

George's assertion that the art of living is a rhetorical enterprise above all else presents the biggest hurdle in this book. Although I agree that Burke's engagement with poetics has rhetorical inflection points and laud George for carefully mining the relationship between rhetorics and poetics, I am not yet convinced by the broad scope of her claim, which, in my view, threatens to collapse poetics into rhetorics. If *Permanence and Change* is best understood as the inaugural work of the New Rhetoric, I wonder why Burke settled on *poetic orientation* to describe the ideal outcome of his civic pedagogy. What was it about poetics that made it a more suitable option at this point in his career? And why did he continue to maintain the distinction between rhetorics and poetics in later works such as *A Rhetoric of Motives*? What does this distinction offer rhetorical critics interested in the broader contours of human communication? In raising these questions, I am not implying that George fails to anticipate or even answer them. In fact, she addresses them in a manner that most critics will find compelling. I am simply arguing that, from my vantage point, her core claim about the art of living resists a more precise theoretical, historical, and methodological engagement with Burke's insights.

My concern should not discourage readers from picking up George's book and learning from its numerous lessons. In fact, in the spirit of both Burke and George, my perspective should be discounted as a piety and, thus, become subject to criticism and revision. The good news is that George invites disagreement in her work. So, as one would with any smart and critical companion, I will return to her fine work again in the coming years both as a professor and scholar. To have such a companion is an extraordinary gift.

KYLE JENSEN
Arizona State University

Philipp Melanchthon, *Principal Writings on Rhetoric*. Edited by William P. Weaver, Stefan Strohm, and Volkhard Wels. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2017. liv + 594 pp. ISBN 9783110561197

Publication of a brand new, state-of-the-art critical edition of Philip Melanchthon's (1497-1560) major writings on rhetoric is excellent news for all scholars working in the field of Renaissance rhetoric. The volume under discussion here is the very first of a multi-volume edition of the *opera philo-sophica*, that is, of all major writings concerning the arts curriculum, taught according to the highest standards of humanism. Volume II-2 will be supplemented by a volume (II-1) in which the writings on dialectic will be published. This volume will also be of particular interest to students of rhetoric, since Melanchthon—following Valla's and Agricola's lead—placed dialectic at the heart of rhetoric. Melanchthon firmly believed in the classical

conception of the *enkyklios paideia*, so eloquently highlighted by Cicero in his oration *Pro Archia*, which was, not by accident, one of Melanchthon's favourite speeches. True to the author's conception, already expressed in his inaugural lecture (1518), the *opera philosophica* series will also republish his writings on grammar, classical literature, history, ethics, politics, physics, and mathematics. Moreover, since Melanchthon defended his philosophical conceptions on numerous occasions, either personally or by proxy, the final volume will contain his famous declamations concerning all areas of academic teaching. In short, this major enterprise, undertaken by the director of the *Melanchthonhaus* in Bretten, Günter Frank, and by church historian Walter Sparr, will supersede the previous editions of Melanchthon's writings, notably the Bretschneider & Bindseil twenty-eight-volume edition published in the *Corpus Reformatorum* over the course of the nineteenth century and the so-called MSA-edition of selected writings directed by R. Stupperich and published from 1951 onward.

Volume II-2 contains the three textbooks on rhetoric published by Melanchthon in 1519, 1521, and 1531. These textbooks are supplemented by the republication of H. Zwicker's earlier edition of the *Dispositiones rhetoricae* (1553), which first appeared in 1911 and was reprinted in 1968. These *Dispositiones* offer 160 outlines of speeches on all kind of matters and are thus working examples of declamations written according to the rules of composition proposed in the textbooks. Melanchthon's writings on homiletics (*De officiis concionatoris*, etc.) are not included in the volume. But they are discussed through the annotations concerning the sections on preaching one finds in the textbooks from the very start.

The volume is co-ordinated by William Weaver. Weaver is the editor of the 1521 *Institutiones rhetoricae*. Stefan Strohm, assisted by Hartmut Schmid, edited the 1519 *De rhetorica libri tres*. And Volkhard Wels was responsible for editing the 1531 *Elementorum rethorices libri duo*. I shall refer to them as Editor B, A, and C, respectively. All texts are published in Latin, without translation; the introductions and annotations are either in English or in German. The quotations given in the notes are in Greek and in Latin. A modern translation with Greek key words added in brackets, especially for the longer quotations in Greek (of Aristotle, Plutarch, etc.), would have been defensible, if not preferable.

Each editor enjoyed maximum scientific freedom in accomplishing his formidable task. And each individual edition offers not only a perfectly established text, but also a rich critical apparatus and a wealth of explanatory notes. The introductions and annotations demonstrate in a definitive way the importance of classical and humanist sources in Melanchthon's writings. Among his humanist predecessors, Agricola and Erasmus are Melanchthon's key authors; but, at a certain stage, George of Trebizond also played a remarkable part. Erasmus is the chief source, not only as the author of *De copia* and similar writings, but also as an interpreter of the Scriptures and as a collector of ancient wisdom in the *Adagia*. With Agricola, he is the great ancestor, who already conceived of rhetoric in close relationship to exegesis and homiletics and who advocated for an eloquence fuelled by

ancient literature. For Melanchthon as well, rhetoric became a tool for analysing texts, both pagan and Christian, for theological and political debate, and for effective preaching. Through imitation, the analysis and production of texts became two inseparable stages of one process.

Outstanding scholarship is displayed in each edition. Editor A deserves special praise for his endeavour to demonstrate two distinct layers in *De rhetorica*, corresponding to different stages in Melanchthon's career: first, as a corrector and a *Konventor* of the realist college in Tübingen, where he was already teaching rhetoric to fellow students, and then, after his appointment as a professor of Greek at the university of Wittenberg, where he met Luther and started collaborating closely with him. This idea had already been suggested previously, for instance by W. Maurer in his study, *Der junge Melanchthon zwischen Humanismus und Reformation* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967-1969, vol. 1). Editor A. gracefully acknowledges his debt to Maurer. Indeed, the text of *De rhet.* 1519 is often unstable and sometimes lacks coherence. These are flaws that could be explained by the supposition that a first draft was orally presented and composed in Tübingen, and subsequently completed and reworked in Wittenberg. We can detect traces of his inaugural lecture (*De corrigendis adolescentiae studiis*, 1518) and of the influence of Luther, together with references to a commentary published by Melanchthon after he had left Tübingen (*Epistola Pauli ad Titum*, 1518). Thus, we can witness the birth of a fellow reformer. Editor A painstakingly identifies more than one hundred interventions in the (supposed) original text, many of which lead to new insertions, conveniently listed in an appendix p. 177-190, followed by a reconstruction of the *Tübinger Rhetorik* outlined on p. 191. This reconstructed rhetoric composed in early 1518 has now been published and translated in the *Blätter für württembergische Kirchengeschichte*, 117 (2017).

In a similar way, the edition of the 1521 *Institutiones rhetoricae* records readings of a hitherto unknown manuscript of contemporary lecture notes by a student of Melanchthon, all the more interesting since the printed text itself is also based on notes taken by one or more anonymous students in Melanchthon's classroom. In the words of Editor B, "we must consider *Institutiones rhetoricae* as an authorised, though not authorial work." Melanchthon was even reluctant to have it published, because the work is somewhat unbalanced, with greater emphasis on *elocutio* rather than *inventio* or *dispositio*. But the work had a wide audience. This audience was probably more eager to discover tropes and figures in a text than argumentative techniques and structures. An epitome of the textbook, compiled by G. Major, was even more successful. Editor B presents a stemma of the different printing stages of the booklet, all derived from a manuscript that has disappeared.

The last textbook, *Elementorum rhetorices libri duo*, was published ten years later, in 1531. It was just as successful as the previous one if not more so. The text and its subsequently added appendices had been edited in an exemplary way as early as 2001 by Editor C, Volkhard Wels. (Notably, one of those appendices was Hermolao Barbaro's reply to a provocative

letter of Pico della Mirandola, “refurbished” by one of Melanchthon’s students and adorned with a logical analysis by the master himself.) This edition is republished in the present volume and need not detain us further (cf. my review in *Bibliothèque d’Humanisme et Renaissance*, 64 (2002): 753-755). Deservedly, it has become a classic, and it is even accessible online.

However, the scientific freedom enjoyed by the editors has its price. With the notable exception of the comprehensive, extremely useful indexes at the end of the volume (which extends to some 35 pages), there is hardly any co-ordination between the different editions. Generally speaking, there are no cross references from one text to another. Editor B, also responsible for the introduction to the volume, does refer to parallel sections of *De rhetorica*, wisely using the same 1519 Basle edition as Editor A, whereas Editor C quotes the 1521 Cologne edition. Editor A quotes the original modern edition (2001) of text C we just mentioned, rather than the new edition published in the same volume (compare pp. 30, 37, 50 n.). Editor C does not refer to notes on text A, while annotating the same concept or a similar section (compare notes on p. 50-51 and p. 277-278, on *genus didacticon*). The bibliographies of the editions are not coordinated either; Erasmus’ works for instance are quoted by one editor in a sixteenth-century edition, by another in a modern edition (e.g., Holborn), by a third in the ASD-edition. Similar remarks could be made about the editions of classical authors (Cicero, Quintilian). In one case, Cicero even completely vanished from the bibliography. But let us remember that this II/2 volume of the *opera philosophica* is the first to be published. It is a remarkable scholarly achievement and offers to the editors of subsequent volumes the occasion to think about ways to improve their overall coordination. Melanchthon would have been the first to welcome such an effort. He never tired of advocating the transparent composition and coherence of texts. After all, one of the spectacular innovations of his rhetoric was the desire to uncover the structure and elegance of major ancient texts in order to learn how to compose coherent writings for the modern world.

KES MEERHOFF
University of Amsterdam

Timothy Raylor, *Philosophy, Rhetoric, and Thomas Hobbes*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018. xvii + 334 pp. ISBN 9780198829690

In a meticulous and learned account of Thomas Hobbes’s lifelong relationship to rhetoric and humanism, Timothy Raylor takes up the peculiar but important challenge of proving that something did not happen. That something is Hobbes’s famed double turn, his rejection of humanist rhetoric followed later by a modified return to rhetoric, as defended in Quentin Skinner’s influential study, *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes* (1996). Raylor presents a