

CRITICA

GÁBOR ALMÁSI – FARKAS GÁBOR KISS: *Humanistes du bassin des Carpates. II: Johannes Sambucus* [Europa Humanistica 14]. Brepols, Turnhout 2014 (LXXIV+291 pp) ISBN 978-2-503-53162-5

The book of Almási and Kiss forms part of the Hungarian contribution (being the second volume of the *Humanistes du bassin des Carpates*, a subseries consisting of five volumes in preview) to a common series (*Europa Humanistica*) publishing the results of an international research that focuses on the transmission of classical texts during the 16th century. This volume discusses the life of the Hungarian humanist Johannes Sambucus (János Zsámboky 1531–1584), attempting to evaluate his philological and editorial work manifested in the editions connected to him. Consisting of two main parts, the very thorough and well-structured introduction (74 pages), and the annotated edition of prefaces and dedications collected from the editions of Sambucus (238 pages), this twofold book promises a tool to comprehend his career better through Latin texts illustrating it, and conversely, to get a better understanding of these paratexts in the light of the social and philological context in which they were written. The Latin texts are preceded by the chronologically ordered list of their editions and by the enumeration of classical authors in alphabetical order, while the back matter of

the book consists of appendices¹, and some useful indices². The volume concludes with the table of illustrations, the illustrations themselves, the abbreviations, the selected bibliography and the general index. All of them facilitate the retrieval of information of various concern, the goal of the whole series being to map the transmission of the texts, i.e. the history of printing and philology, and to shed light on the network of humanists over Europe as well.

Regarding the introduction, which is the French translation of the authors' excellent paper (in *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 117 [2013] 627–691), it gives a very informative summary of the literature about Sambucus and the research carried out by Almási and Kiss, summarizing his biography, delineating his relationship with other humanists, and after a general analysis of his editorial program and philological method follows the in-detail discussion of the most important editions prepared by him. The chapter concludes with the principles of transcription and the acknowledgments.

The selection of texts does not cover all paratexts which mention Sambucus, or which were written by him, only those prepared for classical (including the Greek Fathers and the Byzantine writers) or humanist editions, and where his actual work can be apprehended, according to the opinion of Almási and Kiss. Though in his correspondence Sambucus overdrew his operation as a philologist, in the paratexts and in his self-bibliography he clearly distinguished between emendating a text, editing it, and commenting on it. As illustrated by the philological vocabulary of Sambucus on p. xxv, tabulated with references to the editions in which they appear, he used philological terms in a consequent way through his lifetime. However, as it turns out from the two authors' analysis, the words *edere* and *editio* were not confined to the process or result of his personal philological work. Passing a manuscript from his library to a fellow philologue was reported by Sambucus in this manner as well, thus his own contribution as a philologist in the strict sense of the word can only be attested in those editions where he used the expressions *emendare*, *corrigere* or *illustrare*. Sifting his works according to these criteria, the impressive list of his editions (containing *editiones principes* of authors such as Aristaenetus, Nonnus, Plotinus, Stobaeus and Theophylactus) melts down to Petronius, Plautus, Diogenes Laertius, Vegetius and Caesar. Regarding the others his merits were those of the collector of manuscripts.

As his own philological method, examined by Almási and Kiss, amid the diverging preferences of making witty conjectures or taking variants from different old codices, Zsámboky followed in the footsteps of Piero Vettori, with whom he maintained an active correspondence, and was inclined to minimize the number of emendations as far as possible, and if inevitable, he preferred variants based on old manuscripts. While

¹ Appendix 1 enlists the editions carried out by Sambucus, while Appendix 2 contains the manuscripts formerly belonging to Sambucus, which are conserved in the Austrian National Library. This list, completing a previous one published by Hans Gerstinger, results from the research carried out by the late István Németh. Appendix 3 illustrates an elaborate method of how to publish and not publish a text at the same time. It refers to a reproduction of a letter put into the illustrations, which will be part of another volume of *Europa Humanistica*.

² The first index contains the authors and addressees of the paratexts indicating both their vernacular and humanist names, while the second enlists the typographers according to the places where they worked.

selecting the best manuscript from the available ones and preserving the variants more or less separately proved to be a foregoing decision, this was far away from a selection in the knowledge of the stemma. However, since Sambucus possessed one of the richest private libraries and manuscript collections in Europe, the principle of standing upon one manuscript coincided with the scarce possibility of communicating with the typographers on the one hand, and the intention to increase the prestige of his library on the other hand, as Almási and Kiss argue. His privileged state rendered the creation of the brand *Ex bibliotheca Sambuci* possible, a group of editions which were prepared by other philologues on his initiative or on the basis of manuscripts sent by him, though not all of them contain the aforementioned phrase on the title page. This set is discussed by Almási and Kiss according to their editors, a group consisting of philologists such as Justus Lipsius, Hadrianus Junius, Wilhelm Canter or Johann Löwenklau.

The greater part of the manuscripts used for the editions has been identified, as shown by the very rich annotation under the Latin texts. Almási and Kiss carefully interleave the details gained from the dedications, from the correspondence of Sambucus, from the most recent literature, or from the examination of manuscripts. Their observations on the variants of Eunapius are thought-provoking, of which the authors discovered an exemplar presumably printed for the ambience of Sambucus, differing from the prevalent other one, shaped for the goals of Hadrianus Junius (pp. lvi–lvii). This case reveals the overwhelming importance of situating these texts in the context of the personal relationship between the parties concerned. The fatiguing work of the transcription and collation of these editions was shifted off to other contributors several times, and since Sambucus was a patron not wealthy enough to compensate them, they performed it in the hope of being commended to obtain a chair. The fact that the typographer prepared two tailor-made versions, both accentuating one's talent and passing over the other's in silence, is explained by Almási and Kiss with Christopher Plantin's intention to keep a good relationship with both Sambucus and Hadrianus Junius. The case of the latter can illustrate how closely the various volumes of the series *Europa Humanistica* are related to each other. While the life of the Dutch philologue can be elucidated by the texts to be published in the other section (*Les Humanistes des Pays-Bas* 1)³ of the same series, a novelty hidden in the notes of the Sambucus volume is the attempt to set in time some undated letters of Junius.⁴

The notes to the paratexts offer such details, identifying the manuscript on which the edition stands, if possible, summing up the biographical data about every classical author or contemporary person mentioned in the dedications, poems and prefaces. Every Greek poem and citation is translated, all the classical *loci* are identified, and

³ VAN MIERT, D.: *Adrianus Junius (1511–1575)*. Brepols, Turnhout, to appear.

⁴ In n. 216. This may suit the works of carrying out a new and more complete edition of the corpus of letters written by or to Sambucus, a major project mentioned already in a footnote in Almási's *The Uses of Humanism* (p. XIV. n. 1). However, comparing the dedicatory letters transmitted here with the list of those deliberately left out from the comprehensive collection of the Sambucus letters, the reader can recognize that due to the principles of selection, not all of the missing letters are recovered. At any rate, everyone can hope that they are simply left for a complete epistolary book to appear soon, of which this volume seems to be a precursor.

if there is any discrepancy compared to the source, it is signified and explained, as in the case of some problematic passages like the metrically deviating poem of Obertus Gifanius. While regarding the poems dense with allusions, the more help the better,⁵ the notes are an elaborate work, a big service for all students of this field.

On the other hand, while the introduction and the notes show the careful work of two erudite scholars, the Latin texts testify some lack of precision. Whereas the French and Greek texts contain just a few errors,⁶ not the same can be said about the Latin texts. The use of the lowercase is inconsistent here and there.⁷ The normalization of proper names (*Ioannes* and *Joannes*, etc.) and a more moderate usage of upper case letters, especially in the poems, would make the text more readable. Though the sources of the texts are printed books and some of them have critical editions as well,

⁵ Especially in the case of metrical deviances (e.g. p. 95 ll. 34–35; p. 150 l. 24.) or the obscure hints of the poems of Charles Utenhove (p. 120), where some suggestions on how to solve them would be appreciated. Henceforth 'l.' will be used before line numbers, numbering only the Latin and Greek lines, for the French texts only page numbers will be indicated. For indicating notes, which are numbered continuously in the whole book, their numbers will be given after 'n.'

⁶ E.g. p. 4: *oème* instead of *Poème*; p. 12: *auxquelles* instead of *auxquelles*; p. 15, l. 1: *γνώμας aut χρείας* instead of *γνώμας aut χρείας*; n. 306: *Fisher* instead of *Fischer*; n. 343: *Gyalu Torda* instead of *Gyalu*; p. 103: *lecon* instead of *leçon*; n. 393: *amimaux* instead of *animaux*; n. 643: *Πανοπολίτος* instead of *Πανοπολίτων*; n. 648: *σοφιστων* instead of *σοφιστών*; p. 107, l. 2: *δανεία* instead of *δάνεια*; p. 108, l. 18: *ἐξηγήσεις* instead of *ἐξηγήσεις*; p. 138, l. 14: *ἐλευθερίας* instead of *ἐλευθερίας*; p. 152, l. 22: *φυσικοίς* instead of *φυσικοίς*; p. 155, l. 17: *Μιλησιον* instead of *Μιλησίον*; p. 158, l. 7: *υἱός* instead of *υἱός*; n. 869: *don* instead of *donc*; p. 267: *Apponyi, Albert* instead of *Apponyi, Alexander*; etc.

⁷ E.g. p. 25, l. 9: *latio*; p. 44, l. 19: *paenias*; p. 125, l. 3: *bacchi*; p. 129, ll. 17–18: *Nonnos, Nonnas*; p. 154, l. 12: *latine*; p. 155, l. 15: *graeculo*.

this did not secure them against typos⁸ or omissions of whole words,⁹ which can sometimes lead to ungrammaticality. Where the text had been corrupted this way, it became even worse due to corrections.¹⁰ Elsewhere the word division made the text harder to understand or simply senseless,¹¹ not in one case retaining the errors of the originals.¹² Unfortunately, these errors can have their equivalents in the French summary as well.¹³ While the previous shortages can be attributed to mistyping, the erroneous completion of abbreviations is a more serious issue, for the agreement is often missed.¹⁴ In the case

⁸ E.g. p. 14, l. 8: *yri* instead of *Cyri*; p. 15, l. 5: *quale* instead of *qualem*; n. 311: *poematum* twice, in the same note: *pueri* instead of *pueris*; p. 43, l. 17: *restitua* instead of *restituta*; p. 44, l. 10: *addir* instead of *adit* (here causing a metrical deviation as well); p. 64, l. 6: *videamus* instead of *videamur*; p. 66, l. 11: *ignorans* instead of *ignarus*; p. 72, l. 7: *Winnebe* instead of *Winneberg*; p. 82, l. 7: *annalles* instead of *annales*; p. 83, l. 5: *Colomanno* instead of *Colimanno*; p. 84, l. 2: *comp[os]itio* instead of *comptior*; p. 88, l. 9: *genere* instead of *gerere*; p. 100, l. 20: *Filli* instead of *Filii*; p. 104, l. 10: *vehemener* instead of *vehementer*; p. 116, l. 32: *involuimur* instead of *involvitur* (in spite of the principles of transcription mentioned in the introduction); p. 118, l. 21: *palatinus* instead of *palatinatus*; p. 119, l. 7: *sambucam* instead of *sambucum*; p. 120, l. 14: *Phaebi* instead of *Phoebe*; l. 22: *religionis* instead of *relligionis*; p. 139, l. 15: *commodanti* instead of *commodandi*; l. 20: *occurant* instead of *occurrent*; p. 154, l. 13: *subcesivis* (in the original *subcessivis*); p. 162, l. 12: *offeri* instead of *offerri*; n. 761: *florium* instead of *fluviorum*; p. 168, l. 8: *homium* instead of *hominum*; p. 170, l. 3: *ne* instead of *nae*; *Paullo* instead of *Paulle*; p. 171, l. 22: *Utrum* instead of *Verum*; p. 174, l. 5: *questionem* instead of *quaestionum*; p. 176, l. 8: *tyrannidem* instead of *tyrannide*; l. 9: *conformari* instead of *conformati*; l. 22: *Quos* instead of *quo*; p. 180, l. 8: *commorati* instead of *commorari*; p. 181, l. 11: *ideque* instead of *idque*; l. 22: *Chritophori* instead of *Christophori*; p. 182, l. 7: *maioem* instead of *maiorum*; l. 10: *rator* instead of *orator*; p. 185, l. 11: *Tacitum* instead of *Tacitus*; p. 186, l. 3: *imperatorii* instead of *imperatoris*; p. 187, l. 19: *quinta* instead of *quanta*; p. 189, l. 3: *instituta* in the place of *institutae*; l. 4: *testenda* instead of *testandae*; p. 190, l. 1: *vetustissimus* instead of *vetustissimis*; p. 193, l. 2: *Catholicis* instead of *Catholici*; l. 3: *Chritophorum* instead of *Christophorum*; *Ioannes* instead of *Ioannis*; p. 198, l. 2: *Ioanni* instead of *Ioannis*; p. 202, l. 15: *praeferandum* instead of *praefarendum*; p. 207, l. 14: *collocatis* instead of *pro collatis*, this correction is present in the original's Errata partly transcribed on p. 237; p. 208, l. 9: *param* instead of *puram*; p. 212, last line: *offeruntur* instead of *offeruntur*; p. 213, l. 10: *ipse* instead of *ipso*; p. 220, l. 12: *magnificarum* instead of *magiarum* also present in the Errata; p. 223, l. 5: *dinceps* instead of *deinceps*; p. 224, l. 14: *inscita* instead of *inscitia*; p. 226, l. 20: *inuenti* instead of *inventi*; p. 229, l. 5: *patricidia* instead of *paricidia*; l. 27: *transtulerit* instead of *transtulerint*; l. 32: *morem* instead of *more*; p. 237, l. 10: *fiere* instead of *fieri*; p. 239, l. 5: *pueri* instead of *pueris*; p. 244, l. 15: *copiosissime* instead of *copiosissimo*.

⁹ On p. 70, l. 7: before *fortasse*: *f*; p. 84, l. 1: before *sit*: *epistola*; p. 170, l. 3: after *Rhamnusi*: *et*; p. 171, l. 23: after *genere*: *copiam*; p. 198, l. 20: after *priorem*: *desideravimus*; p. 214, l. 3: after *ab interprete*: *relicta*; p. 226, l. 5: after *vero*: *laudem* (corrected in the original's Errata).

¹⁰ On p. 84, the missing *epistola* may have triggered the correction of *comptior* to *compositio*.

¹¹ Especially in the case of the cliticum *-ne*, e.g. p. 178, l. 4: *bellica ne virtus... an*; l. 17: *ne dum*; p. 193: *plus ne... an*; the same with *-que*: p. 213, l. 23; in the case of compound words: p. 58, l. 3: *tam quam*; p. 216, l. 23: *quo minus*; other typos: p. 114, l. 17: *statua me* instead of *statu a me*; p. 210, l. 15: *virem in entissimum*; p. 229: *Christianum se professus et a cultu de astrorum alienum* (cf. *deastrum* 'idol').

¹² On p. 34, l. 27: *adoras* like in the original, instead of *meas... ad oras*; n. 311: *ex haeredationis* (thus in the original); p. 221, l. 6: *adire* instead of *audire*, where in note 894 the editors cast off the emendation found by them in the margin of the copy examined, though the phrase '*male audire*' rather makes sense (cf. the same phrase about Livy p. 183, l. 13).

¹³ E.g. p. 182: where *Historiam apte scribere... maiorem* (in the original: *maiorum*) *temporibus... rara laus fuit*, in French: *Écrire convenablement une histoire dominant les circonstances... c'est un mérite rare*.

¹⁴ E.g. p. 45, l. 6: *Tui studiosissimi Obertus* instead of *Tui studiosissimus Obertus*; p. 47: *ex... codici veteri* instead of *codice vetere* or *veteri* (cf. the next footnote); p. 49, l. 11: *Iohannes* instead of *Iohannem*; p. 52, l. 4: *gravissimam poetam* instead of *gravissimum*; *imperatorii* instead of *imperatoris* (pp. 102,

of the abbreviation *V.C.*, which can be deciphered as *vir clarissimus*, *vetus codex*, and *urbe condita* as well (the phrase *verbi causa* is not present in this book), it would be reasonable to solve it everywhere, and to do so with more attention.¹⁵ While the collation of the transcription with the originals and a thorough proof-reading could have been a remedy to all these errors, seemingly neither had been carried out. The responsibility of the publisher must be mentioned as well, especially regarding such aesthetic errors like using a font that differs from its ambience (p. 160, ll. 20–21: *pro*); using two different Greek fonts for the same purpose (p. 267 and 269, in the case of Aristaenetus and Eunapius); using two different kinds of footnote numbers (e.g. p. 122–123) or different font sizes (see the French summary on p. 29), not mentioning the commutation of the paragraph styles applied to the French summaries and the Latin texts (e.g. p. 33), blank half pages (p. 32, 143), or the orphaned small capitals (p. 86). Browsing through the reproductions of the original editions, the reader may be overtaken by the feeling that these texts, having come out from the press of typographers such as Christophe Plantin or Jean Oporin, have not deserved this treatment. Thus, to enjoy the advantages of the notes and to avoid the errors of the texts, the parallel use of the annotated texts and the digitized copies of the original editions is recommended.

In spite of these shortcomings, what makes their paratexts more precious is the practical goals which can be derived from them in the framework given in Almási's book mentioned above. If humanism, with all the acts and behaviours in which it manifests itself, is considered a group of certain cultural practices, instead of merely an intellectual movement, then collecting books and editing texts are cultural practices as well, and the question about their uses for their practitioners can be answered with tracing their career and examining how these practices facilitated them in obtaining offices or engaging patrons. In the case of Sambucus, this can explain why he hunted over manuscripts, how he made contacts with other fellows and in which way he used them for his editorial works, or how his editorial program changed over his life. Thus the issue of the *Emblemata* in 1564 and his settle-down in Vienna in 1567 split his career as a scholar into three parts. The first one focusing on translations, paraphrases, own literary works and didactically useful editions, was followed by the worthiest regarding his own philological contribution. This created the image of a scholar who merits higher and higher positions in the imperial court, while in the last third of his career an advancing 'outsourcing' of the different philological operations can be observed.

Due to their sound knowledge of the whole 16th-century *respublica litteraria*, Almási and Kiss organize the data and texts not only into a portrait of a polymath cour-

186, 190, l. 6); p. 178, l. 2: *nepotes* instead of *nepos*; *Caesaris Maiestatis* instead of *Caesareae Maiestatis* (p. 190, l. 3, 204); p. 189, l. 1: *libri* instead of *libros*; p. 191, l. 10: *Celsitudinis* instead of *Celsitudini*; p. 190, l. 8: *Saltzburgensi* instead of *Saltzburgensis*; p. 208, l. 1: *Arcadi et Honorii Augusti* instead of *Augustorum* (the original has *augg.*).

¹⁵ Left in abbreviated form: p. 161, l. 8: *virī clarissimī*; p. 179, l. 30: *post urbem conditam*; p. 237, l. 1: instead of *ad Fr. Pithoeum V[eteri] C[odice]* I suggest the following: *ad Fr[anciscum] Pithoeum v[irum] c[larissimum]*, since it is part of an address. The declension of *vetus* as an ordinary adjective here shows the editors' attention, this usage being very common amongst the writers of the paratexts (and attested in forms wholly written out).

tier, but into a vivid tableau of humanist scholars driven by own goals and interests, in a world where composing Greek epigrams and collecting rare manuscripts could open a way to courtly positions, and where editions of high standard could provide an important impetus to material advancement as well, nevertheless where making all these rewarding was a *tour de force* in itself.

Szabolcs Kondákor
MTA-ELTE-PPKE
Research Centre for Ancient Studies