

Perett presents each issue by first foregrounding it in the relevant literature and then analyzing it using primary sources published in print. Wherever possible, she juxtaposes confrontational texts, quoting short passages from them. You can see her sympathy with some of the discussed authors and ideas for reform, but this in no way undermines the reliability of the research. Perett presents ways of manipulation, or eristic tactics, used by all involved. Her judgments are balanced and based on the assumptions outlined (though, in the cases of Peter Chelčický and Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, the reader may be surprised by the severity of Perett's judgments). Perett skillfully synthesizes considerable reform disputes such as the one over in what ways Christ is present in the eucharistic sacrifice.

Perett usually adopts a method of juxtaposing the views of several researchers on a given topic, with a short discussion of them, sometimes speaking in favor of one of the proposed interpretations. The literature used is dominated by the works of Thomas Fudge, which is understandable given the importance of this historian in the field of contemporary Hussite studies, and otherwise, Perett's bibliography is extensive. However, some of the citations were less than satisfying: Dušan Coufal, author of the most recent study on the utraquist polemics of the period, is quoted only as a reference in the footnotes, although his book could probably be the basis for the evaluation of reformatory texts in the part devoted to communion under both kinds. Somewhat surprising is also the omission of Peter Čornej's *Tajemství českých kronik*, although the author has paid particular attention to the chronicle of Lawrence of Březová. Besides Stanisław Bylina, we will not find a reference to the achievements of Polish scholars: authors such as Krzysztof Moskal or Wojciech Iwańczak wrote about the issues Perett discusses concerning Jan Hus and the Hussite movement. The above remarks would have been completely unnecessary if it had not been for the conviction, which Perett stresses many times, that historiography has so far neglected, or even omitted, the problem she has raised. It is difficult to agree with that. The matters discussed in her book are present in the relevant literature, but usually in a dispersed manner. The book's merit is that it sheds light on the reformatory debates from the angle of communication with laymen in a single synthetic approach.

The book was prepared with great care and is reliable and consistent. This reviewer noticed only two errors: Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini possibly came into contact with the Hussites in Basel in 1433, not in 1432 (195); it is also not very accurate to say that Basel Compacts were revoked by the pope (197). The pope never approved them, so it would be more appropriate to use the word *rejected*.

Perett's book is one of the best attempts to present the reformatory disputes in early-fifteenth-century Bohemia. Transparent, competent, and interesting, it should be one of the first works recommended to those interested in the period. For expert researchers of Hussitism, it will be an inspiring look at the problems with which they already are familiar, furthering our understanding of the communication of theological ideas with laymen during this tumultuous period.

PAWEŁ F. NOWAKOWSKI, Jesuit University Ignatianum

PETER OF SPAIN, *Questiones super libro "De Animalibus" Aristotelis: Critical Edition with Introduction*, ed. FRANCISCA NAVARRO SÁNCHEZ. (Medicine in the Medieval Mediterranean 5.) Farnham, Surrey, and Burlington, VT: Ashgate Press, 2015. Pp. xvi, 451; 8 black-and-white illustrations. \$154.95. ISBN: 978-1-4094-4913-3.  
doi:10.1086/709762

Francisca Navarro Sánchez has given the scholarly community a long-desired critical edition of Peter of Spain's *Quaestiones super libro "De animalibus" Aristotelis*. This documentary edition is based on Madrid, Biblioteca nacional de España, MS 1877 (fols. 256–290), with the variant readings of the only other extant codex, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana,

*Speculum* 95/3 (July 2020)

MS Vat. lat. 6758 (fols. 149ra–177rb), noted in the apparatus. BAV Vat. lat. 6758 is also used to fill in lacunae in BnE 1877 at the end of the *Quaestiones* (426–29). A third codex, Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale di Firenze, MS FCS, G. 4853 (fols. 79–191), thought to be relevant by previous scholarship, is disregarded on the basis of José Meirinhos’s findings in his dissertation (2002). Together with Pietro Rossi’s careful and detailed edition of the prologue of Peter of Spain’s *Quaestiones*, based on the Vatican codex (“L’entrata dei libri *De animalibus* nel Medioevo latino,” in *La zoologia di Aristotele e la sua ricezione dall’età ellenistica e romana alle culture medievali*, edited by Maria Michela Sassi, Elisa Coda, and Giuseppe Feola [2018], 237–68), Ephrem Filthaut’s critical edition of Albert the Great’s *Quaestiones super De animalibus* ([1955], pp. 77–309), Hermann Stadler’s edition of Albert’s *De animalibus libri XXVI* (1916/20), based on the Cologne autograph (Köln Historisches Archiv der Stadt, MS W 258a, fols. 1r–426r), and José Martínez Gázquez’s edition of Petrus Gallecus’s *Liber De animalibus* (2000), we are now in the fortunate position of having access to a more complete collection of extant thirteenth-century commentaries on the *De animalibus* made on the basis of Michael Scot’s translation from the Arabic. An important thirteenth-century author missing in this collection is Gerard of Breuil and his *Scripta supra librum De animalibus* (after 1260), based on William of Moerbeke’s translation from the Greek and, to our knowledge, extant in six codices. Dominic Dold is currently preparing a critical edition of the prologue and books 1, 11, and 12 of this text.

Navarro Sánchez’s edition is of particular importance, as the reception history of Peter’s work in the Latin West suggests. Despite the minimal number of extant manuscripts of Peter’s *De animalibus*, Brian Lawn and Miguel de Asúa have long established Albert the Great’s wide-ranging indebtedness to Peter; and it is Albert’s *De animalibus libri XXVI* that saw the widest dissemination throughout the medieval period, with some forty-two complete codices still extant today. These codices were most likely read not only by philosophers but also by physicians, and thus displayed a permeability of the boundaries between the two sciences similar to that found in the philosophical and medical sources invoked by Peter, who was himself conversant in both professions. In section 5 of her introduction (17–31), Navarro Sánchez briefly discusses these sources, and meticulously lists all of Peter’s explicit references, revealing his extensive knowledge of the available medical authorities of the time. Yet, although she considers their significance (31), she does not locate and provide the texts and pagination for Peter’s references (either in the introduction or in the notes to her edition), with the notable exceptions of one reference to Isaac Israeli and seven to Hippocrates. This admittedly arduous task could have been greatly eased by consulting the references provided in Filthaut’s critical edition to Albert’s *Quaestiones super De animalibus*, which, as is known from de Asúa in particular, share much of their sources and contents with Peter’s *Quaestiones*. For instance, in book 3, Peter (p. 166, v. 51) and Albert (p. 124, v. 28) give highly similar solutions to the question of the distribution of the veins in the body, and they both invoke the authority of Avicenna, who, as Filthaut rightly suggests, provides the material for their solutions in his *Canon* (lib. 1, fen. 1, doct. 4, c. 1). Since Navarro Sánchez has thoroughly traced Peter’s indebtedness to the *corpus Aristotelicum* and some other select philosophical sources, her failure to do so for the medical sources seems a rather unfortunate shortcoming. Nonetheless, in line with her introduction, she provides an index containing the authors and works as mentioned by Peter, as well as the toponyms, animals, animal parts, substances from animals, metals, plants, substances from plants, and illnesses he mentions—all of which will prove helpful to future scholarship.

Regarding some more technical details, the edition follows the manuscripts very closely, even up to marginal glosses, which are included as part of the main text. The editor intended to give a sense of contemporary medieval Latin as “a living language that is in continuous evolution” (43). Hence, nonclassical spellings are preserved (such as “loycus” for *logicus* or

“iusta” for *iuxta*), yet sometimes inconsistently standardized across the text. To name only a few, derivatives of both *reddere* (e.g., 87, 279, 284–87) and *redere* (e.g., 284, 289, 366) appear, as well as cognates of *diffinire* (112, 114, 119, 121, 187, 215, 222, 285, 309) and *definire* (111, 285, 286, 289, 363, 391); similarly, forms of *essencialis* appear from p. 366 onward, while the stem *essenti-* is the default. In some cases, it would have been helpful to find indications of non-sensical scribal mistakes, such as, among many instances, “oppositione” from the marginal gloss (275), which should read *opinione* in Michael Scot’s translation, and “demonstratio est similis faciens scire” (283) which should stand for the standard phrase *demonstratio est syllogismus faciens scire*. Moreover, since José Maria da Cruz Pontes’s study of MS 1877 (“La division du texte dans le MS. inédit de *Quaestiones super libro de animalibus* de Petrus Hispanus Portugalensis,” *Bulletin de la Société internationale pour l’étude de la philosophie médiévale* 4 [1962]: 118–26), it has been known that the marginal glosses structure Peter’s text in a different fashion compared to Aristotle’s books. Nonetheless, Navarro Sánchez uses them for her edition. For instance, despite Peter’s declaring in the prologue his intention to treat “de duplici processu in sc[i]lentiis” (113) in book 11, the edition lists these questions under the heading Liber XII (283), keeping the division from the margins. These problems and Peter’s own style make navigation within the commentary difficult, while the editor could have eased this difficulty by introducing subheadings or other structuring elements.

Navarro Sánchez’s edition was published at a propitious time, as the younger generations in the field are rapidly turning their attention toward medieval natural philosophy and the living world. Her edition will certainly enrich these studies, providing an invaluable textual basis for sophisticated investigations and analyses in Latin medieval natural philosophy and medicine.

KATJA KRAUSE, Max Planck Institute for the History of Science  
and Technical University of Berlin

DOMINIC DOLD, Max Planck Institute for the History of Science  
and Technical University of Berlin

MARCO POLO, *Le devisement du monde*, ed. and trans. JOËL BLANCHARD and MICHEL QUEREUIL, in collaboration with THOMAS TANASE. (Texte courant 8.) Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2019. Pp. lxvi, 800; 6 maps. €18.80. ISBN: 978-2-6000-5900-8.  
doi:10.1086/709561

This volume is the first to present the famous Franco-Italian text of Marco Polo’s *Devisement du monde* (*Description of the World*) with a facing French translation. The text is preserved in one manuscript (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 1116; “F” in the stemma codicum), generally considered one of the oldest surviving copies of Polo’s account. It is no exaggeration to say that this manuscript is of world-historical importance, for reasons too numerous to list. Depending on one’s critical approach and interests, the text in BnF MS fr. 1116 is fascinating, puzzling, or maddening: at once a panorama of its global era and a catalogue of mistranslations, misdatings, misnomers, and missing letters, words, and phrases. Daunting challenges face any editor (what to correct, how to present the text) or translator (how to render proper names and foreign words, whether to keep repetitions, what to annotate).

The introduction to this edition/translation is a concise and informative overview of the *Devisement*’s historical context that covers Polo’s life, the rise of the Mongols, Christianity in Asia, Kubilai’s governance, Polo’s possible collaboration with Rustichello da Pisa, the precision and variety of Polo’s observations, and the interpolated “micro-récits” drawn from miracle stories, *chansons de geste*, and exempla. The editors astutely observe that