

element of the collection—a system of signs which helped by-pass an integral transcription of the new material that was to be added to several oath and commission formulas: full text was entered only to the first formulary in the volume, while all other formularies were given signs referring to it.

The texts are impeccably transcribed, in conformity with the principles of documentary edition. Each document follows the explanation of dating and other information regarding its composition.

The fact that the oath formula sworn by the Count of Dubrovnik in 1293 (plus the additions until the end of the Venetian rule (1357) has been included in this volume on the pages 242-247 will certainly appeal to the readers of *Dubrovnik Annals*. Some correspondence may be established with the famous and published oaths *ad personam* of the counts Tiepolo (1237) and Doro (1254) and with the count's oath from the Statute (II, 1), yet the text from this edition is by far more extensive and elaborate. Hopefully, I shall soon devote myself to a deeper research into the Ragusan formulary, and I believe that the other parts of this valuable book will find their way to those whose scholarly focus rests on the history of Istria and Dalmatia in the thirteenth and fourteenth century.

Nella Lonza

Institute for Historical Sciences in Dubrovnik (CASA)

*PHILELFIANA Nuove prospettive di ricerca sulla figura di Francesco Filelfo [PHILELFIANA New research perspectives regarding Francesco Filelfo]*, ed. Silvia Fiaschi. Firenze: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 2015. Pages x + 173.

The proceedings of the conference held in Macerata from 6 to 7 November 2013 comprise six contributions representing the initial scientific step of the research project *East and West in the European Humanism: Francesco Filelfo's Library and Letters (1398 – 1481)* financed by the Basic Research Investment Fund (FIRB). The papers of Filippo Bognini, Salvatore Costanza, Nicoletta Marcelli, David Speranzi, Silvia Fiaschi and Stefania Fortuna emphasise multifacetedness as a very distinct and striking attribute of Humanism. The aforementioned scholars deal mainly with the general linguistic features of Humanism, and particularly with Filelfo's extraordinary linguistic erudition in terms of Greek and Latin, as well as his use of the vernacular. Also discussed are codicology and text editing, and a paper which tackles Filelfo's epistolary testimony about one of the crucial events in the Europe of that time.

Written by Filippo Bognini, the first article »Per l'edizione critica delle epistole latine di Francesco Filelfo: prime indagini sulla tradizione degli incunabuli« (*Contribution to the critical edition of Francesco Filelfo's Latin epistolary: initial researches of the tradition of incunabula*) addresses the editorial fate of Francesco Filelfo's epistolary opus. Filippo Bognini opens his paper by stating that no critical edition of Filelfo's *opus magnum* has been published to date. He mentions Vito Giustiniani's article from 1986, which put forward the state of research of that time. Consequently, the intention of the author of this contribution is to show the progress made over a thirty-year period.

The very first publication of Filelfo's epistolary is incunabulum H\*12926, published in Venice in 1473 by Vindelino da Spira (=V). This edition is to be considered a partial *editio princeps* because

it contains only sixteen of the total of thirty-seven books. The second edition analysed by Filippo Bognini is Trivulziano (=Triv.), a manuscript dating back to 1477, kept in *Archivio Storico Civico e Biblioteca Trivulziana* in Milan. After a brief presentation of the differences between these two editions (for example, V does not contain Greek letters, different organisation of the material etc.), the author analyses single letters. Since Triv. is an ideograph, Bognini's intention is to show where and why Filelfo made corrections to Triv. in comparison to V. This being the central and most interesting part of the paper, it provides an insight not only into Filelfo's relations with his correspondents, but also into his close attention to text editing and register changes.

At the end of his paper, Bognini examines *Compendium epistolarum* and *Epistole breviores*. The first work is a florilegium which, besides Filelfo's letters, contains the letters of Cicero, Seneca, Bernardo di Chiaravalle, Bruni and others, while the second incorporates some of the exemplary letters of Filelfo's corpus and represents a kind of an epistolographic manual for those who want to learn letter writing. The author compares *Epistole breviores* with V. and analyses its structure, as well as various auxiliary tools designed for students.

Filippo Bognini concludes that the preparation of the first critical edition of Filelfo's *opus magnum* calls for further efforts in the areas of textual criticism and manuscript tradition history.

The paper »Testimonianze epistolari sulla caduta dell'Eubea (1470): la posizione di Filelfo, alter nestor« (*Epistolary testimonies about the fall of Negroponte (1470): Filelfo's position, alter nestor*) is the only contribution dealing entirely with Filelfo's relation to the historical events of that time. After the fall of Constantinople, Europe faced an imminent Ottoman danger. The pope Nicholas V called for an immediate crusade against the Sublime Porte, but the response of European rulers was weak, especially in Italy which was torn by numerous conflicts. The siege and fall of Negroponte (under Venetian dominion at the time), as well as the massacre of 1470, had an enormous impact on Italy. By analysing Filelfo's letters addressed to Lodovico Foscari, Cicco Simonetta, Demetrio Calcondilla and others, Salvatore Costanza tried to depict Filelfo's attitude towards the events in the eastern Mediterranean. It was the fall of Negroponte that marked a turning point in Filelfo's reflections about the Ottoman issue. The author of this paper states that, on the one hand, Filelfo's reactions to the 1453 event have been widely analysed, but, on the other, little attention has been paid to the 1470 event, which reminded Italy of the menacing Ottoman approach. Salvatore Costanza thoroughly examined Filelfo's relationship with Niccolò de Canal, the commander of the Venetian Fleet, responsible for the defence of Negroponte. Venetian authorities accused Niccolò de Canal for the catastrophic defeat, but his friend Francesco Filelfo vigorously sprang to his defence. Filelfo addressed many letters to the Venetian authorities, without any concern that such an action could endanger his position of an esteemed intellectual, and knowing that the marginalised Niccolò de Canal could not repay him in any way, as correctly observed by Costanza.

Even before the 1470 event, in his letter to Cardinal Jacopo Ammannati (1464), Filelfo introduced himself as *alter Nestor*, ready to advise and show his wisdom. Salvatore Costanza has noted that in his letter to Demetrio Castreno, Filelfo also provided a Nestor's antithesis: *alter Attila* and *alter Totila*, depicting Ottoman sultan Mehmed the Conqueror. The fear of Ottoman penetration into the heart of Europe reached its peak in 1480 with the invasion of Otranto. The author lucidly concludes that Filelfo's recurrent invitations to stand in defence of Christianity proved to be more than justified, as well as his insisting on the crucial importance of Eubea and control over the Aegean Sea for the defence of the whole Mediterranean.

All contributions refer either to Filelfo's writing in Latin or in Greek, except »Filelfo "volgare": Stato dell'arte e linee di ricerca« (*Filelfo "volgare": current state of the art and research lines*) by

Nicoletta Marcelli. According to Marcelli, we do not know the exact number of Filelfo's letters in the vernacular. The author names the scholars who published them and the archives and libraries in which those letters are kept. Marcelli provides a list of works in the vernacular attributed to Filelfo, either in verse or in prose, and concludes that their quantity is quite irrelevant in comparison with those in Latin.

In the next chapter, the author discusses Filelfo's reasons for using the vernacular instead of Latin. The analysis starts from the fact that Latin was intended for epistolary production, while the vernacular was used in colloquial communication. In Filelfo's letter to Cicco Simonetta, Marcelli finds that Filelfo distinguished *sermo vulgaris* from *sermo Ethruscus* as two different registers of the vernacular speech. The first one was exclusively dialectal, while the second was characterised by elegance. In a letter to Michele Orsini from 1463, Nicoletta Marcelli finds proof of Filelfo's trilingualism (Latin, Greek and *sermo patrius*) and proceeds with an explanation of what *sermo patrius* meant in the context of medieval Latin production. The author brings different attitudes towards *sermo patrius*, which was regarded as Latin by Petrarch, for example, and as vernacular by Boccaccio and Alberti. For Filelfo, *sermo patrius* was undoubtedly vernacular, i.e. Tuscan language.

The last chapter is devoted to the language, style and characteristics of Filelfo's letters in the vernacular. By analysing mainly the letters addressed to Lorenzo the Magnificent and others, the author offers various proverbs and idioms used by Filelfo in specific situations, trying to decipher their meaning. Nicoletta Marcelli concludes her paper by stressing Filelfo's unique position when it comes to Humanist interlingualism.

David Speranzi's paper »Su due codici greci filelfiani e un loro lettore (con alcune osservazioni sullo Strabone Mbr. G 93 sup.)« (*About two Greek codices and one of their readers: some notes regarding the Strabo manuscript G 93 sup.*) examines two manuscripts owned by Filelfo: Pluteo 59.22 and Pluteo 81.20, kept in the Laurentian Library in Florence. Among other works of the same author, the first one contains Dio Chrysostom's *Captivitatem Ilii non fuisse*, translated into Latin by Filelfo, while the second manuscript contains Aristotle's *Ethica Eudemia*, Horapollo's works and *Definitiones* by Pseudo-Plato. David Speranzi analyses a single note ("a rude man is able to cause damages ten thousand times greater than a wild beast") on the f. 68r of the Pluteo 81.20, handwritten in a way to be found nowhere else in the manuscript. Speranzi wonders why the unknown reader has never been identified. By comparing some letters from these manuscripts with those in manuscript N 87 sup. from the Ambrosian Library, which was already recognised as Constantine Lascari's autograph, Speranzi concludes that the aforementioned notes can easily be attributed to Lascari.

By presenting the manuscript Ambr. G 93 sup. containing Strabo's *Geographia* and Filelfo's and Lascari's marginal notes, Speranzi deepens the story about the bad relationship between these two Humanists. Not only palaeographic analysis, but a meticulous biobibliographical examination as well, reveal the nature of a troublesome relationship characterised by extreme rivalry, especially in the context of Francesco Sforza's court.

Besides this interesting analysis, one of the most important qualities of this paper is an exceptionally abundant list of reference, consisting of the manuscripts studied by David Speranzi.

In her paper »Filelfo tra Ippocrate e Galeno: fonti mediche e rapporti con i physici« (*Filelfo between Hippocrates and Galen: medical sources and relations with physicians*), Silvia Fiaschi examines Filelfo's attitude towards medicine, which became a very significant component of Filelfo's reflections after the 1440s. At the very beginning, Fiaschi stresses Filelfo's translation of Hippocrates' works *De flatibus* and *De passionibus*. She continues by proving his great interest

in medicine, often seen as significant part of the revival of the Antiquity. As Fiaschi notes, Filelfo had a twofold approach to medicine: he praised its theoretical side and yet profoundly despised it for having become an exclusively lucrative activity. The author quotes some letters which prove that Filelfo was acquainted with the ‘other medicine’, practiced by non-authorised persons, as for example, Ioseph “*rusticorum et inopum medicus*”.

Central part of Fiaschi’s paper is dedicated to Filelfo’s relationship with the physicians of that time—Benedetto Reguardati, Guido Parato, Antonio Bernareggi, Niccolò Varoni, Giovanni Garzoni, Lazzaro Datari, Francesco Pontano, Girolamo Castello—with whom he discussed the size of the Sun and other stars, the indivisibility of atoms etc. This proves why the physicians, not being narrowly specialised, are so highly represented in Filelfo’s opus. Another fact of major importance is that the physicians actively participated in the exchange of manuscripts, especially those in Greek.

As Silvia Fiaschi noticed, Filelfo was extremely interested in the dietetic components of medicine. His letters to Mattia da Trevi, Bona di Savoia, and particularly those addressed to Gerardo Colli, reveal a variety of discussions about temper, preventive treatments etc., which mostly rely on medieval tradition.

Filelfo’s correspondence with Guido Paratro not only proves his interest in the lexical component of medicine, but casts light on the fact that the Humanist from Tolentino was a sort of linguistic reference for the physicians of that time and reveals that Filelfo was also acquainted with Galen’s work. Silvia Fiaschi concludes that the only Galen’s work that Filelfo may have read is *De sanitate tuenda*, and possibly some codices containing the writings on hygiene and dietetics, but most certainly he was not familiar with Galen’s nosological writings.

Silvia Fiaschi has shown that medicine represented a very complex component of Filelfo’s work and cultural background, primarily due to the fact that during Humanism medicine was seen as a sort of synthesis of the Antiquity. The author of this paper proved it on the basis of Filelfo’s numerous relations with the physicians of that time.

In her short paper »Francesco Filelfo traduttore di Ippocrate: qualche osservazione sullo stile e sul lessico« (*Francesco Filelfo translator of Hippocrates: some notes about the style and lexic*), Stefania Fortuna deals with Filelfo’s translation of Hippocrates’s works *De flatibus* and *De passionibus*, whose first translations were made by Filelfo in 1444 and were dedicated to Filippo Maria Visconti, duke of Milan. Since scholars lack information on Hippocratic manuscripts in Greek from Filelfo’s library, Fortuna states that Jacques Jouanna and Pilar Pérez Cañizares have confirmed that Filelfo’s translations are very close to Marc. gr. 269 (=M), the most important manuscript of the Hippocratic Corpus. According to Fortuna, Filelfo’s translations testify to the fate of the M in Italy before the 1440s. The manuscript was penned in Constantinople in the tenth century and completed its journey in St. Mark’s Library (*Biblioteca Marciana*) in Venice in 1474, after the death of Cardinal Bessarion to whom it belonged.

Stefania Fortuna proceeds with a linguistic dissection of Filelfo’s translation. She notices that Filelfo had tried to avoid the parataxis that dominates the Greek text, transforming it into coordinate and subordinate clauses. As Fortuna remarks, Filelfo often used the hendiadys for different purposes, but the use of that specific figure of speech is a clear sign of Filelfo’s difficulties in the interpretation of the original. The remaining part of Silvia Fortuna’s paper analyses Filelfo’s use of terminological varieties in order to avoid repetition. Unfortunately, Stefania Fortuna’s interesting paper closes unexpectedly, but we hope that her future work will result in just as attractive contributions.

Apart from the usual index of names and places, this edition also includes a useful index of manuscripts, archival documents and antique prints.

By touching upon some important issues, these proceedings represent a new impetus for the analysis of Francesco Filelfo's work. The contributions are mostly based on Filelfo's *opus magnum*, i.e. his letters, but it should be noted that these proceedings point to the path to be followed by new researches of this prolific author.

There is no doubt that Francesco Filelfo calls for more attention by the Croatian scholars as well. The fact that he most likely never visited the eastern Adriatic coast is a poor excuse for ignoring such a major figure of the Italian Humanism. His son Xenophon spent the ten final years of his life as chancellor of the Republic of Dubrovnik, where he married a local lady. His other son, Giovanni Mario, wrote two works about the history of Dubrovnik: *Raguseide* and *Historia Ragusae*. As a true Humanist, Francesco often encouraged his malcontent son Xenophon to pay more attention to the history and culture of Dubrovnik, but to no avail. One should also take into consideration Francesco's good knowledge of the situation in the Byzantine Empire and his interest in the Levant that strongly marked the cultural and economic history of Dubrovnik. These facts confirm the influence of the Filelfo family on the cultural life of Dubrovnik, which is not to be neglected, and therefore the ties between the Filelfo family and Dubrovnik should also be reviewed. Doubtless, Croatian scholars ought to take part in these efforts, inspiring themselves with this praiseworthy edition.

Vedran Stojanović

PhD candidate, University of Dubrovnik

Niko Kapetanić, *Pod barjakom Svetog Vlaha. Naoružanje i posada na tvrđavi Sokol 1420-1672*. [Under the Standard of Saint Blaise. Armament and Garrison of the Sokol Castle 1420-1672]. Dubrovnik: Društvo prijatelja dubrovačke starine, 2016. Pages 117.

For over two hundred and fifty years, the Sokol Castle (*Castello Falcone*) represented the key stronghold of the Dubrovnik Republic in its eastern region of Konavle. Its role in securing the Republic's hold over this fertile land and guarding the trade routes and passes to the hinterland made this small fortress one of the main strategic assets in the Republic's defensive system, whose importance by far exceeded its modest size, especially in the fifteenth and sixteenth century (in the seventeenth century the Castle lost in significance and was consequently abandoned). So far, this Castle has received little scholarly attention, yet the most recent study by Niko Kapetanić aims to fill this gap.

The main objective of this study, as the author himself states in the introduction, are not the walls of the fortress nor specific buildings, but rather everyday life within them. Nevertheless, in order to provide the reader with a context, the first chapter entitled *Sokol Renewed* offers a short description of the Castle's structure and layout, its main buildings and their purpose. It also brings a survey of the building projects undertaken by the Ragusan government after its takeover of the fortress in 1420. The second contextual chapter deals with the weapons used in the Dubrovnik Republic in the period between the fourteenth and the seventeenth century found in the inventory lists of the Sokol Castle. Though mainly based on the secondary literature, this chapter not only demonstrates the author's profound knowledge of the medieval and early modern weaponry, but it also constitutes a rather useful introductory reading in this topic to any non-expert reader.