

The result of Looney and Possanza's work is rigorously described in the excellent critical apparatus of the book, which highlights and discusses the problems of transmission and the unsolvable cruces generated by such a philological situation. The book is not a new critical edition, but it diverges from Bolaffi's in a significant number of loci and makes it easy for the reader to understand the textual stratigraphy of F and the history and configuration of EP 1553. It meaningfully contributes to the scholarly understanding of the texts that it restores while also making them accessible to any anglophone reader. It reveals how underestimated Ariosto's memory of Latin auctoritates was, as well as how actually varied his library was: an aspect of the author's humanistic culture that promises to gain more space in the analyses of his more famous vernacular works.

One of the most useful parts of the book is the rich section "Notes to the Translation," which occupies almost a fourth of the volume and provides intertextual and explanatory notes as well as an introductory comment for each poem. Since most commentaries and secondary sources on Ariosto's work in Latin are outdated, out of print, or hard to access for an anglophone reader, this new resource (opened by an informative introduction and completed by a thorough bibliography and index) represents a gift and an invitation to researchers in the field of Renaissance studies at large.

Alessandro Giammei, *Bryn Mawr College*  
doi:10.1017/rqx.2020.8

*Sertorio Quattromani lettore di Bembo: I "Luoghi difficili" delle "Rime."*

Pietro Petteruti Pellegrino, ed.

Biblioteca dell'Arcadia: Studi e testi 5. Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 2018.  
vi + 498 pp. €51.

---

Studies of early modern reading practices have increased significantly in number and scope. Along with theoretical questions about the very possibility of a cultural history of reading, scholars have explored the many ways in which reading practices can be looked at through textual evidence. In this context, a particularly important place is held by the commentary tradition. Yet, depending on the kind of source commented upon, commentaries are also relevant to the history of specific literary genres. As such, the study of exegetical practices lies at the intersection of several disciplinary approaches, mobilizing critical tools that pertain to both the materiality of a given tradition and the wider cultural questions raised by the texts commented upon. A fruitful example of this intersection is the study of early modern commentaries on poetry. Not only do they tell us the story of the reception of given poetical texts, but they also illuminate the ways that readings of those texts contribute to the construction and shaping of poetical traditions. This combination of scopes is one of the most significant outcomes of Pietro

Petteruti Pellegrino's study of Sertorio Quattromani's *Luoghi difficili del Bembo*, which includes a rigorous critical edition of Quattromani's previously unpublished commentary on Pietro Bembo's poems based on a manuscript copy of the work now in the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale of Florence.

Along with reviving the intellectual profile of an important, though somewhat neglected author of the late Renaissance (Quattromani lived between 1541 and 1603), this book situates the *Luoghi difficili del Bembo* within the context of coeval interpretive trends as well as debates on poetry, style, and the legacy of the Petrarchan poetical tradition. Petteruti's work is commendable in that it makes available a source of great interest, thus shedding light on the evolving exegetical preoccupations of late sixteenth-century students of poetry. In the long introductory essay ("Quattromani e la lirica dei moderni") the author manages to outline the significance of Quattromani's commentary to a wider set of questions about Petrarchism.

On the one hand, the author dwells on the specificity of Quattromani's method by comparing the *Luoghi difficili del Bembo*—likely drafted in the mid-to-late 1560s—to the scholar's published commentary on the poems of Giovanni Della Casa. Instead of illustrating the text word by word, Quattromani proceeds by selecting passages and terms from Bembo's poetry that, in his opinion, deserve some attention. Primarily interested in issues of language and style, the commentator does not tackle the philosophical implications of the poems, keeping his focus on the poet's compositional process instead, with a strong interest in formal and lexical choices. Accordingly, Quattromani's remarks on *loci selecti* aim at joining the critical conversation that, since the appearance of Bembo's own poetical and theoretical works, had informed the gradual establishment of Petrarchism as the leading thread in the poetical culture of Cinquecento Italy.

On the other hand, by looking at Bembo through the lens of both classical and vernacular authors, Quattromani joins the attempt (fairly popular in the aftermath of Della Casa's poetical experience) to reassess the status of the models canonized by Bembo himself. As suggested, for instance, by Petteruti's discussion of stylistic *gravitas* (43), Quattromani's annotations do look at Bembo's poetry as a corpus that does not resolve the spectrum of poetical possibilities, which, since the 1540s, had been quickly expanding in terms of both subject matter and stylistic options. Key to the commentator's work on the text is his method, primarily based on a careful consideration of intertextuality. Indeed, Petteruti shows that Quattromani's commentary on Bembo relies heavily on the scholar's acquaintance with previous exegetical traditions and that Quattromani turns to commentaries as repositories of *loci paralleli*. In that respect, commentaries on Petrarch are of particular importance to Quattromani, who uses them as a veritable interface between the Petrarchan echoes found in Bembo's poetry and the intertextual references gathered by previous readers of the original Petrarchan passages. Petteruti's study of Quattromani thus illustrates

the proactive role played by exegetical practices not only in the description, but also in the very making of the poetical tradition.

Eugenio Refini, *New York University*  
doi:10.1017/rqx.2020.9

*Écrits sur la dialectique et l'humanisme.* Rodolphe Agricola.

Ed. and trans. Marc van der Poel. Textes de la Renaissance 18. Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2018. 332 pp. €42.

---

This anthology of three of Rudolph Agricola's major texts is a revised and updated version of an edition first published in Paris in 1997. Contrary to that first version (following Alardus's 1539 edition), the revised text is based on a collation of the major early modern editions of Agricola's works. The volume contains the original Latin text and French translations of twenty-two of the seventy-five chapters of Agricola's major work, *De inventione dialectica* (1479), of the central part of *In laudem philosophiae et reliquarum artium oratio* (1476), and of the letter *De formando studio* (1484) addressed to the author's friend and disciple Jacob Barbireau. The very readable French text offers the additional asset of listing, in brackets, the classical sources that Agricola quotes.

The Dutch humanist's role in early modern studies is still somewhat neglected outside of a relatively small group of specialists; hence the editor's insistence, in his introduction, on the influence and innovations deriving from his work, exemplified in the samples provided in this anthology. The frequently debated but often ill-defined shift from Scholasticism to humanism finds a few concrete illustrations in these fundamental texts on dialectic, rhetoric, and the study of the humanities in general. The single biggest achievements illustrated in these treatises might be the combination of dialectic and rhetoric as well as the shift from purely formal criteria to practical applications of the art of reasoning, covered by the classical trivium and picking up on Aristotle's and Cicero's ideas.

Influenced by his Italian sojourns and by humanists such as Lorenzo Valla, Agricola insisted, in this context, on a more practical intellectual formation taking into account ethical, aesthetic, and social values and contexts. Whereas the trivium and the quadrivium are clearly reflected in Agricola's tripartite division of *logica*, *fysica*, and *ethica*, the aforementioned combination of traditionally separated fields such as dialectic and rhetoric, the focus on practicality over purely formal aspects, and the resulting focus on reception open up new perspectives for the art of reasoning. *Docere* has to lead to *movere*: public reception represents an essential criterion for the humanist orator who aims at influencing public opinion by touching critically on social, political, and religious issues.

This new focus on Agricola's treatises illustrates the formation of independent thinking and its objectives, facilitated by the multiplication of loci that his more nuanced