

FRANCESCO BARBARO, *Epistolario*, 2: *La raccolta canonica delle "Epistole,"* ed. Claudio Griggio. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1999. Pp. liv, 807.

POGGIO BRACCIOLINI, *De infelicitate principum*, ed. Davide Canfora. (Edizione Nazionale dei Testi Umanistici, 2.) Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1998. Paper. Pp. cl, 83 plus black-and-white figures. L 50,000.

LEONARDO BRUNI, *Laudatio Florentine urbis*, ed. Stefano U. Baldassarri. (Millennio Medievale, 16; Testi, 7.) Florence: SISMEL, Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2000. Pp. ci, 48; black-and-white figures. L 55,000.

Classical philology began to develop rigorous methods of textual criticism as long ago as the early nineteenth century, but it was not until the 1930s that students of Italian humanism, led by Paul Oskar Kristeller and Alessandro Perosa, began to apply modern critical methods to the editing of humanistic texts. Kristeller's great monument, the *Iter Italicum* (7 vols., 1963-92), laid the foundations for the modern study of Renaissance Latin texts by making it possible for the first time to acquire, for any humanistic text, an organic view of its textual tradition. As humanistic philology has matured over the last three decades, it has developed its own distinctive techniques for dealing with the peculiar methodological problems presented by the last age of the manuscript book. The major challenge, apart from the sheer mass of surviving textual evidence, is the presence of a dynamic element in the form of identifiable authorial interventions of various kinds in the tradition of a text. These include corrections and changes made in dedication copies (not always entered in the author's own copy), successive redactions, precanonical circulation of texts, "open" textual traditions (especially of commentaries or texts used as models of style), and post-humous editorial work by students and followers. A special class of problems arising from "authorial errors" has been identified, giving rise to the study of humanistic Latin as a distinct language with a complex and by no means passive relationship to classical accidence, syntax, and vocabulary. It has moreover become evident that, in an environment where texts are widely circulated among a relatively small literary elite, contamination is the rule rather than the exception; one is almost tempted to formulate the rule "Whenever contamination can occur, it will occur." A new editorial technique has emerged, pioneered primarily by brilliant Italian philologists such as Silvia Rizzo and Vincenzo Fera, to deal with the unique issues presented by early humanist texts. The method that has emerged is a hybrid one, formed from classical philological procedures of recension and emendation, on the one hand, and the methods of the "variorum" edition used by editors of modern texts, on the other. The three volumes under review are excellent examples of this sophisticated new philology of the modern Italian school.

The most considerable of the three is Claudio Griggio's monumental edition of Francesco Barbaro's letters. Barbaro (1390-1454) was a famous diplomat and statesman as well as the most important Venetian humanist of the first half of the quattrocento; his *Epistolario* is a document of primary importance for the study of Venetian humanism. Its contemporary influence is attested by its preservation in some 255 manuscripts and seventy-five printed editions. The second volume, reviewed here, contains the text of the 389 canonical letters as arranged by Barbaro himself; volume 1 (*Prolegomena*), published in 1991, contained a conspectus of manuscripts and an analysis of the textual tradition; volume 3 will present the *extravagantes*, the letters preserved outside the canonical tradition. Griggio's edition, the fruit of more than twenty years of Herculean labors on an extraordinarily large and complex textual tradition, will surely stand as the definitive text for the foreseeable future. It is based on the final redaction of the *Epistolario*, while incorporating in the apparatus the variants of the two previous stages of the text. The discovery of the different stages of the text's evolution is itself a major contribution for which Griggio deserves credit,

and he has invented a *diagramma evolutivo*, replacing the static *stemma codicum*, to represent visually the dynamic relationships between the chief witnesses.

Davide Canfora's edition of Poggio's *De infelicitate principum* is the second volume in a welcome new series, the Edizione Nazionale dei Testi Umanistici, published in cooperation with Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura and directed by Scevola Mariotti. Its scope is to publish critical editions of Latin works by Italian humanists. The present text, by the famous Tuscan humanist and book hunter Poggio Bracciolini (1380–1459), illustrates the troubled relationship between learning and power perceived by some early humanists and the ever-present pull of Epicurean retirement and the contemplative life; it is a useful corrective to the tendency to interpret early quattrocento humanism simplistically as an ideology of republicanism and the active life of politics. From a textual point of view, the work illustrates the difficulty or impossibility of constructing a traditional stemma for popular texts written in the decades just before the invention of printing, when book production had already begun to be organized on a large scale. As Canfora shows, the textual tradition consists of some 60 witnesses, most of them written within about thirty years of each other; analysis of the three main families of witnesses demonstrates the ubiquity of contamination and the very real possibility of authorial interventions even in manuscripts that on recensionary principles ought to be remote from the (lost) archetype. The situation illustrates the importance of external evidence (paleographical and codicological) as well as *divinatio* based on a firm sense of authorial and coeval usage in establishing Renaissance texts. Canfora, it should be said, negotiates all these difficulties with care and good sense and establishes a convincing, impeccable text.

The third text under review, Leonardo Bruni's *Laudatio Florentine urbis* (1404), is the most famous of the three among modern scholars, though it was the least widely circulated of the three during the Renaissance itself. The oration has become the most canonical text in the tradition of "civic humanism" thanks to the influence of Hans Baron's *Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance* (1955, rev. ed. 1966). It has been edited in whole or in part six times since the late nineteenth century. None of these editions, however, made use of more than a handful of the 43 surviving witnesses or attempted to determine their interrelationships. Stefano Baldassarri, however, has now given us a definitive critical edition which surveys the manuscript tradition as a whole and carefully classifies the witnesses. As the tradition is smaller, extends over eight decades, and does not reveal signs of textual evolution, Baldassarri has been able to establish a traditional stemma. An important finding, indeed, is Baldassarri's convincing proof that the *Laudatio* did not undergo further revision when it was recirculated during the 1430s, as has sometimes been alleged. His edition also provides a more complete and reliable identification of the sources than that offered by previous editions as well as some new details concerning the reception of the work. It is a welcome addition to the growing array of modern editions of Bruni's works, which includes Baldassarri's own earlier edition of the *Dialogi* (Olschki, 1994), Ernesto Berti's edition of Plato's *Crito* in Bruni's two versions (Olschki, 1983), the *Orationes Homeri* edited by Peter Thiermann (Brill, 1993), and Susanne Daub's superb edition and study of the *Oratio in funere Nanni Strozze* (Teubner, 1996).

JAMES HANKINS, Harvard University

DOMINIQUE BARTHÉLEMY, *L'an mil et la paix de Dieu: La France chrétienne et féodale, 980–1060*. Paris: Fayard, 1999. Paper. Pp. 637; maps and genealogical tables. F 170.

According to Dominique Barthélemy, when it comes to understanding the year 1000 or the Peace of God, French historiography has yet to emerge from the shadow of Jules Michelet. Michelet regarded the year 1000 as the nadir of French civilization, a barbaric time