intellectual culture, which found its expression in scholastic humanism, becomes untenable.

Why should an historian of Southern's distinction propose a theory which rests on so implausible a view of late medieval thought? The answer is, perhaps, that his views were moulded fifty or sixty years ago, when many specialists in the field, often under the sway of Neoscholasticism, saw in Aquinas all that was most valuable in medieval philosophy: earlier medieval thinkers, as they envisaged it, prepared the ground for his synthesis, and after his death there was a rapid decline. Although Southern has been far more interested in eleventh- and twelfth-century thought than these historians, he appears to have adopted their outline of how medieval philosophy developed and made it the basis for his wide-ranging thesis in social and intellectual history. But historians today, freed from Neoscholastic prejudices, and aided by manuscript discoveries, new editions and a far greater understanding of medieval logic, recognize the fourteenth century as every much as rich a period in philosophy as the thirteenth; and they are beginning to appreciate the scholastic thinkers of later centuries too. For all its author's eloquence and wisdom, *Scholastic Humanism* rests on a discredited view of the history of medieval philosophy. Its readers will find its detailed discussions of social and intellectual history stimulating and informative, but they should treat Southern's general thesis with circumspection.

John Marenbon
Trinity College
Cambridge

The Ur-Gatsby


Even modern books have their own fates. To celebrate the 75th anniversary of *The Great Gatsby,* we are presented with two editions of the proofs of a novel Fitzgerald never published: Bruccoli presents the unrevised proofs; West an edition of the revised proofs that became *The Great Gatsby.*¹ The former comes from the editor's own great collection of Fitzgeraldiana at the University of South Carolina, West's from the revised proofs in the Fitzgerald Collection at the Princeton University Library. In West's words, the draft "is now put into play, not only for comparison with *The Great Gatsby*..."

but for interpretation as a separate and distinct work of art.” 2 Precisely how separate and distinct will be the subject of dissertations and symposia among Fitzgeraldians, who will have to do a fair amount of work for themselves regarding the differences from *Gatsby*.

West is a well-known editor of Fitzgerald, who has previously edited *This Side of Paradise* for the Cambridge series. Matthew J. Bruccoli has served Fitzgerald over the years as a kind of anti-Varius. Unlike Virgil’s editor, who excised anything that Virgil had not finally approved at his death, 3 Bruccoli has, among other services to his author, edited innumerable versions of Fitzgerald’s manuscripts, proofs, and corrected proofs. The publication of facsimiles democratizes the study of text editing, allowing those who cannot travel to the great repositories to do their work in any library that can afford the facsimile volumes. Classicists and others who cherish accuracy, industry, and intelligence will appreciate the abilities both men bring to their tasks.

Nevertheless, readers of a classical background will bring some questions to these works. The first question is Why does this draft version of *The Great Gatsby* bear the title *Trimalchio*? An *editio maior* of this book, bearing the imprimatur of Cambridge University Press, should provide the information from Fitzgerald’s letters in an orderly fashion and answer the question, but neither volume gives a fully accurate answer. Bruccoli’s “Afterword” gives the fuller account, which can also be found in his Cambridge edition of *The Great Gatsby*, 4 but it does not answer the question.

It appears that Fitzgerald never titled his novel “Trimalchio” and that there is no more warrant for bringing this novel out under that title than there is for calling *The Great Gatsby* “Trimalchio.” Fitzgerald liked the title “Trimalchio” and clearly did not like “The Great Gatsby” at any stage of the writing, nor even after its publication (“The title is only fair, rather bad than good” 5). From the moment his editor at Scribners, Maxwell Perkins (1884-1947), heard of Fitzgerald’s plans for his third novel, which he was planning in June 1922 in White Bear Lake, Minnesota, he liked the title: “I always thought that “The Great Gatsby” was a suggestive and effective title,—with only the vaguest knowledge of the book, of course.” 6 This initial attempt at a novel set in “the middle west and New York of 1885” 7 was abandoned. 8

---

2. West, xxi.
3. *Ceterum eidem Vario ac simul Tuccae scripta sua sub ea condicione legavit, ne quid ederent, quod non a se editum esset. Edidit autem auctore Augusto Varius, sed summatim emendata, ut qui versus etiam imperfectos sicut erant reliquerit* (“In his will he left his writings to this same Varius and to Tucca, with the order that they should not publish anything that he himself would not have published. Thus Varius published the poem with the support of Augustus, but he edited very lightly and he left in even the unfinished verses [half-lines], just as Virgil had left them”), Aelius Donatus, *Vita Vergilii*, 40-41.
6. “Always” clearly indicates that this was the title as far back as 1922. Perkins to Fitzgerald 16 April 1924, *Dear Scott/Dear Max*, 71.
8. He wrote 18,000 words, from which he was able to extract only the portion that he re-