Clifford Endres. *Johannes Secundus. The Latin Love Elegy in the Renaissance*. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, Shoe String Press, 1981. Pp. 223, \$25.00.

The *Elegiae* of Johannes Secundus (whose real name was Jan Nicholaus Everaerts, 1511–36) have been considered his best poems by many scholars including Bosscha, the most recent editor of his collected works (1821). Yet these poems have never been so popular or so influential as his *Basia* or *Kisses*, which were directly modelled on the popular love poems of Catullus. There is clearly a need for a modern critical edition and translation of, and commentary on, this work, and Clifford Endres has made a substantial contribution towards this. In this volume Endres has given us a Latin text and English translation, with commentary, of nine of the eleven poems from Book I, along with the three *Solemn Elegies* found in the editions between the first and second books. There follow three of the eleven elegies from Book II and five of the eighteen from Book III. These selections are prefaced by introductory essays on the "Life and Times of Secundus," the history and development of the "Latin Love Elegy," the "Practice of *Imitatio*" among Renaissance poets, and a final section on Endres' theoretical and practical concerns "On the Translations."

Endres' essay on the "Life and Times of Secundus" reviews the background for the development of Neo-Latin poetry and recapitulates the state of our present knowledge about Secundus. By publishing a transcript of a letter (pp. 22–25 and 211–13) written by Gradius, one of Secundus' brothers, Endres adds new information on the poet's family life and his family's attitudes to a variety of questions. This serves as a supplement to the information contained in the biographical notice which D. Crane published in 1931 (*Johannes Secundus: His Life, Work and Influence on English Literature*. Leipzig and London, 1931). This chapter concludes with remarks on the main editions of Secundus' poems (pp. 27–29), the principal translations up to 1979, and the considerable influence which Secundus had on French, Italian, German, and English writers of the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries.

Endres' second essay briefly examines the "Latin Love Elegy" from its origins in the Alexandrine poets through Catullus, Propertius, Tibullus, and Ovid. Endres takes the position that the reader must begin with an understanding of the content, technique, and style of these earlier authors before he can understand Secundus' own proficiency in Latin verse and his creative originality.

Particularly valuable is the third chapter on the "Practice of *Imitatio*" as understood by Neo-Latin writers. Even though Secundus probably never "gave much thought to questions of literary theory" (p. 66), he is nevertheless shaped in many ways by "the intellectual and artistic climate of his age" (p. 67). Endres reviews in quick succession the rhetorical injunctions of Cicero and the mitigating views of Quintilian, before passing to the theoretical comments made by contemporaries like Vida and Scalinger as well as the practical influence which the writings of men like Erasmus and Petrarch were bound to leave on those who read their works.

In the last chapter of his introduction, "On the Translations," Endres acquaints us with the theoretical and practical questions that concerned him as a translator of Neo-Latin poetry. His answer to these is "modern verse form," or free verse, which he sees as the most appropriate means to recreate the "poetic tension" and the "excitement of the original" (p. 76). One of his chief preoccupations has been to attempt to recreate Secundus' diversity of tone. One way to achieve this has been to render the

Latin elegiac couplet into an English stanza of two, three, or even four lines. While he maintains that his norm in each line is a loose five-beat rhythm (p. 77), he has not held to any fixed system and the variation is from three to seven beats. Following the classifications used by Dryden, Endres has striven to achieve the golden mean of translation expressed by Dryden as "paraphrase," (or "translation with latitude") rather than either "metaphrase" (word for word translation) or "imitation" (which we see in the poems of Ezra Pound inspired by Propertius).

For the Latin text, Endres has used the "convenient" edition of M. Rat (Paris, 1938), which is based on the second edition of Secundus' *Works* published by Cripius at Paris in 1561. He does not explain to what extent he has relied on the edition of Bosscha and Burmann (Leiden, 1821) for the "definitive reading in cases of discrepancy." Endres also notes that, in a very few instances, he has adopted the "marginal corrections entered by Janus Dousa ... from the autograph manuscript of Secundus ... no longer extant." In the following cases a note indicating the existence of a textual variant and the reasons for his choice would have been helpful: *Elegiae* I 1, 4 where he has chosen Gay's *quam* over Bosscha's *quem*; I 1, 18 where he has printed *masculine* in preference to Bosscha's and Gay's *iaculisque*; III 3, 21 where he has preferred Bosscha's *cernis* over Gay's *cernes*; and III 5, 10 where we find Rat's *adoratum* used instead of Bosscha's *odoratum*. Like Rat, Endres has standardized the spelling. But while retaining certain features of sixteenth-century Latin orthography, which we see in *rejecit*, *jamque*, *lacryma*, *Quum* (I 11, 23), *queis* (I 11, 16), he has dropped others such as *urbeis* for *urbes* (I 1, 15) and the flexibility in the use of ae-oe-e found in many of the earlier editions. However, for the poems in this volume, these editorial changes do not cause the problems in scansion, word-play, assonance, or alliteration that they sometimes do in poetic texts. *Essequias* at III 17, 78 (*exsequias* in Bosscha and *exequias* in Rat) does not appear among any of the editions I was able to consult.

It must have been difficult to make the final choice of poems for translation and commentary. While Endres states he has selected "typical" representatives of the elegies, almost half of the poems are from Book I (or the *Julia*). This book, to use Crane's words (*op. cit.* [1931], p. 28), "has something of the fire of Propertius with all the freshness of amorous youth." Perhaps it is for this reason that the poems which were chosen allow Endres to show the development of the poet's feelings from naive optimism to disillusionment and finally resignation to his loss of Julia.

The final two books are more miscellaneous or eclectic in content and show a lighter, but at the same time, somewhat more mature touch. The examples from the second book are on such diverse subjects as the poet's preference for Propertius over Vergil and his devotion and esteem for his brothers' literary abilities (II 1), the snowball thrown by his mistress which catches fire in the poet's heart (II 4), and the traditional theme of the *exclusus amator* (II 5). But in the third book, most of the elegies are not about women, love, or the usual themes of elegies, but are concerned with subjects like the poet's debt to Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius (III 3), his appreciation of Erasmus (III 5), a dream in which the figures of Elegy and Tragedy both claim the poet's allegiance (III 7), and the adornment of a Christian tomb in a Gothic cathedral (III 17).

As a translator Endres is conservative and accurate. His versions strike a healthy balance between situating the poems in the "context of the classical tradition" and in showing them to be valid poetic creations in their own right (p. 80). Their diction and

syntax are straight-forward and uncomplicated. But sometimes there is a lapse into American colloquialism:

Parce tuum, dixi, ferro terrere poetam
 Castra prat dudum qui tua sponte sequi

... O spare," I said, "your poet,
 don't alarm with your hardware
 a volunteer to your camp ... (I 1, 11-12)

To translate *ferro* by *hardware* still evokes more an image of the Old West than the mythical realms of Cupid and Venus. Likewise at I 4, 9-12, there is the risk of anachronism and of some damage to the light-hearted tone of this poem:

Oscula, quae possint fugientem sistere vitam
 Restet ubi nullis spes medicaminibus,
 Pallidulamque animam Stygiae subducere lintri
 In non concessas et revocare vias.

Kisses that would pull the pale soul from the raft
 about to sail on the Styx,

calling it back on roads
 closed to return traffic
 one-way to Hades

There are a few other cases where the phrases chosen detract somewhat from the impression the translator has said, in his preface, he is trying to give. Examples are at I 7, 7 where *improbe puer* is rendered as "two-timing Boy" and at III 1, 37 where *munera* is turned into "a Flash of cash."

Much of the charm and originality of Secundus' poems depend on the reader's immediate perception of his often rapid changes of tone and on this point Endres has insisted. For example at III 1, 1-14 we find a list of the heroic deeds which Orpheus was able to accomplish by his songs. This is clearly modelled on Ovid *Amores* II 1, 23 ff. Then suddenly in 15 Secundus changes the tone of his poem to cynicism:

Yet if before he sang his songs, Orpheus
 had plied the Stygian hag with money, ...

he'd have found the gods favorable to his prayers. ...

Orpheus, why so tight?

Secundus has inverted Ovid's context: for Ovid it was songs which exercised supernatural power: for Secundus it is songs which come out a poor second to the promise of riches.

Endres' commentaries are meant to be "suggestive rather than definitive" (p. 81). They deal with the subjects, structure, themes, imagery, classical antecedents, originality, and other special features of Secundus' treatment of his sources, including his use of mythology and topical references. We are left wanting more comment on the poetic devices which Secundus himself used in Latin (e.g. p. 175). We might

also have expected further elaboration in the few instances where textual problems are discussed. For example in the Second Solemn Elegy 23 (p. 149), we find that certain editions have "Transeat, Aeolio positus in carcere ventis," but we are not told why Endres has preferred "Transeat hic, positus immota per aera ventis."

Misprints are few and will cause the reader little trouble. On p. 67, read ελεγεια not ξλεγια. (Scalinger does not cite the actual Greek word in his discussion of the etymology of this word at this place [Book I, chap. 50]). Likewise *amores* (the reading in both Bosscha and Rat) seems best at I 9, 27 rather than *amore*.

Endres's book is a serious introduction to a body of important neo-Latin poetry which has been neglected for the greater part of the last two centuries. We can only hope that it will "stimulate the complete modern [edition, commentary and] English translation he deserves" (p. 80). In the meantime for those readers seeking an edition of the Latin poems not found in this anthology and who do not have access to the edition of Rat (1938) or that of Bosscha and Burmann (1821), there now exists a Latin-Spanish edition by Olga Gete Carpio, *Juan Segundo: Besos Y Otros Poemas* (Barcelona: Bosch, 1979) pp. 150 ff. Nevertheless for some time to come *Johannes Secundus: The Latin Love Elegy in the Renaissance* will prove useful not only for the Renaissance scholar, but for the Classicist interested in the *Nachleben* of the Latin Love Lyric, as well as the student of European literature concerned with the immediate origins of the considerable body of important love poetry from Ronsard and the poets of the Pléiade right up to Goethe.

DENIS BREARLEY, *University of Ottawa*

Claire Dolan. *Entre tours et clochers, les gens d'église à Aix-en-Provence au XVI^e siècle*. Sherbrooke: Centre d'étude de la Renaissance, Université de Sherbrooke, et Aix-en-Provence: Edisud, 1981, Pp. XIV, 433.

Le problème du clergé et de l'église catholique au XVI^e siècle est plein de contradictions. Déjà Lucien Febvre a souligné qu'il ne fallait pas chercher les débuts de la Réforme dans un mouvement vraiment séparé du cheminement intellectuel de l'église catholique.¹ Ensuite Gabriel Le Bras a demandé qu'on étudie les origines de ce qu'il appelait la "déchristianisation" des XVIII^e–XIX^e siècles à travers une enquête historique sur l'état du catholicisme à partir de la fin du Moyen Âge dans les diverses régions de France.² A la recherche de cette "déchristianisation," Jean Delumeau décrit longuement l'ignorance et la superstition qui caractérisaient l'église avant le Concile de Trente. Pour lui cette église était déchristianisée; puisqu'elle était composée d'un clergé analphabète qui ne connaissait même pas les paroles de la messe et de fidèles qui confondaient éléments spirituels et terrestres dans une religion à peine reconnaissable.³ Dans une réponse à Delumeau, A.N. Galphern demande jusqu'à quel point la messe, les dogmes et l'alphabétisme étaient nécessaires au clergé des XV^e–XVI^e siècles; il a démontré que dans la Champagne de cette époque les confréries, pièces de théâtre religieuses, sanctuaires et fêtes constituaient les véritables liens entre l'église et ses fidèles. Pour lui, tout le drame de la dernière partie du XVI^e siècle venait du fait que la popularité de ces manifestations traditionnelles diminuait de plus en plus.⁴ Voilà plusieurs explications d'un problème complexe qui touche l'église, son clergé et toute la société du XVI^e siècle.