

inquisition's jurisdiction to all forms of magic, while Cardinal Santori, head of the inquisition, preferred to pursue actually practised magic rather than fictitious witchcraft. Of special interest are the cases of astrological predictions concerning the fate of reigning popes, and more particularly the execution in 1635 of criminals who had attempted to assassinate the pope by magical means. But various other kinds of magic were also practised including love magic, fortune telling, healing magic, necromancy and magic involving the theft and desecration of a consecrated host. Decker's discussion very strongly suggests that the fanatic zeal for persecutions that was so often evident in the early modern period came not from popes and inquisitors but from simple people, the lower clergy and secular judges. The Church in Italy 'dealt with superstition, demonic possession and witchcraft, not by denying their existence, but by setting very high standards of proof for legal conviction'.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICHESTER

PATRICK PRESTON

*Iulius exclusus e coelis. Motive und Tendenzen gallikanischer und bibelhumanistischer Papstkritik im Umfeld des Erasmus.* By Peter Fabisch. (Reformationsgeschichtliche Studien und Texte, 152.) Pp. viii + 584. Münster: Aschendorff, 2008. €69. 978 3 402 11577 0; 0171 3469  
 JEH (61) 2010; doi:10.1017/S00220469099306X

To pray 'Sancte Erasmo, ora pro nobis', to plagiarise Erasmus speaking about Socrates in the 'Convivium religiosum', the prince of humanists cannot have written the dialogue *Iulius exclusus*. Remember the theme of the pamphlet: when Iulius II dies in 1513 and appears at the gates of Paradise, the supreme bailiff refuses him access. The reasons were diverse: St Peter's ignorance of the meaning of the letters P. M. ('Pestem Maximam?'), the pontiff's humble birth (he was first a boatman), the simoniacal process involved in obtaining the papal tiara and, finally, his behaviour as successor of St Peter and his crimes and warlike adventures, in particular against French interests. The Latin of the short booklet (sixteen folios) is delicious and offers a subtle expression of the satirical dialogue, which was, according to the title page of the 1517 *editio princeps* (Speyer: Jakob Schmidt, Nr 2 in the useful bibliography at pp. 490–9), composed in 1513 by 'F. A. F.', alluding to Faustus Androlinus Foroliviensis. The Erasmian research supposes that it was written in 1513–14 by Erasmus himself, before he learned prudence. We must thank and acknowledge Peter Fabisch for presenting all the texts of the debate and summarising the issue from a historiographical point of view. The first part of his book features the *Iulius* as a purely Gallican pamphlet, the second is devoted to arguing the impossibility of Erasmus as author, and a third deals with indiscretions and manipulations in the publication of the dialogue. An appendix offers a synopsis of the Amerbach manuscript (Basle 1516) with in footnotes the *editio princeps* (Speyer 1517), the third edition (Leuven 1518) and the first Basler publications (1519–20). After only five lines of introduction, Carl Stange's *Erasmus und Julius II.: eine Legende* (Berlin 1937), is quoted. Its thesis is well-known: Erasmus could not have written the dialogue, because his political knowledge was too weak. Although seventy years of research have shown the opposite, Peter Fabisch addresses this odd thesis and tries to

demonstrate, through a complicated interpretative labyrinth, that it would not have been possible for Erasmus to conceptualise *Iulius exclusus*, although one or several manuscripts written in his hand were circulating in 1516. The *Julius-Dialog*, as Fabisch prefers to call it, was conceived in Paris at the beginning of 1511 at the time of the convocation of the Council of Pisa, and in the circle of the Parisian humanists Fausto Andrelini, Jean Lemaire de Belges, Pierre Gringore and Guillaume Budé (pp. 420–7, 481–5). This first draft, under the title *Iulii Genius*, was very quickly tucked away in a drawer. In the summer of 1514 the original manuscript found its way to Erasmus in London, who copied it out in complete secrecy. Erasmus left England in August 1514 and the manuscript was again forgotten for two years, but his secretary, Thomas Lupset, discovered it and took it to Rome, where he showed it around. This manuscript fell into the hands of Ulrich von Hutten, who prepared it for the press in Speyer. Through von Hutten, Bonifatius Amerbach obtained the manuscript and then passed it on to Beatus Rhenanus, who worked on it further. The reader is at liberty to accept this detective story, but other arguments are more problematic. I find for example pages dedicated to ‘der Pariser Bibelhumanismus und Julius II’ (pp. 178–83) unconvincing, because it cannot be proved that Lefèvre met Erasmus in 1511, while Guillaume Budé’s *De asse* cannot be central to the argument because it is not a biblical work. While *Bibelhumanismus* is a part of the subtitle of the book, we cannot be satisfied with that material, which too quickly asserts in conclusion, that the *Julius-Dialog* is the ‘Ausdruck des Bibelhumanistischen Protestes gegen das Renaissancepapsttum’ (pp. 479–87). In conclusion, ‘sic Petrus triplicem argumenti coronam non uidi, necnon undique ueritatis gemmis et probationis auro lucentem pallam, tametsi Iulius per triplicem coronam suam iurauit’. Peter Fabisch does not convince that Erasmus was not the author of the dialogue. One thus looks forward even more eagerly to the publication in 2010 of the critical edition of *Iulius exclusus* prepared by Silvana Seidel Menchi for the Amsterdam edition of *Erasmii Opera Omnia*.

GENEVA

MAX ENGAMMARE

*Vittoria Colonna and the spiritual poetics of the Italian Reformation*. By Abigail Brundin.

Catholic Christendom, 1300–1700.) Pp. xvi + 218. Aldershot–Burlington, VT:

Ashgate, 2008. £55. 978 0 7546 4049 3

*JEH* (61) 2010; doi:10.1017/S0022046909992909

In this learned and thoughtful assessment of the works of Vittoria Colonna, Abigail Brundin undertakes two interrelated tasks; first to reestablish the literary achievements of this prominent exponent of Petrarchism and, second, to show how Colonna’s poetry and prose works manifest the interests of reform-minded Italians of the sixteenth century. In both areas Brundin overturns earlier views of Colonna as a passive figure in relationship to her male colleagues. Colonna, in Brundin’s assessment, creatively used the forms of Petrarchan sonnets ‘to embody a reformed religious programme’ (p. 11). Her careful analysis of Colonna’s spiritual sonnets, in particular those collections dedicated to Michelangelo Buonarroti and Marguerite de Navarre, in the context of her relationships with prominent individuals committed to reform such as Reginald Pole, Marcantonio Flaminio and Bernardino