

NEO-LATIN NEWS

Vol. 59, Nos. 1 & 2. 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.

◆ *Classroom Commentaries: Teaching the Poetria nova across Medieval and Renaissance Europe.* By Marjorie Curry Woods. Text and Context Series, 2. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2010. xlii + 367 pp. The subject of this book is the *Poetria nova* of Geoffrey of Vinsauf, a 2000-line poem written at the beginning of the thirteenth century that teaches Latin verse composition according to rhetorical principles. It is one of several such works that were written beginning in the last third of the twelfth century: Matthew of Vendôme's *Ars versificatoria*, Geoffrey's *Documentum de modo et arte dictandi et versificandi*, Gervase of Melkley's *Ars versificaria*, John of Garland's *Parisiana poetria*, and Eberhard the German's *Laborintus*. The *Poetria nova* was far more popular than any of these other works, surviving in five times the number of manuscripts as any of the other *artes poetriae*. These treatises have been well known since the publication of Edmond Faral's *Les arts poétiques du XII^e et du XIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1924) and served collectively as the subject of a chapter in James J. Murphy's *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1974), but the sheer popularity of the *Poetria nova* has proved an impediment to the production of the monograph called for by its importance. Woods has solved this problem in the heroic, old-fashioned way, by examining most of the 220 surviving manuscripts herself. The result is the definitive study of the

Poetria nova that has been so eagerly awaited by those who have been following the years of travel and research that Woods has invested in this project.

The importance of this book lies in two areas, as indicated by the title. First Woods has chosen to focus on how the *Poetria nova* was taught rather than what it might mean in some abstract, timeless sense. This is significant because it allows her to engage both with specialists in the history of rhetoric and literary criticism as well as the growing body of research into earlier classroom practices. Work in the history of education has tended to focus on theory over practice, in part because it is easier to generalize from a few treatises that are available in modern critical editions than it is to puzzle over hundreds of pages of handwritten documents that contain the records of actual classroom practices but are notoriously difficult to gain access to and decipher. More work is being done on the level of practice, with, for example, a volume of essays being about to appear on the teaching of the classics in the Middle Ages and Renaissance (see *The Classics in the Medieval and Renaissance Classroom*, ed. J. F. Ruys, J. Ward, and M. Heyworth (Turnhout)). The *Poetria nova* is an excellent model for study from this perspective, since a quarter of the surviving manuscripts contain some glosses and half contain enough notes to show what teachers thought was important and how that material was taught. Rather surprisingly, perhaps, Woods has discovered that this same text was taught to students at all levels, from fairly young pupils near the beginning of their educational careers to university students working at advanced levels. It appears to have been taught at different levels in different areas, and to have been taught differently depending on the level of preparation of the students, but this adaptability accounted in part for the popularity of the text.

The other area of emphasis suggested in the title is the one that will be of more interest to readers of this journal. The *Poetria nova* was composed in the thirteenth century, which means that according to the cultural histories of the humanists, it should have been decisively rejected along with the other products of the despised Middle Ages. Yet the documents tell a different story: the majority of the surviving manuscripts date from the fifteenth century, which suggests that as historians of education like Robert Black have been arguing, there

was greater continuity in classroom practice between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance than the humanist educational theorists were prepared to acknowledge (see *Humanism and Education in Medieval and Renaissance Italy: Tradition and Innovation in Latin Schools from the Twelfth to the Fifteenth Century* (Cambridge, 2001). Italian humanists like Bartholomew of Pisa, Pace of Ferrara, and Gasparino Barzizza admired the *Poetria nova*, and it served as part of the curriculum through the fifteenth century at the universities of Vienna, Krakow, and Erfurt. Eventually when humanism prevailed to the extent that only classical writers became acceptable stylistic models, the *Poetria nova* passed out of popularity. But until then, it allowed early Renaissance teachers to make textual analysis into an advanced discipline. In the end, Cicero came to dominate Latin style in the Renaissance, but Woods has shown us that contrary to what we would have expected, Geoffrey of Vinsauf played a key role as well in the Latin classes of the early Renaissance. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *The Return of Lucretius to Renaissance Florence*. By Alison Brown. I Tatti Studies in Italian Renaissance History. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2010. xviii + 139 pp. \$35. While Lucretius was seldom read in the Middle Ages, the outline of his recovery in the fifteenth century has long been familiar. Rediscovered by Poggio Bracciolini in 1417, *De rerum natura* was copied in more than fifty manuscripts, then printed, with further contextualization being provided by Diogenes Laertius's biography of Epicurus. The details of this story continue to be filled out—Ada Palmer, for example, is currently drawing from her research on the manuscripts of Lucretius to update the article in the *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum*—but by this point we know a fair amount about how the text of *De rerum natura* re-entered circulation in the Renaissance.

But while we are reasonably well informed about who was reading Lucretius during this period, we know much less about how he was being read and about how he influenced the history of ideas in the Renaissance. Brown has chosen to tackle these questions in a precise, circumscribed way, beginning with the textual work of others and asking what that work might mean in Florence from the 1450s,

when *De rerum natura* began to play an important role in Florentine intellectual life, until 1516-1517, when the work was prohibited in Florentine schools. Her study focuses on three men whose close personal relationships make a shared interest in Lucretius tenable. Bartolomeo Scala developed his early interest in Lucretius along with Marsilio Ficino, but while Ficino renounced his connection to *De rerum natura* after a religious crisis, Scala continued to be attracted to Lucretius throughout his time as chancellor of Florence, drawing from the poem in the frescoes of his urban villa at Borgo Pinto and in a late poem, *De arboribus*. His successor as chancellor of Florence was Marcello Adriani, who also taught for many years at the Florentine Studio and incorporated Lucretian themes into his lectures throughout his career. Adriani's assistant in the chancery was Niccolò Machiavelli, who likewise found Lucretius's unorthodox thinking to be compatible with his own inclinations.

While it is unlikely, as Paul Oskar Kristeller pointed out long ago, that anyone in Renaissance Florence was really an atheist, some people were more pious than others and intellectual systems could be more or less orthodox. In this environment Lucretius was perceived as a real threat, for in attempting to free his readers from the fear of death, he argued that the gods did not interest themselves in human affairs. *De rerum natura* offers an explanation of how chance operated in human affairs that appealed to men like Scala, Adriani, and Machiavelli, but this explanation rested in a materialism that also denied the immortality of the soul. Even Lucretius's explanation of the emergence of civilization was uncomfortable for traditional thinkers, since it unfolds without divine guidance. It is probably no accident that the three men on whom Brown concentrates lived and worked in a secular environment and that they were not considered at the time to be particularly pious.

This is a valuable book, carefully argued and well documented, that can provide a model for other studies on the reception of classical authors among Neo-Latin writers. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Appunti per un corso sull'Odisea*. By Angelo Poliziano. Ed. by Luigi Silvano. Hellenica, 37. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 2010. CXXIV + 384 pp. 50 euros. Poet, philologist, and teacher, Angelo Poliziano (1454-1494) was one of the most renowned classical scholars of his day, widely recognized as the first man in western Europe whose knowledge of Greek was on the same level as that of the Byzantine émigrés. Poliziano taught rhetoric and poetry at the Florentine Studio from 1480 until his premature death fourteen years later. Each year he devoted one or two courses to the explication of Greek and Latin authors. Over the last forty years a series of publications have made available Poliziano's lecture notes on Ovid, Terence, Statius, Persius, Virgil, and Juvenal along with *recordationes* of his private lessons on Suetonius and other Latin authors (references to these editions can be found in my bibliography on Poliziano in the Renaissance and Reformation series for Oxford Bibliographies Online, to be launched in summer, 2010 and accessible at: <http://oxfordbibliographiesonline.com/subject/id/obo-9780195399301.1>). Poliziano's Greek teaching, however, has been less well served by modern scholarship: his introductory *prolusiones* to Aristotle and Homer have been published in critical editions, but they function more as programmatic statements than records of what actually went on in Poliziano's classroom. Paola Megna recently published an edition of Poliziano's youthful glosses on *Iliad* 2-5 (*Le note del Poliziano alla traduzione dell'Iliade* (Messina, 2009)), but the scholarly path leading to his notes on the *Odyssey* has been less direct. The manuscript in which they are contained, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Par. gr. 3069, has been known for over a century to contain these notes. The *praelectio* has been discussed by several scholars, Lucia Cesarini Martinelli studied Poliziano's grammatical sources in these lectures (1992), and F. Pontani include transcriptions of some of the notes in his larger study on Greek scholia (2007) (references on p. LX of Silvano's study). It was time, in short, for this edition to appear.

A quick glance at the eight plates between pp. LXIV and LXV suggests why no one has been in a hurry to undertake this project. Unlike with his *prolusiones*, Poliziano did not intend to publish these lectures in this form, nor were they necessarily complete: we can imagine him with these pages on his lectern along with others, from which he drew

as the occasion demanded in the kind of virtuoso performance for which he was famous. Since he alone needed to read these notes, the handwriting is worse than usual, contorted with an irregular ductus and a plethora of abbreviations, such that much of it is difficult to read and some passages have remained indecipherable. Tracing his sources also proved a nightmare, in that Poliziano was drawing from early printed editions that are very difficult to find now and sources in grammar and lexicography that are otherwise unknown. In the face of these difficulties, Silvano has produced a work of formidable erudition. His introduction, of more than 100 pages, provides information on the manuscript and its contents, discussing the structure of the presentation, its originality, its sources, and its style. Five indices offer access to readers looking for particular things: two of *lemmata*, arranged by verse and alphabetically, with others of names and *notabilia*, sources and *loci similes*, and manuscripts and annotated books. The volume concludes with a list of other books in this series, the contents of all the volumes of *Medioevo greco* that have been published to date, and a description of the *acta* in the series Quaderni that derive from conferences held by the Centro internazionale di studi sulla poesia greca e latina in età tardoantica e medievale, reminding us of the contributions to later Greek studies made by Enrico Maltese and by Edizioni dell'Orso, which has established itself as a leading outlet in this field. Congratulations to all concerned. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Annotationes in Novum Testamentum (pars quinta): In epistolam ad Galatas, ad Ephesios, ad Philippenses, ad Colossenses, ad Thessalonicenses 1-2.* By Desiderius Erasmus. Ed. by M. L. van Poll-van de Lisdonk. *Opera omnia*, VI-9. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009. xii +483 pp. 99.00 euros / \$ 99.00. This is a critical edition of Erasmus's annotations on Paul's epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Thessalonians. Van Poll-van de Lisdonk also edited the previous volume of the same 'ordo' of the Amsterdam edition of Erasmus's *Opera Omnia*, namely, ASD VI-8, his annotations on his two epistles to the Corinthians.

Five editions of Erasmus's annotations were published during his lifetime, beginning with the one printed in Basel by Froben in 1516, followed by four subsequent revised and expanded editions (Basel 1519, 1522, 1527, and 1535). The editor uses the 1535 edition as the base text and has placed variant readings from the earlier editions in the textual apparatus. The book begins with an introduction (in German) by the editor, followed by the edition itself (accompanied by the textual apparatus and the editor's annotations, also in German), a list of abbreviations, and an index of names.

In the introduction the editor mentions some of Erasmus's notable annotations that appear in this volume. For example, in his note to Eph. 5:32, Erasmus denies that the verse proves that matrimony was one of the seven sacraments; at Phil. 2:6, he defends his substitution of the Vulgate's translation *Esse aequalem Deo* with *ut esset aequaliter Deo* against his critics, who interpreted the change as proof of Arianism; thirdly, as he did in his annotation to 1 Cor. 7:8, Erasmus continued to insist that Paul was married, using Phil. 4:3 as proof; finally, in his annotation to 1 Thess. 2:7, Erasmus oddly inserts a quasi-panegyric to his patron, William Warham, which, however, was removed from the 1535 edition.

This edition continues the superb quality of scholarship demonstrated in the previous ASD volumes. Scholars not comfortable working with the Latin and Greek of Erasmus's annotations are, for the time being, out of luck, since the English translation in CWE is not yet available. The closest is CWE 43, which is a translation of his paraphrases on the same Pauline epistles. (Milton Kooistra, University of Toronto)

◆ *Jacques Lefèvre D'Etaples and The Three Maries Debates: Introduction, Latin Text, English Translation and Annotation*. Ed. by Sheila M. Porrer. *Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance*, 451. Geneva: Droz, 2009. 520 pp. \$219.00. This volume makes available for the first time an edited Latin text and a translation of the four pamphlets published by Jacques Lefèvre d'Etaples (ca. 1460-1536) during the so-called "Three Maries" controversy, an exegetical debate which was launched by the French humanist in 1517 and drew in authors as significant as

the Sorbonne theologian Josse Clichtove (*ca.* 1473-1543), the bishop of Rochester, John Fisher (1469-1535), and the future leader of the conservative faction within the theology faculty, Noel Beda (*ca.* 1470-1537). The book also includes a substantial introduction (137 pages) which details the context and content of—as well as the reactions to—each pamphlet.

It was after a decade of rising anxiety towards humanist exegesis in Paris that Lefèvre challenged three widely accepted church traditions: the belief that the forgiven sinner of Luke 7:36-50, the sister of Martha and Lazarus (Jn. 11:1-2), and the woman from whom seven evils were cast out were the same Mary of Magdalen (Lk. 8:2, Jn. 20:1-18); the popular tradition by which the Virgin Mary had two half-sisters, her mother St. Anne having married three times; and the conventional explanation of the *triduum* (Christ's three days in the tomb) by synecdoche, according to which it was understood that Jesus rose from the dead on the third day since the part (here of a day or night) may be taken to signify the whole. Although the immediate occasion of Lefèvre's first pamphlet was a request by Louise de Savoie, Porrer suggests that the debate was in the air at that particular time for three reasons. First, she notes the general desire for reconciliation with the Greek Church which had come to a head both with the Council of Florence (1438-1442) and the Lateran Council (1512-1517). The Orthodox liturgy, however, had never recognized the amalgam of the three women as Mary Magdalen. A second reason was the resurgence of interest in the Greek and Latin Fathers, several of whom did not identify the three women as one and the same. Finally, the Magdalen problem fit well into the context of the desire for liturgical reform which was prevalent in the second decade of the sixteenth century. By defending the existence of three different Mariés, Lefèvre was also seeking to separate Mary of Bethany from the association with prostitution which dominated her popular personality, and thus to purify the cult of the saints.

In her successive analyses of each edition of the four pamphlets, Porrer not only carefully describes the origin and importance of the popular traditions which Lefèvre was questioning, but also examines the development of the argument in each pamphlet, noting Lefèvre's appeal to Scripture, to the church fathers, or to what he calls the "true

spiritual sense” of Scripture. The last two parts of the introduction discuss the wider debate and, in particular, the two most substantial responses defending the single Magdalen view which were published in 1519 by John Fisher and Noel Beda. While Fisher was mainly concerned with the effects of the debate on public worship from a pastoral point of view, Beda, as a professional theologian suspicious of the new learning, was preoccupied more directly with maintaining orthodoxy.

Porrer’s presentation of the Three Maries Debates constitutes a precious contribution to the history of French humanist exegesis and the early years of the Reformation. Of particular help is her detailed introduction, in which she successfully shows that the Three Maries controversy was in many ways representative of the burning issues of its time, and in particular the question of authority. As Porrer notes, while a major issue at stake in the debate was the authority of the scholars of the new learning to discuss Scripture, patristic tradition, and Church practice, several participants also investigated the relationship between Scripture, Church, Council, and Pope, thus echoing the debate begun between Luther and Rome at the same period. This careful introduction, supplementing a flowing translation and helpful annotations of the Latin text, makes this volume a valuable source and resource for historians of the early years of the Reformation. (Monique Cuany, Deerfield, IL)

◆ *Renaissance Syntax and Subjectivity: Ideological Contents of Latin and the Vernacular in Scottish Prose Chronicles*. By John C. Leeds. Farnham, UK and Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2010. xiii + 232 pp. \$99.95. John Leeds has set himself an ambitious goal, to defend “humanist essentialism” through detailed analysis of and reflections on sixteenth-century Scottish texts written in Latin and in Scots. For Leeds, humanist essentialism is the belief that ideas have objective reality, that ideas are in being as well as in thought. Leeds contrasts humanist essentialism with the (to him) odious belief that human beings only inhabit arbitrary sign-systems, outside of which we cannot act, that reality is simply a construct of our language. Because of his defense of essentialism, Leeds’s book is as much a philosophical as

a philological study.

In each of his four relatively independent chapters, Leeds selects several Latin and Scots passages which deal with the same topic, and indeed are often by the same author writing in the two different languages. After a sentence-by-sentence comparison, Leeds outlines the fundamental syntactic, and hence philosophical, differences between the passages. He then proceeds to cite philosophers from the sixteenth to the twentieth centuries, with special attention to Hegel, in support of his conclusions. The discussions range widely, from scholastic nominalism, the causes of the Scottish reformation, and Roman agriculture to Marxism and Saussure's linguistic theories.

The titles of the four chapters indicate the topic. In chapter 1 ("Sleeping Beauty: Accusative Case, Passive Voice, and the Subject of Production") Leeds selects several passages from Hector Boece's *Scotorum historiae* and the translations of these same passages by John Bellenden, *The Chronicles of Scotland*. He shows how the "dialectic of bondage," that is active and passive agents, were encoded in the Latin and the Scots texts. In the Latin the active agent is not always in the nominative, but in the vernacular this "categorical mismatch" is resolved and the active agent is almost always the subject of the sentence, even if the sentence then must be passive in construction.

Chapter 2 ("Against the Vernacular: Ciceronian Formalism and the Problem of the Individual") concerns humanist education and the rise of Ciceronianism. Leeds compares a passage from Livy and Bellenden's Scots translation of the same passage. Of more interest is Leeds's comparison of parallel passages from John Knox's *History of the Reformation in Scotland* and Buchanan's *Rerum Scoticarum historia*. He makes the point that the difference in emphasis of the two parallel narratives is governed by the different syntactic structures of the two languages: the Scots narrative posits the subject first and organizes each sentence around one individual, with others functioning as objects of that individual. In contrast, the Latin narrative uses a variety of devices for separating the subject and verb, for distributing the activity among several actors, and it assigns different grammatical functions to the same person, often in the same sentence.

Chapter 3 ("From the Ground Up: Matter, Spirit, and the Linguistic Sign in John Lesley's Chronicles of Stewart Scotland") addresses

metaphor in Latin, contrasting the language in Lesley's Scots *History* (1571) and the same author's Latin *De origine* (1578). The former is functional and shows a minimum of rhetoric. The Latin, however, is full of metaphor. Leeds cites words like *effluxere*, *maculae*, *incensi*, and *diffluerent* to point out the pervasive agricultural metaphors which are part of the Latin language; many words refer both to agricultural operations and to political and social affairs. Like the word "cultivation" in English, these metaphors point both up and down, to use Leeds's phrase.

Chapter 4 ("*Corpus Mysticum*: The Status of Universals in John Mair's *Chronicle of Greater Britain*") discusses medieval nominalism, as defined by Ockham, in John Mair's (or Major's) *Historia Maioris Britanniae* (1521). Nominalism, as used here, means that only objects exist and that any generalization (the concept of a species "cat," in contrast with the animal now sitting in my lap) exists only in the mind, and that these generalizations are only names. Leeds shows that Mair was far from a strict nominalist and points out the Aristotelian universals that pervade Mair's work, especially the concept of *corpus mysticum*, meaning (in Mair) the corporate collective of king and people.

This book is especially valuable for its inclusion of long passages from little-read Latin and Scots texts. Leeds gives the reader some help with the Scots texts, which are readable with some difficulty. Most of the Latin texts are translated in the comments. On the surface, this book is for any interested reader, but despite Leeds's hopeless attempts to briefly explain Latin grammar to his audience, only those fairly fluent in Latin will benefit. (Mark Riley, California State University, Sacramento (Emeritus))

◆ *Juvenilia: édition critique, traduction, annotation et commentaire*. By Marc-Antoine Muret. Ed. by Virginie Leroux. Geneva: Droz, 2009. In 1552 Marc-Antoine Muret published his *Juvenilia*, a collection carefully designed to demonstrate the young scholar's virtuoso facility in a range of poetic genres in Latin and to serve as an intervention in wider literary and scholarly debates. The book under review, a revision of the author's doctoral thesis, is no mere critical edition; it also includes a huge amount of paratextual material, the bulk of it in the

‘commentaire littéraire,’ which covers 230 pages and is essentially a collection of seven essays on aspects of text and genre. Covering each of the collections that make up the *Juvenilia*, Leroux examines Muret’s sources and theoretical models and explores the context of composition and publication. Much of the analysis focuses explicitly on questions of genre, and a great deal of thought goes into making formal and thematic distinctions between the different genres. Undoubtedly this was a major concern to Muret himself, as the analysis convincingly demonstrates. The liminary texts strategically positioned Muret’s poems as part of a wider debate about literary genre and aligned his project with that of the Pléiade in the vernacular. Muret wanted his poems to actively define an aesthetic ideal; his approach to imitation was governed by principles of *variatio* and what Leroux terms an ‘esthétique de l’échantillon.’ The collection as a whole is read as a series of attempts on Muret’s part to integrate his poetic vision into a range of properly classical forms.

Muret’s poetry is intimately linked to his scholarship, and Leroux’s analysis brings out intriguing parallels between the *Juvenilia* and his scholarly *œuvre*. His poems combine theoretical reflections on genre with a pedagogue’s interest in the workings of language. Muret’s strong sense of code and genre convention comes through especially in ‘grammatical’ poems, which frequently read as reflections on genre itself. This is particularly evident in those poetic genres that inherently lend themselves to metapoetic reflections on their own conventions, such as the elegy, epigram, and epistle. Leroux highlights this aspect of the text in (for example) her readings of Muret’s elegiac compositions in the context of his scholarly interest in the Roman elegists, as well as his enthusiastic promotion of new kinds of love poetry in the vernacular.

It is clear that Leroux’s primary interest is in questions of genre, and if the approach sometimes risks being overly formal and schematic (not to say glutted with detail), it also has the virtue of illuminating the context of composition and reception, for example in demonstrating how Muret exploits *topoi* to polemical ends, as interventions in wider literary debates. Much of the analysis focuses on Muret’s motivations to construct and be part of a literary community and the ways his poems engage with a wider literary polemic: the poems of the *Juvenilia*

are presented as the ‘Latin counterpart’ to the Pléiade project.

But genre is not the exclusive focus of this edition, and there is a wealth of other material here. An introduction gives an account of Muret’s biography, the more lurid details passed over in favour of a careful tabulation and evaluation of the facts available in the existing chronologies. This, in common with the rest of the book, is researched with great diligence and well supported with reference to recent scholarship. There is a thorough analysis of Muret’s tragedy *Iulius Caesar*, the most important and influential of the works collected in the *Juvenilia* (omitted from Summers’s recent edition of the *Juvenilia*). In it Muret engaged both with the contemporary theoretical discourse on tragedy and with classical models (chief among which was Seneca’s *Hercules on Oeta*) in an ultimately ambiguous exploration of ethical and political questions.

The edition accurately reproduces the text of the *editio princeps* of 1552-1553 (retaining the original punctuation and orthography) and provides a thorough *apparatus criticus*. The facing-page French translation is readable and precise. The detailed footnotes to the text, which supply information on people, literary allusions, and contextual glosses, are usefully cross-referenced to the fuller analysis in the ‘commentaire.’ An *apparatus fontium* at the foot of each page lists Muret’s sources, evidently the fruit of great effort and erudition—a handy resource. A potentially overwhelming mass of information is thus presented in a quite coherent and engaging manner. Leroux has performed a great service to scholars in preparing such a thorough, richly detailed edition of this important text. (Paul White, Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge)

◆ *Mithridates*. By Conrad Gessner. Introduction and French translation by Bernard Colombat and Manfred Peters. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2009. Conrad Gessner’s *Mithridates* (1555) is one of the smaller works of the Swiss polymath (1516-1565), perhaps better known for his encyclopedic *Pandectae* (1549), his *Historia plantarum* (1541), and his *Historia animalium* (1551-1558). The present work is a compendium on linguistics, from Abyssinian to Zagovane. Gessner describes every language he can find out anything about, attempting

to determine their relationships and giving sample texts (usually a version of the “Lord’s Prayer”). While not all the linguistic facts and methods in the book have stood the test of time, as a document of the state of the art in comparative linguistics in 1555, it is fascinating to read.

Colombat and Peters have supplied a useful introduction, a densely annotated translation, and indices. The introduction, at eighty pages almost a monograph of its own, begins with a brief biographical sketch, followed by an overview of Gessner’s other works. Next the authors analyze the structure of *Mithridates* and its relationship with the linguistic ideas of its time. In particular, it was widely believed that Hebrew was the original language, parent of all others, and that there were exactly seventy-two languages in the world, not counting dialect variations (22-23). Gessner’s definition of “dialect” comes from Clement of Alexandria: *est autem dialectus dictio peculiarem alicuius loci notam seu characterem prae se ferens* (1v; I follow the editors in citing Gessner’s text by leaf of the 1555 edition) and later *nos dialectum alias simpliciter sermonem sive orationem articulatam significare observavimus* (2r, discussion 30-32). Examples are the several dialects of classical Greek, though Gessner treats Koine, the language of the New Testament, as the best and purest form of the language and refers to the others as *vulgares dialecti* (46r and 203 note 12).

The introduction goes on to consider Gessner’s treatment of several specific languages: the Slavic family (42-44), Arabic (60-64), Hebrew (64-67), and Icelandic (67-71). There is also an extensive discussion of Gessner’s sources and how he used them. In addition to ancient writers like Tacitus (for Germany), Herodotus, and Strabo, Gessner cites his own contemporaries who have written on ethnography or language. Prominent among these are Johannes Aventinus (*Annales Botorum*), Sebastian Münster (*Cosmographia universalis* and other works), and Henrichus Glareanus (commentary on Caesar). Colombat and Peters catalogue the citations by frequency and length; by their figures (74 and figure 1), some 47% of the book consists of quotations, 11% of text samples in the languages under study, and only 42% of Gessner’s own words. Gessner does not always make it clear where his quotations, translations, or paraphrases begin and end, although he generally does give his source’s name. Colombat and Peters have

marked all the quotations and given precise references, including determining, where possible, which edition of a work Gessner was using.

The book closes with six indices: languages, places, peoples, sources cited, other people named in the text, and the words and passages given as samples. The translation is clear and precise, relatively literal by deliberate choice (91). The typography is complicated but faithfully reproduces the punctuation and sectioning of the 1555 edition, although the modern editors have added some additional paragraph breaks. Very long quotations are marked with a vertical bar in the margin. Footnotes are conveniently marked in both the Latin text and the translation. They flesh out Gessner's internal references (for example, if he just writes *supra*, the note gives a page reference), give the original text of sources Gessner paraphrases, comment on his etymologies with references to standard modern works, correct his notions of linguistic relations (Persian, for example, is no longer considered a dialect of Turkish, 63r, 246), and so on.

Readers may not learn much about language from Gessner's work, but it is a seminal document in the history of linguistics, and this new critical edition makes it available to a broad audience. (Anne Mahoney, Tufts University)

◆ *Hart voor Leiden. Jan van Hout (1542-1609), stadssecretaris, dichter en vernieuwer.* By Karel Bostoën. Zeven Provinciënreeks, 28. Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 2009. 128 pp. 14 euros. *Het Vruntbuuc van Jan van Hout. Facsimile-uitgave van het album amicorum van Jan van Hout (Leiden, Stedelijk Museum De Lakenhal, nr. 3385) met inleiding, vertaling en toelichting.* By Chris L. Heesakkers. Leiden: Ginkgo, 2009. 245 pp. 39.50 euros. On 11 December 2009 the city of Leiden celebrated the four hundredth anniversary of the death of one of its most famous citizens: Jan van Hout (1542-1609), secretary to the town of Leiden and to the governing body of the newly founded university, a Dutch poet himself and an administrator with modern ideas about social welfare. In order to commemorate this day Karel Bostoën was asked by the Jan van Hout Society to produce a new biography of this prominent civil servant, while the transcription of and commentary on Van Hout's *liber amicorum* (= *Vruntbuuc*) was entrusted to the Nestor

of Neo-Latin Studies in the Low Countries, Chris L. Heesakkers.

The structure of the new biography by Bostoën is based mainly upon elements contained in the last will of Jan van Hout, written down in 1606, completed with newly discovered archival materials. It furthermore owes a lot to the dissertation presented at the University of Leiden in 1998 by Johan Koppenol, *Leids heelal: het loterijspel (1596) van Jan van Hout* (Hilversum, 1998). The author pays particular attention to the Catholic upbringing of the poet and his early sexual activities, to his sudden marriage (in 1561), and to the hitherto neglected relationship between Jan van Hout and his father-in-law, who was a prominent citizen of Zoutleeuw (Brabant) and who was also active in literary circles. He elaborates on the affair leading to the dismissal on 9 May 1578 of Hermann Rennecher, Professor of Hebrew, at the University of Leiden, and on the contributions to the *liber amicorum* (in Latin and in Dutch) of Jan van Hout.

It was most probably the example of his friend Janus Dousa which induced Jan van Hout to start an album of his own, but his enthusiasm was of short duration: in a period of five and a half years he gathered no more than twenty-seven contributions. Only five are in Dutch; Latin is used exclusively in ten, while the other ones have a combination of several languages (Dutch, Latin, Greek, French). All these contributions are transcribed, translated, and annotated in an exemplary way by Heesakkers, as he had done before for the *album amicorum* of Janus Dousa: *Een netwerk aan de basis van de Leidse universiteit. Het album amicorum van Janus Dousa. Facsimile-uitgave van hs. Leiden UB, BPL 1406 met inleiding, transcriptie, vertaling en toelichting*, 2 vols. (Leiden, 2000).

Still, a few mistakes and misinterpretations mar this otherwise nicely produced volume. A few examples only: in the introduction (15), it is said that Jan van Hout started his *album* on 10 February 1578, but in the modern Dutch translation of Van Hout's own contribution appears, erroneously, the date 1574 (125). On 139, read *epigramma fusum et cusum* instead of *fusum et usum*. On 143, Heesakkers corrected *gravistellus* to *gravastellus* in the poem by the spendthrift Utrecht canon and Neo-Latin poet Philippus Morus (†1578), arguing on 144 that *gravistellus* does not appear either in classical Latin or in the Neo-Latin dictionary by Hoven, or in the *Neulateinische Wortliste* by Ramminger,

and hence could be a neologism or, more simply, a slip of the pen. That statement might be right: it is indeed *gravastellus* which is read nowadays in all critical editions of Plautus (*Epidicus*, 620), and even in the *apparatus criticus* there is no trace of *gravistellus*. The editor did not, however, take into account that *gravastellus* (gray-headed fellow) is contradicted by a poem by Janus Dousa, entitled *De Rufo*, and even by l. 10 of the poem under discussion, where *purpurei mei Hermanni* also alludes to the red colour of his hair. Furthermore, the term *gravistellus*, indicating a corpulent and imposing figure of a man, is present in all the best sixteenth-century editions of Plautus, including the ones by J. Camerarius (Basel, 1552 and 1558), Johannes Sambucus (Antwerp, 1566), Denis Lambin (Paris, 1576), and even Janus Dousa himself (Leiden 1589). In that same poem the following passage occurs:

Nam qui minus liceret id mihi, nempe
 Amore capto purpurei mei Hermanni,
 Apollinem quod facere non puduit ipsum?
 Quem percitum olim amore regis Admeti
 Aetas vetusta bubulcitarier vidit.

The editor refers here to Hyginus, 49 and explains that Apollo became friends with Admetus and helped him to obtain Alcestis's love. This explanation, unfortunately, is not to the point: the author here refers to the homoerotic love of Apollo for Admetus, which already during the Alexandrian period became the principal motif for Apollo's stay with a mortal and his acting as a herdsman. See my "Apollo and Admetus: The Forms of a Classical Myth through the Middle Ages and the Renaissance," in *Forms of the "Medieval" in the "Renaissance": A Multidisciplinary Exploration of a Cultural Continuum*, ed. George Hugo Tucker (Charlottesville, 2000), 175-203. (G. Tournoy, Catholic University of Leuven)

◆ *L'autobiographie d'Athanasius Kircher. L'écriture d'un jésuite entre vérité et invention au seuil de l'oeuvre. Introduction et traduction française et italienne.* By Giunia Totaro. Bern: Peter Lang, 2009. xiv + 430 pp., illus. \$101.95. Athanasius Kircher's autobiography has long been an enigmatic point of reference in the study of the seventeenth-century Jesuit polymath. Very few copies of Kircher's printed *Vita* survive—Totaro

has identified sixteen, along with six manuscript versions, making it a difficult text to consult. Giunia Totaro has remedied this problem by providing us with a critical edition of the Latin text, accompanied by French and Italian translations and a lengthy introduction. This publication is based on her doctoral dissertation at the Université de Caen Basse-Normandie.

Totaro's introduction has several goals. She examines the ever-growing corpus of Kircher scholarship, especially the work of the past few decades. She discusses all the extant copies of Kircher's *Vita* and reconstructs his relationship with Hieronymus Langenmantel, who facilitated its publication. Finally, she compares key episodes in Kircher's autobiography with other documentation of his life and work to resolve a number of uncertain points—including the date of his birth or the year of his arrival in Rome—and to clarify the choices Kircher made in the composition of his autobiography as a reconstruction of the principal episodes of his life. As Totaro rightfully observes, the *Vita* allows us to understand who Kircher wanted to be in relation to who he actually was. We see the long gestation of his work culminating in the *Oedipus Aegyptiacus*, the virtual absence of any discussion of his equally bulky contributions to the science of magnetism or his much discussed *Mundus subterraneus*, and the omnipresence of his devotion to the shrine at Mentorella, where his heart remains. Totaro is to be commended for her careful reconstruction of Kircher's self-presentation and her insistence on its role in arriving at a better understanding of this fascinating Jesuit.

For all these reasons, Totaro's study of Kircher's autobiography and her richly annotated presentation of the Latin text with translations is a most welcome contribution to recent work on Kircher. Given the value of her critical edition of the *Vita*, it is unfortunate that she partially framed her project as a critique of the work of many scholars who preceded her. Rather than rehashing the specifics, I will simply say that I found a number of her comments ungenerous, some of them doubtful in their conclusions (or put a different way, a declaration of victory in subjects that have been full of ambiguity), and especially uncharitable towards the work of another young scholar whose research she relies on extensively. To some degree, Totaro seems to feel that Anglo-American scholars insufficiently appreciate the

work of their European counterparts—although the rich, multi-lingual bibliography on Kircher and the international nature of a number of collaborative publications in various languages, including Italian, German, and English, does not support this view—and potentially do not read original sources well. I suspect that it is a feature of a relatively unrevised dissertation in which the author is rightfully proud of the discoveries her patient detective work has yielded, perhaps forgetting for a moment that we all stand on a number of shoulders to arrive at our conclusions, knowing that the next generation will revisit and revise them as well. Any scholar interested in Kircher will nonetheless want to own a copy of this book, and scholars interested in Neo-Latin autobiographical writing will welcome this carefully prepared critical edition, which has the additional virtue of making the text accessible to readers in two modern languages. (Paula Findlen, Stanford University)

◆ *The Neo-Latin Epigram: A Learned and Witty Genre*. Ed. by Susanna de Beer, Karl A. E. Enenkel, and David Rijser. Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia, 25. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2009. vi + 350 pages. 59.50 euros. The essays in this volume originated as papers from the conference on “The Neo-Latin Epigram. Towards the Definition of a Genre,” held at the Royal Netherlands Institute in Rome in April, 2006. As one would expect from the theme of the conference, the question of generic definition runs throughout the volume, beginning with the introduction, “The Neo-Latin Epigram: Humanist Self-Definition in a Learned and Witty Discourse,” by one of the editors, Karl A. E. Enenkel. There is no question that the epigram was one of the central genres in Neo-Latin literature, attracting such poetic luminaries as Jacopo Sannazaro, Michele Marullo, Giovanni Pontano, Angelo Poliziano, Conrad Celtis, Thomas More, Ulrich van Hutten, George Buchanan, and Hugo Grotius. Yet surprisingly, there is considerable confusion about what, precisely, the epigram is. An American Supreme Court justice once exclaimed that one of the problems with obscenity is that everyone knows it when they see it, but no one can actually define it. There is a similar problem here, which the authors of these essays confront courageously, head-on.

Enenkel explains in his introduction that, while post-romantic aesthetics and modern hermeneutics can offer some interesting things to say about the Neo-Latin epigram, they should be supplemented by what was said in Renaissance and Baroque poetics. He does this by starting with two modern efforts to define the epigram, those of Peter Hess (*Epigramm* (Stuttgart, 1989)) and Marion Lausberg (*Das Einzeldistichon. Studien zum antiken Epigramm* (Munich, 1982)), integrating his critique of these theories with observations from the chapter on the epigram (III, 126) in Julius Caesar Scaliger's *Poetices libri septem* (1561) and Matthaeus Rader's *De epigrammate* (1601) and offering his own observations on the problem. Enenkel argues that at the core of the epigrammatic enterprise is an effort to create a set of shared values between writer and reader, one that relies on wit and understatement. The importance of wit is stressed in two essays in this volume: Susanna de Beer, "The *Pointierung* of Giannantonio Campano's Epigrams: Theory and Practice," and Johannes Jansen, "The Microcosmos of the Baroque Epigram: John Owen and Julien Waudré." Hess argues that epigrams should refer to a certain material object, and some certainly do, as is confirmed by David Rijser in "The Practical Function of High Renaissance Epigram: The Case of Raphael's Grave," Maarten Jansen in "*Epigramma cultum* and the *Anthologia Palatina*: Case Studies from Michael Marullus' *Epigrammata*," and Moniek van Oosterhout, "Hugo Grotius and the Epigram." Two common epigrammatic themes, love and hate, however, often do not have this material connection, as becomes clear in Christoph Pieper's essay, "Genre Negotiations: Cristoforo Landino's *Xandra* Between Elegy and Epigram." It is often said that the title is an important part of the epigram, but de Beer's essay on Campano suggests that many poems either lack titles or pick them up from someone other than the author. Verse is indeed the usual medium, as Hess suggested, but other parts of his definition appear to be more problematic, such as the claim that the epigram is restricted to one topic or that it is not connected to other poems in a series. A couple of Scaliger's observations—that the genre is unusually flexible and that its brevity is qualified by the complexity of the topic it treats—are valuable and proved very influential, as Jan Bloemendal shows in "The Epigram in Early Modern Literary Theory: Vossius's *Poeticae Institutiones*."

Other essays approach the question of definition from different angles. In “*Versus ex variis locis deducti*. On Ancient Collections of Epigrams,” Stephan Busch goes to the ancient sources, while in “Janus Lascaris and the Greek Anthology,” Marc D. Lauxtermann looks at how Lascaris’s edition of the Planudean Anthology straddles two worlds, that of Byzantium and that of Renaissance Italy. In “The Comic and the Obscene in the Latin Epigrams of the Early Fifteenth Century,” Donatella Coppini focuses on Panormita’s *Hermaphroditus* as a groundbreaking generic model whose brand of comic obscenity carried over into the next several generations of Neo-Latin epigrammatists. Han Lamers follows up on this claim in “Marullo’s Imitations of Catullus in the Context of His Poetical Criticism,” where he shows that in his criticism of Martial and his imitations of Catullus, Marullo challenges the obscenity of Panormita, proposing instead a more chaste and modest poetics that stresses the emotional complexities of love. In “Incisività sublime: l’arte epigrammatica di Aurelio Orsi nel giudizio di Giambattista Marino,” Tobias Leuker used Marino’s *La galleria* (1619) to draw attention to a little-known Neo-Latin epigrammatist, Aurelio Orsi. The important role played by the epigram in the humanist educational activities of Joannes Murmellius is the subject of Juliette A. Groenland’s essay, “Epigrams Teaching Humanist Lessons: The Pointed Poems and Poetics of the Latin School teacher Joannes Murmellius (c. 1480-1517).” Finally, in “Angelo Colocci’s Collections of Epigrams,” Ingrid D. Rowland focuses on the most important compiler of verse in early sixteenth-century Rome, a man who also composed epigrams himself that run the full gamut of themes and emotions.

So what, in the end, is the Neo-Latin epigram? I think it is only fair to give the last word here to the indefatigable Karl Enenkel, whose work in preparing this conference and introducing its proceedings leads to this: “The epigram is a refined and extremely artistic genre of early modern poetry that largely depends on various kinds of learned wit. This may be connected with the reception of classical antiquity, intertextuality, a superior mastering of the Latin language, a constant sidestepping between various forms of learning and scholarship, attitudes, perceptions, between emotional and rational approaches, social settings, and, not in the least, various segments of human life.

Moreover, the various strategies of *argutia* offer a powerful potential for humanist self-presentation and -definition” (22). (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *History of Venice*. Vol. 3, Books IX-XII. By Pietro Bembo. Ed. and trans. by Robert W. Ulery, Jr. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 37. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009. xii + 396 pp. *The Hermaphrodite*. By Antonio Beccadelli. Ed. and trans. by Holt Parker. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 42. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2010. xlvi + 299 pp. *Humanist Tragedies*. Trans. by Gary R. Grund. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 45. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011. xliv + 399 pp. \$29.95. The three volumes under review here represent the riches and variety that continue to pour forth in The I Tatti Renaissance Library. Ulery’s *History of Venice* is the third and final volume of a series that began in 2007. Pietro Bembo (1470-1547) is well known for his writings on love and on the Italian vernacular, but he was also appointed official historian of Venice in 1529 and composed his account of the events covering the years from 1487 to 1513. Internal politics and events are considered, but much of the interest of Bembo’s history lies in its account of Venice’s interactions with the other European states and with the Turks. This edition is the first to contain an English translation and appears at a timely moment, just before Professor Ulery’s retirement from Wake Forest University.

The Hermaphrodite is one of the most scandalous books in the entire Neo-Latin corpus, a collection of poems whose obscenity even led one modern historian to mark it as the first step down the path towards the revolutions of the late eighteenth century. The author was Antonio Beccadelli (1394-1471), often called Panormita from the Latin name for his birthplace, Palermo. Beccadelli himself was of two minds about the work. On the one hand, it functioned as a sort of professional credential for him as he moved about in search of work, from Duke Filippo Maria Visconti in Milan to the University of Pavia to, eventually, the Aragonese court at Naples, where he presided over a stable of humanists, founded the Academia Neapolitana, and served both Alfonso V and his son Ferdinand I. But the poem also

got him embroiled in a series of polemics, with Antonio da Rho, Pier Candido Decembrio, and Lorenzo Valla, leading Beccadelli eventually to write a recantation of his dedication to Cosimo de' Medici. Parker's edition includes much of this polemical material along with the text and translation of *The Hermaphrodite*, along with an unusually full set of textual notes.

Grund's *Humanist Tragedies* is a different sort of work, containing five tragedies in the Senecan tradition written between 1314 and 1493. Senecan tragedy was effectively rediscovered by the Paduan pre-humanist Lovato dei Lovati, so it is not surprising that the earliest of these plays, which predates Petrarch's pioneering humanistic work, was written by one of Lovato's pupils, Albertino Mussato. Mussato's *Ecerinis* depicts episodes in the career of Ezzelino III da Romano, a lieutenant of Emperor Frederick II who terrorized Padua, but the play was actually a thinly disguised portrait of a contemporary Veronese tyrant, Cangrande della Scala. The *Achilles* (1387) of Antonio Loschi likewise comes from the Veneto, but Loschi turned to the Trojan War for the subject of his play. On one level the *Achilles* draws from pseudo-Dares's *De excidio Troiae historia*, but it also continues the rhetorical bombast, *sententiae*, emotional overreaching, and acts of unspeakable horror that comprise the Senecan heritage in drama. The author of the *Progne* (ca. 1429), Gregorio Correr, came from a noble Venetian family and continued the lurid sensationalism of neo-Senecan tragedy from the Veneto, this time incorporating a story from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Leonardo Dati's *Hiempsal* (ca. 1442) went off in a different direction, relying on allegory and presenting a significant moral overlay, while Marcellino Verardi's *Fernandus Servatus* (1493) uses an unsuccessful assassination attempt on Ferdinand II of Aragon, king of Spain, to present one of the earliest experiments in tragicomedy, a genre that would flourish in the next century with Giraldis Cinthio and Guarini.

All in all, three very different volumes, but all done to the high standard of excellence we have come to expect from the I Tatti Renaissance Library. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Budapestinensis: Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies (Budapest, 2006)*. General editor, Rhoda Schnur. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 386. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2010. xxxiv + 865 pp. \$95. Here, almost a year and a half late, are the proceedings of the Budapest congress of the International Association for Neo-Latin Studies, the major professional organization for scholars working in this area. Like its predecessors, this volume begins with a brief presidential address by Jean-Louis Charlet, followed by the five plenary papers, one in each of the five official languages of the IANLS: Joaquín Pascual Barea, “Los certámenes de poesía latina en la España del Renacimiento”; Amedeo di Francesco, “La poesia neolatina ungherese fra tradizione e innovazione”; Karl A. E. Enenkel, “Die neulateinische Autobiographik: ein Versuch zur Methode ihrer Interpretation”; Outi Merisalo, “*Sapere aude*: The Book as a Vehicle of Classical Culture in Northern Europe in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries”; and Colette Nativel, “La lexique artistique moderne: quelques sources néo-latines.”

The rest of the volume is taken up with communications from the congress participants: Dominique Arrighi, “L’usage du latin dans les relations internationales au XVI^e siècle”; Jerzy Axer, “Varietas Latinitatis Reipublicae Polonorum”; Paul Richard Blum, “Platonischer Idealismus bei Francisco Suárez”; Gábor Bolonyai, “Orpheus’ Sweat: Antonio Bonfini as Translator of Hermogenes and Philostratus”; Claudio Buongiovanni, “Tacito e il canone storiografico dell’*Actius* di Giovanni Pontano”; Elwira Buszewicz, “Between General and Particular: The ‘Polish Horace’ Promoting Ladislaus IV Vasa’s Fame”; Claudia Corfiati, “Donne famose del Quattrocento nella scrittura di Giacomo Filippo Foresti”; Zoltán Csehy, “*Hortorum custos* (Alcune manifestazioni del discorso priapeo nella poesia)”; István Cselényi, “La *Tabula aurea* di Pietro da Bergamo: l’opera nel suo tempo”; Zaynab Dalloul, “Sándor Kováznai e Janus Pannonius”; Alexandra de Brito Mariano, “On Gold and Poetry: The *Metallurgicon*, Gold Lore, and the Society of Jesus through the Work of Bartakovics”; Domenico Defilippis, “*Maius solito negotium mei imprendere humeris*: nota sulla descrizione del Regno di Napoli nell’*Italia illustrata* di Biondo Flavio”; Josef Eskhult, “Humanistic Latin Versions of the Hebrew

Old Testament”; Laurent Grailet, “Les *Lettres de Turquie* de Busbecq: néo-latin et méthodes quantitatives”; Roger P. H. Green, “Poetic Psalm Paraphrases: Two Versions of Psalm 1 Compared”; Maria Grazia Bistoni Grilli Cicilioni, “Un frate, un poeta, un pellegrino a Santiago di Compostela e a Finisterre nel 1523”; László Havas, “La conception de l’histoire chez le poète hongrois Janus Pannonius”; Chris L. Heesakkers, “*Ore tuo loqueris*: Joseph Scaliger’s *Epicedium* on Justus Lipsius”; Gerhard Holk, “*Latinitas* as the Medium of the First History of America: The *Decades de orbe novo* by Pietro Martire d’Anghiera”; Simona Iaria, “Enea Silvio Piccolomini: *Oratio in divi Ambrosii celebritate*: un modello culturale per i padri conciliari”; Antonio Iurilli, “Favolistica neolatina in Italia: la *Bestiarum schola* di Pompeo Sarnelli”; László Jankovits, “*Vir tersissimus Iacobus Piso*: A Hungarian Humanist, Poet, and Diplomat in the Erasmian World”; Erika Juríková, “The Present State of Research on Matthias Bel’s Life and Work in Slovakia”; Gábor Kecskeméti, “Philological Activities of Early Modern Hungarian and Transylvanian Humanists”; Zsuzsanna Kiséry, “*Et poetis ipsis necessarium argentum*: Überlegungen zu einem Versuch über den Humanismus in der Umgebung von Sigismund von Luxemburg”; Wolfgang Kofler, “Madruzzo-Lob in Ingolstadt: Johann Engerd und Jakob Fischer”; György Komlóssy, “Hungarian Runic Letters: A Mythical History”; Jozef Kordoš, “The Historical Epos *Tyrnavia nascens* (Stephanus Csiba, 1706)”; Martin Korenjak, “Latin Poetry about Simon of Trento”; Sylvie Laigneau, “De l’éloge de l’humanisme à l’éloge de la France: la *translatio studii* chez Nicolas Bourbon (Nugae, 1533)”; Réka Lengyel, “Dialoghi contraddittori (Sulla struttura dialogica del *De remediis utriusque fortunae* del Petrarca)”; Annamaria Lesigang-Bruckmüller, “*Quid Galli in Germania?* (Anti)französische *Gallicinia* des 17. Jahrhunderts”; Mariano Madrid Castro, “Los comentarios de Badius Ascensius a *Contra amorem* y *De natura amoris* de Baptista Mantuano”; David Marsh, “Obscenity and Poetic Invective in the Early Italian Renaissance”; Maria Aurelia Mastronardi, “La *institutio principis* nel *De felici progressu* e nel *De vera re publica* di Michele Savonarola”; Ida Mastrosera, “Biondo Flavio e le istituzioni di Roma antica: matrimonio e famiglia nella *Roma triumphans*”; Barbara Milewska-Wazbinska, “*Vixi casta*: Neo-Latin Women’s Epitaphs in Poland”; Francesco S. Minervini, “Strutture oratorie delle dedicatorie di Antonio Bonfini a Mattia Corvino”; Laura Mitaro-

tondo, “La scrittura politica di Bartolomeo Platina (1421-1481): fra la tradizione dei classici e l’innovazione umanistica”; David Money, “Poemata Itolorum Neo-Latina atque lectores Angli saeculi decimi octavi: Alexander Pope, *Selecta poemata Itolorum* (1740)”; Stephen Murphy, “Philology and Torture”; Ilona M. Nagy, “Mittelateinische und neo-lateinische Versionen der Legende der Hl. Margit aus der Arpadendynastie”; Karl August Neuhausen, “De Francisci Xaverii Trips eo poemate, quod a. 1688 Coloniae prodiit inscriptum *Heroes Christi In In Vngaria et alibi ad Versus IVratos hostes Otomannos strenue pugnantes?*”; Isabella Nuovo, “Il ruolo del filosofo nell’epistolario di Antonio De Ferrariis Galateo”; Klára Pajorin, “Poggio Bracciolini e l’Ungheria”; Joanna Partyka, “Classical Erudition and ‘a Female Pen’: Education versus Literary Consciousness”; Lee Piepho, “Heaven’s Blessing and Earth’s Joy: Commemorative Anthologies for the Marriage of Frederick V and the Princess Elizabeth”; Krisztina Rábai, “*Morbus Gallicus*, Focusing on the Sixteenth-Century Written Sources”; Ludovica Radif, “Aristofane Aretino”; Valery Rees, “Marsilio Ficino’s Translation Programme in the 1480s”; Ágnes Ritoók-Szalay, “L’edizione critica delle opere di Janus Pannonius”; Giovanni Rossi, “Tradizione politica classica e Controriforma: i *Dialogi de rei publicae dignitate* (1556) di Marco Girolamo Vida”; M^a Teresa Santamaría Hernández, “La interpretación de los textos como instrumento de polémica en la apología *In Leonardum Fuchsium* de Michael Villanovanus”; Raija Sarasti-Wilenius, “How Students Were Taught Latin Letter-Writing in Seventeenth-Century Finland”; Péter Sárközy, “L’edizione delle poesie di Janus Pannonius di Norbert Conradi (1754)”; Sonja Schreiner, “Literatur, Topik, Medizin: William Harveys Dedikationen zur *Exercitatio anatomica de motu cordis et sanguinis in animalibus*”; Nicol Sipekiová, “The Importance of Pomey’s Lexicographical and Grammatical Works (*Syntaxis ornata seu de tribus Latinae linguae virtutibus*)”; Anna Skolimowska, “From Respect to Disdain: Political Geography and Terminology concerning Power in Latin Letters and Occasional Poems by Ioannes Dantiscus”; Daniel Škoviera, “*Hungaria loquitur*. Das Bild von Ungarn in der Paraphrase des Psalms 79 von Georg Purkircher”; Antônia Soler i Nicolau, “El *Codex rationum Octavii Pacati?*”; Katarína Šotkovská, “Franciscus Babai and His Work *Epigrammatum miscellaneorum, sacrorum, et profanorum libri III*”; Lav Subaric, “Writing

a Regional History of Latin Literature: An Example from Tyrol”; Silvio Suppa, “Storia, ragione e critica nel Latino di Giambattista Vico”; György Szabados, “Fountain of Renewal: The Roots of Critical Hungarian Historiography in the Seventeenth Century”; Hanna Szabelska, “Zum Begriff der Konventionalität des Sprechzeichens im Dienste der humanistischen Argumentationen”; M. Szendrényi, “Epic and Creation: Vida and Milton in the Development of Vergilian Epic Tradition”; Nikolaus Thurn, “Die Rolle der volkssprachlichen Kultur für die neulateinische Poesie: Juan de Vilches und Martin Balticus”; Stefan Tilg, “Paulus Ricius (ca. 1480-1541/42): kaiserlicher Leibarzt, Theosoph—und Objekt regionaler Literaturgeschichtsschreibung”; Gábor Tüskés and Éva Knapp, “Deutsch-ungarische Verbindungen auf dem Gebiet der lateinischen Literatur im 17. Jahrhundert”; Piotr Urbaniński, “English Paraphrases and Emulations of Maciej Kazimierz Sarbiewski’s Poetry”; Sebastiano Valerio, “Tradizione classica e cultura retorica nello *Spicilegium* di Lucio Giovanni Scoppa”; Juan J. Valverde Abril, “Al margen de los manuscritos latinos de la *Política*”; Toon Van Hal, “Justus Lipsius’s Discovery of the Wachtendonck Psalms: A Controversial Contribution to Old Germanic Language Study”; Kristi Viiding, “Neulateinische Reisetmethodik in Livland im 17. Jahrhundert”; and Peter Zeeberg, “The *Bucolica* (1560) of Erasmus Laetus.” (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Humanistica Lovaniensia*. Ed. Dirk Sacré, Gilbert Tournoy, Monique Mund-Dopchie, Jan Papy, and Lambert Isebaert. Vol. 59. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2010. 80 euros. vi + 486 pp. This issue of the premier journal of Neo-Latin studies begins with the fourth annual Jozef IJsewijn lecture, given in honor of the founder of the Seminarium Philologiae Humanisticae and this journal: Monique Mund-Dopchie, “*Plus ultra* ou *non plus ultra*? Fortunes et infortunes de la représentation antique de la terre à la Renaissance.” The bulk of the journal consists of the following texts and studies: Alberto Pavan, “Ercolo Strozzi’s *Venatio*. Classical Inheritance and Contemporary Models of a Neo-Latin Hunting Poem”; Mark Crane, “A Scholastic Response to Biblical Humanism: Noël Beda against Lefèvre d’Etaples and Erasmus (1526)”; Walther Ludwig, “Die emblematische *Festina*

Lente—Variation des Achilles Bocchius”; Robert Forgács, “Gallus Dressler’s *Praecepta musicae poëticae*: Musical Humanism and Education in Sixteenth-Century Germany”; Manuel Mañas Núñez, “Sanctius y Scioppius”; Gilbert Tournoy, “*Lipsiana novissima IV*: Justus Lipsius, Livy, Persinius and Pynssenius (Pyndenius, Pynslenius)”; Alejandra Guzmán Almagro, “Lucas van der Torre, Van Torre, Torrius: la identidad de un erudito flamenco a la luz de algunos documentos”; Dirk Sacré, “Torrius. Appendix: Some Unpublished or Little-Known Documents”; Noël Golvers, From Propertius’s *Laudes Italiae (Romae)* to 17th-Century Jesuit *Laus Sinarum*. A New Aspect of Propertius’s Reception”; and Romain Jalabert and Dirk Sacré, “Bibliographie intermédiaire des poètes et versificateurs latins en France au XIX^e siècle.” The next section contains a group of papers delivered on 5 June 2009 at the Belgian Academy in Rome, to mark the publication of a booklet of Latin verse written by Joseph Tusiani: Joannes Carolus Rossi, “De Josepho Tusiani Oratiuncula inauguralis”; Emilio Bandiera, “I *Fragmenta ad Aemilium* di Joseph Tusiani”; Iacobus Dalla Pietà, “Pauca de Latinitate scribendique genere Iosephi Tusiani”; Tom Deneire, “‘Two strange halves of one?’ A Poetological Comparison of Joseph Tusiani’s Latin and English *Standstill*”; and Mauro Pisini, “Aspetti di modernità nella poesia di Joseph Tusiani. Lettura antologica di *In nobis caelum. Carmina Latina*.” Four shorter pieces, under the rubric ‘Instrumentum criticum,’ follow: Katarzyna Jasińska-Zdun and Konrad Kokozkiewicz, “A ‘Poetical Play’? Critical Notes to a Letter of Ioannes Dantiscus (Kolberg, No. 3)”; Thomas Gärtner, “Zur brieflichen Responsio Ulixis ad Penelopen”; Gilbert Tournoy, “Some Observations on the *Liber amicorum* of Jan van Hout”; and Dirk Sacré, “‘Women Latin Poets’: Some Notes.” Next comes the invaluable ‘Instrumentum bibliographicum neolatinum,’ 75 pages listing the books and articles that comprise the year’s work in Neo-Latin studies. Several pages containing newly identified Latin words (the ‘Instrumentum lexicographicum’) and announcements are followed by indices of manuscripts and names from the articles contained in the journal.

It is a sign of health and vitality that Neo-Latin studies is being served by a couple of newer journals, but *Humanistica Lovaniensia* remains the gold standard for the field, the journal against which other

very worthy achievements are still measured, almost sixty years after its founding. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)