

2005

Review: Howard Jones, Printing the Classical Text

Julia H. Gaisser

Bryn Mawr College, jgaisser@brynmawr.edu

[Let us know how access to this document benefits you.](#)

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.brynmawr.edu/classics_pubs



Part of the [Classics Commons](#)

Custom Citation

Gaisser, Julia H. "Review: Howard Jones, Printing the Classical Text." *Renaissance Quarterly* 68 (2005) 683-5.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College. https://repository.brynmawr.edu/classics_pubs/118

For more information, please contact repository@brynmawr.edu.

English version cited by scholars. Rees aimed to provide today's readers with a modern rendering of Bacon's early modern Latin, one that is free from troubling anachronisms and misleading turns of phrase — and he has succeeded.

The brilliance of the translations makes it possible for all readers to fathom the allusions in the preface and work their way through the intricacies of the aphorisms. These aphorisms include some of Bacon's most important philosophical arguments, such as those on the interpretation of nature, the refutation of native human reason (the description of the idols of the Tribe, Cave, and Market), and a discussion of how to discover axioms of nature. The excellent supporting materials that accompany the translated texts will help any reader, no matter how knowledgeable or expert, through the labyrinthine paths of Bacon's own arguments as well as the arguments made about him by generations of scholars and critics. The style of the introduction is especially noteworthy: it is fresh and direct, making it a pleasure to read; it is technically detailed, making it an essential guide for researchers; and it is crystal clear, making it a joy to mull over Rees's arguments about the novelty and force of Bacon's philosophy and the peculiarities of the *Novum organum's* printing history. Rees's claims for Bacon's significance are carefully modulated, avoiding the pitfalls of attributing too much of the Scientific Revolution to him on the one hand, or criticizing him for not being a serious contributor to scientific knowledge on the other.

A simile in the *Novum organum's* preface draws comparisons between the engineering difficulties associated with moving a monumental obelisk and the intellectual difficulties associated with building a new way of knowing. To this simile we could add the scholarly difficulties associated with reconstructing authoritative modern print editions of Bacon's incomplete and influential works. Rees and Wakely have done Herculean work here, and it is work from which we will all benefit.

DEBORAH E. HARKNESS

University of Southern California

Howard Jones. *Printing the Classical Text.*

Bibliotheca Humanistica & Reformatorica 62. Utrecht: Hes & de Graaf Publishers BV, 2004. x + 228 pp. index. append. illus. tpls. bibl. €132.50. ISBN: 90-6194-279-9.

The History of the Book is booming these days, as Cyndia Susan Clegg justly observes in a recent review essay: "History of the Book: An Undisciplined Discipline" (*RQ* 54 [2001] 221-45). Jones's useful book would fit nicely on the shelf with those reviewed by Clegg — probably next to Brian Richardson's somewhat meatier and more detailed *Printing, Writers and Readers in Renaissance Italy* (Cambridge, 1999). While Richardson surveys Italian printing through a wide lens that takes in its technology, finances, and audience, as well as its total production through the sixteenth century, Jones focuses on the Latin and Greek texts printed from 1465 to 1500, which constitute only about 6% of the books of the incunable period (9).

In chapter 1 (“The Marketplace”) Jones surveys the conditions, finances, and subjects of early printing. The chapter culminates in an interesting statistical analysis based on information drawn from the *Illustrated Incunabula Short-Title Catalogue*, in which Jones correlates locations of printers with the types of works printed, comparing the numbers of ancient Latin texts to the total number of works printed in each city. Some cities emerge as centers of classical printing (Leipzig, Rome, Paris, Milan, and Venice): no surprise here. But looking at the statistics by city also allows Jones to pinpoint local preferences for different authors and genres: Deventer and Cologne, for example, show a marked preference for pastoral poetry and philosophy — a distinctly odd couple — and no editions of either Plautus or Lucretius were printed in Rome, although Roman printers published editions of forty-five different Latin authors.

Chapter 4 (“Editors and Editing: A Reappraisal”) revisits the well-known topic of editorial quality — or rather, the lack of it. This chapter is useful primarily as a summary bringing together the work of others, including Kenney, Lowry, Grafton, and Monfasani.

The heart of the book is chapters 2 (“The Latin Heritage”) and 3 (“First Steps in Greek”), which seem to be doing different things: the one offering a chronological analysis of statistics of Latin printing and the other presenting a study of Greek printers and works. In chapter 2 Jones, again using IISTC, breaks the incunable era into seven five- or six-year periods, itemizing authors, works, places, and printers year-by-year in each. For me these statistical tables and Jones’s commentary on them were the most valuable part of the book. Jones’s method allows him to note not only when a given Latin author was published, but also what authors were being printed at what time — and where. He uses it to track the ups and downs of the printing industry, the fortunes of particular authors and genres (again by location), the nationality of printers, and the rise and fall of editions with commentaries. In chapter 3 he traces the development of Greek typography and looks at the publishing programs of the foremost printers of Greek works, emphasizing the early printing of grammars and lexica and the influence of the syllabus of Byzantine schools on the selection of texts.

These chapters are valuable for students of reception, but I do have a caveat: this is a book whose usefulness is based on its facts, but Jones’s facts are not always correct. There are small inaccuracies (Hawkins for Hankins as the author of *Plato in the Italian Renaissance* in the notes and bibliography), astonishing mistakes, as when we are told that the Council of Florence in 1439 “brought about the union of the Roman and Greek churches” (135), and significant errors. I point out two. First, Palladio Fosco’s 1496 commentary on Catullus is listed as the earliest on that author (100), although that of Antonio Partenio appeared in 1485 (in the list of commentators and their works in Appendix C, Jones gets it right). Second, Jones suggests that Filippo Beroaldo abandoned commentary writing after 1488 (103). But Beroaldo published commentaries in 1493 (Suetonius), 1496 (Cicero’s *Tusculan Disputations*), and 1500 (Apuleius). The Apuleius commentary,

Beroaldo's most famous work, is omitted from the lists both of Beroaldo's commentaries (Appendix C) and of authors receiving commentaries between 1495 and 1500 (99–100). Errors like these raise flags. Jones's central chapters suggest important topics for further research, but scholars will want to check his facts.

JULIA GAISSER

Bryn Mawr College

Claudia Schmitz. *Rebellion und Bändigung der Lust: Dialogische Inszenierung konkurrierender Konzepte vom glücklichen Leben (1460–1540)*.

Frühe Neuzeit 88. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2004. vi + 354 pp. bibl. €56. ISBN: 3–484–36588–9.

This monograph is very well organized and clearly written. The introduction states the goals of the study, explains why it is limited to dialogues, letters, and speeches, and recapitulates the findings of each chapter. Each chapter ends with a summary of results of the examination of the texts within it. A concluding summary states clearly and succinctly the significant points made in the work as a whole. Nevertheless, it is difficult to find an appropriate characterization for it.

Though purporting to originate with a discussion of philosophical arguments about pleasure and ultimate happiness as they appear in a variety of Latin and German texts in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, there is very little philosophical analysis of these arguments and no effort to identify the sources from which the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century authors may have drawn them. Instead the author speaks constantly of *Pflicht- und Tugendethik*, *Lustethik*, medieval sinlists and the like — leaving it to the reader to supply whatever content he or she thinks these terms should have. Similarly, arguments are called “Stoic,” “Epicurean,” “Aristotelian” with no indication of what such terms might mean. The author's primary concern, as suggested by the subtitle, is the literary *Inszenierung*, as she calls it, of the various positions taken in disputes about pleasure and happiness. Her object is to adduce from a literary critical perspective the ways in which literary dialogue in early modern times is manifested in staged disputes about pleasure around 1500. Authors are said to repeatedly *inszenieren* this or that idea. But the “important structures” through which this staging is effected are rarely discussed in any useful detail. Nor is the reader informed why this “staging” is significant. Even the concept of “dialogue” is not very clearly defined: it includes not just explicit dialogues, but dialogic elements within other literary forms, in particular “letters” and “orations” (though not sermons). Similarly the chronological limits bracketed in the subtitle are readily breached. The author begins in chapter 2 with a prologue examining the early fourteenth-century *Ackermann aus Böhmen* with its dispute between a bereaved Farmer and Death, and concludes in chapter 6 with an epilogue on the anonymous *Lalebuch* of 1597. In the intervening three chapters there is a chronologically ordered sequence of brief discussions