

NEO-LATIN NEWS

Vol. 55, 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.

◆ *Marginalia figurati nei codici di Petrarca*. By Maurizio Fiorilla. Biblioteca di 'Lettere italiane', Studi e testi, 65. Florence: Olschki, 2005. 96 pp., 67 plates. 19 euros. The seventh centenary of the birth of Francesco Petrarca (2004), as often happens on the occasion of similar events, has brought the name of the honoree to the attention of both scholars and the wider public. Unlike a hundred years ago, there was fortunately no thought of making a new monument in his honor or a pilgrimage to the house and tomb of the poet, but as has already happened more than one time in the past, the celebrations were appropriate to the times. We have the inevitable but fruitless polemics against the slowness of the Edizione Nazionale delle Opere di Francesco Petrarca, born on the occasion of the preceding centenary of the poet's birth (1904). And yet with the festivities now concluded, if we sort through the initiatives and writings that have appeared or been announced on Petrarca and his circle, the balance on the whole is positive. Beyond numerous conferences and the ambitious project launched by the Comitato Nazionale per le Celebrazioni del VII Centenario to publish the *opera omnia* of the poet in a partially critical edition that after almost five centuries could finally substitute for the Basel folio of 1554, the study of the marginalia in Petrarchan manuscripts has been revived, in the glorious footsteps of Nolzac and Billanovich. Editions of marginalia of some of Petrarca's classical and Christian texts are now in print, and others are in preparation. In order of their publication, we have M.

Petoletti, "Petrarca, Isidoro e il Virgiliano Ambrosiano. Note sul Par. lat. 7595," *Studi petrarcheschi*, n.s. 16 (2003), 1-48; F. Santirossi, *Le postille del Petrarca ad Ambrogio (Codice Parigino Lat. 1757)* (Florence, 2004); L. Refe, *Le postille del Petrarca a Giuseppe Flavio (Codice Parigino Lat. 5054)* (Florence, 2004); and F. Petrarca, *Le postille del Virgilio Ambrosiano*, ed. M. Baglio, A. Nebuloni Testa, and M. Petoletti (Rome and Padua, 2006). The contribution of Maurizio Fiorilla is inserted into this profitable line of research and, in a certain sense, reinvigorates it in an original way, furnishing a useful and capable reference instrument for anyone who in the future would like to follow the difficult task of reconstructing and analyzing the library of the humanist. Instead of examining Petrarca's annotations on a single author, Fiorilla systematically collects all the *marginalia* that contain figures in the manuscripts that come from the poet's desk, not overlooking the presence of other hands, more or less definable, earlier or later than the illustrious reader, which are to be put in relation with Petrarca's notes and make precious the examples that hand them down. Fiorilla's work has been conducted on the foundation of all the manuscripts of Petrarca's library registered in M. Feo's "Francesco Petrarca," in *Storia della letteratura italiana*, gen. ed. E. Malato (Rome, 2002), 10:321-29 and "La biblioteca," in *Petrarca nel tempo. Tradizione lettori e immagini delle opere*. Catalogo della mostra, Arezzo, Sottocchia de S. Francesco, 22 novembre 2003 – 27 gennaio 2004, ed. M. Feo (Pontedera, 2003), pp. 461-96. Fiorilla has for the most part examined the manuscripts himself, using in other cases microfilms, facsimiles, and photographs of the originals or copies that often reproduce the manuscripts faithfully. The volume is divided into two chapters and three brief appendices; fundamental is the rich array of tables (sixty-seven in all).

The first chapter concerns the reader's marks and the frames. Petrarca's most frequently used mark is the floweret, formed by two, three, or four little points from which a stroke descends, of varying length, straight or wavy, followed by a small hand with the index finger pointing toward a place in the text that is worthy of interest and, to a lesser extent, by small figures that frame some notes with an exquisitely decorative or, in certain cases, practical aim (as, for example, the frames of Pliny, Par. lat. 6802, in the form of a mountain serving to distinguish among the rich mass of *notabilia* the name of a mountain or of a promontory from that of a river). The complete catalogue of such reader's marks allows Fiorilla to mark out a system of unmistakable glossing, as well as the subtle graphic evolution to which the system was

subject in the course of time, from Petrarca's early forties to old age. This in turn allows Fiorilla to discuss once again the attribution to Petrarca's library of the Cicero in London, British Library, Harl. 4927, a manuscript of the twelfth century of French origin, whose annotator is the same as the one in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Canon. Patr. lat. 210 and 229, which were originally united with the letters of Ambrose. The entire marginal apparatus of the three exemplars cannot be taken back to Petrarca, whose possession of the Harleian Cicero and the Oxford Ambrose has not yet been demonstrated. Fiorilla cautiously leaves the problem open. Different is the case of another manuscript of Cicero's orations, Vat. lat. 9305, from the end of the fourteenth century, taken from a lost Petrarchan source, from which it reproduces glosses and pictorial annotations; for the latter, however, we cannot be certain that they descend from the original manuscript, considering the absence of designs in other copies with *marginalia* of the lost Petrarchan manuscript.

The last part of the first chapter examines the hands of other annotators that can be taken back in different times and ways to Petrarca's circle. Landolfo Colonna, canon of Chartres, author and possessor of an extraordinary library, friend of Petrarca and older by a generation, glossed at least three codices (two miscellanea of sacred texts, Par. lat. 1617 and 2540, and the important historical encyclopedia of Dictys, Florus, and the first three decades of Livy, Par. lat. 5690) which ended up in the hands of Petrarca (the first two in Rome in 1337, the third in Avignon in 1351). In all three manuscripts the *marginalia* of Landolfo (braces, for the most part formed by a vertical stroke in which shell-shaped elements and chains of rings, little hands, and faces are interpositioned, traced in profile along the margins of the column of writing) have a very characteristic style which is differentiated clearly from that of Petrarca. In two other manuscripts from Petrarca's library Fiorilla distinguishes the hand of a second annotator, Giovanni Boccaccio: a *miscellanea* with the *Liber de Regno Siciliae* of Ugo Falcando, Par. lat. 5150, probably a gift of Boccaccio to Petrarca in 1361, and the Claudian, Par. lat. 8082, which has a crowned head once attributed to Boccaccio by other scholars, and a little hand designed in correspondence with a passage of the *De raptu Proserpinae*, whose erroneous interpretation by Petrarca and Boccaccio is perhaps the origin of the false belief in the Florentine birth of Claudian (see Appendix I, 67-73). The fact that cannot be neglected is that Par. lat. 8082, not forming part of the group of manuscripts given by Boccaccio to Petrarca, gives

witness to a reading community between two friends and above all a broad range for the intervention of Boccaccio in the books of Petrarca. The chapter concludes with the attribution to the bishop Ildebrandino Conti, Petrarca's friend, of some new little hands and braces on two manuscripts, the Isidore, Par. lat. 7595, and the Augustine of the Biblioteca Universitaria of Padua, ms. 1490, in which the hand of Ildebrandino had already been identified by Maria Chiara Billanovich ("Il vescovo Ildebrandino Conti e il *De civitate Dei* della Biblioteca Universitaria di Padova. Nuova attribuzione," *Studi petrarcheschi*, n.s. 11 (1994 [2000]), 99-127), and with the individuation of marginalia with figures by anonymous annotators in other manuscripts of Petrarca, among them Par. lat. 1989, the gift of Boccaccio to his friend.

The second chapter is dedicated to the pictures present in Petrarca's library: four in total, distributed in two manuscripts, the previously cited Par. lat. 6802 and 8082, with three pictures and one, respectively. The Pliny has the well-known sketch of Vaucluse, the logo of the recent national celebrations, a picture of Rome, and a head with a bearded man, while the Claudian preserves a crowned head flanked by a little hand. From the end of the nineteenth century until today it has been widely discussed whether Petrarca or Boccaccio is the one who executed these pictures. With several arguments Fiorilla pronounces himself "a favore di Boccaccio sia nel caso della testina coronata tracciata nel Par. lat. 8082, che forse rappresenta proprio il dedicatorio del *De raptu*, sia in quello della testina barbata vergata nel Par. lat. 6802" (63), who for the first time is identified with Abraham. The identification of the hand of the two pictures in Par. lat. 6802 is more complicated. The depiction of the Vaucluse, of which Fiorilla quotes the suggestive description of Contini ("La posizione verticale, a destra, riproduce una rupe sormontata da un sacello e adorna di ciuffi vegetali; ai piedi, nel suo centro, è l'antro sorgivo, dal quale i flutti procedono orizzontalmente verso sinistra, incontrando a cielo ormai scoperto, una fila di erbe e di fiori palustri; all'estremo è un airone con un pesce in bocca," G. Contini, "Petrarca e le arti figurative," in *Francesco Petrarca Citizen of the World*, Proceedings of the World Petrarch Congress, Washington, D.C., April 6-13, 1974 (Padua and Albany, 1980), 115-31), has been the object of debate since the time of Nollac, along with the note that accompanies it, *Transalpina solitudo mea iocundissima*, certainly in Petrarca's hand. Fiorillo puts into the field in Boccaccio's defense a new element in respect to the criticism that has preceded it: he returns to a passage of the *De montibus* in which the writer

recalls the spring Sorgue, certainly having present the passage in Pliny, but probably also the note and the sketch of Par. lat. 6802. Such an argument on Boccaccio's behalf is, in my opinion, more than any paleographical verification, not at all irrelevant, as this is the challenge, that of the more than seventy manuscripts from Petrarca's library, only the Pliny and the Claudian from Paris have pictures. As soon as it became clear, however, that precisely these two manuscripts bear signs of Boccaccio's hand, Fiorilla limits himself to the hypothesis that the two friends could have conceived the figure together in one of their meetings, presumably the one in Milan in 1359. In the last picture examined, depicting Rome, Fiorilla registers the presence of two different hands, one of Petrarca, who could have executed the first part of the picture, and the other, later, of an anonymous reader. Fiorilla arrives at this conclusion exclusively on the basis of stylistic comparisons, retracing in particular a resemblance with the picture that frames the note *Roma* affixed in the margin of Vat. lat. 9305, a copy of an exemplar with autograph notes of Petrarca.

At the end of the volume is the second appendix (75-81), which considers the marginal apparatus of Laur. Pluteo 66,1, a manuscript of the eleventh century from Monte Cassino, with the *Antiquitates* and the *De bello Iudaico* of Flavius Josephus in Latin translation. Fiorilla assigns the phytomorphic designs, the little hands, and the glosses to Boccaccio, as had earlier scholars who had studied the manuscript (with the notable exception of Giuseppe Billanovich, who attributed the *marginalia* to Zanobi da Strada). Fiorilla's thesis appears convincing because it rests on stylistic proof as well as textual comparisons with the *Genealogie deorum gentilium*. (Monica Berté, University 'G. D'Annunzio,' Chieti; trans. by Craig Kallendorf)

◆ *Contra eum qui maledixit Italiae*. By Francesco Petrarca. Ed. by Monica Berté. Collana del VII Centenario della Nascita di Francesco Petrarca (2004), Comitato Nazionale. Florence: Casa Editrice Le Lettere, 2005. 118 pp. 15 euros. *Res Seniles, Libri I-IV*. By Francesco Petrarca. Ed. by Silvia Rizzo, with the collaboration of Monica Berté. Collana del VII Centenario della Nascita di Francesco Petrarca (2004), Comitato Nazionale. Florence: Casa Editrice Le Lettere, 2006. 343 pp. 28 euros. Eighty years ago, the first volume of the Edizione Nazionale delle Opere di Francesco Petrarca, Nicola Festa's *Africa*, appeared, inaugurating what was intended to be the definitive edition of Petrarch's works. Some other volumes (e.g., Rossi's *Le familiari*, in 4 vols.) also

appeared, but the series was never completed, the early volumes have become virtually impossible to find, and modern scholarship has called into question some of the editorial decisions in the editions that were published decades ago. So it is very good to see a new edition of Petrarch's collected works underway, and to see the first volumes in print immediately after the anniversary date that stimulated its creation.

In theory at least the editorial principles for this series are somewhat more modest than those for the older series. When possible the editors will use the texts already prepared for the Commissione per l'Edizione Nazionale delle Opere di Francesco Petrarca. If the commission doesn't have a text to hand, the editors will make one, but the editorial work will rely on a limited number of textual witnesses and the apparatus will be restricted to authorial variants and to sources that have been explicitly cited. The introduction to each volume will discuss the textual tradition of the work it presents, and some basic information will be provided for smaller units in the text like individual epistles. Latin texts will be accompanied by Italian translations.

The principles here are similar to those of the I Tatti Renaissance Library, but as with that series, an ambitious editor is given the scope to do more. The editors of both these volumes have done so, making their volumes into solid scholarly works. It so happens that Monica Berté was the person responsible for producing the text of *Contra eum qui maledixit Italiae* for the Edizione Nazionale, and she has surveyed all thirty manuscripts and four sixteenth-century printed editions. Her critical text is reproduced here for the first time. The textual tradition, now clarified definitively, divides into two streams, one derived from the intellectual environment of the dedicatee, the other from the exemplar kept by Petrarch himself. Much work has gone into the notes, which often go beyond tracking down a half dozen citations a page to include (for example) references to scholarly articles that illuminate the point at issue.

The first volume of Silvia Rizzo's *Seniles*, prepared with the help of Monica Berté, is similarly ambitious. This collection, begun at age fifty-seven and including 127 letters distributed over seventeen books, is one of our most important sources for Petrarch's life and thought, although like everything else he wrote, it was revised throughout his life to present the perspective he wanted at the point of revision. The letters, which are in general shorter than those in the *Familiares*, are arranged in basic chronological order, although some modifications are made (for example) to provide greater thematic

unity. In preparing this edition, the editors have used the *editio princeps* as a base text but incorporated readings from twenty different manuscripts, resorting to conjecture in those cases where no earlier reading is satisfactory. In accordance with the norms of the series, authorial variants are grouped into three categories in the apparatus, which also contains a good number of explanatory notes that go beyond the simple identification of explicit references.

For any series, the inaugural volumes are important in establishing the standards for what follows. As two of the first books to appear in this series, these volumes suggest that neo-Latinists with an interest in Petrarch will soon be able to get good scholarly texts at very reasonable prices. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Lodovico Lazzarelli (1447-1500): The Hermetic Writings and Related Documents*. Ed. by Wouter J. Hanegraaff and Ruud M. Bouthoorn. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2005. \$45. Hanegraaff and Bouthoorn's volume examines the little-known Italian poet and hermetist Ludovico Lazzarelli, as well as his eccentric mentor, the prophet and provocateur Giovanni "Mercurio" da Correggio. Together with Marsilio Ficino, Lazzarelli translated the *Corpus Hermeticum*, a group of Greek texts attributed to the mythical adept Hermes Trismegistus. As a result, the set of philosophical and magical beliefs known as hermetism enjoyed great popularity in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, particularly among humanists such as Ficino, Giordano Bruno, and Giovanni Pico della Mirandola. The most important study of the subject, Frances Yates's 1964 *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition*, emphasized the influence of Renaissance hermetism and portrayed the movement as a precursor to scientific advancement, and even modernity. Despite Lazzarelli's contributions to hermetism, he was for the most part ignored by Yates's analysis, as well as by subsequent histories of the period. Hanegraaff and Bouthoorn argue that Lazzarelli was unfairly marginalized by Yates because of his piety and prophetic enthusiasm, which failed to support her analysis of hermetism as a harbinger of scientific and social progress. In contrast, the authors present Lazzarelli as central to Renaissance hermetism.

A number of scholars have rediscovered Lazzarelli in recent years, and this edition of his hermetic writings (with facing pages in English and Latin) aims to establish further his significance. The volume begins with a lengthy biographical sketch of Lazzarelli and a critical analysis of his best-known

work, the *Crater Hermetis*. Lazzarelli's early life was marked by great honors: he was crowned poet laureate at the age of twenty-one by the Emperor Frederick III, and he became involved with the humanists of the Roman Academy soon after. Lazzarelli encountered both the *Corpus Hermeticum* and the apocalyptic prophet Correggio around 1481, and he consequently abandoned his secular interests in favor of Christian hermeticism and spiritual regeneration. Correggio, who became Lazzarelli's religious teacher, traveled throughout Italy presenting himself as an apocalyptic reformer and even a second Christ, pretensions that led to a brief imprisonment in Florence by Lorenzo de' Medici. Nevertheless, Correggio and Lazzarelli both were able to secure aristocratic patronage for their pursuits. Lazzarelli's ambitions culminated in his *Crater Hermetis*, a bold synthesis of Christianity and hermetic philosophy in which he claimed the role of a semi-divine hermetic master. Hanegraaff and Bouthoorn's edition surveys the biblical, alchemical, and kabbalist sources that shaped Lazzarelli's *Crater Hermetis*, as well as his other hermetic writings. Their footnotes to the edition also offer a useful running commentary on the texts.

Hanegraaff and Bouthoorn's main arguments—first, that Lazzarelli is central to hermeticism and, second, that he undermines Yates's paradigm—seem justified. Unfortunately, the authors briskly dispatch with Yates's progressive “grand narrative” of hermeticism, rather than laying out their objections to her analysis in detail (the thrust of their counterargument is summarized in a footnote on page 103). Likewise, they state that hermeticism played a larger role in Lazzarelli's writings than in those of Ficino, Bruno, and other humanists favored by Yates (they note that such figures should not even be classified as hermeticists), but the authors do not provide any evidence to persuade the reader. Hanegraaff and Bouthoorn also assume a high level of knowledge of kabbalist and hermetic ideas, which decreases the accessibility of the volume.

Beyond their specific response to Yates, the authors criticize historians who lionize historical figures and texts that fit into modern interpretive frameworks while ignoring those that do not. This salient point brings to mind a number of recent challenges to the scientific revolution paradigm, including those collected in Margaret J. Osler's *Rethinking the Scientific Revolution*. It seems unfortunate that Hanegraaff and Bouthoorn accuse Yates of reading history “backwards” for its premonitions of what was to come, since she is usually viewed as a champion of forgotten thinkers and non-canonical sciences over-

looked in the search for what the past got right. Nevertheless, her focus on Bruno, Ficino, and Pico della Mirandola has enhanced their reputations while Lazzarelli languishes in obscurity (at least for now). Perhaps this book, along with other new scholarship on the hermetic poet, will one day elevate him to the Renaissance pantheon. (Leah DeVun, Texas A&M University, University of Wisconsin-Madison)

◆ *Das Argonautika-Supplement des Giovanni Battista Pio*. Intro., ed., trans., and com. by Beate Kobusch. Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium, 60. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 2004. 58.50 euros. In her dissertation, Beate Kobusch deals with one example of the *supplementa*-literature whose popularity in early modern times is only slowly finding resonance in recent scholarship. Her rich book offers one fine example, the supplement to Valerius Flaccus' unfinished *Argonautica* written by the Bolognese humanist Giovanni Battista Pio. The edition is mostly based on the *editio princeps*, Bologna, 1519 (**b**), which was supervised by the author himself. Several later editions from the sixteenth through the early nineteenth centuries do not offer many textual variants, a fact that makes the editor's work easy. Kobusch has chosen not to print the text of **b** in a diplomatic edition but to unify the orthography according to the rules for classical Latin texts. *Hoc loco*, the pros and cons of this decision cannot be discussed in general, although I think that in the case of a textual witness which is so closely tied to the author, it would have been better to stick to the Latin of the *editio princeps* (Kobusch briefly discusses this possibility on 194 f). For the rest, the edition is in general carefully prepared, and the few conjectures (9,171; 9,348; 9,351; 10,148; 10,579) seem to be justified. The edition is flanked by a German prose translation and an *apparatus fontium* which lists all parallels in ancient Latin literature (some of them must surely be judged as coincidental); on the other hand we do not find any references to earlier humanistic poets. In her commentary, Kobusch mostly deals with the reception of the Greek epos by Apollonios Rhodios and the Valerius Flaccus-text, but also offers links to other ancient texts dealing with the topic. Personally, I think the commentary, which retells great parts of the text in order to explain the parallels and differences, could be shortened and thus concentrated on the important aspects of Pio's literary technique; the existing general introduction about Pio as *imitator Apollonii et Valerii* would have allowed Kobusch to skip some less significant passages. Nevertheless, she offers her own inter-

pretation based on her close reading of the text, which adds much useful information to the reader's analysis.

Before her edition, Kobusch gives an introduction (13-196), but this section is surely not adequate for this part and suits the second half (118-196) only, in which she informs the reader about the literary tradition of the *Argonautica*-topic and about Pio's own work on Valerius (besides his creative reception, he also published a commentary on the ancient text). On pp. 13-117, however, she presents a biographical sketch of Pio's life and his dependence on the humanistic culture of his time which should better be called a second short monograph, as it is not always in logical coherence with the edition. But these one hundred pages are by far the best you can read today about Pio in general. Having said this, let me admit that not all chapters convince the reader equally. For reasons of space I must limit myself to selected critical remarks: The overview of the humanist quarrel about imitation or style and Pio's own position towards this question is divided into two chapters (1.3. and 1.10), which forces Kobusch to become repetitive; at the end of her book (5.2), where she takes up again the language and style of the *supplementum*, she comes back to the same point, showing that Pio has opted for a traditional *aemulatio Vergili*—but why does she insist, then, on “apuleianism” as Pio's stylistic ideal (1.3)? Her attempt to combine the two observations by proving Pio's “Interesse für außerkanonische Autoren” (620) with his reception of Lucan, Statius, and Silius is not convincing—all three (with only a slight exception in the case of the last) are frequently used by humanistic poets and should not be excluded from the canon (actually, they were not until the late nineteenth century). Here, it would have been much more interesting to read Kobusch's opinion on a problem not yet solved concerning humanist poetics, namely that poetical theory and practice do not always coincide (a fact which she herself hints at; cfr. 64-67). Chapter 1.4 (Pio as humanist, 31-34) does not really bring the discussion forward, either. Kobusch's effort to define the term *humanista* follows the old idealistic view of the Renaissance (the humanists wanted “durch die Begegnung mit der Antike dem Menschen zum wahren Menschen verhelfen”; cfr. 32 f.), definitely marking too drastic a break with the Middle Ages (education for the “Mensch ohne eigenen Spielraum” in a transcendental world, 32). Later on, Kobusch convincingly shows with the example of Pio himself how dependent the career of a humanist was on the political and cultural discourse of his time, and surely

these circumstances should not be forgotten when we deal with the reception of antiquity in early modern times, which was much less idealistic and (at least for the great majority of intellectuals) a strategy to manage their own lives.

Much could still be said about Kobusch's book, which has a great many unquestionable merits. If I have concentrated on just a few concerns, it is because of the purpose and the restrictions of a review, which is in a way also a *supplementum*: without the book to review, it would not exist, either. (Christoph Pieper, Leiden University)

◆ *Nicolaus Scutellius, O.S.A., as Pseudo-Pletho: The Sixteenth-Century Treatise Pletho in Aristotelem and the Scribe Michael Martinus Stella*. By John Monfasani. Istituto Nazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento, Quaderni di "Rinascimento," 41. Florence: Olschki, 2005. x + 182 pp., 7 b/w plates. 19 euros. This book is actually two works, having their connection by way of a manuscript. Two-thirds of the book concerns Nicolaus Scutellius' writing entitled *Pletho in Aristotelem*. The last third of the book considers the late Renaissance scribe Michael Martinus Stella, whose copy of Scutellius' work is one of two extant manuscripts of it. Prof. Monfasani, a renowned authority on Renaissance thought and the Greek influence upon it, is a careful editor, the apparatus is thorough, and the nine appendices provide detailed descriptions of the manuscripts and further information on Scutellius and Stella.

Nicolaus Scutellius (1490-1542) was a member of the Order of St. Augustine and spent much of his career with Giles of Viterbo. His work here is one of several on Pletho and Neoplatonists, most being translations of their writings. The first part of the book contains a survey of Scutellius' writings and an edition of his *Pletho in Aristotelem*. Prof. Monfasani reasonably argues (10) that Scutellius wrote this in the 1520s as part of the Renaissance Plato-Aristotle controversy, and in order to expand and improve upon Pletho's *De differentiis Platonis et Aristotelis* (1439). Scutellius argues that Plato is superior to Aristotle in regard to both philosophy and theology, including compatibility with Christianity, the Ideas, the immortality of the soul and its nature, virtue, physics, and other subjects. He is not original and clearly draws upon Pletho in support of the claim that there is no common ground between Plato and Aristotle.

The section on Michael Martinus Stella contains biographical information and a survey of his work. Stella was a Renaissance scribe and printer, based primarily in Basel. From 1549-52 he was in Rome copying manuscripts (including Stella's). These were sold to the Fugger family and eventually ended up in Munich. As a printer, Stella printed a variety of works, such as an *editio princeps* of Leon Battista Alberti. At some point Stella converted to Protestantism and was listed on the 1560 Index. Prof. Monfasani carefully presents information about manuscripts and editions involving Stella, most of which have no connection to Scutellius, making this an excellent source for someone interested in Stella and the career of a late Renaissance scribe.

In reviewing this book, two issues arise. The first has to do with Scutellius as "Pseudo-Pletho." On the one hand, Scutellius does draw upon arguments made by Pletho, and Plate II shows the Munich manuscript by Stella clearly having the title *Pletho in Aristotelem* written across the top. On the other hand, Plate III shows that on f. 175v of the Vienna manuscript there is no title, but only a short prefatory statement by the anonymous scribe and then the work by Scutellius. Prof. Monfasani says that on f. 175r of the Vienna manuscript there is a table of contents which was probably not by either the scribe or Scutellius, and it is clear that the chapter headings in the table vary considerably from those actually given by the scribe in the manuscript. Also, both the Munich and the Vienna manuscripts contain two other works by Scutellius, one being a summary paraphrase of Pletho's *De differentiis*. Since this is in an appendix, we see that Scutellius refers to Pletho as George Gemistus, not Pletho. Since Prof. Monfasani says (17) that the scribe of the Vienna manuscript is more reliable than Stella, this raises the question of whether the title *Pletho in Aristotelem* was actually given by Scutellius or was added later either by Stella or someone else. Stella, or any scribe, would certainly get more for a work with Pletho's name in the title than Scutellius's.

If the work is read without the title, rather than being a "Pseudo-Pletho," it appears that Scutellius is setting forth in a general work all the arguments he can in support of Plato over Aristotle, some of which come from Pletho. If Scutellius was "the most competent Hellenist and Neoplatonic scholar in the circle of Giles of Viterbo" (16), it is surprising he is not influenced by Bessarion or Neoplatonic approaches. He does not attempt to reconcile Plato and Aristotle, and passes over much since Bessarion's *In calumniatorem Platonis* of 1469, including his own translation of Proclus in 1520. By the 1520s Platonism

was not going to displace Aristotelianism or Nominalism in Catholic theology and philosophy, and by following Pletho's eighty-year-old model, Scutellius is writing in a way which the controversy itself had left behind.

A second issue has to do with the Order of St. Augustine during a crucial era. The most famous member of the Order at the time is, of course, Martin Luther. Scutellius should have had a decent understanding of the challenge Luther posed and how the leaders were responding since, as part of the group around Giles of Viterbo, he moved in the highest circles of the Order. Giles of Viterbo had been General of the Augustinians from 1506-18, and even after 1518 was a leading figure in the Order, being the Bishop of Viterbo, a cardinal, and the papal legate to Spain. With such a patron, one wonders what Scutellius is doing writing on the Plato-Aristotle controversy at all. In the 1520s the Augustinians are in the process of losing all of their German provinces to Protestantism, so one would expect their leaders to have other concerns than the relative merits of Plato over Aristotle. Prof. Monfasani points out that Scutellius was concerned about Luther, and perhaps in his forthcoming study of Scutellius (indicated on 105) he will discuss this. Here, *Pletho in Aristotelem* leaves us with an image akin to Pliny the Younger studying Livy while Mt. Vesuvius erupts in the background. (Bruce McNair, Campbell University)

◆ *Filippo Beroaldo l'Ancien—Filippo Beroaldo il Vecchio. Un passeur d'humanités – Un umanista ad limina.* By Silvia Fabrizio-Costa and Frank La Brasca. *Leia*, Liminaires-Passages interculturels italo-ibériques, Université de Caen, 5. Bern: Peter Lang, 2005. 192 pp. \$43.95. In 2005 an entire issue of the University of Caen's journal *Leia* was devoted to Filippo Beroaldo the Elder. It contains a series of eight articles, written between 1989 and 2004 by Silvia Fabrizio-Costa and Frank La Brasca. As a common theme, the book sets out to demonstrate how this little-studied provincial humanist, who belongs more to an illustrious jurists' circle than to a recognized humanistic or literary one, played an important role in the intellectual development of his day as what might be called a 'facilitator of the humanities.'

Examining the contents of his letters, the breadth of his correspondence, his translators, and his pupils, the authors succeed in painting a much richer portrait than that sketched by E. Garin and E. Raimondi in 1974. The articles are richly documented, with an appended index of letters, carefully studied

manuscripts, and letters edited with original text (17-21; 49) supported by facsimile manuscripts or printed Renaissance texts (22-28). On pp. 107-9, for example, the authors propose two catalogues, one bibliographical of the *De foelicitate*, collating manuscripts from the Library of Congress, the British Library, and the Bibliothèque nationale de France, and the other a French translation catalogue of Beroaldo's works. All the classical literature quoted by Beroaldo (e.g., Apuleius's *The Golden Ass*) is quoted in the original (126-32), together with the respective prefaces (147-50).

In short, this collection of articles delineates a very modern thinker and a pivotal intellectual figure in the scientific heyday of the Renaissance era.

Although the book is both helpful and well documented, extracts are simply quoted and the authors address themselves to the 'informed reader,' giving neither translations of the Latin or Italian texts nor indications of where these may be found (if indeed they exist). In the absence of any such aids to better understanding, while we must concur with their expressed hope that the volume will be helpful to an erudite readership (XII), we also understand the authors' somewhat diffident dedication of their work to their children, "who will probably never read one of these lines." In our field, if we are to attract readers, perhaps heavier emphasis should be placed on modern, readable translations. (Florence Bistagne, Marseille, France)

◆ *Das Carmen Bucolicum des Antonio Geraldini*. Intro., ed., trans., and com. by Sigrun Leistriz. Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium, 61. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2004. 276 pp. 28 euros. The *Carmen bucolicum* is the most successful work of the Italo-Hispanic humanist and *poeta laureatus* Antonio Geraldini. Published in 1485 and printed several times until 1597 in the German-speaking part of Europe, the poem was written originally as an educational work for Alfonso d'Aragon, illegitimate son of the Aragonese King Ferdinand, who was ordained Archbishop of Saragossa at the age of thirteen. Within the *Carmen bucolicum*, the author presents the New Testament story of the life and sufferings of Christ in a sequel of twelve Virgilian eclogues evoking the most important stations in the life of Jesus through dialogues partly between biblical protagonists, partly between protagonists of the pastoral world. Apart from the edition of Wilfred P. Mustard (Baltimore, 1924), this volume of Sigrun Leistriz presents the first modern edition of this interesting text.

The book consists of three parts. In an introductory section (11-49), Leistritz offers a short but instructive survey of Geraldini's life between Italian humanistic circles, the Catholic church, and the Spanish court as well as his widespread contact with Italian humanists (11-25) and his published and unpublished works (25-31). (The humanist network of Antonio Geraldini and his relationship to high-ranking personalities of his age have been comprehensively addressed in the dissertation of M. Früh, *Antonio Geraldini († 1488). Leben, Dichtung und soziales Beziehungsnetz eines italienischen Humanisten am aragonesischen Königshof. Mit einer Edition seiner "Carmina ad Iohannem Aragonum,"* Diss. Marburg 2003 (Münster, 2005)). Turning to the *Carmen bucolicum*, Leistritz then provides an accurate description of the extant printings of the text (she does not mention the Spanish edition (Salamanca, 1505), which is listed in Früh's study, p. 53). Furthermore, she points out the interdependence between the editions, in which she takes into account, apart from their chronological order, the recurrence or non-recurrence of certain paratexts such as the author's personal epigram, which precedes the text of the *Carmen bucolicum* in the *editio princeps* (Rome, 1485), or a letter of recommendation of a later editor as well as the congruence and disparity of orthographical variants (32-49). The results of the comparisons are documented in a *stemma editionum*, which allows a concise survey of the relationships between the printed editions. It clearly shows that the Leipzig editions of Jacob Thanner (1510) and Martin Landsberg (1511) are derived from the first German edition of Thomas Anselmus (Pforzheim, 1507) and that the later sixteenth-century printings are either derived from the Thanner or the Landsberg edition; thus, the textual history of the *Carmen bucolicum* establishes that the German editors had absolutely no interest in producing a text in accordance with the author's aims, but preferred to reprint (perhaps for financial reasons) any edition they had at hand.

The introductory part of the book is followed by an edition of the twelve eclogues of the *Carmen bucolicum* and a precise and fluent translation of the difficult Latin text and useful explanatory notes on geographical, historical, and mythological details (51-163). In her edition of the text, Leistritz radically adopts modern punctuation as well as the classical Latin orthography. This is a difficult decision every editor of neo-Latin texts is concerned with: On the one hand, the classical orthography makes access to the text easier for a modern reader trained in the reading of classical texts. On the other hand, the

historical orthography can also be regarded as a part of the neo-Latin text (rooted in the conventions of medieval manuscripts, a neo-Latin author did not spell *mibi* but *michi* and not *ratio* but *ratio*) which is lost when the classical orthography is used. In the constitution of the text, Leistritz principally follows the *editio princeps* (Rome, 1485), replacing evident misprints as well as grammatical and semantic errors. The edition of the text is furnished by two apparatuses containing (a) the divergences of the printed editions (including orthographical variants) and (b) *similia* from ancient and neo-Latin literature and from the Bible. The critical apparatus in particular is a considerable improvement on the edition of Mustard, who completely omitted any documentation for the constitution of his text. Nevertheless, it should be kept in mind that the *editio princeps* of Eucharius Silber (Rome, 1485) was authorized by Geraldini himself (45). For this reason, the textual situation of the *Carmen bucolicum* is quite different from the textual situation of any ancient work insofar as the variants in later printings are not at the same level as the text of Eucharius Silber's edition. This causes the problem that any change of Eucharius Silber's text is somehow a correction of the author's own version. If, for example, a later printer or a modern editor corrects grammatical errors in an authorized text (replacing, e.g., Ecl. 2.39, *sine mater* by *sine matre*), this is, in a way, a distortion of the original (even if the author, which is likely in the *editio princeps* of the *Carmen bucolicum*, never saw the print settings). One should also take into account that the early fifteenth-century German editions were primarily produced for scholarly use. Therefore, the German printers sometimes tend to simplify Geraldini's text (e.g., Martin Landsberg prints 1.30 *causas* instead of *ansas*; 7.19 *in orto* for *in herbo*; 7.42 *ab atro* for *opaco*). Thus, the later printings of the *Carmen bucolicum* are documents for the reception of the text rather than instruments for its constitution.

The third part of Leistritz's study is about the literary context, the interpretation, and the reception of the *Carmen bucolicum* (164-249). Leistritz gives a survey of the history of the pastoral in ancient, early medieval, and Renaissance literature (164-84) that is concise, even if it is also quite close to the monographs of B. Effe and G. Binder, *Antike Hirtendichtung. Eine Einführung*, 2nd edn. (Düsseldorf – Zürich, 2001), and W. L. Grant, *Neo-Latin Literature and the Pastoral* (Chapel Hill, 1965). She then places Geraldini's *Carmen bucolicum* within the traditions of ancient and early Christian literature, adds some general remarks on the poem such as the presumed addressees, the language of

the poem, and recurrent motifs within the eclogues (e.g., the metaphors of light and darkness, exhortations for the praise of God, the protreptic character of the eclogues, panegyric passages), and provides an instructive summary of the contents of the single poems (185-214). These general remarks are followed by a closer examination of three eclogues (Ecls. 1, 3, and 12: pp. 215-38). Especially her analysis of the third eclogue, a dialogue between Joseph and Mary about the loss of their son who is later recovered in the temple of Jerusalem, shows convincingly that the purpose of the poem is highly didactic insofar as the dramatic and playful character of the dialogue makes access to the biblical topics easier for the juvenile addressee of the poem, and that, for this reason, the eclogue (as well as the other eclogues of the collection) has very little to do with its Vergilian models. In a final chapter, Leistriz deals with the author's motifs for the composition of the eclogues and the reception of Geraldini's work in the German-speaking part of Europe (239-49). She points out that Geraldini's purpose is mainly a didactic one and that the *Carmen bucolicum* was originally meant to strengthen the Catholic faith in the era of *reconquista*, granting it its success in Germany's Catholic section of the population in the era of Reformation. To sum up, Leistriz's new edition not only allows a convenient access to an interesting example for the adoption and transformation of ancient bucolic poetry, but also to a first-class document for the Christian employment of ancient models in fifteenth-century Europe. (Claudia Schindler, Eberhard-Karls-Universität, Tübingen, Germany)

◆ *Expositions of the Psalms*. Ed. by Dominic Baker-Smith. Trans. and annotated by Emily Kearns, Michael J. Heath, and Carolinne White. Collected Works of Erasmus, 64. Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 2005. xvi + 416 pp. \$150. This is the second of three volumes devoted to Erasmus's expositions of the psalms. The four *conciones*, or addresses designed to spur their hearers to action, were composed between August of 1528 and February of 1531, presenting a moderate and conciliatory stance at a time when theological reconciliation seemed to be an ever-more-elusive goal.

The first of the four psalm expositions treated here is the one to Psalm 85, which was completed by August of 1528. In Erasmus's view the psalm "portrays for us the victory of Christ, the overthrow of Satan, and the de-

struction of idolatry” (3). Unlike earlier expositors like Augustine, Erasmus emphasizes the mystical, moral, and tropological senses of the psalm, interpreting human suffering as referring to Christ and his followers and wickedness as relevant to the Jews, to non-Christians, and to those who are Christian in name only. The exposition of Psalm 22/3 is in some ways disappointing, for the psalm is one of the key texts in Christianity and Erasmus’s exposition of it was written for Thomas Boleyn, the father of Anne, at a time when her marriage to Henry VIII of England was under threat. The *enarratio triplex* developed here, in which the ‘P’ of the psalm is referred at first to Christ, then the church, and finally the individual, is the most interesting part of the work. The exposition to Psalm 33 also develops Erasmus’s ideas about the relationship between literal and allegorical truth.

The *Utilissima consultatio de bello Turcis inferendo*, published shortly after Sultan Suleiman abandoned his siege of Vienna in October 1529, begins with an exposition of Psalm 28/9, but Scriptural exegesis plays a relatively minor role in what is essentially a political tract. Erasmus reads the psalm as a hymn to God’s omnipotence in which the Turks simply serve as the latest in a series of divine warnings that go all the way back to the plagues of Exodus. The idea that military action without reconciliation to God is unlikely to succeed is one that Erasmus had put forth before, but here it unfolds in response to Luther’s writings on the Turkish threat, which began by arguing against resistance to the scourges of God, then ended in a justification for a defensive war. In the end Erasmus’s position is similar to Luther’s, in that both counter the revival of the old crusading spirit with a call to spiritual and moral reformation which looks tepid indeed in comparison to many of the other proposals of the day.

A number of key ideas emerge in these works. One of the most interesting is a sort of double justification formula that recognizes both the received righteousness of faith and the synergistic operation of that faith through love. The formula appears in the exposition to Psalm 22 and is developed further in the treatment of Psalm 33, where Erasmus develops “a striking corporal image in which the bones are faith, the sinews are love, and the flesh is good works, which are inseparable from faith and love” (xiii). Erasmus’s position toward violence in pursuit of orthodoxy is also striking in the context of the Turkish threat, where the emphasis is placed on the need to face first the enemy within. Luther’s passivity against the Turks as the scourge of God is rejected, but so is the idea that death in a war against the infidel offers instant

absolution. In both cases, Erasmus's constant preoccupation is with rediscovering the spiritual dimension of Christianity that carries the believer through outward signs and ceremonies to the personal encounter with God through prayer. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Les lettres authentiques à Nicolas Heinsius (1649-1672). Une amitié érudite entre France et Hollande.* By Jean Chapelain. Ed., introd., and annotated by Bernard Bray. Bibliothèque des correspondances, mémoires et journaux, 22. Paris: Honoré Champion Éditeur. 588 pp. 63 euros. In the third quarter of the seventeenth century, Jean Chapelain, a Frenchman prominent in the political and cultural life of his day, engaged in a lengthy correspondence with Nicolas Heinsius, who held a series of political appointments but is better known today for his scholarly activities. Heinsius wrote in Latin, in a style that was much praised in his day, discussing his scholarly and diplomatic work, his bibliographical activities, his health, his pleasures, and his disappointments. Chapelain responded in French, as a participant in the same community, discussing the newest publications, disputes among the learned, their travels and their interests, and what was happening in military and political affairs. Heinsius's letters do not survive, but Chapelain's do, and it is this latter group that is published here. For readers of this journal, the result is a bit curious at first glance—the letters in Latin on which we would normally concentrate are conspicuous by their absence—but the republic of letters crossed linguistic as well as political boundaries, and there is much of interest here.

Chapelain's letters abound with references to the scholarly world of his day, and they are valuable as well for the light they shed on the life and works of Heinsius. But as Bray notes, they also paint a portrait in words: "la personnalité de leur auteur apparaît ici dans une plus vive lumière que dans les textes publiés jusqu'à présent. Ces lettres ont donc l'intérêt, non seulement d'éclairer de l'intérieur la société des 'doctes', hommes et travaux, où les deux correspondants trouvaient l'occasion de leur dialogue et de fondement de leur amitié, mais plus encore de révéler, mis au jour par le pouvoir génétique de l'écriture épistolaire, le tempérament sensible d'un écrivain que seul l'amour des lettres a pu conduire à dessiner, sans y prendre garde, son autoportrait" (28).

These letters are also of special interest to historians of the French language, for they offer a strikingly rich vocabulary, filled with archaisms and rare words imported from the Greek and Latin environment of the discourse

they carry. Chapelain wrote in French, but he often chose to create French words out of Heinsius's Latin rather than spend time searching for the right equivalents in more common use. Latin also creeps into these letters through proverbs as well as a common cultural ground, both linguistic and cultural in a more general sense. Bray has modernized Chapelain's usage to conform with the norms of the series in which the book appears, but the changes are focused on capitalization, abbreviations, and punctuation. The text is annotated, not in the sense of a full commentary, but as a way to clarify what Chapelain is writing about, so that the brief notes explain historical events, now-forgotten individuals, and bibliographical references. Each letter also contains a cross-reference to the partial earlier edition of Philippe Tamizey de Larroque from the end of the nineteenth century.

In the end it would have been nice to have Heinsius's half of the correspondence, but what we have make a good read nevertheless. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *The Epic of America: An Introduction to Rafael Landívar and the Rusticatio Mexicana*. By Andrew Laird. London: Duckworth, 2006. viii + 312 pp. \$70. Latinists, Laird observes at the outset, are liable to take "Latin literature" to refer exclusively to Roman literature, thereby ruling out a vast treasury of Renaissance, Baroque, and Enlightenment writings. A star example of unjustifiably neglected work is the *Rusticatio Mexicana* of Rafael Landívar, S.J. (1731-1793), a collection in dactylic hexameters of fifteen portrayals from Mexican and Guatemalan colonial life that is rich in poetic appeal and cultural significance. Laird reprints whole the hard-to-secure Latin text and English translation of Graydon W. Regenos (1948) and supplements Landívar's own notes with additional commentary. *The Epic of America* adds three other compositions, all translated: a funeral for a benefactor of the Jesuits, surprisingly embellished with classical rather than scriptural allusions; and a pair of poems, in Latin and Castilian respectively, honoring a biography of the Virgin Mary. Laird includes Landívar's key baptismal and funerary documents, again bilingually (282-83).

Part I of the book presents a prologue ("Landívar, Latin and Colonialism") and three "essay studies" on classical culture in colonial Mexico, Landívar's life and early writings, and literary examinations of the *Rusticatio*. The first study (9-30) "gives an account of the classical tradition in New Spain from the

defeat of the Aztecs in 1521 to the time of the Bourbon reforms in the mid-eighteenth century” (4). Laird recounts the institution of Latin teaching in Mexico City along with the birth of the Colegio de Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco soon after Cortez’s conquest, leading to indigenous Latinists such as Juan Badiano. Vasco de Quiroga, Fray Alonso de la Vera Cruz, Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora, and others appear en route to the “Golden Age of Mexican Latin in the 1700s” (19), the time of Landívar and other Jesuit savants such as Francisco Xavier Clavigero and Diego José Abad. The expulsion of the Jesuits from Spanish realms in 1767 sent Landívar and many of his confreres to exile in Bologna, where he completed the *Rusticatio*.

The second essay (31-42) sketches Landívar’s sparsely documented life. Son of a young Spanish nobleman and a *criolla* (daughter of Spaniards but born in the New World), he entered the novitiate at nineteen, receiving ordination five years later. He taught grammar and rhetoric, and had risen to Prefect of the Congregation at San Borja in Guatemala when the 1767 expulsion occurred. He lived out his years in Italy.

The third essay (43-75) studies the “conception and design” of the *Rusticatio*. Vergil’s *Georgics* is the model that springs ordinarily to mind. Laird observes traces of “an astonishingly wide range of Greek and Roman authors including Homer, Hesiod, Lucretius, Horace, Ovid, Lucan, Pliny, and Apuleius” as well as later writers including Petrarch, Fracastoro, and Thomas More (45). The presence of a *propositio* (what material the poet will discuss), alongside an *invocatio* to a Christian or pagan personage (Apollo, Mary, etc.) at book-openings, establishes “a dialectic between ... the intellectual discourse of science and natural history, and the artistic and more subjective discourse of poetry” (57). Numerous other valuable observations follow.

Regenos’s Latin text is a corrected version of the faulty second Bologna edition of 1782, “although one or two new errors [which Laird emends] have crept in” (96). The translation “taken as a whole” is “highly readable” (96). Laird’s praise for Regenos’s work is richly merited (“the first attempt to present a major work of American Hispano-Latin literature to an English readership,” 96).

Laird has created a timely starting point for use by others who wish to understand the role of Landívar and his writings in New World Spanish colonialism, a field whose analysis Laird mainly leaves to others. (“[T]he sustained application of political or ethnohistorical criticism to particular works is

not so easy to accomplish,” 7; cf. 74). Antony Higgins’ *Constructing the Criollo Archive* (Lafayette, IN, 2002), cited by Laird, is a nice companion to *The Epic of America*, explicating the *Rusticatio* as a *criollo* voice; as Laird notes and Higgins would agree, “Oppositions and differences between Europe and America may have led to the conception and creation of Landívar’s work, but the resulting text does not belong to either continent” (74).

The lavish, ten-page Bibliography opens numberless avenues. I offer three additions: Hans Gadow, *Jorullo; the History of the Volcano of Jorullo and the Reclamation of the Devastated District by Animals and Plants* (Cambridge [Eng.], 1930), for *Rusticatio*, Book Two; W. Michael Mathes, *The America’s [sic] First Academic Library: Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco* (Sacramento, CA, 1985), including a catalogue of books surviving from the Colegio de Santa Cruz and associated institutions; and Arnold Kerson’s 1963 Yale dissertation, *Rafael Landívar and the Latin Literary Currents of New Spain in the Eighteenth Century*, which deserves inclusion with his other cited works.

The Epic of America belongs at the top of any list of neo-Latin texts from or about the New World. (Edward V. George, Texas Tech University (Emeritus))

◆ *Renaissance Rhetoric Short-Title Catalogue 1460-1700*. By Lawrence D. Green and James J. Murphy. 2nd edn. Aldershot, Hants and Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate Publishing, 2006. xxxvi + 467 pp. \$99.95. This is an enlarged, much improved version of James J. Murphy’s *Renaissance Rhetoric: A Short-Title Catalogue of Works on Rhetorical Theory from the Beginning of Printing to A.D. 1700, with Special Attention to the Holdings of the Bodleian Library, Oxford* (New York and London, 1981), drawing as well on Professor Green’s *Rhetoric 1500-1700* in the *Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*, 3rd edn. (Cambridge, forthcoming). RRSTC “provides a comprehensive list of primary printed sources for the study of Renaissance rhetorical theory in Europe and America from the onset of printing to the year 1700. The RRSTC now presents 1,717 authors and 3,842 rhetorical titles in 12,325 printings, published in 310 towns and cities by 3,340 printers and publishers from Finland to Mexico” (xi). As such, it is a monumental achievement.

For someone who has not worked in Renaissance rhetoric or tried to do an enumerative bibliography of early printed books, it is easy to underestimate what has been accomplished here. The project is complicated enor-

mously by the very success of the humanist movement, which managed to saturate early modern culture so thoroughly with rhetorical principles and teachings that it is surprisingly difficult even to draw the boundaries for a retrospective bibliography. The editors state that the “basic criterion for inclusion in RRSTC is that a given work purports to offer preceptive advice for the preparation and delivery of future discourse, or to offer analytical study intended or used for the same purposes” (xvi). So, preaching and letter writing are in, as are works of rhetorical criticism (e.g., Ramus’s *praelectiones* to Cicero’s speeches). Cicero’s speeches are out, but commentaries that delineate rhetorical principles are in. Treatises on the composition of poetry are out, except when they shade into rhetorical *elocutio*; similarly treatises that address systematic or analytical logic are out, but those that shade into rhetorical invention are in. One suspects that in a good number of cases, such distinctions become hard to make, but this is only one problem that Green and Murphy had to overcome. Just as challenging is the fact that to a large extent, this bibliography, like any other, reflects the strengths and weaknesses of its sources. The National Union Catalogue, for example, remains a fundamental source, but it was compiled by reproducing cards from American libraries and is therefore only as accurate as the cataloguing practices at those libraries allow. There are no common conventions even among Anglophone bibliographers, let alone their counterparts in other countries, for names and titles. If the field were smaller, this would not be such a big problem, but with almost two thousand authors and almost four thousand titles, bibliographical minefields abound.

In the face of obstacles like these, there are a few places where a reviewer can quibble. Green and Murphy admit that their bibliography is strong regarding editions from England, France, Germany, Italy, and the Low Countries, but less so regarding books from Spain, Latin America, eastern and northern Europe, and Russia. It is true that online resources for these latter areas lag behind the U.S. and western Europe, but old-fashioned methods like corresponding with librarians still produce good results. Not accenting Greek is barbaric, and while Renaissance practice in this area may indeed have been erratic (xxii), this is a modern work that should rest in modern scholarship. Finally, Green and Murphy have taken considerable care in slaying bibliographical ghosts, not, for example, being content to list books from questionable secondary sources if they couldn’t actually find a copy themselves. They

have visited in person a small group of libraries, mostly the obvious suspects like the British Library and the Bibliothèque nationale de France, but also including a couple of well-chosen, less obvious ones like the Biblioteka Jagiellońska in Kraków, Poland and the Zentralbibliothek in Zürich, Switzerland. But this has the effect, unfortunately, of privileging the very libraries whose holdings are in most cases the most accessible, which can produce a somewhat misleading picture. If a particular book survives in only one or two copies, and those copies are in the British Library and Oxford, the book can look important, but if the same book survives in two minor provincial libraries, it can disappear completely off the edge of the bibliographical radar screen.

One could quibble about such things, but one shouldn't. This is an excellent work which already suggests how our working assumptions about Renaissance rhetoric change when we begin asking seriously who had access to what and when they had it, information that can only be gotten by tracking the early editions that early modern readers used. Green and Murphy suggest, for example, that the influence of Susenbrotus's summary of the schemes and tropes must be overrated because there simply aren't enough copies in all of Europe, much less in England only, to produce the effects attributed to it. They have similarly solved the problem of the National Union Catalogue's "Lugduni, 1643" imprint of Farnaby's *Index rhetoricus*, which is otherwise restricted to a London-Amsterdam printing axis that makes sense given its English school market: this edition turns out to be a false imprint that was actually printed in Cambridge, which makes much more sense. Knowledgeable users of the RRSTC will clarify many similar things. I should also note that this project can serve as a model for how to prepare an enumerative bibliography at the beginning of the twenty-first century. On-line data bases and library catalogues with remote computer access have increased immeasurably the information that can be uncovered, and the introduction to this book provides an excellent list of what is available now. I am preparing a similar work myself on a Latin poet and did not find a single key source in my repertoire that had not been used here.

In short, this is a first-rate scholarly resource, one that should be in the library of every neo-Latinist with a serious interest in rhetoric. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Alaudae: ephemeridis nova series, fasciculus primus*. Ed. by Anna Elissa Radke. *Noctes Neolatinae / Neo-Latin Texts and Studies*, 5. Hildesheim, Zürich, New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 2005. x + 199 pp. 39.80 euros. It must be said at the outset that this is a strange little book. It takes its title from a periodical published by Carolus Henricus Ulrichs between 1889 and 1895 and devoted to the revival of the Latin language. Radke's goal is more modest—to ensure for Latin one voice among many—but she has gone back to Ulrichs' title for her own collection of ephemera. This collection had its birth in a conference organized by the editor some time ago in Poland, with the idea of bringing together poets who write in Latin and philologists who could comment on their work. In the end, however, only one of the critical works is focused on a living neo-Latin poet. The result is a book that is indeed devoted completely to neo-Latin culture, but in which the first half consists of essays on neo-Latin poets from as far back as the fifteenth century and the second half contains Latin poetry composed by living Latin writers.

Part I, entitled “Vorträge über neulateinische Autoren / Acroases de poetis recentioribus Latinis,” begins with Alfons Weische's “Angelus Camillus Decembrio quomodo inter varias observationes demonstrat substantiva officio poetico epithetorum fungi posse,” a study of Decembrio's poetics that focuses on details of usage, closing with a useful bibliography of recent work on Decembrio. Wolfgang Hübner, “De Pontani Uraniae prooemio,” offers a study of fifteenth-century astronomy that centers on the most talented of the learned poets in this area, Ioannes Iovianus Pontanus. In “L'Esprit et l'Art – Matthieu Casimire Sarbiewski et ses Epigrammes,” Elwira Buszewicz analyzes the theory and practice of the Polish Horace, Sarbiewski, in the epigram, a part of his work that has not received the attention it deserves. In deference to Silesia, the location of the conference from which much of the material in this volume derives, Joanna Rostropowicz turns to “Die lateinischen Gedichte Georgs III., Graf von Oppersdorff aus Oberglogau,” showing that these little-read neo-Latin poems by a refined local ruler reflect well the culture of the time and place in which they were produced. Next we get the opening address to this conference, “Vortrag, gehalten auf der Tagung ‘Antike Traditionen in der Kultur Schlesiens’ (21.-24.11.99) in Kamińsk (bei Opole, Polen) vor polnischen Philologen, Historikern und Archäologen,” in which Anna Elissa Radke traces connections between Latin and the vernacular, secular and sacred, in the literary culture of the region. In “De novis Angliae

scriptoribus neolatinis,” David Money confirms that good neo-Latin poetry (as well as good criticism about it) continues to be written in the United Kingdom, while Walter Wimmel presents a short analysis of one of Radke’s poems in “Pädagogische Lenkung als Sonderfall dichterischer Wortmacht. Interpretation eines Gedichtes von Anna Elissa Radke.”

Part II, entitled “Neuere neulateinische Dichter / Poetae Neolatini recentiores,” offers a hundred pages of shorter Latin poems by Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, Manfred Hoffmann, Thomas Lindner, Gerd Allesch, Karin Zeleny, David Money, Alain Van Dievoet, Martin Rohacek, Dirk Sacré, Tuomo Pekkanen, Winfried Czapiewski, and Anna Elissa Radke. The authors come from several countries—Germany, Austria, the United Kingdom, Belgium, and Finland—and demonstrate control of an impressive variety of poetic forms, ranging from alcaics and elegiac couplets to hymns and odes. Among many that could be singled out, there is this haiku of Dirk Sacré’s (145):

Advesperascit.
Ingruunt (viden?) umbrae.
Nox est ... et ... est ... me.

And this rendering of a well-known Shakespearean quatrain by David Money (128):

That time of life thou mayst in me behold,
When yellow leaves, or none, or few, do hang
Upon those boughs which shake against the cold,
Bare ruined choirs where late the sweet birds sang. . . . (Sonnet 73)
Hoc tandem videas vitae venisse cadentis
Tempus, ubi auctumno pendent vel nulla colore
Iam folia arboribus vel pauca, tremescit et algens
Ramus ceu vetitae nudatum frigore sectae
Fanum qua nuper dulces cecinere volucres.

The glory of this book lies here, in the work of a group of living poets that will head out like the crested lark to which the title refers, heralding another new day, but one in which Latin verse composition still maintains a place. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Bonnensis: Proceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies*. Bonn 3-9 August 2003. General Editor, Rhoda Schnur; ed. by Perrine Galand-Hallyn, Antonio Iurilli, Craig Kallendorf, Joaquín

Pascual Barea, George Hugo Tucker, and Hermann Wiegand. *Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies*, 315. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2006. xxviii + 906 pp. \$80. This volume constitutes the proceedings of the 2003 Bonn meeting of the International Association for Neo-Latin Studies, the professional organization of record in the area, which was organized around the theme 'Latin as the International Language of Scholarship from the Renaissance to the Present.' After Stella Revard's "Presidential Address," the five plenary talks appear: C. Codoñer Merino, "La enseñanza del latín en la universidad hasta el siglo XVII"; P. Galland-Hallyn, "Quelques orientations spécifiques du lyrisme néo-Latin en France au XVI^e siècle"; A. Iurilli, "Il Latino della scienza nel dibattito italiano dei secoli XVII e XVIII"; G. H. Tucker, "Neo-Latin Literary Monuments to Renaissance Rome and the Papacy 1553-1557: Janus Vitalis, Joachim Du Bellay, and Lelio Capilupi—from Ekphrasis to Prosopopoeia"; and Hermann Wiegand, "Das Bild Kaiser Karls V. in der neulateinischen Dichtung Deutschlands."

The rest of this substantial volume is taken up with a generous selection of papers presented at the congress: J. Bedaux, "Alexander Hegius und seine Dialoge"; E. Békés, "Physiognomy in the Works of Galeotto Marzio"; E. Bernstein, "Mutianus Rufus und der Gothaer *ordo litterarius*"; A. Biergan, "Francis Bacon: *Nova Atlantis*. Eine Unterrichtssequenz im Rahmen der Begabtenförderung"; C. Bíró, "*Expositio super Cantica canticorum*. il commento inedito di Andreas Pannonius"; J. Bloemendal, "Gerardus Joannes Vossius and His *Poeticae institutiones* (1647). *Perspicuitas* for Would-Be Poets and Their Tutors?"; L. Boulègue, "Le discours médical dans la philosophie d'amour de la fin du XV^e et du débat du XVI^e siècle: de la *fascinatio* ficinienne au lieu retrouvé d'un art érotique"; S. Brown, "One Great Means of Debauching the Learned World: Learned Protestant Women and the Reformation of the Latin Language"; F. Buszewicz, "Buchanan in Poland: Facts, Questions, and Paradoxes"; J.-L. Charlet, "Problèmes de méthode et norms editoriales dans les différents types d'édition de textes latins"; D. Cheney, "Valeriano's *Hieroglyphica* and the Encyclopaedic Project"; J. Considine, "Du Cange's *Glossarium* and the History of Reading"; D. Defilippis, "La *Regio quinta Picenum sive Marchia Anconitana*, nell'*Italia illustrata* di Biondo Flavio"; L. De Grauwe, "Einheit und Vielfalt der germanischen Sprachen nach Conrad Gessner (1555, 1561) im Lichte der 'Theodistik'"; L. de Wree, "Willebrord Snellius: A Humanist Mathematician"; A. Dziuba, "Polemics against West-European Scholars in

the *Chronica Polonorum* of Maciej of Miechow (1457-1523)”; J. Eskhult, “Theological Treatises in Sweden and Germany circa 1700: Style, Phraseology, and Vocabulary”; L. Fabbri, “Giannozzo Manetti e Carlo Marsuppini: gli *Statuta* della biblioteca pubblica del Duomo di Firenze”; M. Gahtan, “Giraldi’s *Aenigmatá*”; E. Galántai, “Über den Sprachgebrauch von Petrus Ransanus anhand seiner *Epithoma rerum Hungararum*”; B. García-Hernández, “La discutida influencia de San Agustín en Descartes y su comparación con la de Plauto”; F. González Vega, “La configuración del lector en la obra gramatical de Antonio de Nebrija”; J. Groeneland, “Murder among Humanists: The Death of Murmellius (1480-1517) According to Buschius”; L. Havas, “La tradition historiographique classique et la réception d’Antonio Bonfini dans l’historiographie latino-hongroise au dix-septième siècle”; G. Holk, “Humanisten und die Neue Welt: Petrus Martyr de Angleria und Pomponius Laetus im Dialog über Weltverständnis und religiöse Vorstellungen der Ureinwohner auf Hispaniola”; L. Jankovits, “Plato and the Muses at the Danube: Platonic Philosophy and Poetry in Janus Pannonius’s *Ad animam suam*”; G. T. Jenson, “The Reception of Icelandic Literature in Neo-Latin Literary Histories”; P. Kasza, “Vom Lehrgedicht zur Wissenschaft: Der wissenschaftliche Wert jesuitischer Lehrgedichte”; G. Kecskeméti, “The Role of Neo-Latin Handbooks of Rhetoric in the Literary Theory and Practice of Early Modern Hungary”; A. L. Kerson, “The *Alexandriac* of Francisco Javier Alegre (1729-1788)”; S. Kivistö, “The Concept of Obscurity in Humanist Polemics of the Early Sixteenth Century”; C. La Charité, “La réception du *De institutione feminae christianae* (1523) de Vivès dans la France du XVI^e siècle: Pierre de Changy et Antoine Tiron”; S. Laigneau, “La mort de Cicéron chez Théodore de Bèze (*Juvenilia*): une silve entre épopée et tragédie”; J. Ledegang-Keegstra, “L’*Epistola Magistri Benedicti Passavantii* (le *Passavant*) de Théodore de Bèze: le latin macaronique en pleine forme”; A. Lesigang-Bruckmüller, “Opusculum hoc author–sibi et aliis injurius–Anglus Anglice scripserat: Englands Debatten des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts um den Sprachgebrauch in der Medezin”; I. López Calahorra, “De Virgilio a Silio Itálico como modelos de la paz en la Guerra de Granada”; M. López-Muñoz, “Carlos Borromeo, Agustín Valerio y Fray Luis de Granada ante la retórica eclesiástica”; M. Madrid Castro, “Sebastian Brant, Kommentator des Baptista Mantuanus”; R. Manchón Gómez, “La *Oratio de summo pontifice eligendo* (1513) del obispo español Pedro Flores”; D. Marsh, “Petrarch and Suetonius: The Imperial

Ideal in the Republic of Letters”; M. Mastronardi, “‘Eloquentiae urbis’. Il dialogo ‘De felicitate Ferrariae’ di Ludovico Carbonel”; I. Mastrorosa, “Le teorie del contagio alle soglie dell’età moderna: fonti classiche per la trattatistica umanistica”; F. S. Minervini, “Virgilio: un modello poetico per Bartolomeo Maranta”; L. Mitarotondo, “Scritture latine nella *paideia* etico-politica del XVII secolo”; A. Moss, “Christian Piety and Humanist Latin”; M. Mund Dopchie and S. Mund, “Les cosmographes et la connaissance du Septentrion à la Renaissance: étude comparée des descriptions de la Moscovie et de l’Islande”; C. Murphy, “Thomas Stapleton’s Latin Biography of Thomas More”; S. Murphy, “Maro mutatus in melius? Lelio Capilupi’s *Cento in feminas*”; C. Neagu, “The *Hungaria-Athila*. Nicolaus Olahus’s Formula of the *Orbis loca* and *Orbis gesta*”; K. A. Neuhausen, “De Francisci Xaverii Trips eo carmine, quod Bonnae compositum Coloniaeque a. 1683 typis excusum inscribitur LIGNUM VITAE REX ARBORUM FAGUS”; R. Niehl, “Editionsprojekt CAMENA, Heidelberg: De editionibus Neolatinis in rete elettronico instituendis”; I. Nuovo, “La riflessione sull’arte in Leon Battista Alberti”; K. Pajorin, “Esposizione mitologica e metodo scolastico nel *De laboribus Hercules* del Salutati”; S. Reisner, “Rudolf I. als historisches Paradigma in der poetischen Habsburg-Panegyrik”; D. Rincón González, “Lateinische Texte auf von Luther und Melanchthon unterzeichneten Flug- bzw. Einblättern”; V. Roggen, “The Development of a Protestant Latin Bible”; G. Rossi, “Le *orationes* de Marc Antoine Muret: *humanae litterae et iurisprudencia* a confronto nella Roma del Cinquecento”; J. Sánchez Gázquez, “Aristóteles en el *Da fato et libero arbitrio* de Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda”; T. Santamaría Hernández, “La difusión del humanismo médico: el boticario Lorenzo Pérez contra los *depravata nomina* o las *demonum appellationes*”; C. Santini, “Citazioni da autori classici, icone e paradigmi ideologici, echi del momento presente nella prefazione all’*Almagestum novum* di Giovanbattista Riccioli”; P. Sartori, “Frans Titelmans e la difesa della *vetus editio* del Nuovo Testamento dalle opere di Erasmo, Faber e Valla”; S. Schreiner, “Die komische Seite der Wissenschaftlichkeit: Avenarius’ *Aelurias*, die neulateinische Übersetzung von Zachariäs Murner *in der Hölle*”; A. Steenbeek, “Lipsius’ Motive für die *Saturnales sermones*, ‘die über die Gladiatoren’”; F. Stok, “Paolo Zacchia e il lessico della psicopatologia”; S. Surdèl and H. Nellen, “Classical Philology and Early Humanism in the Low Countries: Research for *Europa Humanistica*”; H. Szabelska, “Ontologische Grundlagen der humanistischen Konzeption der Sprache als Mediums der gesellschaftlichen Kommunikation”; L. Szörenyi, “Die

Geschichtsschreibung und Gelegenheitsdichtung von György Pray”; I. Tar, “Die *Ars historica* von István Szamosközy”; N. Thurn, “Bartolomeo della Fontes *Adnotationes* in der *editio princeps* der *Argonautica* von Valerius Flaccus (Ric. Ed. R. 431)”; P. Urbanski, “Neo-Latin Drama in Seventeenth-Century Stettin”; S. Valerio, “Tradizione scientifica e polemica culturale nel *De podagra* de Antonio Galateo”; J. J. Valverde Abril, “Una notable página en la historia de la filología: los *Aristotelis politicorum libri VIII* de Ginés de Sepúlveda”; M. Verweij, “Iohannes Fevynus, a Minor Humanist from Bruges at the Crossroads between Erasmus, Vives, Marcus Laurinus, and Franciscus Craneveldius”; K. Viiding, “Zum Formengrundbestand der neulateinischen Propemptikadichtung”; and J. Waszink, “Tacitism in Holland: Hugo Grotius’s *Annales et historiae de rebus Belgicis*.”

The length of this volume alone, which is 50% greater than its predecessor from the Cambridge congress, attests to the vitality of neo-Latin studies today. The proceedings of the 2006 meeting in Budapest should be in print at about the time of the IANLS’s next meeting in Uppsala in the summer of 2009. The readers of this journal would be most welcome there. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Silva: estudios de humanismo y tradición clásica*. Ed. by Jesús M. Nieto Ibáñez and Juan Francisco Domínguez Domínguez. Vol. 5, 2006. Universidad de León, Secretariado de Publicaciones. 463 pp. This volume of *Silva*, the Spanish journal most heavily invested in neo-Latin studies, contains a substantial group of articles that will be of interest to readers of *NLN*. In “Pedro Nuñez Vela, helenista y heterodoxo: documentos nuevos,” Vicente Bécares Botas uses two autograph testaments and a codicil to shed light on a mysterious, religiously heterodox humanist whose previously unknown family history and training made it difficult to determine why he was forced into exile. Avelina Carrera de la Red’s “La rebelión de Martín Cortés según Juan Suárez de Peralta (México, 1589), una ‘catilinaria’ al estilo criollo” identifies the points of contact between the insurrection of the Spanish nobility in sixteenth-century Mexico and the Catilinarian conspiracy of 63 BC. Matilde Conde Salazar and María Victoria Fernández-Savater Martín’s “Comentaristas de la obra de César en el siglo XVII: diferentes estilos, diferentes tendencias genéricas” discusses three seventeenth-century works dedicated to Caesar with different goals: Henri de Rohan focuses on Caesar’s military virtues; Carlos de Bonnyères

on rhetorical, political, and moral comments; and Enrique de Villegas on a synthesis of what is found in the other two writers. In “La fórmula epistolográfica del saludo en las *Heroidas* de Ovidio y su recepción en las *epistulae responsoriae* humanísticas,” Manule Antonio Díaz Gito traces the reception of the salutation pattern from Ovid’s *Heroides* in the works of such humanist poets as Joannes Pierius Valerianus, Iohannes Scheprevus, Ianus Douša ‘Filius’, Marcus Alexander Bodius, and Jacobus Eyndius. Arturo Echavarren’s “Espejo de falsarios: menciones de Sinón en el teatro español del Siglo de Oro” is a fascinating study of the unexpectedly large number of references to Sinon in Spanish Golden Age theater, where he oscillates between being a positive symbol of wit and a negative symbol of treachery. In “La tradición clásica en *La pícaro Justina*,” Francisco Javier Fuente Fernández analyzes the references to the ancient world that permeate this early seventeenth-century picaresque work, showing that like everything else in the plot, antiquity moves within a world of trickery and half-truths, now being employed in a positive sense, then being parodied. “Referencias bíblicas y literatura espiritual en la obra poética de María Joaquina de Viera y Clavijo (1737-1819)” is a source study in which Victoria Galván González demonstrates that the author uses the full arsenal of resources for the Christian humanist. María de la Luz García Fleitas goes in a different direction in “Acerca de las columnas egipcias descritas por Calixeno de Rodas: carta del humanista Pedro de Valencia al pintor Pablo de Céspedes,” using the correspondence between a painter and a contemporary humanist to demonstrate their common interest in ancient Egypt. Much more general is “Comentario renacentista, cambio lingüístico y norma de estilo,” in which Felipe González Vega shows how the eclecticism and pragmatic nature of the Latin used in Renaissance commentaries encouraged the precision of meaning that eventually came to replace the abstruse, highly technical language of scholasticism. In “Un Aquiles barroco: la materia mitológica en *El monstruo de los jardines* de Calderón de la Barca,” Mónica María Martínez Sariago focuses on the episode of Achilles’ cross-dressing on Scyros, tracing various versions of the myth from antiquity to the Renaissance, then showing how the dramatist drew from his sources to integrate mythological material into the play. Jesús Paniagua Pérez extends the reach of his discussion in “Arias Montano y los ilustrados: dos ejemplares en México de sus supuestos escritos contra los jesuitas,” focusing on two copies of Arias Montano’s writings now in the Archivo General de la Nación de

México to show how the Spanish Enlightenment revisited the ideas of a writer whose work was used as justification for the expulsion of the Jesuits from Spanish territory. Finally, Antonio Serrano Cueto offers a critical edition, Spanish translation, and analysis of Martín Ivarra's *Epithalamium* (Barcelona, 1514) in "La boda de Íñigo López de Mendoza (IV duque del Infantado) e Isabel de Aragón cantada en verso latino por Martín Ivarra." Eleven books are also reviewed here.

The articles in this issue are noteworthy for showing the current reach of humanist studies in Spain. We certainly find the traditional sort of thing here, in an edition and discussion of a short poem suitable for treatment as an article rather than a book (e.g., Serrano Cueto) and in studies like that of Bécades Botas, which use archival sources to fill out what we know about a humanist of interest. But these articles are done to a consistently high standard, and several others go in more unexpected directions: Paniagua Pérez and Carrera de la Red show how the Spanish tradition offers unusually interesting possibilities for trans-Atlantic, cross-cultural study; García Fleitas suggests some of the possible connections between humanism and art; and Fuente Fernández, Echavarren, and Martínez Sariago show that the classical tradition entered Spanish vernacular literature in some very interesting ways. Now with five annual volumes in print, *Silva* joins *Humanistica Lovaniensia* and *Neulateinisches Jahrbuch* as one of the journals which every neo-Latinist needs to look at each year. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)