They quote Grafton's felicitous remark that Vossius remains "a butterfly that no one can hope to pin to a single spot on the map of the Republic of Letters." They do, however, suggest several *desiderata* for future work on Vossius, including an edition of his scholarship and the role of personal experimentation in his natural studies. One might also note the relationship of the vernacular to Latin scholarship in Vossius's works. For example, a work not unrelated to Vossius's views on the winds and the tides (and one also liberally plagiarized by Vossius's peer Athanasius Kircher), Cornelis Drebbel's *Een kort tractaet van de natuere der elementen* (Rotterdam, 1621) can also be found in Vossius's extensive library (now Leiden, 634 G 12).

If I may, I will suggest another, broader historiographical *desideratum* into which the question of Vossius's place falls: the nature of the *liefhebber*, *amateur*, *curioso*, or *virtuoso*. This is the lepidopteran species of which Vossius is but one specimen, although perhaps a particularly colorful one. Many of the contributors to this volume deploy one or all of all these terms, yet for wildly differing aims. The very question at the heart of this volume—the relationship between humanist tradition and new scientific approaches—is also central to these terms. In the hands of some contributors, this identity points to an unlimited range of interests, embracing philology as well as natural philosophers. For others, rather than pointing to citizenship in the unbounded Republic of Letters, the marker of '*amateur*' points rather to more local and vernacular (and thus, it seems material and scientific) interests. The editors argue that Vossius's varied interests place him among the "general *curieux*" before "the split between professionals and amateurs, between 'science' and the humanities" was as marked as it would be in the next century (5). Karel Davids argues that in "the case of *amateurs*, *curieux* and *virtuosi* ('*liefhebbers*' in Dutch), the practice of natural philosophy and experimentation constituted not only a means in itself, but also a way to create a community" (125).

Likewise, Dijksterhuis notes “Vossius’ interactions with French savants are substantially documented in his correspondence, but in the Low Countries [sic], he was also surrounded by a circle of ‘liefhebbers’ (*curieux* or *virtuosi*)” (183). Colette Nativel concludes “Plus qu’un ‘humaniste’, Vossius est un ‘curieux’; l’étendue de ses interest semble illimitée” (254). And finally, Jorink and van Miert identify Vossius not “as an eccentric libertine” but as one who “belonged to the world of philologists, natural philosophers, alchemists, *curieux* and *virtuosi*” (312). Before we can hope to place Vossius, we must first identify the *liefhebber*, *amateur*, *curieux*, and *virtuoso*, and their differences, if any, from savants and other inhabitants of the Republic of Letters. (Vera Keller, University of Oregon)

◆ *The Vatican Manuscript of Spinoza’s Ethica*. Transcribed and annotated by Leen Spruit and Pina Totaro. Brill’s Studies in Intellectual History / Brill’s Texts and Sources in Intellectual History, 205/11. Leiden: Brill, 2011. vi + 318 pp. \$132. The relatively recent discovery of a previously unknown manuscript of Benedictus Spinoza’s (1632–1677) *Ethica* (Vat. lat. 12838) (*VMS*) in the Vatican Library, a process which began in October of 2010 and resulted in the publication of Leen Spruit and Pina Totaro’s transcription, is an exciting and unusual event for scholars of Spinoza’s philosophy and seventeenth-century intellectual history. Prior to the discovery of this document, the earliest available version of Spinoza’s primary philosophical work was that contained in the *Opera posthumata* (*OP*), his posthumous works edited and published in Amsterdam by his circle of friends approximately nine months after his death. These circumstances had the consequence that our knowledge of the development of the *Ethica*, and the extent to which its final form reflected the editorial intervention of his friends, has been largely restricted to the limited evidence offered by his correspondence. Spruit and Totaro’s transcription therefore presents a unique opportunity to peer a little more deeply into the development of this fascinating and important philosophical treatise, and the results of their meticulous efforts, especially their close comparison of the *VMS* with the *OP*, do not disappoint.

Spruit and Totaro’s Introduction provides an astute reconstruction of the genesis of the *VMS* and how it came to be preserved. This story

is one of intrigue and betrayal, befitting one of the most controversial and influential figures in European intellectual history. It is inferred from Spinoza's correspondence that the bulk of the *Ethica* was probably written by June of 1665, and that the text as a whole was largely complete no later than August of 1675. By this time, complete copies of the work were circulating among Spinoza's friends, and the *VMS* was most likely copied by Pieter van Gent, a member of the circle and a professional scribe, from a manuscript written by Spinoza himself.

Between 1661 and 1663 Spinoza developed a close friendship with Niels Stensen (1638-1686) on the basis of their shared interest in anatomy and physiology. Stensen, however, would later abandon his scientific studies when he converted from Lutheranism to Catholicism in 1667. In the summer of 1677 (after Spinoza's death), Stensen was nominated Vicar Apostolic of Nordic Missions when, around the same time, he came into possession of a manuscript of Spinoza's *Ethica*, most likely through the physicist and mathematician Ehrenfried Walther von Tschirnhaus (1651-1708), an astute member of Spinoza's circle of friends. With Spinoza's incendiary philosophy laid bare, Stensen was horrified and composed a vehement denunciation of his former friend entitled, "Libri prohibitи circa la nuova filosofia dello Spinoza," leading to bans against Spinoza's works from the Congregation of the Holy Office in 1678 and 1679. Ironically, it was in virtue of Stensen and the Church's prohibition against the *Ethica* that the *VMS* came to be preserved today.

While the *VMS* resembles the *OP* quite closely, thereby helping confirm the belief that the *Ethica* changed relatively little in the final years of Spinoza's life, it also reveals the significant editorial intervention of his friends. Most of these changes appear to be of little doctrinal import, such as corrections of misspellings, adjustments to grammar, minor alterations in word order, and harmonization (e.g., ending each demonstration with "Q.E.D."). Others, however, more clearly raise pressing questions for interpreters of Spinoza's philosophy. Most prominently, the manuscript itself lacks any kind of title, which suggests that the final decision of what to call the work may have been left to Spinoza's friends and helps explain why the *VMS* went undiscovered for so many years. In addition, there is an indication in E2P49s that the *Ethica* was at one time intended to consist of four rather than five

parts. Other suggestive divergences from the *OP* include the fact that in the definition of attribute (E1D4), the scribe apparently wrote and erased *format* following *id, quod intellectus de substaniâ* before writing *percepit*, which may be relevant for the debate between subjective and objective interpretations of the attributes; the fact that the demonstration of E1P5 refers to E1D3 and E1A6 in place of the *OP*'s E1D3 and E1D6, which may entail a somewhat different line of argument for this proposition; and the fact that the *VMS* has *à causis externis fluunt* where the *OP* has *à causis externis fluunt* in the scholium of E1P11, which may be relevant for the question of whether Spinoza adopted an emanative view of divine causation.

However these and other divergences are to be ultimately interpreted, it is clear that Spruit and Totaro's transcription of the *VMS* will be an important resource for historians and philosophers for many years to come. (John Brandau, Johns Hopkins University)

◆ *Le "Theophrastus redivivus," érudition et combat antireligieux au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle.* By Hélène Bah-Ostrowiecki. Paris: Champion, 2012. 336 pp. 85 euros. In 1937, the *Theophrastus redivivus*—a lengthy anti-religious tract from the second half of the seventeenth century—was discovered in manuscript form in the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris and published for the first time. Since then, three other manuscript copies of this anonymous work have been located, the text has been carefully re-edited, and the tract has become subject to increasing critical attention, particularly for its contribution to the history of ideas, and specifically of atheism and materialism in early modern France. In this meticulous study, Hélène Bah-Ostrowiecki provides a clear overview of the *Theophrastus redivivus*, subjecting it to close textual analysis in order to assess the philosophical method underlying the anonymous author's anti-religious stance. In the process, she clearly identifies the position of the *Theophrastus redivivus* within the history of scepticism in early modern Europe and makes a strong claim for the erudition of its author's sceptical thinking and polemical method.

The initial presentation and formal assessment of this lengthy and largely unfamiliar text are clear and concise: Bah-Ostrowiecki neatly summarises the tract's principal arguments, highlighting the structure of the text while also indicating some of its logical contradictions.

These are then presented as an example of sceptical thinking in practice, as the deliberate juxtaposition of contradictory claims invalidates all of them; this is demonstrated through the example of the tract's patently false claim that its anti-religious arguments serve the interests of religious orthodoxy. The author's philosophical position is lucidly analysed and shown to rely on the naturalist perception of everything interpreted by man as divine—including man's tendency to want to create, believe in, and interpret evidence for the existence of some form of the divine—as purely natural. Good parallels are drawn between the tract's assessments of the status of truth and of human (as opposed to natural) reason and the scepticism, both theological and epistemological, of writers such as Montaigne, Pascal, Descartes, La Mothe le Vayer, Gassendi, Spinoza, and Hobbes.

The case made for the erudition of the *Theophrastus redivivus* is moderately successful, combined as it is with a demonstration (through comparative analysis of how the author cites the three examples of Pomponazzi, Cicero, and Bodin) of this rather slippery polemicist's tendency to manipulate his sources. The tract is shown to include citations of a wide range of authoritative sources, irrespective of their chronology or of their specific context, in order both to support its individual claims and to demonstrate how widespread the rejection of religion across all cultures and ages has been. Proliferation of a shared opinion is thus taken, by virtue of verisimilitude, as a guarantee of truth—but only when it is a truth that the author wishes to propagate: unsurprisingly, there is no corresponding consideration of whether the widespread acceptance of religion might in turn validate the tendency towards religious belief. The line drawn here between erudition and highly selective argument is certainly rather fine.

The volume is not perfect: there is no bibliography, but there are signs of editorial carelessness, with fairly frequent typographical errors and inconsistently numbered footnotes. The results of some of the scrupulous analysis are occasionally disappointing: the demonstration of how the text's imagination of a godless world responds to the Christian conception it opposes is detailed, but the conclusion that the anonymous author of this seventeenth-century Latin manuscript is probably writing in a Christian cultural context seems rather self-evident. Equally, the careful demonstration of the manipulative nature

of the dialogue between the anonymous author, a putative orthodox objector, and the reader, who is supposed to be sympathetic to the author's logical stance, could be taken as being typical of the relationship established between author and imagined reader in almost any polemical text. Overall, however, this clear and detailed companion volume to the *Theophrastus redivivus* nevertheless constitutes a useful and scholarly introduction to a quirky and long-neglected text. (Emma Herdman, University of St. Andrews)

◆ *The Art of Arguing in the World of Renaissance Humanism*. Edited by Marc Laureys and Roswitha Simons. Supplementa humanistica Lovaniensia, 34. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2013. VIII + 232 pp. 55 euros. It is no secret that the humanists loved to argue: Filelfo vilified the Medici, who tried to have him assassinated, and Poggio Bracciolini's problems with George of Trebizond also ended in violence. Usually the individuals labeled by Charles Nisard as "gladiateurs de la république des lettres" restricted themselves to words, but as the notorious conflicts surrounding Antonio Beccadelli's *Hermaphroditus* show, even then the level of obscenity could rise (or sink) to remarkable levels. If we focus on humanism as a community of like-minded individuals, then communication becomes an important part of the movement, and as recent sociological research shows, conflict is a species of communication that is necessary for community formation. Humanists defined themselves polemically against scholastics, then northern humanists defined themselves against the Italians and Protestant humanists staked out a position against Catholics who shared a similar education and world view. Sometimes the haggling was primarily *ad hominem*, but as the squabble between Poggio Bracciolini and Lorenzo Valla at the Roman curia from 1451 to 1453 shows, the first extended historical-critical analysis of humanist Latin could arise in the middle of a polemic as well. Little theorizing about all this took place in the fifteenth century, but by the sixteenth century so much arguing had gone on that discussion of the rules became inevitable. Given the nature of Renaissance humanism, it was inevitable that in forming these rules, the polemicists would turn to antiquity, where they found various figures of thought, several strategies and techniques of persuasion, doctrines of emotional appeal and the projection of

character in words, and various genres and traditions that were open to appropriation and adaptation.

Under the guidance of the editors of this volume, sessions were organized on humanistic argument at the XIV<sup>th</sup> International Congress of the International Association for Neo-Latin Studies (Uppsala, 2-7 August 2009) and at the 2010 Annual Meeting of the Renaissance Society of America in Venice. Some of the papers delivered at these meetings do not appear in the present volume, while others were added, giving a solid series of essays on the topic. What is perhaps most valuable among them is the introduction, which proposes a systematic structure to guide research in the area. The proposed interpretive framework begins by identifying two rival parties, the author and the opponent, who are first identified, than analyzed in relation to their mental attitude toward the conflict and the functions of the debate at hand. For each polemic, there is an audience, whose characteristics and type of involvement are crucial; what elements of the classical tradition are appropriated should also be taken into consideration. Also important are the formal and spatial structure of the setting and the more abstract normative context of the dispute. Finally, strategies like self-fashioning, literary fashioning, mediatization, and accompanying non-verbal activities should also be analyzed. This structure provides a framework within which humanist debate can be studied.

The remaining essays in the volume use this heuristic in various ways: Roswitha Simons, “Waffen der Nemesis, Pfeile der Satire. Gewaltmetaphorik im metapoetischen Diskurs neulateinischer Satiriker”; Olga Anna Duhl, “Poetic Theory and Sense Perception in Jodocus Badius Ascensius’s *Stultiferae naves* (c. 1501): From *Subitus Calor* to *Vituperatio*”; Arnold Becker, “Hutten Arminius: Humanistische Streitkultur zwischen literarischer Unverlässlichkeit und nationaler Identitätsstiftung”; Christine Bénévent, “Des Barbares aux Cicéroniens ou comment accomoder l’art de la dispute selon Érasme”; Chris L. Heesakkers, “*Multa fortuito fieri*: Alberto Pio’s Post-mortem *Praefatio* in His Controversy with Erasmus, an Ill-fated Advance”; George Hugo Tucker, “Strategies of Argument, Politics and Poetics in the *Centones ex Virgilio* (1555-1556) of Lelio Capilipi of Mantua”; Marc Laureys, “Die Kunst der Verunglimpfung in Nikodemus Frischlins Satiren gegen Jakob Rabus”; and Joanna Partyka, “The Classical Tradition as

a Weapon against the *Obtrectatores Poloniae*." The volume concludes with information about the contributors and an *index nominum*. All in all, between the methodological introduction and the case-studies, this is a valuable volume in an area that deserves more study. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Neo-Latin Poetry in the British Isles*. Edited by L. B. T. Houghton and Gesine Manuwald. London: Bristol Classical Press, 2012. ix + 276 pp. £25. This wide-ranging essay collection is devoted to the Neo-Latin poetry of the 'British Isles' in the geographical sense of that term, that is, of England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland from the fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries. In their Introduction, "Musa Britannia," the editors provide a readable overview of the composition of Latin poetry in Britain and its place in the educational system from the beginnings to the present day. Seven chapters deal with Anglo-Latin. Andrew Taylor discusses John Leland both as a writer of epigrams in the European tradition and as one of the early humanist Latin poets of sixteenth-century England. Gesine Manuwald provides a thoughtful analysis of the interplay between Thomas Campion's Latin and English poetry, and his debt to ancient Latin. There is, though, more to be said about his love elegies, not the main focus of the essay. When I first came across Campion's Latin more than thirty years ago, I had not realised how unusual it was for an Elizabethan Latin poet to write such poems. Sarah Knight studies the student compositions of Milton and Herbert at Cambridge to illustrate the formative part played by the university curriculum and ambience on their poetic development and the extent to which this is shaped by the classical past. Philip Hardie offers a close and detailed reading of Cowley's *Davideis*, demonstrating its relationship to the English version of the same work and showing how Cowley successfully adapts Latin and Greek sources. Victoria Moul's chapter is also on Cowley, a sensitive and well-judged discussion of the Horatian elements in his *Plantarum libri sex* of 1668, a curious work which has only very recently started to attract attention. Niall Rudd fulfils the role of a traditional classical commentator, offering a series of disparate comments on a number of Dr. Johnson's Latin poems which discuss such matters as style, metre, context, and debt to classical writers. In one of the most readable and

engaging essays in the volume, David Money gives us an overview of the place of Latin verse writing by English gentlemen of leisure and education in the eighteenth century, focussing particularly on one of the commemorative anthologies that were still, and rather unusually, emerging from the two English universities at that time. Money's discussion of the 1736 Oxford *Gratulatio* on the marriage of Frederick Prince of Wales is a model of how such studies ought to be done, and there are many insights here.

There are four chapters on Scottish Neo-Latin. Roger Green provides a succinct account of George Buchanan's life and career, together with an able justification of his metrical practice against the criticisms of previous scholars. Stephen Harrison also writes on Buchanan, offering a close critical analysis of two of Buchanan's extremely popular paraphrases of the Psalms. He shows how Buchanan deploys his formidable knowledge of Horace's *Odes* and of Horatian metre to excellent effect. Angus Vine's analysis of the poetry of John Johnston is a perceptive one which shows how it can be interpreted to reveal Johnston's attitude to politics and religion after the union of the Scottish and English crowns in 1603. The Scottish section concludes with a discussion of a Jacobite epic poem hitherto unknown to me, the late seventeenth-century *Grameid* of James Philps. Ceri Davis has made Welsh Neo-Latin very much his own field. In the single chapter of the book devoted to Welsh Neo-Latin, he gives a deft account of the literary circles of the Stradling family and some of the landscape poetry then produced.

Two chapters on Irish Neo-Latin bring the book to an end. In a very readable chapter Jason Harris identifies two small volumes printed at Wittenberg in 1539 by 'Doncanus Hibernus' as apparently the first Irish Latin poetry to be printed. Harris shows how these verses can throw much light on the intellectual circles of Protestant Europe and England at this time. Finally Keith Sidwell describes a virtually unknown and anonymous Latin epic by an Irish Jacobite which treats of the wars in Ireland of William III in 1688-1691.

Though this volume is, as the editors acknowledge, a collection of case studies rather than a comprehensive account, it nonetheless illustrates the range and vitality of British Neo-Latin in the centuries under discussion. It shows, too, that there are many discoveries still to

be made and many areas of British Neo-Latin which invite reassessment. That all the contributors hold or used to hold university posts in one of the countries under discussion, that there is now a British Society for Neo-Latin Studies, and that regular Neo-Latin seminars and colloquia are held at Cambridge, where courses may be taken at the undergraduate level, further exemplify the vitality of Neo-Latin studies in Great Britain and Ireland today. (J. W. Binns, University of York)

◆ *Opuscula historico-philologica: Ausgewählte Aufsätze 2008-2013*. By Walther Ludwig. Edited by Astrid Steiner-Weber. *Noctes Neolatinae / Neo-Latin Texts and Studies*, 19. Hildesheim, Zürich, and New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 2014. As most academics know, ‘retirement’ can mean many things in our profession. For some, it means what it does in the minds of those outside the academy, the end of a career in teaching, service, and research. For many, it means no more committee meetings, radically restricted teaching that eventually ends entirely, and the chance to turn to long-delayed research projects on a more casual, leisurely schedule. For a few, however, ‘retirement’ means a research and publication program that continues unabated, even accelerates in the freedom from other academic obligations and distractions. Walther Ludwig is one of those rare individuals in this last group, someone who in five so-called ‘retirement’ years accomplishes more than many of his colleagues manage during their entire working career. The first fruits of his retirement appeared in *Miscella Neolatina: Ausgewählte Aufsätze 1989-2003*, 3 vols., with the same editor, series, and publisher as the volume under review here. Next came *Supplementa Neolatina: Ausgewählte Aufsätze 2003-2008*, limited to one volume, but one volume of 875 pages that covers essays written between Professor Ludwig’s seventy-fifth through eightieth years. The volume under review continues the successful editorial and publishing collaboration, offering a selection of essays written during the next five years and brought together in time to mark the author’s eighty-fifth birthday. This is a Neo-Latin career on steroids.

Following a brief proemium, the volume offers twenty essays divided into seven groups: I. Neulatein und Klassische Philologie, 1, “Das Leben der lateinischen Sprache in der Neuzeit”; 2. “Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorffs unbekannte Vorlesung ‘Einleitung

in die Philologie”); II. Horaz, 1. “Die Liebe zu Horaz—Horaz in der Kultur der europäischen Neuzeit”; 2. “Die *Emblemata Horatiana* des Otho Vaenius”; 3. “Horaz als Instrument der Gegenreformation—Die horazisierenden Oden des Johannes Baptista Masculus”; III. Drei Humanisten des 16. Jahrhunderts: Melanchthon, Muretus, Reusner, 1. “Art und Zweck der Lehrmethode Melanchthons—Beobachtungen anlässlich der ersten Übersetzung seiner *Initia doctrinae physicae*”; 2. “Die Monodia des Marcus Antonius Muretus zum Tod des Pariser Parlamentspräsidenten Christophe de Thou (1583)—Idealbilder von Humanismus und Gerechtigkeit”; 3. “Türkisches und persisches Latein? Sultan Murad III. und Schah Mohammed Kohdabanda als Autoren in Reusners *Epistolae Turcicae*”; IV. Emblemforschungen, 1. “Erasmus’ Adage ‘Hasten Slowly’ and the Art of Emblems”; 2. “Die emblematische *Festina lente*-Variation des Achilles Bocchius”; 3. “Das emblematische Willkommbuch der Benediktiner-Universität Salzburg für ihren neuen Fürsterzbischof Johann Ernst Graf von Thun im Jahr 1687”; V. Gnomologische Literatur und Stammbuchforschungen, 1. “Tradition und Kreativität in der Nachfolge der *Disticha Catonis* und der *Monosticha* des Publilius Syrus (Michael Verinus, Petrus Lindebergius, Janus Gruter)”; 2. “Stammbuchforschung als Humanismusforschung—Rückblick und Ausblick”; 3. “Das Wittenberger Stammbuch des Paul Schede Melissus (1565) in der Herzogin Anna Amalia Bibliothek in Weimar”; 4. “Einträge aus Tübingen, Straßburg, Marburg, Jena und Genf im Stammbuch der Brüder Riedesel zu Eisenbach (1593–1598)”; 5. “Der Dreißigjährige Krieg und Schweden in drei zeitgenössischen Stammbüchern deutscher Studenten”; VI. Johann Peter von Ludewig, 1. “Ludewig, Ludwig, Johann Peter (von)”; 2. “Eine Lesefrucht zum Lateingebräuch um 1700”; VII. Über das hohe Alter von Gelehrten, 1. “Übersetzung der *Dissertatio historico-philosophica de senio eruditorum* von Christian Gottfried Hoffmann, Leipzig 1711, mit einer Einleitung.” In a short review like this it is impossible to discuss the essays individually; I will only note that each of them is elegantly written, carefully structured, and richly documented.

The careful reader may have noticed that the title promises that the volume under review offers a “selection” of Professor Ludwig’s publications during this period. Right before the index, this volume concludes with a full list of these publications, which are numbered

from 331 to 388 in the complete *curriculum vitae*. And there is no reason to assume that the torrent of publications will stop, or even slow down, any time soon: in a recent letter, Professor Ludwig informed me that he has made plans to attend the 2015 Vienna congress of the International Association for Neo-Latin Studies. One can only assume that a *Supplementa opuscula historico-philologica* is in the making, and that we will have to wait no longer than Professor Ludwig's ninetieth birthday, five years from now, to have it. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)