

NEO-LATIN NEWS

Vol. 55, Nos. 1 & 2. Published jointly with SCN. Send inquiries to the editor, Craig Kallendorf, 4227 TAMU, College Station, Texas 77843-4227. NLN is the official publication of the American Association for Neo-Latin Studies and is 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.

◆ *Opera poetica*. By Bohuslaus Hassensteinus a Lobkowicz. Ed. by Marta Vaculínová. Munich and Leipzig: Saur, 2006. xl + 328 pp. The *Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana* has traditionally refreshed its focus on the Greek and Latin classics with the critical editions of late antique (e.g., Donatus – Wessner 1902–1908, Macrobius – Willis 1970, Martianus Capella – Willis 1983), patristic (e.g., Lactantius – Heck & Wlosok 2005), medieval (e.g., Remigius of Auxerre – Fox 1902), and humanistic authors (e.g., Lorenzo Valla – Schwahn, 1928). These traditional refreshments also include the *Epistulae* by Bohuslaus Hassensteinus a Lobkowicz (Martínek and Martínková 1969–1980). Marta Vaculínová of the Library of the National Museum in Prague has now provided the critical edition of the *Opera poetica* of Hassensteinus (1462–1510), a humanist author from Bohemia who studied in Italy (Bologna and Ferrara), developed a reputed library, traveled to Greece and the Holy Land, and also worked in Vienna and Hungary (hence his poems *Boemia ad Hungariam sororem*, *Comparatio Bohemiae et Pannoniae*, *Ecloga sive Idyllion Budae*, and so on).

Vaculínová's work is all in Latin and features a straightforward structure. The *Praefatio* offers a short biography of Hassensteinus, as well as discussions of the chronology, the titles (usually later inventions), and the humanist net-

work of the addressees of his poems. The description of the manuscripts (eight codices from the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries) and the editions is followed by the *stemmata codicum*, a statement on the editor's orthographic principles (*aspirationem omitimus... discrimina litterarum e/ae/oe, i/y non respiciamus...*, xxviii), a bibliography with a separate section on the library of Hassensteinus, and finally the *sigla* of the codices and the editions. The main text of *Hassensteinii opera poetica* numbers 1 to 504 poems of varying sizes, and the critical apparatus records the variant readings along with the textual references. The editor's *Commentarii* outline matters of textual and literary criticism as well as historical context (254–91). The *Initia carminum* and the *Index nominum* conclude the volume.

The meter of Hassensteinus' poetry is overwhelmingly distichs, with some Sapphic strophes. The occasional acrostics and telestics are highlighted by typesetting in the present edition. The textual references reveal the author's two types of approach: his classical erudition (Horace, Juvenal, Lucan, Lucretius, Martial, Ovid, Propertius, Seneca, Statius, Tibullus, Vergil) and his leanings towards later authors especially popular in the Middle Ages (Ausonius, Boethius, Claudian, *Disticha Catonis*). The first example of the combination of classical and Biblical influence is number 102 (*In fratrem religiosum*):

*Carmina Nasonis laudas cultumque Tibullum
 Lucanusque tibi Vergiliusque placent.
 Sed mallem Davidis cantus psalmique placerent
 et Salomonicae Musa pudica lyrae.
 Non bene nempe tuo concordat Naso cucullo
 detonsumque odit pulchra Corinna caput.*

The critical apparatus employs here MS Budapest, Hungarian National Library, Clmae. 367, fol. 216r (copied after 1522 and containing only two poems, numbers 72 and 102): while it has a variant reading *placet* for *placent* against the majority of the witnesses, it also has *Sed mallem* against the variant reading *mallem* of the edition of Thomas Mitis (*Farrago prima* 1562) which would transform the line into a spondaic hexameter. The apparatus records the classical antecedent of the epithet *cultumque Tibullum*—Ovid, *Amores* 1.15.28: *culte Tibulle*. The complete Ovidian distich (*Amores* 1.15.27–8: *Donec erunt ignes arcusque Cupidinis arma, / discentur numeri, culte Tibulle, tu*) suggests that Hassensteinus

evokes this Ovidian context by imitating the epithet. The editor's reference to Ovid, *Amores* 3.1.66 is not directly relevant; it should be corrected to 3.9.66 (*Aucāsiti numeros, culte Tibulle, pios*). To elucidate poem 102, the *Commentarii* at the end of the volume quote a letter of Hassensteinus from 1502: *ecclesiastici crebrius de nummis quam de caelo loquuntur saepiusque Nemesim et Laidem quam Christum in ore habent* (272). The combination of classical and Biblical influence is also apparent in poems 202–13 (*Disticha de duodecim apostolis*).

The second example reveals medieval influence on the humanistic author: as the following set of textual parallels indicates, poem 218 (*Salutatio Mariae Virginis*) is an inspired paraphrase of the antiphon *Salve regina*.

Salve regina

*Salve regina, mater misericordiae,
vita, dulcedo et spes nostra, salve.
Ad te clamamus exsules filii Hebrae,
ad te suspiramus gementes et flentes
in hac lacrimarum valle.
Eia ergo, advocata nostra, illos tuos
misericordes oculos ad nos converte
et Iesum, benedictum fructum ventris
tui,
nobis post hoc exsilium ostende.
O clemens, o pia, o dulcis virgo Maria.*

Salutatio Mariae Virginis

*O regina poli, cuius clementia summa est,
vitae dulcedo spesque salutis ave.
Ad te clamamus miserandis vocibus, Evae
eripe nos natos exsulis exilio!
Ad te cum gemitu, lacrimarum valle iacentes
suspiramus, ades, Virgo beata, tuus.
Ergo age, mortalis, genitrix, patrona catervae
luminaque ad populum verte benigna
tuum
et post exilium hoc faciem da cernere Christi,
o clemens, dulcis et pia Virgo, precor.*

The third example, finally, shall stand for what is the most significant aspect of the poetry of Hassensteinus: the classical tradition. A Sapphic strophe of poem 502 (*Ad Mercurium pro salvo conductu Ioannis ad Elysios campos*) runs like this:

*Haec tulit caelo via Scipiones,
hac laborabant rigidi Catones
hacque vivendo sapiens beate
Laelius ibat.*

The critical apparatus records the classical hendecasyllabic antecedent of the epithet *rigidi Catones* – Martial, *Epigrammata* 10.20.21: *Tunc me vel rigidi legant*

Catones. Overall, the above samples from the *Opera poetica* of Hassensteinus and their apparatus clearly demonstrate that Vaculínová's new critical edition is a welcome addition to textual scholarship on Humanistic Latin and the classical tradition in the Renaissance in Bohemia, Hungary, Central Europe, and beyond. Therefore, the present refreshment served by the *Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana* will hopefully delight more than just one type of Latinist scholars: the *rigidi Catones* of classical philology and the *Scipiones* of the classical tradition alike. (Elod Nemerkenyi, Central European University, Budapest)

◆ *Columbus' First Voyage: Latin Selections from Peter Martyr's De orbe novo*. Ed. by Constance P. Iacona and Edward V. George. Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, 2005. xv + 39 pp. \$20. This is an intermediate Latin text that offers unusual promise for the classroom. While the central place in any beginning Latin program must be occupied by the standard Roman authors, most readers of this journal will be open to the argument that judiciously used, Neo-Latin material can offer a useful supplement. Since good Latin in the Renaissance was understood to be classical Latin, the best writers expressed themselves in ways that are very hard to distinguish from Cicero and Virgil. Thus nothing, or next to nothing, is sacrificed in terms of grammar and style if a good Neo-Latin text is read, and something considerable can be gained if the subject matter is of interest to the students. That is what we have here.

Peter Martyr of Angleria (1457-1526) was an Italian in the service of the Spanish crown. He had a patron back in Italy, though, whom he had promised to keep abreast of his activities, and when Columbus returned with stories of what he had found on his voyages, Martyr began almost immediately to interview the travellers and prepare reports on what they said. Samuel Eliot Morison, the distinguished historian, describes *De orbe novo* as the earliest history of the 'new' world, although the full scope of what Columbus had found was not immediately understood.

Columbus has become a controversial figure, being both praised for his daring and courage and condemned for his role in starting the encounter between the Europeans and the indigenous peoples that had such disastrous consequence for the latter group. Martyr's text can be read against both interpretations. The background notes included by the editors refer the reader

to the other main sources for Columbus' first voyage: Columbus' own journal, abstracted by Fray Bartolomé de Las Casas; Columbus' 1493 letter announcing his discoveries; the biography of Columbus by his son Ferdinand; and Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo's *Natural History of the West Indies*. Martyr's account does not always agree with what is found in these other sources, allowing for discussions of motive and historical method that can be fleshed out through reference to the bibliography at the end of the book.

Martyr's Latin style is much like that of Caesar's *Gallic Wars*, favoring spare simplicity over ornate embellishment, making it as easy to use in the intermediate-level classroom as Caesar. Each Latin extract is accompanied by vocabulary and notes, along with contextual explanations in English and engaging pictures. There are also a group of "auxiliary sentences" which convey Martyr's thought in somewhat easier form, allowing different teaching strategies depending on the level at which particular students are working.

For American students in particular, this book offers a chance to see how Latin maintained its relevance beyond the limits they typically imagine. It is one thing to say in general terms that people like Copernicus and Newton wrote in Latin; it's quite another to show them how Latin was the language that carried news of an event whose importance will be immediately obvious to them. I'm going to give this book a try in my intermediate Latin class. (Craig Kallendorf)

◆ *Pichiana: bibliografia delle edizioni e degli studi*. By Leonardo Quaquarelli and Zita Zanardi. Centro internazionale di cultura "Giovanni Pico della Mirandola," Studi pichiani, 10. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 2005. 434 pp., 4 color plates, black and white figures. 45 euros. For the last seventy years Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (1463-94) has been the object of significant scholarly attention, especially from such major Florentine scholars as Alessandro Perosa, Cesare Vasoli, and Eugenio Garin and their students. Back in 1963, at a conference commemorating the five hundredth anniversary of Pico's birth, Paul Oskar Kristeller provided a "tentative list" of manuscripts and an inventory of printed editions divided into texts and studies. Kristeller's *Iter Italicum* moved the manuscript material to a definitive state, but as far as the printed books go, "tentative" still meant tentative, even when the compiler was Kristeller. Accordingly in 1994, the five hundredth anniversary of Pico's death, the Centro internazionale di cultura "Giovanni Pico della Mirandola" commissioned a

series of studies from younger scholars to provide a proper bibliography of the printed material. This book is that study.

The book is divided into four parts. The first two, “Le edizioni antiche di Giovanni e Giovan Francesco Pico” and “La bibliografia moderna di Giovanni Pico,” contain five essays that provide an overview and analysis of the material: L. Quaquarelli, “Gli incunaboli”; R. Campioni, “Le edizioni del XVI secolo in Emilia-Romagna”; Z. Zanardi, “Le edizioni del XVI secolo fuori dall’Emilia-Romagna”; Z. Zanardi, “Le edizioni del XVII e del XVIII secolo: la loro diffusione in Italia e nel mondo”; and L. Quaquarelli, “Le edizioni dell’Ottocento e del Novecento e gli studi.” The third section, “Catalogo,” contains an inventory of editions. The first 116, published between the fifteenth and the eighteenth centuries, are given a detailed treatment according to the principles of descriptive bibliography that govern older books, with a great deal of information about individual copies as well as exacting descriptions of ideal texts. Numbers 117 to 235 bis were printed in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and are treated in short-title format. The final section, “Bibliografia XIX e XX secolo,” presents books and articles about Pico, numbered continuously with the preceding section, from 236 to 999. The book concludes with four indices: “Indice cronologico,” “Indice dei tipografi,” “Indice dei possessori e delle provenienze,” and “Indice dei nomi.”

The decision to move from detailed to short title-format in describing the editions, with the nineteenth century as the dividing point, is certainly reasonable, but using continuous numbering across both the catalogue of editions and the bibliography of secondary materials is a bit curious, although in the end not confusing. It is particularly pleasing to note the presence of the essays in the first two sections. Bibliographies like this are invaluable sources for tracing the diffusion of important works in intellectual history, but the general practice is to do the bibliography and let someone else then use it to ‘tell the story’ of a particular author. Having both between the same covers is most valuable indeed and suggests a model that could be followed usefully by anyone thinking of doing a similar project for another author.

With the aid of the introductory essays, one can pick up several conclusions quickly. First, the *editio princeps*, although posthumous, exerted a great deal of influence on the later dissemination of the text. The *cinquecentine* in turn show that Giovanni and Giovan Francesco Pico exercised a significant im-

pact throughout sixteenth-century Europe, but disproportionately so in Emilia-Romagna. This effect continued, although in gradually diminishing power, through the next two centuries; striking is the existence of only one eighteenth-century edition. Pico's presence in anthologies, often with analogous passages from Savonarola, is interesting, as is the gradual introduction of critical works about Pico beginning in the nineteenth century.

More, of course, remains to be done in tracing the diffusion and influence of the ideas of Pico across the centuries. But thanks to the efforts of these two scholars, the bibliographical work on which such studies should rest is now available. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Alberto Pio da Carpi contro Erasmo da Rotterdam nell'età della Riforma*. Ed. Maria Antonietta Marogna. Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 2005. 118 pages + xvi plates. 13 euros. This book contains three essays by participants in an international meeting held in Carpi in May of 2002 on the occasion of the publication of Fabio Fomer's two volume work, *Ad Erasmi Roterodami expositulationem responsio accurata et paraenetica* (Firenze, 2002). This extended criticism of Erasmus's views had been prompted by a letter Erasmus wrote to Alberto Pio protesting the calumnies and charges which he had heard Alberto Pio was circulating in Rome about him. My review of this work appeared in the Fall-Winter 2004 issue of this journal (vol. 62). But Erasmus's letter and Alberto Pio's response by no means put an end to their controversy.

The first essay, "Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda: un umanista spagnolo difensore di Alberto Pio contro Erasmo," translated from the Spanish by Maria Marogna, is by Julián Solana Pujalte of the University of Córdoba. The posthumous publication in 1531 of Alberto Pio's second book criticizing Erasmus, written in 1526, *Tres et viginti libri in locos lucubrationum variarum D. Erasmi Roterodami, quos censet ab eo recognoscendos et retractandos*, prompted an extended response by Erasmus in his lengthily titled *Apologia adversus rhapsodias calumniosarum querimoniarum Alberti Pii quondam Carporum principis quem et senem et moribundum et ad quidvis potius axomodum homines quidam male auspizati ad hanc illiberalem fabulam agendam subornarunt*.

The deceased Alberto Pio's defense was taken up by his close friend and admirer, the Spanish humanist Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda, in his *Antapologia pro Alberto Pio in Erasmus Roterodannum*, published in 1532. Prof. Pujalte's paper contains a brief biography of Sepúlveda, a criticism of the strongest charges

of Erasmus against Alberto Pio, and a defense that Sepúlveda made of his patron and protector. The first part of the paper surveys his extensive literary works; of special interest to New World scholars is his dispute with Bartolomé de las Casas, the defender of the Indians against the abuses of the Spanish. Sepúlveda vigorously defended the justness of the Spanish wars against native Americans and authored several treatises on this subject.

Then, Pujalte takes up Erasmus' charge that Alberto Pio was not the author of works signed by him, but that they were produced in a sort of *fabbrica anti-erasmiana* (18) by priests in Paris or by scribes paid to do so. Erasmus leveled this charge in editions of his *Ciceronianus* and in the *Apologia adversus rhapsodies* ..., saying *Ne priorem quidem librum, quem ad me misit, scripserat suo Marte, tantum abest, ut credamus hoc opus ab ipso fuisse perfectum* (19, n. 35). Sepúlveda's defense of his mentor in his *Antapologia* ... emphasizes two facts: first, that anyone acquainted with Alberto Pio's education and career could never believe that he needed anyone to revise his works or to furnish him theological and biblical passages to bolster his writings. Second is the charge that Alberto Pio was not the author of works he published. Perhaps, Sepúlveda writes, this mistaken notion arose from the fact that Alberto Pio was ill and dictated his works to secretaries or from Erasmus's charge in the *Apologia* ... (18, 1-2) that many had helped Alberto Pio, among them and specifically, the good Spanish Latinist "Sepulvela." This, Sepúlveda explains, was impossible because at the time Alberto Pio was in Paris writing his *Tres et viginti libri* ... he, "Sepúlveda," was in Italy, not in Paris.

The second essay, "Dare corpo alla saggezza antica. Elementi figurativi e monumentali della ricezione di Erasmo," is by Silvana Seidel Menchi of the University of Pisa. While Alberto Pio was writing energetically against Erasmus, the latter's *Adagiorum Chiliades* were enjoying immense popularity in Italy and had achieved the status of a best seller. It was only a matter of time before this literary work began to influence not only literature, but the plastic arts as well. She discusses a statuary group by Agostino Busti with the title *Lacto lupum* and the literary background of the saying which goes back to the Palatine Anthology. In Ferrara, two palaces, one the Naselli-Crespi (ca. 1530-37) and the other the Contughi-Gulinelli (1542), are, in her words, "testimonianze monumentali della risonanza che l'enciclopedia paremiografica dell'umanista transalpino ebbe nel Ducato estense (32)." While there are twelve tablets with inscriptions on the Naselli palace, she devotes the most attention to discussing

four proverbs inscribed on plaques affixed on the façade of the Naselli palace traceable to the *Adagia*: *stateram ne transgradiaris, ignem gladio ne fodito, leonem ne tondeto*, and *umbram ne metiare*. On the Contughi-Gulinelli there are eight inscriptions from the *Adagia*, but only six preserve the original inscriptions which, according to Prof. Menchi, “... presentano iscrizioni nelle tre lingue canoniche del programma culturale, di conio umanistico-biblico, con il quale Erasmo si identificava: il latino, il greco, il ebraico.” Thus, from the *Adagia*, there are two Latin inscriptions on the façade of this palace, *serpentis oculus* and *lingua clavus*, two Greek, *domus amica, domus optima* and *aut ter sex aut ter tesserae*,” and two Hebrew, *harundines sub eodem tecto ne habeas*, and *malo acceptus stultus sapit*.

Prof. Menchi traces the influence on painting of two of Erasmus’ best-known proverbs, *occasione arripere* and *nosce tempus*, originating in Posidippus and Ausonius. The pictorialization of these concepts is traceable to antiquity’s visualization of *Kairos*, as a figure with winged feet, the front of his head with long hair, but bald in back, standing on a swiftly whirling orb. A painting by Girolamo da Carpi, now in Dresden, with the title “L’Occasione e il Pentimento” is directly inspired by this idea of *Kairos*. Prof. Menchi shifts the inspiration for this painting from the *De deis gentium libri sive syntagmata XVII* of Erasmus’ contemporary, the humanist Lilio Gregorio Giraldi, a long-held thesis established by Rudolf Wittkower in 1937, to Erasmus’ *Adagia*, saying “... la scoperta dell’attualità che le *Adagiorum Chiliades* avevano avuto per Girolamo da Carpi architetto negli anni immediatamente precedenti l’esecuzione del dipinto di Dresda ... pone la questione della sua fonte letteraria in una nuova luce e accredita la tesi della funzione ispiratrice del testo erasmiano (44).” Her essay closes with the statement that the surface has barely been scratched on this topic, viz., the influence of Erasmus on the visual and plastic art.

The third essay in this volume, “Nuovi documenti della polemica tra Alberto Pio et Erasmo da Rotterdam, e alcune lettere inedite,” is by Prof. Fabio Forner, now at the University of Verona. He states that the basic text for Alberto Pio’s “*Responsio accurata et paraenetica ...*” is the manuscript (fondo Falcò Pio, scatola 282, documento numero 6) in the Veneranda Biblioteca Ambrosiana of Milan. Nevertheless, portions of the manuscript have found their way into other collections, e.g., the Biblioteca Comunale Ariosteo in Ferrara, which has fascicles clearly belonging to the Ambrosian manuscript. Another manuscript, now in the Biblioteca Angelica in Rome

(folio 137, ms. 479), contains an extract from Alberto Pio's *Tres et viginti libri ...* contending that Erasmus had shown himself an ingrate to Aldus Manutius. Prof. Forner then describes the French translation of this work, a sumptuous parchment manuscript (Fr. 462) now in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. An almost identical copy also exists in the Musée Condé at Chantilly. Prof. Forner also supports the thesis of Prof. Pujalte, discussed at the beginning of this review, that while the relationship between Alberto Pio and Sepúlveda was of the closest kind, and that while Sepúlveda had collaborated in the writing of Alberto Pio's first work against Erasmus and had expressed a desire to come to his mentor's assistance again (*Si Alpes non intercederent, crede mihi, iam ad te advolassem ...*, p. 56), there exists today no document to support the notion that there was any actual collaboration between the two in writing the *Tres et viginti libri...*

Prof. Forner concludes his essay with a word about the biography of Alberto Pio. He writes, "Come è stato più volte sottolineato, da Carlo Dionisotti *in primis*, una esaustiva opera monografica su Alberto Pio è ancora da scrivere." The *disiecta membra* of his voluminous, unpublished correspondence are scattered throughout libraries in Italy, France, Austria, and the United States. Some of his correspondence, however, has been published, and Prof. Forner lists the works in which these letters have appeared in Appendix 2, publications which include letters both from and to Alberto Pio. It would be difficult to imagine another scholar more qualified to undertake the formidable task of writing "una esaustiva opera monografica" about Alberto Pio or to edit the correspondence of Alberto Pio than Prof. Fabio Forner, and it is to be hoped that the lack of such editions reflects his own inner desire to undertake one or both of these tasks!

The volume also contains a preface by Brunetto Salvarani, an introduction by Anna Prandi, and brief but incisive "linee introduttive" in an essay "Letà della Riforma tra Erasmo e Lutero," by Giuseppe Campana, who has been director of the Centro Studi Religiosi della Fondazione San Carlo in Modena and has taught history and philosophy in the lycei of Carpi and Modena. (Albert R. Baca, California State University, Northridge)

◆ *The Correspondence of Wolfgang Capito, Volume 1: 1507-1523*. Ed. and trans. by Erika Rummel with the assistance of Milton Kooistra. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 2005. xlii + 285 pp. \$95.

Wolfgang Capito (1478-1541) is not well known today, but he was in fact one of the most important figures in Reformation Europe. First as a professor of theology in Basel, then as advisor to the Archbishop of Mainz, Capito remained Catholic until he received a position as a preacher in Strasbourg, at which point he joined the Protestants and worked for the next two decades with Martin Bucer in directing the reformation of that city. He wrote or contributed to more than forty books and pamphlets, in which his basic approach to theological matters becomes clear. After his conversion his humanism became tempered, with the classics firmly subordinated to confessional goals. By personality and belief, Capito was inclined to compromise. He eventually abandoned Catholicism for the Protestant cause, then left Luther for Zwingli, but he tended to express himself with an apologetic rather than a confrontational style and sought accord whenever possible. In the end he never fulfilled the promise he showed in the early years of the Reformation, in part because his age was more suited to the confrontational style he eschewed, but in part because a series of personal misfortunes and an involvement with marginal figures held him back. Nevertheless he played his part on the same stage as Erasmus, Karlstadt, and Oecolampadius (whose widow he married).

These relationships are illuminated most clearly by the letters he wrote to and received from men like Luther and Bucer, over seven hundred of which survive. There is, however, no complete collection of these letters, and this is the gap into which Rummel steps. About a third of Capito's letters are still in manuscript or printed in publications that were published before 1900 which are hard to find and which in most cases offer a text only without translation or background information. How to handle this situation is debatable. First, Rummel chose not to publish the Latin or German originals, but annotated translations into English. This is, of course, the same decision made by the Collected Works of Erasmus series, which is also published by the University of Toronto Press and with which Rummel has been intimately involved for much of her scholarly career. She has, however, gone back *ad fontes* in the best tradition of humanist scholarship, collecting the source material and transcribing the manuscript letters. I suspect that it would have been difficult to find a publisher willing to print several volumes of Latin and German letters, especially since the ones to and from Capito's most famous correspondents can usually be found in other modern editions. It would have been a shame for

this material to remain inaccessible, and here Rummel made a very good decision, to use the internet to make these documents available to those who need access to the originals <www.wolfgang-capito.com>. Her second choice, however, strikes me as less commendable. Rather than doing translations of all the letters, Rummel has published only the letters that were previously unidentified or unpublished, or that were published before 1900 or in venues of limited circulation. The others are listed and summarized in the appropriate place. This decision can certainly be defended, but what constitutes “limited circulation” is open to discussion; only readers with access to a very good research library will actually be able to find all the summarized material readily to hand, and even then there will be a lot of shuffling back and forth between volumes for anyone who wants to work seriously with Capito’s correspondence.

This is the first of three projected volumes. It breaks off at a logical point, at a time when Capito had clearly turned away from the Catholic church. Rummel is a well established, well respected scholar, and this book meets fully what the reader will expect from her, fluent translations with carefully prepared annotation and careful cross-reference. We should be grateful to her and her collaborator for making the works of this unduly neglected reformer accessible, and hopeful that the other two volumes will appear quickly. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Cœuvres complètes, Tome I: Basiorum liber et Odarum liber.* By Jean Second. Ed. and com. by Roland Guillot. Paris: Honoré Champion, 2005. The *Basiorum liber* of Johannes Secundus is among the most celebrated of all neo-Latin poetry today, not least because of the many imitators it found in vernacular literature. The text of this short collection and related materials focusing on the poems’ French reception take up the lion’s share of this edition, the first of five projected volumes of Secundus’ complete works, of which two have been published to date.

Fully one third of the volume is taken up with a compilation of sixteenth-century French-language imitations of the *Basia* by members of the Pléiade, and by the poets of the later generation which saw the ‘baiser’ genre descend into preciosity and ‘mignardise.’ The bulk of the introduction, too, focuses on the influence of Secundus on contemporary French vernacular love poetry. While this will be of great use to many scholars—indeed, there is material

enough there for a book-length study of its own—his choice seems injudicious for what is meant to be a critical edition of the poetry of Johannes Secundus. Of course, any analysis of the *Basia* cannot bracket off the text from the context of its reception, so influential has it been on love poetry traditions; but a balance must be struck. Another problem with this approach is that the *basium* came to take on the status of a genre of its own; and a direct line of influence from the Secundus text to the French ‘baisers’ cannot always be traced. This is further complicated by the fact that Secundus was certainly not the first neo-Latin author to write kiss poems—a fact acknowledged but downplayed by the editor: on p. 28 we find the telling admission that it is sometimes difficult to identify precisely the extent of Secundus’ influence on later poets, given the great proliferation of other models available to them.

The excessive attention paid to Secundus’ imitators leads generally to a back-to-front approach to the poems themselves. In the introduction there is some very suggestive analysis of Secundus’ poetry, but much of it is done *through* other texts. Too often the poems themselves are reduced to the status of ‘texte matriciel’ or ‘hypotexte.’ A reading of the poems ‘on their own terms’ is lacking. This is exemplified by a particularly unfortunate editorial mistake: a paragraph analysing the death-eroticism nexus in Secundus’ *Basia* on p. 16 is reproduced word for word on p. 33, but there the analysis is predicated of the *Baisers* of Belleau! If a reading is equally applicable to source text and imitation, the difference between the two is elided and the poetry itself is devalued.

The introduction, which numbers one hundred pages, is somewhat messy: the ordering of sections is confusing, with no general introduction, and the biographical note delayed until the end. The emphasis on the posterity of the *Basia* again makes it difficult to find a way into the text itself, and the reader must make an effort to glean nuggets of information on Secundus from various footnotes scattered throughout the text, before he is formally introduced.

The notes to the poems are brief, and the editor has taken the decision to confine his attentions to the sources Secundus imitates and to the later French imitations. Commentary on the poems themselves is lacking. The facing prose translation renders the sense of the Latin fairly well, but the notes might have offered more help with the stylistic intricacies that the translation necessarily misses. The notes to the *Odes* are fuller in places, for example in their

exploration of Secundus' *encomia* to Charles V and their models in Horatian paeans to Augustus; but elsewhere they are infuriatingly slight, for example to Ode XI.

The text of the poems, which is based on the 1541 Utrecht edition, is not without typographical errors, and the punctuation is not always clear. Certain errors are repeated: on p. 428 alone we find *paematum*, *paetae* (for *poematum*, *poetae*), and *ziminis* for *criminis*. The *index nominum*, bizarrely, eschews page numbers, as does the index of first lines.

While this volume will be helpful to those interested in Secundus' influence on French poetry, it is of less use to a broad academic audience, and many readers will prefer the inexpensive *Classiques en poche* edition of the *Basia*, which has just been published. (Paul White, Cambridge University)

◆ *Justus Lipsius. Politica. Six Books of Politics or Political Instruction*. Ed., with trans. and intro. by Jan Waszink. Bibliotheca Latinatis Novae. Assen: Royal van Gorcum, 2004. 94.50 euros. This is an important publication. Not only is this volume a helpful complement to other modern studies and editions of Justus Lipsius' *oeuvre*, such as the ongoing project of his correspondence (the *Iusti Lipsii epistolae*) or Jacqueline Lagrée's anthology of the humanist's Stoic tracts; but, above all, Jan Waszink's bilingual edition now makes more easily accessible a text which historians of early modern political thought have long deemed influential on the concept of practical statesmanship in the late sixteenth century and the seventeenth century.

Ever since Gerhard Oestreich underlined the relevance of the neo-Stoic movement for early modern political thought, Lipsius—the formidable editor of Tacitus and Seneca, and the author of a hugely successful dialogue *On Constancy*—has been gaining ground amongst critics as a political thinker. Indeed, the influence of Lipsius' *Politica* has now been detected in works emerging from such divergent contexts as Elizabethan deliberations on the fate of Ireland (most notably Sir William Herbert's *Croftus sive de Hibernia liber*) or the German juridico-political teachings of Johannes Althusius (Althusius [1557-1638]), whose *Politica methodice digesta* appeared in 1603. Be it through translations into French, Dutch, English, Spanish, Polish, and Italian or through the many Latin reprints, Lipsian ideas also filtered through to political tragedies such as P. C. Hooft's *Henrik de Grôte* (a Dutch theatrical portrait of the French King, Henri IV) or German Baroque theatre of the late seventeenth century.

Thus, despite writing in Latin, Lipsius is now readily mentioned in the same breath as vernacular political writers such as Machiavelli or Jean Bodin. To undertake the preparation of a critical edition with English translation was therefore a timely initiative. However, it was also bound to be a thankless task, fraught with pitfalls.

The 839-page book under review opens with a substantial introduction presenting Lipsius and his work, in terms of reception, context, and interpretation. The actual Latin edition of the *Politicorum libri sex*, with facing English translation, then forms the core of the volume (223-709). Four appendices provide further documentation: they include (1) the text of various imprimaturs (“approbations,” Waszink calls them) as well as censorial reports preserved in the Vatican, (2) Lipsius’ *Notae* (722-82), (3) a set of disparate “observations on the structure and composition of the text,” and (4) a section with items of linguistic and typographical interest. A richly furnished bibliography and three indices close this fifth volume of the *Bibliotheca Latinitatis Novae*. The book as a whole thus testifies to an extensive body of knowledge and a great amount of legwork on the part of the editor and translator, who claims ownership of the *Politica* not just by bringing together printed and manuscript sources, but also by moving confidently between the various sections of his publication, thanks to an at-times-bewildering system of cross-references.

The Latin text of the *Politica* is clearly set out, reproducing the original double marginalia, and with italics and roman characters differentiating between Lipsius’ own words and the interlacing borrowed formulae. As for the latter, it is worth noting that Waszink prefers to emphasize their commonplace character, whereby “the longer lines and greater structures of the original disappear from sight altogether” (51-56, pp. 152-55 [here, p. 153]), rather than admit the loaded and often ambivalent intertextuality inherent in the building blocks of the *cento* (the genre is briefly considered on pp. 56, 58 and 59). Nonetheless, the identification, provided on the translation’s side, of Lipsius’ sources according to current reference conventions for classical texts will be a helpful tool for those modern scholars who do wish to pursue the matter of authorial intent and of closed *vs.* open readings of sixteenth-century texts.

It is worth drawing attention also to the fact that the Latin text here presented is based on the 1599 edition of the *Politica*, which Waszink describes as “the most developed authorised edition”; however, it is also an “expur-

gated” version, which was “entirely dominant ... in the seventeenth and eighteenth-century reception of the *Politica*” (193, and again 216) and thus “by far the most widely read” (216). Now, one could follow Waszink’s dismissal of the 1604 edition, the last edition to appear in Lipsius’ lifetime with his permission but apparently with little input on his part (despite the editor’s insistence elsewhere on the importance of variances in punctuation). However, it is also true that the changes in the editions of 1590 and subsequently 1596 (which the 1599 edition largely echoes) with regard to the first editions (Leiden, 1589, in 4° and in 8°) were mostly (though not totally) imposed by external, censorial pressure. So it could be argued that the text of 1589—which sprang from a context of social unrest—was actually more representative of Lipsius’ original thought; since it also seems to have been the basis of at least one French translation, as well as a Dutch and German translation (1590 and 1599, respectively) (198), this version may be considered more relevant to the study of *sixteenth-century* political thought as opposed to that of later eras, which reflect the further *Wirkung* of the text. Certainly, dedicated sixteenth-century specialists will pay special attention to the excisions of 1590 and 1596 (helpfully indicated with square brackets), whilst a summary list of “textual changes,” i.e., instances of significant rewriting, can be found on pp. 187-89.

The *Politica*’s translation into English tends to work adequately overall, and undoubtedly provides a useful crib to Lipsius’ Latin; given the length of the text and the rhetorical polish of Lipsius’ style, that is no mean feat. However, any translation has its flaws, and not everyone will consistently agree with Waszink’s lexical choices. For instance, Lipsius draws the reader’s attention to his preliminary presentation of the plan and objectives of his treatise by urging him *paullum in vestibulo hoc siste* (230). Here I would have preferred “[pause a little while] in this antechamber” to Waszink’s “[stop briefly] in this entrance-court,” since the latter solution conjures up too grand an image of exterior courtyards, whereas the former would have corresponded better to sixteenth-century rituals of politeness and (often delayed) admittance to important personages or spaces. These are minor quibbles, arguably more a matter of taste than of substance.

Nonetheless, and most importantly for a translation that is likely to become a standard work of reference, some baffling inconsistencies remain. It is a great pity, for example, that unlike the main text, Lipsius’ *Notae* to the *Politica*

or indeed the censors' reports have not been provided with a parallel translation. Similarly, as part of his liminary materials, Lipsius lists the sources of his quotations in an "Auctorum Syllabus" (254 ff.); yet apart from the short preamble the actual "List of Authors" (254, 256-58) is not translated. It would have been useful, and certainly coherent, if instead of being referred back to the Latin, the non-Latinist reader had been presented with the common vernacular equivalents for the Latin names of the listed authors, i.e., "Sallust," "Livy," and "Juvenal" instead of "C. Sallustius," "T. Livius," "Iuvenalis," and so on. Translating the entire list might have prevented the editor from claiming, in the first and third footnote to the list of less frequently cited Latin authors (256), that Cornelius Nepos does not feature in it, whereas in fact "Corn. Nepos" is listed in the third column on the same page.

Or take the title of the work itself, in which the expression *civilis doctrina* is rendered as "Political Instruction" on the cover, on the main title-page ([iii]), and at the head of the text itself ([223]). However, the same words in the same context become "political theory" at the head of each of the six books (261, 295, 347, 383, 535, 667). Cicero admittedly opposed the term *doctrina* to the notion of practical experience and concrete applications (*De or.* 1.48.208). Yet the choice of the English term "theory" as a substitute for "instruction" flies in the face of Waszink's introduction, in which he affirms that "in the time Lipsius wrote the *Politica*, Reason of State, concentrating on a ruler's prudence in actual practice, was closer to an antidote to political theory than a theory itself" (3). Moreover, by opting for the term *civilis*, Lipsius himself clearly proffered a Latin-based alternative (*civilis*, based on *cives*, citizen) for the Hellenic term *Politica* (based on *polis*, city, state, or *polites*, citizen)—as indeed the author himself explains in his *Notae* (722). I am not necessarily proposing that a modern translator who wishes to provide a text that is readily accessible to today's readers, transpose the title in some Latinate English or anglicized Latin form, as in William Jones's sixteenth-century translation, *Sixte bookees of politickes or civil doctrine, written in Latine by Iustus Lipsius* (1594) (which was "sometimes consulted to help clarify the Latin or for an English formulation" [218]). Nonetheless, this translation of what I would call Lipsius' *Lessons in statesmanship* will attract more cultural and intellectual historians than politicians amongst its readers, whilst the snares and snags of the early modern Latin political lexis are not served by a translator's undecidedness.

In some instances, interpretation and even accuracy may be at stake. Thus

the expression *de Republica universa* (230) refers not so much to “all forms of government” (the expression implies a collection of individual forms) as to “the entire system of government” or “the entire Common Weal.” The distinction between “all of” and “entire” is a fine one, but inherent in at least the Latin terminology of early modern treatises of political thought, whose legal (not to say, legalistic) underpinnings ought not to be underestimated.¹ Let us consider just one further example. At the beginning of the Second Book, Lipsius outlines, as is his wont, argumentative structures, before focussing on the item that is of immediate interest. Thus he declares, *Vita Civilis in Societate est: Societas in duabus rebus, Commercio et Imperio. Illud alterius** [*in margine: *Nempe Moralis aut Oeconomica*] *argumenti est, hoc mei.* Waszink translates: “Civil life in a community is: to live in community of two things, trade and government. Now the first is of a different subject-matter [*in margine: namely moral or economical*], the last of mine (295).” This rendering does not do justice to the conceptual duality and grammatical parallelism of the original construction. Jones, for all his extrapolations and archaisms, has in this case understood the Latin better: “Ciuill life consisteth in *societie, societie* in two things, *Traffique*, and *Gouernment*. The first, is the argument of an other discourse: the latter, the matter, and subject, I intreat of” (Jones, 16). It is clear that a modern English translation should have read along the following lines: “Civic life lies in (or: relies on) society; society relies on two things: commerce and government. The former belongs to a different sphere of discussion [namely the ethical or economical one], the latter pertains to my present topic.” Jones’s “traffique” is broader and less technical than Waszink’s “trade,” and therefore closer to Lipsius’ *commercium* as a concept of exchange, or interaction, as we find it in a contemporary reader of the *Politica*, Montaigne and his essay *Des Trois commerces*.

¹ See George Garnett’s discussions of the argument of the *Vindiciae, contra tyrannos*, which hinge on the distinction between *universitas* or *universi* (the corporation, or the corporate members of society) *vs.* the individuals (*singuli*). *Stephanus Junius Brutus, the Celt. Vindiciae, contra tyrannos: or, concerning the legitimate power of a prince over the people, and of the people over a prince*, ed. and trans. by George Garnett (Cambridge 1994), pp. xxxiii sqq. The translation was recently attacked, and then robustly defended: see Anne McLaren, ‘Re-thinking Republicanism: *Vindiciae, contra tyrannos* in Context,’ *The Historical Journal* 49,1 (2006): 23-52, and George Garnett, ‘Law in the *Vindiciae, contra tyrannos*: A Vindication,’ *The Historical Journal* 49,3 (2006): 877-91.

That a translator should be diffident of false cognates such as *commercium* / 'commerce' or *societas* / 'society' is in itself both understandable and commendable. However, such diffidence can also be misplaced, especially where the modern vernacular is derived from the Latin and where the *Oxford English Dictionary* (or comparable standard reference work) allows for the required meaning. In fact, Waszink does not hesitate to translate Lipsius' *pietas* now with "faith" (e.g., 263), now with "piety" (which *can* have negative connotations of hypocrisy and sanctimoniousness), because the Fleming himself excludes from his understanding of *pietas* (godliness, devotion) all notions of dutifulness towards the state.

In all, the translation, though useful, comes across as uneven, and at times rugged. Whilst acknowledging the "acute ... difficulties of interpretation" (218) presented by a text that is a patchwork of citations and allusions, one wonders whether the modern adage 'publish or perish' is to blame for the loss of this unique opportunity to provide a truly authoritative English version.

The sheer bulk and ambition of the project also leave it vulnerable, as Waszink attempts to serve too many masters. Why include a "Summary of the *Politica*" (205-13) when Lipsius provides an overview of the *Ordo et index librorum singillatim et capitum* (240-54, with translation)? It might in fact have been wiser to split the work over two volumes: a monograph dealing with the literary and political significance of the work, and a text edition of the *Politica*, alongside the *Notae*, and other *parerga* which are not included here, to wit: the *Adversus dialogistam* and *De una religione*. Such an arrangement would have done greater justice to Waszink's worthwhile re-evaluation of the extent and nature of Lipsius' corrections to his text (187). At the same time, it is no use crying over spilt milk. There is no doubt, after all, that a vigilant and assiduous reader may profitably have recourse to what Dr. Waszink does provide: a significant stepping-stone for further study and research on Lipsius and on early modern political thought. (Ingrid A. R. De Smet, University of Warwick)

◆ *Das Supplementum Lucani von Thomas May: Einleitung, Edition, Übersetzung, Kommentar.* By Birger Backhaus. Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium, 65. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 2005. 541 pp. 48.50 euros. One of the enduring curiosities of Neo-Latin literary life is the number of supplements to Latin authors that were produced during the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries. Probably the best known are the supplements to the *Aeneid* written by Pier Candido Decembrio (1419), Maffeo Vegio (1428), Jan van Foreest (1650), and C. S. Villanova (*ca.* 1697), all of which may now be read in modern critical editions, but many other Latin works were also ‘completed’: Livy, by Johannes Freinsheim (1649–60); Tacitus, by Sir Henry Savile (1649) and Justus Lipsius; Valerius Flaccus, by Giovanni Battista Pio (beg. 16th cent.); and Plautus, by Hermolaus Barbarus, Antonio Beccadelli, and Antonius Codrus, all in the fifteenth century.

Thomas May (1595–1650) approached Lucan’s *Pharsalia* from within this tradition. He began with a translation (1627), then moved to *A Continuation of Lucan’s Historical Poem till the death of Julius Caesar, by T. M.* (1630), then finished with *Supplementum Lucani, lib. vii* (1640). Until the beginning of the nineteenth century, the *Supplementum Lucani* enjoyed considerable popularity, going through fourteen separate editions, often as part of May’s edition of the *Pharsalia*. Somewhat unexpectedly, perhaps, May’s work on Lucan has been attracting considerable interest again in recent years. May was writing during a time of considerable political upheaval in England, when objections to the monarchy grew, leading to the Commonwealth of Cromwell and ultimately to the Restoration. Lucan’s poem referred to a period of similar change in Rome, with the possible parallels being as obvious to May and his contemporaries as they are to scholars of the twenty-first century who are interested in that period. Thus Lucan, and by extension May, have attracted the interest of such formidable scholars as David Quint (*Epic and Empire: Politics and Generic Form from Virgil to Milton*, New Haven 1993) and David Norbrook (*Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics 1627–1660*, Cambridge 1999). The publication of Backhaus’s book, a revised version of his 2004/5 Bochum dissertation, is most timely indeed.

Backhaus presents a Latin text based on the last edition supervised by May himself (1646), along with a German translation, an extensive commentary (almost 300 pages, more than four times the length of May’s Latin text), and a substantive critical introduction. The commentary is devoted

primarily to historical background and verbal parallels, with the introduction providing a sensitive orientation to the poem as a whole. Backhaus argues against the political interpretation currently popular among Anglophone scholars, noting (correctly) that the *Supplementum*, which was dedicated to King Charles I, was completed twelve years before the outbreak of civil war and that in general May presents the murder of Caesar in negative terms. Backhaus argues that May, whose broad range of sources demonstrates his wide classical learning, was drawn primarily to the *Pharsalia* for philological reasons. There are obvious parallels with the work it was designed to complete, but the *Supplementum* is no slavish imitation: the number of books is oriented toward Silius, not Lucan, and the number of verses per book is halved; what is more, May differentiates himself from the *Pharsalia* in a variety of areas, ranging from vocabulary to the presentation of dreams and of pathos. One is left with the impression that May did not intend this to be the poem that Lucan would have written, but one he feels is a worthy alternative.

Not everyone will agree with all of Backhaus's conclusions—I suspect that the political parallels between ancient Rome and seventeenth-century England will remain tantalizing, even if the *Supplementum* is not read as a call to regicide—but this is the right moment indeed for a carefully prepared, readable edition of this particular Neo-Latin poem. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *De arte graphica* (Paris, 1668). By Charles-Alphonse Dufresnoy. Ed., trans., and com. by Christopher Allen, Yasmin Haskell, and Frances Muecke. *Travaux du Grand Siècle*, 24. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2005. 560 pp. 158 CHF. I am embarrassed to admit that not only had I not read *De arte graphica* before, but I do not recall even having heard of it, and I suspect I am not alone among readers of this journal. As is so often the case with Neo-Latin literature, this situation would have been unforeseeable two hundred fifty years ago, when *De arte graphica* was “among the most universal of art theoretical texts in the eighteenth century” (7) and its author, Charles-Alphonse Dufresnoy (1611-68), was known to educated people across Europe. Its demise is undoubtedly due in part to the series of challenges to academic classicism which have shaped art history since romanticism, but in part as well to the fact that a major treatise on art was written in Latin at a time when mass facility in that language was beginning its long decline. Recovery has been

impeded by the fact that today, it is almost impossible to find a single scholar with the requisite expertise in art, didactic poetry, and the classics to do Dufresnoy's text justice. The three Australians who have produced this edition have found an imaginative solution to this problem, combining their expertise to rescue from an undeserved oblivion a key text in western intellectual history.

De arte graphica was intended to distill, in 549 Latin hexameters, the essence of the classicist doctrine that had evolved from Alberti's *De pictura* in 1435 to the artistic debates of the 1630s and 1640s. The poem was controversial at its point of origin, in that the author was a close friend of Pierre Mignard, who was a bitter rival of the head of the new Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture, Charles Le Brun, and that Dufresnoy's editor and translator, Roger de Piles, was a critic of Academic teaching. The poem therefore picked up associations with theoretical anti-academicism which stand ironically at odds with its content, which is essentially conservative, resting in the authority of the ancients and upholding the modern tradition as exemplified by the Carracci and their school. Ancient sources include Vitruvius, Pliny, Aristotle's *Poetics*, Horace's *De arte poetica*, Cicero, and Quintilian; among the modern sources we find Alberti's *De pictura*, Vida's *De arte poetica*, Castiglione's *Cortegiano*, Vasari's *Vite*, and Dolce's *Aretino*. Dufresnoy was also familiar with what was going on in the art world of his own day, like the quarrel that had broken out in Rome in 1636 between Andrea Sacchi and Pietro da Cortona.

Its modern editors admit that "Dufresnoy's not-so-magnum opus is unlikely to win modern admirers for its strictly poetic qualities" (63); indeed, like much Neo-Latin poetry, it reads rather like a tissue of *sententiae* and brief observations on its topic, set out to be remembered. Yet it attracts, curiously. For one thing, as the controversy surrounding its birth suggests, *De arte graphica* presents an interesting tension between the traditionalist tendencies of school and academy and a subjectivist view of art that begins to move away from the Renaissance reliance on objectivism as presented through perspective to a sympathy for Venetian colorism that would be picked up again by the Impressionists. What is more, it has tended rather more than many texts to have become what a succession of readers have made of it. The first edition offered minimal help to the reader, and a series of editorial transformations and deformations have accompanied a poem that turns out to have been surprisingly protean. It was translated into French, English (by John Dryden, no less), German, Italian, and Dutch, then retranslated in these same languages

to meet changing taste.

One always hesitates to say that any book, however well prepared, offers the proverbial last word on its topic, but that may well be pretty much the case here. Dufresnoy's text is accompanied by a straightforward English translation; three introductory chapters on the author, the poem and its place in the didactic poetry tradition, and the reception of *De arte graphica*, almost two hundred pages of commentary, focused not on minutiae but on explicating the themes and topics raised in the text; six appendices, which include relevant documents and two French translations; and a bibliography of primary and secondary sources.

Hail, Dufresnoy *redivivus*! And thanks to the scholars who have raised him from the dead. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Johann Sieders Übersetzung des "Goldenen Esels" und die frühe deutschsprachige "Metamorphosen"-Rezeption. Ein Beitrag zur Wirkungsgeschichte von Apuleius' Roman.* By Birgit Plank. Frühe Neuzeit, 92. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2004. vii + 260 pp. 64 euros. The story of the reception of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* (more commonly called the *Golden Ass*) is as varied and episodic as the plot of the novel itself. Plank's study (based on her dissertation) treats the interesting fortunes of the novel in Germany from the earliest translation (1500) to the end of the seventeenth century. Her work falls into three sections, which discuss the reception of the novel to 1500, the three versions of the German translation by Johann Sieder, and the later use of the *Golden Ass* in the fiction of several German authors, notably Grimmelshausen and Printz.

Plank's summary of the reception of the novel is short and depends mostly on secondary scholarship, some of which is long out of date. It contains some errors: e.g., that Boccaccio's manuscript was the first to combine Apuleius' literary and philosophical works (26 n. 29), and that Bussi dedicated the first edition to Cardinal Bessarion (31). But she does touch on the principal moments in Apuleius' reception from Macrobius to Beroaldo and presents the interesting claim that Fulgentius' allegory of the story of Psyche is based on Neo-Platonic ideas (22-25).

The heart of the study, however, is Plank's extremely valuable discussion of Sieder and his successors. Johann Sieder's translation of the *Golden Ass* is preserved in a manuscript now in Berlin (SB Ms. germ. fol. 1239), which was dedicated to the humanist bishop Johann von Dalberg. In 1538, after Sieder's

death, the translation was printed in a revised form by Alexander Weissenhorn in Augsburg, but this edition was based on a different manuscript from the one dedicated to Dalberg. (Plank deduces the existence of a second manuscript from the fact that the 1538 edition omits a long passage from Book 11 that had been inserted—apparently by the original scribe—as a supplement to Dalberg’s manuscript.) In 1605 the translation was printed again with further revisions, this time in Frankfurt.

Plank notes important differences among the three versions of Sieder’s translation. Sieder completed the work without benefit of Filippo Beroaldo’s commentary (Beroaldo’s work was printed in Bologna on 1 August 1500; Sieder’s dedication to Dalberg is dated 29 September 1500.) But Sieder did have before him Niklas von Wyle’s German translation of Poggio’s Latin translation of the *Onos* (*Ass*) of pseudo-Lucian. (Poggio’s translation was printed in Augsburg ca. 1477, von Wyle’s ca. 1478.) Like von Wyle, Sieder both provided a literal translation and treated the ass story as a satire. Sieder leaves places in his manuscript for illustrations, and this idea too may have come from von Wyle, whose translation included lively woodcuts. His interpretation (unlike Sieder’s) is overtly religious and Christian, but he also emphasizes the entertainment value of the novel. The translation simplifies Sieder’s original and smoothes out some of the complexities in both the content and style of Apuleius. The edition contains interesting woodcuts by two different artists: Hans Schäufelein and the unidentified monogrammist NH, whose illustrations are both superior to Schäufelein’s and somewhat earlier (74). The edition of 1605 emphasizes the sensational and marvellous elements in Apuleius and further simplifies the language.

Plank’s discussion of the three manifestations of Sieder’s translation is required reading for anyone interested in Apuleius in the vernacular. Given the fact that all three versions are extremely rare, however, I would like to have seen more extensive quotations, particularly from the prefaces of each. But a recent article on Sieder by Ralph Häfner does help fill the gap: “*Ein schönes Confitemini*. Johann Sieders Übersetzung von Apuleius’ Goldenen Esel: Die Berliner Handschrift Germ. Fol. 1239 aus dem Jahr 1500 und der erste Druck von 1538,” *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 125 (2003): 94-136. Häfner, whose article is an important complement to Plank’s book, prints the preface from Sieder’s manuscript and juxtaposes several key passages from Apuleius, Sieder, and the 1538 edition to show their differ-

ences.

In the last section of her book Plank argues that the *Golden Ass* is a picaresque novel whose qualities were first appreciated in Germany by Grimmelshausen and Printz. Their predecessors, she suggests, treated only separate aspects of the novel, using it in works that were comic, “historical” (and related to contemporary stories of demonic metamorphosis), or allegorical. This is an interesting discussion, but it does not seem very closely related to the central section on Sieder. The connection is in fact a negative one: Sieder and his redactors did not grasp the complex nuances of the novel, and it was left for Grimmelshausen and Printz to bring together the comic, “historical,” and allegorical elements. (Julia Haig Gaisser, Bryn Mawr College)

◆ *Latin Rhetoric and Education in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*. By James J. Murphy. Variorum Collected Studies Series, 827. Aldershot, Hampshire and Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Co., 2005. x + 334 pages. \$124.95. Rhetoric in Greece and Rome has been studied extensively for a long time, but the centuries after the fall of Rome have received much less attention. Only in the 1860s did the outlines of the medieval art of letter writing begin to take shape, with the arts of poetry coming into focus in the 1920s and the arts of preaching in the 1930s. A good survey of medieval rhetoric was published by Murphy himself in 1974, but much work remains to be done in this field. Murphy has also teamed up with Lawrence D. Green to begin the basic bibliographical work on Renaissance rhetoric, but their identification of some 3,770 titles simply confirms that a true survey is not likely to appear in the near future. Under these conditions, the best that can be hoped for is what this book offers: “a kind of mosaic which will provide the elements necessary to construct a history of a thousand years of language activity” (10), prepared by one of the few people qualified to offer it.

As is the case with all the volumes in Ashgate’s Variorum Collected Studies Series, the essays reprinted here have been previously published in a wide array of venues, which more than justifies gathering them together in one place. They fall into three groups. Under “The Middle Ages” we find “Western Rhetoric in the Middle Ages,” “The Rhetorical Lore of the *Boveras* in Byhrttferth’s *Manual*,” “The Teaching of Latin as a Second Language in the Twelfth Century,” “Two Medieval Textbooks in Debate,” “The Scholastic

Condemnation of Rhetoric in the Commentary of Giles of Rome on the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle,” “Dictamen as a Developed Genre: The Fourteenth-Century «Brevis doctrina dictaminis» of Ventura da Bergamo” (with David Thomson), “Quintilian’s Influence on the Teaching of Speaking and Writing in the Middle Ages and Renaissance,” “Poetry without Genre: The Metapoetics of the Middle Ages,” and “Rhetoric in Fourteenth-Century Oxford.” The next section contains three “Applications of Latin Rhetoric in Medieval English Literature”: “A New Look at Chaucer and the Rhetoricians,” “John Gower’s *Confessio Amantis* and the First Discussion of Rhetoric in the English Language,” and “Rhetoric and Dialectic in *The Owl and the Nightingale*.” The final section is devoted to “The Renaissance”: “One Thousand Neglected Authors: The Scope and Importance of Renaissance Rhetoric,” “Rhetoric in the Earliest Years of Printing, 1465-1500,” “Caxton’s Two Choices: ‘Modern’ and ‘Medieval’ Rhetoric in Traversagni’s *Nova rhetorica* and the Anonymous *Court of Sapience*,” “Ciceronian Influences in Latin Rhetorical Compendia of the Fifteenth Century,” “Raffaele Regio’s 1492 *Quaestio* Doubting Cicero’s Authorship of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Introduction and Text” (with Michael Winterbottom), “The Double Revolution of the First Rhetorical Textbook Published in England: The *Margarita eloquentiae* of Gulielmus Traversagnus (1479),” “Antonio Nebrija in the European Rhetorical Tradition,” and “The Relation between Omer Talon’s *Institutiones Oratoriae* (1545) and the *Rhetorica* (1548) Attributed to Him.” (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Letters*. Vol. 1, Books 1-4. By Angelo Poliziano. Ed. and trans. by Shane Butler. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 21. xiv + 362 pp. *Boaia*. By Giovanni Gioviano Pontano. Trans. by Rodney G. Dennis. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 22. xxiv + 236 pp. *Platonic Theology*. Vol. 6, Books 17-18. By Marsilio Ficino. Trans. by Michael J. B. Allen, ed. by James Hankins, with William Bowen. viii + 415 pp. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 23. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 2006. \$29.95 per volume. This group of texts, the 2006 offerings from the I Tatti Renaissance Library, brings one multi-volume set to a close, initiates another, and offers a freestanding volume of poetry.

The set being initiated presents the first of three planned volumes of the letters of Angelo Poliziano (1454-94), the great humanist scholar who formed one of the embellishments of the Medici court in the Renaissance. As Butler

notes, “even the reader inclined to acknowledge Poliziano’s genius detects something of smoke and mirrors behind the construction of his almost impossibly erudite and authoritative persona” (vii), and the letters offer what is probably the best opportunity to penetrate their author’s self-invention and self-presentation. Some of them were overtly public; others were ostensibly private but in fact crafted in the knowledge that they would be read by others, for it was through his correspondence that a Renaissance humanist defined his place in the *res publica litterarum*. The *editio princeps* appeared from the Aldine press in 1498, but comparison of this edition with manuscript versions of the letters shows how carefully Poliziano revised them, sometimes for content but more often for style, in preparation for publication. This being the case, there are good grounds for the decision Butler made to base his edition on the Aldine, rather than trying to integrate the letters found there with the others not included in this book, for this maintains the integrity of the collection as a collection.

The freestanding volume of poetry in this group is the *Baiae* of Giovanni Gioviano Pontano (1426 or 1429-1503). *Baiae* was the place on the Bay of Naples where “[p]leasure was available and stylish people misbehaved” (viii) in Roman times, so this was also the place that Pontano and his humanist friends went to recreate the ambience of Lesbia and Catullus. The poems treat of friendship, old age, and the variety of human relationships, and it is in this variety that the complexity of Pontano’s poetic persona, and life, appears. He is one of the great poets of married love whose *De amore coniugali* deals in affectionate detail with his wife, Ariane Sassone, to whom he was devoted, yet another collection, *Eridanus*, is devoted to his mistress Stella and another mistress, Focilla, passes through the pages of *Baiae*. The poems sing the pleasures of sex, often evoking Catullus, but they do so through allusions, quotations, references and *loci classica* that only a scholar could manage. These poems had a significant effect on the reception of Catullus in later ages, as Julia Gaisser has shown (*Catullus and His Renaissance Readers*, Oxford 1993, pp. 220-33), and they are well worth our attention now.

Vol. 6 of *Platonic Theology* brings this series to a close. Since the earlier volumes have been reviewed as they have come out in *NLN*, it will suffice here to mention again that this work, the *magnum opus* of Marsilio Ficino (1433-99), played a significant role in the Renaissance reception of Plato. Ficino’s Plato, however, was understood through the Neoplatonism of Plotinus and

Proclus, with an eye to reconciliation with Christianity. It was widely influential in its own day and deserves to be made accessible once again in ours. It is worth noting that this last volume contains comprehensive indexes that facilitate the use of the series.

All three of these volumes present the first-ever translation into English of the works they present. The series aims to extend the Loeb Classical Library into the Renaissance. As such it does not offer critical editions, but reliable texts accompanied by an English translation and supported with a minimal textual apparatus and enough notes to facilitate a first reading by an educated general audience. Thanks to the efforts of the indefatigable series editor, James Hankins, three or four volumes are appearing each year, so that at this point my collection is about to extend onto a second bookshelf. This is a significant accomplishment, and the editor and press are to be congratulated for their success. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Scientia in margine: études sur les marginalia dans les manuscrits scientifiques du Moyen Âge à la Renaissance*. Ed. by Danielle Jacquart and Charles Burnett. École pratique des hautes études, Sciences historiques et philologiques, 5, Hautes études médiévales et modernes, 88. Geneva: Libraire Droz, 2005. xii + 400 pp. 72 CHF. The essays in this volume were originally presented at a colloquium at the Warburg Institute entitled “Writing in the Margin: A Context for the Development of Scientific Ideas, from Late Antiquity to the Renaissance,” held on 20-21 April 2001. Marginalia in general have attracted a good deal of interest recently, from art historians to book historians, and the writing of glosses has been discussed in relation to literary, biblical, philosophical, and legal texts. The colloquium took place as part of this trend, but with an eye on filling a gap: discussion is limited to scientific and philosophical texts, and more particularly to annotators in the process of reacting to the contents of these texts, either as commentators, critics, or readers using the text as starting points for their own ideas. Marginalia tend to be the reader’s first reactions, unedited, often not repeated elsewhere, more personal than what finally makes its way into print and tied in turn to a broader field of experience.

The volume contains the following essays: Danielle Jacquart and Charles Burnett, “Avant-propos”; Brigitte Mondrain, “Traces et mémoire de la lecture des textes: les *marginalia* dans les manuscrits scientifiques byzantins”; Henri Hugonnard-Roche, “Scolies syriaques au *Peri Hermeneias* d’Aristote”; Marwan

Rashed, “Les *marginalia* d’Aréthas, Ibn-al-Tayyib et les dernières gloses alexandrines à l’*Organon*”; Emilie Savage-Smith, “Between Reader and Text: Some Medieval Arabic *Marginalia*”; Tony Lévy, “Le manuscrit hébreu Munich 36 et ses *marginalia*. un témoin de l’histoire textuelle des *Éléments* d’Euclide au Moyen Âge”; Wesley M. Stevens, “*Marginalia* in the Latin Euclid”; Anna Somfai, “The Brussels Gloss: A Tenth-Century Reading of the Geometrical and Arithmetical Passages of Calcidius’s Commentary (ca. 400 AD) to Plato’s *Timaeus*”; Irene Caiazza, “Mains célèbres dans les marges des *Commentarii in Somnium Scipionis* de Macrobe”; Marilyn Nicoud, “Les *marginalia* dans les manuscrits latins des *Diètes* d’Isaac Israëli conservés à Paris”; Dietrich Lohrmann, “Les marges dans les manuscrits d’ingénieurs”; Robert Goulding, “Polemic in the Margin: Henry Savile against Joseph Scaliger’s Quadrature of the Circle”; and Adolfo Tura, “Essai sur les *marginalia* en tant que pratique et documents.”

Chronologically the essays from the sixth to the sixteenth centuries, including material written in Syriac, Arabic, and Hebrew as well as Greek and Latin. In philological terms, the *marginalia* in the manuscripts considered here do not differentiate themselves very much from other glosses, although the calculations they carry perhaps offer an unusual temptation to the copyist to intervene and correct something that looks wrong and their illustrations invite completion as well. And like other *marginalia*, the ones considered here show a tension between the centripetal, integrating and exegetical, and the centrifugal, a looking to other texts that breaks down the structure of the text being commented on. Such *marginalia* can also carry *realia* that are of value, ranging from the names of copyists to records of past events. What is found in this volume is therefore tantalizing, a suggestion of what other scientific manuscripts can offer to those who wish to approach them in this manner. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *On Renaissance Commentaries*. Ed. by Marianne Pade. *Noctes neolatinae / Neolatin Texts and Studies*, 4. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 2005. 139 pp. 34.80 euros. This volume presents six articles based on papers given at the two-part special session “Renaissance Commentary” at the IANLS Congress held at Bonn in 2003. The aim of this session was to ask whether there is such a thing as a Renaissance commentary as distinct from a medieval commentary (as usual, the Renaissance is here being perceived as having a beginning which is more interesting and distinctive than its end).

The first two articles, by Robert W. Ulery, Jr., and Patricia Osmond, have had several incarnations; earlier versions were given not only at Bonn but at the Renaissance Society of America congress in Chicago in 2001, and both arise out of work undertaken for Ulery and Osmond's jointly-authored *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum* entry on Sallust, published in 2003. Ulery points out that the commentary on Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae* which is ascribed to the fifteenth-century humanist Omnibonus Leonicensus in an edition of 1500 is in fact extant in a thirteenth-century manuscript at Bern, and that the printed version shows no sign of reworking by Omnibonus. Having already made the first and more important of these points in print (*CTC* 8: 225-6), Ulery is here fleshing out his earlier work and providing it with documentary support, demonstrating that a medieval commentary really does not look very much like the work of a good fifteenth-century scholar. Osmond addresses another problematically attributed commentary on Sallust, published as by Lorenzo Valla in an edition of 1491, examining sixteenth-century discussions of its authenticity (cf. her remarks on this subject in *CTC* 8: 237), and asking on what criteria early modern philologists might see a commentary as part of, or to be excluded from, the canon of a great humanist: what, in other words, they saw as characteristic of Renaissance commentaries at their best. The fifth article in the collection, by Julia Haig Gaisser, considers the interface between printed commentary and spoken lecture in the Renaissance, giving a lively account of Filippo Beroaldo's pedagogical strategies in his commentary on the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius by looking at "some of the ways in which Beroaldo brought Apuleius to life for his students and readers" and promoted himself into the bargain. It was also premiered in Chicago in 2001, and also includes material which has appeared in print elsewhere, being a substantially rewritten version of her contribution to the Festschrift for Michael Putnam *Being There Together* (2003), which itself reworked material from Gaisser's Presidential Address to the American Philological Association of 2001 (*TAPA* 131 (2001): 1-21, esp. 3-12). Some of its contents are therefore appearing in print in a third version here, having also been presented at three conferences.

Marianne Pade's contribution discusses the *Cornu copiae seu linguae latinae commentarii* of Niccolò Perotti, asking to what extent this vast work really is a commentary on Martial, and arguing interestingly for its status as indeed a commentary, but one which takes the ideal of reading a classical text in order "to acquire an active mastery over its linguistic and doctrinal universe" to an

extreme. Here the relationship between commentary, commonplace book, and reference work is being sketched out, and the boundaries of the commentary are being valuably questioned; Pade comments suggestively on the replacement of the *Cornu copiae* by Robert Estienne's *Latinae linguae thesaurus*, suggesting that the commentary and the dictionary may sometimes serve the same function. Johann Ramminger's discussion of Ermolao Barbaro's *Corollarium* to Dioscorides makes an argument which is the converse of Pade's, proposing that the mass of material in Barbaro's work which "contributes only incidentally to an understanding of Dioscorides" defines the *Corollarium* as not so much a commentary as "a work of humanist philology in the field of medicine." An appendix to this article presents a first-rate discussion of the words *commentarius*, *commentatio*, *commentum*, and *commentari* as used in the Latin of the late fifteenth century, a reminder of the fine work which Ramminger generously makes available online through the *Neulateinische Wortliste* at <www.neulatein.de>. The collection concludes with Craig Kallendorf's "Marginalia and the Rise of Early Modern Subjectivity," whose title should not deter readers who view accounts of the rise of subjectivity with suspicion: this is an argument for the *personal* quality of early modern readers' manuscript marginalia in their books, intended as a corrective to those accounts of the history of reading which have emphasized the functional impersonality of such material in the period, and enriched with fascinating examples, not all of them, it should be said, written in Latin or responding to neo-Latin texts.

Pade provides a minimal introduction (a pity, since an overview of the common ground shared by the six articles, and the points of tension or disagreement between them, would have been welcome), and *indices codicum* and *nominum*, the former excludes printed books with early modern annotations, and there is no general bibliography. But despite these editorial omissions, she has done neo-Latin studies a real service in making these excellent papers available as a separate, thematically unified volume rather than allowing them to be submerged in the large and tardily published body of the conference *Acta*. (John Considine, University of Alberta)

◆ *Centuria Latinae II: Cent une figures humanistes de la Renaissance aux Lumières. A la mémoire de Marie-Madeleine de la Garanderie.* Ed. by Colette Nativel, with Catherine Magnien, Michel Magnien, Pierre Maréchaux, and Isabelle Pantin.

Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance, 414. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2006. 864 pp. 220 CHF. In 1997 *Centuriae Latinae I* appeared, under the editorship of Colette Nativel. Ostensibly a *Festschrift* for Jacques Chomarat, the book consists not of the usual run of miscellaneous essays, but of 100 bio-bibliographical essays on prominent humanists. The venture was quite successful—in each case, the entry in *Centuriae Latinae I* is the most up-to-date starting place for someone who wants an orientation to a new scholar or a handy summary of editions and key secondary works—and the editor is to be commended for retaining the same format in a second volume. Unlike with many movies, in this case the sequel is every bit as good as the original.

The second hundred articles, with their authors, are: Domenico Defilippis, “Belisario Acquaviva”; Jean Irigoien, “Jérôme Aléandre”; Alejandro Coroleu, “Benito Arias Montano”; Pierre Maréchaux, “Claude Baduel”; Antoine Harmsen, “Caspar Barlaeus”; Étienne Wolff, “Caspar von Barth”; Emmanuel Bury, “Jean Baudoin”; Perrine Galand-Hallyn, “Nicolas Bérauld”; Jeanine De Landtsheer, “Johannes Bernartius”; Stéphane Garcia, “Mathias Bernegger”; Domenico Defilippis, “Flavio Biondo”; Sebastiano Valerio, “Giovanni Bernardino Bonifacio”; Michel Magnien, “Nicolas Bourbon”; Michel Magnien, “Jean de Boyssoné”; Jean-Claude Margolin, “Sébastien Brant”; Stephen Murphy, “Guillaume Briçonnet”; Max Engammare, “Martin Bucer”; Jan Papy, “Celio Calcagnini”; Johann Rammingner, “Domizio Calderini”; Jean-Louis Charlet, “Ambrogio Calepino”; André Godin, “Lambert Campester”; Jacob Schmutz, “Juan Caramuel Lobkowitz”; Guy Bedouelle, “Sébastien Castellion”; Hélène Cazes, “Florent Chrestien”; Jean-Pierre Massaut, “Josse Clichtove”; Germain Marchadour, “John Colet”; Jean-Frédéric Chevalier, “Gregorio Correr”; Pierre Laurens, “Richard Crashaw”; Wil G. Heesakkers-Kamerbeek, “Petrus Cunaeus”; Jean-François Maillard, “Pierre Danès”; Jean-Frédéric Chevalier, “Leonardo Dati”; Antonio Iurilli, “Antonio De Ferrariis, dit Galateo”; Jan Pendergrass, “Jean De Pins”; Olivier Millet, “Louis Des Masures”; René Hoven, “Jean Despautère”; Geneviève Demerson, “Joachim Du Bellay”; Hélène Cazes, “Charles Estienne”; Colette Demaizière, “Henri Estienne”; Chris L. Heesakkers, “Jacobus Eyndius”; Étienne Wolff, “Johann Albert Fabricius”; Alexandre Vanautgaerden, “Johann Froben”; Pierre Petitmengin, “Sigismundus Gelenius”; Antonio Iurilli, “Giacinto Gimma”; Jean-Louis Charlet, “Francesco Mario Grapaldo”; Philip Ford, “Gabriel Harvey”; Catherine Magnien, “Gentien Hervet”; Jan W. Bok, “Thomas

Hobbes”; Chris L. Heesakkers, “Lambertus Hortensius”; Dirk Sacré, “Sidronius Hosschius”; Frans R. E. Blom, “Constantin Huygens”; Jacob Schmutz, “Sebastián Izquierdo”; Alain Michel, “Jean de Salisbury”; Michel Simonin, “Michel de L’Hospital”; Colette Nativel, “Domenicus Lampsonius”; Pierre Lardet, “Louis Le Roy”; Marie-Élisabeth Boutroue, “Carl von Linnaeus”; Ann Moss, “Conrad Lycosthène”; Monique Mund-Dopchie, “Olaus Magnus”; Alain Legros, “Jean Maldonat, S.J.”; Marc Laureys, “Bartolomeo Marliano”; Toshinori Uetani, “Jean Martin”; Charles Béné, “Marc Marule de Split”; Isabelle Pantin, “Michael Marullus”; Jean-François Maillard, “Jean Mercier”; Chris L. Heesakkers, “Johannes Meursius”; Catherine Magnien, “Claude Mignault”; Jan W. Bok, “John Milton”; Jean Dupèbe, “Antoine Mizauld”; Philip Ford, “Camille de Morel”; Hugues Daussy, “Philippe Duplessis Mornay”; Juliette A. Groenland, “Johannes Murellius”; Jean-Frédéric Chevalier, “Albertino Mussato”; Jean-Louis Charlet, “Dionigi Nestore”; Alain Michel, “Agostino Nifo”; Cesare Vasoli, “Mario Nizolio”; Gilbert Tournoy, “Fulvio Orsini”; Jean-Claude Margolin, “Gui Patin”; Steve Farmer, “Jean-François Pic de la Mirandole”; Marc Laureys, “Stephanus Vinandus Pighius”; Jeanne Peiffer, “Willibald Pirckheimer”; Lionello Sozzi, “Iacopo Poggio Bracciolini”; Noëlle-Marie Egretier, “Reginald Pole”; Louis Holtz, “Giovanni Gioviano Pontano”; Hilaire Kallendorf, “Francisco de Quevedo y Villegas”; Jean Brunel, “Nicolas Rapin”; Ingrid De Smet, “Nicolas Rigault”; Alain-Philippe Segonds, “Christophe Rothmann”; Pierre Maréchaux, “Marcantonio Sabellico”; Georges Soubeille, “Jean Salmon Macrin”; James Hirstein, “Ioannes Sapidus”; Alejandro Coroleu, “Juan Ginès de Sepúlveda”; James Hirstein, “Jakob Spiegel”; Béatrice Charlet-Mesdjian, “Tito Vespasiano Strozzi”; Kees Meerhoff, “Omer Talon”; Michel-Pierre Lerner, “Bernardino Telesio”; Jeanine De Landsheer, “Laevinus Torrentius”; Jean-Louis Charlet, “Giovanni Tortelli”; Antonius Harmsen, “David Van Hoogstraten”; Craig Kallendorf, “Maffeo Vegio”; André Godin, “Jean Vitrier”; and Jan Papy, “Marcus Wēlser.”

A quick glance at this list suggests that we have a broad range of figures being treated, from first-tier scholars to the more marginal figures about whom it can be very difficult indeed to find information. The contributors come from all over western Europe and the U.S., and the entries are of uniformly high quality. De la Garanderie was an accomplished and much-loved scholar, and this book is a fitting tribute both to her scholarship and to the web of scholarly relationships she fostered. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)