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eclectic volume will be welcomed by scholars in bibliography, book history, and literary and cultural studies. It can further serve as an intriguing entrée for advanced students interested in following one of the top academics in the field as he navigates through problems, process, and possibilities in book history.

JANICE LIEDL
Laurentian University

De Vitoria, Francisco.  

The present book is the first of three projected volumes that aim to make newly available Francisco de Vitoria’s Salamanca lectures on questions 57–122 of the Secunda Secundae of Thomas Aquinas’s *Summa Theologiae*. Since justice is the main topic of this section of Aquinas’s *Summa*, Vitoria’s commentary not only provides us with insight into the reception of Aquinas in sixteenth-century Spanish Scholasticism but, even more importantly, promises us a better understanding of Vitoria’s own views on justice and law—the object of justice, according to Aquinas and Vitoria. Vitoria’s importance in the history of legal and political thought is well established; he is considered to be the founder of the school of Salamanca and the father of international law. Therefore, new editions and translations of any of his works are welcome events.

Among the lectures Vitoria held at the height of his academic career at the University of Salamanca between 1526 and 1546 we have to distinguish between the regular lectures (*lecturae*), which mostly commented on Aquinas’s *Summa*, and the special ceremonial lectures, the so-called *relectiones*. The *relectiones* are usually considered the more important results of Vitoria’s teaching. They have been printed many times since the sixteenth-century, and it is to them that Vitoria owes his reputation and reception. The regular lectures are less well known. They are preserved in student reports, and were not printed
before the twentieth century. It is obvious that these lecturae provide the background for many of the views that Vitoria articulates in the relectiones.

The core of the present volume is a bilingual edition of the lectures on Summa Theologiae II–II, qq. 57–61. In fact, at Salamanca Vitoria gave three cycles of lectures on the Summa; the present edition deals with the second cycle (1535–37). The term “edition” might be misleading, because the Latin text is taken from Vicente Beltrán de Heredia’s edition from 1934 to which the German editor makes only a couple of amendments. The latter are mostly corrections of typos in the editio princeps, they are not based on a re-collation of the manuscripts. The German translation is excellent, both in terms of accuracy and readability. This is no surprise, since Joachim Stüben has ample experience as a translator of Vitoria’s works. However, the notes could have been improved. First, given the price of the book and modern technology, there are no good reasons why the corrections to the Latin text and the additional footnotes (both now in an appendix) could not be reported, as usual, under the Latin text. Second, the notes should have been proofread more carefully and the references to modern editions of source texts could have been better. But as a whole the notes are an improvement on Beltrán de Heredia’s edition of the Latin text.

Moreover, the edition is accompanied by two introductions. In the shorter of the two, Thomas Duve presents a brief general survey of the history of Francisco de Vitoria scholarship. Stüben’s introduction, which covers more than eighty pages, is in part a revised and actualized version of the preface published in his previous edition of Vitoria’s lectures on the treatise on law in the Summa Theologiae (I–II, qq. 90–108); I am not sure that it was necessary to repeat all the materials from the previous introduction. New to this version is what amounts to a commentary on Vitoria’s commentary on qq. 57–61. In this “supercommentary,” the editor highlights some of the key features of Vitoria’s work: for instance, his discussion of international law. But it is less obvious why Stüben felt he needed to summarize, one-by-one, every single article of the translated text. A more succinct presentation of the highlights of Vitoria’s work would have been more helpful and more accessible. Given the ambitious nature of this introduction, it is surprising that the relationship between the present lectures and the relectiones is only treated very briefly and no attempts are made to compare Vitoria’s commentary to other commentaries of his time (e.g., Cajetan, Suarez).
What is the audience of this edition? The masterful German translation makes this important text for the first time accessible to a larger audience and not only to those skilled in Latin. This is to be lauded. However, the exorbitant price of this book, although it may be justified by the high quality printing and binding, makes its use in the university classroom all but impossible and raises doubts that the book will ever find a larger audience, even among scholars. Vitoria’s Latin is not very challenging, so scholars of legal and political philosophy, for most of whom German is not a first language, will rightly continue to use Beltrán de Heredia’s Latin edition of Vitoria’s lectures until they are presented with a new edition that also promises progress on the philological details of the Latin text.

MARTIN PICKAVÉ
University of Toronto


Ars Epistolica seeks to expand the chronological boundaries of the Republic of Letters—and Jürgen Habermas’s ideas of the public sphere—by exposing the complex art of letters that existed in sixteenth-century Europe. In so doing, Ars Epistolica helps bring the art of letters into line with recent historical work that has sought to expand the chronological boundaries of the Scientific Revolution and Enlightenment periods. Ars Epistolica uses comprehensive bibliographic lists to counter the claims that the Republic of Letters began in the eighteenth century. At the centre of this book lie the titles of hundreds of printed volumes of letter collections and instruction manuals on letter writing. It makes for a convincing argument that the Republic of Letters was already well established by the beginning of the sixteenth century.

The introduction by Judith Rice Henderson provides a broad overview of the art of letters in the sixteenth century, as well as summarizing the changing