

NEO-LATIN NEWS

Vol. 54, Nos. 1 & 2. Jointly with SCN. Subscriptions: \$20.00 (\$25.00 international) for one year; \$35.00 (\$45.00) for two years; \$50.00 (\$65.00) for three years. Checks or money orders are payable to *Seventeenth-Century News*, 4227 TAMU, College Station, Texas 77843-4227. 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.

◆ *Une «fantaisie» sur l'antique: le goût pour l'épigraphie funéraire dans l'Hyperotomachia Poliphili de Francesco Colonna.* By Martine Furno. Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance, 377. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2003. 333 pp., including 21 illustrations. 120 SF. As most readers of this journal know, the *Hyperotomachia Poliphili* has probably exercised a greater fascination on later readers than any other single book of its age. Published in 1499 by the great scholar-printer Aldus Manutius, it has attracted attention in part for its 172 illustrations, in part for its macaronic text, a unique combination of elements from Latin, Greek, and Italian. Part of its appeal, though, is certainly tied to the air of mystery that surrounds it. No one knows for sure, for example, who did the illustrations: was it Mantegna, or Bordone, or a Venetian atelier from Aldus's circle? Who is the author: Franciscus Colonna the member of a collateral branch of the patrician family of this name in Rome, Franciscus Colonna the Dominican monk at the convent of Sts. Giovanni and Paolo in Venice, or another writer using Franciscus Colonna as a pseudonym, Felice Feliciano, perhaps, or Leon Battista Alberti? And what does this mysterious text, written in a mysterious language, mean?

Starting in the 1970s, scholars like Giovanni Pozzi have tried to shift attention away from the woodcuts, which have encouraged scholars to see the *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* as an architectural book, to the text, which is a sort of mysterious romance novel. A modern edition and a facsimile reproduction of the original have appeared, along with an interpretation developed in the introduction to the facsimile edition that presents the romance as a sort of initiation into metaphysical knowledge. Furno's book takes a different approach, attempting an interpretation based in Colonna's culture and on his perception of antiquity. The inquiry focuses on Book 1, chapter 19, the chapter on Polyandron, and on the part of chapter 18 where Polia, the heroine of the story, presents the temple of Polyandron and the rites that accompany it. Furno offers, first, a text of these chapters, then a commentary to it, founded on the presupposition that Colonna's antiquity is a mental construct resting on the principle of *accommodatio*: *acommodatio* of architectural and archaeological elements, of ancient languages, and of models and literary genres. Detailed discussion is included about the lexicography and syntax of the Greek, Latin, and Italian as they appear in the text, along with mythology and sources. A series of appendices present the inscriptions found in chapter 19, beginning with a text and translation, then extending to a detailed commentary. The book concludes with reproductions of twenty-one woodcuts from the *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili*, along with a good index.

All this work leads Furno to the conclusion that Colonna knew some of the collections of inscriptions that were circulating in the humanist circles of his day, and that he tried to imitate the material presentation of these inscriptions in his book. He had a taste for, and knowledge of, architecture as treated in Alberti's *De re aedificatoria* and Vitruvius's *De architectura*, and he knew both common Latin sources like Virgil, Ovid, and Valerius Maximus and fashionable new discoveries like the Greek Anthology and Apuleius's *Metamorphoses*. These sources were interwoven into a sort of argument by counter-example, designed to encourage conjugal love. A valuable part of the conclusion is a list of suggestions about what remains to be done by scholars who continue to be attracted to the *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili*: identification of the epigraphic collections Colonna used along with the medieval *florilegia* that he relied on along with direct access to classical texts, further study of the author (whom Furno believes to be the Dominican monk of Venice), and exploration of anachronism and historical 'mistakes' as a way to create a mental world that is

coherent and meaningful. Several pages on the inscriptions from the *Hyperotomachia Poliphili* that in turn made their way into collections of genuine inscriptions beginning in the sixteenth century are of unusual interest.

A lot of work has gone into this volume, which summarizes the research presented in December, 2001 as part of a *habilitation* at the Université Stendhal in Grenoble, but in the end one wonders, at least in passing, if the results really justify the effort. Fumo is quite honest in acknowledging that what she has discovered largely confirms the work of others: “les résultats de l’enquête confirment, dans leur ensemble, les analyses de Pozzi et de Marco Ariani et Mino Gabriele sur la culture de Colonna, et son extraordinaire capacité à bâtir un imagier «beau comme l’antique» à partir d’éléments anciens, médiévaux et modernes. J’espère, simplement, dans les détails, apporter le regard du latiniste qui manquait, jusqu’à présent, aux nombreuses lectures qui ont déjà été faites de ce texte” (12). It may indeed be, as Ludwig Mies van der Rohe once remarked, that God is found in the details, but at a time when it is getting increasingly difficult to find publishers for worthy monographs, it would be better if the whole for one that did find its way into print turned out to be greater than the sum of parts that were largely known already. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Girolamo Rorario: un umanista diplomatico del Cinquecento e i suoi dialoghi*. By Aidée Scala. Firenze: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 2004. 308 pp. + 9 black and white plates, 2 color plates. In her dense but enlightening book, Aidée Scala has done more than kindle interest in the little-known humanist and diplomat Girolamo Rorario. She has also performed a rare service to the profession and to Neo-Latinists in particular by publishing for the first time Rorario’s *Dialoghi*. The dialogues remained unknown until the 1930s, when the Friulan historian Pio Paschini wrote an article on Rorario. In the *Iter Italicum*, P. O. Kristeller recorded copies of Rorario’s manuscript in both Italian and foreign libraries, among which was a fifteenth-century codex held in a private Venetian library (la biblioteca Giustiniani-Recanati). Scala used this manuscript in transcribing the dialogues that make up the second half of her book. (Scala does not, however, comment on access to the Guistiniani-Recanati library or to the availability of the codex for future scholarly research.)

Few other reliable versions exist, probably because, as Scala notes, in the

strained political atmosphere of the early sixteenth century, Rorario distributed copies only to his literary friends and to his patrons. Scala reports that, besides the Giustiniani-Recanati codex, there are only two other fifteenth-century copies of the *Dialoghi* in existence, an eighteenth-century manuscript held by the rector of the Francesco Bassini seminary at Concordia and a copy in the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek in Vienna. She has concluded that neither of these copies contains the author's final corrections, so she therefore decided to use the Giustiniani-Recanati manuscript for the most reliable transcription.

It is ironic, and perhaps bitterly so in terms of Rorario's legacy, that his *Dialoghi* should end up in Venice. Throughout his political life, as well as in his dialogues, Rorario remained virulently anti-Venetian. Scala calls him "filo-asburgico," referring to his loyalty to the Habsburgs, from whom the Rorario family received land privileges in the Pordenone region. Girolamo, who lived from 1485 to 1556, began his studies in Venice at the school of Marcantonio Sabellico, but was then sent to Padua against his will to study jurisprudence. Like many Italian, and later English, humanists, Rorario prepared for the law, only to reject it. He decided that his prospects for a better career lay in "taking the tonsure," which he did immediately, remaining a member of a minor order until 1545. Probably in the same year that he gave up the ecclesiastical habit, he married the woman who was already the mother of his children.

Scala claims that the greatest turn in his life came when, in 1508, he was exiled from his native city for political reasons. His exile only confirmed his anti-Venetian sentiments, insofar as from 1509-1514 Pordenone remained under what Rorario would term the tyranny of Discord (a personification of the Venetian lion) in the dialogue *Fortuna*. The young man landed on his feet, however, in the Viennese court of the Habsburg emperor Maximilian. He won Maximilian's favor and by 1516 was invited to the court of Naples to oversee the royal succession when Carlo d'Asburgo, Maximilian's nephew, came to the throne after the death of Ferdinand. Because of his proven abilities as a diplomat, Rorario next received the charge from Maximilian to make peace between Pope Leo X and Francesco Maria della Rovere, duke of Urbino (whom Castiglione soon immortalized). Here too he proved to be skillful, and his first mission to the court of Rome so impressed the Pope that he gave Rorario the title of *protonotario apostolico*. In subsequent years, he acted as Maximilian's *nunzio*, traveling on diplomatic missions to Germany,

France, Naples, and Rome. He later became a papal *numzio* as well, serving with evident distinction throughout the 1520s and 1530s. In 1540, however, he returned in disgrace to his native city. The details of his fall from the pope's service remain murky, although Scala suggests that Rorario's disgrace was probably remediable. He chose instead to retire to private life, in large measure losing the fruits of many years of meritorious service.

According to Scala, Rorario wrote the ten *Dialoghi* between 1513 and 1520, during his service to Maximilian. She suggests that we regard the works as juvenilia both because they were written when Rorario was still young and because the dialogues seem to represent his first literary effort (he also wrote the *Quod animalia* and the *Heroica historia*, a parody of the *Orlando furioso*). Nevertheless, Scala makes the point that, despite his inexperience, Rorario "demonstrates a certain originality in his decision to compose dialogues in prose on the model of Lucian, a conservative choice anchored to a tradition of the past, that of Greco-Latin humanism, which was dying out" (44). This decision on Rorario's part reflects the prevailing nostalgia of the dialogues (reminiscent of *Il cortigiano*) for a virtuous period in the recent past when 'letters' and virtue went hand-in-hand. The golden age for Rorario was chiefly an anti-Venetian world, but his dialogues are usually not specific on the subject. Scala points out how in both the first and second dialogues, the *Medives* and the *Fortuna*, Rorario interrupts the constant "*divertissement* mitologico-letterario" with satire alluding to anti-Venetian politics. His speakers are the same as those in L. B. Alberti's *Interveneales*, direct descendants of Lucianic satire: Mercury, Virtù, Charon, Justice, and Discord. In his preface to the dialogues, Rorario cites Plato ("divino tra i filosofi") and Cicero as models of virtue and reason, but explains that he will follow Lucian in constructing his "personifications of the gods and of moral qualities" so that readers might more transparently read them for the novelty and interest of the argument. While this might be a valid aim and a potentially enlightening approach (as in Plato, for instance), in Rorario's hands the dialogue format becomes a bit cumbersome. The allegorical "personaggi" tend rather to dull the acuity of the debate, in contrast to, say, Phaedrus versus Socrates (Rorario cites the *Phaedrus* as an exemplar of the triumph of reason). Perhaps, as Scala implies, Rorario's politics interrupt the flow of the exchanges too frequently. Few political satirists weather the ravages of literary time successfully, and one must acknowledge that Rorario is not an exception. While the dialogues certainly owe something to Socratic

banter, in place of wit Rorario often resorts to prolix didacticism. Rorario's shortcomings as a literary stylist, however, do not detract from the value of these dialogues as historical documents. They offer further proof—if proof is needed—that the humanist education of courtiers manifested itself in ambitious writing throughout their lives. More significantly, perhaps, the publication of the *Dialoghi* marks the emergence of a new sixteenth-century voice. That this voice issues from a man so well-placed politically, and so engaged in papal and Pordenese politics, underscores the importance of Scala's contribution to the field.

Unlike many Italian scholarly works, Scala's offers translated passages from the Latin dialogues throughout the preliminary discussion. Although a fair amount of untranslated Latin remains (apart, of course, from the *Dialoghi*, which still await translation), Scala has made an effort to make her summaries more accessible to graduate students and others. The writing is informative and, if not lively, also not as strenuously academic as in other, heftier tomes of Italian historical scholarship. The notes are minimal and largely bibliographic, with occasional textual emendations in the text of the *Dialoghi*, which testifies to Scala's concern for brevity and clarity.

The reader pays a small price for this concern. For instance, the index contains proper names only, which is unfortunate since Scala introduces numerous topics—such as literary satire and court diplomacy—that a reader might have found usefully headed in the back matter. The bibliography is relatively short, which may reflect the paucity of scholarship on Rorario, although, for example, in the Giovanni and Gian Francesco Pico section, one misses recent titles by Francesco Bausi, Patrizia Castelli, and Elisabetta Schisto. Moreover, Scala takes a great deal for granted in regard to background knowledge of such subjects as the history of Friuli, papal politics, the ups and downs of La Serenissima, and even humanist figures—her references to such giants as Alberti, Pontano, and Pico assume a familiarity that at times seems to contradict her efforts elsewhere to be as informative as possible.

In general, therefore, Scala's *Girolamo Rorario* is clearly a book written for scholars who already have a firm background in fifteenth-century Italian politics and who read Latin well. It promises to become a valuable addition to our knowledge of Juvenalian satire in Italy, as well as a confirmation of the popularity and instrumental force of the dialogue. The historical section of the book provides a useful complement to a period often dominated by

such writer-diplomats as Bembo, Castiglione, and Machiavelli. Rorario offers a fresh voice to the standard fictionalized testimonies of Italian court politics, and, in consequence, Scala's book will undoubtedly become required reading for any scholar interested in *umanesimo friulano*. (Raphael Falco, University of Maryland, Baltimore County)

◆ *Collected Works of Erasmus*, vol. 72: *Controversies: Apologia qua respondet invectivis Lei, Responsio ad annotationes Lei*. Ed. by Jane E. Phillips, trans. by Erika Rummel, annotated by István Bejczy, Jane E. Phillips, and Erika Rummel. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 2005. xxxviii + 449 pages. \$150. *Collected Works of Erasmus*, vol. 84: *Controversies: Responsio ad Epistolam paraeneticam Alberti Pii, Apologia adversus rhapsodias Alberti Pii, Brevissima scholia*. Ed. by Nelson H. Minnich, trans. by Daniel Sheerin, annotated by Nelson H. Minnich and Daniel Sheerin. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 2005. cxlviii + 483 pp. \$175. The volumes under review here are two of the twelve already published or in progress on the scholarly controversies in which Erasmus participated with various learned adversaries of his day.

The first story begins with Erasmus's edition of the New Testament, the *editio princeps* that contained the Greek text, a revised version of the Vulgate translation, and annotations. The book aroused strong reactions right away, with the champions of the new learning praising it and traditionalists condemning it as an attack on the authority of the church. It had been prepared in haste, and Erasmus immediately began to revise, consulting with a number of scholars, including Edward Lee, a prominent English cleric. The relationship degenerated badly, however, with Erasmus trying to get a copy of Lee's notes surreptitiously and Lee claiming that Erasmus published his material without attributing it to him. Lee published his critique in 1520, and Erasmus replied immediately with his *Apologia*, then followed a few weeks later with a fuller treatment, the *Responsiones*. Others were pulled into the controversy, with Lee ending up as the subject of several anonymous lampoons, at least one of which may have been written with input from Erasmus. The two men reconciled formally later in 1520, but Erasmus continued to harbor suspicions about Lee, claiming that Lee had provoked the denunciation of him to the inquisitor general in Spain that led to a formal investigation of his works in

1527.

The second volume records Erasmus's disputes with Alberto Pio (1475-1531), the learned ruler of Carpi whose work for the French king, then the Emperor Maximilian, coupled with his marriage into the Orsini family, related to the Medici popes, made him an unusually powerful adversary. By 1525 Erasmus was hearing that Pio was denouncing him in Rome for being neither a good philosopher nor a good theologian, for lacking solid doctrine, and for being too close to Luther. Erasmus wrote to Pio and asked that he stop attacking him, which stimulated Pio's *Responsio paraenetica*. In it Pio mixes together the causes of Luther and Erasmus, but he made sure his lengthy letter did not circulate until 1529. Five weeks after it was published, however, Erasmus had finished his *Responsio*, a rhetorical masterpiece that uses anonymous reports, partial truths, and clever dodges to present its author as the innocent victim of Pio's unprovoked attacks. Pio responded in turn with his *XXIII libri*, which makes its case by relying on quotations from Erasmus's own works. At the heart of the dispute was a radically different conception of how the church should evolve. Erasmus measured current practice by invoking *sola scriptura*, the appeal to antiquity, to what was done in the early church; Pio rested in what would be called today a developmental theory of Christian practice, with the Holy Spirit working actively to bring greater maturity and progress to the church. Erasmus's view of history, in other words, was humanistic, while Pio espoused the Biblical view of history as linear. The *Apologia* repeated some of the same points, but the colloquy *Exsequiae seraphicae* extends the attack to a satirical treatment of Pio's funeral. In his *Brevissima scholia* (1532), Erasmus responded once again to someone he obviously saw as a grave threat to his reputation. But even though Pio was dead, the controversy did not end, for friends like Guido Steuco (1497/8-1548) and Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda (ca. 1490-1573) defended him, as did Luther, thereby provoking Erasmus to write a *Purgatio adversus epistolam Lutheri* (1536).

The controversies unfolded in these volumes are of the utmost importance, for they place Erasmus into both the social and intellectual environment in which his life and thought evolved. The issues were important, both to Erasmus personally and to the life of the church in a key time of transition, and they shed much light on Erasmus himself. The portrait that emerged of his relations with Lee, as we have seen, is not always flattering, and his treatment of Pio is if anything worse, for Erasmus accuses his adversary of lying,

slander, misquotation, and misunderstanding, then of not being smart enough to have written his own books; ultimately he makes fun of his funeral and continues to attack him after he was no longer alive to defend himself. Even when we make adjustments for a different scholarly culture, in which the tolerance for polemic was higher than it is today, this is strong stuff. Yet it provides support for such interpretations as Lisa Jardine's *Erasmus, Man of Letters* (Princeton, 1993), in which the disinterested scholar yields to a skilled practitioner of self-promotion who is determined to win renown in the world of letters. It is difficult to present this portrait through Erasmus's side of the controversy alone, but the editors of both volumes, especially the second one, do a fine job of filling out the discussion by summarizing the views of Erasmus's opponents and providing notes that explain otherwise-cryptic references in the text. Fascinating reading, this. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *La disputa contra Aristóteles y sus seguidores*. By Hernando Alonso de Herrera. Intro. by M.^a Isabel Lafuente Guantes, ed. by M.^a Asunción Sánchez Manzano. Colección Humanistas Españoles, 29. León: Universidad de León, 2004. 278 pp. The author of this treatise, Hernando Alonso de Herrera, is not well known today, but he is a significant figure in Spanish humanism, having held the chair in rhetoric first at the University of Alcalá, then in Salamanca. *La disputa* was published in Salamanca in 1517 and is important for a variety of reasons. It received a certain diffusion in the intellectual circles of Charles I and therefore merits attention by anyone who is interested in the culture of the time. As the title suggests, the treatise contributes to the reassessment of Aristotle that preoccupied many a humanist of the day. *La disputa* inserts itself in the debate between the rhetoricians and the logicians that, again, is an important part of Renaissance culture, and in siding with the rhetoricians, the author makes his contribution to the history of rhetoric in Spain, a subject that has been attracting a good deal of attention lately from scholars like Luisa López Grigera. And interestingly, it was written in both Latin and Spanish, so that while readers of this journal will approach the treatise with one set of questions, scholars of the vernacular will bring to it a different set of concerns.

That said, *La disputa* is not easy reading, again for a variety of reasons. The social, intellectual, and cultural environment from which it emerged has to be

reconstructed, and a reader of today will not have the easy familiarity with the characters in the dialogue and the positions they represent that the original audience had. Time has blunted the intensity of the debate, and the argument is not always easy to follow for an audience not trained in logic. The theme is introduced early: “Que las hablas nuestras no sean cantidades como lo enseña el mismo filósofo en sus predicamentos” (74). And it continues from there.

The authors have done a good job of making the treatise accessible, beginning with an extensive introduction that devotes forty pages to the role of rhetoric in Renaissance culture, followed by information on the life and works of the author and a detailed analysis of both the form and the content of *La disputa*. The critical edition in turn receives its own fifty-page introduction, which explains not only the criteria used in making the text, but also an analysis of the literary form in which the philosophical content is expressed. There is an earlier modern edition of *La disputa*, by Adolfo Bonilla y San Martín, in 1920, but it does not contain the Spanish text. The edition of Lafuente Guantes and Sánchez Manzano is therefore more than justified and joins the works of such humanists as Cipriano de la Huerza, Pedro de Valencia, and B. Arias Montano in the series Colección Humanistas Españoles. The University of León also sponsors the journal *Silva*, making it one of the centers for the study of Renaissance Latin at the turn of the twenty-first century.

◆ *Translation and Commentary on the Lectures on Greek Rhetoric by Pedro Nunes (1502-1578): The Art of Public Speaking.* Commentary and trans. by John R. C. Martyn. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2004. xli + 718 pp. in 2 vols. This is essentially a partial transcription of a newly discovered manuscript, constituting an apparent series of lectures on Greek rhetorical theory by the Portuguese polymath Pedro Nunes (1502-1578; not to be confused with the Valencian humanist-rhetorician Pedro Juan Núñez, 1529-1602). Nunes’s main rhetorical authority is Hermogenes (ca. 160-225 A.D.), from whose *On Issues (Peri tón staseón)* he draws “the ideal structure for a forensic speech, with the [same] ten main divisions and subsections” (xviii). Nunes stood out for his mastery of Greek (“Certainly no contemporary had such a control of that difficult language,” asserts Martyn, xxvi). “Most of the Latin text is a re-working of the Greek used by Hermogenes and the para-

phrases by his major commentators, Sopater, Marcellinus and Syrianus” (xvii). The result is a 292-*page* Latin text laced out from the 1,280-odd *lines* in Hermogenes’s original. Martyn aids the reader with a glossary of Nunes’s technical terms and their English translations (xli). A twelve-page biography of Nunes reveals his experience as a teacher in a wide array of sciences (algebra, Euclidean geometry, Aristotle’s physics, theory of the planetary spheres).

In the blotchy, frequently hard-to-read manuscript, discovered by Martyn at the municipal library of Évora, the text of the lectures begins at folio 45; Martyn assumes the first forty-four folios “covered Grammar, Logic and an introduction to stasis-theory, through the *scholia* on Hermogenes” (xvi). The remainder is conveniently supplied in two volumes, enabling the reader to juxtapose the Latin in the first with the English in the second. Folio markings in the Latin and English, inserted into the running text, are the best key for laying a translation alongside its original. Paragraph numberings, which if consistent would have simplified Latin-English coordination for the reader, mysteriously appear, disappear, and resurface without apparent rationale, and sometimes out of sequence and in the original but not the translation. Latin misprints occur but, in my scan, do not obscure the meaning.

The task completed by Martyn is one of impressive compass and is quite serviceable. He has identified the places where Nunes merely quotes extensive passages of Sopater and the other commentators; I anticipate that here the mere fact of the Latin translation of these Greek originals will command interest. Martyn footnotes literary sources for the case-examples and provides occasional brief historical background notes, a bibliography (where J. IJsewijn’s superseded 1977 *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies* is cited, but not the substantial two-volume later revision), and an index of names. Scholars seeking to pursue and explicate the sometimes-recondite traces of Hermogenes’s influence in sixteenth-century rhetoric will surely find this work valuable.

Nunes is generally readable; sentence brevity is a mark of his style. (Martyn says Nunes cites Cicero only once. Maybe there is a connection.) Yet his expressions can occasionally be obscure; Martyn characterizes the manuscript as not in shape for submission to a printer. The translation ordinarily reproduces the clarity of the original, though the priority on literal rendering sometimes interferes with meaning. Here is an example, from Section F, “On the Pragmatic Issue” (*De statu negotiali*):

Dicitur autem negotialis, non ex eo quod litigantibus exhibet negotium, id quod efficiunt et alii status, sed quia in se ceteros complectitur, quandoquidem fere in omnibus tractatur, in coniectura, in finitione, in absoluta, interdum quoque in ceteris. (228)

(Now it is called pragmatic, not from what shows its business to litigants, which is done by the other issues also, but because it embraces the rest in itself, since indeed it is usually handled in all of them, in conjecture, in definition, in quality and sometimes also in the rest. [615])

The underlined Latin should rather be rendered “not because it creates trouble for the [opposing] litigants,” if the expression *ex eo quod* is rendered properly and if one accepts the meaning of *negotium exhibere alicui* as at Cicero, *De officiis* 3.31.112.

Other translation problems may occur, such as in the following passage:

Praeterea cum duo sint in rhetorica causatum genera quae status accipiunt, deliberativum, et iudiciale, deliberativum quidem solus occupat negotialis. Omnia enim deliberativi generis argumenta ad hunc statum rediguntur. (228)

(Furthermore, although there are two that the issues accept into rhetorical types of cases, deliberative and juridical, only the pragmatic issue in fact occupies the deliberative. For all the arguments of the deliberative type are brought into this issue. [616])

The translation attempts to have *rhetorica* agree with *genera*, confusion ensues. I think the meaning is: “Furthermore, although there are two types of cases in rhetoric, deliberative and juridical, which the issues embrace, in fact the pragmatic issue alone holds sway over the deliberative. For all the arguments of the deliberative type are brought into this issue.”

The manuscript, occasionally introducing case examples of principles, following Hermogenes’s own lead, nevertheless uses these examples sparingly. One gets the impression of a series of amplified source notes for lectures that will be supplemented with further illustrations upon presentation.

Students of early modern rhetoric who adjust for the flaws mentioned above will welcome this publication as a copious reservoir of evidence for how a renowned teacher handles Hermogenes, and will be grateful to Martyn for the considerable investment of labor which the project obviously entailed. (Edward V. George, Texas Tech University, Emeritus)

◆ *La mente di Giordano Bruno*. Ed. by Fabrizio Meroi, with an introductory essay by Michele Ciliberto. Istituto Nazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento, Studi e testi, 43. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 2004. XXXVI + 591 pp. 59 euros. The essays collected in this volume began in a conference held from November 10-12, 2000 in Naples, under the sponsorship of the Comitato nazionale per le celebrazioni di Giordano Bruno nel IV centenario della morte, the Istituto Italiano per gli Studi Filosofici, and the Istituto Nazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento. Unlike many other Italian *Atti*, this set of conference proceedings begins with an introductory essay by Michele Ciliberto, “Bruno nel XX secolo. Filosofia, magia, ermetismo,” which positions Bruno in twentieth-century scholarship as a way to show which issues the conference participants were facing.

The essays that follow are divided into four groups, the first of which includes more general studies focused on sources and on Bruno’s relations with his contemporaries: Aldo Masullo, “Il «confusissimo secolo»”; Enrico Nuzzo, “Le figure metaforiche nel linguaggio filosofico di Giordano Bruno”; Aniello Montano, “Bruno ed Empedocle”; Cinzia Tozzini, “Furori asinini” ed ‘eroici furori’: percorsi teoretici e morali in Juan de Valdés e Giordano Bruno”; Filippo Mignini, “Temi teologico-politici nell’incontro tra Alberico Gentili e Giordano Bruno”; and Rosanna Camerlingo, “L’inferno di Mefistofele e il paradiso di Bruno nel Doctor Faustus di Christopher Marlowe.” The essays in the second part concern the Italian dialogues and the Latin poems: Paul Richard Blum, “Auf dem Weg zur Prozeßmetaphysik: die Funktion der Monaden in Giordano Brunos Philosophie”; Angelika Bönker-Vallon, “I paradossi dell’infinito nel pensiero filosofico-matematico di Giordano Bruno”; Sandro Mancini, “Il monismo modalistico bruniano nel *De la causa, principio et uno*”; Fabrizio Meroi, “Il lessico della *Cabala*”; Maria Elena Severini, “Vicissitudine e tempo nel pensiero di Giordano Bruno”; and Leen Spruit, “‘Spiritus mundi’. Censura ecclesiastica e psicologia rinascimentale a proposito di un documento inedito dall’Archivio del Sant’Ufficio romano.” The next group of essays explores the role of magic and memory in Bruno’s works: Simonetta Bassi, “Struttura e diacronia nelle opere magiche di Giordano Bruno”; Hilary Gatti, “Scienza e magia nel pensiero di Giordano Bruno”; Nicoletta Tirinnanzi, “Il nocchiero e la nave. Forme della revisione autoriale nella seconda redazione della *Lampas triginta statuarum*”; Naria Pia Ellero, “Tra parola e immagine. Retorica e arte della memoria nell’*Artificium perorandi* e negli scritti magici”;

Maurizio Cambi, “«Difficilia enodabo, confusa distinguam, abdita aperiam, obscura elucidabo». Chiarificazione e potenziamento dell’*ars Raymundi*’ nel *De lampade combinatoria lulliana* di Giordano Bruno”; Marco Matteoli, “Principio di mediazione e posizioni antigerarchiche in Raimondo Lullo e Giordano Bruno”; and Ornella Pompeo Faracovi, “Bruno e i decani.” The final group of essays is devoted to the *fortuna* of Bruno: Jean-Claude Margolin, “Marin Mersenne, lecteur hypercritique de Giordano Bruno”; Giuseppe Cacciatore, “Bruno tra Spaventa e Labriola”; Alessandro Savorelli, “«Fusse un frate liberale». Biografi e lettori di Bruno dall’unità a Campo de’ Fiori”; Saverio Ricci, “Giordano Bruno, autore politico. Da John Toland all’odierna prospettiva,” and Francesca Dell’Omodarme, “Frances A. Yates interprete di Giordano Bruno.”

Although the editor notes (577) that some of the essays essentially consist of the texts that were read at the conference, in fact an unusually large number have been substantially reworked, so that they will stand as fully fleshed-out studies rather than simple conference papers. The essays range more widely than one might expect, covering Bruno’s relations with some of his non-Italian colleagues and paying special attention to his place among later thinkers and scholars. All in all, this set of conference proceedings transcends the limitations of its genre, offering a good number of solid, substantive studies on an important, yet enigmatic thinker. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Argenis*. By John Barclay. Ed. and trans. by Mark Riley and Dorothy Pritchard Huber. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 273, Bibliotheca Novae Latinitatis Series. 2 vols. Assen: Van Gorcum; Tempe, Arizona: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2004. vii + 963 pp. Surprisingly, the Romans left us only two novels, Petronius’s *Satyricon* and Apuleius’s *Golden Ass*. Yet these two inspired many imitators in the Renaissance. A large number of Renaissance Latin novels survive, among them the two popular novels by John Barclay, the *Euphormionis Lusitani Satyricon* and the *Argenis*, the latter first printed in Paris in 1621, a work which enjoyed some fifty editions in the next two hundred years or so, and was in addition translated into English, French, Italian, Spanish, German, Dutch, Danish, Swedish, Polish, Russian, and Hungarian. Barclay was thus a figure of European renown, a British Neo-Latin writer famous also as a poet.

Like Sidney's *Arcadia*, the *Argenis* is set in an imaginary landscape in imaginary classical times and owes a great deal to Greek romance. The novel takes its title from a central character, Argenis, daughter of Meleander, King of Sicily, who is in love with the brave Poliarchus and whose marriage to him after many adventures provides the triumphant conclusion of the tale. As with Sidney, the plot is hard to follow, but that is not really the point. The editors provide a helpful summary of the plot of the novel, book by book. These two beautifully printed volumes contain a well-edited text, with spelling and punctuation sensibly modernised. The editors have worked from the first edition of Paris, 1621 and have also been able to consult the printer's manuscript of the work, which enables a few errors in the first edition to be corrected. The translation is slightly adapted from that of the obscure Kingesmill Long, printed in London in 1625, the first of a number of English versions of this novel.

The editors provide a very thorough introduction to the work, giving an account of Barclay's life and writings, and his activities as a controversialist and diplomat on behalf of James I. They discuss its reception and its latinity, and they show that many incidents of the novel parallel contemporary European political realities. Hence the novel has value as a political treatise too, providing comment on events in England, France, and Germany in particular. The work has many international connections and is dedicated to Louis XIII of France, whose queen was Anne of Austria, a Spanish princess by birth. Many topics discussed in early modern formal political treatises, such as religious toleration, taxation, the status of ambassadors, the pros and cons of a standing army, and the merits of a monastic life are also elaborated in this novel. From an early date editions of the novel were provided with a key linking its characters and places to the real world, and the editors reproduce this with their comments. Thus the character of Argenis can be regarded as "a proto-Marianne, the symbol of state power" (46); Mergania stands by an obvious anagram for Germania, and Hippophilus for Philip III of Spain. The authors also provide an illuminating account of the novel's origins and its sequels, and print much ancillary material, including a Latin poem (with translation) on the death of Barclay by Raphael Thorius. The volumes reproduce a number of illustrations from early editions of the work. All in all the introduction is a thorough and informative piece of work, and it seems fair to describe the whole lengthy enterprise as a labour of love. Certainly it is a worthy addition

to the Bibliotheca Latinitatis Novae series, which is doing much to make important Neo-Latin works more easily accessible to a present-day readership. (J. W. Binns, University of York)

◆ *Urania victrix—Die siegreiche Urania*. By Jacob Balde, S.J. Ed. and trans. by Lutz Claren, Wilhelm Kühnmann, Wolfgang Schibel, Robert Seidel, and Hermann Wiegand. Frühe Neuzeit, 85. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 2003. XLIV + 394 pp. 108 euros. In seventeenth-century Europe Jakob Balde (1604-1668) was one of the most celebrated German poets, chiefly because of the range and variety of his works written in Latin. Known as the ‘German Horace,’ his fame eclipsed the likes of Paul Gerhardt (1607-1676), Hans Jakob Christoffel von Grimmelshausen (1622-1676), Andreas Gryphius (1616-1664), and Martin Opitz (1597-1639), authors who appear to be more important to today’s readers. It is interesting to note that Opitz also wrote in Latin, like many of his fellow poets from the *Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft* (Fruitbearing Society), the first literary society on German soil, whose purpose was to standardize the German vernacular in order to increase its appeal to scholars and poets and to create a national literature that could stand up to what already existed in French, Italian, or English. In spite of these efforts, however, Latin retained its dominant status for those addressing an educated public, not only in German-speaking lands but in all of Europe well until the end of the century. It is in this context that Balde’s fame must be viewed. In fact, Opitz’s seminal *Buch der deutschen Poeterey* (1624), which led to a reform of German prosody, was itself primarily based on classical models such as Aristotle, Horace, and the humanist Julius Caesar Scaliger.

Born in Alsace, like so many important early modern authors from Sebastian Brant to Johann Fischart, Balde spent most of his life in Bavaria, where he became a Jesuit after an unsuccessful bid for the hand of a pretty baker’s daughter. He is often referred to as Bavaria’s greatest poet, and the many exhibitions and events organized in honor of his four hundredth anniversary in 2004 testify to a renewed interest in a poet that Johann Gottfried Herder and Goethe held in high esteem. He was an inspiration to many contemporary poets, both Catholic and Protestant, who translated some of his works into the German vernacular.

Urania victrix (1663) is one of Balde’s very last works and remained

incomplete. Only the first volume out of three planned was published. An erotic epistolary novel written in the style of Ovid's elegies, it depicts the struggles of the soul, represented here by Urania, in her effort to fend off the pursuits of the five senses, who are described as suitors competing for their chosen bride Urania (Greek *uranós* = sky / heaven). As the soul's only and true bridegroom is Christ, Urania rejects all these obnoxious suitors for this heavenly union with much humor and wit.

The present work is an edited translation of the first two books of *Urania victrix*: Book I: *Sensus I. Visus* and Book II: *Sensus II. Auditus*. The note on page XLIV makes it clear that this translation was a collective enterprise of Neo-Latin scholars at the University of Heidelberg, but it also emphasizes the major contribution by Wilhelm Kühlmann, a leading Balde scholar, who wrote the introduction and also contributed a great deal to the commentary section. In their introduction the editors justify their choice of not including the translation of the books on the other three senses by pointing out that Balde himself gives a concise overview of his *opus maximum* in his *isagoge*, and that the importance of this work in literary history is sufficiently demonstrated by presenting an edited translation of the first two books (XXXIX). The present translation is based on the first edition from 1663, although all the variants found in the *Opera poetica omnia* of 1729 are listed in the critical apparatus, found at the bottom of each page with the Latin text. Only the critical apparatus for Balde's introduction is presented in its entirety on pages 52-53.

Wilhelm Kühlmann's introduction (vii-xli) is divided into three parts. First he frames this work in its historical and literary context. He then sketches Balde's development as a poet and his poetic program, and finally discusses Jesuit censorship regarding *Urania victrix*. In the second and third part, he focuses on the two senses (*visus* and *auditus*) and presents a rich and detailed overview of the cultural context in which these senses were discussed from antiquity to Balde's time. The German translation (1-203) is impressive, and the thorough commentary (205-372) testifies to the immense research invested in order to highlight philological difficulties and to explain the multitude of cultural and historical references necessary for the understanding of *Urania victrix*. The book closes with a useful bibliography and an *index nominum*.

In conclusion, this work reaches the standards to which all translations aspire but which few attain. The introduction, translation, and commentary are altogether outstanding and will provide a fertile ground for further scholarship for anyone with a solid reading knowledge of German. (Josef Glowa,

Moravian College)

◆ *Pietas victrix—Der Sieg der Pietas*. By Nicolaus Avancini, S.J. Ed., trans., introd., and with commentary by Lothar Mundt und Ulrich Seelbach. Frühe Neuzeit, 73. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2002. Nicolaus Avancini (1611-1686) has always held a special place in the history of German Jesuit theater, but until the appearance of the current edition, scholars have not had much access to his work. From the foundation of the Jesuits in the German Empire in the mid-sixteenth century until their suppression in 1773, German Jesuit schools produced an exceptionally large corpus of plays, written, for the most part, as the crowning exercise of the year's course in rhetoric and performed before the students' parents and the school's sponsors. The majority of these plays are known to us only through the *Periochen*, or program booklets, that offered a scene-by-scene summary in German or Latin of the action on the school stage. In addition, hundreds of anonymous manuscripts of these and other German Jesuit plays still reside, unmined, in the state libraries of central Europe that inherited the collections from the earlier Jesuit schools. Only a relatively small number of German Jesuit plays were published under a particular author's name, and those few writers (e.g., Jacob Greter, Jacob Pontanus, Jacob Bidermann, Jacob Masen, Nicolaus Avancini, Franz Neumeier, Ignaz Weitenauer, Anton Friz) have shaped the current literary-historical understanding of German Jesuit theater.

The dramas of the prolific Avancini occupy an important place in this literary-historical narrative, for his twenty-seven plays, written between the 1630s and 1670s, are held to exemplify a key turning point in the development of Jesuit drama. Before Avancini, Jesuit school plays were rarely performed in a court setting (the dramas performed for the Wittelbachs of Bavaria in the late 1580s and 1590s were a notable exception), and were presented for the most part on modest platforms with minimal props in the auditorium of a Jesuit grammar school. Audiences were mixed: parents and teachers, city administrators and clergy, but few nobles and, with the exception of Bavaria and some German and Austrian bishoprics, few members of the ruling house. In contrast, Avancini's work was written in large measure for the nobility, and especially for the imperial house of Habsburg, and his plays were presented at the court in Vienna. The *Pietas victrix*, which recounts

the victory of Constantine the Great over Maxentius and the proclamation of Christianity throughout the Roman Empire in 312, was written to celebrate the crowning of Leopold I as the Holy Roman Emperor (August 1, 1658) and was presented in a lavish production at court on February 21 and 22, 1659. Although the students and teachers of the Jesuit school in Vienna acted in the play, the production was not a mere series of dramatic set-pieces and stichomythic dialogue inspired by Seneca, but an elaborate, visually exciting performance reminiscent of seventeenth-century operatic stagings in Italy. Characters cavort with devils and journey to the underworld during raging thunderstorms; there are earthquakes; battles on land, on sea (the Tiber), and in the air (between the Austrian eagle and the dragon of *Impietas*); flying angels and devils; parades in Hades replete with chariots drawn by fire-spewing dragons; a stunning re-enactment of the fall of Phaëthon from his sun-chariot; water ballets with Tritons and Naiads; triumphant victory parades culminating in an eye-catching *joyeuse entrée*, and carefully wrought *tableaux vivants* exemplifying the triumph of Christianity over paganism. In melding logocentric neo-Senecan drama with theatrical performance, Avancini achieved the Jesuits' long-standing ambition not only to educate the spectators about the primacy of the Roman Church, but also to persuade them visually of this truth through awe-inspiring performances. His dramas also unabashedly advanced the Hapsburgs' claim to Catholic political hegemony in Europe. This coalescence of theatricality and empire has been seen as the climax of the Catholic Baroque in central Europe. After Avancini, so the argument runs, Catholic Latin writing, indeed even Catholic literature in the vernacular, entered into a state of decline and gradually died out as the new north German (*lege*: Protestant) paradigm of the Enlightenment took hold.

In light of the critical position that Avancini holds in German and Jesuit literary history, it is remarkable that there has been only one modern reprinting of any of his plays: *Pietas victrix*, by the literary historian Willi Flemming in 1930 (rpt. 1965). The current edition is the first German translation—or translation into any modern European language—of this work. *Pietas victrix* exists in three contemporary printings: the work was published separately in 1659, and reprinted twice without the stage directions and copper engravings of the 1659 production in the second volume of the five-volume *Poesis dramatica Nicolai Avancini* (1669; 1675). Flemming's 1930 edition contained only a few of the many stage directions in the text, none of the engravings, and no

translation. Lothar Mundt and Ulrich Seelbach have thus provided an enormous service to early modern German studies by making this text available to a broader readership. In addition to the play, scholars now have at their disposal all the ancillary material from the *editio princeps* of 1659. Besides the invaluable translation, the editors have also provided a historical introduction, a commentary, a fine bibliography of scholarship on Avancini and on Jesuit theater in general as well as of the historical sources to the play, and a useful list of textual variants among the three seventeenth-century editions.

The introduction provides the essential details of Avancini's career as a Jesuit and an overview of his prodigious output, not only as a dramatist, but also as a theologian, preacher, and poet. Based on the numbers of editions of his works, Avancini's fame rests not on his dramas but on his theological and meditational writings. His *Vita et doctrina Jesu Christi* (reprinted 32 times before 1750) continues the *imitatio Christi* tradition best exemplified by Thomas à Kempis, and Avancini's book was often printed together with the latter's work. The editors also review the remarkable range of Avancini's dramatic subjects—the Bible, ancient and medieval history and legend, the history of the Jesuits, the Thirty Years War—the place of drama in the Jesuit schools, and the political nature of Viennese Jesuit drama. They take pains to delineate the historical sources for Avancini's representation of the Constantine / Maxentius struggle, summarizing the deviations in the characterizations from the historical record in a helpful appendix. They also rehearse the familiar connections between Avancini's dramatic panegyric of the Habsburgs and the concept of *pietas Austriaca* (following Anna Coreth's important 1965 study, *Pietas Austriaca: Wesen und Bedeutung habsburgischer Frömmigkeit in der Barockzeit*), and they underline the connections between *Pietas victrix* and other Jesuit plays about Constantine, and between the allegorical figures of piety, justice, good counsel (*consilia*), and hard work (*industria*) and the mottos of those ideal Catholic emperors, Leopold I and his father Ferdinand III. The editors could have noted as well the appearance of other characters from *Pietas victrix* on the Catholic stage: the Louvain dramatist Nicolaus Vernulaeus, a royal historiographer of Ferdinand III, devotes an entire tragedy to Crispus, Constantine's elder son, and his fatal passion for his stepmother. Maxentius, Constantine's hapless opponent, had also appeared in several Jesuit plays as the tormentor of the virgin martyr St. Catherine of Alexandra, and his ultimate punishment at the hands of Constantine was viewed as retribution for this crime. The

editors admit that there are many topics still to be discussed that they hope their edition will inspire, e.g., the relationship of *Pietas victrix* to other Avancini plays and the connections between Avancini's dramas and his literary model, Seneca. To their list of desiderata, this reviewer would add the relationship of Avancini's writings to other historical dramas, both Jesuit and non-Jesuit, both German and Latin. A consideration of the unusual popularity that *Pietas victrix* has enjoyed in German literary history would also be welcome. I suspect that, in light of its inaccessibility and the declining Latin skills of scholars outside of the field, *Pietas victrix* has seldom been read, yet the drama has almost effortlessly assumed canonical stature. Why has *Pietas victrix* been accorded this special status? Why haven't other Avancini plays displaced it? Could the success of this particular play be tied to the alluring copper engravings of the most dramatic scenes from the 1659 edition that appease the fears of literary historians that the German seventeenth century was unusually backward? Do the engravings suddenly give 1659 Vienna the theatrical panache of seventeenth-century Florence or Venice? Has the theatricality of the Italian Renaissance finally arrived in the German Empire through Avancini? These, too, are interesting questions to ponder, and especially important not only for the history of Jesuit theater and its place in the German literary-historical narrative, but also for the concept of the High Baroque in the German Empire. It is hoped that this edition will raise these new issues rather than merely reinforce the standard, and mostly uninformed, literary-historical positioning of this play.

The German translation has been very well done, although there are occasional moments of editorial embellishment of Avancini's plainer Latin original (e.g., *lanceo pede* (I. 2. line 225) becomes "samtwweichen Sohlen"; or *miles ... viam / Per nostra castra ... ingentem ... scripsit* is rendered as "ein Krieger ... eine gewaltige Schneise in unser Lager einzeichnete" (IV.6. lines 2979-2982). The difficulty in translating a neo-Senecan text such as Avancini's into German lies in deciding on the best way to transpose Seneca's compressed style into a language that often syntactically requires more words than Latin to transmit an idea. The editors have mostly succeeded in meeting this challenge, and stylistic infelicities arise in those few instances where they have not, e.g., *Prima lex regni est ...* (Prologium; line 43) is rendered by the prolix "Die wichtigste Voraussetzung zur Ausübung der Herrschaft ...", or *suspensa labris verba* (I. 4. 517) as "Die den Lippen stockend sich entringenden Worte." The editors are not consistent in

their translation of the names of the allegorical figures: sometimes they appear untranslated in the German version; at other times they are translated. This is most confusing with *Consilium*, especially given the semantic range applied to this word: at times it is rendered simply as *consilium*, meaning “good counsel,” at other times as “Klugheit,” meaning political prudence, a central concept in seventeenth-century political theory that is not necessarily consonant with ethical behavior. There are endnotes to many passages in the text in which historical and mythological references are explained, but unfortunately, there is no indication in either the Latin or the German text that the endnotes are present. The notes cover most, but not all, of the obscure passages: e.g., the reader will be left wondering about the underworld creature *quisquis in vivam Leae / Paratus escam membra laniari doles / refecta saepe* (I. 2. line 274), and Perugia (a city in Etruria) is unidentified in III. 2. Despite these minor omissions, the editors / translators have done an enormous service to German Neo-Latin studies, and one hopes that this new edition will inspire future studies of this prolific author and the many Austrian Latin playwrights (both Jesuit and Benedictine) who followed him.

A final note: This edition also serves as a warning for Neo-Latin scholars. The editors’ account of how difficult it was to secure funding for the current edition (the text was ready for the press in 1989!) should alert Neo-Latinists to the challenges facing modern editions of Latin works in the current environment of declining resources for scholarly presses and research libraries. If the purpose of these time-consuming projects is to ensure that works previously buried in the archives are broadly disseminated rather than transplanted back into the libraries once the new edition of a few hundred copies has been printed, then digitalized publication of these works may be the best—and only—course to pursue in the future. (James A. Parente, Jr., University of Minnesota)

◆ *Initia humanistica latina: Initienverzeichnis lateinischer Prosa und Poesie aus der Zeit des 14. bis 16. Jahrhunderts*, vol. 2, part 2: *Prosa, N-Z*. By Ludwig Bertalot. Edited by Ursula Jaitner-Hahner, on behalf of the Deutsches Historisches Institut in Rome. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2004. XVI pp. + pp. 693-1423. 172 euros. This is one of those projects whose usefulness is belied by the modesty of its title. It is, in fact, an index, of first lines of poetry and

prose written in Latin between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries. Anyone who has worked with early modern manuscripts and printed books will at some point have become furious with the citation practices of the past, in which material is quoted without reference to author or title, or with a misattribution caused by quotation from memory. Bertalot kept a file on this material, in which the first lines of early humanist poetry and prose were identified as fully as possible, ideally to author and title, but failing this to a manuscript in which a copy of the work could be found and / or to a modern secondary work in which it was discussed. The existence of this file was known for many years to scholars who were working in Italy, and after Bertalot's death the German Historical Institute in Rome undertook publication. This was no easy task, in that the index was a handwritten finding tool in which many loose ends remained to be tied up. The first volume, covering poetry, appeared in 1985. The first part of the volume on prose came out some time ago, and the volume under review completes the series.

The series is not cheap, but it is invaluable. The two prose volumes contain 24,783 entries, including the first lines of individual letters in letter collections and obscure speeches surviving in very limited numbers of manuscripts as well as the beginnings of well known works whose opening lines scholars do not necessarily recognize out of context. Anyone trying to annotate a Renaissance Latin text, for example, will save hours of work by using these volumes. To be sure, the whole business is rather hit-and-miss, in that a comprehensive version of this index would take a team of scholars many years to complete. This index reflects what Bertalot knew, but in the tradition of German scholars of his generation like Paul Oskar Kristeller, he knew a great deal, and we are all the richer for it. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Humanae litterae: estudios de humanismo y tradición clásica en homenaje al Profesor Gaspar Morocho Gayo*. Ed. by Juan Francisco Domínguez Domínguez. León: Universidad de León, 2004. 546 pp. This volume contains the following essays: Jesús Paniagua Pérez, "Presentación"; Juan F. Alcina Rovira, "Notas sobre la imprenta de Felipe Mey in Tarragona (1577-1587)"; Eduardo Álvarez del Palacio, Ramiro Jover Ruiz, and José Antonio Robles Tascón, "La educación físico-corporal en el Humanismo médico español: el *Examen de ingenios*, de

Juan Huarte”; Saturnino Álvarez Turienzo, “Sobre el humanismo y la filología poligráfica”; Melquíades Andrés Martín, “La convivencia de las tres religiones in España: comentario a un punto de vista del Dr. Gaspar Morocho”; Vicente Bécares Bostas, “Sobre la conciencia histórica en el Rinacimiento”; José Antonio Caballero López, “Los griegos impostores y el famoso dominicano de Viterbo”; Juan Francisco Domínguez Domínguez, “El torno a la tradición de Juvenal: una contribución crítica y exegética”; Sergio Fernández López, “El manuscrito I-I-3 y Arias Montano (la labor de Benito Arias en la conservación de las biblias romances escurialenses)”; Emilia Fernández Tejero and Natalio Fernández Marcos, “Alonso Gudiel: ciencia y miseria”; Francisco Javier Fuente Fernández, “El padre Mariana y los libros prohibidos de los rabinos”; Luis Gómez Canseco and Valentín Núñez Rivera, “Para el texto de la *Paráfrasis sobre el Cantar de los Cantares* de Benito Arias Montano (un manuscrito inédito y alguna cosa más)”; Rosa M.^a Iglesias Montiel and M.^a Consuelo Álvarez Morán, “Escolios griegos en la *Mythologia* de Natale Conti (Venecia 1567)”; José María Maestre Maestre, “Notas de crítica textual y hermenéutica a los poemas latinos del Brocense”; Crescencio Miguélez Baños, “Sermón de fray Dionisio Vázquez *De unitate et simplicitate personae Christi in duabus naturis*”; José María Moreno González and Juan Carlos Rubio Masa, “Documentación notarial referente a Pedro de Valencia y su familia en el Archivo Histórico Municipal de Zafra”; Francisca Moya del Baño, “Una *lectio difficilior* en un soneto difícil de Quevedo (‘Oh, fallezcan los blancos, los postreros’). Una conjetura, sustentada en un texto de Persio, que da luz al lugar y al soneto”; Fernando Navarro Antolín and Luis Gómez Canseco, “Hacia una edición crítica de las *Virorum doctorum de disciplinis benemerentium effigies XLVIII* de Benito Arias Montano y Philips Galle: ediciones y reimpressiones”; Jesús María Nieto Ibáñez, “Flavio Josepho en los *Antiquitatum Iudaicarum libri IX* de Arias Montano”; Jesús Paradinas Fuentes, “Fundamentos bíblicos del pensamiento económico de Pedro de Valencia”; Manuel Pecellín Lancharro, “Casiodoro de Reina”; Miguel Rodríguez-Pantoja, “Preliminares a una edición del *Poema Mariano* de Anchieta”; Joan Salvadó, “Observaciones sobre los manuscritos de la biblioteca de Antonio Agustín conservados en Roma”; M.^a Asunción Sánchez Manzano, “La retórica y su significado según las definiciones de tratados de esa disciplina escritos en latín entre 1500 y 1650”; Juan Signes Codoñer, “El Pinciano y Erasmo”; and M.^a Isabel Viforcós Marinas and M.^a Dolores Campos Sánchez-Bordona, “Los fondos histórico-bibliográficos

del convento de San Marcos de León: dominio del ámbito europeo y olvido americano.”

For a North American Neo-Latinist, this volume may well be of greatest interest for the insight it provides into how our Spanish colleagues approach the field. Essays like those of Bécares Botas on historical consciousness in the Renaissance and Signes Codoñer on Erasmus and another famous humanist (El Pinciano) will seem familiar enough. Others exemplify things that Spanish scholars do especially well. The essays of Moreno González and Rubio Masao, on notarial documents about Pedro de Valencia and his family in the Archivo Histórico Municipal in Zafra, and of Viforcós Marinas and Campos Sánchez-Bordona on historical-bibliographical sources from the convent of San Marcos de León, show the kind of careful attention to archival material that is found in the best of contemporary Spanish scholarship. Spanish scholars also tend to pay more attention to book history than many North American Neo-Latinists, as the essays by Alcina Rovira, Fernández López, Salvadó, Navarro Antolín and Gómez Canseco, and Viforcós Marinas and Campos Sánchez-Bordona show. The essay by Álvarez del Palacio, Jover Ruiz, and Robles Tascón moves into the relationship between humanism and the history of science, something that is certainly done now and again by Anglophone scholars, but not often. Fully eight of the essays in this volume touch on some part of the relationship between humanism and religion—hardly unknown for Neo-Latinists beyond the Pyrenees, but a strain of scholarship that is often considered peculiarly Spanish, a topic that the honoree of this *Festschrift* explored in one of his last writings. Almost as many essays are devoted to matters philological, some as preliminary studies for the preparation of a critical edition, some as an edition of a short work with commentary, and others as observations on the text of key works. The essay of Domínguez Domínguez deserves special mention here as a masterpiece of its genre, a study focused on one word in Juvenal 5.155 that works systematically through medieval manuscripts and humanist printed editions to show that the modern received text rests on an unsupported conjecture of a seventeenth-century humanist and should be emended. The essays focus overwhelmingly on Spanish topics, which is typical of Neo-Latin scholarship in Spain.

The man in whose memory this volume was prepared, Gaspar Morocho Gayo, is the author of five books, along with more than fifty articles and forty

contributions to conference proceedings. He was also the guiding spirit behind the Colección de Humanistas Españoles, which now contains twenty-nine volumes (see the review of *La difesa contra Aristóteles y sus seguidores*, above), and the journal *Silva*, which has recently joined *Humanistica Lovaniensia* and *Neulateinisches Jahrbuch* as one of only a handful of journals devoted specifically to Neo-Latin studies. It is not easy to imagine a Festschrift worthy of a scholar like this, but the editors of this volume have created one. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Humanistica, per Cesare Vasoli*. Ed. by Fabrizio Maroi and Elisabetta Scapparone. Istituto Nazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento, Studi e Testi, 42. Florence: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 2004. viii + 402 pp. 39 Euros. This volume constitutes a Festschrift to commemorate the eightieth birthday of Cesare Vasoli, the distinguished historian of early modern philosophy. Its contributors include his closest friends and colleagues, supported by the Istituto Nazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento, which he served as President from 1988 to 1996. The volume contains the following essays: Domenico De Robertis, “Dante poeta della rettitudine”; Sergio Landucci, “La doppia verità, a Parigi, attorno al 1315”; Lina Bolzoni, “Petrarca e le tecniche della memoria (a proposito del *De remediis*)”; James Hankins, “Lorenzo de’ Medici’s *De summo bono* and the Popularization of Ficinian Platonism”; Gian Carlo Garfagnini, “Bartolomeo Scala e la difesa dello stato ‘nuovo’”; John Monfasani, “The Puzzling Dates of Paolo Cortesi”; Fiorella De Michelis Pintacuda, “La *philosophia Christi* di Erasmo tra Umanesimo e Riforma”; Andrea Battistini, “Linguaggio del concreto e comparazioni domestiche nel *De ratione dicendi* di Juan Luis Vives”; Massimo Firpo, “Prime considerazioni sul processo inquisitoriale di Vittore Soranzo”; Lech Szczucki, “Una polemica sconosciuta tra Christian Francken e Simone Simonini”; Michele Ciliberto, “Morire «martire» e «volentieri»: interpretazione del processo di Giordano Bruno”; Germana Ernst, “Libertà dell’uomo e *vis Fati* in Campanella”; Jean-Claude Margolin, “Une curiosité universelle: réflexions sur l’idée de curiosité à la Renaissance”; Gennaro Sasso, “Qualche variazione su Dante e Vico in tema di linguaggio”; Paolo Rossi, “*Cogitare / videre*: una nota sui rapporti tra Vico e Bacone”; Giuseppe Cambiano, “Herder, Machiavelli e il Rinascimento”; Walter Tega, “Enciclopedia e Università tra XVIII e XIX secolo”; Kurt Flasch, “Konrad Burdach über Renaissance

und Humanismus”; Giuseppe Cacciatore, “Su alcune interpretazioni tedesche del Rinascimento nel Novecento”; and Fulvio Tessitore, “Croce e la storia universale.”

As the preface states, the contributors were invited to submit an essay that contributes directly or indirectly to our understanding of the problem of humanism and the Renaissance, in either historical or historiographical terms. In some cases, the connection is quite indirect, as with the second essay on fourteenth-century Parisian philosophy or the final one on Croce; in others, like the first essay on Dante, we are reminded that Italian scholarship does not necessarily approach this problem in exactly the same way as Anglo-Saxon scholarship does. The essays in this collection range widely, with some interesting pieces on non-Italian material complementing nicely the expected Italian-oriented ones, and most, if not all, are worth reading. As is increasingly the case with Italian essay collections, this one contains a good index, which helps considerably in making its contents more accessible. A worthy tribute, in the end, to one of the great Neo-Latinists of his generation. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)