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Preface

José Manuel Barroso’s plea in his 2011 presidential address to the European Commission for greater integration in the EU recalls another Portuguese politician’s advocacy of European unity in the interest of smaller nations, 150 years before. In A Guerra e a Democracia (1870), António José Enes proposed the foundation of a “Pan-Latin state” (made up of Belgium, France, Spain, Italy and Portugal) in order to stand up to the already existing Germanic and Slavic federations. Following a congress in Madrid in 1902, another Pan-Latin alliance – between France, Spain and the South American nations – was urged as a response to what became President Roosevelt’s “corollary” of the Monroe Doctrine, asserting the United States’ right to military intervention in Latin America.

The focus of the present collection, The role of Latin in the early modern world: Linguistic identity and nationalism 1350–1800, is on authors who chose to write in the Latin language, prior to the emergence of the nation state, not the more modern question of Pan-Latin identity. Nonetheless, the Pan-Latin movements have one thing in common with an important attribute of Latin itself in the “republic of letters”: the protection and promotion of smaller cultures, countries, or language groups. That function of Latin in the early modern age has long been overlooked. The fundamental aim of the discussions assembled here has been to explore a number of cases, in Europe and beyond, in which Latin served as a convenient vehicle for the definition or expression of linguistic, regional and incipient national identities.

Such an end might at first appear to have been best achieved through the use of modern languages, especially if those languages are seen as helping to constitute a particular cultural identity. Yet Latin came to convey ethnic and national difference in all kinds of ways. It could be a medium for the transmission or promotion of local knowledge, for which classical history and antiquarianism were also appropriated. Works of literature and even literary canons established in Latin could also dignify the history of a particular territory, or of an ethnic or linguistic group. Latin also realised this objective in other contexts – for instance as an element of political or confessional propaganda, involving the use of pictures as well as words. The example of Italian humanism deserves first mention both because of its primacy in chronological terms and because of the extent of its impact on the rest of the Latinized world. For fifteenth-century Italian humanists, the use of Latin was nearly always characterized by a disdainful rejection of the vernacular. Nevertheless, Marianne Pade argues, it is thanks to their ex-
traordinary influence that Latin and its heritage remained a defining feature of the modern Italian cultural landscape.\(^1\)

Similar considerations apply to authors and texts from other countries. The classical tradition has always been regarded as an effective guarantor of the past history of many modern nations. Hence its legacy came to be used or abused whenever the search for an uninterrupted lineage from antiquity was perceived as an urgent need. This process naturally secured gravitas and glory for a nation, but it could also provide historians with a valuable heuristic tool. Camden’s choice of Latin for his masterpiece of historiography, *Britannia* (first edition, 1586), may appear to be directed at a learned and supranational audience; at the same time, as Geoffrey Eatough shows, the work makes a genuine attempt to acknowledge the importance of Roman antiquity for early modern Britain – to such an extent that Britons are invited to view their own identity in terms of habits and customs derived from the Roman world.

The desire to provide a convincing portrayal of a people’s ancient past would push humanist scholars to produce sophisticated forgeries, for which the field of epigraphy was the perfect testing ground. An eloquent example pertaining to early modern Spain is proposed by Joan Carbonell Manils, Helena Gimeno Pascual and Gerard González Germain: they highlight the scale of the phenomenon in relation to the spread of scholarly documentation and techniques, and highlight its implications for the methods and agenda of the modern discipline of epigraphy. Even in cases where one would have expected resistance, if not outright hostility, to the overpowering presence of Latin, the final result is the substantial assimilation of Latin culture, rather than the rejection of it. Sixteenth-century French humanism as it was represented by Henri Estienne is a case in point: Estienne evidently aspired to challenge the supremacy of the Italians by eschewing the literary culture of Latin in order to favour that of Greek, as a more appropriate model for the French. Yet the standards and criteria he devised, as David Cowling suggests, reveal a significant adherence to the thinking of Cicero and Quintilian.

While Latin thus underscored the dominance of emerging early modern nations by bestowing upon them the lustre of enduring prestige, it also showed itself as an effective vehicle for political debate, polemic and propaganda on contemporary issues. The examples offered here are illuminating: Antonio de Nebrija’s historiographical theory and his development of allusion as a rhetorical and political weapon (Felipe González Vega);

\(^1\) The paper by Carlo Caruso on humanist discussions of canonicity in relation to the “Three Florentine Crowns” (Dante, Petrarch and Boccaccio), could not be presented for publication.
the use of Latin in political tracts written during the Catalan Revolt of 1640–1652 (Alejandro Coroleu); the ideological manipulation perpetrated by Alonso de Santa Cruz in his Castilian translation of Francesc Tarafa’s *De origine* of 1553 (Eulàlia Miralles); and the debate on Irish and English identities to be discerned in the Latin works of John Lynch and Richard O’Ferrall (Nienke Tjoelker). In such instances, the adoption of Latin does not appear to have been conditioned by a misplaced sense of decorum or untimely nostalgia—rather it is the consequence of a considered and purposeful sense of literary convenience and political opportunity.

The themes of many of the essays just mentioned bear on a central aspect of this collaborative enquiry: the part Latin played in the process of legitimising the identities of ethnic and linguistic minorities. The relationship of Latin to languages as diverse as Catalan, Gaelic and Welsh in Europe, and Nahuatl in America, has implications for linguistic and cultural expression, recognition of ethnic difference, attempts at assimilation, or resistance to it. Andrew Laird examines the construction of an antiquarian legacy for Mexico through a tradition of Latin historiography and poetry cultivated by Jesuit authors, who extended and adapted to the New World the principles of antiquarian research previously tested in the search for early modern Spain’s classical past. Latin epic poetry inspired early modern quasi-didactic epics like Dermot O’Meara’s *Ormonius* (1615). Keith Sidwell demonstrates that this narrative of the heroic deeds of Thomas Butler, 10th Earl of Ormond offers a profound reflection on cultural and political identity in seventeenth-century Ireland against the background of English dominion.

A final comment may be reserved for those uses of Latin outside the literary and scholarly sphere. The ancient language retained a communicative power that equalled, and at times surpassed, that of well-established national languages until relatively recent times. Silvia Canalda i Llobet and Cristina Fontcuberta i Famadas investigate the use of Latin in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Catalan art in relation to the function and status of art works and the debate about sacred images instigated by the Council of Trent. In a paper read in Barcelona but not included in the present publication, Elisabeth Klecker illustrated the role of Latin in the verbal and visual propaganda of Emperor Charles VI (1711–1740).

It is hoped that the vitality of the different traditions surveyed in these papers will prompt further reflections on the wide range of roles Latin had in the articulation of cultural and national identity. The enduring perception of Latin as offering access to diverse forms of expression, mainly (but not only) of the literary and scholarly kind, shows that in the period covered by the present volume there were wide cohorts of readers eager to absorb the lengthy and substantial works in Latin which so many authors were inclined
to compose. Beside the powerfully evocative but also unsettling presentation of Latin’s power as a universally recognized “empire of a sign” in Françoise Waquet’s deservedly acclaimed book, a different and complementary picture should emerge from the essays collected here – a picture of Latin partaking of the nature and aspirations of a variety of vernacular cultures under a variety of conditions. The versatile and adaptable medium of Latin, refined over two thousand years of history, provided those cultures with a unique and potent means of self-definition and self-promotion.

Thus the relation between Latin and the modern vernaculars in literature and in history does not always have to be configured in terms of their mutual opposition. It was this consideration which first prompted the organisation of the conference on *The role of Latin in the early modern world: Latin, linguistic identity and nationalism (1350–1800)*, at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Casa Convalescència, 5 and 6 May 2010, which in turn led to the present collection. That event was very generously supported by the Warwick Santander Fund, as well the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, the School of Modern Languages and Cultures at Durham University, the Department of Classics and Ancient History and the Centre for Study of the Renaissance at Warwick University. We would like to thank the staff at Casa Convalescència, and particularly Anna Pardo Lloveras, for all their practical help during the conference. The editors and authors are also deeply grateful to the Editorial Board of *Renaissanceforum* not only for the opportunity to publish these papers, but above all for their extremely valuable suggestions and acumen in editing this collection of essays.
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HUMANIST LATIN AND ITALIAN IDENTITY:

sum vero Italus natione et Romanus civis esse glorior

By Marianne Pade

From Petrarch onwards humanist writers (Bruni, Lapo da Castiglionchio, Valla, Guarino, Brenta, Sabellico) describe the Latin language, classical Latin as well as contemporary humanist Latin, as essential for the cultural achievement of both ancient Rome and early Renaissance Italy. The way these writers use history, evoking a long lost Golden Age which is now about to return, is analysed with the conceptual framework of modern theories on the construction of national identity. The article argues that by making language a central aspect of the Golden Age myth, which in their interpretation regards Italy and not other parts of the Latin West, Italian humanists succeed in making humanist Latin an essential part of Italian cultural identity.

Even though Petrarch (Francesco Petrarca 1304–1374) grew up with connections to the curia at Avignon, Europe’s intellectual centre during the fourteenth century, he always described the city as an awful place, a den of sin and iniquity, stubbornly refusing to admit that France had any learned men at all. When in the spring of 1368 Petrarch wrote a letter to Pope Urban V in which he urged the pope to move the papacy from Avignon back to Rome he argued that “of the four doctors of the church, two are Italian and Roman. Of the rest one is born near to and almost in Italy, the other has moved to and lived in Italy. All four are buried there. None is French, and there is no learned person in France”. Italians established and developed both secular and ecclesiastical law, you hardly found any orators or poets outside Italy – writing in Latin, that is. The reason was that “Latin literature, the root of our arts and the foundation of every branch of knowledge, is found here, as well as the Latin tongue and the Latin nation, which the French themselves boast they belong to”:

1 A recent monograph on Petrarch’s life is Stierle 2003.
We notice that Italy as a geographical entity is important. To be born Italian or Roman is probably best, as were Gregory the Great and St Ambrose, but if not then at least to be born near it as St Jerome (who was born in Dalmatia) or to move there, as St Augustine, would make it possible for a person to partake of Roman culture. France, on the other hand, offers no such advantages.

Petrarch’s letter provoked a Latin tract by the French theologian Jean d’Hesdin, in answer to which Petrarch composed the *Invective against a detractor of Italy*. Here he denounces French culture as barbarian, while he repeatedly stresses the connection between Italy as a place and true Latin culture. He proudly announces that “in fact, I am Italian by birth and glory in being a Roman citizen”. He also maintains that the great poets of Antiquity, if born elsewhere, needed to come to Italy or Rome to achieve what they did: “wherever they came from, their style is Italian, nor could it be otherwise. Indeed, we perceive the truth of what I wrote in an early pastoral poem: ‘In the fields by the Tiber/ They all learned to speak Latin’ (buc. 10,344.45)”:

Sum vero italus natione, et romanus civis esse glorior [...] Statium origine gallum non infitior; addo, si libet, et Lucanum ex Hispania. Ceterum, undecunque ipsi fuerint, stilus est italus, nempe alter nullus esset; verumque deprehenditur, quod ipse ego in pastorio iuvenili carmine olim dixi: “Tiberina Latine docti omnes per rura loqui” (Petrarca 2003 §§ 45 and 91).²

---

² Another good edition is in Petrarca 1996. We meet very explicit Italian mistrust towards French learning in Giovanni Aurispa’s 1449 letter to Panormita: “ille qui primo Commentum Donati in Virgilium in Italiam apportavit, nuper Romam […] is est et doctus et solers antiquitatis indagator, quamvis Gallus” (Aurispa 1931, 119. He who first brought Donatus’ commentary on Virgil to Italy (Jean Jouffroy) recently arrived in Rome. He is both learned and knowledgeable about antiquity, even if he is French).
Theories of identity

In this article I am going to argue that Latin, both the language of ancient Rome and contemporary humanist Latin, was seen by Italian writers as constituting an important part of their cultural and local, or national, identity. I hope to be able to show that humanist Latin culture was used to constitute a cultural identity which not only comprised a certain cultural, transnational or common European stratum. In Italy it was specifically used to strengthen and further the inhabitant’s sense of belonging or their loyalty towards a specific locality, very often a city state, but also towards Italy as a whole. I also want to show that the process was closely bound to a linguistic project, the renewal, revival or reconquering of classical Latinity, perhaps the core project of renaissance Humanism. When Petrarch repeatedly stressed the connection between Italy as a place and true Latin culture, it was because Italy had a pre-eminent claim to the Latin language which was “the root of our arts and the foundation of every branch of knowledge”.

I am well aware that the development of national cultural identity is generally maintained to be related to the emergence of the modern national states during the eighteenth century and that it may seem anachronistic to apply modern theories of identity to Italian fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Latin humanism. However, as I have argued elsewhere, many of the mechanisms, or strategies, which modern theoreticians have identified as important for the constitution of national cultural identity in nineteenth- and twentieth-century states, are in fact found in renaissance humanist texts. Modern theories stress that the way a given nation chooses to tell its own history and the way the past is valorised are important aspects of the constitution of national cultural identity. In Italian humanist writings we find that a common set of histories or scenarios is created which together constitute the common experiences of a city state or of Italy as a whole, experiences that relate the individual citizen to the history of the specific geographical or political entity. An important element is the origin of the city or the country, wherefore myths concerning the founding of the nation are regularly related, myths which sanction contemporary norms and values with the dignity of age and tradition. We also encounter the notion that those belonging to the city or country pertain to an original people/race. This concept is very effective in creating identity, because only when you are part of the people do

you belong to the nation; others don’t – cp. Petrarch’s statements about the French. Moreover, national identity is often bound to the idea of an earlier Golden Age which the national culture wishes to revive. Such a national renaissance may serve to mobilize the community to fight another, foreign community which threatens its identity: in Italy that Golden Age is of course represented by ancient Rome, the culture of which the humanists strove to revive, after a long period of decline.

In the following I shall discuss some programmatic texts written by Petrarch and by a number of fifteenth-century Italian humanists, showing how these writers all make use of some or more of the strategies I just described and more or less explicitly link the humanists’s literary and linguistic project to Italian cultural identity.

**Early humanism**

In the Latin West the Catholic Church was a factor of cultural convergence, with its own language and rules for communication. All higher education was closely connected to the Church, and like the Church it used the same language all over Europe, namely Latin – a Latin which had developed away from the language of Antiquity, with regard to both orthography, lexicon and syntax. It had also been adapted to new literary and scientific purposes with no classical models.

In spite of being brought up in the cultural orbit of the Roman Curia, Petrarch ceased to see Latin primarily as the means of communication in a pan-European culture. As we saw, he felt that Italians had privileged access to true Latin culture, and it became an important part of his cultural programme to try to restore the language and literary forms of the high culture to which he felt he, as an Italian, was the privileged heir, namely that of ancient Rome. Silvia Rizzo, probably the greatest expert on Petrarch’s Latin, has analysed his development as a writer of Latin. She has shown how Petrarch in the *Familiares* regularly exchanged the medieval lexicon and morphology found in an earlier version with a more classical idiom.

Petrarch’s conscious effort to express himself in classical Latin instead of the Latin used by his contemporaries had a decisive influence on the deve-
lopment of Latin in the following centuries. Quickly a divide developed be-
tween adherents of the traditional more scholastic Latinity and those who
enthusiastically embraced the new classical language norm – a querelle des
anciennes et des modernes, before the word. Fifteenth-century humanists
continued Petrarch’s endeavours to master classical Latinity and a number
of influential works aim at a description of classical Latin lexicon and syn-
tax, among them the Elegantiae linguae latinae of Lorenzo Valla⁸ and Nic-
colò Perotti’s Cornu copiae seu linguae Latinae commentarii.⁹ With time
Petrarch’s linguistic and literary ideas also spread to the rest of Europe, even
to Denmark.¹⁰ In this respect we might say that Petrarch’s cultural initiatives
contributed to the survival of the common European Latin culture, they
were forces of convergence. In other respects Petrarch contributed to the
breaking up of the cultural unity, when he very consciously interpreted the
inheritance from Antiquity as an Italian rather than a common European
concern.

Petrarch’s cultural programme, which links the linguistic and literary re-

vival of ancient Rome and Italian identity, is expressed in many forms in his
works. The theme of the physical, ideological, intellectual and linguistic
return – or coming home – to Italy recurs frequently. As I have shown else-
where, his Farewell to Avignon, and to France, in the eighth eclogue¹¹ is
equally about Petrarch’s need, under the mask of the shepherd Ami-clas, to
return to Italy and Rome.¹² Rome is patria, his native country, and it is in
Rome that the sources of poetry and learning flow clear and life-giving. So
they did for Lucan and Statius in the tenth eclogue mentioned above, and so
they still do for Petrarch. There he will sit alone “in the middle of summer,
on a green hillside or in a shadowy valley, by the border of a clear foun-
tain”, where he will write poetry in a bower, under Apollo’s laurel. His
flock will produce wool and he himself imitate bees, making honey from the
flowers around him.¹³ In Petrarch’s poetry water, fountains and rivers are a
recurrent image for poetry. He wants to imitate bees making honey, an im-

8 Only modern edition is Valla 1999. For the Elegantiae, see Regoliosi 1993, 2000 and
Regoliosi (ed.) 2010.
⁹ Modern edition in Perotti 1989–2001. For a full bibliography on the Cornu copiae,
see Charlet 2011.
¹⁰ This development is described in Rabil (ed.) 1988.
¹¹ Pade 2005. Jensen 1997 contains a thorough analysis of buc. 8, as well as an English
translation which I have used in this article.
¹² “Agnosco validum patrie revocantis amorem”, buc. 8,56.
¹³ “Ipse per estatem mediam, vel colle virenti./ Valle vel umbrosa, nitidique in margine
fontis/ Solus apollinea modulans sub fronde sedebo,/ Lanigerumque gregem pascam, et
loca florea circunv/ Mellificas imitabor apes”, buc. 8,123–127.
language as well as their literary form. In the eclogue, he describes his poetic endeavours as a longing towards his patria, Italy. Thus he turns the Latin literature of Antiquity, and the appropriation of the language it was expressed in, into a national, Italian concern, using it to construct an Italian cultural identity, based on Italy’s Roman heritage.

Petrarch’s conception of his patria was very much bound to his pride in its now long-gone Golden Age, that of ancient Rome; his cultural programme, sometimes described as a return to his patria, was connected to a revival or recreation of that Golden Age. By constant emphasis of the connection between Roman culture and Italy as geographical entity Petrarch made Roman culture into an Italian national heritage which others, for instance – or especially – the French, did not have equal access to.

The concept of imitation was central for this return to the patria, that is the recreation of Italy’s Golden Age. Especially one of Petrarch’s own descriptions of his unremitting study of the Latin classical authors, which made this imitatio possible, has often been quoted. In a letter to Boccaccio he recalls how he reads their works so often and so intensely that he almost absorbs their language and content, and forgets that their thoughts are not his own and so uses them freely in his own writings. However, it has also been noted that Petrarch’s imitatio aimed at similitudo not identitas, and thus the patria, Roman culture, would not only be revived but also enriched by his endeavours. This is expressed very clearly in another letter to Boccaccio where Petrarch describes the budding talents of his young amanuensis, Giovanni Malpaghini. He should elaborate a novel style from his imitation of old masters “so that he will resemble nobody, but rather will seem to have introduced something original into Italy from old sources”, – to Italy, not just to whom it may concern.

---

14 Cp. e.g. fam. I 8.2–3 to Tommaso Caloria: “apes in inventionibus imitandas, que flores, non quales acceperint, referunt, sed ceras ac mella mirifica quadam permixtione conficiunt” (In creative writing one must imitate the bees. They don’t return the flowers as they found them, but produce wax and honey by some wonderful mixing together).

15 “Legi apud Virgilium apud Flaccum apud Severinum apud Tullium; nec semel legi sed milies, nec cucurri sed incubui, […] etsi per omnem vitam amplius non legantur, ipsa quidem hereant, actis in intima animi parte radicibus […] nec cuius sint certe nec aliena meminerim” (I read Virgil, Horace, Boethius and Cicero, and not once but thousands of times, and I didn’t rush through them, no I sank into them […] even if I should never read them again, what they wrote remains with me, since it has struck roots in the deepest part of my mind. But sometimes I forget where it comes from […] and I neither remember clearly whose it is nor that it isn’t mine), Petrarca 1933–1941, ep. XXII 2,12–14 to Giovanni Boccaccio, a. 1359 or 1363.

The fifteenth century

In fifteenth-century Italian writers we repeatedly find the emphasis on the connection between language and identity, and especially between humanist Latin and local or Italian national cultural identity, to some degree, we may assume, due to Petrarch’s influence. In Florentine civic humanism, the city’s republican constitution was consciously and effectively used in the ideological propaganda by Coluccio Salutati and Leonardo Bruni against the threats of monarchical Milan. Salutati and Bruni both recall how Florence was founded by Roman veterans already in the first half of the first century before Christ, that is long before Roman freedom was destroyed by the emperors. Florence is thus heir to the free Roman republic and this explains both the city’s constitution in the fifteenth century – and the character of its inhabitants, especially their love of freedom. As Salutati puts it: “For what does it mean to be Florentine if not both by birth and law (the multifaceted meaning of natura contains an elegant allusion to its etymology) to be Roman, and accordingly to be free, not a slave?” In his Laudatio Florentinae urbis, Bruni enumerates the horrendous crimes of the Roman emperors, and stresses Florentine love of freedom and hate of tyranny, inherited from Republican Rome. In the same work he refers to Tacitus who maintained that the general intellectual level went down in Rome with the loss of political freedom. So according to Bruni, Florence is the heir not only to the political institutions of republican Rome, but also to its culture. In the peroratio, Bruni sums up all aspects of Florentine superiority, among them language. The Florentine vernacular is of course the sweetest, purest and most elegant in Italy, but Latin learning, litterae, flourished too, not the lowly kind, but echoes Horace: “Graccia capta ferum victorem cepit et artis intulit agresti Latio”, ep. 2.1.157–158.

19 “Quid, enim, est Florentinum esse, nisi tam natura, quam lege civem esse Romanum, et per consequens liberum, et non servum?” Salutati 1826, 54. See also ibid. “Nos autem tamquam verum Romanum genus et qui a tantis descendisse viris merito gloriamur” (As we are of true Roman stock and rightly proud to be the descendants of such men). “Ex quo illud evenire arbitror, quod in hac civitate egregie preter ceteras et fuisse et esse videmus: ut florentini homines maxime omnium libertate gaudeant et tyrannorum valore sint inimici”, Bruni 1996, 600.
20 “Nam posteaquam res publica in unius potestatem deducta est, preclara illa ingenia, ut inquit Cornelius, abiere”, ibid. 606 – Tac. hist. 1,1.
that which befits free men and always flowered in a noble people, that kind
thrive[d] in Florence:

Nam quid ego de orationis suavitate et verborum elegantia loquar? In
qua quidem re sine controversia superat. Sola enim hec in tota Italia
civitas purissimo ac nitidissimo sermone uti existimatur. Itaque omnes
qui bene atque emendate loquere volunto ex hac una urbe sumunt exem-
plum. Habet enim hec civitas homines qui in hoc populari atque com-
muni genere dicendi ceteros omnes infantes ostenderint. Littere autem
ipse, non mercenarie ille quidem neque sordide, sed que maxime sunt
liberis hominibus digna, que in omni principe populo semper florue-
runt, in hac una urbe plurimum vigent (Bruni 1996, 644).

As we see, Bruni connects the flourishing of Latin letters in his city, i.e. the
humanist Latin literature of which he himself is perhaps the prime represen-
tative, to the characteristic he and Salutati constantly stressed in their de-
scription of the Florentine, namely freedom. Like Salutati, Bruni used the
circumstances of the foundation of the city to explain the present character-
istics of its citizens: the founding myths and historical institutions of the
city-state are evoked with a clear view to contemporary conditions.

Roman humanism and Valla

Petrarch had been eager for the papacy to return to Rome, and in the follow-
ing century, when it did, the return was often hailed by humanists as the
second, or third, founding of Rome. We can observe a strong interest in the
myths about the founding of Rome and in the early history of the city: hu-
manists assiduously studied the institutions and topography of Early Rome,
and the Pope himself is called pontifex maximus, that is the title of the high
priest of ancient Rome. The title was avoided as being heathen during the
Middle Ages, as Iiro Kajanto has shown, but from the middle of the fif-
teenth century it was more used than “papa” in curial epigraphy.22

All this may be seen as the humanists’s general enthusiasm for all things
classical, but if we keep in mind what happened in Florence, we may also
interpret it as a conscious use of the city’s history and exceptional culture.
Archaeologists distinguish between “Roman” and “city-Roman”, and I sug-
gest we do the same with humanism. We find invocations of the grandeur
and high cultural level of ancient Rome in the writings of humanists all over
Italy, and outside, but from the second half of the fifteenth century we find a
distinct group of humanists whose identity is connected to Rome as a geo-
graphical locality.23

---

I have now repeatedly quoted the theories of scholars like Gellner and Smith, who maintained that history, when used as a factor in the construction of a common or national identity, often contains the idea of an earlier Golden Age, or high culture, which must either be conserved or revived. In the case of Rome, whether we talk about the city or the empire, this Golden Age is closely connected to language and literature. We see this in the preface of Lapo da Castiglionchio (1406–1438) to his translation of Plutarch’s *Publicola*, dedicated to Cardinal Giordano Orsini. Orsini belonged to one of Rome’s oldest families, so a biography of one of the city’s first consuls was a fitting gift, but he was also known as a patron of literary men and owned a fine library.²⁴ Lapo’s hopes for Rome’s rebirth are connected to the Cardinal’s endeavours to collect new or rare works of the Latin classics, for instance Plautus, and to the flowering of humanist Latin: “I watch the study of eloquence, which for so long has been neglected, but has now finally been brought back to us. I look at our contemporaries who are burning with eagerness to express themselves and have been endowed with every gift of nature which should make this possible. And this makes me hope that soon we shall see a truly praiseworthy orator”. Even so, Lapo and his contemporaries had been deprived of the possibility of fully achieving what the ancestors did, because so many of their books had been lost, the poets, historians, jurists, orators and philosophers from which an orator would learn style and rhythm and acquire wisdom. Lapo here talks about the books “our ancestors left us” (*quos maiores nostri scriptos nobis reliquerunt*) and about the various sorts of poets born “in your (i.e. Orsini’s) city alone” (*quos una ciuitas tua tulit*), clearly indicating the special relationship between the Roman Orsini and the writers of old. He continues to express his gratitude that a good fortune let Orsini be born at this very time, so that he could be of help to scholars in reduced circumstances, “for you are the only one in centuries who have tried, and not just tried, but to a large degree also succeeded in raising, developing and adorning the Latin language”, amongst other things by collecting rare books and bringing them to Rome (*in tuam urbec undique contulisti*). As a sign of his gratitude for Orsini’s services to Latin culture, Lapo had translated Plutarch’s life of Publicola, his compatriot, for him. Publicola should be of special interest to Orsini, because he gave Rome, Orsini’s city, the beginnings of freedom after the expulsion of the kings:

Etenim saepissime cum perspicio eloquentiae studia, quae deserta et inculta iam diu iacuerunt, longo interuallo repetita et ad nos relata esse, nostros uero homines ita dicendi cupiditate flagrantes, ita ad eam

²⁴ Pade 2007, I Ch. 7.5.
rem naturae munere instructos, ut non desperem nos perbreui omni laude cumulatum oratorem esse habituros, queri uelhemenet soleo hon nostram aetatem in ea tempora incidisse, quibus facultas eis erepta sit ne ad pristinam illam eloquentiae gloriam peruenire possint, ut mihi aliquod infestum numen huiusmodo laudem inuidisse nosbi ui(de)atur. Nam illi litterarum thesauri, illa doctrinae monumenta, illa uberrima librorum copia, quos maiores nostri scriptos nosbi reliquerunt, delecta est et interiit, egestas et inopia consecuta est. Ut enim omittam de singulis cogitando recordari: ubi tot latini poetae, tragici, satyrici, lyrici, elegi, quos una ciuitas tua tulit, quo nam abierunt, & quibus oratori granditas uerborum et sen<ten>tiarum ubertas, numerorum præterea ac pedum concentus et harmonia quaedam petenda est? Ubi illa historicorum turba, quae nobis monumenta rerum gestarum et uetustatis exempla suppeditet, quae nisi orator percursa animo et decantata habeat, ignarus quidem et hebes uideatur? Ubi tot et tam amplissima uolumina, in quibus ius legum et iuris ciuilis scientia continentur? [...] Quis casus, quae calamitas, quae clades nobis illas eri-puit [...] ut ex infinite pene oratorum numero unum tantum nec eum quidem integrum habeamus? Adde philosophorum libros [...] Sed me in hac tanta molestia mea illa res maxime consolatur, quod spero immortalem deum his nostris incommodis difficultatibusque aliquando tandem prospicere uoluisse, cum te nobis, pater clementissime, tradidit, qui mihi non sorte naturae, sed praecipuo quodam fato huius aetatis genitus et procreatus esse uideris, qui studiosis hominibus inopias laborantibus tuo studio, labore, diligentia, tuis denique facultatibus subuenires. Siquidem unus tot iam seculis extitisti, qui Latinam linguam attollere iacentem, amplificare, ornare conatus es, neque conatus es solum, sed magna iam ex parte perfecisti; tu enim comparandorum librorum gratia aetate longissima itiner a et difficilima ad remotissimas regiones magnis sumptibus labore periculo susceptisti, tu ueteres permultos doctissimos uiris inuentis eorum operibus, quae ante ignorabantur, ab obliuione hominum et silentio uendicasti [...] tot iam solus libros, ut audio, in omni genere doctrinæ, in tuam urben undique contulisti, qui pluribus ciuitatibus ad legendum sufficerent, ut illis homines discendi cupidis sine labore, sine sumptu, sine molestia uerentur [...] Ut et tibi si non digno, grato tamen munere, quod á me debe retur, persoluerem et reliquos ad simile factum prouocarem, itaque Publicolae ciuis tui clarissimi uiri uitam tibi ex Plutarcho interpretatus sum, non tam quod intelligerem te Plutarchi opera studiose quere, quam quod hanc tibi praeceteris iucundam fore existimaui, quod ab eo uiro tua ciuitas exactis regibus libertatis initium habuisse.25

25 Pade 2007, II Ch. 3.2
So in Lapo’s preface we find both the Golden Age, i.e. the high culture of Ancient Rome, the period of decline, i.e. the Middle Ages, and the beginning of the new age which marks the return to the (linguistic) standards of the Golden Age. Lapo celebrates this budding new age by dedicating the life of Publicola, who exemplifies the beginning of Rome’s Golden Age, to his compatriot Orsini, who was instrumental in reviving the high culture of ancient Rome by his patronage of humanist Latin.

The connection between language and (high-)culture is even more explicitly stated in the *Elegantiae linguae latinae* of Lorenzo Valla. Valla (1407–1457) was actually Roman by birth, and the *Elegantiae* is dedicated to his colleague Giovanni Tortelli, the eminent curial humanist who had translated Plutarch’s *Romulus* and written a treatise on the topography of ancient Rome. Valla’s famous preface is written in 1449, under the reign of Nicholas V. It is a composed as a grandiose comparison between the Latin language and the Roman Empire: whereas many people had managed to extend their empire, none had ennobled their own language as the Romans did theirs. Valla writes “as we did”, writing thus as the descendant of the ancient Romans, who – he continues – “in a short time made the Roman language famous and sovereign, the language which is also called Latin after Latium, where Rome is situated”. So Latin is the language of Rome, and the emphasis on Latin as Roman is marked all through the preface, on the lexical, stylistical and figurative level. Latin is defined nine times with the adjective romanus. Valla talks about *lingua romana*, *sermo romanus*, and he uses the expression *romane loqui* several times, instead of the more common *latine loqui*. The juncture with *latinus* is used only six times. Valla further recalls how the provinces had freed themselves as quickly as possible from the yoke of the Roman empire, but kept the language, which as a divine gift educated people and countries in the free arts. The flowering of literature and science presupposes that of the language: “For who were the greatest philosophers, orators, lawyers – if not those who were most intent on expressing themselves well?” Later, however, things deteriorated. “Is there any lover of the arts and the public good who will not cry when he sees that this knowledge, i.e. the linguistic capacity, is in the same sorry

---

26 Pade 2007, I Ch. 7.13 and II Ch. 1.3.
28 A search in the corpus of texts on the CD-ROM *Bibliotheca Teubneriana Latina* (version 3.0, 2004) shows that *latine loqui* is very frequent, whereas *romane loqui* occurs only in a fragment from Ennius: “Hispane, non Romane, memoretis loqui me”, *ann. 503*. 
state as Rome when the city was taken by the Gauls. Everything was thrown
over, burnt down, destroyed, so even the Capitol was hardly left standing. It
is of course many centuries ago that anyone actually spoke Latin, but now
even the written texts are not understood any longer”. Valla’s imagery refers
to the catastrophe of 386 BC, when Rome was captured by the Gauls and
the entire city apart from the Capitoline hill destroyed. The political and
military reconstruction was led by Camillus, accordingly named the second
founder of his country. Valla exhorts his reader to use Camillus as a model
and rout the enemy, that is the linguistic barbary. He addresses his readers,
whom he calls *quirites*, Roman citizens, with heavy allusion to Cicero’s first
Catilinarian speech: “How long, *quirites* […] will you endure that our city is
held by the Gauls […]? How long will you watch, with unfeeling, almost
unpatriotic eyes, while everything is desecrated? […] You ought to take
Camillus as a model, Camillus, who as Virgil says, returned the standards to
the country and restored it”:

nullos tamen ita linguam suam ampliasse, ut nostri fecerunt; […] brevi
spatio linguam Romanam, quae eadem Latina a Latio, ubi Roma est,
dicitur, celebrem, et quasi reginam effecerunt […] Qui enim summī
philosophī fuerunt, summī oratores, summī iurīconsulti, summī
denique scriptores? Nempe iī, qui bene loquendi studiosissimi […]
Nam quis litterarum, quis publici boni amator a lacrimis temperet,
cum videat hanc esse quō olim Roma capta a Gallis? Omnīa
eversa, incensa, diruta, ut vix Capitolina supersit arx, siquidem
multīs iam seculīs non modo latīne nemo locutus est, sed ne latina
quidem legens intellexit […] Quousque tandem, Quirites, […] urbem
vestram, non dico domicilium imperii, sed parentem litterarum a
Gallis esse captam patiemini? […] Quousque profanata omnia duris et
pene impius conspicietis ocūlis? […] Camillus vobis, Camillus
imitandus est, qui signa, ut inquit Virgilius, in patriam referat eamque

Valla promises to lead in this fight, although he modestly maintains that his
strength will probably not suffice. The wording of the preface, the style and
the imagery all come together to make Valla’s linguistic project specifically
Roman. His preface, one of the most important manifestos of the humanists’
endeavours to reconquer the linguistic norm of classical Latinity, elegantly
links humanist Latin to one of the most famous incidents of Rome’s early
history and the grandiose *exhortatio* recalls Cicero’s celebrated rescue of the
republic, when he thwarted the plans of Catiline. So Valla invokes important
elements of what would constitute Roman national identity, and his means
of reviving that ancient high culture is language: only by reconquering the
linguistic norms of classical Latinity would it be possible to revive the cul-
ture of ancient Rome. It is probably not fortuitous that Valla chooses Camil-
lus as the hero whom he would imitate. Camillus rescued Rome from the Gauls, who here, as in the texts by Petrarch we discussed, become the enemies of humanist culture and language. It is difficult to say whether one should see Valla’s text as an expression of Roman “city-humanism” or Italian national pride, but to me there is no doubt that he links humanist Latin to a Roman or Italian cultural identity.

Guarino, Brenta and Sabellico

The next text I want to discuss is a letter by Guarino Veronese (1374–1460). In August 1452 the old Guarino, the highly honoured Nestor of the studia humanitatis, wrote a letter to his son Niccolò, apparently in answer to a letter from Niccolò which has not survived – if indeed it ever existed. Guarino’s letter is part of the so-called Crisolorina, a series of letters that should have been edited together to commemorate Guarino’s beloved teacher, Manuel Chrysoloras, and they are probably not all documentary.

However that may be, from Guarino’s letter it appears that Niccolò had come across some youthful writings of his father’s and had been appalled by their Latin: “You are wondering about some words”, Guarino writes, “which don’t really have the odour of proper Latin” (latini sermonis proprietatem minime redolentia), and indicate a different way of speaking and ornamenting one’s sentences. Niccolò’s remarks prompt Guarino to tell his son how fortunate he was to be born at the day and age he had been born. In his own youth they had the misfortune that there was no interest in humanitas, in good letters, which lay covered in darkness, as a result of which the former charm of Roman eloquence, this wonderful flowering of the letters, had withered away, and a hotchpotch had entered people’s speech, making it harsh:

Nam sicut infeliciter olim nobiscum actum erat, ut ad inune telus usque annos nostros tantopere studia ipsa humanitatis obdormissent iacentis in tenebris, ut avitus ille romanae facundiae lepos suavissimusque scribendi flos emarcuisset et nescio quae “sartago loquendi venisset in linguas” (Pers. 1,80), unde acerbata erat oratio […]

We are definitely confronted with a myth of decline here! Now, Guarino continues, they lived in far better times, a fact Guarino uses to teach Niccolò how times change, and how it came about that Guarino himself had received such a miserable education – in the period before the present happy state of affairs. Guarino said that in his youth there was no interest in good letters, that humanitas lay covered in darkness.

29 Ep. 862. All quotes from this letter are from Guarino Veronese 1915–1919.
There are of course many definitions of what the *studia humanitatis* comprise, but in this connection it may be useful to quote P.O. Kristeller’s definition.\(^{30}\) He maintained that the expression *studia humanitatis* primarily signified the study of rhetoric, grammar, history, poetry and moral philosophy. But Niccolò did not criticise what his father wrote, but the language in which he wrote it, so it is interesting that Guarino blames the dormant *studia humanitatis* for his linguistic deficiencies. In modern terms one would say that Guarino here stresses the connection between language, literature and culture, something we have already met several times in the texts I have examined.

After deploring the general lack of good letters in his youth, Guarino goes on to explain the essence of the problem in more detail: People did not heed “Cicero, who more than anyone else was the father of Roman eloquence, and from whose tongue speech flowed sweeter than honey”, at the time of their ancestors when Italy had created an image of how to speak from his language, as from a mirror.\(^{31}\) Guarino continues to hold up the language of Cicero as the absolute linguistic norm: once the mere emulation of Cicero’s style and the enthusiasm for it had led to very considerable progress,\(^{32}\) in the good old days, before things went wrong. It may be significant that Guarino here uses the noun *aemulatio*; I believe that he here, like Petrarch did in his *imitatio* of the classics, wants to produce a linguistic *similitudo*, not *identitas*, a mechanic reproduction of the original. Guarino continues to explain when and how the linguistic corruption set in: “Long after, when Italy instead of Cicero devoured various Prosperos, *Éva Columba* and *Chartulae*, coming from God knows where, a rough and uncouth style of speaking and writing developed”:

In eius autem locum longo post intervallo cum Prosperos, Evas Columbas et Chartulas irruptentes quaquaversum imbuta absorbuisset Italia, quaedam germinabat dicendi et scribendi horrens et inculta barbaries.

Guarino here criticises the influence from some very widespread scholastic grammars, namely that of Prospero of Aquitania, and two named after their *incipits*, *Éva Columba* and *Chartula*. They had many deficiencies, one apparently being that they weren’t Italian, they were *irruptentes quaquaversum*.

---

\(^{30}\) Kristeller 1956.

\(^{31}\) “Ignorabatur ‘romani maximus auctor Tullius eloquii’ (Luc. civ. 7,62), cuius ex lingua penes maiores nostros ‘melle dulcior fluxerat oratio’ [Cic. Cato 31,16], a qua velut e speculo Italia dicendi formarat imaginem”.

\(^{32}\) “solaque ciceronianae dictionis quondam aemulatio ac delectatio vehementem proficiendi causam induxerat”. 
To Guarino, then, the sad cultural state he experienced in his youth was the result of two factors: neglect of Cicero, the Roman author *par excellence*, as a linguistic norm, and foreign influence. To him, as to Petrarch, Lapo and Valla, the development of humanist Latin is the most important means to revive the cultural Golden Age of Ancient Rome, and that Golden Age is bound to Italy, to the people born or settled there – linguistic influences from elsewhere are not welcome.33

Andrea Brenta’s (†1484) 1482 oration *In disciplinas et bonas artem*, held in Rome, contains a praise of Latin which again makes it clear that Italians, and even more so Romans, were exceptionally blessed in being so to speak born into the mastery of Latin. Latin is their language, the language of the Romans which with its sweetness and elegance conquered the world more permanently than the military might of the Roman empire had managed to. If Latin had not possessed every good quality, the nations of Egypt, Africa, Asia, the Balkans, Germany, France, Britain, Spain – and all other barbarian people – would not have adapted it, held it in honour and used it until the present. The Spaniards, who cherish Latin as much as the Italians, almost made it their home-tongue. So Italians ought to be proud that they were born and raised in Latin! As Plato used to express his gratitude that he was Greek, not barbarian, and born in Athens rather than in another Greek city, so Brenta’s audience should rejoice in the fact they were not barbarians, but Italians, and not born in just any Italian town, but of noble Roman stock. Because they were born and raised – and here the text can mean either – in Rome or with the Latin language, they should be proud and happy, think of themselves as superior to other people and ascribe it to their very fortunate circumstances. For their language and Roman eloquence had without any doubt received, preserved and developed every branch of learning:

> Primum igitur lingua nostra Latina citetur, quae quam excellens, splendida atque praeclara sit non multa demonstratione indiget, quippe quae omnibus manifesta, testata, clara et illustrata pateat ac totum fere terrarum orbem occupaverit et quod vi aut armis retineri non potuit, id

33 We find another example of the connection between Latin learning and Italy as *patria* in the preface of Niccolò Perotti’s (1430–1480) large encyclopaedia of the Latin language, *Cornu copiae seu linguae latinae commentarii*, dedicated to Federico di Montefeltro. Perotti praises the Duke and promises him that people will realise that because of him true learning had again found life, blood and fatherland, having so long been banned and exiled from its native soil: “ut sub te uno spiritum et sanguinem et patriam bonarum artium studia receperint, quae antehac natali solo priuata et perpetuo exilio damnata uidebantur”, CC *proh* 10 from Perotti 1989–2001, vol. I. The learning Perotti refers to is of course his own study of the Latin language, the printing of which he hoped Frederico would subsidise. If the work was printed in Italy, learning would return to its origin, its fatherland.
ipsa sua dulcedine, suavitate et lepore sibi subditum fecit. quae omnia bona nisi inessent in ea, non Aegyptii, non Africani, non omnes Asiatici, non Pannotii, non Illyrii, non Germani, non Galli, non Britannii, non Hiberni, non denique reliquae omnes barbarae nationes eam ampliææ, ea usae fuissent et usque ad hodiernum diem tantopere uteren- tur adamarentque. quid dicam de Hispanis, a quibus lingua nostra non minus quam apud nos colitur, ut iam illum suam propriam et prope vernaculam fecerint […] quanto igitur magis nobis gloriandum est in hac esse natos, altos et educatos! Plato vir ille divinus solitus dicere fertur inter cetera diis gratias habere, quod Graecus, non barbarus, quod Atheniensis, non ex alia Graecorum civitate ortus fuis-set. similiter vobis in maxima laude ponendum est quod non barbari, sed Itali, non ex alia Italiae urbe, sed nobiles Romani nati estis. vos ergo, quibus a natura datum est in hac nasci, nutriri et educari, ea glo- riamini, ea oblectamini, eo vos reliquis hominibus praestare in ani- mum inducite et id optimae for tum vestrae tribuat is. lingua namque nostra et Romanum eloquium cui dubium est quin omnes doctrinas et bonas artes exceperit, conservaverit, excoluerit? (Brenta 1995, §§ 9–15).

We have another very eloquent coupling of Latin and contemporary Roman humanist culture in Marcantonio Sabellico’s (ca. 1436–1506) De reparatione linguae Latinae from 1490. Iacopo Conte Giuliari, one of the interlocutors of the dialogue,34 talks about the decline of Latin culture during the gothica tempestas, the Middle Ages, about the losses that in recent times are being partly remedied. Although true Latinity was not yet restored, there were many now who led the way towards that goal, through whom the Ro- man tongue would shed the barbarian squalor which had long covered it:

Iuliarius/ Sunt non pauci, ut dicis, Sabellice, qui alia atque alia via romanas litteras nuperrime iuvere; nam, praeterquam quod omnia fere emendatoria occurrunt, non desunt qui quotidia aliquid novi in com- munem usum proferant. Quae, et si non sunt talia, ut iacturam illam, quam nostrae litterae gothica tempestate fecere, omnino rescarciant, lev- vant tamen inopiam et egestatem, quam dira illa calamitas latino nomini attulit. Quod malum ita violenter omnia invaserat, ut a clade illa longe vetustissima aegre ad hos annos respirare sit datum. Aliquot igitur effecerunt nostrorum temporum viri, per quos si non rem ipsam, umbram tamen et verum latinitatis adhuc nomen retinemus, si quidem horum ductu et auspiciis romanus sermo omnem exuit squalorem, omnem barbarium, quibus sordibus diu fuerat immersus (Sabellico 1999, 86–87).

34 For Giuliari, see the introduction of Bottari in Sabellico 1999, 13–16.
It should be noticed that the time of decline is designated with a non-Italian name, *gothica tempestas*, and that it is something foreign, *barbaries*, that has marred the Latin language, the *sermo romanus*, for so long.

With a rhetoric which is strongly reminiscent of Valla’s preface to the *Elegantiae*, Sabellico compares the merits of two famous Romans, those of Furius Camillus who rescued Rome from the Gauls and those of Valla, who rescued the Roman tongue and composed the *Elegantiae* as a bulwark against barbarisms. Both merited the name of *pater patriae*, but Valla most, because restoring the language, the most useful of nature’s gifts to man, was an even greater thing than restoring Rome to its inhabitants:

Cui igitur summus ille honor contigit? Huic videlicet a quo patrium sermonem maxime vindicari oportuit. Romanus fuerat Furius, non externus, qui barbaros Urbe expulit, romanus et hic, qui barbarum sermonem prorsus sustulit. struxerat Furius ille intra Urbem legiones, quas in hostem direxit, struxit et Laurentius Vallasins accuratissimos *Elegantiarum* libros in foedam et horridam barbariem. vicit dux ipse primo intra moenia, mox quod reliquum hostium fuit ad unum foris confecit, eodem non alio successu hic quoque Romae primo, mox reliqua Italia inveteratum malum oppressit. restituit ille patriae adempta signa, hic ademptum sermonem: uterque dignus qui pater patriae nominetur, sed eo alter dignior, quod plus certe fuit sermonem, quo nihil ab ipsa natura est homini utilius datum, quam Urbem civibus restituisse suis (Sabellico 1999, 120–121).

In the second part of the dialogue Guarino Veronese’s son Battista discusses the merits of the humanist commentary, which, according to him, played a major role in the restoration of Latin, i.e. in the development of humanist Latin. It was through the worthy compilers of such commentaries that the Roman tongue finally, after thousand disgraceful years, regained its old liberty and that Rome and all of Italy reclaimed its language freed of barbarisms. It had almost been better if the rich literary culture of Greece had never reached Italy, because people who had never been familiar with that kind of culture did not miss it. Italy, on the other hand, had not only profited from it, but also passed it on to other people, and suffered the loss:

Hi sunt igitur – nam de reliquis qui ad nostrum non faciunt institutum nihil attinet dicere –, qui Romanam linguam mille circiter et amplius annos indigno pressam servicio in antiquam libertatem vindicarunt, omnique barbarie prorsus sublata suum Roma caeteraque Italia recept sermonem […] Satius pene fuisset nunquam ex Graecia litteras ad nos delatas, nunquam historicos, poetas, oratores habuisse, si tot claris ingenios, tot fecundis laboribus injuria temporum carituri fueramus. Minus enim desiderantur ea quorum usus ad sensum non pervenit.
As I have mentioned several times in this article, modern scholars have identified the idea of an earlier Golden Age, which the national culture wishes to revive, as an important element in the construction of national identity. If we accept that, then it becomes evident that the development of humanist Latin in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was also a means to constitute an Italian cultural identity. And if language was the vehicle of cultural identity, reconstituting the language of Roman Antiquity meant re-establishing the superiority of Roman culture. Even if the Romans had, through no fault of their own (as Valla is careful to point out) lost their political power, culturally they were once again the dominant power in Europe, “for”, as Valla said at the beginning of the *Elegantiæ*, “the Roman Empire is found where the Roman language holds sway”. Petrarch had lamented the dominance of the barbarian Gauls; Guarino regretted their influence over spheres of culture which were properly Italian, and Valla used the consciousness of his fellow Romans as heirs of a glorious past to describe humanist Latin as the essential means of Roman cultural expansion.
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Latín, nacionalismo y arte alusiva en la historiografía de Antonio de Nebrija

Felipe González Vega*

As well as a fresh study of the historiographical theory presented by Antonio de Nebrija in his Diuinatio in scribenda historia, this essay reconsiders the form and meaning of allusion employed in it. Allusion there operates as an indirect testimony of the historical author's aims, as they are reflected in his personal animosity towards his opponent L. Marineo Siculo receiving the position of royal chronicler. Nebrija's intertextuality is strictly limited to the ordering of phrases or syntactic sequences, and there are no flights of metaphor other than an illustration of the eloquence and passion for narrative which he has employed in his historiographical writing. His priority is not truth with regard to the achievements of the Catholic monarchy, but the production of a deliberately subjective propaganda for the empire: the more efficacious and persuasive it is, the more evidently accomplished is the style in which it is expressed.

En el conjunto de la obra humanística de Antonio de Nebrija (1444–1522) la dimensión inacabada y hasta cierto punto fragmentaria de su obra historiográfica se nos antoja poco consistente como para siquiera asegurar certezas sobre su naturaleza y condición de historiador. En realidad, su publicación en la forma en que se nos ha transmitido no fue decisión editorial que tomara nuestro autor, sino su hijo Sancho pasados veinte años de la muerte de su padre, en oportuna coincidencia con el auge que experimentó hacia los años 50 la preceptiva historiográfica. Pero en la elección de Granada como su lugar de publicación en 1545 quizá fueran más decisivas otras razones de proyección política que las coincidentes literarias. Huelga decir que para los historiadores del Renacimiento no existe otro modelo imitativo que el paradigma cultural grecorromano, ni otra lengua que el latín para una comunicación global y persuasiva en este nuevo

* Este ensayo participa de las actividades del Grupo de Investigación “Tradiciones Clásicas” de la UPV/EHU (GIU07–26) y “LITTERARVM” (GIU10–19).
mundo en expansión. Pero no es menos cierto que a estas alturas del siglo, mediando cincuenta años desde la conquista de Granada por los Reyes Católicos, el horizonte político y cultural de España alcanza verdaderas dimensiones imperiales. La apertura del concilio de Trento en 1545 promoviendo la renovación espiritual de la Europa occidental concitará mayor resonancia europea al imperio español, a cuyo propósito los textos históricos nebrisenses contribuirán con el impulso patriótico y triunfalismo que les anima desde su diseño programático.1

La teoría humanística de la historia muestra dos rasgos sustanciales, un componente retórico o literario que resulta inseparable del otro pragmático. Pues todo relato historiográfico nunca será literatura pura; surge motivado por el empeño muy humanístico de articular su experiencia directa de la política con las lecturas de los clásicos, y siempre tendrá una finalidad práctica, ya sea didáctica, ejemplarizante (como magistra uitae, frente al descrédito moral de la ficción caballeresca), o político-propagandística. A zaga de esta última orientación acudirá, con mayor motivo si cabe en estos tiempos de formación de los estados modernos, el sentimiento nacionalista. Nebrija define y organiza su concepción práctica de la historia en la Diuinatio in scribenda historia, que en su origen es la epístola (o discurso, tanto da) de agradecimiento al rey Fernando por nombrarle historiographus regius, fechada en Alcalá el 13 de abril de 1509, pero publicada casi cuarenta años después, sirviendo de prólogo a los dos libros de Decades que editara su hijo Sancho. No está de sobra que recordemos el encabezamiento completo del prólogo:2

Aelii Antonii Nebrissensis ex grammatico et rhetore historiographi regii rum a Ferdinando et Elisabe Hispanicarum felicissimis regibus gestarum Decades duae, eiusdem ad clarissimum Hispanicarum atque utriusque Siciliae Insularumque Maris Nostri moderatorem Ferdinandum Diuinatio in scribenda historia.

(Las Dos Décadas de Gestas realizadas por los Bienaventurados Reyes de las Españas Fernando e Isabel del Cronista Real Elio Antonio de Nebrija, otrora Gramático y Rétor. Al Ilustrísimo Fernando Regidor
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de las Españas, de las Dos Sicilias y de las Islas del Mar Nuestro su Discurso de Nombramiento para escribir la historia.)

Repárese en que Nebrija desde la misma dedicatoria no olvida su primigenia condición de grammaticus et rhetor, de nuevo vuelta a nombrar en la exhortatio ad beneuolum candidumque lectorem que le sigue. No estamos ante una huera acumulación ornamental de cargos docentes. Tampoco creemos que dada su destacada posición y reiteración en la cabecera de la carta quiera limitarse puntualmente a informarnos de su tránsito y ascenso profesional. Bien al contrario, el sintagma acuña en un único título la vieja profesión gramatical y la nueva de cronista real, como las dos caras de una misma moneda, que revaloriza la polivalencia funcional que define per se al buen gramático y habilita de hecho vías de ascenso profesional. En otros campos exclusivos del saber y de mayor prestigio social como el de la teología, nuestro humanista persiste en mantener el título de sus antiguos cargos, todo por reclamar la legitimidad para intervenir en estas parcelas vedadas entonces al gramático.3

Tres estudios han sido los que a nuestro parecer han hecho progresar significativamente la moderna interpretación de la diuinatio nebrisense.4 Y todos ellos, con mayor o más escueta erudición, han razonado y motivado su Quellenforschung. En las páginas que siguen quiero profundizar en las vetas literarias del texto nebrisense, matizando y ensanchando –eso espero– varios de los puntos de vista conocidos hasta el momento. En definitiva, aspiro a un análisis más comprensivo del uso que los humanistas hacen de la tradición literaria; su aplicada actualización de unos textos latinos antiguos que retraten, nombren y expliquen las nuevas realidades políticas contemporáneas. Fué Tate [1994, 26] el primero en destapar la subyacente alusividad a la Diuinatio in Quintum Caecilium, el discurso con que Cicerón justificaba su elección como acusador frente a Q. Cecilio en el proceso contra Verres. Allí el sabio hispanista británico descubría la relación intertextual de los argumentos conclusivos de Nebrija con el pasaje donde Cicerón criticaba la incapacidad de su rival, pese a sus dotes naturales y excelente formación, para afrontar una causa judicial de tal dimensión y tanta

3 Así leemos en el título de su Apologia: “Aelii Antonii Nebrissensis ex grammatico rhetoris in Complutensi gymnasio atque proinde historici regii in quinquaginta sacrae scripturae locos non uulgariter enarratos. TERTIA QVINQVAGENA”, publicada en Alcalá el 13 de abril de 1516. Sobre lo llamativo de esta tríada de cargos se ha pronunciado Codoñer 2008.

4 Me refiero respectivamente a Tate 1994 y Maestre Maestre 1995. El último y más reciente es el de Codoñer 2008. Como vamos a hacer un uso intensivo de los tres, y por ver de incorporar sus ideas con agilidad crítica en mi exposición, las referencias serán entre corchetes [año, página] o entre paréntesis (apellido año, página).
expectación (Caecil. 12, 39: “[…] si litteras Graecas Athenis non Lilybaei, Latinas Romae non in Sicilia didicisses[…]:

Etsi Latinas litteras in Latio non didicimus nec in Sarmatia quidem, sed in Baetica[…]; etsi Romanum sermonem Romae non didicimus, nec Lilybaei quidem, sed Bononiae[…]

(Y aunque no hemos aprendido las letras latinas en el Lacio, ni en la Sarmacia siquiera, sino en la Bética[…]; aunque no hemos aprendido la lengua de Roma en Roma, ni aun en Lilibeo, sino en Bologna[…])

De paso despejaba en el título los equívocos del término diuinatio en torno a cuál fuera su verdadero significado y alcance, más estructurador en su acepción técnica como “discurso de nombramiento”. Efecto que no se consigue de haberlo entendido en su acepción propia y general como “divinación”, que nos venía sugerida por esa expresión que leemos al final de la epístola:

quod his in rebus quas scripturi sumus, aut ipsi interfuimus, cum gererentur, aut ab iis qui interfuerunt, accepimus, et quasi diuinarem fore, ut aliquando hanc operam nauaturus essem, ita omnia inquirebam, omnia explorabam, omnia notabam.

(respecto de lo que vamos a narrar, o intervínimos en persona mientras sucedía, o nos lo han contado testigos presenciales, y como si divinaras que alguna vez habría de emprender esta tarea, todo lo investigaba, todo lo experimentaba, todo lo anotaba.)

Estas dotes adivinatorias y premonitorias que se atribuye Nebrija no dejan de ser una ampliación del significado primero y técnico, un guiño semántico en la clausura para enlazar ingeniosamente con la apertura. Una pirotecnia verbal, iluminando en el final su genuina vocación de escritor en esta experiencia sobrenvenida, directa o testifical, de los hechos que va a narrar, pero que en su concomitancia significante aún refleja el significado primero y del principio como “oración para dar acusador”.5

De acuerdo al exhaustivo estudio del Profesor Maestre [1995, 168–173] la lectura comparada de ambas diuinationes nos descubre a un Nebrija muy atento a los argumentos primarios (tópoi) con que Cicerón estructura la suya, a tal grado que la dependencia nebrisense rebasaría aquella puntual y breve adaptación sintagmática hasta abrazar “buena parte de su estructura y contenido”. Según éste, la epístola, más que servir de agradecimiento al rey Fernando, constituirla un velado ataque contra Lucio Marineo Siculo, quien por aquellas fechas pujaba con Nebrija por hacerse con el cargo de cronista real. Y, a su vez, esta enconada enemistad personal encarnaría un conflicto

5 Así lo define el propio Nebrija en su Lexicon de 1492.
mayor de intereses entre castellanos y aragoneses-italianos. Los argumentos que proporciona Cicerón se desgranan como “presiones de los amigos del oponente” (Caecil. 22–23), “acusación objetiva del oponente” (Caecil. 30–35) y “sólida formación y experiencia del elegible-elegido” (Caecil. 40–41).

A mayor abundamiento, aporta Maestre las quaestiones que según Quintiliano conformaban las “de accusatore constituiuendo diuinationes”: “maiores causae”, “industria aut uires”, y “fides” (Inst. 7,4,34). El punto de vista adoptado o la idea primaria que organiza la intelección literaria de esta Divinatio in scribenda historia, o de cualesquiera otros prólogos del Renacimiento, consiste para el Profesor Maestre en “descubrir, paso a paso, las hoy oscuras alusiones en ellos encerradas” [1995, 173]. A su propósito el texto solo documentaría las intenciones psicológicas, biográficas o referenciales en las que el autor se sintiera directamente implicado, de modo que tal alusividad ve reducidas sus funciones literarias y pragmáticas a mero testimonio biográfico o factual, en esta ocasión contra L. Marineo Sículo como su antagonista al cargo de cronista real. La función de esta literatura resulta así unidireccional y finalista en su servidumbre de la función política de la historiografía, cuando en buena lógica debiera priorizarse la literatura y observar desde esta ladera cómo configura Nebrija su teoría de la historia y su praxis política. Debemos, por tanto, reconducir el análisis de los procesos imitativos hacia el texto y sus propiedades funcionales.

Podemos volver a recordar la dispositio de la Divinatio in scribenda historia. El motivo primario con que se arranca la carta es doble e interdependiente, agradecimiento de Nebrija y iudicium del Rey:

Non possum non magnificare tuum de me iudicium, clarissime Princeps, quod […] me potissimum delegeris, cui inmortalia tua gesta latino sermone describenda.

(No puedo no apreciar en mucho vuestro criterio sobre mí, M. S., por haberme elegido con preferencia para inmortalizar en lengua latina vuestras hazañas.)

En realidad, el mayor peso lo tiene el criterio real por haber elegido a Nebrija para el cargo de cronista. Esta es la razón por la que no vuelven a hacerse explícitas, ni siquiera en la clausura, las gracias, mientras que el tópico de la elección recorre la carta de principio a fin.

Para ilustrar las posibles dificultades que le surgirán al rey para elegir cronista recurre en la narratio a la conocida anécdota de Alejandro Magno, según la cual éste decidió que nadie le pintara, esculpiera o grabara sobre gema, excepto los más eminentes en cada una de las artes: Apeles, Lisipo y Pirgoteles. Tal acierto en el terreno de las Bellas Artes no se correspondió en el de las Bellas Letras, errando al elegir el escritor que cantase en verso sus hazañas, cierto Quérido poeta ineptissimus. Pero lo que en el fondo
trasciende el ejemplo son la complejas relaciones entre arte y realidad, y entre la verdad y la tergiversación inherentes, hechas depender del criterio de (im)pericia técnica ("ne quisquam opifex artis imperitia quicquam ex uera facie deprauaret"). Quiere decirse que la responsabilidad última sobre la verosimilitud del objeto artístico icónico o textual –esto es, el efecto de verdad que provoca en el receptor–, descansa en el artista encargado de su pintura, escultura, grabado o escritura. Así ha logrado conectar el ejemplo pictórico antiguo con su concreta circunstancia vital:

Haec sunt a me, clarissime Rex, tam multis repetita, non quo uelim me Apelli comparare ad depingendos fortunae tuae successus incredibiles, non Lyssipo ad exprimendas ingenii tui dotes innumerabiles, non Pyrgoteli ad scalpenda figendasque posteritatis memoriae animi tui uirtutes.

(He recordado todo esto, Real Majestad, no porque desee compararme con Apeles pintando fielmente vuestra increíble buena fortuna, ni con Lisipo por saber expresar vuestras incontables cualidades naturales, ni con Pirgoteles por saber cincelar vuestras virtudes para recuerdo de la posteridad.)

El exemplum es el otro modo de vinculación histórica y moral entre mundos diversos y distantes. Desde finales del Cuatrocentos el humanismo había convencido de que la antigüedad a través de sus textos, pese a su mucho boato lingüístico y anticuario, podía repercutir en su vida diaria. La erudición era entonces un saber aplicado que no dudaban en transferir a la sociedad. Las litterae ayudaban entonces a discurrir la realidad de todos los días. La historia revelada en las litterae era entonces el nuevo spectaculum, que había logrado arrumbar todo speculum teológicamente edificante. Ese tal escenario se descubría multiforme, donde sus variadas imágenes o exempla cifraban la “evidencia” histórica, en cuya contemplación habría de fraguarse la “recte vivendi normam” que el maestro Guarino de Verona le suponía. Y del acuerdo que pudiera darse entre los testimonios antiguos derivaba la auctoritas para el presente, pero no hasta el punto de imponerse sobre el emancipado iudicium –el criterio subjetivo de la racionalidad– del humanista.6

Regresemos a nuestra epístola que, motivada por el agradecimiento y la elección de Nebrija, consigue que pierdan fuerza articulatoria en el relato las
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cruelas dirigidas a los italianos y las de estos hacia los españoles. Tales críticas las introduce nuestro humanista relacionadas con el asunto mayor de la historiae fides, esto es con la confianza —nada que ver con nuestra idea de la objetividad o veracidad— puesta en la historia, y cuya definición y concepción intenta ofrecernos en la divinatio. Es este peculiar sentido de la verdad y de su representación el auténtico punto fuerte en su asedio historiográfico.

A tal propósito la equiparación entre pintura y escritura sigue organizando su teoría de la historia. Con la perspicacia que le caracteriza, mi benemérita maestra Carmen Codoñer [2008, 127] descubre tal conexión en la recurrente polivalencia del verbo (de)pingere, que acabamos de leer aplicado a Nebrija a través de la comparación establecida, pero cuya acción siempre le pertenece en el texto a Apelles. Esto sucede desde el comienzo mismo de la anécdota (“ne quisquam ex coloribus imaginem suam pingeret nisi Apelles”), pero también un poco después, al defender como necesarios el “apasionamiento” y la “parcialidad” en la escritura de la historia y comentar la solución adoptada por Apelles en el retrato que hace del rey tuerto Antígono. Se me permitirá que cite por largo el pasaje, pues en su binívoca concepción de la historia y pintura no están ausentes planteamientos neoplatónicos en torno a la veracidad de las representaciones —sean verbales o pictóricas—. La historia, como la pintura, no solo puede, sino que debe atenuar lo feo y honestar lo desfavorable, idealizando con preferencia el parecido del retrato con respecto a su persona real:

Sed esto, aequo illis ac nobis res Hispániae sint notae, utri magis ex animo ipsas scribent, illi qui simulatae ciusdam libertatis amore regium nomen odere regumque imperia detrectant, an nos qui sine regibus degere nescimus [...]. Et quoniam —ut inquit poeta [Hor. Serm. 1, 3, 67–68]— “uitiis nemo sine nascitur optimusque ille est, / qui minimis urgetur”, uter uitia mitiorem in partem nominabit, qui diliget, an qui negligit? Pater qui strabonem filium amat, paetum uocat, uarum eum qui sit utia siue compemis. Apelles ille (nunquam satis in arte pingendi laudatus), cum Antigoni regis imaginem pingeret, qui altero lumine orbatus erat, catagrapham, idest obliquam, fecit, ut quod

7 “Non tamen opinor satis tuto peregrinis hominibus historiae fides concrederetur, Italis maxime, nullius rei magis quam gloriae avaris”. [No obstante, no entiendo que la confianza que tenemos en la Historia pueda encomendarse sin riesgo a extranjeros, en especial a los italianos, que nada ansian más que su propio prestigio.]
8 Léase, por ejemplo, de Platón, Rep. 377e, donde se postula la fidelidad de la imagen al modelo y donde se censura la mentira indecorosa, cuando con palabras se da una falsa imagen de la naturaleza de dioses y héroes, para disponernos aquí Platón el simil del pintor, cuyo retrato no presenta la menor similitud con relación al modelo que trata de reproducir.
corpori deerat picturae potius uideretur, tantumque ab honestiore parte ostendit, cum posset totam ostendere.

(Aceptemos, pues, que a ellos [sc. los italianos] les son conocidos como a nosotros los asuntos de España, ¿quién escribirá de esos asuntos con mayor pasión, ellos que odian el título de rey y rechazan su forma de gobierno por amor a una aparente libertad, o nosotros que no sabemos vivir sin reyes[...]. Y puesto que –como dice el poeta– “nadie nace sin defectos y quien padece de los más pequeños, ese es el mejor”, ¿quién relatará esos defectos en un sentido más atenuado, quien ama o quien desprecia? El padre que quiere a su hijo bizco dice que mira de lado y al estevado lo llama zambo o patizambo. Aquel famoso Apeles [nunca lo bastante elogiado el arte de su pintura], al tener que pintar el retrato del rey Antígono, al que le faltaba un ojo, lo hizo de perfil, es decir de uno de sus lados, para que se viese que lo que le faltaba a la persona le faltaba con mayor motivo al retrato, limitándose a mostrar su lado más hermoso, aunque pudiera mostrarlo completo.)

Esta sería la interpretación a ras de la letra del pasaje: pasión y parcialidad como rasgos primarios de la escritura historiográfica; nuevas ideas que progresan en su teoría de la historia. Claro que en su encadenamiento argumentativo late muy cerca el aliento italiano, los rivales extranjeros que considera inapropiados para contar las gestas del rey Fernando, en virtud precisamente de su decidida vocación antimonárquica. Y aquí atina el Profesor Maestre [1995, 157–159] cuando entiende que estas palabras de Nebrija son réplica directa de la Oratio de laudibus historiae con que Marineo Sículo se habría postulado al cargo de cronista del rey Fernando, acusándole de la deslealtad antimonárquica que acabamos de leer. Mas esa tonalidad reflexiva y teórica que se extiende por toda la diuinatio –a la que serviría la intensa alusividad textual que analizaremos en la segunda y definitiva parte de nuestro estudio– chirría bastante si reducimos sus expectativas y la Quellenforschung a un intencionado ejercicio de animosidad personal por parte de su autor. En tal caso habría optado por la parodia y la sátira como forma que le diera sentido, si tal sistemático ataque contra Marineq fuera la idea de conjunto; si fuera, que no estamos tan seguros de ella. Creo, pues, que por encima de innegables, pero puntuales, dardos dirigidos contra actitudes del siciliano, la diuinatio compone una más cierta teoría de la narración histórica, bien afianzada y engastada en sus perlas literarias.9

9 Bien conocidas para sus lectores de aquellos tiempos, sin embargo en el nuestro, por muy enigmáticas que las haya vuelto el paso del tiempo (Maestre Maestre 1995, 173), no creo puedan explicar por sí solas y tomadas en su conjunto el valor literario de la pieza: son
El símil artístico, que desde el comienzo viene demostrando la plasticidad y verificabilidad de sus efectos fictivos, abandona su carácter ejemplar y anecdótico para asumir al final de la narratio la sustancia teórica del programa historiográfico, justo en la transición a la conclusio, cuando Nebrija define la historia por comparación con la pintura:

Erit itaque historia tanquam pictura, pulchra extollet, turpia, si tolerabilia sunt, dissimulauit, si latere non possunt, mitiori uocabulo nominabit, fallatque potius uitium specie uirtutis et umbra, quam is qui sit fortis, a timidio uocetur audax, ab audaci timidus. Atqui dicet quispiam, prima historiae uirtus est, ut uera narret. Sit ita sane, sed si paululum est a ueritate declinandum, quia non est cuiusque medium assequi, tutius atque magis ingenuum in fauorabiliorem partem declinare. Quando igitur ab Italia his rationibus excludimur, forsan ex Pannonia aut ex Germania aut ex Gallia suppetias implorabimus? Quid si apud nationes illas non minus litteratorum hominum penuria est, quam in Hispania? Quid igitur in tanta rerum difficultate faciendum fuit? Nimirum, ut si optimi non possunt, eligantur tolerabiles aut minus mali.

(Será, por consiguiente la historia como la pintura, resaltará lo bello, lo vergonzoso, aunque tolerable, lo disimulará y, de no poder ocultarlo, lo designará con palabras más suaves, y es preferable disfrazar el vicio con apariencia y sombra de virtud a que el valiente sea tachado de atrevido por el timorato y de timorato por el atrevido. Puede decirse que el primer valor de la historia sea narrar la verdad. De acuerdo, pero si ha de desviarse un tanto de la verdad, dado que cualquiera no puede alcanzar el punto medio, tanto más seguro y mucho más honesto será decantarse por lo más favorable. Y si por todas estas razones prescindimos de Italia, ¿pediremos acaso refuerzos de Hungria, de Alemania o de Francia? ¿Qué criterio, pues, debemos adoptar en tan difícil situación? Ciertamente, si no pueden ser los mejores, elegiremos los aceptables o los menos malos.)

Este pasaje parece una adaptación para la prosa de la poética horaciana, pues el sintagma “historia tanquam pictura” reverbera la bien conocida acuñación del “ut pictura poesis” (Ars 361). Hay otros intertextos antiguos que Nebrija atrae hacia esta configuración “representativa” de la historia – otros inciden directamente– y que trataremos en la discusión funcional de las fuentes. Ahora, fíjémonos en esa otra idea que apela a la también cuestiones de realia, que identifican las circunstancias y, sin duda, la procedencia fáctica de bastantes de las ideas que sostienen el texto, pero no de tanto valor estructural como para hacer pivotar sobre tales incidencias biográficas nuestra interpretación retórica y pragmática de la divinatio.
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horaciana *aurea mediocritas* (o “bendita moderación”, *Carm. 2,10,5*), al proponerla como vía privilegiada pero ardua de acceso a la verdad (“quia non est cuiusque medium assequi”). Porque la práctica historiográfica al uso entraña una decantación “in favorabiliorem partem”, es decir una selección de los aspectos más propicios al sujeto de la historia. Una solución y una justificación del uso propagandístico que encontraba fácil encaje en la famosa carta de Cicerón a Luceyo, rogándole relate su consulado con una pasión y estilo a tal grado de soslayar las leyes de la historia (*De orat. 2, 62* y *De leg. 1, 1–10*) y de mostrarse “un poquito más generoso de lo que consiente la verdad”, para de este modo recuperar el reconocimiento de la sociedad romana contemporánea (*Fam. 5, 12, 3*). Quedaba, entonces, narrativamente legitimada la consonancia entre veracidad –en tanto confianza– y parcialidad. Y de paso los rasgos que convertían a Nebrija en idóneo para el cargo de cronista real: patriotismo, favoritismo y experiencia vital en lo narrado.10

En resumidas cuentas, estamos ante el renovado valor que el Renacimiento otorga a la pintura –en particular al retrato– en la construcción de identidades, con un marcado acento en las exigencias de verosimilitud y parecido con el original.11 Todo esto no hace sino estar apuntándonos cuáles son las directrices fundamentales del programa nebrisense, más narrativas que escrupulosas de la objetividad. Con acierto, Carmen Codoñer [2008, 128–130] ha arguido la importancia que para Nebrija tiene la buena escritura y la calidad literaria en la conformación y consecución de los objetivos nacionalistas de su relato histórico.

---

10 Lo hemos tratado en González Vega 2010, 87–88. Extracto lo que me importa destacar del texto ciceroniano: “itaque te plane etiam atque etiam rogo ut et ornes ea vehementius etiam quam fortasse sensit et in eo leges historiae neglegas gratiamque illam, […] si me tibi vehementius commendabit, ne aspernere amorique nostro plusculum etiam quam concedet veritas largiare”. [Por tanto, insisto abiertamente en mi ruego de que engalanes el relato con una pasión mayor de la que quizá sientes y de que hagas caso omiso de las leyes de la historia […] si me va a hacer valer ante ti con mayor intensidad, no la rechaces y en aras de nuestra amistad sé incluso un poquito más generoso de lo que consiente la verdad.] En la traducción y notación de la carta me complace depender de Beltrán (Cicerón 2008).

11 Baste recordar los tres dísticos que Sebastián de Nebrija coloca bajo el retrato de perfil de su padre en las ediciones granadinas de sus obras (por estos mismos años 50 del siglo XVI): SEBASTIANUS NEBRISSE. ANTONII FILIUS: “Qui cupis ignotum Antonii cognoscere uultum, / aspice tam similem quam fuit ipse sibi. / Peniculo Rhincon pinxit / coeloque Philippus / Germanus molli finxit at ille luto, / sed tandem gladio nunc mira Antonius arte, / quod pressum cernis, scissile fecit opus”. [Tú que deseas conocer el rostro ignoto de Antonio, contémplalo tan parecido como real fue. Lo pintó Rincón con su pincel, con su cincel Felipe, famoso alemán, lo modeló en dúctil barro. Al fin ya Antonio con su arte perfecto y su buril grabó la estampa que ahora impresa ves.]
Algo especialmente perceptible en la conclusio, donde para seducirnos como destinatarios de la talla y dominio que él como escritor tiene para narrar las res gestae reales, no duda en disfrazarse dentro del locus humilitatis con la falsa modestia de quien, afirmándose en Horacio, se reconoce moderadamente buen escritor:

Haec forsan causa te, Princeps sapientissime, in mediocris litteraturae hominem impegit. Qui si non sumus ex prima classe, possumus tamen in secunda censeri et si non possumus magnitudinem rerum gestarum stylo exaequare, at certe conabimur, ut imbecillitatem nostram atque ingenii prauitatem\(^{12}\) studio ac diligentia compensemus. Etsi Latinas litteras in Latio non didicimus nec in Sarmatia quidem sed in Baetica, quae –ut inquit Strabo– prima omnium Hispanorum se in Romanos ritus et linguam transformauit; etsi Romanum sermonem Romae non didicimus, nec Lilybaei quidem sed Bononiae, urbe scilicet omnium bonarum artium altrice. Neque adeo a Musarum fonte abhorremus, ut non simus corriuales Columellae, Canio, Silio, Haenae, duobus Senecis unicoque Lucano aliisque poetis Cordubensibus, quamuis scribat Cicero pingüe quiddam illos et peregrinum sonare. Quid? Quod his in rebus quas scripturi sumus, aut ipsi interfuimus cum gererentur, aut ab ipsis qui interfuerunt accepimus, et quasi diuinarem fore, ut aliquando hanc operam nauaturus essem, ita omnia inquirebam, omnia explorabam, omnia notabam.

(Estas razones, Real Majestad, quizá hicieron os decantarais por un escritor de equilibrada formación literaria, que de no pertenecer a la primera clase, podemos ser considerados de la segunda, y de no ser capaces de igualar con nuestra pluma la grandeza de vuestras hazañas, no os quepa duda de que intentaremos compensar nuestra flaqueza y parcialidad con nuestra entrega y entusiasmo. Y aunque no hemos aprendido las letras latinas en el Lacio, ni en la Sarmacia siquiera, sino en el Bética, que en palabras de Estrabón fue la primera de España en adoptar la lengua y costumbres de Roma; aunque no hemos aprendido la lengua de Roma en Roma, ni aun en Lilibeo, sino en Bolonia, ciudad evidentemente propiciadora de todas las Buenas Artes. Y no soy tan ajeno a la inspiración de las Musas como para no rivalizar con Columela, Canio, Silio, Hena, los dos Sénecas y el solo Lucano y otros poetas cordobeses, por mucho que Cicerón diga que su acento es muy marcado y extranjero. ¡Qué le vamos a hacer! Así que lo que vamos a narrar, o intervinimos en persona mientras sucedía, o nos lo han contado testigos presenciales, y como si adivinara que alguna vez

---

\(^{12}\) Hemos interpretado prauitas como “parcialidad”, ateniéndonos a los significados del propio Nebrija en el Lexicon de 1492 (“por la perversidad”) y en el Dictionarium de 1512 (“por aquella torcedura delo derecho”).
habría de emprender esta tarea, todo lo investigaba, todo lo experimentaba, todo lo anotaba.)

Como antaño Cicerón a Luceyo, Nebrija le dice ahora al rey Fernando que, en virtud de su condición de hombre de letras y de su posición en el canon de autores hispanorromanos, su moderación como escritor no le impide extremar su estilo hasta alcanzar con su relato la alta dimensión exigida por los acontecimientos. Para ello, buen conocedor de sus cualidades e inclinaciones naturales, se entregará con una mayor pasión y dedicación si cabe a ensalzar el poder de la monarquía católica. Confianza (mejor que veracidad) y experiencia, subjetividad y estilo son los fundamentos que dan sentido a todo su programa historiográfico y le acreditan como historiographus regius. Apenas podemos cuestionar en Nebrija esta doble faz de la historia como literatura y como creadora y difusora de ideología, por supuesto en la lengua de Roma, ante un destinatario ya no exclusivamente nacional sino interpretado –por el mismo Nebrija– “universal cosa: catholicus” (Vocabulario, h. 1494).

Todos estos argumentos han demostrado su idoneidad para la propaganda y la parcialidad nacionalistas, que los recién creados estados esperaban de la escritura historiográfica neolatina con vistas a ensanchar su horizonte de expectativas. Un concepto articulatorio esencial de la historiografía imperialista del Renacimiento, que también opera en Nebrija, es su secularización de la idea de providentia divina. Esta concepción providencialista será responsable de que los vencedores experimenten la historia como una teleología que organiza en un todo coherente de principio a fin el relato del cumplimiento de su propio poder. El poder narrativo de lo que se ha dado en llamar “teleología imperial” seculariza el providencialismo teológico medieval con fines ahora decididamente políticos y propagandistas de los imperios y monarquías en construcción. Este poder providencial que durante la Edad Media ejercía únicamente Dios sobre el mundo y sus seres se transforma con el Renacimiento en una manifestación tan plural como numerosas las voces que pondrán su escritura al servicio de reyes y mecenas.13

Solo nos queda ya decir unas pocas palabras acerca del sentido y función que parece desprenderse del uso que en la diuinatio hace Nebrija de la copia auctoritatum. En este sentido, no pueden esperarse conclusiones significativas de orden discursivo a partir del uso de fuentes con fines documentales o que le proporcionan a nuestro autor datos en puridad informativos o eruditos, que es su empleo mayoritario. Así, el exemplum de

---

13 Lo hemos estudiado en González Vega 2010. Excelente, por lo demás, la trama comparativa y de conjunto que ofrece Quint 1993.
Alejandro Magno discerniendo en materia artística lo ha descargado Nebrija de Horacio (Epist. 2, 1, 232–241) en combinación con Plinio (Nat. 35, 85 y 37, 8). Pese a ser el motor de arranque de la teorización posterior sobre verdad y ficción en la pintura de la historia, la alusión no va más allá de la transferencia de datos.

Algo similar ocurre en la primera parte de la narratio, tras enumerar las exhaustivas “uirtutes ex fortuna et ingenio animoque” del rey Fernando. Una vez documenta la anécdota de Alejandro con los literatos de acuerdo a Plinio (Nat. 1, 1, 42–44, para Calístenes, Clitarchos y Onesicrito) y a Eusebio de Cesarea (Hist. ecc. 7, 32, 16 para Aristobulos y Tolomeo), enuncia Nebrija su falta de confianza en los italianos –ahora estilizadamente– con el sintagma: “[Non[…] historiae fides concrederetur, Italis maxime,] nullius rei magis quam gloriae auaris. Inuident nobis laudem[…]” (no[…] que la confianza que tenemos en la Historia pueda encomendarse en especial a los italianos, que nada ansían más que su propio prestigio. Nos envidian la gloria[…]); que remeda la prescripción horaciana contra los griegos de Ars 323–324: “[Grais ingenium, Grais dedit ore rotundo / Musa loqui,] praeter laudem nullius auaris” (a los griegos el talento, a los griegos les dio Musa hablar con boca redonda y nada han deseado más que la gloria). Remata la idea con dos citas testimoniales y casi literales de Catón, solo la segunda reconocida: de un lado, los italianos nos tachan de “nosque barbaros Opicosque uocantes infami appellatione foedant” (nos insultan de modo infame llamándonos bárbaros y palurdos): Frag. 1, 77: “nos quoque dictitant barbaros et spurcius[…] Opicon appellazione foedant” (a menudo nos motejan de bárbaros y cochinos[…] y nos insultan llamándonos palurdos); de otro, Nebrija nos traslada la precaución que recomendaba Catón a su hijo respecto de la literatura griega: “quodque M. Cato ad filium de Graecis scribit[…] quandocumque gens ista nobis litteras dabit, omnia corrumpet” (aquello que M. Catón le escribe a su hijo a propósito de los griegos[…] siempre que este pueblo nos escriba literatura, todo lo echará a perder): Frag. 1, 73: “dicam de istis Graecis[…] et quod bonum sit illorum litteras inspicere, non perdiscere” (diré de esos griegos[…] en aquello que son buenos examinar atentamente su literatura, no aprenderla). Y una más documental (Lex Fannia de plagiariis) de asunto jurídico (Dig. 48, 15). Sobre el sentido de las citas no vemos otra función que no sea transferir saber y orientar pragmáticamente la escritura, manteniendo a veces una perceptible desviación emulativa respecto del modelo (sobre el verso horaciano).

14 Estas fuentes, sin embargo, le confirman a Maestre Maestre 1995, 150–153, en su punto de vista de la carta como velado ataque contra los italianos.
15 Y que aparece glosada en su Iuris Ciuris Lexicon, en Nebrija 2000, 186.
A medida que avanzamos en la narración y las exigencias argumentativas aumentan, se observa una correspondiente acumulación de testimonios, todos implícitos. Entre las razones favorables a la monarquía, los españoles observan una atención como las de las abejas hacia su reina: “[reges] quos non minori observantia colimus quam ducem suum apiculae?” (reyes a los que dedicamos una atención no menor que la de las abejas a su reina): Verg. Ge. 4, 210–212: “[apes] praetera regem[…] obseruant” (abejas que cuidan de su reina); sobre la descripción de defectos cita explícitamente a Horacio: “et quoniam – ut inquit poeta – “uitiis sine nascitur optimusque ille est, / qui minimis urgetur”[…]” (Serm. 1, 3, 67–68: y porque como dice el poeta “sin defectos nadie nace, siendo el mejor al que menos acucian”). El contenido de esta cita no duda en amplificarlo con nuevos datos, pero sin reconocer su procedencia:

_Pater qui strabonem filium amat, paetum uocat, uarum eum qui sit uatia sine comperrnis_. Apelles ille (nunquam satis in arte pingendi laudatus), cum Antigoni regis imaginem pingeret, qui altero lumine orbatus erat, _catagrapham_, idest obliquam, fecit, ut quod corpori deerat pictureae potius deesset uideretur, tantumque ab honestiore parte ostendit, cum posset totam ostendere.

(El padre que quiere a su hijo bizco dice que mira de lado y al estevado lo llama zambo o patizambo. Aquel famoso Apeles [nunca lo bastante elogiado el arte de su pintura], al tener que pintar el retrato del rey Antígono, al que le faltaba un ojo, lo hizo de perfil, es decir de uno de sus lados, para que se viese que lo que le faltaba a la persona le faltaba con mayor motivo al retrato, limitándose a mostrar su lado más hermoso, aunque pudiera mostrarlo completo.)

Se comprueba el eclecticismo lingüístico de Nebrija, su metodología de lexicógrafo atento a todos los usos, mixturando ejemplos poéticos con los de la prosa erudita y anticuaria. Así, a continuación de la fuente horaciana que acaba de reconocer, ofrece otra explicación léxica procedente de la misma obra: “strabonem / appellat paetum pater et pullum, male paruus […] hunc uarum distortis cruribus” (Serm. 1, 3, 44–47: del bizco su padre dice que mira de lado, zambo al que tiene las piernas torcidas), a la que une sin solución de continuidad otra de la prosa de ideas de Varrón: “contra si quis in consuetudine ambulandi iam factus sit uatia aut comperrnis, si eum[…]” (Ling. 9, 5, 10: por el contrario, si por la forma de caminar uno se ha hecho ya patizambo[…]). La anécdota de Apeles y el rey Antígono procede de Quintiliano, muy presente en la configuración del pensamiento gramatical nebrisense, modélico en su fusión de conocimiento y estilo: “habet in pictura speciem tota facies. Apelles tamen imaginem Antigoni latere tantum altero ostendit, ut amissi oculi deformitas lateret” (Inst. 2, 13, 12: en la
pintura adopta una expresión de rostro completo. Sin embargo, Apeles mostró la imagen de Antígono desde un solo lado, para ocultar la deformidad de ser tuerto). Para volver Plinio a subvenirle en la aclaración de una rareza léxica: “hic “catagrapha” inuenit, hoc est obliquas imagines et uariae formare uoltus, respicientes suspicientes uel despicientes[…]

(Nat. 35, 56, 5: encuentra las imágenes de perfil, es decir de lado y componiendo distintas expresiones con la mirada hacia atrás, hacia arriba, de arriba abajo[…]).

Hay auctores que se repiten, en prosa (Plinio el Mayor, Cicerón, Quintiliano) y en verso (Horacio), de los que junto a los datos se permite imitar cláusulas. Así, volviendo a mencionar casos notorios del pintor Apeles, pondera y acota su fama imposible de sobrepujar: “Apelles ille, numquam satis in arte pingendi laudatus, cum[…]” (el famoso Apeles, nunca lo bastante elogiado en el arte de pintar, cuando[…] ), que tiene muy presente un comentario en idéntico sentido que hace Plinio recapitulando las cualidades del escultor Fidias: “haec sint obiter dicta de artifice numquam satis laudato, simul ut[…]” (Nat. 36, 19, 5: sea dicho explícitamente sobre el artista nunca lo bastante elogiado, al tiempo que[[…]).

En el fragmento definitorio de su concepción de la “historia tanquam pictura” hace un empleo combinado de Juvenal más Cicerón. Interesan ambos en su dimensión ética, en sus sentencias de moral aplicada para razonar la ocultación de defectos y el trato favorable: “fallatque potius uitium specie uirtutis et umbra”: (Iuu. 14, 109: “fallit enim uitium[…]”): engaña, en efecto, el vicio[…]), “quam is qui sit fortis, a timido uocetur audax, ab audaci timidus”: y es preferible disfrazar el vicio con apariencia y sombra de virtud a que el valiente sea tachado de atrevido por el timorato y de timorato por el atrevido. En esta segunda sentencia, el texto ciceroniano al que se alude muy oportunamente habla en general de la superioridad de los sentidos humanos sobre los de las bestias, en particular en aquellas artes donde solo cabe un veredicto ocular (pintura y escultura): “[[…] nam et uitutes et uittia cognoscunt, iratum propitium, laetantem dolentem, fortem ignauum, audacem timidumque cognoscunt” (Nat. 2, 145: reconocen, en efecto, virtudes y defectos: al colérico y al pacífico, al alegre y al doliente, al valiente y al cobarde, al audaz y al tímido). Para su autoconsideración de hombre de moderada formación literaria (“in mediocris litteraturae hominem”) acuden en ayuda de Nebrija sus dos principales referentes a lo largo de esta carta: Cicerón y Horacio. En el caso de este último, Nebrija hace una lectura inversa, pues se le está recordando al poeta que no puede ser moderado, que solo en ciertas cosas se puede admitir lo equilibrado y tolerable: “certis medium et tolerabile rebus / recte concedi[…]” (Ars 366 ss: admite de grado lo mediano y tolerable solo en contadas ocasiones). El
pasaje de Cicerón está más relacionado con esta moderación que simula Nebrija: cuando Craso defiende las cualidades naturales para la elocuencia se presenta aparentando ser no un maestro o artista, sino un ciudadano cualquiera de mediana habilidad forense y formación cultural: “quamquam moderabor ipse, ne ut quidam magister atque artifex[…] sed quasi unus homo mediocris neque omnino rudis uidear” (De orat. 1, 111: aunque yo mismo me moderaré para no aparentar ser maestro y artista a la vez, más bien una persona corriente y no excesivamente inculto).

Sigue siendo Cicerón su modelo en las partes especialmente marcadas de la carta (exordio y conclusión), a tal grado que algunos pueden convertirse en estílemas.16 La cláusula del arranque de la epístola: “non possum non magnificare[…]” es típica de Cicerón (también imitada por Quintiliano, Vitruvio y Agustín, entre los modelos más afectos a nuestro humanista): “iuuenem nostrum non possum non amare[…]” (Att. 10, 10, 6). Otros modismos significativos de estirpe ciceroniana en la conclusio misma son “studio ac diligentia” (Brut. 252; De orat. 2, 131; Fam. 13, 68, 3); “non didicimus” (Mil. 10; Orat. 165); “a Musarum fonte abhorremus” (Arch. 27) junto a la explícita pero parafraseada: “aliisque poetis Cordubensisibus, quamuis scribat Cicero pingue quiddam illos et peregrinum sonare” (Arch. 26: y otros poetas cordobeses, por mucho que Cicerón diga que su acento es muy marcado y extranjero). Y la llamativa cláusula del final, cuando juega en alusión al título mismo de la epístola (diuinatio) mediante esa comparación condicional: “quasi diuinarem fore”. Ofrezco un contexto mayor del nebrisense para que apreciemos a continuación la estrecha cercanía con su modelo ciceroniano (Fam. 3, 13, 1):

        quod his in rebus quas scripturi sumus, aut ipsi interfuiimus, cum gerentur, aut ab is qui interfuerunt, acceipimus, et quasi diuinarem fore, ut aliquando hanc operam nauaturus essem[…]

(así que lo que vamos a narrar, o intervinimos en persona mientras sucedía, o nos lo han contado testigos presenciales, y como si adivinara que alguna vez habría de emprender esta tarea[…])

quasi diuinarem tali in officio fore mihi aliquando expetendum studium tuum, sic, cum de tuis rebus gestis agebatur[…]

(como si presintiera que en tales menesteres un día habría de solicitar tu favor, de este modo, al abordar la gestión que habías realizado[…])

---

16 Tal el inicio del Lexicon 1492 (“[…] id quod ego soleo mecum saepe cogitare”) o del Prudencio, en Nebrija 2002, 196 (“Cum Principis nostri Ferdinandi res gestas gerendasque considero[…] diuinam quandam prouidentiam admirari soleo”). Para remontarse ambos ejemplos, por su contextura oracional, al exordio ciceroniano del De inventione: “Saepe et multum hoc mecum cogitavi[…].
Aunque sintagmáticamente la disposición del elemento común difiere – de donde inferimos el acusado sentido pragmático de la alusión–, comparten una misma idea: la de quien manifiesta su presentimiento de futura narración de las obras de otro con el que mantiene algún vínculo especial. Hay una correspondencia del modelo excelente (Cicerón) con la relevancia dispositiva del lugar que ocupan esas cláusulas en la conclusión de la epístola: la de tornear la buena prosa de que quiere hacer gala Nebrija. Así es, en otros lugares no especialmente señalados, cuando los intertextos no se limitan a aportar datos, estos pueden colorear su estilo en alguna expresión concreta, no necesariamente en muchas, para no sobrecargar el pasaje de alusividad, buscando solo cierto ritmo y atmósfera narrativas. Esta es la función más habitual de la intertextualidad en Nebrija, apropiarse de lengua y pensamiento latinos de toda época y géneros. Solo ocasionalmente surgirá de toda esa copia uerborum un estilema que hace suyo y con el que podemos reconocerle. Pero la alusividad no supera el nivel sintagmático, prueba de su capacidad asimilativa como lector y escritor, pero sin sugerir vuelos mayores. No esperemos en Nebrija que su arte allusiva alcance instancias metafóricas y genéricas, ni menos aun rozamientos alegóricos, en alguien tan afirmado en su literalismo y facundia. Entre otras cosas porque Nebrija no es un escritor que haya buscado destacar en distintos géneros literarios. Es en exclusiva un gramático y un rétor que persigue un estilo ágil y eficaz de comunicar y transferir el saber gramatical, sin que esto signifique renunciar a ser un buen escritor ni que carezca, no ya de actitud, sino de aptitudes literarias.17

Final

Acaso nos hayamos persuadido de que en la escritura historiográfica la “pasión narrativa” está por encima de la verdad objetiva, de toda veracidad que no se vea amagada en la subjetividad y en el estilo. La interpretación, creación y propagación de ideología que promete nuestro historiographus

17 Para la naturaleza pragmática del iudicium nebrisense remito a González Vega (Nebrija 2002), 203: “Iudicium meum semper fuit synceri atque puri sermonis eos tantum fuisses auctores, qui floruerunt intra ducentos annos qui sunt ab aetate Ciceronis ad Antoninum Pium, et ad phrasim eloquentiae faciendam hos tantum esse proponendos imitandosque; caeteros uero, quia plurimum conducunt ad multarum rerum cognitionem, non esse contemnendos atque in primis christianos, qui nos ad religionem erudient et magna ex parte facundiam augent”. [Fue siempre mi juicio que el genuino y perfecto latín les correspondía en exclusiva a los autores que brillaron en los doscientos años que median entre el tiempo de Cicerón y el de Antonino Pío y que sólo estos deben proponerse para la imitación y adquisición de estilo; que, en cambio, a los restantes, por ponernos en la mejor situación para obtener grandes conocimientos no deben despreciarse, y entre los primeros a los cristianos, que nos instruyen en la religión e incrementan en gran medida nuestra capacidad de expresión.]
regius no se logra sino a través de la lógica narrativa con que selecciona y ordena los hechos históricos. Esta chocante conjugación en la historia de facta et dicta ya la había razonado el novelista Juan Benet con la agudeza que le era propia en su ensayo de 1966 “Sobre el carácter tétrico de la historia”: [...]

El hombre es un animal bastante indeseable. Poco fidedigno, un mucho falaz, bastante jactancioso, versátil y enemigo de la veracidad. Así que en cierto modo la historia –la ciencia de la veracidad– es el supremo esfuerzo intelectual del hombre porque es aquel que tiene que hacer en pugna con su condición. Es como si los peces se propusieran hacer geología o los lobos manuales de avicultura. Esa suprema parcialidad de la historia –la ciencia de la sinécdoque, de la parcialidad o de lo incompleto– está abiertamente reñida con el carácter compulsorio de su enseñanza y es por lo que decía que la historia debe ser lo último a tener en consideración en un plan de enseñanza.

Benet no sólo define en positivo la historia como ciencia de la veracidad y de la imparcialidad, sino que la reafirma en su contrariedad a pocas líneas de distancia en el mismo texto. Nuestro novelista contemporáneo, como el orador antiguo y el moderno cronista real, no ven contradictorio matrimonia la verdad y la parcialidad en tanto sinécdoques de la historia. Verdad y parcialidad son parte y todo de la historia; la especie veraz y la especie falaz forman un conjunto que vale por todo el género histórico, pues siempre la narración histórica, incluso la más descaradamente propagandística, será dialéctica, transfiriendo una implícita sospecha de falsedad en lo cierto y de certeza en lo encomiástico y exageradamente falso.  

---

18 Este ensayo ha sido recopilado más recientemente en Benet 2003, 143–157 (144). De otro lado, sobre el carácter universal de la narración, léase el muy sugerente Ceserani 2004. Para la dimensión moral y narrativa de la historia no me cansaré de recordar a Todorov 1993, en especial su “Ficción y realidad” (119–144) y un “Post-Scriptum: la verdad de las interpretaciones” (145–159). Razona allí meridiano diciendo que la cuestión del estilo no puede reducirse a simple coloración verbal y que el principio de veracidad histórica va más allá de la estricta adecuación a los hechos. Al asumir como pertinente y propia la misma parcialidad se habilitan los cauces por los que fluye sinuosa esa otra verdad más interesante y esencial a la literatura que es la de descubrimiento, su efecto de verdad y realidad, no la verdad y lo real en su enjuta desnudez.
Bibliografía


Contemporary criticism has emphasized the importance of the analysis of the so called “epigraphic fakes” – either handwritten or material ones – as documents with social, cultural and political values that go beyond the information transmitted by the text. This article analyzes and comments thoroughly on a set of five false inscriptions related to the war between the Romans and Viriathus, which were circulated between 1513 and 1516 by Agostino Nettucci (a poorly known humanist). This episode gives us an insight into the modus operandi employed by sixteenth – and seventeenth-century forgers and the eventual motives for carrying out these forgeries.

Introduzione
L’utilizzo del documento epigrafico e la sua valorizzazione, in quanto testimonianza determinante della presenza romana in un certo territorio, ha inizio dal momento in cui viene meno l’Impero romano. Bisogna, però, attendere la metà del XV secolo per vedere apparire la chiara volontà di conferire alle iscrizioni – e anche alle monete – un valore indiscutibile che supera perfino quello dei testi storici antichi; non per nulla un testo inciso ci consente un approccio più diretto alla società che lo ha prodotto di quanto non faccia un testo letterario, il fine artistico del quale va oltre la semplice annotazione di un fatto, anche se storico. In tale prospettiva bisogna quindi interpretare il
distico che Ambrosio de Morales inserisce nelle sue Antigüedades e che, opportunamente modificato, abbiamo usato come titolo di questo contributo:

Quondam quanta fuit, res gestae, Hispania, monstrant
hae sileant, lapides ipsaque saxa docent.

(Quanto grande fu Hispania, lo rivelano le sue imprese; queste tacciano pure, le iscrizioni e le pietre ce lo mostrano.)

In tale contesto di valorizzazione delle epigrafi in quanto documenti storici fondamentali, la critica moderna ha concesso un trattamento del tutto particolare alla produzione di “falsi” epigrafi, nel tentativo di comprendere le ragioni e i meccanismi di un procedimento che si è ripresentato, in maggiore o minor misura, in ogni fase della storia e che ha avuto momenti di splendore tra il Cinquecento e il Seicento.  

Infatti, è solo verso la metà dell’Ottocento che il progetto di redazione del Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum (CIL) ha implicato un filtraggio sistematico delle iscrizioni considerate “false”, raccolte nel capitolo iniziale di ogni volume con il titolo Inscriptiones falsae vel alienae e segnate da un asterisco (*); fino a quel momento, la storiografia europea, con poche eccezioni, aveva maneggiato con la stessa convinzione i documenti veri e quelli falsi, dando assoluta credibilità a qualsiasi uidio reperitum est con cui un autore intestava un’epigrafe.

Gli studi finora condotti indicano che la creazione massiccia di false iscrizioni romane non può essere svincolata dal contesto politico in cui compaiono o dalle ideologie esistenti al momento. Questo diventa molto evidente nel momento in cui nascono gli stati moderni e, in particolare, la Spagna, frutto dell’unione dei regni di Castiglia e di Aragona e Catalogna nella fine del s. XV. L’interesse per la creazione di un racconto storico riguardante il passato si riflette nell’apparizione di cronache decisamente nazionalistiche il cui scopo ultimo è quello di giustificare lo status quo politico del momento. Di conseguenza, la contraffazione coetanea di epigrafi sarebbe un modo in

1 Alcuni studiosi hanno anche individuato questo fenomeno nell’Antichità stessa, quando già si sarebbero prodotte delle epigrafi per dare prestigio alle città. È il caso della discussa iscrizione di Iliturgi (Menjíbar, Jaén) CIL II 7/7, 32, dedicata a un tale T. Sempronio Gracco con lo stesso nome del governatore della Hispania Citeriore nei 179-177 a.C., il quale non solo ha combattuto nella Citeriore – dove fondò Gracchurris –, ma anche nell’Ulteriore.

2 Il primo lavoro a stampa ad includere le epigrafi ritenute false in una sezione specifica fu quello di J. Gruter, Inscriptiones antiquae totius orbis Romani, Heidelberg 1603, sezione intitolata Spuria ac supposititia che occupa 27 page.

3 Gli eruditi dell’Illuminismo (Mayans, Pérez Bayer, Trigueros, ecc.) si sforzarono di garantire l’autenticità delle epigrafi che analizzavano, anche se i falsari hanno continuato ad avere successo.
più di reinterpretare e manipolare un periodo considerato fondamentale nella storia della Penisola Iberica.

L’allarme moderno sull’importanza di analizzare i falsi è stato dato da Billanovich nel suo studio dedicato a una serie di materiali spuri del XVIII secolo prodotti a Roma, anche se il lavoro forse più importante degli ultimi decenni in questo ambito è stato quello di Grafton, il quale ha proposto un nuovo metodo d’approccio a questo tipo di documenti, che tiene conto non solo della loro analisi interna, ma anche del contesto sociale, politico e culturale in cui sono prodotti. Questo approccio “socioculturale” ha allargato la prospettiva della ricerca sulle falsificazioni epigrafiche, le quali vengono di norma tuttora trascurate dalla ricerca più strettamente epigrafica. In poche parole, il documento falso si allontana dall’ambito strettamente storico-archeologico e si avvicina a quello dello studio delle mentalità.

Il caso ispanico presenta una caratteristica che lo rende singolare rispetto ad altre aree dell’Europa, fatto salvo per Roma e l’Italia: l’esistenza di circa 225 falsi prodotti fino alla fine del XVI secolo. Bisogna segnalare, da una parte, la presenza di epigrafi false già nei primi corpora generali della metà del XV secolo, con una chiara tendenza ad aumentare col trascorrere dei decenni e, dall’altra, l’enorme incremento di tali testimonianze a partire dal terzo decennio del XVI secolo.

La posizione degli umanisti del xvi secolo rispetto ai falsi epigrafici

Nel Quattrocento e nel Cinquecento, il livello di tolleranza rispetto alla lettura di una possibile falsificazione fu elevato. Fino a ben addentro la seconda metà del XVI secolo, tanto le sillogie manoscritte quanto le raccolte stampate di iscrizioni si limitarono a raccogliere, senza alcun vaglio critico, i testi che erano stati tramandati dalla tradizione, in certi casi fin dal Medio Evo. Uno sguardo critico su questi testi che, nel migliore dei casi, se erano genuinamente antichi, presentavano letture poco accurate, era quasi inesistente. Si potrebbe affermare che prima del quinto decennio del suddetto

---

4 Billanovich 1967.
6 L’unico tentativo di comparare numericamente i falsi di regioni diverse è stato compiuto da Abbot 1908. Uno studio comparativo esaustivo, tuttavia, dovrebbe separare le falsificazioni dalle epigrafi localizzate male (alienae), suddividere i falsi secondo la loro cronologia di apparizione e, in terzo luogo, tenere conto dei grandi falsari perché possono adulterare le statistiche finali (a Pirro Ligorio, forse il caso estremo, vengono attribuite soltanto nel CIL VI quasi 3000 iscrizioni false).
secolo, parallelamente alla diffusione degli studi antiquari, non ci furono prese di posizione serie rispetto all’accettazione di testi che i loro copisti sostenevano di aver visto, ma che nessun altro corroborava. E ciò accadde solo a Roma, nell’ambiente del circolo umanista formatosi intorno a O. Pan-tagato, a J. Matal e a A. Agustín, del quale facevano parte umanisti venuti da tutta l’Europa (Smet, Pigge, Budé, Maes, ecc.) oltre agli italiani (Egio, Delfini, Ligorio, ecc.).

Senza alcun dubbio, una delle prime dichiarazioni a stampa – e quindi pubbliche – più incisive contro l’elaborazione e l’uso dei falsi epigrafici è quella che fece Antonio Agustín nell’undicesimo capitolo della sua opera *Diálogos de medallas* (Tarragona, 1587), intitolato “De las medallas y letras falsos y de los que han escrito de medallas y inscripciones”. Malgrado la data tardiva di pubblicazione del libro, non bisogna dimenticare che le idee espresse dall’autore nelle sue pagine erano frutto della sua più che trenten-nale esperienza, dal momento che alcune di esse compaiono nel suo epistolaro già alla fine degli anni cinquanta. Abbiamo già segnalato in altre occasioni la particolarità e la modernità del suo atteggiamento nei confronti delle falsificazioni, una posizione che diviene chiaramente più solida quando, nel fare riferimento all’iscrizione moderna del passaggio del Rubicone [CIL XI 30*], dice:

Mucho tiempo ha que soy dessa opinion [sc. “sin apartar lo incierto de lo que es cierto, no se puede hazer estudio con fundamento”], y assi he procurado en estas cosas no creder de ligero[...] y, con todo lo que me recatava, he recibido engaño algunas veces, pero muchos mas son los que he visto dar credito a cosas que yo tenia por fabulosas. Dire de una inscripcion que siempre la tuve por falsa, y halle hombres[...] que me dezian haverla ellos leida en la piedra original donde estava[...]

Yo les di la razon de las dudas que tenia de aquella inscricion a mi parecer fingida, assi por lo que contienia, como por las palabras della. Y[...] viniendo yo de Alemania[...] pase el rio Rubicon[...] y vi una piedra muy antigua escrita en dos partes, y lo que estaba en la una parte era aquello mismo que yo negava ser antiguo[...] Y ahun [piedra] muy antigua – pero digo piedra, y no la inscripcion della – almenos en la una parte, que ahunque otro tiempo sirvio de epitaphio de un soldado [CIL XI 352] y aquellas palabras mostravan gran antiguedad, en la misma piedra a las espaldas pusieron con letras que se conoce ser muy modernas, un mandamiento para que ningun capitan ni soldado fuesse osado passar el Rubicon[...] (pp. 443–445)

Nel momento in cui tratta le persone che trasmettono i falsi, egli opera una distinzione tra chi considera vittime dei falsari (per esempio A. Manuzio) e i

---

falsari veri e propri, i più importanti dei quali sono, secondo la sua opinione, Ciriaco e Annio, che egli accusa di aver contribuito, con le loro invenzioni, a mascherare la storia della Spagna:9

No fueron menos ingeniosos [que Annio], pero hizieron con mas elegancia sus ficciones Ioviano Pontano, Pomponio Leto, Iuan Camerte [= Giovanni Ricuzzi 1447–1546 (?)] y Cyriaco Anconitano[…]. El mal es que assi Iuan Annio como Cyriaco y otros parece que se hayan burlado de los Españoles fingiendo hechos de España del tiempo de Noe y Tubal[…], y unas piedras de las guerras contra Virlato y Sertorio, y de Cesar y Pompeyo etc. Y dello ha resultado que no haya historia de España sin Beroso y Metasthenes y frai Iuan de Viterbo, ni sin inscriciones de Cyriaco Anconitano[…]. Yo respondo por la honra de todos, que no haviamos de ser tenidos en tan poco, que se nos atreviesseen estos italianos a darnos a entender que havian passado estas cosa por aca, y que se hallavan inscriciones que ellos las havian visto y nosotros no las hallamos. (pp. 450–451)

Nello stesso modo, se leggiamo tra le righe il capitolo cui facciamo riferimento, possiamo dedurre alcune delle cause alle quali Agustín attribuisce la creazione di documenti falsi: avere una prova materiale che confermi fatti descritti nelle fonti testuali;10 ottenere una prova della presenza di popolazioni antiche in un determinato territorio o in una città, per fini d’identità nazionale o locale;11 procurarsi, in conformità a fonti testuali, iscrizioni che sono eventualmente esistite, sebbene non siano giunte fino a noi.12 Inoltre, l’umanista accenna ad alcuni meccanismi che servono a rendere più credibi-
le un testo falso o a renderne difficilmente verificabile il ritrovamento, come per esempio il situarlo in un luogo indeterminato.\(^\text{13}\)

Un decennio prima che venisse pubblicato il libro di Agustín, A. de Morales, rispetto al quale il vescovo aveva espresso opinioni contradditorie,\(^\text{14}\) era stato il primo studioso ispanico a formulare i principi fondamentali dello studio dell’epigrafia e, per estensione, della cultura materiale antica. Le sue ricerche epigrafiche, da considerare nel contesto della *Corónica general de España* che stava scrivendo allora, avevano tra i loro scopi principali quello di stabilire la presenza romana in un luogo, giacché,

si no hay muestras y testimonio de antigüedad en el sitio, en vano se busca lo demás; y al contrario, pareciendo en el sitio antigüedad, incita y obliga a inquirir qué lugar fué allí, y qué nombre tuvo. Lo primero es certificarse que huvo antiguamente lugar allí, y tras eso sigue el buscar qué lugar fué.\(^\text{15}\)

Per Morales, gli indizi,

señales y rastros de tiempo de Romanos [sono chiaramente] algunos edificios o destrozos, o siquiera fundamentos dellos, o alguna piedra escrita o labrada, que aunque no tenga letras, por solo el talle diga quien la labró.\(^\text{16}\)

Il procedimento che egli delinea, quindi, è molto chiaro: in primo luogo, bisogna trovare le evidenze (gli edifici più o meno in rovina e le iscrizioni); quindi è necessario identificare il luogo in base alle fonti classiche.

Più concretamente, nel penultimo capitolo del *Discurso General* che serve da introduzione all’opera, l’autore riassume i due principali obiettivi dello studio delle iscrizioni:

a) saber por una piedra antigua alguna cosa de las que antiguamente pasaron en España, que sin ella no la supieramos, e b) hacer con las piedras mucha certificacion y claridad de los verdaderos nombres y sitios de las ciudades y lugares antiguos que hubo en España en tiempo de Romanos.\(^\text{17}\)

---

\(^\text{13}\) Agustín 1587, 454: “Interlocutor: ‘Que exemplos hai de las inscripciones del Camerte, que V. S. llama fabulosas y ridiculas?’ Agustín: ‘[…][Otro letrero [CIL II 40*] hai para provar que condicio se escrive con C y dize que esta in agro Lusitano porque no se halle tan presto: EGO Gallus Favonius Iocundus etc. Este podria ser que no fuesse del Camere, sino de otro antiquario que llamavan locundio’’.”

\(^\text{14}\) Se ne vedano due: “Y Ambrosio di Morales no tiene tal intencion, antes ha trabajado mucho por escrivir verdad” (Agustín 1587, 346); “Ambrosio di Morales acabo la segunda parte de su historia y antiguedades de España[… ] Lo que me maravillo es que en su profesion sabe poco, especialmente de lo antiguo” (lettera di Agustín a P. Chacón di 22-02-1578).

\(^\text{15}\) Morales 1575, f. 2F.

\(^\text{16}\) *Ibid.* f. 3B.

\(^\text{17}\) *Ibid.* f. 24E.
È chiaro, pertanto, che l’utilità attribuita da Morales allo studio delle iscrizioni è molto simile a quella espressa da Agustín, con la particolarità che la sua formulazione contiene, come l’uovo del serpente, la stessa perversione di cui può essere vittima:

« porque como hemos dicho [...] ninguna cosa hay que con mas verdad y certificacion dé á entender lo que toca al sitio y nombre de una ciudad de las antiguas de España, como una piedra con su inscripcion: ni tampoco al contrario hay cosa que mas haga desvariar si no se entiende bien. »

La sua opinione rispetto alle falsificazioni è meno incisiva di quella di Agustín. Da una parte, non ignora l’esistenza di iscrizioni spurie tra quelle attribuite alla Hispania, ma dall’altra dimostra una capacità di gran lunga più limitata nell’identificarle. In alcune parole del prologo della sua Corónica, è possibile intuire che il metodo da lui usato per decidere della veridicità o falsità di un’epigrafe consistesse nel confrontare le iscrizioni copiate in raccolte manoscritte con la testimonianza degli umanisti e degli antiquari con cui era in rapporto. Questo criterio ha due punti deboli: in primo luogo, serve unicamente a riconoscere falsi di tradizione manoscritta, falsi cioè che non furono mai incisi su un supporto di pietra; in secondo luogo, di fronte all’assoluta fiducia nelle false testimonianze di un osservatore, ci si espone a divenire preda di facili inganni. Questo, per esempio, è il caso dell’epigrafe falsa di Silo Sabinus [CIL II 21*], della quale parleremo in seguito, e che nella Corónica è definita come “la mas antigua que de Romanos se halla agora en España”, giacché vent’anni prima A. de Resende aveva assicurato di averla vista a Évora.

Il terzo personaggio decisivo nella storiografia ispanica contro la produzione di documenti falsi che va citato, è Nicolás Antonio (1617–1684): a

18 Ibid. f. 26C.
19 Morales 1574, f. VIIr–v: “Otras pocas piedras ay de las que andan en España en manos de los hombres doctos y aficionados a las antiquedades que no son muy ciertas, ni nadie dize las aya visto, ni oyo a otros que las vieron: y solo se tienen por relacion de Cyro, o Cyriaco Anconitano[…] Estas dizen unos que se han perdido y gastado las piedras en que estavan: y otros dizen que las fingio Cyriaco, por satisfazer a su gusto y mostrar su ingenio. Como quiera que sea, ellas andan en nombre de antiquedades de España y son muy lindas. Por lo uno y por lo otro, las puse todas en sus lugares: porque no faltasse aqui nada de lo que alguno en esta parte pudiesse dessear”.
20 Ibid., f. 113.
21 Resende 1553, f. 7v: “Eu non screverei salvo ho que achar per auctores dignos de fee, ou per scripturas de pedras, ou ho que per nossos ocelhos inda podemos ve[r][…] Assi posso mostrar grande antiquidade, pois em tempo do grande Lusitano Viriato Evora ia era. Ho que paresce per aquelle letereiro antigo que sta em Sancto Beneto de Pomasre que diz assi [CIL II 21*]”. Nella sua opera postuma Libri quattuor de antiquitatibus Lusitaniae (Évora 1593, f. 112) insiste sul fatto che egli l’ha visto: “ego testis sum oculatus”.
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dispetto che la sua vicenda si situi ampiamente al di fuori dei limiti che abbiamo fissato per questo intervento, e i suoi attacchi si concentri
sull’invenzione di false cronache per giustificare ogni tipo di fatto antico, e
soprattutto di quelli legati alle origini romane o cristiane delle città.\(^{22}\) Il legitimo affanno che affligge ogni città in cerca delle proprie origini aveva
generato, dalla metà del XVI secolo in poi, un tale proliferare di documenti falsi (libri, iscrizioni, ecc.) che un secolo dopo Antonio era indotto a esclamare:

> Nacen cada dia libros sin numero de Historias de Ciudades, de Iglesias, de Religiones, de Reinos, en que no se lee casi otra cosa, que origenes fabulosos, Apostoles, i Predicadores de la Fe supuestos, Martires traidos de tierras mui distantes a enoblecer falsamente la tierra que no tuvieron por madre; Antiguedades, mal inventadas, o ridiculas: que si los limpiassen destas Fabulas, quedarian cehidos a mui pocas hojas. No ai Lugar en España por corto, i obscuro que sea, que ya no piense en hacer propia Historia con los materiales que halla en esta misma recien descubierta, i copiosissima, de estrañezas, i novedades.\(^{23}\)

**Epigrafia e identità: un caso esemplare. Le iscrizioni su Viriato**

Attraverso le critiche, sempre più incisive, espresse da questi tre umanisti, ci rendiamo conto che uno dei vizi principali che essi criticano nei falsari è precisamente quello di voler alimentare le aspirazioni di una comunità volta a costruire la propria identità: sia per ottenere una coesione intorno a un ideale precostituito, sia per opporsi o confrontarsi a un’altra comunità.

In tal senso, sebbene in numerose occasioni non si trovi (e probabilmente non si troveranno mai) le prove necessarie per stabilire la causa diretta che giustifichi la produzione di un determinato falso epigrafico, si può tuttavia intuire che dietro ogni produzione falsa ci possono essere due motivi. Se si tratta di un elaborato puramente testuale (vale a dire, un falso manoscritto), si sta cercando di apportare un’ipotesi che ha bisogno della conferma documentaria; se si tratta della produzione di un testo su un supporto materiale, o ci si trova nello stesso caso precedente o si ricerca un beneficio economico. C’è, inoltre, un’ulteriore possibilità: che si tratti semplicemente di un gioco erudito, ma senza una volontà precisa di pervertire lo studio della storia.

Con l’eccezione dei prodotti realizzati dalle mani dei grandi falsificatori riconosciuti come tali già nel Rinascimento (Annio, Ligorio, Panvinio, Resende, ecc.), è anche molto difficile stabilire con sicurezza il nome che sta

23 Antonio 1742, lib. 1, cap. 1, § 6.
dietro ai testi falsi. Per la maggior parte dei casi, si possono fissare momenti di produzione e ipotizzare in quali circoli sarebbero stati prodotti i falsi, ma nient’altro. In questo terreno già poco sicuro, bisogna aggiungere anche che in svariate occasioni, sebbene si fiuti something rotten, restano sempre alcuni aspetti non ben spiegati che possono spostare l’ago della bilancia dalla parte dell’autenticità o da quella della falsità.24

Per mostrare tutto questo (vale a dire, il modus operandi e le cause eventuali che spingono gli umanisti a inventare falsi), abbiamo scelto un esempio degli inizi del Cinquecento. Analizzeremo, pertanto, un insieme di epigrafi false legate al territorio della Lusitania (aventi a che fare con la guerra di Roma contro Viriato), che offrì diversi vantaggi: l’unità tematica; il fatto che siano state messe in circolo pressoché simultaneamente, in un periodo molto breve (1513–1516); infine, la circostanza che Agostino Nettucci, la prima persona che le mise in circolo, è a tutt’oggi assai poco noto.

Agostino Nettucci e i falsi lusitani

Agostino Nettucci è un umanista poco noto, che compì un viaggio per la Penisola Iberica tra il 1513 e il 1516, in qualità di segretario dell’ambasciatore della Repubblica di Firenze, Giovanni Corsi;25 alla fine di tale viaggio scrisse un De situ […] Hispaniae libellus,26 le cui informazioni epigrafiche non furono tenute in considerazione dagli editori del CIL e neppure dalla critica moderna. Le iscrizioni illustrate da lui copiate durante il viaggio sono, per la maggior parte, false (ce ne sono solo 6 autentiche), tra le quali spiccano nove che compaiono per la prima volta nella tradizione manoscritta, situate nell’antica Lusitania (5), nei pressi di Soria (2), in Gali-

\[24\] Questo è il caso di una delle iscrizioni che ci riguardano, CIL II 57*, di cui Hübner disse: “fictam crederem, si exemplum fraudis praeasto esset; nam Resendii artem videtur excedere. [...] Fortasse genuina” (CIL II, p. 9*). La maggior parte della critica moderna ha continuato a mostrare gli stessi dubbi di Hübner; ci auguriamo che la nostra analisi del modus operandi del falsario serva a chiudere definitivamente la questione della sua indubitabile falsità.


\[26\] Si tratta di un’opera inedita, con un prologo indirizzato al cardinale Giulio de’ Medici (futuro Papa Clemente VII), intitolata De situ, longitudine, forma et divisione totius Hispaniae libellus, scritta nel 1520, della quale esistono due esemplari nella BAV: quello che abbiamo consultato, il MS. Vat. Lat. 3622, e una copia di questo, il MS. Ottob. Lat. 2104 [V. Almagià 1950, che però non avvalora il suo contenuto epigrafico].
zia (1) e a Cartagena (1). Non è questo il momento di citare quali indizi ci hanno indotti a pensare a un’origine comune per tutti questi testi, che probabilmente facevano parte di una stessa sfilza preesistente dalla quale li estrasse Nettucci, ma vorremmo insistere sull’analisi delle cinque epigrafi lusitane.

Seguendo l’ordine in cui appaiono, sono le seguenti:

**CIL II 51** [Vat. Lat. 3622 fol. 38r–v]

In Lanciensium terra epitaph(ium) adscriptum reperitur.

L(ucio) Aemilio L(uci) f(ilio) mortuo in acie sub Nigidio consule dum contra Viriatum fortissime pugnavit Lancenses quorum rem(ublicam) tutarat semper basim cum urna et statuam in loco publico erexere honoris libertatisque ergo.

*(Nel paese dei lanciensi si trova la seguente iscrizione:)*

A Lucio Emilio, figlio di Lucio, che è morto in battaglia sotto il console Nigidio mentre combatteva contro Viriato molto coraggiosamente, i lanciensi, la città dei quali aveva sempre difeso, gli hanno eretto un piedistallo con una urna e una statua in un luogo pubblico, in segno di onore e di libertà.

**CIL II 344** [Vat. Lat. 3622 fol. 38v]

Non longe a Baccia (in margine Bagera) huius provinciae [sc. Lusitaniae] oppido reperta et haec oratio epitaphia.

L(ucius) Cornelius legatus sub Fabio co(n)s(ule) vividam naturam et virilem servavi animum usq(ue) quo animam efflavi, et tandem desertus ope medicor(um) et Aesculapii, cui me voveram futurum sodalem. Fabius hic me consul condidit.

*(Non lontano da Baccia, città della provincia di Lusitania, sono state trovate queste parole come epitaffi:)*

Io, Lucio Cornelio, legato sotto il console Fabio, ho mantenuto uno spirito energico e un animo virile finché ho esalato l’anima e sono stato finalmente privo dell’aiuto dei medici e di Esculapio, a cui avevo promesso di essere compagno. Il console Fabio mi ha seppellito qui.

**CIL II 20** [Vat. Lat. 3622 fol. 38v]

Repertum et hoc est in campis Aranis non inde longe [sc. a Baccia] in marmoreo tumulo.

---

27 Per una altra iscrizione di Cartagena presente in Netucci (*CIL II* 3423 = 5941), si veda Carbonell, Gimeno & González 2011.

28 Trascriviamo i testi così come appaiono nel manoscritto di Nettucci.
Q(uintus) Longinus Tartareo absorptus hiatus ante tempus in campis Aranis, a M(arco) Regulo trib(uno) milit(um) marmoreo sarcophago tectus, hic sum in fronte aediculae Magnae Martis [hoc est Matris] deum.

(Anche questa iscrizione è stata trovata nei campi degli arani non molto lontano in una tomba di marmo:

Io, Quinto Longino, inghiottito prematuramente dall’abisso del Tartaro nei campi degli arani, sono stato sepolto dal tribuno militare Marco Regulo in un sarcofago di marmo; sono qui in fronte al tempiotto della Grande Madre degli dei.)

CIL II 21* [Vat. Lat. 3622 fol. 39]

Est et oppidum Ebora veteris Latii a flumine eiusdem nominis dictum, a quo non longe epitaphium hunc sermonem reperi.

L(ucius) Silo Sabinus, bello contra Viriatum confossus multitudine telorum, et ad C(aium) Plautium praetorem delatus humeris militum, hoc sepulchro(m) et pecunia mea mihi fieri iussi, in quo [sic] neminem velim mecum neque servom neque libertinum inseri. Et si secus fiet velim ossa quorumcunque sepulchro statim meo eruantur et iura Romana serventur in sepulchris plane retinendis voluntate testatoris.

(Lì c’è anche la città di Evora, di diritto latino, nominata così dal fiume dello stesso nome, vicino al quale ho trovato queste parole di epitaffio.

Io, Lucio Silone, crivellato di un sacco di dardi nella guerra contro Viriato, e portato sulle spalle alla presenza del pretore Gaio Plauzio, ho ordinato d’innalzare questa tomba con i miei soldi, dove vorrei che nessuno, né schiavo né libero né libero, fosse sepolto con me. E se non fosse così, vorrei che tutte le ossa di coloro siano subito rimosse dalla mia tomba, e che si rispetti la legge romana nella manutenzione della tomba, secondo la volontà del testatore.)

CIL II 40* [Vat. Lat. 3622 fol. 44v–45]

Est non longe hinc [sc. Cazeres] Turres Iulii oppidum clarum in cuius terrae agro inventum est testamentum in castris sine testibus sine sigillis factum in quo vero ille Romanae linguae candor odorque vetustatis agnoscitur.

Ego Gallus Favonius Iucundus P(ublii) Favonii f(ilius) qui bello contra Viriatum occubui Iucundum et Pudentem filios heredes reliquo et honor(um) lucundi patris mei et eorum quae mihi adquisivi, hactamen condicione ut ab urbe Roma huc veniant et ossa hinc mea intra quinquennium exportent et via Latina condant sepulchro marmoreo
iussu meo condito et mea voluntate. Et si secus fecerint nisi legitime aboriantur causae velim ea omnia quae filiiis relinquo pro reparando templo dei Silvani quod sub Viminali in urbe monte est attribui, Ma
nesque mei opem implorent a Pontifice Maximo et a flaminibus Diali
bus qui in Capitolio sunt ad impietatem contra filios meos ulciscen
dam teneanturque sacerdotes dei Silvani me in urbem referre et sepulchro meo condito; volo quoque vernas qui domi meae sunt omnes a praetore urbano liberos cum matribus dimitti singulisque libram argenti et vestem unam dari. Actum VI Cal(end)as Quintiles bello Viria
tino.

[Servio Galba Lucio Aurelio consulibus. Decuriones Transcudani hoc testamentum ore eiusdem Galli Favonii emissum lapide iussere adsculpi.]

(Vicino a Cáceres c’è la città celebre di Trujillo in cui territorio è sta
to scoperto un testamento scritto in un accampamento senza testimoni né sigilli nel quale si riconosce lo splendore vero della lingua latina e l’odore dell’antichità.

Io, Gallo Favonio Giocondo, figlio di Publio Favonio, morto nella guerra contro Viriato, nomino i miei figli Giocondo e Pudente eredi sia dei beni di mio padre sia di quelli che io ho acquisito, a condizio
e, tuttavia, che egli vengano qui da Roma ed entro il prossimo quin
quennio se ne portino via le mie ossa e li diano sepoltura sulla via Lati
tina in una tomba di marmo innalzata secondo la mia volontà. In caso contrario, fuorché sorgano motivi legittimi, vorrei che tutto ciò che le
go ai miei figli sia destinato al restauro del tempio del dio Silvano sito a Roma ai piedi del monte Viminale; e che i miei Mani implorino l’aiuto del Pontefice Massimo e dei flaminii di Giove in Campidoglio per vendicare l’emprietà dei miei figli; e che i sacerdoti del dio Silvano siano costretti a portarmi a Roma e seppellirmi in una tomba per me stesso. Voglio anche che tutti i miei schiavi nati in casa siano rilasciati dal pretore urbano con le sue madri, e che ciascuno riceva una libbra d’argento e un vestito. Fatto sei giorni prima delle calende di luglio nel corso della guerra contro Viriato.

[Essendo consoli Servio Galba e Lucio Aurelio. I decurioni trans
cudani hanno fatto intagliare sulla pietra questo testamento uscito dalla bocca di Gallo Favonio.]

Il modus operandi del falsario o dei falsari

In primo luogo, osserviamo che, in questo caso, il falsario è mosso da un interesse quasi unico: stilare testi che siano la prova epigrafica di un fatto
storico abbastanza trattato dalle fonti, la guerra dei romani contro Viriato.\textsuperscript{29}

È dunque necessario che i testi ne facciano menzione esplicita (contra Viriatus [51*], bello contra Viriatus [21*], bello Viriatiino e bello contra Viriatus [40*]); o implicita, attraverso riferimenti indiretti. È questo il caso della 344*, con la citazione di un certo console Fabio (sub Fabio co(n)s(ule)) e di una città chiamata Baccia come luogo in cui è stata reperita l’iscrizione (“Non longe a Baccia”), informazioni che, in linea di principio, risultano difficili da identificare. Oppure il caso più sottile della 20*, in cui si riproduce la localizzazione a Baccia – qui sita nella vasta regione degli Arani (“in campis Aranis”), alla quale faremo riferimento più avanti – e il tono bellico del testo.

In secondo luogo, il falsario deve testimoniare l’esistenza inequivocabile dell’iscrizione rispetto agli eventuali dubbi che potrebbero sorgere in un lettore attento, e lo fa utilizzando una formula piuttosto chiara come reperi (21*), che serve, nello stesso tempo, per legittimare formule più impersonali come repertum/-ta est (20*, 344*), inventum est (40*) o reperitur (51*).

In terzo luogo, è necessario che le localizzazioni delle epigrafi coincidano con aree ampie o con zone concrete della Lusitania, regione in cui le fonti antiche situavano le campagne di Viriato durante i quattordici anni che durarono gli scontri. Per ottenere, il metodo sarà diverso. Tutte le iscrizioni riportano nell’intestazione un’indicazione inequivocabile, più generale (“in Lanciensium terra” [51*]) o più concreta (“non longe a Baccia huius provinciae [sc. Lusitaniae] oppido [344*]; in campis Aranis non inde longe [sc. a Baccia] [20*]; oppidum Ebora veteris Latii a flumine eiusdem nominis dictum [21*]; est non longe hinc [sc. Cazeres] Turre Iulii [Trujillo][30] oppidum clarum in cuius terraie agro inventum est [40*]”).

Vale la pena, però, soffermarsi un istante su questo punto, perché qui troviamo la prima “aria di bravura” del falsario. Non si accontenta solo di apportare toponimi più o meno esatti, ma lo fa tenendo in considerazione diverse fonti. Così, prima di tutto abbiamo registrato il nome dei Lancienses (51*), popolazione che è stata situata per due volte da Plinio il Vecchio in

\textsuperscript{29} Le fonti classiche accessibili all’inizio del Cinquecento erano: Liv. per. 52 e 84; Flor. 1, 33; Oros. adv. pag. 5, 4, ed Eutr. 4, 16. I testi di Appiano (Ib. 63–75) e Dione Cassio (22, 73–78) non si diffusero fino alla metà del XVI secolo.

Lusitania, anche se non con precisione.\textsuperscript{31} Quindi, cita una città – secondo la copia di Nettucci Baccia (344* e 20*) – che, a prima vista, è assolutamente enigmatica, la qual cosa fa sì che Nettucci stesso aggiunga la nota chiarificatrice al margine Bagera, che risulta assurda, giacché non esiste nessun nucleo abitato con questo nome.\textsuperscript{32} In realtà, Baccia sarebbe una variante documentata – anche se oggi rifiutata a favore di Buccia – che compare in un frammento di Orosio riguardante la guerra contro Viriato:

\textit{Fabius consul contra Lusitanos et Viriatum dimicans Bucciam oppidum, quod Viriatus obsidebat, depulsis hostibus liberavit et in deditiunem cum plurimis alis castellis recepit.}\textsuperscript{33}

La scoperta dell’ipotesto impiegato permette, inoltre, di identificare il \textit{Fabius consul} citato nell’iscrizione con Q. Fabio Massimo Serviliano, console nel 142 a.C. Il toponimo Buccia / Baccia non compare più nelle fonti e, attualmente, si ritiene che la città dovesse sorgere in qualche punto della Betica.\textsuperscript{34} La terza iscrizione (20*), oltre al riferimento all’\textit{oppidum} di Baccia, cita in quanto luogo di decesso del soldato alcuni campi Arani nelle vicinanze, assolutamente assenti nelle fonti antiche sotto forma di toponimo o come gentilizio. Appare tuttavia strano che, posteriormente alla data di creazione dei falsi, esistano documenti epigrafici che testimoniano l’esistenza di una \textit{ciuitas Arauorum} (\textit{CIL} II 429 e \textit{AE} 1952, 109). Da dove ha potuto ottenere, dunque, il falsario, un toponimo Arani, che si distingue da Araui solo per una lettera diversa? In linea di principio pare chiaro che il mutamento della lettera si debba a un’erronea lettura di un manoscritto, in cui è facile confondere i due grafemi. All’inizio del XVI secolo, l’unica fonte cui avesse potuto avere accesso il falsificatore per avere la forma Arani è la nota \textit{CIL} II 760, nella quale si elencano i popoli della Lusitania che hanno suffragato la costruzione del ponte di Alcântara. Le attuali edizioni di questa iscrizione, quasi illeggibile, riportano la versione Araui; accade, però, che tutte le testimonianze anteriori a Nettucci in cui compare tale voce riportino esclusivamente la versione Arani,\textsuperscript{35} che coincide con quella del nostro falso e che sarà corretta solo posteriormente – senza dubbio, grazie a nuove letture \textit{de visu} dell’iscrizione – da Accursio (1525–1529) e Ocampo, e dal resto

\textsuperscript{31} Plin. \textit{nat.} 3, 4, 28; 4, 35, 118.

\textsuperscript{32} Questa incoerenza continuerà per molti anni, perché Pier Vettori, che conosce il testo del Nettucci, non sarà in grado di identificare il toponimo e proporrà la lettura \textit{ab Accia}, come se fosse il prodotto di una segmentazione sbagliata della catena fonica.

\textsuperscript{33} Oros. \textit{adv. pag.} 5, 4, 12.

\textsuperscript{34} Alcuni autori stabiliscono un rapporto tra Buccia e Tucci (Diod. Sic. 33, 5–7) e Ityke (App. Ib. 66–68), del \textit{conuentus Astigitanus}; cf. Serrano 1981, 204.

della tradizione successiva. È ancor più indiscutibile l’origine dell’“errore”, se osserviamo che il falsario utilizzò la stessa iscrizione in altri due casi che rientrano nell’oggetto del nostro studio. Infatti, i Lancienses citati supra (51*) fanno anche parte della lista di populi e, pertanto, è logico pensare che colui che ha scritto il testo, sebbene conoscesse Plinio, doveva aver sotto gli occhi l’iscrizione del ponte di Alcántara. Ugualmente, nella formula conclusiva della 40*, che non compare nel Nettucci, ma che tramanderanno Ocampo e la sua tradizione, leggiamo “Decuriones Transcudani hoc testimonium […] lapide iussere adsculpi”, che attinge all’iscrizione di Alcántara. Infatti, i Transcudani, esattamente come accade per gli Araui, non erano conosciuti all’epoca della redazione del falso in alcuna altra iscrizione né in alcuna fonte testuale; è chiaro, quindi, che il falsario ha potuto ottenere il nome solamente dalla lettura diretta o indiretta della citata lastra.

Un’altra modalità di dare veridicità al testo consiste nel corretto uso della onomastica, non tanto di quella relativa ai morti protagonisti dell’iscrizione, gente anonima, quanto di quella relativa ai magistrati cui erano affidate le operazioni belliche. In tal senso, abbiamo già citato la veracità del consul Fabius (344*); le fonti classiche della guerra contro Viriato fanno menzione anche del pretore C. Plautius (21*),36 la qual cosa permette persino di situare l’azione raccontata nell’iscrizione nell’anno 146 a.C.; di C. Nigidius (51*) si parla solamente nell’opera anonima De viris illustribus, in cui si dice che fu sconfitto da Viriato dopo Claudio Unimano (ca. 145 a.C.),37 ma, d’altro canto, la fonte non specifica quale titolo ostentasse, la qual cosa doveva indurre il falsificatore a attribuirgli il consolato, che senza dubbio non esercitò mai; nello stesso modo, i consoli Servius Galba e Lucius Aurelius (40*) – citati nella subscriptio finale mancante in Nettucci –, corrispondono ai magistrati del 144 a.C., che sono messi in rapporto diretto con la guerra contro Viriato da Valerio Massimo.38 Un commento particolare merita invece il riferimento a un tale M. Regulus (20*), tribuno militare, con cui il falsario sembra voler ricordare il console M. (Attilius) Regulus, uno dei rappresentanti per antonomasia dell’antica virtus romana, dimostrata durante la prima guerra punica. Questa cronologia lo allontana da qualsiasi presenza in Hispania all’epoca della conquista lusitana e, pertanto, la citazione può esse-

37 Auct. de vir. ill. 71, 1: “Viriatus […] bellum adversus Romanos sumpsit eorumque imperatorem Claudium Unimanum, dein C. Nigidium oppressit”. Valerio, però, omette il praenomen e il cognomen di Lucio Aurelio Cotta. Ambedue i consoli appaiono anche in Frontino (de aq. 1, 7), ma non collegati con gli affari ispanici.
re attribuita solamente alla sua fama storica, riconfermata forse in base al fatto che ricompare in un’altra epigrafe falsa attribuita a Calahorra (CIL II 245*), non appartenente a questa serie.

Come abbiamo già affermato, non è necessario che l’identità dei defunti rispecchi personaggi reali, nella misura in cui si tratta di singole persone il cui unico merito è stato quello di morire lottando per la repubblica. Il falsario, quindi, non si preoccupa molto quando deve improvvisare l’an troponimia. Per esempio, a differenza di Q. Longinus (20*), tutti i Lon- gini citati nelle fonti classiche presentano i praenomen Caius o Lucius;39 Lucius Aemilius (51*) o Lucius Cornelius (344*) sono antroponimi troppo ricorrenti per indurre a identificarli, oltre a conferire una risonanza epica al personaggio;40 per quanto riguarda Lucius Silo Sabinus (21*), l’onomastica conservata nelle fonti epigrafiche o testuali, nelle quali Silo è sempre cognomen, ci fa propendere per considerare Sabinus come un semplice gentilizio e non un cognomen.41 Diversamente da quanto appena affermato, l’onomastica del defunto e dei suoi due figli dell’epigrafe 40* imita, come già indicò Hübner, quella di un’iscrizione autentica di Sagunto (CIL II 3877), andata perduta, che ci è pervenuta attraverso la tradizione anteriore a Nettucci: “M. Aemilio m. f. / Gal. Fauonio / Iucundus lib. / cum Iucundo et Pudente filiis”, un fatto che ci mostra come un errore d’interpretazione di un’abbreviazione – in questo caso corrispondente alla tribù Galeria (Gal.) – può trasformarla in un praenomen come Gallus.42

Questo procedimento, consistente nell’usare altre iscrizioni come fonti d’ispirazione per confezionarne una nuova, si ripete altre volte in questo insieme di falsi che analizziamo. Vediamolo. Nell’epigrafe 21*, la clausola

in qoo neminem velim mecum neque servom neque libertu(m) neque liberum inseri. Et si secus fiet velim ossa quorumcunq(ue) sepulchro statim meo eruantur

è un adattamento del testo dell’iscrizione falsa campana CIL X 187*:

in h(oc) s(epulchro) sive servus sive libert(us) sive liber inferatur ne- mo; secus qui fecerit mitem Isidem iratam sentiat et suorum ossa eruta atque dispersa videat,

39 Anche un altro Longinus con praenomen Cl(audius) appare in un altro falso cinque- centesco (CIL II 352*).

40 Bisogna soltanto ricordare personaggi come Lucio Cornelio Sulla, Lucio Cornelio Scipione o Lucio Emilio Paolo.

41 Sono frequenti i casi in cui i falsi rinascimentali non seguono le norme dell’onomastica latina; cf. Gimeno 1997, 28.

42 Questo procedimento non è esclusivo di questo testo. Si vedano altri esempi in Gimeno 1997, 59, 65, 66, 68 e 73.
un testo già presente in raccolte epigrafiche anteriori, risalenti alla fine del XV secolo (Michele Fabrizio Ferrarini, Giovanni Giocondo, e in seguito in Marino Sanudo e l’anonimo *codex Filonardianus*). Nell’epigrafe 344*, la clausola “vividam naturam et virilem servavi animum” proviene da un frammento di un altro falso della Campania, *CIL X* 185*: “[...] valida natura virilem quem semper servavit animum [...]”.* Inoltre, il riferimento a Esculapio (“Aesculapii, cui me voveram futurum sodalem”) non sembra provenire da una fonte letteraria concreta, anzi, vi si potrebbe vedere una ripercessione delle parole di *CIL II* 410* (“Aesculapio vota vovi templum ingrato”), un falso di lunga tradizione, soprattutto se teniamo presente l’aggiunta dell’apposizione *deus ingratus* che possiamo leggere alcuni anni più tardi nella versione offerta da Pinelli (XVI secolo med.-ex.) e Fabri- cius (1587).

Infine, se accettiamo queste influenze dirette, nell’iscrizione 51* sembra che ci sia da prenderne in considerazione la clausola finale, “honoris libertatisque ergo”, pervenutaci da Nettucci e dai suoi seguaci, con “honoris liberalitatisque er- go”, che estraiamo da tutto il resto dei manoscritti. Si tratta di una clausola epigrafica piuttosto eccezionale, ma testimoniata in un’iscrizione (*CIL II* 1537) di Montemayor raccolta da alcune fonti della fine del XV secolo.

Per tornare al testo di Nettucci, l’autore chiude questa prima parte del capitolto dedicato alla Lusitania (ff. 37v–45v), con un riferimento al monastero di Guadalupe, dove copia l’epitaffio di Ferdinando il Cattolico, e con la copia delle iscrizioni del ponte di Alcántara (*CIL II* 759. 760. 761). Se osserviamo la trascrizione di 760, riportata qui sotto

In aes dextrorum eunti, ita incisum vidi.

Municipia
provinciae
Lusitaniae
conlata pecunia

---

43 Non è possibile menzionare qui la letteratura sulle fonti epigrafiche citate; per quelle usate da Hübner, si veda la praefatio del *CIL II* (p. V sqq.); per il Filonardianus, cf. *CIL II*, Suppl., pp. LXXVI–LXXVII.


45 Le fonti (Polib. 10, 10, 8) menzionano soltanto l’esistenza di un tempio a Cartagena.

46 Il manoscritto attribuito a Gian Vincenzo Pinelli è usato sporadicamente dal *CIL II*, sebbene non sia citato nella praefatio; cf. *CIL III*, p. XXXI.

47 L’epigrafe farebbe parte della prima sfilata d’iscrizioni ispaniche, il cui subarchetipo (compilato negli anni ottanta del XV secolo) è stato nominato *Antiquissimus* da Hübner. Appare anche in Alciato e in Choler (che riportano la clausola correttamente) e in Pere Miquel Carbonell, ma non nel Ferrarini. Nel s. XVI la riportano Agustin e l’anonimo MS. BNM 5973 (*olim* Docampo).
opus pontis fecerunt
Colarni Medubricenses
Lancienses Oppidani
Transcudani Paesures

(In un bronzo alla destra del viandante, vidi una iscrizione incisa così:)

I municipi della provincia della Lusitania, adunati i soldi, fecero hanno fatto questo ponte: i Colarni, i Medubricensi, i Lanciensi Oppidani, i Transcudani, i Pesuri.)

è interessante osservare tre cose: in primo luogo, egli afferma che l’ha vista (un fatto che, se dovessimo dargli credito, ci darebbe una nuova lettura, fino a questo momento non presa in considerazione); in secondo luogo, apporta l’informazione che l’iscrizione è incisa su una lastra di bronzo (fatto finora inedito in tutte le testimonianze che abbiamo analizzato in un’altra occasione e che potrebbe risolvere alcune perplessità relative al supporto dell’iscrizione); infine, non riporta il gentilizio Arani / Araui (che è apparso nella 20*), ma registra Transcudani (che non include nella 40*, anche se lo farà la tradizione di Ocampo).

I falsi lusitani in Florián de Ocampo e la loro tradizione

Le 5 iscrizioni appariranno pochi anni dopo (tra il 1525 e il 1544) nel cosiddetto Libro de Ocampo attribuito al cronista Florián de Ocampo (ms. BNM 3610, ff. 2–29v), con il quale si inaugura una tradizione manoscritta parallela che raccoglieranno il Libro del Rey, Covarrubias, Morales e Strada. Tale tradizione presenta differenze sistematiche tanto nel testo delle epigrafi quanto nelle supposte localizzazioni delle lapidi, dove si eliminano i riferimenti a città e a contrade antiche difficili da situare e si sostituiscono con centri abitati noti del Portogallo. Per esempio, nell’epigrafe 51*, da un’aggrovigliata “Sisapo nunc Zamorra in Lanciensium terra” si passa a un chiaro “prope Viseum Lusitaniae”; l’ultima clausola diviene “honoris liberalitatisque ergo”, e a Viriato, viene attribuito l’epiteto latronem, che sarà incorporato a partire dalla maggior parte delle fonti classiche e medievale.

48 Nella stessa opera c’è ancora un altro documento in cui Nettucci stesso afferma esser andato ad Alcántara, una lettera scritta a Segovia il 13 di aprile di 1515, indirizzata al vescovo di Cosenza, che inizia: “Augustinus Nettuccius scriba Florentinus archiepiscopo Cosenzorum[...]
50 Liv. per. 52; Front. strat. 2, 5; Vel. Pat. 2, 1; Oros. 5, 4, 1; Flor. 1, 33; Eutr. 4, 16; Paul. Diaec. h. rom. 4, 16; Vir. ill. 71, 1.
Nell’epigrafe 344*, la sconosciuta “non longe a Baccia” diviene “prope Castrum Lusitaniae oppidum”.\(^{51}\) Nell’epigrafe 20*, si sostituiscono gli sconosciuti e difficili campi Arani con i campi Lusitani, indubbiamente più chiari, e, nello stesso tempo, s’inverte l’ordine con cui si copiano i testi, in modo tale che la 21* preceda la 20*, e questa iscrizione si situ “prope Eboram Lusitaniae”, città conosciuta e meglio identificabile di Baccia. Infine, il testamento della 40*, che non contiene alcuna caratteristica formale in grado di assimilarlo a un’epigrafe, viene dotato, come abbiamo visto, di una formula conclusiva a modo di subscriptio, che gli conferisce indiscutibilmente tale carattere:

Servio Galba Lucio Aurelio consulibus. Decuriones Transcudani hoc testamentum ore eiusdem Galli Favonii emissum lapide iussere adsculpri

e si ubica nel contempo “in agro prope Colimbriam”.\(^{52}\) Oltre alle modifiche delle localizzazioni e delle aggiunte di nuovi frammenti, la tradizione proveniente da Ocampo incorpora anche una terza innovazione rispetto alla raccolta di Nettucci: riporta per la prima volta un’iscrizione del Portogallo che presenta tutte le caratteristiche che abbiamo riscontrato nei falsi di Nettucci.

*CIL* II 57* [BNM 3610 fol. 20]

*prope Castrum Lusitaniae oppid(um).*

P(ublius) Popil(ius) Avitus P(ublii) f(ilius) indulgentia pontif(icum)

Iceditanor(um) locum sepul(turae) accepi ante aed(em) deae Magnae

Cibelis quam iratam in morte sensi.

*(Vicino a Castro, città della Lusitania.)*

Io, Publio Popilio Avito, figlio di Publio, in grazia dei pontefici Igeditanori sono stato seppellito in fronte al tempio della Grande Dea Cibele, che nel momento della morte ho percepito adirata.)

In primo luogo, Ocampo situa questa iscrizione nello stesso luogo in cui pone la 344*, la qual cosa indica che per lui costituiscono un solo gruppo. In

---


\(^{52}\) È interessante notare come la tradizione non legata al Nettucci o a Ocampo (B. Marliani, W. Lazio, C. Sigonio, A. Manuzio, Romieu) ci fornirà una posizione meno precisa “in Lusitania” o “en Portugal”, attesa la difficoltà di collegare *Turres Iulii, Conimbriga* e i *Transcudani.*
secondo luogo, gli *Igaeditani* sono un’altra delle popolazioni presenti nella lista dei popoli dell’epigrafe di Alcántara (che la tradizione precedente a Nettucci tramanda come *Iceditani*). In terzo e ultimo luogo, troviamo ancora una dipendenza testuale dai falsi della Campania già impiegati per le epigrafi 21* e 344*: “indulgentia pontif. Iceditanor. locum” proviene da “indulgentia pontific. locus” (*CIL X* 186*), e “quam iratam in morte sensi” dipende, a sua volta, da “mitem Isidem iratam sentiat” (*CIL X* 187*). Secondo la nostra opinione, Nettucci non ebbe modo di accedere a questo testo, o l’avrebbe copiato insieme alle altre cinque epigrafi.

**Un ulteriore approccio alla formazione del falsario**

In base alle analisi eseguite fino al momento presente, è evidente che non ci troviamo di fronte a uno o vari falsari inculti, anzi i testi denotano una profonda conoscenza delle sillogi epigrafiche contemporanee e delle fonti classiche latine (o greche tradotte in latino), simile a quella che potevano avere i circoli umanisti italiani. E questo non solo rispetto all’uso di espressioni epigrafiche, ma anche per quanto concerne lo stile. Se ci soffermiamo semplicemente su un paio di esempi, osserviamo come *CIL II* 21* combini espressioni letterarie e giuridiche con quelle di indole epigrafica. Delle prime sottolineiamo “confossus multitudine telorum”, con chiare eco delle fonti classiche, cosi come “delatus humeris militum” e “si patria libera erit”, che sembrano di concezione piu che altro moderna. La clausola “e pecunia mea mihi fieri iussi” è una combinazione di espressioni ricorrenti in epigrafia (“pecunia mea / fieri iussi”), ma la formula risultante rappresenta un *unicum*. Infine, la frase finale “iura Romana […] testatoris” è un’innovazione, di tipo giuridico, del creatore dei falsi, che sviluppa ulteriormente la sequenza presa in prestito dai falsi della Campania.

In questo esempio troviamo anche una caratteristica molto sorprendente: l’apparizione di espressioni che intendono conservare la forma arcaica dell’accusativo tematico – *sepulchrum, seruom* – e, per estensione, una forma inspiegabile di ablativo *in qoo*. È fuori di ogni dubbio, dunque, che ci sia la volontà di conferire al testo un’antichità linguistica coerente con quella dei fatti cui fa riferimento, sicuramente mediante l’esempio di iscrizioni arcaiche (o arcaicizzanti) conservate a Roma o in Italia.

Un’altra clausola dalle chiare risonanze letterarie è l’uso della metafora “Tartareo absorptus hiatu” (20*) per riferirsi all’atto della morte, che ripro-

---


62
duce alcune clausole di Lucano, nonché un “telluris hiatu absortus” che troviamo in testi letterari medievali.

Coglie di sorpresa anche la menzione concreta di un tempio dedicato a Silvano sito ai piedi del Viminale, giacché le fonti classiche non ne parlano. Tra tutti gli autori posteriori a Nettucci che riportano l’iscrizione, solo Marliani (1534) si riferisce alla presenza di un tempio di Silvano a Roma, sotto la chiesa di Santa Agata, documentato, oltre che in questo testo, in un passaggio della Historia Augusta e inferito in base all’esistenza, a Roma, di numerose are dedicate a questa divinità. Il legame con il Viminale, però, l’abbiamo potuto trovare solo in un’epigrafe votiva, già presente nei manoscritti di Giocondo e da lui situata “infra quandam vineam in monte Vimin-ali”.

La realtà ispano-romana descritta nelle epigrafi
Dopo aver analizzato i meccanismi di formazione delle false epigrafi, è giunto il momento di rileggere i testi e, mettendo da parte il motivo concreto che li ha ispirati, vedere quale visione ci offrono della Lusitania del II secolo a.C. e dei suoi abitanti. Una difficoltà da tenere presente è che la maggior parte delle iscrizioni danno voce a soldati venuti dall’Italia – che difficilmente possiamo considerare come i primi abitanti del territorio, giacché muoiono nella lotta –, quindi le loro parole potrebbero non rispecchiare la realtà delle popolazioni autoctone: a tale riguardo è particolarmente significativo il testo della 51*, perché è l’unico di questo gruppo creato dai Lancienses stessi. Diversamente da quanto ci si potrebbe aspettare, inoltre, rende omaggio postumo a un soldato che aveva lottato “contro” Viriato e che si era battuto sempre a favore della loro repubblica. In più, la citazione di un monumento (“basis cum urna et statua”) e la sua eruzione “in loco publico” vorrebbe farci pensare a una popolazione in uno stato di romanizzazione sorprendentemente (e anacronicamente) molto avanzato. I dati apportati dalle altre iscrizioni sono pochi, giacché si riferiscono fondamentalmente a soldati romani. Tuttavia, nella 20* troviamo che gli Arani avevano edificato una “aedicula magnae Matris deum”. Un tempio simile, dedicato a Cibele, è citato nell’iscrizione 57*, non presente in Nettucci. Se osserviamo questo testo e quello della subscriptio della 40*, due popolazioni lusitane (gli Iceditani e i Transcudani) avevano già magistrature romane (o assimilabili), ri-

54 Luc. 3, 261: “at Tigrim subito tellus absorbet hiatu”; id. 6, 712–715: “non in Tartareo latitantem poscimus antro / […] primo pallentis hiatu / haeret adhuc Orci”.
56 CIL VI 602: “uotum siluano / soluit libens / merito t. f. / diadumenus / lurnesianus / praegustator / augusti”.
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spettivamente pontifices e decuriones. Di fatto, i pontefici Iceditani dimostrano la loro indulgenza verso Publio Popilio Avito (un personaggio dall’onomastica assolutamente romana) offrendogli uno spazio privilegiato per esservi sepolto.

Per alcune conclusioni future

Grazie all’analisi di questo gruppo di testi possiamo estrarre una serie di dati sulla genesi della falsificazione. Dunque, come abbiamo sostenuto all’inizio della nostra esposizione, per rispondere alle due domande più difficili (chi e perché) bisogna lasciare il terreno delle sicurezze e addentrarsi in quello delle ipotesi. Pertanto, presentiamo ora una serie di elementi di riflessione, iniziando dai più evidenti, a nostro avviso, per terminare con la proposta di quella che riteniamo essere la questione fondamentale: il rapporto esistente tra il progetto d’identità presente nei falsi, la loro intenzionalità e la loro paternità.

Primo. È ovvio che ci troviamo davanti a un insieme di testi concepiti e-espressamente come testi epigrafici, a prescindere dal loro carattere così spiccatamente letterario. In effetti, sono sempre stati tramandati nelle raccolte epigrafiche ad usum e, fin dal principio, è stata assegnata loro una localizzazione, un fatto questo che elimina qualsiasi altra tipologia testuale.

Secondo. Con il passare degli anni sembra che si manifesti una chiara volontà di rendere più credibili i testi inventati, mediante due azioni: a) adeguare maggiormente i testi a un formato “epigrafico” standard (aggiunta della clausola finale della 40*) e b) alterare la maggior parte delle localizzazioni, trasformando i riferimenti imprecisi in città reali del Portogallo.

Terzo. Il responsabile o i responsabili della creazione hanno potuto accedere facilmente ad abbondanti fonti letterarie (Orosio, Valerio Massimo, il De viris illustribus ecc.) e alle raccolte epigrafiche elaborate in Italia dalla seconda metà del XV secolo, che circolavano tra gli umanisti e nelle quali si mescolavano testi falsi, di carattere più letterario che epigrafico. Un’ulteriore prova di ciò è costituita dai tratti specificamente letterari e arcaizzanti con cui sono ornate le iscrizioni.

Quarto. Il falsario o i falsari devono appartenere a un solo circolo intellettuale molto colto, sito con tutta probabilità in Spagna, giacché la prima diffusione parte da qui, attraverso viaggiatori stranieri (Nettucci, Accursio) o cronisti ispanici (Ocampo e poi Morales).

Quinto. La finalità dell’elaborazione di questo gruppo di falsi non sembra si possa attribuire all’interesse di una città di rivendicare le proprie origini (cosa che invece accadrà frequentemente nella seconda metà del XVI secolo), giacché in tre dei cinque casi studiati non è citato nessun insediamento riconoscibile. Non ci troviamo, pertanto, di fronte a un caso di campanili-
smo; si tratta piuttosto di conferire identità e prestigio globali a una regione estesa che coincide con un territorio antico.

Sesto. Il messaggio contenuto nei testi non denota una condanna dell’invasione romana rispetto all’eroica resistenza lusitana, come ci si potrebbe attendere da una riaffermazione di carattere nazionalista contro l’invasore. Si limita invece a testimoniare, da un punto di vista archeologico, un episodio storico avvenuto in un territorio della Penisola Iberica, nello specifico la Lusitania, che occupava gran parte dell’attuale Portogallo. Nel contempo, non è neppure evidente che ci sia un tentativo di opporre o di mettere a confronto i due moderni territori del Portogallo e della Spagna: non solo non si trova alcun riferimento esplicito, ma l’ubicazione inizialmente a Zamora e Trujillo di due falsi lusitani rende di gran lunga più difficile l’assimilazione della frontiera della Lusitania con quella del Portogallo.

Settimo. In tal senso, la scelta del motivo della guerra contro Viriato potrebbe essere dovuta, almeno, a due cause: prima di tutto è il fatto più conosciuto legato alla Lusitania tra quelli riportati dalle fonti classiche e, in secondo luogo, è uno degli avvenimenti più antichi legati alla conquista dell’Iberia (II secolo a.C.).

Ottavo. Parallelamente, si cerca di presentare una Lusitania in avanzato processo di romanizzazione già verso la metà del II secolo a.C., equiparabile ad altre zone della penisola e dell’Italia che presentavano anch’esse un numero significativo di iscrizioni (vere o false), facenti parte delle prime raccolte manoscritte.

Nono. La produzione “in catena” di questi falsi non può considerarsi casuale e aliena al momento in cui vengono alla luce (primo decennio del XVI secolo). In tal senso, la proiezione, verso un passato remoto della Lusitania, di una visione d’identità come quella che abbiamo appena descritto, ci permette di comprendere la mentalità del falsificatore. Bisogna però tenere presente che questa mentalità può essere passiva, come un riflesso delle idee acquisite sull’antichità, oppure attiva, in quanto risultato di una presa di posizione ideologica o, perfino, in quanto creazione volontariamente propagandistica.

Epilogo

A questo punto, non possiamo ancora fornire una risposta a una delle domande più difficili: cui prodest? C’è un’intenzione politica dietro a questa operazione? Esiste un circolo intellettuale interessato a offrire un’immagine encomiastica della Lusitania che sia, nel contempo, conciliatrice con l’Italia e l’invasione romana? L’autore, o gli autori, andranno probabilmente cercati nei circoli umanistici nati intorno alla corte dei Re Cattolici o della nobiltà, alcuni dei quali erano profondamente italianizzati. Nello stesso modo, non
bisogna perdere di vista altre due considerazioni importanti e complementari. La prima: in quel momento storico si stavano realizzando le diverse cronache della storia della Spagna, tra cui quella di Marineo Siculo e quella incompiuta di Antonio de Nebrija. La seconda: nello stesso periodo, i Re Cattolici erano interessati a far risorgere l’idea della Lusitania in quanto parte integrante della Hispania antica e, per tanto, "destinata" a far parte della nuova Hispania. Parallelamente, all’esterno si comincia a costruire un impero in America, che si vorrebbe assimilare a quello romano, in cui i primi coloni sarebbero stati soldati e in cui si doveva strutturare il territorio e dotarlo di istituzioni urbane e di una lingua e una religione comuni che ne permettessero il controllo. All’interno, a partire dal 1492, si rafforza il tessuto urbano e i Concejos iniziano ad acquisire un maggior protagonismo politico cercando anche di rivendicare un’esistenza remota – soprattutto romana – attraverso le testimonianze conservate.

In tale contesto, è sorprendente la contraddizione esistente tra la costruzione dell’identità proposta dai falsi epigrafici studiati e la tradizione maggioritaria della coeva storiografia spagnola. In effetti, le tesi pre-romane (con Ercole e Tubal come protagonisti) e filo-gotiche, che si erano consolidate dalla stessa tarda antichità, nei secoli XV e XVI vivono un momento di forte auge in Spagna e in Europa (con l’evidente eccezione dell’Italia); il loro scopo non è altro che minimizzare il contributo di Roma (considerata come una potenza straniera e d’invasione) nella costruzione dell’identità stessa delle nazioni europee.

Tale contraddizione raggiungerà il proprio culmine con Morales: da un lato, egli condivide il gusto antiquario e archeologico della metà del XVI secolo (come appare nel distico posto al principio di questo contributo), ed è per l’appunto la sua opera a permettere la massiccia diffusione di falsi epigrafici ispanici come quelli qui studiati; ma, dall’altro lato, egli condivide anche la posizione ideologica che vede nei Goti il vero e proprio asse portante dell’identità spagnola, e in Roma, in fondo, una potenza dominatrice. Tale visione di Roma così distante da quella veicolata dai falsi viene riconfermata in un altro dei distici con cui introduce le sue opere, in questo caso l’edizione del 1574 della sua Corónica:

\[
\text{Illa ego [Hispania] Romanis sum formidata superbis} \\
\text{saecula quam tandem vix domuere duo.}
\]

(Io sono quella temuta dai superbi romani, che due secoli appena poterono domare finalmente.)

---

57 De Hispaniae laudibus libri VII (ca. 1497); De Aragoniae regibus et eorum rebus gestis libri V (1509); De rebus Hispaniae memorabilibus libri XXV (1530).
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This paper argues for the inclusion of writing in Latin in the narrative of “literary nation-building” in early modern France through an analysis of expressions of amor patriae in the learned prefaces of Henri Estienne (Henricus Stephanus secundus). Estienne’s celebrated defence of the French language against putative foreign (especially Italian) influence, conducted in his vernacular writings, is seen to have been nourished by his engagement with Italian and Spanish humanists in respect of Ciceronianism, the proper conception of Latinity and the ethical underpinnings of humanist editorial methodology.

Recent work on the rise of nationhood in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century France has, understandably perhaps, focused primarily on the role of writing in the vernacular in elaborating a shared notion of “Frenchness” that, although contested and frequently controversial, laid the foundations of the modern nation state. Thus Marcus Keller, in his Figurations of France: Literary Nation-Building in Times of Crisis, published in 2011, draws on a corpus of exclusively French-language texts to exemplify the ways in which writers such as Joachim Du Bellay, Pierre de Ronsard and Michel de Montaigne “shape and complicate a concept of nation by inventing notions of France and the French”. Whilst this approach is understandable in terms of the historical importance of a shared national language in crystallising and promoting ideas of a common national identity, as recognised by Etienne Balibar in his essay “The Nation Form: History and Ideology” of 1991 and, of course, in Benedict Anderson’s celebrated Imagined Communities, which ascribes to (vernacular) “print-languages” a key role in “lay[ing] the bases for national consciousnesses”, it does tend to obscure, or indeed occlude,

---

1 Keller 2011, 3.
2 Balibar 1991, 98; Anderson 1983, 47.
the contribution of writing in the learned language to the early modern construction of nationhood and national identity. I wish in this paper to redress this balance by investigating the close reciprocal relationship between writing in the vernacular and in Latin in the work of one of the most celebrated sixteenth-century “defenders” of the French vernacular, the humanist and Hellenist Henri Estienne (Henricus Stephanus secundus). In parallel with an extensive scholarly output of editions of Greek and Roman authors, and his monumental Thesaurus linguae graecae, Estienne produced a series of texts in French during the period 1565–1579 denouncing what he saw as the pernicious influence on the French language of the contemporary Italian and, to a lesser extent, Spanish languages in the areas of phonology, morphology, lexis and syntax, arguing that the French language, and, more specifically, the language used by the leading figures of the legal establishment in Paris, deserved to be considered “pre-eminent” among contemporary European vernacular languages, all of which were, in essence, inferior to it. In attending to Etienne’s learned output, I will draw attention to the ways in which what might appear at first sight to be exclusively scholarly and philological concerns, such as the debate on Ciceronianism and the ideal form of the Latin language, and the elaboration of an ethically-grounded humanist editorial methodology, can be seen to contribute to a parallel debate, conducted in French, on the proper relationship between vernacular languages. At the same time, I will demonstrate how a sense of specifically French – and Parisian – identity shapes Estienne’s learned output and informs his judgements about the Latin language and his changing attitude towards his fellow humanists beyond the borders of France.

A number of recent studies have focused on the construction of “nationhood” or, indeed, “literary nationhood” in sixteenth-century France. Timothy Hampton, in his Literature and Nation in the Sixteenth Century: Inventing Renaissance France (2001), defines the latter as “a kind of pre-history of the national” anticipating the subsequent invention of “nationalism” during the Enlightenment. For Hampton and others, such as David Bell and Joep Leerssen, the concept of the nation in the sixteenth century crystallised itself in an often conflictual relationship with a feared or distrusted Other, be it the Ottoman Turks, the Italians or the Spanish. Identification of “us” and

3 Despite a modest revival of interest in the work of Henri Estienne from scholars such as Bénédicte Boudou and Denise Carabin, who have devoted a book-length studies to his Apologie pour Hérodote (Boudou 2000) and his work on Seneca (Carabin 2006), the only monographic study of Estienne’s vernacular and other works dates from 1898 (Clément 1898). More recent critical work on Estienne is collected in the volume Henri Estienne 1988.

4 For Estienne’s defence of French, see Hornsby 1998; Cowling 2007a and 2007b.

5 Hampton 2001, 8.
“them”, of friends and enemies thus played an important role in the genesis and growth of a specifically French national identity. In addition, at a time when France was riven by civil conflict and trust in the Catholic king of France was in very short supply among Protestant intellectuals, Huguenot writers, such as Henri Estienne, turned to the nation in order to mount an appeal against royal abuses. Hampton identifies language – and specifically figurative language – as the site of such struggles, although he maintains a focus on vernacular writing and uses Henri Estienne as a foil for Du Belay’s more “original” recognition that the vitality of the French language lay not in its purity, which Estienne fought so hard to maintain, but rather in its capacity to appropriate other cultures in what Hampton describes as an “import-export model”. Marcus Keller has, most recently, built on Hampton’s study by privileging the active role assumed by vernacular writers, often against the backdrop of civil unrest and external conflict, in developing what he terms, nuancing Benedict Anderson’s classic formulation, an “imaginary community” that, although constantly evolving and subject to contestation and critique in the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, nevertheless laid the groundwork for the modern nation state. Keller makes no reference, however, to the Latin writing of any of the vernacular authors who make up his corpus, nor to the activity of “hybrid” individuals such as Estienne, whose published output spanned the vernacular and the learned language, and whose bilingual practice provides a challenge to Anderson’s unique emphasis on “unified fields of exchange and communications below Latin and above the spoken vernaculars”, in the form of vernacular print-languages, as motors of the growth of national consciousness in the early modern period. It is clear, however, that Estienne deserves a place among other literary “nation-builders”, not least because of his tactic of playing on existing hostilities and rivalries of all sorts – political, cultural, mercantile, religious and, not least, scholarly – in order to radicalise French opinion against foreign influence and competition in all of these areas. It is, of course, significant – but, given his humanist credentials, hardly surprising – that Estienne conducted this campaign in both the vernacular and in Latin, giving his ideas access to precisely those circles (Italian humanists

6 Hampton 2001, 5; Bell 1996, 106; Leerssen 2000, 269. Leerssen also draws attention to a systematisation in European attitudes, over the course of the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, “whereby character traits and psychological dispositions were distributed in a fixed division among various “nations”” (272).
7 Hampton 2001, 8.
8 Hampton 2001, 27–28, 156.
9 Anderson 1983, 47.
10 For a broader discussion of Estienne’s political and economic context, see Cowling 2009.
and others) who were most likely to be disdainful of the French vernacular. Before looking at some concrete examples of this technique it will be necessary to determine the peculiar existential position from which Estienne mounted this campaign, itself a product of the religious and political upheavals of the sixteenth century, and which contributed significantly to the literary habitus that is evident in his writings.

A key constituent of Henri Estienne’s personality, as both a humanist printer and a defender of his own vernacular, was his acute consciousness of belonging to a great dynasty of Parisian scholar-printers. His grandfather, also Henri (Henricus primus), originally from Provence, established a printing business in Paris at the start of the sixteenth century, producing more than one hundred and twenty volumes over a twenty-year span from 1502. His son Robert Estienne, Henri’s father, took over the printing shop in 1526 and enjoyed significant royal patronage from both king Francis I and his sister Margaret of Navarre, culminating in his nomination as royal printer for Latin, Hebrew and Greek texts in 1541. The preface to Henri’s edition of Aulus Gellius contains a detailed account of the culture of Robert Estienne’s household, in which the vehicular language – common to the print workers, members of the family and, albeit largely passively, the domestic staff – was Latin. The young Henri himself famously bucked this trend by insisting on learning Greek before he learnt Latin, and going on to design a set of Greek characters that were used in his father’s editions in the 1540s. During this period, however, Robert’s repeated editions of Latin bibles, themselves a symptom of his growing Calvinist convictions, led to frequent difficulties with the Sorbonne and the Faculty of Theology from which, in the end, his royal patrons could not protect him; in 1551, taking the nineteen-year-old Henri with him, Robert sought refuge in Calvinist Geneva, where he continued to print works of both theological and linguistic interest – including a French grammar in the vernacular, which Henri translated into Latin – until his death in 1559. His will stipulated that the entire Genevan printing operation should pass to Henri, on the condition that the latter remain loyal to the Calvinist faith and not transfer his residence, or the press, from the city. Henri’s own French nationhood is, therefore, best viewed as a peculiar mixture of family heritage – both geographical and intellectual – and the nostalgic regret of a lifelong exile for an essential element of that heritage.

---

11 For information on Estienne’s family and a detailed biography, see Feugère 1853 (here 6–14).
12 See Feugère 1853, 23–24.
13 See Feugère 1853, 14–15.
14 Estienne, Robert 2003.
15 See Feugère 1853, 35; Clément 1898, 10.
that had passed into other hands. The Estiennes’ Parisian printing house and the librairie that was attached to it were, indeed, retained by Henri’s uncle Charles and subsequently given to his younger brother Robert (Robertus secundus), a loyal Catholic who escaped from Geneva and, despite being disinherited by his father, became printer to the French crown in 1563.\textsuperscript{16} Despite the provisions of his father’s will, Henri maintained close ties with Paris and, in particular, with the milieu of the Parlement; these ties are evident in the dedications of a number of his learned editions in the 1570s and 1580s, culminating in the edition of Aulus Gellius in 1585, which is addressed to five leading Parisian lawyers and members of the Parlement. He also cultivated the ill-fated king Henry III, at whose instigation he composed, while resident at the French royal court, his Traité de la Précéllence du langage françois of 1579.\textsuperscript{17} During this period, however, Henri’s access to the French book market was increasingly disrupted by the series of Wars of Religion, and his desire to resettle in France was finally frustrated by the assassination of Henry III in 1589.\textsuperscript{18} Such material frustrations, while debilitating for Henri’s printing business (which had frequently fallen foul of the censorship restrictions imposed by the Genevan Consistory), did not, however, prevent him from conducting a long-running promotion, through both his Latin and vernacular writings, of French nationhood. I will now look at some examples of Henri’s “patriotism” – a characteristic, it should be pointed out, that was much vaunted by his nineteenth-century French biographers\textsuperscript{19} – in his Latin writings, as a manifestation of the interpenetration of his learned and vernacular activities discussed above.

The rich vein of paratextual material conserved in the more than one hundred and sixty scholarly volumes that Estienne edited or printed over the course of his career from the early 1550s until his death in 1598, which includes prefaces, postfaces, addresses to the reader, dedicatory letters, introductions and commentaries, enables us to trace Estienne’s changing relationships with other humanists across Europe and his developing ideas about both Latin and Greek and his own vernacular. Study of the material recently gathered together and edited by a team led by Judit Kecskeméti for the series La France des Humanistes\textsuperscript{20} reveals a gradual shift of focus away from Italy, to which Estienne made a number of journeys in the 1550s in search of manuscripts of Greek authors, towards Germany, where he attempted to secure the financial support of Ulrich Fugger of Augsburg for

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{16} See Feugère 1853, 29–31.
  \item \textsuperscript{17} Estienne 1896.
  \item \textsuperscript{18} See Feugère 1853, 136–138.
  \item \textsuperscript{19} See Cazes 2003, xx; Feugère 1853, 132.
  \item \textsuperscript{20} Kecskeméti et al. 2003.
\end{itemize}
work on the *Thesaurus linguae graecae*, eventually published in 1572, and, of course, towards France. For Hélène Cazes, the range of dedicatees present in Estienne’s learned output reveals not only the progress of his intellectual training, but also what she terms “sa perpétuelle et difficile hésitation quant à son appartenance à un cercle, une ville, une patrie” (his continuous and painful uncertainty about whether he belonged to a specific circle, town or homeland). There are, however, as we might expect, clear pragmatic motivations for Henri’s choice of dedicatees, and it is no accident that Estienne famously presented himself as the “travelling salesman” for his press in his 1579 piece on the Frankfurt book fair. Early editions are dedicated to his erstwhile Italian collaborators, who provided access to the libraries of Florence and Venice, and with whom Estienne had obviously enjoyed a close working relationship: Estienne’s first edition of the works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1554) is, for instance, dedicated to the Italian humanist Pietro Vettori, with whom he subsequently collaborated on an edition of Aeschylus (1557), for which Vettori provided a manuscript of the hitherto unpublished *Agamemnon*. The edition of Aristotle and Theophrastus of the same year was offered to Vettori as an apology for Estienne’s slowness over the Aeschylus volume. The preface to the edition of Ctesias, the fifth-century BC Greek historian (also 1557) stages a dialogue between Henri and another Italian collaborator, Carlo Sigonio, in the library of St Mark in Venice, to which Sigonio has acted as guide. At the same time, however, Estienne takes the opportunity to make the case for his French compatriots by selecting an area of scholarship, knowledge of Greek, in which he believes that French scholars are well placed to claim pre-eminence; in the Ctesias preface, he asserts that his own Greek teacher, Pierre Darès, is now as well known as a scholar in Italy as he is in his native France, as are his compatriots and fellow Hellenists Jean Dorat and Adrien Turnèbe.

1557 was also marked by two editions of Cicero, in which Estienne’s first attacks on Italian Ciceronians are evident; this hostility expresses itself first in the use of the Horatian term *servum pecus* (*Epistulae*, I, 19, 19) to denigrate the Ciceronians as servile imitators, and then in a series of inventive sobriquets for those who ignorantly revere solecisms in faulty manuscripts as the true words of the master of Roman eloquence: *Ciceroniatros*,

---

21 Cazes 2003, xvi, xviii.
22 Cazes 2003, xvi.
23 Cazes 2003, xvi.
24 See Cazes 2003, xvi; Kecskeméti et al. 2003, 22.
Ciceronicolas, Ciceronipetas, and Ciceronitribas. These apparently playful jibes are, however, grounded in a personal editorial methodology that, as modern scholars such as Hélène Cazes have recognised, ascribes moral fault to editorial error and condemns those who fail to show proper respect to the texts of the ancients by allowing them to be read in faulty editions or inadequate translations. While there is clearly an element of professional rivalry, not to say marketing spin, in Estienne’s criticisms of the deficiencies of other editors’ punctuation, typography and mise en page, his ethical approach to editing, which expresses itself through the metaphor of the editor as doctor treating wounds inflicted on texts, leads him to repeated criticisms of the Italian humanist translators of Maximus of Tyre or Thucydides; no less a figure than Lorenzo Valla is lambasted in 1564 for translating identical passages of the Greek historian inconsistently from one book to another, and again in 1566 for his errors and inconsistency in translating Herodotus. In the preface to his great satirical work in the vernacular, the Traité préparatif à l’Apologie pour Herodote of the same year, Estienne pursues his attack on the Italian Ciceronians by criticising those among the moderns who presume to sit in judgement on the writings of the ancients, and to decide that “la monarchie du langage Latin” (the monarchy of the Latin language) should be given to one author alone. Estienne returned to this theme ten years later in his De latinitate falso suspecta, which, like the Apologie, sought to right a wrong inflicted on the culture of Antiquity by the purported ignorance of modern – and specifically Italian – scholars. Just as Herodotus needed to be defended from the claim that his historiography dealt exclusively in lies and fabrications, Latinity itself, in Estienne’s view, required rehabilitation after the attempts of the so-called “Nizoliiani” (the followers of Mario Nizolio, author of a Thesaurus ciceronianus in 1535) to assert that it could be defined exclusively through the works of Cicero. In order to reinforce his point, Estienne went on to demonstrate that a number of presumed Gallicisms in contemporary neo-Latin, such as promissum tenere (tenir promesse) could in fact be found in Cicero, and to illustrate the manifest similarities between the pre-classical Latin of authors such as Plautus and the French vernacular. This broader conception of Latinity to include forms subsequently found in the vernacular languages was clearly in-

27 Kecskeméti et al. 2003, 36, 42.
29 Kecskeméti et al. 2003, 45, 105, 109, 110, 167; Cazes 2003, xxxiv. For the metaphor of the doctor, see Cazes 2003, xxxiii, and Estienne 1980, 438–439; for Ciceronianism as a sickness in Erasmus’ Ciceronianus, see Cave 1979, 44.
30 Kecskeméti et al. 2003, 175–176.
31 Kecskeméti et al. 2003, 384–385; Clément 1898, 205.
32 Clément 1898, 244.
compatible with the attempts of the Ciceronians to “purify” Latin of its non-canonical features and provides further proof of Estienne’s desire to rediscover and propagate a respectfully authentic view of Antiquity grounded in methodical textual scholarship and an intimate knowledge of both Latin and Greek. In this respect, Estienne’s contemporaneous campaign to “defend” the French language against the encroachments of other Romance vernaculars, chief among them Italian, can be understood both as a polemical riposte to the nation that was most enthusiastic, in his view, in its adoption of Ciceronianism and as an attempt to demonstrate respect for the authentic nature of a language formerly untouched by linguistic borrowings, which he consistently tarred with the brush of unnecessary novelty. The identification of “friends” and “enemies” that runs through the humanist polemic of Estienne’s Latin prefaces thus contributes, albeit indirectly, to the elaboration of a distinctively French approach to language that is inherently hostile to unnecessary foreign borrowings motivated by fashion or unthinking emulation of the nation’s neighbours. It is, furthermore, clear that Estienne’s conception of his own vernacular draws on his broader view of Latinity as extending beyond the works of Cicero to embrace linguistic material that can still be discerned in French, and that thus demonstrates the worth of that language despite its foreign detractors.

The one source of borrowing to which Estienne did not object – predictably, perhaps, given his own pre-eminent status as one of Europe’s leading scholars of that language – was Greek. Indeed, one of the defining characteristics of this language for him was the fact that it had lent to other languages (chief among them Latin, of course) and had borrowed nothing from them in return.33 Already in the Ciceronianum lexicon graeco-latinum of 1557, Estienne lists the words, figures and phrases that Cicero had borrowed from Greek authors;34 it is, perhaps significant that (as Jean Balsamo has noted) at the moment when Latin had become the universal language of the Republic of Letters, Estienne opted to devote himself to Greek, the study of which he saw as on a declining trend in Italy.35 It is, in any case, striking that it is in the preface to the Thesaurus linguae graecae of 1572 that Henri identifies himself most clearly with his French, and specifically Parisian, origins:

Iam vero quoniam multa Graeci habent loquendi genera quae Latinae linguæ sunt negata, quum Gallica contra non adumbret ea tantum, sed ad vivum (ut ita loquar) exprimat: me, Gallum hominem, et vero in

33 Estienne 1853, 19; see also, for the proto-mercantilist dimension of this claim, Cowling 2009.
34 Feugère 1853, 61.
35 Balsamo 1992, 69.
ipsa Galliae Gallia, id est Parisiis, natum atque educatum, patriae et linguae meae iniuriam facturum nisi latentes has sermonis ei familiaris divitias in apertum proferrem, et exeris etiam nationibus conspiciendas praebem. Ideoque in multis huius operis locis, quum latinitismis destituerer, Gallicismorum auxilium imploravi, aut saltem ad eos qui a me commemorati fuerant in libello de Gallicae linguae affinitate cum Graeca (qui inscriptus est, De la conformité du langage François avec le Grec) lectorem remisi.36

(Now since the Greeks have numerous expressions that are denied to the Latin language, and French does not merely sketch them but expresses them [so to speak] in a living form, I considered that, as a Frenchman and, indeed, one born and brought up in the very heart of France, that is Paris, I would be doing my homeland and my language a disservice if I did not bring to light those hidden riches of language that were shared with it, and bring them to the attention of foreign nations. For the same reason in many places in this work, where I had no latinisms to hand, I called on gallicisms for help, or at least I referred the reader to those that I had recorded in a little book on the affinity of the French language with Greek entitled De la conformité du langage François avec le grec.)

As well as providing an advertisement for his earlier work in the vernacular, Traicté de la conformité du langage français avec le grec of 1565,37 which sought to demonstrate in some detail the features of French that could be argued to derive from Greek as opposed to Latin (such as the definite and indefinite article), Estienne argues here that French is peculiarly able, unlike Latin (or, a fortiori, the Latin of Cicero), to render the expressive qualities of Greek, and that it is his patriotic duty as a Frenchman and a native of the most authentic part of France, namely Paris, to bring this affinity to the wider readership of the “exteris nationibus”, who must recognise that French forms (“Gallicismi”) are often more appropriate as a means of explaining a Greek term than are Latinisms.38 The French vernacular is thus presented as better suited to render the riches of the Greek language than the artificially impoverished Ciceronian variety advocated by the Italian humanists whom Estienne has criticised elsewhere. This pragmatic relationship

36 Kecskeméti et al. 2003, 303–304; Cazes 2003, xx. All translations from Latin sources are my own.
37 Estienne 1853.
38 Estienne had already argued that Greek and French were more closely related than Greek and Latin, with resultant benefits for French learners of Greek, in his Colloquiorum seu dialogorum graecorum specimen of 1564; see Kecskeméti et al. 2003, 114–115. For Estienne’s arguments concerning the superiority of both Greek and the language of Paris, see Demaizière 1988.
between French and Greek, grounded in a putative family resemblance, is further developed in Estienne’s Hypomneses de gallica lingua of 1582, a grammar of contemporary French addressed to foreign learners (and therefore written in Latin), in which Greek is used as a means of better understanding some of the particularities of French. This work is, like the Thesaurus, explicitly linked to Estienne’s vernacular output and presents itself as a means of continuing a polemical debate on the relative merits of the French and Italian vernaculars in the learned language. Estienne has been moved to write, he tells his “lector Gallicae linguae studiosus” (reader keen on learning the French language), by a particular occurrence at the court of king Henry III:

Invitavit me (ut verum fatear) is quoque amor quo hanc patriae meae linguam, pro eo ac debeo, prosequeor: & alacriorem simulque audientiorem (audaciorem enim nolim dicere) ad opus aggreidiendum reddidit, iam navata circa eandem linguam opera. Quum enim refellendi mihi coram rege nostro essent qui sermonem Italicum nostro anteponerant (qua de re libellum etiam edidi postea qui de Gallica lingua praecellentia est inscriptus) penius quam antea unquam introspicientiae mihi omnes nostri sermonis partes fuerunt.

(I was also motivated, to tell the truth, by that love that makes me cultivate, as I must, the language of my homeland, which made me more enthusiastic and bolder [not to say more foolhardy] in approaching the task, having completed a number of works on the topic. Since I had to refute a number of people who were arguing before our king that the Italian language be preferred to our own [a topic on which I subsequently published a little book entitled On the Pre-eminence of the French Language], I was obliged to look more closely at all the elements of our speech.)

The rivalry between italianising courtiers and the defender of French, or “them” and “us”, has thus given rise to both a vernacular treatise, the Précellence du langage françois, and the learned Hypomneses. As far as the best variety of French to teach to foreigners is concerned, the speech of the Ile-de-France (Francia) and Paris are again presented as exemplary, with Athens, Graecia Graeciae, providing the classical model. This is not to say, though, that there is no place for the French dialects in Estienne’s Atticist conception of authentic French; just as the Attic dialect has borrowed from

---

39 Estienne 1999.
41 Estienne 1896.
42 For the relationship between language and land as a source of authentic “Frenchness” in Estienne, see Hampton 2001, 156.
the other Greek dialects, especially Ionian and Doric, so the French language can draw on dialects outside the Ile-de-France:

Quemadmodum autem Graeca in lingua praecipuo quidem sermo Atticus laudatur, sed ita ut peculiarem quondam laudem alicubi unaquaque dialectus mereatur: sic profecto, quanvis Gallica lingua in ea potissimum quam dixi Galliae parte [sc. Francia] sedem habeat, non parvum tamen illi decus atque incrementum sunt dialecti: atque ibi quidem commoratur, sed tamen ita ut per has, tanquam colonias, longe illi sit iucundissimum aliquando expatiari, ac nonnulla quae illis propria sunt vocabula domum referre.43

(In the same way the Attic speech is praised above all others in the Greek language, but each dialect deserves its own particular praise: accordingly, although the French language has its most important seat in the part of France that I have named [sc. the Ile-de-France], its other dialects are no small adornment and benefit to it; and, although it lives in that place, it is also pleasant for it to travel through others, as though through its country estates, and to bring home many words that are native to them.)

Estienne goes on to assert that the dialects of French, unlike those of other vernacular languages, conserve between them the full semantic and stylistic richness of Latin – which the Ciceronians had, of course, sought to curb – and also display numerous borrowings direct from Greek. Their combined resources make them a suitable instrument for understanding the full richness of the Latin language, as Estienne had already claimed in the De latinitate falsa suspecta: a suitably humanistic argument for the learning of a vernacular language.

It should be clear from the above that Estienne’s promotion of France and its language grew out of, and was supported by, his engagement with the Ciceronian debate and his pioneering – and, occasionally, lonely – work on Greek. His Latin prefaces also betray a preoccupation with the French Wars of Religion that pitted his co-religionists against French Catholics, themselves generally supported by the French crown, throughout the 1570s and 1580s.44 While Italian involvement on the Catholic side, personified by the Queen Mother Catherine de Medici, was the focus of Estienne’s ire in his vernacular writings, most notably the Deux Dialogues du nouveau langage français italianisé of 1578,45 which attack what the author presents as the degenerate manners and language of the French royal court, evocation of the activities of the Catholic League is frequently accompanied by criticism.

45 Estienne 1980.
of Spain. Already in the Traicté de la conformité du langage françois avec le grec of 1565, Estienne gives both “italianised” and “hispanised” French short shrift;46 his hostility towards Spain is, however, crystallised, in typical fashion, in a scholarly controversy. In the “Parisian Nights” appended by Estienne to his 1585 edition of Aulus Gellius, the Spanish humanist Juan Luis Vivès is taken to task for criticising Aulus Gellius’ Latin style.47 Such criticism, Estienne asserts, is motivated by Aulus Gellius’ own attacks on the style of the Spaniard – as Estienne puts it – Seneca. With a certain irony, Estienne acknowledges that Vivès’ position is grounded in a love of his own patria, but is unworthy of a serious scholar. This tendency to link scholarship and politics finds, perhaps, its clearest expression in the preface to another work devoted to a discussion of Latin style, the De Justi Lipsii latinitate of 1595.48 Shortly before his death, Estienne addressed what he perceived as the unnecessary neologisms and impure, but highly influential, Latin of Justus Lipsius, to which he preferred the more down-to-earth style of Seneca. After evoking the recent presence of Spaniards on the streets of Paris, almost as an occupying force, Estienne attacks the followers of Lipsius, who had himself become historiographer to the king of Spain in 1592, in the following terms:

Quod Gallica liga adversus hunc quoque, verum et legitimum Galliae regem, molita est, Hispanico auxilio freta: idem secta antiquaria, quae tandem (proh dolor) evasit in gentem magnam, ac quae quotidie magna magisque fit populosa, adversus florentis Romae latinitatem, veram et legitimam Latini eloquii reginam, molitur.49

(Just as the French League has mobilised against the true and legitimate French king, with Spanish help, so this archaising sect, which has, unfortunately, grown large and grows more popular by the day, is mobilising against the flourishing Latinity of Rome, the true and legitimate queen of Latin eloquence.)

Just as the Catholic League (“Gallica liga”) has waged war on the legitimate king of France – Estienne is thinking about Henry III, whose compromises with the League and subsequent assassination had previously prevented his own return to France50 – so the followers of Lipsius (“secta antiquaria”), again with Spanish support, are attacking the true queen of Roman Latinity. Scholarly controversy and political conflict seem to be interlinked, or rather indissoluble, in Estienne’s mind, as T. E. Hope has recognised in respect of

46 Estienne 1853, 20.
47 Kecskeméti et al. 2003, 527; Estienne 2007, 12, 30.
49 Kecskeméti et al. 2003, 698.
50 Clément 1898, 43–44.
his vernacular writings,\textsuperscript{51} although sharing a common scholarly language, early modern humanists are viewed as motivated by essentially sectarian and nationalistic concerns that express themselves to the detriment of the classical authors on whom they write. In this respect, Estienne’s conception of scholarly error as moral fault lends itself to a set of judgements about national character refracted through use of, and commentary on, the learned language.

The preceding discussion has sought to demonstrate that Henri Estienne’s contribution to the construction of French nationhood – his “patriotism” – is fuelled, throughout his career, by fundamental aspects of his practice as a humanist editor and printer, involving not just the need to compete in a Europe-wide market for scholarly books, but also the deeply held conviction that the editing or translating of ancient texts required a scrupulous respect for the original source and a catholic attitude towards Latinity. The notion that scholarly error was a form of moral fault, stridently expressed in his criticisms of other scholars – chief among them the Italians – underpins not just his editorial work but also his criticisms of linguistic innovators in the vernacular, who, like the italianising courtiers of Henry III, are often portrayed as morally degenerate. The construction of \textit{amor patriae} in Estienne’s Latin output is thus, I would argue, indissoluble from his constructions of French nationhood in his vernacular writings and is, for that reason, deserving of inclusion in any account of the growth of nationhood in early modern France.

\textsuperscript{51} Hope 1971, 231 (Estienne as an “unrequited political theorist”).
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The achievement of the historian and archivist Francesc Tarafa is essential for an understanding of the relation between historiography and Catalan institutions in the second half of the sixteenth century. This article is devoted to his only printed work which was in Latin, the De origine, and to the translation of that text into Castilian Spanish by the cosmographer Alonso de Santa Cruz. Santa Cruz’s vernacular version manipulates and twists the sense of Tarafa’s Latin original and could perhaps be best understood in the general context of a reaction against the Anales of Jerónimo Zurita led by Santa Cruz himself.

1.

The historian and archivist Francesc Tarafa was born around 1495, not far from Barcelona, in Mas Tarafa de Santa Maria de Llerona, in Granollers, and he died at Rome in 1556. Tarafa began his ecclesiastical career as a beneficiary of the parish of Sant Esteve de Granollers, in 1523. A year later, he took holy orders as a priest and in 1526 he obtained a benefice in Barcelona cathedral. From 1532 he appears as the cathedral archivist, although it is possible he acquired the position before then. After 1543 he was a cathedral canon, and in 1544, he became commendatory prior of Santa Maria de Manlleu, an Augustinian monastery near Manresa. Shortly before his death, Tarafa had renounced the Barcelona canonry, probably in favour of his nephew Marc Antoni Tarafa. A year earlier, he had ceased attending sessions of the Barcelona chapter, with which he had a difficult relationship –

* This article forms part of a Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación team project (La literatura catalana del Renacimiento y el Barroco en el contexto europeo, FFI2009–09630) and a Generalitat de Catalunya consolidated research team (Identitats, cultura i pensament polític en el procés de construcció nacional català, CIRIT, 2009 SGR 808).
the origins of the conflict remain a mystery. In both Barcelona cathedral and in Manlleu he carried out wide-ranging archival reforms, as surviving documents attest. Tarafa died in Rome, a city he had visited several times since the 1540s to attend to chapter business at the Vatican, when he was trying to resolve a dispute with the Barcelona chapter.¹

There was far more to Tarafa than is suggested by the preceding account of a hard-working, restless ecclesiastic who had difficulties with those around him. He was a historian and heraldist whose work is fundamental for our understanding of the relation between Catalan historiography and Catalan political institutions in the second half of the sixteenth century.² He wrote in his mother tongue, Catalan, though he also used Latin, when he considered it appropriate. Despite the fact that most of his work was only in manuscript, it had an extensive circulation. This was not unusual in early modern Catalonia: printers preferred marketable works, and Tarafa’s use of Catalan, as well as his preference for specialised topics was bound to limit the diffusion of his writing.

Nonetheless Tarafa is a figure of considerable importance, and manuscript transmission of his works from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries was notably abundant. More than twenty of his works have survived (not counting fragments and independent excerpts): a copy of the Barcelona cathedral canons’ book of heraldry (1536), a copy of Linea regum Hispaniarum (ca. 1538–1541), five copies of Historia de vitis pontificum ecclesiae Barcinonensis (1547), two of the Dictionarium geographiae universalis Hispaniae or De Hispaniae situ, provinciis, populis, urbibus, oppidis, fluminibus, montibus et promontoriiis dictionarium (1552), two more of the Crónica de la província de Catalunya en la Citerior Espanya (ca. 1553[a]), along with ten manuscripts of the Crónica de cavallers catalans (1527–1556).³ His only work to be published was a more general historiographical study in Latin: De origine ac rebus gestis regum Hispaniae liber (1553b), but this suffices to show we are in possession of a considerable corpus by a historian who was read and appreciated in his own country as well as in Europe.

This paper will address certain connections between Tarafa’s work and Catalan institutions of the time. A brief overview of his career will be followed by a discussion focusing on his most widely-circulated text, De

² For the relationship between institutions and historiography in the later sixteenth century, see Viladamor 2007, especially I, 161–171.
³ Descriptions of various manuscripts can be found in Miralles & Toldrà 1997; see also Duran 1998–2008, 2006.
origine, and its translation into Spanish by Alonso de Santa Cruz, in order to highlight the importance of language choice in the construction of identities.

2.

From 1536 Tarafa took charge of writing the daily account books (Exemplars or Exemplaria) at Barcelona cathedral as well as the cathedral manual of alms (Speculum Pie Elemosine). The latter manuscript included a small heraldry of the cathedral canons in 1536. Tarafa’s responsibilities thus combined archival endeavours with the interest in heraldry which would manifest themselves in his later works. Tarafa also wrote and dedicated to Bishop Cassador an extensive chronicle of the cathedral, the Historia de vitis pontificum ecclesiae Barcinonensis, which was widely disseminated. The Historia filled a gap in the historiography of the Barcelona chapter and represented an advance on historiography of the cenacle. This is evident from scrutiny of the book itself, from abundant subsequent citations of it in similar chronicles, and from its use as a documentary source. Tarafa intended the work to be circulated beyond the cathedral, and he worked hard to achieve this, supervising manuscript copies to ensure there were no errors in the text. He was particularly interested in how this work was used, and his dedication to bishop Cassador was inspired by the Liber de vita Christi ac omnium pontificum of Bartolomeo Sacchi, “il Platina”. Evidence of the interest the Historia inspired are the two (failed) attempts to publish it: first in 1671, and then in the nineteenth century, by the scholar Josep Tastu. As a general historian, Tarafa also wrote a subsidiary genealogy, the Linea regum Hispaniarum, and three works that are essential for understanding the development of sixteenth-century catalan historiography: the Dictionarium geographiae universalis Hispaniae, the De Origine ac rebus gestis regum Hispaniae liber, and the Crónica de la província de Catalunya en la Citérior Espanya.

The Linea regum Hispaniarum is an annotated list of the Spanish monarchs from the beginning of time through to Charles V. It cannot have been well known at the time, and interest was confined to small, erudite circles. It probably was written as a study aid to be used by Tarafa for the writing of larger historiographical works such as the Catalan and Latin chronicles and his geographical dictionary. The Dictionarium was typical of the humanistic geographical treatises which had already been produced in Catalonia a few years before: for example Jeroni Pau’s De fluminibus et montibus Hispaniarum libellus (Rome, Eucharius Silver, 1491), which Tarafa knew and valued. His own De origine was by a Catalan in Latin with the objective of making the Catalan perspective known beyond national boundaries. Tarafa wrote the history of “the two Spains”, the Castilian and the Catalan-
Aragonese crowns, and he published it in Europe. The significance of this will be considered towards the end of this paper. The *Crònica de la província de Catalunya en la Citerior Espanya*, on the other hand was written for a more local readership, for Catalans in Catalan. That work was originally conceived in three parts, although we only have two (from Tubal through to the Roman era) perhaps the third (up to Charles V) was never composed. Tarafa’s recognized expertise in heraldry was displayed in another work, *Crònica de cavallers catalans*, which was widely circulated at the time, largely owing to a text (apparently somewhat altered) which was owned by the heraldist Jaume Ramon Vila, one of Tarafa’s early seventeenth-century copyists.

As a chronicler of origins, Tarafa followed the successful but largely forged work by Giovanni Nanni, *De primis temporibus et quatuor ac viginti regibus primis Hispaniae et eius antiquitate*, published in the *Commentaria super opera diversorum auctorum de antiquitatibus loquentium* in 1498 (Rome, Eucharius Silber) and dedicated to Isabella and Ferdinand, the Catholic Monarchs. This narrative of the first twenty-four peninsular monarchs by Nanni, a Dominican also known as Annio da Viterbo (or Annius of Viterbo) was greatly admired from its first appearance by historians throughout the Iberian Peninsula. Florián de Ocampo, in Castile, and Pere Antoni Beuter, in Valencia, both of them chroniclers active in the first half of the sixteenth century, were among those who relied upon Annio’s mythological theses. Though Tarafa’s sources also included bishop Margarit, Jeroni Pau, and Lucio Marineo Siculo, the reasons why Annio is of particular importance will become clear in what follows.

3.

The circulation of Tarafa’s manuscripts in the early modern period was much documented by Maria Toldrà and myself more than ten years ago, although more information about their transmission is now available. In the sixteenth century, when Tarafa was still alive, there appears to have been efforts, particularly in Barcelona cathedral, to preserve and circulate the canon’s works. Tarafa was himself involved, either copying his own works or correcting and supervising others’ copies. The cathedral, to the best of our knowledge, possessed texts of all, or nearly all, of his work. It is also likely that his nephew, Marc Antoni Tarafa, participated in this labour of preservation and circulation, and continued these efforts after his uncle’s death. Marc Antoni assumed some of the positions left vacant by Francesc (canon of the cathedral, prior in Santa Maria de Manlleu) and several manu-
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scripts connect the uncle and the nephew. We know for instance that they collaborated in *De origine*, which was edited by Marc Antoni.

At the start of the seventeenth century, Jaume Ramon Vila copied for posterity the *Crònica de cavallers catalans*, the basis of most of the later tradition, and we know of more than one contemporary manuscript containing the dictionary and the catalogue of the cathedral. Tarafa’s work thereafter was repeatedly cited, as historians used it, confirmed its utility, and proclaimed its veracity. Between the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries his work was revived, particularly in Barcelona in the circle around the Dalmases family, who possessed all of Tarafa’s manuscript works as well as printed copies of *De origine* as published by Schott in his edition of the *Hispania illustrata*. But even in his lifetime, Tarafa had moved in the circles of the Barcelona cathedral; then in scholarly Barcelona circles around Jaume Ramon Vila; and finally among historians, such as the Dalmases, who gathered in the *Acadèmia dels Desconfiats*; and he was read throughout the Principality of Catalonia. In the rest of Europe, he was primarily known up to the eighteenth century through printed copies of *De origine*. It was not until then that Europeans began copying the works which had not been printed.

Why was there so much interest in Tarafa’s works? His major historiographical work shows that, in addition to personal and family reasons, there also were institutional factors that propelled distribution of Tarafa’s writings in the sixteenth century. In the Principality of Catalonia, there had been no perceptible institutional interest in the proliferation of histories of Catalonia prior to Tarafa’s endeavour, which marked a shift in this respect. The author dedicated the *Crònica de Catalunya* to Prince Philip, noting in his dedication: “En mi no glòria de cupiditat sinó voluntat y amor de la pròpria pàtria me ha donat ànimo enpendre treball, essent pregat de les generalitats y staments de dita província” (I have been moved to undertake this labour not out of glorification of greed but rather out of dedication and love for my motherland, called upon by the generalitats and estates of that province, Biblioteca de Catalunya, ms. 497, f. 30r). So we can conclude that it was the deputies as the representatives of the three estates (*braços*) in the Generalitat (“les generalitats y staments de dita província”) who encouraged him to write the *Crònica*. This may be true although we have no evidence of whether the historian was telling the truth. His words have been interpreted in various ways by modern historians; either as they have been explained here, or as a *captatio*.
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3 On the 1620s circle, see Simon i Tarrés & Villanueva 1999; on the eighteenth-century Academy and the Dalmases family, see Campabadal 2006.
After Tarafa’s death in 1564, it was, precisely, the three estates (braços) that called upon the Cortes to create the post of official chronicler of the Principality and Counties of Rosselló and Cerdanya. This was the last step in a long and fruitless trajectory that began in 1547 when the Kingdom of Aragon nominated its official chronicler. In 1548 the job went to Jerónimo Zurita, and in 1552–1553 the Catalans sent a demand (capítulo) to the Cortes pointing out the need for a chronicler similar to the one their Aragonese neighbours had. The capítulo was never printed and never reached the king. In the aforementioned capítulo for the 1552–1553 Cortes and in the 1564 provision presented by the three estates (braços), the king was asked to create a chronicler’s position modelled on the Aragonese post of 1547 and Zurita’s nomination the following year. In the 1564 provision, more precise than the capítulo of ten years earlier, the representatives asked that the post should go to

una persona experta, sàvia, pròvida en cròniques y històrias naturals dels dits Principat y Comptats, la qual tinga particular càrrech de recopilar, ordenar y escriure una crònica en latí y una altra en vulgar català, com a semblant Principat convé, y de totes les coses notables dels dits Principat y Comptats, axí passades com presents, segons deu fer un coronista savi y de experièntia. (C-1564: f. XXr–XXv)

(an expert and wise person, knowledgeable (pròvida) about the chronicles and geography (històries naturals) of the said Principality and Counties, who will devote himself to assemble, order, and write one chronicle in Latin and another in Catalan, as the Principality desires, with all the notable events of the said Principality and Counties in the past and today, as is fitting for a wise and experienced chronicler.)

Tarafa in principle fulfilled all these requirements. He was an expert, wise, and, above all, pròvid, in that he had already perceived the need to write the history of the country. He was familiar with the chronicles, and he knew geography, Catalan, and Latin. Nevertheless, he was not whom they had in mind, as he had died a few years earlier in Rome. Whatever the case, the dedication of the Crònica de Catalunya along with the unpublished capítulo of the Cortes of 1552–1553 strengthen the hypothesis that he was the candidate they had in mind then. There are other hints as well. Tarafa wrote the Crònica de la província de Catalunya around 1553 at the request of the Generalitat’s council and dedicated it to Prince Philip, along with the De origine in 1553 and the Dictionarium in 1552. It cannot be a coincidence that the three works we can date to the short period of 1552 and 1553, the same period in which the Cortes of Monzón were being held and the post of chronicler was being discussed, were the very three works that Tarafa dedi-
cated to Prince Philip (who would have been the one to approve the nomination of the official chronicler, had it taken place). The Dictionarium, De origine and the Crònica de la província de Catalunya are closely related; they recycle the same materials, are written in a similar style, have similar intentions, and are best understood in the light of each other.

4.

De origine ac rebus gestis regum Hispaniae liber was first published in Antwerp in 1553 in the imprint of Ioannes Steelsius. The work by Tarafa and the Fleming Ioannes Vasaeus, Rerum Hispaniae memorabilium annales a Ioanne Vasaeo, brugensi, et Francisco Tarapha, barcinonensi… appeared in Cologne in 1577. Andreas Schott published Tarafa’s work in his Hispaniae Illustratae, in Frankfurt in 1603. The abovementioned editions of De origine set the stage for the circulation of Tarafa in Europe. In Spain the work was especially known in the translation by the historian and cosmographer Alonso de Santa Cruz, published in Barcelona by Claudi Bornat in 1562 as Chrónica de España … traduzida de lengua latina en castellana. In places, as we will see, that version is barely accurate; it is distorted and manipulated, and, in the eyes of posterity, something of a disappointment.

Santa Cruz was born in Seville in 1505 and died in Madrid in 1567, five years after publishing his translation of Tarafa. He was well regarded at court and among his fellow chroniclers and cartographers. The renowned Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo, for example, knew him personally and described him as “persona a la que se da entero crédito, porque es hombre de honra e tal persona como he dicho en otra parte” (a person of great credit, because he is an honest man, as I have said elsewhere). Santa Cruz wrote historical chronicles of Charles V (in 1550) and of the Catholic Monarchs (in 1551), for whom he worked in various capacities, but they were not published in his lifetime. Nevertheless, he became famous, especially in the Crown of Aragon, for his translation of Francesc Tarafa, published in 1562, and for his fierce criticism of Zurita’s Annales de la Corona de Aragón in 1563.

The Latin edition of 1553 and the Castilian edition of 1562 naturally merit a comparative examination. The former began with the dedication by Tarafa to Prince Philip (“Serenissimo ac potentissimo hispaniarum Principi Philippo, eius nominis secundo, Franciscus Tarapha, canonicus barcinonen-
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sis, foelicitatem”, pp. 3–4) followed by some introductory poems (pp. 5–8). The preliminaries in the 1553 edition do not appear in Santa Cruz’s translation, something which should not surprise us, given that translators and publishers/printers frequently modified preliminaries as they saw fit, according to their likes, dislikes, and commercial imperatives. Thus in the Castilian version we find an epistle to María de Mendoza, the countess of Osorno, dated October 1562 (ff. A2v–A4v), another one from the translator to the readers (f. A5r), and three poems praising Santa Cruz’s own efforts (ff. A5v–A6v). In his brief justification to readers, Santa Cruz tells us he translated Tarafa because in Castilian there was no writer who could bring to life the deeds of their ancestors; the antiquallas (f. A5r) or the “cosas que se han hecho en España des de que se fundó” (things that have happened in Spain since it was founded, f. A3v) were not included in Santa Cruz’s previous works and therefore he was interested in them. He went on to explain his participation in Tarafa’s work:

Y porque no quedasse tan breve como él [este libro] estaba, que parcían cifras, determiné tomar trabajo de mirar todas las historias antiguas y añadir en fin de cada vida de rey lo que pareció más notable. Va señalado con una estrella cruz en la márgen. (f. A5r)

(And so that it would not be so short, appearing almost like code, I decided to take the trouble to look at all the old histories and add to the life of each king what seemed most notable. I have marked them with a star in the margin.)

So in addition to translating, Santa Cruz takes credit for having made additions to Tarafa’s Latin chronicle and also adding tables at the back of the book with lists of the popes through to Pius IV (with the years, months, and days of each one’s pontificate) and the Roman emperors from Julius Caesar to the Hapsburg Ferdinand I (also with the reigns of each one). The table of contents and a chart with the pontifical reigns of Paul III, Julius II, Marcello II, and Paul IV are also likely to have been inserted by Santa Cruz.

Furthermore, the printer Claudi Bornat attached to the end of the Barcelona edition a section called “Del origen de los reyes de España y Francia y del numero dellos” (On the origin of the kings of Spain and France and how many there were, pp. 185–191). Bornat relied on Annio through Tarafa/Santa Cruz for the Spaniards, and for the French he turned to Samotes, the legendary first inhabitant of France, about whom he says, “como lo afirma Bereso […] fue principio de los franceses después que su hermano Tubal uvo llevado gente para poblar a España” (as Berosus says […] he was the prince of the French after his brother Tubal took people to populate Spain, p. 187) (my emphasis), thus pointing out that Spain was more ancient than France.
Apart from these differences, easy to spot when one compares the Latin edition of 1553 and the Castilian edition of 1562, there are other more subtle changes which Santa Cruz implemented in order to unload Tarafa of his citations and thus make the work easier to read and less scholarly. There is no obvious specific criterion for these alterations, which were applied to both classical and modern sources (Pomponius Mela, Silius Italicus, Eusebius, Ptolemy, Jeroni Pau, Giovanni Boccaccio, etc.), nor does there seem to be any method (the same author can be eliminated in one passage and not in another). Along the same lines, Santa Cruz mostly eliminates ancient place-names, presumably also to make the text easier to read, with fewer distractions. Thus, “Tuballam & Tubellam in praesentiarum Tafalla ac Tudela dictas” (Tuballa and Tubella, currently known as Tafalla and Tudela, p. 9) became “dos ciudades que hoy llaman Tafalla y Tudela” (two cities today known as Tafalla and Tudela, f. 3r). The phrases referring to Hispalus, “Hic Hispalim civitatem quae nunc Sibila, vulgo Sevilla, dicitur, condidit” (this built the city of Sybilla, today commonly known as Seville, p. 20), in his version reads, “Éste fue el que fundó a Sevilla” (This is the man who founded Seville, f. 11r). Santa Cruz’s eagerness to trim the text also led to errors, such as converting Betulona (Badalona, next to Barcelona) into Barcelona. These modifications which resulted in the elimination of certain authorities and place-names were largely a result of the readership to which the Castilian version of *De origin* was addressed. The relationship, in the early modern period, between Latin and the vernacular was not merely, in historiography and other genres, one of linguistic preference. As a rule, Latin was used for general works aimed at an erudite readership both within and outside the Iberian Peninsula. By contrast, the vernacular – in the case of Santa Cruz, Castilian – was reserved for a local and perhaps less cultured audience and for works with studied political intentions. That is why Santa Cruz’s version of Tarafa was stripped of many of its citations and etymological disquisitions.

There are additional changes in Santa Cruz’s version. As mentioned above Tarafa wrote the history of “two Spains”, the history of the Crown of Castile and of the Crown of Aragon. He tried to write a balanced account, and his terminology regarding the Catholic Monarchs clearly reflects his ideology and, of course, the territory he represents. Santa Cruz had “difficulties” translating these terms; he systematically equates Castile and Spain, translates “las Españas” as Spain, or ignores the Citerior/Ulterior division that is always present and always important in Tarafa’s works.8 He also “de-

---

8 As we have seen, Tarafa called one of his works *Crònica de la província de Catalunya en la Citerior Espanya*. The equation of Hispania Citerior/Ulterior with the Crown of
Catalanizes” Tarafa’s original text: for example, Tarafa’s description of the first city founded by Tubal, Tarragona, disappears, and we read only that Tubal founded cities in Andalusia. Tarafa was quite clear about his preference in attributing the foundation of Tarragona to Tubal, as were most of his Catalan contemporaries, who fought to defend the idea that they were the first dwellers on Spanish soil. In the Crónica de la província de Catalunya en la Citerior Espanya he states very clearly: “An volgut los de la Spanya Ulterior aplicar ésser sta da la primera població en la província de Bèttica” (those in Ulterior Spain wish to claim that the first town was in the province of Bética [i.e. Andalusia], Biblioteca de Catalunya, ms. 497, f. 35r). Tarafa did not know it, but that was exactly what his translator wished. Santa Cruz disguised the words gotolans and Gotolania, both of them loaded with symbolism and identity, by systematically translating them as “los pueblos de Cataluña” (the peoples of Catalonia) and “Cataluña” (Catalonia). In so doing, the translator directly eliminated Tarafa’s thesis that the etymological origin of the words lay in the Goths and the Alans and thus, as in similar examples, obliterated the Catalan neo-Gothic thesis of the historian and bishop of Girona Joan Margarit (ca. 1424–1484), the above-mentioned Jeroni Pau (ca. 1458–1497) and their followers. There are many other examples of Santa Cruz’s “de-Catalanization”: in his version, for example, the King Pere el Cerimoniós (Peter IV of Aragon, 1319–1387) is portrayed as the author of “espantosas crueldades” (frightful acts of cruelty) which the Sevillan recounts in vivid detail though they are absent from De origine while the biographies of some figures are doubled in length (El Cid’s, for example), and biographies of Castilian characters not included at all in Tarafa’s work do appear in the so-called translation.

What were Santa Cruz’s motives for translating Tarafa’s De origine? What were his intentions in modifying it? If we can believe the publication data, his edition coincided chronologically with Los cinco libros primeros de la primera parte de los Anales de la corona de Aragón (Zaragoza, Pedro Bernuz, 1562) by Jerónimo Zurita, who had been appointed official chronicler of the Kingdom of Aragon in 1548. However, the Barcelona edition of Chrónica de España, with a printed publication date of 1562, could have come out later; the dedication to the countess of Osorno dates from October

9 For example: “allende de otras muchas, hazer mención como mató, assoló y destruyó todo el linage de los Laras, y como mató a la reyna doña Leonor de Aragón, su tía, y a la reyna doña Blanca, su muger, y otras personas de gran lustre” (one must mention, among other things, how he killed, wiped out, and destroyed the entire Lara lineage, and how he killed the queen Doña Leonor of Aragon, his aunt, and the queen doña Blanca, his wife, and other noble people), Santa Cruz 1562, f. 151v–152r.

Aragon/Castile is not Tarafa’s alone; among his contemporaries it was used by Santa Cruz’s publisher, Bornat, in the prologue to Ausiàs March’s translations in 1560.
1562, which means that the book could have appeared at the end of the year or in early 1563.\textsuperscript{10}

It is well known that Zurita’s *Anales* set off a debate of praise and criticism, in large part the result of Alonso de Santa Cruz’s own opinion criticism of the *Anales*. The Council of Castile asked him to issue a statement (*dictamen*) on the *Anales*, which became famous. Santa Cruz, like the chronicler Lorenzo Padilla, criticized Zurita’s Aragonese bias, which allegedly prevented him from offering a balanced account of the history of the two Peninsular kingdoms. As might be expected, Santa Cruz lamented the omission of references to Castile, while in Catalonia, Cristòfor Despuig, Antoni Viladamor, or Pere Gil, complained that Zurita had omitted the feats of the Count-Kings of Barcelona. Nevertheless, Zurita was quickly praised and defended by Ambrosio de Morales, Felipe de Guevara, and Lupercio Leonardo de Argensola.\textsuperscript{11}

The first part of the *Anales* was ready in 1558 and circulated among a learned readership, though it was not printed until later. Santa Cruz’s statement was finished in 1563 and must have been written at the same time as the translation of *De origine*, which, as we have seen, was published in late 1562 or early 1563. It seems, therefore, possible that Santa Cruz saw his manipulated and augmented version of *De origine* as a way of countering the influence of Zurita’s *Anales* throughout the Peninsula. Perhaps he thought the translation would be a quick, parallel way of transmitting his opinions to a non-specialized audience. The translation was an easier, and probably cheaper, work than Zurita’s, more easily digested and aimed at a wider audience. And it was a “new” work, in that it was a recent publication; Marineo’s and Ocampo’s general chronicles had been published long ago, and they were difficult to find and extremely long.

It is clear that after reading Zurita, Santa Cruz did not have the time to write something similar, but he did have time to translate *De origine* and make it his. He also could hide behind the name of a historian, Tarafà, who, like Zurita (though in different ways) was protected by Philip II and was well-known among his contemporaries. Tarafà was a household name (unlike other contemporary historians of Hispania such as Vasaeus), he had published abroad and in Latin, and, it would appear that in Catalonia at least, he was considered as close to an official chronicler as could be.

One must also consider, in looking at Santa Cruz’s decision to translate Tarafà, that Catalan is present in the tales of mythical origins that Zurita

\textsuperscript{10} The possibility of a 1563 publication date was raised earlier by Madurell 1973, 71.

\textsuperscript{11} On the anti-Zurita reaction, especially in the Crown of Aragon, see Santa Cruz 1951: especially I, CXCVII–XXIII; Uztárroz & Dormer 1680, above all 128–138 and 146–152 and Viladamor 2007, I, above all 119–121.
ignored. This may have been what the anonymous friend who dedicated some lines of verse to the translator Santa Cruz had in mind when he wrote: “En poco espacio mucho has colegido / lo que otros de escribir no han acabado / por un estilo breve, y escogido” (In little space you have gathered / what others who write have left unfinished / in a brief, well-chosen style, f. A6r). Perhaps I am reading too much into the text, but it seems possible that Zurita is among these “others”, if we take into account that he, as official chronicler, had been expected to write the history of the Kingdom of Aragon from its origins, which he did not do.

Through Tarafa, who claimed common mythological origins for the entire Peninsula and who began with Annio, Santa Cruz counterpoised the method of Zurita, who omitted the earliest times because he considered them risky subject matter, given the lack of documentary foundation.¹² That is why the section on ancient origins is the part of Tarafa that Santa Cruz changed the least; these were origins shared by all of Hispania, and he did not consider it necessary to add anything. There is, however, one exception to this. One of Tarafa’s shortest biographies of the ancient kings is of Hispano, of whom he said, following the tradition: “ab hoc Hispania provinciae nomen accepit, cum antea Iberia nominabatur” (with him, the province previously known as Iberia acquired the name Hispania, p. 20), adding that his sister or daughter, Iliberia, was the source of the name of the city of Granada. Crònica de Catalunya says the same thing about Hispano (adding the polemic regarding Iliberia’s foundation of Cotlliure, which is not in De origine). Tarafa makes clear in the Crònica why he does not elaborate on this episode: “per ésser fora de la província de Cathelunya” (because it is outside the province of Catalonia, BC, ms. 497, f. 60r).¹³ When Santa Cruz treats Hispano, the king who gave Spain its name (“Deste rey Hispano se llamó España, la qual se llamava antes Iberia” [It is from this king Hispano that Spain, which used to be called Iberia, came to be called Spain, f. 11v]) he found it necessary to lengthen the account by nearly two-thirds and address what he felt that Tarafa, in the Latin and Catalan chronicles, had addressed only superficially.

It is clear, then, what Santa Cruz meant to do and what he did. His translation had an obvious political motivation and an ideological background.

¹² On Zurita’s opinion of origins narratives and of historians who gave them credit, see the prologue to the Anales (Zurita 1967–1985, I, 3–4).

¹³ Other historians make the same argument. Shortly afterward, for example, Antoni Viladamor said Hispano “fundà y poblà molts llochs de Andaluzia y de altres parts de Castella, los quals, per no tocar a nostra història [de Catalunya] deix de amomenar” (founded and populated many towns in Andalusia and other parts of Castile, which I will not cite because they do not affect the history of Catalonia, Viladamor 2007, I, 263).
He took a history that was already written and which ennobled the historical origins of the entire Peninsula (it is worth repeating: a history of both crowns, the Castilian and the Catalan-Aragonese Spains) and he used it to champion his vision of Spain. As I said earlier, Santa Cruz’s translation of Tarafa eliminated all trace of the gotolans and of Gotolania, it eliminated the division between Citerior and Ulterior, it systematically translated “Spains” with “Spain”, etc. Besides, Santa Cruz chose the first historian in the Catalan tradition who wrote a history of the two Spains and who, like Zurita, came from the Crown of Aragon.

5.
Though the theoretical framework may be Hispania in general, De origine is a work in Latin written by a Catalan whose purpose was to publicize Catalan national identity beyond Catalonia’s borders. It is a work which, like the rest of Tarafa’s historiographical corpus, appears to respond to Catalan claims illustrated by the Cortes’s repeated demand to the king that he establish the post of official chronicler for the Principality and Counties of Rosselló and Cerdanya. With his translation of De origine, Santa Cruz manipulated the Catalan point of view and, obviously, the ultimate purpose of the work.

Throughout the sixteenth century, Tarafa continued being read in Latin, even though Santa Cruz’s Castilian edition, at least in the peninsula, achieved the translator’s manipulative objectives. As poignant evidence, we have the words of an early seventeenth-century Catalan historian, Pere Gil, who read Tarafa in Castilian:

La crònica de España que en llen gua castellana ha escrita lo molt reverent e il·lustre senyor Francisco Tarapha, canonge de Barcelona, és tan breu y en ella se fa tan poca menció de cosas de Cathalunya y dels comptes de Barcelona y reys de Aragó que a penes d’ella se pot tràuer concepte ni notícia del que passà en Cathalunya. (Biblioteca Pública Episcopal de Barcelona, ms. 112, f. 53v)

(The chronicle of Spain in the Castilian language that the reverend and illustrious Francisco Tarafa, canon of Barcelona, has written is so brief, and in it there is so little space devoted to the matters of Catalonia and the counts of Barcelona and the kings of Aragon that one can scarcely learn or even form an idea of what happened in Catalonia.)
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WILLIAM CAMDEN’S
INSULA ROMANA

By Geoffrey Eatough

Camden’s Britannia, this most English of works, written by a contemporary of Shakespeare, which told the English especially who they had been and were, and helped shape the politics of the country, is written in Latin, Camden’s preferred historical language, and is informed by Roman civic values, well exemplified in the introduction to the 1607 edition, where Camden confronts the rancours of contemporary society. The Britannia is historical chorography where Roman remains are the major key to understanding the English landscape, and Roman culture remains inwoven in the history of the people, even in its religion, and in its imperialism. The Britannia is a dynamic not just a monumental work, it engages with the future as well as the past, the past being used to deconstruct the prejudices and assumptions of the present, or reinforce them. The history of Rome had been a history of ethnic assimilation, and the British had become Romano-British and for this and historico-geographical reasons had evolved as nations of mixed races. The sea was part of the chorography of Britain. It made Britain a trading nation but also encouraged imperialistic designs. The narratives on Ireland are followed by a classically inspired poetic of islands and territories adjacent to Britain which serve also as images of an imperial future.

In the letter of dedication to Lord Burghley, in the 1590, third Latin edition of Britannia, William Camden writes “it is now ten years since Abraham

---

1 This article is an attempt to demonstrate a major thesis of Camden’s Britannia, Britain as the inheritor of Rome, a thesis which is apparent from a mere reading of the Latin editions of Camden. Camden had contacts with a large number of British and European intellectuals, which makes another interesting story. Where I mention people who influenced Camden, I give brief details on their importance, in almost all instances to be found in the on-line edition of the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (ODNB), which I found was accessible even through a small rural library in a remote part of Wales, which might suggest that it has a near universal presence. The details I present are sufficient for the purposes of this article but there are further interesting details to be accessed. William Cecil (1520/21–1598) who became the first Baron Burghley, was the most influential of Queen Elizabeth’s ministers, Secretary of State 1558–1571, and Lord Treasurer from 1572. He was a modernising statesman intent on promoting the commonwealth (res publica), while protecting the interests of his monarch. Immediately after the death of Elizabeth there was the sense of a golden age, which was in danger of being lost to a new monarch and his sup-
Ortelius, the preeminent restorer of Universal geography, kept pressing me to shed light on that ancient Britain of ours, that is that I should restore her antiquity to Britain and Britain to her antiquity”. The Britain who has her antiquity restored is modern Britain, the antiquity to which she is restored is at base a Roman antiquity. The frontpiece of the book describes the work as “Britannia or a chorographical description of the most flourishing kingdoms of England, Scotland, Ireland and the adjacent islands from deepest antiquity (ex intima antiquitate)”, what can be called an intimate archipelagic empire. The 1607, final Latin, edition of the Britannia, which was
published in an English translation by Philemon Holland in 1610, is dedicated to James, King of Great Britain, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, Born for the Eternity of British Renown and Empire, the Founder of Lasting Peace and Author of Public Security. Here Holland is faithful to Camden’s Latin, but in the letter of address to the reader, which incorporates material from the 1590 letter to Burghley, Holland amplifies the Latin text by having Camden say that Ortelius came to England, which we can learn too from Thomas Smith’s biography of Camden, to “deal earnestly with me that I would illustrate this Ile of Britain”. In the centre of the front-piece of the 1607 edition is a map of the isle of mainland Britain, with many of its ancient British tribes named, along with London, Chester and York, surrounded by its oceans, which are the German, the British, that is the Channel, the Irish, and the Deucaledonian or Scottish, with eastern Ireland and a fragment of France providing a frame. Above is seated Britannia, in what was to become her traditional seated pose, but here with spear at rest pointing down and in her grasp a sceptre, an image which originates on coins of Antoninus Pius, found in a numismatic section, new to the 1600 edition, where on the first example of this type she is seated on rocks, and in the second on a globe. On the left side of the map of Britain in the front-

---

6 I have increasingly read the 1607 edition and Philemon Holland’s translation in the bilingual digital edition of Dana Sutton, 2004. The original editions, which are available in English Books On Line (EEBO), as are all the works published in Britain before 1700, are less easy to read, despite the clarity of the print in the 1590 edition. It is extraordinarily easy to move around in Sutton’s edition, and to search words, especially to compare Holland’s translation with the original. Holland is supposed to have worked in close liaison with Camden. See Herendeen 2007, 7. I am sceptical about the closeness of the collaboration, and the gap between Camden’s Latin and Holland’s English can be a heuristic tool. Because of the convenience and accessibility of Sutton’s texts I had intended to make them the reference points in my notes, but have in the end chosen to make my references to the original texts. I refer to Camden’s 1607 edition by C and to Holland’s text by H. The section at the end of Holland’s text dealing with Scotland through to the Islands has a separate pagination. I refer to them by H followed by general section heading and page, e.g. H British Ilands 204. Camden’s Annales came out in two parts in 1612 and 1627. I refer to them by the year of the edition, followed by the particular year being reported and page, e.g.Camden 1612, Ann. 1578, 279–280. On the astonishing Philemon Holland (1552–1637) see John Considine’s contribution to the ODNB. Holland was the first to translate Livy into English. In rapid succession he translated the whole of the Elder Pliny, which is still commended, Plutarch’s Moralia and Lives, Suetonius’ Lives, Ammianus Marcellinus, this last in 1609 followed the next year by Camden’s massive Britannia, then a supplement to Thomas Thomas’ Latin dictionary, a translation into Latin of John Speed’s The Theatre of the Empire of Great Britaine, a work which should be read in conjunction with the Britannia, and, passing over other works, Xenophon’s Cyropedia.

7 Smith 1691, xii.

8 The coins, according to Sarah Bendall ODNB, were supplied by John Speed (1551/2–1629), a member of the Society of Antiquaries, who in turn was encouraged by Camden, to
piece of the 1607 edition stands a naked Neptune, his private places concealed by the tail of a fishy monster, and on the right Copia with her horn, who primarily may represent the agricultural abundance of the land of Ceres, and also the abundance of all good things, which could be found in this state, which traded with all the world. Below are three cartouches, the central and largest one a depiction of idyllic city life, *rus in urbe*, the left one a fleet of ships, and the right an impressive church. In this edition at this point Ortelius himself is described as preeminent restorer of old or ancient geography.

**Locating the British**

The Britannia, on which Camden was to shed light, had been inhabited by Britons, whom the Welsh claimed as their ancestors, and as a race apart, unrelated to others, and claimed also as imperialists, who in their time and in their way had been world conquerors like the Romans. These claims were supported by selective readings of ancient Latin texts, toponymies, mainly erroneous, and a tenuous oral tradition, which included modern poetry, and romance, especially Arthurian romance. Camden had demonstrated, mainly by linguistics, that the ancient Britons had not been a distinctive insular race but one which had demonstrable connections with peoples in continental Europe. This demolition of Welsh, or ancient British particularism, had implications which reached beyond the Welsh, and was fundamental to Camden’s work as a whole, to his understanding of the ethnography and history of Britain, enabling the modern British, to understand who they were. He expedited his argument by giving preference to the Classical literary tradition, and gave weight to this tradition by quoting in the 1607 edition large chunks of ancient Roman texts, making their testimonies visible to his readers. They were the evidences for this Roman state of Britain,


*C Copia with her horn or cornu appears in Horaces’ *Carmen Saeculare*, 60, part of the celebration of the new Augustan age. Ceres is found in Camden’s introduction on Britain in lines from an allegedly Orphic poem referring to the country’s fertility H3: “Howbeit, the ground enriched so with all sorts of corne, that Orpheus hath reported it to be the very seat of Ladie Ceres; for that which we read in his Poeme thus,

*Lo, heere the stately hauls
Of Ceres Queen.*

is meant of this our Iland; yea, and it hath been the very barne, garner, and storehouse for victuals of the West empire; from whence the Romans were wont yeerely to transport into Germanie, with a fleet of 800 vessels bigger than barges, great store of corne for the maintenance of their armes which there defended the Frontiers”.


*11 C 12–16 H 16–22.*
in which his own Latin writings were enmeshed. More tangible evidence was offered by archaeology, numismatics and epigraphy, mostly Roman. These literary and physical monumenta substantiated Roman urban culture as the exemplary culture, and the major fault line which reveals itself in Camden’s chorography is between the urbanised societies of England and of Scotland, and in Ireland mainly Dublin, in contrast to the less developed societies mainly within Scotland and Ireland. The Scottish Highlander typify these others, and the anachronistic nature of their existence, in the eyes of the English governing classes, is brought out by the antique cast of Holland’s language.¹² There were later other fault lines of a religious nature, which often approximated to this line, yet though there are references to religious buildings or events, religion does not provide a dynamic in the Britannia, as it does in its political contexts in Camden’s Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha.¹³ He was ready to leave religious antiquities and their modern implications to the relevant experts such as Matthew Parker,¹⁴ though in this later edition there are some cutting observations on Henry VIII’s destruction of the monasteries and the appropriation of their property by secular speculators.¹⁵ Camden, this most Anglican

¹² “There inhabite these regions, a kinde of people, rude, warlike, ready to fight, querulous, and mischeevous: they be commonly termed High-landmen, who being in deed the right progeny of the ancient Scots, speake Irish and call themselves Albinich: their bodies be firmly made and well compact, able withall and strong, nimble of foote, high minded, inbread and nuzeled in warlick exercises or robberies rather, and upon a deadly fued and hatred most forward and desperate to take revenge. They goe attired Irish-like in stript or streaked mantles of divers collours, wearing thicke and long glibbes of haire, living by hunting, fishing, fowling, and stealing. In the warre, their armour is an head-peece or Morion of iron, and an habergeon or coate of maile: their weopons bee bowes, barbed or hooked arrowes, and breade backswordes: and beeing divided by certayne families or kinreds which they terme Clannes, they commit such cruell outrages etc”. H Scotland 39, on Braid Albin or Albanie.

¹³ I found it illuminating to read the Annales, on which Camden was working during the publication of the later editions of the Britannia.

¹⁴ Matthew Parker (1504–1575), made Archbishop of Canterbury in 1559. In 1534 he had become chaplain to Anne Boleyn, and in the following year when she faced death she had entrusted her child, the future queen, Elizabeth, to Parker’s spiritual care. Parker had shown outstanding administrative gifts and was to help steer the English reformation. Later in his life he was a great collector of manuscripts and books with the purpose of uncovering the history and the origins of the English church back to a remote past (see Parker & Joscelyn 1572), which led him to becoming a promoter of Anglo-Saxon studies. Like many of his contemporaries he was a public benefactor and gave generously to Cambridge University and his former college Corpus Christi. See the detailed contribution of David J. Crankshaw and Alexandra Gillespie in the ODNB.

¹⁵ See especially South-Folkesive Suffolk, where Camden describes in extraordinary detail Bury St. Edmunds, named after an Anglo-Saxon king turned saint, revered by the English nation, a fine display of Camden’s methodology. It is, despite Bury’s later papal inspired wealth, a celebration of this monastic settlement. Towards the end he inserts a bitter
of Englishmen, was thought by some to harbour Catholic sympathies.\textsuperscript{16} He also wisely left Scottish matters to the Scots, though he does not totally conceal some antipathies. On the Irish however he wrote at ever greater lengths over the six editions.

Much happened between 1586 and 1607 while the successive editions of the \textit{Britannia} were being published. Britain had become an aggressive naval power, increasingly able to defend itself and reach most parts of the world, either militarily as a royal navy or as privateers, and also as merchants trading in ships that were armed,\textsuperscript{17} through a proliferating variety of trading companies. Drake and Cavendish had sailed round the world.\textsuperscript{18} In the \textit{Britannia} Camden has an idealised portrait of London, where the wealth of the world pours in\textsuperscript{19}, whereas in the \textit{Annales}, which he had begun to write during the final editions of the \textit{Britannia}, he describes the sources of that wealth, for example, trade concessions by the Russians, and English merchants making their way down the great Russian rivers in the direction of Persia,\textsuperscript{20} Elizabeth intervening with the Turkish sultan to allow the English to trade in the Turkish dominions and beyond,\textsuperscript{21} or energetically pressing the Danes to abandon their restrictive practices in the Baltic\textsuperscript{22} and setting up at the same time the East India Company, so that trading posts reached to Japan.\textsuperscript{23} Close to England however, in the Netherlands and in France, the British were continually involved in an amphibious continental war, which shaped Britain. The siege of Ostend, described in Camden’s Latin, with its trench warfare, its massed forces subject to heavy gun fire, the huge casualties, is a foretaste of European warfare of the early twentieth century, and illustrates Britain’s indissoluble connection to continental Europe.\textsuperscript{24} Readers of Arthurian legends might dream of ancient British who were world-con-

\textsuperscript{16} Herendeen 207, 501.
\textsuperscript{17} Camden 1612, \textit{Ann.} 1578, 279–280.
\textsuperscript{18} Camden 1612 \textit{Ann.} 1580, 301–302 for Drake, \textit{Ann.} 1587, 470 for Cavendish.
\textsuperscript{19} Camden 1607, 303–304.
\textsuperscript{21} Camden 1612, \textit{Ann.} 1579, 285.
\textsuperscript{22} Camden 1627, \textit{Ann.} 1597, 138–141, \textit{Ann.} 1600, 206–208.
\textsuperscript{23} Camden 1627, \textit{Ann.} 1600, 206–208.
\textsuperscript{24} Camden 1627, \textit{Ann.} 1601, 252–255.
querors, the Elizabethan reality was ferocious more limited wars, not far from London, on which the survival of nations depended, and in which a series of able commanders emerged, John Norris (1547/50–1597), Roger Williams (1539/40–1595), Francis de Vere (1560/61–1609) and Horace Vere (1565–1635), to complement their more famous naval contemporaries. The islands themselves were in a permanent state of instability with recurrent war or rebellion in Ireland, and with England and Scotland riven by factions, generating suspicion and conspiracies, trials for treason with inevitable condemnation and executions, people destroyed by whispers or by misplaced flamboyance, the great dramas being the destruction of Mary Queen of Scots and the Earl of Essex. With Essex’s death Elizabeth herself declines and dies. The atmosphere of the *Annales* is often oppressive, the tone Tacitean, the language in the high style. In comparison the *Britannia* can seem to be an inward looking celebration of the country, but it offered those, who wished to know, a perspective on who they were and who they might become. It was also an open ended work, which pointed to a future, and to which all could contribute. Within its inwardness are metaphors for more world wide ambitions, which are seen in the Irish accounts and more ambitiously unconcealed in Camden’s final poetic journey round Britain.


26 The lives of these four commanders in the *ODNB* are all written by D.J.B. Trim. It is he, who in the life of Norris, makes the comparison with the more famous naval commanders, and reminds us of the importance of the war in Europe. On Williams and his fellow Welshman, Sir Thomas Morgan see Camden 1627, *Ann.* 1595, 103.

27 The final tragic scenes in Mary’s life were played out in 1586 and 1587. Essex (1565–1601), was the favourite of Elizabeth and aspired to be the great military commander of the age, but his ambition for personal glory won in the field of battle was anachronistic, and dangerous. He was undone by his personal instabilities and politicians who knew how to compromise, and intrigue. Camden 1612 *Ann.* 1584, 353–354, reports the complaints of the Catholic exiles against the oppressive behaviour of Elizabeth’s advisers, Leicester and Walsingham, and acknowledges there was truth in their complaints “Et certe ad explorandos hominum animos subdolae artes fuere adhibitae, literae ementitae sub Reginae Scotorum et profugorum nominibus clam submissae, et in Pontificiorum aedibus relictae, emissarii ubique ad colligendos rumores et verba captanda dispersi”, or in Richard Norton’s translation, which is used by Dana Sutton for his bilingual edition, “And certainly to grope mens mindes there were used some subtile devises indeede, counterfeite letters were privilly sent under the names of the Queene of Scots and the fugitives, at least in Papistes houses, spies were sent abroad every where to gather rumors, and lay hold of words”. On Norton’s translation and other translations see Sutton’s introduction, § 17, to Camden 2004.

28 See Sutton’s introduction to his edition of the *Annales*, § 4 to the end, for a detailed discussion of this feature.
The antiquarian theatre

The 1590 edition had two prefaces, one to his patron, Lord Burghley, Queen Elizabeth’s senior statesman, and then an address to the reader, whereas in the edition which came out in 1607, by which time Burghley was dead, there was the one address to the reader, which reworks some of the material addressed to Burghley. In the 1590 address to the reader he describes himself as stepping forth into the theatre of this most erudite age, amid the various tastes formed by men’s minds and judgements. He has been compelled by his love of his country, the glory of the British name and the advice of his friends to take up this persona. Persona with its implications of concealment or representation or self-definition, or as is the case here perhaps, role playing, is an interesting metaphor, as is theatrum. Chorography, such as Camden wrote, had its origins in seeing things, either by walking the land, graphically through writing and images, or by maps, which Camden had inserted in this last Latin edition. A work of chorography could be a theatrum. But it might be relevant to remember that the first production of a Shakespearean play, a history play, Henry VI part 2, was in 1590 or 1591, and the whole corpus of Shakespeare’s dramatic production, many of them history plays, coincides with the publication of the final four Latin editions of Camden. One can however go further. In his Annales the incriminations and execution of Mary Queen of Scots is movingly presented as a tragic drama, as is that of the Earl of Essex. Camden watched the trial of Essex

29 As with Speed 1614a. Thomas Thomas, 1589, in his entry for theatrum offers “A theatre, A place made halfe rounde where people assemble to beholde players; the multitude that beholdeth the sight or play set forth in that place; stage or scaffold; a spectacle or common play: an open place where all men doe see and behold, or wherein one sheweth or declareth etc”. I thank Keith Sidwell for pointing me in the direction of the Tudor Latin dictionaries.

30 Camden in the course of his narrative shows how Mary becomes enmeshed in a past, which she cannot escape, by people and forces out of her control. Her execution is deeply moving, as she reaches out to greatness, and highly theatrical. In Camden 1612, Ann. 1587, 458–460 Camden summarises the chain of events which had brought about her death, and then presents the epithet on her tomb, in which she is made to forecast that her death means that all rulers can be reduced to the status of the lowest class and suffer punishment. It is a new form of tomb where the living are enclosed with the dead, meaning that the ashes of Mary, as diva or saint, were holy and immortal.

31 Essex was forced by his status to act out a drama. He had brilliance and imagination without the political awareness that was now required. Camden concludes a most sympathetic obituary of Essex with these words “Nec ille certe ad aulum factus videbatur, qui ad scelera segnis, ad offensionem accipientem mollis, ad deponendam difficilis, et sui minime obtegenes, sed ut Cuffus mihi conqueri solitus, philophaneros et misophaneros, id est, amorem et odium in fronte semper gessit, nec celare novit. Ut verbo expediam, nemo gloriam ex virtute magis expetivit, et caetera omnia minus curavit”. “And indeed he seemed not to be made for the Court, who was slow to any wickednesse, of a soft nature to take
and his subsequent execution, as did Walter Raleigh who had to be seated where Essex at the point of death for decency could not see his enemy. The trials themselves were dramas where the axe was paraded with its cutting edge facing away from the defendant until their almost inevitable condemnation. Camden continues his address to the reader by creating the environment of the hostile court: “Iudicia, praeiudicia, censuras, obtrectationes, reprehensiones, confertim quasi sub signis in praecinctu undique me circumstare prospicio”. And yet persona could simply refer to the fact that Camden was by profession a school teacher, albeit second master of Westminster School, soon to be headmaster, a seminarium or plantarium for the future civil and religious leaders of the nation, that he, the schoolmaster, was being thrust into the limelight to perform a public role at a level to which he was not yet accustomed. Smith in his biography stresses the modesty of Camden, a key to understanding the man, Camden, but no doubt an impression reinforced by Camden’s careful proposals of new arguments, or his frequent ironies, as for example in his dealings with the Scots. The theatrical image may also have been a natural one for Camden since, Herendeen tells us, Westminster School had deeply rooted musical

offence, and hard to lay it downe, and one that could not cover his affections, but (as Cuffe was wont to complained to me) he carried always his love or hatred on his forehead and could not conceale it. To speake in a word, No man was more ambitious of glory by vertue, no man more carelesse of all things else”. His death, for those with eyes to see, meant the death of the old order, and Camden conveys this in the sombre ending to the Annales. That others did not perceive this, led to the Civil War and the death of a king on the scaffold.

32 Ann. 1601§ 39. Raleigh (1554–1618) was Essex’s rival as an earlier favourite of Elizabeth and as a military commander. Camden had sympathy for Essex, but he must have recognised a kindred spirit in Raleigh who had vision, even if misplaced. Raleigh was an early promoter of a British overseas empire, and harnessed the support of the elder Richard Hakluyt (d. 1591), and the younger Richard Hakluyt (1552–1616) soon to be the editor of an epic collection of voyages. Raleigh became an explorer and searched for the mythical El Dorado (1595–1596 and 1616–1618). He was also a conscientious parliamentarian. He was a poet, as was Camden, and the author of three prose classics: The Last Fight of the Revenge, The Discoverie of the Large, Rich and Beutiful Empire of Guiana, The History of the World. He was executed on trumped-up charges of treason by the reactionary regime of James I, by which time he was destined to become a hero for many in the English nation. See the contribution of Mark Nicholls and Penry Williams in ODNB.

33 On the second page of Lectori. H second page of To the Reader translates, “For I see judgements, prejudices, censures, reprehensions, obtrectations, detractions, affronts, and confronts, as it were, in batalla array to environ me on every side”.

34 Smith 1691, xv, “incomparabilem modestiam”, xvi “Inter tot ingestas amicorum laudes et gratulationes, quasi iisdem pectus impervium habuisset, innatam animi modestiam retinuit Camdenus”, xviii “vir modestissimus”, and most importantly lxxv “Honorum minime appetens, ne equestris quidem dignitatis, quam prae modestia recusavit”.


36 C 86, H 120; C 680–1, H1610, Scotland, 3.
and dramatic traditions. Ben Jonson that most Latinate of dramatists, author of *Sejanus*, was a product of the school, a pupil and enduring friend of Camden.\(^{37}\)

Camden uses the same language in the 1607 edition but drops the mask, confesses that he is indeed an antiquarian, though from the lowest bench (*qui ex infimo antiquariorum subsellio*), which Smith, who pillages these introductions for biographical colour, demonstrates in his adaptation is a metaphor from the classroom.\(^{38}\) One can imagine that the less accomplished boys sat at the back of the class, or more likely those of a lower social class. Camden’s modesty in this edition however might be ironical, perhaps a concealed barb directed at his fierce critic Ralph Brooke, the York Herald, piqued that in 1597 Camden had been advanced, because of his *Britannia*, into the position of Clarenceaux King of Arms, one of the three leading heralds of the College of Arms. This meant that Camden had to understand and define the genealogies of the nobility, and be present on state occasions, indeed help organise such events.\(^{39}\) It made him an expert on the British constitution.

---

\(^{37}\) Herendeen 2007, 145–157 on the theatrical nature of Elizabethan education, a section which is particularly inspiring. Herendeen’s *William Camden: A Life in Context* is a most learned and informative book, and a large book on Camden. Many, like me, will find it a revelation on the social context which produced Camden and the *Britannia*. Herendeen discusses in detail the literary and historiographical nature of the *Britannia*. He does however point Camden in what might be called the vernacular direction, he does not quote the Latin of the *Britannia*, and it seems to me that Camden is a brilliant Latinist, nor does Herendeen have space to wander among the particularities which contribute to the *Britannia*. You may not gain a feel of the topographical nature of the *Britannia* from Herendeen. This means of course that there is scope for others to tread or sail their own path through the *Britannia*.

\(^{38}\) His second page of To the Reader, “For all this I may be censured unadvised, and scant modest who being but of the lowest forme in the schoole of Antiquity, where I might well have lurked in obscurity, have adventured as a scribler upon the stage in this learned age amidst the diversities of reflishes both in wit and judgement”. Smith 1691 xiii, describes how Camden’s reputation even in his younger days stood at such a high, that Barnabé Brisson, President of the Senate of Paris, on an important ambassadorial visit to London, turned his back on the court and sought out Camden “umbratici viri et pulvere scholastico obsiti”.

\(^{39}\) On Camden’s role as herald, his relations with Brooke and the role of heralds in the world of a new historiography see the extensive discussions in Herendeen 2007, 353–396, 410–428 and 445–487, one of the many strengths of Herendeen’s book. More immediately accessible might be Herendeen’s succinct contribution to the *ODNB* on Ralph Brooke (c.1553–1625), whom he tells us was educated at the Merchant Taylors’ School, London, where he would have been a younger contemporary of Edmund Spenser and William Harrison, then was apprenticed to the Painter-Stainers’ Company, where Camden’s father was an active member. He was made herald in 1580, and York Herald in 1592. He was a contentious man, though not without right on his side, and Camden in an appendix to his 1600 edition had to reply to Brooke’s criticism which had been published under the title of *A discoverie of certaine errours published in print in the much-commended Britannia*, 1594.
What the antiquarian now needed to know

In the 1590 edition he had modestly written “Quid vero praestiterim dicant qui recte iudicare norunt: et mihi ipsi hoc liceat praefari, tria illa quae ad antiquitatis veritatem eruandam plurimum habent momenti, neutiquam a me fuisse neglecta”. (What I have achieved, let those say who know how to judge rightly: as for myself let me say this by way of preface that those three things which are most important for digging out the truth about the past, have in no way been neglected by me.) The three things were acquiring the language of the most ancient inhabitants, that is the Welsh, traversing by far the greatest part of the country, and spending long time and much effort reading among the country’s writers (“in scriptoribus diu multumque versatus fui”). Then he says punningly “and what befits an antiquarian I have done this in my ancient good faith. To sin, that is to err, against my faith and against my talent (or guardian spirit or conscience) is forbidden by my religion” (“et quod Antquarium decet, fide sane antiqua et optima. In fidem enim aut Genium meum peccare mihi religio”). In the address to the reader in this 1590 edition he reveals that he has carefully studied Greek and Roman authors and his country’s writers, and has consulted the glossaries of the [ancient] British language, and anyone who was an expert in this language.

The 1607 version shows a massive shift and increase in his duties as an antiquarian, the basis of a confident authority.


(Thus much give mee leave to say, that I have in no wise neglected such things as are most material to search and sift out the Truth. I have attained to some skill of the most ancient British and English-Saxon tongues: I have travailed over all England for the most part; I
have conferred with most skillful observers in each country, I have studiously read over our owne countrie writers, old and new; all Greeke and Latine authors which have once made mention of Britaine. I have had conference with learned men in other parts of Christendome: I have beene diligent in the Records of this Realme. I have looked into most Libraries, Registers, and memorials of Churches, Cities, and Corporations. I have poored upon many an old Rowle, and Evidence: and produced their testimonie [as beyond all exception] when the cause required, in their owne words [although barbarous they be] that the honor of veritie might in no wise be impeached.)

The things to note are his acquaintance with the Anglo-Saxon language. The Anglo-Saxons succeed the Romans as the final race of the three which define the early antiquity of Britain. The Anglo-Saxons were there from the early editions of the *Britannia*, but Camden here expresses the need seriously to engage with them. The experts whom he now consults are not those who are expert in the old British language, but those whose versatility derives from moving around their locality, and who consequently are most knowledgeable about it, who would in many cases be the local gentry or professional classes. The country’s writers are here placed before the Greeks and Latin writers that is Romans. Even one reference to Britain makes a writer a source for British history, part of the great enterprise, an implied requirement to search for authentic minute detail and reject the great weavers of fiction. There is also the germ of the idea that it is this class to whom the land in its particular portions belongs. Finally the vast range of official source material, which he has used, is identified by terms which are Roman, but which must have usually come from sources and contexts which were post Norman conquest, mainly in Latin, or French, a Latinate language, some in Anglo-Saxon, like the Romans a legalistic people, whose laws were being made available in bilingual Anglo-Saxon and Latin translations. And he will let his sources do their own speaking in their own language, mainly Latin, even if this language is barbarously disfigured.

Most of these public documents but especially the historians, the *scriptores patrios*, belonged to what we call the Middle Ages. The great period of English Latin was when the Normans were the imperial power. The

---

42 Camden 1607, first page of *Lectori*. First page of *To the Reader*.
43 Camden compiled a brief anthology of later writers on Britain, his *Anglica, Normanica, Hibernica, Cambrica, a veteribus scripta*, on which see Herendeen 2007, 176.
44 Lambarde 1644 (originally published 1568).
45 Camden does not give us a coherent view of the great post Roman *imperia*, such as that of the later Anglo-Saxons and above all that of the Normans and their immediate English successors, and he gives us scarcely a glimpse of the Danes and Norse. On the post Conquest empire see Davies 2002.
Normans, like the Anglo-Saxons, and indeed the Danes and Northmen, had in a sense become new Romans, imperialists, rulers of a British empire. Camden was pleased to be able to associate the Normans with Britain, since they had been an amazing imperial power, but they had been cruel oppressors of the English. They encouraged magnificent architecture but they also destroyed villages to extend forests, which had primitive connotations, and were the antithesis of Camden’s preferred urbanisation. Yet King William’s Domesday book in a perverse way is an anticipation of Camden’s Britannia in its attention to detail, where accumulation of detail gives power, and Camden uses the book under its many titles. The Middle Ages creep into the Britannia through these sources, and because the higher nobility, whom Camden mentions county by county, often had a Norman origin. There were medieval ruins in the country and unavoidable memories attached to recent civil wars. In the 1590 edition Camden had declared as his objectives an investigation of the most ancient origins of the British and English and the digging out from the realms of darkness the old cities of Britain.

Ad hoc opus elicandum, id est, ad antiquissimam Britannorum et Anglorum originem indagandum, et vetustas Britanniae urbes, quarum meminerunt Ptolemaeus, Antoninus, et alii, e tenebris eruendas, omne industriae meae curriculum, hos aliquot annos subcisivis operis elaboratum est.

46 C 108–110, 188, H, 152–153, 259 on the destruction and suffering caused by the extension of the New Forest, C 210, H 293 where he mentions the Forest of Windsor, and uses that as an opportunity to deliver what might be called a brief paper, long promised, on the custom of forests and their harsh laws.

47 “Iste Rotulus vocatus est Rotulus Wintoniae, et ab Anglis pro sua generalitate, quod omnia tenementa totius terrae integre continuit, Domesday cognominatur. Huius libri libentius meminerim, quod eius subinde memoria usurpanda sit, quemque librum Guilielmi Librum Censualem, Angliae Notitiam, Angliae commentarios Censuales, Acta publica et Angliae luxtram nominare placet”, C 109. “And this Roll was called the Roll of Winchester, and by the Englishmen (for the generalitie thereof, because it contained full and exactly, all the tenements of the whole Land) named Domesday. I have been more willing to make mention of this book because it is to be cited and alleaged often times hereafter: which booke also, it pleaseth me to name, Guilielmi librum Censualem, that is, The Tax-booke of William; Angliae Notitiam, that is, The Notice of England; Angliae commentarios Censuales, that is, The Taxe register or Sessing booke of England; and Angliae Luxtram, that is, The Survey of England”, H 153.

48 At the end of his account of Gloucestershire, when he comes to where he must deal with the dukes of Gloucester, he puts on the mask of historian (“historici personam pauisper induere”) to tell the story of Richard III, a bad man but a good prince, and how he gained power by organising public opinion, relying especially on lawyers. At the end of a long digression, Camden remembers that he is a chorographer and resumes that role, deposita iam persona.
(to accomplish this worke, that is to search out the most ancient origins of the Britons and English, and to dig up out of darkness the old cities of Britain which Ptolemy, Antonius and others mentioned, the whole maine of my Industrie has been employed for many years, tasks of my leisure hours.)

In 1607 the aim is apparently simply to illustrate or shed light on the country:

ad hoc opus elimandum omne industriae meae curriculum hos aliquot annos pertinaci veritatis studio et fide sincere antiqua ad patriam illustrandam elaboratum est

(to accomplish this worke the whole maine of my Industrie hath beene employed for many yeares with a firme setled study of the truth, and sincere antique faithfulnesse to the glory of God and my countrie.)

The light which Camden shed on the country is also an illumination of the future. A most remarkable example in the 1607 edition is Bristol, the great trading city, with its new enterprising class creating a modern city, and involving themselves in the voyages to America, but inevitably, and most of all, London, urbs Britannorum quae digna Britannia dici.

The bonds of civility which must unite writer and readers

Let us now return to the address to Burghley and the sentence “Quid vero praestiterim dicant qui recte iudicare norunt”. In the 1607 edition this is expanded into a magnificent confident affirmation of the intellectual complexity of the Britannia and its destiny.

Quid praestiterim dicant qui recte iudicare norunt, nec illi quidem facile diiudicent. Tempus autem testis incorruptus edocebit, cum invidia quae vivos sectatur conticiscat.

The two sentences form a memorable statement, enhanced by Camden’s liking for alliteration, assonance and balance. Philemon Holland’s translation is colloquial and vigorous,

---

49 My translation based on Holland’s translation for the 1607 Camden edition.
50 C, third page of Lectori. H, fourth page of To the Reader.
52 This line comes from the poem Connubium Thamae et Isis, which makes varied appearances in the Britannia but is never attributed to any known writer. The coyness of the presentation points the finger at Camden, who in writing topographical verse is following the path of his great predecessor John Leland, and at the same time inserting himself into the British Latin poetic tradition, on which he wrote in his Remaines of a Greater Work. This line is an excerpt from a few lines which appear in the climax to the description of London, C 313, H 436, and the sentiments perfectly harmonise with Camden’s view of London.
What I have performed, I leave to men of judgment. But time, the most sound and sincere witness, will give the truest information, when envy, which persecuteth the living, shall have her mouth stopped”.

but the English is less incisive than the Latin and interestingly he omits the second clause, translated in Edmund Gibson’s famous edition from the Augustan period of English literature as “which perhaps will require some consideration”. Camden had made a detailed rebuttal of Ralph Brooke’s criticism in an appendix to the 1600 edition of Britannia. He was however aware of the troubles and dangers of his work not being accepted by people more important than Brooke. He had, under pressure from Burghley, started to gather materials for the Annales in 1597 and was to refuse to have the sections describing the years posterior to 1589 published in his lifetime, avoiding the criticisms and dangers of publishing accounts which had a direct relationship to near contemporary politics. Towards the end of the address to the reader in the 1607 Britannia he confesses that he may have made mistakes in previous editions, but makes a plea for tolerance in the language of civility and religion.

Errata possint esse plura ex imperiti a: Quis enim tam peritus ut caeco hoc Antiquitatis mari cum Tempore colluctatus scopulis non allidatur? […] Locorum peculia alii qui incolunt accuratius observent, si monuerint in quo erraverim, cum gratia corrigam; quod imprudens omiserim, adiciam; quod minus explicaverim, edoctus plenus edocebo, modo sine livore et contentionis studio, quae candidis et veritatis studiosis sunt indignissima, hoc fiat. Haec tamen interea a te, humanissime Lector, tua humanitas, mea industria, patriae communis charitas, et Britannici nominis dignitas mihi exorent, ut quid mei sit iudicii sine aliorum praeiudicio libere proferam, ut eadem via qua alii in his studiis solent insistam, et ut erratis, si ego agnoscam, tu ignoscas. Quae ut ab aequis et bonis magis sperenda quam petenda sentio. Holland translates:

There may be mistakings in regard of my unskilfulness, for who is so skilfull that, strugling with Time in the foggy darke sea of Antiquity, may not run upon rockes? […] Others may be more skilfull and more exactly observe the particularities of the places where they are conversant. If they, or any other whosoever, will advertise me wherein I am

53 Camden 1600. This is an address to the reader which initially echoes the praefatory address and then a defence against the man who thirteen years after the appearance of the Britannia’s first edition has vomited his bitter poison against him (virus acerbitatis evomit). The defence takes up nearly thirty close typed pages.

mistaken, I will amend it with manifold thankes, if I have unwitting omitted ought, I will supply it. If I have not fully explicated any point, upon their better information I will more cleere it, if it proceed from good meaning, and not from a spirit of contradiction and quareling, which doe not befit such as are well bred and affect the truth. Meanwhile let your kinde courtesie, my industrie, the common love of our common mother our native Country, the ancient honour of the British name obtaine so much upon their entreaty, that I may utter my judgment without preiudice to others, that I may proceed in that course that others have formerly done in the like argument, and that you would pardon my errours upon my acknowledgement, which may be as well hoped as requested, from good indifferent and reasonable men.

The picture of Camden being dashed upon the rocks as he fights with time owes much to Sidonius Apollonaris’ (430?–489) picture of daring Saxon pirates, the ancestors of the English, battling with the sea amid storm lashed rocks, an image to which Camden returns at the end of his work.55 No one is in control of historical knowledge, he the teacher is ready to be taught, he is ready to be advised by those whose advice is sincere. He wants a fellowship of those who are willing to learn. Then comes the dominant sentence addressed to the humanissime lector, to which Holland fails to do justice, though he gives us a clue as to how it might be translated. “Kind reader” has prevailed over “courteous reader”, both of which are included in Holland’s translation of humanissime … humanitas. Thomas Thomas in his Latin English dictionary56 under humanus offers “gentle” so we might also have “gentle reader”, but Thomas also offers “not abhorrning from the state of man”, and under humanitas he includes “civility”, “learning” “liberal knowledge”. Caesar famously praised the humanitas of the men of Kent, a maritime people which meant they communicated with others, they were the British people closest to Europe. In Camden they are moulded by a region where there were lots of towns and villages, an agriculture system, including cherries, which reflected that of Italy, secure harbours and industrial raw materials, making them thoroughly civilised. Holland’s preferred translation of humanitas was courtesie, but he has to supplement it in Kent, since these people were not courteous to Caesar, indeed Camden quickly reminds us they were warlike.57 On the western boundary of England Worcester, Camden

56 Thomas 1589.
57 “Incolis ea humanitiatis laus quam Caesar olim tribuit etiamnum iure debetur”. “The same commendation of civilitie and courtesie which Caesar in old time gave the inhabitants is yet of right due unto them”. Caesar, De Bello Gallico, v.14, “Ex eis omnibus longe sunt
suggests, had performed the same function as the Roman cities on the south bank of the Rhine, defence against the barbarians, in this case the Welsh, before the Welsh were engrafted on to the English state. Worcester because of its antiquity, a Roman antiquity, or perhaps because of its beauty, seemed to cause the river Severn as it passed by, to flow more slowly in admiration. It inhabitants were numerous, civilised and wealthy through the manufacture of cloth, able to finance splendid buildings, \footnote{58} which we might well compare with the magnificent buildings, which by public and private initiatives were transforming London, as described in detail in this final edition of Camden.

There are further clues to the weighting which we should give to humanitas in the address to Burghley in the 1590 edition, where one can find the origin of this 1607 plea for humanitas. Camden had been impelled to complete this difficult work by observing Burghley’s example of service to the state, and at a more personal level by Burghley’s generosity in the warm support he had given Camden’s school, his remarkably kind treatment of Camden himself, his sensitive scholarly advice based on Camden’s fields of investigation, and his allowing Camden the use of his own first class library, in a world where libraries had become a scarce commodity, and were to become a serious political issue, \footnote{59} We might think that he had not only facilitated Camden’s work but had been the making of Camden. He was in Camden’s early days the most important of many individuals who influenced Camden.

Privatae vero quae impulerunt causae sunt benignitas tua perspecta plane et cognita, qua Collegium nostrum Westmonasteriense amplexaris et foves, humanitas in me singularis, politissimum in his et huiusmodi eruditis studiis iudicium, et lux non exigua quae mihi in his scriptis e tua instructissima bibliotheca effulsit.

The 1607 address to the reader points to a transformation of this world in which he had lived with Burghley. It is now a world in which Camden is an authority and he must help create a society of like minded individuals, who in this the age of the Stuarts will express the liberal values of the Elizabethan age, which derived from the ancient Roman intelligentsia, and the ancient Christian religion embedded in Roman civilisation. He wants to be

humanissimi qui Cantium incolunt, quae regio est maritima omnis, neque multum a Gallica differunt consuetudine\footnote{58}.”

\footnote{58} “Sed decus est ab incolis, qui sunt numerosi, humani, et lanificio opulent, ab aedificationum nitore, a templorum numero”, C 434. Wealth through manufacture is linked to humanitas. Holland describes them as trading in cloth, H 575–576.

\footnote{59} For an understanding of the importance of particular book collections for Camden especially, and their political contexts see Herendeen 2007, 162–166, 205–209 and 449–450.
treated the same as his fellow human beings, to be given forgiveness, if he recognises the error of his ways. He is looking for it from the boni,60 which is a political as well as a moral class, who are aequi, that is both equal and fair-minded,61 from whom it ought to be expected rather than requested. The candidis, I presume, are not those who are well bred, as Holland translates, but those whose integrity is transparent.62

Patriae charitas is not simply love of one’s country, but showing one’s love by the way that one acts towards one’s country. Camden does not overuse the word, but it was patriae charitas which made the English nobility rally to Harold in great numbers to go to their deaths at Hastings, as Harold had previously won a singular charitatem cum authoritate for himself by his gentle, egalitarian behaviour.63 But it also appears in Camden as a characteristic of the good works done by monasteries in time past. He dares to use the manuscript foundation document of the Cluniac Abbey at Lewes to show that it was the sanctitatem, religionem, charitatem of the Burgundian house which had inspired William de Warren (c.1119–1148), third earl of Surrey and crusader, to bring such monks to England, and there is Malmesbury’s description of the great abbey of Tewkesbury, “ubi et aedificiorum decor rapuit adventantium oculos et monachorum charitas allexit animos”.64 More immediately it comes from Camden’s address to Burghley. The Diva, our Elizabeth, summoned forth Burghley’s wisdom to be used on behalf of the commonwealth and Burghley had been summoned forth by his own very great love for his country, which he measured not by his own feelings, but by the well-being he could bring to his country, and by its glory.65 This was the example, Camden says, which had inspired him to write and have published the Britannia. Besides Burghley’s exemplary charitas there was Camden’s well-known industria. Smith tells us at the outset of his biography that the honours, which others owed to the splendour of their birth, Camden owed to his own qualities and hard work. It becomes a dominant

60 There is a lot of imprecision surrounding bonus, but some of Thomas’ 1589 offerings suit the present context rather well; “honest, gentle, liberall, easie to speake to, treatable, not vile or base, not counterfeyted or suborned”.
61 Thomas 1589 offers for aequus “plaine and even, iust, indifferent, reasonable, equall, alike, content, which taketh all things well or in good wyrth, sometime good, favourable”.
62 Thomas 1589, offers Holland’s much used “courteous”, and indeed “prosperous”, but also “sincere, without malice or ill will”.
63 C 105, 107, H 146, 149.
64 C 224 H 314; C 253 H 359. Malmesbury (c.1090–1142?), a Benedictine monk who travelled widely in England, though attached to the monastery at Malmesbury all his life. R.M.Thomson ODNB describes him as “England’s greatest national and local historian since Bede, and as the most learned European of his day”.
65 “Charitas in patriam maxima, quae non sensu tuo, sed ipius patriae salute et gloria ita metiris”.
thread in Smith’s narrative. Camden wrote and researched his Britannia with help from his friends while being a fulltime school teacher, and worked himself close to death. He tells us in the 1607 edition that he had set about his task deo auspice et comite industria.

Nor is dignitas necessarily Holland’s ancient dignity though dignity must have a history, but it can be present dignity. While Ripon owed its dignitas to religion, “especially to a Monasterie built in the primitive Church of the English-Saxons”, that is in the uncorrupted early age of English Christianity, Hull had recently emerged into its dignitas through its ships, trade and affluence. Dignitas could refer to social standing, the dignitaries being those who often were very much the products of history, the dukes, marquesses, counts and barons, both those by hereditary right and those new created, (Nobiles maiiores vocamus duces, marchiones, comites, et barones, qui vel haereditario ture his titulis gaudent vel iisdem virtutis ergo a rege exornantur.), on whom Camden writes at great length and in fascinating detail in his section Ordines Angliae. These people as King Herald Clarencieux he well knew, yet, in order to undermine Welsh claims to a noble Trojan ancestry, he did expose the folly of taking a pride in birth, with a quote from Seneca by way of John Whethamstede, its origins in Plato, “ne-neminem regem non ex servis oriundum, neminem non servum ex regibus” (that there is no king but hee came from slaves, and no slaves but he descended of kings). Families which seemed destined to succeed could come to grief in spectacular fashion, as the Courtenays who became Earls of Devonshire, got themselves embroiled in civil wars, in which it was necessary to take sides, prompting Camden to say “optimi quique (ut Quadrigarii verbis utar) minime diurnant”, and later in a synopsis of the Anglo-Saxon king-

---

66 Smith 2002, i “tot honores quos alii natalium splendori, ipse propriae virtutie et industriae debuit”: On p. vi Smith tells us great difficulties, such as Camden experienced, are the making of great men like Camden, and he enhances Camden’s phrasing to commend Camden, “duce divina providentia et comite indefessa industria”.

67 C 578–579 H 712–713.

68 C 570 H 700.

69 C 6 H 8. John Whetamstede (c.1392–1465) became abbot of St Albans Benedictine monastery at an exceptionally early age in 1420. For much of his time he was engaged in defending the privileges and property of the abbey, and his life was complicated by the war of the Roses, during which two battles were fought near the abbey. He was involved with the brother of Henry V, Duke Humphrey of Gloucester, who helped bring the Italian renaissance to England and whose books became the basis of the the Duke Humphrey library, later incorporated in what was to become the Bodleian Library Oxford. Whetamstede himself was above all a scholar and James Clark, contributor of the ODNB entry, writes: “He was probably the first English scholar to cite Leonardo Bruni’s translation of Aristotle’s Politics and he also owned early copies of translations of Plato and of the Latin Plutarch”.

70 C 151–152 H 207–208.
doms he writes “quod indies videmus, fortissimorum virorum et clarissimorum familiarum sobolem perinde ac stirpium suos habere natales, florescere, maturescere, demumque marcescere, et sensim emori”.71

More common classes and commonwealths

At the bottom of the list of the *Ordines Anglorum*, each accounted for in just one sentence, are in ascending order the *opifices*, workdoers, or wealth creators we might feel encouraged to translate, whom Camden says work for pay, and were called by the Romans *proletarii*, then the free yeomanry, that is the *plebeii*, who pay taxes, above them are people, whom we might define as the Elizabethan middle class, the rising bourgeoisie, citizens with a strong sense of civic duty, the kind of men who got elected to parliament, and above them gentlemen and common nobility, either distinguished by their birth, or whom their qualities or fortune lifts up from the dregs of humanity, politely translated by Holland as “or raised up from the base condition of people for their vertue or wealth”. Wealth may be the right translation, since you could buy into the nobility, or otherwise, for example, be knighted for bravery and military expertise, like Drake who raised himself and was raised from a base condition.72

Generosi vel promiscue nobiles sunt qui natalibus clari aut quos virtus aut fortuna e faeces hominum extulit.

Cives sive burgesses, qui in sua quilibet urbe publicis funguntur muneribus et in parlamentariis nostris comitiis locum electione habent.

Plebii sive yeomen sunt quos alii ingenuos, lex nostra homines legales dicit, et ex agris quos optimo iure tenent quadranginta ad minimum solidos quotannis colligunt.

---

71 C 211. “The race or issue of the most valiant men, and noblest Families, like as of the of-spring of plants, hath their springing up, their flourishing and maturitie, and in the end begin to fade, and by little and little to die utterly”, H 294.

72 Camden 1612, *Ann.* 1580, 308–309. There is a wonderful account of Elizabeth’s reception of Drake, the knighting of him and the immortalising of his ship the Golden Hind at Deptford. There was one thing which made Drake anxious and that was that several of the leading men at court, when he offered them gold, spat it back at him, as if it had been gained by piratical crime. The common people had however a rather sophisticated view of Drake’s achievement “Vulgus hominum nihilominus admiratione et laudibus celebrarunt, qui non minus gloriosum existimarantr Angliae laudis terminos, quam imperii promovisse”. Drake had indeed shifted the limits of empire, since England could now threaten the Spaniards in her American possessions. Meanwhile the important thing was the increase in status for England. The Queen was not the only person who could knight her subjects. Commanders could knight soldiers for bravery on the field of battle Camden 1612, *Ann.* 1588, 497. This custom with an ambitious commander such as Essex had subversive potentiality, Camden 1627, *Ann.* 1591, 32.
Opifices autem sunt qui mercede operam locant, sedentarii, mechanici, fabri, &c., qui capite censi et proletarii Romanis dicebantur.

Camden’s attitude to class was ambiguous. His father is described by Smith as “mediocris fortunae virum”, which Sutton translates as man of middling fortune, though Smith clearly regarded him as of humble condition. He was a painter and belonged to the company of Painter Stainers. There is evidence that Camden remained loyal to his father’s memory. On his mother’s side he coyly claimed distant connections with nobility, by way of the Curwens of Workington. His mother came from the family of Curwens at Poulton Hall in Lancashire and therefore belonged to that Lancashire gentry, for whose provident moderation and contentment with their own estate Camden expresses such admiration in the Britannia. The four lower classes were extremely important in the Britain that was evolving. He lived in a kingdom whose ruler had merum imperium, that is was answerable in theory to no man, a theory whose mystique Camden was unwilling to analyse, but quietly undermines. Elizabeth, whose paternal ancestry had roots in the cloth trade, is a godlike figure in the Britannia, removed from the political scene, but her image is dependent foremost on the good governance of the state. “reginam Elisabetham principem optimam, ob rempublicam prudentissime administratam et suas virtutes supra sexum heroicas”. Many in Camden’s circle would belong to the generosi and cives. The plebeii and proletarii were the source of the wealth and much of the manpower of the modern commercial state, which Camden promoted. In the Annales Camden worries about the sustainability of Britain’s world trade with the outflow of silver and the constant loss of ships’ crews. In a rare visit in the Britannia to the working classes, he gives us a picture of the heroic yeomen fishermen of Margate, Ramsgate and Broadstairs, seamen, exporters and traders, and

73 Smith 1691 i, “mediocris fortunae virum, et arte ac professione pictorem. Neutiquam puduit filium, quem divinum ac plane heroicum ingenium longe supra humilem istam vitae conditionem ad quam damnatus videbatur evexerat”.
74 C 633 H 769. Through these Curwens Camden claimed a connection to the Gospatricks, Earls of Northumberland. He seems to have been aware that some might regard this as pretentious, “et a quibus nobis, absit verbo invidia, genus maternum” which Holland translates, “from whom (without offence or vanity be it spoken) my selfe am descended by the mothers side”. On Lancashire gentry see C 612 H 748 “provida moderatio et antiqua suis bonis contenta simplicitas”.
75 C 118, “Sed haec sublimioris sunt loci, et non huius argumenti”. “But these are points of a loftier discourse, and not of the argument now in hand”, H 163.
76 Albeit Geoffrey de Boleyn, who was the great grandfather of Elizabeth’s mother, Anne Boleyn, was a wealthy mercer and former Lord Mayor of London.
77 C 186 H 256–257.
no doubt tax payers, whose industry must have surpassed that even of Camden, men who knew how to turn to their advantage a shipwreck, of which fortunately there were many, to their advantage.

For they are passing industrious, and as if they were amphibii, that is, both land-creatures and sea-creatures, get their living both by sea and land, as one would say, with both these elements: they be Fisher-men and Plough men, as well Husband-men as Mariners, and they that hold the plough-tale in earing the ground, the same hold the helme in steering the ship. According to the season of the yeare, they knit nets, they fish for Cods, Herrings, Mackarels, &c., they saile, and carry foorth Merchandise. The same againe dung and mannure their grounds, Plough, Sow, harrow, reape their Corne, and they inne it, men most ready and well apointed both for sea and land, and thus goe they round and keepe a circle in these their labours. Furthermore, whereas that otherwhiles there happen shipwrackes here (for they lie full against the shore those most dangerous flats, shallowes, shelves, and sands so much feared of Sailers, which they use to call The Goodwin Sands, The Brakes, The Four-Foots, The Whitdick &c.), these men are wont to be-stir themselves lustily in recovering both ships, men, and Merchandize endanged.

It was however to the generosi and cives that political power in the near future would however increasingly belong. The Romans in their imperial age had a prince and the pretence of the old republic. In England, when the monarchy was abolished, the respublica or Commonwealth would take command.

It is interesting to see some of the occurrences of respublica in the Britannia, or the instances where citizens are taking important initiatives. Three times Oxford is called a respublica literaria, market for ideas, its teachers walking libraries, no doubt dangerous items. Camden was not well treated

---

79 C 240 H 340.
by Oxford but he in his modesty responded with generosity, endowing a chair in civil history from which public lectures would be given. The Anglican church was a respublica ecclesiastica. Henry’s attack on the monasteries is portrayed like an attack on an independent state, and it is a passage which is not found in the 1590 edition; the body controlling the mines in Cornwall was a respublica. York, was a most ancient city, Roman in origin since the Britons did not know how to build cities, said Camden, its minster built with considerable help from the local nobility, its new walls and laws provided by its citizens, and its dignitas well established in recognition of which Henry devolved to it a council or Parliament, like those in France, to decide on local matters. However it was London which was the respublica par excellence.

Quo tempore Burgus hic Londino ponte ita coniunctus, non solum amplificata urbs erat sed etiam optima reipublicae forma descripta, cives in corpora sive Collegia distributi. Urbs ipsa in XXVI regiones divisa, conciliumque Reipublicae penes totidem senes constitutum, qui ex acetate nostra lingua Aldermen, id est Senatores, dicuntur, quorum singuli singulis regionibus praeescent, et cum antiquitus pro summo magistratus Portreve, i. e. Urbis Praefectum, habuisissent, duos Ballivos instituit Richardus Primus, pro quibus statim Ioannes Rex concessit ut Maiorem sive Praetorem annuum magistratum suis suffragiis e XII primariis corporibus eligerent, duosque Vicecomites, Shirifs vocant, quorum alter Regius, Urbanus alter dicitur, nominarent.

81 C 117–118, “Fuerunt etiam regnante Henrico Octavo (fas sit meminisse) avitae pietatis monumenta ad Dei honorem, fidei Christianiae, bonarumque literarum propagationem et pauperum sustentationem domus religiosae, scilicet monasteria sive abbatiae et prioratus numero 645, e quibus cum pontificis Clementis VII permisso 40 fuerint suppressae in gratiam cardinalis Wolseai, qui tunc duo collegia, alterum Oxoniae, alterum Ipswichi inchoaverat, statim circa annum 36 Henrici VIII in rempublicam Angliae ecclesiasticam quasi torrens rupto aggerre irrit, qui gentis ecclesiasticae partem maximam, orbe stupente et Anglia ingemente, cum pulcherrimis aedificiis funditus prostravit”. “There were also, in the reign of Henry the Eighth (I hope without offence I may speak the truth) many religious places, Monuments of our forefathers pietie and devotion, to the honor of God, the propagation of Christian faith and good learning, and also for the reliefe and maintenance of the poore and impotent, to wit, Monasteries or Abbaies, and Priories, to the number of 645: of which when, by permission of Pope Clement the Seventh, fortie were suppressed by Cardinal Wolseies meanes, who had then begun to found two Colleges, one at Oxenford, the other at Ipswich, straightways, about the xxxvj yeere of the reign of the said Henrie the Eight, a sudden floud (as it were) breaking thorow the banks with a maine streame, fell upon the Ecclesiasticall State of England, which while the world stood amazed, and England groned thereat, bare downe and utterly overthrew the greatest part of the Clergie, together with their most goodly and beautifull houses”, H 163.
82 C 134 H 185.
83 C 575 H 706.
(What time as the bridge was thus made betweene London and this Burrough, the Citie was not onely enlarged, but also an excellent forme of Common-welth was therein ordeined, and the Citizens reduced into certaine distinct Corporations and Companies, the whole City divided into six and twenty wards, and the Counsell of the Citie consisted of as many ancient men, named of their age in our tongue Aldermen, as one would say, Senatours, who each one have the overseeing and rule of his severall ward: and whereas in ancient time they had for their head-Magistrate a Portreve, that is, a governour of the City, King Richard the First ordeined two Ballieves. Instead of whome soone after King John granted them liberty to chuse by their voices yeerely out of the twelve principall companies a Maior for their chiefe Magistrate; also two Sherifes, whereof one is called the Kings, the other the Cities Sherife.)

The Latin resonates much more than the English of Holland for those who have at any time of their life been steeped in ancient Roman history. What was also required in such a commonwealth was that there should be private funding of great public works by private individuals. In Oxford Camden was to found the chair of history named after him, and Bodley had established his library “ut denuo habeat academia publicum sapientiae armamentarium.” Bodley is described as of the equestrian order, which carries both the Roman connotation and the English sense of knight. The Royal Exchange in London was built by Thomas Gresham cive equestris ordinis for the use of business people and to adorn the city, the Guildhall,
a beautiful building, was built by Thomas Knolles, the mayor; Leadenhall by Simone Eyre, a splendid spacious building “the common garner in the time of dearth to pull downe the price of corn” (“ad annonam laxandam”). Gresham also gave a magnificent house, which he had in the city, to be an institute of learning, with professors in six major fields of learning, on generous salaries, so that London was not just a commercial centre, but a well equipped workshop for all the best forms of knowledge, a centre of a *humanitas*, which included all the sciences, as well as a proper attitude to the human race.

**Insula romana; the multi-ethnic origins of Britain**

In a discussion early in the work on the ancient names of the British isles Camden makes the point that the name of a place is not only the name which the inhabitants give to it, but the name by which it is known to other

---

play a public generosity and press the king, Henry VIII, for among other things the setting up of hospitals. Thomas was trained to follow in his father’s footsteps, even serving an apprenticeship. He proved himself an adept trader though not on the scale of his father. He married this to work for the Crown and from 1551–1564 was royal agent in the Netherlands, where he showed great skill operating amid international financial crises and the political incompetence at home. He found more congenial circumstances when Elizabeth came to the throne, a monarch who knew the necessity of keeping sound national accounts. It was most fitting therefore that it should be Thomas who had the Royal Exchange built, though Ian Blanchard says that it was the death of his only son, Richard, which launched Thomas on a career as public benefactor. Blanchard’s contributions on the Greshams in the *ODNB* from which I derive this summary give wonderful insights into the realities of London as a world centre of trade, which needless to say shed light on our modern situation.

88 Thomas Knolles (d. 1435) was a grocer whom Pamela Nightingale *ODNB* suggests may have made his vast wealth in the distribution of raw materials rather than in export. He also invested in property. For Camden he is a figure from more distant times, and in this respect he represents a tradition of generosity among the civic leaders of the city, helping it meet its financial needs even in a time of recession.

89 Simon Eyre, (c.1395–1458), was a member of the Draper’s Company who made his money trading cloth within England, though also acting as middleman to Italian merchants who were excluded from English markets. His Leadenhall project which resulted in him quickly being elected mayor extended to the establishment of schools as part of the development, a visionary project which did not succeed. His was a rag-to-riches story, which even as Camden was writing his later editions of *Britannia* was fictionalised in Thomas Deloney’s *The Gentle Craft* (1597) and Thomas Dekker’s *The Shoemaker’s Holiday* (1600). For these details and others see Caroline Barron in the *ODNB*.

90 C 312–313 H 435. Gresham’s wife attempted to overturn his will. This loss of her house was obviously for her a step too far in the giving of charity. The college still exists with distinguished holders of the chairs, and offering through invited speakers free lectures at their institution near the City of London. See www.gresham.ac.uk By coincidence in May 2011 I heard three of their present and past professors at the Hay on Wye Literary Festival providing illumination to packed audiences in the fields of multi-universes, the mathematics of biology and the King James Bible.
people, and he gives tenuous proofs, but nonetheless proofs that by one or two historical authorities Britain was known as the *insula romana*, a phrase which Camden is happy to recall, since it nicely states the position of Britain, as place that was thoroughly Romanised, and subsequently had a Roman heritage.


(I passe over to speak of Aristides, who named it *The great, and the furthest Island*. That it was called also *Romania*, Gildas after a sort doth intimate, who writeth that *subdued it was of the Romanes so, as that the name of Romane servitude stucke to the soyle thereof*: and by and by after, *so as it might not bee counted Britannia, but Romania*; and one or two pages after, speaking of the same, *The Island*, quoth he, *keeping indeed the Romane name, but neither their custome nor law*. And Prosper Aquitanus in expresse words called it the *Romane Island*.)

*Magna et ultima insula*, the phrase, which he will for the moment overlook, is a phrase taken from Aelius Aristides’ (d. A.D. 189) Roman Oration where he likens the Roman empire to a walled city with its inpenetrable defences, differing from the walled cities of an earlier antiquity through its extent, an empire which extended from the settled area of Ethiopia to the river Phasis, from the Euphrates to the great outermost island toward the West, which was of course Britain. So then Britain in a crucial area of the globe defined the Roman empire. The whole of Aelius’ oration is compulsory reading as a key to appreciating the spirit of the *Britannia*. In the *Roman Oration* Rome is portrayed as on or beyond the periphery of eastern empires, and as having succeeded them as an empire of comparable or superior extent but orientated towards the west. Aristides’ phrase is freighted with importance but Camden instead turns to Gildas, the great authority on the collapse of Roman power in Britain, since he is our closest native extant authority to this event. Camden mischievously suggests that Gildas thought of Britain as Romania which would mean that it was indeed *insula romana*. In fact Gil-
das’ innuit is Camden’s innuendo, he presents Gildas, the British patriot, as revealing that the British had become so abject that they were allowing themselves to be regarded as Romans, and then as not very Roman. Pros-
per Aquitanus, a valuable authority on the years immediately following the Roman empire, gave Camden the resonant phrase he wants. Prosper was a corre-
spondent of St. Augustine with whom he shared a concern about the Pelagian heresy, which had its origins with a Briton and infected Britain. Gildas in his Chronicon mentions the sending of Germain, bishop of Aux-
erre, by pope Celestine to redirect the island [from its British heresy] to the Roman faith.

Gildas’ view of ancient British history is still the popular view, Roman abandonment of the Welsh to Pictish and Scottish invasions, that is foreign-
ers from Scotland, and an invitation for Anglo-Saxon help, which proves treacherous. Camden devotes a complete section, the Excidium Britannia, or The Down-Fall or Destruction of Britain, to a long extract on these events in Gildas’ fantastic unclassical Latin. He is happy to do so, since from Gildas’ mouth he is able to show that all the current inhabitants of modern Britain, that is victims, attackers and treacherous saviours, were once equally barbarous, and that now they have for the moment sunk their identi-
ties and become one people.

Haec cum legerimus non bono Gildae succenseamus, quod in suorum Britannorum vitia, in immanem Pictorum et Scotorum feritatem, in nostrorum Saxonum insatiabilem crudelitatem tam aspere invehatur. Sed cum insitione vel commixtione quadam per tot saecula, iam cuncti gens una simus, religione bonisque artibus emolliti, cogitemus quales et illi fuerint, et quales nos esse debeamus, ne pro nostris itidem vitiiis summus rerum moderator alias huc gentes, vel nobis excisis transferat, vel devictis inserat.

(When we shall read these reports, let us not be offended and dis-
pleased with good Gildas, for his bitter invectives against either the vices of his own countrymen the Britans, or the inhumane outrages of

93 See Gildas 1567 sections § 5 and §10 pp. 9 and 11–12. I presumed De excidio et con-
gestu Britanniae meant The Destruction and Lament of Britain, but I see conquestu con-
stantly translated as conquest. Jocelyn’s edition was dedicated to Matthew Parker, see n.14.
94 (c390–c455). The location of the phrase is unknown to me since I have not yet been able to gain access to most of Prosper’s writings. In his Chronicon he tells us in 416 that the Briton Pelagius preached the beliefs associated with his name contesting the grace of Christ. In 433 the Pelagian Agricola, son of a Pelagian bishop, corrupted the churches in Britain, but the pope Celestine sent Germain, bishop of Auxerre to cast down the heretics and steer the Britons towards the Catholic faith.
95 For an overturning of the common Gildian view, using in the final analysis DNA evi-
dence, see Oppenheimer 2006.
the barbarous enemies, or the insatiable crueltie of our Fore-fathers the Saxons. But since that for so many ages successively ensuing, we are all now by a certain engraffing or commixtion become one nation, mollified and civilized with Religion and good Arts, let us meditate and consider, both what they were, and also what we ought to be: lest that for our sinnes likewise the supreame Ruler of the world either translate other nations hither, when wee are first rooted out, or incorporate them into us, after we are by them subdued.)

What happened to them all and how the contemporary British have arrived at their present state is a history lesson, which if ignored, might lead to them being rooted out, or becoming the base stock on which a superior people will be engraffed. Camden believed that the troubles in Ireland had in part been caused by the distraction of civil war in England, that is the war of the Roses, and more recently by the threats posed by factions in England and Scotland. There is a weakness in the argument, since it might be in everyone’s interest to be engraffed by a superior, more civilised race. He has however a more sophisticated view of national identities than Gildas, and some of his very best writing is where he deconstructs national pretensions. One could say that it is in his interests to do so, since he wishes to eliminate difference, so that everyone can be absorbed into this greater British whole, dominated by a lowland urbanised England, or to be more precise London. The interest, as always with Camden, is in the detail, whereas here for the moment I merely touch on the main thrust of the argument.

Paradoxically Camden’s insula Romana is best understood by being seen in its initial guise as insula Britannica, but not in the sense in which a patriotic Welshman might have assumed. The Picts, a people who had sought to destroy ancient Britain, were in fact unRomanised British, who included both those in the north who for the most part lived outside the ambit of the Romans, and those who had fled from the south to escape the Romans. The similarities between Welsh, that is ancient British, and Irish languages showed that the Irish were in origin British as well, this was supported in Camden’s mind by Classical testimonies, and the shared heritage of British and Irish had in all probability been reinforced by Britons seeking refuge from the Romans in Ireland. So the British Isles had a unity based on peoples speaking versions of the ancient British language. War laid the foundation of nations, whether through refugees, settlement, conquest or colonisa-

---

96 C 79 H 110.
97 The section on the Picts is a brilliant, sometimes amusing piece of writing, as is his section on the Scots. People can be the victims of the way they are labeled or label themselves.
98 C 728 H Ireland 64–65; C 557 H 686.
tion, to this extent the myth of the Brutan origins of Britain contained a truth. The insula Romana, which succeeded the insula Britannica, had at various times extended well beyond Hadrian’s Wall, as far as the Antonine Wall obviously, from which Camden had confirmatory epigraphic evidence.99 The Romans under Agricola had won a battle in the north of Scotland by the Caledonian Forest and mainland Britain had been circumnavigated, which means that in this respect at least the whole island was brought within Roman bounds.100 The role of the sea and a navy in defining territory is a crucial topic, to which I shall come. In the course of the Roman occupation the British, especially in what is now England, had become Romanised and had absorbed a provincial Latin (incolae provinciæ Latinam imbibissent).101

All the British Isles had afterwards been subjected to a Germanic influence. Camden does not subscribe to the idea that the ancient British were slain, or as an entity gradually pushed into the furthest west of the island. He thinks that these Romano-British were for the most part absorbed, and presumably in the north as well, where, as demonstrated by the shared English language, most of Scotland, which had been British, and not thoroughly Romanised, was occupied and transformed by Anglo-Saxons. It was only a small minority of the ancient southern British who preferred the liberty of an otherwise inhospitable country, Wales, to being absorbed by the Anglo-Saxons.

Victi enim omnes in gentem, leges, nomen, linguamque vincentium, praeter pauculos quos locorum asperitas in occiduo tractu tutata est, concesserunt. Nam praeter Angliam pars longe maxima Scotiæ ab Anglo-Saxonibus occupata (Sassones enim sylvestribus et veris Scotis etiamnum vocantur) eadem qua nos lingua, dialecto parum variata utitur. Quam nos cum illis annos iam 1150 quodammodo illibatam simulque regionis possessionem conservavimus.

(For all the conquered, except some few, whom in the Westerne tract the roughnesse of the countrey defended and kept safe, became one nation, used the same lawes, tooke their name, and spake one and the selfsame language with the conquerours. For besides England it selfe, a great part of Scotland, being possessed by the English Saxons [and still to this day the wilde and naturall Scots indeed, terme them Sassesones] useth the same tongue that we do, varying a little in the Dialect onely. Which tongue we and they together for the space now of 1150

---

100 C 45 H 58 C 42–43 H 60–61.
101 C 83 H 116. Holland translates imbibissant, meaning drink deeply, absorb, with the colourless used.
He makes the telling and extremely important point that the English and the English speaking Scots had kept their shared language for 1150 years. There was a basic truth in the remark, but the sameness of the language may have been in details a more recent development, as the English and Scottish kingdoms drew closer together and both came under the influence of the Reformation. It was of course not just the Anglo-Saxons, who occupied the northern parts, but also the Norse, who apart from the damage they inflicted on the English, became almost the forgotten people of Camden’s *Britannia*.\(^\text{103}\)

As for the Picts they were in 740 virtually annihilated by the Scots who absorbed the remainder. As for the Scots, they and their historians swore by their altars and hearths that they originated from Spain and from there went to Ireland.\(^\text{104}\) Camden was inclined to accept this, and, after reviewing the ancient evidence, he came to the conclusion that they were Goths. Goths were a Germanic people too, and so this is an instance where language does not prove a link, because the Gaelic language, which these latter day Goths spoke, had, according to Camden, no links with any Germanic language. They had linguistically been assimilated by the native ancient British. The connecting link with the Goths was in this case a cultural artefact, the kilt, as worn by the Goths in Sidonius Apollinaris’ description.

They are (saith he) of a flaming deepe yellow, died with saffron; they buckle upon their feet a paire of Broges made of raw and untanned leather up to their ankles; their knees, thighes, and calves of their legs are all bare; their garments high in the necke, straight made and of sundry colours, comming skarce do wne to their hammes; the sleeves cover the upper points of their armes and no more; their souldiers coats of colour greene, edged with a red fringe; thei belts hanging downe from the shoulder; the lappets of their eares hidden under the curled glibbes and lockes of haire lying all over them.\(^\text{105}\)

The Vikings too had been a Germanic people, as had all the other *septentrionales*, God’s scourge on the civilised nations when they became deca-
dent. And these Norsemen in their imperial period had settled throughout the British Isles. He suggests that Scotland was in fact a collection of nations, as was England. Ireland too, which was in the middle of the French Sea, midway between Spain and Britain, was a natural place for many peoples to flow together over the centuries and fix their settlement, Norwegians, Easterlings from Germany, Englishmen, Welsh and Scots from the British mainland.

**Insula romana and the material facts of Roman history old and new**

National origins were bedevilled by myth and ideology. Camden keeps clear of the passions aroused by origins by playing the sceptic, from which position he makes a series of tentative suggestions for the Gothic origins of the Scots, which of course he expects to be accepted, based on literary evidence, oral tradition and likely historical processes. In the case of the Roman occupation of Britain, however, which lasted nearly five hundred years, reasonable hypotheses could be supported by material evidence. Even if the sole occupants of what we now know as England had, in pre-Roman times, been, as Camden thought, speakers of a language whose descendant is Welsh, and this is doubtful, the population of the country at the end of the Roman empire had multiple origins.

Haec dum ego commenter de Romanorum in Britannia imperio quod ad quadringentisimum septuagesimum sextum plus minus annum, ut modo dixi, pertigit, commentor, et subinde mecum repeto quot tanto tempore Romanorum coloniae huc deductae, quot milites huc Roma in praedidum continuo transmissi, quot ad res suas vel imperii agendas huc submissi, qui cum Britannis connubiis coniuncti hic et sedes fixerunt, et sobolem susceperunt, ubicunque, inquit Seneca, vicit Romanus, habitat [...] Et par est credamus Britannos et Romanos tot seculis in unam gentem quasi laeta insitione coaluisse

(In writing of these matters concerning the Romanes government in Britaine, which continued [as I said] CCCCLXXVI yeeres, or much thereabout, whiles I consider and think otherwise [sometimes] with

---

106 "ita hi a Deo asservantur septentrionales ac Hyperborei terrores, ut pro poena quadam, quando et quibus providentiae divinae visum fuerit, immitantur", quoting Nicephorus *Historia Romana* I.xxxii.2, C110 H 154.

107 C 88–89 H 124. On the weave of Irish identities, and the Gothic idea in the two centuries following Camden, see Kidd 2006; on the Germans as a key to understanding European identities and especially English identity, see Verstegan 1605 chapter one, “Of the Originall of Nations”, chapter two, “How the Ancient Noble Saxons, the True Ancesters of Englishmen, were originally a people of Germanie; and how honorable it is for Englishmen to be descended from the Germans”.

108 C 86, “Nam ego in hac re Scepticus”.

---
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my selfe, how many Colonies of Romans were in so long a time brought hither, how many soldiery continually transported over hither from Rome to lie in garrison, how many sent hither to negotiate either their own busines, or the affairs of the Empire, who joyning in mariage with Britans, both planted themselves, and also begat children here [for wheresoever the Romans winneth, saith Seneca, there he woneth, and inhabiteth] [...] And meet it is we should beleev, that the Britans and Romans in so many ages, by a blessed and joyfull mutuall ingraffing, as it were, have grown into one stocke and nation.)

Camden is suggesting that at the end of empire there was a new Romano-British people, and in this section he reminds us that for this reason it was called insulam Romaniam or insulam Romanam. Because of this miscegenation we can conclude that the Romans never left Britain, and it was the Romano-British who became one nation with the Anglo-Saxons. The processes of assimilation could be rapid as Camden immediately goes on to illustrate. Within twenty eight years of a colony being founded among them, which was to become the city of Cologne, the Ubii refused to massacre the Roman settlers with whom they had already started to intermarry.

Deductis olim et nobiscum per connubium sociatis, quique mox provenere, haec patria est. Nec vos adeo iniquos existemus, ut interfici a nobis parentes, frateres, liberos nostros velitis.

(This is the naturall Countrey, as well to those that being conveied hither in times past, are conjoyned with us by mariages, as to their off-spring. Neither can we thinke you so unreasonable, as to wish us for to kill our parents, brethren, and children.)

If it were possible to define the Romano-British, account might have to be taken of the number of Britons people who moved abroad. The main evidence concerns British soldiers who must often have settled abroad. Camden has evidence that twelve cohorts or squadrons composed of Britons were serving elsewhere in the Roman empire. More startling is the ethnicity of the Romans who were serving in Britain. They were mainly people from what had been, in their time, regarded as the more uncivilised parts of the empire, and still often were. It becomes a refrain as one reads through the Britannia. The emperor Probus sent Vandals and Burgundians, whom he himself had conquered, to Britain, where he gave them a place to settle, reward for the useful work they had done for the Romans, whenever anyone

110 C 61 H 88.
111 C 60 H 87.
plotted sedition. Anderida on the Saxon shore was defended by a company of Abulci against Saxon pirates, at Richborough, the main port of entry into Britain, Heruli, Batavii, Moesici were landed to defend Britain against the Picts and Scots, there were Frisians in Manchester, a race who were to take part in the Anglo-Saxon movement of peoples, Asturians and Sarmatian horsemen at Ribchester, Dalmatian horsemen at Warwick. Warwick prompted Camden to repeat a theory about the reason for so many foreign troops in Britain, based on a premise which does not fit well with the drift of his own general thesis. It is in the nature of Camden’s style of writing that a variety of voices are heard, what Herendeen describes by the convenient term polyvocality. Not all voices were subjected to Camden’s critique. The voice from Warwick states

such was the provident wisdome and forecast of the Romans that in all their Provinces they placed forraigne soouldiers in garrison, who by reason of their diversity as well of maners as of language from the naturall inhabitants, could not joyne with them in any conspiracy, for (as he writeth) Nations not indured to the bridle of bondage easily otherwise start backe from the yoake imposed upon them. Heereupon it was that there served in Britaine out of Africke the Moores, out of Spaine the Astures and Vectones, out of Germany the Batavi, Nervii, Tungrri, and Turnacenses, out of Gaul the Lingones, Morini, and from other remoter places Dalmatians, Thracians, Alani &c., as I will shew in their proper places.

This is a description of the policing of a nation that would prefer to be free. The troops are a mixed bunch and for the purposes of this divergent thesis are an ill-considered group. The Morini especially were near neighbours of the British and may have spoken a very similar language, the ones designated as Germans were from continental areas very close to Britain, with whom there we can reasonably presume there had been constant traffic from prehistoric times, in a world where the sea joined peoples, did not divide

112 C 50 H 71. Probus also permitted the Britons to have vines.
113 C 247 H 351 Perhaps from Avila in Spain.
See http://www.roman-britain.org/places/anderitum.htm
114 C 240 H 341. Heruli were a nomadic people from east Germany, of Scandanavian origin.
115 C 611 H 746. Camden owed the information to John Dee who had copied out an inscription for him. He described Dee, in Holland’s words, as “that most famous Mathematician and Warden of Manchester Colledge”.
117 C 425 H 562–563.
them, and these had not always existed in their present definitions. In this kind of world the Asturians with their mining skills were near neighbours. Nonetheless the Roman rule could be oppressive. There were unresolved problems for Camden as he contemplated Roman imperialism and its benefits.

In a brilliant passage which is a celebration of Roman civilisation, above all Roman roads, Camden prefaces his laudation in the 1590 edition by saying “Hoc Romanorum iugum quamvis grave, tamen salutare fuit”. (This yoke of the Romanes although it were grievous, yet comfortable it proved and a saving health unto them.)

In the 1607 edition he vastly expands the section on roads making it into a mini-dissertation. He also in a new paragraph, inserted prior to this account, explains why the Roman yoke could be difficult for those used to their own freedoms. Even here he starts with positive remarks about the Roman military occupation, to the effect that legionary camps could give rise to cities, and we can think of York and Lincoln. He then goes on to describe the unpleasantness of the process of being subject to another’s rule with its inevitable abuses of power and Roman misrule. It is as if he were finally confessing how civilisation, of the kind that he approved, such as he wished to see established in Ireland, could be built on cruelty and injustice, such as the English had experienced at the hands of William the Conqueror, and which was evident in Camden’s own London, as described vividly by Camden’s friend and colleague John Stow, who wrote material which he thought might be of use to Camden.

\[\text{118}\] 1590, 37. The Latin wording in the 1590 edition is the same as the in 1607 edition, so we can use Holland.

\[\text{119}\] Stow 1598 in “The Epistle Dedicatiorie” to the Survey comments on regional work being done up and down the country which could add up to a chorography of the country, and “might give occasion and courage to M. Camdin to increase and beautifie his singular worke of the whole”. In fact as well as the good deeds done in London, Stow can tell of things Camden is not as quick to mention, of the degradation of the green spaces in London by rampant industrialisation, 92–93, of a much loved bailiff who was framed on a false accusation and hanged outside the door of Stow’s house, of William Powlett building a great house and garden on land which had provided an amenity near St. Augustine’s Friary, of Thomas Cromwell in Throgmorton Street commandeering land for his private property, some of it belonging to Stow’s father, 140, of weav[ing establishments of foreigner with special skills replaced by rich drapers, 171. Stow, (1524/5–1605) is not identified with any school or university. Nonetheless Barrett Beer ODNB writes that, “it is likely that Stow was the most knowledgeable record collector of the sixteenth century” and also its most prolific historian, who besides The Survey of London wrote Chronicles of England (1580) and Annales of England (1592). Beer also describes him as “a prolific manuscript collector whose interests included chronicles, charters, ecclesiastical and municipal records, wills, literary works, and learned treatises”. This is the kind of material that Camden celebrates in the introduction to the 1607 edition of the Britannia.

(And doubtlesse, the standing guards and Camps of Legions and Roman souldiers were many times the Seminaries, as it were, and Seedplots of Cities and townes, as in other Provinces, so also in this our Britaine. Thus was the yoke of subjection laid upon the Britans, first by a garison of souldiers, which alwaies with terror were ready to command the Inhabitants, afterwards by tribute and imposts; and in that respect forced they were to have Publicans, that is to say, greedy cormorants and horsleeches, who sucked their blood, confiscated their goods and exacted tributes in the name of the dead: Neither were they permitted to use the ancient lawes of their country, but magistrats were sent from the people of Rome, with absolute power and commissio n to minister iustice even in capitall matters. For, Provinces had Propretors, Lieutenants, Presidents, Pretors and Proconsuls. Every city also and State had their municipall magistrates. The Pretor proclaimed yeerely solemne sessions and Assizes, at which he determined the weightier causes sitting aloft upon a high Tribunall seat, and guarded with his Lictors about him proudly executed hee his iurisdiction: rods and whipping cheere were presented to the backs, the ax and heading to the necks of the common people, and every yeere they were forced to receive one new ruler or another allotted to them. Neither was this sufficient: they maintained discord and dissension among them, some also they favoured above the rest, that they might have them to be the instruments of this their servitude.)

120 C 44 H 62.
Inscriptional material and archaeological remains could give indications of more attractive public and personal aspects of life under the Romans. Camden was, for example, interested in the religion of these people. There is an inscription to the god of all the Brigantes, another to Verbeia which he suggests might be a name derived from the nearby river Wharf, itself an ancient British name, meaning swift, and which can be further illustrated by the ancients’ deification of rivers and water. The altar at Ribchester dedicated to Mother goddesses perplexes Camden. There were lots of altars there, some of them small and very personal, so that Camden could muse on whether the predominant religion was a religion of the altar, where people had their own personal altars.

In these altares the posterity no doubt imitated Noah, even after they had fallen away and revolted from the true worship of God. Neither erected they altars to their Gods onely, but also unto their Emperors by way of servile flattery, with this impious title, NVMINI MAIESTATIQVE EORVM, that is, Unto their GOD-HED and Majesty. Unto these they kneeled in humble manner, these they clasped about and embraced as they praised; before these they took their othes, and in one word, in these and in their sacrifices consisted the maine substance of all their religion, so farre forth, that whoever had no altar of their owne, they were thought verily to have no religion, nor to acknowledge any God at all.

This was a hypothesis too far, but altars, especially if each man or woman had their own personal altar, was thought provoking. Camden was living in an age of increasing religious deviation. There were other forms of historical support for the modern implications of ancient religion, since Camden followed Origen’s line that the Druids, the native priests of those far-off times, were in their wisdom and doctrines part of the praeparatio evanglica. Camden himself at the end of his labours dedicated his Britannia to the inclusive Deo Optimo Maximo.

At Maryport at the western extension of Hadrian’s Wall facing the Irish Sea an astonishing number of altars had been discovered, which leads Camden to think of the time of Prudentius, from whom he quotes, when the new Christian religion led to the breaking of the pagan altars. We might note in Camden’s time altars had been destroyed by the new Reformed religion. Elsewhere near the old Roman fort of Bravionacum, by the Wall,
an old lady had in her possession a small altar to the local god, while in the village of Melkrigh there was a broken altar to a Syrian goddess, on which, Holland, adds the women now beat their laundry. Camden gives us the inscription on this altar in all its imperfections, so that we can join with Camden in trying to understand these ancient peoples

\[
\text{DEAE SURI} \\
\text{AE SUB CALP} \\
\text{VRNIO AG.........} \\
\text{ICOLA LEG. AUG} \\
\text{PR. PR. A. LICINIUS} \\
\text{....LEMENS PRAEF} \\
\text{....III. A. IOR.........} \\
\]

He then gives us his reading of the inscription and launches into a wide ranging lively interpretation of this, which includes some very personal imperial detail. Here in Holland’s translation

Which if I were able to read, thus would I willingly read it, and the draught of the letters maketh well for it: Deae Suriae, sub Calpurnio Agricola legato Augusti, Propraetore Licinius Clemens Praefectus, that is, Unto the Goddesse Suria, under Calphurnius Agricola Lieutenant of Augustus and Propraetor, Licinius Clemens the Captaine. This Calphurnius Agricola was sent by Antoninus Philosophus against the Britans, what time as there was likely to be warre in Britaine, about the yeere of Christ 170. At which time, some Cohort under his command erected this altar unto THE GODDESSE SURIA, whom with a turreted crowne on her head, and a Tabber in her hand, was set in a coach drawn with Lions, as Lucian sheweth at large in his Narration of the Goddesse Suria. Which Goddesse also Nero, albeit hee contemned all religion, especially worshipped for a time; and soone after so aviled and despised that hee defiled her with his urine.

facts which would might unknown to the good ladies of Melkrigh. Other inscriptions, of course, told of service done by men from overseas in language, which had become the language of contemporary British inscriptions, often terse and full of dignity, the language and style of power.

---

126 C 659, “Anicula vero quae casulam proximam incoluit arulam votivam antiquam nobis ostendit sic deo indigeti Vitirineo inscriptam”. H 800.
127 H 801 from C 659–660.
The other island; the unRomanised Irish

At the very beginning of the long section entitled \textit{Romani in Britannia} Camden writes that Caesar, when he had finished mapping the Gauls in victories, so that he might join what nature had made separate, by taking captive both land and sea, turned his gaze on the Ocean, as if the world of Rome were too small. Josephus magnifying the achievement of Vespasian wrote that Britain is surrounded by the Ocean, and is scarcely smaller than our world.\footnote{C 44 H 62} In the section describing Britain, Camden writes that the ancients believed that the circumference of Britain was so large that Caesar, who was the first Roman to reveal the nature of Britain, wrote that he had found another world, thinking that it was of such a magnitude that it seemed not so much to be poured around by the Ocean but to embrace the Ocean.\footnote{C 1 H 2.}

It is appropriate to end by glancing at the nature of this embrace, not so much Britain’s relationship to its surrounding seas as to its ownership. John Selden, Camden’s colleague and friend, wrote an extremely popular book called \textit{Mare Clausum}, the first half of which discusses the legalities of ownership, the second the historical \textit{de facto} ownership, tracing the British navy back to prehistoric times, but naturally giving due weight to the period when, what was sometimes, and we might guess most times, a cosmopolitan Roman navy, guarded and exploited the British shores.\footnote{C 50 H 72.} It is clear in Camden that Britain had been the America of its day, in Roman eyes the second largest island in the world, with Ireland the third, the two islands in the West, the largest island in the world being Taprobane which signified the
exotic East. The imperial nature of *insula Romana* is particularly illuminated by its relation to the sea, and in the sections which deal with this relationship there is a significant shift between the 1590 and 1607 editions.

In the 1590 edition the sections on Ireland and the islands were attached as a separate book *Hiberniae et Insularum Britanniae Adiacentium Descrip-tio*, and this was dedicated to Edward Hoby, Golden Knight and best of friends. Hoby (1560–1617) was blessed by fortune, a nephew of Burghley, yet an independent person who frequently irritated those in power, such as Elizabeth herself. He was involved in the preparations to confront the Spanish Armada, and present at the attack on Cadiz, and later in life was governor of the isle of Sheppey, so that he makes an appearance in the book dedicated to him, since in the 1590 edition Sheppey is mentioned among the islands. He was a highly regarded Parliamentarian, both under Elizabeth, but especially James. He had charge of the rolls for the county of Kent, and was a combative Calvinist who engaged in public controversy with Catholic recusants. One can see in these details taken from Louis Knafla’s *ODNB* article some of the reasons why this work might in 1590 have been dedicated to him. In the 1607 edition Ireland and the Islands are integrated into the main body of the text with a continuous pagination and Hoby disappears.

Nonetheless the accounts neither of Ireland nor of the islands are in harmony with the rest of the *Britannia*, though in various ways and styles major themes from the main body of the *Britannia* disclose themselves. Ireland had never been occupied by the Romans, which was says Camden its misfortune.

> Ubicunque enim Romani victores victos humanitate excoluerunt, nec sane alibi per Europam humanitatis, literarum, et elegantiae cultus nisi ubi illi imperarunt.

>(For wheresoever the Romans were victours, they brought them whom they conquered to civility; neither verily in any place else throughout Europe was there any civility, learning, and elegance, but where they ruled.)

There was a problem with the theory that the Irish had needed Roman civilisation. Camden recognised that Ireland had once been a centre of learning, to which the Anglo-Saxons had flocked “tanquam ad bonarum literarum

---

131 C 726 H *Hibernia* 1.
132 Camden 1590, 751.
133 Holland’s translation keeps a separate pagination including the Scottish and these later sections
134 C 729 H *Ireland* 66.
mercaturam”, even to learn writing as demonstrated by the similarity of Irish and Anglo-Saxon scripts, writing the *sine qua non* of being a civilised person. He knew that Ireland had flourished intellectually, while letters in the rest of the Christian world had lain neglected and half buried. He resorts to a theological explanation for this subsequent loss of culture, *optimi maximi rectoris providentia*, which, by use of a poetic conceit, he suggests here acts in a random way. The present state of Ireland is “rudis, semibarbæ et politioris literaturæ ignara”. Nor did it have that ancient historical material which so fascinated Camden. Its history was medieval. It also suffered the defect, which marred Camden’s account of Scotland, that Camden had never walked the land, his view is from the outside, but whereas it is clear that Camden had difficulty summoning interest in Scotland, or had good reason to fear his lack of knowledge of Scotland, he was seriously engaged with Ireland. There is both what Ireland was, and what it represented for Camden. I merely touch on both issues, by way of a few references and observations.

Leinster is the centre of *humanitas* in Ireland, “Fertilis et frugifera est terra, mitissimo coelo, et incolae ad humanitatem et cultum vicinae Angliae, e qua magna ex parte orti, quam proxime accedunt”,135 fertile with a good climate, its inhabitants inclining to the civilised behaviour and culture of neighbouring England, from which most of them came and which was close at hand, the bridgehead to conquest one might say as Kent had been with regard to a Roman continent. The capital city is Dublin, “emporium nobilissimum et primae iustitiae forum, moenibus validum, aedificiis splendidum, civibus frequens” (This is the roiall City and seat of Ireland, a famous towne for Merchandize, the chiefe Court of Justice, in munition strong, in buildings gourgeous, in Citizens populous),136 all the qualifications required for a great, civilised settlement, and recently, endowed by Elizabeth with a new college, Trinity, on an old monastic site, and a fine library. These it was hoped would make Dublin a market place of good letters. Ulster on the other hand illustrated unregenerate Ireland with the characteristics of a country destined for colonisation.

Regio ampla, multis et immensis stagnis interfusa, immanibus sylvis umbrosa, alicubi ferax, alicubi macra, viriditate tamen ad aspectum ubique iucunda et pecoribus passim oppleta. Sed ut regio sine subactione inhorrescit, ita incolarum ingenia sine humaniori cultura maxime efferantur.

135 C 744 H *Ireland* 84.
136 C 751 H *Ireland* 92.
It was alluring, with too many cattle, characteristics of a nomadic people, with not enough agriculture, that is settlement and culture.137

Donegal is the last place mentioned in this Irish chorography, and at the end of the account of Donegal, in a graphic coda, comes an advertisement for English colonisation, prefaced by some bold political statements, though we like Holland, may struggle to extract the correct meaning from providentiam damnosam. Holland’s solution when in doubt is to translate twice.

Nec sane in re quavis alia magis desideratur (modo loqui liceat) Regum Angliae pietas et prudentia, quam quod hanc Provinciam, imo totam Hiberniam, in religione propaganda, Republica constituitenda, et incolarum vita ad humanitatem excolenda tot iam seculis negligentius habuerint; an per supinam socordiam, parsimoniam, aut providentiam damnosam non dixer. Ne diutius autem neglegatur ipsa suo iure efflagitare videtur, quae Insula est tanta, tam vicina, tam ubere gleba, tam pascauis supra fidem laeta, tot sylvis obsita, tot metallorum venis, modo quis scrutaretur, dives, tot fluminibus irrigua, tot portus circumcincta ad navigationes in opulentissimas regiones tam opportuna, et inde vectigalibus quae est futura, hominumque altrix tam foecunda, qui sive animos sive corpora spectemus, ad omnia pacis bellici munia usui esse potuerunt singulari.

(And verily in no one thing whatsoever [pardon this my over-boldnes] have the Kings of England beene more defective in pietie and policie, than that they have for these so many ages seene so slightly to this Province, yea and to all Ireland, in the propagation of religion, establishing the weale publicke, and reducing the life of the inhabitants to civility, whether it was for carelesse neglect, sparing, or a forecast of dammage, or some reason of state, I am not able to say. But that the same may be no longer thus neglected, it seemeth of it selfe by good right to importune most earnestly, being an Iland so great, so neere a neighbour, so fruitfull in soile, so rich in pastures more than credible, beset with so many woods, enriched with so many mineralles [if they were searched], watered with so many rivers, environed with so many

137 C 762. Holland Ireland 104–105 paraphrases, “A large country, bespred with many and those very large loghes or lakes, shaded with many and thicke woods, in some places fruitfull, in others baraine, howbeit fresh and greene to see to in every place, and replenished with cattaile. But as the country for want of manuring is growne to be rough, so the naturall dispositions of the people, wanting civill discipline, are become most wilde and barbarous. Con O’Neale cursed all his posterity, in case they either learned to speake English, or sowed wheat, or built houses: being sore affraied, least by these inducements the English might bee allured to enter againe into their lands and possessions: often saying the language bred conversation, and consequently their confusion, that wheat gave sustenance with like effect: and by building they should doe but as the crowe doth, make her nest, to bee beaten out by the hawke”; H Ireland 120.
havens, lying so fit and commodious for sailing into most wealthy countries, and thereby like to be for impost and custom very profitable, and, to conclude, breeding and rearing men so abundantly as it doth, who, considering either their minds, or their bodies, might be of singular employment for all duties and functions as well of warre as of peace, if they were wrought and conformed to orderly civilitie.)

Contextually it is appropriate that from here Camden goes on to give a long account of the rebellion of the O’Neills, which was however contemporary history, not even medieval history. He says he includes this account, which he has “compendiously collected” from his Annales, where events in Ireland are a yearly refrain, to honour the memory of an old friend, probably Burghley.

He concludes the section on Ireland with the insertion of a medieval chronicle of an outrageously old fashioned kind, covering the years 1152 to 1370, which brings out the brutality of the country, as could a medieval chronicle on England. Between the two chronicles, and found also in the 1590 edition, is what one might call an anthropology of the Irish. It is entitled Hibernicorum mores, veteres et recentes. The testimonies of the veteres have just three representatives, headed by Strabo who claimed to know about their cannibalism and incest, and indeed incestuous cannibalism. The recentes have has their chief spokesperson Giraldus Cambrensis, a party to the early Norman invasions of Ireland. He had to be for Ireland what Caesar was to England. The effect is to make the early modern Irish interesting, but strange and primitive, the kind of people about whom the new historians

---

138 C 773 H Ireland 118.
139 Sean O’Neill (c.1530–1567) was the youngest son of Conn O’Neill who had on Irish terms been a king or chieftain in Ulster but had to settle with Elizabeth to becoming according to an English settlement, Earl of Tyrone. Sean fought his way to this Ulster chieftainship, but desired recognition as Earl of Tyrone. Elizabeth granted this. He promised Elizabeth, as quoted by Christopher Maginn in his ODNB article, that his people “will fall to civilitie and hereafter be faithfull obedient and trew subjectes”. A rift however was created between Elizabeth and Sean by the queen’s advisers with a view to removing Sean by military means. When this failed, Sean came to London with his followers in their Gaelic array as described below. A reaffirmation of Sean’s position was made, but the machinations continued, leading to what has been called the revolt of the O’Neills and the death of Sean.
140 Dana Sutton suggests he refers to Burghley on the strength of the phrase “quem vi-vum colui”, a view which Holland’s translation reinforces, “whom while hee lived I observed with all respect”.
141 C 788 H Ireland 140. The three witnesses are Strabo, Pomponius Mela and Solinus.
142 Gerald de Barry (c.1146–1220/23), an ecclesiastic of impeccable noble Anglo Norman Welsh ancestry, descendants of whom were to become founders of one of the most distinguished Irish families, the FitzGeralds. Gerald served Henry II for twelve years and was dogged for much of his life by an ambition to become Archbishop of St. David’s, the Welsh metropolitan see, which he hoped would become independent of Canterbury.
on America could have talked. Indeed in his Annales Camden has for the year 1562 a marvellous description of the bodyguard, which accompanied Sean O’Neill to court, so like those ancient Scottish Goths in their dress:

\[ \text{cum securigero Galloglassorum satellitio, capitibus nudis, crispatis cincinnis dependentibus, camisiis flavis croco vel humana urina infec-} \\
\text{tis, manicis largioribus, tuniculis brevioribus, et larcernis villosis;} \]

(with a Guard of Ax-bearing Galloglasses, bare-headed, with curled hair hanging downe, yellow surplices dyed with Saffron, or mans stale, long sleeves, short coates, and hairy mantles.) \(^{143}\)

One detects a sly note in Camden’s Latin. The English, whom he suggests were a little provincial themselves, in the early Elizabethan period, and even now, gawped at them in wonder, as they would nowadays at Chinese or Americans (Chinenses et Americanos).

There were problems with Camden’s aspirations for Ireland. When he talks of the great potential in the Irish population for service in peace or in war, he for the moment puts to the back of his mind two problems which concerned him. The first was that the English, who had manpower deficiencies, were already employing the Irish as soldiers in their wars, with the consequence that in any Irish rebellion they found themselves confronting men, trained by themselves in modern warfare, able to resist assimilation. \(^{144}\)

Secondly the assumption of colonialism is that the natives become like us. A concern for Camden was the English in Ireland often “went native”. \(^{145}\) Camden was hoist by his own petard. This could prompt us to ask to what extent in the Romano-British miscegenation in mainland Britain at the end of the Roman empire, the sentiments of the resultant stock, in ways that can no longer be detected, might have remained essentially British, a product of their environment and an underlying culture.

**Embracing the ocean; Camden’s imperial Odyssey**

In what was now the final section of the Britannia he launches out from Ireland, into the seas which Britain embraces, to visit the islands, to conduct an Odyssey, we might say, among a variety of islands, which for good or bad, and usually good, are exemplary. He fears to be dashed on the rocks or to be overwhelmed by the waves of ignorance, but daring will be the captain of

\(^{143}\) C 1612, Ann. 1562, 78. The translation is that of Richard Norton used by Dana Sutton to create his bilingual edition of the Annales.

\(^{144}\) Camden 1612 Ann. 1587, 476.

\(^{145}\) C 757 on the Berminghams, who, like people who having forgotten their birth, had slipped into Irish barbarism and scarcely acknowledged that they were English; C 761 the Burkes married into the Irish, put aside their English culture and donned Irish manners. Camden 1612 Ann. 1580, 311; Camden 1627, Ann. 1598, 173.
his ship.\textsuperscript{146} It is in fact going to be a speculative trip which will include fabulous islands, or islands with an interesting historical tale to tell. First he gives a general summary of the islands of Britain from Plutarch, out of Demetrius, mysterious sacred islands inhabited by demons who control the elements, and where Saturn lies drugged in sleep guarded by Briareus\textsuperscript{147} and comments

\begin{quote}
\textit{sic libuit olim, ut etiam hodie, de locis remotissimis miranda et fabulosa quadam mentiendi securitate audacter confingere.}
\end{quote}

(Thus they took pleasure in old time, as now also at this day, boldly to devise strange wonders and tales of places far remote in a certaine secure veine of lying, as it were, by authority.)

Holland faced with the strange phrase “quadam mentiendi securitate” translates it twice, first with the opaque rendering “secure veine of lying” and then “by authority”. Camden having confronted a voyage on which he might be dashed on the rocks, a journey which had political implications, will on second thoughts be protected by the imaginative guise of his narrative. Holland hints he may also have a passport. Both Camden’s final Latin edition and Holland’s translation are dedicated to King James, among his other offices, “publicae securitatis authori”.\textsuperscript{148}

There are imperial designs in most of Camden’s island visits. He made almost the same trip in the 1590 edition but some islands have now been lost. Anglesey, for example, was scarcely an island. It was also regarded by the Welsh, as their mother country. Camden restores it to the Welsh while dismantling their claims to it. Anglesey means the English island; it contained remains of ancient Irish cottages and had been troubled by the Norwegians, so it was not as Welsh as the Welsh might like\textsuperscript{149} The Isle of Wight too was returned to the mainland, as was Canvey Island, whose distinction was that they had milk youths instead of milkmaids,\textsuperscript{150} as was Sheppey the island of his one time patron Hoby, no longer required. Thanet, dear to the English, and entry point for both them and the Romans, no longer physically an island, remained in the Britannia an island, a memorial

\begin{itemize}
\item \[\text{\textsuperscript{146} C 837 H British Ilands 201.}\]
\item \[\text{\textsuperscript{147} C 837 H British Ilands 201–202. See Plutarch De defectu oraculorum 419E.}\]
\item \[\text{\textsuperscript{148} Camden ends the account of the Ilands with the tale of Oleron, the statement of Pomponius Mela on the history of this island being sufficient authority. Holland translates Camden then adds a pedantic paragraph of his own, where he says his authority is the Lord great Admiral of England, and gives a potted history of English ownership of the neighbouring French territorie. H British Ilands 232, cf. C 859–860.}\]
\item \[\text{\textsuperscript{149} C 540–541 H 672.}\]
\item \[\text{\textsuperscript{150} C 318 H 441, “which I have seene young lads taking womens function, with stooles fastened into their buttokes to milke”}\]
\end{itemize}
also to that prophet of geological change, and Roman civilisation, John Twyne,¹⁵¹ and with it the Godwin Sands long since lost to the sea, which perhaps had never been an island. A large number of beautiful but insignificant islands, mainly famous as bird haunts, remain in the text. More important islands, such as the Hebrides are too quickly passed over, bought by the Scottish nation from the Norwegians, an unproductive place, source of the troublemakers, who poured every summer into Ulster to kill and pillage.¹⁵²

The Isle of Man had once been an object of Scots aggression, on one of the routes from Scotland to Ireland, as shown by another of Camden’s intrusions the *Chronicon Regum Manniae*, covering the period 1066–1318, taken from an old manuscript, with a pendant by Camden bringing it up to the modern day.¹⁵³ The chronicle is a boring account of squalid warfare, but the modern Isle of Man was different, a strange place, which was Irish with a flavour of Norwegian,¹⁵⁴ it was in fact a natural centre for an Irish Sea thalassocracy, and even in Camden’s time Don Juan of Austria, with the encouragement of recusants and the Guises had, according to Camden, considered using it as a base to invade England or Western Scotland, because of its proximity to Catholic populations in Ireland, western Scotland and northern England.¹⁵⁵ It was now under the control of the Early of Derby¹⁵⁶ who had invested heavily in its security. It had its own peculiar language, which turns out to be Scottish Gaelic in the North and Irish Gaelic in the South. We are told the wealthier people took their lead from Lancaster, they were religious, which meant Anglican, peace-loving, and deplored the great disturbance

¹⁵¹ Twyne’s work has never been translated, but he stands between Camden and the Welsh antiquarians, Price and Lhuyd, representing an English and pro-Roman viewpoint on British antiquities.

¹⁵² C 848 H British Islands 215–216.


¹⁵⁴ C 838 H British Islands 204.

¹⁵⁵ Camden 1612, Ann. 1577, 267. Mary Guise (1515–1560) was mother of Mary Queen of Scots. The Guise family were leaders in France of the Catholic opposition to the Protestant Huguenots, among the movers of the Bartholomew’s Day massacre. They had aspired to the French throne through marriage alliance with Philip II of Spain.

¹⁵⁶ Despite their title as earls of Derby the Stanley family were essentially a Lancastrian family with possessions in Lancashire, Cheshire, North Wales and the Isle of Man. Their first loyalty may have been Lancastrian, but during the conflict between Lancastrians and Yorkists Lord Thomas Stanley (c.1433–1504), contrived to stand on whichever side was in the ascendant. He commanded powerful forces, which were needed by whomever was king, to secure the North West, a strategic area, which Stanley managed to preserve from the worst kind of destruction during the conflict, earning his people’s gratitude. He effectively put Henry Tudor on the throne by refusing to participate in the Battle of Bosworth, at which he was present as a notional ally of Richard III. He was married to Henry Tudor’s mother, who on becoming Henry VII, created Stanley, Earl of Derby. For these and other detail see *ODNB* article by Michael Bennett.
they saw in the countries around them. These it should be said were the views of John Meyrick who was bishop of Sodor and Man, which meant that in theory he was bishop of much reformed Man but also the trouble makers who lived in the Western Isles, since that is where Sodor lay. Man had its own extraordinary, peculiar legal system, and method of execution.¹⁵⁷

Man nonetheless was now within the colonising ambience of the English.

The Farne Island off the coast of Northumberland on the east coast of England is of much less strategic significance than Man, being nowadays another of those groups of beautiful small islands famous as the haunts of birds. Camden however gives it symbolic value by recalling Bede’s (672/3–735) life of Cuthbert (635–687). Cuthbert was the patron saint of the northern English and Bede the first English historian. Camden quotes from Bede in a glancing way as he hurries on his journey round Britain, recalling Cuthbert’s imperium there, the city he erected, and the amazing house he built to concentrate his mind on heaven. If Camden’s reader had been induced to return to Bede’s text, as some no doubt were, Bede tells us much more that is pertinent to the present theme. After a training in the solitary spiritual life on Lindisfarne, Cuthbert went to live on the Farne island, which is described as a remote island towards the east, enclosed by the deep and limitless ocean on all sides (“ad Eurum secreta, et hinc altissimo, et inde infinito clauditur oceano”), but not as remote as Bede paints it. No one before Cuthbert, this servant of the Lord, had had the power to live there as a colonus. He had to rout the phantastias daemonum who lived there. These devils are then described as tyrants, which might remind readers of Gildas of the tyrants who had destroyed Britain. This soldier of Christ, when he had

¹⁵⁷ C 839 H British Islands 204–205. Meyrick derives from Maurice. The Welsh form of the name is Meurig and the most common, more anglicised, variant on the name is Morris. The Welsh are portrayed by their Elizabethan contemporaries as being too interested in their ancestry. Consequently we know that John Meyrick (1537/8–1599) was the illegitimate son of Owen ap Hugh ap Meyrick of Bodorgan, Anglesey, and Gwenllian, daughter of Evan of Penrhyndeudraeth, Merioneth. Anglesey was along the old sea routes, the island next to Man, so when he was appointed to the bishop of Sodor and Man, he might be already have been familiar with Man, though Sodor deep in Scottish Catholic territory posed different problems. Stephen Wright in his ODNB articles gives us the invaluable information that Meyrick sent Camden his account of Man in 1585 and that it had been written as a rebuttal of an attack made in Raphael Holinshed’s Chronicles of England that the people of Man were primitive and exploited by the Earl of Derby. It gives us an indication of how Camden might have sometimes flattered powerful men in the provinces. Meyrick was no ordinary Welshman, having been educated at Winchester School and New College Oxford, both elite institutions. This and the spelling of his name are an indication of the ongoing anglicisation of the Welsh.
overcome the army of the tyrants, was made sole ruler of the land to which he had come, and he founded a city suitable for his imperial rule and erected the houses which were perfectly appropriate for this city (“miles Christi, ut devicta tyrannorum acie monarchus terræ, quam adierat, factus est, condidit civitatem suo aptam imperio, et domos in hac æque civitati congruas erexit”). The city was in fact a monastery, which means to say that a well run monastery could have civic virtues, which Cuthbert, this ancient Anglo-Saxon saint, had in abundance. Nonetheless he was a monk and there was a round building where he could withdraw from this world, with walls which prevented him from looking out and being corrupted by the lasciviousness of his eyes and of his thoughts, so that he were forced to look heavenwards (“quatenus ad cohibendam oculorum simul et cogitatum lasciviam, ad erigendam in superna desideria totam mentis intentionem, pius incola nil de sua mansione præter cœlum posset intueri”).

This last is the section which Bede, a respecter of early monasticism, quotes in full, but it is mere part of a more expansive tale.

Orkney which had only come into possession of the Scottish nation in recent times, and was of strategic importance, was given serious historical and geographical treatment. Sometimes simple chorography is not enough. Orkney is on the northern approaches, and a key to the defence of Britain. The western approaches, where Ireland was thought of as British, was well defined and had been guarded, but in the north was a vast sea, which had in recent times been dominated by the Scandinavians, an important route to new worlds. In geographical mythology Ultima Thule had been the limit of the known world in the north. In the 1590 edition by long argument Camden claims to show that Thule was the Shetlands, again islands which had recently come into Scottish possession, and therefore metaphorically peoples of Britain commanded the northern limits of the known world. In 1607 we find the same set of arguments but not the same determination to press the claim. Further north than Shetland was, according to Plutarch, a British isle, clearly in a sea of ice, where Cronos, that is Saturn, lay imprisoned in his sleep. Camden suggests that this was emblematic for an island with concealed mineral wealth, release of which, we might extrapolate, would usher in a golden Age. There also was the Isle of the Dead to which

---

158 C 851–852 H *British Islands* 220–221. I quote from the Latin of Bede which Camden uses. The passages are from chapter 17 of the life. I am grateful to the Online Library of Liberty at http://oll.libertyfund.org for being able to find a Latin text of this life.

159 C 848–850 H *British Islands* 216–217.


162 C 851 H *British Islands* 220.
British seamen conveyed the souls of the dead. As he came down the eastern side of Britain Camden was short of islands, so he gently fingers other people’s islands, some, as he says, obviously belonging to the Danes, but others, as he gets nearer the launching points of the ancient Anglo-Saxons, were almost British. He spends an inordinate amount of time trying to deduce what a ruin called the Huis te Britten meant, and clearly he is mentally trying to gain a foothold in Europe near the Rhine. The English famously in Elizabeth’s time tried to creep back into France and they spent a long time fighting in Brittany on the behalf of French Protestant interest. The great success story was the Channel Islands, and Camden devotes more space to them in the 1607 edition. They guarded Britain just a few miles from the French coast. They are described as stretching out by the French shore, *praetentae*. The Roman fortresses which had protected the civilised British in the Roman conquest of Britain, and which had developed sometimes into cities, were called *praetenturae*. Camden’s chorographical description of these islands make them exemplary islands, the Phaeacia of his *Odyssey*. Guernsey has a special dispensation, a place where the enemy, French and others, are allowed to trade even during the heat of war.

From the Channel islands Camden bends his course back towards the British mainland, to Cornwall, from where the chorography of the *Britannia* had begun, and passes on from Cornwall, appropriately to the Scillies, which he suggests are the Cassiterides, or Tin Islands, the lure which brought first the Phoenicians, or as described by Avienus the men of Tarshish, colonists of the Carthaginians, to Britain, followed eventually by the Romans. It is perhaps the place where the older civilisations became aware of Britain. The island men themselves are described by Avienus as great traders, who amazingly sailed the vast oceans in boats of leather, the British coracle, the Irish corragh. There was an image of them as simple folk dressed in long black cloaks, who did not use money, but traded by exchange of goods, very religious and skilful in foretelling the future. When they felt the time had come to die, they flung themselves off rocks, Camden suggests because they were of the Druid persuasion. Islands were clearly places where one could experience the supernatural. Camden friend of...
Richard Hakluyt, would have learned about the shamans of insular America and the simple ways of the Amerindians.

Camden sails on from the Scillies, his horizon being the seas which stretch to the the Pyrenees, since Pomponius Mela, a Spaniard who should know the truth of these things, said that the Pyrenees jutted out into the British Ocean, which Camden interprets to mean that British naval power must have reached at least to the Spanish border. In the 1590 edition the introductory section on the Oceanicus Britannicus is undeveloped, without its separate heading and there is no mention of Mela, whereas in the 1607 there is also much more on the commodities of the British Ocean especially on it pearls, which make it seem a rival to the Indies. He sails towards his Spanish mark, passes Usshant which had indeed been in waters which were once British, said in ancient times to have been populated by Bacchants, vowed to perpetual virginity, enchantresses able to control the sea and its elements, to turn themselves into the shapes of any creatures, to heal any maladies and foresee the future, in their celebrations superior Bacchants to the Bacchants of the Far East who danced with Lyaeus near the Ganges. Other neighbouring islands were inhabited by the Veneti, the Gallic race, said to be related to the Venetians. The Veneti had inhabited what was later known at Little Britain, and with technically advanced ships had fought Caesar on the sea. Camden finally comes to rest at the island of Oleron in the Gulf of Aquitaine, which in the time when the kings of England were the dukes of Aquitaine, attained such a distinction for its naval science and achievements, that in 1266 laws were passed here, by which these seas were governed, as effectively as the ancient Mediterranean by the laws of Rhodes, a vision for the British, later effectively promoted by John Selden, antiquarian and lawyer, Camden’s associate, in his Mare Clasum. His chorographical journey accomplished, like a sailor who on escaping shipwreck fulfills his vows to Neptune, Camden, the good Roman, the interpreter of inscriptions, makes his dedication to DEO OPTIMO MAXIMO ET VENERANDAE ANTIQUITATI, a politic SOLI DEO GRATIA being added after the end of his work.

---

168 C 712 H Oceanus Britannicus 60.
169 Camden 1590, 675–676.
170 C 858–859 H British Ilands 231–232.
172 Holland Christianises Deo Optimo Maximo by translating “Almighty and Most Gracious God”.
Bibliography


Camden, William 1695, *Britannia, newly translated into English, with large additions and improvements; publish’d by Edmund Gibson*, London.


Miles, David 2006, *The Tribes of Britain: Who are we? And where do we come from?*, London.


Twyne, John (Ioannes Twinus) 1590, *De Rebus Albionicis, Britannicis atque Anglicis Commentarium*, London.

Old English or Gael? Personal, Cultural and Political Identity in Dermot O’Meara’s Ormonius

By Keith Sidwell

Dermot O’Meara’s didactic-epic Ormonius, published in 1615, focuses upon the military career of the 10th Earl of Ormond, Thomas Butler. In doing so, however, it also negotiates, sometimes subtly, sometimes rather bluntly, serious problems of identity, personal, cultural and political (national) caused by the peculiar circumstances of those, like Butler and his poet O’Meara, born in the Kingdom of Ireland, with strong local ties and an affection for the Irish language, in a period when the policies of the English government were more and more inclined towards centralisation and Anglicisation.

Until I started to think about this paper and look at Dermot O’Meara’s five book epic didactic poem of 1615 from the perspective demanded by the theme of the 2010 Texts and Contexts conference, if asked “what is Ormonius about?”, I would probably have replied “the military career of “Black” Tom Butler, 10th Earl of Ormond”.1 In one sense, of course, this is true. The poem’s narrative takes us from his earliest success, against Sir Thomas Wyatt, the Kentish knight who led a rebellion against Queen Mary in the south of England in 1554, through his suppression of various Irish rebellions from the 1550s to the 1580s, to his military contribution to the crown’s victory in the Nine Years War in Ireland in the late 1590s and early 1600s. If asked “what was it written for?”, I would have reiterated the view of David Edwards, my historian co-author on the edition of the poem to appear later this year as Officina Neolatina I from Brepols Publishers, and answered “to publicize the claim of Ormond to have played a major part in the defeat of Hugh O’Neill and thereby to help prop up the position in Ireland of the Butler family under a new dynasty, the Stuarts”: for although Ormond’s mili-

---

1 For Thomas Butler’s life see Edwards 2004.
tary career fell wholly within the reigns of Mary and Elizabeth, the poem was written (between 1609 and 1614) under the rule of King James I of England (the VI of Scotland). What I had not really begun to examine before, though, was precisely how O’Meara attempted to get across this vital message in support of an Irish noble, in a period when English policy in Ireland was increasingly one of an Anglicization and centralization of government even more pronounced than that of Elizabeth I. The answer to this question is in fact completely bound up with the issues of identity – personal, religious and political – which O’Meara was obliged to confront. In the first place, the Irish were largely reckoned politically untrustworthy, whether they came from the original Gaelic-speaking population or from the descendants of the 12th century Anglo-Norman conquerors usually referred to as “Old English”. Secondly, both of these types of Irish people had remained stubborn adherents of Catholicism, despite the English realm’s increasing acceptance – and then imposition – of Protestantism and this increased the general prejudice against all inhabitants of Ireland. Thirdly, rebellion against the crown appeared endemic in Ireland and even where there was support for the monarch, it was still largely based upon the self-interest of those who held power in a system of independent jurisdictions – like Ormond’s Tipperary Liberty – which English policy now sought increasingly to limit by subjection to Vice-Regal authority, exercised from Dublin. In order to state Ormond’s case effectively, then, O’Meara had to find a way of appeasing the basic prejudices of his projected audience – probably the courtiers of King James and even the King himself, a pupil of Buchanan, who was well versed in the learned language. He also needed to equip both himself (as poet) and Ormond (as the subject of his epic) with identities which would do justice to their sense of place, language and culture, but not conflict with the religious and political ideologies and policies of the crown. In one very real sense, then, Ormonius can really be said to be about identity and its negotiation.

The main categories which are crucial to an understanding of the Ormonius’ treatment of identity are basically three – as I suggested above – personal, religious and political. But the first has several components, not all of which can be properly evidenced from the poem or elsewhere for either the poet or his subject, let alone the target audience. Under this head I would count the following: name, place, language and culture. The second category – religious identity – has only two possible poles within the Irish-

---

3 For the political background in the specific context of the Ormond Lordship, see Edwards 2003, 201–332.
English-Scottish context: Catholic or Protestant. Political identity, however, is more potentially varied. There is the independent Irish Gael, who does not accept the authority over him of the English crown. Then again, there is the independent Scottish Gael, who sees his history as stemming from Ireland, but likewise spurns the Scottish and English authorities. There is the Old English Irishman, who does generally accept the authority of the crown, but may be resistant to centralization. And there is his counterpart, the Gaelic Irishman who is submissive to English rule, but likewise is volatile if his local independence is threatened and linguistic Anglicization is imposed. Finally, there is the New English settler in Ireland, who naturally accepts both the authority of the crown, the centralization of governmental control and the policy of linguistic Anglicization. Let us now discuss these categories in turn in relation to the poet, the subject, Thomas Butler, and (at the end) the target audience.

Let us look first of all at how the poet himself locates his personal identity. His choice of how to name himself is interesting: *Dermitius Meara*. He keeps the Irish forename (Dermot) in a form which closely imitates the Gaelic form of the word, Diarmuid, with the ending –*itius* reflecting the vowel –*i* and the narrow consonant –*d*, but conforming to classical stereotypes (e.g. Vettius). But he foregoes the derivative prefix (Ó “from”) which normally (along with Mac “son of”) identifies surnames as Gaelic Irish. That he did not have to do this is shown clearly enough by the citation of his name as *Omearius* by John Lynch in the *Alithinologia* of 1664. His choice is, however, in conformity with that of Anthony Wood when he lists Irish alumni of Oxford in his *Athenae Oxonienses*. It’s reasonable to suggest, I think, that O’Meara not only Latinizes, he also Anglicizes his surname. However, when we turn to notions of *place*, O’Meara is not at all shy. On the Title Page he announces himself as: *Dermitius Meara Ormoniensis, Hybernus*. This shows him proudly claiming in *Ormoniensis* a local affiliation to Ormond, Butler’s territory in the south of Ireland, but also a national identity as *Hybernus* Irishman. In the prefatory *Letter to Thomas Butler* and *Ad Lectorem*, O’Meara intensifies the local aspect by admitting the indebtedness of himself and his family to the present Earl of Ormond and his ancestors. O’Meara’s vernacular linguistic identity is, of course, subordinated

---

4 Ormonius, Title Page.
5 Lynch 1664, p. 19: *Omearius in ormonio*.
6 E.g. Elias Sheth (= O’Shee), Wood 1813–1820, i, 386.
7 *Letter to Thomas Butler* l. 31–35: “Cumque decus omne meum meorumque, quantulumcumque sit, ab Amplitudinis tuae illustriumque tuorum Maiorum benignitate acceptum obliuiisci nequiem, meum esse duxi praecipuo illas suas laudes, quas admiranda virtute comparasti, aeternae consecrare memoriae”. (And since I could not forget that my whole standing, and that of my family, little as it may be, was received through the benignity of
in a Latin work to his membership of the *Respublica Litterarum*, but as I have shown elsewhere, he delights in flaunting – for those in the know – his native language, Irish.\(^8\) He clearly also knows English, however, and uses it, for example, in a marginal note to clarify the English name of the River Blackwater.\(^9\) And he announces his pride in his Oxford education on the Title Page by the phrase *Insignissimae Oxoniensis Academiae quondam alumnus*. I am not certain how well he knew the English language at this point, however. He uses an English word “pricevine” which I have been unable to find in the Oxford dictionary (the usual term even then was “prisage”).\(^{10}\) Of course, his studies in Oxford would not have been affected by inadequate English, since Latin was the University’s spoken and written language, though his dealings with fellow-students and especially with Oxford locals (and in Oxford locals!) might have. The main point is that here he makes an effort to be even-handed in his use of the two languages of Ireland, demonstrating that he does not hold one in favour over the other. As for culture, apart from this poem and a medical treatise on hereditary diseases published (in Latin) in 1619,\(^{11}\) we have not enough knowledge of his other activities to do more than place him where he places himself, at the heart of an educated European elite whose inspiration reaches back into the age of Cicero and beyond.

Unsurprisingly, perhaps, O’Meara’s treatment of Ormond’s personal identity is not dissimilar from his own, *mutatis mutandis*. Though the name most often used in the poem is O’Meara’s newly coined *Ormonius* (usually *Ormondus* in Irish Latin prose and poetry) and relates to his Earldom, his birth name, Thomas Butler, is given in various headings and appears many times in the Latinized form *Butlerus*, used as an adjective (e.g. *Butlera iuventus*) or a noun.\(^{12}\) But it is also made clear in Mercury’s speech in book 1 where he displays to Ormond his ancestors and explains his lineage, that the Butlers are of English origin, as is clearly indicated by the fact that Butler is

---

\(^8\) Sidwell 2010. E.g. *Ormonius, Argumentum II*, l. 16–17: “apud Campanae villam (Hybernice baille in chluig)” (at the town of Ballyclug [in Irish *baille in chluig*].)


\(^{10}\) *Ormonius, Argumentum II*, l. 6–7: “Vinorum etiam vectigalia (vulgo pricevine)” (The taxes on wines [in the vernacular “pricevine”]).

\(^{11}\) *Pathologia haereditaria generalis*, Dublin 1619.

\(^{12}\) *Ormonius* Title Page: *Thomas Butlerus*. Cf. 1, 325: “Butlerae stirpis” (Of Butler’s line).
the English for *pincerna*.13 This English origin is important, because it establishes a *prima facie* case for Ormond’s loyalty to the English crown. It also recurs in passage *Ormonius* 2, 15f., where Morpheus disguised as Hibernia herself makes play with it. When we turn to place, however, we can see from *Ormonius* 2, 9–12 that just before the mention by Hibernia of Butler’s English origin, she makes it quite clear that he is a native born Irishman.14 O’Meara plays up this Irish identity in book 1 and its *Argumentum*, where he is called variously *Hybernus satrapas*, *Hybernus dux*, *Hybernorum decus*, *Iernorum decus* and *ductor Iernus*.15 It is also significant that these appellations occur only here, in the English book, where Ormond is in London and takes (according to O’Meara anyhow) a crucial role in defeating the completely English Wyatt. As for local connections, Ormond’s various titles, written in headings or offered in poetic form (*Carrigiae dominus*, *Ormoniae Comes*, *Satrapas Tiperarius*) underline, like O’Meara’s own *Ormoniensis* on the Title Page, Thomas Butler’s identification with a quite specific set of places and lands in Ireland.16 The poem does not reveal anything specific about the Earl’s linguistic or cultural identity, but we can make some inferences from the passage from *Ormonius* 1, 168–174, which refers to Ormond’s education alongside Prince Edward at Henry VIII’s court.17 Latin will have been the prime medium of schooling, but his com-

---

13 *Ormonius* 1, 324–328: “Walterum natus sequitur Theobaldus, origo/Butlerae stirpis, Domini donatus honore/Butleri hic primus, regno pincerna quod esset/Regis in Hyberno (pincernam idiomate namque/Denotat Angligenûm Butler)” (Theobald follows Walter, origin/Of Butler’s line: he was the first bestowed/The honour of the Butler Lord, because/He was King’s steward in Hibernia’s realm./For in the language of the Englishmen/”Butler” denotes *pincerna*).

14 “Nate, decus viresque meae, mea gloria magna,/Tantane te subito cepere oblivia nostri,/Tantane Brutiadum telluris gratia, post hac/Vt non nativas digneris visere sedes?” (My honoured son, my glory great./My strength, has such a great forgetfulness/Of me so sudden taken hold of you?/Is pleasure in the land of Brutus’ sons/So great that after this you will not deign/To visit more the place where you were born?)

15 Respectively *Ormonius*, *Argumentum I*, l. 23; 1, 583–584; 1, 621; 1, 698; 1, 632; 1, 670.

16 Ormond’s local titles: *Baro de Arkelo; Carrigiae dominus; Comitatus Palatini Tiperariae Dominus; decus Ormoniae; ducor/dux Ormonius; Dynastas Ormoniae; Ormoniae dominus; Ormoniae et Osoriae Comes; Ormoniae Comes; Ormonius; Satrapas Tiperarius; Tiperarius Heros/ductor; Viscomes de Thurles* (see *Index nominum* in Edwards & Sidwell 2011 for specific references).

17 *Ormonius* 1, 168–174: “At ante alios omnes quo sanguine cretus/Et quibus addictus studiis quasque inhibit artes/Inter regales primis nutritus ab annis/Brutigenûm Musas Henrici regis in aula/Octavi et sexti Edvardi sociusque comesque/In studiis qua prima petit securaque juventutem/Ormoniae monimenta comes dat aperta.” (And yet./Before all others, of what blood begott’n./What studies imbued with, what skills he’d drunk down./Nourished from youth among the Muses royal/Of Brutus’ offspring in King Henry’s court/[The
companions – the future King included – will have spoken English in private and indeed the very reason for his presence at court was to ensure that he was Anglicized linguistically and culturally (as well as politically). David Edwards’ remarks in the Introduction to our edition make it clear, however, that Ormond was also fluent in Irish and the presence of an important Gaelic servant in his retinue shows that his parents had no intention of allowing him to forget this tongue while he was in England.\textsuperscript{18} Later, when he inherited the Ormond titles, he became in fact a well-known patron of poetry. However, he was known as a patron both of Irish-language verse and of English poetry. There are many poems in Irish which laud the achievements of the Earl, for example \textit{Eolach mé ar mheirge an iarla} “Well do I know the flag of the Earl” (written after his death).\textsuperscript{19} As for English, a well-known poem (the \textit{Faerie Queene}) written by a member of the New English settlement in Cork (Edmund Spenser) was dedicated in one version to the Earl in the hope of favour, with the most lavish praise of his poetic interests. Note especially: “Not one Parnassus, nor one Helicone/Left for sweete Muses to be harbourd./But where thy self hast thy brave mansione”\textsuperscript{20}

On the personal side, then, O’Meara deliberately gives the impression of himself and his subject as being placed in, and identifying with, a specific part of Ireland, and of being, by birth, Irishmen – and proud of it! His use of Irish underlines the sense of belonging also to what was largely regarded in England as a barbarous linguistic underclass (one with which we know Ormond also identified). Yet he also makes it clear that the English language is an important part of the Irish landscape\textsuperscript{21} and that Ormond is in fact of English stock, with an English name. Both belong as well as to these two disparate identity groups (born and raised in Ireland, educated in England) to the class of the Latinate, and it is important to stress this alongside, as it were, vernacular identity because the use of Latin for such purposes as those of O’Meara (and Ormond) in \textit{Ormonius} of itself made a claim of identification with its potential \textit{audience} which that audience would be expected to register.

\textsuperscript{18} Edwards & Sidwell 2011, 12.
\textsuperscript{19} MS. Maynooth C. 63.
\textsuperscript{20} Edmund Spenser, \textit{The Faerie Queene}, 1596, dedicatory poem (Roche & O’Donnell 1978, 28).
\textsuperscript{21} See also \textit{Ormonius} 2, 215–217: “immo nec discere quisquam/Angla loqui vellet, nulla ut commercia prorsus/Exosa cum gente forent”. (nor wished/To learn to speak in English, that there be/With that most hated race no intercourse.)
When we move on to religious identity, things become – on the surface at least – a good deal simpler. Though Irish people of both Gaelic and Anglo-Norman origin remained on the whole resolutely Catholic – the Ormond family were not clearly Protestant for example until James Butler (1610–1688), twelfth Earl and first Duke of Ormond – to espouse such an identity publicly would not have been prudent. O’Meara makes it clear that he himself is a Christian by his prayers.  

And the word *Christicola* is used of Ormond in the storm-scene of book 3 which imitates Vergil *Aeneid* 1 and Ovid *Metamorphoses* 10. Beyond these explicit references, however, all we have of a religious nature in the whole poem are O’Meara’s appeal to *Summe Theos* to inspire his work (1, 11–13) and Ormond’s recantation of his Aeneas-like despair during the storm at sea in Book 3 (707f.). All that can safely be said of these is that they are addressed directly to God and do not use intermediaries. They are not, then, specifically *Catholic*, at least, even if they are not overtly Protestant. In other respects, where religion might have been an issue (for example in Wyatt’s rebellion against the Catholic Queen Mary), O’Meara avoids it – like the plague it certainly could have been had he touched on it in any other way than he did.

Far the most important identity negotiated and specifically worked out by the poem, however, is the political one. There are five main points I want to make.

---

22 *Ormonius*, *Letter to Walter Butler*, l. 62–64: “Interea ut boni omnis et sapientiae fons ille faecundissimus Christus Deus tuo semper honori et faelicitati consulat, propitiam ipsius omnipotentiam quam suppliciter precor”. (Meanwhile, that that most fecund source of all good and wisdom Christ our God may always look after your honour and happiness, I pray most humbly to His propitious omnipotence.) *Ormonius*, *Letter to Thomas Butler*, l. 61–63: “Cui ut te Christus Optimus Maximus quam diutissime incolumem seruet, et post huius vitae cursum ad gaudia ducat aeterna, duiniam Maiestatem quam suppliciter posco”. (for which I humbly beseech the divine majesty that Christ, Best and Greatest, keep you safe as long as possible and lead you after this life’s race to the eternal joys.)

23 *Ormonius* 3, 705.

24 *Ormonius* 1, 11–13: “Lux ô clarissima mundi,/Summe Theos, caeptis tua non finita potentas/Adsit, et ipse mei foelix sis carminis Author”. (O highest God, the world’s most brilliant light./Let your infinite power assist my words./Be Thou propitious author of my song.) *Ormonius* 3, 707–712: “O coeli rector pontique solique,/Parce precor dictis subito profusis./Si mea vis Scotico submergi corpora ponto,/Nec mihi das crudis ulcisci funera telis,/Me tibi summitto supplex fiatque lubenti/Velle mihi vestrum”. (O ruler of/The sky, of sea and of the earth, forgive,/I pray, my words, poured forth too suddenly./If thou shouldst wish my body to be drowned/In Scottish waters and thou dost not grant/My bloody sword requital of my death,/I, suppliant-like, submit myself to thee./And pray thy will be done to willing me.) On the latter passage, see further Sidwell 2007, 210–212.
The first is that the poem makes its political perspective absolutely clear in a number of passages. In sum they state that the so-called “Norman” conquest in 1169 and following was legitimate, if violent (Ormonius 1, 123–126); that Ireland and England, despite the initial compulsion, are now so closely tied together that an attack on Ireland can be considered an attack on England (Ormonius 2, 17–21); and that the submission of Ireland to Henry II made by some Gaelic chieftains in 1171 is irreversible (Ormonius 3, 195–196). This is to say, the poem not only accepts the authority of the English crown over Ireland, but it also justifies it.

The second point emerges from a long passage in book 5. Despite the increasing reality of an Ireland regarded as troublesome and pretty far down the pecking order, O’Meara represents England and Ireland as sisters: note especially “Hac ubi germanam sensit marcescere cura/ Anglia” (But when England knew/Her sister was enfeebled by this care: Ormonius 5, 67–68). Once England realises how upset Ireland is about her inability to grant her hero Ormond appropriate honours for what he has done for her, she runs at once to Queen Elizabeth (Elissa) and pleads Ireland’s case before her. The Queen at once consents to honour Butler (he was elected to the Order of the Garter in 1587 and installed at Windsor Castle in 1588). This image of sisterhood, while accepting both the reality of submission to the English crown and the superiority of England, nonetheless seeks to blunt the potential resentment of the Irish by stressing the care England takes of her weaker sibling.

The third and fourth points will give some context for this manoeuvre. The poem sets itself clearly and strongly against rebellion. This can be seen at its most virulent perhaps in book 2, where Shane O’Neill’s Ulstermen are “Barbara adhuc” (still barbarian: Ormonius 2, 213) and violently opposed to English manners, titles and language (Ormonius 2, 213–217). In the speech given to Shane O’Neill (Ormonius 2, 395–396), the Ulster leader even calls Ormond’s loyal attempts to suppress Irish revolts a subjection to “Anglo/servitio” (English servitude). But, though disapproving, O’Meara does show some insight into the rebel mind, because he envisages it as sharing with him a passionate love for the land which no longer belongs to the exiled original settlers. At Ormonius 3, 114–133, his Mercury disguised as the earliest King of Ireland, Herimon, attempts to arouse in the MacDonnell

---

25 Ormonius 2, 393–397: “Haece aequa si fers opprobria mente,/Non prius absistet Satrapas Ormonius armis/Te premere, aeternum quam te subiecerit Anglo/Servitio, mihi crede, nouas vel quaerere terras/Impulerit”. (For if ye bear these ills/With equanimity, then Ormond’s Lord/Will never cease to press by force of arms/Until he has to English servitude/Eternal made you subject, or has forced/You all to find, believe me, pastures new.)
leaders a desire for a war of re-conquest by praising the island’s natural advantages: soil, temperature, honey, cattle, rivers, fish, birds, wild animals, metal deposits – and the lack of poisonous creatures, such as snakes (banished by St Patrick, according to legend). The rebel, then, has as his motivation the absolute desirability of Ireland as a place and paradoxically this underscores the importance of Ormond’s military prowess: he has saved this Garden of Eden for the English crown by his unstinting efforts. But O’Meara does not neglect to reflect contemporary English prejudices against the Irish. The first Butler – Theobald Walter – is given in book 1 a reflection on the Irish proclivity for rebellion (1, 339–340). More sinister, perhaps, is the fact that while Ormond is busy trying to defeat the English rebel Wyatt, two English nobles go to the Queen and claim that he has defected. Significantly, they call him (Ormonius 1, 670) “Ductor Iernus” (The Iernian lord). All this serves, of course, to emphasise Ormond’s extraordinary qualities: though an Irishman, he nonetheless fights loyally for Queen and country, even as an English knight rebels.

There is one final factor in the definition of political identity in O’Meara’s poem which emerges from consideration of the space given to Ormond’s skirmishes against the MacDonnells. This clan, settled in the Western Isles of Scotland – which at that time included Rathlin Island, now part of Northern Ireland, caused some trouble in the 1550s by constant raids into Ulster. But my co-author, David Edwards, says that these raids were of little consequence at the time. In fact, they are little reported in the contemporary sources and not at all well known among modern Irish historians of the period. The reason for their prominence (much of books 2 and 3 and a section of book 5 are devoted to details of Ormond’s dealings with them) is to be found in the target audience for the poem. These were not now just an offshore annoyance from an alien kingdom to the English authorities in Ireland (and some of the Gaelic chieftains too). Since Elizabeth’s death in 1603, the kingdoms of England and Scotland had come under the same monarchical jurisdiction, with the ascension to the English throne of King James VI of Scotland as King James I of England. O’Meara is in a sense rewriting Ormond’s history in the light of this event and also in the knowledge of strenuous efforts made by the Stuart King to subdue the rebellious clans of the Western Isles to his centralised control. The MacDonnells, then, now stand anachronistically as rebels against the Scottish/English crown: note how Sorley Boy is called “dux Scoticus” (Scottish leader:Ormonius 5, 15). But these rebels have, like their Irish counterparts, already been bested

26 Ormonius 1, 339–340: “motus/Quam proni ad varios Hyberni” ([Pondering within] how prone th’ Hibernians were/To various revolts.)
by Ormond. The inference the King should draw is obvious: he ought now look to Ormond’s heirs to continue their great predecessor’s loyalist work.

The set of identities which O’Meara negotiates in *Ormonius* leaves perhaps in the end a slight puzzle. Several passages have O’Meara and his Ormond speak of Ormond’s loyalty to a *patria*. Is this Ireland, where both were born and to which both claim local and island-wide adherence as *Hiberni*? Or is it England, which governs Ireland legitimately, as it has for more than four hundred years, and whose Queens and now King Ormond has served loyally for more than fifty years? I think the answer must be that O’Meara wishes the term to encompass both, though if pressed he would have been obliged to opt for the politically safer response “England”. But what O’Meara is attempting to represent in his negotiations of identity is, I think, somewhat against the grain of contemporary English/Scottish thought and aspiration. His Ireland is a junior partner to England politically, yes, but the relationship is not of master to servant (as Shane O’Neill is made to assert in the poem). It is, rather, a familial one, in which the older sister shows real compassion for her weaker sister. It is also a place than which there is no better on earth (for though he puts these words into a rebel King’s mouth, he is reflecting views which can be seen in the late 16th and early 17th centuries from across the spectrum of Irish Latin writers). Hence, the local and Hibernian identity he gives to himself and his subject stresses that difference from Englishness exists, but is not necessarily in any way threatening to the political status quo: look after all at what Ormond has achieved *both* in England, against Wyatt, and in Ireland (sometimes against his own relatives) in loyal support of the crown. His and Ormond’s interest in the Gaelic language and its poetic culture fit into this sense of Irish identity under the crown quite snugly: so long as room is given by the Irish not only to English royal power, but also to the English language, what harm can it do to allow the continuation of the native linguistic culture? However, none of these positions maintained by O’Meara – some subtly, some with a sledgehammer – was ultimately acceptable to the English, or to the new Scottish King of England. The story of the 17th century in Ireland continued as a struggle by the English to impose Anglicization in governance, law, relig-

---

27 *Epistle to Walter Butler*, l. 41: “pro patriae tutela” (in protection of his fatherland). *Ormonius* 3, 686–687: “Hostibus in mediis sacra pro principe pugnans/ Et patria” (amidst/The enemy, fighting for my sacred Queen/And land). *Ormonius* 3, 712–715: “Tantum tua numina votis/ Supplicibus posco, ut nostra de stirpe domoque/ Succedat nostri vivax imitator, amico/ In patriam et fasces animo”. (One thing with suppliant prayers I ask your powers/That from my stock and house there shall succeed/A long-lived imitator of myself/Of friendly disposition towards his land/And to the crown.)

ition, manners and language and a refusal to accept that loyalty could be ex-
pected or trusted from Irishmen if any of these criteria was left unfulfilled.
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IRISHNESS AND LITERARY PERSONA IN THE DEBATE BETWEEN JOHN LYNCH AND O’FERRALL

By Nienke Tjoelker

In 1664, the Irish priest John Lynch published his Alithinologia as a refutation of a report by the Capuchin Richard O’Ferrall in 1658. Their debate provides two interesting examples of polemical texts written by Irish authors in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The style of both authors reflects their identity, that of an ardent Gaelic supporter of Rinuccini (O’Ferrall) and that of Old English cleric who supports the faction trying to achieve a peace agreement with the English as soon as possible (Lynch). This contribution will sketch the historical background of their debate, and contrast the authors in relation to their background, the content of their works and the form and style of their writings.

Introduction

Qui parti ciuem consulunt, partem negligunt, rem perniciosissimam in ciuitatem inducunt seditionem atque discordiam.1

(Those who care for the interests of a part of the citizens, and neglect another part, introduce a most pernicious thing into the state: sedition and discord.)

With this reproachful quotation from Cicero’s De Officiis I, 85 in his Alithinologia (1664), John Lynch accuses the Capuchin Richard O’Ferrall of sedition through his statements about his Old English fellow-countrymen. The debate between these two Irishmen is an interesting example of the vast corpus of polemical texts written by Irish authors in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In their way of writing, we can see that style and form are used by O’Ferrall and Lynch as a means to promote their ideas. O’Ferrall’s style of writing is closely connected with his identity as an ardent Gaelic supporter of the clerical faction around the nuncio in the Confederation of Kilkenny. Lynch, on the other hand, even though he is also a cleric, finds an

---

1 Lynch 2010, 6, l. 14–15; Lynch 1664, Dedicatory letter.
intelligent way of representing himself both as a pious cleric and a supporter of reaching a peace agreement with the English as soon as possible. Their debate gives us an idea of the genre of polemical writing of this period, but is particularly interesting because of the individual qualities of the authors.

The purpose of this article is to explore how their completely different views on Irish identity, in particular of the Old English, are reflected in the form and style of their works. The first part of this article will sketch the historical background of the debate between Lynch and O’Ferrall. In the second part, both authors will be contrasted in three aspects: in relation to their background and situation, the content of their works, and thirdly in the form and style of their work.

**Historical background**

Lynch’s *Alithinologia* and *Supplementum Alithinologiae* (1667) were part of a controversy of the author with the Capuchin Richard O’Ferrall concerning the role of the Old English in the crisis in Ireland. To understand this debate, one needs to take into account the complicated political and religious situation in Ireland at the time. Seventeenth-century Ireland had a mixed population, consisting of three groups: the native, or Gaelic Irish, the Old English, and the New English. However, each of these groups was a complex cluster of smaller groups from different regions of Ireland. The Gaelic Irish were the oldest. Among them, a distinction existed between the more extreme Ulster Irish, who had become the main victims of the British plantations after the Nine Years’ War (1594–1603), and the Munster Gaelic Irish, who lived in close contact with the Old English.² So also divisions existed among the Old English. The Old English, sometimes also called Anglo-Irish, then the principal landowners in the kingdom, were the descendants of Norman settlers who came to Ireland in the twelfth and thirteenth century. In certain areas, such as Munster, they had become assimilated into aspects of Irish culture, but retained the English language and culture to a great extent. However, the Old English in other areas, such as Dublin, were more ex-
extreme in their views.\(^3\) Dublin was a stronghold of Old English authority, which maintained commercial and political contact with coastal cities along the east and England.\(^4\) Therefore, ethnic tensions existed among Catholics in Ireland, although the ethnic boundaries between them became increasingly blurred through intermarriage and a common interest in religion, land and political power by the beginning of the seventeenth century.\(^5\) Finally, the settlers of the sixteenth and seventeenth century, English, Scots and others, who were mostly Protestant, were called the New English. Through the various plantations, the New English confiscated many lands from the Gaelic Irish and Old English. In particular, a great part of Ulster was confiscated and assigned to English and Scottish settlers in the beginning of the seventeenth century.

Driven into rebellion by a lack of political and economic influence and increasingly angry about the religious discrimination against Catholics in Ireland, the native Irish of Ulster went into revolt in 1641, led by Sir Phelim O’Neill. This forced the hand of the Gaelic Irish further south and of the Old English Catholic community. In an attempt to restore order and stability, the Catholic gentry and nobility forged an alliance. In 1642, the political and religious elite of the Irish Catholic community formed a confederation known as the Confederation of Kilkenny, as they took Kilkenny as their seat of government. In the period from 1642 to 1649, they effectively ruled Ireland, and engaged in a bitter conflict with various factions which represented British rule, such as Scottish, royal and parliamentarian forces. The confederation strongly supported the royalist camp in the developing English civil war, but was forced to negotiate with the English king through intermediaries. During the 1640s, James Butler, the Protestant first duke of Ormond, took part in protracted peace negotiations with the confederates as the king’s representative in Ireland. In the late 1640s, Murrough O’Brien, Lord Inchiquin was also involved in peace negotiations. Internal division within the Confederation complicated these negotiations. Recently, Micheál Ó Siochru has demonstrated convincingly that social status seems to have been essential in determining a person’s political outlook. He proposed a three-party model, distinguishing a peace party, a clerical party, and a loose grouping of non-aligned moderates.\(^6\) The first consisted mostly of wealthy, landed members of the elite, mostly Old Englishmen, who wanted a quick reconciliation with the English throne, retaining as much as possible of the

---

\(^3\) For a general account of this, see Clarke 1966. For an example of a work written from the more extreme Old English perspective, cf. Stanihurst 1584.


\(^5\) Ó Siochru 2008, _Confederate Ireland_, 17.

existing social order. The clergy, on the other hand, were only interested in full restoration of the rights of Catholics in Ireland. They refused a quick settlement without major religious concessions and a significant redistribution of land. A third group, appearing from 1644, strove for a compromise peace settlement, but with significantly better terms than the peace party.

In the period 1645–1649, a conflict concerning the actions of the papal nuncio Giovanni Battista Rinuccini (1592–1653) aggravated the divisions among the confederates. Rinuccini had been sent to Ireland in 1645 by Pope Innocent X to assist the Irish Confederates in their war against English Protestant rule. He strongly supported the clerical faction in the Confederation. Despite protests of the clergy and the nuncio, confederates agreed on a cease-fire with Lord Inchiquin on 20 May 1648. On 27 May 1648, Rinuccini pronounced censures against those who supported the peace treaty.7 Internal tensions relating to these events and other peace settlements eventually resulted in the failure of the Confederation. In February 1649, Rinuccini left Ireland.

The conflict concerning Rinuccini’s censures caused a quarrel which dominated the lives of a generation of Catholic churchmen in Ireland. A controversy as to the causes and circumstances of the failure of the Confederation provides the theme of the debate between Lynch and O’Ferrall. Both address the Lord Cardinals presiding over the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide, the Congregation for the propagation of the faith, established in the Roman curia in 1622. It had authority over Catholic affairs in all countries where the Church was not legally established.

Contrast between the two historians in background and situation

The article by Patrick Corish in 1953 on Lynch and O’Ferrall emphasised the differences in personality, fortunes and background of both historians, and the influence of these on their viewpoints. While O’Ferrall came from a noble Gaelic family of Annaly (county Longford), who had lost all its possessions in the plantation of James I at the beginning of the seventeenth century, John Lynch came from an important Old English family from Galway. O’Ferrall had gone to the Low Countries in the 1630s with Francis Nugent, founder of the Irish Capuchins, studied in Douai and Lille and received the habit in 1634 at the Irish Capuchin convent of Charleville (France). After his return to Ireland, O’Ferrall became active in the politics of the Confederation as an ardent supporter and courtier of Rinuccini, and occupied an important position at Propaganda in Rome. He was sent to Rome to defend Rinuccini’s censures, and played an important part in the controversy con-

7 Ó Siochrá 2008, Confederate Ireland, 177; Corish 1953, 217.
cerning the possible absolution of those excommunicated. From 1658 until his death, he worked on the *Commentarius Rinuccinianus*. This extensive documentation of the nunciature in Ireland of Giovanni Battista Rinuccini (1592–1653) was written between 1661 and 1666 by Richard O’Ferrall and Robert O’Connell.

Lynch on the other hand, after spending his youth in Galway, went to Dieppe, Douai en Rouen where he received further education, and, when he returned to Ireland, became connected as a chaplain to the household of Sir Richard Blake. Blake was mayor of Galway in 1627–1628, and a leading member of the anti-nuncioist party. From 1630 until short before his death, Lynch was archdeacon of Tuam. During his exile in France, where he lived from 1652 or 1653 until his death, he became connected to an ancient Breton family. He published most of his works at the printing press in St Malo.

**Contrast in Content**

Ian Campbell also noted the contrast between the two writers in his recent doctoral thesis on the *Alithinologia* and political thought. He argued convincingly that both Lynch and O’Ferrall in their political thought supported early modern Aristotelian ideas in the form of Ciceronian political humanism, and both opposed Reason of State politics, but did not agree in the application of the term to the Old English. They also differed in their views on several other themes, each using different types of political thought which were common at the time in Europe. Campbell also identified the important role of ethnicity in confederate politics. The Gaelic Irish and Old English shared a common genealogical consciousness, uniting the traditional ideologies of traditional genealogists with Aristotelian doctrines of the transmission of physical and moral qualities. According to the contemporary medical theory, women played no role in this transmission, and this explains why there was still a sharp distinction between the two groups, despite extensive intermarriage. O’Ferrall stressed the ethnic distinction between them. At the start of his report, he divides the current population of Ireland into three groups: “Alii sunt veteres seu antique Regni indigenae, aliis recentiores, aliis denique recentissimi”. (Some are Old or ancient inhabitants of the Kingdom, others more recent, and again others the most recent.) The Old Irish are presented as all having sprung from the same ancient stock, right up to the present day honouring their leaders and the Catholic faith. O’Ferrall states that they were governed by the received faith, and by civil, provincial

---

9 O’Ferrall 2008, 10.
and pontifical law, until the English gradually established their own law in these places. He then proceeds to give a very negative description of the Old English:

Recentiores seu moderni orti sunt vel ex Ostmannis, Nordmannis, Norwegiis, Danis et similibus gentibus collectitiis in civitatibus maritimis negotiorum causa sedem figentibus, instar civium et populi Libernici in Hetruria ex diversis advenis coaliti, vel ex Anglis et Cambris in colonias illuc adductis, vel alio modo ab Anglorum invasione ibi admisset, qui postea Anglorum Ministri fuerunt et instrumenta ad supprimendum Ibernos, ex quorum ruina isti se suasque fortunas erigebant. Unde saepe conquesti sung Iberni, nullam fuisse factam expeditionem, conspirationem, aut aliam (ad Nationis extirpationem) susceptam esse machinationem cujus illi non fuerunt inventores, promotores, vel executors. Hi non in uribus solum maritimis, ubi cum eis conspirarunt gentes illae collectitiae, habitant, sed etiam ruri et in coloniis acquisitis, ubi conantur linguam et mores Anglorum retinere. Unde disparitas et dissimilitude magna inter illos et populum antiquum.10

(The more recent or modern inhabitants have sprung from either the Ostmen, Normans, Norwegians, Danes and a similar rabble of peoples, establishing their abodes in the maritime towns for the sake of trade, after the fashion of the citizens and people of the Liburni in Etruria coalesced from diverse groups of immigrants, or from English and Welsh planted there in colonies, or sent by some other means through the invasion of the English, upon whose ruins they erected themselves and their fortunes. And on this account the irish have often complained that no expedition or conspiracy, or any other machination [for the extirpation of their nation] was undertaken, of which they were not the inventors, promoters, or executors. The latter dwell not only in the maritime towns, where that rabble of peoples united with them, but also in the countryside and in the colonies they have acquired, where they try to preserve the language and customs of the English. Whence there is a great disparity and difference between themselves and the ancient population.)

We see in this fragment how O’Ferrall presented the descent from this combination of peoples as an aspect of their bad character, arguing that it was their Englishness and inherent wickedness that eventually caused the destruction of the Confederation.11 In the next paragraph, and throughout the

10 O’Ferrall 1658, 8r.
11 Note that the reference to the Liburni in Etruria in this quotation seems to be a later addition by a copyist of the report, as it does not occur in Lynch’s quotation of the sentence. (Campbell 2009, 214.) The Liburni, known as pirates, were a people of Illyria,
report, O’Ferrall refers to the Old English by the term politicus, a derogatory term for a Macchiavellian opportunist, who valued profane objects above sacred, and as Anglo-Irish, stating that they call themselves by this name. For O’Ferrall the only real Irishman is a Catholic Gaelic or Old Irishman.

Lynch on the other hand stressed the unity of the Irish. Along with many other Irish intellectuals, such as Geoffrey Keating, Michéal Ó Cléirigh and Dubhaltach Mac Fhirbisigh, he asserted the Irishness of the Sean-Ghall or Old English. Lynch stresses how O’Ferrall is causing discord among his own people by his strict distinctions. Lynch did not deny the descent of the Old English from a group of peoples, but he did try to remove the stains of piracy and atrocity through descent from the Ostmen from the bloodline of the Old English. This can be explained by the already mentioned genealogical tradition, in which dishonour could be passed on through generations. O’Ferrall had used the presence of this group in the genealogy of the Old English to attack the same group. Lynch also attacked O’Ferrall’s use of the word politicus or Catholico-politicus to indicate the Old English, giving the following description of a Catholico-Politicus:

Catholico-politicus ille sit tantum habendus, qui politiae, id est, quae- tus aut ambitionis causa, Catholicam religionem prae se fert, et cui virtus post nummos est, sum autem illi ob Catholicae fidei professionem, compendio multo et honore exciderint, non specie tenus sed reuaera Catholici sunt, ac propter meas Catholico-politici minime nuncupandi.14

(Because only he should be considered a Catholico-politique, who professes the Catholic religion, for the sake of policy, which means for the sake of financial gain or display, and for whom virtue comes after money. But since they lost much gain and honour, because of their profession of the Catholic religion, they are Catholics not for the sake of appearances, but in truth, and for that reason should not be called “Catholico-politiques”.)

Lynch uses the Greek politeia (in Latin transcribed as politia) in the meaning of “political cunning”, for which the word policy was used in early modern English. Throughout the Alithinologia, Lynch consistently calls

whereas Etruria is present-day Tuscany. Nevertheless, the idea fits with O’Ferrall’s presentation of this ethnic group as descendants of a group of peoples without honourable genealogy.

13 “Anglo-Ibernorum, ut ipsi sese vocant”.
14 Lynch 1664, 14–15.
this group the more recent Irish (*recentiores Hiberni*), stating that none of them call themselves Anglo-Irish, but that all the famous writers from that stock call themselves *Hibernus* (Irish). Stanihurst had used the term, he admits, but “only once, so that he could explain more meaningfully a division made by him of Ireland into the English and Irish province [...]”, but in that term he does not include the citizens and townsmen of Ireland, and to the Fingallians themselves he assigned the name of ‘Irishman’”. A marginal note refers to page 30 of the work, which explains that the Anglo-Irish should be distinguished from the Old Irish because of their English origin, but that both groups are closely connected by blood relations and other, because of intermarriage (*domestica connubia*) after a long time. Lynch also uses analogies with other peoples in Europe to strengthen his argument. In the rest of the work, Lynch keeps defending the Old English, emphasising their Irishness, ancestry, and their honour.

**Contrasts in Form and Style**

In his analysis of the debate, Campbell stated that both authors used particular literary persona to represent themselves in a certain way. O’Ferrall’s self-representation was that of a Capuchin friar and courtier, a persona constructed by himself, Rinuccini and his friend and colleague Robert O’Connell. Rinuccini had in the 1630s written a popular narrative, *Il Cappuccino Scozzese* about a converted Presbyterian Scot, George Lesley, who became a Capuchin friar and missionary among the Scottish Protestants. It was translated into many languages, for example French, English, and Dutch. For the Roman audience of Rinuccini, O’Ferrall could easily be placed in such a context. Two other aspects of his persona were his lifelong passionate battle against heresy and the ancient nobility of his family. The same picture of O’Ferrall was painted by O’Connell in the *Commentarius Rinuccinianus*. He described the style of O’Ferrall’s report as blunt and unpolished: “Contenta brevius tractatur, detRACTis plurimis et additis pauculis, idque stylo minus polito”.17 According to Campbell, “O’Ferrall’s disdain for classical Latin was part of his persona as plain-speaking friar, fresh from the war on the heretics”.18 Lynch, on the other hand, moved in civic and collegiate political environments. Classical politics, and the concept of an honour-based citizenship played a large role in his literary persona. In the following, I would like to explore a little further how Latin style and literary examples were used in the creation of these personas in O’Ferrall’s report and Lynch’s *Alithinologia*.

---

16 Lynch 2010, 22 (Lynch 1664, 10).
18 Campbell 2009, 67.
O’Ferrall’s report

O’Ferrall described his report and his intentions in the concluding paragraph of his work:

Ego relatiunculam hanc sive potius Ideam eversionis Iberniae eorum jussu, quibus reluctant non poteram, scripsi, paratus ex publicis Actis, quorum citationes hic brevitatis causa prudens praetermisi, probare, et longe graviora detegere, si quis quid ibi ambiguum insinuet. Nullius defectus, errores, aut facinora malevolo animo detexi, sed, omissis gravioribus, haec pausa solum qua potui modestia et sinceritate insinuavi, ut malo adhuc serpenti occurrere dignentur Eminentiae Vestrae”.19

(I have written this little report, or rather image, or the destruction of Ireland at the command of those, whom I could not resist, and I am ready to prove it from public ordinances, of which I have omitted the citations intentionally here for the sake of brevity, and to uncover far more weighty things, if anyone should insinuate any uncertainty in the matter. I have uncovered no failing, errors, or crimes with a malicious mind, but I have introduced only these few matters, leaving the graver unmentioned, as I was able modestly and honestly, in order that your Eminences should deign to oppose the evil crawling to this place.)

He emphasised the wish for conciseness and brevity, even to the extent of omitting all citations to public ordinances. The author presents himself as honest and most respectful to the cardinals of Propaganda fide, and emphasises his good intentions. We can clearly see the modesty-topos, central in humanistic self-representation. The description implies a short, practical report, and not a highly learned literary work. The Greek word idea, which I translated as “image”, was also used in other contemporary titles of works.20

The report is divided in three parts, clearly structured. The first part gives an account of pre-war Ireland, the second of the 1640s organised around the nuncio’s 1648 censures. The third offers a number of remedies for the preservation of the remains of the Catholic religion and people, concluding with a list of names (schema) of those recommended by O’Ferrall for the various bishoprics in Ireland, ordered by province.

The report is not adorned by any quotations, neither literary nor historical ones. Rarely, works are mentioned, but almost always these are historical and religious documents such as papal bulls and documents of the confed-

19 O’Ferrall 1658, f. 17r.
20 Cf. for example John Mullin’s Idea Togatae Constantiae (1629).
On folio 10v there is a reference to three religious books by distinguished Irish Franciscans of Gaelic background, in a passage praising the piety of the Old Irish and as means for increasing piety and learning, all printed at the Irish press in Louvain. Despite this lack of literary adornment, the author clearly did not simply jot down his ideas as they came into his mind. A great deal of attention has been paid to the practicality of the work, and the style of the Latin contributes to a clear, vivid and straightforward presentation of the author’s views. Not many very long sentences are used, no complicated periods. Nevertheless, his classical education is visible. The use of certain rhetorical devices contributes to the clarity and style of his text. For example, in the fragment quoted on page 5. In this fragment, we see several examples of dicolon, tricolon, and illustration. Throughout the text we also see a few proverbs that can be found in Erasmus’ Adagia, such as terra natus (f. 8r), and nobilis e crumenæ (f. 8v). Language of invective is very frequent in the work, and direct criticism is not shunned. One example is this statement about Clanricarde, in which he added several creative descriptions as appositions:

 […] Clanricardiae Marchionem, persecutorem D. Nuncii, Cleromastix, Corvum, Noeticum, qui inter Ibernos solus toto illo bello remanserat inter putrida cadavera via gratiae privata extra sacram Catholici faederis arcam.

([…] the marquis of Clanricarde, persecutor of the lord nuncio, scourge of the clergy, raven, Noetian, who alone among the Irish had remained for the whole war among the putrid corpses deprived of the life of grace outside the holy citadel of the Catholic confederation.)

The first describes Clanricarde as a “pursuer of the Nuncio”, using the post-classical word persecutor. The second, cleromastix or “scourge of the clergy”, is a composition of the Latin clerus, and the Greek mastix, “scourge”, a word-formation very similar to titles of other polemical texts from the period, such as Philip O’Sullivan-Beare’s Tenebriomastix, Zoilomastix, and Archicornerigeromastix. Thirdly, he describes him as a raven or crow, and finally as a Noetian. The Greek adjective Noetianus indicates a

---

21 For example, there is a reference to an Apologia Procerum etc., Anglicanae in Ibernia Coloniae pro assumptis armis, etc. and Norma Regiminis on f. 11r.
22 Namely Doctrina Christiana by Hugh MacCaghwell, primate of Ireland, Speculum Paenitentiae by Florence Conry, archbishop of Tam, and Speculum Vitae Religiosae by Bonaventure Ó hEodhasa, Guardian of Louvain.
23 Cf. Erasmus, Adagia, 786 = I. 8. 86, terrae filii.
24 Cf. Erasmus, Adagia 1727 = II.8.27, “generosus es ex crumenæ”.
25 O’Ferrall 1658, 14r.
26 Cf. Erasmus, Adagia 1096 = II.1.96 ad corvos.
follower of Noetus, who acknowledged only one person (the Father) in the
Godhead, and was an anti-Trinitarian heretic. 27 The word *Noetianus* is also
discussed by Isidore of Seville in his *Etymologiae* VIII, 41. 28 The events
relating to the excommunication by Rinuccini are presented in a rather dra-
matic manner. After confederates had agreed on a cease-fire with Lord
Inchiquin on 20 May 1648, against the wishes of the clerical party and Ri-
nuccini, on 27 May 1648, Rinuccini excommunicated those who supported
the peace treaty. 29 As a strong supporter of Rinuccini, O’Ferrall sees these
censures as a justified measure for the papal nuncio, and even sees other
events as proof of God’s punishment of the supporters of the cease-fire. On
page 14r it is God, the avenger of evil (*ultor malorum*), who takes up
vengeance against the *politiques* (the Old English, and members of the
peace party) at Dublin and Galway by plague and famine, to punish them
for their betrayal of the lord nuncio.

The syntax of the Latin is generally according to classical usage, but con-
tains some peculiarities and errors. Like Lynch, O’Ferrall frequently uses
constructions with gerunds and gerundives. Mistakes in the sequence of
tenses occur: f. 8r has the imperfect subjunctive in a final clause *ne […] app-
peterent in a primary sequence (depending on the present consecutive clause
*ut […] permittant ejus Eversores*). On page 486, in an uneasy discussion of
the papal grant of the Irish kingdom to the English kings, which O’Ferrall
regards of no effect, because contrary to natural law and justice, two un-
grammatical subjunctives instead of indicative are used. Lynch described
this passage as an *argumentorum incondita strues* (*Supplementum Alithi-
nologiae*, p. 23).

Another aspect of the style criticised by Lynch in his *Alithinologiae Sup-
plementum* is the vocabulary. I will confine myself here only to a few ex-
amples mentioned by Lynch. Lynch points out that *votum*, in the phrase
*votis et suffragiis* (f. 9v), is an Anglicism instead of *suffragium*. This use of
*votum* is indeed un-classical, namely Medieval Latin, 30 but in this particular
case, I think the criticism is ignoring the rhetorical effect of the synonymous
pair. *Parens* (in the sense of “kinsman, relative”) is criticised as a Gallicism
instead of *cognatus*. In the report, the word is also part of a doublet. According
to Lewis and Short, the word occurs in this sense rarely and certainly not
ante-classical.

---

Dictionary, s. v. *Noetian*.

28 *Isid.*, 8, Orig. 5.41 “Noetiani – Trinitatem in officiorum nominibus, non in personis
acciipiant.

29 Ó Siochrá 2008, 177; Corish 1953, 217.

Lynch’s Alithinologia

O’Ferrall’s short and clear style in his report stands in contrast to Lynch’s rich and abundant style in the Alithinologia. Lynch describes the work as a speech (oratio). It is written in the tradition of the formal disputation, which was widespread throughout the early modern period as a method of formal argumentation and public debate. The work is structured around quotations from fragments of O’Ferrall’s report, which are discussed mostly in the same order as they occur in O’Ferrall’s text.

The genre of controversial writing has not received the attention it merits. There does not seem to have been a strict rule for the structure of polemical works and refutations, but some kind of conventions can be seen. An analysis of the structure of the Alithinologia can contribute to our knowledge of the genre.

The Alithinologia has a very loose structure. The first part is the dedicatory letter to the cardinals of the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide. This part of the Alithinologia contains elements of the traditional exordium of a classical forensic speech, a speech of the genus iudiciale, such as a captatio benevolentiae. It tries to catch the attention of the audience, and to acquire a favourable attitude from the cardinals. The traditional rhetorical topoi are applied to achieve this: a positive presentation of the author’s own character, emphasising his modesty; a contrasting image of the character of the opponent, who is presented as wicked and rebellious; and, thirdly, a flattering picture of the judges, by paying tribute to their wisdom.

The second part begins with a kind of narratio, which states that Irish Catholics, both clergy and laymen, are in a terrible situation after the recent war. Lately, another affliction has been added to this, namely that O’Ferrall, a fellow countryman, is sowing discord among his own citizens. O’Ferrall’s accusations are false and have been spread to Rome. Although Rome punished him, some have protected him and therefore his memorandum needs to be refuted. The propositio argues that the integrity of the innocent (i.e. the Old English) should be vindicated.

The main body of the text is structured around the refutation of a number of quotations from O’Ferrall’s treatise. This was a common structure in the flourishing genre of refutation and controversial writing of the early modern period. It combines a scholastic method of arrangement with the style of a Ciceronian judicial case, taking each (available) paragraph of O’Ferrall’s

---

31 Lynch 2010, 2–7 (Lynch 1664, i–viii).
33 Lynch 2010, 8–11, l. 15 (Lynch 1664, 1–3).
work, and refuting it, point by point. It is unclear how this structure relates to the classical dispositio (arrangement) of a judicial speech. Unlike many contemporary refutations, the Alithinologia is not divided in numbered chapters or libri, but simply runs uninterrupted until the conclusion. In the main part of the work, the main points in O’Ferrall’s report are refuted. Lynch first explains that he only had access to part of O’Ferrall’s report. Because this part is full of things worthy of reproach, the whole work must be even worse. Therefore, Lynch announces, the work will be structured according to the statements in this part which Lynch wants to refute, unless the situation requires otherwise:

Quod si pars operis ista, quam exagit o, tanta tabe sit imbuta, immensa profecto veneni copia totum opus abundare oportet. Itaque ad eius conuicia conuellenda eo quo ipse protulit ordine, nisi subinde aliud occasio postulet, sermonem conuerto.

(Surely, if that part of the work, which I am attacking, already is so full of foulness, the whole work must be filled with a vast amount of poison. Therefore, in order to tackle his slanders, I shape my discourse in the same order, as that in which he himself produced them, unless the occasion now and then demands another order.)

The Alithinologia discusses short passages of O’Ferrall’s report, only roughly following the order of O’Ferrall’s report.

There are several reasons why Lynch decides to deviate slightly from this order. For example, he postpones discussing O’Ferrall’s mention of the parliament until a more suitable time: “Parlamenti mentione, quam is hic inserit, in commodiorem locum reiecta, coeptae ab illo habitatorum Hiberniae divisioni insistemus.” (“Setting aside for a more convenient time the mention of parliament which he inserted here, and keeping it for a more convenient time, we shall press on with the division of the inhabitants of Ireland which he has begun.”) In O’Ferrall’s report, between the previous quotation from O’Ferrall (O’Ferrall 2008, 12, line 11–13), and the next (O’Ferrall 2008, 13, l. 20), O’Ferrall had stated that “new men (i.e. the Old English, 

34 Cp. for example O’Sullivan Beare’s Zoilomastix and his Tenebriomastix. O’Sullivan’s works are divided into chapters called retaliationes, wherein O’Sullivan takes controversial items from Gerald of Wales’s works as general themes for counter-attack, and sub-headings called certamina, wherein he responds to particular items within these larger headings. Cf. Caulfield 2009, 114. A similar structure is followed by Stephen White in his Apologia pro Ibernia and Apologia pro innocentibus Ibernis, containing elements of a judicial speech, but in which the argument is adapted to a systematic commentary that follows the structure of the texts analysed. Cf. Harris 2009, 130.

35 Lynch 1664, 3–141.


37 Lynch 2010, 13 (Lynch 1664, 4).
ed.) born from the soil and an obscure position had been substituted by the English in the place of princes, magnates and dynasts elected in the parliaments and general assemblies of the kingdom, where now they enjoy the right neither of sitting, voting, or deciding, unless they obtain at a price the titles of baron or lord for themselves. In Lynch’s view, his treatment of O’Ferrall’s division of the Irish people into three classes, a section with ethnographic elements traditionally treated at the beginning of a historical work, is not the right place to deal with the attendance in parliaments, as this topic deserves separate discussion. Lynch returns to this sentence of O’Ferrall’s Relatio on page 35–36, when he defends the Old English (or more recent Irish, as he calls them), asserting that they are worthy Irish citizens. He discusses the matter of the attendance of the Old Irish in the parliament in particular on page 42–43, where he denies O’Ferrall’s statement that the Old Irish no longer sat in the parliament.

Another reason to deviate from O’Ferrall’s order is his style of argumentation, in which one argument leads him to another. The chain-like progression of arguments, in which one example leads to another, while sometimes deviating from the main point, seems to be a common type of argumentation in early-modern polemical texts. In some instances, this leads him also to digressions relating only sideways to a topic which he started discussing while refuting O’Ferrall. These digressions are not digressions in the strict sense, because, even though they digress from a particular argument, they do support Lynch’s overall reasoning. The use of digressions such as these is common in classical rhetoric. According to Cicero, a digression “might involve praise or blame of individuals, comparison with other cases, or something that emphasized or amplified the subject at hand. Thus it is not literally a digression. Cicero criticises the requirement as a formal rule and says such treatment should be interwoven into the argument.”

---

38 O’Ferrall 1932–1949, 486/ O’Ferrall 1658, f. 8r.
40 Lynch 1664, 18–19.
41 Lynch 1664, 22–23.
42 This characteristic of polemical writing is also observed in Sir William Herbert’s Ad Campianum Jesuitam eiusque Rationes Decem Responsio (1581) by Arthur Keaveney and John A. Madden. However, Keaveney and Madden do not consider this element as a characteristic of the genre, and criticise the author’s inability to maintain a coherent argument for any length of time, stating that “ideas are simply jotted down at random as they occur to the author”. (Cf. Keaveney & Madden 2009, xxvii.)
43 Harris noted similar digressions, or rather “increasingly extended discussions” in the Apologiae by Stephen White. Cf. Harris 2009, 130.
An example of such a digression occurs,\textsuperscript{45} when the refutation of O’Ferrall’s accusation of the Old English of taking church property leads Lynch into a discussion of the topic of legitimate ownership of ecclesiastical possessions in the history of other countries, such as France and Spain. First, Lynch states on the authority of O’Sullivan-Beare that no magnates were guilty of claiming church property, because the estates of monasteries were assigned to poor and obscure people. Then, he refutes O’Ferrall’s statement by claiming that the laity in Ireland claimed the possessions of the church by the consent of the pope and the approval of the clergy. He supports this statement by the argument that claiming ecclesiastical possessions by laity can be legitimate, using the mention of several other countries as an argument from history. He also refers to a passage from St Bernard’s \textit{Life of Ma-lachy}, in which Malachy gives away church lands to laity.\textsuperscript{46} So far all the arguments support his initial statement that the Old English did not take church property illegitimately. Now, however, the logically supporting argument that heretics avoided owning ecclesiastical lands because of the fear that it would bring ruin to them, brings Lynch into a digression on the danger of the possession of church property by laymen. He concludes with a warning against this danger to princes and other people:

\begin{quote}
Vt hinc reliqui Principes alique homines discere debent quam periculose siue sub annuo praetenso censu, siue a li modo laicus possideat res Ecclesiae, quas saepe inuiti et nolentes fatigatique precibus, vel aliis compulsii occasionibus vel deceptis suasionibus Romani Pontifices illis possidendas indulgent.\textsuperscript{47}
\end{quote}

(May the remaining princes and other people learn from that, how dangerous it is if a layman owns, either under an annual demanded payment, or another way, goods of the church, of which the Roman popes granted them possession, often unwilling and reluctantly and tormented by requests, or forced by the circumstances, or deceived by false pieces of advice.)

Eventually, on page 37 of the 1664 print, he returns to the (Old English) Catholics who acquired ecclesiastical estates in Ireland, stating that this danger does not apply to them, because they are protected by the indulgence of Paul IV, or the authority of the pope, or by some benefice of the pope onto those who pursued the ecclesiastical land:

\begin{quote}
Sed vt eo, vnde in hoc diuerticulum excessi reuertar, qui Catholici cum veteres tum noui Ecclesiastica praedia sibi compararunt, vel me-
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{45} Lynch 1664, 34–37.
\textsuperscript{46} Lynch 1664, 37.
\textsuperscript{47} Lynch 1664, 37.
morata iam Pauli IV indulgentia tec- tii, vel authoritate Pontificis sibi quisque nominatim im- petrata, vel beneficentia aliqua in sacerdotium a Pontifice consecutos collata, conscientiam extra delicti periculum ple- rumque constituerunt.48

(But in order to return where I left to this digression, the Catholics, both old and new, who acquired ecclesiastical estates for themselves, have fixed their conscience outside of most danger of crime, either protected by the indulgence of Paul IV which was already mentioned, or by the authority of the pope, which each one by one had obtained for themselves, or by some benefice conferred by the pope onto those who pursued the sacerdotal land.)

A similar chain of arguments leading away from O’Ferrall’s statement, but supporting Lynch’s over all argument, occurs later on in the same work, when Lynch contradicts O’Ferrall’s statement that the Old English were punished “by God’s just judgement”.49 He states that, instead of the Old English, rather the Ulster Irishmen should be criticised. He then continues with the statement that many perceived a lack of prudence in Eugene O’Neill, the commander of the Ulster troops.50 In an elaborate passage, Lynch questions his good intentions in his actions, and accuses him of disgracefully stirring up rebellion. After this, a long apology follows for this severe reproval of O’Neill. It includes an analogy to the Phocians, who plundered the temple of Apollo at Delphi, to relieve their poverty. Although all cursed this act of the Phocians for the sacrilege of it, it brought more odium upon the Thebans, by whom they were compelled to this necessity, than upon themselves.51 In the same way, Lynch excuses himself for his severe words against O’Neill. After this long digression away from O’Ferrall’s statement about the Old English, Lynch returns to O’Ferrall’s report:

Nunc diuerticulis, in quae sermo alius ex alio enatus me abduxit egressus, cum adversario congressum redintegro non ad eius dicta, vt hactenus consueui, carpenda […] 52

(Now, after having departed [from my main topic] to the digressions, to which one discussion, arisen from another, brings me, I renew my argument with the adversary not in order to carp at his words, which I was accustomed to so far, but to approve them […]

48 Lynch 1664, 37.
49 Lynch 1664, 55.
50 Lynch 1664, 56.
51 Cf. Justinus, Historiae Philippicae, liber 8, caput 1.
52 Lynch 1664, 58.
On page 141 (Lynch 1664), Lynch eventually moves on from refuting particular points to a general conclusion. In the last pages of the work, he attacks O’Ferrall more generally, by an argumentum ad hominem, and once more explains his reasons for writing his Alithinologia. This passage contains a lot of strong invective language, and a justification of such an angry attack.

Lynch describes O’Ferrall’s work as an “invective” (inuctiua),53 while he presents his own work, on the other hand, as a true account, claiming more credibility.

Contrary to O’Ferrall’s report, Lynch’s 144-page long account is embellished by numerous literary references and quotations, often adapted to fit in the new context. This includes not only strictly classical prose texts, such as Cicero’s De Officiis, but also poetry and later literature. See for example this fragment, taken from Lynch’s defence of the ancestry of the Old English.

Sed iracundi hominis ardor in ciues nondum deferuit, nouo enim adhuc probro eos cumulat, dum affirmat omnes non nisi ex crumena esse nobiles. Nimirum in ciues eius odium sic exarsit, ut ad nobilitatis splendorem illos attollit quam indignissime ferat. Freneat tamen, et disrupatur inuidia licet. Qui per viam virtutis ad honorem tendunt, ad nobilitatem semper emergent. Etenim nobilitas sola est. Atque unica virtus, nec solo genere continetur. Nam virtute decet non sanguine niti. Quo spectat hibernicum adagium, quod latine sic efferri potest, sola sanguinis nobilitas futilis est ac inanis. Non census, nec clarum nomen auorum, sed probitas magnos ingeniumque facit.54

(But the ardour of that irritable man has not yet ceased raging against the citizens, for he heaps yet a new reproach upon them, when he asserts that non are noble except from the purse. Without doubt his anger against the citizens has been inflamed to such a degree, that he bears extremely indignantly that they are being raised to the splendour of nobility. But let his gnash his teeth, and burst with ill-will. Those who strive after honour by means of virtue, will always rise to nobility. For virtue is the one and only nobility, and it is not held by birth alone. For it is fitting to contend in virtue, not in blood. And to this, the Irish proverb refers which can be expressed in Latin as follows: the nobility of blood alone is worthless and vain. Not the fortune, nor the celebrated name of the ancestors, but uprightness and intelligence makes great men.)

The fragment has classical vocabulary expressing the principle of an honour-based nobility. Nevertheless, this is not simply Ciceronian vocabulary, but also an elegant combination and adaptation of various quotations. No-

53 Lynch 2010, 1 (Lynch 1664, i.).
54 Lynch 2010, 29–30 (Lynch 1664, 15).
bilitas sola […] unica virtus is a quotation of Juvenal, Satire VIII, 20. The theme of virtue giving true honour was commonplace in seventeenth-century Latin literature, and Juvenal’s Eighth Satire is a classic text that could be consulted for topoi in this field. The next quotation, virtute decet […] sanguine niti is a sententia from Claudian, De Quarto Consulatu Honorii Augusti Panegyris 220, which had become proverbial in the Middle Ages and occurs frequently in Neo-Latin literature. Then a Latin translation of an Irish proverb follows. The paragraph is concluded with a quotation from Ovid, Epistulae ex Ponto 9.39–40. This verse had also become proverbial in the Middle Ages. The combination of these quotations contributes to a literary persona of a humanist, expert in classical and Christian literature (prose and poetry), as well as Irish literature and culture. As previously mentioned, the Ciceronian civic humanism was essential to his persona. His Latin style was certainly part of this persona. Modern scholars stated that Lynch “wrote Latin with ease, and indeed in a rather complicated style”.

The syntax is characterised by many long sentences, often achieved by the use of consecutive clauses. Constructions such as ita […] vt are very frequent. Lynch also very frequently places the correlative ita directly preceding vt, instead of placing ita separately in a main clause. This is characteristic of Late Latin. In the Alithinologia the expression ita vt is often used to form cohesion between different sentences in a paragraph.

Prepositions with gerundive-constructions are also very frequent. Especially the construction of ad with a noun and gerundive, expressing purpose, is one of Lynch’s most frequent constructions. It also occurs frequently in classical Latin, but Lynch seems to use it particularly frequently as a variation on the ut-clause, which he also uses. Another reason for using this construction might be that it is easier than an ut-clause, avoiding the difficulties concerning the sequence of tenses. Lynch also constructs other prepositions with gerundive phrases and gerunds, such as in + abl. gerundive, mostly according to classical syntax, and inter with an accusative gerund, a usage

55 Helander 2004, 547.
57 D’Ambrìeres & Ó Ciosáin 2003, 51. Cf. also Corish 1953, 227: “The first thing to be noticed about this society was the learning which flourished in it– the learning of the renaissance, as modified by the counter-reformation. John Lynch has all the renaissance scholar’s fastidiousness for purity and elegance of Latin style […]”
58 Cf. LHS 640, II. The earliest example from the TLL of ita used “per abundantium” directly preceding ut, from Vitruvius 4, 3, 9 “sic est forma facienda, ita uti […]” (TLL, vol. VII, 2.1, lemma ita II B, b, p. 524.)
59 Cf. LHS 377; K&S II. 1, 749–750.
60 E.g. Lynch 2010, 10, l. 18: “in insulis […] promendis”. (Lynch 1664, 2.)
61 For example Lynch 2010, 2, l. 4: “inter legendum”. (Lynch 1664, ii.)
familiar in classical Latin, but more frequent in post-classical Latin.\(^{62}\) The construction of *pro* with a gerundive, expressing purpose, also occurs in the *Alithinologia*.\(^{63}\) It is Late Latin, but occurs frequently in Neo-Latin authors.\(^{64}\) Occasionally he also uses the gerundive instead of the non-existent future passive participle.\(^{65}\) This construction does not occur in classical Latin, but occurs frequently in Late Latin,\(^{66}\) and in many Neo-Latin texts.\(^{67}\) Lynch constructs certain verbs with predicative gerundives expressing purpose, such as *ablego* and *abripio*.\(^{68}\) In classical Latin the gerundive is only used predicatively with a restrictive group of verbs. In post-classical Latin, the construction occurs with several more verbs (*tribuo, mando, dividio, commendo, obicio* and similar verbs). The use of this construction spreads to other verbs especially in Late Latin,\(^{69}\) and is frequent in Neo-Latin authors.\(^{70}\)

His vocabulary eclectic, and includes many common expressions from post-classical, Ecclesiastical and Medieval Latin. It also contains some Greek words. *Alithinologia* is a rare Greek word, meaning “true discourse” or “speaking truth”, of which Liddell and Scott only attest two examples, in the second century grammarian Pollux, *Onomasticon* 2.124,\(^{71}\) and in Polybius 12. 26d.1.\(^{72}\) Polybius used the term to describe the correct method of history. In his view, the essential characteristics of the genre of history, a genre not inferior to that of poetry, are truth and the practical value to contemporary and future generations of an accurate knowledge of the past. Polybius and his followers were aware of the danger of subjectivity, and urged caution with regard to it. The precepts of Polybius regarding historical writing were very influential in early modern debates on the theory of history, and it seems very probable that Lynch intended reference to what the

\(^{62}\) LHS 233.

\(^{63}\) Lynch 2010, 44, l. 19 “*pro instauranda religione Catholica*”. (Lynch 1664, 24.)

\(^{64}\) Cf. Löfstedt 1981, 47; Löfstedt 1983, 31; LHS 271b.

\(^{65}\) E.g. Lynch 2010, 11, l. 18: “*in plurimos in medium infra producendos incidit*”. (Lynch 1664, 3.)


\(^{67}\) E.g. Spinoza, A. 338.14/G III 123.20, “*quod cum ex modo dictis, tum ex jam dicendis evidentissime sequitur*”. See Kajanto 2005, 41. Cf. also Löfstedt 1983, 29.

\(^{68}\) E.g. Lynch 2010, 8, l. 9 “*cruiciandi […] alegantur*” (Lynch 1664, 1); p. 9, l. 14 “*venundandi […] abrepti sunt*” (Lynch 1664, 2).

\(^{69}\) LHS 371–372; K&S II, 1, 731.

\(^{70}\) Cf. for example Tunberg 1997, 26, where Tunberg discusses the Latin of the Ciceronian author Christophorus Longolius.

\(^{71}\) Pollux, *Onomasticon* 2.124 (or liber 2, caput 4) refers to Plato for this word.

\(^{72}\) Polybius 12.26 discusses sophistical commonplaces. In paragraph d, the Greek historian Timaeus is criticised for impressing many people by the appearance of a true account (*διὰ τὴν ἐπίφασιν τῆς ἀληθινολογίας*), and the pretence of proof, and in that manner convincing them of falsities.
sixteenth century theorist Uberto Foglietta had called the “Polybian norm” (norma Polybiana) of objective truth. The word also found its way into Pollux’s thesaurus of Greek synonyms and phrases, which was widely available to Renaissance scholars and antiquaries, both in the original Greek and in the Latin translation. It was used frequently by contemporaries for medical and other vocabulary. *Alithinologia* is a compound of the Greek words ἀληθινός (true) and λόγος (discourse, account). The use of Greek words in Latin, in imitation of Cicero, was very popular in the learned culture of the Renaissance and Early Modern period and its use here adds authority to the text. The meaning of the title must have been readily accessible to the contemporary reader, as we know of many vernacular works of the time with titles starting with “A true account”, or “A true discourse”. It is a frequently used name for an early modern work: part of controversial writing, with the claim to unbiased truth. The Latin *veridicus* was also used frequently in this context. Lynch further explains his title with the Latin phrase *veridica responsio*, which confirms the genre of this work.

The title *Alithinologia* is but one example of the frequent Greek words in the work. The Greek vocabulary in the *Alithinologia* is also interesting in view of how Lynch represents himself and Ireland. Lynch addresses the members of the Propaganda Fide as nomophylaces, from the Greek compound word of νόµος (law) and φύλαξ (guard). The Greek word is used by Plato in his *Laws*. It was a title created for the head of the law school in Constantinople in the mid-11th century. It is used in the sense of “guardian of the law” in Neo-Latin, for example by Budé and Bodin. By using this word, Lynch not only shows off his knowledge of the Greek language, but
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74 The Latin translation by Rodolphus Gualtherus (Basel: Robertus Winter, 1541) translated the word as *veritas*, so it seems more likely that Lynch would have consulted a Greek version of the work. The same translation is used in the bilingual edition by Wolfgang Seber (1608).
75 The text was widely available in the Renaissance, and anatomists of the period drew on it for obscure Greek words to describe parts of the body. (Mitchell 2007, 502.) The work is also used extensively in the Adagia by Erasmus. (Phillips & Mynors 1981, v. 31, p. 53.)
76 E.g. *A true relation of a great victory obtained by the forces under the command of the lord Inchiquin in Munster in Ireland*, London 1642 (BL Thomason Tracts E135 f. 26), and Ligon, Richard. *A true and exact history of the island of Barbados*. London, 1657.
77 E.g. *Veridicus Hibernicus, Hiberniae sive antiquioris Scotiae vindicae* (Antwerp, 1621); Thomas Carue, *Responsio Veridica* (1672). The word is also included in Schrevelius’s school dictionary (first edition, Leiden, 1654) with the Greek translation ἀληθινολόγος.
78 Lynch 2010, 6, l. 2 (Lynch 1664, vi).
79 Cf. Plato, *Lg*. 755a, 770c etc.
80 Hoven 1994 gives the meaning “guardien des lois”, referring to Budé II, 171, 53; 312, 21; Bodin I, 184 B 54; etc.
also conveys a sense of respect for his audience as judges in the debate. The leaders of important family groups are described as *phylarchi familiarum*.\(^{81}\) *Phylarchus*, originally a Greek word signifying a leader of a political “tribe”, is very rare in classical Latin, and is used by Cicero to describe the chief of a tribe.\(^{82}\) The word is also used by Thomas More in his *Utopia*, indicating the head ruler of a group of thirty households in the rural districts of his ideal commonwealth.\(^{83}\) Lynch adapts it to an Irish context, and by choosing this Greek word, he places himself in the classicising tradition, and shows his expertise through active *imitatio* of the classics. It also enables him to vary his vocabulary, and to explain typical Irish concepts to a wider European audience.

In some instances, Lynch deliberately uses a particularly rare or strange word to emphasise his statement. For example, he describes his opponent O’Ferrall as a “fellow-countryman, blowing on the coals of internal discord, who tries to rob the Irish of their reputation” (*domesticus intestini dissidii ciniflo fama spoliare contendit*).\(^{84}\) The word *ciniflo* is a very rare noun, attested once ancient literature, in Horace’s *Satires*.\(^{85}\) Porphyrius, in his commentary to Horace, notes that the word has the same meaning as *cinerarius*, meaning a hairdresser, or more literally someone who heats irons used by hairdressers in hot ashes (*cinis*).\(^{86}\) It is used as social satire by Horace. In Medieval Latin, the word is used in plural with the sense of “nobodies”.\(^{87}\) While the phrase is used by Horace as social satire, Lynch intends serious comment on the fomentation of war, playing on the meaning of *cinis*, “ruins of a city laid waste and reduced to ashes”.\(^{88}\) It is clearly intended as an insulting riposte to the address of O’Ferrall, and is a good example of the creative invective language in the *Alithinologia*.

Lynch’s style is moreover characterised by a much more frequent use of rhetorical devices such as antithesis, pairs, tricolon, tetracolon, alliteration, metaphors and paronomasia than O’Ferrall’s style. Apart from that, we have already seen that both Latin and Irish proverbs are used.

\(^{81}\) Lynch 2010, 42, l. 15–16 (Lynch 1664, 23). See also Lynch 1848–1852, 239. It is Lynch’s translation of the concept described in English as “chieftains” in Sir John Davies, *A Discoverie of the True Causes why Ireland was never entirely subdued* (London 1613), 241.

\(^{82}\) Cf. Cic. *Ad Familiares*, 15.1.2 “phylarcho Arabum”.

\(^{83}\) More 1974, 114.

\(^{84}\) Lynch 2010, 3, l. 6 (Lynch 1664, iv).

\(^{85}\) Horace, *Satires* 1.2.98 “multae tibi tum efficient res, custodes, lectica, ciniflones, parasitae”.

\(^{86}\) Cf. TLL.

\(^{87}\) Blaise, *Med*.

\(^{88}\) L&S, lemma *cinis*, II B.
Conclusion

This article explored how the contrasting views of John Lynch and Richard O’Ferrall on Irish identity, in particular of the Old English, are reflected in the form and style of their works. It showed that the background of O’Ferrall, his origins in a noble Gaelic family, who had lost all its possessions in the plantation of James I at the beginning of the seventeenth century, shaped his identity and political activity in the Confederation as an ardent supporter and courtier of Rinuccini. This identity was an important factor in his choice for his particular style in his report on the role of the Old English in the crisis of the failure of the Confederation. Lynch’s religious background as a priest, combined with his connections to members of the peace party placed him at the opposite side of the political spectrum, and his thorough education enabled him to produce a lengthy learned tome on the same subject. The two authors have been contrasted with regard to the content, form, and style of their works. John Lynch’s and Richard O’Ferrall’s views on the Irish identity of the Old English are represented using a carefully crafted literary persona, supported by a particular Latin style. This technique explains the surprisingly long and rhetorical reply by an exiled Irish priest with Old English background, to a short, efficient report by a supporter of the extreme religious views of the papal nuncio in Ireland.
Bibliography
Davies, Sir John 1613, *A Discoverie of the True Causes why Ireland was never entirely subdued*, London.
K&S, see Kühner & Stegmann 1997.
LHS, see Leumann, Hoffmann & Szantyr 1997.
Lynch, John 1662, *Cambrensis Eversus, seu Potius Historica Fides in Rebus Hibernicis Giraldo Cambrensis abrogata*, St Malo.
Lynch, John 1664, *Alithinologia sive veridica responsio ad invectivam mendacii ... foetam*, St Malo.
Mullin’s *Idea Togatae Constantiae* (1629).
Stanihurst, Richard 1584, *De Rebus in Hibernia Gestis*, Antwerp.
Latin played an important role as the language of political discourse and propaganda in the Catalan-speaking lands in the early modern period. As with the Germanies rebellion in sixteenth-century Valencia and the War of Spanish Succession in the early eighteenth century, Latin assisted Catalan scholars and politicians during the war of 1640 to 1652, the so-called Catalan Revolt or Guerra dels Segadors (Reapers’ War). In this essay I examine three tracts written during the conflict, in which Latin was used by Catalan scholars in attempting to offset the arguments employed by their political counterparts.

Despite noble calls to cross academic boundaries and to avoid linguistic divisions, approaches to the literary culture of early modern Spain have tended to concentrate exclusively on vernacular literature, to the detriment of Hispano-Latin humanism and the vast corpus of Latin literature produced by Spaniards between 1500 and 1700. Prone to overlook the fact that, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Latin and vernacular literatures were seen as part of a continuum and not as two sharply divided bodies, critics have frequently underestimated the role of Latin within the literary scene of early modern Spain. This is particularly obvious in recent publications devoted to the study of the construction of political and cultural identity in early modern Iberia. Elizabeth Davis’s Myth and Identity in the Epic of Imperial Spain, Diana Sieber’s Historiography and Marginal Identity in sixteenth-century Spain, and Barbara Simerka’s Discourses of empire: counter-epic literature in early modern Spain, are all good examples of this trend.¹ In their otherwise stimulating monographs these three critics convincingly show how, throughout the second half of the sixteenth century and the first

two decades of the following epic poetry, drama and historiography proved instrumental in exalting or attacking the political status quo. Yet, Davis, Sieber and Simerka’s innovative examination of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century epic, dramatic and historiographical writing is at times heavily marred by their lack of attention to texts written in languages other than Spanish. In all cases even a brief mention of Latin texts would have shown how the political preoccupations of better-known authors writing in the vernacular were also shared by contemporary figures whose choice of the Latin language may have resulted in their exclusion from the canon.

Since the mid-sixteenth century Latin was invaluable to the ruling circles of the Spanish monarchy, which employed it to frame the image of the Empire during the period of expansion and conquest in Europe and the New World. As Brian Tate has shown, at the peak of Spanish domination in Europe and America, the Spanish monarchy needed instruments able to support its claims to supremacy both among the unruly local powers and the other kingdoms competing in the international scenario of early modern Europe. A series of works by Latin historians of Iberian origin was published doubtless contributing to the dissemination of the country’s past and contemporary political achievements. Latin also played an important role as the language of political discourse and propaganda in the Catalan-speaking lands in the early modern period. The Latin writings produced during the Germanies rebellion in sixteenth-century Valencia, and the large corpus of texts in Latin (above all, epic poetry, historiographical and juridical text, as well as collections of letters) written at the time of the Spanish War of Succession at the beginning of the eighteenth century are good examples of how Latin assisted Catalan scholars and politicians in the construction of a political consciousness at times of conflict with Castile. In what follows I would like to focus on a case-study: a series of tracts written around the war of 1640 to 1652, the so-called Catalan Revolt or Guerra dels Segadors (Reapers’ War) as it is known in Catalan. In this essay I hope to show how Latin was central to the historiographical construction of nationhood in seventeenth-century Catalunya.

Let us consider briefly the historical events around which these writings emerged. The dynastic union between the Crowns of Castile and Aragon in 1492 was a decisive step towards the formation of a Hispanic feudal bloc under a monarchy that was tending towards absolutism. Nevertheless, during the sixteenth century Catalunya retained its own independent institutions and type of government, based on a constitutional structure. The laws by

---

2 Tate 1996.

which Catalunya was governed were agreed upon between the prince and his subjects at meetings of les Corts or parliament. After the death of Philip II in 1598 the Spanish kings, however, tended to summon the Courts less and less frequently. From the second decade of the seventeenth century, relations between the Spanish monarchy and the Principality of Catalunya gradually deteriorated, particularly as a result of the policies of the Count-Duke of Olivares (1587–1645), the favourite and chief minister of Philip IV (1605–1665), and his attempts to use Catalan resources to fight Spain’s foreign wars.

The growing tension led ultimately to a rising in 1640, staged by the Catalan peasantry and soon supported by the dominant classes. During the revolt – which began on the day of Corpus Christi, 7 June – the Spanish Viceroy was assassinated. Pau Claris, head of the Generalitat (Catalan Government), turned the social unrest into a political cause and proclaimed a Catalan Republic, independent from the King of Spain. However, in order to ward off a Spanish attack, the Generalitat was obliged to submit to the vassalage of the King of France in January of the following year. For the next decade the Catalans and French fought as allies until a Spanish offensive in 1652 captured Barcelona bringing the Catalan capital under Spanish control again. That same year the French authorities renounced Catalunya, and though the Catalan institutions were still of use in resisting absolutism, the Generalitat governed much less efficiently.4

The conflict whose major events I have just summarized was waged as much on the battlefield as on the printed page. As with other early modern European societies, in Catalunya epic poetry, political tracts and historiography proved instrumental to the ruling elites in creating a genealogy that either exalted and legitimized the political status quo or sought to subvert it. The revolution of June 1640 and subsequent War of Separation from the Spanish monarchy is indeed a good case in point in this respect. On the Castilian side the propaganda machine engaged luminaries such as Francisco de Quevedo, unscrupulous historians who resorted to legends and made-up material such as José Pellicer’s Idea del Principado de Catalunya of 1642 (even though examples of this also abound in the Catalan camp), and several other pamphleteers who supported the monarchy’s position during the Catalan revolt. In Catalunya too contemporary events gave rise to a large body of political and propagandistic writings, a literary corpus mostly in Catalan (and to a lesser extent in Spanish) which was assembled in 1993 by Henry Ettinghausen in his four-volume study of the press of the time.5 Broadly
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4 For a detailed analysis of the revolt see Elliot 1984.
5 Ettinghausen 1993. For a different approach see Simon i Tarrés 1999, where attention to Latin texts is duly paid.
speaking, texts in the vernacular (most of them poetry) circulate in manuscript form and aim at awaking resistance and revolt against the enemy. By contrast, Latin texts are printed and are written in a style (and engage in modes of argument) reminiscent of legalistic and historiographical texts of the previous century. Significantly, and despite their importance, in Ettinghausen’s vast compilation Latin texts go totally unnoticed, even though Latin was also used by Catalan scholars in attempting to offset the arguments employed by their political counterparts.

Olivares’s policies – in particular his insistence on maintaining Spanish troops in Catalunya as well as his utter disrespect for Catalan privileges – could be easily dismissed and attacked by political thinkers and pamphleteers at the service of the Catalan government. The decision by the Generalitat, on 23 January 1641, to place the Principality under the rule of the king of France was certainly harder to justify given the hostility large groups of the Catalan populace felt towards the French. The Catalan government therefore soon necessitated ideological instruments and historical foundations able to support the agreement by which Catalunya declared its allegiance to Louis XIII in return for France’s military protection. This may account for Joan-Lluís de Montcada’s *Annales Catalonieae* (ca. 1585–1653), a work in which the author linked Gallic tutelage over the Principality to the invasion of Catalunya by the French king in the eighth century. Montcada’s attempt has a clear parallel in France, where the monarchy employed political historians to justify the annexation of Catalunya.

From the outset, rather than depicting the war against Castile as a local affair, the propaganda machine of the Generalitat sought to emphasize the international dimension of the conflict. It did so chiefly by drawing parallels with other anti-Castilian confrontations, past and present, and by attempting to arouse the sympathy of other rebellious territories against the Spanish Habsburgs which had succeeded in regaining independence. This may account for the publication in Lisbon of histories of Catalunya such as the *Noticia universal de Cataluña* (Lisbon, 1640) of Francesc Martí i Viladamor, an author to whom I shall shortly return, and of reports of the war of 1640 and 1641 against Castile, which came off the press of Pere Lacavalleria (*Epitome de los principios y progressos de las guerras de Cataluña*, Lisbon, 1642).
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6 Torrent 1984.
7 To my knowledge, no parallels can be found on the Castilian camp of the use of Latin in political tracts, except for attempts on the part of Philip II to justify his invasion of Portugal in 1580 (see Giovanni Viperano’s *De obtenta Portugalia a Rege Catholico Philippo historia*, Madrid, 1583).
9 For example, Sorel 1642, Chanut 1642 and Caseneuve 1644.
Indeed Lacavalleria seems to have played an extremely active role in promoting Catalan interests. He was, for instance, responsible for the publication of the anonymous *Catalonia iterum ad Lilia perfugiens* (Barcelona, 1642).

Dedicated to King Louis XIII, *Catalonia iterum* sets out to justify Catalunya’s association with France on historical grounds. After chronicling, in highly dramatic style, the events of 1641 and the military successes of the Franco-Catalan troops, the text goes on to discuss the inherent differences between Catalans and Castilians, comparing, for example, Castilians to Scythians (in Antiquity the archetypical barbarian), and pointing to the constitutional structure of the Principality as the main difference between Catalunya and other nations. According to the anonymous author, it is precisely the contractual character of this constitutional system that legitimized the election of Louis XIII as king of Catalunya. By this election – the author concludes – Catalans, as with the Portuguese two years previously, have returned to their true masters (p. 22):

For it is known that, by means of a secret stroke of the highest Providence and justice, the kingdoms of Portugal and Catalunya in this century, after a long period of most unjust government, have been returned to their true masters.

The combination of proto-ethnographical arguments, resort to recent history and thorough knowledge of Catalunya’s political institutions exhibited by the author of *Catalonia iterum* is echoed in the work of the lawyer and Royal Chronicler Francesc Martí i Viladamor (1616–1689). In April 1642, under the nom de plume of Marc Tixell, Martí i Viladamor published a booklet entitled *Catalonia sub Urbano foeliciter renata, amota vi iustitiaque eminente. Politica vera, regimen certum optimae Reipublicae*. The title of Martí’s work refers to Urbain de Maillé, marquis of Brézé and Richelieu’s brother in law, who had been appointed first French Viceroy of Catalunya a few months earlier. The text opens with a reminder of the deep love and loyalty the Counts of Barcelona and Kings of Aragon had always felt towards their princes and in particular towards Philip IV:

---

10 Unknown author 1642. I use the copy at Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional de España, VE 170/13.

11 Martí i Viladamor 1642. I use the copy at Barcelona, Biblioteca Nacional de Catalunya, F. Bon. 5952.
Recalling – with a subtle reference to Olivares’s negative influence upon the king – “how Philip himself in a letter sent to the citizens of Barcelona in March 1631 admitted he felt bound to them by tighter links than his other ancestors”, the author laments the king’s attitude and shows how Philip IV had contravened Catalunya’s ancient laws and liberties.

As part of a great tirade against “Castellanae tyrannidis acerbitates” (the violence of the Castilian tyranny), Martí’s pamphlet goes on to list the excesses committed by Spanish troops on Catalan soil which ultimately were to blame for the riot of June 1640. The arrival of the new Viceroy sent by Louis XIII – he claims – guaranteed the immediate restoration of order and initiated a period of prosperity and peace under French protection. Yet, whereas it was easy to prove that the Spanish king had broken his sacred contract with his Catalan vassals, Martí was all too aware of the difficulties in justifying the substitution of Philip IV of Spain by Louis XIII of France. Once the immediate aim of expelling the Spanish soldiery had been achieved, the logic of events in 1640 suggested the possibility of transforming Catalunya into an independent republic. The behaviour of the Spanish king and the conduct of his troops is not the only target of Martí i Viladalmor’s diatribe. Rather, he devotes the second part of his work to demonstrate how the reversal of allegiance on the part of the Catalans was no more than the proper exercise of the Principality’s privilege of choosing its own ruler. It is at this point where Martí’s text becomes a fully-fledged manifesto in which the Catalan jurist formulates his theory of a “politica vera” based on a perfect balance “inter principem et subditos” (between the prince and his subjects), of which Catalunya would be the most conspicuous example.
Catalunya’s freedom – Martí concludes – was emphasized by the voluntary election of her prince.

Two years later, in 1644, Martí elaborated upon some of the ideas outlined in the *Catalonia sub Urbano*… in a longer political tract entitled *Praesidium inexpugnabile Principatus Catalonae pro iure eligendi Christianissimum Monarcham*. Commissioned by the *Consell de Cent*, the Council of One Hundred, the city council of Barcelona, this text was circulated in the town of Münster at the peace conference of Westphalia, at which Martí – on behalf of the city council – acted as Catalunya’s principal delegate between 1646 and 1648. He refers to the ongoing negotiations in the opening paragraphs of his text and singles out the right of the Catalans to elect their own prince as one of the main items on the agenda at Münster, an issue which in fact was only secondary:

> Nunc vertitur apud Munsterium celebri s disputatio de iure Principatus Catalonae eligendi Christianissimum Monarcham. Ex inde pro ipso iure stabiliendo praesidium extruo inexpugnabile.

(A famous dispute is currently taking place in Münster on the right of the Principality of Catalunya to elect the most Christian monarch as her king. Thence I erect an impregnable defence of such a right.)

The principal target in the *Praesidium inexpugnabile* are Olivares’s plans for unity and his ideal of a unified nation marked by “una ley y un Rey” (a single law and king). Martí was careful to write in detail on the many sufferings of Catalunya after the twenty years of government by Olivares, summarized by the Catalan jurist as “eius politica destestabilis” (his abominable administration). The revolution of 1640 after all had been a revolution against the Court of Spain, and in particular against the rule of Olivares. In January 1643 Olivares had, however, been given formal permission by the king to retire from office. Arguments therefore had to be found elsewhere. At this junction Martí also resorted to history and sought to place Catalunya’s renunciation of allegiance to Spain into its historical context.

Historical precedents could indeed become the most effective (and perhaps only) weapon to justify Catalunya’s new association with France. By invoking history, Martí was also responding to a group of Spanish pamphleteers, best represented by José Pellicer, who in his *Idea del Principado de*...

---

12 Martí i Viladamor 1644. I use the copy at Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 37 P. 59.

13 The term “Peace of Westphalia” denotes a series of peace treatises signed between May and October of 1648 in Osnabrück and Münster. These negotiations ended the Thirty Years’ War (1618–1648) in the Holy Roman Empire, and the Eighty Years’ War (1568–1648) between Spain and the Dutch Republic.
Cataluña (1642) had gone as far as to claim that “toda la Corona de Francia pertenece a los Reyes de España” (the whole Crown of Spain belongs to the king of France). A rather loose interpretation of Catalunya’s historical origins and the use of conventional contractual arguments based on historical precedent enabled Martí to state that the right of the Catalans to elect their own Prince – what Martí describes as “lex regia principatus Cataloniae” (the royal law of the Principality of Catalunya) – was confirmed under the government both of the Goths and Carolingian kings, and had remained intact ever since. According to Martí, the laws issued by Louis the Pious and Charles the Bald in the ninth century would therefore include the “pacta legis regiae”, some “pro rege” and others “pro populo”. These pacts, upon which the “lex regia” would be based, would be: (p. 42) “quod Catalani liberi sint et maneant” (that Catalans are free and should remain so); “quod Catalani nullum censum praestare cogantur” (that Catalans should not be forced to keep a census); “quod causae minores apud eosdem Catalanos et non comitem more antiquo, idest Gothico, decidantur” (that minor matters should be decided among Catalans themselves and not by the prince according to ancient custom, that is the custom of the Goths); “quod leges Gothicae retineantur et observentur inter Catalanos” (that the laws of the Goths should be retained and observed among Catalans); “quod leges in Catalonia ferendae sint non per Principem solum, sed per Principem et populum in curiis generalibus, convocatione praeecedente” (that the law in Catalunya should be passed not by the prince alone, but by the prince and the people in general assemblies, after these have been summoned). To Martí’s mind, the “lex regia” (royal law) was implicit in Catalunya’s constitutional system, since those primitive pacts could only be amended or confirmed at meetings of the parliament within the principle of a contractual agreement between the king and his subjects. He concluded that the events of 1640, would have led – as a response to the tyrannical government by the Spanish king – to the derogation of the “lex regia” which was only restored, after an all too brief republican experiment, with the election of Louis XIII in January of the following year.

Even though Catalunya’s own “lex regia” as formulated by Martí could be regarded as a precedent for the idea of popular sovereignty, Martí’s political thought as reflected in the Praesidium inexpugnabile had about it a faded, almost anachronistic air in the circumstances of the seventeenth century. The highly conventional arguments he used had already been deployed by Latin historians of the two previous centuries. Paradoxically, however, these writings had served a very different political function from that of Martí’s Praesidium inexpugnabile. This had been particularly the case in Castile, where historiography had provided ideological instruments in order
to support centralist and unifying policies. Martí’s use of Latin, I would argue, was not only a way of aiming at an international readership, and at Münster at an international audience, but was determined by a long-standing historiographical tradition in Iberia.

This can be illustrated with one example. The legendary foundation of Spain by Tubal, one of Noah’s sons, from which time allegedly stemmed the natural liberty of Catalunya, featured – through a direct borrowing from Annius of Viterbo’s *Antiquitates* – in the *De origine ac rebus gestis regum Hispaniae* (Antwerp, 1553) of the Barcelona archivist Francesc Tarafa (ca. 1495–1556).¹⁴ Dedicated to Philip II, the *De origine*... sought to reconcile respect for the historical rights of the Crown of Aragon within the overall structure of the Spanish monarchy. In spite of all its pan-Hispanism, Tarafa’s research proved however extremely valuable to Martí since one of the documents unearthed by the former in Barcelona was the precept issued by Charles the Bald in 844. The text, included by the historian Francesc Calça (1521–1603) for the first time in his *Liber primus de Catalonia* of 1588, supported the various arguments used by Martí in order to account for the replacement of the Spanish King for the French monarch.

Despite its shortcomings and contradictions, Martí’s political thought constitutes an important attempt, however hesitant, to overthrow (or at least to question) a government at Madrid by means of agitation from the periphery. In retrospect Martí’s ideas also helped perpetuate for a further fifty years a form of government in Catalunya which was however bound to be challenged once more, in 1700 with the enthronement of Philip V and the ensuing War of Spanish Succession. In these circumstances Latin also assisted anti-Bourbon pamphleteers in their defence of Catalan rights and liberties.

The tracts examined in this essay may appear minor in a wider European context. Yet, alongside works of similar subject matter written in the vernacular, these writings played an important role in early modern Catalunya. For one, they are yet another example of how Latin at the time became the acquired speech of an elite community that identified itself by this linguistic marker. More relevant to this discussion, these texts also reveal the existence of a defensive form of patriotism even as early as the seventeenth century. Furthermore, this body of tracts helped preserve a sense of political and historical consciousness which later generations were to exploit more effectively. When Catalanism in the last decade of the nineteenth century became a fully-fledged political movement, it drew heavily – as Joan-Lluís Marfany has argued – upon the imagery and discourse of political thinkers

¹⁴ On Tarafa see Eulàlia Miralles’s contribution in this volume.
of the 1640s. It invented traditions closely related to the conflict I have discussed in this essay. Thus, it adopted as the national anthem a popular song which appeared during the War of Separation explaining the reasons for the insurrection. More importantly, by way of reprints of anti-Castilian texts from the seventeenth century, contemporary Catalanism also revaluated the task accomplished by authors who some two hundred years earlier had proudly invoked medieval Catalunya’s unrivalled liberty in order to oppose Spain’s centralist policies. In the end the political awareness of writers such as Francesc Martí i Viladomor set a precedent for those intellectuals and politicians who at the turn of the twentieth century directed their discontent against Spain into proper political channels.

15 Marfany 1995. An example of late nineteenth-century interest, among Catalan historians of the time, in the 1640 revolt is Josep Coroleu’s *Claris y son temps* (Barcelona, 1880).
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Lengua, identidad y religión en el arte catalán de los siglos XVI a XVIII*

Sílvia Canalda i Llobet & Cristina Fontcuberta i Famadas

The aim of this essay is to examine the use of Latin and the vernacular in early modern Catalan art. At the time of the Council of Trent concern is voiced regarding the language in which the religious message should be transmitted; rather than diminishing, this became a heated issue in later provincial councils of the Tarracconense. The examples studied here show how the use of Latin or the vernacular is closely connected to the function and status of the art works in which either is employed. By no means a minor issue, within early-modern Catalan art the choice of Latin or of the vernacular has important linguistic and identity-related ramifications.

Introducción

En este ensayo se pretenden analizar los diferentes usos de la lengua en las artes visuales catalanas de época moderna. En primer lugar, querríamos contextualizar la problemática lingüística que se generó en tierras catalanas después del Concilio de Trento, tomando en cuenta tanto las directrices de Roma como la realidad política y social de Cataluña en esta época, en la que existe un debate sobre la preeminencia del catalán o del castellano en el ámbito religioso. Una vez dibujado este marco, y a partir del análisis de un número significativo de obras de arte, presentamos algunas conclusiones sobre el uso del latín o de las lenguas vernáculas, que está estrechamente relacionado con los usos, las ventajas y el público de cada medio artístico. Aunque la nuestra es una primera aproximación a la cuestión, creemos que las hipótesis de trabajo nos permiten señalar algunas líneas de investigación que pueden ser concluyentes.

* Queríamos agradecer a sus organizadores, en particular a Alejandro Coroleu, que nos invitaran al congreso, en principio alejado de nuestra disciplina, origen del presente volumen. Somos conscientes de que la aproximación a un mismo fenómeno bajo prismas complementarios enriquece el análisis de la cuestión. Este trabajo se inscribe dentro del Grupo de investigación ACAF-ART financiado por el Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia (HAR 2009-07053).
El debate de la lengua en la Iglesia: el caso catalán

Es importante tomar en consideración este profundo debate sobre el uso de la lengua en la iglesia y recordar qué disposiciones se formularon a partir de Trento y su aplicación en tierras catalanas para entender la situación en las artes. Tener en cuenta en qué idioma se lleva a cabo la reforma católica, en qué lengua se adoctrina, en qué idioma están escritos los textos sagrados, entre otros aspectos, es esencial para comprender bajo qué circunstancias puede aparecer el latín en las obras de arte.

En primer lugar, se debe valorar la traducción de la Biblia al catalán y el acceso a los textos sagrados. Ya desde el siglo XIII hubo la voluntad de traducir la Biblia al catalán pero la Iglesia mostró siempre un gran recelo, y las prohibiciones se fueron reiterando desde entonces.¹ Del siglo XIV se tiene noticia de algunas traducciones encargadas por nobles en manuscritos o copias miniadas, de las que se han conservado algunos fragmentos e incluso se conoce la primera versión impresa de 1478, conocida como la Biblia Valenciana. Esto implica que el catalán fue la tercera lengua moderna en disponer de una traducción impresa de la Biblia –después del alemán y el italiano.² Asimismo, han sobrevivido otros textos religiosos en catalán, como el Speculum animae y el Vita Christi, ambas obras de sor Isabel de Villena y que se fechan a finales del siglo XV, o la misma Leyenda Áurea, traducida ya en el siglo XIII.³

Pero las prohibiciones se reiteraron con los Reyes Católicos y la nueva Inquisición de Tomás de Torquemada en Ávila, erigidos como defensores de la verdadera fe que temían las herejías y nuevas versiones de los textos sagrados. Así, bajo el amparo de la Santa Sede, se rechazó traducir la Biblia y se mandó quemar los ejemplares existentes. En este continuado contexto de combate contra las herejías, y siguiendo posteriormente las directrices de Trento, la Biblia se considerará un texto sagrado no susceptible de ser interpretado y las traducciones se creerán peligrosas, muy al contrario de los reformadores protestantes. Por esto, y por las condiciones políticas adversas que vive Cataluña en época moderna, no existen Biblias

¹ En 1233 la Constitución de Jaume I de Aragón redactada con motivo del sinodo de obispos reunidos en Tarragona, prohibía taxativamente la posesión de libros del Antiguo o el Nuevo Testamento en romance, bajo sospecha de herejía. Aún así, ya en 1287 el rey Alfonso II encargó una traducción de la Biblia del francés in idioma nostrum a Jaume de Montjuïc, la cual no se conserva.
³ Para el Vita Christi, véase la edición a cargo de Hauf y Valls (Isabel de Villena 1995). Versiones comentadas del Speculum animae y de las Vides de sants rossellonesos pueden consultarse en Maneikis & Neugaard 1977, con prólogo de Joan Coromines.
en catalán durante un largo periodo. Habrá que esperar hasta el siglo XIX para una nueva traducción y al siglo XX para su versión completa y con el consenso de las autoridades religiosas.

Así pues, el Concilio de Trento (1545–1563) incide de manera directa en la problemática de los idiomas, ya que la *questione de la lingua* ocupó parte del debate tridentino. Se retomó el viejo problema, ya planteado por Erasmo, de la conveniencia o no de las traducciones bíblicas. Aunque algunos abogaban por el acceso a la Palabra de Dios a través de las lenguas vernáculas, otros veían el peligro de la herejía a través de su mayor y más fácil difusión. Así, se consideró que el texto sagrado se debía reservar a los doctos. Más unánime fue la decisión sobre la lengua para la liturgia sacramental, que seguiría siendo en latín, la lengua sagrada, universal y que garantizaba la inmutabilidad de la Iglesia frente la herejía.

Circunscrito el terreno de latín, se abría para las lenguas vulgares un campo privilegiado, el de la catequesis y la predicación, ya que la educación y el adoctrinamiento de los fieles se consideraba de enorme importancia; bajo el control del clero, y siguiendo las indicaciones hechas en el *Catecismo romano*, fue la palabra dicha desde el púlpito el vehículo lingüístico de la instrucción popular. Como es sabido, la predicación se convirtió a lo largo del siglo XVII en un género literario propio.

Evidentemente, las conclusiones de Trento marcarán de manera radical la historia de la lengua de muchas naciones, y también de las artes. Su repercusión se produjo en todos los ámbitos de la sociedad y desde la historia existen varios estudios sobre esta influencia en tierras catalanas. En el caso que nos ocupa, fue en diversos Concilios de la Tarraconense dónde se discutió sobre la lengua y el estilo más propio de la oratoria sagrada. A grandes rasgos, cabe decir que se defendió el uso del catalán como lengua para la predicación. En el segundo concilio de la Tarraconense celebrado después de Trento en 1591, se publicó un compendio breve del *Catecismo romano* en lengua vernácula y se presentaron las normas que sentaron las

---

4 Cabe recordar que después del matrimonio en 1479 entre Isabel de Castilla y Fernando II el Católico, ambos de la casa castellana de los Trastámara, los destinos de los reinos de las dos Coronas, hasta entonces separadas, se unieron. Sin embargo, la Corona de Aragón mantuvo todas sus instituciones hasta que en el siglo XVIII, con la invasión borbónica de Felipe V y el Decreto de Nueva Planta de 1715, la sumisión a Castilla fue absoluta y se perdieron las libertades y privilegios. Muchos catalanes fueron afines a la causa austriaca en la llamada Guerra de Sucesión y optaron por exiliarse. Aunque esto pasara en el siglo XVIII, durante los siglos XVI y XVII el auge del imperio hispánico (con el dominio de vastos territorios en Europa y el descubrimiento de América) y la crisis interna catalana con una economía débil, llevaron a un proceso de castellanización de la sociedad catalana y especialmente de la nobleza.

5 Véase Parcerisas 2010.

bases de los sínodos posteriores. Así, han quedado muchos testimonios de la insistencia de obispos y sínodos diocesanos de este uso del catalán, dejándose oír muy pronto quejas sobre el uso del castellano por parte de algunos religiosos, sobretodo los jesuitas.7

De hecho, éste será el gran debate de la Iglesia catalana a medida que avance el siglo XVII. La polémica entre los defensores del catalán y los del castellano en la predicación se debe entender a la luz de los conflictos políticos que acontecen en este periodo; no es casual la proximidad de la guerra con Castilla y las tropas del Conde-Duque de Olivares. En el Concilio de 1636, el arzobispo Antoni Pérez ratificaba con contundencia el uso de la lengua autóctona. El rigor del texto encendió aún más la polémica y el debate se enardeció, con textos que defendían ideas contrarias. Entre los partidarios del castellano destaca Alejandro Ros y su Memoria, y en cambio, el canónigo de Lleida Dídac Cisteller remarcaba el hecho que no se podía predicar en un idioma que no hablaba el pueblo y rechazaba la idea que el catalán no fuese una lengua docta como el castellano, ya que entre los argumentos de Ros y sus partidarios destacaba la defensa de la posibilidad de “florecer en el estilo”, con el castellano.8

La historiografía es unánime afirmando que en la Cataluña de época moderna, la predicación se llevaba a cabo en catalán, sobretodo en las zonas menos urbanas y más alejadas de las ciudades y los debates religiosos. Si alguna orden era partidaria de la castellanización del discurso pastoral eran los jesuitas.9 Evidentemente, y como ya se ha señalado, este debate traspasaba la cuestión religiosa y se enmarcaba en la dimensión política e identitaria. Se considera que los argumentos de Ros y otros defensores del castellano remarcaban la idea del Imperio hispánico también a través de la lengua, ya que “el castellano sigue la fortuna del Imperio” y por ello “los obispos deben hablar en la lengua del Imperio y se debe predicar en castellano, que es común a todos”. En el concilio de 1637 siguen enfrentándose posiciones; es interesante que se argumente que el latín no es menos usado que el castellano, y que por lo tanto ya existe una lengua culta. Estudios sobre el tema han demostrado, efectivamente, que en la Barcelona del siglo XVI el latín era la lengua culta por excelencia, y que el segundo

7 Así, el obispo de Tortosa se quejó de la prédica en castellano de los jesuitas, que se encontraban al amparo del Papa. El obispo de Solsona, Pere de Puigmari en Decret de la vida pastoral de 1633 rechazaba el uso del castellano para elaborar un discurso más pomposo. En el Sínodo de Urgell de 1635 se afirmaba que predicar en castellano no alimentaba el alma porque la mayoría de la gente no lo entendía. Véase Prats 1995, 24–26.

8 Para toda esta polémica y documentación anexa, véase Prats 1995, 26–39.

lugar se lo disputarían el italiano y el catalán.\textsuperscript{10} Finalmente, con un texto de apoyo de la Generalitat, se hizo llegar a la Sede Apostólica la decisión de predicar en catalán recogida en la Constitución de 1636. Sin embargo, no se ha encontrado rastro de este documento en los archivos vaticanos. Como ya se ha señalado, la situación se enmarca de lleno en los hechos políticos que estallaron en 1640 y hay quien supone que nunca llegó a su destino en su camino de Tarragona a Roma pasando por Madrid. Fuera como fuese, los territorios catalanes vivieron a lo largo del siglo XVII una progresiva sustitución de la lengua autóctona parecida a la de otros pueblos de Europa, pero diferente a la de otros territorios de la Península, como Portugal, que consiguió su independencia. La cuestión de la lengua se comprende sólo a partir de los acontecimientos políticos posteriores, y es un tema de gran complejidad que varía según cada territorio, por lo cual aquí sólo hemos apuntado algunas ideas. Lo que no puede negarse es que se trata de una de las cuestiones más significativas e importantes de las identidades europeas.\textsuperscript{11}

Teniendo presente estas consideraciones, nos disponemos a hablar de los diversos usos del latín o de las lenguas vernáculas en las artes visuales y la arquitectura.

**El uso del latín en el arte catalán religioso de la época moderna: hipótesis de trabajo**

Antes de exponer las tesis de nuestra investigación cabe señalar algunas particularidades del arte catalán que atañen a la época moderna y a la esfera religiosa. En primer lugar, la pérdida de independencia política con la unión a la corona de Castilla conllevó un empobrecimiento del actual territorio de Cataluña debido, entre otros muchos factores, al traslado de los grupos dirigentes y al trasvase atlántico del comercio internacional. Por otra parte, el patrimonio religioso de este período se ha visto muy mermado por distintos acontecimientos políticos y sociales acontecidos a lo largo de los siglos XIX y XX. Desde la invasión napoleónica, pasando por la exclaustración de los bienes eclesiásticos o las revueltas sociales que acompañaron la Semana Trágica o la Guerra civil española significaron la pérdida, por desplazamiento o desaparición, de buena parte del patrimonio religioso que se hallaba aún en los lugares de culto. De ahí que, aunque la muestra de nuestro estudio sea amplia, la consulta de fondos fotográficos históricos de las obras desaparecidas pueda en un futuro reforzar o


\textsuperscript{11} Calvet 1999.
contradecir las observaciones embrionarias que a continuación presentamos de manera sumaria.

En primer lugar, se constata un mayor uso del latín en obras pictóricas o escultóricas que proceden de encargos significativos dentro del territorio en cuestión, tanto desde el punto de vista económico como de calidad artística. Se trata de obras ambiciosas, solemnes, con voluntad de durar. Precisamente esta última voluntad parece explicar el uso del latín. Expondremos algunos ejemplos. La bóveda del aula capitular de la catedral de Barcelona conserva aún las pinturas murales ejecutadas por Pau Priu a partir del año 1705. En el plafón central se representa la Gloria de los Santos Oleguer y Eulàlia acompañada de la inscripción latina: “Spiritus est qui vivificat” (fig. 1). En los lunetos se representan ángeles sosteniendo de manera elegante filacterias con inscripciones bíblicas en latín, procedentes principalmente del Antiguo Testamento (libros poéticos y sapienciales) y del Nuevo Testamento (Evangelios y Epístolas de San Pablo). Al final de las mismas, en letra cursiva, consta la referencia. Algunos términos se subrayan en rojo porque remiten al significado de las alegorías que se representan debajo. La representación de virtudes a partir del recurso de la personificación se remonta a la Psicomachia de Prudencio. Fue un tema muy habitual durante la Baja Edad Media en programas de inspiración escolástica, cuando las siete virtudes eran asociadas a las artes liberales o a los planetas. El universo alegórico experimentó un amplio desarrollo a partir del Manierismo, justificando este uso masivo la existencia de una obra como la Iconologia de Cesare Ripa. En la bóveda del aula capitular de la catedral de Barcelona se representan doce alegorías, algunas de las cuales están todavía pendientes de identificación. En cualquier caso, a la espera de resolver las lagunas existentes, bajo las figuras unas didascalias aportan la clave interpretativa de las mismas con inscripciones latinas de autores clásicos, Ovidio u Horacio, o de teólogos y humanistas, Próspero de Aquitania (390–455), Miguel Verino (1469–1487) o John Owen (1616–1683), entre otros. A parte de otras consideraciones de carácter general que serán tratadas a continuación, la presencia del latín en la sala capitular de la catedral de Barcelona responde también a la audiencia restringida y culta de este espacio, reservado a los canónigos y a las autoridades civiles invitadas. Un uso mayoritario de la lengua latina se percibe también en otros programas pictóricos ambiciosos de la primera mitad del siglo XVIII, como

12 En la decoración actual se intuye la participación posterior de un segundo pintor, aún sin identificar aunque diversos especialistas proponen el nombre de Francesc Tramulles, quien trabajó en diversas ocasiones en la catedral de Barcelona hacia el segundo tercio del Setecientos.

la Capilla de los Dolores, adjunta a la Basílica de Santa María de Mataró,\textsuperscript{14} o la Capilla de la Santa Cinta de la sede metropolitana de Tortosa.\textsuperscript{15}

La Biblia en el mundo católico, como hemos indicado en el primer apartado, queda sujeta a la lengua latina como precaución a posibles interpretaciones personales o parciales que pudieran conducir a la \textit{falsa} doctrina. Ante este posicionamiento ideológico es natural que en aquellas obras visuales dónde se reproducen versículos, éstos aparecen normalmente en lengua latina con independencia de su medio artístico. A pesar de que el grabado sea un vehículo principalmente vernáculo, como explicaremos en el siguiente apartado, existen infinidad de estampas con el pie de imprenta o la leyenda inferior en lengua castellana o catalana, que incorporan el latín en el interior de la imagen por remitir a pasajes bíblicos. Un ejemplo ilustrativo nos lo ofrece un grabado de Agustí Sellent,\textsuperscript{16} a partir de una composición de Pedro Puig, en la cual la Sagrada Imagen de \textit{Nostra Senyora de Queralt} – protectora de la ciudad de Berga – que se presenta de manera alegórica y paisajística a sus pies, va acompañada de una cohorte celestial que constata su pureza por medio de versículos latinos de procedencia bíblica (fig. 2). La pervivencia del latín en esta estampa es ilustrativa del concepto que explicamos porque se trata de una obra tardía (1796) y de una imagen escultórica de fuerte devoción local. Del mismo modo, cuando se reproduce un diálogo entre los hombres y la divinidad, o se emite un comunicado celestial, el mensaje casi siempre se transmite en latín. Así pues, nos resulta interesante soslayar que la lengua de Dios continuaba siendo, hasta las postrimerías del Antiguo Régimen, aquella considerada sagrada y universal por la iglesia en los concilios, el latín. Los ejemplos son infinitos en el ámbito del grabado. Exponemos un caso. Durante la Contrarreforma se produjo una recuperación de la imagen de San José a causa de la particular devoción que le dedicaron algunos místicos, como la misma Santa Teresa de Jesús –reformadora de los Carmelitas–; pero también porque fue interpretado como patrón de la Buena Muerte. En otro grabado de Agustí Sellent observamos a un moribundo en su lecho de muerte que encomienda su alma al santo, apareciéndose éste acompañado de Jesús en sus brazos y de un ángel sujetando una corona, en alusión a la epístola de San Jaime: lo que Dios prometió, la corona de la vida (fig. 3). La leyenda inferior está en castellano,\textsuperscript{17} pero el diálogo que se produce entre el moribundo y San José

\textsuperscript{14} Alcolea 1990, Bosch 1990 y Miralpeix 2005.
\textsuperscript{15} Vidal 2004.
\textsuperscript{16} El grabador Agustí Sellent estuvo activo en Barcelona, como mínimo, entre los años 1763 y 1815.
\textsuperscript{17} Reza: “Imagen del Patriarca San Joseph especial protector y consuelo para la hora de la muerte. Diciendo Jesús, María, Joseph ante esta Santa Imagen: se ganan por cada vez
está en latín. Jesús dice: “Noli timere. Ego Protector tuus sum”. Y el enfermo, a su vez, reza: “Iam letus moriar quia vidi faciem tuam”. Podrían citarse otros muchos ejemplos precedentes, como los que aparecen en las decoraciones cerámicas del taller barcelonés de los Passoles (fig. 4), cuando un Crucifijo ordena a Francisco reparar su iglesia (“Vade, repara domum meam”) o cuando Saulo se convierte al cristianismo tras una visión encegadora (“Saule, Saule, quid me persequeris?”).\textsuperscript{18} La obligada e ininterrumpida presencia del latín en los oficios litúrgicos explican también que cuando las oraciones, los lemas, las letanías o las antífonas, por ejemplo, asomen en las artes visuales lo hagan también en lengua latina. Expresiones como: “Ad maiorem Dei Gloriam”, “Ecce Agnus Dei”, “Ave Maria Gratia plena”, “Ora pro Nobis”, “Turris Davidica”, “Porta Coeli”, “Hortus conclusus” u “Oratio contra calculum” no debían requerir traducción entre ningún segmento de la población, como ejemplificaría el hecho de que aparezcan de este modo en los impresos más económicos y populares. El conocimiento de la doctrina o la catequesis dependía de la repetición verbal dentro y fuera de la iglesia, como explica Henry Kamen.\textsuperscript{19} La recitación de las oraciones básicas era una práctica frecuente y por lo tanto no necesitaba su traducción tampoco en los medios artísticos, aunque el ejercicio memorístico no conlleva siempre la comprensión del significado.

El latín se aprecia también en obras que conmemoran un personaje con una cierta voluntad de permanencia, de perdurabilidad, de proyección en el futuro. Parece como si la inmutabilidad del latín en la iglesia se trasvasara al recuerdo eterno e invariable de las personas dignas, tanto del ámbito civil como religioso. Buena parte de los monumentos funerarios, pictóricos y escultóricos, realizados en Cataluña durante la época moderna incluyen epitafios en lengua latina; desde la decoración escenográfica concebida por Henrique Fernández para los sepulcros de los condes Ramon Berenguer y su esposa Almodis en el presbiterio de la catedral barcelonesa (1575); hasta las tumbas humanísticas de Antonio Agustín (1539), Joan Terès (1608–1610) o Diego Girón de Rebolledo (1679) –estos tres en la sede metropolitana de Tarragona (fig. 5)–, o el mausoleo del marqués de la Mina (1767) –en la...


\textsuperscript{19} Kamen 1998, 458.
actualidad desaparecido. La misma idea parece repetirse en los monumentos efímeros que se erigían en motivo de las exequias de personajes célebres, como monarcas, cardenales o nobles, el aspecto de los cuales podemos reconstruir en algunas ocasiones por medio de grabados realizados a tal efecto. Una buena muestra puede ser la traducción gráfica realizada del túmulo funerario del Maestro General de la Orden de los dominicos Fra Tomás Ripoll, dibujado por Manuel Vinyals y grabado por Albert Borguny. También en relicarios suele encontrarse el latín en inscripciones o filacterias –como en el relicario de san José (1657) o de San Francisco Javier (1711)–; no en vano todas las reliquias pasaban por un proceso de autentificación y esto conllevaba un contacto con el sector oficial de la iglesia, y por lo tanto con la lengua latina.

Otro ámbito en el que se constata el uso invariable del latín es en los esquemas arquitectónicos derivados de modelos clasicistas, que fueron recuperados en época del humanismo y que perduraron incluso más allá de las prescripciones postridentinas. En el enmarcimiento de puertas y ventanas se aplicaron órdenes arquitectónicos de filiación clásica cuyos entablamentos mostraban concisos mensajes latinos en letras capitales en el interior de sus frisos. Los ejemplos serían de nuevo infinitos: el portal de Santa María la Vella de la Seu de Lleida (1559–1582), la reja de estilo plateresco de la catedral de Tortosa (1590) o la fachada lateral de la Iglesia de Belén en Barcelona (ca. 1690). Muy ilustrativo es el caso de la configuración del presbiterio de la capilla del Santísimo Sacramento de la catedral de Tarragona (1580–1592), obra promovida por el arzobispo Antonio Agustín, uno de los máximos representantes de la Contrarreforma en Cataluña quien participó activamente en el Concilio de Trento, y proyectada a su vez por Jaume Amigó, uno de los máximos exponentes de la introducción del Renacimiento arquitectónico en el sur de Cataluña (fig. 6). En el friso del entablamiento dórico que articula el muro frontal del antiguo refectorio gótico y que acaba generando un arco de triunfo, en cuyo...
interior se encabe el retablo fingido, leemos: “Ecce agnus Dei, ecce qui tollit percata mundi; qui manducat hunc panem vivet in aeternum”.

Obviamente el latín siguió siendo la lengua culta en Cataluña durante los períodos llamados del Renacimiento y el Barroco a pesar del avance inexorable de las lenguas vernáculas y de la particular convivencia lingüística entre catalán y castellano, con la progresiva imposición del segundo tanto en el ámbito religioso como político. Por ello, los impresos de carácter científico son mayoritariamente en lengua latina. Un buen ejemplo son las tesis filosóficas o teologales. Ilustradas con grabados de calidad artística notable, a veces realizados ex proceso y otras re-aprovechados, las líneas argumentales se exponían mayoritariamente en latín. Cabe destacar en este sentido algunas imágenes impresas de Ignasi Valls en defensa, por ejemplo, de la Inmaculada Concepción de María (fig. 7). La audiencia culta, la calidad de eterno y la sacralidad asociada a una lengua explican a grandes rasgos la pervivencia del latín en el arte catalán de época moderna (ss. XVI – XVIII).

El grabado: el medio artístico del adoctrinamiento y la preeminencia de las lenguas vulgares

El grabado es el medio artístico preferente en el adoctrinamiento religioso. La iglesia fue rápidamente consciente de las ventajas que este nuevo lenguaje ofrecía a causa de la reproducción mecánica de la imagen, su bajo coste y fácil transporte. Por todo ello, se adecuaba perfectamente a varios obje""
Fontbona,25 es decir, existen excelentes xilografías y pésimas calcografías. Sin embargo, el coste más elevado del grabado sobre cobre es un factor determinante para su uso entre los sectores con menor poder adquisitivo.

El uso de las lenguas vernáculas en las estampas religiosas coincide principalmente con dos funciones, que a su vez explican la intervención de las mismas para abrazar un amplio espectro social. En aquellos grabados que tienen una finalidad narrativa o descriptiva predomina el vernáculo. La necesidad de explicar de manera detallada alguna acción exigía probablemente el uso de las lenguas vernáculas ya que el mismo contenido en latín difícilmente sería comprensible por una población mayoritariamente analfabeta y alejada de la cultura clásica. En Cataluña el latín podía ser desconocido incluso entre el bajo clero, tanto secular como regular; de igual modo, su uso disminuyó considerablemente entre las élites culturales a lo largo de los siglos XVI y XVII.26 Tampoco se puede olvidar que el contenido literario de las estampas podía transmitirse de manera oral; tanto el mundo católico como el protestante aplicaron la hibridación de medios para la instrucción religiosa de la población. Gran parte de la instrucción se basó en la transmisión oral de las doctrinas.27

Entre los grabados estudiados se aprecia una diversidad de usos dentro de esta tendencia narrativa que busca complicidad con el lector a partir de los detalles. Así, en el anuncio de concesión de indulgencias la imagen va acompañada de un texto en vernáculo que concreta las condiciones del perdón, como en el caso del grabado de Santa Eulàlia (fig. 8).28 Asimismo, en estampas donde se divulga el ámbito de protección específico de un santo, éste se explicita en lengua vernácula. San Jerónimo protegía las parteras y ahuyentaba los malos espíritus; la cabeza decapitada de San Anastasio curaba las enfermedades, o los Santos Mártires Llucià y Marsià protegían contra las inclemencias del tiempo.29 De igual manera, cuando se

28 Reproducimos la leyenda: “El illustissimo Señor Don Asensio Sales Obispo de Barcelona en 26 de Enero de 1763, a todos los Fieles, que delante de esta Santa Imagen de la Virgen y Mártir Catalana Santa Eulalia, hija y patrona de Barcelona, cuyo sagrado cuerpo se venera en la Santa Iglesia Cathedral, rezare un Padre Nuestro, Ave Maria, y Gloria Patri 40 dias de perdón, y rezando el Rosario por cada Padre Nuestro y Ave Maria lo mismo”; que aparece en un grabado de Francesc Boix (ca. 1731–1806) dónde se reproduce una imagen escultórica de plata sobredorada realizada por Joan Perutxena (1644), conservada en el Tesoro de la catedral de Barcelona.
29 Ilustramos este ámbito temático con la reproducción de la leyenda de un grabado anónimo: “Los sants Mårtirs Llucià y Marcìa Particulars Advocats per la Pluja, y contra las tempestats de Trons y Llamps. Patrons de la Ciutat de Vich en Catalunya, en la que se
trata de narrar un hecho prodigioso o un milagro de ámbito local en las leyendas se utiliza el castellano o el catalán. ¿Sería posible interpretar correctamente esta imagen sin el texto que la acompaña? Por otro lado, ¿Qué sentido tendría explicar en latín un éxtasis juvenil de Ignacio de Loyola ocurrido en el barrio gótico de Barcelona? (fig. 9).  

La segunda función que determina el uso mayoritario de las lenguas vernáculas es la devota. Entre las estampas de devoción destacan en Cataluña los llamados goigs, género que gozó de gran difusión y que pervive en la actualidad. Se trata de composiciones poéticas en alabanza normalmente a la Virgen, Jesucristo y los santos locales. Por lo que atañe a su estructura, suelen estar divididas en coplas de seis versos octosílabos, encabezadas por un pequeño grabado mariano, cristológico o hagiográfico en xilografía. Los más frecuentes eran los dedicados a los siete episodios de la Virgen o Septem Gaudia. Mayoritariamente eran en lengua catalana, como bien ilustra la producción del impresor Jolis Pla. En conjunto, se consideran un gran patrimonio de la cultura catalana. Al margen de esta especificidad, infinidad de grabados sueltos con imágenes de misterios, santos o vírgenes locales van acompañados de inscripciones vernáculas. Desde la Virgen del Rosario, a Nuestra Señora de Montserrat o las estaciones del Via Crucis. 

Con independencia de la temática y el uso de las imágenes, se constata la convivencia en muchas ocasiones del latín con alguna de las dos lenguas vernáculas. Esta circunstancia responde a múltiples factores, algunos de las cuales ya han sido explicados, como las citaciones bíblicas o la sacralidad asociada al latín. En otras ocasiones esta pluralidad lingüística responde a la progresiva absorción de series temáticas pertenecientes a la cultura gráfica europea. Se constata en este proceso la existencia de tirajes de mayor calidad con inscripciones latinas junto a otros de menor calidad con leyendas vernáculas. Una buena muestra de esta casuística se encuentra en la serie de los Novísimos o de las Postrimerías, compuesta por cuatro estampas, dedicadas respectivamente a la muerte, el purgatorio, el infierno y guardan y veneran los Sants Cossos en cendras y ossos, celebrantse sa festa en 26 de Octubre".

30 El buril de Francesc Gazán está editado en Barcelona el año 1693. La leyenda dice así: “Ignacio de Loyola, que antes de fundar la Compañía de Jesús, estudiando Gramática en Barcelona, viviendo en casa de Juan Pasqual, en la calle de los Algodoneros, fue del visto muchas veces en la forma que explica esta estampa”.


32 En la actualidad existen diversas páginas web dedicadas a su compilación y difusión (http://bibliogoigs.blogspot.com/).
la gloria, de las cuales se conocen tres ediciones, como mínimo. Otro ejemplo lo ofrece la imagen de San Liborio. Siendo un culto procedente de Italia, las primeras estampas que se encuentran en Cataluña están en latín, mientras que en el ámbito de los goigs toda la plegaria se escribe en catalán y la calidad de la imagen es mucho menor (fig. 10).

En definitiva, las lenguas vernáculas tuvieron un importante papel narrativo y explicativo en las artes visuales a la vez que respondieron a la demanda devota de una audiencia amplia que no conocía el latín con excepción de algunos textos recitativos. En espera del avance de la investigación, hemos esbozado las principales funciones que asumen las lenguas vernáculas y el latín en el arte catalán de época moderna.

---

33 Así, por ejemplo, en la editada por Pere Abadal el año 1684, las leyendas en el interior del grabado están en latín, mientras que las explicaciones al pie de la imagen aparecen en castellano.
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Pere Puig (inv.) y Agustí Sellent (sculp.), La Milagrosa Imagen de Nuestra Señora de Queralt. 1796. Colección particular.
Agustí Sellent, *Imagen del Patriarca San José, especial protector y consuelo para la hora de la muerte... Buril. Colección particular.*
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Fig. 5

Sepulcro de Antonio Agustín. 1576–1586. Tarragona, Catedral, Capella del Santíssim (Fotografía de las autoras).
Fig. 6
Jaume Amigó (proyecto), Bernat Cassany y Pere Blai, Capilla del Santísimo Sacramento. 1580–1592. Tarragona, catedral (fotografía de las autoras).
Fig. 7

Ignasi Valls (del y scul), Tesis filosófica. Barcelona, Tipografia Herederos Bartolomeu Giralt, 1806. Colección particular
Fig. 8

Francesc Boix, Santa Eulàlia, ca. 1763, grabado calcográfico. Colección particular.
Fig. 9.
Patriotism and the rise of Latin in eighteenth-century New Spain:
Disputes of the New World and the Jesuit construction of a Mexican legacy

By Andrew Laird

During the 1700s, Jesuit authors from New Spain sought to promote the richness of Mexico’s nature and culture, in response to Enlightenment polemics about the degeneracy of human and natural life in the Americas. This paper will explain why they wrote in Latin in order to do so – even though creole writers of the later 1600s had followed European practice in adopting the vernacular as a literary and intellectual medium. Consideration of some works produced by these Mexican authors between 1750 and 1780 (including Alegre’s Latin translation of Homer’s Iliad, Abad’s Dissertatio ludicro-seria, López’s Aprilis Dialogus, Eguiara y Eguren’s Bibliotheca Mexicana) indicates the principal reason: the creole Jesuits sought to construct a legacy for Mexico to match the monumental representation of Iberia’s august Greco-Roman past and of the Spanish Golden Age in the Bibliotheca Hispana nova and the Bibliotheca Hispana vetus which the Sevillian scholar Nicolás Antonio had compiled in Latin in the mid-1600s.

In an essay entitled On the Study of Latin which first appeared in 1851, Arthur Schopenhauer lamented that the abolition of Latin as the universal language of learned men, together with the rise of provincialism which attaches to national literatures has been a real misfortune for the cause of knowledge of Europe.¹

Latin was not only a key to the understanding of Roman antiquity and of the Middle Ages; it also facilitated historical understanding of more modern times, up to about 1750: Eriugena in the ninth century and Ramon Llull in the thirteenth wrote in Latin, as did Bacon in the seventeenth. Had these

¹ Schopenhauer 2007, 29.
authors written in the languages of their own times and countries, argued Schopenhauer, much of their meaning would now be lost. This realisation prompted the philosopher to offer a related reflection:

Here let me observe, by way of parenthesis, that when patriotism tries to urge its claims in the domain of knowledge, it commits an offence which should not be tolerated. For in those purely human questions which interest all men alike, where truth, insight, beauty, should be of sole account, what can be more impertinent than to let preference for the nation to which a man’s precious self happens to belong, affect the balance of judgment, and thus supply a reason for doing violence to truth and being unjust to the great minds of a foreign country in order to make much of the smaller minds of one’s own!2

Recent accounts of the role of Latin in the early modern period concur that use of the language rapidly diminished from 1750 to 1800, whilst they emphasise its importance (and that of classical learning generally) for a coherent understanding of Western culture.3 Schopenhauer’s recognition of a tension between Latin and the claims of patriotism, also anticipated – if it did not directly inspire – an observation by the twentieth-century historian Benedict Anderson:

the universality of Latin never corresponded to a universal political system[…]. No sovereign could monopolize Latin and make it his-and-only-his language-of-state, and thus Latin’s authority never had a true political analogue.4

Anderson further argued that printing consolidated the position of regional vernaculars in the early modern period, strengthening perceptions and definitions of linguistic identity which would lead to the emergence of national-ism in the nineteenth century.

Yet from the 1740s onwards, at the very time when the currency of Latin began diminishing in Europe and the “creole patriotism” of Spanish Americans was becoming more pronounced, there was a marked increase in the number and in the scale of works of general literary and intellectual interest being produced in Latin. This trend appears all the more surprising because the Latin authors – creole Jesuits who now constituted New Spain’s intelligentsia – were well aware of the acclaim accorded earlier poets and historians who had followed European practice in adopting the vernacular.5 The

2 Schopenhauer 2007, 30.
5 A comment of Eulàlia Miralles in this volume has ramifications for colonial Mexico: “The relationship, in the early modern period, between Latin and the vernacular was not merely, in historiography and other genres, one of linguistic preference. As a rule, Latin
present paper will show that this rise of Latin literary production was related to the growth of patriotic feeling among creole Mexicans, and it will explain – by moving from effects to their causes – the contingent occurrences which inclined the Jesuits to adopt Latin as the vehicle for their forceful defences of New Spain’s heritage.

1.

By the eighteenth century the Spaniards born in the Americas, now widely referred to by historians as *criollos* (creoles), could no longer identify with those born in Spain, for all that they distinguished themselves from indigenous Americans (whom they called *Indios*, “Indians”), *mestizos* (people of mixed race), blacks, and other groups. The Crown had long regarded its interests as best served if economic and political control in the colony remained in the hands of peninsular Spaniards, making it difficult or impossible for educated creoles to secure positions in the colonial administration. The tough economic conditions imposed by Charles III’s Bourbon Reforms of the mid-1700s help to explain why the intellectual elite, in New Spain at least, was effectively confined to the Society of Jesus, which had become the most prominent and powerful religious order in Spanish America.

The leading lights among the Mexican Jesuits of the later eighteenth century – the philosophers Juan Benito Díaz de Gamarra and Andrés de Guevara y Basoazábal, the historians Francisco Javier Clavigero, Andrés de Cavo and the biographer Juan Luis Maneiro, scholars and poets such as Diego José Abad, Francisco Javier Alegre, Rafael Landívar, Andrés Diego de la Fuente and Agustín Pablo de Castro – were all disciples of Padre José Rafael Campoy (1723-1777), an advocate of the *Nova Scientia*. “No one could write an encomium of any of these men”, wrote Maneiro “without frequently mentioning Campoy’s name.” Although none of José Rafael Campoy’s own writings survive, his reform and expansion of the Jesuits’ curriculum came to accommodate mathematics, Greek, modern languages, and the ideas of Descartes, Bacon, Gassendi, Locke, and Newton. But in
addition to their studies in philosophy and theology, the Jesuits inspired by Campoy were also addressing Mexican themes in texts, which would appear to have been aimed at secular readers or students as well as their Jesuit colleagues.

As a result of Charles III’s reformist legislation, which led to the expulsion of the Jesuits from all Spanish territories in 1767, Campoy and his colleagues were among the 700 members of the Society exiled from New Spain, most of whom settled in the Papal States of Italy.10 Had it not been for this migration, their writings might never have been published to reach European readers.11 Their literary achievements were significant: Alegre’s Latin verse translation of the *Iliad*, his *Alexandrias*, an original Alexander epic with an apologetic essay (Bologna 1776), De la Fuente’s epic on the Virgin Mary of Guadalupe, *Guadalupana Imago* (Faenza, 1773), Landívar’s *Rusticatio Mexicana* (Modena 1781, Bologna 1782), and Abad’s theological epic in forty-three books, *De Deo Deoque Homine Heroica Carmina* (Cesena, 1780, with several reprints). Major prose works produced included Abad’s *Dissertatio ludicro-seria* (1778), Maneiro’s *De vitis aliquot mexicanorum* (Bologna 1791-1792), and Guevara y Basoazábal’s progressive philosophy text book *Institutiones philosophicae ad usum mexicanae iuventutis* (Rome, 1796). Alegre’s study of political ethics on theological principles, *Institutiones Theologicae Libri 7* (Venice, 1789-1791) was published posthumously in 1797 and Andrés de Cavo wrote a lengthy “civil and political history of Mexico” in Latin prose – though only his Spanish version was published.12

This energetic production of these works in Latin was certainly not because the exiled authors were unable to write in Italian. Clavigero, who himself translated his history of pre-Hispanic Mexico into Italian, *Historia antica di Messico* (Bologna, 1780), also produced a *Breve Ragguaglio della Prodigiosa e Rinomata Immagine della Madonna de Guadalupe* (Cesena, 1782), a collection of sources on the apparition of the Virgin Mary of Guadalupe in Mexico, while the South American Juan Ignacio Molina published his *Saggio sulla storia naturale del Chili* (Bologna, 1782). Pedro Marquéz

10 Batllori 1966 is the standard study of the Spanish American Jesuits in Italy; see further Guasti 2006.

11 Abad’s *Dissertatio*, De la Fuente’s *Imago*, and Guevara y Basoazábal’s *Institutiones* are not in the bibliography of works published by Spanish American Jesuits in Italy in Deck 1976, 96–99, but further vernacular items are listed. See also Aymerich 1784, a contemporaneous *Bibliotheca* of work by exiled Jesuits. Burrus 1959, Guzmán 1964, Reveli 1926, Torre Villar 1980 list further sources in European collections: Todá y Güell is a five volume bibliography (in Catalan) of works by Spaniards printed in Italy from the introduction of printing until 1900.

12 Cavo 1836.
was another New Spaniard whose writings were printed in Italian: his accounts of two ancient Mexican archaeological sites, *Due antichi monumenti di Architettura Messicana* (Rome, 1804) was followed by *Esercitazioni architettoniche* (Rome 1808) on architectural theory in Vitruvius and various classical sources.\(^\text{13}\) Moreover, the fact that this group of Jesuits also made Spanish rather than Latin translations of texts in other languages shows that they were well aware of the benefits of propagation in the vernacular: José Ignacio Vallejo produced his translation of Binet’s French lives of Saint Joachim and Saint Anna, along with his own hagiographies of Saint Joseph and the Virgin Mary (Cesena, 1774). Alegre rendered or, more precisely, rewrote in Spanish a version of Boileau’s *L’art poétique* (Bologna, 1776); Agustín García de Castro, another member of Campoy’s group, published *Fábulas de Fedro, iliberto de Augusto* (Madrid, 1781), a translation of Phaedrus’ fables, and he also planned to put the Greek of Longinus and Hermogenes and the Latin of Bacon’s *De Scientiarum dignitate atque incremento* into Spanish.\(^\text{14}\)

The Spanish American Jesuits reserved Latin for ambitious original works which were meant to endure – with the apparent exception of Clavigero’s history. And these substantial, more often literary texts, some of which must have already been in progress when their authors were still in New Spain – were either wholly or partly devoted to Mexican themes.\(^\text{15}\) Landívar’s *Rusticatio Mexicana*, for example, was an ambitious didactic poem in fifteen books on country living in Mexico and Guatemala. Again, Alegre’s short epic poem on Alexander the Great culminated in an encomium of the Mexican Virgin of Guadalupe. Alternatively works signalled their author’s Mexican or American provenance: the frontispiece of the 1788 Rome edition of Alegre’s Latin verse *Iliad* billed him as “Mexicani Veracrucensis” (a Mexican from Veracruz), and an engraving of the author’s portrait in his *Institutiones* was appropriately subscribed “Americanus Civis Veracrucensis” (an American citizen of Veracruz). Again, in at least one of the early incomplete editions of his *De Deo Deoque Homine* (Ferrara, 1775) and in his *Dissertatio ludicro-seria*, Diego José Abad gave Se-

\(^{13}\) Marquéz 2007.
\(^{14}\) Castro’s translation of Bacon (attested in Maneiro 1791–1792, 172 = 1988, 503) is now lost.
\(^{15}\) Along with Alegre’s own testimony (in an apologetic essay accompanying his poem the *Alexandriad* as “a work written by a young man of around twenty” (“juvenis vigesimum circtier annum agentis opus est”), Ms 1600 (see III below) shows his Latin translation of the Homeric *Batrachomyomachia* was written in Mexico; “pirated” excerpts from the *De Deo* published by the philosopher Díaz de Gamarra as *Musa americana seu de Deo carminia* (Cádiz, 1769) indicates Abad had begun the poem before the 1767 expulsion: Kerson 1991, 361.
lenopolitanus, “citizen of the Moon”, as his nom de plume. That is a Hellenization of the original etymology of the word “Mexican”: in the indigenous Mesomamerican language of Nahuatl, Mexico derives from metzli and the locative suffix -co: “place of the moon”. The eulogies of Mexico and Mexican traditions which are to be found in all of these works suggest that the linguistic and literary medium of Latin served as a further de facto demonstration of the richness of creole culture.

2.

Unfortunately, not one of the New Spanish Jesuits who wrote in Latin in the eighteenth century explains why he did so, or offers a direct reflection on where he perceived Latin to stand in relation to the vernacular. However, in the 1770s and 1780s, the three pre-eminent Mexican Latinists in Italy, Rafael Landívar (1731–1793), Francisco Javier Alegre (1729–1788) and Diego José Abad (1727–1779) all comment on their diction and usage in seeking to defend themselves from potential detractors. In his preface to his Iliad, Alegre, after explaining that certain charms and qualities of one language cannot be conveyed in another, made an apparently general point which can be construed as an apologetic for his own Latin usage:

Quod autem de unaquaque lingua universa, id etiam de propriis unius-cujusque gentis, Provinciae, immo & urbis loquutionibus dicendum est, quamobrem & Livius Patavitatem, & Virgilius Mantuanitatem redolere dicitur. Idem etiam quod de verbis, de Heroum moribus judicandum est. Quid enim Achillem carnes scindentem, ac distribuentem, aut Nausicaam ad fluvium lavantem, reprehendant, qui ejus gentis, eorumque temporum mores satis cognitos, ac perspectos habeant?

(What may be said about each and every language taken as a whole may also be said about particular forms of speech among each and every people, province, and city, so that Livy is said to have a whiff of...)

18 Laird 2006, 52–53 on Landívar’s Monitum, 262–281 on his sometimes apotropaic notes; the annotations in Alegre 1778 also justify the poet’s Latin diction, especially in relation to Virgil. For Abad’s Dissertatio see below.
19 Alegre’s translation is an impressive accomplishment: his short preface reviews previous Latin and vernacular translations but does little to explain his own endeavour or its purpose.
20 Alegre 1778, ix (my translation).
his Patavinity and Virgil of his Mantuan identity. In fact judgment to be made about diction is same as that made about the customs of [epic] heroes. For why would people reproach Achilles for carving and distributing pieces of meat or Nausicaa for doing her washing by the river, if they have examined and become very familiar with the customs of that race in those times?21

The likelihood of Alegre’s comment amounting to a covert defence of his Latinity is strengthened by the fact that Diego José Abad in his Dissertatio ludicro-seria (published in same year as the preface to his Iliad was printed in Rome) also appealed to Livy’s Patavian Latin, somewhat playfully, as a precedent for the peregrinitas (foreignness) of his own style:

Fuerunt nonnulli, qui Tito Livo etiam, quia Patavii ultra Rubiconem erat natus, aspergent hanc eandem labem peregrinitatis. Si modo est ejusdem farinae peregrinitas, quam Robertus exters assignat, ferent illi, ut opinor, patientissime peregrinorum censu scribi et annumerari. Quod ad me attingit longe, longeque sim contentus magis T. Livii peregrinitate, et “Patavinitate”, quam omnium ejus obtrectatorum urbaniitate.

(There have been several who cast this same stigma of foreignness even on Livy, because he had been born in Padua, beyond the Rubicon. If this foreignness is of that same kind which Roberti attributes to non-Italians, then these individuals, I believe, will endure very patiently being enrolled and counted in the list of foreigners. As far as I am concerned, truly, I would be more content by far with the foreignness of Livy and with his Patavinity, than with the refinement of all his detractors.)22

The purpose of Abad’s Dissertatio – on “whether any born outside of Italy can write Latin well, contrary to what Roberti asserts” (“Num possit aliquis extra Italiam natus bene latine scribere, contra quam Robertus pronuntiat”) – was to rebut that very claim made by the academician Giambattisti Roberti in a letter to a fellow Jesuit scholar Francesco Maria Zanotti.23 Abad had no shortage of arguments: he pointed out for instance that if Roberti had been born in the Netherlands or France he would be reviling the Latin of the Italians, when authors like Erasmus, Grotius, Vossius, Lambinus and Muret were infinitely better than Italians of the same period.24

Roberti’s provocation came to Abad’s attention in the wake of other charges about Spaniards’ capacities in Latin by Clementino Vannetti, secre-

tary of the Rovereto Accademia degli Agiati, and in works of other prominent Italian Jesuits, such as Gerolamo Tiraboschi’s *Storia della letteratura italiana* (Modena, 1771–1782) and *Del Risorgimento di’Italia* (Bassano, 1775) by Saverio Bettinelli. The immediate sentiments behind these polemics have been explained by Miguel Battlori:

> Just as some [Italians] were annoyed that the Spaniards ventured to speak to them of music, others were displeased that they considered themselves as Latinists no less accomplished than the natives of Italy. The idea that the spread of bad taste – both the baroque tendency at the end of the Renaissance and the decline of classical Latin literature – was due to Spanish influence had great currency, and the names of Lucan, Seneca, and Martial were cited as corruptors of a prior “good taste”.

But it is important to realise that these sentiments were in turn triggered by a broader historical consideration. Productive exchange and rivalry between the cultures of Spain and Italy had continued unabated since the Renaissance. Whilst Iberia and the Americas always accommodated Italian culture, not least the currents of humanism, the Crown of Aragon had ruled Sicily and Sardinia in the fifteenth century, formally establishing a capital in Naples and controlling much of the Italian peninsula. From 1735 Naples and Sicily came under the rule of Philip V, Spain’s first Bourbon monarch. In the late 1700s Italy thus remained fragmented: the Bourbon kingdoms of Naples and Milan and the kingdom of Savoy bordered the Republics of Genoa and Venice, and the Papal States (now Lazio, Romagna, Marche and Umbria, where the exiled Jesuits mostly settled). A sense of Spain’s hegemony and its influence all over Italy, along with the fact that Spain had been politically united since the late 1400s, naturally caused resentment amongst Italians who had a strong sense of their shared linguistic and cultural heritage, and explicit articulations of Italian nationalism were to follow the collapse of Napoleon’s rule in the early 1800s. Thus insecurity about identity was in play for both the groups involved in these polemics: a sense of aggrieved patriotism, if not a kind of incipient nationalism, was motivating the Italian Jesuits as much as it was prompting the responses of the Spanish creoles to whom they were opposed. Given that the two groups faced the same

---

25 Deck 41 n. 16. Kerson 1991, 367: “It was a certain Théophile Blanchard, to whom the *Dissertatio* [of Abad] is dedicated, and whom we have been unable to identify positively, who brought this epistle to Abad’s attention four years after its appearance and who urged the Mexican to reply to the alleged boasting of Roberti and Ferri.”

26 Battlori 1966, 35 (my translation).

kind of predicament, it is not surprising that they were eventually reconciled.28

Whether or not Latin should be used as a literary or scholarly medium was another issue. Abad was well aware of debates provoked by the French Encyclopédiste Jean le Rond d’Alembert about the role of Latin as a universal language.29 D’Alembert had argued for the cultivation of modern languages, principally on the basis that no modern author could write good Latin, in his Réflexion sur l’harmonie des langues... et sur la latinité des modernes (Amsterdam 1767), although in the Discours préliminaire of his Encyclopédie (1751), D’Alembert did concede the utility of Latin as a lingua franca.30 Some indication of Abad’s own perception of the larger role of Latin are given in an emotional apostrophe in his Dissertatio to his friend and mentor Rafael Campoy, who had died the year before it was published:

Memini tui, Josephe Campoi[…] Tu sublimiorum et gravissimarum scientiarum cognitione instructissimus, ab ipsismet Scripturarum et Conciliorum, et sanctorum Patrum fontibus theologiam imbiberas. Tu regnorum, provinciarum, urbium distantiam, situm, descriptionem sic animo comprehenderas, tanquam si de specula quadam altissima totum terarrum orbem contueris, Tu longum historiarum filum a mundi exordioad aetatem nostram tenebas manu, et saniore semper critice adhibita, involutissima quaque expectabas. Tibi antiqui omnes Latinitatis Patres, prae me, qui assidue a puero tecum vixi, erant familiares. Quoties tu mihi de orationis ducti et dicendi genere aliquo, aut de multiformi et versatili verbi alicujus us dubitanti lucem majorem ea quam Pareus, aut Popma, aut Nizolius, aut Stephani Thesaurus attulerant, attulisti! Quoties Plinii majoris, aliorumque antiquorum locos tenebrosos et implicitos dilucidius et planius quam interpretes docti, quos ante consulareram explanasti!31

28 Landívar’s poem was praised by Tirobosci; Vannetti’s acclamation in his Epistula ad Abdadum of Abad’s De deo is quoted in Fabri’s Latin biography of Abad, Specimen Vitae Auctoris: Fernández Valenzuela 1974, 86. Ugo Fosoclo later praised Alegre’s translation of the Iliad: Enciclopedia Italiana ii 1929, 288.
29 Roberti 1797, 310 incorporated a reference to Girolamo Ferri’s response to D’Alembert’s charge that no modern could be “a good Latin author” (“bonum scriptorem Latinum”): Kerson 1991, 367.
30 The full title of the treatise in D’Alembert’s Mélanges de littérature, d’histoire et de philosophie (Amsterdam, 1767) vol 5, 523–568 was: Réflexion sur l’harmonie des langues et en particulier sur celle qu’on croit sentir dans les langues mortes; et à cette occasion sur la latinité des modernes: see further Waquet 2001, 263–264. The Catalan Jesuit exile Mateu Aymerich (note 11 above) published a counterblast under the pseudonym of Quintus Moderatus Censorinus: De vita et morte Latinae linguae paradoxa philologica (Ferrara, 1780).
(I remember you José Campoy[...] Most learned in both the knowledge of the sublimest and weightiest sciences, you had imbibed theology from the very founts of the Scriptures, Councils and Holy Fathers. You had comprehended in your mind the distance, place, definition of kingdoms, provinces, cities, as if you gazed upon the whole world from a certain very high place of outlook. You held in your hand the long thread of history from the beginning of the world to our own age, and always by applying sounder critical principles, you explained whatever things were most complicated. All the ancient Fathers of Latinity were more familiar to you than to me who lived with you since childhood. How often when I was unsure about the structure of a sentence, about the style of expression, or the multiform and versatile use of some word, did you provide me with more illumination than Pareus, Popma, Nizolius or the Thesaurus of Stephanus could bear. How often did you explain the dark and tangled passages of Pliny the Elder and other ancients more lucidly and learnedly than the learned interpreters whom I had consulted before.)  

This touching tribute is also highly ideological. Campoy is presented as a visionary – comparable to Epicurus at the beginning of the third book Lucretius’ *De rerum natura* or to the allegorical figure of Homer’s Odysseus as a philosopher, who looks upon the different men and cities. But this sage, in his contemplation of the full course of history, is characterised by Abad as applying a kind of philological method to everything he sees. While Campoy’s contemporaneous biographers presented him as a progressive philosopher who broke the mold of scholastic influence in the colleges and seminaries of New Spain, Abad puts language and Latinity at the very centre of Campoy’s broad intellectual reach. The implication is that knowledge of Latin can transcend time and space, and constitutes the basis for scientific, humanistic and theological understanding.  

The penning of the *Dissertatio* in response to Roberti’s provocative allegation that non-Italians had an inferior command of Latin has been considered an “overreaction”, attributable to Abad’s condition as an exile and to the forced dissolution of the Jesuits ordered in 1773 by Pope Clement XIV. But Abad and his confrères were not just suffering taunts about their capacities in Latin from local Italian savants. The ambitious intellectual endeavours of the exiled New Spanish Jesuits were being conceived partly to counteract an astonishingly polemical study in French, *Recherches philosophiques sur les Américains* (Berlin, 1768), by the Dutch clergyman Cornelius de Pauw. De Pauw, commending Newton, Leibniz, Descartes, Locke  

---

32 Kerson 1991, 374.
and others, held that no book worth reading had ever come out of America. He characterised the indigenous Americans as a race of men who have all the faults of a child, as a degenerate species of humanity, cowardly, impotent, without physical force or vigour, and without elevation of spirit.33

The calendars and magnificent buildings of the Aztecs were simply the fabrication of cynical, unscrupulous Spaniards. De Pauw partly rested his arguments on the thesis of George-Louis Leclerc Buffon who had argued that America was an immature continent in geological terms, with an unhealthy climate, so that all forms of life (including human beings) which inhabited it were deficient, and weaker than those in Europe.34

That attack on American nature was addressed in the first part of Clavigero’s vernacular history, aimed at a wider public. There can be little doubt that Landívar’s detailed encomium of the natural wonders, culture and production of Mesoamerica in the Rusticatio Mexicana was also in part prompted by the writings of Buffon and De Pauw. Landívar laid considerable emphasis on the extent to which his account was informed by eyewitness testimony, as an implicit retort to claims about the Americas which had no basis in firsthand experience.35 The idea that there was a correlation between the condition of a land’s geography and climate and the capacities of its people was taken up by Abad. He made the point that being in Italy is no more conducive to good Latinity than being anywhere else:

Si quod multi existimant verum esset, qui sub mitiore caelo nascuntur, eos ut plurimum mitiore quoque praeditos esse ingenio, atque ad omnia promptiore et meliore, oportebat profecto Mexicanos esse mortalium ingeniosissimos, quandoquidem caelum nacti sunt indulgentissimum[…] Omnia ibi, et studiis fovendis et alendis ingenii videntur conspirare concorditer. Sed si verum facere judicium volumus et seposita amoris affectione decernere, ubi homines nati simus, ex eodem luto coagmenti sumus omnes.36

(If it were true, as many believe, that those who are born under a milder climate are usually endowed with a milder disposition, more

33 “Si nous avons dépeint les Américains comme une race d’hommes qui ont tous les défauts des enfants, comme une espèce dégénérée du genre humain, lâche, impuissante, sans force physique, sans vigueur, sans élévation d’esprit, nous n’avons rien donné à l’imagination en faisant ce portrait, qui surprendra par sa nouveauté, parce que l’histoire de l’homme naturel a été plus négligée qu’on ne pense.” De Pauw 1768, Préliminaire, p. VIII.
fitted and better for all things, indeed Mexicans would have to be the most ingenious of mortals since they enjoy a most indulgent climate [...] Everything there seems to conspire harmoniously to nurture studies and nourish genius. But if we want to pass true judgment [...] having set aside prejudice we would conclude that wherever we men are born, we are all made of the same clay.)

Thus it is concluded that clever or stupid people can be born anywhere. The claim Abad showed to be tendentious – that the quality of a land could determine the intellectual capacities of its people – was in many respects a reprise of arguments given particular prominence by Julius Caesar Scaliger’s ferocious response, more than two centuries before, to the natural historical theses of Girolamo Cardano’s De subtillitate.37 But it is far more likely that the writings of Buffon and De Pauw precipitated Abad’s apparent “overreaction” to Roberti. Roberti was only talking more generally about non-Italians, and he had made no mention himself of Spaniards or Spanish Americans. For Abad there was more at stake than just the aptitude of Mexicans for Latin: beneath the surface of his tract he was fighting a bigger battle.

In this respect an epistle to the “flourishing youth of Mexico” by Abad’s biographer Manuel Fabri, E[mmanu]elis F[abri] Florentissimae Mexicanae Iuventuti, which prefaced the posthumous third edition of his De Deo (Cesena, 1780), is highly pertinent. 38 Fabri urged young Mexicans assiduously to cultivate Latin to the highest level, specifically in order to make “foreign peoples”, i.e. Europeans, aware of the natural riches with which their country is endowed:39

Agite igitur, Mexicani, Juvenes, in idque totis viribus incumbite, ut puram tersamque Latinitatem, e Tulliano potissimum fonte caeteris>que aetatis aureae Principibus petitam, serio et constanti studio multorumque annorum labore et perseverantia possideatis. Id enim a vobis in primis carissima Patria expectat, ut quas in ejus sinus opes plenis natura manibus profudit, preciosiores apud exteram Gentes efficiatis: Id familiarum vestrarum dignitas exigit; sic enim avitam gloriem, maiorumque decora virtute parta, hoc etiam clarissimo hon-

37 Scaliger 1557 §99, 131 (and passim); Cardano 1550. That seminal Renaissance controversy, explored in detail by Maclean 1984, is overlooked in Gerbi 1973 and other accounts of the “dispute of the New World”. Cañizares-Esguerra 1999 explains the context of Scaliger’s polemic in sixteenth-century Europe and its ramifications for Spanish America.
39 Compare the Appendix (94–112) to the Rusticatio Mexicana (Laird 2006, 258) in which Landívar, the poet of Mexican nature, writing from Bologna, exhorts the florens iuventus in Mexico to cultivate knowledge of science.
ore auctam, posteris vestris magis, magisque augendam hereditatem relinquetis.

(Up then, Mexicans in your prime, apply all your strength to this end, that you may, after serious and constant study and years of steadfast toil, lay claim to pure and succinct Latinity, sought from the spring of Cicero and the other princes of the Golden Age. For your most beloved Patria expects this from you above all, that you render the treasures which Nature with hands full has poured forth into her bosom all the more precious among foreign peoples. That is what the merit of your families demands: in this way the glory of your ancestors and the pride of your elders will be secured by virtue, and increased in honour and renown, it will grow all the more as an inheritance you leave your descendants.)

These sentiments are significant, in part because they run counter to the tenets of D’Alembert and the Encyclopédistes, but mostly because of the remarkable advocation that the most elegant Latin should be the vehicle of Mexican patriotism, in order to secure an enduring legacy for the future.

3.

The exiled creole Jesuits’ tendency – to address their patriotic concerns by using voluminous Latin works as a sledgehammer to smash the walnut of glancing or misconceived invective from Europe – had a significant and conspicuous precedent: Juan José Eguiara y Eguren’s monumental Bibliotheca Mexicana (Mexico City, 1755). The Bibliotheca was designed to provide a dynamic demonstration of Mexican intellectual achievement through a catalogue of every Mexican author from the conquest up to the time when the first volume was published. Arranged in alphabetical order of authors’ first names, the entries of the Bibliotheca Mexicana gave their biographies, followed by a list of works, extant or not, quoting critical verdicts on them and assessing their legacy. Only the entries from A to C went into print before Eguiara died in 1763 – the remaining text in manuscript goes up to the letter J. There is also a series of Anteloquia, prologic excursuses, by Eguiara on the achievements of both pre-Hispanic Mexico and colonial New Spain, the headings of which are reproduced in the Appendix below.

There may have been a variety of peripheral stimuli for this ambitious undertaking – for example an apocryphal account of the Bourbon excavations in Herculaneum printed in Mexico in 1748 evidently engendered cre-

---

40 Abad 1974, 66 (my translation).
41 Eguiara y Eguren 1986.
42 Eguiara y Eguren 1944 is an edition and Spanish translation of the Anteloquia.
oles’ interest in Mesoamerican archaeology. But it is well known that Egüiara’s endeavour was primarily a response to a particular European polemic about the paucity of culture and learning in the New World: a Latin letter in the collected *Epistulae* of Manuel Martí, Dean of Alicante in Spain, first published in Madrid in 1735. In letter 16 of Book 7 Martí offered a bleak picture of intellectual life in Spanish America to a pupil named Antonio Carillo, who had thought about continuing his studies in Mexico:

> Quo te vertes apud indos, in tam vasta litterarum solitudine? Quem adibis, non dicam magistrum, cius praeceptis instituariis, sed auditorem? Non dicam aliquid scientem, sed scire cupientem? Dicam enucleatius a litteris non abhorreantem? Ecquosnam evolves codices? Equas lustrabis bibliotecas? Haec enim omnia tam frustra quaeres, quam qui tondet asinum vel mulcet hircum. Eugepae! Abice has nugas atque eo iter converte, ubi et animum excolere ques et honestum vitae subsidium tibi parare et novos honores capessere: ita tamen cum animo tuo reputa, non te idcirco urbem petisse, ut vias, et compita tereres, ut aedificiorum magnificentiam admirare, ut in salutationibus, caeterisque Candidatorum officiis contabesceres: his enim artibus quid refert Romae ne sis, an Mexici?44

(Martí 1735, ii, 38–39 (my translation).)

Martí’s letter was quoted at length in *Anteloquium* I; shorter passages of it were cited again through all of the *Anteloquia* of the *Bibliotheca Mexi-
Another Latin work by Eguiara, *Selectae dissertationes Mexicanae* (Mexico City, 1746) was prefaced by a eulogy of the University of Mexico, which was devised as another retort to Martí, although there he is not explicitly mentioned.

Eguiara y Eguren was far from alone in responding to the Dean of Alicante’s invective: it was rebutted in a Latin inaugural lecture at Mexico University by Juan Gregorio de Campos y Martínez in 1745, which was published in the same year. The preliminaries of the small volume contain letters, also in Latin from those holding the highest offices in the Royal University of Mexico, including the Rector, Ignacio Rodríguez who wrote to Philip V himself to protest at Martí’s calumny of the Americas and of Mexico in particular. Another less commonly explored response to Martí, included in its entirety in the opening pages of the *Bibliotheca Mexicana*, is the *Aprilis Dialogus* by Vicente López. The dialogue, between a Spaniard, a Belgian, and an Italian, is first conducted under a shady plane tree in a villa outside Mexico City, recalling the setting of Plato’s *Phaedrus*. Leonardo Bruni Aretino and other writers of dialogue in Renaissance Italy favoured such settings, but the environs of Mexico City had also offered an idyllic backdrop for the Latin *Dialogi* by the sixteenth-century humanist Francisco Cervantes de Salazar. López’s staging of his dialogue in April may allude to the date of viceregal *imprimatur* for the first volume of the *Biblioteca Mexicana*, 28 April 1755, but Antony Higgins has also suggested the spring time symbolises an intellectual reawakening in Mexico:

---

45 *Anteloquia* I, II, VII, VIII, IX, in Appendix below.
46 Eguiara y Eguren 1991. As with the *Bibliotheca Mexicana*, only the first volume of this philosophical work was published: three were projected.
47 Copies of Campos y Martínez’ *Oratio apologetica* (1746) are in the Santa Barbara Mission Archive Library and the Lafragua Collection of the National Library of Mexico: Heredia Correa 1991, xxvii–xxxvi; Osorio Romero 1976, 124–130. Brading 2002, 131, 154–155, 235 details other responses to Martí’s remarks by Bartolomé Felipe de Ita y Parra (1743); José de Mercado and José Torrubia who each remarked in 1744 that Martí was echoing Nicolás Antonio’s comment that “all is traded in the Indies, save books”. Brading 2002, 235 also outlines the later reaction of the bibliographer José Mariano Beristáin de Souza in *Biblioteca hispano-americana septentrional* (Mexico City, 1816–1821).
48 Eguiara y Eguren 1986 = 1755 (López’s text has no pagination); López 1987 is a modern edition.
49 *Phaedrus* 230b–c. Plato’s opening is recalled both by Cicero’s use of an oak tree and by a corresponding discussion of myth (Roman rather than Greek) myth at the beginning of the *De legibus* Book 1.
50 Bruni, *Ad Petrum Paulum Histrum Dialogus*: Garin 1952, 76; Cervantes de Salazar’s *Dialogi* (facsimile in León-Portilla 2001) were appended to his text of Juan Luis Vives *Exercitationes latinae* (Mexico City, 1554).
as a place in which humanist scholarship is being reelevated to the state of vitality it enjoyed in Europe during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries [...] the intellectual culture of New Spain is projected as a scene in which standards of erudition and eloquence similar to those set in motion by humanism in Western Europe are being attained.  

López’s interlocutors in the Aprilis Dialogus commend Eguiara y Eguren’s enterprise, and, among other topics, address the availability of books in America, the benefits of chocolate for intellectual inspiration, and the painting of the Virgin of Guadalupe. Martí’s negative view of the Americas is first criticised by the Spanish speaker, before his arguments are rebutted in detail by the Belgian. Even the locus amoenus in which the narrator situates the latter part of the work is turned against him:

eratque loco facies aspectu mirabilis, variis peregrinisque plantis, et stirpibus consita densis etiam arboribus inumbrata, in quibus plures, et apprime canora aviculae nidificabant. Ut qui aderant nec Ciceronis Academiam requirerent, aut Tusculanum; nec ipsius Alonensis decani villam cui desribendae omnes ille orationis lepores et charites advocavit.

(The place was of a beauty worthy of admiration, abundant in varied and extraordinary plants, strewn with bushes and shaded by leafy tree tops, where songful little birds were making their nests. So that those who were there did not miss Cicero’s Academy, or Tusculanum, nor the villa of the Dean of Alicante himself, for the description of which he had summoned all the charms of expression, and the Graces.)

On several occasions Martí had proudly praised his Villa Popiliana in the countryside near Alicante, and it is mentioned with remarkable frequency by the Dean as the location in which many of his letters were written. However, López’s invocation of Mexico’s appealing natural richness and its clement climate primarily serves to indicate their capacity to stimulate learning and intellectual accomplishment.

Thus, in the 1740s in New Spain, just as in the 1780s in Italy, creoles were composing lengthy and elaborate discourses in Latin in order to address European prejudice. But unlike the onslaughts of De Pauw, Martí’s disparaging of the Americas was brief and it was made en passant: the hapless Dean’s central concern appears to have been the formation of his addressee Antonio Carillo. While it is easy to see why his remarks caused antagonism in New Spain, why did they provide the impetus for such vehement replies from so many prominent figures and lead to more than

51 Higgins 2000, 34.
three decades of toil for Eguiara on an encyclopaedic work in Latin, when his previous publications had been shorter works — panegyrics, sermons and theological tracts — mostly in the vernacular.\(^{53}\) The answer to that question lies in who Martí was, and that leads to the fundamental explanation for the New Spanish Jesuits’ inclination to express their creole, or more specifically Mexican, patriotism in Latin.

4. Manuel Martí was a formidable scholar.\(^{54}\) In the 1680s he came to Rome as a young man and drafted several works, including *Notae in Theocritum*, a commentary on Theocritus, a didactic poem on the currents of the Tiber, *De Tyberis alluvione sylva* (Rome, 1688) which he dedicated to the influential Cardinal José Sáenz de Aguirre.\(^{55}\) During his time in Rome Martí considered following the example of Fulgentius the sixth century bishop of Ruspe and committing all of Homer to memory, but abandoned the idea when he realised this would leave no time for his other pursuits.\(^{56}\) The industrious Spanish antiquarian also drafted a playful *Oratio pro crepitu ventris* and the *Satyromastix*, a response to an invective against the academician Gian Vincenzo Gravina.\(^{57}\) Diego José Abad himself would later note in his *Dissertatio* the significance of the fact that the Italian Gravina not only praised the celebrated Spanish grammarian Sanctius “as prince of both ancient and modern grammarians”, but was also prepared to dedicate his treatise on the Latin language, *De lingua latina dialogus*, to Martí.\(^{58}\) But Abad’s phrasing conveys that the Dean was far from unique in meriting such commendation:

Et quod meo judicio plusculum est, *Dialogum*, quem de *Lingua Latina* composuit, Emmanueli Martino, homini item Hispano inscrispit et attribuit, quasi nullum Gravina alium agnosceret Decano Alonensi praestantiorem, cui difficilem provinciam de Latina lingua digne disserendi committeret.

\(^{53}\) De la Torre 1986, cxi–cxii attributes 442 works to Eguiara, of which only fifteen were published.

\(^{54}\) Guglieri Vázquez 2001 and Gil’s introductory study in Mayans y Siscar 1977 are overviews of Martí’s achievements. Hernando Sobrino 2006 examines his significant contribution to epigraphy during the Spanish Enlightenment.

\(^{55}\) A’Becket 1907 is a short biography of Sáenz de Aguirre.

\(^{56}\) Mayans y Siscar 1977, 73–74.

\(^{57}\) Guglieri Vázquez 1995; 1996.

\(^{58}\) Gravina’s *De lingua latina dialogus ad Emmanuelem Martinum* was printed in *Jani Vincentii Gravinae opuscula ad historiam litterariam, et studiorum rationem pertinentia*, (Oxford, 1792), 169–233 is discussed in Teodoro Peris & Pomer Monferrer 2008.
(And something of more note in my opinion is that Gravina inscribed and devoted the Dialogue on the Latin language he composed – again to a Spaniard – as if he could discern no one more outstanding than the Dean of Alicante to whom to entrust the difficult domain of expounding competently on the Latin language.)

Martí’s *Oratio pro crepitu ventris* is worth mention because a copy of the text was included in a Mexican manuscript of orations and poems (including a version of Alegre’s *Alexandriad* and his *Batrachomyomachia*) dated to 1750, now in the National Library of Mexico (Ms. 1600) and which is believed to come from the Jesuit College of Tepozotlan. The full title of the treatise is given as *Oratio pro crepitu ventris habita ad PP. crepitantes ab E. M. E. A. D.*, “Speech in defence of farting delivered before the Farting Fathers by E.M.E.A.D.” The initials stand for *Emmanuelis Martini Ecclesiae Alonensis Decanus*, “Manuel Martí Dean of the Church of Alicante”. His name and title are given in that sequence in full, in the first edition of the *Oratio* (Madrid, 1737) and in the *Bibliotheca Mexicana*. The fact that no more explicit indication of Manuel Martí’s identity is offered in Ms. 1600, which was presumably copied after the controversy provoked by his letter to Carillo, might tell its own story. At any rate, it is unlikely to be coincidence that in a notice of the contents of Ms. 1600, the nationalistic Mexican bibliographer Joaquín García Icazbalceta omitted any mention of the *Oratio* itself, as well as of its unpopular author.

Appointed Dean in Alicante by the Pope in 1696, Martí returned to Spain where he began translating Eustathius’ collations of Homeric scholia. After a chance discovery in a library in Valencia, he published the Latin poetry of Hernán Ruiz de Villegas, a sixteenth-century Spanish disciple of Vives and a friend of Budé. Martí also visited the ancient theatre of Saguntum and the Roman town of Italica near Seville. His letters were collected in

60 Yhmoff Cabrera 1975, 255–256.
61 Martí 1737; compare the designation of Martí in the title of Eguiara’s *Antelogium I* in the Appendix to this paper.
62 García Icazbalceta (Alegre 1889), viii–ix.
63 Martí’s manuscript *Eustathi Patriarchae Thessalonicensis Excerpta in Homeri Iliada* with a frontispiece, acquired of by his biographer Gregorio Mayans, covered *Iliad* Books 1–5.
64 *Ferdinandi Ruzii Villegatis Burgensis, quae exstant Opera: Emmanuelis Martini Alonensis Decani, studio emendata et ad fidem Casteluiniani Codicis Correcta a Bernardo Andrea Lama, iterum recognita ac recensita, nunc primum prodeunt iussu excellentissimi Domini J. Basilii a Castelvi*, Venice 1734. Nicolás had provided a brief notice of Hernán Ruiz de Villegas in the *Bibliotheca Hispana nova* (under the name of Rodericus Fernandez de Villegas).
65 Mayans y Siscar 1977, 106, 156.
twelve books which came out in Madrid two years before his death in 1737 – the following year a second edition was printed in Amsterdam. That publication secured Martí’s reputation for posterity, but not at all in the way that the Valencian scholar would have expected: he is known to Mexican historians simply because of that letter advising the young Antonio Carrillo against travelling to the New World.

But there is more. When he was still in Rome in his twenties, Martí had been called upon by Cardinal José Sáenz de Aguirre to edit and complete the *Biblioteca Hispana vetus*, “Old Library of Spain”, the ambitious inventory of Spanish authors from classical antiquity to the end of the fifteenth century, which had been projected by the Sevillan bibliographer Nicolás Antonio (1617–1684) and was posthumously published in his name. Antonio’s imposing “New Library of Spain”, *Bibliotheca Hispana nova*, on which he worked through the 1640s originally appeared first, in 1672, and remains indispensable for literary historians of early modern peninsular Spain. This is a dictionary of biography in Latin, of all the Spanish authors writing from 1500 until 1672 – which was the year of the *Bibliotheca Hispana nova*’s first publication in Rome. The period covered by the *Nova* thus spans Spain’s Golden Age of art and literature. Accounts of the authors’ lives are followed by detailed descriptions of the editions of their works so that the two volumes of the *Bibliotheca Hispana nova* alone come to a total of 1,500 folio pages in double columns of dense text.

The *Bibliotheca Hispana vetus* (Rome, 1696) consisted of ten books, again in two volumes, amounting to more than 1,020 folio pages in double columns, with several extensive marginal notes. The arrangement of the *Vetus* was chronological, as Book 1 covered the period from the reign of Augustus to the end third century AD; Book 2 treated the fourth century and so on – although each volume was preceded by an alphabetic *Index auctorum*. In the second volume, alphabetic inventories of authors of uncertain period (*Scriptores incerti temporis*) and of Arabic writers (*Bibliotheca Arabico-Hispana*) also formed a coda to the principal ten books, along with a series of chronologies. Though the importance of Manuel Martí’s contribution is nowadays little recognised, the extent of his involvement was made explicit in the *Monita quaedam ad lectorem* (Advice to the Reader), at the beginning of the first Roman edition of the *Bibliotheca Hispana vetus*:

*Ut autem editio haec accuratissima & correctissima esset, idem D. Cardinalis, illam dirigendam plenè & omnino curandam commisit*

---

66 Martí 1738.

67 *The Bibliotheca Hispana nova* and the *Bibliotheca Hispana vetus* were reprinted in 1788 = Antonio 1996a, 1996b.

68 The dates of the Siglo de Oro are contested: see e.g. Ward 1978, 545.
Bibliothecario & convictore suo D. Emmanueli Martí, natione Hispano & patriâ Valentio, satis noto Romae ob singularem eruditionem Graecam & Latinam, qui ingenti cura & pertinacie labore duo haec volumina Bibliothecae veteris fidelissimè edenda & corrigenda curavit, ac praeterea ad marginem quibisdam locis adiecit notulas aliquot opportunas eiusdem Cardinalis nomine. Si qua autem plura circa auctorem, aut opus ipsum Bibliothecae Hispanae, praesertim huius veteris, quae nunc primum profid, praefari oportuerit, seu praemonere lectoribus, idem D. Emmanuel in se recipiet, prout opportuniûs ipsi fuerit visum.

(In order then that this publication might be as accurate and correct as possible, the same Lord Cardinal [De Aguirre] fully and utterly entrusted its care to his librarian and colleague Don Manuel Martí, a Spaniard from the country of Valencia, very well known in Rome on account of his unique learning in Greek and Latin. With great attention and unstinting toil he ensured that these two volumes of the Bibliotheca Hispana vetus would be very reliably produced and corrected, and furthermore he has added a number of useful short notes to certain passages, in the name of the said Cardinal. If then in any respect it is appropriate to say more about the author or the actual text of the Bibliotheca Hispana by way of a preface or advice to readers, especially with regard to this Vetus now coming out for the first time, let the same Don Manuel take it to himself, as it should be regarded as more fitting for him to do so.)

Folio xxxvi of the original 1696 edition of the Bibliotheca Hispana vetus also contained an Additio, “An Addition in which Manuel Martí provides several prefatory notes with regard to this part of the Bibliotheca”, and Eguiara reveals, on just one occasion, in his Anteloquia, that he was aware that Martí had “corrected and embellished” Antonio’s Vetus, at Sáenz de Aguirre’s behest (“Martinus ipse iussu cardinalis de Aguirre Bibliothecae hispanae veteris editionem accuraverit adornaveritque”).

Historians today are well aware of the impact in New Spain of the dismissal of American learning in Martí’s letter to Carillo. What is not so well understood is the extent to which creole intellectuals felt threatened by the daunting reputation for learning of the writer who was responsible for it, a reputation now largely forgotten. Moreover, Martí’s authority was inevitably consolidated by that of Nicolás Antonio, who had received a canonry in Seville.

---

69 This text “To the reader”, Lectori, was also included in the Madrid 1788 edition: Antonio 1996b, xx (my translation).
70 Antonio 1996b, xxvi; Eguiara y Eguren, Anteloquium IX, (1944), 112.
from Pope Alexander VII and the Order of Santiago from Philip IV, and at the end of his life was in the service of Charles II.\textsuperscript{71} Even so Antonio’s own comment that “in the Indies all merchandise is traded, save books” acquired notoriety in New Spain. Some further remarks in the letter from Antonio to Juan Luis Cortés originally written in 1663 and published in 1742 could also have had a part in prompting the infamous views Manuel Martí would later express himself: “Those unhappily exiled [from Europe]” wrote Nicolás Antonio, “lack interaction with \textit{literati} and contact with works of learning, with which the ground of this part of the Old World is so fecund, especially today.”\textsuperscript{72}

At any rate, Martí’s caustic comments about the America and Mexico could not be simply ignored or brushed off: they needed to be countered by the production of an equivalently colossal display of Latin learning. As Martí and Antonio were pre-eminent antiquarians and literary historians, the potential charge that Mexico could not produce comparable scholars, simply because it had no antiquity or literary heritage of its own, also had to be addressed. The \textit{Bibliotheca Mexicana’s} conspicuous resemblance to the Antonio-Martí \textit{Bibliothecae} was thus far from accidental. Eguiara followed the bio-bibliographical arrangement of the \textit{Biblotheca Hispana nova} (again listing authors under their first names), while his prefaces offered a symbolic equivalent to the \textit{Biblioteca Hispana vetus: Anteloquia II–VIII} extolled the “antiquities” of Mexico, conferring a classical status upon the indigenous Mexicans (\textit{Indi or mexicani}), particularly the Aztecs and Tlaxcaltecs, who were shown to have used hieroglyphs, built monuments and practised oratory (III, IV, VI).\textsuperscript{73} That conception of an ancient legacy for Mexico, purportedly equivalent to that bequeathed to Europe by Greece and Rome also meant that New Spain’s own antiquarians and chroniclers of pre-Hispanic culture such as Fray Andrés de Olmos, Fray Bernardino de Sahagún, Francisco Cervantes de Salazar and Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora could be included. And finally, like the \textit{Bibliotheca Hispana} of the previous century, the \textit{Bibliotheca Mexicana} was written in Latin. Eguiara’s creole pride naturally led him to call his work, “Library of Mexico” – but the obvious alternative, “Library of New Spain”, \textit{Bibliotheca Novohispana} or \textit{Bibliotheca Novae Hispaniae}, would have risked confusion or unwelcome association with the \textit{Bibliotheca Hispana nova} which was the very model and inspiration as well as the foil and butt of his own \textit{magnum opus}.

\textsuperscript{71} Mayáns y Siscar’s life of Antonio is in Antonio 1742, i–xxxv.
\textsuperscript{72} Antonio 1742, 644.
\textsuperscript{73} See Appendix below.
5.

Sixteenth and seventeenth-century Spanish and creole vernacular authors who had written about pre-Hispanic and colonial Mexico were more or less reconciled to their works achieving more circulation in the colonies than in Spain. In contrast, the creole Jesuits publishing in the 1770s and 1780s were committed, even more than Egüíara had been thirty years before, to securing a readership outside New Spain and the Hispanic world. The printing of so many of the exiled Jesuits’ books in Europe, as a consequence of their expulsion, does not mean that the expulsion was what led to those books being conceived or written in the first place: as indicated above, many of them were underway before the Society of Jesus was driven from the colony in 1767.

The Jesuits of the later eighteenth century did not all regard themselves as champions of Egüíara’s ultimately unsuccessful venture. Francisco Javier Clavigero, though he admired his predecessor’s work and drew extensively from it, was far more accomplished as an analytical historian. Francisco Javier Alegre was aghast at the suggestion from a Spanish Jesuit that he might himself continue the Bibliotheca Mexicana:

You are making fun of me. Egüíara filled a whole folio volume with three letters; you propose that I make up for everything Egüíara left from item 672, that I should add the authors from the missing letters of the alphabet, when they were born, when they died, what occupations they had etc. [...] *quarum miseranda peritia est* [“experience in those kinds of things is pitiful”]. I do not concern myself with that sort of thing[...]. Dictionaries, *bibliothecas*, character sketches, parallels, compilations, histories of physics, of theology, and other referential works, in which one talks about writers without having read them and which do not convey scientific knowledge, but only words, personalities, and fancies are not my thing.75

Alegre’s expressed disdain for “*bibliothecas*” in general conveys that he was distancing himself from both Nicolás Antonio and Egüíara y Eguren.

Yet there were continuities: Clavigero’s amusing reference to Cornelius de Pauw (who lived in Cleves) as “Monsieur de Pawl, Dean of Berlin” reflects the fact that the Dean of Alicante’s spectre was still looming large in

---

74 Brading 1991, 388–390 hints at the contrasts of methods and circumstances distinguishing Egüíara and Clavigero; Ronan 1977, 204 and passim indicates Clavigero’s admiration for Egüíara whom he may have known personally.

the 1780s. Charles III had ordered the Royal Librarian Francisco Pérez Bayer to follow in Manuel Martí’s footsteps by annotating a new Madrid edition of the Bibliotheca Hispana vetus and the Bibliotheca Hispana nova. With lettering and illustrations by Jerónimo Antonio Gil, who was appointed chief engraver of the mint in Mexico City, the four meticulously produced folio volumes were printed by Joaquín Ibarra in 1788: the exiled creole Jesuits’ scholarly contacts and connections to the Spanish court meant they would have been well aware that this project was underway.

Latin had always served as the Spanish American Jesuits’ standard vehicle for their researches in theology, philosophy and rhetoric, but in eighteenth-century New Spain it became a vehicle of broader cultural concerns. This trend was spearheaded by Juan José de Eguiara y Eguren’s attempt to construct a monument for Mexico, as a response to Martí’s searing invective about the Indies. But Eguiara could hardly compete with the extraordinary testament to Spain’s historical and literary traditions offered by the Antonio-Martí Bibliothecae. His Bibliotheca Mexicana was more poetic than scientific, expressed in diffuse and inelegant Latin, and had little appeal for the Jesuits of the next generation, who were inspired by the progressive rationalism and philological rigour of José Rafael Campoy. They were still impelled to continue the process of constructing a monument for Mexico, but not by completing Eguiara’s unfinished project. Instead Alegre, Abad, Landívar and others produced ambitious works of their own, availing themselves of

pure and succinct Latinity drawn from the spring of Cicero[…] in order to inform foreign peoples of the greater value of the treasures Nature poured forth into the bosom of the Patria, and[…] to bequeath their ancestors’ glory as a legacy to their descendants.

For all that Schopenhauer might generally object to the incursion of patriotism into the domain of knowledge, he would probably have recognised that these Mexican Jesuits were using the medium of Latin in order to rectify injustices to truth, not to perpetrate them.

---

76 Clavigero 1944, 380 playfully situates De Pauw in Berlin because the Recherches philosophiques were published there in 1768.
77 Manuel Luengo, Diario vol. 24 1790, 235–236, cited in Deck 1976, 36 mentions that Angel Sánchez was an intermediary between Alegre and the court of the king of Spain.
Appendix. Titles of the *Anteloquia* to the *Bibliotheca Mexicana* (1755)

ANTELOQUIA occasionem operis, argumentum, methodum, cetera iis affìnia opportune aperientia.
ANTELOQUIUM I Occasio scriptionis propalam ut detur, Emmanuelis Martini, ecclesiae alonensis decani, Epistola xvi, libri VII, qua habetur tom. eius ii, excscribitur.
ANTELOQUIUM II Quanta decanus alonensis mexicanarum ignorantione antiquitatem laboraverit commo[n]stratur priscorumque eruditio indorum ostenditur codicibus ipsorum et bibliothecis in theatrum productis.
ANTELOQUIUM III num litteratura mexicanorum proprie hieroglyphica dici possit?
ANTELOQUIUM IV Illustria aliquot monumenta traduntur, queis proxime dicta illustrantur atque firmantur ulteriusque priscorum eruditio mexicanensium valide asseritur.
ANTELOQUIUM V Antiquorum collegia et gymnasia mexicanensium indorum a gravissimis scriptoribus bono in lumine collocantur.
ANTELOQUIUM VI Mexicanorum in poetica studium et oratoria traditur; peritia in rebus physicis exhibetur, et quibus utebantur leges innuuntur; tum alia ingenia signa paucis notantur.
ANTELOQUIUM VII Priscos mexicanos non iniuria sapientes inter censendos esse, recta demum consecutione ex hactenus datis infertur, inustiusque eorundem nationi alonensis decanus probatur, si eos in Epistola sua indigitavit et stilo confodit.
ANTELOQUIUM VIII Emmanuelis Martini ignorantia de mexicana eruditione ab eo tempore quo excoli ab hispanis America coepit ad usque aetatem nostram aperit et in scribendo temeritas confutatur.
ANTELOQUIUM IX De codicibus et bibliothecis mexicanis Emmanuelem Martinum latentibus, quem notissima eruditis, imo etiam indoctis multum monumenta effugisse monstratur.
ANTELOQUIUM X Bibliothecae mexicanae aperiuntur, in quas alonensis decanus urbanissime excipiendus atque tractandum.
ANTELOQUIUM XI De americanorum ingenio et in literas amore ac studio.
ANTELOQUIUM XII Ingeniorum maturatio americanorum expendit; eruditissimi ac gravissimi critici M.F. Benedicti Feijoo sententia de ea propulsatur.
ANTELOQUIUM XIII Praeponera americanorum ingeniorum defectio conficta ostenditur et ad fabulas amandatur.
ANTELOQUIUM XIV Ex memorandis in BIBLIOTHECA nostra scriptoribus aliqui enumerantur aetati grandiori iuxtaque insigni pollentes ingenio.
ANTELOQUIUM XV P. Petri Murillo Vearde de re americanorum litteraria iudicium vestigatur et aperitur.
ANTELOQUIUM XVI Insignes aliquot indicantur mexicani eruditi et pridem et aetate nostra conspicui admodum et notissimi.
ANTELOQUIUM XVII Argumento proxime dato insistimus et colophon addimus.
ANTELOQUIUM XVIII Materiae de quibus mexicani scripserunt paucis innuuntur et brevissima in tabula collocantur.
ANTELOQUIUM XIX Quid de indorum eruditione ex quo ab hispanis excoli litteris coeperunt sit pronuntiandum.
ANTELOQUIUM XX Titulus BIBLIOTHECAE MEXICANAE aperitur et ab obiectionibus vindicatur.

(PREFACES revealing the motivation for this work, its argument, method and other things suitably pertinent to them:
PREFACE I That the motive of this written work may be revealed, Letter 16 of Book 7 by Manuel Martí, Dean of Alicante, is excerpted from his 2 volumes.
PREFACE II The great ignorance of Mexican antiquities under which the Dean of Alicante has laboured is pointed out, and the learning of the ancient Indians is demonstrated by bringing their codices and libraries into the arena.
PREFACE III Can the writing of the Mexicans be properly termed “hieroglyphic”?
PREFACE IV A number of glorious monuments are recorded, which glorify and confirm what has been said, and which further give forceful affirmation of the learning of the ancient Mexicans.
PREFACE V The colleges and schools of the ancient Mexican Indians are presented in a positive light by the most authoritative writers.
PREFACE VI The Mexicans’ dedication to the arts of poetry and oratory is recorded; their accomplishment in medicine, and the laws they used are touched on; other indications of their intelligence are noted.
PREFACE VII As it duly follows from the information so far provided, the ancient Mexicans are very rightly amongst those peoples judged to be wise, and the Dean is shown to have been quite unjust if he was referring to them in his letter and pierced them with his pen.
PREFACE VIII Manuel Martí’s ignorance about learning in Mexico from the time when America was first settled by Spaniards to our very own age is revealed, and his rash writing is refuted.
PREFACE IX It is shown that there are conspicuous testaments (from the learned as from many who are unschooled) on the Mexican books and libraries unknown to Manuel Martí which have escaped his notice.
PREFACE X The Mexican libraries are laid open into which the Dean of Alicante may be admitted and shown around in the most civil fashion.
PREFACE XI On the Americans’ talent, love and enthusiasm for letters.
PREFACE XII The rapid growth of Americans’ talents is considered; a judgment on it by the most learned and authoritative thinker Fray Benito Feijoo.
PREFACE XIII The rapid diminishing of Americans’ faculties is shown to be a fiction and may be despatched to the realm of fable.
PREFACE XIV Of the authors commemorated in our *Bibliotheca* several may be counted whose talents were flourishing at a rather advanced age.
PREFACE XV The opinion of Father Pedo Murillo Vearde on the Americans’ accomplishment in literature is sought and revealed.
PREFACE XVI Several Mexicans are shown to be illustriously learned, of those who are renowned and well known from former times and our own.
PREFACE XVII We continue the argument just advanced and add a coda.
PREFACE XVIII Themes on which Mexicans have written are briefly indicated and presented in a summary.
PREFACE XIX What verdict may be given about the learning of the Indians after they began to be cultivated by Spanish letters.
PREFACE XX The title of the *Bibliotheca Mexicana* is revealed and defended from objections.)
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