Sam Urlings

Coluccio Salutati and Augustine's *City of God*

Illuminating Intertextual Encounters in Florence at the Dawn of the Renaissance

LYSA

Gent
2023

SEMPERVIRENS
Studies in the Classical Heritage and Its Transformation
1

D/2023/15310/001
NUR 694
ISSN 2983-5542
ISBN 978-94-6444-768-2
e-ISBN 978-94-6444-769-9
DOI 10.54179/2301

All volumes published in this series have been subjected to peer review

Cover illustration: Sandro Botticelli, *Sant'Agostino nello studio* (1494)
Florence, Galleria degli Uffizi

Cover design by Evelien Gillis
Typeset in Arno by LYSA
Printed in May 2023 by die Keure

Table of Contents

Preface

The surface
Of the mirror being convex, the distance increases
Significantly; that is, enough to make the point
That the soul is captive, treated humanely, kept
In suspension, unable to advance much farther
Than your look as it intercepts the picture.
John Ashbery, "Self-Portrait in a Convex Mirror"

The publication of this volume represents the completion of a research project that was initiated in 2017, titled "*Magnum opus et arduum*. Towards a History of the Reception of Augustine's *De civitate Dei*". Originally envisioned by Professors Gert Partoens, Jeroen De Keyser, Anthony Dupont, and Andrea Robiglio, the project's goal – suggested by its title – was to come to a reconsideration of the enduring influence enjoyed by that great work of Latin Antiquity, Augustine's *City of God*. The results have laid bare a wide array of literary, theological, and philosophical reactions, waves of "Augustinianism" breaking through the ages, of which the present work is but one reflection – and, possibly more aptly, refraction. Nonetheless, the microcosm of Florence in the late Trecento and early Quattrocento can teach us much about the ways in which the *De civitate Dei* retained its relevance, even amid radically transformed cultural and political circumstances. As such, though the findings contained in these pages are not intended, necessarily, to bear upon the totality of Augustinian reception studies – a vast and no doubt underexplored research territory –, readers are invited to reflect upon their significance themselves.

In a more personal sense, this volume is also the culmination of a four-year doctoral trajectory that entailed the broadening of my research interests from my roots in English literature to the subjects touched upon in the following chapters. I cannot hope to thank all those who motivated my endeavours, whether through their encouraging advice, their example, or both; nor can I begin to cover all those who were kind enough to provide the feedback necessary to strengthen the final result. I single out but a few names deserving of special mention. The greatest debt is, of course, owed to Gert Partoens,

Fabio Della Schiava, and Anthony Dupont, the triumvirate whose guidance and feedback fundamentally helped shape the book you see before you. The comments of Fabio and Andrea Severi, as co-directors of the new *Sempervirens* series at LYSA Publishers, were vital in turning the initial dissertation into this fully-fledged monograph; as were those of the anonymous referees and the additional members of my doctoral examination committee – Andrea Robiglio, Laurent Baggioni, and Clémence Revest. Jeroen De Keyser deserves thanks for taking a chance on an unsuspecting postgraduate; Florian Schaffenrath and Concetta Bianca for agreeing to receive me and discuss my project; and Andrew Roadnight for scrutinising the language of the manuscript draft. To all of them, I extend my heartfelt gratitude: their expertise has indelibly left its mark both on the publication of this analysis and on my personal research trajectory. This expansion of my scholarly networks and horizons notwithstanding, I have tried, in passing, to pay tribute to some of the English authors close to my heart – something I hope the reader will appreciate.

Library resources have been instrumental to the project, as they are to any inquiry into literary history, and I am grateful to the staff of the many libraries I was able to visit for their patient assistance. Two further institutions are owed an acknowledgement: the grants of the Boltzmann Institute for Neo-Latin Studies and the Academische Stichting Leuven allowed me to conduct my research in Innsbruck and Florence respectively, stays that proved invaluable to my doctoral project as well as to my scholarly motivation amidst the throes of COVID-19. Likewise, the organisers of the various conferences and seminars – be they in-person or digital – at which I was able to advance preliminary findings deserve my thanks. Indebted to their generosity, I have specified previously-presented topics where appropriate.

Salutati wrote that nothing is more inhumane ("nihil inhumanius") than to turn one's back on those who offer friendship, such that I feel obliged to safeguard my own humanity by thanking some of my dearest family and friends. The role of my parents – my most ardent proofreaders – can hardly be overstated, and I will forever be grateful for their unconditional, and occasionally overbearing, support. Many friends have also contributed to the completion of this work, either wittingly or unwittingly, but I would like to single out three in particular: Evelien Van Buggenhout, Karen Spreuwers, and Kevin Foccart were kind

enough to entertain my arcane ramblings on paleography and Augustinianism with grace. They have been my *illuminatores* and *defensores* when most necessary: to them, too, I dedicate this book.

Gentle reader, I perceive how patiently you've waited, so let me conclude this preface by briefly voicing my hopes: firstly, that this exploration of one of the pioneering figures of Renaissance humanism proves as rewarding to read as it was to write; and secondly – to echo the immortal words of Berthold Ullman – that "I have not incurred the wrath of Coluccio!"

Sam Urlings
Leuven, January 18, 2023

Chapter 1

Introduction. *Per os meum ab Augustino*

Iron sharpeneth iron; so a man sharpeneth the countenance of his friend.
Prov. 27.17 KJV

In the final year of his life, Florentine chancellor Coluccio Salutati (1331-1406) received a work addressed to him by the well-known Dominican preacher Giovanni Dominici.[1] Titled – in a typically self-deprecating manner – *Lucula noctis* (and sometimes rendered in English as *The Glow-Worm* or *The Firefly*), the monumental treatise accused Salutati of promoting the reading of the classical poets in cases where the Bible took precedence.[2] Only when one was thoroughly versed in Christian discipline could the classics be thought suitable for reading, Dominici argued, and always ancillary to the message of Holy Scripture. Though he fell ill before he could complete it, what is left to us of the chancellor's reply is fundamentally based on the authority of St. Augustine, who is put to use as a staunch defender of the *studia humanitatis*.[3] After all, who would disagree with a man "of such holiness and erudition" ("tante sanctitatis et eruditionis", *Ep.* 4, 215), "il vero mo-

[1] This initial section on Dominici's *Lucula noctis* is part of my contribution to Claessens & Della Schiava 2021a: see Urlings 2021a, 99.

[2] For more on Dominici and the *Lucula noctis*, see Emerton 1925, 341-77; Witt 1983, 410-14; Baggioni 2018, 183-85. Ullman provides a detailed overview of Dominici's dedication copy, with apparent marginal notes by Salutati, in Ullman 1955, 257-77; currently, the manuscript in question is kept in the Special Collections Research Center of the University of Chicago Library (ms. 831). Two editions of the Latin text exist. The first, by Remi Coulon, was printed in 1908 and is of lamentable quality – Ullman terms it "an extremely poor piece of work" owing to its numerous misreadings and arbitrary changes: Ullman 1955, 260. The second, corrected edition was composed by Edmund Hunt in 1940; see Dominici, *Lucula Noctis*. An English translation of the former (as well as a summary) is provided in Emerton 1925, 341-77. The title refers to the humbling *captatio* in which Dominici "begs Salutati to look with indulgent eyes upon his poor little glimmer of light: 'God, who created the sun, made this worm also'" – see Emerton 1925, 341.

[3] Salutati's response is included in *Ep.* 4, 205-40. Unless mentioned otherwise, references to Salutati's letters relate to Novati's 1891-1911 edition.

dello del sapiente cristiano", who was himself heavily inspired by his reading of ancient models, from Cicero to Vergil?[4]

The central presence of the Church Father in Salutati's letter to Dominici – presumably his last writing – might seem strange in light of the general absence of scholarly interest in the chancellor's "Augustinianism". In fact, we are confronted with a curious dissonance in this regard. On the one hand, it is repeatedly recognised that certain aspects of Salutati's writing owe a debt to Augustine; and so scholars since at least Alfred von Martin have remarked, usually in passing, on salient parallels between the works of both authors.[5] That much is inevitable, perhaps, seeing that Salutati's private correspondence – spanning four monumental volumes as edited by Francesco Novati from 1891 to 1911, the publication that initiated renewed attention for the Florentine chancellor in the first place – frequently makes recourse to the authority of Augustine.[6] On the other hand, this superficial acknowledgement is rarely delved into, and only recently has there been increased critical

[4] Vasoli 2001, 36. This is similarly remarked upon in Baggioni 2018, 184-85. Translations from Latin are my own – with some exceptions, specified in the relevant notes. The spelling of all Latin citations was kept intact, except for cases where *u* and *v* were used interchangeably; capitalisation was adjusted to modern standards where necessary.

[5] This is especially evident throughout von Martin's 1913 *Mittelalterliche Welt- und Lebensanschauung im Spiegel der Schriften Coluccio Salutatis* (Von Martin 1913b), which presents Salutati as a relic of the "medieval" way of thinking – to be discussed further on. It is also present in, for instance, his 1914 article on the *De fato et fortuna*, which almost incidentally notes the treatise's references to "augustinische Gedanken" without inquiring into the implications of such references: Von Martin 1914, 442. See also *ibidem*, 414, on Augustine simply as an applicable interpreter of Holy Scripture.

[6] Agostino Sottili once wrote that, "per sicurezza di testo, ampiezza della corrispondenza e vastità del commento erudito", Novati's edition of Salutati's letters remained unsurpassed in its kind: Sottili 1967, 581. The same is still true almost 60 years later. That said, certain additions were noted in Ullman 1955, 283-305; Billanovich 1964; Nuzzo 2008c. Salutati's official epistolary output as chancellor long existed in the shadow of these private letters (with the exceptions of Witt 1976a and Langkabel 1981); the meticulous philological work of Armando Nuzzo, however, has once again brought them into the limelight. See Nuzzo 2003 for Salutati's letters to the Malatesta family; Salutati, *Epistole di Stato* for Nuzzo's 2003 edition of a selection of missives dating to 1375; Nuzzo 2008b for an in-depth overview of all manuscript sources and *incipits* relating to Salutati's public letters. Since then, a selection of such letters was also printed (alongside an English translation) in the *I Tatti* edition of some of the chancellor's politically motivated work – see Salutati, *Selected State Letters*. On Salutati's letters in general, see Nuzzo 2008a and 2010b as well. The division of his *epistolario* into private and public (or state) letters is, to an extent, arbitrary, as Nuzzo argues: Nuzzo 2010b, 225-26.

Chapter 6

De tyranno. The Demon of Consistency

Indeed, it is a strange-disposed time:
But men may construe things after their fashion,
Clean from the purpose of the things themselves.
William Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar*

There is a point in the defence of his friend, the recently elected aedile Gnaeus Plancius, at which Cicero discusses his shifting alliances with Pompey and Caesar, the great rival warlords of the time. Though he is grateful for the allowances of the former, he cannot but appreciate the merits of the latter, especially in the face of their recognition by the Roman people and senate. Shielding himself from those who would accuse him of political opportunism, he states that his liberty fundamentally consists in the "reasonableness" ("[quaedam moderatio]", *Planc*. 39) thus displayed;

> An, cum videam navem secundis ventis cursum tenentem suum, si non eum petat portum quem ego aliquando probavi, sed alium non minus tutum atque tranquillum, cum tempestate pugnem periculose potius quam illi, salute praesertim proposita, obtemperem et paream?[1]
>
> Were I to see a ship holding its course with favourable winds, if that ship did not make for the harbour which I had formerly chosen, but another which was no less safe and calm – should I risk a perilous fight against the storm rather than yield to it and comply with it in view, above all, of my safety?

At the end of his life, of course, around 44 BC, Cicero would come to unambiguously condemn Caesar's reign, which he brands tyrannical in the third book of his *De officiis* (*Off*. 3.21). Caesar's ambition to be "king of the Roman people and master over the whole world" ("rex populi Romani dominusque omnium gentium") was morally abject, Cicero writes; anyone who declares otherwise must be mad ("amens est"). Even though the enslaved people heaped praise on the perpetra-

[1] Cic. *Planc*. 39.

tor, his crime – the murder of the fatherland ("parricidium patriae") – was anathema to all. Evidently, Cicero seeks to justify the "tyrannicide" of republican guardians Brutus and Cassius; besides, as Accius put it, "to reign is to bear many foes and traitors, and only few friends" ("'Multi iniqui atque infideles regno, pauci benevoli' inquit Accius"). Caesar had it coming.

More than fourteen centuries later, at the dawn of the Quattrocento, Salutati finds himself arguing the exact opposite in his treatise on tyranny. It is this work, aptly named the *De tyranno*, that is looked into in the present chapter: its subject allows us to approach Salutati's ideology from a very different angle. Political concerns undoubtedly carried weight in the three works we have looked at up to now – originally promoting the vindication of Lucretia, and subsequently informing the humanist's stance on the active life and human volition, all with a view to his increasingly influential political role. Never before the *De tyranno*, however, had concerns of an overtly *governmental* nature been thus foregrounded in Salutati's writing. As for the intertextual presence of the *De civitate Dei*, although one might reasonably expect it to be more limited in this context, the marginal notes in ms. Ott. lat. 349 once again bear witness to its relevance as a source of inspiration: one precursory indication is that Salutati remarked on Augustine's understanding of the *res publica*, first on f. 27r ("res publica quid est", with regard to *Civ*. 5.18) and again on f. 135v ("quid res publica", with regard to Cicero's definition as discussed in *Civ*. 19.21).[2] Keeping these elements in mind, then, let us first scrutinise the treatise more closely.

a. Context

The treatise

Written in the summer of 1400, the *De tyranno* (*On the Tyrant*) sets out to defend the judgment of Dante, who placed Brutus and Cassius in the lowest circle of his *inferno* alongside Judas Iscariot.[3] In this context, the

[2] In *Civ*. 5.18, Augustine writes that the *res publica* is "the good of the people, the good of the fatherland, the common good" ("rem publicam, id est rem populi, rem patriae, rem communem").

[3] The bibliography on Salutati's *De tyranno* is not quite as vast as that on his *De fato et fortuna*, but there are still a considerable number of important secondary references,

chancellor first methodically deals with the issue of what makes a tyrant, "so that we may not wade in ambiguity" ("ne forsitan in equivoco fluctuemus", *Tyr. praefatio* 5), and whether it is lawful to kill one.[4] The latter question, especially, is one which he answers in detail, calling upon a series of historical examples to prove his point. Seeing as resistance in protection of one's own property is commonly approbated, "so too it must be authorised to rise up against a usurper of the commonwealth" ("licebit ergo contra rem publicam invadentem insurgere", *Tyr.* 2.7):[5]

> [Q]uis esset legum tam iniquus interpres, quis iustitiae tam adversus, quis rei publicae communisque salutis tam obstinatis animis inimicus qui non censeat hoc idem contra tyrannidem inducere conantes esse permissum, et tanto magis quanto maior est salus publica quam privata?[6]
>
> Who should be such an unfair interpreter of laws, who so adverse to justice, who so stubbornly opposed to the commonwealth and shared welfare, as to conceive that this is not permissible against those attempting to establish a tyranny – all the more so, seeing as public security is that much more important than private security?

among which sections of Baron 1966, to be discussed; Levi 1967; Witt 1969c (carried over into Witt 1983, 368-86); De Rosa 1980, 135-68; Black 1986; Quaglioni 2008 and 2012; Baldassarri 2014; Baggioni 2015, 315-37; Baldassarri 2020. Further references are provided in Quaglioni 2008, 167. In August of 1400, Salutati writes that he has sent "quidam libellus", which Novati correctly identifies as the *De tyranno*, to a student named Antonio dell'Aquila; see *Ep.* 3, 422. He mentions it by name in February 1401 ("magister Antonius, ad quem responsum et tractatum ordinaveram *De tyranno*"): see *Ep.* 3, 479. Five manuscripts containing the complete *De tyranno* are currently known: BAV, ms. Reg. lat. 1391 (f. 23r-40r); BML, ms. Plut. 78.12 (f. 1r-11v); ms. Plut. 90 sup. 41/2 (f. 1r-18r); Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, ms. lat. 8573 (f. 109r-29r); and Rome, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale Vittorio Emanuele II, ms. Sess. 1443 (sometimes also provided as ms. Sess. 167/4; f. 63v-72v). For more, see Quaglioni 2008, 167. The background to Salutati's writing of the *De tyranno* is provided in detail in Baldassarri 2020, 235-46.

[4] References to the text of the *De tyranno* relate to Stefano Baldassarri's 2014 edition; likewise, translations, though my own, are based on Rold Bagemihl's included facing translation. Other editions of the treatise are by von Martin (1913), Ercole (1914 and 1942), and Emerton (1925).

[5] However – and this is essential for Salutati – the slaying must occur *lawfully*, that is, with the legal approval of a higher authority or of the entire people, otherwise the murderer is no less a criminal than his victim.

[6] *Tyr.* 2.2.

And so, having concluded that a tyrant is one who usurps power ("qui invadit imperium", *Tyr.* 1.9; that is, a *tyrannus ex defectu tituli*, who has no legal title to rule) and/or uses it to rule unjustly ("[qui] iniustitiam facit", 1.9; that is, a *tyrannus ex parte exercitii*), and that it must be permissible, commendable even, to resist such an oppressor – Salutati comes to the case of Caesar.[7] Despite his missteps, Caesar reigned "lawfully" ("iure", 3.12) and with such "wondrous clemency" and "humanity" ("mira clementia" and "[tanta] humanitate", 3.10 and 3.12) that the grateful state showered him with honours. A man with such affection can in no way be called a tyrant ("concludamus [...] Caesarem non fuisse tyrannum", 3.12); anyone who declares otherwise is "judging arbitrarily" ("iudicare [...] ad libidinem", 3.12). As a result, the murder of Caesar was in no way justified – in fact, it was an infraction "so much worse than the murder of one's own father" ("longe maius [...] quam patrem proprium trucidare", 4.1).

This final denunciation is lifted from Cicero's *Philippics* (specifically *Phil.* 2.13), and its employment in Salutati's argument here hints at the rhetorician's dual role within the *De tyranno*. On the one hand, he is the prime antagonist, and the opposing assessment of the humanists' shining example of classical learning looms large over the discussion. Consequently, much of the chapter is spent tackling the *De officiis* which Salutati is forced to acknowledge; "Cicero," he writes, "all too eager a persecutor of the late Caesar, seeks to mark, pursue, and attack him" ("Cicero, nimius defuncti Caesaris insectator, eum notat, persequitur atque mordet", *Tyr.* 3.2). On the other hand, one of his main sources in countering Cicero is, curiously, Cicero himself, whose opportunism or "inconsistency" he thus exploits to cast doubt upon the evaluation contained in the *De officiis*.[8] After all, Cicero frequently affirmed his friendship with Caesar before the civil wars ("se sibi semper gessit amicum", *Tyr.* 3.4); he wrote admiringly of Caesar's character and

[7] On Salutati's categorisation of *tyranni*, and its relation to Bartolo da Sassoferrato, see Levi 1967, 721-22, and *infra*, 196.

[8] In doing so, Salutati was undoubtedly influenced by Petrarch, who also reproaches Cicero for his apparent fickleness in his prefatory letter "ad Socratem suum" (the first letter included in Petrarch, *Familiares*, tr. Fantham, vol. 1, 2-25). He speaks of Cicero's "quarrelsome letters and abuse and reproach against the most distinguished men, passionately praised by him a little before, with such amazing volatility of spirit" ("litigiosas epystolas et adversus clarissimos atque ab eodem paulo ante laudatissimos viros iurgia ac probra, mira cum levitate", *Fam.* 1.1.42).

glory in many of his letters (Salutati cites phrases like "divina liberalitas" and "[Caesar] ornandus videretur" from the *Familiares* in *Tyr.* 3.4); and even after the civil struggles had come to an end, he was always heaping praises upon Caesar ("semper […] multis laudibus affecisse", *Tyr.* 3.7). Citing the nautical analogy of political neutrality mentioned above, Salutati turns it against Cicero himself, retorting:

> Nunc autem, cum res publica tamquam navis non secundis ventis sed belli civilis fluctibus agitata non quem volebas sed aequalem forteque meliorem portum intrasset, fuitne iterum in mare turbidum et civicam tempestatem e portu trudenda?[9]
>
> But now, when the ship of state, driven not so much by "favourable winds" as by the currents of civil war, had entered upon a harbour which you did not wish for but one equally as good (and perhaps even better) – would you have it driven out again to the turbulent sea and the civic storm?

In conclusion, how can you trust the disapproval of someone who "not only said now this and now that, but even contradicted himself as times changed" ("nec solum nunc hoc nunc illud dicere, sed contraria mutatione temporum affirmare", *Tyr.* 3.3)?[10]

It is with no small amount of irony that, ever since the early twentieth century, researchers have found themselves similarly puzzling over contradictions in the humanist's own oeuvre. We first caught sight of this in discussing the *De seculo et religione*. Depending on which study one consults, Salutati has either become "a Janus-like figure", as Baldassarri puts it, "a man at a crossroads," torn between the diverging strands of his thinking;[11] or a humanist "Zelig", an opportunist, political or otherwise, steering his rhetorical ship whichever way the wind blows.[12] Certainly, opinions evolve in a myriad of ways as time passes and

[9] *Tyr.* 4.15. This nautical metaphor (which originally derives from Plato) reoccurs throughout the chapter, echoing Cicero's original statement and culminating in this response. This use mirrors Salutati's earlier adoption of the metaphor, then gleaned from Cicero's *De senectute*, in one of his letters (*Ep.* 1, 193). See Baggioni 2015, 130-31.

[10] This is but one of the many strategies Salutati employs in order to discount Cicero's judgment, which also include presenting Caesar as the product of divine intervention, framing the civil war as a necessary evil and Caesar as its cure, and declaring the supremacy of monarchical government – more on which below.

[11] Baldassarri 2014, VII.

[12] Again, I discussed some clear examples of the "rhetorical" approach (most notably Ullman's "faculta[s] disputandi" and Kohl and Witt's "eloquence without a conscience") with reference to the *De seculo et religione*, *supra*, 107-09.

circumstances change – even without mentioning how it might be anachronistic to expect a fully integrated system of thought from a premodern thinker – and yet few writers are charged with contradicting themselves as often and as unremittingly as Salutati is. Sections of Ullman's 1963 study are emblematic in this regard, presenting their subject as an incoherent "kaleidoscope" of different traits struggling for dominance.[13] As we will see, some scholars (with notable exceptions, of course) hence appear keen on dismissing much of his work as *transitional* in anticipation of the full emergence of humanism. If only Salutati had been born *later*, they say, in that "outburst of splendour known as the Quattrocento Renaissance"; his beliefs might have been more fully developed…[14]

The topos of Salutati's "divided consciousness" as first encountered with regard to the *De seculo et religione* is intensified here. Hans Baron's qualification of the *De tyranno* as "a problematical book" has almost invariably accompanied its discussion, even in more recent scholarship.[15] In what follows, then, let us consider why the chancellor, and this political writing in particular, has been so haunted by "what is tempting to call the 'demon' of consistency, one of the dogmas of literary criticism today" – a demon that, as Baldassarri notes, Plato, Cicero, Dante, Tolstoj, and many more have apparently managed to elude.[16] Of course, this is not to imply that we ought to absolve Salutati of any and all incongruities: no author is entirely without them, and, besides, his writing proves incongruous in a number of interesting ways that remain to be explored. That said, certain aspects of his thinking have been historically obscured or glossed over in the wake of the general acceptance of their "inconsistency", and are hence deserving of a critical reappreciation. Witt opens his 1969 discussion of the *De tyranno* by brazenly claiming that "a student of the political ideas of Coluccio Salutati cannot be blamed for wishing that [it] had been

[13] Ullman 1963, 49.

[14] Trinkaus 1970, 53. Trinkaus is in fact one of the exceptions to this tendency; see *infra*, 188.

[15] Baron 1966, 165. Quaglioni's entry on the *De tyranno* for the 2008 *Catalogo* is titled, with reference to Baron, "*De tyranno*. 'A problematical book'", as is his related contribution to Cardini & Viti 2012. See Quaglioni 2008, 165, and Quaglioni 2012, 335, respectively. For more on this topic, see Baggioni 2015, 317, and Baldassarri 2020, 247-48.

[16] Baldassarri 2014, VII.

proven spurious or that it could be counted among the 'lost' works of the author."[17] Since neither is the case, the relationship of Salutati's *libellus* to his ideology (or what is perceived as such) and further literary production warrants our attention. Partly, such a relationship can be established by demonstrating the continued – and arguably intensifying – presence of Augustine, and specifically of his *De civitate Dei*, in Salutati's writing; but before we turn once again to that increasingly familiar presence, let us scrutinize what one might call the "traditional" approach to the *De tyranno*.

Scholarly Reception

Firstly, in order to understand the cause of Salutati's troubled reputation, we have to look back at the work that, after Jacob Burckhardt's 1860 *Die Kultur der Renaissance in Italien*, has come to shape much of the public understanding of the Italian Renaissance: Hans Baron's seminal *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance*.[18] In the 60-odd years since Baron first published his analysis, its notion of "civic humanism" (*Bürgerhumanismus*) has become an inescapable part of Renaissance historiography, and it has been ingrained in the reading of any humanistic work. What is more, despite the barrage of criticism its sweeping implications have had to endure over the decades, even shortly after the initial publication of the *Crisis*, there has been no real paradigm to replace it.[19] "Baron's thesis has enjoyed (and suffered) a degree of attention and con-

[17] Witt 1969c, 434. Witt does, however, develop a more nuanced reading of the *De tyranno* (to be discussed *infra*, 186-87) in chapter 14 of his *Hercules*: Witt 1983, 368-91. Again, see Baldassarri 2020, 247-48 as well.

[18] Burckhardt's work only references Salutati once, and only with regard to his *De laboribus Herculis*: Burckhardt (1860) 2009, 448. Baron's *Crisis* was first published in 1955; a revised edition, which made changes to the sections on Salutati, was subsequently printed in 1966 – though there is no real evolution in the author's views. Unless mentioned otherwise, my citations refer to the latter edition.

[19] For early criticism, see the so-called "Jones thesis": Baker & Maxson 2015, 18. Generally, critics of Baron disagree on a number of points: the chronology of his cases; the precise genesis of the "republican" resurgence; the originality of civic humanist ideas; and the sincerity of the humanists' literary production. As a result, wholesale Baronianism is considered outmoded in modern academic discourse. For more on Baron criticism, see Rabil 1988b; Witt 1996; Hankins 2000a, 1-13; Baggioni 2015, 25-46; Baker & Maxson 2015. The latter two in particular provide an up-to-date overview of scholarship on the Baron thesis.

Indices

Index codicum

Index locorum

The following index contains all generic references to works by classical, patristic, medieval and early modern authors, as well as (whenever applicable) references to and citations from specific books, chapters, or other subdivisions of those writings.

Index nominum

The following index lists all names cited, including those of a mythological, biblical or otherwise fictitious nature, and excluding those of modern scholars.