

## NEO-LATIN NEWS

Vol. 56, Nos. 3 & 4. Jointly with SCN. NLN is the official publication of the American Association for Neo-Latin Studies. Edited by Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University; Western European Editor: Gilbert Tournoy, Leuven; Eastern European Editors: Jerzy Axer, Barbara Milewska-Wazbinska, and Katarzyna Tomaszuk, Centre for Studies in the Classical Tradition in Poland and East-Central Europe, University of Warsaw. Founding Editors: James R. Naiden, Southern Oregon University, and J. Max Patrick, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and Graduate School, New York University. ♦

♦ *The Rhetoric of Cicero in Its Medieval and Early Renaissance Commentary Tradition.* Ed. by Virginia Cox and John O. Ward. Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006. xviii + 545 pp. \$163. Among all the classical authors, Cicero and Virgil held pride of place in the curriculum from the early Middle Ages until the classics in general lost their position at the center of classroom activity several hundred years later. For those interested in the reception of classical authors, this has been a mixed blessing; much has been written about the *fortuna* of both, yet the sheer mass of material makes anything like a complete, definitive treatment impossible. This volume, however, brings us a big step closer toward this goal for Cicero. Given our present state of knowledge, Cox and Ward have decided to limit their inquiry to two works, Cicero's *De inventione* and the pseudo-Ciceronian *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, with an eye on how Ciceronian rhetorical theory was transmitted through texts and paraphrases of, or commentaries on, these two treatises. This is a wise choice, given that these were the two works on which knowledge of Ciceronian rhetoric primarily rested in the Middle Ages

and at least the early Renaissance.

The book is divided into two parts. The first focuses on the two texts themselves. In “The Medieval and Early Renaissance: Study of Cicero’s *De inventione* and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Commentaries and Contexts,” John Ward divides the period under consideration at *ca.* 1050 and again at *ca.* 1215, then tracks important manuscripts and early printed books, especially those with commentaries and glosses, through the resulting periods. Ruth Taylor-Briggs, in “Reading between the Lines: The Textual History and Manuscript Transmission of Cicero’s Rhetorical Works,” offers a spirited challenge to the editorial principles of Friedrich Marx, which have dominated modern textual criticism on the two works in question. Finally, Virginia Cox documents the uneasy coexistence of a medieval civic tradition of Ciceronian rhetoric with a newer humanistic one in “Ciceronian Rhetoric in Late Medieval Italy.”

The second, much larger group of essays demonstrates how Ciceronian material was adapted and transformed in the centuries following Cicero’s death. In “Ciceronian Rhetoric and Ethics: Conduct Literature and ‘Speaking Well,’” Mark D. Johnston notes that advice on speaking well was regularly included in medieval conduct texts. Next Karin Margareta Fredborg considers how Ciceronian material impacted the relationship between “Rhetoric and Dialectic,” in that Cicero remained central to what was taught in the schools, but the great advances in medieval dialectic were not matched by similar advances within Ciceronian school rhetoric. In “Ciceronian Rhetoric and the Law,” Hanns Hohmann notes that medieval jurists raided Ciceronian rhetoric for useful bits and pieces, especially as regards status theory and the theory of rhetorical topics. Mary Carruthers in turn challenges a number of generally accepted ideas in “Rhetorical *Memoria* in Commentary and Practice,” claiming in particular that the influence of the *Ad Herennium* has been overstated and that of the *De inventione*, which she sees as quite important, has been essentially ignored. Rita Copeland uses “The Ciceronian Rhetorical Tradition and Medieval Literary Theory” to conclude that “[i]n its narrowest sense, the Ciceronian rhetorical tradition does not account for all the developments in medieval literary theory; but in its broad conception of textuality and its large structural and discursive perspectives,

it is foundational to hermeneutical theory and practice” (264-65). In “Latin Composition Textbooks and *Ad Herennium* Glossing: The Missing Link?,” Martin Camargo focuses on the rhetorical figures and the attributes of persons and actions to conclude that the medieval arts of poetry and prose did not simply displace the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, but that both held their place in the medieval classroom, so that excerpts from each appear as glosses to the other. Päivi Mehtonen notes the thorough interrelationship of Ciceronian and Horatian principles, with to a lesser extent those of Aristotle, in “Poetics, Narration, and Imitation: Rhetoric as *Ars Applicabilis*,” and Margaret Jennings demonstrates in “Medieval Thematic Preaching: A Ciceronian Second Coming” that Ciceronian organizational categories appear in medieval preaching manuals and that medieval sermons show a practical application of these principles. Another revisionist piece is that of Gian Carlo Alessi, who argues in “The Rhetorical *Juvenilia* of Cicero and the *Artes Dictamini*” that the relevance of Ciceronian rhetorical doctrine to medieval letter writing is not marginal, as has often been argued, but grows gradually through the dictaminal period, provided we keep in mind that the medieval manuals always drew selectively from Cicero. Finally, in “Communication, Consensus and Conflict: Rhetorical Precepts, the *Ars Concionandi*, and Social Ordering in Late Medieval Italy,” Stephen J. Miller examines the place of public speaking in the tradition of medieval and Renaissance Ciceronianism in Italy. The book concludes with an appendix entitled “The Commentaries in Action,” which provides extracts, mostly in Latin, that illustrate unusually interesting points about the Ciceronian heritage, and a collective bibliography for the volume as a whole.

In a collection like this, one can always find something about which to quibble: in a couple of the essays, for example, the relationship to the texts and the accompanying commentary tradition, as opposed to Ciceronian ideas themselves, becomes somewhat tangential. Now and again, the authors of essays in the second part of the volume are forced to admit that even the Ciceronian ideas themselves do not bear very much on their assigned topic (148, 207). But the quality of the essays is consistently high, more so than is usual for a volume by diverse hands, and several of the essays (those of Ward, Cox, Camargo, and Milner) are accompanied by useful appendices

that list primary material in their area. These lists, as their authors acknowledge, will be supplemented as more material comes to light, but like the book as a whole, they provide much useful information that raises research in this area to a new height. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Malleus Maleficarum*. Ed. and trans. by Christopher S. Mackay. 2 vols. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2006. Volume I: *The Latin Text*, 720 pp. Volume II: *The English Translation*, 615 pp. \$285. This magisterial, two-volume set is destined to become the definitive edition and translation of the notorious fifteenth-century “Hammer of Witches.” The work of two Inquisitors, Henricus Institoris and Jacobus Sprenger, this neo-Latin text is legendary for its misogyny and sexual explicitness. Describing in detail, for example, how witches steal men’s penises and place them in birds’ nests (!), the alleged purpose of this book was to persuade skeptics among the clergy of the clear and present danger of acts of sorcery and their perpetrators. A correlative, though secondary, purpose was to provide antidotes for various types of bewitchment as well as a prosecutorial guide for Inquisitors. As such, it stands not only as a monument to fear-mongering but also as a relic of indescribably bad Latin.

This last point may explain why this project was not undertaken before. Half (or more accurately, slightly less than half) of it was undertaken, just last year, in one of those lamentable cases where two scholars were working on the same thing independently of one another. In 2007, P. G. Maxwell-Stuart published an abridged English translation of the *Malleus* through Manchester University Press, a volume which I reviewed favorably in *The Sixteenth Century Journal*. It is clear from the lack of cross-citation that these scholars were unaware of each other’s work. A comparison of their introductions reveals some important disagreements: Maxwell-Stuart asserts that Institoris was the sole author of the treatise, while Mackay takes the alleged co-authorship at face value, demonstrating in detail the contributions of each collaborator. I am more persuaded by Mackay in this instance. Maxwell-Stuart’s prose makes for livelier reading, but Mackay’s exhaustive treatment reflects all the diligence of a classicist (Mackay’s first book was a military and political history of ancient

Rome). While Maxwell-Stuart's one short volume may prove more accessible to students, Mackay's complete edition is the only one that will ever be cited by serious scholars. Unlike its competitor, who inexplicably based his translation on the 1588 Frankfurt edition, Mackay's version is rightfully based on the *princeps*. And the main point in its favor, though rather obvious, should not be overlooked: here we find the complete work in its entirety (Maxwell-Stuart cites page limits and publishing costs as excuses for cutting the *Mallens* down to a more manageable size). This text has been at the center of so much controversy that it is particularly important in this case to read in their original context the very words that burned witches at the stake.

The introduction is indeed masterful, if perhaps overly long. The editor goes off on seemingly irrelevant tangents such as a brief history of the rosary. On the positive side, he offers miniature intellectual biographies of one paragraph each on all the major ancient and medieval figures cited in this treatise. That list by itself is worth the price of the two-volume set and could be excerpted for students in a course packet on medieval intellectual history. He also explicates convincingly the peculiar structure of this text by placing it within the framework of the scholastic *quaestio disputata*. In fact, he even goes so far as to insert the proper scholastic headings which would have marked off the conventional abbreviations dividing sections of the argument. This will greatly assist the modern reader who attempts to follow the logic of these otherwise-obscure passages.

In the English translation, he successfully navigates the particular land mines lurking in this swamp of bad Latin. His choice of "sorceress" over "witch" to render *malefica*, for example, is well-reasoned: as he points out, in the English language there is no real male equivalent to "witch," and a word is needed which will express the parallelism of the masculine and feminine forms. His decision not to correct the authors' bad Latin in his scholarly edition is a good one. This artifact is of potential interest linguistically to academics who study the decline of Latin grammar and the concomitant rise of the vernacular. This text was produced in an era when exorcism manuals, for instance, were still written in Latin, but shortly thereafter, treatises on demonology began to be published at least as often in French, Spanish, Italian, German, etc. The use of Latin in this work was also an implicit assertion

of ecclesiastical authority, as was the accompanying papal bull and approbation (which has since been much contested) of theologians on the faculty at the University of Cologne. But the truth is that only one of these Inquisitors was an academic, and thus a decent writer: Jacobus Sprenger was trained in the scholastic method and thus probably responsible for the theoretical groundwork of the treatise as it is laid out in Part I. Henricus Institoris, by contrast, was the true zealot behind this project, the Inquisitor who included anecdotes of witch trials based on personal experience. The Latin is noticeably worse in the parts of the text which bear his fingerprints.

The only major flaw I can find in this scholarly monument is the lack of an index. This omission is truly unfortunate, considering just how unwieldy this text really is. This could have been the sort of standard reference work which scholars of demonology would store next to their computers. Instead, it will be cited, but only by those who are already familiar enough with this text to know in advance what they are looking for. (Hilaire Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *M. Maruli Delmatae Davidias*. By M. Marcovich. *Mittel-lateinische Studien und Texte*, 33. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006. xxii + 236 pp. As Jozef IJsewijn noted some years ago (*Companion to Neo-Latin Studies*, Pt. 1, *History and Diffusion of Neo-Latin Literature*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. (Leuven, 1990), 92-95), Latin literature flourished on the Adriatic coast from Istria to Albania, in towns like Split (Spalato), Dubrovnik (Ragusa), and Zadar (Zara) that had strong ties with Venice. Croatian scholars like Matthias Garbitius travelled as far as Germany, where he became professor at Tübingen, and foreigners like Laurentius Reginus of Feltre arrived in Dubrovnik to establish there the foundations of Croatian humanism. Croatian humanist poetry began with a flourish with the *Elegiarum et carminum libri III* of Georgius Sigsoreus from Sibenik, published in Venice in 1477: this collection contains some charming poem on Sibenik and Trieste. Croatian prose, like that of the Lutheran theologian Matthias Flacius Illyricus, was widely diffused in Europe, with the word *Encyclopaedia* being used in Latin for the first time in an almost-modern sense by a Croatian, Paulus Scalichius, and with Faustus Verancius's *Machinae novae* containing the first description with a picture of the parachute (plate 38: *homo volans*). Latin remained

the official language of the Croatian parliament at Zagreb until 1847, so Latin poetry was written often and well into the nineteenth century: one thinks of Junius Restius from Dubrovnik, who is one of the great satirists of Latin literature.

One of the best neo-Latin writers in this tradition was Marcus Marullus (1450-1524), whose *De institutione bene beateque vivendi* (1506) was printed in Venice, Basel, Cologne, Antwerp, and Paris and translated into German, French, Italian, Portuguese, and Czech. His masterpiece is the historical-heroic epic *Davidiad*, an edition of which is under review here. Divided into 14 books, the poem contains 6765 Latin hexameters that follow closely the Old Testament narrative from 1 Samuel 13 and 15-31 through 2 Samuel to 1 Kings 1-2. Virgil is the chief stylistic and formal source, although the influence of Ovid, Lucan, and Statius can also be detected.

This poem has had a curious history that has impeded in some remarkable ways the production of a critical edition. It was dedicated to Cardinal Domenico Grimani, bishop of Porto and patriarch of Aquileia, but did not meet with the approval of the cardinal, who disagreed with Marullo's heretical tropology, which offered David as a prefiguration of Christ, notwithstanding the fact that he committed adultery with Uriah's wife Bathsheba and then killed Uriah. As a result the poem was not published and its text was soon lost. The autograph resurfaced in the Biblioteca Nazionale of Turin, where it is cod. G VI 40, which contains the *Davidiad*, the *Tropologica Davidiadis expositio*, and Marullo's Latin verse translation of the beginning of Dante's *Divine Comedy*. Unfortunately the manuscript was badly damaged in the disastrous fire at the National Library in the night between 25 and 26 January 1904. The water used to extinguish the fire has blurred the ink on many of the pages, so that many lines are now very difficult to read.

In the early fifties, Josip Badalić and Miroslav Marcovich began working independently on an edition. Badalić's edition, which became the *editio princeps*, appeared first in 1954, but it was quickly withdrawn by the publisher, who later added an appendix that printed some of the missing verses, corrected some of the misreadings, and so forth. Marcovich's edition appeared three years later, but as he himself admits, it, too, was marred by errors and misprints. In 1974 Veljko

Gortan published an edition to replace Badalić's, with a Croatian translation by Branimir Glavačić and a commentary by Gortan in Croatian. Gortan improved on Marcovich's edition and proposed a number of plausible restorations of words that are illegible in the manuscript, but he worked from microfilm only and did not present an *apparatus criticus*. Marcovich therefore returned to the *Davidiad* in this volume, collating the original manuscript in Turin, adopting most of Gortan's suggestions, and making some additional corrections of his own. An appendix contains a brief *Vita Maruli*, written by Marullo's contemporary Franciscus Natalis (1469-1542).

Finally, then, after more than fifty years of work by three scholars, this fourth effort provides what should be a definitive text of the *Davidiad*. Critical analysis can be found in Winfried Baumann, *Die "Davidias" des Marko Marulić: Das grosse Epos der dalmatinischen Latinität* (Frankfurt am Main and New York, 1984). (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Die Marias von Cornelius Aurelius: Einleitung, Textausgabe und Anmerkungen*. By J. C. Bedaux. Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia, 20. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2006. iv + 198 pp. In this volume, J. C. Bedaux presents the *editio princeps* of an epic poem on the life of Mary that had interested Jozef IJsewijn, who died before he was able to prepare his own edition. The author of this poem is one Cornelius Aurelius, who was born around 1460 and had died by December, 1531. He received his initial education in or near his birthplace of Gouda, attended a Latin school in Deventer in the 1470s, and studied later in Cologne, Leuven, and Paris. In 1486 he took orders, spending the rest of his life in monasteries in Hemsdonk and Leiden. He wrote a number of other religious poems, including *Alphabetum redemptorum*, *Psalterium Davidicum*, and *Vita Mariae Magdalenae*. His poetic talents were praised by Erasmus, who called him *poeta atque theologus doctissimus* (Ep. 17, 18, 28), and Jacobus Wimfeling called him 'an evangelical Horace,' even though Aurelius himself expressed hesitation about his own abilities.

The poem was conceived as covering three decades, and it seems that Aurelius got at least into the second decade, but the manuscript on which the edition rests covers the first decade only. These ten



books work through Mary's life up to the point when Jesus was teaching in the temple. The poem contains echoes of Baptista Mantuanus, Juvenecus, and Prudentius, along with the elegies of Marcus Antonius Sabellicus and the writings of Rodolphus Agricola. The letter accompanying the poem expresses a love for a simple style, but this must be taken *cum grano salis*, given the clear intertextual relationships that exist between Aurelius's poem and those it echoes.

Bedaux presents a modernized text, one that is easy to read, with a minimal apparatus. There are some thirty pages of notes, which elucidate a few ambiguities in the text but mostly identify intertextual references. The edition also contains a brief bibliography and indices of sources and names. Given that this is the first printed edition of the poem, by definition it never had the critical success of the better-known *Christias* of Marco Girolamo Vida or the *De partu virginis* of Jacopo Sannazaro. Like the *Davidiad* of Marullo, however, which is also reviewed in this issue of *NLN*, Aurelius's *Marias* is well worth reading, both on its own merits and as an object lesson in the complexities of religious and intellectual life for neo-Latin writers. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Rhetoricum libri quinque*. By Georgius Trapezuntius. Ed. and intro. by Luc Deitz. *Europea Memoria: Studien und Texte zur Geschichte der europäischen Ideen*, series 2: Texte, 3. Hildesheim - Zürich - New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 2006. XXXI + sign. a<sup>1-8</sup> + 645 pp. When I published my book on George of Trebizond in 1976, I quoted his *Rhetoric* from the 1523 Aldine edition, not because it was the best edition, but because it seemed to me that it was the most widely available one, given how highly prized and therefore better preserved Aldine books are. The best edition, however, I had concluded then and have come to believe more strongly since, was the one prepared by the expatriate Italian humanist Valentinus Curio and printed at Basel the year before, in 1522. Indeed, I have wondered privately whether a modern critical edition of the *Rhetoric* would be worth the enormous work required, since spot checking against the oldest dated manuscript (Bologna, Biblioteca Universitaria 2400) has shown the Curio edition to have a more correct text than the Aldine and to be quite sound overall. Moreover, Curio provides the reader

with quite useful and frequent marginal *notabilia*, where, specifically in Book 5, he also supplies the Greek term from Hermogenes not found in George's Latin text. Finally, the Curio edition begins with a handy sixteen-page alphabetical index giving the page references to a plethora of key words.

Consequently, I can only applaud Luc Deitz's initiative, which has resulted in the reprint of the Curio edition. Deitz has chosen to reproduce the 1539 Paris reprint by Christian Wechel of the Curio edition. The italic print of this edition is very attractive, clean, and readable, with no abbreviations save for an occasional bar over a vowel for 'm' or 'n.' The result is that Wechel's reprint can easily compete with a modern edition in terms of readability.

Deitz has added two new elements that make this new reprint immensely useful. The first is seemingly mundane but actually invaluable, namely, a detailed table of contents, so that the reader can gain control of the *Rhetoric* almost at a glance. The other new element is a product of Deitz's scholarship. Luc Deitz is the modern editor and translator (in German) of Julius Caesar Scaliger's *Poetices libri septem* (5 vols., Stuttgart - Bad Cannstatt, 1994-2003). So his introduction to George's *Rhetoric* is that of a master of the material who knows how to lay out succinctly and clearly the Latin and Greek sources and explain George's rhetorical doctrine. Deitz also gives in his *Vorwort* an economical but effective narrative of the historical and rhetorical context of George's *Rhetoric*. In short, Deitz has provided the reader with all the information needed for understanding George's *Rhetoric* short of an *apparatus historicus* that would report line-by-line the sources and allusions in George's text.

A modern edition with an *apparatus textualis* would, of course, also supply variant readings and would doubtlessly result in a better text than that of the Curio edition. But, as I suggested earlier, a cost-profit analysis in terms of scholarly gain and effort needs to be taken into account. George of Trebizond was a major Renaissance author, and critical editions of his texts are very much to be desired, – indeed, are really necessary. But of all of George's core texts, because of the Curio edition, the *Rhetoric* is that least urgently in need of a critical edition.

So Deitz had performed a signal service for scholarship. His learned and elegant introduction to a learned and elegant sixteenth-century edition will serve modern students of Renaissance rhetoric eminently well. (John Monfasani, The University at Albany, State University of New York)

◆ *Girolamo Fracastoro. Fra medicina, filosofia e scienze della natura.* Atti del Convegno internazionale del 450<sup>o</sup> anniversario della morte, Verona-Padova, 9-11 ottobre 2003. Ed. by Alessandro Pastore and Enrico Peruzi. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 2006. This 362-page volume containing twenty-one articles is divided into four sections: biography and environment, Fracastoro Scientist – Life and Earth Science, as we say today – Fracastoro Philosopher, and lastly, the posterity of Girolamo Fracastoro.

Girolamo Fracastoro was a physician deriving from a family of solicitors and merchants from Verona, with close ties to the Scaligers since the thirteenth century, then landowners during the Venetian Period, although without any medico-scientific background. Fracastoro studied in Padua at a time of major philosophical activity stirring within the Studio (36). The second original feature of this 1500s “elite” Veronese intellectual is underscored by John Henderson (7) and lies in the fact that he makes no connection between disease and moralism and that he is highly distrustful of classic doctors and surgeons who perform major – and often useless – operations. He accordingly placed his trust both in nature and in rational remedies.

In particular, he was the physician for the Council of Trent from February, 1546 to March, 1547, during which period he developed his intellectual doctrine (92). He was a pontifical partisan and adhered to the group wishing to move the Council from Trent not only for political reasons (too near Germany) but also for health reasons.

The remaining articles make an in-depth study of the relationships between medicine and philosophy along with Girolamo Fracastoro’s diagnoses of diseases such as typhus (92), elephantiasis (108), and above all, “the French pox” (73, 311, 317), for which he invented the term “sypphilis” in 1530. In an allegorical poem, a shepherd named Syphilus contracted the horrible disease, giving rise to Fracastoro’s work entitled *De contagione*, in which he establishes the bases of a

theory regarding human contagion.

Lastly, the rarely evoked links between medicine and gymnastics are also addressed in this work. In Verona, fifty years after his death, Fracastoro became the protagonist in a dialogue *Fumanellus seu de arte gymnastica* (163) on the nature of *ars gymnastica* – referred to today as sport – and medicine. The work covers the specific issue of hygiene addressed by Mercurialis (1569) in *De arte gymnastica*. Fracastoro's idea was to develop gymnastics for military purposes rather than for motiveless athletic body building. In this theory, therefore, there is a link with nature and the aims of medicine, given that ill bodies cannot be trained. Health is accordingly a recommendation for gymnastics and not vice versa.

This deductive method specific to Fracastoro is very well illustrated in the article by Cesare Vasoli on *Turrius*, covering Fracastoro's philosophical personality. In the article he emphasises logic as an instrument of natural logic by discarding (183) the opinion that there are reminiscences in the human mind (Aristotelian opinion, pursued in particular by his friend Bembo). The method is therefore not inductive but definitely deductive. This innovative position, between Plato and Aristotle, is confirmed in the articles by E. Peruzzi (217) and H. Hirai (245).

The fourth section is devoted to Fracastoro's posterity in time (in the seventeenth century or again in 1823, 311) and space (in Manchester, 321). While less developed, it does point out the importance of this sixteenth-century physician, particularly from the aspect of the modernity of his diagnoses of "the French pox," an epidemic spreading at the same time as the wars in Italy and the discovery of America.

The portrait drawn in this work is that of a determinedly modern man, a scientist struggling to construct a method. Naturally there are a few somewhat redundant articles; however for an anniversary and in the context of a symposium of this magnitude – the first in 50 years – the good news lies in the number of researchers interested in this figure, an encouraging point for our studies. Furthermore, it should be pointed out that numerous Latin quotes are provided with footnote translations, making for greater readability considering that few texts are available to facilitate the understanding of this period

and that even fewer are translated. (Florence Bistagne, Marseilles)

◆ *Jean Jacques Boissard's Emblematum liber. Emblemes Latins, Metz: A. Faber, 1588.* A facsimile edition using Glasgow University Library SM Add 415 with a critical introduction and notes. By Alison Adams. Imago Figurata Editions, 5. Turnhout, Brepols, 2005. xxiv + 96 + 75 pages. 65 euros. One of the more interesting genres of neo-Latin literature is the emblem book. Here we find a series of vignettes, each containing a motto, a picture, and an explanation. The words in this word-image genre need not be in Latin, but during the early modern period they often were, and such usages provide an important part of the intellectual foundations on which neo-Latin literature was built.

Jean Jacques Boissard (1528-1602) was an important writer of sixteenth-century emblem books. His father was a lawyer and his uncle a professor of Greek; he travelled widely and developed a series of connections with prominent families, first as the recipient of patronage, then as tutor and confidant. During the last two decades of his life he published much, in collaboration with the Metz printer Abraham Faber(t) and the Frankfurt de Bry family of printers, including his *Icones* (first published 1584), *Emblematum liber* (1593), *Theatrum vitae humanae* (1596), *Mascarades* (1597), and *Romanae urbis topographia et antiquitates* (1597-1602). Even a work like the *Theatrum*, which is not an emblem book, is associated with an emblematic way of thinking, in that the structure *inscriptio*-engraving-explanation is retained even though the inscription is reduced to a title and the chapters build a longer, logically linked argument. Likewise the *Mascarades* benefits from an emblematic reading, since it offers brief Latin texts containing a moral comment and engravings that develop this comment further.

The *Emblematum liber / Emblemes latins ...* (1584, 1588) is of special interest because Boissard was a Protestant. Here, as with his 1593 emblem book, Boissard provides both the visual and textual elements, which also include a sonnet in French by Pierre Joly to accompany Boissard's Latin quatrain. The 1593 emblem book has a more humanistic, classicizing feel, but in the earlier volume Joly's French sonnet often makes a specifically Protestant interpretation of the emblems explicit. The *Emblematum liber* is also of special interest because the material it presents is derived from a larger body of

related material in a manuscript in Boissard's own hand that is found in the Bibliothèque de l'Institut in Paris. The manuscript contains more than 150 emblems, with a motto, a picture, and a Latin quatrain normally on the recto and a French prose commentary on the facing verso. The basis for both the *Emblematum liber* and the 1593 emblem book is here, and it is valuable to be able to watch Boissard select from this data bank in preparing his published works. With some tentativeness Adams groups the emblems in the 1584 collection under the following topics: a Christian framework, death, the miseries of everyday life, humanist emblems, a pragmatic approach, friendship vs. hypocrisy, the ruler, pleasure, and ingratitude.

The centerpiece of this volume is a facsimile reproduction of the 1588 Metz edition made from the copy in the Glasgow University Library. The volume begins with a substantial introduction, which is followed by the facsimile. Then comes a commentary, which offers information on textual variants and dedicatees, a description of the picture, a transcription, translation, and identification of the motto, a literal translation of Boissard's quatrain, a gloss of Joly's French sonnet, a transcription of Boissard's prose commentary, and a transcription, identification, and translation of the Greek *sententiae* added in Boissard's own hand to the copy of the book in the Royal Library in Brussels. The introduction and commentary together are as long as the facsimile original, making Adams' work a useful tool indeed for the understanding and appreciation of this most interesting emblem book. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Henri Estienne, érudit, novateur, polémiste. Étude sur Ad Senecae lectionem Proodopoeiae.* By Denise Carabin. *Études et essais sur la Renaissance*, 66. Paris: H. Champion, 2006. 345 pp. In Geneva in 1586, Henri Estienne published his *Ad Senecae lectionem Proodopoeia*. The rare word in the title, derived from the Greek verb *proodopoeio*, refers to preparing the way. Estienne offers an introduction to Seneca that will both enable readers to appreciate the ancient author and lay the groundwork for a superior edition of his works. The philological direction of Estienne's efforts is emphasized by the explicitly textual concerns of his *Epistolae ad Jac. Dalechampium* [...], published together with the *Proodopoeia*. However, Estienne never published an edition of

Seneca, and the present volume constitutes a chapter in the Renaissance reception of the man from Córdoba. It is, the author claims, a crucial chapter that contributes significantly to the turn from a largely negative to a largely positive reading of Seneca's thought and style.

The study first provides context and then examines the *Proo-  
poieia* in considerable detail. A preliminary chapter surveys certain literary-critical principles in Estienne's predecessors (Valla, Erasmus, Budé, etc.) as readers of such ancient prose writers as Cicero and Quintilian. There follows a procession of Seneca's most important sixteenth-century editors and critics. Erasmus's editions of Seneca (1515 and 1528) are generally accompanied by negative comments. On the other hand, Calvin's commentary on *De clementia* (1532) takes important steps towards rehabilitation. The most important edition in the later sixteenth century is the work of Marc-Antoine Muret, published in Rome (1585). Justus Lipsius's varied works on Seneca, which begin in the 1580s and usher in the well-known golden age of neo-Stoicism, provide the terminus of this survey.

The interpretation of Estienne's work looks first at his presentation of Seneca's doctrine, then his comments on Senecan style, and finally Estienne's own "poetics." Needless to say, the categories overlap somewhat.

What Estienne emphasizes in his reading of Seneca and what he neglects both deserve mention. On the one hand, the larger questions of moral philosophy, the theory of the passions, *notiones communes*, philosophical vocabulary, and the relation of Stoicism to other ancient philosophies, notably Seneca's representation of Epicurus, all interest Estienne. On the other hand, he is relatively uninterested in well-worn Senecan themes like contempt for death, providence, friendship, and praise of the virtues, not to mention the philosopher's apocryphal Christianity.

Two parts of this study are most interesting. First, the treatment of Estienne's comments on Seneca's style. In elucidating the philosopher's sentence structure and syntax (his famous brevity) and his vocabulary (particularly Hellenisms), Estienne gives a positive value to characteristics that had been considered defects. He also emphasizes the pleasure available in such a style. Second, some of the author's conclusions about Estienne's style and "poetics." Estienne justifies his

repeated attacks on Muret's Roman edition on philological grounds, but they are also plausibly part of an anti-Catholic polemic pursued with some of the verve of the *Apologie pour Hérodote*. His voice as it emerges from the *Proodopoeia* is individual, deeply learned but entirely unprofessorial. Moreover, the characterization of Estienne as a Skeptical reader of Stoicism is intriguing. Although one misses a clear, over-arching argument, this study does illuminate both Henri Estienne and the Renaissance reading of Seneca.

In 2007 Champion published an edition and translation of the *Proodopoeia* by the author of this volume. *Henri Estienne, érudit, novateur, polémiste* would have been more helpful published after the edition. More fundamentally, it could be argued that the present study would have been preferable in a shortened form as a long introduction published together with the edition. This volume would work best as a guide (a *proodopoeia* in itself) to the text of the *Proodopoeia*. (Stephen Murphy, Wake Forest University)

◆ *Milton's Cambridge Latin Performing in the Genres 1625-1632*. By John K. Hale. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 289. Tempe, Ariz.: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2005. xii + 305 pp., 9 illus. \$32. John K. Hale's latest book presents a critical analysis of Milton's college works in Latin, a language which was "the first language of Cambridge itself" and "second nature to him." Hale's goal is the examination of these compositions "from the inside" with an eye to understanding them according to their different genres. Respecting their "original tongue," Hale wants us "to see them not solely as compositions [...] but as performances" and to think about them from "historical, anthropological as well as linguistic and literary" perspectives. Using his earlier studies, *Milton's Languages* (1997) and *John Milton: Latin Writings* (1998), as a jumping-off point, Hale fleshes out in this book ideas he had only touched on before.

The volume is divided into four units. Each unit contains its own subdivisions, which are numbered consecutively from one to ten. Part One: Milton and the University Exercises deals with Milton's part in the ritualized exercises in Latin, the so-called Cambridge Latin genres, that were required of students. It is split into five sections: 1. Disputations, 2. Milton's Philosophic Verses and the Cambridge



Act Verses, 3. Declamations, 4. Milton's Last Declamation, Prolusion VII (*In sacrario habita pro arte. Oratio. Beatiores reddit homines ars quam ignorantia*), and 5. The Cambridge Exercises and the *Defence of the English People*. Part Two: Voluntaries is organized in three subsections and deals with work Milton did "first and foremost on paper." The divisions are: 6. Praising Dead Worthies, 1626, 7. The University Anthologies, The College Community, and 8. *In Quintem Novembris* and the other Gunpowder Poems. The two portions of Part Three: For the College Community, 9. Milton Plays the Fool: Prolusion VI and "At a Vacation Exercise," and 10. Further Perspectives, present us with Milton "as stand-up comedian and master of ceremonies." Part Four: Milton's Salting (*editio princeps*) Text and Translation, offers readers for the first time a full Latin text and facing translation of Milton's *Oratio* and *Prolusio* from 1628. Working from earlier editions and his own research, Hale describes how he has reconstructed this rarely studied work from disparate parts. Hale has done his readers good service by drawing together and improving upon work done earlier by the Tillyards and the editors of the Columbia and Yale editions.

Hale's new book should draw attention from several groups of scholars, including those working in rhetoric and communication theory and the history of pedagogy (within and outside the British system) to mainstream neo-Latinists and Milton specialists alike. One cannot hope in fact to understand Milton or offer up any comprehensive interpretation of his work without reading his Latin prose and poetry, and that must be done with eye and ear attuned to both varieties, classical and Renaissance – the kind of work that Hale excels at. If fault must be found, it is that Hale seems at times to be trying to 'out-Milton' Milton in terms of witty riposte. The book's cover – a caricature drawn by Murray Webb of a giant-headed Milton with a shrunken, toga-clad torso atop spidery limbs—is itself suggestive. One thinks at once of the plates John Leech made for Gilbert Abbott à Beckett's *Comic History of Rome* (1852). But this is no cause for alarm. Milton's audience was as well acquainted as we should be with the techniques of *spoudaiogeloion*. (Michele Valerie Ronnick, Wayne State University)

◆ *Virgilius Cothurnatus – Vergil im Schauspielhaus. Drei lateinische Tragödien von Michael Maittaire.* Intro., ed., and trans. by Reinhold Gleis. NeoLatina, 12. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 2006. 220 pp. 49 euros. The author of the three short plays presented here is Micha(e)l Maittaire (1668-1747), the son of Huguenot emigrés who settled in England and enjoyed a successful career there, initially as a teacher at his *alma mater*, Westminster School, then as a scholar who produced many editions of classical authors (including one of Virgil in 1715) along with the still-valuable *Annales typographici, ab artis inventae origine ad annum 1500 (cum appendice ad annum 1664)* (The Hague, 1719-1741).

Like Virgil when asked to make selections for Augustus, Maittaire went to the second, fourth, and sixth books of the *Aeneid* in search of the most interesting parts of Virgil's poetry. His goal was to produce dramatic excerpts that would make the *Aeneid* more accessible to his students at Westminster School, not great original art. The first of the three plays, entitled *Excidium Troiae*, draws from Book 2 of the *Aeneid* along with passages from Seneca's tragedies. This play is short and has a certain tentative, experimental air about it. *Dido*, which draws from Book 1 as well as Book 4, is more complex structurally and more polished metrically; we can see Maittaire gaining confidence as he continues through his project. The third play in the group, *Inferna Navigatio*, is the only free-standing dramatization of Book 6 of the *Aeneid*. This is the most sophisticated of the three plays, an original drama that indeed makes the religious and philosophical complexities of its source more accessible to a school audience.

These three plays survive in an autograph manuscript, MS. Bodl. Rawl. D. 284, which passed directly from Maittaire at his death to the collector Richard Rawlinson (1689/90-1755), then to the Bodleian by bequest at its purchaser's death. The manuscript has a good many corrections and changes, which provided the main interest in the preparation of this edition. Gleis has wisely opted for a readable, accessible text, with orthography and punctuation normalized, ligatures and abbreviations expanded, and so forth. The German translation aims at understandability, not high art, and in this, it succeeds. Two apparatuses record textual variants and ancient sources.

A bonus in this book is the appendix, which lists Neo-Latin dramatizations of the *Aeneid*. Fifty years ago Leicester Bradner began

the effort to identify these plays as part of his “The Latin Drama of the Renaissance (1340-1460),” *Studies in the Renaissance*, 4 (1957), 47-48, to which Glei has been systematically adding, first with a list in “Die Turnus-Tragödie J. J. Wolfs (1591),” in G. Binder and B. Effe (eds.), *Das Antike Theater* (Trier, 1998), 253-93, then in an expanded version in “Neulateinische Dramatisierungen der Aeneis—ein Überblick,” in G. Binder (ed.), *Dido und Aeneas* (Trier, 2000), 143-74. This latest version, which contains thirty-eight plays to Bradner’s eleven, is striking proof of the way in which work in Neo-Latin continues to turn up new material, particularly as regards a source as ubiquitous as Virgil was in early modern Europe.

Glei’s book offers an appropriate occasion to pause and recognize the author’s efforts in stimulating a resurgence of interest in Neo-Latin in German universities. He himself has appeared frequently in these pages as the author and editor of books on Neo-Latin topics (see, for example, the review immediately following), but recent issues contain reviews of the books of his students as well. Their work begins in seminars like the one Glei offered in the winter semester of 2002/3 at Ruhr-Universität Bochum, in which Alexandra Kopka, Gabriele Buchenthal, Jennifer Denzinger, Uwe Füg, Rainer Hemesoth, and Thomas Zimmer pored over Maittaire’s manuscript, establishing a text and roughing out a translation. These students are listed as collaborators on the title page, and I would not be surprised to see a Neo-Latin dissertation from one or more of them appearing over the next few years. The German system allows an aspiring Latin professor to do either the doctoral dissertation or the *Habilitationsschrift* on a Neo-Latin topic, and thanks to the encouragement of professors like Glei, an increasing number of students are taking this option. This is the kind of leadership we need if the field is to continue to thrive. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Parodia’ und Parodie. Aspekte intertextuellen Schreibens in der lateinischen Literatur der Frühen Neuzeit*. Ed. by Reinhold F. Glei and Robert Seidel. Frühe Neuzeit, 120. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2006. 363 pp. On 17-18 February 2005 the *Deutsche Neulateinische Gesellschaft* (= DNG, i.e., *German Neo-Latin Society*) held its second workshop in Frankfurt am Main. The DNG is the German counterpart of the

International Association of Neo-Latin Studies (IANLS). It offers scholars a (German-speaking) forum in which to discuss literary phenomena through textual analyses as well as theoretical studies and literary surveys, focussing, however, not just on the German-speaking area. The first workshop concentrated on Latin lyric poetry of the early modern times, whose proceedings were published as *Lateinische Lyrik der Frühen Neuzeit. Poetische Kleinformen und ihre Funktionen zwischen Renaissance und Aufklärung*. 1. Arbeitsgespräch der Deutschen Neulateinischen Gesellschaft in Verbindung mit der Werner Reimers-Stiftung Bad Homburg, ed. by Beate Czapla, Ralf Georg Czapla and Robert Seidel, *Frühe Neuzeit*, 77 (2003). The second—the proceedings of which are the subject of the present review—was on parody and aspects of intertextuality, the third (2007) on Neo-Latin drama; the planned fourth workshop (2010) will deal with poetics in Neo-Latin literature.

The present volume aims to discuss the changing notion and function of the intertextual phenomenon of parody in early modern times, through case studies as well as systematic analyses of it. It comprises twelve contributions in German, mainly dealing with the German-speaking cultural area, but also referring to works written by Italian and Polish authors between the fifteenth and the eighteenth centuries. Most papers include editions of Latin texts, all with German translations.

Why the word ‘parody’ features twice in the title of the book, is explained by the contemporary understanding of the term *parodia*, the meaning of which has evolved between the early modern period and modern times. This phenomenon is well known when dealing with technical terms in literature (see Jörg Robert, 47 ff.), and it is certainly reasonable to remind the reader of it before presenting examples. Indeed a survey of the seventeenth-century idea of *parodia*, especially the *parodia Horatiana*, is provided in the first contribution by Rüdiger Niehl. Drawing on the theories of Eckart Schäfer, who in the 1970s was the first one to describe the vivid imitation of Horace in seventeenth-century Germany, Niehl undertakes an analysis of a broader corpus of texts: the CAMENA collection, i.e., the Corpus Automatum Multiplex Electorum Neolatininitatis Auctorum, an invaluable database of facsimile editions of Latin texts from the early

modern times written in the German-speaking area. The section “Poemata” already includes over 260 authors, that is, 60,000 printed pages. It is part of the larger online collection MATEO: <http://www.uni-mannheim.de/mateo/camenahtdocs/camena.html>. He confirms that the German idea of *parodia* originated in Henri Estienne’s (1528-1598) definition (which stands for the imitation of an entire poem, maintaining the metre and the number of lines, but changing the topic), was disseminated in Germany through the works of Paul Schede (1539-1602), and flourished among Protestant scholars of the time. Convincingly Niehl emends Schäfer’s assumption of a Catholic concept of Horatian parody and specifies the purposes and types of the *parodia Horatiana*.

Subsequently Jörg Robert’s contribution on parody and *parodia* in poetics of the early modern times provides the theoretical background to which Niehl occasionally refers, drawing a line from antiquity (Aristotle, Quintilian) to Julius Caesar Scaliger (1484-1558), Henri Estienne, and Paul Schede. Robert discusses the nature of the *parodia Christiana* as a Jesuit genre (or not), interpreting the very same poetologists and poets mentioned by Niehl (Pontanus, Masen, Balde), yet arriving at some different conclusions, e.g., that Jakob Masen (1606-1681) in his *Palaestra eloquentiae ligatae* does in fact discuss parody.

A succinct survey from Aristotle to Scaliger and Estienne is again drawn by Beate Czaplá, who in her contribution presents a particular Baroque parody, Paul Fleming’s (1609-1640) nuptial dithyramb, based on a dithyramb by the Polish poet Maciej Kasimierz Sarbiewski (1595-1640). Apart from drawing relations between both texts, Czaplá lucidly identifies the references to epithalamia and other genres of classical antiquity and discusses the function of those references.

Intertextual references to antiquity (Ovid) as well as to early Italian humanism (Petrarch) are pinpointed by Christoph Pieper in his study of Basinio of Parma’s (1425-1457) *Liber Isottaens*. Another Italian author is included through the contribution of Reinhold F. Gleis, who examines the *Centones ex Vergilio* by Lelio Capilupi (1497-1560). His paper begins with an innovative treatise on the *cento*. Defining “intra-textual” and “extra-textual” sub-types, which are subdivided into “constructive” and “destructive” types of texts, Gleis identifies four types of cento-poems: pastiche, parody, contrafact, and satire.

As an example of a ridiculing parody, Gleis then presents a particular *cento* by Capilupi, entitled *Gallus*, the text of which he edits, with the respective lines in Virgil also being provided.

Florian Schaffner's essay deals with parodic passages in the epic poem *Columbus carmen epicum* (Rome, 1715), written by Ubertino Carrara. Two further articles treat Italian authors with a considerable importance for the German-speaking area: Elisabeth Klecker discusses a passage of the *Austrias* by Riccardo Bartolini (ca. 1475-1529), who managed to include an equivalent to the Virgilian storm at sea in his panegyric epic poem on the war of succession in landlocked Bavaria. The respective passage in the *Aeneid* was a standard model for imitation in neo-Latin poetry. Yet the relation to Virgil, the main authority of Latin epic poetry, should also be considered when analysing other ancient models, a task undertaken by Wolfgang Kofler in his discussion of the impact of Catullus's *carmen* 64 on sixteenth-century poetry on Lake Garda.

Four further contributions are devoted to significant German authors. First Robert Seidel analyses the poem *Hipponax ad Asterien*, a Latin work written in his youth by Martin Opitz (1597-1639), who established humanistic ideals in German vernacular poetry. Attending to Opitz's sources and models, Seidel provides an intriguing analysis of the poem's intertextuality, its hypertextuality, paratextuality, and architextuality. In 1633 Opitz published a didactic poem on the eruption of mount Vesuvius two years previously; this event is also the theme of a poem by the important Jesuit dramatist Jacob Bidermann (1578-1639). The intertextuality of his *Campanum, seu Vesuvius flagrans* is explored by Wilhelm Kühlmann, who also provides an edition of the text. A nuptial poem by another Jesuit, Jacob Pontanus (1542-1626), is presented by Iris Heckel. For his part, Gernot Michael Müller draws our attention again to Virgil, this time to his eclogues, and discusses extensively the *Bucolicum* by Helius Eobanus Hessus (1488-1540), who claimed to be the first bucolic poet of German origin and positioned himself as a new Baptista Mantuanus.

Rich in examples, thorough in its theoretical analyses as well as in its bibliographical references, this volume is an indispensable handbook for anyone working on (or referring to) parody and intertextuality in middle-European early modern times. A comprehensive index

of names enhances the usefulness of this book. (Veronika Coroleu Oberparleiter, Universität Salzburg)

◆ *El humanismo español, su proyección en América y Canarias en la época del humanismo.* Ed. by Antonio María Martín Rodríguez and Germán Santana Henríquez. Las Palmas: Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, 2006. 445 pp. At the end of the eighties, Professor Gaspar Morocho Gayo of the Universidad de León began a systematic effort to rescue from oblivion the works of some of the key figures of Spanish humanism. His effort has led to a monograph series, *Humanistas Españoles. Estudios y Ediciones Críticas*, which now includes more than thirty volumes; a journal, *Silva. Estudios de Humanismo y Tradición Clásica*, whose most recent issue is reviewed below; and a research group, *Humanistas Españoles*, which includes over thirty specialists in Greek, Hebrew, Latin, and Spanish literature, American history, geography, art history, philosophy, law, and biology from the universities of León, Valladolid, Salamanca, Madrid (Autónoma), Sevilla, Pablo de Olavide, Huelva, Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, La Laguna, and California (Merced). To coordinate the work of this group and to disseminate their findings, a conference is held every two years. The volume under review here constitutes the eighth of these conference proceedings.

The essays are divided into three groups, which reflect the emphases of the research group. The first seven essays are on the subject of “Humanismo español y europea.” In considering “El *cogito* cartesiano y la cuestión de sus precursores españoles,” Benjamín García-Hernández looks at Gómez Pereira, Sánchez el Escéptico, and the *Quixote* for analogies to the Cartesian *cogito*. M<sup>a</sup> Isabel Lafuente Guantes looks at one of these precursors, Francisco Sánchez el Escéptico, in “El problema de las ciencias en el *Quod nihil scitur* de Francisco Sánchez.” In “Humanismo y moral estoica: Epicteto traducido por Pedro de Valencia,” Jesús M<sup>a</sup> Nieto Ibáñez passes from pure to applied philosophy, focusing on Pedro de Valencia, one of the figures most studied by this research group. Raúl López López offers, in “Lorenzo de Zamora: nuevos datos para el primer inventario completo de sus obras y escritos,” an exhaustive inventory of the materials available for the study of the work of Lorenzo de Zamora

(ca. 1550-1614), professor of theology and the Bible at the Colegio de San Bernardo de Alcalá. Eduardo Álvarez de Palacio and Beatriz Fernández Díez write first on “La dietética en los regimientos de salud del siglo XVI español: análisis de la obra de Francisco Núñez de Coria,” then turn to “El humanista inglés Richard Mulcaster: ideas pedagógicas y propuesta de educación física,” in which some surprisingly modern ideas about physical exercise are discussed. In “Arte y humanismo de la Biblioteca de San Isidoro de León,” M<sup>a</sup> Dolores Campos Sánchez-Bordona moves from the discussion of individual works of humanism to the more general ambience of books and the constitution of libraries.

The second group of essays is devoted to the theme “El humanismo español y su proyección en América.” Jesús Paniagua Pérez studies “La visión del hombre americano en Benito Arias Montano y Pedro de Valencia,” two figures that have been central to the work of this research group, while Jesús Paradinas Fuentes analyzes the educational infrastructure of the so-called ‘new world’ in “La educación en América según las *Relaciones de Indias* de Pedro de Valencia.” In “La *Historia de la Nueva México* de Gaspar Pérez de Villagrà: recepción crítica (con nuevos datos biográficos de su autor),” Manuel María Martín Rodríguez studies the reception of Pérez de Villagrà’s epic poem and offers new information about the life of the author. These essays complement one another nicely, in that the first two show the impact of the Americas on European humanism, while the third introduces us to creole culture. M<sup>a</sup> Isabel Viforcós Marinas turns to books and reading in the Americas in “Libros y lecturas a la luz de la normativa sinodal y conciliar hispanoamericana (siglos XVI-XVIII),” with a focus on surviving documents from the vice-royalty of Peru. In “Entre la mitra y la pluma: el «sacerdote ilustrado» Castorena y Ursúa (México, 1668-1733),” Isabel Arenas Frutos studies the figure of Juan Ignacio Castorena y Ursúa, priest, professor of Sacred Scripture for twenty years at the Mexican university, journalist, and author of a series of works discussed in this essay. Finally, in “Humanismo y ciencia: José Antonio de Alzate y las *Gacetas de Literatura de México* (1788-1795),” M<sup>a</sup> Justina Sarabia Viejo focuses on the creole priest Juan Antonio de Alzate y Ramírez (1737-1799), a polymath who concerned himself in particular with the classical languages and authors.



The third group of essays are all on the subject of “Canarias en la época del humanismo.” Carmen González Vázquez studies the presence of the Canary Islands in the voyage of Alejandro Geraldini de Amelia to take possession of his bishopric of Santo Domingo in “Las Islas Canarias en el *Itinerarium ad Regiones sub Aequinoctiali plaga constitutas* de Alejandro Geraldini.” In Geraldini’s day, the Canary Islands represented the western limit of the known world, in which the topos of the *locus amoenus* filled in what was unknown about this distant place. Then in “Fuentes críticas para la edición de los poemas latinos de José de Anchieta,” Francisco González Luis studies the Latin poetry of the man called the “Apóstol del Brasil.” Belén González Morales turns to one of the founders of the literature of the Canary Islands in “«De la esencia y causas de la poética».” La metaforización del espacio poético en la obra de Bartolomé Cairasco de Figueroa,” focusing on metaphor in his work. Eugenio Padorno studies an unedited rhetorical manual conceived on La Palma in “*Los eslabones más fuertes de las cadenas de Alcides*. Una retórica inédita de raíces humanísticas en las Canarias del siglo XVII,” providing information as well about its author, Pedro Álvarez de Lugo y Usodemar (1628-1726). Finally María Mónica Martínez Sariago studies the survival in the oral tradition of the words of the prophet Jeremiah in Lamentations 1.12 in the oral literature of the Canary Islands in “*Si est dolor sicut dolor meus*. Sobre la herencia de los comentaristas bíblicos en un romance de pliego dieciochesco y su pervivencia en la tradición oral de Canarias.”

Each of these sections offers its own appeal. The papers in the first group take their place in the rapidly expanding corpus of work on Spanish humanism in general. The ones in the second group are valuable as well for the continued interest in the Encounter, which has remained strong well after the 1992 anniversary. And this is the only place I can think of offhand that will tell the reader anything about neo-Latin literature in the Canary Islands. Unlike some Spanish conference proceedings, the papers here are not lightly annotated, unrevised versions of what was delivered orally, but substantial essays (averaging twenty-five pages) on interesting, timely topics. In short, a good read. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Silva. Estudios de humanismo y tradición clásica.* Ed. by Jesús-M. Nieto Ibáñez and Juan Francisco Domínguez Domínguez. Nr. 6, 2007. Universidad de León, Spain. 447 pp. The latest issue of this, the newest of the journals devoted to Neo-Latin literature and culture, contains eight articles. In “El poder político o el arte de hacer real lo posible: el Agamemnon de la *Hécuba* de Eurípides y algunas reacciones posteriores (Séneca, Gelli y Pérez de Oliva),” José Vicente Bañuls and Carmen Morenilla offer a very interesting reinterpretation of Euripides *Hecuba*, in which Agamemnon’s actions are generally seen as cowardly and indecisive. This, the authors argue, is because the reservations of the king are misinterpreted: these reservations should be seen as a sign of prudence in specific political circumstances. What makes this reinterpretation interesting is that it is completed through Seneca, Aulus Gellius, and Pérez de Oliva, confirming the argument of Charles Martindale (*Redeeming the Text* (Cambridge, 1993), 7) that our current interpretations are inevitably bound to the chain of interpretations that link us to the original work. Next Florence Bistagne, in “Le *De sermone* de Giovanni Pontano est-il un traité e savoir vivre?,” explores the ideal virtue that makes a person witty in conversation. Wit arises from both ancient rhetoric and from medieval courtesy books, such that *De sermone* becomes both a work of aesthetics and ethics, of theory and practice. In “Publicações cristãs na China no século XVII. Uma edição da *Relatio Sepulturae ... S. Francisco Xaverio erectae*, Pequim de c. 1700,” Manuel Cadafaz de Matos explores the effect of the missionary press in the Far East on the historiography of St. Francis Xavier. This article focuses on two editions (one from India, the other from the Philippines) that concern Father Mastrilli, subject of a miracle by Xavier; and on another, probably Chinese edition that relates to the saint’s burial on the island of Sanchuan.

In a nice complement to the edition of Reinhold Gleis reviewed elsewhere in this issue of *NLN*, Arturo Echavarren analyzes the frequent references to Virgil’s Aeneas in the non-mythological dramas of the Spanish Golden Age. “La figura de Eneas en el teatro español del Siglo de Oro” shows how the intertextual links between Virgil’s epic and a series of plays draw from a similar symbolic connection, but unfold differently in different dramas. In “La poesía *dispersa* de Juan de Mal Lara: una formulación estética entre latín y vernáculo (con

nuevas noticias biográfico-literarias),” Francisco Javier Escobar Borrego studies the poetry of the humanist Juan de Mal Lara (1526-1571), which has been scattered into many manuscripts and older editions. Its variety of registers illuminates the poetry of this humanist and that of a number of other writers linked to his Academy. “Algunas ideas de estética neoplatónica a través de un soneto hereriano,” by Francisco Garrote Pérez, analyzes the neoplatonic ideas which Fernando de Herrera used to compose an exemplary sonnet. Next, in “Silva, comentario y memorial: la *Silva Palentina* de Alonso Fernández de Madrid,” Lilith Lee examines the relationships between ‘commentary,’ ‘memorial,’ and ‘silva,’ showing that the final term can indeed mean ‘miscellany,’ but it also signifies a way of writing—a distinction that proves useful with the *Silva Palatina*, which accords with the second meaning but not the first. In “Mitos y nombres míticos en las obras literarias de Jovellanos,” Juan Antonio López Férez analyzes the presence of myths and mythical names in Jovellanos’ literary works.

I have divided the articles into two groups because the division suggests to me the strengths that recent work on Neo-Latin offers. The second group might be considered traditional in their focus on philology and its concerns, but they are done to a very high standard and lead to new insights about neo-Latin writings we do not know enough about. The three articles in the first group suggest in turn what happens when these traditional philological concerns are opened up by some of the newer methodologies. The first article ends up being a sophisticated application of reception theory, the second a sort of exercise in cultural studies, and the third an interesting account of what happens when west meets east. That both approaches can meet, and meet profitably, in the pages of the same journal suggests that the next decade or two should be unusually interesting for neo-Latin studies. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)