

I must close on a note of gratitude. In this review, I have taken up an inordinate amount of space criticizing what is, on the whole, an immensely useful and essential contribution to the study of Statian reception. The foregoing is not meant to diminish the immense value of the discoveries and provisional classifications Anderson has made. In later years, he may rightly be considered the father of modern Statian studies, and to nit-pick his contribution in the way I have done cannot help but induce a certain amount of self-conscious unease, not to mention risking the appearance of ingratitude. I hope, however, merely to inform the reader of the nature and extent of the provisionality of some of Anderson's classifications and characterizations, if only to spur interest in the further textual work which his contribution doubtless envisions and hopes for. Anyone setting out to study Statius in a textually informed way must consider both this volume and his earlier study of the manuscripts an essential starting point. If the twelfth century has already been ceded to Ovid by scholarly interest, then let Anderson's pioneering work lead the way in making the twenty-first century a veritable *aetas Statiana* for students of classical reception.

Anthony J. Fredette, Independent Scholar

Albertino Mussato: De lite inter Naturam et Fortunam, ed., trans., and comm. Bianca Facchini. Edizione Nazionale dei Testi mediolatini d'Italia 60. Florence: SISMEL, 2021. Pp. 372.

This volume is an important and significant contribution to our knowledge on Albertino Mussato and of philosophical dialogue of the late Middle Ages. The *De lite* is a previously unedited text (with the exception of a partial edition by Andrea Moschetti in 1927, which does not go beyond a few pages), which has received relatively little attention in Mussato scholarship. This annotated critical edition therefore fills an important research gap.

The *De lite inter Naturam et Fortunam* was composed by Albertino Mussato (1261–1329) in the last years of his life, which he spent in exile in Chioggia, between 1325 and 1328, possibly in 1326. Another moral philosophical treatise by Mussato that remains unedited, the *Contra casus fortuitos*, was written in those years. This was shown by Guido Billanovich and Guglielmo Travaglia in an important article that provides the preparatory studies for the edition of both treatises,¹ but the edition has never been published.

¹ Guido Billanovich and Guglielmo Travaglia, "Per l'edizione del 'De Lite inter Naturam et Fortunam' e del 'Contra casus fortuitos' di Albertino Mussato," *Bollettino del Museo Civico di Padova* 31–43 (1942–1954), 279–29.

The *De Lite* seems to have had a limited circulation and testimonies of its reception in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries are rather rare, although Mussato is mentioned by Pietro Alighieri when he is commenting on the famous *terzine* on Fortuna of *Inferno* VII, and by Domenico Bandino and Siccio Polentone. Whether Petrarch, who wrote with his *De remediis utriusque fortune* a thematically related work, knew him, cannot be proven.

The text has been handed down to us in two manuscripts: **C** = Seville, Biblioteca Capítular y Colombina, MS 5-1-5 (saec. XIV), and **P** = Padua, Biblioteca Civica, MS B.P. 2531, which has been dated to the late fourteenth century, but is likely to be from the first half of the fifteenth century. The two manuscripts are accompanied by glosses, each one with different hands intervening. **P** is likely a descendent of **C**, but it cannot be shown with absolute certainty that **C** was the antigraph of **P**. Many of the glosses of **C** are identical to **P** but the latter does not transcribe some erased words in a gloss of **C**; this makes the dependence of **P** on **C** likely. However, **P** has rubrics and the title, which are not to be found in **C**. For these reasons **C** serves as the basis for this edition but it is not followed rigorously. For example, **P** has several variants which likely could be better than those found in **C**, probably due to conjecture, and the editor follows **P** in these cases. In others, the editor convincingly conjectures against **C** and **P**; for example, in § 91: "Mictē et tu insolentiam, ne tu petulantie intolerantia me lacessa!" where both manuscripts have "insolertiam" (as well as "peculantie"). The *nota al testo* and the apparatus provide all information about the manuscripts and the edition's criteria in a clear and exhaustive way. The reader can also find at the bottom of the page, under the apparatus of variants, a second apparatus of notes indicating those sources of Mussato which he integrates faithfully into his text, usually without marking them as citations. The Italian translation is elegant, fluent, and clear.

The *De Lite* is structured as a philosophical dialogue between the personifications of Nature and Fortune, who discuss which of them has greater meaning for men and more power in influencing individual existence and the course of history. The construction and the structure of the text show great originality. The dialogue is introduced as a dream experienced by the author during his exile in Chioggia, which links the treatise to the author's biographical situation. The narrative framing by a dream vision is a theme favored by Mussato, who is also the author of the remarkable little text *Somnium*, in which he transforms into a bird and visits the afterlife realms. Mussato adds to the narrative frame a curious paragraph justifying the likelihood of the vision. The dialogue between Nature and Fortune to which the author assists is located in Salomon's temple in Jerusalem. At the end, the quarrel is resolved by the providential appearance of Christ, who issues two decisive pronouncements ("sententia diffinitiva"), the first on the relation between Nature and Fortune and the second on Fate, denying its existence.

On the one hand, the text is structured as a rigorous interplay of arguments and counter-arguments and as such, can recall genres like the *altercatio*. On the other, the dialogue is full of digressions and offers Mussato the opportunity to touch on a great range of topics, from those belonging to moral philosophy – such as the relation between virtue and fortune and the essence of nobility and friendship – to questions such as the relation between *ars* and *natura* and the underworld. The central issue of the existence of such an entity like *fatum* expands, for example, to lengthy considerations about astrology, the influence of the stars, and prediction. The dialogue gives frequent references to Mussato's life experience and to Padua's history in his time. The allusions to Mussato's personal vicissitudes, motivated perhaps by the difficult situation in which he was when writing the *De Lite*, reveal a form of pessimism. Even when the author finds his inspiration in Boethius's *Consolatio* and thus claims the necessity of detaching oneself from Fortuna's bestowed goods by recognizing their transitory and morally irrelevant nature, he suggests that much in his life depended on *Fortuna*.

The parts of the dialogue concerning politics are highly original and deserve more research (see the recent, excellent article by Rino Modonutti, “Senescens rerum ordo”: Albertino Mussato e la storia. Tra decadenza morale e determinismo cosmico,” in *Le sens du temps / The Sense of Time*, ed. Pascale Bourgain and Jean-Yves Tilliette [Geneva, 2017], pp. 667–80). On a theoretical level, Mussato expounds a theory of the cyclical evolution of political regimes, which inevitably leads to decadence and civil disorder. In relation to the Paduan situation he offers interesting thoughts on Padua's transition to a personal regime under Carrara rule. This transition is described as a remedy for the city's irremediable internal conflicts. The rebellion of Padua against Henry VII and the Scaligeri is considered as the reason for the following deteriorations. We can see here a form of political “realism” which contributes to (and perhaps comes into conflict with) Mussato's well-known anti-tyrannical views. The position expressed in the *De lite* is also innovative regarding the question of the “truth” of pagan myths (and seems to differ from the position expressed in his *epistolae*): Mussato refers several times to pagan myths criticizing them for speaking falsely in light of Christian truth.

Facchini's rich and excellent introduction (pp. 3–60) covers in sequence: “Struttura e contenuti dell'opera,” “Forma letteraria,” “Argomento, personaggi e tradizione letteraria,” “Temi principali,” “Storia politica e biografia,” “Il rapporto coi classici,” “Aspetti stilistici,” and offers, thanks to this wide-ranging approach that takes into account the various dimensions of the work, an excellent initiation to the *De lite*, even for readers who are not specialists in Mussato studies. Facchini (who also has published an excellent study on the sources of the dialogue with particular regard to the relation be-

tween aristotelism and thomism),² offers an accurate and stimulating integration of the themes and thesis of the dialogue in the philosophical culture and discussions of the time. It would be interesting to deepen the comparison with Dante on the question of nobility.

Facchini's introduction also contains valuable remarks on the dialogue's stylistic dimension. Mussato's style in the *De lite* is indeed lively, often in the tone of invective, satire, and polemic, with considerable classical influences (primarily from the much-admired Seneca). The stylistic analysis could be deepened in future research, for instance beginning by an interesting suggestion by Carmen Cardelle de Hartmann that there may be a connection between the dialogue style of ancient tragedy, i.e. in Mussato's case Seneca, and the dialogue form.³ An exhaustive bibliography concludes the introduction.

The commentary ("Note di commento," pp. 327–53) offers supplementary philological annotations, intratextual remarks, i.e., on parallel passages in other writings of Mussato, and lexical notes. Facchini's listing of the sources of Mussato's text (in the apparatus below the text and in the commentary section) is very rich and important for the understanding of the text. They could certainly have been expanded, but that would of course have exceeded the possible extent and the scope of a critical edition. If one follows the author's indications, one finds extraordinarily interesting facts that not only show which authors Mussato uses particularly often (like Seneca), but also how he uses them. Thus when speaking about the wise man's capacity to preserve his virtue regardless of the influence of the stars, Mussato says at § 168:

Oppirus, qui se naturam uniuscuiusque ex aspectu stellarum nosce profitebatur, derisus est a ceteris qui illa in Socrate vitia non agnosere<n>t; ab ipso Socrate sublevatus, cum illa sibi vitia ratione a se diceret. Addiciturque illud in centiloquio Ptolomei: "Sapiens dominabitur astris."

Facchini rightly points out that "Oppirus" stands for "Zopyrus" (who is mentioned by his correct name in § 211), famous for his conviction that one can infer a person's character from their somatic features. The source, also indicated by Facchini, is Cicero, *Tusculanes* IV, 80:

Qui autem natura dicuntur iracundi aut misericordes aut invidi aut tale quid, ei sunt constituti quasi mala valetudine animi, sanabiles tamen, ut Socrates dicitur: cum multa in conventu vitia conlegisset in eum Zopyrus, qui se naturam cuiusque ex forma perspicere

² Bianca Facchini, "A Philosophical Quarrel among *Auctoritates*: Mussato's *De Lite inter Natuam et Fortunam* and its Classical and Medieval Sources," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 55 (2014), 71–102.

³ Carmen Cardelle de Hartmann, *Lateinische Dialoge 1200–1400: Literaturhistorische Studie und Repertorium* (Leiden, 2007), pp. 223–24.

profitebatur, derisus est a ceteris, qui illa in Socrate vitia non agnoscerent, ab ipso autem Socrate sublevatus, cum illa sibi sic nata, sed ratione a se deiecta diceret.

In this case, Mussato manipulates his source to substitute astrology for physiognomy. Socrates's response seems to him to best summarize the meaning of his teaching, that is, the critique of determinism.

On the other hand, the identification of Mussato's sources can give interesting clues about the circulation of the texts in his time and provide the starting point for new research. To briefly consider one example, on the sage's indifference towards the goods bestowed by Fortune, Mussato recalls an anecdote concerning Diogenes at § 75:

Vafre dictum Diocenis adducam, qui lavans olera Siraculis Aristippo dicenti quod, si Dionisio audlari vellet, illa non ederet, respondisse fertur: "immo, si tu ista edere velles, Dionisio non adulareris". Seneca quoque scripsit librum Clementie ad Neronem.

First of all, we can see how the quotations and references create an interesting thematic enlargement. In fact, in addition to the theme of the sage's indifference to the goods of Fortune, Mussato refers here to austere and simple conduct befitting the philosopher (and thus the question of the "philosophical" way of life) as well as to the relationship between the intellectual and the powerful (which also seems to motivate the final sentence of the paragraph on Seneca seemingly unrelated to what precedes). Facchini does not indicate any source regarding Diogenes, perhaps for the very good reason that there is a considerable amount of text to consider. Indeed, the remark is already in Valerius Maximus, IV, III, ext. 4, b: "Idem Syraculis, cum holera ei lavanti Aristippus dixisset 'si Dionysium adulari velles, ista non esses', 'immo' inquit, 'si tu ista esse velles, non adularere Dionysium,'" then again in Vincent de Beauvais's *Speculum Doctrinale*, Liber Quartus, cap. CIV, from where it migrated to the *Flores philosophorum et poetarum* (ed. Irene Villaroel Fernández [Basel, 2020], p. 295). We can note that these are not "classical" sources, and that Mussato also relies on a medieval tradition made of encyclopedias and *florilegia*. But it may be of interest that our passage can be found in the *De vita philosophorum* by the pseudo-Walter Burley (ed. Hermann Knust [Tübingen, 1886], p. 196), since Mario Grignaschi has convincingly shown that this work most likely dates from the years immediately before Mussato wrote the *De Lite*, i.e. around 1220, and that it may be the work of a Paduan author.⁴ The *Liber* transmits to fourteenth-century Latin culture, still mostly unaware of Greek, an important part of the *Lives* of Diogenes Laertius, and the idea that philosophy is not only a doctrine but also a wisdom that is expressed in lifestyle. The *Liber de vita et moribus philosophorum* is therefore a recent and innovative text (which will be quoted and used in the following

⁴ Mario Grignaschi, "Lo pseudo Walter Burley e il *Liber de vita et moribus philosophorum*," *Medioevo* 16 (1990), 131–90.

years by others like the anonymous author of the “Ottimo commento alla Commedia”) and it is possible that it stimulated Mussato’s thought. So even if it is impossible to identify Mussato’s actual source (since the words are almost identical in all sources), this reference reveals an interesting chapter in the history of ideas and in the transmission and circulation of texts.

For such questions and all future research on Mussato, this volume represents an excellent and ever reliable basis.

Johannes Bartuschat, Universität Zürich

Aelred of Rievaulx, Writings on Body and Soul, ed. and trans. Bruce L. Venarde. Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library 71. Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Press, 2021. Pp. xxiv, 360.

This facing-page volume of four monastic works by the English Cistercian abbot Aelred of Rievaulx (1110–1167), edited and translated by medieval monastic scholar Bruce Venarde, is a welcome addition to Cistercian libraries. Different aspects of religious life appear in the four works: *A Pastoral Prayer*, *Spiritual Friendship*, *A Certain Wonderful Miracle*, and *Teachings for Recluses*. As the book’s title suggests, the selection is an eclectic introduction to Aelred’s monastic writing; the works have little in common thematically, generically, or formally, though happily they include both of his works concerning religious women. Medieval scholars would have benefited from a different selection, allowing thematic or formal comparisons. Pairing *Spiritual Friendship* with *Mirror of Charity*, for example, would have allowed a comparative analysis of the two works from different stages in Aelred’s writing career.

The brief introduction summarizes Aelred’s life and works, with an overview of each of the works and a useful discussion of the difficulties inherent in translating overlapping Latin terms, such as those for sweetness/pleasantness, love, and *affectus*. Some factual errors occur. The comment that “Aelred was probably among Stephen’s counselors, and there is no doubt he performed that role for the young Henry II” (p. x) goes beyond what scholars have shown: nothing is known of Aelred’s relationship with Stephen, and while the works directed to Henry hint that Aelred may have hoped to serve him, no evidence indicates that he did so. Again, it is unusual to claim that Aelred portrayed himself as a “sinful, anxious abbot” (p. xii).

Errors also appear in the summary introductions to the texts. Manuscript evidence shows that Aelred’s “most popular work in the Middle Ages” was not, as Venarde says, *Spiritual Friendship* (p. xvi), but *The Life of Saint Edward, King and Confessor*. The summary of *A Certain Wonderful Miracle*, about the rape, pregnancy, and imprisonment of a young nun, implies her fault, stating: “As a teenager, she begins a torrid affair with a lay brother” (p. xvii). While Aelred notes her initial interest upon first seeing the hand-