

SO DEBATE

NEO-LATIN STUDIES: SIGNIFICANCE AND PROSPECTS

HANS HELANDER

Within the short span of approximately 25 years the study of Latin literature from the period ca. 1300-1800 (usually called Neo-Latin) has developed immensely: whereas earlier research almost exclusively dealt with very few authors already famous for their vernacular writing, scientific impact or innovative humanism, a large amount of hitherto unknown Neo-Latin literature has now been made accessible through editions, handbooks, surveys, translations, websites etc. But this successful activity has not led to an easy recognition of the field, either among classicists or within the university system. There are still a number of basic, unresolved problems regarding method, unity, interdisciplinary status, relation to classical studies, etc. *SO* has asked an experienced practitioner in the field, Prof. Hans Helander of Uppsala University, to give a report on the present situation. His challenge is met by a panel of prominent scholars from Europe and North America. After their comments, prof. Helander sums up the discussion. The debate is concluded by a comprehensive bibliography. Further contributions are welcomed.

1. *Some Introductory Remarks*

1.1. *What is Neo-Latin?*

When we talk about Neo-Latin literature we are usually referring to texts written in Latin from the dawn of the Renaissance, and subsequently during the following centuries. On the whole, scholars agree on the use of the term. Jozef IJsewijn, who was one of the leading experts in the field, gave the following definition in his monumental *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies*:

By "Neo-Latin" I mean all writings in Latin since the dawn of humanism in Italy from about 1300 A.D., viz. the age of Dante and Petrarch, down to our time (IJsewijn 1990, Preface V).

Walther Ludwig defines the area in a similar way:

Die neuzeitliche lateinische Literatur wird im allgemeinen und auch im folgenden als neulateinische Literatur bezeichnet. Es ist die Literatur, die von Italien ausgehend die mittellateinische Literatur in allen durch sie geprägten Ländern Europas vom 14. bis zum 16. Jahrhundert durch ihre bewusste Distanzierung von der mittellateinischen Sprachtradition und ihre

Neuorientierung am klassischen Latein der Antike abgelöst hat und die sich in beschränktem Umfang bis in die Gegenwart erstreckt. Die ihrerseits vielfältig gegliederte Hauptepoche der neulateinischen Literatur reicht bis etwa 1800 ... (Ludwig 1997, 324).

Ludwig completes this with the following description:

Neulateinische Literatur beginnt mit der Orientierung der verwendeten lateinischen Sprache an der klassischen Antike und mit dem Bestreben, spezifisch mittelalterliche Orthographien, Worte und Konstruktionen ebenso wie mittelalterliche literarische Formen auszumerzen. Dieses Bestreben beginnt in den verschiedenen Ländern verschieden früh (im 14. bis 16. Jahrhundert), und zwischen Vorsatz und Durchführung liegen immer mehrere, manchmal viele Jahrzehnte (ibid. 334).

These are good definitions and descriptions that have the advantage of being short and of giving the essentials of the matter. There are some complications in the concepts, however, that need a more detailed exegesis and further restrictions. I shall dwell for a while on some difficulties of this kind. What I shall say will hardly be controversial and should not be seen as a correction of the scholars quoted, but as an introductory statement of the distinctions that must be made in the enormous field of Neo-Latin studies:¹ We must realize that it encompasses all kinds of literature, “belletristic”, educational, philosophical, theological, historiographical, and scientific of all disciplines (the list could be specified and more complete), written in Europe (and other continents) from the Renaissance and onwards, during the four hundred centuries when Latin was still the most important learned language.

As explicitly stated, we are indeed dealing, in the first place, with new stylistic and literary ideals, viz. those of the Renaissance and of Humanism. This is absolutely fundamental: the Renaissance meant a transition to a new code, which in reality was an old one, viz. that of ancient Latin. The code that was abandoned was often labelled as *barbaric* and *corrupt*.² This movement is clearly discernible in the texts; it is also programmatic, it embodies the ideals and efforts and the pride of the age, and the classical preferences are most expressively stated by leading scholars. But, even if the orientation towards ancient Latin is the most conspicuous feature, we must be aware of the fact that this is a tendency that is triumphant in the *literary*, *belletristic* genres, whereas conditions are significantly different in *factual* prose. In certain dis-

¹ The vastness of Neo-Latin literature (taken in the widest sense) is wittily summarized by De Smet 1999, 205.

² Burke 1987, 3: The main theme is that of the break with one code or tradition, that of the medieval ('German', 'Gothic', 'barbaric') past, and the development of another, modelled more closely on classical antiquity.

ciplines, medieval expressions and vocabulary linger on, in many areas fully accepted, not only for a while but all the time, as long as Latin is used as the natural medium of discourse. Even within the literary genres, the ideas of classical purity change over time. As expected, the zeal of Ciceronian orthodoxy reached its peak in the heroic days of conversion and transition, which is psychologically easy to understand: so many scholars were eager to show that they had seen the light and that they knew the right way. Very soon this zeal abated, giving way to a more relaxed and eclectic style and to other ideals, even in the best authors and in the most literary texts (see 3.3.1 below).

Accordingly, there are differences of disciplines and genres existing all the time; and there are also constant changes in the literary conventions and expectations to take into consideration.

Neo-Latin scholars know this, of course, but these circumstances are often not emphasized enough. It is easy to say why this is so: Literary texts have been at the centre of attention, and for many good reasons the focus has been on belletristic works and especially on literary texts from the heroic age of transition, i.e. from the Italian Renaissance and the period of growth and spread of Renaissance Humanism during the 15th and 16th centuries.³

In fact, Latin held its position much longer than is generally believed. It is true that over time there was a steady absolute and proportional increase of books printed in the vernacular. It is important, however, to make distinctions here: the figures we see are usually based on all the edited titles; from such surveys we get an impression of a rapid decrease of works in Latin. However, if we investigate the figures for scholarly and scientific works, it becomes clear that in these areas Latin was dominant much longer than most people realize. For example, up to 1680, the majority of the books exhibited at the Frankfurt Fair were in Latin; of the works published in Oxford between 1690 and 1710, more than 50% were in Latin; of all the publications mentioned in *Bibliothèque raisonnée des ouvrages des savants de l'Europe* 1728–1740, 31% were still in Latin.⁴ In many European countries, academic dissertations were normally written in Latin at least up to the beginning of the 19th century. The chief period of Neo-Latin may consequently be said to fall between 1400 and 1800.⁵

³ Ludwig 1997, 332: “Der Schwerpunkt der bisherigen neulateinischen Arbeiten liegt zeitlich im Bereich der Renaissance, sachlich im Bereich der Poesie”.

⁴ The statistical material taken from Waquet 1998, 102 ff.

⁵ After 1800, Latin was no longer the chief vehicle of European thought and learning. Consequently, most Latin texts produced during the last two hundred years will be of little interest to Neo-Latin scholars.

It was common for learned works written in the vernacular to be quickly translated into Latin in order to reach an international public. Galileo's *Dialogo sopra i due massimi sistemi del mondo* became known to Europe primarily through the Latin edition of 1635. In the same way the physics of Descartes was spread and studied abroad by means of a Latin translation by Jacques Rohault that saw six editions between 1682 and 1739.⁶

In short—here we are dealing with literature (in the wider sense of the word) that witnesses the development of ideas and knowledge in Europe for almost four hundred years, indeed, with texts that are in reality very often the chief and most important sources for the investigation of the history of learning and culture.

It is remarkable that many learned scholars today are unaware of the existence of this huge treasury. As Walther Ludwig remarks, it has become so utterly forgotten “dass im Bewusstsein der gebildeten Schichten des 20. Jahrhunderts sogar die Erinnerung an ihre frühere Existenz weitgehend schwindet” (Ludwig 1997, 324). It was indeed a major event in the annals of both classical studies and European historiography when, not more than 40 years ago, Neo-Latin studies first began to attract scholars on a larger scale.

Since then, much work has been done in various countries. Forgotten and neglected texts have been published with commentaries, linguistic and literary problems elucidated, and the importance of Neo-Latin literature for the understanding of European history demonstrated most convincingly.

An indispensable work that gives fundamental information about Neo-Latin research in all its dynamic aspects is IJsewijn's *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies*, 2nd ed. 1990 & 1998 (I: History and diffusion of Neo-Latin literature; II [with Dirk Sacré]: Literary, linguistic, philological and editorial questions). Walther Ludwig's recent survey of the history of Neo-Latin literature in Graf's *Einleitung in die latineinische Philologie* (“Die neuzeitliche lateinische Literatur seit der Renaissance”, pp. 323–356) contains a valuable bibliography.

1.2. *The aims of the present article*

One purpose of this brief paper is to show the vast extent of Neo-Latin research, in time, space and subject matter. The corpus of Latin texts encompasses all kinds of literature, belletristic as well as factual, and forms the basis of all disciplines.

I shall also try to demonstrate that Neo-Latin texts were generated by the needs and demands of the society in which they were written, and that they

⁶ Waquet 1998, 107 f. The basic work on Latin translations is W. Leonard Grant “European Vernacular Works in Latin Translation” (1954), continued by Peter Burke “Translations into Latin in Early Modern Europe” (forthcoming).

mirror and express the basic convictions of their various times. These texts were produced by the same forces that created Early modern Europe: the rise of the nation-state, the geographical discoveries, the Protestant movement, the Counter-Reformation, the scientific revolution. Latin was the vehicle of all the new ideas, beliefs and insights generated by these processes, from Early Renaissance up to the end of the 18th century. This is a long period of dynamic innovations, and the world of 15th-century Italian scholars is very different from the conditions of the baroque *theatrum mundi* of the mid-17th century, and these in turn utterly dissimilar to the Age of Reason that was to follow. I have tried to sketch the historical background in section 2 below.

There is a certain tendency to regard Neo-Latin texts as composed according to the rules of rhetoric and poetic manuals, as writing exercises produced by antiquarian pedants whose knowledge and interests belonged to the past. (This view is common among those who are not at all familiar with this kind of Latin; but there are also Neo-Latinists who seem to be of this opinion.) Nothing could be more misleading. It is true that there are works that may be treated and analysed in this way, but they generally belong to the world of primary education and basic linguistic exercises.

The Neo-Latin works that deserve our attention, however, are in the first place those written by the leading scholars of each age, men who usually took part in the turmoil of events and in the intellectual, political and scientific debates. They were normally deeply steeped in classical erudition, most of them regarding Latin as their first language, but they used the language with the freedom of masters for their own purposes.

In section 3 I discuss some aspects of orthography, morphology, vocabulary and intertextuality. I have had to confine myself to a few aspects and very few examples, not chosen at random but with a view to demonstrating certain methodological principles that I think are worth bearing in mind.

Thus, to summarize the *avis au lecteur*: first and most importantly, I shall clarify the actual need for Neo-Latin research. It is a study of great urgency and importance, which at present appears as one of the most rewarding among humanistic disciplines, καλὸν γὰρ τὸ ἀθλοῦν καὶ ἡ ἐλπὶς μεγάλη!

Secondly I stress the need for a diachronical historical perspective. If we want to study texts that mirror the development of ideas and knowledge, our attention will automatically be directed towards scholarly, factual and learned Latin texts within the different disciplines. Poetry and rhetoric have been in the focus so far. But investigations of the various kinds of scholarly and scientific discourse must be regarded as a very rewarding task and of great general interest. This is a field that has hitherto been neglected.

Such a shift of focus would mean that we concentrate more on texts that are of greater importance within a general framework of the history of ideas. Quite generally, I would like to issue a warning against too great and exclusive a concentration on the analysis of texts as products of rhetorical and poetical precepts. Such a method may lead to a situation similar to that of visitors to Gizeh in Egypt who come in from the wrong direction and see a heap of blocks without discerning the face of the Sphinx.

2. *The Historical Background—a World in Change*

2.1. *Some general remarks*

The movement of the *renascentes litterae* had begun in Italy. Its gradual spread to other regions, from the middle of the 15th century, coincided with the great geographical discoveries that opened up the world and changed it irrevocably. Italy itself, the cradle of the Renaissance, was subjected to wars and invasions that culminated in the 1520s. The peninsula was devastated: Rome was sacked in 1527 (as were prosperous cities like Genoa, Milan, Naples and Florence).

The 1520s also brought the beginnings of the Protestant Reformation, which soon released the Counter-Reformation. The hegemony of the Roman Catholic Church was irrevocably broken. Western Europe was divided by bitter religious controversies which accompanied the rise of the new nation-states. Nation-building and religious orthodoxy, often in close relation, were to put their mark on the history of the continent for the next two centuries.

The Muses that went north from a devastated Italy came to different nation-states with different religious beliefs, and it turned out that the Nine always enthusiastically cherished the religion and the convictions of the prince of their country.

Around the turn of the century 1700, having sung and danced for a very long time in a world of cruelty and bigotry, the Pierides witnessed the dawn of Enlightenment, the most radical revolution in the history of man, and had to adapt to new tunes and different modes.

As conditions changed, different aspects of classical antiquity were taken into use and consideration. The classical world *was used* as an inventory and thesaurus for the interpretation of modern times. The canon of texts changed, according to the needs of society; ideas that had been in vogue went under the horizon and new concepts and interpretations won the day. There was in fact increasingly more material to use, because knowledge about the classical languages and the ancient world was growing constantly.

Classical scholars were the heroes of the intellectual world, down to the middle of the 18th century, and the study of Latin and Greek attracted many

of the most brilliant minds. Even those among the more outstanding geniuses who did not become classical scholars nevertheless learnt absolutely everything they knew by means of literature written in Latin. This holds good for all disciplines, including the sciences.

2.2. *Some Important Renaissance Ideas*

I shall give a brief survey of some basic Renaissance ideas that lived on for a considerable time and which manifest themselves as important and constantly recurring themes in the texts that concern us here. They have their roots in the ancient and medieval worlds and they surface all the time *at the beginning of the period treated here*, and they are gradually superseded by more modern ideas. The present study is not one of the history of ideas, but it is inevitable to mention some of these clusters of notions, since they form, for a considerable time, the frame of reference for the authors (not the least the Latin scholars) of our period and tend to occur again and again in the Latin texts, but in different ways over time though: I think that one could say they are self-evident parts of the world picture at first,⁷ but that slowly and gradually they are questioned and more and more assume the character of literary adornment.

The concept of *philosophia perennis* is of vital importance for understanding the mentality of the earlier phase of the period we are treating (cf. Kelley 1998, 154). The central idea of this doctrine is that immediately after the creation Man was in possession of perfect knowledge about God and his work. This knowledge, however, was thought to have vanished during the course of time, since men paid more interest to earthly than to heavenly things. The real understanding of God's plan for the Universe was preserved only in the minds of a few wise men who transmitted their insight to coming generations. In its purest form this ancient wisdom was thus kept alive through the efforts of certain great sages living in the first nations to be established among men. Among these heroes of Mankind were Hermes Trismegistus, Zoroaster, Moses and Orpheus. Pythagoras and Plato were their successors.

A philosophy with the message summarized above must lead to a renaissance for the ancient myth of the *original Golden Age*. The best known among the ancient expressions of the innocence of newly created man are to be found in Virgil's Fourth Eclogue and in Ovid, *Met.* I, 89 ff.

The thought of the wisdom of the first generations of men filled the philosophers with inspiration and enthusiasm. In his work *De perenni philosophia*, the learned orientalist Augustinus Steuchus exclaims that the first men

⁷ For a general survey of Renaissance ideas, including the ones treated here, see E. M. W. Tillyard, *The Elizabethan World Picture*.

were morally superior and pious. Idolatry was the result of deterioration and actually against human nature: *Crede mihi, quo sunt homines rerum exordio propiores, hoc meliores et singularis optimique Dei colentiores. Idololatria fuit error posteriorum saeculorum, contraque impetum Naturae* (*De perenni philosophia* III c. 2).

The inevitable fate of human societies is decay. In fact, the world itself is ageing. Expressions like *mundus senescens* and *senecta mundi* are frequently met with in the texts.

The world had been created about 5000, or perhaps 5500 years, before the birth of Christ, according to the variously interpreted chronology of the Bible. A common basic idea concerning this quite surveyable course of history was that there had been a *successio imperiorum*, in all *four great monarchies*, which had succeeded each other, namely the Assyrian, the Persian, the Macedonian and the Roman (which was thought still to exist as the Holy Roman Empire). At the beginning of the period under study, nearly everyone seems to have believed this. This historical pattern was regularly linked to and took its authority from the story of the Colossus in the book of Daniel, chapter 2. As will be recalled, Nebuchadnezzar had a dream in which he saw a colossus with a head of fine gold, with breast and arms of silver, a belly of bronze, legs of iron, feet partly of iron and partly of clay. Daniel explained the dream to the king as a prophecy about future kingdoms. Subsequently, Christian exegesis interpreted the enigmatic passage as a reference to the succession of the empires just mentioned. This thought won additional support from a combination with the belief in gradual deterioration and the myth of the Ages of the world (named after the metals gold, silver, copper, and iron), so well-known from classical authors, e.g. Hesiod, Virgil and above all Ovid. The idea was especially cherished by Lutheran scholars: It formed the base of Johannes Carion's influential *Chronica* (1532) and was regarded as self-evident by the famous Johann Sleidan, who in his treatise on the subject (1556) argued that the culmination of God's plan coincided with the mature phase of the last of the four Empires, i.e. the time when Charles V's power extended over all the world and Martin Luther, simultaneously, appeared on the scene.⁸

So, for early Renaissance scholars, history was interpreted as a succession of doctrine (*successio doctrinae*), as a transition from youth to old age (*mundus senescens*), and as a translation of empire (*translatio imperii*). These ideas show considerable tenacity in the minds of the men of the Renaissance, and

⁸ Cf. Kelley 1998, 168 f. and Fueter 1936, 201 ff. Sleidan's work on the four monarchies became immensely popular. It was among the first purchases of Isaac Newton when he entered on his academic career in the early 1660s (see Westfall 1993, 24).

of the 17th century, but they were to be questioned and superseded by others (cf. 2.3 below).

The seasons of the year were four, the ages of man were four, the ages of the world (and the empires) were four. This was because everything, intrinsically, was coherent in a mystical way. Renaissance men lived in *a world of correspondences*. Ideas like these reached their peak in the early 17th century. In reading texts from the 15th, 16th and 17th centuries, it is absolutely necessary to be aware of the tendency to conceive the world as intrinsically consisting in a pattern of analogies, as being built on correspondences. Typical of the age is the theory of correspondences which Athanasius Kircher formulated in his work *Oedipus Aegyptiacus* (1652–54), in which Neo-Platonism, dreams of the *philosophia perennis* and cabalistic ideas are creatively combined. There are three worlds, the archetypal (*coelestis*), the angelic (*intellectualis*) and the sensible, and these are said to correspond (*correspondere*) in the most miraculous way.⁹

We always run the risk of not taking expressions of such beliefs seriously enough, misreading them as metaphors (see Burke 1987, 201).

2.3. *Discoveries and inventions. From mundus senescens to mundus crescens*

In the course of time, however, these beliefs and categories dissolve away and other ideas dominate the scene instead. In the first place, the discovery of the Americas destabilized the old patterns of thought. The words in Seneca's *Medea* (375 f.) were suddenly verified: *Venient annis saecula seris/ quibus Oceanus vincula rerum/ laxet et ingens pateat tellus*. The world was clearly expanding in a dramatic way, and the rapid changes and discoveries generated a belief in progress and new inventions. The ambitions are epitomized in the works of Francis Bacon. On the title page of his *Instauratio magna* there is a ship sailing through the Pillars of Hercules, with the motto *Multi pertransibunt et multiplex erit scientia*, a quotation from the book of Daniel (12,4). This prophecy has now been fulfilled, according to Bacon, for the same age has witnessed discoveries and circumnavigations as well as progress in the sciences:

*Neque omittenda est Prophetia Danielis de ultimis Mundi temporibus: Multi pertransibunt et multiplex erit scientia. Manifeste innuens et significans esse in FATis, id est, in providentia, vt pertransitus Mundi (qui per tot longinquas navigationes impletus plane, aut iam in opere esse videtur) et augmenta Scientiarum in eandem aetatem incidant.*¹⁰

⁹ See *Oedipus Aegyptiacus* T. II, and Leinkauf 1993, 88.

¹⁰ *Instauratio magna* I, XCIII.

A new age had come. "Between 1550 and 1650 Western thinkers ceased to believe that they could find all important truths in ancient books", as Anthony Grafton puts it in his excellent study *New Worlds, Ancient Texts. The Power of Tradition and the Shock of Discovery*.

Thus, although Europeans first tried to interpret the new findings in the light of old convictions, it gradually became apparent that the basic concepts of historiography had to be modified and changed. The *Theatrum mundi* (to use a favourite Neo-Latin metaphor¹¹) had expanded in a spectacular way. A very ingenious application of the theatre notion is to be found in Ubertino Carrara's *Columbus* (1715). The Old World and the New World are there compared to two crowded theatres, from the beginning placed back to back with each other. Through Columbus's discoveries, however, the whole world has become one stage ("All the world's a stage"!); both stages have been turned towards each other, now forming one grand theatre.¹²

The four monarchies and the ages of the world gradually disappear from the analyses of serious historiographers.¹³ Moreover, scholars had already begun to question and redefine the idea of *translatio imperii*. The emergence of the several nation-states, each with its own great ambitions, had given the notion of empire "more mundane and 'Machivellian' connotations" (Kelley 1998, 158).

During the course of the 18th century, these views of the history of mankind were superseded by other more modern ideas. Ludwig Holberg makes fun of those in Germany who still believed in the existence of the fourth empire:

*De monarchia Quarta adhuc in Germania florente magnifice loquuntur; sed alii Imperium putant, quod in solis Germanorum cerebris extat.*¹⁴

There was a strong sensation of Mankind's having passed into a new Era: new continents, with all their riches, suddenly lay open, regions that had

¹¹ It seems to meet everywhere. Cf. just to give a couple of examples, Athanasius Kircher: ... *in eam deveni cogitationem, ut nihil in hoc sensibili mundi Theatro adeo esse inaccessum crederem, ad quod Lux et Umbra nobis aditum non praeberent* (*Ars magna lucis et umbrae. Ad lectorem*); Emanuel Swedenborg: *Tali ornatu Tellus nostra Theatrum sui Orbis ingressa est* (*De cultu et amore Dei* 1,2,19); C. Linnaeus: *ut in theatrum hujus mundi prodeundo, Potentissima Creatoris mirabilia, Omnipotentiamque ejus laudibus praemiisque concelebremus* (*De curiositate naturali* 1).

¹² See Hofmann 1994, 500 (note 249). (The movable double wooden theatre described by Pliny the Elder in *Nat. Hist.* 36, 116 ff. has perhaps prompted this special idea, as is also suggested by Hofmann *l.c.*)

¹³ Cf. Kelley 1998, 156 ff., with further literature.

¹⁴ *Ad virum perill.* Kragelund's ed., 586.

been totally beyond the grasp of the ancient world. In his epos *De navigatione Christophori Columbi* (1581), Lorenzo Gambara says that Columbus was superior to Hercules and even to Dionysus, because not only had he found his way to India, he had also Christened the natives in the countries he discovered (see Hofmann 1994, 433).

Explorations and discoveries soon added force to what was to become “the topos of the superiority of Moderns over Ancients” (Kelley 1998, 160). Lists of “things invented” (in the widest sense) that had been unknown to the ancients were composed. Among these, Polydore Vergil’s *De rerum inventoribus* and Pancirolli’s *Nova reperta* are the best known.

Comparisons with ancient history were often made, and the famous Virgilian line *nec vero Alcides tantum telluris obivit*¹⁵ was frequently used or alluded to, especially in homages to the Habsburg rulers, on whose Empire the sun never set. The catch-word that summarized the whole superiority complex, as it were, was Claudian’s *Taceat superata vetustas*.¹⁶ The theme is common, however, also outside the sphere of explorations and discoveries.¹⁷ In their homages to prominent men, orators and poets were fond of declaring that the hero of the occasion was more prominent than a similar figure in ancient history. Francis Bacon, for instance, frankly declares that James I was the most learned of all the kings that had lived after the birth of Christ. (This agrees well with the general attitude of Bacon: The Moderns are superior in general knowledge and in other domains as well.) According to Bacon, James is a miracle and to be compared to Hermes Trismegistus:

Neque vero facile fuerit, Regem aliquem post Christum natum reperire, qui fuerit Majestati tuae, Literarum Divinarum et Humanarum varietate et cultura comparandus. Percurrat, qui voluerit, Imperatorum et Regum seriem, et juxta mecum sentiet. Magnum certe quiddam praestare Reges videntur, si delibantes aliorum Ingenia ex compendio sapiant, aut in Cortice Doctrinae aliquatenus haereant, aut denique literatos ament, evabantque. At Regem, et Regem natum, veros Eruditionis Fontes hausisse,

¹⁵ In the homage to Augustus, *Aen.* 6,801 ff.

¹⁶ In *Rufinum* 1,273 ff. Claudian praises his hero Stilicho for having crushed Rufinus. Stilicho is clearly more admirable than the heroes of the ancient myths. They had killed awful monsters, but Rufinus was much worse than these, having threatened all the Roman world. “The days of old are surpassed; let them be silent”: *Taceat superata vetustas*. As regards the theme of “surpassing the ancients” in ancient Latin literature, cf. also Martial 9,101.23 and Ammianus Marcellinus 18,6,23.

¹⁷ I want to stress this point. To many it may seem surprising that this feeling of superiority over Classical Antiquity should be so important in Neo-Latin literature. But the theme is undisputedly there, and it became, of course, one of the prerequisites for the famous *Querelle des anciens et modernes* of the late 17th century.

*imo ipsismet Fontem Eruditionis esse, prope abest a Miraculo. Tuae vero Majestati etiam illud accedit, quod in eodem Pectoris tui Scrinio, Sacrae Literae cum profanis recondantur, adeo ut cum Hermete illo Trismegisto, triplici gloria insigniaris, Potestate Regis, Illuminatione Sacerdotis, Eruditione Philosophi. Cum igitur alios Reges longe hac laude (proprie quae tua est) superes, aequum est, ut non solum praesentis Seculi fama, et admiratione, celebretur ... etc.*¹⁸

The theme of surpassing antiquity seems to me to be one of the most important and most conspicuous in the Neo-Latin panegyric genre: The subjects of eulogies (kings, warriors, explorers and learned men) not only surpass their contemporaries, they excel the most valiant heroes of classical history and classical myth as well. Here we are dealing with one of the sources of the abundant use of hyperbole, which is so characteristic of baroque texts.

The above-mentioned ideas about the succession of wisdom find a certain parallel in the theme, "the migration of the Muses". Here is a cluster of mutually connected and intertwined ideas: There is the thought that the centre of learning has shifted several times during the course of history. The Muses left Greece for Italy, and then went north, etc. Bacon has expressed it in his description of the history of learning.¹⁹ There is also a less grandiose but more charming notion, i.e. the idea that the Muses arrive in a place, summoned by a poet's invocation. Petrarch had once brought the Nine to Vaucluse, and thereafter they had kept listening to the prayers of their worshippers, arriving in a variety of places, which they never visited in ancient times; we get beautiful and moving pictures of poetry and learning arriving in a number of places *where they had never before belonged*, springs gushing forth in a *locus amoenus*, where the Muses and nymphs dance and Apollo plays.²⁰ Through scenes like this we get a picture of the revival of learning and its spread *over a changing world*.

2.4. *The progress of knowledge. The scientific revolution. Anni mirabiles*

The period between the appearance of Copernicus's *De revolutionibus* (in 1543) and Newton's *Principia* (in 1687) has been called *anni mirabiles* (see Smith 1962, 25). The growth of knowledge manifests itself in a steadily increasing number of learned and scientific treatises and academic dissertations, the majority of which were, as we have seen, in Latin, up to the beginning of the 18th century (I.I. above). IJsewijn 1998 II: 326–364 contains a valu-

¹⁸ *De augmentis scientiarum*, the 1662 ed., 3 f.

¹⁹ *De augmentis scientiarum* 2.4. Cf. Morhof's *Polyhistor* I, p. 9.

²⁰ See Nichols 1979, 5 and Skafte Jensen 1988, 137.

able bibliography of important Latin scientific literature within the various disciplines, with collateral literature. Another excellent source is Morhof's *Polyhistor*, which appeared in 1688. Its fourth edition is easily accessible in a facsimile reprint of 1970: *Danielis Georgii Morhofii Polyhistor literarius, philosophicus et practicus, cum accessionibus virorum clarissimorum Ioannis Frickii et Iohannis Molleri, Flensburgensis. Editio quarta, cui praefationem, notitiamque diariorum litterariorum Europae praemisit Io. Albertus Fabricius*. Lubecae 1747. With its 1882 pages it is a gold-mine of bibliographical information in all fields of learning. The sciences are to be found in the second and third tomes. I mention it with a certain emphasis, since experience has taught me that its existence is strangely neglected. (In the two editions of IJsewijn it is only briefly mentioned [1977: 129 and 1998 II: 198].) In the following sections, I shall have reason to return to this remarkable work.

The progress of knowledge made itself manifest in all kinds of literature. At the end of the 16th century, Theodor Zwinger's monumental *Theatrum vitae humanae, omnium fere eorum, quae in hominem cadere possunt, Bonorum atque Malorum exempla historica, Ethicae philosophiae praeceptis accommodata et in XIX libros digesta comprehendens* saw no less than five editions, between 1565 and 1604, each of them more comprehensive than the preceding. Here, we are dealing with "the world's largest single collection of commonplace excerpts", to quote W. J. Ong.²¹ Something quite different saw the light in 1630 when Johann Heinrich Alsted published his *Encyclopaedia* (the first dictionary to appear under that title), which comprises all learning then available, collected thematically under various headings (philology, theoretical philosophy, practical philosophy, theology, law, medicine, the mechanical arts). Two generations later, in 1677, appeared the first edition of Johann Iacob Hofmann's *Lexicon universale historico-geographico-chronologico-poetico-philologicum*, a work that definitely presents a more modern impression, with the entries arranged in alphabetical order; the second edition, published in 1683 also contains certain *addenda*, but is above all enriched in the field of natural sciences: *comprehendens historiam animalium, plantarum, lapidum, metallorum, elementorum ...* The European mind had undergone revolutionary changes which are clearly illustrated in the changing demands on all-compassing hand-books like these. Such works as Zwinger's represent a dying world of lingering orality and commonplace thinking. The general tendency is well summarized by Ong:

... the age of intensified information-collecting was beginning to succeed the age more given to utterance-collecting. Soon commonplace collections, which

²¹ W. J. Ong in Bolgar 1976, 111. Ong's description of Zwinger's *Theatrum* and his analysis of the impact of this work can be heartily recommended.

were essentially collections of what persons had said (or, later, written) would be absorbed and superseded by encyclopaedias in the modern sense, beginning with the primitive 'methodised' works of John Heinrich Alsted and terminating in such works as today's *Britannica* ...²²

So by the end of the 17th century Zwinger was hopelessly out-dated. Morhof's verdict is harsh: *Imprimis molesta est tam anxia et sollicita rerum divisio, quae nescio quam μικρολογίαν sapit, in hoc Scriptorum genere inutilem; distrahit enim animum et oculos inquiringentis.*²³

What had happened is illustrated also in the contents of the rhetorical manuals that all the time appeared in new editions and revisions. At the end of the 17th century the *inventio* part tends to decrease, whereas the chapters on *elocutio* tend to dominate. Rhetoric slowly becomes the same thing as *elocutio*, i.e. the correct use of tropes and figures (see Hansson 1990). This must be seen as an expression of another view on the relation of rhetoric and reality. The minds of men were occupied with the rapid changes of early modern Europe, by the furious political and religious debates, by the various scientific ideals of the men who paved the way for the scientific revolution, Francis Bacon, Petrus Ramus, Descartes and Newton. It was this turbulent world that supplied the material of *inventio* rather than antiquated rhetoric models (cf. Fafner 1982, 229–234).

The new attitudes and interests are discernible in literary texts, too. Just one example: Enumerations of the various aspects of learning had always been a popular motif in poems containing some sort of *curriculum vitae*, whether it is a question of *naeniae* or *epithalamia* or a congratulatory poem written on some other occasion. Education plays an important role in surveys of this kind, and the various subjects acquired are often indicated in short catalogues. The parts concerning the natural sciences are very often inspired by similar classical catalogues on the theme "the causes of various phenomena", primarily to be found in several passages in Lucretius (e.g. 5.416 ff.) and especially in Virgil, above all in the *Eclogues* 6.31 ff. (Silenus's song) and *Georgica* 2.475 ff. (the Muses show the causes of natural phenomena), both of which owe much to Lucretius. But the times were changing, as we have seen: By the end of the 17th century the impact of the scientific interest paves the way for more detailed descriptions that truly mirror the revolution that took place. A good example is the poem which Olof Hermelin, then Rector of the University of Dorpat, wrote in honour of Erik Dahlbergh, then Governor of Livonia, when the latter arrived in Livonia in the autumn of 1696.²⁴ According to Hermelin, Dahlbergh studied *the principles of the*

²² Ong, *o.c.* 125. ²³ Morhof, *o.c.* 1,1,21,23.

²⁴ As regards Hermelin's years as a professor at Dorpat, see Olsson 1953, 75 ff. The homage to Dahlbergh is briefly mentioned *ibid.*, 123.

Universe, the causes of things, what Nature is and what God is (vv. 2–3 in the quotation below). He then went on to *physics and meteorology* and learned about the quarters of the winds and the origin of lightning (v. 3). Then follow *the principles of moral philosophy* (how ugly crime is and how befitting a man and how glorious is virtue) (v. 4). Next came *politics* and the proper governing of cities (v. 5). But Dahlbergh's intellect was above all attracted by Euclid, and then by the teachings of Clavius, Tycho Brahe, Kepler, Wallis and Borelli (vv. 6–9). He then went on a great European tour and visited many universities where he eagerly embraced the mathematical and scientific theories of Kircher, Baptista and Mutius Oddo (vv. 10–20.) Finally, he visited the Italian centres of learning; Naples, Florence, Padua (vv. 21–22):²⁵

- 1 *Mente polos adiit scrutans primordia mundi,*²⁶
 Et rerum caussas, et quid natura Deusque,
 Flamina queis spirent oris, quis fulminis ortus,
 Quam deforme scelus, quam mascula et inclyta virtus,
- 5 *Queisve gubernandae dextre sint artibus urbes.*
 Maxime at Euclidea trahunt mire cupientem,
 Et docte numeros, docte variare figuras.
 *Hinc Clavii rimatur opus*²⁷, *rimatur et omne,*
 *Quod Tycho, Keplerus, Wallis*²⁸ *docuitque Borellus.*²⁹
- 10 *Jamque libet celebres trans Pontum visere terras,*
 Ut dapibus mentis vix exsaturabile pectus
 Expleat, atque sitim restinguat cuncta sciendi.
 *Detinet Albis*³⁰ *eum, quadam dulcedine Rhenus*
 Allicit, et Rhodani lymphae arrisere palato.

²⁵ The poem is quoted from Schyllberg 1722, 18 ff.

²⁶ This line and the two following lines contain clear echoes of Ovid, *Met.* 15, 67 ff., in which Ovid tells of the teachings of Pythagoras: ... *magni primordia mundi/ Et rerum causas et, quid natura, docebat, / quid deus, unde nives, quae fulminis esset origo* ... ; Virgil's *Georgica* 2.490, mentioned above, is alluded to in the phrase *rerum causas*.

²⁷ Christoph Clavius, d. 1612, German mathematician, editor of Euclid.

²⁸ John Wallis, d. 1703, English mathematician. This may be an anachronism. These verses refer to Dahlbergh's early studies, in the 1640s, and I do not think that Wallis was known to him *then*.

²⁹ Giovanni Alfonso Borelli, d. 1679, Italian physiologist and physicist. This reference may be an anachronism for the same reason as the mention of Wallis above.

³⁰ *Albis*, the Elbe, here metonymically stands for Hamburg. Young Dahlbergh attended a school for clerks in Hamburg when he was between 13 and 15 years of age. See SBL, s.v. Dahlbergh, Erik Jonsson, p. 616.

- 15 *Albula*³¹ *cum primis placuit, qui fonte scaturit*
Gratior et nitidis sese magis approbat undis,
*Hic, quae Kircherus*³², *Baptistaque*³³, *Mutius Oddo*³⁴
Ac alii, quos reddiderat divina Mathesis
Insignes, scriptis evulgavere politis,
- 20 *Colligit, in patriae servatque fideliter usus*³⁵
*Parthenope*³⁶ *miratur eum, Florentia magnis*
*Laudibus extollit, quas urbs Antenoris*³⁷ *auget,*
Arctoque decus Regni magnum fore prudens
Augurat ...

In this new world, Latin was still the vehicle of learning, science and intellectual debate. It is important to realize that Latin actually held its position as the international language of science *much longer* than in the humanities and in occasional literature (cf. 1.1 above) (see Ludwig 1997, 341).

2.5. *The rise of the nation-states*

Early Modern Europe is characterized by the rise of the nation-states. This is an era of building nations, and kings prudently enlisted learned men in their great projects. The task of scholars was to produce vindications of the sovereign's rights, learned investigations into the glorious past of the nation and eloquent eulogies of the valour of its princes and soldiers. The result was an enormous production of historiography and occasional literature, eloquence and epic poetry. We have here in fact to do with one of the main driving forces behind the production of Neo-Latin literature.

National historiography flourished. Donald R. Kelley has summarized the situation in this way:

In the sixteenth century, truth took both national and confessional forms, as the European states, in imitation of ancient Rome, generated their own secular

³¹ *Albula* = the Tiber. Cf. Virgil, *Aen.* 8, 332. The river metonymically stands for Rome.

³² Athanasius Kircher (1602–80), the famous polyhistor. References to his works meet us everywhere at this time. Cf. also 2.2 above and 3.3, 3 below.

³³ Possibly Joh. Battista Riccioli, d. 1671, Italian astronomer.

³⁴ Mutius Oddo, or Oddus, d. 1631, Italian mathematician.

³⁵ “He gathers knowledge and preserves it to use it in the service of his country.” This line agrees well with Dahlbergh's actual career and it is also an expression of Hermelin's educational ideas: according to Hermelin's pedagogical programme, all education ought to serve practical purposes and aim at the formation of effective officials in the service of the King. See Olsson 1953, 101 ff.

³⁶ =Naples. ³⁷ =Padua.

cults and ideology and as their historiographers began the task of inventing traditions to suit modern needs and hopes.³⁸

The old national myths of medieval origin were given new life and new fantastic combinations were made. Speculations about the origin of various nations found nourishment primarily in two myths: (1) the wanderings of Noah's descendants after the Flood and (2) in the legends of Troy, and the fate of the heroes of that war, which lived on in the minds of men throughout the Middle Ages, all the time overlaid with new fanciful additions. These were the great archetypal stories with which imaginative historians always tried to connect annals of their own peoples.³⁹

In *England*, historians contended that the English Kingdom was founded by Brutus the Trojan, who was reputed to be the great-grandson of Aeneas and to have founded New Troy (later London).⁴⁰ In *France*, in the 15th and 16th centuries, there flourished a myth about Francus, who was said to have been a son of Hector.⁴¹ Francus had escaped from Troy when the city fell (in the same way as Aeneas did) and gone to central Europe, where he became the ancestor of the Frankish nation.⁴² In another French tradition,⁴³

³⁸ Kelley 1998, 174. See there also a detailed account of German, French and English historiography, 174–187.

³⁹ Cf. Kelley 1998, 136: "According to this mélange of myths, European culture appeared as the product of two dispersals—that of Noah's sons after the Flood and that of the Trojan heroes after the fall of their city." A very important source of inspiration for many scholars was the fantastic work of Annius of Viterbo, the *Antiquitates* (1498). Annius forged and invented ancient texts (by e.g. Berossus and Manetho) and thus created a strange web of Biblical and ancient history. An elucidating—and amusing—survey of the historiographical speculations of this kind can be found in Anthony Grafton's fascinating study on Joseph Justus Scaliger's chronological work (Grafton 1993, 76 ff.).

⁴⁰ This myth was spread in several versions, among which ought to be mentioned Geoffrey of Monmouth's influential *Historia Britonum* and Robert Wace's *Roman de Brut* (both written during the 12th century). In addition to these ideas, Annius's confabulations (see the preceding note) gave extra material; obviously the Annian forgeries were extremely successful among British scholars (cf. Grafton 1993, 78).

⁴¹ About French historiography and the national myths quite generally, see Kelley 1998, 141 ff.

⁴² This myth can be traced back to the 7th-century chronicle of Fredegar, and it had been continually expanding during the Middle Ages. In the 16th century, the legend was widely known in France and indeed by many believed to be true. In any case, it afforded a splendid material for poets. When in an *epithalamium* George Buchanan extolled the wedding between Mary, Queen of Scots, and Francis II, King of France (which took place in 1558), he addressed the young prince as *decus Hectoridum iuvenis (Francisci Valesii et Mariae Stuartae, regum Franciae et Scotiae, epithalamium, in the Sylvae)*. Ronsard made the myth the subject-matter for his epic *La Franciade* (1572) (see Maskell 1973, 67 ff.).

⁴³ This tradition is represented by Guillaume de Postel in his work *De originibus* (1553).

the French are descended directly from Japhet, via Gomer. Hence, the history of the French begins immediately after the Flood and, since there is no other people existing who can claim such a lineage, the French are the only true successors of the authority with which God invested Adam (Grafton 1993, 85). *German* historians maintained that the Germans descended from Noah's son Japhet. The first born of the latter was Ascenas, also called Tuiscon, who became the first German king. He started his reign 1787 years after the foundation of the world, 131 years after the Flood. He was succeeded by a series of kings, the first ten of whom were named, in chronological order: Mannus, Ingaevon, Isthævon, Hermion, Marsus, Gambrivius, Svevus, Vandalus, Teuto and Alemannus. There was also a *Dutch* nationalistic myth, presented to the literary world by Johannes Goropius Becanus (d. 1572), who in his famous *Origines Antwerpianae* (1569) contended that history began in Brabant. The ancient Cimmerians lived there and their language—Dutch—was the oldest language in the world. In *Sweden* the “Gothic” historiographers went back to Jordanes's description of Scandinavia as an *officina gentium* and a *vagina nationum*, from which victorious nations have repeatedly sallied forth. Johannes Magnus was the author who, on the basis of earlier contributions, laid quite a new foundation for Gothic historiography. In his *Historia de omnibus Gothorum Sueonumque regibus* (1554), he gave Sweden a complete list of kings from Magog, the grandson of Noah, to his own days. Sweden was the oldest realm on earth.⁴⁴

There were always scholars who would not tolerate such nonsense. George Buchanan scrutinized and ridiculed fabulous stories of this kind in his *Rerum Scoticarum Historia*.⁴⁵ Another outstanding representative of a critical attitude was the brilliant Joseph Justus Scaliger, who ruthlessly attacked the champions of such ideas, trying to show that they were nothing but figments of the imagination based on forgeries and fantasies (Grafton 1993, 82 ff.). At the dawn of the Enlightenment, most of these myths collapsed under the weight of their own absurdity.⁴⁶

⁴⁴ Swedish historiography went on along these lines during this period. In the 17th century, Messenius and Stiernhielm were important exponents for the Gothic tradition. The visions of Gothic grandeur culminate in Olof Rudbeck the Elder's *Atlantica* (four volumes 1679–1702), in which the author wants to prove that Sweden was Plato's Atlantis, and the Isles of the Blessed in ancient myths. Sweden was the real home of learning, letters and philosophy.

⁴⁵ *Rerum Scoticarum historia*, pp. 38 ff. in the 1697 Utrecht edition.

⁴⁶ Johan Ihre's series of Latin dissertations on the history of the runes (1769–1773) stands out as a very good example of the critical and rational stance taken in such matters by the 18th century. With wonderful humour and a Voltairian smile, Ihre makes a clean sweep of the Gothic theories, e.g., in the dissertation *De runarum patria et origine* 36: ... *pervenit ad manus meas Scriptum, cui Mysterium Alphabeti Runicum ... titulum dedit Auctor, in quo ostenditur runas, si recte comprehendo, Linguamque Gothicam a THARA, ABRAHAMI Patre excogitatas fuisse:*

Gradually, such fabulous historiography was superseded by more critical approaches, which had been generated by the relentless research into historical sources that was conducted all the time. The energetic investigations into annals, documents and treatises were to a large extent also prompted by the interests of the State. In addition to “antiquarian” research of this kind, high-strung moral and political historiography flourished, with fewer discussions of facts but with the focus on ethics and style, a genre in which History appeared as *magistra vitae* in the old style.⁴⁷ Latin remained the vehicle of all these ideas, “this pandemonium of traditions, bedlam of interpretations and riot of disputes” (Kelley 1998, 174).

Scholars also devoted time to the defence of the rights of their Princes, and the vindication of the growing autocracy. “The divine right of kings” became a literary *locus communis* (Cf. Healy 1969, xli), receiving special emphasis in Protestant countries. He who attacks the sovereign attacks God himself, says William Gager in his homage to Elizabeth I:

Coelo minatur qui solio invidet;
Cognata regum est conditio Iovi:
Quos qui lacessit fraude, seu vi
*Ille Deum petit impotenter.*⁴⁸

We should read this elegant little Alcaic stanza as an epitome of the autocratic ideals that were to dominate Europe even more in the course of the 17th century. Political treatises of the period abound in strongly worded expressions of similar ideas. The king is an image of God on earth, his power is a reflexion of the divine power, he is closer to God than his subjects: *Princeps est imago et exemplar Dei in terris, rerum moderator et arbiter in cuius manu positae opes, dignitas, vita omnium nostrum;*⁴⁹ *Principes proximi a Deo sunt, et vicem atque imaginem ejus in terris repraesentant: ergo et colere ac venerari magis par est, quo propius et norunt supremum illud Bonum et senserunt.*⁵⁰ The great Hugo Grotius, in his dedication for his *De jure belli ac pacis* to Louis XIII, stresses in the same way the similarity between the King and God himself. May God bestow success on Louis in the work for peace, may he thus augment the honour of the King, whose majesty is most close to the majesty

quum vero illud me iudice non tam ad runarum quam ingenii humani ejusque symptomatum historiam pertineat, aliis examinandum relinquitur. See Östlund 2000, 24 f.

⁴⁷ As regards the distinction between ‘antiquarian’ and ‘moral’ (or ‘political’) historiography, see Skovgaard-Petersen 1999.

⁴⁸ In *Catalinarias proditioes*. Quoted from Bradner 1940, 62.

⁴⁹ Justus Lipsius, *Flores* ... (1618), 160.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 162.

of God himself: *Deus pacis, Deus iustitiae, Rex iuste, Rex pacifice, cum aliis bonis omnibus, tum hac etiam laude cumulet tuam suae proximam Majestatem.*⁵¹

Thus, during the 17th century the princes of Europe are images of God. In addition, they regularly surpass all previous rulers, as we have seen (cf. 2.3 above), and are also unrivalled Guardians of the True Religion (whichever religion this may be; cf. 2.6 below) and Rulers by the grace of God: The King of France is *Christianissimus*, the King of Spain is *Catholicissimus*, the King of Sweden is *Piissimus* and *Restauratae Religionis amantissimus*. Each of them is furthermore *invictissimus* and by glorious ancestry rightful heir of supreme power.

Basic circumstances like these dictate the contents of the texts written during the 16th and 17th centuries. It is true that rhetorical and poetic handbooks contain advice concerning various ways of praising princes. It is also true that ancient literature contains most excellent patterns for panegyrics and eulogies of men in power. But we should not suppose that the Neo-Latin authors who eulogized their sovereigns did so because the manuals prescribed these patterns. The manuals delivered the material, but the content was dictated by fundamental dogmas beyond dispute, viz. that the sovereigns of the new nation-states were the *rightful* rulers, with *impeccable* ancestry, with *unsurpassable* virtues, who had achieved the *most glorious* deeds. Such statements were not engendered by rhetoric, but by down-to-earth facts of real life. Those who misapprehended fundamentals of this kind were not sent to a new course in rhetoric, but to the scaffold to be broken on the wheel.

Epic poems were also powerful vehicles of nationalistic, royalistic and religious ideas. They regularly accompany the dramatic events of the last half of the 16th and the whole of the 17th centuries. There is a brief survey of the genre in IJsewijn 1998 II:24 ff. I shall here briefly mention just a few of the important works that are *not* mentioned there.

The English victory over the Spanish armada was sung by Christopher Ockland in the epic work *Elisabetheis* (Bradner 1940, 37). The epic works on the Gunpowder Plot are numerous: Thomas Campion, Michael Wallace, Phineas Fletcher, John Milton and many others contributed.⁵² No less than three *Gustavides* and one *Adolphis* were written by grateful foreign protestants in honour of Gustavus Adolphus, to celebrate his deeds in the great German war. John III Sobieski's victory over the Turks at Vienna was celebrated in the poem *Sobiescias* by Andrzej Wincenty Ustrzycki. The recurring wars be-

⁵¹ *De iure belli ac pacis* (1625).

⁵² Bradner 1940, 69 ff. As regards Fletcher, see Haan 1996.

tween Denmark and Sweden were the themes of several epic poems written by Danish and Swedish patriots.⁵³

Such epic works are well worth studying as testimonies to the political and religious debates of their times. These were tales told by intelligent people, full of sound and fury, but signifying many things.

Latin was in fact used in all possible ways for propaganda purposes, on fly-leaves,⁵⁴ in short poems and in pamphlets. Latin was still an important and efficient means of rousing political opinion at the beginning of the 18th century. Suffice it to adduce two drastic examples from the Nordic countries to prove that this was the case: Olof Hermelin, Secretary at the Royal Chancellery, composed Latin pamphlets by order of Charles XII, which contained furious attacks on Augustus II, Saxon Elector and King of Poland, and Peter I, Czar of Russia. The diatribes are vigorous and venomous, especially those directed against the Muscovite, in which Hermelin predicts that the western countries will have to suffer *novos Attilas novosque Tamerlanes, flagella orbis*. After the fateful battle of Poltava,⁵⁵ the all too ingenious pamphleteer was identified among the Swedish prisoners, and it is rumoured that the Czar drew his sword and killed him with his own hand, a gesture which must be regarded as a somewhat sinister, yet obvious recognition of Hermelin's literary achievements.⁵⁶ When, in October the same year, Denmark declared war on Sweden, one of the reasons adduced was the fact that Magnus Rönnow, one of the many talented Latin authors of this period, had called Charles XII *Magnae Scandinaviae Imperator* in one of his propaganda poems. Concerning this point, the Swedish Senate stated in its answer that "Rönnow himself ought to state his opinion in suitable iambi" (Helander 1995, 178 f.).

2.6. *The Protestant Reformation – and the Counter-Reformation*

The Protestant Reformation changed the western world. In the process it produced an enormous amount of literature (not least in Latin), written by both partisans and enemies: pamphlets, polemical treatises, translations of the Bible into the vernaculars and (not least) into Latin,⁵⁷ propaganda literature of various kinds and historiography.

⁵³ See Skovgaard-Petersen 1988; 1991 and 1993; Skafte Jensen 1997, 64 f., and Berggren 1994, 227.

⁵⁴ See Planer 1916 and Beller 1940.

⁵⁵ On June 28th, 1709, the Swedish army was defeated by Czar Peter at Poltava in the Ukraine. The battle was a turning-point in the war.

⁵⁶ See Helander 1994, 487 f. with further literature.

⁵⁷ It must be kept in mind that Latin quotations from the Bible in Protestant countries are very often not from the Vulgate, but from some of the reformed or Protestant Latin Bible

The most characteristic features of baroque literature are well suited to express the passionate antagonism of the rival churches. It has, indeed, been claimed that Baroque literature, in its essence, is an expression of the mentality that reigned in Europe as a consequence of the Counter-Reformation (cf. Segel 1974, 34).

Much of the literature in the Catholic countries in Europe became a vehicle for religious propaganda and merciless attacks on heterodox views. Striking examples are the great epic poems on Columbus's discoveries that were written by Lorenzo Gamba (*De navigatione Christophori Columbi*, 1581), Giulio Cesare Stella (*Columbeis*, 1585), Vincentius Placcius (*Atlantis re-recta*, 1659) and Ubertino Carrara (*Columbus*, 1715). They all extol the progress of Roman Catholicism, the only true church and the sole means of salvation.⁵⁸ The great Sarbievius, "the Polish Horace", was an ardent propagandist for the Roman Church, whose glory he sings again and again in his magnificent *Carmina*; and in France Latin poetry during the seventeenth century became to a great extent "a Jesuit affair".⁵⁹

The historiography of the Protestant movement expresses the growing confidence of the new evangelical churches. The aim was one of massive revisionism.⁶⁰ The authors strove to show that the claims of the Papacy were false and, at least partially, based on forgeries; instead, they "sought a usable ecclesiastical past"⁶¹ in harmony with the evangelic truth. In 1555, Johann Sleidan published his most influential *De statu religionis et reipublicae Carolo Quinto Caesare commentarii*, which saw many editions. His views and analyses were decisive for ecclesiastical Protestant writers for centuries.⁶²

Religious zeal generated a great part of the English Latin literature written at the end of the 16th and the beginning of the 17th century. The reign of terror of Bloody Mary and the Spanish threat inspired a host of English Latin poets to string their lyres and sing the victory of the True Religion over Papal and Jesuit aggression: William Alabaster, Thomas Watson, Thomas Campion, Michael Wallace, Phineas Fletcher and John Milton, just to mention a few. In all these works we find the motif of the Infernal Council, originally taken from Claudian, but here elaborated to suit the needs of modern times: the message is that Satan, having consulted the best (i.e. the worst) of

translations, e.g. the ones by Tremellius, Iunius or Schmidius. See the *Cambridge History of the Bible*, III.

⁵⁸ For an exhaustive discussion of these poems, see Hofmann 1994.

⁵⁹ IJsewijn 1977, 92. The aim was twofold, to refute heresy and to edify morals. Cf. Bradner 1940, 91.

⁶⁰ Kelley 1998, 167. ⁶¹ *O.c.* 166.

⁶² See Fueter 1936, especially pp. 186 ff. and 200 ff.

his Devils, sends the Pope and the Jesuits to do as much harm as they can (cf. Bradner 1940, 38 ff.).

The tone of the debate is sharpened to ruthless vehemence during the great war in Germany (1618–1648). Eloquent testimonies to the conviction and fighting spirit of the Protestant churches are the works written in praise of Gustavus Adolphus, especially the *Gustavides* of Venceslaus Clemens and Johannes Narssius (both printed in 1632; cf. 2.5 above), long epic works, that depict the great war in Germany as an apocalyptic struggle between Evil, incarnated in the Papal Church, and Good, personified in the Swedish King himself, a Hero in the successful struggle for the true reformed Christian religion. The motif of the Infernal Council is introduced here, too.

In this way the great epic works—both Roman Catholic and Protestant—become strange and fascinating expressions of the Baroque *Welttheater* (see Hofmann 1994, 576).

3. *The Latin Language of the Period under Investigation*

3.1. *Orthography*

Strictly speaking, there is no such thing as Neo-Latin orthography. In the early Renaissance texts we meet with medieval spelling, but this is, from the very beginning, in a state of transformation, since knowledge about ancient spelling is increasing all the time, gradually but steadily, along with the general growth of knowledge. The main sources were the epigraphic and numismatic documentation, the carefully collated readings of the best of old manuscripts and the (often etymological) arguments of the ancient grammarians (*lapides, nummi, libri antiqui, grammatica* and *etymologia*, in the words of the lexicographers).

The increase in knowledge can be shown through a comparison between the spellings recommended in three very important normative works representing different ages of the period under investigation: 1. Ambrosius Calepinus, *Dictionarium copiosissimum* (the 1516 ed.); 2. Basilius Faber Soranus, *Thesarus eruditionis scholasticae* (the 1686 edition); 3. Joh. Frid. Noltenius, *Lexicon Latinae Linguae antibarbarum quadripartitum* (the 1744 ed.).⁶³

⁶³ Ambrosius Calepinus (c. 1440–1511) published the first edition of his dictionary in 1502; it was for long *the* Latin dictionary of Europe, with numerous editions; many other lexica were based on this important work, hence the almost proverbial expression *Bonus ille Calepinus toties coctus et recoctus parum sapit* and Morhof's witty reflection: *Calepinus ... quidem, si in nomine aliquod omen est, per anagrammatismum Pelicanus, sanguine suo et succo minorum gentium Lexicographis vitam dedit* (Polyhistor 1,4,9,9). Basilius Faber Soranus (1520–1576) published his dictionary for the first time in 1571. It was then re-edited repeatedly; for instance,

I have chosen five words, known to be spelt in different ways (1. means Calepinus; 2. Faber Soranus and 3. Noltenius):

<i>artus, a, um</i>	1. arctus	2. arctus or artus	3. artus or arctus
<i>hiems</i>	1. hyems	2. hyems or hiems	3. hiems or hyems
<i>lacrima</i>	1. lacryma	2. lacryma	3. lacrima or lachryma
<i>letum</i>	1. letum	2. lethum or letum	3. letum
<i>silva</i>	1. sylva	2. sylva or silva	3. silva

Thus, we should expect the spelling of words in books printed around 1500 to differ considerably from books printed around 1750. Other important changes in the orthographic field occur in this period. To begin with, there is a lavish use of abbreviations, the *linea nasalis*, the ampersand and other ligatures, habits of writing automatically taken over from the manuscript tradition. In addition, accents are very often used for distinctive purposes (the grave over prepositions [à;è] or over adverb endings [citò]); the circumflex over ablative endings [è mensâ] or the short genitive plural [inferûm]). All these features gradually disappear from our texts in the course of the 17th century. By 1700, the accents were considered old-fashioned and a bit ridiculous. Christopher Cellarius explicitly dissuades from the use of accents in his Latin grammar of 1693 (p. 127): “Gleichfalls stehen auch die *accentus* zu mässigen, die oft ohne einige Bedeutung eines Unterscheidis aus blosser Gewohnheit v.g. in *Atquè, Benè, Tàm* &c. gesetzt werden. Kindern und Unerfahrenen geben sie eine Beyhülffe, aber Gelehrte wissen ohne selbige alles wohl zu unterscheiden.”

It is important to realize, however, that the process of change was very slow. Authors apparently never cared much about the orthographical debates. Erroneous spellings linger on long after they have been condemned by grammarians. The verdict of Benner & Tengström (1977: 71f) is worth quoting: “Orthographical rules meant practically nothing for the spelling in the seventeenth century. One learnt to spell through imitation. / - - / The impact of specialized literature was therefore slight.” The statement is too strong; for there was definitely a gradual, albeit slow, change. But the point that Latin was learnt mainly through imitation is clearly a very important one. It holds good also in the area of vocabulary, grammar, stylistics and quite generally. I shall return to this aspect later.

To normalize the spelling in editions of Neo-Latin texts (viz. adjust the spelling to our orthographical habits) must be a grave mistake. The actual

by Cellarius in 1686, by Graevius in 1710 and by Gesner in 1726. These later editions took over the role earlier played by Calepinus. Noltenius says that Faber *omnium nunc manibus teritur, ac praesertim in scholis regnat, velut in Calepini locum surrogatus* (col. 1927).

orthographical habits of the author are always interesting: his usage may be compared to the spelling of his contemporaries and to the precepts of the hand-books. It may also mirror etymological ideas, e.g. the spelling *sylva*, which was up to the time of Cellarius explained with reference to its alleged *origin from* the Greek ὕλη. In addition, normalization is quite devoid of meaning. Those who are at all able to read Neo-Latin texts will not be confused or disturbed by the small differences from our modern spelling.

3.2. Morphology

Neo-Latin aberrations from ancient morphology are treated in IJsewijn 1998 II:405 ff.; the chapter is a short one, and at the beginning it is stated (II:405) that “there is no special need for a full ‘Neo-Latin morphology’, since one can use the well-known treatises which describe classical and ancient Christian Latin”. Generally speaking, this is most certainly true; nevertheless, it is advisable to have some old grammars at hand, e.g. Gerhard Johan Vossius's *De arte grammatica* (1635) as well as a couple of smaller works in this field, such as M. Johannes Rhenius *Donatus latino-Germanicus* (1651) or Christopher Cellarius's *Erleichterte lateinische Grammatica* (1693).⁶⁴ Those who study Swedish Neo-Latin have reason to consult *Grammatica Latina* (1688) by Arvid Johan Tiderus. My experience has taught me that there are more morphological peculiarities to find in the texts than we usually suspect; in some instances, on checking the grammars we find that the usage actually corresponds to what was believed to be correct classical usage.

There are indeed some features that stand out as remarkable, and I shall mention a few of them, which either do not occur at all in the survey in IJsewijn or (in one case) are not, I think, sufficiently illustrated there.

The first declension: Many Neo-Latin grammarians and lexicographers believed that *all* names of rivers, even all those ending in *-a*, were masculine.⁶⁵ To these belonged William Lily, whose grammar was the most influential in England for centuries (see Padley 1976, 24 ff.). Other grammarians are not so sure. Vossius contends that some names of rivers are feminine,⁶⁶ as does Cellarius.⁶⁷ I have noticed that very many authors actually treat rivers in *-a* as masculine. *Sala*, the name of the Fyris river, which flows through Uppsala, is regularly regarded as a masculine noun; so is *Emma*, the river of the univer-

⁶⁴ Morhof supplies us with a long list of grammars, including short assessments of each of them (*Polyhistor* 1,4,10 [pp. 830–836]).

⁶⁵ For a modern analysis, see Sz. §15.

⁶⁶ Vossius 1635, *De analogia* I, 38.

⁶⁷ *o. c.*, p. 10.

sity town of Dorpat (Tartu) in Estonia. *Vistula* is treated as a masculine noun by the great Sarbievius, and also by the Swedish poets in the 17th century.⁶⁸

The fourth declension: The treatment of neutra of the type *cornu* deviates in a remarkable way from what we now consider to be correct. In grammars of the 17th century, e.g. Rhenii *Donatus* (1651) and Cellarii *Lateinische Grammatica* (1693), *cornu* is declined, in the singular, as follows:

nom.	<i>cornu</i>
gen.	<i>cornu</i>
dat.	<i>cornu</i>
acc.	<i>cornu</i>
abl.	<i>cornu</i>

Thus, the same form recurs in all the cases. We can accept the dative *cornu* instead of *cornui*; we know that several ancient authors, especially poets, use this form. The genitive in *-u*, however, does not regularly occur in our modern grammars. Nevertheless, ancient Latin grammarians, e.g. Charisius, considered it to be the correct form.⁶⁹ The dictionaries of the period we are studying often express the same opinion. Under *cornu* we read in Petri Gothus's *Dictionarium* (1640) that it is "in singulari indeclinabile". Lindblom's *Lexicon Latino-Svecanum* from 1790 claims that *cornu* is "indecl.in sing.", and the 19th century editions of *Forcellini* express the same opinion. There was not, however, complete consensus: in *De arte grammatica* Vossius contended that the correct genitive form of *cornu* is *cornus* (II, XVII, p. 330), and quotes from Lucan (7,217) *cornus tibi cura sinistri*.

Thus, *we cannot know what to expect in the texts*. Only extensive reading will show us what the authors of the time actually preferred and used. I consider this worth stressing, from a methodological point of view. As regards the type *cornu*, I have got the impression that most authors during the 17th century chose the *-u* form of the genitive. Just to give a few examples from my excerpts: Johannes Loccenius, describing the movement of the left wing of the Swedish army in the second battle at Breitenfeld, in 1642, writes *copiis sinistri cornu productis*.⁷⁰ Samuel Pufendorf relates that the command of the

⁶⁸ It is a frequent name in Swedish heroic poetry because of the Polish campaigns of Charles X Gustavus and Charles XII.

⁶⁹ Kühner & Holzweissig 1912, 394. Sommer tries to explain the mistake (Sommer 1914, 389): "Wenn die Grammatiker den Neutra z.t. einen G. auf *-u* aufoktroyieren ... so wissen sie mit den zu ihrer Zeit nicht mehr lebendigen Formen keinen Bescheid. Den Anstoss gaben vielleicht die in Rezepten häufigen partitiven Gen. der medizinischen Fachausdrücke *cornu bubuli* ... deren erstes Glied, nachdem das Ganze zum einheitlichen Begriff geworden war, seine Flexion einbüsste."

⁷⁰ *Historiae rerum Svecicarum ... librum novem*, p. 664.

right wing was given to Wrangel before the march over the Little Belt in the words *dextri cornu regimine in Wrangelium collato*.⁷¹ Therefore, if a scholar is writing a commentary on a Neo-Latin text and finds the genitive *cornu* in his text, he must not confine himself to a reference to Charisius; such information is practically worthless, because it does not say anything of the actual usage of the period. The question to be asked is: Is the genitive *cornu* used in the text typical or an aberration from what was *then* the norm? And the answer can only be found in a comparative perspective, through extensive reading of the contemporary literature.

The fifth declension: My impression is that Neo-Latin authors tend to change the ancient norm and *extend* the usage, in three ways. (1) The fifth declension words of the type *avarities*, *materies*, *mollities*, *mundities*, *luxuries* (variants of *avaritia*, etc.) were apparently regarded as attractive and tempting. We find words like *almities* and *lautities* in our texts. (2) In ancient Latin, nouns that belong to the *avarities* category did not normally have their genitive form in *-iei* (Kühner & Holzweissig 1912, 403 f.). Neo-Latin authors on the contrary often show a predilection for such forms. (3) In classical Latin *res* and *dies* are in principle the only nouns of this declension to occur in the genitive and the dative or ablative plural. In late Latin (Apuleius, Palladius and Cod. Just.), we also find these case forms of *species*, viz. *specierum* and *speciebus*. Cicero in *Topica* 7,30 had condemned such forms, saying that *formarum* and *formis* are the correct Latin equivalents.⁷² Neo-Latin authors, however, do not care about such limitations. The scientists *needed* the various plural forms of *series*, *species* and *superficies*, and they use them without hesitation. Some examples from my excerpts:

Joh. Kepler: *subsistentia generum et specierum Mathematicarum*;⁷³ *in aestimandis figurarum speciebus*;⁷⁴ *corpus superficibus terminatur*;⁷⁵

Isaac Newton: *De computo serierum*;

Daniel Morhof: *ubi figura superficierum ... in corporibus in consilium adhiberi (debet)*;⁷⁶ *aliquid ... ab ipsis singulis speciebus diversum*;⁷⁷ *quibus superficibus ... contingat*;⁷⁸

⁷¹ *De rebus a Carolo Gustavo ... gestis* 1696, p. 369.

⁷² The few other instances of fifth declension nouns that appear in the genitive and dative plural are to be regarded as mere curiosities (Kühner & Holzweissig 1912, 407).

⁷³ *Harmonice Mundi* IV, Caspar's ed. p. 211.

⁷⁴ *Harmonice Mundi, Prooem.* 5. Caspar's ed. p. 18.

⁷⁵ *Harmonice Mundi. Prooem.* I. Caspar's ed. p. 15.

⁷⁶ *Polyhistor* 2,2,2,31, p. 405. ⁷⁷ *Ibid.* 2,2,2,11, p. 316.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.* 2,2,2,31, p. 406.

Emanuel Swedenborg: *Quis non mirabitur in sinibus et intestinis Telluris tantam entium diversorum et specierum copiam et variam supellectilem dari;*⁷⁹

Carolus Linnaeus: *nondum speciebus ad propria genera redactis.*⁸⁰

3.3. Vocabulary

The various features of Neo-Latin vocabulary are elucidated in an excellent way in IJsewijn 1998 II: 382 ff. There have previously been many misunderstandings in this area, but the reader can get to know some of the basic facts there.

My short exposé below in the main agrees with IJsewijn's, but with a different emphasis. I have chosen examples from my own excerpts that may perhaps shed some additional light on this important field:

3.3.1. *Extreme purism of the doctrinal Ciceronian type is very rare and quite untypical.* There were some famous Ciceronian debates that have attracted much interest, but they belong to the end of the 15th century and the beginning and middle of the 16th (Paolo Cortesi *versus* Angelo Poliziano; Pietro Bembo *versus* Gianfrancesco della Mirandola; Stephanus Doletus *versus* Desiderius Erasmus).⁸¹ On the contrary, an eclectic attitude is dominant and words are coined when they are needed. In addition we must always bear in mind that Cicero was not always the cynosure: Justus Lipsius chose Tacitus and Seneca as his models, and from the end of the 16th century Lipsianism reigned in Europe for many decades. The extreme adherents of this stylistic ideal were said to *lipsianizare*.⁸²

Genre is, however, decisive: belletristic works are quite naturally more puristic than scientific texts. There were always grammarians who advocated a stern purist attitude, but their influence was minimal, and they were regularly ridiculed by scholars of sounder judgement (see 3.3.4 below).

Furthermore, we should be careful when we use the expression 'classical vocabulary'. Our definition of the classical period (viz. the time from Cicero to A.D. 120) was clearly of little relevance for the authors we are studying, even for literary texts with a puristic bias. It was considered to be legitimate to use words from earlier and later periods, provided that they occurred in

⁷⁹ *De cupro, Praef.* 4.

⁸⁰ Linnaeus/Heiligtag, *De Acrosticho*. In *Amoenitates academicae*, p. 145.

⁸¹ In this list of antagonists, the Ciceronian occupies the first place. See also IJsewijn 1998, 412 ff. where the Ciceronian debates are treated under the chapter *Style*, and *Der neue Pauly* 13, s.v. *Ciceronianismus*.

⁸² Morhof, *Polyhistor* 1,1,21,38 *in quibus molesta κακοζηλία semper Lipsianizat*; Cf. *ibid.* 1,1,24,57 *est vero Gruterus etiam inter simias Lipsianas; sed qui praeter κακοζηλίον Lipsianam mire ineptus est in frigidis allusionibus et verbis antiquatis*.

the works of *auctores probati*. For this reason we ought to talk about ‘ancient Latin’ rather than ‘classical Latin’, when we discuss the vocabulary of Neo-Latin authors.⁸³

3.3.2. *In the belletristic works*, a kind of moderate classical purism was quite generally the guiding star. But even there, *new words were formed all the time in analogy with the derivational rules of ancient Latin*. Any persistent reader of Neo-Latin texts will soon notice how even the best and most elegant of purely literary works abound in words that do not occur in the ancient texts extant to us. In the literary texts we meet with a creative impetus in the field of derivation, forming new nomina agentis (*abductor, consutor; directrix, fulminatrix*), abstract nouns (*extractio, semotio; gratitudo*), diminutives (*laudatiuncula; scriptorculus*) and adverbs (especially those in *-im*, as *apertim, fusim, concisim*). Apparently the authors did not care whether these words existed in the preserved Latin literature, as long as they were regularly formed. As a rule, their judgement was very sound, and in most cases we will not as readers realize that we are dealing with neologisms. In many instances, we realize that this is the case only when we have dutifully looked the words up in order to list them in the common way, as part of the work we think we have to do as editors of Neo-Latin texts.⁸⁴ A large number of them were probably on the lips of the ancient Romans, although they have not survived in the texts preserved to us. One might wonder whether we are right in calling such words “neologisms”.

Patronymica require a special commentary. Many authors rejoice in forming new fanciful and learned compositions by means of Greek patronymic suffixes. I shall mention just a few examples that I have found to be especially frequent in the texts: *Hectorides* are the French, since they were thought to be the off-spring of Francus, son of Hector (cf. 2.5 above);⁸⁵ likewise *Pepiniades* (as descendants of Pepin le bref);⁸⁶ *Thariades* (whom we meet very often in the texts) is Abraham, son of Thera;⁸⁷ why call him Abraham when such a wonderful name is at hand?

⁸³ See Benner & Tengström 1977, 42 ff. and Tengström 1983, 83 ff.

⁸⁴ In IJsewijn 1998, 382, it is remarked that “Budé was fond of substantives ending in *-tor*, and J. J. Pontanus needed lots of diminutives for his love poems. Neither of them ever checked to see if all their words had Roman testimonials. Many of the words they used are not found in Roman writings (or rather in Roman writing already published in their age), but they are nevertheless quite good Latin.” Hoven 1994, 389ff. contains a very handy list of “Mots classés d’après divers suffixes ou terminaisons”. See there, e.g., the huge number of “neologisms” in *-tor*, *-sor*, *-trix* and adverbs in *-sim* and *-tim*.

⁸⁵ E.g. in George Buchanan’s *Sylvae (Francisci Valesii et Mariae Stuartae ... epithalamium)*.

⁸⁶ E.g. in Garissoles, *Adolphis* I, 226.

⁸⁷ The name-form in LXX and the Vulgate is not Thera, but Thare. For example, see e.g. Venceslaus Clemens, *Gustavis*, pp. 5 ff.

Another type of word-formation apparently felt to be open for innovations was verbs formed with the Greek verb-suffix *-izo*, which came into fashion in the 16th century, e.g. *Danizo*, *Germanizo*; *Papizo*, *Pelagizo*; *Ciceronizo*, *Lipsianizo* (see 3.3.1 above). Most of these formations were prompted by the debates of the 16th and 17th centuries, and they belong to areas where polemics have always been brutal and ruthless and where there has always been a great need for new invectives, viz. nationalistic, theological and philological debates.

3.3.3. *In the sciences, new words were coined all the time.* This was inevitable, given the enormous growth of knowledge (cf. 2.3. above.) Writers who comment on the actual usage sometimes feel themselves obliged to refer to Cicero's famous words in *De finibus* 3,3: *Imponenda nova novis rebus nomina*. Learned and eloquent vindications of the right of coinage will be found in many authors, e.g. in Pufendorf's *De jure naturae et gentium* 1,1,1. The Latin language as actually used was certainly not petrified by the *imitatio* ideal, as Eduard Norden once suggested. Instead, Leonardo Olschki gave the correct picture of the situation when he stressed the vitality and potentialities of Latin as a learned language (see Benner & Tengström 1977, 41–63).

In this area, the importance of the Greek language must always be stressed; it was a wonderful resource to take advantage of: The Greek vocabulary is so much richer than the Latin, and composite words are so much easier to form in Greek. The resources of Greek were systematically exploited: Greek words that had not been used by the Romans were introduced, and, in particular, new words were formed on Greek stems. Scientists delight in coining such terms. Some of these words were short-lived and belong to the history of learning as illustrative testimonies of grandiose theoretical systems that often turned out to be blind alleys or cul-de-sacs, as *steganographia* (Johannes Trithemius [1462–1516]); *panaugia*, *pansophia*, *pampaedia*, *panglottia*, *panorthosia*, *pannuthesia* (Johannes Comenius [1592–1670]); *chromocritica*, *echo-campice*, *photosophia* (Athanasius Kircher [1602–1680]). But the overwhelming majority still belongs to the terminology of the sciences and have found their way by thousands into modern languages as well as *termini technici*. Anyone familiar with the language of medicine knows that the greater part of the vocabulary of pathology is Greek. Thus, what is traditionally called 'scientific Latin' will on closer examination turn out to be 'Latin' words formed on Greek word elements.

There are so far very few investigations into this world of neologisms. The general background and the main principles for the study have been excellently outlined in Benner & Tengström (1977). Reijo Pitkäranta's study on some types of Latin word formations in 17th century dissertations printed in Finland is a pioneering work that sheds much light on a limited area. The

best dictionary in this field is actually the *Oxford English Dictionary*, which will usually supply us very generously with etymologies, semantic distinctions and first occurrences of *termini technici*; it is true that the entries are English words, but the normal background, up to the beginning of the 18th century, will be that the word was coined as a purely 'Latin' word (from Latin or Greek morphemes) which then some time afterwards appeared as an English word in the English literature.

The elucidation of the growth of Latin vocabulary in scientific and learned texts should be seen as one of the most important areas of Neo-Latin philology. In general, it must be said that the investigation of the learned discourse in factual literature, e.g. in the dissertational academic prose, is one of the most interesting and urgent tasks.⁸⁸

3.3.4. Apart from the sciences, *there were other areas where the use of medieval words, "barbarian words", or ancient words in a new sense was common and even obligatory*. In IJsewijn 1998 II:386 ff. these areas are classified as follows [the examples are taken from the lists there]: (1) political and social concepts, institutions and functions (*Delphinus, Elector, Landgravius*, etc.); (2) the army, fleet and warfare (*bombarda, campi-mareschallus*, etc.); (3) the academic world (*baccalaureus, licentiatus*, etc.); (4) the ecclesiastical world (*cardinalis, capellanus*, etc.); (5) money, trade, industry and art (*thalerus, minera*, etc.); (6) plants and animals (*tabacum, tulipa*, etc.); (7) foods and drinks (*thea, coffeum*, etc.).

The relevance of this list will be confirmed by experience to anyone who studies Neo-Latin texts. It demonstrates that Latin authors met the demands of their times, their society and practical life in an unorthodox and pragmatic way. The titles mentioned under (1) and (2) were an extremely sensitive and even dangerous matter. Noltenius issues a peremptory warning in his treatment of hybrid titles of the type *Archidux, Archimareschallus*. Such titles *are* hybrids and some of them *are* barbarian, he says, but he strongly advises against any attempts to use classicistic circumscriptions in order to create a "purer" Latin; the result may be ambiguity and even diminishment of the dignity of the titled people: *Vix enim haec possunt elegantius magisque Latine reddi, ut non dignitati magnorum horum Principum quidquam detrahatur. Quocumque enim modo v.g. vocabulum Archiducis reddideris, vix effugies reprehensionem. Si Magnos Duces vocaveris, pares illos reddes Magno Duci Etruriae, si Supremos Duces a nexu cum Romano Imperio eos absolves,*

⁸⁸ Krister Östlund's study on some Swedish dissertations contains valuable information about vocabulary and phraseology in learned Latin in the middle of the 18th century (Östlund 2000). By means of an unusually broad perspective (more than 70 dissertations have been examined) Östlund has been able to uncover the specific features of this kind of prose.

si Primos duces, hoc quoque insolens erit (Antibarbarus, col. 425). It is stupid, Noltenius goes on, to try to please some grammarians who are so dull-witted that they cannot combine their care for the Latin language with common sense, and thus to prefer to displease princes and insult their majesty in order not to seem to insult the dignity of Priscian: *Stultum est, ut placeas non nullis Grammatistis, qui cum cura Latinitatis rectum de rebus iudicium propter hebetem mentis aciem conjungere nequeunt, Principibus displicere malle, et horum laedere majestatem, ne Prisciani dignitatem laesisse videaris (Antibarbarus, col. 425).*

As regards the domain of warfare, there was an urgent need of terminological innovation because of the introduction of fire-arms and the appearance of fighting units of kinds unknown to the ancients. My impression is that the problems in this area were solved mainly through neologisms of sense, usually in a classical, elegant and unambiguous way. The users of these words were, after all, mostly historiographers, orators and poets. Artillery is *res tormentaria*, a gun is called *canna*, *catapulta*, *machina* or *tormentum*, a musket *sclopus*⁸⁹ and musketry enters the scene as *sclopetarii*. Gunpowder goes under the name of *pulvis bombardicus* (or *ignivomus*, *pyrius* or *tormentarius*). The heavily armoured cavalry are called *cataphracti* (like their late antiquity equivalents), and the dragoons were suitably called *dimachae* (after a type of mounted infantry named δῖμαχαι in e.g. Diodorus Siculus; a word subsequently used by Curtius). A colonel of a dragoon regiment was then a *tribunus dimacharum*.

3.3.5. There are *certain words that are rare in ancient Latin but become popular in Neo-Latin*. That this is so cannot be perceived unless we study a number of authors to get a picture of what is in vogue during a certain period. Let us suppose that we find the word *adorea* (or *adoria*), 'glory', 'distinction (won in war)' in a panegyric work of the 17th century that we are studying and perhaps editing. We will do little service to our future readers if we only remark that this is a word of low frequency in ancient Latin, that it occurs once in Plautus, once in Horace in the classical period and then in some of the archaizing authors (Fronto and Apuleius). The fact is that this noun enjoyed enormous popularity in the 17th century. Just to give a few examples:

J. V. Andreae: ... *quo divino ... favore omnes triumphos Tuos et adoreas superabis*;⁹⁰

⁸⁹ Basilius Faber Soranus (like other lexicographers) believed that *sclopus* was an ancient Latin word, identical with *stloppus* (to be found in Persius 5,13): "*Sclopus sonus est, qui emittitur e buccis inflatis ... Legunt et stloppus; inde ad bombardas minores transfertur.*"

⁹⁰ *Pietatis Germanae ad Gustavum Adolphum alloquium* (1633).

M. C. Sarbievius: ... *non tibi debitael/ Auguste Caesar, reddat adorea/ Palmas, triumphalemque laurum, et/ Populei diadema serti.*⁹¹

Venceslaus Clemens: *Hunc alit eximiae praepinguis adorea famae.*⁹²

Hence, a commentary ought to give information of the high frequency of *adorea*; a mere reference to the few ancient occurrences would create the impression that the 17th-century author had used a rare word, whereas the fact is that the *absence* of this word from a panegyric work of this period would have been remarkable.

There are very many words of this category. The noun *prosapia* means “family”, “lineage”, “race”. In classical Latin it was considered to be an old-fashioned word, as Cicero explicitly states when using it (*Tim.* 39): *ut ... memoremus ... reliquos ... et eorum, ut utamur vetere verbo, prosapiam*. Quintilian mentions *prosapia* among the words that should be avoided because they are hopelessly out of date (1,6,40): (We should not use words) *ab ultimis et iam obliteratis repetita temporibus, qualia sunt ... exanclare et prosapia et Saliorum carmina vix sacerdotibus suis satis intellecta*. He returns to it again in 8,3,26, where he calls it *insulsum (verbum)*.⁹³ We find *prosapia* a couple of times in early ancient Latin (Plautus, Cato). Sallust puts it in the mouth of the uncouth Marius (*Jug.* 85,10), who sneers at *hominem veteris prosapiae et multarum imaginum*. Then it occurs in Suetonius, and in some late ancient writers such as Justinus, Apuleius, Symmachus, Ammian and Prudentius. In Krebs & Schmalz the word is characterized as vulgar (II, p. 375): “es war ein vulgäres Wort, welches Sallust wohl absichtlich dem ungebildeten Marius in den Mund gelegt hat”. This noun, however, clearly belongs to the most central vocabulary of our Neo-Latin authors. There it becomes *the* word and the correct technical term to denote noble ancestry.⁹⁴ Just a couple of examples: when Schefferus wants to say that Erik XIV was guilty of the death of so many innocent men of noble birth, he writes: *tot innocentium caedes ex prosapia illustri natorum ... commissae*.⁹⁵ Pufendorf used the word frequently, as in his description of the ancestry of Charles Gustavus: *Huic igitur Comitum*

⁹¹ *Carm.* 2,1,33 (*Ad Ferdinandum II Caesarem Augustum, cum Thracum copiae excessissent e Pannoniae finibus*). The subject of the sentence is Hercules, whom Ferdinand has surpassed (cf. 2.3 above). The *Thracum copiae* are the Turks, as very often in Neo-Latin poetry. (I have seen them so named in, for example, Bembo, Petrus Lotichius Secundus and Emanuel Swedenborg).

⁹² *Gustavis* 6, p. 118. ⁹³ Cf. Palmer 1954, 136.

⁹⁴ Cf. Krebs & Schmalz 1905-07, II, 375: “Gleichwohl findet es sich im N.L. je nach dem Geschmacke des Schreibers; der jüngere Burmann z.B. spricht von einer *nobilissima prosapia*.” The authors have apparently not realized how frequent the word was in Neo-Latin.

⁹⁵ *Memorabilium Sueticae gentis exemplorum liber singularis* p. 17.

*Palatinorum ad Rhenum prosapia oriundo ad Sceptra Sveciae aditum praebuit non tam sanguis per matrem e Regibus Sveciae demissus, quam favor Christinae Reginae.*⁹⁶

Words expressing the concepts of “lineage”, etc., were of course needed during the hey-day of European nobility, in a period obsessed with pride of birth.

Another word that became very popular was *exantlo* (*exancio*), which was, as just mentioned, condemned by Quintilian as hopelessly out of date. But our heroes during the Renaissance and the following period are constantly said to *exantlare labores*, i.e. perform (with enormous effort) their deeds. This holds true for the glorious kings and princes, but also for learned men who are very often said to get their degrees *post exantlatos labores*.

Likewise, the verb *collimo* (i), a hapax in Apuleius, was frequently used by the best authors, in the sense of ‘aim’. It was believed to be synonymous with *collineare* and to have occurred in Cicero.⁹⁷ I have found it in a great many authors, from all genres, e.g.:

Francis Bacon: *Cum enim diligentiores literarum Coryphaei ad id collimare debeant praecipue, ut arti, quam profitentur, aliquid praeclarum adjiciant ...;*⁹⁸

John Val. Andreae: *Huc unice collimant Saxoniae et Brandenburgi electores;*⁹⁹

John Milton: *pronos numquam collimat ad ictus.*¹⁰⁰

Philological knowledge was growing all the time, however. At the end of the 17th century, Cellarius issued warnings against *collimo* both in his *Antibarbarus* and in his edition of Basilius Faber Soranus (1686); he declared that he had realized that it is a *sordidius verbum*. But as was apparently always the case, authors did not care much. The usage continued for long time: In the middle of the 18th century the verb is still frequent and to be found in abundance, e.g. in Linnaeus's and Swedenborg's works. The impact of dictionaries and manuals quite generally was not great; or rather we should perhaps say that the process of change was very slow. The same holds good in a number of similar instances; I have commented upon this tendency before, in my treatment of orthography above (3.1). Scholars learnt Latin through *imitation* and developed their knowledge in the same way. They spent their

⁹⁶ *De rebus a Carolo Gustavo ... gestis* 1696 p. 5. Cf. also *De jure naturae et gentium* I, I, 18.

⁹⁷ Cf. Krebs & Schmalz 1905-07, I: 269.

⁹⁸ *De augmentis scientiarum*, the 1662 ed., p. 52.

⁹⁹ *Gustavi Adolphi ad Pietatem Germanam suprema verba*, p. 26.

¹⁰⁰ *Epitaphium Damonis* 196. MacKellar 1930, 170.

whole time in a Latin speaking environment, listening to and giving lectures and public speeches in Latin, reading practically everything they read in Latin books.

3.3.6. The *Geographical names* must always be handled with utmost care. A good introduction to the problems in this area will be found in IJsewijn 1998 II: 400 ff. I shall only give some examples here, which I think may illustrate some fundamental principles:

We often have to do with names occurring in the ancient literature, whose exact reference in a certain Neo-Latin author may not be obvious. A good example is *Belgium*, a name which has led many translators of Neo-Latin texts astray. Normally, it refers to the Netherlands, often with the addition *foederatum*. The Dutch may then be called *Belgae foederati* (so Pufendorf). *Utrumque Belgium* then refers to both the Dutch Republic and the Spanish Netherlands (after 1713 the Austrian Netherlands). The actual historical conditions must be carefully studied.

Another elucidating example is *Codanus sinus*, which may refer to either Kattegatt or the Baltic Sea. To decide which of these alternatives we are dealing with, we must pay heed to the context, to other contemporary texts, and to *Atlantes* of the period. In most instances during the 17th century, this name actually seems to refer to the Baltic. Daniel Heinsius and other panegyrists who praised Gustavus Adolphus in 1631 and 1632 mention his march *a Codano sinu ad Confluentes* (or *ad Brigantinum lacum*),¹⁰¹ in which case *Codanus sinus* is of course the Baltic. Hugo Grotius, in his *Historia Gotthorum* (1655), quite unambiguously writes *mare Balticum sive Codanum*. I mention this example because it illustrates a fundamental methodological principle by demonstrating so clearly that it is only by consulting adequate manuals and by *actually reading contemporary Neo-Latin literature* that we can attain knowledge in instances like these. If we believe that it is sufficient to go to the ancient authors, we shall make our field of study *zum fröhlichen Tummelplatz des Unwissens* (to quote Leo Spitzer from another but similar context).

3.4. *Imitation and intertextuality*

3.4.1. *The importance of rhetorical and poetical manuals*

I have several times mentioned the necessity of having at hand manuals of different kinds that mirror the actual level of knowledge of the periods we are studying, e.g. the *dictionaries* that supplied the suitable ancient vocabu-

¹⁰¹ E.g. Du Cloux, pp. 1 and 362.

lary (3.1 above) and the *grammars* that gave information about correctness of language (3.2). We have also seen some examples of important *encyclopaedic works* that contained and organized the world of general knowledge (2.4 above).

In addition to such literature, Neo-Latin writers had at their disposal more special manuals of various kinds designed to guide the process of writing, viz. to assist the authors as far as *inventio* and *elocutio* were concerned: rhetorical and poetical manuals, and collections of *loci communes*, *sententiae*, *florilegia* and *exempla*. Among the *rhetorical works*, Gerhard Johan Vossius's *Oratoriae institutiones* stands out as an all-embracing work in this field (many editions, of which the Leiden imprint of 1643 was considered to be the best). Morhof enumerates over 50 other rhetorical treatises, from early Renaissance and onwards (*Polyhistor* 1,6,1), but gives the palm to Vossius (*primum sibi ante alios omnes locum vindicat*) (*Polyhistor* 1,6,1,22). Vossius's little *Elementa rhetorica* was much used in Protestant Europe, especially in Sweden, where it reigned in the schools and saw many editions (see Hansson 1990, 38 ff.). Important *poetic manuals* were Marcus Hieronymus Vida's *Poeticorum ... libri III* (1st ed. 1527), Julius Caesar Scaliger's *Poetices libri septem* (1st ed. 1561), Georg Fabricius's *De re poetica libri VII* (1st ed. 1584) and Jacobus Pontanus's *Poeticarum institutionum libri tres* (1st ed. 1594). There is a small list containing those just mentioned and a few others in IJsewijn 1998 II:315, with further literature, but the best survey is to be found in Morhof's *Polyhistor*, where we find—as is to be expected—an overwhelming number (1,7,5–20; pp. 1007–1022 in the 4th ed.). The works containing *sententiae*, *loci communes*, *progymnasmata* and the like are innumerable. Morhof treats them in *Polyhistor* 1,1,21 [pp. 236–258 in the 4th ed.], under no less than 120 (!) paragraphs, many of which mention several authors.

Thus, there were explicit generic patterns to follow, there were τόποι and *loci* which were more or less obligatory for every kind of literature. During the last few decades, hosts of scholars have made attempts to show the correspondences of their texts with the demands of literary conventions, often with convincing results. This has been—and always will be—an important work. We have had to struggle with a deeply rooted somewhat naive 'romantic' attitude to literature as being spontaneous and generated by the author's feelings and inner convictions, an attitude that was bound to generate fallacies.

There are dangers, however, in this, I think. *Pro primo*: In our persistent analysis of the texts as products of literary conventions we are threatened with the danger of over-interpretation, viz. we sometimes tend to discern patterns where there is presumably none to be seen. *Pro secundo*: We may neglect the aspect of content, the obvious references to contemporary society

and contemporary ideals and convictions. In other words, we may fail to focus on the ideas and forces that in reality produced the text.

If in a mid-17th-century oration a king is praised for his deeds and victories, and his glorious ancestors are enumerated, it is true that this will be in accordance with the rules of rhetoric, but we must realize that these components are there primarily because they are in agreement with the society of 17th-century Europe, indeed absolutely demanded by the fundamental conditions of power (cf. above 2.5). In the same way: if in a funeral oration or poem of the same period the beloved deceased is said to have been very pious and very virtuous, these statements will in the first place be prompted by the religious teaching of that age, whose piety and orthodoxy were unsurpassable. And if a *naenia* or *lessus* contains expressions of sorrow and hopes of a better life hereafter, such thoughts may even be said to be inspired by feelings that are quite natural for human beings. (I have myself heard such reflections formulated at funerals in rural areas by people who had not attended school more than six years. Had they really studied Scaliger or Vossius?)

3.4.2. *Intertextuality*

In Neo-Latin texts, allusions to the ancients occur in abundance. To trace these and comment upon them will always be an important task of the scholars who edit Neo-Latin authors. There are some methodological desiderata to take into account here, I think. The following seem to me to be important:

(A) *The allusions are often fraught with meaning and rich in associations;* they evoked, in the minds of the learned readers, the whole context of the classical source. Therefore, in very many instances it will not be sufficient just to indicate the source of inspiration in some kind of apparatus. A poem commemorating the opening of the University of Lund in 1668 begins with the words, addressed to the young King, Charles XI (then only 13 years old):

*Carole rex salve, salve rex, alta propago
divinae subolis, magnum Iovis incrementum ...*

As regards these verses, we must not confine ourselves to remarking that the second line¹⁰² is a slightly manipulated loan from Virgil's *Bucolica* 4,49, without further explanation. The point is that the words are taken from the so-called Messiah eclogue; in reality they are meant to indicate that Charles's reign will bring with it a new Golden Age. The stately phrase thereby sets the frame of reference and gives the key-note for the whole poem. A commentary on these lines also ought to mention that references to the Fourth

¹⁰² The first line was probably inspired by Lucretius 1,42.

Eclogue occur very often in inaugural addresses at the universities, in homages to a new rector, etc. When Johannes Gartman became Rector of Uppsala University in 1678, Olof Hermelin, after some introductory lines, declared his belief in the future: *Te duce si qua manet priscae dementia mentis ...*, with a quotation from line 13 in the Messiah eclogue.¹⁰³ The examples could easily be multiplied.

Databases can help a great deal, but during the recent few years I have gained the impression that some scholars rely too much on such resources. Parallels are being quoted that are not very convincing (but found by the computer), and, conversely, obvious references that are of great significance are being overlooked, just because we are not dealing with a *verbatim* quotation, not even in a paraphrase, but sometimes just with the imitation of a structure or even only the ethos of a writer. Just two examples from the historiography of the 17th century: Joh. Widekindi's great historical work, *Historia belli Sveco-Moscovitici decennalis*, begins with a *prooemium* containing the magnificent sentence *Opus nascitur causa grave, consiliis multiplex, difficile iudicio, animorum affectibus, et rerum eventu varium* (p. 3), which must be intended to echo Tacitus' *Hist.* 1,2 *Opus aggredior opimum casibus, atrox proeliis, discors seditionibus, ipsa etiam pace saevum. Quattuor principes ferro interempti; trina bella civilia, plura externa ...* etc. Samuel Pufendorf's history of the wars of Charles X Gustavus opens up in a similar way, inspired no doubt by the same source: *Caroli Gustavi Regis Svecorum res gestas condere aggredior, opus paucos quidem annos complexum, sed arduum ac varium magnitudine eventuum, difficultate negotiorum, successuum vicibus. Concussi validissimi populi, duorum Regum alter extra fines regni sui ejectus, intra Regiam obsessus alter ...* etc. (*De rebus a Carolo Gustavo ... gestis* 1696, p. 5).¹⁰⁴ The computers will not easily help us in such instances.

The conclusion is that we have to read the ancient authors, which is anyhow what ought to be the first occupation of a Latinist.

(B) *The intertextual play comprises many levels.* We must also realize that Neo-Latin authors also borrowed from other Neo-Latin authors.¹⁰⁵ The leading idea in Morhof's *Hyle Inventionum Poeticarum* is to recommend to his readers, under each genre, a great number of good humanist authors, from

¹⁰³ *In fasces Academicos Dn. Johannis Gartman.* The poem is printed in Schyllbergs's *Prodromus*, pp. 2 f.

¹⁰⁴ We should not wonder at Tacitus being imitated by historians. During the period from c. 1580 to 1680 Tacitus was regarded by many as *the* historian of the classical world. Partly this was due to the influence of Justus Lipsius. Cf. Burke 1966. Karen Skovgaard-Petersen has shown how the Dutch-Danish historiographer Johannes Meursius very closely imitates Tacitus. See Skovgaard-Petersen 1995, 215 ff.

¹⁰⁵ For this type of complex intertextual play, see Ludwig 1993.

early Renaissance to his own time, whose works may be suitable models for the writing of poetry (*Polyhistor* 1,3,12). (So what Morhof does in this area is primarily not to prescribe rules but to recommend good writers.) The sources of influence are consequently many, primarily, I would say, the following: (a) the ancient authors; (b) the humanist authors deliberately read as models; (c) the literature that was studied in the various disciplines; and (d) all the occasional eloquence, all the poetry, all the learned lectures and discourses and debates that these scholars met with in their daily life, all the Latin that sounded around them all the time.

4. *Concluding remarks*

As stated in the introduction (1.1), the existence of Neo-Latin literature long seemed to be almost forgotten. To some modern scholars who do not know Latin, oblivion has in a way been merciful. In the long run, however, it will be impossible to support the myth that the study of European culture can be maintained without the knowledge of Latin.

Against the background outlined above, the reasons for the study of Neo-Latin texts should after all be obvious to everyone. Here we are dealing with a Latin literature that is absolutely vital for the understanding of the development of European mentality and the growth of knowledge from the Renaissance and onwards. All Latinists ought to be aware of the role played by Latin during these centuries; and a considerable number of Latinists will in fact be needed for the exploration of this vast field of learning.

In the light of the above, it is self-evident that the study of classical Latin must be the foundation of the scholars who devote themselves to Neo-Latin. The classical study must in fact accompany a Neo-Latin scholar all the time. There is consequently no *via regia* to this area of work. The ideal situation for a Latinist will in fact be to be active in both the classical and the Neo-Latin fields. To many classical scholars the new domain of study will offer new possibilities. There *are* those who have begun to feel that they want some change and that they do not want to *recoquere cramben eandem centies*.

It is also evident that Neo-Latin texts must be understood as expressions of the aspirations of Early Modern Europe, as has been argued above in section 2. The diachronic perspective is fundamental. The texts should be read as testimonies to the changing and dynamic conditions under which they were produced. A Neo-Latin author must also always be studied from a synchronic perspective, in comparison with other contemporary writers, as I have tried to show in section 3.

To conclude: there are more things between 1400 and 1800 than are dreamt of in our philology. Scholars of various disciplines are becoming gradually more and more conscious of the existence of Latin texts that form

the basis of their own disciplines. Latinists will be needed in fruitful interdisciplinary work with the aim of elucidating hitherto neglected areas. In addition, the usefulness of classical education will become the more apparent.¹⁰⁶ Great tasks and challenges lie ahead which will necessarily provide stimulus and vitality to classical studies. *Et dubitamus adhuc virtutem extendere factis?*

COMMENTS

JULIA GAISSER

Hans Helander's paper differs not only in subject matter, but also in kind, from that of Minna Skafte Jensen, which was the subject of last year's *SO Debate*, since it presents not a position on a specific question within a specific sub-discipline, but rather a review or survey of an entire field. Last year, "Dividing Homer: When and How were the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* Divided into Songs?" This year, "Neo-Latin Studies: Significance and Prospects."

The difference is significant. The field of Neo-Latin is still in the process of defining itself, and it is both too new and too diffuse to have produced specific questions and controversies that would engage more than a small number of specialists. To put it another way: scholars have been discussing the ins and outs of Homeric composition for two hundred years, but comparable questions in Neo-Latin studies have not yet been identified and agreed upon. At this point our important questions must still be of a very general nature. Most interesting, to me at least, is how we should describe and classify our field. Is Neo-Latin a separate discipline? Can it be? Should it be? How is it related to already established disciplines that deal with the period from c. 1300 to 1800? These matters have been touched on in various ways by several recent studies, including IJsewijn 1990, IJsewijn and Sacré 1998, Ludwig 1997, De Smet 1999, and Ford 2000.

Helander does not directly address the question of defining Neo-Latin as a discipline, but his whole discussion makes the difficulty and importance of the matter clear. He well achieves his purpose of demonstrating the temporal and spatial extent of Neo-Latin and its vital importance to the understanding of almost every aspect of European intellectual history, including the-

¹⁰⁶ The whole situation has recently been summarized by Walther Ludwig in a most clarifying way (Ludwig 1997, 324): "Die neuzeitliche lateinische Literatur ist heute noch in vielen Bereichen eine *terra incognita*. Ihre Kartographierung, die auf Schritt und Tritt zu neuen Entdeckungen führt, ist nicht nur für einen an der Forschung interessierten Latinisten fesselnd und befriedigend, sie bedarf auch des Latinisten bzw. des Klassischen Philologen, da nur er die sprachlichen Voraussetzungen und die Kenntnis der antiken Literatur mitbringt, die für ein Verständnis neuzeitlicher lateinischer Texte notwendig sind."

ology, philosophy, science, political thought, education, law, and literature. These points have been made before, but they are important enough to deserve restatement, and one can only applaud his assertion that the idea “that the study of European culture can be maintained without the knowledge of Latin” is a “myth.” The very pervasiveness and centrality of Neo-Latin, however, forces us to question its status with regard to other fields. Can we conceive of Neo-Latin as a single or separate discipline when for half a millennium it was a primary vehicle for every aspect of the intellectual history of all the European nations—and spilled over into the New World as well? Neo-Latin is always a part of something else, and usually of several things at once.

Helander understands this, of course, and he argues quite cogently that Neo-Latin texts both rise out of the interests of their particular society (I would say societies) and reflect “the basic convictions of their various times [p.5].” His own focus is the history of ideas: his long central section on the development of major intellectual, political, and scientific assumptions and ideas is the most valuable part of the article, providing a lucid and helpful guide for anyone trying to make out the shape of the forest from the separate trees of individual Neo-Latin texts. But Helander's emphasis on large themes that cross national boundaries also allows him to skirt the relation of Neo-Latin texts to *specific* times and places and to vernacular literature and culture. These relations vary with the writer, the genre, and the subject; and we cannot lay down a hard and fast definition that will apply equally to every text. Sometimes we will be able to proceed as if (or almost as if) Neo-Latin were discrete and self-contained; at other times our subject will force us to take an interdisciplinary or multi-disciplinary approach.

My own instinct is to think that the medium of expression by itself is not enough to define a discipline: a student of sixteenth-century Neo-Latin poetry written in France or Italy, for example, will have far more intellectual common ground with scholars of French or Italian literature or history or art than with scholars of eighteenth-century Latin scientific or legal writing. We should acknowledge the fact that Neo-Latin is too broad and deep for simple definition. It must assert its place in the whole study of European culture—a task that will be both easier and more difficult than it might have been a generation or so ago. Easier, since the boundaries of all disciplines are becoming increasingly fluid and permeable, and hence more open to new methods and subject matter. More difficult, because of an ever dwindling number of scholars trained in Latin and an ever dwindling support for the humanities in both Europe and North America. At present, however, for individual scholars with the necessary skills, Neo-Latin's lack of a fixed identity is both a strength and a stimulus to research. Almost all of us in Neo-Latin

are immigrants from somewhere else, and the texts we study constantly force us to look outside our previous experience—to scholarship and colleagues in other fields, to new questions and approaches. The process is sometimes daunting, but if it keeps us off balance, it also keeps us on our toes.

My greatest criticism of Helander is that his discussion implies a unity for Neo-Latin studies that they do not possess. The history of ideas is an appropriate field for all students of European culture, including Neo-Latinists. But it is not the only appropriate field, and Helander's focus on tracking major concepts and scholars, while bringing together much material from different genres and periods, still leaves out too much. He asserts that: "The Neo-Latin works that deserve our attention ... are in the first place those written by the leading scholars of each age, men who most often took part in the turmoil of events and in the intellectual, political, and scientific debates." One could certainly object to this definition on the grounds that Neo-Latinists should not be creating a canon at the very moment when other scholars of European culture are revising and dismantling them. More important, however, is the fact that the description makes no room for literature and literary studies, social history, or writings of those not engaged "in the turmoil of events," including women (for the last, see King and Rabil 1983, King 1991, Robin 1997, 2000). To ignore any of these subjects is to exclude Neo-Latin from major areas of contemporary scholarship.

Helander does consider poetry and other literature, but as a vehicle for the major concepts of the society in which it was written. Speaking as someone whose interests are in poetry, "belles lettres," and reception, I would revise the idea, to say that a work of literature not only expresses, but is shaped by the ideology, ideas and world view of a particular time and place, and that understanding these ideas is essential for interpretation. Contemporary literary theorists would put it differently. Here is Fowler 1997, p. 14 (he is speaking of intertextuality, but his remarks apply equally well to ideology):

We do not read a text in isolation, but within a matrix of possibilities constituted by earlier texts [*I would add, "and by contemporary ideology"*], which functions as *langue* to the *parole* of individual textual production: without this background, the text would be literally unreadable, as there would be no way in which it could have meaning.

But understanding the *langue* is only the first step. To take a classical example: the *Aeneid* has much to teach the reader about Augustan ideology; conversely, a knowledge of Augustan ideology is necessary for reading the *Aeneid*. But to interpret the poem as a specific work of literature (Fowler's "*parole*"), one must not only recognize Augustan ideas, but also place them in a context of narrative, symbolism, imagery, and complex self-referential and intertextual allusion.

Helander treats intertextuality—oddly, I think—under the rubric of language, along with orthography, morphology, vocabulary, and geographical names. The section on language is extremely valuable—not least in its insistence that we consider words in their contemporary context and not merely as aberrations of classical usage. Intertextuality, however, deserves a separate and far more detailed discussion. Helander treats classical and Neo-Latin allusions quite differently, noting that the context of the classical source is important for the meaning of the allusion, but merely pointing to the use of Neo-Latin authors as models. The matter is more important and complex. Neo-Latin and classical allusions are not necessarily different in kind. Moreover, many classical allusions are filtered through Neo-Latin works, acquiring new meanings and contexts in the process (see Gaisser 1993, 193–254). For intertextuality and allusion see Pasquali 1951, Pigman 1980, Greene 1980, Conte 1986.

The prospects for Neo-Latin research are great, as Helander notes. But we also have many needs: more texts, additional venues for publication (but note the advent of two new journals in the last year or so: *Neulateinisches Jahrbuch* and *Les Cahiers de L'Humanisme*), a unified on-line bibliography (which would also include work in modern European languages from 1300 to 1800), more Latinists, and more support for the humanities. I will end optimistically, on a personal, intertextual note, happily seconding Helander's quotation from Plato's *Phaedo* as it appears in the last line of a twentieth-century American Neo-Greek work, the Bryn Mawr College Hymn:

καλὸν τὸ ἄθλον καὶ ἐλπὶς μεγάλη

Bryn Mawr College
Departments of Greek and Latin

YASMIN HASKELL

The Columbus Paradigm—or Complex?—in Neo-Latin Studies

In an eye-opening discussion (§3), full of insights gleaned from his own wide reading, Professor Helander indicates some of the opportunities that beckon—and dangers that lurk ...—over the largely uncharted seas of Neo-Latin lexicology and morphology. Even more interesting than the mere recognition of linguistic deviance from classical norms is the practical use to which such knowledge can be put in *exploring our texts*. (The necessity of reading the original texts, of not taking shortcuts, is a point repeatedly and rightly stressed by Helander.) There are indeed 'many more things between 1400 and 1800 than are dreamt of in our philology'. Long-forgotten grammars and dictionaries have a real instrumental value; along with commonplace books, manuals and treatises on rhetoric, poetics and education,

they can help us navigate the literature and mentalities of the early-modern world.¹⁰⁷ After all, we Neo-Latinists love nothing better than *discovery*. Discovery has always been one of the chief delights of IJsewijn's *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies*. New texts and new perspectives on ancient texts: that is what led us to Neo-Latin studies in the first place, many of us from the mother discipline of Classics.

One of the main strengths of Professor Helander's paper is the attention he pays to the wealth of 'non-belletristic' literature in Neo-Latin; he emphasises the fact that Latin existed as a learned and scientific language long after it had ceded its primacy to the vernacular in the literary sphere.¹⁰⁸ But he also seems to share De Smet's (q.v.) vision of Neo-Latinists operating from within, and challenging the boundaries of, traditional Classics departments (§4). I wish I could be so optimistic. For one thing, Classics as a discipline in the modern university has its own urgent battles to fight. In the English-speaking world, at least, instruction in the ancient languages is giving way everywhere to courses on classical myth, civilisation, and literature in translation; positions for 'pure' philologists are increasingly rare, and many modern departments view Neo-Latin with suspicion, if they are aware of it at all. It is not uncommon for classicists to be ignorant of the distinction between medieval and Neo-Latin. In Britain, there have always been Neo-Latin colonies in Oxbridge (and latterly, at the University of Warwick), but by no means all, or even most, British scholars active in Neo-Latin studies are currently affiliated with Classics departments. It is, of course, important for Neo-Latinists, especially Neo-Latinists working on literary topics or on the reception of ancient texts, to keep one foot rooted in the ancient world, but if we are also to be the bearers of more recent traditions—historiographical, juridical, political, religious, philosophical and scientific ...—we should seriously ask ourselves whether our shoulders, viz. the shoulders of classicists, are broad enough. In the past when classicists moonlighted as Neo-Latinists they ran the risk of being seen as dabblers and dilettantes. Today we run that risk again when we turn our classical telescopes on so many enticing New Worlds, worlds which our mere mastery of the Latin language seems to reveal to

¹⁰⁷ Helander recovers one such piece of useful pedagogic driftwood in Morhof's *Polyhistor literarius, philosophicus et practicus*. See also Ann Moss, *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996); Neil Kenny, *Curiosity in Early Modern Europe: Word Histories* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1998).

¹⁰⁸ See further: Isabelle Pantin, 'Latin et langues vernaculaires dans la littérature scientifique européenne au début de l'époque moderne (1550–1635)', and Ann Blair, 'La persistance du latin comme langue de science à la fin de la Renaissance', both in *Sciences et langues en Europe*, ed. Roger Chartier and Pietro Corsi (Paris, 1996).

us. More importantly, we run the risk of *not being seen at all*.¹⁰⁹ Professor Helander writes from experience in recommending interdisciplinary work, which, I would argue, is not only desirable, but crucial to our material and intellectual survival. Neo-Latinists have much to offer modern linguists, historians of art, science, philosophy, political theory, etc, and exposure to the preoccupations and methodological premises of other disciplines can only illuminate our own.¹¹⁰

But perhaps it is premature, if not inappropriate, to describe Neo-Latin studies as a *discipline*. Professor Helander's paper attests to the rapid expansion of our field over the last fifty years and to the availability of some excellent new research tools;¹¹¹ new journals and series of editions and translations have been founded;¹¹² lively discussions have crystallised around major figures (Ficino, Bruno, Erasmus, More, Lipsius, Kircher ...), ideological groups (humanists, the *res publica litterarum*, Jesuits, women writers, libertines ...), and 'genres' (epistolography, historiography, autobiography, mythography, fiction, satire, travel writing ...); clever younger scholars are being recruited in growing numbers. We can call ourselves 'Neo-Latinists' and feel confident that perhaps a thousand people in the world know what that means. It is important to have and affirm this sense of corporate identity, if for no other reason than to ensure our visibility and viability within academe. That said,

¹⁰⁹ Though written for philologists, Thomas Haye's *Das lateinische Lehrgedicht im Mittelalter* (Leiden: Brill, 1997) would repay the attention of historians of science. See my essay review in *Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science* 31 (2000): 173–88. (Haye also treats a selection of 'Renaissance' and early-modern poems and has interesting things to say about periodisation).

¹¹⁰ Helander himself has recently collaborated on an edition of William Turner's *Libellus de re herbaria novus* (1538) with Mats Rydén and Kerstin Olsson (Uppsala, 1999). Historians of science should profit, for example, from the translation of the Latin correspondence of Carolus Linnaeus by Tomas Anfält, Eva Nyström, Ann-Mari Jönsson and Toon van Houdt (URL: <http://www.c18.org/pr/lc>).

¹¹¹ To Helander's near-comprehensive list I would add: *Centuriae Latinae. Cent une figures humanistes de la Renaissance aux Lumières offertes à Jacques Chomarat*, réunies par Colette Nativel (Geneva, 1997), with further volumes projected.

¹¹² The *Neulateinische Jahrbuch* and *Les cahiers de l'humanisme* join the pioneering *Humanistica Lovaniensia*. New text series include the 'I Tatti Renaissance Library' (Harvard, MA); 'Neo-Latin Texts and Translations' (Tempe, AZ); 'Noctes Neolatinae' (Bonn); 'Library of Renaissance Humanism' (Signal Mountain, TN); 'Bibliotheca Latinitatis Novae' (Assen). Some of the texts commissioned are already well-known. 'I Tatti', for example, aims to publish the classics of Renaissance humanism, and the first volume in the series 'Bibliotheca Latinitatis Novae' was an anthology of Milton's Latin poetry by John Hale (author of the acclaimed *Milton's Languages: The Impact of Multilingualism on Style* (Cambridge, 1997)). There are also exciting opportunities for striking new gold, and thus for transforming intellectual landscapes across several disciplines.

there is no getting away from the fact that 'Neo-Latin' lacks the firm and confident disciplinary boundaries of 'Classics', or even 'Renaissance Studies'.

Neo-Latinists might have a better chance of engaging their dinner companions on topics of mutual interest than, say, delegates at a conference on the 'Classical Tradition', but there is as yet no generally accepted Neo-Latin canon, much less a coherent programme of research objectives. This has something to do with the relative youth of the subject, but also, paradoxically, with the age and experience demanded of its practitioners. For several reasons Neo-Latin has tended to be the preserve of graduates. The study of original texts, for which few bilingual editions exist, presupposes an advanced level of linguistic competence. Latin apart, secondary and contextual literature must be consulted in languages not the student's own. Documents must be accessed in out-of-the-way libraries, usually out of bounds to undergraduates. Above all the Neo-Latinist requires a mature sense of intellectual geography, of knowing where to look for buried treasure and how to go about finding it, often without much in the way of structured, institutional guidance. An experimental Neo-Latin paper will shortly be offered to undergraduates in Cambridge under the auspices of the Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages (not Classics!), but it will be years, presumably, before these students are ready to sample the sophisticated fare on Professor Helander's smorgasbord. To state the obvious, the graduates and mature scholars who undertake research in Neo-Latin studies—or, at least, research which requires the reading of Neo-Latin texts—are, to date, not formed in Neo-Latin departments. Some hail from disciplines other than Classics. I suggest that we cannot afford to be too fussy about their provenance, that we should embrace the variety of experience which their different backgrounds can bring to bear on the multitude of texts inviting attention. It goes without saying that the professed Neo-Latinist must be a competent Latinist, but perhaps it is too much to ask that every Neo-Latinist be an active classicist.

I would submit, then, that Neo-Latin is best conceived not so much as a *terra nullius* to be colonised by classicists with wanderlust, than as a *vehicle* for encounters, on multiple fronts, with the history and culture of Europe since the Renaissance. While some Neo-Latinists may operate effectively within the borders of the classical homeland, others may have an aptitude for, as it were, missionary work, for bringing the message—or rather, the medium—to a wider academic community. Such ambassadors will need to tread carefully, to combat prejudices, old and new, about the pedantry and elitism of Latinists; they must be prepared to learn as well as to teach and will inevitably be transformed by the intellectual cultures with which they come into contact. In short, they will not be Columbuses, but, like the Jesuits in Ming and Manchu China, they will achieve most by demonstrating the ad-

vantages of their technology and by adapting to local circumstances. Will Neo-Latinists ever have a country of their own? In the university, probably not, or at best a marginal one. That said, we are beginning to put roots down on the Internet, and there is nothing to stop us from working towards a more vigorous *Res publica litterarum* online. The Internet is fast becoming a significant venue for the publication of Neo-Latin texts and resources. Its potential as a locus of *interaction*, as a meeting point for the exchange of ideas and information—the checking of references, the confirmation of the dates of rare editions, the physical description of books and other documents—has not yet, I think, been adequately appreciated.¹¹³ Perhaps this will be the final frontier for the ever-enterprising Neo-Latin spirit!

HEINZ HOFMANN

Das zunehmende Halten von Plädoyers für die Notwendigkeit der neulateinischen Studien zeigt, wie prekär die Situation von den Fachvertretern noch stets eingeschätzt wird, obwohl sie gleichzeitig betonen, welchen Aufschwung diese Studien in den letzten 30 Jahren genommen haben und welche wichtige Resultate in Form von Editionen, Übersetzungen, Kommentaren sowie literatur- und sprachwissenschaftlichen Untersuchungen bisher erzielt worden sind. Der vorangehende "Leitartikel" von Hans Helander reiht sich damit in einige andere Beiträge ein, die in jüngster Zeit zu diesem Thema erschienen sind,¹¹⁴ und nimmt eine Problematik auf, die erstmals vor zehn Jahren in der neubearbeiteten Auflage von Ijsewijns *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies* (Ijsewijn 1990) und in den Vorträgen eines 1989 in Rom gehaltenen

¹¹³ The database of Nordic Neo-Latin Literature is well-known to readers of this journal. The editors' choice of an open-ended format, inviting further contributions from visitors to the website, was certainly judicious. (It has inspired this scholar, at least, to work towards publishing an interactive database of Neo-Latin didactic poems on the web. While I have records of over three hundred and fifty of these poems, I am under no illusion that my 'results' are complete. After all, they were collected by an individual, relying on the usual bibliographical aids but also on the serendipities of academic correspondence, antiquarian catalogues, and the browsing of bookshelves. The Internet, on the other hand, holds out the promise of virtual 'bilocation', with all that implies for the facilitation and consolidation of research.) Online resources for Neo-Latinists include Johannes Ramminger's Neo-Latin word list: <http://www.lrz-muenchen.de/~ramminger/index.htm>, and Graesse's *Orbis latinus*: <http://www.columbia.edu/acis/ets/Graesse/contents.html>—the latter to be handled with care in the light of Helander's *caveat* (§3.3.6). The marvellous MARABU (formerly 'Editio Theodoro-Palatina'), a branch of the University of Mannheim's MATEO project, provides online editions of, *inter alia*, Neo-Latin texts by and about women, and of Neo-Latin poetry by German authors ('Camena'): <http://www.uni-mannheim.de/mateo/camenaeng.html>, soon to be linked to the digitized Lewis and Short Latin dictionary and library of classical texts via the Perseus Project of Tufts University.

¹¹⁴ Ludwig 1998, Roloff 1998, De Smet 1999, Hofmann 2000a und 2000b.

Kongresses, unter denen insbesondere auf den langen und reichhaltig dokumentierten Aufsatz von P. L. Schmidt hinzuweisen ist, ausführlich erörtert wurde.¹¹⁵ Helanders Aufsatz berührt sich zudem in manchen Punkten mit meinem eigenen Beitrag, den ich, als ich von den Herausgebern der *Symbolae Osloenses* die Einladung erhielt, mich an der *SO Debate* über Neulateinische Studien zu beteiligen, bereits in Paris und Bonn vorgetragen und für den Druck fertiggemacht hatte. Ich möchte daher im folgenden weniger auf diese Übereinstimmungen eingehen—obwohl ich natürlich sehr glücklich bin, mich mit einem so eminenten Kenner der neulateinischen Literatur in so vielen Punkten eins zu wissen—, sondern einige ergänzende Überlegungen anstellen.

1. Um mit einem scheinbar nebensächlichen Punkt zu beginnen, der jedoch in jüngster Zeit kontrovers diskutiert wurde und zu dem Hans Helander eine dezidierte Position eingenommen hat: der Orthographie. Helander weist zurecht auf das Fehlen orthographischer Konventionen bei neulateinischen Autoren und die daraus resultierende variierende Schreibweise in Manuskripten und Editionen bis ins 18. Jahrhundert hin, und ich würde ihm auch ohne weiteres beipflichten, daß die spezifische Orthographie neulateinischer Autoren interessant ist und sogar etymologische Anschauungen reflektieren kann, wie das von ihm angeführte Beispiel *sylva* < ὕλη zeigt.¹¹⁶ Allerdings möchte ich ihm darin widersprechen, daß es ein schwerer Fehler sei, die Orthographie in modernen neulateinischen Editionen nach dem Standard der Editionen antiker lateinischer Texte—etwa in den OCT- oder Teubner-Ausgaben—zu normalisieren.¹¹⁷ Erstens würde sein Prinzip zu einer diffusen, willkürlichen und letztlich auch für den versierten Lateinleser verwirrenden Orthographie führen; zweitens sollen moderne neulateinische Editionen keine diplomatischen Transkriptionen vorhandener Manuskripte und alter Drucke sein; drittens würde dieses Prinzip beim Vorhandensein mehrerer zeitgenössischer Manuskripte und inkonsistenter Orthographie des Autors selbst und der von ihm beaufsichtigten Drucke (*litus-littus, silva-sylva, coelum-caelum-celum* usw.) sich schnell *ad absurdum* führen; viertens würde eine solche Entscheidung konsequenterweise auch implizieren, daß man die Abkürzungen, Ligaturen und Akzente wieder einführen¹¹⁸ und vor allem die

¹¹⁵ *Filologia* 1993; darin besonders Schmidt 1993.

¹¹⁶ Allerdings ist darauf hinzuweisen, daß nach Walde-Hofmann s.v. *silva* die etymologische Ableitung von ξύλον und ὕλη noch stets die wahrscheinlichste ist.

¹¹⁷ Auch diese standardisierte Orthographie ist eine historische Fiktion, wie die aus der Antike erhaltenen lateinischen Inschriften, Papyri und Codices zeigen, jedoch eine für die *Res publica litterarum* notwendige Konvention, um nicht im Meer der Beliebigkeit zu ertrinken.

¹¹⁸ Zum Problem der Akzente hätte man auf die einschlägigen Studien von Steenbakkers 1994a und 1994b hinweisen können.

Interpunktion der alten Editionen beibehalten müßte, die unseren modernen Interpunktionsgrundsätzen, die (schwierig genug!) ohnehin von Land zu Land verschieden sind, eklatant widersprechen und die Lektüre erheblich erschweren würden; fünftens würde eine Beibehaltung der historisch-individuellen Orthographie eines Einzeltextes in neulateinischen Editionen konträr zur Editionspraxis nationalsprachlicher Texte stehen, bei denen ebenfalls nicht die historische Orthographie und Interpunktion des 17., 18. oder 19. Jahrhunderts beibehalten wird, sondern die in der jeweils gültigen modernen Orthographie gesetzt werden (ungeachtet der derzeit heftigen Auseinandersetzung um die sog. Rechtschreibreform in den deutschsprachigen Ländern). Es führt also kein Weg daran vorbei, wenn man nicht in historistisch-positivistischen Quisquilien versinken will: Auch moderne Editionen neulateinischer Texte sollen sich der standardisierten Orthographie der OCT- und Teubner-Texte anpassen und den Leser nicht durch vermeintlich korrekten orthographischen Schnickschnack verwirren. Eine solche Handhabung der Orthographie und Interpunktion haben z.B. J.Ijsewijn, W. Ludwig, L. Deitz, A. van Heck u.a. empfohlen und in ihren Editionen angewendet,¹¹⁹ und daran sollten sich künftige Editoren halten.

2. Helander hat sehr gut die Bedeutung des Lateinischen als Sprache der neuzeitlichen Wissenschaften und des gelehrten Diskurses verschiedener Disziplinen bis ins 18. Jahrhundert skizziert. Obgleich es nicht sein Ziel war, auch eine Übersicht über die Gattungen der Dichtung und der wissenschaftlichen und literarischen Prosa zu geben (in dem vorgegebenen Rahmen wäre dies auch nicht zu leisten gewesen), sollte auf eine Gattung der neulateinischen Literatur hingewiesen werden, die gegenüber den antiken Vorbildern eine gewaltige Ausdehnung erfahren hat und gleichsam an der Schnittstelle zwischen (schöner) Literatur und Wissenschaft, zwischen *ars* und *scientia* steht: das Lehrgedicht. Der literarische und poetologische Bastard, von Aristoteles aus dem Bereich der Dichtung ausgeschlossen, brachte es dennoch bereits in der Antike zu hohem Ansehen und großer Beliebtheit bei Autoren und Publikum, wie die ansehnliche Zahl erhaltener und die noch größere Zahl uns nur dem Titel nach bekannter Lehrgedichte bis in die Spätantike beweist. Auch im Mittelalter eifrig gepflegt,¹²⁰ experimentierten neulateinische Dichter um die Mitte des 15. Jahrhunderts erstmals mit didaktischen Formen (Gregorio Correr, Basinio da Parma), bis zwischen

¹¹⁹ Ijsewijn 1998, 46 fff.; Ludwig 1977, 73f.; Deitz 1997; vgl. auch Hödl-Wuttke (Hgg.) 1978. Für A. van Heck sei auf seine Editionen der Werke von Enea Silvio Piccolomini (Pius II.) verwiesen: *Commentarii rerum mirabilium*, Città del Vaticano 1984 (*Studi e Testi* 312/3); *De viris illustribus*, Città del Vaticano 1991 (*Studi e Testi* 341); *Carmina*, Città del Vaticano 1994 (*Studi e Testi* 364).

¹²⁰ Vgl. dazu die neue Monographie von Haye 1997.

1490 und 1530 die gleichsam klassischen Lehrgedichte von Pontano, Vida und Fracastoro entstanden, die bis ins 19. Jahrhundert als Modelle für die Gattung dienten. Hatten die antiken Lehrdichter nur die Themenbereiche Landwirtschaft, Astrologie und Astronomie, Jagd und Fischfang, Geographie, Medizin und Pharmakologie, Philosophie und Naturwissenschaften, Metrik und Philologie, Poetik, Kochkunst, Metrologie, Erotik sowie bei den Christen Dogmatik und (christliche) Ethik behandelt, fügten die mittelalterlichen Lehrdichter noch Mathematik, Musik, Kanonistik, Rhetorik, Literaturgeschichte, Mythologie und Schachspiel hinzu und erweiterten das Gattungsspektrum auch innerhalb der antiken Themenbereiche beträchtlich (Veterinärmedizin; Badewesen, Diätetik; Steinkunde, Chemie und Alchemie; Zoologie; Gartenbau; Kalender und Kirchenjahr; einzelne theologische Disziplinen wie Sakramentenlehre, Pastoralleben, Liturgie; allegorisches Lehrepoes). Eine wahre Explosion erlebte dann die Gattung bei den Neulateinern,¹²¹ die nicht nur versuchten, die antiken Lehrdichter in den von diesen behandelten Lehrgegenständen zu übertreffen, sondern auch Lücken, welche die Alten gelassen hatten, auszufüllen, vor allem auf dem Gebiet der Landwirtschaft—man denke an Vergils Aufforderung an künftige Dichter, den Gartenbau ausführlicher zu behandeln (*Georg.* 4, 147f.), der vor allem seit dem 16. Jahrhundert zahlreiche Lehrdichter gefolgt sind—, und dazu die neuen Gebiete, welche die Entdeckungen und der wissenschaftliche Fortschritt erschlossen hatten, ebenfalls im Lehrgedicht nach klassischem Vorbild darzustellen. In der Medizin und Pharmakologie spielte die Diätetik (Ernährung, Gesundheit, allgemeine Lebensführung) eine große Rolle, dazu die Anatomie und die Behandlung einzelner Krankheiten, in der Landwirtschaft der Pflanzenbau, vor allem die neu importierten Genußpflanzen wie Kaffee, Tee und Tabak, die Tierzucht (insbesondere die Seidenraupenzucht), die Teichwirtschaft und die diversifizierte Gutswirtschaft der adeligen Großgrundbesitzer, in der Geographie die Entdeckungen in Übersee, in den Naturwissenschaften die neuen Erfindungen im Bereich der Chemie, Mineralogie und Elektrizität, in Kunst und Technik die Bildenden Künste, neue Technologien wie Schiffbau und Seefahrt und neue Erfindungen (Feuerwaffen, Barometer, Buchdruck) nebst möglichen Erfindungen wie dem Luftschiff, in der Philosophie bestimmte Teilgebiete wie Cartesianismus, Logik, Anthropologie und Seelenlehre; dazu kamen als neue Themen Staats-

¹²¹ Für eine Vorlesung über das neulateinische Lehrgedicht im Sommer 1999 habe ich in kürzester Zeit über 160 neulateinische Lehrgedichte gefunden und bibliographisch verifizieren können Yasmin Haskell erwähnt, sie habe “records of nearly three hundred early-modern didactic poems in Latin alone” (Haskell 1999, 132 A. 4). Wir planen, unser Material in absehbarer Zeit zugänglich zu machen und damit zu weiterer Suche nach neulateinischen Lehrgedichten anzuregen.

lehre und Politik, die verschiedenen Teilgebiete der Pädagogik (Kindererziehung, Ausbildung, Tischzucht, Klosterzucht, Fürstenspiegel) und Formen des Alltagslebens, der Kommunikation und Geselligkeit. Im einzelnen läßt sich freilich eine scharfe Abgrenzung nicht durchführen: Lehrgedichte über Pädagogik und zwischenmenschliche Kommunikation, über Politik und Staatskunde gehören auch in den Bereich der Philosophie und Ethik, solche über Erfindungen zum Teil auch in die Bereiche, in denen sie verwendet werden—so etwa das Barometer in die Landwirtschaft, wie auch die antiken Lehrgedichte über Astronomie (Hesiod, Arat) eine starke pragmatische Ausrichtung auf Landwirtschaft und Seefahrt hatten—, während bei anderen, z.B. den Kalendergedichten über das Kirchenjahr in der Tradition von Ovids *Fasti*, die ja auch kein Lehrgedicht, sondern ein aitiologisches Gedicht in der Tradition von Kallimachos' *Aitia* sind, der didaktische Zweck von anderen Funktionen überlagert sein kann. Schließlich erweiterten die neulateinischen Lehrdichter auch insofern die Gattung, als sie sie in ihren poetischen Experimenten bis an die Grenzen der Fiktion trieben, und veränderten sie auf diese Weise nachhaltig: Augurelli gab—uralter Menschentraum!—Vorschriften für das Herstellen von Gold, die so unpräzis und phantastisch waren, daß alles andere herauskam, nur kein Gold; Fracastoro durchwob seine *Syphilis* mit so zahlreichen Mythen und Erzählungen, daß sie mehr einem Epos als einem Lehrgedicht glich, blieb aber seinen Lesern die wichtigsten Informationen bewußt schuldig, so daß er und Augurelli die Fiktionalisierung des Lehrgedichts betrieben; Vida episierete sein Schachgedicht durchgängig, indem er die Regeln des Spiels anhand der ersten Partie erklärte, die auf dem Olymp nach der Hochzeitsfeier für Herkules und Hebe von Apollo und Merkur gespielt wurde, und Zamagna gab Vorschriften für den Bau eines Luftschiffes, das es damals in Wirklichkeit noch nicht gab, das aber als Möglichkeit denkbar und realisierbar vorgestellt wurde. Gerade das Lehrgedicht ist also eine der interessantesten Gattungen der neulateinischen Literatur, in der die aufregendsten Entwicklungen sich vollzogen, so daß es für mehrere Punkte des von Helander ausführlich thematisierten Aspekts “a world in change” wichtige Erkenntnisse im Hinblick auf “discoveries and invention”, “the progress of knowledge”, “the scientific revolution” und die literarisch-ästhetischen Veränderungen der antiken Gattungstraditionen liefern kann.

3. Ein Aspekt, der in Helanders Exposé meiner Meinung nach zu kurz kam, ist jener der Synchronie von Latein und Volgare. Das gilt sowohl für sein drittes Kapitel über die neulateinische Sprache als insbesondere für das zweite Kapitel über den historischen Hintergrund der neulateinischen Literatur. Das Neulatein in all seinen drei Aspekten als *parole*, *langue* und *littérature* ist nicht nur innerhalb der lateinischen Tradition und des lateini-

schen Kontextes zu sehen, sondern ebenso innerhalb der Umgebung der jeweiligen Nationalsprache und -literatur. Das beginnt damit, daß häufig ein und dieselben Autoren in Latein und ihrer Muttersprache schreiben, und endet mit den von Helander erwähnten Übersetzungen volkssprachlicher Werke ins Lateinische. Dazwischen liegt der unermessliche, in all seinen Verflechtungen kaum abzuschätzende Bereich der Interdependenz von Latein und Volgare in allen europäischen Literaturen: Petrarca's *Canzoniere* hat die neulateinische Lyrik genauso beeinflusst, wie es Catull und Properz, Tibull und Ovid taten; Tasso und Ariost haben die neulateinische Epik ebenso geprägt wie Vergil und Claudian, und das gilt noch für eine Reihe anderer Texte und Gattungen, die hier nicht im einzelnen aufgezählt werden können.¹²² Die neulateinische Literatur ist eine supranationale Literatur, die von Angehörigen mehrerer linguistischer Gruppen und Ethnien gesprochen und geschrieben wurde, darin heute vergleichbar dem Französischen und Englischen, das als Literatursprache nicht nur von Franzosen und Engländern allein verwendet wird, sondern auch von Angehörigen anderer ethnischer Gruppen, häufig solchen aus den früheren Kolonialgebieten, in denen das Englische und Französische noch als *lingua franca*, als übergeordnete Amts- und Verständigungssprache, gebraucht wird; die frankophone und anglophone Literatur haben daher eine über das jeweilige Staatsgebiet hinausgehende Verbreitung, die sich noch am ehesten mit jener der neulateinischen Literatur vergleichen läßt, wengleich die Verbreitung des Lateinischen als Literatur-, Wissenschafts- und Verständigungssprache in der frühen Neuzeit relativ gesehen wesentlich größer war als es heute das Englische und Französische sind. Jedenfalls ist die angemessene Berücksichtigung der die Sprachgrenzen überschreitenden Traditionen eine wichtige Aufgabe für alle, die auf dem Gebiet der neulateinischen Sprache und Literatur arbeiten, wenn freilich sie wegen beschränkter Kompetenz sowohl auf latinistischer als auch auf nationalsprachlicher Seite nicht immer adäquat erfüllt werden kann.

4. Damit bin ich beim letzten Punkt angelangt, auf den mich Helanders anregungsreicher Aufsatz gebracht hat: der Umsetzung der Einsichten und Forderungen in die alltägliche Praxis von Universität und Schule. Bereits in meinem o.g. Aufsatz¹²³ hatte ich darauf verwiesen, daß Bewahrung und Pflege des Vermächtnisses der neulateinischen Autoren die Aufgabe von eigens dafür ausgebildeten Neolatinisten sein müsse: denn die Erforschung der

¹²² Für die lateinische Epik in Frankreich im 17. Jahrhundert hat dies Braun 1999 betont und dabei auf meine Ergebnisse in Hofmann 1995b hingewiesen. Vgl. auch Ludwig 1998, 13ff., 18f. und De Smet 1999, 207 ("the close relation that exists between Neo-Latin and the vernacular").

¹²³ Hofmann 2000b, 95f mit Verweis auf Schmidt 1993, 889 ff., bes. 892, der ebenfalls von einer "vertikalen" und "horizontalen" Doppelkompetenz spricht. Auch De Smet 1999 und

neulateinischen Literatur darf nicht länger den Klassischen Philologen und den Neuphilologen überlassen werden, die dafür nur eine Teilkompetenz—die Latinisten für die Sprache, die Neuphilologen für die Epoche—haben und entweder auf sprachlich-literarischem oder epochenspezifischem Gebiet diltettieren, sondern muß Spezialisten anvertraut werden, die die sprachlich-latinistische *und* die epochengeschichtliche Kompetenz in sich vereinen. Analog zur inter- und supranationalen Funktion des Neulatein müßte es daher in *jedem* Literatur- und Sprachwissenschaftlichem Institut einen Neolatinisten (m/w) neuen Zuschnitts geben. Er/Sie hätte einerseits über die Rezeptionsforschung die Verbindung zur antiken und mittelalterlichen Tradition herzustellen, andererseits den nicht unbeträchtlichen neulateinischen Sektor der neueren Literaturen den Studierenden zu vermitteln. Die universitäre Ausbildung dieses künftigen Neolatinisten (m/w) würde—auf einer soliden griechischen Basis—das Studium des Lateinischen in diachroner Perspektive (Klassisches Latein, Spätlatein, Mittellatein und Neulatein, mit Schwerpunkt auf letzterem) mit dem Studium einer (als Hauptfach) oder zwei (als Nebenfächer) neueren Philologien verbinden, und zwar insbesondere der vormodernen Literatur, d.h. der Literatur vor der zweiten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts. Neulateinische (wie auch mittellateinische, aber dies steht hier nicht zur Debatte) Lehrveranstaltungen sollten zudem einen kleinen, aber integralen Bestandteil des Lateinstudiums ausmachen. Damit sollen die Studierenden einerseits einen Blick über den von M. Fuhrmann vor über 30 Jahren beschworenen Antike-“Guckkasten”¹²⁴ hinaus werfen können und eine Ahnung von dem unermesslich weiten Feld der Rezeption der lateinischen Literatur der Antike und Spätantike in der lateinischen Literatur der folgenden 1500 Jahre bekommen; zum andern sollen sie, soweit sie später den Lehrerberuf ergreifen wollen, auf die Behandlung neulateinischer Texte im gymnasialen Unterricht vorbereitet werden, für die sie gegenwärtig noch kaum gerüstet sind, obwohl die Lektüre neulateinischer Texte am Gymnasium zunimmt und dafür schon vereinzelt Schulausgaben und didaktische Anleitungen in den einschlägigen deutschen Fachzeitschriften (*Gymnasium*, *Der Altsprachliche Unterricht*) zur Verfügung stehen.¹²⁵ Mit einer entsprechenden Ausbildung während des Studiums sind die künftigen

Leonhardt 1999 plädieren inzwischen für einen interdisziplinären und komparatistischen Ansatz bei den neulateinischen Studien.

¹²⁴ Fuhrmann 1969; Fuhrmann-Tränkle 1970.

¹²⁵ Vgl. meine kurze Übersicht in Hofmann 2000b, 68f. mit A. 36–38. Von der Situation in den übrigen europäischen Ländern ist mir nur die in den Niederlanden ein wenig vertraut, wo nicht zuletzt meine ehemaligen Groninger Studenten ihre Schüler auch mit dem Neulatein bekannt machen und die Zeitschrift *Lampas* einzelne Aufsätze und ganze Themennummern der neulateinischen Literatur widmet.

Gymnasiallehrer vielleicht auch motiviert und in der Lage, selbst weitere Schulausgaben neulateinischer Texte zu erstellen und Unterrichtsvorschläge und Interpretationen für ihre Kollegen zu erarbeiten. Auf diese Weise kann der Lateinunterricht aus seiner Fixierung auf den "Guckkasten" der Antike und der damit verbundenen Gefahr seiner Isolation befreit und an den Literatur- und Geschichtsunterricht in den neueren Sprachen herangeführt werden, vielleicht sogar an den in den Naturwissenschaften, wenn dort gelegentlich auch über deren historische Rückbindungen gesprochen wird (Friese 1998). Erst wenn das Neulatein auch an den Schulen einen im Verhältnis zum antiken Latein, das selbstverständlich stets an erster Stelle stehen muß, zwar geringeren, aber festen Platz erworben hat, kann wieder von einer zeitgemäßen Neuorientierung der Latinistik und ihrer gleichberechtigten Einbeziehung in den Kreis der übrigen philologischen und historischen Fächer die Rede sein. "Great tasks and challenges lie ahead, which will necessarily provide stimulance and vitality to classical studies": Hans Helander hat recht, und es wäre zu wünschen, daß auch viele andere einsähen, wie recht er hat!

Tübingen

GERLINDE HUBER-REBENICH

In seinem Beitrag zu Bedeutung und Perspektiven neulateinischer Studien verfolgt Hans Helander ein anspruchsvolles Ziel: Er will die enorme zeitliche und räumliche Ausdehnung und die thematische Vielfalt dieses Forschungsgebietes aufzeigen und das Bewußtsein dafür schärfen, daß die in lateinischer Sprache abgefaßten Texte der (frühen) Neuzeit keine von antiquarischem Interesse getragenen Fingerübungen von Stubengelehrten sind, sondern Ausdruck und Reflex der weltbewegenden Neuorientierungen dieser Epoche. Auf diesem Hintergrund betont er die Notwendigkeit der neulateinischen Forschung für das Studium der europäischen Ideengeschichte. Deshalb will er sich in seiner Darstellung vor allem auf solche Texte konzentrieren, die über diese Bereiche Aufschluß geben können und die zum Teil in die Sparte der Fachschriftstellerei gehören, statt sein Augenmerk einmal mehr auf die schon häufiger behandelte neulateinische Literatur im engeren Sinne zu richten, die er dem Umfeld des Poetik- und Rhetorikunterrichts zuordnet.

Helanders Plädoyer für die Berücksichtigung des neulateinischen Schrifttums im Rahmen der geistesgeschichtlichen Forschung ist nur allzu berechtigt. Daß sich der Umfang der neulateinischen Literatur auf 40 Seiten allerdings nur ansatzweise vor Augen führen läßt, ist jedem, der sich mit der Materie auch nur oberflächlich auskennt, klar. So beschränkt sich denn auch Helander auf die Betrachtung einiger ausgewählter Gesichtspunkte

und verweist zur allgemeinen Einführung auf Ijsewijn's *Companion* und Walther Ludwigs Artikel in Grafs *Einleitung*. Ergänzend wären hier zu nennen: A. Rabil jr. (Hg.), *Renaissance Humanism*, 3 Bde., Philadelphia 1988, die Forschungsberichte in E. Follieri (Hg.), *La Filologia medievale e umanistica Greca e Latina nel secolo XX*, 2 Bde., Rom 1993 oder T. O. Tunberg, *Humanistic Latin*, in: F.A.C. Mantello/A.G. Rigg (Hgg.), *Medieval Latin. An Introduction and Bibliographical Guide*, Washington, D.C., 1996, S. 130–136. Besonders die beiden letzteren enthalten hilfreiche weiterführende Bibliographien.

Eine Opposition von poetisch-rhetorischen Texten auf der einen Seite und ideengeschichtlich bedeutsamen auf der anderen, wie Helander sie nahelegt, läßt sich indes nicht aufrechterhalten, führt er doch selbst nicht wenige Beispiele aus formal durchaus 'schulmäßiger' Dichtung an, mit denen er ein neues Selbstverständnis belegen will (z. B. die Columbus-Epen). Die Abgrenzung der beiden Bereiche soll denn wohl auch eher den Ansatz des Beitrages widerspiegeln, bei der Zusammenstellung der Texte nicht nach formalen Kriterien (wie Gattungen, Chronologie oder geographischen Regionen) vorzugehen—ein Prinzip, dem Ijsewijn und Ludwig weitgehend folgen—sondern die 'großen Themen' einer sich wandelnden Welt in zeitgenössischen Texten darzustellen. Grundsätzlich bietet diese Gliederung eine sinnvolle Ergänzung zu den genannten Einführungen und ist dazu angetan, die Relevanz dieser Texte vor Augen zu führen und auch das Interesse anderer Disziplinen an ihnen zu wecken.

Die 'großen Themen' behandelt Helander im 2. Kapitel seines Beitrages. Ausgewählt wurden das neue Geschichtsverständnis 'von *mundus senescens* zu *mundus crescens*' infolge der Entdeckungsreisen und Erfindungen, der damit einhergehende Fortschritt in den Wissenschaften, die Entstehung von Nationalstaaten sowie Reformation und Gegenreformation. Interessant wäre hier auch ein Blick auf die Wirtschaftsgeschichte gewesen, da die neuen ökonomischen Bedingungen keinen geringen Beitrag zu politischen und sozialen Veränderungen leisteten. Beispiele für Reflexe in der Literatur hätten sich leicht finden lassen (z. B. Georg Agricola, *De re metallica libri XII*, Basel 1553).

Ein grundlegendes Manko dieses Kapitels ist, daß Helander durch die Fokussierung der "world in change" den Blick für Konstanten verliert.¹²⁶ Auch in seinen 'Concluding remarks' tritt er lediglich dafür ein, daß sich die Philologen statt nur mit antikem auch mit neuzeitlichem Latein beschäftigen sollen. Das Mittelalter überspringt er und beraubt sich so der Möglichkeit,

¹²⁶ Eine Ausnahme bilden die 'nationalen' Gründungsmythen in Kapitel 2.5.

Kontinuitäten von Diskontinuitäten zu scheiden. So postuliert Helander manches als typisch humanistisch oder neuzeitlich, was im Mittelalter schon vor- oder gar voll ausgeprägt war.¹²⁷ Hier einige Beispiele:

—“Renaissance men lived in a world of correspondences“ (S. 13). Das taten die Menschen des Mittelalters auch. Man denke nur an die Mystik einer Hildegard von Bingen, an die Methode der typologischen Weltdeutung oder an die Mikrokosmos-Makrokosmos-Vorstellung, wie sie etwa im *Planc-tus Naturae* des Alanus ab Insulis zum Ausdruck kommt.

—“The theme of surpassing antiquity seems to me to be one of the most important ...“. Das Überlegenheitsgefühl über die Alten teilten die Humanisten ebenso mit früheren christlichen Schriftstellern wie mit den selbstbewußten Intellektuellen des 12. Jahrhunderts. Seit der Zeit der Apologeten wurde gerade das von Helander zitierte Beispiel des Hercules (S. 13) immer wieder als Exemplum bemüht, um die Superiorität christlicher ‘Helden’ hervorzuheben. Und das auf Bernhard von Chartres zurückgehende Bild von den ‘Zwergen, die auf den Schultern von Riesen sitzen’¹²⁸—und damit den größeren Überblick haben—ist geradezu emblematisch für das Selbstverständnis der scholastischen Elite.

—Im Zusammenhang mit der Herrscherpanegyrik in Kap. 2.5 wäre es interessant, genauer der Frage nachzugehen, ob und inwieweit die (früh)neuzeitliche Preisdichtung in ihrer Topik und ihren thematischen Schwerpunkten tatsächlich von der mittelalterlichen—etwa der karolingischen—abweicht. Die Gesichtspunkte der Herrschaftslegitimation (durch Religionspolitik) und der Verteidigung des ‘wahren Glaubens’ können nicht die unterscheidenden Merkmale sein. In dem Epos *Karolus Magnus et Leo Papa*¹²⁹ wird Karl der Große programmatisch als ‘rex pius’, ‘lumen pietatis’ u. dgl. bezeichnet,¹³⁰ die ‘translatio imperii’ von Rom nach Aachen festgeschrieben¹³¹ und die enge Verbindung des karolingischen Hauses mit dem Papsttum unterstrichen. Natürlich hat Helander recht, wenn er sagt, daß die neulateinische Herrscherpanegyrik nicht nur topisch, sondern auch von aktuellen Konflikten diktiert ist (S. 24). Das gilt aber grundsätzlich für jede

¹²⁷ Vor dieser Gefahr warnte schon J. Ijsewijn, *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies*, Part I, Leuven 1990, S. 22: “Ignorance of medieval Latin literature ... will induce a Neo-Latin scholar into overrating or misinterpreting the novelty of some of the features he finds in his authors”

¹²⁸ Vgl. Johannes von Salisbury, *Metalogicon* III, 4.

¹²⁹ Edition von F. Brunhölzl, in: *Karolus Magnus et Leo papa. Ein Paderborner Epos vom Jahr 799*. Mit Beiträgen von H. Beumann, F. Brunhölzl u. H. Winkelmann, Paderborn 1966, S. 55–97.

¹³⁰ Vgl. z. B. vv. 15, 38–40, 45–46, 415, 463.

¹³¹ Vgl. v. a. vv. 94–136.

Herrscherpanegyrik. Aufschlußreich für den Geist der neuen Zeit wäre es, wenn man wesentlich neue Aspekte innerhalb der Gattung fände oder aber neue Gesichtspunkte der Funktionsweise dieser Art von Literatur. Will man “Epic poems” als “powerful vehicles of nationalistic, royalistic and religious ideas” und—ähnlich wie Flugschriften—als Propagandamittel verstehen, müßte man unbedingt auch die materiellen Voraussetzungen und die gesellschaftliche Infrastruktur berücksichtigen. Die Bedeutung des neuen Mediums Druck und die Frage, welche gesellschaftlichen Gruppen aufgrund ihres Bildungsgrades überhaupt mit solchen lateinischen Texten zu erreichen waren, sollte in diesem Zusammenhang mitbedacht werden.

In Kapitel 2.6. zur protestantischen Reformation und zur Gegenreformation legt Helander den Akzent auf Epik als religiöse Propaganda. Hier hätte aber auch ein Hinweis auf die in dieser Zeit aufblühende christliche Lyrik—wie z. B. die Psalmendichtung des Helius Eobanus Hessus oder Buchanans¹³²—erfolgen sollen. In vielen Fällen entstand diese für den Schulunterricht oder aus diesem heraus, so daß einmal mehr die Trennung von Zeitgeist und poetisch-rhetorischer Übung nicht aufrechtzuerhalten ist. Grundsätzlich hätte es sich angeboten, in diesem Kapitel den Einfluß, den Reformatoren wie Philipp Melanchthon und Vertreter des Katholizismus wie die Jesuiten auf die Bildungspolitik ausübten, zur Sprache zu bringen. Einen Überblick über das umfangreiche theologische Schrifttum der Reformation und Gegenreformation kann Helander im Rahmen seines Artikels natürlich nicht leisten. Aber ein Verweis auf die beiden Antagonisten der konfessionellen Kirchengeschichtsschreibung – Matthias Flacius Illyricus mit seinen *Centuriae Magdeburgenes* und Caesar Baronius mit seinen *Annales Ecclesiastici* – sollte nicht fehlen.

Das 3. Kapitel über formale Aspekte der lateinischen Sprache im Untersuchungszeitraum bietet eine Fülle von Material. Bereits in Abschnitt 1.1 hat Helander auf die Vielfältigkeit der neulateinischen Sprachkonventionen hingewiesen und auf das Fortleben mittelalterlicher Gepflogenheiten insbesondere in den Fachsprachen. Aber zu den erklärten “aims of the present article” gehört eine so umfangreiche Besprechung von Orthographie, Morphologie und Vokabular nicht. Zwar fallen die vorgestellten zeitgenössischen Grammatiken und Lexika unter die Rubrik ‘Fachliteratur’, die

¹³² Vgl. etwa J. A. Gaertner, “Latin Verse Translations of the Psalms 1500–1620”, in: *The Harvard Theological Review* 49 (1956), S. 271–305; K. P. Wald, *Engagierte Dichtung im 17. Jahrhundert. Studie zur Dokumentation und funktionsanalytischen Bestimmung des Psalmendichtungsphänomens*, Stuttgart 1975; I. Bach / H. Galle, *Deutsche Psalmendichtung vom 16. bis 20. Jahrhundert* (...), Berlin 1989; G. Huber-Rebenich, “Der lateinische Psalter des Eobanus Hessus und das Ideal der *docta pietas*”, in: W. Ludwig (Hg.), *Die Musen in Reformationszeitalter*, Leipzig 2001, S. 283–303.

Helander in seinem Beitrag verstärkt berücksichtigen will, und auch der wiederholte Hinweis darauf, daß sich in den Handbüchern der Kenntnisstand der jeweiligen Epoche widerspiegelt, ist richtig. Aber das ganze Kapitel beschäftigt sich weniger mit den methodischen Ansätzen der einzelnen Grammatiker und Lexikographen—was Licht auf das Wissenschaftsverständnis der Zeit werfen würde—als mit den sprachlichen Erscheinungen selbst. Um diese zu illustrieren zieht Helander über die Beispiele aus den Nachschlagewerken hinaus noch zahlreiche Belege aus einzelnen exzerpierten Autoren heran. So gelingt ihm zwar eine anschauliche Charakterisierung neulateinischer Sprachphänomene, aber die Materialfülle überlagert die konzeptuelle Struktur des Beitrags. Helanders abschließende Bemerkung "it is only by consulting adequate manuals and by actually reading contemporary Neo-Latin literature that we can attain knowledge in instances like these [gemeint: sprachliche Erscheinungsformen]" ist zutreffend. Aber das gesamte 3. Kapitel begibt sich auf eine sehr viel 'handwerklichere' Ebene als die vorausgehenden und wird dem Vorsatz, neulateinische Literatur als Ausdruck der Ideengeschichte und eines neuen Wissenschaftsverständnisses zu beleuchten, nicht ganz gerecht.

Zu dem Stichwort 'Sprachkonventionen / überliefertes Formengut' hätte sich ein Überblick über die Anfänge der historisch-kritischen Editionsphilologie angeboten (etwa am Beispiel von Lorenzo Vallas Entlarvung der 'Konstantinischen Schenkung' als Fälschung aufgrund sprachlicher Kriterien),¹³³ der geeignet gewesen wäre, die Relevanz des Gegenstandes für eine bis in die Gegenwart praktizierte Methode zu unterstreichen.

Zu der von Helander genannten Literatur zur neulateinischen Sprache ist der Artikel von Tunberg in: Mantello/Rigg (s.o.) mit seiner 'Select Bibliography' zu ergänzen. Zum Abschnitt 3.3. ('Vocabulary') sei der Hinweis auf das 'Instrumentum lexicographicum' in den *Humanistica Lovaniensia* nachgetragen und ausdrücklich auf das einzige moderne Wörterbuch zur Humanistenprosa hingewiesen (R. Hoven, *Lexique de la prose latine de la Renaissance*, Leiden 1995). Letzteres erscheint zwar in Helanders Bibliographie, wird aber innerhalb der Problematik der neulateinischen Wortschatzerschließung nicht eigens erwähnt.

In Abschnitt 3.4. hebt Helander zurecht 'Imitation and intertextuality' als zentrale neulateinische Ausdrucksform hervor. Unter den Beispielen für zeitgenössische Stil-Handbücher hätten die—zugegebenermaßen in der Forschung vielzitierten—Werke des Erasmus nicht unerwähnt bleiben dür-

¹³³ Vgl. W. Setz (Hg.), Lorenzo Valla. *De falso credita et ementita Constantini donatione* (MGH, Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters; Bd. 10), Weimar 1976.

fen, wirkte ihr Einfluß doch zu prägend auf seine Zeitgenossen und die jüngere Humanistengeneration. Sprichwörter, 'Adagia', in die eigenen Texte einzubauen wurde zeitweilig geradezu zur Manie.¹³⁴ Helanders Warnung davor, in jeder Formulierung nach Intertext zu suchen und darüber den Bezug der Texte zur Realität aus den Augen zu verlieren ist indes berechtigt. Diese Gefahr ist allerdings nicht auf das Gebiet der neulateinischen Literatur beschränkt. Daß eine sinnvolle Durchdringung der intertextuellen Bezüge sich nicht auf (datenbankgestützte) Wortstatistik beschränken darf, sondern eine tiefergehende Interpretation voraussetzt, macht Helander an einigen Textbeispielen deutlich. Zurecht betont er die Vielgestalt möglicher Inspirationsquellen—antike Autoren und zeitgenössische Schriftsteller jeglicher Fachrichtung. Helander betrachtet das Phänomen aber ausschließlich unter dem Aspekt der stilistischen Modellhaftigkeit. Einen wichtigen Gesichtspunkt des Selbstverständnisses humanistischer Autoren läßt er dabei außer acht: Anspielungen gerade auf zeitgenössische Texte dienten auch dazu, die eigene Zugehörigkeit zur *res publica litterarum* oder zu einem bestimmten Zirkel zu demonstrieren. Man war auf dem laufenden, was der und jener geschrieben hatte, und ließ es die Eingeweihten wissen. Die stilistische Orientierung an einem Vorbild wie beispielsweise Erasmus von Rotterdam ist zudem Ausdruck eines Elitebewußtseins und Abgrenzung gegen andere Kreise wie die 'Dunkelmänner'. So weist der Intertext über rein stilistische und innerliterarische Fragen hinaus auch auf eine gesellschaftliche Wirklichkeit.

Helanders Ausführungen sind zwar—wie bei der Fülle und Mannigfaltigkeit des lateinischen Schrifttums nicht anders zu erwarten—im einzelnen ergänzungsbedürftig, bieten aber insgesamt vielversprechende Anknüpfungspunkte für eine themenorientierte Beschäftigung mit neulateinischen Texten. Um die Spezifika dieser Literatur schärfer zu fassen und herauszufinden, in welcher Hinsicht sie wirklich 'neu' ist, sollten künftige Forschungen allerdings den Vergleich mit der mittelalterlichen Tradition stärker berücksichtigen, als dies bisher der Fall war. Das Selbstverständnis der Renaissance Menschen als 'modern' sollte nicht unhinterfragt übernommen werden.

CRAIG KALLENBORG

Professor Helander has provided a splendid overview of the current state of Neo-Latin studies, and I find myself in agreement with almost everything he says. In my brief response, I would like only to propose one additional direction in which I think research in the field might profitably proceed.

¹³⁴ Vgl. z. B. M. Mann Philipps, "Comment s'est-on servi des Adages?," in: J. Chomarat et al. (Hgg.), *Actes du colloque international Erasme* (Tours 1986), Genf 1990, S. 325–336; G. Huber-Rebenich, "Erfurter Humanisten und ihre Vorbilder—Euricius Cordus und Erasmus", in: *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 34 (1999), S. 101–114, hier: 105–7.

In his remarks, Professor Helander generally follows the practice of most Neo-Latinists today in separating the Neo-Latin texts he is considering from the material form in which they have come down to us. To be sure, everyone working in the field is aware, for example, that manuscripts, early printed books, and modern critical editions cannot be treated in the same way. For most Neo-Latinists, however, the modern critical edition is the *desideratum* because in it, the principles of nineteenth and twentieth-century textual criticism purge away corruption and restore the text as the author originally intended it to be. As Jozef IJsewijn observes in the first sentence of the section on “Texts and Editions” in his *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies*, “The solid basis of every sound literary and linguistic study is the text in its *original version*” (original emphasis); “old editions”, as he notes, offer “problems” that modern philology can eliminate.¹³⁵

Outside the field of Neo-Latin, however, not everyone sees it this way any more. Textual critics like Jerome J. McGann and bibliographers like D. F. McKenzie have recently challenged the automatic location of textual authority in authorial intention and approached texts instead as collaborative and socially constructed, the product of the cultural, social, economic, and institutional forces that inevitably affect writing, publishing, and reading (McGann 1983; McKenzie 1999). The need for patronage encourages some lines of thought and discourages others; distribution networks stimulate the dissemination of some books and constrict the dissemination of others; whether a book is written in Latin or the vernacular affects not only whether it can be read by particular individuals, but also what expectations those individuals bring to the reading experience. Modern critical editions remove most of the evidence of this collaborative process, evidence that is preserved in the older editions in which Neo-Latin works originally appeared. The field that guides us in recovering this material, in looking *at* an old book rather than *through* it as we are taught to do by modern reading practices, is generally referred to as *histoire du livre* in deference to the seminal work of Lucien Febvre and Henri-Jean Martin from which it has developed (Febvre and Martin 1976), and I believe that this field offers great promise to Neo-Latin studies at the beginning of the new millennium.

I can only begin to suggest here what can be learned from this approach. In terms of what book historians call “production”, the original manuscript,

¹³⁵IJsewijn 1998, 434, 442. Occasionally IJsewijn is more sympathetic to what the older editions have to offer (*v. e.g.* 447), but even here a bias in favor of traditional textual criticism and modern critical editions returns by the proverbial back door: “In many cases complete critical editions of these texts are not to be expected in a foreseeable future, but even when they are available, *the old editions will not become entirely useless ...*” (460; my emphasis).

the *editio princeps*, and the early reprints that followed generally contain a great deal of information that modern editors pass over: one or more dedications to potential or actual patrons, prefatory letters from a printer who highlights what he sees as valuable in the work or an editor who explains what has been done to the text and why, indices that show which concepts were originally considered important, and so forth. Sometimes an *imprimatur* or *nihil obstat* can suggest that compromises were made with the ecclesiastical authorities, and the name of a printer like Aldo Manuzio or Henri Estienne carried the same intellectual flavor in the sixteenth century as, for example, Cambridge University Press carries today. Few books were written in true isolation, and books viewed as objects offer important clues about the negotiations that went on between their authors and the powerful individuals and institutions around which they lived and worked.

The second concern of book historians, “distribution”, also affects Neo-Latin studies, for as Professor Helander rightly points out, the relevant texts are best understood within the general framework of the history of ideas, and we need to know precisely which books were available in a given place to pursue this work responsibly.¹³⁶ Old book catalogues and library lists can provide invaluable resources here,¹³⁷ although they must be used with caution: a book can be offered for sale and even purchased without ever being read. But recent work on ecclesiastical censorship, for instance, suggests that much received wisdom regarding book distribution is in need of revision. The Index is supposed to have shut off the circulation of dangerous books in Catholic countries, but banned texts regularly turn up even in ecclesiastical institutions and books written by Protestant authors were often reprinted anonymously in France and Italy.

But it is in the third area of book history, “consumption”, that much of the work that is most relevant for Neo-Latin studies is being done. Who bought Neo-Latin books, and how were they read? Many early owners left their names in their books, and something can often be found out about these owners through provenance research (See Pearson 1994). Early books were generally sold unbound, so that how their early owners chose to have them bound is significant: Anthony Hobson, for example, has shown how classical antiquity influenced Renaissance binding taste in the same way as it influenced textual production (Hobson 1989). And many early readers left notes in their books, showing us something of how they read and what they

¹³⁶ For a fascinating example of how attention to book history can reorient traditional intellectual history, see Johns 1998.

¹³⁷ A good introduction to how this material can be used is Taylor 1986.

valued. Recent catalogues produced according to the latest bibliographical standards facilitate this sort of study; the catalogue of the collection of annotated books formed by Bernard Rosenthal is especially noteworthy as a contribution to Neo-Latin studies, both for the number of books it contains that were written in Latin and for its careful analysis of the handwritten marginalia in them (Rosenthal 1997)—marginalia that, when written in Latin, themselves become a legitimate object of study for a Neo-Latinist.

As I have suggested elsewhere, production, distribution, and consumption are in the end inseparable. The sixteenth-century commentary to Virgil's *Georgics* written by Iodocus Willichius was an unproblematic volume in Protestant Germany, but was not supposed to be read by Catholics until it had been expurgated. It was printed six times in late sixteenth-century Venice—itsself an unexpected phenomenon—but then withdrawn from later Virgil editions by the printers who had first published it there, suggesting how distribution problems could stifle production of texts (Kallendorf 1999, 131–39). Another example: a book entitled *Sententiae et proverbia ex poetis Latinis ... in communem puerorum usum*, published in Venice in 1547 without the name of either an author or a printer, turns out to have been written by Robert Estienne, whose skirmishes with the Catholic church ended when he fled to Geneva and converted to Calvinism. My copy of this book contains the clues that allowed me both to discover who wrote it and to figure out why it was reprinted anonymously in Venice, to use this book to show that books and ideas in fact moved more freely in sixteenth-century Europe than we might have expected, and to recover enough information about the target audience of the original work—it was designed for school use, as an aid to the production of commonplace books—to understand why its Venetian publisher was willing to risk fines and imprisonment for the opportunity to tap this potentially lucrative market.¹³⁸ I cannot envision that this book will ever receive a modern critical edition or a reproduction in facsimile, but even if it did, much of what we need to know to understand its place in the Latin culture of its day would disappear in those formats.

In the end, book history offers what I see as a valuable supplement to the principles articulated so eloquently by Professor Helander. As he says, “Neo-Latin texts were generated by the needs and demands of the society in which they were written, and ... mirror and express the basic convictions of their various times”. The early books in which these texts have been transmitted also reflect social needs and demands, and if we can learn to see the traces of these needs and demands in the physical books as well as in the texts they

¹³⁸I have worked through the problems posed by this book at length in Kallendorf 2000.

carry, these pre-modern volumes will offer Neo-Latinists opportunities rather than problems.

Texas A&M University

WALTHER LUDWIG

Gedanken zu Hans Helanders Essay

Gebeten, mich zu dem Aufsatz von Professor Helander zu äußern, möchte ich zuerst meine ungeteilte Bewunderung und meine prinzipielle Zustimmung zu dem ausgezeichneten Aufsatz ausdrücken, der Bedeutung und Notwendigkeit neulateinischer Forschungen durch Klassische Philologen so eindringlich vor Augen stellt und so überzeugend vor allem auf drei Desiderate hinweist: die Beschäftigung mit der wissenschaftlichen Literatur des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts, die Erforschung der lateinisch kommunizierten politischen, kulturellen, religiösen und philosophischen Ideen der frühen Neuzeit und die Untersuchung der Abweichungen der neuzeitlichen lateinischen Sprache von der antiken in Grammatik und Wortschatz. Ich könnte den mir zur Verfügung gestellten Raum darauf verwenden, besonders beachtenswerte Gedanken und besonders treffende Formulierungen aus diesem Aufsatz zu unterstreichen, aber, wie ich kürzlich las, "nichts ist in einer Talkshow so langweilig wie Menschen, die der gleichen Meinung sind". Ich will mich deshalb bemühen, einiges zu ergänzen und manchmal auch, möglichen Mißverständnissen vorbeugend, zu präzisieren oder zu modifizieren.

In der Klassischen Philologie ereignete sich in der zweiten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts eine Revolution. Als ich um die 50er Jahre studierte, waren neulateinische Themen in Deutschland (ich bitte mir diese geographische Begrenzung zu konzederen) nirgends im Lehrangebot. In Tübingen sprach mein Lehrer Wolfgang Schadewaldt etwas geringschätzig nur vom "Eloquenz-Humanismus" der Renaissance; mein Lehrer Otto Weinreich erwähnte in seiner Catull-Vorlesung immerhin Janus Secundus, aber nur wegen der Motivtradition in den *Basia*. Die neuzeitliche lateinische Literatur lag außerhalb des Interessenfeldes eines Klassischen Philologen. Jetzt, im Jahr 2000, gibt es in fast allen Universitäten des deutschsprachigen Raumes mindestens einen Klassischen Philologen, der auch im neulateinischen Bereich forscht und mehr oder weniger regelmäßig Lehrveranstaltungen dazu anbietet. Die Veränderung ist seit den 60er Jahren nicht so rasch erfolgt, wie einzelne es erwarteten. Aber es ist stetig immer mehr Klassischen Philologen bewußt geworden, daß die lateinische Literatur eine über 2000-jährige Dimension hat und es unsere Aufgabe auch ist, zu der Entdeckung der neuzeitlichen Latinität beizutragen. Noch aber haben zahlreiche Klassische Philologen der alten synchronen altertumswissenschaftlichen Orientierung die diachrone sprach-, literatur- und kulturgeschichtliche Perspektive nicht hinzugefügt, und ins-

besondere ist im öffentlichen Bewußtsein der Medien—und auch der Gebildeten—Latein immer noch weithin ausschließlich die Sprache der alten Römer. Bei manchen Klassischen Philologen und Mittellateinern spielt auch ein einprägsames, aber unsinniges Bonmot des großen Eduard Norden immer noch eine verhängnisvolle Rolle, daß nämlich die Humanisten der Renaissance dem Latein den “Todesstoß gegeben” hätten. Die zugrunde liegende Vorstellung ist schon oft widerlegt worden—auch jetzt wieder durch Helander—, aber sie wird gerne aufgewärmt, um die Beschäftigung mit der lateinischen Literatur der Neuzeit als überflüssig erscheinen zu lassen.

Wenn sich Klassische Philologen (und ich bitte, diesen Ausdruck im folgenden immer auch auf Klassische Philologinnen zu beziehen) ihr zuwenden, müssen sie sich allerdings darüber im klaren sein, daß sie dieses Interessengebiet—abgesehen von der Grammatik und Lexik der neulateinischen Sprache—mit vielen Disziplinen teilen, die sich jeweils sogar eigentlich zuständig fühlen. Sie kennen diese Situation aus der Antike nur in Teilgebieten wie der Philosophie oder der Patristik. Während sie in ihrer Arbeit mit der neulateinischen Literatur gegenüber den Neuphilologen, Historikern, Kunsthistorikern und Philosophen einen Vorsprung in der lateinischen Sprachkompetenz und in der Kenntnis der Beziehungen zur Antike haben, sind letztere von ihrer Ausbildung her besser bewandert in der zeitgenössischen nationalsprachlichen Literatur, der Geschichte oder der seit dem 17. Jahrhundert auch nationalsprachlich vermittelten Philosophie. Das heißt nicht, daß sich Klassische Philologen auf das Edieren, Übersetzen und Kommentieren der Antikerezeption beschränken sollten, aber es heißt, daß sie, um die literarischen Werke aus ihrer Zeit und in ihren thematischen Zusammenhängen interpretieren zu können, sich Kenntnisse und Methoden der entsprechenden Disziplinen anzueignen haben, und auch, daß sie die Vertreter dieser Disziplinen, deren nicht selten unzureichende Lateinkenntnisse ihnen oft nicht bewußt sind oder für ihre Forschungszwecke als irrelevant gelten, durch ihre Arbeiten erst überzeugen müssen, daß die Latinistik wichtige Beiträge zu der betreffenden Disziplin leisten kann und daß zu einer Erforschung der frühen Neuzeit in Europa auch die Erforschung ihrer lateinischen Literatur unabdingbar gehört. Lateinische Texte, die alle Bereiche des Lebens und der Kultur betreffen, stehen dabei nicht nur in Büchern, sondern sind oft auch in andere Zusammenhänge eingebettet. Kunsthistoriker beachten zum Beispiel oft nicht, daß ein Porträt und ein dazugehöriges lateinisches Epigramm eine künstlerische Einheit bilden, Buchhistoriker übersehen die lateinischen Motti, die zu Druckersigneten gehören. Lateinisch-nationalsprachliche Mischformen gibt es nicht nur in der makkaronischen Poesie und mündlich in Luthers Tischreden, sondern auch in vielen akademischen Niederschriften und Protokollen.

Die angemessene Arbeitsteilung wird sich in der Forschung letztlich aus den individuellen Fähigkeiten der beteiligten Forscher ergeben. Aber es scheint mir natürlich zu sein, daß sich der latinistische Beitrag zum Beispiel im Falle der wissenschaftlichen Literatur des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts mehr auf die Fragen ihrer formalen Gestaltung, wozu auch die Terminologie gehört, beziehen wird. Und da die Forschung bei der Untersuchung der politischen, kulturellen, religiösen und philosophischen Ideen und Themen jeweils auch die Äußerungen in verschiedenen Nationalsprachen einbeziehen muß, wird sie im allgemeinen inhaltlich besser von philosophischer, geistesgeschichtlicher oder wissenschaftshistorischer Seite geleistet werden können, was nicht ausschließt, daß die betreffenden Kompetenzen und eine latinistische Kompetenz in besonderen Fällen in einer Person vereint sind. Es gibt in der Forschung keine fixierten disziplinären Grenzbarrieren, und im neulateinischen Bereich arbeitende Klassische Philologen werden immer disziplinäre Grenzen überschreiten müssen, aber sie werden doch auch gut daran tun, vor allem dort zu arbeiten, wo ihre Stärken liegen.

Zu ihren Stärken gehört der Nachweis, an welche antiken Textstellen sich ein neulateinischer Autor anschloß und welche rhetorischen oder poetologischen Lehren er befolgte. Wegen des gemeinsamen Bildungshintergrundes von Autor und damaligem Leser werden dadurch auch Verständnishorizonte aufgedeckt. Natürlich ist es damit nicht getan, und für die Interpretation stellt sich dann die Aufgabe, Gestalt, Sinn und Eigenart des betreffenden Textes in seinen zeitgenössischen Bezügen zu erschließen. Das letztere erübrigt aber nicht das erstere, und das erstere kann einem Neuphilologen von seiner Ausbildung her unter Umständen entgehen, so daß ich vor solchen Untersuchungen nicht warne, sondern nur daran erinnere, daß man bei ihnen nicht stehen bleiben darf. Eine Stärke der Klassischen Philologen ist oft auch das kritische Edieren, und viele nur handschriftlich oder in alten Drucken überlieferte neulateinische Texte verdienen bekanntlich moderne Ausgaben. Wenn es möglich ist, sollte man es nicht bei der puren Edition bewenden lassen, sondern nationalsprachliche Übersetzungen und Erläuterungen, die den Text für andere Disziplinen zugänglich machen, hinzufügen. Hierbei möchte ich besonders auf die vielen noch unerschlossenen Briefsammlungen und ausdrücklich auf die Fülle noch nicht kopierter und den Witterungseinflüssen preisgegebener Bau-, Grab- und Denkmalschriften hinweisen.

Das inschriftliche Latein sollte in der Öffentlichkeit permanent sichtbar sein. Wie oft wurde es gelesen? Dies führt zu Fragen, die meines Erachtens noch zu wenig gestellt und untersucht wurden. Wo begegneten die Menschen der frühen Neuzeit dem Latein in ihrem Leben und wie weit waren Lateinkenntnisse verbreitet? Wie dicht oder weitmaschig war das Netz

der Lateinschulen, Gymnasien und Universitäten, der Akademien und Sozietäten in den verschiedenen Regionen und Epochen? Wie lernte man Latein (und auch lateinisches Dichten) in diesen Institutionen und wie gebrauchte man es? Was für Lateinkenntnisse wurden erworben, welche Teile der Bevölkerung waren in der Lage, einzelne lateinische Worte zu verstehen oder Latein zu lesen, zu schreiben und zu sprechen? Eine solche bildungs- und gesellschaftsgeschichtliche Untersuchung ist dringend notwendig, um die Rolle der lateinischen Sprache in der damaligen Zeit richtig bestimmen zu können. Von dieser Grundlage aus ergeben sich weitere Fragen: Welche Textkenntnisse hatten die humanistisch Gebildeten und wie weit waren ihnen lateinische Texte auswendig präsent (Joachim Camerarius schrieb, wie ich gerade las, daß er größere Partien der Dichtungen Pontanos auswendig kannte!), wie viele Bücher und welche Autoren besaßen sie? Die Auswertung der historischen Privatbibliotheken im Hinblick auf die Lateinkenntnisse ihrer Besitzer steckt noch in den Anfängen. Welche Autoren hatten internationale Verbreitung, welche nationale oder nur regionale Geltung? Wie entwickelt sich das Verhältnis von lateinischer zu nationalsprachlicher Literatur in den verschiedenen Bereichen, bei den Bibliotheksbesitzern, in der gleichen wissenschaftlichen Disziplin? Welche Wirkung übte das neuzeitliche Latein auf die Entwicklung der Nationalsprachen in ihrem Vokabular und in ihrer Syntax aus? Helander wies mit Recht darauf hin, daß neulateinische Neologismen ihren Weg in nationale Sprachen fanden. Es waren nicht nur die Neologismen. Aus dem Fundus des geschriebenen und gesprochenen neuzeitlichen Lateins, das das antike Latein absorbiert hatte, gelangten auch die vielen antiken lateinischen Wörter, die die Nationalsprachen in der frühen Neuzeit integrierten, zu diesen.

Alle diese Probleme geben zusammen eine Antwort auf die Frage nach der Bedeutung des Lateins in der Neuzeit, und sie sind nur in interdisziplinärer Zusammenarbeit lösbar. Noch liegt das Schwergewicht der gegenwärtigen neulateinischen Forschungen auf dem 16. Jahrhundert, und es gibt auch noch viel in ihm zu entdecken, im poetischen wie im prosaischen Bereich (im 11. Internationalen Neulateinischen Kongreß in Cambridge im August 2000 war letzterer in den Vorträgen bei weitem am meisten vertreten). Die Mahnung, dem 17. und 18. Jahrhundert mehr Aufmerksamkeit zuzuwenden, soll nicht Energien vom 16. Jahrhundert abziehen, sondern zusätzliche den folgenden Jahrhunderten zuleiten. Hierbei ist auch um 1800 kein Schlußstrich zu ziehen, obwohl die Hauptepoche der neulateinischen Literatur damals ihr Ende erreichte. Aufmerksamkeit verdienen nicht nur die historischen Gründe für dieses in den verschiedenen Ländern zeitlich gestufte Ende, sondern auch die Formen der fortdauernden Existenz des aktiven Gebrauchs der lateinischen Sprache. Im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert ist die Erforschung ihrer stark

geminderten Rolle vielleicht noch mehr als zuvor mit der Erforschung der Geschichte des lateinischen Unterrichtswesens zu verbinden.

Es sei erlaubt auf zwei weitere Aufgaben neolatinistischer Betätigung noch eigens hinzuweisen: Erstens die Regionalgeschichte im kulturell weitesten Sinne. Es ist verständlich, daß die sich mit neuzeitlichem Latein beschäftigenden Latinisten sich besonders den Autoren ihres eigenen Landes zuwenden (und daneben dem Mutterland des Humanismus), da die geschichtlichen Begleitumstände ihnen hier am leichtesten zugänglich sind. Neben der nationalen gibt es oft eine auf hohem wissenschaftlichem Niveau stehende regionale historische Forschung, der eine latinistische Mitarbeit, die hier auch leicht mit Erfolg auf lokale Archive zurückgreifen kann, sehr willkommen ist. Zweitens: Der schulische Lateinunterricht ist zwar allenthalben zurückgegangen. Aber an einigen Orten können die Lateinlehrer auch neulateinische Unterrichtseinheiten einbringen, indem sie neulateinische Texte auswählen, die sich an einen antiken Autor anschließen lassen oder die regionale Interessen betreffen. Der forschende Latinist sollte, wo immer möglich, Lateinlehrer bei solchen Projekten beratend unterstützen und allgemein, soweit es in seinen Kräften steht, im öffentlichen Bewußtsein die Vorstellung verändern helfen, Latein sei seit dem Ende der Antike eine "tote Sprache".

Die Klassischen Philologen, die die Grenzen der Antike überschreiten, um ihre Arbeit auch der neuzeitlichen Latinität zuzuwenden, finden sich in einer forschungsgeschichtlich völlig anderen Situation: Dort zahlreiche Editionen zu jedem Autor, meist auch mehrere Kommentare und Monographien und viele Aufsätze; der Wortschatz ist vollständig erfaßt, die Arbeitsgebiete sind systematisiert; die Bibliographie wird seit über einem Jahrhundert in wohlgeordneten Kategorien dargestellt. Hier zu den wenigsten Autoren moderne Editionen, kaum Kommentare, selten Monographien und, wenn überhaupt, nur wenige Aufsätze; die Arbeitsgebiete sind unübersehbar, und die Grenzen zu den anderen Disziplinen fließend; eine bibliographische Wegweisung existiert seit einigen Jahrzehnten, kann aber wegen der offenen Grenzen nie die altertumswissenschaftliche Vollständigkeit erreichen. Der Raum der Klassischen Philologie gleicht einem kultivierten Garten mit wohlbebauten, wenn auch immer wieder veränderten Beeten, der der Neulateinischen Philologie einem großen noch nicht durchforsteten Wald mit einigen Wegen und wenigen schon bepflanzten Lichtungen.

In den 80er Jahren sagte ein angesehener, mir wohl gesonnener englischer Professor des Griechischen zu mir: "Too bad, you left the Classics." Die Klassischen Philologen, die sich der neulateinischen Literatur zuwenden, verlassen die griechisch-römische Antike jedoch nicht, sondern sie entdecken zusätzlich ihre produktive Rezeption in der Neuzeit und mehr und tragen dazu bei, daß die Gegenwart ein adäquateres Bild von beiden Zeitaltern er-

hält. Mit vollem Recht schließt deshalb Hans Helander seinen Essay mit einem Appell an die Klassischen Philologen, den er ihnen zur Freude und Vergil zu Ehren in einen Vers aus der *Aeneis* kleidet.

ANN MOSS

Professor Helander has provided an admirable survey of the current state of Neo-Latin studies and pointed towards areas where considerable opportunities for further research exist. This is one of the factors that make Neo-Latin studies exciting. Because post-medieval writing in Latin was to a large extent neglected up until quite recently, it is relatively easy to find research topics in the area and experiment with novel approaches to synthesis. The Neo-Latin field is also marvellously interdisciplinary. Classicists (some classicists!) are now prepared to explore the after-life of ancient Latin without prejudice, and vernacular specialists, having lost their inferiority complex with respect to classical studies, are less inhibited about embarking on ancient languages. This makes Neo-Latin a meeting place for researchers coming from different disciplines with different traditions of theory and analysis. And as 'Neo-Latin' means everything written in that medium, its community of scholars includes historians of science, philosophy, politics, law, theology, and almost every conceivable discipline of learning, most of which acquired their modern form at the period when Neo-Latin was the language of intellectual inquiry.

Professor Helander rightly stresses that the history of ideas must provide the framework for a survey of the importance of Latin production in the Early Modern period. He prefers to highlight the 'world of correspondences' in which thinkers operated, a loosely Neo-Platonic vision of their mental universe. The most beguiling expression of this world is to be found in the works of Frances Yates, and the notion that this was the characteristic 'episteme' of the age was given currency by Michel Foucault. It does need, however, to be complemented by a thorough knowledge of other philosophical systems that were far more powerful in instigating and programming the debates that define the intellectual profile of the age. The *Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy* is probably the best introduction to the full range of philosophical ideas in operation. Even that scarcely touches the ideas that mattered most. Those ideas were religious. The sphere of theological controversy provides a wealth of opportunity for research, not only because most of it was published in Latin, but because Latin was a part of the controversy. The early Reformation period not only set Reformers against Catholics, but humanists against scholastics, promoters of new translations of the Bible against defenders of the Vulgate, writers of new hymns against lovers of the old, practitioners of one sermon style against another. These are only some

of the points at issue, but they are listed here to show that, in addition to their ability to explore sources in the intellectual history of the period, Neo-Latinists have a special expertise that gives them a particular and fundamental insight into the Early Modern mentality.

All the thinkers and controversialists of the period had been trained in language studies programmed by humanists convinced that ideas could be adequately formulated only in ancient Latin reconstituted according to their standards and by their methods. Professor Helander has given a very cogent account of that Latin, and one cannot stress enough how important it is to relate the language of Neo-Latin writers to the resources with which writers worked: dictionaries, model phrase-books, encyclopaedias, bibliographies, rhetorical manuals, collections of quotations, sayings, examples, and rhetorical figures. These were both a product of Neo-Latin culture and the guides that set the course of its development. Morhof's *Polyhistor* is an invaluable repository of information, but Morhof writes as an antiquarian. Other major reference books, such as Konrad Gesner's *Pandectae* of 1548 and Antonio Possevino's *Bibliotheca selecta* of 1593, resourced Neo-Latin writing at the time it was mapping the cultural and intellectual horizons of Western Europe.

The study of reading practice is just as important as the study of writing, and all the more so in the Neo-Latin period because it was axiomatic for humanist educationalists that the genesis of new texts was intimately linked to the analysis of pre-existing ones. From a close study of ancient Latin in approved authors one learnt to imitate their diction, their habits of expression, and the niceties of rhetorically elaborated style. One also learnt how to develop an argument. The procedures of rhetoric and dialectic underlay Neo-Latin writing in all disciplines, scientific, legal, theological, and historical, not just literary, and their detection is both a perennial fascination for the modern scholar and a gateway to an intellectual universe at once familiar and strange. Even commonplaces, mere banalities to the twenty-first century, turn out to be fundamental elements in the structure of that universe. The lessons reading had for writing are contained in innumerable paedagogical manuals, which further investigation will reveal to be a rich source of information about the production of ideas, as well as about their historical development and local variation. The study of reading practice also includes the study of commentaries on classical texts, which opens onto the whole area of the reception of classical culture by Neo-Latin writers, for whom it mattered so much, but for whom it was in many respects an alien form of life. The investigation of the printed commentaries that mediated ancient texts to the reading public is fairly well advanced for some classical authors (Ovid, in particular, but also Virgil, Statius, Cicero in some respects) and for some Neo-Latin critics (Antony Grafton's volumes on Joseph Scaliger are the

model in the field), but other subjects await the curious, and they will be well rewarded.

The question of reception introduces a topic not emphasised by Professor Helander, and that is the relationship between Neo-Latin and the West European vernaculars, which were, in many instances, at the most exuberant stage of their development at precisely the same period when almost all 'serious' writing was committed to Latin. Neo-Latin specialists (who very often are specialists in vernacular literatures and earn their living by teaching them) are best equipped to appraise this important issue. It will involve investigation of the audiences for Latin and vernacular books; different expectations by those audiences with respect to different areas of knowledge (the prolongation of the use of Latin in law and medicine is a case in point); translations back and forth between Latin and the vernaculars (which Professor Helander touches on). The latter will pay particular attention to the modelling of vernacular production on standards of writing inculcated by Latin humanists, the 'trickle-down' effects of translating Latin textbooks concerned with rhetoric and dialectic for consumption by non-Latinate readers, and, at the other end of the spectrum, the interesting cases of major thinkers supervising, or sometimes doing, translations of themselves (Calvin, Bacon, Descartes).

National consciousness and confessional divisions, as Professor Helander points out, were a major feature of the age of Neo-Latin. One of the special contributions that a study of the Neo-Latin output can make is to show how a remarkably homogeneous culture, derived from the common source of ancient Latin, was nourished by texts and reference books that crossed boundaries. Neo-Latin research charts how it developed and flourished, so as to constitute a mental universe which was shared by all literate Western Europeans. They were members of the same speech community. In Neo-Latin, all were equally at home. A European idea was in the making.

Durham

MINNA SKAFTE JENSEN

It is no easy task Hans Helander has set his commentators, since his survey of the status of Neo-Latin studies is so well informed and clearly presented that there is actually little to be said against it. Inside its narrow frame it succeeds in describing the field of study, criticising its performance, and delineating some of the most urgent problems waiting to be solved. What is more, through the text shines an excitement that proves infectious, for the wonders of the Latin language and its capacity of adapting itself to an ever changing world, and for the progress brought about by the Enlightenment. It is a great

experience to read an essay that is so basically optimistic in its understanding of humanity.

In his choice of topics, Helander has focused on the development of ideas during the period c. 1400–1800, and on the way the language developed in order to express them. It is a recurring theme, explicitly and implicitly, that Latin was just as living a language as the vernaculars, and that it was learnt not so much in the school-room as in normal practice, through constant imitation. One of Helander's very interesting points is that even though grammarians discussed how to stick to vocabulary and orthography known from antiquity, speakers and writers of the language coined new words all the time. It follows that this period of Latin deserves careful linguistic study in the same way as other phases of its long history, and here Helander's essay is not only a survey, but in itself an important contribution.

Helander has two main criticisms of Neo-Latin scholarship. Firstly, ever since the arrival of these studies as a special discipline in the early 1960s, interest has centred on belletristic literature. This is disproportionate, he argues, compared to the surviving corpus of Neo-Latin in which scholarly and scientific texts occupy the majority of the field by far. Secondly, in some (not mentioned) recent works he sees a mechanical use of handbooks of rhetoric, as if poetry or orations were composed purely on the basis of rhetorical examples, not of the actual situation to be treated. His arguments in connection with this second point are especially striking and memorable, but perhaps slightly over-dimensioned. This is still a young discipline and various approaches have to be tried out in its course of development.

To the first point, however, I have a few more things to say. There is no contesting Helander's statement of fact, and I can only hope that he will succeed in attracting the interest of more scholars towards the scientific field. On the other hand, it is not only easy to explain why the situation is as it is, I should also consider it very sad if energy were now directed away from the study of poetry and other kinds of more or less fictional literature.

The overwhelming majority of scholars in the field have had their training as classicists. This means that the topics considered central in classical studies are naturally projected into Neo-Latin, and the literature of early modern Europe read as so many commentaries on Cicero, Virgil and Ovid, and on their Greek predecessors. This is one-sided, of course (and even ancient studies are revolting against a form of classicism that is increasingly felt as a strait-jacket), but it is interesting that it is possible at all. It reveals to what degree Neo-Latin literature is all the time referring to ancient models.

This holds more true for the “heroic” periods than for later phases—a development that is in itself an important topic in the history of ideas and mentalities—but the thread remains after all unbroken right through the his-

tory of Latinity. To express oneself in Latin was to conjure up ancient authorities, even though the feeling may have been more conscious on some occasions than others, and to various speakers. To Ludvig Holberg, when towards the middle of the 18th century he composed his *Nicolaus Klimius*, Thomas More was probably a more important model than Lucian, but neither the English nor the Danish author would have thought in the way they did had it not been for Lucian, and they were both very well aware of the fact.

Composition of poetry actually had tremendous prestige during the Neo-Latin centuries. It reveals itself economically: young men qualified for important posts by composing Latin poetry, and patrons were prepared to pay considerable rewards for poems that in one way or another fulfilled a purpose he/she considered important. This comes out also in less manifest ways: the care with which books on all kinds of topics were introduced by laudatory poems, and the fact that even scientific authors might add poetry to their works. Thus, when the Danish anatomist Thomas Bartholin published his invention of the lymphal system (1653) in hard competition with the Swede Olof Rudbeck, he not only added a small funeral poem on the liver, but announced the fact on the title page.

Still another signal of how prestigious poetry was, lies in the fact that the commonplace of inviting the Muses, mentioned by Helander, normally was a metaphor especially of composing poetry. This is how it was used by Conrad Celtis, when in 1486 he claimed to be the first to invite Apollo and the Muses to cross the Alps; and also to Celtis's many imitators poetry was considered a concise form of learning, being its peak as well as its symbol.

Therefore, considering that poetry had a special status among those who communicated in Neo-Latin, it is no mere historical coincidence that so much study is invested in this branch. And also from a very different point of view I find it important to continue and even intensify the study of belles-lettres. During most of the 20th century the Latin part of the early modern literatures was almost forgotten to a degree that came close to regular falsification of history. This situation is actually changing these years. There is a growing interest among literature scholars in the interrelationship between Latin and vernaculars as poetic media; such is the situation not least in the new flowering of Baroque studies. It would certainly be tragic if Neo-Latinists tired of their struggle at the very moment in which they were finally having a certain success.

Like all Latinists, Helander is of course preoccupied by the small space left for Latin studies in the modern world; the situation is especially critical when seen from a Nordic angle, as is the case with his essay. Recently, a German scholar, Jürgen Leonhardt, formulated his opinion on the matter, and even though the problems he addresses are analogous to Helander's, the situ-

ation described in his 'seven theses' is strikingly different from what we see in Scandinavia. There is obviously much more freedom of movement for Latinists in Germany with its many universities and stable tradition of (Greek and) Latin learning than what we know of in the Nordic countries.

I find it hard to see easy solutions. In Scandinavia most Latinists are occupied as teachers and/or researchers in classical, not later, Latin. But there are few of us. If Neo-Latinists really succeeded in making their colleagues in the fields of history, modern languages and literatures, as well as the natural sciences, realise the amount and importance of Latin texts from c. 1400–1800, it would be very difficult for this limited staff to meet the interdisciplinary demands raised. I do not agree with Helander on the answer he seems to suggest with his phrase about the same cabbage being cooked again and again, that classical scholars should abandon their traditional field of research and take up Neo-Latin instead. On the contrary, I find it more important than ever that a lively and modern research in classical literature and culture is continued, in order that our communities should not lose what is left of historic coherence. Neo-Latin literature is in itself an important testimony both to the archetypal position of classical literature and to the remarkably different ways in which they have been read during the centuries. Modern readers must necessarily have their own dialogue with ancient authors.

I conclude on my only really critical note: To whom is Helander addressing himself? His essay holds sharp, if politely worded, criticism of colleagues, but I doubt that his intention has been only to be read by Latinists. At least, we are not the ones who need to be reminded that the study of European culture cannot be maintained without the knowledge of Latin. If Helander wants to change anything he must write in a way readable for a wider audience. Not least it is important to approach politicians and other influential readers, and they would soon lose patience with a text interspersed with Latin phrases and exemplified by untranslated quotations.

Centre for Greek and Roman Studies, Odense

KAREN SKOVGAARD-PETERSEN

Hans Helander has given an admirably clear and inspiring presentation of contemporary Neo-Latin studies. His main point—that the Latin literature of the early modern period is “absolutely vital for the understanding of the development of European mentality and the growth of knowledge”—is, as I see it, both important and convincingly argued. The same goes for his insistence that the modern scholar should consult contemporary manuals, dictionaries, grammars, encyclopaedias and—with the reservations made by Helander—rhetorical and poetical manuals. What I have to offer here is

therefore not so much points of disagreement as additional considerations inspired by his fine survey.

Among the ideas listed in Helander's section 2 might also have been included the notion of the commemorative power of the written and printed word, a notion that permeates the Latin literature of the 16th and 17th centuries. To take just a single example: When in 1577 the Danish writer Erasmus Lætus composed a long account of the baptism of the young prince Christian (IV) he demonstrated his awareness of the importance of being mentioned in writing—or being left unmentioned. Listing the high-ranking audience in the church he concludes by informing his readers that there were in fact more guests present than those just mentioned but he will not name them:

“Apart from these men I saw, as far as I know, no one. But later I understood that there were in fact some people present, who had hidden themselves in more remote pews. I had come to realize that they did not care about the honour I previously had bestowed on them by naming them honourably in my printed works, in return for what I thought, or imagined, was friendship and sympathy—and I have therefore no intention of mentioning them here”.

(Præter hos, quod quidem sciam, vidi neminem. Adfuisse tamen alios quosdam, seque in sellas obscuriores abdidisse, intellexi postea, quibus quod humanitatis atque amicitiae, quam tum quidem nobis vel imaginati sumus vel persuasimus, officium, quo honestam nominis eorum mentionem publicis aliquando scriptis feceram, neglectum esse cognouerim, hoc quidem in loco minime nominandos esse putem) (Lætus (ed. 1992), pp. 188–189).

The passage well illustrates the importance attached to public mention. Normally we see the positive side—the actual naming of a patron or a friend. Here the opposite side appears—the announced *damnatio memoriae*.

This awareness is probably to be seen in connection with both the strong sense of revival of classical literature and with the new art of printing. It is worth emphasizing, I think, also because it directs the modern scholar towards considerations of media and communication and, generally, sociological factors.

In connection with the rise of the national state Helander notes the importance of royal patronage of national historiography and occasional literature: “We have here in fact to do with one of the main driving forces behind the production of Neo-Latin literature”. This broad statement is here connected only with rulers enlisting learned men in their service. But it should be used in an even more encompassing sense: The dependence of writers on patrons—not only kings, but generally men of influence as well as institutions of various kinds, e.g. universities—is one of the fundamental, and striking, features of Neo-Latin literature (indeed of early modern literature in

general). Establishing and confirming personal relations, whether to superiors or to equals, was one of its central functions. It is perhaps most clearly to be seen in a poem addressed to and celebrating a patron, but it goes for all works containing a dedication—epigrams and scientific treatises alike. Nor is it confined to vertical relationships, so to speak, where the addressee is of a superior status than the writer. Much Neo-Latin literature functioned as networking on the horizontal level, e.g. when a friendship is celebrated in a valedictory poem, the wife of a colleague is mourned in a funeral poem, or a commentary on a classical text is dedicated to a colleague. In the passage quoted above, Erasmus Lætus's indignation is aimed at his former colleagues.—This sociological aspect must constantly be taken into consideration, and it is to my mind not sufficiently emphasized by Helander.

Helander rightly underlines the importance of royal patronage in connection with historiography and other kinds of historical literature. Let me just add that this phenomenon, widespread as it was, no doubt varied considerably in its workings from case to case—and that this variety in itself deserves to be an object of investigation. A case I have had occasion to look closer into is the official historiography in the court of Christian IV of Denmark. Two historians, both of Dutch extraction, were engaged by the king to write the history of Denmark, viz. Johannes Pontanus in 1618 and Johannes Meursius in 1624. The king himself turns out to have been rather in the background, the architect of the project being the chancellor Christen Friis. Preserved letters between the authors and the chancellor reveal how he instructed the authors with regard to contents and design of the books. While being concerned about the nation's reputation he also had an eye to the prestige attached to up-to-date scholarly points of view. The preserved material thus allows a glimpse of the interaction between politicians and intellectuals in the formation of national ideology. This is a subject that can be conducted with more success on early modern historiography than on that of previous periods, from which the extant classical and medieval material in most cases does not permit us to go deeper than describing a work as an expression of the interest of a given ruler or institution.

Pontanus belonged to that group of historians mentioned by Helander who uttered their scepticism with regard to the old myths of national beginnings. Discarding the traditional version of Danish history, according to which the first king of Denmark, Dan, ruled many generations before the birth of Christ, Pontanus instead began with the Cimbrians' march against Rome around 100 BC. But Pontanus casts no doubt on the ultimate descent of Danes and other Europeans from Noah's son Japhet. He strives to show how Tacitus's information on the Germans can be reconciled with the wanderings of Japhet. My point is that while the various versions of Trojan

origins became an object of ridicule already in the early 16th century (which did not prevent them from being widely used), it was quite another thing to question the assumption that mankind could be traced back to Noah. It is true that the various attempts to reconstruct in detail the early period after Noah's sons was met with learned contempt, and increasingly so during the early modern period. But it is misleading, as Helander does, to lump the two kinds of original myths, the Trojan and the Noatidean, together as "such nonsense". Before the archeological paradigm gained ground in the 19th century, texts—classical and biblical—remained the basis for theories on the earliest history of man.

What Pontanus and George Buchanan and others offered as compensation for the national myths they discarded was a national beginning in classical times, based on information on the northern European peoples found in the classical, particularly the Roman, authors. Their approach illustrates Helander's point that the classical world served as a constant inventory and thesaurus. I would perhaps put more stress on the *ideological* continuity from the early Renaissance. It was clearly important to Pontanus and Buchanan to demonstrate that Denmark and Scotland, being mentioned in classical texts, had been known to the ancients, had formed part of the classical world. Antiquity still carried momentous prestige. It is yet another dimension of the fascinating theme of *mundus renascens*, the increasing sense of superiority of moderns over ancients—that it is expressed within the classicizing paradigm, e.g. the celebration of Columbus as a new Aeneas, the catchword from Claudian *taceat superata vetustas* etc.

Still it is important to underline, as Helander does, that imitation of classical texts is stronger in literary texts than in scientific. But one should bear in mind that borders between literary and scientific texts were more fluent, indeed often ran differently, than today. This is, as I see it, an intriguing difference, which clearly deserves our attention. Didactic poetry is a point in question. Within the field of historiography a huge number of historical poems appeared, epics in imitation of classical historical epic as well as shorter poems. The characteristic features of historical poetry as opposed to historical writing in prose are a subject which ought to be investigated.

Helander's emphasis on scientific texts is refreshing and it explains why relatively little space is allotted to the subject of intertextuality in his paper. Had the focus been more literary, intertextuality would presumably have played a prominent part, the constant and conscious imitation of classical and contemporary literary models being a fundamental feature of this branch of Neo-Latin literature.

Helander regards research of scientific Neo-Latin texts as a desideratum, and I certainly agree, but with some minor reservations. At least I find it only

natural that Neo-Latinists, trained as they are in interpreting literature, tend to concentrate on non-scientific texts. It might even be claimed that specialized topics, within for example medicine or geology, should not be included in a general history of Neo-Latin literature or in a periodical devoted to Neo-Latin studies. As Helander is also well aware, the study of such texts is an ambitious endeavour which must involve collaboration with specialists within the various fields—theology, law, medicine, philosophy, mathematics, etc.

Great tasks and challenges lie ahead, Helander enthusiastically concludes. His own synthesis of the field testifies to the considerable progress already made during the past decades.

Manuscript and Rare Book Department
Royal Library, Copenhagen

FRANCESCO TATEO

Ritengo che l'articolo abbia opportunamente richiamato l'attenzione degli studiosi dell'Umanesimo sul punto di vista che ha modificato negli ultimi decenni il panorama della cultura scritta fra i secoli XIV e XVIII, ma soprattutto il metodo con cui leggere i testi latini di quel periodo come tradizione distinta da quella volgare, con una sua identità. È utile tuttavia considerare le motivazioni per cui la storiografia e la critica letteraria, soprattutto italiane, hanno mancato spesso di riconoscere alla scrittura latina dal Cinquecento in poi—ossia dopo i primi secoli dell'Umanesimo—questa identità e hanno mostrato scarso interesse per la specificità dello strumento linguistico, valutando i fenomeni culturali per i loro contenuti storici e per il loro senso, piuttosto che per il loro particolare veicolo formale. Hanno pesato da una parte lo scrupolo di ridimensionare gli aspetti tecnici e formali che proprio la cultura delle *humanae litterae* aveva esaltati, dall'altra la prevenzione nei confronti di una forma letteraria non più egemone e comunque legata ad istituzioni come la scuola, l'accademia, la Chiesa, che l'Ottocento e il primo Novecento italiani hanno visto come retaggi del passato.

La proposta di cui discutiamo parte giustamente dalle definizioni di Josef Ijsewijn e di Walter Ludwig, le quali giustificano oltre tutto una denominazione ("neo-latino") che nella tradizione italiana si riferisce—quasi in senso opposto—alle lingue "volgari" derivate dal latino, o che continuano il latino, distinguendosi nettamente dalla sua "rinascita". È certamente un difetto della critica storica attribuire scarsa importanza alla tipologia dello strumento linguistico, e mi pare storicamente notevole che l'attenzione rivolta alla vitalità del Neo-latino provenga da una cultura europea che agli studi linguistici e formali ha dato molto spazio nell'educazione scolastica, anche oltre il suo livello elementare, fino ai nostri giorni. In particolare l'invito a

tener conto del ruolo avuto dai manuali è uno dei punti più rilevanti di questa proposta di Hans Helander. Ed è errato partire dal pregiudizio, dovuto ad un orizzonte in cui viene privilegiata la produzione retorica e poetica, che la quantità delle opere scritte in latino sia minore rispetto a quella delle opere scritte in volgare. Il rischio di una visione falsa della effettiva cultura globale di alcuni secoli è stato messo nel dovuto rilievo in questa proposta.

Ma, nonostante i limiti di certa critica storica tradizionale, può risultare fecondo un punto di vista che non perda d'occhio, alla fine, la considerazione sincronica della produzione per quel che riguarda alcuni momenti e alcuni autori, in cui effettivamente la scrittura latina e la scrittura volgare possono essere volta per volta scelte empiriche e poco significative, o comportare un interesse 'intertestuale', giacché lo scrittore neo-latino non ha presente soltanto la tradizione latina, ma anche il proprio, attuale mezzo espressivo ai livelli sia del parlato, sia della letteratura. Bisogna guardarsi (e perciò lo studio specifico del neo-latino è almeno un antidoto) dal ricavare da questo punto di vista, di per sé non trascurabile, il disinteresse per la specificità e la funzionalità della tarda scrittura latina, l'emarginazione delle opere scientifiche, religiose ecc., quasi fossero materiale non riguardante la letteratura, l'idea che il volgare sia più espressivo del latino, perché lo è solo per chi non conosce il latino o lo considera uno strumento puramente tecnico, una lingua speciale.

C'è poi una ragione più sottile che induce a privilegiare i secoli iniziali della rinascita del latino, distinguendoli dai successivi, al di là del fatto che la riscoperta e la ridefinizione dell'Umanesimo italiano si siano verificate nell'ambito della storia della filosofia e della scienza del Rinascimento (Francesco Fiorentino, Giovanni Gentile, Eugenio Garin, Cesare Vasoli), e nell'ambito della filologia classica, medievale e umanistica (Remigio Sabbadini, Giuseppe Billanovich, Alessandro Perosa, Scevola Mariotti, Gianvito Resta). La tendenza a privilegiare la fase iniziale di un fenomeno e i suoi aspetti meno appariscenti, o meno letterariamente maturi ed elaborati, e meno diffusi, ha fatto rivolgere l'attenzione di chi lavorava per il recupero della scrittura umanistica alla tradizione manoscritta e ai tempi del suo predominio, ai legami con la cultura medievale, sia pure per indicarne le indefinibili differenze, sullo sfondo di una questione ideologica assai viva nella prima metà del Novecento, il contrasto e la continuità fra le due epoche. È stata così evidenziata l'originalità dell'Umanesimo tre-quattrocentesco a scapito di quelli che erano considerati epigoni o propaggini, mentre non mancava una considerazione positiva della rinascita volgare del Cinquecento quale erede effettiva della tradizione umanistica originale.

Un esempio fra i più significativi potrebbe essere quello del Ciceronianismo, apprezzato e studiato di più nei suoi primordi (Francesco Petrarca, Coluccio

Salutati, Gasparino Barzizza, Lorenzo Valla), quando esso non è una scelta assoluta, ma costituisce un problema, e meno apprezzato quando esso raggiunge il grado della consapevolezza critica, come in Francesco Filelfo, Paolo Cortese, Bartolomeo Scala; ciò anche per effetto dell'anticiceronianismo di un filologo e poeta prestigioso come Poliziano. Si è disponibili ad accettare il classicismo di Pietro Bembo più che quello dei continuatori e restauratori del ciceronianismo latino dei secoli successivi. In questo atteggiamento agisce certamente un'idea stereotipata dell'imitazione e una disattenzione alle modifiche da cui è scaturita la lingua neo-latina, argomenti affrontati in modo convincente da Helander. Ma il limite principale di questo atteggiamento consiste—a mio parere—nel non riconoscere la funzione diversa che assume la scrittura di tipo ciceroniano, che a parte gli attacchi di Erasmo (in realtà meno radicali di quel che sovente si pensa), funge proprio contro il classicismo più retrogrado, come strumento di comunicazione chiaro, logico e distinto. A ciò contribuiscono gli aggiornamenti anch'essi autorizzati dal modello ciceroniano. In questa funzione la prosa, ma spesso anche la poesia neo-latina, continua ad agire perfino nei confronti del volgare, in quanto disciplina e richiamo alla normalità. Non è da escludere che la linearità che si afferma in alcuni volgari (francese e inglese ad esempio) o nella prosa dell'Ottocento italiano di fronte al persistente modello del Boccaccio, derivi non solo dall'influsso del parlato, ma dalla disciplina scolastica di un latino duttile, adattato alla comunicazione e alle esigenze didattiche.

Quello della struttura linguistica del Neo-latino è un argomento di grande importanza, che potrà illuminarsi soltanto attraverso un'analisi come quella che nell'articolo di Helander viene svolta nei capitoli sull'Ortografia, la Morfologia e il Vocabolario. Se non che a questi capitoli che privilegiano il lessico va aggiunto quello della sintassi e dello stile nel suo complesso, tradizionalmente meno frequentato dagli studiosi della lingua latina moderna, per la stessa difficoltà di registrare le varietà, le differenze e le analogie, e soprattutto per la quasi impossibilità di utilizzare a questo fine lo strumento informatico. Il Neo-latino ha conosciuto alla fine del Quattrocento una tensione all'interno della retorica, dovuta ad un duplice esito dello stesso insegnamento ciceroniano e quintiliano, spesso assemblati nell'ottica degli umanisti, e che si può semplificare e riassumere nel modo seguente: l'ideale dell'oratore, *homo bonus dicendi peritus*, può battere l'accento sulla *convenientia* fra *inventio* ed *elocutio*, sulla gerarchia delle scelte stilistiche e sull'equilibrio nella gamma delle possibili scelte, ovvero sulla molteplicità delle scelte che si offrono all'abilità dell'oratore, sull'efficacia di uno stile caratterizzato dalla *periodus* o dal *genus abruptum* e sulla stravaganza dei contrasti, insomma sulla rottura dell'equilibrio fra *inventio* ed *elocutio*. I due indirizzi, nei quali può riconoscersi un'antica competizione, riemergono

nell'età moderna non meno nel neo-latino che nel volgare, anche se in quest'ultimo è più visibile e nel primo più nascosti sotto la veste affettata della latinità. Riemerge del resto anche la possibilità di un incontro e di uno scambio fra queste due tendenze fino a non essere più riconoscibili come divergenti.

A questa vicenda c'è, nelle pagine di Helander, un importante richiamo quando si parla del decrescere della parte riguardante l'*inventio* rispetto a quella riguardante l'*elocutio* nei manuali di retorica alla fine del secolo XVII. La vicenda può essere riguardata anche come progressivo divaricarsi, nella cultura europea, dove più dove meno, del mondo delle scienze dal mondo delle lettere, come ipertrofia della retorica da una parte e disimpegno retorico dei tecnici dall'altra, ma in effetti può leggersi anche come divaricazione di due gusti diversi di stile. Basterà, per quel che riguarda la storia della retorica, accennare alla fortuna del metodo di Hermogenes a cominciare dalla fine del Quattrocento, propriamente dal rilancio a stampa del *περὶ ἰδεῶν* che sostituiva alla considerazione primaria dei tre stili ricondotti ai tre gradi contenutistici fondamentali, la descrizione ed esemplificazione di una molteplicità di esiti stilistici e di combinazioni stilistiche, in cui la *lexis*, la *sententia*, il metro e gli altri elementi caratteristici della *compositio* giocano in modo che l'effetto emozionale prodotto dalla forma linguistica abbia il sopravvento, volta per volta, sul mero significato della comunicazione.

Comunque questa vicenda della retorica, che occupa i secoli XV–XVII ma che non manca di ripresentarsi posteriormente in altre sembianze, va retrodatata ai secoli XIV–XV, quando si pensi alla polemica sui *colores*, e rappresenta un filo con cui congiungere lo svolgimento del Neo-latino con la tradizione medievale e della tarda antichità. La prospettiva di Curtius non va dimenticata, anche se è rischioso insistere sulla continuità e sottovalutare alcuni segni inconfondibili della nuova cultura moderna quale si manifesta nell'uso disinvolto del Neo-Latino, una lingua generalmente duttile, limpida, alla quale non è un caso che sia stato affidato il compito di divulgare nozioni scientifiche e filosofiche.

Alcuni importanti motivi segnalati da Helander come tipici della letteratura neo-latina del secolo XVI sono tuttavia da considerarsi elaborati nel secolo XV, quando si pensi che la polemica fra antichi e moderni, ereditata dalla tradizione cristiana, è uno dei motivi contraddittori, perfino drammatici, del Quattrocento e viene già recepita da Machiavelli in ambiente umanistico volgare; che l'idea del trasferimento, nel corso dei secoli, della sede della civiltà si fonda sul concetto storico della *translatio imperii* ed ha il suo modello mitico nelle interpretazioni umanistiche del viaggio di Enea; che la considerazione di Colombo come nuovo Ercole o Dionisio, molto significativamente citato per rappresentare l'idea della superiorità dei moderni riposa sulla consuetudine

del primo umanesimo a trasferire il mito nella realtà moderna. L'insistenza su questi motivi potrebbe avallare la convinzione della ripetitività e dei limiti eruditi della cultura neo-latina.

Per finire aggiungerei in margine una frammentaria esemplificazione di ordine geografico, ma che avvalora l'iniziativa di richiamare l'attenzione sul "significato e le prospettive di studio del Neo-Latino", evitando l'equivoco del termine "Umanesimo". In alcune regioni dell'Europa—ed è interessante che ciò avvenga anche in Italia, patria dell'Umanesimo rinascimentale—la scrittura latina è rimasta a lungo egemone rispetto allo stesso volgare per via della struttura scolastica e del predominio ecclesiastico dell'insegnamento. Nei secoli XVI–XVII in Terra d'Otranto, l'attuale Salento, la presenza alle soglie del Cinquecento di un umanista *sui generis*, polemico nei confronti di alcuni aspetti dell'Umanesimo, Antonio Galateo, ha alimentato una cultura neo-latina durata fino all'erudizione sette-ottocentesca. La sua lingua è un esempio tipico di uso rinnovato del latino senza rigidità filologica, ed è significativo che la sua opera abbia avuto una fortuna europea. Anche altre opere di 'napoletani' come Andrea Matteo Acquaviva, autore di un commento enciclopedico a Plutarco, e Bartolomeo Maranta, autore di certe *Lucullianae quaestiones* in cui si applica al latino una lettura retorica al limite del manierismo, non ebbero diffusione in Italia ma furono accolte nella tipografia europea. Ancora nel Mezzogiorno i manuali ciceroniani di Quinto Mario Corrado sostenevano la competizione, fino al sec. XVII, con l'uso colto del volgare, mostrando la maggiore funzionalità del latino, e nel sec. XIX un latinista come Diego Vitrioli, vincitore del *Certamen Hoeffianum* del 1845, sosteneva la continuità della tradizione classica con un orientamento culturale che potremmo dire neo-latino più che umanistico. Del resto una parte cospicua dell'intellettualità del Mezzogiorno d'Italia, educata nella scuola ecclesiastica più che in centri cortigiani e laici, cittadini, incline a cercare una sua identità nella Magna Grecia, cioè in un'antichità diversa da quella privilegiata dall'Umanesimo latino, presenta fino al secolo XIX problemi affini alle culture latinizzate dell'Europa intese a cercare nella civiltà prelatina una loro motivazione e autonomia culturale.

Bari

REPLY TO COMMENTS

HANS HELANDER

Reading the comments on my article has been a pleasant and instructive experience. I have found there *various additions* to my survey, with references to

relevant literature, which are valuable complements to the works I have mentioned. Some of my colleagues have highlighted and stressed the importance of areas which I have just briefly mentioned or not gone into at all. There are also some *general objections* concerning my basic analysis, or details of it. One colleague contends that I have underestimated the heterogeneity of the Neo-Latin area, whereas others argue that I have not paid enough attention to certain constant phenomena and the obvious continuity of the literature under investigation. One of the participants in the discussion advocates an approach to the specific subject of orthography that turns out to be the opposite of what I find recommendable. Then there are *discussions about various ideas and suggestions concerning the future development of Neo-Latin research*. The participants outline plans for the exploration of hitherto neglected areas, but some also express their concern for vital and central parts of the study that must not be neglected.

I shall deal with the comments in roughly the order indicated above.

(A) *Various additions*. Heinz Hofmann rightly points to the importance of Neo-Latin didactic poetry. I might have mentioned this prolific genre (it would actually fit in very well in section 2.4 of my survey, considering the many didactic works that mirror the rapid growth of knowledge). Gerlinde Huber-Rebenich quite correctly remarks that Latin Christian lyrics, hymns etc. might have been included under section 2.6 in my exposé of the kinds of literature that were prompted by the bitter religious controversies of the 16th and 17th centuries.

Ann Moss, Heinz Hofmann and Francesco Tateo mention a topic of great importance which I refrained from treating, namely the relationship between Neo-Latin and the West European vernaculars. I whole-heartedly agree with their emphasis on this subject. It is rewarding in many ways. Even the comparison of the same author's achievements in Latin and in his own vernacular is very often elucidating. I might mention that as far as the prominent Swedish authors are concerned, the difference in the level of performance is remarkable, in very many cases actually quite astonishing, at least up to the turn of the century in 1700: their Latin writings are elegant, allusive and stylistically refined, reflecting their erudition and knowledge, whereas their Swedish writings seem childish and retarded, witnessing the author's laborious struggle with his recalcitrant native tongue. One gets a feeling of meeting two different persons in each of these writers. Still more interesting are the sociological questions, mentioned by Ann Moss and Heinz Hofmann, that investigations of this kind pose: Who were the readers of the respective literatures and what were the various developments in the direction of the vernacular for various genres and disciplines?

The sociological perspective is justly emphasized also by other participants in our discussion, who bring out several aspects of this fruitful area. Walther Ludwig stresses the importance of research into questions like: How many in a given society were able to understand Latin? To which strata of society did they belong? Which authors were actually widely read? Karen Skovgaard-Petersen accentuates a central feature of Neo-Latin literature, viz. its “function of establishing and confirming personal relations, whether to superiors or to equals”, and she argues that sociological aspects of such relationships, vertical as well as horizontal, must constantly be taken into consideration. In the same vein Craig Kallendorf advocates the study of the Neo-Latin text as a “product of the cultural, social, economic, and institutional forces that inevitably affect writing, publishing and reading” and he directs our interest towards book history, arguing that dedications and prefatory letters should not be excluded in modern editions, since such short pieces are highly informative of the conditions under which the work was conceived and produced. The importance of the laudatory pieces that serve as introductions to works of all disciplines is also stressed by Minna Skafte Jensen. These are poems to be read by us today as testimonies of social patterns and expected behaviour and as witnesses to the enormous prestige of poetry.

Again, I can only say that I agree with all these remarks and observations. My sections 2.5 and 2.6 were actually intended to demonstrate how dependent the authors were on those in power and the extent to which their works mirrored the aspirations and ambitions of their patrons. *La trahison des clercs* has always been the natural state of affairs. To omit prefatory and dedicational texts is indeed not to be recommended, since they tell us so much about the actual setting and background of the text. Moreover, the short congratulatory poems that often accompany major works mirror the expectations and evaluations of the contemporary scholars. The examples are legion.

It is true that in my article I did not mention what Karen Skovgaard-Petersen calls “the networking on the horizontal level”. I might very well have underlined the importance of these relations. The friendship of the scholars that belong to the *res publica literaria*, and partake in the *commercium eruditi orbis*, is indeed a striking feature in Neo-Latin literature, visible not least in the learned correspondence. Their expressions of this *amicitia* are no doubt partly dictated by convention, but nevertheless the reader cannot help feeling that they are sincere in their happiness and in their enthusiasm for learning, when they exclaim *O pabulum animi* or *Quam dulce est sapere* on reading an author who fascinates them. Furthermore, they are linked by a strong feeling that, within their republic of letters, they are to a certain extent free of the oppressive social hierarchies that otherwise dominate life in their societ-

ies and also prescribe much of the conditions for their daily work. It is clear to them that the *orbis eruditus* is different: Here it is not necessary to be a *homo veteris prosapiae ac multarum imaginum*. Both the egalitarian potential of such sociological patterns and the basic conviction of these eruditi that life has meaning and dignity deserve our attention and study.

(B) *Some general objections concerning my basic analysis, or details of it.* Julia Gaisser objects to my preferences in the choice of authors, which I state under section 1.2: “The Neo-Latin works that deserve our attention ... are in the first place those written by the leading scholars of each age, men who usually took part in the turmoil of events and in the intellectual, political and scientific debates.” Neo-Latinists should not, according to Professor Gaisser, “be creating a canon at the very moment when other scholars of European culture are revising and dismantling them”. What I wanted to stress is that we shall necessarily have to select from the rich and varied Neo-Latin material (I certainly do not mean that our field of study is homogeneous). Since there is today so much focus on the study of elementary education and the dependence on rhetoric and poetic manuals that most certainly characterized the host of less talented writers, I wanted to issue a warning here: It is true that such investigations are valuable, but the Maevii and Bavii should not take too much of our time, and the simple analytical models suitable for puerile tirocinia will often turn out to be procrustean tools in our efforts to understand the more gifted spirits. Furthermore, it is impossible to deny that we have to establish a sort of canon, if our work is to be considered as relevant. It is more tempting to read those authors that really have something to say than those who just feel they have to say something.

Gerlinde Huber-Rebenich criticizes me for having (in section 2.2) overlooked the continuity of certain phenomena that originate in ancient Latin literature and also prevail in the Middle Ages. As examples she mentions the “correspondences”, the “theme of surpassing antiquity” and the homages to the rulers. She is most certainly right in directing our attention to such topoi that exist through the centuries, from Classical antiquity, during the Middle Ages and into modern times. Similar observations will be found at the end of Francesco Tateo's article. I have, however, never contended that themes like these are not present in medieval literature! On the contrary, I explicitly state this fact at the beginning of section 2.2, where I say about all these Renaissance ideas that they “have their roots in the ancient and medieval worlds”. What I wanted to stress, however, is that these ideas underwent significant changes during the Renaissance: From the end of the 15th century, theories about the correspondences got additional impetus from neo-Platonism, being thus strangely enriched and transformed; and the theme of surpassing antiquity was invested with quite a different meaning during the 16th cen-

tury when the world had been circumnavigated, hitherto unknown continents and oceans discovered, and native kings in Africa, Asia and the Americas saw their fortresses reduced to ruins by European artillery fire; and no less so during the 17th century when scientists with a wild surmise observed satellites of the planets through telescopes and discerned miraculous diminutive worlds through their microscopes. The homages to the rulers also take on a different character during the ruthless process of nation-building. There may be a continuity of themes, but I want to emphasize the need of perceiving the development, over time, of notions and ideas expressed through the same means of common themes and topoi.

Heinz Hofmann criticizes my treatment of orthographical matters. (In section 3.1, I argue that it is a mistake to normalize the orthography of the texts.) Professor Hofmann's main objections seem to be the following: The retention of the original orthography will confuse readers, it will automatically lead to the retention of abbreviations, ligatures, accents and punctuation, and it is contrary to editorial praxis for editions of old texts in the modern languages. To treat these arguments in reverse order, the third one is, as far as I can see, not correct; praxis varies considerably as far as modern languages are concerned. The second one is a *non sequitur* and I have never argued that abbreviations and original punctuation be retained. As regards the first, I will contend that those who are at all able to read the texts we are dealing with will not be confused by the aberrations in spelling; on the contrary, they will be instructed. We have a lot to learn from the actual orthography of our texts about the gradual growth of knowledge in the fields of vocabulary and etymology, as I have stated in section 3.1. To give some extra examples: Up to the end of the 17th century many scholars believed that there was one adjective *charus*, meaning 'dear', 'beloved' and another *carus*, meaning 'dear', 'expensive'. For an editor to change *charus* into *carus* is to withhold from the reader information about the author's knowledge of the language. The same holds true for many words, e.g. the noun *dissidium*, used alternating with *discidium* by eminent writers well into the 18th century, e.g.:

Joh. Cluverus: *Georgius Basta ... intestinum Hungaris et Dacis movit dissidium*;¹³⁹

Daniel Morhof: *Quot non Religionis dissidia Bibliothecas et libros pessum dedere*;¹⁴⁰

Joh. Loccenius: *dissidium eos in seipsos convertit*;¹⁴¹

¹³⁹ *Historiarum Totius Mundi Epitome*, 759.

¹⁴⁰ *Polyhistor* 1,1,5,26, p. 39.

¹⁴¹ *Historiae rerum Succicarum ... libri novem*, 679.

It is easy to find *dissidium* in medieval dictionaries (Latham, Niermeyer), and 17th-century lexica take it for granted that the word exists: Jonas Petri Gothus's dictionary has the entry "Dissidium, ij n.2 Oenigheet, twedrächt ... Germ Uneinigkeit/zweidrächt". In Basilius Faber Soranus (the 1686 ed.) the words are arranged according to principles that would today be called morphematic; *dissidium* is listed there under *sideo* (given this spelling, such an etymology would be self-evident): "*Dissidium* dissensio, discordia, segregatio. Cic. *de Amic.* cap XXI *Ne qua amicorum dissidia fiant*". Noltenius accepts both words and explains their etymologies, which leads him to assume a difference in sense, based on the derivations: (col. 52) "*Discidium* a discindo ... Die Scheidung, die Trennung; *Dissidium* a dissideo ... die Vneinigkeit."

Is it really reasonable to change *dissidium* into *discidium* in instances like the ones quoted? Another example is the instances where the spelling *decollo* is used in the sense of *decolo*. As will be remembered, *decollo* means 'behead' and possibly also 'remove from the neck', whereas *decolo* means 'trickle or drain away' (also transferred 'to come to naught', 'to fail' about hope). *Decolo* is very rare in the ancient Latin texts. Already in ancient Latin the incorrect spelling with double *l* occurs under influence from *decollo* (see TLL s.v. *decollo* l. 31). In Neo-Latin texts this erroneous spelling survives, and scholars apparently thought that they were dealing with just one verb. In the 1686 edition of Basilius Faber Soranus we find a fanciful explanation of the semantics of this verb s.v. *collum*: *Decollare, securi caedere ... Sed Plauto decollare fallere et decipere est ... Solebant veteres de collo crumenam sibi suspendere. Quae cum in collo amplius non erat, decollare dicebatur. Hinc decollare pro deesse vel perisse, sive amisum esse dicebatur.*

Against this background, I cannot think that we ought to change the spelling of Joh. Loccenius, when he writes: *spes resistendi Sveticis aut auxilii a Rege Poloniae ... ferendi ... prorsus ferme decollavit. (Historiae rerum Svecicarum ...*, 713). In doing so we would change and violate the metaphor that Loccenius thinks he is using. To sum up, Professor Hofmann's treatment seems to oversimplify the complexity of the orthographical issues. An interesting and nuanced discussion of the problems involved here will be found in IJsewijn & Sacré (1998), *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies* II: 472–74.

Finally, I shall comment briefly on (C) *the ideas and suggestions concerning the future development of Neo-Latin research*. One of the most attractive things of the Neo-Latin field is *the inherent interdisciplinary character* that is necessarily a part of the study. Several participants in the discussion describe our study as a meeting-place for scholars and scientists from a wide range of various disciplines and point to the possibilities of co-operation that offer themselves automatically. (See the comments of Yasmin Haskell, Ann Moss and Walther Ludwig.) Some useful warnings against elitistic attitudes are issued

at this point. As classicists, we have to realize that we, too, must learn from the material, methods and approaches of the disciplines we come into contact with: “Such ambassadors will need to tread carefully ...” in the words of Yasmin Haskell. Apart from all other considerations, interdisciplinary work is, as Yasmin Haskell puts it, “crucial to our material and intellectual survival”. The excellent educational plans outlined by Heinz Hofmann (in the last paragraph of his essay) contain very good arguments for development in this direction.

The *vastness of the Neo-Latin field* is another aspect treated by several of those who have reacted to my article. Walther Ludwig compares classical philology to a well-cultivated garden and Neo-Latin philology to “*einem grossen noch nicht durchforsteten Wald mit einigen Wegen und wenigen schon bepflanzten Lichtungen*”. The direction of further work in this forest must be discussed. We shall have to find ways and methods of combining further cultivation of areas that have already been opened up with pioneering work in other less known sylvan districts. One important thing to remember is that our forest is four-dimensional, and that directions must therefore be indicated by means of spatio-temporal coordinates. Minna Skafte Jensen and Walther Ludwig, while being positive to more research on the 17th and 18th centuries and scientific texts quite generally, both declare that exploration of new regions must not entail the neglect of Renaissance studies and research on poetic texts. I completely agree with them, but I allow myself to be optimistic: the number of classicists working in the Neo-Latin field is steadily growing, and I think that interdisciplinary work with texts of all kinds, and not least scientific texts, may create resources and strengthen the position of classical studies quite generally. It must be remembered that Latin held its position in the sciences well up to the turn of the 18th century, and even into the 19th century (the works of Euler and Gauss have become the paradigmatic examples of this late period).¹⁴² Research into the workaday Latin used by mathematicians, scientists and physicians must be a most rewarding task. Such investigations should be concerned with phraseology, syntax and vocabulary and would certainly yield interesting results.

Finally, most of the contributors to the debate seem to agree that *classical studies will remain the solid starting point* for the work of Neo-Latinists. Our texts are fraught with allusions to ancient literature that are meant to convey vital information. I have commented upon intertextual aspects in section 3.4.2, but I will readdress this issue quite briefly. Databases will be of help, but we must not think that they can substitute for our own reading. In an epic work in honour of Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden the author describes

¹⁴² IJsewijn & Sacré (1998), *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies* II, 258.

how the King liberated Nuremberg from Wallenstein's siege. The inhabitants can leave the battlements and go out to look at the camp of the enemy:

*Norica porta patet: venit cum milite civis
Hostiles operas inimicaque visere castra,
Et circumductos spacioso limite vallos.
Hic Bavarum manus; hic saevus tentoria fixit
Valstenius; duro sedes haec dicta Galasso:
Hic disponi acies, fremere hic tormenta solebant ...*¹⁴³

This is based on the passage in Virgil's *Aeneid* 2,26 ff., in which the Trojans pour out of their city in exultation to look at the deserted camp of the Greeks who, they think, have returned to their native countries:

*Ergo omnis longo solvit se Teucra luctu.
Panduntur portae; iuvat ire et Dorica castra
desertosque videre locos litusque relictum.
Hic Dolopum manus, hic saevus tendebat Achilles,
classibus hic locus, hic acie certare solebant.*

Exactly as in the other examples of intertextuality I have given in section 3.4.2, this is an example of an elegant allusive technique. There are not many words and phrases that are common between the two passages. Computers cannot help us here; it is necessary to have read Virgil. Besides, it is vital to realize that we are not dealing here with minute details in the text. Garissoles certainly did not mean the learned reference to be mere embellishment. On the contrary, the parallels and analogies create an extra dimension and additional tension, a feeling of relief as well as of possible future danger.

It is interesting to note how many quotations and allusions (also of this less obvious kind) are to be found in scientific works, also those that are relatively late, viz. from the 18th or 19th centuries. When Carolus Linnaeus repeatedly writes *cum non omnis ferat omnia tellus*,¹⁴⁴ it is easy enough, for anyone, by means of concordances or computers, to ascertain that this is just a negation of the Virgilian *omnis feret omnia tellus*, in the fourth Eclogue. The phrase, in its negated form, seems to have become a catch-word among botanists, an almost compulsory reference to be made when a difference in climate is being treated. It is my impression that we meet the expression everywhere, in varying forms; and the variations may of course be less obvious and present difficulties. Johannes Franck (Franckenius), a professor of medicine and a botanist in Uppsala in the middle of the 17th century, com-

¹⁴³ Antoine Garissoles, *Adolphis* 10,711 ff.

¹⁴⁴ E.g. in *Musa Cliffortiana*, p. 1 and *Hortus Cliffortianus*, Dedicatio.

mented upon the variety of climates in his *Speculum botanicum*, using this phrase: *nam non quaelibet tellus quaslibet fert plantas*. Only our own reading and memory will help us in such cases.

Reading the comments has been a pleasant and instructive experience, as I said at the beginning of this rejoinder. I have profited from the additional remarks and the objections I have met with. Consensus seems to reign on certain basic questions, whereas there are areas in which the preferences of the scholars involved differ considerably. The differences may well be seen as a natural reflection of the vastness of Neo-Latin studies. The specialization and concentration on different tasks is one of the things that will contribute to the good results of the *mellificium*, as is attested in the Georgics 4,158 ff., and this also holds good for the *mellificium sapientiae*; about which we may now say

Fervet opus, redolentque thymo fragrantia mella.

Bibliography

- Andreae, J.V. 1633: *Pietatis Germanae ad Gustavum Adolphum alloquium*. / - - /.
- Auhagen, U., Lefèvre, E., & Schäfer, E. (eds.) 2000: *Horaz und Celtis*. Tübingen.
- Bacon, F. 1620: *Instauratio magna*, Londini/London.
- Bacon, F. 1662: *De augmentis scientiarum libri IX*, Amstelodami/ Amsterdam.
- Bartholin, Thomas 1653: *Vasa Lymphatica, Nuper Hafnia in Animantibus inventa, Et Hepatis exsequia*, København.
- Beller, E. A. 1940: *Propaganda in Germany during the Thirty Years War*, London.
- Benner, M. & Tengström, E. 1977: *On the Interpretation of learned Neo-Latin. An Explorative Study based on some Texts from Sweden (1611–1716)* (Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis. Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia XXXIX), Göteborg.
- Berggren, M. 1994: *Andreas Stobaeus. Two Panegyrics in Verse* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Latina Upsaliensia 22), Uppsala.
- Binns, J.W. 1990: *Intellectual Culture in Elizabethan and Jacobean England. The Latin Writings of the Age* (Arca 24), Leeds.
- Blänsdorf, J., Janik, D., & Schäfer, E. 1993: *Bandusia. Quelle und Brunnen in der lateinischen, italienischen, französischen und deutschen Dichtung der Renaissance*, Stuttgart.
- Bolgar, R.R. (1954) 1973: *The Classical Heritage and its Beneficiaries*, Cambridge.
- Bolgar, R.R. (ed.) 1976: *Classical Influences on European Culture A.D. 1500–1700. Proceedings of an international Conference held at King's College, Cambridge 1974*. Cambridge.
- Bradner, L. 1940: *Musae Anglicanae. A History of Anglo-Latin Poetry 1500–1925*, New York & London.
- Braun, L. 1999: "Lateinische Epik im Frankreich des 17. Jahrhunderts", *NLatJb* 1, 9–20.
- Buchanan, G. 1697: *Rerum Scotticarum Historia*, Trajecti ad Rhenum/Ütrecht.
- Burke, P. 1966: "A Survey of the Popularity of Ancient Historians, 1450–1700", *History and Theory* V, 135–152.
- Burke, P. 1987: *The Italian Renaissance. Culture and Society in Italy*, Cambridge.

- Calepinus, A. 1516: *Dictionarium copiosissimum*, Argentorati/Strassbourg.
The Cambridge History of the Bible. 1963–70: I–III, Cambridge.
- Cellarius, Chr. 1693: *Erleichterte lateinische Grammatica*, Merseburg.
- Celtis Protucius, Conrad 1494: *Ars versificandi et carminum*, Leipzig: Martin Landsberg.
- Clemens, V. 1632: *Gustavis = Gustavidos libri IX, quibus Gustavi II vel Magni et Augusti ... Victo-
 riarum heroicarum, rerumque per Germaniam gestarum series carmine Heroico narratur*,
 Lugduni Batavorum/Leiden.
- Cluverus, Joh. 1639: *Historiarum Totius Mundi Epitome a prima rerum Origine usque ad annum
 Christi MDCXXX*, Lugduni Batavorum/Leiden.
- Conrady, K. O. 1962: *Lateinische Dichtungstradition und deutsche Lyrik des 17. Jahrhunderts*,
 Bonn.
- Conte, G.B. 1986: *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and other Latin
 Poets*, Ithaca and London.
- Deitz, L. 1997: "Editing Sixteenth-Century Latin Prose Texts: a Case Study and a Few General
 Observations", in: G.W. Most (Ed.), *Editing Texts. Texte edieren*, Göttingen, 141–164.
Der Neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike. Rezeptions- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte 1999: 13 A-Fo.
 Stuttgart–Weimar.
- De Smet, I.A.R. 1999: "Not for Classicists? The State of Neo-Latin Studies", in: *The Journal of
 Roman Studies*, Vol. LXXXIX. Pp. 205–209.
Dictionary of the Middle Ages 1982–1989: Vols. 1–13, New York.
- Du Cloux, A. (ed.) 1637: *Gustavus Magnus sive orationes panegyricae*, Lugduni Batavorum/
 Leiden.
- Faber Soranus, B. 1686: *Thesaurus eruditionis scholasticae ... jam olim post aliorum operas per
 Augustum Buchnerum recensitus et emendatus ... cura et studio Christophori Celarii*, Lipsiae/
 Leipzig.
- Fafner, J. 1982: *Tanke og tale. Den retoriske tradition i Vesteuropa*, København.
- Febvre, Lucien & Martin, Henri-Jean 1976: *The Coming of the Book: The Impact of Printing
 1450–1800*, trans. David Gerard, New York (First published 1958: *L'Apparition du Livre*,
 Paris).
- Filologia* 1993: *La filologia medievale e umanistica greca e latina nel secolo XX*, Atti del Congresso
 Internazionale Roma, Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Università La Sapienza, 11–15
 dicembre 1989, 2 vol., Roma.
- Forcellini, A. 1858–92: *Totius latinitatis lexicon ... amplissime auctum atque emendatum ... cura
 et studio V. De-Vit*. 1–10, Prati.
- Ford, Philip 2000: "Twenty-five Years of Neo-Latin Studies," *Neulateinisches Jahrbuch* 2,
 293–301.
- Foucault, M. 1966: *Les mots et les choses. Une archéologie des sciences humaines*, Paris.
- Fumaroli, M. (ed.) 1999: *Histoire de la rhétorique dans l'Europe moderne 1490–1950*, Paris.
- Fowler, Don 1997: "On the Shoulders of Giants: *Intertextuality and Classical Studies*," *Materiali
 e Discussioni* 39, 13–34.
- Franckenius, Johannes 1659: *Speculum botanicum renovatum*, Upsaliae/Uppsala.
- Friese, M. 1998: "Über sieben Brücken muß du gehen. Ein Plädoyer für die Lektüre eines
 neulateinischen Fachtextes", *Gymnasium* 105, 445–480.
- Fueter, E. 1936: *Geschichte der neueren Historiographie*. (In: *Handbuch der mittelalterlichen und
 neueren Geschichte* I, München).

- Fuhrmann, M. 1969: *Die Antike und ihre Vermittler*, Konstanz.
- Fuhrmann, M.—Tränkle, H. 1970: *Wie klassisch ist die klassische Antike?*, Zürich & Stuttgart.
- Gaisser, Julia Haig 1993: *Catullus and his Renaissance Readers*, Oxford.
- Garrisoles, Antoine 1649: *Adolphidos sive de Bello Germanico ... libri duodecim*, Montalbanil/ Montauban.
- Grafton, A. 1983: *Joseph Scaliger. A study in the History of Classical Scholarship. I Textual Criticism and Exegesis*. (Oxford-Warburg Studies), Oxford.
- Grafton, A. 1992: *New Worlds, Ancient Texts. The power of Tradition and the Shock of Discovery*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Grafton, A. 1993: *Joseph Scaliger. A study in the History of Classical Scholarship. II Historical Chronology* (Oxford–Warburg Studies), Oxford.
- Grant, W. L. 1954: “European Vernacular Works in Latin Translation”, in: *Studies in the Renaissance* I, 120–156. New York.
- Greene, Thomas M. 1980: *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry*, New Haven.
- Grotius, H. 1655: [*Procopii*] *Historia Gothorum, Vandalorum et Langobardorum ab Hugone Grotio partim versa, partim in ordinem digesta*, Amstelodami/ Amsterdam.
- Grotius, H. 1712: *De iure belli ac pacis libri tres*. Amstelaedami/Amsterdam.
- Haan, Estelle 1996 = Fletcher, Phineas, *Locustae vel Pietas Iesuitica*. Edited with introduction, translation and commentary by Estelle Haan. *Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia* IX. Leuven.
- Haase, W. & Meyer, R. (eds.) 1994: *The Classical Tradition and the Americas*, Vol I: *European Images of the Americas and the Classical Tradition*, Berlin & New York.
- Hansson, S. 1990: *Vossius' Elementa Rhetorica på svenska översatt och utgiven av Strina Hansson*, Litteraturvetenskapliga institutionen, Göteborgs Universitet, Meddelanden nr. 5.
- Haskell, Y. 1999: “Work or Play? Latin ‘Recreational’ Georgic Poetry of the Italian Renaissance”, *HL* 48, 132–159.
- Haskell, Y. & Hardie, P. (eds.) 1999: *Poets and Teachers: Latin Didactic Poetry and the Didactic authority of the Latin Poet from the Renaissance to the Present*, Bari.
- Haye, Th. 1997: *Das lateinische Lehrgedicht im Mittelalter. Analyse einer Gattung*, (Mittellatein. Studien und Texte XXII) Leiden etc..
- Healy, T.S. 1969: *John Donne. Ignatius his Conclave*, Oxford.
- Heilen, St. 2000: *Laurentius Bonincontrius Miniatisensis. De rebus naturalibus et divinis. Zwei Lehrgedichte an Lorenzo de’ Medici und Ferdinand von Aragonien. Einleitung und kritische Edition*, Stuttgart & Leipzig.
- Helander, H. & Hermelin, I. 1983–1984: “Olof Hermelins Elegi om fältlivets vedermödor (Elegia de incommodis vitae castrensium). Edited with introduction and translation by Ingeborg Hermelin and a commentary by Hans Helander”, in: *Annales Societatis Litterarum Humaniorum Regiae Upsaliensis*, Årsbok 1983–1984, 43–66. In Swedish, with a summary in English, Uppsala.
- Helander, H. 1988:1: “Om Swedenborgs latin” in: *Svensk kyrkohistorisk årsskrift*, 25–33.
- Helander, H. 1988:2: *Emanuel Swedenborg, Camena Borea*. Edited with introduction, translation and commentary (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Latina Upsaliensia 20), Uppsala.
- Helander, H. 1985: *Emanuel Swedenborg, Festivus applausus in Caroli XII in Pomeraniam suam adventum*. Edited with introduction, translation and commentary (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Latina Upsaliensia 17), Uppsala.

- Helander, H. 1989: *Olof Hermelin, "Ad Carolum XII, Svecorum regem, de continuando adversus foedifragos bello"*. Edited with introduction and translation, in: *Annales Societatis Litterarum Humaniorum Regiae Upsaliensis*, Årsbok 1989, Uppsala, 57–86.
- Helander, H. 1994: "Olof Hermelin—Poet in the Service of the King", in: *Acta conventus Neo-Latini Hafniensis. Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies*, Binghamton, New York, 485–493.
- Helander, H. 1995: *Emanuel Swedenborg. Ludus Heliconius and other Latin Poems*. Ed., with introduction, translation and commentary (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Latina Upsaliensia 23), Uppsala.
- Hobson, Anthony 1989: *Humanists and Bookbinders: The Origins and Diffusion of the Humanistic Bookbinding 1459–1559 with a Census of Historiated Plaquette and Medallion Bindings of the Renaissance*, Cambridge.
- Hödl, L. & Wuttke, D. (eds.) 1978: *Probleme der Edition mittel- und neulateinischer Texte*. Kolloquium der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft, Bonn 26.–28. Februar 1973, Boppard.
- Hofmann, H. 1993 (ed.): *Julius Caesar Stella. Columbeis, Boek I en II. Epos over Columbus ontdekking van Amerika*, Groningen.
- Hofmann, H. 1994: "Adveniat tandem Typhis qui detegat orbis. Columbus in Neo-latin Epic Poetry (16th–18th Centuries)", in: *The Classical Tradition and the Americas*, Vol. I.1, 420–656.
- Hofmann, H. 1995a: "Die Geburt Amerikas aus dem Geist der Antike", in: *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*, Vol. 1, No. 4, 15–47.
- Hofmann, H. 1995b: "Aeneas in Amerika. Komplikationen des Weltbildwandels im Humanismus am Beispiel neulateinischer Columbasepen", *Philologus* 139, 36–61.
- Hofmann, H. 2000a: "Point de vue sur les méthodes et les perspectives des études néo-latines", *Les Cahiers de l'Humanisme* 1, 11–33.
- Hofmann, H. 2000b: "Neulateinische Literatur: Aufgaben und Perspektiven", *NLatJb* 2, 57–97.
- Holberg, Ludvig 1741: *Nicolai Klimii Iter Subterraneum*, Copenhagen & Leipzig: Jacobus Prussiaus.
- Holberg, L. 1965: *Tre levnedsbreve 1728–1743*, I–III. Ed. A. Kragelund, København.
- Hoven, R. 1994: *Lexique de la Prose Latine de la Renaissance*, Leiden.
- Humanistica Lovaniensia* brings general bibliographical information, and *Symbolae Osloenses* promises a similar service for Scandinavian Neo-Latin.
- IJsewijn, J. & Kefler, E. (eds.) 1973: *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Lovaniensis, Proceedings of the First International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies Louvain 23–28 August 1971*, Leuven & München.
- IJsewijn, J. 1977: *Companion to Neo-Latin studies*, 1. ed., Amsterdam.
- IJsewijn, J. 1990: *Companion to Neo-latin Studies*, Part I, *History and Diffusion of Neo-Latin Literature*, Second entirely rewritten edition (Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia V), Leuven.
- IJsewijn, J. & Sacré, D. 1998: *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies*, Part II, *Literary, Linguistic, Philological and Editorial Questions*, Second entirely rewritten edition (Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia XIV), Leuven.
- Johns, Adrian 1998: *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making*, Chicago and London.

- Kallendorf, Craig 1999: *Virgil and the Myth of Venice: Books and Readers in the Italian Renaissance*, Oxford.
- Kallendorf, Craig 2000: "Proverbs, Censors, and Schools: Neo-Latin Studies and Book History", in: *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Abulensis: Proceedings of the Tenth International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies (Ávila, 1997)*, ed. Rhoda Schnur, Tempe.
- Kelley, D. R. 1998: *Faces of History. Historical Inquiry from Herodotus to Herder*, New Haven, Conn.
- Kepler, Joh., 1940: *Harmonice Mundi*, in: Johannes Kepler. Gesammelte Werke, Band VI. Herausgegeben unter der Leitung von W. von Dyck und Max Caspar. Berichte der Kepler-Kommission; 1. München.
- King, Margaret, and Rabil, Albert Jr., eds. 1983: *Her Immaculate Hand: Selected Works by and about the Women Humanists of Quattrocento Italy*, Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, Binghamton, New York.
- King, Margaret 1991: *Women of the Renaissance*, Chicago.
- Kircher, A. 1646: *Ars magna lucis et umbrae in decem libros digesta*, Romae/Rome.
- Kircher, A. 1652–1654: *Oedipus Aegyptiacus*, Romae/Rome.
- Krebs, J.Ph. & Schmalz, J.H. 1905–07: *Antibarbarus der lateinischen Sprache* [...]. Siebente [...] umgearbeitete Auflage, I-II, Basel.
- Kühner, R. & Holzweissig, F. 1912: *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. Erster Teil. Elementar-, Formen- und Wortlehre*, Hannover.
- Leinkauf, Th. 1993: *Mundus combinatus. Studien zur Struktur der barocken Universalwissenschaft am Beispiel Athanasius Kirchers SJ*, Berlin.
- Leonhardt, Jürgen 1999: "Sieben Thesen zum Verhältnis von Latein und Geisteswissenschaften", *Neulateinisches Jahrbuch* 1, 283–88.
- Lily, William, *Brevissima institutio seu ratio grammatices*, London 1549.
- Lindblom, J. Axelson 1790: *Lexicon Latino-Svecanum*, Uppsala.
- Linnaeus, Carolus 1736: *Musa Cliffortiana florens Hartecampi 1736 prope Harlemum, Lugduni Batavorum/Leiden*.
- Linnaeus, Carolus 1737: *Hortus Cliffortianus*, Amstelaedami/Amsterdam.
- Linné, C. von, 1749: *Amoenitates academicae, seu dissertationes variae physicae, medicae, botanicae, antehac seorsim editae, nunc collectae et auctae cum tabulis aeneis. Accedit hypothesis nova de Febrium intermittentium causa*, Vol. primum, Lugduni Batavorum/ Leiden.
- Linné, C. von, 1962: *De curiositate naturali* = Linné, C. von, *Om undran inför naturen och andra latinska skrifter*. Inledning och urval av Knut Hagberg, Stockholm.
- Lipsius, J. 1618: *Flores ex ejus operibus discerpti in locos communes digesti*, Erphoridae/Erfurt.
- Lipsius, J. 1658: *Politicorum sive civilis doctrinae libri sex ex Instituto Matthiae Berneggeri*, Francofurti/ Frankfurt.
- Loccenius, Joh. [1662]: *Historiae rerum Svecicarum a primo Rege Sveciae usque ad Caroli Gustavi Regis Sveciae obitum deductae libri novem*, Upsaliae/ Uppsala.
- Loccenius, Joh. 1670: *Antiquitatum Sveo-Gothicarum libri tres*, Upsaliae/Uppsala.
- Ludwig, W. 1977: *Die Borsias des Tito Strozzi. Ein lateinisches Epos der Renaissance. Erstmals herausgegeben, eingeleitet und kommentiert*, (Hum.Bibl., R. II, Bd. 5) München.
- Ludwig, W. 1993: "Vom Jordan zur Donau—die Rezeption Sannazaros durch Joachim Münsinger von Frundeck", in: *Humanistica Lovaniensia*, Vol. XLII, 252–258.
- Ludwig, W. 1996: *Der Ritt des Dichters auf dem Pegasus und der Kuß der Muse - zwei neuzeitliche Mythologeme* (Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen 1996, 3), Göttingen.

- Ludwig, W. 1997: "Die neuzeitliche lateinische Literatur seit der Renaissance", in: *Einleitung in die lateinische Philologie*, ed. by Fritz Graf, 323–356, Stuttgart und Leipzig.
- Ludwig, W. 1998a: "Risiken und Chancen bei der Erforschung der neuzeitlichen Latinität", in: *Jahrbuch für Internationale Germanistik*, Jahrgang XXX:1.
- Ludwig, W. 1998b: "Das bessere Bildnis des Gelehrten", in: *Philologus* 142, 123–161.
- Ludwig, W. 1999: *Vater und Sohn im 16. Jahrhundert. Der Briefwechsel des Wolfgang Reichart genannt Rychardus mit seinem Sohn Zeno (1520–1543)*, Herausgegeben und erläutert, Hildesheim.
- Maskell, D. 1973: *The Historical Epic in France, 1500–1700* (Oxford Modern Languages and Literature Monographs), London.
- Mathieu-Castellani, G. & Plaisance, M. (eds.) 1990: *Les Commentaires et la naissance de la critique littéraire*, Paris.
- McGann, Jerome J. 1983: *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*, Chicago and London.
- McKenzie, D.F. 1999: *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*, Cambridge (Originally published 1986, London (The Panizzi Lectures 1985)).
- Milton, J. 1930: *The Latin Poems of John Milton, edited with an introduction, an English translation and notes by Walter MacKellar* (Cornell Studies in English XV), New Haven.
- Morhof, D. 1970: *Polyhistor literarius, philosophicus et practicus, cum accessionibus virorum clarissimorum Ioannis Frickii et Iohannis Molleri*, Neudruck der 4. Ausgabe, Lübeck 1747, I–II, Aalen.
- Mortensen, L. B. 1994: "The Printed Dedication: its Functions and some Danish Statistics from the Nordic Neo-Latin Database", *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Hafniensis*, Binghamton-New York, 699–709.
- Moss, A. 1996: *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought*, Oxford.
- Moss, A. 1999: *Latin Commentaries on Ovid from the Renaissance*, selected, introduced and translated, Tennessee.
- Murgatroyd, P. 2000: *The amatory elegies of Johannes Secundus*, Leiden.
- Nativel, C. (ed) 1997: *Centuria latinae. Cent et une figures humanistes de la Renaissance aux Lumières* (Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance 314), Geneva. (A second encyclopedia and bibliography of a further hundred Latin humanists is to be published in 2001).
- Nichols, F.J. 1979: *An Anthology of Neo-Latin Poetry*, edited and translated by F.J. Nichols, New Haven.
- Noltenius 1744 = *Ioh. Frid. Noltenii Lexicon Latinae linguae antibarbarum quadripartitum*, Lipsiae/Leipzig.
- Norden, E. 1909: *Die antike Kunstprosa von VI Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*, 1–2, 2. Aufl., Leipzig.
- OLD = *The Oxford English Dictionary* 1989: prepared by J.A. Simpson and E.S.C. Weiner, 2. ed., Oxford.
- Olschki, L. 1922: *Geschichte der neusprachlichen wissenschaftlichen Literatur*, Band 2: *Bildung und Wissenschaft im Zeitalter der Renaissance in Italien*, Leipzig.
- Olsson, S. 1953: *Olof Hermelin - en karolinsk kulturpersonlighet och statsman*, Lund.
- Ong, W.J. 1976: "Commonplace Rhapsody: Ravisius Textor, Zwinger and Shakespeare", in: Bolgar, R.R. (ed.), 1976, 91–126.
- Östlund, K. 2000: *Johan Ihre on the Origins and History of the Runes. Three Latin Dissertations from the mid 18th Century edited with translation and commentary* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Latina Upsaliensia 25), Uppsala.

- Padley, G.A. 1976: *Grammatical Theory in western Europe 1500–1700. The Latin Tradition*, Cambridge.
- Palmer, L.R. 1954: *The Latin Language*, London.
- Pancirolli, G. 1631: *Nova reperta sive rerum memorabilium recens inventarum et veteribus incognitarum, pars posterior. Ex Italico Latine reddita, nec non Commentariis illustrata et locis prope innumeris postremum aucta ab Henrico Salmuth Ambergensium Syndico emerito*, Francofurti/Frankfurt.
- Pasquali, Giorgio 1951: “Arte allusiva,” in: *Stravaganze quarte e supreme*, 11–20, Venice.
- Patterson, Annabel M. 1970: *Hermogenes and the Renaissance Seven Ideas of Style*, Princeton.
- Pearson, David 1994: *Provenance Research in Book History: A Handbook* (The British Library Studies in the History of the Book), London.
- Petri Gothus, J. 1640: *Dictionarium Latino-Sveco-Germanicum ex variis probatorum auctorum lexicis [...] excerptum [...]*, Lincopiae/Linköping.
- Pigman, G.W., III 1980: “Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 33, 1–32.
- Pitkäranta, R. 1992: *Neulateinische Wörter und Neologismen in den Dissertationen Finnlands des 17. Jahrhunderts. Personenbezeichnungen und Sachabstrakta auf -ia*. (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae B 263), Helsinki.
- Planer, O. 1916: *Verzeichnis der Gustav - Adolf - Sammlung mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Schlacht am 6/16 November 1632*, Leipzig.
- Polydore Vergil 1606: *De rerum inventoribus libri octo ... Accesserunt C. Plinii, Alexandri Sardi, aliorumque de eadem materia collectanea*, Argentorati/Strassburg.
- Pontanus 1594: *Poeticarum institutionum libri tres*, Ingolstadt.
- Pufendorf, S. 1696: *De rebus a Carolo Gustavo Sveciae Rege gestis commentariorum libri septem*, Norimbergae/ Nürnberg.
- Pufendorf, S. 1672: *De jure naturae et gentium*, Londini Scanorum/Lund.
- Rhenius, Joh., 1651: *Donatus Latino-Germanicus seu ratio declinandi et conjugandi*, Lipsiae/ Leipzig.
- Rizzo, Silvia 1986: *Il latino nell’Umanesimo*, in *Letteratura Italiana*, diretta da Alberto Asor Rosa, vol. V: Le Questioni, Torino, 379–408.
- Robin, Diana, ed. 1997: *Letters and Orations: Cassandra Fedele*, Chicago.
- Robin, Diana, ed. 2000: *Collected Letters of a Renaissance Feminist: Laura Cereta*, Chicago.
- Roloff, H.-G. 1998: “Die Erschließung der neulateinischen Literatur und Europa—eine vordringliche Aufgabe”, *Jb. f. Internat. Germanistik* 30, 21–27.
- Rosenthal, Bernard 1997: *The Rosenthal Collection of Printed Books with Manuscript Annotations: A Catalog of 242 Editions Mostly before 1600 Annotated by Contemporary or Near-Contemporary Readers*, New Haven.
- Rummel, E. 1995: *The Humanist-Scholastic Debate in the Renaissance and Reformation*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Sandys, J.E. 1903–1908: *A History of classical Scholarship*, I–III, Cambridge.
- Sarbievius, M. C. 1980: *Lyrice, quibus accesserunt Iter Romanum et Lechianos fragmentum*, with introduction, Latin text and commentary by Mirosław Korolko and Polish translation by Jan Okon, Warszawa.
- Scaliger, Julius Caesar 1561: *Poetice libri septem*, Lugduni/Lyon.
- Schefferus, Joh. 1687: *Memorabilium Sueticae gentis exemplorum liber singularis*, Hamburgi et Holmiae/Hamburg and Stockholm.

- Schmidt, P.L. 1993: "Die Studien in Deutschland zur humanistischen und neulateinischen Literatur seit dem ausgehenden 19. Jahrhundert", *Filologia* II, 831–910.
- Schmitt, C. B. & Skinner, Q. (eds) 1988: *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, Cambridge.
- Schyllberg, P. 1722: *Prodromus deliciarum Svecorum Poëtarum*, Upsaliae/Uppsala.
- Segel, H. B. 1974: *The Baroque Poem*, New York.
- Skaft Jensen, M. 1988: "Latinsk renaessancepoesi i Danmark", in: *Renaessancen, Dansk-Europaeisk-Globalt*, ed. by M. Pade and M. Skaft Jensen, 132 ff. (Renæssancestudier 2), København.
- Skaft Jensen, Minna: 1991 "The Language of Eternity: The Role of Latin in 16th-Century Danish Culture", *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Torontonensis*, Binghamton-New York, 41–61.
- Skaft Jensen, M. (ed.) 1995: *A History of Nordic Neo-Latin Literature*, Odense.
- Skaft Jensen, M. (ed.) 1997: *Homer gennem Tiden. Historie eller fiktion*. Studier fra Sprog- og Oldtidforskning 330, København.
- Skovgaard-Petersen, K. 1988: *Erasmus Laetus' Margareta. Klassisk epos og dansk propaganda*, Studier fra Sprog- og Oldtidforskning 312, København.
- Skovgaard-Petersen, K. 1991: "Danish Neo-Latin Epic as Anti-Swedish Propaganda", in: *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Torontonensis*, 721–727. Binghamton, N.Y.
- Skovgaard-Petersen, K & P. Zeeberg (eds.) 1992: *Erasmus Laetus' skrift om Christian IVs fødsel og dåb (1577)*, (Det danske Sprog- og Litteraturselskab), København.
- Skovgaard-Petersen, K. 1993: "The literary feud between Denmark and Sweden in the 16th and 17th centuries and the development of Danish historical scholarship", in: J.R. Brink, & W.F. Gentrup (edd.): *Renaissance Culture in Context. Theory and Practice*, Cambridge, 114–120.
- Skovgaard-Petersen, K. 1995: "Tacitus and Tacitism in Johannes Meursius' Historia Danica (1630–38)", *Symbolae Osloenses* 70, 212–240.
- Skovgaard-Petersen, K. & P. Zeeberg 1997: "Recent work on Nordic Neo-Latin literature (1992–96)", *Symbolae Osloenses* 72, 172–84.
- Skovgaard-Petersen, K. 1999: "Pontanus' og Meursius' Danmarkshistorier. Nogle betragtninger over deres plads i historiografiens historie", *Historisk tidsskrift*, 99:2, 387–405.
- Skovgaard-Petersen, Karen 2001: *Historiography at the Court of Christian IV. Studies in the Latin Histories of Denmark by Johannes Pontanus and Johannes Meursius*, København.
- Sleidan, Johann 1555, *De statu rei publicae et religionis commentarii*, Argentorati/Strassburg.
- Sleidan, Johann 1556, *De quatuor summis imperiis*, Argentorati/Strassburg.
- Smith, P. 1962: *A History of modern Culture*, Vol 1, *Origins of Modern Culture 1543–1687*, New York.
- Sommer, F. 1914: *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre. Einführung in das sprachwissenschaftliche Studium des Lateins*, 2:e und 3:e Aufl. (Indogermanische Bibliothek 1:1:3:1), Heidelberg.
- Steenbakkens, P. 1994a: "Accent-marks in Neo-Latin", *ACNH*, 925–934.
- Steenbakkens, P. 1994b: "Towards a history of accent-marks in Neo-Latin", in: P. Steenbakkens, *Spinoza's Ethica from manuscript to print. Studies on text, form and related topics*, Diss. Groningen, Utrecht (*Quaestiones Infinitae*, XI), 71–101.
- Steuchus, A. 1540: *De perenni philosophia*, Lugduni/Lyon.
- Swedenborg, E. 1734: *Opera Philosophica et Mineralia. Tres tomi: Tom.I. Principia Rerum Naturalium sive Novorum Tentaminum Phaenomena Mundi Elementaris Philosophice Expli-*

- candi. Tom.II. Regnum Subterraneum sive Minerale de Ferro deque Modis Liquationum Ferri per Europam passim in usum receptis; deque conversione ferri crudi in chalybem: de vena ferri et probatione ejus; pariter de chymicis praeeparatis et cum ferro et vitriolo ejus factis experimentis. Tom.III. Regnum Subterraneum sive Minerale de Cupro et Orichalco deque modis liquationum cupri per Europam passim in usum receptis: de secretione ejus ab argento: de conversione in Orichalcum: inque Metalla diversi generis: de Lapide Calaminari: de Zinco: de Vena Cupri et probatione ejus: pariter de chymicis praeeparatis et cum cupro factis experimentis, &c &c. Cum figuris aeneis, Dresdae et Lipsiae/ Dresden and Leipzig.*
- Swedenborg, E. 1745: *De cultu et amore Dei*, Londini/London.
- Sz.= Leumann, M., Hofmann, J.B. & Szantyr, A. 1965: *Lateinische Grammatik*, 2. Band: *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 2,2,2.) München.
- Tateo, Francesco: *La critica virgiliana di B. Maranta e l'Ermogene latino di A. Bonfini*, in *Tradizione classica e letteratura umanistica. Per Alessandro Perosa*, Bulzoni Editore, Roma 1985, pp. 661-673.
- Tateo, Francesco 1991: *Sulle traduzioni umanistiche di Plutarco. Il De virtute morali di Andrea Matteo Acquaviva*, in *Filosofia e cultura. Per Eugenio Garin*, edd. M. Ciliberto & C. Vasoli, Editori Riuniti, Roma, vol. I, 195-214.
- Tateo, Francesco 1992: *L'Umanesimo*, in *Lo spazio letterario del Medioevo. Il Medioevo latino* edd. G. Cavallo, C. Leonardi, E. Menestò, Roma, ol. I, t. I, 145-179.
- Tateo, Francesco 1994: *Ciceronianismus*, in *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, herausgegeben von Gert Ueding, edd. G. Kalivoda, H. Mayer, F. H. Robling, Max Niemeyer, Tübingen, 226-239.
- Tateo, Francesco 1994: *Puglia neolatina. Un itinerario del Rinascimento fra autori e testi*, Bari.
- Tateo, Francesco 1997: *La questione dello stile nell'epistolografia. L'alternativa umanistica*, in *Saeculum tamquam aureum*, Internationales Symposium zur italienischen Renaissance (Mainz, 14-16 Jahrhunderts am 17-18 September 1996), Mainz, 219-231.
- Tateo, Francesco 1999 (ed.): *Umanesimo e culture nazionali europee. Testimonianze letterarie dei secoli XV-XVI*, Palermo.
- Tavoni, Mirko 1984: *Latino, grammatica, volgare: storia di una questione umanistica*, Padova.
- Taylor, Archer 1986: *Book Catalogues: Their Varieties and Uses*, 2nd edn. revised by William P. Barlow, Jr. Winchester (Originally published 1957: Chicago).
- Tengström, E. 1983, *A Latin Funeral Oration from early 18th Century Sweden. An interpretative Study* (Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis. Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia XLV), Göteborg.
- Tillyard, E.M.W. 1963: *The Elizabethan World Picture*, Harmondsworth.
- Vossius, G.J. 1635, *De arte grammatica libri septem*, Amsterdam/Amsterdam.
- Vossius, G.J. 1643: *Institutiones oratoriae*, Lugduni Batavorum/Leiden.
- Waquet, F. 1998: *Le latin ou l'empire d'un signe*, Paris.
- Westfall, R. S. 1993: *The Life of Isaac Newton*, Cambridge.
- Widekindi, Joh. 1672: *Historia belli Sveco-Moscovitici decennalis*, Holmiae/ Stockholm.
- Wiegand, H. 1984: *Hodoeporica. Studien zur neulateinischen Reisedichtung des deutschen Kulturraums im 16. Jahrhundert*, Baden-Baden.
- Yates, F. A. 1966: *The Art of Memory*, London.
- Zedelmaier, H. 1992: *Bibliotheca universalis und Bibliotheca selecta. Das Problem der Ordnung des gelehrten Wissens in der frühen Neuzeit*, Cologne, Weimar, Vienna.

Zeeberg, Peter & Lars Boje Mortensen 1997: "The database of Nordic Neo-Latin literature on the World Wide Web. Introduction and Status", *Symbolae Osloenses* 72, 185–9.

Zwinger, Th. 1565: *Theatrum vitae humanae, omnium fere eorum, quae in hominem cadere possunt, Bonorum atque malorum exempla historica, Ethicae philosophiae praeceptis accommodata et in XIX libros digesta comprehendens*, Basileae/Basel.