

BOOK REVIEW

Békés, Enikő (ed.). **Galeotto Marzio, *De doctrina promiscua*: Critical Edition with Introduction and Notes.** Micrologus Library, 119. Firenze, Sismel, Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2024, 322. ISBN 978-88-9290-301-2.

Reviewed by **László Takács***

Published online: August 19, 2025

© 2025 The Author(s)



Although the number of volumes published in the *Micrologus Library* series has continued to grow, volume 119 demonstrates that the series—now running for almost thirty years—has fortunately not lost any of its momentum. A well-established set of editorial standards now governs the publication of texts in the series, ensuring the consistent release of high-quality works.

While it is true that this now extensive library includes not only critical editions but also monographs, it continues to set a clear benchmark for the publication of texts by Renaissance authors. It serves as a valuable guide for scholars preparing editions of humanist texts that are either unpublished or difficult to access.

It is with this goal in mind that Enikő Békés has prepared a critical edition of *De doctrina promiscua* by Galeotto Marzio. Two fortunate developments should be noted: first, that no modern edition of this important work by Marzio had previously been available; and second, that the task has been undertaken by a scholar who is both a recognized authority on Marzio and an active participant in the Hungarian tradition of humanism research. This tradition pays particular attention to the remarkable contributions of Italian humanists at the court of King Matthias, and at the Royal Castle in Buda.

In keeping with the nature of a critical edition of this kind, our primary focus is on the editor's scholarly work, though we also offer a few remarks on the key findings presented in the introductory study. Surprisingly, the editor does not label the twenty-page opening section with the conventional title "Introduction." Instead, the reader is immediately confronted with the central question of the study, posed in the form of a provocative title: *Physician or Quack? Two Examples of Paduan Astrological Medicine: From Pietro d'Abano to Galeotto Marzio* (pp. 3–24).

Despite its unconventional title, Békés provides a sufficiently detailed account of Marzio's life in this section. Special attention is devoted to the period Marzio spent in Hungary and to his connections with Hungarian humanists. The editor then proceeds to outline the ideological background of *De doctrina promiscua*, explaining how Marzio came to embrace astrological medicine and how this belief shaped his broader intellectual output. The introduction also

*Pázmány Péter Catholic University, Hungary. E-mail: takacs.laszlo@btk.ppke.hu

discusses the intellectual movement to which Marzio belonged and the authors who influenced his engagement with this form of natural philosophy.

Drawing on the relevant scholarship, Békés demonstrates that Marzio relied heavily on the work of Pietro d'Abano. She then explores the parallels between *De doctrina promiscua* and d'Abano's *Lucidator*, supplementing her analysis with references to Michele Savonarola's *Speculum physiognomiae*. This comparison highlights the close connection between the texts and shows that Marzio's theoretical framework is largely derived from d'Abano's teachings. Békés further supports this claim with textual evidence, offering philological proof of the ideological continuity between the works.

In sum, the introduction meets the scholarly expectations for a critical edition of this kind. It also provides a compelling answer to the question posed in the title: the theory to which Marzio adhered, though intellectually serious in its time, was ultimately relegated—after a century and a half—to the realm of quackery.

The next section of the introduction offers a scholarly account of the textual witnesses on which the edition is based (pp. 25–29). *De doctrina promiscua* survives in two manuscripts: one held in the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana in Florence, and the other in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. The work was first printed in 1548 by Lorenzo Torrentino in Florence, and—understandably—this edition was based on the Florentine codex. The complete work was subsequently published two more times in Latin, in 1552 and 1602, and an Italian translation appeared in 1615. (Prior to the present edition, only a partial version of the text, with critical notes, was published by Mario Frezza in 1949.)

Based on a comparative analysis of the manuscripts and printed editions, Enikő Békés—rightly, in my view—selected the Florentine manuscript as the base text, since the Vatican copy was derived from it. In addition to transcribing the text, Békés has also identified the sources of the direct quotations. Although Marzio often cites these sources in forms that differ from modern editions, the editor—again, correctly—preserves the original phrasing.

After the introductory chapter, the description of the editorial principles, and the acknowledgements (which could perhaps have been placed earlier), the critical edition of the text follows, spanning approximately three hundred pages (pp. 31–313). Enikő Békés, true to her promise, supplements the main text with two types of apparatus: on the one hand, she provides textual variants found in the manuscripts or the *editio princeps*; on the other hand, she indicates the exact sources of the direct quotations. The main text of *De doctrina promiscua* is, as promised, based on the Florentine codex.

Where she intervenes in the text as editor, punctuation takes precedence, followed by spelling. Even without reading the entire volume, it can be seen from the dedication to Lorenzo Medici alone that Enikő Békés consistently applies the editorial principles she has set out—although it is debatable whether these principles could have been refined further.

If we examine the punctuation, the first sentence of the dedication is given by the editor as follows: *Plurima sunt Medice Laurenti, quae Medicorum familiam iamdudum illustrarunt, reddideruntque toto orbe clarissimam, et haec quidem claritas non nisi ex cumulata nobilitate eluxit, quandoquidem notitiam laus, laudem uero recte factorum magnitudo produxit.* [...] In the Florentine codex, the same sentence, with the abbreviations [] between them, reflecting the spelling, reads as follows: *Plurima sunt medice laurenti quę medicoru[m] familiam iamdudum illustrarunt : reddideru[n]tque toto orbe clarissima[m] & hæc quidem claritas non nisi excumulata nobilitate eluxit q[ua]n[do]quidem notitiam laus laudem uero recte factorum*

magnitudo produxit: haec [...] In the *editio princeps*, the sentence reads as follows: *Plurima sunt Medices Laurenti, quæ Mediceorum familiam iandudum illustrarunt, reddideruntq[ue] toto orbe clarissimam, et hæc quidem claritas non nisi ex cumulata nobilitate eluxit, quandoquidem notitiam laus, laudem vero recte factorum magnitudo produxit.*

In light of the Florentine codex and the *editio princeps*, it becomes clear that Enikő Békés did not intend to overload her edition with punctuation. The result of this approach is that her punctuation aligns more closely with that of the *editio princeps*. Consequently, where we, as readers of a modern edition, would expect a comma, it may be absent; and where punctuation appears, it reflects the manuscript and printed tradition.

In my opinion, although the edition is entirely consistent in this regard, it might have been more appropriate to separate vocatives from the rest of the sentence with commas. For example, in the case quoted—*Plurima sunt, Medice Laurenti, [...]*—a comma around the vocative would be more fitting. By contrast, the comma following *illustrarunt* and *reddideruntque* could have been omitted, as they are linked by an adverbial conjunction and share the same grammatical level.

In other instances, the use of commas in the *editio princeps* is justified, and it is correct that the editor retained them after *clarissimam*, *eluxit*, and *laus*.

The first sentence also offers insight into the spelling practices. What is most striking is that the Florentine codex, though consistent in its approach, employs a variety of representations for the classical diphthong *ae*, which—unlike modern textual standards—appears in the manuscript as *ē*, *ae*, or *æ*. Enikő Békés, adapting the text to modern expectations, departs from the practice of the *editio princeps* (rightly, in my opinion) and standardizes the spelling to *ae*.

As for other transcription conventions, she remains consistent: the classical diphthong *oe*, which appears simply as *e* in both the manuscript and the printed edition, is also rendered as *e* in nearly all cases (for example, *coelitus* is retained as such). Similarly, in line with the manuscript and unlike the printed edition, the new edition avoids the use of the letter *v*.

Turning to another important aspect of the editor's work, we must consider the expansion of abbreviations. Most of these are resolved convincingly, yet a few editorial choices—while defensible—may leave the reader somewhat uncertain. Among these, one particularly notable case, already mentioned in the context of punctuation, concerns the abbreviation of Lorenzo Medici's name. The Florentine codex almost always shortens his name to *M. Laurentius* in the appropriate grammatical case. In the salutation, it appears as *ad M. laurentium*, while in the initial address it already becomes *medice laurenti*. At the beginning of the first paragraph of the dedication, the codex reads *M. laurenti*, whereas the *editio princeps* renders it as *Magnifice Laurenti*.

In this instance, Békés appears to have followed Torrentino's interpretation, which undoubtedly elevates the tone and aligns with the fact that the adjective *magnifice* does appear later in the codex. Even so, it would have been worth noting explicitly that the new edition preserves the reading of the first printed edition in this case.

After addressing punctuation, spelling, and abbreviations, the structuring of the text must also be mentioned, as it is far from negligible. Both the manuscript and the first edition present the work as a nearly continuous block of text, interrupted only by punctuation. Torrentino had already introduced sentence divisions and capitalization, but in the present edition, Békés goes further: she divides the text not only into sentences but also into paragraphs. This significantly

clarifies the flow of thought, making the text easier to read and interpret, and greatly enhancing accessibility for the modern reader.

One of the most important responsibilities of an editor is to establish an accurate text. In the *apparatus criticus*, the editor of the present edition clearly marks the words she considers incorrect or contextually inappropriate, and in every case—at least in my opinion—she corrects them in a reliable and judicious manner. All of this demonstrates that Enikő Békés is indeed an expert on the text, and I would have welcomed the use of even bolder editorial choices to clarify the meaning of certain passages. In particular, I am thinking of her treatment of Marzio's translations of personal names, such as Aristotle's *optimus finis* or Hippocrates' *equorum frenator*. These could have been made more immediately recognizable by placing them in quotation marks: '*optimus finis*' and '*equorum frenator*'. I note in passing that a few minor typographical errors have unfortunately slipped into the Latin text—likely due to the typesetting process rather than editorial oversight.

Enikő Békés has also undertaken the task of identifying the classical sources quoted verbatim in the text. She highlights these quotations in italics—quite rightly—and provides full and reliable references, which greatly facilitates the work of anyone engaging with Galeotto Marzio or making use of this newly published edition.

In conclusion, Enikő Békés's edition of *De doctrina promiscua* is a long-awaited, gap-filling contribution, prepared on the basis of serious scholarly groundwork and a deep familiarity with the text. It is textually reliable, though I would encourage a bit more boldness in clarifying the author's meaning for modern readers. In other words, I would welcome an editorial approach that goes even further in guiding the reader toward interpretation.

I am confident that Enikő Békés's work will draw renewed attention to the writings of Galeotto Marzio. It will undoubtedly serve as an indispensable resource for the study of astrological medicine and will attract new readers to the work of this eminent Italian scholar, whose influence on Hungarian humanism was profound.