Nordic Journal of Renaissance Studies

17

2020

Meaningful Memories: A cultural memory perspective on humanist interaction with the past

eds. Lærke Maria Andersen Funder
& Trine Arlund Hass

Meaningful Memories, eds. Lærke Maria Andersen Funder and Trine Arlund Hass
Nordic Journal of Renaissance Studies 17 • 2020
General Editor of *NJRS*: Johann Ramminger

(*NJRS* was formerly known as *Renæssanceforum: Journal of Renaissance Studies*)

ISSN 2597-0143. URL: www.njrs.dk/njrs_17_2020.htm

Table of Contents

Appendix

* Due to the time constraints of the present publication this article is not included in the present volume. It will be added subsequently.

Fickle Models and Flexible Memories:

A cultural memory perspective on humanist interaction with the past

By Lærke Maria Andersen Funder & Trine Arlund Hass

As every Renaissance scholar knows, Petrarch rediscovered Cicero's letters to Atticus, Brutus, and his brother Quintus in the Biblioteca Capitolare of the Cathedral in Verona in 1345. The letters were not lost as such, as they were sitting on the shelves of the library; but they had been lost to memory. Petrarch quite literally pulled them out of oblivion and brought them into the light. In announcing his findings through the publication of a comparable collection of his own letters, including two addressed by him to Cicero, Petrarch made clear that the content of Cicero's letters had changed and expanded both his knowledge and his conception of Cicero.

In transcending the time gap, Petrarch was attempting to reach back in time and piece together a picture of his hero from the scraps that had made it through to his time. As he salvages these sources from oblivion, Petrarch is not so much reminded of Cicero as he is recollecting and constructing an idea of that person from the past by fitting the newly acquired pieces into the existing puzzle. The memory of Cicero he establishes is thus a construction as well as an interpretation. This is true for the humanist understanding of the past in general, just as it is for ours today.

The humanists ventured to recover remains from the classical era and piece them together into as complete images as possible. The ancient texts, artworks etc. were considered canonical, but not untouchable. When new pieces were discovered (as with the Cicero letters) or new insights and new hypotheses emerged, or following changes in the scholars' own context, the value and meaning of the canonical texts were continually discussed and renegotiated. More than that, the humanists to a higher degree than today activated the classical remains by intervention: incomplete works were mended with new parts, such as the legs added by Guglielmo della Porta to the Farnese Hercules, or Maffeo Vegio's supplement to Virgil's *Aeneid*. The humanists' use of intertextuality – the interweaving of new works, be they of architecture, art, or literature, with borrowings from the classical – is an expression of the same praxis.

In order to examine the role of the classical heritage and the mechanisms of the humanists' way of engaging with it, this volume studies the Renaissance humanists' interactions with the classical past within a cultural memory framework. Considering this as a memory process emphasizes the fickleness of the humanists' grasp of the models after which they were shaping themselves and their works. It allows us to focus on the role of the individual and the individual's cultural context in the appropriation of the vast potential of the past into memories that are meaningful to that individual's world. Memory studies, likewise, enable us to explore how the relationship between individuals and their cultural contexts strikes a balance between the successful reinvention of parts of the past and the continued oblivion of others.

Memory studies

Memory studies originate in Maurice Halbwach's concept of collective memory: of how not just individuals, but communities too "have" a memory or construct versions of the past.[1] Memory studies blossomed in the 1980s with Pierre Nora's significant contribution of the concept "lieux de mémoire", still gaining an ever surer foothold in all sorts of disciplines performing studies of culture. Memory studies approach memory as the culturally embedded act, practised by individuals and groups, of recollecting elements of the past. Memory is not factual or objective; it is a selective and subjective act. The act of remembering places the remains of the past within the context of the present of the remembering subject or community. And when talking of cultural memory, it is clear that it transgresses the limits of personal experience. Considering memory as a cultural phenomenon also emphasizes that it is inherently precarious, operating between the individual and the collective:

> Memory nonetheless captures simultaneously the individual, embodied, and lived side as well as the collective, social, and constructed side of our relations to the past.[2]

The example of Petrarch who, having recovered Cicero's letters from oblivion, in response addresses his idol of the past, is an image of this complexity. Petrarch treats his reading experience as a lived encounter with a colleague: this seemingly very personal experience first results in a reorganization of his own ideas about the past, but soon this expands to include a reconsideration of his community's and his culture's memory of one

[1] Halbwachs 1925, 1941, and 1950; Erll 2008, 1.
[2] Citation from Erll 2008, 2.

of the finest and most important idols of their model culture. This example similarly confirms remembering to be a creative act that enables individuals and cultures "... to build new worlds out of the materials of older ones".[3] We may add here that forgetting can serve the same purpose.

The conceptualization of memory as *culturally embedded* is core to memory studies. This allows for the approach not only to encompass multifaceted memory practices, such as memory as a social practice, a material and mediated practice, and a cognitive practice, but to transcend the boundaries between these distinctions.[4] While one may theoretically distinguish between memory as a personal praxis that is cognitive and actual on the one hand and memory as a collective, societal and symbolic praxis on the other, Erll argues that:

> ... in practice the cognitive and the social/medial continuously interact. There is no such thing as pre-cultural individual memory; but neither is there a Collective or Cultural Memory (with capital letters) which is detached from individuals and embodied only in media and institutions.[5]

In this volume, we add to the development of memory studies by engaging with core theoretical and conceptual aspects. We see Renaissance humanism as a turning point in the European culture of memory, and as formative for all later interaction with the classical heritage. This culture is marked by a meta-discursive turn: the humanists actively theorized and debated how they were to engage with the past, developing a culture that incorporated critical reflection on its practices as a key element.[6] Renaissance humanists were acutely aware of the power of memory in their engagement with the past. At first they addressed mainly the legacy of classical antiquity, but as the humanist culture spread to regions beyond the Roman territories with their own local pasts, such as the Gothicism of Scandinavia, remembering – and forgetting – became a cultural practice that enabled the humanists to actively shape the narrative of their past as well as future. By the early sixteenth century, the humanist understanding of the power of memory had come to influence such diverse fields as literature, historiography, and natural history. Just as the focus expanded over time from literature and language to encompass all aspects of ancient culture, the material remains became just as important for the constructions and reconsideration of the memory of the past.

[3] Rothberg 2009, 5.
[4] Erll, 2008, 4.
[5] Erll 2008, 5.
[6] Horster & Pade 2020; den Haan 2016.

The primary point of convergence between past and present – the classical texts – was more than just media through which memory could be conveyed. The very act of reading and writing in the style of the ancients was an act of memory practised (*imitatio*). As Aleida Assmann succinctly puts it:

> As long as there was some kind of spiritual kinship, a later reader could communicate with the author across a wide expanse of time, because the writing could synchronize their communication.[7]

Writing in imitation of the ancient models was a way of drawing them out of the distant past and into the present – just as Petrarch treats Cicero as if he had been brought back to life. The distance between now and then was erased.[8] This praxis was expanded to a holistic engagement with the past: besides collecting and restoring the material relics of the past, this also included imitating past practices – establishing academies and developing methodologies for natural history and historiography based on ancient examples, for instance. Remembering the past was performed both on an individual and collective levels; it involved the mental act of remembering while also expressing itself through actions.

The field of memory studies has developed rapidly over the last three decades. Its scope – ranging from studies of the cultural memory of the Holocaust to the exploration of memory as an industrial complex embodied in the heritage sector – is remarkable in its breadth.[9] Memory studies are part of a larger wave of approaches to the interpretation of the past, also encompassing branches such as critical heritage studies and reception studies,[10] all of which share the same general view of the past as a construct made up of a plurality of subjective interpretations of events rather than as an objective entity. Thus a scholarly perspective entails acknowledging the subjective quality of our sources as we engage with the past, and demands that we understand the context and vantage point of those sources. This allows for an increasingly sophisticated understanding of both historical and contemporary uses of the past. Through reception studies, for example, which originated in Classics, we have come to understand the heritage of classical antiquity not as an objective monolith, but as a mosaic of complex appropriations reflecting the cultural contexts both of historical individuals and of groups of recipients.[11] Memory studies have been influential in critical

[7] A. Assmann 2011, 193.
[8] A. Assmann 2011, 180.
[9] See e.g. S. Macdonald 2013; Rothberg 2009.
[10] L. Hardwick & Stray 2008; Whitehead, S. Eckersley, M. Daugbjerg & G. Bozoğlu 2019.
[11] Zuckerberg 2018; Quinn 2019; Hall & Stead 2020.

heritage studies, where both cultural memory (often institutionalized) and individual memory have been shown to be instrumental in defining identities and normative discourses and in challenging and disrupting them.[12] The influence on critical heritage studies is just one illustration that memory studies is an interdisciplinary field held together by a set of common theoretical assumptions and concepts across a wide spectrum of empirical and disciplinary traditions.[13]

Cultural memory in this volume

The articles in this volume explore the concept of memory across a range of materials and contexts from the development of Neo-Latin in fifteenth-century Italy to historiographical conflicts in sixteenth-century Scandinavia. Focusing on written sources, the case studies show how the humanist engagement with memory places the act of remembering between the individual and their cultural context in a dialectic mediated through the re-imagining and reproducing of meaning.

In most of the contributions, Aleida Assmann's distinction between active and passive memory – what she terms *canon* and *archive,* or *functional* as opposed to *storage* memory – is of particular importance. The archive is also explained as a *reference memory*. A concrete example might be an actual archive or library, or the storage holdings of a museum: each of these is an institution of "passively stored memory that preserves the past past",[14] holding memories that are not in active use, that may be forgotten but are not lost. For this reason, Assmann describes the archive as "a space that is located on the border between forgetting and remembering".[15] Storage memories are uninterpreted; they are a mass of potential that can be reactivated – as were Cicero's letters on the dusty shelves of the library in Verona. Following Petrarch's announcement of his find, Cicero's letters were read by his fellow humanists and they became part of the canon, which Assmann has defined as "actively circulated memory that keeps the past present".[16] But one of the steps towards admission of the new texts to the canon also has to do with mechanisms of forgetting. In Petrarch's account, his immediate reaction to the discovery of the letters was to write a letter to Cicero himself, in which he reproaches Cicero for the less attractive character traits reflected in the letters: Cicero had not always been the great philosopher and statesman that Petrarch

[12] Gentry & Smith 2019.
[13] Erll 2008, 1–3.
[14] A. Assmann 2008, 98 [*sic*].
[15] A. Assmann 2008, 103.
[16] A. Assmann 2008, 98.

knew from the philosophical works and the speeches available. Petrarch seems here to be urging that these new-found character traits of Cicero's be suppressed; but rather than doing just that and letting this new and less appealing side of his idol sink back into oblivion, Petrarch uses it to promote his find. He pinpoints it and dwells on it to highlight how different these texts are from all the others currently known (or remembered) from Cicero's hand. It is an effective way of adding Cicero's letters to the canon, signalling that not only is a new genre being inscribed in the catalogue, but a new insight into one, if not *the*, primary icons of the humanist culture.

Marianne Pade uses Aleida Assmann's concepts to describe the development and use of the humanist variant of Latin that is now called Neo-Latin. She argues that it can be shown that the humanists were capable of writing in more than one stratum of Latin depending on the context and the recipient, thus activating and suppressing (or forgetting and remembering) different styles and vocabularies even if these differed from their preferred variant. Neo-Latin imitates ancient Latin, but it is an active and, if not independent, then at least a particular variant. A central component of Assmann's theory of cultural memory is forgetting. Like memory, forgetting can be active and passive: a matter can suffer willed destruction, or simply fall out of use.[17] Through an examination of the prescriptions for writing Neo-Latin of influential humanists like Niccolò Perotti and Lorenzo Valla, Pade explores their construction of a language canon by means of active as well as passive forgetting.

Johann Ramminger examines the relationship between language and memory in the *Antiquitates* of Annius of Viterbo, a work of purported source texts or translations of source texts of named authors that were in fact fictional, having been composed by Annius himself. After identifying connections between what were considered to be the earliest languages (including Etruscan, in Annius' view), Annius goes on to develop, on the basis of his invented "sources", a theory of language change that allows him to identify the Etruscan substrate of contemporary toponyms and ethnonyms. Ramminger complements Aleida Assmann's takes on cultural memory in his analysis with those of Jan Assmann, as well as a schema developed by Jakub Mlynář in which cultural memory emerges from language, memories are structured linguistically, and patterns of cultural memory affect language. Following this schema, Ramminger shows how Annius presents a coherent argument, which subsequently became influential in language studies even though his fakeries were scorned by Annius' contemporaries.

[17] See A. Assmann 2008, 97–98; Pade (this volume), 12.

Maren Rode Pihlkjær examines Lorenzo Valla's Latin translation of Pericles' funeral oration in Thucydides' *Historiae*, today a key text in the classical canon. Thucydides' work had been subject to passive forgetting in the West along with the rest of the Greek literature. Pihlkjær finds that Valla's translation is both a symptom of and an agent in the humanist attempt to reinsert the Greek authors into their own cultural memory of classical antiquity, next to the Roman writings that were linguistically (if not necessarily physically nor culturally) more accessible. Combining Aleida Assmann's concepts with translation theory, Pihlkjær examines how "democracy" is translated and transferred by Valla. Valla's contemporaries had no practical experience of the concept and knew it only from Aristotle's work, where it was criticized; whereas in the funerary oration, "democracy" is a positive, connecting factor for the people of Athens. Pihlkjær shows how Valla handles this by attempting to reproduce the intended effect of Thucydides' text, finding that rather than letting the text play on a sense of "belonging", Valla turns to the effect of "othering". Thus in Valla's translation the mood of unity is constructed by highlighting the opposition between the Athenians and their foreign enemies rather than by appealing to their commitment to the particular democratic state of which they were part.

Anders Kirk Borggaard's paper modifies Aleida Assmann's concepts of canon/functional versus archive/storage memory with a conceptual framework for reception studies developed by the project "Transformationen der Antike". Using this blended approach, he considers classical literature to have become in Renaissance humanism what he calls a *canonical archive,* as the classics had become just that, classics, through long-time preservation and a high degree of familiarity with the texts of the ancient authors. Borggaard applies his memory framework to the examination of how a hitherto unstudied epicedion by the Dutch/Danish humanist Johannes Saskerides imitates and fuses elements of two different canonical archives in order to construct what Saskerides intended to be an enduring memory of the Danish King Christian III. Here, Borggaard demonstrates how the cultural memory frameworks helps in the extraction and explanation of how new meanings were constructed from past models.

Trine Arlund Hass uses Jan Assmann's modified version of Aleida Assmann's distinction between passive storage memory and active functional memory. Jan Assmann offers alternative descriptions of these two states as *latency* or *potentiality* on the one hand and *manifestation* or *actualization* on the other.[18] Hass examines intertextual loans from Lucan's *Pharsalia* – that

[18] J. Assmann 2008, 117–118.

is, the actualized parts of its potentiality – in the biography of Julius Caesar as presented by the Danish poet Erasmus Lætus in *Romanorum Cæsares Italici* (1574). Lætus himself embeds his work within a memory framework when he states in his preface that he expects learned readers to be reminded of his sources and young readers to be stimulated to seek them out. Following Renate Lachmann in understanding intertextuality as the embedding or storing of (elements of) texts within a new text, Hass finds that there is a mnemonic relationship between the stored and storing texts.[19] Using Lachmann's typology, she analyses cases of intertextuality in central passages of Caesar's biography in order to determine how they are used to construct Lætus' own image of Caesar – which is quite unlike that of his source, Lucan.

Lærke Maria Andersen Funder combines Aleida and Jan Assmann's concepts of passive storage memory and active functional memory with Ludwick Fleck's theoretical concept of *thought collectives* as a way of conceptualizing museography as an emerging academic discipline in the seventeenth century. Jan Assmann argues that culture is intertwined with memory and that, through remembering, a given culture constitutes itself at the crossroads between past, present, and future. Funder explores how remembrance and forgetting have been employed as strategies in the making of a scholarly tradition. Analysing the direct references to Ole Worm's influential *Museum Wormianum* in the later museographies, she shows which parts of Worm's work were seen as worth remembering and which ones were marked for oblivion in the emergent narrative of the new discipline of museography. Especially the act of active negation – that is, creating a discourse arguing that some things ought to be forgotten while others remembered –reveal how mechanisms of remembering and forgetting are employed strategically to shape academic disciplines in their socio-cultural frameworks.

Matthew Norris examines the sixteenth-century dispute between Denmark and Sweden over the right to use the three crowns in heraldic symbols, and in particular the evidence presented by Swedish antiquarians in favour of the Swedish case. He begins by considering whate these "monumenta" meant to the humanists: as the etymology indicates, they were considered prompts, intended to remind their audience of something. Going back to classical memory theory, which distinguishes between the sensorial recollection of experienced past and memories "artificially" imposed through an anachronistic reminder, Norris embeds the antiquarian approach to memory within tradition. He moves from the classical theory of memory to neo-

[19] Lachmann 2004, 165.

Platonic explanations, and their further development into a simultaneously psychological and metaphysical view of memory by the Franciscan and cabalist Pietro Galatino. Norris finds that this latter view fits with the antiquarian interest in monuments that were considered to be "the shared icons of communal or cultural memory".[20] He shows how the field of cultural memory studies may provide a solution to historiography's struggle to unite empirical approaches to material evidence with the imaginative approaches of the humanists.

Acknowledgments

This volume is a collaboration between the two projects "Cultural Encounter as a Precondition of European Identity" and "Our Caesar: Danish receptions of Gaius Julius Caesar", both funded by the Carlsberg Foundation.[21] The "Cultural Encounter" project studies the intrinsic drivers of Renaissance humanism as well as its journey to the North, while "Our Caesar" examines the reception of Julius Caesar in Denmark and adapted to Danish culture across time. Drafts of some of the papers in this volume were presented at The fourth conference of the Nordic Network for Renaissance Studies (Helsinki 2018), and we thank the audience there for providing constructive feedback.

[20] Norris (this volume), 127.

[21] See project details at www.acdan.it/projekter/ce/index.html and https://www.carlsbergfondet.dk/da/Bevillingshaver/Formidling/Bevillingsoversigt/CF17_0622_Trine-Johanne-Arlund-Hass (visited 22 September 2020).

Bibliography

Assmann, Aleida 2008, "Canon and Archive," Erll & Nünning 2008, 97–108.

Assmann, Aleida 2011, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization: Functions, Media, Archives*, New York.

Erll, Astrid & Ansgar Nünning (eds.) 2008, *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*, Berlin & NewYork.

Erll, Astrid 2008, "Cultural Memory Studies: An introduction," Erll & Nünning 2008, 1–18.

Gentry, Kynan & Laurajane Smith 2019, "Critical heritage studies and the legacies of the late-twentieth century heritage canon," *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 25, 1148–1168.

Halbwachs, Maurice 1925, *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire*, Paris.

Halbwachs, Maurice 1941, *La topographie légendaire des évangiles en terre sainte: Étude de mémoire collective*, Paris.

Halbwachs, Maurice 1950, *Mémoire collective*, Paris.

Hall, Edith & Henry Stead 2020, *A People's History of Classics: Class and Greco-Roman Antiquity in Britain and Ireland 1689 to 1939*, London & New York.

Haan, Annet den (ed.) 2016, *The Metadiscourse of Renaissance Humanism*, *Renaessanceforum* 11 (URL: http://www.njrs.dk/rf_11_2016.htm, visited 28 August 2020).

Hardwick, Lorna & Christopher Stray (eds.) 2008, *A Companion to Classical Receptions*, Malden, Oxford & Chichester.

Horster, Camilla P. & Marianne Pade (eds.) 2020, *Cultural Encounter and Identity in the Neo-Latin World*, Rome.

Lachmann, Renate 2004, "Cultural Memory and the Role of Literature," *European Review* 12.2, 165–178.

Lachmann, Renate 2008, "Mnemonic and Intertextual Aspects of Literature," Erll & Nünning 2008, 301–10.

Macdonald, Sharon 2013, *Memorylands: Heritage and identity in Europe today*, London.

Quinn, Josephine Crawly 2018, *In Search of the Phoenicians*, Princeton & Oxford.

Rothberg, Michael 2009, *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization*, Palo Alto.

Whitehead, Chris, Susannah Eckersley, Mads Daugbjerg & Gönül Bozoğlu (eds.) 2019, *Dimensions of Heritage and Memory: Multiple Europes and the politics of crisis*, London & New York.

Zuckerberg, Donna 2018, *Not All Dead White Men: Classics and misogyny in the digital age*, Cambridge MA.

Canon and Archive in Humanist Latin

By Marianne Pade

Early Modern Latin, the variant of Latin in use between c. 1350 and 1700, has often been dismissed as a mechanical copy of its model, the Latin of ancient Rome. However, Early Modern Latin writers did not embrace the Latin of all periods of antiquity equally, even though many of them were familiar with other kinds of Latin than the ones they themselves favoured. I shall argue that, given the knowledge we see in many influential writers of this period of the diachronic variations of Latin, the relationship between the Latin actually used by individual writers and communities and the strata of Latin available to them may fruitfully be described in the terminology of A. Assmann as the relationship between linguistic canon and archive. I shall show this with examples from fifteenth-century Latin texts written in Italy. My point of departure will be Niccolò Perotti's work on the Latin language, the Cornu copiae (1470s).

Language change: canon and archive

Over time, any language becomes a repository of obsolete words, forgotten meanings, constructions no longer in use, and forms of discourse shaped by former periods that are now awkward. Language change and traditions of discourse have been studied by linguists and literary historians, and described with a huge variety of methods. In Aleida Assmann's famous article on "Canon and Archive", her discussion in the section on "The Dynamics of Cultural Memory between Remembering and Forgetting" does not include language as one of the core areas of active cultural memory.[1] Even so, I shall argue here that Assmann's concept of cultural archive and canon may prove useful in describing some of the characteristics of humanist Latin, the variety of Latin cultivated by Italian humanists from the end of the fourteenth century. Assmann writes about how cultural memory creates a connection between the past, the present and the future:

> In recalling, iterating, reading, commenting, criticizing, discussing what was deposited in the remote or recent past, humans participate in extended horizons of meaning-production [...] As the Internet creates a framework for communication across wide distances in space,

[1] Assmann 2008, 100.

> cultural memory creates a framework for communication across the abyss of time.[2]

Assmann stresses that in order to be able to remember, we also have to forget that which it is not necessary, convenient or pleasant to remember. She distinguishes between two forms of forgetting, an active and a passive:

> Active forgetting is implied in intentional acts such as trashing and destroying [...] The passive form of cultural forgetting is related to non-intentional acts such as losing, hiding, dispersing, neglecting, abandoning, or leaving something behind.[3]

With passive cultural forgetting, objects are not materially destroyed, they simply fall out of use. Assmann compares these two modes of cultural memory to different rooms in a museum. Prestigious objects are carefully selected and arranged in representative rooms to catch the attention and to make a lasting impression, but there are also rooms full of objects kept in store. Actively circulated memory that keeps the past present is referred to as "canon"; passively stored memory that simply preserves the past is called "archive".[4] The selection process that leads to some objects being put on display (canon) and others forgotten in storerooms (archive) often implies value judgments. Therefore changes of values will often influence the contents of the canon; and "elements of the canon can also recede into the archive, while elements of the archive may be recovered and reclaimed for the canon".[5]

Early Modern Latin

Early Modern Latin holds a special place among the European languages of the period. On the one hand, the Latin text production of Early Modern Europe (also called Neo-Latin) is by far the largest corpus in a single European language before the nineteenth century; on the other, it is the least researched.[6] The reasons for this are manifold. One is that Early Modern Latin had no native speakers and has therefore been a regarded as a dead language, incapable of change. Another is that many of its users held up ancient Latin as a standard to emulate and described the imitation of ancient Latin as central to language acquisition and use – wherefore Early Modern Latin has often been (erroneously) dismissed as a mechanical copy of its model.

---

[2] Assmann 2008, 97.
[3] Assmann 2008, 97–98.
[4] Assmann 2008, 98.
[5] Assmann 2008, 104.
[6] On the special status of Early Modern Latin, see Hankins 2001, Waquet 2002 and Ramminger 2014.

Whereas ancient Latin may be said to constitute the norm for Early Modern users of Latin with regard to vocabulary, syntax and forms of discourse, individual users and speech communities did not embrace the Latin from all periods of antiquity equally, nor did they adopt the same forms of discourse.[7] Even so, many users were familiar with other kinds of Latin than the ones they themselves would actively use or advocate, from reading or because they worked in an environment with different norms. It is for instance well known how humanists who otherwise wrote in a very classicizing idiom could effortlessly switch to a different kind of Latin with regard to both vocabulary and syntax – and even orthography – if so required, for instance in the execution of the duties of public administration.[8]

In light of the knowledge that we see in many influential Early Modern users of Latin of the diachronic variations of Latin and the familiarity with various registers, one may describe the relationship between the Latin actually used by individual writers and communities and the strata of Latin available to them as a relationship between linguistic canon and archive. In the following, I shall discuss this with regard to both language descriptions and choice of vocabulary. We shall see both how some parts of the Latin lexicon are put on display, or canonized, for instance in humanist works on how to write good Latin, while others are placed in archives, through acts both of active and of passive forgetting (see above the paragraph on Language change: canon and archive).

Language and values

Within the vast corpus of Early Modern Latin, I shall concentrate on the lexicon of fifteenth-century Latin as written by Italian humanist writers who aimed to express themselves in a language that had "the fragrance of proper Latin".[9] The development of the classicizing variant of Latin that is often called humanist Latin was a central part of the humanist movement, the *studia humanitatis*, as may be seen from the huge corpus of writings on Latin produced during this period.[10] The humanists' project – the recovering of classical Latinity – was described in glowing metaphors that show how much the memory of ancient Rome, of its glory and its values, was vested in the

[7] Ramminger 2014, Knight & Tilg 2015, 1.

[8] Cp. Pade 2006a.

[9] I have borrowed the expression from a letter written in 1452 by the Nestor of humanist education, Guarino Veronese, to his son. Guarino deplores that in his youth, before the return of "good letters" to Italy, his writing did not have "the fragrance of proper Latin"; he had used "vocabula quoque nonnulla latini sermonis proprietatem minime redolentia", GVARINO *ep* 862. When possible, I refer to Neo-Latin texts with the sigla used by Johann Ramminger in the *NLW*, where also the standard editions used in this article are listed.

[10] See Baker 2015, Celenza 2005, Moss 2003, and Rizzo 1986, 1988, 1996, 2002, 2002.

Latin language – in, that is, the right variety of Latin.[11] The preface to the first book of Lorenzo Valla's *Elegantie lingue latine* is a good example of this. Addressing his fellow citizens – anybody interested in the *studia humanitatis* – Valla asks:

> Quousque tandem, Quirites [...] urbem vestram, non dico domicilium imperii, sed parentem litterarum a Gallis esse captam patiemini?
>
> How long, citizens, will you endure that your city – and I don't mean the seat of the Empire but the parent of letters – is held captive by the Gauls? VALLA *eleg* 1, *praef* 35.

"Quousque tandem" recalls the speech Cicero made when Rome was threatened by the populist Catiline – and Cicero saved the day. Now, once more, Rome is in danger: Valla stresses the need to "reconquer" their native city (that is, classical Latinity) from the Gauls (that is, from French medieval grammars). The image refers to the catastrophe that befell Rome in the fourth century BC when, for a period, the Gauls held Rome. Afterwards it was rebuilt by Camillus, the republican hero who was honoured as the second founder of Rome. Only a new Camillus could now restore the true glory of Rome, its language.

We have another example of the connection made between the recovery of classical Latinity and a return of the values of ancient Rome in the letter I referred to above (see note 9). Here Guarino Veronese rejoices at the flowering of the *studia humanitatis* he has witnessed in his lifetime: of liberal education, the study of Greek and Latin letters:

> Sensim augescens humanitas veteres, ut serpens novus, exuvias deponens pristinum vigorem reparabat, qui in hanc perdurans aetatem romana portendere saecula videtur
>
> Like a new-born serpent, slowly growing and shedding its old skin, humanitas, humanist culture, recovered its old vigour; having survived until today, it seems to portend a new Roman Age, GVARINO *ep* 862.

This passage is found in a context where Guarino is specifically celebrating the effects of the return of Greek studies to Italy due to the teaching of the Byzantine scholar and diplomat, Manuel Chrysoloras.[12] It is in itself significant that Guarino so emphatically links the progress of Latin culture, by which he also implies the active mastery of "good" Latin, to the study of

[11] On interpretations of the humanists' project as the "restoration" of classical Latinity, see Charlet 2009 and 2016.

[12] For the renewal of Greek studies in Italy in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, see Weiss 1977, Maisano & Rollo 2002, and Pade 2007, I, 66–97. On Chrysoloras, see Maltese & Cortassa 2002, 7–46.

Greek. However, what interests me here is that the flowering of humanist culture portended a "new Roman Age". The expression "aetas romana" is not especially common in ancient Latin, and I believe that to many of Guarino's readers it would call to mind a famous anecdote in Valerius Maximus' *Memorable Deeds and Sayings*.[13] Valerius was a popular school author at the time, and Guarino is known to have lectured on him, so there can be no doubt that Guarino knew the anecdote and that he could expect readers to recognize the allusion.[14]

The story concerns Gaius Atilius Regulus (cos. 257 BC) who defeated the Carthaginian navy during the First Punic War. He came from the same family as the Marcus Atilius Regulus who – according to some sources – chose to be tortured to death by the Carthaginians rather than go back on his word.[15] Gaius Atilius Regulus was celebrating one victory after another in Africa against the Carthaginians and had had his command extended when he heard that the overseer of his modest farm in Italy had died. He begged the Senate to replace him as commander so that he could provide for his family on the farm. The Senate instead decided that Atilius' family should be provided for from public funds. Valerius concludes that every Roman Age will be proud of his example ("virtutis Atilianae exemplum, quo omnis aetas Romana gloriabitur", VAL. MAX. 1,1,14). By his allusion to Atilius, Guarino implies that the recovery of classical Latinity he has witnessed during his lifetime – the fact the people can now use a language that has "the fragrance of proper Latin" – will entail the return of the values of the "Roman Age".

These two examples show that choice of (the right variant of) language was far more than a question of aesthetics; it entailed cultural choices too. Humanist Latin, the variety of Latin that was based on a thorough mastery of the idiom of ancient Latin, was an inalienable part of the humanist movement and bearer of its cultural values. Latin, but *nota bene* the right variety of Latin, became a *lieu de mémoire*, a "site of memory". This concept was popularized by the French historian, Pierre Nora, who defined it as "any significant entity, whether material or non-material in nature, which by dint of human will or the work of time has become a symbolic element of the memorial heritage of any community".[16] For humanist writers such as Valla and Guarino, good Latin was an important element of the memorial heritage of ancient Rome, evoking both the political grandeur of Empire and its cultural achievements. As we saw with Guarino's allusion to Valerius Maximus, words could

[13] ThLL I c.1137, 63–65.
[14] Crab & De Keyser 2013.
[15] Cf. VAL. MAX. 1,1,14.
[16] Cp. Nora, P. et al. 1993–1997. I quote from the preface to the English edition in Nora & Kritzman 1996–1998, I, p. XVII.

actually place moral *exempla* before the reader/listener, thus inherently pointing to an ethical standard. Language is inherently instrumental in constructing a specific cultural identity, and fifteenth-century humanists were consciously (re)creating the language of their ideal cultural community. In other words, if language can be "a symbolic element of the memorial heritage" (so Nora) of a community, it is part of that community's cultural memory, and it is important what is remembered and what forgotten. It was therefore essential for the humanists' project to create the right linguistic canon and to relegate that which did not belong there to the archive through either active or passive forgetting (see above, Language change: canon and archive)

In what follows, I shall view the usage prescribed by influential theoreticians of humanist Latin such as Lorenzo Valla and Niccolò Perotti as a canon. In a series of case studies, I shall ask (1) which layers of Latin does the canon comprise? (2) Which layers of Latin are excluded from the canon? (3) Does the exclusion happen by way of "active forgetting", for instance criticism of a specific usage, or through apparently "passive forgetting"? And (4) what are the criteria used to decide whether a word, or a specific use of a word, should be excluded from or included in the canon, and whether it is allowed to rise from archive to canon?

My point of departure will be Niccolò Perotti's work on the Latin language, the *Cornu copiae*, but I shall also discuss Lorenzo Valla's *Elegantie lingue latine*.[17] Valla had been Perotti's teacher, but even though the latter often mentioned Valla with respect, he often disagreed with him in the *Cornu copiae*.[18] Though different in scope and format, both these works are intended as guides for contemporary readers to the writing of good Latin, and I shall compare their precepts – the canon they aim to establish – with contemporary usage.

Which Latin? Insisting on the canon

> Benedico, laudo, bene loquor; a quo benedicus et benedicentia
>
> Benedico, "I laud", "I speak well"; from it are derived benedicus and benedicentia (Perotti ccopiae 3,453).[19]

[17] There is a growing scholarly interests in Perotti's *Cornu copiae*. For a recent bibliographical overview, see Charlet 2011, 28–40. The literature on Valla's *Elegantie* and his influence is vast; I shall here just refer to the two fundamental volumes, Besomi & Regoliosi 1986 and Regoliosi 2010.

[18] See Stok 1993.

[19] All quotations from the *Cornu copiae* are from Perotti 1989–2001. The full text of the edition is now available on the website of the *Repertorium pomponianum*: http://www.repertoriumpomponianum.it/textus/perotti_cornu_copiae.htm.

This entry on the word *benedico* from Niccolò Perotti's *Cornu copiae* shows the author's grasp of the semantic development of Latin. In form a commentary on Martial (the *Liber spectaculorum* and first book of the Epigrams), but in reality a huge lexicon of Latin language and culture, the *Cornu copiae* contains entries/lemmata on about 23,000 words which Perotti defines as belonging to "Latin".[20] While Perotti decidedly privileges the Latin of earlier periods both in his choice of lemmata and in his explanations of them, the Latinity of other periods is present in the work as well, as we shall see later. However, in his explanation of *benedico*, Perotti gives us the meaning of the word only in classical Latin.

Perotti called his work *Horn of Plenty* (*Cornu copiae*) or *Observations on the Latin Language* (*Commentarii linguae latinae*, *ccopiae* proh. rubric) and "a treasure-chamber of the most valuable and recondite knowledge within all fields of learning" (*ccopiae* proh 6). Perotti maintained that the work was useful, even necessary, for men of almost any profession, including scholars, physicians, philosophers, theologians, peasants and architects; they would acquire from it not just an encyclopedic knowledge of the ancient world and classical Latin, but also, one assumes, language skills that would help them in the contemporary world.[21] Besides being a "treasure-chamber" of knowledge about classical Latinity, the *Cornu copiae* was also a handbook for modern-day Latin language users. As such it became extremely popular, and was printed at least thirty-six times up until the 1530s, with layout, paratexts and indices that increasingly facilitated its use as a lexicon of Latin. It was replaced in this role by Robert Estienne's 1536 alphabetical Latin dictionary.[22]

How does this square with Perotti's entry on *benedico*? No fifteenth-century writer would be faulted for using the word to say "I laud" or "I praise", but most people at the time would have been utterly familiar with another meaning that the word had acquired after the classical period, namely "to bless"; and they would be well acquainted with another noun derived from

[20] For this statistic, see Ramminger 2011, 167.

[21] "Certe non liber mihi, sed thesaurus quidam uisus est optimarum in omni genere rerum, ac reconditarum. Hinc grammatici, hinc rhetores, hinc Poetae, hinc Dialectici, hinc earum artium, quas liberales uocant studiosi, hinc medici, hinc philosophi, hinc ciuilis ac pontificii iuris antistites, hinc rei militaris periti, hinc agricolae, hinc pictores, hinc architecti, hinc fabri omnes atque opifices multa et pene infinita haurire possunt eorum studiis necessaria, et ita necessaria ut affirmare ausim plurima eos, nisi haec legerint, ad ipsorum disciplinas artes que maxime pertinentia ignoraturos, ne dicam in multis ut nunc faciunt permansuros erroribus, quos si haec legent aliquando recognoscent, et hoc opus non unius Poetae, sed omnium latinorum autorum commentarios iure optimo dici posse intelligent", *ccopiae* proh 6. For a discussion of the passage, see Pade 2012, 26–27.

[22] See Milde 1982; Pade 2014c and forthcoming[b].

it, namely *benedictio* (blessing). Perotti nowhere mentions this meaning of *benedico,* and there is no entry on *benedictio* in the *Cornu copiae*, although the word is exceedingly common in Early Modern Latin. The reason for this omission is obviously stylistic. Perotti explained the use of *auctores*, of the best authors, but would not include 1,300 years of ecclesiastical usage in his canon of good Latin – in spite of the fact that he hoped to have theologians among his readers (see above and note 21). He was, however, perfectly able to change register, and we find *benedicere* and *benedictio* (to bless, blessing) in Perotti's own works when he writes as the high-ranking curial official he also was, rather than as the *avant-garde* humanist.[23] We have an example in a sermon delivered before the pope and the cardinals in 1460:

> A te uero, Pontifex Maxime, (sc. requiro) benedictionem [...] qua in celos ascensurus benedixit discipulos suos [...] Ita te benedicat deus, Summe Pontifex [...]
>
> From you, Holy Father, I desire a blessing [...] such as the one with which (Christ) blessed his disciples when he ascended to heaven [...] Thus God may bless you, Holy Father [...].[24]

When Perotti takes up his pen as humanist, it is a different matter. In a letter to Baptista de Brennis, Perotti, student and admirer of Lorenzo Valla, talks about the polemic between Valla and Poggio Bracciolini, gloating over Poggio's shortcomings:

> Miseret me conditionis tue, Poggii, pudet senectutis tue, qui cum aliquam anteacta etate benedicendi laudem consecutus esses eam omnem in senectute amisisti
>
> I pity the state you are in, Poggio, your age is shameful, you – who in former times were praised for speaking well – you cannot claim that in your dotage, *ep ed. Cessi* p. 82, a. 1453.

Here Perotti uses *benedico* in the sense recorded in the passage of the *Cornu copiae* mentioned above: "Benedico, laudo, bene loquor" (*Benedico*, I praise, I speak well, *ccopiae* 3,453).

Lorenzo Valla's *Elegantie lingue latine* is another enormously influential fifteenth-century handbook on the Latin language. Compiled in the 1440s, it may be described as a manual on advanced idiomatic Latin.[25] It is structured in chapters on semantic and syntactic issues, rather than lexicographic entries.

[23] For Perotti's life, see Charlet 1997 and D'Alessandro 2015.

[24] The paragraphs on *benedico* are based on Ramminger 2011, 171–172, who also transcribed Perotti's sermon. Ramminger mentions Perotti's entry on *praedico* as another instance where he determinedly ignores the common contemporary meaning of the word, i.e. "to preach', cp. *ibid*. p. 172.

[25] Cp. Jensen 1995, 64.

In a chapter on words ending in *-cus*, Valla also mentions *benedico* and *benedicus*:

> benedicus autem non inveni, quia nec benedico invenitur, licet eo Priscianus utatur et hoc tempore utamur more Graecorum, quorum auctoritate dedimus huic verbo accusativum praeter naturam suam, quum postulet dativum, sicut maledico, quod et ipsum nunc ad imitationem Graecorum habet etiam aliquando accusativum. De Benedico unius vocis loquor, non duarum, nam tunc et aliud significat et aliter regit.
>
> but I didn't find benedicus, i.e. friendly, because benedico does not exist either, albeit Priscian uses it and we also use it today in the Greek way. On their authority we make it govern the accusative, against its nature, since it demands the dative, like maledico. Now that also sometimes takes the accusative in imitation of the Greeks. I speak of benedico in one word, not in two, for that means something different and is constructed differently, VALLA-L *eleg* 1,12.

Valla here makes a distinction that Perotti did not, namely between *benedico* in one word and in two. He denies the existence of *benedico* – in good writers of Latin, we must understand – as one word, though he acknowledges that that usage (the one Perotti does not even deign to mention, where *benedico* means "to bless") is common in his day, even, moreover, governing the accusative. The meanings Perotti listed in his entry are for *bene dico* in two words, governing the dative.

In his own writings, Valla uses *benedico* both ways, but when it is one word and governs the accusative, it is always in a Christian context, for instance in his work on the text of the New Testament, and not just when he quotes the Vulgate, but also when he suggests alternative translations of the Greek: "et complexus eos impositisque super ipsos manibus benedixit illos" (and he embraced them when he had placed his hands above them, he blessed them, VALLA-L *coll* p.84, a. 1440). We have another example in his *Historia Ferdinandi regis*, when he describes a bishop giving his blessing to a bride ("advenit Sancius episcopus Palentinus ducens sponsam [...] Eam benedicens [...]", VALLA-L *gesta* 3,9,1). When Valla uses *bene dico* in two words, it means either "to speak well", "to be eloquent" or, with the dative, "to praise", as for instance in "bene dicite Domino, omnes angeli eius" (praise the Lord, all his angels, VALLA-L *recip* 44,2, a quotation from *Psalms* 102,20).

So both Valla and Perotti firmly insist on the classical use of *benedico* when they write about good Latin – even though both were fully aware of the meaning the word and its derivatives had acquired in ecclesiastical Latin, and used it that way when writing in contexts where that would be fitting and required. Their way of dealing with the post-classical meaning of the word in

their theoretical works, however, may be described as strategies of what Assmann calls active and passive forgetting: Valla criticizes it fiercely (active), whereas Perotti simply ignores it (passive).[26]

From archive to canon

> Ab animaduerto uero fit animaduersio, quod modo attentionem, modo punitionem significat, et animaduersor, punitor. Apuleius: Exponam breuiter quod animaduersor meus fecit
>
> From animaduerto, "I observe" comes animaduersio, which sometimes means attention, sometimes punishment, and animaduersor, one who punishes. Apuleius: I shall briefly relate what my punisher did, PEROTTI *ccopiae* 3,335.

In this entry on *animaduerto* and some of its derivatives, there are two surprising elements. The first is Perotti's explanation of *animaduersor* as "one who punishes"; the second is the quotation from Apuleius which he uses to illustrate this. In the *apparatus fontium* of the modern edition of the *Cornu copiae*, the Apuleius quotation is listed as "Apul.? fr. *inc*. 74", meaning that this is one of the many instances where Perotti seemingly quotes Apuleius; but we cannot identify the quotations in any of the works by Apuleius we possess today.[27] Another reason this is odd is that according to the ThLL the only occurrence of the word in ancient Latin is in Cicero, where it means an "observer".[28]

The question is why Perotti here renders *animaduersor* with *punitor*? Apart from the passage in Cicero, I have found two occurrences of the word (if a conjecture by De Coninck is correct) in the fifth-century ecclesiastical writer Iulianus Aeclanensis: one instance where the word still means "observer",[29] and another where it seems to mean "corrector".[30] But this is scant evidence, and Perotti would of course not have known De Coninck's conjecture.

---

[26] Asmann 2008, 97–98.

[27] The question of the many unidentified quotations from classical authors in the *Cornu copiae* has been discussed for decades; there is an overview of the literature on this question in Charlet 2011, 32–33. On the fragments of Apuleius in the *Cornu copiae*, see Prete 1988.

[28] CIC. *off*. 1,146 "si acres ac diligentes esse volumus animadversores[que] vitiorum".

[29] IVLIAN. *in Am*. I 5 l.320 "Diu me, inquit, quasi absentem et quae gereretis penitus non uidentem, nequiquam estis experti:. . . nunc iam in regionem tuam sacrilegiis inquinatam is animaduersor ingrediar..."

[30] IVLIAN. *epit*. *in psalm*. XI 121 "Decretum, inquit, quod animaduersoris [*coniecit* De Coninck] iustitia promulgauit, ita probum et colatum est ut argentum, quod admixtione uilioris materiae ignis admotione purgatur, et ita sincerum redditur ut etiam probum uocetur, quo uilitatis contumelia ab eius aestimatione pellatur".

My guess is that we must look at one of the important factors in the development of fifteenth-century humanist Latin culture, namely the huge number of Latin translations from the Greek that were produced from the very beginning of the century.[31] These translations not only made hitherto unknown Greek texts available to a Latin readership, they also contributed to the development of Early Modern Latin at a time when translators were struggling to render Greek concepts in a satisfying Latin garb.[32] Guarino Guarini of Verona (1374–1460), with whom Perotti may have studied in his youth, was one of the most prolific of the fifteenth-century humanist translators.[33] He dedicated much of his philological work to the study of Plutarch, translating all in all thirteen of his *Parallel Lives*. In 1414 he translated the *Life of Dion* and dedicated it to Francesco Barbaro, the Venetian patrician who was one of his favourite pupils and himself a translator of Plutarch.[34] Guarino's translation is extant in thirty-seven manuscripts, and it was continuously printed from 1470 and onwards in editions of the Latin translations of Plutarch's *Lives*.[35]

In the *Dion*, Guarino translates the Greek κολαστής (chastizer, punisher) with *animaduersor*: "iurauit Dionis quidem ultorem et acerbissimum Heraclidis animaduersorem fore" (he swore that he would revenge Dion and become the most furious punisher of Heraclides, *Dion* 49.7).[36] Would Perotti have known Guarino's translation? I think it is highly likely. It was, as I mentioned above, available in many copies and printed editions. Moreover, in the *Cornu copiae*, Perotti actually quotes Iacopo Angeli da Scarperia's translation of *Brutus*, the other half of the Plutarchan pair, and the two translations often circulated together.[37] Moreover, in his famous letter to Guarneri (1470), Perotti discusses the *editio princeps*, so he may well have owned a copy himself.[38]

If Perotti came to explain *animaduersor* with *punitor* because of the passage in the *Dion*, he may well have accepted *animaduersor* with this meaning because of Guarino's authority. We find it with the same meaning

[31] See Pade 2016 and 2018a-b.

[32] For translation as a source for neologisms in Early Modern Latin, see Pade 2014b.

[33] For the possibility that Perotti studied with Guarino at Ferrara, see Charlet 1997, 601, Stok 2006 and d'Alessandro 2015.

[34] For Guarino's translations from Plutarch, see Pade 2007, I, chapters 3.16–18, 4.1, 4, and 5, and 6. For the translation of *Dion*, see Pade 2011 and 2013.

[35] The *editio princeps* is Plutarchus, [1470].

[36] For a discussion of Guarino's Latin lexicon in the translation, see Pade 2013.

[37] See the *apparatus fontium* to *ccopiae* 71,4. Perotti also quotes Giovanni Tortelli's translations of *Romulus* (*ccopiae* 64,5), *Demetrius* (*ccopiae* 6,240), *Numa* (*ccopiae* 1,375)

[38] For the letter to Guarneri, see Monfasani 1988. Modern edition of the letter in Charlet 2003, who also lists some of Plutarch's *Lives* among the sources of the letter.

in later Latin vernacular dictionaries,[39] but *animaduersor* with the meaning "observer" also becomes common.[40] We cannot know if Perotti was aware that *animaduersor* meaning "punisher" was not classical, but he certainly endorsed it and was instrumental in securing its place in the Early Modern Latin canon.

Another word that was extremely rare in ancient Latin, but used by Guarino and after that incorporated as a lemma in the *Cornu copiae* is *f(o)edifragus*, "league-breaking", which Guarino uses to translate ἔκσπονδος in the *comparatio* between Dio and Brutus (*comp*. 5.2). In ancient Latin the adjective is attested in Cicero (*off*. 1,30 and *rep*. *frg*. *inc*. 7, the latter of course not known to Guarino), and after that in Gellius and in a few late Latin writers (GELL. 19,7,5, MART. CAP. 9,912 and SIDON. *epist*. 6,6,1). It then becomes fairly common in medieval Latin. Perotti explains *foedifragus* with *ruptor foederis* (*ccopiae* 14,3), but by then it was already fairly common in humanist Latin; it was widely used also in the sixteenth century.

We see a similar trajectory with the adjective *inculpandus*, "not to blame", from the verb *inculpo,* which Guarino used to translate the Greek ἄμεμπτος "blameless": "In re igitur bellica Diona inculpandum fuisse imperatorem liquet" (In matters of warfare, it is clear that Dion could not be faulted as a general, *comp*. 3.1). The verb *inculpo* is very rare in ancient Latin and not attested before Porphyrio, who used it in his commentary on Horace's *Satires* (late second or early third century AD). After that the verb and derivatives from it become frequent in medieval Latin. Even so it is used in texts that purport to be written in humanist Latin, like Valla's Latin translation of Thucydides: "Lacedaemonii [...] Agidem uaehementer inculpabant, quod [...]" (The Spartans [...] strongly blamed Agis, because [...]" 5,62), in the opposite sense, "to blame".) Again, Perotti registers the word in the meaning used by Guarino:

> nam sicut omnis culpae priuatio inculpatum facit, Inculpatus autem instar est absolutae uirtutis
>
> just as the absence of all blame makes one blameless, so the blameless is the image of absolute perfection, *ccopiae* 1,59

Unintended canonization?

As the *apparatus fontium* of the modern edition of the *Cornu copiae* shows, Perotti relied heavily on the great medieval dictionaries such as Hugutio and Papias. In spite of this, very few of his lemmata are not found in ancient Latin;

[39] Cp. Pedersen 1510 "animaduersor, reffserman"; and KILLIAAN *etym* p.536 "STRAFFER. animaduersor. punitor".

[40] See Pade 2010.

in fact, as Johann Ramminger once calculated, using all *prae*-composita as a sample, only six per cent of Perotti's lemmata must be attributed to medieval Latin and/or Neo-Latin.[41] I shall return later to some examples of Perotti's attitude to contemporary Latin coinages, but in view of his *damnatio memoriae* of the non-classical meaning of *benedico*, it is hardly likely that he would embrace medieval neologisms of form or sense as belonging to good Latin. It is therefore interesting that in a passage on *vitium* ("fault", "vice", "error", "offence") and its derivatives, we come across the lemma *uituperium*: "Et uituperium. Cicero: 'Vel etiam a uitio dictum uituperium'" (And *uituperium*. Cicero: Or else *vituperium* is derived from *vitium*, "vice", *ccopiae* 3,144). As was the case with the Apuleius quotation in the explanation of *animaduersor*, the *apparatus fontium* of the modern edition points to a problem with the quotation from Cicero. It says "Cic. *fin*. 3,40 uar.", thus indicating that Perotti's quotation does not correspond to the text of our editions of the *De finibus*, nor indeed to anything recorded in their apparatus. They read "vel etiam a vitio dictum vituperari": that is, the very word the passage should attest is not there.[42] It is, in fact, almost non-existent in ancient Latin: according to the archive of the ThLL, *uituperium* is attested only twice in fifth- to sixth-century texts.[43] It is, however, found in medieval dictionaries (Hugutio and modern dictionaries), meaning "insult", "slander" or "offence".

The reason why Perotti accepted the word as good Latin – and gave it an impeccable pedigree – was probably the fact that by the time he compiled the *Cornu copiae*, it had been in use in humanist Latin for many years. Again, my first example is Guarino's translation of the *Dion*. He renders the description of the bodily violence suffered by Dionysius' wife, ὕβρεις, as follows: "mulieris corpus grauibus et iniquissimis affecére uituperiis, ob quæ sibi necem sponte consciuit" (They, *i.e. the people of Syracuse*, inflicted terrible and outrageous bodily harm on the woman, and in consequence she put an end to her own life, 3.2).

[41] Ramminger 2011, 167.

[42] In the *apparatus fontium* to his edition of Idung's *Dialogus duorum monachorum*, Huygens mentions *vituperium* as a variant reading to *vituperari* in both Cic. *fin*. 3,40 and *leg.* 3,23. Cp. Huygens 1972, 101. I have, however, not been able to identify any manuscript with that reading. It is not mentioned in the *apparatus criticus* of modern standard editions of the work, and I have controlled the passage in the *De finibus* in the editions [Köln], [ca. 1470]: ISTC ic00564000 and Moguntiae (=Mainz): Scheffer 1520, and the passages of both *De finibus* and *De legibus* in the edition of Bologna: Benedictus Hectoris, 1494, ISTC ic00571000 – and all read *vituperari*.

[43] In the *Historia Apollonii regis Tyri*, A32 (which was, admittedly, very popular at the time), and in a letter of Spanish Bishop Iustus Urgellitanus, edited in Migne 67, cc.961–2.

In his polemic against Antonio da Rho, the *Raudensiane note* (1433/49), Valla doubts the existence of *vituperium* – in good Latin, that is. In his work on rhetorical imitation, Antonio had quoted Cicero saying: "Similiter laus et vituperia" (praise and *vituperia* are the same, *i.e. antinomes*), and Valla comments: "'Vituperia' ostende quis dicat" (*Vituperium*, show me who uses that, VALLA-L *in Raud* 33). In spite of this, *vituperium* as antinome to *laus* became very common in humanist Latin, and Valla himself later uses it in his translation of Thucydides to express "slander" or "offence": "tum uero ipse quo maiore iniuria affectus sum: eo magis uituperio [...]" (then I, who have been more wronged, have more reason to vilify, *i.e. democracy*, 6,89).

From Perotti, *vituperium* also makes its way into other Early Modern Latin dictionaries, along with the attribution to Cicero. In his 1502 *Dictionarium latinum*, Ambrogio Calepio makes ample use of the *Cornu copiae*, as also the entry on *vituperium* shows: "Vituperium idem quod uituperatio. Ci. Vel etiam a uitio dictum uituperium".[44] Calepio's *Dictionarium*, mostly known as *Calepinus*, was reprinted a number of times, thereby helping to propagate the Ciceronian pedigree of the word, but it did not make it into Robert Estienne's magisterial *Latinae linguae Thesaurus*.[45]

Accepting lexical change

New coinages

In spite of their emphasis on classical Latin, both the *Elegantie* and the *Cornu copiae* contain entries on words so far attested only in post-medieval Latin texts.[46] Both works also sometimes consciously accept semantic expansions of classical Latin.

We find an example of such an intervention in the passage where Perotti discusses the word *aspergulum:* a case where Perotti accepts an Italian word in Latinized form. He says:

> Quidam etiam iuniores aspergulum usurpant, nouum quidem, sed non inelegans uocabulum: significat autem instrumentum quo nos sacris aquis solemus aspergere,
>
> Some more recent writers use the word aspergulum, aspergill. It is new, but in no way clumsy. It signifies the instrument we use to sprinkle holy water, *ccopiae* 84,1.

We find the word *aspergulum* in later dictionaries, for instance in Calepinus, but he and others omit to mention that the word comes from the vernacular

[44] Calepinus 1502. On Calepio's use of the *Cornu copiae*, see Stok 2002.
[45] Estienne 1536, lemma *vitupero* with sublemmata.
[46] See Pade 2006b.

aspergolo.[47] I have here quoted the text of the modern edition that reproduces the text of the dedication copy, cod. Urb.lat. 301 of the Vatican Library. However, the early printed editions of the work – of which three are recorded in the critical apparatus of the modern edition – all substitute *aspergillum* for *aspergulum*. That had in the meanwhile become the normal Latin word for the instrument, and of course the one from which the English "aspergillum" is derived.

Semantic expansion

Another aspect of the changes Latin underwent during this period is the semantic expansion of some ancient Latin words: old words being given new meanings. A famous example of this is the case of *traducere*. In ancient Latin the word means "to lead, bring, carry across", "to transport", "to spend", etc. Then in 1404, in a famous letter on translation, Leonardo Bruni used the verb metaphorically to describe his own translation process. He continued to use it, and the new meaning quickly caught on, not only in Latin, to the extent that today in the Romance languages the words for "to translate" stem from *traducere*.[48] By the time Perotti compiled the *Cornu copiae*, *traducere* for "to translate" was already well established. Contrary to what we saw with *benedicere*, Perotti acknowledges this new usage, though somewhat hesitantly:

> Traduco [...] Aliquando transfero, ut hoc loco, "traducta est Getulis", hoc est, translata ad Getulos. Unde etiam traducere librum ex una lingua in aliam quidam dicunt, hoc est interpretari.
>
> Traduco [...] sometimes means lead over, transfer, as in this passage "it was lead over to the Getuli", that is transferred to the Getuli. Hence some say "to lead a book over" from one language into another, that is "to translate", *ccopiae* 4,76.

Even if Perotti may have had reservations about the new usage, he did thus accept it in his canon, and he himself regularly uses *traducere* in its new meaning.

The last entry I want to discuss here is very short and concerns a sublemma of *publicus*, namely *Res Publica,* which Perotti explains with *res populi* (*copiae* 2,782).

In ancient Latin, *res publica* means "common good", "commonwealth", "the affairs of the state" or even "the state" – but what does *res populi* mean? One very common meaning is "the affairs/ achievements of the (Roman) people" (cp. LIV. 1,1), but that is obviously not what Perotti intends here.

[47] On the acceptance of both Valla and Perotti of influence from the vernacular in Latin, see Charlet 2010.

[48] For this, see Ramminger 2015–16.

Cicero juxtaposes *res publica* with *res populi* in his *The State* (*De re publica*), named after Plato's *Politeia*. In the rather fragmented book one, the commonwealth is defined as *res populi*, "the people's case", but, *nota bene,* an assembly of the people gathered with respect for justice and for the common good:

> Est igitur, inquit Africanus, res publica res populi, populus autem non omnis hominum coetus quoquo modo congregatus, sed coetus multitudinis iuris consensu et utilitatis communione sociatus (CIC. *rep*. 1,39).

Shortly afterwards, Cicero opposes *res populi* to monarchy, however just the ruler may be:

> Itaque si Cyrus ille Perses iustissimus fuit sapientissimusque rex, tamen mihi populi res – ea enim est, ut dixi antea, publica – non maxime expetenda fuisse illa videtur, cum regeretur unius nutu ac modo
>
> Therefore, even if Cyrus was a most righteous and wise king of the Persians, it does not seem to me that the people's case, the res populi – which, as I said, is also the res publica – was much promoted, when it depended on the beck and nod of one individual, *rep*. 1,43

The *res populi* cannot exist when there is rule by one.

In book three of *The State*, Laelius mentions the state of Athens under the Thirty, that is, the oligarchic government which was installed in Athens after its defeat in the Peloponnesian War in 404 BC. Then, Laelius says, there was no real commonwealth, *respublica*, because there was no *res populi*:

> quae enim fuit tum Atheniensium res, cum post magnum illud Peloponnesiacum bellum triginta viri illi urbi iniustissime praefuerunt? num aut vetus gloria civitatis aut species praeclara oppidi [...] aut admiranda opera Phidiae aut Piraeus ille magnificus rem publicam efficiebat? Minime vero, Laelius, quoniam quidem populi res non erat.
>
> For what was the state of Athens, when after the great Peloponnesian war, the city was subjected to the most unjust rule of the Thirty? Did the old glory of that city, the famous sight of it [...] the admirable works of Phidias or the magnificent harbour of Piraeus, did all that constitute it a res publica? Lœlius. Not in the least, because it was not a res populi, *rep*. 3,44

In this passage we have *res populi* opposed to oligarchy. In the three passages, we first see *res populi* defined as "an assembly of the people gathered with respect for justice and for the common good", then as something that cannot thrive under monarchy, however just and wise, and lastly as something absent under oligarchical rule. Like Plato and Aristotle, Cicero operates with a system of constitutions divided into rule by one, rule by a few, and rule by

many; it appears that *res populi* was one of the expressions he used when talking about constitutions in which the people had a say.[49]

The problem is of course that Cicero's *The State* was not known during the Middle Ages and in the Renaissance. So how can all this have a bearing on Perotti's definition *res publica*? The *index auctorum* in volume eight of the modern edition of the *Cornu copiae* shows that the works of Augustine, not least *The City of God* (*De civitate dei*), was frequently quoted by Perotti. He was definitely familiar with the chapter in book two in which Augustine discusses Cicero's definition of the *res publica*, as he quotes it just before the *res publica* lemma (*ccopiae* 2,781).[50] Augustine admittedly says that there can be a *res populi* under any just government, which is not quite what we find in Cicero's *The State*, but he also quotes the passage where the *res populi* is defined as "an assembly of the people gathered with respect for justice and for the common good".[51]

The term *res publica* is important in the history of fifteenth-century political thinking, as it is in translation studies. As the American Renaissance scholar, James Hankins, was able to show, on the basis of his examination of thousands of passages in ancient Latin where the word occurs, it could be used of a "free state" as opposed to a tyranny, but, in contrast to what we have been accustomed to think, a *respublica* is not the antithesis of a monarchical state; and the term *respublica* was never used in antiquity to signify the Roman Republic, that is, the period after the kings and before Augustus.[52]

Cicero did not have one specific term for "popular government", or, when talking about Greek political systems, for "democracy".[53] When in the thirteenth century scholars such as Robert Grosseteste and William of Moerbeke translated the political works of Aristotle into Latin, they consistently transliterated the technical terms, thus using terms like *oligarchia*, *timocratia* and *democratia*. The vast corpus of scholastic commentaries that grew up around these translations partly repeated the transliterated terms and partly developed a fairly stable terminology in which "democracy" was rendered *status popularis*.[54] When Leonardo Bruni retranslated the *Nicomachean Ethics* (1416/17), he maintained the scholastic terminology for the Greek constitutions, even though he rendered the two works in humanist Latin.[55] However, in his hugely popular commentary on

[49] For this, see Pade, forthcoming[a].

[50] Augustine discusses the definitions of *res publica – res populi* in *civ.* 2,21 and 19,21.

[51] Cp. "esse rem publicam, id est rem populi, cum bene ac iuste geritur sive ab uno rege sive a paucis optimatibus sive ab universo populo", *civ.* 2,21.

[52] Hankins 2005, 2010, 2014, 2016.

[53] Cp. Pade forthcoming[a].

[54] See Pade 2017.

[55] See Hankins 2003.

the Pseudo-Aristotelian *Economics*, Bruni wrote that "in republica quidem plures imperant", in a *respublica* many govern. As James Hankins has shown, this is the first time ever that "res publica" is used not for "state" in general, but specifically for "popular government" – a meaning the word never had in ancient Latin. When in the 1430s Bruni translated Aristotle's *Politics*, he used *res publica* for "good popular government".[56] From this technical context, the semantic expansion of the term spread to other contexts, and *res publica* was increasingly used by translators of Greek historical works for "democracy". One of them was Perotti, who, in his 1454 translation of Polybius, repeatedly renders Greek *democratia* with *respublica*; whereas Valla, for his part, renders "democracy" with the more traditional *status popularis* in his almost contemporary translation of Thucydides. Perotti's acceptance of the new meaning of *res publica* is also seen in the *Cornu copiae,* in which *res publica* is implicitly something different from monarchy in several passages, for instance, *"*item oratores legati dicuntur, quod principis aut rei publicae mandata peragant" (orators are also called legates, because they carry out what they have been ordered either by a prince or a *respublica*, *ccopiae* 10,56).

It seems that Perotti in his lemma on *res publica* endorses the semantic expansion of the term that had taken place due to Bruni's lexical initiative. He thereby helped ensure that *res publica* – "non-monarchical state" – became part of good Latin, that it was included in the canon. It was in this meaning that the word entered the modern vernaculars. It was taken up by Machiavelli who has – mistakenly – been credited as the first to use *repubblica* in the modern sense of the word.[57]

Conclusion

To return to my initial questions about the layers of Latin included in the canon of humanist Latin in relation to the mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion, of remembering and forgetting, the analysis of Perotti's lemmata and Valla's treatment of the same words does reveal an interesting pattern. It is hardly surprising that ancient Latin words are included in the canon, but as we saw with *benedicere*, later semantic developments may not be, especially if they are medieval. Perotti did not deign to mention that the word could mean "to bless", whereas Valla stated that it did not exist: in other words, Valla's criterion for rejecting *benedicere* meaning "to bless" was that we do not find it in ancient Latin (Priscian, from the sixth century, does not count).

Perotti accepts a number of rare late Latin words like *animadversor*, *foedifragus* and *inculpandus*. He may have known them from Guarino's

[56] Hankins 2014, 83–84.
[57] Pade 2018, 336–338.

translation of Plutarch's *Dion*, which meant that they were, so to speak, already taken up by a major humanist Latin writer. In the case of *animadversor*, Perotti claims that it had been used already by Apuleius, and although this is probably a falsification, the Apuleius quotation added respectability. Whatever the cause, *animadversor*, with the non-classical meaning of "punisher", became part of the Early Modern Latin canon, as did *foedifragus*.

Perotti has very few lemmata from medieval Latin. The one instance I examined here, *vituperium*, may, again, have been made palatable to Perotti because it had been used by Guarino. As we saw with *animadversor*, the word is given an acceptable pedigree by a quotation from an ancient author, in this case Cicero; but whether or not Perotti had a Cicero text with the word *vituperium*, we cannot decide. Valla, for his part, doubted the existence of the word in good Latin.

Apparently Perotti's judgment with regard to older strata of Latin when he compiled the *Cornu copiae* was influenced by the usage of other humanist writers, but his criteria for including a word in his canon, or rejecting it, are not explicitly stated. That was not the case with contemporary developments. Perotti accepted the import from the vernacular of *aspergulum*, because it was not clumsy, and he acknowledged the semantic change in *traducere* that had taken place during the fifteenth century. If we compare that development with that of *benedicere*, the reason for Perotti's acknowledgment – even if given grudgingly – may have been that this new meaning of *traducere* had been coined in humanist Latin, by Bruni. With regard to *res publica*, Perotti must surely have been aware that his explanation of it with *res populi* hardly covered the spectrum of meaning the word had in ancient Latin. One can only guess, but I find it likely that Perotti here, by going back to Cicero via Augustine, created a legend for the new meaning of *res publica* which he himself accepted.

We also saw that Valla and Perotti obeyed their own precepts and wrote in "canonized" Latin, embracing new developments, but avoiding usages that had been relegated, whether through active criticism or passive ignoring, to the archive. Their mastery of Latin, however, was such that when the subject or their audience required it, they would effortlessly switch register and use other layers of Latin. All in all, the canon they worked to create was far from being a mechanical copy of that of ancient Latin. Both Valla and Perotti acknowledged that Latin was subject to change, and even endorsed many developments – if only the result was elegant.

Bibliography

Assmann, Aleida 2008, "Canon and Archive", *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*, eds.: Astrid Erll & Ansgar Nünning, Berlin, 97–107.

Baker, Patrick, 2015, *Italian Renaissance Humanism in the Mirror*, Cambridge.

Besomi, Ottavio & Mariangela Regoliosi (eds.) 1986, *Lorenzo Valla e l'umanesimo italiano. Atti del convegno inter-nazionale di studi umanistici, Parma, 18-19 ottobre 1984*, Padova (*Medioevo e Umanesimo* 59).

Calepinus, Ambrosius 1502, *Dictionarium latinum*, Rhegium Lingobardiae (= Reggio d'Emilia).

Celenza, Christopher S. 2005, "Petrarch, Latin and Italian Renaissance Latinity", *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 35,3, 509-536.

Charlet, Jean-Louis 1997, "Niccolò Perotti", *Centuriae Latinae: Cent une figures humanistes de la Renaissance aux Lumières offertes a Jacques Chomarat*, ed.: Colette Nativel, Genève (*Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 314), 601–605.

Charlet, Jean-Louis 2003, *Deux pièces de la controverse humaniste sur Pline*: *N. Perotti*, *Lettre à Guarnieri*. *C. Vitelli*, *Lettre à Partenio di Salo*, Sassoferrato.

Charlet, Jean-Louis 2009, "Lorenzo Valla, Giovanni Tortelli, Niccolò Perotti: La restauration du Latin", *Syntagmatia. Essays on Neo-Latin Literature in Honour of Monique Mund Dopchie and Gilbert Tournoy*, eds.: Dirk Sacré and Jan Papy, Leuven (*Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia* XXVI), 47–60.

Charlet, Jean-Louis 2010, "La conception du *volgare* chez L. Valla et la signification du *Cornu copiae* de N. Perotti", Regoliosi 2010, 299–319.

Charlet, Jean-Louis 2011, "Niccolò Perotti, humaniste du quattrocento: Bibliographie critique", *Niccolò Perotti*: *The Languages of Humanism and Politics*, eds.: Camilla Horster & Marianne Pade (*Renæssanceforum* 7), 1–72. URL: http://www.njrs.dk/7_2011/01_charlet_perotti_bibliographie.pdf (visited 1.8.2020).

Charlet, Jean-Louis 2016, "La restauration du Latin au Quattrocento: Valla, Tortelli, Perotti", *Giovanni Tortelli, primo bibliotecario della Vaticana. Miscellanea di studi*, eds.: Antonio Manfredi et al., Città del Vaticano (*Studi e Testi* 499), 249–264.

Crab, Marijke & Jeroen De Keyser 2013, "Il commento di Guarino a Valerio Massimo", *Aevum* 87, 667–684.

d'Alessandro, Paolo 2015, "Perotti, Niccolò", *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 82, 431–433.

Estienne, Robert 1536, *Dictionarium sive Latinae linguae Thesaurus*, Parisiis.

Ford, Philip et al. (eds.) 2014, *Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Neo-Latin World*, Leiden & Boston.

Hankins, James, 2001, "A Lost Continent of Literature", *The Lost Continent*: *Neo-Latin Literature and the Birth of European Vernacular Literature*, ed.: James Hankins, *Harvard Library Bulletin*, I-II, 21-27.

Hankins, James, 2003, "The Ethics Controversy", *Humanism and Platonism in the Italian Renaissance*, ed. James Hankins, Rome (*Edizioni di storia e letteratura* I), 193–239.

Hankins, James 2005, "*De Republica*: Civic Humanism in Renaissance Milan (and other Renaissance Signories)", *I Decembrio e la tradizione della Repubblica di Platone tra Medioevo e umanesimo*, eds.: Mario Vegetti & Paolo Pissavino, Naples, 484–508.

Hankins, James 2010, "Exclusivist Republicanism and the Non-Monarchical Republic", *Political Theory* 38, 4, 452–482.

Hankins, James, 2014, "Leonardo Bruni on the Legitimacy of Constitutions (Oratio in funere Johannis Strozze 19-23)", *Reading and Writing History from Bruni to Windschuttle: Essays in Honour of Gary Ianziti*, ed.: Christian Torsten Callisen, Farnham, Surrey & Burlington VT, 73–86.

Hankins, James, 2016, "Europe's first democrat? Cyriac of Ancona and Book 6 of Polybius", *For the Sake of Learning: Essays in Honour of Anthony Grafton* I-II, eds.: Ann Blair and Anja-Silvia Goeing, Leiden & Boston, II, 692–710.

Huygens, Robert B. C. 1972, "Le moine Idung et ses deux ouvrages: 'Argumentum super quattuor questionibus' et 'Dialogus duorum monachorum'", *Studi Medievali* 13 (1972), 291–470.

ISTC, *Incunabula Short Title Catalogue: the international database of 15th-century European printing.* URL: https://data.cerl.org/istc/_search (visited 1. 8. 2020).

Jensen, Kristian, "The Humanist Reform of Latin and Latin Learning", *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*, ed.: Jill Kraye, Cambridge, 63–81.

Knight, Sarah & Stefan Tilg (eds.) 2015, *The Oxford Handbook of Neo-Latin*, Oxford.

Maisano, Riccardo & Antonio Rollo (eds.) 2002, *Manuele Crisolora e il ritorno del greco in occidente: Atti del Convegno Internazionale (Naples, 26-29 giugno 1997)*, Naples.

Maltese, Enrico & Guido Cortassa (eds.) 2000, *Rome parte del cielo: Confronto tra l'Antica e la Nuova Rome di Manuele Crisolora*, Torino.

Milde, Wolfgang 1982, "Zur Druckhäufigkeit von N. Perottis *Cornucopiae* und *Rudimenta grammatices* im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert", *Studi Umanistici Piceni* 2 (= *Res Publica Litterarum* 5a), 29–42.

Monfasani, John 1988, "The First Call for Press Censorship: Niccolò Perotti, Giovanni Andrea Bussi, Antonio Moreto, and the Editing of Pliny's Natural History", *Renaissance Quarterly* 41, 1–31

Moss, Ann 2003, *Renaissance Ttruth and the Latin Language Turn*, Oxford.

NLW, Ramminger, Johann, *Neulateinische Wortliste: Ein Wörterbuch des Lateinischen von Petrarca bis 1700*, 2003–. URL: www.neulatein.de (visited 30. 7. 2020).

Nora, Pierre et al. (eds.) 1993–1997, *Les lieux de mémoire* I–III, Paris.

Nora, Pierre & Lawrence D. Kritzman (eds.) 1996–1998, *From Lieux de memoire to Realms of Memory*: *Rethinking the French Past*, New York.

Pade, Marianne 2006a, "La forza del destinatario", *Studi Umanistici Piceni* 26, 11–21.

Pade, Marianne 2006b, "New Words in Neolatin", *La linguistique au Coeur*. *Valence verbale*, *grammaticalisation et corpus: Mélanges offerts à Lene Schøsler à l'occasion de son 60e anniversaire*, eds.: Hanne Leth Andersen, Merete Birkelund & Maj-Brit Mosegaard-Hansen, Odense, 249–257.

Pade, Marianne 2007, *The Reception of Plutarch's* Lives *in Fifteenth-Century Italy* I–II, København (*Renæssancestudier* 14).

Pade, Marianne 2010, Lemmata *animaduersor*, *anteloco*, NLW.

Pade, Marianne 2011, "The Latin Dion: Guarino Veronese's translation of the Plutarchan life (1414)", *Humanistica*: *an international journal of early Renaissance studies* VI.I 2011 [i.e. 2012], 33–42.

Pade, Marianne 2012, "Le *Noctes Atticae* di Gellio e la prefazione del *Cornu copiae* di Niccolò Perotti", *Studi Umanistici Piceni* 32, 21–28.

Pade, Marianne 2013, "Guarino's Latin lexicon", *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Vitam Dionis & Comparatio et de Bruto ac Dione iudicium Guarino Veronensi interprete (1414): critical edition and introduction*, ed.: Marianne Pade, Florence (*Edizione nazionale delle traduzioni dei testi greci in età umanistica e rinascimentale*), 33–42.

Pade, Marianne 2014a, "From medieval Latin to neo-Latin", Ford et al. (eds.) 2014, 5–19.

Pade, Marianne 2014b, "Translation as a source for neologisms", Ford et al. (eds.) 2014, 1188–1190.

Pade, Marianne 2014c, "The Material Fortune of Niccolò Perotti's *Cornu Copiae* in the Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries", *Neo-Latin Philology*: *Old Tradition*, *New Approaches*, ed.: Marc van der Poel, Leuven (*Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia* XXXV), 72–87.

Pade, Marianne 2016, "Translating Thucydides: the metadiscourse of Italian humanist translators", *The Metadiscourse of Italian Humanism*, ed.: Annet den Haan, *Renæssanceforum* 11, 1–22. URL: www.njrs.dk.

Pade, Marianne 2017, "Popular Government Revisited: New texts on Greek political history and their influence in fifteenth-century Italy", *Neulateinisches Jahrbuch* 19, 313–338.

Pade, Marianne 2018a, "Neo-Latin and Vernacular Translation Theory in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries: "The tasks of the translator" according to Leonardo Bruni and Étienne Dolet", *Neo-Latin and the Vernaculars: Bilingual Interactions in the Early Modern Period*, eds.: Florian Schaffenrath & Alexander Winkler, Leiden & Boston, 96–112.

Pade, Marianne 2018b, "Greek into Humanist Latin: Foreignizing vs. domesticating translation in the Italian Quattrocento", *Issues in Translation Then and Now*: *Renaissance theories and translation studies today* eds.: Annet den Haan et al., *Renæssanceforum* 14, 1–23. URL: www.njrs.dk.

Pade, Marianne forthcoming[a], "Il lessico politico europeo: dal latino alla lingua volgare", *Bibliothèque de Linguistique Romane*.

Pade, Marianne forthcoming[b], "The paratexts to the printed editions of Niccolò Perotti's *Cornu* copiae: commissions, patronage and intended readership", *I paratesti nelle stampe di commenti ed edizioni di scrittori classici greci e latini* (*1450–1700*), eds.: Giancarlo Abbamonte et al., Pisa, (*Testi e studi di cultura classica*).

Pedersen, Christiern 1510, *Vocabularium ad usum dacorum*, Paris.

Perotti, Niccolò 1989–2001, *Cornu copiae seu linguae Latinae commentarii* 1–8, eds. Jean-Louis Charlet, Giancarlo Abbamonte, Martine Furno, Pernille Harsting, Marianne Pade, Johann Ramminger & Fabio Stok, Sassoferrato.

Plutarchus, [1470], *Vitae illustrium virorum*, ed.: Johannes Antonius Campanus, I–II, Romae, Udalricus Gallus. ISTC: ip00830000.

Prete, Sesto 1988, "La questione della lingua nel Quattrocento e l'importanza dell'opera di Apuleio", *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* I, ed.: Heinz Hofmann, Groningen, 123–140.

Ramminger, Johann 2011, "Half of (which?) Latin: the Lemmata of Perotti's *Cornu copiae*", *Niccolò Perotti*: *The Languages of Humanism and Politics*, eds. Camilla Horster & Marianne Pade, *Renæssanceforum* 7, 163–180. URL: www.njrs.dk.

Ramminger, Johann, 2014, "Neo-Latin: Character and Development", Ford et al. 2014, 21–36.

Ramminger, Johann 2015–2016, "Language Change in Humanist Latin: the case of *traducere* (to translate)", *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici* 40–41, 35–62.

Regoliosi, Mariangela (ed.) 2010, *Lorenzo Valla*, *la riforma della lingua e della logica. Atti del Convegno del Comitato Nazionale VI centenario della nascita di Lorenzo Valla, Prato, 4-7 giugno 2008*, Florence (*Edizione nazionale delle opere di Lorenzo Valla. Strumenti* 3),

Rizzo, Silvia, 1986, "Il latino nell" Umanesimo", *Letteratura italiana* V, Torino, 379-408.

Rizzo, Silvia, 1988, "Il latino del Petrarca nelle 'Familiari'", *The Uses of Greek and Latin*. *Historical essays*, eds.: Carlotta Dionisotti et al., London, 41–56.

Rizzo, Silvia, 1996, "Il latino del Petrarca e il latino dell" umanesimo", *Quaderni Petrarcheschi* 9–10, 349–365.

Rizzo, Silvia, 2002, *Ricerche sul latino umanistico*, I, Rome (*Storia e letteratura*, *raccolta di studi e testi* 213).

Rizzo, Silvia 2004, "I latini nell'Umanesimo", *Il latino nell'età dell'umanesimo: atti del Convegno, Mantova, 26–27 ottobre 2001*, ed.: Giorgio Bernardi Perini, Florence (*Accademia nazionale virgiliana di scienze lettere e arti* 12), 51–95.

Stok, Fabio 1993, "Le laboratoire lexicographique de Niccolò Perotti", *Vichiana* s. 3, 4,1, 100-110, now in Stok (ed.) 2002, 11–42.

Stok, Fabio (ed.) 2002, *Studi sul Cornu Copiae de Niccolò Perotti*, Pisa (*Testi e studi di cultura classica* 2).

Stok, Fabio 2002, "Perotti, Calepino, Forcellini e l'OLD", Stok (ed.) 2002, 217–230.

Stok, Fabio 2006, "Perotti, Valla e Guarino sulla storia della letteratura latina", *Studi Umanistici Piceni* 26, 23–35.

ThLL, *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, 1900–, Leipzig & Berlin.

Waquet, Françoise 2002, *Latin*, *or The Empire of a Sign*. *From the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Centuries*, tr. John Howe, London (French Paris 1998).

Weiss, R. 1977, *Medieval and Humanist Greek*, Padova, (*Medioevo e Umanesimo* 8).

Language and Cultural Memory in the *Antiquitates* of Annius of Viterbo

By Johann Ramminger

The Antiquitates *of Annius of Viterbo (Rome, 1498) presents a counter-narrative to the dominant cultural discourse of contemporary humanism. Embedded in Annius's text is a linguistic system which emphasizes the connections between what he considers the earliest languages on Earth, such as Scythian, Egyptian, Hebrew/Aramaic, and Etruscan. From these, he formulates rules of language change which allow him to recognize the Etruscan substrate in historical and present-day toponyms and ethnonyms. Finally, basing himself on the (Biblical) name of the earliest city after the Flood, called "City four", Annius elaborates a theory of urban development based on a new terminology expressing the hierarchy of settlements in the early world and in Etruria.*

Introduction

The Antiquitates of Annius of Viterbo

The *Antiquitates* of Annius of Viterbo (Rome, 1498) is a collection of spurious interrelated texts and commentaries.[1] Some of these are supposedly historical texts (or translations of these), speciously attributed to early authors as diverse as the Chaldean Berosus (known from Josephus), Xenophon (a namesake of the author of the Anabasis), Fabius Pictor, and Cato (some

[1] The literature on Annius has grown immensely in the last decades, and I can only mention those publications that had an impact on my research (individual documentation is provided in the notes): Baffioni 1981 (fundamental for the language and sources of Annius), Ferraù 2002 and 2003, Fumagalli 1984, Grafton 1998 and 2019, Stephens 1989, 2004, 2011, 2013, Rowland 2016, Weiss 1962 and 1962a. A copious bibliography is in Nothaft 2016, 714–715, n. 8.

"new" fragments), as well as two fragments said to be from the *Itinerarium Antonini*, the survey of the roads of the Roman empire; all are fictitious.[2] Then there are Annius's commentaries on these and a commentary on Propertius's *Carmen* IV. 2 (about the Etruscan deity Vertumnus), and several additional works on Etruscan antiquity.[3]

These "originals" were from early on seen as audacious (or inept) forgeries.[4] Indignation at the credulity seemingly expected from readers of the newly "discovered" works overshadowed the brilliance of this alternative universe, proposed unabashedly at the heyday of humanist philology. Ironically, however, the methodological rigour of Annius's *Antiquitates* was instrumental in the development of a set of basic rules for source evaluation in philological and historical analysis.[5] The early contempt has more recently made way for an appreciation of Annius as "a conscious artist creating a coherent piece of work".[6]

That the "originals" in the *Antiquitates* are works of fiction should be less troubling to the modern researcher; fictive texts were more integrated into the humanist cultural narrative than is usually emphasized.[7] From (Pseudo-) Fenestella's *De magistratibus* (a later attribution, probably to "upgrade" the little-known author Andrea Fiocchi) to the numerous "unidentified" quotations in Perotti's *Cornu copiae,* there is no lack of humanist texts from

[2] Stylometrically, source texts, commentaries and other texts in the *Antiquitates* are indistinguishable, see Ramminger forthcoming. Annius likes referencing quite obscure texts; some of these have been identified (recently in Grafton 2019), others may be just as fictitious as the larger source texts in the *Antiquitates* (e.g. the *vita S. Protogenis martyris* cited on sig. N5v).

[3] A fine discussion of the "originals" is in Ferraù 2002, 159sqq., n. 17. In the following I will quote from Annius, Johannes, Viterbiensis, *Auctores vetustissimi*, Rome: Eucharius Silber, 1498, ISTC ia00748000. For a list of editions, see Stephens 1989, 344–45 (appendix 2); a detailed analysis of the content is found in the incunabula catalogue of the Bodleian Library, Oxford (URL: http://incunables.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/record/A-299, seen on 24 June 2020). Annius himself refers to his work collectively as *Commentaria antiquitatum* (e.g. sig. a2r, in the preface; naturally excluding the supposedly original works by other authors). In my quotations, punctuation and capital letters have been modified according to modern customs. "ę" is rendered as "ae", otherwise the orthography of the quotations is unchanged. Letters turned upside down are corrected; if other emendations of the text are introduced, the original reading will be indicated with "ed.". All translations, if not otherwise indicated, are my own. The texts given as earlier sources by Annius will be quoted with double names (e.g. "Berosus-Annius"), the other texts will be just quoted as "Annius". Abbreviations for ancient Latin sources will follow the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, those for Early Modern Latin sources the *Neulateinische Wortliste* (Ramminger 2003–).

[4] See Speyer 1993, 44 and n. 151.

[5] Goez 1974, Ligota 1987.

[6] Grafton 1998, 16.

[7] Partial overview in Kivistö 2015.

the Quattrocento that do not pass strict procedures of authentication.[8] Historiographical fiction was a genre not restricted to Annius; suffice it to mention Leonardo Dati's "Latin translation" of the *Gesta Porsennae* of one Vibius, a contemporary of the Etruscan king Porsenna, or the genealogies of princes going back to Venus or Troy, which could alternatively be believed or disbelieved as the situation demanded.[9] On a more general level, fictitious source texts have often played a crucial role within "invented traditions" such as the one we will discuss in the following.[10]

Research on the *Antiquitates* is complicated by the fact that the text on which we have to rely, the Roman edition of 1498, is the work of typesetters who had little or no Latin and limited skill in deciphering the manuscript they typeset from. Judging from the typesetting mistakes (such as the elementary *corpera* for *corpora*, presumably from the customary abbreviation used for *per/por/par*), the manuscript exemplar of the print was written with even more abbreviations than the print still contains; this may have contributed to the lack of orthographic consistency – which in any case was normal at the time.[11] Since proper names are not only spelt inconsistently but often invented by Annius or written in his particular orthography, emendations of the texts are often problematic. Improvements of the first edition in later printings may as often be corrections of Annius's authorial intention as of the typesetters' ignorance.[12]

Cultural memory and language

Like the other papers in this volume, this study operates within the framework of cultural memory studies. Cultural memory will be generally understood as "the interplay of present and past in socio-cultural contexts", in which meaning is handed down.[13]

> [Cultural memory] is "cultural" because it can only be realized institutionally and artificially, and it is "memory" because in relation to

[8] For Fiocchi/Fenestella see Spagnesi 2006, for Perotti Charlet 2011, 32–33.

[9] For Dati see Bertolini 2013. A perceptive account of literary forgery is in Ruthven 2004. Doll 2012 on the reception of falsifications.

[10] See Hobsbawm 1983, 7 (Ossian).

[11] In some cases, we have to decide without much evidence between orthographical possibilities. The most egregious case is "Vertūnus", over a hundred times abbreviated thus and only in in some rare instances expanded to either "Vertunnus" or "Vertumnus".

[12] Stephens 1989, 344 argued that the Josse Bade edition of 1515 should be used because of its greatly improved text. Grafton 2019 prefers the Bade edition of 1512.

[13] Erll 2008, 2. Assmann 1992/2011, 6. Although here I am not using Zerubavel's terminology, I have been influenced by his writings (esp. Zerubavel 2003).

> social communication it functions in exactly the same way as individual memory does in relation to consciousness.[14]

It is a *mémoire volontaire*, a voluntary memory, which is socially constructed.[15] Aleida and Jan Assmann introduced the distinction between "cultural memory" (with a longer historical perspective) and "communicative memory" (sometimes called "social memory"; relating to a timeframe close to the present).[16] The latter had been termed by Halbwachs "collective memory". Since cultural memory is unavoidably collective in a general sense, the term "collective memory" in cultural memory studies often stands for "cultural memory".[17] Cultural memory revolves around fixed points:

> fateful events of the past, whose memory is maintained through cultural formation (texts, rites, monuments) and institutional communication (recitation, practice, observance). We call these "figures of memory". […] In cultural memory, such islands of time expand into memory spaces of "retrospective contemplativeness".[18]

The term "figures of memory" was later replaced by "lieu(x) de mémoire" (sites of memory), a term popularized by the French historian Pierre Nora and (for the English publication of his *Lieux de mémoire*) defined as

> any significant entity, whether material or nonmaterial in nature, which by dint of human will or the work of time has become a symbolic element of the memorial heritage of any community.

Jan Assmann concretizes Nora's definition of *lieux de mémoire* as "things such as dishes, feasts, rites, images, stories and other texts, landscapes".[19] These are selected from a hypothetical repository of the maximum available historical knowledge and incorporated into what Aleida Assmann has called

---

[14] Assmann 1992/2011, 9. See also n.19 below.

[15] This is a term used by Proust in an interview from 1913 and introduced into cultural memory studies by Jan Assmann. The relevant passage is printed and translated in Cano 2010, 122. Assmann 1992/2011, 4 and 33 n. 41.

[16] See Assmann, 1988/1995, Assmann 2008 and (revised) 2013. Burke 2017, 20 (social memory).

[17] E.g. Pomian 1998.

[18] Assmann 1988/1995, 129. It is not clear whether the plural "memory spaces" is just a rhetorical liberty on the part of the English translator or a genuine departure from the German text. It implies a series of memory constructs complementing each other that together form the "cultural memory". The German original has the singular "Erinnerungsraum" (memory space, German version p.12), which signifies the opposite, a unitary construct containing the "figures of memory" (Erinnerungsfiguren).

[19] Nora 1996, xvii. Assmann 2008, 111 (a reformulation of Pierre Nora's definition from 1984; see den Boer 2008, 21). See also Rothberg 2010, 8: "sites of memory do not remember by themselves – they require the active agency of individuals and publics".

"actively circulated memory" ("canon"), while other parts of historical knowledge are relegated to "passively stored memory" ("archive").[20]

I will discuss Annius's cultural narrative against the background of a set of characteristics of cultural memory put forward by Aleida and Jan Assmann.[21] Of these, it is the first two properties (1. It connects facts to a specific identity; 2. It rearranges the narrative of the past) that will be of interest to us, since these are functions that can be performed by an individual. The others are outside the scope of the present inquiry. I will pay special attention to the way Annius uses language; and in connecting language to collective/cultural memory, I will use a schema proposed by Jakub Mlynář:

> (1) collective memory emerges from language […], (2) collective memories are structured linguistically […], and (3) the patterns of collective memory influence language […]

The elements of Mlynář's schema will, in adapted form, also provide the headings for the main part of this paper.[22]

The cultural narrative of Italian humanism

The Italian cultural landscape of the Quattrocento contained, as Pomian has remarked, rival cultural memories (*mémoires collectives*) – of different accentuation and with overlapping constituencies. The Church, political entities and administrative bodies had their own cultural narratives.[23] The newcomer amongst them was the *respublica litteraria*, the humanists, who created a distinctive Italian intellectual identity within the late medieval culture of Europe.

The Italian humanism of the Quattrocento was Rome-centric in all respects: it is no accident that three of the four major works of Flavio Biondo have "Rome" in their title. The topography of Italy was for the humanists a landscape defined by the triumphs and defeats of a pre-ecclesiastical Rome. The (often lamented) ruins of ancient Rome provided concrete *lieux de mémoire*, and the whole was bound together by explanations extracted from a highly selective repertoire of Roman literature. The Etruscan roots of Italian cities such as Mantua and Bologna were acknowledged, but always within the

[20] Assmann 2008.
[21] Assmann 1988/1995.
[22] Mlynář 2014, 218–219. Mlynář focuses on "communicative memory", but his schema, with some modifications, provides a convenient framework for language and "collective/cultural memory" as well. More generally for cultural memory and language see Samata 2014, 8–9, and Yelle 2014. Language as site of memory is discussed by Pade (this volume).
[23] Pomian 1998, 83–88.

context of Roman culture.[24] The language aggressively promoted by this cultural community was Latin – not the Latin of the Church, but a historicizing Latin anchored in a canon of Roman authors, assiduously mined (significantly, Sabellicus declared commentary on the works of the ancient authors to be the most significant achievement of the humanist *studia*).[25] Again, Latin was the language of Rome; *latine loqui* – if properly done – was *Romane loqui*, to cite a phrase favoured by Lorenzo Valla.[26] Against this background, Annius invented a (supposedly submerged) cultural tradition that purported to attest to a culture of the Italian peninsula that was (far) older and consequently more glorious than the Greco-Roman past.[27] Such a tradition would have entailed the history of Rome becoming absorbed into the much older history of Etruria, with Viterbo as its centre (Viterbo at Annius's time was the capital of the Patrimonium Petri, the Papal States, and thus a city of some importance).

Humanism's focus on language is adopted by Annius in his methodology, text production and treatment of sources.[28] Where Ermolao Barbaro had devised more or less untrammelled "etymologies" to connect present-day vernacular words with the Latin or Greek of antiquity, Annius enlarged the humanist "rules" of language change to allow much older connections to Assyrian, Egyptian, and Hebrew/Aramaic and other languages. Humanists had now and then encoded cultural information into Latin (e.g. Hellenizing orthography);[29] Annius turned linguistic speculation, by way of orthography, into an art form. Disambiguation of homonyms (such as the Senecas or the

[24] See Bruni's letter about the origins of Mantua to Francesco Gonzaga and the comments by Pade 2016, 43; for Bologna see Ramminger 2003a.

[25] Baker 2015, 205 and *passim* for the revival of Latin.

[26] Pade 2012, 11. For humanist Latin see Ramminger 2014; for the *Questione della lingua* concerning Latin and volgare both in the Rome of antiquity and the *Quattrocento* see Tavoni 1984; new bibliography in Schöntag 2017.

[27] For the concept of "invention of tradition" see Hobsbawm 1983. The concept has been variously criticized; see esp. Sarot 2001.

[28] This clash between the humanists' and Annius's cultural narrative evokes Foucault's "counter-memory" (*contre-mémoire)*, which designates a marginalized discourse formulated in opposition to a dominant discourse within a society. This framework has been mainly used to describe the mechanisms of ideological/political oppression and resistance; Gowing 2005, 94–96, uses the term to describe Lucan's *Pharsalia*. Annius's project in this context would be an attempt to reaffirm – through a thoroughly laicized reading of the Bible – the dominance of an ecclesiastical cultural narrative subverted by the humanists.

[29] An example of encoding cultural memory into language would be the spelling "Rhoma" (for *Roma*) frequently used by Italian humanists, which encoded the prestige of Greek into the name of the cultural capital of Italian humanism; cf. TORTELLI *Rhoma* and VOLPE *ep* 6 (1446). When Tortelli concluded from the evidence of coins and inscriptions that the Hellenizing spelling was wrong, Volpe encouraged him not to reject Greek wisdom for some stones with spelling mistakes.

Plinies) was a major achievement of humanist philology, but it pales next to a whole book of disambiguations (the *Equiuoca*) under the name of one Xenophon (not to be confused with the homonymous author familiar to classical scholars) and Annius's accompanying commentary. Where Beroaldo and Poliziano had proposed miscellanies to discuss various – mostly philological – questions pertaining to Roman antiquity, Annius used the same format for his "Questions of Annius" (*Quaestiones Anniae*) concerning Etruscan antiquities. Just as countless humanists of the second half of the Quattrocento had composed commentaries on texts from antiquity, Annius offered commentaries on the texts published by himself – and furthermore on a poem by Propertius which, as it turned out, entirely supported Annius's understanding of the Etruscan deity Vertumnus. Where Calderini "found" an unknown Roman history in France, Annius got his "Berosus" from Armenian monks.[30]

The humanists had routinely embedded their ownership of Latin in their writings by using the first-person plural rather than an impersonal passive form ("as we say in Latin"). Annius uses the same ploy to emphasize his Etruscan identity: "[…] as Cato writes and we Tuscans say" ("ut Cato scribit et Tusci proferimus"; Annius, sig. s4v).[31] Moreover, he adds, he himself is only one of "our" Tuscan authors. There still exists an Etruscan *génie* ("ingenium Thuscum") among writers. This explains why some have more trustworthy information concerning Etruscan antiquity than others.[32] Fazio degli Uberti, whose *Dittamondo* is one of the sources named by Annius, is repeatedly called "Florentinus noster",[33] another is "our" Giovanni Tortelli from the Etruscan Arezzo,[34] and then there are "our" two *Aquinates*, Juvenal and Thomas Aquinas.[35] Above all, there is "our Tuscan family, the Annii", which in antiquity had brought forth several emperors.[36]

[30] For Calderini's claim see Ramminger 2014a. For the provenance of Berosus: "Frater autem Mathias olim prouincialis Armeniae ordinis nostri, quem existens prior Genuae illum comi hospitio excepi et a cuius socio magistro Georgio similiter Armeno hanc Berosi deflorationem dono habui", Annius, sig. P6r.

[31] See the examples in notes 71–74.

[32] "Fatius Florentinus illustrior Blondo fuit, ut qui ingenio Thusco excelluerit et explorata loca melius et certius tenuerit" (Annius, sig. g5r). For Annius's aversion to Biondo see Stephens 2013, 278.

[33] "Fatius de Vbertinis Florentinus noster in sua geographia uernaculo metro edita" (Annius, sig. I8r); "noster Florentinus, Thusco sanguine natus atque noticia patriae doctior Fatius" (Annius, sig. d6v).

[34] "Tortellius noster Aretinus", Annius, sig. V3r, sig. X3v.

[35] Juvenal: Annius, sig. B2v, sig. B6r, sig. I2v, etc.; Thomas Aquinas: sig. I6r, sig. Z1r, sig. g3v, etc.

[36] "opus Anniae Tuscae familiae nostrae dicaui" (Annius, sig. f4r); "Hec urbs Etruria […] praecipuis Anniae uere antiquissime Tuscorum familiae augustis imperatoribus, Antonino, Vero et Comodo enituit" (Annius, sig. h2v).

Memoria: the transmission of the past

Annius's point of departure is what he sees as a faulty perception of Italy's past, consequence of an all-pervading Greek point of view in the cultural memory promoted by the humanists:[37]

> Therefore, since the origin and age of Italy go back to before the most ancient Ninus, when the Greeks were not even young yet, I was moved by the splendour of such antiquity to revive the history of old Italy. This endeavour will be hugely welcome to those judges who are the most learned. […] For the rest, just as according to Cicero true philosophy is happy with few judges, if they are learned, and deliberately avoids the masses, so [are] all our works about history.[38]

The irony of Annius' appeal to Cicero will not have been lost on his humanist readers – the reference points to a passage in the *Tusculans* that critizises Greek intellectual life. Annius proposes to expose the lies of the Greeks, and to introduce more reliable sources:

> For my part I have decided to push the Greek fog away from Latin chronography and, with regard to the Etruscan times, which are better attested in Latin sources, to restore time lines and kings, antiquity and the most splendid origins to our homes.[39]

Rescuing the dormant memory of Italy's greatness, Annius presents himself as heir to a tradition going back to Cato. As we learn from a fragment from the *Origines* published (and invented) by Annius, Cato was the first to record systematically the traditions of the Italian tribes:

> Therefore, to show the way for other Latin writers, I intend now, by the grace of the Gods, to put down in writing all that has been recorded in memory by the peoples of Italy, now subject to Roman power.[40]

---

[37] Annius mentions *Grecia mendax* numerous times. See Tigerstedt 1964.

[38] "Quare cum ante Nynum uetustissimum – nedum nouellos Grecos – cepta sit origo et antiquitas Italiae, mouit me tantae splendor antiquitatis neglectae ad historiam antiquitatis Italicae suscitandam, cuius labor censoribus eruditissimis scio quam uoluptuosissime gratus erit atque ab eis probatus. […] Ceterum, sicut teste Cicerone uera philosophia paucis est contenta iudicibus eruditissimis, tamen multitudinem consulto ipsa effugiens (Tusc. 2, 4), ita et cuncta nostra de antiquitatibus opera" (Annius, sig. Z8v).

[39] "Equidem et ipse institui Grecas nebulas a Latina chronographia dissoluere, et per Etrusca [Etrsuca *ed*.] tempora, quae magis certa in Latinis habentur, integra nostris laribus reddere tum tempora et reges, tum antiquitates et splendidissimas origines" (Annius, sig. Z8v).

[40] "Quam ob rem nunc, ut caeteris Latinis uiam faciam, quaecumque memoria prodita gentibus Italiae sunt et nunc Romano imperio subditis, diis uolentibus scribere instituo" (Cato-Annius, sig. B2r).

This is a carefully crafted programmatic declaration. Annius enlarges on it in his commentary on this passage:

> Cato […] collected whatever was transmitted by memory amongst the individual tribes of Italy, especially amongst the Turreni who were the ancestors of the Umbrians and still remembered those ancient laws, letters, rites, customs, the time of the Flood and of Ianus.[41]

"Laws, letters, rites, customs", in combination with a narrative about the distant past, is a quite precise description of "cultural memory". The crucial term here is *memoria*. In the Latin of antiquity, *memoria* is a multi-faceted term.[42] As well as the act of remembering, it is the (mostly) human faculty of remembering *something*, especially great deeds (often synonymous with "glory"); this seamlessly expands into a more general remembrance of the past conserved by human memory. In a further expansion, *memoria* can also be an artefact (book or monument) that transmits facts that are to be remembered; *memoria* can be the mention that records a fact; and finally, it is information about the past itself (which obviously still has to be remembered).

For Annius, *memoria* is not individual memory, but the collective "knowledge about the past" (in phrases such as "memoriā tradere"). The polyvalence in the classical material, however, allows Annius also to understand *memoria* in three further senses: as the historical message conferred onto an object, as the medium that transmits knowledge about the past (a book, an inscription), and as the contents of that medium (in the phrase "memoriam facere", to mention).[43] Annius is conscious of the fact that the cultural identity of a group is closely connected to its belief that it shares a common past (i.e. to a common cultural memory), and he sees it as his task to reset the cultural memory of his Etruscan fellow citizens by showing them that before their eyes lies a whole new (or rather old) world waiting to be discovered.

---

[41] "Ipse (*sc*. *Cato*) […] quecunque memoria prodita erant apud singulas gentis Italiae collegit, potissime apud Turrenos qui patres Vmbrorum fuerunt et illas uetustissimas leges, litteras, ritus, mores, temporaque inundationis et Iani retinebant" (Annius, sig. f4r).

[42] See Prinz 1942. Most of the semantic development happened before or in Cicero's writings, i.e. in texts that would have been readily available to Italian humanists looking for guidance from antiquity; obviously, absent semantic studies similar to the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* for antiquity, we do not know how close humanist use of *memoria* was to the Latin of antiquity, and whether Annius's usage was distinctive in any way. I have, however, found no indication that Annius made changes to the semantic model of antiquity.

[43] "memoriam facere": "de his omnibus memoriam facit […] Plinius" (Annius, sig. D1v). "De Bante inscriptio Grauisca memoriam facit" (Annius, sig. &3r-v). 'meaning': "Cur uero primi reges deorum […] nominibus cognominati fuerunt idem Lactantius ait ob propagandum fulgorem nominis et memoriam indidendam" (sig.H8v). 'medium': "neque uetusto auctore neque alia memoria" (i.e. archival material, sig.V6v); "excisa memoria" (i.e. inscription, sig.&2v); "ueterum titulorum et memoriarum (i.e. unspecified sources, sig.g6v).

Cultural memory emerging from language

Etruscan memoria and the languages of the Earth

For Annius, the Etruscan cultural memory will emerge from language, if decoded properly. To access the *memoria* contained in *lieux de mémoire*, both material and immaterial, he proposes a theory about language diversification and the relative chronology of the languages involved that not only accounts for language development in early society, but connects it to the linguistic reality of contemporary Italy. Languages can be distinguished in two overlapping respects, sound system and derivation (*prolatio*, *deriuatio*).[44] *Prolatio* corresponds to pronunciation and – in the case of writing – orthography, while *derivatio* designates the development of lexicon as well as pronunciation across different languages. Especially Latin and Etruscan differ from each other both in *prolatio* and in *derivatio*.[45] The establishment of the *derivatio prolationis* of a word can establish equations of meaning across languages:

> Secondly, attention should be paid to the noun "saga", as the Arameans pronounce it, and "sangni", as the Etruscans and Sabini, and "sanctus", as the Latins. These are not different in meaning, but only in the development of the pronunciation, because from "saga" is derived "sangni", and from "sangni" "sanctus" with change of the letter "g" into "c".[46]

By identifying a word's earlier form/orthography/pronunciation, we gain access to the message contained in it (in this case the meaning of Sagalbina, an early "Etruscan" city founded by Noah).

Derivatio concerns also the etymology through which a word can transport the *memoria* of its origin: "All words that have the same derivation and origin have the same meaning" ("quecumque eandem propriam deriuationem et originem nominis habent, eandem rem significant", Annius sig.c4v).

---

[44] Examples of differences in *prolatio*: "Ita Phenissam et Lybissam Romana lingua profert Pheniscam et Lybiscam" (Annius, sig. h1v); "Phesulai prolatione Aramea et Phesulae prolatione Romana" (Annius, sig. B5v); *prolatio* is a powerful comparative feature that can establish some surprising connections: "Cydnus a diuersis gentibus aliter et aliter pronunciatur. Babillonii cednum, Scythae cydnum, Greci cynum, Latini cygnum. Etrusci uero, ut sepe diximus, de more in compositione sineresim faciunt et consonantem litteram .d. uel .c. aut .g. abiiciunt" (Annius, sig. T6r). *Prolatio* in the meaning of "pronunciation" is not classical; Banta 2000 records only examples from the fifth-century grammarian Consentius (1815, 27–31). It is frequent in Medieval Latin (see URL: https://logeion.uchicago.edu/prolatio, visited on 2 July 2020). For Early Modern Latin see Ramminger 2003–, "prolatio".

[45] Annius, sig. M8v.

[46] "Secundo memoratu dignum est nomen saga, ut Aramei proferunt, et [ut *ed.*] sangni, ut [et *ed.*] Etrusci et Sabini, uel sanctus ut Latini. Hec non differunt significato, sed sola deriuatione prolationis, quia a saga sangni et a sangni sanctus deriuatur mutata littera .g. in .c." (Annius, sig. O6r).

To ensure the proper application of *derivatio,* Annius posits two age groups for languages. There is an older group which contains Etruscan, but is otherwise is rather fluid; often it includes Aramaic (sometimes distinguished from Hebrew, sometimes not).[47] It is in Aramaic and the closely related Egyptian (in use in old Etruria!) that Annius seeks the submerged *memoria* of the Italian peninsula.[48] In addition, Annius also cites Scythian as a language related to Etruscan and consequently very similar to Hebrew and Aramaic.[49]

The younger group consists of Latin and Greek. These cannot be used for eliciting the *memoria* preserved by words that predate them:[50]

> One has to know that the names of the twelve [Etruscan] cities predate any kind of Latin. Therefore, those who think in Latin terms are in profound error, such as those who explain "Fiesole" from "fia sola" (being alone), and "Arezzo" from "ara" (field) or "aratura" (ploughing) or from "ariditas" (drought). All these names predate the Latin language; they were given by the Etruscans and are of Aramaic origin.[51]

How old Latin is in Annius's view is difficult to discern, since Annius mostly emphasizes its newness. Implicitly the date of origin seems to be approximately the fall of Troy, when also the name "Latins" came into use for the inhabitants of Rome.[52]

---

[47] Hebrew and Aramaic identical: "Aramea enim et Hebrea lingua iain uinum dicitur" (Annius, sig. A1v); "Apud Arameos simul et Hebreos malot dicitur uates angelus" (Annius, sig. T3r). Hebrew differentiated from Aramaic: "Quod enim Hebrei sara, id Aramei para, idest principem […] intelligunt" (Annius, sig. I8r); "asserebat apud Arameos Man et Mon dici quod apud egyptios Myn, et quod apud Hebreos Maon idest habitatio" (Annius, sig. K6r). Certainly the Hebrew scholar whom Annius often quotes speaks Aramaic: "Sale autem Aramea lingua est origo et exitus alicuius: ut Rabi Samuel interpretatur" (Annius, sig. A2v).

[48] Annius, sig. i4r. For Annius's interest in Egyptian culture see Curran 1998-99, 167–181, Grimm 2007.

[49] "Neque tamen a luce latino uocabulo, sed potius eorum tum *Etrusco*, *Scythico sermoni cognato*, uerbo" (Annius, sig. V2r; my emphasis). Examples: "Ianus non spectat ad originem Latinam uel Grecam, sed, ut ait Berosus, Scythicam, qui uti Hebrei uinum dicunt iain" (Annius, sig. F4r); "tribus Scythicis et Arameis dictionibus" (Annius, sig.V1r).

[50] "quoniam lingua barbara praecessit Latinam et Grecam" (Annius, sig. g4r); "Ianum regiam suam quadriurbem statuisse, et ideo uocabulis Arameis et non Latinis nominasse, quia tunc non extabat lingua Latina uel Greca" (Annius, sig. N2v).

[51] "Sane sciendum est ante omnem linguam Latinam fuisse supradicta nomina urbium.xii. Et ideo qui Latine putant dicta, falluntur nimis, sicut qui Phesulas Fia sola et Aretium ab aris uel aratura uel ab ariditate exponunt. Hec enim nomina ante Latinam linguam ab Etruscis indita sunt Arameae originis" (Annius, sig. B6r). The etymology for Fiesole had been proposed by Giovanni Villani, *Nuova Cronica* 1, 7 "però fu nominata Fia sola, cioè prima, sanza altra città abitata nella detta parte".

[52] Age of Latin: "Quare penultimum nomen Thybris inditum fuit Albulae ante ruinas Troiae sub Priamo, anteque urbem conditam annis quatrincentis quinquaginta et amplius, quando non extabat lingua Latina. Et multo minus ante Troiam conditam extabat lingua Latina, quando uetus uerum et priscum nomen Albula erat" (Annius, sig. C1v); Age of

There was some transference between older and younger languages. Thus Greek contains many barbarian words, since barbarians inhabited Greece before the Greeks.[53] Similarly, Latin received words from Etruscan.[54] In the case of such words we should not accept etymologies derived from Latin because of a simple rule:

> At this point, the following rule comes into play, that where there is a barbarian term, there is an earlier barbarian origin, even if the term later entered the Latin or Greek language.[55]

The heterogeneity of Latin and the influx of Etruscan words had already been observed earlier by humanists, notably in the *questione della lingua*.[56] In addition to loanwords, there are according to Annius also a number of loan translations from Etruscan into Latin, and these preserve traces of the cultural identity of the Etruscans.[57]

Etruscan memoria in Roman authors

When, eventually, the Etruscans succumbed to decadence, The Romans according to Annius played a crucial role in the preservation of Etruscan cultural memory. Annius uses a two-pronged presentation. First, he has Manethon – as a "contemporary" observer – state the fact of the shift of power in Italy: "The Etruscans weakened by luxury are diminished, the Latins, on the other hand, grow" ("Turrheni delitiis eneruati decrescunt; econtra latini crescunt", Manethon-Annius sig. Z7v). Then Annius, in his own voice, elaborates on the historical process. Etruscans kept their identity and wisdom alive until the end of the Republic.[58] Not only did Romans consult Etruscan specialists for

"Latins": "Hoc tamen constat Eneam profugum domo uenisse ad Latinum Aboriginum regem, a quo primum Aborigines Latini dici ceperunt" (Annius, sig. Z6v).

[53] "quia Greciam prius barbari incoluerunt, et multa his uocabula barbara remanserunt" (Annius, sig. I3v).

[54] "Volturnus non spectat ad linguam latinam etiam si transit in usum latine linguae" (Annius, sig. C2r)

[55] "Nunc uero regula succedit, quod ubi est nomen barbarum, ibi origo prius fuit barbara, etiam si id nomen postea effluxerit in linguam Latinam uel Grecam" (Annius, sig. C5r).

[56] E. g. by Poggio: "Mitto Gallos, Germanos, Aphros, Hispanos ac diversarum nationum gentes in servitutem redactas, quorum lingua inter se dissidens erat, qui omnes in urbe recepti, necesse fuit ut suis verbis Latinam linguam inquinarent ex frequenti usu, ita ut plura a Tuscis reliquisque nationibus verba in usum reciperentur praeter latina, ut sermo latinus, ex tam variis verbis commixtus, confusior esse videretur" (POGGIO *ling com* 78–79).

[57] "Multa nomina Etrusca Romani in linguam suam transtulerunt, uti et aliarum gentium" (Annius, sig. F5v). An example: "Est autem Arameae Horchia per interpretationem id quod Pomona latine" (Annius, sig. F2r).

[58] "[…] cum ille Turrhenus ingenuus status et concordia cepit eneruari dissensionibus.xii. populorum. Quibus et delitiae et loci opulentia magno decidendi ab imperio et paulatim cedendi locum Romanis adiumento et fomento fuerunt. Perseuerauit tamen in eis que a Iano

various forms of divination; many Etruscan institutions were taken over wholesale by the Romans, often in improved form ("que [*i.e. some Etruscan institutions*] imitati postmodum Romani inque melius aucta, ad suam rem publicam transtulere", Annius, sig. Z8r).

That Annius could consult Roman literature for information about the Etruscans was due to the fact that Romans, and especially Roman authors, for a long time had a knowledge of Etruscan. An example is Virgil, who according to Annius was actually Etruscan ("Virgil, who had a good command of Etruscan, since he was born in the Etruscan city of Mantua").[59]

For Annius, the most important author with knowledge of the Etruscan language is Varro. He is generally more learned ("doctior"), but, more importantly, older and thus more trustworthy than later authors. He is extremely knowledgeable on the region of Rome ("Romanam regionem plenius edoctus", Annius, sig. M4r). Specifically, his information about Etruscan words and etymologies is based on Etruscan sources.[60] On the other hand, when Servius gives a Greek etymology for the word "Etruria", he can safely be dismissed, because by his time the Etruscan language had already died out ("iam abolita lingua Etrusca", sig. h2v). This had been a gradual process,

> because the younger Roman and Latin writers – having renounced the Etruscan language which they earlier used to learn, as Livy mentions in the ninth book of *From the Foundation of the City* – wrongly turned to Greek or Latin etymologies when they did not know the etymologies of Etruscan words.[61]

A special case is Livy, whose contemporary Propertius was still steeped in Etruscan cultural knowledge (Annius sig. M8r). For Bruni and Biondo, Livy is "the father of Roman history",[62] for Annius, he is a bit simple-minded ("Liuius et alii simplices Latini"; Annius, sig. h2v). Because he was envious of the Etruscans, he acted maliciously to expunge them from his readers' cultural memory:

---

tradita fuit philosophia et interpretatio fulgurum et effectuum naturalium atque Theologia usque ad etatem Diodori Siculi sub Iulio Cesare" (Annius, sig. Z8r).

[59] "Virgilius, qui probe linguam Etruscam nouerat ut qui Etruscorum urbe Mantua natus" (Annius, sig. f6v).

[60] "Varro his doctior et antiquior […] testes[…] antiquissimos utriusque linguae, Latinae ac Etruscae, peritos produxit Iunium et Tolumnium tragediarum Tuscarum scriptorem" (Annius, sig. h2v).

[61] "quia iuniores Romani et Latini scriptores dimissa lingua Etrusca, quam ante solebant addiscere, ut Liuius autor est in nono Ab urbe condita (9,36,3), cum uocabulorum Etruscorum origines ignorarent, falso ad Greculas origines se conuertebant aut Latinas" (Annius, sig. h2v).

[62] BRVNI *bell Pun praef*, BIONDO *Italia* 1,5, DECEMBRIO-A *pol* 1,5,1.

> While all these origins of Rome are told in Fabius (Pictor), Propertius and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, why did Livy alone in *From the Foundation of the City* suppress all mention of them? I am prepared to state and will prove if necessary that Livy was envious and jealous of the rival fame of the Etruscans. Wherever he can he conceals the fame of the Etruscans and piles on falsities in favour of the glory of others and adverse to these (i. e. the Etruscans).[63]

In Alaida Assmann's terms, Livy is exercising an act of 'active forgetting'.[64]

Etruscan memoria in the contemporary vernaculars of former Etruria

In the same way as the humanists believed that the vernaculars could attest to Latin words lost in the written tradition, Annius considered the contemporary vernacular(s) of Etruria a repository of traces of old Etruscan.[65] These not only confirm his linguistic reconstruction, but also culturally connect the Tuscans to their common past (particularly the Tuscan youth, for whom the *Institutiones iuuentutis Etruscae* in the *Antiquitates* are written). The linguistic heritage is visible both in *prolatio* and in *derivatio*.[66] A feature of pronunciation connecting the present-day Etruscan to its antecedent is a shared sound system, such as the similar pronunciation of "u" and "o":

> The Etruscan language formerly and in my time does not have a full "o", but a vowel between "o" and "u", and in several words it is closer to "u". For that reason, the Etruscan Faustulus pronounced "Rumulus" with an "u", the Sabini and the Latins pronounced "Romulus" with an "o".[67]

The "o/u"-vowel is also sometimes pronounced as "o":

> In Viterbo there are four "pont"; two of these are still used by (local) speakers: "pont Remolum" and "pont para Tussum", commonly "pont para Tossum", because the local language converts "u" into "o".[68]

---

[63] "Que omnia cum inicia Romana et Fabius, Propertius et Dionisius Halicarnasseus contineant, cur solus Liuius Ab urbe condita cuncta suppressit? Audeo dicere et cum opus fuerit probabo, inuidum et liuidum alienae Thuscorum gloriae enim [non *ed*.] Liuium fuisse. Qui ubicunque potest subticet Thuscorum gloriam et falsa pro aliena gloria his aduersa cumulanda adiecit" (Annius, sig. M7v).

[64] See Pade (this volume), 12.

[65] See Ramminger 2019 on the vernacular research of Ermolao Barbaro.

[66] "ad hanc diem Aramea *prolatione atque uocabulis* dicimus Para Tussam" (sig. N3r, my emphasis).

[67] "Nam Etrusca olim lingua et etate mea non habet.o. integrum, sed inter.o. et.u. et magis appropinquat.u. in compluribus. Quare quod Faustulus Etruscus protulit per.u. Rumulus, ipsi Sabini et Latini pronunciabant [pronunciabunt *ed*.] per.o. Romulus" (Annius, sig. L3r).

[68] "Viterbi autem pont sunt, quorum duo adhuc sunt in usu loquentium, pont Remolum et pont para Tussum – uulgo pont para Tossum, quia.u. in.o. conuertit uernacula lingua" (Annius, sig. g2v)

Also, the pronunciation of the "J" in certain positions as /dʒ/ in Venetian dialect is an inheritance from the Etruscans:

> All the mountains through which one travels to Aquileia are to this day called [alpes] "Zuliae" (Julian Alps) in the language and pronunciation of the Etruscans, but corruptly they are commonly called "Zeliae".One usually pronounced as"z" the letter "i" of the common pronunciation, such as "Zasius/Iasius", "Zulius/Iulius", as we find in Etruscan inscriptions.[69]

"T" and "c" are also pronounced similarly, leading in certain toponyms to a shift:

> Our age pronounces this (the name of) this town – with a corruption of the "t" and insertion of a "c" because of the closeness of the pronunciation – not "Turrena", but "Cursena".[70]

Equally important is the fact that some Etruscan words still survive:

> To this day we say in the old Etruscan language "Corit Ny Enta" (i.e. Corgnenta), i.e. mountain and town Coritus.[71]

In addition to vowel and consonant changes, names also change through contractions. These are categorized into *syncopa* (truncation of the first syllable, as in "Oropitum" > "Orpitum") and *syneresis* (initial truncation of the second word in compounds).[72] Annius uses two semantic markers to indicate the continuity of the Etruscan language community, "adhuc" (still, until now) and "ad hanc aetatem" (to this day), often in combination.[73] The

[69] "omnes alpes per quos uersus Aquilegiam transibatur [transibat *ed.*] lingua et prolatione Thusca adhuc Zuliae, uulgo uero corrupto Zeliae dicuntur. Nam literam .z. .i. comuni prolatione proferebant, ut Zasius, Iasius, Zulius et Iulius, ut in inscriptionibus Etruscis inuenimus" (Annius, sig. K2r).

[70] "Hoc oppidum etas nostra corrupta prima littera.t. et posita.c. ob propinquitatem prolationis, non Turrenam sed Cursenam profert" (Annius, sig. B1r).

[71] "quod usque ad hanc etatem dicimus ueteri lingua Etrusca Corit Ny Enta, idest Coriti mons et oppidum" (Annius, sig. N4r). The identification with Corgnenta is taken from Signorelli 1966, 82.

[72] "compositio sineraica sepe adimit finem prime dictionis et principium secundae, ut patet in composito nomine Macto idest magis aucto" (Annius, sig. g5r). Examples of corruption (my emphasis in all examples): "Tertiam posuit Tarco: nomine patris Turrheniam dixit, et *per sincopam* Turrhniam: cuius partis *hodie* porta Torrhnia dicitur, quamuis *corrupte et rudius* quam Cortonienses Perusini pro.T. ponentes.B. dicant Burrhniam pro Turrhniam" (Annius, sig. f6r). "Volturrene siue *per sincopam* Volturne" (Annius, sig. f5r). "Arino siue *per sincopam* Arno" (Annius, sig. e2r). "*Tusca uernacula lingua* quae *sinaeresi* utitur Mar Scylliano uocamus" (Annius, sig. Z6r).

[73] (my emphasis in all examples): "montem iuxta Orpitum, quem *adhuc* Peliam dicimus, sed eius amnem Peliam corrupte Paliam pronunciamus" (Annius, sig. A2r). "Vnde limitem eius *adhuc* dicimus uulgo caduta di Sale vmbrone" (Annius, sig. A5r). "quod herbam illi olim

differences between what Annius posits as old Etruscan and the present-day forms are – in the same way as humanists regarded language change in Latin – understood as corruptions.

The distinction between the speech of the educated (*grammatice*, i.e. in Latin) and the common people (*vulgo* or *in sermone vernaculo*: Annius sees the speech of the uneducated or *rustici* as a promising vein of Etruscan, as had the humanists in the case of Latin) is at the same time one between orality and written language.[74] In charters and other legal documents, oral phenomena may enter the written language:

> Since notaries write place names as the common people pronounce them, therefore it has become customary to write and say "Viterbum" instead of "Veterbum".[75]

For this reason – which we can confirm from numerous testaments, inventories and similar documents – according to Annius several old Etruscan toponyms occur in legal documents preserved in the archives of his order.[76]

Cultural memory is structured linguistically

Linguistic artefacts can also provide important structural information for the (re)construction of Etruscan cultural memory. Annius identifies two types of words that store structured *memoria*: toponyms and ethnonyms.

---

dicatam in similitudinem crinium albarum, capillos Ianae *ad hanc etatem* Volturreni uocamus" (Annius, sig.M8r; not a toponym, but the name of a herb).

[74] (my emphasis in all examples): vulgo-grammatice: "Exemplum possum accipere *in uernacula nostra lingua* quia ubi *grammatice* scribit Phylippus, Nicholaus, […] Osiricella, Veiuzus, et eiuscemodi, *uulgo* truncata prima syllaba pronunciamus Lyppus, Cholaus, […] Syricella, Iuzus" (Annius, sig. I6r). "Nam quae *grammatice* dicimus Eliam, Estam, Annam, Annum, […] *uulgus* profert Veliam, Vestam, Nannam, Nannum, […]" (Annius, sig. N6r; this is the rule that allowed Annius to transform his name from *Nanni*). "usque ad oppidum quod ad hanc etatem Cap Abium *uernacula lingua*, *Latina* uero capud Abantum dicimus" (Annius, sig. Z1v). *rustici*: "Et a Vetralla incipiunt *rustici* uocare planiciem Sale" (sig. A3r). "quod *mei rustici Viterbenses* dicunt" (Annius, sig. K2v). "Est autem oppidum Arae Mutiae, quod *rustici* AreMuza uocant" (Annius, sig. M3r). orality: "grammatice *scribitur* – uulgo […] *pronunciamus*" (Annius, sig. I6r). "Etruscan" orthography means the spelling of Etruscan words in Latin: "Itaque dicimus Volturrenam esse *orthographiae simul et Etruscae originis* et compositum nomen ab "ol" et "Turrena" " (Annius, sig. f5r).

[75] "Porro quoniam notarii loca scribunt plurimum ut uulgus profert: idcirco usus obtinuit ut Viterbum pro Veterbo scribatur et dicatur" (Annius, sig. g5r).

[76] "ut contractus in archiuis nostri conuentus nominat" (Annius, sig. S6v). "in testamento […] seruato in archiuis conuentus" (Annius, sig. T4r). "Stic Kity Arim *uetustissima Etrusca lingua* contractus nominant, quos in Archiuis seruant fratres nostri Heremitani" (Annius, sig. h3v, my emphasis)

Toponyms

Historical topography as a field of study had been defined by Flavio Biondo, mainly in his *Italia illustrata*.[77] The *nominum mutatio* is commented upon by Biondo countless times:

> I wanted to try if I, with the knowledge I have gained about the history of Italy, could attach to the older places and peoples a current name, to the recent ones an authentic one, to the obliterated ones a life of memory, and so clear up the fog of Italian history.[78]

We notice that Biondo – like Annius later on – uses the metaphor of removing "fog" to describe his operation of restoring authentic toponyms. *Memoria* and the correct name are connected. For Biondo it is historiography (and the knowledge he brings as a historiographer) that validates (or provides) correct toponyms. Annius inverts Biondo's paradigm: topography is the part of history (i.e. historiography) that inventories historical toponyms ("pars localis historiae quam Greci uocant topographiam et chorographiam", Annius, sig. &1r). Historical place names are thus sources which validate, or invalidate, other historiographic texts:

> Therefore we would not believe that this is Rome (i.e. the Rome mentioned in historical sources) if the Tiber and the hills and parts and places of Rome had no old names because these are living proofs drawn from historical topography.[79]

Attention to toponyms is a failsafe means to keep antiquity alive ("ut uiuam […] antiquitatem teneas", Annius, sig. g2v), "because the old place names of antiquity are unfailing proofs of their origin" ("quia nomina antiquitatis prisca locorum sunt argumenta infallibilia originis ipsorum", Annius, sig. i1r), because "in fact every people imposes names in their own language" ("quaeque enim gens imponit nomina suae linguae", Annius, sig. c2r).

What kind of information toponyms carry had been explained by "Berosus" when he described the migration which took place after the Flood:

> These are the ones who migrated after Nimbrotus, one by one with their families and colonies. They left their names in places as a sign of the

[77] See Laureys 2020, 203–204. I thank M. Laureys for letting me see an advance copy of the publication.

[78] My translation, with use of White's translation in Biondo 2005, 5. "[…] tentare uolui, si per eam quam sum nactus Italiae rerum peritiam uetustioribus locis eius et populis nominum nouitatem, nouis autoritatem, deletis uitam memoriae dare, denique rerum Italiae obscuritatem illustrare potero." (BIONDO *Italia praef* 3–4).

[79] "Nam non crederemus Romam esse, si Thyberis et collium et partium locorumque Romae nulla uetusta essent nomina, quippe quia hec sunt uiua topographiae atque historiae argumenta" (Annius, sig. g2v).

> expedition their father Ianus had charged them with, and as a monument for their descendants, so that they would know who their founder was.[80]

The information about the meaning of place names given by "Berosus" is taken up by Annius in several passages:

> […] since the people in former times named mountains, rivers, and places after themselves, as Berosus says in the fourth book of his Antiquities and we have shown in the commentary to him. Thus, names provide a very strong proof of history, as Livy emphasizes concerning the extension of the realm of the Etruscans in the fifth book From the Foundation of the City.[81]

These toponyms carry the *memoria* of "memorable" incidents, such as accession to the throne by a ruler, victories, the death of a beloved parent or friend, and so on. More precisely, they are the metadata that ensure that the significance of various types of *lieux de mémoire* can be decoded:

> At the start of a reign, on the day of the acclamation as king, the ancients customarily consecrated statues or composed inscriptions as a reminder, or built towns or founded colonies as a perpetual reminder of the event and to spread the glory of their name. Therefore the old names given to places are a very strong argument in historical research.[82]

Decoding toponyms is, however, no trivial matter. *Derivatio* helps to distinguish between homonymous toponyms, as in the case of "Volturna" (either a river, the city of Capua, or the Etruscan city).[83] But a toponym can also have a number of different explanations, depending on different points of view. As an etymological approach, this was not new (see below on "Kyriat Arba" for an example from Nicolaus de Lyra), but Annius develops the method much

[80] "Hii sunt qui egressi sunt post Nymbrotum singuli cum familiis et coloniis suis, relinquentes nomina sua locis in signum expeditionis a Iano patre commisse, et ad monumentum posteris, ut scirent quis eorum fuerit conditor" (Berosus-Annius, sig. Q5v).

[81] "[…] quia ad fulgorem ac memoriam rei gestae ueteres imponebant sua nomina montibus, fluminibus, et locis, ut in quarto antiquitatum Berosus dicit et nos in comentariis super eum probauimus. Et ideo a nominibus est ualidissimum historiae argumentum, ut Liuius (5, 33, 7) arguit de amplitudine imperii Thuscorum in.v. Ab urbe condita" (Annius, sig. d4r).

[82] "ueteres pro inito regno solitos die acclamationis regiae sua sacrare simulacra uel titulos inscribere ad memoriam, et oppida edificare, et colonias mittere suo nomine illustratas ad perpetuam memoriam gestae rei et ad fulgorem nominis propagandum; et ob id uetusta nomina locis indita faciunt in historia efficacissimum argumentum" (Annius, sig. X5r).

[83] "Aut Volturna est nomen primitiuum sine compositione sincopaque, aut simplex et deriuatiuum, aut compositum sincopatum et deriuatiuum. Si est primitiuum simplex et sine sincopa, significat fluuium in Samnio […]. Si uero sit simplex et deriuatiuum, significat Capuam, […] quia deriuatur a cognomine fluuii Volturni [oVlturni *ed.*] […]. Ceterum si sit nomen compositum a uol et turrena et per sincopam in compositione dictum Volturna, tunc significat urbem, caput imperii Thuscorum […]" (Annius, sig. c1r).

further. An example are the etymologies for "Viterbum". The toponym "Viterbum" first of all attests to its former power:

> Therefore we find that ancient names expressing public power are compounds of two words; one of them expresses old age, the other the word (i.e. communication) and the state of authority. An example from the Hebrews is "zanedrim" (i.e. seventy elders), from the Romans "Decree of the Senate", from the Greeks "paleologos", from "paleos" "old" and "logos" "reason and word", from the Etruscans "lucumonium", from "lucu" "old" and "moni" "reason and word", and finally "Viterbum" "old word or power".[84]

But the expression of its old power is not the only message "Viterbum" conveys. Annius uses medieval semantic theory, according to which a *nomen* (*noun* or *name*) can have multiple meanings:

> Concerning this, what the blessed Thomas [Aquinas] teaches, should be noted; he says that it is one thing whence a name is imposed, another what it is meant to signify. As is asserted by the most learned Donatus, the noun/name signifies the substance and individual or common quality, and nevertheless it signifies the substance, i.e. another essence […]. Therefore, when the most knowledgeable Desiderius [the Longobard king] gave the very old city a new name, he imposed the name "Viterbum" because of its individual and common properties, and nevertheless he signified something else. First, we have to see on which qualities the name "Viterbum" is based, then, what it signifies in respect to its substance. And we will proceed after grammatical rules as follows. Viterbum has several qualities, and therefore the name comes from several sources, and consequently all opinions are correct – except the first one.[85]

---

[84] "Vnde nomina importantia publicam potestatem apud ueteres composita inuenimus ex duabus dictionibus, quarum altera uetustatem et senium, altera uerbum et rationem imperiosam importet, ut apud Hebreos zanedrim (*i.e.* septuaginta seniores, sig. H2r), apud Romanos senatus decretum, apud Grecos paleologum, a paleos uetus, et logos ratio et uerbum, apud Etruscos Lucumonium a ucu uetus et moni ratio et uerbum, et tandem Viterbum ueterum uerbum siue dictatura" (Annius, sig. H3r-v). For *dictatura* in the meaning of "power" in "Viterbum" cp. "Et hoc modo accipitur uerbum in nomine Viterbo pro dicto siue *imperio* et presidentia suffragiorum atque dictatura" (Annius, sig. e5r, my emphasis).

[85] "Pro quo notandum est quod in prima parte docet beatus Thomas dicens, aliud esse a quo nomen imponitur et aliud ad quod significandum imponitur. Nam teste peritissimo Donato, nomen significat substantiam et qualitatem propriam uel communem, quia nomina imponuntur a proprietate rei quae est eius qualitas propria uel communis, et tamen significat substantiam, idest aliam essentiam […]. Itaque cum Desiderius litteratissimus adiecit urbi antiquissimae nouellum nomen, ab eius utique qualitatibus propriis uel communibus Viterbum nomen imposuit, et tamen aliud significauit. Primo igitur uidendum est, a quibus qualitatibus Viterbum nomen dicatur, deinde quid substantialiter significet. Et ita grammatice

The wrong opinion referred to first afterwards is no more fanciful than the seven others that follow. Together they provide a unifying structure for the qualities of Viterbo's past, its heroes, its fortifications, its being a settlement of Roman veterans, and so forth. Concerning the substance of the *nomen*, the *uera significatio* (Annius, sig. e4v) of "Viterbum"/"Veterbum" preserves the *memoria* of the old political power of the city.

Ethnonyms

Ethnonyms are no less significant as markers of *memoria*; but they follow different rules, and rules that may contradict each other. They provide, however, strong structural indicators of the distant past, if deciphered correctly. Firstly, the immigrant takes the name of the indigenous.[86] Secondly, the defeated gets the name from the victorious.[87] Thirdly, ethnonyms can be derived from the names of the rulers:

> The name of the Celts has often changed. First they were called Samothei, then after [their ruler] Celitus Celts, then after Galatus Galatians, thence after Beligius Belgians, afterwards by the Romans Gauls, finally descendants of Francus.[88]

The same has happened to the Germans – according to Tacitus this last name was imposed on them by the Romans (*Germ*. 2,5) – whose dizzying name changes started out with one Tuyscon, a giant and son of Noah after the Flood, after whom they were first called "Tuyscones" ("Germanum quoque nomen sepe a ducibus uariatum fuit", Annius, sig. X2r).

---

procedemus. Qualitates plures habet Viterbum, et ideo a pluribus originem habet, et ob id omnes opiniones uerae sunt, excepta prima" (Annius, sig. e4r). Thomas discusses this several times, e.g. *Summa theologiae* IIª-IIae q. 92 a. 1 ad 2, *Scriptum super sententiis* lib. 1 d. 22 q. 1 a. 2 co. See corpusthomisticum.org (consulted on 14.4.2020). "Donatus" means the *Ianua*. See Schmitt 1969, 74. The definition is often quoted by humanists, e.g. by Lorenzo Valla in the *Dialectica* and Niccolò Perotti in the *Cornu copiae* (see Pade 2000, 75).

[86] "et tunc quia indigenae non denominantur ab aduenis, et item ante Pelasgum regem Turrenum nomen et dominium inuenitur, consequens est ut antiqui Turreni non dicantur a Torebo nouitio neque sint proles lydorum, sed econtrario ipse aduena [aduene *ed*.] Torebus ab indigenis Turrenis cognominatus sit Turrhenus. […] Item quia aduenae ab indigenis cognominantur" (Annius, sig. B1r–B1v). On "Turrhenus" see Wifstrand Schiebe 1993, 389–396.

[87] "Ad hoc respondetur per id quod ait Seruius super primum Eneidos (1, 6), quia uicti a uictoribus nomen accipiunt. Et idciro Etrusca Vmbria Pelasgia, licet parum durauerit, a uictoribus Pelasgis dicta fuit" (Annius, sig. B1v). Since the Phenicians were defeated by the Assyrians, Phenician letters are also called Assyrian: "Hoc omnes concedunt, quod Nynus […] et totam Asiam […] armis subegit […]. Et quia teste Seruio super Eneida a uictoribus uicti denominabantur antiquitus, idcirco Assyrii omnes uocabantur, et ob id eaedem sunt antiquae litterae Assyriae atque Phenices" (Annius, sig. I5v).

[88] "Sepe uariatum est Celtarum nomen. Nam principio Samothei dicebantur, inde a Celito Celte, post a Galate Galatii, hinc a Beligio Belgae, post a Romanis Galli, postremo Francigenae" (Annius, sig. X2r).

Patterns of cultural memory influence language

Annius's interest in historical toponymy leads him to identify a fundamental message embedded in the layout of cities as *lieux de mémoire*, as sites of memory of their (former) importance; and to describe this phenomenon adequately, he develops a new terminology.

"Four cities" in history

Medieval Bible commentaries (and Jerome before them) had long been interested in the name of an early city mentioned in Joshua 14, 15: "Cariatharbe", later called Hebron. Jerome had in *De situ et nominibus* explained this as a compound noun meaning "city four".[89] Nicolaus de Lyra, the early-fourteenth century postillator of the Bible, collected the various attempts to explain the meaning of the name:

> The name Hebron: it was earlier called Cariatarbe, i.e. city four, because the four major patriarchs are buried there with their wives […]. Or because of the four giants buried there, as is said in more detail in Gen. xxiii. Some say that it was called Cariatarbe, i.e. city of Arba, who was the ruler there and from whom other giants are descended. […] One can bring all these explanations into agreement [by saying] that by the infidels it was called Cariatarbe because of the four giants buried there and because of the proper name of the ruler there. But by the faithful it was called Cariatarbe because of the four major patriarchs buried there.[90]

Annius picks this up in a discussion of settlement history immediately after the Flood, where Hebron takes pride of place as the world's oldest settlement. Annius registers its earlier name as Chyriat Arbe and discusses its meaning:

---

[89] HIER. sit. et nom. p. 84, 10–12 "Arbe, id est quattuor, eo quod ibi tres patriarchae, Abraham, Isaac et Iacob, sepulti sunt, et Adam magnus". p. 108, 32–33 "Cariatharbe, id est uillula quattuor, quae et Chebron: de qua iam supra dictum est". See *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae Onomasticon*, lemma: Cariatharbe, vol. II col. 190,49–60 (Jacobsohn) Lipsiae 1907–1910. *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, lemma: Arbee, vol. II col. 403,57–60 (Vollmer) Lipsiae 1900–1906.

[90] "Nomen Ebron: antea vocabatur Cariatarbe, idest ciuitas quattuor, eo quod quattuor Patriarche principales ibi sunt sepulti cum suis coniugibus […], uel propter quattuor Gigantes ibi sepultos ut plenius dictum fuit Gen. xxiii. Aliqui uero dicunt quod uocata est Cariatarbe id est ciuitas Arbe qui dominatus fuit ibi, et a quo descenderunt alii Gigantes. […] potest autem dici predicta concordando quod ab infidelibus uocata est Cariatarbe propter quattuor gigantes ibi sepultos et propter nomen proprium illius qui ibi dominatus fuit. A fidelibus uero uocata est Cariatarbe propter quattuor patriarchas principales ibi sepultos" (Nicolaus de Lyra, *Postilla super Bibliam*, ad Ios. 14, 15). Text from Nicolaus de Lyra, *Postilla super totam Bibliam*, ed. Johannes Andreas, Rome: Conradus Sweynheym and Arnoldus Pannartz, 1471–72, ISTC in00131000, (without page numbers).

> Some Hebrews have a different view – followed by the brother de Lyra – wherefrom directly after the Flood (Hebron) was called "chyriat arbe", that is in Greek "tetrapolis", in Latin "urbs quadrata" or with one word in the manner of the Greeks "quadriurbs", or – as the common commentators (of the Bible) say, – "city four".[91]

Annius agrees with earlier commentators that "Chyriat Arbe" was *four city*, but four of what? Annius rejects de Lyra's interpretations. His own theory emerges slowly from other "four cities" known from the Bible:

> And thus, every ruler of a people was four-cityish and royal like the ruler of Kyriat Arba. And Nimbrot, the ruler of the Chaldeans was four-cityish; as he himself attests, the royal seat was Babel, Arat, Acat, Calanne. The royal city of Ninus was a four city, Ninive, Fora, Cale, Resem. A four city was the royal Jerusalem, Sion, Moria, Iebus and Salem.[92]

The constituent element of the "four city" is clear from these examples: it has four parts, and this defines its importance.

A theory of urban development and a new terminology

Out of the toponym of the earliest "four city", Annius develops a theory and terminology of urban layout as a *memoria* of the former importance of a town, since the earliest cities differed not in the size of their populations, but in the number of their parts.[93] Number of parts and importance of a city were closely correlated:

> And therefore, Xenophon says in some fragment: "In old times a city which was a monopolis was rural, a dipolis rich, a tripolis was one that was the capital of a province, a tetrapolis was royal."[94]

Semantically, Annius's terminology is quite problematic. He treats the terms "tetrapolis", "quadriurbs", and "urbs quadrata" as synonymous, which they actually were not.

---

[91] "Verum quidam Hebrei dissentiunt, quos frater de Lyra sequitur, unde ab inicio post diluuium dicta sit chyriat arba, idest Grece tetrapolis, Latine uero urbs quadrata siue uno ut Greci uocabulo quadriurbs, siue ut uulgares postillatores urbs quatuor" (Annius, sig. I6v).

[92] "Et ita singulos populorum duces fuisse quadriurbios regios, ut dux Kyriat Arba, et Nymbrotus dux Caldeorum fuit quatriurbius, quia ut ipse testatur sedes regia fuit Babel Arat, Acat, Calanne. Regia item Nyni quatriurbs fuit, Nyniue, Fora, Cale, Resem. Quatriurbs fuit regia Ierosolima, Sion, Moria, Iebus, et Salem" (Annius, sig. I7v).

[93] "Differebant enim urbes antiquitus non multa magnitudine, sed multitudine partium eiusdem, quod aliae erant monopoles, aliae dipoles, aliae tripoles, regiae uero semper tetrapoles" (Annius, sig. N6r).

[94] "Et ideo Xenophon in quodam fragmento, "Antiquitus', inquit, "urbs monopolis rustica erat, dipolis uero opulenta, tripolis quae prouinciae caput esset, tetrapolis uero regia" " (Annius, sig.I7r).

"Tetrapolis" is, like the other Greek loanwords "monopolis", "dipolis" and "tripolis", regularly formed. Similar compounds are in Latin already in Hugutio (though not "monopolis" and "dipolis").[95] There, however, the terms designate regions with a certain number of cities (i.e. a tetrapolis is a region with four cities). In classical Latin we find only "tetrapolis", though not in the meaning used by Annius. The situation in Greek itself is similar. "Monopolis" is not attested (according to Liddell-Scott-Jones), "dipolis" is twice in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, though not in the Latin translation by Birago (see below for "urbs quadrata"), "tripolis" is somewhat more frequent, though with the meaning "league of three cities", and "tetrapolis" has a number of Greek examples which also are not in Annius's meaning. It is also transliterated rather than translated in the Latin *Strabo* of Guarino and Tifernas, a text Annius was well acquainted with (again in the meaning "region with four cities").

"Tetrapolis" is the only one of the four types of city for which Annius suggests terms with Latin roots, "quadriurbs" and "urbs quadrata".[96] Annius considers "quadriurbs" a loan translation from the Greek ("uno ut Greci uocabulo", see above), but it is in a variant form attested in the *Breviarium* of Festus (in the *Epitome* by Paulus Diaconus):

> Accius called Athens a four city, because the inhabitants had come together from four cities into one.[97]

According to the *Epitome* the term refers to four groups of inhabitants of Athens, though nothing is said about a fourfold division of the city itself. There Again, Annius – if he was aware of the passage in Festus – took over the word form, not the meaning.

"Vrbs quadrata", too, is neither a synonym of "tetrapolis" nor does it otherwise designate a "city in four parts". The binomial normally means quadrangular city, referring to its layout, and is usually applied to the layout of the mythical first settlement in Rome. The designation first appears in Solinus: "Rome is called quadrangular, because [*its layout*] was designed for balance" (SOLIN. 1, 17). In the same meaning it is used in humanist Latin, for example

[95] Hugutio, *Derivationes* P 102, 19 "Item componitur tripolis, tetrapolis, pentapolis, exapolis, neapolis, decapolis, idest regio in se continens vel civitas habens sub se alias III vel IIII vel V vel VI vel IX vel X civitate".

[96] Other terms floating around in Quattrocento Latin are "biurbs" in Tifernas's *Strabo* (14, 1, 43, gr. δίπολις) and Piccolomini's *Asia* (PICCOLOMINI *Asia* p.370), and "triurbs", also in *Strabo* (16, 1, 24, gr. τρίπολιν).

[97] "Quatrurbem Athenas Accius appellavit, quod ex quattuor urbibus in unam civitatem se homines contulere" (PAVL. FEST. p.259). The orthography of the word oscillates. The codex Farnesinus of Festus has *quadrurbem*, the *Epitome* (in Lindsay's 1913 edition) has *quatrurbem*, probably influenced by the "t" in *quattuor*. "Quadriurbs", the form used by Annius, would be the "normal" form, parallel to other compounds with *quadri-*. Annius could have found the definition also in Perotti's *Cornu copiae* (48, 5), which he cites elsewhere.

in the translation of Dionysius of Halicarnassus by Lampo Birago, often quoted by Annius, where it serves as translation of the Greek "tetragonos" (with four angles).[98] The information from the (Latin) Dionysius is transformed by Annius into a confirmation of his theory of urban development:

> In the same book Dionysius says that Romulus on the Palatine hill established an "urbs quadrata" of the same size as Athens.[99]

The mention of Athens, which is not in Dionysius, might suggest that Annius was aware of the Festus passage quoted above. The "urbs quadrata" Rome of the preceding example is in fact a tetrapolis:[100]

> Also, Romulus developed the town Rome into a city by incorporating the Palatine hill and made it into a tetrapolis consisting of Rome, Vellia, Germallia, and the Forum, as Fabius Pictor says in his book *About the Origin of the City of Rome*, and as Varro implies in the first book *About the Latin Language* with the etymologies of these words.[101]

The information in "Fabius Pictor" is the following:[102]

> Romulus […] converted in Latium the townlet Rome into a royal tetrapolis and put its foundations on the Palatine hill. He sent to Etruria for a seer and priest and established an olymp[103] and consecrated a

---

[98] DION. HAL. 2,64,3 τεκμήριον ὅτι τῆς τετραγώνου καλουμένης Ῥώμης; "quod is extra eam est quae quadrata dicta est Roma, quam Romulus muro cinxit" (trad. Lampo Birago)

[99] "In eodem dicit Romulum in Palatino colle quadratam fecisse urbem tantae quantitatis quantum habent Athene" (Annius, sig. M3r).

[100] An overview is provided in Baffioni 1981, 331–2.

[101] "Romulus item oppidum Romam in urbem conuertens totum collem Palatinum cinxit et tetrapolim reddidit constantem Roma, Vellia, Germallia, et Foro, ut exprimit Fabius Pictor De origine urbis Romae, et Varro in primo De lingua Latina (5, 53–54) per origines horum uocabulorum significat" (Annius, sig. I7v).

[102] The information is also in Sempronius-Annius: "At Romulus solum ex oppidulo Roma in Palatino colle quadratam et regiam reddidit, cuius quatuor portiones erant Roma, Vellia, Germallia" (sig. L2v), although either by an oversight of Annius or a loss of text only three parts of the four-part city are actually named.

[103] *Olympus* is here used in a meaning created by Annius: " 'Olympus' is not only the heavens and a very high mountain, but also the city boundary, i.e. the space which has been hallowed first in a city by an omen; this is told among the Greeks by Xenophon in the book *About Homonyms* and by Plutarch in the *Life of Romulus*, where he says: 'The Etruscans hold sacred some writing, secret rites and a furrow which we call olymp'." ("Est autem olympus non solum celum et mons quisque altissimus, sed et pomerium idest locus augurio primum in urbe sacratus, ut docent ex Grecis Xenophon in libro De Equiuocis [*i. e. Xenophon-Annius*, *sig. I3r*], et Plutarchus in Vita Romuli dicens: 'Etrusci sacrant litteris et mysteriis quibusdam et fossa, quam olympum dicimus'", Annius, sig. F6r). Plutarch (*vita Romuli* 11,2) actually says more or less the opposite, namely that the Etruscans called this furrow "mundus" and used the same word for the heavens (= *Olympus*). Of the two translations of the *Vita Romuli* available in print, by Lapo da Castiglionchio and Giovanni Tortelli, Annius uses the translation by Lapo: "Vocant autem fossam ipsam eodem quo Olympum nomine mundum" (text

> border; from the olymp in the vicus Thuscus over the Palatine he led the plough around from the foot of the hill to the top and (thus) marked the *urbs quadrata*.[104]

Annius's terminology shows its full potential in the description of the urban development of early Etruria:

> You are asking about "tetrapolis": what is a tetrapolis? Answer: It is a "quadriurbs" or "urbs quadrata" containing four big towns, such as Etruria [i.e. Viterbo] which contains Volturna, Vetulonia, Para Tussa, Arbanum.[105] A "tripolis" contains three large cities, such as Arezzo and Perugia which contains the towns Griphonium, Vibium Achaeum, and Meon Turrhenus. […] A "dipolis" contains two big cities, such as Bagnoreggio which contains Ciuita and Roda. Similarly, Tuscanella contains Ciuita uetus and Ciuita noua. The same layout is found in Nuetum, now Cornuetum […] which contains Castrum Nouum et Castrum Vetus. Finally there is the "monopolis" which contains one town, such as […] Blera, Veianum and similar towns.[106]

Thus Annius arrives at an understanding of urban geography as a *lieu de mémoire* of cultural structures that are no longer visible otherwise. Since an appropriation of the cultural dynamic thus uncovered depends upon an adequate descriptive terminology, Annius creates, partly by redirecting existing terms, partly by inventing new designations *ope ingenii*, a lexicon corresponding to what he sees as the urban realities of a pre-Roman and pre-Greek culture.

---

from: Plutarchus, *Vitae illustrium virorum* [Latin]. (Venice: Nicolaus Jenson, 1478), sig. a10v; ISTC ip00832000). The Tortelli-translation does not contain the word "Olympus": "Quae quidem cum in orbem deducta esset mundum ut caelum appellabant" (Plutarchus, *Vitae illustrium virorum* [Latin], ed. J. A. Campanus ([Rome]: Ulrich Han, [1470]), sig. b2r; ISTC ip00830000 (besides the Campano edition I also checked the Tortelli translation in BAV Ottob. lat. 1863, fol. 160v; both at this point have an identical text).

[104] "Romulus […] in Latio Romam oppidulum in regiam tetrapolim uertit inque Palatino colle fundauit. Ascito enim ex Etruria uate atque sacerdote olympum fecit pomeriumque sacrauit, et aratro ab olympo in uico Thuscho [!] per Palatium circumducens ab imo collis ad uerticem quadratam urbem signauit" (Fabius Pictor-Annius, sig. M4v).

[105] cp. "Quod nunc Viterbum dicitur, olim regia tetrapolis Etruria dicebatur" (Annius, sig. c7r).

[106] "Queris item de tetrapoli: quid est tetrapolis? Responsio. Est quadriurbs siue quadrata urbs continens quatuor magna oppida, ut Etruria quae continet Volturnam, Vetuloniam, para Tussam, Arbanum. Tripolis uero continet tres magnas urbes, ut Aretium, et Perusia quae continet oppida Griphonium, Vibium Acheum, et Meonem Turrhenum. […] Dipolis uero continet duas magnas urbes, ut Balneoregium quod continet Ciuitam et Rodam. Similiter Tuscanella continet Ciuitam ueterem et nouam. Pari forma Nuetum nunc Cornuetum, latina uero interpretatione Grauisce, quae continet Castrum nouum et uetus. […] Porro monopolis quae continet unum oppidum, ut […] Blere, Veianum et eiuscemodi" (Annius, sig. h3r).

Conclusion: the cultural memory of language

If we now return to Mlynář's description of the interaction between language and collective memory – used, in adapted form, as my section headings – we see that it describes Annius's *modus operandi* aptly. With considerable ingenuity Annius proposes rules of language change and etymology that allow him to bring forth the submerged memory of a forgotten language retained in a wide variety of sources: some of them also used, but "misunderstood" by humanists, some little used as historical sources (the Old Testament, arguably the most significant historical work outside the humanist orbit), some invented by himself. Once the desired "cultural memory of language" is established, a careful analysis of particular toponyms or ethnonyms can provide a structured approach to the cultural narrative encoded.[107] Finally, we have discussed a striking example where the discovery of certain patterns in the urban landscape of the old world leads to an innovation in Latin necessary to describe the new insights ("tetrapolis", etc.). Weaponizing these methods, Annius presents what is probably the most thorough rearrangement of historical information available at his time.

The weaknesses of Annius's cultural construct were, from the beginning, all too obvious. Still, the model was not altogether unsuccessful, and not only in Viterbo.[108] Countries such as Germany or France gleefully adopted a version of their past that allowed them to bypass the "Roman connection".[109] Such successes had nothing to do with plausibility or philological and historiographical rigour, but everything with political and cultural identity politics at any one time – which made the "lightness of interpretation" of the Annian approach quite bearable, even welcome.[110]

We will forever remain in doubt whether Annius really hoped to replace the humanists' version of the past with his own. What he did, beyond doubt, accomplish was to de-stabilize humanist historiography by showing that with the same methodology, given enough imagination, one could arrive at a very different, but overall hardly less meaningful memory.[111]

---

[107] The term "cultural memory of language" is from Samata 2014, although she uses it in a different context.

[108] The speech of the Viterbese notary Tommaso Veltrellini before the French king Charles VIII (1994) contains one of the first echoes of the nascent cultural ideology of Annius (such as the origin of the Palaiologan emperors from Viterbo and the *Decretum Desiderii*). See VELTRELLINI *or ad Carolum VIII* p.37–38.

[109] Niutta 2018, 47–48. Lepschy 1998, 50. 52–53. Müller 2010, 260 and 261 n. 100. Nothaft 2016, 716. Rhein 1996, 378.

[110] The "unbearable lightness of interpretation" is a phrase often used in memory and mentality studies, coined by Cofino 2008, 83.

[111] See the considerations by McCaffery 2002 in his review of Ruthven 2001.

Whether Annius of Viterbo was a compulsive liar and falsifier, a psychotic madman obsessed with false memories, an accomplished writer of scholarly fiction, a brilliant – if by our standards misguided – socio-historical researcher, or a satirist set on destabilizing the prevailing cultural narrative of his day, we will never know.[112] What is clear, however, is that the theoretical foundations he formulated had an impact that was much further-reaching than his intricate and often amusing reconstructions and imaginings of an Etruscan world at the beginning of time. His clarity concerning the evaluation of sources in historical research has been noted by Annius researchers; and we can now add his achievements in language research. Many of his individual assumptions about etymology and language change are as muddled as those of his more respected contemporaries. Nevertheless, the cogency of his edifice of language development from the earliest times to the vernaculars of his day, its relation to social and political events and structure and, finally, his insights into the importance of language for the preservation of cultural memory are achievements that, even though largely based on imaginary sources, can be put side by side with the products of the humanists of his time.

[112] A similar madness was described by Beiner 2018, xvii. Curran 1998–99, 169 suspects "fits of madness". Ligota 1987, 56 suggests that Annius might have been "a sophisticated explorer of fictions", comparable to the Argentine author Borges. Nothaft 2016, 715 calls the *Antiquitates* an "antiquarian hoax".

Bibliography

Assmann, Aleida 2008, "Canon and Archive", Erll & Nünning 2008, 97–108.

Assmann, Jan 1988/1995, "Kollektives Gedächtnis und kulturelle Identität", *Kultur und Gedächtnis*, eds.: Jan Assmann & Tonio Hölscher, Frankfurt/Main, 9–19. English translation by John Czaplicka as "Collective Memory and Cultural Identity", *New German Critique* 65, 1995, 125–133.

Assmann, Jan 1992/2011, *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization*: *Writing*, *Remembrance*, *and Political Imagination*, Cambridge. (German ed. 1992).

Assmann, Jan 2008, "Communicative and Cultural Memory", Erll & Nünning 2008, 109–118.

Assmann, Jan 2013, "Communicative and Cultural Memory", *The theoretical foundations of Hungarian "lieux de mémoire" studies*, eds.: Pál S. Varga, Karl Katschthaler, Donald E. Morse, Miklós Takács, Debrecen (*Loci Memoriae Hungaricae* 1), 36–43 (reformulated version of Assmann 2008).

Baffioni, Giovanni 1981, *Annio da Viterbo*. *Documenti e ricerche* I, Rome.

Baker, Patrick 2015, *Italian Renaissance Humanism in the Mirror*, Cambridge.

Banta, David 2000, "prolatio", *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* X, 2 (Leipzig & Stuttgart), 1814–1816.

Beiner, Guy 2018, *Forgetful Remembrance: Social Forgetting and Vernacular Historiography of a Rebellion in Ulster*. Oxford.

Bertolini, Lucia 2013, "Il *De Gestis Porsenne* di Leonardo Dati: Montepulciano, gli etruschi e un' idea di identità regionale", *Architettura e identità locali* 2, eds.: Howard Burns & Mauro Mussolin, Florence (*Biblioteca dell" «Archivum Romanicum»* ser. I: *Storia*, *Letteratura*, *Paleografia* 425), 91–102.

Biondo, Flavio 2005, *Italy Illuminated* I books I–IV, ed. and tr.: Jeffrey A. White, Cambridge, Ma. & London (*I Tatti Renaissance Library* 20).

Burke, Peter 2017, "Shaping Memories", *Literature and cultural memory*, eds.: Mihaela Anghelescu Irimia, Dragos Manea, Andreea Paris, Leiden & Boston (*Internationale Forschungen zur allgemeinen und vergleichenden Literaturwissenschaft* 194), 19–30.

Cano, Christine 2010, *Proust's Deadline*, Urbana, Illinois.

Charlet, Jean-Louis 2011 "Niccolò Perotti, humaniste du Quattrocento: Bibliographie critique", *Niccolò Perotti*: *The Languages of Humanism and Politics*, *Renæssanceforum* 7, 1–72 (URL: http://www.njrs.dk/7_2011/01_charlet_perotti_bibliographie.pdf, seen on 5 July 2020).

Cofino, Alon 2008, "Memory and the History of Mentalities", Erll & Nünning 2008, 77–84.

Curran, B. A. 1998/1999, "*De sacrarum litterarum Aegyptiorum interpretatione*: Reticence and Hubris in Hieroglyphic Studies of the Renaissance: Pierio Valeriano and Annius of Viterbo", *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 43–44, 139–182.

den Boer, Pim 2008, "Loci memoriae – Lieux de mémoire", Erll & Nünning 2008, 19–25.

Doll, Martin 2012, *Fälschung und Fake*. *Zur diskurskritischen Dimension des Täuschens*, Berlin (*Kaleidogramme* 78).

Erll, Astrid & Ansgar Nünning (eds.) 2008, *Cultural Memory Studies*: *An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*, Berlin (*Medien und kulturelle Erinnerung* 8 / *Media and Cultural Memory* 8).

Ferraù, Giacomo 2002, "Riflessioni teoriche e prassi storiografica in Annio da Viterbo", *Principato ecclesiastico e riuso dei classici: Gli umanisti e Alessandro VI*. *Atti del convegno*, *Bari-Monte Sant'Angelo*, *22–24 maggio 2000*, eds.: Davide Canfora et al., Rome, 151–193.

*Ferra*ù*,* Giacomo 2003, "Nota sulla "*filologia*" *di Annio* da Viterbo", *Confini dell'umanesimo letterario: Studi in onore di Francesco Tateo*, eds.: Mauro De Nichilo et al., Rome, 631–647.

Fumagalli, Eduardo 1984, "Un falso tardo-quattrocentesco: lo pseudo-Catone di Annio da Viterbo", *Vestigia*. *Studi in onore di Giuseppe Billanovich*, eds.: Rino Avesani et al., Rome, 337–363.

Goez, Werner 1974, "Die Anfänge der historischen Methoden-Reflexion in der italienischen Renaissance und ihre Aufnahme in der Geschichtsschreibung des deutschen Humanismus", *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 56, 25–48.

Gowing, Alain M. 2005, *Empire and Memory*: *The Representation of the Roman Republic in Imperial Culture*, Cambridge.

Grafton, Anthony 1998, "Invention of Traditions and Traditions of Invention in Renaissance Europe: The Strange Case of Annius of Viterbo", *The Transmission of Culture in Early Modern Europe*, eds.: Anthony Grafton & Ann Blair, Philadelphia, 8–38.

Grafton, Anthony 2019, "Annius of Viterbo as a Student of the Jews. The Sources of His Information", *Literary Forgery in Early Modern Europe*, *1450–1800*, eds.: Walter Stephens & Earle A. Havens, Baltimore.

Grimm, Alfred 2007, "Osiris, König der Etrusker: Giovanni Nanni da Viterbos 'Tabula Osiriana Aegyptia' als Beitrag zur *Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes*", *Exotisch*, *weisheitlich und uralt*: *europäische Konstruktionen Altägyptens*, eds.: Thomas Glück & Ludwig D. Morenz, Hamburg, 81–116.

Hobsbawm, Eric 1983, "Introduction: Inventing Traditions", *The Invention of Tradition*, eds.: Eric Hobsbawm & Terence Ranger, Cambridge et al., 1–14.

Kivistö, Sari 2015, "Crime and its Punishment: Alfonso Ceccarelli's False Chronicles", *Past and Present in Medieval Chronicles*, ed.: Mari Isoaho,

Helsinki (*COLLEGIUM*: *Studies across Disciplines in the Humanities and Social Sciences* 17), 148–175.

Laureys, Marc 2020, "Assessing the influence of Biondo Flavio's historical geography: the case of the Low Countries", *Cultural Encounter and Identity in the Neo-Latin World*, eds.: Camilla Horster & Marianne Pade, Rome (*Analecta Romana Instituti Danici – Supplementum* LIV), 203–217.

Lepschy, Giulio 1998, *History of Linguistics III*: *Renaissance and Early Modern Linguistics*, New York. (first Italian ed. 1992)

Ligota, Christopher R. 1987, "Annius of Viterbo and Historical Method", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 50, 44–56.

McCaffery, Larry 2002, Review of Ruthven 2001, *Modernism/modernity* 9/1, 200–202.

Mlynář, Jakub 2014, "Language and Collective Memory: Insights from Social Theory", *Slovak Journal of Political Sciences* 14, 217–236.

Müller, Gernot Michael 2010, " 'Quod non sit honor Augustensibus si dicantur a Teucris ducere originem': Humanistische Aspekte in der 'Cronographia Augustensium' des Sigismund Meisterlin", *Humanismus und Renaissance in Augsburg Kulturgeschichte einer Stadt zwischen Spätmittelalter und Dreißigjährigem Krieg*, ed.: Gernot Michael Müller, Berlin, 237–273.

Niutta, Francesca 2018, "Falsi, falsari e pubblico. Gli apocrifi di Annio da Viterbo e le pseudo-storie troiane di Ditti Cretese e Darete Frigio nel Cinquecento", *Roma nel Rinascimento*, 39–51.

Nora, Pierre 1996 *Realms of Memory*: *The Construction of the French Past*, ed.: Lawrence D. Kritzman, tr.: Arthur Goldhammer, New York. (revised from ed.: *Les lieux de mémoire*, ed. Nora Pierre, Paris 1984–1992).

Nothaft, C. Philipp E. 2016, "The Early History of Man and the Uses of Diodorus in Renaissance Scholarship: From Annius of Viterbo to Johannes Boemus", *For the Sake of Learning: Essays in honor of Anthony Grafton*, eds.: Ann Blair & Anja-Silvia Goeing, Leiden & Boston (*Scientific and Learned Cultures and Their Institutions* 18), 711–728.

Pade, Marianne 2000, "Valla e Perotti", *Studi Umanistici Piceni* 20, 72–85.

Pade, Marianne 2016, "Intertextuality as a Narrative Device. The Epistolographic Genre in the Renaissance", *Fiction and figuration in High and Late Medieval Literature*, eds.: Marianne Pade et al., Rome (*Analecta Romana Instituti Danici Supplementum* XLVII), 31–40.

Pomian, Krzysztof 1998, "De l'histoire, partie de la mémoire, à la mémoire, objet d'histoire", *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, 63–110.

Prinz, Otto 1942, "memoria", *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* VIII (Leipzig), 665–684.

Ramminger, Johann 2003-, *Neulateinische Wortliste*. *Ein Wörterbuch des Lateinischen von Petrarca bis 1700*. URL: http://www.neulatein.de

Ramminger, Johann 2003a, " 'Das altehrwürdige Bologna.' Zu Absicht und Vorbildern von Perottis 'De origine urbis Bononiae'", *Studi Umanistici Piceni* 23, 59–74.

Ramminger, Johann 2014, "Neo-Latin: Character and Development", *Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Neo-Latin World*, eds.: Philip Ford, et al., Leiden (*Renaissance Society of America Texts & Studies Series* 3), 21–36.

Ramminger, Johann 2014a, "Domizio Calderini", *Repertorium Pomponianum*, ed.: Marianne Pade. URL: http://www.repertoriumpomponianum.it/pomponiani/calderini_domizio.htm, (visited on 21/4/2020).

Ramminger, Johann 2019, "Il volgare e la cultura testuale latina di fine Quattrocento: gli studi del volgare di Ermolao Barbaro". *Paper delivered at CILPR XXIX*, *Copenhagen*, *1–6 July 2019*. Abstract at https://www.slir.org/wp-content/uploads/Section-1.pdf.

Ramminger, Johann forthcoming, "Stylometry in a language without native speakers: a test case from Early Modern Latin", *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici*.

Rhein, Stefan 1996, "*Italia magistra orbis terrarum*. Melanchthon und der italienische Humanismus", *Humanismus & Wittenberger Reformation*. *Festgabe anläßlich des 500*. *Geburtstages des Praeceptor Germaniae Philipp Melanchthon am 16*. *Februar 1997*, eds.: M. Beyer et al., Leipzig, 367–388.

Rothberg, Michael 2010, "Between Memory and Memory: From Lieux de mémoire to Noeuds de mémoire." *Noeuds de mémoire*: *Multidirectional Memory in Postwar French and Francophone Culture*. *Yale French Studies* 118/119, 3–12.

Rowland, Ingrid D. 2016, "Annius of Viterbo and the Beginning of Etruscan Studies", *A Companion to the Etruscans*, eds.: Sinclair Bell & Alexandra A. Carpino, s.l., 433–445.

Ruthven, K. K. 2001, *Faking Literature*, Cambridge. (repr. of 2004).

Samata, Susan 2014/2016, *Cultural Memory of Language*, London & New York (*Contemporary Applied Linguistics Volume* 5) (first published 2014).

Sarot, Marcel 2001, "Counterfactuals and the invention of religious traditions", *Religious identity and the invention of tradition*: *Papers read at a NOSTER Conference in Soesterberg*, *January 4–6*, *1999*, eds.: J. W. van Henten & A. W. J. Houtepen, Assen (*Studies in theology and religion* 3), 21–40.

Schmitt, Wolfgang O. 1969, "Die Ianua (Donatus): ein Beitrag zur lateinischen Schulgrammatik des Mittelalters und der Renaissance", *Beiträge zur Inkunabelkunde*, dritte Folge, 4, 43–80.

Schöntag, Roger 2017, "Il dibattito intorno al volgare antico tra Leonardo Bruni e Flavio Biondo sullo sfondo della cognizione linguistica di Dante", *Forum Italicum* 51/3, 553–572.

Signorelli, Mario 1966, *Sui sentieri dei lucumoni etruschi*, Viterbo.

Spagnesi, Enrico 2006 "Andrea Fiocchi, il Fenestella, e la storia del diritto", *Il capitolo di San Lorenzo nel Quattrocento*, ed.: P. Viti, Florence, 145–183.

Speyer, Wolfgang 1993, *Italienische Humanisten als Kritiker der Echtheit antiker und christlicher Literatur*, Wiesbaden (*Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur* 3).

Stephens, Walter 1989, *Giants in Those Days*: *Folklore*, *Ancient History*, *and Nationalism* Lincoln, Nebraska & London.

Stephens, Walter 2004, "When Pope Noah Ruled the Etruscans: Annius of Viterbo and his Forged Antiquities" *Modern Language Notes* 119 Supplement, S201–S223.

Stephens, Walter 2011, "Complex Pseudonymity: Annius of Viterbo's Multiple Persona Disorder", *Modern Language Notes* 126 (French Issue), 689–708.

Stephens, Walter 2013, "From Berossos to Berosus Chaldaeus: The Forgeries of Annius of Viterbo and Their Fortune", *The World of Berossos: Proceedings of the 4th International Colloquium on 'The Ancient Near East between Classical and Ancient Oriental Traditions' Hatfield College*, *Durham 7–9 July 2010*, eds.: Johannes Haubold et al., Wiesbaden, 277–289.

Tavoni, Mirko 1984, *Latino*, *grammatica*, *volgare*: *Storia di una questione umanistica*, Padova.

Tigerstedt, F. N. 1964, "Ioannes Annius and Graecia Mendax", *Classical*, *Medieval*, *and Renaissance Studies in Honor of Berthold Louis Ullman*, ed.: C. Henderson, 2, Rome, 293–310.

Weiss, Roberto 1962, "Traccia per una biografia di Annio da Viterbo", *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 5, 425–441.

Weiss, Roberto 1962a, "An Unknown Epigraphic Tract by Annius of Viterbo", *Italian Studies Presented to E. R. Vincent*, eds.: C. P. Brand et al., Cambridge, 101–120.

Wifstrand Schiebe, Marianne 1993, "Tyrrhenus the Degraded Hero: On Changing Concepts in the Work of Annius of Viterbo", *Aevum* 67, 383–396.

Yelle, Julie Anne 2014, *The Role of Language in Constructing Palestinian Collective Memory*. MA Thesis, U. of Texas-Austin.
URL: https://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/handle/2152/26411

Zerubavel, Eviatar 2003, Time Maps: Collective Memory and the Social Shape of the Past, Chicago & London.

Changing Cultural Memory Through Translation:

A new understanding of democracy

By Maren Rohde Pihlkjær

In 1452, Lorenzo Valla finished the first ever Latin translation of Thucydides' History of the Peloponnesian War*, in which he introduced Thucydides' version of the political phenomenon of democracy to fifteenth-century readers. This article examines and discusses how Valla, by changing the sense of belonging on which the Greek original builds to one of* othering*, in his translation offered his audience a new understanding of democracy: one that differed both from the cultural memory of Thucydides' fourth-century BC audience and from that of Valla's own fifteenth-century AD readers.*

Introduction

> χρώμεθα γὰρ πολιτείᾳ... καὶ ὄνομα μὲν διὰ τὸ μὴ ἐς ὀλίγους ἀλλ' ἐς πλείονας οἰκεῖν δημοκρατία κέκληται.[1]
>
> Our constitution... is called a democracy because power is in the hands not of a minority but of the greatest number.[2]

These immortal words echo in modern Europe, where democracy is still defined as Pericles defined it. When the constitutional treaty for the EU was drafted in 2003, the quotation above was proposed as its epigraph.[3] Though the EU chose not to keep the quote in the final treaty, it shows the value traditionally attributed to Pericles' funeral oration in discussions of how to define democracy. For what is democracy? In a time where nationalism is growing alongside the border fences, the question of the nature of democracy is once again relevant, and one of the most prolific discussions is whether

[1] Thucydides, *Historiae* 2.37.1.
[2] Hansen 2008, 16.
[3] Hansen 2008, 15–16.

democracies are based on *belonging* or *othering*.[4] In a democracy based on *belonging*, the democracy is defined and constituted by the citizens belonging to it; whereas in a democracy based on *othering*, the democracy is defined and constituted by its distinction from all other nations.

This article examines a cornerstone in the historical definition of democracy in Europe: the 1452 translation of Thucydides' funeral oration by Pericles from Greek into Latin by the Renaissance humanist Lorenzo Valla. It argues that Valla, through his use of *othering* rather than *belonging*, offered a new understanding of democracy that differed from how it was understood both in the original work and in the recipient culture.

Early modern understanding of democracy

A significant feature of Renaissance humanism is the new interest in ancient Greek literature. However, the rarity of the ability to read Greek proved a barrier for the Italian humanists as they strove to find and read the classical works. Only when Manuel Chrysoloras (c. 1355–1415) was invited to Florence to teach Greek in 1397 did the ability to understand the ancient language begin to flourish once again. It is not known how many people mastered ancient Greek, but we do know that as the popularity of the Greek authors grew, the prestige in translating them into eloquent and fluent Latin increased as well, and that as a consequence, a great number of Greek texts were translated by Renaissance humanists during the fifteenth century.[5] Pope Nicholas V played a significant role in the transferring of Greek works into Latin. In the mid-fifteenth century he commissioned a great number of Latin translations, among which were *The history of the Peloponnesian war* by Thucydides.[6] This translation, made by the renowned humanist and Latinist Lorenzo Valla, became the standard version of the work for centuries to come; the first printed edition was produced in 1483, and the last published in Paris as late as 1840. Furthermore, several translations into vernacular languages were made directly from the Latin version.[7]

During the Middle Ages and up to 1400, few Greek authors were accessible in Latin translations. Among them was Aristotle, whose *Ethics* and *Politics* had both been translated before the arrival of Chrysoloras. The *Politics* had been translated into Latin in the mid-thirteenth century and formed an important part of the self-understanding of the city-states in

[4] The public debate on the subject was supported by several institutions such as the SFU Morris J. Wosk Centre for Dialogue (SMWCD), the Centre for Public Impact, and the Othering and Belonging Institute at UC Berkeley.

[5] Taylor 2014, 330–331.

[6] Pade 2015, 29.

[7] Pade 2006, 789.

northern Italy. Its descriptions of the Greek city-states gave the Italian city-states a powerful role model for an independent form of government without a monarch. The prime example of an ancient city-state, according to Vincent Azoulay, was considered to be Sparta.[8] Azoulay argues that the city-states' interest in discipline and in military achievement made it easier for them to identify with the political system in Sparta. The Athenian democracy, on the other hand, was criticized by Aristotle. In the *Politics*, he concludes that democracy is the rule of the masses and of the poor, and as a result he considers it to be deviant, while he deems *πολιτεία* (politeia) to be the better form of majority rule.[9] Other than Aristotle, no noteworthy Latin translations of Greek political and historical literature had been made before the arrival of Chrysoloras in 1397.

The word *democratia* was in use during the Late Middle Ages and occurs in Thomas Aquinas' *De regno ad regem Cypri* (1,2), Marsiglio of Padova's *Defensor pacis* (I, VIII, 2), and Dante's *Monarchy* (*c*. 1309–1313).[10] All these works reflect Aristotle's views on democracy, and render *democratia* as a deviant form of government that in its pure form should be avoided. Another proof of widespread use of the word is a passage in Leonardo Bruni's *De interpretatione recta* (c. 1420), where Bruni criticizes the use of *democratia* as a translation of *δημοκρατία* in place of the Latin term *popularis status*:[11] he finds that there is no reason to transcribe the term, since another and more correct Latin term is available. Bruni is right in his critique, in the sense that the term *democratia* was not widely used in classical Latin – the lemma *democratia* in *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* is remarkably short, with only three textual references, all referring to post-classical authors.[12] However, the term *popularis status* is not common either, and, in fact, is not even classical.[13]

This narrow understanding of democracy following Aristotle is significant in the discussion of the cultural memory of democracy; but before engaging in this, I shall define the central theoretical concept *cultural memory*.

Cultural memory

Cultural memory is the dynamic long-term shared memory of a group or society, and it forms part of the cultural identity. It is inherited from one

[8] Azoulay 2014, 153.
[9] Aristotle, *Politics* 1279b.
[10] See Pade 2017 for greater details on the use of the word *democratia* in late medieval and early humanist sources.
[11] Bruni Interpr. 95.
[12] For a thorough study of the political lexica in Neo-Latin see Pade 2017.
[13] See Pade 2017, 315.

generation to another, but at the same time it is also under constant development, especially as societies encounter and interact with other societies. Aleida Assmann describes the development of cultural memory in this way:

> This type of memory [cultural memory] does not come into existence or persist of its own accord; it has to be created, established, communicated, continued, reconstructed, and appropriated. Individuals and cultures construct their memories interactively through communication by speech, images and rituals. Without such representations it is impossible to build a memory that can transcend generations and historical epochs...[14]

Cultural memory comprises both physical memories, such as archive records, and non-physical memories, such as traditions and rituals, which provide self-images as well as normative standards for its members. Cultural memory is an integral part of memory, and it influences the way individuals perceive both new and well-known objects and phenomena. It is based on generations of knowledge and experience, yet at the same time, it is constantly changing.

Both the human mind and physical archives have their limitations in storage capacity. That limited capacity signifies that not everything can be remembered, and that remembrance therefore must always be accompanied by forgetting. Forgetting, in the context of cultural memory, can occur on two different bases,[15] *active* and *passive*. Active forgetting is an intentional act, such as trashing and/or destroying. This can be a necessary part of social and cultural transformations, but it can also be a destructive and violent tool when inflicted top-down. Passive forgetting, on the other hand, is a non-intentional act through which a memory is lost or neglected, but still conserved in some form.

It is the exception rather than the norm that memories are remembered. Remembering, like forgetting, takes two forms, *active* and *passive*. Active memory is actively circulated, while passive memory is stored passively to conserve the past. Assmann[16] exemplifies this using the image of a museum. Active remembering is the displaying of objects in the part of the museum accessible to the public: these objects are actively remembered, and are also referred to as the *canon*. Passive remembering is the objects hidden away in the storage vaults of the museum, inaccessible to the public: this Assmann also refers to as an *archive*.

Together, these four phases (active and passive forgetting, active and passive remembering) form the foundation of our understanding of cultural

[14] Assmann 2011, 10.
[15] Assmann 2008, 98.
[16] Assmann 2008, 98.

memory. In the present study, the fate of the classical Greek texts that following neglect and lack of interest went unread to such a degree that knowledge of their language was lost is considered a case of passive forgetting. The texts were left unconsulted in libraries and archives. The renewed interest in ancient texts in Latin as well as Greek during the Renaissance caused a shift from passive forgetting to passive remembering, which ended in active remembering and the canonization of most of the works now termed "classical". In the case of Thucydides, Valla's translation can be seen as a result of, as well as an agent in, this process.

In the case of the cultural memory of democracy in Renaissance humanist society, it is debatable whether we should categorize this as passively remembered or passively forgotten. It is my estimation that democracy, as portrayed by Thucydides, must be recognized to have been passively forgotten, while I understand the word and the phenomenon of democracy to have been passively remembered owing to the works of Aristotle that were read throughout the Middle Ages.

I am working from the hypothesis that the cultural memory of democracy, as portrayed by Thucydides, shifted from passively forgotten to actively remembered in Renaissance humanist society owing to a change in physical artefacts: the appearance for the first time of a translation of the *History of the Peloponnesian war*. In the following I will examine the portrayal of the Athenian democracy both in the original Pericles funeral speech and in the Latin translation, in order to show how the scarce knowledge of Athenian democracy influenced Valla's translation and his portrait of the Athenian democracy. I will furthermore discuss whether the translation was capable of effectively altering the cultural memory of democracy in the humanist environment.

The translation

To examine how Valla conveys the notion of democracy, I have analysed the senses of *belonging* and *othering* linked to the Athenian democracy in the Greek text of Pericles' funeral oration and in the Latin translation. I understand the sense of *belonging* as how the Athenians saw themselves (the Athenian "*us*"), and the sense of *othering* as how they saw others (allies as well as enemies, here referred to as "*them")*. I have registered forty-two instances of discourse on "*us"* and "*them"* in the Greek text, and below I will examine how Valla has transferred these passages into Latin. I shall not comment on all forty-two examples, but highlight some of the most significant.

Translating "us"

In the Greek text,[17] the most common term (with fifteen occurrences) for "*us*", that is, the Athenian community, is the word *πόλις*, which was and still is quite difficult to translate.

According to Liddell-Scott-Jones (LSJ), *πόλις* has the following definitions:

- "city" (A.I.1)
- "one's city or country" (A.I.2)
- "community or body of citizens" (A.III.1)
- "state or community" (A.III.2)

The various meanings contained in the word *πόλις* are difficult to render with just one word. Perhaps for this reason, many modern languages transcribe the word. *Πόλις* can signify both the state/city as a physical entity and the state as the committed, emotional unification of its citizens that gives them a reason to work and fight for the nation. Valla renders this in four different ways, *civitas* being the most frequent, with nine occurrences.[18] The remaining three are *patria* (three occurrences), *urbs* (two) and *res publica* (one). None of Valla's four Latin translations fully covers this, but the most equivalent term is *civitas*.[19] Seemingly, Valla is using four different terms that corresponds to the different meanings of *πόλις*.

Patria

Of the four words used by Valla to translate *πόλις*, *patria* (fatherland) conveys the strongest pathos. It may come as a surprise that in a speech delivered in time of war, at a time when it is necessary to stand up for your fatherland and be patriotic, Valla only translates *πόλις* with *patria* three times. The first example of *patria* in the speech is found in 2.36.3:

καὶ τὴν **πόλιν** τοῖς πᾶσι παρεσκευάσαμεν καὶ ἐς πόλεμον καὶ ἐς εἰρήνην αὐταρκεστάτην.	et **patriam** omnibus que uel ad pacem uel ad bellum pertinent instruximus atque ornauimus.

[17] For this study I have used the text edition of Thucydides' *Historiae* published by J. Alberti, Thucydides 1972–2000.

[18] The archetype of the translation is available online through DigVatLib, https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.lat.1801 (seen 1.9.2020).

[19] Lewis and Short defines *civitas* as: "the condition or privileges of a (Roman) citizen, citizenship, freedom of the city"; "the citizens united in a community, the body-politic, the state, and as this consists of one city and its territory, or of several cities, it differs from urbs, i.e. the compass of the dwellings of the collected citizens"; "= urbs, a city (rare and mostly post-Aug.; not in Cic. or Caes.)"

Here Pericles is describing how the *πόλις* has been prepared for the future by its citizens, be that in case of war or peace. In the Greek text, it is difficult to decide which of the meanings of *πόλις* is in use. It seems that the *πόλις* is the object of practical preparations and is consequently to be understood as either the physical city (LSJ A.I.1) or the state (LSJ A.III.2); but by translating it with *patria*, Valla brings home to the reader how much more than the physical city is at stake. With his use of *patria,* he marks the city's importance for the Athenian identity. Here Valla's text appeals to the emotions, while the Greek text of the passage can be read as appealing to logos.

The second example is in 2.37.1:

οὐδ᾽ αὖ κατὰ πενίαν, ἔχων δέ τι ἀγαθὸν δρᾶσαι **τὴν πόλιν**, ἀξιώματος ἀφανείᾳ κεκώλυται.	neque propter paupertatem quis quominus publico munere non fungatur, dummodo **patrie** prodesse possit pro uirili parte prohibetur.

Here it is stressed that all citizens, no matter their social rank or status, are seen as capable of contributing to the wellbeing of the state. In this case, it is clear that Valla's use of *patria* is equivalent to the meaning of *πόλις* in the Greek text, and it stresses the importance of the argument: if we work together, regardless of individual social status, we can achieve more. The appeal to emotions contained in *patria* is important if this argument is to be valid in Latin as well as in Greek.

The third and last example is found at the climax of the oration in 2.43.1:

Καὶ οἵδε μὲν προσηκόντως **τῇ πόλει** τοιοίδε ἐγένοντο..	Et isti quidem quales par erat tales in **patriam** extitere.

Here Pericles finally addresses the fallen soldiers in whose honour he is giving the oration. Pericles stresses that the soldiers' death was worthy, because they died defending the *πόλις*. This is one of the most emotionally charged moments in the oration, made very clear in Valla's translation by the use of *patria*. It is worth noting that even in this pathos-filled passage, Thucydides has Pericles use the word *πόλις* rather than, for instance, *πατρίς* (fatherland).

Besides the three translations of *πόλις*, Valla also uses *patria* as the translation of *πατρίς*, the more direct equivalent term in Greek. *Πατρίς* is used only once, in 2.42.3:

καὶ γὰρ τοῖς τἆλλα χείροσι δίκαιον τὴν ἐς τοὺς πολέμους ὑπὲρ **τῆς πατρίδος** ἀνδραγαθίαν προτίθεσθαι: ἀγαθῷ γὰρ κακὸν ἀφανίσαντες κοινῶς μᾶλλον ὠφέλησαν ἢ ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἔβλαψαν.	Etenim iustum est eos qui prestare alia nequeunt, certe in bellis **patrie**, fortitudinem animo proponere, cum melius publice de ciuitate quam peius priuatim meruerint, hoc malum illo bono obruentes.

Here Pericles states that any defects on the part of individual Athenians before the war have been rendered invisible by their laying down of their lives for the fatherland. This effect is diminished in the Latin version because Valla uses *patria* repeatedly.

Civitas

As stated previously, Valla's most-used translation for *πόλις* in the oration is *civitas* ("the citizens united in a community, the body-politic, the state", LS II). Especially when Pericles is speaking of the nature and structure of the *πόλις* – of its military education and strategy, for instance –Valla has chosen to translate with *civitas*. This is the case in six of the nine translations with *civitas.* The remaining three, however, are a little different.

The first of these special cases is in 2.43.1:

ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον τὴν **τῆς πόλεως** δύναμιν καθ᾽ ἡμέραν ἔργῳ θεωμένους καὶ ἐραστὰς γιγνομένους αὐτῆς,	sed uel magis si contemplantes quotidie ex operibus potentiam **ciuitatis** efficiamini illius amatores

Here Pericles encourages his audience to feast their eyes upon "τὴν τῆς πόλεως δύναμιν" (the power of the polis) from day to day, the result of the hard-working Athenians, so that they are filled with love for the *πόλις* and eventually become its *ἐρασταί* – lovers of the state. This word, frequently used to designate physical lovers, creates an emphatic image of the bond between city-state and citizen. Valla transfers the image using *amatores*, an equivalent word. The argument by Pericles clearly relies on pathos, which makes the translation of *πόλις* with the otherwise logos-appealing *civitas* seem odd standing next to a pathos-filled word like *amatores*. Of Valla's four different translation choices, *patria* here would have emphasized the pathos of the text and strengthened the argument.

The second instance is in 2.43.1:

οὐκ οὖν καὶ **τὴν πόλιν** γε τῆς σφετέρας ἀρετῆς ἀξιοῦντες στερίσκειν,	non statuerunt sua uirtute fraudandam esse **ciuitatem**

Pericles claims that no personal calamity could induce the Athenians to deprive the *πόλις* of their *ἀρετή*. The word *ἀρετή* is defined in LSJ as "goodness, excellence, of any kind" (LSJ A.I) and "active merit, good service" (LSJ A.II), but the concept of *ἀρετή* is relative and depends on who possesses it. Here the subject is the citizens, so Valla translates *ἀρετή* with *virtus*. This very powerful statement follows shortly after the first mention of the fallen soldiers over whom the funeral oration is being given. Both the nature of this example and its position in the speech call for a much more pathos-filled translation than

civitas. As in the example above, Valla could easily have translated this example with the patriotic *patria*, but instead chooses the more neutral *civitas*.

The third and last instance is at 2.46.1:

τὰ δὲ αὐτῶν τοὺς παῖδας τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦδε δημοσίᾳ **ἡ πόλις** μέχρι ἥβης θρέψει	Quorum liberos **ciuitas** hinc ad pubertatem publice alet

This occurs at the very end of the oration. It differs from all the other instances of *πόλις* in that here, for the first and only time, the *πόλις* is doing something for its citizens. Up until this point, it has been stressed how the citizens should work together for the good of the *πόλις*, fight for the *πόλις*, and love the *πόλις*. Here, the *πόλις* suddenly becomes the active party: Pericles assures the audience that the *πόλις* will take care of the children of the fallen and raise them at the state's expense. Now the *πόλις* is the state as an institution (LSJ A.III.2) providing for its citizens, but Valla has chosen to continue the use of *civitas* rather than using *res publica*, which seems to be the equivalent to the meaning in LSJ A.III.2. In this example Pericles is making use of ethos, not on his own behalf, but establishes it on behalf of the *πόλις* by assuring that the state will take care of its citizens. It stresses the sense of community in the oration. Perhaps Valla translates with *civitas* and not *res publica* because *civitas* emphasizes the embodiment of the community, while, as we shall see below, this meaning is not associated with *res publica*.

Res publica

The appearance of *res publica* ("the common weal/state", LS II.K), used only once to translate *πόλις*, occurs when Pericles addresses the parents of the fallen soldiers and encourages them if they still can to have more children, both as a comfort and as a reassurance for the state, 2.44.3:

καρτερεῖν δὲ χρὴ καὶ ἄλλων παίδων ἐλπίδι, οἷς ἔτι ἡλικία τέκνωσιν ποιεῖσθαι: ἰδίᾳ τε γὰρ τῶν οὐκ ὄντων λήθη οἱ ἐπιγιγνόμενοί τισιν ἔσονται, καὶ **τῇ πόλει** διχόθεν, ἔκ τε τοῦ μὴ ἐρημοῦσθαι καὶ ἀσφαλείᾳ, ξυνοίσει: οὐ γὰρ οἷόν τε ἴσον τι ἢ δίκαιον βουλεύεσθαι οἳ ἂν μὴ καὶ παῖδας ἐκ τοῦ ὁμοίου παραβαλλόμενοι κινδυνεύωσιν.	Tolerare tamen oportet spe aliorum liberorum eos qui in etate adhuc sunt procreandi. Siquidem futura soboles et quibusdam erit peculiaris obliuio defunctorum et **rei publice** bis proderit quod eam nec desolatam patietur et tutam prestabit. Non enim possunt aut par aut iustum consilium dare ii qui exponunt periculis liberos istorum more, et qui non exponunt.

Why Valla chooses to translate with *res publica* is unclear; if we compare this with his previous translation with *civitas*, both instances are focusing on the *πόλις* as institution and state (LSJ A.III.2) rather than citizen body. Consequently the meaning of *πόλις* is the same. Valla's translations, however, differ. As a result, the use of *res publica* distances the *πόλις* from the citizen

body, perhaps to stress that a new crop of children will reassure not only the bereaved parents, but also the state.

Urbs

The use of *urbs* (city) as a translation of *πόλις* occurs twice. The first occurrence, in 2.39.1, clearly refers to the physical city of Athens:

τήν τε γὰρ **πόλιν** κοινὴν παρέχομεν	quod **hanc urbem** omnibus exhibemus

The second occurrence in 2.41.2 is more interesting, since it occurs in a description of the nature of the *πόλις,* and therefore in a context where Valla usually translates with *civitas*. In this example, the word *πόλις* is used three times in a row, but it is translated differently into Latin, 2.41.1–2, 5:

ξυνελών τε λέγω **τήν** τε πᾶσαν **πόλιν** τῆς Ἑλλάδος παίδευσιν εἶναι καὶ καθ᾽ ἕκαστον δοκεῖν ἄν μοι τὸν αὐτὸν ἄνδρα παρ᾽ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ πλεῖστ᾽ ἂν εἶδη καὶ μετὰ χαρίτων μάλιστ᾽ ἂν εὐτραπέλως τὸ σῶμα αὔταρκες παρέχεσθαι. [2] καὶ ὡς οὐ λόγων ἐν τῷ παρόντι κόμπος τάδε μᾶλλον ἢ ἔργων ἐστὶν ἀλήθεια, αὐτὴ ἡ δύναμις **τῆς πόλεως**, ἣν ἀπὸ τῶνδε τῶν τρόπων ἐκτησάμεθα, σημαίνει.... [5] περὶ τοιαύτης οὖν **πόλεως** οἵδε τε γενναίως δικαιοῦντες μὴ ἀφαιρεθῆναι αὐτὴν μαχόμενοι ἐτελεύτησαν, καὶ τῶν λειπομένων πάντα τινὰ εἰκὸς ἐθέλειν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς κάμνειν.	Atque ut semel dicam uidetur mihi hec **ciuitas** tum in totum esse grecie magisterium, tum per singulos uiros corpus ad plurima rerum genera idoneum exhibere cum gratia precipue et uenustate. Et quia hec in presentiarum non orationis iactatione magis quam rerum ueritate nitimur, hec **urbis** potentia quam his artibus parauimus est documento [...] Pro hac igitur **ciuitate** et isti quod indignum ducerent eam euerti, preliantes generose occubuerunt, et reliquorum decet unumquenque uelle anniti.

As shown above, Valla translates with *civitas* the first and third time here, but for some reason chooses to change his strategy when he translates *πόλις* for the second time. Here *urbs* is used in the sense "as a political entity" (OLD 1,a). I see no other reason to translate with *urbs* than a wish to vary the language. The variation in Valla's language means that the repetitive use of *πόλις* in the Greek text is lost.

Democratia

Besides using *πόλις* to describe the "*us*" of the text, Thucydides also uses *πολιτεία* (two occurrences), *δημοκρατία* (one), and *ἀστός* (one).[20] One word seems to be missing in the formation of the idea of "*us"*: the name "Athens" is never

[20] πολιτεία is always translated with res publica, and in both occurrences it is used in the description of Athens as a democracy. Ἀστός is used as the antonym of ξένος, and is translated with ciuis. In this article I will not comment further on these translations.

used in the oration, and furthermore "Hellas" is only used when referring to other cities than Athens.

Δημοκρατία occurs once in 2.37.1:

καὶ ὄνομα μὲν διὰ τὸ μὴ ἐς ὀλίγους ἀλλ' ἐς πλείονας οἰκεῖν **δημοκρατία** κέκληται	nomenque habemus non quod ad paucos sed quod ad multos pertinent, **democratia**

This very famous appearance of *δημοκρατία* in the Greek text is crucial in the discussion of cultural memory in successive societies. The passage appeals strictly to logos without emotional implications, simply stating that the form of government used in Athens is called democracy. Nonetheless, the use of the word is crucial for readers not fully acquainted with Athenian democracy, including Valla's. Here Valla chooses not to translate the term, but to transcribe it. Bruni's critique of the use of *democratia* as a translation of *δημοκρατία* cannot have been unknown to Valla, and, in fact, elsewhere in the *Historiae,* Valla does translate with the endorsed *status popularis*: according to Pade,[21] the word *δημοκρατία* or words derived from it occur thirty-two times in the *Historiae*, and Valla almost invariably translates these with *popularis status*. In transcribing *δημοκρατία* rather than replacing it by, e.g., *popularis status*, Valla could have been following a strategy to promote, rather than domesticate, the concept. Pade argues that this is unlikely to be an oversight: she suggests that Valla opts for the transcription because Pericles mentions the term or *nomen δημοκρατία*.

Translating "them"

Turning to the most-used term for "*them"* in the Greek text, this is the Greek word *πολέμιος* (enemy). This occurs only five times in the oration, meaning that the enemy is almost invisible in the Greek text. This is quite unexpected, considering that the Athenians are at war and the oration honours their fallen soldiers. Furthermore, the enemy – the Spartans – is mentioned only once by name (this goes for both the Latin and Greek texts). Valla translates all instances of *πολέμιος* with *hostis* (enemy), but interestingly this is not the only term that he translates with *hostis*: *ἐναντίος* (opponent or enemy), which occurs twice, is also translated with *hostis* or *hostilis*.

The first occurrence is in 2.39.1:

Διαφέρομεν δὲ καὶ ταῖς τῶν πολεμικῶν μελέταις **τῶν ἐναντίων** τοῖσδε	In studiis autem rei bellice hinc quoque differimus ab **hostibus**

[21] Pade 2017, 330–332.

Here *hostis* is used as the translation of *ἐναντίος*. Though this may seem an equivalent translation, Thucydides' choice of *ἐναντίος* rather than the *πολέμιος* he uses elsewhere in the oration indicates a differentiation between the two terms. *Πολέμιος* is the stronger of the two, since it removes all doubt: this is not just someone who is not "*us"*, but someone who intends "*us*" no good.

In the second occurrence, at 2.42.4, it seems a bit odd of Thucydides not to use *πολέμιος*:

τὴν δὲ **τῶν ἐναντίων** τιμωρίαν ποθεινοτέραν αὐτῶν λαβόντες	preoptans [...] **hostilis** penę quam salutis sue cupidiores

Here it is quite clear that those in question are an enemy, since there is talk of vengeance. We might therefore expect Thucydides to use *πολέμιος*. My suggestion is that Thucydides wishes to stress the vengeance itself rather than the enemy: the desire is for vengeance, and the enemy is less important.

Besides these seven mentioned instances, Valla uses *hostis* one more time, when he translates "αὐτοῦ τούς τιμωρεῖσθαι" (his own revenge) with "*ultione hostium"* (revenge on the enemies). Valla's non-differentiation between *πολέμιος* and *ἐναντίος* brings the sum total of Valla's uses of *hostis/hostilis* eight.

Belonging or othering?

The most interesting discovery in the course of my analysis is the repetitive use of *πόλις* and the difficulty of translating this concept. In the Greek text, the repetitive use of *πόλις* portrays Athens and Athenian democracy as an inclusive institution founded on the collaboration between citizens and state. This builds a sense of *belonging* in the audience, and stresses the importance of the individual loving, working for, even dying for the community, the *πόλις*. Supported by the structure of the Athenian democracy in which the citizens take an active part in government, the sense of *belonging* becomes the dominant notion of democracy.

The analysis has also shown that Valla in his translation emphasizes "*them"* far more than does Pericles in the original version. Valla's use of *civitas* in some passages shows that he could have made *civitas* almost as present in the text as *πόλις*. Had he done so, he could have emphasized "*us*" and thereby the feeling of *belonging*. But instead of reproducing the existing imagery of *belonging* in the oration, he replaces it by fear of the other, the enemy. The result is to make the enemy – almost invisible in the Greek text – much more visible by cultivating a sense of *othering*. This very fundamental change of focus from the inclusive community of the city-state towards the alienation of the remainder of Hellas, specifically Sparta, gives a very different depiction of democracy than is portrayed in the Greek text.

Why did Valla translate as he did? The answer may lie in a combination of two factors. The first of these may be his readers' ignorance of the Athenian democracy. Before Valla's translation, Athenian democracy must be considered a casualty of passive forgetting. Valla therefore presents a version of democracy that is more acceptable to his readers, one based on *othering* rather than *belonging*. Fear of an enemy is universal, and the need to stand together against the common enemy is easy to understand. The unifying idea implicit in direct democracy is more complex, perhaps even harder to understand for readers who are not part of a democracy. For the Renaissance humanists, Aristotle's criticism of democracy made it harder still.

The second factor may simply be a matter of following the prevailing translation strategy of "non verbum pro verbo": that is, not to render word for word, but sense for sense – a strategy celebrated by (Pseudo)Cicero in *On the Best Kind of Orators*.[22] This strategy was one of several adopted by the Renaissance humanists, who were great admirers of Cicero (to whom the text was attributed at the time). In the Renaissance period, this strategy was expressed as a wish to translate the ancient Greek texts as if the original Greek authors had written them in Latin in the first place.[23] Had Valla transcribed *πόλις*, or used just one term to render it, he would have been translating "verbum pro verbo" rather than translating the meaning of the word on each separate occasion.

In the end, Valla's translation strategy presents the readers with a slightly altered image of democracy from that portrayed by Thucydides. Not only that, but at the same time his approach portrays a new understanding of democracy that differs from that already existing in the cultural memory at the time. These physical texts represent the first step towards a possible change in the cultural memory. The vision of democracy that Valla offers is more accessible to his readers than the vision in the Greek text: Valla is offering the Renaissance humanists a new conceptual framework in which to understand, interpret, analyse and discuss democracy. It is a framework that makes space for a more nuanced discussion of democracy, perhaps even a re-evaluation of Aristotle's negative dismissal of democracy.

Once Valla's text was disseminated and read, the new understanding of democracy could become part of the active cultural memory and, over time, replace or give a more nuanced view to the image of democracy portrayed by Aristotle. Already in the second half of the fourteenth century, we see an increase in historiographers referring to Thucydides.[24] Today, we have

[22] Ps.Cic. *opt. gen*. 5.

[23] Like Bruni, who wishes to let Plato speak as if he had known Latin, Bruni 1741: ep. I 8 a. 1404–1405.

[24] Pade 2006, 791.

twenty-two existing manuscripts of the translation, as well as numerous printed editions.[25] Along with the version of democracy it presented, Valla's translation, in use for so long and across the whole span of Europe, became a key to the European cultural memory of democracy.

[25] Pade 2006, 789.

Bibliography

Assmann, Aleida 2011, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization*: *Functions*, *Media*, *Archives*, New York.

Assmann, Aleida 2008, "Canon and Archive", *Cultural Memory Studies*: *An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*, eds.: Astrid Erill & Ansgar Nünning, Berlin & New York, 97–108.

Azoulay, Vincent 2014, *Pericles of Athens*, Princeton.

Hansen, Mogens Herman 2008, "Thucydides' Description of Democracy (2.37.1) and the EU-Convention of 2003", *Greek*, *Roman and Byzantine Studies* 48, 1, 15–26

Pade, Marianne 2017, "Popular government revisited: new texts on Greek political history and their influence in fifteenth-century Italy", *Neulateinisches Jahrbuch* 19, 313–338.

Pade, Marianne 2015, "The Renaissance", *A Handbook of the Reception of Thucydides*, eds.: Christine Lee & Neville Morley, Chichester, West Sussex, 26–42.

Pade, Marianne 2006, "Thucydides' Renaissance Readers," *Brill's Companion to Thucydides*, eds.: Antonis Tsakmakis & Antonios Rengakos, Boston & Leiden, 779–810.

Taylor, Andrew 2014, "Introduction: The Translations of Renaissance Latin", *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature*, 41, 329–353.

Thucydides, 1972–2000, *Historiae*, ed.: Giovan Battista Alberti, Rome.

Venuti, Lawrence 1995, *The Translator's Invisibility*: *A History of Translation*. London & New York.

NOUUS ÆNEAS LUTHERANUS:

Canonical Archives and the creation of meaning in Johannes Sascerides' *Epicedium in obitum Christiani Tertij* (1559)

By Anders Kirk Borggaard[1]

Using an adapted version of Aleida Assmann's theory of cultural memory, this article explores how the humanist practice of imitating canonical literature contributes to the creation of meaning in Johannes Sascerides' Epicedium in obitum serenissimi et potentissimi Daniæ etc. Regis Christiani Tertij. *It is argued that Sascerides uses a combination of Virgil's Aeneid and Biblical allusions to fashion a meaningful memory of King Christian III of Denmark-Norway in which the king is presented as a new Aeneas, his position resting on personal agency and Lutheran piety rather than the divine mandate that normally characterizes Virgil's canonical hero.*

Introduction

The imitation and emulation of classical literature was a practice central to the literary production of the Renaissance humanists. United in the pursuit of Latin eloquence, they believed that a precondition for the production of Neo-Latin literature that could rival the works of the ancients was to acquire true eloquence and learn the proper use of genre by meticulously studying, internalizing, and imitating the writings of the best classical authors.[2] A literary canon therefore emerged that supplied budding humanists with the appropriate models. While this resulted in a literary frame of reference that was shared among humanists all over Europe, a further consequence was that

[1] The material for this paper was first presented at the Fourth Nordic Network for Renaissance Studies Conference in Helsinki. The paper was written during my PhD fellowship funded by the Carlsberg Foundation and Aarhus University.

[2] My understanding of Renaissance humanism is largely based on the humanist meta-discourse presented in Baker 2015 as well as on the concept of "The Pursuit of Eloquence" presented in Gray 1963. For the concepts of *imitatio* and *aemulatio*, see Fantazzi 2014.

the canon in turn became a common archive full of themes and passages that could be incorporated into new works of literature.[3]

However, for those belonging to the *Respublica litterarum*, simply to replicate what one had found in a text that was worthy of imitation was not sufficient. Authors were expected to draw upon the culturally significant canon of literature in a manner resembling that of the bees: just as bees produce honey by collecting the pollen of a variety of flowers, transforming it within themselves to create a new substance, so each humanist had to bring together narrative structures and verbal elements from the rich variety of works that were common to all, combining them in novel ways or mixing them with new material to produce a work that, like honey, retained the characteristics of its sources while still being the author's own creation.[4]

The aim of my article will be to explore how the humanist practice of selective imitation and drawing upon canonical works contributed to the creation of meaning in the *Epicedium in obitum serenissimi et potentissimi Daniæ etc. Regis Christiani Tertij* (Hafniæ 1559) of Johannes Sascerides (1526–1594), a Flemish-born professor of Hebrew at the University of Copenhagen. Written as a poetic biography commemorating the recently deceased King Christian III of Denmark-Norway (1503–1559), for the most part the *Epicedium* comprises a detailed account of the many personal details and historical events that made up the life of the deceased king. But within this biographical account, Sascerides also includes a number of references to two works, each of which held a central position in the humanist literary environment: Virgil's Aeneid and the Christian Bible. To show how Sascerides uses these allusions to fashion the memory of the king into the memory of a new – but distinctly Lutheran – Aeneas who comes to power as God's pious champion in a civil war-like battle for power, I will approach the *Epicedium* through the lens of Aleida Assmann's theory of cultural memory.

The following will therefore open with a brief introduction to Assmann's theoretical framework, which I modify slightly in order to apply it to the products of a literary culture devoted to the imitation of canonical literature.

[3] See for instance the reading list provided by Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini (later Pope Pius II) in his *De liberorum educatione*, 69–73 (ed. Kallendorf 2002), as well as Fantazzi 2014.

[4] The bee simile, first popularized by Petrarca and later on by Erasmus, was itself copied from Seneca. For an overview, see Fantazzi 2014. Stefan Tilg has recently demonstrated how the Neo-Latin novel could play around with fact and fiction by creating allegorical narratives in which historical or contemporary events were concealed in a fictitious narrative inspired by ancient literature, thereby effectively splitting the work into "einen fiktiven Vordergrund und einen faktischen Hintergrund" (Tilg 2020, 78–79). This allegorical blend of classical motifs and contemporary content had been part of bucolic poetry since the time of Virgil, and it continued to be an essential part of the genre within Renaissance humanism (see e.g. Marsh 2014).

I then outline the content and structure of the *Epicedium,* while paying close attention to a passage in which Sascerides reveals the principles that govern his method of utilizing classical and Biblical material within his work. Next, I go deeper into the text to investigate how such canonical borrowings are used to frame and give meaning to episodes central to the portrayal of Christian and his ascent to power, before finally taking a step back to discuss how Sascerides' imitative practice has ultimately shaped the resulting narrative.

Cultural memory and literary canons

According to Assmann, all narratives of the past that are present and active within a society can be defined as *functional memories*. These, she explains, are constructed on the basis of material drawn from the passive *archives* of history, in a binary relationship similar to that existing between the narratological concepts of *syuzhet* and *fabula*.[5] Unlike functional memories, which are alive and meaningful, Assmann sees archives and the material they contain as dormant and in themselves void of signification, describing them as "de-contextualized and disconnected from their former frames which had authorized them or determined their meaning".[6] Since material only enters into an archive after it has lost its original addressees and has thus ceased to be immediately present within society – yet without yet having been consigned to the realm of *forgetting* – everything that the archives contain "is stored and potentially available, but it is not interpreted".[7] Assmann therefore concludes that in order for the dormant material found in an archive to become part of a functional memory, it must first be reawakened and reinterpreted.

This perception, however, does not really hold true for the canons of classical and Biblical literature that served as important archives for humanist writers, since these in no way contained dormant material lacking in signification. On the contrary, as pointed out by Hartmut Böhme in relation to the research project "Transformationen der Antike", the canonical position enjoyed by antiquity would rather have conferred on its material and literary relics a special energy and vigour. While Böhme follows Assmann in acknowledging that the discontinuation of the ancient world turned its remnants into "ein Archiv des Toten" (an archive of the dead), he posits that

[5] Assmann first used the terms *functional memory* and *storage memory* (see Assmann 2011), which in time became *canon* and *archive* (see Assmann 2008, especially 98–99). I have chosen to combine the two into the conceptual pair of *functional memory* and *archive*, thereby actively abstaining from Assmann's use of the word *canon,* which I reserve for literary canons.

[6] Assmann 2008, 99.

[7] Assmann 2008, 102–103. See also Assmann 2011, 127.

the stability and continuity conferred by that canonization at the same time gave these remnants power, influence, and the potential to determine or transform the meaning of any new material with which they might come into contact.[8] I therefore propose that we adapt Assmann's system so as to accommodate the special position of what might accordingly be termed *canonical archives*, by acknowledging how these can oscillate between the roles of passive archive and active memory. As a consequence, we must observe that canonical archives supply a special kind of material: one that not only comes with meaning that is already well defined, but also has the potential to influence, even transform the meaning of other elements in the resulting functional memory – even if these elements in turn belong to other canonical archives of culturally foreign or rival traditions.[9]

It is easy to imagine how the Bible might have had this effect as an important canonical archive in the communal memory of the European humanists. Although its content was not easily reconciled with a literary tradition founded upon the works of pagan antiquity as I will touch upon below, the Bible was an archive of Judeo-Christian history and literature, and as the source of Christian doctrine, it offered up a variety of themes, parables, and historical narratives all deeply imbued with religious significance.

Virgil's Aeneid, on the other hand, owed its dual importance to the special position it enjoyed at the very top of the humanist canon of classics. Virgil was revered as the undisputed master of and model for the genre of epic,[10] and his twelve-book masterpiece on the mythological foundation of the Roman Empire by the Trojan hero Aeneas was seen as providing its humanist imitators with more than just examples of Latin epic style. It also contained a wealth of epic conventions that could easily be adapted to suit new narrative content. More importantly, at the core of the Aeneid were themes touching upon powerful ideals of heroic virtue, divine support, and the God-given right to rule. In the centuries that followed the first attempt at a true Neo-Latin epic, Francesco Petrarca's unfinished *Africa*, numerous works were produced after a distinctly Virgilian template. New epics were written on ancient themes, contemporary princes were cast as mighty warriors and founder of dynasties, and even Christian protagonists such as the Egyptian hermit Saint Anthony of the Desert (in Maffeo Vegio's four-book *Antonias*) and Jesus Christ

[8] Böhme 2011, especially 16–17.

[9] Assmann herself regards literary canons as belonging to the category of *functional memories*, but she does not recognize their equal potential as *archives* of communal memory for the creation of new *functional memories*. See Assmann 2008, 101.

[10] While other authors such as Lucan and Claudian also influenced the Neo-Latin epic, Virgil continued to hold, and strengthen, his position as the main model for epic literature, cf. Schaffenrath 2016, 199, particularly n. 24 ("Ab dem 16. Jahrhundert aber übertrifft Vergil die Bedeutung der anderen Epiker bei weitem.").

himself (in Marco Girolamo Vida's influential six-book *Christias*) were celebrated as proper heroes in the language and style of Virgil.[11]

It is not surprising, then, that Sascerides too turned to Virgil for inspiration as he composed his *Epicedium* on the life and death of Christian III.[12] In fact, the deceased king lent himself quite easily to being commemorated in a Virgilian vein. Just as Virgil's hero had carried the ancient gods from Troy to Latium, Christian had been the reformer king responsible for the (official) introduction of the Lutheran confession; he had also, after his ascent to power in the bloody and civil-war-like interregnum known as the Count's Feud (1534–1536), re-established his branch of the Oldenburg dynasty's claim to the Danish throne. This could accordingly be seen as mirroring Aeneas' role as founder of the Roman Empire after his victory over Turnus in the war following his arrival in Latium. Rather than merely decorating his tale with borrowed feathers, however, Sascerides consciously exploits the innate significations of this canonical archive to impart certain meanings to his portrayal of the king, whom he tellingly describes as a "nouus Æneas" (new Aeneas).[13] Moreover, he adds further nuance the Aeneid-inspired narrative with the help of Biblical allusions. As we might expect given such a canonical source, these in turn exert their own influence on the type of "nouus Æneas" that ultimately emerges from the functional memory of the devout king and dynastic (re-)founder.

Content and structure of the Epicedium

The *Epicedium* is made up of 580 verses of elegiac distichs, arranged into three units roughly corresponding to the basic structure of an epicedium: a lengthy proem (vv. 1–90); a main narrative (vv. 91–550); and a short epilogue (vv. 551–580).[14] In the main narrative, the life and reign of Christian III is

[11] For an overview of Virgilian epic in the Renaissance, see Bloemendal 2014; Kallendorf 2014; Schaffenrath 2015; Gwynne 2017. An introduction to Vegio's *Antonias* can be found in Michael Putnam's preface to his edition of Vegio's short epics (Vegio 2004, xxxvi–xlvi), just as an introduction to Vida, known as the Christian Virgil, and the *Christias* can be found in James Gardner's preface to his edition of the *Christias* (Vida 2009, vii–xxviii).

[12] The *Epicedium* is part one of a three part volume (see Sascerides 1559) which contains two more poems by Sascerides: the shorter *Carmen gratulatorium* on Frederik II's, Christian's son and heir, victory in the war against the peasants' republic of Ditmarschen, and the *Historia de Coronatione* on the coronation of Frederik II. While the *Epicedium* has not received much scholarly attention, Karen Skovgaard-Petersen has pointed out allusions to the Aeneid in the *Historia de Coronatione*, see Skovgaard-Petersen 1991, 12–13. I have made some preliminary investigations into the *Epicedium* in Borggaard 2019.

[13] Sascerides, *Epicedium*, v. 155 (fol. Br).

[14] A brief introduction to the genre can be found in Gräßer 1994, 11–18, while a detailed overview of the treatment of funerary poetry such as epicedia in renaissance poetics is given in Witstein 1969, 98–131.

unfolded chronologically, beginning with his illustrious lineage and ending with his death on New Year's Day 1559. This biography is divided into two distinctly different parts of roughly the same length (234 verses and 226 verses respectively) by Christian's coronation in 1537: the first part recounting how he became king, the second portraying his rule as king.

The first part (vv. 91–324) consists of a continuous narrative that largely follows the basic structure of the Aeneid, as I will show in greater detail below. It opens with a brief summary of Christian's family, birth, and childhood years before describing how Christian as a young man was sent to the court of his maternal uncle, Elector Joachim I of Brandenburg. While there, he attended the imperial Diet of Worms, and the encounter with Protestant ideas led him to convert to Lutheranism. On his return home, he brought the new confession with him and quickly converted his father, Frederik (then duke of Schleswig-Holstein). Together, the two began a small-scale Reformation in the duchies. Christian then joined a war to put his father on the Danish throne; afterwards, he returned to Schleswig. On his father's death ten years later, Christian was called upon to leave Schleswig and accept the Danish crown in order to save the country from the civil war that had erupted in the wake of Frederik's death. Reluctantly agreeing, he entered into the Count's Feud against Count Christopher of Oldenburg. After years of fighting, Christian finally captured Copenhagen and defeated his enemy.

The second part (vv. 325–550) is a topical presentation of Christian's government after his coronation. Christian reforms the Church and the educational system, brings in Lutheran staff from Wittenberg, and commissions a Danish translation of the Bible. Then, in the midst of the peace and prosperity his government had created, Christian is portrayed as falling gravely ill, recovering thanks only to his piety and unwavering trust in God. Finally, Sascerides describes the very end of Christian's reign and how he always exhibited great piety in his private as well as public life. This was also true of his final days, and the main narrative ends as Christian, lying on his deathbed, closes his eyes as he recites the *Nunc Dimittis*.

Before analysing the first part of the main narrative in greater detail, we first need to take a look at the proem, as Sascerides here seems to reveal how he intends to exploit and combine two separate canonical archives, the pagan Aeneid and the Christian Bible, within his work. In accordance with the nature of an epicedium, the proem opens with the poet lamenting the king's untimely death. As the lamentation reaches a climax, Sascerides invokes the classical Muses, asking them to take part in mourning the king and praising his deeds:

> Promite pierides lachrymas, proferte querelas,
> Lugubreque humenti fundite ab ore melos.
> Plangant laurigeri communi in clade poetæ,

Tristia nam vester fata patronus obijt.
Plangat doctiloquę plæbs nata vacare Mineruę,
Et quibus est verbum cura sonare Dei.
Cessit enim terra, superasque migrauit ad arces,
Qui verę columen relligionis erat.
Et per quem Christi doctrinam habet vltimus orbis,
Vt, quo vix radios sol iacet, illa micet.[15]

Weep, Pierian Muses, bring forth your sorrows, and sing a mournful song with tears in your eyes. Let the poets with their laurel wreaths lament in this universal misfortune, for your patron has met a sad end. Let the crowd born to pursue the eloquent Minerva lament, those whose duty it is also to preach the Word of God. For he has left the earth and moved to the highest of heavens, he who was a column of true religion and spread the teaching of Christ to the end of world, so that it shines where even the rays of the sun can barely reach.[16]

It is a commonplace in epic as well as other genres of (Neo-)Latin poetry to invoke the classical Muses as the source of poetic eloquence and the divine authors of the narrative that is to be unfolded through the agency of the poet. However, Sascerides expands on this theme by asking the Muses to sing not just through their usual representatives, the humanist poets identified by their laurel wreaths, but also through a crowd that combines Minervan eloquence with the preaching of the Bible. Moreover, Sascerides' invocation of divine assistance does not end with the traditional authority of the classical Muses. After having cursorily touched upon Christian's main achievements as king and subsequently lamented the harsh times that are surely to come following his death, Sascerides concludes the proem by directing his attention to God, imploring Him to assist in expounding Christian's many deeds:

Sis Deus auxilio, nec nostrum hunc desere nisum:
Te cano nunc etiam, dum tua dona cano.
Nunc age sim gratus, magnasque exponere laudes
Egregij digno principis ore queam.[17]

God, help me and do not desert me in this undertaking, for when I sing of Your gifts, I sing of You as well. Let me now be found pleasing and able to set forth the great praises of that illustrious prince with a mouth that is worthy of him.

[15] Sascerides, *Epicedium*, vv. 25–34 (fol. Aiijr).
[16] All translations in the article are my own.
[17] Sascerides, *Epicedium*, vv. 87–90 (fol. A4r).

Sascerides thereby appears to blend two distinct traditions by having the classical Muses sing together with the Christian God through the agency of a particular type of scholar who is distinguished from other humanist poets by his ability to unite classical literature with the dissemination of Biblical doctrine. This may seem to be a way of addressing Christian's dual role as patron of the Muses and proponent of Lutheranism, but I believe that it should rather be seen in connection with how the Lutheran scholarly environment in which the *Epicedium* was produced sought to unite classical literature and Christian doctrine in the production of new literature.

The practice of merging classical traditions from the pagan past with material from contemporary Christianity had not always been straightforward in humanist tradition. The Muses were commonly invoked in epics composed on the deeds of European princes to signal the beginning of a narrative in which historical material was to be cast in a classical mould, but the same *modus operandi* was less well received in epics devoted to Christian themes or Biblical narratives. While Iacopo Sannazaro followed classical tradition and invoked the Muses to sing of the virgin birth of Christ in his *De partu Virginis* commissioned by Pope Leo X, critics such as Erasmus "found the classical language inappropriate to the Christian subject".[18] As Craig Kallendorf has argued, it was against the decorum of its content to invoke pagan deities in a Christian poem which, despite its classical style, needed to convey a distinctly Christian theology. Accordingly, Marco Girolamo Vida, an otherwise ardent admirer of Virgil, opens his *Christias* by calling upon the Holy Spirit rather than the Virgilian Muses.[19] Maffeo Vegio had previously done something similar in his *Antonias*, in which he explicitly rejects Apollo and the false Muses of antiquity, choosing instead to invoke Jesus Christ as the poetic authority behind his work.[20]

In a Lutheran context, the Muses could more easily be made to sing a Christian tune, as humanism was regarded as the essential point of departure for both the study of theology and the proper reading of scripture. This view had played a key role in the early Reformation, and with the formalization of the Melanchthonian system, humanism and theology became fused as two mutually indispensable parts of Lutheran education. As a consequence, both classical and Biblical literature became canonical archives in the cultural

[18] Sannazaro, *De partu Virginis*, 1.1–18. Gwynne 2017, 212–213.

[19] Vida, *Christias*, 1.1–14. Kallendorf 1995, 58–60.

[20] Vegio, *Antonias*, 1.1–14. Francesco Benci also turned his back on the Muses by choosing to invoke the *Caelicolae* ("those who dwell in heaven", i.e. angels or Christian martyrs) in his *Quinque Martyres e Societate Jesu in India* (1591), which constituted the beginning of a new genre, the Jesuit epic. See Gwynne 2016, 7. On the *Caelicolae* as angels, see also Gregory 2006, 64.

memory of every Lutheran humanist, and the ability to display familiarity with both literary canons became essential to securing ecclesiastical offices or positions at the university in the newly reformed societies. This was effectively a way of expressing membership in the Lutheran *Respublica litterarum*.[21] It is therefore telling that Sascerides asks the classical Muses to sing under the direction of the Christian God in accordance with this ideal through the agency of a crowd remarkably similar to Lutheran scholars such as himself,[22] who knew how to combine classical eloquence with the propagation of the Gospel. To a contemporary reader educated in the Melanchthonian tradition, this would have suggested two things: that the *Epicedium* would employ elements from the canonical archives of both disciplines, and, more importantly, that these elements would cooperate, in accordance with Lutheran ideology. While the Muses would provide a classical model for the eloquent memorialization of Christian's life, the authority lent by God and the Bible would ensure that the resulting narrative harmonized with Lutheran theology, thus creating a literary syncretism that promoted Lutheran orthodoxy through a classical motif.[23]

Meaningful episodes in the life of a new Aeneas

1. The one where Aeneas became a Lutheran

Within the main narrative of the *Epicedium*, Sascerides effectively transforms the first half of the biography into an epicizing narrative which utilizes the general framework of the Aeneid to portray how Christian became the rightful king of Denmark-Norway. For this, he relies on a series of verbal and thematic allusions to Virgil's canonical work. The first time he takes advantage of the

[21] The Lutheran theology of education is concisely explained in Witte 2002, 262–267. For a thorough treatment of the environments in Wittenberg and Copenhagen, see Grane 1987, especially 104–114. See also Skovgaard-Petersen & Zeeberg 2007, 245 and Skafte Jensen 1993.

[22] Sascerides had previously demonstrated his abilities as a Lutheran scholar by combining theology and humanism in his *Odarum*, *siue carminum sacrorum libri IX* (Basileae 1557), which was dedicated to Christian III and came with a letter of recommendation from Melanchthon. It contained among other things a Latin translation and versification of the entire Book of Psalms and of songs from the Old and New Testament, and it earned him the position of professor of Hebrew in Copenhagen. Jacoby 1890; Rørdam 1900. Both Jacoby and Rørdam provide an overview of the life of Sascerides, but for a more nuanced view, see also *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek*, *s. v*. Rørdam 1872, 495–502 moreover provides a survey of Sascerides' activities at the University of Copenhagen.

[23] Cf. Kallendorf 1995. I have recently demonstrated how the classical *topos* of the paternal prince (*Pater patriae*) was transformed to comply with and promote a Lutheran ideal, see Borggaard 2019.

canonical archive to shape his narrative is when young Christian returns home from the Diet of Worms and introduces his father to the new Lutheran faith. As he does so, Sascerides explicitly compares him to the protagonist of Virgil's epic:

> Aggreditur mira iuuenis pietate parentem,
> Quę secum attulerat, pura docere sacra.
> Et nouus Æneas gestando horrentibus illum
> Eripuit tenebris, in quibus orbis erat.[24]
>
> The young man approached his father with marvellous piety to teach him the pure religion which he had brought with him. And as a new Aeneas he picked up his father and rescued him from the horrible darkness which then covered the earth.

By referring to Christian as a new Aeneas, Sascerides openly directs the reader's attention to the Aeneid, and he does so at a key point in the epic's canonical narrative. Chronologically speaking, the Aeneid begins in book two, as Aeneas sets out from the falling city of Troy to the destined shores of Latium. On his shoulders he carries his ageing father Anchises, and with him he has the Penates, the Trojan gods, which he is taking with him to the new homeland. In portraying Christian as a new Aeneas, rescuing his father from the darkness of the Catholic Church while wielding the "pura sacra" of Lutheranism, Sascerides is exploiting this well-known motif to signal the beginning of a new Aeneid with Christian as its new protagonist. However, in this version of the culturally significant narrative, a major influence is exercised by the "pura sacra" brought home by Christian from Worms. Whereas Virgil's Aeneas is divinely commanded to carry his father and the Penates away from Troy, Christian uses the "pura sacra" to rescue his father from the clutches of Catholicism. His ability to assume the role of "nouus Æneas" is therefore intimately linked to his conversion to Lutheranism at the Diet of Worms immediately beforehand.

In Worms, despite being in the company of the Emperor and the German nobility, all eager to condemn Luther as a heretic, Christian had secretly embraced the teachings of Luther, that "innocent and divinely inspired servant of God".[25] This momentous event, however, is not described using motifs from the Aeneid or the canon of classical literature. Instead, Sascerides

[24] Sascerides, *Epicedium*, vv. 153–156 (fol. Br).

[25] Quando palam instructo diuinitus ore Lutherus
Vera fatebatur dogmata iussus ibi.
Turbati proceres illum tacuisse volebant,
Prę reliquis iram Carolus ipse fouet.
Insontemque Dei famulum proscribit inique:
Cur adeo papę Carole diue faues?" Sascerides, *Epicedium*, vv. 135–140 (fol. A4v).

turns to his Biblical archive. He uses an allusion to a key passage of scripture, the parable of the sower, known from the synoptic gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, to accentuate the narrative significance of young Christian's acceptance of Lutheranism:[26]

> Dux autem iuuenis cor nondum affectibus atris
> Præclusum, quos dat ruga senilis, habens,
> Haurit ibi furtim diuinę semina lucis,
> Quę cito et excrescent vbere iacta solo.[27]
>
> But the young prince who did not yet have a heart closed up by the dark emotions that come with wrinkly old age, embraced there in secret the seed of the divine light, and the seed quickly grew forth from the fertile soil in which it had landed.

In the parable of the sower, the Word of God is compared to the seeds scattered by the sower across his field. While many of the seeds die, having fallen on stony ground or among thorny shrubs, some land on fertile soil, where they grow and bear fruit. This is meant to symbolize how a good Christian is supposed to embrace the Word when he hears it – as does our young protagonist in Worms – and thereby serve as the fertile soil in which the Word can grow and bear fruit.

The lesson contained in the parable of the sower touches upon something lying at the centre of contemporary Lutheran theology. In the influential *Enchiridion theologicum* (Wittebergae 1557), published only a few years prior to the *Epicedium*, Niels Hemmingsen, a leading theologian and Sascerides' colleague at the University of Copenhagen, had explained how a Christian could become part of God's divine plan of salvation, which constitutes "the foundation and main cause of all good things that we receive from God".[28] While the offer to be entered in the Book of Life is universally extended to all people by the infinite grace of God, Hemmingsen cautions that we need to actively accept this invitation in faith and piety whenever God extends it to us.[29] How this relates to the parable of the sower and its significance to the episode in Worms becomes evident as Hemmingsen clarifies how and when God invites us to accept His gift:

---

[26] Matthew 13:1–23; Mark 4:1–20; Luke 8:4–15.

[27] Sascerides, *Epicedium*, vv. 141–144 (fol. A4v).

[28] "Nam æterna Dei prędestinatio est fundamentum ac prima causa bonorum omnium, quæ à Deo percipimus". Hemmingsen 1557, fol. V8v. As a testament to Hemmingsen's influence on Lutheran theology, he was honoured as the *Praeceptor Daniae* (Teacher of Denmark) just as Melanchthon had been the *Praeceptor Germaniae*. On Hemmingsen and his influence, see Rørdam 1893; Witte 2002, 139–140.

[29] Hemmingsen 1557, fols. V8r–X8v.

> Quando uocat? Ab initio mundi, statim post lapsum parentum nostrorum, ipse Dominus uocare cœpit, et postea nonnunquam per Angelos, interdum per Prophetas, postea per Filium et Apostolos, et hodie uocat omnes, quibus ex sua bonitate Euangelium patefacit.[30]
>
> When does He invite us? From the beginning of the world, immediately after the fall of our ancestors, the Lord began to extend His invitation Himself, and since then He has done so sometimes through angels and at times through the prophets, then through His Son and the apostles, and today He invites everyone to whom the Gospel is revealed by virtue of His goodness.

As the passage shows, God is represented as calling upon each person to whom the Gospel is preached through His divine mediators, disseminating the Word across the world like seeds across a field.[31] Sascerides undoubtedly knew the *Enchiridion,* as he had in fact composed the epigrammatic *Ad lectorem* that accompanied Hemmingsen's work. It is therefore telling that he portrays Christian's conversion at the hands of Luther, the divinely inspired servant of God, using a parable which exemplifies one of the most fundamental teachings of Lutheranism. The parable thereby comes to exert a strong religious influence on the new Aeneid that is about to begin, as Sascerides uses it to implicitly connect Christian's proclamation as a new Aeneas with his demonstration of Lutheran piety in accepting the Word of God. We have already seen that it was Christian's conversion that gave him the tools he needed to carry out the Virgilian rescue of his father; but he in fact becomes Aeneas at the very moment when he first spreads the Gospel, thus bearing fruit in accordance with the parable, by sowing the Word in the heart of his father. The resulting image of the "nouus Æneas" as a sower of the Gospel is made strikingly explicit in the passage immediately following Frederik's conversion at the hands of his son, where the metaphors from the parable reappear in even greater number and intensity:

> Quoque magis pietas excresceret orta, peritos
> Aduocat, vt spargant semina sancta, viros.
> Misit Iohannem celebris Goslaria Slauum,
> Holsatico vt sereret verba salutis agro.

[30] Hemmingsen 1557, fol. X7r.

[31] Hemmingsen stresses the importance of divine mediators in the exposition of the parable in his later *Postilla seu Ennaratio Evangeliorum*: "Seminator Deus est, qui tametsi per homines semen in terram mittit: tamen ipse unà adest et operantur: quare ministri verbi coadiutores Dei dicuntur" (God is a sower who scatters His seed on the earth although He does so through humans. He is nevertheless present and works through them, wherefore preachers of the Word are called assistants of God), Hemmingsen 1561, 184–197, 187.

> Iamque pio sudore viri seges extitit ingens,
> Et pressę vepres occuluere caput.[32]
>
> In order for the piety which had sprung forth to grow even stronger, [Frederik] invited learned men to spread the holy seed. Renowned Goslar sent Johann Wenth to sow the Word of Salvation in the soil of Schleswig-Holstein, and with his pious sweat a bountiful field soon appeared, and the struggling thorn-bushes concealed their heads.

This time it is Frederik who, as duke of Schleswig-Holstein, facilitates an even wider dissemination of the Gospel, but Sascerides makes sure to remind us that it all began when Christian, or Aeneas, rescued his father from Catholicism by successfully sowing the first seed.[33] The Aeneas figure is thus intimately linked to the parable of the sower, and the two canonical influences accordingly join forces to portray how Christian could only assume the role of an Aeneas – a role which tradition would expect to result in kingship and dynastic greatness – through exhibiting his Lutheran piety. Incidentally, this piety is also what moves the narrative along: following the small-scale Reformation effectively begun by Christian, God in his gratitude has Frederik chosen to be king of Denmark-Norway. While this is in fact a chronological falsification from the pen of Sascerides – the Reformation in the duchies did not in fact happen until after Frederik's coronation, and by then it was Christian who invited Johann Wenth to spread the word[34] – the manoeuvre emphasizes the narrative importance of earning God's favour through piety.[35] Moreover, it provides Sascerides with an opportunity for introducing one of the most well-known motifs from the Virgilian canonical archive.

2. When Aeneas met Dorothea

Craig Kallendorf has remarked that "it is difficult to imagine a Virgilian epic without a Dido story",[36] and Christian's withdrawal to Schleswig-Holstein after his father's coronation provides an opportunity for Sascerides to use the tragic romance between Aeneas and Queen Dido of Carthage in book four of

[32] Sascerides, *Epicedium*, vv. 161–166 (fol. Br).

[33] Non minus ad nati spectare videntur honorem,
Cuius ea instinctu cæpta fuere pio.
Per natum pater edoctus veracia passim
Erigi, et extingui dogmata falsa iubet.
Sascerides, *Epicedium*, vv. 219–222 (fol. Bijr).

[34] Andersen 1979–1984.

[35] Cf. Paul Gwynne on the lack of historical veracity in the poetry of Johannes Michael Nagonius: "The poet's purpose [. . .] is not historical veracity. In keeping with panegyric tradition, historical events are reshaped into an ideal pattern". Schirg & Gwynne 2015, 30.

[36] Kallendorf 2014.

Virgil's epic as the canonical background on which to add further nuances to his new Aeneas. But instead of a new tragedy, we are presented with an image of exemplary Lutheran bliss as Christian, now a duke, sets about ordering his estates and marries the pious Dorothea of Saxe-Lauenburg, who bears him five children. The familiar Dido motif is thereby turned into a representation of how the new Aeneas starts a family and becomes the *Hausvater* or head of a Lutheran household. Since the family was regarded as the nucleus of Lutheran society, the passage consequently serves to display more of Christian's Lutheran virtues, this time in relation to the temporal world.[37]

The passage should not, however, be seen simply as a negation of the well-known Dido motif in favour of a Lutheran emendation. Rather, the motif from the Virgilian archive supplies the subtext necessary for Sascerides to further demonstrate that the single most important trait of his new Aeneas is his piety. Educated readers who would certainly recognize the canonical model would also have identified the differences between the old and the new Aeneas, thus appreciating that the addition of Christian's exemplary piety, demonstrated to excess in the preceding episode, is what effectively converts tragedy into bliss and the new Aeneas into a good *Hausvater* – and, in turn, an exemplary Lutheran. Both levels of signification are needed to construct this edifying image of Christian, and Sascerides thus enforces the principle he presented in his proem by promoting Lutheran doctrine by way of a classical motif. But this fusion of canonical subtexts has yet another consequence: as Lutheran doctrine taught that the office of *Hausvater* was the source of all worldly authority, Christian's abilities as the head of a household can be seen as a guarantee of his capabilities as the king that a reader would expect the Aeneas figure to eventually become.[38]

3. Aeneas and the Game of Thrones

The sudden death of King Frederik propels the narrative forward with the prediction that "horrida bella" (horrible wars) now threaten the kingdom.[39] The phrase "horrida bella" is used twice in the Aeneid to announce the gruesome fighting awaiting Aeneas in books seven to twelve – first spoken by the Sybil in Cumae in book six (*Aen*. 6.86), then repeated by the poet as he opens book seven to reveal the bloody content of the final six books (*Aen*. 7.41) –

[37] The importance and responsibilities of the *Hausvater* in Lutheran social theology can be seen in the exhaustive treatment of the Fourth Commandment (Honour your father and your mother) in Luther's *Deudsch Catechismus* (Luther 1529, fols. XVIIr–XXVIv). This topic is also treated in Stopa 2018; Holm 2018; Koefoed 2018 as well as in Borggaard 2019.

[38] Luther 1529, fols. XVIIr–XXVIv.

[39] Illiusque fluens gelido de corpore sanguis
Ciuibus orbatis horrida bella notat". Sascerides, *Epicedium*, vv. 229–230 (fol. Bijr).

and Sascerides thus exploits the connotations of the conspicuous phrase to alert the attentive reader to a leap in the canonical model from the Dido story to the war for power over Latium.

In this part of the Aeneid, Aeneas is destined to triumph over Turnus, who in opposing the divinely favoured hero has defied the will of the Fates. Sascerides uses the same basic model to describe Christian's struggle against Christopher of Oldenburg in the Count's Feud. Christian is the champion of God; Christopher, who, like Turnus, displays his heedless fury by attacking the pious hero without the customary declaration of war, is doomed to fail together with his allies in the attempt to conquer the Danish throne. There is, however, an obvious difference between the two. Whereas the Aeneid presents a divine polyphony characteristic of classical epic – some gods support Aeneas, others Turnus – only the One True God is present in the *Epicedium*.[40] This change from divine pluralism to a single almighty God makes it possible for Sascerides to add a Biblical layer to the martial narrative, and this addition shapes the traditional war account by illustrating how Christian's exemplary confidence in God leads him to exhibit a very un-Virgilian clemency towards his enemies. When approached by the demoralized Hanseatic city of Lübeck, one of Christopher's allies, Christian is happy to make peace with his enemy, sure in the belief that he has no need to show cruelty as long as he places his trust in God, a sentiment which echoes Psalms 40:5.[41] The Biblical allusion is thus used to evoke the by now well-established image of Christian as a new Aeneas characterized above all by piety; and the depiction of Christian as morally surpassing Virgil's hero reinforces the importance of this Lutheran virtue still further. This becomes poignantly clear when Christian victoriously captures Copenhagen and the defeated Christopher kneels before him in supplication. This recalls the very end of the Aeneid, where the victorious Aeneas bestrides the suppliant Turnus, who

[40] Tobias Gregory argues that while the shift from Roman polytheism to Christian monotheism could necessitate alterations to the divine scene, some divine interaction was still necessary in works emulating Virgil (Gregory 2006, 4–12, 56–101). Within a monotheistic context, divine support could thereby gain a moral significance: "When one side is represented as beloved of the One True God. . . epic conflict becomes a struggle between heaven and hell, godly and infidel, truth and error", Gregory 2006, 12. Vegio and Vida emphasized this by allowing Satan and his minions to become divine actors on the side of evil.

[41] Territa tum pacem venit exorare Lubeca,
Quam quoque supplicibus non grauis ille dedit.
Nec minus et, capto si quid pro Rege valerent,
Concedit, quoniam spes Deus eius erat.
Sascerides, *Epicedium*, vv. 273–276 (fol. Biijr).
Cf. Psalms 40:5, here in the translation of Luther: "WOl dem / der seine hoffnung setzt auff den HERRN" (Blessed is the man, who puts his trust in The Lord), Luther 1545, fol. CCXCIXv.

commends his life to his victor's mercy. But whereas Aeneas cuts his enemy down in a fit of passion, Christian shows mercy and allows Christopher to return home unscathed. Sascerides is thus using the final scene of the Aeneid as an anti-heroic background on which to superimpose the image of a victor who not only triumphs because of exemplary piety, but can afford to show mercy because he, in accordance with Psalms 40:5, places all his trust in God. In time this would become one of the mottoes of the king.[42]

Presenting a Lutheran ideal through a classical motif

It should by now have become evident that Sascerides has created a cultural memory of Christian III in which the deceased king has become a morally emended (read: Lutheran) version of Virgil's canonical hero: something that is achieved by presenting Christian as acting in accordance with Biblical doctrine in otherwise Virgilian situations.[43] However, taking a step back from the individual episodes, we can further see how Sascerides in fact uses his two canonical archives to modify the narrative on a deeper level, so as to construct a narrative that exploit the significations of the Aeneid while simultaneously allowing Biblical elements to radically alter the very *raison d'être* traditionally associated with the Aeneas figure.

To humanists, one of the most significant aspects of Virgil's epic was the divine prophecy that gave rise to and supported Aeneas' role as future king and dynastic founder. Not even halfway into book one, Jupiter reveals to Venus that it is already written in the book of fate that Aeneas is to resettle the Trojan race in Latium and thereby found the Roman race and establish an empire unlimited by time or space. Prophecies of this type were popular in humanist epics, as the Virgilian theme could be used to legitimize a ruling dynasty's claim to power: they too had been divinely chosen to rule, and they too would usher in a Golden Age.[44] Yet nowhere in the *Epicedium* is it suggested that Christian was predestined to become a new Aeneas, and there is little that foreshadows any dynastic greatness. Instead, Sascerides has built a new foundation for his new Aeneas as he reinvents the divine action of his

[42] One of Christian's mottoes was "Zu Got mein trost allein, Sonst andern kein" (My trust is in God alone, I require nothing more). On this motto, see Bording 1559, fol. B4r and Thomesen 1560, 47.

[43] Vegio similarly improved on Aeneas to make him the embodiment of Renaissance *virtù* in his supplementary thirteenth book of the Aeneid, cf. Putnam 2004, xiii.

[44] Prominent examples are Riccardo Bartolini's *Austrias* (Schaffenrath 2015, 65; Schaffenrath 2016), Francesco Filelfo's *Sphortias* (Kallendorf 2014), and Gianmario Filelfo's *Cosmias* (Haye 2016). The theme also played a central role in the epyllia of Johannes Michael Nagonius, who thus prophesied greatness to a number of European ruling houses (Gwynne 2012, in particular 65–89). Such prophecies are closely related to what Gombrich has termed the "Vergilian formula", cf. Gombrich 1961; Gwynne 2012, 64–65.

pseudo-epic by linking the success of the Aeneas figure to Christian's Lutheran piety, as seen most strikingly when the parable of the sower is used to transform Christian into a "nouus Æneas" whose position rests upon merit and personal agency.[45] Since the parable with its theological connotations requires active devotion to be shown *before* divine assistance can be received, Christian has to earn his position, rather than passively accepting it as a divine mandate. This change should not be seen as a negation of the Virgilian model, however. Rather, it reveals how drawing on both canonical archives allows Sascerides to turn Christian's biography into a Lutheran Aeneid by exploiting the potential contained in the two works.

As a canonical archive, the Aeneid contains many elements with predefined significations, most notably the character of Aeneas, who is inextricably associated with divinely sanctioned kingship. But the epic's dual position as both archive and functional memory means that the familiar storyline itself can become a meaningful element that can be exploited. We know the ending, we recognize the protagonists, and we remember the main points that make up the narrative – in the case of the Aeneid, these being the divine prophecy and the escape from Troy, the tragic detour in Carthage, and finally the divinely aided ascent to power in Italy. This means that once the storyline is moved from the archive into a new functional memory (as from *fabula* into *syuzhet*), it matters less how one event leads to another – and by what means – as long as the events are there in the right order, because the basic meaning and expectations associated with the structure are preserved. Incidentally, preserving the "correct" order makes the omission of an episode all the more conspicuous by its absence, as with the prophecy, which Sascerides consciously omits from his work. It is this meaningful structure that Sascerides exploits in the *Epicedium* to give special meaning to his portrayal of Christian's journey towards kingship. While the biographical data of the deceased king provides almost all the material for the actual narrative, the functional memory follows a well-known structure which, as soon as Sascerides had likened Christian to Aeneas, would have awoken a certain set of expectations in the reader. What the Biblical allusions subsequently do is to fill in the gaps, so to speak, and connect the individual episodes in the canonical structure supplied by the Aeneid. In Virgil's epic, fate and divine will carry Aeneas from one episode to the next;[46] in the *Epicedium*, it is

[45] Cf. Gregory 2006, 4.

[46] Aeneas is often described in the passive as being *driven* or *carried* by fate, see e.g. *Aen*. 1.32 where he and his men are described as *acti fatis* (driven by fate); *Aen*. 1.382 where Aeneas describes how he left Troy and *data fata secutus* (followed the fate I had been given); and *Aen*. 3.7 where Aeneas reveals that they set sail *incerti*, *quo fata ferant* (uncertain as to where destiny might take them).

Christian's piety that again and again enables him to progress along the Virgilian path, just as it was his exemplary piety that initially earned him the privilege of assuming the role of Aeneas and then, in turn, won him the divine support necessary for him to fulfil our expectations by being crowned king.

As I have demonstrated above, the Biblical allusions also serve the general purpose of emphasizing just how pious Christian actually was. Whenever Christian exhibits his piety in a Virgilian situation, the presence of the religious subtext simultaneously illustrates Christian acting as an exemplary Lutheran: he embraced the Gospel at a time when no one else did, he exhibited everyday piety as a *Hausvater* at the head of a family, and he spared his enemies by relying on the will of God rather than violence. In the proem, Sascerides had indicated how he planned to use classical motifs to promote Lutheran orthodoxy, and it is not without reason that he portrays Christian as an example worthy of emulation via the Virgilian narrative. During the early Reformation, it was crucial that temporal rulers were pious Lutherans: they were expected to promote Lutheranism, and to ensure the orthodoxy of their subjects.[47] In the *Enchiridion theologicum*, Hemmingsen explains why the rulers' own piety was the key to achieve this goal:

> Pietate […] prælucet subditis, ac in omni humanitatis officio eisdem anteit: unde fit, ut quemadmodum subditi legem ut iustissimam uitæ normam intuentur, ita exemplum normæ principem ipsum ob oculos statuentes, eiusdem pietate tanquam stimulo ad omnia humanitatis officia incitentur [...]
> Regis ad exemplum totus componitur orbis.[48]
>
> With his piety, [the prince] lights the way for his subjects, and with it he guides them in every human office. The result is that just as subjects look upon the law as the most righteous precept for life, so they place their own prince before their eyes as a living example of that precept and are roused towards every human office with his piety as their goad [...]

[47] Svend Andersen even refers to the princes as "emergency bishops" called upon to oversee the reformations in Northern Europe, cf. Andersen 2018, 191. See also Wolgast 2014, 398–401.

[48] Hemmingsen 1557, Epistola dedicatoria, fols. *2v–*3r. Cf. Claudian, Panegyricus de quarto consulatu Honorii Augusti, 299–300. Sascerides shared this view and reproduces the sentiment of his influential colleague in the preface to his Epicedium, stating that no divine gift is better than a king who governs with piety, since "Eius ad exemplum totus fit iustior orbis" (the whole world becomes more righteous after his example), Sascerides 1559, fol. A2r. The passage in question contains several intertextual references to a similar passage in the Epistola Nuncupatoria to Sascerides' Odarum, siue Carminum Sacrorum Libri IX (Sascerides 1557, 4). The Epistola, however, lacks the rewritten sentence of Claudian, and its presence in the preface to the Epicedium may therefore be a testament to the influence of Hemmingsen and his Enchiridion.

The whole world arranges itself after the king's example.

Given that a Lutheran ruler was expected to govern by his own pious example, we can see how Christian's exemplary piety deserved to be the driving force behind his development as a new Aeneas. Since Christian had demonstrated that he could light the way for others – as he had in fact, as a sower of the Gospel, already done – he was more than fit to be king. His exemplarity conduct earned him the favour of God, who rewarded him for his diligence by lending him the support necessary to fulfil Aeneas' canonical destiny.[49] But could Christian's piety also secure his dynasty a longevity equal to that of Aeneas' Roman lineage? The answer appears to be no. Instead, the *Epicedium* seems to suggest that just as Christian had become a new Aeneas by virtue of his exemplary piety, so his successors – in lieu of the missing prophecy – must earn God's continued support by following Christian's example and governing with such sincere piety that they too would be able to light the way for their subjects.[50]

Conclusion

The canonical motif of Aeneas and his journey to become king and founder of the Roman Empire evidently provided Sascerides with a potent model with which to portray Christian's ascent to the Danish throne. Combined with Biblical allusions laden with religious meaning, the resulting narrative becomes even more significant than the sum of its parts. What emerges from this fusion of two canonical archives is a transformation of the pagan Aeneas figure that promotes central doctrines of Lutheranism by presenting them as essential to kings hoping for divine support.

When Sascerides composed his culturally meaningful memory of Christian III, he was consciously exploiting the abundance of connotations available in the archive of canonical literature that could be invoked through imitation to provide narratives with additional layers of meaning visible to those who are part of the same cultural tradition. To access these layers of meaning, as I have attempted to do, it is necessary to be aware that texts which hold a special cultural significance can act both as active memories and as passive archives, or what I have termed canonical archives. As a Lutheran, Sascerides naturally turned to the two archives that were central to the Lutheran *Respublica litterarum*, and he used elements from both to add

[49] Cf. Hemmingsen 1557, fols. R4v–S6r, where he argues that God rewards people not as payment for a service provided, but as the gratuitous reward for a duty performed with exceptional care and diligence.

[50] Sascerides seems to add a dynastic tail to this point using an allusion to King Hezekiah of the Old Testament in the second half of the main narrative, but this lies beyond what can be sufficiently covered here.

meaning to his work. Individual episodes were thus framed in a Virgilian storyline while made to display Lutheran piety through allusions to the Bible. The two influences were woven together to create larger narrative structures that relied on an intricate interaction between multiple levels of canonical meaning. As a result, not only does the Lutheran Aeneid contained in the *Epicedium* provide a guide for kings on how they may best secure divine support; the composite narrative also demonstrates how imitation creates meaning in texts by exploiting the cultural memories with which canonical archives are filled.

Bibliography

Andersen, J. Oskar 1979–1984, "Johann Wenth", *Dansk Biografisk Leksikon*, 3rd ed. (URL: http://denstoredanske.dk/index.php?sideId=299236, visited 10 February 2020).

Andersen, Svend 2018, "Two Kingdoms, Three Estates, and Natural Law", *Lutheran Theology and the Shaping of Society*: *The Danish Monarchy as Example*, eds.: Bo Kristian Holm & Nina Javette Koefoed, Göttingen (*Refo 500 Academic Studies* 33), 189–213.

Assmann, Aleida 2008, "Canon and Archive", *Cultural Memory Studies*: *An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*, eds.: Astrid Erll & Ansgar Nünning, Berlin & New York, 97–107.

Assmann, Aleida 2011, "Function and Storage: Two Modes of Memory", *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization*, Cambridge, 119–134 (first German edition 1999).

Baker, Patrick 2015, *Italian Renaissance Humanism in the Mirror*, Cambridge (*Ideas in Context* 114).

Bloemendal, Jan 2014, "Neo-Latin Literary Genres and the Classical Tradition: Adaptation and Inventions", Ford, Philip et al. 2014, 303–308.

Böhme, Hartmut 2011, "Einladung zur Transformation", *Transformation*: *Ein Konzept zur Erforschung kulturellen Wandels*, eds.: Hartmut Böhme et al., München, 7–37.

Bording, Jacob (Jacobus Bordingus) 1559, *Oratio de obitu serenissimi principis Christiani. III. Daniæ et Noruegiæ regis. etc. Conscripta á Domino Iacobo Bordingo*, *ipsius medico*, Hafniae (LN 421).

Borggaard, Anders Kirk 2019, "Transforming the Paternal Prince: A Study of the Allelopoietic Relationship between Humanist and Lutheran Princely Ideology in Neo-Latin Literature of the Early Reformation" (unpublished MA thesis, Aarhus University).

Faini, Marco 2008–2010, "'Heroic Martyrdom Unsung': Some reflections on the tradition of Christian epic in Renaissance Italy and the European context", *Wolfenbütteler Renaissance-Mitteilungen* 32:2, 135–152.

Fantazzi, Charles 2014, "Imitation, Emulation, Ciceronianism, Anti-Ciceronianism", Ford, Philip et al. 2014, 141–153.

Ford, Philip et al. (eds.) 2014, *Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Neo-Latin World*, Leiden & Boston.

Gombrich, E. H. 1961, "Renaissance and Golden Age", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 24/3–4, 306–309.

Grane, Leif 1987, "Studia humanitatis und Theologie and den Universitäten Wittenberg und Kopenhagen im 16. Jahrhundert: comparative Überlegungen", *Der Humanismus und die oberen Fakultäten*, eds.: Gundolf

Keil, Bernd Moeller & Winfried Trusen, Weinheim (*Mitteilung der Kommission für Humanismusforschung* 14), 65–114.

Gräßer, Ingeborg 1994, *Die Epicedien-Dichtung des Helius Eobanus Hessus*, Frankfurt am Main (*Bochumer Schriften zur deutschen Literatur* 40).

Gray, Hanna H. 1963, "Renaissance Humanism: The Pursuit of Eloquence", *Journal of the History of Ideas* 24/4, 497–514.

Gregory, Tobias 2006, *From Many Gods to One*: *Divine Action in Renaissance Epic*, Chicago & London.

Gwynne, Paul 2012, *Poets and Princes*: *The Panegyric Poetry of Johannes Michael Nagonius*, Turnhout (*Courts*: *Medieval and Renaissance Court Cultures* 1).

Gwynne, Paul 2016, "Francesco Benci and the Origins of Jesuit Neo-Latin Epic", *Exploring Jesuit Distinctiveness*: *Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Ways of Proceeding within the Society of Jesus*, ed.: Robert Alexander Maryks, Leiden & Boston (*Jesuit Studies*: *Modernity through the Prism of Jesuit History* 6), 4–23.

Gwynne, Paul 2017, "Epic", *A Guide to Neo-Latin Literature*, ed.: Victoria Moul, Cambridge, 200–220.

Haye, Thomas 2016, "Die *Cosmias* des Giovanni Mario Filelfo (1426–1480)", *Portraying the Prince in the Renaissance*: *The Humanist Depiction of Rulers in Historiographical and Biographical Texts*, eds.: Patrick Baker et al., Berlin & Boston (*Transformationen der Antike* 44), 271–286.

Hemmingsen, Niels (Nicolaus Hemmingius) 1557, *Enchiridion Theologicum præcipua veræ religionis capita breviter et simpliciter explicata continens*, Wittebergae (LN 841).

Hemmingsen, Niels (Nicolaus Hemmingius) 1561, *Postilla seu Ennaratio Euangeliorum*, *quæ in dominicis diebus et in festis sanctorum vsitatè in Ecclesijs Dei proponuntur*, *in gratiam piorum ministrorum Euangelij conscripta*, Hafniæ (LN 870).

Holm, Bo Kristian 2018, "Dynamic Tensions in the Social Imaginaries of the Lutheran Reformation", *Lutheran Theology and the Shaping of Society*: *The Danish Monarchy as Example*, eds.: Bo Kristian Holm & Nina Javette Koefoed, Göttingen (*Refo 500 Academic Studies* 33), 85–105.

Jacoby, Daniel 1890, "Sascerides, Johann", *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 30, Leipzig, 396–397 (URL: https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd130654493.html#adbcontent, visited 27 November, 2019).

Kallendorf, Craig 1995, "From Virgil to Vida: The *Poeta Theologus* in Italian Renaissance Commentary", *Journal of the History of Ideas* 56/1, 41–62.

Kallendorf, Craig 2014, "The Neo-Latin Epic", Ford, Philip et al. 2014, 449–460.

Luther, Martin 1529, *Deudsch Catechismus*, Wittemberg (VD16 L 4339).

Luther, Martin 1545, *Biblia*: *das ist*: *Die gantze Heilige Schrifft*: *Deudsch Auffs new zugericht*, Wittemberg (VD16 B 2718).

Koefoed, Nina Javette 2018, "The Lutheran Household as Part of Danish Confessional Culture", *Lutheran Theology and the Shaping of Society*: *The Danish Monarchy as Example*, eds.: Bo Kristian Holm & Nina Javette Koefoed, Göttingen (*Refo 500 Academic Studies* 33), 321–340.

Marsh, David 2014, "Pastoral", Ford, Philip et al. 2014, 425–436.

Rørdam, H. F. 1872, *Kjøbenhavns Universitets Historie fra 1537 til 1621: Anden Del: Kjøbenhavns Universitets Historie i kong Frederik den Andens Tid* (*1559–1588*), Kjøbenhavn.

Rørdam, H. F. 1893, "Hemmingsen, Niels", *Dansk Biografisk Lexikon*, ed. C. F. Bricka, vol. VII, Kjøbenhavn, 324–334 (URL: http://runeberg.org/dbl/7/0326.html, visited 27 November 2019).

Rørdam, H. F. 1900, "Sascerides, Johannes", *Dansk Biografisk Lexikon*, ed. C. F. Bricka, vol. XIV, Kjøbenhavn, 612–613 (URL: http://runeberg.org/dbl/14/0614.html, visited 27 November 2019).

Sascerides, Johannes 1557, *Odarum*, *siue Carminum sacrorum libri IX*. *Quinque priores Dauidicorum*. *Sextus Biblicorum*. *Reliqui tres recentium*, Basileae (VD16 S 1841).

Sascerides, Johannes 1559, *Epicedium in obitum Serenissimi Potentissimique principis Christiani Tertij Daniæ*. *etc*. *Regis*. *Cui adiunctum est carmen gratulatorium de victoria Ditmarsica ad illustrissimum Regis Christiani filium Regem Fridericum secundum*. *Item*. *Historia de Coronatione eiusdem illustrissimi Regis Friderici versibus heroicis conscripta*, Hafniæ (LN 1440).

Schaffenrath, Florian 2015, "Narrative Poetry", *The Oxford Handbook of Neo-Latin*, eds.: Sarah Knight & Stefan Tilg, Oxford, 57–71.

Schaffenrath, Florian 2016, "Riccardo Bartolinis *Austrias* (1516) oder: Wie ein Herrscher zum Feldherrn gegen die Türken wird", *Portraying the Prince in the Renaissance*: *The Humanist Depiction of Rulers in Historiographical and Biographical Texts*, eds.: Patrick Baker et al., Berlin & Boston (*Transformationen der Antike* 44), 193–213.

Schirg, Bernhard & Paul Gwynne 2015, "The 'Economics of Poetry': Fast Production as a Crucial Skill in Neo-Latin Encomiastic Poetry", *Studi Rinascimentali: Rivista internazionale di letteratura italiana* 13, 11–32.

Skafte Jensen, Minna 1993, "Melanchthon, the Muses and Denmark", *Renaissance Culture in Context*: *Theory and Practice*, eds.: Jean R. Brink & William F. Gentrup, Aldershot, 136–144.

Skovgaard-Petersen, Karen 1991, "Beskrivelser af Frederik d.2.s kroning på dansk, tysk og latin", *Latin & nationalsprog i Norden efter Reformationen*:

Konference 1.–5. august 1987, Biskops-Arnö, eds.: Marianne Alenius et al., København (*Renæssancestudier* 5), 11–20.

Skovgaard-Petersen, Karen & Peter Zeeberg 2007, "En glemt litteratur", *Dansk litteraturs historie*, *bind 1*: *1100–1800*, eds.: Klaus P. Mortensen & May Schack, København, 244–267.

Stopa, Sasja Emilie Mathiasen 2018, "'Honor Your Father and Mother': The Influence of Honor on Martin Luther's Conception of Society", *Lutheran Theology and the Shaping of Society*: *The Danish Monarchy as Example*, eds.: Bo Kristian Holm & Nina Javette Koefoed, Göttingen (*Refo 500 Academic Studies* 33), 107–127.

Thomesen, Hans (Iohannes Thomas) 1560, *Oratio de illustrissimo principe ac domino*, *domino Christiano Tertio*, *Rege Daniæ*, *et Noruegiæ*, *etc*. *Qui obijt Calendis Ianuarij*, *Anno Christi 1559*, *ætatis uerò quinquagesimo sexto*. *Scripta à Iohanne Thoma Ripensi*. *Aiectum est et Epichedion*, *scriptum à Petro Hegelio Ripensi*, Basileae (LN 1582).

Tilg, Stefan 2020, "Autor/Erzähler und Fiktion im neulateinischen Roman: Ein Beitrag zu einer historischen Narratologie", *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Albasitensis*: *Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies* (*Albacete 2018*), eds. Florian Schaffenrath & María Teresa Santamaría Hernández, Leiden & Boston, 68–90.

Vegio, Maffeo 2004, *Short Epics*, tr. & ed.: Michael C. J. Putnam, Cambridge, MA & London (*The I Tatti Renaissance Library* 15).

Vida, Marco Girolamo 2009, *Christiad*, tr. & ed.: James Gardner, Cambridge, MA & London (*The I Tatti Renaissance Library* 39).

Witstein, S. F. 1969, *Funeraire poëzie in de Nederlandse Renaissance*: *Enkele funeraire gedichten van Heinsius*, *Hooft*, *Huygens en Vondel bezien tegen de achtergrond van de theorie betreffende het genre*, Assen.

Witte, John 2002, *Law and Protestantism*: *The Legal Teachings of the Lutheran Reformation*, Cambridge.

Wolgast, Eike 2014, "Luther's Treatment of Political and Societal Life", *The Oxford Handbook of Martin Luther's Theology*, eds.: Robert Kolb, Irene Dingel & L'ubomír Batka, Oxford, 397–413.

REMEMBERING CAESAR:

Mnemonic Aspects of Intertextuality in Erasmus Lætus' portrayal of Julius Caesar in *Romanorum Cæsares Italici*[1]

By Trine Arlund Hass

This study examines the biography of Julius Caesar presented by the Danish theologian and poet, Erasmus Michaëlis Lætus, in his biography of 1574 of thirty-six Roman emperors, written in elegiac couplets. In a prefatory text, Lætus writes of his intended readers that he expects sophisticated readers to have their memory of the work's classical sources refreshed, while younger, less experienced readers will have their curiosity piqued and their appetite for getting to know them stimulated. Thus Lætus himself embeds the reading process in a memory framework, which this study aims to explore, employing the cultural memory aspects of intertextuality presented by Renate Lachmann (2004; 2008). The article first explores and quantitatively compares the themes emphasized in Lætus' and Suetonius' respective biographies of Julius Caesar. Next, Lætus' use and management of the seemingly most frequently used hypotext, Lucan's De bello civile, in a significant passage of the biography is examined.

Introduction: literary aspects of cultural memory

In 1574 the Danish theologian and poet, Erasmus Michaëlis Lætus, published a collection of biographies, written in elegiac couplets, of thirty-six of the Roman emperors. In his biography of Julius Caesar in this work, Lætus portrays that complex character as a morally sound role model – even though the text draws inspiration from Lucan's *De bello civile*, a text that presents Caesar as a rather problematic figure.[2] Based on the examinations that follow, I suggest that Lætus is attempting to renegotiate the image of his protagonist

[1] This is part of a larger study of Danish receptions of Julius Caesar carried out in the project "Our Caesar: Danish Receptions of Gaius Julius Caesar", funded by the Carlsberg Foundation. I am grateful for the responses to an early version of this paper given at the Nordic Network for Renaissance Studies in Helsinki, 26–28 September 2018, and especially to Arsenij Vetushko-Kalevich, who first pointed me in the direction of Lucan. Likewise, I am grateful to the anonymous peer reviewers for their feedback.

[2] See Walde 2006, 47–54 on Lucan's representation of Caesar and ibid., 56–59 on the reception.

that was established by the *hypotext*[3] of his work, and that by doing so he can be understood as attempting to reshape the cultural memory of Caesar.

Part one of the study will focus on the organization of Lætus' biography in terms of the space (based on the number of lines) he devotes to prominent themes, compared with another biographer, Suetonius. Part two will examine a significant passage in the text with regard to its intertextual relationship to Lucan's *De bello civile*, leading to a discussion of the resulting dynamics in terms of cultural memory.

In regarding intertextuality as connected to cultural memory, my examination follows the definition given by Renate Lachmann:

> Each literary text incorporates or stores other texts, thus mnemonic space unfolds between and within texts. In storing and accumulating cultural data, the literary text in its intertextual dimension functions as part of cultural memory.[4]

This study is therefore based on the understanding that when a text builds its narrative partly from quotations from and allusions to other texts, it exercises a preserving function: in pointing to these elements, perhaps even repeating them verbatim, it allows them to live on. As we shall see below, however, both the relationship between hypotext and hypertext and the aim in incorporating preceding texts into new ones may vary.

As we examine Lætus' engagement with his classical predecessor in his biography of Caesar, it is useful also to work with Jan Assmann's version of Aleida Assmann's dichotomy between *canon* and *archive*, as elaborated in the passage below. Jan Assmann argues that different expressions of memory represent different types of tension and transition between polarities, which he suggests calling *latency* or *potentiality*, and *manifestation* and *actualization*:

> Transitions and transformations account for the dynamics of cultural memory. Two typical directions have a structural significance and should at least briefly be mentioned in this context [...] the other concerns, within cultural memory, the move from the rear stage to the forefront, from the periphery into the center, from latency or potentiality to manifestation or actualization and vice versa. These shifts presuppose structural boundaries which are to be crossed: the boundary between embodied and mediated forms of memory, and the

[3] Genette defines *hypotext* as the source of intertextual loans, while the new text based on the loans is called the *hypertext*. Genette 1997, 5. The term *intertextuality*, coined by Julia Kristeva, is used, although Genette suggested the alternative term *transtextuality*.

[4] Lachmann 2004, 165.

> boundary between what we propose calling "working" and "reference memories" or "canon" and "archive" …[5]

Especially in the context of a culture like the humanist movement of the Renaissance, in which proving one's knowledge of the canonical, classical texts was essential, the creation of literature is a selective process. Here it is the previous body of literature that is the mass of *latency* and *potentiality*, while any new text, to the extent that it is the product of an embedding of selected elements of the earlier texts, is a *manifestation* or *actualization* of them. Consequently Lætus, in his selection of which aspects of Caesar's biography to point to and which elements of Lucan's text to reuse, is bringing about the transitioning of material from the archive (that is, the body of classical texts) and from a status of potentiality to actualization and manifestation in a new text. As my analysis of Lætus' biography will show, however, it is not just the elements selected that are of interest as we attempt to understand this process; it is just as enlightening to consider what elements of the potential, archival material have been deselected and thus suppressed or *backgrounded*.[6]

It is a prerequisite for the argument here that it is not the entire body of classical texts that is understood as playing the role of the canon in the Assmanns' sense. While that may be the case on the macro level, the present study is concerned with the micro level, zooming in on a particular treatment of a particular classical text and examining how the balance is managed on the scales between the latent and the manifest.

Lætus and his work

Erasmus Lætus was a central figure in the intelligentsia of Copenhagen in his day. Although his academic career was successful to the extent that he became professor of theology in 1560, his primary passion seems to have been his literary production, which earned him the name of "the Danish Virgil".[7] He

[5] Cf. J. Assmann 2008, 113 and (for the quotation) 117–8.

[6] Cf. Iser on the reader's *recreation* of meaning (creation of meaning/interpretation must contain elements of the original producer's, hence it is termed *recreation* by John Dewey and the term is taken over by Iser): "This process [i.e. recreation] is steered by two main structural components within the text: first, a repertoire of familiar literary patterns and recurrent literary themes, together with allusions to familiar social and historical contexts; second, techniques or strategies used to set the familiar against the unfamiliar. Elements of the repertoire are continually backgrounded or foregrounded with a resultant strategic overmagnification, trivialization, or even annihilation of the allusion. This defamiliarization of what the reader thought he recognized is bound to create a tension that will intensify his expectations as well as his distrust of those expectations."

[7] For Lætus' biography, see Andreasen 1979–84 (in Danish); Skafte Jensen 2003, 502–3 (in English); Skovgaard-Petersen & Zeeberg 1992, 399–400 (in English). He is called

enjoyed the rare honour of being ennobled by King Frederik II in 1569, and in 1572 he embarked with the King's blessing on a long scholarly tour through Germany and northern Italy. He took with him several more-or-less prepared works, which he proceeded to publish and dedicate to prominent institutions and people, some of whom he met on his journey. These works include the didactic epic *De re nautica libri IV* (Basel 1573), dedicated to the city council of Venice; the hexametric poem *Colloquiorum moralium libri IV* (Basel 1573), dedicated to Carl of Lothringen; the heroic epic *Margareticorum libri X* (Frankfurt am Main 1573), dedicated to Queen Elizabeth of England (although he did not visit her in England); the heroic epic *Rerum Danicarum libri XI* (Frankfurt am Main 1574), dedicated to Danish King Frederik II; *De republica Noribergensium libri IV* (Frankfurt am Main 1574), dedicated to the city council of Nuremberg; and last but not least *Romanorum Cæsares Italici* (Frankfurt am Main 1574), written in elegiac couplets and dedicated to the Holy Roman Emperor Maximilian II (1527–76, r. 1564–76).

Romanorum Cæsares Italici consists of two prefatory texts, "Epistola nuncupatoria" (prose, fol. 2r-10r) and "Imperiorum in humano genere, causa et fundamentum" (hexameters, fol. 10v-12v),[8] followed by the main body of the biographies in the form of thirty-six chronologically organized biographies of imperial reigns (elegiac couplets, pp. 1–215), with a final postscriptum (hexameters, pp. 210–15).

In his presentation of the organization of his work in "Epistola nuncupatoria", Lætus begins on a broad scale by defining his conceptions of Roman emperors as:

> ... those who occupied the highest position in this empire and served and promoted it by their council, authority and use of the sword. There are three categories: Italian, Greek and Germanic.[9]

By "Italian" Lætus understands the Romans, by "Greek" the Constantinopolitan, and by "Germanic", the emperors following Charlemagne. Each category in turn comprises three further *classes*, each of twelve emperors (or rather, twelve imperial reigns, as emperors are treated together if they shared the post): first, Julius Caesar to Domitian (pp. 1–101); second, "A Cæsare Nerva usque ad Alexandrum", treating Nerva to Heliogabalus (pp. 102–154), and third, "Ab Alexandro Severo ad Constantinum Magnum", treating Alexander

"Daniæ nostræ Maro" by the physician and antiquarian Ole Worm in the work *Monumenta Danica* (Copenhagen 1643), cf. Skafte Jensen 2004, 31.

[8] The pages of the prefatory material are unnumbered, for which reason it is referred to by foliation; for the remaining material, references are to the original pagination.

[9] ". . . qui huius imperij summum occuparint locum: eumque consiljs [*sic*] authoritate ac gladij vsu asseruerint ac propagarint. Eius generis tres esse ordines, italicos, Græcos et Germanos", Lætus 1574c, 5[r]. Unless otherwise stated, all translations are by the author.

Severus to Diocletian and Maximianus (pp. 155–210). Lætus' work *Romanorum Cæsares Italici* thus covers the first group of emperors, as promised by the title. In fact, Lætus suggests in the prefatory letter expanding the treatment all the way down to the great-grandfather of his dedicatee, Maximilian I (1459–1519, r. 1509–19). In so doing he indicates that his work is intended as flattery of Maximilian II, while he suggests making this even more explicit by placing Maximilian's family directly in the line of emperors going back to Julius Caesar. The work consequently attempts to inscribe itself in the genre category of mirror of princes. As we shall see, however, it is not only princes that Lætus wishes to learn from his text.

Virtue, vice, and mnemonic intentions

Lætus constructs a moral framework for the work, opining that the various emperors whose biography he presents will be useful to the reader for their different qualities. Declaring that Julius Caesar's destiny was to be war, he considers that to be the respect in which Caesar performed to the fullest. Augustus's destiny, on the other hand, was to be peace; yet Augustus too managed those circumstances in an exemplary manner. Rulers wishing to learn from the biographies should therefore pick their role model according to the circumstances of their own time.

The entire design of the work, we are then shown, is made with a careful regard for moral balance. In "Epistola nuncupatoria", Lætus associates eight emperors (Vespasian, Titus, Nerva, Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus, Probus, and Constantine the Great) with virtue, eight others (Caligula, Nero, Vitellius, Otho, Domitian, Commodus, Heliogabalus, and Maximinus) with vice.[10] Although he is not one of the eight mentioned, Caesar must be counted among the virtuous, as he has already been presented as an instructive example. This is emphasized in a further explication of the moral organization of the work when Lætus states that each *classis* begins with a good and ends with a bad emperor:

> While Julius had opened the first *classis* – a man who is most excellent with regard to *fortuna* and wisdom as well as to the greatness of the things he did – it ended with Domitian, who, due to his savageness and inept way of governing, proved to be hated by the Senators and unworthy to rule.[11]

[10] Lætus 1574c, 4v.

[11] "Cum Iulius primam classem exorsus esset vir et princeps fortuna, sapientiaque et rerum gestarum magnitudine excellentissimus: equidem in Domitiano illa desijt: qui truculentia et inepta gubernandi ratione inuissum sese patribus, et imperio indignum esse declarauit", Lætus 1574c, 8v.

Lætus' statement is further confirmation that we are operating here within a moral discourse about the behaviour of the uppermost classes of society. Yet Lætus also insists repeatedly in the prefatory text that his work has universal value. This leads us to the focus of the present study. Here Lætus reflects on the mnemonic and didactic function of his work:

> While [the learned] will find this poem an occasion to recall for themselves and be brought back to the memory of what they have previously read in the authors of Roman history. That, I believe, could be a nice and, as I have said already, pleasant thing for educated and knowledgeable people.
>
> Yet, for young people, who may be less versed in the sources of history, although they nonetheless have a spirit which is undoubtedly eager for thoughts on the most significant matters that with diligence and labour are to be searched out and put together from these monumental works of writing, I am providing an opportunity to inquire further into these authors themselves. The young will not have been referred to the sources proper from modest writings, neither would they have studied or tasted them, nor with competent enough attention to the beauty and thought of the more significant matters aspired to, or been affected by them.[12]

For Lætus, sophisticated readers of *Romanorum Cæsares Italici* will be reminded of what they have already read, while for younger and less educated readers the work will serve as an introduction to matters he has no doubt they will wish to pursue further. The second group of readers should then be motivated by their reading to "go to the archive", so to speak: to search out the ancient texts that were Lætus' source material for his composition, and to study it themselves.

For the learned reader, Lætus thus sees his work functioning as a mnemonic tool,[13] facilitating remembrance of the ancient sources of his work. It has the function of keeping the reader "sharp" – he will have to pay attention if he is to distinguish which parts draw on Suetonius, Plutarch or, in this particular case, Lucan. Lætus thus relies on Aristotle's view that recognition

[12] ". . . dum [eruditi] quæ pridem in authoribus historiæ Romanæ lecta sunt; ex huius Carminis occasione reuocari sibi et sub memoriam referri sentient: quod quidem gratum, et, vt dixi, iucundum doctis exercitatisque hominibus futurum esse putem. Tum verò iuuenibus, qui minus adhuc fortasse in historiarum fontibus versati sunt: animum tamen gerunt, auidum certè cognitionis rerum maximarum, quæ studio ac labore ex ipsis Scriptorum monumentis petendæ sunt et comparandæ; occasionem dederim plurima in Authoribus ipsis inquirendi: de quibus è tenuioribus scriptis non admoniti, nec fontes ipsos inspicerent degustarentque: nec satis solerte cura ad rerum maximarum pulcritudinem et cognitationem aspirarent atque afficerentur", Lætus 1574c, 9r-v.

[13] Lachmann 2004; 2008.

is pleasant.[14] In terms of cultural memory, recognizing the hypotexts has a *preserving* function and shows the text to be a *carrier* or *transmitter*, because it reactivates the memory of, and thus ensures the continued status of, the source material. One could say that this contributes to maintaining the status of the canonical authors as canonical – or classical.[15] For young readers, on the other hand, the didactic function that Lætus describes can be understood as attributing initiating power to the work: by leading the reader to the classical source material, it paves the way for him to become part of the society that is preserving the cultural memory of the classical world and its literature.

Although Lætus presents his work modestly almost as an *ancilla* that will lead different types of reader by differing routes towards the classical authors of history, the *Romanorum Cæsares Italici* is, of course, as expressed, a constructed version of a memory of the Roman emperors in its own right. To study that version more closely, we turn, in what follows, to Lætus' biography of Caesar and to its organization.

Formal organization

In his biography, Caesar is initially presented as the first leader of the Empire. It is stated that his origin can be traced back to Julus Ascanius, and that the fifth month of the Julian calendar was named after him (vv. 3–6). After the initial summary, a chronological narrative follows, of which this survey presents the main events:

Vv.	Content
1–6	Introduction
7–10	Reached age of toga, became a Flamen Dialis priest
11–14	Married to Cinna's daughter, had a daughter
15–18	Obtained many honours abroad, progressed **further** in Rome
19–20	Off to the Celtic regions
21–22	Conquered much in Gaul

[14] Aristotle, *Poetics* 4/1448b.

[15] Cf. J. Assmann 2008, 114 on preservation, as well as differentiation in participation of groups in cultural memory, and Lachmann 2008, 306: "In quoting and discussing philosophical, aesthetic, theological, historical, and scientific knowledge, literature stores and transmits knowledge, transforming it into an element of the artistic text. . . Literature becomes the bearer of actual and the transmitter of historical knowledge and it construes intertextual bonds between literary and non-literary texts. Furthermore, literature recovers and revives knowledge in reincorperating some of its formly rejected unofficial or arcane traditions".

23	Brought Roman law to the British
24	Subdued the Allobroges
25–28	Promoted Rome far and wide. Ten years in Gaul
29–56	Initiation of the Civil War: Senate recalled command. Rubicon. Rome feared Caesar as no one else
57–76	Pompey's flight, death and Caesar mourning him
77–80	Caesar put pressure on Cato in Africa
81–82	Victory over Pompey's sons
83–84	Caesar went to Rome, took power
85–86	Remission of debts and punishments
87–94	Artes honestae
95–124	Conspiracy, stabbing, death

It can be deduced from the number of verses devoted to these themes that, in quantitative terms at least, Lætus is focusing especially on four aspects of Caesar's biography:

1. Vv. 29–56 (28vv.): The initiation of the Civil War
    a. Vv. 29–38 (10vv.): Negotiations with the Senate about legions
    b. Vv. 39–56 (18vv.) The crossing of the Rubicon and the Civil War
2. Vv. 57–76 (20vv.): Pompey's flight, Caesar's pursuit, and Pompey's death
3. Vv. 87–94 (8vv.): *Artes honestae*, especially the calendar reform
4. Vv. 95–124 (30vv.): Caesar's death

These longer passages have a more narrating character than the shorter treatments of themes, which function almost as enumerations of facts.

The importance of the number twelve in the general arrangement of Lætus's work is a clear pointer to the influence of Suetonius, who wrote biographies of the first twelve emperors. But Lætus' emphasis differs from that in Suetonius' biography of Caesar, a text whose emphases have been quantified in terms of section word count, as defined in Westcott & Rankin 1918. The following themes in the Suetonius life are treated at greater length than the average section length of 110 words (sections in bold mark correspondence with the themes addressed at greater length in Lætus' work):

1. Early life (147 words)
4. Debut at the bar; adventure with pirates (134 words)
6. Quaestor, 67 or 68 BC (121 words)
9. Suspected of conspiracy (181 words)
14. Praetor elect, 63 BC (131 words)

19. Canvasses for the consulship, 60 BC (138 words)
20. Consulship, 59 BC (299 words)
24. First triumvirate (129 words)
25. Conquest of Gaul, 58–50 BC (114 words)
26. Plans for a second consulship (187 words)
28. Attempts to recall Caesar (155 words)
29. Compromise proposals (136 words)

30–35. **The Civil War** (576 words)

30. The Civil War (211 words)

31–32. Crossing of the Rubicon (170 words)

33. Address to the troops (82 words)
34. Conquest of Italy and Spain (113 words)
35. Victories in Macedonia, Egypt, Asia, Africa, and Spain (148 words)
39. Shows and games (190 words)
41. Reforms (145 words)
42. Economic legislation (153 words)
44. Public works (150 words)
45. Personal appearance (130 words)
49. Scandals (217 words)

50–51. Amours (138 words)

52. Cleopatra (167 words)
54. Rapacity (121 words)
55. Eloquence (199 words)

56–67. Authorship (322 words)

68. Loyalty and devotion of his troops (230 words)
74. Moderation in vengeance (112 words)
75. Clemency in the Civil War (277 words)
76. Offices and honours (191 words)
79. Suspected of aiming at royalty (154 words)
80. The conspiracy against Caesar's life (195 words)
81. Fatal omens (272 words)
84. Funeral (234 words)

Two – or, if we add the initiation of the Civil War to the flight and death of Pompey, three – of the themes that receive fuller than average treatment in Lætus' biography mirror those receiving fuller treatment in Suetonius. This attempt at a quantitative thematic comparison is of course complicated by the fact that these divisions of the work are mine, rather than stemming from either author, but they hint nevertheless at the difference in character between the two works. It is consistent with Lætus' general moralistic approach in categorizing emperors as either positive or negative exempla, for instance,

that he does not treat Caesar's affairs and scandals at length, because he has stated that Caesar is a valid positive role model. Suetonius, on the other hand, does not flatter the subjects of his biographies, but shows all facets of their characters.

Narrative strategies and intertextual discussions

In this section, we shall see how Lætus' strategy to unify Caesar's moral image in the biography unfolds on the textual level, and how in so doing he attempts to reorganize the cultural memory of Caesar for his readers. For this purpose I will examine the second of the two longer passages of the work, that is, the section dealing with Lætus' treatment of Pompey's flight and death in 48 BC after the battle of Pharsalus. To show the mechanisms at play, the terminology of intertextuality and narratology will be employed.

> Pompeius fugit, ac procerum fugit ordo,[16] secutus
> Quem sibi delegit curia moesta Ducem.
> Strenuus[17] insequitur fugientem Iulius hostem,
> Et **Generum**[18] trepidam vertere cogit humum.[19]
>
> Pompeius fled, and the order of the highest fled, following him
> whom they had selected as their leader in the sorrowful Curia.
> Strenuous Julius pursued the fleeing enemy
> and forced his son-in-law to plough up the land.

This is how the section on Pompey's escape and death begins. The passage is presented in a compact narrative style. There are hardly any descriptions; events are boiled down to their essence. The only adjective in the first couplet characterizes the Curia as sorrowful or mourning, personifying the political system or even the constitution and thereby inserting a general perspective into a conflict otherwise described only through the persons involved. We are told that the ruling class accompanies Pompey on his flight, underlining that Pompey, far from being a solitary figure, is the leader of the faction opposed to Caesar, although he is the only one who receives a thorough treatment.

Pompey is still fleeing (*fugientem*) in the next couplet, but as soon as Caesar enters the scene, he is reduced to the object of the sentence, while Caesar's, the subject's, role is that of the pursuer. Pompey is now not just a

[16] 56: Lucan, *Bellum Civile* 8.506: "Nec soceri tantum arma fugit, fugit ora senatus." Plutarch, *Caesar* 33.5: ". . . ὁρᾶν καὶ τὴν πόλιν ἐξέλιπε, κελεύσας ἔπεσθαι τὴν γερουσίαν καὶ μηδένα μένειν τῶν πρὸ τῆς τυραννίδος ᾑρημένων τὴν πατρίδα καὶ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν."

[17] 59: Sallust, *Epistulae ad Caesarem senem de re publica* 6.2–3: "cum ipse bonus atque strenuus sis".

[18] 60: "generum. . . hostem…": Petrarca, *De vita et gestis Cesaris* 20: "Gneus Pompeius, gener atque hostis Cesaris…" See also Lucan, *Bellum Civile* 9.1058 and 9.1086.

[19] Lætus 1574c, vv. 56–60, my emphases.

fugitive, but a fleeing enemy. In this otherwise quite black-and-white picture, it is noteworthy that Pompey's role is now developed even further: he is presented, first as fleeing, then as the enemy, and finally as Caesar's son-in-law. Expanding the representation of Pompey to include the word *gener* unveils the complicated the conflict between Caesar and Pompey: it could be seen both as justification for Caesar's sternness and as the opposite. Considering the mood set by the personified Curia just before, I argue that it adds to the characterization of the entire event as tragic. It pins down the horridness of civil war in which the warring parties are countrymen – or, as here, even family – thus concurring with Lucan's presentation of the war in the very first line of his epic as *plus quam civilia* (worse than civil). This is supported in the description of the end of Pompey's flight and life, and of Caesar's reaction. In the intervening lines, Caesar's role as pursuer is reiterated as it is explained that he forces Pompey to leave Italy and go into exile; Pompey remains in the role of fugitive. But in the last four lines of this section, Caesar's character is developed:

> Cæsar at vt laceros Pompeij corporis artus
> Cernit, et allatum tristia visa caput:
> Fleuit; et affectus lacrymis testatur obortis,
> Te quibus extinctum Magne sepulte[20] colit.[21]
>
> But Caesar, when he saw the wounded limbs of Pompey's body
> and the head with its sorrowful gaze that was brought to him,
> wept, and his compassion was attested by the tears that sprang
> from his eyes; he honoured you after you had been extinguished
> by others, Magnus, so that you were buried.[22]

Caesar's actions are highlighted by the emphatic placement of his name and the two verbs *cernit* and *flevit* (the position of *cernit* at the beginning of the line underlines that he himself was not the direct cause of Pompey's death and mutilation). This passage is more descriptive and detailed than the previous one, naturally motivated by *cernit*, but the style continues in the description of Caesar's reaction. It contrasts with the representation of Caesar

[20] 76: On Pompey's burial cf. Lucan, *Bellum Civile* 8.712–872. The passage first treats Cordus' funeral pyre and burial, then the narrator presents it as a heroic deed and talks at length about the unworthiness and injustice of Pompey's anonymous grave. The passage contains a great deal of apostrophes addressing Pompey as "Magne".

[21] Cf. Lucan, *Bellum Civile* 9.1039–46 (quoted and treated below) and ibid. 9.1064–1104 where Caesar speaks at the sight of Pompey's head, expresses sorrow, commands that the head is properly prepared and buried. In ibid. 1104–8, the narrator describes howno one else wept and that Caesar's audience did not believe him to have been sincere.

[22] Lætus 1574c, vv. 73–76. On Caesar commanding Pompey's head buried, see Lucan 9.1089–93 and Appian 2.90.

above, in v. 59, but confirms the melancholic mood established there. The narrator even steps in to underline that Caesar's tears must be taken as evidence that he was genuinely affected, and dwells further on the reaction in what can be considered to be the conclusion of this passage, v. 76, where the narrator addresses Pompey to reassure him that Caesar's lament is sincere.

In the apostrophe (one of only two in this biography) the narrator is arguing with Pompey; but once we take into account the most prominent hypotext of the passage, Lucan's *De bello civile,* there appears to be a discussion also on a meta-level. As note 21 demonstrates, the themes and points in the following passage are repeated several times, making it very likely that Lætus and his readers were aware of this aspect of Lucan's text. Lucan writes:

non primo Caesar damnauit munera uisu
auertitque oculos; uoltus, dum crederet, haesit;
utque fidem uidit sceleris tutumque putauit
iam bonus esse socer, lacrimas non sponte cadentis
effudit gemitusque expressit pectore laeto,
non aliter manifesta potens abscondere mentis
gaudia quam lacrimis, meritumque inmane tyranni
destruit et generi mauolt lugere reuolsum
quam debere caput. qui duro membra senatus
calcarat uoltu, qui sicco lumine campos
uiderat Emathios, uni tibi, Magne, negare
non audet gemitus. o sors durissima fati!
Huncine tu, Caesar, scelerato Marte petisti,
qui tibi flendus erat?
...
Quisquis te flere coegit
impetus, a vera longe pietate recessit.[23]

Nor at the first sight did Caesar condemn the gift and turn his eyes away; his gaze stuck fast to it until he could believe it; and as soon as he saw the proof of the crime and thought it safe to be a good father-in-law to the one he saw, he shed tears that did not fall of their own accord and expressed sighs from his happy chest since there was no other way for him to hide the manifest joy of his mind than with tears; he diminished the mad service of the king and preferred to mourn the head that had been torn from his son-in-law than to be indebted for it. He who with had trampled on the Senate a straight face, who had seen the fields of Pharsalia with dry eyes, for you alone, Magnus, did he not dare to refuse sighs. Oh, hardest lot of fate! Was it him whom you, Caesar, pursued

[23] Lucan, *De bello civile* 9.1035–56, my emphasis. I thank Arsenij Vetushko-Kalevich for suggesting this might be Lætus' hypotext in the relevant passage.

> together with a wicked Mars, the one that had to be mourned by you...
> Whichever impetus forced you to cry, it is far removed from true piety.

The core elements in Lucan's passage are the same as those in Lætus' text (and several other texts on this subject matter): Pompey's head is brought to Caesar, who weeps at the sight of it. However, Lucan's sympathy is different. In this passage, the narrator clearly displays a negative attitude to Caesar: Caesar's tears are presented as insincere, and he is judged severely for them. Lucan can be understood as applying what is in narratology termed *internal* or *embedded focalization*, that is, giving the reader access to Caesar's thoughts or seeing the event through his eyes while still using the narrator's voice.[24] Once we are actually told that this is what went on in his mind and what made him react in the manner that he did, this makes him come across as even worse. In Lætus' passage, the reader is granted access neither to Caesar's nor to Pompey's thoughts; the narrating style is externally focalized – the narrator describes from Caesar's point of view, but as we might see the scene in a movie – and the narrator's interpretation sets the mood of the scene, most explicitly when the dead Pompey's gaze is presented as sad.[25] One could argue that *affectus* shows this to be another instance of embedded focalization, but even if it is understood as such, we are quite far from the extent of reflection that Lucan grants his reader access to during the ten lines in which he unfolds the workings of Caesar's mind.

The quoted passage from Lucan contains two of many apostrophes in his work addressed to Caesar and to Pompey. As stated in note 21, those addressing Pompey frequently use the vocative, "Magne". In using this mode of address, therefore, Lætus is further flagging an allusion to Lucan; interestingly, however, "Magne" could also be taken as Caesar's immediate response to the head brought to him, thereby working as direct speech transsectioning through the narrative layers.[26]

As Lachmann has pointed out, "... each new act of writing is a traversal of the space between existing texts".[27] In apostrophe, the boundaries between

[24] De Jong 2014, 50: "It is one of the special characteristics of narrative texts that a primary narrator-focalizer can *embed* the focalization of a character in his narrator-text, recounting what that character is seeing, feeling, or thinking, without turning him into a secondary narrator-focalizer (who would voice his own focalization in a speech)". She follows Bal who has merged two of Genette's three types of focalization (zero, internal, external), zero and external. While Genette defines focalization according to the narrator's knowledge about characters and events, Bal defines it according to point-of-view. Niederhoff.

[25] Theoretically, this could be taken as an instance of both personalization and embedded focalization.

[26] I thank the peer reviewer for this suggestion.

[27] Lachmann 2008, 304.

narrative levels within the text are temporarily breached,[28] as when both Lætus and Lucan let their anonymous narrators address characters in the narrative directly. When Lætus includes an apostrophe resembling those frequently used by Lucan in a text for which Lucan's poem is one of the primary sources, then uses it to state a dissenting view, the text also in a way becomes an address to Lucan. Lætus is engaged in discussion with his source: he finds that he is disagreeing with its interpretation of Caesar's reaction to Pompey's death.

In her treatment of intertextuality, Lachmann defines three types of intertextuality as a mnemonic phenomenon: *participation*, *troping*, and *transformation*.[29] If we accept Lætus' prefatory description of his two different kinds of readers, it would seem that the scholarly reader will recognize Lucan's poem as hypotext, and consequently also understand that Lætus is engaged in discussion with it – or *correcting* it.[30] Lætus' use of Lucan's text thus falls under Lachmann's category of *troping,* where intertextuality is defined as a struggle between the hypotext and hypertext. The younger reader, on the other hand, must be supposed to really feel the pathos of the scene and grasp the melancholy mood, remembering the greatness of Caesar, who mourned the death of his enemy, the wicked son-in-law.

The result in Lætus' text is consequently an apostrophe that insists on the protagonist's compassion and decency. As argued above, Lætus presents a family tragedy in which Ptolemy is the villain, even if Pompey is the enemy, and Caesar is the stern yet sympathetic hero.[31]

Lætus' mnemonic struggle: summing up

At the beginning of the analysis, we compared Lætus' selection of and emphasis on events to those of Suetonius in his biography of Caesar. There

[28] Cf. Genette 1980, 134–35 (*metalepsis*); De Jong 2009, 93–97 (on apostrophe as *metalepsis*). On apostrophe in other Danish Neo-Latin poetry, see also Hass 2017; Hass 2020.

[29] "Participation is the dialogical sharing in the texts of a culture that occurs in writing. I understand troping in the sense of Harold Bloom's concept of the trope, as a turning away from the precursor text, a tragic struggle against those other texts that necessarily write themselves into the author's own text, and an attempt to surpass, defend against, and eradicate traces of a precursor's text. In contrast, I take transformation to involve the appropriation of other texts through a process of distancing them, through a sovereign and indeed usurpatory exertion of control over them." Lachmann 2008, 304–5.

[30] Thomas 1986, 185 (original emphasis): "Perhaps the quintessentially Alexandrian type of reference is what I would call *correction*, Giangrande's *oppositio in imitando.* This type, more than any other, demonstrates the scholarly aspect of thepoet, and reveals the polemical attitudes that lie close beneath the surface of much of the best poetry of Rome. The process is quite straightforward, at least in its working principles: the poet provides unmistakable indications of his source, then proceeds to offer detail which contradicts or alters that source."

[31] The king is called "Barbaricus" and the land "turpia". Lætus 1574c, v. 77.

we saw that Lætus passed over the scandals and love affairs on which Suetonius dwells. Lætus in this sense is actively suppressing elements of Caesar's biography, thereby applying a strategy of *backgrounding*.[32] His treatment of Lucan, however, is different. In a passage clearly based on Lucan's text, Lætus takes over one of Lucan's favourite tools for creating pathos, the apostrophe, and uses it in a passage to narrate the same event as Lucan but with a 180-degree shift in the verdict on Caesar. This could be seen as an attempt to "cheat" the reader less familiar with Lucan's text into believing that he is dealing with a direct allusion – that this is what Lucan wrote. That would be a case of Lachmann's third type of intertextuality, *transformation*,[33] attempting to supplant Lucan's rendering of the event and thus actively strive to forget the attitude of the hypotext. In this interpretation, without ignoring Lucan, Lætus is subtly setting him straight and streamlining the portrait of his protagonist.[34] However, since as stated Lætus' attitude to Caesar is consistent throughout his biography, this strategy will only work if the reader's knowledge of Lucan is superficial. For the educated reader, the use of the device will come across as an attempt to correct, or at least discuss, Lucan's evaluation of Caesar.

Lætus is clearly an ambitious poet; and for that reason, it is worth considering whether this attempt to renegotiate the cultural memory of Caesar is intended to supplant Lucan by providing an unambiguous and useful portrait of Caesar in poetic form. Lætus' work, however, did not become the success he hoped it would. As far as we know, he never wrote the volumes on the Greek and Germanic emperors. For posterity, it was his work rather than Lucan's that faded into oblivion.

[32] Cf. note 6.

[33] Cf. note 29.

[34] Cf. also J. Assmann 2014: "While knowledge has no form and is endlessly progressive, memory involves forgetting. It is only by forgetting what lies outside the horizon of the relevant that it performs an identity function."

Bibliography

Andreasen, Øjvind 1979–84, "Erasmus Lætus", *Dansk Biografisk Leksikon*, 3rd ed., Copenhagen.
URL: http://denstoredanske.dk/index.php?sideId=293918 [last visited 8 January 2020]

Assmann, Jan 2008, "Communicative and Cultural Memory", Erll & Nünning 2008, 110–118.

Bal, Mieke [1985] 1997, *Narratology*: *Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*, Toronto.

Erll, Astrid & Ansgar Nünning (eds.) 2008, *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*, Berlin & NewYork.

Genette, Gérard 1980, *Narrative Discourse*: *an Essay in Method*, tr.: Jane E. Lewin, Ithaca (transl. from *Discours de récit*, Paris 1972).

Genette, Gérard 1997, *Palimpsests*: *Literature in the Second Degree*, trs.: Claude Doubinsky & Channa Newman, Lincoln (transl. from *Palimpsestes: la littérature au second degré*, Paris 1982).

Hass, Trine Arlund 2017, "Amerinus' apostrofer", *Renaessanceforum* 12, 79–92. URL: www.njrs.dk

Hass, Trine Arlund 2020, "Playing your part: Bucolic Traditions and Positions in Hans Lauridsen Amerinus's *Ecloga de pacis foedere* (1573)", *Cultural Encounter and Identity in the Neo-Latin World*, eds.: Camilla Horster & Marianne Pade, Rome, (*Analecta Romana Instituti Danici*. *Supplementum* LIV), 63–81.

Iser, Wolfgang 1972, "The Reading Process: a Phenomenological Approach", *New Literary History* 3.2, 279–99.

De Jong, Irene 2009, "Metalepsis in Ancient Greek Literature", *Narratology and Interpretation*, eds.: Jonas Grethlein & Antonios Rengakos, Berlin & New York, 87–116.

De Jong, Irene 2014, *Narratology and Classics*, Oxford.

Lætus, Erasmus Michaëlis 1573a, *Colloquiorum moralium libri IV*, Basel.

Lætus, Erasmus Michaëlis 1573b, *De re nautica libri IV*, Basel.

Lætus, Erasmus Michaëlis 1573c, *Margareticorum libri X*, Frankfurt am Main

Lætus, Erasmus Michaëlis 1574a, *De republica Noribergensium libri IV*, Frankfurt am Main

Lætus, Erasmus Michaëlis 1574b, *Rerum Danicarum libri XI*, Frankfurt am Main

Lætus, Erasmus Michaëlis 1574c, *Romanorum Cæsares Italici*, Frankfurt am Main.

Lachmann, Renate 2004, "Cultural Memory and the Role of Literature", *European Review* 12, 2, 165–178

Lachmann, Renate 2008, "Mnemonic and Intertextual Aspects of Literature", Erll & Nünning 2008, 301–310.

Lucanus, Marcus Annaeus 1957, *The Civil War*, tr.: J. D. Duff, Cambridge, MA.

Niederhoff, Burkhard: "Focalization", Paragraph 4, *The Living Handbook of Narratology*, eds.: Hühn, Peter et al., Hamburg. URL: http://www.lhn.uni-hamburg.de/article/focalization (visited 8 January 2020).

Skafte Jensen, Minna 2003, "16th Century Nationalism: The Case of Erasmus Laetus", *Germania latina – Latinitas teutonica*: *Politik*, *Wissenschaft*, *humanistische Kultur vom späten Mittelalter bis in unsere Zeit*, 2 vols., eds.: Eckhard Kessler & Heinrich C. Kuhn, Munich, 499–516 (Humanistische Bibliothek, Reihe I: Abhandlungen 54).

Skafte Jensen, Minna 2004, "Latin Bucolic Poetry in Sixteenth-Century Denmark", *Friendship and Poetry*: *Studies in Danish Neo-Latin Literature*, eds. Marianne Pade, Karen Skovgaard-Petersen & Peter Zeeberg, Copenhagen, 27–58.

Skovgaard-Petersen, Karen & Peter Zeeberg 1992, *Erasmus Lætus' skrift om Christian IVs fødsel og dåb* (1577), Copenhagen.

Thomas, Richard F. 1986, "Virgil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference", *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 90, 171–198.

Walde, C. 2006, "Caesar, Lucan's *Bellum Civile*, and their Reception", *Julius Caesar in Western Culture*, ed. Maria Wyke, Malden, MA, Oxford & Carlton, 45–61.

Westcot, John H. & Edwin M. Rankin 1918, *Suetonius*: *Julius – Augustus*, Norwood, MA.

Worm, Ole 1643, *Monumentorum Danicorum Libri Sex*, Copenhagen.

In Search of the Three Crowns:

Conserving, Restoring, and Reproducing Cultural Memory in Early Modern Sweden[1]

By Matthew Norris

Among the disputes concerning political, historical, and cultural priority that beleaguered Swedish-Danish relations during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the quarrel over the provenance of the heraldic emblem of the Three Crowns played a central role. In Sweden the dispute led directly to the formation of an expansive, state-managed heritage industry that remains largely intact today. This article discusses Swedish efforts to establish the antiquity and domestic origin of the emblem through the lens of early modern theories of memory and shows how these efforts were bound together with developing strategies for the conservation, restoration, and reproduction of historical monuments.

In the middle of the sixteenth century, the Swedish national emblem of the Three Crowns (*Tre Kronor*) became the subject of a heated dispute when the Danish king Christian III added it to his coat of arms. As a matter of state honor, it was cited by Swedish regents as a motive for armed conflict. As a question of historical pedigree, it spawned a domestic research industry funded by the state and administered by scholars who characterized themselves as antiquaries. Indeed, the dispute was a driving force in the formation of the Riksarkivet (National Archives) and the Riksantikvarie-ämbetet (Bureau of the Antiquary of the Realm, today the Swedish National Heritage Board), as well as in the emergence of state-sponsored antiquities collections and protected heritage sites. The question of the origin and history of the emblem was such a powerful impetus that it remained a focus of Swedish antiquarian scholarship long after the political dispute that had spawned it was officially resolved through the Treaty of Knäred in 1613. For more than a century, scholars ransacked the Swedish landscape in search of evidence testifying to the origin, meaning, and use of the emblem in the past.

[1] Research for this article was financed through a project grant by the Swedish Research Council (Vetenskapsrådet).

And in some cases, whenever monument-sized gaps appeared in the material record, they conjured the evidence itself into being.

This article argues that perspectives developed in the field of memory studies in recent decades can help to unravel what the history of historiography has long treated as a thorny paradox: namely, the persistent coexistence of empirical and imaginative approaches to material evidence in early modern research on the distant past. In practice, research on the Three Crowns centered on the study of what scholars regarded as *monuments*, including inscribed stones, illustrated manuscripts, plaques, coins, seals, paintings, and sarcophagi. Etymologically — and for early modern antiquaries, *essentially* — the *monumentum* was something that served to remind (*monere*); it was a prompt fashioned for the sake of preserving memory (*memoriae causa*).[2] Classical theories of memory drew a distinction between the thing remembered as either perceived originally by the senses or conceived by the intellect and the anachronistic likeness or copy (*eikon*) that allows us to recall it in the present. Moreover, they discriminated between remembrance (not forgetting something) and reminiscence (recalling something forgotten), the latter operation developed by Renaissance Neoplatonists into a theory of *anamnesis*, in which memories of things never remembered could be produced through a form of intuition directed by intellectual inquiry and imagination.[3] Plotinus had described this process as an intellectual operation in which the image-making power (*phantastikon*) of the soul granted access to the Ideas present in Mind (*nous*).[4] For Renaissance humanists like Marsilio Ficino, who were eager to distance the Platonic theory of reminiscence from the theologically problematic notion of the transmigration of souls, this Mind was synonymous with the mind of God, conjunction with which granted access to a kind of universal understanding of all things past, present, and future.[5] Indeed, in some cases memory could be equated with God himself. The Franciscan cabalist Pietro Galatino, in a passage read with great interest by one of the central protagonists in this story, held that Moses' perplexing account of the creation of the world by the plural Elohim in Genesis 1 represented the Holy Trinity through "three powers of the soul," namely, memory, understanding, and will. Memory (God the Father) gave rise to understanding (the Son), and the conjunction of these engendered will (Holy Spirit). That God had created man in his own image

[2] Varro 1938, 6.49.
[3] Nikulin 2015; Clucas 2015.
[4] Catana 2005, 74–75.
[5] Hankins 2005; Corrias 2012.

entailed that humanity had been granted access to the limitless power of divine memory.[6]

This simultaneously psychological and metaphysical view of memory could be adapted to the material orientation of antiquarianism when monuments were perceived as the shared icons of communal or cultural memory. Antiquaries were capable of appreciating old artefacts as the products of particular times and places, but they were also obsessed with origins, the vaguely perceived precedents lying behind historical particulars. The comparative approach that often characterized antiquarian research on the distant past laid emphasis on continuity rather than difference, prompting the enquirer to look through historical types as instantiations of primordial archetypes. In Sweden and elsewhere, the old trope of the *mundus senescens* was combined with the Renaissance notion of a *prisca theologia* in a scholarly sensibility that viewed historical time as the gradual dissolution and fragmentation of an originally unified Urzeit in which cultural expressions emanated directly and necessarily from the divine mind.[7] Through this process of dissolution, historical time was split into two trajectories, the profane and the sacred, the contingent and the non-contingent, and accordingly icons situated along these trajectories called for different methods of analysis. Glossing Iamblichus, Ficino held that "just as we reach things temporal and contingent through knowledge which is temporal and contingent, so we have to attain things necessary and everlasting through a knowing which is necessary and everlasting, and this precedes our inquiring just as rest precedes motion."[8] While the decorative imagery bordering a runic epitaph could be viewed as contingent, reflecting the tastes of the time and the genius of the artist, the form and layout of an ancient church, used to commemorate the tenets of the true faith, were perceived to be essential. For

[6] Galatino 1550, 68; glossed by Johannes Bureus c. 1609 in Linköping, Stiftsbiblioteket, MS N 24, fol. 48^{v}. See also fol. 61^{v}, where these powers are described as "intellectualium creaturarum potentiae." Cf. Augustine 2002, X.11–12.

[7] A concise history of this process of fragmentation was given in the opening chapters of the popular *Aurora philosophorum*, attributed pseudepigraphically to Paracelsus, and first published in 1577. On the Renaissance view of ancient theology, see Walker 1972; Yates 2002; Schmidt-Biggeman 2004. The notion of the *prisca theologia* and its connection with sacred history played an important role in Swedish interpretations of domestic antiquity in the early decades of the seventeenth century. Although the *prisca* tradition began to fall out of favor by the middle of the century, the idea of a kind of primordial Golden Age followed by centuries of decline nevertheless persisted in the form of Gothicism. This structural continuity allowed a general conception of the relation between objects and archetypes to remain relatively consistent, even if the metaphysical and spiritual bases for this conception in Neoplatonic philosophy and theologically charged interpretations of the *Historia sacra* were downplayed or absent. On Gothicism in general, Nordström 1934, ch. 2.

[8] Ficino, 2004, 51.

many Swedish scholars, the emblem of the Three Crowns represented an instance of the latter. The heraldic emblem was by its very nature anachronistic; its representation on a medieval coin or seal was viewed as a replication, an icon pointing backwards through a continuous tradition to a lost archetype located in the depths of sacred history. The sacred monument — and if one directed one's gaze far enough back in time, all monuments were sacred — bore an essential relation with its mental image in the divine mind. Here image and icon were one and the same. The thing itself was innate in the idea of the thing. If one could tap into the mental image, it was possible to restore the missing icon, the monument that no longer existed in physical space.

These remarks naturally run the risk of overstatement. By no means all — or even most — Swedish antiquaries were Neoplatonists, and the Aristotelian view of memory as belonging to the lower sensory faculties was well represented in the philosophical dictionaries of the time.[9] Moreover, although the ongoing Reformation had placed the question of religious heritage at the forefront of all scholarly inquiry, particularly in Sweden where Catholic claimants to the throne on the other side of the Baltic posed a constant threat, it would be mistaken to suggest that antiquaries were uninterested in charting profane history. Yet while the more down-to-earth scholars of the late seventeenth century could scoff at Neoplatonism's exaltation of intellective memory as a quasi-miraculous form of henosis, they nevertheless remained able to perceive monuments as icons that bore a non-contingent relation to earlier icons in a chain that issued from a set of primordial and most often mythical archetypes. Throughout the early modern period, as Alexander Nagel and Christopher Wood have shown in their studies of Renaissance anachronism, the boundary separating the contingent and the necessary, *what may have been* and *what must have been*, remained moveable, adapting to encounters with objects and the questions asked of them.[10] In general terms, Swedish antiquarianism was characterized by the often amicable if increasingly uneasy coexistence of two modes of perceiving the relation between things and time — schematized by Nagel and Wood as the opposition between the principles of *performance*, in which the artifact or artwork was linked to the specific event of its creation, and *substitution*, in which the identity of the artifact was linked to a conceptual archetype and

[9] Clucas 2015, 133–139. Another line of influence stems from Petrus Ramus, who argued for the status of memory as an intellective faculty, and whose influence on late sixteenth-century and seventeenth-century Swedish thought was profound.

[10] See above all Nagel and Wood 2010.

remained constant across a chain of material substitutions.[11] The Neoplatonic theory of memory can perhaps be viewed as an extreme expression of a more widespread and enduring scholarly mentality in which the traces of former things (*vestigia*) were bound together so tightly with the search for them (*vestigare*) that the process often proved capable of producing the premises.[12]

In the context of early modern Swedish antiquarianism — and as is particularly evident in research on the national emblem, as the examples in this article have been selected to demonstrate — this process took the form of a set of complementary practices: *conservation*, the directed preservation of cultural artefacts that had survived intact; *restoration*, the renovation of cultural artefacts that had survived in part (e.g. a partially effaced inscription, a collapsed shrine); and *reproduction*, the (re-)creation of cultural artefacts that had been lost altogether. These practices were reflected in contemporary theories of memory. As the German theologian and philosopher Johann Heinrich Alsted put it in 1612: "The character of intellective memory is twofold: faithfully conserving [*retinere*] intelligible species, and readily restoring [*reddere*] them when the need arises."[13] For Alsted, importantly, memory was twofold because the process of *redditio* encompassed the latter two categories (i.e. restoration and reproduction). Similarly, early modern Swedish antiquaries employed words such as *instaurare*, *restaurera*, and *förnya* to signify a wide range of practices that the modern historian (who has long abandoned the belief in non-contingent history) would describe at the extreme ends as either conscientious restoration or conscious forgery. In the following pages, I will explore how these principles and practices were employed in representative instances by examining the ways in which two antiquarian scholars at the opposite ends of the seventeenth century, Johannes Bureus (1568–1652) and Johan Hadorph (1630–1693), dealt with the problems of origin and provenance in their research on the history of the Three Crowns.

Christian III's appropriation of the Three Crowns into the Danish royal arms was justified as a commemoration of the Kalmar Union, the personal union of the kingdoms of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden that had been in effect between 1397–1523.[14] The Danes held that the emblem had been used

[11] I would stress that the principle of "performance" played a more pronounced role in seventeenth-century Swedish scholarship than in the earlier historical contexts studied by Nagel and Wood.

[12] On the etymology of *vestigia*, see Isidore of Seville 2006, 15.16.13.

[13] Alsted 1612), 137: "Memoriae intellectivae duplex est virtus: retinere fideliter species intelligibiles; & eas, si quando opus est, reddere promte."

[14] Whether this was Christian's own motive is unclear, as the Danish motivation only came to light with the onset of the feud after Christian's death in 1559. See Landberg 1925, 235–243.

to symbolize the union since the reigns of Margaret I and Eric of Pomerania, as was clear from their coins and seals. Gustav Vasa, whose rise to power ran parallel with the dissolution of the union, interpreted the action as an official statement that the Danish Crown continued to claim jurisdiction over the Swedish kingdom.[15] The Swedish position was that the emblem had never been used to signify the union, but had been a central element in the coat of arms of Sweden long before its formation in 1397.[16] Tensions between the neighboring kingdoms soon reached the boiling point, and the right to bear the emblem became a focal point in the Northern Seven Years' War (1563–1570) initiated by Christian's and Gustav's heirs, Frederick II and Erik XIV. The Danes and Swedes both agreed that the emblem functioned as a monument, but were at odds on the question of what it had been intended to memorialize.

From the beginning, the Swedish court recognized that the conflict had to be contested with antiquarian weapons. Writing from his cell in Gripsholm Castle in the early 1570s, the deposed king Erik XIV gave vent to his grievances against the Danes in the margins of a copy of Marcantonio Sabellico's *Opera*, recalling how his father Gustav Vasa had drawn on material evidence to disprove the Danish claims:

> No one is unaware that our Illustrious Father and Master demonstrated with the clearest evidence that the Three Crowns had been the emblem of Sweden prior to the ostentatious reign of Queen Margaret [i.e. Margaret I, founder of the Kalmar Union]. And no one should doubt that I, too, satisfied them [i.e. the Danish calls for proof]: he [i.e. Frederick II] was convinced by the letters, seals, reliefs, and paintings of the kings Erik Knutson, Magnus Ladulås, and Albert of Mecklenburg, the Duke of Finland Bengt Algotsson, and many other rulers that the Three Crowns are the possession of the Swedish Kingdom.[17]

[15] See for example Gustav Vasa's letter to Jöran Gylta, 30 December 1557, in Almquist (ed.) 1913, 207–211. For an overview of the sixteenth-century dispute, see Landberg 1925, 234–259; Skovgaard-Petersen 2009.

[16] Swedish scholars consented that the emblem had been used by the union monarchs, but insisted that this appropriated emblem symbolized authority over the Swedish kingdom rather than the union as a whole. See for example Bureus' explanation in Stockholm, Kungliga biblioteket, MS Rål. 9 8º, 95, where beneath an illustration of the emblem on the seals of Margaret I and Erik of Pomerania he noted: "Däd är achtandes uti Regenternes Insiglen at så ofta som Tre kronor stå aftrykta inne uti Skiölden, Så finnes altid Swea Rikes Namn uti Omskriften." Modern scholarship has shown that the emblem was in fact used to symbolize the union. See Bartholdy 1997.

[17] Erik XIV 1828, 113: "Nemini autem ignotum […] fieri, Dominum Patrem illustrissimum testimoniis ostendisse evidentissimis, ante Regine Margarate superba gubernacula Regni Suetie insignia 3 coronas fuisse. Ne quis dubitet, me etiam illis satisfecisse; convictus

Viewed from the perspective of the political feud, it was only necessary to demonstrate that the emblem had been in use in Sweden prior to the formation of the Kalmar Union. This aim appears to have sufficed entirely for Gustav Vasa, and largely for his son Erik, who drew up an extended list of evidence in the midst of the Seven Years' War.[18] In the official statement on the dispute he commissioned from the theologian Petrus Michaelis Fecht, Erik's brother and successor John III appears to have been content to trace the use of the emblem back to Birger Magnusson (r. 1290–1318).[19]

The Swedes had more than enough evidence to prove the point that the Three Crowns had been used by Swedish monarchs prior to formation of the union. The royal seal and coins of King Albert (r. 1364–1389), cited repeatedly by Swedish rulers and scholars throughout the debate, sufficed on their own to make the case. Moreover, earlier authentic examples, such as the three crowns on the counter-seal of Magnus Ladulås (r. 1275–1290), should be viewed as compelling evidence in the context of the early modern debate, although modern scholarship has interpreted the emblem in these instances as a decorative device without conscious heraldic intent.[20] And yet the desire of Swedish leaders to drive home the point quickly turned into an obsession. John III assembled a collection of medieval coins and seals in the recently renovated Stockholm palace (newly rechristened the "Castle of the Three Crowns"), effectively constituting the seed of collections today housed in the Royal Coin Cabinet and the National Museum. He employed the chronicler and genealogist Rasmus Ludvigsson to travel the country collecting documents and sketching memorial inscriptions, a commission that would lead to the formation of the National Archives. He dispatched agents to Rome to search the Casa di Santa Brigida in search of documents that could be used to support the Swedish claim.[21] At bottom, he set in motion a potent, focused, state-funded antiquarian enterprise whose momentum could not easily be

est litteris Regis Erici Canuti, Regis Magni Ladulos, Regis Alberti Megalopolitani, Ducis Benedicti Finlandiae & multorum aliorum Regum litteris, sigillis, sculpturis & picturis, ad Regnum Suetiae pertinere 3 coronas."

[18] Erik XIV, "Excerptum ex Dissertatione belli Sveci-Danici anno 1563," in Schefferus 1678, 263–279.

[19] Petrus Michaelis Fecht, "Des Reichs Schweden Beweis wegen der Drey Chronen" (c. 1574), in Schefferus 1678, 286. There were exceptions of course. The Catholic archbishop and historian Johannes Magnus, whose aversion to Gustav Vasa's reformation was only outweighed by his patriotic contempt for Danish claims to historical priority, asserted that the origin of the emblem could be traced back to the seventh century AD, when it had been used in the coat of arms of the otherwise undocumented Swedish king Arthus. The claim was based on the author's reinterpretation of the iconography of King Arthur in medieval depictions of the Nine Worthies. Johannes Magnus 1554, 8,31.

[20] See for example H. Hildebrand, 1888, 21–26.

[21] Willers 1937; K. Hildebrand 1898, 217 ff.; Gillingstam 1995–1997, 700.

slowed even after the political dispute had been resolved through the Treaty of Knäred in 1613.[22] If anything, the stakes of the matter would prove to intensify. For seventeenth-century Swedish scholars, who were occupied with conjuring a domestic history that reflected the self-identity of a country that had recently emerged as a European superpower, it was not enough that the emblem was old. It had to be primordial.

One question sixteenth-century research on the Three Crowns left open for the scholars of the following century bore on the emblem's original meaning. Although Olaus Magnus had suggested in the middle of the century that the emblem signified "the inscrutable size of the dominions of Sweden, its magnificent military accomplishments, and the inexhaustible bounty of its mineral deposits,"[23] the explanation was glibly dismissed by later Swedish scholars.[24] The question remained tantalizingly open, and it fell perfectly in line with the sensibility of the first protagonist in this story, Johannes Bureus, Sweden's first *antiquarius regni*.[25]

Bureus began his career in 1590 as a clerk in the chancellery of John III, and gradually emerged as an intellectual luminary and scholarly jack-of-all-trades during the regency of Duke Charles (later Charles IX). His *Runtavla* (completed 1599) established him as Sweden's leading expert in domestic antiquities by default. Charles supplied him with funding and a letter of passage to collect and document antiquities in the northern provinces in 1600–1601, and during the following two years he was appointed to serve as an expert in heraldry during border negotiations with the Danes.[26] Although his journal entries give little indication of the evidence he presented during these occasions, it is likely that the backbone was comprised of the same medieval coins and seals that had been forwarded in the preceding decades.[27] Yet from the beginning his investigations were driven by a greater scholarly ambition. As a keen student of material remains, he placed an even greater store than his predecessors in an undated stone engraved with the emblem found among the Stones of Mora, identifying it as the *Morasten*, the stone upon which the kings of Sweden had been elected from time immemorial.[28]

[22] Jensen 2014.

[23] Olaus Magnus 1555, 88: "Nunc vero Suecorum Principes tribus aureis coronis in campo coelestini coloris, ob inscrutabilem dominiorum amplitudinem, magnifica bellorum gesta, & inexhaustam minerarum ubertatem, utuntur."

[24] Messenius 1612, ch. 12.

[25] On Bureus' life and work, H. Hildebrand 1910; Håkansson 2014; Norris 2016.

[26] Bureus 1883, 15–28.

[27] See for example Stockholm, Kungliga biblioteket, MS Rål. 9 8º, 94–97.

[28] Stockholm, Kungliga biblioteket, MS F. a. 3, 6–7. This and the following note refer to the first section of an unpublished prospectus on Swedish antiquities (*Antiquitates*

As a bibliophile (he was later named head of the Royal Library), he pointed out that early Danish books printed during the Kalmar Union — such as the Danish *Rimkrønike* (1495) and Saxo Grammaticus' *Gesta Danorum* (1514) — included woodcuts which made clear that Danes had recognized the Three Crowns as the heraldic device of the Swedish kingdom prior to the dissolution of the union.[29] If Christian III had forgotten the provenance of the emblem, his ancestors Hans and Christian II certainly had not.

Yet all the while that Bureus was accumulating the kind of hard evidence that could be used effectively in international negotiations, he was hard at work reconceptualizing the cultural significance of the emblem for the original inhabitants of Sweden, eventually settling on three concurrent explanations.

> 1. In the beginning Sweden, which was coterminous with the province of Uppland, had been divided into three folklands, Attundaland, Fjädrundaland, and Tiundaland, as was testified by medieval legal texts.
>
> 2. Religious worship in Uppsala, the secular and spiritual capital of ancient Sweden, had been directed at a triumvirate of deities: Thor, Odin, and Freyja.
>
> 3. The primordial ruler of Sweden — the "Ättefader" or "Pater Patrum familiarum termaximus" — held the three offices of King, High Priest, and Chief Magistrate.[30]

For Bureus, these historical circumstances were not to be understood as arbitrary human inventions, but rather as having issued necessarily from a primordial, sacred mindscape in which the concept of the ternary had played a formative role. They were thus joined at the hip with the metaphysical triads elaborated in Neoplatonic philosophy, the *mundus triplex* (Intellectual, Celestial, Physical) and the *homo triplex* (Spirit, Soul, Body), as well as Paracelsus' three alchemical principles (Mercury, Sulphur, Salt), Plato's tripartite division between God, Idea, and Matter, and Heinrich Khunrath's discussion of the three books of Scripture, Nature, and Human Consciousness.[31]

Scanzianae). Although the undated text was drafted in the years around 1610, the opening section on the Three Crowns was likely drafted earlier (c. 1604). See Lindroth 1943, 96.

[29] Stockholm, Kungliga biblioteket, MS F. a. 3, 8; *Then danska krønnicka* (Copenhagen: Gotfred af Ghemen, 1495), colophon; Saxo, *Danorum regum heroumque historia* (Paris: Jodocus Badius, 1514). Bureus' reference to the Saxo edition concerns the historiated initials at the beginning of the book divisions, such as the initial on fol. 1^{r}.

[30] Stockholm, Kungliga biblioteket, MS F. a. 3, 11; MS Rål 9 8^{o}, 85–93.

[31] Bureus' notes and reflections on ternaries are spread throughout his surviving manuscripts. See especially Linköping, Stiftsbiblioteket, MS N 24, passim.

The genealogical basis for this chain of associations was Bureus' theory, inspired by Renaissance notions of the *prisca theologia*, that Sweden had been colonized in deep antiquity by Noachidean settlers led by Gether, grandson of Shem, and known to the gentile historians as Zoroaster. The first inhabitants of Sweden (a Semitic people in this revision of postdiluvian genealogy) were thus the inheritors of an all-encompassing divine wisdom that had been granted by God to Adam, inscribed by his descendants on two steles,[32] rediscovered by Noah after the Flood, and passed along to his son Shem.[33] The theory fueled Bureus' attempts to produce a syncretic reconstruction of ancient Swedish culture based on Oriental models. He viewed the three offices of the Swedish patriarch as akin to documented Eastern prototypes, the *munus triplex* (King, Priest, Prophet) of the Hebrews as described by Eusebius, and Ficino's interpretation of the epithet of Hermes Trismegistus as referring to his status as "the greatest philosopher and the greatest priest and the greatest king."[34] A devoted Christian cabalist, he held that the underlying significance of the three crowns was reflected in the original division of the fifteen-letter runic futhark into three groups of five,[35] and his intensive study of ancient writing systems led him to recognize that the three Hebrew "mother letters" Aleph, Mem, and Shin described by Abraham in the *Sefer Yetzirah*[36] were each topped with a three-pointed crown when transliterated back into Samaritan, a script held by Guillaume Postel and Joseph Scaliger to have been the predecessor of Hebrew.[37] It perhaps comes as no surprise, then, that he interpreted the worship of three deities in the Uppsala Temple not as a token of pagan superstition but as a conceptualization of the Christian Trinity: Thor conceived as God the Father, Odin as a prefiguration of the Son, and Freyja as the Holy Spirit.[38]

Bureus understood his lifelong project to rememorialize the spiritual culture of ancient Sweden as wholly commensurate with the ongoing Reformation's attempt to restore the original and true form of Christian belief and practice. His scholarship can best be understood as a form of

[32] Bureus followed a pseudo-Paracelsian reinterpretation of the story of the pillars of Seth relayed by Josephus. See Dorn 1581, 154–155.

[33] Norris 2016, 103–107, 558–562.

[34] Eusebius 1926, 3.1; Ficino 1576: "philosophus maximus, & sacerdos maximus, & rex maximus extitit." See for example Stockholm, Kungliga biblioteket, MS F. a. 12, fol. 743^{r}.

[35] Bureus was aware that the Younger Futhark contained sixteen letters, yet argued that one of the two R-runes — Reið and Yr — had been a later addition.

[36] Early in his career, Bureus ascribed to the medieval tradition that the *Sefer Yetzirah* had been written by Abraham, and was therefore older than the Pentateuch.

[37] Stockholm, Kungliga biblioteket, MS F. a. 3, 95; Norris 2016, 534–549.

[38] This interpretation is presented most thoroughly in the various manuscripts of the *Adulruna rediviva* composed around 1640, for example Stockholm, Kungliga biblioteket, MS Rål. 9 8^{o}.

ecclesiastical antiquarianism in which the Swedish past was mobilized to satiate the spiritual needs of the present. Yet if Protestant historiography had found it difficult to unearth solid documentation bearing on the first centuries of worship after Christ, Bureus, who dedicated a half century of his life to the search for material remains, recognized that nothing tangible had survived from the age of domestic proto-Christianity. Although he was no less prone than his contemporaries and successors to overestimate the age of artifacts (particularly runic inscriptions), he held consistently to the view that the earliest surviving material traces originated from a later time already subjected to historical corruption. It was thus necessary to excavate deeper historical strata than could be elucidated through mere autopsy. Historical forms had evolved, or rather devolved, from an original ideal form.[39]

Bureus' method was honed through his early and intensive study of Renaissance Neoplatonism, particularly the writings of Ficino, whose endeavor to extract a reformed version of Christian theology from Platonic philosophy served as a kind of template for Bureus' attempts to Christianize the ancient Swedish past.[40] For antiquaries throughout Europe the paradigm of the sacred artifact was the ancient temple, which could be subjected to analyses based on Neoplatonic theories of architecture.[41] Discussing architectural beauty in the *Enneads*, Plotinus interpreted the well-designed structure as "the inner idea stamped upon the mass of exterior matter, the indivisible exhibited in diversity."[42] And turning to the subject of temples (*hiera*) in particular, he explained that the ancient wise men had designed such structures to function as an image, or representation, or reproduction of the Soul.[43] Ficino, treating architecture more broadly in the *De amore*, held that the material edifice as "body" (*corpus*) existed solely in a subordinate relationship of similitude to the edifice as *incorporea idea*. "Remove the material" (*materiam subtrahe*), Ficino urged, and the edifice remained as a pattern or plan (*ordo*) in the intellect. Its true form was entirely independent

[39] Norris 2020.

[40] Linköping, Stiftsbiblioteket, MS N 24, passim.

[41] Hendrix 2004, ch. 4.

[42] Plotinus 1956, 1.6.3: "But what accordance is there between the material and that which antedates all Matter? On what principle does the architect, when he finds the house standing before him correspondent with his inner ideal of a house, pronounce it beautiful? Is it not that the house before him, the stones apart, is the inner idea stamped upon the mass of exterior matter, the indivisible exhibited in diversity?"

[43] Plotinus 1956, 4.3.11: "I think, therefore, that those ancient sages, who sought to secure the presence of divine beings by the erection of shrines and statues, showed insight into the nature of the All; they perceived that, though this Soul is everywhere tractable, its presence will be secured all the more readily when an appropriate receptacle is elaborated, a place especially capable of receiving some portion or phase of it, something reproducing it, or representing it, and serving like a mirror to catch an image of it."

of matter.[44] Platonic archaeology induced its practitioners to excavate the monuments of the mind.

In a Christian context, a similar logic was often applied to those three structures whose design was attributed to God himself — Noah's Ark, the Mosaic Tabernacle, and Solomon's Temple — which were the subject of a profusion of scholarly reconstructions throughout the early modern period. Bureus pointed out that no less a spiritual authority than Yahweh himself, speaking to Moses, explained that the Tabernacle and its contents had existed as a *tabnith* (form, pattern, likeness, copy) accessible as a vision before it existed in physical space.[45] From this, Pseudo-Justin argued in the *Exhortation to the Greeks* that the whole of the Platonic theory of Forms should be understood as a partially corrupt derivation of this account, which Plato had become acquainted with in Egypt, though he had been unable to fully comprehend it.[46] Bureus argued that sacred monuments embodied a principle of unity that preceded the later conceptual division between *naturalia* and *artificalia*: the Tabernacle, read correctly, was a blueprint for the "Composition of the World" (*Dispositio Mundi*), an instruction book in Mosaic Physics that should replace the Aristotelian *Physica* read at universities.[47] Here Bureus was operating within a tradition of exegesis implemented by Pico della Mirandola in the introduction to the *Heptaplus*, where the Tabernacle was analyzed as a diagram of the threefold cosmos,[48] and more recently by the Spanish Jesuit Juan Bautista Villalpando, who in the second volume of the *Ezechielem explanationes* (3 vols., 1596–1604) offered a meticulous reconstruction of Solomon's Temple based on a combination of biblical exegesis, comparative archaeology, and Neoplatonic philosophical

[44] Ficino 1944, V. 5, 70: "Quod si quis quaesierit, quonam pacto corporis forma, animae, mentisque formae, et rationi similis esse queat, is, oro, consideret aedificium architecti. Principio architectus aedificii rationem, et quasi ideam animo concipit. Deinde qualem excogitavit domum, talem pro viribus fabricat. Quis neget domum corpus existere, eamque ideae artificis incorporeae, ad cuius similitudinem effecta est, esse persimilem? Porro propter incorporalem (f) ordinem quendam potius, quam propter materiam est architecto similis judicanda. Age igitur materiam subtrahe, si potes; potes autem cogitatione subtrahere; ordinem vero relinque. Nihil tibi restabit corporis, nihil materiae. Immo vero idem erit penitus, qui ab opifice provenit ordo, et qui remanet in opifice. Idem in quovis hominis corpore facias. Reperies illius formam animi rationi quadrantem, simplicem esse, materiaeque expertem."

[45] Exodus 25:40; cf. Exodus 26:30, "mishpat"; Hebrews 8:5: "typos"; Linköping, Stiftsbiblioteket, MS Spr. 1, fol. 6r: "Och ser til at tu gör efter den Eftersyn, som du på berget seedt hafwer."

[46] Justin Martyr [pseud.] 1870, ch. 29.

[47] Linköping, Stiftsbiblioteket, MS Spr. 1, fol. 22r. On Mosaic Physics, Blair 2000.

[48] Pico della Mirandola 1506, sigs a2^{v}–a3^{r}. Bureus glossed Pico's exegesis of the Tabernacle in Linköping, Stiftsbiblioteket, MS N 24, fol. 150^{v}.

analysis, and come to the conclusion that it had been constructed to function as a microcosm of the universe.[49]

For Bureus, memory was not something passively received, but something to be actively pursued through intellectual inquiry and spiritual (at times, mystical) contemplation. Sacred monuments that had ceased to exist in the archaeological landscape persisted in the eternal Mind, which could be accessed through the noetic ascent (*ascensus*) of the soul, in which the temporally bound human intellect was able to unite with the omniscient and omnipresent consciousness of the One, the godhead of Christianity.[50] God had created man in His image, as a microcosm of the whole of creation, and endowed him with the divine gifts of understanding (*intellectus*), wisdom (*sapientia*), and memory (*memoria*).[51] For Bureus, the last of these was associated with *dianoia*, discursive reasoning, which Plato had placed above conjecture (*eikasia*) and belief (*pistis*) in a scale of cognition that terminated in *noesis*, immediate apprehension.[52] *Dianoia* was the mental faculty that allowed man to proceed from a knowledge of sensible particulars to an apprehension of intelligible forms. In a similar way, memory was capable of functioning in the field of sacred antiquities as a bridge or intermediary between particular material remains and monumental archetypes. Bureus' research into the origin of cultural signifiers was directed at the retrieval of a primordial space prior to historical contingency in which Idea and Phenomenon, Referent and Icon, Memory and Monument, were one and the same.

The method proved capable of leading to striking and sudden epiphanies, as it did on the morning of 1 December 1610, when a detailed model of the primordial home of religious worship in Sweden suddenly took shape in his mind. His hastily executed sketch depicts a three-tiered garden complex, which he labeled the "Hyperborean Gardens concealed from the common people" (*Hyperborei Horti absconsi vulgo*), echoing the Renaissance view of the ancient theology as an occult wisdom administered by an intellectual elite.[53] Eager to stress that this mental reconstruction was capable of granting access to a lost physical edifice, he added that such gardens had truly existed

[49] Morrison 2015. Bureus was well acquainted with Villalpando's work.

[50] Bureus' conception of noetic ascent is treated thoroughly in Lindroth 1943, ch. 2.

[51] Cf. 2 Esdras 14:40: "et accepi et bibi, et in eo cum bibissem cor meum eructabatur intellectum et in pectus meum increscebat sapientia. nam spiritus meus conservabat memoriam."

[52] Stockholm, Kungliga biblioteket, MS F.a. 9, unpag. chart headed "ΜΙΚΡΟΚΟΣΜΙ-ΚΟΝ." The triad *intellectus*, *sapientia*, and *memoria* is equated with heart (*kardia*), soul (*psykhe*), and discursive reasoning (*dianoia*). Cf. Matthew 22:37; Plato 2013, 509d–511e.

[53] Linköping, Stiftsbiblioteket, MS N 24, fol. 131^{r}. On the association of Sweden with Hyperborea, Nordström 1934, ch. 4.

in Sweden.[54] At the center of the complex, the Holy of Holies was represented by a tent, modeled on the Desert Tabernacle whose features and proportions had been dictated by God to Moses in the book of Exodus.[55] And within the tent, in place of the Ark of the Covenant (which had yet to exist according to his chronological reckoning), a throne inscribed with the Three Books (Scripture, Nature, and Human Conscience[56]), the Three Crowns, and an emblematic representation of the tripartite runic alphabet.[57] The noble primitivism of the complex as a whole expanded upon antiquarian deliberations on the origin of Christian architecture forwarded already in the Quattrocento, when humanists like Lorenzo Valla and Leon Battista Alberti contrasted the simple austerity of early Christian shrines with the excessive decadence of Renaissance cathedrals.[58] Here as elsewhere, Bureus' ultimate aim was to restore the tenets of the true faith to an international Christian community that had forgotten them, and in order to do so he was obliged to reproduce, or rememorialize, the monumental archetypes that underlay them. Luther, he believed, had posed critical questions rather than supplied definitive answers. Taken together, the *Horti*, the tent, and the throne embodied that answer in the form of a monumental setting, an accretion of cultural memory that existed somewhere in the blurry middle-region between the material and the conceptual. In the framework of secular history, the Swedes had the right to bear the arms of the Three Crowns through the criterion of priority. But in the far more important context of sacred history, the emblem stood as a divinely sanctioned standard in the ongoing war of religion doctrine, culminating a decade later in the Swedish intervention in the Thirty Years' War.

In 1630 Bureus was appointed head of the newly formed bureau of the Antiquary of the Realm (*antiquarius regni*), a state-funded research agency that would gradually evolve into the modern Swedish National Heritage Board (still called Riksantikvarieämbetet).[59] Among the initiatives he sought to introduce was a practical ordinance for the conservation and restoration of antiquities. Already in 1602 he had discussed with Duke Charles measures to restore (*förnyia*) the all-important Stones of Mora, which had fallen into

[54] Ibid.: "Sådana nogh i Sverike." It should be pointed out that in the early seventeenth-century the adverbial *nog* meant "verily" or "truly."

[55] Bureus drew not only on the biblical account but on a long tradition of exegetical commentary stretching from Josephus and Philo of Alexandria to Pico della Mirandola and Juan Battista Villalpando. Cf. Linköping, Stiftsbiblioteket, MS Spr. 1, fols 22r–28r. Lindroth 1943, 201–204.

[56] Drawing on Khunrath 1609.

[57] Linköping, Stiftsbiblioteket, MS N 24, fol. 171^{v}; Norris 2016, 255–268.

[58] Grafton 2019, 21–22.

[59] Gödel 1930, 11–31; Schück 1932–1944, I:120–145; H. Hildebrand 1910, 127 ff.

disrepair, and in 1631 he and his assistants petitioned the court for a royal decree that would compel landowners to treat monuments as the property of the state.[60] But Bureus lacked the administrative acumen and practical focus to see the majority of his projects through to completion, and upon his death in 1652 he left to posterity a pile of unpublished manuscripts and a collection of loose threads.

These omissions would be remedied a decade later with the rise to prominence of the focused and determined Johan Hadorph, who became the driving force behind the enactment of early legislation for the conservation of antiquities (*Placat och påbudh, om gamble monumenter och antiquiteter*, 1666), the commencement of a comprehensive inventory of domestic cultural heritage (*Rannsakningar efter antikviteter*, 1666–1693), and the inauguration of the Collegium Antiquitatum (1667), a state-funded research institute charged with processing, documenting, synthesizing, and disseminating the information attained through the inventory.[61] Hadorph's motive for these interventions could not be clearer: Because monuments (a broad category that included written texts as well as orally transmitted myths, beliefs, and traditions) were the bearers of cultural memory, their conservation was crucial to fending off the cultural amnesia that was the product of time and human neglect. No one defined the antiquarian project as a battle against oblivion more decidedly than Hadorph, who tended to use the word *påminnelse* (reminder) to signify what we would term historical evidence. While memory recorded in even the truest of written histories could be called into doubt, memory embodied in physical monuments was unassailable given its ability to bridge the distance between image and icon.[62]

On the question of the antiquity of the Three Crowns, he held that the emblem had its origin in the distant past with the cultic worship of Thor, Odin, and Freyr, noting on one occasion that he had discovered an engraving of the emblem on a pagan rune stone in the village of Säby.[63] But he was above all

[60] Norris 2016, 368–369.

[61] Schück 1933.

[62] See for example Hadorph's letter to Magnus Gabriel de la Gardie, 9 March 1666, qtd. in Leijonhufvud 1910, 146, where he frets that if conservational measures are not taken posterity will "få orsaak till att hålla dhe sanneste wåre historier för osanning, när dhe see ett och annat uthi slijke saker, som förfäderne så mycket omtaldt hafwa, nu inge vestigia meer quarlempna."

[63] Hadorph 1678, 324; cf. Peringskiöld 1710, 306: "Åfwan på wårt Monument, hwarest i stenen är af naturan såsom en Altarefoot eller afsätning / finnes tre hielmar i rad med try kors uthhuggne / hwilke på thetta sättet ritade / äfwen wäl kallas Aegis Hielmar / hwarigenom betecknas the tre krönta Afgudars minne. Thetta wisar Stenen wara i hedendomen uprättad / och dess ålder til efwentyrs wara ifrån konung Ödmundz / then elliest så kallade Bröt-Omunds tid / i den siette hundra åhrige tiden efter Christi födelse / då en dehl här i landet under högbemälte Ödmundz Fader konung Ingvar, woro Christne / men en tid ther efter åter

interested in extending the documentary chain of icons backwards from the thirteenth century through the study of medieval coins, seals, and (his own specialty) memorial stones. It proved to be no simple task. According to a reliable sixteenth-century eyewitness — the historian, genealogist, and royal secretary Rasmus Ludvigsson — the ledger stone over the grave of King Sverker the Elder (d. 1156) at Alvastra Abbey Church had been engraved with the emblem, "but now," Hadorph sighed, "ever since the church was ravaged by fire, its fractured remains are missing" (*men nu sedan kyrkian är affbränd / aldeles sönderslagen och borta*).[64] He had given more extensive vent to his frustration in an earlier "Brief Report Concerning the Discovery and Conservation of Antiquities in the Kingdom" (*kort Upsatt om Antiquiteternes uppfinnande och conservation i Rijket*) appended to a letter to Magnus Gabriel de la Gardie (25 September 1666), where he noted that a great number of royal tombs and funereal monuments had been

> squandered and destroyed, as has occurred in Alvastra, Varnhem, and other places, so that not even the scantest trace is to be found of the kings, queens, and royal families who lie buried there, but through the violent decimation and unchristian pillaging carried out by the locals all [of these monuments] have been so completely obliterated that if the Histories did not inform us of the names of those who lay buried there, no one today would have knowledge of their resting places. And so every respectable Swedish man bears a great displeasure and empathy for the fate of those Swedish kings who, […] not receiving the same compassion from posterity that they demonstrated through the many solicitudes they performed in the service of the fatherland, were unable to rest in peace and have their gravestones and burial places remain unmolested.[65]

afföllo /som wi tilförene pag. 253 antecknat hafwa." The stone in question (U 951) had been erected by Christians, and the image Hadorph referred to appears to have been intended to depict the steeples of contemporary churches.

[64] Hadorph 1678, 322.

[65] Qtd. in Leijonhufvud 1910, 145–146: "[…] förkompne och ruinerade, såsom i Alwastra, Warnheem och flerstädes skedt ähr, hwarest icke dhet ringeste tekn finnes till dhe Rijksens konungar, konunga Barn och drottningar som dher begrafne liggia, uthan alt sammans igenom dhe närboendes wåldhsamme niderbrytande och ochristelige afförande så förstördt att hwar Historierne icke underwiste oss om dheras nampn, som dher begrafne liggia, skulle dheras grafplatzer ingen i denna dag kunnig vara, dher till hwar redelig swensk man bär ett stort misshag och medymkan öfwer dhe swenske konungar, som fordom wid Landh och Rijke sutit hafwa, sådanne kloster och klosterkyrkior till Guds ära, sina åminnelse och Lägerstellen upbygdt och uthwaldt, men icke nutit den barmhertigheet af sine efterkommande att dhe hade för alla sine welgerningar emoot fäderneslandet fått liggia i fredh och niuta sine grafstenar och lägerstellen omolesterade."

Fortunately, Hadorph could report that other early royal memorials had enjoyed a more agreeable fate, managing to survive destruction by the skin of their teeth. At times his progress reports were marked by a gleeful optimism, whenever the diligent fieldwork of the antiquaries and the early fruition of the inventory project appeared to promise auspicious results: "Many antiquities that have not been observed formerly still exist. […] In Skara, Varnhem, and other places we have discovered numerous *monumenta sepulchralia* which Messenius does not make note of in his *Tumbae*, instead complaining that none exist."[66] Indeed, he was happy to report that the gravestones of Inge the Younger (r. 1118–1125) and Ragnvald Knaphövde (r. ca 1130) in the abbey church at Vreta had managed to escape destruction, to which he added a curious caveat: "Though it is likely that their stones were engraved some time after their deaths, it nevertheless occurred in old monkish times, long before the dispute with Denmark concerning the provenance of the Three Crowns."[67]

Here Hadorph's prevarication was warranted, albeit grossly misdirected. Stylistically the royal memorials bore nothing in common with twelfth-century memorial monuments inscribed with Latin epitaphs known to Hadorph, such as the mid-twelfth-century grave marker for the brother of Saint Botvid in Botkyrka Church. The gothic miniscule used for the inscription was adopted from late medieval codices rather than early Christian epigraphy, clearly the work of an individual more at home with manuscripts than monuments. And there was no need to dig deep in search of a cause for these discrepancies. Indeed, the aforementioned Rasmus Ludvigsson — playfully characterized by his contemporaries as a muddleheaded genius, "Sapientia in confusione" — had designed the ledger stones in 1580 as part of an extensive renovation project carried out by King Johan III.[68] The project, which had been carefully documented in the state archives, was well known to the antiquaries of the seventeenth century. Johannes Messenius reported that the inscriptions in the church had been "a serenissimo rege Iohanne III perbelle paucos ante annos renovatis" (very handsomely restored by that most serene king Johan III not many years ago), which — depending on how one interpreted the action signified by *renovatis* — suggested that the inscriptions had perhaps been copies of then existing originals.[69] While this may have been true for some of the later non-royal inscriptions, it certainly

[66] Hadorph, letter to Magnus Gabriel de la Gardie, 17 December 1669, qtd. In Leijonhufvud 1910, 145, n. 1: "Fast många Antiquiteter finnas ännu, som förr aldrig observerade ähro. […] wij uthi Schara, Warnhem och flerestädes funnit åthskillige Monumenta Sepulchralia, som Messenius i sina Tumbis intet omrörer, uthan beklagar att på dhe rum inga finnas."

[67] Hadorph 1678, p. 322.

[68] On the renovation project, Martin Berntson, "Vreta kloster och reformationen," in Göran Tagesson et al. ed., *Fokus Vreta kloster* (2010), pp. 375–379.

[69] Messenius 1611, 34.

was not in the case of the royal epitaphs, which were selected from a number of suggestions devised in Ludvigsson's own hand and executed by the stone-cutter Hans Edler the same year, a fact Hadorph could have discovered in the same set of documents from which he had learned of the lost Alvastra inscriptions.[70]

Hadorph was not only a passive participant in this process, allowing himself to taken in by the pseudo-antiquities fabricated by his predecessors, but could also play an active role in the production of anachronistic artifacts. In 1666, as we have seen, Hadorph lamented that the medieval burial monuments in the abbey church at Varnhem had been willfully pillaged by the local population to the extent that not even the "scantest trace" (*icke dhen ringeste tekn*) remained. Three years later he could report that "monumenta sepulchralia" were still to be found in the church, despite the false reports of earlier antiquaries. And in a later letter to Johannes Schefferus, published in the latter's *De antiquis verisque regni Sueciae insignibus* (1678),[71] he specified that these were the ledger stones of the kings Inge the Elder (d. ca 1110),[72] Knut Eriksson (r. 1167–1195/96), and Erik Knutsson (r. 1208–1216), all of which — as luck would have it — were inscribed with the all-important emblem of the Three Crowns.[73] Comparing these reports leads one to assume that Hadorph managed to discover medieval ledger stones during an investigation of the church at some point between 1666 and 1678. But this was not the case, at least not exactly. In this instance, Ludvigsson's reproduction of the burial monuments in Vreta functioned both as an invisible window onto the past, and a concrete and conspicuous exemplar worthy of emulation.

Lord High Chancellor Magnus Gabriel de la Gardie, for decades Hadorph's most devoted sponsor, had received Varnhem Abbey as a donation from Queen Christina in 1647. From the beginning it was his desire to restore the abbey church to its former glory, which took shape as a comprehensive, long-term renovation project that after a number of false starts was set fully in motion in 1668. As part of the project de la Gardie ordered that grave markers — including effigies and epitaphs — were to be erected honoring the medieval kings who were held to be buried there. This raised a problem. Not

[70] Curman and Lundberg 1935, 166–171; Toll 1922.

[71] It should be noted that while the title page of the book gives the date of publication as 1678, it was first published posthumously in late 1679 or early 1680. It is therefore uncertain whether Schefferus would have assented to the inclusion of Hadorph's letter. See Schück 1932–1944, III:276.

[72] Hadorph was following the information given in Johannes Magnus 1554, 584.

[73] Hadorph 1678, 322.

only did no such monuments exist in the church,[74] entailing that they could not be "restored" in the strict sense, but de la Gardie was himself unsure which kings were interred there. He addressed a letter to the Collegium asking for "a precise account (as far as can be extracted from the documents at hand and those who have knowledge of the times) concerning the foundation of the church in question and the lives and exploits of those old Swedish kings who lie buried there," adding that "I have at one time had some little knowledge of the subject, but nowhere near as thorough and precise as I expect to receive from you, dear sirs."[75] Within a short time the Collegium responded with a formal list — whose unusually elegant formatting and calligraphy give it the sheen of an official certificate of authorization — detailing the rulers who, according to domestic histories, archival documents, and tradition, had been buried in the church. Alongside the list, the Collegium attached a number of suggested designs for the royal monumental settings stylized in typical Baroque fashion. But soon after it was decided that the monuments should be carefully fashioned to appear as though they had been produced in the thirteenth century.[76]

Although the sources do not give a clear indication of who the instigator of this shift in direction was, Hadorph's hand is unmistakable. He had been hired by de la Gardie to serve as something of an expert consultant entrusted with overseeing the project, a task to which he applied himself with a fastidiousness best described as pathological. A Latin elegy composed by Schefferus to commemorate the church's renovation explained that the broken fragments of the burial chapels' arched vaults were meticulously sifted from the rubble one by one and re-pieced together during the construction.[77] Although we should read a degree of Baroque exaggeration into this account, it nevertheless gives a glimpse into the underlying mentality that governed the work. When it came to the missing ledger stones, however, Hadorph had to turn to different tactics. Indeed, we know that Hadorph knew how to date a medieval ledger stone because he knew how to make one when the need arose. He composed Swedish epitaphs for the walls of the chapels, and entrusted Schefferus with designing the Latin inscriptions and effigies "in a more antique fashion" (*antiquiori modo*) than the imaginative and anachronistic woodcuts found in Johannes Magnus' *Historia*.[78] By early 1671

[74] Raised empty burial vaults without lids appear to have been erected in the 1570s during an earlier restoration commissioned by John III. See Hahr 1905, 131.

[75] De la Gardie to the Collegium antiquitatum, 15 July 1668, in Schück, 1932–1944, III:453; Edenheim and Rosell, 1982, 79; Leijonhufvud, 1910, 144–145.

[76] For an overview of the restoration project, Edenheim and Rosell 1982, 71–108.

[77] In Leijonhufvud 1910, p. 143.

[78] Letter from Hadorph to Magnus Gabriel de la Gardie, 18 October 1669, in Leijonhufvud 1910, 149.

the designs for the stones were finished, and Hadorph turned his attention to their physical forms, specifying the type of stone to be quarried and the precise dimensions in which the slabs were to be cut, noting that they should be finished "in the ancient manner" (*antiquo more*).[79] He was worried that the engravers would be unable to scale up the gothic majuscule script Schefferus had designed for the inscriptions accurately, and instructed the Collegium's artist to produce a full scale copy that could be used as a template. The monuments were completed and placed in the royal chapels no later than 1674.

There is a temptation to conclude that Hadorph's judgements were the products of ignorance or waged in bad faith. Clearly his own warmhearted patriotism and *horror vacui* converged to allow him to see what he wanted to see, or indeed make what he wanted to see, which in the more extreme instances appears to have crossed the boundary separating self-delusion and conscious deception. According to Sigrid Leijonhufvud, who identified Hadorph as the agent responsible for the decision to style the Varnhem stones as antiques: "Hadorph's eagerness to sweep all traces of his ancestors' vandalism under the rug makes him suspect of having offered such a suggestion with the conscious intention to deceive posterity."[80] Yet in neither of the two instances does deception appear to have been a reasonable motive. Not only did Hadorph *know* that the Vreta ledger stones were not particularly old, he knew that others knew as well, including those like Messenius who had written on the topic. And yet he nevertheless *believed* that they were medieval. In the case of the Varnhem stones, he did not act in secrecy, but rather directed a large team of scholars, copyists, artists, architects, stone masons, and engravers to see the work through to completion, all of it carefully documented through detailed progress reports and itemized accounts.[81] Indeed, upon completion of the project, a series of memorial plaques were installed in the church detailing the structure's history, where it was stated in plain terms that by the time work had begun in 1668 all the royal choirs had collapsed and fallen into ruin.[82] The readers of Hadorph's account in Schefferus' *De insignibus* knew that the ledger stones were new, and yet it was believed that these same readers would perceive them as old. Indeed, at some point between 1674 and 1678 the already thin line between restoration and reproduction became blurred, and Hadorph himself appears to have viewed his own creations as genuine antiques.

[79] Letter from Hadorph to Magnus Gabriel de la Gardie, 10 February 1671, in Leijonhuvud 1910, 159–160.

[80] Leijonhufvud 1910, 148.

[81] Edenheim and Rosell 1982, 243–244.

[82] Johan Peringskiöld, *Monumenta Sveo-Gothorum*, vol. 9, Stockholm, Kungliga biblioteket, MS F. h. 9, fols 245v–246r.

The paradox that presents itself here is likely all too familiar to anyone who has spent time studying early modern antiquarianism, and in a fascinating series of books and articles Christopher Wood and Alexander Nagel have offered a compelling solution.[83] They argue that the well-known material turn in early modern scholarship not only gave rise to a new culture of criticism in which things were allowed to challenge the received testimony of texts and traditions, but at the same time, established an intellectual space in which the *factuality* or *historicity* of things emerged first within a framework of meaning regulated by written history, myth, tradition, and belief. Old objects did not, or at least *not only*, stand as barriers to the imagination; just as often they spurred creative and fanciful ways of thinking about the relation between things and time. Antiquarian credulity can in many cases be viewed as the effect of a complex state of mind in which

> all artifacts — not just statues but also chairs, panel paintings and even churches — were understood […] to have a double historicity: one might *know* that they were fabricated in the present or the recent past but at the same time value them and use them *as if* they were very old things. This was not a matter of self-delusion or indolence but a function of an entire way of thinking about the historicity of artifacts repeatedly misunderstood by the modern discipline of art history.[84]

The ledger stones in Vreta and Varnhem functioned as legitimate substitutes for missing originals that were known to have been real. They served to redress the accidental absence of their prototypes. Hadorph was able to look through the contingent features of their recent production in order to see the missing originals of which they stood in lieu. Their referential meaning merged with what was taken to be their true meaning. Through this act of suspension the boundary between reproduction and original was dissolved, and the retroactively fabricated monuments became, for all intents and purposes, authentic antiquities. Antiquarian scholarship, as Wood notes, "often drifted into a disorienting middle ground where the fabricated supplements to fact could cycle back and become corroborating testimony to their own reality."[85] Anachronism was a way of engaging with the past.

Importantly, the empirical perspective never fell by the wayside. Theories of Swedish antiquity were extrapolated from surviving monuments, and yet the same theories folded back onto and predetermined the monumental landscape in a circular movement with no clear point of origin. It is typical that Olof Rudbeck could devote an early chapter of the *Atlantica* to

[83] See above all, Nagel and Wood, 2010; Nagel 2011; Wood 2008.
[84] Nagel and Wood 2005, 405.
[85] Wood, 2012, 152.

establishing a testable scientific method for the accurate dating of excavated artifacts, and several chapters later cite the evidence of an ancient wooden escutcheon inscribed with the Three Crowns alongside a serendipitous runic gloss, an "antiquity" that had either never existed or been manufactured for the occasion.[86] Here as elsewhere, the difference was not the moral discrepancy between good and bad faith, but an outcome of the adaptability and variability of epistemological approaches and practices that characterized the antiquarian encounter with things. Hadorph's acceptance of the authenticity of the Vreta stones, together with his admission of their anachronistic form, demonstrates that although the friction between the contingent and non-contingent features of the object had become more pronounced in the second half of the seventeenth century, he was still able to understand them "as belonging to more than one historical moment simultaneously."[87]

Strategies of conservation, moreover, were not aimed merely at securing monuments from damage and destruction, but at allowing them to realize their proper mnemonic function. Just as practitioners of the *ars memoriae* sought to preserve individual memory through the mental fabrication of images (*imagines*) situated in places (*loci*), antiquaries sought to conserve cultural memory through the systematized arrangement of artifacts in collections, whether physically in the form of cabinets, museums, and archives, or virtually in the form of sylloges, inventories, and albums. The collection served as the catalogue raisonné of a people, registering the achievements that had managed to elude oblivion, and revealing through their conspicuous absence those that had not. Swedish antiquaries sought to provide a functional blueprint of the memory palace of domestic antiquity through the inductive processes of collection and documentation. And the expertise they acquired along the way gave them sanction to furnish the empty rooms and corridors by means of deductive intervention.

In a number of important ways, Hadorph's scholarship represented a break from that of Bureus. The metaphysical and mystical underpinnings of Bureus' project to recover a lost Swedish proto-Christianity appear to have been entirely alien to his successor. Yet in some respects Hadorph went even further. Bureus, it should be stressed, never presented his pseudo-antiquities as anything other than conceptual reconstructions. Indeed, he tended to sign them, allowing his authorship to animate the interplay between past and present that was the overarching point of his scholarly enterprise. That they existed solely as ideas did not make them any less *real* than the authentic runic inscriptions he spent his life documenting. The far more down-to-earth

[86] Rudbeck 1679, ch. 6 and p. 732.
[87] Nagel and Wood 2005, 407.

Hadorph, who liked to style himself a "Materialist" (in a non-philosophical sense), envisioned cultural memory as a vast archaeological treasury in which things could speak for themselves, even if things sometimes required a helping hand to speak correctly, or indeed at all. The Swedish past was filled with memories that had been dislodged, unfairly, from their monumental envoys through the destructive forces of time and human neglect. Conservation and restoration were procedures used to manage icons of memory that had come down to the present either in whole or in part. Reproduction was a complementary strategy used to rectify the clefts and intervals that inevitably followed in the wake of autopsy. Significantly, the examples cited in this article were far from isolated. Viewed from the perspective of modern historiography, much of the evidence supporting the antiquity of the Three Crowns forwarded by Swedish antiquaries in the seventeenth century can be described as the anachronistic products of heated imaginations, externalizations of the hopes and dreams of individuals eager to secure the identity of the present on the foundations of the past. This suffices to make "monuments" like the Hidden Gardens and the Varnhem memorials historically important. Yet just as important, if exceedingly more difficult, is to remember that for a time they possessed a realness, authenticity, and solidity that the same perspective of modern historiography has compelled us to forget.

Bibliography

Almquist, Johan Axel (ed.) 1913, *Konung Gustaf den förstes registratur*, vol. 27, Stockholm.

Alsted, Johann Heinrich 1612, *Philosophia digne restituta*, Herborn.

Augustine 2002, *On the Trinity*, ed.: Gareth B. Matthews, trans.: Stephen McKenna, Cambridge.

Bartholdy, Nils G. 1997, "De tre kroner og korset: Unionssymbolik, ambition og rivalitet", *Heraldisk Tidsskrift* 76, 233–260.

Berntson, Martin 2010, "Vreta kloster och reformationen", *Fokus Vreta kloster: 17 nya rön om Sveriges äldsta kloster*, eds.: Göran Tagesson et al., Stockholm, 369–383.

Blair, Anne 2000, "Mosaic Physics and the Search for a Pious Natural Philosophy in the Late Renaissance", *Isis* 91:1, 32–58.

Bureus 1883, "Anteckningar af Johannes Thomae Agrivillensis Bureus", ed.: Gustaf Edvard Klemming, *Samlaren* 4, 12–43, 71–126.

Catana, Leo 2005, *The Concept of Contraction in Giordano Bruno's Philosophy*, Aldershot.

Clucas, Stephen 2015, "Memory in the Renaissance and Early Modern Period", *Memory: A History*, ed.: Dmitri Nikulin, Oxford & New York, 131–175.

Corrias, Anna 2012, "Imagination and Memory in Marsilio Ficino's Theory of the Vehicles of the Soul", *The International Journal of the Platonic Tradition* 6, 81–114.

Curman, Sigurd & Erik Lundberg 1935, *Vreta klosters kyrka*, Stockholm (*Sveriges kyrkor: Konsthistoriskt inventarium* 2).

Dorn, Gerhard 1581, *Congeries Paracelsicae chemiae de transmutationibus metallorum*, Frankfurt.

Edenheim, Ralph & Ingrid Rosell 1982, *Varnhems klosterkyrka*, Stockholm (*Sveriges kyrkor: Konsthistoriskt inventarium* 190).

Erik XIV 1828, "Responsum contra Danos", *Handlingar rörande Skandinaviens historia*, vol. 14 [cont. from vol. 13], Stockholm.

Eusebius 1926, *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 1, trans.: Kirsopp Lake, Cambridge, MA (*Loeb Classical Library* 153).

Ficino, Marsilio 1576, "Argumentum Marsilii Ficini Florentini, in librum Mercurii Trismegisti, ad Cosmum Medicem, patriae patrem", *Opera Omnia*, Basel, 1836.

Ficino, Marsilio 1944, *Marsilio Ficino's Commentary on Plato's Symposium*, ed.: Sears Reynolds Jayne, Columbia, MO.

Ficino, Marsilio 2014, *Platonic Theology*, vol. 4, ed.: James Hankins, tr.: Michael J. B. Allen, Cambridge, MA.

Galatino, Pietro 1550, *Opus de arcanis catholicae veritatis*, Basel.

Gillingstam, Hans 1995–1997, "Rasmus Ludvigsson", *Svenskt biografiskt lexikon*, vol. 29, 700.

Grafton, Anthony 2019, "Past Belief: The Fall and Rise of Ecclesiastical History in Early Modern Europe", *Formations of Belief: Historical Approaches to Religion and the Secular*, eds.: Philip Nord, Katja Guenther, & Max Weiss, Princeton, 13–40.

Gödel, Vilhelm 1930, *Riksantikvarieämbetet*, Stockholm (*Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademiens handlingar* 41:1).

Hadorph, Johan 1678, "Påminnelser om de 3. Cronor", Schefferus 1678, 308–325.

Hahr, August 1905, *Konst och konstnärer vid Magnus Gabriel de la Gardies hof*, Uppsala.

Hankins, James 2005, "Marsilio Ficino on *Reminiscentia* and the Transmigration of Souls", *Rinascimento* 45, 3–17.

Hendrix, John 2004, *Platonic Architectonics: Platonic Philosophies and the Visual Arts*, New York.

Hildebrand, Hans 1888, "Heraldiska studier I: Det svenska riksvapnet", *Antiqvarisk tidskrift för Sverige* 7:1, 1–98.

Hildebrand, Hans 1910, "Minne af riksantikvarien Johannes Bureus", *Svenska Akademiens Handlingar* 23, 57–435.

Hildebrand, Karl 1898, *Johan III och Europas katolska makter 1568–1580*, Uppsala.

Håkansson, Håkan 2014, *Vid tidens ände: Om stormaktstidens vidunderliga drömvärld och en profet vid dess yttersta rand*, Gothenburg & Stockholm.

Isidore of Seville 2016, *The "Etymologies" of Isidore of Seville*, trs.: Stephen A. Barney, W. J. Lewis, J. A. Beach, & Oliver Berghof, Cambridge.

Jensen, Ola W. 2014, "*Antiqua serva*: Några brottstycken ur den tidiga minnesvårdens rättskultur", *Med hjärta och hjärna: En vänbok till professor Elisabeth Arwill-Nordbladh*, eds.: Henrik Alexandersson, Alexander Andreeff, & Annika Bünz, Gothenburg (*GOTARC Series A. Gothenburg Archaeological Studies* 5), 127–144.

Johannes Magnus 1554, *Historia de omnibus Gothorum Sueonumque regibus*, Rome.

Justin Martyr [pseud.] 1870, *Hortatory to the Greeks*, tr.: Marcus Dods, *Ante-Nicene Christian Library: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325*, vol. 2, eds.: Alexander Roberts & James Donaldson, Edinburgh.

Khunrath, Heinrich 1609, *Amphitheatrum sapientiae aeternae*, Hanau.

Landberg, Georg 1925, *De nordiska rikena under Brömsebroförbundet*, Uppsala.

Leijonhufvud, Sigrid 1910, "Kungastenarna i Varnhem", *Fornvännen* 5, 138–165.

Lindroth, Sten 1943, *Paracelsismen i Sverige till 1600-talets mitt*, Uppsala & Stockholm.

Messenius, Johannes 1611, *Tumbae veterum ac nuperorum apud Sveones Gothosque regum, reginarum, ducum, aliorumque heroum et heroidum*, Stockholm.

Messenius, Johannes 1612, *Specula, ex qua inclytam Svecorum et Gothorum conditionem, manifesto atq; prolixo contemplari licet quaquaversum prospectu*, Stockholm.

Morrison, Tessa 2015, "Villalpando's Sacred Architecture in the Light of Isaac Newton's Commentary", *Architecture and Mathematics from Antiquity to the Future*, vol. 2, eds.: Kim Williams & Michael Ostwald, Basel, 183–196.

Nagel, Alexander 2011, *The Controversy of Renaissance Art*, Chicago.

Nagel, Alexander & Christopher Wood 2005, "Interventions: Toward a New Model of Renaissance Anachronism", *The Art Bulletin* 87:3, 403–415.

Nagel, Alexander & Christopher Wood 2010, *Anachronic Renaissance*, New York.

Nikulin, Dmitri 2015, "Memory in Ancient Philosophy", *Memory: A History*, ed.: Dmitri Nikulin, Oxford & New York, 35–84.

Nordström, Johan 1934, *De yverbornes ö: sextonhundratalsstudier*, Stockholm.

Norris, Matthew 2016, *A Pilgrimage to the Past: Johannes Bureus and the Rise of Swedish Antiquarian Scholarship, 1600–1650* (*Ugglan, Lund Studies in the History of Ideas and Sciences, Minerva Series* 19), Lund.

Norris, Matthew 2020, "The Cross before Christ: Ecclesiastical History and Esotericism in the Antiquarian Scholarship of Johannes Bureus", *Faith and Knowledge in Late Medieval and Early Modern Scandinavia*, eds.: Karolina Kjesrud & Mikael Males, Turnhout, 243–267.

Olaus Magnus 1555, *Historia de gentibus septentrionalibus*, Rome.

Pico della Mirandola, Giovanni 1506, *Omnia Opera*, Reggio Emilia.

Plato 2013, *Republic*, vol. 2, eds. and trs.: Christopher Emlyn-Jones & William Preddy (*Loeb Classical Library* 276), Cambridge, MA.

Plotinus 1956, *The Enneads*, tr.: Stephen MacKenna, rev.: B.S. Page, London.

Rudbeck, Olof 1679, *Atland eller Manheim*, vol. 1, Uppsala.

Schefferus, Johannes 1678, *De antiquis verisque regni Sveciae insignibus*, Stockholm.

Schmidt-Biggeman, Wilhelm 2004, *Philosophia Perennis: Historical Outlines of Western Spirituality in Ancient, Medieval, and Early Modern Thought*, Dordrecht.

Schück, Henrik 1932–1944, *Kgl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademien: Dess förhistoria och historia*, 8 vols, Uppsala.

Schück, Henrik 1933, *Johan Hadorph: Minnesteckning*, Stockholm.

Skovgaard-Petersen, Karen 2009, "Political Polemics in Early Modern Scandinavia", *Negotiating Pasts in the Nordic Countries: Interdisciplinary Studies in History and Memory*, eds.: Anne Eriksen & Jón Viðar Sigurðsson, Lund, 79–88.

Toll, Hans 1922, *Kungagravarna i Vreta kloster*, Stockholm.

Varro, Marcus Terentius 1938, *On the Latin Language*, vol. 1, tr.: Roland G. Kent, Cambridge, MA (*Loeb Classical Library* 333).

Walker, Daniel Pickering 1972, *The Ancient Theology: Studies in Christian Platonism from the Fifteenth to the Eighteenth Century*, London.

Willers, Uno 1937, "Myntsamlande i samband med trekronorstvisten", *Nordisk numismatisk årsskrift*, 101–105.

Wood, Christopher 2008, *Forgery, Replica, Fiction: Temporalities of German Renaissance Art*, Chicago.

Wood, Christopher 2012, "The Credulity Problem", *Antiquarianism and Intellectual Life in Europe and China*, eds.: Peter N. Miller & François Louis, Ann Arbor.

Yates, Frances 2002, *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition*, Abingdon.