points to the legacy of older mysticism, as it is reflected in the works of the Romantics, and in those of twentieth century writers and artists. Text excerpts, which in most cases rely on accepted, standard translations, include works by the important medieval mystics, such as Hildegard of Bingen, Mechthild of Magdeburg, Meister Eckhart, Seuse and Tauler, and two anonymous texts as well, of which the latter, the *Theologica Germanica*, gained fame because it was edited by Martin Luther. Of the later period, the editor chose the two most important Baroque mystics, Jacob Boehme, and Angelus Silesius. That two women figure prominently among the major writers presented is no accident. Especially in older German mysticism, female authors played a pivotal role. To claim, however, as some critics have done, that the sensitive branch of mysticism is a female domain is a gross oversimplification. The highly erotic depictions of "Jesus-Minne" in Angelus Silesius' work are proof that mysticism is not tied to a specific gender perspective.

For the student of German literature, it is somewhat unusual to find medieval mysticism in the same volume as mystical poetry of the seventeenth century, but this presentation has the advantage of showing the continuity of literary traditions to which the editor alludes in her erudite "Introduction". Altogether, the book is a very worthwhile undertaking. Although authors such as Albertus Magnus, Daniel Czepko, or Friedrich von Spee, may be missed by some readers, their inclusion would have required a much larger book than the scope of the series would have permitted, and to select, of course, always means to leave out.

MANFRED K. KREMER, *University of Guelph*

Angelo Poliziano. *Lamia. Praelectio in priora Aristotelis Analytica*. Critical edition. Introduction and Commentary by Ari Wesseling. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1986. Pp. xxxviii, 124.

This book provides the first critical edition of Angelo Poliziano's *Lamia*, or *Praelectio in priora Aristotelis Analytica* (1492). With this work Poliziano began the series of lectures on Aristotle's *Analytica* which he delivered at the University of Florence. In this discourse he defends himself against those fervent adherents of neoplatonism and scolasticism who refused to give him, the cultivator of rhetoric, the right to devote himself to their subject of study. Poliziano proclaims that the grammarian's sphere of research encompasses texts from all the disciplines; and on this premise he elaborates his well-known manifesto of philology. Ari Wesseling asserts with good reason that it is probably in this manifesto that "the task of philology was proclaimed for the first time in later European history" (p. xxi). Wesseling's sound analysis of Poliziano's proclusion underlines the extent to which

it is constituted by many borrowings and allusions, along with placing Poliziano's ambivalent stance toward neoplatonism in the fresh perspective. The veiled presence of irony is made known and some of the philosophers who are attacked receive information (Marsilio Ficino, Cristoforo Landino, Demetrios Chalcondyles, Ioannes Lascaris, Bartolomeo Scala).

The present critical text is based on the edition printed in Florence in 1492 by Antonio Miscomini. The *Lamia* was re-published numerous times in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. There is also a sixteenth-century manuscript kept in the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana of Florence, copied probably from a sixteenth-century printed edition. We have had, however, very few printed modern editions. In 1864 Isidoro Del Lungo published the *Lamia* with an Italian translation. Del Lungo then offered a reprint of the *Lamia* first in 1897 and subsequently in 1926. Del Lungo's text is cursorily and carelessly prepared, contains errors and omissions and it frequently distances itself in orthography from the *editio princeps*. We have another edition of the *Lamia* (cf. Poliziano. *Praelectio in priora Aristotelis Analytica, cui titulus Lamia*. Padova: A. Draghi di G. B. Randi e figlio, 1931) which, according to Wesseling (p. xxxvi), is a reprint of Del Lungo's text. Nevertheless, in this 1931 text Del Lungo's name is not mentioned, and the Italian translation is left out.

Clearly, none of these modern editions has carried out the painstaking and thorough collation provided by Wesseling. For his text Wesseling has collated the *editio princeps*, all the fifteenth-century editions, a sixteenth-century edition and the sixteenth-century manuscript. The present critical edition is accompanied by a concise critical introduction to the *Lamia*, the customary philological note – which comprises a list and a succinct description of the printed editions and the one manuscript, and an explanation of the general criteria of transcription (in his rendering of Poliziano's text Wesseling follows modern practice) – and a rich and informative commentary. The critical apparatus is conveniently printed at the foot of each page. Indices of names and subjects of sources and other passages cited in the commentary conclude this most welcome and valuable contribution to our better understanding of Poliziano. Thanks to this philologically accurate reconstruction of the *Lamia*, it is now possible to analyze this work with greater certitude.

MICHAEL LETTIERI, *University of Toronto*