

NEO-LATIN NEWS

Vol. 64, 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.

◆ *The Deeds of Commander Pietro Mocenigo*. By Coriolano Cippico. Translated by Kiril Petkov. New York: Italica Press, 2014. XXXVIII + 109 pp. The author of this book, Coriolano Cippico (1425–1493), was a Dalmatian nobleman who worked within the orbit of Venetian humanism, having received a good education at the University of Padua and associated with such intellectuals as Marcantonio Sabellico and Palladio Fosco. He left Trogir (Trau), his ancestral home, to serve for four years with Pietro Mocenigo after the Venetian Senate launched a naval force against the Ottoman Turks in response to the capture of Negroponte. Composed shortly after his return, *The Deeds* was dedicated to Marcantonio Morosini, who was then the Venetian ambassador to the duke of Burgundy.

The Deeds offers an account of Cippico's service in behalf of the Venetian republic, but as the lengthy introduction explains, it is a complex work that resists easy categorization. Cippico was drawn into this adventure because his home town was under the control of Venice, and his work is certainly an encomium of an exemplary Venetian noble, but it is not an unvarnished praise of Venice, for Cippico was motivated as much by patriotism toward Trogir as he was by his obligations to Venice. Mocenigo is presented as a model of civic duty, loyalty, and service to the state, but the values Cippico is prais-

ing are more universal than restricted to the Venetian Renaissance. By education and temperament, Cippico was a humanist, and his treatise was constructed in the manner of Plutarch's *Lives* and written in a straightforward Latin prose that met the avant garde standards of the day, with sources including Pliny the Elder and Strabo and with Mocenigo coming to resemble Julius Caesar. But in many cases, the ethnographic and antiquarian lore seems more ornamental than substantive, since the guiding structure looks like a throwback to the Venetian tradition of maritime warfare. Religion is an important part of the narrative, but in the end the treatise fails to present a clear differentiation between Christian and Muslim that could provide a sustained high moral ground: indeed more than once, Mocenigo and his troops resemble thieves more closely than pious crusaders. Petkov explains this as resulting from the fact that the period in which *The Deeds* was written "reflects a period during which the moral certainty of the traditional crusade had given way to a confused double standard through which the paradigm of encountering the 'other' was incorporated into Western political practice" (XXXV). This analysis may reflect more of our values than Cippico's, but Petkov is certainly right to note that the interplay of the various strands within the work gives the treatise unusual interest for the modern reader.

The volume contains a translation, but not a Latin text. This is a pity, since a modern edition was made by Renata Fabbri in her *Per la memorialistica veneziana in latino del Quattrocento. Filippo da Rimini, Francesco Contarini, Coriolano Cippico* (Padua, 1988). Since the translation comes to only a little over a hundred pages, it would have been nice to have a bilingual edition. Petkov explains in his introduction (XXXVII) that he had aimed for a literal translation and apologizes for what he considers an unfortunate amount of clumsy phrasing that resulted from this goal, but I have to say I failed to notice this: the translation is straightforward and perhaps not elegant, but these are really qualities that are inherent in Cippico's Latin. The translation is lightly annotated and supplemented with a good bibliography, which is important given that even specialists in Renaissance humanism are often not very familiar with what went on in the eastern Mediterranean basin during that period. All in all this is a nice little book that will make interesting reading for anyone interested in humanist history

written within the Neo-Latin tradition. (Craig Kallendorf)

Review Essay: The Worldwide Web of Erasmus

Desiderius Erasmus Roterodamus (1467-1536) left a huge written legacy.¹ To this day, many people are still working hard to manage this abundant inheritance, and there are countless readers who draw upon the richness of his works. Erasmus himself had no doubts about the value of his legacy and designed a publication schedule that formed the basis for the most important editions. A version of that design can be found in the volume of letters under discussion here.² In 1540, Erasmus' loyal friend and pupil Beatus Rhenanus (1485–1547) worked with Sigismund Gelenius (1497–1554)—corrector at Froben from 1524 until his death³—on the first publication of his *Opera omnia*. Between 1703 and 1706, a new, expanded edition was published, identified as LB (Lugduno-Batavorum), after the place of its publication.⁴ As well as editions and translations of separate works by Erasmus across the world, the 1960s also saw the start of a major project on a new edition of *Opera omnia*, referred to as ASD, an abbreviation

¹ C. Reedijk, *Tandem bona causa triumphat. Zur Geschichte des Gesamtwerkes des Erasmus von Rotterdam*. Vorträge der Aeneas-Silvius-Stiftung an der Universität von Basel XVI (Basel-Stuttgart 1980); cf. J. Coppens, 'Où en est le portrait d'Érasme théologien?', in: J. Coppens (ed.), *Scrinium Erasmianum* (2 vols.; Leiden 1969) II, 569-620; 594-598: schematic chronological survey.

² Letter 2283, to Hector Boece (Freiburg im Breisgau, 15 March 1530), CWE 16, 210-218.

³ Klara Vanek, 'Der Philologe und Übersetzer Zikmund Hruby z Jelení, Gen. Gelenius (1497-1554). Ein Porträt', *Acta Musei Nationalis Pragae Series C: Historia Literarum* 57.3 (2012) 69-74.

⁴ Cornelis Reedijk, 'The Leiden edition of Erasmus' *Opera Omnia* in a European context', in: August Buck (Hrsg.), *Erasmus und Europa*. Wolfenbütteler Abhandlungen zur Renaissanceforschung 7 (Wiesbaden 1988) 163-182; Marc van der Poel, 'Over de rol van Jean Leclerc bij de Leidse uitgave van Erasmus' *Opera omnia*', *Neolatinistenverband, Nieuwsbrief* 25 (2012) 13-20; the edition of 1540 and the LB-edition are both accessible via www.erasmus.org.

of its place of publication, Amsterdam. Not long after, the decision was made in Toronto to publish translations of Erasmus' works, the *Collected Works of Erasmus* (CWE). These were published from 1974 onward and based on the ASD edition wherever possible.

The first volume of the ASD edition was published to mark the major Erasmus commemoration in 1969, based on the controversial assumption at the time that Erasmus had been born in 1469.⁵ Now his year of birth is generally considered to be 1466, although my personal preference is for 1467.⁶ Since 1969, 47 volumes in the ASD series have been published, the last five of which are our subject here. Three volumes in the CWE series have also been recently published. Volume 16 contains the letters 2204 to 2356, numbered according to Allen's *Opus epistolarum*,⁷ which forms the basis for the letters series (envisaged to be 22 volumes, with which the CWE starts). Occasionally letters that were previously unknown to Allen emerge, enabling letters he had published earlier to be included in a new, more correct

⁵ ASD I.1 (Amsterdam 1969), 'General Introduction', XV; cf. Johannes Trapman, 'Editing the works of Erasmus: some observations on the Amsterdam edition (ASD)', in: Erika Rummel and Milton Kooistra (ed.), *Reformation Sources* (Toronto 2007) 87-101.

⁶ Jan van Herwaarden, 'Erasmus of Rotterdam: the image and the reality,' in: Jan van Herwaarden, *Between Saint James and Erasmus. Studies in late-medieval religious life: devotion and pilgrimage in the Netherlands*. Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought 97 (Leiden-Boston 2003) 509-533; 513-514; 1466: Harry Vredeveld, 'The ages of Erasmus and the year of his birth', *Renaissance Quarterly* 46 (1993) 754-809; John B. Gleason, 'The birth dates of John Colet and Erasmus of Rotterdam: fresh documentary evidence', *Renaissance Quarterly* 32 (1979) 73-76: Colet, born in January 1467 (following the *mos anglicus*: 1468); Vredeveld 776 and n. 53 (reference to Gleason) passes (778-779) too carelessly to two Erasmus letters (Allen nrs. 844 en 867, cf. also nr. 392).

⁷ P.S. Allen, H.M. Allen and H.W. Garrod (eds.), *Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami* I-XI; XII: *Indices* (Oxford 1906-1958); cf. *La correspondance d'Érasme*, sous la direction d'Aloïs Gerlo et de Paul Foriers (up to vol. V) I-XI (Brussels 1957-1982) XII: *Tables générales* (Brussels 1984) and the Dutch edition: *De correspondentie van Erasmus* 1-12 (Rotterdam 2004-2014), up to letter 1801, March 1527.

position; both of these things occur in these publications. The two other volumes are *Spiritualia* and *Pastoralia* (CWE 67 and 68), which include the translation of *Ecclesiastes sive de ratione concionandi* (1535; ASD V.4 and 5),⁸ preceded by *The manner of confessing* (the translation of *Exomologesis sive modo confitendi*, 1524), based on the text of the LB edition (the relevant treatise has not yet been published in the ASD series).⁹

CWE 16: Letters, August 1529-July 1530

These CWE letters cover the period between 9 August 1529 and 31 July 1530, which Erasmus spent in Freiburg im Breisgau. He had moved there from Basel on 13 April 1529, after the Protestant Reformation arrived in that city. In a letter to Thomas More on 5 September 1529, Erasmus wrote that his departure was caused by the (alleged) plotting by a Dominican who advised him in his polemic with the Parisian theology faculty.¹⁰ During this period, Erasmus was seriously ill for a time—suffering from a difficult-to-define *carbunculus*—which hindered his correspondence and movement, but did not prevent him from working.¹¹

⁸ *The correspondence of Erasmus. Letters 2204 to 2356, August 1529 – July 1530*, translated by Alexander Dalzell, annotated by James M. Estes. *Collected Works of Erasmus* 16 (Toronto-Buffalo-London 2015); *The manner of confessing. Exomologesis sive modus confitendi*, translated and annotated by Michael J. Heath, in: *Collected Works of Erasmus* 67 (Toronto-Buffalo-London 2015) 1-75; *The evangelical preacher*, book one. *Ecclesiastes sive de ratione concionandi* I, translated by James L.P. Butrica, annotated by Frederick J. McGinness, *CWE* 67, 77-443; *The evangelical preacher*, books two to four. *Ecclesiastes sive de ratione concionandi* II-IV, translated by James L.P. Butrica, annotated by Frederick J. McGinnis. *Collected Works of Erasmus* 68 (Toronto-Buffalo-London 2015).

⁹ ASD-text *Exomologesis*-edition in press (ASD V.8; information by Prof. Dr J. Bloemendal).

¹⁰ Letter 2211, to Thomas More (Freiburg im Breisgau, 5 September 1529), *CWE* 16, 38, ll. 66-69; James K. Farge, 'Introduction', *ASD* IX.7, 17-18.

¹¹ J.M. Estes, 'Erasmus' illness in 1530', *CWE* 16, 410-411.

In a lengthy letter to his correspondent and member of the Papal Curia Jacopo Sadoletto (1477–1547), the longest letter in this volume, Erasmus complains about the ferocious conflicts but remains optimistic despite everything.¹² Somewhat later, in a letter to one of his closest correspondents, the papal diplomat Lorenzo Campeggi (1474–1539), he would demonstrate his preoccupation with the Turkish peril—“On top of all this there is the ferocity of the Turks”—and his dislike of the Anabaptists: “Think how blindly the hapless [better: calamitous, JvH] Anabaptists are rushing to their deaths.”¹³

Fear was ever-present and Erasmus was convinced of being in the gravest danger, since “once the signal for war is given, Erasmus will perish like the proverbial bean at the end of the row.” Erasmus is here referring to a proverb that, although not included in his *Adagia*, was at his disposal. It is interesting to note the lack of any annotation to this passage, just as in Allen, despite the fact that it could have been known that the source was to be found in Erasmus’ library.¹⁴

‘New’ letters here include a scribbled note to Bonifatius Amerbach (1495–1562), who continued to represent Erasmus’ interests in Basel (in terms of the number of letters, their correspondence is the most

¹² Letter 2312A [=Allen 2315], to Jacopo Sadoletto (Freiburg im Breisgau, ca 16 April 1530), CWE 16, 306, ll. 294-296: “two things give us some hope: one is the wonderful genius of the emperor Charles, and the second is that these people disagree among themselves over their own doctrines”; cf. James D. Tracy, *Erasmus of the Low Countries* (Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1996) 171-174.

¹³ Letter 2328, to Lorenzo Campeggi (Freiburg im Breisgau, 24 June 1530), CWE 16, 328-333, ll. 81-83; 99-100; 123-124; “disastrous” instead of “hapless” (cf. Allen VIII, 451, l. 123: *Iam infelices Anabaptistae quanta coecitate in mortem ruunt*): Erasmus did not mean the disposition of the Anabaptists but hinted at what they brought about, namely disaster; 107-108.

¹⁴ Frits Husner, ‘Die Bibliothek des Erasmus’, in: *Gedenkschrift zum 400. Todestage des Erasmus von Rotterdam*, herausgegeben von der Historischen und Antiquarischen Gesellschaft zu Basel (Basel 1936) 228-259; 242: nr 286: *Nonius Marcellus, Festus Pompeius. Varro*; cf. Margaret Mann Phillips, *The ‘Adages’ of Erasmus: a study with translations* (Cambridge 1964) 91: Erasmus had an excerpt from Flaccus (55BC-AD 20) *De significatione verborum* by Sextus Pompeius Festus (2nd century) at hand.

substantial in this volume). “I am very anxious to know what *Borus* is doing,” Erasmus wrote on 6 November 1529 from Freiburg im Breisgau.¹⁵ Reading that, an immediate association with Luther, who was, after all, Katherina von *Bora*’s spouse, sprang to my mind. I soon discovered that Rotterdam-based Erasmus expert Niek van der Blom (1917–2006) had got there before me.¹⁶ However, in his annotation to the letter, Peter G. Bietenholz refers to Martin Borrhaus from Stuttgart (1499–1564), thought to have been called Martinus Cellarius and included in the *Contemporaries of Erasmus* under the keyword *Borus*, but who had virtually no other associations with Erasmus.¹⁷ It seems to me that Van der Blom’s suggestion is more likely than the far-fetched identification of Borrhaus, especially since the comment about ‘Borus’ is in line with the way in which Erasmus thought of Luther in that period: “As for Luther, I have no idea how things stand between him and me,” he wrote in August 1529.¹⁸

CWE 67–68: *Exomologesis* (1524) and *Ecclesiastes* (1535)

The *Exomologesis* dates from 1524 and the *Ecclesiastes* from 1535, and however significant these time differences may be, Erasmus’ work also seems to form a consistent whole here, too: in letter 2205 to Johann von Botzheim, a passage is based on a view of the proper effect of confession, according to the *Exomologesis*.¹⁹ A little later, it is evident from letter 2225, written in October 1529, that Erasmus was

¹⁵ Letter 2233A, to Bonifatius Amerbach (Freiburg im Breisgau, 6 November 1529), CWE 16, 89, ll. 9-10.

¹⁶ *Correspondance d’Érasme* VIII, 388, n. 5; N. van der Blom, ‘Qui était Borus?’ *Moreana* 33 (1972) 51-58.

¹⁷ P.G. Bietenholz, ‘Borus’, in: Peter G. Bietenholz and Thomas B. Deutscher (ed.), *Contemporaries of Erasmus. A biographical register of the Renaissance and Reformation* 1-3 (Toronto-Buffalo-London 1985-1987) 1, 174.

¹⁸ Letter 2204, to Janus Cornarius (Freiburg im Breisgau, 9 August 1530), CWE 16, 2-4, ll. 19-20.

¹⁹ Letter 2205, to Johann von Botzheim (Freiburg im Breisgau, 13 August 1529), CWE 16, 8, n. 10.

already hard at work on what would later become the *Ecclesiastes*.²⁰ He had already started on this as early as 1519, although at that time it concerned something that Erasmus “had promised by way of a joke” (*ioco promissus*), as he testified much later.²¹ For that matter, this brooding over *Ecclesiastes* can be seen far earlier, in the way in which *Concio de puero Iesu* (1511) was drafted.²²

Ecclesiastes is Erasmus’ most substantial writing, in which he re-emphasises “that grammar is the basis of all disciplines” and “dialectic is blind without grammar.”²³ He once more addresses almost every subject that ever mattered to him throughout his life: the work “virtually recapitulates the entirety of the man’s career.”²⁴ However the lack of his opinions about Turks, pilgrimages, and indulgences is striking—opinions that he repeatedly included elsewhere in his works and particularly in the other writings under discussion here. In only a single comment, albeit a very characteristic one, does Erasmus give his judgment on one of these subjects in the *Ecclesiastes*: “How many set out for Jerusalem through so many dangers, leaving at home their sweet children and dearest wife.”²⁵ It is probably because he adopted

²⁰ Letter 2225, to Ludwig Baer (Freiburg im Breisgau, 22 October 1529), CWE 16, 70, n. 10.

²¹ Letter 932: proposal by Johan Becker van Borselen (28 March 1519); Letter 952: Erasmus’ reaction (24 April 1519), Allen III, 514-516, ll. 16-18; 555-556, ll. 1-15; cf. CWE 67, 86-87; Letter 2979, to John Cochlaeus (Freiburg im Breisgau, 24 November 1534): Allen IX, 51, ll. 3-4: *ioco promissus*.

²² E. Kearns (ed.), *Concio de puero Iesu*, ASD V.7, 159-188; 160-161.

²³ CWE 68, 473, 474; ASD V.4, 252, ll. 138-139: *Primum illud constat grammaticen esse disciplinarum omnium fundamentum, ...*; ll. 150-151: *Atqui dialectica caeca est absque grammatica*; cf. Jacques Chomarat, *Grammaire et rhétorique chez Érasme* (2 vols.; Paris 1981) I, 165-167.

²⁴ CWE 67, 78: ‘Introductory note’, cf. Christine Christ-von Wedel, *Erasmus of Rotterdam: advocate of a new Christianity* (Toronto-Buffalo-London 2013) 140-141; 140: “the whole of salvific history as an epic story,” cf. 237-238.

²⁵ *Ecclesiastes* I, CWE 67, 367; ASD V.4, 156-158, ll. 480-482: *Quam multi sunt, qui per tot rerum discrimina proficiscuntur Hierosolymam, domi relictis dulcibus liberis et uxore clarissima?*

such a skeptical approach to these kinds of phenomena that he did not wish to consider them as a subject about which to preach. Erasmus ends the *Ecclesiastes* with a reflection about unity, *concordia*, “the agreement of good men in a good cause,” and the statement that nothing corresponds more to human nature than friendship, *amicitia*.²⁶ In one of his very first writings, Erasmus had responded to the Hook and Cod Wars (*Hoekse en Kabeljauwse twisten*) of the County of Holland by expressing his views on the theme of *discordia-concordia*, and it is no coincidence that both of the first *Adagia* are on the subject of *Amicitia*.²⁷

ASD V: *Spiritualia et Pastoralia* 7

ASD V.7 contains 5 annotated writings that relate to pastoral care and a commentary on 2 hymns by Prudentius. First of all, these concern “A sermon on the immense mercy of God,” *De immensa Dei misericordia concio* (1524),²⁸ intended for pupils at the school run by John Colet (1468–1519) in London, that particularly struck a chord in Italy.²⁹ With the second text, “The Comparison of a Virgin and a Martyr,” *Virginis et martyris comparatio* (1523 abridged, 1524 full text),³⁰ Erasmus was fulfilling a promise made to the rector of a nunnery in Cologne, where Maccabean remains were to be found. He had previously edited a text for him about the Maccabees that was at that time attributed to Flavius Josephus. His *Comparatio* partly

²⁶ CWE 68, 1098-1104; quotation: 1103.

²⁷ Marc van der Poel, ‘Erasmus’ *Oratio de pace et discordia contra fictiosos ad Cornelium Goudanum*, in: Dirk Sacré and Marcus de Schepper (ed.), *Et Scholae et vitae* (Amersfoort 2004) 45-62; ASD II.1 (Amsterdam 1993) 84-86, ll. 684-741: *Amicorum communia omnia* (I.1.1); 86 (-114), ll. 742-766: *Amicitia aequalitas. Amicus alter ipse* (I.1.2; + extension i-xxxvi).

²⁸ CWE 70 (Toronto-Boston-London 1998) 69-140, translated and annotated by Michael J. Heath.

²⁹ ASD V.7, 6; Silvana Seidel Menchi, *Erasmus als Ketzer. Reformation und Inquisition im Italien des 16. Jahrhunderts*. Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought 49 (Leiden-New York-Cologne 1993) 97, 202-203.

³⁰ CWE 69 (Toronto-Buffalo-London 1999) 153-182, translated and annotated by Louis A. Perraud.

formed the inspiration for the creation of a new gilded reliquary for the Maccabees, which is now in Cologne's St. Andrew's Church.³¹

The third text is "A Sermon on the Child Jesus," *Concio de puero Iesu* (1511), a didactic text intended for John Colet's School in London, including a remarkable observation: "In fact, to sum up, Christianity is nothing other than a rebirth and a sort of renewed infancy": *Omnino Christianismus nihil aliud est quam renascentia, quam repuerascentia quaedam*.³² In the same context, but originating from earlier, "A short debate concerning the distress, alarm, and sorrow of Jesus," *Disputatiuncula de tedio pavore tristitia Iesu* (1503), dedicated to Colet, plays on a reaction from Colet and Erasmus' answer to it.³³

Shortly after Erasmus arrived at Oxford in October 1499 and met John Colet (1468–1519), they became involved in a discussion of the interpretation of the events at Gethsemane (Mt. 26:36–46), with Erasmus taking the commonly-held view that Jesus felt a human fear for his imminent suffering, whereas Colet followed in Jerome's footsteps in thinking that Christ has a presentiment of the guilt that the Jewish people were about to take on for their role in Jesus' death.³⁴

The fifth piece of writing is the "Exhortation to the pious reader," *Paraclesis ad lectorem pium*, an introduction to *Novum Instrumentum*, the original title of Erasmus' edition of the New Testament. Erasmus again emphasised some of the key principles of his *Enchiridion* (1503), "imploring readers to put off all human pretence and embrace

³¹ Werner Schäfke, *Köln. Zwei Jahrtausende Kunst, Geschichte und Kultur* (Köln 1989²) 135; Roswitha Hirner, *Der Makkabäerschrein in St. Andreas zu Köln* (Bonn 1970) 20–36; 42; cf. Pál Ács, *The names of the holy Maccabees. Erasmus and the origin of the Hungarian Protestant martyrology*, www.academia.edu/4145179 (2002).

³² ASD V.7, 178, ll. 199–200; CWE 29 (Toronto-Buffalo-London 1989) 51–70, translated and annotated by Emily Kearns; 62; Georges Chantraine, *'Mystère' et 'philosophie du Christ' selon Érasme. Étude de la lettre à P. Volz et de la 'Ratio verae theologiae'* (Namur-Gembloux 1971) 215–217.

³³ CWE 70, 1–67, translated and annotated by Michael J. Heath.

³⁴ For this see G.J. Fokke, 'An aspect of the Christology of Erasmus of Rotterdam', *Ephemerides theologiae Lovanienses* 54 (1978) 161–187; ASD V.7, 194–195: 'Le montage de G.J. Fokke'.

the simplicity of the Gospel.”³⁵ The 2 commentaries on poems by Prudentius concern one on the subject of the Nativity and one on the Epiphany.³⁶ They are dedicated to Margaret Roper (1505–1544), Thomas More’s daughter, highly esteemed by Erasmus, who had just become a mother.³⁷

ASD VI: New Testament and *Annotationes* 10

ASD VI.10 is the final volume of the series on the New Testament, the first 4 volumes of which contain the Greek-Latin edition and the subsequent 6 contain Erasmus’ annotations on it, the *Annotationes*. This corpus, completed by the *Paraphrases*³⁸ (published later) that make up the *Ordo VII* in the ASD edition, forms the core of Erasmus’ work.³⁹ This volume contains the annotations from 1 Timothy up to Revelations. Here again we can see the extent to which Erasmus had been inspired in this work by the *Annotationes* of Lorenzo Valla (1407–1457),⁴⁰ although “his textual scholarship surpassed that of

³⁵ Tracy, *Erasmus of the Low Countries*, 75.

³⁶ Up to 1540 both comments followed on Erasmus’ *Commentarius in Nuce[m] Ovidii*: Ch. Béné, ‘Introduction’, ASD V.7, 308-309.

³⁷ Erasmus commemorated Margaret also in his Colloquy *Abbatis et eruditae* (ASD I.3, 403-408); inversely Margaret translated Erasmus’ *Precatio dominica*: John Archer Gee, ‘Margaret Roper’s English version of Erasmus’ *Precatio dominica* and the apprenticeship behind early Tudor translation’, *The Review of English Studies* 13 (1937) 257-271; see also R.J. Schoeck in CE II, 455-456; cf. Hilmar M. Pabel, *Conversing with God: prayer in Erasmus’ pastoral writings* (Toronto-Buffalo-London 1997) 109-154: ‘Interpreting the Lord’s prayer’, esp. 112-124.

³⁸ R.A.B. Mynors, ‘The publication of the Latin *Paraphrases*’, in: Robert Dick Sider (ed.), *New Testament Scholarship: Paraphrases on Romans and Galatians*, CWE 42 (Toronto-Buffalo-London 1984) xx-xxix; cf. Christ-von Wedel, *Erasmus of Rotterdam*, 97-110: ‘Erasmus the paraphrast’.

³⁹ Christ-von Wedel, *Erasmus of Rotterdam*, 79-96: ‘The New Testament Scholar’; cf. Jerry H. Bentley, *Humanists and Holy Writ. New Testamental scholarship in the Renaissance* (Princeton 1983) 112-193: ‘Desiderius Erasmus: Christian humanist’.

⁴⁰ R.J. Schoeck, ‘Erasmus and Valla: the dynamics of a relationship’, *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook* 12 (1992) 45-63; Christ-von Wedel,

his predecessors.”⁴¹ Valla’s name occurs by far the most frequently in the references, even more so than that of Jerome, who was after all Erasmus’ mainstay in this: it is no coincidence that Erasmus is referred to as *Hieronymus redivivus*.⁴²

This volume includes the annotation to verse 7 of 1 John 5, with Erasmus’ commentary concerning the notorious *Comma Johanneum*: “dieser Konflikt um das *Comma Johanneum* dauert noch immer an” (this conflict over the *Comma Johanneum* still rages on).⁴³ The oh-so-intriguing digression about the trinity that bears witness to faith in Jesus Christ is shown in square brackets in many newer translations of the Bible. In the original version of the text, the Spirit and the water and blood sufficed in bearing witness in the earth, supplemented in the *Comma* by: “in heaven: the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one.” This is not to dwell on this theological nicety and its impact on the religious contradictions of the time, but to highlight that Erasmus was very much aware of the historic nature of his texts and that it was only after some hesitation that he reached the textual version that, because it had been included in the Vulgate, would be authoritative.⁴⁴

Erasmus of Rotterdam, 54-59.

⁴¹ Bentley, *Humanists and Holy Writ*, 155.

⁴² Eugene F. Rice, Jr., *Saint Jerome in the Renaissance* (Baltimore-London 1985) 116-136; 242-248 (notes): “Hieronymus redivivus: Erasmus and St. Jerome.”

⁴³ M.L. van Poll-van de Lisdonk, ‘Einleitung’, ASD VI.10, XI-L; XLVIII.

⁴⁴ ASD VI.4, 27-111; extensive examination of ‘Codex 61 (Monfortianus) and 1 John 5, 7-8’; 482-484; VI.10, XLVIII, 540-551 and references, esp. H.J. de Jonge, ‘Erasmus and the Comma Johanneum’, *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 56 (1980) 381-389 and Grantley Robert McDonald, *Raising the Ghost of Arius. Erasmus, the Johannine Comma and the religious difference in Early Modern Europe* (Brussels 2011).

ASD IX: *Apologiae* 6, 7, and 8

This concerns 3 volumes with apologies.⁴⁵ The first in this series contains Erasmus' contribution to the polemic with Alberto Pio (1475–1531),⁴⁶ the diplomat robbed of his principedom, Carpi, who, during the period in which Erasmus was polemicising with him, died in France as an asylum-seeker dressed in a Franciscan habit (which Erasmus would reveal in his Colloquium *Exequiae seraphicae*⁴⁷). Even though he realised that he was conversing with a dead man, Erasmus persisted with his polemic—*ludus exit in rabiem*, “the game became a fury.”⁴⁸ The second is addressed to the scribes at the theology faculty at the University of Paris.⁴⁹ The third—the first of the three chronologically—is a continuation of the publication of the polemic that the

⁴⁵ Erika Rummel, *Erasmus and his Catholic critics I: 1515-1522; II: 1523-1536* (Nieuwkoop 1989).

⁴⁶ *Apologiae adversus Albertum Pium*, ed. C.L. Heesakkers in collaboration with W.G. Heesakkers-Kamerbeek, ASD IX.6 (Leiden-Boston 2015); vgl. CWE 84: *Controversies*, ed. by Nelson H. Minnich, translated by Daniel Sheerin, annotated by Nelson H. Minnich and Daniel Sheerin: *Controversy with Alberto Pio* (Toronto-Buffalo-London 2005).

⁴⁷ ASD IX.6, 38-39; cf. Letter 2441 to ‘Eleutherius’ = Sebastian Franck (Freiburg im Breisgau, 6 March 1531), Allen VIII, 153-156, ll. 64-77; the colloquy: ASD I.3 (Amsterdam 1972) 686-699; CWE 40 (Toronto-Buffalo-London 1997) 996-1032 (with extensive annotation by the editor, Craig R. Thompson).

⁴⁸ ASD IX.6, 34: quotation from Letter 2108 to Hermann Phrysius (Basle, 25 February 1529), Allen VIII, 66-67, ll. 15-16; dispute with dead individuals, etc: ASD IX.6, 248-250, ll. 14-19; 364, l. 877: *Non est phas antipaizein* (in Greek) *in mortuum*; 552, l. 735: *Sed desino ludere in mortuum*; Chris L. Heesakkers, ‘*Argumentatio a persona* in Erasmus’ second apology against Alberto Pio’, in: J. Sperna Weiland and W.Th.M. Frijhoff (ed.), *Erasmus of Rotterdam: man of letters* (Leiden etc. 1988) 79-87; 81: colloquy *Exequiae seraphicae*.

⁴⁹ *Declarationes ad censuras Lutetiae*, ed. C.H. Miller and J.K. Farge, ‘Introduction’, ASD IX.7 (Leiden-Boston 2015); vgl. CWE 82: *Controversies* (Toronto-Buffalo-London 2012).

Spanish theologian Diego López Zúñiga,⁵⁰ later supported by Sancho Carranza de Miranda, had entered into with Erasmus, in particular concerning his publication of the New Testament.

Erasmus' initial response had already been published in this series (ASD IX.2), in which Erasmus' reactions to both criticisms now continues, whereby it should be noted that the whole of this polemic should be placed in the context of Erasmus' responses to critical comments made by a number of Spanish monks, which first appeared in 1528.⁵¹ It is hard to imagine that Erasmus was able to write these exhausting polemics, and indeed how he did so. In his ever-valuable Erasmus biography, Huizinga refers almost with sadness to these polemical activities:

Erasmus never emerged from his polemics. He was, no doubt, serious when he said that, in his heart, he abhorred and had never desired them; but his caustic mind often got the better of his heart, and having once begun to quarrel he undoubtedly enjoyed giving his mockery the rein and wielding his facile dialectical pen.⁵²

In his letter to Jacopo Sadoletto referred to earlier, Erasmus viewed the battlefield himself and concluded regretfully: "If only it were possible to unweave the past and begin again!"⁵³ Erasmus' regret primarily concerned his plea for the *libertas spiritus* that had led to no shortage of misunderstandings, when in fact all he had intended was to provide believers with some relief from ceremonial obligations in

⁵⁰ *Apologia contra sanctium Caranzam et quattuor contra Stunicam*, ed. H.J. de Jonge, ASD IX.8 (Leiden-Boston 2015).

⁵¹ Letter 1967, to Alfonso Manrique (Basel, 14 March 1528), Allen VII, 348-354; text: LB IX, 1015-1094.

⁵² Johan Huizinga, *Erasmus and the age of Reformation* (London 2002 [=1924]) 158; 177, cf. Allen I, 56-71; 68, ll. 445-447: "had he known that an age like theirs was coming, he would never have written many things, or would not have written them as he had."

⁵³ Letter 2312A [=Allen 2315], CWE 16, 295-306; ll. 308-309; cf. Allen VIII, 428-436; 435, ll. 299-300: *Utinam liceret omnia ab integro retexere!*

order to make them more open to true piety (*vera pietas*).⁵⁴ It is not too far-fetched to see in this one of Erasmus' reasons for going on to complete his *Ecclesiastes* after all.

* *

*

Erasmus, the networker in his letters, Erasmus the pastor, or at least the sympathetic adviser *in spiritualiis* in his pastoral writings, the grammarian / theologian in his edition of the New Testament with all the accompanying writings, and Erasmus the polemicist—all these aspects of his life and works complement each other. These publications, with their meticulous annotations and descriptions, form an almost inexhaustible source from which to draw freely, not least thanks to the registers. (Jan van Herwaarden, Erasmus University Rotterdam; translated by UvA Talen, University of Amsterdam, Translations)

◆ *La correspondance de Guillaume Budé et Juan Luis Vives*. Introduction, critical edition, and notes by Gilbert Tournoy. Preface and introduction by M. Mund-Dopchie. Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia, 38. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2015. 160 pp. This volume constitutes, by its own admission (7), a slim chapter in the history of the life and work of two giants of early sixteenth-century humanism. Only 10 of the letters exchanged by Guillaume Budé (1467–1540) and Juan Luis Vives (1493–1540) between 1519 and 1533 are known to us today. Indeed, one of these letters, the last presented in the present volume (Vives to Budé, Bruges 1533, 145–48), was included as a model letter in Vives' *De conscribendis epistolis* (1534) and, as such, was probably never intended to be sent. While thin, however, the book represents a new and genuinely interesting contribution to knowledge about the life and preoccupations of Budé and, to a lesser extent, Vives. The volume's success is in no small part due to the masterful treatment of the material by the two experienced editors, whose careful French translation, thorough critical handling of the Latin and Greek texts, and informative commentary make the

⁵⁴ Letter 1887 (15 October 1527), Allen VII, 198–201, ll. 11–15: ...; *ut vehementer doleam me quondam in libris meis praedicasse libertatem spiritus ... Optabam sic aliquid decedere ceremoniis ut multum accresceret verae pietati.*

book at once a useful tool for specialists and rewarding material for the interested reader.

The book's introduction (11–22) is economical, but nonetheless effectively contextualises Budé and Vives' correspondence: Intellectual life in Europe is dominated by Erasmus, but the figures of Budé, Vives, and Thomas More (1478–1535), whose surviving letters are outnumbered by those of Erasmus by more than ten to one (11), also have significant roles to play. Budé and Vives had met twice in Paris in May and then June of 1519. Their correspondence began shortly afterwards with a letter from Vives in June or July of the same year. This letter is now lost, but the reply from Budé survived, and it is with this letter (19 August 1519, 25–43) that the present volume begins. There followed an intense exchange of letters until 1521, the surviving testimony of which takes us to letter 7 of the present volume, before their correspondence dwindled for reasons proposed in the introduction (13–15). Towards the end of 1529, Vives wrote to Budé (letter 8, 129–36), expressing his wish to resume their fruitful discussions, and in the final surviving letter actually sent between the two (letter 9, 137–44), Vives responds to a request for advice from Budé by saying that it is not for him, as the younger of the two, to counsel the elder statesman. He does nevertheless eventually advise Budé to take care of himself and to take up a role as mentor if his health and competing commitments prevent him from standing in the first line of scholarship. Indeed, Vives' position in this letter is representative of his attitude throughout the correspondence, that of the younger and less experienced scholar who, though admiring his elder, nonetheless eloquently expresses his opinions to Budé and achieves his ends through careful writing.

The 10 surviving letters edited here represent a tiny fraction of the total correspondence between the two men. While Budé reworked and published the 6 letters in the collection that survive from him, the 4 by Vives had more varied fates (7). It is perhaps for this reason that the overall impression of the present volume is one dominated by Budé: it is Budé's personal life that is most often at the centre of discussion (his move to Marly, the slow unpacking of his library, his responsibilities in Paris, etc.); Budé's need for rest after the publication of his *De asse et partibus eius* (1515/1516) and, perhaps most

interestingly, Budé's reflections and concerns on his growing rivalry with Erasmus—often only tactically expressed in these letters—come to the fore. But this is not the fault of the editors, who have provided neat summaries and perceptive comments on each letter with a balanced respect for both authors.

Thus Tournoy and Mund-Dopchie's edition assuredly takes its place alongside the recent modern editions of Neo-Latin scholarly correspondence. The desire that some readers may feel for more detailed reflection on the literary aspects of the letters in the commentary (Budé develops, for example, a long combat metaphor in letter 2, which receives only cursory explanation in the notes) may well be better satisfied in a separate study. And specialised readers will appreciate the translation of Vives' eulogy of Budé (1522) in the volume's appendix, and the presence of a formal bibliography of secondary source material at its end. (William Barton, Ludwig Boltzmann Institut für Neulateinische Studien, Innsbruck, Austria)

◆ *Praelectio et commentaire à la Silve Rusticus d'Ange Politien (1518)*. Par Nicolas Béraud. Édition, traduction et commentaire de Perrine Galand, avec la collaboration de Georges André Bergère, Anne Bouscharain et Olivier Pédeflous. Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance, 537. Genève: Droz, 2015. LXX + 618 pp. Depuis son élégante traduction des *Silves* d'Ange Politien, précédée d'une substantielle introduction (Paris, 1987), Perrine Galand n'a cessé d'explorer à la fois l'histoire de ce genre protéiforme et la réception de l'humaniste florentin, en particulier dans la France de la Renaissance, comme en témoigne un grand nombre de ses travaux, parmi lesquels on rappellera son édition et sa traduction de la *Sylve Parisienne* de Joannes Vaccaeus (Genève, 2002) et plus récemment le collectif *La Silve. Histoire d'une écriture libérée en Europe, de l'Antiquité au XVIII^e siècle* (éd. avec Sylvie Laigneau, Turnhout, 2013). C'est donc tout naturellement que P. Galand s'est penchée sur le professeur et philologue natif d'Orléans Nicolas Béraud (c. 1470-ap. 1545), ami d'Erasme et de Guillaume Budé qui a contribué à introduire, avec l'éditeur Josse Bade, les travaux du Florentin dans les milieux humanistes parisiens. Dans ce volume, elle livre une édition critique du texte latin et une traduction française de la *praelectio* (leçon inaugurale) à la silve *Rusticus* de Politien pro-

noncée par Béraud à Paris au collège Tréguier le 9 novembre 1513, ainsi que des textes liminaires et du copieux et érudit commentaire qui l'accompagnent dans l'édition publiée chez Froben à Bâle en 1518. Le geste de Béraud forme une sorte de mise en abyme, puisque la silve *Rusticus* de Politien constitue elle-même une *praelectio* écrite en hexamètres dactyliques par laquelle le professeur introduisit son cours sur la poésie géorgique à Florence en 1483. Dans la fidèle traduction que donne P. Galand des textes de Béraud, le lecteur pourra regretter à l'occasion une absence d'actualisation qui aurait été bienvenue: pour rendre *Lutetia*, l'anachronique «Lutèce» a été préféré à «Paris»; quant aux dates, P. Galand a choisi de conserver le système du calendrier romain, utilisé par Béraud certes, mais qui s'avère d'une lisibilité discutable aujourd'hui et qu'il faut par conséquent gloser en note. A l'exclusion de cette (petite) réserve, la qualité de la traduction offerte par P. Galand force l'admiration, tout comme l'incroyable richesse de l'appareil de notes qui vient mettre au jour l'immense culture encyclopédique de Béraud en identifiant avec précision ses sources, tant antiques que médiévales ou modernes, et souligne les multiples enjeux de l'œuvre.

L'ensemble des textes de Béraud est précédé d'une introduction qui les replace dans leur contexte de composition et en dégage les principaux apports. Après une indispensable synthèse critique, P. Galand fournit d'importants renseignements bio-bibliographiques sur Béraud. L'introduction sait en outre mettre en évidence le rôle crucial qu'a joué Béraud en commentant la silve *Rusticus*: ce choix original d'auteur permet à Béraud de diffuser à Paris les théories poétiques novatrices de l'humaniste florentin d'une part, de montrer que la *translatio studii* se poursuit en France d'autre part. Une analyse de la *praelectio*, avec une utile mise au point sur ce genre pédagogique encore imparfaitement étudié, et du commentaire de Béraud vient nourrir une part importante de l'introduction, qui s'achève par la présentation des principes d'édition retenus.

L'ouvrage se clôt sur une bibliographie, en toute logique plus axée sur Béraud que sur Politien, ainsi que sur un précieux index des noms d'auteurs anciens, médiévaux et humanistes cités aussi bien par Béraud que par P. Galand; cet outil permet de circuler aisément dans le volume.

Avec ce beau livre, P. Galand procure au public savant une étude qui passionnera tous ceux qui s'intéressent non seulement au genre de la silve dans l'Europe de la Renaissance, mais aussi aux relais grâce auxquels l'héritage de l'humanisme italien a pu se diffuser dans les cercles intellectuels français au XVI^e siècle. Cette étude présente en outre un intérêt majeur pour qui travaille sur les productions littéraires pédagogiques telles que les leçons inaugurales ou les cours, encore trop peu connues en dépit de l'importance avérée par de multiples témoignages de ces pratiques scolaires et universitaires. (Lucie Claire, Université de Picardie Jules Verne, Amiens, France)

◆ *The Correspondence of Wolfgang Capito*, vol. 3: 1532–1536. By Wolfgang Capito. Translated by Erika Rummel. Annotated by Milton Kooistra. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015. xxx + 515 pp. \$175. The book under review here constitutes the third of four volumes of the complete correspondence of the reformer Wolfgang Capito (1478–1541), the first part of which appeared in 2005. The first volume's themes were formative in nature, depicting a young humanist Erasmian advisor to the Archbishop-Elector of Mainz slowly losing and finding himself on the canvass of spreading confessional and doctrinal skirmishes of the budding Reformation. The second volume's horizons are broader and more open-ended, illuminating both the man who seems to have accepted his role as one of those "whom God has sent to defend the Word!" and his efforts to foster the victorious Reformation's blossoming in his adopted Strasbourg, with all the vicissitudes such an avocation entailed. The third volume covers correspondence from the years 1532 through 1536, which culminated in the Wittenberg Concord, a compromise negotiated by Capito and his colleague Martin Bucer between the Lutheran and Reformed churches. During this time Bucer became the leading theologian in Strasbourg, as Capito found that his efforts to mediate were not up to the increasingly partisan environment in which he found himself. The letters in this volume illustrate Capito's efforts to negotiate the Concord and to encourage churches in the various cities to accept it, along with his efforts to help settle other disputes that arose at this time. His reputation extended through Switzerland, Germany, and France, as his correspondence shows, but the majority

of the official letters from this period concern internal matters that needed the attention of the authorities in Strasbourg. These included financial questions and matters concerning the administration of the church, doctrinal questions as they affected public order, and the education of future ministers, and they often indicate collaborative efforts between the magistrates and the church. Many of the letters also contain information about Capito's personal life. He remarried during this period and also struggled against illness and financial difficulties. This was nevertheless a productive time for him, in that he published a translation of one of Erasmus's works, editions of two of Oecolampadius's commentaries, a pamphlet, and a volume of prayers. Much interesting material is to be found here.

Like the first two volumes, this one is based on Olivier Millet's finding list of Capito's letters, increased by about 20% to reflect a broader definition of what constitutes authorship by Capito. Texts that are easily accessible in modern works like the editions of Amerbach, Bucer, Luther, Vadianus, and other prominent scholars are summarized here but not translated, a decision that is debatable but that admittedly kept an already large project from expanding to possibly unmanageable proportions. The Latin and German texts on which the translations are based are also not printed, but they can be found on the project website, <http://www.itergateway.org.capito/>. As was the case with the previous volumes, the letters here are translated into idiomatic English and provided with a level of annotation that is more than adequate for an informed first reading of the text. All in all, this volume continues the success of its predecessors and offers a sense of relief that after more than a decade, the end of this worthy project is in sight. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Aulularia and Other Inversions of Plautus*. By Joannes Burmeister. Edited, translated, and introduced by Michael Fontaine. Bibliotheca Latinitatis Novae. Leuven: Leuven University Press 2015. XI + 278 pp. In contrast to other modern Neo-Latin editions, Fontaine (hereafter F.) starts the introduction (1–91) of his masterful edition of Johannes Burmeister's (1576–1638) 'inversions' of Plautus not with the ordinary bio-bibliographical information, but with a demonstration of what makes these receptions of Plautus peculiar and unique:

Burmeister had discovered that some of Plautus' comedies follow the same plot as certain biblical episodes. On this basis, he decided to rewrite biblical stories in the form of a Latin comedy and thereby to follow as closely as possible his formal model Plautus. In doing so, he had to change the names of the characters, but he kept the series of scenes and even the order and sequence of Plautus' single lines. In the best-case scenario, this meant not having to change a single element of a line, which got its new (i.e., biblical) meaning from its new context alone. This mixture of Plautus and the Vulgate, together with Burmeister's obsession with pranks and puns, makes his comedies an extraordinary example of the role that baroque form plays in the reception of Plautus. F.'s new edition of these comedies is therefore very welcome. In the following chapters of the introduction, F. deals with Burmeister's biography (17–32). Here he is able to correct some mistakes that have occurred in earlier studies on this Protestant pastor and author. F. gives an overview of Burmeister's other works (32–37), among which is also a *carmen heroicum* on St. John the Baptist. Then F. treats the single comedies in more detail: *Mater Virgo* (1621) tells the story of Christ's birth, modelled on Plautus' *Amphitryon* (37–49). Although the text of Burmeister's play is lost today, it was known to 2 scholars in the nineteenth century, out of whose works F. edits the fragments of the play (203–247). Completely lost is *Susanna* (1622–1624?), which rewrites Plautus' *Casina* (49–55). F.'s sketch of the 'Forschungsgeschichte' (55–64) of the lost *Asinaria* (1625) in the next chapter is very impressive; it is now clear that our knowledge of the play does not go back (as previously thought) to Sulzer, but to a handwritten note in Johann Albert Fabricius' *Bibliotheca Latina*—an impressive and convincing discovery. The longest chapter (64–91) deals with the *Aulularia* (1629), the edition of which forms the core of the book (93–201). In this play, Burmeister combines Plautus' *Aulularia* with the biblical story of the Israelites after their conquest of Jericho; the prostitute Rahab had hosted 2 spies before the conquest and was therefore spared. Although the Israelites' commander Joshua had declared the entire booty God's possession, Achan stole a treasure. God became angry and foiled the Israelites' attack on the city of Ai. Only when Achan, in whose tent Rahab sought refuge, is stoned to death, can the Israelites conquer Ai. Burmeister uses not only Plautus'

(incomplete) text, but also later supplements, one by an anonymous author and the other by Codrus Urceus. He wrote the play in exile in Hamburg, where he had to flee during the Thirty Years War. This biographical background is for F. the reason that frequent mention and criticisms are made of the destructive acts of plundering soldiers in the *Aulularia*. There follows a solid and reliable edition of the Latin text of the *Aulularia* and *Mater Virgo* (the line numbers of the Plautine model are indicated throughout). F. provides his reader with an English translation, where he attempts to imitate the numerous puns; if he does not succeed, he explains the pun in a footnote. The series *Bibliotheca Latinitatis Novae* can be proud of this volume from a distinguished Plautus expert, presenting an extraordinary piece of reception to their readers. (Florian Schaffenrath, Ludwig Boltzmann Institut für Neulateinische Studien, Innsbruck, Austria)

◆ *Oedipus Aegyptiacus* (1652-1654). By Athanasius Kircher. A facsimile edition with an introduction by Wilhelm-Schmidt Biggemann and an annotated index of authors and passages by Frank Böhling. Athanasius Kircher Hauptwerke, 3. Hildesheim, Zürich, and New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 2013. 4 vols. cxxiv + 440 + 470 + 572 + 851 pp. with 4 fold-out plates. In 1968 a West German organization calling itself the International Society for Research on Athanasius Kircher announced an audacious plan to publish the seventeenth-century Jesuit's *Opera omnia*, including reprints of all his books, collected correspondence, and unpublished manuscripts. Although a 1972 promotional brochure proclaimed the publication of the first of 66 promised volumes (available both in a standard edition and in a highly limited luxury edition "for Kings and State Presidents," priced at DM 50,000), in fact, the society never issued a single volume. The venture collapsed in scandal amid charges of financial malfeasance (attributed by the society's president and editor-in-chief to postwar Germany's most vicious character assassination campaign). Regardless of the proximate cause, it must be said that the time was not ripe for such an undertaking. In the 1970s Kircher was a marginal historical figure, typically dismissed as a fool or charlatan by those few scholars who mentioned him. But times change. In dramatic testimony to Kircher's twenty-first-century rehabilitation, the quixotic vision of the

Internationale Athanasius Kircher Forschungsgesellschaft has largely come to pass, albeit under the auspices of more conventional academic forces. First, the Institute and Museum of the History of Science in Florence and Stanford University made Kircher's surviving correspondence available online. And now, the German publisher Olms has begun to issue reprints of Kircher's *Hauptwerke*, including the work here under review. Ultimately, fourteen titles are slated for publication.

Oedipus Aegyptiacus is a remarkable specimen of seventeenth-century erudition. Ostensibly a solution to the riddle of the hieroglyphs, its 2,000 Latin pages—heavily larded with quotations in Greek, Hebrew, Arabic, Coptic and other oriental languages as well as hundreds of woodcut and engraved illustrations—amounts to a baroque encyclopedia of Egyptology, occult philosophy, antiquarianism, sacred history, paganology, and oriental philology. As such is it a valuable source for scholars interested in any of those topics. The book is divided into 3 main parts, distributed among 4 volumes. In part 1, Kircher lays the historical groundwork for his interpretation of hieroglyphic inscriptions by demonstrating the supposed links connecting ancient Egyptian culture to other pagan civilizations as well as ancient Judaism. The 2 volumes of part 2 comprise a dozen treatises devoted to sundry traditions that, according to Kircher, preserved aspects of the “hieroglyphic doctrine,” including Jewish Kabbalah, Arabic magic, astral medicine, and Hermetic theology. Part 3 presents Kircher's famously wrong interpretations of obelisks and other hieroglyphic monuments in Rome and elsewhere.

Wilhelm Schmidt-Biggemann, Germany's leading scholar of early modern philosophy, has supplied the first volume with a deeply learned introduction that readers of German will find quite useful. Following a summary of the structure of *Oedipus Aegyptiacus* (essentially, German translations of the titles and subheadings of the work's many divisions), the introduction comprises a concise overview of Kircher's life and works and descriptions of the book's main sections. Schmidt-Biggemann is primarily interested in Kircher as the architect of a philosophical system based on the ideal of universal knowledge and traditions such as *philosophia perennis* and Christian Kabbalah, and his interpretation reflects this outlook. Volume 4 has an extensive annotated index of all of the authors mentioned by Kircher in the course

of his work, compiled by Frank Böhling. Anyone wishing to study *Oedipus Aegyptiacus* deeply will find this section invaluable. Kircher's text is presented in a photographic facsimile of the original edition, similar in quality to a good microfilm. This is not a critical edition.

When I wrote my doctoral dissertation, I spent months working through *Oedipus Aegyptiacus* in the reading room of the Vatican Library. A decade later, as I completed the ensuing book, I consulted one of the numerous digital copies that by then had become freely available on the Internet. Both formats have advantages. But for sustained, slow reading of a long and difficult text, it is hard to beat the ease of use of an old-fashioned book. The miraculous proliferation of online digital copies of early modern books has been a tremendous boon to scholarship, but it inevitably threatens the viability of traditional reprints. Olms and the series editors are to be applauded for making hard copies of Kircher's work accessible beyond the confines of rare book rooms. (Daniel Stolzenberg, University of California, Davis)

◆ Siegmund Döpp. *Vaticinium Lehninense—Die Lehninsche Weissagung. Zur Rezeption einer wirkungsmächtigen lateinischen Dichtung vom 18. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert*. Noctes Neolatinae, 21. Hildesheim, Zürich, and New York: Georg Olms Verlag. 132 pp. 34.80 euros. Although the last few years have seen an increased interest in Neo-Latin works and, as a result, a remarkable number of editions, commentaries, and the like, an incredible number of texts still remain to be presented to a larger public. This is notably the case for smaller and relatively unknown texts, which have so far received minor attention from scholars but which have had particularly interesting historical impact.

The book under review represents a substantial effort to fill this gap: Siegmund Döpp dedicates an entire monograph to a hundred-verse prophecy poem, the *Vaticinium Lehninense*, including the Latin text, its German translation, a linguistic and historical commentary, and an overview of reception from the eighteenth up to the twentieth century. The prophecy treats the rise of the Protestants, the different dynasties reigning over the Mark Brandenburg (one of the most important provinces in the Holy Roman Empire), and their decline.

Döpp starts with a short, informative introduction to the *Vaticinium*, which is essential for the reader to deal with the text and the following chapters. The *Vaticinium* purports to be written by a monk, Frater Hermannus, in the monastery of Lehnin (situated near the city of Potsdam) in the thirteenth century. Döpp, however, informs us right at the beginning that this ascription is most likely not to be trusted: it is more plausible that the text is a forgery from the seventeenth century produced for the purposes of propaganda and manipulation.

After a short summary of the textual tradition (we lack an autograph but do have a large number of early modern manuscripts), he presents the Latin text, without an apparatus, to allow a quicker comprehension. The text is followed by a translation into German, which follows the original very closely. This helps provide an impression of the style in which the *Vaticinium* is written, but in some cases it might also obscure the meaning. The choice to structure the different paragraphs by using subtitles, as in prior editions of this text, is a helpful one, as it also supplies a summary of the content.

Then follows a short excursus on the word Israel (v. 94), which suffered from extensive misinterpretation and improper use during later centuries, especially in anti-Semitic contexts. This chapter is fundamental for the subsequent part focussing on the text's reception, but it might have been preferable to treat this particular aspect at a later point in the book, perhaps after the information of a more general kind that Döpp supplies in the next part. After a comprehensive overview of the contents, he starts with the interpretation of the *Vaticinium* by discussing the historical context and the origins of the text. He presents different theories about the identity of the author, which he carefully invalidates one by one, before arriving at the conclusion that the real author cannot be uncovered with our current state of knowledge. The only fact we can be certain about is that the text was written in the early modern era as a product of the religious tensions due to the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation. Döpp then focusses on linguistic aspects, such as the metre, the prosody, and other particularities that also strengthen the argument for the seventeenth century as the time of origin.

Especially attractive is the elaborate and lucid examination of the *Vaticinium's* reception. We are informed that the prophecy had gained popularity in the eighteenth century and became an important matter of interest in the nineteenth century. It had a considerable influence on German literature (one might mention Theodor Fontane and Margarete von Bucholtz), polemical writings during the revolution of 1848, and even sacred architecture. During the twentieth century, the *Vaticinium* was (mis-)used for political purposes such as the promotion of World War I or, later, as anti-Semitic propaganda. The book ends with a fine conclusion, condensing and explaining the reasons for the great importance of the *Vaticinium*. A very extensive bibliography as well as an index follow.

With his monograph about the *Vaticinium Lehninense*, Döpp presents a highly informative and fascinating work that illustrates the historical and political importance of a minor Neo-Latin text. It is to be hoped that more books like this will appear in the coming years. (Caroline Weber, Ludwig Boltzmann Institut für Neulateinische Studien, Innsbruck, Austria / Universität Würzburg, Germany)

◆ *Andreas Friz's Letter on Tragedies (ca. 1741–1744): An Eighteenth-Century Jesuit Contribution to Theatre Poetics*. By Nienke Tjoelker. Drama and Theatre in Early Modern Europe, 4. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2014. x + 295 pp. This book contains an edition and translation into English of a lengthy *Letter on Tragedies* and the Latin text of the *Analysis tragaediarum Racini* of Andreas Friz, a Jesuit who taught the poetry class at the University of Graz. The importance of this material is not immediately obvious, since the general assumption has been that Jesuit school drama had retreated into the colleges and was dying out in the eighteenth century. However as Tjoelker shows in her lengthy introduction, more plays were actually performed in the German-speaking areas between 1701 and 1773 than had been recorded for the period 1555–1700, and a significant amount of theoretical effort was still being expended by the Jesuits themselves during this later period. And Jesuit drama continued to develop in new directions, with meditational plays emerging in significant quantities, more plays getting into print, and additional performances taking place in individual classes.

Friz's treatise on tragedies takes the form of a letter to an unknown addressee, which allows him to react to common ideas about the Jesuit stage and to develop his own ideas. The letter discusses the purpose of drama, verisimilitude, and procuring the attention of the audience through clarity and delight. The main purpose of drama, he argues, is to purge the emotions and to instill the love of virtue and aversion to vice, such that the play teaches through pleasing, as Horace had recommended. Many of his contemporaries placed so much emphasis on spectacle and music that the moral imperative got lost. As one can see, Friz was influenced by Aristotle and Horace, but he developed an interpretation of classical French tragedy that differs from many of his colleagues, who preferred a moderate respect for the dramatic rules combined with an ornate and festive kind of theater; for Friz, the overriding aim of moral improvement could only be achieved by strict adherence to the three classical unities and to the concept of verisimilitude. A lengthy appendix takes up a second document, Friz's analysis of the tragedies of Racine. Each play is discussed using the same interpretive scheme: description of the story, list of characters, discussion of the plot, how the passions are aroused to evoke the love of virtue and hatred of vice, reflections on the relationship of the action to verisimilitude, characters, quotations regarding emotions and the most elevated feelings, and (sometimes) identification of prophetic scenes. In other words, Racine's plays are presented as if they were Jesuit dramas suitable for performance in the schools.

The texts for these two documents are found in Manuscript 938 of the University Library in Graz. Tjoelker's edition is the first published version of each. At the end of the day, one cannot argue that this material marks a decisive intervention into the history of drama as a genre, but it is valuable indeed for calling into question some of the prevailing assumptions about eighteenth-century Jesuit drama and showing how the broader quarrel of the ancients and moderns played out in this often-neglected area. Rescuing forgotten texts has always been an important part of what Neo-Latinists do, and Tjoelker has performed that service admirably here. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *El Latin en el Perú colonial. Diglosia e historia de una lengua viva.* By Ángela Helmer. Lima: Fondo editorial de la Universidad nacional mayor de San Marcos / Grupo Pakarina, 2013. 376 pp. Diglossia is not the same as bilingualism. In 1959 Charles A. Ferguson first applied the term ‘diglossia’ to situations in which the principal spoken language of a society has, in addition to its primary dialects, a ‘high,’ more codified variant. The high language acquired through education is used in writing and in formal speech, but not in ordinary conversation. Joshua Fishman enlarged this notion of diglossia in the 1970s to accommodate societies in which the high language was not related to the low varieties. Such scenarios are familiar to historians of Latin and vulgar Latin in Europe from late antiquity onwards.

Theories of diglossia have provided Ángela Helmer with a framework for her study of Latin in colonial Peru, in terms of relations between languages and the different kinds of status accorded them. This framework is outlined in Chapter 1: in accord with Fishman’s model, the high language, A, of power was Spanish; and the indigenous languages of Peru, such as Quechua or Aymara, constituted the lower variant, B. (That could not have been the case all over Peru: in some rural areas those Andean *linguas generales* must have retained their elevated position.) Helmer has discerned another diglossia between two further variants *within* A: cultivated written Spanish, and Latin, which was acquired exclusively in the urban environment of universities and seminaries.

As hinted by the parenthesis above, the geographical extent of *el Perú colonial* for this study is never directly defined, but Helmer is concerned with ‘the colonial Peruvian city’ (25). In fact her focus is on the lettered elites of Lima alone, although Chapter 2 adumbrates the broader social hierarchy, in terms of ethnic groupings. There it is shown that the colonial system of education served Spaniards, and the position of Latin in the curriculum led to its function as a ‘social marker’ (71–95). Chapter 3 then offers a cursory panorama of Latin’s reach from antiquity to the Renaissance (drawn from Roger Wright, Joseph Ijsewijn, Hans Helander, and others), with a notice of its presence in the Americas, especially in New Spain (113–16), before concentration on Peru (116–38). Richard Kagan’s chapter on Latin in *Students and Society in Early Modern Spain* (1974), which examined

the position of Latin in relation to Spanish with statistics for book production in both languages, would have usefully informed this account of Latin's role in Lima.

The account is presented synchronically, giving the impression that neither Latin nor the *virreinato* itself were subject to historical change or transformation. There are no references to successive European debates about Latin's value and utility (which came to have ramifications throughout Spanish America in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries) and barely a mention of the expulsion of the Jesuits from Spain's territories in 1767. The decree of expulsion had an immense impact on education and the social order all over the Americas, permanently diminishing the presence of Latin in school curricula in one stroke, if not eliminating it altogether. In a letter translated in Chapter 4, the Prior General of the Augustinians endorsed Charles III's decree, urging Provincial Fathers not to communicate with the Jesuits (157). Helmer herself had earlier referred to the events of 1767 to explain why the Guatemalan Jesuit Rafael Landívar composed his *Rusticatio Mexicana* in exile (116). But the drastic consequences for Latin in Peru of the sudden removal of the Jesuits are never addressed.

In Lima, as in Mexico City, Latin had been used in education and in religious and secular ceremonial contexts, and was a vehicle for poetry, academic treatises, eulogies, and inscriptions. Helmer comments on the obstacles to producing a comprehensive collection or survey of the texts: fire, war, neglect, and longstanding antipathy to scholastic and oratorical productions of the colonial period. Her study is confined to printed works in Latin or combining Spanish and Latin, listed in *Anexo 1* (193–302). Two catalogues, purportedly of all items printed in the colony, provide most of her primary data: *Imprenta de Lima* (1904–1907) compiled by José Toríbio Medina and volumes 7–12 of Rubén Vargas Ugarte's *Impresos peruanos: Biblioteca peruana* (1935–1957). As well as subsuming these, Helmer incorporates additional Latin and Latin-Spanish works she has located in library collections in Peru and the United States. Her more comprehensive catalogue usefully organises its entries into groupings according to their subject or context (religion, science, education, jurism, etc).

Four short exemplary texts are transcribed and translated to illustrate the varied functions of Latin in Chapter 4: an anonymous

Asclepiadaeum published in 1816 to honour Viceroy Joaquín de la Pezuela y Sánchez; the aforementioned 1767 letter to the Augustinian Provincial Fathers by their Prior General, Francisco Javier Vazquez; an 1804 treatise on chocolate by a student named José Urreta; and a 1716 oration by Pedro Peralta y Barnuevo to close his first year as Rector of the University of San Marcos—the speech is in Spanish but peppered with Latin tags and quotations. Helmer's translations of the Latin texts are provisional and approximate, as she indicates (153, 188), and they do contain errors. Oddly, the facsimiles of the imprints in *Anexo 2* are easier to read than the transcriptions: the latter are packed together without paragraphing, and with line divisions of the originals indicated by numbered *virgules*.

In her conclusion Helmer reaffirms her objective: to 'analyse the role Latin played in colonial Peruvian society from the perspective of diglossia' (189). This objective has been fulfilled, given the open acknowledgement that the 'colonial Peruvian society' surveyed here is that of the ecclesiastical and academic elites in Lima. Other scholars, as the author observes, have considered diglossia in Peru for its bearing on the power struggle between Spanish and indigenous languages, but the purpose of this study has been to highlight the extent to which Latin provided a 'mechanism of division.' That is a fair enough point to make, which no historian of Latin, whether in Europe or the Americas, would contest.

The interlingual dynamics, though, are more complicated than even the most flexible analysis conceived in terms of diglossia alone could reveal. Latin was not just a language which served as shibboleth at the top of the social pecking order. Latin was identified with grammar itself and was often referred to in Spanish as just that: *gramática*. As such, Latin was believed to have been refined from the vernaculars with which it coexisted, whether it had a close linguistic connection to those vernaculars (as with romances) or not (as with Germanic or Scandinavian languages). In the Americas, Latin arguably had a more intimate and intrusive relationship with indigenous 'vernaculars' than it did in Europe, in that it supplied a structure for systematising them in the process known as *reducción*. Leaving aside the contents of Fray Domingo de Santo Tomás's foundational *arte* of Quechua, published in 1560, the first word of the title—*Grammatica o Arte de la lengua*

general de los Indios de los reynos del Peru—bespeaks the extent to which Latin interacted and interfered with Amerindian languages.

With regard to diglossia *per se*, much more could have been revealed if manuscripts had been part of Helmer's purview: no reason is given for the stated decision not to take account of relevant manuscripts in Latin, Spanish, and other languages (124). Handwritten letters, journals, and memoirs can sometimes reveal or suggest patterns and practices in spoken language which printed texts do not. In the case of New Spain, for example, written sources reveal far more than printed materials about the role and function of Latin in relation to Spanish and indigenous languages, especially Nahuatl and Purépecha. Such evidence has to be taken into account to prevent a linguistic history from remaining grounded as a history of the book. As well as the documents in the Archivo de la Nación in Lima, there are heaps of papers in the Jesuit Historical Institute in Rome that were produced in Peru and remain to be edited. Fortunately those recording the Society's educational and missionary endeavours between 1565 and 1604 have been published in eight substantial volumes: the *Monumenta Peruana* (1954–1986) are daunting but essential sources. Archives in other Italian cities hold further writings by creole Jesuits from Peru who settled in the Papal States in the later 1700s.

The observations in the preceding paragraphs of this review are really offered as suggestions for future investigation and should not detract from the hard work that has gone into this book. *El latín en el Perú colonial* is an ambitious and complicated venture, attempting to stretch beyond linguistics and Hispanic studies to traverse Latin philology and cultural history. The 100 pages of Helmer's *Anexo I* alone, as a digest of the Latin and Hispano-Latin items collated from Medina and Vargas Ugarte, supplemented with new additions and classified by their subjects, are no mean feat and will serve as an enduring scholarly resource. Ángela Helmer ends her work by expressing the hope that others will be encouraged to pursue research in the same field. It is a field she has envisioned herself, and her contribution will make subsequent endeavours easier. (Andrew Laird, Brown University and University of Warwick)

◆ *Humanism in the Low Countries*. By Jozef IJsewijn. Edited by Gilbert Tournoy. *Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia*, 40. Leuven: Leuven University Press. 568 pages. 79.50 euros. The republication of previously published essays is often a fraught venture. My university's bibliometrics specialist recently told me that the most common number of citations received by scholarly articles is zero, which ought to give pause to someone thinking of republishing anything. And by definition, all the essays in this volume are available somewhere else; if someone wants to read an essay and incorporate it into his or her research, it can often appear in a researcher's inbox in 24 hours or less, given the increase in digital resources and the ever-growing sophistication of interlibrary loan services. Occasionally, however, there are good reasons to republish, and this is one of those cases. The author of these essays, Jozef IJsewijn, was one of those rare scholars who could truly be said to have established a field—in this instance, the modern discipline of Neo-Latin studies. He was the founding father of the International Association for Neo-Latin Studies and attended every one of its congresses until 1997, when the illness to which he would soon succumb kept him away. His *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies*, first in the single-volume edition of 1977, then in the 2-volume expanded version of 1990–1998 (prepared with Dirk Sacré), was until very recently the only such guide to the field and is still consulted regularly by everyone in the discipline. With Gilbert Tournoy, he edited for many years the journal of record in Neo-Latin Studies, *Humanistica Lovaniensia*, and ran the major research institute in the field, the Seminarium Philologiae Humanisticae at Leuven University. So the decision to republish these essays makes sense.

We find here 21 essays that cover the life and / or work of a single humanist from the Netherlands, the development of Neo-Latin literature in the Low Countries, or the relationship between humanism in the Low Countries and its counterparts elsewhere in Europe: “Un poème inédit de François Modius sur l'éducation du prince humaniste,” “The Beginning of Humanistic Literature in Brabant,” “Erasmus ex poeta theologus sive de litterarum instauratarum apud Hollandos incunabulis,” “Alexander Hegius († 1498), *Invectiva in Modos Significandi*: Text, Introduction and Notes,” “The Coming of Humanism to the Low Countries,” “The *Declamatio Lovaniensis de*

tutelae severitate: Students Against Academic Authority at Louvain in 1481,” “Annales theatri Belgo-Latini: Inventory of Latin Theatre from the Low Countries,” “Theatrum Belgo-Latinum: Neo-Latin Theatre in the Low Countries,” “Lo storico e grammatico Matthaues Herbenus di Maastricht, allievo del Perotti,” “Het humanisme, de Nederlanden en Spanje,” “La fortuna del Filelfo nei Paesi Bassi,” “Supplementum *Phoenissis* seu *Thebaidi* Senecanae adiectum ab Henrico Chifellio Antverpiensi,” “Theognidis Sententiae a Francisco Craneveldio Latine versae (1541),” “A Correspondent of Lipsius: Roeland van Winkele / Rolandus Vinchelius,” “Humanism in the Low Countries,” “Humanisten uit de Nederlanden en Portugal [French translation],” “Umanisti del Nord in difesa dell’etica e della vera scienza: Erasmo-Vives-Tommaso Moro,” “La filologia umanistica nei Paesi Bassi,” “Latin and the Low Countries,” “Humanistic Relations between Scandinavia and the Low Countries,” and “Emblems in Honor of a Dead Poet (Natalis Rondinus).” Each essay appears as it was originally published, except for the correction of a handful of minor typographical errors. This was a good decision: the editor was tempted to add information and update bibliography, but this would have created a bibliographical mess, in that scholars would be forced ever after to indicate clearly which version of the ‘same’ essay they had used.

The republication of these essays constitutes a fitting homage to a giant in our field, a scholar whose work remains as relevant today as it was when the first of these pieces originally appeared exactly 50 years ago. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Poematia Moderna: Modern Latin Poetry*. Edited and translated by William Cooper. Wilmington, NC: Scaeva Press, 2014. xi + 298 pages. While the Golden Age of Neo-Latin poetry is undoubtedly long in the past, everyone knows that even today, some poets are still composing in Latin. The problem is that it is not easy to find this material. Other efforts to collect contemporary Latin poetry have been made—one thinks of the volumes edited by Dirk Sacré and Anna Radke—but these anthologies are often difficult to find, and none offers any pretense of completeness. So the volume under review is welcome indeed.

Poematia Moderna presents over 300 Latin poems by 69 poets from 17 nations, most from the preceding century but some from this one as well. Many of these writers, as we might expect, are not household names, but some, like Giovanni Pascoli, are well-known poets in their own right and a couple, like Wolfgang Schadewaldt and Michael von Albrecht, are renowned classicists whose verse compositions will come as a surprise to those who know only their traditional scholarship. The most common meters are elegiac couplets, Sapphic and Alcaic stanzas, and dactylic hexameters. Poets like Fidel Rädle use rhyme successfully, Ton Smerdl writes in a kind of free verse, and on p. 94 we even find Latin haiku. The themes, in the end, are not much different from poems written in any language, at any time—love, friendship, nature, mortality, God, and family—but there are peculiarly modern takes, including the Big Bang, bikinis, cell phones, heart transplants, and skateboards, things that initially, at least, sound odd in Latin.

The best way to sing the merits of this collection, I believe, is to let it speak for itself, through a range of examples. Some of the poems, like “In patris obitum” of Orazio Bologna, could have been written two thousand years ago:

Te Deus, alme pater, iustis soletur in aevum
 Muneribus. Lumen luceat ipse tibi.
 Terra levis solamen adhuc tibi praebeat alnum,
 Collacrimante, pater, coniuge, prole tua.

Others, like “Quaeris cur” by Eric Johnson, are just as serious, but are clearly the products of our time:

Puer vidi fratres slavos
 Et Judaeos condemnatos
 Capitis Germanice;

Deinde Mortem exaudivi
 Voce saeva et servili
 Eloqui Slavonice;

Posthoc ipse cum Vandalis
 Militans Americanis
 Deliravi Anglice.

Quaeris cur Latina canam,
 Cur hac lingua versus pangam.
 Quod non olet sanguine.

Not everything has to be serious, although for soccer fans like Pietro Bruno, the tirade against the hated Roman squad Lazio mixes humor with venom in “In quondam arbitrum certaminis harpasti dirae”:

O barbe arbiter ac inique iudex
 Tu quid saepe aciei nihil merenti
 Mendosae Latiae favere es ausus,
 Quae in rete ingerere impotens habetur
 Follem (nam manibus vetatur uti):
 Quaenam convicia probrosiora
 Pro tuo crimine, ultor haud benignus,
 In tuum facinus vomam pudendum?
 Rebus qui Latiis studet misellis
 Profari nequit intumente bile,
 Quod indigna satis putatur certe
 Quam Victoria das ei repente,
 O trifucifer arbiter spuende!

Others, like the two little poems entitled “Telephonum mobile,” incline still further toward the *dulce*, although there is just enough *utile* to make them worth a moment’s thought:

Machina parva tibi, quamvis sit noxia, prodest:
 Dum delet cerebrum, nuntia multa tenet.

Effigies passim rapide transmittere possum:
 Ne tunicam ponas, casta puella, cave!

Enough said, I think. Just order the book, and enjoy! (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)