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LITTERAE AD CRANEVELDIIUM
BALDUINIANAE
A Preliminary Edition.

4. Letters 86-116
(November 1521-June 1522; April 1523; November 1528)

Edited by J. IJSEWIJN, D. SACRÉ, G. TOURONEY and M. VERWEIJ

Introductory Note.

This is the fourth and last instalment of unpublished letters to and from Cranevelt, which completes the series of letters edited in HL 41 (1992), 1-85 [letters 1-30], 42 (1993), 2-51 [letters 31-55] and 43 (1994), 15-68 [letters 56-85]. The edition is prepared according to the same principles as the 1992 publication. It is again the result of the close collaboration between the persons mentioned in the preface to the first edition. Moreover, a second grant of the National Bank of Belgium enabled us to engage again the cooperation of Dr. Michiel Verweij.

Mr. R. Truman (Oxford) offered us invaluable help not only by improving our English but also with useful suggestions concerning our notes to, and interpretation of the texts. We are grateful to Prof. Hubertus Schulte Herbrüggen for some useful suggestions and to the British-Flemish Academic Research Collaboration Programme which substantially facilitated the cooperation between Louvain and Oxford.

As soon as possible we will now proceed to the definitive edition of the whole collection in book form, to which will be added corrections and additions to De Vocht’s Literae ad Craneveldium of 1928.

Jozef IJsewijn.
Ep. 86. J. L. Vives (Louvain) to Fr. Cranevelt (Bruges).

89 (f. 112) 2 XI <1521>

This letter, bearing an exact date, was written by Vives's secretary and consequently corrected by Vives himself, who added the final sentence in his own hand.

The first part of the letter is about Thomas More. More has left Bruges and with him all pleasures have disappeared. Bruges is like an orphan. How can Cranevelt and his friends Laurinus, Fevynus and Eucollius bear the sight of the places where More has been? Luckily More has left an image of himself in the person of Clemens. This man is certainly John Clement, a former member of More's household and the tutor of his children. From 1520 onwards he devoted himself to medicine, partly in Louvain (although he cannot be found in the Matricule de l'Université de Louvain), where he stayed with Vives (cf. Vives te Leuven [Leuven, 1993], p. 16). This letter proves against CE I, p. 311 that Clement did not arrive at Louvain before Erasmus's departure for Basel on 28 October. Afterwards Clement practised medicine in England, until the reign of Edward VI, when he left for reasons of religion and settled in Louvain. He died July 1, 1571. (cf. Lit. Cran., 154; CE, 1, p. 311-312).

Vives concludes this paragraph with his best wishes to More, who deserves every success, and with a remark on an epigram he apparently had written on him. In that epigram, he explains, he had written the name Morus as a pyrrhichius or a iambus, that is, with a short o, in order to escape the censure of an (unnamed) critic. But since More prefers his name to be read with a long o, Vives proposes a new version of the verse with the correct length. The whole affair is a little strange because, ever since Erasmus's well-known pun on More's name in his Praise of Folly, the connection with the Greek word μωρός (foolish) was common knowledge.

Next, Vives refers to his correspondence with Cranevelt. He has received from him two letters to which he had not yet written an answer, although he had apologised for not answering in another letter to which Cranevelt has not reacted so far. It seems that Cranevelt in his letters had submitted some problems or questions to Vives which the latter could not answer immediately and, therefore, Vives had sent (as he explains) an excuse before he might be accused of not caring for his friend. Vives hopes that his apology was acceptable, especially since there is no person in the world he likes better than Cranevelt.

The letter with excuses to which Vives is referring may be Ep. 85 (HL [1994], 65-68).

In the last part of the letter Vives discusses their common philological interests, first of all Greek ones. Cranevelt has Clemens with him, so he does not really need Vives. Cranevelt behaves badly towards Clemens if he thinks Clemens cannot assuage a longing for a thousand Viveses, when it comes to knowledge of Greek. Cranevelt is fortunate enough to have spare time to read Cicero's philosophical dialogues. Vives points out that Cicero's De Universitate (= Timaeus), a passage of which Cranevelt apparently has not understood, is a
translation by Cicero of Plato’s *Timaeus* from §27d onwards. Therefore Cranevelt should rather consult Macrobius or Marsilius Ficinus than the busy Vives. As Vives mentions the fact that Cranevelt desired ‘numeri’ to be explained, he may be referring to Cic., *Tim.*, 23-24 = Plat., *Tim.* 35c-36c, passages commented upon by Macrobius, *Somn. Scip.*, 1, 6, 2-4 and Marsilius Ficinus, *In Platonem: In Timaeum commentarium*, 19 (Opera omnia, Basileae, 1576 = Torino 1989, pp. 1445-1446).

Greetings to all common friends (Laurinus, Fevynus, Eucollius, Clemens) and to Cranevelt’s wife. In a postscript Vives commends his family in Bruges to Cranevelt’s care and attention.

Vives Cranaveldio suo S<alutem>.


[[άλλα]] σύ δέ ταύτα ἐμόι ποιητικώς τάχα λεκτέντα? Atqui scito me nihil verius expressiusque existimare, et putare haec omnia fieri a me dicente minora vero; tantum abest ut verbis in maius augeam. Precor illi non iter modo, sed quaecumque inceptarit, prosperima: dignus est enim maximis bonis, quae spero illum consecuturum.

De priore parte brevi sic feci dedita opera, ut omnino effugerem rabiem illius rixosi, qui ultimam litteram Graeci alphabeti admiscendam duxit nomini Latinissimo. Ita ego malui hunc bellacem pyrrhicum aut etiam acrem iambum, idque contra illum, quam spondaeum vel trochaeum. Sed si Morus διχρονου se in initio esse gaudet, mutetur sic illa ex epigrammate meo versiculus: “Sternet te Morus viribus eloquii”.

Venio ad priorem tuam [epla] epistolam, hoc est non [quae] prius reddatum, sed prius scriptam. Binas enim abs te accepi, quibus quod nondum responderim, excusavi epistola quadam mea ([[c]]) cui nondum (quod equidem sciam) respondisti, et dixi caussam ante quam vel fierem reus vel committerem crimem, ut quandoquidem peccatumur me sciebam,

---

1 Eucollius: vide *ep.* 2 (*HL* 41[1992],11-14 [p. 11]).
2 “a me”: corr. Vives supra lineam pro: “ante”.
3 “trochaeum”: corr. Vives pro “trhocaeanum”.
4 διχρονον: in margine additum.
malui purgare me futuri peccati dum vacabat, quam ad id cogi occupatissimo tempore. Confido caussam tibi meam esse probatam. Si dixero me quoque consuetudinis dulcissimae tuae desyderio propemodum intolerabili teneri, videbor forsan reddere mutuum, sed verissime certe dixero. Atque ita me Christus bene amet, ut numquam videor mihi cum homine aliquo versatus, cuius consuetudinis etiam quam diutissimae minus me tuerit sacietas quam tui. Usque adeo videris in hoc unum incumbere, ut quo tractaris diutius, eo plus placeas magis gratiorque sis altissime perspectus et cognitus quam extrinsecus tantum spectatus. Et sum ipse alioqui “homo”, ut inquit ille in comedia, “perpaucorum hominum” ac stomachi mire fastidientis.

Sed, quaeso te, Claementem istic habes et Vivem in Graecitate desyderas? Male profecto mereris de ilio, quem non unum sexcentorum Vivium desyderium quantum ad Greciae linguae peritiam spectat, lenire posse credis, aut si credis, non profitseris. O te fortunatum, cui ad evolvendos philosophicos Ciceronis dialogos vacet! Ecquid visisti homine illo divinius? In De Universitate numeri illi nec apertiores nec reconditores sunt Platonici, sed idem ipsi. Libellus enim ille est pars Platonici Timaei versa a Cicerone ab illo loco: “Quid est quod semper sit neque ullum habet ortum”12. Itaque numeros explicari tibi a Macrobius potius vel [a] Marsilio petas quam a me homine tantopere negotioso.


(Add. Vives propria manu) Commendo tibi affines illas meas, si qua in re opera tua eguerint; quod accuratius non facio, qui scio tibi esse nos omnes commendatissimos.

Vives

A tergo: Domino Francisco Cranaveldio / iuris consultiss<imo>, amico meo / summio / Brugis.

---

5 “incumbere”; corr. pro “incumbere” (?).
6 “tractaris”; corr. pro “tactaris”.
7 “magis”; add. Vives supra lineam.
8 “homo perpaucorum hominum”; cf. Ter., Eun., 408-409.
9 “o te fortunatum”; cf. Cic., Quinct., 80: “o hominem fortunatum”.
11 “quid est”; interposita lineola corr. Vives pro: “quidest”.
12 “ortum”; corr. pro: “sortum”.
Ep. 87. J. L. Vives (Louvain) to Fr. Cranevelt (Bruges)

90 (f. 113) 4 XI 1521

A short letter in Vives’s own hand repeating his request to Cranevelt to advise his relative in Bruges. The relative must be either Clara Cervent, widow of Bernardo Valdaura, who died in January 1521, or her mother; cf. Ep. 2 (HL 41[1992], 11-14, n. 8) and Ep. 38 (HL 42[1993], 20-24). Vives asks Cranevelt to help her as he would Vives himself. Their friendship ensures that there is nothing more to be added. Vives then refers to the previous letter which he had written two days earlier and which is a ‘real’ letter. Therefore, if Cranevelt does not count the present one as an official letter, he may consider it as a supplement.

S<alve>, mi Cranevel<di>. In medio tumultu occupationum mearum hec ad te scribo, solum quo1 te precer, ut si qua in re afftnis istic mea eguerit Consilio tuo, consulas ei, ut mihi faceres. Amicitia nostra facit, ne quid maius videar mihi posse addere. Ea re nulla mihi poterit esse gratior. Vale multum. Nudius tertius ad te scripsi iustam epistolam. Si hanc 

Tuus Vives.

A tergo: D<omino> Francisco Cranevel/dio Iurisconsulto, amico / omnium optimo./ Brugis.

Ep. 88. Leonardus Clodius (Bruges) to Fr. Cranevelt (Bruges).

88 (f. 111) <After 6 XI 1521>

This rather flattering letter from Clodius to his patron was written on a double sheet so as to look as beautiful as it reads. It contains a sequel to the matter of Clodius’s nomination, so that its dating, although the letter bears no date, does not present any real difficulty.

The first part of the letter consists of extremely verbose praise of Cranevelt. If friendship can only exist between equals, Clodius cannot understand how Cranevelt is always treating him so kindly and without any possible recompense from Clodius’s side, since the latter is of low birth, small scholarship and in every way Cranevelt’s inferior. Cranevelt is, he continues, the oracle of Flanders,

1 “quo”: “u” supra lineam addita.
so that to be compared with him is as anomalous as the comparison of the night with the radiant Apollo (the Sun) himself. But enough of this: he returns to business, although he could fill deep abysses with Cranevelt's praise.

If Cranevelt does not arrange a meeting with Bertrandus (v. ep. 76 and 82) and try to persuade him, he might not hold to the agreement (concerning Clodius's nomination). That is the general opinion of all Clodius’s supporters, Laurinus, Brydalus, Feyynus and a good many other members of the chapter. Furthermore, Cranevelt should insist upon the fact that the possession of the degree of Magister is not necessary for the fulfilment of this function, as Clodius’s own schoolmaster proved, as well as the apostles and such learned princes of true religion as Jerome, Augustine and Ambrose, who never took a university degree. A title may increase the authority of fools but not their knowledge. Furthermore, the present schoolmaster, who has taken his degree, is now being rejected. Therefore Cranevelt is begged again to intercede on Clodius’s behalf.

Apparently, Clodius who so far had not been appointed, did not complete studies at the university as seems to have been requisite in this office. However, he may have started: on 27 November 1514 a ‘Leonardus Cloet de Brughis’ was matriculated at Louvain (cfr. Matricule de l’Université de Louvain, 3 p. 501, n. 56). To identify this student with our Clodius is attractive, although this can not be proved.

In a few days Clodius will send his prologue to Plato’s Hipparchus, which has been performed on the recent feast of St. Leonard (November 6) in honour of the three ‘Leonardi’, viz. Vandevalus, Eleopolus and Clodius. He asks Cranevelt to read it with a friendly eye.

Si amicitia nulla queat nisi inter pares subsistere firma, eosque egregie probos, sapientissime domine doctor, non video — nec possum vel Argi lumine multiplici — qui fiat ut me tantopere ames, nempe qui neque corporeos molestos labores, neque vigiliarum, studiorum animique allubentissimas opellas prodigus recusaveris unquam. Et tamen nihil est omnino, quo vel aspectu tanto beneficiorun cumulo respondeam, tantum abest ut effectu possim. Me quippe si tibi parem putes, humanitatis videlicet titulo, Parmesiam cautem cum sempiterno Iove rectius contuleris, nedum homuncionem. Generis enim tui illustris claritudo plebeiam nostram ita antecedit, annique iam longius praecurrunt humilitatem. Ita summorum reverentia graduum in te, abiectae sortis misellum me a

2 “allubentissimam”; “allubens” not in Antiquity; the form allubescens can be found in Apuleius.
3 “Parmesiam cautem”: erroneously written for “Marpesiam cautem” (cf. Verg., Aen., VI. 471).
tuo {me} merito seiungit amore, ut ne coelum sit istinc distantius. Tum quoque ad illam in te iuris peritiam ac ad utriusque linguae opulentas divitas quis hominum hac tempestate vel audidat aspirare? Propter quae rursus sic tecum sum conferendus velut noctis caliginosa tenebrae cum omnium rerum illustratore⁴ Phoebo. Consiliis preterea simul et prudentia vales ut merito huius secoli venerere nomodidactes⁵, addam Solon, imo et addam non Franciscus, non Craneveldius, sed is ipse a quo in Flandria ceu ab Apolline exaudiretur oracula. Viden igitur, maxime vir, quam dissimilem praecelegeris Oresten⁶, quam imparem Corydona⁷ amare decrevisti, a quo tamen nihil unquam profectum est quod minimum amicitiae conciliet scintillulam. Sed mavis benigna⁸ quadam et prompta benignitate fovere quem tot nominibus totque titulis [(cominus)] quam longissime⁹ anteverteris, devictis unius humanitatis studio, quam in omneis Christianos // profundis meracissime.

Verum plura non hodie, quamquam et abyssos plurimas tuarum laudum copiosa multitudine possem explere, etiam profundissimae. Ceterum Bertrandus noster pacta non servaturus est aut tecum aut cum alio quovis, nisi tu, liberalissime patrone, hominem rursus convenias, qui nihil tibi aut negare possit aut negare certo non¹⁰ debet. Haec est omnium amicorum communis persuasio; ita decanus Laurinus hortabatur, haud aliter dominus Brydalus¹¹ archipresbyter, quem Christianitatis¹² decanum nostrates appellat; sic doctissimus consuluit Fevynus, et persuasit reliquorum bona pars canonorum: ut si tu iubeas aut amanter horteris, mox ille parebit.

Addas etiam atque gradus magistralis eclipsim neque omnino quicquam templum officere, neque praetera necessariam, id quod in meo

---

4 “illustratore”: since Lactantius, but rare.
5 “nomodidactes”: not in antiquity in Latin form; the Greek word occurs e.g. in Plut., Cat.m., 20.
6 “Oresten”: Orestes and Pylades were proverbial friends; cf. Otto, Römische Sprichwörter, p. 258.
8 “benigna”: first written “benignit”.
9 “quam longissime” added above the line.
10 “non” added above the line.
11 Brydalus: Nicolaus Breydel (1465-1523) was dean of the district of Bruges and canon of the fourteenth prebend in St. Donatian’s (since 1500); cf. Lit. Cran., 35, 7n.
12 “Christianitatis” first written “chriatum” (?).
praeeptore\textsuperscript{13}, secundo ante hunc Paschasium\textsuperscript{14} apud eos egregie (per Iovem) docto ludimagistro promotio (ut vocant), proinde atque Apostoli aut Hyeronymus, Augustinus, Ambrosius et id genus verae doctrinae proceres. Titulus enim auget et in stultis\textsuperscript{15} auctoritatem, scientiam vero non sic. At rursus non cuivis\textsuperscript{16} homini contingit adire Chorynthum. Promotum magisteriique imagine insignitum habent modo, quem nunc reiiciunt. Quid in eo excusat promotionis dignitas, quin potius refellat magistralitas? Quare, Catonianissime domine doctor, tu solus asylum; in te uno proiecta est extremae salutis anchora. Presta, precor, ne in mora periculum, auxilium et suspensum quodammodo salva. Futurum prope diem spero ut te tot honestatum titulis, tot modis victorem vermiculus ego ipse revincam, idque integerrimo promptissimoque animuli mei et affectu et officio.

Prologum nostrum\textsuperscript{17} utcumque in Platonis Hipparchum proxima divi Leonardi\textsuperscript{18} festivitate lusum in gratiam trium Leonardorum, utputa Vandevali\textsuperscript{19}, Eleopoli\textsuperscript{20} et demum Clodii ad te transmittemus non post multos dies. Eum dignare lectura amica.

Bene vale, maxime patrone. Ex aedibus nostris hodie. Tuus ut supra Leonar<dus> Clo<dius> ex animo.

\textit{A tergo:} Iureconsultissimo doctori et / Mecoenati amplissimo, domino / Francisco Craneveldio

\footnotesize{a [[conso]] / consiliis Bruganis.}

\textsuperscript{13} "meo praeeptore": this should be Petrus Oesterhout, who was appointed May 23, 1509 and who cannot be found in the Louvain registers. He was succeeded on March 17, 1512 by Gislenus de Brabander from Utrecht, who matriculated at Louvain in February 1505 (cf. Matricule de l'Université de Louvain, 3, p. 289, n. 221); cf. A. C. De Schrevel, Histoire du Séminaire de Bruges, 1 (Bruges, 1895), p. 222.

\textsuperscript{14} "Paschasium": Pasquier de Corte from the diocese of Thérouanne, appointed Feb. 9. 1516. On May 29. 1526, he became 'clericus sanctuarii'. His matriculation is unknown (or at least cannot be found under this name in Louvain); cf. A. C. De Schrevel, l. c.

\textsuperscript{15} "et in stultis" added in the left margin.

\textsuperscript{16} "non cuivis": Hor., Epist., 1, 17, 36.

\textsuperscript{17} "prologum nostrum": otherwise unknown text which may be a declamation.

Another equally unknown work by Clodius is the school drama \textit{Compendium Epicureae Theologiae} (cf. Lit. Cran., 39).

\textsuperscript{18} "Leonardi" added in the left margin.

\textsuperscript{19} "Vandevali": cf. ep. 76.

\textsuperscript{20} "Eleopoli": a Leonardus Heliopolus matriculated at Louvain on May 21, 1518 (cf. Matricule de l'Université de Louvain, 3, p. 585, n. 117). He is called a 'clericus Tornacensis', being originally from Bruges, then in the diocese of Tournai. He seems to have been somewhat older than most students.
Ep. 89. P. Curtius (Louvain) to Fr. Cranevelt (Bruges)

91 (f. 114) 20 XI <1521>

As Cranevelt’s servant [Andreas; see letter 91] is leaving Louvain for Bruges, Petrus Curtius (cf. ep. 63: HL 43 [1994], 30-33) does not want to lose the opportunity of sending Cranevelt his regards. He has not enough time to write a long letter, but he wants to give Cranevelt a report of the actions taken against Luther and his followers.

A new papal legate has brought a new and more severe bull. When the Emperor Charles V perceived opposition against it among the local and regional authorities he sent for Nicolaus Baechem Egmondanus (the well-known adversary of Erasmus; cf. CE, 1, pp. 81-83 and ep. 22: HL 41 [1992], 59-64), who eagerly accepted the task of finding out people suspected of heresy, whether male or female, and accordingly went to Antwerp, where many people suffered from that ‘disease’. Egmondanus also consulted with Margaret of Austria (Regent of the Low Countries from 1517 till 1530, who certainly at the beginning took a rather neutral course in this matter; cf. CE, 2, pp. 388-389). In Antwerp Egmondanus has put on his black list, among others, a burgomaster, a clergyman and Petrus Aegidius (Gillis) and turned their names over to the Emperor. What is to become of them is uncertain, as Egmondanus has not yet returned from Oudenaarde in the South of Flanders. Rumour has it that he is after their wealth.

Since Charles V and Margaret were residing at Oudenaarde from 26 October to mid-December 1521 in connection with the war operations in Northern France, it is clear that Egmondanus had followed the court there. See J. de Jongh, De Hertogin. Margaretha van Oostenrijk, hertogin van Savoie 1480-1530. Regentessen der Nederlanden, 1 (Amsterdam 1981), p. 398.

Everything that Curtius has told Cranevelt is confidential. Greetings to his wife.

The new papal legate must be Aleander (cf. CE, 1, pp. 28-32) who after the promulgation of the Edict of Worms (May 26, 1521) went with the Emperor to the Low Countries. He will have brought with him the second bull against Luther, Decet Romanorum, promulgated by Leo X on January 3, 1521, after the first bull Exsurge Domine, published on June 17, 1520. One of Egmondanus’s victims was Petrus Gillis or Aegidius, town secretary of Antwerp and friend of Thomas More (cf. CE, 2, pp. 99-101; the information given there, p. 100, on Gillis’s house, is not correct. Gillis lived in the house De Biekorf in the Oude Veemarkt, now Eiermarkt. See HL 40 [1991], 475-476). In 1522 a rumour spread that he had been captured but it proved false (cf. Alien, Ep. 1293-1296-1318). From the present letter one can deduce the fact that Aegidius was under suspicion already by the end of 1521.

Secundam salutem.¹ Non potui non tuo familiari ad te dare literas, vir ornatissime, ne parum diligens videri possim, qui tanta occasione ne

¹ “secundam salutem”: This rather uncommon greeting formula seems to be coined after expressions such as “res secunda”, “secunda fortuna”, “tempora secunda”.
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salutem quidem dicerem. Ceterum non patiebatur temporis angustia pro-
lixe aut elaborate scribere; proinde has nostras perbreves et tumultuarias
boni consules.

Videbar mihi non ingratam rem tibi facturus, si quae iterum adversus Lutherum fautores mo-
liantur, de integro perscripsero. Ea sunt huiusmodi. Ad imperatorem brevi recens quidem et novus appul-
tus pontificius novam atrocioremque superiore afferens bullam. Qua permutus imperator, quibusdam ex nostratibus frigidam (quod aiunt) suffundentibus, Egmundanum ad se accersere iubet (nam hic eiusmodi negotii incendiariis quaestionariisque est aptissimus) datque negoti-
ciun ut si quos invenisset huius Lutheriane vie viros aut mulieres, notatos ad se perferret. Is strenuus ac libens hoc capessens oneris Antverpiam se4 confert, ubi tum illustrissima Margarita agebat cepitque eo loco complures describere (nam illic aiunt homines hoc morbo vehementer laborare) notavitque inter ceteros unum et bur-
gimagistris (quos vocant), alterum e curatoribus animarum, eciam, ut intellexi, Petrum Aegidium cum aliquot aliis, quorum nomina ad imperatorem detulit. Quid de hiis futurum sit, incertum. Nondum enim ex Aldenardo reedit Egmundanus. Interpretantur quidam illorum divi-
tis hac arrepta occasione insidias strui. Sed hec tibi secretisque amicis solis perscripsi.

Vale cum tua coniuge suavissima, cui commendari percupio.

Lovanii, 12 Calendas Decembreis.

Toto pectore tuus P<etrus> Curtius

A tergo: Insigni Iuris utriusque Doctori / Magistro Francisco Cra-
neveldio / Oppidi Brugensis pensionario primo./

Brugis.

---

2 "frigidam suffundentibus": sc. aquam; cf. Plaut., Cist., 38; Erasmus, Adagia, I 51 = 951.
3 "quaestionarii": not used as an adjective in antiquity; cf. Niermeyer, Lexicon medii aevi minus, p. 878.
4 "se": in margine.
Ep. 90. Paulus de Mera (Louvain) to Fr. Cranevelt (Bruges)

92 (f. 115)  11 XI 1521

Another letter from the Louvain schoolboy Paulus de Mera, on whom see letter 77 (HL 43 [1994], 54-56). Its position in the bundle just after the letter of Paulus’s teacher at Louvain, Petrus Curtius (dated 20 November), suggests that the two letters were sent together to Bruges exactly as the letters 77 and 78. In the inner space of the capital letter Q with which the letter begins the boy has drawn a little face.

Paul begins his letter by wondering why Cranevelt does not write more frequently. Has he forgotten his nephew? That seems impossible. Or has he fled from work? That seems also most unlikely for such a man as Cranevelt who never wastes his time in idleness. Perhaps he could not find someone to carry the letters to Louvain, although there is much coming and going between Louvain and Bruges. When Paul heard that Cranevelt’s servant [Andreas; see letter 91] was in town, he did not rest until he had finished a letter to his uncle.

Paul first wants to describe the agitation caused in Louvain by the departure of the militia on November 2. This is an allusion to the departure of 200 infantry and 100 horsemen who left the town for Tournai, besieged by the army of Charles V. Cf. J. A. Torfs, Geschiedenis van Leuven van den vroegsten tijd tot op heden (Leuven, 1899), p. 225.

Next he sends his special regards together with a small gift to his favourite cousin Catharina, viz. Cranevelt’s third daughter (1512-1572), who later entered Thabor convent in Mechlin (cf. Lit. Cran., pp. LXII-LXIII; Paul mentions Catharina as well in Lit. Cran. 31, l. 41; and 34, l. 37). He hopes that she will accept this little present given by a poor boy and quotes on the subject verses of Baptista Mantuanus (Mantuan) and the Disticha Catonis, two elementary schoolbooks. (Both figured, for instance, as first authors in the programme of studies of the Gouda Latin school ca. 1520; cf. P.N.M. Bot, Humanisme en Onderwijs in Nederland (Utrecht-Antwerpen, 1955), pp. 143-144).

Paul then refers to a former letter, written on St. Calixtus Day (October 14), which seems to be lost (ep. 77 was delivered to Cranevelt on 3 October). He promises to write more often in the future. His next letter to be preserved dates from December 21, 1522 (cf. Lit. Cran., 31).

Greetings from his family. He should like to see the letter written by Catharina.

[-] Paulus Meranus docto cumprimis viro Francisco Craneveldo, cognato suo suavissimo, S<alutem> P<lurimam> D<icit>.

Quid te remoratum est, cognate suavissime, quo minus me tuis lacesseris litteris? Oblitum te mei putem? Delectiorem1 me tibi esse arbitror2 quam

---

1 Paul obviously meant “Dilectiorem”, better loved.
2 “arbitror”: Paul originally started writing “abitror” but corrected himself immediately.
ut tam facile mei te caperet oblivio. An fugisse te laborem? Nec hoc quidem credere possum, tantilli laboris tedium\(^3\) cepisse te hominem, a quo nullum tempus (pulcherrimum immortalis Dei munus) aut ocio aut dishonestis studiis turpiter consumitur ac transigitur. An non fuisse qui proferrent? Nihilominus tam crebri\(^4\) enim eunt reeduntque quotidianum istuc, istinc hac cursantes, atque ut ne dicam tuum ipsius famulum secundis (ut aiunt) avibus\(^5\) huc appulisse. Denique quid memorem aut quid in causa vis esse credam?

Verum ego ubi intellexerim famulum adesse tuum, non conquievi, non defatigatus sum neque tantilli laboris me tedium cepit, quin tibi litteris mandarem hic ingentem bellum appareatum fieri; nimirum milites nostri selecti ac destinati variis bellicos armis probe instructi ac muniti secundo Novembris magni triumpho ingentis pompa exerunt, ita ut mihi scripta tibi credita periculo fieri non possint.

Sed ego Katarinam, neptem meam dilectissimam, hoc meo xenio dono ac oro ut velit grata sumere manu\(^6\), licet sit parvum; nam ut vulgato Mantuani carmine utar: “Paupere de loculo xenia parva damus”\(^7\) et Catoni, obscurus, audito dicenti [monendique] momentique: “Exiguum munus quod dat tibi pauper amicus, grata sumere manu”\(^8\).

Reor mea litteras ipso Chalixti conscriptas te acce pisse atque ne graveris, queso, me crebrioribus visere litteris\(^9\). Quid enim mihi evenire\(^10\) poiesis aut gratius aut iucondius? Prorsus nihil. Quorum enim littere conducunt et quid est earum\(^11\) munus, nisi quod\(^12\) ad parandam et alendam mutuam benevolentiam ac consuetudinem\(^13\) imprimis valent?

---

\(^3\) “tedium”: here and in the next paragraph Paulus wrote “taedium”, then changed it into “tedium.”

\(^4\) “crebri”: ante corr.: “cerebri”.


\(^6\) “grata sumere manu”: based on the expression from Catonis Disticha. See note 8.

\(^7\) Bapt. Mant., Ad Falconem libellus 2.8: “Paupere de loculo vilia dona damus” (Omnia Opera, Bologna, 1502, f. 378v). By changing “vilia” (cheap or poor [presents]) into “xenia” (gifts to a guest or a friend) Paulus introduced a metrical error. The “e” is short, but the meter demands a long syllable.


\(^9\) “litteris”: ms. litteras.

\(^10\) “evenire”: ms. evere.

\(^11\) “earum”: supra lineam, corr. pro: “epistolarum”.

\(^12\) “quod”: supra lineam.

\(^13\) “consuetudinem”: ante corr. “consuedudinem”.
LITTERAE AD CRANEVELDIUM 86-116

Uterque parens, una et preceptor et universa nostra familia plurima salute te uxoremque tuam liberosque tuos, omnem denique tuorum cetum impertit. Illam filie tue Katarine epistolam mihi abs te dari semel opto.

Vale [[tu]] tumultuarie ex aedibus paternis. Anno 1521 ipso Martini. Et me tibi totum dedico consecroque.

[[Paulus Meranus]]

A tergo: Eruditissimo viro utriusque iuris/ doctori Francisco Cran- eveldo/ cognato meo suavissimo/. BRUGIS.

Ep. 91. J. L. Vives (Louvain) to Fr. Cranevelt (Bruges)

93 (f. 116) 13 XI <1521>

A long letter from Vives, written by his amanuensis, except for the last lines, which were added by Vives himself. Vives has received two letters from Cranevelt, one carried by Cranevelt’s brother-in-law [Comelis] van Baussele, one by his trusted servant Andreas (Cf. Ep. 11: HL 41[1992], 38-39; the latter is without doubt the “famulus” mentioned in the letters 89 and 90). Vives showed Andreas his house so that he could give Cranevelt a description. The house is but small but full of interest, that is, full of books and papers.

Vives is glad that Cranevelt accepted his excuses for not writing. With a quotation from Virgil’s Eclogues, he assures him of his eternal friendship. He continues his allusion to the Eclogues by expanding on his material expectations. If omens are to be believed and trusted, wealth is waiting! On the other hand Vives has certain doubts on auguries: a soothsayer has predicted so much wealth for him that he will resemble King Midas, and when during dinner he opened Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, he read some really promising verses but he is still waiting for all this to come true. Therefore he has decided to see if [mediaeval] verses which predict riches from medicine and law are right. If that turns out to be the case, he will prefer mediaeval versifiers such as Evrard de Béthune and John of Garland to Ovid.

Cranevelt will wonder at this greed of Vives, but Vives reassures him: he has not changed. The only thing he wants is a quiet life of study, far from all futile discussions and jealousies. If he cannot obtain this merely by wishing, it is at least comforting to write about his dreams to a good and trustworthy friend. That way the situation will be more bearable for him and it will not harm Cranevelt. Nevertheless, Vives does not want to be some kind of tragic hero but rather a character from a comedy with moderate affections and a happy ending.

But enough of such complaints. In the next paragraph Vives speaks rather enigmatically about a war and about money which must be obtained. Fate must
have decided the course of war; otherwise one cannot understand what is happening. The war alluded to must be either the expedition against Tournai also mentioned two days earlier by Paulus Meranus in letter 90, or the first war between Charles V and Francis I.

Concerning the money to be claimed: did Cranevelt really think it is an easy business? It is more difficult than to take a fortress and money is harder than rock! Possibly, Cranevelt had asked Vives to collect some money (a debt?) for him at Louvain or Brussels, but we do not now the facts behind Vives’s allusive words.

Vives then passes on to another subject. He has heard that Clement (cf. ep. 87) is studying medicine energetically and at the same time working so hard on his Greek that Vives fears lest he will not be understood when consulting him in Latin in case of illness, as may well happen after the winter because he (Vives) has demanded too much of his constitution by working too hard. He has decided to moderate his way of life. Greetings to Clement, Fevynus, Laurinus and Cranevelt’s wife.

Vives furthermore announces that he may be expected on [the Sunday of] Quadragesima (that is, the beginning of Lent). In a few humorous lines Vives tells Cranevelt that, by then, he will be crammed with juridical (classical and mediaeval) learning. Moreover, he has already sent a ‘herald’ with a flag of peace after his row or war with the Faculty of Law (referred to in Lit. Bald. 7 and 9 (HL 41 [1992], 24-27 and 29-34). Although he prefers peace, he will not look for reconciliation any more if the jurists do not want it, but will satisfy himself with the ancient Romans such as Ulpian, Papinian and Paulus.

These lines are interesting for Vives’s relation with jurisprudence and the professors of the Faculty of Law. We know from other letters (Lit. Bald. 7 and 9) that he ridiculed some of the practices and professors of that Faculty (See J. IJsewijn, “Satirical Elements in the Works of J. L. Vives”, in R. de Smet [ed.], La satire humaniste [Brussels - Louvain, 1994], pp. 151-163), but we know also that he was deeply interested in law itself (cf. A. Monzon i Arazo, “Humanismo y derecho en Joan Lluís Vives”, in: Joannis Lodovici Vivis Valentini Opera omnia, I, Volumen Introductorioro, coordinado por A. Mestre [Valencia, 1992], pp. 263-316).

Under the letter Vives adds in his own handwriting that he has finished the greater part of the work asked for by Rodericus Navarretus and that he will bring it when he comes to Bruges. Rodrigo de Navarrete was a Bruges merchant, belonging to the Spanish nation. In 1523 and 1524 he was involved in financial difficulties: cf. Lit. Cran., 104. As we know his name in full from our letter, we can accept De Vocht’s identification with Rodrigo de Navarrete, mentioned in a law-suit at Bruges, March 12, 1524.

Vives Craneveldio suo S<alutem>.

Binas abs te litteras habeo. Priores reddidit mihi affinis tuus Baussellus,

1 “binas litteras”: cf. ep. 87.
2 “Baussellus”: Cornelis van Baussele; cf. Lit. Bald.,1 and 2 (HL 41[1992], 10-13); on Cranevelt’s family see Lit. Cran., p. XL-XLII.

Excusationem te meam accipere gaudeo. Sed ego mei Craneveldii obliviscar? "Ante leves pascentur in aequore cervi et freta destituent nudos in littore pisces!" Tu me edidicisse putabis Tityrum Vergilii: ita alias de caseo, nunc de cervis et piscibus, idque ex eadem aegloga.

Si ominibus est credendum, mutationem aliquam fortunae spero, quae me a caseo ad piscis et cervos ducat, hoc est, a tenui vita ad splendidiorum aliquam et copiosiorem. Quod nescio an optem, etiam si promit tente fortuna ipsa essem consecuturus. Vide quam credendum sit mihi ominibus, auguris, ἀποτελέσματα. Chaldaeus mihi quidam abhinc annos duos tam multa promisit ut cogeret me sollicitum esse usi tam effundentem se fortunam recuperem et [a] locarem, asseverans fore ut non carneus essem, sed aureus, timendumque mihi esse Midae fatum. Non ita multum post, quum forte ad mensam sederem solus etiamque famulus atque pulmentum, aperui librum Metamorphoseon Ovidii ac primum in versiculos illos incidit:

"Omnia fictilibus; post haec caelatus eodem sistitur argento crater..." (nosti reliqua), et habebam pocula omnia figlina! Quid tu qui es multo me sapientior? Non putasses ad praedictionem illam matemathici (!)
eius modi versus facere? Praesertim quum olim sortes peterentur\textsuperscript{10} ex versibus poetarum. Θήσαυρον ζητήσας\textsuperscript{11} "ανθρακας έυρηκα\textsuperscript{12}. "Ω εί γάρ μοι τά "ορη χρύσες'\textsuperscript{13} ἐκείνα\textsuperscript{14}; "Venient", inquis. Fieri potest, sed passu Callipidico\textsuperscript{15}, ut iam sim mortuus quum pervenerint. Et quod magis mirere: mathematicus dicebat astra id portendere intra sesquicursum solarem. Ter ille se iam convertit et me eodem semper reliquit loco. Idcirco statui experiri an incepta aliqua sint vera et inprimis illi versiculi: "Dat Galienus opes et sanctio Justiniana"\textsuperscript{16}, ut videam num isti verum dicent quod alii sunt mentiti. Quod si ita fuerit, Ovidio praeponam Ebrardum\textsuperscript{17} et Joannem de Garlandia\textsuperscript{18} sive Irelandia, certe tanto intervallo quanto res verbis et verum mendacio antecellit.

Mireras unde tam repens // et insueta cupiditas habendi. Si quicquam Vivi tuo credis, mi Craneveldi, non maior quam esse soleat, et frigidior quam estimare possit qui me loquentem ea de re audiat. Vin scire quae sunt illa quae efflictim\textsuperscript{19} desydero? Ociunm ad perficiendum quod institui, nempe opera studiis nec inuicunda nec (ut spero) inutilia, tum etiam nec Christo\textsuperscript{20} ingrata, vitam compositam et si quid est in rebus humanis certi, certam, tranquillam, honestam, sanctam et si hoc verbum ire sine

\textsuperscript{10} "sortes peterentur": allusion to the sortes Vergilianae, Homericae and Biblicae; cf. Lexicon der Alten Welt, (Zürich-Stuttgart, 1965), c. 2840. The best known example of this mantic practice is of course Augustine’s “tolle, lege” (Conf. VIII 12).
\textsuperscript{11} “ζητήσας”: ante corr. “ζητή[?]]σας”.
\textsuperscript{13} “τά δρη χρύσεα”: cf. Erasmus, Adagia, 1 ix 15 = 815; the expression is found in Aristoph., Acharn., 82 and in Plaut., Aul., 701; Ter., Phorm., 68; cf. Otto, Die Sprichwörter, p. 227.
\textsuperscript{14} “Θήσαυρον . . . ἐκείνα” add. Vives propria manu.
\textsuperscript{15} “passu Callipidico”: reference to Callipides, an Athenian mimic actor, who imitated the movements of a person hurrying away, without moving himself; cf. Cicero, Att., XIII 12. 3; Suet., Tib. 38; Erasmus, Adagia, I vii 43 = 543.
\textsuperscript{17} “Ebrardum”: the famous mediaeval grammarian Evrard de Béthune (d. 1212), author of a Graecismus. Modern edition by J. Wrobel (Breslau 1887; repr. Hildesheim 1987).
\textsuperscript{19} “efflictim”: ms. “efflictiti”; corr. Vives: “efflictititum”.
\textsuperscript{20} “Christo”: ms. “CHRisto”.
invidia potest, qualem ingenium meum decet, semotam a puerilibus\textsuperscript{21} ineptis, a μικρολογία\textsuperscript{22} absque invidiolis, absque obrectatiunculis, quae me plus conficiunt quam ullus studiorum labor, quod est ingenii mei pabulum saluberrimum. Si haec optando non [[venint]] veniunt, certe iuvat me de his ad te scripsisse et affectus desyderiaque mea in sinum tanti tamque synceri amici effudisse ac velut partem nonnullam oneris, quo premitur cor meum, in animum tuum inclinasse, praesertim quum illud mihi hoc modo futurum sit levius et tibi nihil hinc accedat grave praeter commiserationem amici. Non quia velim unus ex heroibus tragi

fici sericatus vel auratus: mallem comicus mediocri amicitias panno, temperatis affectibus, sine ferro et cruore, laeta totius fabulæ catastro
phe\textsuperscript{23}. Verum illud est omnium sapientiss<imum> et (ut puto) verissimum, arbitrari semper quae a Deo\textsuperscript{24} fiunt, esse meliora quam quae nos optamus: quae [[in]] una est mea ceu sacra\textsuperscript{25} in tempestatibus anchora.

Allea μεμψεων "άλις\textsuperscript{26}: de bello ἐπεκλωσόμενα\textsuperscript{27} πάντα\textsuperscript{28}, alioqui non possent haec fieri, quae videmus agi adverso flumine, velut coactis mortalium animis vi quadam superiore.

De pecunia exprimenda: hanc tu artem existimaras de postremis? Quasi vero non huc maiores sint admovendae machinae et crebriores quam obsidionem quantumvis munitæ arcis, et non fortius sit aes ipsum quibusvis saxis.

Asclepius est (ut audio) cum Claemente totus: vereor ne nobis fiat Ἄσκλεπιος\textsuperscript{29} et salutandus sit Graece etiam in civitate Latina, Albutius\textsuperscript{30} ille Lucillianus; precor Deum, ut vel ille ne dediscat Latine vel ego discam melius Graece, quo possim ei morbum meum aperire, si quando

\textsuperscript{21} "puerilibus": ms. "pueribus".
\textsuperscript{22} "μικρολογία": add. Vives.
\textsuperscript{23} "catastrophe": ante corr. "catastrophae".
\textsuperscript{24} "a Deo": ms. "adeo".
\textsuperscript{25} "ceu sacra": ante corr.: "consacra".
\textsuperscript{26} "άλλα μεμψεων "άλις": add. Vives; add. Cranevelt in margine: "sed quarelerarum satis".
\textsuperscript{27} "ἐπεκλωσόμενα": ante corr. "ἐπεκλοσόμενα" (the correct form would be "ἐπικλωσόμενα"); We wonder if Vives did not intend to write an aorist form (ἐπικλωσόμενα), because a future makes hardly sense in the text. Cranevelt added a Latin explanation in the margin: "fatis disposita et dictum a Clotho ἐπικλωθήθω, id est, colum fusum, et refer ad fatum".
\textsuperscript{28} "ἐπεκλωσόμενα πάντα": add. Vives.
\textsuperscript{29} "Ἀσκλέπιος": add. Vives.
aegrotaro. Quod subvereor ne post hyemem contingat; usque adeo me immodicis operis nunc eneco. Sed statui temperare mihi et de conatu atque intentione31 non parum remittere, ut sim posthac aliis quoque laboribus tolerandis, ne effoetus // fiam unice foetu egesto.

Tu illum mihi salutabis, si quando sui copiam tibi faciet, simul et Fevinum dulcissimum nostrum, cui nil dubito te ostensurum hasce litteras, quas velim putet scriptas quoque ad se. Laurino s<alutem> et co-niugi optimae cum charissimis pignoribus.

Vale, mi Craneveldi candidissime, et expecta me ad Quadragesima nihil aliud crepantem quam mera digesta32, codices, institutiones, glossulas, Bartolos, Baldos, Accursios33 quibus iam misi caduceatorem ut amicitiam ineamus. Quid post bellum inter me et illos tam atrociiter gestum dicturi aut facturi sint, nescio. Ego caduceatorem34 meum expecto; qui si renunciarit illos vel mussare vel dies aliquot ad deliberandum petere vel animos mihi subiratos prae se ferre, et non primo quoque tempore oblatam fuerint amicitiam [[ample]] complexati (vide quam ferox sum!), statui nullum posthac facere de reconciliacione verbum et, illi si fecerint, non admittere. Satis mihi fuerit, si cum Ulpianis illis et Papianiis et Paulis mihi conveniat iterum. Vale. Lovanii XIII Novemb<ris>. 

(Vives add. propria manu)
Roderico Navarreto nostro dices me confecisse bonam partem eius operis quod est a me precatus; allaturum mecum Brugas quum eo ibo. Ei salutem pl<urimam>.

A tergo: D<omino> Francisco Craneveldio / iurisconsulto amico inte-gerr<imo>/.

Brugis.

31 “intentione” : ms.: “intentionem”.
32 “Digesta, codices, institutiones” are the codes and the handbook of classical Roman law.
33 “glossulas, Bartolos, Baldos, Accursios”: allusions to the famous mediaeval law books and authors at whom Vives repeatedly poked fun. See his Aedes Legum and Lit. Bald., 9 (see n.7 and 12).
34 “caduceatorem”: ante corr.: “caduciatorem”.
This letter is an answer to a (lost) letter of Cranevelt in which the latter had reacted to the first part of letter 78 (HL 43[1994], 56-58) written by Curtius on 24 September and received by Cranevelt on 3 October.

The date, or rather the position of the letter in the bundle, presents a problem. The letter is clearly dated on the feast of St. Luke, which is on 18 October, but in the bundle it is found after letter 91 of 13 November and even after letter 89 from the same Curtius, dated November 20. We do not know the date of Cranevelt’s answer to letter 78 but the lapse of time between 3 and 18 October is long enough for a letter from Bruges to have been delivered to Curtius at Louvain. At the end of his letter Curtius announces the recent publication of Erasmus’s Apology in response to Jacobus Lopis Stunica [Diego López Zúñiga]. That book was printed by Dirk Martens at Louvain in September and published before 10 October, barely a week before Curtius’s letter. On the other hand Curtius does not mention Erasmus’s departure to Basel, which happened on 28 October. It seems, therefore, that Cranevelt misplaced this letter in his collection (the folio number does not leave any doubt as to its position) or that the letter was delivered very late. Unfortunately, this time Cranevelt did not mark the day of receipt.

Another, less likely, explanation would be that Curtius erroneously wrote “die festo Lucae” instead of “die festo Luciae”, which is on December 13. In that case the position of the letter in the bundle is right.

The contents of the letter are rather philosophical. Curtius begins with a discussion of the ideas expressed by Cranevelt in his last letter, ideas with which he partly agrees: it would be nice if one could see the thoughts of other people, but that is utterly impossible. Curtius does not agree, however, when Cranevelt says that little profit could be gained from such a possibility. If one could truly and reliably know the inner man from his outward appearance, from his words or looks or public reputation, there would be gain in that, but it is in fact not possible. We can never be sure about someone’s friendship and we may well choose a deadly enemy as our most trusted friend. Great care and prudence are needed in this matter. Cicero’s ideal friendship is unworlidy or at the least something more suited to Plato’s Republic. Curtius sides rather with Bias (one of the seven wise men of Greece), who warned of the need to remember that present love may be turned into future hatred.

News from Louvain: Erasmus has now published an answer to Stunica’s attacks. It is to be hoped that in this conflict Erasmus will be as successful as he was against Lee. Both these adversaries are of very much the same kind.

Stunica or Diego López Zúñiga (d. 1531) was a Spanish theologian who studied at Salamanca. Well versed in Greek and Hebrew, he was invited to work on the Complutensian Polyglot Bible. From 1517 onwards he launched several severe attacks on Erasmus’s edition of the New Testament (CE II, pp. 348-349). The Responsio by Erasmus, mentioned in the letter, is the Apologia respondens ad ea quae Jacobus Lopis Stunica taxaverat in prima dumtaxat Novi Testamenti
aeditione, printed by Dirk Martens at Louvain in September and published before 10 October 1521. See the critical edition by H. J. de Jonge, in ASD IX — 2, p. 49, §VI.

Salve, doctissime Craneveldi. Scribis tuis proximis literis elegantissimis quidem illis et philosophicis plane, dignisque Craneveldio, scribis inquam, cum Momo optari posse ut cogitatus hominum nobis vel solo intuitu intra praecordia etiamdum inclusi innotescant; ceterum optari frustra, quandoquidem id fieri non possit. Hactenus tecum sentio. Quod autem addis parum allaturum emolumenti, etiam si maxime id fiat, mihi certe non probatur (licebit enim cum tua bona venia modestae disputatio grafa abs te dissentire). Nam quis erit qui non comperid existimabit homines intus noscere et in cute? Quis non deputabit in lucro non falli, sed nec falli posse in deligendo amico [(cum)] quocum2 iocos seriaque omnia communices? Id vero quo pacto assqueutis ut falli non possis, ni pectus penitus possis intraspicer? Quod enim verbis fidas aut fronti aut fame publice, securum omnino futurus si hec tuo veto respondenter, stultissimum est. Meministi namque scriptum esse: “Omnis homo mendax”3 et fronti nulla fides4. Scis item plurimos esse Silenos, non eos Alcibiadaceos, sed diversos atque his contrarios5. Porro quantum fame aut mobili vulgo in eiusmodi6 censura defferendum sit, Seneca definit, dum spectum haberis iubet quicquid vulgo placet7, nempe cu semper pessimia pro optimis placuerunt. Itaque vides nil posse statui certi sine hac, quam memoravimus8, cogitatum inspectione in his rebus quas non sine gravii pecurlo ignoramus. Ob istius carentiam9 fit

1 “Momo”: allusion to the story of Momus criticising the structure of the human body mentioned by Curtius in the first paragraph of letter 78 on the basis of Erasmus’s Adage 474. See HL, 43 (1994), p. 57, note 3.
2 “cum”: add. supra lineam.
4 Compare Martial, I 24.4: “Nolito fronti credere”.
5 A clear allusion to Erasmus’s Adage III iii 1 = 2201, Sileni Alcibiadiis (ASD II 5, pp. 158-190), one of the most famous essays in the collection. In the classical tradition Silenus was the ugly, drunken and lascivious tutor of Bacchus, but the Sileni of Alcibiades in the humanistic tradition originating from Giovanni Pico della Mirandola were statuettes of that old Silenus with rare and precious jewels inside. See the first lines of the adage: “Sileni Alcibiadiis apud eruditos in proverbium abiisse videntur..., quo licebit uti... de homine, qui habuit vulitque longe minus praes se ferat quam in animo claudat”.
6 “eiusmodi”: Curtius corretix pro “eiusdi”.
8 “memoravimus”: ms. “memoravius”. It is an allusion to his former letter 78.
9 “carentiam”: a typically scholastic word, in Antiquity only used in philosophical treatises and commentaries on Aristotle. Cf. Th. L. L., III c. 448.
aliquoties ut amicum deligamus non redamantem, immo vero interdum et in mortem nostram machinantem. Hinc circumspectissimus Bias\textsuperscript{10} monuit: “Ama, inquit, tamquam aliquando osurus”, ne videlicet, si omnia illi committas quae tibi vel commodo vel exitio esse possint, is omnia tibi in perniciem adducat. Scio reclamare huic dicto Ciceronem tamquam vero amicitie toxico\textsuperscript{11}; verum advertendum eciam atque eciam describi, fingi atque [[optari]] proponi\textsuperscript{12} potius illic a Cicerone amicitiam quandam supramundanam\textsuperscript{13} aut forte Reipublice Platonis\textsuperscript{14} quam eam, que communes deceat homines aut saltem reperiri possit pro corrupto hoc seculo, qualem\textsuperscript{15} Fabius suum describit oratorem\textsuperscript{16}.

Exiit\textsuperscript{17} nunc bonis avibus \textit{Responsio D. Erasmi ad Stunicam}, que quam illius traducid impudentiam, arrogantiam pariter et inscitiam non attinet commemorare. Spes est non minus infeliciter conatus illius successuros quam praecedentes successere Leici\textsuperscript{18}. Nam ita alteri alter similis est, ut deieres vel ab eodem preceptore utrumque vel ab altero alterum artem hanc didicisse sycophanticam.

Bene vale cum tua dulciss<ima> coniuge et me D<omino> Fевinο, si non graveris, commenda.

Lovanii, die festo Lucae.

Tibi tuisque devotiss<imus> P<etrus> Curtius.

\textit{A tergo}: Rara eruditione ac civilitate / conspicuo viro, Magistro Francisco / Craneveldio, iuris utriusque doctori / et oppidi Brugensis primo./

Brugis.

\textsuperscript{10} Bias: cf. Arist., \textit{Rhet.} B 13- 1389 b 23; Cic., \textit{Amic.}, 59 (which must be Curtius’s source as he probably did not understand much Greek).

\textsuperscript{11} “amicitie toxico”: cf. Cic., \textit{Amic.}, 59, where Scipio is said to have rejected this statement of Bias: “negabat ullam vocem inimiciorum amicitiae potuisse reperiri”.

\textsuperscript{12} “proponi”: supra lineam.


\textsuperscript{14} “Reipublice Platonis”: proverbial for an ideal political state.

\textsuperscript{15} “qualem”: ante corr.; “quo modo”.

\textsuperscript{16} cf. Quint., \textit{Inst.}, I, pr., 9-10: “Oratorem autem instituimus illum perfectum, qui esse nisi vir bonus non potest...”.

\textsuperscript{17} “exiit”: ante corr. “exiet”.

\textsuperscript{18} The English theologian Edward Lee, who the year before had published in Paris his \textit{Annotationum libri duo} against Erasmus’s New Testament; cf. CE II, pp. 311-314 and \textit{Lit. Bald.}, 82 (HL, 43 [1994], 62-63).
Ep. 93. Th. More (Chelsea) to Fr. Cranevelt (Bruges)

95 (f.118) 12 XI <1521>

More has received a letter from Cranevelt which is altogether worthy of its author. When he returned from Bruges, he found his family safe and sound, although a pestilence was raging in the vicinity. However, he caught the tertian fever himself, but is recovering now and is almost recovered. Greetings from his family to Cranevelt and from More to Cranevelt’s wife.

The war, More observes, is causing distress to Cranevelt’s country. He hopes that someday princes will be wise enough to be content with a land that is more than large enough for ten of them. Weariness of war, he hopes, may bring peace soon. Greetings.

More is referring to the war between Charles V and Francis I of France, which began in 1521 when Robert de la Marck, Lord of Sedan, started the hostilities at the instigation of Francis I. A first attempt by Henry of Nassau to seize Mézières was unsuccessful. Maybe More hints at this lack of success. Fortune turned when Charles V took Tournai in December 1521. More’s hope for peace was not fulfilled: the hostilities ended only in 1529 with the Treaty of Cambrai. See on these events: Algemene Geschiedenis der Nederlanden, first edition, 4 (Utrecht e. a., 1952), pp. 68-71.

The text of this letter together with a facsimile and an English translation has been published by CI. H. Miller, “Thomas More’s Letters to Frans van Cranevelt”, Moreana XXXI 117 (March 1994), 3-66 (pp. 24-26). Correct “Bellam” (recte: Bellum) in line 7 and “lus” (recte: plus) in line 9).

Accepi, mi Craneveldi, nuper abs te litteras tui piane simillimas, hoc est, optimas et amantissimas ac piane litteratissimas. Incolonis reversus meos omnes incolens reperti, quamquam undique grassante pestilentia. Deum precor ut id velit esse diuturnum. Ipse statim a reditu incidi in tercianam, sed nunc incipio revalescere ac pene revalui. Mea schola tota1 te salutai. Tu dominam et uxorem nostram salutato. Bellum istud, ut video, vos non admodum belle tractat. Precor aliquando sanam mentem principibus saltem hactenus ut velit2 quilibet unus esse3 tanta ditione contentus quanta plus satis esset decem. Sed pacem brevi spero vel belli tedium feret.

Vale, mi Craneveldi, quo nunquam mihi sodalis obtig[i]t quisquam charior. In rusculo meo4 prope Londinum, XII die Novembris.

1 More’s children and wards who were educated at his home, first at the Barge in Bucklersbury (in the middle of London), later at Chelsea. See R. W. Chambers, Thomas More (London 1935; repr. 1963), p. 169). We thank R. Truman for this reference.
2 “velit”: ante corr. “velitit”.
3 “esse”: supra lineam.
4 “rusculo meo”: identified by H. de Vocht as More’s residence at Chelsea; cf. Lit. Cran., 262, l.15.
A tergo: Viro ornatissimo et amico longe charissimo domino Francisci Craneveldii urbi Brugensi a consiliis / Brugis.

Ep. 94. John Clement (Bruges or Louvain?) to Fr. Cranevelt (Bruges).

96 (f. 119) XII <1521>

A short letter from John Clement (on whom see Ep. 87), the right margin of which has been lost with, possibly, considerable loss of text. From what we do possess, it appears that Cranevelt had lent his Suda [Suidas] and his copy of the Epistolae Graece elegantissimae (see also letter 99!) to Clement who, as we know, was an ardent student of Greek. Clement wants to repay his debt for having kept the books so long by adding some remarks on the notes, made apparently by Cranevelt himself, in the margin of his books. The rest of the letter contains a short list of Greek phrases from Philostratus’s Epistolae together with a Latin translation or paraphrase.

This letter is an interesting document in several respects. First, it seems to be the very first letter in Clement’s hand to be found; next, it throws light on the study of Greek in the humanistic circles in Bruges: it appears that Cranevelt was interested in such uncommon texts as the Suda lexicon and the Epistolae of Flavius Philostratus [II] (2nd-3rd centuries A.D.). These Epistolae are the first part of an anthology of Greek letters printed by Dirk Martens at Louvain in 1520. Cf. Catalogue Dirk Martens 1473-1973 (Aalst 1973), p. 283, M201.

The first edition of Philostratus’s letters was published in Venice 1499. Letter 1 of Martens’s selection — one of the texts excerpted by Clement — can be found among the Epistolae of Philostratus until the Olearius edition of Leipzig 1709. It was eliminated from the editions of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (K. L. Kayser, Zürich, 1844; R. Hercher, Paris 1873 and A. R. Benner — Fr. H. Fobes, London — Cambridge Mass. 1949).

One cannot be sure where Clement’s letter was written, but it was more probably at Bruges than at Louvain. Against the surmise of De Vocht (Lit. Cran., p. 425), given as a certainty in CE I, p. 311, that Clement came to Louvain before Erasmus left for Basel on 28 October, it is now absolutely clear that Clement was still in Bruges in the early days of November (See Epp. 87 and 91 written by Vives on 2 and 13 November). On 9 January 1522, however, Vives explicitly mentions that Clement is at the university: “Clementem habemus hic et ornat
hanc cacademiam sua praesentia". (Ep. 96, p. 32). Probably Clement returned Cranevelt’s books on the eve of his departure to Louvain, sometime in December.

The fact that Clement arrived at Louvain about two months after Erasmus’s departure explains a passage in Vives’s letter to Erasmus from 19 January 1522 (Allen 1256) in which he says that Clement was sorry that Erasmus had left without his knowledge. If Clement had been at the University on 28 October he would have witnessed his departure. It also explains Vives’s last remark in letter 96 about Eucollius’s not having sent him a letter through Clement.

We indicate with a slanting stroke (/) where the broken off lines of the letter end.

Rermitto tibi, d<omine> Crannielli, et Suidam tuum et Epistolas, quas nuper abs te commodato accepi. Et ne gratis tanto tempore [tuis libris carueris, tibi adnotavi] / quae mihi ex notulis illis marginaris non satis exacte tenere videris.

Διεσκέφθαι mea sententia significat "expendisse aut [explorasse. oίδε μηδέν οντες όπότε εἰσίν] / τίνες ἂν εἶχεν, ὅποτ’ οὔκ εἰσίν": at quae nihil habent momenti dum sunt, quenaem ea futura putes cum non fuerint.

"Ωσπέρ ἄνεσχεν ἕκ τῶν[ ] / τὸ πυρὸν ἄντι δάδων[ ]: roae spiculorum loco spinas gerunt, facularum vice ignem quiddam.

"Οπωρα καὶ ἐπιδημία[ ] nescio[ ]./ Ubi primum te conven ero, declarabo. [[An]] Tunc videlicet et reliquos duos scrutulos fortasse tibi eximam, de quibus nihil iam dico, qu[ia.... .Vale].

Joannes Clemen[s]
Decembris an[ni 1521]
Ep. 95. Guilielmus Zagarus (Ghent) to Fr. Cranevelt (Bruges)

97 (f. 120) 21 XII <1521>

Zagarus had received a letter from Cranevelt accusing him of bad faith because he had not returned a book which he had promised not to take with him to Zealand. Zagarus explains that he is not to blame: when he was about to leave, Frans Zandijck, a distant relative of Cranevelt, had asked to borrow the book which he wanted to copy, and promised to return it immediately afterwards to Cranevelt through another relative, Willem Henovliet. Zagarus refused the request and entrusted the book to Geldenhouwer, who was to bring it to Cranevelt. Geldenhouwer, however, gave it to Zandijck, against Zagarus’s wish, with the argument that he would be pleasing Cranevelt twice, viz. by returning the book and giving the latter an opportunity to meet a relative. To set the situation straight Zagarus is sending now his brother to Cranevelt in his own place to give back the book in perfect condition.

Guilielmus Zagarus or Willem Zagere, probably from Goes (Zealand), studied in Louvain (matriculated 1507; M.A. 1510) under Hadrianus Barlandus in the Paedagogium Porci (the Arts college “Het Varken”) and became town pensionary and rector of the Latin school in Zierikzee (Zealand). He may be the same person as a namesake, known to Erasmus, who in 1533 was imperial councillor in Frisia and who died in Leeuwarden on 4 December 1538 (CE III, p. 467).

Zagarus turns up once as correspondent of Cranevelt in Lit. Cran., 147, written at Zierikzee on 29 March 1525. Furthermore, his countryman Jacobus Zovitius dedicated his play Ruth (1533) to him. Finally, it appears from the present letter that Zagarus already knew Geldenhouwer before 1522, when he met him at Zierikzee (Lit. Cran., p. 403 ad 147).

The secretary, “Franciscus Zandicus [Zantdyck] noster”, figures in exactly the same words also in Lit. Cran., 147. He was town secretary of Zierikzee in 1525. The relative Wilhelmus Alexandri de Henovliet could be the same as the ‘Wilhelmus filius Alexandri de Henvliet’ who matriculated as ‘minorenxis’ at Louvain, July 10, 1504, together with his brothers Johannes and Cornelius. See Matricule de l’Universite de Louvain, III, p. 277, n. 89. Another possible relative, Petrus Johannes de Henovliet, matriculated at Louvain in 1505 (Matricule, p. 297, n. 218). There is no reference to Wilhelmus Alexandri in the rest of Cranevelt’s correspondence.

Vir optime, D<omine> Francisce Crane<ve>lidi, accepi epistolam tuam, qua me malae fidei insimulas. Quod ego fore non dubitaram, tametsi effugere conabar sedulo. Verum sum extra noxam, et culpa plector aliena.

Dederas tu librum commodato mihi stipulatus ne eum mecum una in Zelandiam veherem. Spopondi1 ego. Verum sub abitum meum, dum

---

1 “spopondi”: ms. “spepondi”.

This content downloaded from 201.153.243.100 on Wed, 28 Mar 2018 20:32:15 UTC
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meam liberare fidem volo, interpellat me Franciscus Zandicus noster a secretis, ut sibi eum accommodem, curaturum se exscribendum, deinde remittendum per quendam suum consobrinum Guilielmum Alexandri Henovlieti filium, tibi ex matre sua consanguineum. Nihil impetrat tamen a me Franciscus. Adest forte Gerardus Noviomagus noster. Is librum a me accipit ut ad te ferat. Bene habent tibi hec principia. At Gerardus ut est facilis in amicos omnes et adversum te fide opt<ima>, me ludens Francisco nostro librum tradit meque adeo invito; dumque repugno, aiunt duplicem redituram gratiam, si tibi hoc praestem, uti hac occasione quem dixi tuum consanguineum Guilielmum agnoscas et ille te. Ita scilicet ego male fidei insimulor et tu tuo frustraris libello. Verum, mi Craneveldi, si quid peccatum est, ignosce. Ego hac una caussa fratrem meum ad te mittio ut mihi placeras, librumque tuum integrum, salvum, sarctum tectum² ad te remitto.

Bene vale. Ex Gandavo, duodecimo Calendarias.

Toto pectore tuus Guilie<lus> Zagar<us>.

A tergo: Doctiss<imo> simul ac humaniss<imo> / viro D<omino> Francisco Craneveldio, / U<triusque> I<uris> Doctori, Urb<ii> Brug<en>si / a consiliis prudentiss<imo>.

Ep. 96. J. L. Vives (Louvain) to Fr. Cranevelt (Bruges).

98 (f. 121) 6 and 9 I 1522.

A long letter from Vives, written by his secretary on three pages of a bifolium with a last sentence, added three days later in Vives’s own hand.

First Vives reacts to a supposed irritation of Cranevelt, transmitted by Fevynus, because Vives has not been writing much. He says that he is not seeking excuses for the future and that in the past he spoke when it was possible.

Vives received a rather long letter from Cranevelt (which has not been preserved), which did not please him at all. As if it were not enough that I had bad luck, he explains (with an allusion to the death of his patron De Croy), now Fate is also soliciting my good friends. He himself has experienced the dark side of high life [so we interpret the term “Magnificentia” used by Vives]. It makes him think of a word of Socrates in Plato’s Phaedo [70d-e] about how

² Cp. Cic., Verr. II i.131: “Monumentum..., quamvis sartum tectum integrumque esset”. The spelling “sartum” is erroneous and under the influence of the infinitive “sarcire”.
different something can be from its origins. So people who are now mean had splendid forbears.

Vives must be alluding to some problems Cranevelt seems to have had with the authorities in Bruges. Some advice he gave his friend further down in this letter points in the same direction. We do not know the precise nature of these problems, but they probably added to Cranevelt’s decision to leave Bruges before the end of the year.

His friend’s problems bring Vives to gloomy reflections on the difficult times now that war is raging and none can survive except a bloodthirsty robber. There is not much hope for improvement as long as the princes are young and rash (an allusion to the age of the two adversaries, Charles V [aged 21] and Francis I [aged 27]), and their counsellors not wiser. On this war see the introduction to letter 93.

There is no mention of peace whatsoever, Vives continues; there is only devastation, plunder and blind annihilation. Victorious will not be he who has beaten his enemy but he who is not altogether lost and ruined. They are fighting like blind men, trying to hurt the adversary without thinking of themselves. Both parties are just devastating each other’s country. Vives has heard that Charles V has collected a band of black devils [“nigrorum cacodaemonum”] to be sent against France as wolves into a flock, and the French terror is equally brutal. The cruelty on both sides is such that one cannot believe it is a war among Christians or even human beings, for that matter, but against wild beasts.

Under these circumstances neither Cranevelt nor any good man can choose his fortune, which does not offer itself easily in time of war. One has to take and to keep it as it comes, and wait for better times to carry out honest and wise purposes. Fortune is a grudging partner even in peace, but in war it despises every wisdom and virtue. Vives who is of less wisdom than Cranevelt cannot advise him anything except to use his forensic position and not to take a hasty decision. Time will be our best guide, as Thales said; besides Vives is hoping that Cranevelt’s astrologer will prove as unreliable as his own (an allusion to a passage in Vives’s letter 91 of 13 September).

Vives continues his sad musings on fortune and virtue by regretting that there is no proper and stimulating reward for virtue. His countrymen have discovered so many islands rich with gold and jewels (an allusion to the Spanish conquistadores); if there were one island without gold, fortune or tyranny, Vives would travel to it braving every sea and peril. It is unbearable that fortune should have power not only over wealth, but also over fame, virtue and our own selves. Which god decided thus? Vives feels the urge to exclaim with the ancient sages: “If there is a God, whence then comes the evil? If there is none, where from the good?”

Some people demand fifty million for squandering and living luxuriously, and they get it! You ask eight thousand to live honestly with your wife and to educate your children, and you do not obtain it! If God arranges this, he must be angry, as some lunatic said in Quintilian.

At this point Vives feels that he has gone too far. Am I myself a lunatic, he asks. Certainly, there is no such thing as fortune except God, who knows that virtue will be rewarded not here but in eternity. What we call good or evil
depends on false judgments. Good is only good for good men and evil for evil men; the decision as to who will be rich and who poor is God’s, and he does not want us to know why, only to reverence it. Wealth will make the evil man even less excusable, poverty makes the good one yet more gracious. Vives would accept wealth only to do good with it; if he cannot find riches, he will consider his virtue as purified and rendered more manly thereby.

Fevinus has at last written to Vives, twice even. His style is excellent and Cranevelt may tell him so. Maybe there has been some irritation on Feynus’s side. It seems that he believed that Vives did not think much of his stylistic qualities. But Feynus should know better and there is no reason to quarrel. Although he is busy, Vives will write him a letter as soon as he has finished the present one.

Clement is in Louvain and is an ornament to the ‘academy’, as Vives writes jokingly. If he should depart there would be no element of erudition left there. In Louvain only mediocrity prevails. Most humanists there content themselves with one or two poems, three words of Greek and a very short letter from Erasmus’s or Politian’s collection instead of striving at a level of erudition which they do not regard as greatly different from insanity, identifying erudition with drunkenness and preferring to get drunk with wine or beer rather than with literary studies. Speaking of wine, they are feeling the inconveniences of war. There is plenty of local wine but it is a kind of a miracle because here vinegar is turned into wine. How often he has got the gripes in these days! He will never more drink the Louvain wine and from now keep only to barley-water. He prefers to be healthy than to write immortal poems [under the influence of wine].

Up until the end of the 16th Century wine was produced in Louvain, but its quality, which was never very high, deteriorated because of the climate growing colder. On the slopes on the northern and western part of the city, inside the town walls where the grapes were grown, a building for a wine press, owned by the St. Gertrude Abbey and dating from the 16th century, is still to be seen; cf. Arca Lovaniensis 7: “De beste Stad van Brabant”. Deel I: Geschiedenis van het stadsgewest Leuven tot 1600, samengesteld door R. van Uytven (Leuven 1980), p. 146-153.

In closing, Vives asks Cranevelt not to take it badly if he writes less frequently while he is finishing his commentary on Augustine’s City of God: his time is spent on this activity for the benefit of all scholars, if there is any use in his endeavours at all.

Greetings to all: Cranevelt’s wife, Laurinus and Eucollius (Fevinus is not mentioned). Vives is wondering why Eucollius did not send him a letter by way of Clement.

Jo<annes> Lodo<vicus> Vives Fran<cisco> Craneveldio Suo S<alutem>.

Quid est, mi Craneveldi humaniss<ime>, quod Fevinus scribit mirari te [[quod]] nihil a me vobis scribi, qui soleo esse diligentiss<imus>? Quaeso te, non excusavi futurum silentium, et cum licebat, locutus sum, ne tacenti esset unde succenseres. Quod si meminiisti, duo [[abste]] abs
te precor: alterum mirari uti desinas, alterum ut huius intermissionis officii facias mihi gratiam.


Pacis nulla mentio; imo illud animo videtur uterque obstinasse, perdere aut se aut alterum. Profecto nimis est illud etymon "Mavortis" verum: "magna ipsum verte". Quem futurum hisce rebus spermus, nisi novum et caeteris fere bellum speramus, ut quorum uterque alterius8 opes satis attriverit, is deum sit superior, non qui inimicus vicerit. Nam mutuo non concurrunt caeci ut modo adversarium feriant, rationem sui non habeant. Populantur Galli agrum huius; hic vicissim, qui Galliam vastent, emittit. Melius forsan sperarem si, quod potius et certe natura prius est, uterque domum suam ab iniuria defenderet, antequam invaderet alienam. Nunc narrant mihi comparatam nescio quam manum nigrorum cacodaemonum9, ut in Galliam

---

1 "τοιούτων": ante corr. "τοιον".
2 [τι]: sive [ή].
3 read "κατεπείγετ": the error may be due either to inadvertence or to Vives's ignorance.
4 cf. Plato, Phaedo, 70d-e: οὗτοι γίγνεται πάντα, οὐκ ἀλλοθεν ἢ ἐκ τῶν ἐννυτιῶν τὰ ἐννυτια.
5 "non": supra lineam.
6 "εἰς κόρακας" is a classical proverbial phrase found in Aristophanes's Nubes 133 and Plutus 394 and 604; cf. Erasmus, Adagia, II, i, 96 = 1096. The pun with κόλακας does not seem to occur in Greek literature.
7 "Mavortis magna ipsum verte": cf. Cic., Nat. deor. II 67.
8 "alterius": ante corr. "alteris (?)".
9 The word "cacodaemon" ("devil") was commonly used in Vives's time for black people. See, for instance, Clenardus's reports on life in Evora, Portugal: "Verum ubi primum ingressus sum Eboram, putabam me venisse in civitatem aliquam cacodaemonum. Tot ubique occurrebant Aethiopes...". (Letter 24 [ed. A. Roersch], I, 248-250, of 26 March 1535).
immittatur ceu lupi\textsuperscript{10} in gregem. Contra alterum illum magnos ubique delectus habere, \textit{[ut]} incendia, caedes, rapinas, vastitatem huic terrae minitantem. Putes istos non dico cum christianis, sed nec cum hominibus rem gerere. Quae pararentur in feras civitatisbus infestas atrociora?

In tam aspera conditione temporum, nec tibi, mi Craneveldi, nec cuiquam bono viro eligenda est fortuna. Nam non se tam facilem illa inter tot armatos prebet, sed qualscumque oblata mordicus etiam arripienda retinendaque, dum mutatis in melius occasionibus bono et prudenti viro pronius est exequi honeste ac sapienter cogitata. Fortuna enim, quum sedatis tranqullisse rebus non omnino volens libensque rectiora consilia comitatur, tum vero si Mars concutere omnia coeperit, probatìs, // sapientiae, sanitatis omnis est inimica, totam se in Martis sinum effundit inter arma et stoliditatem. Quo circa, mi Craneveldi, quum tu sis consilio tam uberi nec minus efficaci, inepte fecerim, si tibi quicquam consulueram. Tantum admonebo forensem hominem, ut loco in quo quotidie versarist, uti scias; nihil statuas subitum; tempus, ut dicebat Thales\textsuperscript{11} magistrum fore optimum quid erit in se agendum. Nam mathematicus tuus tam erit, ut spero, mendax, quam meis fuit.

Illud vehementer dolendum est deesse virtuti premia non dico sua (nam ea infinita sunt et quae ab hominibus proferi non queunt), sed qualscumque certa alimenta quibis sustentatur\textsuperscript{12}. O si, ut multas inveniunt nostrates insulas, in quibus aurum nascitur, gemmæ passim inveniuntur, esset aliqua, in qua nec auri nomen nec fortunae vis ac tyrannis esset! Quam libens illam ego pro mille peterem maria, per mille pericula! Valere fortunam in opes, dominari, saevire in eas, forsae esset tolerable, at licere illi tantum in famam et gloriam, in corpora nostra, in virtutem quoque ipsam, hoc quis deorum statuit? Rapi me impetus exclaimandi cum antiquis illis sapientibus: “Si Deus est, unde mala? si non est, unde bona?”\textsuperscript{13}

Petit ille HS quinquages, ut edat, ut potet, ut vestiatur luxuriosissime, ut transigat aetatem totam inter scurras, scorta, canes, tesseras, chartas lusorias\textsuperscript{14}, nec videat solem multis diebus neque diem, circumdatus

\textsuperscript{10} “lupi”: ante corr. “lupos”. The image may be a reversal of the biblical phrase (Mt. X 16): “Mitto vos sicut oves in medio luporum”.
\textsuperscript{11} cf. Diog. Laert. , I 35 (σοφώτατον χρόνος ἁνευρίσκει γὰρ πάντα); Erasmus, \textit{Adagia} II, iv, 17 = 1317.
\textsuperscript{12} “sustentatur”: ante corr.: “sustent (?), deinde: sustentatu (?)”, denique sustentatur (?)” paene illegibile.
\textsuperscript{13} “sapientibus”: we have not been able to trace this quotation.
\textsuperscript{14} “lusorias”: supra lineam.
spurciss<imis> voluptatibus, et impetrat!15 Petis tu octo millia num-
nummum16 ut castissime et frugaliss<ime> alas pudicissimam coniugem,
modestiss<imos> liberos, studia tua honestiss<ima> atque sanctiss<ima>,
et non consequeris! Haec si Deus iubet, iratus est, ut inquit ille apud
Quintilianum phanaticus.17

Sed quo rapior? Sumne et ego phanaticus? Profecto fortuna nulla est
nisi Deus, qui scit nulla esse virtuti in hac vita premia, in altera repensu-
rum se copiosissime. Haec quae nos bona dicimus, quae mala, corruptis
iudiciis sic appellari; sola bona virtutes esse, sola mala vicia. Reliqua
quae bona dicimus, bonis bona sunt, malis mala. Consilia eius, cur hi
opulenti sint, illi secus, uní sibi vult esse explorata. Caeteros admira-
tores, non conscios statuit. Et malum virum inexcusabilem reddunt divi-
tiae, et bonum gratiosiorem, quam paupertate sit virtus exercita. Haec
sentire, sic sapere et loqui decet homines ex puriorre illa et sublimiore
Christiana philosophia.

Quibus de causis et rationibus si contigerint mihi divitiae, non illas
reiiciam, sed vertam in instrumentum virtutum; sin me fuerint asper-
natae, existimabo puriorem esse, sola mala vicia. Haec quae bona dicimus, quae mala, corruptis
iudiciis sic appellari; sola bona virtutes esse, sola mala vicia. Reliqua
quae bona dicimus, bonis bona sunt, malis mala. Consilia eius, cur hi
opulenti sint, illi secus, uní sibi vult esse explorata. Caeteros admira-
tores, non conscios statuit. Et malum virum inexcusabilem reddunt divi-
tiae, et bonum gratiosiorem, quam paupertate sit virtus exercita. Haec
sentire, sic sapere et loqui decet homines ex puriorre illa et sublimiore
Christiana philosophia.

Scripsit [Fevinus] tandem ad nos Fevinus et quidem bis, elegantiss-
sime mea sententia. Nec curò te hoc illi ostendere, quasi aliter vel ego
unquam putarim, vel ipse sit tam stupidus et ignorans sui, ut putarit me
putare. Scis illud praeceptum γνώθι σεαυτόν20 non minus ad arrogan-
tiam minuendam facere, quam ut bona nostra norimus. Non praeseverunt
litterae ullum in te invidiam. Quid enim invideat alicui rem tam
humilem? Sed mihi succenset, quod non prior provocarim, quasi deceret
ociosum a negocioso provocari et non potius contra. Rescribam ei simul
primum hanc epistolam perfecero.

15 “impetrat”: r littera supra lineam scripta est.
16 “numnum”: an archaic genitive: “nummorum”.
17 Quint.,?. Source not found.
18 “sustentandum”: ms. “sustandam”.
19 “transeundum”: ms. “traseundum”.
σεαυτόν noli putare ad arrogantiam minuendam solum esse dictum, verum etiam ut bona
nostra norimus”.
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Vale. Et te etiam ac etiam rogo consulas boni, si interea, dum absolvo Augustini Civitatem, minus ad te crebro scripsero. Ferre enim aequo animo debes, si publicam utilitatem (si modo ulla reditura est ex hac mea diligentia ad studiosos homines utilitas)...28; sed tarnen non29 feres indigne si, dum me puto publicis commodis servire, tantisper tuo desyderio non satisfecero, praesertim quum non sim illud diu frustraturus. Vale. Epiphaniis30 Christi.

---

21 "οὐδέν ἄγαν": cf. Erasmus, Adagia , I, vi, 96 = 596. Normally one finds "μηδέν ἄγαν: ne quid nimis".
22 "aurea est mediocritas": cf. Hor., Carm., II, 10. 5.
23 "Erasmi aut Politiani": ante corr. "Erasmo aut Politiano".
25 "vivitur exiguus melius": Claud., In Rufin., I, 215.
26 "perpessus": ms. "perpesus".
27 An allusion to Horace, Epist. I 19.2-3: "Nulla placere diu nec vivere carmina possess / quae scribuntur aquae potoribus".
28 Something like "euro" or "praetulero" is wanting.
29 "non": supra lineam.
30 "Epiphaniis": this date and the following greetings were added by Vives in his own hand.
Dic salutem pro me uxori optimae et Laurino candidissimo et Eucollio iterum atque iterum, quem miror nihil ad me scripsisse per Clementem. Vale, mi [Cr]anevel<di>, IX Ianuarii 1522.

A tergo: Domino Francisco Craneveldio / iurisconsulto amico optimo./
Brugis.

Ep. 97. J. Fevynus (Bruges) to Fr. Cranevelt (Bruges)

99 (f.122) <I-II 1522>

Fevynus is returning Cranevelt’s text of Lucian, apparently in a Latin translation. Cranevelt may have missed it on account of his Greek studies, where he has ready resort to Latin as a help to understanding. Fevynus admits that he should have returned it earlier, but because he was fascinated by Lucian’s entertaining dialogues or because of the bad weather, he did not find an earlier opportunity and offers therefore his apologies.

Lucian was an important author in the 16th Century, both from the linguistic and the moralistic point of view. The editio princeps of the Greek text was published in Florence in 1496. Erasmus made a Latin translation of several pieces of Lucian (first edition Paris 1506; second enlarged edition Paris 1514; then Basel 1517 and 1521; see ASD, I-1, pp. 361-627), as did Thomas More and many other humanists. It is possible that the copy of Lucian referred to here, is Erasmus’s version.

In an afterthought Fevynus wants his servant to bring from Cranevelt, if agreeable, some small collection of sententiae. From Fevynus’s words, which are never very clear, it is impossible to know whether he meant a printed book or a private collection of Cranevelt’s. If we correctly understand the last part of the sentence, Fevynus does not want the collection for itself, but because it contains a “treatise” begun recently among his colleagues and chaplains.

The letter does not bear a date, but as it follows Vives’s letter from Louvain, of January 9, and precedes that of Vandevalus which Cranevelt received on 10 February, it must have been written in the latter part of January or the early days of February 1522. There is no other known letter from Fevynus since November 1521.

S<alutem> P<lerimam> D<ico>. Lucianus tuus oblectavit sane aliquot dies me et nescio an incommodo tuo diutius usus sim, quod cum

grecisses, tum Latina haud gravate admisces sive ut expeditius et minore opera illas condiscas, sive ut conferas has Latinas cum illis. Ego remissem me hercule citius, sed cum studium refriguerit, distinuerunt eo diutius me illius dialogii lepidissimi, vel ob sales (et si quid Lucianus in iis plus prestat, nunc difficulter hanc quoque vel exusciuunculum conscribo) vel ob hyemis rigorem. Quare ignoscas improbitati vel temporis vel Fevyni importunitati. Bene atque optime vale.

Et si libet, ut famulus secum adferat sententias aliquot, que in libellum conbgeste sunt, non quod hoc velim, eas videre, sed tractatum quendam inter collegas et sacellanos dudum1 initum. Vale.

Tuus ex animo Fevynus.

A tergo: Doctiss<imo> Cranevel<di>o, / suo <domino> observando.

Ep. 98. L. Vandevalus (Bruges) to Fr. Cranevelt (Bruges).

100 (f.124) <received 10 II 1522>

Leonardus Vandevalus, a physician (cf. Ep. 76: HL, 43 [1994], 51-54 [p. 52]), was preparing a book and wrote this flattering letter to Cranevelt to ask his judgment concerning it. Most of the letter is taken up with rather abject flattery: Vandevalus stresses his own humbleness and the excellence of Cranevelt who surpasses on his own Demosthenes, Cicero, Isocrates and Cato in eloquence, Aristotle, Plato and Socrates in wisdom. Cranevelt’s opinion is therefore very important to the author. Only the first part of the book was actually written: if it should be judged positively, the second part would follow quickly. There is, however, no known published work by Vandevalus. Perhaps the work was never finished or printed. More details on this subject can be found in letters 101, 104 and 105. From letter 101 we learn that the book was about alchemy and rather negatively judged by Fevynus. The tone and contents of this letter show that Vandevalus was not on intimate terms with Cranevelt and was trying to gain acceptance in his circle.

D <octissimo> D<omino>1 Cranevellio suo Vandevalus ἐν πράττειν.

1 “dudum”: supra lineam.

1 The abbreviation D.D. normally means “Dominus Dominus”, viz. Monsignor, a title which is not applicable to Cranevelt. Hence the solution we propose. It could also be, of course, “Disertissimo Domino” (cf. the first line of the letter), but that seems less obvious for a form of address.
Miraberis meam ineptiam, imo verius impudentiam, Cranevell disertissime, quod non ausim dicere “tuum Leonardum” (nam qui ausim homuncio ego me tanto assere re amico?), quamquam plus quam tuum, imo magis ac suum, sed certe hominem in tuarum gremium Musarum quod non ausim dicere “tuum Leonardum” (nam qui ausim homuncio ego me tanto asserere amico?), quamquam plus quam tuum, imo magis ac suum, sed certe hominem in tuarum gremium Musarum2 et κέρας τό τῆς Ἀμαλθείας3 admodum gestientem admitti,vides hoc ceu arrabone tuam interpellare celsitudinem. “Quis, inquies, Cynthia in hoc aurem vellicavit?”4 Hic me hercle meus inoelix partus, qui, qualscumque est aborsus, tuam accedit censuram, ut te Aristarcho tua vindicatus censoria virgula5 sibi paulo plus fidat. Nam hanc priorem huius libelli partem, si tibi sensero probari, animus p[[a]]lane accessero fausto pede in alteram absolvandam. Habet nescioquid energiae opus favore, iudicio, stimuli, calcaribus adiutum, probatum, extor- tum, adactum, favore (inquam) eorum quorum eloquentiam cum sapientia coniuxerunt6; quorum alterum sine altero aut dementia est aut infantilis balbucies. In utrorumque coetu tantus mihi videris, ut si rhetores numerentur Demosthenes, Cicerones, Isocrates, Catones, non modo [[n]] unus ex his videare, sed hi omnes; hoc est, quod in illorum aliquo desyderatum, in te nemo est qui desyderet. Rursus si sapientes quis narrat Aristoteles, Platones, Socrates, nullus non sis, et adeo Plato es et [[aut]] Cicero ut uberius pene in te videatur eloquentia et relucet sapientia quam in illorum alterutro. Haec a me putabis fortassis adulantius dieta; nam scimus hoc omnibus prudentibus commune, ut suam non agnoscant cum magnitudinem, tum societatem. Sed ego non fucis ago, at vera rerum imagine. Quare hoc ceu colophonem habeto: me tuo unius iudicio non minus innixurum atque Zopyro, [[de]] quem narrat historici unum Dareio pluris fuisse atque centum Babylonas.

2 “gremium musarum”: “gremium” in the medieval sense of “guild”.
3 “κέρας τό τῆς Ἀμαλθείας”: cf. Gell. I 8.2; Otto, Die Sprichwörter, p. 94.
6 “Aristarcho”: proverbial for a judge of literature; cf. Erasmus, Adagia, I v 57 = 457 (ASD II I, pp. 532-533, II. 349-354); e. g. Cic., Att. I, 14, 3; Hor., Ars P., 450.
8 “eloquentia cum sapientia”: the traditional Ciceronian ideal; cf. e. g. Cic., Or. 14-16.
9 Vandevalus has made a grammatical error. It would be correct to write: “quorum altera sine altera...” Obviously he was already thinking in terms of “eloquentes et sapientes”, as in the next sentence.
10 “Zopyro”: a Persian nobleman who mutilated himself to seize Babylon for King Darius; cf. Herod., III 153-160; Vandevalus alludes to a saying, attributed to Darius and found in Plut., Mor. (Apopth.), 173 A, repeated in Erasmus, Adagia, II, x, 64 = 1964.
His vale et tuum Leonardum in amicum aut saltem clientulum adscribito. Hodie e nostra Medicina\textsuperscript{11}.

Λεονάρδος ὁ βανδέυαλος.

\textit{A tergo} Utriusque Iurisprudentiae professori / eruditissimo D<omino>
Francisco Crane/vellio ab intimis consiliis Bruganis./
\textit{Manu Craneveldii:} 10 februarii a° 1522.

\textbf{Ep. 99. Fr. Cranevelt (Bruges) [to J. L. Vives?]}  

101 (no foliation) \hspace{1cm} 15 III <1522>

A letter in Cranevelt’s hand, probably a draft. We do not know the person to whom it was addressed, but he must have belonged to the Bruges humanistic circle, which at this moment was so much interested in Greek: in all probability it was Vives. Cranevelt felt obliged to write a letter, but there was little news to tell. He was therefore sending his translation, together with the original Greek text (which sounds better), of a very short letter by the Church Father Basil the Great, \textit{Ep.} 13 [Cf. St. Basil, \textit{Letters}, ed. R. J. Deferrari, 4 vols. (London — Cambridge Mass.), vol. I (1926), p. 104]. He had chosen that letter because it suited the time of the year, viz. the winter. In fact, the letter says that every season has its particular fruits, those of the winter being learned conversations. There can be no doubt that Cranevelt had found the text in the \textit{Epistolae Graeae elegantissimae} printed by Martens at Louvain in 1526 (See above, introduction to letter 94), where it is on f. g iv\textsuperscript{r}.

Cranevelt would write more, but his fingers were growing numb with cold. About the war he does not know what to say, except that — as Phalaris wrote to the people of Leontini — “we are starving of hunger and fear”. The reference is to letter 53 of Ps.-Phalaris: see R. Hercher, \textit{Epistolographi Graeci} (Paris 1873 = Amsterdam 1965), p. 421. Cranevelt had found the text in Martens’s anthology on f. g iv\textsuperscript{r}.

Short as it is, this letter is very interesting for the additional light it throws on Cranevelt’s Greek studies. It appears now that he had been reading work of St. Basil over a number of years before he published (in 1534 and 1535, at Louvain of Rescius’s press) Latin translations of four homilies of the same Church Father (see De Vocht, \textit{Lit. Cran.}, p. lxxi). Basil was widely read and used for educational purposes.

\textsuperscript{11} The archaic use of “medicina” in the sense of a doctor’s cabinet is found in Plautus (\textit{Amph.}, 1013). It may be another reminiscence of Vandevalus’s studies with Dorpius in Louvain (See letter 76, introd.).
purposes in humanistic circles, especially his *Ad adolescentes*. Clenardus’s enormously successful *Meditationes Graecanicae* (Louvain, 1531), a handbook for private study of Greek, consisted of St. Basil’s letter to Gregory of Nazianzus on the solitary life with a word-for-word rendering and G. Budé’s translation.

Cranevelt, not surprisingly, had read also (some of) the so-called letters of Phalaris, the notorious tyrant of Agrigentum, Sicily (6th c. B. C.). Phalaris was considered to be the author of a collection of 148 letters, which in 1697 Bentley proved to be a falsification from late Antiquity (2nd c. A. D.? — cf. Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie* XIX, cols. 1649-1652). Ever since their first printed edition (Venice 1498) the letters were favourite reading among the humanists, possibly because they were considered to be the work of Lucian: cf. Erasmus, *De conscrib. epist*. [ASD I 2, p. 224, ll. 6-7, with a misleading note]: “Epistolae..., quas eruditi tribuunt Luciano”.

In the transcription of this letter we have not corrected the errors and omissions in the Greek accentuation, because they show the limits of Cranevelt’s knowledge.

Si vales <gaudeo>¹, nam et nos valemus. Cum non esset quod scriberem, non potui tamen diutius cessare. Proinde verti epistolam quandam Grecam, sed plane laconicam, Basilii ad Olympium, quae mihi videbatur satis convenire tempori.

“Quemadmodum”, inquit, “quaelibet res alie² suo quodam tempore maturae sunt ac nobis obviae³, vere quidem flores, estate [[vero]] autem⁴ aristae, autumno vero pomum, sic hyemis fructus sunt sermones”.

Que, quoniam multo iucundius Grece sonant, non piguit eciam ad scribere:

“Ωσπερ τῶν ἄλλων ὃριμων ἔκαστον ἐν τῇ οἰκείᾳ ὥρᾳ ἀπάντα, ἐν ἤρι μὲν τὰ ἀνήλι, ἐν θέρι δὲ οἱ στάχυες, τῷ δὲ μετοπῶρῳ τὸ μύλον, οὕτω χειμώνος καρπός εἰσιν οἱ λόγοι”¹.

Plura scriberem nisi digiti prae frigore obstupefierent. Vale.

De rebus bellicis nescio quid divinemus, εί μή ὃτι πάντων ἐνδεεῖς ἔσμεν, πλὴν λιμοῦ καὶ φόβου, τούτων δὲ ἡμας φησίν λίαν εὕπορεῖν, quod Phalaris scripsit Leontinis.

Id<ibus> M<artiis>.

¹ Only the lower half of the g and the o survived after a part of the upper margin was lost (eaten by mice?).
² “alie”: supra lineam.
³ “obviae”: the ‘o’ is a correction by Cranevelt for another no more distinguishable letter.
⁴ “autem”: supra lineam.
Ep. 100. Poem on the election of Pope Adrian VI.

102 (no foliation).  
<ca. 15 III 1522?>

On the occasion of Hadrian VI’s election as pope (9 January 1522) someone composed this poem in dactylic hexameters. It may have been Cranevelt himself, as the handwriting is his and the text presents (above the lines, or following the first term) three alternative readings between which the final choice had not yet been made. We have marked these second versions in the text by means of italics between / /. The author in the first place rejoices at the success of Charles V, victorious in war, whose wishes God had granted through the election of Hadrian. Since in 1522 Cranevelt entertained great expectations for advancement in his career through the Emperor, this poem could well be a part of his bid for Charles’s favour. The second part of the poem praises the new pope for his piety, his earlier work as counsellor [of the Emperor] and as military commander [in Spain, as regent of Charles V, when he took Toledo by force], and finally for his theological scholarship. The poem seems to be otherwise unknown.

Aurea nunc solita fulgebunt sydera\(^1\), luce  
Splendidius\(^2\), nosterque polus, tardusque Bootes\(^3\),  
Posteaquam magni Cesar ter maximus orbis\(^4\)  
Propensos in vota deos\(^5\) caelumque meretur.  

5 Victor erat multis /cunctis / rebus certamine belli,  
Nunc et consiliis et certo munere divûm,  
Pontificis quod /quia / nomen habet Rhomamque tuetur  
Sanctis praesidiis et castae munere vitae  
Optimus hic presul, nulli pietate secundus,\(^6\)  

10 Consilioque armisque potens, divûmque penetrans  
Abdita, mortali quanta est permissa potestas\(^7\).

---

1 "aurea sydera": cf. Verg., Aen.II 488; ib. XI 832-833.  
3 “Tardus Bootes” is a most common “iunctura” in classical poetry (cf., for instance, Ov., Met. II 176). Bootes symbolises Northern Europe where the new pope came from.  
4 “ter maximus orbis”: cf. Verg., Georg. I, 26: “…te maximus orbis/”. While slightly changing the end of a Virgilian verse Cranevelt gave Charles the title which is usually connected with the Egyptian God Hermes: Hermes Trismegistus / Termaximus.  
7 “mortali quanta est permissa potestas”: cf. Verg., Aen., IX, 97: “cui tanta deo permissa potestas”.

---
Dicite io, juvenes, pueri innuptaeque puellae\(^8\),
Dicite io, vetuli, jam jam aurea secula surgunt /sunt\ /\(^9\).

Cum renunciaretur Adrianum sextum in
Pontificem Maximum Rhome electum
esse Mense Januario a\(^o\) 22.

Ep. 101. J. Fevynus (Bruges) to Fr. Cranevelt (Bruges).

103 (f.125) <after 15 III 1522>

This letter is connected with Vandevalus’s letter 98. Apparently, Cranevelt passed Vandevalus’s book on to Fevynus for a second opinion. Fevynus sends it back with a rather negative judgment, but without critical notes added on its pages, because Vandevalus had chosen Cranevelt as a critic of his work, not Fevynus.

Fevynus considers Vandevalus’s treatment of alchemy too elementary; things are not so simple as he represents them. Perhaps the second part of the book will be better and offer more enjoyable reading, certainly if it has passed Cranevelt’s criticism. Fevynus is prepared to be a critic of that second part also if Cranevelt wishes it. Fevynus’s style is, as usual, awkward and unclear.

From this letter we know the subject of Vandevalus’s manuscript, at least of the latter part of it, viz. alchemy. It provides also an interesting glimpse of the intellectual activities of the humanists in Cranevelt’s circle, not only as regards the reading and criticising of books but also as regards their interest in, and study, of alchemy. One will remember that among Erasmus’s Colloquies one is about Alcumística. It was first published in the summer of 1524 in Basel (Cf. ASD I 3 [1972], pp. 424-429).

Part of the upper margin and of the lower right margin, and the bottom of the sheet, are damaged (obviously by gnawing mice) with some losses of text in each case.

S<alutem> P<lurimam> D<ico>. Re[m]itto tibi Vandavalum nostrum,
ut in pluribus mendo\ud{s}um, ita et integrum totum. Nam ut aliquid obiter ceu obelo adnotem aut castigem (etiam si postulas), non videtur id exigere libellus. Neque item si velim aut liberet, ausim admove re manum, preser\ud{t}im cum delegerit Craneveldium Aristarchum et censorem\(^1\) sibi.

---


---

De alcimia quam in libelli calce adponit, metuo ut ne id cogitet, sed potius pro ingenii modo ludat. Quis enim unquam post tot\(^2\) exantlatos atque exhaustos in ea arte perdiscenda labores, post tot utplurimum vana, inutilia et ridicula experimenta, quis scripto\(^3\) quicquam, praesertim quod esset compertum aut prope manifestarium, de alcimistica prodidit? Si modo ars tam facilis sit, quam ille persuadere nititur! Aut cur non passim ab omnibus in hoc elaboratur, quo tandem\(^4\) consequamur, id quod tanto dispendio, tanta cura, tot vigiliiis inquirimus? Sed in iis primitiis praeludat Vandevalus. Post viderimus q[uid] secundus secum adferet libellus, eo fortassis iucundifor\], quo iverit hic tuo iudicio aut probatus aut cert[e] non contennendus. Ac tum vel tua causa censorem ag[am], homo alioqui gravis et prope morosus censor, ne dicam iudicii stolidiss<simi> et censure nimisquam superbe et prodigiose.

\[V[a]lem / ....] tuam epistolam.

\[Fevynus \] semper t[u]us\(^5\)

A tergo: D<omino> Craneveldio suo / d<omi>no et amico integerrimo.

Ep.102. J. L. Vives (Bruges) to Fr. Cranevelt (Bruges)

104 (no foliation). \(<\text{possibly III 1522}>\)

A short note by Vives to ask for some books, the Suda [Suidas] lexicon, Cicero’s philosophical works and Erasmus’s New Testament (second edition of 1519). Vives ends his note by asking Cranevelt to indicate a time and place that same day for meeting their friend Fevynus.

In letter 91 Vives had announced his intention to come to Bruges for Lent. Since Easter Day 1522 was on 20 April, he probably arrived around 5 March. This note must have been written a couple of weeks later: Vives, obviously, is already at work again (on St. Augustine), and in the MS bundle his note is placed after document 99 (probably of 15 March) and a few more undated letters.

There is a striking similarity between the requests in this note and those in letter 79, written in the summer of 1521: Vives is asking again for Cicero’s philosophical works and Erasmus’s New Testament, and for an appointment with Cranevelt.

---

\(^2\) “tot”: ante corr. “tont”.

\(^3\) “scripto”: the “o” looks more like an “e” in the manuscript.

\(^4\) Fevynus wrote “tamdem”.

\(^5\) The upper part of “T” (?) and one stroke of a first “u” (?) survive.
As with the preceding documents, mice have eaten part of the upper margin with some loss of text.

D<omi>ne Cranaveldi, mitt[e, quaes[o, ad] me Suidam et opera philosophica Ciceronis et Novum Instrum<entum> Erasmi cum annotatio<nibus ex II editione, et vide ubi et quando velis congregiamur hodie cum Fevino nostro. Vale.

Tuus Vives

Ep. 103. Arnoldus de Gruithuys (Arnhem) to Fr. Cranevelt (Bruges)

106 (f. 126) 6 III 1522

As De Vocht wrote in his General Introduction (Lit. Cran., p. LIII), Cranevelt’s position in Bruges was not without misgivings and he looked for something more appropriate. From this letter it appears that Cranevelt in 1521 or 1522 made inquiries as to a possible position in the service of Charles, Duke of Guelders. Arnoldus de Gruithuys [or Arnold van (den) Grythuyzen], one of the Duke’s most trusted councillors (cf. Lit. Cran., 164, l. 7 + n.; and Ep. 5, n. 1 [HL, 41 (1992), 18]), answered Cranevelt’s letter with the present one.

Arnold expresses his joy at Cranevelt’s benevolence to his native land and his Duke. He did not hesitate to speak immediately to the Duke, who was himself very glad about it. Grythuyzen is therefore of the opinion that Cranevelt could be invited one day to return to Guelders. Just now no suitable position is available. It is true that the chancellor is almost crippled and hardly equal to his duties, but the Duke seems to think it inhuman to remove the man or substitute him when he is still alive, and Grythuyzen thinks that it is for this reason that the Duke has not yet pledged himself to something definite. As soon as he knows anything for certain he will at once write to Cranevelt. In the meantime Cranevelt can be assured that he finds in the Duke a most clement and benign prince and in Grythuyzen himself a zealous defender of his interests. The carrier of the letter will tell him in full about the latest news and the war. Greetings to his family, also on behalf of Grythuyzen’s wife.

Nothing else is known about this matter. Cranevelt never entered the service of Duke Charles but he was appointed by Charles V a member of the Mechlin Parliament, or Grote Raad, on September 27, 1522.

The old chancellor must be Wilhelmus van Lanck from Cologne. He matriculated as a minor at Cologne in 1471 and entered the Faculty of Arts. In 1484 he became a bachelor and in 1493 licentiate and Doctor of Law. In 1497 he was
appointed a canon of St. Severin’s in Cologne. In 1505 he was still a member of the Cologne Faculty of Law (See H. Keussen, Die Matrikel der Universität Köln, I [Bonn, 1928], p. 818, 329th rectorate, nr. 56). Shortly afterwards he seems to have entered the service of the Duke of Guelders, since he is mentioned as chancellor in documents ranging from 1506 to 1530 (Cf. Is. An. Nijhoff, Gedenkwaardigheden uit de geschiedenis van Gelderland, VI [Arnhem — ’s Gravenhage, 1859-1875]). He repeatedly acted as a negotiator between his Lord and the latter’s Burgundian and Hapsburg adversaries; for instance, in 1508 (Treaty of Cambrai; see Nijhoff, nrs. 628-630), in 1513 (Nijhoff, nr. 720) and in 1517 (Nijhoff, nrs. 875 and 892). In some documents Van Lanck is also mentioned as “prepositus” of Zutphen (Nijhoff, nrs. 1053 and 1574). He seems to have died between 1530 and 1535. Cf. A. J. van der Aa, Biographisch Woordenboek der Nederlanden, L (Haarlem, 1852), p. 32 (where he is called, erroneously, a Doctor of Medicine).

S<alutem> P<lurimam> D<ico>. Cum ex postremis tuis ad me litteris singularem quandam animi tui benevolentiam et non vulgarem pietas affectum in patriam principemque nostrum liquido intelligerem, non dis
tuli mox id, quibus optime verbis ex mei ingenii facultate poteram, ipsi
principi declarare. Qui mirum est quam grato animo et hilari fronte tuum
istud officium acceperit, ut maximam omnino mihi speram attulit fore ali
quando ut honestissime ac utiliter tibi quisque nec non nobis omnibus
iucunde in patriam revoceris. Sed quia dignam et congruam excellentia et
virtutibus tuis conditionem nullam habere hic apud principem ipse poteris
praeter eam que id munere suscitet quod vocamus cancellarii, quem licet
paraliticum iam et membrorum suorum dissolutione vehementer afflic
tum ideoque ad multa imprimisque necessaria inutilem, amovere tamen et
abiicere viventem alterumque superstiti adhuc illi sufficere, impium esse
sibi princeps neque satis honestum fortassit arbratur. Id quod ego non
temere suspicer in causa fuisse, cur certum aliquid mihi princeps nondum
hac de re responderit tibi suo nomine significandum. Si quid autem
interim certi intellexero, tibi perscribere non differam. Hoc unum certo
scias in omnibus tuis rebus et negociis principem habere benignissimum
clementissimumque meque patronum (quod probe nosti) et causarum
tuarum defensorum ubique [[dignissimum]] diligentissimum.

De novis rebus bellorumque hic successu omnia ad plenum intelliges
ex eo qui has tradet humanitati tue, quam cum uxor et liberis salvam et
felicem ego et uxor quam vehementissime optamus.

Vale et me, uti soles, ama. Ex Arnhem, sexta martii anno Domini XXII°.
Tuus ad omnia obsequительissimus
Arnoldus de Gruithuys
subscriptisit.
A tergo: Disertissimo ornatissimoque viro iuris utriusque / consul-tissimo doctori magistro Francisco Kraneveldio / praecipueti et amico suo integerrimo.

Ep. 104. L. Vandevalus (Bruges) to Fr. Cranevelt (Bruges).

107 (f. 127) <III 1522>

This letter, slightly damaged at the edges with some loss of text, is the third document on Vandevalus's book (see letters 98 and 101). It contains his answer to the critical remarks made by Cranevelt. These are mainly linguistic, so that it remains difficult for us to determine the exact contents of the book, apparently a mixture of medicine, alchemy and magic. It is equally hard to establish Cranevelt's real opinion of it, which would be interesting to know as we have learned already that Fevynus did not rate it very high.

The letter begins with a great flow of rhetorical expressions of gratitude towards Cranevelt, called "the most lovable of men" by Vandevalus. After half a page of such effusions, Vandevalus turns to the two letters Cranevelt has sent him regarding his manuscript. From Vandevalus's words we learn that the first letter was little more than a friendly acknowledgment of receipt with some words to encourage him in his study. The second was more substantial and contained critical remarks, some of which at least Vandevalus reviews in the last part of his letter. Although he again thanks Cranevelt in excessively humble words, one seems to perceive some irritation at the critical remarks coming through. Be this as it may, Vandevalus accuses Cranevelt in friendly fashion of having expressed a far too mild judgment, of not having marked every mistake, etc. He cannot rely on his own judgment as he approves his own trash too readily. Perhaps Cranevelt only marked the minor faults as Vandevalus would identify the major ones for himself. Of course he is glad about Cranevelt's mild criticism but he fears that Cranevelt is overdoing his mildness. Therefore he asks him again to approve only what can really be approved of. Vandevalus is aware that Cranevelt is showing consideration towards his reputation, but since he [Vandevalus] knows that he is not greatly learned or talented, he is afraid of the general opinion, certainly less indulgent than Cranevelt.

Next Vandevalus moves on to Cranevelt's specific observations. According to Cranevelt the noun akkimiva does not occur in the dictionaries. Vandevalus agrees but, he adds, he has followed the Egyptians Hermes [Trismegistos] and Geber [Jabir] who wrote in Arabic. "Al" is the Arabic article and the word "klimia" is the Arabic version of what Dioscorides and Pliny call "cathimia", so his use of this apparently unusual or even non-existent word is correct. In fact, Vandevalus uses here an Arabic word "al-iqlümìya", which has been borrowed from the Greek kadmeia, in Latin "cadmea" or "cadmia" (ore of zinc or calamine), written in some mss. "casemia" or "catimia". In this discussion of
Arabic terms Vandevalus furthermore refers to the 13th-century Simon of Genua and his book on medical language, to his own contemporary Symphorien Champier, who criticised Simon’s style but himself relied too confidently on Isidore’s *Etymologiae*, and, finally, to (the pseudonymous) Stephen of Alexandria. This paragraph is followed by some minor remarks, some of which make us believe that Cranevelt had misread certain terms in Vandevalus’s manuscript. They regard the double meaning of “abortientes” (probably: women having either a miscarriage or a premature delivery) and Cranevelt’s preference of “maiestas” instead of “dignitas praetoria”. The next point is about the calculation of climacteric years. A certain passage in Vandevalus’s text Cranevelt could only understand if one reckoned in periods of nine years. Vandevalus states that that is the correct procedure and he refers to the Roman mathematician Firmicus Maternus and to a letter by the emperor Augustus to prove his thesis. Then follow some minor remarks of an orthographical nature and a defence by Vandevalus of his somewhat barbaric-sounding language. Among other points he defends the use of the word “concivis”, against the opinion of Vives, with a reference to L. Valla and N. Perotti.

Among all these linguistic remarks we find some interesting statements. Cranevelt notices that jewellers have found that it is impossible to break diamonds with the blood of he-goats. Vandevalus more or less agrees, mentioning again the opinion of Simon of Genua, but thinks the blood may be able to soften the diamonds. Furthermore, Cranevelt does not understand the expression “proiectio medicinae mineralis”. With a reference to Arnoldus de Villanova (13th c.) Vandevalus explains that this is the normal alchemical term to denote the fusion of a small part of the philosophical stone (after its preparation is complete) with lead or other liquified metals.

According to alchemistic beliefs, every element is convertible into another, but one must use a medium called “medicina”. For metals this “medicina” is mercury, for minerals it seems to be the philosophical stone. If one mixes mercury with a little of the Elixir and adds after some further preparation a fragment of gold or silver, one should see the whole mixture converted into gold or silver. This last and final process is called (as are possibly some other kinds of liquid emissions of) “proiectio”. We consulted on this matter the interesting work by, or attributed to, Arnaldus [or: Arnoldus] de Villanova, *Thesaurus Thesaurorum et rosarium philosophorum*, where he points out that mercury is the only “medicina” for metals, and that the philosophical stone is the basis of all alchemical research, explaining how one should make this stone and what the different preparations are, finally (2. 31) how to make gold: “de modo faciendi proiectionem”. Works of Arnoldus were printed at Lyons in 1504, on 20 Dec. 1509 (A copy of this edition was at Ghent in St. Peters Abbey on the Blandijenberg and is now in the University Library in Ghent [Med. 46]), in Venice 1514, at Basle in 1515, etc. In 1520 a new edition appeared at Lyons with Arnoldus’s life written by Symphorien Champier: *Arnoldi de Villanova medici acutissimi Opera nuperrime revisa, una cum ipsius vita a Symphoriano Campegio edita recenter hic apposita* (Copy in the University Library at Louvain [P133.5:54/ Fo]).
It seems that Cranevelt requested Vandevalus to make known his sources. For this reason Vandevalus promises to send Cranevelt a little book which he once stole (!) from the library of Johannes Wuesbroec, an expert astrologer and alchemist (to this book Cranevelt alludes in letter 105). It is written in a barbarous language, but in such books sometimes great secrets are contained, as Pico della Mirandola once wrote to Hermolaus Barbarus. As to Cranevelt’s question whether Vandevalus was writing about alchemy in earnest or in jest, he answers rather evasively. A last correction of Cranevelt, based on the *Suda* lexicon, is conceded without objections: Galenus did, in fact, live to be 70 years of age.

The end of the letter is rather damaged; it contains some excuses for having trespassed on Cranevelt’s time and a recommendation of or from Leonardus [possibly, Eleopolus?].

D<omino> Cranevellio suo Vandevalus.

Salve, virorum amicissime. Hoc enim tui meum το έπίθετον quot¹ optimo mihi videre asserere: poteram eruditissimum, optimum, inte-gerrimum, disertissimum appellare, sed nescio qui factum sit ut istuc ipsum inter omnia maxime applaueri, imo plane scio; quo enim facto addubitem tam candidum animum mei amantissimum (at non sine [[u]] foenore!) qui pro levi chartula eaque ineptiarum plena a clientulo (nam amiculum dicere nondum satis audeo, quamquam et amo [[et]] effussis-sime et vicissem redamor, ut [[t m]] τὰ μνημόσυνα σου clamant sincere et ingenue excepta) non dico tam amicas, uberes, disertas, eruditas, copiosas literas, sed integros commentarios τα πάντα βιβλία nobis reddideris? Dispeream, mi Francisce, si unquam mellitus mihi contigit! Legi, relegi, nec exaturata mens est. Saepius deosculatus sum tarn candidum erga nos pectus, tarn amoris piena praecordia, tam denique nostrae tenuitatis studiis amplitudinem. Superos interim oro haec cepta secundent.² Mea (fateor) peccavit temeritas, at tua donavit humanitas. Utinam, charissime Cranevelli, has cordis fibras cerneres! Videres quam ardeat, suspiciat, observet, colat, veneretur istas tuas τάς χάριτας καὶ τὸν σὸν ἔρωτα; dispiceret tua sinceritas quam gestiast haec mea balbuties et infantia tuae facundiae nonnumquam instar τῆς τέττιγος fìeri obstrepera.³

1 Sic pro “quod”!
3 “obstrepera”: in Antiquity only in Apul., *Flor.*, 13, with regard to crickets; cf. *ThLL*, IX 2, c.250.
Priores illae [Il]literae quanta continent indicia morum tuorum vere liberorum, hoc est tractabilium, suavi[m], benignorum, facilium, erga nos prorsus pronorum, agnosco magis quam eloqui queam; quam amice nostrum ignavum opusculum alleves, quam dulciter ignaviam eleves, quam blande foves infoelicem partum! Horta[ris] pergam, suades per ora volet et oras. At σπεύδε βραδέως⁴ [mones?].

Alteris literis idem agis, asscribis notulas aliquot, te futilem Aristarchum⁵ appellas, iubes me meo uti iudicio. Itane, opt[ime] Novio magis quam sit mihi mea curta sup[ellyx]⁶ Scio te magnitudinem tuam solum nolle agnosce. Vereor ut minus [iustum?] te exhiberis iudicem. Civiliter nimium agis! Vide, quaeo, quo detrudas: approbas pene omnia, demptis aliquot minutii. Tam φίλαυτον me putas, qui totus stupidus mea mox probem // nugamenta,⁷ quaeque in buccam forte v[enerint].⁸ At fortassis eo ho[s] minutulos dumtaxat errores annotasti, quod nimimum ex his subodorem quam sint longe plures iique graviores et οὐδὲν πρὸς ἐποχής⁹ facientes. Visus fueras paulo salvis mihi consuluisse, si quicquid dislicuerit toitis obeliscis¹⁰ transfìsses, non quod non summam habeam grattiam ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀστερισκῶν verius quam τῶν δβελόν,¹¹ sed plusquam summam eram habiturus, si nihil apud me probares quod tibi non probaretur. Nam quid hic placere tanto viro potuit, nequeo dispicer. Sed non sinit tua man-suetissima inodes te amici scripta obirurgare aut castigare [Itel]. Scio, scio! Verum iterum atque iterum consyderet tua perspicacia quid de meo capitae statuendum censeas, quid dicerent homines, imo quid non dice- rent, ubi videant scriptionem tam immature contra Augusti proverbium¹² properatam. Novi tuam integritatem, e regione meam perspectissimam habeo imbecillatem, quippe quam sim ingenio invalidus, arte minor,

---

5 “Aristarchum”: cf. ep. 98.
6 “curta sup[ellyx]”: Cf. Pers. 4, 52: “Noris quam sit tibi curta supellex”.
7 “nugamenta”: cf. Apul., Met., I 25: this locus is the only one in Forcellini, Totius Latinitatis Lexicon, 3, p. 404.
8 “in buccam venerint”: a very frequent expression; cf. Erasmus Adagia, I v 72 = 472 (ASD II 1, p. 546); Otto, Die Sprichwörter, p. 59.
9 “οὐδὲν πρὸς ἐποχής”[with wrong accent on ἐποχή!]: Lucian. Philops. 1; id., Herm. 36; cf. Erasmus, Adagia, I v 45 = 445 (ASD II 1, pp. 518-520).
10 “obeliscis”: ordinary use of these correctional signs in Antiquity shows exactly the reverse of what is hinted at here.
11 “τῶν δβελόν”: ante corr.: “τούς δβελόνυς”.
12 “Augusti proverbium”: sc. σπεύδε βραδέος. See note 3 above.
rerum et verborum peritia minimus. Ita fit ut inter saxum (quod dicitur) haeream et sacrum,13 metuamque ne dum tenerime parvulo indulge, de meo capite (ut dixit Sarsinas)14 agantur comitia. Porro impudentissimus aut certe ingratissimus sim, si sic tecum agere pergam. Donabis haec itaque nostrae pusillanimitati tibique (pene dixeram) imputabis hanc meam expostulationem: iussisti etenim meo uterer iudicio, quod imprudentius fortasse a me factum est, quando non videor recognoscere beneficiun, quod adeo sumnum est ut nihil putem mihi maius posse contingere; atqui rursum prudenter opinor, ubi meae consultum optarim anxietati, quae hoc est vehementior quo penitus intueor quam sum nihil.

Sed ad tuas venio annotationes, si forte fortuna nonnihil afferam, quo occasionem praebam15 alia insigniora delicta verubus tuis iugulandi. 'Αλκλυμίαν (inquis) non reperiri in dictionariis, nec adeo in ipso Suida.16 Sat credo, sed ego Hermetem et Geberum Aegyptios17 cito, quos pene in confesso est lingua usos esse Arabica, eque hac //[[lingua versos(?)] horum commentarios, quibus barbarolatini utuntur. Q[uamquam] id non adeo assevero ut demonstratione me putem posse docere. Quam Dioscorides et Plinius18 “cathimiam” nominant, Avicenna et Arabes caeteri “klymiam” appellant, estque caput super ea in secundo Canonis;19 eandem iterum “alklymiam”. Nam tò “al”20 articulus est Arabum eqve
passim in Grecis vocabulis vel iis, quae a Graecis sunt flexa, utuntur, quamadmodum “algaliam” nuncupant “galiam”, confictionem. Tametsi non ignorem dubitare Symonem Ianuensem, virum non indiligentem nec de tribus medicis Unguis male meritum (quamquam hunc non admodum politum putat Symphorianus Champirius, homo non ineruditus, sed videat quam eraverit iudicio, dum quartum των κακευμών Isidori amplexus bonum autem sit aspernatus), Symonem inquam vacillare num a Graeco “alkymia” sit “alacritas”. Stephanus item “cathimia” ait esse “alklymia”. Nimis prolixum esset verba Plynii recensere.

Subiicis scrupulum super amphibologia in abortientes. Non diffiteor, sed facile revellitur ei qui mox antecedentia legerit.

Admones “nova instituta” legendum: ita erat in autographo.

Addis “maiestatis” aut “maiestatem” scribendum. Non reclamo, quamquam haud video cur non ita liceat loqui: “Aliquid imminuis dignitati praetoriae”.

21 “vocabulis”: ante corr. “vocabulus”.
22 “algaliam”: a mixture; medieval (and technical) Latin, of uncertain origin, maybe related to Arabic ‘alachuin’; the normal form is “alga”; cf. Mittellateinisches Wörterbuch, I (München, 1967), c. 444.; Ducange, Glossarium mediae et infimae Latinitatis, I, p.179 (with a different meaning).
23 “dubitare”: ante corr. “dubitarem”.
24 Symon Ianuensis or Simon of Genua, viz. Simone de Cordo, chaplain and physician of the Popes Nicholas IV (1288-1292) and Boniface VIII (1294-1303), is the author of a Synonima Medicinae (Clavis Sanationis), printed at Milan in 1473 (copy in British Library) and at Venice in 1486, 1507 and 1510. See U. Chevalier, Répertoire des sources historiques du Moyen Age. Bio-bibliographie (repr. New York, 1960), II, col. 4270.
25 “Symphorianus Champirius”: Symphorien Champier (1472-1539), physician (amongst others of Antoine de Lorraine), accompanied Louis XII to Italy in 1509; wrote many books on history and medicine, one of which, Rosa Gallica omnibus sanitatem adfectantibus necessaria (Paris,1514) might be the work here referred to. On Champier see P. Jodogne, “La correspondance de Symphorien Champier avec Jérôme de Povie dans le ‘Duellum epistolare’ (1519)”, in G. Verbeke - J. Isewijn (eds.), The Late Middle Ages and the Dawn of Humanism Outside Italy (Leuven, 1972), pp. 44-56.
26 “Isidori”: sc. Isid. Hisp., Etym. IV (De medicina), with a pun on the name of the work.
27 “Stephanus”: presumably “Stephanus of Alexandria” the unknown author of a work called De magna et sacra arte, falsely attributed to an Athenian physician Stephanus from the 7th century (ed. J. L. Ideler, Physici et medici Graeci minores, 2 (1842 = Amsterdam, 1963); cf. RE, III A2, c. 2404-2405. In this work καδμεία indeed occurs (book 3; see the edition, p. 209, l.10) but not the word ἀλκλυμία. Maybe Vandevalus just means that Stephanus calls “alklymia” “cathimia” or Vandevalus used a Latin version (he quotes the terms in Latin, not in Greek) to which the translator or editor added an explanation or a gloss.

Anneci[s] debere scribi “non nesciam”. Fateor, agilitas calami in causa f[uit].

Subiungis “omiserat” loco “amiserat” legendum. Ita est apud Hieronomy[mum] et nescio quomodo ex a factum sit o. Item dogma dogmata; it[em] Adhue “concives” as Vivem cum quibusdam putare non satis re[cte] Latine dici;33 aliter docent Laurentius34 et Sypontinus,35 grammatici et [recte] rhetores illustres. Rides barbariem nostram in principio meo de me[dicina]. Balbos sum imitatus, nam sic passim est in illorum empirii.36

Mavis “novemdiale” quam “nondiale”, at ego Plautum secutus sum in Aulula[ria] //: “Coquus ille nondialis est, in nofnum diem so[l]et ire coctum”.37

28 Cf. Firmicus Maternus, *Mathesis* IV 20, 3: The sixty-third year is most dangerous, because it is the result of the multiplication of seven and nine and “…septeni et noneni anni… gravia pericula hominibus semper indicunt.”.


30 “scalarii” [= climactericus]: the word is not found in Antiquity in this sense; its variant form “scalaris” was common in humanistic Latin. See R. Hoven, *Lexique de la Prose latine de la Renaissance* (Leiden 1994), p. 322.

31 “inquit”: sc. Augustus apud Gelium.


33 “concives”: The word appears for the first time in the *Itala* translation of the Bible and in Tertullian.


36 It is not clear what Vandevalus is saying here. The word “empiriis” is enigmatic. Does he mean “empiriciis”, viz. writings on medical experiments (cf. Plin., *Hist. Nat.* XX 120), or simply medical experiments and diagnostics (the Greek ἑιμπαται), the barbarous Latin of which will still be ridiculed by Molière in the seventeenth century?

37 Plaut., *Aul.* 324. Modern editions read “nundinalest”.
Subiungis aliquos malle “in civitate Brug(a)rum” quam “in Brugensi”; ego aut “in urbe Romana” dicendum puto aut “in urbe Roma”.

Annectis gemmariis vanum38 esse deprehensum hircinum sanguinem adamanta rumpere;39 Symon aurifabros experts dicit vanum esse non posse alia vi aut arte adamanta frangi atque sanguine, non negare tamen hoc pacto rumpi, modo adamas sit nativus et germanus.40 Ego certe saltem molliri puto.

Pro “loisario” notas “lotiarium”:41 “lotiarium” scriptum invenio.42 Pro “magera”, “megera”43. Scriptum est “mageía” per εἰ diphtongon Graecam: eatenus enim super magia nonnihil disputaveramus. Absit a me mordacitas illa acerba: nihil magis odit nostra simplicitas atque huiusmodi tragœdias!

Pro “ήμερων” “ήμερων” legis et recte: non [[p]] credideram ita scriptum donec locum inspexissem.

Scrib[[er]]is non te intelligere de proiectione medicinae mineralis. Eam appellant alchymiste Arnoldus44 et caeteri fusionem, qua aliquan[tula] pars lapidis philosophici iam perfecti immiscetur corpori plumbi, stanni aut reliquorum metallorum liquefactorum.

Iubes impertiri amicis que gloriosulus45 polliceor. Libellum ad te mitto practicum, quem quondam summo furto mihi comparavi ex arcanis

38 “vanum”: ante corr.: “vanam”.
39 The belief that diamonds can be cut with use of goat’s blood is mentioned in several classical and humanistic texts. See Pliny, Hist. Nat. XX 2: “Adamanta, rarum opum gaudium, infragilem omni cetera vi et invictum, sanguine hircino rumpente.”; St. Augustine, Civ. XXI 4.4: “Adamantem lapidem..., qui lapis nec ferro nec igni nec alia vi ulla perhibetur praeter hircino sanguine vinci”; Erasmus, Eccles. III (ASD V 5, p. 84, 629-630): “adamas sanguine hircino vincitur;” Paracelsus, Coelum Philosophorum 2 (Translated by A. E. Waide, The Hermetic and Alchemical Writings of Paracelsus the Great, 1 [London, 1894 = New York, 1967], p. 17).
40 “Symon”: Symon Januensis. See note 24. We could not locate the reference which may be second-hand.
41 “lotiarium”: not in ThLL, but probably a derivation of “lotium”.
42 Obviously, and not surprisingly, Cranevelt and Vandevalus had difficulties with each other’s handwriting.
43 “magera”: Cranevelt seems to have thought of “Meg(a)era, but Vandevalus had written “mageía”, inserting two Greek letters in the Latin word which had misled Cranevelt.
44 “Arnoldus”: sc. Arnaldus de Villanova (b. near Valencia? 1235- d. Genoa 1311/12), a famous physician to whom several alchemical works were wrongly attributed, i.a. Thesaurus thesaurorum et rosarium philosophorum. In the Rosarium Philosophorum, a late mediaeval alchemical anthology printed at Francfort in 1550, he is called “Arnoldus” (cf. J. Telle - L. Claren, Rosarium Philosophorum: ein alchemisches Florilegium des Spätmittelalters, Weinheim, 1992).
45 “gloriosulus”: not in ThLL, but common in humanistic Latin. See R. Hoven, O. l., p. 151 and hereafter, p. 66 l. 9.
M<agistri> Jo<hann>is Wuesbrouc,\textsuperscript{46} viri summi in rebus astrologiciis et alchymisticis. Senticeta sunt et barbariae verborum, sed in his non-numquam abstrusa reconduntur, ut scriptis Picus superior \[\alpha\pi\omega\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\kappa\omicron\omega\varsigma\] Hermola\o\_ Barbaro in causa philosophorum barbarorum.\textsuperscript{47} Si aliqua sit ars transmutationis metallorum,\textsuperscript{48} hanc puto esse quae hic in opus deducitur. Rogas \[[\ell]\] etenim identidem luserim ne an serio scripserim super alchymia: me hercle, non secus respondere ausim quam super androgyno responderunt deus ille et dea (ut est in lepidissimo epigrammate),\textsuperscript{49} siqui
dem ipse nondum apud me decrevi quid sentiam.

Admones minimum esse vulgi, coniectura assequi ex “minio” factum esse “minimum”. Vehementer arridet ea lectio, quamquam passim habent exemplaria.

Postremo de Galeni vita citas Suidam;\textsuperscript{50} a\[i\]: “\[\epsilon\beta\iota\omega\, i\nu\kappa\iota\, \epsilon\tau\eta\, o’\]”. In tuam et Suidae sententiam ut discemad, me ipse monet Galenus, qui suarum saepem meminit aegritudinem. Ita legeram apud Sypontinum\textsuperscript{51} et nescio quos praeterea.

Vid\[es quantop\]ere tua abutar patientia, sed boni consules haud diffido, \[ de\]syderatissimum musarum daelicium. M<agistri> Leonar\[dus\],\textsuperscript{52} utraque lingua anxie doctus dixit commendatum

\textsuperscript{46} “Johannes Wuesbrouc”: cf. ep. 103.

\textsuperscript{47} “Picus”: sc. Giovanni Pico della Mirandola in his letter to Hermolaus Barbarus of June 3, 1485, edited in Angelus Politianus, \textit{Epistulae}, 9.4. Vandevalus does not give a literal quotation from this letter, but a summary of its contents (perhaps borrowed from an other source?). Pico is called “superior” to distinguish him from his nephew and biographer Giovanni Francesco (1470-1533).

\textsuperscript{48} “ars transmutationis metallorum”: definition of alchemy; cf. e.g. \textit{Rosarium Philosophorum} (attributed to Arnaldus [see note 44] and printed, for instance, in a collection of alchemical works: \textit{Liber de compositione alchemiae}, s. 1. a. [end sixteenth/ early seventeenth c.], p. 279); Paracelsus, \textit{Coelum philosophorum}, 2 (as in note 39), p. 16

“epigrammate”: not found.

\textsuperscript{50} “Suidam”: sc. \[\Gamma\], 32 (ed. Adler, 1, p. 506).


\textsuperscript{52} “Leonardus”: possibly Eleopolus; cf. ep. 86.
A tergo: Eruditionis et morum decoris ornatissimo / viro M<agistro>
Francisco Cranevellio Noviomago, / Jurisprudentiae professori53 doctis-
simmo.

Ep. 105. Fr. Cranevelt (Bruges) to L. Vandevalus (Bruges).

105 (no foliation). <III 1522>

Although preceding it in the bundle (but without a series number) this seems to
be an answer of Cranevelt to Vandevalus’s apologetical letter 104. The references
to the booklet from the collection of Joannes Wuesbroeck and to Eleopolus con-
firm that the present letter is indeed in answer to letter 104 and not to letter 98.

Cranevelt thanks Vandevalus for his letter and the booklet of Wuesbroeck,
which he has not yet digested in full. Cranevelt seems to be looking for excuses
for not pronouncing a judgment. He expresses his opinion that the subject
(alchemy) is too difficult even if one believes in it, something which Cranevelt
does not. He will readily accept Vandevalus’s apology as he thinks his own
remarks smell of calumny.

In letter 104 Vandevalus calls Johannes Wuesbroeck an excellent master of
astrology and alchemy. Although the name is uncommon, no more seems to be
known about this man. The expression “ex archanis” is unclear: does it mean
Wuesbroeck’s private library or his teaching?

Eleopolus — a friend of L. Clodius and L. Vandevalus (see end of letter 88)
will be taken under Cranevelt’s patronage and the three Leonardi (cf. also Ep.
88, ll. 52-53) have already been his friends for some time.

About the edition: Vandevalus should himself decide what is best, but not
take Horace’s advice, namely, to lay his book away for nine years, too literally
(cf. Hor., Ars 388). Cranevelt wants to read the booklet over together with Van-
devalus before sending it back, but if Vandevalus should need it, it will be
returned at once.

Across the sheet on the extreme right of the verso side Cranevelt wrote five
lines in French.

Salve, mi [Vande]vale. Habeo tibi gratiam pro tuis illis huma-
niss<imis> literis et libello ex archanis Wuesbroeck, quem identidem
repetens non potui concoquere. Deinde videtur nimia difficultas rei
propositae, eciam si porro certa sit fides, quae tamen apud me vacillat.

53 “Professor” does not mean “professor” or “teacher”, but indicates that Cranevelt
is “doctor (iuris)”. Compare the matriculation of Erasmus at Louvain on 30 August 1517:
“Magister Erasmus de Roterdammis, sacre theologie professor” (Brussels, Algemeen
Rijksarchief, Fonds Univ. Leuven, nr. 23, f. 236’).
Apologiam tuam facile recipio, utpote qui iam antea mihi persuasissem annotatiunculas meas calumniam redolere.

Eleopolum scito mihi fore commendatisseme meque trium Leonar-dorum nomina iamdudum in album amicorum retulisse.

De aeditione statues ut libebit, modo non nimis anxi Horatianum illud novennium concedi tibi postules. Vale et me, ut facis, ama.

Tuus Craneveldius.

Libellum non remitto, priesquam tecum perlegero, id quod per ocium spero brevi licebit. Quod si tibi eo fuerit opus, mittetur actutum. Iterum vale.

A tergo: Eruditiss<imo> viro M<agistro> Leonardo / Vandevalo medico ac ph<ilosoph>o.

e transverso:
Comme le cas est advenu recemment la classe est le cas alle le maistre averty (?) de la paresse (?) de lest alla prendre (perdre?) ses affair ass par quel moyen il se asseurer (=assurer?) ses previsions (?) de …puter demission (?) seroit chose par perilleuse et dangeureuse

Ep. 106. J. Fevynus (Bruges) to Fr. Cranevelt (Bruges).

108 (f. 128) 

A small note from Fevynus rather severely damaged at the left top side and the lower right margin, with loss of text.

Fevynus is glad that Cranevelt has received a letter from Vives (ep. 96 may have been the one meant), but less pleased that there was no word in it for him. He surmises that Vives had written a letter to him also, but that is only a guess. He would have been more pleased with greetings in the letter to Cranevelt.

After the evening prayers he will be at home unless friends detain him. He will come himself to Cranevelt [when that will be is lost in the damaged part of the text] and then they will talk about Leonardus and Vives’s “schedium”(?).

Several points are obscure or uncertain. First, there is no date. Going by its position in the bundle this note seems to have been written in the last days of
March or the first of April. Vives was then in Bruges, as we know from letter 102 and Allen 1271, written on 1 April. However, the note could be also a reaction to letter 96 of early January, in which Vives indeed omitted to send greetings to Fevynus and promised to write him a letter. If that is correct, the note was misplaced in the collection.

However, there are other problems. Fevynus promises to come to see Cranevelt and to talk about Leonardus and something related to Vives. If Leonardus is the doctor and alchemist Vandevalus, the discussion will have been about his book. But that was possible only some time after 10 February (see letter 98). Another Leonardus was the schoolmaster Clodius, on whom see letters 82-83 (HL 43 [1994], 62-64). Fevynus and Cranevelt will also talk about a learned “schedium” of Vives. The reading of “schedium” is partly conjectural, only “sched” being clearly written. Its meaning is also puzzling. Usually it means an extemporaneous poem (but Vives was no great writer of poems), but it can also be a manuscript. Was it a page from the Commentary on St. Augustine which Vives was preparing and for which he repeatedly called upon the help of his friends in Bruges?

S<alutem> [P<lurimam>D<ico>, Domine Cr<aneveldi>. Quod acceperis a Vive nostro l<iteras pergrajtum mihi [[gratum]] est; ingratum autem mihi, quod ne verbulum ille unquam ad me. Quare etiamsi dissimulas cum in tuis non impertit salutem nobis, suspicor iam tandem scripsisse quiddam. Hoc divinare possum, illud ut dixi multo iucundiss<imum>. 

A vesperarum horis absolutis ero domi, id quod soleo, ni remorentur me amiculi. [Alias (?)] ipse te invisam, ac tum de Le<on>ardo' et Vivis h[umaniss<imo>] et doctiss<imo> schedio.2 Vale. 

Tuus Fevynus.

A tergo: D<brmi> no suo F<rcisco> Craneveldio.

Ep. 107. Fr. Cranevelt (Bruges) to J. Clement (Bruges).

109 (no foliation).  

An invitation from Cranevelt to Clement to come to Cranevelt’s house, where More is expected after noon for a cosy chat. At the same time Cranevelt apologises for disturbing thereby Clement’s studies.

1 “Leonardo”: ms.: “Leardo”.
2 “schedio” is a conjectural reading of what looks like ‘schend’ (“sched”, with a long horizontal stroke reaching back from the top of the “d”), which does not make sense. Since “Vivis” is clearly a genitive, the ending must be another ablative depending on “de”.
The letter does not bear a date. Since More is in Bruges it must be placed in 1521 before More's return to England. It follows, therefore, that its position in the bundle among the correspondence of the spring of 1522 cannot be correct. Moreover, it is surprising that it is found in the bundle at all. Had it not been despatched for some reason unknown to us? Or was it, for an equally unknown reason, returned to Cranevelt at a later date?


Tuus Craneveldus.

A tergo: Eruditissimo viro D<ominus> / Clementi Britanno,/ utriusque lingue peritissimo.

Ep. 108. Johannes Borsalus (Veere?) to Fr. Cranevelt (Bruges)

110 (f. 129) <Spring 1522>

The right-hand margin and the end of the this letter are badly worn with considerable loss of text, which it is not always possible to restore with certainty.

The author of this letter is the Zealander Johannes Becker Borsalus, whom we already know from letters 23, 24 and 29. As in letter 24 he begins with an apology because he has not written for a long time [as a matter of fact, for more than a year]. It was not due to any diminished friendship but to the burden of his duties (viz. the deanery of Zanddijk near Veere), which oblige him to recite endless prayers in church as well as at home. One task grows out of another and so his activities have no end. What is worse, his priestly office is linked to the court (of Adolph of Burgundy), which means more work and more running about to do, as Fevynus was once able to see. Therefore, he has scarcely any time for himself or his friends, especially the distant ones.

Recently he tried to escape from this position of slavery, when an opportunity presented itself in the shape of the deanery of the chapter of St. Peter's in Middelburg. However he met with a strong opposition at the Imperial Court and he found no support whatsoever, not even from his patrons Lord Adolph of Bur-
gundy and his wife, who were opposed to his leaving them. So he did not dare to challenge his competitor. He will continue living in Veere, hoping that God may give him still another chance, which is rather unlikely because of his age. Borsalus’s statement that he is a “quadragenarius” (forty or even in his forties) allows us to put his birth around 1480, which is in accordance with the fact that he came to Louvain as a student in the summer of 1495.

In the autumn of 1522 Borsalus told the same story in a letter to Erasmus (Allen 1321) written on 23 November at Louvain whither he had accompanied Philip, a son of Lord Adolph, at the end of September.

Borsalus does not know how much Cranevelt had heard about the affair, maybe from Henry Zwynghedau, whom he had consulted a couple of times in Ghent. Because of all this, he did not have sufficient time to write, nor to travel to Bruges the previous summer. In fact he did not move at all except to the nearest island (viz. Noord-Beveland).

Greetings from his nephew Jacobus.

On Borsalus and his career see CE I, pp. 115-116.

[Johannes Bo]rsalus D<omino> Francisco Craneveldio iureconsulto S<alutem>.

Pudet me nonnihil, humanissime Craneveldi, quod hactenus in scribendis ad te epistolis fuerim negligentior ac segnior, nec semel iterumque provocatus tuis humanissimis literis quicquam responderim, nisi vel aliquot mensibus post, vel cum tua egerem opera, quam tamen etiam parum sic merito [[tamen]] impartisti promptissimam. Verum hoc velim amico credas: neque ex imminuto meo [[amo]] in te amore neque contemptu tui hoc natum silentium tam diuturnum, quin potius ex servitute, quam servio variam ac gravem. Scis enim sacerdotium quo fungor, quam sicut tempore minime liberum, praesertim a curis et occupatio-nibus; primum multis ac prolixis preculis1 horariis oneratum, quas et palam in templo et domi privatim permurmurare2 oportet; quicumque hoc iugum subierint, minime hoc rerum st[atu]; deinde qui presit sacerdotum collegio, qui presit gregi Christi satis etiam numer[o?] sinit perpetua diversis de rebus negotia? Id si ipse non es experientia edoctus, [roga cui] in huiusmodi palestra versari contigerit. Nascitur negotium ex negotio

---

1 “preculis”: cf. Ducange, Glossarium mediae et infimae Latinitatis, 5, p. 428: ‘rosary’. The word also means liturgical hours.

2 This verb does not seem to occur in classical texts but in combination with “preculas” it is quite common in northern humanistic Latin. Cf. R. Hoven, Lexique de la Prose Latine de la Renaissance (Leiden 1994), p. 260. Compare Erasmus, Moriae Encomium (ASD IV 3, p. 176, 838): “si preculas illas suas utcunque permurmurarint”.
atque [ita fit ut Hydrae] more in uno preciso capite secundum hoc malum congeminetur. Ad hec communia omnis mortalis incommoda, hoc accedit etiam quod aulicum sum nactus sacerdotium, quod magis (ut) Fevinus coram vidit) currere et recurrere compellor. Et aule nomen quando audias, nonne hoc statim vocabulo tibi occurrit ingens molestiarum ac tediorum oceanus? Hinc est quod minime sum meis, minime sum amicorum, presertim absentium; tametsi minimi meis amicissimo.


---

3 "Hydrae" (conj.): cf. Erasmus, Adagia 1.x9 = 909: "Hydram secas". (no quotation).
4 "quod": one expects "quo", but the abbreviation suggests "quod".
5 We have filled the gaps with the help of the very similar passage in Borsalus’s letter to Erasmus (Allen 1321), 11. 17-21: "In locum defuncti Decani S. Petri Middelburgenensis omnium collegarum suffragis sum electus, renitens propemodum et invitum... Eam electionem prosequutus totam Imperatoris aulam mihi expugnans sum obstinantem". Since "electus" does not fill the whole second lacuna, possibly the words "et renitens" or something similar preceded the verb.
6 "S. Petri Middelburgensis": the oldest church of the capital of Zealand which was demolished in 1834. A chapter was founded in 1310 or 1314 and existed until 1574, when this church was the first to be used by the Calvinists. Cf. A. J. van der Aa, Aardrijkskundig woordenboek der Nederlanden, 7 (Gorinchem, 1846), pp. 888-889.
7 "dominus a Beveris": viz. Adolph of Burgundy, lord of Veere and Beveren, one of the most important counsellors of Charles V; cf. Lit. Cran. 53, 1.14 n.; CE I, pp. 223-224.
licet iam quadragenario. Nescio [autem] quid hac de re audieris, a ma-
gistro Henrico Baliolano⁹ fortasse, quem tum Ganda[vi] agentem
subinde consului.

His itaque de causis factum est ut rarius ad te scripser[m]. Revera, ut
scripsi anno superiore, isthuc [venire speravera]m¹⁰, sed nusquam movi
pedem [ea ae]state, nisi in proximam nobis insulam¹¹. [Rescribi voluit
tibi salutem] Dominus Jacob[us¹², meus e sorore ne]pos, nobis olim con-
victor [Lovan(?)]iens[i]

A tergo: Eximio et incorruptissimo iure-/-consulto Magistro Francisco/
Craneveldio, consiliario ma/-gistratus ac senatus Brugensis,/ amico singu-
lariter dilecto.


111 (f.130) <III 1522>
Received 6 IV <1522>

More thanks Cranevelt for the letter he has received and for the care Crane-
velt bestowed on a painting which More had ordered to be prepared in Bruges.
The Holy Virgin (obviously the subject of the painting) will also thank him.
More thought that he had left with a friend in Bruges the balance of three
crowns, to be paid to the painter when the work was completed. He has now
made arrangements so that the sum can be collected from Jan van Porter. A further
half crown will be added as a gift if the work proves to be of great quality.

Next follow a few remarks on Bruges. This part of the text is badly damaged
at the right side, so that a correct understanding is not easy. More wonders about
the meanness of the otherwise extravagant people of Bruges. They spend

⁹ "Henricus Baliolanus": or Zwynghedau, born at Belle in Southern Flanders [now
Bailleul in Northern France], a licentiate in canon law and an intimate friend of Cranevelt,
was from 1521 an official of the bishop of Tournai at Bruges. He died in that town in
March 1532; cf. Lit. Cran. 43 and 212.
¹⁰ In letter 29, of 27 january 1521 (HL 41 [1992], pp. 82-84), Borsalus expressed the
hope of visiting Cranevelt in the following summer. See ll. 8-9: "...spero...ut coram me
estate proxima tibi expurgem".
¹¹ "proxima nobis insula": The nearest island to Walcheren, where Veere is located,
is Noord-Beveland (entirely swallowed by the sea in 1532 and re-created in the late six-
tenth century).
¹² "Dominus Jacobus": cf. letters 23, n. 4 (HL 41[1992], p. 66) and 29, l. 39 (ib., p.
84), which we have used to restore the sense, if not the very words of the last part of the
letter.
immense sums in some cases and then try to repair the outlay little by little by cutting back where actually some further expenditure should be added. Most probably More is alluding to Cranevelt’s unsuccessful request for a better salary and the town council’s resolve to reduce it. In October 1522 Cranevelt will explain to Erasmus that this disagreement made him leave Bruges for Mechelen: “Volebant illi (viz. Brugenses) di[urnum] minus dare quam consuessent; ego contra plusculum postul[labam]. Ita factum est dissidium” (Lit. Cran. 20, II. 8-10).

Cranevelt, whose character is of other stuff, will have no problem finding a situation that is honest and, so More prays, happy. If Cranevelt wants More’s help he should say so and More will do all he can, as if all his own fortune and that of his relatives depended on it.

Greetings to Cranevelt and his wife.

Like the other letters at the bottom of the bundle, this one is also quite damaged at the top, the right side and the bottom.

This letter has been published with a facsimile of the original and an English translation by Cl. H. Miller, “Thomas More’s Letters to Frans van Cranevelt”, Moreana 31, 117 (March 1994), 3-66 (pp. 29-31). In a number of places we restore the gaps in the text in a different way for reasons we explain in the notes.

Litte[ras tuas, mi] charissime Cranevelli, recepi, quae mihi fuerunt ut omnia tua gratissimae. Imaginem meam tibi curae fuisse habeo gratiam. Referet ipsa Virgo1 quae te exigente [[te]] maiore2 cura est absoluta. Reliquos coronatos tres, qui opere perfecta deberentur artifici, credideram me apud quempi[a]m ex amicis istic reliquisse, verum nunc effeci ut recip[erentur]3 a Joanne van Porter4 et [[die]] dimidium coronati pr[aemio addam] dono5 supra pactum, si opus ostendet meruisse.

1 Understand: “Referet (gratiam) ipsa Virgo”. The Virgin, obviously, is the Holy Virgin, whose portrait More had ordered to be painted. Miller thinks that the painter may have been Jan Gossaert (Mabuse), but that seems unlikely because Gossaert was working in the castle of Duurstede (near Nijmegen) in the years 1517-25.
2 “maiore”: ante corr. “maioe”.
3 Miller proposes “recip[iat]” which seems to short to fill the lacuna, unless More did not fill the line to the end.
4 “Joannes van Porter”: unknown, his last name could be “Van der Poorte” or “Verpoortere”. The form “Van Porter” is not a correct Flemish name.
5 Miller proposes “pr[oprio meo] dono”. We do not see why More would say that he is giving it out of his own pocket, which is rather obvious. For our own restoration (also hypothetical, of course) we rely on Terence, Eun. 1057: “quodvis donum praemium a me optato”. One can also restore: “pr[etera]”.

This content downloaded from 201.153.243.100 on Wed, 28 Mar 2018 20:32:15 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms
Brug[ensium], mi Cranevelli, mire me commoverunt tantaee sordes in tan[ta opum]6 prodigentia; qui immensas opes quum in ea consumpserint [expensa (?)]7, quae quicquid impeditur perit, unciatim8 reparare co- [nantur]9 ex hiis decerpentes, quibus aliquid potissimum con[veniret]10 adicerere. Sed hec [[illorum]] ipsorum11 ut vicio, ita etiam malo [fiant]. Nam tibi (quae tua est, mi Cranevelli, virtus et d[iiligentia]) nusquam non reperietur honesta condicio, quam et felicissi[mam] precor, et si qua vides per me ad id commodari posse, sic enitar ut fiat ut si omnium necessario rum meorum fortunae omnes ac mea quoque ipsius in statu tuo forent collocatae. Vale, charissime Cranevelli, cum uxore matrona omnium optima ac d[ulcissima; saluta]nt te [uxor m]ea atque omnes mei12.

A tergo: Viro ornatissimo atque/ eruditissimo D<omino> Francisco / Cranevellio, urbi Brugensi / a consiliis.

Manu Craneveldii: VI aprilis.

Ep. 110. L. Clodius (Bruges) to Fr. Cranevelt (Bruges).

112 ([f.131-133]) 13 IV 1522

This long letter written by Clodius has been damaged at three edges with loss of text. In this letter Clodius, whose former letters are much influenced by his reverential attitude towards his patron Cranevelt, shows himself an interesting and often witty author.

6 Miller supplies only “tan[ta]” which is definitely too short to fill the gap. For our restoration compare Tac., An. VI 14: “prodigentia opum”, and the following “opes”. “Rerum” is another possibility.

7 Miller proposes “re”, which again is too short. It is hard to fill the gap for two reasons: first, it is not clear whether the preceding “ea” is an ablative singular or an accusative plural; second, it is even less clear how the following sentence is to be construed. If “quae” depends on “reparare” it must be an accusative plural and “quicquid impeditur, perit” an intercalated general reflection. If we take “quae” to be the subject of “perit” it is a feminine singular, but then there is no way to connect it grammatically with “reparare co[ ]”, where the damaged verb must be a plural because of the following “decerpentes”.

8 “unciati”?: supra ‘u’ atramento leviore add.: “v”, ut vocalis significetur.

9 Miller proposes “coguntur” which is equally possible.

10 Miller proposes “con[veniret]”.

11 “ipsorum”: supra lineam.

12 Miller proposes: “d[iiligentissima. Saluta]nt te [coniunx m]ea atque omnes mei [?]”. We believe that before the final “t” of the verb the stroke of a suspended “n” is still visible. We prefer “uxor” because More used the word also for Cranevelt’s wife. Compare also Lit. Cran. 115, II. 40-41: “Uxor mea et liberi salutem tibi compencantur”.

He begins his letter by apologizing for the late return of Cranevelt’s copy of Lucian. His pupils liked Lucian very much and they translated several dialogues both into their mother tongue and into Latin. After this piece of news, which was the actual reason for writing, he describes what happened at a meal in some citizen’s house where he was invited. Apart from the host, his wife and a certain Hadrianus Westhusius, Clodius met there with six Dominicans. Originally only three of them were invited, but being of a rather thrifty disposition, they each brought a companion.

First there was a discussion about the place of honour at the table but after some debate it was decided that it would be given to Father Procurator, the next one to Father Lector and the third to the Father who preaches in St. Donatian’s. Then the party started to eat, although this was not the proper expression for the Dominicans: they devoured their meal like vultures and emptied their glasses in quick succession. Theology was not so far discussed at the dinner table (conversation being at the level of the wine) but when everybody was sufficiently full and equally heated by the wine, the time came for scholastic jokes.

At this moment Clodius happened to mention Erasmus, Vives and More, deliberately refraining from speaking about Luther. One of the Dominicans, the Lector, immediately attacked Clodius by asking him whether he too was one of those modernists. A rather fierce discussion followed about humanistic latinity and the ancient Fathers. At last Clodius asked, ironically, whether Thomas Aquinas was a theologian at all. His opponent cursed his feigned stupidity and promised to demonstrate that Thomas was the best theologian of all. Clodius urged a calm discussion as the wine was clearly having some effect, but his adversary would have nothing of the kind. When Clodius asked him to behave, he was seized with rage and called Clodius an ass. Clodius answered that his adversary was a Midas, as he would not call a priest an ass. The other repeated his transforming act and Clodius had to accept his change of essence.

After this discussion, the party had some more wine, too much of it even (the Dominicans paying visits to the bathroom to vomit and then to resume drinking), and a new fight started when the friar announced that he would defeat Erasmus and his whole gang with his book Ibis. According to classical science, the ibis had the rather curious custom of purging its inside by putting its beak in its rectum and thus cleaning its intestines with water. Clodius’s opinion was that the same would be suitable for a friar who happened to have a rather crooked nose. After that he mockingly assented to everything the poor man asserted, applauded and supported by his fellow Dominicans. It was only when another Dominican, Bartholomew, preacher at St. Giles’s, entered the discussion and started jesting too freely and in Flemish at Clodius’s expense that the latter reminded him that he risked being chased from that church because his own Lector had been expelled from it after stealing the money collected for a penitent prostitute.

In this manner dinner ended after five hours. Grace was said under rather Bacchic influence. Clodius has told the story to Cranevelt because the day before he had already told it to Fevynus and Vives. The latter said he knew the Lector, a man more vainglorious than the Terentian Thraso. As for himself, Clodius just likes the bonae litterae and all scholars and he hates the mendicants. Greetings.
We know that Clodius is the author of a lost school-play *Compendium Epicureae Theologiae* (cf. Lit. Cran., 39, to be added to J. Ijsewijn, *Annales theatris Belgo-Latini*, in: J. Veremans (ed), *Liber amicorum Prof. Dr. G. Degroote [Brussels 1980]*, pp. 41-55), performed in 1526. This letter is the only text we have from which to get an idea of his literary talents. He certainly had a taste for story-telling and for caricaturing and we can only regret that nothing more has come down to us.

Apart from its contents the letter also presents some linguistic interest. Clodius gives the impression of rendering the table discussion fairly literally. Consequently, some words and phrases are medieval, such as “de via” (l. 48 “school, group, way of thinking”; cf. the term ‘via moderna’ in mediaeval philosophy; the use of “de” is similar to that in the Romance languages; “to belong to”), “fruitus” (l. 106) late Latin, in juridical texts and Vulgata; cf. M. Leumann, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft* 2, 2, 1 [Munich, 1977=1926-28], p. 617), “claustraliter” (l. 122; cf. Niermeyer, *Lexicon minus*, p.187) and “odio” instead of “odi” (l. 132; cf. *ThLL*, IX, 2, c. 454 [grammarians, Itala]; *Novum Glossarium mediae Latinitatis, O* [Hafniae, 1983], c. 328-329).

Other words cannot be traced in *ThLL* but are normal Latin formations, some of which already appear in mediaeval authors, others in humanistic texts. Such words are: “ampullosus” (l. 42, “empty, without sense”; cf. Ducange, *Glossarium*, 1, p. 239; Niermeyer, p.42.), “rudimentarius” (l. 68), “indolere” (l. 79), (instead of “indolesco, perf. indolui”? or comp, pro simpl.?), “gloriosulus” (l. 86) (cf. ep. 104, p. 50: in a letter of another Leonarus, viz. Vandevalus), “rostrosus” (l. 97), “verbosulus” (l. 100, cf. Ducange, 6, p. 771 (one example)), “confraterculus” (l. 107, “confrater” in Ducange 2, p. 535; Niermeyer, pp. 244-245) and “magistellus” (l. 108). Finally, there are two puns: “theologus” (l. 100), a verbose theologian, and “Erasmus” /Erasmus (see note 26).

The (double) date of the letter requires some comment. In fact, Palm Sunday 1522 was on 13 April. The Roman date “Kalendis 18 Maiis”, if properly calculated, corresponds to 14 April. Most probably Clodius forgot that the Romans included the Kalends in their counting. As to the year-date 1521, added by Cranevelt(?) below the address, one must bear in mind that Bruges used Easter style.


S<alutem> P<lurimam>. [Lucianus]**3 tuus, clarissime vir, postliminio nunc ad te revertitur, quem precor ne tantae morae tu obiurgaveris, qui

---

1 The first letter of the lost word seems to be an ο.
2 “presbyter”: Clodius is nowhere else mentioned as a priest, but the abbreviation (pbr) seems quite clear.
3 “[Lucianus]”: The textual restoration is certain. Not only the horizontal stroke of L survives, but the name is mentioned again a few lines further. Cf. also letter 97, where Cranevelt’s copy of Lucian is returned by Fevynus, clearly another reader of Cranevelt’s book.
neutiquam sit in culpa. Verum quod hactenus apud me moratus sit, tirunculorum est peccatum, quos videbam impense Lucianum amare argumentisque huius maximopere delectari propter variam in eo fabularum novitatem. Nonnullus et Latino in vernaculum4 sermonem lepide traduxerunt dialogos, eosdemque varia enallage in Romanam linguam utcunque [verterunt]. Eam igitur ob rem ne succenseas precor aut mihi [aut] parvulis, homo omnium multo candidissime; tibi enim haec [ ]5 uni debentur studia.


4 “vernaculum”: ante corr. “vernaculam”.
5 For the sense nothing is really missing. Maybe the worn part of the paper was blank.
6 “Hadrianus Wuesthusius”: otherwise unknown; his (anonymous) brother, the Carthusian is mentioned in Lit. Cran., 89, l. 26; another member of this family, Olivier van den Westhuuse, established a mass to be celebrated by the Carthusians, according to his will of 9 November 1521 (cf. Monasticon Belge, 3 [Brussels, 1978], p. 1211).
7 Cf. Fevynus’s description of the man in January 1524 (Lit. Cran., 89, ll. 25-28): “Hic noster ille Westhuzius, sacerdos [monachus] Carthuzianus per vicos obambulat, liberatus a voto, cum uxorcula adultera belle se oblectans”. He must have been an early case of a monk in Flanders who under the influence of Lutheran principles left his convent (in 1521 or early in 1522) and married.
8 “procurator”: underlined. Not traceable in printed works. The title “Magister Noster means that the man was a “doctor theologiae”. Perhaps Donatianus Scuten (†1526) is meant, who seems to have been procurator in Bruges for some time. In the Dominican convent of Bruges he is mentioned on 9 May 1505, 19 January 1517 and 21 August 1522. See S. P. Wolfs (ed.), Acta capitulorum Provinciae Germaniae Inferioris Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum (The Hague 1964), p. 31, l. 39 and note, where Scuten is mentioned as a Lubilarius in 1518.
9 “Maybe a genitive of “os” (“mouth”) and some word on which it depended is missing.
10 “lector de ligno”: underlined. Iohannes de Ligno or Jan van Houte (†1533) was a “filius” of the Bruges convent, where he received the habit on 15 February 1502 and took his vows in Bruges on 18 June 1506. He was appointed lector at the Chapters of Utrecht (1517), The Hague (1518) and 's-Hertogenbosch (1519) and received the privileges of the function at the Chapter of Douai (1520). He is still mentioned as lector at Bruges on 21 August 1522 and 31 July 1523. See S. P. Wolfs, o.c., p. 43, l. 24 and note. A namesake had been scholasticus at Bruges in 1484. See A. Himpe, Studie over het Humanisme aan het St. Donatuskapittel te Brugge, (unpublished licentiate dissertation, Ghent, 1941) p. 13. At Bruges Van Hout(e) is a most common name.


¹¹ The “concionator Insulanus” must have been from Lille or Rijsel, nowadays in Northern France. He may have been Stephanus de Monte who came from Lille to Bruges in 1517 as master of the novices. See S. P. Wolfs, o. c., p. 25, l. 229.
¹² Here, again, no text seems to be lost in the gap.
¹³ Half of the “n” (?) survives, but only a very few letters can have been lost.
¹⁴ “de Ligno”: underlined.

Sub hae[c ] fraterculi potabant indulgentius, adeo ut in atrinam a mensa crapulae gratia evomendae clanculum facessent, redeunekte

15 “Philippus Melanchton”: the “praeeceptor Germaniae” and the humanist assistant of Luther, who at first followed Erasmus but was later more influenced by Luther and by 1521 even became estranged from Erasmus. Cf. CE, 2, pp. 424-429.
16 “ex Paulo”: cf. 1 Cor. 13.
18 Micio or Micio is the good-hearted tutor in Terence’s comedy Adelphi.
19 An allusion to Apuleius’s famous novel The Golden Ass, in which the hero Lucius is turned into an ass.
20 The mythical king Midas of Phrygia was given ass’s ears by Apollo when in a musical contest the king preferred Pan to Apollo.
21 “metamorphosin”: ante corr. “methamorphosim”.
22 “bovem non queam”: cf. Erasmus, Adagia II, viii, 4 = 1704: “Bovem si nequeas, asinum agas”.
23 “asinos asellos”: We are not able to find a reasonable explication for this phrase. There is no proverb of this kind either in Latin or in Dutch. Perhaps it existed in the Westflanders or Bruges dialect.
simul ad pocula rursus. Me[us] autem Lector, ubi poculum ame\textsuperscript{24}, ut supra, ebibisset, \[ait\] “Indoleo, per Deum, vicem vestram. Utinam per ord[inem] liceret! Vos facile dedocuero istam hanc haeresim, [quae] vos per precipitia incautos adigit. Prestarem ego [non (?)] admodum, inquit, poenitenda, si ea mihi, quae tibi, esset [licentia(?)].” Non potui non ridere hominis theologi ineptissimam arrogantiam, qui vellet docere ipse indoctissimus. Praeterea admir[atus sum] stoliditatem, quasi sicellicet in ordine non liceat vel opt[ima] docere. Comminabatur tamen novam pugnam in q[ua] iam exultavit ceu victor gloriosulus, adversus Eras[mum], Lutherum et praecones omnes. Libello\textsuperscript{25} namque suo nome[n ab(?)] i[b]i\textsuperscript{26} indiderat. Ibis autemavis est ciconiae non admodum ab[similis] quae in Aegypto clysteris u[sum medicis monstravit (?) cum] // rostri aduncitate eam purget part[em qua corporis excre]ta exonerat\textsuperscript{27}.

“In hoc libro belle Erasinum expediam”. “Erasinum” mediusfidius effu
tit homuncio! non flumen e Stymphalo\textsuperscript{28} Arcadiae lacu erumpentem (sic!) praedicans, quasi omnis eloquentia ab ipso promanaret Christo lacu per Roterodamum Erasinum, sed ‘errantem asinum’ asinum innu
ess. Quae res illi vortat male!\textsuperscript{29} “Vereor”, inquam, “ne tua ibis quoque

\textsuperscript{24} “ame”: ama is either a kind of vase (cf. \textit{ThLL VI}, c. 2520) or a measure of contents (cf. Ducange 1, p.215). As an “ama” was the equivalent of 150 liters, Clodius slightly exaggerates.

\textsuperscript{25} “libello”: not traced; it was perhaps never printed.

\textsuperscript{26} The title of the book (Ibis) is partly lost. Only the two “i’s” clearly survive and the upper part of what must have been an “b”. The work itself seems unknown.

\textsuperscript{27} Cf. \textit{Cic.}, \textit{N. D.} II 126: “Atque illa mirabilia, quod (ea quae nuper, id est paucis ante saeculis, medicorum ingenii reperta sunt)… purgantes autem alvos ibes Aegyptiae curantur”. \textit{Plin.}, \textit{Hist. Nat.} VIII 96-97 (a text commonly known in the Middle Ages): “Hippopotamius in quadam medendi parte etiam magister exstitit... corpus exonerat.../ Simile quiddam et volucris in eadem Aegypto monstravit, quae vocatur ibis, rostri aduncitate per earam partem se perluens, qua reddi ciborum onera maxime salubre est”. Unless he saw it in a manuscript (which is unlikely) Clodius could not yet know a passage of Erasmus’s \textit{De pueris instituendis} (LB I 496B = ASD I 2, p. 37, ll. 11-12): “Clysteris usum, quem mire probant medicorum filii, monstravit ibis avis Aegyptia”. (first edition: Basel, September 1529).

\textsuperscript{28} “flumen e Stymphalo”: sc. the Erasius which according to classical opinion was the outlet of lake Stymphalos, but flowed some distance underground (cf. Strabo, VI 275 and VIII 371; Herod., VI 76.1; Paus., II 24. 6 and especially VIII 22.3; \textit{Sen.}, \textit{Quaest.} III 26.4). Clodius explains that the Dominican when making the pun “Erasmus / Erasinus” did not have in mind the classical river name, but a combination of the words “errans asinus”, which he applied to Erasmus. We wonder if, at the end of the sentence, Clodius did not write “asínum” twice erroneously. It would make better sense to write “‘errantem asinum’ Erasínum innuens”.

\textsuperscript{29} Expression borrowed from ancient comedy; cf. Plaut., \textit{Curc.} 273: “quae res male vortat tibi”, or Ter., \textit{Phorm.} 678: “quae quidem illi res vortat male”.
foedum quiddam oleat ac inepto rostro cloacam quandam aperiat neminem non infecturam. Solent namque rostrosae superiores dissonum cantillare, ut praestiterit siluisse plurimum quam garrivisse paucissimum30. Porro codici adfinxit titulum oppido commodum: leviusculus est author Lector, verborum, insanissimus et incredulus Thomista32. Nasum praeterea habet apprimite aduncum ac mentulo curvo33, fere accommunicatum, quem velim, si quando (ut fit nonnumquam in avibus) concrescat Lectoris ibis rostrum, in ibis posticum immersus penetret, ne illo incommodo dilecta pereat ibis.

Astipulabar quicquid deinceps [deinceps] evomeret Lector Midas. Interim bellissime frutus est ille sua insania. Applaudebant ex adverso culinarii34, confraterculi35 et ridebant valde iucundum, ac subinde noster (de quo hactenus nihil nominatim) magistellus36, non bacchalaureus, in Zellandia37, promotus Bartholomeus38, iocatus est in me liberius et facunde quidem ac diserte, sed Teutonice39, quem concionantem aiunt quotidia huius Quadragesimae apud divum Egidium40, et ideo admonui caveret sibi exilium a templo illo. "Unde istud?" rogat. "Quod, inquam,

30 The word seems unknown from ancient texts.
31 Not ancient either, but in accordance with the humanistic predilection for diminutive adjectives.
32 "incredulus Thomista": pun on the image of the doubting apostle Thomas.
33 "mentulo curvo": underlined. The diminutive of "mentum" is not found in ancient texts.
34 "culinarii": perhaps as well an allusion to the Erasmian "Latinitas culinaria"; alliteration.
35 Not ancient.
36 For various diminutives of "magister" used by humanists see the lexicon of R. Hoven.
37 "in Zellandia promotus Bartholomeus": obscure. We have not found a proverb of this type. There is clearly some pun on the degree of bacchalaureus. As in Zealand there has never been a university, the significance of a "degree" from that county is evident. There could also be an allusion to the proverbial bluntness of the Zealanders, cf. the Middle Dutch stanza: "Lange pycken,/ Slyckege dycken,/ Ende den taruwen cant:/ Dat syn de bottaerts van Zeeland", quoted by C. C. van de Graft, Middelnederlandsche historieliederen (Utrecht 1904 = Arnhem 1968), pp. 4-5; G. Komrij, De Nederlandse poëzie van de 12de tot en met de 16de eeuw in 1000 en enige bladzijden (Amsterdam 1994), pp. 322-323.
38 "magistellus Bartholomeus": underlined with the drawing of a hand in the margin. This Bartholomaeus, not mentioned so far, is unknown and must have been one of the Dominicans.
39 Not German ("Deutsch"), but Flemish ("Diets"; cf. English "Dutch").
40 "apud divum Egidium": the church of St. Giles in Bruges (a former village incorporated in 1280) North of the parish of St. Walburgis, where Clodius lived, and of the Spiegelrei. In this parish Vives lived afterwards.
Lector iste vester De Ligno suffuratus sit pecuniolam a populo in usum meretriculae penitentis erogatam. Ita, inquam, populo imposuit iste Lector sacrilegus. Re postmodum compacta impostorem a templo submergunt, atque ita ut pertransire non liceat impune". Sed haec [ ] Lector, Baccho inturbante, hiis demum // [ ] prandium, opiparum hercle ac celebres. [Interim nulla fiebat] ieunii mentio. Dormitabat istic relligio, frigebat abstinentiae amor, omne denique bonum in altissimam abyssum praecipitabantur. Protractae sunt commissationes per horas quinque continuas. Actae sunt tandem Christo per transennam\(^{42}\) grataes, at bacchic\([is]\) labellis\(^3\) et blesis balbisque. Valedictum est undique reverenter et claustraliter.

Habes, gravissime <omnes> doctor, meorum Thomistarum gravitatem ac patrum veternum modestiam, quam non potui te lateret. Namaque hesterno pomeridie eandem [[fab]] comoediam domino [meo]\(^{44}\) Fevino ac praeceptorì Vivi. Vives se\(^{45}\) hominem aie\([at]\) novisse [[se]] quovis Thrasone\(^{46}\) gloriosiorem bullaque ventosa inaniorem.

Quantum ad me attinet, [non] sum in via neque de via huius sive huius, amo [ ] simpliciter bonas literas et doctos omnes, quos [ ] doctissimis video nusquam non acceptos. In me [non] tantum est iudicii ut diiudicem. Sentio autem [ ] secundum veritatem, pestilentem menditium [istum] tumultum odio, quem precor Christus componat et in universam pacem conglutinet, in quod\(^{47}\) vale longum foelicissime.

Brugis, e cubiculo nostro, diet Palmaram, Kalendis 18 Maiis, ante Pascha.

Tuus ex animo Clodius.


Alia manu in imo angulo dextro: a\(^{e}\) 1521.

\(^{41}\) "de ligno"; underlined.

\(^{42}\) "per transennam"; cf. Erasmus, Adagia, III, i, 49 = 2049 (ASD II 5, pp. 65-66).

\(^{43}\) "bacchicis labellis": note the deliberate effects of alliteration etc.

\(^{44}\) The first stroke of what could be an "m" or an "n[oster]" survives.

\(^{45}\) "se": add. supra lineam.

\(^{46}\) "Thrasone": the vainglorious soldier of Ter., Eun. (cf. e.g. vv. 391-439). No actual representation of the Eunuchus in Bruges is known. Clodius himself wrote a school-drama (see introduction to this letter), the school-drama was linguistically influenced by Plautus and especially by Terence. Terence was the first author read as a form in school, so Clodius was sufficiently versed in his comedies and language.

\(^{47}\) viz.: Christo.
Ep. 111. J. L. Vives (Bruges) to Fr. Cranevelt (Bruges).

116 (f. 135) <about 20 May 1522>

A note from Vives, slightly damaged on three sides, without an address. From this fact and from the contents, it may be deduced that the letter was written in Bruges. Vives was in this city in May 1522 to see some of his countrymen before they embarked for Spain with the Emperor. The Court was in Bruges from 13 to 22 May and then proceeded to Calais (Gachard, II, p. 32; see also letter 113). During this stay Vives wrote a letter to Erasmus as well (Allen, 1281, cf. Lit. Cran. 6, note to I. 11). Our note clearly stems from that period, which explains the allusion to “aulicae molestiae partem”. In his letter to Erasmus Vives also complains about the busy life at Court which leaves him no time for his work on the commentary on St. Augustine.

Vives returns Cranevelt’s copy of Ptolemy (a book not yet mentioned in earlier letters) and expresses his gratitude for the loan of this and other books (cf. letters 79 and 102). Cranevelt will be busily involved in Spanish and other matters, but Vives also had his share of the burden of Court duties. Therefore they have not had much time to give to each other, but as Vives will be staying for another four or five days, he hopes he will enjoy Cranevelt’s company after all. Greetings to Cranevelt and his wife.

The Spaniards alluded to in the letter are, of course, the members of the Imperial Court. Vives’s pun on the Greek words ἐρίοις [wool] and ἐρίσι [quarrel], when speaking of the Spaniards, is rather obscure and must have been so to Cranevelt too. This appears from Vives’s next letter to Cranevelt (Lit. Cran. 6, from 24 June), in which he came back to the pun. Unfortunately, that part of the letter is heavily worn so that it makes obscurity yet darker. The fact that Bruges was the main centre for Spanish wool exports and even the staple town for that product does not seem to be of importance here. In any case one does not see the relation with the Court.

In the left margin underneath, Cranevelt has added a Latin translation of Vives’s Greek words, half of which has disappeared.


Vives toto pec[tore].

Infra a sinistra, Craneveldi manu: [eurum lanis] et litibus.²

Ep. 112. <L. Clodius (Bruges) > to Fr. Cranevelt (Bruges).

117 (f. lost) <1 VI 1522?>

Another letter by Clodius, damaged on all sides, but with loss of text at the beginning, the end and the entire right side of the letter. The hand is clearly that of Leonardus Clodius.

As far as the damaged text allows us to understand it, the letter is basically one on behalf of a poor friend. The greater part however serves as a “captatio benevolentiae”.

Clodius begins by apologizing for his frequent correspondence. He refers to the principle that a long silence between friends seldom does any good, but that friendship gains from contact. This is proved by the correspondence of Cicero, Pliny and the “Cicero of Rotterdam” [Erasmus], who all wrote frequently. Therefore he hopes that Cranevelt will forgive his assiduity. Besides, if he seems to become impudent, it is rather Cranevelt’s fault as he led on an unworthy man with benefits bestowed. Clodius is also most grateful for the fact that, thanks to Cranevelt, he and his pupils can daily visit Erasmus, whom he sets above large pearls. We take it that Cranevelt had presented Clodius and his school with a copy of one of Erasmus’s works, or lent him one, such as the Colloquia or Adagia. Furthermore, Clodius asks to be adopted more or less as a son by Cranevelt, whom he not only holds in high esteem but rather reveres like a god. In the last and heavily damaged sentence Clodius asks for a favour on behalf of an unknown third person, mentioned as the “pauper”, and requests Cranevelt to read his letter and give his judgment on this matter in the margin. Then, if he is successful, the poor man will [do something for Cranevelt] and Clodius will respond, if not with Croesus’s wealth, then with an everlasting friendship.

The date of this letter is, at least in part, conjectural. Its place in the bundle immediately after Vives’s letter of the end of May 1522 (ep. 111) [and preceding Vives’s letter of 24 June (Lit. Cran. 6)] points to the last days of May or the first of June. If our restoration in the last line: (iu[nii prim[o]]) is correct, the letter was written on 1 June. The two “i’s” are clearly visible, the “n” only in part,

¹ This seems to be an allusion to Cranevelt’s efforts to be better paid by the town of Bruges or to get an appointment from the Emperor in Mechelen.
² A Latin translation of the Greek words in the letter.
making it clear only that it cannot be "[Iujlii". However, the possibility that the letters are the remnants of something other than the date cannot be ruled out entirely, especially since Clodius usually put a Roman date at the end of his letters (see letter 110 and Lit. Cran. 36)


Proinde quando ita vi[detur] tibi ut tu tantus (quem non solum suspicio max[ime], sed vice numinis cuiusdam lubens recelo) hom[inem] infimum diligere voles et amare, cupio cum apostol[o rogare]2 non modo ut ames, verum totum me tibi facias [familiarem (?)] et adoptes in filium. Caeterum si das usum m[ihi] huius, hanc opellam mihi propter pauperrimum a[micum (?)] impedas atque chartulam istanm perlectam3 semel a[que in] margine tuum apendias super casibus inscrip[tum] iudicium, quod pro oraculo exosculabimus. Pollic[etur] pauper iste se (si triumphet) tuis responsurum lat[ _  ], sed ego semper, si non Craeseis divitiis4, animo cer[te ... perp]etuo. V[ale] lit[mens Iu{nii pri[mo]}

---

2 "cum apostolo": maybe an allusion to St. Paul, Rom., 13, 8 and 10: "Nemini quidquam debeatis, nisi ut invicem diligentis. Qui enim diligent proximum, legis imple-vit...; Dilectio proximi malum non operatur. Plenitudo ergo legis est dilectio". (We thank R. Truman for this suggestion).
3 The verb is not found in ancient texts, but it is used by Erasmus. See R. Hoven, Lex-iqve, s. v., p. 260.
4 "Craeseis divitiis": Croesus’s wealth has been proverbial since Antiquity; cf. Otto, Die Sprichwörter, p.98-99; Erasmus, Adagia I vi 74 = 574 (Croeso ditior). “Croeseus” (not in ThLL, only “Croesus”, one example in Martianus Capella) is a latinization of Κροήσειος.
As we know scarcely anything of the background of this letter except what it tells us, much of its contents remains obscure. The author, H. Bothe, a priest (if our restoration of the signature is correct!) from Deventer is not much better known, unless he is the same man as “Magister Hadrianus Borttus” (?), a priest and “fiscalis procurator” who attended a meeting at The Hague in August 1522 (See G. Geldenhauer, Collectanea, ed. J. Prinsen [Amsterdam 1901], p. 58). He obviously was in Zealand and Flanders on business and staying with fellow clerics. His origin in the Eastern Low Countries is evident from the peculiarities of the Dutch used for the address which contains forms typical of the Eastern dialects (e.g. ‘und’ instead of the Brabantian and Flemish ‘ende’ [and]). Furthermore, he seems to be acquainted with Geldenhouwer, who went to school in Deventer and whom Bothe may have met there (cf. J. Prinsen, Gerardus Geldenhouwer Noviomagus, pp. 12-14).

The author has heard that the Emperor had arrived in Calais and from there proceeded to London. This, quite clearly, refers to Charles Vth’s journey to London in late May 1522, where he was formally welcomed in the city by Th. More on 6 June (Hall’s Chronicle, I, 250; Harpsfield, Life of More, ed. Hallett, p. 26).

Bothe had hoped to conclude some business with the Emperor and for that reason had left a sum of money with Cranevelt. Now he is afraid of being frustrated in his hope. He begs Cranevelt now to return his money or, if he thinks it better, to keep it until he knows for sure whether the Emperor has given his signature [for a matter unstated] at Calais or not. As he is laid up with fever himself, Bothe could not come to Cranevelt in person, but if Cranevelt thinks it would be wise to go to London, he will do so, in spite of his physical condition.

If Bothe was a priest indeed, the business for which he needed the Emperor’s signature and had to pay a fee, was in all likelihood an ecclesiastical preferment. One can compare this with Borsalus’s endeavours to obtain the deanery of Middelburg (See letter 108).

5 We have restored the lost signature, exempli gratia, with the help of letter 110.
Geldenhouwer is not there at present, otherwise he would have recommended Bothe in a letter of his own. Greetings from Adrianus Cordatus and greetings to Cranevelt’s family.

Adrianus Cordatus was a humanistically-minded canon of St. Peter’s at Middelburg, and a good friend of Geldenhouwer’s: cf. *Lit. Cran.* 71; *CE* 1, pp. 338-339. This letter proves that Cordatus and Cranevelt knew each other well before March 1525 (vs. *Lit. Cran.* 71, note to l. 10).

The fact that Bothe had heard in Middelburg of the Emperor’s departure from Calais to London indicates that the end of May 1522 is the earliest date possible. The day is less easy to define: the phrase “die d[ominica] ‘mutare vocem’” may refer to a liturgical text of the mass, beginning with these words (*Gal.* 4, 20), but so far we have not been able to find such a mass. Moreover, the reading “mutare” is far from certain. The mass of the fifth Sunday after Easter, which would be on 25 May, begins with “Vocem iucunditatis” but that seems too far from Bothe’s quotation.


Humilis tuus servulus,

H. Bothe S[acerdos (?)]

Daventrien<s>s>.

*Manu Craneveldii in imo angulo sinistro:* Remisi ei per hanc literam pecuniam omnem, uti mihi concredita fuerat, annumeratam.

¹ Viz. Gerardus Geldenhouwer, Cranevelt’s good friend from his youth and a correspondent.

² We have serious doubts about the reading of this word (“mutatur” seems also to be possible) but cannot offer a better solution.
A tergo: Den werdigen und hoechgeleerden meyster / Ffranciscus Cranenvelt, pensionarius / der stede van Brugge, mynen by/sunders lieven hern.

Ep. 114. Fr. Cranevelt (Brussels) to J. van Dongelberghe (Brussels?).

114 (no f.) 29 IV 1523.

This letter and the following letter were written by Cranevelt in Brussels in April 1523. It is clear, therefore, that they were at some time misplaced in the bundle, as they really belong among the letters of the collection edited by De Vocht (Lit. Cran.). The two letters seem to be closely connected and they were both directed, obviously on the occasion of a journey to Brussels, to lawyers who do not occur otherwise in the correspondence but were nevertheless old acquaintances of Cranevelt. Another question is why these letters, apparently originals and not copies, are found in Cranevelt’s archives. Did he, after all, not send them off?

Both letters are badly worn with considerable loss of text.

As far as we can understand from the letter, Dongelbergius and Cranevelt had known each other for several years but contact seems to have grown rather infrequent. Cranevelt first ponders on the vicissitudes of life, for which the medicine is to be found in philosophy. He seems to say that he has not yet found a haven, maybe an allusion to the fact that, during his first months in Mechelen, he had not yet a house of his own.

Other people may envy someone’s happiness but Cranevelt does not. He hopes Dongelbergius will be happy with his wife and children, to whom Cranevelt is totally devoted. For them as for Dongelbergius, anything is readily done.

Finally Cranevelt mentions the case being brought by his mother-in-law, which should be recommended by Dongelbergius to a councillor (probably of the Brabant Council as all this takes place in Brussels and Cranevelt would have known him if he had been a member of the Mechelen Parliament): Cranevelt is not well acquainted with that man and thinks that Dongelbergius’s authority is the greater.

Jacobus van Dongelbergh (†1 IX 1523) was a barrister of the Brabant Council: cf. J. Nauwelaers, Histoire des avocats au souverain conseil de Brabant (Brussels 1947), 2, p. 8. Perhaps he may be identified with the Jacobus de Donghebert de Thenis (“Tienen”) who was matriculated as an Arts student at Louvain university on 31 August 1498 (Paedagogium Lilii / Lily College; cf. A. Schillings, Matricule, 3, p. 174, n. 192). He was buried in St. Michael’s Cathedral (formerly St. Gudula’s Church) in Brussels.

[me(?), quod te post tot annos v[i]di / magnam cepi volupt(?)]atem. ipse per multa variaque vite [discrimina iact?]atus neque
ad-huc portum aliquem cons[cutus sum]. Sed hoc fatum nostrum moderatione quadam animi et [studio (?) ] bonarum artium facimus aliquanto levius, cum harum perturbationum omnium medicina ex ipsa philosophia petenda [sit ]. Alius fortassis inviderei Aliene felicitati; ego plane spero (?) tibi esse volupce cum suavissima uxore et optimis [liberis ], quibus ego me, quantus quantus sum, totum dedo, ut [nihil omnino] sit neque tam magnum neque tam difficile quod non tua [vel etiam] illorum causa facile mihi videatur esse suscipiendum. [    ]


Vale dimidium [anime] mee.3 Bruxelle, 29 Aprilis anno XXIII.

T<uae> D<ornationis> deditissimus4 servus Francisco[us Craneveldius]

A tergo: Ornatissimo viro Magistro / Jacobo Dongelbergio U<triusque> Iuris / Licentiato amico primario.

Ep. 115. Fr. Cranevelt (Brussels) to Balthasar van Vlierden (Brussels).

113 (no f.) 29 or 30 IV 1523.

This letter, like the preceding one, dates from the end of April 1523 and was written in Brussels in Cranevelt’s own hand. See introduction to letter 114.

Cranevelt wrote it when he was about to leave Brussels (presumably for Mechelen): consequently its date must be either April 29 (as was the case with ep. 114) or April 30, depending on the restoration of the lost part of the date: x[xix] or x[xx].

Although this letter looks badly damaged, the loss of text is rather slight except at the beginning.

Cranevelt expresses his gratitude to Van Vlierden and returns a piece of the latter’s clothing which Cranevelt had been allowed to use. He adds that Van

1 “socrus”: Catherine, Baronesse of Helmont (cf. Lit. Cran., XL and XLIII; she is mentioned in Lit. Cran., ep. 15 and 26).
2 If this word was read correctly, it must be the name of the counsellor. A name such as De Hert is perfectly well possible.
3 Cf. Hor., Carm., I 3.7: “Et serves animae dimidium meae”.
4 “deditissimus”: ms. “dededitissimus”.
Vlierden should employ him and his belongings as his own. He sends his regards to Van Vlierden’s wife and children who possess the same qualities as their father. He is writing in haste and is already dressed for leaving.

Balthasar van Vlierden was born in Oirschot, a small country-town in Brabant (now in the Dutch province of Noord-Brabant, a few miles to the west of Eindhoven). The mansion of the patrician family van Vlierden, just north of the town, is no longer extant. Balthasar registered in Louvain on 5 May 1495 (cf. A. Schillings, Matricule de l’Université de Louvain, 3, p. 129, n. 4) in the Paedagogium Falconis (Falcon College) and passed his examinations as primus in 1498. Afterwards he studied law while teaching the arts in his old college, where Cranevelt was possibly one of his students. He stayed in Louvain till at least 1505. Later he became a barrister of the Brabant council (like Dongelbergius) and died on 6 February 1528. See E. Reusens, Documents relatifs à l’histoire de l’Université de Louvain (1425-1797), t. 4 (Louvain, 1886-88), p. 392; Lit. Cran., p. XXXV; J. Nauwelaers, Histoire des avocats, 2, p. 15; M. Verweij, “Oirschot en de Leuvense universiteit”, in: H. J. M. Mijland et al. (edd.), Oog op Oirschot (Oirschot, 1991), pp. 158-189 (on Balthasar van Vlierden: p. 164 and p. 173, n.22).

[Tibi habeo gratiajs quantas possum maximas pr[o / tua singularji beni-volentia. Remitto vestem qua sum usu[s] ut mea; tu vicissim me meisque rebus utere non aliter ac tuis ut iuxta veterem illam paroemiam: Amicorum omnia sunt communia1. Placebit [me] commendare dulcis-sime conthorali2 et suavissimis liber[is], quorum indole sum mirum in modum delectatus. Videntur enim paternum ingenium ac genuinam pro-bitatem faci[e] imitaturi.

Vale et me, ut facis, ama.

Brux[elle], iam accinctus ad abeundum festinans scripsi. X[XIX] Aprilis anno XXIII - †cum voluptate† (????)

T<uae> D<ominationi> deditissimus amicus
Franciscus Craneveldius.

A tergo: Ornatissimo viro Magistro / Balthasare de Vlierden U<triusque> I<uris> / licentiato, amico integerrimo.

1 “paroemiam”: cf. Ter., Ad. 803; Cic., Off. I 51; Sen., Ben. VII 12, 1: this proverb was ascribed to Pythagoras. See Otto, Die Sprichwörter, p. 20; Erasmus, Adagia, I, i, 1 = 1 (ASD II 1, pp. 84-86). Vives used its Greek form in letter 38, i. 7 (HL 42 [1993], 20-24).

Ep. 116. Th. More (London) to Fr. Cranevelt (Mechelen)

49 (f. 220) 8 XI 1528

More writes to Cranevelt in Mechelen to thank him for his letter which he received via Hackett.

Sir John Hackett (†1534), courtier and diplomat, ambassador of the English King to the Imperial Court at Mechelen (1526-1530), where Margaret of Austria was regent at the time. Cf. Elizabeth F. Rogers, “Margaret of Austria’s gifts to Tūnstaff, More and Hackett (1529)”, Moreana XII (1966), 57-60; The Letters of Sir John Hackett 1526-1534, ed. E. F. Rogers, Archives of British History and Culture, I-II (Morgantown, West Virginia, 1971), passim. There seems to be no reference to Cranevelt in Hackett’s letters.

More expresses his relief that Cranevelt can live in peace again and hopes that the Christian world may enjoy a general peace. The “restored peace” may be an allusion to the truce which was signed in June 1528 at Hampton Court between England and the Emperor (cf. Léonard, Receuil des Traitez, II, pp. 337-41), but it may equally well refer to the end of some troubles in the Netherlands. The war between the Emperor and Francis I was still going on and would end only a year later with the Ladies’ Peace at Cambrai (3 August 1529).

In addition, More compliments Cranevelt on his thorough acquaintance with Homer and his excellent rendering of Homeric verses into Latin. More is referring here to Cranevelt’s Greek and Latin epitaphs on the death (1525) of Martin Dorp, with the Greek version entitled Cen ton Homericus, first printed in Erasmus’s Ciceronianus, Basel, Froben, 1528 and reprinted at Paris by Simon de Collines, in June of the same year. Both epigrams are in De Vocht, Lit. Cran., p. LXXIV. Cf. the comments of Vives, Erasmus and Fevinus in Lit. Cran. 185, ll. 1-11; 261, ll. 31-32; 260, ll. 8-10.

Finally, More sends his best wishes for the journey of Cranevelt’s wife [Eli sabeth van Baussele] and concludes with some jokes about married life. Cranevelt had once written to him that it is pleasant sleeping in a bed without one’s wife. But, More says, that is true only for the first nights of the wife’s absence. Then desire creeps back and sleep loses its pleasure, unless the wife has left a substitute servant. Cranevelt’s wife, he thinks, has been so wise as to take all the maidservants with her.

Schulte Herbrüggen and Miller connect the absence of Cranevelt’s wife with the death of her mother Catherine, Baroness of Helmont, and the arrangements to be made for the inheritance. This is rather unlikely. Catherine had already died in May at Louvain. One can hardly imagine that Cranevelt did not accompany her to the funeral or that she would stay five months and more in Louvain because of her inheritance. After all, Mechelen and Louvain are only 25 km. apart and communication was easy enough. More does not express any sympathy either, which he could not have omitted to do if Cranevelt had told him that the reason of the journey was family mourning. Quite the contrary, he is joking, which would have been totally out of place.
This letter is foliated 220, although our bundle only runs up to f. 135. The date, established by Cranevelt’s addition “received 22 Nov. anno ’28” and the references to the restored peace and Cranevelt’s Homeric verses (published in 1528) clearly place the letter in the second bundle, edited by De Vocht and ending with folio 219. Apparently it was removed from this second bundle at a certain moment and inserted erroneously in our bundle.

The letter has been edited twice (with facsimiles of the original and an English translation) since its discovery in 1989. The first edition was prepared by H. Schulte Herbrüggen, “Seven New Letters From Thomas More”, *Moreana* XXVII, 103 (Sept. 1990), 49-66 (p. 61), the second by Cl. H. Miller, “Thomas More’s Letters to Frans van Cranevelt”, *Moreana* XXXI, 117 (March 1994), 3-66 (pp. 13-15).

Misit ad me vir clarissimus D<ominus> Hakkettus, serenissimi regis nostri orator apud vos, literas tuas quae mihi tarn iucundae fuerunt, quam eius esse par est, quo non alius esse potest animo meo charior. Paci vobis redditae vehementer gratulor. Atque utinam aliquando liceat gratulali publicae, cuius desiderio iam diu christianus orbis affligitur.

Gaudeo te sic homericum esse factum, ut versus eius ad quidlibet tibi commode tibi subserviant, quos tamen ita Latinos fecisti, ut Grecis nulla parte sint1 cessuri.

Coniugi tuae, matronae plane primariae, faustum iter et negotiis ex sententia confectis celerem precor reditum. Quamquam olim memini te2 scripisses mihi iucundissime dormiri [[e]] in eo lecto, qui uxore vacet. Sed hec sunt verba maritorum primis noctibus ab amandatis uxoris; nam reliquis obrepit desiderium et, nisi vicariato reliquerit uxor, somnum insuavem reddit. Tuam puto, qua est prudentia, pedissequas omnes avexisse secum.

Vale, vir omnium dulcissime. Londini, VIII Novembris
Quantulus est ex animo totus tuus
Thomas Morus eques

*A tergo:* Viro virtute et literis / ornatissimo D<ominus> Francisco / Craneveldio Cesareae / maiestati a consiliis / Mecliniae.


---

1 Miller erroneously reads “sunt”.
2 “te”: added above the line.
Silvester 1463 schloß Enea Silvio Piccolomini seine ‘Commentarli’ ab; sie begründeten seinen Ruf als Biographen seiner selbst in den verschiedenartigsten und vielfältigsten Bezügen zu der ihn umgebenden Welt, und es ist oft festgestellt worden, daß Enea — oder vielmehr: Pius II. — eigentlich ein Panorama der europäischen Zeitgeschichte schuf, das in einer bisher so nicht gekannten Fülle die Darstellung der politischen Entwicklung und seiner eigenen Rolle darin mit Beobachtungen aller Art verband: mit geographischen Darstellungen und historisch-kulturgeschichtlichen Abrissen, mit Städtebildern, Anekdoten — und eben Porträts und Lebensbeschreibungen von Zeitgenossen.\textsuperscript{1}

Der rhetorisch-stilistischen Tradition seit der Antike entsprechend hielt auch Enea biographische Schilderungen für Formen der Geschichtsschreibung, und er verwendete sie vornehmlich in historiographischen Texttypen: abgesehen von den erwähnten ‘Commentarli’ und kurzen Charakterisierungen in Briefen inserierte er Personen- und Lebensbeschreibungen vor allem in seinen Darstellungen des Konzils von

 Basel, in der ‘Historia Australis’ (in drei Redaktionen 1453/54-1458 entstanden) sowie in der ‘Historia Bohemica’ (im Juni 1458 beendet).


3 Diener (wie Anm. 2), S. 187 und 191-192.


Sollte also die Sammlung nach Eneas Vorstellung ein “liber” oder sogar ein “tractatus” werden, so muß jegliche Interpretation sie zunächst als selbständiges Werk ins Auge fassen und nach dessen Strukturen fragen. Es wird sich zeigen, daß dem Autor gewisse Auswahlkriterien und Ordnungsprinzipien vor Augen standen, die das seit Georg Voigts Aussage von dem Werk “ohne sonderliche Ordnung” geltende Urteil6 widerlegen.


nimmt als terminus ante quem die Kalendens des Januar 1450 (S. IX) und als terminus post quem das Jahr 1445 (S. X) an.


Dem Verzeichnis zufolge setzte Enea nach dem König und der Königin von Sizilien mit drei "duces" aus dem mailändischen Haus der Visconti fort; sechs Kardinäle sowie ein Advokat und ein Kleriker, deren Anwesenheit beim Basler Konzil sie in Eneas Blickfeld gerückt

9 Diener (wie Anm. 2), S. 188-189, Anm. 31. Van Heck (wie Anm. 2), S. VII.
10 Van Heck (wie Anm. 2), S. VII-VIII; Diener (wie Anm. 2), S. 188-189, Anm. 31.

Mit Nicolaus Piceninus beginnt eine Reihe italienischer Militärs und Stadtherrschers, die nach Cosmus de Medicis in eine Group gelehrter Humanisten übergeht. Im Verzeichnis führt Enea Leonardus Aretinus (Bruni), Marianus Sozinus, Johannes de Imola und Bartholomeus de la Capra auf; in den Texten erweitert er die Lebensbeschreibungen Brunis und Sozzinis um Namen und kurze Darstellungen zahlreicher anderer humanistischer Gelehrter und Dichter. Er selbst gerät dabei zunehmend in den Blick, indem er als Ohren- und Augenzeugen die Leistungen der Genannten mit eigener Erfahrung belegen und sich gegebenenfalls als ihr Schüler erweisen kann. Die Zeugenschaft kann auch zu abwertenden Urteilen führen wie im Falle des Johannes de Imola: "hunc Imole uidi in domo sua, cum Patavium irem nec uidisse uoluissem; minuit enim presentia famam; nam homo is erat, qui in scriptis totus esset, ...".

11 "Amator studiorum est ..." beginnt der letzte Satz der Beschreibung (van Heck [wie Anm. 2], S. 2, Z. 13); man kann also schließen, daß Enea diesen Text vor dem Tod des Kardinals 1444 schrieb. Eine solche Datierung steht in Widerspruch zu van Hecks mit begründeten Argumenten ermittelten Datierung des gesamten Werkes (s.o. Anm. 5). In ähnlicher Weise müßten auch die anderen Viten untersucht werden.

12 "... nec enim ului statim de parte ad partem transire." (van Heck [wie Anm. 2], S. 6, Z. 21).


\[16\] Am Ende dieser Vita erwähnt Enea eine Predigt vor einer Mailänder Synode, die er habe halten dürfen “quamuis nondum sacris essem ordinibus initiatus” (van Heck [wie Anm. 2], S. 45, Z. 10); das bedeutet, daß Enea diesen Text nach seiner Priesterweihe 1445 oder, wie van Heck (wie Anm. 2, S. X) argumentiert, 1446/47 im Zeitraum der folgenden Weißen verfaßt hat.

\[17\] Van Heck (wie Anm. 2), S. 43-45.
me fecit, sibi ut fabellas Esopi in prosam redigerem; nam metricas non plane intelligebat. cui parui libens”. Als letzten *vir illustris* behandelt Enea den böhmischen Hussitenführer Jan Žižka. In die Gruppe der Herzöge hat der Autor sowohl in seinem Verzeichnis als auch in der Sammlung zwei hohe Geistliche eingeschoben: Petrus de Luna, als Papst Benedikt XIII., und Alfonso Sancti Eustachii cardinalis; Gründe für diese Anordnung werden nicht deutlich.


Der inhaltliche Rahmen der Frauenbiographien wirkt mithin enger gesteckt, als der der meisten Männerbiographien, aber auch unter ihnen gibt es Texte, die nur wenige Charakteristika ihres Objekts erfassen. Denn so sehr Enea den seit der antiken Biographie traditionellen rhetorischen Mustern verpflichtet ist, so sehr erweitert er die Freiheiten in deren Anwendung, indem er — ohne daß sich dies anders als mit der vermuteten Vorläufigkeit seiner Niederschrift begründen ließe — nie alle Positionen seines in der Abstraktion erkennbaren Schemas ausfüllt: Herkunft, Aussehen, Charakter oder Eigenschaften, gegebenenfalls Ehen, Ausbildung und Begabung, Stellung und berufliche Laufbahn.

---

18 Van Heck (wie Anm. 2), S. 102, Z. 7-9.
19 Felix V. und Benedikt XIII. widerlegen die — wohl Voigt (wie Anm. 6, S. 324) entnommene — Aussage Worstbrocks im Artikel des Verfasserlexikons (wie Anm. 1, Sp. 656), keine Papstbiographie liege vor; dem widersprach schon Bürck (wie Anm. 6, S. 79).
affällige Leistungen, gegebenenfalls Tod, *studia* und Anteil am Humanismus, vielleicht noch andere Gelehrte desselben Faches oder derselben Universität. Auch die klassische Unterscheidung nach *personae publicae* und *personae privatae* findet sich weder als Darstellungsmuster noch als Gliederungskriterium des intendierten „*liber*“.


Über die Feststellung und Beschreibung seiner Auswahl hinaus bleiben offene Fragen: wenn sogar ein mit langjähriger Auslandserfahrung und internationalen Beziehungen versehener Mann die von ihm als berühmt geschätzten Zeitgenossen noch in Landsleute und Ausländer unterteilt, warum umfassen dann diese beiden Kategorien nicht dieselben Berufsgruppen, d.h. insbesondere: warum fehlen Gelehrte bei den Nichtitalienern? Warum nennt Enea keine bedeutenden italienischen

---


Frauen? So groß sind die Defekte der Überlieferung nicht, daß sie derlei Fragen gegenstandslos erscheinen ließen.


Wie groß auch immer der Anteil des nur Skizzenhaften, des an historiographischer Verwendbarkeit orientierten Entwurfs sein mag, so bleibt doch festzuhalten, daß Enea seinen “liber” mit einem durch jahrhundertealte Traditionen festgelegten Namen bezeichnete, der geeignet war, der Sammlung einen katalogartigen Charakter zu verleihen. Der Buchtyp der Viri illustres war wohl erst durch Hieronymus, der sich dabei auf Sueton beruft, auf einen Schriftstellerkatalog beschränkt und zugleich mit christlichem Inhalt gefüllt worden. Seine Fortsetzer Gennadius von Marseille und Isidor von Sevilla führten ihn als Kirchenschriftstellerkatalog fort; Ildefons von Toledo nahm jedoch auch nicht literarisch ausgewiesene


Anders als in den Schriftstellerkatalogen gleichen Titels von Hieronymus über Sigebert von Gembloux bis zu Johannes Trithemius hat

30 Vgl. Klaus Arnold: Johannes Trithemius (1462-1516). Zweite, bibliographisch und überlieferungsgeschichtlich neu bearbeitete Auflage, Quellen und Forschungen zur
sich Enea kein Denkmal am Ende gesetzt. Er braucht dies auch nicht zu
tun, da er in auffälliger Weise in den Biographien präsent ist, wenn seine
Anwesenheit, sein Erleben die Authentizität des Berichts verstärken
können. Dadurch gerät, besonders in den Gelehrtenviten von Leonardus
Aretinus bis zu Bartholomeus de la Capra, ein Element des Autobiogra-
phischen in sein Werk, das den Texttyp Vita in einer Sammlung verän-
dert und erweitert.

Vergleicht man unter diesem Aspekt Eneas Viten berühmter Männer
und Frauen mit seinem eigentlich autobiographischen Werk, den ‘Com-
mentarii’, und hier insbesondere mit deren erstem Buch über Eneas Wer-
degang vor dem Pontifikat, so läßt sich zeigen, daß Enea in seinem in
der dritten Person gehaltenen Lebensbericht sowohl seine Eindrücke als
auch die Darstellung der ihm begegnenden Zeitgenossen wesentlich
mehr in historiographische narratio auflöst als innerhalb der gewisser-
maßen ‘objektiveren’ Gattung Biographie.

Solche Überlegungen verraten jedoch bereits die neuzeitliche Folie:
die Autobiographie als persönliches Zeugnis und Dokument im Gegen-
satz zur abstrahierenden Biographie zu betrachten, ist in der Rücküber-
tragung unhistorisch, unhistorisch auch noch im Blick auf Enea Silvio
Piccolomini, der durch sein Werk in so vielen Punkten neue Seh- und
Schreibweisen gelehrt hat.

Universität der Bundeswehr Hamburg
Institut für Geschichtswissenschaft
D - 22039 HAMBURG

Geschichte des Bistums und Hochstifts Würzburg 23 (Würzburg 1991), S. 117-132, hier
S. 122. Ders.: "De viris illustribus. Aus den Anfängen der humanistischen Literaturge-
schichtsschreibung: Johannes Trithemius und andere Schriftstellerkataloge des 15. Jahr-
hunderts", Humanistica Lovaniensia 42 (1993), S. 52-70.
Erika RUMMEL

IN DEFENSE OF “THEOLOGIZING HUMANISTS”:
AURELIO BRANDOLINI’S “IN SACRAM EBREORUM
HISTORIAM...PREFATIO”

In 1526 Noël Béda, a prominent member of the faculty of theology at Paris, coined the term humanistae theologizantes (“theologizing humanists”) to denote scholars like Desiderius Erasmus and Jacques Lefèvre, who had dared to edit, expound, paraphrase, or translate Scripture without due authorization.1 The arguments he advanced against them — they did not have a doctorate in theology, literary criticism should not be applied to the scriptural text, it was sacrilege, if not heresy, to change the Vulgate wording — were well rehearsed by that time. They had been brought against a number of prominent biblical scholars, from Lorenzo Valla and Gianozzo Manetti to Antonio Nebrija, Jacques Lefèvre, and Desiderius Erasmus. All of them had answered their critics, echoing (and indeed, citing) the apologetic prefaces of St. Jerome, who had been exposed to similar accusations before them. By the end of the 15th century a standard line of defense had emerged. The humanists argued that they were wrongly labelled innovators — they were in fact restoring the text to its pristine condition. The revisions suggested by them did not imply criticism of the original, inspired author, but merely corrected mistakes introduced by an ignorant translator or inattentive scribe. Their new versions were not designed to replace the official version used by the church or at universities, but intended for private study. Stylistic embellishments added by them did not vitiate the message of the Bible — on the contrary, they made this message more palatable and persuasive and gave it the dignity it deserved. Aurelio Brandolini’s apologetic preface to his “Epithoma in sacram Judeorum historiam”, which dates from the late 1400s, is a representative example of the humanist line of defense. The text transcribed below and the parallels given in the notes, supply

1 Cf. below, note 13.
the historical context to a debate that unfolded in the 15th century and continued with renewed vigour in the 16th century against the backdrop of the Reformation.²

Aurelio Lippo Brandolini (c. 1454-1497) was born in Florence,³ but moved to Naples as a boy, when the family found itself in straitened circumstances. As a young man, Brandolini made a name for himself as a poet and teacher of the humanities. Moving to Rome around 1480, he enjoyed the favour of Sixtus IV and his successor Innocent VIII, as well as the patronage of several prelates, among them Cardinal Francesco Piccolomini (later Pope Pius III), to whom the text below is addressed. Brandolini was associated also with Pomponio Leto and the Roman Academy, pursuing his antiquarian and philological interests in that scholarly circle. In 1489 he left Rome for the court of the Hungarian king, Matthias Corvinus. After the King’s death in 1490 he returned to Italy, teaching rhetoric at Pisa and Florence. The following year he became a member of the Order of Hermits of St. Augustine near Florence. He died of the plague in 1497, while visiting Rome. Brandolini left a collection of poems, a number of essays and orations, translations from Pliny, and textbooks on grammar and style. His best-known works are *De comparatione reipublicae et regni* and *De humanae vitae conditione*. His epitome of the historical books of the Bible is extant in manuscript only. The following is a transcription of the apologetic preface preceding the “Epithoma” (ms. Bibl. Vat. Ottob. lat. 438, ff. 2γ-9γ).⁴ I have modernized the punctuation (and consequently, the capitalization), but am reproducing the spelling of the writer.

³ The most recent biographical and bibliographical information can be found in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 14, pp. 26-28, with bibliography. See also next note.
[2r] Lippi Brandolini in sacrum Ebreorum historiam ad reuerendissimum patrem et dominum dominum Franciscum Picolomineum Cardinalem Senensem prefatio, in qua huius operis scribendi causas commemorat seque aduersus eius rei criminatores defendit.

1. Inter omnes mortalium actiones nulla mihi, religiosissime pater, prestantior, nulla homini melior, nulla homine dignior uideri solet rerum divinarum contemplatione ac studio. Quippe quum omnis nostra et spes et salus in uno deo, immo (ut uerius loquamur) unus deus sit, siue intellegere aliquid siue appetere uelimus, utraque uis hac una re maiorem immodum expletur atque acquiescit: intellectus enim, qui natura duce ad uerum indagandum fertur, ac demum ipsius dei qui summa ueritas est contemplatione id quod uult perfecte absoluteque consequitur; voluntas uero, quo bonum semper affectat, in hoc uno quod summum, immo unicum, bonum est, secura conquiescit. Quo fit ut existimem omnes, qui aut sane mentis sunt aut suae salutis cupidi, hoc uno studio atque hac una cupiditate teneri oportere. Ego quidem hac contemplatione ita delector, ita afficior, ut quodcumque datur a re domestica ocii, id omne in eam conferam, cupiamque ob hoc solum mihi ocii plurimum et copiarum dari, ut possim in eo studio quod reliquum est etatis industrie consumere. Itaque quum proximis his annis sacrum Ebrearum historiarum uolumen, siue (ut nunc appellamus) Bibliam, unde omnis nostra divinarum rerum cognition pendet, accuratius legerem uelique ex ea lectione fructum aliquem reportare, rem neque mihi inutile neque aliis inio[2v]cundam me facturum putaui, si ea quae erant ab antiquissimis illis Iudeis auctoribus plebeia quadam simplicitate et inconcina uerbo rum copia ante conscripta,5 et a nostris postea ita ut erant uulgi gratia necessario translata, ego in unum quasi corpus collecta et breuius et ornatius explicarem. Quae enim ita posita erant, neque ab omnibus libenter legi neque memoria facile retineri posse uidebantur, immo multos ab sui lectione partim propter longitudinem deterrebant, partim

5 For a similar verdict on the style of the bible cf. Petrarch, De otio (ed. G. Rotondi, Città del Vaticano, 1958, p. 103) citing Jerome: “[tarditatem] in me hactenus minus miror, cum Ieronimum ipsum de se fatentem audiam quod sibi...sermo horrebat incultus. Quod si ei tali viro...potuit evenire, quid non potuit michi peccatori...qui magistros habui...qui omnem divine textum pagine non aliter quam aniles fabulas irredent”. Similarly, Valla referred to the Vulgate as “inelegans” and “barbarum” (Antidotum, ed. A. Wesseling, Assen, 1978, pp. 114, 118); Erasmus said that the apostles spoke like sailors and cart drivers (“sic tum aurigae loquebantur et nautae”, Ep. 1304: 142).
propter inconcin nitatem auocabant. Qui uero ea semel legerant, neque recordari omnia propter multitudinem rerum poterant neque repetere propter lectionis tedium laboris uolebant. Itaque quum scirem nihil esse tam orridum tamque incultum (ut inquit Cicero) quod non splendenscheret oratione et tanquam excoleretur, tentare ului an addere aliquam pulcherrimis rebus lucem ornatu et uenustate orationis posse, effecque ex uniuersa illa quae in sacro uolumine continetur historia quoddam quasi epithoma, quod esset et ad res memoria retinendae propter breuitatem accommodatum, et ad legentium uoluptatem propter orationis grattiam non inociundum. Ea uero, quibus uel uaticinia prophetarum uel uitae precepta continebantur, quae quidem, quum in singulis uerbis mysticos sensus haberent, aliter dici non poterant, omnino non attigi. Quoniam autem eadem a Josepho doctissimo apud Iudeos uiro historia fuerat summa cum diligentia fideque conscripta, isque non nullis in locis dissentire a scriptoribus sacris uidebatur et tamen illorum semper auctoreitate nitebatur, ego qui discernere inter eos et iudicare uerum non possem, ut plenior perfectiorque haberetur omnium rerum notitia et fides penes auctores esset, utramque in dubiis rebus opinionem posui, ratus hos labores nostros prodesse multis, nemini obesse aut displicere posse.

2. Verum mihi multo aliter quam putabam euenit. Nonnulli enim ex eorum genere hominum qui et sacrarum sibi rerum scientiam vendicant et ab litteris nostris abhorrent, ubi me hoc opus inchoasse audierunt inuidia pariter arrogantiaque adducti, magno in nos impetu atque

---

6 Cf. Erasmus, Ep. 843: 31-6: "...intelligam permultos offensos prodigiosis solocelisms...abborrere a sacrorum voluminum lectione".

7 Cicero, Paradoxa 3.

8 Sic pro quaedam ... quae ... accommodata ... inociunda.

9 Interestingly, Erasmus made the same point in order to encourage the reading of Scripture in the original language: "Quaedam ob sermonis idiomata ne possunt quidem...transfundii in alienam linguam" (Ratio, ed. H. Holborn, Munich 1933, p. 182).


11 Erasmus characterizes his critics in similar terms: "Hii magno studio conspirant in bonas litteras. Ambiunt in senatu theologorum aliquid esse et verentur ne, si renascantur bonae litterae...videantur nihil scisse" (Ep. 337: 326-9). Cf. Erasmus’ contemporary, Paolo Cortesi, who says that the theologians condemn "quae se assequi posse diffidant" (In Sententias, Basel, 1513, sig. B 2’; cf. Cic., Or. 3).
ardore insurrexere modisque omnibus nostrum hoc studium, summii etiam pontificis auctoritate addita, impedire et ea que ad id tempus scripta fuerant abolere conati sunt, nouam fieri Bibliam, ueteremque ob id neglectum iri clamantantes, Jeronimi verba immutari nefas esse,\(^{12}\) neque licere eum qui in theologa doctorum ornamenta atque insignia non accepi esset quicquam omnino sacrarum rerum conscribere.\(^{13}\) Neque uero extreme sortis homines, sed trium summorum ordinum principes haec dictabant. Sed repressa tandem est improborum hominum iniundo rumque peruersitas cum mansuetudine atque equitate Pontificis Maximi,\(^{14}\) tum uero tua, Francisce doctissime, tuorumque Collegarum prudentia atque doctrina, cognitaque huius operis utilitate mihi scribendi quicquid uidetur potestas est facta.

3. Absolui itaque primo quoque tempore quam inchoaueram inuitis obtrectatoribus rerum Ebrearum historiam tuoque sacratissimo nomine dedicaui quem quidem et harum rerum doctissimum et nostri amantissimum esse sciebam. Atque illis quidem nihil eo tempore respondendum

\(^{12}\) This is an attitude that was already combated by Jerome, cf., for example, Patrologiae cursus completus, Series Latina, ed. J.-P. Migne (Paris 1844-84) vol. 28, 1186A; ibidem, vol. 29, 558B: Quis non statim erumpat in vocem, me falsarium, me clamans esse sacrilegium, qui audeam aliquid in veneribus libris addere, mutare, corrigere?" The same accusation was brought against textual critics in the Renaissance, e.g. Bessarion, ibidem, vol. 161, 625-6, after showing up an error in the Vulgate translation: "Post haec asserunt, nihil in sacra Scriptura innovandum esse"; Erasmus, Opera Omnia (Leiden, 1703-6) vol. VI **4r: "[Dicunt] quicquid hic vertit Interpres Spiritui Sancto libet adscribere, et ob id nefas esse quicquam hinc mutare".

\(^{13}\) Cf. Valla, Apologia (Opera, p. 356): "Hic statim monere coepit atque castigare, ne falcem mitterem in messem alienam, esse mea doctrina contentus, neve sacra iura illos manibus tractarem"; sim. the Spanish philologist Antonio Elio Nebrija justifying his work on the Scriptural text in the Apologia (n.l., 1516?, sig. a iv'-v): "Atqui, inquit, etiam si sacri codices essent castigandi, non licere tamen...mihi homini ad sacras litteras non indiato". Cf. also Erasmus' defense of Valla, Ep. 182: 126-30: "An dicent non idem esse iuris Vallae grammatico quod Nicolao theologo?...imo totum hoc, divinas vertere scripturas, grammatici videlicet partes sunt". The argument that only theologians were entitled to engage in scriptural studies was still advanced a hundred years after Brandolini wrote his apologetic preface. Noël Béda, a prominent member of the faculty of theology at Paris, may serve as an example. In the preface to his Annotationum libri duo (Cologne, 1526) sig. aal1, he criticized Lefèvre and Erasmus: "Solis humanitatis ac linguarum praesidiis instructi, sacra omnia edisserere sunt agessi". In 1533 he lodged a complaint against the lecteurs royaux because as "simples grammariens ou rethoriciens non ayans estudié en ladict Faculté [de théologie] s'efforçoient lire publicquement de la Saincte Escription" (quotd J. Farge, Le Parti Conservateur au XVIe siècle, Paris, 1993, p. 118).

\(^{14}\) The chronology of Brandolini's writings is vague; he was in Rome under the pontificates of Sixtus IV (1471-84), Innocent VIII (1484-92), and (for brief visits) Alexander VI (1492-1503).
est uisum, ne magis ueribus quam re ipsa eorum maledictis responderem, neque scribendo minus quam respondendo eorum audaciam arrogantiumque reprimere. Nunc autem perfecto atque absoluto opere breuiter illis respondere decreui, ne uel mea taciturnitas illis animum ad oblatandum auxisse uel eorum audacia mihi uires ad respondendum minusse uideatur; simul ut tibi nostri consilii rationes explicem teque earum non tam lectorem quam judicem faciam tuoque iudicio atque auctoritate, cui plurimum tribuo, post hac uel aliiquid in sacris rebus conscribam, uel omnino a scribendo abstineam.

4. Dicunt igitur primum nobis, qui theologie (ut ipsi appellanti dociores non sumus, in sacris rebus quicquam non licere. Hoc enim primum munus esse eorum atque ipsis tantum scribendi ius esse, aliis non esse. Deinde si caetera [3V] scribere maxime liceat, sacrum tamen Biblie uolumen in quo omnia nostre religionis misteria continentur alii quam sit scriptum uerbis, aut alio stilo scribi, aut omnino mutari nefas esse. Misteria enim non in rebus ipsis tantum, sed in singulis quoque uerbis contineri. Hoc autem modo perueri ueterem Bibliam, nouamque fieri, non exerpi historias aut eadem explicari. Postremo res sacras elegantiori stilo aut cultiori oratione scribendas non esse, quippe que non ad doctos modo iueros sed ad imperitam etiam plebem et adeo ad omnem etatem sexumque pertineant; quae autem omnium salvit intersunt, ab omnibus quoque intelligi oportere.16 Quod si ea splendorem

15 Cf. Paolo Cortesi in the preface to his In Sententias (Basel, 1513), who notes that some people prefer a lowly style ("squallidiorem et horridiorem") for philosophical and theological matters, but they must be opposed: "Oppugnanda est eorum theologorum arx, qui dixerendi elegantiam a theologia seiuungunt" (sig. B 1 verso). Erasmus said that it had become a commonplace in his time to argue "in divinis literis non esse recipiendam sermonis elegantiam" (Opera Omnia, Leiden 1703-6, vol. IX, 777C). The Paris doctors Noël Béda and Pierre Costurier may serve as examples of this attitude. Beda writes in his Annotationum libri duo, sig. aa 3: "Quamquam vero pulchrum sit Fabro et Erasmo visum necnon et promovendae religioni utile novo dicendi genere, i.e. cultius politiusve divinas tractare literas, a prudentibus tamen et expertis viris maxime incatum impietatisque ac sacrilegio vicinum semper est iudicatum". Costurier writes in De tralatione Bibliae (Paris, 1525) fol. 66: "Stilus scripturae divinae mutandus non est, habet enim scriptura sacra proprium idioma, quo a caeteris scripturis distat. Adde quod pompa sua cultus verborum sacris litteris minime convenit". For this work of Costurier's, which is directed against Erasmus and Lefèvre, cf. E. Rummel, Erasmus and His Catholic Critics (Nieuwkoop, 1989), II, pp. 61-73.

16 Cf. Costurier, De tralatione, fol. 66: "Certum est... nec faciendum esse pro doctis viris latinam editionem, quae non in templis, sed 'in cubiculis' legatur, sed omnes tam doctos quam indocitos communi tralatone contentos esse debere" and (fol. 68) "pauci sunt docti latini comparatione caeterorum, qui bibliam ipsam intelligere possent, si ad puritatem latinae linguae restituta esset. Et revera inter clericos ac religiosos paucissimi
orationis elegantiamque desiderassent, Jeronimum\textsuperscript{17} Ciceronis usque ad uitium amatorem,\textsuperscript{18} a quo ea essent translata, id et facere optime putuisse et libertissime fuisse facturum.\textsuperscript{19} Haec fere sunt quae illi nobis obicere consueuerunt.

5. Quae quidem illi cum dicunt, ita dicunt ut magis imperitiam suam detegant quam ostendant nostram. Nam cum scribendum nobis in theologica propeterea quod doctores non sumus quicquam negant, in qua tandem urbe homines stultissimi negant? nempe in ea in qua omnium disciplinarum homines qui nullis doctorum insignibus sunt ornati quotidiie de grauissimis theologiae locis orant, disputant, scribunt, et tamen haec omnia nondum impune sed cum summa quoque sua laude coram Pontifice Maximo faciunt. Quid, obsecre, meis equalibus Rome in sacris rebus licet, quod mihi in eadem urbe iisdem in rebus non liceat? An illis coram summno pontifice orare de his rebus et disputare permittitur, mihi in cubiculo scribere non permittitur?\textsuperscript{20} Sed omittamus hodiernos homines, qui uel amicitia uel gratia uel eadem qua nos arguunt audacia ad id munus accedere possunt existimari, qui denique et peccare et puniri quum adhuc viuam facile possunt. Quid ueteres illi doctissimi ac sanctissimi uiri, quorum hodie scripta non modo probamus, uerum etiam ueneramur: \[4^r\] Hylarius, Cipri anus, Lactantius, et (ut grecos quoque non taceam) Crhisostomus,\textsuperscript{21} Origenes, Eusebius, innumerabilesque ali, qui tam multa tanque preclara nobis in theologia ab se scripta uolumina reliquere?\textsuperscript{22} Fuerunt ne illis, quae isti tantopere appetunt, tanto imprecio habent, ornamentis obnoxii? Quid illi ipsi qui hodie quoque Christianae sunt, qui eam vel intelligere possent, vel legerevellent, quippe qui potius veritatem et res ipsas quam verba consideranda putant". For the use of the phrase “in cubiculis” by Brando lini, cf. the text below at note 20. Erasmus used the phrase as well, noting that his edition was not intended to replace the official text used in the liturgy, but was meant for private use (“in cubiculis”, \textit{Opera Omnia} (Leiden 1703-6), vol. IX 137A, 180A, 193E).

\textsuperscript{17} It was the prevailing view that Jerome was the author of the Vulgate translation then current, although the humanists (Erasmus and Lefèvre among them) had cast doubt on this. Cf. E. Rice, \textit{St. Jerome in the Renaissance} (Baltimore, 1985), pp. 173-200.

\textsuperscript{18} A reference to the famous dream, in which he was flogged for his love of Cicero (cf. Jerome, Ep. 22.30 and E. Rice, \textit{St. Jerome in the Renaissance}, pp. 3-4).

\textsuperscript{19} Cf. Cousturier, \textit{De tralatione}, fol. 49v: “Nec ibi quaerendas esse verborum phaleras, quae potissent in tralatione servari, si spiritu rhetoricorum fieri debuisset”.

\textsuperscript{20} Cf. above, note 16.

\textsuperscript{21} \textit{Sic}.

\textsuperscript{22} Cf. Erasmus, \textit{Opera Omnia}, Leiden 1703-6, vol. VI \textit{****}; “Quod si nefas judicant quicquam exstare diversum ab hac editione [Vulgata], abolendi essent Ambrosiani commentarii, supprimendus Cypri anus, Hieronymus et Augustinus, nihil attingendum Graecorum interpretum”. Cf. also below, note 43.
IN DEFENSE OF “THEOLOGIZING HUMANISTS” 97
ecclesiae doctores appellantur, Jeronimus, Gregorius, Ambrosius, Augustinu-
s? Ulla ne officii aut doctrinae insignia aut acceperae aut optauere
unquam? Quod si illi qui hanc nobis theologie scientiam peperere non
modo eam nullis ornamentis subiecre, sed ne ipsi quidem ullam uti
uoluere, uos qui eam uestra ignorancia labefactatis atque perueritis (uos
enim criminatores parumper appello, uobiscum hunc sermonem instituo),
quibus obsecro de causis aut quo pacto ea uobis usurpare audetis? Quae
sanctissimi uiri maiores nostri liberrima omnibus esse uoluere, uos quo
scelere uobis arrogare tentatis? An uos illis doctiores et sapientiores
estis? Vtinam, utinam uos ab illis ut uita et moribus, ita etiam doctrina
et sapientia non maxime differretis. Noui ne aliquid quod illis incogni-
tum esset inuenisti? Vtinam non uetera multa ab illis optime inuenta
ignoraretis. Aliquam, credo, sectam23 siue (ut nunc loquimur) heresim
nostre religioni aduersam uestra doctrina et sapientia debellasis, ut
eius uictoriae ornamenta atque insignia mereamini; uos potius impudent-
tissimi uiri, uos inquam ab aliis insequi ac debellandi essetis, qui et
pessim de religione ac fide sentitis, et a Christiano homine maxime
aberrantem uiam ducitis. Quod si haec insignia neque a maioribus
uestris accepistis, neque ipsi postea comparastis, quo pacto uobis ea
usurpetis aut qua ratione uobis hoc scribendi munus arrogetis non intel-
ligio. Videte ne haec summa potius ambitio uestra sit, qua uos pre cae-
teris mortalibus laboratis; quam enim potest homini dignitatem conferre
uel nomen illud doctoris, uel illud uestis aut amiculi ornamentum, vt qui
haec habeat scribere possit, qui non habeat non possit? Quid porro [4]
nomen illud doctoris significat? Nonne eum qui ad docendum idoneus
sit? Si quis hanc docendi facultatem sua doctrina consecutus sit, qui
magis doctor erit si acceptis ornamentis non doceat, quam si doceat non
acceptis?

6. At est hoc parte24 iam doctrinae testimonium. Vtinam non esset
aperte sepe numero ignorantiae occultatio. Ubi enim homines quae pe-
bant ornamenta sunt adepti, contenti dignitate studia deserunt ratique se
pares aliis effectos esse atque ad disciplinarum culmen peruenisse, suam
imperiti dignitate occultant. Quod si esset hoc parte iam doctrinae tes-
rimonium, neque nisi ab iis qui de summa doctrina iudicare possent, hoc
est, a doctissimis uiris, neque nisi in eos qui doctissimi iudicati essent

23 My correction for the faulty “septam” in the manuscript.
24 I.e. partae. Three sentences further on the phrase is repeated, with the same
spelling.
conferretur; nunc autem quum et a principibus qui ut plurimum indocti sunt et omnibus pro cuiusque opibus aut gratia haec ornamenta promiscue prebeantur, quod doctrinae testimonium afferre possint non uideo. Quod enim ita creati doctores possunt aut docere aut scribere? Quanti uero est eorum doctrina, quanti sunt eorum scripta facienda? Quam multi uero sunt sine ornamentis doctissimi, qui et docere et scribere omnia optime ac facillime possint? Vtris tandem uos hoc scribendi munus magis conuenire arbitramini: illisne qui sine doctrina insignibus sunt ornati, an iis qui sine insignibus doctrina sunt prediti? Non puto uos esse tam stultos, quamuis uestrorum inuentorum amantissimi sitis, ut ornamenta doctrinae in scribendo preferre audeatis, immo quicquam ad scribendum conferre existimatis. Quod si doctrina est sola que scribit, ut certe est, neque ab ullis iuuari ornamentis potest, non debet hoc scribendi ius magis doctoris esse quam quaum docti, neque is qui ornamentis caret minus ad se eam pertinere prouinciam existimare quam is qui ornamentis et doctoris nomine tumidis atque elatus incedit.

7. At est theologorum non oratorum proprium de diuinis rebus per scribere. Ego uero a uobis primum quero qui magis haec materia theologorum quam oratorum sit propria, quum oratores [5'] diuina et humana omnia sibi subiecta ad dicendum habeant, et ut queque latissime patent ita maxime oratori conueniant. Deinde, quid demum prohibeat me et oratorem et theologum esse? Discipline enim omnes inter se coniuncte et cognate sunt adeo, ut qui unam quamquam absolute sequi uelit, omnes quodammodo attingere atque ad se attrahere compellatur. Postremo qui suspicemini me non esse theologum quum sciatis

25 Cf. the provision of the University of Louvain governing admission to the faculty of theology, which specifically excluded persons who had been granted their degree by the pope or the emperor (“bullati”) rather than by a university: “prima est quod universitas non acceptet aliquem graduatum ad doctoratum vel licenciam, nisi hujusmodi gradum in aliqua universitate notabili et famosa de rigore examinis acquisierit; et hoc propter bullatos” (H. de Jongh, L’ancienne faculté de théologie de Louvain, repr. Utrecht, 1980, p. 5*).


me Christianum esse\textsuperscript{28} et de deo non modo loqui non imperite, quod theologi nomen efficat, uester etiam non inscite scribere videatis?

8. At vero materia, inquint, haec scribendi non erat. Bibliae enim uerba in quibus singulis mysteria singula continentur mutare nefas est. Inuidiam profecto uestram in hac re summam ostenditis, ne dicam stilatiam, ut quod facere ipsi nescitis, alios facere doleatis. Quae enim materia per immortalem deus nescit, quae Christiano homini melior, quae Christiano dignior, quam ea quae omnia nostre religiosis, nostre salutis continet fundamenta? Non nape omnis modis, omnibus auctoribus, omnibus linguis,\textsuperscript{29} ut longe lateque ad omnes nationes perueniat, uulganda et diffundenda est? Quis in hac re potest, non dico ulla ex parte damnari, sed non etiam sum-mopere commendari?

9. At verba illa mutari propter misticos sensus non debent. Primum ego mysteria in sententiis et rebus ipsis non in uerbis singulis contineri dico, uerba enim et sententiarum gratia inuenta sunt, et per se significare nihil possunt.\textsuperscript{30} Deinde non esse a nobis immutata contendo. Utrum enim uos mutari appellatis, cum pro uno uerbo aliud eiusdem significations siue in eadem siue in alia lingua uerbum ponitur, ut si pro pane argente grece, aut pro uino temetum latine vel merum dicam, an cum uerbum aliud significans sustituitur, ut si pro pane triticum, pro uino uas ponam? Nam si superiori modo mutari uerba intelligitis, sic ego et ab Jeronimo et ab alius quicunque aliquid transtulerunt \textsuperscript{[5V]} mutata esse contendo; sin posteriori modo mutari appellatis (ut magis consentaneum est) sic a me quoque uerba immutata esse nego. Quis est enim locus in quo ego sententias non ad uingem expresserim? Si quis tamen est, uos eum uidere a principio cum huic operi detrahebitis non potuistis.

10. Si autem uos in eo me reprehenditis quod sacras historias alio quam sunt scriptae stilo atque oratione explicauerim, idque mutari aut


\textsuperscript{29} Sic.

\textsuperscript{30} Cf. Erasmus, \textit{Opera Omnia} (Leiden 1703-6), vol. VI **4**: “Audio quosdam adeo superstitioneos, ut nihil patiantur immutari a verbis Euangelistarum in vertendo. Quasi vero isthuc vertere sit, ac non potius pervertere. Duabus rebus constat oratio, verbis ceterorum, et sententia velut anima. Si utrumque reddi potest, non obsto quo minus fiat; si non potest, praeposterum fuerit, interpretatem verborum tenacem a sententia recedere”.
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innouari Bibliam appellatis, cur non modo alia oratione, sed alia quoque lingua haec eadem expresserunt?  


12. Sed apostolis in dicendo, Jeronimo atque aliis summis uiris interpreting quausius uti lingua et oratione licuisse dicas. Quod de Prudentio, Iuuencho, Aratore, aliisque permultis dicemus, quorum ali euangelia, ali actus apostolorum, ali has ipsas hebreorum historias atque uniuersum uetus (ut appellant) testamentum pulcherrimo atque elegantissimo carmine sunt complexi, mutauerunt orationem? An easdem ad unguem omnes explicare sententias uersibus potuerunt? Quod si illi legibus astricti carminis easdem seruare sententias potuere, ego cur idem facere non possim nulla numerorum aut sillabarum necessitate astrictus? Aut si hoc illis facere uersu licuit, cur mihi soluta oratione non liceat? Atque illi quidem omnes Christi res gestas, omnia precepta in quibus nostra salus uniuersa fidesque continetur [6r] prosecuti sunt. Ego neque uatum predictiones quae mysticos sensus continent, neque Salomonis precepta quae priuato quodam modo scripta sunt attingere uolui; quod si illorum scripta non modo non reiciuntur, sed ab omnibus quoque summa cum auctorum laude expetuntur, nostra cur hoc nomine repudiari possint non videam. Sin uos illorum scripta improbatis, nostra quoque improbetis plane uolo. Malo enim tantis authoribus errare, quam uobiscum bene sentire.

31 Similarly, Erasmus, Opera Omnia, Leiden 1703-6, vol. VI ** 4r: “Iam si quicquid hic vertit Interpres Spiritui Sancto libet ascribere, et ob id nefas esse quicquam huc demutare, cur audet reprehendere Hieronymus quod apud hunc legitur?  

32 These are standard examples in apologetic literature. Cf. Salutati, Epistolario (ed. Novati, IV, 231-2) in defense of poetry: “Male quidem minusque Christiane fecissent Iuvencus atque Sedulius...stulte fecisset Arator...peccaverunt et alii...ut Prudentius atque Prosper et pater Ambrosius”. Erasmus, Opera Omnia, Leiden 1703-6, vol. VI *** 1r, defending his revision of the Vulgate: “Quod si Novum Testamentum vertisset carmine, quod fecit Iuvencus?” and Ep. 345: 83-5: “Quid si libros divinos omnes paraphrasi explanassem...num isti dicam mihi scriberent? Laudem etiam promeruit Iuvencus, qui Evangelicam historiam ausus est versibus includere”.
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13. Nos igitur qui sacras historias et culta et dilucida oratione explicamus, biblia innoaumus, uos qui eam barbaris commentationibus corrumpitis, intactam inuiolatamque seruatis. Nos qui res gestas orationis splendore et claritate illustramus, biblia obscuram reddimus, uos qui omnia barbarie, caligine, et opinionum multitudo atque obscuritate inuoluitis, eam uestro iudicio declaratis atque illustratis. Videte, queso, uidete ne istud potius sacra volumina corrumpere atque immutare sit; uos potius qui nouas quotidie atque inanes ueteribus scriptis opiniones astruitis, sacra volumina deprauatis. Vos uestra ignorantia res sacras confunditis, uos, inquam, uestra barbaria non modo bibliai, sed uniuersum quoque theologiam foedatis atque peruerititis. Proinde a nobis biblia nostra oratione immutata dicatur, modo eam a uobis uestris commentatiunculis constet esse deprauatum atque corruptam. Sit sane id quod nos agimus biblia inuouare, modo sciatis uos eam perdere atque aboletere. Sed uideamus quam tandem afferant sue siue ignorantiae siue stultitiae rationem (quod erat ex obiectis nobis criminius reliquum).

14. Sacre, inquiet propria scripta sunt, ab omnibus quoque intelligi posse necesse est. Quasi uero aut haec intelligi ab omnibus non possint, aut illa legere homines prohibeantur. O summam atque intolerabilem hominum ignorantiam, ne dicam, an ne inuidiam an ne utranque! Quis, obsecro, futurus est qui haec nostra non intelligat preter uos, qui nisi quae auestri similibus scripta sunt, aliud omnino nihil intelligitius? Num alas ex uobis iudicatis, uestrique omnes qui simillimos esse creditis, ut quae uos non intelligitis, ipsi quoque intellecturi non sint? Nonne haec latina, nonne propria, nonne usitata uerba sunt? Quid nos? Nonne sub hoc coelo, in hac lingua nati et educati sumus? Quid, obsecro, cuiuis facilius esse debet quam linguam patriam intelligere? Quid gratius quam eam omni tempore atque in omni disciplina posse lectitare? An expectamus ut Germani eam Sciitheque intelligent? Quamquam ipsi quoque

33 Similarly Erasmus, Opera Omnia, Leiden 1703-6, vol. VI ***1**: "Illis temere licet pro suo arbitratu depravare, mihi non licebit ex fide veterum codicum...restituiere?" Nebrija, Apologia sig. aiiii: "Quaeiam igitur invidia est velle nobis praecludere illud unicum emaculandi libros...[cum ali] nihil putant sibi non licere, alius aliquid addens, alius detrahens, alius transverso calamo illinens, alius expungens, alius inducens".

34 Cf. above, note 16.

35 I.e. Scythians, proverbial for lack of culture; Germans were routinely labelled "barbarians", cf. Franciscus Irenicus, Germaniae Exegeseos volumina duodecim (Hagenau, 1518) II, chapter 33, quoted, G. Strauss, Manifestations of Discontent in Germany on the Eve of the Reformation (Bloomington, 1985), p. 73.
illam Hodie (si diis placet) et studiosius legunt et frequentius accuratiusque perdiscent. Latina igitur scripta a nostris potissimum et legenda et intelligenda sunt. Sed nimimum uos ut a nostris moribus, ita a lingua maxime aborretis, aliosque item aborrere existimatis.

15. Sed esto, ululgus nostra non intelligat. Quis, obscuro, cogit quem quam ut uel hec legat, uel illa non legat? Habet ululgus qua erudiatur, qua delectetur, in sacris rebus lectione illa perfruatur. Hanc eruditioribus cultioribusque relinquit; ut enim ululgus intelligere haec cultiora non potest, ita erudit simplicia illa legere et longiora non possunt. Huc accedit, quod nos non omnia complexi sumus, sed ea tantum quae historiam texere posse uidebantur, caetera, qui uolet, ab illis archetypis accipi necesse est.

16. At negligentur pro istis uetustiora illa et sanctiora uolumina. Primum quidem si uerum istud esset, haberem ipse quod cuperem, ut mala nostra scripta non essent. Nam si illa quae optima esse nemo dubitat nostrorum gratia negligenterunt, mala proiecto nostra non essent. Mala enim bonis, si modo sanus est, prefert nemo. Deinde qui possunt illa pro nostris omittit, quum haec neque ab omnibus (ut uos ipsi fatemini) intelligantur neque omnia quae sunt in illis scripta continerant? Sed inuidetis uos quidem maiorem immodum nostrae laudi, et ues non modo non scrivere, sed ne intelligere quidem potestis, ea uel scribi ab aliis uel intelligi uel omnino legi indignamini.

17. Atqui res divinae, quum per se [7r] satis splendide ornateque sint, nitore aut cultu orationis non egent. Quae (malum) ista uestra dementia est (leuiori enim uocabulo uti non possunt) ut quae uos ignoratis, ea

---


37 Cf. the Louvain theologian F. Titelmans (*Collationes quinque*, Antwerp, 1529, sig. d4 r-), asking the literary critics to distinguish between the worldly eloquence found in orators and secular philosophers and the special kind of eloquence inspired by the Holy Spirit: "Haec est simplex illa et casta, humiliis et modesta, mitis et benigna, severa et amabilis, munda et nitida eloquentia, qua et ipse est in carne nobiscum locutus et suos item discipulos loqui voluit".

18. At enim diuiniae res quum per se satis pulchre illustresque sint, externo, credo, cultu et splendore non egent. Immo (si uerum fateri voluerim) multo magis egent. Preciosissima enim queque ornatissimis ac pretiosissimis tum operiri uestibus, tum loculis conuidi et seruari decet. Videmus formosissima hominum corpora tum demum suam maxime pulchritudinem et ostendere et seruare, quum preciosissima ueste et cultu suae formae consentaneo redimita sunt. Videmus preciosissimae gemmas quamquam mirum illum a natura decorem speciemque accepserunt, nisi auerum gratiamque amittere.

19. Sed ut ad ea quae nostrae disputationi propin[7v]quiora sunt uenia mus, nonne caeterae omnes disciplinae quae liberales appellantur hoc orationis ornatu tanquam ueste detracto nude abieceteque uidentur?38 et tum demum suam speciem uenustatemque recipiunt, cum hoc adhibito exornantur? quod si uel humana corpora uestibus uel gemme auero, uel caeterae disciplinae oratione ad se excolendas perficiendasaque indigent, immo non nisi his demum adhibitis ornamentis eam quam habent a natura pulchritudinem aut ostendere aut retinere satis possunt, nonne illis diuiniae res illustrari atque excoli, immo sine illis enuntiari atque efferri

38 For another comparison between style and clothing in the same context, cf. Erasmus, Opera Omnia, Leiden 1703-6, vol. VI**4**: “Nunc expediat [orationem] mutari, quando nec Apostolico cultu nunc utuntur Episcopi, sed in omnibus splendor accessit Ecclesiae”.
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non posse existimandae sunt? An preciosissimas epulas putamus in uilibus ac sordidis uasis corrumpi atque infici, res diuinæ quae omni precio maiores sunt orationis coeno ac sordibus foedari et corrumpi non putamus? Vis autem in persuadendo quanta sit orationis, neminem dubitare arbitror. Quis est enim tam hebeti tamque obtuso ingenio, qui non animum his eloquentiae uiribus in omnes flecti partes atque his tan-quam frenis parere intelligat?

20. Quis est uel natura tam ferreus tamque inhumanus, uel huic facultati tam inimicus tamque infensus, qui non se ab ea ad omnes affectus moueri et quodammodo compelli fateatur? Quippe cuius et finis persuadere et officium apte ducere ad persuadendum sit, nihilque sit tam incredibile quod dicendo (ut ait Cicero) non fiat probabile. Diuinæ uerò res, quæ nostram omnem non modo fidem, uerum etiam cogitationem excudent, quo pacto sine summa ui dicendi et copia orationis uel describi aut pronuntiari queant ut populo probentur, non uideo. Quis enim est tanta animi facilitate qui cum audit uel hominem sine coitu natum de virgine, uel totum Christi corpus in exiguis hostiae figuris conclusum, uel tres in una substantia esse personas, et quæ nostri dogmatis positiones sunt, facile adduci possit ut credat? Summa protexto uel dicendi et infinita quædam orationis [8r] copia ad haec persuadenda opus est, quam quidem prestare nisi eloquentia non potest. Est igitur (ut uidere) eloquentia cum ob eam quam affert rebus dignitatem ac speciem, tum ob eam quam habet in persuadendo uim diuinis rebus uel maxime necessaria.


39 Cicero, Acad. 1.32, De leg. 1.62.
40 In the manuscript the word in is repeated by mistake.
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tam multa nobis ingenii sui monumenta reliquerunt.42 Quantam in illis uim, quantam elegantiam, quantam copiam reperietis!43 Ut et illos eloquentissimos uiros fuisse et necessarium diuinis rebus eloquentiam exsimasse negare non possitis.

22. At usus, credo, elegantiam hodie in diuinis rebus non recipit. Ego vero, ut nostra chorus decantet, non postulo. Sed quid uos? Elegantiam ne usque ad aras et sacrificia uenire non putatis? Quid himni, orationes, lectiones, et caetera quibus hodie in uniuersa re diuina utimur: nonne et omnia pene elegantissima sunt et a disertissimis uiris conscripta? Immo (si uerum accuratius discutiamus) nihil in illis non tersum et elegans reperitur, nisi quod a uobis et uestri similibus postea per summam audaciam atque importunitatem est additum, adeo ut liquido appareat quicquid in rebus diuinis corruptum est, a uestra barbaria et ignorantia esse corruptum.

23. Cur igitur bibliam transtulit sine ullo uerorum lepore [8V] ornatuque Jeronimus? Nempe quia sic apud Hebreos scriptam reperiebat. Quum autem eo tempore permulti uerum ipsum omni ex parte oppugnarent eaque de causa frequentes aduersus religionem nostram secte uno quoque bibliam suo arbitratu interpretante insurgerent, necesse fuit cum ut aliena confutari, tum ut nostra confirmari possent, ita latine sonare biblia, ut Grece ebraiceque sonabant, uerbaque nostra singula singulis illorum uerbis suo ordine respondere, adeo ut in ea interpretatione Jeronimus, qui ad unguem omnia cupiebat exprimere, ipsius etiam grammatices leges ac fines egredi non dubitaret, sed quod tunc instantibus adversariis dubiaque rebus nostris necessario faciendum fuit, necesse fuit cum ut aliena confutari, tum ut nostra confirmari possent, ita latine sonare biblia, ut Grece ebraiceque sonabant, uerbaque nostra singula singulis illorum uerbis suo ordine respondere, adeo ut in ea interpretatione Jeronimus, qui ad unguem omnia cupiebat exprimere, ipsius etiam grammatices leges ac fines egredi non dubitaret, sed quod tunc instantibus adversariis dubiaque rebus nostris necessario faciendum fuit, necesse fuit cum ut aliena confutari, tum ut nostra confirmari possent, ita latine sonare biblia, ut Grece ebraiceque sonabant, uerbaque nostra singula singulis illorum uerbis suo ordine respondere, adeo ut in ea interpretatione Jeronimus, qui ad unguem omnia cupiebat exprimere, ipsius etiam grammatices leges ac fines egredi non dubitaret, sed quod tunc instantibus adversariis dubiaque rebus nostris necessario faciendum fuit, necesse fuit cum ut aliena confutari, tum ut nostra confirmari possent, ita latine sonare biblia, ut Grece ebraiceque sonabant, uerbaque nostra singula singulis illorum uerbis suo ordine respondere, adeo ut in ea interpretatione Jeronimus, qui ad u...
quid est quod nostrum hoc studium nostramque exercitationem reprehendere ulla ex parte aut accusare possitis? Nonne ego tantorum uiro-rum in re presertim tam honesta exemplo uti debo?

24. Desinite igitur tarn gruae, tarn honestum, tarn sanctum in nobis scribendi studium criminari, quoniam neque a nostra dignitate neque a nostra professione alienum est et christiani hominis officio ac pietate dignissimum. Desinite hanc scribendi materiam reprehendere, quum et bibiam nos non ulla ex parte immutemus, sed dilucidiorem iocundioresque reddamus et in ea re clarissimorum uirorum exemplum imitemur. Desinite in sacris rebus nitorem orationis elegantiamque damnare, quamquidem illis et necessario adhibendam esse et ab omnibus adhibitam fuisse perspicitus. Desinite unquam in nos uterius oblatare, ne uestram potius ignorantiam quam nostram diligentiam arguatis. [9r] Id autem mihi licere permitte, quod et ab omnibus christiane religionis auctoribus factitatum est et esset sine ullo etiam exemplo faciendum.

25. Sed uobis quidem satis in presentia responsum sit. Si posthac nobis molesti esse pergetis, achrius uestram impudentiam grauiusque reprehemus. Tu vero, humanissime pater, nostram hanc defensionem sic accipies, ut non minus iudicandam tibi meam causam quam legendam esse scias. Nostrasque historias ita leges, cum per publicas occupationes et grauiora studia licebit, ut non occupande tuae beniuolentiae magis quam tui iudicii eliciendi gratia tibi dedicata esse intelligas. Existimaui enim hoc demum pacto posse a tua modestia impedire et iudicandi atque emendandi curam refugeris, si tuum opus dedicatione efficerem. Sceivebam enim te, qui acerrimus tuorum defensor esse consueuisses, pro tua summa in omnibus rebus diligentia beniuolentiaque erga nos prope singulari non passurum ut nostra, quae tibi dedicata essent, in manus hominum non emendatissima peruenirent, presertim quum essent multorum maledictis obtrectationibusque obnoxia. Ego uero Pontifici Maximo promississem me hoc opus non nisi ex doctissimorum uirorum consilio publicaturum. Tu itaque, Francisce doctissime, in hoc opere non tantum amici aut principis, sed iudicis quoque et censoris partibus atque officio, si me amas, fungaris uelimum, tuo quoque arbitratu opus hoc uel supprimas uel emittas; id enim omnibus probatum iri sperabo, quod tibi probari intellexero. Sed iam ad ipsam historiam uenimus.
The insatiable bibliophile Sir Thomas Phillipps purchased, in 1836, from the Richard Heber collection what became Phillipps manuscripts 8070 to 8497.1 Manuscript 8234 among these books2 is now MS X878L614/S7 in the Rare Book and Manuscript Library of Columbia University in New York City.3

The manuscript contains, on its ten paper leaves, Venus, a collection of sixty-seven amatory epigrams written by an Italian hand of the early sixteenth century. Frequently the text exhibits blots from a pen badly interacting with the paper. There is, however, no clear evidence that the manuscript is or is not autograph, though the marginal reading “foedas” for “turpes” of the text in poem 22 line 1, consistent with “foedas” at 25.8, perhaps suggests that the poet was correcting himself.

The collection of verses, seemingly unpublished,4 is by an anonymous poet, who leaves few clues, all tenuous, about himself. Possibly the poet once lived in Rome (cf. poem 21.11). If so, when he says in poem 35

---

1 A.N. L. Munby, The Formation of the Phillipps Library up to the Year 1840, Phillipps Studies no. 3 (Cambridge, 1954), pp. 73-80, 163.
4 The opening of the work is not listed in Hans Walther, Initia carminum ac versuum medii aevi posterioris Latinorum (Göttingen, 1959) with supplement (Göttingen, 1969) or in L. Bertalot, Initia humanistica Latina: Poesie (Tübingen, 1985). The Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes informed me by letter of 24 January 1992 that it has no record of the work. Also, as Consuelo Dutschke (letter of 27 September 1992) kindly let me know, there does not appear to be any mention of the manuscript in the files of correspondence or in the bibliographical records of the Rare Books and Manuscripts Library at Columbia University. So too, Rudolph Ellenbogen of the Library has no recollection of anyone working on the manuscript (his letter of 27 September 1991); and Professor P.O. Kristeller (letter of 5 October 1993), unaware of any edition, has expressed delight that I have undertaken to edit the poems.
that our women weep over the departure of Mennula Stratiotas while the Florentine women rejoice at his coming, the “nostras” (35.1) might refer to the women of Rome. In the poems the author appears as an old man. He speaks of himself as elderly in 31.5-6 and implies as much by “Hac...aetate” in 40.1. Indeed he is not desirable prey for a prostitute since he is old, without money or strength (26.3-4). He repeatedly compares old and young men in love (poems 27, 31, 42, 51) and contrasts the vices of youth with the vices of the aged (poem 32). Specifically, the poet declares himself an elderly man of fifty-five years (51.11). But one cannot determine in the collection which statements, if any, about the poet and his circle are fictional.

His poem 8 is an adaptation of an anecdote in Poggio Bracciolini’s Facetiae, of which no. 249, the last dated piece, is from 1452-1453.5 Two persons are mentioned in Venus without fictional names, Mennula Stratiotas (34-36) and the poet Thomas Pratensis (60). This Thomas is presumably the Thomas Pratensis recorded by P.O. Kristeller as a poet6 who directed verses to Marcus Antonius Amaltheus (1475-1558) and wrote about Zacharias Ferrerius (born in 1479 and active in the first half of the sixteenth century).7 Furthermore, poems were addressed to Thomas by Hieronymus Bononius (1454-1517).8 Like Amaltheus, Ferrerius, and Bononius, the poet of Venus seems to have lived in the latter part of the fifteenth century and the first half of the sixteenth.

His collection of epigrams begins with a preface, speaking of the work as a little book (“libellus”) called Venus. According to this preface, Venus contains naughty material (“lasciva”) which should give enjoyment to the young, for there are many works aimed to delight the aged but few compositions for the pleasure of the young. Still, the collection is not

---

entirely lascivious. Some moralistic pieces appear in the collection (see 21, 22, 25, 27, 47, 63), and poem 47 glorifies wives.

Following the preface are, befittingly, two epigrams addressed respectively to Venus and Cupid. After poem 3, the themes turn to the poet and his acquaintances, except for a few pieces based on classical authors (5, 19, 24, 47), on Poggio (8), and the Latin translation of an epitaph in German (20). Even so, the poem paraphrasing Pliny the Younger (19) presents the author's own twist at the end.

Anyway, the main body of the poems, addressed to many people, especially ladies, offers a wide range of feelings. There are poems expressing affection (e.g. 3, 7); hostility, perhaps pretended sometimes (e.g. 4, 10, 34-36); playfulness (e.g. 6, 18, 38, 50, 55), which occasionally descends to crudity (e.g. 58, 64-67); joy (e.g. 29); amusement (e.g. 12-14); the deep throes of love (15, 41); excitement over a woman's beauty (37); heartbreak (40, 42); annoyance at inconsistency in a relationship (43).

Apart from Mennula Stratiotas (34-36) and Thomas Pratensis (60), the personal names are, it seems, fictional: the poet himself declares that Phyllis is a pseudonym (44.1). In fact, the names of persons are almost all drawn from classical literature, especially Martial, and follow the tradition of such classical poets as Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius, who used assumed names for women about whom they wrote.

Indeed there is a strong pagan tone in the collection. There is an interjection calling upon the gods (“Dii superi” in 7.1), and classical allusions abound, e.g. Mysus (3.1), Helen and Thais (21.17), “Lydaque castra” (33.4), “Attica mella” (37.1), “salis Attici” (51.25), Priapus (48.4, 49.1), Cato (51.17), Socrates and Alcibiades (53.2-3), Catullus (64.10). Venus (12.3, 12.5) quotes from Vergil’s Eclogues, and gives whole pieces based on Macrobius (5), Pliny the Younger (19), Ausonius (24), and the Historia Augusta (47). As my notes on the text will show, the frequent stylistic imitation of classical authors reveals that the poet was steeped in classical learning.

He was, most notably, influenced by Catullus, whose he names (64.10); by the anonymous Priapea, which came to light in the fourteenth

---

century;\textsuperscript{10} and by Martial, whose text began to proliferate only in the second quarter of the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{11}

Both strong classical training and independent skills enabled the poet to compose polished verse, not only in elegiac meter, the main meter of Martial and himself, but also in choliambic (34, 47) and hendecasyllabic (13, 48, 50, 51, 53, 60, 61, 63, 64, 66) strains.

My edition, which follows, will enable a comparison of \textit{Venus} with another skillful fifteenth-century collection of amatory poems, the \textit{Hermaphroditus} of Panormita (Antonio Beccadelli), which has recently been re-edited by Donatella Coppini.\textsuperscript{12}

And now I express my gratitude to the Rare Books and Manuscript Library, Columbia University, for preparing clear microfilm of \textit{Venus} and for permitting publication of the work: in particular I wish to thank, for their encouragement, Kenneth A. Lohf, Librarian for Rare Books and Manuscripts; Rudolph Ellenbogen, Assistant Librarian for Rare Books and Manuscripts; and Consuelo Dutschke, who is engaged in cataloguing the medieval manuscripts of Columbia University.

University of Virginia
Dept. of Classics
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

\textsuperscript{11} Reeve in \textit{Texts and Transmission}, p. 242. For the influence of Martial in Italy see Frank-Rutger Hausmann, “Martial in Italien”, \textit{Studi medievali ser. 3}, XVII (1976), 173-218.
\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Antonii Panormitae Hermaphroditus}, ed. Donatella Coppini (Rome, 1990).
VENUS: A HUMANIST’S EPIGRAMS ON LOVE

VENUS

LIBELLUS QUI INSCRIBITUR VENUS

Continet exiguus quaedam lasciua libellus,
Insignem titulum cui dedit alma Venus.
Sunt electa senes alibi quae multa iuuabunt:
Est aequum iuuenes haec quoque paucu iuuent.

1. VENUS

Sum Venus humanae res dulcis amaraque vitae.
Ocia sunt castris irrequieta meis,
Bellica pax, odiosus amor. Sunt denique mixta
Omnia mellito pocula felle mea.

2. CUPIDO

Nudus et alatus, caecus, pharetratus et infans
Delirat figit, nil uidet, errat eget.

3. AD AMICAM

Vt iuueni Myso conamine missa potenti
Haesit Achillea Pelias hasta manu,
Mox tamen a dextra repetitum uulnus eadem
Vulnere sanauit uulnus utrunque nouo,
Sic mihi nunc infers laesa quae fronte dolorem,
Suauia si dederis, causa salutis eris.

4. AD GELIAM

Cum referas priscam facie praestante Lacoenam,
Gelia, sit similis nulla puella tibi,
Nupsisti foedo tanta cum dote marito,
Informi et coruo clara columba data es.
Nimirum culpant omnes, sed cauta fuisti
Nullum etenim nuptae dedecus esse graui.
5. DE IULIA EX MACROBIO

Ederet Agrippae similes cum Iulia natos,
   Altera Vulcanum fallere docta Venus
Quaerenti causam respondit callida: “Nam sum
   Vectorem plena tollere nae memor”.

6. AD NYSAM AMICAM

Sponte prius dederas; poscenti, Nysa, negasti,
   Deficeret longa cum mihi lingua prece.
Tanta sed illata est ex hoc iniuria fastu
   Ut te uix salum deinde uidere uelim.
Nulla fuit seu parua quidem quae contigit ultron
   Gratia. Nunc odium te renuente graue est.
Disce sed ut fatuos melius modereris amores.
   Quod rogo da, sed quod non rogo, Nysa, nega.
Gratior est quae cunque uenit otiuua uoluptas.
   Insperata minus gaudia nempe iuuant.

7. SOMNIUM FELIX EX CANDIDA

Dii superi, regina Venus, pharetrate Cupido,
   Quam subiit felix hac mihi nocte sopor,
Qualia sopitum mulserunt gaudia pectus,
   Quanta quies votis saepe petenda meis!
Somnus enim lassos placidus perrepererat artus;
   Cum foret exactum iam prope noctis iter,
Visa iacens nexit circums mea colla lacertis
   Candida iam fastus poenitusuisse trucis,
Mille dehinc tremula figens mihi basia lingua,
   Mille modis animam dillacerare meam,
Ense uelut blandis traicieto corde susurrirs,
   Seminecem nimio cogere amore mori.
Magna fuit, non uera quidem nec plena, uoluptas,
   Candida, quam vultus obtulit umbra tui.
Quod si te dederis, uera sub imagine tandem
   Vnus ero felix et deus unus ero.
8. EX POGIO

Parturiens acres queritur dum Tusca dolores
Haec obstetrici uerba puella dedit:
“Quid tantum patulos seruas, ignara, meatus,
Editus in lucem qua solet ire puer?
Inuia postici scrutare foraminis antra.
Hac etenim forsan sum quoque parte grauis”.

9. IDEM

Offendit si quos petulans lasciuia, quaeso
Parcite. Non omnes pagina casta iuuat.
Carmina phas Veneri fuerit permettere pauca
Quando opere ex toto plurima Pallas habet.

10. AD PAULAM

Pro me lena sagax temptauit: Paula, negasti,
Sic tamen ut spes nonnulla relict a foret.
Ad paucos exinde dies lenone ministro
Me reuocas. Ego iam laesus adire nego.
Ipsa leuem licet appelles, extinxit amoris
Quenlibet affectum prima repulsa mei.
Ingenui est animi mentes spreuisse superbas
Fallacesue dolos seu sit utrunque simul.

11. OPTATISSIMI AMORIS COPIA

Hunc Venus ipsa mihi si promisisset amorem,
Dixissem: “Fallax, das mihi uerba, Venus”.
Et tamen optati gratissima copia furti
Contigit: audaci profuit esse mihi.
Aspera temptanti primum sed denique mitis
Succubuit longa facta puella prece.
Est leuis ingenii subitae dare terga repulsae.
Spes plaerumque tenax munera magna refert.

12. DE PONTICO

Ponticus arrecto resupinus penne iacebat.
Dum tua cantaret carmina, dieu Maro,
“Dic mihi Dameta” quaeque ordine cuncta sequuntur,
Ad postremum inter cetera dixit et hoc:
“Parta meae Veneri sunt munera”. Risimus omnes,
Munera nam Veneri quae magis apta feras?

13. DE LIBIDINOSO SENE

Dum segnes parat excitare lumbos
Ducturus teneram senex puellam,
Coena luxuriante nuptiali
Exquirens epulas libidinosas,
Pigram quis venerem ferunt cieri,
Inter cetera crapulae uigentis
Erucae patinam uorauit amplam.
Tum dulces ruiturus in palestras,
Multae nec patiens morae, uomendum
Dat lecto chaos ebriamque molem.
Ergo massa rudis statim fatigat
Afflictum stomachum graui dolore.
It putor fluidus nec ore tantum
Sed qua commodior patet meatus.
Vt casum expediam breui iocosum,
Fomento venerem salacis herbae
Irritare uolebat: irritauit.

14. DE PHYLLIDE

Aegroto Phyllis tandem uiduata marito
A sene responsum tale petita dedit:
“Aegris fessa quidem clysteria ponere iam sum.
Haec cupio ponat qui mihi nunc iuuenem”.
Dixerat, e multis legit sibi protinus unum.
Hunc uiue clysteris prouida Phyllis habet.

15. VEHEMENS AMOR

Vecordem cari merito ridetis amici.
Mente cor attonita sentio abesse mihi:
Scilicet illecebris rapuit Lucretia uafris,
Pectoris atque utinam clauserit arce sui.
VENUS: A HUMANIST'S EPIGRAMS ON LOVE

16. IN ARCHETYPAM AMICAE EFFIGIEM

Hanc mihi, cum stupidum cor arundine fixit acuta,
   Effigiem medio pectore fixit Amor.
Quanta uenustati, lector, sit gratia ueræ
   Haec quam miraris ficta docere potest.

17. MAGNI AMORIS VIS

Vesano Caluus quam flagret amore docere,
   Vt lateant aliae, causa uel una potest:
Sese eadem poni tabula caramque puellam,
   Vno eodem unctum corpore utrunque, iubet.
Nimirum delirat amans et quisquis amanti
   Paret. Amor nulla sub ratione iacet.
Ponere enim pictor duo corpora corpore in uno
   Qui sciat, hunc Echo pingere posse putem.

18. IN MULIEBREM LIBIDINEM

Amisso dudum iuuenili aetate marito
   Iamque anus in uuido Penelopea toro,
Multis ante procis constanti mente repulsis
   Nec contemnenda conditione quidem,
Dum iuueni natum commendat saepe magistro
   (Hic ad eam admissus itque reditque frequens),
Incidunt in quoddam quod desperauerat ulli
   Esse uiro, quantum rarus asellus habet.
Protinus incaluit furtiuo foedere, quaeque
   Noluerat iuuenis nubere, nupsit anus.
Quam pia materna est in natos cura fouendos,
   Quam quiduis durum sustinet illa pati.

19. EX EPISTOLA PLINII IV ATQUE XX LIBRO VI

Vlcus ubi aspexit spe iam sanabile nulla,
   Putruerant aegri quo pudibunda uiri,
Persuasit facile huic secum miserabilis uxor
   Fluctiuaga mergi se pateretur aqua.
Protinus excepit uicinus Larius ambos,
   Fortis ut audaci uinxerat ipsa manu.
Plinius hoc laudat. Sano magis ipse probarem
Inguine siquis sui posset obire uiri.

20. EX GERMANICA IN LATINAM LINGUAM TRANSLATUM

Hic iaceo Henricus potans modo uiuus edensque,
  Tum veneri indulgens. Omnia mors rapuit.
Exemplo quicunque meo legis ista, caveto.
  Hora tibi uitae munere ne qua uacet.

21. AD PYRRHUM LIBIDINOSUM

Vxorem teneram quae te vesania cogit
  Linquere, nescio quae scorta pudenda sequi?
Est vxor iuuenis, satis et formosa decensque,
  Qua contentari coniuge, Pyrrha, queas.
Tu tamen informes et anus secatibus ubique, 5
  Praeter et vxorem quaelibet apta tibi est.
Ante alias illam, si non foret uxor, amares.
  Sola abigunt animum uincla marita tuum.
Balnea sic Thomae, Petri modo, saepe Georgi
  Visis ob Illyricas Teutonicasque lupas.
Saepe propinquas petis Magnae pumoniae Matri,
  Gannea Nicoleo saepe propinquas petis.
Pone tuae fraenum (quaenam haec lascivia?) uitae
  Et tandem fessus disce coire domi.
Alma quidem varias facies Natura puellis, 15
  Vasa eadem cunctis sed dedit aequa Venus.
Nil Helene differt a Thaide, Thais ab Anna.
  Omnibus est eadem rima, saporis idem.

22. DE CALVO LIBIDINOSO

Iurauit quoties meretrices linquere foedas
  Caluus et ad spurcas nolle redire lupas.
Quaeris quam longo constantia tempore duret.
  Quatuor ad summum uix manet illa dies.
Si quod forte novum scortum, non ante petitum, 5
  Occurrat, subito, nec pudor obstat, adit.
Simplicius peccare potes, periuria tolle,
  Calue salax, si te tanta libido rapit.
Stulticia est iurare deos et fallere: per se  
Fraena potest menti ponere quisque suae. 10

23. DE CALVO

Scorta petit versusue facit quicunque uagari,  
Calue, cupid, solus tu sed utrunque facis.

24. ALLUSIO AD POETAE AUSONII VERSUS

Laidas et Glyceras, lasciuæ nomina famæ,  
Vafra tuo coniux carmine cum legeret,  
Ludere te dixit falsoque in amore iocari,  
Se quoque ut in uero ludere amore putes.

25. AD MATRONAS

Matronae, monitis aures aduertite sanctis,  
Quae colitis casti iura pudica tori.  
Rerum opifex mamas natis formauit alendis,  
Lacteus infantes educet unde liquor.  
Turpe dei munus temerare libidine tanta.  
Indignos habitus ponite siqua proba est.  
Humani altrices generis uelate papillas.  
Hoc habitu foedas uix decent ire lupas.

26. AD THAIDEM

Quid me, Thai, uocas? Munus, quod propter adiri  
Quaque cupid mulier, defit utrunque mihi.  
Non mihi sunt nummi, non uires: desine, uana,  
Ergo inopem et gelidum, Thai, uocare senem.

27. PECCATA AFFECTU IPSO ESSE PARIA

"Turpe seni, fateor, scortari; turpe marito  
Moechari, fateor: crimen utrunque graue est.  
Vnicuique suum est. Infamis patrat Amyllus  
Quo nullum toto turpius orbe scelus,  
Ille sed est iuuenis. Iuuenis scortabar et ipse.  
Qui fuimus iuuenes, ii sumus inde senes.  
Non habet uxorem, verum sanabile defit
Cui medicus tantum, cui medicina malum est.
Non bene ago, fateor, sed longe peius Amyllus.
Cuique libido sua est. Parcite si qua mihi est":
Haec Matho, qui, dum se a uitto conatur aperto
Expurgare, duos increpat ore leui.
Sunt paria affectu peccandi crimina. Peccat
Corruptus satis hic cui semel est animus.

28. IN PULCHERRIMUM CUBICULUM

Viuendum laete locus admonet undique ridens.
Ex hilari tristis limine maeror eat.
Hoc Venus, hoc Musae lustrant Charitesque cubile.
Carpe memor, fugiunt gaudia, quisquis ades.

29. ALIUD

Laeta domus ridet. Turpes discedite curae.
Hanc Amor, hanc Charites, hanc Cytherea colunt.
Dulcia securae decerpite gaudia uitae
Dum licet. Hic maestum conuenit esse nihil.

30. AD PUELLAE SPECIOSISSIMAE AMATOREM

Quid mandas laudanda tuae speciosa puellae
Munera? Sol radios pandit ubique suos.
Auricomum dicamne decus frontisne serenae
Sidera lucifera splendidiora face,
Molliter impressas turgenti pectore mamas,
Oscula Paestanis anteferenda rosis?
Palladias dicamne manus solidosne lacertos?
Vix infinitum singula laudet opus.
Nota tibi et cunctis haec sunt extrinseca. Quaedam
Nota tibi et paucis tu tibi solus habe,
Neue leui cures thesauros prodere uulgo,
Sed tacite felix utere sorte tua.

31. AD EUNDEM

Quaere alios comites. Quaenam imprudentia nostra est?
Non comitem dominum te decet esse mihi.
Te decorat titulis virtus pulcherrima claris.
Pressa iacet mea sors inferiore loco.
Tu iuuenis firmusque; senex ego debilis, aegrum
Rheumate continuo quem pituita tenet.
Fudit opes pleno largas tibi Copia cornu;
At me paupertas perniciosa premit.
Te fouet explosis riualibus inclyta, qua non
Pulchrior in terris ulla puella uiget,
Gallicus infami signat quam stigmate morbus.
Est mihi de vili plaebae petenda venus.
Non bene mus taurusque iugo sotiantur eodem.
Sint comites aequa conditione decet.

32. QUOD SENUM VITIA SINT PEIORA QUAM IUVENUM

Insanos agitat iuuenes furiosa libido,
In venerem nulla qui ratione ruent.
Corrupunt grauiora senes peccata pudendos:
Ambitio atque auri prodigiosa fames.
Se spoliat iuuenis, sed egentem ditat amicam;
Efficiunt ditem damna aliena senem.
Auctori ergo nocent iuuenilia crimina soli;
Ipsa sibi et multis noxa senilis obest.

33. AD NIGRINAM

Amissam non flet maerens Nigrina parentem.
Viuit anus. Quonam vulnere laesa dolet?
Mennula, Lampsacio famosus munere, Pisas
Belligeras abiens Lydaque castra petit.
Ignosco, miseranda, graui, Nigrina, dolori.
Iactura est rebus maxima facta tuis.

34. AD MENNULLAM STRATIOTAM

Paruo tibi qui Mennulae indidit nomen,
Blaese uocauit mentulam. Sed errauit,
Facilius et dicturus aptius mentam.
35. AD EUNDEM

Flere decet nostras, Tuscas gaudere puellas.
    Deseris has; illas, Mennula care, petis.
Oris inest morumque tibi, Stratiota, uenustas
    Nulla, queas at qua parte placere palam est.

36. AD EUNDEM

Quam iucunda manent Hetruscas gaudia matres,
    Mennula membrosus quas Stratiota petit.
Non coma, non facies illi quibus urat amantes:
    Parte alia captas vitiiore iuuat.

37. AD PUELLAM ELEGANTISSIMAM

Poma tibi primam, dant Attica mella secundam,
    Vltima de niueo syllaba lacte uenit.
Poma rubent: tibi labra genae. Sunt dulcia mella:
    Vincis Hymeteos tota uenusta fauos.
Lac niueum: niueus nitor est tibi corpore toto.
    Muneribus nomen conuenit ergo tuis.

38. DE GENERE VOCABULORUM CUNNUS ET PRIAPUS

Grammatici hunc cunnum sicut dixere, priapum
    Dicere debuerant hanc ratione pari.

39. DE AUGUSTO MILITE

Incipit Augustus: “Verbi memor effuge mustum
    Et venerem, uitiet nec tibi lympha merum”.

40. CORDOLIUM EX AMORE

Hac igitur rursus quod non aetate putabam,
    Insidiis plector, saeue Cupido, tuis.
Et mihi foemineo miserum cor surripit astu
    Illa canis, poenas nil miserata meas.
Illa canis, tandem proprio quam nomine prodam,
    Vulnera uel fuerit mille necesse pati,
Allexit facili me consuetudine primum:
Moribus allexit blanditiisque suis.
Mox, ubi cernici manibus pedibusque catenas
Iniecit, iam non quod fuit ante manet.
Continuo semel admittit uix mense nouasque
Tum longas causas consuit usque morae.
Discrucior, superest alto medicina dolori
Nulla, leuant morbum pharmaca nulla grauem.
Res, loquor expertus, uiridi tolerabilis aeuo
Dura sine exemplo est in sene verus amor.

41. AD AMICAM PHYLLIDA

Seu uigilo, uigilans de te, mea, cogito, Phylli;
Dormio: sunt de te somnia, Phylli mea.
Denique, quicquid ago, tibi totus inhaereo, Phylli.
Vna anima est tecum, Phylli, eademque mihi.

42. CORDOLIUM

Munus amor nempe est iuuenili aetate decorum.
Quisquis amat iuuenum, nobile pectus habet.
Sunto senes ab amore procul canente capillo:
Res perridicula est captus amore senex.
Exornat iuenum generoso pectora cultu,
Insanire senum pectora cogit amor.

43. AD PHYLLIDA

Phylli, negas; das, Phylli: haec me inconstantia perdit.
Ne peream, uel da, Phylli, uel usque nega.

44. AD PHYLLIDA

Phyllis amor meus est ficto sed nomine; verum
Pandere non tutum est: phasque pudorque uetant.
Cur igitur capior non tuto stultus amore?
Cur quod amare nephas insipienter amo?
Phylli, vale, victus rationi cedere cogor.
Vitandum est omni quod ratione caret.
45. AD AMICUM

Reddiderit ne te iactes quod Paula decorum.
Noluit hoc; maius, cum uolet, illa petet.

46. DE BARBARA

Barbara prostabat; prostantem rarus adibat,
Exigua facilis cum stipe posset emi.
Vsque adeo affectus ciet inconcessa voluptas:
Mille procos, postquam Barbara nupsit, habet.

47. EX VITA AELII VERI APUD SPARTIANUM

Est dignitatis uxor, haud voluptatis,
Nomen. Maritus continet grauis sese,
Libidinosis congredi modis parcens.
Exerna lucta munus exhibet gratum.
Odit pudicae coniugis Venus mores,
Blandos reseruans mollibus iocos scortis
Vagosque tactus basiationesque.
Ad procreandos liberos data est vxor,
Tutela praesens, columna et domus sanctum.

48. DE VENERE, PRIAPO, ET MARTE

Tractabat clypeum procax Dione,
Marti zelotypo studens placere.
Turgens inguine stabat ut proteruo,
“Pone o pone”, Priapus inquit “illis
Arma haec sunt manibus decentiora”.
Riualem metuens periculosum,
Tum sic Armipotens: “Facesse monstrum
Obscoenae temerariaeque caudae,
Cui falx haud temere additur recurua.
Est, ut blandula tractat arma, ludens,
Haud experta semel mihi esse praesto
Quae tractet dea serio iocoque”.
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49. IDEM

Tractanti clypeum Veneri inquit “Pone” Priapus
   “Conueniunt manibus haec magis arma tuis”.
Tum Mars impatiens et iusta percitus ira:
   Quam bene falx istec monstra pudenda decet.
Allia uel corpus, siqua est tibi, tractet amica.
   Sunt mihi quae decent, inuide, quaeque iuuent.

50. DE CUIUSDAM SOCRUS SIMPLICITATE

“Sextilis, mea nata, saeueus instat.
Sponso parere sis memor salaci,
Luctam ne repetens frequentiorem
Morbos incidat in graues repente.
Tangi quotidie semel sat esto.
Ad summum patiare bis nec ultra.
Aestus cesserit insolens ubi mox,
Totam ne dare te negaris unquam,
Vel si comprimat octies in hora”.
O quam prouida, quam benigna socrus,
Saluum quae generum uelit nouellum.

51. AD MODESTUM

Ludit tecum Ariadna uafra de me,
Nam te deperii impotenter amens.
Illam tu lepide obiicis mihi quod
Dudum perdite amas habesque cordi.
Nec me Lyncea propter hoc uocaris
Audax quod ualeat uidere cantor,
Quod litis miser arbiter iocosae,
A me nec metuas, tua est puella
Communis mihi nempe parte nulla.
Totam cedo tibi libens uolensque,
Lustrorum memor undecim meorum.
Scortillum tibi habe uoluptuosum
Lascium petulansque garrulumque,
Vix quarto iuuenis Modeste lustro.
Cuius me insimulas iocus, nec ille
Exemplum facit ad Catonianum
Lauduit Cato fornice exeuntem,
Albenti puto non coma, sed illum
Aetati similem tuae salaci.
Sed non sobrius ipse forsan: olim
Aiunt ut solitum mero madere.
Haec lasciuia uix decet iuuentam;
Canae turpius est nihil senectae.
Ludicrum sene nullum amante maius,
Vas ingens salis Attici, Modeste.

52. AD PAULAM

Paula, negas. Insto, sed dum nimis ipsa reluctas,
Longam inter luctam mens mihi sana redit.
Desino, miraris. Mirari desine, teque
Vafra noua posthac calliditate dato.
Si fortasse olim repetam, concede repente.
Nec dato tam longum consilio spacium.
Dum stimulat praecip ac in consulta libido,
Multa iuuant quae mox facta fuisse pudet.

53. AD AMICUM IOCOSE

Quod me iunior elegantiorque
Ficto nomine Socratem uocaris,
Vis Alcibiades mihi esse forsan.

54. AD EPHOEBUM ELEGANTEM THORACE INDUTUM

Quid thorace tegis corpus? Nil parte timendum est
Hac tibi: parte alia uulnus, epoebbe, caue.

55. IOCOSE AD AMICUM

Robore praestanti iuuenem rus ducis; et eius
Velle piros, malos dicis ope inserere.
Scire velim de te, tuus insitor ille peritus
Norit an et ficus quality inseritur.
56. MULIEBRIS FACILITATIS EXCUSATIO

Vsque adeo in venerem stimulis agitatur acutis
   Feminei sexus lubrica mollicies:
Quod sint tam faciles mirari desino multae;
   Miror sunt aliquae si modo difficiles.

57. CASUS DE EQUA

Mortua collapsa est alio temptata meatu,
   Mas uiolenter equam dum male cautus init.
Debuerat sic turpe scelus Natura notare,
   Sed patratorem poena decebat atrox.

58. OBSCOENI CUIUSPIAM SENIS EPITAPHIUM

Hic iacet ille senex (nomenque genusque silebo
   Ne turpi infamet seque suosque nota),
Scorta domi qui scorta foris tot alebat, ephebis
   Praeualidis possent quot satis esse decem,
Pro ferula tremulos famulis subeuntibus artus
   Quotidie has illas suetos adire lupas.
Inter scorta puer seros eductus in annos
   Prae reliquis coluit te, Cytherea, deis.
Parce rosis, haeres: mingant hoc scorta sepulchro
   Multa iube. Hos manes talia iusta decent.

59. VITAE LIBIDINOSAE DETESTATIO

Foeda Venus, qua non pestis praesentior nulla est,
   Parce animum tandem sollicitare pium.
Ingenium per te misero mihi concidit omne,
   Inficit egregium fama notata decus.
Deficiunt uires labefacti corporis aegrae,
   Duriter aggastae dimminuuntur opes.
I procul. Ingenium mihi protinus omne redibit,
   Antiquus famae restituetur honos,
Firmius et morbis alienum corpus amaris
   Viuet, opes fructus utilioris erunt.
Reperit ad sobolem quod opus Natura creandam
   Legitime patret qui cupit esse pater.
60. AD THOMAM PRATENSEM

Longis litibus et laboriosis,
Natus te quibus impius fatigat
(Dictum aegre rogo ne feras iocosum),
Thoma, si bene prouidus fuisses,
Soluiisset semel inquinata lena.
Tam paruus labor ut uoces laborem.
O quam tedia multa sustulisset,
O quantum tibi commodi parasset,
Vita digne senex quietiore.

61. AD AMMIANUM IRRUMATOREM

Dulcem quae tibi dicit esse pennem,
O quam turpe nefas inepta prodit,
Nam quod dulce uocetur aut amarum,
Gustu noscitur, Ammiane, solo.

62. DE FRONTONE INEPTO BASIATORE

Fronto duos stolidus dentes excussit amicae,
Instantem linguam dum male cauta uorat.
Ille quidem satis est (quis non fateatur?) ineptus;
Non tarnen est […]is dentibus illa satis.

63. TURPISSIMA ISTORUM TEMPORUM OBSCOENITAS

In prima memini mea iuuenia:
Sero uespere pallioque tecti
Intrabant iuuenes lupanar ipsum,
Suffusi ingenuo rubore mallas,
Sanctus quod Cato ferre posset aeque.
Confestim duo tresue quatuorue
Induxere nouum scelus potentes,
Poenam nec uriti seueriorem,
Paedicare palam; statim receptum est
Quid fellare foret, quid irrumare:
Molli de numero cinaedulorum
Ausus prodere nesciebat ullus.
Nullus draucus erat tribasque nulla.
At nunc (proh facinus!) licentiosi
Corruptissima turpitudo secli
Verbis dicere quod pudet nefandis
Horrendo scelus omne patrat ausu;
Permisso scelus omne patrat usu.
Tot iam crimina nequiora fiunt,
Paedicare nihil potest putari.

64. VOCABULUM RUSTICANUM
Appellant uietum uirile membrum
Nostri ruricolae et quidem Latine
Sed cum significant senile inersque.
Pennis mentula vel priapus olim,
Firmo cum foret integrum uigore,
Vt non immerito fuit uocatum,
Dignum nomine quolibet ducenti:
Frigescens uietae gelu senectae,
Apte iam uietum potest uocari,
Beta languidius Catulliana.

65. IN MAGNO ALGORE
Inter testiculos gelido mihi penne latente
Quaerebam quisnam de tribus ille foret.
Mingere cum cuperem sumpta de more matella,
Se demum officio prodidit ipse suo.

66. AD AMICUM
Membrosissimus omnium Priapus,
Plus aequo superans equoue cunctos
Dum cunnos cuneo repleret omnis
Praegrandi ualido tumente duro,
“Est mi foemina laxa nulla” dixit.
Dictum quod repetis tibi iocatus
Haud sane illepide nec infacete,
Diuersa ratione forsan aptum:
Cuius plumbea debilisque sica,
Vaginam titubans ad interiorem,
Condi uix patulo potest hyatu,
Quouis obice se statim reflectens.

67. AD CRISPINUM

Appellat qui te natum, Crispine, fatetur
Haud dubie matrem se futuisse tuam.

NOTES on the TEXT

(Praef.) 1 exiguus...libellus: Ov. Ibis 447. 2 Insignem titulum: Cic. Tusc. V 30; Liv. IV 29.6, XXX 45.7; Luc. VIII 73. alma Venus: cf. esp. Lucret. I 2; Verg. Aen. I 618, X 332; Ov. e.g. Met. X 230, XIV 478, XV 844, Tr. II 262; Stat. Siluae I 2.52.


VENUS: A HUMANIST’S EPIGRAMS ON LOVE


8 See Poggio Facetiae 181 (Poggio Bracciolini, Facetie, edd. Eugenio Garin and Marcello Ciccuto, Milan 1983, p. 312). 3 patulos...meatus: cf. Ov. Met. III 162, XI 60; Sil. II 119, III 34; Mart. Epig. III 19.3; cf. Adams p. 89. 4 Editus in lucem: e.g. Lucilius (Nonius 78M); Cic. Tusc. II 115; Ov. Met. XV 221; Gellius XII 5.7.


11 6 Succubuit...puella: Ov. Fasti II 810. longa prece: Cie. Epist. Ad Brutum 21.2. 7 leuis ingenii: Liv. XXII 43.5; Seneca the Younger Epist. 56.12; Serv. Ecl. 9.36. 8 plaerumque=plerumque.

12 Tit. Pontico: this name appears in Mart. Epig. II 32.2, II 82.1, II 60.9, IV 85.1, V 63.2, IX 19.2, IX 41.1, IX 41.10. 1 arrecto: cf. Priap.
68.32. 3 Die mihi Dameta: Verg. Ecl. 3.1. 5 Parta meae Veneri: Verg. Ecl. 3.68.

13 2 teneram...puellam: Copa 33; Propert. II 25.41; Tibull. I 10.64, III 12.2; Ov. e.g. Am. III 7.53, Her. 14.87, Ars I 403; Mart. Epig. I 109.16, III 65.1, XIV 149.1. 5 pigram...uenerem: cf. Moretum 84. 7 Erucae: for the reputation of colewort as an aphrodisiac see e.g. Priap. 46.8 and 51.20, Moretum 84, Ov. Rem. 799-800, Mart. Epig. III 75.2-3. 8 palaestras: cf. Mart. Epig. X 55.4 and Adams pp. 158, 229. 10 chaos...molem: Ov. Met. I 7.11; Ov. Met. I 70 and I 7. 14 meatus: cf. 8.3, supra. 16 salacis herbae: Ov. Ars II 422; Mart. Epig. X 48.10. The adjective “salax” is applied to “eruca” in Priap. 51.20, Ov. Rem. 799, and Mart. Epig. III 75.3.

14 Tit. Phyllide: the name Phyllis, which also appears in the title of poems 41, 43, 44 below, occurs in Mart. Epig. X 81.1, X 81.3, XI 29.2, XI 29.8, XI 49.1, XI 49.12, XII 65.1, XII 65.9. 3 fessa: fersa MS; “fessus” sometimes is used with an infinitive, as in Seneca the Younger Oed. 170 and Claudian 20 (In Eutr. Liber Alter) 367. 5 e multis legit: Cic. Orat. 190.


17 1 Vesano...amore: Pliny the Elder VII 127. Caluus: this name perhaps occurs in the title of Mart. Epig. XIV 196.


19 See Pliny the Younger Epist. VI 24. 4 Fluctiuaga: for this rare adjective see Stat. Siluae II 1.95 and III 1.84, Theb. I 271, IX 305, IX 360; Sedul. Carmen Paschale V 395; Prudent. Cathemerinon III 46. 5 uicinus Larius: cf. Pliny the Younger Epist. VI 24.2; cf. Serv. Georg. II 159. 8 sui: notice the unusual synizesis.


21 1 quae — cogit: cf. Catull. 40.1-2. Verse 11 of Venus refers apparently to the area of the Palatine Hill in Rome. 16 vas: cf. Adams p. 88. 17 Thaide: the famous courtesan, noticed e.g. in Ov. Rem. 383-386; other women were also named Thais, as in Ter. Eun. e.g. 188, 231, 391
and in Mart. Epig. e.g. III 8.1, VI 93.1, XIV 187.2. 18 rima: cf. Adams p. 95.

22 Tit. Caluo: for this name see on 17.1, supra. 1 foedas: turpes (foedas added to the margin by the scribe; cf. 25.8, infra: foedas...lupas) MS. 2 spurcas...lupas: Mart. Epig. I 34.8. 8 libido rapit: Juv. 8.135. 9 iurare — fallere: cf. Ov. Her. 20.198.

23 Tit. Caluo: for the name see on 17.1, supra.

24 Auson. Epig. 39. 4 ludere amore: Lucret. IV 1101; Propert. II 25.27; Ov. Tr. III 3.73, IV 10.1, V 1.22; Mart. Epig. XIV 187.1.


26 1 Thaidem: see on 21.17, supra.


28 2 tristis: turpis (tristis added to the margin by the scribe) MS. 4 Carpe...fugium gaudia: Mart. Epig. VII 47.11; cf. also Ov. Her. 15.109 and Petron. 128.6.verse 7.

29 1 Laeta domus: cf. Lucret. III 894; Ov. Her. 16.91, Fasti IV 543; Phaedrus IV 26.21; Seneca the Younger Herc. Fur. 161 and Oed. 627.

30 2 radios — ubique: cf. Lucret. VI 737. 3 Auricomum: for this rare adjective see Verg. Aen. VI 141; Sil. III 608; Valer. Flaccus IV 92; Macrobr. Sat. V 14.8; Auson. Technopaeagion 11.2; Martianus Capella I 12. dicamne...frontisne: for the rare use of “-ne...-ne” in questions (see also 30.7 below), cf. Verg. Aen. XI 126. frontisne serenae: Verg. Aen. IV 477; Mart. Epig. VII 12.1; Sil. II 414, III 298; Stat. Siluae I 3.91-92, II 6.65-66; Apuleius Met. IX 27. 4-6 lucifera...Paestanis rosis: Pseudo-Ausonius De Rosis 11-12. 6 Paestanis...rosis: ibid.; Mart. Epig. IV 42.10; cf. also Ov. Pont. II 4.28. Palladias manus: Seneca the Younger Med. 366. 12 utere sorte tua: Verg. Aen. XII 932.

31 senex...debilis: Cic. Phil. 8.31; Hist. Aug.; Maximini Duo 18.1; Servius Aen. II 434. 6 pleno...Copia cornu: Hor. Carm. Saec. 59-60, Epist. I 12.29. 11 plaebe=plebe.

32 1 furiosa libido: Ov. Ars I 281. 4 auri...fames: Verg. Aen. III 57; Laus Pisonis 219-220; Pliny the Elder XXXIII 48, XXXIII 72; Octauia 425. 6 damna aliena: Ov. Met. XV 547-548; Stat. Siluae V 5.47.
33 *Tit.* Nigrinam: this name appears in Mart. Epig. IV 75.1 and IX 30.3. 3 Lampsacio: this very rare adjective occurs in Mart. Epig. XI 16.3 and XI 51.2. 3 munere: cf. Adams p. 164.


36 Tit. Puellam: her name is Pomella, as spelled by the clues of the poem. 1 Attica mella: Ov. *Medic.* Faciei 82; Mart. Epig. XIII 108.1. 2 niumeo...lacte: Verg. *Ecl.* 2.20; Tibull. III 2.20, III 5.34; Ov. *Met.* XIII 829, *Fasti* IV 151, IV 780. 4 Hymeteos = Hymetteos.

38 1 priapum: cf. Juv. 29.95, also Adams p. 230.


43 Tit. Phyllida: see on 14 Tit., supra. 2 da...nega: Mart. Epig. IV 71.6.

44 Tit. Phyllida: see on 14 Tit., supra. 1 ficto...nomine: Ov. *Her.* 16.245. 4 insipienfer: this word, rare in Classical Latin, appears in Plautus *Mil.* 561 and *Truc.* 827; Cic. *Sen.* 68, *Fam.* V 20.4. The word also stands in Vulg. 1 Par. 21.8 and Job 42.3. 6 ratione caret: Ov. *Am.* I 10.25 and *Fasti* III 119.


61. 5 pudicae coniugis: Hor. *Carm.* III 5.41. 6 iocos: cf. Adams pp. 161-
162. 7 basiationes: this very rare word is found in Catull. 7.1 and in
Mart. *Epig.* II 23.4 and VII 95.17. 9 Tutela presens: Hor. *Carm.* IV
14.43.


50 4 Morbos incidat in graues: e.g. Cic. *Clu.* 175, 198, *Sen.* 67;
Nepos, Dion 2.4; *Hist. Aug.*, Hadrianus 23.1; Poggio *Facetiae* 249 (edd.
Garin and Ciccuto p. 380). 5 Tangi: cf. Adams pp. 185-186. 9 compri-

51 *Tit.* Modestum: for this name see Mart. *Epig.* X 21.1. 1 uafra: this
adjective is rare in the feminine but see Mart. *Epig.* VI 64.26 and XII
66.3. 2 te deperit impotenter: Catull. 35.12. 7 lis...arbiter iocosae: Ov.
*Met.* III 332, *Ibis* 261. 10 cedo tibi...ulensque: cf. Ov. *Am.* I 13.27. 8-
9 puella Communis: *Priap.* 34.2-3. 12 Scortillum: Catull. 10.3 (this is
the only appearance in Classical Latin of the diminutive of “scortum”:
121 “A diminutive, found only here”). 15 me insimulas: *Cic. Fam.* VII
13.1. 17 fornice exeuntem: for this expression and the entire episode see
Hor. *Serm.* I 2.31-35. 18 Albenti...coma: Ov. *Pont.* IV 12.30. 20-21 For
the notion that Cato was fond of strong wine see Hor. *Carm.* III 21.9-12.
21 mero: *corr., it seems, from* merito MS. mero madere: Tibull. II 28 and

52 *Tit.* Paulam: see on 10 *Tit.*, supra. 2 mens...sana: Juv. 10.356.
25.2, *Epig.* VI 89.8; cf. also Ov. *Am.* I 4.7; see also 56.3, infra.

53 2-3 Socratem...Alcibiades: cf. Petron. 128.7.

54 1 Robore praestanti: Liv. XXIII 26.11. 4 ficus: see Adams p. 113.
56 stimulis agitatur: Ov. *Fasti* II 779; “Quint.” *Decl.* 324. 3 mirari
desino: see on 52.3, supra.

58 Cf. Panormitanus (Antonio Beccadelli), *Hermaphroditus* I 7 (ed.
Donatella Coppini, Rome 1990, pp. 16-17): the poem of Panormitanus
is the epitaph for an immoral lame man, called Pegasus, who desires
lewd behavior to take place at his tomb.

3 Curved brackets enclose this verse in the manuscript. 5 inquinata: cf. Adams pp. 198-199.

Tit. Ammianum: this name appears in Mart. *Epig.* II 4.1, II 4.2, II 17.4, IV 70.1, IV 70.4. Tit. irrumatorem: see Adams pp. 2, 125-130, 133-134, also Quinn, *Catullus*, pp. 143-144.

Tit. Frontone: the name Fronto appears in Mart. *Epig.* I 55.2, V 34.1, XIV 106.2. 1 dentes excussit: Juv. 16.10; *Hist. Aug.*, M. Aurelius Claudianus 13.6, 13.7. 4 The word after “est” is partly blotted in the manuscript. Professor Edward Courtney kindly suggests (by letter of 27 April 1992) that the mostly illegible text might read “firmis”. I think that his view can be supported by Sil. X 127: “Nondum sat firmo catuli certamina dente”, but the reading remains uncertain.


1 uietum: the e of the second syllable is shortened (also in 64.9 and in “uietae” of 64.8), but cf. Hor. *Epod.* 12.7, where “uietis” has the regular long e; nothing on the sexual term appears in Adams. urile membrum: according to Adams p. 46, “membrum urile” is not found before Tertullian. 6 non immerito: quondam (deleted, non immerito superscript) MS. 10 Catulliana beta: Catull. 67.21 “languidior tenera...beta”; see Adams p. 26.

De Libidinose ian.

Deum sequi, parente, eternam lumina.

Dux terrarum sincerum pulchrum,

Contra luxuriantis ignibus.

Exquiritis quodis libidinosus.

Pigillum quod nostrum是从 versus

Inter annos regum insignus.

E'nume patiam non fiat amplita.

Tum delae visuini in palam

Malaer nor patiam morati, nemodum

Dux luteo choros, nivei a moenia

Cyno mara nody, liam furgat.

Alitis fraumnum genu downward.

Ipse enim humum non un humum

In quin commodior post be.
In this article I will review the *Compendium* of Antonius Liber. I shall discuss its contents and sources in general, and will then concentrate specifically on three items it contains, viz. the letters of Liber and Rodolphus Langius (Von Langen), those of Aquinas, and twelve letters that were inserted anonymously. Quotations will be made directly from the *Compendium*, since the text of Liber’s and Langius’s letters in Crecelius’s two articles (1876 and 1879) contains a number of errors.

It was probably in the year 1475 or 1476 that Antonius Liber (Vrije, Vrye, Vrie, Vrien) composed his *Familiorum epistolarum compendium ex diuersis hinc inde probatissimis autoribus pro communium studiendorumque rettorum ac oratorum eruditione per discretum ac eruditum uirum Antonium Liberaus Zusatensem recollectum*. He was born in Soest in Westphalia, Germany. The date of his birth is unknown, as is much of his youth. He studied at different universities, and (part of) his studies were financed by the abbey of Aduard. His matriculation at any of the German universities cannot be proved. From his own letters and from a poem by Fridericus Maurus (Mormann) dedicated to Liber it appears that he studied in Pavia. In February 1469 he was a teacher at St. Martin’s School in Groningen, and verger of St. Martin’s Church. In Groningen he was also *notarius* in the early
seventies,⁵ and there he married his wife Bert(h)a, to whom he wrote a letter in Latin from Cologne. As he indicates himself in his dedicatory letter to the Compendium, he left Groningen for Cologne. There he composed the Compendium, which was then printed by Koelhoff the elder along with a grammar written by Liber, and a De orthographia edited by him. We know nothing of Liber’s other activities at Cologne, though he must have been quite active, if we exclude the possibility that he was kidding his wife when he wrote

\[
\ldots \text{tot sum tantisque rebus inuolutus, ut nesciam aliquando unde mihi sumendum sit laboris initium. Nam nostris se causis publice etiam utilitatis quedam immiscuerunt negotia ... [Comp. f. M9r]}
\]

Worstbrock (1985: 748) assumes that Liber also worked for printers at Cologne, because in another letter he mentions a trip he had planned to several universities in the south of Germany with 1500 newly printed books; a trip he had now cancelled, because he had been told that it was not safe to travel through that part of the country.

\[
\text{Qui me inopinatus terror mille et quingenta illa uolumina pro renoauatone Latine lingue impressa coegit particularibus studiis communicare. [Comp. f. M10r]}
\]

Obviously, Liber meant 1500 copies of the De orthographia by Titus Livius de Frulovisiis, which he had edited, and Koelhoff had printed. One could also assume that he had bought these from Koelhoff, and that he was now trying to sell them to make a profit out of it. From the same letter, we learn that Liber planned to leave Cologne and travel to Deventer and Zwolle, and from there to Louvain and Paris. Whether he actually did so remains uncertain. In 1482, when Agricola visited him,⁶ we find him as notarius in Kampen. From Easter 1485 he also worked in this town as secretarius, at least until 1499.⁷ In later years he worked as a teacher at the Latin schools in Amsterdam and Alkmaar, where he died around 1507.

---

⁵ Bakker 1988: 106, who refers to the Municipal Archives of Groningen, Stadsarchief, Rood voor de Reductie 877, 1092², 118. Liber’s words publice [...] utilitatis [...] negotia (see the first quotation from the Compendium) also seem to refer to this.

⁶ Agricola, ep. 29.

⁷ Don 1963-6, vol.II, lists as the most recent documents that mention Liber (as notarius) nr. 69 of the inventory of St. Nicholas’s or Boven Church (d.d. May 6th, 1492) and nr. 69 of the Archieven van Kerken en Kloosters (also d.d. May 6th, 1492; Don II, R.750). According to Santing (1988: 177), however, there are six charters and one document in the Municipal Archives of Kampen drawn up by Liber in the years 1482, 1485, 1487 (2), 1490, 1492 and 1499. I have not yet verified this.
Only a few books came from Liber’s hand, and they all seem to be intended for use in school. Besides the Compendium, he wrote a Latin grammar called Aurora grammaticae.\footnote{Proctor 1044.} It was printed without any mention of an author or date; Crecelius was the first to point out that Liber was its author.\footnote{Crecelius 1879: 140.} He also wrote a commentary on Prudentius’s hymn Inventor rutili.\footnote{Proctor 1045.} Finally, he prepared an edition of Titus Livius de Frulovisiis’s De orthographia.\footnote{Printed in Deventer by Richard Pafraet in 1493 = Hain 10073.} From this it is clear that Liber played an important part in stimulating the development of and increasing the importance attached to the new humanist ideas at the Latin schools in the Low Countries. He devoted himself first and foremost to the renovation of Latin style and grammar. Apart from his school books, all that Liber has left us is four poems. Already known were his carmen panegyricum (ten disticha) on Wessel Gansfort’s return from Italy (c. 1475), an epigram in laudem autoriis in his edition of the De orthographia (two disticha), and an In laudem inclite Colonorum urbis epigramma (ten disticha), which was printed for the first time in 1483. Recently Santing has found a fourth poem by Liber in a Munich manuscript;\footnote{Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm. 528, f.200v.} it is entitled In osores studiorum humanitatis, a favourite theme among early northern humanists (see e.g. the letters of Langius and Liber), and consists of thirteen disticha.\footnote{Schoonbeeg 1993: 340 (Carmen X).} Perhaps something more of Liber’s work remains to be discovered, but it will surely not be much. Liber’s merits lie in his school activities; literary composition was not his forte. For this reason he claruit in breui, as Butzbachius puts it.\footnote{Auctarium de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis, i.ll - Krafft/Crecelius 1870: 59.}

The Compendium was printed only once. From the epistola dedicatoria, we know that Liber composed it in Cologne, and it has been established that the book was printed by Johan Koelhoff the elder in his letter type four.\footnote{Proctors 1036.} The year of publication is unknown, but on December 9th, 1476, Dietrich Brandes from Lübeck obtained the power of attorney to collect the claims of Koelhoff on Antonius Liber from Groningen.\footnote{Corsten 1955: 61.} However, Koelhoff also printed Liber’s Aurora grammaticae and the De orthographia edition, which unfortunately are also undated. Voulliéme dates them...
around 1479, whereas he gives c. 1475 as the date of the *Compendium*. Proctor puts the *Compendium* in the year 1477, and the other two in the year 1479. There seems, therefore, to be some agreement on dating the *Compendium* before the other two books. If Liber indeed composed this book first, we can surely date it before December 9th, 1476.

We have more certainty about Liber’s reason for composing his *Compendium*. He explicitly states it in his dedicatory letter to Arnold von Bevelen from Hildesheim, headmaster of St. Martin’s School in Groningen, and one of the Aduard *sodales*. It was at his request that Liber collected the letters in Cologne:

> Optauisti, dum abste discederem, Arnolde fidissime, ut Colonie inter tot tantasque bibliothecas constitutus aliquot familiarium epistolarum tibi colligerem, quibus et uisis et perlectis scholares tui spretis barbarorum insciis tersum forte nitidumque scribendi stilum amplecterentur. [Comp. f. a2r]

The book was intended to provide pupils with examples of how to write Latin in a classical style on all kinds of topics. In this way they could improve *in arte dicendi scribendi stilo*. It was not meant to be a letter book, in the sense that it was to give instructions on how to compose a letter on a specific topic to a certain person (like, for example, the *Epistolarum formulae* of Carolus Viruli). It contains not a single piece of theory on how to write a letter on a particular topic, or to a particular person. On the contrary, when copying letters from his source Liber removed any theoretical material. The ‘anonymous’ letters are clear evidence to this (see p. 148 ff.). Liber actually hoped that the *Compendium* would benefit not only the pupils in Groningen, but everyone with an eye for the new ideas that had spread from Italy:

> ... sperans ipsum <sc. compendium> non modo tibi uni tuisque discipulis solum, sed plerisque etiam aliis pro sua ubertate profuturum. Planum est enim, quod non omnes, qui has optimas ad artes anhelant, tot tantorumque autorum completa epistolarum volumina habere possunt. [ibidem]

Of course, the idea of using letters for this purpose was by no means a new one; letters had been used for didactic purposes for a long time. The only thing that changed with the humanists was their choice of a different style and different models of style: the classical authors, especially Cicero. Consequently, in the humanist letter collections letters of esteemed classical and contemporary authors were most frequently used as models. There are innumerable manuscripts from the humanist age that contain a mixed bag of letters by classical and especially by humanist authors,
clearly copied for their value as models. On the other hand, a teacher could also choose to write model letters himself, and thus be able to adapt them more exactly to his own purposes. Of the humanists, Gasparinus Barzizius was the first to edit model letters in a classical style (his *epistolae ad exercitationem accommodatae*, written around 1420). These were fictitious letters to be used by the pupils of his private school in Padova, and they gained an immense popularity in Italy and elsewhere. Their *editio princeps* of 1470 was the first book ever printed in Paris, and another fourteen editions came off the press before 1501 (GW 3675-3689). North of the Alps, Carolus Viruli (Menneken; Menniken, Maneken) chose the same method. He wrote his *Epistolinarum formulae* for the pupils who studied in Louvain at the *paedagogium Lili*, of which he was the rector. They were first printed in 1476, and also became very popular as a schoolbook.

The use of authentic classical letters for didactic purposes was not confined to the earliest stages of humanism. Henricus Bebelius, in his *Commentaria epistolinarum coniciendarum* (1499-1500), advocated the same method that Liber applied: letters should not be taught in a theoretical way by a list of rules; the best way to learn how to write them is by reading *exempla* from Cicero and other prestigious authors. Exactly the same idea was expressed by the university of Cologne in 1525, when some changes were made in the curriculum of the faculty of Arts. On Latin style, the *acta* say: *Quantum ad Latini sermonis imitationem attinet, epistolae eis exponantur aut Ciceronis aut Philelphi aut alterius probati nominis.* Even a hundred years later, Marcus Antonius Muretus still considered the genre to be eminently suitable for teaching Latin. In his *Oratio habita Romae prid. Non. Novembr. MDLXXXII*, cum interpretari inciperet epistolae Ciceronis ad Atticum, he writes:

> Ego quidem, quoniam ad pure et emendate loquendum [...] nullius omnino libri lectionem utilior, quam epistolae ad Atticum judico, quoniam eas Latinae linguae studiis pervolutandas, manibus et oculis conterendas, ad verbum, si fieri posset, ediscendas censeo ...


18 Perhaps they were printed as early as 1474; H. De Vocht, *History of the Foundation and the Rise of the Collegium Trilingue Lovaniense*, 1517-1550 (Louvain 1951-1955), I, p. 89.

19 They were printed more than fifty times in the years 1476-1520 (Gerlo 1971:110).


21 Kappius 1825: 470-471 = oratio II, XIX.
Liber’s *Compendium* contains letters written by Cicero, Jerome, Symmachus, Bernardus Claravallensis, Beccadellius, Seneca, Guinifortus and Gasparinus Barzizius, Aeneas Sylvius, Philelphus, Sidonius, Aquinas and A Kempis, Poggius, Leonardus Brunus, Phalaris, and Salutatus. At the end of his book Liber added fourteen letters written by himself and his friends Agricola and Langius, evidently with the intention to claim a place in the classical tradition for himself and his *sodales* from Aduard. By the number of folios that each author occupies, it appears that Liber considered the letters of Cicero, Beccadellius, Guinifortus Barzizius, Aeneas Sylvius and Salutatus most valuable. In the list of authors, Pliny is a conspicuous absentee. Though Pliny’s letters were less popular than Cicero’s, he was influential, and above all one of the favourite authors of Agricola, who was the ‘leader’ of the Aduard circle, and a friend of Liber’s. The absence of Petrarch’s letters is less remarkable, and confirms that they were not very influential; his Latinitas, which had been very much exposed to medieval influences, could well be judged unfit for pupils who were intended to learn classical Latin. As far as contents are concerned, the letters of Seneca, Jerome, Bernardus and Aquinas are remarkable. Whereas most of the letters treat insignificant topics, these letters deal exclusively with ethics and matters of faith; clearly, they have been included primarily because of their contents.

The order in which the letters are arranged seems to be random. The authors do not form a chronological or alphabetical sequence. Sometimes, the reason that Liber arranged the letters of a single author in a particular way is obvious; for example, the letters of Symmachus, Seneca, and Sidonius have the traditional order that is still preserved in modern editions. Philelphus’s epistles were inserted chronologically, as in the printed edition of 1473, which was Liber’s source; Langius’s and Agricola’s letters were ordered on the same principle, but it is significant that Liber did not apply this method to his own letters. The letters of Beccadellius are arranged according to addressee. In the case of most authors, however, there seems to be no clear-cut principle of arrangement. Sometimes a tendency can be detected to group together letters on a single theme, but this concerns only a very few cases. Therefore, I think Liber looked in ‘his’ library in Cologne for letter manuscripts or editions, and inserted the letters into his book in the order in which he encountered them, adding at the end the letters of his two friends and his own.

22 For a detailed list of the letters inserted by Liber, see Appendix I.
It is very difficult to trace Liber's sources. So far, I have tracked down only two, both incunabula (see p. 150). However, Liber must also have used manuscripts, since not all of the letters that he selected had yet been printed by 1476. There are still innumerable manuscripts with letters of the Compendium authors, and many more are probably lost. Kristeller's Iter Italicum offers manuscripts with model letters, model phrases, model exordia, model salutations, groups of letters that concern one topic, groups of letters written by one author, groups of letters to one addressee, manuals on the art of letter writing, and official correspondence. Of the authors in Liber's book, Symmachus, Guinifortus Barzizius, Sidonius, Aquinas, and A Kempis are rarely found in such manuscripts; favourites are Cicero, Gasparinus, Aeneas Sylvius, Poggius, and Phalaris. I have not been able to find any manuscripts that contain letters of all the specifically humanist authors in Liber's book, let alone all authors of all types. The popularity of the Compendium seems to have been very limited. First, it was only printed once. Moreover, I have not been able to track down anyone mentioning Liber's book, except for Johannes Butzbachius, who merely lists it as one of Liber's works in his Auctarium de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis on f.77: Epistolarum ad Arnoldum...

Five of the six letters by Langius that we find at the end of the Compendium were addressed to Liber, and one of Liber's replies has also been added. They were written in February and March of 1469, when Langius was in Aduard, and Liber in Groningen. This correspondence clearly expresses the humanist disposition of both men. They encourage each other in their efforts to write Latin in a classical way, to persist in this, and not to be discouraged by the fate that put them non inter Musarum choros, sed inter Bachi orgia. They discuss correct Latin, and ask for certain humanist books to be sent. They complain about those who are critical of the new humanist ideas. Besides this correspondence,
there is a letter by Langius to his compatriot Lubbert Zedeler, in which he advises him to turn to humanist literature, which will greatly profit him. Finally, there are a few short letters by Liber to his wife, and to some friends. These do not involve humanist matters, but deal with daily business like the recommendation of a friend, or the loan of some money and books.

The humanist zeal that clearly emerges from Liber’s and Langius’s letters was still quite rare in the Low Countries of those days, especially in the north. Even in the south, where contacts with Italian culture were more frequent, the new literary ideas from Italy were received with hostility. The letters of Johannes de Veris (Van den Veren) clearly prove this. He worked as a teacher in Middelburg (?), Oudenburg, and Bergen op Zoom in the 1460’s. From his letters, he, too, appears as a strong advocate of the humanist cause, but his efforts to reform the school curriculum in a humanist direction were thwarted. He was not able to find anyone like-minded who was influential enough to help him carry through his reforms. Despite his efforts, everything remained the same.

In Groningen the situation was evidently different, since it was the headmaster of the city school himself, Von Hildesheim, who asked Liber to compose his book. He explicitly intended it to be used in his school, and there seems to be no reason to assume that this plan was not carried out. Von Hildesheim and Liber would have had the support of a number of sodales from Aduard who had considerable influence in the city of Groningen (like Agricola, Johannes Canter, and Wilhelmus Frederici).

The letters of De Veris also show that practice and theory are two different things. Even though he adhered to the new stylistic ideal, he had not mastered it, and many traces of medieval Latin can be found in his letters. In this respect, Liber and Langius outshine him completely. Even though some examples of non-classical Latin can be pointed out (especially in Liber’s letters), both men have fully mastered classical Latin. Like that of most humanists from the north, their style is not marked by the apparent ease and naturalness that characterizes the Latin of many Italian humanists (like Poggio and Philalethus). It is very polished, and the sentences can at times be rather complicated. A comparison of the way in which De Veris, Liber, and Antonius Beccadellius

29 For Zedeler, see Schoonbeeg 1993: 359. However, he is not the Osnaburgius iuuenum pedagogus mentioned by Langius, which Schoonbeeg suggests (ibidem: 360).
deal with the topic of *taciturnitas* illustrates the differences in stylistic skill between Liber and Beccadellius on the one hand, and De Veris on the other. One of De Veris’s letters begins thus:

> Stupeo quam maxime nec tui sat dimirari quo, cur nequidem ali-quantillam saltem minusculamve mihi transmittis scedam una cum aliis tuis quas vitrico misisti litteris, siquidem a me dum receseras [recesseras? AHL] Lovanium profecturus firma spoponderas fide id non siturum te, quin interdum tuis me missivis exhilarares.

The word *sc(h)ida* (De Veris’s *sceda*) means ‘the smallest piece of paper’. De Veris probably read it in the *Ad Familiaribus*, where Cicero uses it in exactly the same context: ...*puto te iam suppudere, quem haec tertia iam epistula ante oppressit quam tu schidam aut litteram...*33 De Veris uses it pleonastically, because a *schida* is already *aliquantilla* and *minuscula*. Besides this, the expression *nequidem ... saltem* is also pleonastic: a classical author would have written *ne ... quidem* or *ne ... saltem*, but would not have used a combination of the two. Furthermore, *ne quidem* is rarely not separated, and *missiva* is not a classical word. When we now compare De Veris’s phrase with Beccadellius’s and Liber’s treatment of this topic, we see that they have handled it in a way that reveals their versatility:

> Nullas a te litteras accepi, postquam a te digressus sum. Immo etiam ad te litteras dedi plenis epistolis, quibus rogavi te, ut saltem linea mihi responderes. Nihilominus siles. Quid in causa sit, tute dixeris.
> Solebas interdum litteras ad me dare et me de tua ualetudine certiorem reddere. Quod tanto mihi gratius fuit, quanto frequentius contingebat. Nunc uero te ab hoc instituto alienatum plane uideo et uere meum preter demeritum. Cuius mihi rei causam quam primum obsignari cupio.

From Langius’s and Liber’s letters it appears that both were familiar with a great number of classical and humanist writings. One Italian humanist in particular is praised by Langius for his achievements in advocating classical *Latinitas*. On February 27th of 1469, he writes to Liber:

---

32 *Oxford Latin Dictionary, s.v. schida.*
33 15,16,1.
34 Beccadellius, letter to Andrea Palazzo, Pavia 1429 (= Resta 1954: nr. 409); *Comp.* f. d1v.
35 Liber, letter to Johannes de Saxis (not dated); *Comp.* f. M9v. Admittedly, (*certiorem*) *reddere*, *demeritum* and *obsignari* are not classical in the meaning here intended.
Langius is referring to Augustinus Datus’s *Elegantiolae*. This booklet was the school book *par excellence* in the second half of the fifteenth century, and was printed more than a hundred times in the period 1470-1501, under several titles. It gives many examples of classical Latin idiom from a number of classical authors, especially Cicero, Terence, and Aulus Gellius. From his letter it appears that Langius did not know the author of the booklet; he suspected that it had been written by a pupil of Valla. In another letter to Liber, Langius replies to the fact that somebody had accused him of writing non-classical Latin in his letter to Liber. He then lists expressions from Datus to prove that his own Latin is correct by classical standards, and fulminates violently against his critic. Though we have no writings by Langius from before February 1469, it seems that his Latin was to some extent (re)formed by Datus’s remarks. However, there are many instances in which Langius totally ignores Datus’s instructions. Most strikingly, this is the case with one of Datus’s essential subjects, i.e. word order. Whereas the Sienese humanist elaborately indicates that in a sentence where the subject is expressed, it should be preceded by the object, Langius hardly ever does so. It seems to me that he had already reached an age at which he was no longer in a position to change such essentials of style. In this respect, the same can be said for Antonius Liber. Though he himself does not mention Datus in his letters, Langius’s letters tell us that he, too, thought highly of him. Moreover, the ‘anonymous’ letters (to which we shall turn shortly) prove that he used a printed edition of the *Elegantiolae* during his stay in Cologne. Though they did not follow Datus’s instructions slavishly or unconditionally, both northern humanists had great respect for his ability, and their style was concretely influenced by his booklet.

Two sections in the *Compendium* are of special interest. The first contains nine letters which Liber evidently thought to have been written by Thomas Aquinas (ff. i3v-i5v). Only very few letters of this famous

---

36 *De variis loquendi figuris sive de modo dictandi; Regulae elegantiarum; Libellus aureus in eloquentia; Super Tullianis elegantius et verbis exotici libellus; De dictamine; Elegantiae minores.* See GW VII: 289.

37 Langius’s letter d.d. 21-3-1469. [*Comp.* ff. M5v-M6v]
philosopher can be found in manuscripts today. Best known, and most
often copied, is his *epistola de modo studendi*, which is also the first
letter offered by Liber in this paragraph. Its authenticity is not un-
disputed, though in Liber’s times this was not an issue.\(^{38}\) Comparing the
text as inserted in the *Compendium* with the one that Mandonnet edited,
and to three versions of it contained in manuscripts in the Bayerische
Staatsbibliothek in Munich, I found numerous differences.\(^{39}\) The nature
of the changes in the text in Liber’s book leads me to suspect that they were
made by a humanist. Its style matches that of humanist correspondence,
and does not have any resemblance to Aquinas’s style. The same goes
for the contents, which one would suppose to have been written down by
a Thomas a Kempis rather than by the Italian philosopher.\(^{40}\) The next six
letters in this section were actually written by A Kempis, though in a
completely different form. They derive from his *Epistula incitativa ad
spirituallem profectum*;\(^{41}\) this long letter has been divided into six short
ones, each of which has been given a thematic heading (*De patientia
adquirenda, De zelo correctionis erga alium, De misericordia libenter
proximo impendenda*, etc.). The contents have been rephrased so as to
address a friend; valedictions have been added, and the first part of the
letter as offered by Pohl has been left out. All these modifications, too,
point to a humanist censor.

So far I have not been able to establish the identity of this censor;
perhaps it was Liber himself who made the changes. Thanks to Harth’s
critical edition of Poggius’s letters, we can see that even in his case,
where typically humanist letters which needed no changes in style were
involved, the text was considerably modified before being inserted in the
*Compendium* (ff. i5-18v). There are many major alterations in Liber’s
text that cannot be found in the manuscripts used by Harth. In most
cases we find simplifications of the Latin, or the removal of topical
references that would only puzzle a reader unfamiliar with the circum-
stances to which Poggius refers.\(^{42}\) On the other hand, the two instances

\(^{38}\) Grabmann 1931\(^2\) : 323-324.

\(^{39}\) Mandonnet 1927: IV, 535. The Munich MSS are clm. 5594, f. 234v; clm. 18637,
f. 141v; clm. 14125, f. 197v.

\(^{40}\) Herding already noted this, reviewing the contents of codex C 687 of the university
library in Uppsala, in which this letter also occurs. See Herding/Mertens 1990: I, 71.

\(^{41}\) Pohl 1918: IV, 447-461.

\(^{42}\) A procedure that humanists would apply to their own *epistolae familiares* when
editing them, and which Pasquali (1962\(^2\) : 457) described as ‘trasportar le <lettere> dal
tempo all’ eternità’.
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in which I have traced Liber’s source show that he altered almost nothing in the text that he copied. However, these were printed sources, whereas in the case of Aquinas, A Kempis, and Poggioius manuscript sources must have been used. Even in our days, the authority of a printed text is often valued more highly than that of a written one.

I have not yet been able to track down the author of the last two letters in this section. That it was not Aquinas seems certain. Their form, contents, and style resemble that of the previous letters. They do seem to form a pair. At least twice, both have been added to a printed edition of Antoinius Haneron’s *De breuibus epistolis edendis*. In the 1475 (?) edition of this booklet they can be found on folios 23v-24v. There, Aquinas is mentioned as the author of these letters, but his name has been erased (f. 23v). The letters can also be found in an incunabulum that contains Datus’s *Elegantiolae*, a *Rhetorica minor* ascribed to Datus, and Haneron’s letter treatise.43 Here Aquinas is not named as the author. Instead, the letters are announced as *epistole due peramene ad discipulum de correctione per magistrum sibi illata conquerentem*. It is tempting to connect Haneron with the authorship of these two letters.

The second notable section contains twelve letters *ex diuersis hinc inde autoribus summa cum diligentia collecte* (ff. L7v-M2v). Liber mentions no author(s) for these. The last two are Philophilus’s: Liber took them from the 1473 edition of his letters, which he also used for the other letters that he inserted in his book under Philophilus’s name. The remaining ten letters belong together, and originate from a short manual offering some theory for and examples of the *epistola petitoria* and *consolatoria*. This manual begins with five precepts for writing a letter of petition. The first two letters in this section of the *Compendium* then illustrate these. The treatise continues with advice on how to request something for ourselves, and for the benefit of the addressee himself. The next five letters from Liber’s book then serve as examples of this. Finally, the letter of consolation is dealt with. Another five letters are given to exemplify this, of which Liber has inserted three in his book. The contents of all the letters are very traditional,44 and the theoretical parts of the manual (which Liber omitted) are very short and simple.

43 Printed in 1486 by Matthias van der Goes in Antwerp = GW 8077. The letters are on ff. h5v–.
44 For example, Cicero’s *Fam.* 5,16 is the main source for the *loci consolationis*. 
This manual can be found in a number of manuscripts, mostly without the author being mentioned, and in some incunabula. For this reason it has been attributed to three different humanists. First, Frank Baron considers it the work of Petrus Luder, chiefly because it occurs frequently in manuscripts that also contain authentic writings of this early German humanist. Bertalot, too, seems to have thought of Luder as its author. Perhaps he did so because of an announcement of one of Luder’s lectures, which dealt with epistolography (and was edited by Bertalot). Luder writes in this intimatio: Itaque si qui regulas rhetoricales quadrangina, sine quibus nec aliquis rite partes in oracione locare poterit, item canones, quibis epistole formande sunt, cum adiunctis epistolis exemplaribus cum optima declaracione conscribere velint, veniant cras hora septima … This description could very well refer to the manual. Moreover, the library in Stuttgart possesses a manuscript with Regule rhetoricales Petri Luder de Kislau oratoris. However, only the first folio contains something written by Luder, viz. an introduction to writings of his Italian teachers (meis preceptoribus). Then follows part of Datus’s Elegantiolae, and the manual on letter writing.

This Augustinus Datus is the second author to whom the manual has been ascribed. In eleven incunabula (GW 8123–8133), his Elegantiolae are followed by two short treatises, entitled Praeceptorum summula and Modus orandi. Fle is named as the author of both. The second one is our manual on letter writing, and the contents are identical to that in the manuscripts. However, no manuscripts attribute these works to Datus, and they are not included in his Opera omnia edition of 1502.

46 Baron 1966: 78, 124 and 126; Baron 1985: 957; Baron 1993: 89.
49 Cod. poet. et phil. 4o 13, ff. 145 sqq.
50 On ff. 145'-156'; inc. Plerumque enim qui oratorie artis floribus (= GW 8037, f.1'); expl. consul Rome se consulem gerit imperatorem (!) (= GW 8037, f. 19'). The catalogue does not mention Datus.
The *Gesamtkatalog* points to the real author of this manual: it is Gasparinus Barzizius. The manual is very frequently found in the company of other authentic writings of Barzizius. Furthermore, he is without doubt the author of the *Praeceptorum summula*. In the incunabula, this work consists of thirteen rules that a good *oratio* should follow. In manuscripts, these guidelines are more numerous and form part of Barzizius’s *Summa praecceptorum ad eandem partem compositionis pertinentium quae ad ordinem et collocationem verborum specta(nt)* or *Praeccepta Gasparini*,¹¹ which in its turn is an appendix to his *De compositione*.¹² Further evidence for Barzizius’s authorship of the manual is found in cod. 639 of the university library in Erlangen, on f. 60⁴, where he is explicitly named as the author: *Incipit foeliciter modus orandi epistolandiique Casparini de pergamo. Peticionis loci sunt quatuor ...* Finally, these model letters fit in perfectly with the other writings of Gasparinus. He wrote not only the famous *Epistolae ad exercitationem accommodatae*, but also *exempla exordiorum*.

Liber used the *editio princeps* of Datus’s book as his source for these letters by Barzizius. I have collated Liber’s text with four manuscripts: in each case the differences are numerous, and sometimes substantial. On the other hand, Liber’s text is nearly identical with that printed by Zell around 1470. They differ in only eighteen instances. Five of these concern the heading, which Liber had to change, since he left out the three theoretical parts. Five instances are obvious misprints, and four times Zell’s edition presents an incorrect reading, which Liber very likely corrected. Only four significant differences, therefore, remain, all of which occur in the final two letters. On the other hand, in nine cases Zell’s and Liber’s texts agree in error, and in 26 instances they agree against all the manuscripts. We can, therefore, conclude that Liber used two incunabula (Philelphus and Datus) as his sources for this section.

In order to substantiate my findings, and because these letters have never been published in a modern edition, I add here the text of the

¹¹ See, for example, these codices: London, BL, Harley Mss. 2594 (ff. 10⁴-13⁴) and 3871 (ff. 18⁰-18³); Erlangen, Univ. Lib., cod. 659 (ff. 33⁵-38⁴); Munich, BSB, clm. 4393 (ff. 80-81); Vienna, ÖNB, cod. Pal. 3244 (ff. 58⁰-60⁴; cf. f. 171⁴, where the anonymous letters are called *Summa preceptorum*). Likewise in Albertus de Eyb’s *Margarita poetica* (GW 9530: ff. 20⁰-56⁰); he quotes Barzizius more than any other Italian humanist.

¹² Sonkowsky 1964: 260 and 262-263. However, he does mention the fact that it can be found in different versions in the manuscripts, which might suggest that Barzizius was not the (sole) author.
anonymous letters as they are found in the *Compendium*. In the *apparatus criticus*, I have listed all variants from the manuscripts and incunabula I consulted that I thought to be of any significance. I have left out only minor differences. I do not claim to present a critical edition, since I have not been able to trace (let alone consult) all the manuscripts containing these letters.53
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APPENDIX I:

THE LETTERS IN THE COMPELLIUM

Cicero: *Ad Familiare* (ed. Shackleton Bailey 1988) epp. 2.4; 2.2; 2.3; 2.19; 3.1; 3.2; 2.11; 2.14; 2.13; 4.5; 4.6; 2.7; 2.9; 5.14; 2.1; 6.15; 6.16; 6.17; 13.47; 1.6; 1.3; 1.9; 1.10; 10.2; 7.27; 4.10; 4.12; 4.15; 4.9.

Hieronymus: (ed. Labourt 1949) epp. XVII; XLVII; IV; V; VI; Cl.

Symmachus: (ed. Callu 1972-1982; ed. Seeck 1883) epp. 1.6; 1.9; 1.10; 1.11; 1.14; 1.16; 1.25; 1.31; 1.36; 1.41; 1.42; 1.43; 1.53; 1.56; 1.63; 1.73; 1.80; 1.82; 1.84; 2.17; 3.26; 3.40; 4.23; 4.44; 4.73; 5.13; 5.21; 5.30; 5.49; 5.51; 5.77; 7.60; 7.84; 8.4.

Bernardus: (ed. Leclercq/Rochais 1974) epp. 24; 9; 27; 28; 96; 103; 106; 109; 185.

Beccadellius: (Resta 1954) nrs. 625; 592; 595; 616; 629; 623; 602; 627; 620; 405; 404; 409; 175; 151; 154; 155; 188; 168; 181; 147; 198; 178; 131; 158; 176; 148; 109; 114.

Seneca: (ed. Reynolds 1965) epp. 1.1; 1.2; 1.3; 1.4; 1.5; 1.6; 1.7; 1.8; 1.9.

Gu. Barzizius: Inc. Litteris tuis lectis, que petebas Anthonio
Inc. Circumspexi, reuerende pater, neque in paucis
Inc. Habe tibi gracias, uir egregie, pro tua
Furietti, Gasparini Barzizii [...] et Guiniforti [...] opera, 1723: 81 (d.d. 14-8-1431)
Inc. Huius quod pro mea in te observantia
Inc. De uestro in me amore atque animo liberali
Furietti 1723: 119 (d.d. 25-4-1438)
Inc. Grate adeo fuerunt nobis littere tue (by Christophorus Barzizius to Guinifortus)
Inc. Si cum maximis te implicitum curis scio
Inc. Immensas tue clementie gracias debo princeps
Inc. Incredibile tui me desiderium tenet quod nisi
Inc. Tam gratus mihi aduentus fuit modestissimi uiui
Inc. Que ab omnibus instinc ad nos proficisceturibus
Inc. Diu tacui serenissime rex nil ad te scribens
Inc. Quod in tuorum numero me habeas magnanime
Inc. Cognito serenissime regine magnanimi principis
Inc. Si tibi uerbis acceptior quam re uel
Inc. Eo te in loco esse uir splendide ubi
Inc. Nuper ad te scripsi uir splendidissime
Sabbadini, Epistolario di Guarino Veronese, 1919: II,317
(d.d. 7-10-1437)
Inc. Cum preter consuetudinem meam domo egressus
Inc. Quantum et sollertia et gratia tantum
Inc. Tot me honestissime rationes Petro sacerdoti
Inc. Nuper in hunc usque in diem hortatus fui
Inc. *Quae a me expectabas missurus iam dudum ad te fui*
Inc. *Paulus Barzizius necessarius meus sue in Mantuanam*
Inc. *Dupliciter me affecerunt litterae tue*

Ga. Barzizius:
(ed. Furietti 1723) p.220, ep.I; 220,II; 221,1; 222,II; 245,1; 246,II; 222,1; 223,II; 223,1; 224,II; 224,1; 225,II; 226,1; 226,II; 227,1; 228,II; 228,1; 229,II; 230,1; 231,II; 325,1; 325,II; 320,II; 290,1; 291,II.

Aeneas Sylvius:
The first seventeen letters are in the edition of Wolkar 1909-1918: vol. 1,1: nr. 135; vol. 2: nr. 10; vol. 1,1: nrs. 38, 87, 52, 68, 85, 164, 162, 3, 113, 145, 54, 2; vol. 2: nr. 25; vol. 1,1: nrs. 37, 79.
Ten of the remaining twelve letters are in the *Opera omnia* edition of Basle 1551: nrs. 395, 231, 223, 227, 251, 364, 274, 255, 292, 342.
After ep. 395 of the Basle edition, Liber inserted two letters that I have not been able to trace:
Inc. *Fredericus Dei gratia Romanorum Imperator*
Inc. *Periocundae mihi fuerunt litterae tue, quibus cepi*

Philephus:
(ed. Veneti 1502) epp. I,4; I,5; I,7; I,8, I,11; I,13; I,14; I,15, I,20; I,24; I,25; I,27; I,28; I,32; I,33; I,34; I,37; I,40; I,41; I,42; I,44; I,45; I,46; I,47; I,50; II,20; II,23; II,28; II,30; II,32.

Sidonius:
(ed. Loyen 1970) epp. 1,1; 1,8; 1,10; 2,3; 2,7; 2,8; 2,10; 2,14; 3,10; 3,14; 4,8; 4,16; 4,19; 5,1.


Th. a Kempis: *Epistula incitativa ad spiritualem prefectum*, ed. Pohl 1918: IV, 457 (line 9)- 461 (line 10).

ps.- Aquinas: *Inc. Amantissime fili, conquereris quod tibi intolerabile sit*
Inc. *Causaris, carissime fili, ubilibet me tibi solito plus rigidiorem esse*

Poggius: The first letter is not in Harth: *Inc. Accepi te litteras pro Cambio nostro*
Then follow: (ed. Harth 1984-1987) vol. II: nrs. V,7; I,4; IV,13; VII,2; vol. III: nrs. VIII,22; IX,14; vol. II: nrs. V,5; III,3; II,5; IX,10; II,8.

The third letter is Poggius’s; ed. Harth, vol. I, app. I. (‘versione abbreviata’).
The second, fourth and fifth letter are (ed. Luiso 1980) II,11; I,11; I,13 respectively.

Phalaris: (ed. Hercher 1878) epp. 1; 70; 71; 21; 84; 2; 3; 6; 9; 11; 12; 13; 17; 18; 19; 20; 67; 118; 4; 5; 53; 112; 96; 85; 8; 26; 105; 28; 29; 30; 104; 32; 120; 38; 61; 98; 41; 42; 44; 45; 46; 47; 48; 49; 50; 51; 55; 74; 77; 95; 110.
Ga. Barzizius: Modus epistolandi: ten letters (see Appendix II).
Philelphus: (ed. Venetie 1502) epp. 1,22; 1,23.
Langius: (ed. Crecelius 1876: 5-12, with a number of errors; to be edited with a commentary in my forthcoming PhD thesis)
Inc. Haberem meo quidem iuditio quo te
Inc. Si tecum mihi super scriptionis elegantia
Inc. Iohannem XXII pont. max. quem sacer
Inc. Relegenti hanc mihi Elegantiolarum
Inc. Poteram ego quidem quod a me actenus
Inc. Est M.T. Ciceronis in VI de rep. sententia
Liber: (ed. Crecelius 1879: 145-150, with a number of errors; to be edited with a commentary in my forthcoming PhD thesis)
Inc. Accepi epistolas tuas Rodolphe suauissime
Inc. Pergrate mihi fuerunt littere tue suauissima
Inc. Solebas interdum litteras ad me dare
Inc. Moneo et item opto ut presenti nuncio
Inc. Wilhelmo Westphalo qui nunc in curia
Inc. Adhuc multa sunt a me agenda mi Arnolde
Iohannes G. S D Petro suo.

Venit ad me uesperi familiarissimus mihi Iohannes, quicum mihi non modo familiaritas antique necessitudinis, uerum etiam affinitas intercedit, rogauitque me, ut omni studio cura diligentiaque curarem, ne prefecturam Mutinensem amitteret, quam propemodum consecutus esset. Ego uero cum te apud senatum autitate plurimum ualere meminissem nullumque plus posse certe scirem, statui abs te petere, ut, si quid umquam gratum mihi te facturum existimes, hoc illud arbitriris. Rogo enim, ut Iohannem ab emulis suis obrectatoribusque defendas, qui prefecturam Mutinensem arripere temptant. Hoc mihi in maximo beneficiorum cumulo collocabo; erit enim mihi maximo honorì familiarem meum opera mea hunc magistratum obtinuisse. Etenim raro magistratum expertus est profiteorque me tibi perpetuo obnoxium inmortali beneficio fore. Sed si quid etiam in me meritum interdum contulisti, studui ea quidem tibi summum studio pro uiribus cumulate restituere. Vale.

\[\begin{align*}
M &= \text{BSB Monaci, clm. 4393, f. 113v} \\
H3 &= \text{WLB Stutgardiae, cod. HB XII 3, f. 33r (\text{usque ad uersum 2 rogauitque me})} \\
H4 &= \text{WLB Stutgardiae, cod. HB XII 4, f. 97v-98r} \\
P1 &= \text{NK Pragae, cod. XXIII F 106, f. 95v} \\
P2 &= \text{NK Pragae, cod. I D 12, f. 22v} \\
Dz &= \text{GW 8123 = Datus, \textit{Elegantiolae}, Coloniae c. 1470, f. 37r-v} \\
L &= \text{Liber, \textit{Compendium}, Coloniae c. 1476, f. L7v} \\
D &= \text{GW 8133 = Datus, \textit{Elegantiolae}, Spirae 1499, f. d5r}
\end{align*}\]
Non potui, dulcissime Mathia, efficere, ut nunc ad te non perscriberem, quanto
feruore, quanto studio, quanta denique iocunditate Iohannes tuus sacris legibus
operam hactenus dederit. Quod si in ea facultate uti perpulcre inceperat per-
geret, paucis post diebus summum legum apicem pertingeret. Quia uero heste-
terno uesperi, quemadmodum pecuniis deficere incepisset, mihi retulit,
admodum uereor, ne studium suum deserere postponerque cogatur. Quod qui-
dem impedies, si ex redditibus tuis, quos hoc anno uberrimos suscepisti, sibi
sueque egestati subuenies. Fortassì frater tuus, qui (ut audio) quamprimum ex
Asia ad te uenit, (nam negotiatiioni fortuna plurimum arrisit) luceri sui, quod
inestimabile est consecutus, te faciet potissimum participem, si nepotis sui uir-
tutes quamplures ab omnibus predicari teque uelle occurrere pre-
senserit. Quid inquam amabilius, quid melius aut quid optatis tibi posset
accidere quam filium litterarum perfectissimum eloquentia ac prudentia
magnopere preditum habere, qui domui tue nobisque familiaritatis et affinitatis
tibi uinculo coniunctus auxilio consilio honorì et glorie esse poterit. Itaque hec
omnia tecummente reuolue pecuniasque quamprimum ad eum transmittas.
Hoc enim te scire uelim, nisi eum tanta egestate laborare uidissem atque eas
impensas, quas facies, tam necessarias et frugi futuras, nihil hoc tempore ad te
scripsiisse. Quocienscumque enim aliquid percepit, quod honorì ac fortunì
tuis potuit conducere ac deetrhere, non potui supersidere quin rederem te cer-
tiorem.

M, f. 114r; H3, f. 40r (usque ad uersum 4 pertingeret); H4, f. 98r-v; P1, f. 95v-96v; P2,
f. 22v; Dz, f. 37v-38r; L, f. L7v; D, f. d5r-v; Aliud exemplum.
Aliud exemplum.

Memini me et patrem tuum mirum in modum coluisse et clarissimo uario summa amoris necessitutinique coniunctum fuisses, quod uir tum ingenio clarus tum uero animi magnitudine prestantissimus esset. Preterea memini me abs te observantia quadam singulari complexum, ut nihil si quod ego abs te petere dubitem, preser-
5 tim cum, quicquid petiturus sim, id omne ad te unum pertineat. Ex quorundam enim communium amicorum sermonibus intellexi te disciplinam rei militaris, quam meo potissimum persuasus sequi ceperas, dereliquisse. Hec persuadere non quidem satis mihi poteram, nisi tue ad me quandoque accessisset littere, que ser-
10 mones, quos acceperam, plene confirmarunt; ex quo non mediocrum molestiam suscepier. Te enim sperabam uirum rei militaris prestantissimum fore, quem, cum
imperatorem exercitus uel legionis prefectum conspicerem, ego mirifice gloriacer, qui tibi huiusmodi capiendorum studiorum causa fuisses. Sperabam te et amicis commodissimum et patre gloriosum et tibi utilissimum fore atque ita profecto fuisses. Subeunt enim studiorum militarum peritii uiri et ciuitatum et principum potissimorum familiaritates, a quibus sepies opida et castella munificissima meren-
tur; stipendioque uberrimis ab illis conducuntur et (quo maximun est) immorta-
15 litariane glorie consequuntur et perpetua apud posteros nominis sui monimenta relinquent. Si igitur cepta hec studia desueris, nudum te omnium probatissi-
marum artium inuenies; neque enim mercature acribus studiis nec litteris ope-
ram dedisti, sed militari tantum discipline primas etaties tue partes deuoisti rur-
susque sequentes annos quaumplures in ipsa consumpsi. Quare totum hoc omne
tempus amissum inuenies et difficiliores iam erunt anni, quos facile bonis aliqubis
committas. Secordie autem atque ignave concius tui omnes te damnabunt, qui
15 exercitationem armorum abs te iam diu suscipiam temere nelsextas. Itaque
si quid apud me amicitiae paternae, si quid necessitutinum fratris tui relinquit,
20 te rogo atque obseco, ne me uanum tibi persuasusam fuisses patiaris, sed uel tui uel mei causa dimissa nunc aliquidus militaria studia magnanimo recipias.
Aliud exemplum.

Cum nuper Hierosolimam una proficisceremur, ea familiaritas ac necessitudo, que inter parentes nostros semper fuerat et tandem nobis hereditario quodam iure relicta est, roborata ac stabilita est adeo, ut nos inuicem ad bona quelibet inuitare et a malis retrahere, quantum possibile sit, debeamus. Sed quia nudiustertius ad aures meas peruenit, quod litterarum studiis posthabitis honore proprio neglecto luxurie sordibus lasciuieque animum applicuisti (quod mihi profecto molestissimum est ac mentem meam summe exagit), plane, nisi huic sententie cesseris et ab huiusmodi uiiciis te retraxeris, priscam de te opinionem existimationemque labefactam quamprimum sencies, familie ac patrie dedecori eris et tandem fortunis prodigaliter expositis omnium amicorum expers presidio miserrimus hominum euades. Solent namque meretricule amatores, postquam ipsis bona blanditiis et dolo abstulerint, ad inopiam urgentes plus ceteris ludibrio habere et (quod peius estimo) eorum egestatem atque insaniam per uicos et totam urbem dilatare. Quod si hanc uiam turpissimam, quam instituisti, aspernandam animum induxeris et litterarum studiis et uirtutibus operam dederis, hoc tibi polliceli audeo: quam paucis annis elapsis summos honores, amplissimas laudes et ingentes consequeris. Scio namque te ingenio et eloquentia prope pridem singulari; quod quidem ingenium si scienciis, uirtutibus quoque accommodaueris, omnes coetaneos tuos antecellere uideare. Rogo igitur maiorem in modum, si unquam tibi rem gratam facere studui aut efficere aliquid, quod tibi gratissimum sit, potero, ut tamen mei gratia ab hac uiam turpissimam ad honestatem te familiaque tua dignum reducas.

M, f. 115r-v; H4, f. 99v-100r; P1, f. 98r-v; P2, f. 23r-v; Dz, f. 39v-40r; L, f. L8r-v; D, f. d6r-v

Aliud exemplum.

Preceptis quidem meis adhuc optime paruisti, quod studeres nihil a uoluntate mea alienum committere, adeoque et a primis annis te mihi studiosissimum iudicaui, quecumque mihi uidentur honoris tuo glorieque conducere. Nihilo uero minus nunc quoque te studiosissimum esse scio, quod et mea in te beniuolen-
tia tuaque iterum in me caritas indies mote uideo. Quapropter quas nuper inimicitias cum principe suscepisti, scis aduersus uoluntatem meam maxime suscepisse. Nam et te a dignitate, quam in agro regino geris, facile repellet et seditionis tu sibi emulorum obtrectione suspectus eris et familiarius pene tuis infestissimus eris. Te igitur ab huliummodi inimicitia abstine et ab ipso ueniam sapientissime petere. Id enim si feceris, persuadet is sibi indignationem tuam illam non quidem de industria factam, sed inconsulto potius quodam animi calore teque non solum pristino amor restituet, uerum etiam nouas indies dignitates tibi demandabit et sic fere quod-
dam pietatis presidio ab obtrectoribus te distinguet. Que cum ita sint, cures
diligenter uelim, ut principi supplices, si uidis stomachatus de te sit, dignetur tibi remittere, ne uid etiam mihi et reliquis familiaribus tuis detrimenti hee
tue inimiciicie afferent.

M, f. 115v (una cum sequenti simplicem epistolam constituit); H3, f. 27r (usque ad uer-
sum 3 iudicaui); H4, f. 100r-v; P1, f. 98v-99v; P2, f. 23v; Dz, f. 40r-v; L, f. L8v; D, f. d6v-e1r

Exemplum aliud.

Quibuscumque in rebus et auxilio et consilio tuo opus erat, adeo faciilem et beniuolum te prebuiisti, ut quidem non modo mihi consuleres meque adiuuares. Verum ne aliquid quidem attemptare decreuisti, quin prius opinionem meam de ea re percepiisses. Ex qua quidem tua in me beniuolentia ac familiaritate tantum animi affectum fiduciamque nactus sum, ut nihil mihi ad impetramund difficile uideatur; quare nec hoc quidem tempore adquiescere potero, quin ea, que honori ac utilitati tuo conjunctorumque tuorum plurimum conducere possunt, ad te perscribam. Nosti quod nobilissima tua familia, que per longissima tempora a maioribus tuuis tuis descendit, nunc scilicet in te uno conservatur. Igitur ad eam conservandum ut legittimo matrimonio te copules, oportet. Ex qua quidem copula et soboles tua propagatur, familia conservatur et maiorium tuorum laus honorque immortalis redditur. Sin uero alio sis animo, maiorum tuorum gesta magnifica uiultesque, quas maiores tui magnopere colebant, paulo post deleuit obliuo; fortune ac diuicie multis sudoribus ac uigiliis adquiesce ad exteros deuenient et ciuitas tua hoc preclaro genere, quod eam usque adeo mirum in modum decorauit, priuabitus. Que namque familia tot preclaros exercitus imperatores, tot iurisconsultos, tot legisperitos, tot omni genere uiros pridentes reipublice producet. Itaque ut ciam te uiirgini pulcerrime legittimo matrimonio cura coniungas, ex qua liberos procreare possis, qui ut ipsorum parentes ciuitati nostre et nobis preserent familiaque te coniunctorumque plurimum conducere possint tueri.

M, f. 115v-116r (una cum antecedenti simplicem epistolam constituit); H4, f. 100v-101r P1, f. 99v-100r; P2, f. 23v; Dz, f. 40v-41v; L, f. L8v-M1r; D, f. e1r

Aliud exemplum.

Accepi superioribus his diebus ex litteris Iohannis, quod laudum mearum amplificatorem simulque honorum meorum defensorem, emulis etiam meis te aduersarii prebusti; preterea in rebus meis familiarii gerendis te adeo familiaris ac facilem prebusti, ac si res tua propria ageretur. Ex qua quidem re ea mihi oblata est fiduitia, ut nihilo abs te imperandum mihi difficile iudeatur, pretium cum ea abs te rogo, quod utilitati tue conferre aliquid possunt. Credo equidem te non fugere, quanto tempore ciuitas nostra obsidione tenetur et quemadmodum militum predia nostra deuastarunt; agri desolati relinquentur et pene omnia ad nihilum reducantur. Quam ob rem frumento incipientem deficere, quod profecto tanti existimatur, ut estimatio uix equa pecunia coequari. Sed quia frumento admodum te abundare gaudenter percepi, tibi persuasus esse uelim, in illud aliquo pacto hoc tempore distrahas, sed magis aliud compares ac frumento tuo adicias; quamprimum enim ab ista obsidione liberabimur (quod paulo post futurum spero), frumentum tuum ipsum huc aduici facias et eo pretio quo libet uendetur. Quod ut facilius fieri possit, me scito omni studio et diligentia pro uirili mea cooperaturum. Quod si frumentum tum nunc uenundare (ut ex eisdem litteris didici) statuisses, non poteris id percipere pretium, quod decuplum decursis tribus mensibus perciperes, nec aderant hii mercatores, qui actenus frumentum a te emere tibique pecunia numerata satisfacere soliti sunt, sed pocius rusticis et uicinis credendum tuis et hoc creditum ab eis exigere difficilimum erit. Siigitur preces atque adhortationes meee quid apud te ualeat pecunia coequari. Sed potius ut para, ut, quamprimum hos te aduersarii descesserint, nulla mora precedente huc aduehi possit, ut et tu pecuniam in magna quantitate percipias et nos tibi familiaritate coniuncti, qui fame pene destructi sumus, consolari et refici possimus.

M, f. 116r-v; H4, f. 101r-v; P1, f. 100r-v (usque aduersum 13 adicias); P2, f. 23v; Dz, f. 41v-42r; L, f. M1r-v; D, f. e1r-v

M. f. 116r-v; H4, f. 101r-v; P1, f. 100r-v (usque aduersum 13 adicias); P2, f. 23v; Dz, f. 41v-42r; L, f. M1r-v; D, f. e1r-v

M. f. 116r-v; H4, f. 101r-v; P1, f. 100r-v (usque aduersum 13 adicias); P2, f. 23v; Dz, f. 41v-42r; L, f. M1r-v; D, f. e1r-v

M. f. 116r-v; H4, f. 101r-v; P1, f. 100r-v (usque aduersum 13 adicias); P2, f. 23v; Dz, f. 41v-42r; L, f. M1r-v; D, f. e1r-v
Exemplum aliud.

Casum quidem sapientissimi patris tui peracerbe tuli, qui calendas Iunii mihi renuntiatus est; neque enim poteram non commoueri, qui non minorem persuaderem ex eius mihi morte iacturam factam esse quam tibi. Erat enim is mihi antiqua familiaritate coniunctus et rerum meorum diligens administror. Nescio autem mei pocius quam tui causa molestia hec mihi illata sit; te enim ut fratrem colo et non minus pene tibi quam mihi amoris tribuo. Verius tamen dicam utriusque me uicem molestia quoque eum semper existimau, qui, quociens casus euentum uiderit nulla posse ratione depelli, nihil omnino meroris inducat. Morti enim resistere temerarium est; ea namque talis est, ut differri quidem possit, euitari autem minime. Varia autem sunt genera mortis atque hii obscuro carceri, hi obsidione, hii miserando ferarum impetu moriuntur. Itaque patris tui obitum eo equiori animo feres, quo magis natura proxime mortem spem eius interitus accidit. Nam et domi mortuos est et grandis etate interiit, ut concessisse illum nature putemus. Nullum denique aptius tibi solatium inuenies quam gentilium sapientiam simul atque animi magnitudinem, ex quibus Catho pro defuncto filio uiro clarissimo laudationem habuit, in qua reliquis, qui ad funus conuenerant, consolationis attulit consilia. Quonam animo Q. Fabius consularis uiri filii sui obitum tulerit, omnes intelligunt atque hii gentes nihil omnino meroris 30 euitati sacrosancte fidei hic attingebant, que sola nos pene cogit ad nostrorum casus fortiter ferendos et quicquid Deo placuit magnanimo recipiendum. Que cum ita sint, pectoris amoribus quantopere commotas quam facile deponas et commori quidem propter hominis esse cogitabis. Sapientis autem est, quod humana natura moderari.
Aliud exemplum.

Doleo quidem uehementissime, quod edes tue incendio perierunt, et eo magis
doleo, quo magis animaduerto, quibus delitis qua iocunditate quibus denique
oblectationibus in eis sim sepe delectatus. Factura autem, quam tu ex eo incendio
consequeris, non minus mihi dolores attulit. Scio enim quas impensas et quot
labores ipsis edibus construenda sustulisti. Et quia ea inter nos contracta est
familiaritas fraternitasque, ut omnia nostra bona corporaliter fortune uiribus subi-
ciuntur, que arbitrio suo ea administrat (illi bona amplificat, illi uero diminuit),
non potui mihi persuadere operpretio esse, si qua preter equitatem et fata
acciderunt, ut tanto merore conficerer. Fatuum etiam semper existimaui ea
deflere, que neque humane subjecta sunt potentie neque aliqua prudentia, quin
eueniant, possunt precare. Hanc meam exsitionemem tibi subicerem memento,
obsecro, tam innumerabilia regna, tam preciosissima edificia, urbes et castella
incendio aut ruina esse deuastata. Recordare Troyam, que potentia sua ceteris
regionibus dominabat, edibus pulcerrimis atque edificiis alias urbes superasse;
nunc uero desolata deuastata et inhabitabilis relicta est. Que si te non possunt
consolari ac dolorem tue minuere, saltem hoc te consoletur, quod paulo ante
domus istius uiri ignis ui consumpta est simulem pene omnia bona sua neque tot
sibi supersunt facultates, ut eam ualeat reificere. Tibi uero tot relicte sunt diuicie,
Ut domum tuam non modo reificere, uterum preclariorem construere potes. Quod
si nec illud dolorem tue leuiat, propose ante oculos gentilium sapientiam, que
luminis fidei expertes fuere; nihilominus quecumque ipsis aduersa acciderant,
equino animo ferre studuerunt. Quotomagis tu, qui Christianus religiosissimus es
ac Sacre Scripture scientis magnopere preditus, debes ea, que Deum immortalem
nobiscum et bonis nostris disponere uelle senseris, nedum laudare, sed etiam
animo gratissimo acceptare. Itaque si omnia ista tecum reuolvereis, istum qui
nuper accidit tibi casum non tam molesto atque iniquo animo feres.
Exemplum consolationis de peste.

Hesterno uesperi, quo Iohannes noster adueniebat, is me certiorem reddidit pestis discrimen Bononiam admodum misere inuasisse, quod profecto mihi summum dolorem attulit. Statui namque Ydibus Maii illuc proficisci et studium meum ceptum perficere. Ibi enim uictualium maior copia, doctorum legentium maior diligentia simulque peritia et (ut omnia breui complectar sermonem) amplior facultas studendi prestolatur. Preterea plurimum egre fero tot mihi preceptores familiares ac amicitia coniunctissimos mortis miserande periculo subiectos fore et eo magis tui gratia indoleo, quo te antiquiori amore mihi coniunctum scio. Quia uero hathenus omnis ferme Ytalia hac detestanda peste laboraut atque omnia gimmasia alia pene a scolaribus deserta relicta sunt, puto aut flagello Dei aut ex aeris aut regionis corruptione omnem nostram regionem molestari oportere; cui flagello sola Bononia superesse minime poterat. Quia etiam intelligo legis diuine ac nature preceptis modis omnibus nos teneri neque ipsis alqua ratione posse resistere, stultum arbitratus sum ammodo pestem tam nephariam ac detestandam lugere. Te uero, quem lectura, quam hoc anno istic obtinere meruisti, discedere nphas esset, maiorem in modum obseuco obtestorquc, ut eadem clade tuum animum perturbari nequaquam sinas; neque enim cure tue ac molestie, etsi te consumerent, ad aerem purgandum pestemque repellendam aliquid conducere. Sint tibi exemplo clarrisssimi iuir iurisconsulti, qui toto anno Ferrarle a lectionibus nunquam feriati sunt; et tamen illic pestis inualescebat et longe plures in die quam Bononie interierunt. Animaduertas denique uerba Oratii, qui optatam metam cursu pertingere cupientem multa ferre oportere dixit; tamen in quo fidei lumen nullum uigebat, tu autem religionem Christianam profiteris. Si hec mentis tuo oculis subicies, huius pestis discrimen, ymo mortis periculum aspernandum facile existimabis.

22-23 Hor. Ep. 2,3,412

M, f. 118v-119r; H3, f. 39v (usque ad uersum 3 proficisci); H4, f. 104v-105r; P2, f. 24v-25r; Dz, f. 46r-v; L, f. M2r-v; D, f. e3v
Aliud exemplum.

Quod me hortaris, ne properem neque desperem (fore enim, ut melius mihi Venetiis quam usquam gentium consulatur), hortaris tu quidem recte, modo non sit pretio spes emenda. Quare si ita certi quicquam intra constitutum tempus allatum fuerit, ut intelligam non esse diutius mihi arandum littus, sequar consilium tuum uel in hoc uite discrimine. Sin aliud nihil quam uerba animaduertero, faciam ut scripsi ad te antea meque aut ad Bononiensis recipiam aut Florentinos. Vale. Ex Venetiis iii Idus Februarias.

Ego quod fore nunquam putaui, hoc uesperi nauim inscendere institui Ferrariam uersus nauigaturus. Inde Bononiam petam, ubi si honesta mihi conditio proposita fuerit, eam accipiam. Nam si secus ceciderit, concedam ad Florentinos, quos audio Grece litterature atque eloquentie imprimis studiosos. Quicquid egero, quamprimum tibi declarabo litteris, quo meos ad me libros aduolaturos cures. His enim mihi, ut scis, admodum opus est. Vale. Ex Venetiis.
Before I proceed to the business of writing notes on Erasmus’ *De contemptu mundi*, I ought, perhaps, to explain “asterisco praenotanda” in the title of this article*. That this phrase, of all things, should itself require to be marked with an asterisk is a piquant twist of irony that might have brought a smile to Erasmus’ lips.

The expression occurs in the editio princeps of his *Panegyricus ad Philippum* (Antwerp, [1504]), where a marginal note, reprinted in subsequent editions, tells the reader: “Asterisco praenotanda sententia” (ASD IV, 1, p. 37, apparatus criticus to l. 367). What are we to make of this sidenote? Otto Herding, the editor of the work in the Amsterdam *Opera omnia*, frankly declares himself at a loss. Elsewhere, he says, Erasmus uses the asterisk in the traditional way, to indicate a corrupt passage he could not emend. But why would he want to add an asterisk in his own book, the printing of which he was supervising himself?

To understand the phrase in Erasmus’ sense, we have to look at his usage elsewhere. As so often, the *Adagia* is a good place to start. In *Adag*. 457 and again in *Adag*. 2442 we learn that the phrase “stellis signare” is to be taken in a metaphorical sense. Just as the stars guide sailors on the high seas, Erasmus explains, so the little stars or “asterisci” in edited books guide the readers’ attention to something especially worthy of note. This meaning comes out clearly in his discussion of the question “Quis sit modus repetendae lectionis” prefacing his *Familiarium colloquiorum formulae*: “Si quid venustius, si quid elegantius, si quid

---

* I have used the following editions of Erasmus’ works: *Omnia opera*, Basel, 1538-1542, 9 vols., hereafter referred to as BAS; *Opera omnia*, ed. J. Clericus, Leiden, 1703-1706, repr. Hildesheim, 1961-1962, 10 vols., hereafter referred to as LB; *Opera omnia*, Amsterdam, 1969-. The abbreviation CWE refers to *Collected Works of Erasmus*, Toronto, 1974-. The poems of Erasmus are cited according to the edition in CWE 85-86/ASD I, 7. For kind advice and helpful criticism I am grateful to Drs. Nicolaas van der Blom as well as to the anonymous readers for this journal.
concinnius dictum videbitur, annotabis indice aut asterisco apposito” (ASD I, 3, p. 119, ll. 14-16). And in Ep. 283, II. 129-130, commending the numerous splendid lines in Andrea Ammonio’s panegyric poem to King Henry VIII, he observes that the poem contains many more verses that deserve to be marked with an asterisk (“sunt et alia permulta digna quae notentur asteriscis”). Evidently, then, it is in this sense that we should read the sidenote “asterisco praenotanda” in the Panegyricus: it points to a “sententia” so noteworthy that it deserves highlighting with an asterisk.

Since antiquity, of course, editors have added asterisks to texts for a rather different purpose, to alert the reader to irredeemable corruptions and omissions in the transmitted text. As Professor Herding mentions, Erasmus himself uses asterisks like this in his edition of Seneca’s works (1515). It is interesting to see, however, that his use of the “asteriscus” in editorial work is by no means limited to spotlighting a corrupt passage that he cannot emend. In fact, he employs the asterisk also to mark problems and obscurities that demand explanation in a footnote. To put it differently: an asterisk in the edited text points to the corresponding “little star” at the foot of the page — the scholium that casts light in the darkness. In Ep. 2091, I. 196, for example, he says that his notes, like so many little stars (“stellaris”), are intended to elucidate textual problems in Seneca’s works. Naturally such “asterisci” can address not just editorial matters but also questions of interpretation. In the preface to his edition of Cicero’s De officiiis (Ep. 152, II. 20-21) Erasmus remarks that his explanatory notes are like little stars illuminating all manner of obscurities in the text: “crebras annotatiunculas asscrisimus, que velut asterisci quidam commodo ad omnem caliginem alluceant”. And introducing the first edition of his Adagiorum Collectanea (Ep. 126, II. 105-106), he writes that an obscure proverb ought to be marked with an asterisk and explained with due care (“asterisco prenotandum diligentiusque explicandum”).

It goes without saying that the phrase “asterisco praenotanda” in my title should be understood, not in the sense of the marginal comment in the Panegyricus, but in the sense just adumbrated. The following notes try to shed light, however faint, on the text of De contemptu mundi. As such, they wish to supplement the insightful commentaries by Sem Dresden in ASD V, 1 and Erika Rummel in CWE 66 and to round out the textual criticism offered in Marcel Haverals, “Une première rédaction du ‘De contemptu mundi’ d’Erasme dans un manuscrit de Zwolle”, Humanistica Lovaniensia 30 (1981), pp. 40-54.
Line references to *De contemptu mundi* are keyed to the edition in ASD V, 1, pp. 39-86. Abbreviations for ancient and patristic authors as well as for Erasmus’ works are the ones used in ASD. The sigla for printed editions of *De contemptu mundi* are Dresden’s, except for the siglum *E*. Mentioned in his list of editions on p. 35 and again in the “Conspectus siglorum” on p. 38 as referring to the Cologne reprint of 1523, *E* is absent from the critical apparatus itself. The siglum *Z* indicates the reading of the Zwolle manuscript, as reported in Haverals’ article. References to Petrarch’s *De remediis vitriusque fortunae* (*Rem.*) and *Secretum* are to his *Opera quae extant omnia*, I (Basel, 1554; repr. Ridgewood, N.J., 1965).

Works cited in abbreviated form:


Paynell *De Contemptu Mundi* (1488?) by Desiderius Erasmus, Translated by Thomas Paynell, facsimile reprint of the Berthelet edition of 1533, introduced by W.J. Hirten (Gainesville, Fla., 1967).


**A. TEXTUAL NOTES**

*Epistula* (Ep. 1194)

6 *essent* According to Allen, *D* reads “erant”.

16 *desinam* BAS and LB change this to “desinant”.
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De contemptu mundi

18 prudenter Read “pudenter”, as in B-D. Balancing the preceding “amanter”, “pudenter” here is meant to recall the repeated opposition of “amor”-“pudor” in ll. 10-14.

20 vt Read “aut”, as in Z and B-D.

53 motus Haverals (p. 45) wonders if we should prefer “metus”, the reading of Z. But “motus” makes far better sense and is supported by a close parallel in the contemporaneous Orat. fun. Bert. de Heyen, LB VIII, 554 D: “inter tantos fluctuantis seculi tumultus”.


256-257 debacchationes The apparatus criticus does not match the edited text.

285 fac virtutem amplectere Since the construction with “fac” requires a subjunctive (cf., for example, p. 42, ll. 71-72; p. 58, l. 505; p. 60, ll. 547-548 and 560-561) “amplectere” should be changed to “amplectare”, as in B D.


308 immane Haverals (p. 44) notes that A gives the reading “immanae” and implies that the form “immane” is among the “fautes étonnantes” of Dresden’s edition. But “immane”, which comes from Iuv. 10, 107, is the correct form; “immanae” is formally and metrically impossible.

312 Cum The reading “Tum” in Z is the correct one, since “euanuerit” later in the sentence is evidently a future perfect indicative, not a perfect subjunctive. “Tum” introduces a statement; it does not continue the preceding question.

356-357 nemo sit qui credat The context demands that “nemo” be followed by a negative. Accordingly we should either adopt the reading of Z, “nemo sit qui non credat”, or emend to “nemo sit quin credat”.

443 liuor tinget Haverals (p. 45) wonders whether we should prefer “liuor turget”, the reading of Z. But “liuor turget”
makes no sense here. Furthermore, the context requires a future tense.

448 petas The verb stands in a series of verbs in the future tense. The correct form must be “petes”, as in D.

465 essent Read “erant”, as in Z and B-D.

491 a hospite An obvious error for “ab hospite” (B-D).

577 differe A misprint for “differre”.

631 ipsam Read “ipsa”, as in Z and B D.

641 Aliquoi An error for “Alicuo” (Z).

659 certo Probably a misprint for “certe”, the reading in Z and D. Erasmus could not have been pleased with the jingling phrase “certo sunt multo”, particularly since this is immediately followed with “plura et potiora”.

704-705 ‘Ita est’, inquis, ‘qui’ The apparatus criticus evidently misrepresents the reading in B.

705 qui The correct reading is “quin” (D). Z gives the meaningless “quum”.

762 cura A misprint for “curia” (Z and B D).

777 dubitaeurit A misprint for “dubitauerit”.

782 conuiuis In his critical apparatus Dresden reports that D reads “conuiuis” and “conuiuiis”. But “conuiuiis” occurs only in C (and Z), not in D.

829 extrema The correct reading is “externa” (Z and D), contrasting with “interna” in the next sentence. Cf. l. 807: “Nam et externa illa quies internam fouet, alit, tutatur”; l. 921: “Hic interna illa pax maxima, externa nisi hic nusquam”.

984 vlla Read “illa”, as in Z and D.

1108 in aconita Read “inter aconita”, as in Z and D.

B. COMMENTARY NOTES

*Epistula* (Ep. 1194)

9 *ad improbas preces* For the exordial topos “I write at the urging of a friend” see Curtius, p. 85; H.J. de Jonge in *ASD* IX, 2, p. 59, note to ll. 6-7.

1194 = CWE 66, p. 134), understand the word in the classical sense “nephew”. In ecclesiastical Latin, however, it often also means “cousin”; Willem Hermans, for example, is called Cornelis Gerard’s “nepos” in Ep. 28, l. 6. That is the most likely sense here, since Jodocus and the writer of the declamation are said to be virtually the same age (p. 40, l. 5) and to have been companions since childhood (p. 40, l. 22). Cf. Jean-Baptiste Pineau, Erasme, sa pensée religieuse (Paris, 1924), p. 32, note 5; Albert Hyma, The Youth of Erasmus (Ann Arbor, 1930), pp. 169-176. The sense “nephew” may definitely be ruled out in the heading’s original version, where the writer is explicitly said to be Erasmus himself. Edmond J.M. van Eijl, “De interpretatie van Erasmus’ ‘De contempitu mundi’”, in: Pascua mediaevalia: Studies voor Prof. Dr. J.M. de Smet, ed. R. Lievens et al. (Louvain, 1983), p. 338, rightly notes that Erasmus could not have had a nephew. After all, his one brother was a monk, and the two brothers did not have a sister.


De contempitu mundi

21-24 *Maximae ... benevolentia* There is a very similar captatio benevolentiae in *De conscr. ep.*, ASD I, 2, p. 400, l. 15-p. 401, l. 4 (at the beginning of another suasoria, the *Encomium matrimonii*).


41-42 *Quis ... secundis* The sentence inverts the proverbial “fighting against the current”; see Otto 680.

49 *non sine lachrymis* Hor. *Carm.* III, 7, 7-8; Erasmus, Ep. 4, l. 10; *Carm.* 93, 17.

50 *gnatum ... cogitat, gnatum dormiens somniat* Cf. Ep. 3, l. 30: “te cogitamus, te somniamus”; Ep. 61, ll. 6-7: “Soli sumus, Christianum cogitamus ... Dormimus, te somniamus”; *Ter. Eun.* 194: “me somnies, me exspectes, de me cogites”.

51 *animo peiora veretur* Quoted from Ov. *Met.* I, 587.

52-107 *Sed noui ... harena* This amplifies Hier. *Epist.* 14, 6, quoted in Erasmus, *De cop. verb.*, ASD I, 6, p. 245, ll. 164-172 as an example of extended metaphor (parable of the shipwrecked soul). For the image of the shipwreck cf. Erasmus, *Orat. funebr. Bert. de Heyen, LB VIII*, 554 D-E (with numerous close parallels in language and imagery, but praising Berta for the strength of character that allowed her to live outside a convent). Cf. also *Paean Virg.*, *LB V*, 1232 E-F; *Obsecratio, LB V*, 1233 E-1235 C; *Adag.* 1744, ASD II, 4, p. 176, l. 598 (with note); *Rat. ver. theol.*, *LB V*, 75 D. For the metaphor as an argument to induce youths to enter the safe harbor of the monastery see Ep. 447, ll. 260-263; *Coll.*, ASD I, 3, p. 179, ll. 1779-1780.


nemo ... effugit Cf. Enchir., LB V, 60 B: “illae Sirenes [libidinis], quas haud fere quisquam euasit, nisi qui procul au fugit”.

Vlysses ... sapientis perfectique personam gerit In the allegorizing interpretation of the Odyssey in antiquity and the Christian Middle Ages, Odysseus was regarded as a paragon of wisdom and fortitude, a man unmoved by the temptations of the Sirens, indomitable in facing the disasters of life. See, for example, Hor. Epist. I, 2, 17-18: “quid virtus et quid sapientia possit, / vtile proposuit nobis exemplar Vlixen”; see further: Hugo Rahner, Griechische Mythen in christlicher Deutung (Zürich, 1957), pp. 424-430; Symbole der Kirche: Die Ekklesiologie der Väter (Salzburg, 1964), pp. 260-266; Erasmus, Ep. 52, ll. 41-45; De cop. verb., ASD I, 6, p. 235, ll. 940-942; De conser. ep., ASD I, 2, p. 337, ll. 1-3; p. 350, l. 22.

Vlysses ... effugit Odysseus, it is said here, plugs up his own ears with wax in order to avoid the Sirens’ song. The detail, which runs counter to Hom. Od. XII, 39-54 and 166-200, seems to have originated in St. Basil’s widely read booklet Ad adolescentes 4. It is not difficult to explain how St. Basil came to reinterpret the story. If Odysseus was indeed the exemplar of the wise man and if
such a man does not wantonly expose himself to temptation (see, for example, Sen. Epist. 31, 2; Otto 213 and 1657), it follows that he must have plugged up his ears against the Sirens’ deadly song. Cf. ll. 154-157, below; Orat. funebr. Bert. de Heyen, LB VIII, 554 E: “Sirenarum exitiales modos surdis praeteriit auribus”.

St. Basil’s interpretation of Odysseus’ encounter with the Sirens resurfaced in the Renaissance, most probably via the fifteenth-century Latin translation of the Ad adolescentes by Leonardo Bruni. The work, which furnishes important arguments to those Christians eager to study the pagan authors, remained outside of Erasmus’ ken while he was still at Steyn; indeed, in his early works and letters against the barbarians he never once refers to St. Basil’s work. Erasmus’ immediate source must have been Bartholomaeus Zehender’s Silua carminum, printed at Deventer on 16 February 1491. On the last page of this booklet, a copy of which he had in his possession by c. March 1491 (Ep. 28, ll. 20-22), he read: “Auribus oppleitis caera versutus Vlysses / Syrenum molles praeteriit modulos”. Certainly Erasmus’ wording “aures oppleuerit” is far closer to Zehender’s phrase “auribus oppleitis” than to Bruni’s translation of the passage in Ad adolescentes 4: “auresque claudendo”.

Erasmus refers to the unhomeric variant even in later life, long after he became familiar with the epic at first hand — so powerful was the moral lesson it contains. See Panegyr. ad Philipp., ASD IV, 1, p. 63, l. 181; Parab. ASD I, 5, p. 170, ll. 154-156; Coll., ASD I, 3, p. 180, ll. 1800-1801; Adag. 3207, LB II, 1009 B; Ep. 2879, ll. 148-150. For occurrences in later Renaissance literature see Vredeveld, pp. 762-763, note 24.

76-77 aures oppleuerit Plaut. Rud. 905.
83-86 Quid Charybdium ... simulachrum Cf. Otto 382; Erasmus, Orat. funebr. Bert. de Heyen, LB VIII, 554 E; De cop. verb., ASD I, 6, p. 262, ll. 619-620; Adag. 2641.
93 *ad sydera sese tollentium* For the hyperbole cf. Verg. *Aen.* I, 103: “fluctus ... ad sidera tollit”; *Ps.* 106, 26 (of storm-tossed sailors): “Ascendunt vsque ad caelos”.

98-100 *Quid quod ... facies* Cf. *Obsecratio, LB* V, 1235 A.

107 *Nudus et* This is the standard reading in late medieval manuscripts and early printed editions of Verg. *Aen.* V, 871 (instead of “nudus in”). The conjunction “et”, therefore, should have been italicized in *ASD*.


129 *perpetua ... anxietate* See note to l. 836, below; cf. Carm. 94, 3-4: “perhenni ... anxietate”. The phrase “perpetua anxietate” comes from Iuv. 13, 211, quoted in l. 877, below.


139 *fascinat oculos* Cf. Carm. 94, 36; 96, 34; also Gal. 3, 1.

139 *male bland* See note to l. 68, above.

143 *amicorum turbam* The phrase crops up again in ll. 457-458, below (where *ASD* mistakenly prints “comicorum turbam”).

144-145 *quid tandem ... amat misere* The model is Ter. *Ad.* 665-667: “quid illi tandem creditis / fore animi misero ..., / qui infelix haud scio an illam misere nunc amet”.
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saxea pectora Ep. 9, l. 11; cf. Otto 1593; Nachträge, pp. 79, 116, and 209.

quicquid in te est virium Cf. Hor. Epod. 15, 12: “si quid in Flacco virium est [variant reading for viri est]”; Erasmus, Carm. 103, 24: “virium si quid mihi est”.

At his ... poenitet Cf. Carm. 96, 17-34.

At his ... perniciosius Cf. Sir. 10, 9-10: “Auaro autem nihil est scelestius.... Nihil est iniquius quam amare pecuniam”; l. 176, below: “auaricia (qua nihil est tetrius)”. materiam For this form (rather than “materiem”) see Adag. 1097, LB II, 447 A; cf. De cop. verb., ASD I, 6, p. 246, l. 191: “vitiorum materiam”. The same reading occurs in Petrarch, Rem. II, 13, p. 141: “gemmas et lapi-des, aurum et inutilem summi materiam mali”. The word should have been italicized in ASD.


Alter rei seruus ... non habet The thought is proverbial; cf. Walther 4813a; 28167a-28168; 28183; Alenus de Insulis, De planctu Naturae XIII, 54-56: “Diuicias non diues habet, sed habetur ab ipsis. / Non est possessor nummi, sed possidet ipsum / Nummus”; Erasmus, Carm. 96, 101-104. Cf. also Mt. 6, 24.

pretiosa pondera Cf. Boeth. Consol. II, m. 5, 28-30, where “auri ... pondera” are dismissed as “pretiosa pericula”; Erasmus, Carm. 96, 59: “preciosa pericula”. For the oxy-moron cf. also l. 606, below.

solicitudine, tum augendi studio, tum amittendi metu ex-
carnificant”; also amplified in *Adag.* 2602. For the prover-
bial wisdom that riches bring only cares and worries see,
for example, Walther 6059; 6108; 6112b; 6125; Hor.
*Serm.* I, 1, 76-78; Erasmus, *Carm.* 96, 61-70.

188-189

*parandis inhiat* Cf. Lotario dei Segni (Pope Innocent III),
*De miseria condicionis humane*, ed. R.E. Lewis (Athens,
Georgia, 1978), II, 14 (“De auaricæa”): “sempet inhiat
adquirendis”; Petrarch, *Rem.* II, 105, p. 222: “quaerendis
inhias”; Erasmus, *Ep.* 35, ll. 35-36 (Willem Hermans to
Jacob Batt): “nunquam partis fruuntur, dum semper pa-
riendis inhiat”.

190

*montibus aurum aequauerit* Cf. Otto 1132; Erasmus,
*Adag.* 815.

192-193

*Crescentem ... pecunia crescit* The two verses are quoted

together also in *De sarc. eccles. concord.*, *ASD* V, 3, p.
281, ll. 814-815. Erasmus imitates Iuv. 14, 139 in *Carm.*
96, 81: “Auri dira sitis crescit crescentibus arcis”.

193

*crescit* This is a common reading (instead of “creuit”) in
manuscripts and early printed editions of Iuv. 14, 139,
reflected also in Walther 3731 and Erasmus, *De sarc.
ecclusae concord.*, *ASD* V, 3, p. 281, l. 815. The word
should have been italicized in *ASD*.

200

*arca ferrata* Cf. Iuv. 11, 26: “ignorat quantum ferrata
distet ab arca / sacculus”.

200-201

*non aliter ... incubas* Cf. Ep. 29, l. 46: “quibus hactenus
ceu draco quispiam Hesperius incubas”; *Enchir.*, *LB* V,
43 F: “non ... vt congestis opibus inops custos incubaret,
quemadmodum draconem vellus aureum seruasse poetae
fabulantur”. For the comparison see Iuv. 14, 111-114;
Erasmus, *Enarrat. in Ps.* 22, *ASD* V, 2, p. 366, ll. 235-
237.

201

*noctes diesque* *Adag.* 324.

207-208

*At quisquis ... declarat* Cf. Otto 225-227; Arist. *Rhet.*
II, 13, 8; Boeth. *Consol.* III, 3, 9; Erasmus, *Carm.* 96,
89; *De cop. verb.*, *ASD* I, 6, p. 160, l. 311 (borrowing
from Sen. *Epist.* 2, 6): “Is pauper est qui plurimum
cupit”; *Enarrat. in Ps.* 22, *ASD* V, 2, pp. 365-366,
ll. 231-248.
per fas nefasque See the note to Carm. 96, 12 in CWE 86 / ASD I, 7.


rutila Since the epithet occurs in a verse quoted from Iuv. 14, 299, it is pointless to connect it with the Rutulian warrior Tagus, as Dresden does.

Turpissimum ... difficile Cf. Enchir., LB V, 59 C-D: "Quod nemo gentilium philosophorum non contempsit, hoc tu pauperis Christi discipulus et ad longe meliorem possessionem vocatus, vt magnum quiddam admiraberis?" Cf. also LB V, 40 E-41 B and 60 C.

Nulla ... capii Cf. Cic. Cato 13, 44: "diuine enim Plato 'escam malorum' appellat voluptatem quod ea videlicet homines capiantur vt pisces"; Erasmus, De conscr. ep., ASD I, 2, p. 251, ll. 5-9. See further Adag. 1473 and 1474; Enchir., LB V, 14 A and 57 C; De cop. verb., ASD I, 6, p. 216, ll. 502-503; De conscr. ep., ASD I, 2, p. 431, ll. 5-7; Eccles., ASD V, 4, p. 410, l. 60.

melle ... dissimulans Cf. Otto 1083 and 1085; Nachträge, pp. 279-280; Erasmus, Conc. de puero Iesu, LB V, 607 E; Coll., ASD I, 3, pp. 732-733, ll. 465-466; Carm. 30, 3.

quidam Erasmus alludes to the unknown author of Disticha Catonis. In IV, 17 of these moral distichs we read: "Si famam seruare cupis, dum viuis, honestam, / fac fugias animo quae sunt mala gaudia vitae".

Ducunt ... descendunt A quotation from Iob 21, 13. Erasmus also quotes the verse in Lingua, ASD IV, 1A, p. 86, ll. 9-10, and Conc. de Dei misericord., LB V, 573 C.

At quid ... vide For St. Jerome’s anti-matrimonial views see also De conscr. ep., ASD I, 2, p. 431, ll. 15-17.

in aurem dicam Adag. 247.
274 capistro ora porrigere By italicizing these words Dresden suggests that they are an exact quotation; but Iuv. 6, 43 reads: “stulta maritali iam porrigit ora capistro”. Cf. Alexander Hegius, Carmina (Deventer, 1503), sig. B2r (the same poem from which Erasmus quotes some verses in ll. 714-715, below): “Hic ora porrigit capistro feminae”; Erasmus, Carm. 103, 13; Enchir., LB V, 57 E; Moria, ASD IV, 3, p. 80, ll. 161-162; cf. Coll., ASD I, 3, p. 286, l. 318: “Vulgus coniugium capistrum vocat”.

286-288 Vt enim ... assequare Cf. Otto 764; Petrarch, Secretum III, p. 414: “Insanus profecto videatur, qui die medio per solis ardorem, vt vmbram cernerei ostenderetque alii, cum labore discurret, atque nihilo sanior est, qui inter aestus vitae multo cum labore circumfertur, vt gloria est suam late diffundat”; Walther 32116c: “Vmbram dum sequens fugit, at sequitur fugientem, / Vmbra sit arbitrio gloria vana tuo”; Erasmus, De conscr. ep., ASD I, 2, p. 358, ll. 20-21: “Non est affectanda gloria fortior, suapte virtute contento: sed haec benefacta non aliter quam vmbra corpus consequitur”.

295-296 summan ... necesse est Otto 871; cf. Erasmus, De cop. verb., ASD I, 6, p. 262, l. 641; Ep. 658, ll. 5-6; 1451, ll. 69-70; Adag. 2001, ASD II, 5, pp. 24-27, ll. 14-116; Carm. 93, 165; 132, 23-24; also Carm. 2, 4-5; 110, 145-146.

300-301 Difficillimum ... incidere Cf. Otto 917; Erasmus, Adag. 51-53.

303 perpetua anxietate See note to l. 836, below.

312 rerum amarissima mors For the idea that death is the greatest of all afflictions see Arist. Eth. Nic. III, 6, 6, quoted in Erasmus, De praep. ad mort., ASD V, 1, p. 339, l. 3 and alluded to in Vidua christ., LB V, 723 F. Cf. Erasmus, Euripides, ASD I, 1, p. 348, l. 2021; Carm. 2, 171: “mors ..., malorum maxima”; Coll., ASD I, 3, p. 723, ll. 111-112; Ennarr. in Ps. 38, ASD V, 3, p. 239, l. 599: “mors ..., res omnium tristium tristissima”.

313 insomniorum ... auolant Cf. lob 20, 8 (of the hypocrite): “Velut somnium auolans non inuenitur, Transiet sicut visio nocturna”; Erasmus, Carm. 2, 83-84 (the flight of
youth): “Sic sic effugiunt tacitae vaga somnia noctis / Simul auolante somno”. For the image cf. also, for example, Hier. Epist. 140, 9, expounding Ps. 89, 5-6; Walther 26677; 26683; Erasmus, Carm. 95, 101-102.


316 scopulos et montes rupit aceto The quotation from Iuv. 10, 153 begins with “scopulos et”, not with “montes”, as Dresden makes it appear. Z here has the standard reading “montem”; but the plural form “montes” does occur in some manuscripts of Juvenal’s poem. And when Erasmus writes “rupit” rather than “rumpit”, he is following another manuscript tradition, reflected in the early editions.

318 molestum ... ociosum Cf. l. 808, below: “molesta, ociosa, imo perniciosa”.
324-351  

*Profecto si ... rexerit* Cf. *Orat. de pace*, *LB* VIII, 548 A-D, where an ancient Persian king, resurrected from the dead for this purpose, delivers himself of a moralizing speech on the subject of worldly riches.

327  


336  


336-337  


338  


338  

*ab* This preposition is part of Vergil’s text and should have been italicized.

339-341  

*Quondam ... coherceor* Cf. Iuv. 10, 168-172; Fulgentius, *De aetatis mundi et hominis* X, 40: “Et quia mundum peragrando parum sibi esse creditit, ideo tribus contentus sepulchri cubitis obdormiit”; Petrus Alphonsus, *Disciplina clericalis*, *PL* 157, 705 D: “Heri totus ei non

341-342 Mors … corpuscula Dresden and Rummel rightly point to Iuv. 10, 172-173, but do not mention that the preceding verses discuss the vain ambitions of Alexander the Great.

342 adorato amiculo In note 21 to CWE 66, p. 146, Rummel accepts the reading “odorato” in D and translates: “I was renowned for my perfumed cloak”. But “adorato”, the reading in Z and A-C, makes better sense, in my opinion. It refers to the divine honors paid to Alexander; cf. Sen. Suas. 1, 2; Amm. Marc. XXI, 9, 8: “adorandae purpu-rae”. In view of the context, Rummel’s understanding of “amiculo” as “cloak” is to be preferred to Dresden’s interpretation of it as “dear friend”. See Jozef IJsewijn, in: Humanistica Lovaniensia 31 (1982), p. 217.


346 multo acerbior mors The “mors secunda” mentioned in Apoc. 2, 11; 20, 6; 20, 14; 21, 8. See also Erasmus, De praep. ad mort., ASD V, 1, p. 354, II. 330-331.

348 sero intelligere coepimus Cf. Otto 1410; Erasmus, Adag. 28; Carm. 2, 172-173; De conscr. ep., ASD I, 2, p. 227, l. 18; Adag. 1474, LB II, 574 B; Enchir., LB V, 57 F.
sibi magis imperare quam aliis Cf. Otto 1514.


luce ... clariore Otto 999; Erasmus, Ep. 20, l. 47.

quum nihil ... ab animo Erasmus varies the proverbial “out of sight, out of mind” (Otto 1271) by saying: “in sight, yet out of mind”.


Itane ... meminerimus Cf. De conscr. ep., ASD I, 2, p. 435, l. 31-p. 436, l. 1: “Quis tantum obliuionis ex illo Letheo flumine bibit vnquam, vt nullo natalis terrae, amicorum, vxoris, liberorum desiderio teneretur?”; Carm. 64, 62-64: “Nuncubi somniferae gustasti flumina Lethes, / Qui dulcis patriae terraeque altricis alumnus / Non meminisse potes?”

amne letheo (vt aiunt) obliuionis Cf. Otto 943. Since the words “amne letheo” are not an exact quotation from Verg. Aen. VI, 705, they should not have been italicized in ASD.

rapidissimi in morem amnis For the metaphor see, for example, Ov. Ars III, 62; Met. XV, 179-184; Erasmus, Enarrat. in Ps. 38, ASD V, 3, p. 216, ll. 702-703; De praep. ad mort., ASD V, 1, p. 342, ll. 67-68; Carm. 2, 79-80; 95, 26.

Mixta ... funera Cf. De conscr. ep., ASD I, 2, p. 443, ll. 3-4 (alluding to Hor. Carm. I, 28, 19): “inter tam densa senum ac iuuenum funera”. The line, which continues the quotation from Horace, should have been italicized. See Hor. Carm. I, 28, 19, where modern editors write “ac”
and “densentur”. The readings “et” and “densantur” reflect the manuscript or early printed text used by Erasmus.

376-400 Quid tu ... vita hominum The passage was inspired primarily by Petrarch, Rem. I, 1; cf. also Rem. I, 2; Erasmus, De praep. ad mort., ASD V, 1, p. 358, ll. 454-457; Carm. 95, 69-74.

376 Aetas integra est Quoted from Petrarch, Rem. I, 1, p. 7.


378 annis ... graues Verg. Aen. IX, 246; Hor. Serm. I, 1, 4; Erasmus, Carm. 1, 9.


379-380 iam leue caput, ... nasus perpetuo madens Cf. Iuv. 10, 199.

379 malae pendulae Cf. Iuv. 10, 193.

380 dentes ... luridi Hor. Carm. IV, 13, 10-11.

380 cornice vivaciores Otto 434; Erasmus, Adag. 564; cf. Carm. 2, 41-42.

380-381 dextra suos annos computant Cf. Iuv. 10, 249; Erasmus, Carm. 102, 47.

382-383 corpus vegetum ... et succi plenum Cf. Ter. Eun. 318.

385-398 Sin illa ... mortalium Closely paralleled in De conscr. ep., ASD I, 2, p. 449, l. 11-p. 450, l. 6 (especially p. 450, ll. 1-6, where “senectae limen” means age sixty); cf. also Eccles., ASD V, 5, p. 48, l. 874; Carm. 95, 89-94; Cic. Cato 19, 67-68.


391 mors certa ... vita incerta A variation on the proverbial “Mors certa, hora incerta”; see, for instance, Walther 15117; 15123; 15133; Bernardus, Sermo de conversione ad clericos, PL 182, 843 B; Petrarch, Secretum I, p. 380; III, p. 409; Erasmus, Enarrat. in Ps. 85, ASD V, 3, p. 363, l. 934; Conc. de Dei misericord., LB V, 569 F.

392-398  *nemo tam iuuenis ... videat annum* Cf. Cic. *Cato* 19, 67: “Quamquam quis est tam stultus, quamuis sit adulescens, cui sit exploratum se ad vesperum esse victurum? Quin etiam aetas illa multo pluris quam nostra casus mortis habet .... Itaque pauci veniunt ad senectutem”.

411-413  *Mille morborum ... soluit* Cf. Carm. 95, 73-84.

411  *Mille morborum ... casus* Cf. *De conscr. ep.*, *ASD* I, 2, p. 428, l. 32.


412  *mortis laquei* Hor. *Carm.* III, 24, 8: “mortis laqueis”; Ps. 17, 6; Prv. 21, 6; Erasmus, *Antibarb.*, *ASD* I, 1, p. 97, l. 30-p. 98, l. 1. For the image cf. Carm. 95, 82; *Enchir.*, LB V, 57 E.


415  *Aliena curamus* For the phrase cf. Ter. *Heaut.* 76; for the

mors ... mille modis insidias struit Cf. note to 1. 412, above (“mortis laquei”); Prosper, *Ad vxorem* 26: “mille modis miseris mors rapit vna homines”; Erasmus, *Enchir.*, *LB* V, 56 D: “Cogita ... quam vndique imminens [sit] insidiosa mors”; *LB* V, 57 E: “Perpended ... quot laqueos nobis struat mors, nullo non loco, nullo non tempore insidians”; *De praep. ad mort.*, *ASD* V, 1, p. 362, l. 553; *Carm.* 95, 82.

curamus cutem Cf. Otto 494; Erasmus, *Adag.* 1375; Ep. 61, l. 63; Ep. 87, ll. 18-19; *Antibarb.*, *ASD* I, 1, p. 131, l. 6; *Enchir.*, *LB* V, 2 B; *Moria*, *ASD* IV, 3, p. 84, l. 244; *Coll.*, *ASD* I, 3, p. 45, ll. 407-408; p. 46, l. 444; p. 90, l. 402; p. 91, l. 439; p. 196, l. 2297; p. 197, l. 2351.

ambimus magistratus Plaut. *Am.* 74.

Quod si ... sordescerent Cf. *Carm.* 108, 5-10.


sua cuique senecta mors est For the idea that old age is a living death see the note to *Carm.* 2, 29 in *CWE* 86 / *ASD* I, 7.

rosae in modum, ... pollice decisa Cf. Martial. X, 93, 5: “vt rosa ..., metitur quae pollice primo”.

[amici] vt hirundines exacta aestate ... deuolarunt For the sentiment see Cic. *Lael.* 17, 64; *Rhet. Her.* IV, 17, 24; Otto 93; Erasmus, *Adag.* 1781 and 2404; cf. *Adag.* 3405;

466-467

Virtus ... desinit Cf. Carm. 93, 31-32: “Nunquam ... rodere desinit, / Nunquam carpere desinit”; Confl. Thal. et Barbar., LB I, 890 E: “Nunquam inuidere nobis, nunquam lacerare desinit”.

473-477

Quotquot ... vidimus This refers to the factional wars between the Hoeken and Kabeljauwen that flared up again in 1477-1483 and 1488-1492. See J.-B. Pineau, Érasme, sa pensée religieuse (Paris, 1924), p. 33, note 5; A. Hyma, The Youth of Erasmus (Ann Arbor, 1930), pp. 15-18 and 176; also J. IJsewijn, “Zur Interpretation von Erasmus, ‘De Contemptu Mundi’, cap. VII”, Wolfenbütteler Renaissance Mitteilungen 12 (1988), pp. 62-64; and Vredeveld, pp. 758-759. Once the historical background is taken into account, the misunderstandings in CWE 66, p. 150, can be easily taken care of: “factiones” refers not to “rebellions” but to the factions then warring in Holland; “caritates” means “high prices”, not “poverty”; and “sterilitates” refers to “crop failures”, not to “childlessness”.

475

quid non vidimus nostro aeuo mali Cf. Orat. de pace, LB VIII, 550 C: “Ipsi proh! nostra aetate satis superque didicimus, haec nocentissima furia quid quantumue pariat mali”.

475-476

Iam quartum et vigesimum annum agimus A marginal note in the Zwolle manuscript (copied in 1513 or shortly thereafter) says that the phrase refers to Erasmus’ age: “etas auctoris”. The passage is, indeed, the earliest reference to the humanist’s age and, hence, to his year of birth (1466). See Vredeveld, pp. 757-763. Erasmus uses the first person plural in “vidimus” because he and his “cousin” are about the same age; see p. 40, 1. 5.

476-477

bellorum strepitu Liv. IV, 1, 5; cf. Erasmus, Carm. 94, 69.
ferias A holiday from war; cf. Hor. *Carm.* IV, 5, 37. Erasmus uses the word also in *Carm.* 50, 95 (with reference to the civil wars in Holland) and *Carm.* 4, 57-58 (the Wars of the Roses in England).


*Penuriae* Also lamented in *Orat. de pace, LB* VIII, 550 E: “In vrribus praeterea … victus magna penuria”.

*Scelerum … seges* Prud. *Amartigenia* 258 (of the hunger for gold): “inde seges scelerum, radix et sola malorum”.

ferream … aetatem *Iuv.* 6, 23.

*fugere* A common reading in manuscripts and editions (also modern ones) of Ov. *Met.* I, 129; hence it should have been italicized in *ASD*.

dolique Though part of Ovid’s text in Renaissance and modern editions, “dolique” is not italicized in Dresden’s text.

*Nona* This word ought to have been italicized, since it is the standard reading in *Iuv.* 13, 28, also in modern editions.

*numero* Since it frequently occurs in manuscripts and early editions of *Iuv.* 13, 26, this word should have been italicized.

*Permagni … emendatiorem* For the sentiment cf. Otto 1148; Erasmus, *Adag.* 973 and 974 (quoting inter alia Sen. *De ira* III, 8, 1-3, with close parallels); *De pueris*, *ASD* I, 2, p. 36, l. 32-p. 37, l. 6; *Carm.* 49, 84-85.
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Concoloribus ... volitant Cf. Sir. 27, 10; Otto 1335; Erasmus, Adag. 120-124. As Dresden suggests, it seems likely that the English proverb “Birds of a feather flock together” has its origin in the present passage, via Paynell’s translation “Birdes of one colour flye togyder” (p. 80). Paynell’s version of 1533 was expanded in W. Turner, Rescuing of the Romish Fox (1545) to “Byrdes of on kynde and color flok and flye allwayes to gether”. In G. Whetstone, Promos and Cassandra (1578) this version became: “Byrds of a fether, best flye together”. See The Oxford Dictionary of English Proverbs, revised by F.P. Wilson (Oxford, 1973), p. 60 (without reference to Paynell or Erasmus).

marmoreus Cf. Carm. 43, 77: “O bis marmoreum pectus”.

lasciui ... motus Marcantonio Sabellico, In natalem diem divae virginis Mariae (Deventer, R. Pafraet, 1490), poem 3, sig. a4*: “lasciui motus risusue procaces”; Erasmus, Lucianus, ASD I, 1, p. 382, l. 25: “lasciuo corporis motu saltitare”.

agitataque in numerum brachia Cf. Carm. 102, 65: “in numeros agitabat brachia”.

hernia Modern editions of Iuv. 6, 326 do have “hirnea”, as Dresden says; but “hernea” is a common spelling in manuscripts and early printed texts. There is no reason not to italicize the word.

solet morbi ... puto See Adag. 179: “Ex aspectu nascitur amor”; cf. Carm. 100, 5; 102, 67.

oculi laesos Erasmus’ version of this quoted phrase is a common variant reading of Ov. Rem. 615 (for “laesos oculi”). He cites it in this form also in Adag. 973.

Nunc igitur ... aduola Erasmus is imitating (and, in part, quoting) Cic. Att. II, 23, 3: “Quam ob rem, si me amas tantum quantum profecto amas, si dormis expergiscere, si stas ingredere, si ingredieris curre, si curris aduola”. He quotes Cicero’s words also in De conscr. ep., ASD I, 2, p. 355, ll. 4-5, as a model of exhortation.

Babylone Cf. Precat. ad Iesum, LB V, 1212 A; Enchir., LB V, 22 C.

Non tibi Dedaleis ... insiliendum Erasmus is alluding, first, to Daedalus’ feat of escaping Crete on artificial
wings and flying across the Mediterranean Sea ("vasta traicienda aequora"); and second, to Hercules' labors, which ended with his ascending the pyre on Mt. Oeta ("ignibus insiliendum").


633 expertis fidem habeant Proverbial; see Otto 615; cf. l. 327 (with note), above.

641 mos gerundus est illorum tarditati Cf. Petrarch, Secretum I, p. 374: "Tarditati tuae mos gerundus est".

675-676 nihil nobis ... quicquid libet Proverbial; see Otto 949. Erasmus refers to the proverb again in l. 1183, below (condemning this monastic attitude).

684-699 iam tibi ... potest The model is Pers. 5, 124-137, also used in Erasmus, Adag. 1246.


685-686 Quis enim ... potis est Cf. Apophth., LB IV, 96 E: "Intellexit neminem esse liberum qui seruiret cupiditatibus".


697 terra marique Otto 1762; Erasmus, Adag. 325; cf. Adag. 3926.

700 ociosam Cf. l. 318, above: "singulos recensere et molestum esset et prope ociosum"; l. 808, below: "molesta, ociosa, imo perniciososa". For the reading "odiosam" in Z and C, which also makes good sense, cf. Plaut. Merc. 608: "Odiosat oratio, cum rem agas longinquom loqui".

710 pistrino ... dedunt Cf. Ter. Andr. 199: "verberibus caesum te in pistrinum ... dedam"; Otto 1432.

739-740 decorum ... excepisse Cf. Hor. Carm. III, 2, 13.

769 fumantia tecta Cf. Carm. 6, 6 (contrasted with the solitude in the country): "fumida tecta"; De rat. stud., ASD I, 2, p. 127, l. 8: "Musae fontibus ac nemoribus vnice gaudent, a fumosis vrbibus abhorrent"; Coll., ASD I, 3, p. 221, ll. 3-4 and p. 231, ll. 3-4: "Quum omnia nunc vernent ac
rideant in agris, demior esse, qui fumosis vrbibus delecten-
tur”.

769-770 deserta virentia incolentibus manna depluit Understood in
CWE 66, p. 160 as: “Life-giving manna rained from
heaven … on the dwellers in the desert”. However, the
epithet “virentia” is a plural form; it cannot modify the
singular “manna”, nor can it mean “life-giving”. I should
add that the “deserta” referred to here are not the arid
deserts that we tend to think of (the Israelites could not
have survived forty years in such a place) but an uninhab-
ited wilderness that could be used as pasture land. Paynell
(p. 115) rightly translates “deserta virentia” as “the flour-
yshyng wyldernesse”.

777 digito monstrare Cf. Otto 549; Erasmus, Adag. 943.
793 diinus ille furor The “divine frenzy” of the poets. See
Curtius, pp. 474-475; and, for example, Plat. Phaedr. 245
a; Cic. Div. I, 31, 66; De or. II, 46, 194; Stat. Silv. II, 7,
76; Erasmus, Carm. 6, 4; 120, 15; Ep. 948, II. 50-55;
Adag. 2154, ASD II, 5, p. 136, II. 758-759.
810 potes This word — part of Ov. Rem. 580 — should have
been italicized in ASD.
826-828 Quanquam … migrare Cf. Moria, ASD IV, 3, p. 100, II.
528-530.
836 perpetua anxietate Iuv. 13, 211 (cited in l. 877, below);
cf. also II. 129 and 303, above; Enchir., LB V, 56 D.
853 quantum eis malitiae tantum sit et fortunae Proverbia;
see Walther 5122: “De quanto nequam peior, tanto sors
sibi maior”; 9901: “Fortunator est tanto, quo nequior
exstat”; 23609; 23611; 25674; 25698b: “Quo quis
nequior, hoc fortunior”; 25699: “Quo quisquam est
peior, tanto felicior exstat”.
864-867 Quapropter … iudicauerunt Cf. Enchir., LB V, 56 C-D.
871 quatiens Since this form is found in some manuscripts of
Iuv. 13, 195, it ought to have been italicized here.
III, 331: “scelerum furiis agitatus Orestes”. Cf. Erasmus,
Moria, ASD IV, 3, p. 118, l. 877, also explicitly referring to the “dirae vltvices”: “nocentem et conscium animum furiis ac terriculorum facibus agunt”; Adag. 991; Lingua, ASD IV, 1A, p. 76, ll. 655-656; Ennarrat. in Ps. 85, ASD V, 3, p. 398, ll. 860-861; Carm. 119, 15-16.

vitae nostrae ratio Ep. 30, l. 3: “Solitudinem ... vitae nostrae ratio poscit”.

quantum cum foenore Cf. Carm. 54, 8; 113, 10. For the image see, e.g., Cic. Cato 15, 51; Tib. II, 6, 22.


Deinde coelestium ... gustarunt Cf. Moria, ASD IV, 3, pp. 192-194, ll. 248-267; Conc. de pueru Iesu, LB V, 608 D: “Adde his gustum quemdam felicitatis futurae, quem piae mentes subinde percipiunt”.

ex hoc corpusculo euolare Cf. Cic. Rep. VI, 14, 14: “e corporum vinculis tamquam e carcere euolauerunt”; Erasmus, Ep. 61, l. 15: “tanquam e vinculis euolare” (of the soul escaping the body in dreams); Ennarrat. in Ps. 38, ASD V, 3, p. 171, l. 15, in similar context; De sarc. eccles. concord., ASD V, 3, p. 287, ll. 9-10; Modus orandi Deum, ASD V, 1, p. 122, ll. 53-54. For the pejorative “corpusculo” see, for example, Iuv. 10, 172-173; Sen. Epist. 23, 6; 24, 16; Dial. XII, 11, 7; Erasmus, Carm. 71, 16; Ennarrat. in Ps. 4, ASD V, 2, p. 274, ll. 612-613; De sarc. eccles. concord., ASD V, 3, p. 280, ll. 800-801; Coll., ASD I, 3, p. 551, l. 486; De praep. ad mort., ASD V, 1, p. 344, ll. 100-101.

tantae certe ... videatur Cf. Carm. 108, 9-10.

tanta hilaritate supremum vale dicere The clause is meant to contrast with Ov. Met. VI, 509-510: “supremumque vale pleno singultibus ore / vix dixit”.
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1034-1035 supremum vale dicere, ... suprema diuidere oscula Cf. Vidua christ., LB V, 725 D (as gestures of pious love toward the dead): "dedisse nouissimum osculum, dixisse vale aeternum". Here the gestures indicate that the young people entering the monastery are henceforth dead to the world.

1034-1035 suprema ... oscula Ov. Met. VI, 278; Fast. IV, 851.

1064 Frustra, nam Hor. Carm. III, 7, 21; III, 13, 6; Erasmus, Carm. 103, 19.

1097-1100 Si veritas ... ponitur Cf. Antibarb., ASD I, 1, p. 124, l. 19-p. 125, l. 2; Carm. 93, 61-64.

1099-1100 christianum Ciceronem In Ep. 49, II. 100-101 Erasmus attributes the phrase to Rodolphus Agricola; he uses it also in Ep. 3043, II. 50-51, but without attribution. Cf. also Antibarb., ASD I, 1, p. 124, II. 22-23 (imitating Hier. Epist. 58, 10).


1111-1112 quam blanda ... gramina Cf. Ov. Fast. IV, 430: “pictaque dissimili flore nitebat humus”.

1155 induere talaria Adag. 142.

1183 liceat quicquid libet Cf. II. 675-676 (with note), above. There this attitude has only positive connotations.

1231 qui crepant Rummel (p. 175) translates: "who repent". But “crepant” (like the preceding “aman” and the following “exprimunt”) has as its object the virtues of truth, chastity, sobriety, and modesty. Cf. Enchir., LB, V, 51 B: "quod sentis, non tam saeuis intonandum verbis, quam moribus exprimendum"; Conc. de puero Iesu, LB V, 610 A: "Hunc penitus sapiamus, hunc loquamur, hunc moribus exprimamus"; Enarrat. in Ps. 1, ASD V, 2, p. 66, II. 2-3: "Qui penitus hoc amat quod docet, ... qui moribus exprimit quod praecipit". As these examples show, “crepant” in the present passage must refer to “speaking”. For this
unusual sense cf. Ep. 37, l. 2: “nil nisi agros pecuniamque crepares”. Paynell (p. 176) therefore correctly translates: “do bothe in worde and dede expresse the same [virtues]”.


si candidam vestem ... incontaminatam In the “Ordo Baptismi” of the Rituale Romanum (quoted according to ASD V, 1, p. 373, note to l. 800), the priest tells the neophyte who has just been baptized: “Accipe vestem candidam, quam perferas immaculatam ante tribunal Domini nostri Iesu Christi, vt habeas vitam aeternam”. Cf. Erasmus, De praep. ad mort., ASD V, 1, p. 372, ll. 799-801: “Caeterum, quotus quisque nostrum est, qui vestem candidam gratis in baptismo datam non multis modis inquinarit?”

The Ohio State University
Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures
When reading Erasmus we repeatedly come across “solet/solent” meaning “solebat/solebant”. In the new critical edition of Erasmus’ Opera omnia (Amsterdam, 1969 -; hereafter ASD ) this phenomenon was commented upon for the first time by J.H. Waszink in his edition of the Lingua (ASD IV, 1A, published in 1989). Waszink considered it an idiosyncrasy of Erasmus’ style (“une particularité assez étrange du style d’Erasme”, p. 63, n.l. 170).

In his edition of Books I-II of the Ecclesiastes, which appeared in 1991, Jacques Chomarat pointed to the same peculiarity, restricting himself to a reference to Waszink’s commentary (vid. ASD V, 4, p. 73, n.l. 810-811). Both Waszink and Chomarat respected Erasmus’ wording and did not emend the main text.

We have every reason to believe that Erasmus himself considered this use of “solet” as something quite normal. Should it have been other-
wise, he would have corrected it in a new edition, as he usually does when he is not pleased with what he wrote. As far as I know, Erasmus never feels bound to replace “solet” by “solebat” when meaning the imperfect tense. Strangely enough, even the contrary seems to be the case, at least if we judge by the critical apparatus of the Modus orandi in ASD V, 1 (1977), ed. J. N. Bakhuizen van den Brink. The editor based his text on the ed. Basel, March 1525 (called B), which is enlarged by almost a fifth as compared to the ed. princeps of October 1524 (called A). On p. 167, l. 629-630 we read: “…velut eiaculatae praecatiunculae, quae solent olim monachis apud Aegyptios opus manuum interrumpere…”. The apparatus has “solebat B: solet A”, suggesting that Erasmus substituted his original (and “correct”) “solebant” by “solent”, which would be hardly conceivable. In fact, the apparatus is inaccurate. Both A and B (copies at the Gemeentebibliotheek Rotterdam, vid. resp. fol. e8v and fol. f6r) have the reading “solent”, just as the other contemporary
editions have (Strasbourg, Dec. 1524; Neurenberg, Febr. 1525; Strasbourg, March 1525; Antwerp, 1525; copies at Rotterdam). The Basel 1540-edition of the *Opera omnia* (tom. V, p. 941) has “solent”, as well as the Maire-edition, Leiden, 1641, p. 129. It is only in the Clericus-edition of the *Opera omnia* (hereafter LB), that we find “solebant” (tom. V, Leiden, 1704, col. 1129 A). This form must have crept into the apparatus of ASD from LB, probably because the editor (like various other editors) made a first draft of the Latin text on the basis of LB.

In this passage of the *Modus orandi*, Clericus was the first editor to change “solent” into “solebant”, and he made the same correction elsewhere. Apparently he did so on his own initiative because he felt the former to be incorrect, not because the change was supported by the textual tradition. While Clericus did not comment upon the aspect of Erasmus’ style under discussion, Jortin, I suppose, was the first author who did. In his *Life of Erasmus* (first ed. 1758-1760; vid. second ed. 1808, tom. III, p. 232, note) he remarks with respect to a “solet” meaning “solebat”: “I have often observed in Erasmus this way of using the present tense, where the praeter-imperfect would be more proper”. Jortin made this observation with respect to a passage in Erasmus’ preface to his edition of St. Jerome, Fribourg, 1533 [= Allen Ep. 2758, l. 77]: “Frequenter apud suos hanc vocem solet emittere...” [sc. William Warham, the Archbishop of Canterbury, who had died some time before].

Similarly, P.S. Allen drew attention to this phenomenon in a note to Erasmus’ long letter to Jodocus Jonas of 13 June 1521 (= Ep. 1211, n.l. 89), where he writes, with reference to “solet”: “For this use of the present tense cf. ll. 138, 456, 513”. In Ep. 1211 we have indeed four instances of “solet” meaning “solebat”. When Allen died in 1933, the edition was carried on by his wife, H. M. Allen, and H. W. Garrod. When they came across an unusual “solet” in Ep. 3032 (= *Responsio ad Petri Cursii defensionem*, l. 216, they went further than P. S. Allen would have gone and did not hesitate to replace it (“correximus”) by “solebat” against the edition of Basel 1535, the Basel *Opera*, and even Clericus.

We have seen that an expression such as “solet” meaning “solebat” was felt to be incorrect, or at least unusual, by Clericus and later scholars. This, however, seems not to have been the case with Neo-Latin authors of the sixteenth century. As a matter of fact, Erasmus was not the only one to use it, vid. the following examples.

— Gerardus Listrius, *Oratiuncula habita in coetu scholasticorum Suollensium* (Zwolle, [1516?]; Nijhoff-Kronenberg no. 3411), fol. b1r
(on Demosthenes):
Quippe qui corpusculo, ut Plutarchus et Libanius scribunt, adeo fuit
valitudinario, ut ne palaestram quidem ad quam omnes Atheniensium
liberi solent se conferre, prae insigni imbecillitate adire potuerit...

— [C. Honius], Epistola christiana admodum ...ex Bathavis missa
...longe aliter tractans coenam dominicam quam hactenus tractata est
(s.l., [1525?], in Corpus Reformatorum 91, p. 512, l.19 (=the well-
known Honius-letter which had a great influence on the eucharistic
doctrine of Zwingli and Bucer):
...animum ab omnibus avertet quae prius amare solet, et soli Christo
inhaerebit...

— Gilbertus Cognatus, OIKETES, sive de officio famulorum (Paris,
1535; Basel, 1562), in Franz Bierlaire, La familia d’Erasme, (Paris,
1968), p. 116:
Heliogabalus solet libertis suis praescribere, ut hic colligeret undece
millia muscarum, ille aranearum: ut hoc negotio occupati, non face-
rent quod alii liberti solent, miscentes sese patronorum publicis nego-
tiis, interdum et fumos vendentes. Ridiculum est quod fecit Helioga-
balus...

— Henricus Paulinus, Oratio de vita...Cornelii Colthunii (Emden,
1568), fol. Cr3:
Venio nunc ad conciones Colthunii, plenas profecto atque eruditas,
quas habere solet in Ecclesia. Erat, ut scitis, disertus...

In the Oeconomica christiana, a sort of manual instructing people
how to believe, and to live according to, the Gospel, written in the 1520s
by an anonymous Dutchman, we come across no less than nine (perhaps
ten) instances of “solet” etc. where we would expect the imperfect
tense. The Oeconomica was republished, jointly with its contemporary
Dutch translation (the Summa der godliker scrifturen) by the Amsterdam
church historian J. J. van Toorenenbergen (Het oudste Nederlandsche
verboden boek. 1523. Oeconomica christiana. Summa der godliker scrif-
turen, Leiden, 1882). In his edition he corrected the Latin text, relegating
the original readings to the footnotes (vid. pp. 48 (twice), 71, 73, 74, 75,
87, 88 and 89; “solent” at p. 11, line 2 from below was probably over-
looked). In so doing Van Toorenenbergen may have acted on the advice,
or at least with the approval, of his Amsterdam colleague, the great
Mennonite historian J. G. de Hoop Scheffer, who revised his conjectural
readings. Only two other scholars dealt with the text of the Oeconomica,
viz. the church historian H. G. Kleyn and the classical scholar J. C. G. Boot.
The former agreed with most of Van Toorenenbergen’s corrections, but
observed at the same time that the editor had sometimes treated as faults
what were in fact idiosyncrasies of the author of the *Oeconomica*, such as “solent” for “solebant” (See Kleyn, “De auteur der ‘Summa der Godliker Scripturen’”, in: *Theologische Studiën* 1(1883), p. 316, n.1).

Boot sent a number of emendations to Van Toorenenbergen, but did not comment upon “solet/solebat”. He may, therefore, be considered as agreeing with the latter’s relevant corrections. (See J. J. van Toorenenbergen, “‘Het oudste Nederlandsche verboden Boek’. (Summa der Godliker Scripturen)”, in: *Theologische Studiën* 18(1900), p. 443-444).

As it happened, A. Horawitz was struck about the same time by an unexpected “solet” when editing the codex which came to be named the Horawitzianus after him (The MS is in the Gemeentebibliotheek Rotterdam and contains among other things 28 letters to or from Erasmus). In a letter from Jacobus Thomas to Martinus Lypsius (1525) we read: “Solet enim gloriari noster Iulianus omnia se habere Ciceronis opera, quae quidem extant”. Since this Iulianus was already dead in 1525, Horawitz observed: “Solebat? denn er war ja damals gestorben” (vid. A. Horawitz, *Erasmus von Rotterdam und Martinus Lipsius. Ein Beitrag zur Gelehrtengeschichte Belgiens*, Wien, 1882, p. 102).

It has become clear that the use of “solet” meaning “solebat” in the sixteenth century was less uncommon than we might expect. Supposing Erasmus was the first author to practise this idiosyncracy — and I have not come across precedents as yet — we would like to know what induced him to do so. Returning to the *Modus orandi* quoted above, we find the combination “solent olim” (cf. also *Oeconomica christiana*, p. 71, 74). The bringing together of these words as such is not unclassical, cf. Ovid. *Fast.* VI, 149-150: “…color oris erat, qui frondibus olim/esse solet seris, quas nova laesit hiems”. This “olim”, however, means “sometimes”; it does not refer to the past and does not constitute, therefore, a parallel with the point at issue. What I am discussing here are instances of “solet/solent” surrounded by forms of the imperfect, in some cases together with “olim” in the usual sense of “in olden times, formerly, previously”.

Having found no satisfactory answer to our question I can only refer, *faute de mieux*, to a suggestion made by H. G. Kleyn concerning the Latinity of the *Oeconomica christiana*. To his mind its Latin made sometimes the impression of being “translated Dutch”. To illustrate this Kleyn provides some examples, including the use of “solent” for “solebant” (*Theologische Studiën* 1(1883), p. 318). However, he does not
explain why this should be a “Dutchism”. It is possible that Kleyn had
in mind that in mediaeval Dutch “sy plegen” (they are accustomed to;
solent) in some cases is the form of the imperfect tense. We read, for
instance, in the Summa der godliker scrifturen (ed. Van Toorenenber-
gen, p. 167): “In voeren tijden waren sommige vrouwen, ghenoemt
Paula ende Eustochium...die met haren ioncfrouwen plegen latijn te
lesen...”. The Oeconomica christiana has here “Paula et huius filia
Eustochium atque cum his aliae virgines solent [solebant editor] latine
sua cantica psallere...” (ed. Van Toorenenbergen, p. 73). Dr. H.
Heestermans (Leiden) drew my attention to the fact that “pleeg/ plegen”
as forms of the imperfect tense (third person singular/plural) — instead
of the usual “plag/plagen” or “placht/ plachten” (the latter form is also
the one in current usage) — was especially in use in the County of Hol-
land (vid. Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal, vol. XII, 1 (’s-Graven-
hage/Leiden, 1931), col. 2483).

Is it possible that Erasmus’ “solet” in the sense of “solebat” is a
Dutchism, or, geographically more precisely, a Hollandism? Whatever it
is, Erasmus was apparently never criticised by his contemporaries for
using it; even his Ciceronian enemies did not seize this opportunity,
an indication all the more that sixteenth-century Latin was more com-
prehensive than Clericus and other censors would have it.

Dr J. Trapman
Constantijn Huygens Instituut, Dept. Erasmus
P.O.Box 90754
NL - 2509 LT Den Haag
Jacques Chomarat

L’EMPLOI DE NUM ET NONNE DANS LES ORATIONES DUAE IN THOLOSAM D’ETIENNE DOLET

Les grammaires latines usuelles d’aujourd’hui énoncent ainsi les règles d’emploi de num et de nonne dans l’interrogation directe: num introduit une question dont la réponse attendue est “non”, nonne la réponse “oui”:

“Num insanis?” “Est-ce que par hasard tu es fou?” (non, bien sûr!);
“Nonne Socrates sapiens erat?” “N’est-il pas vrai que Socrate était sage?” (si, bien sûr). Mais cette règle n’est pas formulée par les grammairiens antiques, Priscien ou autres. L’ignorant, les humanistes ne la respectent pas, sinon par hasard, ce qui n’est pas sans faire naître parfois des problèmes d’interprétation. C’est le cas des Orationes duae in Tholosam qui viennent d’être publiées à nouveau dans leur présentation de 1534, avec une traduction et des notes dues au travail approfondi de MM. Lloyd-Jones et Van der Poel.1

Voici un premier passage où Dolet emploie Num pour introduire une question qui appelle pourtant une réponse manifestement affirmative. Dolet décrit l’activité de la “nation française” à l’Université de Toulouse comme celle d’une société de secours mutuels: les étudiants s’entraident, les plus aisés offrent à ceux qui sont dans le besoin, qui manquent d’argent ou sont malades, leur assistance et leurs services: lorsque l’un d’eux meurt sans famille, ils se chargent des funérailles:

“Num id sanctum? num religiosum? num pietati ac Christianae persuasioni consentaneum?”2
“Cela n’est-il pas saint? n’est-ce pas dévot? n’est-ce pas conforme à la piété et à la foi chrétiennes?”

2 p. 14, l. 20 s.
Cette interprétation est d’autant plus assurée que quelques lignes auparavant Dolet écrivait:

“Porro quid a nobis aut religione aut morum integritate dignum, iure illi requirant?”

“Et puis de quelle vertu religieuse ou morale pourrait-on à bon droit nous reprocher d’être dépourvu?”.

L’idée d’une inadvertance, d’une négligence, est écartée si l’on considère le caractère élevé du style et surtout quand on rencontre d’autres exemples du même emploi de Num …?

Dans le deuxième Discours Dolet évoque le désastre de Pavie: faut-il dire que cette défaite suffit à effacer la gloire qu’avaient jusqu’ici value aux Français leur bravoure et leurs succès? Si quelqu’un soutenait ce jugement injurieux, “num hoc simul falso et impudenter asserere videatur?” Traduire ici num par “est-ce que par hasard …?” serait faire dire à Dolet le contraire de ce qu’il pense, c’est-à-dire: “N’est-il pas évident qu’en disant cela cet homme proférerait un mensonge et un mensonge éhonté?”; num a clairement ici le sens usuel de nonne en latin classique; de plus il faut prendre le verbe videri dans l’acception non pas de “sembler”, mais d’“être évident” (p. 45, l. 28).

Dans le premier Discours à propos des étudiants qui ont délaissé leur pays natal et leurs amis pour venir à Toulouse:

“Num deorum immortalium et hominum consensu singulari comprobandum videatur, vt Gallus Gallum, Italus Italum, Hispanus Hispunwrapum, patriae studio et insita ab incunabulis charitate incensus pro se quisque diligat?”

“N’est-il pas évident que le jugement unanime des dieux immortels et des hommes doit approuver que, brûlant de zèle pour sa patrie et d’une affection enracinée depuis le berceau, chaque Français aime les Français, chaque Italien les Italiens, chaque Espagnol les Espagnols?”

Là encore num signifie “n’est-il pas vrai?” et videri “être évident”.

Voici encore un exemple tiré du même discours. A Orléans et à Poitiers où maints adolescents avaient commencé leurs études, les groupements en “nations”, dit Dolet, étaient considérés comme normaux et même louables; certains étudiants sont ensuite venus à Toulouse où les “nations” ont été accusées de provoquer des troubles, puis interdites. Pourtant, objecte Dolet, en prenant de l’âge ces jeunes gens, loin d’être

3 p. 14, ll. 12-13
4 p. 6, l. 25s.
devenus plus turbulents, ont gagné en sagesse; l’ardeur et les passions de l’adolescence se sont refroidies:


“N’est-il pas vrai que le temps, que l’âge plus avancé apportent quelque chose qui fait s’apaiser les passions de la jeunesse? qui nous amène à repousser le plaisir? à trouver le contentement dans la seule vertu? Qu’ils supposent qu’à Orléans nous étions sages, qu’ils proclament qu’à Poitiers nous étions paisibles et vertueux, ne trouvera-t-on pas néanmoins vraisemblable qu’ici par l’effet de l’âge nous soyons encore plus paisibles et plus vertueux?”

Suivent deux autres questions introduites par num, à prendre dans la même acception.

Un dernier exemple est fourni non pas par les Orationes elles-mêmes, mais par l’avant-propos en forme de lettre dû à un nommé Symon Finetius. Celui-ci assure avoir pris lui-même à l’insu de Dolet la responsabilité de faire paraître les deux Orationes. On ne pourra pas me reprocher, dit Finetius, d’avoir sali la renommée de mon ami “scriptorum indoctorum et male cultorum editione” “par la publication d’écrits dépourvus de savoir et de style”; au contraire, continue-t-il en apostrophant le destinataire de sa lettre:

“What unum ex omnibus nostri temporis Doletum esse mecum censes, cuius commentationes et summis laudibus et iucundissime gratissimi meque docti sint excepturi?”

“N’est-il pas vrai que, comme moi, tu estimes que Dolet est celui de tous nos contemporains dont les doctes accueilleront les travaux avec les plus grands éloges, avec le plus de plaisir et de gratitude?”

L’emploi de num est le même que dans les Orationes. Il n’y a rien à en conclure, mais peut-être ce recours répété à l’interrogation oratoire, pour forcer en quelque sorte les auditeurs ou le correspondant à reconnaître l’évidence, est-il caractéristique d’un tour d’esprit et de style. On peut y voir un argument de plus en faveur d’une hypothèse formulée.

---

5 p. 15, l. 3s.
6 “Ils” désigne ici les adversaires des “nations”, donc de Dolet.
7 p.* 2, l. 17 et 19-22.
ailleurs: ce Symon Finetius n’aurait jamais existé, ce serait une ruse de Dolet pour dissimuler le fait qu’il édite lui-même ces Orationes qui lui avaient valu tant d’inimitiés et que, peut-être, il avait promis aux autorités toulousaines de ne pas publier?

Y a-t-il en sens inverse des emplois de nonne pour introduire une question appelant une réponse négative? Dans le deuxième discours Dolet a recours à la prosopopée. Il fait parler Gallia, la France: elle reproche à Pinache, porte-parole de la “nation gasconne” à l’Université, de l’avoir injustifiée; après quoi, Dolet reprend la parole pour son propre compte, en s’adressant à son tour au même Pinache:

“Haec si tecum Gallia loquatur, nonne exanguis atque aestuans repente in illam inuolabis, nonne cum fractis quibusdam ac inanibus minis loquenti insurges? nonne sine vultus constantia, sine colore, sine voce, tanta tibi exprobrantem opprimes?”

En quel sens prendre ici nonne? Dolet veut-il dire que Pinache, en butte à de tels reproches, va entrer en fureur et s’opposer avec fplusé à celle qui le blâme? Ou au contraire que cela lui sera impossible? Ces questions oratoires équivalent-elles à une affirmation ou à une négation? La suite immédiate, la réponse que Dolet lui-même donne à ses questions plaide pour la deuxième interprétation:

“Simile nihil ages: at tuae turpitudinis recordatione victus et benefactorum, quae in te a Gallia profecta sunt, memoria territus silebis, etc.” (p. 42)

La honte obligera Pinache à garder le silence face aux reproches de Gallia. On pourrait toutefois émettre une objection et prêter à Dolet un degré de subtilité supplémentaire (c’est ce que font les traducteurs) en disant: “N’est-il pas vrai que tu vas faire une scène à la France?” Il rialerait, il soulignerait par l’ironie l’invaisemblance caricaturale d’une réaction de colère de Pinache; il ne reprendrait le ton direct et sérieux qu’avec Simile, etc. qui la rendre plus humiliante la honte de Pinache réduit au silence. Sans être absolument impossible cette interprétation est tout de même fort compliquée. La suite des idées, la cohérence du ton sont mieux préservées dans l’autre interprétation: “Si la France venait à te parler ainsi, te précipiteras-tu soudain sur elle, blême et plein

8 Vivarium 32 (Nimègue, 1994), 125-130.
9 Au lieu de futurs on attendrait des potentiels, mais ce serait un autre problème.
de rage? Te dresseras-tu devant elle, tandis qu’elle te parle, avec des menaces impuissantes et vaines? Chercheras-tu à l’intimider pendant qu’elle t’adresse de si graves reproches et que tu n’as ni fermeté sur le visage ni couleur ni voix? Tu ne feras rien de tel; au contraire vaincu par le remords de ta conduite passée et atterré par le souvenir des bienfaits qui te sont venus de la France, tu garderas le silence”.

Ainsi il est plus difficile qu’on ne croirait d’être cicéronien. Il ne suffit pas de proclamer son admiration ni d’imiter un style; il faudrait respecter les mêmes usages que le maître en matière de langue; mais pour cela il faudrait les connaître.

Qui a le premier formulé les règles d’emploi de num et de nonne? Valla effleure le sujet (Eleg. II 15), mais ni Jules-César Scaliger, ni Turnèbe, ni Lancelot dans La nouvelle méthode pour apprendre la langue latine n’en soufflent mot. L’édition de 1740 du Thesaurus linguæ latiæ de Robert Estienne, enrichie par Birrius, écrit:

Num: Adv. interrogandi cui subauditur negatio. et

Ce n’est là que la bien mince esquisse d’une analyse. C’est seulement Madvig qui formulerà en 1844 pour la première fois les règles aujourd’hui familières aux débutants. Toutefois sans les formuler certains humanistes ont pu, consciemment ou non, les respecter. Ce serait une enquête longue et difficile.

6 Château-Gaillard,
F-94700 Maisons-Alfort.

10 Je remercie vivement Mlle Colette Baudelot qui m’a aimablement fait connaître la thèse de M. Hoff consacrée à ce sujet: Le système linguistique de l’interrogation en latin classique, thèse de 3e cycle, sous la direction de Henriette Fugier, soutenue à l’Université de Strasbourg II, oct. 1979 (non publiée; exemplaire dactylographié).
Although royal visits to Universities tended to generate a great deal of poetry and drama, the general dearth of literature produced in connection with Elizabeth’s visit to Oxford in September 1592 is striking. The literary centerpiece was the production at Christ Church of two old comedies, William Gager’s *Rivales* and Leonard Hutten’s *Bellum Grammaticale*. The present lyric cycle by the Chaplain of Magdalene College seems to have been the only original composition elicited by the occasion; it was issued by Joseph Barnes, printer to the University, later in the same year. The fine quality of Sanford’s lyrics is particularly remarkable because of the speed at which he was obliged to write (the visit was only announced in early August) and because, save for two poems in a 1596 University anthology on the death of Sir Henry Unton, the present work is his only known literary effort.

What we know about Sanford’s life comes from Anthony à Wood’s biographical sketch, quoted in part here:

John Sanford, son of Richard Sanford of Chard in Somersetshire, gentleman (descended from those of his name in Devon) was born in

---

1 This dearth of literature cannot be explained by thinking the university was newly combined after Long Vacation, for that institution lay well in the future.

To gain an overall idea of the queen’s entertainment on this occasion, one may read the decrees drawn up by the special committee charged with making the arrangements, reproduced by Andrew Clark, *Register of the University of Oxford* (Oxford, 1887) I, pp. 228 - 30.

I should like to take this opportunity of extending my thanks to the two anonymous readers of this article, whose corrections and suggestions have gone far toward improving it.


Somersetshire, entered a commoner of Baliol college about the time of the Act in 1581, where continuing till he was bach. of arts, was then made one of the chaplains of Magdalene college. At length having contracted a friendship with John Digby, commoner of that house, did travel with him into France, Spain, and Italy, whereby he did much advantage himself in the modern languages. Afterwards he went in the quality of a chaplain to the said Digby, then known by the name of sir John Digby, at which time he was sent into Spain to treat of a marriage between the infanta, sister of the king of that realm, and Prince Charles of England. After his return, Dr. Abbot, archbishop of Canterbury made him his domestic chaplain, and at length prebendary of Canterbury, and rector of Ivychurch in Kent. He was a person of great learning and experience, and a solid divine, well skill’d in several languages, and a tolerable Latin poet.

As printed, the Εὐκτικά Εἰδύλλια falls into two parts. In the first (1 - 298), Apollo and the Muses, exiled from Greece, make their way to Oxford, encounter the queen, and each Muse offers a prayer for the welfare of her and her realm, in a different lyric meter: hence the work’s title. This, perhaps, was what Sanford originally wrote for recitation at a Magdalene College banquet given by Nicholas Bond, President of Magdalene and current Vice Chancellor of the University, for the members of the Privy Council. But the feast was cut short by a movement by the queen (420ff.). The second part consists of a description of the Magdalene banquet. This may have been written subsequently to bring the piece up to publishable length.

Sanford must have been aware of the published cycles of odes on the would-be regicide William Parry and on the Babington Plot by Oxford’s leading poet, William Gager (1555 - 1622). Like those odes, they are written in imitation of Horace, and Sanford surpasses Gager’s adventurousness in attempting various lyric meters. Though somewhat larger, the present volume looks as if it is designed as a continuation of this series of Oxford printings comprising Gager’s lyric volumes and the anonymous hexameter poem Pareus. The conceit of momentarily fusing Athens and Oxford, bringing Apollo and the Muses to the banks of the Thames, recalls Gager’s similar strategy in two memorable elegies in the University

4 Polymetric choruses of Muses are familiar in continental Neo-latin literature: Erasmus, Constantinus Hugenius (Huygens), etc. But this is the only such work produced in England of which I am aware. Without polymetrics, the same format had been used in England by Gabriel Harvey in Smithus, vel Lachrymae Musarum (1578) and Spenser in The Teares of the Muses (1591).

memorial anthology on the death of Sir Philip Sidney. More immediately, Gager wrote a special prologue for Hutten’s Bellum Grammaticale, spoken by Apollo, newly come to Oxford (this is quoted in the Commentary note on 11f.). It is probably no coincidence that Sanford and Gager employed this same device; one imagines that the two poets did so according to the prior agreement that this would be the emblematic theme of the visit.

Sanford’s cycle was issued by Joseph Barnes, printer to the University, in 1592; it is tempting to suppose that the licensing of Barnes’ press, the forerunner of the Oxford University Press, in 1584 involved an understanding that he would issue a certain amount of literature on subjects congenial to the government and established religion. One could point to the volumes just cited, and many other items of Anglo-Latin literature written under Elizabeth and James, as examples of patriotic effusions, sometimes downright political propaganda, manufactured for the consumption of the educated classes. And of course both the writing and the publication of poetry of this sort constituted an elegant means for the University to profess its loyalty at the same time it displayed its literary talent.

A transcript of the printed text was included in the anthology Elizabethan Oxford edited by Charles Plummer. All of the early poetry volumes issued by Barnes are very rare. In the present instance, only two copies survive, one in the British Library, the other in private hands when Plummer wrote. I do not know its present whereabouts. In the same anthology Plummer included other documents pertinent to the 1592 royal visit, which occupied September 22 - 28, the most interesting of which is an eyewitness account by Philip Stringer, a rather jaundiced Cambridge-educated follower of Lord Burghley (on this visit the Queen was accompanied by the full Privy Council).

6 Exequiae Illustriissimi Equitis D. Philippi Sidnaei, Gratissimae Memoriae ac Nomini Impenseae, printed by Joseph Barnes, Oxford, 1587, edited by Gager. The final poem in this collection, a fine Sapphic ode by William Whitlock of Christ Church, is quoted in full as another example of Gager’s influence on his contemporaries by Bradner, ib. p. 67.

7 The pageantry connected with the wedding of Prince Frederick of the Rhine to Princess Elizabeth of England in 1613 was similarly stage-managed around the mythological theme of Jason returning with the Golden Fleece, both in England and in Germany. Cf. Gager’s Complete Works (ed. D. F. Sutton, New York, 1994) III, pp. xvif.

8 Particularly interesting, being a form of courtly flattery peculiar to Anglo-Latin poetry, is the frequent comparison of Elizabeth to a divinity, the prediction of her deification after death, or even the description of the queen as a living goddess. Often the technical language of the Roman Caesar cultus is appropriated for the purpose. This is not the place to expatiate on the possible political or religious implications at stake. But Sanford’s poem contains much evidence that could fuel such a discussion and would warrant publication for that reason alone.

ORNATISSIMO VIRO
DOMINO DOCTORI BONDO, ALMÆ ACADÆMÆ INSIGNI PROCANCELLARIO,
ET COLLEGII MAGDALENENSIS DIGNISSIMO PRÆSIDI;
PATRONO ET MÆCENATI SVO LONGE OPTIMO

Accipe, Maecenas, cecinit quos nuper Apollo,
et quos versiculos turba novena dedit,
cum subiit nostros princeps augusta penates,
viseret ut doctas Elisabetha scholas.

Carmina nos Musis affinximus ista: sed ecce,
vilia sunt, tanto nec satis apta choro,
 nec bene tersa satis, nec loevi pumice munda,
digna sed ut iaceant sordibus uncta foris.
Qualiacunque sient, nostro sub nomine poni
vix patiar, ni sint numine tecta tuo.

Tuæ dignitati deditissimus,

IOANNES SANFORDVS
TO THAT DISTINGUISHED GENTLEMAN, DOMINUS DOCTOR BOND, NOBLE
VICE CHANCELLOR OF OUR MOTHER THE UNIVERSITY, AND MOST WORTHY
PRESIDENT OF MAGDALENE COLLEGE, THE AUTHOR’S PATRON AND MOST
EXCELLENT MAECENAS

Accept, Maecenas, the trifling verses which Apollo lately sang, which
the ninefold crew of the Muses gave forth, when our august sovereign
Elizabeth entered our precincts to visit these learned schools. (5) I have
ascribed these songs to the Muses. But see, they are tawdry things,
unworthy of such a choir. They are insufficiently terse, unpolished by
the fine pumice, but are worthy to be tossed out to lie in squalor. But no
matter what they may be like, I should scarcely allow them to be put for-
ward under my name, (10) were they unprotected by your authority.

Most devoted to your dignity,

JOHN SANFORD
IN REGINÆ ELIZABETHÆ AVSPICATISSIMVM ET EXOPTATISSIMVM ADVENTVM,
APOLLONIS ET MVSAVM EÚKTIKÁ EÍΔÚLLIA

Dum sedet ad Thamesin Parnassi fonte relieto
Cynthia, hic vitreus lento qua flumine serpit
Isis, et Alfredi doctam vagus alluit urbem,
attonitus novitate loci, coelique solique
temperie, dixit, “certum est hic ponere sedes
Musis perpetuas, huius nunc incola terrae
dicar, et hunc populum nostro celebrabimus ore.
Vos iuga Pieri montis, vos stagna valete,
Gorgonis unda vale, valeant et Phocidis amnes”.*

Affatusque suas comites, “quam turpiter”, inquit,
“expulsi patria, quam dulcia liquimus arva,
quamque per aequoreos fluctus huc paupere cumba
appulimus, scitis, quanquam meminisse doletis;
hic tamen et sylvas, et prata virentia passim,
(quaeram enim) vix concedentia primis
cernitis, has terras certe Dea magna tuetur”.
Haec dum mirantur stantes in margine ripae,
ecce sub illum noctem feriata per agros
turba ruens, inflansque tubas et tinnula sistra,
clamat adesse deam, proprias ut visat Athenas.
Tum deus, aurata sumpta testudine, laudem
principis aggreditur pulsis ad carmina nervis;
quem parili studio Musarum turba secuta
concinnuere, sono vicinia tota resultat.

APOLLO

O semper querulo carmine barbiton
gratum diis superis, deliciae Iovis,
te posco positis prorsus amoribus
nunc insigne melos, quale frequens sonas
inter lauta dapum fercula coelitum
non Daphne capitis nunc decus unicum
nostri; non Clymene filia Tethyos;
non Circes genetrix, nec Chione dolo
quae me sensit anum Daedaliania;
sted nec Leucothoes thurea virgula

* post amnes non interpunxit liber
WORSHIPFUL IDYLLS OF APOLLO AND THE MUSES ON THE MOST AUSPICIOUS AND WELCOME ARRIVAL OF QUEEN ELIZABETH.

When Apollo sat by Thames-side, having abandoned his Parnassan font, here where glassy Isis\textsuperscript{10} wends her gentle way, watering Alfred’s learned town, amazed by the novelty of the place and the mildness (15) of its climate, he exclaimed, “I am minded to make an enduring home here with the Muses; now let me be called a citizen of this land, and with my mouth I shall celebrate its people. Farewell to you, Pierian ridges, farewell to you, marshes and Gorgon-waters, farewell, you streams of Phocis”. (20) Addressing his companions, he said “You know (though the memory be painful) how shamefully we have been exiled from our native land, how we have departed our pleasant fields, how we have meanly made our way over the waters in a skiff. But here you can see greenwoods and verdant fields, (25) which I am bound to confess are in no wise inferior to their predecessors. And indeed a great goddess watches over this land”.

As they marveled at these things, standing on the river bank, behold, a wild band came rushing over the fields in the moonless night, blowing trumpets and shaking their jingling rattles. (30) They exclaimed that the goddess was at hand, come to visit her own Athens. Thereupon the god, having taken up his golden lyre, undertook the sovereign’s praises, twanging his strings as he sang. With equal zeal the crew of Muses joined in, and the entire neighborhood resounded with their music.

APOLLO

(35) O my lyre, always welcome to the gods above for your plaintive tune, Jove’s delight, I ask you to set aside your loves and play an excellent song such as you sing as you haunt the Olympians’ lavish banquets. (40) Now you are not to sing of Daphne, the unique ornament for my head, nor of Tethys’ daughter Clymene, nor of the mother of Circe, nor of Chione, daughter of Daedalion who by deceit was seduced by me in the guise of a hag, nor yet again of Leucothoe’s frankincense shrub.

\textsuperscript{10} The Latin name for the upper confluence of the Thames.
nunc cantanda tibi est: fertilior seges
in promptu dabitur carminis aurei.
En regina suo cincta satellite,
heroum celebri nobilium choro
ascito, niveis vecta iugalibus,
Musarum studiis structa palatia
exoptata subit, quam procerum cohors
ambit purpureis splendida vestibus,
sublimesque citis terga premunt equis.
Quos inter Tyrio murice virgines
distinctae properant, colla monilibus,
ornataeque sinus torquibus aureis.
Hos longo sequitur plebs levis agmine,
tantae festa canens iubila principi.
Huius tu modulis suavibus et sono
dulci fac celebres inclyta numina,
quae nos hospitio suscipientes novo
tutatur, Latii barbarus incola
quos diris odiis expulit, et vagos
eiecit patriis sedibus exules.

CALLIOPE

Tu qui potenti Iova regis manu
poli micantis militiam vagam,
qui syderum vultus minaces
comprimis, imperioque fraenas,
deterge coelo nubila tempora,
tollat nocivum Sirius et iubar
hinc usque ad Afros, nec procellas
excitet Aeolias Orion.

Obstringe ventos ne rabies Noti
imbres furenti depluat impetu,
absconde Pleiadas madentes
atque Hyadas pluviale sydus,
ne forte moto turbine principis
tardetur ardor, quo minus impigre
huc pergat interesse doctis
litibus, ac lepido duello.
(45) A more fertile crop of splendid songs will lie ready at hand. Behold, the Queen, surrounded by her retinue, having received her brilliant company of noble lords, drawn by snow white horses, (50) enters the great houses built for the Muses’ pursuits, that she has longed to visit; a throng of noblemen attends her, splendid in their purple raiments, and sitting high they freight the backs of their swift steeds. Together with them hasten along maidens, perfumed with Tyrian myrrh, (55) decorated at the throat with ruffs, with golden necklaces at the breast. These are followed by the fickle commons in a long train, singing their gladsome whoops for such a ruler. (60) Celebrate her renowned godhead with agreeable measures and sweet music. She receives us with newfound hospitality and protects us whom the barbarous inhabitants of Latium have exiled with bitter hatred, who have ejected us as outcasts from our paternal homes.

CALLIOPE

(65) God, You Who guide the glittering heaven’s wandering army with Your mighty hand, and restrain the threatening aspects of the stars, controlling them by Your government,

Sweep the sky clean of cloudy weather; (70) let Sirius shift his ruinous heat from here to Africa, nor let Orion stir up his Aeolian squalls.

Bind the winds lest Notus’ fury bring down the rains with raging force; (75) hide the sodden Pleiades and the Hyades, the rain-star,

Lest perchance a storm arise and our sovereign’s zeal be chilled for hastening hither to attend the learned (80) disputations, the pleasant contention.
Dies serenus solis ab exitu
egressus, octo perpetuet vices,
spectaculis ut ter beata
Elisabeth saturata clamet:

85 “satis iocorum vidimus undique
satis scholarum, risimus et satis.
nil non probamus; ecce laeta,
‘plaudite’ saepe dato,* recedo”.

Clio

Pande sublimes age laeta portas,
sede Musarum celebris Calaeva,*
urbis aeratae pateant revulso
cardine valvae.

Advenit longa comitata turma
virgo regali trabeata veste,
continens sceptrum manibus tremendum
Elisabetha.

Ita vos, cives, date dona divae,
principi praetor gladium resignet,
liector huic fasces ferat, et secures
tradat habendas.

Nos novem quales deceant sorores,
prominus sacros codices, scholarum
aureos foetus; damus haec benignae
pignora mentis.

105 Munus amborum capiet serena
fronte, quod Marti simul et Minervae
apta, nativo genio utriusque
noverit arma.

Fervet ad pugnas animo virili,
sicut armatas ruit in cohortes,
dignior certe meliore sexu
Volsca Camilla.

* saepedato lib.  + Calaena lib.
Let days clear from sunrise endure for a week, so that thrice-blessed Elizabeth, sated by the spectacles, may exclaim:

(85) "We have seen enough of pastimes on all sides, enough of the schools; we have laughed enough. There is nothing of which we do not approve. Lo, I retire joyfully, a ‘huzzah’ having frequently been given”.

Clio

Calæva, famous for your home of the Muses, (90) joyously fling open your gates, let the gilt doors of the city stand wide, their hinges bent back.

A virgin approaches, escorted by a lengthy train, clad in robe of state, (95) Elizabeth, wielding a mighty scepter in her hand.

Come, townsmen, present your gifts to the goddess, let the Mayor present her with his sword, let the Beadles bring their staves, and (100) hand over their rods of office for her safekeeping.

As befits the Nine Sisters, we submit holy scrolls, golden fruit of the Schools; we proffer them as tokens of our friendly disposition.

(105) She will receive both with unfurrowed brow, as she is equally proficient in the arts of Mars and Minerva, having mastered the weapons of both with her innate genius.

With manlike spirit she yearns for battle, (110) as she rushes against the serried ranks — assuredly a Volscian Camilla worthy of a nobler sex.
Fertur ad pacis studium suapte
sponte, dum stringit manus una ferrum;
alteram sacri tenet occupatam
pagina verbi.

Pallas utrinque est: vacat illa doctis
literis, et quas faciunt lituras
bella, subridens probat, arte, Marte
nobilis aeque.

Ergo coniunctis animis precemur
principi tantae senium Sibyllae,
copias Xerxis, cumulosque Croesi
aeris et auri.

THALIA

Salve conspicuum decus Brytannum,
tu regum soboles, iubar perenne
lucis, cura Iovis, favor deorum.
Te divam colimus, deam canemus
Musis propitiam, benigna cuius
promit dextera liberalitatis
gazas Attalicas opem roganti.
Non ignara mali faves egenis,
extorres miserios domo paterna
tu regina capis domo patenti,*
olim Sidonis ut vagos Elisa,
Teucros hospitio suo fovebat.
Vivas perpetuo beata regno,
et votis habeas deum annuentem,
cives morigeros: cita rebelles
plectantur nece perduellionis,*
qui turbare volunt tuam quietem.
De coelo tibi Iova largiatur
annis Nestoriae pares senectae,
laetos ut videas diu Brytannos,
laeti et te videant diu Britanni.

* patenti. lib.  * perduelliones lib.
But her inclination leads her to the practice of peace; as one hand
wields the drawn sword, (115) in the other she continues to grasp the
sacred Word.

In both respects she is a Pallas; she has leisure for learned letters, and
smiles at the wars which cause ink-blots, (120) noble alike in peace and
war.

Therefore with united hearts let us pray that such a sovereign receive
the old age of the Sibyl, the military might of Xerxes, and Croesus’ piles
of bronze and gold.

**Thalia**

(125) Hail, preeminent glory of the Britons, scion of kings, enduring
ray of light, care of Jove, darling of the gods. We worship you as a
goddess, we shall sing of you as a goddess favorable to the Muses, (130)
whose generous hand of bounty offers Attalid coffers to him who begs
your aid. Not unfamiliar with hardship, you support the needy; as queen
you receive miserable outcasts into your capacious home, (135) just as
once Sidonian Elisa supported the wandering Trojans with her hospitality.
May you live, happy in your enduring kingdom, and may you find a God
Who smiles on your wishes, and an upright citizenry. (140) May rebels,
such as desire to disturb your peace, be stricken with treason’s swift
death. From out of heaven may Jove bestow on you years equal to
Nestor’s old age, so that you may long gaze on your happy Britons,
(145) and your happy Britons may long gaze on you.
EVTERPE

Ergo ades, Elisabeth, nostros visura penates,
Pieridumque domos?
Ergo ades ut spectes exercent qualia nostrae
ludicra bella scholae?

150 Hic nobis supremus honos: en erigit omnes
nominis aura tui.
Coelica diva vides reficit quam suaviter omnes
numinis umbra tui.
Cernis ut ampla cohors iuvenum per compita passim
densat utrinque vias.
Per vicos glomerata frequens stant ordine longo
gens onerata stolis.
Hi tibi gratantes clamant (lectissima princeps)
vivat Elisa diu.

160 Vivas, et firma teneas pro iure precantur
regia sceptra manu.
Tu parili studio doctas foeliciter artes
dulcis alumna fove.
Praeside te nostra florescant rostra, Lycaeii
principe te vigeant.
Sic veniente die subsellia nostra sonabunt,
et fugiente canent:
Vivat Elisa diu nobis, post funera semper
vivat Elisa Deo.

ERATO

170 Iovis cerebro tu dea
prognata, nostrae quae praees
turbae, regisque fervidos
gentis togatae spiritus,
suffunde venam fertilem,
atque inde vires coelitus
ad carmen aureum, tuo
dignum choro, dignum chely.
Tu mitis inventrix sacrae
olivae ades, mater bonae

180 pacis, virenti fronde* fac
ornes alumnos obsecro,
ut prodeamus obvii

* fronte lib.
Euterpe

And so, Elisabeth, are you present, come to see our homes, the abodes of the Muses? And so have you come to see what kind of playful wars are fought in our schools? (150) For us this is the highest accolade: see how the aura of your name has uplifted us all. Heavenly goddess, you see how pleasantly the shadow of your godhead refreshes us. You perceive how a goodly throng of youths gathers at the crossroads, (155) choking the streets. Throughout our streets our people, weighed down by their gowns, stand numerous in long rows. Cheering you, most excellent sovereign, they shout “Long live Elisa!” (160) They pray that you live, and that you lawfully grasp the royal scepter in your strong right hand. And you, sweet daughter, happily protect the learned arts with no less zeal. With you as our champion let pulpits flourish, (165) with you as sovereign let our debating-halls thrive. Thus when the day dawns our benches will resound, when the day ends they will chant “Long live Elisa for us, and after her death may she always live with God!”

Erato

(170) You, goddess sprung from Jove’s brain, who presides over our crew and who rules the ardent spirits of the toga-clad race, provide us with a fertile vein of talent (175) and celestial powers fit for a golden song, one worthy of your chorus, worthy of the lyre. Be present, kindly inventor of the sacred olive, mother of wholesome (180) Peace; I pray that you adorn your children with verdant fronds, so that we may pour forth to meet you,
ramo arboris tuae, velut
caduceo insignes. Adest
proles Iovis, princeps pia,
virgo diserta, publicae
quietis altus quam subit
amor, colona scilicet
fontis Caballini, tuo
sancto dicati numini:
tuas Athenas quae colit,
et nunc sua praesentia
exornat artifex proba.
Hic ergo defigat pedem,
trahatque longas hic moras,
fausto et recedens te duce
iter capessat omine.

POLYHYMnia

Sic te, diva potens, regat
tutis auspiciis* Iupiter optimus,
ut quocunque feras pedem,
vites insidias cautius anguibus.
Neptunusque maris deus,
sic circum Albionis candida littora
aestu perpetuo fremat,
hostes ut rapidis fluctibus arceat.
Sic Mars veste adamantina
munitus vigiles excubias agat,
ne sicarius impio
telo virgineum perterebret latus.
Illum ex cautibus editum
credo Caucasiis, quem Armenius leo
sevit, tigris et ubera
admovit genitrix, nutriit aut lupa,
cui primo stetit in manu
regalem sitiens pugio sanguinem.
Dii nos foemineum genus
tutentur faciles numine provido,
ut quas invalidas facit
sexus, quas faciunt innocuas pudor,
candor, casta modestia,
fortes efficiat, fulciat et Deus.

* auspiciis. lib.
distinguished by a branch of your tree as if by a herald's staff. (185) Jove's child is at hand, the pious ruler, the learned maid, who is over-whelmed by a profound love for public tranquillity, a colonist indeed at the Nag's Font, (190) dedicated to your sacred godhead; she fosters your Athens, and now as a virtuous master of the art she adorns it with her presence. So let her plant her foot here, and long may she protract her stay. (195) And with you as her guide, when she retraces her route may she take the road with a favorable omen.

**POLYHYMnia**

With safe auspices, puissant goddess, may Jupiter so guide you (200) that wherever you direct your step you may shun traps, more cautiously than serpents. May Neptune, god of the sea, thus gird Albion's white shores with perpetual storms, (205) that with swift currents he may thus ward off the enemy. May Mars, clad in adamant armor, keep wide-awake watches by night lest the assassin pierce the virginal side with his impious blade. (210) I think him born on Caucasian crags, sired by an Armenian lion, suckled by a tigress-mother or reared by a wolf, in whose hand first sprang up (215) the dagger thirsty for royal blood. May the favoring gods protect us, the female race, with their provident powers, so that God may make strong and defend women enfeebled by their sex, (220) innocent by their bashfulness, purity, and chaste modesty.
MELPOMENE

Coeli monarcha, praepotens deum sator,
et rex bonus mortalium,
cui praepes ales armiger ferox gerit
225faces coruscas fulmine,
de sede sublimis throni nos despece
stratas humi sororculas,
et voce supplici rogantes, ut velis
Anglam beare principem.
230Tu fac avitum haeres diu solium premat
prognata virgo regibus;
diadema fronte, scepsra fac manibus ferat,
regatque gentem bellicam
pacisque cum dici pares cupiae bonae,
235aevo fruatur optimo.
Et si quod ulcus, publicae aut pestis rei,
tam corneis fibris siet,
qui fortis ausis impiis, struat scelus
240tibi sacratae virgin,
tu stringe sulphureum pater telum cito
in tam feri monstri caput,
ut mole pressus Aetnaea Enceladi levet
onus, latusque languidum,
ne vivus aerem scelesto polluat
245oris sui contagio.
Aut si superstitem velis, notam gerat
quam caedis author, carnifex
et primus infami tulit maculam, grave
in fratre designans nefas,
250ut sic cruces homicida stigmaticus malae
mentis perennes sentiat.

TERPSICHORE

Vos lanificae trina sorores
numina, quarum est texere fatum,
queis pulchra colus tenui filo
255fundit nostrae stamina vitae,
nostris precibus sistite cursum
vestris digitis: dulcis Eliae
260tardo currat police fusus.
Vos Penelopes aemula turba,
sedula quicquid fortiter urget,
fessa diurno dextra labore,
MELPOMENE

Monarch of heaven, mighty parent of the gods and kindly king of men, whose fierce armed bird bears (225) torches glittering with lightning, look down from your lofty throne on us poor Sisters, prostrate on the ground, who beg with suppliant voices that you elect to bless our English sovereign. (230) Grant that this scion of kings may long occupy her ancestral throne; grant that she bear the crown on her brow, the scepter in her hand, and that she govern this warlike race, while craving to be called the parent of wholesome peace, (235) and that she enjoy a time of greatness. But if some canker, some plague upon the nation should be so hard of bowel, being so strong in impious impulses, as to work evil against you, consecrated virgin, (290) then, Father, quickly level your sulphurous weapon at the head of such a fierce monster so that, weighed down by an Aetnaean mass, he might relieve Enceladus of his burden, the sluggishness oppressing his side, lest he live and pollute the air (295) with the wicked pollution of his mouth. Or, if you wish him to live, let him bear the stigma which the inventor of slaughter, the original murderer, once bore as a mark of sin, he who designed evil against his brother, (250) so that thus the murderer may feel the eternal pangs of a guilty conscience.

TERPSICHORE

You three divinities, wool-working Sisters, whose duty it is to weave a man’s fate, whose distaff (255) plays out our life’s fair fabric with its thin thread, at our prayers cease its passage through your fingers, let sweet Elisa’ spindle run slow beneath your thumb. You must be a Penelope-like band, (260) and whatever your industrious hand accomplishes to its...
rursus tacita nocte retexat.
Et Mygdonii senis aetatem,
et quos Nestor viderat annos

per tria saecula, vatis et aevum
Dircaeii, vetulae sive Sybillae,
faciles nostrae apponite Elisae.
Spargant seri tempora cani,
nullaque frontem ruga senilis

aret, aut tremulos fulciat artus
fractos senio triste bacillum,
maneat pulcro candor in ore,
decor et malas roseus tingat
semper solito more rubentes.

Numquam (id certe dabitis nunquam)
pectus tantae principis atri
Laethi durus sauciet ictus.
At quia fatum ferre necesse est,
sero saltem funera curet.

Vrania

illa ego, qua vivunt orbes, animantur et ignes,
cuius moventur spiritu sydera clara poli,
a love nacta genus, coelo notissima virgo,
cuius corusca splendidum nomen ab arce gero,
signavi, regina, locos ubi stabis in axe,
postquam supremum mors tibi clauerit atra diem.
Est locus Erigonen inter plaustrumque Bootae,
coelo sereno lucidus, conspicuusque solo,
unde micat rutilum pulchrae Minoidis astrum,
et lulum sydus cui Roma superba subest.

Hinc tua subiectis radiabit stella Brytannis,
et lene nautis Anglicis sparget amica iubar.
Tu Cynosura tuis, Heliceque per aequora vectis
hinc navibus clara feres praevia luce faces.
Duxque per ambiguos tractus, ad littoris oras
sistes, quiescat ut suo tuta carina vado.
Pone metum, princeps, sedes tibi certa paratur.*
Stellas et aether parturit, iam tibi mundus ovat.
Sera tamen subeas foelicia regna precabor,
ut fulgeas throno diu, celsior inde polo.

* post paratur non interpunxit lib.
exhaustion, it must also unweave in the silent night. And let her come to see the advanced age of the old Mygdonian man,\textsuperscript{11} the years of Nestor (265) that spanned three generations, the age of the Dircaean seer,\textsuperscript{12} or of the ancient Sibyl. Make yourselves compliant for our Elisa. Late may the gray hairs sprinkle her temples, the wrinkle of years (270) wither her brow, or a staff support her limbs broken by sad old age. Let the comeliness remain in her fair face and beauty paint her rosy cheeks, glowing always as is their wont. (275) Never — but assuredly you will never grant this — never let black death’s stroke wound the breast of such a sovereign. But as it is necessary for her to bear this fate, let her at least be late in finding her end.

\textbf{Urania}

(280) I am she who makes the spheres to live and animates their fires, whose breath moves heaven’s bright stars, deriving my pedigree from Jove, the most famous virgin in heaven, taking my renowned name from its bright citadel. I have designated, o queen, the place where you are to stand in the sky (285) after black death has put an end to your final day. There is a spot between Erigone and Bootes’ wain, bright in the serene heaven, conspicuous on earth, where shines the gleaming constellation of Minos’ daughter\textsuperscript{13} and Caesar’s star, under which lies proud Rome. (290) From here your star will shine down on your subject Britons and will shed a gentle light for English navigators. You, a cynosure and Helice\textsuperscript{14} for your people that travels before as they traverse the waters, will illuminate them with a bright light. As a guide through the doubtful tracks you will bring them to the shore, (295) so that their ships may find rest in their shallows. Have no anxiety, sovereign, a sure place is readied for you. The welkin gives birth to stars, for your sake the universe rejoices. Yet I shall pray that you be late in coming into this kingdom, that you long may shine on your throne, and thereafter even more brightly in heaven.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[12] Tiresias.
\item[13] Ariadne: cf. the Commentary note.
\end{footnotes}
Haec cecinere novem Phoebō praeeunte sorores Aonides, plausuque dato nemus omne remugit; hinc regina potens plumatis tracta quadrīgis, auratique rotis currus, atque agmine denso nobilium procerum comitata subintrat Athenas virgine de tanta, de tanta principe laetas.

At diversa petunt venerandi tecta dynastae, invisuntque domos alias quas laudibus ornant, miranturque suis cum fundatoribus arces.

Aedes Christi

Stat procul a reliquis rēdivivi solis ad ortum nobile gymnasium Waynfleti; proxima cuius unda lavat muros, ubi tardo labitur amne Cherwellus, lentiōse intersecat arva fluentis. Amplā domus*, spaciōsa loco, speciosā superbas ostendit portas; surgunt fastīgia pinnis, intus et e pictis camerata cubilia tignis, fundatoris opes et opus sine voce loquuntur.

D. Doctor Bondus

Convocat huc regni primores praeses ab aula principis huc missus, quem tota academia patrem suspiciens reverenter amat, quem vita probatis moribus exornat, quem pagina sacra disertum efficit, et gravitas decorat non tetrica frontem.

Hospitibusque suis epulum facturus opimum, tantos convivas dapibus genialibus explet. Dulcia vina cada depremit, fercula magnis sumptibus accersit; circumstant ordine longo qui mensas onerent famuli, qui vina ministrent, coelatosque scyphos, aurataque pocula ponant.

D. Cecilius magnus

Nobilis a dextra sequitur Cecilius heros, vir gravis et doctus, verae pietatis amator, facundusque senex, ævi prudentia nostri. Qui designatus quaestor primarius, ampol praeficitur fisco: sapiens vigilansque senator, principis et patriae graviora negotia tractat.

* solenni lib.  * ampla dom’ lib.
Thus the nine Theban sisters sang as Phoebus led the way, and the entire grove resounded. Thereafter the puissant queen, drawn by plumed carriage horses in her coach with gilt wheels, escorted by a packed throng of peers, entered an Athens made joyous by such a virgin, such a sovereign. And in its accustomed way this armed escort solemnly led her to the house which Wolsey once erected with an outlay worthy of the Attalids. But these venerable lords themselves sought out various lodgings and were guests at other colleges which they heaped with praises, admiring these establishments and their founders.

Waynflete’s noble institution stands off to the east, apart from the others, where its walls are lapped by the Cherwell’s waves as it wends its lazy way through the fields. This is an ample structure, spacious in its grounds, and it handsomely displays its lofty gates. Its roofs surge up with their spires, and inside rooms with painted beams mutely attest its founder’s efforts and outlay.

Here our President, sent from the sovereign’s court, summoned the first lords of the land, this man whom the entire University reveres, looking up to him as its father; his life enlarges him with its approved morals, the sacred page renders him learned, and a gravity that it is not severe adorns his brow. He was to give an excellent banquet for his guests. He regaled his table-companions with genial feasting, pouring sweet wines from the cask and calling for costly dishes. The servants appointed to furnish the table and pour the wine stood in a long row, dealing out the chased cups and golden flagons.

The great men took their places. Then, august in his dignity, the ambassador sent from Celtic climes occupied the first seat, the image of the great Bourbon, the one of which warlike France boasts as its stout-hearted ruler.

To his right sat noble Lord Cecil, that grave and learned gentleman, lover of true piety, an eloquent old man, “the wisdom of our times”. He, having been appointed Lord Treasurer, presides over our ample fisc. A shrewd and vigilant member of the Privy Council, he handles the weightier business of sovereign and state.
Comes Vigorniensis

E regione locum tenuit comes inclytus ille, fertilis eximium cui dat Vigornia nomen. Quem gentile decus, quem laus, et laurea magnae cognitionis, amor patriae, prosapia clarum efficiunt; geminos cuius de corpore natos, spirantesque patris generoso in pectore mores, nobilium fratrum par nobile, suscipit alma Magdalena domus, tanto et laetatur alumno.

D. Herbert: Henr: Somerse. 345

Comes Cumbriae

Affuit his epulis generosus Cumbrius heros, fervidus ad pugnas, qui ter congressus Iberis, in quos (navali bello violenter adortus) horribili tonitru Vulcania dirigit arma, omnibus et gemmis et mercibus exuit Indis, laetus et in patriam spoliis remeavit onustus.*

Comes Pembrochiæ

Ordine tum sequitur dominus Pembrochius, ipse nobilitatis honos, cuius praeconia cantat Cambria, quam dextre tranquilla pace gubernat, rite secans lites iudex, ac iurgia praesae.

D. Herbert: filius comitis Pembroch. 360
cuius illud est emblema

Proximus accubuit reliquis Essexius heros, comes Essexiae nobilis et sapiens, superans iuvenilibus annis magister equitum cognitione senes, canosque aetate magistros, qui doctos homines miratur, doctior ipse, Maecenasque bonos passis amplectitur ulnis, de Titaresio in bello pugnax, vir strenuus Ως "Αρηος, in bello pugnax, vir strenuus ὅς "Αρηος, cuius in Hyspanos res forti pectore gestas, sensit ab occiduo Lusitia sole tepescens, dum per agros medios ruit acer, et ipse superbae pulsat Ulyxbonae ferrata cuspite portas. Cuius et insultus (dum vitae prodigus ardet afflicto Gallos tegere auxiliaribus armis) laudibus Armoricae celebrat gens incola terrae. Ille cito subiectus equo qui nariibus ignes spirat, et indocilis rigidum mordere lupatum spumeus exultat, sequitur te, regia virgo,

* onustus, lib.
The opposite place was held by that famous Earl who takes his title from Worcester, renowned for pedigree, praise, the laurels garnered by a deep intellect, patriotism, and foresight. Magdalen has enrolled his two sons, (345) breathing their father’s character in their hearts, a noble pair of noble brothers, and rejoices in acquiring such progeny.

The noble Earl of Cumberland was present for the feast, (350) eager for battles, who has thrice come to grips with the Spanish, having violently attacked them by sea, plying his Vulcan’s artillery with horrible roaring; he had acquired all the Indies’ gems and wares and joyously returned to his native land, laden with spoils. (355) Thus he addressed his comrades: “Lo, glory vouchsafes herself to us while we are living. But what”, he said, “if a soldier is sunk in the sands15 without honor of a grave? He who is buried in the waves is covered with marble”.

Next in order followed the Earl of Pembroke, the very (360) glory of the peerage. Wales proclaims his achievements, how adroitly he manages her with tranquil peace. As magistrate he duly arbitrates disputes, as governor he settles quarrels. His true religion and burning ardor for the Lord have demonstrated how he has supported the pious, (365) favored the learned. His son, accompanying his father on this visit, sits at the banquet, a very noble heir of high character, but one for whom a cornstalk stands up among the grass16

Next to these sat Lord Essex, noble and wise, in the flower of his youth (370) surpassing his elders in wit, surpassing his teachers, hoary with age. He admires the learned, though yet more learned himself. As a Maecenas he enfolds good men in his capacious embrace. Aggressive in war, an active child of Ares, whose grave-hearted deeds against the Spanish (375) sun-baked Lusitania has felt, as he dashed though her fields and personally struck at proud Lisbon’s gates with his iron-shod spear. (380) The dwellers in the Armorican land17 celebrate his onslaughts as, heedless of his life, he yearns to protect the afflicted French with helpful arms. He rides along on a fire-breathing steed wildly champing at the hard bit, exulting in the foam, as he follows you, virgin Queen, a famous horseman, a fierce

---

15 Of the sea bottom.
16 His family motto.
17 Britanny.
Post hunc insequitur clara de stirpe dynasta,
iure suo dives quem South-Hamptonia magnum
vindicat heroem; quo non formosior alter
affuit, aut docta juvenes praestantior arte,
ora licet tenera vix dum lanugine vernent.

Assidet his satrapis multum celebratus Houardus
corpore procero et reliquis superiminet omnes,
magna ducum soboles, proavorum clara propago,
cui soli regina favens de stemmate tanto,
iussit ut illius tutelae regia classis
mandaretur, onus non quovis remige dignum,
se magnis cautisque viris et pectore forti.

Nec tuus hinc aberat, comes inclyte, filius haeres,
Derbia cui paret, quemque insula Mona salutat
regem, sed talem qui magnae iussa caressis
principis, illius sceptro tua iura resignans:
qui diadema geris quod nectit bractea plumbi,
vilior argento, fulvoque impurior auro.

Hi sunt (si memini) tua qui convivia, praeses,
qui, Waynflete, tuos castos adiere penates.

Unus abes, Sackville, choro dilecte togato,
summus Academiae maximus urbis honos, academia nostra patrono
Oxon: Cancillarius qua gavisus suo est, et Maecenate benigno.

Quae tibi sic loquitur: “cur gaudia nostra moraris,
vocibus et votis cum sis mihi mille petitus?
Ostendunt crebri gemitus, querimonia tristis,
quam sit dulce frui, quam te caruisse dolendum.
Hinc tamen ad regni maiora negotia missus
cogeris esse procul; quem munera magna fatigant,
curaque sollicitum destringit adesse volentem.
quod quoniam regina tui fidissima iussit,
postulat obsequium. Quare parere necesse est”.

Haec, inquam, mihi visa queri; Stupor ora deinceps
occupat, et matris natorum iuncta querela est.

Hi sedere duces, vario sermone trahentes
tempus, et appositis satiantes corpora mensis.
Ista quibus viva dicenda poemata voce
si licuisset erant, subito sed rumor ad omnes
pertigit, egressam thalamo, tectoque relictum,
reginam divae properare ad Virginis aedes.
Proinus ut dederant ultimo citroque salutem,
discedent; magnas capitis hospes ab hospite grates.
soldier, the Master of your Horse.

(385) After him follows a magnate of high degree, a man whom by right Southampton claims as her great lord. No gentleman more comely was present, no youth more distinguished in the arts, though the down scarce grows on his gentle face.

(390) Seated among these grandees was the very famous Howard, who overtopped the rest with his lofty frame; a great descendent of captains, brilliant whelp of his ancestors. Favoring him alone among his bloodline, the queen has ordered that the royal fleet be (395) charged to his care, a responsibility not for any tar, but only for great and provident men of stout heart.

Nor, famous Earl, was your son and heir absent, you whom Derby has given us, whom the Isle of Man calls its king — though you are a king such as heeds the bidding of our great (400) sovereign, yielding your rights to her scepter, wearing a crown of gold-washed lead, cheaper than silver, less pure than the yellow gold.

These, if I recall aright, were those present at your festivities, President; these were the men who visited your chaste dwelling, Waynflete. (405) Many of lower estate were there also, of whom I keep silent, whom it would be tedious to enumerate.

You alone were absent, Sackville, darling of the toga-clad throng, greatest glory of this city, in whom our academy rejoices as its patron, its kindly Maecenas. (410) And thus she addresses you: “Why impede our joys, when I have sought you with a thousand pleas and entreaties? Frequent sighings and sad complaints show how sweet it is to enjoy your company, how doleful to live without you. But, having been despatched on royal business, (415) you are obliged to tarry afar, you who are worn down by great responsibilities, distracted by care, though you crave to be present. The fact that the queen, always loyal to your interest, has commanded you, compels your obedience, you must comply”. Thus, I say, she seemed to make her plaint. Then a numbness (420) overcame her mouth and the mother's complaint merged with that of her children.

These great men remained seated, drawing out the time in varied conversation, while satisfying their bodies with the dishes set before them. And, had it been possible, these poems would have been recited for them. But suddenly word (425) came to them all that the divine queen had come out of her chamber and quit her lodging for St. Mary’s church. The lords departed, as soon as they had exchanged greetings, and the host received great thanks from his guests.
CONVIVANTIBVS REGII CONCILIARII PAVCA QVÆ DICENDA ERANT CARMINA

Hactenus, egregii proceres, spectastis honorem quem dedit effuso ruris gens incola censu, turbaque magnificis epulis generosior auxit.
Nunc, quibus applaudit vobis academia votis, excipit et quantis urbs undique laeta triumphis principis adventum, festa plebecula voce testatur, vacuas quiatens clamoribus auras.
Nec sua sunt tantum plauditent gaudia vulgo, verbaque non solum spirantibus edita fibris vocales sparsere sonos: sub turribus altis pendula pulsatis tremuerunt icibus aera.
Muta domus loquitur candenti perlita gypso, picta coloratis trabibus; minioque renidens clamat Io paries, et moenia celsa videntur submississe caput, vobisque assurgere portae, ut vestris meritis reverentia debita fiat.

Vestit honoratos heroas gloria tanta.

Gaudia sic cives peragunt, rurisque coloni sic partes egere suas; nos, altera turba, nos humiles Musae, tenues humilesque myricae quas dabimus grates? gratae quae munera mentis?

Nulla sub his tectis gemma, aut pretiosa supellex, transtulit Eois qualem mercator ab Indis, non Syrae merces, non lamina fulva metalli danda venit nobis, non byssina tela, quotannis qualia ab arboribus depectunt vellera Seres.

Vivimus hic tenui quadra, stat paupere mensa parca Ceres, raro fervent convivia Baccho. Ergo quid e nostro promemus pectore? Certe vota decent humiles et verba precantia Musas: haec satis una placent vobis, si nil damus ultra; cum simus tenues, molimur grandia frustra. Vivite foelices, et limina nostra frequenter visite, conspicui proceres, famulantia vestris nutibus, has aedes, has Palladis arces structas a vestris proavis, munite favore.

REIEM HONORATISSIMIS VIRIS

Romulus, ut fertur, iaculum dum librat in aprum, colle Palatino rasilis hasta stetit,
Et crevit stabilita novis radicibus arbor,
frondescensque altas ventilat illa comas.

Romuli hasta in cornum arboreum mutata. 
Ovid. Met. lib. 15
A FEW THINGS THAT WERE TO HAVE BEEN BE SAID TO THE MEMBERS OF
THE ROYAL COUNCIL THEN PRESENT

Thus far, excellent lords, you have witnessed the duty (430) paid by
our rustics at lavish expense, that the more well-bred congregation has
amplified with magnificent feasting. Now the academy testifies its devotion
by the well-wishing with which it hails you and the exultation with which
our happy city receives its sovereign, (435) shaking the empty air with
its shouts.

These rejoicings do not belong only to the cheering throng alone, nor
do our words, issuing from heaving lungs, alone broadcast vociferous
sounds: the brazen bells in their lofty belfries shiver as they are struck,
(440) the mute houses wax eloquent with their new coats of whitewash,
tricked out with their painted beams. The walls, gleaming with vermilion,
shouts out “huzza”, the high walls seem to bow their heads, the gates
spring open for you, so that due reverence may be paid your high
accomplishments. (445) Such glory attends honorable peers.

Thus the townsmen revel in their joy, thus the yokels play their part.
We, another crew, we humble Muses, tender and humble as tamarisks,
what gratitude shall we express? (450) Under this roof there is no gem,
no elegant furniture fetched by some merchant from the East Indies; no
Syrian wares, no plate has come to us for the giving, no silken fabric
such as the Chinese harvest like wool from trees. (455) Here we live on
simple bread, a thrifty Ceres adorns our humble table, our banquets
rarely glow with Bacchus.

Therefore what are we to offer from our hearts? Our prayers and
worshipful words befit the Muses; this alone pleases you, if we give no
more, (460) and since we are lowly we undertake great things in vain.
Live happy, outstanding Lords, come often to our threshold devoted to
your wills, to these halls, these edifices, these citadels of Pallas built by
your forefathers, defend them by your favor.

TO THE SAME MOST NOBLE GENTLEMEN

(465) They say that when Romulus was wielding his javelin
against a boar, the polished spear struck the Palatine hill and a tree
grew, supported by novel roots; it burgeoned with leaves and raised
its lofty head to the breeze. It blossomed and offered shade for the ad-
crevit & viruit
usque tempora
belli civilis sub
Iulio Caesare,
Plut. in vita Romuli.

floruit, et populo miranti praebuit umbras,
donec in imperio civica bella silent.

Post ubi Caesaream discordia fregerat urbem,
sanguineque imbuerat plebs furiata manus,
protinus excussis foliis ruit Itala cornus,
aruit, et ramos exuit alta suos.

Vestris (aurati proceres regnique senatus)
fraxinus auspiciis consiliiisque viret.
Lancea fit laurus, frameam pacalis oliva
vestit, et inducto cortice fronde tegit.
Nos inter Martis lituos fera bella minantes,
securos agimus pace vigente dies.
Dumque ruunt alii strictis in vulnera telis,
auspice regina terra Brytanna canit,
et canet assiduo, tutaque quiescet in umbra,
si pugnae vestra sedulitate cadant.

Sin fremat infestis odiis, et concitus oestro,
imperio populus libera colla gerat,
concidet Iliacis subito gens nostra ruinis,
concidet Elisabeth, curia sacra ruet.
Quaeque prius tereti succreverat arbor ab hasta
caesa dabit nostrae tela cruenta neci.

Arceat hoc nostris Deus a cervicibus omen,
et pia pro regno sint rata vota velit.
Publica res vigeat, salvum cum principe vulgus
floreat, hostiles nec tremat illa dolos.

Vosque, quibus regni sunt tota negociar curae,
qui consulta datis, ter genera cohors,
prontite solertes faecundi pectoris artes,
ferveat ut sacrum religionis opus,
quae nunc ingenii male convenientibus acta,
liubis innumeris, dissidiiisque gemit.

Sic deus intererit vestris conatibus, et vos
diriget afflatu spiritus iste suo.
Sic dabitur semper vestris et fascibus haeres,
consulis et proles vestra subibit onus.

Vivite nunc laeti, vobis pincerna deorum,
nectaris et succos, ambrosiamque ferat.

bon pro vous faïe.
ming populace (470) as long as civil wars were silenced by government. Afterward, when discord had shattered the city and the people had drenched their hands in gore, this Italian ash shed all its leaves and died, withered, and lost its limbs. (475) Our ash flourishes, golden Peers, Councilors of the realm, by your auspices and counsels. The lance becomes a laurel, the peaceful olive clothes the spear, a bark grows, it is covered with leaves. While Mars’ trumpets threaten wild wars, (480) we spend our days in security amidst a thriving peace. While others go a-dashing, swords drawn for the wounding, the land of Britain sings under our queen’s auspices. And it will sing unremittingly, safe and tranquil in the shade, if battles lapse thanks to your industry. (485) But if our people should rage with bitter hatreds, stung by the gadfly, and try to keep its neck free of government, of a sudden our nation will collapse in ruins worthy of Troy. Elizabeth will fall, our sacred Court will suffer its downfall. And the tree that has grown out of a polished spear (490) will be killed and supply weapons for our slaughter. May God avert this omen from our necks, may He approve of our pious prayers for the realm! May our republic thrive, may the Commons fare well along with its sovereign, may she not quake at our enemies’ tricks! (495) And you, to whom all the realm’s affairs are charged, who offer your counsel, thrice noble committee, hatch clever devices in your fertile hearts, that religion’s sacred work may be carried forward with fervor, for religion is now practiced by minds scarce in agreement, (500) groaning because of our countless quarrels and schisms. Thus God will be present in your endeavors, and will guide you with the onbreathing of His spirit. Thus an heir will always be granted you for your staves of office, thus your progeny will relieve you of the burden of your counsels. (505) Now live happy, may the gods’ cupbearer bring you the juice of nectar and ambrosia. God serve you well.
TEXTUAL COMMENTARY

1 - 10 This introductory poem addressed to Dr. Nicholas Bond, President of Magdalene College and current Vice Chancellor of the University, written in elegiac couplets, stands in lieu of a dedicatory epistle. It is signed by the author, whose name does not appear on the title page. (The title dominus was given any University man who had been admitted to the degree of B. A.).

3 Nostros...penates means Magdalene College, not the University as a whole.

11 - 34 The poem’s first passage, in dactylic hexameters, sets the fictive stage for the following sequence. Apollo and the Muses, ejected from their Grecian haunts, have made their way to Oxford where they intend to make a new home. Why they have been cast out of Greece is not yet stated: for the reason, cf. 62ff. with the Commentary note ad loc. Now at last they are delighted to find a new and equally hospitable environment.

It is probably no coincidence that a special prologue written for the revival performance of Gager’s Rives before the Queen on Tuesday, September 15, as attested by Philip Stringer, p. 255 Plummer, is very similar. Here too Apollo is the speaker:

saltus relinquens clara Woodstockii iuga,
venatione fessus, ac dammis satur,
et iam necandis tempore exacto feris,
meis reviso nobilem Musis domum.
sed unde tanta sedibus nostris nova
successit hospes? ore quam sese ferens!
quae celsitudo! quanta maiestas adest!
genus esse divum credo, nec vana est fides.
tune illa Elisa, nympha quam Syrinx suo
Tamesis ad undas pulchricoma Pani edidit?
tune illa es, annos ante quae bis iam decem
et sex, ad istos prima venisti lares?
ipsam esse memini, pristinum agnosco decus.
regina salve virgo, terrarum dea,
caelique cura, saeculi ac mundi Stupor,
ο singulare pectoris Studium tui!
iterumne tibi delubra Musarum sacra
subire placuit, et tui, dignum tuo
utiam absolutum, adire monumentum patris?
bis hospes, et bis grata venisti, mihi
Phaeboque, Graiisque, Musisque, omnibus,
uteque aliqua merito gratia habeatur tuo,
soccum Thalia comicum ornabit tibi.
laetare quaeo, diva, sceptrique inclyti
repone pondus, et supercilium grave.
iocosa laetos Musa tibi ludos dabit.

13 In his dissertation on the antiquities of Oxford, Sanford's contemporary Leonard Hutton recorded a tradition that the University of Oxford was founded by King Alfred (cf. Plummer's Elizabethan Oxford pp. 41 - 4).

19 Gorgonis unda refers to the Hippocrene, so called because this fountain was created by the blow of Pegasus' hoof; cf. Ovid, Epistulae ex Ponto IV.viii.79f.:

quae quoniam nec nos unda submovit ab illa,
ungula Gorgonei quam cava fecit equi.

21 Cf. Vergil, Eclogue i.3, nos patriae finis et dulcia linquimus arva.

29 Special rattles (sistra) were used in Greek and Roman religious processions.

30 The identification of Oxford as a modern Athens is a recurrent theme throughout the cycle: cf. 191 and 304. Here and at 190 there is a concomitant insinuation that Elizabeth is to be identified with Minerva.

35 - 64 The meter is Lesser Asclepiadics

40 Daphne, pursued by Apollo, was transformed into a laurel tree, from which was made a wreath for the god (Ovid, Metamorphoses 1.452 - 567). For decus unicum cf. Ps. - Seneca, Hercules Oetaeus 749.

41 - 5 A bevy of women mentioned by Ovid in the Metamorphoses. Clymene, daughter of Oceanus and Tethys, was the mother of Phaethon (II.156). Perse was the mother of Circe (IV.205). For Chione cf. XI.301 - 45. Leucothea (or Leucothoe), loved by Apollo, was changed into a frankincense bush (IV.255).

49 In his description of the royal visit, Philip Stringer wrote of "the coach wherein she was" (p. 250 Plummer). The "band of noble lords" are the members of the Privy Council, to whom we shall be introduced below.
The palatia are the various colleges and halls of the University.

Since monilibus and torquibus would seem redundant if both referred to necklaces, perhaps the former word is employed to designate ruffs.

It is now revealed why Apollo and the Muses were ejected from Greece: the coming of the Romans put an end to Greek civilization (Sanford had perhaps read such works as Plutarch’s essay On the Decline of the Oracle at Delphi). But surely there is a subtext: the Church of Rome is inimical to learning and culture.

Evidently in writing these lines Sanford was thinking of a passage in Ovid’s Metamorphoses in which the island of Delos offers its hospitality to Latona, pregnant with Apollo and Diana (VI.184 - 9):

Latonam praeferre mihi, cui maxima quondam
exiguam sedem pariturae terra negavit!
nec caelo nec humano aquis dea vestra recepta est:
exsul erat mundi, donec miserata vagantem
"hospita tu terris erras, ego” dixit “in undis"
instabilemque locum Delos dedit.

These lines are written in Alcaic stanzas.

Iova, a humanistic poetical contraction of Jehova, is also found at line 99 of Michael Wallace’s In Serenissimi Regis Jacobi...Carmen ἐπιχάρτικον, printed by Richard Field at London, 1606. (This poem has been published by Estelle Haan as “Milton’s In Quintum Novembris and the Anglo-Latin Gunpowder Epic, Part II”, Humanistica Lovaniensia 42 [1993], 368 - 401).

Sanford may have been thinking of Vergil, Aeneid I.53f.:

luctantis ventos tempestatesque sonoras
imperio premit ac vinclis et carcere frenat.


Academic disputations were staged as part of the Queen’s entertainment; Stringer and Wood provide detailed accounts, and some of the arguments advanced on this occasion survive.

The Queen’s visit lasted from September 22 to 28, eight days by the Roman inclusive method of reckoning.
89 - 124 This passage describes Elizabeth’s formal reception into Oxford on the afternoon of September 22, 1592. Some of its details can be glossed by Philip Stringer’s description of the event; others refer to transactions not mentioned by him.

Clio’s song is written in Sapphic stanzas.

89 Perhaps Sanford was thinking of Vergil, Aeneid XII.584, urbem alii reserare iubent et pandere portas.

90 An anonymous reader for this journal has pointed out that the book’s Calaena is a misprint for Calaeva, an old Roman name sometimes given to Oxford. Cf. the entry for Oxford in J. G. T. Graesse, Orbis Latinus (Amsterdam, 1969) vol. III, p. 89.

91f. According to Stringer (p. 250 Plummer) the Queen was greeted by Vice Chancellor Bond and other academic luminaries at Godstow Bridge, about a mile outside the city. If any gates were still hanging, their function was purely ceremonial. Cf. Nicholas Robinson’s description of the Queen’s 1566 entry (p. 176 Plummer), introit Regina in urbem per portam Aquilonarem, in qua carcer publicus est, qui Bocardo dicitur, intra duas turres quae portam utrinque claudunt, quaeque dealbatae erant.


98f. Cf. Stringer, ib., “Whereupon the Vicechancellor delivered up unto her Highness the Beadles staves, which were immediately re-delivered unto her by himself, with the signification of a speech wherewithall they were provided (as hir Highness understood) so that it were not too longe”.

101 - 4 A speech was then delivered by Mr. Thomas Savile of Merton College, Senior Proctor of the University, and brother of Sir Henry, the famous Tacitean scholar. Presumably the Queen was simultaneously presented with a copy of the oration.

109 For animo virili as a quality attributed to a woman cf. Ovid, Fasti II.847, Metamorphoses XIII.165, and Seneca, Agamemnon 958.
Camilla was the amazon-like Volscian princess who fought and died for the Italian cause in Book XI of the *Aeneid*.

This assertion is not quite true: during this visit a controversy between William Gager and Dr. John Rainolds about the propriety of acting, currently dividing the academic community, erupted, and Elizabeth was obliged to intervene during the present visit; in her farewell speech to the University she issued a warning against such dissension and implicitly rebuked Rainolds (for the text cf. Plummer, *op. cit.* 272f.).

This passage is written in Phalaecean lines.

The Attalids were a wealthy dynasty of Pergamum during the Alexandrian period.

Non ignara mali refers to Elizabeth’s treatment under Mary. The echo of Vergil, *Aeneid* 1.630, *non ignara mali miseris succurrere disco*, already makes Elizabeth a kind of second Dido.

The reference is to Dido receiving Aeneas and his wandering Trojans. There may be an allusion here to William Gager’s *Dido* of 1583, in which the comparison between Dido, often under the name Eliza, and Elizabeth had been drawn repeatedly.

The phrase *ludicra bella scholae* would seem calculated to echo the special prologue Gager wrote for the revival performance of Leonard Hutten’s comedy *Bellum Grammaticale* on this occasion:

```
accensa canimus praelia ac regum minas.
tu, diva, tantum propitia nobis fave,
o principum, regina, quot sunt optima,
et quot fuerunt, quotque venturis dehinc
erunt in annis. nec tamen tragoediam
ideo expavescas, bella quia canimus, dari.
ridicula canimus bella, ridiculos duces,
grammatica nempe bella, grammaticos duces.
arma hic sine armis, vulnera hic sine sanguine,
sine caede strages, saucii sine vulnere,
sine morte caedes, turgidae regum minae,
```
sed nominales atque verbales minae, 
fruitalesque turbae, scilicet quales dare 
rex nominalis rexque verbalis solent, 
academica mera iurgia ac rixae irritae. 
nihil hic erit reale, sed erunt omnia 
idola rerum, spectaque ac larvae leves. 
nam murium cruenta cum ranis fuit 
tristisque pugna. nullus hic manat crur, 
nisi forsan albus, quem fluere superis ferunt. 
hic sunt iocosa praetia, iocos duces; 
hic pugna, ludos, vulnera cachinnos dabunt. 
utinam illa suavem, diva, tibi risum exprimant.

166f. Cf. Vergil, Georgics IV.466, te veniente die, te decedente canebat.

170 Again, Sanford returns to the theme of identifying Elizabeth with Minerva, for Elizabeth is the proles Iovis of 185 - 93.

The meter of 170 - 97 is iambic dimeters. In the book lines 183 - 5 and 187 are indented for no obvious reason.

173 The gens togata is presumably the Athenian race and simultaneously the gown-clad Oxonians: cf. 191ff. (for the phrase cf. Vergil, Aeneid I.282, Martial XIV.cxxiv.1, and Statius, Silvae I.vi.360).

180 The book has virenti fronte, as if the prayer is to impart shining faces to the Oxford citizenry. This reading is scarcely impossible, but fronde seems to fit the context better; cf. also fronde with forms of vireo at Ovid, Metamorphoses XI.27, XI.108, and Statius, Silvae I.ii.231.

183ff. Cf. Vergil, Aeneid VI.808f.: 
quis procul ille autem ramis insignis olivae 
sacra ferens?

189 For Caballinus ("The Nag’s Spring") = Hippocrene, cf. Persius, Proem 1. Gager had used his expression in one of his printed odes on Elizabeth’s rescue from the Babington plot (poem XX.15).

198 - 221 Polyhymnia’s passage is written in Second Asclepiadeans.

201 In my translation I am not sure what to do with anguibus. I have construed it with cautius, as if Sanford were echoing Matthew 10:16, estote ergo prudentes sicut serpentes. But it might also be taken with
insidias. At the anonymous poem *Pareus* published by Barnes in 1585 (probably by George Peele), sig. A 7r, the image of the snake in the grass is also employed as a symbol of treason.

**202ff.** In writing these lines Sanford must have been thinking immediately of the storm that destroyed the Armada. More generally, he is touching on a theme that appears in a good deal of Elizabethan literature, the provident nature of England’s isolation. This theme can be traced back to Vergil, *Eclogue* i.5, *et penitus toto divisos orbe Britannos*. Cf. Shakespeare, *Cymbeline* III.i.13f., “a world by itself” and III.iv.136f. *I’ th’ world’s volume / Our Britain seems as of it, but not in’t*, and the speech in *Richard II* II.i. that begins with the line *This other Eden, demi-paradise.*

**210ff.** Sanford was of course thinking of a famous passage from the *Aeneid* (IV.364 - 6):

>nec tibi diva parens generis nec Dardanus auctor,  
>perfide, sed duris genuit te cautibus horrenes  
>Caucasus Hyrcanaeque admorunt ubera tigres.

**215** William Gager also wrote about this peculiar thirst for royal blood. For example, in poem III he discussed the dagger of the would-be assassin William Parry:

>praelurit olim pugio qui tuus  
in creditoris sanguine subditi  
>iam victimam spernens minorem  
imperii caput expetebat.

See also poems *VII.1f and XXV7f.*

**222 - 51** The meter is iambic trimeters alternating with iambic dimeters.

**237** Cf. Persius, *Satire* i.47, *neque enim mihi cornea fibra est.*

**240ff.** Once the Giants rebelled against Zeus, who buried one of them, Enceladus, under Mt. Aetna. The prayer is that this weight be shifted to modern conspirators, which would have the incidental effect of relieving Enceladus of his burden.

This passage seems reminiscent of a passage from Gager’s poem XXIII, from his cycle of odes on the Babington Conspiracy (45 - 60).
illi periclo dispereant suo
nati gygantum sanguine. spiritus
contunde sublimes, malumque
eveniat male cogitanti.\textsuperscript{18}

Pindo Tiphoeus Pelion obruat,
Ossamque Olympi mole cacuminet,
frendant Gygantes, et revulsas
Enceladus iaculetur ornos:

\textit{mainer trisulco fulmine Iuppiter}
\textit{sternet rebelles, impiger aggeres}
evertet, \textit{aeternumque flammis}
sulphureae cruciabit Aetnae.

Titana proles, consilii fere
expers, ruinam mole trahit sua.
odere divi quicquid altum
tentat iter, vetitumque nobis.

The present passage also echoes Vergil, \textit{Aeneid} III.578 - 82:

\textit{fama est Enceladi semustum fulmine corpus}
\textit{urgeri mole hac, ingentemque insuper Aetnam}
impostam ruptis flammis exspirare caminis,
et fessum quotiens mutet latus, intremere omnem
murmure Trinacriam et caelum subtexere fumo.

\textbf{247} The \textit{caedis} author is Cain.

\textbf{252 - 79} This passage consists of anapestic tetrameters, variously resolved.

\textbf{259 - 62} The image would be fresh in Oxonians’ minds since Gager’s tragicomic \textit{Ulysses Redux} had been produced at Christ Church in the preceding February.

\textbf{261} Cf., evidently, Ovid, \textit{Metamorphoses} IV.215f., \textit{ea fessa diurnis / membria ministeriiis nutrit reparetque labori}.

\textbf{263} Statius, \textit{Silvae} II.ii.108, \textit{Mygdonii Pyliique senis}. Presumably Sanford, like Statius, meant to indicate Tithonus, who asked for and received immortality from the gods but forgot to ask for perpetual youth,

\textsuperscript{18} The last two lines of this stanza were translated by the late C.F. Tucker Brooke as \textit{honi soit qui mal y pense}. 
so grew increasingly decrepit and eventually turned into a cicada. But this seems a strange kind of immortality to wish for Elizabeth!

264 Cf. the prophecy at Silvae IV.iii.150f.:
\[
\text{annos perpetua geres iuventa}
\quad \text{quo fertur placidos adisse Nestor,}
\]

280 - 99 Urania’s song consists of iambeliegic distichs: dactylic hexameters alternating with a line consisting an iambic dimeter + two and a half dactylic feet (a meter used in Horace, Epode xiii).

286 - 90 Sanford mentions three astrai transformations described by Ovid in the Metamorphoses, that of Erigone and Bootes, or Icarius (X.446ff.), of Ariadne (VIII. 172ff.), and Julius Caesar (XV.745ff.). In the case of the third of these, there is probably an insinuation here that Elizabeth’s Protestant star will eclipse Caesar’s Roman one. For Iulium sydus cf. Horace, Odes I.xii.46 - 8:
\[
\text{micat inter omnis}
\quad \text{Iulium sidus velut inter ignis}
\quad \text{luna minores.}
\]

The reader attuned to classical echoes might have recalled Propertius III.xiii.60, frangit tur ipsa suis Roma superba bonis.

This passage bears a striking resemblance to one in another 1592 volume of Latin poetry. At the end of the fourth Eclogue of Thomas Watson’s Amintae Gaudia the spirit of Sir Philip Sidney is transformed into a bright new star, appropriately named Astrophilus: cf. sig. K 1. Since Watson was buried at the church of St. Bartholomew-the-Less, London, on September 26, 1592, and Amintae Gaudia was registered with the Stationers’ Company on November 10, it is doubtful that either poet influenced the other. Presumably both were thinking of the nova of 1572 which inspired Tycho Brahe’s de Nova Stella, although that event actually occurred in Cassiopeia.

300 - 464 The meter changes to stichic hexameters.

301 For Aeonides = Boeotian or Theban, cf. the examples cited in the Oxford Latin Dictionary entry.

308 The Cathedral College of Christ was founded, under the name of Cardinal College, by Cardinal Wolsey in 1525. For “Attalid” cf. the Commentary note on 130.
312 The College of Mary Magdalene was founded by William Waynflete, Bishop of Winchester, in 1459.

316 The printer misread Sanford's curled abbreviation for -us as an elision-signifying apostrophe: read *ampla domus*.

319 Cf., evidently, Ovid, *Amores* I.iv.19, *verba...sine voce loquien-tia*.


> centum aliae totidemque pares aetate ministri,
> qui dapibus mensas onerent et pocula ponant.


335 - 40 William Cecil, Lord Burghley (1530 - 98).

337 As indicated by the sidenote, the tag *aevi prudentia nostri* comes from Ovid, *Metamorphoses* XII.178.

341 - 8 Edward Somerset, fourth Earl of Worcester (1553 - 1628); cf. the *D. N. B.* biography. He was one of several members of the Council who received an M. A. on this occasion. His sons Henry (destined to be the fifth Earl and first Marquis of Worcester) and Charles were both Magdalene men (Joseph Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses*, London, 1891 - 2, reprinted Nendeln, 1968, IV, p. 1389).

A full list of recipients of M. A.'s on this occasion, with some biographical sketches, is given by Anthony à Wood, *Fasti Oxonienses* I, p. 260f.

349 - 58 George Clifford, third Earl of Cumberland (1558 - 1605); cf. the *D. N. B.* biography. He too received an M. A. now.

358 A grim but untranslatable pun: the surface of the sea is sometimes called *marmor* in Latin poetry.
359 - 67 Henry Herbert, second Earl of Pembroke (1534? - 1601); cf. the D. N. B. biography. Another recipient of an M. A. His son William Herbert was also present on this occasion.

367 A heraldic motto suggested by Ovid, *Heroides* xvii.265.

369 - 83 Essex had attended Cambridge where, according to the practice of the the times, he received a courtesy M. A. Those familiar with Essex’ flamboyant career at Cambridge, where he distinguished himself chiefly by running up debts, will be amused by this account of his erudition. It is noticeable that the passage devoted to Essex is the longest of the series.


373 Though ὁζος Ἀρηος is a common Homeric formula, the sidenote cites its application to Titaereus at the Hesiodic *Shield of Heracles* 181.

375 - 80 In 1589, without first securing the queen’s permission, Essex joined Drake’s expedition, where, as his D. N. B. biography put it, “he distinguished himself in an aimless way”.

385 - 9 Henry Wriothesley, third Earl of Southampton (1573 - 1624); cf. his life in the D. N. B. He is of course best remembered as the patron of Shakespeare.

390 - 6 Charles Howard, Baron Howard of Effingham and Earl of Nottingham, the Lord High Admiral (1536 - 1624); there is a biography in the D. N. B.


397 - 402 Fernando Stanley, Lord Strange (1559? - 94). “On the death of his father on 25 September, 1593, he succeeded to the earldom of Derby and the sovereignty of Man” - D. N. B.

407 - 9 Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst (1536 - 1608), the Chancellor of the University of Oxford; cf. the D. N. B. life.

426 According to Stringer, pp. 251 and 257 Plummer, Elizabeth twice heard disputations at St. Mary’s, on the afternoons of September 23 and 26. The former occasion was the first full day of her visit, and on the 25th the Privy Council had met in session (*ib.* p. 256). It would seem more probable that this banquet was held at midday on the 26th.

442f. Sanford was perhaps thinking of Psalm 24:9, *Lift up your heads, O ye gates; even lift them up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of glory shall come in.*


451 For *Eois...ab Indis* cf. Ovid, *Amores* II.vi.1. But of course the phrase had acquired a new significance in view of modern geographical discoveries.

454 Cf. Vergil, *Georgics* II.121, *velleraque ut foliis depectant tenuia Seres?* (evidently Sanford had no clearer idea than did Vergil of how silk is manufactured).

455f. Is there an insinuation that the inmates of Magdalene live, and extend hospitality, like Philemon and Baucis at Ovid, *Metamorphoses* VIII.629 - 724?

465-506 Elegiac distichs.

465-74 The sidenote refers to Ovid, *Metamorphoses* XV.560ff. and Plutarch, *Life of Romulus* xx.5 - 6 (but Plutarch only says that in the time of Caesar the tree was inadvertently destroyed by workmen).

The University of California, Orange, CA 92717.
A LATIN FUNERAL ORATION FROM VILNIUS (1594)
Edited, with introduction and notes*

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this article is to offer a new edition of the following funeral oration: *Oratio in exequiis nobilis et generosi adolescentis Adaucti Kownacki, studiosi Academiae Vilnensis, S<ocietatis> I<esu>, A Iacobo Eucholcio habita Vilnae in aede sacra D<ivi> Ioannis, ad studiosam iuventutem III. Kal<endas> Aprilis M. D. XC. IV. Vilnae, In Officina Societ<atis> lesu*.

With the oration we will edit the accompanying pieces, viz.
1. a dedication letter of Ludovicus Weiher to Valentinus Kownacki, father of the deceased Adauctus Kownacki;
2. four *epicedia*, written by Thomas Karlowski, Bartholomeus Radziminowicz, Ioannes Milecki and an English poet Gulhielmus Soteronus and, finally,
3. an *eteostichon* (chronogram) by Andreas Rochmanius Nieswiezensis.

1. THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM AT VILNIUS UNIVERSITY IN THE 16TH - 17TH CENTURIES

Vilnius University was founded on the basis of a secondary school — the College of Vilnius — which existed from 1570. Pope Gregory XIII announced the bull concerning the transformation of the *Collegium Vilnense* into the *Alma Academia et Universitas Vilnensis Societatis Iesu* on October 30, 1579. The bull read that all the rights of the newly established university were granted to the Superior General of the Jesuit

---

* I am particularly indebted to Doc. Dr. Hans Helander for his unremitting help and expert advice concerning this edition. My thanks to Prof. Dr. Sten Eklund and Dr. Monica Hedlund from the Department of Classical Languages at Uppsala University (Sweden).
Order. Thus the Pope handed Vilnius University into the property of the Jesuit Order.

Unlike most universities in Western Europe, which usually had four faculties (theology, philosophy, law, and medicine), the University of Vilnius had only two, theology and philosophy.

From the end of the 16th Century all Jesuit schools were governed in accordance with the regulations issued by the Superior General and called Ratio Studiorum (published in Rome in 1599). They set out the duties of provincials, rectors and other officials, as well as the main aims of educational theory. The Jesuits used a formal humanistic teaching method — linguistic-philosophical method — at the University. It was a typical model of education commonly used in Europe.

First of all, students had to take a five-year course at the College. At that time Latin was a vehicle of culture and scholarship in Europe. As prescribed by the Ratio studiorum, Latin was taught throughout all five years at the College: three years were assigned to the rudiments of Latin, one year to stylistics, and the last year to rhetoric. In order to improve the level of Latin studies, the Jesuits introduced a six-year course of Latin in 1583. The course in Latin grammar was divided, too. During the first two years students had to learn the rudiments of morphology and some rules of syntax, in the third year they had to study morphology and syntax at a more advanced level, and in the fourth year they went over the whole subject again.

For grammar classes students analysed Cato’s distichs, read and learned by heart texts of Canisius’s catechism, Despauterius’s grammar book, analysed selected letters from Cicero, learned the rudiments of Greek. The main textbook for teaching Latin at first was Aelius Donatus’s Ars Minor (Ars Prima), but the most famous textbook was De institutione grammatica libri tres (ed. princ.: 1572) of the Portuguese Jesuit Emmanuel Alvarus [Alvarez], which had already been widely used in Western Europe for twenty years or so before it was published for the first time at Vilnius in 1592.

Four years was a long enough period for students to master Latin grammar and to learn to speak Latin. The fifth year was devoted to the literary and stylistic analysis of Roman authors, such as Virgil, Horace, Ovid etc. Students sometimes even tried their hand at writing verse in Latin which was then corrected by their teachers.

Eucholcius’ text illustrates the results of this education. His vocabulary consists of soundly classical words, and only allows a few terms with a
typically Christian or mediaeval meaning, such as "academia", a university, "dominus" used as a title, "Deus" the God of the Christians and "divinae literae", the Bible. The same can be said of Eucholcius's morphology which is entirely classical except for one instance of late and mediaeval usage, which survives in many Neo-Latin texts, viz. the ablative singular ending on i: maiori cura instead of maiore cura. Finally, in matters of syntax the author essentially adheres to the moderate Ciceronian model as can be expected in a text written in a Jesuit environment.

In rhetoric students had to learn the art of eloquence. From the end of the 16th century the textbook of another Portuguese author, Cyprianus Soarius's De arte rhetorica (1560) was used for rhetorical studies at the University. The author referred to the classical rhetorical rules of Aristotle, Cicero and Quintilian. The students analysed various aspects of Cicero's orations and wrote Latin speeches themselves. Cicero was the greatest authority in matters of style, but other authors read during all the years of studia humaniora were, among others: Ovid, Virgil, Horace, Tibullus, Catullus, Tacitus, Caesar, Sallust, Livy, Homer, Demosthenes, Isocrates, Hesiod, Theognis, Aesop, and John Chrysostom.

After graduating from the College, students could enter the Faculty of Philosophy where the studies went on for another three years. Here they studied logic in the first year, physics (natural philosophy) in the second year, and metaphysics and ethics in the third year. The professor of philosophy had to adhere to scholastic philosophy, and especially to the teaching of such authorities as Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus etc. The moral philosophy course which was also based on Aristotle, treated spiritual and physical good as two opposites. True good could only be spiritual and moral in its nature.

Young men who did not want to be ordained finished their studies by graduating from the Faculty of Philosophy, whereas seminarians continued their studies in the Faculty of Theology for about four more years. This faculty had departments of Theology, Holy Scripture and Hebrew. So the complete studies lasted for around twelve years, and the student graduated from the Faculty of Theology became a member of the Jesuit Order.1

2. Latin in Vilnius.

Quite a lot of literary works on Lithuanian matters were written in Latin before the University was founded.

One of the first Lithuanian authors who wrote in Latin was Michalo Husovianus (around 1480 - after 1533). His poem Carmen de statura, feritate ac venatione bisontis, published in Cracow in 1523, describes the Lithuanian landscape, way of life and customs, touches on some actual political problems, and reflects the clash of paganism and Christianity. A person under the pseudonym Michalo Lituanus (around 1490 - 1560) wrote a treatise De moribus Tartarorum, Lituanorum et Moschorum in the middle of the 16th century, but it was not published until 1615 in Basel. An extraordinary figure in the cultural life of Lithuania in the 16th century was the lawyer and poet of Spanish origin Petrus Roysius Maurus Alcaginicensis (around 1505 - 1571). The publicist, lawyer, and mayor of Vilnius, Augustinus Rotundus (around 1520 - 1582) wrote a no longer extant history of Lithuania in Latin around the year 1560. Ioannes Radvanus, a humanist poet of the second half of the 16th century, wrote an epic poem imitating the Aeneis of Vergil. His Radivilias, intended to become the Lithuanian national epic, was published in Vilnius in 1588.

These and other writers of prose and poetry created a rich humanistic Latin literature of various genres, and the newly established Academia et Universitas Vilnensis could draw from its tradition.2 Neo-Latin literature at the Academy is connected with European Neo-Latin literature in general, viz. with the genres and forms of ancient literature reborn in the times of Humanism. At the same time, it is full of local color and references to the cultural and political life of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

The professors and students of the Academy wrote in verse as well as in prose. They dedicated their works to kings and dignitaries attending the temple of knowledge, congratulated them on their birth or marriage, and wrote funeral orations on their decease. Victories, nearly every school holiday, conferral of the academic degrees etc. were immortalized in verses. Everyone who graduated from the College was supposed to be able to write poetry.

---

The habit of holding funeral orations in Latin spread in Lithuania in the 16th century. Not so many of these funeral orations are extant and it is difficult to determine the date when the first of them was held.

3. Eucholcius’s Oration.

Funeral orations (oratio or laudatio funebris), as we know, belong to epideictic oratory (genus demonstrativum), the aim of which is to praise a person’s qualities and virtues. This can be done by means of the encomiastic topoi. An epideictic oration was supposed to create a pattern of virtue and to make it attractive to the audience through the use of a ceremonial style. How this was achieved by Eucholcius we will try to show by means of a few remarks on the author’s inventio and his Latin language.

The author’s first task is to collect the material for his text (Inventio). The orator, according to Cicero (De oratore II 99), must be well acquainted with his subject matter. Therefore, an author of a funeral oration should be well informed about the course of life of the deceased.

Jacobus Eucholcius in his oration on Adauctus Kownacki, however, does not care much for biographical details, and it is not an exaggeration to claim that the biographical element is hardly present at all. Eucholcius does not bother to give us a full and reliable curriculum vitae of Kownacki (sometimes the Latinised form Kownacius is used). He does not even try to draw a comprehensive picture of the deceased. It seems as though the person to whom the oration is devoted serves only as a means to achieve other goals, which is why just the most common traits of the character and deeds of the deceased are mentioned. Adauctus Kownacki was “… ingenii viribus et facultate subnixus, usu, exercitationeque dicendi perpolitus, forma et specie liberali praeditus, in rebus agendis promptissima quadam celeritate gratus”, so that “…in tantis naturae et fortunae muneribus, submissione animi ornatus, oculos omnium recreare ac delectare sua presentia, atque animos in sui amorem et admirationem potuit pertrahere” (§2). Furthermore, he was an “optima spe et indole praeditus adolescens” (§72).

Since Aristotle the inventio was based on a number of loci communes or topoi which the author was supposed to use. Among such topoi we usually find an apology of the orator’s inadequacy to treat such an important theme in fitting terms. Surprisingly, therefore, Iacobus

---

Eucholcius, does not regret his insufficient skilfulness to compose a funeral oration. On the contrary, he is quite sure that he is able to do what is required (§8). And, in order to make himself credible, Eucholcius often refers to his own or his listeners’ personal experiences, another well-known locus communis: nam potestis recordari (§2), arbitror (§12), animaduerteremus (§22), videmus (§37), animaduertimus (§58), intelligitis (§61), recordamini (§66), mihi credite (§72).

Among the many other topoi in Eucholcius’s oration I will limit myself to one more, viz. the mediaeval “Ubi sunt?” motive, best known from the students’ song Gaudeamus igitur: “Ubi sunt qui ante nos, in mundo fuere, etc.” Compare §56 of the text in which it appears in combination with the related Ash Wednesday motive: “Memento, homo, quia pulvis es...”.

4. TEXT EDITION

a) The Authors

The authors of the Oratio and the funeral poetry were obviously students of Vilnius University, but since there is no matricula of the Alma Academia et Universitas Vilnensis extant it is very difficult to know more about Iacobus Eucholcius and the other authors of the book. We only can refer to some other books of the same period (1594-96) in which we find their names and which show that they were rather actively engaged in writing epicedia.

1. The Threni in exequias ... Lazari Philonis Kmitae Czarnobylski Palatinidae Smolescensis ... (Vilnae, 1594) contain the following contributions:
   Iacobus Eucholcius, Non segnis stat remeatque dies;
   Ludovicus Veiherus, In obitum Lazari Kmitae ode tricolos tetrastrophos;
   Ioannes Milecki, Mors reprobis nox, electis lux;
   Gulielmus Soteronus Anglus, Hic via, ubi patria;
   Thomas Karlowski, Homo vitae commodatus non donatus est;
   Barholomeus Radziminowicz; Non mors at Kmita triumfhat..

2. In the Parentalia in obitum ... Georgii Chodkievicii Generalis Capitanei Samogitiae etc. etc. A sodalibus Congregationis Parthenicae, Academiae Vilnensis, Societatis Iesu ... (Vilnae, In Typographia Academiae S. I., 1595) one finds again three of them:
   Iacobus Eucholcius, Sodalitas Parthenica moerorem et desiderium testatur;
   Ioannes Milecki, Cinis exaequat omnes;
   Gulielmus Soteronus Anglus, Moerorem terrigenis, gaudium coelitibus attulit.
3. A third collection is *Funebris laudatio et threnodiae, in exequis Ornatissimi et Lectissimi adolescentis Ioannis Barscii. A studiosa iuventute conscriptae, in Academia Vilnensi Societatis Iesu* (Vilnae, In Officina Academicis societatis Iesu, 1595), with, again, Iacobus Eucholcius as the author of a *Chorus sive responsum puerorum Brausbergenium*, and Gulielmus Soteronus Anglus, who contributed an *Epitaphium Ioanni Barscio defuncto*.

4. Finally, one of the poets, Ioannes Milecki, is the author of *Virtutem sequitur gloria* in a booklet published one year later, viz. *Threni in obitum ... Nicolai Szymanowski, studiosi philosophiae in Academia Vilnensi Soc. Iesu. A iuventute eiusdem Academiae scripti* (Vilnae, 1596).

b) The Original Edition

Iacobus Eucholcius, *Oratio in exequis nobilis et generosi adolescentis Adaucti Kownacki, studiosi Academiae Vilnensis, S. I.*


The cover of the book is missing. The text is placed in an ornamental border. The pages are cut down to the border; the present format is 13,5 cm x 17,5 cm.

Only copy known: Uppsala (Sweden), University Library. Shelf mark: Kapsel Biografi Slav. [Kownacki].

c) Editorial Principles

I shall edit the texts here on the basis of the only known copy of the oration printed in Vilnius in 1594.

The number of misprints in the text is very low. I have corrected two grammatical errors which are obviously instances of accidental lapses (*opresserit* (§38) was spelled with one *s* and *praecoccupari* (§39) — with one *c*).

The original and rather inconsistent and in places unclassical spelling has been kept everywhere. Accents have been removed, abbreviations have been resolved (including *q* with a flourish which has been resolved into *-que*) and the numerous ampersands spelled out as “et”.

In accordance with modern principles I used a modern punctuation (Cf. J. IJsewijn. *Companion to Neo-Latin studies*. Amsterdam 1977¹, p. 222 ff.). The use of capital letters has been left the same as it is in the original text in order to preserve the spirit of the panegyric.

I have divided the text into paragraphs for the sake of convenience. The original edition itself did not contain any paragraphs or subdivisions.
LUDOVICUS WEIHER VALENTINO KOWNACKI S.P.D.


⁵ For the expression “Vincula corporis” (also used by Eucholcius in his Oratio, §6) compare Cic., Sen. 81; Tusc. I 75; Rep. VI 14; Nat. Deor. II 115. It is a common Platonic image: “vincula” may just mean “bonds” joining the soul to the body, the δεσμοι of Plato, Timaeus 42e, 44b, 81D; but there is often the further implication that the body is a prison for the soul.
⁶ Cf. Cic., Tusc. I 85: “Metellum enim multi filii, filiae, nepotes, neptes in rogum imposuerunt...”
⁷ Cf. Cic., Sen. 73.
perfecto functus est munere". 6. Caeterum pergratum tibi fore arbitror, quod pro meo amore et studio, quo mirifice Adauctum prosequebar, hanc ad te funebrem misi Orationem, ut tu potissimum eam haberes, ad quem maeroris pars maxima pertinebat. Vale. Vilnae Idibus Aprilis M. D. XC. IV.

(II)

ORATIO
IN EXEQUIIS NOBILIS ET GENEROSI ADOLESCENTIS
ADAUCTI KOWNACKI, STUDIOSI ACADEMIAE
VILNENSI SOCIETATIS IESU HABITA.

1. Vellern Deus immortalis fecisset, lectissimi atque omatissimi Auditores, ut viuum potius Adauctum Kownacium, nobilem adolescentem haberemus, quam eidem mortuo honores quaereremus. 2. Nam potestis recordari, quantum ingenii viribus et facultate subnixus, usu exercitatione dicendi perpolitus, forma et specie liberali praeditus, in rebus agendis promptissima quadam celeritate gratis, atque in tantis naturae et fortunae munere submissione animi ornatus, oculos omnium recreare ac delectare sua praesentia, atque animos in sui amorem et admirationem potuit pertrahere. 3. Iam autem mortuus, quem fructum, quod commodum, quod solatum potest nobis adferre, quam ut seipsum triste et lugubre exemplum praebat, ac cunctos mortales ex hoc suo lamentabili feretro, quanquam vitali spiritu priuatus, graviter admoneat: 4. Nihil solidum et constans in rebus esse humanis, nullam aetatem tam firmam atque robustam, nullam tarn elegantem et gratam esse speciem corporis, quam ex improviso dies supremus irruens non possit conuellere atque deiicere.

5. Merito igitur Pythagoras, in naturis abditis rerum difficilium iustrandis atque explicandis ingeniosissimus, non minus sapienter quam vere docuit: omnibus hominibus, cuiuscunque sint conditionis et fortunae, fato decretum esse mori, ut tempestiue integerrimam vitam, modestissimos

8 The author erroneously quotes Aeschines. The quotation is found in the Anthologium of Ioannes Stobaeus (edd. C. Wachsmuth and O. Hense, Berlin 1912, vol. V, p. 1072, quot. 24-25). It is attributed to Musonius, but follows one ascribed to Aeschines [not the Athenian orator and opponent of Demosthenes, but the 4th c. B. C. philosopher Aeschines Socraticus]. Hence the mistake of Weiher or his source.

9 Quotation taken from the Aurea carmina Pythagorae. See: Virgilius collatione scriptorum Graecorum illustratus, opera et industria Fuluii Ursini (Antverpiae, Ex officina
mores, summam fidem, continentiam, pietatem, innocentiam esse completae, condiscerent universi. 6. Atque utinam inuigilemus quos diligenterissime et excubemus, Auditores optimi, ne imparati ac pietatis atque virtutis ornamentis destiti, ex hoc vitae ergastolo ac vinculis corporis a Deo Optimo Maximo euocemur; quod quo commodius fiat a nobis, in hac literatissimorum adolescentum frequentia dicendum est praecipium studium ad hoc esse conferendum, ut subsidia nobis ad bene moriendum, dum vivimus, comparemus. 7. Vos oro atque obscecor in re maximim momenti attentionem singularem ne denegatis. 8. Quod si mihi a vobis tribui concedique sentiam, perficiam profecto ut non solum tam tristi, tam lucutoso, tamque moesto spectaculo interfuisse, verumtim cum fructu et emolumento hasce exequias vestri diarissimi atque optimi commilitonis Adaucti Kownaci, celebriassie videamini.

9. More consuetudineque non sapientissimorum modo ac prudentissimorum virorum, sed etiam vulgi et inferioris conditionis hominum esse receptum didicimus in actionibus nimirum humanis et ciuilibus, quo maiores sunt temporis angustiae ad negotium perfeicendum, ex quo plurimum vel utilitatis vel incommodi sive in Repmublicam sive in privatas vitae rationes profuit, eo diligentius et acriore studio incumberendum esse, ut non parai momenti negotium, finem suam ac exitum foeliciem atque prosperum valeat obtinere. 10. Etenim brevitas temporis cum rei magnitudine coniuncta ita solet mortalium mentes ad neruos et vires intendendas acuere, atque adeo infiammare, ut vix possint alium quam de negotio transigendo cogitare. 11. Sapientis autem est non solum uti velie in rebus praeclaris temporis opportunitate et commoda occasione, verumtim, cum in breve temporis spatum nostrae concludentur actiones, solicite atque summa vigilantia easdem expedire, ac salutari fine atque exitu terminare.

12. Praeclarum igitur fuisse consilium clarissimi et eloquentissimi viri Demosthenis arbitror, cum Atheniensibus ancipiti deliberatione distractis Olynthios in amicitiam et societatem, quam per Oratores suos postulabant, recipiendos esse suasit. 13. Videbat enim vir prudentia praeditus


11 See note 3 above.

12 Dem., Olynth. I

16. Sei Chrysostomus, vir cum in dicendo copiosissimus, in permovendis animis vehementissimus, in exponendis divinis litteris argutissimus, tum vero in virtutibus exercendis studiosissimus, dixit: “Non secus habere se hanc vitam, quam somnium quoddam et scenam, qua sublata, omnes rerum varietates tollerentur, utque oriente sole tolluntur insomnia, sic in fine vitae cuncta euanscere et ad nihilum recidere; arborem quidem plantatam et insitam domumque aedificatam diutius perstare, artificem autem qui construxit et agricolam qui plantauit, cito ex hoc caetu et frequentia mortalium fatali quadam necessitate semigrare ac secedere”. 14 17. Nec minus vere omnis sanctitatis atque eruditionis lumen et ornamentum Augustinus testatum reliquit: “Ipsa, inquit, longa hominis vita tanta brevitate constringitur, ut ad universum seculum, tanquam una gutta ad immensam maris amplitudinem comparetur”. 15

18. Sic est, Auditores: ex hac vita discedimus tanquam ex hospitio, 16 non tanquam ex domo: commorandi enim nobis natura diuersorium, non habitandi dedit. 19. Dies aetatis nostrae celeriter velut umbra fugiunt, repente ceu fumus deficiunt, velocius praeterunt quam ab opifice tela succiditur. 20. Xerxes ille magnus Rex potentissimusque, qui montes subuertit, maria constrauit, flumina exhausit, cum e sublimi loco, infini tam hominum multituidinem et innumerabiles vidisset copias, fertur lachrymasse, quod post centesimum annum nullus eorum, quos tunc cernebat, superfuturus esst. 21. Quod si super altissimam liceret speculam

---

14 A paraphrase of John Chrysostom’s In Episl. I ad Timoth. 5, homil. 15.3.
16 For “hospitium” as “mundus tanquam temporarium habitaculum” or “terra, quae christianis ad patriam caelestem migrantibus hospitium tantum est”, see ThLL, coll. 3041, 76 ff.
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ascendere, Auditores studiosissimi, ex cuius fastigio terram videremus uniuersam, iam totius mundi ruinas, gentes gentibus, Reges Regibus, regna regnis intueremur contemplaremurque quasi sata et collis; alios etiam torqueri, alios necari, alios fluctibus absorberi, alios in acie occumbere cernemus. 22 Hic laeticiam, ibi plantum esse, hos nascli, illos subito mori, alios diuitis aliquanto tempore affluere, alios inopia premi atque ad interitum labi voluntarium animaduerteremus. 17


29. Ac aetatis quidem breve et minime protentum interiullum ad subsidia comparanda, quibus in extrema animi et corporis disiunctione utile liceat, nos excitat. 30. Quod dicam de variis et subitis casibus ac procellis quibus eadem hominum vita obsidetur, oppugnatur, capitur. 31. Nonne ut solici, ut anxie, ut accurare vitae nostrae rationes dispiciamus, utque in iis ad viam rectam et planam, tempore antequam quispiam casus interueniat, et lucem hanc nobis eripiat, deducendis, operam et studium ponamus admonemur? 32. Quis autem ex omni hominum aetate, ordine,

17 §§20-24 are partly a verbal quotation and partly a paraphrase of St. Jerome, Epist. 60, 18.6-19.


19 For the combination of “momentum et punctum temporis” see Hier., In Eph. 4.22; Prud., Paenit. 56.2; Ps. Ambr., Paenit. 2, p. 973C.
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genere reperietur, cui casus aliquando ad eripiendam vitam non immineat atrociter, non impendeat misere, non appropinquet periculo? 33. Nam quemadmodum nova fictilia vasa perinde sunt exposta corruptionis periculo ac vetera, ita adolescentes florenti aetate ac vigore omnium sensuum atque promptitudine ad res obeundas et perficiendas praediti, peraeque mortis acerbitate ac vehementia concidunt et franguntur, ac homines qui vel senio debilitati, vel longinquitate morbi sunt defessi.

34. Adeo quaelibet aetas subjectam se mortis dimicationi et contentioni experitur. Non enim ea lege nati viuimus ut ad summam senectutem pertingere sit necesse. 35. Quod cum ita sit, nolite quaeso, ea spe freti, virtutes sanctissimas et religionis amorem negligentius comparare. Quidquid datur ad vivendum temporis, id lucro apponite.21 36. Magno errore ducitur et vehementer, mihi credite, fallitur, qui normam recte ac laudabiliter agendi in extremam differt aetatem, nec iuventutis suae inesperatos repentinosque casus et prolapso reformidat. 37. Ut enim si in officinam quisquam ingressus, in qua vasa finguntur lutea, mensam vasis fictilibus partim recens factis, partim antiquioribus referatam videt, atque ex artifice quodnam istorum fictilium citius frangetur, et suae amittet formae pulchritudinem quaereret, id feret ab eo responsi: vas illud prius fractum iri, quod in terram prius delapsum fuerit. Sic equidem cum hominum genere et aetate agi videmus. 38. Nam ex hac vitae atque lucis excidit communione, et in externas ac longe disiunctas migrat regiones, non qui fuerit aetate proueectior et antiquior, sed quem casus repentinus et improvisus oppresserit, et minimè sperata vis morbi ex hoc vitae amplissimo theatro expulerit atque exturbavit. 39. Et quemadmodum accidit eos, qui iter faciunt et sermones varios miscent et ultro citroque tempus colloquiis fallunt, dum minime cogitant, soleas occasu praecipitante, antequam ad locum praefixum perveniant, luce destituti et tenebris increbrescentibus praecipitati, ita mors incautos ex improviso plurimos, de cuius aduentu tantum abest ut cogitauerint, ut ne suspiciati sint quidem, adoritur.

40. Atque utinam, Auditores nobilissimi, nec punctum temporis ad bene et honeste in integritate pulchritudineque conscientiae moriendum simus imparati. 41. Optarem authori et parenti omnis naturae Deo, optarem, inquam, cum ea qua par est sanctimonia ac innocentia animum, quocunque casu, seu repentino, seu praeuoso, auulsum a corpore pie et religiose redderemus, illudque quod bonus et frugi famulus faciendum

sibi cogitat, vel potius decernit, faceremus. Nam cum se ab hero suo, cui obsequium praestabat, dimittendum et ablegandum animadvertit, prior ipse praeveniens herum, sponte et ultero postulat missionem. 42. Hoc si-quidem honestius esse et consultius iudicat, ut non tam ejcendum, quam decenter se ab obsequiis liberatum palam cuiuis interroganti respondere possit. Sic cum haec vita mortalis certissime ac fortassiss ex insperato desertura nos sit ac derelictura, satius est ut eius amore deposito, lenociinis repudiatis, suauitate contempta, ad relinquendum eam paratis-simae ac promptissimae inueniamur, nostrique officii putemus esse manere in vigilia perenni, neque oculos a pietate et religione deicere, cum tempus ignemus occasus nostri atque iteritus. 43. Age vero, num se vivisse verè dicere potest, qui viciis, qui sceleribus, qui flagitiis aetatem suam per annos complures turpissime infecit ac nefarie contaminavit?

44. Sicut enim ille, quem saewa tempestas a portu exceptum huc atque illuc vi ventorum undique ex aduerso furentium per eadem maris spatia in orbem egit, non multum nauigasse, sed multum iactatus esse dicitur, sic qui variis in criminiibus et sceleribus vitam suam sanctam in orbis quo-dam turpiter circumegit et nequiter finuit, non tam vivisse diu, quam diu hic fuisse dixi debet. 45. Illa, illa demum vera vita et hominis dicenda est, quae in rectissimis et laudatissimis virtutibus ab ineunte aetate usque ad extremum spiritum consumitur. Quam ut egisse videamini, Auditores, per Deum immortalem oro, remittite nuncium improbitati; cum virtute necessitudinem et coniunctionem instituite; frena cupiditatibus inii-cite; amorem rerum conditarum in ipsummet conditorem et authorem potentissimum et sapientissimum omnium rerum Deum transfundere contendite. 46. Ille enim bene et suauiter moritur, qui semper studio singulari ad extremum cum morte conflictum se sit, dux vivit, comparavat.

47. At si numen Diiunum, immortale ac aeternum non ex qualibet aetate et conditione homines ad mortem destinaret, sed tantummodo aetatis viros grauioris ad desendentum hanc miseram et calamitosam vitam cogeret atque impelleret, profecto, qui adolescentiae et iuuentutis tempus minimé excessimus, secure et desidiose in cura nostri animi versari possemus et, tanquam ultimas procul distaret terminus, remisse et negligenter de fine ultimo vitae cogitaremus, et de vigiliis atque excubiis, quas Servator uniuersi orbis maximus mortalium generi consulit, remitteremus; sin autem certissimum est, ulli aetati mortalium non modo non ignosci, sed etiam cunctos homines sub iura mortis, tam pueros et adolescentes, quam iuuenes ac viros trahi, quid faciendum esse nobis existimabimus?

48. Quo curas et cogitationes conuertemus? Quem ad finem haec in
nobis perniciosa securitas permanebit? 49. Certe “omnes eodem cogimur; omnium versatur urna serius ocus”, ut ait excellens Poeta,
†sit† “exitura”; 22 “omne capax mouet urna nomen; sortitur insignes et imos”; 23 “mors non parcit imbellis iuuentae polпитibus”; 24 “mista
senum ac iuuenum densantur funera”. 25 Et tamen nos periculi non commouet magnitudo! Fiducia virium corporis erigit ac extollit; adoles-
centiae et iuuentutis ardo sperare iubet longiora; negligere integritatem
animi et in aliud tempus patituir diifferre!

51. Sed ne longinqua et externa aliunde sumamus exempla, te unum
alloquor, ADAUCTE KOWNACKI, et quidem tristis ac pene suffusus
lachrymis te, inquam, alloquor, quem in aetate florentissima, in ipso
cursu industriae tuae, cum arcem et fastigium Eloquentiae 26 prehendere
conarere, cum inter aequales nauiter, et quam studiosissime officium
tuum, cum dignitate tuere, ex insperato aggressa est corporis aegro-
tio, quae breui tempore te iuuenem ex Academiae conspectu summo
conactorum dolore commilitonum violenter abripuit. 52. Tu equidem cae-
teris adolescentibus tuo exemplo praescriversi non annis iuuenilibus,
non integris viribus, non scientia et optimarum artium studiis gloriant-
dum, sed, quantumuis haec sint in quolibet adolescentum maxima, appa-
ratum quendam virtutum singularem, quarum praesidio in fine ultimo
atque exitu vitae tuti et muniti simus, instituendum esse. 53. Iam tuus
decor, ο ADAUCTE charissime, iacet hoc feretro tristi et squalido; iam
forma et species liberalis contabuit; iam viuidus et pene roseus ille color
e vultu cecidit; iam omnes partes corporis sordescunt; iam vermium
multitudine scatent; iam lingua quondam diserta torpet; iam omnis
industria sopita concidunt; iam te familiares tui atque amici vix sine hor-
roke aspicere possunt. 54. Quam cito illa omnia, quae in bonis corporis
numerari solent, forma, vires, celeritas, in tantam venere abiectionem! Ο
miseros homines, qui haec caduca, fragilia, interitiu subiecta munera plus
aequo, cum in seipsis, tum in aliis admirantur ac diligunt! Ο inconsultam
animi temeritatem, quae hisce, infaelix, bonis inanibus nimium detinetur!

55. Videte, oro, Auditores humanissimi, et animis vestris consilium
salutare et necessarium maximi et clarissimi Doctoris Ecclesiae

22 Hor., Carm. II 3. 25-27, where one reads “sors exitura”.
23 Hor., Carm. III 1. 15-16, quoted in reversed order.
24 Hor., Carm. III 2. 13-15.
25 Hor., Carm. I 28. 29.
26 A combination of Tacitus, Dial. 10.5 (“arx eloquentiae”) and Quintilian XII 1.20
and XII 11.28 (“fastigium eloquentiae”).
Augustini penitus mandate, qui homines bonis hisce caducis affluentes, ad considerationem supremi diei atque contemplationem, reuocat. 


57 Haec sane verissima est innocentis simi et grauissimi viri sententia.

58. Idcirco vosipsi, Auditores lectissimi, tacitis animi sensibus expendite ac iudicate, quam sit periculosa cunctatio et tergiuersatio, non mature quietem et tranquillitatem optimae quaerere conscientiae, quae superueniente repentino mortis casu possit animum mentemque consolari et omni desperatione liberare, atque in conspectu seuerissimi mortalium cunctorum judicis incolumes et saluos collocare. 59. Sed proh dolor, etiamsi caeteros ex hac vita in iuuenilibus annis excedere animaduertimus, tarnen quodammodo nos mortales esse non cogitamus ac ne idem nobis paulo post accidat minime pertimescimus, nec ad eluendas vitiorum sordes animum adicimus, perindeque nobis accidit ac nauibus duabus, quae in alto mari contra se plenis velis remisque contendunt. 59. Quemadmodum enim cum una alteram praeteruehitur, utrique quod ipsamet firma consistat et altera celeriter praetereat videtur, cum tarnen reuera ambae velocem etaeque cursum teneant; ita complures profecto sunt homines, qui seipsos quasi immortales putant et firmos ac stabiles esse existimant, atque adeo quotidie se mori et debilitari non sentiunt.

60. Imitandi sunt potius ii viri, qui sanctimonia, qui constantia, qui fide caeterisque virtutibus praestantissimis, clarissimam lucem etiam post obitum suum nobis reliquerunt, et vitae degendae ac recte mioriendi perfectum exemplar et documentum tradiderunt. 61. Si enim illi Basilii, Chrysostomi, Hieronymi, Augustini, Bernardi, Antonii et alii sexcenti ad supremum diem mortis, ad dimicationem extremam, ad luctam terribilem summa cura et studio vehementi seipsos non comparauissent,

27 This text cannot be found in St. Augustine, but it contains a reminiscence of Gen. 3.19 (“in pulverem reverteris”).

This content downloaded from 201.153.243.100 on Wed, 28 Mar 2018 20:33:15 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms
certe liceret fortassì etiam nobis indormire huic tanto tamque arduo negotio, nec operam nauare singularem; sin autem diligentissimos in stadio vitae huius conficiendo et cursu ad portum dirigendo sapientes et fortes cognoscimus exitisse, intelligitis quod a nobis requiratur. 62. Nimirum illi nihil tam in omnibus suis actionibus spectauerunt, quam ut nullo se se grauiore crimine implicarent ac irretirent, tempusque mortis parati et instructi expectarent. Quid ita? Nam ii demum maximo et incredibili sub finem vitae suae solatio perfruuntur, quos conscientiae vis eo tempore non redarguii ac refellit, fitque munificentia ac liberalitate Dei Optimi Maximi infinita ut ii soli tanquam frugi vigilantesque serui praemium excubiarum in aeternis domiciliis longe uberrimum consequantur. 63. Quid vero de iis censendum est, qui turpiter et nefarie hanc fabulam aetatis suae peragunt? Vix fieri potest ut bene moriantur. 64. Praeclare enim Lactantius, insigni doctrina excultus atque expolitus, testatum monimentis posteritati reliquit: “Sicut, inquit, ipsa vita bonum est, si cum virtuteconiungitur, sic vita malum est, si cum scelere traducitur, ac pròinde mors ex praeteritis vitae actionibus est aestimanda. Si enim vita in cultu diuinno atque pietatis studii fuerit transacta, mors malum non sit necesse est; sin secus, malum erit, nosque ad extrema mittet supplicia”. 65. O praestantissimum in re maximi momenti testimonium! Quid verius? quid clarius? quid accommodatius ab eo viro dici potuit? quid magis vestrum animum percelle potest, quid pectus efferere quam cum recordamini in morte periculose eum conficii, quem nullam in vita cum vitiis pugnam et dimicationem certum est suscipisse. 66. Foelices eos mortales, qui inter sua emolumenta numerant et reponunt, non solum frequenter refricare eius temporis memoriam, quo animus a corpore digreditur et tam arcta coniunctio disoluitur, dum corpus terram spectat, animus autem ad iudicis iustissimi conspectum rapitur, verum etiam ea meditatione et consideratione sui exitus, uniussera vitae suae rationes ita gubernant et administrant, ut pisces in aquis cursum suum et volucres in aere volatum extremis parte corporis sui tanquam gubernacula quodam dirigere solent. 67. Et vero ipsem AdAUCTUS KOWNACKI, quem moesti et tristes excessisse et vita doletis, cuius funeri iusta cum gemitu ac lacrymis cuncti soluitis, quem mandari sepulturae aspictis, si loqui posset, apud vos hisce vocibus uteretur: “Ego, cui fortuna non solum genus nobile, verum etiam natura ingenium elegans, memoriam excellentem, formam

28 Compare Lact., Div. Inst. III 19B.
ac speciem non vulgarem, celeritatem ad agendum mirificam largita est, 
cui non postremas dotes ad Eloquentiae facultatem atque ad ornate
dicendum necessarias liberaliter et copiose eadem naturae communicavit, 
usus autem et exercitatio naturae munera mediocris perpoliuit; ego, 
inquam, ex hac vitae scena in adolescencia florentissima (quandoquidem 
ita summo ac praepotenti cuncorum mortalium imperatori et principi 
Deo placuit) semigraui, eoque in regiones metuendas et admodum formi-
dables, per quas euntem me amicorum comitatur nemo, ad iudicis seuere 
tribunal venio, ubi quid mihi sententia aequissima sit euenturum, nescio. 
68. Utinam ad homines, a quibus discessi, potestas reuertendi daretur! 
Equidem posthabito fluxarum et volubilium rerum amore, contempta 
leuitate, spreta immoderatione, non laxe et remisse aeuum exigerem, sed 
seuerè et grauiter meas expenderem actiones; non familiaritati et neces-
situdini importunae studerem, sed numen diuinum quod toti orbi praesidet, 
religione summá colerem; non viam praecipitem et lubricam ad-
olescentium dissolutorum inirem, sed me legibus sanctissimus perpetuo 
conseruandis traderem ac dicarem. 69. Heu me infoelicem, qui aestu adoles-
centiae abreptus, me serio diuinis rebus multo ante mortis aduentum 
non addixi et consecraui! qui tempus pretiosissimum, in quo ampliorem 
Dei Optimæ Maximæ gratiam potui promereri, pro nihilo duxi! 70. Quare 
vos, vos inquam, serio me negligentiam perniciosam deplorantem audite, 
ae meo exemplo et casu permoti, ita viuete, ut voluptates pestiferas 
fugiaistis, amorem mundi detestemini, de ratione bene mortiendi cogitetis”.

71. His si vocibus ADAUCTI KOWNACKI vos alloquatur, Auditores stu-
diosissimi, quis vestrum non pertimescat? Quis calamitate tanti ac tam 
egregii adolescentis conturbatus, confestim ac nulla interposita mora ad 
seipsum non redeat? 72. Mihi credite, Auditores humanissimi, mortuus qui-
dem est optima spe et indole praeditus adolescens, ADAUCTUS KOWNACIUS, 
seu unumrumque nostrum forrasse Diuina et infinita Maiestas commone-
facere eius abscessu voluit, quam infirma, quam fragile, quam imbecilli 
simus, quos cito successor diem septimum ex hac aspectabili mortalium 
luce paulo acrior et vehementior morbus et aegrotatio potest exturbare.

(III)

AD MANES DEMORTUI ADAUCTI KOWNACKI APOSTROPHE.

THOMAS KARLOWSKI

1 Sic inopinus abis, sociosque relinquis, ADAUCTE,
   Lux KOWNACIACAE magna futura domus?
Sic ruis ante diem, viridique fatiscis in aeuo,
Flos Ciceronaei non inhonore fori?
Non genus ingeniumue sagax, non forma, nec aetas
Tam florens Atropi vim cohibere queant?
Te sacra Mnemosyne sobolesque nouena peremptum
Moesta flet, et Clarii praeses Apollo chori.
Te Litaui lugent electrilegique Borussi,
Quos mouet ingenii spesque vigorque tui:
Brunoris urbs luget te, Pessaridesque Camoenae,
Quarum annos aliquot fides alumnus eras,
Villiadumque phalanx violis, prece, thure, piaclis,
Flebilibus decorant et tua busta modis.
Ac tibi Nestoreum locat hunc Polyhymnia cippum,
Nec tua Sarmaticis fama silescat agris.

(IV)

IN STEMMA NOBILIS ADOLESCENTIS ADAUCTI KOWNACKI.

BARTHOLOMEUS RADZIMINOWICZ

Gentili lituum pro Stemmate gessit ADAUCTUS,
Cur ita? conueniens omen, opinor, inest:
Nempe Maronaeis lituis Heroas et arma,
Gestaque coelituum dicere doctus erat,
Tulliacisque tubis causas orare disertus,
Testis Athaeneum conscia Vilna tuum:
Virtutum nutrix ab eo, Submissio mentis
Quam fuit appositis percebrata modis?
Nuperus Haereticos quae fulmina torsit in hostes
Iustitiae immemores iudiciiique Dei?
Ter faelix, sanctum tuba cui suprema timorem
Insinuat: res est reliigiosa timor;
Hoc ubi verba super fecisset Adauctus, ut ipsa
Re, quod erat fatus, rite probaret, obit.

29 "electrilegus": collecting amber. Addendum lexicis.
30 Brunoris urbs: Braniewo / Braunsberg.
31 Pessarides: maybe the Muses [viz. the school] of the East-Prussian town of Pisz / Johannisburg.
32 Villiades: the students of Vilnius.
(V)

ACADEMIAE QUESTUS.

IOANNES MILICKI

Effera Morta meas celeri cur falce Camoenas
Contemeras toties, Pieriosque choros?
Vulneris accepti nondum mihi clausa cicatrix
Est prior, alterius vulneris ecce dolor:

Cum mihi tam subito rapitur KOWNACIUS arte
Eloquii, forma, nobilis ingenio.
Ah quoties gemitus dabis o studiosa iuuentus,
Ah quoties lacrymas huius amore dabis?
Ah quoties dices: "ubi iam requiescis, ADAUCTE?
Quo sub sidere agis? te locus ecquis habet?"
Ah quoties repetes: "sit Olympus adauctus Adaucto?
Nos cinis afflictos eius et urna leuet".

(VI)

UMBRA.

GULHIELMUS SOTERONUS ANGLUS.

Terrea deserui penetralia, adauctus Olympo
Nunc meliora colo: ne mea fata gemas;
Tramite quo? rogitas? haud per mala gaudia vulgi
Huc feror, at placitum per pietatis iter.

Qui sapis, o vegeti ne crede coloribus aevi,
Formae, opibus, generi: Mors cita quaeque metit.

(VII)

ETEOSTICHON.

ANDREAS ROCHMANIUS NIESWIEZIENSIS.

MartIUs OCtAVVVs ConCLaVe reLInqVere Labens
Te probe KOWnaCl per stata fata IVbet.

Department of Classical Studies,
University of Vilnius (Lithuania).
Coinciding with Shakespeare's theatrical career is a rekindled interest in Geoffrey of Monmouth's legendary kings of Britain, an interest which the plays under discussion must also have helped to foster. Among the neglected texts on this topic are some Latin poems on Geoffrey’s kings which may have a bearing on these plays, perhaps helping with chronology, certainly casting some light on contemporary reception of the stories that both Shakespeare and this Latin author represent.

In 1607 in Frankfurt the London lawyer John Ross had published a collection of poems on the ancient kings, written in elegiac couplets, entitled Britannica, sive de Regibus Veteris Britanniæ usque ad Exitium Gentis et Saxonum Imperium. Omission from the STC has guaranteed the book’s obscurity. Except for brief mention in Bradner’s Musæ Anglicanae and T. D. Kendrick’s book on the vogue of Geoffrey, Ross has met with oblivion, until the publication in 1991 of his Poems on Events of the Day, 1582-1607.¹

Personal information in the latter collection of poems supports the possibility that Ross knew or knew of Shakespeare: he had several friends in the Earl of Essex’s entourage; he addresses a poem to the famous Twelfth-night visitor, Virginio Orsino Duke of Bracciano; he was a long-time friend to the Earls of Rutland, including the sixth earl, with whom Shakespeare was acquainted. Ross, a Buckinghamshire native a year older than Shakespeare, attended Westminster school, the preparatory inn of chancery called Lyons Inn, and the Inner Temple.

¹ For details of Ross’s life and for poems other than Britannica, which has had no edition since Ross, see Poems on Events of the Day, 1582-1607, ed. Richard F. Hardin (Delmar, NY: Scholars’ Facsimiles and Reprints 1991); brief notices are in Leicester Bradner, Musæ Anglicanae (New York, 1940), pp. 39-40, and T. D. Kendrick, British Antiquity (London, 1950) 100.
where records show him in residence at various points from 1584 until his death in November 1607. His will indicates friendships with several luminaries, including Edward Coke, William Camden, and Margaret Clifford Countess of Cumberland.

*Britannica*, an octavo volume, also exists in a Bodleian manuscript (Bodl. MS 573) containing passages in Ross’s hand, along with a licensing statement signed by Owen Gwyn on 3 December 1606, which helps set the date for his poems. Since *King Lear* was performed at court on 26 December of that year, with public performance perhaps a year earlier, it is inviting to compare Ross’s version of the Lear story with those of Shakespeare and his sources to consider whether there are any indications that Ross knew Shakespeare’s adaptation:²

DE CORDELLAE PIETATE IN PATREM LEIRUM SECUNDUM.

Chara fuit Genorilla patri, et Regana Leiri
Deliciae, regnum dividit hisce suum.
Quippe patrem fingunt ardenter amare; Leirus
Credit ut nimis est credulus omnis amor.
Confectum senio tamen hunc diademate privant,
Hospitio prohibent, exilioque premunt.
At Cordella, suum quae fingere nescit amorem,
Displicuit graviter simplicitate patri.
Hennino Regana duci, Genorilla Maglanno
Nubit; Cornubiae is, Scotiae hic est dominus.
Tertiam Aganippus ducit Rex Gallicus, at cui
Nulla fuit thalami dos, nisi dos sit amor.
Sola viro est faelix, sed regno, patre, sorore
Infaelix (ita si tale quid esse potest).
Deserit hanc genitor, qui post desertus et ipse,
Ex aliis patitur, quod facit ipse, malum.
Privatus sceptro, breviatis inde ministris,
Indiget hospitio Rex, pater, isque senex,
Vestibus attritis, non ut qui fingeret esse
Se miserum, cum non sit, sed et illud erat.
Sic inquam senio, sic paupertate laborans
Rex (at mendicus) Gallica regna petit.
Ut patris aduentum Cordella intelligit, o quam
Gaudet, et ex animo gestit adesse senem!
Fluctuat huc illuc variis mens motibus, ut cui
Gaudia cum tacito mixta pudore forent:
Ardet adire patrem, mox vero accersere mallet,
Sed quod posterius pectore volvit, agit.
Magnificas mittit vestes, celeresque quadrigas,
Et, qui stiparent (ut decuit), famulos.
Sic restauratus Rex sese accingit ad aulam,
Et cupit amplecti quam prius abnuerat.
Praeteriti Cordella memor ne sit, timet, et non
Vana timet, nam sic causa timere fuit.
Illa (quod est vere generosum) cuncta remittit,
Utque oblita rei, tale nihil memorat.
Conveniunt, lachrymis miscentur et oscula, quales
Saepe cadunt imbres, sole micante, leves.
Post epulas genitor vindictae haud immemor, arma
Expetit, et natae sollicitavit opem.
Quid multis opus est? verbum satis esto; Leirum
Instruct armatis, regnaque restituit.
Nata rejecta patrem recipit, dilecta repellit:
Quam foveat, illa fugat; quam fugat, illa foveat.
Totus ad hanc mundus convertat lumina; maior
In patrem pietas non fuit, est, vel erit.

On the Loyalty of Cordella to her Father Leir the Second

Dear was Genorill to her father, and Regan was Leir’s delight; he divided his kingdom between them. They pretended to love their father dearly; Lear believed them (as every love is too credulous). They took the crown from him, however, weakened by old age; they forbade him lodging, and forced him into exile. But Cordella, who did not know how to pretend her love, seriously displeased her father with her simplicity. Regan was married to Henninus, Genorill to Maglannus — (10) one lord of Cornwall, the other of Scotland. The French king Aganippus married the third, but received no dowry unless the dowry was love. She alone was lucky in her husband, but (if there can be such a thing) unlucky in kingdom, father, sister. Her father abandoned her, who was later himself abandoned; he suffered the evil from others that he committed himself. Deprived of scepter, reduced in attendants, this king, father, old man, stood in need of shelter — clothing in rags, not pretending to be (20) poor when he was not, but poor. Thus, I say, laboring with old age, with poverty, the king (yet beggar) went to the kingdom of France. When Cordella heard of her father’s arrival, O how she rejoiced, rejoiced in her heart that the old man was there! With diverse motions her mind was tossed here and there as one for whom joy would mingle with silent modesty: she longed to go to her father but then wanted to call him to her. She considered the latter, and did so. She sent magnificent clothes, swift carriages, (30) and to accompany him, as was fitting, servants. Thus restored, the king came to the court and desired to embrace her whom he earlier denied. He feared that Cordella would recall the past, and feared not in vain, for there was reason to fear thus. She forgave all (which was truly generous), and as forgetful of the matter, remembered nothing of it. They met, tears and kisses mingled as often light rains fall while the sun is shining. After a feast the father, not unmindful of vengeance, longed for arms (40) and asked his daughter’s aid. What more need be said? Let it suffice that she furnished Leir with an army and restored the kingdom. The rejected daughter received her father, the loved one rejected him. She whom he loved chased him away; she whom he chased away loved him. Let all the world’s eyes regard her. Greater loyalty to a father never was, is, or shall be.
Obviously what interests Ross is Cordelia’s loyalty or pietas, mentioned both in the title and at the end. Many omissions from Geoffrey — and Ross’s main source is definitely Geoffrey, as seems unlikely with Shakespeare — can be explained by the desire to underscore this point. To be noted are the following details that are not in Geoffrey, and that might have been suggested to Ross by a viewing of the play, whose stage history before December 1606 is not clear.

1. The refusal of hospitium, which I translate as “lodging”, is not in Geoffrey or Holinshed (who follows Geoffrey rather closely), or other earlier versions such as Spenser’s or that in The Mirror for Magistrates. In the anonymous Leir play, the king has housing and one faithful attendant, being driven to France when he discovers that the daughters have hired a man to kill him. The violation of hospitality, one of the extreme instances of cruelty in Shakespeare’s play, is likely to have imprinted itself on an audience’s memory.

2. Cordelia’s simplicity, simplicitas, her utter frankness in answering her father, is not so labeled in Geoffrey. Shakespeare calls this “plainness", and the anonymous play speaks of Cordelia’s “playne meaning” (B2). Spenser’s version in Faerie Queene mentions Cordelia’s “simple answere” (II.x.28), and in view of Ross’s love of Spenser I suspect that simplicitas was the result of both seeing Shakespeare’s Cordelia and reviewing his Spenser before writing the poem.

3. The image of Lear’s “clothing in rags” before his going to Cordelia is unique to Shakespeare and Ross. Geoffrey says that when Lear went to France he was shocked to find that he was ranked only third among the boat passengers; after arriving, Lear “non habebat quid commederet vel indue ret” (had nothing to eat nor clothes to put on). The anonymous playwright represents Leir and his faithful Perillus exchanging their expensive clothes for the plain sailors’ garb in order to pay for their passage across the Channel.

4. A good part of Ross’s small poem concentrates on the emotive dimension of the story. Geoffrey is silent about the emotions surrounding the reunion, though these are carefully worked into the anonymous play. Unlike the author of that play, both Ross and Shakespeare isolate Cordelia from her husband at this meeting. None of the other stories center on the two figures in quite this way. Ross’s combination of tears and kisses, rain and sunshine, could well have been suggested by the alternating joy

---

3 Geoffrey of Monmouth, The Historia Regum Britanniae of Geoffrey of Monmouth, ed. Acton Griscom (London, 1929), p. 268 (II.xii). Ross probably read one of the editions of Geoffrey by Josse Bade (Paris 1508, 1517), since he quotes a preface to this text by Ivo Cavellatus.
and remorse either in Shakespeare’s or the anonymous play’s scene. But a significant verbal resemblance exists in Shakespeare’s
You have seen
Sunshine and rain at once. Her smiles and tears
Were like a better way
(IV.iii.17-19).

There are, of course, some major differences between Shakespeare’s and all other versions of the story, Ross’s included. Lear journeys to France in all the other versions, while Shakespeare sets the reunion in England on the eve of the battle near Dover. Most exceptionally, of course, Shakespeare doubles the pathos of the original story. After the powerful scene of recognition between father and daughter when Lear awakes, comes the crushing, wholly unexpected ending unique to Shakespeare. Like Spenser, Ross recognizes the original story as more about Cordelia than Lear. This is not a story of an abused father but a parable of filiopiety and a daughter’s love — so much so that Ross scarcely mentions Lear’s triumphant return to England. The case cannot fully be made here, but among Ross’s poems on the ancient kings, the Leir poem is unique in its pathos and sentiment. Why should this particular poem be so different? One explanation is that it reflects an experience of something more moving than either Geoffrey or the anonymous play. In this respect it stands as a mute testimony to shared emotions of Elizabethan and modern audiences in response to Shakespeare’s tragedy.

Ross was a lawyer with the common lawyer’s pride in the legendary antiquity of English common law, going back, as many said, “time out of mind”, to traditions predating the coming of not only William the Conqueror but even Julius Caesar. Accordingly, one turns to his treatment of Cymbeline in search of possible comparison with Shakespeare regarding British legal traditions. The laudatory speech on Dunwallo Mulmutius in Cymbeline III.i corresponds to Ross’s poem on Dunwallo (not given here) in its general thought concerning English law. Ross, who dedicated his book to James I, praises Mulmutius as the first to codify law, while Shakespeare also says he was first to call himself king of England. Leah Marcus detects in Shakespeare’s play a special interest in James I’s plans for the union of England and Scotland; this is also a principal theme throughout Ross’s book on “Britain”. As for Cymbeline and his sons, here are Ross’s pertinent poems (Britannica 32-34):

DE TENANTII, KYMBELINI ET GUIDERII GUBERNATIONE.

Androgeus Romam cum Caesare deinde profectus,
   Prae sceleris liquit regna pudore sui.
Interea sceptrum tenuit Tenantius. Iste
   Terribilis bello, pace serenus erat.
Hinc Kymbelinus successit jure paterno,
   Quo regnante:
Nascitur in mundum mundi salvator Iesus,
   Qui peccata suo sanguine nostra lavat.
Virque Deusque simul, de virgine, sed sine patre,
   Nam sine patre fuit vir, sine matre Deus.
Hinc Kymbelino successit bina propago,
   Guiderius senior, junior Arviragus.
Denegat exactum Romanis ferre tributum
   Guiderius; vulgo sic placet esse levi.
Non tuli id populus Romanus, at arma capessit
   Ut Britones cogat solvere, quod renuunt.
Claudius huc Caesar properans, et Lælius Hamo
   Instimulant Britones in nova bella feros.
Non tamen in primis adeo faeliciter alis
   Pugnatur, quin et Claudius ipse fugit.
Lælius astutam mox, deficiente leone,
   Vulpem agit (ut vafri pectoris usque fuit).
Commutat clypeos, Britonumque insignia et arma
   Induit, et linguam Brutigenum simulat.
Talibus instructus, falsa sub imagine, technis
   Vimque suis addens (sorte iuvante) dolis,
Se Britonum turmis sociat, ne credere posses
   Hunc fore Romanum, sed potius Britonem.
Inventoque aditu ad Regem nil tale timentem,
   Guiderium ad mortem funditus ense ferit.
Hinc medios facto jam murmurare lapsus in hostes
   Lælius ad socios incolum redit.
On the Rule of Tenantius, Kymbelinus, and Guiderius

Androgeus, traveling to Rome with Caesar, left the kingdom because of the shame of his crime. Tenantius meanwhile held the scepter, a terror in war, calm in peace. By paternal right Kymbelinus succeeded him.

During his reign Jesus savior of the world was born into the world, who washes our sins away with His blood. Both man and God, of a virgin yet without father; (10) as a man he was without father, as God, without mother.

The dual offspring of Kymbelinus succeeded him, the elder Guiderius, the younger Arviragus. Guiderius refused to give the tribute exacted by the Romans, which pleased the fickle people. The Roman people would not put up with this; they took arms to force the Britons to pay what they refused. Claudius Caesar and Laelius Hamo hastened to stir the savage Britons up for a new war. It was not fought well in the first attack, (20) and Claudius himself retreated. Laelius, unable to play the lion’s part, played the fox — always at heart a crafty man. He changed his shield, put on the insignia and arms of Brut’s race, and pretended to speak their language. Outfitted with these things, behind a false exterior, adding strength to his crafty deceits (luck did its part), he mingled with the British troops, and you would have thought he was a Briton, and no Roman. When he had gotten near the king, who was not on his guard, (30) he killed Guiderius on the spot with his sword. As the lamentations arose, Laelius, rushing through the enemy, returned from there to his own side.
VINDICTA ARVIRAGI IN LAELIUM HAMONEM, ET VIRTUS EIUS.

Hamonem Arviragus scelerata caede superbum
Obsidet, et fratris vindicat ense necem.
Claudius hinc prolem Genuissam iungit, ut isto
Connubio iunctus fiat ab hoste comes.
Ille tamen patriae pro libertate recusat
Romanum ulterius velle subire jugum.
Praelia Romanis multo cum sanguine movit,
Et domuit turmas, Vespasiane, tuas.
Ista fuit Britonum non ultima gloria, nolle
Se fieri dominis mancipia Ausoniis.
Is vitii mastix fuit, et virtutis asylum,
Romani terror, gloria Brutigenum.
Is patriae leges stabilivit, ut inde corona
(Quae sine lege ruit) tutior esse queat.
Non adeo pronus forsan punire malignos,
Quam fuit ingenuus sponte fovere bonos.
Utque fuit senio provector, arma reliquit,
Et studuit pacem (Marte silente) sequi.
An metuat vel amet magis hunc Romana potestas
In dubio est, sed et hunc diligat atque timet.
Staminibus fusis, huic Claudiocestria bustum
Praeparat in templo, quod struit ille patri.
Arviragus’ Revenge on Laelius Hamo, and His Courage

Arviragus attacked proud Hamo for this wicked murder and revenged his brother’s death with the sword. Claudius had his daughter Genuissa married to him, by this union seeking to make a friend from an enemy. Arviragus, for the sake of his country’s liberty, refused from then on the Roman yoke. He undertook a very bloody war with the Romans and, Vespasian, was victorious over your forces. This was not the final glory of the Britons, unwilling (10) to become slaves to Italian masters. Arviragus was scourge of vice and refuge of virtue, a terror to the Romans, the glory of Brut’s race. He made firm his country’s laws so that from that time on the crown, which without law is doomed, could rest more safely: this noble man was perhaps not as ready to punish evildoers as he was to lavish his personal attention on good men. And as he grew advanced in years he quit making war and, Mars being silent, endeavored to follow the way of peace. It is uncertain whether Rome feared or loved him more, (20) but it admired and respected him. When the thread of his life had been severed, Gloucester erected for him a funeral monument in the temple, which he built for his father.
Cymbeline is usually dated not before 1610, and there is no reason to challenge the point based on Ross’s 1606 poems; Ross says virtually nothing about this king, in fact, except that the birth of Jesus occurred during his time, a detail that he found in both Geoffrey and Spenser. Two general parallels with Shakespeare’s play are suggested, however. One is the way both authors develop the love-hate relation between Britain and Rome — admiration coupled with envy, imitation with a desire for liberation. Ross’s portrait of Arviragus as a sort of ideal king plays up the relation between the crown and the law — to have a secure throne there must be secure laws. In Shakespeare the Dunwallo speech emphasizes that the first king was also the first lawgiver.

Ross does help, I think, with an episode in the play that has always been puzzling. As in Geoffrey and Holinshed, Ross has Cymbeline’s sons lead the war against Rome over the tribute, while Shakespeare makes Cymbeline responsible. At the conclusion of this play, amid the notoriously many reunions and recognitions, Cymbeline seems to yield up his victory to the defeated Romans. He hears from his soothsayer that under him Britain is promised “peace and plenty”. “Well”, says Cymbeline,

My peace we will begin. And, Caius Lucius,
Although the victor, we submit to Caesar,
And the Roman empire, promising
To pay our wonted tribute, from the which
We were dissuaded by our wicked queen. (V.v.459)

Cymbeline now disavows the patriotic rhetoric of refusal to pay the tribute in Act III. Instead, he proclaims, “Let / A Roman and a British ensign wave / Friendly together” (479), seemingly oblivious to what seemed to be justifiable reasons for war in the first place.

Marjorie Garber, seeing this play as a Christian myth, links the tribute to Augustus’s proclamation of the tax at Jesus’s birth, and associates the peace with the pax Romana and the peace of Christ. For whatever reason, this seems to be Shakespeare’s invention. Geoffrey makes it a valiant act when Cymbeline’s son Guiderius refuses to pay tribute. Holinshed seems to concur, though he does make Guiderius something of a demagogue: “This Guiderius being a man of stout courage, gave occasion of breach of peace betwixt the Britons and Romans denieing to paie them tribute,

and procuring the people to new insurrections, which by one meane or another made open rebellion”. Although Ross applauds the “glory of the Britons, unwilling to become slaves to Italian masters”, he seems to condemn Guiderius as courting popular favor rather than dealing justly: “Guiderius refused to give the tribute…, which pleased the fickle people”. I doubt that Ross was the first to put this spin on the story. If both he and Shakespeare think there was something wrong with the Britons’ refusal to pay tribute, then perhaps there was a tradition, if only an oral one among the common lawyers and their students, that the Britons had not dealt fairly with their emperor. Reading Shakespeare, then, as Ross would have, the queen and Cloten in Act III, urging the king to break with Rome, could be voicing the destructive influence of the fickle and foolish multitude in matters of state.

J. W. Binns’ massive and seminal book, The Intellectual Culture of the English Renaissance (1990), while overlooking Ross, lists hundreds of English authors who, like John Ross, gambled on the permanence of Latin and lost. Their body of writing, as vast as it is neglected, still speaks to us about their culture, including the writings of those hundreds of English authors who, like Shakespeare, were on the winning side.
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The name Marco Girolamo Vida (1485-1566), neo-Latin poet of the Italian Renaissance, occurs quite frequently in commentaries on Milton’s Latin poetry.\(^1\) Scholars have noted several minor links between Vida’s *Christiad* and *Paradise Regained*\(^2\) and *Samson Agonistes*.\(^3\) More significant parallels have been highlighted between Vida’s epic and *Paradise Lost*\(^4\). I have argued elsewhere that the hymn to Light in *Paradise Lost* 3 conflates features from Vida’s first Latin Hymn to God as Light and the Father/Son debate in *Christiad* 6,\(^5\) and that the patterns of invocation in *Paradise Lost* 1, 7 and 9 draw upon Vida’s third Latin Hymn to the Holy Spirit.\(^6\) It is evident that an intimate awareness of Vida’s Latin writings underlies the Miltonic corpus — an awareness that was to persist from his earliest juvenilia (illustrated by his intriguing reference to Vida’s pre-eminence the field of Christian Latin epic [“Loud ore the rest Cremona’s trump doth sound”, *The Passion* 26]) right through to his


\(^2\) See, for example, Mario A. Di Cesare, *A Milton Encyclopedia* (London/Toronto, 1980), viii.136, who regards *Paradise Regained* as “the poem closest to Vida’s in subject, and one in which Vida’s example is felt in various ways, but less directly than indirectly”. For further discussion, see E. Haan “Milton’s *Paradise Regained* and Vida’s *Christiad*”, *From Erudition to Inspiration, Essays in Honour of Michael McGann*, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations (Belfast, 1992), pp. 53-77.

\(^3\) R. Fox, *Notes and Queries* (1959), pp. 370-72 argue that the famous ship simile in *Samson Agonistes* 710-24 is based on *Christiad* 1.331-34.


most mature vernacular *magnum opus*. This article will confine itself to a discussion of hitherto unnoticed points of contact between some of Milton’s Latin poetry (*Ad Patrem; Elegia Quinta; In Quintum Novembbris*) and Vida’s *De Arte Poetica* (and to a lesser degree his *Christiad*).

I

**Ad Patrem**

*Ad Patrem* is in effect a son’s token of gratitude to his father for providing him with the means of acquiring an excellent education — an education which is presented as a gift from father to son, in return for which the son offers his own gift: the poem itself. Milton thus repays his father with a “divine...song” (*divinum ... carmen* [17]), the polished work of the poet (*vatis opus* [17]) and the embodiment of the education which he has received. Furthermore, he seeks to emphasise the integrity and validity of this accomplished gift and in so doing vindicates the poet’s vocation and art. In its fusion of the themes of the poet’s education and the defence of poetry *Ad Patrem* echoes *De Arte Poetica* in a number of respects. Vida’s poem outlines from an essentially didactic standpoint the prerequisites of the aspiring poet’s upbringing, asserts the validity of his vocation and issues important precepts on inspiration, composition, imitation, use of language *inter alia*. By skilful verbal reminiscence and subtle adaptation Milton at times assumes the didactic voice of Vida, exhorting his father to value poetry, while at others he presents himself as the educated son, thanking his father, who, he implies, has fulfilled in a practical sense the recommendations laid down by Vida, and is an ideal Renaissance educator. Vida’s aim: “to educate from his youthful years an illustrious poet” (*vatem egregium teneris educere ab annis* [DAP 1.3]) has been achieved by Milton père. The continual shift in perspective affords Milton’s poem an air of gentle humour and light-hearted banter combined with genuine appreciation and gratitude.

In the opening lines of the poem Milton conveys his desire that the Pierian springs flow through his heart and that the stream which issues from Mount Parnassus pour through his lips:

```
Nunc mea Pierios cupiam per pectora fontes
irriguas torquere vias, totumque per ora
volvere laxatum gemino de vertice rivum (1-3)7
```

The language is vivid and rich in its long vowel sounds depicting the transfusion of inspirational waters through a physical being. The Pierian springs are to constitute virtual baptismal waters as the poet receives voluntary initiation. Viewed in the context of Vida, Milton’s lines are the embodiment of a recurring leitmotif. De Arte Poetica likewise opens with a reference to the Pierian springs. Here the speaker asks the Pierians for the sanction to proclaim their secrets and reveal their “holy springs”:

Sit fas vestra mihi vulgare arcana per orbem,
Pierides, penitusque sacros recludere fontes. (DAP 1.1-2)8

It is the poet’s privilege to uncover the secret waters of the Pierians. The language, echoing Virgil,9 is more formal than Milton’s simple cupiam. Vida proceeds to outline the purpose for which this sanction is required. He intends to delineate the education of an illustrious poet, the singer of epic and of hymns. Milton, however, by a clever shift of emphasis, follows his invocation to the Pierians by a reference to the parent as opposed to the son — the educator rather than the educated:

ut tenues oblita sonos audacibus alis
surget in officium venerandi Musa parentis. (4-5)

The Muse, abandoning all that is lowly, is to soar aloft in order to honour a venerable parent.

Milton’s desire to be immersed in the Pierian springs is balanced by Vida’s later statement that the aspiring poet must be acquainted with the Pierians from a tender age and approach their springs as soon as he has acquired the basic rudiments of speech:

Nulli etenim insignem dabitur gestare coronam,
Pieridum choreas teneris nisi norit ab annis.
Postquam igitur primas fandi puer hauserit artes,
iam tunc incipiat riguos accedere fontes
et Phoebum, et dulces Musas assuescat amare. (DAP 1.84-88)

Later, the young poet is to wash in the Aonian waters (1.109-10). Vida had insisted that such an act be voluntary. The puer must become accustomed to love the Muses. Milton, another puer (66), desires (cupiam) the springs to imbue his lips.

8 All quotations from Vida are from Opera (Venice, 1550). I have modernised spelling and altered punctuation.
9 sit mihi fas audita loqui, sit numine vestro/pandere res alta terra et caligine mersas (Aen.6.266-67).
Milton has composed his poem as a gift which, however small, (exiguum meditatur opus (7)) is an attempt to repay his father. There is an irony underlying Milton’s assumed modesty topos,\(^\text{10}\) for Vida had precisely recommended that the young poet compose “a small work” — an exiguum opus — embellished with ornamental figures:

\begin{verbatim}
    altum aliis assurgat opus
tu nocte dieque
    exiguum meditator ubi sint omnia culta
    et visenda novis iterumque, iterumque figuris. (2.339-41)\(^{11}\)
\end{verbatim}

Surprisingly however Milton urges his father not to despise poetry:

\begin{verbatim}
nec tu vatis opus divinum despice carmen (17)
\end{verbatim}

This admonition recurs in line 56:

\begin{verbatim}
nec tu perge precor sacras contemnere Musas
\end{verbatim}

Vida had likewise advised his addressee:

\begin{verbatim}
    Primus ades, Francisce. Sacras ne despice Musas (1.11)
\end{verbatim}

But Vida’s warning was issued to a nine-year old boy, Francis, the Dauphin (\textit{puer} 1.19)!\(^\text{12}\) Herein lies Milton’s inversion. In \textit{Ad Patrem}, Milton, the \textit{puer} (66), is adopting the paternal/didactic stance of Vida, gently admonishing his would-be pupil — his father! The joke is picked up in lines 67-68 as Milton states that his father only pretends to hate the Muses:

\begin{verbatim}
Tu tamen ut \textit{simules} teneras \textit{odisse Camoenas},
non \textit{odisse} reor
\end{verbatim}

Milton is echoing Vida’s warning that if a pupil feels hatred towards his master, he may simultaneously hate the Muses:

\begin{verbatim}
    Ille autem pueri cui eredita cura colendi
    artibus egregiis in primis optet amari
    atque odium cari super omnia vitet alumni
    ne forte et sacras simul oderit ille \textit{Camoenas} (1.232-35)
\end{verbatim}

The verbal similarity may extend beyond \textit{odisse Camoenas} if Milton’s \textit{simules} (67) is regarded as a pun on Vida’s \textit{simul} (235). Vida however

\(^{10}\) Milton transforms the Virgilian modesty topos (\textit{cum canerem reges et proelia, Cynthiae aurem vellet et admonuit} [\textit{Ecl}.6.3-4]) in \textit{Lycidas} 77: “Phoebus replied, and touched my trembling ears”.

\(^{11}\) Italics are mine.

had developed the theme to include adults who abuse poets. He says that he has witnessed the ingratitude of men elevated by the Muses, but refusing to speak to poets. Furthermore he issues a general injunction to mankind not to annoy poets:

At nimium trux ille ferisque e cautibus ortus
qui sanctos, genus innocuum populatumque deorum,
aut armis audet vates aut laedere dictis.
Vidi ego qui ad summos Musarum munere honores
evecti mox ingratos contemnere Musas
nec vates saltem alloquio dignarier ipsos.
Parcite, mortales, sacros vexare poetas. (1.497-503)

Again Milton picks this up and inverts it as he urges his father (who, like Vida’s ungrateful men elevated Musarum munere (500), is quarum (sc. Musarum [56]) ipse peritus/munere (57-58)), not to regard the Muses as void and unprofitable:

nec tu perge precor sacras contemnere Musas
nec vanas inopesque puta, quarum ipse peritus
munere mille sonos numeros componis ad aptos (56-59)

Milton père, a skilled musician (doctus [60]), must not behave like Vida’s contemptuous ingrates. The didactic tone, while pointed, is semi-humorous. Father and son (now given their rightful status (genitorque puerque (66)) are depicted as sharing the god Apollo (representative of music and poetry alike).13

That Milton père is not hostile to the Muses is suggested not only by the fact that he is himself an accomplished musician, but, Milton says, by the way in which he reared his son. Now the focus shifts as the addressee becomes the ideal parent of Vida’s poem forever advised as to the education he should give his son. Milton’s lines moreover describe methods which approximate Vida’s precepts. Milton’s father did not order (neque ... iubebas (68)) his son to follow a path towards materialism14 or to enter the legal profession:

... neque enim, pater, ire iubebas
qua via lata patet, qua pronior area lucr

---

13 Contrast the singular consecration of the young poet to Apollo in Vida, DAP 1.381: et sese Phoebi addixit, propriumque sacravit.

14 The theme of course finds classical precedent in Horace, Satires 1.6.85-88, in which he praises his father for not forcing him into money-making: nec timuit, sibi ne vitio quis verteret, olim/si praeco parvas aut, ut fuit ipse, coactor/mercedes sequerent neque ego essem quaestus: at hoc nunc/laus illi debetur et a me gratia maior.
Vida had criticised “severe … parents” (duri … parentes) on precisely these grounds as they ordered (iusserunt) their sons to follow more lucrative pursuits:15

Nonne vides duri natos ubi saepe parentes
dulcibus amorunt studiis et discere avaras
iusserunt artes … (DAP 1.290-92)

In another Latin poem, lamenting the death of his parents, Vida expresses his gratitude for the fact that in spite of their great poverty, they did not deter him from his vocation to be a poet.16

In addition, Milton père enabled his son to retire to the country — a reference to the retirement to Horton:17

sed magis excultam cupiens ditescere mentem,
me procul urbano strepitu, secessibus altis
abductum Aoniea iucunda per otia ripae
Phoebo lateris comitem sinis ire beatum. (73-76)

While the concept of the poet’s withdrawal is in accordance with Renaissance literary theory,18 it is also recommended by Vida in strikingly similar terms. Vida warns:

Quod superest etiam moneo creberque monebo
ne quisquam nisi curarum liberque laborum
inchoet egregium quidquam, verum procul urbis
attonitae fugiat strepitus et amoena silentis
accedat loca ruris ubi Dryadesque puellae

15 This practice had been denounced by Petrus Paulus Vergerius: Verum evenit ut plerique ingenio liberali praediti dum recta studia sequi ipso contendunt aut manu inicia revocant aut quibusdam oppositis quasi repagulis in cursu subsistere cogunt aut alio divertunt: plurimis nam angustia rei familiaris impedimento fuit quae liberum animum et ad meliora natum quaestui coegit inservire. (De Ingenuis Moribus [Venice 1493]).

16 Vos claras me scilicet artes/re licet angusta potius voluistis adire/quam genere indignis studiis incumbere nostro./Atque ideo doctis dociems misists ad urbes;/quamvis in nostris lusisset lubrica rebusiampridem fortuna et opes vertisset avitas/et res fluxa alias potius revocaret ad artes (Geelmi Vidae et Leonae Oscasalae parentum manibus [60-66]).

17 Milton describes this in Defensio Secunda: paterno rure quo is transigendae senectutis causa concesserat, evolvendis Graecis Latinisque scriptoribus summum per oitium totus vacavi (CM 8.120).

Both Vida and Milton convey the poverty which is associated with the poet. In both instances the adverb *procul* is juxtaposed with the noun *urbs* or its adjective *urbanus* and a further noun *strepitus*: *(procul urbis/attonitae fugiat strepitus [488-89]; me procul urbano strepitu [74]). Vida’s jussive subjunctive *fugiat* (489) has been fulfilled in Milton’s past participle *abductum* (75). Both stress the absence of *curae*. Vida states that a good poet must be *curarum ... liber* (487) and reinforces this in 495. The same theme occurs in *Ad Patrem*:

```
iamque nec obscurus populo miscebor inerti,
vitabuntque oculos vestigia nostra profanos.
Este procul vigiles curae, procul este querelae (103-5)19
```

Milton proceeds to thank his father for the variety of languages which, through his expense and efforts (*tuo ... sumptu* [78]), he was enabled to study: Latin, Greek, French, Italian and Hebrew. He describes the Italian language as that which the modern Italian pours from his degenerate mouth, seeing in him the embodiment of the barbarian invasions:

```
et quam degeneri novus Italus ore loquelam
fundit, barbaricos testatus voce tumultus (83-84)
```

It is hardly a coincidence that Vida had described this in some detail, emphasising, like Milton’s *degeneri ... ore*, the gradual degeneration as native Italians were forced to assume the language of the invader:

```
degenerare animi atque retro res lapsa referri.
Hic namque ingenio confusus posthabet artem,
ille furit strepitu tenditque aequare tubarum
voce sonos versusque tonat sine more per omnes.20
Dant alii cantus vacuos et inania verba
incassum, sola capti dulcedine vocis,
Phierides donec Romam et Tiberina fluenta
deseruere Italis expulsae protinus oris.
Tanti causa mali Latio gens aspera aperto
```

19 Both Vida and Milton are fusing two phrases from classical Latin literature: the Sibyl’s command in *Aen.*6.258: *procul o procul este, profani* and Horace’s dismissal of those who are ignorant of the muses in *Odes* 3.1.1: *odi profanum vulgus et arceo.*

20 Mistranslated (as though the Latin were *sine mora!*) by Williams, *op.cit.*
One of the most successful features of Ad Patrem is its skilful integration of the themes of education and the defence of poetry. These are much more compatible than might appear at first sight. Milton’s poem is a gift and thus it need not be surprising that he should depict this gift as important and valid per se. This he does through celebrating the powers of carmen in a passage which recalls Vida. Milton however inverts the structural arrangement of Vida’s lines, in which the praise of carmen had followed the educational precepts. In Ad Patrem the defence of poetry precedes the account of the poet’s education. Milton, it is implied, is already the educated poet who in his celebration of poetry is vindicating his own vocation and art, repaying one gift by another and presenting his father with the fruits of his efforts.21

Milton’s defence of poetry (17-55) draws upon Vida, De Arte Poetica 1.515-63, which in itself recalls Politian, Nutricia.22

Common to Vida and Milton is the association of Prometheus with the origins of poetry — a factor emphasised by a subsequent passage in which the noun carmen is repeated. Vida professes that the Muses are gifts of the gods and — probably an instance of Vida’s own invention — that they were brought to earth by Prometheus after his theft of fire:

\[
\text{Dona deum Musae. Vulgus, procul este, profanum.}
\text{Has magni natas Iovis olim duxit ab astris}
\text{callidus in terras insigni fraude Prometheus,}
\text{cum liquidos etiam mortalibus attulit ignes. (DAP 1.515-18)}
\]

Vida recounts the incident (519-29), and follows the Prometheus reference with a section (532-63) in praise of poetry. Similarly in Ad Patrem an allusion to Prometheus serves as an introduction to the carmen section:

\[
\text{nee tu vatis opus divinum despice carmen,}
\text{quo nihil aethereos ortus et semina caeli,}
\text{nil magis humanam commendat origine mentem,}
\text{sancta Prometheae retinens vestigia flammæ. (17-21)}
\]

22 Nutricia is the title of the fourth book of Politian’s Sylvæ.
23 Cf. Politian, Nutricia 74: ausa Prometheæ caelestia semina flammæ.
In both instances the noun *carmen* recurs in different cases, thereby constituting a hymnic motif. Vida asserts that from the beginning it was through *carmen* that the gods revealed their mysteries:

\[ \text{sed ventura prius pandebant carmine soli} \]
\[ \text{caelicolae, dubiisque dabant oracula rebus (DAP 1.532-33)} \]

Echoing Politian, he states that Jupiter, Themis and Faunus employed *carmina* to deliver their prophecies:

\[ \text{Ipse pater divum Dodonae carmina primus} \]
\[ \text{et Libycis cecinit lucis; mox Phocidis antro} \]
\[ \text{insonuit Themis alma; suos quoque pulcher Apollo} \]
\[ \text{responsis monuit Delphos; nec defuit olim} \]
\[ \text{antiquis Faunus caneret qui fata Latinis. (DAP 1.534-38)} \]

Milton states that Sibyls used *carmina*:

\[ \text{Carmine sepositi retegunt arcana futuri} \]
\[ \text{Phoebades, et tremulae pallentes ora Sibyllae (24-25)} \]

The same point had been made by Vida:

\[ \text{tum sacra Sibyllae} \]
\[ \text{nomina divinas caeli in penetralia mentes} \]
\[ \text{arripuere, deumque animis hausere furentes.} \]
\[ \text{(DAP 1. 539-541)} \]

and by Politian:

\[ \text{quin et veteres prompsere Sibyllae} \]
\[ \text{carmen} \]
\[ \text{(Nutricia 219-220)} \]

*Carmina* were used by mankind after banquets when the praises of heroes were sung. Vida states:

\[ \text{Nec mora, quae primum Fauni vatesque canebant26} \]
\[ \text{carmina mortales passim didicere per urbes,} \]
\[ \text{post epulas laudes heroum et facta canentes. (DAP 1.542-44)} \]

He conveys the orphic powers of *carmen* as it moved rocks, drew forests and held them under its power (*tua munera saxa/dura movent silvasque trahunt hinc inde sequentes [DAP 1.552-53]*) Moreover, it prevailed upon the realms of Tartarus. Addressing divine song, Vida says:

\[ \text{24 This finds classical precedent in Ovid, Amores 2.1.23-28.} \]
\[ \text{25 Nutricia, 207-8.} \]
\[ \text{26 Cf. Ennius, Ann. 214: versibus quos olim Faunei vatesque canebant.} \]
Te quoque senserunt olim impia Tartara, et umbræ pallentes stupuere. Minas tibi ianitor Orci oblitus, saevas posuere et Erinnyes iras. *(DAP 1.554-56)*

*Ad Patrem* has a parallel passage. Like Vida (532, 534, 543), Milton has the almost hymn-like repetition of *carmen* in different cases, although he develops the technique on a larger scale:

- *carmen* amat superi, tremebundaque Tartara *carmen* (21)
- *carmine* sepositi retegunt arcana futuri (24)
- *carmina* sacrificus sollemnes pangit ad aras (26)*\(^{27}\)
- *carmina* regales epulas ornare solemne solebant (41)
- *carmine*, non cithara, simulacraque functa canendo (54)

The patterning of Milton’s catalogue, as it were, is interesting. He reduces the lengthy accounts of the gods vis-à-vis *carmen* to the simple *carmen amat superi* (21). Then, echoing both Vida and Politian,\(^ {28}\) he describes some of the ways in which *carmen* was used:

- *carmen* amat superi, tremebundaque Tartara *carmen* (21)
- *ima ciere valet, divosque ligare profundos, et triplici duros Manesadamante coercet.*
- *carmine* sepositi retegunt arcana futuri
- *Phoebades*, et *tremulae pallentes ora Sibyllae; carmina sacrificus sollemnes pangit ad aras aures seu sternit motantem cornua taurum; seu cum fata sagax fumantibus abdita fibris consultit, et tepidis Parcam scrutatur in extis. (21-29)

In Vida, *carmen* had soothed the angry *Erinnyes* (556); in Milton, it restrains the *Manes* (23). Where Vida had linked the Tartarus and Orpheus passages (552-56), Milton splits the two, reserving Orpheus until the end of the section:

- *silvestres decet iste choros, non Orphea cantus, qui tenuit fluvios et quercubus addidit aures carmine, non cithara, simulacraque functa canendo compulit in lacrimas.* (52-55)

Milton however extends the functions of *carmen* to embrace heavenly music after death and the harmony of the spheres (30-40), but returns to Vida (543-44) in linking *carmen* with banquets and the singing of great heroic deeds:

\(^{27}\) For the association of *sacrifici* with *carmen*, cf. Politian, *Nutricia* 281.

\(^{28}\) *Nutricia*, 216-96.

carmina regales epulas ornare solebant (41)
tum de more sedens festa ad convivia vates
aesculea intonsos redimitus ab arbore crines,
heroumque actus imitandaque gesta canebat (44-46)

Ad Patrem is closely related to De Arte Poetica 1 in terms of content, expression and overall treatment. In his fusion of the themes of education and the defence of poetry Milton presents in miniature what Vida had achieved on a wider scale. The subtle combination of the didactic and the expository, of the formal and the personal has resulted in a tribute to a father that draws upon, but at the same time goes beyond, Vida, De Arte Poetica 1. Links between Milton, Vida and Politian are highlighted in Figure 1.

II
Elegia Quinta

Elegia Quinta is the most descriptive of Milton’s Latin poems. In its celebration of the spring-season it takes its place beside classical and neo-Latin treatments of the theme. Its language is abundantly rich, and the poem seems to pulsate with vibrant energy in the manner of Stravinsky. One of the key features of the elegy is the parallel which is established between nature and the speaker, between the new surge of life and activity displayed by the natural world and the onset of inspiration within the poet’s breast — a parallel that seems to transport the whole outside the realm of the spring-poem.

Lines 1-29 constitute a virtual prologue to the elegy. The poet places himself amidst his natural surroundings, as the growth and fertility which the earth displays at springtime are balanced by the vires which have returned to him:

In se perpetuo Tempus revolubile gyro
iam revocat zephyros vere tepente novos.
Induiturque brevem Tellus reparata iuventam,
iame soluta gelu dulce virescit humus.
Fallor? an et nobis redeunt in carmina vires,
ingeniunque mihi munere veris adestr?

30 For examples of neo-Latin poems on spring, see Naugierius, Carmina Illustrium Poetarum Italorum (Florence, 1719-26), 6, pp. 478-79; Basilius Zanchus, ibid., 11, pp. 413-15; Fracastorius, Delitiae CC Italorum Poetarum (Frankfort, 1608) 1, p. 1118; George Buchanan, Maiae Calendae. For a general examination of Elegia Quinta vis-à-vis spring-poems, see Don Cameron Allen, “Milton as a Latin Poet” in J.E. Phillips and D.C. Allen, Neo-Latin Poetry of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (Los Angeles, 1965), pp. 30-52.
**Milton's Latin Poetry and Vida**

**Politian**

70-71 Link between poetry and Prometheus
Addresses divine Penicia and associates her with the god
74 Aenea, Prometheus, Policratis animae flammare
202-5 Prometheus's shaft of fire

206-17 **GODS AND CARMEN**
207 Alcin Thronis
208 Iapetus ipse
216 Faunus

219-220 **SYBILIAE AND CARMEN**
qui et veteres proponent Sybiliae

carmes

281 **SACRIFICIUM AND CARMEN**

287-296 **Ophyeus and Carmen** (Tartares)
291 Illus argus etiam patrem quedea
292 Tartara

**Vida**

516-518 Link between poetry and Prometheus
Prometheus brough Monoe to earth

519-520 PROMETHEUS STORY

532-538 **GODS AND CARMEN**
534 Iapetus duxivus (Jupiter)
536 Thronis alius
538 Faunus

539-541 **SYBILIAE AND CARMEN**
nomia divinae, cuncti in penetralia menes

542-544 **CARMINA AT BANQUETS (HEBROCIC SONG)**
carmine mortuis passim didicerat per urbem,
past epulis ludus heroico et facies canecens.

554-556 **CARMEN AND TARTARUS**
Te quoque satem ulima ambit Tartara, et umbrae
pallentiam susurri. Minos tribd timitor et
oblivit, servas posset et Ennomys iras.

**Milton**

17-20 Link between poetry and Prometheus
Poetry retains the vestiges of Prometheus's flame

20 Promethei retineo vestigia flammare

21 **GODS AND CARMEN**
Carmen amans superi

21-23 **CARMEN AND TARTARUS**
tremendissimae Tartarae carmen

23 inae cives valde, divusque lingis profusionis,
et triplici dono Mares adnctant coercet.

24-25 **SYBILIAE AND CARMEN**
Carmines appositi vestigiae solet

25 Phoebades, et tremulantae palamens ex Sibyllae.

26-29 **SACRIFICIUM AND CARMEN**
carmine sacrificia solet pars ad menas

41-44 **CARMINA AT BANQUETS (HEBROCIC SONG)**
carmine reginae ipso amnare

44 hermoque arxas imitandaeque gestis cecoebat.

52-55 **Ophyeus and Carmen**
qui intus flumin et quaeque ad nos accesser

carmine, non igitur, simulacrumque facies canendo

55 complicat in fatares.

**Figure 1**
Munere veris adest, iterumque vigescit ab illo
(quis putet) atque aliquod iam sibi poscit opus. (1-8)

There is a parallel between virescit (4) of the earth as it receives new life and becomes green and vigescit (7)\(^\text{31}\) of the poet’s ingenium at the onset of inspiration. He answers his own rhetorical question: Yes, he has received inspiration and his mind is in a fervour of poetic activity. A balance is achieved between nature and the poet through the use of images and phrases which suggest reawakening and renewal. The earth has been renewed (Tellus reparata [3]); similarly, the speaker receives strength to compose poetry (et nobis redeunt in carmina vires (5)). Spring is presented in both a literal and metaphorical sense: the spring which is occurring outside the poet’s self, and the spring — the sense of inspiration — which the poet feels within his very being. Both are closely related:

ingeniumque mihi munere veris adest (6)\(^\text{32}\)

Milton proceeds to convey the intensity of such inspiration as he describes the haunts of the Muses hovering before his eyes. He tells of the poetic frenzy which has taken possession of his breast: the arcano ... motu (11) and the sonitus sacer (12) within him. He welcomes the arrival of Apollo, who, as sun-god and god of poetry alike, is an important link between the two worlds of the poem. Once more the poet recounts his own experiences — iam mihi (15)\(^\text{33}\) recalling et mihi (10). This time inspiration is presented on a higher plane, on a quasi-spiritual level, as the mens is whirled aloft to the heights of the sky and, freed from the body, can perceive hidden realms:

Iam mihi mens liquidi raptatur in ardua caeli,
perque vagas nubes corpore liber co.
Perque umbras, perque antra feror penetralia vatum,
et mihi fana patent interiora Deum.
Intuiturque animus toto quid agatur Olympo,
nec fugiunt oculos Tartara caeca meos.

\(^{31}\) Cf. Catullus 46.7-8: *iam mens praetrepidans avet vagari/iam laeti studio pedes vigescunt.*

\(^{32}\) The notion of inspiration as a gift (*munus*) occurs in Vida, DAP 2.420-21 as the poet tries in vain to exercise his normal powers (*consueta ... munera*): *Ah quoties aliquis frustra consuetas retentat/munera.* Later, poetry is described as the gift of Apollo: *saepe etiam in somnis memores Phoebia versant/munera* (2.441-42).

\(^{33}\) Cf. Michael Marullus, *Hymni Naturales* 3.1.12-14: *iam mihi, discussa mortali pectori nube,/Parcarum reseratur opus; iam panditur ingens/annorum series...*
Quid tam grande sonat distento spiritus ore?
Quid parit haec rabies, quid sacer iste furor? (15-22)

The reference to spiritus (21), and several other features suggest links with Vida, Hymn 3 Spiritui Sancto.34 There an essentially spiritual onset of inspiration was vividly described. Both use the phrase intus agit to depict a motivating force. Milton states: “a sacred fury and sound motivate me within” (et furor et sonitus me sacer intus agit [12]). In Vida, the force is God: “God motivates me within and moves in my heart” (intus agit Deus, et nostro se pectore versat [5]).35 Both make use of the fallor an motif: “Am I deceived or does the power to compose poetry return to me also?” (Fallor? an et nobis redeunt in carmina vires [5]); “Am I deceived or does that heat rush forth?” (Fallor? an ille ruit calor? [25]). Both allude to a source of inspiration which hovers before the speaker’s eyes: “The Castalian spring and the twin-peaked summit hover before my eyes” (Castalis ante oculos, bifidumque cacumen oberrat [9]); “behold, a very great light hovers before my eyes” (ante oculos lux en mihi plurima oberrat [26]).36 More generally, lines 15-22 of Milton’s poem can be compared with Vida, 28-38.

However the overall parallel between the arrival of spring in the natural world and the onset of inspiration within the poet constitutes a skilful inversion of Vida, De Arte Poetica 2.395-454, in which the arrival and subsequent departure of inspiration are compared to nature’s ever-changing yet perpetual cycle as manifested in the seasons of the year. More specifically, just as spring does not always adorn sunny fields, so inspiration does not always attend the poet. At such a time his strength languishes, and the Muses and Apollo himself are absent.

The first point of similarity between Vida and Milton is the emphasis upon the sacred nature of the frenzy which takes possession of the human heart. In both instances this is denoted by the phrase sacer ... furor.37 Vida asks:

Quid, cum animis sacer est furor additus atque potens vis (DAP 2.395)38

---

34 Poemata quae extant omnia (London, 1732) II, 42-55. For links between this hymn and Milton’s invocations of Urania in Paradise Lost, see my article cited in n. 6 above.
35 Cf. Virgil, Aeneid 6.726-27: spiritus intus alit, totamque infusa per artus/mens agit at molem et magno se corpore miscet.
37 Cf. Lucan, BC 7.551: hic furor, hic rabies; Pontanus, Urania 3.1189 sacrumque ...
38 Cf. Politian, Nutricia 139-40.
Milton uses the phrase on two occasions: firstly, in his description of the onset of inspiration:

\[ \text{et furor et sonitus me sacer intus agit} \] (12)

and, secondly, in his attempt to analyse the force:

\[ \text{Quid tam grande sonat distento spiritus ore?} \]
\[ \text{Quid parit haec rabies, quid sacer iste furor?} \] (21-22)

Vida states that inspiration is not present at all times. Indeed the hearts and dispositions of men vary in accordance with nature’s changeable weather:

\[ \text{nunc variant species animorum, et pectora nostra} \]
\[ \text{nunc hos, nunc illos multo discrimine motus} \]
\[ \text{concipiunt, seu quod caeli mutatur in horas} \]
\[ \text{tempestas, hominumque simul quoque pectora mutant.} \] (DAP 2.396-99)

This, it could be argued, is the beginning of a parallel between Vida and Milton on the subject of inspiration compared to, and even influenced by, the spring. Whereas Vida concentrates upon the negative aspects, stating what will happen if the season is unsuitable and inspiration not present, Milton inverts the whole, presenting a positive view. The features which Vida bewails as lacking in nature and in the uninspired poet are depicted by Milton as actually present in the natural world and, more importantly, within the inspired poet’s breast.

Underlying Vida’s lines is an awareness of the transience of spring and of inspiration itself. This is conveyed through the repetition of interdum (404, 403, 410 and 414), and of nec semper (411 and 412). The same theme is implicit in Elegia Quinta which, for all its positive elements, sees spring as but one season within Time’s recurring cycle:

\[ \text{In se perpetuo Tempus revolubile gyro} \] (1)

Moreover there is an allusion to the cold of winter (gelu [4]) which has just passed; the youthfulness which the earth assumes is shortlived (brevem ... iuventam [3]). Spring is only part of nature’s pattern. With

39 It is possible that sacer qualifies both furor and sonitus.
40 On a general level, Milton’s attempt to analyse the process of inspiration may recall Politian, Nutricia 25-31.
41 Cf. the invocation of a vernal Venus in Lucretius, De Rerum Natura 1.1-61
42 Cf. Horace, Ars Poetica 350: nec semper feriet quodcumque minabitur arcus.
43 Cf. Buchanan, El. 2 (Maiae Calendae) 9: dum renovat Maius senium revolubilis aevi.
the poet himself, inspiration is returning (redeunt in carmina vires [5]); his ingenium is beginning to grow strong again (iterumque vigescit [7]). It is as though he too has endured his winter when inspiration was absent, and is now recovering his strength like the world of nature around him. This notion may underlie the closing lines of the poem proper as the speaker prays that the passing of springtime be gradual and that the arrival of winter be delayed. His concluding plea to Apollo (presented earlier [13-14] as a virtual symbol of inspiration) may contain an implicit hint that with the arrival of winter, inspiration itself will vanish:

Tu saltem lente rapidos age Phoebe iugales
qua potes, et sensim tempora veris eant.
Brumaque productas tarde ferat hispida noctes,
ingruat et nostro serior umbra polo. (137-40)

Milton then, while certainly stressing a much more positive side of the theme, resembles Vida in his recognition of the transience of the seasons and of inspiration.

It is in his account of the features which mark the arrival of spring and of inspiration that Milton presents what is in effect an antithesis of Vida’s lines.

Vida states that at times nature is wholly deprived of life: woods lack foliage, rivers are short of water and spring does not always adorn sunny fields:

Interdum et silvis frondes et fontibus humor
desunt, nec victis semper cava flumina ripis45
plena fluunt, nec semper agros ver pingit apricos. (DAP 2.410-12)46

The opening lines of Milton’s poem seem to counter and invert such a negative viewpoint. Instead of lamenting the absence of spring, Milton rejoices in its presence, as Time recalls the fresh west winds in the warmth of that season:

In se perpetuo Tempus revolubile gyro
iam revocat Zephyros vere tepente novos (1-2)

44 Cf. in a general sense Horace’s spring poem: Odes 4.7.1 Diffugere nives, redeunt iam gramina campis.
Instead of portraying the absence of foliage from the trees, Milton describes the burgeoning of nature as the earth becomes young and the ground becomes green:

induiturque brevem Tellus reparata iuventam,
iamque soluta gelu dulce virescit humus. (3-4)

The inversion is more obvious in the subsequent lines. Vida says that the same fate often befalls poets, and describes the sluggish torpor which can take possession of their hearts, with the result that the strength to compose carmina weakens, the senses falter and vigour rapidly disappears:

sors eadem incertis contingit saepe poetis.
Interdum exhaustae languent ad carmina vires,
absumptusque vigor, studiorumque immemor est mens.
Torpescunt sensus, circum praecordia sanguis
stat gelidus.47 (DAP 2.413-17)

The phrase sors eadem (413) is a direct link between nature and the poet. Milton achieves a similar link through the phrase et nobis (5), but unlike Vida who had conveyed the languishing of strength and the inability to compose poetry, Milton celebrates the arrival of strength and the great urge to compose:

Fallor? an et nobis redeunt in carmina vires,
ingeniurmque mihi munere veris adest?
Munere veris adest, iterumque vigescit ab illo
(quis putet) atque aliquod iam sibi poscit opus. (5-8)

Milton’s redeunt in carmina vires (5) echoes and inverts Vida’s languent ad carmina vires (414). Vida’s phrases describing lifelessness and lack of energy (languent [414]; absumptusque vigor [415]; torpescunt sensus [416] and sanguis/... gelidus [416-17]) are replaced in Milton by phrases denoting new life and activity (ingenium ... adest [6]; vigescit [7]).

Vida proceeds to bewail the absence of the Muses. Because of the poet’s lack of stimulus, one would think that the Muses had departed:

... credas penitus migrasse Camoenas (417)

Milton, on the other hand, sees the haunts of the Muses: the Castalian spring,48 Mount Parnassus and the fountain of Pirene:

47 Cf. Virgil, Georgics 2. 484: frigidus obstiterit circum praecordia sanguis.
48 While Castalis is regularly used to mean the Castalian spring, it also occurs as a substitute for the Muses, e.g. Castalidum grex, Martial 7.12.10. If Milton’s Castalis = Muse, this would be an even more specific inversion of Vida’s credas penitus migrasse Camoenas (417).
Castalis ante oculos bifidumque cacumen oberrat,
et mihi Pyrenen somnia nocte ferunt. (9-10)

The association of inspiration with dreams may echo in a general sense Vida’s statement that poets can compose even in the midst of sleep:

saepe etiam in somnis memores Phoebeia versant
munera, et inventi quidam qui saepe sopore
in medio Musis cecinere et Apolline digna. (DAP 2.441-43)

Vida stresses the fear that Apollo may never return to the poet’s breast and states that the Muses and Apollo himself are of no avail:

notaque numquam ipsum rediturum in pectora Phoebum.
Nil adeo Musae, nil subvenit auctor Apollo. (DAP 2.418-19)

Milton inverts this by celebrating the arrival of Apollo:

Delius ipse venit, video Peneide lauro
implicitos crines, Delius ipse venit. (13-14)

Vida asserts that it is useless to try to compose poetry when inspiration is lacking, but outlines a more positive instance of a man who was able to woo back inspiration by singing ancient poetry whereby his strength returned, his mind was renewed and vigour was restored:

Quidam autem inventus qui saepe reduceret auras
optatas veterum cantando carmina vatum,
paulatimque animo blandum invitaret amorem,
donec collectae vires, animique refecti,
delit vigor ille, velut post nubila et imbres
sol micat aethereus. (DAP 2.423-28)

This has already happened in Milton’s case (et nobis redeunt in carmina vires [5]). Vida’s simile of the shining sun is interesting in view of the role of Apollo in Milton’s poem. As sun-god and god of poetry alike, he is representative of both nature and poetry.

In his inversion of a passage from De Arte Poetica 2 Milton has achieved a successful balance between the rejuvenation of the natural world at springtime and the onset of inspiration within the poet. Parallels are illustrated in Figure 2.

49 sc. credas (417)
FIGURE 2

VIDA

395 INSPIRATION AS SACER FUROR
Quid cum animis sacer est furor additus atque potens vis

410-412 ABSENCE OF SPRING: WOODS LACK FOLIAGE
Interdum et silvis fruendes et foetibus humor
desunt, nec victis semper cava fluminis ripis
plena fluint, nec semper agros ver pingit apricos.

413 PARALLEL BETWEEN ABSENCE OF SPRING AND LACK OF INSPIRATION
sors eadem incertis contingit saepe poetis.

414-417 LANGUISHING OF STRENGTH (VIRES)
Interdum exactas languent ad carmina vires,
ahsumptusque vigor, studiorumque immenior est mens.
Torpescunt sensus, circum praecordia sanguis
stat gelidus.

417 DEPARTURE OF MUSES
... credas penitus migrasse Camoenas

418-419 DEPARTURE OF APOLLO
notaque numquam ipsum reddirum in pectora Pusebun.
Nil adeo Museae, nil subvenit auctor Apollo.

426-428 RETURN OF STRENGTH (VIRES)
ducec collecter vires animique refecti,
et reedit vigor ille, velut post nubila, et imtres
sol micat aetherius.

428-429 QUESTION MOTIF
unde haec tam clara repente
tempestas?

441-443 POETRY IN THE MIDST OF SLEEP
saepe etiam in somnis memora Pusebunia versa
mutura, et inventi quidam qui saepe sopore
in medio Musis ceceinere et Apolline digna.

MILTON

1-4 ARRIVAL OF SPRING: EARTH BECOMES GREEN
In se perpetuo Tempus revolubile gyro
iam revocat zephyros vere tepente novos.
Induitorque brevem Tellus reparata inuentam,
tamque soluta gelu dulce virescit humus.

5 PARALLEL BETWEEN ARRIVAL OF SPRING AND ONSET OF INSPIRATION
Fallor? an et nobis redeunt in carmina vires,

5-8 RETURN OF STRENGTH (VIRES)
Fallor? an et nobis redeunt in carmina vires,
ingeniunque mihi munere veris adeat?
Munere veris adeat, iterumque vigescat ab illo
(qua potest) atque aliquod iam abhirs opus.

9-10 ARRIVAL OF MUSES (as represented by Castalian spring etc)
Castalis aete uolos bilidumque caumen oberrat,
et mihi Pyrenae sonnum nocte ferunt.

12 INSPIRATION AS SACER FUROR
et furor et soflitus me sacer intus agit

13-14 ARRIVAL OF APOLLO
Delius ipe venit, video Peneide lauro
implicitus crines, Delius ipe venit.

21-22 QUESTION MOTIF
Quid tam grande sonat distento spiritus ore?
Quid parit haec rabies, quid sacer iste furor?
III

In Quintum Novembris

In Quintum Novembris merits discussion a priori in a neo-Latin context. Although the poem has rightly been viewed by scholars as a striking anticipation of Paradise Lost, it is much more than this. Genre is of paramount importance here, for the poem constitutes in effect a miniature Latin epic on the Gunpowder Plot, and closely mirrors contemporary neo-Latin epics on that subject. But it is also possible that Vida’s presentation of Satan in the Christiad functioned among others as an important precedent in conveying in rich and vivid terminology the Satanic origins of an evil plot. Points of similarity include the portrayal of the corrupting force of evil upon the virtuous, the physical characteristics of the enraged Satan, the use of disguise inter alia, while on a broader level, the power of God ultimately to thwart Satanic malice.

Milton presents Satan as a second Pluto, the father of the Eumenides, reigning in the Underworld, but exiled from Heaven:

... ferus ignifluo regnans Acheronte tyrannus
Eumenidum pater, aethereo vagus exul Olympo (7-8)

Vida’s Satan is likewise a second Pluto: “ruler of the world of shades, a wretched monster” (mundi regnator opacilinfelix monstrum [Chr. 1.121-22]), who, after summoning his infernal crew, describes them (and himself) as exiles from Heaven:

quos olim huc superi mecum inclementia regis
aethere deiectos flagranti fulmine adegit (Chr.1.168-69)

Traversing the earth, Milton’s Satan recruits his accomplices, causing hatred among friends and ensnaring the virtuous by luring them to his evil ways:

50 See Macon Cheek, “Milton’s In Quintum Novembris: an epic foreshadowing” Studies in Philology 54 (1957), 172-84. I have developed this in my doctoral thesis: John Milton’s Latin Poetry: Some Neo-Latin and Vernacular Contexts (Queen’s University, Belfast 1987), pp. 238-50.
53 Cf. Virgil, Aeneid 7.324-28 in which Pluto is named as the father of the Furies.
54 Aethereo … Olympos, a stock phrase, occurs in Christiad 4.114 nondum homini tamen aethereum patfectit Olympum, and 4.1001 et aethereo transscriptis Olympia.
forte per immensum terrarum erraverat orbem, 
dinumerans sceleris socios vernasque fideles, 
participes regni post funera moesta futuros; 
hic tempestates medio ciet aere diras, 
illic unanimes odium struit inter amicos, 
armat et invictas in mutua viscera gentes; 
regnaque olivifera vertit florentia pace, 
et quoscunque videt purae virtutis amantes, 
hos cupit adiicere imperio, fraudumque magister 
tentat inaccessum sceleri corrumpere pectus, 
insidiasque locat tacitas, cassesque latentes 
tendit ut incautos rapiat. (9-20)

Satan in himself is a virtual embodiment of the demons in Vida’s poem:

nee minus illi etiam diversis partibus orbis 
convenient properi qui terris omnibus errant 
hortantes scelera, ac variis mortalit ludunt 
pectora imaginibus, rectique oblivia suadent. (Chr.1.156-59)

In book 2, like Milton’s Satan, they sow hatred.55

Both Milton and Vida describe the evil party wandering over the earth (terrarum erraverat orbem [9]; terris omnibus errant [157]), seeking accomplices in crime (dinumerans sceleris socios [10]; hortantes scelera [158]) and corrupting and beguiling the hearts of men (inaccessum sceleri corrumpere pectus; insidiasque locat tacitas cassesque latentes/tendit [18-20]; variis mortalit ludunt;pectora imaginibus [158-59]) as they urge them to abandon or forget what is virtuous (quoscunque videt purae virtutis amantes; hos cupit adiicere imperio [16-17]; rectique oblivia suadent [159]). In both poems Satan or his followers sow hatred (unanimes odium struit inter amicos [13]; inspirant odiumque animis [2.36]).

Milton’s Satan, on seeing England at peace and her people worshiping the true Godhead (venerantem numina veri/sancta Dei populum (33-34)), utters an embittered outburst of indignation, heaving sighs that reek of Tartarean fire and lurid sulphur. His eyes are ablaze and he gnashes his teeth:56

... tandem suspiria rupit
Tartareos ignes et luridum olentia sulphur
qualia Trinacria trux ab love clausus in Aetna

55 principio spargunt occultum in pectora virus;vipereamque viris animam caecumque fuorem/inspirant odiumque animis, et crimina linquant (Chr. 2.34-36).

56 Cf. the vivid account in Marino, La Strage degli Innocenti 1, stanzas 7-8.
Milton’s lines seem to recall Vida both verbally and thematically. The phrase *suspiria rupit* (34) finds a parallel in *Christiadi* 2.951: *ingemuit, rupitque imo suspiria corde*, while *armorum fragor* (39) occurs in *De Arte Poetica* 2.382: *armorum fragor audiri, gemitusque cadentum*. On a thematic level, the description of the angry Satan’s physical characteristics may be compared with *Christiadi* 1.147 ff. Here he and others belch forth heat, smoke and black fire from their lips and eyes:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{at centum-geminus flammanti vertice supra est} \\
&\text{arbiter ipse Erebi, centenaque brachia iactat} \\
&\text{centimanus, totidemque eructat faucibus aestus.} \\
&\text{Omnes luctificum fumumque atrosque procaci} \\
&\text{ore oculisque ignes et vastis naribus efflant} \quad (Chr. 1.147-51)
\end{align*}
\]

A further point of contact between Milton and Vida is the demon’s use of disguise and, more specifically, the features and habit of one under holy orders. In both instances the purpose of the disguise is to ensnare a victim. Milton’s Satan transforms himself into a Franciscan friar:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{cum niger umbrarum dominus rectorque silentum} \\
&\text{praedatorque hominum falsa sub imagine tectus} \\
&\text{astitit} \quad (78-80)
\end{align*}
\]

Milton proceeds to describe the Franciscan habit in some detail thereby echoing George Buchanan, *Somnium* and *Franciscanus*. It should not go unnoticed however that Vida’s demons likewise assume human form as a means of deceiving their victims:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Multi etiam in facies hominum vertuntur et omnem} \\
&\text{protinus incendunt variis rumoribus urbem} \quad (Chr. 2.37-38)
\end{align*}
\]

Indeed they transform themselves into priests:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{quin ipos templi mentiti veste ministros} \\
&\text{singula tecta adeunt, patresque ad limina sacra} \\
&\text{conciliumque vocant} \quad (Chr. 2.48-50)
\end{align*}
\]

The evil party implements and recommends fraud:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{insidiasque locat tacitas cassesque latentes} \\
&\text{tendit ut incautos rapiat} \quad (Q. Nov. 19-20)
\end{align*}
\]

---

57 See *Poemata Quae Extant* (Amsterdam, 1687), 1, 260, 19-20; 2, 293.

tu callidus utere fraude (Q.Nov.114)
nunc tectis opus insidiis, nunc viribus usus (Chr.1.223)

Finally, the general association of gunpowder with demons is common to both poems. In *In Quintum Novembris* Satan, disguised as a Franciscan, advocates the use of gunpowder:

hos tu membratim poteris conspergere in auras,
atque dare in cineres, nitrati pulveris igne
aedibus iniecto qua convenere sub imis. (119-21)

Vida had compared the demonically inspired priests to gunpowder in a cannon:

Infremuere omnes contra gemitumque dedere.
Qualiter aere cavo dum sulphura pascitur atra
inclusus magis atque magis furit acrior ignis
moliturque fugam, nec se capit intus anhelans;
nulla sed angustis foribus via, nec potis extra
rumpere materiam donec comprenderit omnem;
tum piceo disclusa volat glans ferrea fumo.
Fit crepitus: credas rupto ruere aethere caelum,
iamque illa et turres procul ecce! stravit et arces;
corpora et arma iacent, late et via facta per hostes. (Chr.2.204-13)

Parallels between *In Quintum Novembris* and the *Christiad* are by necessity of a general nature. Nevertheless the reader of this Latin poem on the Gunpowder Plot should bear in mind the fact that Vida provided Milton with an important precedent of the presentation in Latin of Satanic malice: the origins and ultimate defeat of evil. Moreover Milton’s poem anticipates that much more skilfully developed portrayal of Satan in *Paradise Lost* — a poem which in itself merits comparison with Vida’s epic.60

The Queen’s University of Belfast

59 Cf. *Paradise Lost*, in which gunpowder is associated with demons, who use cannon as their weapon (6. 478-91). Raphael describes the actual concoction of gunpowder (6. 509-515), and conveys the havoc caused when it is ignited in the cannon (6. 578-89). Perhaps the demonic origins of gunpowder are most fully embodied in a simile in 4. 814-19. Satan, suddenly surprised by Ithuriel and Zephon as he whispers into Eve’s ear, is likened to gunpowder itself when ignited by a spark: “As when a spark/Lights on a heap of nitrous Powder, laid/Fit for the Tun som Magazin to store/Against a rumord Warr, the Smuttie graine/With sudden blaze diffus’d, inflames the Aire:/So started up in his own shape the Fiend”.

60 I wish to express my thanks to Michael J. McGann (Queen’s University, Belfast) and Anthony D. Nuttall (New College, Oxford) for their helpful comments upon an earlier version of this paper.
The life and work of Ferdinand Verbiest (°1623-†1688), one of the three ‘pillars’ of the Jesuit mission in China during the seventeenth century, has been discussed and studied in many aspects in recent years, with particular emphasis on the ‘scientific missionary method’ he applied, after the model of several fellow fathers in China, with so much success; nonetheless, much work remains to be done. In the present article, I would like to discuss in more detail the language of his Latin written reports on Jesuit activities in the fields of astronomy and other mathematical sciences in Peking, the preferred areas in which both Verbiest and his forerunners tried to impress the Chinese upper class with an eye to their conversion. I will do so within the limits of my competence, i.e. as a Latinist, involved since several years in the study of the original sources on this mission, which were mainly written in Latin (and Portuguese). This research originated from reflections on the specific vocabulary of Verbiest’s Astronomia Europaea during the preparation of my English translation, which has recently appeared; the results of these reflections will be found in various notes scattered throughout the commentaries of that edition as well as in the present contribution, which should be seen partly as a further justification of that translation and partly as a complement to the commentaries.

* I am grateful to Mr. P. Van Dessel (K.U.Leuven), who revised the English text of this article.
1 The history of this ‘method’ is still to be written.
However, in order to have a more substantial and representative corpus of text for this research, I have enlarged the spectrum to other, related Verbiest texts. In consequence, the corpus now contains: (a) his already mentioned *Astronomia Europaea* (AE), written in 1679/1680 in Peking and eventually published in Dillingen (Swabia) in 1687; it included in its Chapter XII the earlier (b) *Compendium Latinum* (CL), itself the result of the joining, in 1678, of two previous ‘compendia’ dated between 1669 (at the earliest) and 1676; (c) the *Mechanica* (M), i.e. a complete but concise Latin description of 106 drawings of the newly constructed European-sized astronomical instruments, drafted in 1676; important parts of this are assimilated in the AE as well, but many others are not; (d) the *Compendium Historicum* (CH) of 1676, summarized in AE, ch. I-XI; on the interrelationship between these texts, and between the Latin texts and their Chinese counterparts, see my conclusions in the aforementioned edition;⁴ (e) finally, three of Verbiest’s letters from that time, which deal mainly with the same matter, dated August 20, 1670 and published in his *Correspondance*, pp. 166-184 (C).⁴ All in all, this material constitutes almost all of Verbiest’s Latin writings on the matter; only very few references to scientific work have been found in other (Latin or Portuguese) letters. On the other hand, this rather small corpus of texts displays a closed character, as it was composed within the decade 1669–1679/1680, in quite particular circumstances which I cannot discuss here, and because they all deal with the same (semi-) technical topics; therefore it becomes an adequate and, because of its particular historic relevance — being the expression of ‘humanistic’ European technological traditions and knowledge transmitted into China — even an attractive target for lexicological research.

Apart from the letters these texts were until recently hardly available or even unknown: my research has indeed shown that European libraries and collections have preserved only a few copies of the *Astronomia Europaea* (AE),⁵ and the unique manuscript copy of the *Compendium Historicum* and *Mechanica* has only very recently been discovered. This situation has now changed since the aforementioned edition of the AE

---

³ N. Golvers, pp. 25 - 35.
⁵ This small volume of only 128 pp. has thus attained a very high value on the antiquarian market: a copy from the Philip Robinson collection was offered at auction on Nov. 22, 1988, for £2000–2500, and eventually sold for £7150!
and will be further improved by the publication of the text of the *Mechanica* and *Compendium Historicum*, which is in preparation.

As for the content of these texts, they all concern: (a) the somewhat spectacular astronomical tests by which Verbiest, in late 1668 and early 1669, could demonstrate and prove the technical ‘superiority’ of western astronomical knowledge over contemporary Chinese knowledge, so that the Jesuits could return to public life and regain the Emperor’s esteem, to the benefit of the until then persecuted Christian mission; (b) the construction of the six astronomical instruments of European size, built by Verbiest and his Chinese helpers between 1669 and 1673/4 for the Peking observatory, their main parts and the physical principles on which their working was based, from which it appears clearly that these texts and their vocabulary have a mainly technological character (see infra).

Ultimately the unequal quality of the transmitted text at our disposal must be emphasized; a lexicological study like the present one necessarily implies a sound text at the basis of all considerations. Whereas for the AE (including the CL) we dispose of a contemporary printed version — and for the CL even a xylograph in Verbiest’s own hand! — of generally good text quality, the text of CH and M is known only from a copy, made in 1693 in Moscow after the autograph, by someone who probably did not know much Latin and who surely had some difficulties in reading Verbiest’s handwriting. In any event, this hand-made copy of CH and M, although done with manifest care, provides a text of poor quality, and the emendations needed to reconstruct a comprehensible and sound text are very numerous, as will be shown in the forthcoming edition. It apparently contains some ‘neologisms’ which should belong to the material inventoried here but, as their form is still not certain, they have been incorporated in the following list with a *crux interpretum*. Finally, of the three letters in our corpus the autographs have survived, all in the collection of the Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu, J(apano-)S(inica), 145, f° 7-8; 9-10; 11-14.

My first and principal aim in this contribution is to analyse the Latin vocabulary of this small, coherent text corpus, especially with regard to its neologisms, and to present them in a neatly arranged vocabulary, the promised extension of the list at the end of my AE edition. As ‘neologisms’ I regard, and have listed *infra*, those words which in the sense they have
in our texts are absent from Lewis & Short's *Latin Dictionary*, the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, and Forcellini’s *Lexicon totius Latinitatis* for the classical period, from the dictionary of A. Souter, *A Glossary of Later Latin to 600 A.D.* (Oxford, 1964) for later Latin, and from Blaise’s *Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens* (Turnhout, 1954) for Christian Latin. I intend to distinguish systematically between medieval and post-medieval or Neo-Latin neologisms, in order to get a reliable idea about the specific medieval component of Verbiest’s Latin vocabulary and about the persistence of this terminology — through his formation and the sources he consulted — in his works. Moreover, the post-medieval or Neo-Latin words and terms which — compared to the Latin dictionaries as yet available — appear in Verbiest for the very first time (in our list without*) are not necessarily, even mostly not, of his own finding or creation, although this can only be proved after a large reading of contemporary sources.

Besides chronologically, the material will be classified according to the linguistic technique by which the neologisms were created, either in the Middle Ages or in modern times (16th–17th centuries). In this way, this study will present, apart from a simple extension of the lexicon of Neo-Latin words (word-forms and meanings) and proper names, a somewhat deeper insight into how the vocabulary of a ‘scientifically’ educated Jesuit in the mid-17th century was constituted, and throw some light both on his terminological background and, as far as personal neo-creations are concerned, on his terminological abilities after about one decade in China, in a period when he openly, but in all probability not without some literary pose, ‘confessed’ to a progressive loss of his mastery of Latin.7

This last point will be briefly investigated in a survey of the characteristics of the author’s Latin orthography, morphology and syntax, presented in the last part of this contribution.8

---


7 Cf. on this question my edition, p. 149 - 150 (n. 109).

8 As the direct model for this study I point to the authoritative essay by M. Benner & E. Tengström, *On the Interpretation of Learned Neo-Latin. An Explorative Study Based on some Texts from Sweden (1611-1716)* (Göteborg, 1977), which, both for the period and
1. Vocabulary.

1.0. First I will present a list of the 186 words and terms found in the aforementioned corpus which correspond to the characteristics described above. An asterisk (*) indicates a mention in one or more Middle Latin dictionaries, regardless of the date of the testimonia. In addition, the following sigla are employed:


B: F. Blatt, *Novum Glossarium Mediae Latinitatis ab DCCC usque ad annum MCC* (Hafniae, 1957 ff.).


DC: Du Cange, *Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis* (Parisiiis, 1840 etc.)


for the kind of texts it covers, seemed the most adequate prototype; another model was the brief contribution by K. Isacson, "A Study of Non-classical Features in Book XV of Olaus Magnus' 'Historia de Gentibus Septentrionalibus', 1555", *Humanistica Lovaniensia*, 38 (1989), 176-199.
a.: ante.
c.: century.
f.: figura.
°: reconstructed form.
†: form of the word uncertain.
‡: an authentic, but linguistically corrupt lectio of the author.
?: sense or gender uncertain / unknown.

A

acclive, adv.: M, f.31: “uphill”.
aeolopila, -ae, f.: AE, 87: “aeolipyle”.
aequatorius, -a, -um: M, f. 1: “relating to the equator; equatorial”.
albo-niger: M, f.97; AE, 71: “white-black”.
5 albo-ruber: AE, 71: “white-red”.
‡alilada for * al(h)idada, -ae, f.: M; AE, 50 and passim: “alhidade”. DC; BL;
PL: 1284 etc.; L2 and L3: 1326: “alhidade”.
anacampticus, -a, -um: AE, 60: “anacamptic; reflecting or reflected”.
anacastaticus, -a, -um: M, f.102; AE, 59: “anacastic; refracted”.
anemodicticum, -i, n.: M, f.1; AE, 48: “a wind-indicator; a weathercock”.
anemodicticus, -a, -um: M, f.1: “relating to a weathercock”.
anemoscopus: M, f.1: “wind-observer”.
anima, -ae, f.: M, f.105; AE, 66; 67: “the bore of a gun”.
annuere, -o: M, f.74: “to converge”.
antisacoma, -atis, n.: AE, 83; 85: “counterweight”.
10 *applanare, -o: AE, 94: “to flatten”. DC; L2: a. 1250; FW; BL; MW; BT.
aqueus, -a, -um: M, f.97; AE, 70; 71: “relating to water”. L2: a. 1211; FW;
BL; BT; PL; F. Verantius (1551-1617), Machinae novae, eh. VI.
arcto-zephyrus: M, f.97; AE, 69: “northwest”.
arenarium, -i, n.: AE, 97: “sand-glass”.
armatura, -ae, f.: M, f.66: “tackle block”.
20 *armilla, -ae, f.: M f.2.3.4; AE, 49; 50 and passim: “armillary sphere”. L
(1267); MW; PL (Vitelo; Copern.).
*armillaris, -is, -e: M, f.42; AE, 44; 50: “relating to an armilla”. PL
(Vitelo).
*astrolabium, -i, n.: M, Praef.; “astrolabe”. DC; N; L (1110); L3 (Walcher,
† 1135); BL; FW; MW; BT; PL (Vitelo)
astrologaster, -i, m.: AE, 11; 18; C, p. 567: “would-be astrologer”.
astropicus, -a, -um: M, f.40; AE, 10; 42; 47 and passim: “relating to star
observation”.
25 azimuthalis, -is, -e: AE, 48, 50: “relating to the azimuth”.

B

ballistica, -ae, f.: M, f.105; AE, 61: “ballistics”.
bicrus, -ruris: adj.: AE, 95: “two-legged”.
*bifurcatus, -a, -um: AE, 88: “bi-forked”. DC; L; FW; BL; MW; BT; PL.
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10
curriculus, -i, m.: AE, 79: “a chariot, carrying fire for heathing”. DC; BL.
cursor, -soris, m.: M, f.97; AE, 71: “cursor”.
cursorius, -a, -um: M, f.97: “relating to a cursor”.
cylindraceus, -a, -um: M, f.101; AE, 94: “cylindric”.
cylindricus, -a, -um: AE, 92: “id.”. L (1686).

diaphragma, -atis, n.: AE, 82: “partition; diaphragm of an instrument”.
digressiuncula, -ae, f.: C 178: “a small digression”.
dioptalis, -is, -e: M, f.2; 6; 12; AE, 43: “relating to a diopter”.
draconicus, -a, -um: C 182: “resembling to a dragon”.

eclipsis for * ellipsis: -is, f.: M, f.37: “ellipse”. PL (Vitelo); L (17th cent.).
eclypsiare/i: AE, 30; 31: “to eclipse”. DC; L2 (1179); FW (15c.); BT (1733).
ecliptica, — ae, f.: AE, 45: “ecliptic”. DC; L (1267); L3 (early 12th c.); PL.
eclipsomalis, -is, -e: AE, 19: “intercalary”. DC; L (1079); BT (1689); PL.
embolismic, -a, -um: AE, 19: “id.”.
erigere, -ο (figuram; epitaphium): AE, 29; 92: “to draw up (a figure; an epitaph)”.
explicatiuncula, -ae, f.: M, Praef.: “short explanation”.
extuberantia, -iae, f.: C 181: “projecting parts (of an instrument)”.

filaris, -is, -e: M, f.4; 40; AE, 51: “consisting of thread”.
fixa, -ae, f.: AE, 15; 23; 24: “fixed star”. BL.
frisa, -ae, f.: M, f. 105; AE, 64: “frieze”.

gazetta, -ae, f.: C 173: “journal”.
geod(a)esia, -ae, f.: M, f. 43; AE, 55; 58: “geodesy; land measuring”. PL (Copern.).
glossocomum, -i, onz.: M, f.77; AE, 79: “a device to lift up heavy weights”.
gradialis, -is, -e: M, f. 16: “relating to degrees”.

halo, -onis, (f): M, f. 98, AE, 93; 94: “(lunar) haloes”. L2 (a.1294); PL (Vitelo); FW (14c.).

12 A. Souter also mentions a Late Latin embolismaris (quoted from the Comput. 
Carth., a source from 455 a.D.), which is a dissimilatory variant of an older embolismalis.
horizon (azimuthalis), -ntis: M, f.1; AE, 48; 50: “horizon (astronomical instrument)”.

horologus, -a, -um: AE, 59; 85; 92: “reading, indicating the time”.

horolotechnia, -iae, f.: AE, 91: “the technique of watch-building; horologic technology”.

hydragogica, -ae, f.: AE, 69: “the technique of water conveyance; hydragogics”.

hydragogicus, -a, -um: M, f.97; AE, 72: “relating to the (technique of) water conveyance”.13

hydragogus, -i, m.: M, f.97; AE, 72: “a channel digger; a hydragogic engineer”.

hydraulica, -ae, f.: AE, 82: “hydraulics”.

hydragolica, -ae, f.: AE, 87: “a hydraulic engine”.

*hypochochium, -i, n.: M, f. 28; 67: “the support of a lever”.14

I

*incidentia, -iae, f.: M, f.101: “(angle of) incidence”. PL (Vitelo); L (ca. 1240); FW; BT (1689).

incubus, -i, m.: AE, 83: “a float”.

L


ligno-metallicus, -a, -um: M, f.105; AE, 64; 67: “wooden-metal”.

lucida, -ae, f.: AE, 15: “the brightest star in a constellation”.

M

magnetice, adv.: M, f.85: “magnetically”.

mandarinicus, -a, -um: AE, 12; 24; 25: “relating to a mandarin”.100


*meteora, -orum, n. pl.: M, f. 1; 98; 101; AE, 48: “atmospheric phenomena”. FEW (14c.); PL (c.15c.).

*met[h]eoricus, -a, -um: M, f.101: “high, atmospheric”. DC; L(?); B (c. 1200); BL; FW (15c.); BT (1689); PL.

*meteorologia, -iae, f.: AE, 93: “meteorology”. FW (15c.).

*meteorologicus, -a, -um: AE, 94: “meteorologic”. PL (Vitelo); FW (15c.).15

*mil[l]io, -ionis, f.: M, f.42; AE, 19/20: “million”. DC; L (1365); BL; PL (1457); BT (1802).

13 This term, as well as hydragogus, is only superficially identical to medieval hydragogicus (L [1250] and hydragogus (PL: 16th cent.), respectively, which had a purely medical sense, like its classical models.

14 In Vitruvius (X 3.2), hypochochium was still quoted as a Greek term: “...supposita...centro vectis...pressione, quod Graeci ὑπομόχλιον appellant”.

15 Cf. also R. J. Schoeck, p. 425 (who omits to mention the medieval character of the derivation).
*missionarius, -i, m.: AE, Praef.; 98: “missionary”. BT (1876).
musica, -ae, f.: AE, 26: “band”.

N

*nadir, indecl.: M, f.5; AE, 51: “nadir”. L (ca. 1233); PL (Albert, 1482).
noctu-diurnus, -a, -um: AE, 84: “for night and day”.

O

110 *observatorius, -a, -um: C 181: “relating, belonging to the observer”. PL (1524); BT (1835).
octangularis, -is, -e: AE, 77: “octangular”.
ocotolateris, -is, -e: M, f. 102: “eight-sided”.
*optica, -ae, f.: AE, 75: “optics”. L (1267); NED.
organotheca, -ae, f.: M, f.43: “instrument-collection”.

P

115 palaestra, -ae, f.: AE, Praef.[p. 4]: “book of study”.
pantocrator, -oris, m.: M, f.66; C 182: “almighty; device to lift up heavy weights”.
pantometrum, -i, n.: M, f.43; AE, 56: “pantometer; proportional compass”.
*parallaxis, -is, f.: AE, 22: “parallax (astr.)”. L (17th cent.)
parallelce, adv.: AE, 95: “parallel”.
120 †parascheuma, -matis, n.: M, f. 17: “?”.
parastaticus, -a, -um: M, f. 102; AE, 77: “displaying, representing”.
pataka, -ae, f. (patacon):16 AE, 68: “pataka; Portuguese currency in the Far-East”.
pedestal, -alis, n.: M, f.2; AE, 49: 50; 52: “pedestal”.
pegma, -matis, n.: AE, 25: 26: “palanquin; pavilion”.
125 pendulum, -i, n.: M; AE, 78: “pendulum”.
peritroch[l]ium, -i, n.: M, f. 76: “wheel revolving round an axle (mech. instr.)”.
*perpendiculariter, adv.: AE, 42: “perpendicularly”. DC; L(1233), BL; PL (Vitelo).
perpendiculum, -i, n.: M, f.105; AE, p. 62: “pendulum”
perspectiva, -ae, f.: AE, 97: “a painting in perspective”.
130 pinnacidium, -i, n.: M, f.2; 12; 60; AE, 14; 50; 52: “pinnule”.
*planisphaerium, -i, n.: AE, 83; 85: “planisphere”. L (1326).
pneumatica, -ae, f.: AE, 87: “pneumatics”.
*polaris, -is, -e: M, f.77: “relating to the poles (of an instrument)”. L (1275); BT (1876).

16 The Latin variant patacon (cf. Port. pataçao) is, to my knowledge, attested only once, viz. in Verbiest’s letter to Spatharj of 1680, of which we have only a 17th century copy; it is also quoted by the publishers of Verbiest’s correspondence (H. Josson & L. Willaert, p. 452), but is to be replaced there by the usual patacas, as is demonstrated by control of the autograph.
polyedrum, -i, n.: AE, 60: “many-sided solid; polyhedron”.

polyedrus, -a, -um: AE, 60: “polyhedral; many-sided”.


*porcellana, -ae, f.: M, f.102; AE, 60: “vessel of porcelain”. DC (17c.); L (1622).

*portatilis, -is, -e, adj.: M, f.62: portable”. L (ca. 1190); BT (1876).

*practice, adv.: M, f.43; 101: “in practice”. L (after 1300).

*practicus, -a, -um: AE, 72 and passim: “practical”. L (c.1170); BL; BT (1852).

*practicus, -i, m.: M, f.63; AE, 72: “practitioner”. L.

*praeludium, -i, n.: AE, 88; 92: “prelude of the carillon”. L (ca. 1177); BL; BT (1608-1652).

*praxis, -is, f.: M, f.56; 100; 102; AE, 76: “method of working; application”. L (ca. 1250).

*progressio, -onis, f.: M, f.43; AE, 56: “(arithmetic and geometric progression”. L(1686).

*prorex, -regis, m.: AE, 31 and passim: “vice-Emperor”. L (ca. 1190); BT (1490-1552).18

*prototypum, -i, n.: AE, 79: “model”. L (1345); BL.

*pyramidalis, -is, -e: AE, 75: “pyramidal”. DC; L (12c.); BL; BT (1743).

*pyrius, -a, -um: AE, 64: “relating to fire”. DC (1720); L (1622); cf. HELFER, s.v. Schiesspulver.

Q

*quadrans, -ntis, m.: M, f.43; AE, passim: “1/4 of a vertical arc” as a geometric figure: AE, 62; as an instrumental support: AE, 53; as an astronomical instrument: AE, 14; 43; 51. L (ca. 1227).

R

radius (astronomicus), -i, m.: AE, 56: “Jacob’s staff”.

*reais, -is, -e: M, f.43: “relating to the facts”. L (ca. 1218); A; FEW; BT (1804-1818).

*refluxus, -us, m.: AE, 93: “ebb-tide”. DC; L (ca. 1190); BL; A; BT (1876).

regula (horizontalis), -ae, f.: M, f.4; 13: “alhidade”.

S

semicylindrum, -i, n.: AE, 75: “half-cylinder”.


*semidigitus, -i, m.: AE, 7: “half an inch”. BT (1783).

semisignum, -i, n.: AE, 11: “half sign”.

sextans, -ntis, m.: M, f.77; AE, passim: “sextant”.

17 ThLL, s.v.: “vocem non omnino receptam esse in sermonem latinum testantur codices saepius cum litt. graecis exhibentes et tradentes plerumque formas decl. gr.”.

18 Cf. also R. J. Schoeck, p. 433.
sparto-statica, -ae, f.: M, f.75: “statica based on the working with ropes”.
*statica, -ae, f.: M, f.70 etc.; AE, 58; 79: “statics”. L (1686).
subsultus, -us, m.: C 170: “a tumbling”.
superaffigere: AE, 64: “to attach on top”.

-thaumaturgus, -a, -um: M, f.102; AE, 77: “wonderworking, thaumaturgic”.
BT (1688).
thaumaturgus, -i, m.: M, f. 102; AE, 77: “miracle worker, thaumaturg”.
thermoscopium, -i, n.: M, f.99; AE, 95: “thermoscope”.
titularis, -is, -e: C 168: “belonging to an inscription”.
*transversalis, -is, -e: M, f.2; AE, 50: “transversal”. DC; L (1250); BT (1668).
*trigesies: M, f.66; AE, 75: “thirty times”. L (1267).
trigonometria, -ae, f.: AE, 9: “trigonometry”.
*trigonometricus, -a, -um: AE, 10: “trigonometrie”. L (1686).
trusio, -ionis, f.: C 178: “pressing (a force-pomp)”.
turbinatim, adv.: M, f.6; AE, 52: “on the manner of a spinning-top”.

umbratio, -ionis, f.: AE, 79: “shadowing; painting with the shadow technique”.
uranologia, -ae, f.: AE, 95: “(personification of) the study of heavens.
*uranicus, -a, -um: M, f.101; AE, 94: “relating to the (astronomical) Heaven”.
N; L (ca. 1000); BL.

venari, -or: C 183; M, f.6; AE, 52: “to investigate thoroughly”.
*vermix, -ics, f.: M, f.105; AE, 64: “varnish”. L (1296); BT (1729).
*vitis, -is, f.: M, f. 66; AE, passim: “screw”. DC (s.v. vis); BL (id.).

xirometricum, -i, n.: M, f.99: “a dryness-meter”.

zodiacalis, -is, -e: AE, 49: “relating to the zodiac”.
zodiaco-aequatorius, -a, -um: AE, 44: “zodiocal-equatorial”.
zodiaco-aequinoctialis, -is, -e: AE, 43: “zodiocal-equinoctial”.

19 Cf. also R. J. Schoeck, p. 442.
Proper names\textsuperscript{20}

Arabico-Sinicus, -a, -um: AE, 12: “Arabo-Chinese”.

Argolus, -i, m: AE, 11: A. Argoli, Italian scientist (\(^{\circ}1570-\text{†}1657\)).

Bettinus, Marius: AE, p. 87: Italian Jesuit scientist (\(^{\circ}1582-\text{†}1657\)).

Bulius, Ludovicus: AE, p. 3; 8; 78: Italian Jesuit in China (\(^{\circ}1606-\text{†}1682\)).\textsuperscript{21}

Cam Hy: AE, title page; p. 34; 40; 46; 47; 73; 80: the regnal title of the second Chinese-Manchu Emperor (1654-1722).

Cantoniensis, -is, -e: AE, Praef. [p. 4]; 99: “relating to Canton”.

China (occidentalis): AE, 2.

Cochinchina, -ae, f.: AE, 28: “Cochin-China”.

Coloniensis, -is, -e: AE, 3: “inhabitant of the German city of Köln” (Lat. Colonia).

Eschinardus, Franciscus: AE, p. 87: Italian Jesuit scientist (\(^{\circ}1623-\text{†}1703\)).

Flandro-Belga, -ae, m: AE, p. 3: Jesuit priest belonging to the S.J. province of Northern “Belgium”.

Fokinensis, -is, -e: AE, 28: “relating to the province of Fokien”.

Fu gin (ms.: giù): AE, 37; 39: “Chinese title of the woman of a promoted man”.


Japo(n), -onis: AE, 17: “inhabitant of Japan”.

Japonia, -ae, f.: AE, 97: “Japan”.

Kircherus, Athanasius: M, Praef.; AE, p. 80: A. Kircher, coryphaeus of contemporary Jesuit learning (\(^{\circ}1602-\text{†}1680\)).

Lu Keu: M, f. 66: “Lu Keu-bridge near Peking”.

Lusitanus, i, m.: AE, 88: “Portuguese”.

Macau, -i, n.: AE, 89: “Macao”.

Magallanes, Gabriel de: AE, 3; 8; 10; 92: Portuguese Jesuit in China (\(^{\circ}1610-\text{†}1677\)).

*Mahumetanus, -a, -um: AE, 3: “Muslim”. L (1502); BT (Maho-).

*Mahumetanus, -i, m.: AE, 6; 13: “a Muslim”.

Pekinensis, -is, -e: AE, passim: “relating to Peking”.

Pekinum, -i, n.: M, f. 66; AE, 44; 61: “Peking”.

Pequinensis, -is, -e: AE, 1; 40; 58: “relating to Peking”.

Quo Xeu (ms.: Xen) King: M, Praef.: Chinese astronomer Kuo Shou-ching (\(^{\circ}1231-\text{†}1316\)).

Sardonicus, -a, -um: AE, 9: “Sardonic”.

Scheinerus, Christophorus: AE, 79: Jesuit scientist (\(^{\circ}1575-\text{†}1650\)).

Sinensis, -is, -e: AE, 2; 12: “Chinese”.

Sinicus, -a, -um: AE, 20; 89; 90: “Chinese”.

Sino-Arabicus, -a, -um: AE, 15.

Su Chuen: AE, Praef. [p. 3]: the Chinese province of Ssu-ch’uan.

tai (var. tay) cham su: AE, 35; 36; 37; 38; 39: Chinese honorary title.

\textsuperscript{20} Contrary to the list of nouns, this onomastic list does not include the names in Verbiest’s correspondence, which are far too numerous to be incorporated in this research.

\textsuperscript{21} The occasional variant *Bulio is found in AE, Praef.
*Tartaricus, -a, -um: passim: “Manchu”. DC; L.
Tartaro-Synicus: AE, 2.
Tartarus, -i, m.: AE, 28 etc.: “The (Chinese-)Manchu Emperor”.
Tum fum ta fu: AE, 35; 36; 37; 39: Chinese title.
Tumkinensis, -is, -e: AE, 28: “relating to Tonkin”.
Tychonicus, -a, -um: M, f. 7; AE, 52: “Tychonic; relating to the Danish
astronomer Tycho Brahe (*1546–†1601)”.
Xan Si: AE, Praef. [p. 4]: the Chinese province of Shan-hsi.
Xen Si: AE, Praef. [p. 4]; 65: the Chinese province of Shen-hsi.
Yangquangsenius, -i, m.: AE, 3; 18; 28: the Chinese opponent par excellence
of Verbiest, Yang Kuang-hsien.

The total number in this list is 186 words and terms, and 45 proper
names (total: 231 items). Not all are of equal importance, varying
between simple ‘Augenblicks-Bildungen’ such as substantivated adjectives (type: chronodicticum from chronodicticus) and slight ortho-
graphic variants of classic terms such as aeolopila22 on the one hand,
and true neo-compounds such as thermoscopium etc. on the other. How-
ever, it does not seem sound to alter this total figure before a further
analysis of this list has been made.

On the other hand, for various reasons I have not retained as neo-
logisms the following words in Verbiest’s text: first those words which
are demonstrably due to a copyist’s or printer’s error: usquemodo (AE, 
p. 87) for usque modo, the regular spelling which is also found in
Verbiest’s autograph letters, e.g. ARSI, JS 145, f° 45r. (cf. C, p. 362),
the anomalous catoptica, for which the author himself elsewhere uses
the normal catoptrica (See C, p. 308),23 and the completely isolated
metallus, -a, -um: “metallic” in M, fig. 23, which is to be replaced
either by the current metall<in>us or metall<ic>us.

Unlike the former cases, in the three next items the aberrant orthography
is confirmed either by other copies of Verbiest texts or by some autographs,
so that we must reckon with a kind of idiosyncratic variant of the author
himself. First, there is the not uncommon spelling praeseferre for prae se
ferre, found not only in the printed version of the AE (p. 10; 64; 94; 97),

22 Cf. N. Golvers, pp. 309-310 (n.3).
23 Catoptice, however, is also used by Politianus: see the quotation in R. Hoven, Lexi-
que de la prose latine de la renaissance(Leiden, 1994), p. 54.
but also in the copy of M, and thus in all probability Verbiest’s own spelling in both manuscripts. Another aberrant and hitherto unexplained spelling is *alilada* for the current medieval *alidada* (see supra), clearly recognizable in Verbiest’s own hand in several places of the xylograph of CL;\textsuperscript{24} *torneare*: “to turn on / in the lathe”, is clearly the result of a confusion between the medieval *torneare*: “take part in a tournament” and the classical Latin *tornare*: “to turn on / in a lathe; to round off”; as this spelling returns in M, fig. 105, it was in all probability an authentic orthography of the writer himself. A similar substitution may be at the basis of the spelling *eclipsis* for *ellipsis*: “ellipse”, confusing two etymologically cognate terms, i.e. *ellipsis*: “ellipse” and *eclipsis*: “eclipse”, the astronomical content being more frequently used by Verbiest.\textsuperscript{25}

I have positively inserted in the list two terms, preserved in the copy of M, in which a neologism is apparently hidden, though its form is thus far unclear, due to the poor condition of this copy:

(1) the subst. *́parascheumata* is quoted in M, f. 17: “parascheumata quaedam ad divisionem instrumentorum”; it probably bears some relation to Gr. παρασκευή: “praeparatio ad demonstrationes” (Micraelius) v.s.; perhaps it should be emended to “parascheu<as>-mata, with a copyist’s error of haplography between the two identical syllables -as-. The Greek παρασκεύασμα is a regular derivation from the verb παρασκεύαζειν, and a good parallel to 17th-century pseudo-Greek derivations such as *technasma, elasma*, etc. (G. Schottus); in addition, cf. the derivation “pars...parasceuastica” both in G. Schottus and A. Kircher.

(2) *́xicometricum* (sic), probably to be read as *óxico-metricum* (instrumentum), less probably as *́sic(c)o-metricum*, i.e. “dryness-meter”, which would be fully in accordance with the content of the description.\textsuperscript{26} The component -metricum may be compared to *chrono-metricum* (M, f. 59) and *ageo-metricum* (Micraelius,\textsuperscript{27} s.v.).

Thus far, no external support in the contemporary sources has been found for these hypotheses.

\textsuperscript{24} Cf. a similar, but not identical error *alidala* in MW, I, 446, and others in PL, s.v. *allidada(-lada?)*.  
\textsuperscript{25} Other testimonia of such confusion are presented in PL (from 13th cent.: Vitelo).  
\textsuperscript{26} This presumption is now confirmed by A. Segonds (Paris, Belles Lettres), by letter of 29 November 1994, for which I am grateful.  
1.1. The nature of these neologisms.

In view of the (semi-)technical nature of our texts (cf. supra), it is not amazing that 146 of 186 items, i.e. 78%, can be considered technical neologisms, referring to new inventions, instruments, parts of instruments etc., while only 40 belong to the general vocabulary. This was perhaps not only a question of a specific need, which was undoubtedly felt more strongly in technical matters, but maybe there also existed a kind of reluctance towards unnecessary neologisms in the general vocabulary. On the other hand, the fact that only 9 of the 186 items are verbs, i.e. 4.8%, fits well with an earlier conclusion made by M. Benner — E. Tengström on a similar type of roughly contemporary Swedish dissertation texts, who relate it immediately to the specific character of 17th-century science which focused on “things and their qualities…rather than processes”.28

The most conspicuous group among the technological neologisms are the names of the various scientific (mathematical or mechanical) disciplines. Fourteen of them appear in the heading of a separate chapter in the second part of the AE, several others appear elsewhere. Only four are of classical origin (gnomonica, mechanica, musica, and the Late Latin perspectiva), the other ten are neologisms. This is shown in the following overview:

Ballistica (AE, ch. 15): existing neither in Greek nor in Latin, it was first used and in all probability created by M. Mersenne in 1644 (Cogitata physico-mathematica, tr. 6: Ballistica et acontismologia, t. 9, p. 46). As Mersenne was one of Verbiest’s sources, he may well have found this neologism here.

Catoptricia (AE, ch. 19): the oldest attestations in my possession go back no further than the 16th century: cf. Engl. catoptrike (1570), and French catoptrique (1584).

Horolotechnia (AE, ch. 26): no modern antecedents nor parallels on -technia are known to me.29

28 M. Benner - E. Tengström, pp. 55- 56.
Hydragogica (AE, ch. 16): for this term, indicating the construction of a drainage channel, including all the preparatory stages, such as the levelling etc., I could find no parallel, neither in Latin nor in the ‘national’ vernaculars. Verbiest’s application of this term only finds an echo in 17th-century English sources: see NED, s.v. (1661): “…hydragogical conveyances”. It is the extension of Greek ὑδραγ-ωγία + the Latin suffix -ica.

Hydraulica (AE, ch. 23): Cf. Greek τὸ ὑδραυλικὸν δργανον (Hero), Latin hydraulicus, also applied to the same kind of organ. The semantic transposition to the science and construction of machines operated by water power, or in which water is conveyed through pipes, occurred in English about 1661 (NED, s.v.) and is attested in French since 1690 (Furetière).

Hydrostatica (AE, ch. 22): this term first appears in the Latin translation by W. Snellius (Mathematicorum Hypomnematum de Statica, Leiden, 1605) of Simon Stevin’s Dutch treatise Waterwichtdaet. From there the term was introduced in English (1660: Boyle), in French (1691: PEW, IV, 522a) and in other languages.

Meteorologia (AE, ch. 27): this term, already found in Aristotle, was reintroduced in the early modern era: in Latin since the 15th cent. (FW), in French since 1578 (Trésor) or even 1548 (FEW, VI, 2/3, p. 59), in Italian since Fausto da Longiano (16th cent.).

Optica (AE, ch. 18): This word derives from Greek ἡ ὀπτική and was introduced into medieval Latin in 12th-century translations of Euclid and Ptolemy: see NED, s.v., which quotes the names of Henri- cus Aristippus and Eugenius, and E. Grant Physical Science in the Middle Ages (Cambridge, 1977), p. 16 - 19. Contrary to the current medieval form (neutr. plur.), Verbiest uses this term as a fem. sing.

Pneumatica (AE, ch. 24): though the adj. πνευματικός is already attested in classical Greek (Arist.), and pneumaticus also in classical Latin, the subst. pneumatica — in its technological sense — was derived from it only later: the Italian pneumatica (“meccanica dei corpi aeriformi”) first appears in the work of E. Tesauro (1591-1675), Engl. pneumatics in 1660 (Boyle), and French pneumatique even as late as 1743 (but the adj. already in 1547: FEW IX, 108).

Statica (AE, ch. 21): see Greek ἡ στατική (Plato); the oldest modern instances I know of date back to the very 17th century, with the afore-mentioned Latin translation of Stevin’s Waterwichtdaet by Snellius; the oldest attestations in French date from 1634 (FEW, XII, 244), in English from 1656 (NED).

30 The graecizing spelling optice is already found in Vitruvius (1.1.4).
In addition to this series, but mentioned only passim in the text, we find such ‘new’ sciences as geod(a)esia, first mentioned in Politianus,\textsuperscript{31} uranologia, first mentioned in 1583,\textsuperscript{32} and sparto-statica, also coined by Snellius in his 1605 as a translation of Stevin’s tauericht.

Finally, of these 13 neologisms, only five were drawn directly from the ancient Greek technological vocabulary known to us, either in the Middle Ages or in the 16th-17th centuries: geodesia, optica, catoptrica, statica, meteorologia. The other 8 terms in the series were apparently built during the 16th-17th centuries from pre-existing Greek elements: either starting from a pre-existing adjective (pneumatica; hydraulica), built by analogy with other formations available (the series of terms on -logia; hydragogica), or by diversifying an already existing term (both hydrostatica and sparto-statica from statica). Of some of these Neo-Latin neologisms, we can guess the origin with some degree of probability: Ballistica has a good chance of having been created by M. Mersenne, statica, hydrostatica and sparto statica by Snellius. Only for the ‘double compound’ horolo-technia (‘horolo-technia’ I was unable to find a single parallel, which is a slight indication for a neo-creation by F. Verbiest himself.

1.2. Typology of the neologisms.

Further analysis of this material, whatever its origin, medieval or post-medieval, has to explain the technique by which the neologisms were created, either by Verbiest himself or in the sources he immediately relied on, viz. by indicating the formation types they represent. For this research, let us start from a preliminary distinction between ‘neo-formations’ on the one hand, and ‘neologisms of sense’ on the other, with a separate section for semi-compounds (type: arcto-zephyrus) and a last one for special phenomena. In each of these, I will list the items involved, with a brief explanation of the formation process, adding, where available, an indication pointing to the approximate chronology of the term’s origin, extracted from various sources. Indeed, it must not be forgotten that the term ‘neologism’ relates these words only to the contemporary dictionaries, not to their actual origin, Verbiest being by

\textsuperscript{31} See R. Hoven, p. 149; the oldest testimonia in English date from 1570 (NED), in French from 1664 (Trésor, 9, 206; FEW IV, 117: 1647).
\textsuperscript{32} R. Pitkäranta, pp. 95-96.
no means necessarily the πρῶτος εὑρετής or inventor of these terms, not even when they indeed appear for the first time in his texts!

1.2.1. Formal neologisms (words or word-forms not previously attested in the current Latin dictionaries).

These neologisms stricto sensu can in turn be subdivided into several sub-classes:

1.2.1.1. Neologisms through substantiation or ellipsis: a word, formerly exclusively used with an adjectival valence, appears for the first time as a substantive; the substantive valence is, therefore, derived from the original adjectival one by substantiation ("zero-morphem"), the easiest way to create new substantives both in Greek and in Latin. This is the origin of:

— (a) such feminine nomina as: ecliptica (linea), fixa (stella), lucida (stella) — all terms related to astronomy — and hydragogica, hydraulicca and pneumatica, the name of three artes (< hydragogica ars, etc.) derived from pre-existing adjectives after the example of such former Graeco-Latin science-names as στατική (τέχνη) / statica — statica (ars) etc.

— (b) such masculina as: practicus and thaumaturgus; Mahumetanus, indicating one of Verbiest’s main adversaries, viz. Wu Ming-hsüan. In the latter example, the ellipsis has a certain euphemistic effect, such as in the Christian malus, malignus.33

— (c) such neutra as: anemodicticum (signum: cf. M, fig. 1); arenarium (vas); chorometricum, chronodicticum, hydraulicum, pendulum, xirometricum — all names of instruments (through ellipsis of instrumentum?), and polyedrum (corpus?).

In view of the easy transition from adjective to substantive by way of this process, which always remained active in living Latin, it can be assumed that some of these terms are only momentaneous formations, created by the author ad hoc and without further success.

A special category is represented by cases in which a part. praes. is used substantivally, approximatively with the value of a ‘nomen agentis’: these cases, which are not listed above among the neologisms sensu proprio, are: famulans = famulus (AE, p. 15), observans = observator (AE, p. 24), collimans = collimator (AE, p. 72); spectantes = spectatores (AE, p. 93); gratulans = gratulator (M, fig. 105). Compare such common terms as serpens. These formations may also be regarded as momentaneous creations of the author.

1.2.1.2. Neologisms through derivation.

1. Nouns:

Here, the following substantive formations are represented: (1) some diminutives with simple or with cumulative suffix, the former with -culus in clavi-culus, the latter with -un-cula in digressi-un-cula and explicati-un-cula or with -ac-idium in the terminus technicus pinn-ac-idium, an alternative of the purely Latin pinn-ula; (2) a (semi-) professional name on -arius, in mission-arius;35 (3) a depreciative derivation on -aster is represented in the hapax astro-log-aster, referring (again) to the contemporaneous Muslim astronomer Wu Ming-hsüan; this type of derivation was popular during the whole period of Latinitas as is shown by the list of F. Seck,36 and by such contemporary formations as Schottus’ surd-aster37 etc.; (4) -ica in ballist-ica and hydragog-ica are derivations made directly with the Latin substantive ballista and the Greek δραγογός, respectively, both after the many other science-names on -ica (cf. sub 1.1); (5) two forms on -ix are found in corn-ix and vern-ix, apparently secundary latinizations of previous Italian formations (see infra); (6) abstracta on -ntia are represented in *incid-e-nf/a from incid-e-re and extubera-ntia from extubera-re;38 (7) another abstractum on -tas, -tat-is (Leumann, §328.1) appears in cari-tas (annonae): the classical meaning “high prices” does not fit well in the series of natural

34 See also M. Benner - E. Tengström, p. 157.
35 See already in 1670 the French equivalent missionnaire (Trésor, 11, 892).
37 G. Schottus, Technica Curiosa, sive mirabilia artis libris XII comprehensa (Nürnberg,1664), p. 676.
38 R. Pitkäranta, pp. 53-58.
calamities, listed in AE, p. 29; the true sense seems therefore to be rather “period of high prices”, or even “period of dearth”, as the result of a new derivation, directly from the verb care-re; (8) similar formations on -tio, -sio, derived from part.perf., are represented in circumvolu-tio, tru-sio, libella-tio, and umbra-tio, through the part. perf. circumvolu-tus, tru-sus, libella-tus and umbra-tus, derived from the verbs circumvolv-e-re, trud-e-re, libella-re and umbra-re, relating to instrument building, hydrostatic operations, water-leveling, and a specific painting technique, respectively; (9) a parallel formation on -tus, -tut- (Leumann, §328.2) is sub-sul-tus, built on sub-silire, in analogy with the couple in-silire: in-sul-tus etc.

In the class of adjectives, which is well represented, by far the most productive suffix is (1) -icus, of Greek origin. It was part of many ‘readymade’ learned borrowings from the Greek technological vocabulary in classical Latin (cf. infra, sub 1.2.1.5.1), but after a simple analysis it became productive to make new ‘Latin’ derivations as well, always in the technical orbit, and mostly from borrowed Greek stems. However, it is not impossible that many of these classic Latin formations are in fact hidden borrowings from lost Greek models. This type of derivation was not unknown in medieval Latin, as a text like De Spera by Sacrobosco (early 13th century), containing such terms as antarticus, concentricus, cosmicus, cronicus, tropicus demonstrates. Its great success, however, came in the Renaissance, with the general regeneration of the knowledge of Greek. It is in this line that Verbiest’s neologisms are also be situated, either his own creations or those taken from his various scientific sources:

- ana-campticus: < ἀνα + καμπτικός: “bending, flexible” (Arist.);
- anemo-dicticum, -i, n.: < ἀνεμο- + δεικτικός/ν: “able to show” (philos.; gramm.);
- astr-opticus.· < ἀστρ(ο)- + όπτικός: “of / for sight”;
- choro-metricus: < χωρ(α)- + μετρικός: “metrical”.

39 "...atque aeris vicissitudo, quaeque illam sequuntur, sive pestis, sive alij morbi, sive caritas annonae etc., expressis etiam ipsis diebus, quibus venti, fulmina, pluviae, nives et alia ejusmodi contingunt, prognostico plane scrupuloso praedicenda sunt”.
40 Micraelius, s.v. prefers a new derivation from the adjective ‘carus’: “Caritas annonae est tempus quo annona, qua vivimus, care vendiur”.
41 On trudere= forcing, installing a force-pump, see M. (p. 45): “aquas vel hauriendo vel trudendo in Alum...attollere”.
chrono-dicticus: < χρόνο- + δεικτικός: “able to show”;
chrono-metricus: < χρόνο- + μετρικός;
conicus: < κωνικός: ‘conic’.
tri-gono-metricus: < τριγωνο- + μετρικός;
ana-clasticus: cf. ἀνάκλαστος: “bent back, reflected” (gramm. term!) + -icus;
draconicus: < δράκων (stem -οντ-) + -icus;
embolismicus: < ἐμβολισμ(ο)- + -icus;
hydr-agogicus: < έδραγωγία + -icus;
meteoricus: < μετέωρα + -icus;
°parallelicus (behind the adverb parallelice): < Gr. παράλληλης + -icus;
uranicus: < ουρανός + -icus;
Tartaricus: < τάρταρος + -icus;
Tychonis: < Τύχων + -icus;
mandarinicus: mandarinus + -icus.

All these apparently newly created derivations started from original Greek bases, whether previously borrowed in Latin or not; two neo-derivations for contemporary realities, Tartaricus and Tychonis, the first indicating the class of Manchu rulers inside China since 1644 and their cognates outside, the second the famous 16th-century instrument builder and astronomer who provided Verbiest with both his cosmological view and the prototypes of his instruments, are in a certain sense extensions of Greek stems, as both τάρταρος and Τύχων, -ωνος are well-known Greek words, although indicating another concept. For that matter, this derivational type has extended its ‘domain’ to only one non-Greek noun, i.e. mandarinicus. The derivation respects the rules of Graeco-Latin morphology, except in draconicus, which has not been derived from the stem -οντ-, thus producing °draconticus, which indeed appears in French dracontique (1771)\(^{43}\), but from the Latin genitive draconis.

Apart from this first group of -icus derivations, we also have the following other categories of adjectival formations: (2) the neologisms on -alis, and after -l-, its dissimilated variant -aris (Leumann, §313.3): azimuthalis; dioptralis; embolismalis; gradialis; pyramidalis; realis; transversalis; zodiacalis; (zodiaco-)aequinocitialis, versus armill(a)-aris, (circum-)polaris, filaris, octangulalis, polaris, titulalis; (3) a

\(^{43}\) Another derivation from the stem dracon-, instead of dracont-, is given in the occasional draconinus, quoted in PL and L\(^2\), s.v.
typical Latin derivation on -anus in Mahumet-anus, with -(i)anus as a regular formative to derive names of groups of persons from various words or names; Neo-Latin models or parallels in the religious atmosphere are Calvin-ianus, Luther-anus, Zwingli-anus\textsuperscript{44} and, of course, Christi-anus (Leumann, §295.1b); (4) other adjectives are derived with -eus, namely *aqu-eus (< aqua), in all probability transposed from the classical Latin derivatives of material names (Leumann, §271.1) and, in the same orbit, chalyb-eus (chalybs); a cumulative variant, also attested in classical Latin is -ac-eus (Leumann, §272.2), represented in cylindr-ac-eus; (5) newly formed adjectives on -ius are all derived from subst. on -or- and result in the normal classic type on -or-ius: aequator-ius, cursor-ius and observator-ius;\textsuperscript{45} (6) only once do we find a new formation on -ilis, built on a part. perf., following classic patterns: portat-ilis from porta-re — porta-tus, analogous with the more frequent rotat-ilis (AE, p. 53), derived from rota-re — rota-tus (Leumann, §311.2a).

In the category of adverbs, we refer to one neologism on -atim, derived regularly from a passive participle on -atus (Leumann, §389 Zus. C), in turbina-tim: < part. turbina-tus (class.); other adverbs are derived from thematic adjectives of the first class through the well-known classical suffix -e (Leumann, §386, a): see chorographic-e; magnetic-e, parallelic-e, practic-e; speculativ-e; theoric-e. Finally, one adverb is derived from an adj. of the second class, viz. accliv-e (M, f. 31) from the adj. acclivis (see AE, p. 82; M, f. 32), certainly in analogy with the pair proclivis: proclive (Lucr.; Macr.).

2. The verbs:

The only instance concerns the denominative eclypsis → eclipys-are, comparable with classic derivations from -are on -i-stems (cf. gravi-s → grav-are: Leumann, §412, A).

\textsuperscript{44} R. Pitkäranta, p. 42 and passim, who refers to the 37 names of sects in Isidorus, Et., 8, 4-5!

\textsuperscript{45} The neut. observatorium, however, apparently created by Galileo in the first half of the 17th cent. (osservatorio), and also found in French since 1667 (observatoire: Trésor, 12, 365), in English since the same year (observatory: NED), is not found in Verbiest’s descriptions of the Peking observatory, who always refers to it by means of the old terms specula or turris astropicta (mathematica).
1.2.1.3. Neologisms through compounding.

Here too, purely Latin as well as Greek elements — the latter in their latinized form — appear side by side, more than once in so-called hybrid compounds, as a proof of the composite heritage of the 16th and 17th-century learned tradition in Europe. Therefore, these compounds can be further subdivided into the following groups:

1.2.1.3.1. Purely Latin word-formation:

1°. Nominal compositions:

a) on a nominal stem:

- A prepositional compound such as °bi-crus (not attested), bi-cru-r-is (stem °crus-);\(^{46}\) it may be built after such models as bi-pes, bi-frons.

- A hypostatic compound with suffix such as contra-pond-ium may be built analogically with super-pondium (Apuleius); see Bader §§334-338;

- A hypostatic compound without suffixation such as pro-rex is analogous with pro-consul etc.; see Bader, §§327-333;

- With prefixes semi-, productive especially in later Latin (see Bader, §446), and again in Neo-Latin and in 'vulgar' technical derivations: cf. metrological terms such as semi-digitus, semi-quadrans (after classical semi-modius — sem(i)-uncia), semi-signum;

- Also largely productive since Imperial times are the compounds with a 'governing' prefix plus a suffix (see Bader, §343) such as in circum-pol-aris (< °circum-pol-alis, through dissimilation: see supra);

- oct-angul-aris is certainly built after tri-angul-aris (Mart. Cap), itself being a dissimilatory variant of the -alis derivation °triangulalis;

- octo-later-is can be compared to quadri-laterus (AE, p. 7, 41), with a variation -is / - us, well-known in Latin adjectival derivations (see Bader, §§192-199);

b) on a verbal stem:

- a hypostatic compound with suffix (on which see Bader, §267; Leumann, §275, B), see °pra-e-lud-i-um derived from pra-e-lud-e-re (Ecclesiastical Latin);

\(^{46}\) See on this type of compound F. Bader, La formation des composés nominaux du latin. Annales littéraires de l’Université de Besançon, 2ième série, nr. 46 (Paris, 1962), pp. 160-164.
- another hypostatic formation, without suffix (see Bader, §§327 - 333), is represented in the 'terminus technicus' incubus = incubare; it indeed represents a new creation, directly on the verb incubare, rather than an extension with semantic shift of the classical incubus: “nightmare”. It is a substitution for Greek φελλός, Lat. tympanum: “scaphium inversum” (Vitr., I,6,5);

- reflexus is derived from reflure, through analogy with fluxus (Plin.) from fluere;\(^47\)

- trans-vers-alis is rebuilt on trans-vers-arius (Caes.) just as Augustinus rebuilt anni-vers-alis on anni-vers-arius (Varro): see Bader, §333.

2°) Verbal composition:

The few examples are all of the same type, i.e. prepositional compounds:

\[\text{ap-planare, circum-armare, circum-cursitare, co-incidere, cor-responderere, super-affigere; cf. also col-limare, in fact a wrong reading for classical col-lineare (see infra, sub 1.2.3.1).}\]

1.2.1.3.2. Compounds existing of only Greek elements.

In the next cases, the Greek compound behind the superficially latinized spelling is not attested in our ancient Greek documentation; it may have been built, therefore, in modern times, mostly to indicate new technical realities or the like:

- anemo-scopus: “wind-observer”, < Gr. ἀνέμος + σκοπός; the most probable model seems to have been Greek μετεωροσκόπος (Plato).

- anti-sacoma: “opposing (apparent) weight” < Gr. ἀντὶ + σήκωμα, Neo-Latin sacoma: “(apparent) weight”, with a prefix ἀντί-, known in some other Greek technical compositions, such as ἀντὶ-σπαστος etc.;\(^49\)

- horo-logus (adj.): < Gr. ώρα- + λόγος, with -ο- instead of -α- as the normal vowel of the composition, and -logus, Greek -λογος in its original meaning of “reader (reading)”; cf. such compounds as Greek ψευδο-λόγος and classical horologium;

- hydro-statica: a Neo-Latin diversification of the Greek and Latin *statica (cf. supra, sub 1.1);

\(^47\) See also R. Pitkäranta, p. 54.

\(^48\) Cf the derivation circumcursitatio in BT, 1694.

\(^49\) Antisacoma was introduced by Snellius as a counterpart of the Vitruvian sacoma in his Latin translation of Stevin’s work (Leiden, 1605, t. IV, pp. 34-35; rendering stalt-wicht).
- **organo-theca**: < Gr. ὀργαν- + θήκη, after such Graeco-Latin models as biblio-theca, pinaco-theca; cf. such Neo-Latin innovations as rareo-theca, etc.;

- **panto-metrum**: Gr. παντ- + μέτρον: the classical Latin has only some prepositional compounds such as dia-, epimetrum, whereas Greek has nominal models such as στιό-μέτρον, δδό-μέτρον;

- **sparto-statica**: < Gr. σπάρτο- + στατική; another nominal specialisation of *statica* (cf. hydro-statica supra), with Greek σπαρτο-;\(^{50}\)

### Compounds with suffix:

- **chrono-metr-ia** / -icus: “chronometry, -metric”: < Gr. χρον- + μετρία / μετρικός.

- **horolo-techn-ia**: abbreviated from *horo-lo[gio]-techn -ia*: < ps.-Gr. δρο-λογιό- + τεχν-ία; there are no Latin models for such compounds with -technia,\(^{51}\) while classical Greek has only πολυ-τεχνία and χειρο-τεχνία!

- **poly-(h)edrus** “many-sided” / poly-(h)edrum, -i, n.: “a many-sided solid”;\(^{52}\) as the ancient Greek πολύεδρος (Plut.): “with many seats” has a different meaning, Neo-Latin poly-(h)edrus may be derived by composition from Gr. πολυ- + ἐδρα: “face of a regular solid” (lambl.) and subsequent metaplasm (-a —> -us);

- **thermo-scop-ium**: < Gr. θερμό- + σκοπ- + suffix -iurtr, the only Latin model is the Late Latin (Sid. Ap.) horo-scop-ium, but in classical Greek the parallels are more convincing: cf. always in the field of sciences, such instrument-names as ύδρο-σκόπιον “hydrostatic instrument” (Galienos); id.: “waterclock” (Syn.); ὅρο-σκόπιον (Ptol.), μετεωρο-σκόπιον (Ptol.). Learned compositions on -scope, meaning “instrument”, such as meteoro-scope (FEW VI, 2, 59), hygro-scope (1666) and thermo-scope (since 1690: Furetiere) are already attested in French from the 16th cent.; cf. Engl. hygro-scope (1665), Italian igroscopio (1681), etc.;

- **trigono-metr-ia**:\(^{53}\) < Gr. τριγων- + μετρ- + suffix -ia: in Latin, geo-metr-ia is to my knowledge the only parallel with nominal first element; in Greek they are more numerous: στερεο-μετρία, χωρο-μετρία, στο-μετρία etc.;

- **urano-log-ia**: < Gr. οὐραν- + λογ- + -ia\(^{54}\).

---


\(^{51}\) Besides, R. Pitkäranta has no Neo-Latin parallels for such formations!

\(^{52}\) Micraelius, s.v. specifies: “...pluribus quam sexhedris seu superficiebus”.


\(^{54}\) On Neo-Latin compounds with urano-, see R. Pitkäranta, p. 95f., on those with -logia pp. 74- 97.
These pseudo-compositions are regularly made through the accumulation of two ‘ready-made’ Greek terms or Greek stems, such as in anemoscopus, anti-sacoma, horo-logus, hydro-statica, organo-theca, pantometrum, sparto-statica, of which the first shows its usual form in other pre-existing Greek compounds, and the compound itself follows good Greek models. In a second group, the neologism is morphologically characterized, on the level of the Latin composition, by a suffix, i.e. either -ia (chrono-metr-ia, horolo-techn-ia, trigono-metr-ia, urano-log-ia), or -ium (thermo-scop-ium) or by metaplasm -us (poly-hedr-us). These two classes continue a type of Latin word-formation already productive in classical times (Bader, §266). The Latin models are inexistant or not very convincing, and it is more likely to think that these compounds were actually made with Greek elements, after Greek models, reflecting a thorough mastery of the Greek vocabulary; it is, therefore, not mere chance that, as far as I know, none of these formations are found in medieval Latin.

1.2.1.3.3. Hybrid compounds:
- clavi-cymbalum: i.e. Latin clavus + Greek κύμβαλον, Lat. cymbalum with -i- as the normal ‘Kompositionsfuge’ in a compound of Latin type;
- plani-sphaer-ium: i.e.Lat. planus + Gr. σφαίρα / Lat. sphaera, and -i- as in the former case;
- Compounds of Latin semi- and a stem of Greek origin, such as semi-cylindrum, semi-diameter.

The Greek element in each of these cases had been already borrowed in classical Latin, so that these compounds can be defined rather as inner-Latin formations, instead of hybrid Graeco-Latin formations.

1.2.1.4. Neologisms through semi-composition: the multi-word neologisms.

A first type, representing syntagmata in which real compounding has actually not yet occurred: formations such as regula proportionum, radius astronomicus, quadratum geometricum, progressio arithmetica and trigonometrica, etc.

A second type represents a semi-compound in the proper sense, where two words are combined into one occasional unit, indicated by the use of
the first element as a thematic stem (after Greek or pseudo-Greek examples) followed by a hyphen. See in Verbiest such formations as albo-niger; albo-ruber; Arabo-Sinicus; arcto-zephyrus; ligno-metallicus; noctu-diurnus; zodiaco-aequatorius; zodiaco-aequinoctialis (Leumann, §34). By their nature, they can be regarded as the author’s momentaneous formations; on the other hand, it has become a very prolific type of neof ormation in our modern scientific language: e.g. Graeco-Latin, etc.

1.2.1.5. Neologisms through borrowing.

Borrowing is a very important source of neologisms in all languages and vocabularies (esp. the technical), frequently occurring in a context usually indicated as “Wörter und Sachen” (the word or name is borrowed in connection with an object, a notion etc.). This category is also well-represented in Verbiest’s language and mainly shows borrowings from Greek and the contemporary national languages, as can be seen in the following overview:

1.2.1.5.1. Direct borrowings from the Greek (without Latin intermediary, as far as I can see):

- A first series consists of borrowed Greek derivations with -ικός-ending, both substantives and adjectives:
  - catoptrica: < Gr. κατοπτρική (Procl., in Eucl.); cf. supra sub 1.1;
  - chorographicus: < Gr. χωρογραφικός (Strab.);
  - conicus: < Gr. κωνικός;
  - cylindricus: < Gr. κυλινδρικός (a.o. Hero, Pneumat.);
  - (ligno-)metallicus: < Gr. μεταλλικός (a.o. Galen.);
  - meteorologicus: < Gr. μετεωρολογικός (a.o. Arist.);
  - optica: < Gr. ὀπτική: cf. supra sub 1.1;
  - parastaticus: < Gr. παραστατικός (a.o. Antioch. Ascal.);
  - practicus: < Gr. πρακτικός (pass.).

As the Greek model of anacampticus, viz. ἀνακαμπτικός, is attested only from the 12th cent.(!), I prefer the hypothesis of a Neo-Latin creation through the borrowing of the common classical Greek simplex καμπτικός: “bending, flexible” (Arist.!), with a secondary prefixation ἀνα-, ana-, to express the new concept of “re-fracting” within the frame of the discovery of the “Laws of refraction” (Snellius).

- Further borrowings are:
  - *astrolabium*: < ἀστρολάβιον (Synezius); ἀστρολάβος, in Ptolemy and Proclus;
  - *character*: < χαρακτήρ (Plut., etc.): "figure of letters";
  - *cochlea*: < κοχλίας (Apollonius Pergaeus; Hero-Pappus);
  - *diaphragma*: < διάφραγμα (a.o. in Hero, in the sense of: "partition");
  - *ellipsis* (ms.: eclipsis): < ἥλλειψις (Apollon Perg.);
  - *geod(â)esia*: < γεωδαισία (Arist.; Proclus in Eucl.);
  - *glossocomum*: < γλωσσόκομον (Hero; Pappus);
  - *halo, -onis, f.*: < ἀλως (a.o. Arist.; Galen.);
  - *hydragogus, -i, m.*: < ὑδραγωγός (Plut.);
  - *meteora*: < μετεώρα (Arist.);
  - *meteorologia*: < μετεωρολογία (Arist.);
  - *pantocrator*: < παντοκράτωρ (passim);
  - *parallaxis (astr.)*: < παράλλαξις (Ptol.);
  - *peritrochium*: < περιτρόχιον (Pappus, 1060.9);
  - *polygonum*: < πολύγωνον (Gal.);
  - *polygonus*: < πολύγωνος (a.o. Arist.);
  - *praxis*: < πράξις (passim);
  - *prototypum*: < πρωτότυπον (subst.); -ος (Pollux);
  - *thaumaturgus*: < θαυματουργός (Athenaeus).

Apart from some observations concerning a secondary semantic shift (diaphragma, glossocomum, pantocrator), on which below (1.2.2), some other remarks may be made here: (a) the source of the term *halo, halonis* was not found in living classical Latin (the quotation by Sen., *N.H.*, I 2.1 does not contradict this), and it is not a direct continuation from the Greek model ἀλως, gen. ἀλω, as is proven both by its *casus obliqui* (halon-), and by the Italian halone (since Galilei), Spanish halón. On the contrary, it is directly derived from the ancient Greek variant ἀλων,
-ωνος, of which the meaning regularly was “threshing-floor”; that exactly this term was metaphorically transposed to the celestial haloes in Greek is explicitly attested by another passage in Seneca, *N.H.*, I.2.3, substituting Lat. *area* for *halo*, proving once more that this Greek word was felt as a ‘foreign’ body in Latin: “…*tales splendores Graeci ‘areas’ vocavere* [i.e. Greek ἀλόνας], *quia fere terendis frugibus destinata loca rotunda sunt*”. As Aristotle uses the former version (ἄλως) in his Meteorologics, the medieval *halo*, *halonis* (since the 13th cent.: Vitelo) and its Neo-Latin successor suggest that Aristotle’s influence even in meteorological terminology was not undisputed; (b) it is interesting to note that *meteora* is used by Verbiest still in its ancient meaning of “atmospheric phenomena”, whereas this term in the (late) 17th century underwent considerable restriction and specialization into the meaning of “heavenly body” (*FEW* VI, 2, pp. 58-59); (c) *pantocrator* is probably nothing but a ‘Greek’ translation of the Dutch term *almagtigh*, as S. Stevin quite poetically had named his new invention; it is quite parallel to the term *pancratium*, also introduced in the 17th century to indicate an engine for lifting heavy weights; (d) *parallaxis* is also represented in medieval Latin but not, in the sources available to us, in its technical meaning of “parallax”; it is therefore more probable that the 17th-century term represents a new borrowing from the Greek, rather than a re-use of the former Latin formation, with a complex semantic shift.

The most interesting conclusion, however, concerns the origin of the borrowings: as most of these terms stem from authors which had been translated into Latin, either in medieval times (e.g. Aristotle and Ptolemaeus), or in the 16th and 17th centuries (Euclid and Hero-Pappus), I think it was precisely through these translations that these Greek terms may have been introduced into Latin (medieval or Neo-Latin respectively); this has already been demonstrated, for instance, for such a term as *meteora*, but it may also be the case for several of the other terms listed with an asterisk (*). In this hypothesis, Verbiest used these terms as ‘Latin’ terms of Greek origin, not as Greek borrowings.

---


Finally, there are two words which at first glance appear to represent direct Greek borrowings, but more probably are neo-creations: first, as Greek ἄντι-σάκωμα occurs only in one Egyptian papyrological text of the Byzantine period (PSI 238.10), also his anti-sacoma may represent a Neo-Latin creation. Also the Greek ὥρολόγος is attested once, viz. in one of the fragments of Chaeremon, a philosophical and historical writer, preserved through Porph., indicating an Egyptian priest, in which it seems hard to recognize the source for Neo-Latin horologus: "time-speaking / time indicating"; therefore, despite the first impression, this transparent compound may also represent a case of Neo-Latin creation.

1.2.1.5.2. Probable borrowings from European ‘national’ languages.

Several times, Verbiest explicitly refers to a borrowing from the sermo vulgaris, i.e. one of the contemporary ‘national’ vernaculars [in opposition to the Latin language]. One of these is Italian, the source language of the following borrowings:

AE, p. 64: "...ac praeterea 5 circulos ex metallo fusos in formam eorum, quos cornices et frisas architecti vulgari nomine appellant, superaffixi...";

M, f. 102: "...in ampio et profundo vase, quam porcellanam vocant";

AE, p. 60: "Vas horologum erat amplum et profundum (porcellanam Sinicam vulgo appellant)...; quae omnia ingeniosa pictoris manu in figuram piscis transformavi, qui, quando aqua porcellanam implebat, in superficie ipsius aquae nature videbatur";

AE, p. 49: "...qui et ipsi pedestali (ut termino architectis usitato utar) trabibus aeneis in crucem obliquam decussatis innituntur...".

These terms require further comment:

cornix: "cornice". A medieval reference for this term, in this meaning, is given in Blaise, without any further source indication. It is by no means identical with classical Latin cornix, which lacks this sense, but as the Italian cornice (perhaps a descendant of the former Latin term) has exactly the same meaning since the 1st half of the 14th cent. (Trésor, 6, 197), the origin of this (late) medieval neologism cornix may be Italian, -ix being the latinization of Italian -ice;

frisa: "frieze", quoted in the same passage; it is in all probability a latinization of the North–Italian friso, freso, in its turn a late representative of Lat. phrygium (Trésor, 8, 1271);

pedestal, -is: “pedestal”; for morphological reasons, this form is neither the continuation of the Medio-Latin pedestallus, -i (Du Cange), nor
does it fit directly with it; therefore it is rather a parallel new borrow-
ing from the latter’s Italian successor pedestal, which is attested since
the 1st half of the 16th cent. (Trésor, 13, 342); morphologically, it has
been adapted to the nearest morphological class, the Latin neutra on
-al, -alis;

porcellana: originally “porcellana (terra)”, but in Verbiest “a vessel
of porcelain”. In this case too, the first examples of the latter meaning
are found in Italian (since the 14th cent., but probably originating
from Marco Polo’s Millione); since the 16th cent., this sense is
sporadically also found in Portuguese and Latin. A precursor of Ver-
biest’s application is found in the Novus Atlas Sinensis (1655) of the
Italian (!) China-missionary M. Martini, perhaps also the direct source
for Verbiest.

The ‘vulgar’ source language of these 4 terms — of which 3 find their
origin in the technical language of the architects — appears to have been
Italian; this reminds us of the Italian term ingeniere (Lat. ingeniarius),63
quoted twice in M, viz. in fig. 66 and 97.

Italian is also the source of several other ‘cultural’ borrowings:

bombarda: the author uses this term as a simple synonym of the
classic tormentum (for shooting pilas and globos), opposite to bal-
lista (for missilia); this use covers the late antique situation, as described
by Ph. Fleury.64 The Neo-Latin bombarda is apparently a mere
latinization of the Italian bombarda, already attested in the early 14th
century;65
gazetta: “newspaper”, a superficial latinization (see the unusual -z-)
of the Italian gazetta (piccola gaza?) — originating before 1580
(Borgini) — or of one of its ‘national’ descendants, e.g. the French
gazette (since the end of the 16th cent.: Robert, s.v.), and the English
gazetti (!) (since 1605: NED);
milio: “million”, in all probability the latinization of Italian milio(ne),
an augmentative extension of Latin mille, attested since M. Polo and
the 14th century;66 see, however, an early French testimonium in 1266
(Trésor, 11, 829).

63 See this term in Verbiest’s letter of July 16, 1677, quoted by I. Dunyn-Szpot, in
arsi, JS 109, II, p. 126.
64 Ph. Fleury, “Vitrue et la nomenclature des machines de jet romains”, Revue des
66 See B. Bianchi, “Storia dell’ i mediana (...)”, Archivio glottologico italiano, 13
vernix: “varnish”; apart from the medieval Latin veronice (8th cent.), vernix appears already in 1296 in Latin sources from the British Isles (L); the Neo-Latin vernix, then, is either a continuation of the latter — isolated — term, or a superficial latinization of the Italian vernice or of its French counterpart, attested since the 12th century (Robert).

Another small group of terms finds its origin in Portuguese, which borrowed them from several other Far-Eastern languages:

bonzius: Already in the middle of the 16th cent. the Portuguese borrowed bonzo from Japanese bōzu (< Chin.-Jap. bonsō): “a buddhist monk”,67 from where it entered other European languages, such as Latin: see already J.P. Maffei in a letter of 1551, ed. 1588, p. 12a68 and, as the most immediate model of Verbiest, A. Schall von Bell, Historica Relatio, p. 207 and passim. It is not clear why the result of the latinization is not °bonzus (-i), but bonz-ius?;

colaus: current latinization, at least since M. Ricci — N. Trigault (beginning of the 17th century) of the semi-official Chinese title ko-lao;69 the first ‘European’ testimonia, however, are found in Portuguese, and go back to 1552 (colous).70 Its morphological adaptation as a Latin thematic -o- stem (ko-lao → co-laus) was self-evident.

mandarinus: as there were no Latin personal designations available on -inus (Leumann, §296 I), this word is the latinization of a Romance derivation, either the Portuguese mandarini, or its Italian counterpart mandarino, first appearing in 1514; both are borrowed71 from Malay mantari or from Hindi mantrin; in the latter form, the Romance suffix -im, -ino was visibly prepared; the depreciative value of the Romance -ino derivations fits well with the general attitude of the Europeans towards the Chinese prominents, as it emanates from the contemporary sources.

pataca: a superficial latinization of Portuguese pataca (patacão), itself of Arabic origin.

Finally, two (three) terms — relating to astronomy — are borrowings by medieval Latin, probably directly, from Arabic:

68 Quoted by Chr. Helfer, Lexicon Auxiliare, Editio tertia (Saarbrücken, 1991), p. 134, quoting from Maffei’s Selectarum epistoluarum ex India libri quatuor (Venetiis, 1588).
70 S.R. Dalgado, I, p. 296.
alidada, prob. borrowed directly from Arabic (FEW, XIX, p. 73; Trésor, 2, 508); the first testimonia date from the 13th century (PL); see further French la(l)idada (1562), al(l)idade (1585) and Latin al(l)idada (Clavius). On Verbiest’s anomalous spelling alilada, clearly recognizable in the xylograph copies of the CL, see infra, sub 1.0;

azimuth, the medieval basis (Sacrobosco)\(^{72}\) of the Neo-Latin derivation azimuth-alis (see infra); see also L (1326), Engl. azimuth since 1391 (NED), Italian azimuth since E. Danti (16th cent.), Fr. azimuth since 1544 (Trésor, 3, 1159);

nadir, borrowed in medieval Latin from the Arab nazir. The first occurrence known to me is in Sacrobosco (early 13th century); later testimonia in the ‘national’ languages, such as Italian nadir since E. Danti (16th cent.), French nadir (since 1366: Trésor, 11, 1297) may be the echo of Sacrobosco’s unceasing success.

1.2.5.1.3. Conclusion on neologisms through borrowing:

The 26 borrowings from ancient Greek (i.e. 14% of the total number of neologisms) make up a not insignificant number, reflecting the acquaintance with Greek in 16th and 17th century scientific circles. Moreover, a personal element can perhaps be seen in the fact that Verbiest, before becoming a missionary in the Far East, was for several years a professor of ancient Greek in the Jesuit college of Brussels. On the other hand, several of these borrowings, viz. the medieval ones (optica; meteora) were in Verbiest’s time already part of an established Latin tradition, since they were borrowed from Greek in the 12th century during the translations of Aristotle etc. Terms clearly or in all probability borrowed from scientific authors such as Hero and Pappus could have been taken by Verbiest and his contemporaries from the 16th-century Latin translations of those same authors by F. Commandinus.

Apart from Greek, Italian seems to have been the most prominent source language, but here too the transition of original Italian words into Latin may have occurred before Verbiest, and it is not clear in how far the strong Italian element in the contemporary China mission, even in Verbiest’s immediate context (M. Martini; L. Buglio; F. Grimaldi), and

\(^{72}\) On the date of Sacrobosco’s De Spera, see L. Thorndike, The ‘Sphere’ of Sacrobosco and its Commentators(Chicago, 1949), p. 5.
in how far his own command of Italian — although mainly passive\textsuperscript{73} — played a role in this process. In the case of porcellana, however, it becomes quite attractive to hypothesize a direct link between Verbiest's knowledge of this term, in its sense of "vessel of porcelain", and the work of M. Martini. Also, Verbiest's Latin terms for Far Eastern realia (such as bonzius; colaus; mandarinus) are fully in accordance with those found in the Latin writings of his predecessors; they derive, mainly through Portuguese mediation, from various Asian sources. Finally, some astronomical terms of Arabic origin had already been assimilated into the technological vocabulary of astronomy in medieval Latin (alidda, azimuth, nadir) or at least by the middle of the 16th century (Clavius); this is the language of Verbiest's direct sources, from which he adopted, quite naturally, the established terminology.

An unexpected conclusion in this dossier is the almost complete absence of Chinese loan words, with the exception of colaus and bonzius (through Portuguese mediation). Here a special excursus may be inserted on the distinct ways in which Verbiest fit the inevitable Chinese names of his "story" in the Latin context.

a) Borrowing and assimilation of Chinese proper names.

In this corpus, the number of Chinese proper names, especially that of anthroponyms, is also small, i.a. because the European public, being unacquainted with Chinese micro-realía and the Chinese language, was not particularly interested in them. The same conclusion has been drawn concerning many other Jesuit reports to Europe, e.g. the Litterae Annuae, and has been explained also from a certain "horreur des détails précis" nourished by a "culture latine, trop soucieuse d'élégance".\textsuperscript{74} I list here the toponyms as well as the anthroponyms which appear in our text corpus (see 1.0), comparing them, where possible, with the corresponding variants in earlier or contemporary Jesuit sources on China.

Geographical names:

\textit{Cantoniensis}: i.e. \textit{Cantoni-ensis}, the regular Latin derivation of the toponym Canton-ia, the occasional latinization of Chinese Kuang-tung,

\textsuperscript{73} See his own testimony in his correspondence: see H. Josson & L. Willaert, p.440, n.3.
as attested i.a. by G. Gabiani:75 "...in Quam Tum provinciae Urbe pri-
maria Quam Cheu, vulgari nomine Cantonia dicta..."; Cantoniensis is
found in Gabiani, De Rougemont,76 Verbiest.77 Moreover, there is Can-
ton, -onis, also in Verbiest (C, p. 173, 174, 465), itself the latinization of
the hispanized toponym Canton (C, p. 278; 407 [in the autograph!]), of
which the regular derivation should be Canton-ensis (Gabiani, 606 etc.);
M. Martini (Atlas, p. 132) has "Quangtung provincia".

Cochinchina: Apart from variants like Cocincina in Ricci, N 317 and
even Concincina in other Italian sources such as Chr. Burrus, quoted in
A. Kircher,78 we read Cochinchina as early as 1622 in the correspon-
dence of J. Terrentius,79 as in Martini (Atlas, p. 2; 3). The first element
represents Chinese Kowchin, a name for Annam and Cambodia;80

Fokinensis: unusual derivation of the Chinese province name Fu-chien,
in then current 17th-century spelling Fo kien or Fokien, as in M.
Boym;81 M. Martini (Atlas, p. 121: "Fokien provincia"); G Gabiani
(p. 370 etc.); its prevalent — and normal — derivation was either
Fokien-ensis (Gabiani, p. 479) or — by haplology — Fokiensis (De
Rougemont, p. 26);

Hu Quam: the name of one of China’s 15 provinces, found in the
same spelling in F. De Rougemont (p. 234), G. Gabiani (p. 352), G. de
Magalhães,82 Ph. Couplet.83 Other spellings are Uquam in M. Ricci (N
517), Huquang in M. Boym (passim), Hu Quang in M. Martini (Atlas,
p.74);

Japonia and Japones: both forms are well established since the 16th
century; cf. also the correspondence of J. Terrentius (Gabrieli, p. 496):
"Pater Japon..."; id., p. 500: "Japonia";

Lu Keu: this spelling in the copy of M has proven to be authentic, as it
corresponds to that in the autograph of C, p. 168: Lu Keu kiao;84 it is

399; 579 etc.
76 F. De Rougemont, Historia Tartaro-Sinica nova (Louvain, 1673), p. 6.
77 Cantoniensis in the edition of H. Josson & L. Willaert, passim is in ali cases a wrong
‘correction’ for the correct form Cantonensiis in the autographs!
78 A. Kircher, China Illustrata(...) (Amsterdam, 1667), p. 145-146.
79 G. Gabrieli, ‘Giovanni Schreck Linco Licesita e Missionario in Cina e le sue Let-
tere dall’Asia’, Rendiconti dell’ Accademia dei Lincei. Scienze morali, storiche e filo-
logiche, s. VI, vol. 12, 5-6 (1936), pp. 462- 514 (p. 508).
80 See i.a. H.A. Giles, A Glossary of Reference on Subjects connected with the Far
East, third edition (London, 1900) p. 54.
81 M. Boym, Flora Sinisit(Vienna, 1656), p. d.
82 G. de Magalhães, Nouvelle Relation de la Chine (Paris, 1688), p. 41.
83 Ph. Couplet, Catalogus Patrum Societatis Jesui (Paris, 1686), p. 17; 27; 39 etc.
84 Here too the spelling in the edition by H. Josson & L. Willaert is arbitrary and
erroneous.
identical with the transcription in F. De Rougemont (p. 324), and in G. de Magalhães (p. 34); obsolete transcriptions are *Lo-keu* in Pr. Intorcetta\(^{85}\) and *Lo-co-kiao* in A. Greslon (quoted by Intorcetta, p. 35);

**Macaum:** current latinization of the Chinese-Portuguese toponym Macao, of which an obsolete older variant was *Amacau* (J. Terrentius [Gabrieli, p. 501]), reflecting the former Portuguese *Amacao*, and the Chinese ‘etymon’ *A-man-ngao*; see M. Martini, *Atlas*, p. 134.\(^{86}\) By interpreting the final -o in the Portuguese forms as a Latin locative ablative, a nominative *(A)Macaum* was the normal issue;

**Pekinum:** Chin. *Pei-ching* was also transcribed *Pacchino* (e.g. M. Ricci, N 523),\(^{87}\) *Pechinum* or *Pequinum* (Trigault, p. 341; 440; etc.), *Pekino* (Intorcetta, p. 40 & passim), *Pe kim* (G. de Magalhães, p. 41); Ph. Couplet, p. 5; 34; F. De Rougemont, p. 182; 283), *Peking* (M. Boym, passim; M. Martini, *Atlas*, p. 27; 28 etc.) and, last but not least, *Pekinum* in J. Terrentius (Gabrieli, p. 511). Verbiest’s *Pekinum* may represent either a superficial latinization of the Italian *Pekino*, *Pequino* (see Ricci-Trigault; Terrentius; Intorcetta, and see Verbiest’s own variant *Pequinensis*, twice in AE [p. 1; p. 40]), or a retrograde derivation from *Pekinensis*, itself the assimilatory derivation from the Portuguese, and thus widespread, toponym *Pekim* (*Pekim-ensis*; see also s.v. *Tumkinensis*);

**Su Chuen:** Chin. *Ssu-ch’uan*; Verbiest’s spelling returns in *Suchuen* in M. Boym (*Suchuen*), M. Martini (*Atlas*, p. 3; 65), A. Schall\(^{88}\) (p. 129; 195), G. de Magalhães (p. 41); Ph. Couplet (p. 28; 32; 37 etc.), versus the older orthographies, such as *Suciuen* in M. Ricci (N 312), *Sutschun* in J. Terrentius (Gabrieli, p. 506) a.o.;

**Tumkinensis:** common derivation of the Chin. country name *Tung-ching*, Port. *Tumkim*; the spelling *Tumkim* returns in G. de Magalhães (p. 41), but M. Boym (p. d) spells *Tunchin*, and M. Martini (*Atlas*, p. 25) in his turn *Tungking*. *TumkiNensis* seems to be a dissimilated variant of °*Tumkim-ensis* (cf. supra: *Pekinensis*);

**Xan Si:** see the same spelling in M. Boym (p. d); M. Martini (*Atlas*, p. 37); A. Schall (*Xansy*: p. 189); G. de Magalhães (p. 41); Ph. Couplet (p. 11); F. De Rougemont (p. 199); G. Gabiani (p. 265) etc.; distinctly different is the transcription *Sciansi* in M. Ricci (N 516);

---


\(^{87}\) On this strange transcription: P.M. D’Elia, I, p. 15, n. 1.

Xen Si: cf. the same transcription in M. Boym (p. d); M. Martini (Atlas, p. 43); G. de Magalhães (p. 41); A. Schall (Xensy: 123); Ph. Couplet (p. 18); F. de Rougemont (p. 128); G. Gabiani (p. 418). Cf. the older spelling Scensi in M. Ricci (N 516).

To check in how far these (and other) printed transcriptions reflect Verbiest’s own spelling, let us compare them with the spelling of the same names in Latin autographs in his hand preserved in his correspondence. This leads to two surprising conclusions. First: the comparison proves that the spelling in the edition by H. Josson & L. Willaert is wholly unreliable, as the authentic orthographies for Chinese names have been systematically replaced with their ‘modern’ counterpart, and even in the latinized Chinese names a fictitious variant has sometimes been substituted for the authentic form: this is the case with Canton-ensis, which was wrongly substituted for the only correct form in the autograph letters Cantoni-ensis, proving that the spelling in AE (Preface, p. 4) indeed reflects the original spelling of the AE manuscript. Second: the authentic Verbiest spellings appear to be very close, if not completely identical, to the spellings of de Magalhães, and more than once they differ from those in Martini’s Novus Atlas; this is somewhat surprising, in so far as we would expect the latter work to have been the main authority on Chinese geography for the Peking Jesuits, the more so as Verbiest himself regularly and respectfully quoted from it in his correspondence (see pp. 51; 52; 53; 288; 314; 315; 402). This may due to the authority of G. de Magalhães — a close collaborator of Verbiest until 1677 — who was an expert on the Chinese language and the composer of a treatise on the matter; he indeed criticized Martini’s Atlas, especially for its spelling of Chinese toponyms and their desinence, showing -ng instead of -m, which was the spelling ‘à la façon portugaise’. One case, in which the printed form in the AE edition deviates from the variant in his correspondence, is the unusual Fokinensis, against the common Fokiensis in (the published version of) his letter to Alfons VI.

89 See H. Josson & L. Willaert, Introduction, p. XIX.
90 Cf. G. de Magalhães, p. 20-21 (and elsewhere), and Martini’s own statement on this point in his Atlas, p. 17: “...multas ego per -NG scribo quae ali per -M, ut Peking, ali Pekim scrispere, quia M in qualibet syllaba aperto ore pronuntiandum est, ut a Lusitanis fieri solet, alias Sinica pronuntiatio minime exprimitur”.
91 H. Josson & L. Willaert, pp. 256-266 (260).
Personal names.

These are limited to the 3 names of the Chinese *dramatis personae* in this corpus; in addition, there is the name of the Chinese builder of the previous instruments in the Peking observatory:

*Cam Hy*, with the variant *Cang Hy* (AE, p. 2), the name of the Chinese *K'ang-hsi* Emperor; this corresponds well to the transcriptions in Ph. Couplet (p. 19 etc.: Cam hi), Pr. Intorcetta (p. 45 & passim: *Cam-hi*); F. De Rougemont (p. 314); G. Gabiani (p. 603);

*Uming-huen*: i.e. Chin. *Wu Ming-hsüan*;

*Yangquangsenius*: i.e. Chin. Yang Kuang-hsien, the famous opponent of F. Verbiest. Cf. G. Gabiani (p. 486): *Yam quam sien*; Pr. Intorcetta (p. 14): *Yanquansenio* (dat.); F. De Rougemont (p. 324): *Yam Quam Sien*. The suffix *-ius* certainly is an adaptation to the class of Roman gentilicia on *-ius*;

*Quo Xeu* (ms.: *Xen*) *King*: i.e. Chin. *Kuo Shou-ching*; cf. A. Schall (p. 9): *Co Xeu kim*!

Institutions, titles:

Only those mentioned in Verbiest’s Imperial diplomata, or in the direct context of them, are quoted nominativum; all the other institutional names are substituted by Latin pendants, on which see infra:

*Fu gin* (ms.: *giu*): i.e. Chin. *fu-jen* (Hucker, no. 2066);

*Tai* (var. *Tay*) *cham su*: i.e. Chin. *t'ai-ch'ang-ssu* (Hucker, no. 6145);

*Tum chim su chim tam*: i.e. Chin. *t'ung-ch'eng* (shih) *ssu*+ *cheng-t'an* (cf. for its first part Hucker, no. 7467);

*Tumfum ta fu*: i.e. Chin. *t'ung-feng ta-fu* (Hucker, no. 7484).

This kind of research has to be extended to a much larger corpus of transcriptions before it can produce a list of concordances between Verbiest’s transcriptions and their counterparts in Wade-Giles; some temporary concordances, however, may be presented here: ch- = ch’-; gi- = je-; h- = hs- (and hu- = hsu-); qu- = ku-; s- = hs- or ss-; v- = w-; x- = sh-; final -m = -ng (although some cases of -ng for -ng are attested as well). Most of Verbiest’s transcriptions deviate from older ones, but are in line with those found in G. de Magalhães, Ph. Couplet, F. De Rougemont, G. Gabiani; as was concluded for the geographic names, this could be the result of the authority of de Magalhães in matters concerning the Chinese
language (and European transcriptions), for whom contemporary Portuguese was the standard of the transcription.

b) Loan translations from the Chinese:

Not only here, but also in other texts, Verbiest not infrequently presents his Chinese names in a Latin translation or paraphrase; nor is he the first Jesuit writer on China to have done so. To give just one example from our corpus: the famous Imperial hunting park south of Peking, and referred to in our texts by the simple indication ‘saltus suburbanus’ (cf. e.g. AE, p. 75), is called in C, p. 362 “filius maris”, a correct translation of its official Chinese name (Nan) Hai-tze; this is reminiscent of the ‘Filius maris’ in M. Martini (Atlas, p. 13), a (wrong) translation of the Chinese river name Yangtze, but nevertheless adopted by later writers (cf. e.g. G. de Magalhães, p. 8).92 Perhaps we must recognize in these translations — which in my impression are more numerous in Verbiest than in the works of his fellow-fathers — a ‘gloss’ for European readers not acquainted with the Chinese toponyms.

Nominal loan translations:

*anemo-dicticum:* this Latin neologism is a possible transposition of its Chinese counterpart hsiang-feng-ch’u: “wind-direction indicator”;93

*curia,* as synonym of ‘regia’, indicates the Imperial Court and, by extension, the Manchu City of Peking = Pei-ching. Its use seems to have been inspired by the 2nd part of the Chinese toponym, i.e. ching = court: cf. especially G. de Magalhães, p. 22: “…car kim [in Pe kim] signifie Cour”. The former Mongol name of Peking in Marco Polo, well known to the Jesuits, was Cambalu, translated by them as “Regis sedem” as well (G. de Magalhães, quoted by I. Pih);94

*specula astr-optica:* this term, replacing the former *specula mathematica* (G. Gabiani; A. Schall; F. De Rougemont), seems to translate Chin. kuan-hsing-tai, with the characters ‘look/watch’, ‘star’ and ‘platform / tower’, respectively; cf. also the contemporary gloss of the

---

92 Martini, *Atlas,* p. 13: “Primum locum haud immerito sibi vindicat flumen, quod Yangçu Kiang, vel per antonomasiam Kiang Sinae vocant, ac si maris filium diceres”. The confusion is as old as the beginning of the 17th century, and was originally committed by N. Trigault (1612), as is demonstrated by P. M. d’Elia,, vol. II (Roma, 1949), p. 17 n. 3.


term Torre das observações in C, p. 143, n. 13: “Elle s’appelle Koan sing tai, c’est-à-dire: tour pour voir et découvrir les étoiles”.

Onomastics:

*Agri Regii* vel (*Agri*) Imperiales (M, fig.97; AE, p. 69; 70; 71; 72; 80; 81): translation of the Chinese toponym (or: generic indication?) *kuan-chuang*;

*Decem mille fontes* (M, fig.97; AE, p. 69; 80): direct translation of Chin. *Wan-ch’üan* (“The ten thousand wells”), mentioned in the contemporary petitions;

*Montes Occidentales* (M, fig. 105; AE, p. 63; 65; 72): direct translation of the Chin. onronym *Hsi-shan*, the name of a mountain group west of Peking; cf. *Si Xan* in C, p. 410.95

More hypothetic are the following two cases, for which I refer to the commentary in my edition of the AE:

*flumen *noti nominis...* (AE, p. 69), to be emended, in my view, into "*flumen novi nominis*, i.e. *flumen Novi nominis*, with a hidden river name *Novus* (fluvius, v.s.); the strongest argument for this emendation is, that a “New River” is indeed mentioned in the related petitions;96

*De Wolf* (AE, p. 37): as shown in my AE edition, p. 239-240, the substitution of *De Wolf* for Van der Straete (the real name of Verbiest’s grandmother) is due to a wrong translation of her Chinese honorary name Lang as “… wolf”, after confusing 2 similar characters.

c) Substitution of Latin expressions to Chinese institutions, etc.:

It is a classic and well-established custom, when speaking of foreign countries, to replace the foreign names of institutions and realia of all kinds by terms etc. more familiar to the readers. In a narrative context, this could be inspired by a certain ‘esthetic’ feeling (cf. the words of J. Dehergne, *supra*), but surely also by a consideration of ‘economics’, for it renders superfluous the introduction of translations or explicit comparisons; on the other hand, it creates a new ‘sense’ for the substituting term. Such substitutions are, in the case of Verbiest’s writings on China, very numerous,97 often repeating an older model in the Jesuit tradition of Latin compositions on China, but more than once creating an original

95 H. Josson & L. Willaert, p. 410 again have the wrong transcription *Si Chan*!
96 See N. Golvers, p. 288, n. 6.
97 See a first list in my edition, p. 45.
substitution as well. Most of these terms are commented upon in my AE edition (see such terms as aediles, classis, comitia, diploma, eunuchi, factio, magnates, monasterium, oeconomi, praefectus, prorex, regulus, secta...). I will dwell here on just one case, viz. the frequently used term tribunal: this term from the bureaucratic sphere, in general use at least since M. Ricci-Trigault at the beginning of the 17th century, stands for Chin. pu ("ministry": Hucker, no. 4764), chien ("Directorate": Hucker, no. 786), and ssu ("office, bureau": Hucker, no. 5533), sometimes — as in AE, p. 21, l. 18; p. 48, l. 26 — even for the buildings belonging to them. As yet, it is not clear to me how this classic term — with its essential judicial connotation — acquired this role in a Chinese context. Some criticisms were formulated in the 1670s by A. Grelon, S.J., exactly on account of that judicial character:98 "...nisi per abusionem vocatur Tribunal..."; nevertheless, its success remained unbroken even in the 18th-century writings of the French Mission!

1.2.2. Neologisms of sense.

I list here several Latin words and terms which in Verbiest’s texts (or his sources) display a new sense, i.e. a meaning not yet incorporated in the aforementioned major dictionaries. Here again, by far most of these instances concern technical terms, or current words applied in a new technical context; although I did not make a systematic search into the origin of these new applications, there are enough indications to assume that most were already common property, either in Latin or in the national languages, before Verbiest employed them.

anima: the classical Latin word, occasionally meaning “vital spot” (Quint., Declam. 1, 10), developed, on the basis of this latter sense, a new, technical sense of “bore of a gun”; the oldest references at my disposal are from 1611 in French (Trésor, 2, 724-725);

annuere: the classical Latin verb meaning “to consent, to agree” in the technical context of mathematical writings has developed the new sense of “to converge” after the model of its Greek synonym συν-νεύειν, the first meaning of which is “to converge, to incline to a point”. This interesting example of a loan translation is at least as old as Copernicus who, according to PL, s. v., uses annuere with the sense of “accedere, appropinquare” (de motu planetarum). It is also found in the Latin translation of Proclus, in Eucl. 176, 7 ff.99

98 Autograph in Archivio Romano S. I., JS 122, f° 339r. (1669); quoted in ch. 8, n. 4 of my edition.
99 I owe this information to A. Segonds (Paris, Belles Lettres), to whom I am grateful.
arenarium: the semantic evolution from the classical sense ‘sand-pit’ into ‘sand-glass’, in the 17th century, is a simple matter of specialisation;

armatura: this classical (and medieval) term originally had a purely military application; in fig. 66 of M, it appears as an as yet unparal-leled indication for a tackle block: “…et hic praeiretim quaero quot orbiculi inferioris armaturae respectu superioris esse debeant, et cui armaturae funis <...> annectendum sit”; the transposition may have been realized through the classical and medieval maritime applications (L2, s.v.: “equipment, gear [naut.]”). Further technological applications in French are noted in FEW I, 141 from as early as the 15th-16th century;

armilla: this ancient, general term for “ring” developed a secondary, technical meaning of “armillary sphere”, indicating: (a) the armilla zodiaco-aquinoctialis (see AE, p. 43) or by abbreviation armilla zodiacalis (M, fig. 2 = AE, p. 49), i.e. the zodiacal or ecliptic armillary; (b) the armilla zodiaco-aequatoria (AE, p. 44) or by abbreviation armilla aequatoria (M, fig. 3 = AE, p. 50), i.e. the equatorial armillary. This semantic shift from “ring” to “instrument provided with (celestial) rings” is of the type ‘pars pro toto’;

character: this term, used in classical Latin in the sense of “mark; style”, developed in Middle Latin the specialized sense of ‘letter mark, letter form, letter’; it is already found in M. Martini (Atlas, p. 17) to indicate the Chinese characters;

curia: the classical sense of “assembly of the Senators” quite naturally assumed, in medieval Latin, the sense of “Imperial or Papal Court” (FEW, II, 1564); this sense is transposed by Verbiest (and his Jesuit predecessors) to the Chinese Imperial Court in Peking, as a synonym of the classical regia. The transposition to Peking could have been inspired by an etymological motif, as (Pei-)Ching means: “(Northern) Court”; see also supra;

curriculus: in AE, p. 87, this apparently refers to a four-wheeled chariot carrying burning coals and an aeolopyle put in them: “…curriculum bipedalis longitudinis […] conficiendum curavi, […] in cuius medio vasculum vivis carbonibus plenum et vasculo aeolopilam impo-sui”. This application is in all probability a continuation of one of the medieval senses listed in DC: “chariot, carrying fire for heating”, in its turn a specialization of the classical diminutive curri-culus: “little wagon”. Another specialization of the latter is represented in the chapter on Statics (AE, p. 79) and its previous version in M, sub fig.77 (“curriculus glossocomi”; “glossocomum in curriculo…”): in these passages a moveable support with a glossocome-like engine (cf. infra) is apparently meant;

cursor: in classical texts synonymous with tabellarius, it is used by Verbiest in exactly the same sense as the present English “cursor”: cf.
M, fig. 97 = AE, p. 71: “inserui tabellam palmarem, instar cursoris sursum ac deorsum mobilem”; the English term is first attested in 1594 (NED, s.v.: “a part of a mathematical, astronomical or surveying instrument, which slides backwards and forwards”), and its French counterpart already in 1562: “petite pièce mobile glissant dans la coulisse d’une règle, d’un compas...” (Trésor, 6, 636). In Latin too, then, this semantic neologism may be older than this Verbiest passage;

erigere: used twice by Verbiest with a term indicating a composition or a drawing as its direct object (AE, p. 29: figuram caelestem; p. 92: epitaphium); this is an extension of the classical use: “to erect” → “to draw up”;

glossocomum: in classical Greek texts the term γλώσσοκομεῖον, by abbreviation γλώσσοκομον, indicated a casket to keep the tongues of musical instruments, or anything else (compounded of γλώσσα and κομεῖν); technological applications are already found in Heron (Pneumatica; Automata) — Pappus, l. VIII. Only from the 17th century on have I found testimonia for the sense: “chest containing an apparatus to lift up heavy weights”, or simply “engine for lifting”, etc.; the term is used in this application by S. De Caus, M. Bettini, M. Mersenne, P. Casati. See also the dictionaries of Furetiere and Aquilano. In Zedler, Universalexicon, s.v., it is a synonym of Fr. cric, pancratium, Fuhrmanrswinde. The semantic transition from “chest” to “engine, put inside a chest” is a transition of the type ‘pars pro toto’, and seems to have been provoked by the Latin translation of Pappus by Commandinus;

horizon: as an abbreviation for horizon azimuthalis (AE, p. 50), it is the name of one of Verbiest’s Tychonian instruments, already described by T. Brahe. It concerns a horizon cum triangulo azimuthali, with the circulus horizontalis as one of the main parts (AE, ibid.): the semantic development may be summarized, then, as follows: horizon > artificial horizon (Sacrobosco) > horizon of a measuring instrument > instrument provided with a horizon. Moreover, a horizon is also mentioned as part of the stellar globe (AE, p. 52);

musica: “(musical) band”. Cf. AE, p. 26: “...quos [...] praecedit Regia instrumentorum multorum musica, tympanis et tubis augmentum quiid sonantibus”. This sense is found neither in classical nor in

100 See N. Golvers, p. 301, n. 3.
101 S. De Caus, Les raisons des forces mouvantes (Frankfurt, 1615), l. 1, Theor. XVI, fig. 8.
102 M. Bettini, Apiaria universae philosophie mathematicae (Bologna, 1642), t. 1, ap. IV, progymn. 2, prop. 4.
104 P. Casati, Terra machinis mota (Rome, 1655), p. 1; 2; 3.
105 As part of a torquetum, already mentioned in PL (Franco, 1284).
medieval Latin; the new development in Neo-Latin may chronologically connect it with the first appearances of this sense in French in 1553 (Trésor, 11, 1258) and almost simultaneously in English in 1568 (NED, VI, 783); the exact primacy cannot as yet be established;

*palaestra*: “study book”, found in AE, Praef. [p.4]: “…apertam quandam totius Astronomiae palaestram ante oculos ponere…”. The semantic shift: wrestling school > physical training > intellectual training > study106 > study book107 parallels other common 17th century metaphors, such as in the case of *gymnasma*, *progymnasma*;108

*perspectiva*: The sense “a painting in perspective “is found once in AE, p. 97: “…Alia etiam ejusmodi plura, uti clepsydras illas, sive arenaria […]*, perspectivas, tubos opticos, pannos, telas, horologia rotatilia & mentito nomine Europaeo tamquam pretiosiora passim carius vendunt”. This specialised sense is represented neither in the Late Latin *perspectiva*, nor in its Medio-Latin and Italian cognates, all exclusively indicating by this term the very *ars* of painting in prospect; on the contrary, we find the reduced sense in French since 1551 (Trésor, 13, 149), in Dutch since 1604 (Van Mander’s *Schilderboeck*), in English since 1644 (NED, s.v.);

*pegma*: the name of the curtained palanquin or pavilion, in which the Emperor’s calendars (decrees etc.) were transported, and in which they were venerated as the emanation of the Emperor himself. This use seems to have been inspired by the ecclesiastical Latin *pegma*: “*machina lignea, in qua statuae collocabantur*” (DC).109

*progressio*: indicating, in mathematics, the arithmetic and geometric series; in classical times, *progressio* was used only as a term of rhetoric, and so far I do not see when the application to mathematical science could have been made.

*quadrans*: one of its original meanings, viz.: “1/4 of a circle” was transposed, by specialization, to an astronomical measuring instrument, representing a quarter of 360°.

*radius*: the basic element of a Jacob’s staff, hence called *radius astronomicus*, at least since G. Frisius, *De radio astronomico et geometrico* (Antwerp, 1545); it apparently represents a new specialization of Latin

---

107 Cf. titles such as *Palaestra eloquentiae ligatae* (1654) by J. Masenius, S.J..
108 On *gymnasma*, *progymnasma* as ‘exercitium’, first in the physical sense, and then transposed to the level of rhetoric (and generally intellectual) training: see R. Pitkäranta, p. 119, n. 264.
109 Another specialization is the sense of “scaffold”, mentioned in BT, 1687.
radius in the sense of an astronomical, etc. rod for drawing and measuring figures.

sextans: this instrument, also described by T. Brahe, is named after the one-sixth of 360° it spans, in analogy with quadrans (cf. s.v.);

thaumaturgus: quoted in its usual hagiographic context in C, p. 171 ("...Divus Gregorius Thaumaturgus..."), it is also transposed to more profane applications, viz. "inventor of miraculous mechanics", and even, through personification, to engines with miraculous effects, such as one peculiar type of tubus (AE, p. 77: "tubus nocturnus..., quem Thaumaturgum jure appellare possumus");

torrentum: from "an instrument to shoot missiles by applying the principle of tightening ropes" (classical; medieval), it was transposed, by broadening of sense, to a new type of instruments "built for the same purpose, relying on the force of gun powder";

umbratio: metaphorically transposed to a newly developed, contemporary technique of drawing;

venari: classical Latin 'to hunt, to chase', medieval Latin 'piscari' (DC) > Neo-Latin "to investigate"; see already G. Schottus;110

vitis: "screw", metaphorically transposed from its classical sense "vine" to "screw"; its first attestation, according to Du Cange (s.v. vis!), is already found in medieval Latin; the form vitibus in his quotation is not to be corrected to vicibus, as the author suggests, nor the nom. to vis.

1.2.3. Some particular cases.

1.2.3.1. Some involuntary neologisms.

Some neologisms apparently stem from contemporary (but now forgotten) lectiones in the ms. tradition of classical authors which, from the viewpoint of the 17th-century writer, were not neologisms at all. The most striking example concerns the geodesic term collimare (M; AE, p. 71), the result of the misreading of the compound col-liniare in the only five classical testimonia. It was mainly propagated by Kepler's Ad Vitellionem Paralipomena (Francofurti, 1604), p. 211, and was thereafter generally accepted as part of the astronomical terminology in the 17th century;111

110 G. Schottus, p. 870.

111 From here it found its way even into the 'national' languages, such as Italian (collimare since P. Segneri [°1624-†1694]: cf.DEI, s.v.), English (NED: since 1623: collimate: "to levell or winke with one eye"); French (collimation since 1646: cf. Trésor, 5, 1046).
both forms are used mutually interchangeably by, for instance, T. Brahe in his *Astronomiae Instauratae Mechanica* (Wandesburgi, 1592). In all recent editions, however, it has been replaced by the common form *con(col)-lineare*: “to bring something in one line with…”.

Some more of Verbiest’s ‘neologisms’ of this type already date from the Middle Ages. This is the case with his compound *conspicilium* (AE, p. 97) which, according to Forcellini (s.v.), was in Plautus, *Cist.*, 91 (as well as in the fragments), and meant “glasses”; this lectio since has been replaced by *conspicillus* (-m), so that the only real lexical support for this term is now lost and it becomes a true ‘neo-logism’.112 Finally, the medieval reading *praeludium* in Cic., *Phil.* 14. III.8, and source of the ‘Neo-Latin’ *praeludium*, has been replaced now by *propudium*.

1.3. Concluding remarks: stratigraphy of the neologisms.

The foregoing research has demonstrated that Verbiest’s vocabulary in these texts on astronomy and 14 other ‘mathematical’ sciences bears a firm medieval and Neo-Latin stamp: the neologisms in this rather small corpus number 186. This might seem a small basis for ‘statistic’ considerations, but I nevertheless believe that some valuable conclusions are possible. To draw a chronological distinction between medieval and Neo-Latin neologisms, I propose the year 1400, the formations first appearing between 600113 and 1400 being regarded as ‘medieval’, and all later innovations as Neo-Latin neologisms.

1.3.1. The medieval neologisms.

Before any reliable conclusion on the medieval component in Verbiest’s vocabulary becomes possible, four important aspects must be emphasized concerning the dictionaries listed at the beginning of this study (1.0) and the material they present.

112 Cf. also the item +*-conspicilla(-lia)* in R. Hoven, p. 82.
113 Verbiest’s Latin also contains a series of Late Latin terms, such as *appendo* (“to suspend”), *borealis*, *constellatio*, *cosmographia*, *curvitas*, *deforis*, *embolismalis* (cf. n. 12), *flammivomus*, *idioma*, *immobiliter*, *magneticus*, *meridianus*, *mil(i)are*, *speculariter*, *superligare*, *transmigratio*, etc.
1° Most of them are still in progress, so that for several letters only a very partial comparison can be made;

2° The same dictionaries of medieval Latin occasionally cite post-medieval and even modern items and testimonia, not always clearly distinguished or distinguishable from Neo-Latin references. Consequently, as the asterisk (*) in the above-mentioned list indicated only the presence of the quoted term in one or more of these medieval sources, it does not imply that the term is also of medieval extraction! Indeed, after a detailed check, only 54 words and terms could with certainty be retraced to a medieval origin (See the list in appendice).

3° On the other hand, the major medieval lexica (DC and N) present only a partial selection of the linguistic material — a commonly known fact, and abundantly confirmed during the present study (cf. infra). Therefore, I have extended the comparison to the material collected in ‘minor’, mostly regional dictionaries of medieval Latin, such as Arnaldi, Bartal, Blaise, Blatt, Fuchs & Weijers, Latham, the Mitellateinisches Wörterbuch, Plezia; especially the material published in L (L²: L³) and PL has proved to be of particular value in complementing DC (N). But even in these dictionaries, the spectrum is very unequal and incomplete, and it is precisely the specific language of the writings under scrutiny in our corpus, i.e. the astronomical — mathematical — technological terminology, which is more deficiently represented than any other.

4° Finally, other (etymological) dictionaries and some monographs occasionally refer to the medieval origin of certain words: thus such important terms as meteora, -orum: “atmospheric circumstances”,114 practicus,-a, -um: “practical”,115 realis, -is, -e: “related to reality”116 appear to be of medieval extraction, although they are not listed as such in DC or in N.117

115 Cf. FEW IX, 276: since ± 500.
116 Originating from the Late Latin and medieval didactic terminology, according to FEW X, p. 134.
117 In my list I have also marked these terms with an asterisk *. 
All this means that, for our purpose, of the 186 appellative neologisms listed above, at least 54, i.e. 29% or less than one-third of Verbiest's neologisms, are of medieval origin. Because of the incomplete character of the available evidence, and for the limited spectrum represented by our instruments of medieval Latin, this proportion might rather be an underestimate. This calls to mind two other estimates of a more general import: that made by J. IJsewijn who, on the basis of the material published in *Humanistica Lovaniensia*, conjectured that “…ungefähr drei Viertel der nicht in antiken Quellen nachweisbaren und von Humanisten benutzten Wörter sich schon in mittelalterlicher Texten vorfinden”!118 On the other hand, of the 8,550 ‘notices’ (both formal and semantic neologisms) collected by R. Hoven in his aforementioned *Lexique de la prose de la renaissance*, only 1600 items, i.e. only one-fifth of the material, is listed with *, i.e. as “…déjà latin médiéval”. It is as yet not clear how the difference between these three figures has to be explained, but see infra.

Although the application of the words cannot always be clearly specified, it seems reasonable to assume that at least 41 of these 54 neologisms of medieval origin (viz. ca 76%) are technical terms. They mainly concern: (a) astronomy and astronomical instrument building (*alidada*; *armilla*; *armillaris*; *astrolabium*; *circumvolutio*; *eclipsare*; *ecliptica*; *embolismalis*; *fixa*; *incidentia*; *nadir*; *planisphaerium*; *polaris*; *quadrans*; *uranicus*) — this is the largest group; (b) meteorology (*halo*; *meteora*; *meteoricus*; *meteorologicus*); (c) the names of other ‘mathematical’ sciences (*optica*); (d) other instruments, their parts (*claviculus*; *concavum*; *curriculus*; *vitis*), their characteristics (*chalybeus*; *polygonus*; *practicus*; *pyramidalis*; *transversalis*), etc. It thus appears that the persistence of medieval Latin was particularly strong in the field of ‘science and technology’, which seems a reasonable conclusion. Conversely, the far lower degree of survival of what can be called the ‘general’ vocabulary could be the result of a certain stylistic ‘purification’, which of course exerted less influence on the established terminology of the sciences. For that matter, this predominantly technical character of Verbiest’s medieval neologisms may partly also explain why R. Hoven

---

arrived at a lower proportion of medieval elements in the Neo-Latin vocabulary than I have, viz. 1/5 versus ±1/3 respectively: scientific texts played only a secondary role in his corpus, contrary to the corpus under scrutiny in this study. All in all, the two figures do not appear irreconcilable, whereas the proportion cited by IJsewijn (and based on the annual lists of neologisms in *Humanistica Lovaniensia*) remains inexplicably high.

As to the typology of Verbiest’s medieval neologisms, various types are represented: (1) Medieval derivations on classical roots (e.g.: claviculus; transversalis; circum-volutio…). (2) Classical words with a secondary semantic shift (e.g. armilla). (3) A not unimportant group of borrowings, first (3a) those of Greek origin: they represent 17 of 54 items, viz. 31% of the medieval neologisms, almost all in the technical or scientific sphere, and more or less adapted to Latin morphology. The majority cannot be traced further back than the 12th or 13th century, and therefore it is likely that they were created within the framework of the Latin translations of Greek scientific works, such as the ‘Corpus Aris totelicum’, Galenus, Ptolemaeus, Euclid, etc., which were all made in the course of those two centuries. It is remarkable, then, that several of these 12th and 13th-century ‘Graeco-Latina’ appear precisely in L (L²: L³) — which perhaps reflects the important role of the English universities, especially Oxford, in these translations, albeit from Arabic? In his Teubner edition of Hero, vol. II, pp. xxxviii-xlIII W. Schmidt lists 21 cases of Greek technical terms borrowed by the Arabian translations on mechanics. It is in this milieu, then, that the origin lies of such neologisms as astrolabium (L: 1110), ecliptica (L³: early 12th cent.), halo (L: Bacon, †1294), meteora (BL: Alfr. Anglicus), met[he]oricus (L²: id.), practicus (L: ca. 1177), praxis (L: ca. 1250), theorice (L: 1275). Other Greek terms were borrowed during the translation of the same texts directly from the Greek Originals in Sicily: this is in all probability the case for optica, attributed to Eugenius or Henricus Aristippus (NED). All in all, only two Greek borrowings among Verbiest’s medieval neologisms are attested earlier (polygonus uranicus), both of ‘English’ origin as well. Apart from this ‘English’ connection, Vitelo (13th cent.) also seems to have been influential in successfully transposing Greek scientific terms

into Latin: see, apart from several purely Latin terms, the family of \textit{eclipsis}, and \textit{halo}. Besides from the Greek borrowings, (3b) at least one cultural term was recognizably borrowed from Italian, viz. \textit{cornix}. Finally, (3c) some Arabic loan words are represented, viz. \textit{alidada}, \textit{azimuth}, and \textit{nadir}; all three belong to the field of astronomical terminology, and were introduced at the lastest in the early 13th century through Sacrobosco's \textit{De Spera} (\textit{nadir}, \textit{azimuth})\textsuperscript{120} or slightly later (\textit{alilada}: 1284). Unlike \textit{nadir}, which remained indeclinable, the two others received proper flexion.

As by far most of these medieval Latin neologisms reappear in several 'national' medieval dictionaries (see my list in 1.0), they were widespread or even in common use throughout Europe, being part of the 'intellectual' vocabulary, specialized or not. As such, they belonged to the linguistic heritage to which Verbiest was surely introduced during his 'philosophical' studies in Leuven (\textit{Corpus Aristotelicum}; Sacrobosco), either through publications he read, or the courses he attended.

\textbf{1.3.2. The post-medieval neologisms.}

With all due reservations (cf. \textit{supra}), the \([186 - 54 =] 132\) non-medieval neologisms must represent post-medieval creations from the 15th–17th centuries, either then in current use or created by Verbiest \textit{ad hoc}. Of these, only six are listed by R. Hoven in his aforementioned \textit{Lexique de la prose latine de la renaissance} (8.550 'notices'!), viz. the words \textit{cylindricus}, \textit{character}, \textit{chorographicus}, \textit{geodesia}, \textit{semidigitus} and \textit{semiquadrans}, to which \textit{catoptice} and \textit{conspicilium} may probably be added. The same picture appears when we check other modern repertoria of Neo-Latin terminology or linguistic studies in the field of 17th-century Latin terminology, such as the \textit{Lexicon auxiliare} by Chr. Helfer (Saarbrücken, 1991\textsuperscript{3}), the aforementioned publications of the 'group' around E. Tengström (University of Göteborg), and those by R. Pitkäranta (cf. n. 28): consequently, these are our additions to a future Neo-Latin dictionary.

\textsuperscript{120} A direct source of Verbiest's, as this author was still part of the philosophical curriculum at Leuven University in his day! On the success of Sacrobosco's \textit{De Spera}, even in 17th-century university teaching: see L. Thorndike, pp. 41-42.
These post-medieval neologisms mainly represent ‘new terms for new realities’ (‘Wörter und Sachen’). First, these ‘new realities’ concern the Far East and China, the discovery of which basically occurred from the 16th century. As a result, a whole set of terms was needed to indicate various aspects of this ‘new’ world and the novelties it produced. When Verbiest wrote his Latin works on China (from the early 1660s), there existed an already well-established Latin tradition on China, of which an important part was of specifically Jesuit signature, a heritage to which he evidently adhered for the terminology concerned. In this respect, the 16th-17th-century neologisms bonzius, colaus, mandarinus (-icus) must be noted, as well as pataca, a numismatic term connected with the Oriental expansion of Portugal.

In the same sense, all the terms indicating new scientific or technological disciplines, their discoveries, instruments, applications, ...are Neo-Latin neologisms; in this field, we have: (2a) appellations for new, or revitalised, branches of scientific research and technology, such as ballistica; catopt<io>ica; geod(a)esia; horolotechnia; hydragogica (and -icus); hydraulica (and -icus); hydrostatica; pneumatica; spartostatica; trigonometria (and -icus); uranologia; (2b) names of instruments, such as aeolopila; anemodicticum; armatura; chorometricum; chronometricum; cochlea; conspicilium; glossocomum; horizon; incubus; pantocrator; pantometrum; pendulum; pinnacidium; radius (astronomicus); regula; sextans; thermoscopium; ʻxirometricum’; (2c) terms indicating parts of the same instruments, their material, the shape and their working: anima; antisacoma; azimuthalis; bicrus; chorographicus (and -e); chronometricus; contrapondium; cursor (and cursorius); cylindricus; cylindraceus; diaphragma; dioptralis; exuberantia; filaris; frisa; horologus; hypochromochium; libellatio; ligno-metallicus; octangularis; octolateris; organotheca; pedestale; peritrochium; pinnacidium; polyedrum (-s); semicylindrum; turbinatim; (2d) specific techniques: circumar- mare; hydragogus; libellatio; parastaticus; perspectiva; thaumaturgus; trusio; umbratio; (2e) physical laws: anacampiticus; anaclasticus; magnetice; pyrius; (2f) things relating to astronomy, such as aequatorius, anemoscopus, astropticus, circumpolaris, embolismicus, lucida, observatorius, parallaxis, semisignum, zodiacalis; (2g) concerning mathematics: annuens, gradialis fparascheuma; semidigitus; semiquadrans; (3) the names of other ‘realia’ that originated in the same period, such as gazetta; missionarius; (4) finally, common terms and varia: acclive; albo-niger and...
-ruber; arcto-zephyrus; arenarium; astrologaster; caritas; draconicus; erigere; explicationuncula; gradialis; musica; noctu-diurnus; palaestra; subsultus; superaffigere; titularis; venari.

As for the medieval neologisms, the sources of this ‘new’ vocabulary were (1°) to be found first in Latin, both classical and medieval, from which neologisms were created either by derivation (e.g. fil-aris; libellatio; in-cubus, etc.) or by compounding (e.g. bi-crus, prae-lud-ium) — always according to the rules and models of classical morphology — or by semantic shift (e.g. cursor; musica). In addition, (2°) many terms were borrowed, mainly from ancient Greek, the knowledge of which became widespread and much improved since the 15th–16th century. Moreover, a series of newly discovered or newly edited sources, especially in the areas of scientific and technological research, introduced a series of new terms, which may have been adapted to Latin in contemporary Latin translations of such Greek authors as Hero–Pappus, Euclid, Galenus, Apollon of Perge, Proclus, in which Commandinus had played an important role. Furthermore, thanks to the improved knowledge of Greek, scientists also now had at their disposal an inexhaustible quarry of new linguistic material, both words and stems, with which to build, occasionally in combination with Latin elements, new, partly ‘hybrid’ terms, which have since remained typical of the ‘learned’ language. In our material 57 Neo-Latin terms are purely ‘Greek’ borrowings or formations (type: sparto-statica; dia-phragma) and 7 are of hybrid origin (type: astrologaster; ballist-ica). Apart from the latter category, the proportion of Greek terms has now significantly increased from 31% in the medieval neologisms (cf. supra) to 57 or — with the inclusion of the hybrids — 64 out of 132 items, i.e. 43,1% (or even 49%). Among these Neo-Latin ‘graecisms’, some, which were already known in Greek, seem nevertheless to represent new ‘constructions’ rather than real borrowings, for semantic or other reasons explained ad hoc: this may be the case for anacampticus; antisacoma; horologus. On the other hand, such terms as, hydragogus and hydragogicus, although attested in medieval Latin, were probably borrowed a second time in the 16th or 17th century for similar semantic reasons.121 (3°) Another not unimportant source of borrowings were the national vernaculars, for obvious reasons first and

121 Cf. supra, n. 13.
foremost Portuguese (pataca), which also was the intermediary for the reception of some terms from the Oriental languages (see colaus; bonzius; mandarinus). Besides, some ‘cultural’ terms appear to be latinizations of originally Italian terms (bombarda; frisa; pedestal; porcellana). Finally, direct Neo-Latin borrowings from Oriental languages, at least in the corpus of the present study, are limited to the field of onomastics (toponyms, anthroponyms), where the ‘barbarian’ Chinese names were either morphologically latinized (type: Pekinum; Yang-quangsenius) or simply incorporated in the text as ‘foreign elements’ (type: tum fum ta fu, etc.); loan translations (type: Montes Occidentales) and a series of substitutions (type: Tribunal, for Chinese pu, chien or ssu) can be seen as a ‘gloss’ for the western reader.

Even a superficial comparison with contemporary writings, both in the orbit of ‘science and technology’ and in the tradition of scientific writing on China, shows that Verbiest’s neologisms were for the most part not original creations, but inherited from his sources and the contemporary context. In this respect, I compared his vocabulary with T. Brahe’s Astronomiae Instauratae Mechanica (Wandesburgi, 1592), the source book of Verbiest’s Instruments as well as his cosmological model. Apart from several medieval neologisms, which appear both in Brahe and in Verbiest, and which were part of the technical terminology of astronomy since the Middle Ages (e.g. astrolabium; bifurcatus; chalybeus; collimare; ecliptica; fixa; incidentia; nadir; polaris; portatilis; praxis; quadrans; semidiameter; transversalis; cf. also an expression such as area [instrumenti]), 12 common Neo-Latin terms were found, all concerning astronomy, its instruments, their construction and their manipulation, viz. aequatorius, azimuthalis, cochlea, horizon, lucida, parallaxis, pedestal, pinnacidium, radius astronomicus, regula, sextans, zodiacalis. On the other hand, some of Verbiest’s technical neologisms like alidada, trigonometria, venari, vitis are not, or not yet, in Brahe, who has regula, scientia triangulorum, rimari (capere, dimetiri) and cochlea, respectively.

Clues for further and more systematic comparison are to be found in the ‘frame of reference’ quoted in this very corpus. Explicitly mentioned are only the names of A. Kircher, with his China Illustrata (M, Praef.; fig. 66; AE, p. 80) and his Magia Parastatica, part of the celebrated Ars Magna Lucis et Umbrae (M, fig. 102; AE, p. 77); M. Bettini and his
Aerarium in the edition with Eschinardi’s supplement on the ‘hydrargyrol ogium’; the Historica Relatio by A. Schall (AE, praefatio; edition Vienna, 1665); Pr. Intorcetta’s Compendiosa Narratio (ibid.); M. Martini’s Novus Atlas Sinensis (M, Praef.; C; passim); Chr. Scheiner (AE, p. 79); Clavius’ Euclid translation (M, fig. 43; AE, p. 55). Other sources can be identified only in an indirect way, i.e. through analysis (“Quellenforschung”) of the contents of these Latin writings and of their Chinese counterparts, and here the possibilities are nearly endless: an incomplete list will contain the names of Kepler, G.B. Riccioli, G. Schottus, M. Mersenne, S. Stevin, Besson, De Caus, P. Casati, etc. It is clear that such an enterprise can only be undertaken as part of a more comprehensive project which, perhaps, could start from contributions on a smaller scale such as those produced at Göteborg University, and such as the present modest study of the Verbiest corpus.

In line with this, other links can be anticipated between Verbiest’s terminological neologisms and contemporary lexica or scientific encyclopaedias, in Latin or in the national vernaculars, which may be expected to have combed more or less thoroughly through the corpus that constituted Verbiest’s ‘scientific background’. For the final decades of the 17th century the most important of these lexical instruments are those by R. Goclenius,122 J. Micraelius (see supra, n. 27), H. Vitalis,123 J. Gezelius,124 Chr. Wolff,125 and J.H. Zedler.126 However, here too the initial results are disappointing and the correspondences limited: the lexicon of Micraelius, for instance, shares with Verbiest’s neologisms only a variant like aeolopila, a derivation on -metricum (ageo-metricum, comparable to Verbiest’s choro-metricum and πξηρο-metricum), and a term such as polyhedrum. The main reason for this may be that these lexica were more interested in concepts than in concrete terms.

---

122 R. Goclenius, Lexicon Philosophicum, quo tamquam clave philosophiae fores aperiuntur (Francofurti, 1613).
124 J. Gezelius, Encyclopaedia Synoptica (Aboae, 1672).
125 Chr. Wolff, Mathematisches Lexicon, darinnen die in allen Theilen der Mathematik üblichen Kunst-Wörter erklärt (Leipzig, 1716).
A final complementary source for comparison may be the dictionaries of the ‘national’ vernacular languages (French, English, Italian). The underlying idea for the extension to this category of sources is the international character of 16th and 17th-century scientific terminology and relations, whereby one can expect a newly created term in Latin to find an echo in the contemporary national ‘vernaculars’, and vice versa. This supposition is fully confirmed by a glance through these dictionaries. The incomplete inventory of the material makes it hard to determine in which language the term was originally created and in which it was afterwards borrowed. This research (to the results of which we have referred above) demonstrates that Verbiest’s neologisms are roughly contemporaneous with the first appearances of the same terms in the corresponding French, English, Italian (mostly technical) vocabulary.

On the other hand, some cases could be tentatively listed here in which an expected neologism, noted in other contemporary sources, is missing, while the object in question is mentioned under an older appellation. This is the case with the name of the Astronomical Observatory of Peking, which is constantly in the centre of Verbiest’s Latin astronomical treatises; although G. Galilei had already created in the 1st half of the 17th century the term osservatorio, which in the following decades was accepted in French and English (cf. n. 45), Verbiest never uses observatorium, and instead always prefers the syntagmata specula astropatica or mathematica, in line with his predecessors (Schall) and perhaps echoing the then current Chinese name (see supra, loan translations). Also lacking is atmosphaera: “atmosphere”, while a third example of a missed contemporary semantic evolution is seen in meteora, which is apparently still used in its older sense of: “celestial phenomena”, the 17th-century restriction to “celestial bodies” not yet being accepted.

127 Quite frankly, the first Latin testimonium so far known dates from ... 1686 (L, quoted by Helfer, p. 403).
128 The Latin term atmosphaera is first attested in 1647, in Gassendi’s Institutio Astronomica(....), 1, 51, but was created in English in 1638 (Wilkins). While it was here related to the “globe d’air vaporeux dont un astre est enveloppé tout autour” (FEW XXV, 671–672), its first application on the earth’s atmosphere is only found in 1678, in the French atmosphère (but Trésor, 3, 796: 1665), contemporary with It. atmosfera, used since D. Bartoli (†1685).
129 The first examples of this specialization are noticed in English in 1593 (NED); in Italian it appears first in F. Corsini (2nd half of the 17th century), in French only at the end of that century (Furetière: 1690)
In the field of instrument building, the absence of both *telescopium* and *hygroskopium* (-metrum) amazes, as the former is already quoted in the 16th century (Helfer, 548) and the latter attested in French as early as 1665 and 1670 (Trésor, 9, 1016);\(^{130}\) in our corpus, the former instrument is mentioned in passing as *tubus opticus* or anonymously (AE, p. 95), while in the case of the hygroscope (-metre) the obsolete †*xirometricum* is once used (M, fig. 99). A final obvious absence concerns the term *lense*, -nitis: “lense, objective”,\(^{131}\) for which Verbiest uses the generic term *vitrum*. If the *argumentum silentii* in these cases has any real value, and the absence of these terms or meanings — truly astonishing in the case of *telescopium* — is not the result of a misleading coincidence, it may be interpreted as the effect of a certain terminological ‘delay, as the first testimonia of most of these terms date from the 1660s and 1670s, i.e. shortly after Verbiest had left Europe. This would constitute an interesting conclusion, but the matter still requires the verification of further historic research.

2. Orthography.

The most striking deviations from the usual classical orthography in the AE are: -e- for -ae- (*pene* on p. 13; 54; 79; 85; *septum* on p. 54; 68; *geodesia* on p. 55); the reverse (and false) spelling -ae- for -e- (*fraeno*; 82); -ae- for -oe- (*paena* on p. 6; 19; 23; 57; *amaenues* on p. 5; 55; 58; 98; *aestro* on p. 18); -y- (occasionally) for -i- in non-Greek terms: *Synicus* (p. 4); *hyemis* (p. 22); *hybnum* (p. 41); *hyerno* (48), but also in Greek terms: *syphon* (p. 83) versus *sipho* elsewhere; -c- for -t- only in *nuntius* and its derivations (*annunciant*: p. 33; 67; *nuncia*: p. 67; 82; *annunciandis*: p. 83; 92; 93; *annuncianda*: p. 93). None of these ‘aberrations’ are unusual in the orthography of humanistic editions. That they reflect Verbiest’s own spelling can occasionally be proven for those parts of the text of which we possess the original xylograph in his own hand: this indisputably shows that such spellings as *pene* (p. 54), *septa* (p. 54), *geodesia* (p. 56), *amaeniores* (p. 58), *hybnum* (p. 41), *hyerno* (p. 48) represent Verbiest’s own orthography. The same can be

---

\(^{130}\) See also the first English testimonia, which date from 1665 and 1670, respectively (NED, s.v.), and Italian, dating from 1681 (*igroscopio*, -metro).

\(^{131}\) Italian *lente* is already testified in G. Galileo (early 17th cent.: *Grande Diz. Ling. Ital.*); the first Latin testimonium known to me is referred by Helfer, p. 350 s.v. *Linse* to G. Schottus (1662), certainly one of Verbiest’s sources! In English, *lens* is attested since 1693 (NED).
demonstrated for common 17th-century spellings like *imo* (passim); *impostern* (p. 75); *pedissequus* (Praef.); *nequidquam* (p. 18; 73); *seorsim* (p. 20); *sexcentos* (p. 73); -x- for -xs- in compounds such as *exurgens* (p. 18), *expirant* (p. 19), *extincta* (p. 22) etc.; *utrinque* (p. 48; 50); *duntaxat* (p. 59 and passim). Most of these forms are also found scattered through Verbiest's autograph letters, with the exception of the latter two which are commonly spelled by the author himself as *utrimque*, *duntaxat*.

Furthermore, there is a series of occasional spellings that deserve no attention as they represent mere printing errors, as sometimes can even be shown: apart from the examples in the Praefatio, referred to in my edition on p. 151, there are the following: *expungendum* for *expungendam* (p. 19); *conciliarij* on p. 20, a 'Verschlimmbesserung' by the corrector for the original consiliarij, preserved in the ms. version of Verbiest's letter of 15 August 1678;*fixi* for *fixis* (p. 45), *Hadir* for *Nadir* (p. 51), *cochleis* for *trocchleis* (p. 52),*manifesto* for *manifesta* (p. 54), *difficilora* for *dificiliora* (p. 56) — the last four examples were exposed or demonstrated by comparison with the xylograph — *sequutae* for *secutae* (p. 57), *scenia* for *schema* (p. 71), *celeberimus* for *celeberrimus* (p. 73), *ac* for *at* (p. 76), *eorum* for *earum* (p. 86: sc. stellarum, not instrumentorum or the like), *rotarrm* for *rotarum* (p. 87), *harmanico* for *harmonico* (p. 91); also, the insertion of *ac* on p. 94, l. 20 is superfluous and indeed absent in the parallel text in M, fig. 101.

Another — final — series concerns some verbal endings, which are singular for plural: *offera(n)tur* (p. 25), *observa(n)t* (p. 32), *offendere(n)t* (p. 98); in these cases too a simple misprint is the most obvious interpretation, probably due to the erroneous solution of a barely legible abbreviation: *offerat*, *observât* and *offenderêt*, respectively; for that matter, in the case of *offenderent* (p. 98) we can prove that it is also the authentic spelling, for it appears in the prior version of this paragraph in C, p. 248, and in the autograph of the same letter (see ch. 7; introduction).

3. Morphology.

As one might expect, there are no spectacular aberrations or unusual phenomena in Verbiest's Latin morphology; the only discrepancies worthy

---

133 See N. Golvers, p. 259, n. 76.
of mention are primarily of medieval origin, as the following overview will demonstrate:

3.1. In the morphology of the nouns, note the use of abl. sing. on -e for the class of -i-stems, e.g. turris, basis and imber: turre (M; AE, p. 24; 41; 84; 92), base (AE, p.76), imbre (AE, p. 73), respectively, as opposed to the acc. basim (AE, p. 52; 76) and turrim (AE, p. 80). The gen. plur. of the 5th declension on -erum probably appears once in M, f. 14, in the corrupt †superficierum. As for the gender of the nouns, a certain hesitation is noticeable in the gender of dies: see AE, p. 44: “die tertio” and ibid. “die tertia”.

Greek loan words follow partly the Latin, partly the Greek declension: compare basim (AE, p. 52), Euclidis (AE, p. 55), and mathematicae versus the nom. sing.(1) Uranie in AE, p. 56, the gen. sing. mathematices on p. 57, matheseos in AE, p. 55 and metamorphoseos in M, fig. 102 respectively.

3.2. In the field of adjectives, there is the systematic use of the abl. sing. on -i instead of -e in the flexion of the comparatives, very common in medieval texts. The abl. sing. of the part. praes., however, ends indiscriminately on -i and -e, without any discernible distributive system: cf. ex occasione incidenti (AE, p. 77) and ex incidente occasione (AE, p. 68); see, on the other hand, such fixed formulas as die sequenti (passim), and the predominant use of -e within the ablativus absolutus syntagmata.

3.3. Among the numerals, note the systematic substitution of the cardinals duo, tres by their distributive counterparts bini and trini (not terni), respectively, following a tendency already present in the poetic sources of the classical period; the systematic use of trigesies (M, fig. 66; AE, p. 75), ‘thirty times’, for classical trigies (tricies) has its origin either in medieval authors (see L) or in a simple analogy with vige-sies: vig-inti — vig-esies > trig-inta — trig-esies. Note also the unusual quater mille (AE, p.18; 46) for quatuor milia.

3.4. Nothing special is to be noted concerning the declension of the pronouns. Probably the most striking fact in this respect is the pleonastic

---

use of *ille*, which comes very near to a true definite article. Also pleonastically used is the reflexive pronoun *suus*; in three passages (AE p. 26, 33, 70) this reflexive character is apparently absent, but these ‘exceptions’ are not wholly against classical rules, as *suus* could at an already early stage apply to the object, in the meaning of ‘belonging to’: 135 ‘qui publicis operibus...locum et tempus suum præscribunt’ (AE, p. 30): “who are prescribing for the public works...the appropriate place and time”.

3.4. As for prepositions, I mention only a sporadic use of *absque*, in the expression *absque comparatione* (M, fig. 66) for the usual classic *sine comparatione* quoted in the same paragraph, and especially the systematic and very frequent use of *iuxta* in the sense of ‘according to’ instead of the classical *secundum*.

3.5. Finally, in conjugations only one phenomenon is worth notice, viz. the regular composition of the passive perfect tenses by means of the participle perfect plus the perfect tenses of the auxiliary verb *esse*: *rejecta fuiisset* (AE, p. 12), *fuerint munita* (AE, p. 23), *praefectus fui* (p. 46), *usus fueram* (p. 47), *decepti fuerint* (p. 78), instead of *rejecta esset*, etc. This phenomenon is also well known since medieval Latin.

4. Syntax.

4.1. Case. The only phenomenon worth mentioning in this respect is the systematic use of the ablative to indicate the measure following such adjectives as *altus* (AE, p. 41), *latus* (AE, 41), *longus* (AE, p. 64), *crassus* (AE, p. 65), etc., in apparent contravention of the classical use of the accusative, but in accordance with Late Latin: 136 “Columna...alta 8 pedibus geometricis”.

4.2. In one case, the adverb is perhaps used syntactically as an adjective, as became increasingly frequent in late-Latin137: AE, p. 85: “...ut ascendente incubo et antisacomate descendentе, *transversim ille axis circumactus intra 24 horas indicem...circumageret*” (cf. ibid., l. 28: “...axi transverso”).


137 J. Svennung, p. 495.
4.3. In several cases, the ablative of the gerund comes very close to the sense of a part. praes.: see inclinando — reclinando (AE, p. 52); tornando (p. 67); renitendo (p. 79); modulando (p. 90), also reflecting a well known phenomenon in Late and Middle Latin. In another important matter, viz. that of the gerund with object, Verbiest perfectly reflects the classical model, replacing the gerund by the gerundive in all cases, except in (most of) the passages with the gerund genitive (exception in AE, p. 6 and 57).

4.4. More interesting are three features relating to the gerundive. First, the predicative use of the gerundive in relation to the object (the well known classical type: ‘sepulchrum faciendum curavit’) is represented very often in our corpus after several verbs which did not have this construction in classical times: indeed, apart from curare, exponere, mandare, mittere, petere, relinquere, suscipere and traditur, which already in classical times displayed this construction, Verbiest extends it to committere (AE, p. 19; 80), excipere (AE, p. 32), imponere (AE, p. 46), postulare (AE, p. 62), praedicere (AE, p. 6), praeparatur (AE, p. 87), proponere (AE, p. 84; M, fig. 2), putare (AE, p. 84); this extension is in line with a tendency already productive in Late Latin authors. A second feature concerns the nine gerundives in an attributive use without a classical precedent: see AE, Preface, p. 5, 7, 10, 25, 30, 44, 81, and twice in M, fig. 66: “ob causas mox indicandas” (AE, p. 81). Thirdly, in at least one of the latter examples, the gerundive clearly has the sense of a pass. part. fut., any notion of obligation being absent: see AE, p. 30: “Supremum Tribunal Ritum ipsum futurae eclipsis diem...necon digitos eclypsandos in libello suo Imperatori obtulit...”, i.e. “...the number of digits that would be obscured”. This too represents a Late Latin development.

4.5. Concerning subordinate clauses, only a few insignificant features could be noted, each with clear Late Latin connections. Such is the case with the occasional use of ut after opus est and necesse est (AE, p. 87

and 73 respectively), as became common in Late Latin.\(^{142}\) The occasional substitution of the indicative for the subjunctive in indirect interrogative clauses, such as in AE, p. 83: "...monstrabat quaenam erat hora",\(^{143}\) could be interpreted in the same way. Furthermore, there are some irregularities concerning the conjunction dum, such as its use in the sense of "while" followed by the subj. imperfect: see AE, p. 78 and 87: "Jam a tribus annis, dum aeolopilae vires examinarem, curriculum bipedalis longitudinis conficiendum curavi".\(^{144}\) In AE, p. 54 and M, fig. 59 the same conjunction is unexpectedly followed by the indicative plusquam-perf., apparently in the sense of "after", both times with a clear iterative character; for this construction, I could find only one uncertain parallel in Ammianus Marcellinus. Finally, I have noted at least one case where the sense of sive is very near to "et", and for which medieval parallels are attested:\(^{145}\) see AE, p. 30: "Ego quidem pluribus ante diebus cujuvis eclipsis typum sive imaginem adumbratam...mittere soleo", to be compared with p. 31: "...ejusmodi typo eclipsis jam instantis & (!) imagine adumbrata oculos pascunt"; a less certain example is in AE, p. 74. Other features, including the ‘special’ rules of the consecutio temporum in a consecutive subordinate clause, the use of vereri with ut (AE, p. 64), and non dubitare with inf. (AE, p. 24), etc., all have more or less common classical precedents.

5. Conclusion.

This research in the field of syntax (parts of speech; subordinate clauses) has demonstrated that here the influences of post-classical and Late Latin on Verbiest’s Latin idiom are minor; this may be taken as proof of a profound classicizing influence, due to his Jesuit education and the Jesuit context in which he always worked. The ‘innovations’ within this corpus with respect to the classical standard are mainly situated in the area of terminology, with 186 ‘neologisms’, especially in the technical sphere; here, the ‘innovations’ are of course introduced in connection with some technological or scientific invention and by their nature fall outside any ‘classicizing’ influence; on the other hand, the latter probably


\(^{143}\) See also K. Isacson, p. 188.

\(^{144}\) See R. Kuehner - C. Stegmann, vol. 2.2, §210, who classifies this construction as ‘nachklassisch’.

\(^{145}\) See J. Svennung, p. 495.
remains responsible for the low number of neologisms in the ‘general’ vocabulary. It is important to note that, among these neologisms, about 30% — most of them technical terms represented in several European traditions — are of medieval origin, proving the persistence of a certain medieval technological terminology until the 16th and 17th century. On the other hand, the post-medieval neologisms (at most 70%) were either taken by the author from his sources or inspired by the context in which he was working: the former is as yet proven only for a small group of terms, the latter becomes increasingly probable since it could often be demonstrated that their appearance in our corpus is contemporaneous with the first appearance of the same term in the most important modern vernaculars of Europe (English; French; Italian). In any event, all the lamentations of Verbiest, formulated in a recently discovered Latin letter of 1676 to Tsar Alexei Mikhailovitc, \textsuperscript{146} about his diminishing command of the ‘
aurea lingua’ — after the model of Ovid among the Getae — appear groundless from the strictly linguistic point of view. Nevertheless, these words may reflect more than just the overall influence of a popular poetical topos,\textsuperscript{147} and they probably ventilate the author’s awareness of his sometimes sloppy style, in competition with occasional traces of literary embellishment. Therefore, the former may probably be due more to his extreme lack of time, on which he often complains, than to a really decreasing mastery of the idiom he employed right up to the end of his life in so many letters and reports to Europe.
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\textsuperscript{146} The passage reads as follows: “post 20 et amplius annos tamquam exul et aureae linguae oblitus, cum poeta exule paucis mutatis possum dicere ‘Tartaream didici Barbaricamque loqui’” (referring to Ovid., Ep. ex Ponto, III 2, 40). This letter will be published in the planned supplement to Verbiest’s correspondence, containing 58 new items, which I am preparing for 1996.

\textsuperscript{147} See, concerning this topos, the contribution of K. Smolak, ‘Der verbannte Dichter. Identifizierungen mit Ovid in Mittelalter und Neuzeit’, Wiener Studien, Neue Folge 14 (1980), 158–191, to which the ‘case Verbiest’ may be added now.
The medieval neologisms in Verbiest’s corpus (attested before ca. 1400 / 15th century).

1. alidada
   applanare
   aqueus
   armilla
5. armillaris
   astrolabium G.
   bifurcatus
   chalybeus
   character G.
10. circumvolutio
    claviculus
    coincidere
    collimare
    conicus
15. cornix
    correspondere
    curia
    curriculus
    eclipsis G.
20. eclypsare G.
    eclyptica G.
    embolismalis
    fixa
    halo G.
25. incidentia
    meteora G.
    met(h)eoricus G.
    meteorologicus G.
    milio
30. nadir
    optica G.
    perpendiculariter
    planisphaerium
    polaris
35. polygonus G.
    portatilis
practice G.
practicus (subst.; adj.) G.
praeludium

40. praxis G.
prorex
prototypum G.
pyramidalis
quadrans

45. realis
refluxus
semidiameter
speculative
theorice G.

50. transversalis
trigesies
uranicus G.
vernix

54. vi(ti)s
Fabula *Ecclesia in exilio triumphans* ad usum scholae scripta anno 1673 die 21. mensis Maii, qui erat Pentecostes, acta est Leutschoviae (Slovace Levoča), in civitate libera regia, in quam professores discipuli que Collegii statuum evangelicorum superioris Hungariae post diem 8. mensis Martii eodem anno Eperiesio (Slovace Prešov) pulsi confuge runt. Fabula numquam adhuc typis impressa est nec aliud exemplar textus eius inventum est praeter unum chirographum, quod hodie in Tabulario litterarum artiumque Slovacarum in Matica slovenská, quod Sancti Martini est, in codice MJ 597 signato habetur. Codex et alias fabulas in Collegio Eperiensiensi ab anno 1668 usque ad annum 1673 actas continet. In titulo unius earum, quae *Eleazar Constans* nuncupatur, Elia Ladi vero auctore fol. 206, 7 legitur: “Interfui huic actui missus a nobilissimo senatu Bartfensi ad examen publicum annuum”. Ex quo aeque atque ex eo, quod omnes paene fabulae una manu scriptae formis humanioris aevi characterorum cursivorum sunt, deduci potest fabulas eodem tempore actas et memoriae proditas esse.

In edendo textu apographo a professore Johanne Vilikovský facto, qui fabulas, quas maioris momenti esse existimavit, divulgandas curare frustra conatus est, niti potui. A lectione apographi cum codice manuscripto collato duobus solum locis differo: fol. 22, 22 “Nil nil nitum rebus in orbis” in “Nil nitendum rebus in orbis” et fol. 23 v, 9 “sacrato dieta festa” in “sacrato dicata festa” emendavi. In transcribendo chirographi orthographiam sequi contendi, interpunctio autem et usus magnarum ac parvarum litterarum in normam orthographiae hodiernae rediguntur.

2 Index fabularum, quae in codice continentur in op. cit., p. 26-27 inventitur.
Ecclesia in Exilio
Triumphans

Spem inter ac metum, inter dolores ac solatia, 
lamenta et jubila, diem (: Pentecostes vel alium :) 
celebrans, post majorem aeterni Numinis et 
Flaminis gloriام in piam ac devotam recordacionem 
Domini NN.S.P. 
et gratiam ac honorem Domini NN.C.S. 
Anno quo

[............................]

Prologus

Quousque Marspiter tonabit insolens, 
quousque Bistoniо cruentus classico 
terrebit orbem Christianum? Quo furor 
quove ibit atrox hostium indignatio?
Semperne tristi vulnerat pectora 
rumore Fama? Semper horror ingruet?
Sat jam minaci terruit parma ferus 
victos penates hostis belligerantibus 
Mavorte turmis, luctuosa sufficit 
clades piorum, vulnus atque Ecclesiae, 
jactura Parnassi, atque casus exedrae. 
Jam purpuratum Numen ante sanguine 
ascensio chori

Lethoque victum vincit atque coelicos 
ducit triumphos, hostium premit caput 
Erebumque frangit, jam Poli Capitolia 
augusta scandit, Pneuma legans inclytum. 
Prodi, quid haeres, moesta, prodi, Ecclesia!
Et pulsa Pallas, quid lates? Prodi, Themis!
Apollo, prodi! Jam sacra Flaminis
pacatorì festa fulgent sidere,
delapsus alto dius æthere Spiritus
brumam pavoris solvit atque flamine ||
refovet gelata corda moesto frigore
plaususque pascit. Festa promite jubila,
celebrate Numen, Numinis charismata.
Sic laeta Pietas almacque imperat Fides.
Patent theatra, si theatra clausa sunt,
panditur eremus, grata ubique encomia
pii Tonantis igneique Flaminis.
Patete mentes, corda, prodit Cynthius.

Inductio I.

Apollo canens: Heu luctuosa tempora!
   Heu fata luctuosa!
   O sortis atrae fulmina,
   eheu dies dolosa!
   Quonam rotamur turbine
teloque vulneramur?
   Quid tangimur, quid angimur
   pulsique sauciamur?
Vivo ergo! Vita morte me pejor manet.
Vivo, sed eheu quid juvat me vivere?
Postquam dolosis invidentibus inferis
fremente mundo sedibus miser excidi,
   ut excidi, sic occidi. Quo me dolor,
quo cura raptat? Quove fluctus pectoris ||
animique luctus? Quo furores imperi?
Quid Aeacus tremendus urget Arbiter?
Quo me Rhadamantheae innocentem urgent minae?
Stellante quondam pulsus exul æthere
afflictus errabam. Quid exulem me denuo,
acerba tellus, arva cogis querere?
   Heu! Exulamus, ejulamus perditì!

Cantus extra theatrum:
   Heu! Exulamus, ejulamus perditì!

Tangit cytharam: Tacuere buxi, pro chely planctus sonat. Lugete, Gryphi, suave concidit decus, lugete, cives, vestra gloria concidit, et laureata Pindi flete numina. En ipsa lugent astra, congemunt Lares. O urbi decus, o amata gloria Pannonum, quo decidisti? Tacta Ditis turbine quo decidisti?

Cantus Apollinis: Heu luctuosa etc. Funesta sunt, non festa nobis gaudia, ll f. 22 infesta gignit sors dolenti taedia. Divum reposcit Pneuma plausus jubila: At me reposcit nox doloris nubila, dicabo Jovae vota: Quomodo, quomodo


( : Discende illo chorus cantu: Heu! Exulamus! : )

Inductio II.

Ecclesia suo de exilio et calamitatibus queritur, Geniis duobus aggemen- tibus et meliora sperare jubentibus.

Genius 1.: Heu quam saevo tangimur ictu, quam praecipiti volvimur orbe sortis iniquae: nunquam constans Fortuna stetit, quam stabilivit hodie Titan, donec Olympi circuit axem, praecipitavit.

Genius 2.: Quanti pulsant pectora casus! Quantusque dolor corda fatigat! Nil nitendum rebus in orbis, ll
f. 22v
quicquid nisu conatuque
surgit in altum, praecipitatur.

Cantus:
O casus! O dolor! O damna! O moeror!

Genius 1.:
Nunquam fida est Fortuna bonis,
favet indignis dignosque premit.

Genius 2.:
Sic nulla dies secura micat.
Lumenque parit nubila sortis,
miseranda dolet culmina Pindi.

Genius 1.:
Themis alma gemit, luget Pallas.
Ah Ecclesia queis mergitur undis,
ubi Religio victa refugit
plangensque latet lachrymansque tacet!

Cantus:
O casus! O dolor etc.

Genius 2.:
Sed quo queralae, quid juvant quaerimoniae?
Quousque moeror? Quid latens Ecclesia?
Lugebit? Evocemus, en festa evocant
dicata sacro Pneumati.

Genius 1.:
Vocemus!

Genius 1. et 2.:
Fida mater o fidelium,
prodi, sacrata dum vocitant te jubila.

Cantus:
O mater o fidelium,
ad diva festa prodi!

Genius 1.:
Audimur.

Genius 2.:
En audimur: aggemens adest.

Ecclesia:
Quis me inquietat sauciam furoribus?
quae vox fatigat obrutam doloribus? I

f. 23
Genius 2.:
O mater alma Ecclesia,
ad jubilum vocaris.
Alma o parens fidelium,
ad festa nunc citaris.

Ecclesia:
Eheu! Acerba festa pectori anxio
tristisque plausus lugubrisque cantio,
qualis tremenda sede dum Babylonica
captiva flevi; fracta flebant barbyta
dulcesque chordae conticebant Musis:
Tali dolore victa cordis anxii
suspendo buxum: gaudia en sunt lachrymae
solatiumque pectoris suspiria.

Cantus:
O mater o fidelium etc.
Genius 2.: O mater alma Ecclesia, ad jubilum vocaris.

Genius 1.: Alma o parens fidelium, ad festa nunc citaris.

Ecclesia: Qualis trisulco qui perictus fulmine est, aut occidit, aut se nescit aeger vivere: sic haereo perculsa tantis casibus Laribusque pulsa propriis. Quae me plagae, quae me fovebit ora, quod petam solum? En Pannonum tellus mihi praecuditur tutamque livor figere heu sedem vetat. ||
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Ah ibo, quo raptabit aura, quo dolor et fata ducent, o fideles, ibimus!

Cantus: O mater o fidelium etc.

Genius 2.: O mater alma Ecclesia, ad jubilum vocaris.

Alma o parens fidelium, ad festa nunc citaris.


f. 24

O sors dolenda posteris, o lachrymosa fata!

Cantus: O sors etc.

Genius 1.: Resume vires, flebilis o Ecclesia!

Genius 2.: Animum resume! Quo querelae, quo dolor?
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Ecclesia: Solamen in dolore, deliciae in cruce, 
juvant querelae, lachrymae sunt pharmacon.
Genius 2.: Spera in Tonante, jura pristina sanciet.
Ecclesia: Sperabo, dum spirabo! Corda sauciet 
totamque Numen vulneret vel enecet, 
sperabo semper sauciata coelico  
amore Jesu, vulnerata vulnere.
Cantus:  O sors dolenda etc.
Genius 1.: Quid fata plangis? Laeta pectore concipe.
Ecclesia: Mea fata plangam, tangar, angar, non tamen 
dolore frangar, jubilabo, dum gemam.
Cantus:  Fata plangam, tangar, angar, 
non tamen frangar.
Ecclesia: Silete, chordae, fata dum tacita queror.
Cantus:  O sors dolenda etc. 
et Fata plangam etc.

Inductio III.

Themis et Pallas similiter sua querentes damna lamentantur: Ecclesia 
rediens vel umbram sublati delicii (: id est Pomarii :) videre desiderat, 
quà ll apparente et disparente luctus omnium sequitur.
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Pallas: Quousque saeva consonabunt classica 
lituique clangent? Quid coactae fulminant 
armis phalanges? Quid vibrata pollice 
torrente tela? Quidve acinaces volunt, 
rhomphaea et ensis? Arma nostra non furunt, 
haestae quiescunt. Dira non semper placent, 
Gradive, bella et jurgiorum praelia. 
Postquam corusco dissiparunt brontea 
fulgere noctes, conquiescunt fulmina. 
Postquam minaci terruit Mavors globo, 
tremendas hostis arma ponat et facies. 
Quid nostra munia? Quid Camoenae, quid Lares 
meruere diri? Quid verenda altaria? 
Quo tendis impotens furor, quo te effera 
trudit Megaera? Siste praeceptatem gradum!

Themis: Et me cruentato tremendae perculit 
Bellona conto, saeva postquam praelia
miseranda tellus usque sentit Pannonum.
Et me ferores inquietant turbinis
tumultuosi et tela tangunt Marspiris.
Ubi priscas libertas, ubi felicitas
vigorque legum patriaeque faustitas?
Astraeas postquam pulsa mundi crimine
orbem reliquit et petivit aethera, ll

heu execranda regnat heu Iniquitas,
summis et ima miscet imis summamque.
Ubi sceptrum, leges, jus, ducum potestia?
En occupavit Livor insolens Lares
et exedram Themidis, negantur limina.
Propria fugamur aede. Quid cessas, pium,
tonare, Numen, fulminare perfidos?
Sic vincet Impietas, triumphabit furor?

Pallas: O quando, juste, vindicabis, Arbiter,
artes et alma quando coeli dogmata,
fidelis ultor? Dextra fulmine cur vacat?
Cur pertinaces hostium vincent minae?

Themis: O quando demes, Jova, molem pectoris
onusque tolles, saxa quando Sisyphi?
Jam triplicata crux meam gentem premit,
immo opprimi! Quid heu! Severus aspicis
nec vindicas me? Duco vix suspiria.
Exspiro languens.

Pallas et Themis: Numen, porrique dexteram
vitamque reddas, redda patriae decus.

Cantus: Fata plangam etc.
Pallas: Socia doloris en adest Ecclesia,
lugubris exul, flebilis fidelium
genitrix piorum.

Themis: Lachrymosa coelitum
o nata, salve!

Ecclesia: Luctuosa biga, ave,
comes doloris vulnerisque particeps!
Solatium est, ubi mali fidus comes
superest gementi.

Pallas: Triste sed solatium
querimur dolentes.

**Themis:**

**Ecclesia:**

**Pallas:**

**Ecclesia:**

**Pallas:**

**Ecclesia:**

**Pallas:**

**Themis:**

**Cantus:**

**Ecclesia:**

**Pallas:**

**Themis:**

**Pallas:**
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**Ecclesia:**

**Pallas:**

**Ecclesia:**

**Pallas:**

**Themis:**

**Pallas:**

**Themis:**

**Pallas:**
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**Ecclesia:**

1 Samuel Pomarius, rector Collegii Eperiensis.

2 M. Christianus Seelmann, pastor Leutschoviensis.
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Themis: Glaucoma lumen nescio quod fascinat!
Pallas: Quae mira cerno? Quis parit phantasmata?
Ecclesia: Et gaudeo et tremo. Quod est querentibus, o numen, omen!

Themis: Tange leni pollice!
Pallas: Relligio sit!
Ecclesia: Quis, ah quis, edic, angelus?

Themis: Ede, cur refugit Lares?

Ecclesia: Non umbra loquitur.

Themis: Siste Pegasios gradus!
Pallas: Ο lumen orbis patrii, ο Musae jubar, 

Pallas: O lumen orbis patrii, o Musae jubar,
auriga Pannoniae, clientibus pares
illustris innubisque Phoebe siderum,
dura, per orbem Hunniacum mica!

Umbra: Quid me fatigant vota, quid suspiria?
Ecclesia: Quis, ah quis, edic, angelus?

Umbra: Infesta Palladi atque divis artibus 
invida Ditis suscitavit agmina 
Megaera, rupto tristis angue vertice 
sinu reliquit impiorum tetricum, 
triste et venenum. Saevit nunc animi furor, 
enses ministrat. Fraga\(^3\) quis nescit fero 
perculsa Cauro tetricoque turbine?
Mars imperavit dirus incitam fugam. 
Vito furores, tuta quaero limina, 
furens Enyo donec impetu occidat 
frangatque vires proprias te vindice, 
o rex polorum! Moesta fide Ecclesia 
vinces ferendo, palma ceu sub pondere 
vel pressa surget, crux virescet enthea. 
Vale! Me reposcunt fata.

Ecclesia: Quo ruis meae ℗
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decus cohortis?

Themis: Siste Pegasios gradus!
Pallas: O lumen orbis patrii, o Musae jubar,
auriga Pannoniae, clientibus pares
illustris innubisque Phoebe siderum,
dura, per orbem Hunniacum mica!

\(^3\) Urbs Eperiesium (Slovace Prešov) et Fragopolis nuncupatur.
Umbra: Recede!
Ecclesia: Cedit.
Pallas: Siste!
Themis: Siste, sistito
mentem gradumque!
Umbra: Cede!
Ecclesia: Contine meos,
quisquis es, amores!
Themis: Ah, catena stringite,
catena amoris ac honoris inclyti,
o lumen!
Pallas: O column!
Ecclesia: O amor fidelium,
amplectar!
Pallas: Effugit.
Themis: Tene!
Pallas: Heu evanuit!
Ecclesia: O, o amor!
Pallas: Dulcis parens!
Themis: Solatium!
Ah vadit!
Pallas: Eheu cedit!
Ecclesia: Eheu effugit!
O triste punctum temporis! Nox incubat,
languore vincor.
Pallas: Deliquium gravi
patitur dolore.
Themis: Sume vires!
Ecclesia: Langureo.
Pallas: Reddas quieti sensa!
Themis: Quantus o dolor!
Cantus: Fata plangam etc.

Inductio IV.

Chritus Ecclesiam consolatur, libertatem spondet; hinc Ecclesia animata
cum Geniis, Pallade et Themide Pentecosten laudibus atque votis cele-
brat.
Christus: Itane ferores sensa confundunt minae?
Itane timore victa protinus cadit,  
quam Numen erigit favens, Ecclesia?  
Nondum cruentus spicula Herodes vibrat,  
Aetnaea nondum saeviunt incendia,  
nondum Neronis flamma pixque territat  
aut dirus ensis, quem tyrannis saevior  
vibrabat olim semper hostis Numinis.  
Sola exili tam dira sors fidos premit?  
Ubi martyres? Corona martyrum et decus  
natum cruore, purpuratum sanguine?  
Ubi mille tela, mille mortes et cruces?  
Quis sustinebit, si dolores non ferat?  
Non per virentes tendimus Paesti rosas  
Alcioni et hortos; per truces tribulas poli  
petimus vireta, morte vitam et gloriam  
pia nundinatur turba. Quo titubans fides  
luctusque verget? Percita adsis fulmine,  
Ecclesia orbis, Numen arma suggeret.  

Ecclesia:  
En luctuosa rebus adsum perditis,  
spoliata libertate, cassa dogmate.  
Ubi fuisti, dum gravi premerer cruce,  
electe, ubi, dilecte? Cur severus aspicis?  
Nunquam tanta, Christe, cura tangeris?  

Christus:  
Electa coeli nata, quid tantum gemis,  
quid lachrymosam voce prodis naeniam?  
Quoquisque luctus, quo graves quaerimoniae?  
Non te reliqui, lecta mille e millibus,  
non te reliqui: sed probante dextra  
almi Parentis tanta lustrabam mala  
dolore tactus ac amore saucius.  

f. 27v  
Quid moesta luges, Pannonum ο Ecclesia,  
dilecta Jovae? Dum premit, tollit Deus.  
Annon cruentas pertuli pro te manus,  
colaphos, catastes, arma, fames, verbera  
clavosque, lanceam ac acerba funera?  
Te minima tangunt atque dejiciunt mala.  
Non per voluptam, per dolores, per crucem  
quae rerum virtus atque coeli gloria,  
enata tribulis serta coelites gerunt.
Cantus: O laeta permutatio,
quae dissipat dolores!

Ecclesia: Tandem revixi, o alma capitis gloria
coelique splendor atque delicium mei
perenne cordis. O amande millies,
dilecte Jesu! Nunc feri, nunc vulnera
secaque et ure, crux mihi solatium!

Christus: Devince tandem mentis anxia tormina,
irata temne sortis atrae fulmina,
victorioso laeta sub labaro crucis
vinces triumpho nobilis fidelium.
Nunc poscit almum Pneuma laudum munia
festosque plausus. Ito, coge turbulas
metu fugaces!

Ecclesia: Ah mane!
Christus: Pneuma evoca!
Ecclesia: O laeta permutatio,
quae dissipat dolores,
o festa jubilatio,
o Numinis favores! Ⅱ
f. 28
Jesu sidere pulchrior,
tecum vivere amem,
tecum obeam libens.

Cantus: O laeta permutatio etc. 4 lineae.
Ecclesia: Adeste tandem, trepida nuper pectora!
Genius 1.: Adeste, fida celsi corda Numinis!
Genius 2.: Adeste, festa dum citant.
Themis: Io citamur!
Pallas: Io vocamur!
Themis: O dies,
o lux dierum, gaudii compendium!
Pallas: Pulso furore tuta nascitur quies.
Ecclesia: Gaudete sociae! En astra mentem corrigunt.
Genius 2.: Dicata sacro colite festa Numini!
Genius 1.: Plausus ciete et in dolore plaudite!
Themis et Pallas: En adsumus, celebramus almo Pneumati
dicata festa jubilumque prodimus.
Pallas: Io dolores, cedite!
Themis: Io recedite,
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Genius 1.: Io triumphum!
Genius 2.: Io triumphum dicite!
Themis et Pallas: Io triumphum, io triumphum dicimus!
Cantus: Io triumphum, io triumphum dicimus!
Ecclesia: Iterate plausus atque cordis jubila!
Genius 1, et 2.: Io triumphum, io triumphum dicite!
Pallas: Io triumphum!
Pallas, Themis: Io triumphum dicimus!
Mars: prius classicum canet vel strepitum edet. Il
Pallas: Dolor in triumpho? Quid quietum perculit?
Genius 1.: Inanis horror, fulmina ex pelvi crepant.
Cantate laudes!
Pallas, Themis, Ecclesia: O poli victoria!
Mars: Hala, hala, hala!
Pallas: Oho redit furor!
Mars: Tregbri, fegni!
Themis: Perimus!
Ecclesia: Eheu perdimur!
Mars: Ebrehe giti sana siti!
Pallas: Spes occidit.
Mars: Ruite, perite, sortis o ludibria!
Quid vana pacis somniatis secula?
Themis: O terra!
Pallas: O astra!
Ecclesia: Numen, eripe perditos!
Mars: Non sic abibunt festa, non sic gaudia.
Fata insonabunt, nostra vincent classica
turmaeque et enses et phalanges efferae
tremendaque hasta. Flante vanae quid strepunt
Mavorte Musae, quid struit Themis exedram,
calcata Relligio quid extollit caput?
Noster triumphus! Cedite, o ludibria!
Ecclesia: Succurre, Numen!
Mars: Agite vires ad neces!
Christus: Adsum. Quis horror?
Mars consternabitur: Occidi!
Christus: Adsum, perfidi vindicta Martis.
Mars: Occidi, eheu occidi!
Cantus: Io triumphum, io triumphum dicimus!
Genius 1.: Sic ergo desperata spes triumphat et statuit colossos.
Genius 2.: Cessit eja tetrica pestis piorum, laeta spargite symbola, in vota conspirate, vota jungite!
Ecclesia, Themis, Pallas: In vota conspiramus.
Pallas: Aura Numinis lenis aura pectoris sinum fove, veni!
Themis: Veni!
Ecclesia: Veni!
Genius 1. et 2.: Veni! II

Ecclesia, Themis, Pallas: O suave lumen mentium!
Cantus: Veni, veni, veni, veni.
o suave lumen mentium!
Themis: Dispelle noctes tetricas mortalium!
Pallas: Accende lumen et jubar, poli o amor!
Genius 1.: Veni!
Genius 2.: Veni!
Ecclesia, Pallas, Themis: O dulce cordis gaudium!
Cantus: Veni, veni, veni, veni,
o dulce cordis gaudium!
Themis: O alme Spiritus, veni autorque gaudiorum!
Pallas: O sancte Spiritus, veni motorque jubilorum!
Idem cantant Ecclesia, Themis, Pallas, Genius 1. et 2.
Item: Veni, veni, veni, veni,
o suave lumen mentium!
Veni, veni, veni, veni,
o dulce cordis gaudium!
Inductio V.

Diana sacro plausui aemula comites ad vernale gaudio invitat, pro quibus dispersis duo prodeunt Satyri voce, per partem instrumentali musica laetitiam vernalem declarantes, quibus Echo adsonat. Ille

Diana: Quis ille plausus atque mundi jubila?
Ecquis tumultus urbe et orbi personans
mentem inquietat provocatque ad gaudia?
Num Marte pulso laeta pac ebuccinat
pacata gentibus meare secula?
An Paphia taedas primulo accendit thoro
Hymenaeus atque plaudit, exulant chori?
Quicunque terrae plausus et poli sonat,
et me sonora provocant melismata
verisque frondes et poli serenitas.
Non semper Oete, Tmolus, Aemus ac Athos,
Etyx vel Othrys, Caucasique culmina
Rhodopesque saltus, tela non semper placent
aperque Marsus, quem premant teretes plagae.
Tandem quiete confovenda pectora,
vires parandae recreandaeque otio,
adeste fidae Cynthiae comites! Ubi,
ubi latetis? Eja adeste fervidae!
Vernale sidus emicat
plaususque tellus imperat.

Cantus: Vernale sidus emicat
plaususque tellus imperat.

Diana: Non audior! Dispersa turba, quid lates?
Satyri parete, gaudiorum nuncii! Ille

f. 30 Satyri duo procedunt ludentes: deinde cantabunt et declamabunt:

Satyrus 1.: Io poli favores,
io soli virores,
o purpurata Flora,
o candidata veris
amoena sparge lilia
et mille sparge flores,
calthasque jacta cum rosis
conjunge mille odores!

Echo: Mille odores!
Satyrus 2.: Virete lauri Daphnicae
laeti virete colles,
comae vigete Phoebicae,
artus amate molles!
Eja consonate luci,
adsonate cantibus,
eja jubilate Tempe
et favete plausibus!

Echo: Ausibus.

Diana: O socia biga jubilorum! Perplaces.
Festiva signa promitto!

Satyrus 2.: Et nos amoena provocat felicitas
et nos vocamur, invitamur ad jocos.

Ad jocos. II

f. 30v Satyrus 1.: Sat jam gelatae saevierunt flamina
Arctoa brumae, sat furentis Africi
Caurique turbo perculit Tempe impetu
ruens feroci. Nec Notus semper fremat
Boreaeque flatus impetat cacumin.
Alterna currunt sole verso tempora.

Echo: Tempora.

Satyrus 1.: Aestate pulsa dives autumnus redit,
cedente bruma ver redit suavius.

Echo: Avius.

Satyrus 2.: Sat ominosa saevierunt sidera,
sat luctuosos orbe vidimus dies,
dum nubilosa nox premebat aethera
Titanque vultus atque condidit jubar,
dum fama terras atque sylvas terruit.

Echo: Ruit.

Diana: Inversa fata sunt nova catastrophe!

Cantus Satyrorum pars prior: Io poli etc.

Echo: Mille odores.

Satyrus 1.: At nunc virenti vere pax redit solo.

Satyrus 2.: Vernante coelo terra vernat sylvaque.

Satyrus 1.: Jam nube pulsa sol micat serenior.

Satyrus 2.: Tempeque redeat, lucus est amoenior II

f. 31

Echo: Altus.
“ECCLESIA IN EXILIO TRIUMPHANS” 387

Satyrus 2.: Undique
sonant susurri, concinunt et alites.

Echo: Lites.

Satyrus 1.: Saliunt Napaeae.

Echo: Evae!

Satyrus 2.: Ludunt Camoenae.

Echo: Amoenae.

Diana: O vera veris jubila!

Echo: Eris jubila.

Satyrus 2.: Sylvae sonat!

Satyrus 1. et 2.: Consonate plausibus!

Echo: Ausibus.

Satyrus 1.: Io! Decora sparge Flora lilia
festique purga nomina!

Echo: Omina.

Satyrus 2.: Certate sylvae vocibus reciprocis,
Majo virente plaudite!

Echo: Audite!

Diana: Audite, plaudunt, Musicis Echo adsonat.

Echo: Sonat.

Diana: Sonate, cuncta perstrepent!

Echo: Strepent!

Cantus Satyrorum pars posterior: Virete lauri etc.

Echo: Ausibus.

Diana: Uterque dignus laude.

Satyrus 1.: Nonne laurea?

Echo: Aurea.

Satyrus 1.: Audisne: dignus laurea.

Echo: Rea.

Diana: Revocabit Echo.

Satyrus 1.: Nonne dixit aurea?

Echo: Ea. II
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Satyrus 2.: Ea, pandit, eja laurea.

Diana: Haud penetro, roga.

Satyrus 1.: Dic, anne laurea aurea?

Echo: A.

Diana: In a, sit herba, cingo flore tempora.

Echo: Ora.

Satyrus 1.: Io Camoenae, nunc Apollo sum novus.
Satyrus 2.: Adhucne restant praemia?
Diana: Ciebo, si fas, musicam.
Rotate saltus!
Diana ludet vel si poterit, cantet. Saltus satyrorum ad invicem capita col-
Diana: Jam sat voluptae, me vocant plagae.
Echo: Age!
Cantus: Vernale sidus etc.

Epilogus

Sic luctuosa clauditur tragoedia,
vertente coelo fata, non triste exitu.
Vidistis umbram Marte pulsae Ecclesiae
et exulantem propria aede Palladem
Themidisque damna vindicanda coelitus,
audistis aegri pectoris suspiria,
lamenta Phoebi, luctuosos inclyti
questus remoti (: proch dolor! :) Pomarii.
Quis tanta fando damna patriae explicat?
Quis fata Religionis ac Apollinis
Themidisque digne defleat? Luget solum, ll
lachrymatur aether, coelici lugent chori.
Ast in dolore nascitur solatium!
Achillis ille more nos qui vulnerat,
coeli Machaon sanat ipso vulnere.4
Non ille cedit, dum recedit tetricum
simulans furorem, caesa diliget amplius
curatque corda. Leutsha, testis inclyta,
quae tot furentis vicit orbis fulmina
et tela Ditis; tuta scandit liberos
templi Penates, Pierum tuta exedram.
O Leutsha felix, o amata Numini,
quam fida missi cura sanat Pneumatis
et curat excellentis alma Davidis
medicina duplex, consili atque pharmaci
magnusque Seelmann sanat arte coelica!

I porro felix, vince tetricam luem,
celebrans Tonantis flamen et leonibus
tutis triumpha, in duplci vincas cruce.
Sic tua Pallas et Themis et Ecclesia
David colossos atque Seelmann erigant. II

Personae

1. Prologus
2. Apollo
5. Ecclesia
6. Themis
7. Pallas
8. Umbra
9. Christus
10. Diana
11. Satyrus 1.
13. Echo
14. Mars
15. Epilogus

(: NB. Satyri ultimas voces, quas Echo reddere debet, possunt cantu edere etc. ad libitum :)
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1. Generalia

1.1 Bibliographica


Costas Rodríguez J. - Carrasco Reija L. (edd.), Boletín bibliográfico de estudios humanísticos, 2 (Universidad Nacional de educación a distancia, Departamento de Filología Clásica, 1994).


1.2. Historica


AEGYPTUS
— Vide infra 4.2: Barbatus (Abudacnus) Iosephus.

AMERICA LATINA

AMERICA SEPTENTRIONALIS

AUSTRIA

BALTICUM

BELGIUM VETUS (Belgié, Nederland, Luxemburg)


— Vide et infra 1.5: De Smet; 2.1.: Heesakkers; 4.1.: Sellin.


— LOVANIUM: vide infra 2.2.: Baten Michael.

BRITANNIA


CANADA

CECHIA


CROATIA

— Stipcevic E., “Erasmo, l’umanesimo in Croazia e la cultura musicale nel XV e XVI secolo”, in Olivieri, pp. 249-256


DANIA


ESTONIA


— Lill Anne, “Latin at the University of Tartu (Dorpatum) in the Seventeenth Century”, in Mare Balticum, pp. 97-105.


FINNIA

— Kajanto I., “Finland”, in Nordic Neo-Latin, pp. 159-200.

— Merisalo Outi, “The Use of Latin in School and Administration in Finland from the Sixteenth to the End of the Eighteenth Century”, in Mare Balticum, pp. 53-9.
— Sarasti-Wilenius Raija, “Finnish Neo-Latin Literature (Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries)”, in Mare Balticum, pp. 60-70.
— Vide sub 4.2: Juusten Paulus.

FRANCOGALLIA
— Vide et infra 1.5: De Smet.
— lutetia: vide infra 4.2: Maciotus Germanus.

GERMANIA
— COLONIA AGrippina (KÖLN): Vide 4. 2: Wagener Matthias.
— POMERANIA: Vide supra: sigla (Pommern).
— RATISPONA (REGensburg): vide infra 2.2: Celtes (Rowland).

GRAECIA
— vide supra: Germania (Eideneier).

HIBERNIA
— vide infra: 6 (Luce).

HISPANIA
— Vide et supra: Abbreviationes: Mundo Clásico, Nebrija; 1.1: Costas Rodríguez J. - Carrasco Rejia L.
— GRANADA: González Vázquez J., “El círculo de escritores latinos de la Granada renacentista”, in Mundo Clásico, pp. 115-34.
HUNGARIA

ISLANDIA

ITALIA


— **POMPOSIA**: *Pomposia Monasterium modo in Italia primum: La biblioteca di Pomposa*, Medioevo e Umanesimo (Padova, Editrice Antenore, 1994). Vide imprimis Gius. Billanovich, “Lovato Lovati e il Giustino e il Beda di Pomposa” (pp. 181-212); Guido Billanovich, “Il Seneca tragico di Pomposa e i primi umanisti padovani” (pp. 213-32); A. Manfredi, “Dispersione dei codici e visite di umanisti a Pomposa tra Quattro e Cinquecento” (pp. 319-49).


— **TICINUM (PAVIA)**: — Sottili A., *Documenti per la storia dell’Università di Pavia nella seconda metà del ’400*. I (1450-1455), Fonti e studi per la storia dell’Università di Pavia, 21 (Bologna, Cisalpino, 1994). Eduntur documenta CCVIII.


**LETONIA**

LITHUANIA
— Jurgelénaité Rasa, “Vilnius University as the Centre of the Study and Creation of Latin Literature in the Grand-Duchy of Lithuania”, in Mare Balticum, pp. 139-49.
— Vide et infra 4. 2: Eucholcius Iacobus.

LUSITANIA
— Vide etiam sub 4.2: Osorius Hieronymus.

LUXEMBURGUM

MEXICUS
— Vide 2.2: A Cruce Johanna Agnes.

NORVEGIA
— Vide et 2.2: Thomaeus.

POLONIA
— vide et supra: Germania/Silesia; infra 1.5. (Florus).

RUSSIA
— Sirkka H., “Books From St. Petersburg in the Helsinki University Library”, in Mare Balticum, pp. 71-86.
— Vide et sub 4.2: Langius Ioachim.

SCANDINAVIA

SERBIA
— Vide et sub 4.2: Langius Ioachim.
SUECIA
— Upsalia: Ström Annika, Lachrymae Catharinae. Five Collections of Funeral Poetry from 1628. Edited with Studies on the Theoretical Background and the Social Context of the Genre, Studia Latina Stockholmiensia 38 (Stockholm, Almquist & Wiksell, 1994). Eduntur carmina a studiosis Upsaliensibus scripta in funere Catharinae Tidemanni (1602-1628), quae uter erat professoris theologiae necnon rectoris Universitatis. Sunt elegiae, odae necnon et Colloquium funebre et Dialogus funebrales inter viatorem et alumnem, maritum et matrem et sorores. Inter auctores illustriores sunt Iohanas Columbus (1586-1663) et Iohannes Loccenius Germanus (1598-1677). Nonnulla inveniuntur verba novata, ut in 1.2.2 coccysare (dictum de cuculo); 1.7.15 Iova (= Iehova, Deus); 1.8: dialogistice; 2.1.45: luctigenus dolor; 2.2.4: gemebundulus; 2.2.12: graviuscule; 2.2.18: fumigera flamma; 2.2.58: paradisicus; 5.39.175: doctorissa (uxor doctoris) etc.— Ead., “Tears for Karin Timansdotter”, in Nordic Neo-Latin, pp. 281-93; — Vide et infra 1.5.: Kajanto; 3.2.: Bergenhielm Johannes.

1.3. Litteraria
— Feo M., “‘Litterae’ e ‘litteratura’ nel medioevo e nell’umanesimo”, in ACNH, pp. 21-41.
— Vide et supra 1.2.: Dania (Mortensen); Suecia/Upsalia.
1.4 Linguistica

— Lessico filosofico dei secoli XVII e XVIII. Sezione latina. A cura di M. Fat

tori con la collaborazione di M. L. Bianchi, I.2: aetherius = animositas,

Lessico Intellettuale Europeo, 63 (Firenze, Olschki, 1994).

— Cardona G. R., “Moduli antichi e mondi nuovi: la storiografia delle sco

perte”, in Storiografia I, pp. 93-111. Tractat i. a. Petri Martyris latinitatem,

at verba Latina multis erroribus deturpata adfert.


169-78.

— Díaz y Díaz M. C., “Lexicografia tardomedieval en Hispania”, in Nebrija,

pp. 389-97.

— Eco U., La ricerca della lingua perfetta nella cultura europea, Fare l’Eu

ropa (Bari, Laterza, 1993).


557-65.

— Lozano Guillén C., “Tradición y novedad en la teoría gramatical renacen-

tista: el ablativo absoluto”, in Mundo Clásico, pp. 601-11.

— Maccagni C., “Leggere, scrivere e disegnare la ‘scienza volgare’ nel Rinas-

cimento”, Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Classe di Lett. e

Filos., s. III.23 (1993), 631-75.

— Montero E. - Carrera de la Red Avellina, “El Dictionarium Medicum de E.

A. de Nebrija”, in Nebrija, pp. 399-411.

— Moreno Uclès J., “Aportación al estudio del léxico humanista”, in Mundo

Clásico, pp. 655-666.

— Ortega Castejón J., “Sobre el significado de linea en Latín y las Explica-

ciones de D. Juan de Fonseca y Juan Luis de la Cerda”, in Mundo Clásico,

pp. 687-697.

— Rössing-Hager M., “‘Küchenlatein’ und Sprachpurismus im frühen 16. Jahr-

hundert. Zum Stellenwert der ‘Latinismen’ in frührneuhochdeutscher Pros”,

in Henkel N. = Palmer N. F. (edd.), Latein und Volkssprache im deutschen

Mittelalter 1100-1500. Regensburger Colloquium 1988 (Tübingen, Nie-

meyer, 1992), pp. 360-86.


— Vide et infra: 4.2: Doletus (Chomarat); Erasmus (Trapman); Nebrissensis;

Sanctius Brocensis, Sepulveda; Verbiest; 6: Der altsprachliche Unterricht;

= Angelino.

1.5. Thematica

— Bisanti A., “Dall’exemplum alla facezia: l’apologo dell’asino”, Esperienze


— De Smet I.A.R., “Vers, prose et prosimètre dans les satires néo-latines et

françaises du XVIIe siècle: polarité, hybridisme ou symbiose fortunée?”,


— Dilke O.A.W., “The Use of Latin on Maps in the Great Age of Explora-

tion”, in ACNH, pp. 375-384.


Celsus: vide 2.2: Clossius.
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GALENIUS: vide infra 4.2.: Vesalius.


HOMERUS: vide infra 2.1.: Klecker.


IUSTINUS: vide supra 1.2: Italia / Pomposa.

LONGINUS: vide infra 4.2.: Junius Franciscus (Nativel).

MARTIALIS: Vide infra 2.2: Politianus (Saggese); Vilches.

OPPIANUS: vide infra 4.3.: Acquaviva Belisarius (Defilippis).


PLATO: vide infra 4.2.: Decembrius (Zaggia); Ficinus (Allen).


PRUDENTIUS: Vide 2.2 et 4.2: Nebrisensis (González).


SENECA TRAGICUS: vide supra 1.2: Italia / Pomposa.


TACITUS: cf. infra 1. 7.


TERENTIUS: vide infra 1.3: Norland.

VALERIUS MAXIMUS: vide infra 4.2: Conversinus; - Marulus; - Boccaccius.

VERGILIUS: De Jong J.L., “The Wandering of Aeneas as a Figure for the Active Life in Italian Renaissance Painting”, in ACNH, pp. 239-47. Attinguntur


Vide et supra: Abbreviationes / Dignité; 1.2.: Belgium Vetus: Lugdunum Batavorum (Janssen); Germania: Bonna; 1.2.: Dania (Mortensen); infra 4.2.: Ferrettus.

1.6 Scientifica


— Hallyn F., “Kepler, Snellius en de lichtbrekingswet”, Academiae Analecta, Klasse der Wetenschappen, 56/2 (Brussel, 1994), 112-134.


— Vide etiam supra 1.4.: Maccagni; infra 4.2: Salinas (Doctrina musicologica); 4.2: de Casabona; Copernicus; Mercator; A Bra; Huddenius.

1.7. Ecotica

1.8. Didactica

— Vide et infra: 4.2: Langius Ioachim; 6: Der altsprachliche Unterricht.

1.9. Interpretatoria

— Vide et sub 1.5: Plutarchus; 2.2: Royzius; 4.2: Gaza Theodorus; Nebrisensis.

2. Poetica

2.1. Generalia


Piastra C.L. M., La poesia mariologica dell’Umanesimo latino. Repertorio e incipitario, Quaderni di cultura medievol, 11 (Spoleto, Centro italiano di studi sul’alto medioevo, 1994).


Vide et supra 1.2.: Austria; Belgium Vetus: Leida (van den Berg); Francogallia: Caletum; Suecia: Önnerfors; 1.5.: Lausberg; 1.6.: Schubert; infra 2.2: Celtes (Rowland), Orth (Kühlmann).

2.2. Poetae


AGRICOLA RUDOLFUS: Vide sub 4.2.


AQUITINAS PAULUS (†1569): vide 1.2: Cechia/ Olorcumium.


BAPTISTA MANTUANUS: Romano Laura, “‘I mali chierici’. Il chierico corrotto in Erasmo, Folengo e Battista Mantovano”, in Olivieri, pp. 329-41; = vide etiam supra 1.5.: Ovidius (Schmidt); infra 4.2.: Erasmus (Piepho).


BEBELIUS HENRICUS: vide infra 2.2: Casselius.


BERGANUS GEORGIUS IODOCUS: Vide supra 2.1: Klecker.


BOCCCHIUS ACHILLES BONOIIENSI: Watson Elisabeth S., Achille Bocchi and the Emblem Book as Symbolic Form (Cambridge U. P., 1994); — vide 2.1: Colonna St.

BOLLANUS JOHANNES ANG. (° Mediolani saec. XV exeunte): vide infra 4.2.: Ringius.

BORGBIURUS IOHANNES (° Neisse/Silesia; fl. 1516): vide 1.2: Cechia/ Olomoucium.


BROUKHUISUS JANUS: vide infra 4.2.: Pufendorfius Samuel.


CARRARA HUBERTINUS S.J.: cf. infra: Grill.


CHYTRAeUS NATHAN: Nathan Chytraeus (1543-1598), Voyages en Europe (Hodoeporica). Poèmes latins de la Renaissance édités, traduits et annotés par M. Bastiaensen, Institut Interuniversitaire pour l’ étude de la Renaissance et de l’ Humanisme, Translationes, 2 (Leuven, Peeters, 1994); — vide et supra 1.5; Ovidius (Schmidt).


COLOMBUS IONAS (1586-1663): cf. supra 1.2; Suecia/Upsalia.

CRAMERUS DANIEL: vide supra 2.1.: Mödersheim.
CURIO CAELIUS SECUNDUS: vide supra Celtes (Hess).
ECKIUS VALENTINUS (Lindau 1494 - Krakow 1556): vide 1.2: Cechia/ Olomou-cium.
ENNIIUS SIMON (Klattau, ca. 1520 - 20 II 1561): vide 1.2: Cechia/ Olomucium.
FALCO IACOBUS (Valencia 1522-1594): López-Cañete Quiles D., “Un epigrama de Jaime Juan Falco y un soneto de Quevedo”, in Mundo Clásico, pp. 557-64.
FILELFUS: vide Philelphus.
FRANCISCI PETRUS: vide infra 4.2.: Pufendorfius Samuel.


Grapheus Cornelius: vide supra 1.2.: Belgium Vetus (Antverpia).


Hovius Andreas: vide 4. 2. s. v.


JAMOTIUS FREDERICUS: vide 4.2, s.v. Hoius Andreas.

JANUS SECUNDUS: vide infra: Secundus.


LANDIVAR RAPHAEL (Santiago de los Caballeros, 1731 - Bologna, 1793): Por los campos de México. Prólogo, versión y notas de O. Valdés, Biblioteca del estudiante universitario, 34 (México, UNAM, 1993). Deest textus primigenius.

LATOMUS BARTHOLOMAEUS: vide 4.2: Iovius.

LAZARELLUS LUDOVICUS: vide supra 1.5: Ovidius (Fritsen).


LOTICHIIUS PETRUS: vide supra: Franciscus Johannes; 2.1: Kühllmann.

LUPATUS DE LUPATIS (Lovato Lovati): vide supra 1.2: Italia / Pomposa.

MACIOTUS GERMANUS: vide infra, 4.2. s.v.


MARSTALLERUS MARTINUS: vide supra 2.1.: Mödersheim.


MINIANA IOSEPHUS EMMANUEL (Valencia 1671-1730): Pérez Durá F. J., “Un nuevo poema épico latino en los albores del s. XVIII: La Saguntineida de J. M. Miñana”, in Mundo Clásico, pp. 775-84; Vide et 4.2: Martinus Emmanuel.

MOELLER HENRICUS: vide infra 4.2: Osiander.

MONTANUS, BENEDICTUS ARIAS: vide infra: 2.2 Vida.

MORISOTUS CLAUDIUS BARTHOLOMÆUS: vide supra 1.5: Ovidius (Schmidt).


INSTRUMENTUM BIBLIOGRAPHICUM

MYRTEUS PETRUS: vide infra 4.2: Iovius.


OSIANDER ANDREAS Sr.: vide infra 4.2 sub nomine.


This content downloaded from 201.153.243.100 on Wed, 28 Mar 2018 20:33:52 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms


PONTANUS IOHANNES IOVIANUS: Vide supra 1.5: Horatius (Tateo); Ovidius (Tateo); 2.1: Deramaix; Klecker; infra 4.2., s.v.


RATALLERUS GEORGIVS: vide infra 4.2: Encinas, pp. 22-35 (Carmina II Lovanii aestate 1543 scripta).

REUCHLIN IOHANNES: vide supra; Casselius Johannes.


RÖNNOU MAGNUS (fl. saec. XVIII): vide supra.; Bengenheim Johannes.


RUTGERSIUS JANUS: vide supra 1.2: Belgium Vetus: Lugdunum Batavorum.
SAMBIGUCCIUS GAVINUS Sardus Sassariensis: vide 2.1: Colonna St.
SANNAZARUS JACOBUS: Vide supra 1.5: Horatius (Tateo); 2.1; Deramaix.
SARCA: vide supra: Bembus.
SIIBUTUS GEORGIUS (*Tannrode 1475/80 - post 1528*): vide 1.2: Cechia/ Olomoucium.


Taurinus Stephanus (Zwittau, ca. 1485 - Gran 1519): vide 1.2: Cechia/ Olo- mucium.


UREÑA & LOAYSA ILDEFONSUS: vide infra 4.2: Ximenius.

URSINUS VELIUS CASPAR: vide 1.2: Cechia/ Olomucium.


VIDA MARCUS HIERONYMUS: Pérez Custodio Maria V., “Las relaciones poética-retórica en la teoría literaria renacentista: Jerónimo Vida y Arias Montano”, in Mundo Clásico, pp. 759-74; — vide et supra 1.5: Vergilio (Kalendorf); 2.2: Milton (Haan).


WICHMANS FRANCISCUS AUGUSTINUS: vide infra 4.2, s.v.


3. Scaenica

3.1. Generalia


— Norland Howard B., *Drama in Early Tudor Britain 1485-1558* (Lincoln-Nebraska and London, U of Nebraska Press). Magna libri pars etiam studii neolatinis utilis, imprimis “Part two: Contemporary views of Drama” (pp. 65-145), quae tractat Commentarios Terentianos necnon sententias Erasmi, Vivis, Thomaes Mori, aliorum de re dramatica, et “Part V: the Emergence of Tragedy” (pp. 295-334) in qua agitur de Thomaes Watsonii *Absalom* (Cantabrigiae, ante 1545?), Ioannis Christophersonii *Jepthah* (Cantabrigiae, 1544, latine et graece), et Nicolai Grimaldi *Archiprrofeta* (Oxonii 1546-47). Dolendum quod secundum usum Americanum perversum textus non ad veritatem Latinam sed tantum anglice versi adducuntur. Utinam tandem prela academica resipiscant et ad genuinas verae doctrinae leges redeant!


— Parente J. A. Jr., “Neo-Latin Drama and German Literary History”, in *ACNH*, pp. 775-84.


— Vide et supra 1.2: Suecia/Upsalia.

3.2. Scriptores scaenici


**CHRISTOPHERSONIUS IOANNES**: vide supra 3.1: Norland.

**CORRARIUS GREGORIUS**: vide supra 2.2, sub nomine. Liber continet editionem criticam tragoeidiae *Prognes*.


**GRIMALDUS NICOLAUS**: vide supra 3.1: Norland.

**HOUIS ANDREAS**: vide infra 4.2. s.v.

4. Prosa Oratio

4.1. Generalia

— AA.VV., “Proyecto de índice de historiografía hispano-latina renacentista”, in Mundo Clásico, pp. 369-76.
— Aragüéz Aldaz J., “El modelo de los Dicta et Facta Memorabilia en la configuración de las colecciones de Exempla renacentistas”, in Mundo Clásico, pp. 267-82.
— Costas Rodríguez J., “La historiografía hispano-latina renacentista”, in Mundo Clásico, pp. 41-59.
— Solana Pujalte J., “¿ Clausulas métricas en la prosa hispano-latina del s. XVI?”, in Mundo Clásico, pp. 1033-45.
— Vega María J., “Computatio omnium temporum. La edad del mundo en la historiografía reformista”, in Nebrija, pp. 97-106.
— Vide et supra 1.2: Britannia / Cantabrigia (Diggle); I 3: La Storiografìa; 1.5: Kajanto; 1.5 (Florus).

4.2. Auctores

ABUDACNUS: vide infra: BARBATUS.


AEGIUS: vide EGIUS.


Augustinus Moravus: vide 1.2: Cechia/ Olomucium.


Barbatus (Abudacnus) Iosephus (Cairo, ca. 1575/80 - Wien[?], post 1664[?]): Hamilton A., “An Egyptian Traveller in the Republic of Letters:


Beatus Rhenanus (1485-1547): cf. supra (1.7).

Bebelius Henricus: vide infra Poggius Bracciolinus (Mühlherr).


Bellarminus Robertus: vide infra: Lessius Leonardus.


BODINUS JOHANNES: Blair A., “The Languages of Natural Philosophy in the Late Sixteenth Century: Bodin’s *Universae naturae theatrum* and its French Translation”, in ACNH, pp. 311-23; = Davies K., “Superstition in Jean Bodin and His Classical Sources”, in ACNH, pp. 335-42.

BONINSEGNUS JOHANNES BAPTISTA: vide supra 1.2.: Italia, Florentia (Hankins).


BREEN, DANIEL DE (Haarlem 1594 - Amsterdam 1664): Trapman J., “Erasmus seen by a Dutch Collegiant: Daniel de Breen (1594-1664) and his posthumous *Compendium Theologiae Erasmicae* (1677)”, Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis 73 (1993), 156-77.

BRIGOS H.: vide infra: Kepler.

BROCENSI: vide infra: Sanctius.


**Calderinus Domitius**: vide 1.5: *De Rosis nascentibus*.

**Callistus Andronicus**: vide supra 1.2: Italia, Florentia (Hankins).


**Camerarius Ioachim Sr**: vide supra 1.5: Ptolemaeus; 2.2: Orthus.


Clichtoveus Judocus: vide supra 1.2: Belgium Vetus: Leodium.


Constantius Antonius: vide 1.5: Ovidius (Fritsen).


Crinitus Petrus: vide supra 1.5: Pseudo-Probus.


Corrarius Gregorius: vide supra: 2.2.


DARDANUS ALOYSIUS: Magnani Franca, “Il *De claris mulieribus* di Luigi Dardano e la sua fortuna”, in *Tradizione dell’antico. Studi... Maria Bellincioni Scarpat* (Roma [1990]).


DURBRAVIUS IANUS: vide infra: Encinas.


EGNATIUS JOHANNES BAPTISTA: vide supra 1.5 (Cicero).


Esteve Joan: vide infra: Stephanus.


FILELFUS FRANCISCUS: vide supra 1.5: Xenophon.


FONSECA IOHANNES: vide 1.4: Ortega Castejón.


FOX MORCILLUS SEBASTIANUS: Pineda González M. V., “Humanismo e imitación; la doctrina de Fox Morcillo”, in Mundo Clásico, pp. 831-6.


GALBIATUS GEORGIUS (saec. XV): vide supra 1.5: Terentianus Maurus.


de Goethuysen Jodocus: vide supra: de Casabona.

Gogava Antonius (Grave 1529 = Madrid 1569): vide supra 1.5: Ptolemaeus.


Goropius Becanus Johannes: vide supra 1.2.: Belgium Vetus: Brabantia.

Goropius Becanus Johannes: vide supra 1.2.: Belgium Vetus: Brabantia.

Goropius Becanus Johannes: vide supra 1.2.: Belgium Vetus: Brabantia.

Goropius Becanus Johannes: vide supra 1.2.: Belgium Vetus: Brabantia.

Goropius Becanus Johannes: vide supra 1.2.: Belgium Vetus: Brabantia.

Goropius Becanus Johannes: vide supra 1.2.: Belgium Vetus: Brabantia.

Goropius Becanus Johannes: vide supra 1.2.: Belgium Vetus: Brabantia.

Goropius Becanus Johannes: vide supra 1.2.: Belgium Vetus: Brabantia.

Goropius Becanus Johannes: vide supra 1.2.: Belgium Vetus: Brabantia.

Goropius Becanus Johannes: vide supra 1.2.: Belgium Vetus: Brabantia.

Goropius Becanus Johannes: vide supra 1.2.: Belgium Vetus: Brabantia.

Goropius Becanus Johannes: vide supra 1.2.: Belgium Vetus: Brabantia.

Goropius Becanus Johannes: vide supra 1.2.: Belgium Vetus: Brabantia.

Goropius Becanus Johannes: vide supra 1.2.: Belgium Vetus: Brabantia.

Goropius Becanus Johannes: vide supra 1.2.: Belgium Vetus: Brabantia.

Goropius Becanus Johannes: vide supra 1.2.: Belgium Vetus: Brabantia.

Goropius Becanus Johannes: vide supra 1.2.: Belgium Vetus: Brabantia.

HOFMANN VON HOFFMANNSWALD AU CHRISTIANUS: vide supra, 2.2, s.v.


IEWELL IOHANNES: cf. infra: Mocket Richardus.


IVARRA CANTABRICUS MARTINUS († 1557): Salvadó Recasens J., “La edición Barcelonesa del De accento latino de Nebrija y el De prosodia de Martín Ivorra”, in Nebrija, pp. 311-319.

Lambert Andreas: vide supra 1.2. Gallia (Sacré).
Languet Hubertus: vide infra: Vindiciae contra Tyrannos.
Legrand Antonius: vide supra 4.1.: Greiff.


LIPPUS BRANDOLINUS, AUERLIUS: vide supra 1.2.: Italia, Florentia (Hankins).


description of the north and his feelings for his homeland', *JIRS*, 2 (1993), 181-90.


**Manzanares Ferdinandus**: Faulhaber Ch. B., “Las Flores rhetorici de Fernando de Manzanares (Salamanca, ca. 1488) y la enseñanza de la retorica en Salamanca”, in *Nebrija*, pp. 457-67.


**Marulus Marcus**: Béné Ch., “Un émule heureux de Valère Maxime: Marc Marule de Split”, in *ACNH*, pp. 303-310.

**Malachthon Philippus**: vide supra 1.5: Ptolemaeus; infra s. v. Osiander.

**Mercator Gerardus**: Waterlet M. (ed.), *Gerardus Mercator Rupelmondanus, 1512-1594* (Antwerpen, Mercatorfonds, 1994); = Gerard Mercator cartograaf 1512-1594 (Brussel, Gemeentekrediet, 1994); = *Annalen van de Koninklijke Oudheidkundige Kring van het Land van Waas*, 97 (1994) de Mercatore praeprimis agunt. Continent i.a. Th. Penneman, “Gerardus Mercator de Rupelmunda. Vragen bij de biografieën” (pp. 11-25); Id., “Astrologie in de eeuw van Mercator. Een reeks schetsen” (pp. 27-158); W. Louwet, “De portretten van Gerard Mercator door Simon de Passe” (pp. 159-70); R. Van Daele, “Ex libris Gerardi Mercatoris/Oudetongii” (pp. 171-86); = Vide et supra 1.6: Mund-Dopchie.

**Merula Georgius**: vide supra 1.2.: Italia, Florentia (Hankins).


**Miniana Josephus Emmanuell**: Vide supra 2.2 s. v. et 4.2: Martinus Emmanuell.

**De Mirabilibus Nicolaus**: vide supra 1.2.: Italia, Florentia (Hankins).

MORELY IOANNES: Denís Ph. - Rott J., Jean Morély (ca. 1524-ca. 1594) et l’Utopie d’une démocratie dans l’Eglise, Travaux d’Humanisme et Renaissance 278 (Genève, Droz, 1993). De vita et theologia auctoris Calviniani bilinguus. Latine scriptis *De Ecclesiae ordine atque disciplina* ([1576], Paris, B. N., ms. 4361) et *De ecclesia ab Antichristo... liberanda* (Londini, 1589).


MORNAY PHILIPPUS: vide infra *Vindiciae contra Tyrannos.*


MURMELLIIUS IOANNES: Mehl J.V., “Johannes Murmelliius’s Approach to the Artes liberales and Advice to Students in his *Didascalici libri duo* (1510)”, in *ACNH*, pp. 641-650.


Nizolius Marius: vide supra 4.1: Del Nero.

Nogarolus Leonardus: vide supra 1.2: Italia, Florentia (Hankins).


Ortelius Abraham: vide supra 1.6: Mund-Dopchie.


Pastorius Ioachimus (1611-1682): vide supra 1.5 (Florus).


Paulus Marsus: vide infra: Stephanus Ioannes.

Perottus Nicolaus: vide infra: Stephanus Ioannes.


Philelphus Franciscus: vide supra 1.5: Xenophon.


POLITIANUS ANGELOS: vide supra, 1. 5, s. v. Pseudo-Probus; 2.2, s.n.; 4.2: Leonicenus.


(Roma, Bulzoni, 1995); = Ead., “Giovanni Pontano tra prassi e teoria sot-
oriografica: il De Bello Neapolitano e l’Actius”, in Storiografia I, 573-651;
= Ead., “Echi di scoperte geografiche in opere di Giovanni Pontano”, in
Columbeis V, pp. 283-303; = Vide et supra: Borgia Hieronymus.
PORTUS AEMILIUS: vide supra 1.5: Pindarus (Hummel).
PORTUS FRANCISCUS: vide supra 1.5: Aeschylus (Kallergis).
POSTEL GUILIELMUS: Leathers Kuntz Marion, “Guglielmo Postel e le idee Eras-
miane”, in Olivieri, pp. 51-8.
PRISCIANUS PЕREGRINUS (Ferrara, ca. 1435-1518): “Zanella G., “Le Historie
Ferrarienses di Pellegrino Prisciani”, in Storiografia I, 253-65.
PUFENDORFIUS SAMUEL: Palladini F., “Pufendorf e due poeti neolatini olandesi
(P. Francius e J. Broukhusius)”, in ACNH, pp. 761-73.
PUTEANUS ERYCIUS: vide supra 2.1.: Hallyn (Poésie expérimentale); 1.3.: Jans-
en.
RAIMUNDUS COSMUS: Jones H., “Cosma Raimondi - Epicurean, Humanist, and
Failure”, in ACNH, pp. 517-27.
REGIUS RAPHAEL: vide supra 1.5: Ovidius (Moisan).
RENERIUS [RENIERI] ANTONIUS (Colle di Val d’ Elsa, 28 II 1515 = post 1591):
Pidatella D., “Antonio Renieri da Colle: lingua, accademia, trattenimento e
scuola nella Toscana del XVI secolo”, in Colle di Val d’ Elsa: diocesi e
città tra ‘500 e ‘600 a cura di P. Nencini, Biblioteca della ‘Miscellanea storica
della Valdelsa’, 13 (Castelfiorentino, Società storica della Valdelsa,
RINCIUS BERNARDINUS (fl. Italia et Gallia, saec. XVI): Bamforth S. - Dupèbe J.,
editur B. Rincii physici Mediolanensis Silva ... (Parisii, 1518); qua contin-
netur descriptio ludorum (etc.) Parisisi anno 1518 habitorum. Accedit car-
men praevidum Iohannis Ang. Bollani Mediolanensis (saec. XVI).
RINUCIUS ARETINUS (Castiglioniorentino, s. XIV ex. - 1457?): Fabulae Aeso-
picae. A cura di Maria Pasqualina Pillola, Favoristi latini medievali e umani-
stici, IV. Pubblicazioni dell’ Istituto di filologia classica e medievale
dell’ Università di Genova, N.S. 151 (Genova, Università, 1993). Editio
critica cum versione Italica.
RUDAWSKI W. IOHANNES (1617-1690): vide supra 1.5 (Florus).
RUTGERUS SYCAMBER (Venray, 1456 - Höningen, ca. 1516): Beriger A., “Rut-
ger Sycombe von Venray: Rede zum Lob der Brüder vom gemeinsamen
SABELLIUS MARCUS ANTONIUS: De Latinae lingae reparatone. Editio Vene-
tiana c. 1494 Anastatia expressa est in Storiografia, III, 197-230.
SACHERIUS HIERONYMUS S.J. (San Remo 1667 - Milano 1733); Angelelli I.
demonstrativam (1697; iterum anastatische: G. Olms, Hildesheim, 1980).
SALINAS FRANCISCUS (Burgos 1513 - Salamanca 1590): Francisco Salinas,
fascimil; edición y traducción [por] Antonio Moreno Hernández. Colección
de ediciones en facsimil de la Sociedad Española de Musicología,
no 4 (Madrid, Once - Biblioteca Nacional, 1993). Editio princeps alterius
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DE SALVIATIS GEORGII BENIGNIUS: vide supra 1.2: Italia, Florentia (Hankins).


SCRIBANI CAROLUS: vide supra: Lipsius (Birely).


Torrentius Laevinus: vide supra 2.2, s. v.


VEDEL: vide Velleius.


Vida Marcus Hieronymus: vide supra 4.1: Greiff.


Voetius Gysbertus: vide supra 1.2.: Belgium Vetus: Brabantia.

Vossius Gerardus Johannes: vide supra 4.1: Sellin.


5. Inscriptiones


BELGIUM


BRITANNIA


GERMANIA

Vide supra 2.2: Choreander.

HISPANIA
— Vide supra 4.2: Augustinus Antonius (Crawford).

ITALIA


6. Latinitas novissima


GEISSLER HASSO (Dramburg, Pommern, 1944 -): Zu folgen alten Karawanen... Silvae carminum et Theodiscorum et Latinorum (Leichlingen, R. Brune, 1994).


LICOPPE CAIUS - FLOUR ANDREAS: Ambulatio Latina secundum litus Belgicum (Bruxellis, Domus Editoria Melissae, 1994).


Sacré Theodoricus: [Epigramma in A. Welkenhuysen], in Welkenhuysen, p. 5.


Der altsprachliche Unterricht, 36 (1994), N. 5: “Latein sprechen”. Continet commentationes has: M. von Albrecht, “Linguae Latinae amicis salutem” (pp. 6-7); W. Stroh, “Lateinreden in der Schule? Mit einem satirischen Anhang von Dirk Sacré” (pp. 8-15); H.-J. Glücklich, „Das gegenwärtige Begründungsdefizit der Lateinsprechmethode“ (pp. 16-21); A. Fritsch, “Lateinsprechen im Unterricht = eine Zwischenbilanz” (pp. 22-7); U. Wagner, “Lateinische
Gesprächsspiele im Anfangsunterricht” (pp. 31-6); T. Eggers, “Latinitas viva in der Lehrbuchphase” (pp. 37-42); S. Albert, “Übungen zum Latein sprechen” (pp. 43-5); G. Fink, “Ambulatio Latina” (pp. 46-52); W. Stroh, “De colloquii Latinis in litterarum universitate Monacensi habitis” (pp. 53-5); U. Wagner, “Latine loqui in der Ausbildung der Lateinstudenten” (pp. 56-7); B. Mouchová, “De litteris Latinis in Bohemia et Moravia renascentibus” (pp. 58-9); R. Maier, “Europäische Lateinwochen und Europäische Lateinische Brieffreundschaften” (pp. 60-4); C. Eichenseer, “Clusura tractilis. Neologismen im Neulatein” (pp. 69-71); D. Sacré, “Zeitschriften in lateinischer Sprache” (pp. 72-5); W. Stroh, “Hilfen zum Lateinsprechen. Bibliographie von hundert ausgewählten Titeln” (pp. 76-95); id., “Vereine und Veranstaltungen zum lebendigen Latein” (pp. 96-9).

7. Incepta

— Monica Niederer in seminario mediolatino universitatis Turicensis ad licentiae gradum adipiscendum dissertationem parat c. t. “Beiträge zur Wirkungsgeschichte der Tragödien Senecas im italienischen Humanismus: A. Mussato, A. Loschi, L. Dati.”

— Adrian Nüssel (Seminar für Klassische Philologie der Universität Heidelberg) parat dissertationem doctorem de Scipionis Capycii libris duo De Principiis Rerum, duce G.W. Most.

— Helmut Wolf Darmstadiensis parat dissertationem doctorem de Amoribus Troili et Cresieda a Francisco Kynaston (saec. XVII) Latine versis. Disser
tatio paratur in Univ. Dusseldoriensi duce U. Baumann.

8. Sub Prelo

1. Societas Internationalis Studiis Neo-Latinis Provehendis
   b) Decimus Societatis Conventus anno 1997 diebus 4-9 mensis Augusti Abu- lae apud Hispanos celebrabitur. Plura qui scire velit, letteras mittat ad

Dr. K.A. NEUHAUSEN

Philologisches Seminar der Univ. Bonn Am Hof 1e D-53113 Bonn
Tel.: 49/228/737385 Fax: 49/228/737748
E-mail: upl3203@snphilos1.philos.uni-bonn.de

1. INTERNET
   1) Plura reperiuntur per rete electronicum INTERNET sub siglo:
      http://www.arts.kuleuven.ac.be/nl/dep/lit/neolatin/neolatin.htm

2) “The Database of Nordic Neo-Latin Literature is now accessible in the internet (www).
   The database, which is the result of an inter-Nordic research project, presents detailed descriptions of Neo-Latin books and prints from or about the Nordic Countries, 1500-1800.
In collecting the material, the national bibliographies of the single countries have normally been followed, where such exist. But the descriptions in the database are based on independent examination of the books themselves, and will often present much information not available elsewhere. Apart from standard bibliographical data, such information has been included as: topics, genres, dedicatees, incipits of poetry, lists of persons mentioned, etc.

At present the following main areas have been covered: Denmark: 1536-1600. Finland: Occasional literature, 1562-1713. Iceland: 18th Century. Norway: 1519-1600. Sweden: 1523-1600. But to this has been added much miscellaneous material. In total the base contains c. 2500 documents.

The address of the database is: http://www.uib.no/neol.html

Lars Boje Mortensen (Bergen), Karen Skovgaard-Petersen (Bergen), Peter Zeeberg (Copenhagen), editors". 
NOVA LEXICA

- Novum Glossarium Mediae Latinitatis ab anno DCCC usque ad annum MCC: Passibilis - Pezzu (Hafniae, E. Munksgaard, 1993).

INDEX VERBORUM RECENTIORUM


*accommunicare = to link: p. 67
*Admiralius = admiral: p. 232
*alchymista = alchemist: p. 51
*alcimia = alchemy: p. 40
*alcimistica = alchemy: p. 51
*algalia = mixture: p. 48
*ampullosus = bombastic: p. 64

†barbarolatinus = a mediaeval scholar: p. 47
†blaese = stammeringly: p. 119
Brutigena = Roman: p. 276, 278
*bullatus = a person who had been granted his degree not by a university but by the pope or the emperor: p. 98
cacademia = “cacademy”: p. 32
*canonicus = canon: p. 7
*capitaneus = governor (Polish magistrate): p. 255

*claustrialiter = as usual in a convent: p. 62, 68
*comes = count: p. 230-232
*commentatiuncula = commentary (contemptuously): p. 101
confratervs = fellow monk (derisive term): p. 67
*contoralis = bed-fellow: p. 76
Croeseus = of Croesus: p. 71

decanus = dean: p. 7
dictionarium = dictionary: p. 47
dimirari = “demirari”: p. 145
docent = doctorate: p. 98
†dulciusculus = sweet: p. 160 in app. crit.
electrilegus = collecting amber: p. 268
elegantiola = dimin. of “elegantia”: p. 146
*empiria (?): see p. 49, note 36.
etostichon = chronostichon: p. 250

gloriosulus = vainglorious, bragging: p. 50, 66

*graduatus = holding an academic degree: p. 98

Hunniacus = Hungarian: p. 379

*incitativus = hortatory: p. 147

*indolere = to regret: p. 66

*instrumentalis = instrumental: p. 385

Iova (with long “o”!) = Jehova, God: p. 218, 373, 377, 381

†leviusculus = rather light: p. 67

lotiarium = a derivation of “lotium”? : p. 50

magistellus = a petty master: p. 67

mentulum = a little chin: p. 67

mineralis medicina = alchemical expression; see p. 44; p. 50

†missiva = letter: p. 145

nitratus pulvis = gunpowder: p. 304

*novennium = nine years: p. 53

*paterntitas = a monk’s dignity: p. 65

*pecuniola = a small sum of money: p. 68

perictus = hit: p. 375

†perlectitare = to read through: p. 71

†permurmare = to recite: p. 56

Pessarides = inhabitants of Piszs / Johan- nisburg: p. 268

preculae horariae = breviary prayers: p. 56

†procancellarius = vice-chancellor: p. 228

quaestor primarius = Lord Treasurer: p. 228

ragorialis regula = rhetorical: p. 149

rostrous = with a long beak: p. 67

†rudimentarius puér = schoolchild: p. 65

scalarius = climacteric: p. 49 (†: scalaris)

splendidescere = to be shining: p. 103

†stigmaticus = marked, branded: p. 224

*novennium = nine years: p. 53

*theologizare = to theologize: p. 90

*Thomista = Thomist: p. 65, 67, 68

†threnodia = mourning poem: p. 256

*universitas = university: p. 228

verbosulus = rather prolix: p. 67

Villiades = inhabitants of Vilnius: p. 268
INDEX CODICUM MANU SCRIPTORUM

Groningen, Stadsarchief, p. 138.
Kampen, Stadsarchief, p. 138.
München, Bayer. Staatsbibliothek, clm. 528: p. 139.
München, Bayer. Staatsbibliothek, clm. 5594: 14125; 18637: p. 147

Rotterdam, Gemeentebibliotheek, Codex Horvitzianus: p. 200.
Vaticano, ms. Ottob. lat. 121; 438: p. 91
Vaticano, ms. Vat. Lat. 3887: pp. 80-83.
2. INDEX NOMINUM

a) **Index Craneveldianus** (pp. 1-78)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accursius</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolphus de Burgundia</td>
<td>55, 56, 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrianus VI</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegidius Petrus</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albucius Titus</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleander Hieronymus</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambrosius</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andreas (Craneveldi famulus)</td>
<td>9, 11, 13, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna of Bergen</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoine de Lorraine</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristoteles</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnaldus de Villanova</td>
<td>44, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustinus Aurelius</td>
<td>6, 16, 28, 40, 50, 54, 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustus Caesar</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avicenna</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baechem Nicolaus</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldus</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baliolanus Henricus</td>
<td>vide Zwynghedau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptista Mantuanus</td>
<td>11, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbarus Hermolaus</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barlandus Hadrianus</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartolus</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basilius Magnus</td>
<td>36, 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baussele, Cornelis van</td>
<td>13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baussele, Elisabeth van</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertrandus Gulielmus</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biblicae sortes</strong>:</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonifacius VIII</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borsalus Johannes</td>
<td>55, 56, 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bortus Hadrianus</td>
<td>see Bothe H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bothe H.:</td>
<td>72,73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brabander, Gislenus de</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breydel Nicolaus</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brydalus</td>
<td>see Breydel N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolus V Caesar</td>
<td>9, 14, 22, 27, 38, 41, 57, 72, 77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carolus, dux Geliae: 41, 42
Catharina baronissa de Helmont: 74, 75, 77
Cervent Clara: 5
C(h)amperius Symphorianus: 44
Cicero, M. Tullius: 2, 3, 40, 70
Clemens (Clement) Johannes: 2, 3, 14, 23, 24, 28, 54
Clenardus Nicolaus: 29, 37
Clodius Leonarius: 5, 6, 8, 54, 60-68, 70, 71
Collines, Simon de: 77
Cordatus Adrianus: 72
Corte, Pasquier de: 8
Craneveldia Catharina: 11
Craneveldius Franciscus: 2-78
Croius Gulielmus, Cardinalis: 26
Curtius Petrus: 9, 10, 11, 19
Dioscorides: 43
**Disticha Catonis**: 11, 12
Dongelbergius Jacobus: 74
Dorpius Martinus: 36, 77
Edward VI: 2
Egmondanus: vide Baechem.
Eleoporus Leonardus: 8, 45, 51, 52
Erasmus: 2, 9, 19, 23, 24, 25, 28, 32, 33, 37, 39, 40, 50, 52, 56, 59, 61, 62, 65, 66, 69, 70
Eucollius Nicolaus: 2, 3, 28, 33
Everardus Bethuniensis: 13, 16
Fevynus Joannes: 2, 3, 6, 14, 26, 28, 33, 34, 39, 40, 43, 53, 55, 61, 62, 63
Franciscus I, rex Franciae: 14, 22, 27, 77
Frobenius: 77
Galenus: 45
Gaverius: vide Laetus
Geber: 43, 47
Geldenhouwer Gerardus: 25, 72, 73
Gillis: vide Aegidius Petrus
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICES</th>
<th>457</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gossaert Johannes:</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregorius Nazianzus:</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gruithuys, Arnoldus de:</td>
<td>41-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackett John:</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heliopolitanus Leonardus:</td>
<td>vide Eliopolus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henricus Balliolanus:</td>
<td>vide Zwynghedau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henricus Nassoviensis:</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henvliet Cornelius:</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henvliet Johannes:</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henvliet Petrus Johannes:</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henvliet Wilhelmus Alexandri:</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermes Trismegistos:</td>
<td>43, 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hert, de (?):</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hieronymus, Sanctus:</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homericae sortes:</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homerus:</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horatius:</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houte, Jan van:</td>
<td>vide Ligno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannes de Garlandia:</td>
<td>13, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isidorus Hispalensis:</td>
<td>44, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jabir:</td>
<td>vide Geber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanck, Wilhelmus van:</td>
<td>41, 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurinus Marcus:</td>
<td>2, 3, 6, 14, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Eduardus:</td>
<td>19, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo X:</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ligno, Johannes de:</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludovicus XII:</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucianus:</td>
<td>33, 37, 61, 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutherus Martinus:</td>
<td>9, 61, 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macrobius:</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marck, Robert de la:</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaretha de Austria:</td>
<td>9, 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martens Theodoricus:</td>
<td>19, 20, 23, 32, 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsilius Ficinus:</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternus Firmicus:</td>
<td>44, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanchthon Philippus:</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mera, Paulus de:</td>
<td>11, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte, Stephanus de:</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morus Thomas:</td>
<td>2, 9, 22, 33, 54, 58, 59, 60, 61, 77, 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navarretus Rodericus:</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolaus IV:</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oesterhout Petrus:</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovidius:</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papianus:</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paracelsus:</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paschasius:</td>
<td>vide Corte, Pasquier de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulus Julius:</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perottus Nicolaus:</td>
<td>44, 49, 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phalaris:</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippus, Adolphi Burgundi filius:</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philostratus:</td>
<td>23, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picus Mirandolanus Ioannes:</td>
<td>20, 45, 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato:</td>
<td>3, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plautus:</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plinius maior:</td>
<td>43, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plinius minor:</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politianus Angelus:</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter, Jan van:</td>
<td>58, 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemaeus:</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintilianus:</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scuten Donatianus:</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Ianuensis:</td>
<td>44, 48, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simone de Cordo:</td>
<td>vide Simon Ianuensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socrates:</td>
<td>26,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanus Alexandrinus (pseudo-):</td>
<td>44, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stunica Jacobus Lopis:</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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