Introduction

Lucy R. Nicholas and William M. Barton

European Neo-Latin and its development

Given the marginal place of Latin today, it is difficult to imagine a world in which this language was a dominant force, as either a spoken or a written phenomenon. In fact, within Western history it is the last two centuries that are anomalous; for Latin was viewed as a perfectly natural linguistic option, and often the most obvious medium, for a vast gamut of subjects, right through the medieval era and up to the end of the eighteenth century. Indeed, the period from 800 to 1800 CE has been referred to as Europe's 'Latin millennium'.[1] It is tempting to compare the status of Latin in that period with that which English now enjoys. A still better analogy is modern standard Arabic, which is rooted in the classical period, and so divorced from any spoken vernacular, but is used throughout the Arab world as the language of education and of formal speech and writing.

The term 'Neo-Latin' denotes the Latin employed during the second half of this Latin millennium, so from *c.* 1300 to *c.* 1800, and, more specifically, a use of this language that attempted to revive the 'real' Latin of the ancient world. The expression 'Neo-Latin' has its detractors: some prefer descriptions such as 'early modern Latin' or 'Renaissance Latin'. Of course, none of these labels were used at the time in which this kind of Latin flourished; they were coined at a much later stage.[2] Furthermore, any claim that writers of this period were resurrecting an 'authentic' Latinity is susceptible to challenge. Nevertheless, here the term 'Neo-Latin' shall be adopted throughout, as it at least has the advantage of signalling that early modern Latin was of a different order to the Latin of the Middle Ages that preceded it.

With the arrival of humanism in the period we know today as the Renaissance (*c.* 1350–1600), there was a resurgence in the production of Latin literature throughout Europe, and the Latin language was quickly recalibrated along strictly classical lines. This is not to suggest that medieval Latin should be viewed as an independent language without any relation to

the Latin of the Romans or indeed to Neo-Latin.[3] Many medieval orthographical and syntactical conventions find their way into Neo-Latin texts. Nor was the classicizing impetus of the Renaissance entirely new: the medieval period also witnessed attempts to reform Latin in accordance with classical and early Christian norms, during what is sometimes dubbed the Carolingian Renaissance (*c.* 750–815) and again in the twelfth century, above all in France and England. However, from the thirteenth century onwards, reverence for the classics increasingly yielded to other tendencies in the development of Latin: on the one hand, assimilation to the vernacular and, on the other, the growth of new, specialized vocabularies in the courts, chanceries and universities.

In reaction, the early humanists then attempted to overhaul what they perceived as the decayed status of the Latin language, which they held to reflect a wider decay in European culture. Aiming to base themselves exclusively on classical and patristic models, authors such as Petrarch, Giovanni Boccaccio and Gian Francesco Poggio Bracciolini – to name but three – sought to recreate the Latin of an ancient past, just as their contemporaries in the visual arts similarly pursued their craft in accordance with ancient models. In literature, Virgil and Cicero quickly emerged as the principal models for poetry and prose respectively.[4] In a cultural atmosphere now hypersensitive to questions of language and literary 'elegance', European authors spilt much ink over questions of appropriate vocabulary, grammar, syntax and style. Here Lorenzo Valla's zealously classicizing work, the *Elegantiae linguae Latinae* ('*The refinements of the Latin language*', composed *c.* 1449, first published 1471), emerged as one of the most important studies of the Latin language to date. The work continued to circulate long after its author's death in numerous edited and abridged versions.[5]

Valla's philological focus made him an important figure in the development of Latin style, and his approach spread to numerous areas of study.[6] But his strong opinions on the correct and tasteful use of Latin, as well as his ideas about the areas appropriate for philological enquiry, contributed to numerous quarrelsome exchanges with his contemporaries in Europe. In particular, Valla's mid-fifteenth-century clash with Poggio Bracciolini saw the nature of the humanist project as a whole come under dispute:[7] Valla's critical approach to the Latin language, and thereby its literature, placed even the works and style of ancient authors under the philological microscope. Moreover, he was prepared to subject ecclesiastical documents and Scripture to the same sort of critical investigation.[8] Poggio, on the other hand, felt that Valla's fierce philological criticism often went too far. He preferred to see Latin as a more flexible tool for the expression of literary ideas and insisted that the work of theology and of philology should remain separate.[9]

The reverberations of the contemporary debates over Latin language and style inspired by Valla and Poggio, among many others, could be felt all over Europe, and the ideals of the Neo-Latin project continued to gain ground. Responses to their discussions over style, imitation and the value of 'good' Latin were subsequently expressed in various literary guises. Among the most important interventions were those of Erasmus of Rotterdam. His *Ciceronianus* ('*The Ciceronian*', 1528), for example, staged a satirical dialogue over writers' slavish imitation of Cicero's language and promoted a more moderate, yet still largely 'classical' Latin style. The same author's *Colloquia familiaria* ('*Familiar Colloquies*', 1518) presented examples of suitable, cultivated conversation for training pupils' Latin skills. This collection's combination of pleasant style and characteristic humour made it an early modern bestseller. Again, on the satirical side, for example, the anonymous collection of letters from fictitious German scholastic writers, the *Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum* ('*Letters of Obscure Men*', 1515–19), sought to mock opponents of the humanist Johannes Reuchlin by giving their voices a distinctively out-of-date, that is to say non-humanist, style.[10]

The relative linguistic and stylistic cohesion of the Latin that emerged from this early debate was based, then, largely on ancient models, while rejecting scholastic forms and neologisms rooted in the vernacular. This Latin admitted, however, classicizing neologisms where necessary and allowed, in moderation, innovative syntactic arrangements according to taste. The resulting unity, which still provided room for individual authors to express themselves in a distinctive style, encouraged the steady, widespread adoption of Neo-Latin across Europe and beyond. The rapid dissemination of printing technology based on moveable type after its development in Germany and later arrival in Italy both aided and promoted this process immeasurably. As an early form of mass communication, printing made Latin books more easily accessible to a wider range of readers across the continent.[11] The subsequent advances in the book trade (for example, Aldus Manutius' easily portable classics in small octavo format) quickly transformed the humanist register of Latin into a standard. These developments established Neo-Latin as an international tool for diverse groups: ecclesiastics, merchants and soldiers, authors, diplomats and royalty across Europe were now able to communicate in Latin – though not always seamlessly![12]

The ensuing formation of a *res publica litterarum* ('Republic of Letters'), which emerged in the fifteenth and became cemented throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, served as an important means of establishing networks and a more consistent literary style.[13] Swiss polymath Conrad Gessner, for instance, maintained throughout his career lively exchanges with colleagues in France, Italy, Austria and Germany, on botany,

chorography, medicine and zoology. He was thereby able to collect the data necessary for his efforts towards encyclopedic knowledge. Well into the mid-eigheenth century, European intellectuals (especially natural scientists) still relied on Latin for their correspondence, between centres as far apart as Sweden and Sicily or Portugal and Hungary / Romania.

While Latin thus took precedence over vernacular languages in its role as a European lingua franca for the larger part of the early modern period, it was nonetheless instrumental in the establishment of linguistic study of Europe's national languages and of their own structural development. Andalusian scholar Elio Antonio de Nebrija, for example, published the first recognized grammar of a modern Romance language in 1492. His approach to Castilian in the *Gramática de la lengua castellana* ('*Grammar of the Castilian language*') drew almost exclusively on the philological apparatus of Latin grammar, as established among early humanists.[14] Indeed, European expansion saw the subsequent 'Latinization' of vernacular languages across the globe. This process meant that languages as far removed from Indo-European, let alone from Latin, as Innu (Montagnais) and Japanese, for example, were described according to Latin's grammatical structure.[15]

Latin's role as a stimulus for the development of European vernaculars through the production of grammars depended heavily on its position as the language of education.[16] Following the medieval tradition of grammar schools, Latin continued to operate as the main – ideally exclusive – language of instruction from the first school classroom all the way to the university lecture halls. Indeed, the fundamental place of linguistic skills within the first stage of the *artes liberales* ('liberal arts'), the *trivium* (grammar, logic and rhetoric), underlines the central role of Latin and language in Renaissance and early modern education: students were expected to master these three fields before moving on to the later stage of the *quadrivium* (arithmetic, geometry, music and astronomy). The three great university disciplines of law, medicine and theology were also largely taught in Latin. Moreover, the development of a new curriculum – the *studia humanitatis* ('humane studies') – on the back of the medieval *artes dictaminis* ('treatises on letter-writing') meant that good Latin and thorough knowledge of the Greek and Roman classics came to symbolize not only proper linguistic and intellectual training but the acme of moral and cultural polish.[17] The place of Latin as the primary tool and subject of this pedagogical system ensured the progress of a recognizable humanist style across Europe. Diplomats, tradesmen, businessmen and representatives of the church from all corners of the continent were exposed to this idiom as part of their basic and continued education.[18]

Once established, the uses, forms and areas of life for which this Latin register was required remained remarkably stable across the continent until

around the middle of the eighteenth century. Latin was employed in areas well beyond the realm of belles-lettres, in literary and non-literary productions, including in political, philosophical, religious, technical and more personal, everyday writing of all kinds. With the growth of writing in Europe's vernacular languages, the role of Latin dwindled slowly until the end of the nineteenth century.[19] Today, the use of Latin is limited to a small number of specific fields: alongside occasional verse, for example, Latin is still used in accordance with isolated academic traditions and for the formalized descriptions of plants within the field of botany. It also remains the official language of the Vatican: papal encyclicals, for instance, continue to be published in Latin, alongside their vernacular versions. Meanwhile, contemporary writing associated with a rise in interest in *Latinitas viva* ('living Latin') has contributed to the recent resurgence of new Latin titles.

Neo-Latin as a literary medium

Neo-Latin was central to the activities of the intellectual elite, but also to many of the significant contemporary cultural developments at all levels. It is not an overstatement to claim that the history of early modern Latin runs parallel to the history of the Western mind. Latin was a vital medium for articulating the period's religious upheaval, Europe's expansion through exploration, military conflicts and warfare, and the appearance of the 'new science' that set the path towards the eighteenth-century Enlightenment. Martin Luther's ninety-five theses of 1517 were, for instance, formulated in Latin, and, notwithstanding the valid association made between the Reformation and the rise of the vernacular, the ensuing controversy continued principally in Latin. Erasmus proposed his moderate approach to the Church's schism exclusively in Latin. John Calvin's systematic Protestant philosophy in his *Institutio Christianae Religionis* ('*Establishment of the Christian Religion*', 1536) was set down, too, first in Latin. The subsequent Catholic Counter-Reformation also found expression predominantly in Latin: the Jesuit order, for example, framed its influential programme of study, the *Ratio studiorum* ('*Plan of Studies*', 1599), which in turn relied heavily on a foundation of classical learning, in Latin.

Latin was likewise a key means to communicate news of pioneering discoveries. European powers, bent on expansion, commissioned expeditions in every direction and, for example, among the earliest reports of the European explorations that would eventually facilitate the Jesuits' missions across the world was Peter Martyr's Latin *De orbe novo decades* ('*Decades on the New World*', 1511–25; first printed together 1530). This collection of letters

and reports, on the back of Amerigo Vespucci's earlier Latin pamphlet *Mundus novus* ('*New World*', 1503), paved the way for an intensive Neo-Latin literary production on the theme 'New World' across Europe.[20]

The onset of the Thirty Years' War (1618–48) in central Europe was the beginning of one of the most destructive periods of European history. The Treaties of Westphalia, which sealed the peace after the conflict, were formulated in Latin (*Instrumentum Pacis Monasteriensis*, *Instrumentum Pacis Osnabrugensis*; '*Peace Treaty of Münster*' '*Peace Treaty of Osnabrück*', 1648). Throughout the tragic events that devastated large parts of central Europe, literary responses emerged across the continent. There was, from Sweden, for example, the epic *Adolphid* ('*On Adolphus*') (1629), written by French Huguenot Antoine Garissoles to the glory of the Swedish king, Gustavus Adolphus; from Germany, Cyricacus Lentulus' didactic poem *Europa* ('*Europe*') (1650) cast in poetical form an image of the continent in the wake of the war; while Petrus Lotichius' *Austria parva* ('*Little Austria*', 1653) presented a history of the war in the form of an encomium of Ferdinand IV, Archduke of Austria.

The European 'scientific revolution' was another widespread cultural event in which Latin played a crucial role. From the famed early foundational publications in Latin (e.g. Nicolaus Copernicus' *De revolutionibus orbium coelestium*; '*On the revolutions of the celestial orbs*', 1543), Latin remained the primary language of the natural philosophical project until well into the eighteenth century. Isaac Newton's 1687 *Philosophiae naturalis principia mathematica* ('*Mathematical principles of natural philosophy*') reached its international public through its author's choice of Latin, and Carl Linnaeus' *Species plantarum* ('*Species of plants*') changed the face of scientific botany in 1753.[21] Indeed, such was the prevalence of Latin in the fields of science and philosophy that important works published in vernaculars were quickly translated into the ancient language to ensure their international circulation. Galileo Galilei's controversial *Dialogo sopra i due massimi sistemi del mondo* ('*Dialogue on the two chief world systems*', 1632) was translated under the title *Systema Cosmicum* ('*World system*') for an international audience by 1635, and Newton's influential *Opticks* (1704) was translated into Latin by 1706.[22]

The Latin of the Renaissance and early modern period played a significant part in the major historical events of the age and participated fully in the associated cultural shifts and ruptures that formed the Europe that we know today.[23] The extent, variegated uses and wide appeal to contemporaries of literary and intellectual discourse in Latin can also be illustrated by the sheer number of works that continue to surface as interest in this literature grows and library catalogues are digitized. The number of German books only overtook those in Latin at the Frankfurter Buchmesse in 1681 – then as now the world's largest book fair – this gives some idea of the sheer size of Latin

literature's 'lost Atlantis'.[24] Likewise, the continued rediscovery of Neo-Latin publications of every sort, from poems on tea to intensive scholarly studies of Oriental poetry, underlines the amount still to be learned about the Latin of early modernity.[25]

Neo-Latin literature and its genres

Overview

The corpus of European Neo-Latin literature as treated in this anthology was produced over a period of about 350 years and is as vast as it is varied. One way to marshal such a voluminous body of material is through division into different types or classes of work. Most early modern works of Neo-Latin can, at least superficially, be assigned to a particular literary genre. Indeed, in recent Neo-Latin surveys, generic classification has been adopted as a useful organizing principle.[26] Modern scholarship has thus helped to delineate frameworks, while highlighting a need for the continued evaluation of genre as a concept and of the practices used within certain genres. As useful as such studies can be, their focus is often exclusively on the literary categories of poetry and belles-lettres. Yet, as suggested above, much, if not most Neo-Latin output belongs to less purely literary fields: science, theology, philosophy, law, administration, etc. While it is not possible to be comprehensive in the space permitted, this anthology intends to be representative of this true generic variety.

The genres covered in this volume have been determined either by content or form. They are: historiography, epistolography, satire, drama, dialogue, epic poetry, pastoral, love elegy and occasional verse, medicine, philosophy, theology, commentary and scholarship. These are not purely anachronistic designations imposed by modern scholars; the original authors would have recognized them. Genre was a major concern throughout early modernity, with early modern critics demonstrating a consistent interest in formal generic distinctions, not least because so many Neo-Latin writers looked back to the classical canon and were attentive to the generic forms established in antiquity.[27] However, before examining these genres in detail, a few caveats must be registered.

The first relates to the ancient canon. While this canon undoubtedly provided models and parameters that gave definition to the genres of the early modern period, Neo-Latin productions often transcend the generic confines of the classical tradition. Such developments were arguably *imitatio* on a grand scale, encompassing all the subversion, deviation and change that the longstanding practice of imitation entailed. Thus genre, even when based

on classical models, was far from a static entity; early modern genres evolved and bifurcated, while new ones flourished as the world changed. The Reformation, the growth of the universities, advances in science and the ensuant new perceptions of the world and the universe, new ideologies and pan-European upheavals had a direct impact on modes of Latin expression. Regional developments could also influence shifts in generic structures, and the notion of a circumscribed European Neo-Latin genre *tout court* may be challenged by any number of local variations.[28]

Furthermore, as well as adhering to classical systems, Neo-Latin genres evolved in parallel, and sometimes in tension, with other more contemporary forms. These included a number of medieval genres. For example, hagiographical works and hymns are often also found composed in the humanist Latin idiom. Neo-Latin works likewise interacted with early modern works in the vernacular, to which Latin writers, who frequently wrote both in Latin and their native tongue, responded. On the face of it, generic groupings of vernacular writings tended to take the same shape as those in Neo-Latin. However, the substance of each could diverge radically. First, Latin was a far more natural linguistic channel for classical allusions and rhetorical forms. Secondly, assumptions about intended readership could result in quite different tones and approaches.[29]

Early modern genres also overlapped. While the genres of antiquity tended to be strictly separated (at least from a modern point of view), each genre having its own history, lexicon, main features, metre (in the case of verse) and principal representatives, for Neo-Latin texts the situation is less clear-cut. We may attribute a work to a specific genre, but the vast majority contain elements that defy such tidy taxonomy. Take, for example, Newton: this towering thinker was a scientist but also a biblical exegete, and his theological considerations were wholly bound up with his mathematical investigations. The history of Neo-Latin is peopled by creative thinkers who astonish our own world of specialism with their extraordinary command of several disciplines at once.[30] Neo-Latin literature was thus dynamic and constantly shifting in its aspirations, fields of reference and scope. Given the scale of research still to be undertaken on the Neo-Latin corpus, it seems certain that generic categories will be added to and refined as scholars examine them more closely, and that further permutations will emerge.

Genres covered in this volume

As for the genres featured in this volume, let us begin with those that may appear most familiar today. The first is historiography. The early modern period abounds with Neo-Latin works dealing with the history of peoples

and places from all over Europe, Asia and the New World, and there are a range of subdivisions, including chronicles, biography and numismatics. Many regard Leonardo Bruni's *Historiae Florentini Populi* ('*History of the Florentine People*'), written over the space of a quarter of a century between 1415/16 and 1442, as the first in a bountiful succession of humanist histories, many very large in scale.[31] These emerged at the same time as systematic manuals on the *ars historica*, which prescribed the requisites of the historian's art: these generally centred on veracity and rhetorical elegance. However, even though the term *historia* was widely applied, all such productions tended to be a blend of several genres, incorporating elements of classical and medieval historiography, along with, for example, geography, panegyric and philology.[32] Pietro Bembo's monumental *History of Venice* of the early sixteenth century is a fine example of such variety (Text 4). Bembo composed this work in his capacity as Venice's official historian, a post awarded primarily on account of his Latin style,[33] and the work's stylistic underpinnings are immediately in evidence. His coverage of Christopher Columbus and his discoveries in the New World engaged with contemporary geographical, scientific and sociological interests.

Epistolography or letter writing is another genre that sits at the heart of the Neo-Latin oeuvre and played a crucial role in the *res publica litterarum*. A fashionable activity in antiquity, literary epistolography was also given fresh impetus in the Renaissance when in 1345 Petrarch discovered a manuscript containing a large number of Cicero's letters.[34] The letter form, as it had developed through the medieval *ars dictaminis* ('the art of writing letters'), had, in the early modern mind, a close correspondence to rhetoric, and there was a fine line between *oratio* and *epistola*.[35] Letters composed in Latin tended to have a literary character and often constituted a form of self-fashioning, advertising as they could a person's intellectual calibre and capacity to operate on the international stage. Epistolary exchanges were often published and, even when they were not, were almost certainly composed with a notional public in mind. Correspondence can also offer an important window into wider historical developments. One of this anthology's entries presents letters exchanged between Cardinal St Robert Bellarmine and a Jesuit priest, Francisco Enzinas, writing to the cardinal in Rome from the Philippines, concerning the Catholic liturgy (Text 12). The letters are testimony both to the immense geographical distances such correspondence could cover and to the cohesion of Latin speech communities.

A second extract likewise contains the letter form, namely the *Epistulae Obscurorum Virorum* (*EOV*, Text 8). This entry similarly draws attention to features of the Neo-Latin Republic of Letters, but shows a very different goal from that of Bellarmine and Enzinas. These letters are in fact imaginary and

deeply satirical, rooted in a wider quarrel between university faculties and humanists about the advisability of Hebrew learning and about traditional academic approaches more generally. Satire was an established genre in antiquity and likewise flourished in the early modern period: some of the best-known of all Neo-Latin texts are Erasmus' *Encomium moriae* ('*Praise of folly*', 1511) and Thomas More's *Utopia* (first published in 1516). The *EOV* can be considered alongside these and a number of other satirical dialogues, novels and even joke books of the time.

Drama was another genre reanimated by Neo-Latin, and plays written in Neo-Latin flourished across Europe for centuries. There is evidence of thousands of plays from this period, both published and unpublished, of which the vast majority were written for performance in schools and universities. While the classical playwright Terence was widely read throughout the Middle Ages, the early modern dramatic scene was further enriched by the resurfacing of Plautus and Seneca and by the Greek plays which were increasingly being translated into Latin. All this stimulated intensive emulation and innovative adaptation on the early modern stage. Many plays, such as the one featured in Text 13, were written in the manner of a Senecan tragedy. This play, authored by Matthew Gwinne and composed in iambic trimeters, centres on the life of the emperor Nero and, in this excerpt, the deaths of Seneca and his wife Paulina. Yet even as it cleaves to the Senecan model, its very title *Nero: Tragaedia Nova* ('*Nero: A New Tragedy*') points to innovation. It is in effect a historical chronicle clothed in verse and concerns itself as much with the historical works of Tacitus and contemporary topical issues, such as the conduct of women, as it does with the revenge themes inherent in Senecan drama. Indeed, by far the most pressing aim of most early modern drama was pedagogy rather than entertainment. This emerges especially clearly in Text 19, which was written by a teacher and school librarian, Gottlob Krantz, in order to educate students at a school in Wrocław about the contents of their library. The dialogic structure of the play served to assist the inculcation of spoken Latin as well as contributing to the cultural and moral instruction of pupils.

Dialogue, though strictly speaking a form, may be considered a genre in its own right. There exist numerous examples of Neo-Latin dialogues throughout this period, which drew on the prose dialogues of Plato, Lucian and Cicero in particular, the colloquia of Late Antiquity (such as the *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana*) and even ancient stage comedies. A strong medieval culture of disputation probably helped sustain the form, however much humanists challenged the pedantry of much traditional dialectic. An overriding purpose of early modern Neo-Latin dialogues was to teach Latin conversation, while simultaneously inculcating an ethical code. The Latin

could be pitched at a simple or a more advanced level, and content could range from the quotidian to more important religious, cultural and social issues. The most famous proponent of the dialogue was Erasmus, whose *Colloquia* became a landmark text, repeatedly reprinted and imitated. Yet the typology 'dialogue' hardly does this multilayered work justice: as Text 3 shows, it incorporated both satirical and philosophical content.

Neo-Latin poetry was a widespread and diverse pan-European phenomenon. The sheer quantity of early modern Latin verse dwarfs what survives from antiquity and what was produced in the Middle Ages. Various genres proliferated, and, given the extent of uncharted territory in Neo-Latin verse, it is likely that certain genres still await identification. Still, many poetic genres of this period did deliberately and self-consciously model themselves on ancient forms and their corresponding metrical schemata. Only a handful of genres may be discussed here. The first one, epic poetry, appears in surprising guises in this anthology. Epic verse was one of the most prestigious genres in the ancient literary canon and continued to thrive through the Middle Ages. Neo-Latin epic poets duly observed elements from the Greek and Roman compositions at their disposal (Virgil's *Aeneid* often standing as the paradigm form), including their metre, heroic grandeur, combination of narrative and direct speech, similes and ecphrases. Yet these ancient tropes blended with modern concerns: subjects could be taken, for instance, from the Christian Bible, contemporary warfare, international exploration and conquest, and Jesuit missionary work. The selections in Texts 2 and 11 illustrate these developments. Jacopo Sannazaro's epic *De Partu Virginis* ('*On the delivery / offspring of the Virgin*') was a religiously motivated treatment of the birth of Christ and imbued Mary, the mother of God, with heroic status. Francesco Benci's *Quinque martyres e Societate Iesu in India* ('*The five martyrs from the Society of Jesus in India*') was the first in a series of Jesuit epics of martyrdom. Both poems are unmistakably Virgilian in style, but the didactic dimensions of Virgil's writing are redirected towards specific religious causes and the provision of holy moral exemplars.

Another work by Virgil, the *Eclogues*, along with its own Hellenistic predecessors, above all Theocritus' *Idylls*, was central to the formation of another genre, pastoral poetry. Medieval interpretations and reworking of this material along Christian lines continued well into the early modern period. For Christian Neo-Latin poets of the Renaissance and beyond the polyvocalism of Virgil's *Eclogues* afforded the possibility for radical and creative experimentation,[36] and key elements of pastoral, such as the humble style, use of allegory and satirical digressions were reconfigured afresh. Sannazaro, in addition to epic, also wrote pastoral poetry; indeed, his Italian-language masterwork *Arcadia*, which instantiated an idealized pastoral world

among the shepherd-poets, is one of the best-known vernacular manifestations of this genre. The *Adolescentia* ('*Youth*') of Battista Spagnoli Mantovano ('Mantuan') here illustrates the development of this genre in Latin (Text 1): from this collection of ten eclogues, selections from one of these convey how Neo-Latin pastoral could function not just as a display of Latin virtuosity, but also as an important moral and religious tool.

Elegy is another poetic category, though one rather differently understood in its Latin incarnations than in its English counterpart, which tends to be a lament. In classical as well as Neo-Latin elegy the genre was defined less by its occasion or substance than by its metre, namely the elegiac couplet. The range of subjects thought appropriate for treatment in this metre was vast and varied, and love elegy – the best known of classical elegiac forms – should be regarded as only one branch of a much broader landscape. Joachim Du Bellay's *Amores* ('*Love poems*', Text 10) have affinities with medieval erotic literature and vernacular love poetry. They also accommodate the devices, motifs and propensities of the amatory verse of Propertius, Tibullus and Ovid, including, most obviously, the construct of the elegiac *puella* ('girl' or 'beloved') but also the paraklausithyron ('lament by the closed door') and themes of enslavement and loss. Similarly in keeping with its pagan predecessors, these *Amores* draw attention to their own generic instability through frequent allusions to epic. But Du Bellay's experimentation extends yet further, for his poems also contain characteristics of the epigram which, despite metrical overlap with elegy, was generally considered to constitute a separate genre.

Another type of verse that burgeoned during the early modern period was what is often termed 'occasional' poetry, i.e. verse produced for a specific event. Such pieces sprang directly from a special set of social experiences, such as royal births, anniversaries or bereavements. Several established genres originated as occasional works, including epithalamia ('wedding songs') and victory odes. George Buchanan's epideictic poem marking the ceremonial visit to Bordeaux of Holy Roman Emperor Charles V in 1559 (Text 7) represents a type of such occasional poetry, one that also draws on the classical model of panegyric. The composition belongs to a larger collection of verse entitled *Silvae* ('*Forests*'). These look most immediately to the Roman poet Statius' *Silvae* as their model in terms of metre, length and topic, but are also informed by the fields of oratory and declamation.

Readers may be struck by the diversity of topics addressed in Neo-Latin poetry. There was seemingly no bar to the subject matter that could be treated in poetry. A huge diffusion of poems engaged with areas of science, for example, and many great scientists were also accomplished poets, such as the Danish astronomer Tycho Brahe.[37] Girolamo Fracastoro's poem in dactylic hexameter about syphilis (Text 5) is a prime example and constituted a

significant contribution to the medical exploration of epidemic disease, even as it sought to maximize the expressive and denotive potential of Latin. Classical models for scientific themes were not lacking, and early modern poets who penned poems about plague would naturally look to writers like Virgil and Lucretius as well as to the prose account of the Greek historian Thucydides.

Fracastoro's *Syphilis* therefore takes us into a variety of genres that we might loosely place under the umbrella of science. Yet, as scholars have observed, it is misleading to speak of 'science' per se in the period from 1400 to 1800.[38] Rather, an intensified interest in answering the questions left open by earlier traditions, matched with a growing readiness to interrogate these traditions' long-held truths, resulted in a succession of critical advances in the fields we now know as the sciences. Latin was crucial to the pursuit and promulgation of all such research, not least because of the technical precision Latin offered and its role as a lingua franca between natural philosophers across Europe. A keen interest in medicine, but also in topography, geography and natural philosophy, is clearly on display in the works of the Swiss writer Conrad Gessner. In *Descriptio Montis Fracti sive Montis Pilati, iuxta Lucernam in Helvetia* ('*A Description of the Fräckmünt or Mount Pilatus, near Lucerne in Switzerland*', Text 9) Gessner describes the mountain terrain of Mount Pilatus, surveying not just the effect of the mountain air on the body, but also the area's flora, fauna and quality of spring water. Such approaches would, in time, give rise to the natural sciences, while the encyclopedic tendencies exhibited in this work have much in common with the genre of scholarship.

The discipline of philosophy as established and entrenched in antiquity had obvious relevance for the development of all subsequent philosophical writing. There has been no philosopher in the Western tradition who was not in some way or another indebted to classical philosophical systems.[39] In the first instance, early modern philosophers were profoundly influenced by late medieval philosophy and the Aristotelian ideas and methodologies that had been introduced during that period. This notwithstanding, modes of philosophical enquiry underwent a series of radical transformations. Humanist translations of newly discovered Greek philosophical materials (chiefly Plato and the Neo-Platonists) had a profound effect on the practice of philosophical writing and the concepts that were now broached. Philosophers also inhabited a world in which Christianity dominated, so that questions on the nature of God and man's relationship with God were central to many contemporary philosophical tracts. This is exemplified in Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz's *Confessio philosophi* ('*The philosopher's confession*'), which interrogates the relationship between determinism and free will (Text 18). This counts as Leibniz's first substantial contribution to a lifelong interest in

theodicy. Greater levels of sensitivity concerning historicity and cultural relativism, in parallel with profound shifts in metaphysics and epistemology, likewise had an impact on philosophical practices. In particular, the work of René Descartes (who wrote in Latin as well as in French) marked a significant break from the Aristotelian tradition. The importance of Cartesianism may be witnessed in the *Principia philosophiae antiquissimae & recentissimae* ('*Principles of the most ancient and modern philosophy*') by Anne Conway, a text that conveys a deep concern with the notion of existence and the relationship between body and spirit (Text 15).

Descartes' influence would be felt in a wide range of disciplines, including mathematics and physics, whose most famous early modern proponent, Isaac Newton, is also featured in this volume (Text 17). Newton's *Philosophiae naturalis principia mathematica* ('*Mathematical principles of natural philosophy*'), the foundational work of modern physics, opened with a devastating critique of Descartes.[40] While the physical world was the ostensible focus of this work, the ground covered in the section extracted in this volume, the General Scholium, was distinctly theological in flavour. Newton's explicit reconciliation of the role of God within Nature and his explicitly anti-Cartesian stance entailed a holistic conception of the fields of natural philosophy and theology, an approach that was very much in line with his great predecessors, such as Nicolaus Copernicus and Johannes Kepler.

Theology itself had a central place in the intellectual life of Europe. From the New Testament onwards, Christians have sought to combine faith with reason, and specifically with the classical philosophical tradition, in order to better understand God's nature and message, and to define orthodoxy. In the high Middle Ages theology had developed into a highly formal and complex university discipline, requiring extensive training in formal logic and in the works of Aristotle.

With the onset of the Reformation and the birth of printing, theology remained a vital genre, but its proper scope and methods became subject to vigorous controversy. Traditional approaches, such as the framework of dialectic that had shaped theological debates throughout the medieval period, and especially the use of the technical, 'scholastic' Latin of the university theology faculties, came under serious challenge. The theological output of the early modern period expressed this reaction and was especially marked by a new emphasis on historical consciousness and the appropriation of classical topoi, style and rhetoric. Reformers like John Calvin produced theological treatises that combined doctrinal *gravitas* with Ciceronian flair. Martin Luther, too, as illustrated in the extracts from his work *De abroganda missa privata* ('*On the necessary removal of the private mass*') harvested principles of classical oratory so as to inject his polemics with greater elan and eloquence

(Text 6). The Reformation is often associated with the demise rather than the resurgence of Latin, but many of the most important of the works produced in the Catholic–Protestant reformation controversy were written in Latin. Reformers on both sides of the divide, especially Jesuits, continued to view Latin as the foremost language of theological discourse and to use it as such.

Of the final two genres represented in this volume, the first is the textual commentary. A spectacular number of Neo-Latin commentaries were produced between 1400 and 1700. Writers used the form to meditate on and investigate a huge spectrum of texts and topics, from ethnography to jurisprudence, zoology to diplomacy. Medieval scholars commented on classical and indeed medieval literary texts, but the bulk of their efforts was devoted to canonical texts, such as the Bible and Aristotle. With the arrival of the Renaissance, there was an unparalleled diffusion of commentaries on classical texts, for example. In this species of commentary, the late antique commentator on Virgil, Servius, became an important point of departure, and had a significant influence on textual interpretation and the reception of classical works and also on the creation of a canon. Commentaries became so popular that ancient texts were often primarily accessed through these intermediary forms, such as the monumental work on Virgil by Juan Luis de la Cerda (Text 14).

The function and significance of the commentary involved more than simply textual criticism. Rather, the commentary stood as a medium for collating and transmitting information. Commentaries therefore fall into the larger genre we term 'scholarship', which also proliferated during the early modern period and is a key marker of the advances in historical and scientific learning. In this genre, Jean Mabillon's pioneering *De re diplomatica* ('*On diplomatics*', Text 16) was an ambitious and far-reaching investigation into different types of medieval documents and manuscripts, including scrutiny of their scripts, style and relevant comparanda, and the confirmation of authentic documentation and the detection of forgeries. The book is now viewed as the foundational work of palaeography and diplomatics.

Aims and coverage of this volume

The field of Neo-Latin has been described as a 'lost continent'.[41] Given the sheer scale of the body of Latin literature composed between the fourteenth and eighteenth centuries across the globe, all we can hope to do in this volume is offer an aperitif to whet a reader's appetite for further study. This anthology presents fourteen genres from nine modern European nations. The regions represented are those that have tended to be associated with a

more traditional and conservative understanding of a western European bloc, but there is every reason that future Neo-Latin anthologies will place focus on the prolific Neo-Latin of, for example, eastern Europe, Scandinavia and Spain. To put our volume into some perspective – larger surveys of early modern Neo-Latin literature cover approximately thirty countries or regions and over a hundred genre-based divisions.[42]

Given this immense scale and variety, editorial decisions about what to include and what to leave out of this miscellany were difficult: there is no right way to select nineteen texts to represent 500 years of 'European' Latin. As the previous section sketched out, we chose generic division as, on balance, the most helpful organizational principle, and selected texts that seemed able to chart the core characteristics of the generic range. Such an approach has enabled us to widen the field of contributors, to include scholars from beyond the discipline of Classics and its hinterlands. We hope in turn to attract an interdisciplinary readership. We also feel that a selection by genre is preferable to one by 'nations', as it more accurately reflects the world of Neo-Latin and the nature of the Republic of Letters. While an overview of the Neo-Latin produced in a single geographical area, such as has been done in the anthology of British Neo-Latin literature in this same series, can helpfully chart a region's cultural and historical trends, categorizing according to national borders is contentious. It is not at all straightforward to speak of, say, Swiss Neo-Latin, whereas there certainly is such a phenomenon as theological Neo-Latin. Moreover, many of the authors featured in this volume, while they could in theory be assigned a single country of origin, spent much of their life elsewhere. Buchanan (Text 7), for example, though a Scot, was raised and educated in France and resided there for many years. Erasmus, a Dutchman by birth, was essentially an international scholar who travelled extensively, feted by courts across Europe for his humanist learning.

Division by genre also prompted us to offer space to less well-known authors as well as the more famous. While there can be no doubt that certain Neo-Latin figures were deeply influential in the standards they set, the textual blueprints they forged and their impact on the further development of genres, the very issue of 'familiarity' in modern times is a complex one. It is often the case that writers who were in their own time highly celebrated have fallen into relative obscurity precisely because fewer modern readers are able to access the works they wrote in Latin. On the other hand, a writer's lack of success in his/her own time does not necessarily imply a concomitant lack of historical or literary value. Furthermore, and perhaps surprisingly, the Latin writing of well-known authors does not always have a corresponding translation in English (parts of a treatise by Luther are translated for the first time in this anthology).

A further consideration for the editors was that of gender. Women's voices have tended to be rather muted in Neo-Latin digests, most immediately because the bulk of published texts was by men. Even so, as a spate of recent scholarship is powerfully demonstrating, there are numerous examples of women who knew Latin and were proficient in it.[43] A number of these were female royals or noble women who benefited from the privileged place of Latin at courts across Europe and who tended to be given the same instruction as their male counterparts. Queen Elizabeth I of England (1533–1603) was instructed in advanced Latin and Greek composition, as was Queen Christina of Sweden (1626–86). Nuns in convents often attained high levels of learning in Latin, and in the seventeenth century a number of women successfully secured entrance into academies and universities on the Continent.[44] Some women even had the unusual distinction of having their works in Latin published – for example, the English-Czech poet, Elizabeth Jane Weston.[45] This notwithstanding, the bilingualism of the early modern intellectual culture more often than not stood as a barrier rather than an opportunity for women. It is revealing that the one female author featured in this volume, Anne Conway (Text 15), wrote her *Principles of the most ancient and modern philosophy* in English (subsequently translated into Latin). While the potential for women to be versed in Latin may be inferred from another section of this anthology, namely the excerpt from Erasmus' *Colloquia* (Text 3), which benignly portrays a learned lady at the expense of a doltish abbot, this is a fictive female voice in a tract written by a man.

This volume also aims to provide a meaningful chronological snapshot. In this, we have decided to begin *c.* 1500, leaving out the first flowering of Neo-Latin in the Italian Renaissance. This implies no deprecation: rather, we consider that a wide selection of texts from that period is already more readily available, owing most notably to the vigorous Italian tradition of philological study of the Renaissance and to the wide range of translations into English provided by the *I Tatti Renaissance Library*. Still, our selections begin with two exuberant creations of Italian humanism, from the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. We then move through a medley of texts from the sixteenth and on to the philosophical trailblazing and the explosion in knowledge acquisition of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

The extracts also seek to convey a sense of the stylistic range of Neo-Latin. Many of the authors included in this volume adhered to a classically honed, rhetorically affective and elegant Latinity, often developed in self-conscious opposition to the drier Latin of the medieval schoolmen. The view that texts should both teach and delight had considerable currency. Bembo (Text 4), for example, cultivated an exquisite Ciceronian style in his work of history.[46] Stylistic trends were by no means static, and Cicero and Virgil were not

always the supreme guides; other stylistic ideals emerged, some cleaving to other ancient authors like Tacitus and even to contemporary ones such as Erasmus, the Flemish humanist Justus Lipsius or (in poetry) the Italian Giovanni Gioviano Pontano.[47] Nor can talk of literary models do full justice to the linguistic reality of Neo-Latin. In many cases, Latin style remained utilitarian. For example, it is clear from Bellarmine's letter (Text 12) that Latin could be used simply as a convenient and economic medium for conveying a message. Newton's Latin (Text 17), too, is noticeably workaday. Although many who operated in the field of science also prized a refined Latin style, scientific Latin appears to have often been a working language rather than one of display.[48]

Nevertheless, the majority of the texts included in this anthology were composed by humanists whose primary agenda was to emulate and, if possible, to surpass the ancient models that they held in such high esteem. The practice of *imitatio* was fundamental, and occurred at both the macro level, in terms of generic reproduction and general themes, and at the micro level, as evidenced by the frequent classical syntax, diction and allusions in so many texts in this volume. For readers, knowledge of this classical legacy is necessary and illuminating, certainly, but compendia of classical parallels without further consideration of the contemporary context where they are used is an arid exercise. The contributors to this volume have instead attempted to address the different ways in which early modern texts worked in dynamic dialogue with the classical tradition. Pagan terms of reference can look to modern eyes highly incongruous, especially when, for example, woven into the overtly Christian framework of so many early modern works. So, for instance, in Sannazaro's orthodox Catholic poem on the Virgin Mary (Text 2), God is calqued onto Jupiter and the angel Gabriel onto Mercury. Yet such phenomena must be understood in light of early modern humanists' total immersion in classical writing, internalized to the point of perfect fluency of recall and recombination.[49] The writers of this era felt a deep level of comfort with the pagan past they had recreated and imagined: beyond easy comparisons, this led as far as reformulation of the idea of civilization itself in terms of the ancient models.

Despite the humanist origins of the Neo-Latin register and its related literary interests, works written in Latin were not merely focused on a classical past and, in this sense, somehow backward-looking. As individual entries in this anthology highlight, the more immediate contexts and purposes of individual authors could be very determinative of form and content. Engagement with other literatures, including Scripture and patristics, along with other contemporary works both in Latin and the vernacular, could also be instrumental in shaping the contours of a text. Indeed, within Neo-Latin

research,[50] the nature of Latin's relationship with the rising vernacular languages is currently generating increased attention. While the focus of this volume is Neo-Latin, certain entries draw attention to the multidirectional exchanges possible between different linguistic repertoires – for example, as regards the translation into Latin of Anne Conway's philosophical tract (Text 15), the German counterpart of Luther's Neo-Latin *De abroganda missa privata* (Text 6) or the parody of vernacular-inflected Latin in the *EOV* (Text 8).

The texts can be read in the order presented. At the same time, they are all self-contained and may be studied selectively and individually. Each entry opens with an introduction, offering necessary background on the biography of the writer, the context of the work in question and important features of the selected passage. This is followed by the original Latin text accompanied by a modern English translation and attached commentary notes (keyed to line numbers for verse passages and to numerical references within the text in the case of prose texts). Beyond this standard structure, details vary between entries according to what is most appropriate for each author and text, and also what contributors, approaching these texts from different angles, have chosen to highlight. These differences of approach are integral to one of the overriding aims of this book, which is to introduce readers not simply to a broad range of texts, but also to the broad spread of possible ways to engage with the study of Neo-Latin literature.

Latin texts: sources and conventions

One of the pleasures of working with early modern texts is that it is possible to consult original editions (now often available online). Thus, some of the Latin texts in this book have been taken directly from early printed books; some of the popular ones were printed so frequently in the early modern period that a decision had to be made as to which edition should be used for reference. In the case of some entries new modern editions could be adduced, and their versions of the texts have then generally been compared with the original editions. The basis for the text given is identified in each instance.

Despite the standardization we have broadly adopted, the early modern layout of these texts is not unimportant to the study of Neo-Latin. Since authors often liaised closely with their printers, the arrangement of the words on the page, the use of marginalia, the choice of typeface or the decision to employ particular abbreviations have to be regarded as potentially meaningful details of a composition.

Early modern practices regarding the presentation of Latin texts can initially seem quite confusing. For the convenience of readers, the texts

included in this book have been slightly adjusted and standardized to match modern conventions (often following modern editions of these texts where they exist). For instance, the medial <s>, <ſ>, has been replaced by <s>, and <ij> by <ii>; ligatures such as <æ> and <œ> have been written as two letters <ae> and <oe>, and abbreviations have been resolved. Medieval spellings have mostly been adjusted to their more classical forms, and we do not envisage there will be any difficulty with more obvious orthographical variants. The accentuation of words (diacritics), which was another common feature of the early modern presentation of Latin, has similarly not been reproduced. Capitalization has also been standardized. Moreover, readers of Neo-Latin cannot escape some outlandish (to modern eyes) uses of punctuation. For example, commas were often used (sometimes in order to assist with oral delivery) where they would not be in a modern text, and authors / printers would put an exclamation mark where nowadays a question mark is used. We have generally modernized the punctuation, at least where it was most likely to cause confusion. We have assumed readers are familiar with the practice of verbal contractions, which are common in Latin more generally, and these have accordingly not been systematically explained.

Neo-Latin texts often comprised more than the main text. Editions might include elaborate prefaces and dedicatory letters or poems (so-called 'paratexts'), which can offer intriguing information about the contemporary cultural and intellectual background. A good example is the General Scholium to Newton's third edition of his *Principia mathematica* (Text 17).

As for the translations, contributors have sought to produce felicitous renderings into English, but ones that remain faithful to the Latin. The translations are not intended to be definitive: their primary aim is to help readers make their way through the Latin.

This volume does not provide a word list or a glossed vocabulary; so, for the purposes of independent interpretations, other lexicographical resources may be necessary (for an overview of Neo-Latin reference works and tools see Knight / Tilg 2015: 575–9). Lewis and Short's *Latin Dictionary* should, for the most part, be sufficient, not least because of the classical configuration of so much of the Latin in the passages provided. Due to the broader chronological scope of its coverage of Latin usage, Lewis and Short can yield more helpful results than the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* for post-classical Latin texts and their sources. For later Latin coinages and for early modern linguistic nuances, additional sources of information are available, such as Johann Ramminger's *Neulateinische Wortliste* (http://ramminger.userweb.mwn.de). A number of Latin dictionaries useful for reading Neo-Latin texts, including Lewis and Short alongside Du Cange, are available via the Logeion website (http://logeion.uchicago.edu).

Notes

1 The concept of Europe's Latin millennium is borrowed from the title of chapter 3 in Leonhardt 2013: 122–244.
2 The coinage 'Neo-Latin' had its origins in Germany in about the 1760s as 'Neulatein' or 'neulateinisch' (Knight / Tilg 2015: 1).
3 A point robustly made in Sidwell 1995: preface.
4 For the place of Cicero and Virgil in the development of Neo-Latin as well as an overview of the register's linguistic characteristics see J. Ramminger, 'Neo-Latin: Character and Development', in Kallendorf / Ford / Bloemendal / Fantazzi 2015: 21–36.
5 On Valla and the *Elegantiae* and for a sketch of the work's wide-reaching influence for the Neo-Latin world see Korenjak 2016: 131–3.
6 For Valla's early contributions to the fields of historical, biblical and philosophical scholarship, within the history of Neo-Latin literature see Ostler 2007: 244–6.
7 Poggio's *Orationes in Laurentium Vallam* ('*Speeches against Lorenzo Valla*') and Valla's *Antidota in Pogium* ('*A remedy against Poggio*') (*c.* 1453) represent highpoints of these humanists' conflict.
8 Valla's *De falso credita et ementita Constantini Donatione declamatio* ('*Speech on the forged and falsely attributed Donation of Constantine*', *c.* 1440) and his *Adnotationes in Novum Testamentum* ('*Notes on the New Testament*') are examples of this philological approach to ecclesiastical and holy scripture.
9 The irony and humour of Poggio's *Orationes* showcases an approach to literary work very different from the dense, dry style of his opponent's *Elegantiae*.
10 On the debate over Latin style generally, and the opposition between camps of Ciceronianism and a more moderate, eclectic style, see T. Tunberg, 'Approaching Neo-Latin Prose as Literature', in Moul 2017: 237–54.
11 On the turn in literary culture after the invention of the printing press see Eisenstein 1979.
12 On Latin as a lingua franca for diverse groups all across Europe (and even outside of it) see Burke 2014: 45–8. Latin was already a medieval lingua franca, but in the early modern period Latin was increasingly standardized and used over a wider geographical area and by a greater range of socio-economic groups.
13 For a general introduction to the 'Republic of Letters', its various changes and impact even today in a digital world see van Miert 2016: 269–87.
14 On Nebrija's Latin philological work and his application of these techniques to Castilian within the context of contemporary European discussion of Latin see Ostler 2007: 256–9.
15 For Innu-aimun (Montagnais) see Jean-Baptiste de la Brosse, *Montanicae linguae elementa* ('*Rudiments of the Montagnais language*', 1768). For Japanese see Diego Collado, *Ars grammaticae Iaponicae linguae* ('*Grammar of the Japanese language*', 1632).

16 On Latin's general position in education early in the period see Black 2001: 1–5.
17 Korenjak 2016: 118–20. Works on the moral training of pupils by means of intensive engagement with ancient authors in the original included Juan Luis Vives' *Introductio ad sapientiam* ('*Introduction to wisdom*', 1524) and Erasmus' *De pueris instituendis* ('*On educating boys*', 1529).
18 On the spread of this learning style and its contact with various layers of society see Bloemendal 2016: 92–7.
19 A concise overview of Neo-Latin alongside increasing literary production in various European vernaculars is offered in Leonhardt 2013: 206–9; see also Winkler / Schaffenrath 2018.
20 For a detailed overview of this field see A. M. Blair, A. Laird, M. Mund-Dopchie and Z. von Martels, 'Latin and the New World', in Kallendorf / Ford / Bloemendal / Fantazzi 2015.
21 For a general introduction to Linnaeus' Latin, including the continued use of his system today, within an account of Latin's history as a whole, see Janson 2007: 152–6.
22 For a recent overview of Neo-Latin and the natural sciences see Korenjak 2016: 234–53; on the frequent translations from the European vernaculars into Latin in general see Korenjak 2016: 145–7. On the translation of works from the vernacular into Latin particularly to ensure their cultural status see Bloemendal 2016: 185–7.
23 For a statement of Neo-Latin's constant contemporary cultural relevance see Korenjak 2019: 14–15.
24 For the statistics see Würgler 2009: 40. For a 'lost Atlantis' see Cameron 1941: 403.
25 For a poem on tea see Pierre Petit, *Thia Sinensis* ('*Chinese Tea*', 1685); for a study of Iranian poetry see William Jones, *Poeseos Asiaticae commentariorum libri sex* ('*Six books of commentaries on Asian poetry*', 1774).
26 Most recently, Moul 2017, but see also Knight and Tilg 2015, which dedicates one of three sections to 'Language and Genre'; Kallendorf / Ford / Bloemendal / Fantazzi 2015; and IJsewijn and Sacré 1990–8.
27 Moul 2017: introduction.
28 As detailed studies of Neo-Latin works are increasingly demonstrating.
29 Although, as Peter Burke points out, there was 'an ever-shifting division of labour' between Latin and the vernacular ('"*Heu domine, adsunt Turcae*": A sketch for a History of Post-Medieval Latin', in Burke 1993: 56). Burke is rightly interested in the sociolinguistic frameworks in which Neo-Latin developed and in the 'politics of choice' about which language to write in (Burke 2004).
30 Knight / Tilg 2015: 3.
31 See Leonardo Bruni, *History of the Florentine People*, ed. and trans. by J. Jankins, 3 vols, Cambridge MA, 2001–7 (I Tatti Renaissance Library 3, 16, 27); and G. Ianziti, 'Challenging Chronicles: Leonardo Bruni's History of the Florentine People', in S. Dale, A. Williams Lewin and D. J. Osheim (eds),

Chronicling History: Chroniclers and their Historians in Medieval and Renaissance Italy, Philadelphia 2007.
32 F. Mundt, 'Historiography', in Moul 2017: 358–76, at 373.
33 C. Kidwell, *Pietro Bembo: Lover, Linguist, Cardinal*, Montreal / Kingston 2004: 360.
34 For the importance of Petrarch in the development of this genre see J. Glomski, 'Epistolary Writing', in Moul 2017: 255–71.
35 Glomski, 'Epistolary Writing', 258.
36 See E. Haan, 'Pastoral', in Moul 2017: 163–79, at 164.
37 IJsewijn / Sacré 1998: vol. 2, 59.
38 Knight / Tilg 2015: 263.
39 Kallendorf / Ford / Bloemendal / Fantazzi 2015: 659.
40 Kallendorf / Ford / Bloemendal / Fantazzi 2015: 661.
41 J. Hankins, 'The Lost Continent of Neo-Latin Literature and the Rise of Modern European Literatures; Catalog of an Exhibition at the Houghton Library, 5 March – 5 May 2001', *Harvard Library Bulletin*, 12 (2001): 1–92.
42 IJsewijn / Sacré 1990–8.
43 For example: J. Stevenson, *Women Latin Poets*, Oxford 2005; L. J. Churchill, P. R. Brown and J. E. Jeffrey (eds), *Women Writing Latin*, vol. 3: *Early Modern Women Writing Latin*, 3 vols, New York / Abingdon 2002; and see also the bibliography in 'Gender', in Knight / Tilg 2015: 374–7.
44 'Gender', in Knight / Tilg 2015: 370–3.
45 D. Cheney, *Neo-Latin Women Writers: Elizabeth Jane Weston and Bathusa Reginald (Makin)*, London / New York 2016.
46 Kallendorf / Ford / Bloemendal / Fantazzi 2015: 926.
47 A point developed in Winkler / Schaffenrath 2018: 2 and *passim*.
48 Kallendorf / Ford / Bloemendal / Fantazzi 2015: 703.
49 P. Hardie, 'Vida's *De arte poetica* and the Transformation of Models', in *Apodosis: Essays Presented to Dr. W. W. Cruickshank to Mark His Eightieth Birthday*, London 1992: 47–53, at 48.
50 Deneire 2014; Bloemendal 2015; Winkler / Schaffenrath 2018.

Bibliography

Black, R. (2001), *Humanism and Education in Medieval and Renaissance Italy: Tradition and Innovation in Renaissance Schools from the Twelfth to the Fifteenth Centuries*, Cambridge.
Bloemendal, J., ed. (2015), *Bilingual Europe: Latin and Vernacular Cultures – Examples of Bilingualism and Multiculturalism c. 1300–1800*, Leiden / Boston.
Bloemendal, J. (2016), *Latijn. Cultuurgeschiedenis van een Wereldtaal*, Amsterdam.
Burke, P., ed. (1993), *The Art of Conversation*, Cambridge.

Burke, P. (2004), *Languages and Communities in Early Modern Europe*, Cambridge.
Cameron, A. (1941), 'Latin Literature', *Modern Language Quarterly*, 2: 403–20.
Deneire, T., ed. (2014), *Dynamics of Neo-Latin and the Vernacular. Language and Poetics, Translation and Transfer*, Leiden / Boston.
Eisenstein, E. (1979), *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change*, 2 vols, Cambridge.
IJsewijn, J. and D. Sacré (1990–8), *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies*, 2 vols, Leuven.
Janson, T. (2007), *A Natural History of Latin*, Oxford.
Kallendorf, C., A. Ford, J. Bloemendal and C. Fantazzi, eds (2015), *Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Neo-Latin World*, Leiden.
Knight, S. and S. Tilg, eds (2015), *The Oxford Handbook of Neo-Latin*, Oxford.
Korenjak, M. (2016), *Geschichte der neulateinischen Literatur. Vom Humanismus bis zur Gegenwart*, Munich.
Korenjak, M. (2019), *Neulatein: Eine Textsammlung. Latein / Deutsch*, Stuttgart.
Leonhardt, J. (2013), *Latin: The Story of a World Language*, Cambridge MA [translated by K. Kronenberg; original German – Munich 2009].
van Miert, D. (2016), 'What was the Republic of Letters? A brief introduction to a long history (1417–2008)', *Groniek*, 204: 269–87.
Moul, V., ed. (2017), *A Guide to Neo-Latin Literature*, Cambridge.
Ostler, N. (2007), *Ad infinitum: A Biography of Latin*, New York.
Sidwell, S. (1995), *Reading Medieval Latin*, Cambridge.
Winkler, A. and F. Schaffenrath, eds (2018), *Neo-Latin and the Vernaculars*, Leiden / Boston.
Würgler, A. (2009), 'Medien in der frühen Neuzeit', in *Enzyklopädie deutscher Geschichte*, vol. 84, Munich.