♦ Before Utopia: The Making of Thomas More’s Mind. By Ross Dealy. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 2020. xii + 400 pp. $120. As the title suggests, this is a traditional intellectual biography in which a scholar investigates the evolution of a famous person’s thought, looking for influences from the subject’s past and filiations in his or her present. While the book is long and the development is detailed, Dealy’s main point is deceptively simple. Stripped of all its accompanying nuance and support, his argument is that prior to 1504, More vacillated between whether he should choose the active or contemplative life. This reflects an either/or world view, but that world view changed in late 1504, when More came to recognize that he did not have to choose because each life requires the other. This new both/and world view was radically transformative, and Dealy rightly asks how and why it came to be. The proximate cause, he argues, was Erasmus, in particular Erasmus’s De taedio Iesu and Enchiridion, which led More to see that Stoicism offered a world view that had a place for both the worldly and the non-worldly, honestum and utile, a unitary understanding that supplied an intellectual method that functioned as well at the beginning of the sixteenth century as it did in antiquity. More’s Lucian (1506) works out this unitary, two-dimensional way of thinking, and Erasmus in turn utilizes the same approach in his Praise of Folly (1511), as does
More’s *Utopia* (1516), where it is developed within an imaginary New World setting. In other words, *Utopia* is not a rhetorical *jeu d’esprit*, but the programmatic working out of an approach to life with serious consequences for humanism and the history of classical scholarship.

While the genre in which this book is situated is traditional, its argument is not. It is not easy to say something new about one of the most frequently discussed works of Neo-Latin literature of all time, but Dealy has done so. His argument unfolds in dialogue with other scholars, whose works are cited and discussed in detail. Its novelty is confirmed by the number of times in which Dealy references other scholars, only to assert that they are wrong. This gives his book a polemical edge in places, but it is the polemic of someone who has immersed himself deeply in the primary sources, thought about them at length, and tested his ideas against the work of others. In fact this is the second long book on a similar topic that Dealy has published within the last three years: in his *The Stoic Origins of Erasmus’ Philosophy of Christ* (reviewed in the spring 2018 issue of *NLN*), he argues that Erasmus’s *philosophia Christi* originated in late classical Stoicism and shows that the *Disputatiuncula de taedio, pavore, tristitia Jesu* (1499-1501) and the more famous *Enchiridion militis Christiani* (1503) should be read together, as two important stages of Erasmus’s early thinking. Dealy’s two books together function as a sort of diptych that provides a new picture of the first generation of sixteenth-century humanism, as seen in the works of two of its most famous adherents. I suspect that not every reader will accept every detail of Dealy’s argument, but the research that lies behind these eight hundred pages and the clarity with which his conclusions are presented guarantee that his will be one of the more significant voices in Erasmus and More studies over the next generation. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

♦  *The Republic of Venice: De magistratibus et republica Venetorum.* By Gasparo Contarini. Edited and introduced by Filippo Sabetti. Translated by Giuseppe Pezzini with Amanda Murphy. The Lorenzo Da Ponte Italian Library. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2020. lx + 135 pp. $34.95. As any student of the Italian Renaissance knows, the ‘myth of Venice’ was disseminated throughout Europe during this
period. The myth begins from the peculiar longevity of the Venetian republic and predicates several causes for its stability, ranging from the city’s geography and institutions to a unifying patriotism that made a striking impression on foreign visitors for generations. The myth has been much discussed for centuries, but Contarini, who belonged to an old patrician family and was therefore well positioned to analyze it from the inside, offers a distinctive take on it by focusing on the institutions by which the republic’s political aims were realized. These institutions created an equilibrium of plural centers of power, which produced a high degree of ‘buy in’ from the patricians, a minimal risk of factional violence, and an accountability for those who held office.

Book 1 focuses on the location and origin of the city and its form of government, with an emphasis on the basic political institution, the Great Council. The second book discusses the doge as the head of state and chief magistrate, while the third and fourth books move through the Senate, the Council of Ten, and the chief judicial tribunals and magistracies. The treatise concludes with a discussion of how Venice governed its territories on the mainland and how the various community organizations worked. For Contarini, Venice achieved long-term success by combining Aristotle’s and Polybius’s three forms of rule, with the monarchical vested in the Doge, the aristocratic in the Senate, and the democratic in the Great Council. To this ideal, mixed government, geography, institutions, and habits of mind contributed as well. The term ‘myth’ suggests a certain uncritical attitude toward the world around us, and it is true that Contarini tended to idealize the founders of the republic and to accept the kinds of social and political inequalities that have bothered some modern historians. But he also drew attention throughout his treatise to individual failings, political corruption, and institutional weakness.

This book has several things going in its favor. As someone who himself has written about the myth, I confess that I have always found the institutional framework within which it evolved to be complex and ultimately rather mystifying. Contarini’s De magistratibus demystifies the inner workings of the Venetian government quite nicely. The front matter of this edition, however, strikes me as a bit misleading, in that including on the title page the name of someone who edited and introduced the book suggests to me that it will contain a Latin
text as well. This is not the case, but given that the translation and introduction are as short as they are and that there is no modern edition of the text, it is a pity that one was not included here. But what we do have will draw welcome attention to a text that merits further study. Within the last couple of generations, Venice has established itself alongside Florence as a focal point for Renaissance history in both the Anglophone and Italian-language worlds, but thanks to the outsized influence of Hans Baron, scholarship on Renaissance republican thought tends to remain centered on the Arno. *De magistratibus* suggests that we should turn our attention to the northeast as well, and that we should spend less time on ideology and more on institutions. As scholars like J. G. A. Pocock noted some fifty years ago, discussions like these take their place within the ‘Atlantic republican tradition,’ which makes this one of those places where Neo-Latin scholarship has something significant to say directly to modern cultural and political life. Thanks to the team that produced this book, Contarini should be able to take a larger role in this conversation from this point onward.

(Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

♦  *De origine, moribus et rebus gestis Scotorum VIII.* By John Lesley. Edited with Latin text, introduction, translation, and commentary by Bernhard Söllradl. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Edition Woldan, 7. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2020. c + 376 pp. €69. The volume under review here presents a Latin text with an introduction, translation, and commentary for the eighth book of the ten-volume account of the origin, culture, and history of Scotland by John Lesley (1527-1596), bishop of Ross. The years covered here, from 1437 to 1513, include the struggles of the young king James II with the powerful house of Douglas, the rebellion of the nobles against the unpopular James III, the splendid wedding of James IV with Margaret Tudor, and finally the decisive Scottish defeat by the English at the Battle of Flodden. Lesley’s account, however, is not restricted to the basics of political history: he also chronicles the Scottish role in the internal and external diplomatic maneuvers between the English and French and the conditions within the Scottish church that made it
receptive to the ideas of the Protestant reformer John Knox.

Lesley’s account provides both rich historical detail and a satisfying read on stylistic grounds, but it has been largely forgotten today. Söllradl suggests—rightly, I believe—that this obscurity results from Lesley’s unwavering loyalty to the Catholic Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots. This meant that the powerful Scottish Protestants of the sixteenth century rejected his account as biased in the wrong direction and turned instead to the *Rerum Scoticarum historia* of George Buchanan. Buchanan has become a writer of considerable interest to Neo-Latin scholarship today, which has in turn eclipsed Lesley’s work even further. Söllradl’s edition therefore serves as a welcome partial corrective to Buchanan’s Protestant bias.

I say ‘partial’ because Söllradl’s edition covers only one of the ten books of *De origine, moribus et rebus gestis Scotorum*. Given the length of Lesley’s work, the decision to restrict one’s self to one book is a reasonable one, and given the importance of the events from this period, book 8 was a good choice. On an editorial level, this raises again a question that often recurs in Neo-Latin studies: should we try to publish modern print versions of every Neo-Latin text, given that readership will remain relatively small, the paratextual aids that accompany the early editions are lost in this process, and the internet offers the options of reproducing an early edition or providing a modern version in a low-cost format? Söllradl’s solution—to do a modern edition of one key part and to direct the reader to an early edition for the rest—strikes me as an interesting compromise that should be considered more widely.

Both the Latin text and the German translation are well prepared, and the commentary, while brief, provides what is needed for an informed first reading of the work. This is a competently done example of the stock in trade of Neo-Latin studies, the edition of a previously neglected work, and as such, it should be consulted by anyone interested in Scottish history and culture of the period. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)
Ever since the late eighties, increasing attention has been paid to what Gérard Genette called the ‘paratext,’ that is, things like dedicatory letters, commentaries, and indices that were added to the text itself to help the reader navigate through and understand it. The essays in this volume build on this work by focusing on a period prior to the one in which Genette was most interested, and by confronting the problems that arose in early editions of the classics, where the paratexts were provided not by the author, but by third parties like editors, commentators, and printers.

A number of themes emerge from the essays. In some cases, like that of Erasmus, dedicatory letters were republished apart from the texts they originally accompanied; in others, like that of the *Cornu copiae* of Niccolò Perotti, the paratext took on a life of its own to the extent that the text itself served as little more than a foundation for it. The paratextual material accompanying a text often grew and grew, accumulating greater mass over time, then changing shape again to accommodate the needs of readers with different abilities and goals. Paratexts reveal relationships within the *res publica litterarum*, and they often served to situate a text within the ideological and political controversies not of the ancient culture in which it was produced, but of the editors and commentators who brought it back to life. In other words, paratexts offered powerful tools for generating more informed readings, but they opened up the possibility of new misreadings as well, as early modern scholars also recognized. In addition they provided a vehicle by which early modern authors could maneuver to have their works recognized as modern-day classics.

After the introduction by the editors and before the indices of names and ancient authors cited, the volume contains four groups of essays. The first, collected under the title “Paratesti di edizioni e traduzioni di classici greci,” includes Claudio Bevegni, “Il greco di Aldo Manuzio nelle lettere dedicatorie”; Ioannis Deligiannis, “The Classical Sources of the *Marginalia* in M. Palmieri’s Latin Translation of Herodotus’ *Histories* from Florence, BML, ms. Acq. e Doni 130”; Angelo Meriani, “Vicende di un paratesto: il *Prooemium in Musicam Plutarchi ad Titum Pyrrhinum* di Carlo Valgulio”; Maria Stefania Montecalvo, “Il ruolo delle dediche e degli elementi paratestuali nelle


The final section, “I paratesti dei nuovi classici,” presents Marc Deramaix, “Ut ad poema redeam. Le lettere di Egidio da Viterbo e di Belisario Acquaviva a Sannazar nell’editio princeps del De partu Virginis”; and Antonio Gargano, “Un moderno classico spagnolo: Garcilaso de la Vega nei commentari del Brocense a di Herrera.”

This is a substantial volume on a topic of great interest to readers of Neo-Latin News. And at €39, it is also quite a bargain. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)
Placentinis – Libassi. By Jacob Sense. Noctes Neolatinae / Neo-Latin Texts and Studies, 34. Hildesheim, Zürich, and New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 2019. 404 pp. €88. At first glance the subject of this book, which originated as a doctoral dissertation at the Westfälischen Wilhelms-Universität Münster, might seem to be an exercise in perversity: why would anyone choose to translate a vernacular poem into Latin at the point when the linguistic balance was tipping in exactly the opposite direction? And why, at a time when fewer and fewer people read Latin at all, would a scholar study such a translation now? Yet as Sense shows, the Tasso poems translated here are hardly an isolated phenomenon, since his catalogue of the Latin translations of the Gerusalemme liberata (356-60) lists twenty-nine versions that were published between 1584 and 1900. And Tasso was not the only vernacular author who was treated in this way—my library, for example, contains a copy of Lapsus protoparentum ex poemate Miltoni Cantus VI. Accedit Supplementum ad Lib[rum] VI Aeneid[os] de Fatis Imperii Romano Germanici et Aug[usto] Gente Austriaco (Vienna, 1768), by Ludwig Bertrand Neumann (1726-1779), which shows that this exercise was still popular a century after its heyday. Sense has selected five versions from among the twenty-nine in his catalogue for further study: the Solymeis (1584) of Scipio Gentilis, the poem of the same title (1611) by Johannes Baptista Valentianus, the Hierosolyma liberata (1623) by Guido Vanninius, the Hierosolyma vindicata (1673) by Hieronymus de Placentinis, and the Solymeis (1683) by Vincentius Libassi.

The question posed above, about why anyone would undertake a project like this, is answered at length in Sense’s analysis. For one thing, it was often argued during this period that for a work to be universally accessible, it needed to be in Latin, since the knowledge of vernacular languages was limited geographically. Second was the aesthetic argument, that Latin possessed a greater maestas than the vernaculars, so that translating a work like Jerusalem Delivered or Paradise Lost would elevate the reading experience. In addition, translation into Latin also allowed for an expansion of the literary features that were characteristic of the epic genre. And there are several good reasons for studying these poems now, even though they are even less likely at this point to gain a wide audience than they were when they were
published. First, it is sometimes forgotten now that after the fall of Constantinople, the idea of a crusade was still very much alive, as was the threat of an Ottoman invasion of Europe; these poems played a part, albeit a small one, in the accompanying discussions. Second, the period in which these five poems were written was marked by a good deal of theorizing about both literature in general and translation in particular. And finally, the growing interest among scholars today in paratexts (see the review of I paratesti nelle edizioni a stampa dei classici greci e latini (XV-XVIII sec). in this issue of NLN) encourages us to examine the connections between these poems and their dedicatees, which provides insight into their place in both the political environment and literary culture of their day.

The book begins with a sixty-five-page introduction that examines the current state of scholarship in this area, the idea of a crusade after the fall of Constantinople, Latin translation in theory and practice, and the general issues surrounding the Latin versions of Tasso’s epic. The main body of the monograph offers separate sections on each of the five poems selected for study, with each section examining the author and the environment in which his poem was produced, followed by a study of the poem itself. The book concludes with a general summary, an extensive bibliography of both primary and secondary sources, an index of abbreviations and the complete catalogue of Latin versions of Jerusalem Delivered, and three indices: an index nominum et operum, index locorum, and index rerum. Everything is done well, resulting in what will remain the definitive study of its subject.

As those who attend the IANLS congresses regularly know, the interaction between Neo-Latin and the vernacular has become a subject of considerable interest in the last generation. That interest is generally focused on the movement from Latin to the vernacular languages, but this book reminds us that linguistic transferral went in the other direction as well and that the second deserves serious study along with the first. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

is a lightly revised version of the author’s doctoral dissertation from
the Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg, examines the role of the
chorus in the dramatic works of Jakob Balde. Dänzer begins from the
premise that these works can be best understood from two reference
points: the institutional framework of the Jesuit order in which Balde’s
literary activity took place and the tragedies of Seneca, which served
as a literary model for his plays, especially the *Jephthias*, which is the
best known of the group.

After a brief overview of the Jesuit theater in the Baroque period,
Dänzer moves to an extended analysis of almost a hundred pages that
considers the role of the chorus in Senecan tragedy, with a focus on
*Oedipus* and *Troades*. While she has considerably more to say in this
section, the key conclusion is that “[d]ie Tragödien sind eine Form des
Philosophierens für Fortgeschrittene, ihre Chorlieder fungieren dabei
als kondensierte Interpretationsanleitung, die nach dem Prinzip der
*mise-en-abyme* die einzelnen Akte zusammenfasst” (216). The second
part of the book explores how and to what extent Balde takes over
this principle in his own works. Dänzer first explores the function of
the chorus in Balde’s non tragic plays. The section titles summarize
nicely what Dänzer sees in each of the relevant works: “Was ist ein
tragischer Chor: *Regnum poetarum*,” “Gattungsmarker: *Iocus serius*”;
“Ohne Chor: *Drama Georgicum*,” and “Ein Grenzfall: *Arion Scaldicus*.”
The last fifty pages are devoted to the function of the chorus in the
tragedy *Jephthias*. As she indicates in her final paragraph (219), Dänzer
shows that Balde understood well the importance of the chorus in
the tragedies of Seneca and developed it further and with more flex-
ibility as a key to the meaning of his plays, in which the concept of
the *mise-en-abyme* takes on a new importance in Latin literary history.

Balde has been better known and appreciated for his Neo-Latin
lyrics, which have earned for him the title of ‘the German Horace.’
His dramas have not received nearly as much attention, which makes
this work a welcome addition to the scholarly literature. In one sense,
some of Dänzer’s conclusions underwhelm, in that if we think about
it for a moment, the idea that Balde’s plays should be unpacked in
reference to Baroque school drama and to Seneca is where most people
sitting down to write this book would begin. The argument that the
choral passages are the “key to tragedy,” as the title suggests, is more provocative; it may strike some readers as debatable, but the debate is worth having. And even if Dänzer’s conclusions do not open up a breathtaking new approach to Neo-Latin drama, they remind us of a couple of important points that we are in danger of forgetting. When we think today of Oedipus, for example, we tend to think of Sophocles, not Seneca, but since Latin was always better controlled by more people than Greek, pre-modern readers were more likely to access the version of the latter than the one of the former. For this reason alone, Dänzer’s study is important, for directing attention to Seneca’s dramatic works and to how they were understood and adapted in later periods. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

Napoleo Latinitate vestitus. Napoleon Bonaparte in lateinischen Dichtungen vom Ende des 18. bis zum Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts. Vol. III: Vom Frieden von Tilsit bis zu Marie-Louises Schwangerschaft (1807–1811). Edited, with translation and commentary, by Hermann Krüssel. Noctes Neolatinae, 37. Hildesheim, Zürich, and New York: Olms, 2020. XII + 621 pages. €98. Given the role that Latin continued to play in European culture at the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries, it should not surprise us to find that there was some Neo-Latin literary activity connected to Napoleon Bonaparte. When the first volume in this series appeared (reviewed by Joanna Luggin in the fall 2012 NLN), I at least was not expecting to learn that there are almost two hundred such poems. This is the third of a projected four volumes devoted to this understudied corpus.

The poems in this volume cover just four years, from the Peace of Tilsit to the pregnancy of Marie-Louise. The first two poems are the longest: Bardus Hercyniae, Poema Vincentii Monti a Francisco Bottazzi epicis Latinis interpretatum, an Ossianic epic in 1747 hexameters, and the teacher Pierre Crouzet’s Colloquium apud Elysios manes inter Carolum Magnum et consultissimum virum Tronchet. The remaining poems in this volume are arranged in groups, with twenty-five coming after the Peace of Tilsit, another nineteen devoted to Napoleon’s marriage with Marie-Louise, and six focused on her pregnancy. Written by poets
from Germany, Austria, and Italy as well as France, the poems reveal a longing for peace, but they also touch on a variety of sub-themes, with Joseph Matthias Arnold’s *Napoleon primus, qui Maximus esse meretur* being of special interest for what it has to say about life during the Napoleonic era, both as regards its author and in general. Each poem is accompanied by an extensive introduction and commentary that place the works into their contemporary historical contexts and link them to other poetry in the Latin literary tradition, along with a translation that is both accurate and elegant, in that the meter of the original Latin is preserved in the German translation.

This collection is valuable for several reasons. First, it must be recognized as a long labor of love. Krüssel first had to locate each of the poems, which are dispersed in archives and libraries in Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, and England; the poems then had to be sorted into groups, translated, and equipped with the paratextual material necessary to make them comprehensible to readers who do not have either the historical knowledge or the literary background that educated people in Napoleon’s day had. Then he had to find a publisher willing to commit to a project that has already come to 1,900 pages in print, with a fourth volume still to appear; for this we owe thanks not only to Georg Olms Verlag, but also to a foundation, Pegasus Limited for the Promotion of Neo-Latin Studies, that has been the silent partner for a good deal of publication in this field over the last generation. In short, this collection and the volume reviewed immediately below offer a valuable reminder that Neo-Latin retained considerable importance after the Renaissance and Baroque periods on which attention is more generally focused. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

♦ *Studies in the Latin Literature and Epigraphy of Italian Fascism.* Edited by Han Lamers, Bettina Reitz-Joosse, and Valerio Sanzotta. *Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia,* 46. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2020. x + 364 pp. €59.50. Mussolini’s fascination with Latin and the Roman past is well known; indeed one could argue that the twenty-year period in which Italy was dominated by fascism probably marks the high point for Neo-Latin in the twentieth century, in the
sence that the language was cultivated and appreciated more widely and deeply within society than it was before or since. But ask yourself how you feel after you have read this sentence: rather uneasy at least, right? This feeling, as the editors point out (1), has until recently inhibited the study of the literary and epigraphical use of Latin in Italy from 1922–1943.

But this is changing: “[r]ecent publications have explored what it meant to write in Latin under Mussolini and argued that the language was made to serve as the language of Fascist romanità, as a modern and a specifically Fascist language, as a national and international language, and as the language of Italian imperialism” (2). The subject was initially explored in a colloquium, “Fascium decus superbum. Neo-Latin in the Ventennio Fascista,” which took place at the Bischöfliches Institut Vinzentinum in Brixen on 7 and 8 October 2016, although the presentations have been refined into a form that is of more permanent value than most acta. For one thing, the essays build on recent research and open up new avenues to pursue by focusing on three recurring topics: the important role that Latin played in linking fascist Italy to ancient Rome, the variety of contexts in which Latin was used in fascist Italy, and how fascist Latin manipulated the ‘myth of Rome’ as it appeared more broadly in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Italy. More important, perhaps, is that while most essay collections are presented by marketing departments as ‘opening up new avenues of research,’ this one actually does so: the notes and bibliography are unusually full, and the volume closes with an “Instrumentum bibliographicum” of some eighty pages that invites the reader to dive in and develop her own project.


This is a well prepared and well executed collection that belongs on the bookshelves of anyone who feels the need to explain the relevance of Neo-Latin studies in the modern period. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Albasitensis: Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies (Albacete 2018). General editors, Florian Schaffenrath and María Santamaría Hernández; edited by Jean-François Cottier, Carla Maria Monti, Mariannne Pade, Stefan Tilg, and Juan J. Valverde Abril. Acta Conventus Neo-Latini, 17. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2020. XXXIV + 703 pp. €165. Every third year, the International Association for Neo-Latin Studies hosts an international conference that has become the largest and most important meeting in the field. The 2018 congress took place in Albacete, Spain. The fifty-four participants whose papers were submitted for publication and passed peer review are included in this volume.

The volume opens with the congress program, the presidential address by Ingrid A. R. De Smet, and a list of illustrations. IANLS practice is to have a plenary paper in each of the five official languages of the organization, with the speakers serving as editors for the other papers in their language. The plenary speakers gave the following papers: Jean-François Cottier, “Le De Alea (1561) de Pascasius, ou l’invention des addictions et de la thérapie analytique”; Carla Maria Monti, “Petrarca e la natura”; Marianne Pade, “‘Conquering Greece’: On the Correct Way to Translate in Fifteenth-Century Humanist Translation Theory”; Stefan Tilg, “Autor / Erzähler und Fiktion im neulateinischen Roman: Ein Beitrag zu einer historischen Narratolo-
gie”; and Juan J. Valverde Abril, “Apuntes sobre la transmisión textual de la versión latina de la *Política* de Leonardo Bruni.”


As always, this volume offers an excellent overview of the field, and as such, it takes its place among the preceding *acta*, all of which should be on the bookshelves of any serious Neo-Latinist. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)