humanist culture. Rizzi's study also shows that the relationship between Latin and the vernacular in the period considered was active, productive, and creative—not antagonistic, as frequently professed. Meaningfully adding to a growing body of scholarship dedicated to the understanding of early modern translation and its contribution to the intellectual landscape and scribal cultures of the Renaissance, the monograph offers a coherent representation of translators' effective use of the paratext to assertively self-fashion their work and promote its cultural value. This is an important and significant correction of the view that the vernacular, and translation into it, was culturally marginal in Quattrocento Italy. At the same time, the carefully selected corpus, summarized in a useful appendix, might project a coherence and unity of purpose that was perhaps in reality more variable and fluid. The exclusive focus on the paratext also means that readers will not find a detailed analysis of how paratextual statements are effectively upheld in the translations that form part of the examined corpus. However, Rizzi's reflections on the authority of the translator, on self-fashioning statements about translation practices, and on the function of eloquence in governing approaches to translation fruitfully prepare the ground for further research in this direction.

Claudia Rossignoli, *University of St Andrews*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2019.127

Sozomeno da Pistoia (1387–1458): Scrittura e libri di un umanista.
Irene Ceccherini.
With Stefano Zamponi and David Speranzi. Biblioteca dell'"Archivum Romanicum" Serie I: Storia, Letterature, Paleografia 431. Florence: Olschki, 2016. xx + 466 pp. +120 b/w pls. €65.

Zomino di ser Bonifazio, usually known as Sozomeno (1387–1458), was a Pistoian priest, canon, humanist, and canon lawyer. He was a teacher of grammar and rhetoric, occasionally employed by the University of Florence but more often serving as a private tutor to members of the Florentine elite; he was also the author of a Latin universal chronicle, but he is most important as a scribe and bibliophile. He was one of the earliest practitioners of the new humanist script, developed by Poggio in imitation of Caroline book hand. Sozomeno began using this script, contemporaneously known as *littera antiqua*, in 1410, copying numerous classical Latin authors and humanist texts over the following two decades. At the same time, he amassed a large library, embracing classical and medieval grammar, rhetoric, poetry, history, philosophy, and canon law. To add to his humanist credentials, Sozomeno learned Greek, benefiting from intermittent lessons with Guarino Veronese, resident and teaching in Florence from 1410 to 1414, and as a result he began making his own copies of Greek classical literature, history, and philosophy. He studied most of his books closely, making copious marginal and

interlinear glosses; he also wrote freestanding lemmatic commentaries on the Latin classics used as school authors in the Middle Ages and early Renaissance (Persius, Horace, Cicero, Juvenal, Ovid, and Seneca the Tragedian).

With the present volume, Irene Ceccherini has completed the first comprehensive catalogue of Sozomeno's books, now dispersed throughout Europe and Britain. The contemporary inventory of his collection listed 110 volumes, of which an astounding three quarters have now been identified and included in this catalogue. Ceccherini provides the fullest imaginable palaeographic and codicological description of each volume, including at least one black-and-white plate for nearly every entry. The work also includes a useful presentation by Ceccherini's research group leader, Stefano Zamponi, summarizing Sozomeno's importance as a scribe and humanist. Tilly de la Mare had included a chapter on Sozomeno in her pioneering volume on humanist scribes, but Ceccherini now offers what she terms as a new interpretation of Sozomeno's development as a copyist. While de la Mare, so Ceccherini suggests, saw a linear progression on Sozomeno's part from Gothic script to *littera antiqua*, she herself sees what amounts to a regression from his humanist book hand of the 1410s and '20s to a cursive script in later life, retaining some humanist elements but mainly similar to the Gothic *bastarda* characteristic of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. It is true that as Sozomeno's interests moved from copying to intensive reading, annotating, and commenting on his books, he adopted what could be termed a more practical cursive semi-humanist script, not dissimilar to scribal hands in the Florentine mid-fifteenth-century chancery; nevertheless, de la Mare's focus was on Sozomeno as a humanist scribe, not as a working student and teacher of classical and medieval authorities.

Ceccherini is in her element describing and chronicling Sozomeno's Gothic, humanist, and cursive script in the first half of the fifteenth century, but Sozomeno was also a bibliophile, whose collection of manuscripts included exemplars from the eleventh to the early fourteenth century. When dating and localizing some of these older copies, Ceccherini, like many paleographers, does not specify her criteria. In fact, greater account needs to be taken of crucial features, such as the abbreviation for *qui*, slanting or vertical ductus, counterpoised curves, *t* as an uncrossed or crossed letter, and the lower bole of *g* as separate or compressed. After inspection based only on the plates provided, the following suggestions can be offered: Harley 4804—North Italy, not France; Harley 4838—XII in., not XI^{1}; Forteguerriana A.30—Italy XIII in., not France XII^{2}; Forteguerriana A.31—Italy $XIII^{2}$, not France XII^{1}; Forteguerriana A.36—Italy, not France; Forteguerriana A.38—XI–XII, not XII^{mid}; Forteguerriana A.62—XIV^{1}, not $XIII^{2}$; Forteguerriana A.65—Italy, not France; Romorantin, Musée de Sologne, Fonds Martin 8—XIII–XIV, not $XIII^{mid}$.

David Speranzi appends an essay to the volume, treating Sozomeno as a Greek scribe. He provides further paleographic evidence that Sozomeno was a pupil of Guarino in Florence, although, given Sozomeno's documented residence as a student of canon law at Padua from 1407 to 1413, this instruction must have been limited, and

Sozomeno needs to be regarded largely as a self-taught Hellenist. Completely original, however, is Speranzi's discovery that Mattia Lupi, a grammar teacher and bibliophile from San Gimignano (1380–1468), knew Greek and was a Greek copyist; based on annotations of provenance now nearly invisible, Speranzi shows that two Laurentian manuscripts with Greek annotations (Pl. 21.7 and 69.25) came from Lupi's library. This evidence can be confirmed by the fact that Lupi glossed the latter manuscript in his distinctive Latin script, with letters identical to those used in writing Greek (*a* and *t*). As Speranzi correctly observes, the view that Lupi could not write Greek will need revision.

Robert Black, *University of Leeds*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2019.128

Porcelio de' Pandoni: L'umanista e i suoi mecenati. Momenti di storia e di poesia. Antonietta Iacono.
Latinae Humanitatis Itinera Nova: Collana di Studi e Testi della Latinità medievale e umanistica 3. Naples: Paolo Loffredo, 2017. 290 pp. €13.50.

As its title promises, Antonietta Iacono's new work is an examination of the poetry of Porcelio de' Pandoni, a Neo-Latin poet active in fifteenth-century Italy, focusing on the interplay between patronage and poetic creation. Given the extensive critical attention devoted to the poets and court players of the Renaissance, it is always a delight to become acquainted with figures whose works and lives have been obscured by the canon. This is precisely what Iacono has done in her study of Pandoni.

Iacono's point of departure is the recognition that the centuries of scant criticism devoted to Pandoni have not been kind in the assessment of this poet's literary output. The primary charges lobbied against Pandoni are his continual search for patrons and frequent polemics against prominent humanists of his day (Panormita, Bartolomeo Facio, and Pier Candido Dicembrio). The goal that Iacono sets for herself is to provide both new and seasoned scholars of the Italian Renaissance with an objective (and frequently favorable) assessment of Pandoni's position in history and of his poetry. Iacono accomplishes this by examining Pandoni's biography followed by critical analysis and editions of selected poetic works.

The biographical profile of the poet (part 1) tracks Pandoni's movements throughout the peninsula during his long life (spanning from ca. 1400 to ca. 1485) and the poetic output that accompanied them. Iacono essentially confirms the criticisms that have plagued Pandoni's reputation in posterity: though predominantly associated with the court of Alfonso I of Naples, Pandoni made overtures to and sought patronage from many powerful leaders of Italian courts. Instead of being a detriment, argues Iacono, this makes Pandoni of particular interest to Renaissance