

NEO-LATIN NEWS

Vol. 68, Nos. 3 & 4. Jointly with SCN. NLN is the official publication of the American Association for Neo-Latin Studies. Edited by Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University; Western European Editor: Gilbert Tournoy, Leuven; Eastern European Editors: Jerzy Axer, Barbara Milewska-Wazbinska, and Katarzyna Tomaszuk, Centre for Studies in the Classical Tradition in Poland and East-Central Europe, University of Warsaw. Founding Editors: James R. Naiden, Southern Oregon University, and J. Max Patrick, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and Graduate School, New York University.

◆ *Introduction à la méthode de Leon Battista Alberti. L'art de colorer dans le De pictura.* By Isabelle Bouvrande. Le savoir de Mantice. Paris: Honoré Champion, 2019. 330 pp. €52.15. One of the most famous texts in the rich oeuvre of the humanist Leon Battista Alberti (1404–1472) is his treatise on painting (*De pictura*). Alberti wrote the treatise in three books in Florence in the 1430s. An innovative systematization of the art of painting steeped in classical learning, *De pictura* gave a theoretical dimension to the artistic praxis. The text circulated in two versions, one in Latin, the other in *volgare*, both of which flowed from Alberti's pen. The Latin version is not only extant in more manuscripts, but was also printed first, with its *editio princeps* being in Basel in 1540. In the last two decades, a rising interest in the primary text manifested itself in a wave of new editions and translations into German (2000, 2nd ed. 2011), French (2004), and English (2011).¹

1 *Leon Battista Alberti: Das Standbild. Die Malkunst. Grundlagen der Malerei*, ed. Oskar Bätschmann and Christoph Schäublin (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2000); *Leon Battista Alberti: La Peinture*, ed. Thomas Golsenne and Bertrand Prévost (Paris: Seuil, 2004); and *Leon Battista Alberti: On Painting. A New Translation and Critical Edition*, ed. Rocco Sinisgalli (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

The interest of art historians in Alberti's theory of painting has often focused on central perspective. The new book of the French art historian Isabelle Bouvrande takes another path. It casts light on an understudied aspect of *De pictura*: the art of coloring (*ratio colorandi*). Complementing central perspective in creating the illusion of three-dimensionality in the two-dimensional art of painting, *ratio colorandi* refers to the method of shading colors in order to suggest a relief (10). Bouvrande sets out to provide the first systematic and exhaustive book-length study of the art of coloring in *De pictura* (7 and 10).

The study takes an analytical approach, isolating a number of terms and notions that inform the art of coloring. The basis of this analysis is the Latin text of *De pictura*, since according to the author, it has a greater lexical richness than the *volgare* version (8 and 12). With its deep engagement with the text and terminology of Alberti's treatise, Bouvrande's study is located at the cross-section of art history and Latin philology. This review approaches the book from a philologist's perspective, highlighting its potential for the field of Neo-Latin studies.

After a short introduction (9–15), the main body of the study is divided into three parts. The first provides a panorama of the sources and fields of knowledge that inform Alberti's presentation of the art of coloring (19–47). It touches upon the collection and systematization of knowledge (Quintilian), natural philosophy (Aristotle), optics (Ptolemy), the history of painting (Pliny) and its praxis (Cennino Cennini, *Il libro dell'arte*), the art of memory (rhetorical handbooks), and myth (Ovid). The second part is at the heart of the work (51–252). In the form of an alphabetical lexicon, twenty-nine terms and notions connected to the art of coloring, from "altérateur" to "voile intersecteur," are isolated from the text and described individually. The third part brings together these terms and notions in order to extrapolate the *modus operandi* of coloring from Alberti's *De pictura* (255–75). At the end of the book, there is an excursus on Giotto, the only modern painter named in the Latin treatise (279–287), as well as three appendices on the Aristotelian concepts of place and the transparent and on the art of memory (291–312).

Due to the analytic approach and the lexicon layout, the understanding of Alberti's presentation of the art of coloring assembles itself like a jigsaw puzzle in the course of reading, until the pieces are finally put together in the third part. The alphabetical order of the second part in particular makes this assemblage a non-linear detective work. The non-linear layout means that readers should have a solid prior knowledge of Alberti's original text or read it in parallel to have a good overview of the course of argument in *De pictura* and the passages central to the art of coloring. In the second book of his treatise, Alberti divides painting into three parts (II 30–50): *circumscriptio* (II 31–34), *compositio* (II 35–45), and *receptio luminum* (II 46–49). The third part is the central passage on coloring in *De pictura* and is quoted most often in Bouvrande's book. The titular *ratio colorandi* appears in II 47, where Alberti states that if the painter correctly outlines the surfaces and determines the areas of light, the process of coloring will be simple (*facilis tum quidem erit colorandi ratio*).² Using *ratio colorandi* as a technical term, Bouvrande interprets it as permeating all three parts of painting and highlights thematic connections to other passages in the treatise.

While the lemmata of the alphabetical lexicon are in French, quotes from the Latin text of *De pictura* are found on almost every page. The Latin passages are always followed by a French translation (the 2004 translation mentioned above) and often juxtaposed with the corresponding parts from Alberti's *volgare* treatise. The quality of the Latin quotes is generally decent, if not free from typos (e.g., 38: *ferocuem* instead of *ferocem*, 158: *excitate* instead of *excitante*, 255: *edsiscant* instead of *ediscant*). A few minor slips in Latin grammar occur as well: e.g., while *concinntitas* and *compositio* are referred to in the nominative, *conlibratio* is referred to in the ablative (211–13: *conlibratione*) and the infinitive forms of *uti* (215: *utere*) and *diluere* (262: *diluare*) are wrong. However,

2 Alberti made an earlier reference to coloring in II 32, using a similar expression: if a surface changes gradually from a dark tone to a bright color, a line should be drawn in the middle of the two areas in order to remove doubts about how to color the whole area (*quo omnis colorandi spatii ratio minus dubia sit*).

these are quibbles that do not affect the understanding of the text. Where the argument steers into philological waters, the results are not always convincing: e.g., when Alberti writes *pinguiore idcirco, ut aiunt, Minerva scribendo utemur* (I 1), he does not allude to Horace's *Ars poetica* 385 (29–30), but imitates Cicero's *Laelius* 19 (*agamus igitur pingui, ut aiunt, Minerva*).³ Alberti's construction of a painter Daemon (II 37 and 41) from a passage in Pliny's *Natural History* (*pinxit demon Atheniensium*, 35.69) seems to be the result of a plausible mistake rather than an active reinterpretation (37–38), if one considers the rate of scribal errors and the fluid orthography in manuscript culture, as well as the fact that transliterations of the Greek δῆμος occur only very rarely in ancient Latin literature (*TLL* s. v. *demus*).

But none of these points of criticism should distract from the merit of Bouvrande's study in tackling a type of literature that requires intimate knowledge of both the subject and the literary language in which the subject is expressed. Based on a close reading of *De pictura*, Bouvrande's study of the terms and notions of the art of coloring bridges the fields of philology and art history. In the field of Neo-Latin studies, it could stimulate further research into the creation and development of a terminology of painting, both in Alberti and beyond. (Irina Tautschnig, University of Innsbruck)

◆ *Miscellanies*. By Angelo Poliziano. Edited and Translated by Andrew R. Dyck and Alan Cottrell. 2 vols. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 89–90. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990. xx-viii + 639, 418 pp. \$29.95 per volume. Angelo Poliziano (1454–1494) was one of the cultural icons of his day, a man who was exceptionally talented as a scholar, teacher, and poet while also becoming one of the first men in western Europe in centuries whose knowledge of ancient Greek approached that of the people who spoke it in classical times. He had his limitations, to be sure: his philological acumen

3 As indicated by the addition *ut aiunt* both in Cicero and Alberti, *pingui Minerva* was proverbial. The proverb has an entry in Erasmus's *Adagia* (1.1.37).

was extraordinary, but he lived before the development of systematic codicology, lacked a community of similarly skilled scholars, did not always have the historical knowledge necessary to identify the shortcomings in some of his sources, and sometimes got carried away in polemic, especially against Domizio Calderini, his principal *bête noire*. Yet he must be given his due. His access to earlier manuscripts gave him an almost unparalleled knowledge of the ancient world, he devised a way of grouping and analyzing manuscripts that was quite advanced for his day, and his Greek was good enough for him to be able to fill in *lacunae* or emend corruptions in the Greek passages that were embedded within Latin manuscripts.

All of these skills were put to good use in his *Miscellanies*. The humanists of preceding generations followed in the footsteps of their medieval predecessors, writing commentaries that went through a classical text line by line and explained everything that a reader might need to know. This approach, however, did not suit Poliziano's temperament. Two of his contemporaries, Domizio Calderini and Filippo Beroaldo, developed a genre, the *miscellanea*, that was based on the *Attic Nights* of Aulus Gellius, in which they isolated particular problems to analyze and solve. This was a more suitable vehicle for Poliziano's talents, and he adopted it eagerly, selecting the most intractable problems and solving them to show off his philological skills, or offering up obscure but fascinating tidbits from his wide-ranging knowledge of classical texts to others who had neither his access to manuscripts nor his prodigious memory.

The *Miscellanies* exists in two parts, each intended to have a hundred chapters; the first set was published in 1489 and the second, which was left unfinished at Poliziano's death, was first printed in 1972. To prepare this work, Poliziano went to the marginalia in the books he owned, his manuscript papers, and the notes that had been taken by his students, all of which have received intense study in recent years and give us a good idea of how he worked. From them he would extract a problem, often a passage that did not seem to make sense grammatically or metrically or that seemed to contradict what was known about the author or his society. He typically presented the passage along with previous efforts to explain it, then showed why those efforts did not suffice; he would then outline his solution and

how he reached it, generally supported by a good number of parallel passages that support his argument. His best solutions present small changes to a received text that he arrived at either by working back to the earliest recoverable reading or by drawing from his knowledge of the kinds of mistakes that scribes tended to make when they tried to read earlier scripts. He was not always right, but his solutions were generally worth considering and some still stand today.

As is usually the case with volumes in this series, this edition of both centuries of the *Miscellanies* is not a critical one. But the history of the text has been examined carefully and the Latin as presented is reliable, with a list of textual variants for those who want it. A lot of work has gone into the English translation, which is more helpful than usual given the kind of material with which Poliziano is working. There are also enough notes to facilitate a first reading of the text. In short, the work itself is well worth the read, and the editors / translators have done a real service in making it much more accessible than it has been. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Fabularum Ovidii Interpretatio—Auslegung der Metamorphosen Ovids. Edition, Übersetzung, Kommentar.* By Georg Sabinus. Edited by Lothar Mundt. Frühe Neuzeit, 226. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter 2019. 422 pp. \$149.99. The *Fabularum Ovidii interpretatio tradita in Academia Regiomontana*, first printed in 1555 (Wittenberg: Georg Rhau Erben), continued to attract attention far beyond the lifetime of its author, Georg Sabinus (1508–1560), a German poet, professor of poetry and rhetoric, and first rector of the University of Königsberg. His famous commentary on Ovid was reprinted many times in Germany, but also in France and Great Britain. Fortunately, in 2019 Lothar Mundt published a very valuable edition of this significant work. The edition includes a German translation and a short but insightful commentary.

In his excellent introduction, Mundt outlines the context, content, and impact of Sabinus's *Interpretatio*. In addition to a convincing argumentation for Sabinus's authorship (the *Interpretatio* was sometimes attributed to Philipp Melanchthon), Mundt carefully sets out Sabinus's intention for his work and underlines its didactic relevance

for students and young readers: With the *Interpretatio*, Sabinus primarily intended to improve young people's rhetorical and stylistic skills in Latin versification. He included the discussion of the allegories (moral, historical, naturalistic, and—though rarely—rhetorical; never spiritual) to make the reading more enjoyable. This way, Sabinus's commentary should also provide an exercise for the study of the Scriptures by young Christians. Sabinus arranges his commentary according to the different narratives of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, and he discusses the allegories to varying degrees; in some cases, Sabinus offers several possible interpretations. Occasionally he relates his considerations directly to contemporary events or enriches his explanations with anecdotes. Furthermore Mundt contextualizes the *Interpretatio* as one of the early modern commentaries on Ovid and makes a few concluding remarks about the afterlife of Sabinus's work. Mundt's introduction is concisely written, succinct and without unnecessary digressions, but with all the important information and with a clear focus on the preparation of the reader. Mundt's notes on another short work by Sabinus, *De carminibus ad veterum imitationem artificiose componendis praecepta*, help the reader understand the rhetorical dimension and the approach of Sabinus's interpretation of Ovid.

After the introduction, Mundt presents Sabinus's text along with a translation from Latin into German. The presentation of the text is based on the second printing of 1555; Mundt's emendations are reasonable and convincing. Special terms (particularly proper names) or allusions are explained by Mundt on 378–94 in a commentary that varies in length but always supports the understanding of the text, for readers from other disciplines as well. The history of Sabinus's text, the principles on which it was edited, and the critical apparatus are also given afterwards (359–77). Only references to other authors or works mentioned in the text, as well as indirect or direct quotations, are listed in an apparatus placed directly below the Latin text.

One of Mundt's particular merits is the brilliant translation, which accurately and readably reproduces the Latin original. Given the length of Sabinus's text, it is not surprising that a few small words have been lost in Mundt's translation (e.g., *autem*, 'but', 24/l.197; *olim*, 'once', 104/l.238 and 280/l.10; *sapientiae*, 'of the wisdom', 18/l.119; *coelestis*, 'celestial', 34/l.341; *eo*, 'in this', 280/l.27). In even rarer cases,

tenses have changed (e.g., *considerarunt*, 104/l.238, is translated as a past perfect instead of a simple perfect). The superlative in *maximam quoque calamitatem* ('the biggest', 36/ll.360–361) was only reproduced as a positive. The modern punctuation is concise; there is just one comma in the Latin text (*ut res ostendit, et Aristoteles inquit*; 6/l.62) that unfortunately has been forgotten in the translation and distorts the meaning.

There are only a few passages that I would like to discuss in more detail: concerning the sentence *Poetica nihil aliud est nisi philosophia [...] fabulis concinna* (10/l.3), it should be considered whether it would be more reasonable to translate *concinna* as 'fitting' or 'convenient', rather than 'pleasant' (as Mundt does it in other passages, e.g. twice on 6). Then it would not be translated as "Die Poesie ist nichts anderes als eine durch Versmaße und dichterische Erfindungen gefällig gestaltete Philosophie" ('Poetry is nothing else but a philosophy made pleasant by measures and poetic inventions'), but as 'Poetry is nothing else than a philosophy made convenient to the measures and the poetic invention'. On 15, Mundt does not reproduce the syntactic connection *quòd [...], in hoc* (14/ll.73–74) as 'that ..., therein...', but instead constructs a conditional period. For the reference to be retained, it ought to be written: 'But in the fact, that the poets teach [...], they do not agree with [...]'. On 16, the reference of *Dei* ('gods'; l.102) has to be considered: the Latin *homo singulari consilio et providentia Dei creatus est* (ll.101–102) is translated by Mundt as follows: "weil der Mensch [...] von Gott mit einzigartiger Besonnenheit und Voraussicht geschaffen worden ist" ('because man [...] has been created by God with unique prudence and foresight'). The *Dei*, however, is a genetic attribute of *providentia* and means 'divine foresight', so that the sentence should be corrected to: 'because man [...] has been created by God's unique counsel and foresight'. Mundt came to his translation from the comparison between man and animal, which makes it tempting to assume a unique reason of man. On 21, Mundt translates *rerum humanarum conditio* (20/l.155) as "die Bestimmung der menschlichen Dinge" ('the destiny of human things'). In the context that the world would become worse over time, this hardly corresponds to God's plan of creation. Thus I suggest translating *rerum humanarum conditio* as the 'disposition of human nature'. The *[h]omines graves* (122/l.72),

which Sabinus compares with the *homines leves et garruli* (122/l.74), are perhaps less “Menschen mit gefestigter Persönlichkeit” (‘men with a consolidated personality’), but rather ‘serious men’, for a consolidated personality is not the suitable contrast to ‘careless and talkative men’. Besides, when Sabinus says that animals were revered *divinis honoribus* (122/ll.79–80) by the Egyptians, this does not mean that they are ‘divine beings’, but only that they were given ‘divine honors’. The word *usitato* (276/l.126), finally, is not referring to the *locus communis*, but to *interitu* (ibid.), so that one should translate it as ‘of the common downfall of heroes’.

These few remarks on nearly 350 pages of text and translation show impressively how carefully Mundt proceeded in his edition. It is to be hoped that thanks to Mundt’s effort, Georg Sabinus will once again be studied more closely in research on the reception of Ovid, early modern approaches to myths, and the history of education or mentalities. In any case, I can be certain that researchers who are concerned with these topics will greatly appreciate Mundt’s edition. (Dennis Pulina, University of Freiburg)

◆ *Grotius Collection Online: Printed Works*. Prepared under the supervision of Henk Nellen and Jeroen Vervliet. Leiden: Brill, 2018. <https://brill.com/view/db/gro>. \$11,920 (free 30-day institutional trial available). Hugo Grotius (1583–1645) is one of the towering figures of Neo-Latin literature in the Low Countries. He wrote plays and made contributions in theology as well, but Grotius is most remembered today for his work in philosophy, political theory, and law, in particular for the idea that the principles of international law, especially those used to justify war, should rest in natural law. His two most influential books in this area are *Mare liberum* and *De iure belli ac pacis*.

In 1914 a collection of 55 editions of *De iure belli ac pacis* was donated by the Dutch publisher Martinus Nijhoff to the library of the Peace Palace in The Hague. The collection included editions in the original Latin as well as translations into French, English, Dutch, and German, published between 1625 and 1901. In the years since this donation, the librarians have worked to establish as complete a collection as possible, of *De iure belli ac pacis* and of other works by

Grotius, in both printed form and in photocopies. By this point the collection is the largest in the world, containing over 1,200 volumes, including 200 editions of *De iure belli ac pacis* in every language, 100 legal works (including *Mare liberum*), and Grotius's writings in other areas like history, theology, philology, and poetry. The two books that remain fundamental for Grotius studies, *Bibliographie des écrits imprimés de Hugo Grotius* (The Hague, 1950) and *Bibliographie des écrits sur Hugo Grotius, imprimés au XVII siècle* (The Hague, 1961) by Jacob ter Meulen and P.J.J. Diermanse, serve as a frame of reference for the collection, which makes the library and its holdings the 'go to' place for research on Grotius.

The library, whose focus is international law, is responding to COVID-19 disruptions like everyone else, but it was open to researchers at the time this review was written. Given the present uncertainty, however, this is an especially good time to stress the importance of online projects. Much of the most interesting work now being done in Neo-Latin studies relies on access to the early printed editions, but even in normal times, not everyone can free up the time and resources to travel to collections like this. Digitization has transformed the way that research can be done, but it can still be quite a chore to assemble a working digital research library from different sources that allow users to do different things. That problem has been solved here, where we have something that remains a real rarity: a comprehensive collection that has been brought together by informed specialist researchers and offered ready made to serious scholars. It comes at a price, but one that is not unreasonable when the savings in time and travel costs are factored in. One can only hope that as more and more of the world goes on line, we will see more projects like this and that they will get the use that is needed to justify their creation. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Musaeum Celeberrimum* (1678). By Athanasius Kircher. Introduction by Tina Asmussen, Lucas Burkart, and Hole Rößler; index of authors and places with commentary by Frank Böhling. *Vita*. By Athanasius Kircher. Critical edition and introduction by Frank Böhling. Athanasius Kircher Hauptwerke, 11. Hildesheim: Georg

Olms Verlag, 2019. Athanasius Kircher (1602–1680) has long been a controversial figure. He was accused in his day and ours of being a quack and a charlatan, but as Paula Findlen noted in the subtitle to a 2004 collection of essays about him, he was also “The Last Man Who Knew Everything.” Interest in him as a serious figure has grown of late, to the extent that the German publisher Olms has undertaken a 14-volume folio series that contains reprints of his main works, fortified with abundant paratextual material in the best tradition of German scholarship.

The main work in this, the eleventh volume in the series, is Kircher’s *Musaeum Celeberrimum*. Ostensibly it is a sort of catalogue of his collection of statues, pictures, and other objects that was rooted in the ancient world and had become an obligatory stop on the grand tour of Europe with which an educated gentleman of the day completed his education. But it was more than that. Kircher’s mind worked in such a way that it reached out to embrace everything at the same time as it effaced the boundaries that kept things apart. This makes *Musaeum Celeberrimum* a tool to appreciate a collection of objects, but it was also a book that was presented as being valuable in its own right, and the book in turn was a physical manifestation of Kircher’s mind. It was organized into three parts. The first part includes sections as varied as *Larvarum marmorearum, fictiliumque vasorum descriptio* and *De obeliscis Aegyptiorum*; part 2 ranges from *Officina vitriaria* and *De magnete & magneticis machinis & operationibus* to *Apparatus rerum peregrinarum ex omnibus orbis pelagis collectus* and *Hermetica experimenta*; the third part goes from *De musicis instrumentis* and *De mobili perpetuo* to *De oraculo Delphico*. The facsimile of the edition published in 1578 by the Janson-Waesberg publishing house in Amsterdam is clearly reproduced and accompanied by the scholarly apparatus that is needed to appreciate a project like this. Like the *Musaeum Celeberrimum*, the introduction is divided into three parts: “Buchgeschichte” describes the social and cultural context in which the book was produced; “Paratexte” examines the material like the title, motto, and dedication that surrounds the text in the book itself; and “Inhalte” focuses on some of the more distinctive content areas like antiquities and Egyptology. A valuable annotated index of authors and places is added, which results in a presentation in which the

accompanying scholarly analysis in total is longer than the facsimile itself. But the scholarship is meticulous and the result is worth the effort that went into producing it.

The other work presented here is the *Vita* of 1684. Here Kircher presents himself in a way that is different from the biography that had appeared some time earlier. The later biography appeared four years before his death and reveals the reflections of a person who had reached the point where it made sense to put his life into a larger perspective. The theme that guides this work is religious, Kircher's belief that his life had unfolded under the direction of God, which places the *Vita* into the literary tradition of popular piety. The presentation of the material differs from that used in the *Musaeum Celeberrimum*, in that the scholarly introduction (this time much shorter) is followed by a modern text with a critical apparatus and a German translation.

In their own ways, each work in this volume provides real insight into the mind of the seventeenth-century equivalent of "The Most Interesting Man in the World," as they say in the Dos Equis beer commercial. Kircher deserves the renewed interest he is receiving today, and both the scholars who are preparing the volumes in this series and the publisher who has taken it on deserve our thanks. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Non omnis moriar: Die Horaz-Rezeption in der neulateinischen Literatur vom 15. bis zum 17. Jahrhundert / La réception d'Horace dans la littérature néo-latine du XV^e au XVII^e siècle / La ricezione di Orazio nella letteratura in latino dal XV al XVII secolo (Deutschland–France–Italia)*. Edited by Marc Laureys, Nathalie Dauvois, and Donatella Coppini. *Noctes Neolatinae / Neo-Latin Texts and Studies*, 35.1–2. 2 vols. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 2020. XX + 1450 pp. €296. The essays in this collection began as papers delivered at a joint Italian, German, and French research conference that took place between 2012 and 2014 at the Villa Vigoni on Lake Como, whose goal is to promote dialogue and collaboration between Italy and Germany within the European context. The purpose of this conference was to explore the reception of Horace in the Neo-Latin literature of Italy, Germany, and France. The basic structure of the exploration drew

from Charles Oscar Brink's postulate that Horace's place in modern literature could be divided into three categories: *Horatius criticus*, *Horatius lyricus*, and *Horatius ethicus*. The organizers of the project did not adhere slavishly to this scheme, but it did prove useful in grouping what would otherwise have been left as an undigested, although valuable, mass of material.

After a preface by the three editors and an opening presentation by Walther Ludwig, "Die Liebe zu Horaz: Horaz in der europäischen Kultur der Neuzeit," volume I consists of two main parts. Part 1, *Trasmissione e interpretazione del testo*, contains one paper on the manuscript tradition, Claudia Villa's "La circolazione di Orazio fra Tre e Quattrocento: lettori e collezionisti," and two on the tradition as continued in printed books, Antonio Iurilli's "La fortuna editoriale di Orazio nei secoli XV–XVIII," and Concetta Bianca's "Note su Orazio e l'Umanesimo romano: Francesco Elio Marchese, Antonio Mancinelli, Pomponio Gaurico." The last section, on commentaries, is divided into two subsections. The first, on commentaries to the *opera omnia*, contains Donatella Coppini's "L'Orazio platonico di Cristoforo Landino," Nicolle Lopomo's "Iodoco Badio Ascensio commentatore delle opere oraziane," and Nathalie Dauvois's "Le commentaire de Denis Lambin: le discours et la méthode." The second subsection, on commentaries to the *Ars poetica*, contains five essays: Ilaria Pierini, "Gli umanisti esegeti dell'*Ars poetica* di Orazio: il caso di Aulo Giano Parrasio, commentatore indeciso"; Michel Magnien, "Aristotéliser Horace? La *Paraphrasis in librum Horatii ... de Arte poetica* de Francesco Robortello (1548)"; Monique Bouquet, "Jason Denores—Jacopo Grifoli—Francesco Luigini: *L'Art poétique* d'Horace et la *Poétique* d'Aristote"; Marc Laureys, "Neue und alte Wege der Textexegese in Johannes Sambucus' Kommentar zu Horazens *Ars poetica* (Antwerpen: Plantin, 1564)"; and Michel Magnien, "Domestiquer la Chimère par la méthode? Le commentaire inédit de Nicolas de Nancel sur l'*Art poétique* d'Horace (ca. 1581)."

Part 2 is devoted to Horaz in literaturkritischen Diskursen der Frühen Neuzeit. Section 1, *Von Horaz und seiner Rezeption* ausgehende literaturkritische Diskurse, presents five papers: Virginie Leroux, "Une *quaestio* horatienne: *natura an arte?*"; Émilie Sérís, "La formule horatienne *ut pictura poesis* chez quelques commentateurs et

poéticiens humanistes”; Walther Ludwig, “Der expurgierte Horaz im jesuitischen Schulunterricht”; Anja Stadeler, “Die Verhandlung von Obszönität in Lambins Horazkommentar (1561)”; and Jörg Robert, “*Ars sine arte*—Horaz-Kritik bei Scaliger und Heinsius.” Section 2, Die Wirkung der horazischen Dichtung auf die Poetik und Literaturkritik der Frühen Neuzeit, contains four contributions: Mariangela Regoliosi, “Orazio lirico nelle *Elegantie* di Lorenzo Valla: ovvero il posto della poesia nello statuto della lingua latina”; Ilaria Pierini, “Orazio nel *De poetis latinis* di Pietro Crinito”; Perrine Galand, “L’influence d’*Horatius criticus* sur la première poétique humaniste. Le *De poetica et carminis ratione* de Joachim Vadian, Vienne, 1518”; and Tristan Vigliano, “Présence d’Horace dans l’oeuvre de Vives.”

Volume II is similarly divided into two parts. Part 3, Réécritures d’Horace: Présence de l’*Horatius lyricus* dans la littérature néolatine, begins with section 1, Héritages et vues d’ensemble: Michele Feo, “Il re del canto lirico”; Jean-Louis Charlet, “La réception des mètres lyriques d’Horace dans la poésie néo-latine italienne et française (XIV^e–première moitié XVI^e s.)”; Ilaria Pierini, “Orazio lirico nella poesia medicea del Quattrocento”; Tristan Vigliano, “Denise et Canidie: le loi des trois demis (Ronsard lecteur des *Épodes* d’Horace)”; Nathalie Dauvois, “Lieux lyriques à la Renaissance. Les *Carmina* dans les florilèges, les anthologies et les recueils de lieux communs”; and Marc Laureys, “Bemerkungen zur *parodia Horatiana* im Lichte der neueren Forschung.” Section 2, Études de cas, contains five essays: Blandine Boulanger, “*Léthos* horatien de Pietro Crinito: le masque d’un poète dissident sous la république Florentine (1474–1507)”; Suzanne Laburthe, “L’imitation d’Horace chez Macrin”; Virginie Leroux, “Le modèle des *Odes* d’Horace dans les oeuvres poétiques et philologiques de Marc-Antoine Muret”; Jörg Robert, “Nachahmung, Übersetzung, Akkulturation. Horaz-Rezeption(en) in der deutschen Lyrik (1580–1650)”; and Marc Laureys, “Die Horaz-Paraphrasen des Jacobus Wallius.” Part 4, Réécritures d’Horace: Présence de l’*Horatius ethicus* dans la littérature néolatine, is the longest, as one might expect. Section 1, Débats éthiques, offers Mariangela Regoliosi’s “Presenze della poesia oraziana nelle opere di Lorenzo Valla: spunti ideologici ed etici,” Tristan Vigliano’s “*Est modus in rebus*: Horace mesuré—Horace moralisé,” Virginie Leroux’s “Éthique et poétique: interpretations et

influence de l'*Art poétique* d'Horace," Nathalie Dauvois's "*Horatius ethicus* chez les commentateurs français d'après 1560 (de Denis Lambin à Henri Estienne)," and Robert Seidel's "Die Rezeption des *Horatius ethicus* im Medium lateinischer Thesendrucke des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts." Section 2, Réécritures des satires et des épîtres, is the longest in the two volumes: Silvia Fiaschi, "Un modello nascosto: Orazio nelle *Satyrae* di Francesco Filelfo"; Roswitha Simons, "*Horatius ridens* im poetologischen Diskurs neulateinischer Satiriker und Poetiken"; Ilaria Pierini, "Orazio nel *Liber secundus epistolarum ad amicos* di Alessandro Braccesi"; Béatrice Charlet-Mesdjian, "Horace dans le *Sermonum liber* de T.V. Strozzi"; Arnaud Laimé, "Les épîtres horatiennes aux sources du renouveau poétique en France au XVI^e s. Les *Epistolae familiares* de Pierre de Ponte"; Michel Magnien, "L'épître horatienne comme dérivatif et consolation: l'*Epistolarum Liber* du jurist Jean de Boyssoné (ca. 1542–1555—ms. B. M. Toulouse 835, 64r–101r)"; Perrine Garland, "Éthique et militantisme dans les épîtres de Michel de L'Hospital (*Carmina*, 1732): pour une réforme de soi même et du monde"; and Karl Enenkel, "Horaz als Lehrmeister der Ethik: Vaenius' *Emblemata Horatiana*." The collection concludes with an Elenchus Fontium et Commentationum (Fontes, Fontes manu scripti, Fontes typis expressi, and Commentationes), three Indices (Index nominum, Index locorum Horatianorum, and Index codicum manu scriptorum), and a Brevis conspectus bio-bibliographicus.

An enormous amount of work has gone into this collection, over a period of several years, and it has been worth it. It has been over twenty years since the appearance of the *Enciclopedia oraziana*, and it is therefore time to revisit Horace's reception in Neo-Latin literature. Antonio Iurilli offered a key foundation from which this reworking could begin in his *Orazio nella letteratura italiana. Commentatori, traduttori, editori italiani di Quinto Orazio Flacco dal XV al XVIII secolo* (Rome, 2004), and the appearance of his *Quinto Orazio Flacco. Annali delle edizioni a stampa (secoli XV–XVIII)* (Geneva, 2017) while this project was in progress offers the bibliographical guidance that is needed as long as such resources as the Robert Patterson '76 Collection of Editions of Horace at Princeton continue to lack proper modern catalogues. There is more work to be done, to be sure: the circumstances under which this project was undertaken, for example, precluded research

on Horace's reception in England. But that has led to a *felix culpa*, in the sense that this is one of the few such volumes that does not contain a word of English. This may sound ironic coming from an American, but I regret very much the growing ascendancy of English within Neo-Latin studies in the past two generations. This collection was born, nurtured, and printed on the continent, and I am pleased to see it in its proper linguistic garb. This has allowed an important point made by the editors to come through clearly: "La variété des langues d'étude et des méthodes d'approche a permis de la mettre en valeur en créant progressivement une vraie synergie, de l'apport philologique de la méthode italienne à la tendance analytique des Français à l'esprit de synthèse des Allemands. Nous avons beaucoup appris les uns des autres et envisagé de manière complémentaire notre sujet" (XVII). Our subject may be the same, but our approach to it is not, and it is good to see what happens when the various national traditions are set next to one another. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *The Latin of Science*. Edited by Marcelo Epstein and Ruth Spivak. Mundelein, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci, 2019. 395 pp. \$29. This book is a stimulating contribution to the recent swell in anthologies dealing with Latin literature from a timespan wider than the more commonly surveyed classical and medieval periods. Viewed even within this relatively progressive group of publications, the present volume takes an innovative approach. If Minkova's *Florilegium Recentioris Latinitatis*, Riley's *Neo-Latin Reader*, and Korenjak's *Neulatein* have made selections from the blossoming field of Neo-Latin available to interested readers,⁴ Epstein and Spivak's collection is the first—to this reviewer's knowledge—to consider Latinity in its entirety for the selection of texts. Moreover, in focusing on the natural sciences and addressing an audience of language learners outside of the humanities, *The Latin of Science* genuinely earns itself a characterization as

4 M. Minkova *Florilegium Recentioris Latinitatis* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2018); M. Riley, *The Neo-Latin Reader: Selections from Petrarch to Rimbaud* (Sophron Editor, 2016); M. Korenjak, *Neulatein. Eine Textsammlung. Lateinisch/Deutsch* (Ditzingen: Reclam, 2019).

something new and very exciting.

The book has its background in a course run at the University of Calgary. The two-term Latin of Science course introduces students majoring in fields other than Classics to the Latin language and its 2000-year-long tradition of writing on natural philosophy. Accordingly, the present volume presents readers with an overview of Latin grammar (249–325) as well as a translation glossary, alongside twenty-three extracts of scientific writing from twenty-one authors on everything from natural history through engineering, mathematics, astronomy, and optics to economics and chemistry. On the book's companion website (<https://www.bolchazy.com/Latin-of-Science-P3958.aspx>), interested readers can also access electronic facsimiles of the volume's texts, as well as exercises in aspects of Latin grammar and their answers. A companion volume that will offer translations of the Latin passages presented in this book is also planned (cf. xvii).

In their aim to stimulate readers with a wide range of periods and scientific subject matter in their selection of texts, Epstein and Spivak have certainly been successful. William Harvey's vivid explanation of blood circulation in his *Exercitatio anatomica* will be a surefire hit, while the anonymous translation of the reflections of Maimonides (Rabbi Moshe ben Maimon) on the dramatic ups-and-downs in the mental and physical condition of his king, Al-Afdal ibn Salah ad-Din, makes for absorbing reading. The comparison of Adelard of Bath's twelfth-century Latin translation of an Arabic rendering of Euclid's *Elements* with the thirteenth-century version from Campanus of Novara is another noteworthy example of the editors' stimulating selection of texts: The case offers fascinating perspectives on both the role of Latin as a linguistic medium in Europe's history and on the transmission of mathematical thought through the ages. Moreover, in their inclusion of clear geometrical diagrams (e.g. 108, 113) and strong notes on the mathematical issues at play in Euclid's text (109–10, 117), Epstein and Spivak show themselves very capable pilots for non-expert readers through the occasionally choppy waters of mathematical propositions and their early forms of explanation.

The editor's well-written introductions to each author and text are both lively and interesting. They offer valuable perspectives on the place of the various works in the history of science more gener-

ally—this holds especially true for the present journal’s Neo-Latin readership in the introductions to Kepler’s *Epitome astronomiae* (145), for example, Copernicus’s *De revolutionibus* (127–28), and Libavius’s *Alchemia* (33)—but there are also engaging details from the life and times of their authors (cf. Galvani’s attitude towards Napoleonic control in late eighteenth-century Italy (95) or Leibniz’s and Newton’s dispute (119)). Lists of further reading for each chapter, or fuller notes on the figures and ideas dealt with in these introductions, would perhaps have made it easier for interested students to take their curiosity further, should they wish.

The notes on the texts are, on the whole, instructive and are surely successful in making the Latin more accessible, especially to less experienced readers. This reviewer shares the editor’s enthusiasm for one of their preferred explicatory techniques, that of reordering a Latin passage into a form easier to grasp, which is put to good use throughout the volume. Occasional moments of ostensibly terse commentary involving either straightforward English translation or the repeated “subjunctive; why?” (cf., e.g., 93) may be less helpful for the wider readership, but they do not hinder the overall impression of a well-thought-through guide to the text for learners.

That a good share of the space in the notes goes to ironing out variations in orthography, spelling, and basic textual issues points to one of the very few problematic choices in the book, namely that of relying on early modern editions and the occasional manuscript as sources for the texts. Many of the resulting snags are straightforward and should not hold up students for too long (e.g., *quattuor* / *quatuor* (32), *Appollo* / *Apollo* (69), or *ijs* / *iis* / *eis* (185)). And the early modern misprints **Rx* (for *rex*, 79) or **a postesartes* (for Greek ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς, 23) are easily explained away, even if they are perhaps unnecessarily troublesome for beginners. But deeper textual issues resulting from this choice are treated frequently in the notes (cf. *iere* for *ire* or *ierunt*, 18, or *inventor* for *invento*, 240, for example). These moments are anything but helpful for language learners approaching Latin texts for the first time. The game of ‘spotting errors’ can be entertaining for bright students, of course, but ‘gloves-off’ textual criticism is surely a step too far for second-semester students.

While a reasonable case can be made for the value of presenting early modern works in their original form when few, or no editions whatsoever, are available, this is not the case for ancient and medieval works. For these texts the editors' explanation of their decision to use early modern sources "in the same spirit as playing period music on the corresponding period instruments" (xiii) does not hold water: We have no surviving autograph manuscripts of Seneca the Younger's *Quaestiones naturales*, Pliny's *Naturalis historia*, or Isidore of Seville's *Etymologiae*, for example, and the philological work done since the earliest Renaissance editions of their works has done much to improve the quality of the texts and our understanding of their authors' ideas. A quick comparison of the present volume's passages with the latest modern editions of these three authors reveals a remarkably high number of textual disparities, some of them important (cf., e.g., Isid. *Etym.* IV.4.2). It could be argued that Latin readers early in their experience will neither notice, nor likely care too much about, these philological differences. But when one of the stated aims of the book (and of the course at its origin) is to build "an active awareness of one of the most important components of human culture, namely the vast literary output of scientific works written in Latin over a period of twenty centuries" (113), it seems only fair—to this reader—to offer students only the best available texts from the outset. These are, after all, the very product of our twenty centuries of reading the works.

The volume's three appendices offering introductions to the pronunciation of Latin (I), a functional overview of Latin grammar (II), and notes on the formal 'quirks' of the early modern prints (III) are well presented and carefully thought through for early learners. The Latin-English glossary at the back of the book completes the volume as a stand-alone handbook for its readers. Questions may well be posed over the inclusion of the seventy-six-page grammatical overview, especially in light of the easy accessibility of introductions to Latin grammar in academic bookstores. But it must be said that the book's editors undoubtedly reach their goal of offering the "fundamental tools necessary to analyze and translate a text" (xii) in a self-contained volume. Their willingness to forego some of the minutiae of Latin grammar in favor of direct access to the texts they present is, then, to be applauded.

In sum, Epstein and Spivak's *Latin and Science* is the result of an attractive and ambitious concept to introduce students from outside of the humanities to Latin literature on science from a period of over two thousand years. The editors achieve this in an extraordinarily stimulating self-contained volume that sees students through the basics of Latin grammar and into an exceptionally exciting selection of primary texts. Epstein and Spivak's well-controlled notes and comments, paired with their appealing introductions to the texts, are sure to arouse interest among students and language learners, but also among the broader community of Latin readers who have not read widely on scientific subject matter in the language. If this reviewer has had reason to pause over the decision not to use the latest modern editions in the presentation of the volume's ancient and medieval material, this is only to add a voice to the editors' hope that the present anthology "spurs the publication of other works of this kind" (xiii). Epstein and Spivak's *Latin of Science* remains a pioneering contribution in its approach, subject matter, audience and,—most stimulating for this journal's readership—perspective on the history of Latin literature. (William M. Barton, Ludwig Boltzmann Institute for Neo-Latin Studies, Innsbruck)

◆ *Virtue Politics: Soulcraft and Statecraft in Renaissance Italy*. By James Hankins. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2019. XXVI + 736 pp. \$45. This is a book that has been awaited eagerly for some time now. In part this is because its author, James Hankins, is one of the most important scholars at work today in Renaissance intellectual history, so a new monograph from him demands attention. Hankins is as indefatigable in his travels as he is in his research, and he has been presenting and refining his ideas on this topic in lectures and at conferences for a decade. And a book whose premise is that the political thought of the Renaissance humanists *in toto* has been fundamentally misunderstood is bound to make an impact in a way that a single-author study, as valuable as that might be, cannot.

The book is written with admirable clarity around a deceptively simple thesis, that the principal message of the humanist reformers

was “that cities needed to be governed by well-educated men and women of high character, possessed of practical wisdom, and informed by the study of ancient literature and moral philosophy” (XIII). At first glance this point may not seem controversial; what is new is the assertion that this is the central premise of the political philosophy of the age. The general perception is that humanist political thought has little new or interesting to offer, that study should be focused on what has come to be referred to as ‘civic humanism’ or ‘the republican tradition,’ and that scholarly attention should continue to center on Machiavelli as the best entry point into Renaissance political thought. The importance of humanism is widely acknowledged, but not as a movement whose protestations about morals and character formation are to be taken seriously; the prevailing approach is to view it instead as a linguistic and stylistic phenomenon whose best moments are found in the philological work of figures like Lorenzo Valla and Angelo Poliziano.

It is worth reflecting for a moment on how, if Hankins is right, this scholarly train went so far off the tracks. One of the major issues has to do with which sources have been read and processed. Ever since Hans Baron latched on to a handful of works whose preoccupation with republican ideals resonated with his resistance to twentieth-century authoritarianism, scholars in the Anglophone world at least have emphasized the same theme as Baron did. Yet there are many other orations, letters, and dialogues, even poetry, that discuss political themes like the morality of war, the role of wealth in society, the relationship of laws to character, and the need to balance individual ambition with the broader social good. Many of these works have lain unread because they are still in manuscript, even though in this period manuscript dissemination counted as publication in the same way as being printed, and others remain understudied because they are in a language, Latin, that is controlled with less and less facility by each new generation of scholars. The current understanding of humanism also causes problems. Influential scholars like Anthony Grafton and Lisa Jardine have pointed out, correctly, that records of what actually went on in Renaissance schoolrooms reveal an almost total preoccupation with grammar and the identification of names and places, which has led to the identification of a disjunct, again correct (at least in part),

between humanist educational theory and practice. Hankins's response is that Renaissance humanism was broadly concerned with values, but that the evidence for this concern lies in the unread literature of the period, not in student notebooks.

This is a big book, over seven hundred pages in length, but it is fair to ask someone who wants to reorient a field to marshal sufficient evidence to do so. The first four chapters lay out the basic argument, defining key terms and showing their interconnection. The next nine chapters turn to the most important figures in humanist political thought—Petrarch, Boccaccio, Leonardo Bruni, Biondo Flavio, Cyriac of Ancona, Leon Battista Alberti, George of Trebizond, Francesco Filelfo, and Francesco Patrizi—to show that the central concept of virtue politics was widely accepted among influential thinkers and writers. The final three chapters integrate Machiavelli into the discussion.

As I continue thinking about this, I am finding myself persuaded: the idea that character mattered in some way or other is a commonplace of Renaissance humanism, and there is no reason why that concern should not be as central to political thought as it was to other areas. I suspect that not everyone will agree with everything Hankins says, but I am certain that *Virtue Politics* will reset the discussion of Renaissance political thought for the next generation. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum: Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries*. Volume XIII: *Ancient Greek Sophists, Publius Papinius Statius*. Editor in Chief, Greti Dinkova-Bruun; Associate Editors, Julia Haig Gaisser and James Hankins. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2020. XL + 364 pp. \$95. This is the thirteenth volume of a series that was founded in 1946 by the venerable Paul Oskar Kristeller. Its goal remains the same now as it was then: to offer a comprehensive list of manuscript and printed commentaries on each Greek and Latin author from antiquity, along with a detailed essay on that author's *fortuna* and, in the case of Greek authors, a survey of Latin translations as well. Some changes in the series guidelines have recently been made, so that in some cases contributors can go past the original limit of

1600, take account of material written in the vernacular, and include more paratextual information than the earliest volumes did. Readers should also note the existence of an open-access website for the project (<http://catalogustranslationum.org/>), where the first eleven volumes can be consulted in pdf form.

This volume contains two lengthy articles. The first is on the ancient Greek sophists, understood here to include Protagoras, Gorgias, Prodicus, Thrasymachus, Hippias, Antiphon, Lycophron, and Xenias, along with *Anonymus Iamblichi* and *Dissoi Logoi*. In the Middle Ages, access to the sophists became scattered and fragmentary, but in the first decade of the fifteenth century, the translations of Guarino Guarini and Leonardo Bruni began to turn things around. Translations into Latin continued for the next twenty-five years, and Marsilio Ficino's edition of the complete works of Plato with commentary in 1484 also focused interest on the sophists by expanding access to Plato's anti-sophist polemics. In the next century the most important year for the *Nachleben* of the sophists was 1570, when Henri Estienne published his edition of Diogenes Laertius with an appendix of fragments of Pythagorean moral philosophy and Hieronymus Wolf produced his edition of Isocrates's letters and orations. Knowledge of the sophists was also disseminated through miscellanies like those of the *Commentarii urbani* (1506) of Raffaele Maffei and the *Lectiones antiquae* (1516) of Ludovicus Caelius Rhodiginus.

The other author treated in volume 13 is Publius Papinius Statius. The reception history of his poems is complicated and different in each case. The *Thebaid* was his most popular work, surviving in 254 manuscripts. There are multiple medieval commentaries, but the tradition is dominated by two, one that is attributed to Lactantius Placidus (probably fifth century) and the other the twelfth-century 'ip' commentary that seems to have been drawn from multiple sources. Primarily on the basis of this poem, Statius was ranked only slightly behind Virgil as a poet and influenced writers ranging from Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio, and Chaucer to Tasso, Spenser, and Milton. The *Achilleid* circulated in 219 manuscripts, with the twelfth-century 'Kobenhaven–Pommersfelden' ('KP') commentary and the so-called 'Tradition A' being the major commentaries. The *Achilleid* was seen primarily as an educational aid in the Middle Ages and its popular-

ity declined in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, with interest being largely confined to philological circles. The reception of the *Silvae* went in a different direction: it survives in only thirty-seven manuscripts, and all of the commentaries date to 1470 or later. Once the poems reentered wider circulation, however, they became very popular, with ten collections of *silvae* being published before 1501 and imitations coming from Lorenzo de' Medici, Poliziano, Spenser, and Ben Jonson, among others.

Since 1960, articles on almost a hundred classical authors have appeared, but most of them have been on writers whose works did not circulate widely or attract a large number of commentators. This makes sense: it takes less time and work to cover Juvenal than it does to treat Homer, and since articles are published in the order in which they are completed, it is no surprise to find ourselves where we are now. It is worth noting, however, that the tide is turning: the article on Statius that is published here comes to almost three hundred pages, and the ones on Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and the Renaissance commentaries to Virgil are nearing completion. There is much work still to be done, but the movement into the top tier of the most influential classical authors is a welcome sign of things to come in a project whose results provide the foundation on which any responsible reception study must rest. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Una lingua morta per letterature vive: il dibattito sul latino come lingua letteraria in età moderna e contemporanea*. Atti del convegno internazionale, Roma, 10–12 dicembre 2015. Edited by Valerio Santozza. Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia, 45. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2020. VIII + 451 pp. €79.50. The theme of this volume of conference proceedings is expressed well in its title: how did Latin, a living language that was spoken at the beginning of the early modern period, take on new life as a literary language that continues in use today? After a brief preface that explains the theme and gives a little information about the conference at which it was initially explored, the volume offers the following essays: Andrea Comboni, “Note sulla fortuna dell’*Osci et Volsci dialogus* di Mariangelo Accursio”; Marco Leone, “Latino *vs.* volgare: *scriptores Latini e scriptores vernaculi*

nel Rinascimento”; Martin McLaughlin, “*Il Cortegiano* in Inghilterra: la traduzione latina di Bartholomew Clerke (1571)”; Clementina Marsico, “A ciascuno il suo: discussioni e rivaltà nelle grammatiche latine dell’inglese”; Marc Laureys, “Friedrich Taubmann’s Views on Latin Style and Poetic Composition”; Jürgen Leonhardt, “Lateinische Dichtung zwischen Kommunikation und nicht-Kommunikation: Überlegungen zur Rolle des Gelenkenheitsgedichts im 18. Jahrhundert”; Francesco Saverio Minervini, “Italiano e latino nel Settecento: tra primato della lingua e sovranità politica”; Maurizio Campanelli, “Il latino allo specchio: cultura e scuola in alcune satire italiane del Settecento”; Dirk Sacré, “Girolamo Ferri et ses *Pro linguae Latinae usu epistolae adversus Alambertium* (1771)”; Florian Schaffenrath, “Wie John Milton zum lateinischen Epiker wurde: Zu lateinischen Übersetzungen von *Paradise Lost* und den *Parnassidos libri IV* (1773) von José Pueyo y Pueyo”; Isabella Walser, “Jacob Grimm als Cicero wider Willen? Die Propagierung der Deutschen Kulturnation in Grimms Antrittsrede *De desiderio patriae* (1830)”; Xavier Van Binnebeke and Paola de Capua, “Letteratura e antifilologia nello *Xiphias* di Diego Vitrioli”; Leopoldo Gamberale, “Tradurre i propri versi nella propria lingua: storie di poeti”; Sebastiano Valerio, “Andare in cerca del nuovo tenendo l’occhio all’antico’: Pascoli, la scuola e il latino”; and Yorik Gomez Gane, “@Pontifex: la Santa Sede tra latino, italiano e le altre lingue.” The volume concludes with two indices, one of manuscripts, printed editions, and archival sources and the other of names.

As the editors explain in the preface, the conference originally had two parts, one devoted to the Italian Cinquecento and to the way in which the Settecento opened up to a European-wide horizon, and the second that ran from the Otto-Novecento to the modern era. Taken together, this allows an exploration of the full run of Neo-Latin literature, which is beneficial given that, while it is generally recognized in theory that Neo-Latin runs from Petrarch until today, in practice the emphasis often falls on the Renaissance and Baroque. This is also a good place to note that the conference and the publication of its proceedings unite the two most prominent institutional supporters of Neo-Latin today, the Ludwig Boltzmann Institut für Neulateinische Studien in Innsbruck, which sponsored the conference, and the Seminarium Philologiae Humanisticae, which accepted the volume into its monograph series. May this spirit of cooperation long continue! (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)