



Bibliotheca Dantesca: Journal of Dante Studies

Volume 2

Article 22

2019

**Marsilio Ficino. 'De Christiana Religione.' Guido Bartolucci, ed.
Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2019.**

Eva Del Soldato

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.upenn.edu/bibdant>



Part of the [Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance and Baroque Art and Architecture Commons](#), [Italian Language and Literature Commons](#), and the [Medieval History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Del Soldato, Eva (2019) "Marsilio Ficino. 'De Christiana Religione.' Guido Bartolucci, ed. Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2019.," *Bibliotheca Dantesca: Journal of Dante Studies*: Vol. 2 , Article 22.
Available at: <https://repository.upenn.edu/bibdant/vol2/iss1/22>

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. <https://repository.upenn.edu/bibdant/vol2/iss1/22>
For more information, please contact repository@pobox.upenn.edu.

chapters Bembo modified in P1. His analysis reconstructs the stratigraphy of the annotations, so as to chronologically map the various interventions that the author made to his work over a period of more than twenty years.

In the fourth chapter (*Descrizione codicologica e paleografica*, pp. 123-76), Marco Cursi conducts an in-depth paleographic examination of the hand that wrote the notes. In these pages, the paleographer demonstrates the autography of Bembo's interventions and determines a chronology of the various phases in which the Venetian humanist inserted his notes in P1.

The fifth chapter (*Gli autori e le opere in P1*, pp. 177-217) focuses on the authors and works that Bembo cites in P1 and identifies several manuscript sources that the author used during his many revisions of the *Prose*. It is very interesting to notice that Bembo used as a reliable source for the references to Dante and Petrarch the codex Vat. Lat. 3197, i.e. the manuscript that the humanist compiled for the editions of the *Canzoniere* and *Commedia* edited by him, and published by Aldo Manuzio in 1501 and 1502 (p. 185).

The last chapter contains the text of the *Prose* "according to the last intention of the author" (pp. 219-316). This portion of the book provides the complete transcription of the text of the 1525 edition accompanied by the additions and changes that Bembo inserted in his personal copy of the *editio princeps* of the *Prose*.

In conclusion, the volume edited by Pulsoni, Cursi and Bertolo is a work of crucial importance for the philological studies of the Italian Renaissance. Through this book, the authors open new avenues of investigation not only on the figure of Bembo as a scholar and a book-man, but also on the study of marginalia as a fundamental element of Renaissance cultural and literary history. *Il Bembo ritrovato* is a book that is destined to be used by all those scholars who, in the future, will be interested in the "Fourth Crown" and in the work that marked the history of the Italian language.

Natale Vacalebri, *University of Pennsylvania*

Marsilio Ficino.

De Christiana Religione.

Guido Bartolucci, ed.

Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2019. 356 pp. €30.

De Christiana religione has always been one of the most fascinating and elusive texts in the production of the Platonic philosopher Marsilio Ficino (1433-1499). The recent critical edition by Guido Bartolucci offers therefore a crucial contribution to clarify many questions related to the work itself and its relationship with other writings of the philosopher from Figline, going "nei meandri dell'officina di Ficino" (11). He does so through a patient comparison between the variants of the text and a painstaking recognition of its several sources.

Originally composed and published in the vernacular (1474), *De Christiana religione* was subsequently re-elaborated multiple times and in multiple ways, with a revised vernacular version (1484), which also takes into account the additions Ficino made in two Latin rewritings. The printed Latin version (1476), the one Bartolucci had selected for his edition, survives in several exemplars enriched by handwritten additions and corrections by Ficino himself or by some of his collaborators. The collation of these different variants represents certainly one of the most remarkable contributions offered by Bartolucci, but the conclusions he is able to draw from considering the treatment made by Ficino of his sources, by cherry-picking and omitting, is particularly relevant from the perspective of intellectual history.

In terms of quotations, the lion's share in *De Christiana religione* belongs to Eusebius of Caesarea. Ficino shares several of his main tenets with the Church Father, about divine justice, the *logos*, etc. And yet, as Bartolucci notes, Ficino removes from his Eusebian borrowings passages and motifs that would have been too harsh against ancient pagan philosophers, who are instead associated by Marsilio with the Biblical Patriarchs. Eusebius plays nonetheless a pivotal role in the delicate passages on the naturalness of religion, that Bartolucci analyzes suggesting their complementarity with sections of the *Platonic Theology*. Bartolucci devotes then his attention to a newly discovered source of the work, the *Contra Judeos* by Gerónimo de Santa Fe (fl. 1400-1430), an anti-Judaic text which relies on an allegorical reading of the Scriptures. This kind of approach contributes to form Ficino's articulate reflection on Judaism, in which he emphasized the ancient Jewish tradition as the holder of the true natural religion and the witness of the early appearances of the *logos*. This allows Ficino to remark the continuity between ancient wisdom, not only pagan but also Jewish, and Christianity. In other cases, Ficino intervenes on his text not by adding or adjusting sources, but by taming and removing some of his own potentially controversial doctrines. This happens in a passage on the original sin and the terrestrial paradise, that Bartolucci puts in connection with Origenes, that Ficino ended up to remove. The topic was of course insidious, and involved – among others – the larger question of the salvation of the pagans, more specifically of the virtuous pagan philosophers, that he endorsed (see more generally, on this long-lived debate, John Marenbon, *Pagans and Philosophers*, PUP 2015, not mentioned by Bartolucci, who offers nonetheless a satisfying picture of the traditional theological positions with which Ficino was in contrast). And yet the salvation of the pagans, was not completely obliterated in *De Christiana religione*, since Ficino re-used material taken away from the main text in a letter accompanying the vernacular 1484 edition. In this letter Ficino used, appropriately, an authority that would have resonated strongly with his vernacular readers: Dante, who posed the question without solving it. Since the letter focuses on both those who lived before Christ, but also of those who could not know Christ after His coming, Kristeller was probably right in suggesting that Ficino is referring to a passage from *Paradiso* 19, in which the destiny of the man “born along the shoreline of the Indus River” (*Par.* 19.70-71) is discussed, but without a resolution. Bartolucci rightly notes that another possible reference is not only the obvious *Inferno* 4, but also the *Monarchia*, a text that Ficino knew very well, having translated it in the vernacular. In any case, the mention of Dante in this crucial and difficult passage certainly inspires

further investigation on Ficino's views on vernacular philosophy and its deep connection with the *Sommo Poeta*, also thinking of the well-known Dantean subtext in *El libro de amore*.

Bartolucci's analysis, in sum, has the merit to restore *De Christiana religione* to its actual role within the corpus of Ficinian work: not a mere apologetic tool, but a mirror of his ongoing philosophical, social and religious concerns. And his edition will certainly represent a precious reference for future scholarship.

Eva Del Soldato, *University of Pennsylvania*

Aleksandr Nikolaevič Veselovskij.

Studi su Dante.

Renzo Rabboni and Roberta De Giorgi eds.

La Parola del Testo 21.1-2 (2017). Pisa-Rome: Fabrizio Serra Editore, 2017. 128 pp. €125

Aleksandr Nikolaevič Veselovskij (often transliterated as Alexander Veselovsky in English) was a Russian literary theorist and historian in the second half of the 19th century whose broad work as a comparatist has largely remained untranslated. In the present volume, Renzo Rabboni and Roberta De Giorgi aim to make some of Veselovsky's work accessible to a broader audience by editing and translating his writings on Dante into Italian. Their edition was published as the 2017 volume of the journal *La Parola del Testo*, and includes two introductory essays by the editors, various writings on Dante penned by Veselovsky, and a review of the Russian translations of the *Commedia* by Natalia Rogova Popova.

Renzo Rabboni's 'Dalla scuola storica al Formalismo' provides an essential introduction to Veselovsky's intellectual formation—how his travels and contact with other Dante scholars across Europe shaped his approach to the poet. Roberta De Giorgi's 'Il Dante di Veselovskij tra apocrifi e letteratura popolare,' focuses on Veselovsky's pervasive interest in folklore, and how many of his writings on Dante are a pretext to write about popular literature.

The main body of the volume consists of seven short works on Dante, written by Veselovsky between 1859 and 1893, and organized chronologically. These range from book reviews to encyclopedia entries, and showcase the critic's interest in Dante's folklore influences as well as the political use of Dante in the 19th century. 'Dante Alighieri: la vita e le opere' [1859] is a review of Hartwig Floto's *Dante Alighieri, sein Leben und seine Werke* (Stuttgart, 1958) that commends the German scholar for writing a biography that is refreshingly unlike those "innumerabili lavori tendenziosi, dai quali viene fuori un Dante socialista, rivoluzionario [...] mentre di Dante stesso non vi è traccia" (55). Veselovsky also reviews Filippo Zamboni's *Gli Ezzelini, Dante e gli schiavi. Pensieri storici e letterarii con documenti inediti* (Firenze, 1864). While he concedes that Zamboni's readings of Dante are mostly successful, he takes issue with a reading of a particular passage (*Inferno* 23.61) and