Howard Louthan the replacement of Hussite and Calvinist iconoclasm with Tridentine iconophilism in seventeenth century Prague. Political and ecclesiastical authorities feared similar clashes in Augsburg, and Duane Corpis shows that their deliberate efforts to police confessional boundaries—geographic, social, and ritual—carried on to the end of the eighteenth century.

Coster and Spicer have compiled a collection that is fascinating, timely, and balanced. The essays range across Europe, drawing on most of the major Protestant confessions, most of the national varieties of reformed Catholicism, and Eastern Orthodoxy. What emerges above all is the continuing investment of all believers in the ordering of their spaces of belief and of worship, the influence of the past and of neighbours, and the reality of change, albeit often at a glacial pace.

NICHOLAS TERPSTRA, University of Toronto


The subject of Fiorilla’s book is the system with which Petrarch annotated his books—specifically, the graphic signs and small figures which accompanied his marginal notes. These signs and figures, primarily decorative lines and pointing hands marking off passages but also including faces, buildings, and topographical features, were not used exclusively by Petrarch but were also employed by other annotators in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, probably in imitation of the founder of the humanist movement. Since Petrarch was often not the only, or final, annotator of the books in his library, the fact that his successors marked their books in the same way as he did has made it difficult to say for sure whether a particular symbol is Petrarch’s or not. The principal contribution of Fiorilla’s study lies here, in providing a reasonable sense of closure to a couple of debates over attribution that have been occupying scholars since the nineteenth century.

The arguments vary in complexity with the particular manuscripts involved. In the cases of Harl. 4927, a Cicero manuscript, and Bodleian Library, Canon. Patr. Lat. 210 and 229, a collection of the letters of St. Ambrose that was once united in a single manuscript, Fiorilla notes that comparison with the body of annotations securely assigned to Petrarch shows that the signs and markings in these manuscripts attributed recently to him do not reflect his normal practice. Three other manuscripts in the Bibliothèque nationale de France (two miscellanies of sacred texts, lat. 1617 and 2540, and a historical encyclopedia, lat. 5690) belonged to Cardinal Landolfo Colonna before Petrarch obtained them and contain annotations by both owners, clearly distinguishable now by different styles of annotation. The two Parisian manuscripts from Petrarch’s library that contain marginal pictures properly speaking, lat.
8082 with a head drawn next to a passage from Claudian’s *De raptu Proserpinae* and lat. 6802 with another head and pictures of Rome and the Vaucluse next to sections from Pliny’s *Natural History*, have proved more controversial. Some scholars have attributed these pictures to Petrarch, but others have assigned them to Boccaccio, with whom he is known to have worked closely. After a review of previous work on these problems and a careful analysis of the annotational practice of both scholars, Fiorilla concludes that both heads, the one in lat. 6802 identified for the first time here with Abraham, were drawn by Boccaccio. As far as the pictures of Rome and the Vaucluse go, Fiorilla notes that these are the only pictures of this type to be found in any marginalia attributed to Petrarch, while Boccaccio regularly drew pictures in the margins of his manuscripts. Fiorilla nevertheless concludes that if the picture of the Vaucluse was executed by Boccaccio, he must have been working side by side with Petrarch at this point, while the first part of the picture of Rome should be assigned to Petrarch and the second to an unidentified later hand. Two appendices treat problems closely associated with the arguments of this book: the erroneous belief that Claudian was born in Florence, and the attribution of marginalia and pictures in Florence, Laur. 66.1 (a manuscript of the *Antiquitates Iudaicae*) to Boccaccio.

This is a work of solid scholarship, meticulously researched and clearly presented. Fiorilla has examined every manuscript thought to have been annotated by Petrarch, the majority in person, and the conclusions he comes to take full account of previous scholarship. It is always difficult to say that any book like this will become the proverbial last word in its area: now and again candidates are proposed for inclusion in the corpus of extant Petrarchan marginalia, and new lines of scholarly reasoning are always possible. But thanks to the detail in this book, and particularly thanks to the generous selection of well-chosen illustrations, anyone who returns to this topic will have to do so via Fiorilla’s study.

Marcozzi’s bibliography reflects a similar level of scholarly achievement. Petrarchan studies offer a couple of special challenges to the bibliographer, ranging from the mingling of scholarly research with antiquarian book collecting and the difficulties inherent in dealing with the many books and articles on Petrarchism, whose concern with Petrarch proper varies widely. Marcozzi begins where the earlier bibliography of Joseph G. Fucilla left off and carries on up to the eve of the seventh centenary of Petrarch’s birth in 2004. The bibliography covers manuscripts and printed editions along with secondary scholarship that extends from biographies and literary criticism to philology, the arts, and Petrarchism. An inventory of 2,647 items from only fourteen years suggests that some very extensive digging has been done, an impression that is confirmed by a glance at Section 21, “Varia,” which includes *inter alia* an article on how to decline Petrarch’s name in Croatian, another on Petrarch’s annotations on gardening from Vat. Lat. 2193 in the journal *Garden History*, and a general presentation on Petrarch in Estonian. Computerized data bases have revolutionized what can be done in enumerative bibliography over the last few years, and Marcozzi has taken full advantage of the opportunities here. An extensive
index allows the reader to organize bibliographical research by scholar instead of subject.

For both these books the level of scholarship is not in question. In different ways, however, the decision to publish in this format is. Fiorilla’s focus is narrow, and given the relative brevity of his study (the text proper, even including the appendices, is only eighty-one pages long), I could see it just as easily in the form of the longish article that many Italian journals regularly print. I also suspect that the days of enumerative bibliographies devoted primarily to secondary scholarship are numbered. Marcozzi’s book is just the sort of publication that is ideally suited to the web, where it could be updated easily and made available more widely than in traditional print format. However, given the low cost of these two volumes—something for which the publisher is to be commended, given the inflated prices of many scholarly publications these days—there is no reason why these books should not be present in the library of any serious Petrarchan scholars.

CRAIG KALLEN DORF, Texas A&M University