

NEO-LATIN NEWS

Vol. 70, Nos. 3 & 4. Jointly with SCN. NLN is the official publication of the American Association for Neo-Latin Studies. Edited by Patrick M. Owens, Academia Latinitatis Fovendae, Donnelly College; Former Editor: Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University; Founding Editors: James R. Naiden, Southern Oregon University, and J. Max Patrick.

◆ Réka Lengyel and Gábor Tüskés, eds., *Vergil, Horaz und Ovid in der ungarischen Literatur 1750–1850*. Wien: Praesens Verlag 2020, 320 pp. (Singularia Vindobonensia, Band 9) The present volume contains a selection of eleven papers delivered at a conference on “Roman Poets in Hungarian Literature of the 18th and 19th Centuries—Virgil, Horace, Ovid,” at the University of Miskolc October 6–8, 2016. The first publication of the papers in Hungarian appeared in Budapest in 2017,¹ the volume under review publishes six of the papers in English and five in German, thus making them accessible to a wider readership of the *Respublica Litterarum*.

In her preface, Réka Lengyel explains the choice of the hundred years between 1750 and 1850 with the argument that in the period from the beginning of the eighteenth until the middle of the nineteenth century the literature of ancient Greece and Rome had exerted a particularly strong influence on Hungarian literature and that Latin was until 1844 the official language of the government administration and the school system—an influence that only since the second half of the nineteenth century has faded considerably.

In the first contribution of the volume, Wilhelm Kühlmann presents “Johann Ladislaus Pyrkers *Tunisiás* (1820)” (13–47) with the somewhat pompous subtitle “Karl V. und die Nord-Süd-Konflikte der Frühen Neuzeit im klassizistischen Heldenepos der Restaurationsepoche” that would suit a lengthy monograph on that poem rather

¹ *Római költők a 18-19. Századi magyarországi irodalomban: Vergilius, Horatius, Ovidius*, szerkesztette Balogh Piroska, Lengyel Réka. Budapest: MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont, Irodalomtudományi Intézet, 2017.

than his 33 pp. article in which he briefly discusses that German (not Latin, as the title *Tunisiás* might suggest) epic poem in 12 books and ca. 10,000 hexameters written by the Austrian-Hungarian prelate and later archbishop of Eger/Erlau, Ladislaus Pyrker (1772–1847), on emperor Charles' V campaign in North Africa (1535), a *work in progress* on which the author has worked since 1810. The first edition was published in Vienna in 1820, followed by five later reprints (with corrections) in his *Sämmtliche Werke* between 1832 and 1857, and there were also translations into Italian and Hungarian (when and by whom, Kühlmann does not tell us). It is not surprising that this poem is heavily influenced by the ancient epic tradition, in particular by the *Aeneid* whose length and structure, especially in its second half, Pyrker meticulously imitates as Kühlmann demonstrates with a few examples from the first four books. Judging from the fact that the author was a Catholic clergyman and high functionary of the church and wrote “in der restaurativen Atmosphäre nach der Niederwerfung Napoleons und dem Wiener Kongress” (16), it is neither surprising that, in Kühlmann's words, the *Tunisiás* is a “weitläufiges Werk der historischen habsburgtreuen, demgemäß kontrarevolutionären Romantik” and depicts “den Traum einer christlichen deutsch-österreichisch-habsburgischen Universalmonarchie [...] im Schatten und im Widerschein der napoleonischen Ära und der postnapoleonischen Erfahrungen” (45).

Attila Buda and Anna Tüskés give an overview on “Works of Horace, Ovid and Virgil in the Collections of Aristocratic Houses,” using the example of “The Helikon Library of Festetics Palace in Keszthely and the Library of Károlyi Palace in Fót” (49–77). Both noble families had built up libraries of respectable size: that in Fót consisted of some 6,600 volumes in 1843, 10,000 in the second half of the nineteenth century and in 1927 of an estimated 20,000 volumes but it unfortunately perished after 1945, its books being scattered and mostly lost or, rather, not traceable any more except a few hundred that had found their way into other Hungarian libraries. There survive, however, two ms. catalogues dating from 1830 and 1843 that give us an impression of the richness of the collection. Concerning the three Augustan poets, Horace was represented by six printed editions, five in Latin dating from 1761 until 1829/31 and one in

French translation by the Jesuit Sanedon (Amsterdam 1756), Ovid with the *Metamorphoses* in French translation and, in Latin, the *Opera omnia* ed. Heinsius-Burmannus 1820/4 and the *Epistolae Heroicum* in a sixteenth-century ed. *sine loco et typographo* that has survived in the Rare Works Collection of the Metropolitan Ervin Szabó Library in Budapest,² and Vergil also with three editions: a Latin-French one of the complete works (Paris 1736), the Italian translation (1581) of the *Aeneid* by Annibale Caro (Venice 1734), both of them now also in the same library, and a Latin ed. of the *Opera* by the French Jesuit Charles de la Rue (Tirnaviae 1760). The Helicon Library, housed in an especially erected wing at Festetics Palace in Keszhtely between 1799 and 1801, is still preserved³ and holds today eight editions of Horace (the oldest Antwerpiae: Stelsius 1563, the second oldest is the Jesuit ed. Monachii 1632, “Ab omni obscenitate Romae Expurgatus”), eleven of Ovid (the oldest is Opera, Venetiis: Tauchini de Tridino 1518) and ten of Virgil (the oldest is *Poemata quae extant omnia*, Tiguri: apud Christoph. Froschoverum 1561). There are also twelve catalogues compiled between 1746 and 1894 whose listings show that in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries there were editions that are no longer present in the actual stock. The essay by Buda & Tüskés opens an interesting glance at those libraries and the primarily didactic (and moral) purposes for which the texts of the three Augustan poets mainly have served.

In her chapter “Zur Rezeption von Vergil, Horaz und Ovid in den ungarischen Übersetzungen des *Zodiacus vitae* von Palingenius” (79–103), Éva Knapp observes at the beginning that the *Zodiacus vitae*

2 Buda and Tüskés are here not precise in their statements: on p. 56 they write “Although the volume’s spine says *Ovidi Libri Amorum*, it does not contain the *Amores* but instead the *Heroides*,” but from their subsequent transcription of the title page follows that this volume also contained “*Amorum libri 3. De arte amandi libri 3. De remedio amoris libri 2*” (according to the practice of the majority of the younger mss. and early printed editions that divided the *Remedia* in two books with vv. 1-396 and 397-814 respectively). Anyway, this ed. is not mentioned in the 1843 catalogue of which they on p. 54 reproduce the relevant section with <Opera> ex rec. Heinsio-Burmanniana, Paris 1820/4, *Epistolae <seu Elegiae de Ponto>*, Tyrnaviae 1731 and *Met.* in French translation by J.G. Dubois-Fontenelle (Paris 1802).

3 A useful survey of editions of Horace, Ovid and Virgil in this library is added in an appendix on pp. 72-77.

has not been printed in Hungary but that numerous copies of it have been present in ecclesiastical and private libraries and that there were two Hungarian translations both of which, however, have never been printed: a complete one by József Elefánti Jáklín from 1771, transmitted in four handwritten copies, and a fragmentary one (only books 1 & 2), also in ms., by the Unitarian János Pettényi Gyönggyössi the Younger from 1820 that was intended for didactic purposes in the schools. Knapp finds that “Die Leistung beider Übersetzer bleibt hinter den Erwartungen der Zeit, sie ist in literarischer Hinsicht wenig inventiös, ihre ästhetische Qualität mittelmäßig” (89) and analyses a number of places in both the Latin text and the two translations where the three Augustan poets have been imitated and alluded to in different ways, but, as far as the translations are concerned, always with a view to their use in the curriculum in the 17th and eighteenth centuries and therefore, consequently, also expurgated from Palingenius’ views as far as these were not compatible with the doctrines of Catholic Faith.

János Rédey’s essay “The Poetry of Ovid and Virgil in István Agyich’s *Saeculum: A Survey of Classical Antiquity in Late Eighteenth-Century Latin Poetry of Hungary*” (105–139) traces imitations of and allusions to Ovid and Vergil in the poem *Saeculum liberatae a tyrannide Turcica Civitatis Quinque-Ecclesiae* (129 elegiac couplets),⁴ published by István Agyich (1730–1790) in *Quinque Ecclesiae/Pécs* in 1786, in which the author celebrates the centenary of the liberation of the city of Pécs from Ottoman rule in 1686 and praises Count Ferenc Széchényi (1754–1820), a Hungarian politician and founder of the Hungarian National Library and National Museum, “for his revival and governance of the city and its environs” (111).

In her article “Horace and the Hungarian Art Theories in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries” (141–167), Piroska Balogh studies the way in which the German philosopher Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten (1714–1762) “utilized the Horatian tradition in his works and particularly in *Aesthetica*, as his writings and methods formed determinative models for Hungarian thinkers” (143). Stating that “Horace’s works served as a particularly influential inspiration for the new discipline” (144) of aesthetics in Hungarian literary and

4 The poem is printed in the Appendix, 131–139.

philosophical theory of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, she analyzes “three main types of Horatian references” in the writings of Georg Aloys Szerdahely (1740–1808), Professor of aesthetics at the Faculty of Humanities of the Hungarian Royal University, of Johann Ludwig von Schedius (1768–1847), a student of Christian Gottlob Heyne in Göttingen and since 1792 Professor of Aesthetics in Pest, and of the Catholic priest Ferenc Verseghy (1757–1822), a Hungarian poet and linguist who wrote a Hungarian grammar in Latin, published many didactic works and became an important translator mainly of English and German literature and poetry into Hungarian. She concludes that Szerdahely and Schedius saw “Horace as a paragon—an ideal aesthetician and theoretical thinker of arts” and “utilize[d] Horace’s text, primarily *Ars Poetica*, to corroborate and support certain topics and discourses emphasised by Baumgarten’s *Aesthetica*” (145 f.), whereas to Verseghy Horace “was not an excellent poet writing exemplary poems” but “appears as a model for a severe and ironic critical reviewer” (161), i.e., “During the nineteenth century, Horace’s authority subsequently seems to have diminished” and “his texts now appeared [as] ironic reviews and satires” (167).

In her contribution “Scythischer Horaz,” Etelka Donczes is in search of “Antike Muster im Lebenswerk János Batsányis” (169–193), a Hungarian poet (1763–1845) who was called “scythischer Horaz” by his wife, the Austrian poetess Gabriele Baumberg (1766–1839): not only because Horace is “einer der am häufigsten zitierten antiken Autoren” (175) in his poems and writings, but also because he took a similarly ambivalent attitude to Emperor Franz II. (I.) as—in Batsányi’s view—did Horace towards Emperor Augustus, and compared himself to Horace in his long *Apology* although Horace, as Donczes rightly remarks, was not opposed to the regime, but “eher seine Kaiser Augustus verehrenden Texte, sein opportunistisches, der kaiserlichen Propaganda dienendes Verhalten im Vordergrund standen” (184). Batsányi, however, was a strong opponent of Habsburg rule in Hungary, a Hungarian Jacobin who for his liberal ideas, his anti-Habsburg agitation and his participation in the conspiracy of Ignác Martinovics (1794) even went to jail and was later confined to the Austrian city of Linz on condition that he never left the town. It would, therefore, be interesting to study closer how it came that

Horace could be conceived of as an opponent to Augustus (and not Ovid, as it was traditionally the case) both by Batsányi himself and by some members of the illuminated and patriotic circles of Hungarian poets and intellectuals in the eighteenth and eighteenth centuries.

Gyula Laczházi contributes some “Anmerkungen zum Verhältnis von Horaz-Rezeption und Empfindsamkeit: Pál Ányos, Ludwig Hölty und Dániel Berzsenyi” (195–217). In this paper he looks for thematic affinities between the poems of Horace and those by the three lyric poets, Hölty being chosen because Ányos’ poems also show parallels to the contemporary German lyric poetry, in particular to that of the Göttingen *Hainbund* of which Hölty, “auch ein begeisterter Leser des Horaz” (210), was a member. In both Ányos and Hölty “manifestiert sich die Affinität zu Horaz im Gedanken der Vergänglichkeit bzw. in der Thematik der Freundschaft und der heiteren intimen Gesellschaft,” a “Nebeneinander des Bewusstseins der Vergänglichkeit und der Sehnsucht nach Harmonie” (212) that also forms the thematic nucleus in the poetry of Dániel Berzsenyi (1776–1836), the ‘Hungarian Horace’, whose poem *Horác* stands as an example for the figure and the teaching of Horace who impersonates a “Lebensform, die für den Sprecher als harmonisch, aber unerreichbar erscheint” (215): love is not only a source of happiness but also of pain and grief. Laczházi considers it therefore as important that “die Aufgeschlossenheit für den *Carpe-diem*-Gedanken und für die Thematik der Vergänglichkeit stellen in der Rezeptionsgeschichte nicht zwei aufeinanderfolgende Etappen dar, vielmehr ist eine Gleichzeitigkeit dieser Motive erkennbar” (217).

Dániel Berzsenyi is also in the centre of Gábor Vaderna’s article “The Productive Moment: Imitation, Horace and Dániel Berzsenyi” (219–237), in which he scrutinizes Horace’s influence on the poetic practices of the Hungarian poet that had given rise to a controversy among contemporary literary critics concerning the originality of his poetry between intended allusions and sheer plagiarism.

Rumen István Csörsz’s article “*Vinum facit rusticum optimum latinum*: Latin Convivial Songs in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Hungarian Popular Poetry” (239–271) is a brief survey on Latin and Hungarian poems celebrating the drinking of wine and the joyfulness of drinking societies “which flooded manuscript collections

of poems and prints in surprising abundance during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries” (241) whereas they did not exist in earlier times. Csörsz ascribes this to the growing influence of student culture and Latin-language student songs in Hungary at that time and discusses a number of such poems, showing their dependance from Medieval Latin drinking poems as they were known from the 13th century ms. of the *Carmina Burana* that had been discovered during the secularization in the library of the monastery of Benediktbeuern and from which already in 1820 a fragment of CB 196 (*In taberna quando sumus*) had appeared in a Debrecen manuscript. But since the first publication of the *Carmina Burana* dates only from 1847, Csörsz supposes that this and other songs “must therefore have been introduced by wandering students returning from foreign universities,” but he also takes into account that the genre may have been known from other medieval collections that became known in Hungary in the eighteenth century. But also, the influence of Horace’s sympotic poems is clearly recognizable as the authors shows from the poems by Mihály Csokonai Vitéz (1773–1805).

Katalin Czibula’s essay “Naso unter Blumen und Gemüse: Ovid in protestantischen Dramenhandschriften des 18. Jahrhunderts” (273–291) draws the attention to the protestant *Schuldrama* in Hungary that since the second half of the eighteenth century has been “grundsätzlich ungarischsprachig” (275) and was the main genre for the transmission of the knowledge of ancient mythology and ancient authors; she shows this through an analysis of the drama *Nasonak Számkivetése* (“Naso’s Exile”) and its transmission in three manuscripts from the end of the eighteenth century two of which originate from the reformed lycea in Sárospatak and Lizenz/Losonc. The three mss. contain further dramatic and other texts, mainly occasional poetry among which several epitaphia on Ovid, with topics from ancient mythology (Pandora, Proserpina, Dido, Golden Age, Phaedra, Aeneas, Turnus, Thetis and Lyaeus a.o.). The play on Ovid’s exile—as do other plays of that kind – exhibits “eine eigenartige Aktualisierung [...] mit einer ironisch-komischen Färbung” (280), for instance, in Ovid’s comic dialogue with the Getes and in the fiction that Ovid on his way back from Tomis to Italy passed through Hungary: there he came to Losonc where he drank wine with the students and discussed with

them on poetry, and died in the town of Savaria. The main source for the play was, next to the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*, Ovid's amatory poetry from which many verses are quoted and imitated so that the pupil-actors could acquire a rich thesaurus of original Latin verses from Ovid.

The last essay in this volume, Réka Lengyel's "*Ovidius est magister vitae (et litterarum): Language, Literature and Life through Ovid in Hungary in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*" (pp.293–310), is a study of "Ovid's reception in early modern Hungarian literature". "By collecting data on printed editions, the manuscript tradition and translations of the Ovidian corpus," Lengyel intends "to explore the lesser-known aspects of the classical poet's historical reception" (296). She underlines that Hungarian readers usually acquired the Latin text or German and French translations from abroad because in Hungary printed texts of Ovid's works were available only from the second half of the eighteenth century on. What was available before were mostly expurgated textbooks for schools which mainly served didactic purposes of learning the Latin language, chief among them the *Metamorphoses*. The 'harmful' texts of *Amores* and *Ars Amatoria*, on the other hand, were difficult or impossible to get, because "according to the censorship decree of 1792, it was forbidden to distribute the works of Kotzebue, Wieland, Rousseau and Ovid in Hungary" (299)! Therefore, it is not surprising that "the first complete Hungarian translation of the *Amores* was published in 1820, its Latin text in 1907; *Ars amatoria* was first published in Hungarian as late as 1883" (300), whereas before that there circulated only manuscript texts and translations as, for instance, that of the *Amores* by László Kazinczy written in 1784, followed by full translations of *Heroides*, *Metamorphoses*, *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* until the middle of the nineteenth century. In general, Ovid's poems "not only served as reference points for works on historiography, philology and ethics, but also in textbooks on botany, dietetics and psychology" (303) and "instructed a wide readership on how to live and love" so that Josephus Dezericus (1702–1765), a Piarist priest, could state (with slight exaggeration) that "even pigherds in Hungary were able to speak Latin fluently and recite Ovid's verses" (310).

The rich volume gives a vivid impression of the reception of the three classical poets in Hungarian society, culture and literature and can be throughout recommended to all those who should like to learn more about a province and a period of the *Nachleben* of Latin literature and classical antiquity in general that up to now has not found the attention of scholars that it really deserves. (Heinz Hofmann, University of Tübingen)

◆ *François II Rákóczi, Confession d'un pécheur*. Traduite du latin par Chrysostome Jourdain. Édition critique avec introductions et notes établies sous la direction de Gábor Tüskés. Avant-propos de Jean Garapon. Avec la collaboration de Csenge E. Aradi, Ildikó Gausz, Zsuzsanna Hátori-Nagy, Réka Lengyel, Zsolt Szebelédi, Ferenc Tóth et Anna Tüskés. Édition revue et préparée par Michael Marty. Paris: Honoré Champion Éditeur 2020, 777 pp. (Bibliothèque d'Études de l'Europe Centrale, 25. Série « Littérature »)

In *The Neo-Latin News* 67, 3&4, 2019, 226–232, I briefly reviewed the English translations of two works by the Hungarian nobleman Ferenc Rákóczi II (1676–1735): his *Confessio Peccatoris* of 1716, translated from the Latin and Hungarian and with notes by Bernard Adams (Budapest: Corvina 2019), and *The Memoirs of Prince Ferenc Rákóczi II concerning the war in Hungary 1703 to the end* (published posthumously in 1739), translated from the Hungarian and with notes by Bernard Adams (Budapest: Corvina 2019). There I mentioned that the *editio princeps* of the *Confessio Peccatoris*, though badly executed with numerous misreadings and misprints, was published by Ágost Grisza in Budapest in 1876, but has not yet been replaced by a modern critical edition, and that a first French translation had been made by the Camaldulian Chrysostome Jourdain of Grosbois in ca. 1776 which, however, remained unprinted and that a partial edition of that translation, together with extracts from the *Mémoires*, was published by Béla Köpeczi and Ilona Kovács (Budapest: Corvina 1977), but that a complete critical edition would appear in 2020 (Adams' English translation of 2019 does not give the full text). This complete edition has now been published, and not only will the friends and readers of Rákóczi be happy at this fine and beautifully produced book but also historians, philologists and literary critics

will be glad to have at hand this highly informative and well-written work of Rákóczi, “une grande figure de la culture et de la vie politique européenne” (Garapon in his *Préface*, p. 8), because it is an immensely important source for the history of Hungary and the Habsburg and Ottoman Empires and Europe in general in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

While we still have to wait for a new edition of Rákóczi’s original Latin text of his *Confessio Peccatoris*, Jourdain’s French translation is now available in this exemplary critical edition, enriched with helpful introductory studies and copious textual and editorial materials, both rounded off with a detailed chronological table, an extensive bibliography and three indices (“citations, allusions et réminiscences, noms de personnes, noms de lieux”). The *Introduction* consists of four chapters: in the first (15–38), Ferenc Tóth gives a short biography of Rákóczi, “le prince et l’homme,” and in particular of his diplomatic and political activities which he deployed in order to restore Hungary’s independency from the Habsburg Empire and establish his own reign over his fatherland.

In the second, the longest and most ambitious chapter (39–141), Gábor Tüskés, no doubt the leading authority on Rákóczi, as his numerous publications show,¹ gives a careful and dense analysis of the *Confessio Peccatoris*, discussing questions of sources, motifs and the literary programme of the author, structure and themes of the work, typology and concept of “péch^é” (*peccatum*), problems of language, rhetoric and “écriture de soi,” the balance between fiction and reality and the literary genre of the *Confessio*, and briefly sketches the *Nachle-*

1 For instance: “Les méditations d’un prince chrétien,” *XVII siècle* 46 (1994), 555–580; “Schuld und Süße in der *Confessio peccatoris* von Fürst Ferenc Rákóczi II.,” *Simpliciana* 38 (2016), 379–414; “Psychomachie d’un prince chrétien: au carrefour des genres autobiographiques et religieux. François II Rákóczi: *Confessio Peccatoris*. Première partie,” in *Louis XIV et Port-Royal. Chroniques de Port-Royal* 66 (2016), 401–426, and “*Ido.*, (Seconde partie),” in *Le Christ à Port-Royal. Chroniques de Port-Royal* 67 (2017), 323–341, further his essay “Ferenc Rákóczi II and *Confessio peccatoris*,” in *Ferenc Rákóczi II, Confessio Peccatoris. Translated from the Latin and Hungarian and with notes by Bernard Adams*, Budapest 2019, 367–382; “Ferenc Rákóczi II: Mémoires,” in *Ferenc Rákóczi II, Memoirs. The memoirs of Prince Ferenc Rákóczi II concerning the war in Hungary 1703 to the end. Translated from the Hungarian and with notes by Bernard Adams*, Budapest 2019, 225–236.

ben of the text and its French translations and its importance and later influence. But in spite of the work's moral and religious reflections and its confessional, self-deprecatory basis, it is also a work of eminent historical and political importance, for "il dépeint en miniature les principales idées, la vie religieuse, les valeurs morales et la culture du temps [...] Le narrateur réagit continuellement à la politique et à la diplomatie françaises, polonaises, autrichiennes et russes, à la situation en Italie et en Turquie" (41); therefore, Tüskés continues, it is regrettable that it has been unknown for such a long time, mainly because of the late discovery of the original Latin manuscript, the quality and 'anomalities' of its Latin in comparison to classical Latin, and the poor and unreliable edition of the Latin text by Ágost Grisza (Budapest 1876), so that even today it remains widely neglected and underestimated and "ne constitue pas une source historique établie pour l'appréhension de son époque" (44). He states that Rákóczi conceived his *Confessio* at a decisive turning point in his life, "à la suite de sa «conversion», au moment où il prenait conscience de la transformation de son émigration en exil," when he was forced to "se donner un nouvel objectif, une vocation nouvelle" (48) when, after the Peace of Rastatt (1714) and the war between the Ottoman Empire and the Venetian Republic and the Habsburg Empire, in which the latter acquired the Banat of Temeswar, western Wallachia, northern Serbia including Belgrade and the northern part of Bosnia, his political hopes for the restitution of his Duchy of Transylvania have finally faded away. Moreover, his work is "un chapitre distinct dans l'histoire de la réception de saint Augustin au début de l'époque moderne littéraire" (61). In the following paragraphs Tüskés investigates Augustine's influence upon structure and contents but also on single motifs of Rákóczi's *Confessio Peccatoris* as, for instance, his concept of "sin" according to the Augustinian triad of *concupiscentia*, *curiositas* and *superbia* (89). Very interesting and revealing the principles of Rákóczi's narrative strategy is the paragraph on "Fiction et réalité" (104 ff.) in which Tüskés, viewing the autobiographic genre in its *Spannungsfeld* between fiction and reality and its oscillating "entre mémoires et roman" (105), reminds the reader that "dans la mémoire de Rákóczi, les situations, les déclarations, les événements et les dates ont changé avec le temps et ont été modifiés" (111), that

“La relation entre la réalité et la fiction dans l’œuvre se caractérise par des changements fréquents de perspectives, les contradictions internes, une dichotomie particulière entre la représentation quasi réelle et la fiction, la transformation de la carrière consciemment théologisée, entre religion et mythe” and that “La fiction sert souvent à créer de la crédibilité” (113). In the discussion of the literary genre of the *Confessio Peccatoris*, Tüskés rightly sees its place in the autobiographic tradition as it has developed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as a means for the construction of identity, representing “le type d’autobiographie spirituelle dont le point de départ est l’acte de «repentance», qui résulte d’une crise de la vie, et dans lequel le cours de la vie et les événements historiques apparaissent principalement dans un contexte religieux” (116).² Finally, in the section on *Nachleben*, Tüskés carefully traces the history of the mss. of the *Confessio* and other works by Rákóczi³ and their translations, starting from the only existing ms. 13628 Fonds St. Germain-des-Prés latin (1.111 pp.) of the BN in Paris that contains next to the *Confessio Peccatoris* (1–671, in autograph, written ca. 1716–1720) two other works by Rákóczi, written by a different hand but corrected by the author himself and bound together presumably by the Camaldulians of Grosbois: the *Aspirationes Principis Christiani* in Latin and French and the *Réflexions sur les principes de la vie civile et de la politesse d’un chrétien* (in French only), and discusses the two extant French translations of the *Confessio*: the complete one by Chrysostome Jourdain of the Camaldulians of Grosbois, executed between 1768 and 1778 (autograph transmitted in Troyes Ms. 2144) and an abridged and very short one (“*Sentiments*

2 In this context the author could have referred to volume VIII of the group “Poetik und Hermeneutik” on *Identität*, ed. by O. Marquardt and K. Stierle (München 1979) in which a section of shorter “Statements” deals with “Identität und Autobiographie” (685–717); here Manfred Fuhrmann sees “Rechtfertigung durch Identität” as a “Wurzel des Autobiographischen” (685–690), a line of argumentation that was taken up in the discussion by the other members of the group.

3 Tüskés uses the title *Confession* for both the Latin original and the French translation so that sometimes it is not quite clear of which of both he is speaking, for instance, at p. 125 he writes “Il n’est pas exclu que plus d’un manuscrit de la *Confession* ait existé après 1720,” but he means the Latin text so that he better should have written “*Confessio*”. Similarly at p. 126 “il (sc. Rákóczi) recommandait aux moines (sc. de Grosbois) la lecture de la *Confession*” (of course the Latin version), and elsewhere.

de piété de François Ragosci Prince de Transylvanie ou Extraits de ses confessions, Traduits sur l'original latin"), probably by the Benedictan monk Jean-Baptiste Bonnaud (1684–1758) of Saint-Germain-des-Prés, that "vise à résumer l'essence de la *Confession*" (135), executed already ca. 1740/50 and transmitted in BN Ms. Fr. 17690 fol. 236a–245b and also printed in the present volume (689–724). The biographical sketches of the persons involved in the translations and editions of Rákóczi's works and of the history of these texts are useful. Tüskés characterizes Jourdain's translation as "documentaire, fidèle, si possible, au contenu" and states that "Il ne voulut rien omettre du text ni rien ajouter et essaya de garder les images et les tournures, en plus des idées" (132)—a statement that can be assessed by the readers only when a reliable critical Latin edition will have been published whereas his judgement of Jourdain's style as "clair, souvent élégant et agréable" and of the translation in general as showing "des ambitions littéraires" (132) is, thanks to this excellent edition, already now thoroughly understandable.

In chapter III (143–167) Ildikó Gausz presents a short "Étude comparative du Latin original et de la traduction française," based on a selection of some 30 passages of which she analyses syntax, semantics, vocabulary, the omissions and imperfect renderings of the Latin text, arriving at the conclusion that in spite of some shortcomings and alterations of meaning, Jourdain's translation stands out thanks to its "fidélité à l'original" and avoids "la servilité d'une transcription littérale" and that the changements he made "contribuent à rendre la prose plus limpide et à rendre ainsi plus accessible ce texte de caractère méditatif," the translator showing by and large "un grand respect pour le texte latin" (167).

In chapter IV (167–189), Csenge E. Aradi and Zsuzsanna Hámori-Nagy briefly describe the two mss. of the two translations, the main attention, of course, lying on Troyes Ms. 2144, Jourdain's autograph of his translation, with observations on orthography and punctuation, corrections and additions by the writer. The abridged version of 10 folios, contained in ms. BN Ms. Fr. 17690 fol. 236a–245b, is kind of a first draft, "une version préliminaire, dont quelques parties sont faites d'une manière précipitée" (175), that, for reasons unknown, was not continued by the translator. He intervened more strongly in

the text, transposing the narrative from the first into the third person singular, but retaining the first person singular for the meditative sections which he put between inverted commas; in those sections he followed the Latin text much more closely, whereas the narrative of the events is considerably condensed so that it often comes down to a mere enumeration. The whole section is rounded off by a few remarks (181–184) explaining the textual and editorial principles of the following two editions.

The edition of Jourdain's translation that covers the largest and central part of the volume (185–622) is accompanied by a wealth of explanatory notes and verifications of the quotations and allusions in the text that are of great help for those readers who may not be so well acquainted with the historical events and persons of the period covered by Rákóczi's *Confessio*, and followed by "Notes textologiques" (623–688) that form the *apparatus criticus* of the edition.⁴ In nearly the same way proceed Tüskés and his team with the "Sentiments de piété" (689–724), i.e., the abridged translation by (presumably) Jean-Baptiste Bonnaud, except that the notes are left out because the explanation can be found in the relevant passages of Jourdain's translation.

The volume is rounded off by a detailed chronological table in which the life of Rákóczi is related to the contemporary political and literary history (725–737), a bibliography (739–745), two maps with the itineraries of Rákóczi between 1676 and 1735 and various indices (751–773).

Rákóczi's "autoportrait idéalisé" is, according to Tüskés, "un document historique et la manifestation originale d'une personnalité tout à fait unique" and, from the literary point of view, "un mélange singulier de fiction et de réalité [...], une tentative de relier des pensées religieuses et profanes par des outils littéraires, une description des conflits intérieurs et de l'introspection de Rákóczi," by which "le narrateur cherche à réconcilier la tradition autobiographique et

4 On p. 184 the responsibilities for the edition are explained: Csenge E. Aradi made the transcription of Jourdain's manuscript and the textual notes, Zsuzsanna Hámori-Nagy that of Bonnaud's manuscript and the relevant textual notes, and both transcriptions have been checked and corrected by Anna Tüskés. The "notes historiques" were compiled by Ferenc Tóth, the "notes des références littéraires" by Réka Lengyel, the "notes des allusions bibliques et liturgiques" by Zsolt Szebelédi.

historique hongroise contemporaine et la réalité politique européenne du temps avec la spiritualité et la conception littéraire augustinienne et jansénistes, passées au tamis de ses expériences personnelles” (137 f.) and arrives at the conclusion that “avec cette œuvre, Rákóczi a créé une variante particulière de la prose néolatine autobiographique ou de confession, remplie d’émotions qui, à maints égards, préfigure le roman psychologique et l’individualisation” (139), but warning at the same time that the *Confessio Peccatoris* “ne peut être utilisée avec la même valeur historique que les sources primaires” whereas “les chercheurs n’ont réalisé que récemment le caractère essentiellement littéraire de l’œuvre” (141).

The present volume with its careful edition and the accompanying studies which provide an excellent access to Rákóczi’s main work should be compulsory reading for anyone studying European politics, history and literature of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. But it also increases the desire to read at last the Latin original of the *Confessio Peccatoris* in a reliable critical edition. (Heinz Hofmann, University of Tübingen)

◆ *Poema de Hibernia: A Jacobite Latin Epic on the Williamite Wars*. Edited by Pádraig Lenihan and Keith Sidwell. Dublin: Irish Manuscripts Commission, 2018. [LXXXIII] + 563 pp. €50. This hefty volume, bound in full buckram, printed on excellent paper sewn in signatures, furnished with color plates and a dust jacket depicting a classically attired James II in his glory, finished with a silk ribbon marker, and priced so that individuals can afford it, is a worthy monument to both the poetic achievement of an anonymous poet and to the editors’ scholarly industry. Upon opening the book and gaining acquaintance with its contents, the reader grows ever more convinced that such lavish production has been worthily expended to present the fruits of scholarship and the inspiration of the muses to a wider readership than has hitherto been possible. The *Poema de Hibernia*, as the volume’s subtitle makes clear, is a Latin epic poem more than half the length of the *Aeneid* composed by an eyewitness to the Williamite War (1689–1681), the Irish phase of the historical event generally memorialized in the Anglosphere as the “Glorious Revolution” and on the Continent as “The Nine Years’ War.” On this side of the Atlantic,

the conflict is remembered, if at all, as the relatively bloodless coup, supported by Parliament, that made possible a practical experiment of JoŃ Locke's political theories and inspired a later revolution, somewhat better remembered, in the thirteen colonies. That this edition grants access to a voice from the other side of that conflict, one that is Irish, Catholic, and royalist, will be justification enough for many readers to peruse its contents. That that voice chose to express itself by means of a Latin epic makes the prospect of undertaking a journey to the "foreign country" of the past all the more fascinating. That the *Poema* is one of only three contemporaneous Irish accounts of the Williamite War makes it essential reading for all serious students of both Jacobitism and the Glorious Revolution. That it is not unique but rather belongs to a small corpus of Latin poems recounting the war make it precious to those who wish to recover an important chapter in the history of Latin literature and recall that even in the last decade of the seventeenth century, there existed a class of warriors capable of recording their experience of battle and reflections on it in classical verse.

In their preface, the editors explain that the edition is the product of "a process of discussion, during which each author [made] important contributions towards every aspect of the joint work." In such complimentary endeavors, the editors consider the chief contribution of the philologist to be "notic[ing] important implications of language" while the historian's task is to remind the philologist "to take... account of realities." The team, with Sidwell serving as philologist and Lenihan as historian, has fulfilled this aim admirably, working to contextualize the *Poema* both as an exponent of the tradition of Neo-Latin epic in all its diachronic profundity, and as a valuable eyewitness record of an important chapter in Irish history. The editors relied on two manuscripts, one roughly contemporary with the author but difficult or impossible to read in places, and the other, an occasionally defective but much clearer nineteenth-century copy. Apart from a few extracts, this edition marks the first time the *Poema* has been printed.

As many Neo-Latinists know, it is difficult to work with texts that have attracted little scholarly attention. In the case of the *Poema*, the task is made harder since it has been impossible to discover the name

of the author. In the opening sections of their extensive introduction, the editors have used circumstantial evidence to narrow considerably the pool of candidates for the *Poema*'s author. He was, they demonstrate, involved in the upper echelons of the Irish legal system, a novice poet, in exile in France, charged with treason, and had direct experience of many of the events he describes. Lenihan and Sidwell rehearse the arguments for seven likely candidates before making their case for Thomas Nugent, Lord Chief Justice. They close their discussion of this tentative identification, by inviting further research and saying that though their case is strong, their evidence fails to support a definitive judgment. There follows a thorough codicological description of the manuscript, a discussion of the scribal practice and culture that produced it, and the annotations that sometimes illuminate and sometimes obscure the early history of its reception, the whole illustrated by two well-produced plates.

In their discussion of the poet's art, the editors call attention to his employment of ring composition, his deep knowledge of Latin epic, his connections to contemporary Hiberno-Latin literary production, and his interaction with Gaelic and English traditions. While the poet alludes to Vergil (nowhere more clearly than in his opening lines, which serve both as an homage to Vergil and as a *praeteritio*, wherein he implies that his poem will not aim to compete with the bard of Mantua), the substance derives from Lucan. Like Lucan, the author of the *Poema* at times reflects on the nature of history and politics, situating the recent past in the *longue durée* while laying out a program for the future that is at turns both hopefully idealistic and practically specific, giving his readers suggested invasion routes and the sort of logistical information that will be useful to military planners. The editors are careful also to point out the author's profound engagement with biblical sources and his skillful deployment of situations and motifs derived therefrom in classical dress. The introduction ends with a consideration of the poet's metrical practice and vocabulary, concluding that he was "by no means a bad versifier" and that he, like most Latinists of his day, was unafraid to draw on post-classical sources. Throughout, the editors draw attention to the author's knowledge of native traditions, which this unfortunately Gaelic-less reviewer found particularly useful and interesting.

The translator has chosen to maintain traditional English poetic diction while matching the Latin line-by-line, allowing the English to act as guide to the Latin and replicate the archaic diction that is proper to epic. The opening lines of Book 3 offer a soupçon of the effect produced: “Now two-faced Janus opens and pulls back / The bolts that put a stay upon his gates / And through all roads to War licence does give / To go and play his merry havoc there.”

The Latin text mostly preserves post-classical spellings and seventeenth-century use of majuscules, while the punctuation has been modernized. The translator is unafraid of employing “thee” and “thou” along with obsolete contractions like “whoe’er,” “twas,” and “th’,” which the reviewer regards as a feature rather than a defect. The Latin text is surrounded by indications of the manuscript’s foliation, notes concerning scribal practice, and a *conspectus fontium* of classical and biblical allusions. Endnotes follow each book, and these are mostly of an historical character. The whole is followed by appendices containing a list of similes, a glossary of allusions, an *index auctorum*, re-presenting the information contained in the *conspectus fontium* in a format that will aid readers interested in tracing the influence of a particular author or work throughout the *Poema*. Indices of Latin names of modern places, of rare Latin words, and of the edition as a whole bring Lenihan and Sidwell’s almost 600-page tome to a close.

The production of so expansive and luxurious edition of a Neo-Latin work is an event to be celebrated. Typographical errors are infrequent and limited to dangling punctuation and other such minor infelicities that in no way impede the reader. It is to be hoped that this edition of a poem composed in Latin by an English-speaking Irishman on behalf of a French-reared, Scottish-descended King against his Dutch rival finds a wide readership among students both of seventeenth-century history and of Neo-Latin epic. (Erik Ellis, Hillsdale College)

◆ *John Milton’s Roman Sojourns, 1638–1639: Neo-Latin Self-fashioning* by Estelle Hann. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, Vol. 109. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society Press, 2020, 231 pp. \$37. This volume is another milestone in the prolific career of Professor Estelle Haan. She has long been a

leader among Milton scholars and her expertise in Neo-Latin poetry from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is unmatched. Now an emerita professor of English and Neo-Latin Studies at Queens University-Belfast Haan's focus on Milton began with her dissertation titled "JoŃ Milton's Latin Poetry: Some Neo-Latin and Vernacular Contexts," and completed at Queen's University-Belfast in 1987 under Professor Michael J. McGann. Since then she has written numerous articles and contributed, either as an author, an editor, or both to many volumes including: *From Erudition to Inspiration: Essays in Honor of Michael* (Belfast: Queen's University of Belfast, 1992), *From Academia to Amicitia: Milton's Latin Writings and the Italian Academies* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1998); *Thomas Gray's Latin Poetry: Some Classical, Neo-Latin and Vernacular Contexts* (Brussels: Collection Latomus, 2000), *Andrew Marvell's Latin Poetry: From Text to Context* (Brussels: Collection Latomus, 2003), *Vergilius Redivivus: Studies in Joseph Addison's Latin Poetry* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2005), *Classical Romantic: Identity in the Latin Poetry of Vincent Bourne* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2007), *Sporting with the Classics: The Latin Poetry of William Dillingham* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2010), *Both English and Latin: Bilingualism and Biculturalism in Milton's Neo-Latin Writings* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2012), *The Complete Works of John Milton, Volume III: The Shorter Poems* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014) with Barbara Kiefer Lewalski, and *John Milton: Epistolarum Familiarium Liber Unus and Uncollected Letters* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2019) for which she was awarded the JoŃ T. Shawcross Award of The Milton Society of America in March of 2021.

All of this is to say that for those who relish JoŃ Milton's work in Latin this volume is a 'must read.' Its contents have been evenly divided into three sections, "Milton, Giovanni Salzilli, and the Academies of Rome," "Milton's Latin Epigrams to Leonora Baroni, and Milton," and "Lucas Holstenius, and the Culture of Rome." These are followed by two useful appendices providing both Latin text and English translation on facing pages of Milton's Latin writings during 1638–1639 and Milton's apologia for making his trip to Rome that appeared many years later in his 1654 *Defensio Secunda*. The book

is a fascinating investigation into the months that Milton spent in Rome during the extended tour of France and Italy he had begun in May of 1638 when he was 29 years of age and ended in the late summer months of 1639.

This was a formative period for Milton, when Milton had to calibrate his physical senses and his thoughts to a modern and vivacious Rome that had been built upon the ancient site. He was as well forging his own identity, and we find him styling himself in Latin as ‘MILTO’ in his letter to Salzilli (‘MILTO alumnus ille Londini,’ line 9 in *Ad Salsillum Poetam Romanum*). Using every available source including the Umbrian antiquarian, bookseller, publisher Pompilio Totti whose illustrated tourbook of Rome, *Ritratto di Roma moderna*, had come fresh from the shop of the printer Vitale Mascardi in late 1638, Professor Haan has made meticulous efforts to reconstruct and explain what happened during this period. No fault can be found in the text; the volume is beautifully edited. One wishes however that a set of illustrations could have been included such as the *impresa* of the *Accademia dei Fantastici* as well as that of the *Accademis degli Umoristi* studied in the first chapter, but perhaps that will be the subject of future work, an illustrated study of what our ‘MILTO’ likely saw during his sojourns in seicento Rome. (Michele Valerie Ronnick, Wayne State University)

◆ *David Salomoni, Educating the Catholic People: Religious Orders and Their Schools in Early Modern Italy*. Boston: Brill, 2021, [X] +220 pp. \$119. David Salomoni, an accomplished young scholar of early modern Italy, has made a significant contribution to the history of education with his book *Educating the Catholic People: Religious Orders and Their Schools in Early Modern Italy (1500–1800)*. By providing a comparative approach to the educational initiatives of numerous religious orders active in Italy, Salomoni overcomes the historiographical tendency to focus on one particular order—often the Jesuits—in favor of a panoramic perspective.

Educating the Catholic People is divided into five chapters. The first provides historical background for schools in Renaissance Italy, the second explores the pedagogical identities of various orders, the third explains the processes of settlement in the peninsula, the fourth

provides a taxonomy of schools operated by the orders, and the fifth discusses how the schools handled the scientific and political revolutions of the eighteenth century. A great deal of information, case studies, and synthesis are contained in this relatively slim volume.

The sixteenth century witnessed a proliferation of new active religious orders, but with the exception of the Jesuits, they were relatively slow to invest themselves in education. Learning and culture was seen as a potential source of pride or deviation for religious and students alike (41). Yet the educational needs of the period, as well as the pressures of the Protestant Reformation, led the new orders to increasingly embrace schooling as a major apostolate. Salomoni follows the respective histories of the Jesuits, Barnabites, Somascans, Piarists, Theatines, and Servites among male communities, and the Ursulines, Angelic Sisters, and Pious Sisters among the female communities.

Building on the work of Paul Grendler, the author presents a taxonomy of schools in the period. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, the Renaissance network consisted of three major elements: the municipally-funded public schools, schools in smaller settlements maintained by aristocrats, and the studia of Dominicans and Franciscans. The new religious orders continued to seek patronage from municipalities and aristocrats, but in various institutional forms. Some schools were independently owned and operated by the orders, whereas others were merely staffed by them. Some schools were established in large cities and taught a full humanist curriculum, whereas others imparted the rudiments of reading and arithmetic to younger students of humbler origins in smaller settlements. Boarding schools for the children of the nobility were also part of the landscape. Numerous factors led to the success of these new religious order schools: economic decline in Italy that undermined municipal independence in education, the increasing patronal role of the seigneuries, and the Catholic need, especially in the episcopate, for effective means of combating Protestantism (95–96).

Salomoni undertakes a painstaking examination of the spread of the various orders throughout the Italian Peninsula. The Somascans and Piarists, unlike the Theatines or Jesuits, preferred to build new schools in smaller settlements, rather than in large urban centers (103).

The Theatines aimed their activities, including education, at multiple social levels, which allowed them to have a deep impact on the general population (109). The author observes that the orders competed while simultaneously borrowing from each other. The Barnabites, for example, deliberately imitated the Jesuit Ratio Studiorum, and even took over some schools in the early seventeenth century from which the Jesuits had withdrawn. This takeover increased dramatically after the suppression of the Society of Jesus in 1773 (99). In a different vein, the Piarists thought they were the victims of a Jesuit plot in the early 1640s, although this was not in fact the case (163).

Educating the Catholic People has two particularly valuable features. The first is a robust treatment of women's education, which pushes back against the "boys only" stereotype of early modern Italy. The network of "Schools of Christian Doctrine" established in the middle decades of the sixteenth century, which Salomoni regards as paving the way for the entrance of the religious orders into the educational market, was explicitly committed to teaching boys and girls without distinction (37–39). With the assistance of Charles Borromeo, the Ursulines began establishing two basic types of schools: boarding schools for the daughters of nobles and rich bourgeois, and free schools that taught useful skills to poor young women (83). Salomoni provides additional case studies of women's education, such as the Educandato model, where nuns hosted and taught externs in their convent (155).

The second valuable feature is the treatment of the religious orders' scientific endeavors in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Against the persistent assumption that the Catholic Church was "anti-science" in this period, Salomoni explores Galileo's strong ties to the intellectuals of religious orders. The Piarist commitment to Galileo's theories, which brought them to the brink of suppression, became a defining aspect of their institutional identity (159–60, 167). The author claims that it was not so much the scientific backwardness of the religious schools that made them a target of Enlightenment rulers and French revolutionaries, but rather the latter's desire to wrest control of education away from the Church (169). The features that educational innovators disliked about the ancien regime more generally, namely, the lack of uniformity and irregularity in government structures, were characteristic of the religious schools as well (183).

With the suppression of the Jesuits and the French invasion of Italy under Napoleon, these networks were effectively dismantled, making way for new state-controlled educational institutions.

Educating the Catholic People might have benefited from closer attention to the curricular content and pedagogies of the religious schools. To what extent did the various orders teach the same materials according to the same methods? Did they generally follow the Jesuit example, or did they take other approaches? With its painstaking attention to the data, concise and insightful arguments, and panoramic perspective of the teaching apostolate of numerous religious orders, *Educating the Catholic People* merits a place on the bookshelves of early modern historians. (Sam Zeno Conedera, SJ, Saint Louis University)