



**EVENTEENTH-**



**ENTURY**



**EWS**

**SPRING - SUMMER 2017**

**Vol. 75**

**Nos. 1&2**

Including

**THE NEO-LATIN NEWS Vol. 65, Nos. 1&2**

---

# SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

VOLUME 75, Nos. 1&2

SPRING-SUMMER, 2017

**SCN**, an official organ of the Milton Society of America and of the Milton Section of the Modern Language Association, is published as a double issue two times each year with the support of the English Departments of Texas A&M University.

**SUBMISSIONS:** As a scholarly review journal, *SCN* publishes only commissioned reviews. As a service to the scholarly community, *SCN* also publishes news items. A current style sheet, previous volumes' Tables of Contents, and other information all may be obtained via our home page on the World Wide Web. Books for review and queries should be sent to:

Prof. Donald R. Dickson  
English Department  
4227 Texas A&M University  
College Station, Texas 77843-4227

E-Mail: [d-dickson@tamu.edu](mailto:d-dickson@tamu.edu)  
<http://scn.sites.tamu.edu>

ISSN 0037-3028

# **SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS**

## **EDITOR**

**DONALD R. DICKSON**

Texas A&M University

## **ASSOCIATE EDITORS**

Livia Stoenescu, Texas A&M University  
Michele Marrapodi, University of Palermo  
Patricia Marie García, University of Texas  
E. Joe Johnson, Clayton State University

## **WEBMASTER**

Megan N. Pearson, Texas A&M University

## **EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS**

Megan N. Pearson, Texas A&M University  
Hunter Corb, Texas A&M University

## CONTENTS

VOLUME 75, NOS. 1&2 ..... SPRING-SUMMER, 2017

Peter Redford, ed., <i>The Burley Manuscript</i> . Review by DONALD R. DICKSON .....	1
John Cramsie, <i>British Travellers and the Encounter with Britain</i> . Review by ANDREW McRAE .....	3
Judith H. Anderson, <i>Light and Death: Figuration in Spenser, Kepler, Donne, Milton</i> . Review by THOMAS P. ANDERSON .....	7
Igor Djordjevic, <i>King John (Mis)Remembered: The Dunmow Chronicle, the Lord Admiral's Men, and the Formation of Cultural Memory</i> . Review by DANIEL L. KEEGAN .....	10
Maren-Sofie Røstvig, <i>Ars Aeterna and Other Essays on Literary Structure</i> . With a Preface and Appendix by H. Neville Davies. Review by MARIA SALENIUS .....	17
Brian Lockey, <i>Early Modern Catholics, Royalists, and Cosmopolitans. English Transnationalism and the Christian Commonwealth</i> . Review by JONATHAN WRIGHT.....	21
John Walter, <i>Covenanting Citizens: The Protestation Oath and Popular Political Culture in the English Revolution</i> . Review by BRETT F. PARKER.....	25
Palmira Fontes da Costa, ed. <i>Medicine, Trade and Empire: Garcia de Orta's Colloquies on the Simples and Drugs of India (1563) in Context</i> . Review by ALESSANDRO GIOSTRA.....	29
Michael Hunter, <i>Boyle Studies. Aspects of the Life and Thought of Robert Boyle</i> . Review by ALESSANDRO GIOSTRA.....	33
<i>The Spanish Golden Age: Painting and Sculpture in the Time of Velázquez</i> . REVIEW BY LIVIA STOENESCU .....	36
NEO-LATIN NEWS.....	40

Peter Redford, ed. *The Burley Manuscript*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017. xiii + 447 pp. £90.00. Review by DONALD R. DICKSON, TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY.

In the 1879 report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, Alfred J. Horwood brought to the attention of the scholarly world the existence of a seventeenth-century manuscript miscellany in the possession of the Finch family at Burley-on-the-Hill, noting that it contained “copies of letters seemingly by and to Sir Henry Wotton.” Logan Pearsall Smith then made considerable use of it for his edition of *The Life and Letters of Henry Wotton* (Oxford, 1907) at which time a transcript of the Donne-Wotton portions was made. Herbert J. C. Grierson drew upon the manuscript for his edition of *The Poems of John Donne* (Oxford, 1912), having discovered in it the previously unknown verse letter to Wotton, “H: W: in Hiber: belligeranti.” When an extensive fire broke out at Burley-on-the-Hill in 1908 that destroyed most of the archives and library, this transcript was thought to be the only witness of the Burley Ms. until 1960 when I. A. Shapiro discovered the manuscript in the National Register of Archives where it had been moved for safekeeping before the fire. Now that Peter Redford has edited this important manuscript, those interested in Donne, Wotton, Spenser, and other poets of the seventeenth century will be able to assess its significance more readily.

The Burley Ms. contains 373 folios (61 of which are blank) with writing on both recto and verso. All told there are 616 items in this manuscript miscellany that includes poems, letters, semiofficial reports, and other kinds of writing, most in English. The volume was assembled from previously copied booklets that were acquired, expanded, and eventually bound together by Sir William Parkhurst (1581-1667), who had been secretary to Sir Henry Wotton in Venice and later Warden of the Mint. Redford conveniently gathers all that is now known of Parkhurst into a brief chapter on his life (as yet there is no *ODNB* article for him). About half of the manuscript is in Parkhurst’s hand; the rest, in various sixteenth- and seventeenth-century scribal hands, notably a hand called “D1” by Grierson and Pearsall Smith that copied most of the Donne materials. While Redford lists all 616 items with an *incipit* and notes about the scribal hand that produced the item,

he only transcribes the private letters and the verse in English. *The Burley Manuscript* is thus more useful to students of literature than of history. His transcriptions retain the original spelling but expand contractions, normalize i/j and u/v, so the text is reader friendly (though not diplomatic).

One of Redford's most interesting contributions is his theory of interception to explain how the "45 or so private letters" were copied into the Burley. Noting that the bulk of the Donne-Wotton correspondence (most in the hand of the D1 scribe) is from 1598-1601 when both men were employed as secretaries to Sir Thomas Egerton and the Earl of Essex, Redford argues that these letters were copies of copies made as part of a domestic surveillance effort most likely ordered by the Secretary of State, Sir Robert Cecil. This is a plausible explanation for why these early letters (which lack dates and subscriptions) were copied. It seems also clear that other letters that can be dated from the time of Wotton's first Venetian embassy (1604-1610) must have been copies of letters received in Venice. The emphasis on surveillance intercepts in Redford's account also takes care of a point of courtesy. In Donne's letter to Sir Henry Goodere that begins "S<sup>r</sup>. Only in obedience" and transmits a copy of his *Paradoxes*, Donne asks "on the religion of your friendship that no copy shall be taken"; the presence of a copy of the *Paradoxes* in the Burley Ms, it had been assumed, meant that the addressee had forsworn himself by making such a copy. Redford's theory of interception explains how a copy could have been made surreptitiously without consent. Equally interesting, though more difficult to prove, is his assertion that "memorised, rather than copied, texts may form at least part of the whole manuscript" (44). Redford considers textual variants in a number of poems that are potentially the result of faulty memory. These are plausible but readers will have to decide for themselves. In my view, these variants are not the sort that we see in comparisons to, for example, the Q1 text of *Hamlet* that seems almost certainly a pirated text based on memorial reconstruction.

The texts of the poems and letters presented in *The Burley Manuscript* make it possible to study the Burley as a manuscript miscellany. To assist in his own analysis of the manuscript, Redford constructed a database in which each item was indexed giving its precise location (often there are multiple items on a folio), title (where possible), the

first line of its text, its language, its genre, its author (when known), its addressee, its date, its handwriting, and notes about its scribe. Using this database, he can tell us 37% is in verse, 9% is private letters, and 7% is official letters; and 82% is in English. Would that Manchester University Press had included a digital form of this database as part of the edition, so that others could continue the analysis.

Redford's transcriptions are accurate though not without error: his item 452 is a letter, probably from Wotton to Donne, whose first line is transcribed "Right Honorable Lord: It may seem strang to you that ..." but actually reads "Right. Ho: L: It may seeme strang to y<sup>e</sup> Ho: that ..." (fol. 300v). (Evelyn Simpson also makes this same error in *A Study of the Prose Works of John Donne* [1948, 335].) Redford furthermore claims the *Donne Variorum* fails to cite a variant reading in line 17 of the Burley's witness of Donne's elegy "To his Mistress going to Bed," when it clearly does: while the copy text's "safely" is recorded in 22 witnesses, the rest of the 67 collated manuscripts read "softly" as designated in the textual apparatus by Σ, among whom is LR1 (the Burley Ms.). Still Redford's edition of this fascinating manuscript is a welcome contribution to scholarship of the period.

John Cramsie. *British Travellers and the Encounter with Britain*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2015. x + 552 pp. + 26 illus. \$80.00. Review by ANDREW McRAE, UNIVERSITY OF EXETER.

While the travels of early modern British men and women beyond their nation's shores have been addressed by a range of researchers in recent decades, the efforts of those who chose instead to examine their native lands have been less well documented. John Cramsie's *British Travellers and the Encounter with Britain* is the most thorough effort yet to tackle this question. It is concerned with the knowledge that such travellers accumulated, and the ways in which they went about their research. In particular, it pursues an argument that these writers perceived Britain as "multicultural" (6), not just in the model of the "three kingdoms," which has been dominant in recent seventeenth-century historiography, but also down to much more local levels. When these people travelled, they saw not sameness but "cultural

complexity” (7).

The book is structured into three parts, each of which is centred upon one key figure in the history of “the encounter with Britain.” In the first part this man is John Leland. This is the most logically organized of the book’s parts, with a chapter on Leland framed by a valuable opening chapter on the motivations behind travel at the outset of the early modern era, and later chapters on “Leland’s Scottish counterparts” (14) and the early efforts of chorographers, such as William Harrison, John Stow and William Lambarde, in the reign of Elizabeth. The material on Scotland, in particular, is fresh and engaging, demonstrating a parallel—and, in intriguing ways, interconnected—tradition of national description in this nation in the decades before the accession of James VI and I to the English throne.

The second section is centred on Fynes Moryson, a traveller most active in the early seventeenth century who has never had the level of attention that he warrants, and certainly not for his descriptions of Britain. Indeed his most valuable work on Britain was never published, apparently on account of a lack of interest from publishers. Other chapters in this section associate other writers, of roughly the same period, with what Cramsie defines as the same general project established by Moryson. Through this lens Cramsie approaches, among others, Thomas Churchyard, James Howell, William Brereton, and John Taylor. He even includes men, including Richard Carew and George Owen, whose descriptions stretched no further than the boundaries of their native counties. (While these county chorographers produced some of the most compelling descriptive writing of the period, they stretch Cramsie’s underlying concern with “travel” in ways he might have done more to examine.) Overall this proves to be an interesting yet in truth somewhat miscellaneous group. Cramsie tends to describe them as Moryson and his “stand-ins,” yet there is really very little sense in which they themselves appreciated their work in this way.

The third section is centred not so much on William Camden as on the long-term project of his *Britannia*, as it unfolded over more than one hundred years. Others have examined the development of this book from its first Latin edition in the 1580s through to the English translation of the “final” substantial folio edition of 1610. *British Travellers and the Encounter with Britain* is not greatly interested in

this process, though it is notably strong in its careful interpretation of Camden's representation of a land being formed through the influence of multiple cultures and civilisations. Crucially, it attends to the development of the *Britannia*, effectively as a multi-authored text, at the latter end of the seventeenth century. A number of men were involved in this project, including the best known, Edmund Gibson, along with fascinating figures such as the Scot Timothy Pont and the Welshman Edward Lhuyd. The distinguishing feature of this process of revision was the effort to approach the research in a systematic way, most notably through the use of questionnaires, completed as the travellers entered any new settlement. The gathering of knowledge, and hence the ways of understanding places and their histories, had changed substantially since the time of Camden himself.

The book is rich in its information and enlightening in its attention to some lesser-known figures. But the structure is not without its problems. Fundamentally the reader is struck by just how disparate a group of people—who resist comparison as much as they appear to invite it—Cramsie gathers together. For instance, claiming Moryson as somehow definitive of a movement, complete with “stand-ins,” is never entirely convincing, whereas following the *Britannia* over more than a century has the effect of grouping together men in different times with different interests. Another effect of this method are the “why not?” questions that it invites. Most notably in this regard, his collection of significant authors is exclusively learned and male, and this focus causes the elision of parallel traditions of writing that were equally sensitive to cultural differences, despite maybe appearing more frivolous in their motivations. Celia Fiennes, one of the most engaging of seventeenth-century travel writers, warrants only one passing mention.

The book's method is solidly based on description of material that will not be well known. Cramsie is uncomfortable with what he perceives as the “highly theorized” approaches of literary scholars, which seems unfortunate given the fact that his book's argument has so much to offer them. Cramsie's engagement with theories of cultural—and racial, another term which lurks fascinatingly at the margins of his research—identity is sketchy, largely confined to a survey in the introduction, and this leaves the conceptual development of his

argument somewhat limited. Moreover, it is not unrealistic to expect historians, in an age of interdisciplinarity, to engage with questions of form, genre and tone, all of which would have made a difference to this book. Cramsie has little to offer to ongoing debates about the politics of chorography, nor does he question how and why the idiosyncratic Moryson departs from that genre. Moryson's failure to find an audience is curious given the wealth of information that his work contains, and begs questions about the ways in which his work was packaged and received. To take another example, Churchyard's work is quite differently positioned in its tone—and hence in its imagined audience—by contrast with Camden's; so how does this lend shape to the respective texts' representations of the British nations and their many cultures? Taylor, who jokingly differentiated his populist and commercial project from that of the chorographers, also sits uneasily here, and Cramsie looks only at a very small selection of his work.

*British Travellers and the Encounter with Britain* is a very long book. At one point Cramsie reflects that it rather got out of hand, the final section expanding exponentially from his initial intention. Research works like that sometimes, yet it seems to me that tough decisions about the book's purpose were dodged along the way, by author and editors alike. As a description of relatively unknown material, the book works well enough, and some readers may appreciate the lengthy quotes and outlines of the contents and interests of relatively understudied works. For Moryson, or for the late seventeenth-century effort to revise the *Britannia*, this book deserves to become the first port of call for researchers for many years to come. But this book is driven also by an important argument about early modern understandings of nationhood, and this is somewhat swamped by the sheer weight of evidence. I suspect that many of the people who should engage with this book's arguments will not persevere with it, and that is unfortunate. It would have been more effective if it had been no more than half its eventual length.

Cramsie closes his book with a reflection on the politics of the national history syllabus in British schools. This is compelling and passionate, but feels misplaced at the end of such a doggedly scholarly book, otherwise speaking to an international audience for decades to come. It might have been better placed, reaching a wider and more

relevant audience, as an article in a relevant British educational journal. For the reader of *British Travellers and the Encounter with Britain*, however, it offers a final reminder of the strengths and weaknesses of Cramsie's project. This is a copious and capacious study, packed with information and detail, and underpinned by a powerful and admirable commitment to the material and topic. Yet its length will stretch its readers, and as a result the book may not achieve the impact it deserves.

Judith H. Anderson. *Light and Death: Figuration in Spenser, Kepler, Donne, Milton*. New York, NY: Fordham University Press, 2017. vii + 316 pages. \$65.00. Review by THOMAS P. ANDERSON, MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY.

Judith Anderson's *Light and Death: Figuration in Spenser, Kepler, Donne, Milton* is a wonderfully complex book. The author fills the book with complex close readings about analogy, metaphor and meaning in the poetry and prose from five of the most canonical early modern writers. Anderson explores complex early modern scientific discourse with rare depth and curiosity, and she shapes her audience's reading experience with a complex structure to her own book, which seeks to replicate Anderson's own process of the discovery that analogy is at the very core of both scientific and poetic discourse in the early modern period.

There is no ready and easy way to make sense of Anderson's argument in *Light and Death*. The book concludes provocatively that "analogy arguably vies in importance with the introduction into Western culture of the mathematical sign zero" (226). By tracing its point of origin to early modernity, the link between poetic and scientific discourse posed by Anderson effectively denaturalizes the perceived dichotomy between science and the humanities. The book's argument, therefore, has important implications across a university—and perhaps outside of a university as communities continue to establish values predicated on a two-culture mythology that pits scientific against humanistic inquiry.

At the core of Anderson's argument is a reading of analogy or analogical thinking from Aristotle inherited by Bacon, Galileo, and

Descartes. She argues that our own “modern framing” (83) separates “the concerns and methods of science and the imaginative arts and, more fundamentally, of things and words” (83). This tendency to view science as a narrative of progress that sheds the language of analogy and metaphor in its ever-more precise discovery pretends to “uproot without a trace” (83) the figurative language that had once been at the deep, psychological and imaginative core of scientific discourse and discovery. In the book’s fourth chapter “Connecting the Cultural Dots: Classical to Modern Traditions of Analogy,” Anderson offers a robust account of how scientific discourse redefines its own analogical practice to exclude other disciplines such as literature, philosophy, and religion. Focusing on the work of psychologists Dedre Gentner and Michael Jeziorski, Anderson shows how modern scientific frames altered the structure of analogy by stressing the structural content (79), a distinction that Anderson argues oversimplifies imaginative language, casting early modern analogy as “*mere metaphor*” (80).

The book’s fourth chapter is not only a trenchant critique of the transition in the way western culture accounted for the figure of analogy, but it also works diligently to present an alternative understanding of its function in scientific discourse. Anderson rehabilitates a classical understanding of analogy by exploring three essays in the history of science journal *Isis*. The articles by Katharine Park, Lorraine Daston, and Peter Galison all explore the force of the imaginative analogy in early modern science. This kind of deep engagement with historians and philosophers of science often gets relegated to the footnotes in literary analysis, but Anderson insists on its centrality to her argument for the “elusiveness of definitive difference between a rhetorical, psychological, and epistemological technique of analogy” within what we now tend to see as distinct systems of thought (90). Anderson’s work in the fourth chapter does not end, however, on contemporary scientific terrain; she turns back to Aristotle, and then Boethius, and then Aquinas to show that early modern scientists, even as they avoided transcendent metaphysics in their method and logic, do not “establish the absence of metaphor” from their practices (107).

The fourth chapter of *Light and Death* will unsettle some literary scholars (me) because of the demands it places on its audience (me). Yet, it is the book’s vital chapter, serving as the pivot between the

imaginative spaces occupied by darkness and light, death and life. Anderson locates her readers on more comfortable terrain in the book's other six chapters—a chapter on Spenser and Donne together, one on Spenser, one on Kepler, another on Donne, and two chapters on Milton. In the end, Anderson renders sensitive, surprising, and brilliant readings of the most canonical and widely-taught literature of the early modern period. These chapters gain in impact in their relation to the book's fourth chapter. Its demands on the reader are worth it.

Defining analogy as “*the* connector of the known to the unknown, the sensible to the subsensible and infinite” (5), Anderson organizes the first three chapters on Donne, Spenser and Milton on the perception of death—its “figuration” (3). In these chapters, Anderson unfolds the several ways death, as allegory or analogy, is represented in these poets' major works. In the final three chapters on Kepler, Donne and Milton, Anderson shifts from death and darkness to light. Anderson links Kepler's and Donne's analogical thinking through their use of the word “proportion.” As a word and concept key to Kepler's writings about optics and vision, Donne uses it over a dozen times in the *Anniversaries*, which for Anderson, signals his investment in “confident, constructive analogy” (12). According to Anderson, “the very physicality of death, captured in analogy, enables redemption” (12).

The book's final chapter, “Milton's Twilight Zone: Analogy, Light, and Darkness in *Paradise Lost*,” is at times breathtaking. Anderson's excellence as a close-reader is on full display in her analysis of the poem's many epic similes, which she claims are “fundamentally analogical” (186). The chapter explores the different effects of analogies from the poem's many characters, the poem's narrator, and Milton himself. In the end, Anderson argues that the force of analogy in Milton's epic resides in its form. She writes, “Form is what shapes, distinguishes, and actualizes a thing. Associated with essence in Milton's thinking, it is real” (216). Here, readers may hear the echo of Anderson's earlier work on the sacrament from *Translating Investments: Metaphor and the Dynamic of Cultural Change in Tudor-Stuart England* (2005). She insists on the force of an analogy that does not represent real presence but instead is an assertion of faith. Suggesting how the analogical in Milton connects the known to the unknown, Anderson writes, “Analogy connects cognition with rhetoric, God's creation with the poet's,

and both of these with darkness and light” (225). In what feels like a definitive account of the poem’s movement from the darkness of books one and two to light in book three and after, Anderson shows how this transition is also a movement into uncertain knowledge. In Anderson’s account of analogy, Milton’s movement from dark to light is as much about optics as symbolism. According to Anderson, the relational function of analogy in Milton, and in early modern scientific and literary discourse more broadly, “is neutral with respect to content, as the greater materiality of twilight, for example, is not, yet both serve in their own ways to mediate extremes and opposites” (214).

Like one of Milton’s famous epic similes, Anderson’s *Light and Death* is richer and more complex with every re-reading. The impact of either work—a Miltonic simile or Anderson’s book—inheres in content to be sure, but as Anderson shows her readers, impact is a product of form too, and scholars of early modern literature, history, religion or science will value the impact of the thoughtful, indeed formal, complexity of *Light and Death*.

Igor Djordjevic. *King John (Mis)Remembered: The Dunmow Chronicle, the Lord Admiral’s Men, and the Formation of Cultural Memory*. Farnham, Surrey, and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2015. xi + 204 pp. \$112.00. Review by DANIEL L. KEEGAN, AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF SHARJAH (UAE).

Igor Djordjevic has produced a fascinating work of literary and cultural history, one centered around the sort of discovery that “any researcher in the early modern period dreams of, yet seldom finds” (6). In *King John (Mis)Remembered*, Djordjevic recalculates the trajectory of John’s posthumous reputation, especially as it intersects with a shadowy document called “the Dunmow Chronicle” and with the figure of Robin Hood (or, Djordjevic might have more accurately said, with that of Maid Marian). Djordjevic locates this intersection in the hothouse of theatrical and dramatic competition between the Lord Admiral’s and the Lord Chamberlain’s Men at the end of London’s sixteenth century. Djordjevic’s study will be essential reading for anyone interested in the historiographic, theatrical, literary, and

cultural reception of King John. It also provides suggestive tools for thinking about theatrical-cultural influence and inheritance and for rehabilitating neglected plays from the dramatic archive.

Djordjevic's avowed and insistent aim in *King John (Mis)Remembered* is to recalibrate critical and scholarly expectations for plays in the "topical cluster of King John" (6; all quoted emphases original). This recalibration can be usefully distinguished into two levels. First, he seeks to resist the expectations of "postmodern critics who seem unable to conceive any early modern John other than a proto-Protestant tragic hero" (188); he argues that "John ... *never* had a univalent meaning, especially in the Elizabethan period, and more broadly in the early modern period in general" (165). On this level, Djordjevic richly examines the particular engagements of the many texts in the topical cluster with the matter of John. It is this detailed examination that is the major accomplishment of this study. Second, and somewhat more problematically, Djordjevic seeks to beat back the political and interpretive desires of these "postmodern critics." We will return to what I see as the problems of this line of argument in conclusion.

In order to defuse the "postmodern" desires of critics for a political and religious John, Djordjevic turns his attention to the dialogues between different writers in the John cluster, from the middle ages to the Civil War. If, as Djordjevic writes, some of the texts in the cluster might rightfully be accused of "baroque entanglements" (142), the reception history that he tracks here might well be accused of the same. Djordjevic does a remarkable job of tracing these entanglements in detail: I sketch the main arc here.

Chapter One, "Reclaiming John from the Monks," establishes the "remarkable consistency" among the Tudor chroniclers "in their portrayal of the major events of [John's] life and reign" (14). Moving away from the "devastating" (13) portrayals by Roger of Wendover and Matthew Paris, "[s]ixteenth-century English chroniclers, in some cases due to a reforming zeal, but even more thanks to their period's developing critical approach to historical sources, did much to excavate a historically nuanced yet ambivalent portrait of John and his reign" (14). These portraits were, however, by no means univocally Protestant: although John Foxe with his "clear Protestant agenda" (18) "insists on an almost monochromatically positive view of John

as a victim of treacherous barons and perfidious churchmen" (19), most of the sixteenth-century chroniclers present him "as a much maligned, if imperfect, victim of overwhelming circumstances" (20). It was, however, his "conflict with the pope" that was represented as "the signal event of the reign and an exemplum teaching the most important political lesson" (20).

This exemplarity cannot hold in the face of Shakespearean political realism. Chapter Two, "Ground Zero: Peele, Shakespeare, and the Birth of the Topical Cluster," "serve[s] as a descriptive introduction to the first works [George Peele's *The Troublesome Reign of King John* (c. 1589–90, printed 1591) and Shakespeare's *King John* (c. 1595–96)] that bring King John out of the mists of time ... to a popular audience" (22). These plays begin "the process of *de-exemplification* and *de-mystification* of John's character that will be picked up and amplified by the [later] contributions to the cluster" (31). While both plays "essentially stage the basic elements of the propagandistic "thesis" of the Protestant apologetic approach to John's reign" (24), these plays, and especially Shakespeare's (through, according to Djordjevic, Shakespeare's characteristic "unblinkered" (35) political realism), begin a process of unsettling this Protestant exemplarity.

It is at this point that things get really interesting. John suddenly becomes less a political or religious figure than an *erotic* one. The vector for this transformation is John Stow's 1580 *Chronicles of England* in which Stow reproduces an episode from the *Chronicle of Dunmow* in which it is said that one of the major events of John's reign, the baronial rebellion, was motivated by his lust for "Mawde called the Faire, daughter to Robert Fitz Water," one of those rebellious barons (qtd. Djordjevic 43). This calumnious "*alternate history*" (47), which as Djordjevic argues was likely influenced by FitzWalter himself (48), was then picked up and adapted by such of Stow's readers "as Michael Drayton and Anthony Munday [who] sought to capitalize both on its originality and its novelty" (47). Drayton converts "Mawde called the Faire" into the titular heroine of his 1594 long poem *Matilda*, which seeks to establish Mawde/Matilda as "a suitably *English* exemplar of female virtue and chastity" (57). According to Djordjevic, this adaptation "skirt[s] the political and religious thornbushes of John's reign entirely, by reducing the whole civil war to an erotic melodrama

about a king who fell prey to lust and repented in the end" (57). Following Stow and Dunmow, Anthony Munday also "recast[s] ... a national uprising against royal power as predicated on John's lust, thereby reducing the *national* to a *familial* crime, and transmuting the *political* conflict into an *erotic* one" (75). The plays in which he does so—*The Downfall of Robert, Earl of Huntington* (1598) and *The Death of Robert, Earl of Huntington* (1598)—also have the distinction of being "the first known dramas to stage King John and Robin Hood together" (61) and "the first [plays] to identify Maid Marian with Matilda FitzWalter" (76). From them John emerges "decisively *de-mystified* but now *re-exemplified* forever as a king who was a slave to extreme passions" (94).

John's reception by the Lord Admiral's Men is not entirely bad news for his character. Chapter Five, "The Sexy Side of History and the Specter of Bastardy: *Look About You*" examines how in this anonymous play (printed in 1600), John is once again staged in proximity to an eroticized politics; this time, however, it is not John's eroticized politics but those of his father Henry II that are staged, especially in terms of the competition that erupts between Henry's "estranged wife and ... the late object of his infatuation, the fair Rosamond" (102). Although John has been demystified by Shakespeare and Peele and reviled by Drayton and Munday, it is precisely "thanks to the essential ambivalence of [these] portrayals in the 1590s" that "John has enough elasticity" to emerge as the most complex among a collection of "ridig[ly]" defined characters (114).

Even so, the "long *shadow*" (165) of the libelous Dunmow Chronicle continues to extend itself in the cultural memory. Not everyone is taken in: Chapter Six, "Historical Poesy Strikes Back," examines two writers who sought to redress the literary rise of the FitzWalters and the moral fall of John. John Speed, in his *History of Great Britaine* (1611), feels "compelled to set the record straight regarding a number of historical fictions ... that had emerged over the two decades that preceded the first printing of his work" (118), especially by reevaluating FitzWalter. Richard Niccols, "editor and author of ten new tragedies added to the 1610 edition of *A Mirrour for Magistrates*" (118), rewrites John as the "undeserving victim of a vicious conspiracy between the malicious pope, the duplicitous French, his treacherous nobles, and

a fearful, ignorant, and inconstant commonalty that willfully gives up its freedom" (124). In this narrative, John "accepts no blame for any of his actions as king" (125); instead, Niccols invents a new but not influential "*alternate history*" in which "John is truly a king more sinned against than sinning" (126).

Chapter Seven, "Dunmow *Redivivus*: Vallans, Daniel, and Davenport," examines three attempts to square Dunmow with responsible historiography. Two historiographical attempts fail; one artistic attempt succeeds. "Vallans"—Djordjevic's name of "convenience" (132) for the unknown author of a 1615 text concerning the "famous history of the noble Fitzwalter" (132)—produces new archival sources, apparently from his own research, but is unable to "provide narrative coherence and to link the events [of Dunmow] to actual dates" (134). Samuel Daniel, who in his *Collection of the History of England* (1618) is able to "inoculate[] the story [of Dunmow] against its inherently sensationalist and melodramatic overtones" (137), nonetheless cannot help but fall victim to the "most egregious and hysterical charges leveled at John" by medieval monks (138). It is, however, Robert Davenport, the author of "the last Renaissance history play focusing on King John" (139), who provides a sort of hero for *King John (Mis) Remembered*; Davenport splices Dunmow into "the spine of the mainstream chronicle tradition" (150) and, thereby, "creat[es] what will stand as the last and most creative work in the topical cluster" (150).

I leave it to the reader to attend to the complexity of Davenport's effort (and Djordjevic's sensitive reading of this effort) to tie together "all the loose strings and attempts to reconcile hitherto conflicting narratives" (152). At this point, we can say that "what began as a few scattered medieval pieces of gossip ... became a coherent story revealing King John's irrational and homicidal grudge against an entire family because he had been rejected sexually by a woman" (144). In this story, "the truth was apparently not half as interesting on stage as the lie Dunmow had passed down through the ages" (146). Chapter Eight follows the "Long Shadow of Dunmow" "that falls across the generations" (165). Although John's reputation after Davenport was still by no means univocal, Dunmow's "umbra now starts to envelop an entire culture's memory of King John" (167) so that, of all the English kings who had "their peccadillos adapted for the stage ... John has

the dubious honor of being the only one whose reputation as a salacious creep was perhaps totally undeserved” (188). This reputation, moreover, began well before the habitual dating which “misplace[d] the turning point of John’s relapse [into the disdain brought to bear by the monks] in the nineteenth century” (9).

Djordjevic’s accomplishment of research is undeniable. Some points of presentation and argument may be critiqued. For a work determined to, among other things, reintroduce neglected texts into scholarly and critical discourse, more might have been done to ease the reception of these works. One character, Matilda Bruse, is mentioned (80) several pages before she is discussed in any detail (84–89); this is in a play (and indeed a paragraph) that involves *another* character named Matilda—Matilda FitzWalter/Maid Marian. Elsewhere, we are told that Robin Hood utters “an ambiguous riddle promising to be Richard [the Lionheart]’s bedmate, which not only reminds the audience of Robin’s introduction as Richard’s bedfellow but also establishes another intertextual link with Rosalind’s riddling promises to her various suitors in *As You Like It*” (112–13): we are never told what this “riddling promise” is. The discussion, at times, gets tangled in the “baroque entanglements” of the plots it discusses.

We should return to the question of Robin Hood. As you will have noticed, I have only just mentioned him in my discussion of Djordjevic’s argument. This despite the claim, enunciated early on, that John is transformed into our popular “caricature of political ineptitude, avarice, and boundless ambition” (8) because “his path intersected with a beloved figure of legend, the perennial swashbuckling darling of Hollywood: Robin Hood” (9). On the evidence of *King John (Mis) Remembered* it would be far more accurate, as I suggested above, to say that John’s misfortunes began at the moment that he met Matilda FitzWalter who, in Munday’s hands, would be identified with Maid Marian, making “a lasting imprint on the “greenwood saga” (76). In Munday’s plays, Djordjevic admits, Robin’s character “is probably the least interesting of all” (78) and in *Look About You*, the other “Robin Hood” play discussed, “Robin is unambiguously cast as a minor character” (101). Robin, moreover, has minimal bearing on Djordjevic’s main argument. If this character was designed by the Lord Admiral’s Men to “match and answer the popularity of the Bastard” in Peele’s and

Shakespeare's plays (100–01), it seems like a bad job was done of it.

Robin Hood's prominence in Djordjevic's rhetoric, if not his argument, is tied to another problematical level of the book's discourse: Djordjevic's desire to castigate "postmodern critics" for their political and subversive desires. While he is evidently correct, on the basis of his own careful analysis, to criticize, for example, authors such as Stephen Knight who seek in Munday's plays a subversive Robin Hood—these plays, Djordjevic demonstrates, "are unambiguously *John* plays" (89)—he does so in the service of a model of politics and of political drama that is never clearly elucidated. Although I applaud Djordjevic's emphasis on the intra-topical cluster dynamics, it is at the same time surely no longer necessary to imagine "tenuous links between a Bankside playwright and a stormy scene in a chamber at Whitehall" (8) or a "direct causal link between the political goings-on at Westminster and the repertory of a professional acting company" (139) to find politics in a play. Although such imaginations are, as I take them, ones that Djordjevic attributes to his critical opponents, his own parameters for political drama could be more clearly drawn. How is it, for example, that "reducing the whole [baronial] civil war to an erotic melodrama" (57) can be interpreted as an *a*political gesture? Why might not such "reduction" be precisely political?

One more point on the framing of Djordjevic's argument: he intriguingly relies "on the lexicon of twentieth- and twenty-first-century film studios and cinema-going audiences (*prequel, sequel, reboot*)" in order to characterize the relationships between the different texts, and especially dramas, in the textual cluster. Although he notes that such "intertextual and allusive dynamics appear to have shaped early modern drama's topical clusters" (23 n.9), a more theorized account of these dynamics in early modernity would have been welcome. This is less a criticism than it is a note on the suggestiveness of Djordjevic's approach.

I have been obliged to leave out many of the intriguing interpretations that Djordjevic provides of the various entanglements of these texts: to note only one, his discussion of the abortive genealogy of the Bastard in *Look About You* is particularly exciting. One can only hope for more books like this.

Maren-Sofie Røstvig. *Ars Aeterna and Other Essays on Literary Structure*. With a Preface and Appendix by H. Neville Davies. Oslo: Novus Press, 2015. 314 pp. €49.50. Review by MARIA SALENIUS, UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI.

*Ars Aeterna* is a collection of essays by the Norwegian literature scholar Maren-Sofie Røstvig (1920–2014), collected and published in honor and in memory of her life's work. The collection focusses on essays on poetics and literary practice by Røstvig over three decades.

The Preface (5–13) of the book is written by H. Neville Davies, and it opens with a moving description of Maren-Sofie Røstvig's heroic resistance work as a 23-year old student in Second World War Norway. Thus the Preface also defines the aim of the collection: It is not only a compilation of her scholarly accomplishments, but a valorization of her life's work. Maren-Sofie Røstvig is not only presented as a literary scholar but as a publisher of words on "freedom" and "peace" (the Norwegian title of the paper she was involved in publishing during the war was *Frihet og Fred*). This introduction sets the stage for Røstvig's enthusiasm and dedication for her undertakings in general. The Preface then goes on to depict Maren-Sofie Røstvig's education; her graduate studies in the United States and her doctorate at UCLA, and eventually her career at the University of Oslo. The Preface finally ends with explaining how Røstvig chose to reside "in the kinder climate of southern Spain" (12) in her retirement years, and this gives the Preface a somewhat obituary-like quality, which may perhaps undermine the focus on her scholarly career. (It felt slightly irreverent to continue to refer to the mature Dr. Røstvig merely as "Maren-Sofie" throughout the Preface.) However, although the purpose of the collection is to valorize Maren-Sofie Røstvig's academic work, it particularly also wants to point to Røstvig's whole life's work and especially her aptitude to combine her private devotion and her public scholarship. For this, then, we need this more comprehensive and more personal introduction.

The book reproduces a total of thirteen of Maren-Sofie Røstvig's essays, focusing on the later part of her career, from 1969 to 1999; it is divided into two parts, titled "Poetics" and "Literary Practice." The parts include four and nine essays respectively. (Røstvig's interest in

number symbolism could perhaps inspire some structural implications from this division.) The essays are arranged chronologically within each part, the essays in the first part ranging from 1970 to 1999 and in the second from 1969 to 1997. This gives the two parts a logical sequence and an idea of the progress of Røstvig's thinking within the topics discussed.

The first essay in Part I, "Ars Aeterna: Renaissance Poetics and Theories of Divine Creation" (first published in *Mosaic* in 1970), has lent its title for the collection, and it thus, quite justifiably, sets the tone for the whole volume. It is an article that from its very outset strongly underlines the ancient, medieval and early modern tradition of "mathematical formulas" (21). Røstvig illustrates how the ancient numerical formulas link up with philosophical deliberations and with the biblical tradition. The plan in religious text—and the Bible in particular—is one of creating an illusion of harmony and symmetry, in order to support the *vera religione*. In addition to early writers, such as Augustine and Bonaventura, Røstvig also shows the continuum of this reasoning through to the reformers, with her strongest example being that of Calvin. Finally, the tradition reaches the English poets Edmund Spenser, John Donne, and John Milton.

The second article in Part I is titled "Structure as Prophecy: The Influence of Biblical Exegesis upon Theories of Literary Structure" (originally published in the collection *Silent Poetry: Essays in Numerological Analysis*, edited by Alastair Fowler in 1970). While this article is grounded in the theories of rhetoric (mainly Puttenham and Wilson), the latter part of the essay—and its application to early modern poetry—strongly illustrates the discussion of biblical exegesis and religious poetics with support from numerical argumentation.

Røstvig's third essay in this part, titled "Images of Perfection" (first published in 1971 in *Seventeenth-Century Imagery: Essays on Uses of Figurative Language from Donne to Farquhar*, edited by Earl Miner), continues in the same vein: Spenser, Milton, and a number of the Metaphysical poets, are enlisted in the pursuit of the *harmonia mundi* through their resolute application of symbolic and numerical structures. Finally, the fourth essay in the group is a much later text ("Coming to Terms," originally published in *Nordlit* in 1999), and it returns to the theme through Røstvig's early reading of John Donne's

*Essays in Divinity*. In this essay, Røstvig seeks to make the distinction between more purely “numerological” study (with all its long-time stigma), and a “topomorphical” approach (with a more balanced view of both numerical and verbal structures where the main literary focus is on the verbal patterns). (This latter approach had earlier been presented in Røstvig’s book *Configurations. A Topomorphical Approach to Renaissance Poetry*, 1994.) In addition, in this essay Røstvig introduces the third concept of a “conceptual mode” (106 ff.) of reading, which seeks to reconcile the verbal and the numerical as well as the realistic and the allegorical.

Part II of the volume includes articles with more overall poetic deliberations and scriptural analyses, yet strongly supported by numerical arguments. Again, the earlier essays (like “*The Shepherdes Calender—A Structural Analysis*,” the oldest essay in the volume, published first in *Renaissance and Modern Studies* in 1969) tend to be more straightforward in their numerical analysis, whereas particularly the two later ones (“*The Craftmanship of God*” of 1995, and “*Arithmetical Divinitie*” of 1997) turn to intricate structural analysis of especially the *verbal* patterns which underline the rhetorical purpose of the text.

The second article in Part II, “*Syncretistic Imagery and the Unity of Vaughan’s ‘The World’*” (first published in *Papers on Language and Literature* in 1969), presents both a Hermetic and a theological reading of the poem. This is the least numerical of the articles in the volume, and the focus is most strongly on visual presentation—including a discussion of the image of the title page of John Swan’s *Speculum Mundi* (1644). The discussion of both Platonic and biblical visual images, though, links this article strongly to the other depictions of symmetry and balance.

Another article that could be seen to diverge slightly from the overall line of the volume is the sixth article in Part II, “*New Perspectives on Fielding’s Narrative Art*” (originally published in 1981 in a collection of papers from the First Nordic Conference for English Studies in 1980). In this article Røstvig applies the structural formulas perhaps most generally, and on a later text than in the others, yet showing that the same Renaissance concepts and biblical exegesis apply.

The remaining articles in Part II include “*Structural Images in Cowley and Herbert: A Comparison*” (from *English Studies*, 1973),

“In ordine di ruota: Circular Structure in ‘The unfortunate Lover’ and *Upon Appleton House*” (from *Tercentenary Essays in Honor of Andrew Marvell*, edited by Kenneth Friedenreich, 1977), “A Frame of Words: On the Craftsmanship of Samuel Daniel” (from *English Studies*, 1979), and “Golden Phrases: The Poetics of Giles Fletcher” (from *Studies in Philology*, 1991). As the titles indicate, the articles all seek to provide structural and verbal readings of their texts and authors by presenting strong support of numerical/structural arguments. Also, the articles all show a good grounding in both the Classical and the biblical interpretative models. Yet, the most interesting aspect here is to trace the development of the arguments from one context to another.

The article titled “The Craftsmanship of God: Some Structural Contexts for the Poems of Mr. John Milton (1645)” (published first in the collection *Heirs of Fame: Milton and Writers of the English Renaissance*, edited by Margo Swiss and David A. Kent in 1995), as suggested above, is indeed a breathtakingly exhaustive account of structural detail in a number of texts and writers. Røstvig returns to Augustine and Plato’s *lambda* formula, already introduced to the reader in the opening article in this volume, and her arguments are painstakingly minute.

The volume ends with the article “‘Arithmetical Divinitie’ and the Unity of Sir Thomas Browne’s *Religio Medici* (1642),” originally published in *Contexts of Baroque: Theatre, Metamorphosis, and Design*, edited by Roy Eriksen in 1997. Chronologically, this is not the last article in the collection, but it provides a suitable conclusion, and it allows the author to end the volume with prose and thus close the circle by returning to the more prose-centered discussions of the first part of the volume. This article, too, presents diagrams and structures when describing the context of the Reformation and the “balance between the individual and the Church, reason and doctrine” (292).

The choice of these particular thirteen articles out of the total of more than fifty in Maren-Sofie Røstvig’s scholarship is reasonable for the present purpose (although some readers may have wished for some further presentation of some of Røstvig’s eighteenth-century interests, or maybe even of some of her insightful reviews). For the seventeenth-century specialist, the particular importance of the present volume of Røstvig’s essays is that it presents a collection of writings especially

focusing on different aspects of (religious) literary scholarship from late Renaissance writers to the seventeenth century, like Spenser and Milton, and setting them against the backdrop of older texts and concepts by, for example, Plato and Augustine.

Furthermore, this volume presents an overview of the development of the thinking of a particularly devoted and engaged scholar, who set out to establish a role for her specific form of scholarship. Starting in her twenties, as a dedicated resistance operative, a champion of freedom and peace, Røstvig continues to fight for space for some fundamental attributes of (primarily) Renaissance literature that have unfortunately much been obscured under the pseudo-scientific terminology of ‘numerology’. Maren-Sofie Røstvig’s arguments show the often disregarded realities of Renaissance studies and seek to establish a balance between symbolic and numerological structures, both lines of thought that today’s scholarship often finds rather marginal, while at same time steering clear of any risk of being considered unwarranted. The early modern world is indeed a foreign country, and sometimes today’s scientific thought and analytical thinking prevent us from seeing the complete historical context. Perhaps we should follow Røstvig’s advice and “learn to adjust our own vocabulary to Renaissance usage” (27).

Brian Lockey. *Early Modern Catholics, Royalists, and Cosmopolitans. English Transnationalism and the Christian Commonwealth*. Farnham, Surrey, and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2015. xi + 376 pp. \$129.95.  
Review by JONATHAN WRIGHT, DURHAM UNIVERSITY.

It was unsurprising that Elizabethan Catholics, increasingly persecuted and marginalized at home, would turn to a long-established sense of a pan-European Christian commonwealth as a source of solace and identity. As Brian Lockey explains in his intriguing book, this provoked both tensions and opportunities. It was crucial for leading English Catholic figures, men like Edmund Campion and Robert Persons, to insist upon their fundamental loyalty to the Tudor regime but they also subscribed to a theological and, perforce, political worldview in which the papacy was entitled, indeed duty-bound, to criticise

individual rulers: and even, as with Elizabeth I, excommunicate them and produce a climate in which the concept of overthrowing an alleged tyrant might be legitimate. Could English Protestants have meaningful interaction with this way of conceptualising Europe? That is precisely what Lockey argues in his book: and he makes a compelling case.

A very different sense of commonwealth emerged in post-Reformation England. The monarch was established as the supreme ecclesiastical authority, religious uniformity on the regime's terms was deemed mandatory and, as the phrase went, this realm of England was an empire. For good reason, scholars have traced how this sense of English nationhood developed, and its expression in literature has been a keen focus of this work. It was not, Lockey argues, the only construct of commonwealth available, however. English Protestants may not have wanted anything to do with the pope, and they may have seen limited value in old exempla like Archbishop Ambrose of Milan rebuking the Emperor Theodosius back in the fourth century, but there was still value in a more universalist, cosmopolitan understanding of commonwealth that transcended national boundaries and in which the conscience of the monarch could be prodded. Lockey refers to this as the secularization of an older theological/ecclesiastical model and he is not slow to identify the ironies it provoked.

In the fictional work of Anthony Munday and Sir John Harington, for instance, Lockey locates a "secular version of the papal or episcopal overseer, responsible for correcting an errant or tyrannical sovereign" (8). The tales were set long ago and far away, of course, but contemporaries were presumably attuned to the resonances. That Munday should develop this concept is perhaps unexpected, though as Lockey explains, Munday's precise religious sympathies remain elusive. For all the rabid anti-Catholic polemic, some scholars have discerned some indicators of Catholic sympathy. This hand has probably been overplayed, but it is still striking that Munday, throughout his works, spent so much time dwelling on transnational themes. Harington clearly had some sympathy for Catholic exiles and supported a fledgling understanding of religious toleration (though referring to these inclinations as ecumenical seems rather anachronistic) so dialogue with an earlier concept of commonwealth is less remarkable. Harington does, however, appear to have sailed close to the wind upon occasion. In his 1596 *A New*

*Discourse of a Stale Subject*, the notion of an external, higher power being entitled to criticise and correct an errant monarch does bear some resemblance to notions of papal supervision and intervention. It would seem that ways to “rein in untrammelled sovereign power” (149) had not gone entirely out of fashion.

Another component of this hybrid understanding of commonwealth was faith in transnational cooperation and oversight. We find sympathy for this, according to Lockey, in those sections of Spenser’s *The Faerie Queene* which touch on the concept of equity and the mechanisms that can sustain or restore natural justice, and particularly in the writings (and workaday career) of Philip Sidney. The unusually well-travelled Sidney kept up enduring correspondences across Europe and adopted an idealistic approach to pressing geopolitical issues. He was eager for England to come to the assistance of persecuted Protestants abroad and, during the 1570s, led the unsuccessful charge to establish a Protestant league. This all fed into his fiction with, for example, Euarchus of Macedonia in *The Old Arcadia* striving to establish a pan-Hellenic alliance and, in *The New Arcadia*, a universalist agenda which “cuts against the grain of English national formation” (170). Good riddance to the pope, of course, but Sidney’s transnational dreams bear, for Lockey, “an uncanny resemblance to the vision of universal papal government promoted by his enemies” (21).

The second half of the book leaps forward to the later Stuart era. How had these complex articulations of commonwealth and cosmopolitanism developed, and who inherited them? Sir Richard Fanshawe emerges as one key figure, developing the trope of a cosmopolitan figure entitled to counsel and correct the sovereign. Milton, too, is positioned as a keen advocate of tearing down unnatural borders and boundaries, especially in the realm of faith. Whether or not Milton had read Luis de Camões’ *Os Lusíadas* (either in the original or in Fanshawe’s translation) is unclear but, regardless, he seems to have rejected the nationalistic vision it encapsulated. In *Paradise Lost*, Adam and Eve spend far too much time fixating on the narrow history of the Eden that they have lost: a hallmark of their fallen nature. So, too, do politics become obsessed with narrow interests and local concerns. Far better, for Milton, to have like-minded sovereigns working in consort, backed by an intellectual “transnational elect” (265) of which, needless

to say, Milton saw himself as a key member.

The laurels for radicalism apparently go to Aphra Behn, however. In the two-part play *The Rover*, much influenced by the writings of the royalist exile Thomas Killigrew, we encounter a transformation of the concept of nationhood as previously understood. The play, on the face of things, evokes nostalgia for the good-old-days of sixteenth-century England when the nation joined battle, on many fronts, with Spain but a “post-imperial perspective” (295) can also be discerned. In a new world of ever-expanding trade it is necessary to see old boundaries dissolve, leaving us with “the levelling effects of commercial forces” (312).

This way, perhaps, lay the future and one of the strengths, and potential risks, of Lockey’s analysis is its chronological sweep. This can lead to long-term historical trajectories which are sometimes just too neat and tidy, and in which causal links and webs of influence are stretched close to breaking point. Lockey works very hard, for instance, to identify a direct route between musings on cosmopolitanism in the sixteenth century and articulations of the concept during the Enlightenment. A fine section of the book, for example, looks at 1590s dramatic portrayals of the globe-trotting Thomas Stukeley. His ability to develop an increasingly expansive view of the world is dependent on the stability of his identity: he is ever-so English. But this Englishness becomes the “window on to a broader transnational identity that ultimately works to dislodge and destabilize national identity itself” (189). This is credible, but the attempt to link such processes to later Enlightenment understandings of transnationalism, to claim the accounts of Stukeley as direct precursors, involves several significant hermeneutic leaps. Can we really see a fully thought-through ideal of the “secular non-coercive universal community” (30) as early as the 1590s? Similarly, making intellectual bedfellows of the Spanish Dominican Francisco de Vitoria (with his thirst for natural justice and understanding of the oneness of humanity) and Kant (with his talk of perpetual peace) is overly ambitious.

None of this diminishes the importance of Lockey’s volume. He is more than reliable on broad topics (excellent, for example, on the tensions between loyalty to faith and secular authority among Elizabethan Catholics) and has a keen eye for revelatory episodes: I found his analysis of the 1579 student revolt at the English College

in Rome particularly worthwhile. Above all, he provides a valuable challenge to a rather monochrome understanding of how literature influenced ideas about sovereignty and nationhood during the early modern period. We often hear about the journey towards a modern, centralised, self-sufficient state but other paths were available and they were taken for rather longer than we might imagine.

John Walter. *Covenanting Citizens: The Protestation Oath and Popular Political Culture in the English Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017. x + 266 pp. \$100. Review by BRETT F. PARKER, ISOTHERMAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE.

In this extensively researched and skillfully crafted study of Parliament's Protestation oath in 1641, renowned social historian John Walter advances two fundamental arguments. The first, which is the aim of the first two chapters, is that the Protestation was created and intended as a loyalty oath to both Parliament and the "true reformed church." It sought to secure and continue Parliament's reform agenda by binding the nation into a Protestant association. The second, developed especially in chapters four and five, is that the taking and administering of the Protestation revealed a level of popular political consciousness that justified violence and legitimized Parliament in its war with the king. Although Walter focuses his study on 1641–1642, he suggests that the Protestation served as a charter of governance and faith for the nation throughout the Civil War. It is these two claims that move the Protestation from the margins of English historiography into the center of the mid-seventeenth century upheavals.

The Protestation was born of fear and anger, specifically over suspicions that the king was preparing to suppress Parliament and free the Earl of Strafford from the Tower (13–14). Mistrust between the king and Parliament was exacerbated by swirling rumors of a popish plot at court, moving John Pym to lay out the idea of an armed association to defend both crown and church. Significantly, two questions arose immediately; one, what was exactly meant by an oath, a word that carried great importance in post-reformation England, and second, was this to be a Parliamentary oath or a national covenant. As Walter

makes clear, these questions were answered by the growing radicalism of Parliament and its “godly” members, who used the Protestation as a loyalty oath by which to extirpate opposition to their reform agenda (33–35). Of course, the Protestation was not without controversy, and suffered severe criticism from moderates and constitutional royalists who sought to highlight the Protestation’s promise to defend the king. This is an important point, one that Walter might have followed more in his analysis of the counties. What he does show is that much of the uneasiness over the Protestation, as well as its protean meaning, stemmed from the various copies of the oath, copies that historians have failed to take into account. These differing copies, he argues, reflect the concern many had over the meaning of “true reformed religion,” as well as the conditional promise to defend the king.

The linchpin of Walter’s argument is that the Protestation was not simply an act of Parliament, but a performance by the London crowds, city activists, and Puritan ministers in the provinces, without which the Protestation would not have become a national loyalty oath. This “joint achievement” was in part a spontaneous response to the crisis gripping London and reveals the intimate network of godly reformers who sought to arm the nation in defense of the church and Parliament (79). This coordination was especially salient in the drafting and printing of the “Explanation” of the Protestation, which Walter contends came from those outside Parliament who wanted a more precise statement concerning the “true religion” (62). Of course, all was not smooth sailing, as debate took hold as to whether the House of Commons had the authority to compel subscription to the oath. Such an unprecedented step was helped, however, by events in January 1642, when Charles attempted to arrest five members of Parliament for high treason. With crowds taking to the streets and news of the event circulating in print, it was then that the Protestation came “into its own” (78).

The importance the Protestation played in the events of 1641 and early 1642 meant that its meaning was fluid, and Walter seeks to show in chapter three how the Protestation generated intense debate over the nature of political authority and the role of conscience. The first area in which the Protestation was shaped was in the pulpit, where Puritan preachers like John Geree told parishioners they were

swearing a covenant with God to remove popery and defending the true reformed religion. This entailed a program of radical reform, including the elimination of the Prayer Book and episcopacy. Walter rightly notes royalist pushback against the Protestation, demonstrating how Parliament's authority was challenged and its members tarred with inciting violence and condoning seditious print. This dispute over political authority elided with the Parliament's appropriation of notions of popular sovereignty and mixed government. In an effort to assuage subscribers' consciences, pamphleteers like Henry Parker justified the Protestation by distinguishing the office of the king from the man (108–109). At the heart of the debate was the issue of obligation and obedience, as well as the ultimate question of where sovereignty rested.

If the Protestation suffered from “linguistic indeterminacy,” its importance was revealed in the nature, speed, and logistics by which the nation came to take it in early 1642 (111). Walter emphasizes two points: one, that Parliament was much more successful in shaping political opinion and appropriating royal machinery of government that has historiographically been given credit and two, the swearing of the Protestation demonstrates a politically engaged network of Parliamentarians, ministers, and local activists. A key source to making this latter case is the “City Orders,” a resolution drawn up by radical ministers in London that directed how the oath was to be administered (119–20). The “City Orders” provided a model for the counties, and surveying many county returns, judicial records, and ministerial letters, Walter concludes that it had much to do with the growing alacrity of taking the Protestation.

If the speed and direction of which the Protestation was sworn tells us about the ability of Parliament to seize political events on the eve of the Civil War, then how the oath was taken in local communities and by individual subscribers tells us how Parliament and people came together to form a political nation. Taking the reader deep into individual counties, Walter examines the thousands of subscription lists extant in parish registers and Parliamentary archives. What these returns establish is that subscribers were eager to take the oath and knew it was a sacred act, rightly carried out in sacred spaces. Engaging the masses in an unprecedented way, taking the Protestation was

a collective, individual, and public act (167). Nevertheless, Walter rightly highlights the fact that many refused to take the oath, especially more moderate ministers and, of course, Catholic recusants. The Protestation, therefore, helped shape local identity around “confessional exclusion” and “confessional association” (184).

The radical and hereto underestimated power of the Protestation was its illocutionary force. As the Puritan minister Richard Ward emphasized, “things protested must be performed” (198). This meant that taking the Protestation “bestowed an ‘office’ on all takers. It obliged them active to defend institutions and individuals under attack” (199). As a personal obligation to defend Parliament and the “true reformed church,” subscribers were even encouraged to inform local authorities of suspected enemies. The Protestation even emboldened some to appeal to the law of God to justify crowd violence, presaging the increasing diminution of the *lex terra*. All of this was intended to give marginalized groups a direct say in the state’s confessional and political identity. In the end, the Protestation was a charter of action and badge of Protestant identity, one that was appropriated and broadened as the Civil War unfolded.

*Covenanting Citizens* is a welcomed contribution to our understanding of early modern oath-taking and political engagement on the eve of the Civil War. Walter’s detailed and balanced research into manuscripts, diaries, and print culture, shows that the Protestation was much more than an act by Parliament; it was a sacred promise, taken in every county, to defend a reformed Protestant nation. What is remarkable is how central the Protestation became to the political upheavals of the 1640s as ideological positions hardened and the king became demoted in the identity of the new English state. To Walter’s credit, he does what so few works of the period are able to do effectively, i.e., show how high and popular politics intersected to significantly shape historical events. Walter’s argument that Parliament’s radical intentions fit the fears of local Protestants confirms that the road to civil war was paved with puritan intentions at all levels. One does wonder how this godly discourse played to the ingrained constitutionalism of the age or how this charter of freedom compared to the highly politicized Magna Carta. This study also raises questions about the politics and procedures of Parliament’s bookend Engagement Oath in 1650. It too

was intensely contested and given variegated meaning. Despite these minor considerations, *Covenanting Citizens* is a substantial contribution to seventeenth-century scholarship.

Palmira Fontes da Costa, ed. *Medicine, Trade and Empire: Garcia de Orta's Colloquies on the Simples and Drugs of India (1563) in Context*. Farnham, Surrey, and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2015. xxiii + 279 pp. £78.99. Review by ALESSANDRO GIOSTRA, DEPUTAZIONE DI STORIA PATRIA—ANCONA.

During the Renaissance and early modern age, the hunt for new botanical species and investigation on their properties formed an integral part of medicine. New chairs in medical botany and botanical gardens were established in the most important universities. This new trend influenced the demand for more accurate naturalistic illustrations in botanical books and more complete descriptive publications as a consequence of the complexity of the argument. The growth of colonial empires helped increase Western medical knowledge, as Europe was not the only site of the botany-medicine interaction. This volume includes papers delivered at a conference, held in April 2013 at the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, to celebrate the 450<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the edition of Garcia de Orta's *Colloquies on the Simples and Drugs of India* (1563). Despite the fact that Garcia de Orta had received a traditional education, he can be considered an innovator. His move in 1534 to Goa, the capital of the Portuguese empire, as Chief Physician of the Spanish Captain of the Indian Seas, allowed him to collect a wide range of information about Indian medical treatments. The final outcome of de Orta's investigation consists in this dialogical structured work, in which the reader is fully involved in this specific subject. The choice of adopting a dialogical form reflects his relationship with many different people, whose learning enriched his knowledge. He was aware of the didactic relevance of the dialogical form for scientific communication; through the dialogical form he intended to create a room where different opinions could be expressed. In the dialogue, Western medical ideas are personified by Ruano, a fictitious colleague interested in the medical practice.

In that theatrical setting an important goal of the *Colloquies* lies in the correction of errors, which arose from the disparity between new and existing knowledge; these corrections were preventable with an objective knowledge of Eastern medicine. One of the problems frequently highlighted by Orta was the Western opposition to Muslim medicine. The critic against Vesalius in the forty-seventh colloquy is a clear instance of his approach to medical communication. So, the statement “I have no hate except for errors and no love except for the truth” (88) can be deemed to be the motto of his medical project.

The sixty colloquies forming part of Orta’s book present a medical view moving away from Galenism and Aristotelianism, and based upon modern botany and iatrochemistry. Furthermore, the economical context in which he lived exerted a deep influence on his conception. The case of the China Root, which was considered a valid remedy for syphilis, is emblematic, because Orta suggests a kind of preparation for sale. Broadly speaking, his appreciation of Chinese products reflects the importance of China for the Portuguese trading activity, and the medical marketplace represents a stimulus for innovation.

The *Colloquies* were printed in Goa, and, being influenced by the typical culture of investigation dominating in that area, they deal with a wide range of arguments about medicine in the Indian land, including drug prices and methods of healing. Those contents represent the new global context following the expansion of the Portuguese colonial empire in the beginning of the sixteenth century, an era in which the impact of new animals, plants and drugs was changing the common perception of nature. It was probably the first book concerning Indian medicine that had a relevant impact in the European medical science, although its circulation was limited by the posthumous condemnation of the author by the Inquisition. Notwithstanding that limitation, beginning in the seventeenth century the *Colloquies* was well regarded for the variety of contents. In order to have a complete idea of the importance of Orta’s work, it is necessary to take into account a “contextualized and innovative analysis [...] by reputed scholars in complementary areas of expertise” (5).

The reconstruction of Orta’s biography highlights some common features with other Iberian physicians, although there is a lack of knowledge about his personal identity. He was part of a network of

researchers able to support their own profession in a milieu in which the Inquisition was taking action against them, even if scientific curiosity was also part of his decision to move to Orient. The relevance of his action leads us to see his “self-appointed role as the centre of a network of cosmopolitan exchanges of European and Indian culture and especially medical knowledge” (267). Being a cosmopolitan researcher with a knowledge of different languages, he relied on many authorities. He exercised his profession in the Royal Military Hospital Garden, an institution whose staff was composed of indigenous Christians. As a matter of fact, notwithstanding the different cultural contexts, there were many common practices between Eastern and Western medicine, as European, Muslim, and Hindu doctors followed the same authorities. Portuguese settlement in Asia during the modern age brought about a great impact on European science. Just the attention he devoted to local medical practices is the reason why we can affirm that he was “less Cartesian, more Montaignian” (89), and more an eye-witness than a traditional professor. As a consequence, he wrote in an easy language and direct style, as his book was addressed also to ordinary readers. Moreover, his decision to write the *Colloquies* in Portuguese was probably due to his desire to make them available to the main port cities of the Indian Ocean. The *Colloquies* created a long-standing tradition, as more than two centuries later the medical remedies suggested by Orta were still studied and used all over the Portuguese empire in the same way he had described in his book.

In 1567 the Latin edition of the *Colloquies* by Clusius, made this work readable to a wider public in Europe; Italian, English and French versions were then based upon Clusius’s edition. In any case, it must be specified that Clusius’s version was a Latin translation of the original Portuguese text. Moreover, Clusius removed the dialogical form and added personal comments and woodcut illustrations. The work continued to arouse interest and five further editions by Clusius proved its commercial success. So, without Clusius’s work “it is hard to imagine that Orta’s work would have become famous in Europe” (193). Among the people who sustained his legacy, we can find some Jesuit missionaries who were interested in looking for medical solutions in their evangelical work. They incorporated the Goa medical gardens and continued to use the healing plants Orta had dealt with.

A document held in the Society of Jesus Archive in Rome witnesses the enduring influence of the *Colloquies*, as the Jesuit pharmacies in different areas of the world used the same medical substances highlighted by Orta. More in general, all “Portuguese colonial agents (missionaries, merchants, military officers, medical practitioners, colonial administrators) displayed widely varying motives for gathering and disseminating indigenous knowledge about healing” (236).

Unfortunately, medicine is not among the most commonly discussed subject-matters by historians of science, although it played an important role in shaping culture during the Scientific Revolution. The relevance of the *Colloquies* must be contextualized in an historical milieu in which anatomy and medical botany were emerging as leading disciplines within medicine. Furthermore, the attention devoted to empirical knowledge was part of the background for the radical turning point in scientific matters. The discovery of new drugs, plants, and remedies in Indian territories was part of the new *materia medica* and started reinforcing the bases of a medical practice that was showing interest in remedies arising from empirical evidence. In other words, Orta’s book just fits in the modern age characterized by revolutionary ideas that were bringing about a revision of the traditional remedies and new observations of the effects of plants. Moreover, the advancement of medical learning, due to the expansion of Western influence in Central-Southern America and Asia, represented the beginning of a “globalized” medicine that started taking into account the knowledge belonging to various traditions.

This collection of essays written by leading scholars in the field is very good reading for specialists as well as for readers with a basic background on biological sciences during the Scientific Revolution. Its merit lies in arranging the specific contents of the *Colloquies* in the broader context of the medical culture and formation of colonial empires in the sixteenth century: “De Orta and the *Colloquies*, much like science in general, belong to us all and, as such, throughout time and in different parts of the world, they have united people and renewed the universal values of humanity” (xxii).

Michael Hunter. *Boyle Studies. Aspects of the Life and Thought of Robert Boyle*. Farnham, Surrey, and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2015. xiv + 244 pp. £63,00. Review by ALESSANDRO GIOSTRA, DEPUTAZIONE DI STORIA PATRIA—ANCONA.

Robert Boyle (1627–1691) belongs to that small group of researchers able to introduce very significant innovations in natural science. Both the breadth and depth of his interests make his achievements all the more significant. The distinctive features of his biography and scientific inquiry render this historical character a very difficult figure to study. He is described as the father of modern chemistry who supported the view of nature as a mechanism. Moreover, he owed very much to the English medieval natural philosophy, although that influence did not prevent him from formulating innovative ideas. Similar to other protagonists of the Scientific Revolution, he was a man of remarkable piety and believed in God as Creator and sustainer of the natural order. His “wishlist,” reported as an Appendix to the Introduction (1–32), witnesses how his promotion of science included scientific and non-scientific matters.

Recent research has begun to change our understanding of Boyle. “The result is that, in the twenty-first century, Boyle has become a more mixed-up and perhaps therefore more interesting figure” (131). This collection of nine essays, some of which have been published elsewhere, offers a detailed account of Boyle’s thought, even if some aspects still need further investigation by historians. Notwithstanding the major role Boyle played in the progress of modern science, he has not occupied much space in historical essays. However, that paradoxical situation has been partially changing in the last decades, thanks to the work made in archives, and the advancement in history of science as a specific discipline. In the Introduction, the author highlights the fact that the Newtonian paradigm dominates the common perception of English scientific tradition. Moreover, the celebration of Newton during the age of Enlightenment brought about the decline of Boyle. Thus, “our task in relation to Boyle [...] is to restore prominence to those aspects of his science the Newtonian paradigm tended to occlude” (25).

The reconstruction of Boyle's early intellectual evolution (33–52) is complicated by the wide spectrum of topics he dealt with. His early writings on moral and religious questions reflect the deep learning he had gained in traditional subjects. After 1649 experimental science became his main concern, though he had been engaged in the English scientific context since the mid-1640s. That decisive turning point determined a radical change in his activity, but it was not due to the cultural context surrounding him. The adoption of the experimental scientific approach, indeed, did not represent a discontinuity with his religious preoccupations, as the understanding of nature as a whole mechanism was closely connected to a broader religious viewpoint that was based upon divine creation as the reason of natural order and beauty. Moreover, in Boyle's mind his study of the *Book of Nature* was a response to the attacks to religion launched by modern scientists or natural philosophers. In any case, all the aspects pertaining to his own scientific research "owed much to the sheer range of traditions on which he drew and the eclecticism he deployed" (51). Another important historical matter was Boyle's participation in the Royal Society. Since the foundation of that institution in the period 1660–1662, its membership included different kinds of scientists, who started holding informal meetings to discuss scientific questions. However, the Baconian approach to scientific practice and the new mathematical trend in investigating nature can be seen as common grounds for its members. The early Royal Society exerted an influence on Boyle: his organizing data through "heads" and "inquires," that is a typical Baconian methodology, is a clear instance of that influence, even though it could have started in the years preceding the establishment of the Society.

Understanding his attitude to secrecy (131–48) is essential to grasp some distinctive features of his own personality. In some of his important works, Boyle upheld the necessity for the dissemination of knowledge as a moral duty for every man devoted to science. Despite that purpose, during the same years, in accordance with traditions surrounding alchemy, he maintained secrecy as part of his chemical experimentation; thus, he was not always eager to popularize all types of knowledge. The same sort of ambivalence can be found in his use of print (149–162), which was making available more books and at a

lower cost to the scientific community. Since the end of the decade of the 1650s, Boyle realized the importance of print, and in the following six years he published some of his most relevant works. Since Latin remained the official language of the academic world, he provided Latin versions of his works. Those Latin editions included additional material that were not part of the originals in English. Despite the common use of Latin as an academic language, finding professional translators was not so easy in seventeenth-century England, especially because of the new technicalities about experimental practice. One original solution adopted by Boyle from 1665 onwards was to list in each work all his writings in chronological order. That strategic use of print was part of his effort to communicate science, aimed at achieving a large audience.

Boyle made his mark not only in chemistry, but in theology too. He devoted himself to biblical studies, and ancient languages such as Hebrew and Arabic. The religious dimension of his thought perfectly fits with his corpuscular worldview, as he warned against the mixing of religion and science. For instance, he was sure that a literal interpretation of Genesis 1 could be a stimulus for atheism. The relationship between Boyle and the *Supernatural* (163–84) represents probably the most intriguing aspect of his writings. Broadly speaking, he considered his own investigation as a kind of religious obligation or worship. The optimistic view on human abilities and the trust in the natural order established by God's creation were an integral part of his scientific approach and Christian belief. He used the word "Supernatural" to indicate above all questions, such as creation, that go beyond the dominion of science. He did not favor supernatural explanations of natural phenomena, which was the dominant tendency within the English academic world. However, some elements of his view show a more ambivalent attitude. Despite his attacking vitalism as a kind of pantheism and denial of divine power, the influence exerted by alchemy, indeed, led him to believe in the possibility of contact with supernatural agents such as the presence of supernatural entities in the work of witches and magicians. Boyle's conception of the supernatural was also part of his criticism to Descartes' mechanical philosophy, which excluded final causes, namely the goals for which the natural mechanisms are created by God. The need to reconcile the idea of

the clockwork universe while leaving God with room to act led him to believe that some divine purposes can be known and that science was the right way to achieve that knowledge. The addition of a small collection of “Strange Reports” to his *Experimenta & Observationes Physicae* (1691) reflects this interest in extraordinary phenomena. They were natural anomalies that could not be explained through the basic tenets of mechanical worldview. Moreover, one must recall Boyle’s distinction between “supernatural” and “preternatural,” the last indicating perfect natural phenomena transgressing the ordinary course of nature.

This collection of essays is the last of a series of collections by Michael Hunter, Emeritus Professor of History at Birkbeck, University of London. As it deals with some specific aspects of Boyle’s thought and personal events, it is suitable to readers who have already acquired a basic knowledge of the topics belonging to the Scientific Revolution, the discussion on science in modern Britain, and the impact of the Irish scientist on the achievement of the scientific account of nature.

*The Spanish Golden Age: Painting and Sculpture in the Time of Velázquez*, exhibition catalogue, München: Hirmer, 2016. 334 pp. + 122 colored plates. €29. REVIEW BY LIVIA STOENESCU, TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY.

The catalogue associated with the exhibitions *El Siglo de Oro: The Age of Velázquez* (Gemäldegalerie – Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, 2016) and *The Spanish Golden Age: Painting and Sculpture in the Time of Velázquez* (Kunsthalle der Hypo – Kulturstiftung 2016/2017) is a scholarly undertaking. While the exhibitions’ purview was to present the German public with an unprecedentedly comprehensive access to leading seventeenth-century Spanish artists, the catalogue provided the theoretical undergirding for such enterprise. The focus on the significant, albeit understudied, painter Alonso Cano and sculptor Gregorio Fernández; on the cultural differences and similarities between Spanish and Italian Baroque; on technical difficulty (*dificultad*) as a feature central to the iconographical multiplicity of Spanish Baroque; on naturalistic tendencies and highly individualized styles for depicting the Spanish mystical lore thus distinguish the catalogue *El Siglo de*

*Oro: The Age of Velázquez* from its predecessors.

In recent years, the London exhibition *The Sacred Made Real: Spanish Painting and Sculpture 1600–1700* (2009; catalogue edited by Xavier Bray et al.) concentrated on the idiosyncrasies of Spanish mystical approach to depicting religious visions by painters, sculptors, and designers of the *Siglo de Oro*. Organized in 2009 as well, the Indianapolis Museum of Art exhibition *Sacred Spain: Art and Belief in the Spanish World* (catalogue edited by Ronda Kasl) addressed the multifarious character of Spanish Baroque's intersections with emerging Counter-Reformation orientations in Spanish America. Expanding on these topics, *El Siglo de Oro: The Age of Velázquez* defends that the seventeenth-century political decline acted as a foil for "the stability of the world power Spain as a foundation for culture" (18). Spain's collapse as the universal power coincided with the advent of Calderón's *La vida es sueño* (*Life is a Dream*) and *El gran teatro del mundo* (*The Great Theater of the World*); Gracián's *El Criticón*; and the most compelling creations by Velázquez, Francisco de Zurbarán, Alonso Cano, and the young Bartolomé Esteban Murillo. The eroding Spanish monarchy orchestrated the aesthetic principles of *stillo desornamentado* (unadorned style) that originated El Escorial and developed with Juan Gomez de Morá's initiatives for the Royal Monastery Church of the Incarnation (*De La Encarnación*) in Madrid (23). A new Spanish tradition of sculptural Baroque décor, distinct from the Italian Baroque, hence spread across Andalusia and Mexico.

Karin Hellwig's chapter "Theory and Practice: The Fine Arts in Seventeenth-Century Spain" reflects on critical artistic criteria for Spanish painting and sculpture. The Spanish theorists Vicente Carducho and Francisco Pacheco effected new belief in the *paragone* (the debate over the competing claims of painting and sculpture) not only to dispute opinions on the superiority of sculpture but also to affirm that painting is the prevailing form of art and the cumulative Spanish reaction to the first forum for *paragone* that Benedetto Varchi held in Florence in 1547. Hellwig argues that Pacheco, the authority of seventeenth-century Spanish art theory, defended the superiority of painting over the sister arts with recourse to ideas he derived from the practice of painters who employed polychromies, pigments, and media (34, 35). Pacheco claimed *perfección* (perfection) for painting based

on the observation that only painting relies on pigment as medium intrinsic to color, unlike sculpture that only inadvertently reaches to perfection with the use of pigment—the quintessential element of painting—and therefore subordinates itself to painting (35). Works by Pacheco, Juan Sánchez Cotán, and Francisco de Zurbarán evince the competition between their polychrome painted compositions and the vividly colored sculptures of Montañés, Gregorio Fernández, and Juan de Mesa. Painting confirmed a higher complexity or *dificultad* in the creation of three-dimensionality, which has been recognized as one of the defining features of the illusionistic character of Spanish Baroque art (37).

By expanding on issues of technicality and medium, Roberto Contini highlights the seventeenth-century Spanish accomplishments in “polyphony and polycentrism” (41). Bartolomé Carducho’s *Death of St. Francis* (1593) exhibited naturalistic effects that anticipated and influenced Caravaggio, whose style manifested the radicalization of all objectivism and independence from idealizing tendencies borrowed from classicist aesthetics (41). Contini notices that naturalism appeared on the Spanish art scene shortly after 1590 (42).

Like Hellwig’s and Contini’s, Manuel Arias Martínez’s commentary on materials and techniques are important contributions to a line of research that yet awaits theoretical attention. In the assessment of Martínez, both materiality and medium were essential factors in creating a unique blend of supernatural and mundane Spanish artistic ethos. While the catalogue insists on the preeminent role of painting, it concurrently emphasizes the significance of three-dimensional artifacts that Spanish painters referenced. The devotional, carved images of the *Virgin of Atocha*, *Virgin of Fuensanta*, and the famous *Soledad* at the convent of Victoria in Madrid were transmitted through copies that appear in numerous oil-on-canvas seventeenth-century paintings (69).

*The Spanish Golden Age: Painting and Sculpture in the Time of Velázquez* offers theoretical positions on pressing issues in contemporary art historical discourse and fulfills new orientations towards art history in relation to materials, techniques, and media. The catalogue is, for this reason alone, a valuable enterprise that concurrently directs our attention to incomplete discussions of what naturalism entails in early modern art. Is naturalism an encouragement to follow nature with

the refinements of painting? Did the painter's specificity in rendering the coloristic ornaments of the cloths of angles and saints stem from a naturalistic attentiveness to the seventeenth-century surround? Was the Spanish interest in capturing the varying qualities of materials different from the kind of naturalism that guided Italian painters to ground their practice in the laws of optics? The relationship between Spanish and Italian early modern art is strikingly close and a shared interest in their forceful plasticity awaits future examination.



## 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* (!) *illustrium* 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 Enjambelements 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 prosimità 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 inexperienced 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)