

## NEO-LATIN NEWS

Vol. 65, 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.

◆ *Sozomeno da Pistoia (1387-1458): Scrittura e libri di un umanista*. By Irene Ceccherini. Preface by Stefano Zamponi, with an essay by David Speranzi. Biblioteca dell'«Archivum Romanicum», Serie I: Storia, letteratura, paleografia, 431. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 2016. XX + 466 pp. €65. I have to admit that I began reading this book with a sinking feeling. Basically a library catalogue of a minor humanist that no one has ever heard of, presented in enormous detail, as homage to a favored local son and funded by a bank that (unlike many others) succeeded in completing its act of cultural homage before the fiscal crisis hit and terminated most projects like this in Italy, the project initially seemed to promise little. By the time I finished the preface, however, it became clear that this book fully merits all the time, effort, and expense lavished on it. Let me explain.

The protagonist of this story is one Zomino (also referred to in the sources as Zambino, Zembino, and Zombino), who Hellenized his name to Sozomeno and is now generally referred to as such. He was born in Pistoia and received his initial education there, but after winning a scholarship for students of modest means, he studied canon law, first in Padua, then in Florence. While in Florence he entered the orbit of the humanism that was emerging there and studied Greek with Guarino da Verona. He was fortunate enough to attend the

Council of Constance, where he had the chance to learn of Poggio Bracciolini's manuscript discoveries and to rub shoulders with some of the students of Manuel Chrysoloras, after which he returned to Italy and was elected canon of the cathedral in Pistoia. For more than a decade he continued to live and study primarily in Florence, teaching (probably privately) the sons of Palla Strozzi, Matteo Palmieri, and Leonardo Dati and lecturing at the Florentine *Studio* in poetry and rhetoric. After finally returning to Pistoia and actually taking up residence there, he participated in the religious and cultural life of the city until his death some twenty-five years later.

Sozomeno was not, to be sure, a superstar scholar like Poggio Bracciolini, Leonardo Bruni, or Lorenzo Valla, but he is an excellent representative of the middle to upper middle register of learning at the dawn of humanism. This by itself merits some attention now, but the same could be said for a good number of others. There are, however, three things that render Sozomeno and his work unique. First is the fact that the surviving documentation allows us to study him in more detail than anyone else like him: he is the only mid-level humanist born in the 70s and 80s of the Trecento whose passage from his initial scholastic education to the new grammatical and rhetorical learning, based in Greek as well as Latin, can be followed in this kind of detail. This transformation can be followed in the books that he copied or had copied for himself and annotated as part of his scholarly and pedagogical activity. Second, we can see this transformation on another level as his handwriting transforms itself at the beginning of the fifteenth century. Like most educated people of his day, Sozomeno began writing a Gothic bookhand and a cursive based in the notarial matrix, but as he adopted humanist principles, he also developed a humanist hand that allowed him to begin preparing books in what was then understood to have been the *all'antica* manner. This transformation extended to Greek as well, as David Speranzi explains in his accompanying essay. Finally, there is the question of his library and its disposition. Other early humanists had more books than Sozomeno and had similar ideas about what to do with them, but Sozomeno had decided as early as 1423 that he wanted his books to be useful to others and he was the first to act legally and to destine his library for public usage. This is one of those fortunate cases where a good

idea—to take advantage of the richness of the surviving resources to fill out our picture of mid-level humanism—was joined with top-level scholars able to do the work and with financial resources adequate to fund the research and subvent its presentation. Quite remarkably, Ceccherini has been able to find 83 of the 110 manuscripts listed in the inventory of 1460, along with four others not noted there, and to provide exacting descriptions of them. Given the importance of the handwriting issues discussed in the paragraph above, extensive illustration was necessary to do this job right, and the Fondazione Cassa di Risparmio di Pistoia e Pescia, after financing the research, provided the funds to offer an illustration of every single manuscript, making this volume a virtual reconstruction of a library that has been dispersed throughout Europe. Additional relevant information can be found in four appendices, and the whole is well indexed and easy to use. We are told that as part of the same project, Giliola Barbero will be publishing the results of her research on the life of Sozomeno and on his work as a grammarian and commentator of classical texts. I look forward to seeing this material as well and to learning more about someone who deserves to be better known than he has been up to now. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Iohannes de Certaldo. Beiträge zu Boccaccios lateinischen Werken und ihrer Wirkung.* Hgg. Karl Enenkel, Tobias Leuker, and Christoph Pieper. *Noctes Neolatinae / Neo-Latin Texts and Studies*, 24. Hildesheim: Olms, 2015. xxiii + 267 pp. €39.80. Dieser Band stellt die Ergebnisse einer Tagung zu „Giovanni Boccaccios (1313–1375) lateinischen Werken und ihrer Wirkung“ vor, die 2013 anlässlich des 700. Geburtstags des Dichters in Münster stattfand. Es handelt sich um den ersten Sammelband, der nicht vorrangig Boccaccios italienischen Werken, sondern (fast) ausschließlich seinem lateinischen Oeuvre gewidmet ist. (Auch im jüngsten Überblickswerk zu Boccaccio (G. Armstrong et al. (Hgg.), *The Cambridge Companion to Boccaccio*, Cambridge, 2015) bleibt das lateinische Oeuvre ein Randthema.) Sein lateinisches Frühwerk (z.B. die *Elegia di Costanza*) und seine Briefe bleiben dabei zugunsten der Hauptwerke – der mythographischen *Genealogia deorum gentilium*, der biographischen Werke *De casibus virorum illustrium* und *De mulieribus claris* sowie des *Buccolicum*

*carmen*–unberücksichtigt. Nach einer kurzen Einleitung zum Stand der Forschung zu Iohannes de Certaldo (wie sich Boccaccio selbst mit Vorliebe in latinisierter Form nannte) kommen zwölf Vertreter verschiedener Disziplinen (Neolatinistik, Mediävistik, Germanistik, Romanistik, Philosophie) zu Wort, deren Beiträge vier Schwerpunkten zugeordnet werden. Zuerst geht es um das Verhältnis des lateinischen Boccaccio zu den intellektuellen Diskursen seiner Zeit. So analysiert Pia Claudia Doering unter Berücksichtigung von gesellschaftshistorischen, kunstgeschichtlichen und biographischen Aspekten das Spannungsverhältnis zwischen Dichtern und Anwälten in der *Genealogia* (XIV,4) und im (italienischen) *Decameron* (VI,5). Thomas Ricklins Beitrag weist anhand von *De casibus* auf den Einfluss des Astronomen Andalò del Negro hin, eines von der Forschung bislang kaum beachteten *maestro* Boccaccios. Tobias Leukers Diskussion der Bedeutung des *prudencia*-Begriffs für die (italienische) *Ghismonda*-Novelle fällt strenggenommen aus dem Konzept des Bands („lateinische Werke“) heraus, verortet den Text aber wenigstens in den lateinischen Gelehrten Diskursen des Mittelalters.

Im Fokus des zweiten Teils stehen die beiden Sammelbiographien Boccaccios. In einem erhellenden Vergleich von *De casibus* mit Petrarcas *De viris illustribus* deckt Alexander Winkler die oft verkannten kompositorischen Stärken Boccaccios gegenüber seinem Freund und *maestro* auf. Franz Römer wirft vor dem Hintergrund von Boccaccios *De mulieribus claris* ein Licht auf die Frauengestalten in *De casibus virorum* (!) *illustrum* und ihre didaktische Funktion. Wie diese Biographien in der deutschsprachigen Literatur der Frühen Neuzeit rezipiert wurden, vollzieht abschließend Barbara Sasse Tateo nach.

Die dritte Sektion beleuchtet Boccaccios Umgang mit Mythen. Philipp Weiß zeigt, wie der Dichter in seiner elften *Ekloge* ovidische Mythen und Biblisches im bukolischen Rahmen zu einem christlich-allegorischen Weltgedicht zusammenführt. Über Boccaccios Weiterentwicklung des Phaeton-Mythos vor dem Hintergrund der euhemeristischen und naturwissenschaftlichen Ovid-Auslegung sowie der Bindung des Mythos an die italienische Topographie handelt Christian Peters. Einen begriffsgeschichtlichen Einblick in Boccaccios Homerdeutung bietet John Nassichuk mit seinem Beitrag zum Partizip *κεστός* („bestickt“), das in der *Ilias* (14,214–15) den Gürtel

der verführerischen Venus näher beschreibt, in der *Genealogia* aber als Substantiv verstanden wird und zusätzlich die Funktion eines „safeguard against excess“ (183) erhält.

Die schon bei Weiß behandelte Eklogendichtung Boccaccios ist Gegenstand des letzten Teils: Bernd Roling bespricht Boccaccios christliche Bukolik und im Besonderen die Rolle der Olympia als *donna* und *madonna* in der 14. *Ekloge*. Petra Kortes Beitrag zur bukolisch-dantesken Unterweltsschau in der zehnten *Ekloge* (*Vallis opaca*) und Claudia Corfiatis Ausblick auf die Editions-geschichte des *Buccolicum carmen* beschließen den Band.

Der knappe Überblick über die verhandelten Themen dürfte bereits einen Eindruck von der Vielfalt und der perspektivischen Breite der Ansätze in diesem Sammelband geben. Der Anspruch, der im Titel formuliert ist, wird dabei zufriedenstellend eingelöst: Nicht nur die rein rezeptionsgeschichtlichen, sondern *alle* Aufsätze nehmen auch die Wirkung und das ‚Nachleben‘ der besprochenen Werke in den Blick. Die verschiedenen Prätexte sowie die Diskurse und Traditionen, in die sich der lateinische Boccaccio einschreibt, werden dabei nie aus dem Blick verloren. Freilich findet bei dem überschaubaren Umfang der Beiträge (ca. 20 Seiten) kaum ein Thema eine erschöpfende Behandlung, und genau darin liegt einer der Vorzüge des Bands: Er bietet vielfältige Anregungen für die weitere Beschäftigung mit dem Boccaccio Latinus. Nützlich wäre dafür eine Bibliographie mit ein-führender Literatur gewesen; der ‚Neuling‘ bleibt auf die Fußnoten der Einleitung und die Einzelbibliographien der Aufsätze angewiesen. (Niklas Gutt, Ruhr-Universität Bochum)

◆ *Baiae: Zwei Bücher Elfsilber*. By Giovanni Gioviano Pontano. Translated, with an afterword, by Tobias Roth. Illustrations by Petrus Akkordeon. Berlin: Edition ReVers #04 Verlagshaus Berlin, 2016. 194 pp. €18.90. *Sylva in scabie: Wald aus Krätze*. By Angelo Poliziano. Translated, with an afterword, by Tobias Roth. Vienna: Hochroth, 2016. Unpaginated. €8. In Roman times, Baiae referred to the place on the Bay of Naples where “[p]leasure was available and stylish people misbehaved” (page viii of the edition and translation by Rodney G. Dennis in *The I Tatti Renaissance Library*, published in 2006 and reviewed in the spring 2007 *Neo-Latin News*), so this was also the place

to which Giovanni Gioviano Pontano and his humanist friends went to recreate the ambience of Lesbia and Catullus. The poems treat of friendship, old age, and the variety of human relationships, and it is in this variety that the complexity of Pontano's poetic persona, and life, appears. Pontano is one of the great poets of married love whose *De amore coniugali* deals in affectionate detail with his wife, Ariane Sassone, to whom he was devoted, yet another collection, *Eridanus*, is given over to his mistress Stella and another mistress, Focilla, passes through the pages of *Baiae*. The poems sing the pleasures of sex, often evoking Catullus, but they do so through allusions, quotations, references and *loci classici* that only a scholar could manage.

Pontano's *Sylva in scabiem* is a different sort of work. It was found by Paul Oskar Kristeller in a miscellany of collected works, the Codex Palatinus 555 of the Biblioteca Palatina in Parma. As with the *Baiae*, there are other editions, those of Alessandro Perosa (1954) and Paolo Orvieto (1989), but by the early nineties the poem had largely dropped off the scholarly radar. This edition therefore does a service by drawing attention to the *Sylva in scabiem* once again. The work should not be removed from its setting, with its suggestion that Lorenzo de' Medici is the *medicus* of the body politic, but it is really a bravura display piece, one that was designed to show off its author's rhetorical skills while pushing against the boundaries of what was socially acceptable. As Roth puts it in his afterword, "Die *Sylva in scabiem* ist ein exemplarischer Text für die deregulierte Literatur des Quattrocento, ebenso für die schweinische Belesenheit und Virtuosität Polizianos, sie ist ein Bravourstück. Der Text scheint keinen Rahmen zu haben, er wuchert und wuchert wie die Krankheit, die in ihm beschrieben wird. Er lässt sich schwer im Gattungssystem einordnen, wie die Krankheit selbst nicht bestimmt werden kann. Das Vokabular ist exotisch, die Versifikation zäh. Die Hexameter werden durch häufige Enjambements überschritten wie die Leidenschaft des Ich; aber weder der Hexameter noch das Ich dürfen zugrunde gehen. Die Beschreibung pendelt zwischen Haut- und Geisteskrankheit (scabies/rabies – Krätze/Tollwut), sie schöpft aus der antiken Psychopathologie des Zorns ebenso wie aus den Schilderungen von Epidemien und Viehseuchen. Das mythische Nessushemd, das das Fleisch seines Trägers verbrennt, scheint über das Bewusstsein des Ich gestülpt" (fourth unnumbered

page of the afterword).

What both of these books have in common is that they are important not only for the text they carry, but also for the format in which they present it. This is not something to which Neo-Latinists have traditionally paid a great deal of attention, but that is beginning to change. *Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Neo-Latin World*, edited by Philip Ford, Jan Bloemendal, and Charles Fantazzi (Leiden and Boston, 2014), offers an entire section with seven chapters entitled "Latin and Printing," while *A Guide to Neo-Latin Literature*, edited by Victoria Moul (Cambridge, 2017), contains my "Using Manuscripts and Early Printed Books," which is also designed to facilitate the intersection of Neo-Latin studies with the emerging field of book history. Essays like this have begun to get us accustomed to looking *at* rather than *through* our books, to seeing them as physical objects rather than mere vehicles for passing on texts. The next step, which is the one that has been taken here, is to make the book into a work of art in itself, one that uses special paper, unusual formats, and unique binding styles to provide the viewer with an aesthetic experience that complements that of reading the text. Throughout the twentieth century, artists' books like these have been created for everything from children's literature to books about animals, but to my knowledge little Neo-Latin literature has been presented in this format. The Poliziano volume is bound as a pamphlet, but at the beginning black and white pages, with a circle cut out of the top page, give us something quite different from the usual paperback book. The Pontano volume is an even more ambitious artists' book. It has an open spine with the stitched gatherings visible, two pages of heavy brown card stock at the beginning and end, and a series of drawings in a highly stylized primitivism scattered throughout the book. A series of pictures of the second volume is available at <http://verlagshaus-berlin.de/programm/baiae/>, although these pictures do not do the book justice. Given the prices at which the books are being sold, however, my advice would be to forget the pictures and pick up a copy for yourself. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Modelli di episteme neoplatonica nella Firenze del '400: le gnoseologie di Giovanni Pico della Mirandola e di Marsilio Ficino.* Simone Fellina. Centro internazionale di cultura "Giovanni Pico della Mirandola",

Studi pichiani, 17. Florence: Leo S. Olschki editore, 2014. 228 pp. Il tardo Quattrocento è notoriamente epoca d'incomparabile vivacità intellettuale. Al vertice della sua parabola, la cultura rinascimentale si esprime con autorevole originalità in molti e molto diversificati ambiti: soprattutto in quello filosofico, essa produce concezioni innovative, come conseguenza della riacquisita possibilità di leggere integralmente Platone e i neoplatonici (Plotino, Porfirio, Giamblico, Proclo), e della fino allora inedita possibilità di conoscere e utilizzare la tradizione cabalistica medioevale.

Marsilio Ficino (1433–1499) e Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (1463–1494) sono artefici e promotori di tale palingenesi filosofica: alla teoria della conoscenza da essi concepita Simone Fellina dedica un libro denso, documentato, frutto di un'indagine vigile e critica di alcune fondamentali opere dei due filosofi, cioè, soprattutto, *El libro dell'amore* (1468–1469) e la *Theologia Platonica* (edita nel 1482) del Ficino; il *Commento sopra una canzone de amore composta da Girolamo Benivieni* (1486) e le *Conclusiones nongentae publice disputandae* (1486) del Pico.

La conciliazione del pensiero platonico con la rivelazione cristiana è proposito fondante del pensiero ficiniano. Infatti nel primo capitolo dell'opera, *L'antropologia e la gnoseologia di Marsilio Ficino e Giovanni Pico della Mirandola: i rapporti tra anima e corpo, le facoltà, la conoscenza sensibile* (9–64, a sua volta suddiviso in tre distinte sezioni, la prima dedicata alla dottrina della conoscenza sensibile in Ficino; la seconda e la terza, rispettivamente, alla concezione di *vehiculum animae* e alla psicologia in Giovanni Pico), viene chiarito come Ficino persegua tale conciliazione anche in ambito gnoseologico: egli riconduce tutte le facoltà conoscitive alla spiritualità dell'anima, definisce le facoltà della conoscenza sensibile (in ordine gerarchico decrescente: la *phantasia*, l'*imaginatio*, lo *spiritus* e il corpo), riconosce allo *spiritus* una funzione speciale, quella di *animae currus*, cioè veicolo dell'anima (concetto che ricorre in tutto il neoplatonismo, ma che Ficino concepisce specificamente sulla scorta di Proclo); lo *spiritus*, in quanto *animae currus*, è considerato tramite nella realizzazione delle attività conoscitive sensibili, è il mezzo al manifestarsi delle potenzialità dell'anima, la quale *cogitat* (conosce) essendo unita allo spirito presente nel cervello; ha sensazione in quanto unita allo spirito presente nei sensi.



Diversamente da Ficino, il proposito di Pico è piuttosto quello di conciliare il pensiero aristotelico con quello platonico: tale proposito si manifesta bene nella dottrina dei veicoli dell'anima (ὀχήματα), che sono tre secondo Ficino (nel caso seguace di Proclo), due soli secondo Pico, uno celeste ed eterno, uno corruttibile e formato dai quattro elementi; la riduzione a due soli ὀχήματα rispecchia e salvaguarda la dottrina aristotelica dei due corpi, l'uno eterno, e l'altro corruttibile; il veicolo eterno è inoltre da Pico identificato nel πνεῦμα aristotelico. Ma tra Ficino e Pico sensibile è anche la divergenza riguardante il rapporto fra anima e veicolo: perché secondo Ficino l'anima non aderisce direttamente al veicolo, ma lo vivifica, proiettando su di esso il suo *idolum*; secondo Pico, invece, l'anima razionale direttamente vivifica il veicolo (ciò coerentemente con l'idea che ogni anima ha un'affinità specifica con uno specifico corpo celeste; da esso discendendo, l'anima plasma il proprio veicolo e corpo). A questa concezione è connessa la teoria del sentimento amoroso, che è condivisa dai due filosofi: tra immagine dell'amato e dell'amante c'è una conformità sussistente in ragione della comune appartenenza a uno stesso astro; proprio tale conformità innesca il sentimento d'amore.

Pur accogliendo la terminologia aristotelica di anima vegetativa e sensitiva (già diffusa nel neoplatonismo), Pico costruisce una teoria della conoscenza fondata sulla distinzione schiettamente platonica tra *ratio* e intelletto, intesi come *dianoia* e *nous*: è proprio la conoscenza intellettuale «per la quale l'uomo così conviene con gli Angeli, come per la parte sensitiva conviene con le bestie» (Pico, cit. a 41). E nella *Oratio de hominis dignitate* propone la tripartizione platonica dell'anima (concupiscibile, irascibile, razionale), la quale concorre a definire un complesso sistema di corrispondenze fra le parti dell'anima e le *Sephiro*: la tradizione cabalistica è così accordata con quella platonica, alla quale Pico anche congiunge elementi della tradizione tomista, ravvisabili nella definizione di una parte dell'anima concupiscibile e irascibile detta 'superiore'.

Se, rispetto alla teoria della conoscenza, Ficino assume una posizione distinta da quella di san Tommaso (Ficino riconduce infatti tutte le facoltà conoscitive ad attività dell'anima immateriale), non univoca è la posizione di Pico, il quale talora si approssima al tomismo, talora al neoplatonismo ficiniano. Sulla teoria della conoscenza sensi-

bile, sicuro è il suo dissenso rispetto a Ficino in particolare in merito alla “bellezza”: essa secondo Ficino è una grazia che coinvolge animo, corpo e voci; secondo Pico, va invece ricondotta unicamente alla vista. Pico inoltre riconosce importanza al senso comune, concetto che ricava probabilmente dal *De anima* aristotelico, perché come nel *De anima*, così nelle *Conclusiones nongentae* il senso comune è una modalità di funzionamento complessiva e d’insieme dei sensi esterni, ma è privo di un proprio organo. È peraltro ravvisabile in Pico un «antiempirismo, tutto neoplatonico», per il quale la conoscenza procede «dalle facoltà superiori a quelle inferiori, in un rispecchiamento sul piano gnoseologico di ciò che sul piano cosmologico e metafisico è il processo emenativo che, a partire dall’Uno, si depotenzia e degrada progressivamente sino a giungere alla realtà inerte» (61).

Nel secondo e più ampio capitolo dell’opera, *L’antropologia e la gnoseologia di Marsilio Ficino e Giovanni Pico della Mirandola: la conoscenza intellettuale* (65–177, a sua volta suddiviso in sei distinti paragrafi), viene anzitutto rettificata la corrente interpretazione, secondo cui l’antropologia di Ficino sarebbe debitrice della dottrina plotiniana dell’anima “non discesa”, mentre, in maniera diversa, quella di Pico sarebbe ispirata a Giamblico (secondo cui le capacità conoscitive dell’uomo sono limitate, in quanto l’anima è interamente “discesa”, e perciò interamente corrotta); anche Pico, come dimostra Fellina, si conforma in realtà alla dottrina plotiniana, dove afferma che «l’anima razionale ... così come partecipa la sostanza dell’intelletto, così partecipa esse Idee e conseguentemente la bellezza di quelle» (*Commento sopra una canzone de amore*, cit. a 73); l’uomo cioè, anche secondo Pico, *direttamente* partecipa alla realtà intellegibile, possiede cioè un’intelligenza essenziale e non una mera ragione intellettuale.

È probabilmente la pubblicazione delle *Conclusiones* pichiane che induce Ficino a riaffermare la propria autorità in seno alle ricerche sul neoplatonismo, e a tradurre (o meglio parafrasare) il *De mysteriis* di Giamblico: in tale lavoro Ficino avverte e comprende l’ispirazione religiosa propria di Giamblico, ma non focalizza la critica che Giamblico muove alla dottrina plotiniana dell’anima “non discesa”; in ciò converge con Pico, e la prossimità dei due filosofi è documentata anche dall’uso comune dello stesso manoscritto giamblicano del *De mysteriis*, il Vallicelliano F. 20.

Conformemente a Plotino, nel *El libro dell'amore* Ficino attribuisce all'anima la facoltà dell'*unitas* (di congiungersi cioè al creatore nell'unità della sua essenza); alla ragione la facoltà di mobilità e discorsività. Nella *Theologia Platonica*, in modo diverso e meno lineare, riconosce all'uomo, quale massima facoltà, la *mens*, in cui, a sua volta, distingue un'Intelligenza parte dell'anima e un'Intelligenza pura o angelica. E ancora diversamente, nei *Commentari al Parmenide* e al *Fedro*, con chiarezza maggiore e in sintonia con Proclo, distingue un piano intellettuale e uno psichico. Nel quadro di una complessiva «scarsa attitudine alla coerenza teorica», si ravvede in Ficino «la scomparsa della *ratio* come facoltà dotata di principi conoscitivi propri, psichici, i quali vengono ricompresi nella *mens*» (100). Anche la noetica di Pico, pur non rinunciando a elementi della tradizione aristotelica, ha un impianto decisamente neoplatonico, ed è prossima alla formulazione ficiniana (*Theol. Plat.* XI 2), per cui il processo conoscitivo «si riduce a un rispecchiamento dell'anima e della sua conoscenza innata». L'ispirazione neoplatonica del Pico è in particolare comprovata da due delle sessantuno *Conclusiones secundum opinionem propriam* (n° 60 e n° 62), le quali dimostrano una netta distanza dalla tradizione peripatetica e dal suo empirismo.

Nel riconoscere all'uomo un *intelletto particolare*, Pico recupera e adatta la noetica procliana, che intende graduare ogni piano dell'essere, senza salti ontologici. L'anima umana è dotata di una *natura intellectualis*, e in questo si accorda alla natura angelica, dalla quale tuttavia si differenzia, essendo anche dotata di una *natura rationalis*, che costituisce l'aspetto specifico delle realtà psichiche; il rapporto tra intelletto umano e angelico è delineato in modo simile anche in *Theologia Platonica* I 5,1, dove Ficino avverte che la natura intellettuale è parte dell'anima, non ne costituisce l'essenza intera. Cioè sia secondo Ficino sia secondo Pico, l'anima è prossima all'intelligibile; in essa si distingue anche una sostanza psichica, e perciò esiste un ordine gerarchico di *mentes*, sempre più perfette quanto più ci si approssima al sommo intelligibile.

Per quanto attiene alla natura dell'intellezione, Ficino è propenso a riconoscere alla *mens* la capacità di trascendere i limiti propri del pensiero dianoetico psichico, così da attribuire all'uomo la facoltà di contemplare gli intelligibili. Il suo pensiero è tuttavia segnato da

oscillazioni dipendenti dalla «eterogeneità dei platonismi cui di volta in volta dà voce» (139): sicché in non pochi luoghi della *Theologia* (ad es. XI 3 II) egli piuttosto afferma una diversità sostanziale tra l'*intelligere* angelico e quello umano, che sarebbe ancorato, contrariamente a quello angelico, alla *dianoia*, cioè a una facoltà prettamente temporale e discorsiva.

È evidente in Pico la preoccupazione di riscattare la tradizione aristotelica dalla condanna di naturalismo e sensismo che il neoplatonismo fiorentino gli addebita; ma per farlo Pico tende a platonizzare Aristotele; la lettura dei pochi suoi testi concernenti la conoscenza intellettuale sembra – contrariamente a quanto di norma assunto – di nuovo avvicinarlo fortemente a Ficino, poiché anche Pico afferma che la *natura intellectualis* esiste in atto nell'anima (in particolare nella *Conclusio* 5,63, riportata e discussa a 144).

Il terzo e conclusivo capitolo dell'opera, *Gli sviluppi dell'antropologia picchiana* (179–213), è dedicato agli scritti di Pico successivi alla pubblicazione delle *Conclusiones*, quelli cioè composti nel periodo della conversione del filosofo a uno stile di vita rigidamente ascetico: cioè l'*Heptaplus* e le *Expositiones in Psalmos*. L'analisi di Fellina conferma la sostanziale continuità di queste opere con la linea di pensiero sottesa alle precedenti: «è ancora l'ispirazione neoplatonica ... a guidare l'individuazione delle facoltà conoscitive in dotazione all'uomo, sulla base del concetto di microcosmo e del consueto assunto epistemologico che vuole le stesse facoltà essere ordinate in ragione della maggiore o minore vicinanza al corpo e quindi della maggiore o minore prossimità a Dio» (185).

Questi in sintesi (e con inevitabili semplificazioni) i punti nodali di un libro necessariamente complesso: le filosofie di Ficino e di Pico fioriscono dal recupero e dalla rielaborazione di una tradizione di studi millenaria, da fonti antiche e medievali di cui sempre occorre tenere conto per interpretare correttamente l'opera dei due pensatori rinascimentali. Nella prospettiva di ricostruirne le gnoseologie (segnate, come si è visto, da ondeggiamenti, incongruità, formulazioni sovente opache) Fellina dimostra una conoscenza puntuale non solo delle opere di Ficino e di Pico, ma anche degli autori che ne sono la fonte, delineando in maniera nuova ed equilibrata il rapporto fra i due pensatori: rapporto che appare caratterizzato da una condivisa,

tendenziale congruità al platonismo plotiniano, anziché da alterità e divergenze, su cui la recente critica ha forse troppo insistito. La ricerca di Simone Fellina contribuisce dunque in modo sostanziale alla conoscenza della filosofia rinascimentale, cioè di un episodio vivacissimo e appassionante nella storia del pensiero occidentale. (Matteo Venier, Università degli studi di Udine)

◆ *Die Ökonomie der Dichtung. Das Lobgedicht des Pietro Lazzaroni an den Borgia Papst Alexander VI. (1497)*. Bernhard Schirg. Noctes Neolatinae, 26. Hildesheim: Olms, 2016. €88. Bernhard Schirgs (S.) ‚Die Ökonomie der Dichtung‘ ist eine Publikation zum umfangreichsten literarischen Werk des Paveser Rhetorikprofessors Pietro Lazzaroni, dem ca. 2100 Verse umfassenden *Carmen ad Alexandrum VI*, das dem Borgia-Papst Alexander VI. gewidmet ist. S. legt im Rahmen dieser Studie eine Erstedition mit ausführlicher Interpretation und Kommentierung vor. Lazzaronis dichterisches Œuvre, von dem man bislang fast ausschließlich in Fußnoten Notiz nehmen konnte, wurde von der Forschung, wie S. einleitend feststellt, für lange Zeit vernachlässigt und als minderwertige Dichtung abqualifiziert. Dabei seien besonders häufig panegyrische Texte aus dem Blick geraten, die durch ihren meist gewerblichen Hintergrund und die zweckgebundene Produktion nicht der vorherrschenden Ästhetik entsprochen hätten. Anknüpfend an die Arbeiten von Thomas Hays (‚Päpste und Poeten‘, Berlin, 2009) und Paul Gwynne (‚Poets and Princes‘, Turnhout, 2012) wirbt S. daher für einen Paradigmenwechsel von einer ausschließlich nach ästhetischen Kriterien ausgerichteten Analyse hin zu autorenbezogenen Studien, die verschiedene Produktionsbedingungen und Wirkungskontexte einbeziehen. Der Anstoß für die Untersuchung dieses Textes war also nicht allein, die Dichtung Lazzaronis dem Forschungsdiskurs zugänglich zu machen, sondern ebenso einen Beitrag zur allgemeinen Neuinterpretation der lateinisch-panegyrischen Dichtung des 15. Jahrhunderts zu leisten.

Der Titel ‚Ökonomie der Dichtung‘ bezieht sich besonders auf den ökonomischen Einsatz des Faktors ‚Zeit‘. S.s zentrale These gründet nämlich auf der Annahme, dass Lazzaronis Dichtungstechnik durch die inhaltlichen, performativen und insbesondere zeitlichen Anforderungen eines spezifischen Widmungsanlasses geprägt sei.

„Das Ökonomische“ in Lazzaronis Dichtung manifestiere sich vor allem in einem „Streben nach einem vorteilhaften Verhältnis zwischen Produktionsaufwand und einem dichterischen Endprodukt“ (29).

Um den postulierten Zusammenhang zwischen Widmungsanlass und ökonomisch-effizienter Produktionsweise darzustellen zu können, muss S. einige Vorarbeit leisten: Nach einer Einleitung zu Autor und Werk sowie einer knappen Darstellung des Forschungsstands versucht S., den historischen Entstehungshintergrund des *Carmen ad Alexandrum VI* zu rekonstruieren, um im Anschluss mit philologischem Rüstzeug die Frage erörtern zu können, welche Bezüge sich zwischen Dichtung und historischem Kontext herstellen lassen. S. zeichnet die komplexe Konstellation des Frühsommers 1497 nach, die wesentlich durch die politischen Verflechtungen zwischen dem Mailänder Herzog Ludovico Sforza, Papst Alexander VI. und dem päpstlichen Legaten Bernardino de Carvajal geprägt ist.

Die Einzelheiten können hier nicht *in extenso* dargestellt werden, jedoch ist festzuhalten, dass es S. gelingt, auf Grundlage vieler noch unveröffentlichter Quellen plausibel nachzuweisen, dass die Dichtung Lazzaronis in einem unmittelbaren Zusammenhang mit den diplomatischen Interessen Ludovico Sforzas stand. S. leitet daraus ab, dass Lazzaroni das *Carmen ad Alexandrum VI* im Auftrag Sforzas auf die Rückkehr des päpstlichen Legaten Carvajal, mithin für einen konkreten Wirkungszusammenhang, zugeschnitten habe. S. geht deshalb davon aus, dass Lazzaronis Gedicht in eben diesem Zeitraum fertiggestellt wurde, zusammen mit anderen Briefen einige Tage vor Carvajals Rückkehr nach Rom gelangte und bei diesem Anlass am 11. Juli 1497 in Anwesenheit der Kardinäle öffentlich vorgetragen wurde. Die Produktion des Gedichts sei demnach politisch motiviert und innerhalb kürzester Zeit umgesetzt worden, um „die bestmögliche Stimmung für die Aufnahme Carvajals“ zu schaffen (91).

Dass das Gedicht aus tatsächlich bei diesem Anlass vorgetragen wurde, kann S. leider nicht lückenlos nachweisen. Ungeachtet dessen ist S.s Argumentation insgesamt schlüssig und durchaus überzeugend, da die Bezüge zum Widmungskontext auf verschiedenen Ebenen dargestellt werden können (Inhalt der Bücher, institutionelle und personelle Verflechtungen). Doch erst auf dieser Grundlage beginnt die eigentliche, philologische Untersuchung der Hauptfragestellung, näm-

lich die Klärung der Frage, wie es Lazzaroni in dichtungstechnischer Hinsicht gelang, das umfangreiche Werk in dem zeitlich limitierten Wirkungsfenster zu platzieren. In einzelnen Unterkapiteln arbeitet S. ganz verschiedene Ebenen dieser Aufwandsreduzierung auf. Besonders herauszuheben ist die Wiederverwendung von Textbausteinen aus früheren Texten („copy and paste“) und die Versifikation literarischer Vorlagen. Auch auf inhaltlicher Ebene kann S. eine ‚Recycling‘-Technik nachweisen. Anhand des Textapparats lassen sich Textreferenzen und adaptierte Vorlagen unmittelbar bei der Lektüre nachvollziehen. An die kritische Edition des Textes schließt sich ein ausführlicher Stellenkommentar an, der die bereits vorangegangene Textinterpretation ergänzt. (Lorenzo di Maggio, Ruhr-Universität Bochum)

◆ *Cristoforo Landinos Xandra und die Transformationen römischer Liebesdichtung im Florenz des Quattrocento*. Edited by Wolfgang Kofler and Anna Novokhatko. NeoLatina, 20. Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto Verlag, 2016. X + 287 pp. Cristoforo Landino is one of those Neo-Latin authors whose image has changed a good deal over the last couple of generations. At the end of the last century, scholars like Roberto Cardini, Manfred Lentzen, Arthur Field, and myself were focusing primarily on his commentaries to Dante and especially Virgil within the context of Neoplatonic thought. Now, however, the emphasis is on Landino as a lyric poet. Mary Chatfield’s I Tatti Renaissance Library edition of Landino’s *Poems* (Cambridge, MA, 2008) has brought awareness of this part of his oeuvre to many more people, while Antonia Wenzel’s *Die Xandra-Gedichte des Cristoforo Landino* (Heidelberg, 2010) allowed scholars to study the development of the collection and Christoph Pieper’s *Elegos redolere Vergiliosque sapere: Cristoforo Landinos ‘Xandra’ zwischen Liebe and Gesellschaft* (Hildesheim, 2008) began the effort to examine these poems with greater critical sophistication. The decision to devote the thirteenth Freiburger Neulateinische Symposium to the *Xandra* therefore makes sense, with the essays collected here being the fruits of that meeting.

The essays go in a variety of directions, reflecting the different approaches currently being developed to Landino’s *Xandra*. Hartmut Wulfram, for example, analyzes the appearance of Leon Battista Alberti in these poems and compares that picture to the one that Jacob Burck-

hardt had developed of Alberti as the prototype of the universal man. Stefan Faller examines the *Mons Asinarius* of the Florentine Servite monastery as it appears in *Xandra* 2.8 and discusses the poetic function of this ekphrasis, while Krystina Kubina shows how *Xandra* 3.4, 7, and 18 use the funeral elegy to construct Florentine identity in the past, present, and future. Christoph Pieper connects these poems to the so-called *poeti medicei* on both thematic and structural grounds, and James Hirstein links two *propemptika* of Rudolph Agricola's not only to Catullus and Martial, but also to Landino. Florian Hurka uses Wenzel's edition of the so-called B-Version to trace the evolution of the *Xandra*, while Wenzel herself shows that the close connections that Landino develops with Florentine culture in the second redaction were already present *in nuce* in the first one, and Thomas Gärtner examines how Landino moves the Propertian love elegy in the direction of a comprehensive panegyric of Florence. Thomas Baier turns to the mythological elements of the poems and argues that Landino layers connections to Statius into the Platonizing effects of his Petrarchan references; Ulrike Auhagen in turn uses B 1 and B 53 as a kaleidoscope of intertextual connections that reveals much about Landino's poetic technique, Theodora Chrysostomou analyzes *Xandra* 2.3 not as a way for Landino to position himself in terms of practical philosophy, but as a poet, and Sonja Caterina Calzascia examines the place of Ginevra de' Benci in Landino's *Carmina* 3–8. Matteo Taufer uses the figures of Orpheus and Eurydice to connect the *Xandra* to Landino's commentary on the *Georgics*, and Gérard Freyburger uses information from Landino's commentary on Horace to elucidate passages from the *Xandra*, thereby linking poetic practice and philological theory. Jean-Louis Charlet offers a detailed metrical overview of the *Xandra* that places Landino's practice in this area in relation to other poets, while Natalia Pedrique looks at the three Sapphic strophes in the collection as a unit that bears fruitful comparison with the works of Horace, Virgil, and Petrarch.

Not all conference proceedings merit publication, but this one does, both for its timeliness and its quality. Given how much flux Landino studies are currently in, it will be interesting to see where scholarship on this author, rather underappreciated a couple of generations ago, will end up over the next few years. (Craig Kallendorf,



Texas A&M University)

◆ *Corpus Epistularum Ioannis Dantisci*. Part 4: *Inventory of Ioannes Dantiscus' Correspondence*, vol. 3: *Inventory of Latin Letters to Ioannes Dantiscus with Addition of Letters in Spanish, Polish, Italian, Czech, Dutch and French, a. 1511–1548*. Compiled by Anna Skolimowska with the collaboration of Katarzyna Jasińska-Zdun. 607 pp. Part 5, *Respublica Litteraria in Action: New Sources*. Edited by Katarzyna Tomaszuk. *Supplement: Mercurino Arborio di Gattinara Oratio Supplicatoria, 1516*. Transcription, commentary and annotations by Anna Skolimowska with the collaboration of Michał M. Kendziorek-Skolimowski. Warsaw and Cracow: Faculty of 'Artes Liberales', University of Warsaw and Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences, 2016. 264 pp. The subject of these volumes is one Johannes van Höfen-Flachsbindler, known in Polish as Jan Dantyszek to show that he was a citizen of Gdansk (Lat. *Dantiscus*). Dantiscus, as he is generally known, was prince-bishop of Warmia and bishop of Chełmno (Culm); he also served for three decades as a diplomat and secretary for the Polish crown, as a result of which he is sometimes called 'The Father of Polish Diplomacy'. He wrote many poems in Latin, an autobiography (*Vita Joannis de Curiis Dantisci*), and thousands of letters to relatives, scholars, and prominent persons throughout Europe. The two volumes under review here, which join eight others that began appearing in 2004, are part of a series devoted to Dantiscus's correspondence.

The publication of this correspondence, under the auspices of a research project entitled 'Registration and Publication of the Correspondence of Ioannes Dantiscus (1485–1548),' is organized according to a meticulous plan. Part 1, *Ioannis Dantisci Epistulae Latinae*, will include five volumes that contain all of Dantiscus's Latin letters that have not been published to date. Part 2, *Amicorum Sermones Mutui*, includes three volumes of correspondence between Dantiscus and those of his friends whose contacts with him, as documented by their letters, are of major importance for broader studies on European humanism. Part 3, *Epistolae et Commentationes*, will include several volumes devoted to interesting trends and issues that can be explained on the basis of Dantiscus's correspondence. Part 4, *Inventarium*, offers a four-volume inventory of the 12,000 known manuscript documents

containing Dantiscus's letters. Part 5 includes materials presented during sessions that accompany the presentation of volumes in this series to the International Board of the research project. The *Corpus of Ioannes Dantiscus' Texts and Correspondence* was posted on the web in 2010, at <http://dantiscus.al.uw.edu.pl>, as an advance version of the *Corpus Epistularum Ioannis Dantisci* produced in book form.

The inventory volume is devoted primarily to the Latin letters to Dantiscus that have been numbered 3241 to 6010; they document his official activity, both as diplomat and churchman, along with his contacts with members of the *respublica litteraria* throughout Europe. Also contained in this volume are ninety-seven vernacular letters, including thirty-seven in Spanish, thirty-five in Polish, sixteen in Italian, four in Czech, three in Dutch, and two in French; the German letters are found in volume 2/2. Most of these letters survive in original fair copies, since Dantiscus was meticulous about preserving his correspondence. This has facilitated the work of the editors, but there were still problems to overcome. For one thing, the collection was dispersed from its original home in the archives of the bishops of Ermland, so that relevant material is now found in forty-eight libraries in fifteen countries around Europe. What is more, many letters were bound in sewn files, which means that text is damaged or obscured where the pages were sewn deeply into the spine of the file, and some of the relevant collections are better organized than others. In the making of the inventory, the letters have been divided first by language, then arranged chronologically. Information about the addressee, the place from which the letter was sent, and the date appears first, followed by references to manuscript sources, print and web publications of the letters, and notes that contain a variety of supplementary information.

The volume on *New Sources* contains six papers and an extensive supplement. Anna Skolimowska begins with a discussion of one of the most important sources for this project, Files H.154 and H.155 in the Uppsala University Library, including a stemma that illustrates the links between the originals and the main copy books that is extremely useful for anyone who wants to navigate through this material. The next four papers discuss poems by Dantiscus. Gilbert Tournoy offers a critical edition of two newly discovered poems, *De Lucretia Barbara* and *In Lucretiam Romanam sese interficientem*, while

Anna Skolimowska discusses the manuscript sources of these two works. Jerzy Axer then redates the autobiographical poem *Vita Iohannis Dantisci* to 1534 from the date previously assigned to it (1548), which forces a change to the ideological interpretation of the text. Anna Skolimowska's study of the *Vaticinium riuturæ Poloniae* shows that this poem endured as political propaganda for almost 200 years, while Walter Ludwig's publication of a previously unknown poem by Joseph Justus Scaliger, *In tyrannidem Papatus sive Superstitio*, documents conflicts and relationships within the international scholarly network. The critical edition contained in the supplement, Mercurino Arborio di Gattinara's oration from 1516, promotes the idea of a new universal monarchy along with many self-apologetic elements.

These two volumes, along with the series of which they are a part, suggest the need for basic editions of important Neo-Latin writers, along with the importance of eastern and central Europe, areas that are often overlooked by scholars in other countries, for a full understanding of later Latin culture. They belong in all research libraries within the field. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *The Codex Fori Mussolini: A Latin Text of Italian Fascism.* By Han Lamers and Bettina Reitz-Joosse. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016. X + 139 pages. \$89.99. The book under review contributes to the exploration of non-religious uses of post-classical Latin by rediscovering, translating, and analyzing a Latin text stored under the Mussolini Obelisk. This obelisk, located at the entrance of the former Mussolini Forum (presently "Foro Italico") in Rome, was planned and built by the *Duce* of Fascism only four years after the first project.

The first part of the book ("The *Codex Fori Mussolini* in Context") consists of eight chapters, in which the authors analyze the origin, authorship, and location of the *Codex* and many issues related to this text. The second part provides an excellent translation of the Latin text into English, an account of the textual variants, and a commentary. A very useful timeline and an ample bibliography complete this book, which is an excellent tool for any reader wishing to explore the history and institutions of the Fascist period in Italy.

The authors suggest that, with this text, Mussolini intended to leave a message, being aware of the imminent fall of the regime. Thus, in 1932, the *Duce* had a “time capsule” built together with the obelisk. According to the 1989 *Oxford English Dictionary*, a time capsule is “a container used to store for posterity a selection of objects thought to be representative of life at a particular time.” Such capsules may be buried at the inauguration of buildings, in order to be found in the future. For example, a capsule Samuel Adams buried in 1795 under the foundations of the State House was opened in 2015 at the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston. NASA did the same in 1977 with the Voyager Golden Records, containing sounds and images selected to portray life and culture on Earth and carried into space by the Voyager 1 and 2 spacecraft.

It is more likely, though, that Mussolini’s *codex* aimed to provide future historians with a source that might differ from the systematic denigration of the regime that, as Tacitus and Suetonius witness and the *Duce* knew, is typical *post mortem dictatoris*; indeed, Fascism did not express any doctrine comparable to the Nazi “Tausendjähriges Reich.” Similarly, Augustus left his *Res gestae*, which have become a fundamental historical source to outline the positive aspects of his life and rule. Nevertheless, the *Codex Mussolini* cannot be considered as the *Duce*’s spiritual testament: in 1932, Fascism was still rising and had not reached its highest point yet, which was represented by the conquest of the Empire in 1936.

As for the use of Latin, the authors suggest that it was intended to establish a connection with the Roman Empire, as well as to show Latin as the universal language of a sort of Fascist International, opposing the Communist International. The revival of the Roman Empire and “Romanità” (“Romanness”) were certainly two of the main elements of Fascism. For Fascism, however, the external aspects of this revival and a pragmatic view of Italy’s fate mattered much more than any attempt to recover ancestral theories or traditions following the Nazi model. Fascism was totally Italian: as Mussolini remarked, “We can look at some doctrines from North of the Alps with supreme contempt” (Bari, September 6, 1932).

The Catholic Church had already established Latin as a universal language. In 1923, Giovanni Gentile’s reform of the Italian educational

system gave great importance to the study of classical culture in general and the Latin language in particular. In this way, national education at the time of Fascism was definitely oriented toward classical studies. The use of Latin in the *Codex* aimed to preserve the goals and memory of the entire Mussolini Forum, which now, seventy years after the fall of Fascism, continues to be used successfully.

Latin mottos and sentences can also be read on coins, monuments, buildings, etc. of other nations. The earliest national motto of the United States was *E pluribus unum*, which was followed by “In God We Trust” only in 1956. The words *E pluribus unum* appear on one-dollar bills, as well as on Capitol Hill in Washington, D.C., where we also find *Annuit Coeptis, Novus Ordo Seclorum*, and the date *MDCCLXXVI* (1776) in Roman numbers. Many other examples may be quoted, but none of them shows any attempt to replace American English with classical Latin in a hypothetical Capitalist International.

The book contains much information and, at the same time, is pleasant to read. In addition to an accurate translation of the Latin text, it provides a general view of the planning, building, and propagandistic use of the entire Mussolini Forum, where the obelisk is still standing: its Latin inscription—not hidden, but in full evidence—reads: *Mussolini Dux*. (Marco Valli, University of Rome-La Sapienza)

◆ *Exemplary Reading. Printed Renaissance Commentaries on Valerius Maximus (1470–1600)*. By Marijke Crab. Zürich: Lit Verlag, 2015. 328 pp. €59.90. Just as the protagonist of Dostoevsky’s “Bobok” finds that at times the dead begin to babble after a couple days in the ground, so it happens that an author sometimes rises from the grave and bursts out “I should like a taste of life!” In this diligent study of printed commentaries on Valerius Maximus’s *Memorable Deeds and Sayings*, Marijke Crab breathes new life into the unread by showing how Renaissance scholars printed, commented on, and interpreted an author whose corpus in our day has yet to receive a proper burial. The genre of *exemplum* literature elides the line between history, rhetoric, and moral philosophy and thus appealed to the humanists of the fifteenth century for the same reason that its popularity began to decline in the sixteenth. In fact, the change in Valerius Maximus’s identity from moral philosopher to historian was accompanied by a

shift in the way commentators packaged the text for their readers. Crab demonstrates that around the middle of the sixteenth century, the line-by-line school commentaries that swallowed the text and regurgitated it to students were replaced by a more erudite series of *annotationes* that followed the text as an appendix in smaller octavo volumes. With this transition away from the classroom and into the scholar's study, the commentaries of the later sixteenth century were almost exclusively concerned with questions of a philological nature. Crab's work thus informs us as much about the *fortuna* of Valerius Maximus in the Renaissance as it does about the emergence of a new kind of textual philology, which at once baptized Valerius Maximus a historian and found him increasingly unworthy of the name.

The author begins her account with Dionigi Da Borgo San Sepolcro, whose commentary on Valerius Maximus was the first to be printed in the fifteenth century (before 1475). Comparing it with scholastic commentaries on philosophical texts, she concludes that Dionigi treated Valerius Maximus not as an historian but as a moral philosopher and that his commentary relied on the traditional format of medieval exegesis. In 1482 a collection of student notes, or *recolleetae*, on Valerius Maximus was printed in Venice under the name of Omnibonus Leonicensus. This commentary was quickly replaced in 1487 by a student of Omnibonus, Oliverius Arzignanensis, who set out to vindicate his teacher's reputation in 1487 by supplementing the commentary attributed to his teacher with an "erudite work of reference, intended for scholars as well as students" (109). Both of these commentaries proceeded line-by-line, emphasizing the usefulness of Valerius Maximus's *exempla* to students. The commentary printed in 1506 under the name of Theophilus Chalcondyles was an exception to this trend. Aside from the question of authorship, forged as it was in a polemic between Aulus Janus Parrhasius and Alexander Minutianus, this learned commentary was the first to take questions of a text-critical nature into consideration and thus anticipated the commentaries of the later sixteenth century. In 1510 Jodocus Badius Ascensius's "familiar" commentary offered a paraphrase to lazy students and a companion to Oliverius and Theophilus, alongside of whose commentaries it was printed in a "triumphant triumvirate." In 1553 Henricus Glareanus introduced a new stage in the history of printed commentaries, as he

was the first to raise questions about the historical credibility of some of the *exempla* not from a moral, but from a text-critical perspective. In 1567 Stephanus Pighius followed in tow by inaugurating what Crab calls the the “aetas Pighiana” (1567–1600), a period concerned almost exclusively with textual criticism.

Not only will scholars of Renaissance humanism find the book rich in information, especially about some lesser-known figures such as Oliverius Arzignanensis and Theophilus Chalcondyles, but Marijke Crab’s contribution also stands as a useful case study in the history of the book, humanist education, the printed commentary tradition, and the history of classical scholarship (Adam Foley, University of Notre Dame).

◆ *Pierre Ramus et la critique du pédantisme: Philosophie, humanisme et culture scolaire au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle.* By Marie-Dominique Couzinet. Paris: Champion, 2015. 536 pp. This monograph offers a new contribution to the history of philosophy and education in sixteenth-century France. It tells the story of how both the University as an institution and philosophy as a discipline became humanist due to the efforts of Petrus Ramus (1515–1572). With humanism initially having been characterised by a philological orientation, and secondly having originated outside the context of the university, which was at Ramus’s time still bearing scholastic Aristotelian traits, Ramus eventually came to be the missing link between humanism, education, academic culture, and philosophy. By means of his teachings, collectively known as Ramism today, he set out to reform the existing educational programme and to shake the humanistic world view. Marie-Dominique Couzinet approaches this aspect in three big parts: 1) “Contre les professeurs: critiques du pédantisme”; 2) “Ramus vu par ses biographes”; and 3) “Philosophie et éloquence.”

In her introduction (9–25), Couzinet prepares the subsequent argument convincingly by providing some initial thoughts on early French humanism and its development in the sixteenth century, which paved the way for Ramus’s reforms. The slow but gradual establishment of humanism in France during the first half of the sixteenth century led to a critical reassessment of the dogmatic conception of knowledge in general, and the Aristotelian system in particular. Knowledge and

truth were from now on meant to be rearranged and made applicable. According to Couzinet, Ramus, one of the first key figures of French humanism, could meet these demands perfectly, as he came from a humble background and was, to a great degree, a self-educated man. This path of life would ultimately shape his view of the academic culture of knowledge and the purpose of philosophy. As a *lecteur royale* (since 1551) and a member of various reform committees at the Collège de France, he exerted a considerable influence on the educational programme at the Faculty of Arts. The proclaimed goal of his measures (this included, among other things, the implementation of a new canon of literary and philosophical reading, or the direct interpretation of and commenting on ancient texts by means of dialectical principles beyond Aristotle) was to educate the students broadly on the basis of a combination of philosophy and elocution, and to equip them correspondingly for the part they were later going to play in society.

In the first part of her investigation (“Contre les professeurs: critiques du pédantisme”, 27–180), Couzinet argues against the school of modern scholarship that views Ramus as an inexpert schoolmaster instead of a humanist, and Ramism as just as an educational intervention instead of a philosophical school of thought. Representatives of this opinion often criticise Ramus’s subordination of elocution to dialectic (whereas for proper humanists, they say, philology and rhetoric stand out inseparably), as well as Ramus’s practical orientation toward philosophy (whereas proper philosophers, they say, are ethically geared). Couzinet, however, is able to show in defence of Ramus that this critical attitude towards him draws heavily on the early modern accusation of ‘pédantisme’ as stated by Michel de Montaigne in chapters xxv–xxvi of his first book of *Essais* or Giordano Bruno in his Italian dialogues. To that end, she gives a rough overview of the state of research on Ramus and Ramism, analysing the criticism of Ramus starting from Montaigne and Bruno. She then puts this research into perspective by highlighting Ramus’s commitment to philosophy and education without either taking a biased position or reducing humanism to a simple ideology and education and philosophy to a simple set of techniques to produce knowledge.



In order to support her argument, Couzinet opposes the criticism of Ramus in the second part of her investigation (“Ramus vu par ses biographes,” 181–300) by looking at another sort of material on Ramus: biographies written by some of his pupils after his death. These *vitae* indeed constitute a relevant source, as they provide us with both direct (from Ramus) and indirect (from his pupils) traces of Ramus’s doctrines. Specifically, Couzinet conducts a comparative study into the life, character, oeuvre, and philosophy of Ramus on the basis of three key biographies. They were composed by the German philosopher Johann Thomas Freigius (1575), the French pastor Théophile Banosius (1576), and the French doctor Nicolas Nancelius (1599). Couzinet’s close examination of these *vitae* reveals that Ramus’s humble background indeed gave rise to his understanding of the practical usefulness of education, that he actively encouraged and supported the practical realisation of his teachings in class by means of a steady interchange of ideas, that his principles of teaching and thinking had a far-reaching impact on the social and political context and did not remain restricted to the academic world, that he spent years improving his dialectical system, and that he was the first humanist ever to pay attention to the fruitful conjunction of eloquence and philosophy. At the same time as Couzinet is carving out these views, she does not fail to deduce from them some possible points of criticism that might have driven Montaigne or Bruno into their judgement. Among those points are the fundamental distinction in philosophy between ‘teaching’ and ‘thinking,’ the joint undertaking of teacher and students, Ramus’s perpetual labor to improve his efforts to reach the never-altered goal, his reduction of the rhetorical system to *elocutio* and *pronunciatio*, or his insistence on the actual usage of knowledge, which must have sounded like an offence to a humanist’s ears. The thing, however, that stands out as consistently unclear in all three biographies and which certainly had to arouse the suspicion of Ramus’s challengers was the question of whether rhetoric or dialectic was of greater importance for his thinking.

This open question is treated in the third part of Couzinet’s investigation (“Philosophie et éloquence,” 301–474). For that purpose, she looks directly at Ramus’s discourse conducted in texts like his *Aristotelicae animadversiones* (1543), *Dialecticae institutiones* (1554),

and *Prooemium reformandae Parisiensis Academiae* (1562). Of particular interest to her are the passages in which Ramus talks about his objectives and practices, allowing insights into the nature of his proclaimed *usus* of knowledge. The results show that apparently for Ramus, rhetoric is supposed to depict the process of thinking in detail and is therefore closely related to dialectic – or even serves the syllogistic method. At the end of each thinking process stands the *usus*, which eventually proves or refutes the truth of the knowledge sought.

Couzinet's monograph closes with an extensive bibliography listing literature by Ramus, other primary sources ancient and early modern, as well as general research literature on Ramus. The index is divided into a useful index of names on the one hand and an index of subjects on the other. The book in sum, although not comprehensively innovative, provides at least some new aspects that contribute in part to a better understanding of Ramus's oeuvre and philosophy. Presenting insights both from a secondary (first and second part) and a primary (third part) perspective, it makes a well-rounded study, notwithstanding the lengthy and the repetitive character especially of the third part. Essentially the study constitutes a continuation and specialisation of Couzinet's earlier research on Ramus in *Ramus et l'Université* (together with Jean-Marc Mandosio, Paris, 2004) and *Sub specie hominis: Études sur le savoir humain au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 2007). With its critical analysis of the existing research literature on Ramus, the book can also be read with profit by non-experts on Ramus or as an introductory text to Ramus and Ramism as a research field. Last but not least, Couzinet's French displays a praiseworthy degree of readability and comprehensibility – a pragmatic approach to educating the reader that would certainly have gained Ramus's appreciation. (Isabella Walser, Ludwig Boltzmann Institute for Neo-Latin Studies, Innsbruck)

◆ *Amaltheae favilla domus: Un'antologia poetica da Paolo ad Aurelio Amalteo*. Edited by Matteo Venier. Pubblicazioni dell'Accademia San Marco, Letteratura, 10. Pordenone: Accademia San Marco, 2016. 654 pages. The subject of this book is the family Amalteo, who moved from Innsbruck to Pordenone in the fifteenth century and occupied a prominent position there, as painters, poets, scholars, notaries, government officials, schoolmasters, and churchmen, for the next

five hundred years. Many of their writings have survived, which offered Matteo Venier the opportunity to make a selection of the most important works and the local learned society, the Accademia San Marco, the chance to bring the resulting anthology into print.

After a hundred-page introduction that presents the key members of the family and traces their history, the anthology proper begins. The members of the first generation, three brothers, wrote in Latin, with the works of Paolo (edited by Marta Varutti) being represented by three poems, and Marcantonio (edited by Antonio Ferracin) and Francesco (edited by Matteo Venier) by one each. Francesco had three sons, one of whom is similarly represented by three works but the other two of whom are presented at greater length (all three were edited by Chiara Rossi). Girolamo's oeuvre is represented by a dozen works, while Giovanni Battista, whose compositions extend through a third of the book, offers seventeen poems in Greek and Latin along with a fifty-seven-item collection of lyric poetry. Giovanni Battista's efforts mark the decisive turn from Latin to the vernacular, with the work of the four remaining members of the family all being in Italian. Ottavio, son of Girolamo, wrote two poems (edited by Matteo Venier) presented here, while the other three authors come from other branches of the family. Maria Cristina Cescutti presents a sonnet by Alvisè Amalteo, while Matteo Venier offers several works of Ascanio's and Elisa Tomaselli has edited more than a hundred pages worth of material by Aurelio, including the libretti of two operas and thirty-one poems. After the Seicento, the creative impulses of the family declined and the anthology comes to an end.

This work is valuable for several reasons. For one, it rescues from virtual oblivion the work of several perfectly competent Neo-Latin writers, which remains one of the principal tasks of scholarship in the field. Second, it offers a clear example of when and how one family made the shift from Latin to the vernacular, a subject that continues to attract attention in Neo-Latin circles but that would benefit from a broadening of the evidentiary base on which conclusions are drawn. And finally, this anthology offers an eloquent witness to the importance of local history, done by scholars from the area who can offer a balance between broader national and international trends on the one hand, and what makes a particular region distinctive on the other.

Given the point of origin of this family, one thinks of the monumental *Tyrolis latina: Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur in Tirol*, edited by Martin Korenjak, Florian Schaffenrath, Lav Subaric, and Karlheinz Töchterle (Vienna, 2012), of which *Amaltheae favilla domus* can be seen as a logical extension.

The book is nicely produced, with each work annotated to allow a basic first reading and with two indices, one of manuscripts consulted and the other of names. All in all, a nice book, well worth spending some time with. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Ubi fera sunt*. By Maurice Sendak. Translated by Richard Lafleur. Mundelein, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, Inc., 2016. Unpaginated. \$24. By definition, Neo-Latin continues up to the present moment, which has spawned a cottage industry of sorts that in a sort of reverse translation process, renders works originally written in a vernacular language into Latin. One thinks, for example, of *Cattus Petasatus*, *Quomodo invidiosulus nomine Grinchus Christi natalem abrogavit*, *Winnie ille Pu*, *Alicia in terra mirabili*, and of course *Harrius Potter et philosophi lapis*. Now we have *Ubi fera sunt*.

*Where the Wild Things Are* was first published in 1963. The text and illustrations are by Maurice Sendak (1928–2012), who was generally recognized at his death as one of the greatest, if not the greatest, children’s book artist of the twentieth century. He went on to write and illustrate many more books afterward, but *Where the Wild Things Are* is the work on which his reputation rests: it has sold over twenty million copies to date, won the 1964 Randolph Caldecott Medal for “the most distinguished American picture book for children,” and in 2015, a half century later, was ranked first in *Time* magazine’s list of the “100 Best Children’s Books of All Time.” Two film versions exist (the 1973 one with music and narration by Peter Schickele and the 2009 one directed by Spike Jonze), as do translations into French, German, Spanish, Hebrew, and even Finnish.

Ostensibly this is a story about a boy who gets angry at his mother because he got sent to bed without his dinner, but this catastrophe leads to an imaginary voyage and a menagerie of fanged monsters, here presented in the remastered images that were prepared for the fiftieth anniversary edition. Here is how the Latin version begins:

Ea nocte Maximus vestem lupinam gerebat et faciebat malum unius modi et alterius. Mater eius eum appellavit, 'ferum!' et Maximus dixit, 'Comedam te!' Missus est, igitur, ad lectum sine edendo quidquam. Illa ipsa nocte in cubiculo Maximi silva crescebat et crescebat et crescebat, dum de camara eius pependerunt vites et parietes circumundique facti sunt mundus et oceanus praeterlapsus est cum cumba privata Maximo et per noctem diemque enavigavit.

I should probably stop here, in part because the words without the pictures really do not do the story justice.

What to do with this, of course, is the question. One can enjoy it as a novelty, at several different levels: the Latin generally follows classical usage, but those who once had some Latin but forgot most of it will find that lexical and syntactical choices that align well with English have been favored. What is more, as past president of the American Classical League, the translator has had the idea of using this book as a means to teach Latin via a story that is familiar to many of his Anglophone readers. Accordingly there is a website with classroom tools (<http://www.bolchazy.com/Ubi-Fera-Sunt-Where-the-Wild-Things-Are-in-Latin-P3892.aspx>), including a vocabulary list and a guide to pronouncing Latin.

This is one of those little projects that will not change the course of western civilization, but it is a charming trifle that offers eloquent testimony to the enduring value of Latin and to the fact that Neo-Latin lives on, even now. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ «*Studium in Libris*»: *Mélanges en l'honneur de Jean-Louis Charlet*. Edited by Herbert de la Portbarré-Viard and Annick Stoehr-Monjou. Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Antiquité, 201. Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 2016. XXXVIII + 630 pp. €76. As past president of the International Association for Neo-Latin Studies, Jean-Louis Charlet is well known to many readers of *NLN*. What is perhaps less well known is just how wide his interests are and how productive he has been over his forty-five-year teaching career. Author of some 230 scholarly publications along with another eighty-three reviews, Charlet has worked in the entire range of post-classical Latin. His books and articles on late antiquity and the Middle Ages

are anchored in a major edition of Claudian, while he is probably best known as a Neo-Latinist for his editions of Niccolò Perotti, although his work in this field covers poetry and metrics; lexicography and encyclopedias; philology, epistolography, commentaries, and the humanist reception of classical texts; history of paper, books, and libraries; and ancient, medieval, and modern numismatics. Less well known outside France is the role Charlet has played in the administrative and political life of the French university: from 1995 to 2004 he was secretary general of the Fédération Nationale des Syndicats Autonomes de l'Enseignement Supérieur et de la Recherche; from 1996–1997, secretary general of the Confédération syndicale de l'Éducation nationale (CSEN); and from 2004 to 2007, president of the Fédération Nationale des Syndicats Autonomes de l'Enseignement Supérieur et de la Recherche (renamed Autonomesup). Now technically *en pension*, as he likes to say, he continues to maintain a work schedule that would kill many a much younger man.

It is little surprise, then, that Charlet's friends and admirers would assemble a *mélange* in his honor. It begins with an introduction by the editors and a useful list of Charlet's publications, followed by a suitably lengthy *tabula gratulatoria*. The volume quite properly divides into two sections, reflecting the major areas of its honoree's scholarship. The first one, on late antiquity and the Middle Ages, offers fourteen essays in the first subsection: Florence Garambois-Vasquez, "Dire l'indicible dan les épigrammes d'Ausone: quelques exemples"; Franca Ela Consolino, "Le epistole di Claudiano a Olibrio e Probrino (*carm. min.* 40 et 41)"; Isabella Gualandri, "Immagini di Marte in Claudiano"; Henriette Harich-Schwarzbauer, "Claudians *Bellum Gildonicum* irritiert. Zwischen 'Blitzkrieg' und 'Fürstenspiegel'"; Heinz Hofmann, "Weitere Überlegungen zu 'Andachtsbildern' bei Claudian"; André-François Basson, "Consoling Pneumatius and Fidelis: Paulinus of Nola's *carm.* 31"; Jean-Michelle Poinssotte, "Rutilius Namatianus, *De reditu suo* 1, 377–398: un testament antijuif (?) de la Rome païenne"; Michele Cutino, "Per un inquadramento dell'*Heptateuchos* di 'Cipriano Gallo': cronologia relativa e finalità compositive"; Paul-Augustin Deproost, "'Tout est né ici'. La pédagogie des délices dans le paradis de Claudius Marius Victorinus"; Annick Stoehr-Monjou, "L'apparition d'Apollon dans le *Rapt d'Hélène* de Dracontius: mis en

scène d'une réécriture sous forme de mosaïque virgilienne (*Romul.* 8, 183–212)"; Vincent Zarini, "Ennode entre Prudence, Ambroise et le 'monde': à propos de deux poèmes de la *Paraenesis didascalica*"; Michael Roberts, "Stylistic Innovation and Variation in the Poetry of Venantius Fortunatus"; Michel Jean-Louis Perrin, "L'utilisation des citations bibliques par l'abbé Raban Maur dans le *De humore parentum* (834): quelques considérations littéraires, historiques et politiques"; and Sylvain Leroy, "La réécriture des Noces de Cana dans le *De Gratia Novi Testamenti* (XI<sup>e</sup> s.): de la métamorphose de l'eau à la mutation d'un genre." The second subsection, on the transmission of texts, textual criticism, and literary criticism, presents four works: Benoît Gain, "Les épitaphes de Grégoire de Nazianze sur son ami Basile de Césarée. Aperçu sur leur transmission et leur tonalité chrétienne"; François Dolbeau, "La prédication d'Augustin pour l'Ascension: quelques problèmes philologiques"; François Ploton-Nicollet, "Les Huns franchissent le cours gelé du Danube: note critique et esthétique à Sidoine Apollinaire, *carm.* 2,269–271"; and Luca Cadili, "Le poète du *Culex* et ses imitateurs à l'époque carolingienne: le ms. *Trevirensis* 1086 (Trier, Stadtbibliothek)." The third and final subsection, on archaeological texts and contributions, contains Gaëlle Herbert de la Portbarré-Viard, "Dire le marbre des édifices chrétiens dans les textes latins tardifs (IV<sup>e</sup>–VI<sup>e</sup> siècles)"; Michel Fixot, "Du vestibule paléochrétien à la tour-porche médiévale, une traduction architecturale: les exemples de Saint-Victor de Marseille et de la cathédrale de Fréjus"; and Jean Guon, "De l'Antiquité tardive au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle: le dossier d'un 'corps saint' des catacombs transféré en 1863 de Rome à Chaillol (Hautes-Alpes)."

The remaining fourteen essays are distributed among three subsections in the second part of the volume, on Neo-Latin subjects. The subsection on editing, translation, and commenting on texts presents Jean-Frédéric Chevalier, "Les strophes saphiques d'Albertino Mussato: poésie, tragédie et spiritualité dans l'*Hymne sur la Passion du Seigneur*"; James Hirstein, "Trois nouveaux poèmes de Veit Kopp, conservés par Beatus Rhenanus: les épitaphes à la mémoire de Clara Spiegel et de Johann Huttich"; Catherine Schneider, "Le *Tribunus Marianus* par Lorenzo Patarol (1674–1727). Un essai de traduction"; Perrine Galand, "Les precepts matrimoniaux de Jakob Micyllus (*De*

*officio uxoris*) entre morale et élégie”; and Béatrice Mesdhjian-Charlet, “*Cento nuptialis a Ioanne Aloysio Caroleto per matrimonium suum compositus et a Perrina Galando recitatus*.” The second subsection, on philology and lexicography, contains Jean Meyers, “*Grande volumen comportavi: la conception de l’Evagatorium d’après le manuscrit autographe de Félix Fabri*”; Cécile Bertrand-Dagenbach and Agnès Molinier-Arbo, “L’apport de Pétrarque à l’établissement du texte de la *Vie d’Alexandre Sévère* de l’*Histoire Auguste*”; Luigi-Alberto Sanchi, “Les manuscrits pliniens étudiés par Budé”; Florence Bistagne, “*Urbanus, festivus, comis, lepidus: quelques essais pour nommer la civilisation des moeurs au Quattrocento*”; Anna Maranini, “Incontro di culture antiche e moderne: tra lessicografia, filologia e critica”; and Ginette Vagenheim, “Polémique philologique de Lilio Gregorio Giraldi contre Niccolò Perotti et Ermolao Barbaro sous la plume de Pirro Ligorio (1512–1583). Remarques sur la composition des *Antichità romane*.” The final subsection, on texts, images, and arts of poetry, presents Anne Rolet and Stéphane Rolet, “Proto-emblématique et symbolique: à propos de quelques images du *Labirynth de Fortune* de Jean Bouchet”; Sylvie Laigneau-Fontaine, “Poésie et peinture dans l’épigramme Lyonnaise des années 1530–1540”; and Marie-France Guipponi-Gineste, “Place et rôle de Claudien dans l’art poétique de Jacob Balde (*Dissertatio praevia de studio poetico, Expeditio Polemico-Poëtica*).” The volume closes with abstracts of the articles (in French and English, along with a third language if an essay is written in German or Italian) and four indices, of Biblical references, authors and texts, names of persons, and manuscripts.

As the titles suggest, the volume contains a diverse collection of essays touching on a wide variety of topics, joined together in a handsome, well-organized volume that is a worthy tribute to one of France’s greatest living Neo-Latinists. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)