INTRODUCTION

SARAH KNIGHT AND STEFAN TILG

What Is "Neo-Latin"?

When we talk about "Neo-Latin," we refer to the Latin language and literature from around the time of the early Italian humanist Petrarch (1304–1374) up to the present day, focusing particularly on its period of greatest intellectual and social relevance: from the fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries. For this reason, the term is often used synonymously with "Renaissance Latin" or "early modern Latin." During these four centuries or so, Neo-Latin contributed significantly to the history of Europe, but also to that of other continents, as our chapters on the Americas and Asia show.

That said, the term "Neo-Latin" is convenient but should be used with careful awareness of the questions it raises and how far it extends. First, no early modern author would have described himself or herself as writing "Neo-Latin." Like many terms we readily use now to delineate phases of artistic expression or cultural activity—"Renaissance," "humanism," and so on—the term "Neo-Latin" is a late invention. Its origin seems to lie in Germany, where the poet and philosopher Johann Gottfried Herder speaks of *Neulatein* and *neulateinischen* poems and poets in a number of works from the 1760s onwards. The term first appears in a title in the *Neulateinische Chrestomathie* (*Anthology of Neo-Latin Texts*, 1795), a textbook assembled by the Silesian teacher Ernst Gottlob Klose. In the early nineteenth century, a scholar from Liège in Belgium, Johann Dominicus Fuss, used the phrase *poetis neolatinis* in his *Dissertation on Neo-Latin Poetry and Poets* (1822; see Verbeke 2014; *CNLS* 1:27–28). From this Greek-Latin formation, or from the German (or both), the word was adopted into other European languages, and at the first congress of the International Association for Neo-Latin Studies in 1973, "Neo-Latin" was officially sanctioned as the name of a budding discipline.

Second, while Neo-Latin can be defined in terms of chronology, the term also often connotes a more stylistically ambitious and more self-consciously "classical" form of Latin, as opposed to what we might think of as "medieval" or "scholastic" Latin. But while this dichotomy has proved useful in many respects, not least for understanding the

project of humanists like Valla and Erasmus in "purifying" the Latin language, readers should bear in mind that there are many exceptions, and that there is no such thing as a linear and uniform development from "medieval Latin" to "Neo-Latin." Several chapters in this handbook show the crucial role that scholastic Latin and scholastic thought continued to play in intellectual life until the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; and, more generally, the complicated tensions between scholasticism and humanism that often inform our idea of "Neo-Latin" are a common thread running throughout this volume.

Finally, to the majority of researchers active in the subject today, "Neo-Latin" means much more than a particular phase of artistic and linguistic expression, relating mainly to poets and literary prose writers. Neo-Latin has increasingly been seen as a foundation of all early modern culture in the Western world and its areas of influence. Accordingly, we extend our parameters more widely: we not only focus on concertedly "literary" works but are also interested in, for instance, philosophical writing, scientific treatises, rhetorical manuals, and so on. Moreover, although all chronological periods have their share of turbulence, the ideological upheavals that shaped this era factor so directly into the history of Neo-Latin expression that we thought it artificial to separate writings from their historical context. The Ottoman conquest of Constantinople in 1453, for example, forced out Greek intellectuals into Italy, where their teaching and scholarship underpinned the comparative textual studies in Latin and Greek undertaken by contemporary humanists. From the 1510s onwards, the impact of the Protestant Reformation reverberated throughout Europe and beyond: reformers like Martin Luther worked to make vernacular versions of the scripture available, so that priestly mediation of God's (Latin) Word was no longer paramount; while Philipp Melanchthon and his colleagues established a rigorously schematized Latin pedagogy, which influenced the European school system for centuries. The Catholic Church reacted forcefully, reclaiming and reasserting the Latin of Vulgate Bible and liturgy with which their denomination had been so intimately associated for so long. Gathering momentum from the mid-sixteenth century onwards, and given fresh purpose by the Catholic Counter-Reformation, the Society of Jesus became one of the most conspicuous forces in Latin education, drama, and rhetoric, as well as the most mobile, as it extended its theological mission and pedagogical system as far as colonial North and South America to the west, and China and Japan to the east.

In addition to these close associations between historical circumstance and composition, another difficulty if we try to disentangle Neo-Latin writing from its context is the fact that many of these works defy tidy categorization in their transgression of our modern delineations of genre and scholarly discipline. Thomas More's *Utopia* (1516), for example, is one of the few Neo-Latin works regularly taught on English literature, history, and politics courses; at the time of writing, one can buy a paperback copy (in translation) either as a Penguin Classic, a Norton Critical Edition (listed on the Norton website both as "British Literature" and as "Political Theory"), and as a Cambridge Text in the History of Political Thought. Students, scholars, and, more recently, publishers writing marketing copy have clearly struggled to define the discipline into which *Utopia* fits. Referring to two of the most distinguished early modern Latin writers, Anthony Grafton reminds us that

Leibniz was an historian and linguist and Newton was an alchemist and biblical interpreter (Grafton 2009, 2): in the early twenty-first century, we might more readily praise these men's roles in inventing the calculus and dramatically advancing our understanding of physical laws, but to their contemporaries, their innovations in the mathematical and physical sciences were only a part of their contribution to scholarship. A similarly gifted multi-tasker, Thomas More, trained as a lawyer at Lincoln's Inn in London, lectured on Saint Augustine, worked as a diplomat, advised Henry VIII, translated the Greek satirist Lucian, and acted as Lord Chancellor, as well as authoring *Utopia*. More, Leibniz, and Newton are not isolated examples: the history of Neo-Latin writing is peopled by such rigorous and creative thinkers who astonish us in our own world of academic specialism by their extraordinary command of several disciplines at once.

Many of the authors discussed in this book not only move impressively between scholarly disciplines but also balance (often with acute self-awareness) expression in their mother tongues against their use of Latin. During the early modern period, Latin was both model and competitor for emerging vernacular languages and literatures, but it was also the only truly international language—spoken, written, and read all over Europe and beyond. To take just one example, the primacy of Latin and the complexity of its linguistic relationships with modern vernaculars prompted one historian of education and ideas earlier in the twentieth century to despair of producing any kind of history of Neo-Latin. The American Jesuit Walter J. Ong (1912–2003) began his 1958 study of the charismatic, controversial scholar Pierre de la Ramée (Petrus Ramus, 1515–1572) by establishing the centrality of Latin to the world Ramus inhabited, but Ong's assessment does not apparently augur well for a new study of Neo-Latin (Ong [1958] 2004, 10):

> there exists no general history of modern Latin literature, from the fourteenth to the eighteenth century, for the good reason that such a history is simply too vast to think about. It would cover all Europe and America, and weave in and out of the history of every vernacular literature from Portuguese to Hungarian, and from Italian to Icelandic, and be simply the history of the Western mind.

What we would perhaps call *early* modern Latin literature—Neo-Latin—was "too vast" a topic for Ong because of its global scope and its absolutely formative position in institutions, education, and a majority of learned communication in this period. Ong called it a "universal language," a claim substantiated by the existence of a republic of letters, a community of learned exchange conducted largely in Latin and discussed by many contributors to this book. He was right to state that a history of early modern Latin runs in parallel to "the history of the Western mind," and we should keep in mind, too, his point that early modern Latinity is intimately entangled with contemporary vernacular languages, to the east as well as the west, and that most of these languages were forming literary canons of their own during the same period. This book does in fact consider how early modern Latin relates to Ong's deliberately far-flung choices of Portuguese, Hungarian, Italian, and Icelandic, but also to the vernaculars of Arabic, Dutch, English, French, German, Mandarin, Romanian, Spanish, Swedish, and many more.

Deciding whether to write in Latin or the vernacular was a genuine dilemma for many of the authors discussed here, and we have already seen how the wish to reach out to the wider republic of letters might prompt a writer to choose Latin over the vernacular.

The adoption of movable type in Europe from the mid-fifteenth century onward resulted in another important question for early modern authors, one that their classical or medieval counterparts had not faced: should they circulate their works in manuscript—still a viable option for many, especially those working in locations that did not have advanced print technology or a wide distribution network—or opt for print? As a consequence, in paratexts and letters of the period particularly, we sometimes read about authors' anxieties, not only about their choice of linguistic medium, but also about their decision to publish their works commercially. In the preface to his wide-ranging, erudite *Anatomy of Melancholy* (first printed in 1621, and continually revised throughout his lifetime), for instance, the Oxford scholar Robert Burton worried about the implications of his choices (Burton 1989–2000, 1:2):

> It was not mine intent to prostitute my Muse in *English*, or to divulge *secreta Minervae* [Minerva's secrets], but to have exposed this more contract in *Latin*, If I could have got it printed. Any scurrile Pamphlet is welcome to our mercenary Stationers in *English*, they print all . . . but in *Latine* they will not deale.

Over three centuries earlier, Dante had written *De Vulgari Eloquentia* (*On Eloquence in the Vernacular*, ca. 1304–1305) to argue for the rhetorical potential of his native Tuscan, but Burton's assertion that writing in English is a form of prostitution aligns the vernacular with "vulgar" in our contemporary sense of crass and money-grabbing, rather than with Dante's more neutral usage. An author's rejection of Latin meant that he cared more about the commercial gains accruing from a vernacular readership than about using a more elevated idiom better suited to the goddess of wisdom's secrets and more elegantly concise ("contract") mode of expression. But he represented himself as fatally inhibited from choosing the loftier linguistic option because "mercenary Stationers," greedy for the next best-selling "scurrile Pamphlet," vetoed writing in Latin. Burton's complaint neatly captures that the history of the book, whether manuscript or printed, is just as difficult to disentangle from the history of early modern Latin writing as is the history of vernacular literatures or the history of the Reformation.

The Development of Neo-Latin Studies and Reference Works

From the start, like the works of many of its most able practitioners, Neo-Latin studies have been unavoidably interdisciplinary in nature. We have seen that scholars have conceived of Renaissance and early modern Latin as a definite phase of linguistic and

literary development from the late eighteenth century onward, but the contours of Neo-Latin as an expressly defined and self-aware discipline were not decisively traced until the 1970s, when the International Association of Neo-Latin Studies was established (1971) and the first edition of the Leuven Classics professor Jozef IJsewijn's *CNLS* appeared (1977; see De Smet 1999). The significance of Neo-Latin in the early modern period has not always been appreciated in modern scholarship, for Neo-Latin has long been marginalized, eclipsed by the study of its classical predecessor—ancient, pre-medieval Latin literature—on the one hand, and by the study of vernacular modern languages on the other. We can still safely state that Neo-Latin literature is the least known and least systematically studied of Europe's major literatures: James Hankins, initiator of the renowned *I Tatti Renaissance Library*, describes it as a "lost continent," while Walther Ludwig, doyen of German Neo-Latin studies, has called it "terra incognita" (Hankins 2001; Ludwig 1997, 324).

That said, over the last few decades, the momentum of Neo-Latin studies has increased. A number of Neo-Latin research centers have been founded across Europe and North America, while disciplines such as Classics, history, English and other modern languages have increasingly adopted Neo-Latin studies into their undergraduate and postgraduate curricula. Learned societies like the International Association of Neo-Latin Studies, the British Society for Neo-Latin Studies and Cambridge Society for Neo-Latin Studies, and the German Deutsche Neulateinische Gesellschaft promote the discipline through conferences, workshops, publications, and postgraduate-targeted events. The number of editions of Neo-Latin texts, monographs, and articles grows yearly. This growth of Neo-Latin studies has been mapped and discussed in various contributions on the current state of the discipline (e.g., De Smet 1999; Helander 2001; Ludwig, Glei, and Leonhardt 2003). The publication of companions, encyclopedias, and similar reference works is a logical step in this development.

The classic reference work, cited by many contributors to this handbook, is Jozef IJsewijn and Dirk Sacré's *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies* (*CNLS*) in two volumes—the second edition of IJsewijn's pioneering *Companion* of 1977, mentioned above. The first part, by IJsewijn, is entitled "History and Diffusion of Neo-Latin Literature" and focuses on the development of Neo-Latin literature in individual countries; the second part, by IJsewijn and Sacré, is entitled "Literary, Linguistic, Philological and Editorial Questions" and considers individual genres. The *Companion* proved fundamental in establishing terms of enquiry within the discipline. IJsewijn and Sacré take an encyclopedic approach to the subject, which they dissect into numerous small parts. In the first volume, for instance, thirty countries or other larger geographical areas are dealt with one at a time. In the second volume, Neo-Latin literature is divided into some hundred genre-based subdivisions. Some space is devoted to almost every aspect of Neo-Latin, but little to any one specific element. Larger interpretative issues are somewhat neglected, to prioritize a broad survey of the field. It is impressive to see that only two individuals—in fact, IJsewijn wrote the first volume alone—were able to achieve this survey, but given the vastness of material and the complexity of the issues, any new reference work of this sort must be an intellectual collaboration between many experts in the discipline.

We did not have new reference works until very recently. But then, astonishingly, and suggesting contemporary interest in Neo-Latin, 2014–2017 saw not one, not two, but three related books commissioned by major publishing houses. These are this handbook, *Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Neo-Latin World* (*ENLW*) in two volumes, and the *Guide to Neo-Latin Literature* (*NLL*). The *Encyclopaedia* is a comprehensive and complex work building on the encyclopedic approach of IJsewijn and Sacré's *Companion*. It has sixty-six longer and 145 shorter articles, including many specialized subjects such as "coins and medals" and "the typography of Renaissance humanism." The *Guide to Neo-Latin Literature* has a narrower focus. The word "literature" in its title signals the book's emphasis on the literary form and aesthetic potential of major Neo-Latin genres; close readings of individual passages are central to its coverage. Our own handbook is meant to be more compact than the *Encyclopaedia*, while placing a more concerted emphasis on cultural and historical contexts than does the *Guide to Neo-Latin Literature*. As well as at dedicated Neo-Latinists and Renaissance scholars, we aim at a broad, international, and diverse readership—to include those interested in early modern languages and literatures; classicists working on early modern reception and the shifting characteristics of post-classical Latin language and literature; political, social, and intellectual historians; and readers working on particular geographical areas of interest. We hope that this handbook will also provide a clear and helpful point of access to those readers new to Neo-Latin studies who want to learn more about the discipline before taking their own research forward.

Inevitably, as the discipline has grown, it has also become more methodologically contentious and more self-aware. The variety of approaches adopted by contributors to this handbook reflects this development, and we believe that the chapters, taken in their entirety, are representative of the state of the subject today (for recent accounts of Neo-Latin methodology, see, e.g., Van der Poel 2014; Verbeke 2014; Van Hal 2007). To identify just a few examples, some of our contributors have focused on detailed critical readings of individual Latin works; considering, for instance, the nuanced decisions made by poets about diction and meter (e.g., Chapter 5, "Epigram"); other contributors explore the ideological engagement of Neo-Latin writing, analyze their authors' discourse, and consider both in historical context (e.g., Chapter 22, "Political Action"); others still adopt a more cultural-historical approach, examining Latin's contribution to sociological and intellectual formation across a broad chronological span of time (e.g., Chapter 24, "Social Status"). The division of the handbook into three discrete sections has facilitated this variety of approach: the first thirteen chapters, "Language and Genre," combine philological discussion with literary criticism and rhetorical analysis, and, in most cases, consider these aspects within an author's or work's historical context. The following eleven chapters in the "Cultural Contexts" part focus—with some overlap—on pedagogy and education, academic disciplines, and confessional and sociological categories (such as gender and class). In the final eleven chapters, the "Countries and Regions" part, we have tried to expand our coverage as broadly as possible, proceeding roughly (and without implying any ranking) from the countries that generated a conspicuous amount of Neo-Latin writing throughout the early modern period (such as

Italy, France, and the German-speaking countries) to the countries that produced far fewer Latin works in terms of quantity, but where composition in Latin was still fundamental to the self-definition, development, and ideological purpose of those writing it (as in the Americas and Asia).

Editorial Principles and Practices

A multi-author project like this handbook raises numerous editorial issues, and it may be helpful to explain some of the more significant decisions we made. First and foremost, we wanted to make the volume as accessible to a varied readership as possible. Our selection of chapters cannot, of course, encompass every single aspect of and context for Neo-Latin writing, but aims instead to introduce key forms, topics, and geographical areas of activity to a diverse audience. Nor should complete coverage be expected from the individual chapters: written by leading specialists in the field, they represent distinctive scholarly approaches and perspectives while introducing specific topics. There are no footnotes: references are provided in the text, and supported by a "Suggested Reading" section at the end of each chapter, which gives some direction for further study, as does the annotated bibliography we have included at the end of the volume. All contributions are in English, today's successor to Latin as the international *lingua franca*. All Latin (including titles) and other foreign-language citations have been translated into English (with a few exceptions concerning proper names, Latin words whose meaning is self-evident, and titles clearly paraphrased in the immediate context).

A particular difficulty was the presentation of Latin citations. Although Neo-Latin is fundamentally the same language as classical Latin, it often *looks* slightly different: in early modern manuscripts and printed texts, we see, for instance, "unclassical" spellings like *lachryma* (for *lacrima*, "tear") and *amicitie* (for *amicitiae*, "of friendship"). Printed texts frequently adopt digraphs and an accent system meant to mark out certain grammatical forms: indeclinable forms, for example, often carry a grave accent (such as the adverb *latè*, "widely"); the circumflex distinguishes vowel lengths (the nominative *rosa* ["rose"] is distinct from the ablative *rosâ*; Steenbakkers 1994). Other features like punctuation are affected by early modern usage (which often differs from its modern equivalent) as well as by the purpose of the text itself: an oration to be delivered to an audience, for example, may be differently punctuated from a treatise intended to be privately read. Scholars often fall into two factions when editing Neo-Latin texts (cf. Deneire 2014, who includes further references to this debate; and Rabbie 1996): one group wishes to retain all or most of these early modern features, while the other advocates standardization according to classical and modern conventions. We opted for standardization, because as editors of a multi-contributor volume (rather than a single-author or single-work scholarly edition), we had to work with very divergent material across the chapters. After all, thirty-nine different contributors across thirty-five chapters cite Latin passages from both manuscripts and printed works, written across several centuries by

many authors (who are themselves often inconsistent) in a variety of different genres. Therefore, we have agreed on some basic principles of standardization. We use classical spellings except when spelling has a particular significance for meter, meaning, or interpretation (but we have not standardized titles if this would create difficulties for readers wanting to find out more about specific works, which tend to appear with the idiosyncrasies of the early modern Latin). For clarity, we distinguish between "u" and "v," so forms like *Vua* or *Uua*, both found in early modern printed works, become *Uva*, "grape"); "j" becomes "i" (*jacio* is rendered *iacio*, "throw"); and "ae" (as in *laetus*, "happy") and "oe" (as in *poena*, "punishment") are preferred to "e" (*letus, pena*). We drop all accents and resolve all digraphs (*ae*, not *æ*). We expand the ampersand (using *et* not *&*), and we expand abbreviations whose meaning would not otherwise be clear. Punctuation is modernized where necessary, and we do not mimic early modern print characteristics like the long *s* ("ſ").

The spelling of personal names will be important to readers researching a particular author or group of individuals. Here again we had the choice of two contrasting approaches: we could either "classicize" all names following Latin and Greek practice, as many authors did themselves and as IJsewijn and Sacré tend to do, for instance, in their *CNLS*; or we could use only vernacular name forms. Again, we aimed for clarity and practicality: adhering absolutely to either of these two approaches would, we think, become jarring and even confusing. Few people today speak of Leonardus Brunus or Coluccius Salutatus, for example, rather than Leonardo Bruni or Coluccio Salutati, and even fewer would recognize Joris van Lanckvelt more easily than by his much more commonly used humanist name Georgius Macropedius. When in doubt, a variety of national library catalogs and especially *CERL* (Consortium of European Research Libraries; http://www.cerl.org/resources/cerl_thesaurus/main) proved helpful tools in making editorial decisions. For personal names from classical antiquity, we relied on the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (which has, for example, "Virgil" and not "Vergil").

Our general editorial style follows *The Chicago Manual of Style* (16th ed., 2010), but we departed from that model in several details. Where *Chicago*, for instance, distinguishes in English translations of foreign titles between published and unpublished translations and accordingly uses uppercase and italics for the former (e.g., *The Praise of Folly*) and lowercase and Roman type for the latter (e.g., Experiments and exercises), we thought this would overcomplicate presentation and opted for consistent use of the "published" model (e.g., *Experiments and Exercises*). A final word on references to classical authors: these are usually given without indication of a particular edition and page numbers, as is usual in the discipline of Classics, but with reference to book and line or section number; e.g., Virgil, *Eclogues* 1.2 (Book 1, line 2), or Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations* 4.5 (Book 4, paragraph 5).

This book has profited from the advice and support of many people. In particular, we would like to thank Stefan Vranka from Oxford University Press (OUP) for commissioning the volume, for the interest with which he followed the project, and his patience when delays were inevitable. We also thank the anonymous OUP readers

for their constructive comments on the handbook's structure and contents at proposal stage, and Sarah Pirovitz and Heather Sieve at OUP for their help with the volume. Philip Ford encouraged the project from its start and always expressed the idea that a handbook like this was a desideratum: his death in 2013 was a profound loss to Neo-Latin scholarship. Moreover, Stefan Tilg is grateful to the Ludwig Boltzmann Institute for Neo-Latin Studies in Innsbruck, Austria, which provided an excellent environment for working on the book. Discussions with its team, especially Martin Korenjak, Farkas Kiss, Florian Schaffenrath, Lav Subaric, and Valerio Sanzotta, constantly yielded valuable ideas. Sarah Knight would like to thank several friends and colleagues for fruitful conversations that took place while editing the handbook: at the University of Leicester, Gordon Campbell, John Coffey, Mary Ann Lund, and especially Philip Shaw; and for advice early on, Michael Davies and Greg Walker. She is also grateful to past and present officers and members of the British Society for Neo-Latin Studies, particularly Ingrid De Smet, Philip Ford, Jacquie Glomski, Brenda Hosington, Gesine Manuwald, Ann Moss, Victoria Moul, Elizabeth Sandis, and Andrew Taylor, for valuable discussion.

—S.T. and S.K.
Freiburg and Leicester
August 2014

References

Burton, Robert. 1989–2000. *The Anatomy of Melancholy*. Edited by Thomas C. Faulkner, Nicolas K. Kiessling, and Rhonda L. Blair. 6 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Deneire, Tom. 2014. "Editing Neo-Latin Texts: Editorial Principles; Spelling and Punctuation." In *ENLW* 2:959–62.

De Smet, Ingrid A. R. 1999. "Not for Classicists? The State of Neo-Latin Studies." *Journal of Roman Studies* 89:205–9.

Grafton, Antony. 2009. "A Sketch Map of a Lost Continent: The Republic of Letters." *Republics of Letters: A Journal for the Study of Knowledge, Politics, and the Arts* 1:1–18. http://arcade.stanford.edu/rofl/sketch-map-lost-continent-republic-letters.

Hankins, James, ed. 2001. "The Lost Continent: 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* 12:1–92.

Helander, Hans. 2001. "Neo-Latin Studies: Significance and Prospects." *Symbolae Osloenses* 76:5–102.

Ludwig, Walther. 1997. "Die neuzeitliche lateinische Literatur seit der Renaissance." In *Einleitung in die lateinische Philologie*, edited by Fritz Graf, 323–56. Stuttgart: Teubner.

Ludwig, Walther, Reinhold Glei, and Jürgen Leonhardt. 2003. "Klassische und Neulateinische Philologie: Probleme und Perspektiven." *Rheinisches Museum* 146:395–424.

Ong, Walter J. (1958) 2004. *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rabbie, Erwin. 1996. "Editing Neo-Latin Texts." *Editio* 10:25–48.
Steenbakkers, Piet. 1994. "Accent-Marks in Neo-Latin." *ACNL* 1994, 925–34.
Van der Poel, Marc. 2014. *Neo-Latin Philology: Old Tradition, New Approaches*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
Van Hal, Toon. 2007. "Towards Meta-Neo-Latin Studies? Impetus to Debate on the Field of Neo-Latin Studies and Its Methodology." *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 556:349–65.
Verbeke, Demmy. 2014. "History of Neo-Latin Studies." In *ENLW* 1:905–20.